UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 111—PART 9

MAY 25, 1965, TO JUNE 8, 1965
(PAGES 11453 TO 12894)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1965

J
11
.R
V. 111
pt. 7

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1965

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1965)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, whose mercy and love are from everlasting to everlasting: Coming at noontide to this altar of Thy grace, from all the tangled, winding paths our weary feet are treading, with so much that is unpredictable and unsure, unless our feet are to slip, we must be sure of Thee, even amid the flood of mortal ills prevailing. Preserve us, O Lord, for in Thee do we put our trust.

We come to lay our burdens and tasks before Thee, not that we may leave them there, but that we may carry them with gallant hearts, and that having seen what we are called to do and bear in the light of Thy promised power, and having received new strength and courage, we may find that even weights may be changed to wings, and that statutes may turn into songs, as we run and are not weary, and as we walk and are not faint.

We ask it in the name of the One whose promise never fails:

"Come unto Me, all ye who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 24, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 339) to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. From which side will the time necessary for the quorum call be taken?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time necessary for the quorum call be equally divided between the two sides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the time necessary for the quorum call will be equally divided. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] wishes to introduce a bill. I would be glad to yield to him whatever time he suggests he needs.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the Senator. I shall need only 2 or 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

A NEW WHEAT PRICE SUPPORT PROPOSAL

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a new wheat price support proposal which is simple but will provide the wheat producers of this country with the increased income they so badly need at this time.

In short, this bill will assure farmers complying with acreage allotments a blended price of at least $2 per bushel for their normal production. Minimum price support levels would be established at 50 percent of parity—presently $1.27½—or the 3-year average of the world price—about $1.30—whichever is the higher. The difference between this level and the $2 per bushel blended price would be paid directly to farmers through production payments from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Processors would be required to purchase wheat certificates for all wheat milled for domestic human consumption. These certificates would be priced at the difference between the minimum support level and 100 percent of parity, presently $2.55 per bushel. Receipts from the sales of certificates would, in large measure, finance the entire program.

No diversion payments would be made on the mandatory 11.1-percent reduction which wheat farmers must make in their plantings to comply with the program. Diversion payments would be available to those producers who reduced their plantings beyond the mandatory requirement, if the Secretary of Agriculture chose to make such a diversion program available. There would be no export certificate program under this bill.

While this proposal would provide much higher income to farmers, the cost to the Federal Government would be considerably less than the program now in effect for 1965. In no instance would the consumers be paying more than parity for the wheat—which by Government standards is only a fair price.

It has been my observation that objections to Federal farm programs have taken three forms: first, Government costs are too high; second, they are too complicated and difficult for farmers to understand and work with; and, third, the price protection provided for the farmer is too low. I think, Mr. President, that this proposal effectively meets all three of these objections.

Government costs under this bill would be held to a minimum. Assuming a minimum price support level of $1.30 and 85-percent farmer participation on a wheat crop of 1.2 billion bushels, the cost of payments to farmers would be $714 million.

Sales of certificates to processors should bring receipts of about $625 million. Thus, the net Government cost of this program, exclusive of any voluntary diversion payments, would be approximately $89 million. The assumed 85 percent participation is the same as for the 1965 wheat program which assures farmers a price of more than 30 cents per bushel less than they would receive under this proposal. Total wheat income would, under this bill, be increased by a minimum of $310 million above the estimated level for 1965.

Opponents, and even many well meaning supporters, of farm programs have often been heard to object to the complicated explanations and interpretations of farm legislation. This bill and the program established under it is extremely simple. It assures the farmer a minimum of $2 per bushel for his wheat and the only thing the producer must do to be eligible for program benefits is sign up for the program and plant within his acreage allotment. The program would be completely voluntary and anyone wishing could plant all the wheat he wanted and market it free of penalty. He would not, however, receive price support protection or price support payments.

The greatest objection farmers have to the present wheat certificate program is that the price assurance it accords farmers is grossly inadequate. This legislation would do much to correct this condition. As I have mentioned, the assured price level is $2 per bushel compared with $1.69¼ which farmers will receive under the 1965 program.

In addition, if the market price is above the minimum support level, the price to farmers will be proportionately higher. The higher quality wheats usually demand premium prices in the marketplace.

Mr. President, I cannot emphasize too strongly that the farmers of this country are facing problems of great magnitude. In a recent study made at the request of Senators McCarthy, McGovern, and myself, Dr. Walter Wilcox, of the Library of Congress, concluded that in the absence of farm price support programs net farm income in recent years would have been 52 percent lower. It is not difficult to conclude what the results would be if the farmers of this Nation were to suffer such an income loss. Similar conclusions have been reached by other noted farm economists who have studied this problem.

We hear much from those opposed to the present wheat program, and the several bills that have been introduced to modify and extend it, concerning how price support programs have fostered inefficiency on the farm, how they have cost us markets for our products, and how they have limited the chances for the farmer to make a decent living.

These people are largely opposed to any adequate, workable farm program. Let me state that if I thought the farmers of America could earn any kind of a decent living without the price support programs, I would be among the first to seek an end to them.

It is argued by some that if we permit cash wheat prices to seek the level of that provided by the world market, all of the wheat farmers' problems will disappear and farmers will be able to produce as much wheat as they desire. Little is said about what price level such markets would provide.

Currently the farm price equivalent to the world wheat price is about $1.25 per bushel and this price could go even lower in future years. World prices are not established in the marketplace. They are determined almost entirely by negotiated sales between various governments of the world. They are rigged prices that have little relationship to a free market.

The consumption of wheat in the United States today is only about 500 million bushels, which is almost identical with what it was 30 years ago. During this 30 years, farm efficiency has gone forward by leaps and bounds. Production per acre has more than doubled but, because of the ever-increasing costs of everything a farmer has to buy, costs of operation have risen sharply.

The changing food habits of the American public means that wheat producers have not experienced any increase in per capita consumption and can expect little in the future. This means we are going to have to continue to export more than half our production—even more than that if wheat farmers are to be able to increase their production.

Unlike Canada and all other surplus wheat producing nations of the world, the United States does not sell wheat to China and many other Communist countries where the great dollar market for wheat exists at present.

We have not been able to take advantage of much of this dollar market for wheat in Communist countries but we have expanded our markets substantially in other areas. Unfortunately, a sizable part of these sales have been for foreign currencies rather than U.S. dollars. We can expect to increase our markets even further if we put forth the necessary effort.

Mr. President, the bill we are offering today will, as I have pointed out, increase farm income and provide a simpler and more workable farm program. In the coming weeks this Congress will consider farm legislation that could well decide the economic future for millions of farmers and people in business related to or dependent upon agriculture. It will have an important bearing on our overall national economy.

Wheat is but one of many farm commodities which will be considered. I feel this bill offers the simplest, soundest approach yet offered as a solution to the problems facing the wheat-producing areas of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a technical explanation of the bill I have just introduced in behalf of myself and other Members of the Senate.

Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the bill to lay on the desk until the close of business on June 1 should any other Senators care to join as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation of the bill will be printed in the Record and the bill will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from North Dakota.

The bill (S. 2025) to provide for a voluntary wheat certificate program, under which the price of all wheat would be supported at not less than $2 per bushel, introduced by Mr. Young of North Dakota (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Explanation of Bill To Provide for a Voluntary Wheat Certificate Program, Under Which the Price of All Wheat Would Be Supported at Not Less Than $2 Per Bushel

This bill provides for a voluntary wheat price support and certificate program under which producers would receive price support of not less than $2 per bushel. It would—

1. Repeal existing provisions for marketing quotas;

2. Make permanent the provision for a minimum national acreage allotment of 49,500,000 acres;

3. Provide price support (a) through loans, purchases and other operations at not less than the higher of (i) the farm price equivalent of the previous 3-year average world market price, or (ii) 50 percent of parity; and (b) additional price support through payments to bring the total support level to not less than $2 per bushel and not more than parity;

4. Repeal provisions for acreage penalties for overplanting;

5. Require the special acreage reserve for old wheat farms to equal 1 million acres, change the formula for its apportionment, and provide for its apportionment only once (the increase to be reflected in future allotments to the farms receiving such increases);

6. Permit producers of excess wheat to store their excess and qualify for price support, and (on other farms) for diversion payments;

7. Repeal existing provisions for issuance of marketing certificates to producers and require processors to obtain certificates valued at the difference between the loan value and parity for wheat processed for domestic food consumption;

8. Permit the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates;

9. Repeal the provision for monetary penalties for producing crops on acreage required to be diverted from wheat;

10. Extend the wheat diversion payment program permanently (but restricted to the acreage diverted in excess of the acreage required to be diverted) with a mandatory payment rate equal to 50 percent of the normal production of the acreage diverted; and

11. Increase the minimum CCC resale price for wheat to 115 percent of the current support price, plus reasonable carrying charges.

Under the bill, acreage allotments would be proclaimed every year. The amount of the national acreage allotment would be the larger of 49,500,000 acres, or the acreage needed to meet the production objective, which could not be less than 1 billion bushels. It would be apportioned among States, counties, and farms as provided by existing law, except that no loss of history would result from the overplanting or underplanting of allotments. Marketing certificates would not be issued to producers as under existing law, but producers would receive price support at approximately the world value through loan or similar operation and additional support through payments to bring the total support level to not less than $2 and not more than parity. Processors would continue to be required to obtain marketing certificates as at present, except that no certificates would be required on exports and the certificate value would be increased to the difference between the loan level and parity. The President could suspend the requirement that processors acquire certificates to the extent that he determined such suspension would contribute to effectuation of the purposes of the act.

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

Repeal of marketing quota authority—extension of 49.5-million-acre minimum allotment

Section 1 repeals the existing provisions for wheat marketing quotas, and continues in effect the minimum national acreage allotment of 49.5 million acres.

Subsection (a) provides that, instead of proclaiming marketing quotas when the supply would otherwise be excessive, the Secretary shall determine a production objective each year and proclaim a national acreage allotment designed to achieve it. The formula for determining the production objective would be the same as the present formula for determining the amount of the marketing quota, and the national acreage allotment would be the same as under existing law, except that, in addition to the 1 billion bushel minimum provided by existing law, this subsection would continue the 49.5-million-acre minimum which existing law makes applicable to 1965 only. The national acreage allotment would be apportioned to States, counties, and farms as provided by existing law, except that section 2 of the bill would prevent any history loss by reason of underplanting or overplanting in the same manner that the Agricultural Act of 1964 prevented such loss in 1965, and section 3 of the bill would provide a fixed acreage of 1 million acres for the special acreage reserve for old wheat farms created by the 1964 act. The formula for apportionment of the special reserve is changed to assure that the entire reserve can be apportioned. The special reserve would be apportioned only once, for the 1966 crop, but the apportionment in 1966 would be reflected in future allotments to the farms receiving increases in 1966. Acreage allotments could be increased as under existing law, but the existing provision for termination is deleted.

Subsection (b) repeals Public Law 74, 77th Congress, which deals with wheat marketing penalties, and amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 by striking out section 336 which deals with the marketing quota referendum, section 338 which deals with transfers of farm marketing quotas, and provisions in various other sections which have no meaning in the absence of marketing quotas. Paragraphs (8) and (9) of Public Law 74, which deal, respectively, with rice marketing penalties and support for the 1941 through 1946 crops are obsolete, and their repeal merely strikes out ineffective provisions. Rice marketing penalty rates are now established by section 356 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Subsection (c) makes changes in headings in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 required by the deletion of quota provisions.

Acreage penalty repeal

Section 2 makes permanent those provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1964 which prevented any loss of State, county, or farm acreage history in 1965 as a result of overplanting or underplanting allotments.

Subsection (a) prevents such loss of history in the case of the State allotment. The proviso to be amended by subsection (a) was added by section 202 (1) of the Agricultural Act of 1964.

Subsection (b) prevents such loss of history in the case of the county allotment. The proviso to be amended by subsection (b) was added by section 202(2) of the Agricultural Act of 1964.

Subsection (c) prevents such loss of history at the farm level in the same manner as was provided for 1965 by section 202(3) of the Agricultural Act of 1964.

Subsection (d) complements subsections (a) and (b) by making changes in section 334(g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 necessary to assure that States and counties do not lose history as a result of the overplanting of farm allotments.

Million-acre special acreage reserve

Section 3 would amend the special acreage reserve provisions added to section 334(a) by the Agricultural Act of 1964. Under the amendment, the special acreage reserve would be a flat 1 million acres which would be provided only for the 1966 crop. There would be no specific limitation based on a percentage of the average ratio of wheat acreage allotment to cropland, but the Secretary would be given broad discretion and could provide for an appropriate limitation based on the ratio of allotment to cropland so long as it did not prevent apportionment of the entire 1 million-acre reserve. The acreage history of States, counties, and farms would be adjusted so that the relative advantage of the increases provided in 1966 from the reserve would be maintained in subsequent years. Similar increases in acreage history would be made for farms which received no increase or an inadequate increase from the reserve in 1966 because, under their crop rotation system, their allotment for 1966 was zero, or otherwise disproportionately low when compared to their allotments for other years.

Wheat price support through loans, direct payments without marketing certificates, and other operations

Section 4 repeals the existing provisions for the issuance of marketing certificates to producers and for certificate and noncertificate support prices. It provides instead for (1) price support through loans (or similar operations not including payments) at the higher of the world price or 50 percent of parity, plus (2) payments in an amount sufficient to bring the total support level to not less than $2 per bushel and not more than parity.

Subsection (a) amends section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, repealing the existing provisions for a domestic marketing certificate support level, an export certificate support level, a noncertificate support level, and the support level when marketing quotas are not proclaimed or are disapproved. In lieu of these provisions subsection (a) provides for—

1. Price support through loans and other operations (not including payments) at a level equal to the higher of (i) the U.S. farm price equivalent of the average world market price of wheat during the immediately three preceding marketing years, or (ii) 50 percent of parity; and

2. Additional price support through payments to bring the total support to not less than $2 per bushel and not more than parity.

The additional support would be paid on the basis of the normal production of the acreage allotment and would be shared by the producers on the farm in the same proportion that they share in the wheat produced on the farm.

At present price support is not made available in the noncommercial area if a commercial area is established, but marketing certificates are made available in that area. Since direct payments would replace marketing certificates under this bill, subsection (a) provides that support through loans would not be available in the noncommercial area, but that price support payments would be made in such area on such basis as the Secretary may determine to be equitable.

Section 202(13) of the Agricultural Act of 1964 amended section 379c(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 effective for the 1965 crop only to permit producers exceeding their allotments to qualify for marketing certificates, but not for diversion payments, by storing their marketing excess in accordance with the Secretary's regulations. The existing definition of "cooperator" extends this provision by reference to permit such producers to qualify for price support. Since this bill would repeal all provisions relating to the issuance of marketing certificates to producers, including section 379c, the provision permitting producers to store their excess and qualify for price support has been incorporated by section 4(a) of the bill into the price support provisions. Section 4(a) also makes this provision permanent, extends it to permit a producer who stores his excess produced on one farm to qualify for diversion payments on another farm, and makes other technical changes required by the repeal of provisions for marketing quotas and marketing certificates.

Subsections (b) and (c) repeal existing provisions for the issuance of marketing certificates to producers. Under the bill price support payments would take the place of certificates, and achieve the same purpose in a much simpler manner.

Processors required to acquire marketing certificates unless such requirement is suspended—Certificates not required on exports

Section 5 would fix the face value of marketing certificates required to be acquired by processors at the difference between the support level (not including the additional support made through payments) and parity. It further would authorize the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates. This section also repeals the requirement that exporters acquire marketing certificates for wheat exported by them, since it is the purpose of the bill that wheat move freely into export. The President might suspend the requirement that processors acquire certificates either in whole or in part. If he determined, for instance, that the regulation of commerce would be better served by requiring the processors to acquire certificates for a part of the wheat processed by them, he could so provide. The suspension might be for an entire marketing year or a shorter or longer period, as determined by the President.

Repeal of monetary penalties for production on diverted acres

Section 6 repeals the provision for monetary penalties for producing crops on acreage required to be diverted from wheat. Producers would continue, however, to be subject to loss of eligibility for wheat price support if they produced crops on such acreage. The Agricultural Act of 1964 made similar provision with respect to the 1964 and 1965 crops.

Extension of wheat acreage diversion payment program

Section 7 extends the authority for a wheat acreage diversion payment program permanently (but limits it to the acreage diverted in excess of the acreage required to be diverted by section 339(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938) and provides for a mandatory payment rate if such a program is promulgated equal to 50 percent of the support price (not including payments) times the normal production of the acreage diverted from wheat.

Minimum Commodity Credit Corporation sales price

Section 8 increases the minimum price at which Commodity Credit Corporation may sell wheat to 115 percent of the current support price, plus reasonable carrying charges. The existing law provides that (1) for 1964 and 1965 the minimum CCC sales price is 105 percent of the current support price for wheat unaccompanied by marketing certificates, and (2) beginning July 1, 1966, the minimum CCC sales price would be 105 percent of the current support price for wheat accompanied by certificates.

Effective date

Section 9 would make the bill effective with the 1966 crop. If allotments were established for the 1966 crop before passage of the bill, they would be effective without further action.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the pending amendment has only one purpose, and that is to require the Attorney General, in the first instance, to go to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia rather than to enable the findings by the Attorney General to trigger off the use of Federal registrars. I should like to point out that under the bill, when the Attorney General makes a finding that a test or a device is being used, and the Director of the Census finds certain statistics to be present, the use of Federal registrars would automatically be triggered.

That course can be circumvented if the affected State or political subdivision comes into the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and seeks to obtain a declaratory judgment declaring that actually there will be no discrimination in the future.

I suggest to Senators that that is a most unusual procedure. In fact, according to the record, I have not been able to find anywhere any similar use of a triggering device by the Congress before.

The proposal is not quite an ex post facto law, although that term has been used against it. The reason is that ex post facto laws relate only to criminal matters. This is not a criminal matter; it is a civil matter. But I suggest to Senators that as long as we are used to judicial procedure, it seems to me that we ought to follow it.

That point was debated and discussed on the floor of the Senate on several occasions. It appears in the RECORD for April 22 on page 8297. At that time the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] asked the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] a question, after calling attention to the fact that in certain communities the question of discrimination is to be passed upon by a court:

> Mr. ELLENDER. Then, why was not that same provision made applicable to other parts of the bill, wherein it is left to the Attorney General to make the decision upon showing that a certain percentage of those of voting age or those who are registered do not vote? Why is that left to the Attorney General instead of leaving it to the courts?
>
> Mr. MANSFIELD. In some areas where the facts support it, Congress, I hope, will assume the responsibility by making the legislative finding upon which this bill is founded; in the other less difficult areas the courts have assumed it and will continue to have the responsibility.
>
> Mr. ELLENDER. Is that the only reason?
>
> Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the reason.

On page 6, commencing with line 19, the star print substitute amendment provides:

> A determination or certification of the Attorney General or of the Director of the Census under this subsection or under section 6 shall be final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

At pages 8298–8299 of the RECORD for April 22, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] asked:

> Is the effect of that language such that a finding of the Attorney General or of the Director of the Census, when published in the Federal Register, becomes nonappealable, with no way of reviewing it by appeal or certiorari?
>
> Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Later, we read:

> Mr. HOLLAND. It is upon that finding that these registrars are to be appointed. That finding is to be made beyond the reach of any appeal to any court, either the circuit court of appeals or the U.S. Supreme Court, if I correctly understand the distinguished Senator.
>
> Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Still later:

> Mr. HOLLAND. I ask the Senator if I understood him correctly to say that the reason he had no objection to the proposed delegation of such high authority to the Attorney General by leaving his finding not subject to any appeal was that the Senator would be willing to abide by the discretion of the Attorney General to do either the right or the wrong thing.
>
> Mr. MANSFIELD. That is it in part.

At page 8301 of the RECORD for the same day, we read:

> Mr. HART. Statistical experience demonstrates that, where there is a coincidence of (a) the use of tests or devices with (b) low registration and voting and (c) a substantial Negro population, there is a strong probability that the low registration and voting are the result of racial discrimination in the use of the tests.

In the committee report on the bill, at page 13, we read:

> The record before the committee leaves no doubt that, where the three factors described above are present—

Those are the factors to which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] referred—

> low electoral participation is almost always the result of racially discriminatory use of tests and devices.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The 5 minutes yielded to himself by the Senator from Iowa have expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself another minute.

The point is this: According to the manager of the bill and according to the committee, when these factors are present, there is a strong probability of discrimination, but there is no conclusive probability. My amendment seeks to require a determination of the conclusiveness of discrimination by requiring the Attorney General to go to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. If he showed that those factors were present, my amendment provides that he would have a prima facie case. It would then be necessary for the State or political subdivision to go into court and rebut that presumption. That might be a difficult problem; but at least there would be an opportunity to appear before the court. My amendment would require the following judicial procedure to be followed——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the pending amendment will be rejected. In our judgment, it affects materially an important feature of the bill. As the Senator from Iowa has properly described it, it would leave to the court the determination of the accuracy of the presumption which is established under section 4 when those figures are shown. We believe it is far more desirable, in the light of history and in the light of the circumstances which bring us to this moment in history——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Michigan suspend his remarks until order is obtained in the Senate? The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we feel strongly that this is the feature that has been retained throughout the development of the bill: that the presumption which Congress can fix should be maintained until a State or a political subdivision has convinced the district court that in its particular case the rule is inapplicable. This is the key to the amendment that is pending. It is the key feature of the bill that the leadership has developed. For that reason, we hope that the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself a minute and a half.

I point out to the Senator from Michigan that my amendment would not hamstring anybody. I ask the Senator, What is wrong with giving the presumption of discrimination to the Attorney General if he comes into the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and produces statistics? What is wrong with that procedure? Why is the Senator from Michigan reluctant to require the Attorney General to come into the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and present statistics to show a presumption of discrimination and thus make a prima facie case? Why should the Senator ask for any more? I cannot understand why the committee or the Senator from Michigan should insist upon a triggering device which requires only a finding by the Attorney General.

Under the present Attorney General, perhaps there will be an adequate determination; but Senators know that the words show that only a presumption, only a probability, would be required; it would not be conclusive.

My amendment seeks to give the court an opportunity to determine how conclusive the presumption is. If the Senator from Michigan can show the Senate any other situation in which this procedure has been used, I should like to hear about it. I can cite one. In income tax cases, if the Internal Revenue Service determines a certain amount to be due, the taxpayer had better go to court to settle the case. But that is not true of millions of taxpayers.

Under the present measure, 30 or 40 States or 30 or 40 counties might be involved. There is no excuse for such a procedure. I hope my amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield as much of my remaining time as he may require to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Iowa will be rejected. What he proposes to do is to change the entire approach and the entire concept of the bill.

First, he would strike out entirely the triggering approach, over which we have labored so long and earnestly in the hope of expediting some of the so-called denial and abridgment cases.

The Senator from Iowa would leave it to the Attorney General to institute suits in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia if there were any indication that the voting right had been denied. The Attorney General, on request, could then have a three-judge court. But having obtained it, the rest of the bill provides that there is a presumption of denial or a presumption that the right to vote is abridged, when it has actually been established in court.

That would be an interminable business. The only result would be a continuous series of lawsuits in that court, because one would start with the presumption and then come to the proof. In every case, the Attorney General would be exactly where he is now in the enforcement of the rights of citizens when the voting privilege has been denied.

That is the reason why the amendment ought to be defeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], as modified, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended (No. 124), offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 66, as follows:

[No. 83 Leg.]

YEAS—30

Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Curtis
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Hickenlooper

Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long, La.
McClellan
Miller
Mundt
Robertson

Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—66

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Case
Clark
Cooper

Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Inouye

Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara

Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Muskie

Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff

Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—4

Cannon
Carlson

Church

McGovern

So Mr. MILLER's amendment, as modified, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended (No. 124), offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if I am in order, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. According to the unanimous-consent agreement, the time from now until 1 p.m. will be divided equally between the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield one-half minute to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to S. 1564 and ask unanimous consent that it be considered as having been read under rule XXII.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield a quarter of a minute to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to S. 1564, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered as having been read under rule XXII.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 15 seconds to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask unanimous consent that it be considered as having been read under rule XXII.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 15 seconds to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

"THE LAND WE LOVE"—INSPIRING MOTION PICTURE PRODUCED BY WARNER BROS.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, greatly intensified awareness is being shown of late in the rare treasures bestowed upon this land in the form of scenic wonders and an extraordinary range of natural beauty.

The Congress and the executive branch, especially in the past couple of years, have undertaken a commendable variety of programs to preserve and perpetuate this precious heritage.

The magnificence of America is emphatically brought home to our people in a motion picture produced by one of the Hollywood film industry's true giants and an outstanding patriot, Col. Jack L. Warner, who over many years, and through hundreds of notable productions, consistently has demonstrated his devotion to our Nation. The wide range of Warner Bros. films repeatedly has depicted the cavalcade of history and progress, our bountiful resources and opportunities, and America's incomparable scenic beauty.

The appeal of the United States is vividly presented in a new Warner picture appropriately entitled "The Land We Love," which was produced for the Treasury Department. Offering an inspiring view of the whole vast panorama of America, this picture enlisted cooperation of the entire motion picture industry. With the 50 separate States occupying the role of individual stars, the settings are the mountains and valleys, the deserts and streams, the cities and towns that constitute America. The drama is the dynamic story of a Nation.

Ably narrated by Raymond Massey and designed to stimulate public interest in U.S. savings bonds, "The Land We Love" will enchant viewers by spectacular views of this country's wonderland. I commend Jack Warner for its production. I am confident this film will stir pride in and appreciation for our great Republic by our people.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

(Mr. FULBRIGHT introduced, by request, a bill, which appears elsewhere in the RECORD.)

(Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted a matter for the body which appears elsewhere in the RECORD.)

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 161

Mr. ERVIN. I call up my amendment No. 161, as modified, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as modified, to the substitute by Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. DIRKSEN (No. 124), as follows:

On page 10, lines 12 and 13, strike out the words "such additional allegations, including."

On page 10, line 16, insert the words "on account of his race or color" between the word "law" and the comma.

On page 10, lines 16 and 17, change the comma to a period and strike out the words "as the Attorney General may require."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. It merely makes certain that in applying for registration before a Federal examiner the application must state that the applicant——

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. The time will not come out of the Senator's time.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, this amendment merely makes it plain that an application to a Federal examiner must contain an allegation that within 90 days preceding the application which has been filed the applicant has been denied under color of law the opportunity to register or to vote or has been found not qualified to vote by a person acting under color of law on account of his race or color.

In its present form, this provision, according to existing decisions, is unconstitutional. This amendment merely tries to make it constitutional, if the proponents desire it to so be.

COINAGE OF SILVER DOLLARS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes to discuss another matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, along with other western Senators, I have repeatedly urged on the floor of the Senate that the silver dollar be preserved as a coin of traditional usage in Montana and in other States. Our sole object in advocating the minting of additional cartwheels has been to keep the coin alive and circulating, at least in our States. Just recently the President announced that he would honor the commitment which the Treasury Department had made to the Congress and order the minting of 45 million silver dollars. I was more than pleased along with other western Senators. That is, we were pleased until it was revealed shortly after his announcement that some dealers in coins were already offering "$5 each for any of the 45 million cartwheels ordered last week to be minted by President Johnson." This revelation was carried in the Wall Street Journal of May 24, 1965.

I noted further in a news story in the Denver Post of last week:

> One Treasury official said he had seen the still unminted dollars advertised for sale at $7.50 apiece. A Washington, D.C., coin dealer said one promoter was guaranteeing delivery of bags of 1,000 new silver dollars for $2,500 a bag.

I also noted, according to the American Metal Market of May 18, 1965:

> Some dealers have given a tentative value of $5 to the new 1964-dated cartwheels.

I have since seen advertisements in magazines and newspapers to the effect that orders were being accepted for silver dollars, now, at $28 per roll in two-bag lots. I have seen figures quoting $2.25 apiece for new silver dollars.

This information has disturbed me deeply since my sole purpose in advocating an additional minting of silver dollars was to serve the needs and traditions of the people of my State.

It is never easy to march up the hill and down again. But it is now apparent that a minting of silver dollars in their present form and at this time will not serve the people of Montana. It is, therefore, with deep regret that I must recognize on the basis of information which has reached me relative to prices already being bid for the new silver dollars that to persist in a new coinage at this time will serve only to enrich a few speculators and hoarders without, in any way, promoting what we seek; that is, the free and useful circulation of the cartwheel.

Beyond hoarding, the difficulty arises, in part, from the increasing value of silver itself. Further, the Treasury Department advises that only 5 million cartwheels can be minted at Denver before the end of the present fiscal year when the congressional authority to mint is due to expire. And if only 5 million in new dollars were released this year, the speculator's price would rise to a scandalous $15 or $25 or more for each coin. Certainly there would be no free circulation of silver dollars in my State or in other States like mine.

I want to say that I appreciate the attitude of the President and the Treasury Department, as expressed in their willingness to go ahead on the basis of the congressional authority. The Department has been completely frank with the interested western Senators. Treasury officials, however, have now laid the facts on the line as to what will happen if this mintage occurs. In the circumstances and after consultation with Treasury officials yesterday around noon, a consultation attended by my distinguished colleagues Senators METCALF, BIBLE, and CANNON, I feel that the only honest course is to sustain the action of the Treasury Department in stopping the minting of silver dollars at this time and we so informed them.

This does not end, however, the effort to restore the cartwheel to actual circulation and usage. That effort to preserve a useful coin and a worthy tradition will continue.

It is clear that the problem which confronts us now with respect to the silver dollar is a conspicuous part of the problem involving all silver coins. Sooner or later a basic change is going to have to come in the content of all money containing this metal. I have been assured by Treasury officials that, in this context, the dollar piece—which is just as valid as a medium of exchange as a half dollar, a quarter or a dime—will not be overlooked. I fully expect, therefore, that at a more appropriate time, the minting of cartwheels with a drastically reduced silver content and in sufficient supply will be undertaken to insure the circulation of this coin. As I have said many times, it is the symbol which is important, not the amount of silver contained in the coin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the present, however, because of the clear evidence of widespread speculation even before the silver dollars are minted and because of my strong belief that none of these dollars if they were minted now would ever go into circulation in the State of Montana and any other State, I feel that there is no alternative but to withdraw my support for the minting of silver dollars at this time. In the context of a general revision of all silver coins, however, I shall continue to work for the retention of the cartwheel.

I ask unanimous consent that a press report released by the Treasury Department on yesterday be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DECIDES AGAINST PRODUCING SILVER DOLLARS

> The Treasury today announced that it has decided against the minting of any new silver dollars at this time.
>
> Last year, in response to a Treasury request, Congress appropriated $600,000, an amount sufficient to manufacture 45 million silver dollars.
>
> To carry out the expressed intent of the Congress, the Treasury recommended to the White House that the U.S. Mint be authorized to begin production. It was on this recommendation that the White House announced May 15, that production could begin.
>
> Since that time, however, Members of the Congress who, by reason of their committee assignments, have a direct and responsible interest in U.S. coinage, have strongly urged the Treasury not to proceed with the production of these dollars. After conferring with the White House, the Treasury has therefore determined that the mint will not make any of these dollars at this time.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is time that we have an end to the vacillation and indecision that has characterized the Treasury Department's policy on silver and silver coinage. The Treasury, it seems, is deciding its policy with a flip of the silver coin.

This latest reversal on the question of minting silver dollars is a glaring example. The production of 45 million silver dollars authorized by Congress last year has been an on-again, off-again operation since October of 1964. News last week that it was an on-again situation so late in the fiscal year came as somewhat of a surprise to me, and although I fully support keeping the silver dollar as an honorable part of our coinage, my enthusiasm was somewhat restrained.

When I learned yesterday in a conference with fellow western Senators and Treasury officials that no more than 5 million could be minted before the fiscal appropriation expired, I knew it would be foolhardy to go into production. We would merely have created a speculator's paradise.

I have maintained throughout the consideration of the coinage problem in general and the silver dollar problem in particular that we must have a policy of unlimited minting to put public faith into our coins. I have stated repeatedly that 45 million silver dollars would not be enough. I have warned consistently since 1963 that we must protect our silver reserves and adopt a firm policy with regard to silver coinage.

Congress has experienced first indifference then delay with the Treasury. We still await Treasury recommendations on a sound silver and coinage policy.

Without the benefit of firsthand experience and advice from the Treasury, many of us in Congress have been forced to move ahead independently. We now have various bills directed at the problem but it remains difficult to proceed.

I have cosponsored a bill in the current session to reduce the silver content of our coins. Just last week, following the on-again announcement on silver dollar production, I introduced a bill designed to head off the speculators and hoarders who have driven the silver dollar out of circulation and who have contributed to the general shortage of silver coins.

As much as I champion the silver dollar, I must now support the decision to withhold their production under existing circumstances. I will continue to champion the silver dollar, but I would oppose any attempt to mint a small number of them until we have attacked the silver and silver coinage problem as a whole.

I call again for a firm statement of policy from the Treasury. I call again for action to examine the amount of silver to be carried in our coinage. I call again for legislation to put an end to the spiraling speculation and hoarding that magnifies the problems as we attempt to solve them.

Mr. President, on last Friday, I introduced a bill, S. 2012, and made a statement on the overall question of hoarding and speculation, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement which I made at that time on May 21, 1965, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Prohibition of Certain Practices Which Create Artificial Shortages in the Supply of U.S. Coins

Mr. Bible. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit certain practices creating artificial shortages in the supply of coins of the United States.

Last Saturday President Johnson directed the mint to proceed with turning out 45 million silver dollars. In his statement he said substantial progress in bringing the supply of small coins into line with demand had been made and that it had always been his intention to carry out the congressional mandate to mint the silver dollars.

I was pleased to learn of the President's order for I know the people of Nevada have a strong affection for the silver dollar and hard money. It has been an honorable medium of exchange in the State of Nevada since the State became a member of the Union. Other States in the West also share this interest. Nevertheless, I realize, without unlimited coinage of the silver dollars, shortages could soon develop and a need for protection of the dollar and other silver coins is necessary to keep them from being made collectors' items, or falling into the hands of speculators and hoarders.

If enacted into law, the bill I am proposing will amend several existing statutes. It also provides penalties for violations of the several provisions which follow:

First. To melt silver coins.

Second. To make loans on coins where the coins are held as security, except loans on bona fide collections of rare coins.

Third. To accumulate coins in excess of the reasonable demands of business or personal use.

Fourth. To export coins from the United States or its possessions.

Fifth. For the purchase and sale of coins, except where coins are used in jewelry, for a price in excess of their monetary value. Again, the bill would protect and exempt coins which, because of their rarity, have a value to bona fide collectors.

The bill would cause the Treasury Department to publish in the Federal Register from time to time a list of coins deemed to be of numismatic value.

Mr. President, since the order was given to the mint to start production of silver dollars, many interesting comments have been made by the press and others.

It is the general supposition that the minting of only 45 million silver dollars will, in effect, further the shortage of the Treasury's supplies of silver stocks and that the dollars will soon be gobbled up by the speculators and will never get into the channels of trade. These allegations certainly are worthy of note for they could become a reality if we do not act to protect our coinage system.

The House Committee on Government Operations has devoted a great deal of time and thought to the Treasury's crash program of minting coins and silver and its relation to coin production. Hearings were held during March of this year by the committee. In addition, the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee have all given study and thought to the problem of the coin shortage. It is my contention that no true shortage exists; however, I am well aware as are others that serious dislocations have occurred and hoarding and speculating have caused artificial shortages which have become real shortages in the commercial channels of trade.

I am hopeful that this bill will aid in a return of some of our coins to the channels of trade and to the banking facilities which serve our trade needs.

In the 6 fiscal years 1959–64, population increased by 8 percent; the gross national product increased by 28 percent; and vending machine sales increased by 47 percent. However, reliable these indicators may be of economic growth, they did not prove adequate standards for measuring coin demand. Coin production by the mint increased 174 percent, far exceeding growth in these indicators without preventing—or fully stopping—the shortage of coins.

I am happy to note that the flowback of coins to the Federal Reserve banks has increased in recent months. Irrespective of all the reasons advanced for the shortage of coins, it is my belief that speculation and hoarding of coins are mainly responsible for creating an artificial shortage. I believe such practice should be curtailed and stopped. It was of more than passing interest to me to read in the report issued by the House Government Operations Committee the following:

"Some further conception of sizes of hoards is reflected in an article in the Wall Street Journal for January 14, 1965, which reports that a bank has loaned speculators $1.1 million, secured by 34 tons of silver coins, and expressed a willingness to make more such loans."

My bill would stop such practices and they should be stopped.

Further evidence was given in the report, as follows:

"Some measure of the quantities held by speculators is evident from advertisements placed in coin publications. One recently contained ads of 53 dealers and 69 individuals who offered in quantities exceeding $100,000 in asking price, and some are offered by the ton. For instance, 1 ton ($33,333) of common date silver dollars is offered for $39,995 or 3 tons (6,000 pounds), for $119,995."

I am certain this body realizes our coinage system should be protected and that such practices as just mentioned should not be permitted to continue. This is no more than a black market in silver dollars which was pointed out by the senior Senator from Ohio before this body on January 6 of this year when he introduced legislation designed to stop black market practices. To those who may have missed remarks of the distinguished Senator from Ohio which were made as a basis for his bill, S. 718, I wish to quote from the record a portion of his statement which included the reading of an advertisement as follows:

"Who has all the coins? Even 'Pep' the coin man doesn't know. But he can alleviate your banks' coin shortage with all denominations of coins at a small handling charge which includes delivery of wrapped and boxed coin. What's the handling charge? Call me now at (609) 662–6644 (Camden, N.J.), (215) 925–8981 (Philadelphia, Pa.)."

It is common knowledge that some business houses have paid premiums for certain types of coins during recent shortages. These coins have originated from speculators, who have in many instances made contacts with those who are engaged in services where large amounts of coins are collected, such as the vending machine operator, distributors of newspapers, and various other similar activities. It has even been stated that some businessmen have sought to alleviate the shortage of coins by asking churches to turn over their collections to them.

My bill would make it a criminal offense to deal in the sale of coins in this manner.

The mint has more than doubled its volume in production of small coins during the past few years. This operation has in part alleviated the artificial shortage. Nevertheless, the mint needs assistance in controlling this problem. The larger amounts of coins which are necessary to our commerce are or should be in the channels of commerce. It is the flowback of coins to the Federal Reserve banks which is the nub of the problem and which needs correcting. I stated the flowback of coins had been increasing in recent months and I am hopeful it continues to increase. Precautions which can be taken by provisions in my bill will, I believe, step up the flow back.

In turn the Federal Reserve will have more coins to offer member banks who in turn usually serve other banking facilities and our coins will return to circulation.

It is apparent to me that we would still have a plentiful supply of silver dollars in the West if the historic run on the Treasury had not been made in early 1964 by the speculators and hoarders.

Silver dollars have not been minted since 1935 and according to the Treasury's circulation statement of U.S. money the stock of silver dollars consisted of 481,722,100 as of May 31, 1964—including 2,945,754 held by the Treasury, and 49,242 held by the Federal Reserve banks and agents. The outflow of silver dollars during the period 1954–59 from the Treasury stocks averaged 16,298,547 per year. During the same period the Federal Reserve System had a net increase of

4,559,676 silver dollars. This indicates there was not an excessive demand for the period 1954–59. However, net losses of Treasury stocks of silver dollars increased in 1960 to 20,096,777; in 1961 losses were 33,685,557; 1962 losses were 49,726,664 and in 1964 when the run was made on the Treasury by speculators losses soared to 62,817,320. The Federal Reserve banks suffered additional losses and the Treasury wound up with virtually no stocks at all except for a few valued rare dollars which remain today in the Treasury stocks.

The present price of silver does not make it profitable to melt silver dollars. Silver certificates can be redeemed for silver bullion at the Government's assay offices and it is pointless at this time to melt coins to extract the silver content. This is common knowledge, yet some speculators may feel the time will come when an advantage will exist. This speculation should be stopped, and my bill will make it a criminal charge to melt coins.

The latest Treasury statement shows the U.S. Government is still the owner of the world's largest stock of silver and holds more than 1 billion ounces. The total is actually 1,025,957,304.3 troy ounces.

It is my contention if we can by pursuing the course outlined in my bill, enact legislation which will cause a flow back of coins, the amount of Treasury stocks of silver will still permit the continuing use of silver in our traditional coinage system.

I fully realize world supplies and production have not in recent years met the demand of industry. At the same time, there are some promising silver discoveries and if a more realistic price was paid to the miner, I sincerely believe the production could be increased.

I want to see silver continued in our coinage system. It may be necessary to take steps to lessen the amounts now used in the silver coins, although I believe we should first attack this problem of speculation which has been permitted to exist for too long.

The Acting President pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2012) to prohibit certain practices creating artificial shortages in the supply of coins of the United States, introduced by Mr. Bible, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to reintroduce that bill, S. 2012, on behalf of myself, the Senators from Montana [Mr. Mansfield and Mr. Metcalf], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2036) to prohibit certain practices creating artificial shortages in the supply of coins of the United States, introduced by Mr. Bible (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, when I introduced my bill (S. 2012) a few moments ago, I neglected to ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 10 days for those who may wish to cosponsor it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will lie on the desk for 10 days for cosponsors, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I completely concur with my colleagues as to the silver policy which has been adopted. The minting of 5 million silver dollars would have meant merely a windfall for collectors and speculators.

We in Montana, in Nevada, and other areas of the West, would like to see silver dollars in circulation. We would like to have a silver policy which would put silver coins in circulation. We look forward to a report from the Treasury Department which would provide for the continued use of silver in our mometary system.

We do not care whether the silver content of a silver dollar is 90 percent silver and 10 percent bronze, or 50 percent silver and 50 percent bronze. We wish to see actual silver coins in circulation including the silver dollar. We acquiesced in the Department's decision because the minting of 5 million silver dollars would have meant diversion of silver from subsidiary coins, and a bonanza for collectors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, while I can understand some of the reasons advanced for delaying the minting of silver dollars in the face of evidence that these dollars would largely not enter the avenues of commerce as intended by the Congress, I wish to make clear that the delay will not in any way constitute an abandonment of congressional or administration determination to resume silver mintage at the earliest possible time.

I believe that we should not make the mistake of separating the problem of silver dollar mintage from the overall coin shortage.

A year ago, many of the Members of this body became alarmed at the growing crisis confronting the Nation's coinage system, in the growing wake of a serious depletion of our silver stocks.

Last April, I proposed to the administration that a series of steps be taken to preserve the vital and time-honored, silver-based coinage system which has served the Nation well since 1792. Among the steps I advocated—which have since been adopted by the administration—was the temporary suspension of new dates on coins, and a study in depth of the long-range effects of proposals to lower the silver content of coins.

It is true, Mr. President, that production of coins has doubled in the past 12 months, and that our maximum capacity is not yet reached. Yet, a production of 10 billion pieces of coin annually seems inadequate to the needs of a nation which is becoming increasingly automated in its commerce, with a vending machine industry approaching $4 billion a year, an increasing population, and a growing local and State demand for the coins needed to support sales taxes.

Still other steps are needed, including a subsidy for silver producers which would stimulate domestic production, steps to insure an adequate stockpile of coinable metals, and reopening of the mints at San Francisco and Carson City.

These are some of the proposals I made last year, together with an appeal to the President urging his administration to appeal directly to the American people to place their dust-gathering and hoarded coins into normal channels of commerce as a way of helping their country and responding to a serious national need.

This latter point has been partially fulfilled by Government and business cooperation, but it seems that altogether too many Americans, albeit a minority, do the very thing which they are asked by the Government not to do; hence, legitimate collecting of coins by numismatists is complicated by those who hoard coins by the bag. They are intent on easy profits through an artificially created shortage on the one hand, and on the other by speculation that the price of silver will increase sufficiently above its $1.29 per ounce level to a price which would make the melting down of coins a profitable venture.

For proof of this, we need to look no further than the silver dollar or the sad fate of the Kennedy half-dollars, 250 million of which have been minted; and yet their appearance in common business transactions is a rarity. We have witnessed the disappearance of our silver dollars, and we are now facing a growing shortage of half-dollars.

Mr. President, the activities of hoarders and speculators, I am convinced, cannot be curbed by purely voluntary appeals to their patriotism, ethics, morality, or sense of fairplay. Individuals who engage in these activities make the demand for coins a never-ending cry, and the fulfillment of that demand a bottomless pit. The appetite with which these coins are devoured may be but one manifestation of our affluent society. We cannot ignore, however, that a significant portion of the Nation's economy turns on coins.

The Congress will have to come to grips with the 1965 realities of our coinage system. I believe that we will overcome the shortage that exists through continued unlimited production of all coins which are in short supply.

I also believe that Congress, through appropriate committees, should begin consideration of various measures which already have been introduced to discourage hoarding, using coins as collateral on bank loans, melting down the coins for their silver content, and other practices which seriously aggravate our monetary system.

Above all, let us never succumb to the voices which would urge us to abandon the use of silver from a time-honored coinage system which has stood the test of time, dating back to 1792. This folly would indeed deal a tragic and fatal blow to our coinage system, and would lead to hoarding and speculating on a magnitude which would make such practices today pale by comparison.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I applaud my western colleagues for the position they are taking in the Senate today on the minting of silver dollars.

I appreciated their sincerity when previously—for the believed benefit of their States' economies—they would wish the traditional silver dollar minted by the million.

They are equally sincere today in recognizing the practical difficulties, dangers, and disadvantages entailed in the minting program the Treasury might have had in mind in carrying out the expressed intent of the Congress.

We would be playing into the pockets of the hoarders—doing nothing to help commercial coinage circulation—and doing irreparable harm to industries dependent on the use of silver—and the bread and butter jobs dependent on those industries.

Today's discussion performs a tremendous service. It points up the silver question in a fashion that must be understood by all Americans—East and West, North and South.

There just is not enough silver being produced in the free world to meet all our silver needs.

The free world production is only 225 million ounces of silver. The industrial requirements are 300 million ounces. These are divided among such employing industries as silverware and jewelry, electronics, photographic film, batteries, missiles, and medical and dental requirements.

There is a 25-percent deficit between consumption and production. There is no new production left for silver coinage—and the present Treasury stocks must be safeguarded to protect our present coinage.

Present coinage requirements alone threaten to exhaust our Treasury stocks in 3 years.

The price of silver rises each year—but the price rise does not stimulate production. Since producers outside the United States account for 85 percent of the total free world production, they would derive the major benefit from increased silver prices.

I hope the western Senators will now take a good look at the worldwide and long-range problem that silver proposes.

Their local desires, and pride and purposes, have my sympathy and my respect—just as I respect their present realization that only the speculator could profit from a piecemeal treatment of the silver situation.

Again I applaud my western colleagues for their straightforward action and declarations today; and I am sure we can move together for the best interests of the American people—American industry and the American worker.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I join my western colleagues in commending them for the statements which they have made on silver, which I heartily endorse.

VIETNAM—SPEECH OF SENATOR HARRIS BEFORE THE STATE CONVENTION OF THE OKLAHOMA BANKERS ASSOCIATION, TULSA, OKLA., MAY 7, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of a speech delivered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris] before the State convention of the Oklahoma Bankers Association, in Tulsa, Okla., on May 7, 1965.

I have studied the speech very carefully. It is addressed to the question of Vietnam. The Senator explores a series of myths which have tended to confuse the issues at stake in this grave situation.

His handling of those myths is so articulate that I am convinced that a reading of the speech by all Senators will benefit them, if they could share in the views the Senator from Oklahoma has expressed in his remarks.

I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech of Senator Fred R. Harris, Before the State Convention of the Oklahoma Bankers Association in Tulsa, Okla., May 7, 1965

I serve on the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations, and, as a Member of the Senate of the United States, have special responsibilities in the field of foreign affairs.

Though each of us, you and I, is deeply concerned about the Senate banking inquiry, the events now transpiring in southeast Asia and South Vietnam, and the actions of our Government there, may have far greater impact on our lives than all the banking inquiries put together.

So, I want to talk with you some about Vietnam. I support the President's policy there.

A respected Member of the Senate once made a speech on foreign policy called, old myths and new realities. I would like to plagiarize a little and on another subject, Vietnam, turn that title around to call these remarks new myths and old realities.

Many well-intentioned people, discussing the Vietnamese situation, have not been possessed of, or convinced of the facts there. Consequently, some new myths have gained currency in some sectors here at home and abroad.

Myth No. 1 is: "The United States has no business being involved in southeast Asia."

The reality is to the contrary. Since the French were forced out of Indonesia, and the Geneva Conference of 1954 divided it up into Laos, Cambodia, and North and South Vietnam, the Communists have made this area a principal arena of Communist aggression. The last Communist attempt to take over a free country by conventional military attack, Korea, failed.

Since then, the Communists have developed and are attempting to test the theory of what they call wars of national liberation, which in free-world terms means Communist aggression by terror and subversion, using local guerrillas to achieve external Communist ends. South Vietnam, particularly, and southeast Asia, generally, are the testing ground for this theory.

Control of southeast Asia has been the intent of many of history's major powers. It was for such control Japan started World War II. England fought a war for it. The Germans fought a war for it. The Dutch fought a war for it. The Portuguese fought a war for it. Senator Gale McGee, of Wyoming, has recently stated: "The hard fact is that it makes a difference who has southeast Asia, as to what kind of balance exists in the world." There are great resources there of rice, tin, oil, bauxite, and rubber. There are hordes of people there, entitled to be free, and there are seas and geographic areas essential to the independence of nations such as Japan.

China must not be allowed to achieve domination over this area without a struggle.

The United States is a major world power and must accept its responsibilities as such. Even in this space age, we cannot just say "stop the world and let me off." We cannot in this world of modern weapons, where there are no impregnable walls or defenses, put our hopes in a new isolationism and attempt to retreat to our own shores.

The reality, then, is that we do have business being involved in southeast Asia because our own peace and security are there involved, and preparedness and adequate, timely action in that area of the world are and will be required of us.

Myth No. 2: "South Vietnam is not important to the United States."

The reality is otherwise. Testing their new theory of "wars of liberation," the Communists have made South Vietnam the principal stage for their aggression. South Vietnam may be some 7,000 miles away, but it represents 15 million people to whom this country, under three Presidents, has made a solemn pledge of assistance in their continued struggle for freedom and independence.

True, this present type of warfare is against South Vietnam, but it is not restricted to that country alone. Should South Vietnam fall prey to communism, the impact of such a Communist victory in lesser developed countries of the free world would indeed be incalculable. New efforts of this type would be mounted, not only in other parts of southeast Asia, but in Africa and Latin America.

The success of this type of warfare in South Vietnam would also immeasurably strengthen the world's most aggressive Communist power, Communist China, in its twin theses that aggression pays off and that the United States is but a "paper tiger."

If we break the pledge of three Presidents to South Vietnam, how can other Asian nations and their peoples count on us in the future?

We must not only study history but learn from it. President Johnson on April 28 said, "This is the clearest lesson of our time. From Munich until today, we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and brings even more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of a lasting peace.'

How well we should remember the triumphant words of British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, in September of 1938, when he returned to England after his Munich conference with Hitler and Mussolini. He said, "For the second time in history, a British Prime Minister has returned from Germany bringing peace for our time. Go home and get a nice quiet sleep."

I prefer, instead, the words of realism of Winston Churchill, which proved so true: "The belief that security can be obtained by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion."

Myth No. 3: "We will eventually lose, and Communist China will inevitably control Asia."

I will not accept that as reality, and there is no need to. Even the Communists wish they could count on this myth as a reality. Our actions have rudely jarred their firm belief that it is so.

China has not actually controlled this area for most of the past 1,000 years, and will not, if free nations remain firm. Unquestionably, our hardened actions are getting results—in the morale and will to resist on the part of the South Vietnamese—in greater respect for America's will to do what it says and follow its commitments. Indeed, there are reports of new tensions in Hanoi itself. Reports which commence to indicate that the North Vietnamese themselves have become more and more split due to the tighter pressure we have placed upon them and there are increased and more serious bickerings between Communist China and the Soviet Union.

There is no question that China will continue to be influential, and increasingly influential, in Asia, but even dominance need not and must not mean domination.

President Johnson has said in answer to the myth of China's inevitable victory in southeast Asia, "There is no end to that argument until all of the nations of Asia are swallowed up."

But, to the pessimists and defeatists, I would say that in the long view of history, people who demonstrate their determination to fight to achieve and to maintain their freedom, remain free. We shall honor our commitment to help South Vietnam defend itself. With the free world's great strength and with our equally great determination, we shall remain free.

While holding out his offer for "unconditional discussions," the President has nevertheless issued a clear warning against Communist aggression. He said, "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw either openly, or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

Myth No. 4: "Vietnam is a civil war."

This is myth, not reality. Even Hanoi does not attempt to deny that it is actively supporting, assisting, and abetting the Vietcong in South Vietnam. Even they, when calling upon us to discuss peace terms with the National Liberation Front, which includes a few non-Communists as window dressing, but is overwhelmingly Communist-dominated and controlled, have stated that North Vietnam would have controlling numbers in any peace discussions. Most of the National Liberation Front leaders are residents in Hanoi.

Our intelligence information, statements of captured and defecting Vietcong members, clearly show the stepped-up and heavy infiltration of soldiers from North Vietnam into South Vietnam. As a matter of fact, in recent months Hanoi has begun to give direct radio signals, orders to units operating in South Vietnam, coordinating their numbers and concentration of targets.

Evidence shows that major regular army units from Hanoi are now operating in the south and that there has been wholesale importation of supplies and armaments brought in to the guerrillas. In recent battles, the Vietcong are found to be armed with weapons, 90 percent of which come from outside, mostly from China and Czechoslovakia and nearly 100 percent of the larger weapons from China. We stepped up our efforts in South Vietnam as the efforts of the North Vietnamese aggression were stepped up on the other side.

New though its tactics may be, the situation in Vietnam is not civil war, but outright aggression. As President Johnson has said, "The confused nature of this conflict cannot mask the fact that this is the new face of an old enemy. It is an attack by one country upon another. And the object of that attack is a friend to which we are pledged."

Myth No. 5: "South Vietnam is incapable of stable government."

First, let me say that there are truly nationalistic forces in South Vietnam who have not supported some or all of the governments there in recent time—young Turks in the military, some Catholic elements, some Buddhist elements, and some students. No one is happy with the "musical chair" approach which has been prevalent recently in South Vietnam's Government.

But let me say this: First of all, the only government the people of South Vietnam knew, before their own independent government was established, was that of France, which, at that time, was almost a model in its frequent changes for what has been taking place in the South Vietnamese Government. Furthermore, the South Vietnamese have had little chance for governmental stability. The Communists never intended to abide by the Geneva accord of 1954. They were supposed to pull back to the 17th parallel as the French left. Instead, they left arms caches, infiltrators, and guerrillas in the south, and took others to the north for training and eventual reentry. Immediately, they made plans for control of South Vietnam, which they felt was ready to fall like a ripe plum, but it has not been so. At first it was felt they would be successful in 6 months. Ten years have passed, and they have not been successful.

What chance for governmental stability is there in a country where local and national officials have been systematically murdered and kidnaped to the degree that, had such terroristic efforts been carried on in the United States in such proportion, it would have been the equivalent of killing 6,000 mayors and kidnaping 20,000 mayors here?

The people of South Vietnam seek freedom and independence. They have proved themselves courageous and hard working. Equally important, they are among the most persistent and determined people on the face of the earth. Any people which has taken so many casualties and gone on fighting, deserves the respect of the entire world. They are at least entitled to have their borders sealed off and achieve self-determination without outside aggression. The Quat government, now in power, has lasted longer than most. Every day it lasts, its chances of continuing are greater. The people of South Vietnam want to govern themselves; they are fighting for that right and we must help them.

Myth No. 6: "The people of South Vietnam are in sympathy with the Communist Vietcong."

Our evidence is very much to the contrary. The South Vietnamese now have approximately 500,000—one-half million—of their people as regular troops, fighting in the field against the Vietcong. Does this sound like support for the Vietcong? During the last 5 years, the South Vietnamese forces have suffered nearly 80,000 military and civilian casualties in fighting the Vietcong. In relation to their population, this would be equivalent to more than 1 million casualties for the United States. Does this sound like support for the Vietcong?

Despite dissension in past governments, no South Vietnamese Government leader has ever advocated bringing representatives of the Vietcong into the government.

Morale is clearly increasing among the people of South Vietnam because of our help and planned escalation of hostilities, as is plainly indicated by a cross section of press accounts from that area. There are other indications of improved morale in the south. More and more weapons are being captured by the South Vietnamese. More and more defectors are leaving guerrilla forces to return to their home and families. In many places the efforts in the south on our side have now shifted from offensive to defensive. And, very importantly, in 1 week recently it was reported that 8,000 South Vietnamese volunteered for service in the South Vietnamese Army. Not long ago we would have been talking about South Vietnamese deserters, instead of volunteers.

The South Vietnamese, by their own sacrifices, have so eloquently said that they do not support the Vietcong or want Communist domination, that this myth should not be given any responsible belief.

Myth No. 7: "The United States is going it alone in Vietnam."

This is not so. Thirty-three free world countries, including the United States, are providing, or have agreed to provide assistance to South Vietnam. A 2,000-man South Korean engineer battalion arrived in Saigon in mid-March. Last week, Australia announced it would soon dispatch an 800-man combat infantry battalion to South Vietnam. These two recent efforts are small in comparison to our own, more than 30,000 fighting men there, but they are most significant because they evidence a growing awareness by the people of Asia that this is basically their fight.

Many decry our efforts there and wish that the United Nations or some other multilateral organization might assume this heavy burden. I say: "Easier said than done."

There has been criticism of American efforts there without international organization approval. First, let me say that I was glad to see the approving action just last Wednesday by the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, and, second, let it be said that in the words of Senator GALE MCGEE of Wyoming:

"We have to live with our conscience. We have to do what we believe in our best judgment is right because it is right, not because we are trying to win a popularity poll with some of the governments of the globe. Those who are the most powerful in the world are rarely the most loved. We can never conduct our policies on the basis of trying to be loved by everyone or trying to be the good guy. In the recent history of mankind the only force which has been able to keep international relations on a peaceful plain has been that of balance of power."

The United States is not going it alone, and I believe that others will continue to join us. But, until the aggression is stopped or until other resistance to aggression is assumed by additional nations or by some international organization, we must continue the great responsibility inherent in great power.

Myth No. 8: "The United States has violated the 1954 Geneva accord."

The reality is that the United States increased its personnel and weaponry and its planned escalation there only after confirmed Communist violations of the Geneva accord, and our increased efforts have been measured and responsive to the increased violations. We were and are in favor of United Nations-supervised elections and ultimate unification of the two countries, but the facts of life are that neither earlier, nor now, do conditions exist for really free elections in North Vietnam or immediate reunification.

Every agreement is a two-way street. Therefore, we have not and we should not be bound by restrictions while the other side is free to do as it pleases.

Myth No. 9: "The United States is concerned solely with military actions in Vietnam and is the real block to peaceful settlement."

The realities show there has been a long list of accomplishments in the economic sector of South Vietnam, that it was making steady progress toward economic soundness and that it was experiencing steady growth in its gross national product, prior to the increased efforts against it by North Vietnam.

The President has indicated his desire in no uncertain terms to turn our interests there toward peaceful pursuits, rather than toward war. He has made it clear over and over again, as he did in his speech at Johns Hopkins University, that we remain ready for "unconditional discussions." Yet, the Communist response has been decidely negative thus far, although the offer remains open.

All that is necessary for peace to be restored and for our military efforts to be reduced is for the North Vietnamese to stop their aggression. Even Yugoslavia doesn't believe this myth and has indicated that Hanoi and Peiping are being unrealistic in their demands.

So, finally, we come back to the reality that the Communists have not changed their goals, but only altered their strategy. We come back to the reality that this is old-style aggression, dressed up in new clothes. We come back to the reality that aggression feeds upon itself and spreads unless met and stopped when its starts. We come back to the reality that this is not a war over South Vietnam, but over the peace and security of southeast Asia and the world.

We come back to the reality that there is no dramatic way to bring things back to normality in one fell swoop, but that patience and perseverance are required. We come back to the reality that America's word, its commitment has been given and accepted and must be kept.

We come back to the reality that this should not be a debate by the "hawks" and "doves," those who seek war and those who seek peace, because all of us seek peace. But we must take to heart the history-taught reality that he who seeks peace, by taking risks now in order to assure that such peace will be just and lasting, is no less a peacemaker than he who asks for peace immediately with no safeguard that it may not have to be enforced or defended later at much greater price.

We come back to the reality that only increased pressure will stop this aggression and only increased will and determination will preserve the freedom and independence of the countries of southeast Asia and the world.

The ultimate reality is that the goal of this country is and must remain, as Churchill set for his own people: "In war, resolution; in defeat, defiance; in victory, magnanimity; in peace, good will."

(By unanimous consent granted subsequently, Mr. YARBOROUGH's following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD before the vote on cloture.)

GI BILL FAVORABLY REPORTED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this morning the Labor and Public Welfare Committee favorably reported the cold war GI bill, S. 9, to the Senate. It is my hope that this body will not allow the cold war GI bill to languish on the Senate Calendar, as it did for more than a year during the 88th Congress, but will give the bill a fair and adequate consideration on the Senate floor.

This bill is cosponsored by 41 Senators, the most in its history, and it has accumulated a vast amount of support from all areas of this country. If we are to achieve the Great Society, it is essential that we do not discriminate against the 40 percent of our draft-eligible young men who defend this country. We cannot create pockets of poverty by neglecting these men and still expect this country to progress toward the Great Society.

The predecessors of the cold war GI bill, the World War II, and the Korean GI bill have proven to be two of the most successful pieces of legislation ever passed by Congress. Our choice is simple: We can either continue to neglect these men and impede our progress as a Nation, or we can provide them with the effective and just educational assistance they need, adding additional thrust to the success of this country.

I believe the latter course is the only wise position, and hope that this body will consider this proposal in the near future.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter I recently received from Pfc. William Iver Lessley, of the U.S. Army, be printed at this point in the RECORD to emphasize the need for this bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APO NEW YORK, 09154,
March 13, 1965.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Recently, my attention was brought to the bill which you helped to sponsor that deals with the aid for the education of cold war veterans, while I was perusing a January 1965 issue of Harper's magazine. The bill, as explained in your article, proposes, in my opinion, a great good for the country. The fact that the total outlay for the program each year would only be a fraction of a percent of the whole defense program, combined with the convincing argument which shows that the money spent on the program would be more than paid back during the next two or three decades in higher taxes paid as a result of greater earning power through education, makes me believe that the bill, or one similar to it would, indeed, be a positive good for the Nation as a whole, and not a program that would just favor a very small portion of the population. One must remember that money spent on education is nothing short of an investment in the future of the individual involved, and therefore an investment in the future of the Nation. In the long run, all citizens will benefit from the passing of the proposed bill for the assistance to the education of cold-war veterans.

The very fact that most of the first-term men in the services of the Nation are not involved in a career, but, rather, interrupting a career, or delaying the start of one for the sake of their country—for the protection of the country they love—seems to me to qualify them for a little extra consideration by their countrymen. When a man gives 6 months, 2 years, 3 years, or more of his life to insure the safety and security of his country and loved ones, is it too much to ask of those for whom he has served so well, for so long, for so little—is it too much to ask of those who owe so much—is it too much to ask of those people such a relatively small donation to help the men who have defended the Nation that they love and have served so well? Is it too much to ask this small deed so that they (the cold-war veterans) may further their own education and become more responsible citizens who would be not only willing, but able to help further develop and improve the country and society that they have served and protected by way of their time in the military service? My answer, as I am sure would agree with yours, to these questions is an emphatic no. The men in the services who have given up so much for their country deserve a helping hand from those whom they have served. It only seems fair.

Although I am not a citizen of Texas, my wholehearted support, both as a serviceman and as a citizen of the United States of America, is with you in your efforts to make this bill to aid in the education of cold-war veterans into law. Good luck in your difficult task.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM IVER LESSLEY,
Private, First Class, U.S. Army.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment No. 124, which is now pending, be printed as amended, and modified up until this hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

VIEWS OF RALEIGH, N.C., WOMAN'S CLUB MAKE GOOD SENSE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, many people who, like myself, believe strongly that all qualified citizens should be able to register and vote without regard to race or color, nevertheless have strong reservations about the pending voting rights bill. Many of its provisions have a disturbing potential for creating menacing problems out of all proportion to the token contribution they might make toward eliminating racial discrimination in the administration of voting laws.

Perhaps the provision which has been most severely criticized in this respect is the provision prohibiting certain States from requiring passage of a literacy test as a precondition for voting. I recently received a letter from the board of directors of the Raleigh, N.C., Woman's Club, raising objections to that provision which make good sense and which merit careful consideration by all of us.

I know that we are all familiar with the fine work of America's federated clubwomen in the area of teaching adult illiterates to read and write. The Raleigh clubwomen have been very active in this area and have been quite effective in convincing many illiterate adults that the ability to read and write is a fundamental skill without which living in this day and age is made much more difficult and infinitely less rewarding. The efforts of these dedicated women and of other similar groups have helped countless uneducated adults to acquire the invaluable gift of literacy and, as a byproduct, to take a giant stride toward escaping from the cycle of poverty and dependence in which many of these adults find themselves trapped.

The experience of the Raleigh Woman's Club has indicated that one of the most effective means of persuading illiterate adults to undertake the task of learning to read and write is to impress upon them the need to acquire that skill in order to satisfy the literacy requirements for such basic activities as voting and obtaining a driver's license. The Raleigh clubwomen make the compelling point that passage of the voting bill with its literacy-test prohibition would have the inevitable effect of removing the most meaningful incentive of many of those uneducated adults who most need to acquire the fundamental skill of literacy.

The second objection raised by these ladies, Mr. President, is that proscription of the literacy requirement deprives the States of their most effective means of insuring an independent and intelligent exercise of the franchise. Surely, an educated electorate is an indispensable element of our democratic form of government. Admittedly, literacy and intelligence are not synonymous, and some illiterate people may be more intelligent voters than some literate ones. Nevertheless, in our society where newspapers, magazines, books, and other printed matter canvass and debate myriad and complex political issues, a State might legitimately presume that only those persons who are literate are qualified to exercise the franchise.

The Raleigh clubwomen have long recognized the need for an educated electorate, as have clubwomen everywhere. These ladies have worked and studied to inform themselves on the issues and to stir up similar interests in others. They have learned firsthand that knowing how to vote intelligently is an ambitious goal for an educated and alert person and a well-nigh impossible one for an illiterate person. As the Raleigh clubwomen so aptly note, a simple, objective, and fairly administered literacy requirement for voting would appear to be a greater protection of the strength of our democratic government than a system which grants the right of suffrage to the illiterate and uninformed who are unable to exercise the right intelligently and who are more susceptible to influence and control.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the excellent letter from the chairman of the education department of the Raleigh Woman's Club printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH CAROLINA FEDERATION OF
WOMEN'S CLUBS, RALEIGH WOMAN'S CLUB,
Raleigh, N.C., April 27, 1965.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: The board of directors of the Raleigh Woman's Club is concerned about the possible passage of a voting rights law which would exclude literacy as a voting requirement and has asked me to express their views to you.

First, there has been a great deal of time and money put forth by federated club women in America to teach adult illiterates in accordance with our conviction that the ability to read and write is a fundamental tool for living in this day and age. We have joined with others who have been seeking methods of breaking the "cycle of poverty" by providing a new opportunity to throw off old ways of dependency and unemployment. It seems to us that removing the literacy requirement from such activities as voting and obtaining a driver's license is to remove the incentive for many of the people who need this basic skill the most and is a denial of one of the initial premises of all antipoverty activity.

Second, one of the major points of emphasis for clubwomen in the area of legislation and citizenship has been the need for an educated electorate. It is not enough, we have said, to simply "get out and vote." The strength of a democracy lies in the voter knowing how and why he is voting in every election from dogcatcher to president. This is an ambitious goal for an alert and intelligent group and an impossible one for the uneducated. A uniformly drawn, uniformly administered code of requirements for the right to vote is a greater protection of the rights of the individual than an unrestricted system which allows the votes of the uninformed to be controlled by bosses, precinct wardens, or others whose methods are not above suspicion.

I hope that the depth of our concern is evident here. I realize that voting rights in general have become voting rights of the Negro in particular but we are disturbed that in trying to rectify the errors in this regard we will establish a potentially more menacing situation.

Sincerely yours,
KATHERINE H. HOLOMAN,
Education Department Chairman.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, an editorial in the June 5, 1965, edition of the Saturday Evening Post, entitled "A Plea for a Responsible Vote," criticizes the voting rights bill on the same grounds as the Raleigh Woman's Club; namely, that, in prohibiting literacy tests altogether, the bill goes much too far. Noting that 18 States, including New York, require proof of literacy as a precondition for voting—on the theory that an illiterate voter is apt to be an ill-informed voter—the editorial concludes with this statement which we all would do well to keep in mind:

> Clearly the ability to read does not guarantee the ability to vote intelligently, but it is a good beginning.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLEA FOR A RESPONSIBLE VOTE

Legislation to protect the voting rights of every American citizen is long overdue. However, in its zeal to correct the wrongs of the past, the administration may have gone too far with the bill it has recommended. The new law, which would affect those States with a history of discrimination against Negro voters, contains a provision that would invalidate literacy tests in the States to which it applies. It is obvious that several southern States have used unreasonable tests for the sole purpose of disfranchising the Negro. We agree that such tests should be abolished. But should we abandon literacy tests? We don't think so. On the theory that an illiterate voter is an ill-informed voter, 18 States, including New York, require proof that the prospective voter can read and write. Clearly, the ability to read does not guarantee the ability to vote intelligently, but it is a good beginning.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I expect to offer several amendments quickly and will ask for the yeas and nays on them at the appropriate time.

I believe that the Senate could facilitate its work if, after a vote on the cloture motion, regardless of how it eventuates, Senators would remain in the Chamber to complete action on my amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is not in order. The Senate will be in order.

Does the Senator from North Carolina yield further time?

Mr. ERVIN. Does any Senator wish time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana desire to yield time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield a half minute to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to S. 1564, to be inserted in the appropriate place in the bill, and ask that it be considered as having been read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and considered as having been read.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, submitting the nomination of W. Brewster Kopp, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice Edmund T. Pratt, Jr., resigned, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

Wilbur J. Cohen, of Michigan, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Paul D. Pedersen, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Services; and

Eileen Hernandez, and sundry other persons, to be members of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Alan S. Boyd, of Florida, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles S. Murphy to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service, which were on the Secretary's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on my own time, I wish to present a statement which I have prepared.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the Senator's time, and without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I shall vote against cloture. Inasmuch as I voted for cloture last year in connection with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and also 3 years ago in connection with the late President Kennedy's communications satellite bill, it should be quite obvious that I will vote for cloture when I believe, in good conscience, that it is proper for me to do so.

I do not believe that any such emergency in debate has arisen as to warrant the invocation of cloture at this time. Much has been said about the number of days which have expired since this bill came out of the committee, but this is a superficial analysis of the situation. Considerable time has been taken up by what might be termed "irrelevant" matters. There have been no morning or late evening sessions, which ordinarily evidence a concern on the part of the leadership for speeding up action on legislation.

I have made a tabulation of the time elapsed which shows that the opponents of the bill have only used some 23½ hours of debate time on the bill and amendments. Still the Senate is now being asked to close debate. I think this action is premature. Unlimited debate in the Senate is a fundamental and vital characteristic of this body and of its role as a guardian of minority rights of the States. Only under unusual and exceptional circumstances, evidenced, for example, by morning and evening sessions of the Senate, should this fundamental right be denied. I recognize that the right to vote is a fundamental right and that action is needed to protect it. But that does not mean that fundamental rights of debate in the Senate should be prematurely cast aside.

I ask unanimous consent that the tabulations to which I referred be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Time on voting rights bill

Date	Proponents	Hours	Opponents	Hours	Other
Wednesday, Apr. 21	(No session)				
Thursday, Apr. 22	Mansfield, Dirksen, and Hart	3½			
Friday, Apr. 23	Javits and Tydings	2			
Monday, Apr. 26		1½			Williams amendments.
Tuesday, Apr. 27	Short debate on Williams amendment				2d supplemental appropriations bill.
Wednesday, Apr. 28	Javits, and Kennedy of Massachusetts	1	Speeches by Robertson and McClellan	1½	
Thursday, Apr. 29	Vote on Williams amendment, Clark	0			
Friday, Apr. 30	Substitute No. 124 introduced	½	Talmadge, Stennis, and Fulbright	1½	
Monday, May 3		½	Ervin judicial procedure substitute, speech by Thurmond.	1½	
Tuesday, May 4			Stennis	1	
Wednesday, May 5			Ervin amendment	1	Vietnam appropriations.
Thursday, May 6	Kennedy poll tax amendment	½	do	1	Do.
Friday, May 7	do	2½		1	
Monday, May 10	do	3½		½	
Tuesday, May 11	do	1	Ervin amendments, Russell	2	
Wednesday, May 12		1	Ervin amendments, Sparkman amendments.	1	
Thursday, May 13		1½	Ervin amendment re literacy test	1½	
Friday, May 14		1	Talmadge amendment re enforcement of State laws.	1½	
Monday, May 17	Further Mansfield-Dirksen tax amendment.			2	
Tuesday, May 18	Further poll tax amendment	½		1½	
Wednesday, May 19	Poll tax vote and Kennedy-Javits Puerto Rican amendment.	2		1	
Thursday, May 20	Puerto Rican amendment	1	Ervin amendment re removal to local courts.	2½	
Friday, May 21	Cloture petition filed		Ervin amendment	1½	
Total [1]		23½		23½	

[1] Assuming about 3 to 4 pages per ½ hour.

April 9, 1965: The bill was reported to the Senate from the Judiciary Committee without recommendation. Debate was scheduled to begin April 21 after the Senate returned from Easter recess, but was delayed until April 22 when Senator Johnston died.

April 26, 1965: There was brief discussion on the Williams amendment on April 26, but much of the time on this date was taken up by Senator Morse, who gave a long speech on Vietnam on a matter of personal privilege.

April 27, 1965: "Supporters of S. 1564 began a series of conferences April 27 to resolve the differences." "Both sides were still shaping strategy throughout the week," (p. 824, CQ).

The Senate took up the second supplemental appropriations bill on this date in addition to the voting rights bill. There was very little on the voting rights bill on this date and most of it pertained to the Williams amendment.

April 29, 1965: In addition to voting rights debate, there was a rather lengthy speech by Senator McGee and considerable amount of time was spent on the conference report on the second supplemental appropriations bill. There was very little time consumed by the opponents to the bill on this date.

April 30, 1965: The Mansfield-Dirksen amendment No. 124 in the nature of a substitute was presented, and by unanimous consent, made the pending amendment. On this date there was a considerable amount of time spent in a speech by Senator MORSE on the Dominican Republic and Vietnam.

May 3, 1965: "The Senate's Republican and Democratic leadership indicated that a cloture vote to cut off debate might be sought during the week of May 10–14, but plans were not definite as of May 6" (p. 857, CQ). This was the date on which our Dominican Republic speech was given.

May 4, 1965: There was a speech by Senator STENNIS on this date, but there were also other speeches by Senator LONG on Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, by Senators JAVITS and MANSFIELD on the Dominican Republic, by Senator CHURCH on Vietnam, and several other shorter ones by various Senators not relating to voting rights.

May 5, 1965: Unanimous consent was entered into to vote on Thursday, May 6, on Ervin amendment relating to filing of suits in the local district courts rather than in the District of Columbia. The Vietnam appropriations bill was debated at some length on this date and most of the allotted time was on the Vietnam appropriations bill rather than the Ervin amendment.

May 6, 1965: Vote was taken on the Vietnam appropriations bill, followed by limited debate and a vote on the Ervin amendment relating to filing of suits in the subdivision in question. The Kennedy poll tax amendment was then made the pending amendment and it was agreed by unanimous consent that debate should continue on it beginning at the conclusion of the morning hour on Friday, May 7, continuing through Monday, May 10, with a vote thereon to be held at 1 p.m. on Tuesday, May 11.

May 11, 1965: After the vote on the Kennedy poll tax amendment, there was a unanimous consent agreement to vote on Ervin amendments en bloc at 3 p.m. the next day, Wednesday, May 12.

May 12, 1965: Sparkman amendments were called up after the vote on the Ervin amendments and it was agreed to vote on them at 2 p.m. the next day, Thursday, May 13.

May 13, 1965: After the vote on the Sparkman amendments, it was agreed to vote on this Ervin amendment by 2:30 p.m. on the next day, Friday, May 14.

May 14, 1965: After the vote on the Ervin amendment, it was agreed to vote on the Talmadge amendment on Monday, May 17, by 2 p.m.

May 17, 1965: By unanimous consent, two modifications to the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment were made by the leadership: (1) as to the language respecting poll taxes and (2) respecting language as to application to an examiner in order to be placed on the list of eligible voters. One leadership amendment relating to strengthening the poll tax provision was in agreement and made the pending business.

May 18, 1965: The Mansfield-Dirksen poll tax amendment debate continued and it was agreed to vote by 3 p.m. on Wednesday, May 19, on this amendment.

May 19, 1965: Vote was taken on the leadership poll tax amendment and the Kennedy-Javits amendment relating to Puerto Ricans was made the pending business. It was agreed to vote on this amendment by 1:30 p.m. on the next day, Thursday, May 20. The leadership also announced on this date that it intended to file a petition for cloture on Friday, May 21, with a vote to be taken at 1 p.m. on Tuesday, May 25.

May 20, 1965: Vote was taken on the Kennedy-Javits amendment relating to Puerto Ricans and the pending business was a further Ervin amendment providing for removal from District of Columbia court to the local district courts.

May 21, 1965: Petition for cloture was filed on this date.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

In accordance with the provisions of rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the motion presented by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], on the 21st of May, that debate be brought to a close upon the pending bill. Therefore, the Chair under the rule, directs the roll to be called to ascertain the presence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 84 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

In further pursuance of rule XXII, the Chair now puts the question, which is as follows: Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate on S. 1564 to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required by the rule; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 30, as follows:

[No. 85 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—30

Bennett
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Jordan, N.C.
Long, La.
McClellan
Miller
Murphy
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Young, N. Dak.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the motion to bring the debate to a close is agreed to.

Under the rule, each Senator will be entitled to speak in all for not more than 1 hour on the unfinished business, amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to address a parliamentary question to the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So far as I know, the RECORD does not indicate that there has ever been a ruling with respect to the necessity for germaneness of all amendments and all discussion once cloture has been adopted. I should like to advance that as a question to the Chair now for its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The language of rule XXII reads, in part, as follows:

> Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time.

The controlling language reads:

> No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Rule XXII also provides:

> Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same * * *.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I gather from what the Chair has read that no extraneous discussion or no extraneous matters can be presented while the cloture rule is in effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the view of the Chair. Unless the Senate rules to the contrary, that is the ruling.

Does any Senator offer an amendment or yield time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

As I evaluated the situation last night and early this morning, there were pending——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have order? I cannot hear the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There will be order in the Chamber and in the galleries, so that the Senate can conduct its business and that the Senator from Illinois may be heard.

The Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in making a survey this morning, I found that 56 amendments were pending. One, offered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], has been disposed of.

There was one amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], but I could not reach him this morning to ascertain whether or not he intended to offer that amendment.

Two amendments were submitted by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. I am not advised as to whether those amendments will be called up.

There was one amendment by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and one by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. The Senator from Mississippi will call up his amendment.

There were three amendments by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who, I understand, intends to call up one.

There were 12 amendments by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. He has not quite decided whether those amendments will be called up or not.

There were 35 amendments by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. He had in mind calling up perhaps 10 or a dozen, and limiting himself to a minute or 2 minutes of discussion on each amendment, and in some cases asking for a yea-and-nay vote.

If that were the case, I believe it would be the part of wisdom for Senators to remain close to the Chamber, because if the discussions are to be short and there are to be yea-and-nay votes, we can dispose of a great deal of this workload before the day runs out.

I make the suggestion mainly because I know that many Senators have commencement speeches and Memorial Day speeches and desire to get away early in the week, if they can. I believe we can expedite action in the Chamber if we will be diligent upon our duties, now that cloture is in effect.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 seconds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 20 seconds.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I do not have 35 different amendments. The bill has been drawn and redrawn four or five times. I have 11 or 12 amendments. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina (No. 161) as modified, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended (No. 124), offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 74, as follows:

[No. 86 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Fannin
Fulbright
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Curtis
Eastland
Jordan, N.C.
Long, La.
McClellan
Miller
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Ellender
Ervin
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower

NAYS—74

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

So Mr. ERVIN's amendment, as modified, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended (No. 124), offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 158

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 158.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk read the amendment of Mr. ERVIN (No. 158) to the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute, as follows:

> On page 6, line 18, change the period to a colon and add this proviso: "*Provided, however*, That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply in any political subdivision of any State in which 95 per centum of the persons of voting age applying for registration in connection with the presidential election of November 1964 were adjudged literate and registered by the election officials."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the bill contains a triggering process which the proponents say will logically raise a presumption that States or political subdivisions of States falling within such process are discriminating against citizens in voting on account of their race or color.

North Carolina has 34 counties included in this triggering process. The records assembled by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights shows that during recent years only three out of every thousand citizens who have taken a literacy test in North Carolina have failed it.

It is therefore absurd to condemn the State of North Carolina or any of its counties under the triggering process of the bill.

My amendment would merely exempt from one provision of the bill any county or parish where 95 percent of the persons applying for registration in connection with the presidential election of 1964, were adjudged literate and registered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. This amendment would add to section 4(b), "automatic trigger," a provision excluding any political subdivision of any State in which 90 percent of the persons of voting age applying for registration in connection with the presidential election of November 1964 were adjudged literate and registered by the election officials.

This amendment ignores the crux of the voting discrimination problem, which is that, because of the effects of past discrimination, Negroes have not been encouraged to apply to register in any significant numbers. Thus, those who applied to register in connection with the presidential election of November 1964 probably were mostly whites, and the result of this amendment would be that, if the registrars allowed most of those whites to register, whether they were actually literate or not, the State or political subdivision would be exempted from the provisions of this bill. There is no apparent basis for letting a State escape the coverage of S. 1564 for the reason allowed by this amendment. Further, it is possible that many States and political subdivisions which should be covered would escape because of the way this amendment would work.

It should also be noted that this provision is tied only to persons who applied for registration in connection with the presidential election of November 1964. In a political subdivision where registration is permanent, this could be a very small number. For example, if 20 whites who had just reached 21 applied and 18 were registered, the political subdivision would be beyond the ban of section 4.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to reject amendment No. 158.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 158, offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, numbered 124, offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 70, as follows:

[No. 87 Leg.]

YEAS—21

Bennett
Curtis
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Long, La.
McClellan
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond

NAYS—70

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—9

Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Hayden
Neuberger
Pearson
Robertson
Sparkman

So Mr. ERVIN's amendment (No. 158), was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 138

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 148, and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 4, insert the following between the colon in line 24 on page 4, and the "*Provided*" in line 25 on page 4: "*Provided*, That if the Attorney General determines that the effects of denial or abridgment, if any, of the right to vote on account of race or color have been effectively corrected by State or local action and that there is no reasonable cause to believe that any test or device sought to be used by such State or political subdivision will be used for the purpose or will have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, he shall certify such fact in writing to such State or political subdivision, and in that event, such State or political subdivision shall be exempt from the provisions of this Act without the necessity of prosecuting any action for a declaratory judgment in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia."

On page 4, line 25, insert the word "*further*" between the word "*Provided*" and the comma.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ERVIN. With all due deference to everyone concerned, if the Senate were now legislating in a rational world, the amendment would be accepted. The amendment would make the bill more workable.

The amendment would provide that if the Attorney General should find that a political subdivision had corrected all of its past violations of the 15th amendment and there was no danger that the political subdivision would violate the 15th amendment in the foreseeable future, the Attorney General, instead of requiring that political subdivision to come all the way to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, could issue a certificate to that political subdivision excusing it from bringing a court action for its exoneration. In other words, it provides that the Attorney General of the United States, by certificate, may exonerate such a political subdivision without a court proceeding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the point sought to be made by the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina was discussed in the hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary. For reasons that I believe are reflected to a large measure in that record, I hope very much that the amendment will be rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 138) offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended (No. 124), offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senfrom Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 88 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, W. Va.
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Jordan, N.C.
Long, La.
McClellan
Miller
Mundt
Murphy
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Talmadge
Tower
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Yarborough

NAYS—63

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—9

Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Hayden
McGovern
Neuberger
Robertson
Sparkman

So Mr. ERVIN's amendment (No. 138) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended (No. 124), offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 153

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 153 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair). The amendment will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

> On page 5, line 19, change the period to a colon and add this proviso: "*Provided, however,* That the court shall not retain jurisdiction of any action pursuant to this subsection in case judgment is rendered in favor of the State or the political subdivision of a State."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The portion of section 4(a) of the substitute amendment which appears on page 5, lines 13 through 19, is a provision which applies to all cases brought in the District of Columbia for exoneration. The language provides that the States and political subdivisions of States are to be condemned by legislative declaration without notice, without an opportunity to be heard, without evidence, and without trial. A State or a political subdivision must come to the District Court of the District of Columbia to exonerate itself in a trial which would occur anywhere from 250 to 1,000 miles from its location.

The language of the substitute amendment provides, in the lines I have mentioned, that jurisdiction of a case should be retained by the court for 5 years after judgment. If a State or a political subdivision under the language, proved, in the trial in Washington, that it was absolutely innocent, jurisdiction of its case still would be retained by the court for 5 years.

My amendment would merely deprive the measure of some of its vindictiveness by providing that if a State or a county came to Washington and proved that it was absolutely innocent of any violation of the 15th amendment, jurisdiction of its case would not be retained by the court for 5 years, as the measure now provides.

I urge Senators to support the amendment, so that we may remove from the bill a little of the vindictiveness which it contains.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would hope that the value that the committee and the leadership attribute to this feature would be recognized. The record of recent years shows that while a situation may be in very good posture at a given moment, State legislatures and other bodies can change that atmosphere quickly. It is felt desirable that the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia should retain jurisdiction for the period stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 153, offered by the Senator from North Carolina to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I anounce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 68, as follows:

[No. 89 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Bennett
Byrd, W. Va.
Curtis
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long, La.
McClellan
Miller
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—68

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—7

Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Church
Hayden
Neuberger
Russell, Ga.
Sparkman

So Mr. Ervin's amendment (No. 153) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended (No. 124), offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 166

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] is recognized.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 166 and ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read Mr. Ervin's amendment (amendment No. 166) to the substitute amendment by Mr. Mansfield and Mr. Dirksen (No. 124) as follows:

> On page 6, strike out everything from the article "A" on line 19 through the word "Register" on line 22.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, lines 19 to 22 on page 6 of the star print of the substitute, dated May 17, provides:

> A determination or certification of the Attorney General or of the Director of the Census under this subsection or under section 6 shall be final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

This provision would confer upon the Attorney General and the Director of the Bureau absolute infallibility, no matter how erroneous their certifications might be. This is a very serious matter, because, under an amendment adopted in the committee, if the Director of the Census determines by a survey that the total number of persons of any race or color who are registered to vote in any State or political subdivision is less than 25 percent of the total number of persons of such race or color of voting age residing in the State or political subdivision, that State or political subdivision is automatically condemned by the bill and deprived of the right to exercise a portion of its sovereignty.

All the testimony taken before the committee was to the effect that in those States and political subdivisions, as well as in other States of the Union, persons are not registered by race, and the records of this registration do not reveal their race. Yet the bill would confer infallibility on the Director of the Bureau of the Census if he were to make a certification under the provision I have just referred to, no matter how unreliable the information underlying the certification.

The Supreme Court of the United States has held time and time again that Congress cannot establish a conclusive presumption because a conclusive presumption denies due process of law to litigants as guaranteed in the fifth amendment as against the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield myself 30 seconds more.

I appeal to the Senate to show respect for the Supreme Court of the United States on this point as well as for the fundamentals of fairplay.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I oppose the amendment which is offered by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. In my judgment, it would cripple the act. It would eliminate many of the automatic features of the bill, the end result of which would be extensive litigation which would delay the right to vote by individuals which this bill is designed to assist in their right to vote.

The population and voting statistics which the Director of the Census will determine under section 4(b) will be based on the most authoritative and reliable information available.

That is the reason why we wrote the section we did in committee. That is the reason why the bill reads as it does. The pending amendment woud open the door for extensive litigation, questioning the Census Bureau's findings and statistics, which are the best available to us at this time in this country.

I resist the amendment, and hope it will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], No. 166, to the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the substitute was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

(Mr. YARBOROUGH made a statement on the GI bill (S. 9) which, by unanimous consent, appears elsewhere in the Record.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not that I have particular objection to what the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] has just advanced, but I thought we had a ruling this morning that all matters, while we are under cloture, must be germane. This is a matter coming from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee that has no relevancy to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair has stated on previous occasions, the Chair awaits a point of order being raised as to the germaneness of debate; and if a point of order is raised, the Chair has announced today that it will rule that the germaneness rule applies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A point of order would be after the fact as of this moment, but I believe I ought to serve notice that the cloture motion is not to be violated, and that extraneous matters ought not to be submitted while the pending bill is under consideration.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I have made be printed just before the vote on cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 173

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 173.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment offered by Mr. Ervin (No. 173) to the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute, as follows:

> On page 4, strike out everything between the word "that" on line 18 and the colon on line 24 and insert the following in lieu thereof: "this Act is unconstitutional as applied to it, or that such State or such political subdivision is not denying or abridging the right of citizens to vote on account of race or color".

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, I modify my amendment by striking from lines 3 and 4 the following language: "this Act is unconstitutional as applied to it, or that."

As thus modified, the amendment would provide that a State or political subdivision coming to the District Court for the District of Columbia would not have to prove that it had not sinned in the past or that it had corrected the consequences of past sin and that it would not sin in the future so far as the 15th amendment is concerned. The amendment, as modified, provides instead that, if a State or political subdivision shows to the District Court for the District of Columbia that it is not engaged in violating the 15th amendment, it shall be exonerated from the provisions of the bill.

This bill is said to be a bill to enforce the provisions of the 15th amendment. If so, a State or political subdivision ought to be permitted to obtain exoneration if it shows that it is not violating the 15th amendment. That is all my amendment, as modified, is designed to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I resist the amendment. This amendment, in my judgment, would restrict the court in its ability to look at what has gone on in the past in depriving persons of the right to vote. I am not entirely certain in my own mind what the new amendment, or the amendment as modified, would do, but in my judgment the original amendment would mean definitely that it would weaken the act as a whole.

I hope the amendment, and the amendment as modified as well, will be defeated.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I cannot see how anyone can argue against the contention that when one is charged with violating the 15th amendment he can be acquitted when he shows he is not violating the 15th amendment. That is what my amendment would do.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], numbered 173, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, numbered 124, offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen].

The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 69, as follows:

[No. 90 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cotton
Curtis
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Long, La.
McClellan
Prouty
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower

NAYS—69

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—5

Cannon
Church
Hayden
Neuberger
Sparkman

So Mr. Ervin's amendment as modified (No. 173) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 149

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 149, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The Chief Clerk. On page 6, lines 7, 8, and 9, strike out the words "or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964,".

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the amendment would strike from the triggering process the provision which is based upon the fact that less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age in a State or county voted in the presidential election of 1964.

I seek to strike that provision from the bill because the number of people who voted has no necessary relevancy whatever to the question of whether a State has violated the 15th amendment in registering voters. A State can register every person of voting age without discrimination on the basis of race or color; but a State has no way of compelling any of those people to go to the polls and vote.

The failure of people to do something that a State or a political subdivision authorizes them to do ought not be used as a triggering device to condemn the State or the political subdivision. The amendment seeks to strike out the provision in the bill which does this.

The proponents of the bill in effect admit that there is no relevancy between the number of persons voting and discrimination, because they condemn 34 counties in North Carolina under this part of the triggering process while they exempt from the triggering process 137 counties in the State of Texas in which less than 50 percent of the adult population failed to vote. They exempt from the triggering process the entire State of Texas, which voted only 44.4 percent of its persons of voting age in the 1964 presidential election. Yet 34 counties in North Carolina, are condemned, despite the fact that 51.8 percent of the persons of voting age in North Carolina voted in the 1964 presidential election and despite the fact that 19 of those 34 counties cast a higher percent of their possible vote than the State of Texas. That shows how absurd that part of the triggering process is. Therefore, I seek to strike out the provision referring to States or political subdivisions in which less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age voted in the presidential election of 1964. Such provision has no relevancy to discrimination. That is true because a State could register every person in the State without discrimination, but it has no way of compelling those persons to go out and vote. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The reason why South Carolina has come under the bill is not because anyone has alleged that there has been any discrimination against any person in South Carolina in the matter of voting. South Carolina is included in the bill because we have a literacy test and had one on November 1, 1964. It is a very simple literacy test. If anyone can read and write, that satisfies the requirements of the literacy test.

Less than 50 percent of our voting-age residents voted in the 1964 presidential election. Slightly over 38 percent of those of voting age voted in the 1964 presidential election.

The third provision in the section refers to more than 20 percent of the population being nonwhite according to the 1960 census. Somewhere between 35 and 40 percent of the population of South Carolina was nonwhite according to the 1960 census. Neither the State of South Carolina nor the officials of South Carolina have ever tried to prevent anyone from voting. No one has ever proved that he has been denied the right to vote in our State because of race or color. Merely because less than 50 percent of those of voting age in our State actually voted in our State, we come under the provisions of the bill. That is the effect of it. However, well over 50 percent of the voting age population was registered to vote on November 1, 1964. We do not feel that it is right to overlook this fact.

There are various reasons why people do not choose to vote. Almost 250,000 registered voters failed to vote in the presidential election last year in South Carolina.

There are many grounds on which a person can be disqualified from registering and voting, which do not offend the Constitution. I read from the Code of Laws of South Carolina, title 23, chapter 2, section 62:

> (b) Persons who are mentally incompetent, paupers supported at the public expense and persons confined in any public prison shall be disqualified from being registered or voting; and
>
> (c) Persons convicted of burglary, arson, obtaining goods or money under false pretenses, perjury, forgery, robbery, bribery, adultery, bigamy, wife-beating, housebreaking, receiving stolen goods, breach of trust with fraudulent intent, fornication, sodomy, incest, assault with intent to ravish, miscegenation, larceny or crimes against the election laws shall be disqualified from being registered or voting, unless such disqualification shall have been removed by the pardon of the Governor. (1952 Code § 23-62; 1950 (46) 2059; 1961 (52) 50; 1963 (53) 155.)

It is easy to see that there are various reasons why certain persons would not be eligible to register to vote. It is not because of discrimination. Even considering this, over 56 percent of those over 21 were registered to vote in the fall of 1964. I repeat that no one has been discriminated against in the matter of voting in South Carolina.

I believe this amendment is a good amendment. We believe it ought to be adopted. The mere fact that less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age did not vote in the presidential election in 1964 should be no ground for including a State in the bill. That is the main reason why we are in this category. We hope the Senate will adopt the amendment. It is a very fair amendment. It is impossible to make people vote. People in our State who are eligible to vote have the right to vote, and no one has tried to prevent them from voting. We hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. President, this amendment would strike out the heart of section 4 of the bill, which provides for automatic protection in those areas where, because of the record made before the committee, we feel there was almost certainly racial discrimination. The amendment itself would remove the 50 percent voting requirement, leaving only the 50 percent registration requirement.

Section 4 provides that in those areas where more than 20 percent of the 1960 voting age population was nonwhite and either less than 50 percent of the registered persons voted, or less than 50 percent of the people were registered, the testimony in the record before the Committee on the Judiciary showed that almost certainly racial discrimination had been the cause of the low vote.

To remove that provision, which has to do with the number of persons who voted, would cut out the heart of the bill.

I hope that the amendment will be rejected, because the amendment would cut the heart out of the voting rights bill.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

I have before me a clipping from the State, the largest newspaper in South Carolina. It is dated May 24, 1965. The article I have before me is entitled "South Carolina Needs No Aid, NAACP Leader Says." It reads in part:

> The Reverend I. DeQuincey Newman, NAACP field secretary, said, "In the last 4 years there has been a 147-percent increase in Negro voter registration without any outside invasion.
>
> "I think this is one of the best records of voter registration anywhere in the South. I think that record speaks for itself as to whether or not we need outside assistance."
>
> Registration of Negroes increased from 58,000 in 1960 to more than 150,000 in 1964, he said.

Mr. President, the Negroes themselves are not claiming that there is any discrimination in our State. Any Negro who wishes to register can register and vote in South Carolina. All we ask is, if there is discrimination, let it be shown. If there is no discrimination shown, why should the people of our State be punished? It is proposed to punish all the people of a State, and to hold them up to the ridicule of the world as practicing discrimination, when that is not the case.

If there is discrimination, let it be punished. If not, do not include us. We are not guilty. We believe this is very unjust. Congress would do well to encourage States not to discriminate rather than seek to punish them for alleged, but unproved, evils. We have not discriminated. Yet the bill would put us in the category of those who have discriminated.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

North Carolina has registered 76 percent of all of its voting-age citizens. It has one of the best registration records in the Nation. It has a higher percentage of people of voting age registered than 13 States which are exempt from the provisions of the bill.

The Civil Rights Advisory Committee of North Carolina has stated in substance that there is no discrimination in North Carolina on the basis of race. One member of the committee has stated that if any Negro possessing the requisite qualifications for voting is not a registered voter in North Carolina today, it is his own fault.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 149) offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended (No. 124), offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 91 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Curtis
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Gore
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long, La.
McClellan
Morton
Mundt
Prouty
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—64

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Fong
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—5

Cannon
Church
Hayden
Neuberger
Sparkman

So Mr. Ervin's amendment No. 149 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended (No. 124), offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 137

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 137 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 18, insert the following between the word "that" and the word "the": "this Act is unconstitutional as applied to such State or political subdivision, or that".

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The amendment is simple. Out of an abundance of caution, I attempted in this amendment to spell out that the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia should have power to pass upon the constitutionality of the act in any proceeding for exoneration brought by a State or political subdivision of a State under the provisions of section 4(a).

I ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator in charge of the bill, whether he deems the amendment necessary. I ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan whether the bill was designed, or, in his judgment, can properly be interpreted as an attempt to deprive the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia of jurisdiction to pass upon the constitutionality of its provisions.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina expressed serious concern that, absent some clarification on this point, we might find ourselves in a position in which none of us wants to be, that is, of having enacted a law which forecloses a State or political subdivision from raising questions as to the constitutionality of the act.

We have felt that the effect of the leadership substitute would not produce such a result. Nevertheless, I think it desirable, so long as a man so able and sincere as the Senator from North Carolina has some doubt about it, that we make it clear in the Record that without the amendment—and I would hope that the amendment would not be agreed to—there is no purpose or intention to foreclose, nor do we believe the measure has that effect, a State or a subdivision from testing the constitutionality of the act.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I express deep gratitude to my friend from Michigan.

I ask the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], who is one of the authors of the bill, and who has been active in the committee and also on the floor of the Senate in respect to its provisions, if he would care to express his opinion on this point.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I fully concur in what the distinguished Senator from Michigan said. In addition, at no time did we have in mind trying to insulate the bill against any kind of constitutional attack. That would be the last thing we would want to do.

Mr. ERVIN. I was sure that neither the distinguished Senator from Michigan nor the distinguished Senator from Illinois had any such purpose; but I desired to make this point clear as a matter of legislative history.

Having made this point clear as a matter of legislative history, with the assistance of the Senators from Michigan and Illinois, I now withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 150

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 150 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 20, add at the end of line 2 an additional provision reading as follows: "In case the Attorney General denies the petition filed by a political subdivision of a State under clause (a), such political subdivision may bring a civil action against the Attorney General in the United States district court for the district in which it is situated alleging that there is no longer reasonable cause to believe that citizens will be deprived of or denied the right to vote on account of race or color in such subdivision. Upon demand of the Attorney General, such action shall be tried by a three-judge court convened in the manner prescribed by Sixty-second Statutes at Large, page 968 (28 U.S.C. 2284). In case the court finds on the trial of such action that there is no longer reasonable cause to believe that citizens will be deprived of or denied the right to vote on account of race or color in such subdivision, the court shall so adjudge and enter a judgment terminating listing procedures in such subdivision and permitting its election officials to resume the exercise of the power to determine the qualifications of persons applying for registration to vote in such subdivsion in accordance with the provisions of applicable State law. An appeal shall lie from such judgment to the Supreme Court."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Section 13, which appears on pages 19 and 20 of the star print of the amendment in the nature of a substitute dated May 17, would authorize the Attorney General of the United States to terminate listing procedures upon certain conditions which are spelled out. This is one of the provisions of the bill which vest in the Attorney General powers not subject to review.

My amendment merely provides that when a State or a political subdivision of a State petitions the Attorney General for termination of listing procedures and the power to resume the registration of voters according to its own laws and that petition is denied, the State or political subdivision of the State shall have the right to bring suit in the U.S. District Court in which the capital of the State is located or in which the political subdivision is situated and to have the question determined by the court.

The amendment provides that upon the demand of the Attorney General, a three-judge district court, shall be convened to hear the case.

I do not believe that the decisions of any public official who rules upon the rights of States or political subdivisions of States should be immune from judicial review.

The only purpose of my amendment is to provide for judicial review of the decision of the Attorney General rejecting the petition of a State or political subdivision of a State for the termination of listing procedures by Federal examiners and for the resumption of its rights to register its own voters in accordance with its own laws.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I resist the amendment for the reason that sections 3 and 4 of the bill both provide for judicial review and judicial protection that the Senator from North Carolina seeks to give to a State or local official.

Section 7 and section 13—the latter section is the object of the amendment—relate to the actual listing procedure. That is the procedure under which the registrar of the Attorney General conducts the listing of persons in the areas which the courts or the triggering device of the bill have already determined to be areas where discrimination has taken place.

To open the gates for litigation at this stage rather than in the areas covered by the sections of the bill which already provide for it would, in my judgment, bog down the entire registration process for which the bill provides and thus, in effect, by delaying litigation, cripple the magisterial effect of carrying out what the bill seeks to do, namely, to enable persons to vote who have been previously denied that right on account of race or color.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, there is no provision in the bill which would afford any State or political subdivision any escape by judicial process open to it as a matter of right from the provisions of the bill after the original action in the District Court of the District of Columbia.

The amendment would merely provide that after the provisions of the bill have taken effect and Federal examiners had been acting in a State or political subdivision, the State or political subdivision could obtain a court review of the action of the Attorney General if he should deny its petition that listing procedures be terminated and that it be permitted to resume its right to pass upon the qualifications of those applying for registration within its bounds.

I do not believe in eternal damnation for anybody. I do not believe that a State or political subdivision should be subjected to the danger of eternal damnation by the Attorney General of the United States. I believe that some time between now and the time when the last lingering echo of Gabriel's horn trembles into eternal silence, there ought to be a place for judicial exoneration of a State or political subdivision if the Attorney General should improperly refuse to allow it to resume the power which the Constitution and the laws of the country vest in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 150) offered by the Senator from North Carolina to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended (No. 124), offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 72, as follows:

[No. 92 Leg.]

YEAS—24

Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Yarborough

NAYS—72

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—4

Cannon
Church
Neuberger
Sparkman

So the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], numbered 150, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended (No. 124), offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 145

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 145.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk read the amendment of Mr. ERVIN (No. 145) to the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute, as follows:

On page 20, strike out subsection (b) of section 14 in its entirety and reletter subsections (c)(1), (c)(2), and (d) of section 14 as subsections (b)(1), (b)(2), and (c), respectively.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

I announce for the information of the Senate, that this is the last amendment I shall offer.

Section 14(b) of the substitute bill, which appears on page 20, lines 6 to 14, both inclusive, provides:

No court other than the District Court for the District of Columbia or a court of appeals in any proceeding under section 8 shall have jurisdiction to issue any declaratory judgment pursuant to section 4 or any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction against the execution or enforcement of any provision of this Act. The right to intervene in any action brought under the authority of this Act shall be limited to the Attorney General and to States, political subdivisions, and their appropriate officials.

My amendment would strike that provision from the bill and renumber the other subdivisions of section 14 appropriately.

This is a broad provision. It would place jurisdiction in the District Court for the District of Columbia with respect to every action for any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction or other relief against the execution or enforcement of any provision of this act.

It is conceivable that, in carrying out the provisions of the act, Federal officers would injure or threaten to injure not only States and political subdivisions of States, but State officials and individuals as well. This is conceivable since Federal officers and Federal examiners are subject to the fallibility which is inherent in all men.

My amendment would strike out the provision requiring that those injured or threatened with injury by the Federal officers in the enforcement of the bill would have to leave their homes and go all the way to the District Court for the District of Columbia in order to obtain the protection of the law. That requirement amounts to a virtual denial of the protection of the law for most of the people who would be injured or threatened with injury by the illegal acts of Federal officers allegedly enforcing the provisions of the bill.

All my amendment would do would be to strike out this provision, and allow those injured or threatened with injury by the enforcement of the bill or by the wrongdoing of the Federal officers professing to act under the bill the right enjoyed by all other Americans of access to the courts for a redress of grievances and the prevention of threatened injuries. That is all my amendment would do.

I respectfully submit that it ought to be adopted. Americans are supposed to have a government of laws. We do not have a government of laws if those who are injured or threatened with injury are not allowed to go to the nearest court to obtain redress or protection.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I resist the amendment of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. The Senate earlier rejected a similar amendment. The amendment would take from jurisdiction of the three-judge court in the District Court for the District of Columbia questions of review under section 14(b) and other sections of the act.

There was a reason why the committee included that section. It is obvious that a great many suits unquestionably will be arising from enforcement of the act. If the pending amendment were adopted and this provision were taken out of the bill, suits could be going on in many districts within the same circuit. Different suits could be going on in different circuits. All of them would lack uniformity. It is conceivably that there might be different rulings in two districts of the same circuit.

We felt that it would be commendable to have one court handle these matters in order to have uniformity. There is historic precedent for this. Article III, section 2, of the Constitution, authorizes cases between the United States and States to be tried in the Supreme Court. We have historic precedent in the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, which provided for suits under that act to be tried in the District Court for the District of Columbia. With respect to allowances or disallowances of debts or claims before the Alien Property Custodian, there is precedent for suits under that law to be tried in the District Court for the District of Columbia. There are other types of situations where uniformity is highly desirable.

I submit that the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

There are 91 district courts in the United States. Cases involving questions under every other act of Congress can be tried and determined in any one of the 91 district courts of the United States. Yet it is proposed to restrict the determination of all questions arising under this bill to one district court; that is, the District Court of the District of Columbia.

It is no more important to get uniform decisions in the first instance under this bill than it is under the Fair Labor Standards Act or any of the hundreds of other laws enacted by Congress. All 91 district courts of the United States have jurisdiction to hear cases arising under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the hundreds of other laws enacted by Congress. There is uniform jurisdiction throughout the Nation in all the 91 district courts.

This is another provision of the bill which, as I have said, prostitutes justice by providing that out of 91 courts litigants shall have access to only 1 of them.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], numbered 145, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, numbered 124, offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen].

The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 75, as follows:

[No. 93 Leg.]

YEAS—20

Byrd, W. Va.
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long, La.
McClellan
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond

NAYS—75

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Fannin
Fong
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—5

Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Church
Robertson
Sparkman

So Mr. Ervin's amendment (No. 145) to the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 123

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 123. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment not be read but printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, No. 123, was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

On page 30, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 16. Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other Act, when the governing authority of any political subdivision certifies in writing to the Attorney General of the United States that in its judgment a demonstration, if conducted or participated in by persons other than those who claim to have been denied the opportunity to register to vote and who by the residence, age, and citizenship requirements of such political subdivision would be entitled to vote therein, would—

"(a) unreasonably interfere with public officials in the performance of their duty to register voters, keep the peace, or to perform necessary functions of their office, or

"(b) place upon such political subdivision an unreasonable financial burden to keep the peace,

the Attorney General shall institute in the United States district court for the judicial district in which such political subdivision is situated a proceeding for a restraining order, or a temporary or permanent injunction, or other appropriate relief to prevent such demonstration by persons who have not been denied the right to register to vote within such political subdivision, or who under applicable voter residence, age, and citizenship requirements are not entitled to vote in such political subdivision."

On page 30, line 8, strike out "Sec. 16." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 17.".

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require. I do not expect to speak at length.

DEMONSTRATION AMENDMENT

The recent marches, sit-ins, and other demonstrations that have disrupted the conduct of government in counties, cities, and even entire States make it apparent that our public officials must have some effective and legal protection from the demonstrators, who seem determined to continue a campaign of harassment.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide protection and assistance for registrars and other public officials who want to discharge their duty to register voters, keep the peace, or to perform necessary functions of their office. It also provides the taxpaying citizen of a political subdivision some assistance in obtaining relief from demonstrations which cause an unreasonable financial burden upon the Government which they must support with their taxes.

In brief, this amendment merely provides that when a group of outsiders come into a community and unreasonably encroach upon the rights of the public officials or taxpaying citizens, the Attorney General must give assistance to those whose rights are violated.

Under this amendment the governing authorities of a political subdivision may certify to the Attorney General that in their opinion the rights of persons within their political subdivision have been or are about to be violated by a demonstration. The Attorney General of the United States then must take appropriate action to stop or to prevent the demonstration.

The matter is then put before the U.S. district court for the judicial district in which such political subdivision is situated. The court will hear the evidence and determine whether or not the demonstrations would, in fact, unreasonably interfere or are interfering with the rights of others, including the duty of registrars to register voters. If the court determines that such a demonstration would unreasonably interfere or is unreasonably interfering with rights of others, then the court should, of course, order the demonstrations stopped.

The amendment does not attempt to abolish existing constitutional rights or establish new ones. It merely compels the U.S. Attorney General to take action to protect the constitutional rights of all persons.

The key to the amendment is the word "unreasonable." It is a well-settled rule of constitutional law that one individual's right ends where the exercise of that right unreasonably encroaches upon the right of another.

I emphasize the language of the amendment. It applies only in those cases where the demonstration in question is conducted or participated in by persons other than those who claim to have been denied the opportunity to register to vote in a particular political subdivision and who by residence, age, and citizenship would be entitled to vote therein; and second, where the demonstration would in the judgment of the governing authority of the political subdivision: First, unreasonably interfere with public officials in the performance of their duty to register voters, keep the peace, or to perform the necessary functions of their office; or second, place upon the political subdivision an unreasonable financial burden to keep the peace.

I believe it is fair to state that the Attorney General is under just as high a duty to protect the rights of a public official or a taxpaying citizen of a political subdivision as he is to protect the rights of a demonstrator from outside the political subdivision, particularly in cases where under the terms of the voting rights bill the demonstrator could not vote there anyway.

I invite attention to the fact that the amendment has no application to any person who meets the residence, age, and citizenship requirements of the political subdivision in which he desires to demonstrate and who claims to have been denied the right to register there.

If it is proper to provide by law that the Attorney General must throw the full weight and assistance of his office into the effort to secure for some people the right to vote—as under this bill a petition by 20 persons would do—it is also proper to provide by law that the Attorney General must throw the full weight and assistance of his office into the effort of public officials and private citizens to secure the right to live in peace and perform their duties.

The law-abiding residents who as taxpayers must pay the bill caused by demonstrations are entitled to a means of relief. The innocent private citizens who must suffer inconveniences and the dedicated public officials who must do their work are also entitled to the assistance of the U.S. Attorney General in the protection of their right to perform their duties without unreasonable harassment. By law they are entitled to protection.

The amendment merely provides that the Attorney General, if requested to do so, must assist State, county, and local government officials to do the same thing the Attorney General did himself when demonstrators invaded his office, that is, throw them out so that "he could get some work done." Both the Attorney General and the White House have recognized that demonstrations interfere with and prevent the orderly and efficient accomplishment of work. This was admitted when demonstrators were ordered removed from the Attorney General's office and from inside the White House.

Under the amendment, the Attorney General would be compelled to answer the call for help from public officials of any political subdivision when persons who have not been denied the right to register there and are not residents therein, nevertheless storm in and create strife and discord and interfere with the discharge and performance of official duties.

When he is requested to do so, it imposes upon the Attorney General the duty to see that the rights of all individuals are protected.

The necessity of adopting this amendment is underscored and emphasized by recent statements of civil rights leaders. Some of them have stated they feel no moral obligation to obey laws with which they did not personally agree.

It is clear that some groups intend to force their demands—most of which are beyond all reason—with threats of marches, violence, and strife. To them, there is nothing unlawful or improper about doing so. They do not consider encroachment upon the rights of others or causing an unreasonable financial burden upon the State and communities in which they demonstrate as improper or illegal.

It would be a mockery of justice for the Congress to provide that the full weight of the Federal Government must be thrown behind such groups and refuse to give the assistance of the Federal Government to those who want to obey the law and discharge their duty under peaceable circumstances.

The Department of Defense has made public the cost to the Government of the recent Selma-to-Montgomery civil rights march. It cost a half million dollars for 1,860 National Guardsmen called into Federal duty. That figure does not include the pay and allowances for about 1,000 Regular Army personnel who were also used. Certainly this would have been an unreasonable cost to the State of Alabama. In fact, the State had to call upon the Federal Government to pay the bill. Few communities, if any, could afford a bill even a fraction of that size to keep the peace. Our military forces are needed badly elsewhere. They cannot go to every mass-singing or march to keep the peace.

There is a most disturbing aspect to these demonstrations. Repeated statements have been made in the press about known Communists participating in racial demonstrations. In the New York Times of April 28, the president of Howard University stated the Communists had joined a student protest group on the campus there. His remarks were interpreted by the reporter as "plainly issuing a warning to civil rights groups on the campus that radicals of the extreme left were seeking to cloak themselves in the mantle of civil righters." The president of that university said he knew there were at least two Communists there because he saw them and recognized one as a Communist he had defended as an attorney.

In the April 12 issue of Newsweek magazine, a leader of a west coast civil rights organization was quoted as saying he knew some Communists were in the civil rights group that worked and demonstrated in Mississippi last summer. The Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, has warned repeatedly of the Communists' attempt to infiltrate and use the civil rights movement to create strife and disorder.

If the power of the office of the U.S. Attorney General is to be used at all, surely it should be used to prevent demonstrators from trampling upon the rights of peace-loving, law-abiding citizens.

The proposed voting rights bill, if it is enacted, will give to the Attorney General every legal and necessary authority to secure the right of every citizen to vote. It goes so far in giving him this authority that it violates the Constitution and I am opposed to its passage for the reason that it makes a mockery of constitutional principles. I shall oppose it with all my strength. If the bill is passed, the Attorney General will be empowered with more authority than has ever been given to one individual in the history of this Government. I am opposed to giving one man the power that is given the Attorney General under the terms of this bill, but if he is to have such power, he should be compelled to use it in the protection of all citizens, especially those public officials who want to honorably perform their duties and also those citizens who seek to live in peace and who have a right to do so, without unreasonable interference.

Surely, with all of the power available to the Attorney General under the proposed bill, and with all of the legal procedures available to those who seek the right to vote, there is no need for marches, sit-ins, stand-ins, and other demonstrations that would unreasonably interfere with the rights of others. This amendment would strengthen the method of taking the issue out of the streets and placing it into the courts, where it properly belongs.

Unlike the terms of the substitute bill, this amendment applies to all States and political subdivisions, not just a select few. It will be needed in every State and in many cities outside the South. The April 12 issue of Newsweek magazine contained an article which quoted a civil rights leader as saying demonstrations would be conducted nationwide in the coming year. He said:

> You can expect this in New York and in Philadelphia and Chicago and Detroit and Los Angeles and Selma.

This amendment is not just to protect the South—it is to preserve law and order throughout the Nation.

The growing demonstrations are apparently a matter of grave concern to high-ranking officials in the administration, including the White House, where the same Newsweek issue states that Presidential aids have privately expressed fear that what they call responsible civil rights leaders might lose their leadership to SNCC hotheads.

This amendment is necessary as a protection to our public officials and the taxpaying, peaceable citizens of our Nation. I urge its adoption.

The substance of the amendment is to regulate demonstrators and marchers through the regular judicial processes; and the main officer for the enforcement of its provisions is the Attorney General of the United States. The amendment would not put any restrictions whatever on, and would not apply to, any demonstrator or marcher who met the requirements for voting in the political district in which the demonstration occurred. In other words, any person who was a resident and came within the age requirements and was otherwise eligible to become a qualified elector in the voting district would not be affected by the amendment and would not be restricted or restrained in any way. He would have every right, constitutional and otherwise, to parade and to demonstrate and to protest in a lawful way.

I point that out repeatedly, because I do not wish that point to be confused. The amendment would not invade the province, rights, or other activity of any person.

The amendment further provides, however, that if the political head or the governing authority, such as the mayor of a city, should determine that demonstrations were carried on, in whole or in part, by those who could not become voters or registrants under any rule, that is, through nonresidence, and certified that fact to the Attorney General, and certified that those demonstrations were getting beyond control, or were beyond control, or hindering, delaying, or impairing the carrying out of the public law by a registrar or by any official connected with registration, or any other official, or was imposing an undue or unreasonable financial burden upon the taxing authority or city authority or political subdivision, the Attorney General could, under this bill, and under the high prerogatives of his office, proceed in court.

Under the amendment, the Attorney General could not throw them out of town, as he rightly threw them out of the corridors in front of his own office. He did so then for a very good purpose, as he said—so he could get some work done. Under the amendment he would not have the authority to act arbitrarily or with haste, but would be required to go into court and follow all the judicial processes. He would have to proceed to obtain a restraining order, injunction, or follow whatever procedure might be appropriate.

Under the procedure stated in the amendment, incidents such as those which occurred at Selma, Ala., could be prevented.

Two years ago, in the little city of Greenwood, Miss., the type of action to which the amendment relates was first vividly called to my attention. Week after week and month after month the chief of police, the marshal, the mayor, and all the city officials of Greenwood, Miss., were harassed. Other people were also harassed. They were inconvenienced. Ordinary business functions could not be carried on. Ordinary police power could not be exercised. Happily, things never got beyond control and no one was hurt, at least not seriously. But the citizens of Greenwood underwent many weeks of turmoil, strife, and bitterness. During all that time, or at least most of the time, as I remember, registrations were proceeding. People who wished to register were being served, as at least most of them thought they should be served.

But promoters, organizers, and agitators who came from elsewhere conducted an organized drive. I have in my hand some of the news stories in connection with those incidents. For example, a New York Times article stated:

> Mississippi county is turned into major battleground of Negro civil rights fight. Tension builds up.

That story is under date of April 5, 1963, the year before last.

I have in my hand another news article, a UPI item, entitled "Ten Days of Tension." That article refers to the Greenwood situation.

Mr. President, I know the mayor of Greenwood. Nowhere in the United States is there a finer official, one who is more dedicated and more anxious to do his job and to do his duty than he is. The policemen in Greenwood maintained a semblance of control. As I have said, no one was seriously hurt.

Demonstrations of that kind do not get restraint and restriction from those in higher office. They get encouragement. They get encouragement from segments of the press.

Cameramen, newsmen, and television reporters follow them and help build up a sentiment and an interest in regard to voter registration. What can a little town, a small village, or a county with limited revenue do about that type of situation?

What can it continue to do day after day with such vexations, and how can it foot the bill?

Mr. President, the amendment is very simple. Under the amendment nothing could be done to anyone who lives in a political subdivision who might possibly become a qualified elector, even under the terms of the bill. I say anyone. They would not have to pass a literacy test or meet with any other requirement to be exempt from the amendment. But if they met the requirements, the qualifications under the bill, it would be possible for them to become voters in that political subdivision, and then they could not be proceeded against by the Attorney General. Only those who might be in the community from outside the protected category could be proceeded against, and then only after the governing official had verified that the acts specified were going on. The Attorney General would come in. He would pick up the instruments of the bill in the regular, lawful, judicial process and would proceed to try to obtain a restraining order. He would not get it unless the facts should justify it under the terms of the amendment and under the terms of law that applies in a general way.

On my responsibility as a Member of this body, I state to Senators that I have very carefully looked into the legal aspects of the question. I have very carefully examined the authorities. They are abundant. I have looked into the cases from the Supreme Court of the United States, as well as other cases; and in my own mind I am satisfied—and I have no doubt whatsoever about it—that the amendment is entirely justified under the uniform precedents of the courts, both Federal and State. There is a legal basis for the protection of the constitutional rights of the citizens.

The amendment would not invade the constitutional rights of anyone, even though he be a newcomer and not a resident citizen. He could not possibly infringe upon any of a citizen's rights. But the amendment would bring the power and responsibility of the office of the Attorney General of the United States into play and would give him the authority, if the court should give him a decree, merely to help keep things under control. He would have to certify that there would be a financial injury to the city or the town before it would be applicable again.

The amendment would apply only to voting rights questions.

I am not happy to make the statement I am about to make to Senators from other parts of the country, but I am satisfied in my mind, based upon what I have observed and my understanding of the background of various groups of people, that somewhere, at some time, and in some manner provisions will have to be made effectively to deal with situations that will arise in parts of the country outside the South, and on other subjects.

I read that the other day in Syracuse, N.Y., demonstrations were being carried on. Those demonstrations did not relate to elections and voters' rights, but to alleged civil rights in other fields. The news article which I read stated that 18 marchers and demonstrators had been imported from Selma, Ala., and they were helping to organize and carry on the demonstrations.

I say to Senators from other areas of the country than the South, "Your time will come." I do not desire to bring bad news to anyone, but as certain as night follows day, the present trouble will spill over in a large way into the housing question. Last year, when a provision in the 1964 Civil Rights Act related to housing was considered, it spilled over on the floor of the Senate. A provision was inserted in that act to withdraw Federal funds from guarantee contracts. It was thought that the provision might apply to various Federal loans for dwellings and housing. Therefore, the provision was very quickly withdrawn by the proponents of the bill. It was not defeated or taken out by the opponents of the bill.

Mr. President, again I say to Senators from other parts of the country than the South, "Your time will come."

Last year another provision was inserted in the Civil Rights Act from which the proponents of the bill ran like, in biblical times, the Egyptians ran from the plague. That provision related to the busing of schoolchildren. Language in that bill provided that funds could be spent to make a survey of what was necessary with reference to the busing of schoolchildren. Almost overnight great opposition grew up even at the thought of such a thing. The provision was quickly removed from the bill—not by the opponents, but by the proponents.

I say again, "Your time will come."

Last year, in Philadelphia, Pa., there occurred some highly unfortunate incidents.

I say, "If you keep running from the facts of life, your time will come."

No group, it makes no difference what their color, should be allowed full leeway to demonstrate. That practice should be stopped.

I remember that last year, when the World's Fair was about to open, there was a sit down or a demonstration of some kind in the streets, blocking the way to the fair on the opening day. Naturally, there was great concern about that, both here and elsewhere, and something was done to correct the situation.

But in my part of the country, where we have special problems, there is no help, or whatever help is provided does not come in time.

The Attorney General would be vested in the pending bill with more power than any other man has had in this field of activity under our form of government. My amendment would merely fill out the blank space. It would permit the Attorney General to be in charge of registrations and in charge of the examiners who would be given power here, power there, and power everywhere. The amendment would give him some responsibility to try to keep marchers and demonstrators under some kind of control. We are about to let the Federal Government spend more money—not a great deal, but some—to help local taxpayers. Furthermore, the power and resources of the Attorney General would be made available for use in this very limited field.

Aside from keeping law and order and protecting officials—no one has yet told the full story about the kind of job the registrars have—the amendment would help to create a calmer atmosphere and would set a firmer tone to activities.

These problems will not be solved merely by passing laws and telling people, "You shall do this," or "You shall do that." A new tone would be set if we filled out the bill with this simple, limited provision that would be effective in this field.

I frankly and honestly submit this proposal to the membership of this body. We have a responsibility in this field. To ignore it is merely to pour more and more salt into a wound.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question, which is to be charged to my time?

Mr. STENNIS. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I note on line 6, page 2, of the Senator's amendment that the Attorney General "shall" institute a suit upon the filing of a complaint. I assume that the suit is mandatory, and that whether he believed, or had cause to believe, that the allegations had justification, he would have no choice but to file a case in court. I was wondering whether the Senator had considered substituting "may" for "shall" or some clause that would indicate that the Attorney General should file a complaint only if he believed that the complaint made out a prima facie case or had merit.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his question. It is well put. I thought about that very point in connection with the same language. My judgment is that the Attorney General would have to find the facts to be substantially as certified to him by the governing authority, and that he would proceed into court upon a set of facts under this general guideline, upon which he could reasonably expect to sustain his proof, because he has to make out his case and prove it in court. I do not believe there would be any real difficulty in that respect. If certain conditions exist, it shall be his duty to proceed. Does that satisfy the Senator's inquiry, which he has very well raised?

Mr. COTTON. Still charging this colloquy to my time, I have great respect, first, for the purpose of the Senator from Mississippi. I know it to be the highest possible purpose, and I have sympathy with its object even though I question the merits of this amendment.

I also recognize that the Senator's legal experience and ability as a former judge are far superior to my own. But I have always thought that I knew the difference between "shall" and "may." It would seem to me, according to the present phraseology, that upon the filing of such a written complaint, the Attorney General would have no choice but to file the case and pursue it, whether he prevailed or not. That was the point I raised. I was not quite satisfied. I hope the Senator from Mississippi understands that I am not merely trying to find flaws.

Mr. STENNIS. I fully understand. The amendment was carefully drawn by skilled draftsmen who are learned in the law. I believe it would bind the Attorney General to bring suit if on examination of the facts reasonable testimony is available to sustain them in court. That was my only purpose. I would not expect the Attorney General to go any further than that. As the offerer of the amendment, that was what I had intended to convey. But I would not want the situation to be left wide open, so that some remote assistant or someone else representing the Attorney General could brush it off by merely calling the Attorney General on the telephone and saying, "There is nothing to it." The Attorney General ought to have personal responsibility.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. His expression establishes a useful legislative history for his amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I do not wish to detain the Senate unduly, but this is a serious matter. It cannot be brushed off by saying that it is only an effort to alleviate a situation. I wish to underscore the point that the decision would be left in the hands of the Attorney General. He is the one who would have control of the general situation in areas where the bill was operative. An additional responsibility would be placed upon him. I believe that the mere inclusion of my amendment would have a salutary effect upon the demonstrations and the atmosphere, and would determine whether law and order was to prevail in those areas.

Something must be done to correct the situation. These matters are pressed to the utmost in many places, without regard to the conditions or the feelings of the people. When groups of outside marchers, including those armed with force and the power of the law, it is a little less than civil butchery. We would not think of treating anyone, any people anywhere on the globe, in such fashion, without being willing at least to carry a little of the responsibility.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the Senator knows that I have great respect for his legal knowledge and judgment, and also for his sense of justice.

Mr. STENNIS. I assure the Senator from Kentucky that I share mutual feeling toward him.

Mr. COOPER. I recall that at the close of the debate on the civil rights bill last year, the Senator from Mississippi spoke in the Senate, and said that although he opposed the civil rights bill that had been passed, he hoped that time would be given to accommodate the processes of the law. I expressed the same opinion, saying that, having great respect for the processes of the law, I hoped that every opportunity would be given to make certain that the provisions of the bill could be carried out under the law, and that the people of the South would give it their consent, that consent which is an important element in our system of law and government. Demonstrations have been carried out throughout the South and, indeed, all over the land. I believe they will continue, until enforcement of the law and consent to the law are obtained.

The amendment of the Senator from Mississippi, as I have read it, would instruct the Attorney General to apply for an injunction or other remedy in the event that a demonstration was undertaken for any purpose other than to secure the right to register or vote. As the Senator knows, I can talk to him freely. I know him and I trust him. The Senator knows that demonstrations have been carried out and will be carried out for other purposes—to influence public opinion and to secure other rights—rights which some of us believe are inherent and secured by the Constitution, and rights which have been made available to citizens, particularly to those of our Negro citizens, as a matter of public policy under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Would the amendment of the Senator direct the Attorney General to initiate legal action to secure an injunction, say, in the event of a demonstration carried out for the purpose of securing equal rights in the field of public accommodations, school desegregation, or other rights guaranteed either by the Constitution or by the civil rights bill of 1959, 1960, and 1964?

Mr. STENNIS. The amendment is drawn so that it would apply to registering, voting procedures, demonstrations, and marches. The amendment concerns the subject matter of the bill.

I believe that it would require a special act of Congress to cover other kinds of demonstrations. The time will come when we shall have to enact a law to control demonstrations.

The provisions of my amendment would not come into play, according to the terms of the amendment, until an unreasonable interference with public officials in the performance of their duties occurred. The provisions of the amendment would not be applicable merely because there was marching or demonstrating. The provisions would not apply to local people. However, my amendment would apply if public demonstrations were led or participated in by people who were not qualified to vote in the State or political subdivision, and the marches were to interfere with the performance of the duties of public officials—to register voters, keep the peace, and so forth, and were to place an unreasonable financial burden upon the political subdivision or State—not an ordinary or additional cost, but an unreasonable financial burden. The key word in the entire amendment is "unreasonable." The cost involved would have to be beyond an extraordinary cost.

Then if the facts were such that the Attorney General thought a case could be sustained, it would be his duty to file a suit. I want to place the duty upon the Attorney General. He would be directed to carry on other processes with reference to voting. The provision of the amendment would have a narrow application, but it would be effective.

May I ask the Senator to ask the questions, if he will, on his own time?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; I have time.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has 1 hour.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it may be charged to my time.

Mr. President, as the Senator knows, a difficult problem is involved in all these demonstrations. I know that a State or municipality has the authority to enact local ordinances to limit demonstrations. On the other hand, citizens demonstrate for what they believe to be—and I believe they are correct—their constitutional rights.

There are also, as the Senator so well knows, the rights of citizens under the first amendment of petition and of free speech. I believe that this language of the Senator's amendment would reach far and would limit legal or peaceful demonstrations, and actually infringe on the rights guaranteed under the first amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I can understand the Senator's thought. I doubly assure the Senator that, in my opinion, it does not invade those principles.

If the Senator was present when I started speaking, I stated that my amendment would not apply under any circumstances to parades, marches, or any other demonstration by local people who could qualify to register or vote. Those people could demonstrate. We could not take that right away from them. My amendment would come into play if the demonstration were led or participated in by people from outside the State or political subdivision thereof.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, does the Senator believe that we can restrain persons from demonstrating legally even though they are from outside of Somerset, Ky., which is where I live or any place in the United States?

Mr. STENNIS. I believe so, if the demonstration were to unreasonably interfere with the performance of the duty of public officials to register voters, and so forth.

As a result of the demonstrations in Selma, the registrars were so crowded, sought after, and rushed to such an extent that they could not carry out the functions of their office on some days. My amendment is directed to such activity.

Mr. COOPER. Are there not local statutes dealing with interference with the duties of officials?

Mr. STENNIS. I suppose that there are some such statutes. However, my amendment would give some responsibility to the Attorney General in these premises. As I illustrated a while ago, marchers and demonstrators came to Washington and lay down in front of the Attorney General's office. They went to the White House and lay down in the corridor. For some reason the demonstrators were not removed from there for 6, 8, or 10 hours. However, Attorney General Katzenbach said, "Take them out. I must carry on my work."

Mr. COOPER. I believe that he was right. But I hold that the Senator's amendment would attempt to infringe on the rights of citizens under the first amendment. I shall vote against it.

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly he was right. I commend him highly.

Mr. President, may I ask how much time I have used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). The Senator from Mississippi has used 28 minutes of his allotted time.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield the floor.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I have enjoyed listening to the colloquy between the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton].

I find myself in a rather embarrassing position, having to contest the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, because of the illustrious career he has had, not only in the Senate but also on the bench in his State. However, I feel compelled to do so. I believe that the wording of the amendment, despite the honest and sincere intentions of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, would indeed go much further than he desires it to go.

I bring the attention of the Senate to the wording of the amendment itself, which starts as follows:

> Not withstanding any other provisions of this or any other Act.

It seems to me that the fear raised by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is well founded—that the amendment does not limit this matter to voting rights alone, but limits the right to petition or redress one's government in in the entire area. We talk about a political subdivision. This means that any person from one township within a city could be denied, if it were so desired, the opportunity to petition in another township. I am sure this is much broader than what the Senator from Mississippi desires.

Also, I call attention to the fact that, as the Senator from Indiana reads it, there are two clauses on page 2, (a) and (b); and, as has been pointed out, the word "shall" is used. In order to compel the Attorney General to bring an injunction proceeding, it could be done not only if the demonstration unreasonably interfered with public officials in the performance of their duty to register voters, because the word "or" is used, and not "and," but if it would place upon such political subdivision an unreasonable financial burden to keep the peace.

So this is a much broader intention than the Senator from Mississippi has indicated.

Leaving that argument aside for a moment, in my judgment—and here again I respect the Senator's opinion to the contrary—the main thrust of this argument would come from the fact that it violates the first amendment of the Constitution.

To be sure, what the Senator has said is correct—namely, that we must consider this law not only as it applies to the South, but all over the country. This amendment, as he has said, would apply all over the country.

We do not wish to get into a position that would prevent a person who lives just outside a town from having the right to come within the confines of a town to express his protest. This is not only not just, but it violates a constitutional right.

I sympathize with a locality that would have a financial burden placed upon it. But there is a sufficient remedy, if the locality cannot meet that burden, in having the State enforcement agency help, rather than go to the Attorney General for help.

Second, I believe the amendment is unnecessary to accomplish even the purpose the Senator desires to accomplish.

In addition, I believe its purpose is dangerous, and a violation of the Constitution and a violation of the right to petition.

A law enforcement officer should always go to his Governor and ask for help from the State organization before he sends for help from the Attorney General.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The Senator from Indiana has made a fine argument, as has the Senator from Kentucky by his questions, with respect to the issue of constitutionality which is involved here and with respect to the mandate to the Attorney General to sue.

They are quite correct in the argument that if this amendment were adopted it would not stand up under the first amendment to the Constitution.

Leaving aside the question of practicality, I rise because I see the main thrust of the amendment directed at those who come from New York, Illinois, or Massachusetts, and go into Mississippi or Alabama, where there are civil rights problems, in order to help the people of those States. Today, they have been characterized as interlopers who are causing the difficulty.

Some young people have lost their lives in this effort; and I could not sit here and fail to speak at least in their names, because they have been martyrs in the cause of full equality.

If it could be claimed that any people have civil rights, it also is the right of citizens to go into a community to protest the denial of the rights of people in that community and to help them receive those rights.

I am not for indulgence of the law, nor do I say it should not be applied to all people, whether they go from New York or Chicago into Alabama or Mississippi, or go from Alabama or Mississippi to New York or Chicago; but the enforcement of the law should be equally applicable to everyone.

The civil right to protest is just as important and effective a civil right as the right to vote in the particular community in which the people who have been denied that right live.

I speak in the name of hundreds of young men and women who have undergone great dangers, and some of whom have lost their lives, in their effective efforts for civil rights and in protesting the denial of those rights to others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 1 more minute.

That effort should be protected and reserved and referred to and honored on the floor of the Senate.

We talk about the fact that there should be morale in our young people; that we want idealism to live in this Nation; and that there should be great patriotism. It is great patriotism that college students and others should make this effort to help people who have been denied their rights for decades by their States.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New York. The matter of petition in the civil rights issue cannot be limited to State boundaries so far as the rights of enforcement are concerned. It does not happen to be a State problem, but a national problem. I said in a speech on the floor of the Senate that we need to hear across the country the tramp, tramp, tramp of marching feet as free Americans march in protest against the denial of constitutional rights to the Negroes of America wherever they are denied.

So long as such rights remain denied, we need more marchers, not fewer, and we need people from many places in this country to go into certain areas of the country in which these rights are being denied to the Negroes of the country, and demonstrate, within the law. The time has come for constitutional rights to be granted Negroes and first-class citizenship guaranteed to them.

I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], numbered 123, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, numbered 124, offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 74, as follows:

[No. 94 Leg.]

YEAS—17

Bennett
Byrd, W. Va.
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Hill
Holland
Jordan, N.C.
Long, La.
McClellan
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Smathers
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond

NAYS—74

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Symington
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young. N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—9

Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Church
Hayden
Magnuson
Neuberger
Randolph
Robertson
Sparkman

So Mr. STENNIS' amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "by such State or subdivision against the United States" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "against the United States by such State or any political subdivision of such State, or by such political subdivision with respect to which such determinations have been made as a separate unit."

On page 4, line 21, after the word "color," it is proposed to insert: "within the territory of the State or political subdivision bringing such action."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The amendment merely proposes that the parishes and counties in the six States that are being picked out as culprit States because less than 50 percent of the people voted at the last presidential election—which include Louisiana—be given the same right that every other county in the United States is given to come to the District of Columbia and prove that they are not discriminating. They would come to the court chosen by the Attorney General and carry the burden of proof. Therefore, those parishes would be relieved of having Federal examiners to replace those who are doing their jobs in registering Negroes.

I should like to point out how the proposal would apply to my State.

In Louisiana, obviously there are some parishes in which a case could be made for the appointment of a Federal registrar. Here are some figures provided by the State—a parish, in which the percentage of Negroes registered to vote is 1.9 percent.

Then here is Plaquemines Parish. The percentage of Negroes registered to vote in Plaquemines Parish is 3.3 percent. In another parish in Louisiana the percentage of Negroes registered to vote is 1.7 percent.

Obviously those parishes could not make a strong case to prove that they were not discriminating against Negroes registering.

On the other hand, let us look at some of the other parishes. For example, let us look at Evangeline Parish in the French-speaking country. In that parish 93.8 percent of Negroes are registered. Mr. President, we do not have that high a percentage of whites registered in that parish.

Look at Acadia Parish. In that parish 78.6 percent of the Negroes are registered. In Allen Parish, 81.6 percent of the Negroes are registered. In Cameron Parish, 79.5 percent of the Negroes are registered. In Lafourche Párish, 78.1 percent of the Negroes are registered. In St. Charles Parish, 89.4 percent; St. James, 70.3 percent; Vermilion Parish, 88.9 percent.

Mr. President, in the Third Congressional District of Louisiana, the registrars have been ignoring the law in order to permit Negroes to register. State law requires that registrars may not register an applicant unless he can read, write, and take a literacy test. There are at least 4,500 Negro citizens in the Third Congressional District who are registered, and yet they cannot read and write. How did they become registered? The registrar filled out the information for them—notwithstanding all the pressure that could be brought by a State board of registration to compel those registrars to keep those people from voting.

I should think it would be only fair that those registrars should not be relieved of their responsibility without being given an opportunity to come to Washington, D.C. and prove that they are not discriminating against Negroes as the bill provides with respect to any other county. They can show that they have not turned anyone down. We have registered everyone who has showed up at the courthouse. If an applicant is not registered, it is because he did not apply, or perhaps because he is not a resident of the parish.

In a State where more than 50 percent of the people voted in the Governor's election in the same year that less than 50 percent voted—49.7 percent—in the presidential election, voting districts—parishes in Louisiana, counties in other States, would have the right to prove, and carry the burden of proof, that they are not turning anyone down.

Would it not be better, when presented with a choice of two positions, to urge a registrar to register everyone who comes in, rather than exert the power—the hand of the Attorney General and others—merely because James Farmer or someone else wishes to hold a demonstration down there? Would it not be better to give a parish or a county the opportunity to say, "All right; we are going to avoid a Federal registrar. We have a recourse. We have the right to go into the Federal court that the Attorney General himself chooses, the one he is likely to dominate, and have our case for declaratory judgment heard so that we can prove that no wrong has been done?"

I am satisfied that the Attorney General would agree to something along that line if we had time to work with him on the point. Since he cannot agree to my proposal, and would like to have more time to think about it, I shall not ask the Senate to remain in session overnight or for several hours, because Senators are anxious to legislate.

The House committee report inserted some vague language along the general line I have proposed.

But, to me, the very idea of imposing Federal authority in a voting unit in which 93.8 percent of the citizens who are Negroes have been registered without pressure of the Federal Government, and with the pressure at the State capitol level having been the other way around is arbitrary and absurd. Those people should not have a Federal registrar imposed upon them without the right to go into the one court where the burden of proof would be the most difficult for them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They would be in a court where the burden of proof would be the most difficult, where the distance would be a handicap, and where the Attorney General would have every conceivable advantage. To deny them the right to have their case heard under those circumstances is rather ridiculous. I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield for a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Louisiana quoted figures which are very powerful to the effect that when a parish has had registered, let us say, 93 percent of the Negroes in that parish, it ought not to suffer the condemnation that would come about by reason of the proposed legislation. My question is asked with absolute sincerity. What is the reliability of the figures which the Senator from Louisiana has quoted?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Our law requires us to keep the figures which I have quoted. When a person comes in to register, he fills out a form in which he says that he is either colored or white, Caucasian or Negro. He states his race on the registration form. Our registration law so requires. I suppose that is a holdover from the time when a white primary was held in the State. Our law has always required that, as a part of the registration form, a person's race be included.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator repeat the figures which he stated about the registration in the particular parishes which he identified?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. In Evangeline Parish, 93.8 percent of all the Negroes of voting age were registered. In Acadia Parish, 78.6 percent—almost 79 percent—of the Negroes of voting age are registered. In Allen Parish, 81.6 percent. Incidentally, in each case the percentage of Negroes registered exceeds the percentage of adult citizens registered in the State.

In Livingston Parish, 78.1 percent of the Negroes of voting age are registered. In St. Charles Parish, 89.4 percent; St. James Parish, 70.3 percent; Vermilion Parish, 88.9 percent.

If those registrars do not have the right to go into court and say, "We have not turned anyone down and we are not turning anyone down now," and ask for a declaratory judgment, I ask, who as a matter of conscience has such a right?

Mr. LAUSCHE. How many parishes are there in the State of Louisiana?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Sixty-four.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How many parishes has the Senator from Louisiana referred to?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have stated the percentage in relation to about 8 parishes, but in Louisiana, in 28 out of 64 parishes, the registration percentage of Negro citizens of voting age registered exceeds 40 percent of the population. That figure increased to that point during the past 20 years from zero. My best information is that in not one of those parishes, is there any discrimination whatever.

To be fair, I concede to the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I concede that there are parishes in which Negro citizens have been denied the right to vote. They should be made to comply with the provisions of whatever bill is enacted into law. But, on the other hand, to deny a day in court to those fairminded officials who have gone out of their way to register citizens of all races of their parish is, from the point of view of this Senator, unfair.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I ask a further question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The purpose of the Senator is to avoid the accusation that comes upon the whole State from also falling upon individual counties, the records of which show on their face that there has not been discrimination.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. To draw the case, is it fair to make Evangeline Parish, which has 93.8 percent—almost 94 percent—of its Negro citizens registered, carry the burden of what is happening in a distant parish, in which only 1.7 percent of the Negroes are registered?

Mr. LAUSCHE. How would that happen?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The officials of Evangeline Parish would have to come into court and undertake to prove that they had not denied anyone the right to vote.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How would Evangeline Parish become a victim? Would the action be brought against the State?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It would take not more than 25 citizens signing a petition to the effect that they felt they had been denied the right to vote, the Attorney General agreeing with them, whether they were right or wrong.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Against the whole State?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Invoked against the parish.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Do the Senator's figures show what percentage of the Negroes registered in various parishes actually voted?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They do not; but they show one interesting fact, and that is that in the parishes I have cited practically all the Negroes voted for Lyndon Johnson, and he carried those parishes. Many of them did vote, because he ran very well with the colored vote. He did not run nearly as well in parishes where there were practically no Negroes registered.

Mr. MORSE. Speaking only hypothetically, a considerable number of Negroes could be registered to vote, while only a small number of Negroes actually voted. That raises the question: Why did they not vote, and what prevented them from voting?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Now I see what the Senator from Oregon is driving at. I live in Louisiana. I do not know of a single case—and I say this on my honor as a Senator—I do not know of a single Negro citizen who was denied the right to vote in the last 3 or 4 years in Louisiana because of any sort of intimidation whatsoever.

Of course, in some parishes there have been cases in which only a small percentage were registered, and where efforts were made to intimidate people from voting. Also there have been cases in which they were denied the right to vote, not as a matter of intimidation, but as a matter of registration. They were asked complicated questions or were required to fill out complicated forms, and were then told that they had failed to pass. The registrar would not explain why they did not succeed, or accord them an opportunity to correct the error, and that was why they were denied the right to vote.

On the other hand, many officials, in violation of State law, have registered Negroes who were not even able to fill out forms. State law provides that people must be able to read and write or to answer an intelligence test before they can be registered. The reason some local officials wanted to let Negroes register was because they felt that Negroes would vote the same way as the officials registering them.

I could cite a parish that would be affected by the bill in which a sheriff won in the runoff. If one is the sheriff and is running behind his opponent, he could very well be defeated, because the incumbent usually has to lead in the primary to win.

In that instance, that sheriff put every deputy on the highway, looking for Negroes to help them register, because Negroes had been voting for him. He won the election because he succeeded in registering enough Negroes to win the runoff election. That parish has about 55 percent of its Negroes registered. That sheriff is popular with Negroes because he helped Negroes to register. He is a strong man.

It could be that someone like James Farmer might go to such a community and tell Negroes that they would be better off dead, merely because they did not have a paved street in front of their homes, and they could be made to feel that they were discriminated against. Thereupon he could inspire a number of demonstrations. Then, if 25 Negroes signed a petition as provided by the bill, the Attorney General would be under pressure to appoint a Federal examiner. The local registrar would be denied the right to go up and make a case, saying that not a single one had been denied the right to register. The sheriff, who had been bringing them in in his police cars to register, would be denied the right to prove, if need be, that discrimination, if it existed, had actually favored Negroes.

It could be argued that the Attorney General might have to prove his case in court. But let us look at the other side of the coin. How would Senators like to be the Attorney General and have James Farmer and his powerful organization come in with a signed petition, saying, "We want you to assign a Federal examiner in that particular parish." If I were the Attorney General, in a doubtful case, I would like to let the court decide whether I had been arbitrary. I would like the court to say whether I had turned anybody down; or if I had turned someone down, that to my knowledge that person was not registered in my particular parish but was registered in another parish.

It seems to me that the election officials ought to have an opportunity to make their case; failing that, it would seem to me that the bill is arbitrary.

If the Attorney General wants to protect himself and see to it that people are registered, and the time comes to prove that the local officials have corrected any sort of discrimination that had existed, if he wants to, he can keep an FBI agent in the office every day; and if the local officials decline to register a single Negro citizen, he can bring the FBI agent to Washington to testify and say, "You turned this man down." Under the penalty that unless he could show that not a single person has been discriminated against, the Attorney General could proceed to appoint a Federal examiner. The local official ought to be allowed to show that the facts are false and that there was no discrimination. People who want to do right ought to be rewarded rather than condemned.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator have any official figures from parishes in Louisiana showing the ratio of registered colored people who vote and the ratio of registered white people who vote?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not have such figures, although I could get them. On occasion, I have compiled figures on this point. However, my impression has been that when there is a race in which two men are running, one of whom is expressing contempt for the Negro and urging that people vote for him because he is for white supremacy, and that sort of thing, while the other man is not making race an issue, tending to have Negroes sympathize with him, the Negroes vote in a higher percentage, based upon registration, than do the whites.

When two white men are running, and both are cursing the poor Negro, Senators can understand why Negroes might not go out to vote for either one.

But in a case in which one is kind to the Negroes, as against someone who is unkind toward them, studies I have seen have indicated that Negroes vote in an even higher percentage than do the whites.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. In the case of the sheriff, the Senator said that the man who went out on the highways and byways, urging Negroes to register, was the incumbent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. He is still the sheriff.

Mr. MORSE. Speaking hypothetically, let us suppose a case in which the sheriff did not want Negroes to vote. Would he have any influence in preventing them from registering, in view of the fact that he was the law enforcement officer?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It would be very easy to make certain that citizens voted in such a case. Both Federal and State Government have a number of good laws to deal with cases in which someone intimidates or prevents another from voting. Louisiana has good laws to protect the right to vote, once a person is registered. But the problem that has to be confronted is that there are instances in which there is a denial of the right to register, so that one cannot qualify to vote.

In parishes where one finds that Negroes have been freely registered—and I live in such a parish—there is no problem about their voting. Practically all of them vote. No one attempts to keep them from voting. In Louisiana, efforts have been made to influence the outcome of elections by seeing to it that every white man is registered in parishes where the officials try to deny the right of Negroes to vote and try to retard Negro registration.

During the Governor's race in Louisiana, we had this situation: One candidate was carrying south Louisiana; the other candidate was carrying north Louisiana. The candidate leading in south Louisiana tried to get Negroes registered so they could vote for him. The candidate leading in north Louisiana tried to get whites registered to vote for him.

Where we find officials who do everything to give Negroes the opportunity to vote, I should think they should have the right, in the event the Attorney General, quite erroneously, appointed Federal registrars to relieve them of their responsibilities, to go into court and prove that they did not discriminate.

Mr. MORSE. The language of the bill in its present form gives full protection; the facts support the contention the Senator from Louisiana is making.

If, on the other hand, we were to find great disparity, as seems to exist in some areas, between the number of citizens registered and those who finally voted, that would raise a question as to why a Negro did not vote after such registration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, a Federal examiner could not do anything to answer the question as to why a person does not vote. However, if a person could prove that there had been no discrimination, it would seem to me that he should have a right to do so. This bill would afford to 94 counties the duty to assume the burden of proving that the Attorney General was in error in having a Federal registrar sent there, that there was no discrimination, or that any discrimination that perhaps had existed had been corrected.

I believe that I have made a case that cannot be successfully rebutted. Counties in Louisiana have as high a percentage of Negroes registered as any county in any of the States. I have figures for counties in South Carolina and Georgia. In Appling County, Ga., 97 percent of the Negroes were registered.

Should the bill convey the power to the Attorney General—without the county having any recourse—to deny the right of a hearing to a county which registered 97 percent of its adult Negroes?

It would seem to me that that is a very interesting case in the State of Georgia. A county oddly enough, known as White County, according to the figures made available to me, in 1962 registered 100 percent of all its adult Negroes.

It does not seem reasonable to say that the Attorney General should have power to appoint Federal registrars without having to prove his case, when the officials of a political subdivision would have to prove their case even though 100 percent of the adult Negro citizens had been registered to vote.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, where would the action be brought?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In the District of Columbia, in the district court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The action would be brought in the very court that the Attorney General picked out.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Senator has stated that 100 percent of the Negroes in White County, Ga., were registered. Does the Senator have the percentage of white voters who were registered?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I regret to say that I do not.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am familiar with that county.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It could not be any greater than 100 percent.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I am familiar with that county, and I do not think that it is as high as 100 percent in the case of the white citizens.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe that the facts show that in the counties I have cited in Louisiana, there should be some reward for those who have gone the extra mile in recognition of the fact that they have tried to protect the rights of Negroes and have been friendly. I believe that those people should be given the right to come up and have an opportunity to make their case in court.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I believe that all of us in the course of the development of this bill have been sensitive and conscious of the situation that has been described by the Senator from Louisiana. Indeed, we believe that we have responded in large measure to that concern.

On page 9 of the star print of the leadership substitute, there is a limitation with respect to the action by the Attorney General in designating examiners to go into a State.

We provide that, if, "in his judgment (considering, among other factors, whether the ratio of nonwhite persons to white persons registered to vote within such subdivision appears to him to be fairly attributable to violations of the 15th amendment)," still and nonetheless, he should conclude that it is necessary to appoint examiners, he shall do so.

However, we have indicated clearly to him—and this exchange may be helpful in this regard—that an examiner ought not to be sent to counties such as those counties for which the figures have been supplied by the Senator from Louisiana.

I believe that in an exchange at the hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary, it was clearly stated that the Attorney General anticipated that there would be counties in which the tests and devices had been suspended, into which he would not send examiners.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, would the Attorney General have the final determination as to whether he should send in an examiner, or would that determination become final upon the review of the court?

Mr. HART. Yes. Mr. President, we know this Attorney General, and we would be reasonably confident that any Attorney General would act prudently in the exercise of this judgment which we ultimately vest in him. However, the language is rather clear in its caution.

The second point that we should understand in dealing with this amendment is that the suspension of tests and devices which would reach into Louisiana—and the appointment of examiners in such subdivisions as the Attorney General determines he should appoint—would not operate to put out of business, so to speak, the action of the local registrars who, in this case, the figures reveal have been acting fairly in their treatment of all their citizens.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, why should greater reliability be placed upon the discretionary power of the Attorney General than would be placed upon the judgment of a district court in Washington to which the direct action would have to be taken?

Mr. HART. To say that it would be a ministerial function, I think would beg the question, but, in substance, I think that is the answer.

The most important and, to us, the most persuasive reason for suggesting that this amendment would not be helpful is that we are talking about one of the centers of political power in a State which is decently motivated and has, on the record, performed well.

If, as a consequence of the failure to perform well elsewhere in the State, that good political unit is now prohibited from using a test and device—parenthetically, the Senator from Louisiana has told us they are not using them, anyway—we have reason to think that this may result in the kind of internal pressure on the State legislature that would be most likely to produce improved performance statewide.

Once the local subdivision is immunized or protected or brought out from under this act, it becomes or may become completely indifferent to the performance of its neighbors elsewhere in the State. It would have a salutary effect, in our judgment.

The reason that that good county would feel, at least in theory, the application of this law is that it would then make sure that the State legislature would know about its displeasure, and that would not be displeasure voiced by somebody from Michigan, Oregon, or Illinois. It would be displeasure expressed by local people who want the practice in their State to improve in tone in order that at least technical intrusion shall not apply.

It is for this reason that we feel that we would be withdrawing good yeast from this kettle if we were, by the adoption of this amendment, to immunize, withdraw, the good county, the county that we think can be presumed to be trying to exert an effort to improve the general quality and performance elsewhere in the State.

I could go on and make the additional point that it is conceivable that by the adoption of this amendment we would have a great deal of litigation here in the District of Columbia. A great deal could be said on the merits of that question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the position of the Senator from Michigan that a county that has been honest and fair in the registration of its qualified voters should not be allowed, in a court, to try to escape the force of the Federal Government's entry into the State because, with that innocent county being put under pressure, it will induce the State in general to comply with the law? Is that what the Senator is saying?

Mr. HART. It would be hoped, among other reasons, that the good counties would go to bat in Baton Rouge, or Lansing, or whatever the capital might be.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For example, let us assume a county that is fair. It must anticipate the weight of the law.

Mr. HART. Let me ask, What is the actual consequence to that good county? Let us examine that before we act on this amendment to see if it is as harsh as the Senator implies.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It must suffer the weight of the law so as to compel it, while innocent, to induce the State to conform to the edict of the Federal Government. That is what the Senator seems to be saying.

Mr. HART. Among other things, yes. There is logic behind the position that a good corner of the State, finding that this law has at least technical application to it as a consequence of overall State performance, will be perhaps more influential in correcting the State's attitude than any voice that might be raised in Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would not the county be justified in saying, "I have been good, decent, and honest. Why do you force upon me the responsibility of exerting the effort to induce other counties that are wrong in complying with the law? I have been honest and decent. The record shows that I have been honest and decent"?

I am arguing a question of morality.

Mr. HART. In terms of morality, neither the Senator nor I could conclude that there is a very great moral principle involved. The question is one of prudence, and a suggestion of where the higher claim is. The county is really the creature of the State. It could be asked, Why force the creature to influence its creator? But we know that internal forces within a State can bring about greater efforts and perhaps be more effective than a court in the District of Columbia.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator's statement and my statement have illustrated the difference in the position we have taken, and I have nothing further to say on it. It is rather clear which position is right.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. On the very point that the Senator from Ohio has raised, it occurred to me that the Senator from Michigan is arguing that when one child in a particular family misbehaves, the other children should be taken to the woodshed and whaled. That is a theory that does not seem to rest at all with me as being on the basis of equity and fairness.

It seems to me that logic and justice are on the side of not punishing or not subjecting to these restrictions a county which is ordinarily decent and in compliance with the law, merely for the sake of attempting to secure coercion in some other area that might be acting arbitrarily, through some bureaucrat, and be declared to be in violation or in contravention of the law.

I cannot follow the sense of the Senator's argument in law or equity which is used to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HART. What is it that we would visit on these good counties by the enactment of the act? It is that they shall not be permitted to apply tests and devices. This is what we are trying to correct. And from what source come the tests and devices? Not the county. They come from the State legislature. So the pressure is to correct it at that level. We think thrusts in applying pressure from political groups within the State in trying to make that correction would have greater effect than any voice from here.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My principal objection is not to the suspension of the tests and devices that the bill applies. My objection is to replacing an honest, respectable public official, who has leaned over backwards to see to it that Negroes are fairly treated, with a Federal registrar who alleges that he has done something wrong; to convict the accused and to deny him the right of proving his innocence, even though he is carrying the burden of proof, and going to the Attorney General's chosen court, at considerable expense and over a great distance, to do it.

I have great difficulty in understanding why an innocent man should be denied the right to prove his innocence.

When I used to argue against all efforts to apply the gag rule, I did not think there would ever be a time when I would be arguing that an innocent man should have a right to prove his innocence, when in the ordinary case a man is presumed to be innocent until he is proved guilty. Now, under a gag rule, we are permitted to speak for only 1 hour to argue that people who are innocent should have the right to prove their innocence, and that that right is being denied.

There is a county called Long County—that is an appropriate name—in Georgia in which 100 percent of the Negroes are registered. That is the second county in Georgia in which 100 percent of the Negroes are registered. What better can the registrar there do? Yet James Farmer can go down there and become angry enough to stir up trouble. The Attorney General might be hesitant about resisting CORE and send a Federal registrar there, even though the local registrar had registered 100 percent of the Negroes in that county. Yet he would not have the right to prove that he was innocent because 44.9 percent voted in Louisiana. I think the figure was 44 percent in Texas. Therefore that person would be denied the right, when he was innocent, to prove his innocence, when the fact is that he did not discriminate, but did exactly the opposite.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield on my time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I ask the Senator from Louisiana if the action would be brought in the Louisiana court or in the District of Columbia court?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They would have to come here. The officials in Vermilion Parish, where nearly 100 percent of the Negroes are registered, or in Long County, Ga., where 100 percent of the Negroes are registered, would have to come, at their own expense, a distance of 500 or 1,000 miles, to the court in the District of Columbia, and provide their own proof to show that they had not discriminated in any respect. If the Attorney General produced even one bit of evidence to the contrary, the court would, without doubt, uphold the Attorney General, and all the money that the man had spent trying to prove his innocence would be wasted.

But this is one of the weak points in the bill which I tried to point out, of being guilty without even being given the opportunity to prove one's innocence. I hope that the Senator would not persist in denying the right of an American citizen to prove his innocence.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia, on my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator from Louisiana will recall, a few years ago, when the Senate listened to stirring speech after stirring speech in this Chamber from the liberals and the pseudoliberals denouncing the doctrine of guilt by association; this doctrine of guilt by association came about if a man's name was even mentioned as having been seen with a Communist, such as having a meal with him, causing the person to be denounced because he had associated with Communists. This was regarded as a horrible thing, that a person had been named at a committee hearing as having associated with Communists.

But, in this case, it is proposed to establish guilt by geography, by the fact that one county happens to be in the same State with another county. It is the same thing as requiring that a patriotic honorable man be brought into court under so-called guilt by association. If the suggestion had been made that a person accused of associating with Communists would have to come into the District Court of the District of Columbia and prove that he was not a Communist, the liberals and pseudoliberals by the thousands would have had apoplexy.

In this case, it is proposed by the sponsors of the bill that merely because a county is located within a certain State, without regard to the conditions existing in that county the county officials would not be permitted even to go on into court and prove that although they are guilty of guilt by geography, they are not guilty of any other offense.

It is interesting to me that those who claim they are most opposed to guilt by association are the most vigorous in their efforts to convict everyone in my section of the country through guilt by geography, even though we know as a practical matter that more real courage has been manifested in the effort to achieve justice within those areas than in any other section of the United States.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The fact is that the registrars who would seek to protect the rights of citizens are men who, with great courage and against great pressures from within their own State government, in many cases have been resisting such pressures in order to register Negroes, even though the policy of their State government might have frowned on the practices which they were using to achieve that result.

These are the people in a position to prove—and would be prepared to prove—that they are far from discriminating against anyone and denying anyone his rights because one county in a State or a number of parishes in a State discriminate against someone should be denied the right to prove that they are innocent of any wrongdoing with regard to those citizens who have voting rights which this bill seeks to protect.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I believe that all of us are conscious of the danger of proceeding on a county-by-county basis in the application of the proposed legislation, at least in the areas we describe as "hard core." The amendment would permit each subdivision in each of the several States covered to file suit a day after enactment; thus, the Justice Department would be required to make proof in almost a thousand cases, and at one time. Those of us familiar with the record of the difficulty of developing proof, even with presumptions, are sensitive, concerned, and anxious to avoid doing such a thing.

As I have told the Senator from Louisiana, the committee and the leadership, in seeking to develop a responsible bill, have been sensitive with respect to the problem presented by so-called good counties.

We felt that the limitation on the judgment of the Attorney General, in explicitly requiring him to consider the ratio of nonwhites to whites registered in any subdivision, was adequate response.

To go further, I wonder whether the Senator from Louisiana would feel that the problem he developed this afternoon, and has developed with us on other occasions, could be met, in large part at least, if the language could be added on page 19 of the star print draft of the substitute amendment, if in line 18, after the word "Commission," we were to add, "or whenever the District Court for the District of Columbia determines in an action for declaratory judgment brought by any political subdivision with respect to which the Director of the Census has determined that more than 50 percent of the nonwhite persons of voting age residing therein are registered to vote." Also on page 6, line 21, after the words "section 6," insert the words "or section 13."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I take it that the precise meaning of that wording is that if a parish had 40 percent of its citizens of the Negro race registered and then proceeded to register up to 50 percent in short order, once the registrar was in a position to show that he had 50 percent registered, and is then in a position to show that no one had been denied the right to vote, they would then be regarded as not denying voting rights.

Mr. HART. This goes to the concern we all feel that the Attorney General should not be arbitrary. If an examiner is directed to go into a subdivision with high nonwhite registration, the subdivision could come to the district court and make this showing. I still have a deep and abiding belief that in the face of the figures recited by the Senator from Louisiana, no Attorney General would send in an examiner to such counties.

However, I cannot say that it would never happen. It could.

Let me ask the Senator from Louisiana if he does not feel that this would be a clear action on our part to insure against that kind of arbitrariness.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That would go to my two-thirds distance. If the Senator believes that the amendment should require it, I believe that figure would be more appropriate—namely, the 50 percent figure; and I would be willing to agree to that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be modified accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds to ask a question of the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. JAVITS. This remedy, as I see it, would be the only way in which, by proceeding under section 13, a political subdivision may come out of the examiner status. Here is an original amendment relating to how it may go in, and how it may proceed in court when it is put in; is that not correct?

Mr. HART. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. That is acceptable to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in justice to myself, in the early efforts I made on the pending bill, I thought we should keep in the escape hatch. The fact is, I had the figure set at 50 percent, and there was a good deal of caterwauling in the committee. Someone prevailed upon me to change it to 60 percent, and I was willing to do that to preserve harmony and to get an acceptable and enforceable bill.

But, in the long discussion, someone thought I had condign designs upon the bill and wanted to stick a knife into it. They said that DIRKSEN was trying to "gut" the bill, a bill for which I was in part responsible. I cannot imagine "gutting" a bill which was partially my own brain child. However, I was trying to do the acceptable thing. So now we have come 360° around the circle, and we are back again at the 50-percent escape hatch.

I am delighted my friend the Senator from Louisiana finds the 66⅔ acceptable to him, and I am hoping that he is equally delighted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 2, of the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute amendment No. 124, strike out the word "education" and insert in lieu thereof the following word: "educational."

On page 16, line 12, strike out the period after the word "Code" and insert the following words: "and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court."

On page 17, line 6, strike out the word "to" proceeding the word "intimidate."

On page 20, line 9, after the phrase "section 4' insert the following words: "or section 5".

On page 20, line 15, strike out the words "term 'vote'" and insert in lieu thereof the following words: "terms 'vote' or 'voting'".

Mr. HART. Mr. President, these amendments are in the nature of technical corrections. I hope they will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I call up my amendments Nos. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 4, on the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment No. 124, strike out the words "such test or device" and insert in lieu thereof the following words: "tests and devices".

On page 4, line 1, strike out the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof the following word: "and".

On page 7, line 24, strike out the word "or" and in lieu thereof add the following word: "and".

Mr. HART. Again, Mr. President, I hope the amendments will be agreed to. They, too, are in the nature of technical corrections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no further votes tonight. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF FORTUNE MAGAZINE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a fine statement by Henry Luce on the miracle wrought by U.S. private enterprise on the 35th anniversary of Fortune magazine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE ENTERPRISE HAS TO BE FOUGHT FOR IN THIS COUNTRY DESPITE ITS SUCCESS

(The idea of Fortune began to take shape just before the Wall Street crash of October 1929, which might have discouraged many publishers from going ahead with a magazine of this kind. Yet as events turned out, Fortune's dedication to reporting the philosophy of American business and its tangible assets—its steel mills, its drilling rigs, its agriculture, and the day-to-day work of its entrepreneurs and managers—fulfilled a real journalistic need in the depression thirties, and thereafter. In this article, Henry R. Luce, who staked out Fortune's original claim and who has at every point influenced its development, sums up the extraordinary accomplishment of U.S. enterprise, and reflects on the nature of the institutions that have carried the Nation thus far and will carry it further.)

(By Henry R. Luce)

A few years ago we were all speaking of the "miracle of Germany"—of the fact that within a decade Germany had risen from a mass of dead rubble to a great prosperity and that it had done so mainly because of free enterprise. The chief worker of this miracle (under the aegis of Adenauer) was Prof. Ludwig Erhard. I met this corpulent, blue-eyed professor a few months after war's end. We walked for an hour or two through the streets of Munich, which were piled high with rubble and empty of traffic. The professor kept saying over and over again, "Free enterprise—free enterprise—Marktwirtschaft—that is the only way." To me, he sounded pixilated; it seemed impossible to have such unqualified faith in free enterprise in the midst of all that silent ruin. Erhard is one of the very few men in history who had a faith, who got the chance to put that faith into practice, and who saw it work.

In that winter of 1945–46, when I was walking with Erhard, everyone—almost literally everyone, including American foreign correspondents—assumed that the countries of Europe would be ruled, after the war, by popular front (Socialist-Communist) governments. They did not foresee the rise of the Christian Democratic parties, which were to be one of the factors in swinging Western Europe toward free enterprise. Another factor was the Marshall plan, which under the persuasive genius of Paul Hoffman planted the seeds not only of "productivity" but also of free enterprise.

So, in a decade, came the miracle of Germany. And then came the miracle of Italy and then the miracle of France and the miracle of Europe generally, and then—way off yonder—the astonishing miracle of Japan. And then we gave up talking about miracles and settled down to taking all these amazing achievements almost for granted.

Yet all the while, of course, the greatest miracle of them all was the miracle of the American business-enterprise system, which had been the inspiration and the source of all the rest.

The American economy has now reached an extraordinary point, one rarely, if ever, reached by any large human construct. The American economy has arrived at the point where it meets all, or very nearly all, the demands put upon it. It meets the demands both of capitalism and of socialism. It meets the demands of businessmen that it should provide ample opportunity for production for profit—and it also meets the demands of the welfare of all the people.

To this last statement there will be instant objections. But consider, in his famous book, "The Affluent Society," our former colleague on Fortune, John Kenneth Galbraith, argued that we are spending our affluence on all the wrong things—on tail fins (that was back in the fifties) instead of on education or medicare. He may have been right; he may still be right. But note that Mr. Galbraith was not arguing that the American economy was incapable of meeting social demands; he was simply saying that the demands made on the economy (fins) were not the demands he himself would make. As for me, I would be happier if the $6 billion we now spend on agricultural subsidies were to be spent on more inspiring projects.

Since Mr. Gailbraith's book, two things have happened: the economy has grown bigger, faster; and the criticisms of American life have become deeper and more widespread. This was shown in the 1964 presidential campaign, when there was a minimum of bread-and-butter issues. Both sides stressed intangibles: Mr. Goldwater stressed individual freedom and morality; Mr. Johnson, not satisfied with having all the bread and butter on his side, stressed utopian hopes.

To whatever degree President Johnson's utopianism is taken seriously—and I think it ought to be taken seriously—it is not entirely impractical and it serves a purpose. It fills, or seeks to fill, an aching void. That void is in the heart, mind, or soul of Americans—the feeling that, with all our wealth and power, we are deficient in those moral and ideal purposes which give life its zest and savor.

This void is also felt by the followers of Goldwater; it is even more painfully felt by liberal democrats. Thus, speaking as a liberal democrat, Charles Frankel, professor of philosophy at Columbia, opens his book on "The Democratic Prospect" with a chapter entitled "The Politics of Malaise." In that chapter Professor Frankel says: "At a moment in [our history] * * * when almost all the most liberal programs of the preceding generation have been realized, malaise and a sense of helplessness and drift have become the badges of the liberal mind." The rest of the book is devoted to showing liberal democrats how much there is still to do. The significant thing is that, in setting forth a liberal agenda, Professor Frankel starts with the premise of malaise and says little about the inadequacies of the American economy as such. This is a very different approach from old-fashioned liberal attacks on capitalism.

But, after all, is there not still poverty? Yes—and some might add that it took President Johnson's political genius to discern it. Putting behind us all such uncompassionate thoughts, we can see that poverty in America today is not primarily a defect in the economy, not even in the distributive aspect of the economy. Poverty in America today is primarily the result of social, including educational, disabilities. The problem is now being attacked on these terms. And the solutions require more than money from the public treasuries. But insofar as money is required, the economy can afford it. That is my point. The American economy can and does supply both guns and butter—both in excess. It can and does supply both TV wasteland and academic excellence.

Obviously, the economy cannot supply every absurdity (like farm subsidies or solid-gold putters) that anyone could possibly think of, and the present malaise or aimlessness will not last forever. We will grow out of it or we will be shocked out of it either by new goals or by new misfortunes and most probably by both. My fundamental assertion has to do with the instant moment: the American economy has reached the extraordinary point where it can and does meet all the demands that can reasonably be made upon it.

Now, how did all this come about? My observations, in glancing back over 35 years, will be directed mainly to that question. First of all, of course, we have to note the proliferating miracles of science and technology. But, as can be seen by the drab example of Russia, science and technology work no economic miracles by themselves. We have then to note, second, and in my view most important, the American political system. However much erosion there may have been of the pristine principles of the Constitution, the system established by our Founding Fathers still puts an effective check on statism. It leaves nearly all economic activity (including most Government expenditures) to non-Government or "private" enterprise.

In recent years commentators (many of whom are innocent of any knowledge of commerce or industry) and even some businessmen have allowed themselves to use a formulation that comes out of faraway India: they speak of the "public sector" and the "private sector" of the economy. These phrases may correctly describe the situation in India, where poverty flourishes under a lot of state ownership and state planning. But this Indian English makes no sense in America. Our economy is at heart capitalistic: special dividends or taxes are taken from business-created wealth to pay for all sorts of nonprofit enterprises (many of them private) such as art museums, symphonies, universities, churches. They also go to pay such tax-supported activities as universal education and social security. There is no public sector in our economy, or hardly any; what we have is profitmaking business from which taxes and other contributions are drawn to pay for nonprofitmaking, though salutary, activities.

Granted, then, the basic importance of modern technology and granted the even more basic blessings of our form of government, we must also emphasize the extraordinary contribution of a type of economic system that perfectly fits and complements our form of government. The wonder of the enterprise, or market, economy is that it disperses economic power and decision while at the same time coordinating human effort in the interest of what the public wants. Now in one sense this kind of economy is nothing new, and businessmen, in producing for profit and hence for use, are not so different from their whiskered confreres of yesterday. Yet in other respects there have been vast changes in how businessmen act and in what we expect from them. I would cite at the start the proposition on which Fortune was founded—that all business is vested with a public interest. And since it is, like no other capitalistic business anywhere, ever, American business in the 20th century has been open to inspection. It is not only open to inspection by all manner of Government agencies including the Antitrust Division and the Securities and Exchange Commission. It is also open to the inspection of journalists, and in this Fortune has played a leading role.

I elaborated all this once in a speech to young businessmen, when I said: "It is, I suppose, almost impossible for the younger men here to realize how radical was this proposition of inspection when I was your age. To be sure, at the beginning of this century there was a great deal of public law. Teddy Roosevelt had made the antitrust law a real force and—imagine—he had even gone so far as to instigate a pure food and drug act. And grocers were required to have scales that didn't cheat—thus putting a limit on the age-old law of caveat emptor. But still, with all of that, the bankers in Wall Street and La Salle Street and the heads of great corporations sincerely thought of themselves as individuals going about their private business, with essentially no more accountability to the public than the corner grocer or soda pop vender.

"Journalistically, this meant that no leading banker or businessman considered that the inquiring reporter had any right to knock on his door—unless he came to write a puff story. The idea that the journalist should inquire after the facts was not only outrageous to the businessman, it was inconceivable. And anyway, who cared about the facts of business? And then came the great depression, and suddenly everybody cared—in a bewildered, confused, bitter, hysterical way. The heavens had fallen. Business was the villain. Well, you know the rest of the story—how the New Deal brought in many great reforms but no prosperity; and how the war came with its tremendous upsurge of productivity; and then these amazing postwar years.

"And not least of the wonders is how universally it is now accepted that all business is vested with a public interest. That proposition is of course fundamental to socialism. The fallacy of socialism, however, is that it leaps to a false conclusion from a sound premise: since all business is vested with a public interest, the Government should own and operate business. This Socialist fallacy may lead to tyranny of the Communist variety or some other, and it certainly leads to inefficiency and poverty. It is the genius of America that it has worked out an economic system by which the public interest is continually represented, while the public enjoys the blessings of liberty and the fruits of competitive and skillful management and initiative. In most of the rest of the world you will not find anything like this."

THE PARADOX OF SUCCESS

I come now to the second of my observations—to the paradox that free enterprise, or, as I prefer to call it, business enterprise, has to be fought for in this country, despite its success. Fought for against whom? Who is against it? Presumably people who call themselves liberal Democrats and organizations like the ADA, recently rescued from obscurity by Goldwater-Miller.

The Republican Party, through all these years, has stood for business enterprise. Is, then, the majority Democratic Party against it? By reason of its stream of welfare legislation it might seem to stand under that accusation. And yet I cannot think of a single Democrat in Congress or in any other high office who would not feel cruelly maligned if you said he was against business enterprise.

In my New York apartment in 1960, when Joseph Patrick Kennedy and I were waiting to hear his son's speech accepting the Democratic nomination for the Presidency, I said to Joe that of course Jack would have to be left of center on domestic affairs but * * *

Joe cut in with all the colorful explosion of language at his command. He said: "Blank, blank, how can you imagine that any son of mine would be any blank blank liberal?"

I calmed him down by explaining that, in the nature of American politics, the Democratic candidate couldn't possibly be elected without being a tiny bit left of center, and that we wouldn't hold that against him, provided he performed well on other counts.

In fact, President Kennedy did not feel himself to be against business enterprise. He wanted "to get this country moving" and that to him meant getting business moving forward. He probably regretted the storm that blew up about steel prices. In any case, he always seemed, to me at least, to be both a little baffled and a little hurt by any hostility that business felt toward him.

And now, of course, we have a President who, unlike Kennedy, got a lot of businessmen to vote for him and who has spoken more ardently in praise of business than any other President since Calvin Coolidge. You recall President Johnson's heartfelt burst of enthusiasm when he expressed his pride in a system where "the employer, hoping to make a little profit, the laborer hoping to justify his wages, can get together and make a better mousetrap."

Perhaps we have come to the end of a long era and business enterprise will no longer have to fight for its existence against creeping socialism and all that. Perhaps. But I do not think so. Why? Partly because the business-enterprise system tends to be a disruptive as well as a creative process, overturning older and more static ways of economic organization; it is no fun to have the worth of one's effort measured in the marketplace. Again, a political democracy will always find it easier to dream up new programs for redistributing wealth already created than to strengthen the incentives that produce wealth. Finally, it is no easy task to define and to fight for the proper functions, and the proper limits, of Government power in our economic affairs. The enterprise economy needs strong Government in the realm of external defense, of internal security, and of monetary policy, to mention a few. It is all too easy to confuse these needed powers with attempts of Government officials to run the whole show—to dictate specific prices and wages and other matters, in this whole business the price of freedom is indeed eternal vigilance.

FAILURE OF THE NEW DEAL

The nearest Fortune ever came to intimate involvement with high politics was in the Willkie campaign of 1940. Hundreds of people felt that they were uniquely responsible for Wendell Willkie's nomination in that dramatic convention in Philadelphia. The fact is that two men were mostly responsible—first, Willkie himself, a lawyer for big business who had a powerful personality and powerful gift of speech; and second, Russell Davenport, then managing editor of Fortune, a passionate idealist who saw the intimate connection between freedom for business and all human freedom. Willkie and Davenport worked out an impressive case against the New Deal, showing how the New Deal had miserably failed to produce prosperity, how prosperity arising from business activity was not incompatible with social welfare, and why social welfare without business prosperity is a sickness both of body and spirit. If the Hitler blitz had not come that year, I believe Willkie would have been elected.

When Davenport first met Willkie—it was only in 1939—he was well prepared for the role he was to play, because in his years as managing editor his major preoccupation had been business and government. He recognized that in this technological age government would have to do a lot more than it had previously done, but also that government must keep one end in view—namely, the stimulation, not the stagnation, of business enterprise.

The war came. President Roosevelt said he was no longer "Dr. New Deal." What a giveaway that was. Roosevelt had always behaved as if the American economy was something that had to be treated as a perpetual invalid. Happily for the economy, President Roosevelt now declared himself in effect to be Dr. Win the War. In the process of winning the war, America found its economic muscles again. And after the war, contrary to liberal theoreticians, there was no massive unemployment. America had returned to its native trend line of advancing business enterprise prosperity.

Yet the fight for the principles of enterprise had to continue, and in 1948 Fortune reorganized its editorial charter accordingly, taking on a "mission," namely, "to assist in the successful development of the American enterprise system." We recognized that, besides reporting the business game, we needed to give heed to defining the "rules of the game." And we did this in the very year when it looked to most observers as if a Republican, Thomas Dewey, would be elected.

With Dewey's defeat we found more than plenty to do in enterprise's defense. For President Truman, when elected, kept sending to Congress demands for such massive expenditures that they would have exhausted the resources of Al Capp's Shmoo. Why did this solid little man from Missouri act this way? Partly because no doubt he knew darn well Congress wouldn't agree to his demands. In any case, Harry Truman had the best of both political worlds. He could ask for everything for the common man and yet count on Republicans and conservative Democrats to keep the country solvent and the climate fairly safe for business enterprise.

It is notable that when Eisenhower came in he did so on a series of issues summarized in the Republican slogan, "Communism, Korea, and Corruption," and not as the champion of free enterprise as such, though he himself understood the contribution of the system full well. Perhaps this serves to point up the fact that in a political democracy it will always be necessary for independent voices of opinion to stand up for the market economy, whoever controls the government. Be that as it may, the Republican Party in its present hour of unhappiness may at least take this consolation: that insofar as it stood for free enterprise during these 35 years, it shares at least equal credit with its quasi-socialist opposition for bringing America to its present pitch of material welfare.

Like many others whose views are apt to be more right than left of center, I would give full credit to much of our social legislation. Much of it has been right and proper, not only for the primary purpose of serving the ends of justice and compassion, but to broaden the base for the ever-expanding potential of a free economy. But I cannot refrain from expressing a vain wish: I would wish that the time might come when those who style themselves liberal Democrats would have the plain fairmindedness to acknowledge the indispensable contribution of business enterprise to the kind of country that they want.

FIRST WAS THE ANTHILL

My third line of observation concerns the growth of that notable contemporary phenomenon, the organization. Of course, there have always been organizations, ever since men began to band together. And there was the anthill before that, and the word might even be applied to the gravitational music of the spheres or indeed to the whole universe. But never before the 20th century have organizations been so many, so big, so various, so efficient, so heavily relied upon for the world's work, and, above all, never before have thinking men been so conscious of the phenomenon of organization.

In 1938, Chester Barnard, president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co., published his book, "The Functions of the Executive." This book was given to me by Charles L. Stillman, then as now the chief financial officer of Time Inc. In the early days of the magazine Stillman also served as a part-time editor, helping us to achieve a touch of economic sophistication. Mr. Barnard's book made a great impression on me. It was, I was told and correctly, the first book in the history of human thought to deal with organization in terms of philosophical-analytical theory. A marvelous example of how the world's thinkers can ignore major phenomena of life right under their noses—and on their breakfast tables.

Organization has everything to do with modern economic development—whether by socialist or capitalist means. It also has everything to do with the present and future governments of the world. Thus modern tyrannies, Communist or Nazi, are more terrible than tyrannies of the past because of their ability to make organization effective—thereby preventing revolts against them. An absolute monarch like Louis XIV was incapable of exercising anything like the power of, say, the U.S. Treasury, let alone of Stalin or Hitler.

Awareness of organization has, of course, been growing rapidly for a century or more. But there is a world of difference between both the fact of and the feeling about Morgan's U.S. Steel or John D. Rockefeller's Standard Oil and the fact and the feeling about these same companies today. The same could be said for many another company—Sears, Roebuck, for example—and in addition we have a whole new form of organization in NASA and the moon shot.

It was Fortune's William H. Whyte, Jr., who made the "Organization man" a household word—and the organization wife, too. His was a fine achievement in sociological reporting. In it he related the phenomenon of the business organization to questions of human personality and values. The kind of people who are eager to hear the worst about American society assumed that Mr. Whyte was predicting the destruction of individualism by the organization—by, that is, the business organization. Weirdly enough, these antibusiness people never worry about the organizational dangers of socialism to the individual. After Whyte's book came out there was a lot of ululation about the dangers of conformity. It amused one to note that for several years one of the noisiest examples of conformity was the preachment, in commencement speeches and elsewhere, against conformity.

Whyte was not a doomsayer. True, he was uneasy about corporate life, which seemed to stifle creativity and individualism. He was uneasy about the subtle pressures in the office and at home that called for smooth performance rather than daring creation. But he did not urge the organization man to leave his secure environment. Rather he urged him to fight the organization when necessary and he was optimistic that the battle could be successful. "Fight the organization," he wrote. "But not destructively." He added, I write with the optimistic premise that individualism is as possible in our times as in others. I speak of individualism within organizational life."

To me several things seem quite clear about the organization as it has developed in our time—especially in the United States and particularly in U.S. business.

The organization increases, rather than diminishes, opportunities for the individual—not necessarily for all individuals but for the many millions who are tolerably well suited to organization life. The individual in an organization has facilities that he could not possibly have otherwise.

Organizations, meaning large and very large organizations, are obviously essential to do the work of today's world. Manhattan Project is a milestone in human history—not only because it produced the bomb, but because it showed so dramatically that only an organization of that size can get that kind of work done. The current equivalent is NASA—and the organizational equivalents of the future will be mining in the oceans and capturing the energy of the sun.

THE RULES ARE FAIR

The growth of thought about the problems of organization has made the business corporation more humane. It is generally recognized that corporations are highly conscious of their public responsibilities. It is perhaps not so well understood that internal management today is characterized by a keen sense of concern for justice and fairness, and also for the informal virtues of human kindness. Walter Guzzardi's recent Fortune study of the "Young Executive" finds that, while the fellow is by no means a sentimentalist, and harbors no old-schooltie feelings of loyalty to the corporation, the young executive does credit the modern corporation with being a place where the rules of the game are fair and where ability and talent will be noted and rewarded.

Equally important, the growth of the modern corporation has gone hand in hand with increasing knowledge and sophistication about business methods and problems. The businessman today not only emphasizes efficiency in production but also has a far more competent grasp than formerly of changing markets and the problems of distribution. In addition, he has come to see that what his corporation does in the matter of investment may have a very real effect on the economy taken as a whole. We have yet to conquer the business cycle, but it is fair to say that the businessman today goes about his work with larger knowledge of the total economy than in the days when he kept his profit-and-loss statement in his hat and occasionally took a look at the latest figure on carloadings. We of Fortune have tried to increase this understanding, specifically through Business Roundup, which, starting as a history of events in the past month, today seeks to look forward into the future, and indeed indulges in the hazardous task of 18-month forecasts.

All of which is not to say that the organization, and particularly the large business organization, does not present dangers to the desirable development of man. It carries with it a full complement of the faults of humanity. And some of these faults—such as, broadly, materialism—it may tend to aggravate. But the organization is the outstanding new means by which we can achieve whatever we may mean by a Great Society. And within the organization there seem to be possibilities of tempering man's inhumanity to man.

One of the points Chester Barnard made most strikingly was that, in any organization, there is a formal organization and an informal one—and that the informal may be more important than the formal. The formal organization is represented by the organization chart and by all the rules and formal commands given within the organization. But, as everyone knows, what often counts most is not the meeting of the executive committee—but what is said at coffee breaks or at the 19th hole. It is there, quite as much as in the boardroom, that reputations are made and policies initiated—and wild ideas or dreams materialized.

It is to be hoped that many people in years to come may lead highly individual lives—contemplative or creative. What I have been trying to stress is that organization is the means by which most of the social work of man will be done, that we should appreciate its enormous possibilities and strive to make organization correspond more and more to whatever may be best in human affairs and working relationships.

HONG KONG IS DIFFERENT

Finally, I should like to make a few simple points about a vast subject—the importance of the United States to the economies of the whole world.

Six years ago when I stopped off at Bangkok, I was surprised to find that during the previous week Bangkok had overnight abolished all rickshaws and pedicabs. The wide streets of that city would henceforth be filled only with motor traffic. This is just a dramatic example of how all the cities of the world more and more resemble each other. Great diversities of culture still happily remain: the personalities of Hong Kong and Rome and Chicago are unmistakably different. But they remain different only within an increasingly universal pattern of machines and commerce. The motorcar takes over the widened streets. Tall buildings rise above the temples. The hurrying crowds are dressed mostly Western style; Madame Butterfly vanishes. The shops are full of much the same merchandise and Coca-Cola is everywhere. Pepsi-Cola too.

This is sometimes called Americanization. But it is not essentially that; it involves essentially the rapid spread of modern technology, more or less available to all, and, equally important, the spread of modern methods of commerce and finance. This tide of modernization is remaking the social structures of Europe and Japan and wherever else it reaches. It creates a consumer economy and a much bigger middle class. The Americanization of Europe is often deplored, especially by the aristocratic right and the would-be leaders of the proletarian left. But whether it is good or bad, it is not being done mostly by Americans; it is being done mainly by Europeans—and Japanese and the businessmen and engineers of other lands.

Nevertheless, the United States has a very special responsibility with regard to this worldwide panorama of economic progress.

The first responsibility is elementary, though often lost sight of. It is to protect freedom—to protect specifically Europe and Japan and other places in the world where the institutions of freedom exist or are being developed. Economic progress depends upon freedom (surely the evidence on that point is now conclusive), but it also depends upon a large measure of peace and order. The miracle of Germany, the miracle of Japan, and all the other miracles could not have occurred except under the reliable umbrella of the Military Establishment of the United States. And without the continued guarantee of that umbrella, all the economic miracles (and social securities) will vanish.

The United States has many other responsibilities toward the growing world economy. One of them, for example, is to take the lead in developing adequate monetary policies. The responsibility that I should like to cite as being the most important (next only to the protection of existing freedom) is the responsibility to advance, to promote, and to encourage the formation of constitutional governments in all those parts of the non-Communist world where constitutional governments either do not exist at all or exist only in a very dubious manner. On this point there is much disagreement and confusion of tongues. It is argued, rightly enough, that many nations are not "ready" for truly democratic governments. To this it may be replied that governments may be reliably constitutional without an excess of direct democracy.

It is also argued, again with reason, that nations differ so widely in their characteristics that it is foolish to expect them to become, politically, like us. This is the argument that, in my view, needs more careful analysis. It is my belief that, if the matter of cultural differences is more carefully examined, it will be found that there are principles of freedom and order that are universal in their human and psychological and even in their institutional truth. Anyway, the truth of "liberty under law" is the truth we know, and live by, and so we should never tire, with all our busyness of business and politics, in showing forth by word and deed the truth we live by. Let every nation make its own adaptations but let us never cease to make plain that what most concerns us as Americans is human freedom and the institutions that guard and promote it.

Fortune's John Davenport has just written a most valuable book entitled "The U.S. Economy." His last chapter is "Of the American Mission." I am happy to conclude my reflections by quoting his concluding paragraph.

"What is that mission after all? To maintain a sheltering shield of military power against the further encroachment of tyranny, and to roll back and neutralize those who have said they will bury us; to project outward the rule of law and liberty under the law which has been both our inheritance and our pride; to shape not only a more prosperous America but an America that, in the phrase of John F. Kennedy, 'will not be afraid of grace and beauty'; to use the promise of the machine, not just for the conquest of poverty, but for the pursuit of excellence and distinction. Great tasks require great builders, and the mission of America is to build no less than to defend. Yet in the clamorous and busy world of tomorrow, let us hope too that there will be time for reflection in those silent and indeed lonely hours when the spirit reasserts its influence and reanimates the human endeavor. America is not a purpose but purposes, not an ideal but ideals, not a crowd but men and women. It will be in the heart and mind of each one that the future of the Republic will be shaped, its promises vindicated, and its promises fulfilled."

AMENDMENT OF WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 231, S. 199.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 199) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "cost" and insert "costs"; and in line 11, after the word "it", to insert a comma and "taking into account the estimated fair market value of the affected land both before and after construction of the project,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (1) of section 4 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666), as amended, is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding the following: "*Provided further,* That the costs of utility relocations shall be borne by the Federal Government whenever the Secretary determines either that the local organization is financially unable to bear such costs or that the bearing of such costs by the local organization would work an undue hardship upon it, taking into account the estimated fair market value of the affected land both before and after construction of the project, except that with respect to any single plan for works of improvement, the amount of such costs to be borne by the Federal Government shall not exceed 5 per centum of the estimated total Federal construction cost (including engineering costs)."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It has been cleared by both sides. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point portions of the report showing the need for this legislation.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 199), to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with amendments.

This bill is identical in substance to S. 1790, as passed by the Senate June 26, 1964. It would authorize the Federal Government to bear costs of utility relocations on projects covered by the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act when the local organization is unable to bear such costs or cannot do so without undue hardship. The amount of such costs borne by the Federal Government could not exceed 5 percent of the total Federal construction cost (including engineering costs).

Under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act the local organization sponsoring the project is required to acquire the lands, easements, and rights-of-way needed for the project, without costs to the Federal Government. In order to obtain such lands and easements, the local organization may be required to bear the cost of relocating utilities now crossing such lands. In some cases, such as those requiring relocation of gas or oil pipelines, these costs may be beyond the ability of the local organization to pay without undue hardship. The bill is designed to take care of such cases. It covers only costs which the local organization would otherwise be required to bear, and the Federal Government would not assume any costs which would otherwise be required to be borne by the utility.

The committee amendments are of a clarifying nature. The first committee amendment corrects a typographical error, changing the word "cost" to "costs." The second committee amendment requires the Secretary of Agriculture, in determining whether the bearing of the utility relocation costs would work an undue hardship upon the local organization, to take into account the effect of the project on market values of affected lands.

The Department of Agriculture believes that the authority provided by the bill would be needed in only a small percent of the projects covered by the act. However, since proposals for projects are initiated by local organizations and differ widely, no estimate could be made as to the extent to which the bill might result in increased Federal expenditure.

The Department of Agriculture recommends enactment. The Budget Bureau recommends against enactment until uniform cost-sharing requirements for water resource development projects are developed. In May 1962 the President wrote to the Secretary of the Interior requesting a study of such cost sharing. Since then five different committees have been appointed at different times to work on such a study, but little progress has been made to date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT ON FEDERAL WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAM

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the Federal water resources research program for the fiscal year 1966, prepared by the Committee on Water Resources Research of the Federal Council of Science and Technology which with the accompanying report was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 35

Concurrent resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, unless Congress shall sooner have submitted such an amendment, to provide for the election of the President and Vice President in a manner fair and just to the people of the United States; directing the secretary of the Senate to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the several Members of the said bodies representing this State therein

Whereas under the Constitution of the United States, presidential and vice-presidential electors in the several States are now elected on a statewide basis, each State being entitled to as many electors as it has senators and representatives in Congress; and

Whereas the presidential and vice-presidential electors who receive the plurality of the popular vote in a particular State become entitled to cast the total number of electoral votes allocated to that State irrespective of how many votes may have been cast for other candidates for elector; and

Whereas this method of electing the President and Vice President is unfair and unjust in that it does not reflect the minority votes cast; and

Whereas the need for a change has been recognized by Members of Congress on numerous occasions through the introduction of various proposals for amending the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 13th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

SECTION. 1. That application is hereby made to Congress under article V of the Constitution of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an article of amendment to the Constitution providing for a fair and just division of the electoral votes within the States in the election of the President and Vice President.

SEC. 2. That if and when Congress shall have proposed such an Article of Amendment this application for a Convention shall be deemed withdrawn and shall be no longer of any force and effect.

SEC. 3. That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the several Members of said bodies representing this State therein.

Adopted by the senate the 12th day of April 1965.

ROBERT M. MURPHY,
Acting President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 12th day of May 1965.

J. D. MCCARTY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

BASIL R. WILSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H.R. 6691. An act to validate certain payments made to employees of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture (Rept. No. 244).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 1689. A bill to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502) (Rept. No. 243).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

H.R. 7031. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf (Rept. No. 245).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 2025. A bill to provide for a voluntary wheat certificate program, under which the price of all wheat would be supported at not less than $2 per bushel; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2026. A bill to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to increase the permissible State and local matching of Federal funds used for construction of facilities for public community colleges and public technical institutes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOWER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 2027. A bill to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes;

S. 2028. A bill to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries; and

S. 2029. A bill to authorize the sale or loan of naval vessels to friendly Latin American countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2030. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kiyoshi Ogura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 2031. A bill to amend the act of Congress approved August 7, 1935 (Public Law 253), as amended, concerning U.S. contributions to the International Council of Scientific Unions and certain associated unions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2032. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to require air carriers to procure aviation accident insurance for the benefit of passengers on certain journeys subject to the Warsaw Convention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 2033. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2034. A bill to designate the Dominican Republic as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 2035. A bill to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. METCALF, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 2036. A bill to prohibit certain practices creating artificial shortages in the supply of coins of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S.J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim a "Day of Recognition" for firefighters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it has been brought to my attention by a number of junior college presidents and deans in my State that a shortcoming exists in the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. This shortcoming operates to restrict the flexibility of State education agencies in dividing funds among worthwhile education projects.

I send to the desk a bill which I hope will remedy this defect in present law, and I ask that the text of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2026) to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to increase the permissible State and local matching of Federal funds used for construction of facilities for public community colleges and public technical institutes, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 105(a)(2) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out "other than a project for a public community college or public technical institute".

SEC. 2. Section 107(b) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "other than a project for a public community college or public technical institute", and (2) by striking out "shall be 40 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall in no event exceed 40 percentum".

SEC. 3. Section 401(d) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before "40 per centum" the following: "a percentage (as determined under the applicable State plan) not in excess of".

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the law now states that the Federal share of education projects must be 40 percent of the development cost of the project attaining the highest priority according to the criteria, standards, and methods set forth in the State plan involved.

This strict requirement has operated in some States to restrict the flexibility of State education commissions. It has meant that a few projects have been well funded while other deserving projects have gotten no assistance. This is because 40 percent of a large project can amount to a very sizable part of the total Federal funds allotted to a State under the 1963 act.

As this Senate knows, I am a firm advocate of State control of education. It is my feeling that additional flexibility should be granted to State education agencies so that they may have more choice about where the Federal funds are utilized.

The bill I introduce today would achieve that goal.

It would not in any way restrict the amount of funds a State agency could grant to any project. It would in no way require a State agency to spread funds over many smaller projects. All it would do is grant flexibility to the State agency to fund smaller projects if such funding is in line with the State education plan and goals.

I note that the U.S. Office of Education shares my concern about the restrictive present law. The Office informs me that it has concluded that the "best way to solve this continuing problem would be to permit the State commissions the same flexibility for community college projects which they now have in determining the Federal shares of projects under the act for other institutions of higher education."

The Office of Education is recommending that Congress amend the act to make the community college program more flexible.

The bill I submit today will do exactly that, and I hope its provisions are included in the higher education bill now being considered by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, by request, for myself and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and one bill to authorize the sale or loan of naval vessels to friendly Latin American countries.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter of transmittal requesting introduction of the legislation and explaining its purpose be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of each bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters accompanying the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 2027. A bill to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 2027 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1965.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation "to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress and it is related to the mutual defense and development program. The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would authorize the loan of two submarines to Italy and a helicopter carrier to Spain.

The Italian Government has requested the loan of two submarines to be used by the Italian Navy to replace existing obsolete and shallow diving vessels. The resultant improved submarine services will markedly improve the proficiency of the Italian ASW forces which are a significant part of the free world naval strength. If the loan of these two submarines is approved, limited activation will be accomplished prior to transfer to Italy where these submarines will receive extensive overhaul and modernization.

The Spanish Government requested the loan of a Cabot class helicopter carrier. If the loan of this carrier is approved by Congress, the Spanish Government will pay the cost of activation, overhaul, and modernization in the U.S. shipyards, and will buy U.S. helicopters. With this helicopter carrier the Spanish intend to build a significant ASW capability that would be helpful to the United States in combating the threat posed by Soviet bloc submarine forces.

The following factors were considered before the new loans were proposed. First it was determined that the transfer of ships for the specific intended uses of this legislation would not adversely affect the U.S. Navy's military capability and is in keeping with the U.S. national policy for the countries under consideration. The loans were then examined in relation to the naval tasks which the nations will be performing under their bilateral and multilateral agreements. Finally, an appraisal was made of the countries' demonstrated will to provide for their own defense and available manpower in conjunction with their capability to operate the ships, and the countries' economies. These factors have been weighed in the field by the U.S. Ambassador and the Chief of the Military Assistance Advisory Group in each country, by the Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command, and by the Departments of Defense and State. At each of the levels it was determined that it is to our advantage to initiate the loans to these countries.

The United States would derive significant advantages from these loans as they are the most economical and effective means by which the United States can assist these navies to meet their force improvement program.

In view of the advantages, the political desirability of these loans, and the military requirement for these forces, it is considered that the legislation proposed herein should be enacted.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that the cost of activation and mobilization of the vessels which are covered by the draft bill will total approximately $20.5 million. These costs will be charged to funds provided by the recipient government under the reimbursable provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or successor legislation.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. NITZE,
Secretary of the Navy.

S. 2028. A bill to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 2028 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1965.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation "to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress, and it is related to the mutual defense and development program. The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would authorize the loan of six vessels of the destroyer and destroyer escort categories of the Reserve Fleet to certain friendly foreign countries.

The following factors were considered before the new loans were proposed. First it was determined that the transfer of ships for the specific intended uses of this legislation would not adversely affect the U.S. Navy's military capability and is in keeping with the U.S. national policy for the countries under consideration. The loans were then examined in relation to the naval tasks which the nations will be performing under their bilateral and multilateral agreements. Finally, an appraisal was made of the countries' demonstrated will to provide for their own defense and available manpower in conjunction with their capability to operate the ships, and the countries' economies. These factors have been weighed in the field by the U.S. Ambassador and the Chief of Military Assistance Advisory Group in each country, by the Commander in Chief Pacific, and Commander in Chief U.S. European Command for the countries in their respective areas, and by the Departments of Defense and State. At each of the levels it was determined that it is to our advantage to initiate the loans to these countries.

The United States would derive significant advantages from these loans, foremost of which will be the increased capability of free world navies to combat the threat posed by the Sino-Soviet submarine forces. This increased capability will result from effectively trained and combat-ready free world antisubmarine forces on station in potential areas of operation.

In view of the advantages, the political desirability of these loans, and the military requirement for these forces, it is considered that the legislation proposed herein should be enacted.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that the cost of activation and mobilization of the six vessels which are covered by the draft bill will total approximately $17 million. These costs will be charged to funds programed for the recipient government as grant military assistance under provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or successor legislation, or will be charged to funds provided by the recipient government under the reimbursable provisions thereof.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. NITZE,
Secretary of the Navy.

S. 2029. A bill to authorize the sale or loan of naval vessels to friendly Latin American countries, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 2029 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1965.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation "to authorize the sale or loan of naval vessels to friendly Latin American countries, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress, and it is related to the mutual defense and development program. The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would authorize the sale or loan of 12 vessels of the destroyer and submarine categories of the Reserve Fleet to certain friendly Latin American countries. This authority is requested to enable the Latin American navies to continue replacement of obsolete ships and standardization on general purpose units suitable and effective for peacetime surveillance of coastal waters, support of counterinsurgency operations in coastal areas and wartime patrol of convoy routes along their coasts. The annual United States-South American ASW training exercises (UNITAS VI is scheduled for fall 1965) have demonstrated the value of standardizing equipment and training to improve the collective strength of United States-South American naval forces.

The following factors were considered before the sales or loans were proposed. First it was determined that the transfer of ships for the specific intended uses of this legislation would not adversely affect the U.S. Navy's military capability and is in keeping with U.S. national policy. The proposals were then examined in relation to the naval tasks which the nations will be performing under their bilateral and multilateral agreements. Finally, an appraisal was made of the countries' demonstrated will to provide for their own defense and available manpower in conjunction with their capability to operate the ships, and the countries' economies. These factors have been weighed in the field by the U.S. Ambassador and the Chief of the Military Assistance Advisory Group in each country, by the Commander in Chief Southern Command, and by the Departments of Defense and State. At each of the levels it was determined that it is to our advantage to initiate the sales or loans as they are the most economical and effective means by which the United States can assist these navies to meet their force improvement program.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that costs of the proposed sales or loans covered in the draft bill will vary from a minimum of $38 million to a maximum of $80 million, dependent upon the extent of overhaul and modification desired, and whether title to the ships is purchased by the recipient countries. The costs for activation and rehabilitation of the vessels will be charged to funds provided by the recipient government under the reimbursable provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or successor legislation. All future costs of maintenance and overhaul will be paid by the recipient government.

Sincerely yours,

Paul H. Nitze,
Secretary of the Navy.

U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC UNIONS AND CERTAIN ASSOCIATED UNIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of Congress approved August 7, 1935, Public Law 253, as amended, concerning U.S. contributions to the International Council of Scientific Unions and certain associated unions.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Acting Secretary of State and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record at this point, together with the letter from the Acting Secretary of State, dated May 13, 1965, as well as a table consisting of the U.S. dues to the International Council of Scientific Unions and its constituent unions for the calendar year 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and table will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2031) to amend the act of Congress approved August 7, 1935 (Public Law 253), as amended, concerning U.S. contributions to the International Council of Scientific Unions and certain associated unions, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2031

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 253, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended by Public Law 627, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby further amended by striking the words "such annual share, not to exceed $65,000 in any one year," and inserting in lieu thereof the words, "the United States annual share."

The letter and table presented by Mr. Fulbright are as follows:

Department of State,
Washington, May 13, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate.

Dear Mr. Vice President: I submit herewith a proposed draft amendment to Public Law 253, 74th Congress, as amended by Public Law 627, 85th Congress, to remove the authorized $65,000 ceiling for appropriations to meet annual contributions of the United States to the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU) and certain associated unions. The National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, the adhering body through which the United States chose to exercise its membership in ICSU, supports the Department in requesting this legislation.

When Public Law 253, 74th Congress, was enacted in 1935, only six unions were affiliated with the Council and a statutory limit of $9,000 was adopted. For a period, this amount proved sufficient to meet U.S. obligations. In time, however, this amount fell short of the assessed dues of the United States and, while it was financially able to do so, the National Academy of Sciences assisted through the use of funds from private sources in meeting the U.S. obligation. To correct this situation, Senate Joint Resolution 85, 85th Congress, which increased the statutory limit to $65,000, was enacted in 1958.

Now, however, the authorized contribution of $65,000 is insufficient. With the accumulation of gradual increases in dues of the 14 associated unions in the subsequent years, the U.S. obligation of total dues for 1964, $76,421, exceeds the appropriation. It is estimated that there will be additional periodic increases in dues, possibly rising to around $80,000 in 1965 and $94,000 for several years thereafter.

Considering the increase in the number of affiliated unions and in practically all costs since 1935, the total U.S. dues for ICSU and its associated unions are relatively small. Normally, the U.S. contribution is between 15 and 20 percent of total contributions.

Enclosed is a statement of the U.S. assessed contributions for calendar year 1964 for ICSU and its affiliated unions.

Although ICSU is a nongovernmental confederation, the United States has been one of its leading members. Its delegates have not only gained worldwide scientific respect for the United States by virtue of their scientific contributions but they have been instrumental in keeping international science oriented toward the Western community.

It is our belief that U.S. interests would best be served by removal of the legislative ceiling on the ICSU contribution. The ceiling itself is not a budgetary control and its limitation on the U.S. contribution could be interpreted either as less than complete support of ICSU by the United States or as dissatisfaction over the costs of the scientific activities of the unions. Neither would be a correct assumption. Over the years, the increases in contributions have been moderate and reasonable, resulting from an increase in the number of associated unions, continual increases in the costs of goods and services, and expansion of scientific activities on the part of the individual unions. Removal of the ceiling would be in accord with the Department's view that annual congressional appropriations review is a more appropriate method of assuring financial responsibility.

The Department of State is convinced that continued support of ICSU and its associated unions by the United States is vital to the scientific interests of this country.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

George W. Ball,
Acting Secretary.

U.S. dues to International Council of Scientific Unions and its constituent unions, calendar year 1964

	Amount due
International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU)	$16,800
International Astronomical Union (IAU)	1,568
International Union of Biochemistry (IUB)	400
International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS)	5,000
International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC)	25,000
International Union of Crystallography (IUCr)	900
International Geographical Union (IGU)	1,500
International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics (IUGG)	13,440
International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS)	2,250
International Union of the History and Philosophy of Science (IUHPS)	1,200
International Mathematical Union (IMU)	783
International Union of Pure and Applied Physics (IUPAP)	2,280
International Union of Physiological Sciences (IUPS)	500
International Scientific Radio Union (URSI)	4,800
Total	76,421

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO AVIATION ACCIDENT INSURANCE FOR PASSENGERS ON CERTAIN JOURNEYS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to require air carriers to procure aviation accident insurance for the benefit of passengers on certain journeys subject to the Warsaw Convention, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of State, on behalf of the Department of State, Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Federal Aviation Agency, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record, together with a statement of purpose and need for the bill, and a section-by-section analysis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, statement, and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2032) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to require air carriers to procure aviation accident insurance for the benefit of passengers on certain journeys subject to the Warsaw Convention, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter, statement of purpose and need, and section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

APRIL 30, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Department of State, the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency submit and recommend for consideration of the Senate a draft bill "to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to require air carriers to procure aviation accident insurance for the benefit of passengers on certain joiurneys subject to the Warsaw Convention, and for other purposes." The draft bill is enclosed.

The principal purpose of this legislation is to meet a problem presented by the U.S. continued participation in the Warsaw Convention as it would be amended by The Hague protocol currently before the Senate. The United States would continue its adherence with the other nations of the world to uniform rules relating to liability of carriers engaged in international carriage by air but at the same time would require its carriers to carry accident insurance giving to its passengers protection in addition to that possible under the convention.

The Warsaw Convention entered into force for the United States, subject to a reservation, in 1934. Included in its many provisions relating to the conditions of international transportation by air was a limitation on the liability of air carriers for passengers on certain international flights in the amount of approximately $8,300. On September 28, 1955, a protocol was signed at The Hague which would amend a number of provisions in the Warsaw Convention. One of these amendments increases the limitation of liability to approximately $16,600. The provisions of the Warsaw Convention and the protocol are described in Senate executive G, 73d Congress, 2d session, and in Senate executive H, 86th Congress, 1st session.

During the 87th and 88th Congresses, an extensive study was made of the position the United States should take on the Warsaw Convention and The Hague protocol, with special emphasis on the problem of limitation of liability for passengers. During this study by the Interagency Group on International Aviation, interested persons and organizations expressed their views to the study group both in writing and in public hearings.

As a result of that study the Interagency Group on International Aviation recommended that the United States should (1) ratify the protocol thereby increasing the limits of liability provided in the Warsaw Convention, and (2) enact complementary legislation requiring U.S. air carriers to provide, in addition, accident insurance up to $50,000 for each of their passengers in international air travel to or from the United States and covered by the Warsaw Convention. The Department of State recommended the ratification of the protocol near the end of the 88th Congress. This communication is intended to start the procedure for carrying out the second of these recommendations in the 89th Congress.

This bill was prepared because the Interagency Group concluded that even the increased limits of liability provided in the protocol would leave U.S. victims of international air accidents without adequate compensation by U.S. standards. The three most important provisions of the bill (1) require U.S. air carriers to procure aviation accident insurance for the benefit of their passengers on journeys which originate or terminate in the United States and which are subject to the Warsaw Convention, (2) require certain procedures by both U.S. and foreign air carriers to bring to passengers' attention the monetary limits of liability applicable under the Warsaw Convention, and (3) clarify the right of action for bodily injury or death granted by the Warsaw Convention. The amount a victim may recover under the accident insurance ranges up to $50,000 for the death of a passenger over 12 years old, or for the total disability of any passenger, plus medical expenses up to $10,000. The insurance would be payable regardless of fault on the part of the carrier. In addition, the victim could assert the rights he has had heretofore against any person. A more complete statement of the purpose and need for the bill and a section-by-section analysis are enclosed.

The draft bill, together with the statement of purpose and need and the enclosed section-by-section analysis, have been approved by the Interagency Group on International Aviation.

A letter similar to this one is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the legislation for the consideration of the Congress from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

——— ———,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.

——— ———,
Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency.

(Enclosures: (1) Draft bill, (2) statement of purpose and need, (3) section-by-section analysis.)

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to require air carriers to procure aviation accident insurance for the benefit of passengers on certain journeys subject to the Warsaw Convention, and for other purposes

The proposed legislation would amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to (1) require U.S. air carriers to procure aviation accident insurance in the amount of $50,000 for the benefit of passengers transported by them on certain journeys subject to the Warsaw Convention, (2) require air carriers to give clear notice of the limits of liability under the convention, and notice of the insurance being provided, and (3) clarify the grant of a right of action under the Warsaw Convention for injury or death in cases covered by the convention. The legislation is in accord with recommendations by the Interagency Group on International Aviation (IGIA) to the Secretary of State that the United States enact legislation of this nature in connection with ratification of The Hague protocol to the Warsaw Convention.

The Hague protocol, which would amend the Warsaw Convention so as to double the airlines limit of liability for death or injury of international passengers from $8,300 to $16,600, was transmitted to the Senate by President Eisenhower on July 24, 1959 (Ex. H, 86th Cong.) with the recommendation that it be ratified. However, in 1961, the Secretary of State, at the invitation of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, initiated a review of the relationship of the United States to The Hague protocol and the Warsaw Convention. The Interagency Group on International Aviation (IGIA), which is chaired by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and consists of representatives from the Departments of State, Commerce, Defense, and the Civil Aeronautics Board, was requested to undertake this review in consultation with representatives of industry and the public.

Pursuant to this request, IGIA invited comments from representatives of the aviation and insurance industries, as well as from numerous international and aviation law professors and practitioners, regarding the relationship of the United States to the convention and the protocol. A public hearing was also held before representatives of the interested Federal agencies. On the basis of the comments received, and the views expressed at the public hearing, the majority of the agency representatives involved recommended to the Secretary of State that the Department of State advise the President to maintain the request for Senate advice and consent to The Hague protocol, and that complementary legislation of the nature proposed herein be enacted. This recommendation was submitted by the Secretary of State on August 9, 1962, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations with the statement that legislation in implementation thereof would be submitted to the Congress.

The proposed legislation, which implements this recommendation of the IGIA, incorporates a number of the suggestions submitted by the air carriers and the insurance industry. The legislation meets the major criticism directed at the Warsaw Convention and The Hague Protocol that the limit of liability thereunder is too low. At the same time it makes possible, by continued adherence to the convention, preservation of desirable features of the convention, such as uniformity of law, standardization of transport documents, and presumption of carrier liability.

Requiring U.S. air carriers to procure at their expense $50,000 of aviation accident insurance for the benefit of Warsaw passengers transported by them on journeys from or to the United States would be the principal means of accomplishing this objective. Under the proposed legislation, the carriers would have to submit evidence to the board that they had procured such insurance. Recovery under the insurance would be in addition to any amounts recoverable against the carrier under the Warsaw Convention. Thus, the face value specified for death, and the amounts specified for injuries, would be paid without regard to, and have no effect on, the damages recoverable under the convention. In this respect, the insurance is comparable to regular commercial accident insurance, under which payments for losses are not normally offset against recoveries from tort feasors.

The obligation to procure the insurance is imposed only on U.S. carriers for the reason that other countries might contend that an attempt to compel foreign carriers to provide the insurance would constitute a violation of this country's treaty obligations under the Warsaw Convention. Although the U.S. carriers may suffer a disadvantage with their foreign competitors because of being required to absorb the cost of the insurance, it is believed that such insurance will in fact give the U.S. carriers a competitive advantage and that the foreign air carriers will find it desirable to procure similar insurance for passengers on segments of international journeys performed by them.

The legislation avoids a difficult administrative problem by requiring that in the event of death the proceeds of the insurance shall be paid to the passenger's personal representative for the benefit of designated individuals. In addition to avoiding the problem of attempting to give the passenger an opportunity to designate a beneficiary at the time of ticketing, the designation results in the same persons being beneficiaries as those for whose benefit an action for the death of the passenger may, as proposed in another section of the legislation, be brought under the Warsaw Convention.

The difficult problem of the issuance of policies to Warsaw passengers is avoided by requiring U.S. air carriers to provide such passengers with a statement in writing concerning the insurance, in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Board, as well as to display signs at ticket counters with respect to such insurance.

In addition to requiring U.S. air carriers to furnish written notice concerning the insurance, the legislation also requires such carriers to provide Warsaw passengers with a statement in writing concerning the limits of liability that may be applicable under the Warsaw Convention. Such carriers, as well as foreign air carriers maintaining ticket offices in the United States, would also be required to display signs at ticket counters advising of the limits of liability of the convention.[1] There is practically unanimous agreement inside and outside the Government that the present Warsaw notice appearing in small print on airline tickets is inadequate to advise passengers of the liability limit. In March 1964 the Civil Aeronautics Board amended its regulations to require air carriers and foreign air carriers to give improved notice to passengers of the limitation of liability under the convention in the form of a printed notice delivered with the ticket and a sign posted at the ticket counter. Notwithstanding this action by the Board, the notice provision in the legislation is considered desirable in order to make the improved notice by the carrier a statutory requirement rather than a matter of agency discretion, to assure that the Board has power to require notice of the insurance, and to make travel agents utilized by carriers in the United States directly responsible for giving the notice.

The provisions in the legislation to the effect that the Warsaw Convention shall be deemed to grant a right of action for bodily injury or death with respect to damage to which the convention relates is considered highly desirable in view of recent court decisions in this country indicating that no cause of action is created by the convention. As a result of these interpretations, it is possible that no suit could be brought under the convention unless a cause of action otherwise exists under the law of the forum or the place where the accident occurred. The legislation provides, therefore, that a civil action for damages under the convention may be brought in any court of competent jurisdiction in the United States. Such an action, however, will be in place of all other rights which the injured person may have against persons liable under the convention. The right of action is vested in the injured person, or, in the event of his death, in his personal representative for the benefit of the surviving spouse and children, or, if none, for the parents, next of kin, or the estate, in that order.

There is attached a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF A BILL

A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to require air carriers to procure aviation accident insurance for the benefit of passengers on certain journeys subject to the Warsaw Convention, and for other purposes

Section 1. Amends section 101 of the act, containing definitions of the terms used therein, so as to include a definition of the term "Warsaw Convention." The term is defined as meaning the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Transportation by Air signed at Warsaw on October 12, 1929, or where applicable, the Warsaw Convention as amended at The Hague, 1955.

Section 2. Amends title IV of the act, relating to the economic regulation of air carriers, by adding a new section 418, entitled "Aviation Accident Insurance Requirements."

Subsection (a) of the new section requires air carriers holding certificates under title IV to procure aviation accident insurance for the benefit of passengers engaged in journeys originating or terminating in the United States subject to the Warsaw Convention who suffer accidental injury or death while being transported by such carriers. Evidence must be submitted to the Board within 6 months after the date of enactment of the section that insurance has been obtained which complies with the requirements of the section. Air carriers transporting passengers under charter agreements with the Department of Defense are exempted from the insurance requirements in those instances where the entire capacity of the aircraft is reserved to the Department by the agreements. Charters of this character provide for higher limits of liability for bodily injury or death than those in the Warsaw Convention.

Subsection (b) requires that the insurance provide that $50,000 will be paid for the death of any passenger over 12 years of age, and $25,000 for the death of any other passenger. Specified amounts, ranging from $15,000 to $50,000, would be paid for designated bodily injuries, including total disability, with a maximum total payment of $50,000 for injury and death. Additional payments not in excess of $10,000 would be made for medical expenses, as they accrued, directly to the individual or medical facility (including a facility of the U.S. Government) providing the services for which the expenses were incurred. Sums due at death would be payable to the personal representative for the benefit of the surviving spouse and children, or, if none, for the parents, next of kin, or the estate, in that order. Actions to recover on the insurance would have to be brought not later than 3 years from the date of the accident. An action for death would have to be brought by the personal representative for the benefit of the same classes of persons for whose benefit sums due at death would be payable.

Subsection (c) makes it unlawful for an insurance company to attempt to be subrogated to any rights of recovery which a passenger may have, and declares any agreement for such to be null and void. However, the insurance company would not be precluded from exercising any subrogation rights which it might have as the result of payments under insurance which was not procured pursuant to the section.

Subsection (d) requires that insurance premiums be paid by the air carrier procuring the insurance. Payment of such a premium would not provide a basis for the reduction of damages otherwise recoverable from the carrier.

Subsection (e) requires the Board to immediately enter upon a hearing for the purpose of determining whether an air carrier's certificate should be modified, suspended, or revoked where it has reason to believe that a carrier has failed to comply with the provisions of the section, or any regulation or order issued thereunder. The subsection specifically provides that the Board shall not be precluded from imposing a civil penalty for such a violation.

Section 3. Amends title IV of the act by adding a new section 419, entitled "Notice of Limits of Liability and Aviation Accident Insurance."

Subsection (a) of the new section requires air carriers delivering tickets for journeys originating or terminating in the United States subject to the Warsaw Convention to furnish at the time of such delivery a statement in writing, in form and manner approved by the Board, concerning the monetary limits of liability for death or bodily injury, and other limitations, that may be applicable under the convention. Such air carriers would also have the responsibility for seeing that such a statement was delivered by their ticket agents and other agents. Both air carriers and foreign air carriers, maintaining locations in the United States for the sale of tickets, would be required to display at locations for the sale of tickets, such notice as might be prescribed by the Board concerning such limits of liability. Notices presently furnished pursuant to the convention do not contain the monetary limits of liability, nor does the convention require that notices concerning the limits of liability be displayed at locations for the sale of tickets.

Subsection (b) requires air carriers delivering tickets for journeys originating or terminating in the United States subject to the Warsaw Convention not only to furnish at the time of such delivery a statement prescribed by the Board concerning the insurance provided pursuant to section 418, but also to cause to be displayed at locations maintained by them for the sale of tickets such notice concerning the insurance as may be prescribed by the Board. As in the case of the statements concerning the limits of liability under the Warsaw Convention, the air carriers would have the responsibility for seeing that their ticket agents and other agents furnished statements concerning the insurance.

Subsection (c) requires ticket agents and other agents in the United States, unless exempted by the Board, to display notices prescribed by the Board concerning both the

---

[1] The provisions of the new sec. 419 requiring notice are intricate and lengthy. The effect of the section can be illustrated in the following table, in which the letters represent the subsections and paragraphs authorizing the Board to prescribe the appropriate notice.

	Warsaw notice		Insurance notice	
	Written notice [a]	Sign on counter [a]	Written notice [a]	Sign on counter [a]
Air carriers:				
In the United States:				
At own offices	(a)(1)	(a)(2)	(b)(i)	(b)(ii)
At agents' offices	(a)(1)	(c)(1)	(b)(i)	(c)(i)
Outside the United States:				
At own offices	(a)(1)	(a)(2)	(b)(i)	(b)(ii)
At agents' offices	(a)(1)	-------	(b)(i)	-------
Foreign air carriers:				
In the United States:				
At own offices	-------	(a)(2)	-------	-------
At agents' offices	-------	(c)(2)	-------	-------
Outside the United States:				
At own offices	-------	-------	-------	-------
At agents' offices	-------	-------	-------	-------

[a] Form and contents to be prescribed by the Board.

limits of liability under the Warsaw Convention and the insurance when acting for air carriers, and to display notices concerning the limits of liability under the convention when acting for foreign air carriers.

Section 4. Amends title IV of the act by adding a new section 420, entitled "Inapplicability of State Laws."

The new section provides that the provisions of sections 418 and 419, and regulations of orders issued thereunder, shall be applicable notwithstanding any State or local laws, ordinances, or regulations, which are inconsistent therewith. Practically all insurance companies are subject to rules or regulations of various State commissions, and the provision is designed to make certain that such rules and regulations will not impair the ability of the insurance companies to provide the insurance which air carriers would be required to procure under this legislation.

Section 5. Amends section 1106 of the act, providing that nothing contained therein shall abridge remedies existing at common law or by statute, by adding provisions declaring that the Warsaw Convention shall be deemed to grant a right of action for bodily injury or death. A civil action for damages, with the right of trial by jury, could be brought in any court of competent jurisdiction in the United States by an injured person, or, in the event of death, by his personal representative for the benefit of designated individuals. Such an action would be in place of all other rights which the injured person, or his representative, might have, at common law or under statute, against persons liable under the convention for bodily injury or death. Contributory negligence would not be a bar to recovery, but the damages that would have been recoverable in the absence of the limits of liability of the convention would be diminished in proportion to the degree of negligence attributable to the injured person. The damages awarded could not exceed the limits of the convention, and would be apportioned by the court among the persons for whose benefit the action was brought in proportion to the loss they may have suffered as a result of the death of the decedent. An additional amount for reasonable attorney's fees, court costs, and other expenses of litigation would have to be allowed by the court whenever permitted by the convention.

Section 6. Amends portions of the table of contents contained in the first section of the act so as to reflect the amendments made to title IV and to section 1106.

DESIGNATION OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC AS A COMBAT ZONE FOR FEDERAL TAX PURPOSES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill, the purpose of which is to designate the Dominican Republic as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes with respect to armed services personnel serving in that area.

Under Executive Order No. 11216 issued by the President of the United States recently, armed services personnel serving in South Vietnam are exempted from payment of Federal income tax, on the basis of the fact that this area is considered a combat zone for such purposes.

I have no quarrel with Executive Order No. 11216. As a matter of fact, I commend the President for taking action along this line.

I feel, however, that those of our armed service personnel in the Dominican Republic crisis on or after April 28, 1965, should have equal treatment accorded them and to continue until such time as the President declares the termination of combatant activities.

As of May 17, 1965, the Department of Defense pointed out that 18 members of our Armed Forces have been killed and 93 wounded in the Dominican Republic. Their service in behalf of the United States and the cause of freedom has, in my opinion, the same degree of importance as those of our Armed Forces serving elsewhere. The purpose of my proposal is to provide equality of treatment to members of our Armed Forces serving in both areas.

I feel confident that our President would look with favor on the proposed legislation or extending the Executive order, which would accomplish the same result. Certainly, our Armed Forces personnel in the Dominican Republic, protecting American interests and the cause of freedom against the Communist threat to the Western Hemisphere, are performing outstanding service for their country and should be entitled to the same treatment as those of our Armed Forces serving in South Vietnam.

I sincerely trust that the proposed bill will receive prompt and favorable consideration by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2034) to designate the Dominican Republic as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 208

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute—No. 124—proposed by Mr. MANSFIELD—for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN—to the bill, S. 1564, to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table, and that they be considered as read for the purposes of cloture. I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the amendments be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the explanations accompanying the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 208 is as follows:

The purpose of this amendment is to reduce from 25 to 20 percent the figure currently used in subsection 4(b)(3). The effect of this amendment would be to release from potential coverage five of the seven Arkansas counties which have registered more than 20 percent of their nonwhite population of voting age.

These five counties, and the percentage of nonwhites registered are: Cross, 23.1 percent; Independence, 23.4 percent; Lee, 24.1 percent; Poinsett, 23.3 percent; and Pope, 24.3 percent.

AMENDMENT NO. 209

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 209, submitted by Mr. McCLELLAN, is as follows.

The purpose of this amendment is to eliminate the additional 25 percent triggering device added to the bill during executive sessions. Based on figures supplies by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, seven counties in Arkansas would be covered by this new provision.

That this 25 percent figure was deliberately contrived in the numbers games played by the sponsor of this amendment is clear from the fact that of the seven Arkansas counties covered by this provision, five have registered more than 23 percent of their nonwhite population.

Mr. President, we want our people in Arkansas to register and vote but I do not believe that we should compel people to vote.

Even the Civil Rights Commission reported as long as 4 years ago that there are no significant racial barriers to voting in my State. That being the case I cannot understand why the sponsor of this amendment is so bent on castigating a State that is trying to do a good job.

We have a new and simple registration law in Arkansas, and I would like to see my people afforded the opportunity to test its adequacy without Federal interference.

I was, of course, heartened by the adoption of an amendment sponsored by the junior Senator from Arkansas and myself, which would suspend the power to appoint examiners in Arkansas under this bill for a period of time, but I would be even more pleased to have this entire section stricken from the bill.

Incidentally, a report of the individual views on S. 1564 by the majority on the Judiciary Committee, states that even they hold differing views with respect to this added triggering device. And thus I urge them to join with me in deleting this contrived device from the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 210

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, and ask that it be considered as read under rule XXII for the purposes of cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 211

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered as having been read for the purposes of cloture under rule XXII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 212

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment. I ask that it be considered as read under rule XXII for the purposes of cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, May 25, 1965, he signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 327. An act to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters; and

H.J. Res. 436. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 6497. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States; and

H.R. 8122. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 25, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 327) to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT:

Statement by him on the 275th anniversary of Philadelphia's 21st ward.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK SIGNIFICANT—STRENGTHENING OF NATIONAL AND WEST VIRGINIA ECONOMY AIDED THROUGH SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the week of May 23 through 29 has been designated National Small Business Week by President Lyndon B. Johnson. This is a particularly appropriate time to recognize the very real contributions of small businesses to a growing economy in the United States, including West Virginia as it increases its productivity and employment.

In our Nation today there are approximately 4.7 million business concerns in this category, which comprise about 95 percent of the total of all businesses. They are the primary source of consumer goods and services. By their independence and creativeness, they form the backbone of our complex and competitive society.

It has been my privilege to serve as a member of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business since 1959. I am privileged to be chairman of its Subcommittee on Science and Technology and a member of its Subcommittee on Procurement. Our hearings have resulted oftentimes in the introduction of legislation designed to aid owners of small businesses.

I am a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 30, a measure which would invest the Senate Small Business Committee with legislative authority. Such action is warranted, I believe, inasmuch as small businesses and their welfare are so essential to the continued economic vitality of America.

Mr. President, this special week also provides a fitting time for recognition of the achievements of the Small Business Administration under the capable and constructive direction of Administrator Eugene P. Foley. In West Virginia, for example, the community development program of SBA has helped to create 1,200 jobs in 18 projects since 1960. SBA has made loans totaling more than $2.5 million in that program in our State during the past 4 years. John Horne, former SBA Administrator, was helpful to West Virginia. I wish to also commend the efforts of sincere workers on the SBA staff in our State.

Regular small business loans in West Virginia have amounted to almost $19 million in the last 4 years in some 320 approvals. And, under SBA set-aside programs, 357 Government purchases totaling more than $25 million were awarded to West Virginia firms through competitive bidding. These are effective examples of Federal participation in the building of a stronger small business segment of the economy. Definite programs and procedures are in being and in process to further improve and widen the SBA values to West Virginia firms.

During 1964 the Small Business Administration approved a record total of 10,707 business loans for the entire Nation. These loans amounted to $425.8 million.

It is also gratifying that congressional approval of a substantial supplemental appropriation for the Small Business Administration's activities has brought relaxation of curtailment on business loan ceilings. After President Johnson signed the measure on April 30, 1965, SBA Administrator Foley announced that the new limit on immediate participation bank loans has been set at $100,000 if the bank's share is less than 25 percent, and $350,000 if the bank's share is 25 percent or more. This will be welcomed by hundreds of business owners and proprietors who hope to take advantage of Federal assistance programs, since it means that SBA will be able to handle approximately 97 percent of its approvable loan applications.

Mr. President, the importance of the small businessman in preserving a wholesome and expanding economic climate cannot be overstated. He is the backbone of commerce in the United States and, indeed, the world. During National Small Business Week citizens join in honoring owners and operators of small business concerns for their dedication to the principles of free enterprise and individual initiative.

THE NEED FOR AFRO-ASIAN STUDIES IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the rapid emergence of the Afro-Asian states since the end of World War II has brought a new equation into the old formula of the balance of power.

At the time of the founding of the United Nations in 1945, there were only 7 Afro-Asian member states. Today there are more than 50.

The combined votes of Africa, Asia, and Latin America number 77, a clear majority of the General Assembly's total membership of 114.

And within a few months there will be further additions to their numbers.

Old patterns of thought, old preconceptions, in which we in the United States considered the vast tracts of Africa and the teeming populations of Asia as no more than part of one or the other colonial backwaters, must be realined with the realities of the new world power structures.

Gone are the days when we could deal with the problems of the Congo through Brussels, the problems of Indochina through Paris, the problems of Indonesia through Amsterdam, or the problems of the Middle East through London.

Our responsibilities in unfamiliar and distant lands have expanded greatly and in the interests of freedom and democracy and in the interest of our own security we must meet these responsibilities.

To successfully do this, to successfully cope with the myriad problems of two-thirds of mankind, to successfully fulfill their revolution of rising expectations, we must know these people, we must be able to communicate with them in their languages, and we must be fully informed about their views concerning their political, economic, and social problems.

We in American have been too lax in educating our young about the ways and ideas of non-Western peoples.

Mr. President, I ask unanmious concent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks an article by Dr. Thomas P. Melady entitled "Needed: Afro-Asian Studies," which appeared in the May 15 issue of America.

Dr. Melady is the author of several books and many articles on African affairs and is president of Africa Service Institute, one of the major foundations engaged in African relations. His work is well known in Africa and Europe, as well as in the United States.

In his call for introducing courses on Africa and Asia into our educational system, he states:

> In preparing our young people—whether on the graduate, undergraduate, high school or elementary school level—to face the world as it is today, we shall be doing not only the world, but ourselves, the best possible service. For the preservation of our own cultural heritage depends on these young

people's ability to function in a changing world—while it is changing.

I say this is good advice. I say we must heed it in the interests of our Nation and our way of life. I urge my fellow Senators and our American educators to read Dr. Melady's excellent article and give it the careful thought it merits.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: AFRO-ASIAN STUDIES

(By Thomas Patrick Melady)

Within the past half-year, the world watched Pope Paul's visit to India and his naming of another black African as prince of the church. Here in our own country, American Catholics are now meeting black, brown, and yellow princes of the church—any one of whom may one day be elected Pope. For some, these and other startling changes mean only the sunset of a great past. But for others they mark a new and hopeful turn in world affairs.

The peoples of Africa and Asia constitute 60 percent of the world's population. While the two continents were dominated by the Western colonial powers, this obvious majority in numbers had little or no significance. But today, in view of the political power they have seized, it has to be taken into account. In 1945, when the United Nations was founded, there were four member states from Africa and three from Asia. Now 53 Afro-Asian states are represented. The revolutionary political changes that brought them into being have had a real effect on the precarious balance of world power. In the corridors of the United Nations, with its assemblage of white, brown, black, and yellow men, the Western diplomat can no longer command; he must convince.

Are Americans aware of the adjustments that their Government, along with those of the other nations of the West, will have to make? It would seem that they are not. It is frightening to see how ignorant the average American still is about the changes going on in today's world. And yet the United States, because of its commanding position, will have to take the lead in making these adjustments. Indeed, on our grasping the altered situation and accepting its challenge depends the very future of Western civilization. As things now stand, however, we are faced with grave danger. Neither is the present generation prepared to take up the responsibility thrust upon it, nor are we preparing the next generation with the necessary depth and speed to cope with a changed and changing world—and especially to enter into meaningful conversation with our Afro-Asian neighbors.

There has been a vast gap in our educational policies that we have only recently begun to close. For long, our universities and our schools have simply ignored the non-Western areas of the world. At a conference in April 1964, cosponsored by the New York State Education Department and UNESCO, 35 leading educators met to discuss the study of non-Western areas by American students. Their conclusion was not reassuring: "Our schools and colleges are producing half-educated individuals who have been exposed to the historical traditions and contemporary condition of only a minority of mankind."

True, a few distinguished privately supported institutions of higher learning, such as Princeton, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, and the University of Pennsylvania, have journeyed outside the traditional scope of Western studies. There were pioneering efforts, too, by institutions of a less formal educational nature. And missionery groups, Catholic and Protestant, had a sustained interest in those parts of the world where they were engaged in Christianizing the population. Strange tongues and customs were taught to men and women who had vowed themselves to serving in distant lands.

Again, several museums, with their small, wealthy, "eccentric" clientele, financed special collections and conferences, and sponsored travel to "odd" places. And major Western commercial interests, dependent on raw materials and markets of the non-Western World, saw the value in training personnel in the local cultures and languages where their interests lay.

These beginnings, however, were meager indeed. They touched only a privileged few—hardly enough to supply a few experts when war broke out in 1939. It was, in fact, only this crisis of World War II that shocked American Government policymakers and responsible citizens into providing for study of the vast neglected areas of the world.

North Africa and the Far East had now become strategic areas for expected combat and occupation; for the first time, military leaders began to see every corner of the globe in terms of possible conflict. But the factor needed to insure victory—personnel who possessed a working knowledge of the local languages and customs of these vital areas—was missing. Crash programs were therefore devised under the Army specialized training program to provide, through contracts with a number of universities throughout the country, accelerated courses in language and area study. Overnight, several eastern universities became centers of strategic training for servicemen who were expected to carry on administrative duties in local languages in Malaya, Burma, and north Africa. Various foundations aided the Government with financial contributions for the development of non-Western studies.

After the war, when military personnel were no longer needed and Federal money dwindled, it was these large foundations that saw the implications of the changed world. Most of their aid was poured into a few of the major universities to establish area studies programs on the graduate level. It was not until 1958 that the Federal Government again entered the scene in a substantial way.

Aroused by the Russian sputnik and increased Communist advances in the African and Asian Continents, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act, which authorized Federal Government expenditures for scholarships, libraries, research grants, conferences, travel grants, and salary support for professors in the development of Afro-Asian studies. The results of this act have been increased incorporation of non-Western studies into the average universities; these latter, unlike the heavily endowed institutions, could not afford to allocate funds of their own for extensive research and new developments. The tendency has been to establish area studies and separate departments for specialized and graduate study in African, Near Eastern and Far Eastern affairs, and to offer some courses for undergraduates.

Afro-Asian studies, however, are still far from an accepted normal offering on the undergraduate level in most of our universities and colleges. Moreover, undergraduate courses in civilization, literature, and philosophy rarely refer to any contributions outside the North American-Western European sphere. The ancient and wise teachings of Buddha and the Hindu philosophers, the rich imagery of the Koran, the carefully guarded traditions of the Hova people of Madagascar, have been available to only a few students in our universities. The vast majority of college students are still being educated for the world of yesterday.

How can we expect our young people to enter into dialog with the non-Western World on these terms? We are failing them so long as we do not give them all the tools necessary to work toward better understanding of all peoples—a vital factor in maintaining our very existence. Preparation must not begin at the graduate level for only an elite, nor merely at the college level, but must spread down to high school and even early educational levels.

At the present time, we lack adequately prepared teachers. The excitement of the pioneering spirit found in the study and research of a new field usually translates itself into dynamic and positive expression in everyday teaching. But the fact is that most of our secondary school and primary school teachers have never been exposed to these new fields. Fortunately, there are signs that the situation may be improving.

A few of the State boards now encourage and even require prospective teachers to study at least one course in non-Western history or culture. Some States are engaged in developing and circulating curriculum materials and newsletters on the Afro-Asian areas. New York State has a program of summer institutes, academic year seminar courses, and oversea field observation for secondary school teachers. A world culture course is required of all high school students in Pennsylvania, and Indiana has installed "selected areas of the non-West" as a required course for seventh graders.

The universities have already begun to recognize that they bear a responsibility for training teachers in the Afro-Asian field. Some offer special scholarships for teachers of social studies to participate in summer programs of non-Western history, politics and contemporary geography. A further development, supported by both universities and large foundations, has been the introduction of non-Western languages in secondary schools. Harvard and Yale have a combined program in Boston for the teaching of Chinese in high school. Seton Hall has a summer institute to train teachers of Japanese. These are only beginnings.

What, it may be asked, will be the effect of all this study of alien cultures on the thinking and behavior of our young people? In making themselves ready to meet, work with and live among those of vastly different backgrounds, will they be led to abandon all our cherished values? Quite the contrary. Perhaps some of our symbols may change, but in the process they may well become enhanced. For the symbols of heroic deed and of honor may just as aptly be expressed by the strong and loyal actions in the tales of, say, the Berber peoples of Mauritania as by those of the Knights of the Round Table. Certainly, the cultural patterns of the Orient, with its emphasis on family dedication and respect, can help refine our own practice of family loyalty.

Even in the field of literature, however, our material is insufficient. The traditional source of books on heroes for children and young people has been the public library. And in recent years, the mass production of paperbacks at low cost has enabled many young people to make some of these books their own. But though a few publishers have offered adaptations of tales from the East, for the most part the young people's reading experience is still restricted to a small portion of the world's literature. An important part of our obligation to coming generations is to see that authors and publishers correct this lack.

In preparing our young people—whether on the graduate, undergraduate, high school or elementary school level—to face the world as it is today, we shall be doing not only the world, but ourselves, the best possible service. For the preservation of our own cultural heritage depends on these young people's ability to function in a changing world—while it is changing.

DEDICATION OF JACKSONPORT (ARK.) STATE PARK, AND CENTENNIAL OF CONFEDERATE TROOPS' SURRENDER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of my former employees, Mr. Phillip McDonald, is now in business in Newport, Ark., and is Secretary of the Jackson County Historical Society there. He has just informed me of an event which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues, all of whom, I know, are interested in the preservation of our historical heritage.

The Jackson County Historical Society and the Newport Chamber of Commerce will sponsor a double celebration on Saturday, June 5, at Jacksonport, Ark. Featured will be a centennial observance of the surrender of Confederate troops—6,000 men—by Gen. Jeff Thompson, CSA, at Jacksonport, on this date in 1865, and the dedication of Arkansas' newest State park. The centennial will be the last such observance in the State, and probably in the entire Nation.

The Honorable Orval E. Faubus, Governor of Arkansas, will dedicate the Jacksonport State Park during the afternoon festivities. The old courthouse building—built in 1829—was being used to store grain, when purchased by the historical society in 1961. It is now in the process of renovation, and will become a museum depicting the history of Jackson County.

The centennial and dedication are a tribute to the citizens of Jackson County who believe cultural advancement can best be provided by cherishing our heritage. They have asked that I extend an invitation to my colleagues and to the people of the Nation to attend this observance.

EXPANDING RELATIONS WITH RED CHINA

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the continuing debate on both national and international issues in which we here constantly engage, mixed with the pressures of our other day-to-day activities, all too frequently prevent us from sharing the views and the wisdom of those who have an opportunity to observe these same issues in a somewhat more removed fashion and with the benefit of many years of experience and national leadership.

My good friend Alf Landon is one of our esteemed elder statesmen whose active personal participation in the affairs of this Nation was cut short by a tide which ran against him in his time but who has subsequently enjoyed the opportunity to see many of his views broadly accepted and endorsed by their acceptance as national policy.

Alf Landon continues to participate in both the broad general policy discussion and the detailed issues which confront the Nation. Some of his views still stir controversy and in spite of my close friendship and admiration for him, we do not always see eye to eye. But I nevertheless find his contribution stimulating and thought provoking.

Last October, for example, Governor Landon spoke to the Ohio Petroleum Marketing Association at which time he advocated expanding relations with Red China. I ask unanimous consent that Governor Landon's statement be included in the RECORD at this point. A few weeks ago Mr. Clyde Reed, editor of the Parsons Sun, commented on Governor Landon's views in a manner which demonstrates the Governor's contribution to continuing debate.

Within recent weeks, Governor Landon also submitted to the Republican National Committee a suggested policy statement relating to foreign policy, social security, and conflicts of interest.

I ask unanimous consent that these, too, be included in the RECORD as I am sure that Members of the Senate, regardless of political party and regardless of whether or not we agree with Governor Landon, will find the views expressed of interest.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY

Successive administrations' foreign policy has put all Americans in the position where we—come what may—must oppose armed attack by Communist North Vietnam on South Vietnam under the guise of "liberation."

We believe, parallel to extending America's military power against that aggression—we should make clear that the United States of America is willing—through the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and in cooperation with other Asiatic nations—to join in a concerted concentrated big program of economic and technological developments by and through regional association of Asiatic nations.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The welfare State—which can be a desirable mixture of private and public responsibility—is still in the trial and error period.

If used as a pork barrel or combined with Government massive planned economy, it will ultimately destroy itself and the democratic processes.

We believe that the distinction between a feasible mixture of enterprise capitalism—with Government regulation and Government social responsibility—in contrast to a massive Federal planned economy—is vital and urgent both for an equitable welfare State and democratic processes.

The weakening of the American dollar is also a great threat to both. The steps the national Democrat administration is taking do not meet the immediate and pressing problem created by our deficit in balance of international payments.

Our European allies take a dim view of our fiscal policies based on chronic inflation. We are opposed to that.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The vast expansion of Government throughout the economic life of our Nation demands a strong and workable conflict of interests statute—a statute covering both the giver and the taker of all gifts, loans, fees, or commissions, whether in cash or in kind. Such a statute should apply to all echelons of the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government and their staffs—not only during their terms of public service, but for 5 years thereafter. It should also apply to members of their families and any partnership, firm, family corporation, or limited trust agreement.

Men are willing to sacrifice their lives in the Armed Forces of our country. The traditions of public service without reward—except honor—reach back to the beginning of our great and beloved Republic. We believe they are still valid.

The attempt to avoid the appearance of conflict of interests by arrangements that cover only the limited period of public service is a pitiful sham. The Republican Party should lead the fight to curb these present and potential abuses.

[From the Parsons Sun, Apr. 30, 1965]

ALF'S GRIN

The august U.S. Chamber of Commerce and no one else but has called upon our Government to "more effectively open channels of communication with the people of mainland China."

That's Red China, if the point is not clear, and because it is Red China and because it is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce which did the resolving, here is news of more than passing significance.

That affable old radical, Alf M. Landon, who forever plots against the status quo over the luncheon table in a dim corner of Topeka's Chocolate Shop, has been saying for a long time that you can't ignore 750 million people.

Alf simply was too far ahead of the country, as he is on most international issues of moment. The rest of us have been making like ostriches and pretending, among other things, that one-quarter of the world's population by some strange fate of magic does not exist.

The U.S. chamber meanwhile never has won prizes for daring innovation. Or even just plain innovation.

From the New Deal forward, it has cried "hold the line" louder than Jack Mitchell when Missouri is on the Kansas 1-yard stripe. The chamber has been just as successful as Mitchell, too, on most occasions.

So when the members in solemn session depose that what we need is more communication with Red China, which at least includes conversation and possibly even trade, Alf must be smiling like an oil man who just brought in a new wildcat, which he probably did day before yesterday, and who is to say he's not entitled to cut loose with a grin as broad as the Kaw River?

FOR AN OPEN-DOOR POLICY

(By Alf M. Landon, Ohio Petroleum Marketers Association, Columbus, Ohio, Oct. 20, 1964)

I speak tonight of the world-shaking and world-shaping changes that occurred just 5 days ago. In close to one 24-hour period, we had the Russian upheaval—the Chinese bomb—and the British election.

A future historian may well mark the middle of October 1964, as the start of a chain of decisions that shaped the lives of all the world peoples.

Those changes are and will continue to be controversial. They involve a reversal of not only our basic foreign policies, but of other countries also.

Right now, it would be hard to find a subject on which there are more widespread and divergent views than relations with China and Russia.

Five days ago, China exploded its first nuclear bomb—an event of more immediate political than military significance.

China is a long way from the stockpile of nuclear weapons—or ways and means for their effective use—that military action or threat of action requires.

Mao accompanied the firing of the bomb with a formal proposal: "to governments of the world that a summit conference of all the countries of the world be convened to discuss the question of the complete prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons."

This proposal is more of interest and significance than the bomb itself, because of Mao's previous belligerent position—the size of China—her natural resources—the political place it occupies with the nonalined countries of Asia and Africa.

I completely disagree with Senator PASTORE, who said that—while he agrees with the need for that conference of nuclear powers—he did not believe in letting Mao take the initiative.

Of course, there is nothing new in Mao's proposal. Disarmament or limitation of armaments is an old vision of mankind. Who cares about the initiative? We should be alert to any opening for a realistic discussion of these ideal international relations.

Secretary of State Rusk's first reaction was that it was simply Mao's smokescreen for his other plans.

So what? Mao has probably not suddenly changed from his Genghis Kahn role to that of a great humanitarian leader—unless it fits his policies for Chinese and Communist conquest of the world. But it could be that he has.

We must be alert to that possibility. Of course, Mao is thinking of China's interests first—just as we must think first of America's interest.

America would be in a stronger and better position if we approached Mao's formal proposal to all the countries of the world with cordiality and caution rather than with coldness and negativity.

China is showing the same internal strain as Russia and other Communists countries in the failure of the Marxian principles to work. There is the same doubt and confusion in top Chinese circles that there is in Russia and the European Communist countries.

With China's economy having a bad time, Mao's proposal would relieve China of the financial burden and staggering cost of building real nuclear power and the effective means of delivering it. It would also be the best way of getting into the world markets China needs—and laying the ground for mending Mao's relations with other peoples and governments he badly needs. And it would give him a better opportunity for subversive activities if diplomatic relations are established and China is admitted to the United Nations.

It can't be stated too often that of even greater importance and significance in the life of the world than the successful explosion of the Chinese bomb itself was Mao's call for a summit meeting of all nuclear powers and nations possessing nuclear power for the destruction of nuclear weapons.

Equally important—that is a total reversal of Mao's hitherto belligerent position of deliberately planning a nuclear war for Chinese Communist conquest of the world.

Mao, in his planning for a nuclear war, has said, according to no less authority than Pandit Nehru, that the loss of 200 million Chinese or more in that war meant nothing because there will be more of them left than any other peoples in the world.

There is no doubt in my mind of the intrinsic value of Mao's proposal for a summit meeting of nuclear powers, to be followed by a meeting of all countries, for the purpose of limiting the spread of nuclear technology for military purposes.

It is not only the holocaust of a nuclear war that confronts us. It is the question of the effect on unborn generations—in simply testing for one—that no one knows for sure and won't know for another 25 or 30 years or more.

The dramatic and unexpected change in Russia's leadership 5 days ago sent shock waves into every foreign office and stock market in the world. Of more than passing interest to all peoples is that the first grab of the new Russian leaders was of editors and broadcasters to insure control of the dissemination of the news.

There is little doubt in my mind as to the vital place that Leonid Brezhnev, the new head of the Soviet, as Chairman of the Soviet Central Committee, now occupies and the vital part his policies will play in any design for stability and peace in the world.

It may cause more of a pause among some of the nonalined nations on deciding when to get off their fence and what side to land on.

If the new leadership in Russia continues Khrushchev's basic policy at home, the same as abroad, it has the advantage of a fresh start unhandicapped by personal likes and dislikes that have played such a part in all governments and international relations throughout history.

Certainly, for the time being, world foreign policies will be in a confused state. There is no area in the total world picture where we and the Russians are not involved to some extent and generally deeply.

The first appraisal will be on the effect of the transition in Russia.

The internal change in policy is not yet apparent. One vital decision is on continuance or reversal of Khrushchev's policies of diluting the unworkable Marx-Lenin dogmas with the capitalistic principles of individual incentive profit motives—freer discussion.

A shock to the Communist world—along with the bitter split between Russia and China—is the split in Russia between the moderates and the Stalinists. These divisions have been aggravated by the letter of Togliatti written to Khrushchev that was released after the Italian's death several weeks ago.

Togliatti, the leader of the biggest Communist Party in any country outside the Communist bloc, wrote Khrushchev that the failures of the Communist dogmas of Marx and Lenin were evident—that they no longer could be concealed. Togliatti emphasized that mankind inherently demanded freedom of discussion and spiritual values instead of purely materialistic policies.

Not to be overlooked in the problem confronting Brezhnev's formulation of his policies is the change taking place—with more looming ahead—in the European Communist bloc. Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and others are following the example set by Yugoslavia in achieving a measure of national independence.

But the big foreign question was Chairman Brezhnev's relations with China. There was no hesitation regarding that. He did not wait 48 hours to settle the crucial question in his international policy—whether he was going to continue Khrushchev's policies with China—or reverse them.

Mr. Brezhnev turned loose in Pravda a slashing attack on Peiping.

In that, he supports and maintains Khrushchev's policies that Mother Russia's vital interests preclude allowing China to establish positions of strength on its boundary line with Russia—the longest boundary line between countries by far in all the world.

Then came a flat statement from top Soviet leaders calling on all the people of the world to "struggle for the complete ending of nucelar weapons tests." Whether that was meant as a friendly answer to Mao's proposal or not remains for further developments. At least, it was a statement of like intent.

Then there is De Gaulle. France refused to sign the ban nuclear bomb testing treaty. Keep in mind that the French nuclear power is more sophisticated and highly developed than that of the Chinese.

That brings me to our own American policies in the light of the accomplished Chinese nuclear bomb—and Secretary of Defense McNamara's recent prediction that in a decade or two, "tens of nations" will have usable nuclear weapons.

President Johnson—in last Sunday's national broadcast—went all around Mao's formal proposal. While keeping the door open by his general statements of policy—he did not get into it. A President cannot be expected to discuss in a public address a matter of such importance until he has had time to give it serious and vigilant consideration and to consult with our allies.

He did invite Mao to join the nuclear test ban treaty.

Since 1948, I have urged the recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations. I have said that discussions of limitation of world armament—a world court—even the United Nations—were useless without including China, with a fourth of the world's population; that China could no more be ignored than Pikes Peak. It would be as if the jurisdiction of the Kansas Supreme Court did not cover the largest county in Kansas. Above all, why cement the Orient and the Occident together?

Therefore, if we are to seriously examine Mao's proposal for a summit conference of nuclear powers to deal with control of nuclear weapons—as I believe we should—in all good faith—we must be prepared to reverse our policy of nonrecognition of China and opposition to its admission in the United Nations. Maybe that will give the U.N. the lift it badly needs.

All that follows—one step after the other—as day does night.

Perhaps the time is ripe for the five nuclear powers to meet preliminary to a larger meeting of all governments.

I emphasize the "perhaps"—until preliminary discussions have taken place with Mao—with Chairman Brezhnev—with the Russian Premier Alexi Kosygin—with the new British Prime Minister, Harold Wilson—with De Gaulle of France—Ehrhart of West Germany—with Japan—with the other great nations of the Western Hemisphere.

With Mao himself, no one knows just what kind of a workable agreement can be arrived at to preserve mankind from the spread of nuclear weapons testing and possible nuclear war.

If agreements come among the powers of nuclear limitation, we must keep in mind that they will involve a host of major decisions affecting every facet of international relations.

Most certainly, while Mao's changed policy—whether he means it or not—in the final analysis—points in the direction of world disarmament—it calls for serious intent and prompt consideration. It must be approached with caution and vigilance in searching for a meeting of minds on all the vital questions involved in protecting national interests and security in this meeting of the major nuclear powers.

We have been getting the cart before the horse in all this talk about eroding nationalism as necessary to establishing a world without arms.

We are always going to have national interests and patriotic love of country. There never will be a world of peoples without a country.

But a world without at least nuclear weapons is a practical proposition—if we do not try to swallow too much at one gulp—and worth thorough and complete explorations with our associated free nations. That calls for negotiation with Mao to find out what his real intentions are.

It is President Johnson's responsibility to move promptly and firmly in these first steps—though making it clear that we are looking for general world peace—not responding to blackmail.

This is the time for nonpartisan foreign policy. Republican party representatives should be included and have a full and complete part in all negotiations from the first to the last. They should be as fully and completely informed as the President himself.

I would now agree to putting off the United Nations meeting to consider Russia's nonpayment of dues. What was a major point of difference becomes somewhat of a minor one now and should not interfere with considering—negotiating—and settling, one way or the other, this momentous proposal of Mao.

If it fails, we can well see the collapse of the United Nations—and a rush of nations to join the nuclear club—as it were.

With France—and probably Egypt and Israel—getting in—Prime Minister Wilson may change his mind that Britain should depend on the United States of America in another major war and not set aside Britain's independent nuclear weapons in its own defense.

I must confess I am disappointed at all the attention being paid to discounting the significance of the Chinese bomb itself—and the failure to pay more attention to Mao's infinitely more important proposal for a conference of the present five nuclear powers—America—Russia—France—Great Britain—and now China—leading to a worldwide meeting on nuclear disarmament.

One factor is sure. The military might of the free world nations—their enormous resources—their immense economics—preclude any suspicion that China's bomb is worth being concerned about—any more than any other nuclear nations.

If Mao's proposal is simply a change in tactics—the quicker that is known, the better it will be for all the peoples of the world.

If it is a change in policy—that might—only might—join the nations of the world together in a workable agreement that recognizes and protects their national interests and, at the same time, removes the menace of the holocaust of a nuclear world war and the threats to the health of future generations in even preparing for one by increased and continuous testing of nuclear weapons.

I am simply arguing that America should at least keep the door open for the pooling of the resources of energy and experience of mankind in pushing the new opening for an operational agreement for peace. That has always been America's traditional policy.

A universal dominion for peace has hitherto been beyond the grasp of mankind. It may now be within man's grasp—and who gives a tinker's dam who gets the credit—just so the job is done.

"BIG BROTHER"—OPENING OF MAIL BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, my "big brother" item today was inadvertently sent to our distinguished majority whip, the "other Senator LONG," who very kindly forwarded it to me.

The item concerns opening of mail and is contained in correspondence from Mr. George D. Barr, of Orlando, Fla.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Barr's letters to both Senators LONG be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORLANDO, FLA.,
April 15, 1965.

The Honorable RUSSELL LONG,
U.S. Senator From Louisiana,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: That outstanding remark you made loud and clear over TV last night should be repeated over and over. It was a classic. I refer to what you said to the chief postal inspector in regard to spying into private mail. You said in effect, if not these words, "The Post Office Department should deliver the mail and not pry into it." It would appear now if the tax people haven't socked everybody into a corner, the Post Office Department will.

Very recently I had occasion to mail a manuscript to a literary agent in New York for possible sale to a publisher. As received by him, he reported the pages of the manuscript stuck together at the bottom. He returned the whole thing, and several pages were stuck together as he mentioned, with what looked like white library paste. As I mailed them to him, the pages were held together with a paper clip, with top up at the sealed end of the large envelope. Neither of us at the time could understand what had happened. Now the whole thing is clear. Evidently the envelope was opened at the bottom and in resealing some of the paste got between the bottom of the pages.

I lost a sale, of course. The pages in question will have to be retyped, and the time element lost. No telling what is happening to this agent.

With best regards and more power to you for what you are doing. You are from a fine State.

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. BARR.

ORLANDO, FLA.,
April 28, 1965.

Senator EDWARD V. LONG,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: I appreciate your answer to my letter. Please pardon my mistake in addressing this to the wrong Senator LONG. I did not get the first of the TV broadcast, and only heard "Senator LONG." I am happy that my letter was forwarded to the correct Senator LONG. Having been stationed in Kansas City, Mo., and living in Independence, as well as working all over the State of Missouri before my retirement, I have a soft spot in my heart for your wonderful State.

You have my permission to do anything you wish with my letter, my remarks, my name or any other idea in any way you see fit. As documentary evidence in the case mentioned of the pages of the manuscript being stuck together at the bottom, I have the letter from the literary agent in which he says "I am sorry that some of the pages were stuck together. I was very careful, but a certain amount of damage was unavoidable." Without his permission I am at least for the time being, withholding his name. I also have the manuscript with the pages, some separated, some still stuck together, as the agent returned them to me. Of course an editor would never look at anything like this, with pages stuck together. It is my intention to revise this manuscript, but I will be very careful to keep the pages stuck together. This along with the letter just in case some one doesn't believe us.

The late Senator Olin Johnston, of South Carolina, was a personal friend of mine, from a long time back. He will be missed. He was a good man.

Most sincerely,

GEO. D. BARR.

STATE'S RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Texans feel strongly about retention of their State's right-to-work law, judging from the mail and telegrams I have been receiving. I fully agree with them.

In order that other Senators may be advised of the depth of Texas concern, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram to me from the Pecos Chamber of Commerce be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator JOHN G. TOWER,
Washington, D.C.:

The officers, directors, and entire membership of the Pecos Chamber of Commerce urge your strongest opposition to any change in the present right-to-work laws for labor. This precious right must be retained without compromise.

C. K. DOZIER,
President,
Pecos Chamber of Commerce.

THE UNDERPROTECTED MIGRANT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the New York Times editorial board has over the years taken great interest in farm labor problems. Its editorials in this field have been factual and thought provoking.

The Times' most recent observation in this area dealt with Attorney General Katzenbach's action of yesterday in authorizing an extension until June 1 of 500 West Indians to work on the Florida celery harvest. The Times' editorial dated May 25 is entitled "The Underprotected Migrant."

I believe the Senate should have the benefit of this informative commentary and, therefore, ask unanimous consent at this point for this editorial to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNDERPROTECTED MIGRANT

No American worker enjoys fewer statutory safeguards than the migratory farm laborer; he is outside virtually all the laws that guarantee any element of decency in wages or working conditions. Yet, he can always be sure that powerful political and economic interests will combine to erode whatever small measure of protection he finally wins through Government action.

That dismal history is being repeated in California and Florida, where growers are shooting holes in the fences erected by Congress to keep out cheap foreign labor and thus help push up the wretched level of earnings for domestic farmworkers. Secretary of Labor Wirtz, who has fought resolutely to enforce the ban on the importation of Mexicans, has found himself obliged to give ground twice under pressure from California growers of strawberries and vegetables.

Thus far the breakthrough has been confined to 2,500 braceros, but the political heat on Mr. Wirtz can be expected to grow more intense as the harvest season advances. His ability to resist has now been weakened by an undermining action from within the Johnson Cabinet. Attorney General Katzenbach has just overruled Mr. Wirtz by authorizing an extension until June 1 of the work permits for 500 West Indians harvesting celery in Florida.

Unquestionably, the farmowners in both States made a persuasive demonstration that crops would rot if they were denied the use of foreign labor. They will always be able to make such a demonstration so long as they know there is a door to unlock. Whenever the growers bring farm wages up to some level of parity with the wages prevailing elsewhere in the American economy, there will be no lack of domestic labor to harvest the country's fruits and vegetables. With or without a war on poverty, it is the Government's obligation to convince them that the escape hatch is closed for good.

THE CASE OF THE DISAPPEARING AIRLINE OR THE MYSTERIOUS FLIGHT OF PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, since March 26, 1965, the people of Alaska have been adjusting themselves to a mysterious phenomenon of Federal regulatory procedure as shocking in its way, as unexpected in occurrence and as quixotic in effect, as the famous earthquake of March 27, 1964, that shook the State devastatingly a year earlier.

The calamity that has befallen Alaska this year was not produced by nature but was, rather, an act of the Civil Aeronautics Board, compounded by a sudden and shocking reversal of position by Pan American Airways, always in the past regarded as Alaska's friend and repeatedly and unceasingly on record, publicly and privately, that it would fight to the last ditch the CAB's efforts to diminish its service in Alaska. Methods of rescue are available to the Board and it is our hope they will be applied rapidly, restoring to the people of Alaska an assurance of the air transportation services on which they are dependent.

On March 26 the Civil Aeronautics Board delivered itself of a decision in the case of Pacific Northwest-Alaska Air Service revising routes of air carriers serving Alaska. If allowed to become effective, the decision of the Board would make drastic changes in air transportation from the other States to Alaska—changes uniformly opposed by the State of Alaska, the capital city of Juneau, and other communities affected, including Anchorage, Fairbanks, Ketchikan, Sitka, Homer, and Kodiak. Petitions for reconsideration of the decision have been filed by six airlines operating in Alaska—reflecting dissatisfaction of the industry with the Board's action.

The major cause of disappointment and dismay is that the Board's decision would deprive the communities of the southeastern area of Alaska, including the capital city of Juneau, of a choice of air carriers, leaving the citizenry in jeopardy of total isolation from the rest of the world in the event of an emergency causing cessation of service by the single carrier left to provide service from Seattle to southeast.

Other aspects of the decision—its failure to decide the important question of establishing reliable commuter service between Anchorage and Fairbanks, service long needed by those communities; its implication of economic pressure to induce a major carrier to terminate essential services now operating direct from Seattle to Kodiak and to the Kenai Peninsula; and the reliance upon obsolete data no longer indicative of the transportation needs of Alaska—are deplorable. Many reasons can be found and have been stated by the parties to the case for reconsidering the decision of the Board.

The effect of the decision on southeast Alaska is, however, so drastic, so damaging, and so serious to the welfare of the people affected, that the Civil Aeronautics Board must be persuaded to reopen the matter and revise its decision.

While the Civil Aeronautics Board has, we believe, rendered an insupportable judgment in this case, Alaskans are as stunned by the actions of Pan American Airways, long thought to be our friend and aid in the controversy before the CAB, as we are by the decision of the Board.

Pan American World Airways is one of the petitioners to the Board for reconsideration of its decision. Seemingly as one in its position with the State of Alaska, the city of Juneau and other protesting Alaskans, Pan American's petition to the Board after its March 26 decision cries of outrage, violation of rights, and vociferous protest. This is what was to be expected from the carrier. Pan American had been the pioneer airline serving Alaska to and from "outside"—the Alaskan term for the rest of the United States. In 1940, Pan American extended its Fairbanks-Whitehorse-Juneau intra-Alaska service to Seattle via Ketchikan, giving Alaskans a new and highly valuable service. Before Pan American arrived in 1940 to fly us in and out of Alaska, there was no easy means of access to the outside world. (Long previously it had pioneered intra-Alaskan service.) No highway connections to the States existed in the days before the Alaska highway. Access to the rest of the world was limited to travel by steamship—slow, hazardous, and uncertain.

The advent of airplane transportation to the States via the southeastern area of Alaska gave us, for the first time, swift passage to destinations outside Alaska.

Alaskans have always given Pan American Airways great credit for inaugurating its Pacific Northwest-Alaska service, as it has been invaluable in stimulating the advance to statehood and making Alaska a part of the community of the United States.

Thus, we were astounded when we read Pan American's answer to other petitions for reconsideration filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board. Here we find that our long-time friend and defender is abruptly deserting the position so strongly taken before and is announcing the departure of Pan American Airways from southeastern Alaska.

The company has announced that it is willing to accede to the order of the Board and suspend its service between the Pacific Northwest and Alaska on May 28. As stated in the filing of the company, its intention is that this state of affairs would exist for a period of 1 year, after which the implication is that the Board will have been proved so wrong in its order removing Pan American from the service it now voluntarily quits that action will be imperative to return Pan American to southeastern Alaska.

The speciousness of this approach needs no comment.

Certainly, the proposition that acquiescence in the Board's order really amounts to opposition to it—the curious position Pan American attempts to take cannot be seriously accepted.

Alaska had depended on Pan American to help fight the Board order removing the airline from southeastern Alaska. Now our assumed ally has retired from the field. However, the Alaskans are not giving up the fight.

We have requested it formally, and we will take every other means available to move the Civil Aeronautics Board to change its decision in the Pacific Northwest-Alaska Air Service case.

The reason Alaskans feel so strongly about the absolute necessity of dependable transportation services lies in the geographical facts of life and in the long history of Alaska of exclusion from surface transportation facilities taken for granted by the rest of the country. Alaska is remote from the rest of the country. That is a geographic fact. To understand the meaning of this, one must consider that for all transportation purposes Alaska is as much an island as is our sister Pacific State, Hawaii. Virtually all supplies of commodities needed for living must be imported from the manufacturing and industrial centers of the Nation—far removed from the State.

We have depended for passenger transportation between Alaska and the other States on air carriers since the time Pan American inaugurated its Pacific Northwest service. More than residents of any other State in the Union, Alaskans are accustomed to flying rather than traveling by surface transportation wherever they have to go.

In no respect is the contrast between Alaska and all the other States more marked than in the existence of surface transportation facilities.

Alaska has but one railroad line, the 500-mile Alaska Railroad running from Seward in south central Alaska to Fairbanks in the center of the State. Our capital city of Juneau is entirely unconnected with the railroad, as is most of the State.

As for highways, Alaska has suffered a unique discrimination, not applied to any other State in the Union. It was not until 1956 that Alaska received any assistance under the Federal Aid Highway Act, and then under a special formula limiting its participation by allowing only one-third of the area of the then territory to be used in computing entitlement to assistance. Thus, even limited participation in this form of Federal assistance did not come until 40 years after the Federal Aid Highway Act was passed and the States enjoyed its benefits. Not until after statehood for Alaska, with enactment of the Alaska Omnibus Act in 1959, was Alaska allowed to participate fully in the Federal Aid Highway Act. Alaska is still not included in the Interstate Highway Act.

The Bureau of Public Roads has estimated that if Alaska had been fully included in the Federal Aid Highway Act, it would have received approximately $300 million never allowed because of its exclusion.

The disadvantage to Alaska of exclusion from highway programs takes many forms. Perhaps the most graphic is the basic fact that most of the principal cities of Alaska, including the capital city of Juneau, are entirely unconnected with each other by highway. It is, for example, impossible to drive from Juneau to Anchorage. Outside the city limits of Juneau, the roads run as far as homes have been built and people are living. But they are, literally, roads to nowhere.

Two years ago, the State of Alaska, in its infancy, inaugurated an imaginative and increasingly successful marine highway. Because of the rugged geography of southeastern Alaska it is not feasible to build roads from Juneau to Ketchikan, a major fishing and woodpulp center, or roads connecting these communities and their neighbors, Petersburg, Wrangell, and Sitka. So the new State attacked, as a first order of business, the problem of providing transportation between the communities of southeastern Alaska. We put a road on the sea by building and operating seagoing ferries to transport passengers and vehicles otherwise without means of travel.

The ferry system has been a boon to southeastern Alaska and the State is to be congratulated on this ingenious approach to its surface transportation problems. It is also of benefit to western and northern Alaska.

This contribution to intrastate travel was not intended nor can it be a transportation system linking Alaska with the rest of the country. For this, Alaska is and will remain entirely dependent on air transportation.

That is why the loss of service of a carrier is so serious to southeastern Alaska, especially when the loss of that carrier results in the availability of but one airline to transport passengers from the capital of Juneau and the whole region of southeastern Alaska to the centers of government, industry, and commerce located far from Alaska. The very life and sustenance of the communities affected may well depend on the availability of fast transportation. It is not difficult at all to imagine the seriousness of crises that could develop when Federal and State officials, residents of the capital of the State, and thousands of other Alaskans cannot leave their island because the only certificated carrier to the other States is forced to suspend service by reason of strikes, of operational failures, or any of the other eventualities that could make flights impossible.

These are the reasons Alaskans feel so keenly the threat of loss of a carrier in the Pacific Northwest-Alaska service. We are losing a service to which I believe we can establish a right.

The Civil Aeronautics Board will, I hope, heed the warning before it of the serious consequences of its decision of March 26.

The strange action of Pan American Airways in suddenly reversing its position in this matter and accepting the Board's judgment in this case cannot be easily explained. Pan American knows the facts of Alaska transportation hazards as well as any organization that has ever operated in the State. Certainly, the company knows it is doing Alaska a disservice by failing to fight for its service between southeastern Alaska and the Pacific Northwest.

But Alaskans do not know and cannot understand Pan American's sudden capitulation to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

This is another reason for a reopening of the Pacific Northwest-Alaska Air Service case. The mystery of Pan American's last flight out of southeast must be explained.

A rehearing of the case before the Civil Aeronautics Board would be a good way to clear up the mystery.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD communications from Alaska protesting the CAB decision.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 68

Joint resolution protesting the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board regarding air service between Alaska and Seattle

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board has announced a drastic curtailment of air service between Alaska and the rest of the Nation via Seattle; and

Whereas the State of Alaska, through its legislature and Governor, has long been on record for more rather than less air service to connect it with its sister States; and

Whereas the latest decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board will drastically curtail service to Alaska in general and to southeast Alaska in particular where Pan American World Airways, which pioneered interstate service for that region, will be denied its stops at Ketchikan and Juneau; and

Whereas the decision also includes a denial of the direct flight between Fairbanks and Seattle to Alaska Airlines: Be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Alaska protests the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board regarding Alaska-Seattle service and urgently requests the Board to reconsider and withdraw its decision; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, Chairman, and the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board; and the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators; and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

Passed by the senate April 2, 1965.

ROBERT J. MCNEALY,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed by the house April 7, 1965.

MIKE GRAVEL,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

NADINE WILLIAMS,
Chief Clerk of the House.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor of Alaska.

April 12, 1965.

APRIL 22, 1965.

ALAN S. BOYD,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.
JUAN TRIPPE,
Chairman of the Board,
Pan American World Airways,
New York, N.Y.

SIRS: As commissioner, Alaska Department of Labor, I recommend reversal Civil Aeronautics Board decision to revoke Pan American World Airways certificate to serve southeast Alaska. In keeping with President Johnson's policy to increase jobs for an expanding economy, CAB action has adverse effect by eliminating approximately 50 jobs in Ketchikan and Juneau, with wages and services loss at nearly $1 million.

Pan Am's million-dollar bolster to Alaska's economy is without Government subsidy. In addition, two competitive air carriers necessary to spur growth of commerce, tourism, and overall economy of southeast Alaska. In the event of an airline strike, similar to Pan Am's recently settled pilot's strike, southeastern Alaska would be a strike-bound area devoid of direct air service to Seattle. This important region, including Alaska's State capital of Juneau, would be placed at a definite disadvantage under one carrier, particularly since this area uniquely leans heavily on this important air link to other States.

Copies of this telegram sent to Senators GRUENING and BARTLETT, Representative RIVERS, and Governor Egan.

GIL JOHNSON,
Commissioner of Labor.

ALASKA STATE CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE,
May 12, 1965.

Hon. ALAN S. BOYD,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOYD: The Alaska State Chamber of Commerce joins with the numerous other civic and service organizations in our State, opposing your Board's recent recommendations in the Pacific Northwest-Alaska Air Service case. The Board's proposals making major revisions in our air routes and in many cases reductions of service to our major markets, is a step in the wrong direction.

Our board of directors this past weekend, again discussed and reviewed your recommendations and have agreed to reiterate their past stand favoring competitive service to all major markets of Alaska from Seattle and Portland.

Because of the adverse effect of your decisions on many parts of our State, we believe it is imperative that the Board reconsider its recommendations.

Sincerely,

DON DICKEY,
General Manager.

CITY TO CARRY PAN AM BATTLE

"The city of Juneau was dumbfounded at Pan American's announcement yesterday that it intended to suspend services to Juneau and Ketchikan the 28th of this month. Pan Am's intention to acquiesce in the CAB's decision of March 26, 1965, very seriously impairs the fight by the city of Juneau and by the State of Alaska to overturn the decision, and achieve fully competitive service for southeast Alaska," it was announced today by Acting Mayor A. W. Boddy.

The city, however, is not quitting in its efforts to reverse the CAB. Mayor Lauris Parker is in Washington, D.C., at the present time testifying before House and Senate committees on the Snettisham project. When the announcement was made, he immediately contacted Hubert A. Schneider of Washington, D.C., vice president and general counsel of Pan American World Airways. Toward week's end he intends to confer with top Pan Am officials in New York City to encourage them to reverse themselves and continue to oppose the CAB order of March 26. Governor Egan is also in Washington and Mayor Parker expects to join him in a common effort to keep competing air service in southeast Alaska, Boddy said.

"If the Civil Aeronautics Board grants the city's petition for rehearing, there is the hope and possibility that the Board will see the sense of the city's as well as the State's petition, and keep competing air carrier service in Juneau and Ketchikan. If the order resulting from the hearing reverses the earlier edict that Pan American must lease southeast, then Pan Am's certificate here will compel it to provide daily service to the area, whether it desires to leave us or not," Boddy added.

Pan American has indicated that its contemplated action will result in "an atmosphere in which sounder solutions can be achieved," he said. "Any atmosphere in which Juneau, the capital of the 49th State, is left without competing carriers is neither a constructive nor a sound one. During the past 40 days, we actually had one carrier service on 15 of those days, either because of the pilot strike or equipment trouble. If either of the operating carriers had been the sole carrier during the period, Juneau would have been without any service to Seattle whatsoever for either 10 or 5 days, depending on which carrier would have been our only one," he said.

"The transportation picture for the capital of Alaska is in grave peril today; the city of Juneau will not stand idle while there is still a fighting chance. I suggest that as many people as possible express their disappointment with the area's pioneer carrier; a great number of citizens signed petitions to aid Pan Am in its efforts against the CAB, only to see their labors lost by Pan Am's willingness to temporarily leave southeastern Alaska," Mayor Boddy said.

JUNEAU, ALASKA,
May 7, 1965.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

When Pan Am World Airways pilot strike idled that line from April 1 to 10, Juneau, capital of Alaska, had only one carrier service; namely, Pacific Northern Airlines. For past 3 days Juneau has had only one carrier service—namely, Pan Am—because PNA jet inoperable due to equipment change. If either line had been sole carrier, city would have been without srvice for total of 13 days during last 35 days. This is further clear proof that competing air carrier service essential to capital of 49th State. It is obvious that CAB decision of March 26, 1965, not consonant with public convenience and necessity. Similar telegram to Alaska delegation and CAB.

LAURIS S. PARKER,
Mayor of Juneau, Alaska.

JUNEAU, ALASKA,
April 8, 1965.

ALAN S. BOYD,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOYD: As one of many resident Alaska families benefiting by the daily Seattle-Juneau flights of two competing airlines, we are compelled to appeal to you for a reconsideration of recent CAB action taken in the Pacific-Northwest Alaska Air Service case. The fine service we have had is, in large part, we feel, attributable to the competition offered.

The curtailment of the excellent service provided by the first airline to bring daily jet service from Seattle to Juneau and without benefit of Government subsidy will pose a serious threat to the efficient, dependable transportation now existing. It could well create further grave problems in southeast Alaska which would serve to retard, rather than improve, our economic growth.

The Board statement that a merger of the Pacific Northern and Alaska Airlines offers a reasonable solution to the problem in our opinion, and we cannot understand why the Board does not bring about such a merger after finding that it is so obviously in the public interest. In the case of the Ellis Airlines and the Alaska Coastal Airlines, you did bring about such a merger in the interests of the public.

In summary, we repeat our strong conviction that the wiping out of the Pan American competitive air link on the Seattle-Juneau route is very undesirable. We sincerely hope that the Board will reconsider their action.

Very truly yours,

G. H. GISSBERG.
CLAUDIA GISSBERG.
JOHN GISSBERG.

JUNEAU, ALASKA,
April 6, 1965.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We as Alaskans cannot sit idly by while autocratic bureaus dictate policies alien to American rights and principles of government and enterprise. Therefore we must urgently and forcefully protest this new edict handed down by the Civil Aeronautics Board on Pacific Northwest-Alaska air transportation.

The CAB has dictated that southeastern Alaska must be served by one air carrier of their choosing notwithstanding Southeastern Alaska's position as the center of government of the largest State in the Union. While our Government in Washington decries and legislates against monopolies the CAB creates this monster and closes the door upon the first principle of competitive enterprise, but leaves the portals open wide to increase tariffs, reductions, and/or inferior service because of this denial of free competition.

The CAB apparently chooses to ignore the pioneering of Pan American World Airways in Alaska uniting our great State. Must this air sourdough take his place upon the roster of replacement by some bureau seeking to create a new Alaskan?

The CAB dictates these tenets in our best interests—the canceling of a work force, the deletion of a payroll, the transfer of Alaskans to a new residence or to seek new fields of employment? Is this Government by the people? Are we to reward Pan American's years of pioneering by banishment? This is not the Alaskan way. Progress is to increase the service and growth through competition, not decrease it.

Furthermore, the CAB seeks to eliminate a non-subsidized air carrier in favor of a subsidized carrier. What kind of bureaucratic reasoning is that? Is this the price of success?

Therefore, we the members of Local 869 and its officers, protest loudly and vigorously this dictatorial edict. Furthermore, we support the stand and position of our Alaska Congressional Delegation to reconsider and repeal this arbitrary ruling as not in Alaska's best interests or desires or of sound business principles.

As free Americans and Alaskans we ask our voice be heard and that our Government continues to foster the pioneering efforts of our Nation.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. LELAND,
President.

JUNEAU, ALASKA,
April 7, 1965.

Hon. ALAN S. BOYD,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BOYD: I am strongly opposed to the action taken by the CAB as related to the Pacific-Northwest Alaska Air Service case and urgently ask for a reconsideration of the case.

I fail to understand completely the repeated statement that the CAB does not have the power to bring about a merger of such airlines as Pacific Northern and Alaska Airlines. Your Board did not seem to have any difficulty in causing the merger of Ellis Airlines and Alaska Coastal Airlines in the past, and I feel strongly that this course has not been pursued at any length, but rather avoided.

Your Board does release the announcement that a merger or mergers is the only sensible course and in this the people of Alaska share your thinking, but are disturbed that such wastes in duplicate maintenance facilities and overall operations of these two airlines are permitted to exist.

The lack of competition in southeastern Alaska will cause situations far more grave to this part of Alaska than I feel your Board has care to research.

I repeat again my very strong objection to the action the Board proposes and feel strongly this action will not begin to bring about the economies that are suggested.

Very truly yours,

LAUREL C. MCKECHNIC.
D. W. LARRY.

APRIL 5, 1965.

THE CHAIRMAN,
Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The recent decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board to suspend Pan American World Airways from operating between Seattle, Ketchikan, and Juneau disturbs me very much.

I am a lifelong resident of Juneau, and when I was a kid in grade school I watched the first plane arrive at the Pacific Alaska Airways Airport on March 25, 1935—a PAA Lockheed Electra. Since that time I have watched Pan Am improve its service and its equipment, and they have always been the pioneer in these things.

The fact that Pan Am is not now subsidized, while Pacific Northern continues to receive a large subsidy for its operation makes me wonder at the thinking of the CAB in suspending Pam Am and leaving the subsidized carrier operating solely.

The decision of your Board to allow Cordova Airlines to fly between Anchorage and Juneau seems to me very good. This route has been served by only one carrier for many years and will now have competition. Competition is extremely important in keeping up the quality of service and reliability of schedules. Thus, the elimination of the competition on the more important southern segment of the route from the States to Alaska simply does not make sense to me.

I know a great many other people in this area feel the same as I do about this matter, and I sincerely hope you will take this into consideration and reconsider your decision in suspending Pam Am in southeastern Alaska.

Sincerely,

MINARD MILL, Jr.

JUNEAU, ALASKA,
April 10, 1965.

Mr. ALAN S. BOYD,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOYD: The recent ruling of the CAB which would deprive southeast Alaska of the services of Pan American World Airways services is a matter of grave concern to many of us.

PAA not only pioneered in this area, but has continued to give extraordinarily fine service. If a private business is willing to lose money in maintaining a service it does not seem equitable that the Government should prevent its doing so. Competition is a basic factor in American economy, and to give a monopoly to another company, particularly a subsidized one, is a perplexing decision.

This area will be expanding. It is not the time to decrease necessary services.

With hopes that reconsideration may be given to the decision,

Sincerely,

MRS. LESLIE B. AVRIT.

Juneau, Alaska,
April 19, 1965.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Gruening: Enclosed, for your information, is a copy of correspondence directed to Mr. Boyd, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, concerning their recent decision to eliminate Pan American World Airways in southeast Alaska.

We appreciate your stand in this matter and hope you will continue your efforts to have the CAB decision rescinded.

Very truly yours,
Louis A. Bonnett.

Juneau, Alaska,
April 19, 1965.

Mr. Alan S. Boyd,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Boyd: We are very distressed over the recent CAB decision to eliminate Pan American World Airways from service in southeastern Alaska; namely Ketchikan-Annette, and Juneau. Our reasons are set forth as follows:

1. Being in the aviation fuel business at the Juneau Municipal Airport, the loss of revenue from Pan American, our largest customer, will have a devastating effect on our operation and the type of service we will be able to provide the remaining aircraft using our facilities. Pan American supports local business and has purchased approximately four times as much turbine fuel in the past year as the competing airlines. The loss of this volume will force us to reduce our payroll considerably and make our financial operation only marginal at best. We are a small business with four employees at the present time.

2. The fact that Pan American employs some 20 people and puts $497,000 a year into the economy of this area is reason enough for the people of southeastern Alaska to become alarmed at their threatened elimination. The State of Alaska can ill afford to lose a half million dollars when in fact we are aggressively attempting to attract business and industry to our State. Will the remaining airline cover this loss? The city of Juneau's municipal airport operation will suffer severely from loss of revenues derived from Pan American, both from landing fees and especially from fuel taxes.

3. As lifelong residents of Alaska we have been enjoying the benefits and services of travel via Pan American for many years. Since Pan American pioneered the route to Alaska in 1934 and to southeastern in 1940 they have continuously carried the greatest number of passengers—proving the majority prefer flying with the airline that consistently provides the best service to the traveling public.

4. Pan American does not require a Federal subsidy—does it not seem more logical for PAA to make $20,000 profit a year on this run than pay the competing airline several hundred thousand dollars out of the taxpayers' pocket?

5. Your decision has left our capital city and all of southeastern Alaska (at least five of the major towns in Alaska are located in this area) with only one airline serving Seattle. If PAA should have a pilot strike or mechanical trouble with a plane we would be completely cut off by air from the south 48, which would mean we would be deprived from attending to emergency medical attention, urgent business matters, or any crises that would demand our immediate presence outside.

6. Competition is healthy in any business—we are not advocating the removal of the competing airline. It seems imperative that we be allowed the privilege of being served by more than one airline on the Juneau-Seattle run.

In view of the above we strongly and respectfully urge that you reconsider your decision to eliminate Pan American World Airways from this area.

Very truly yours,
Mr. and Mrs. Louis A. Bonnett.

Douglas, Alaska,
April 12, 1965.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: Enclosed please find copies of correspondence sent to members of the Civil Aeronautics Board which accompanied a petition with 1,300 signatures of individuals throughout the State opposing the Board's decision to terminate Pan American World Airways from southeast Alaska.

A copy of the petition has been sent to Senator Bartlett, as well as to Pan American in New York City.

We truly hope that the Civil Aeronautics Board will give the petition some consideration and that you will continue to lend your support in the restoration of Pan American's authority to service southeast Alaska.

Sincerely yours,
Donna Isaak.

Juneau, Alaska,
April 26, 1965.

Chairman Alan Boyd,
Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I have been flying with Pan American Airways since their first flights into Alaska, and I value their good service very much. Therefore I wish to protest against removing them from the Seattle-Juneau run. Why remove competition, which is the life of business, and leave us with the poor service such as we now have between Juneau and Anchorage.

Very sincerely yours,
Mrs. E. L. Hunter.

Douglas, Alaska,
April 12, 1965.

Alan Boyd,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Boyd: Many of us in the Juneau and Douglas area, as well as individuals in other parts of Alaska are greatly dismayed about your recent decision to suspend Pan American World Airways' authority to service Juneau and Ketchikan from Seattle.

It is extremely difficult to understand why this service should be discontinued, after taking all facts into account.

We are, therefore, submitting the enclosed petition with 1,300 signatures of individuals from communities throughout Alaska.

We realize that public opinion is often considered in matters such as this, and we hope that the petition will be given attentive regard, and will have some bearing in the restoration of the outstanding service Pan American has been offering this area for 30 years.

Sincerely yours,
Donna Isaak.

Douglas, Alaska,
April 12, 1965.

Robert T. Murphy,
Chevy Chase, Md.

Dear Mr. Murphy: I am enclosing a copy of a letter to Mr. Boyd stating that we have sent him a petition which 1,300 individuals have signed opposing the discontinuation of Pan American World Airways.

Your recent decision to terminate Pan American from southeast Alaska was truly a blow to this area, not only economically, but the stunning impact that the airline which pioneered this route and the only airline serving this area without a subsidy should be ousted.

We urge you to please give the petition, which was sent to Mr. Boyd, your perusal and consideration.

Sincerely yours,
Donna Isaak.

Douglas, Alaska,
April 5, 1965.

Mr. Alan Boyd,
Chairman, CAB,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We take this means to object to and register complaint about the recent CAB ruling regarding the removal of Pan American Airlines service to Juneau, Alaska.

Pan American Airlines is the only line not subsidized by Government moneys; it is the pioneer airline into Alaska and over the years has provided only the best of service. We strongly object to the decision to remove Pan American from the area and urge the CAB to review this ruling.

Sincerely yours,
Sigurd T. Olson,
Esther T. Olson.

Auke Bay, Alaska,
April 22, 1965.

Hon. Alan S. Boyd,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: As a resident of southeastern Alaska for the past 18 years, and having the best interests of this area in mind, I feel it my duty to protest your recent action to suspend Pan American World Airways from operating in our area for the next 7 years, effective May 28, 1965.

Generally, my views are those in favor of the smaller operator and I like to see him get ahead. In this case, however, I believe you are doing an injustice to the company which pioneered commercial aviation in southeastern Alaska, that being Pan American and its subsidiary Pacific Alaska Airways.

I do not know whether Pan American ever received a subsidy from the Federal Government, but the fact that they are not now receiving one is, in my estimation, very important in this consideration. It just does not appear to me to be good business where you have to pay a carrier to operate and suspend another which is operating without a subsidy.

I also feel that our service to the continental United States will deteriorate with but one carrier operating as competition keeps everyone on their toes, as you are well aware.

Pan American has a large investment in their facilities in Juneau and Annette Island. Many families would be disrupted by your order.

In view of the above reasons, and others which you have undoubtedly been made aware of by others, I would respectfully request your reconsideration of the order suspending Pan American from operating in southeastern Alaska.

Sincerely yours,
David A. Andrus.

Auke Bay, Alaska,
April 5, 1965.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: I am employed as Mr. Claude Millsap's secretary, and as such was able to review the protest which the Alaska congressional delegation sent to Chairman Boyd, of the Civil Aeronautics Board. I agree completely with the stand taken by you, Senator Bartlett, and Representative Rivers.

I object most strongly to the elimination of competition by the removal of Pan American from southeastern Alaska, and further, protest the displacing of the many Pan American employees and their families from this area.

I don't believe I need further enumerate my objections to the CAB decision, inasmuch as your statement adequately covers the points I wished to make. I want to thank you for your efforts in protesting this decision, and I urge you to continue taking a strong stand for the setting aside of this decision, with a rehearing at the earliest possible time.

I believe that your efforts will be greatly appreciated by the people of southeastern Alaska.

Sincerely,

PAMELA L. BONNET.

APRIL 9, 1965.

Mr. ALAN BOYD,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Mr. JOSEPH MINETTI,
Member, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Mr. WHITNEY GILLILAND,
Member, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.:

Greater Anchorage Chamber of Commerce at complete loss to understand why Civil Aeronautics Board completely ignored its position and numerous witnesses presentations on need for competitive service by local carrier on Anchorage-Fairbanks route in its recent Pacific Northwest investigation case decision. Having followed this case since its inception, we cannot understand your action in adding competition on Anchorage-Juneau route and Anchorage-Seattle route where no service complaints were received. Naturally, we are very happy to have this additional service on these routes, but still feel you failed in your decision by not solving local air transportation problems between Alaska's two largest cities. Petition for reconsideration of your decision is being filed by this body, and it is sincerely hoped that you will now focus on this Anchorage-Fairbanks problem.

GREATER ANCHORAGE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

[From the Fairbanks News-Miner, Apr. 15, 1965]

TIME TO PETITION CAB AGAIN

"It seems to us incredible that 5 of the 10 largest cities in our State would, under your decision, have no opportunity to enjoy the unquestioned benefits of competitive air service to the Pacific Northwest"—Alaska congressional delegation to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Other Alaska communities will no doubt follow the lead of Anchorage and our congressional delegation in asking the Civil Aeronautics Board to give further study to the Pacific Northwest-Alaska air service case.

Fairbanks should continue to press its contention that the lowest rates and the best service result from competition. The city and the chamber of commerce, which traditionally have worked together to express this policy, have until April 29 to file a petition for reconsideration.

Fairbanks, Ketchikan, Juneau—among Alaska's principal cites—all are being shortchanged under the CAB decision.

As explained by Senator E. L. BARTLETT in a boiled-down version, the decision would remove Pan American from operating to southeastern Alaska, would permit the company to be the only one operating nonstop between Seattle and Fairbanks, and would add Portland as a coterminal point with Seattle-Tacoma.

It would leave Pacific Northern as the only carrier with rights to serve Ketchikan and Juneau on its States-Alaska route and would suspend the company's authority to serve Portland, would prohibit Alaska Airlines from operating nonstop between Seattle and Fairbanks by requiring a stop at Anchorage both northbound and southbound and would suspend the company's authority to serve between Portland and Seattle-Tacoma; and would amend Cordova Airlines' certificate to permit service to Juneau, subject to a two-stop restriction between Anchorage and Juneau.

One favorable aspect of the decision is that it is not as senseless as the previous one that would have eliminated the pioneer (since 1932) unsubsidized carrier, Pan American, from Alaska altogether.

However, it makes no more sense to throw Pan American out of Southeastern in preference to Pacific Northern than it did previously to recommend throwing Pan Am off the Seattle-Fairbanks run.

All four of the larger Alaska cities should have competitive service. Just how many carriers should be involved, or which they should be, is not for us to say. But obviously at least two carriers must be involved to give this type of service that will be alert to the needs of the traveling public.

We have seen what happens with one-carrier service linking Alaska's two largest cities. It is a weak link and, surprisingly enough, the CAB decision is tantamount to an endorsement of it, as it would perpetuate exclusivity.

The history of airline operations shows very clearly, moreover, that local service between two cities which originates in those two cities is certain to be more reliable than when it is tied into a long route pattern connected with other areas, particularly cities such as Seattle where fog at many times of the year delays flights considerably.

Other applications for the busy Fairbanks-Anchorage air market have been pending for years. They should be considered further. If one of the carriers were based at Fairbanks and offered service originating in Fairbanks, then the scheduling would benefit Fairbanks as well as Anchorage-based travelers. This is not the case now.

While the CAB is earnestly seeking route patterns that will reduce subsidy costs, it seems to us that this latest major decision is simply another in a series of varied and sometimes conflicting findings.

The States-Alaska service case is so old now that, in the interest of providing the best service at the lowest rates to the traveling public, reconsideration can't possibly do any harm. All the larger Alaska communities should promptly urge it.

THE KENAI METHODIST PARISH,
ALASKA MISSION OF THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Kenai, Alaska, April 16, 1965.

Re docket 13463 et al., Pacific Northwest-Alaska Air Service case, decided March 26, 1965.

DEAR SIR: When I attended a recent chamber of commerce meeting I was made aware of a recent decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board which may affect the air service to this portion of the Kenai Peninsula and points south of us.

As a private citizen here, I would urge you to reconsider your earlier decision. I personally conducted a religious survey of the city of Kenai last fall and our population figures show a clear growth in population from the 1960 census. From the activity witnessed at our airport in the volume of passenger traffic there has been a great increase in traffic. I sincerely believe that a decrease in air service would be a detrimental factor as far as the economic development of our area.

The economy of the Kenai Peninsula has not been the greatest since the 1964 earthquake, but there are many signs of recovery. Some of the positive decisions this past year include a favorable ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States in regard to the leases in the only producing (I should say first producing) oilfield in Alaska located in the Kenai area; the decision of the oil industry to bring into production an oilfield in the Cook Inlet offshore from Kenai, and the further development of the industrial complex 10 miles north of Kenai. At present there is an oil refinery and in the near future there are plans for a liquid methane plant.

Efforts should be made to increase air service from this area, as air traffic increases. It would certainly improve the understanding of the people in this area if they were provided an opportunity to present facts and figures to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. SHAFFER, *Pastor.*

KENAI, ALASKA,
April 23, 1965.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Will you, please, intervene for us with the CAB in the matter of the reduction of plane flights by Pacific Northern Airlines into Kenai?

As you know, this area is growing rapidly, and our airfield is the most active of any in the State, other than Fairbanks and Anchorage. With the added oil activity here, it is essential for our development, and for the development of the entire area that our plane service be maintained and perhaps stepped up in the not too distant future.

Our Kenai Chamber of Commerce has, no doubt, furnished you with facts and figures of the growth of activity at our airport since the 1960 figures from which, as we understand it, the CAB ruling was made—so won't you, please, go to bat for us in this very crucial matter?

Thank you,

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. ELMER L. KNUDSON.

KODIAK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
April 24, 1965.

Mr. ALAN BOYD,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Transmitted herewith is a petition to the Civil Aeronautics Board regarding the *Pacific Northwest-Alaska Airline Service* case, docket No. 13463 which we believe is to be heard by the Board on or after April 29, 1965. The petition contains the signatures of 1,234 citizens of Kodiak who have used this means to show their alarm at any possible curtailment of direct Kodiak-Seattle airline service.

Having circulated one of these, I would like to say that this petition was enthusiastically received, and not one person having been offered the opportunity to sign, declined to do so. Many indicated that increased direct service should be given more emphasis.

We pray that the wishes of these users of the Kodiak-Seattle airline service will be considered in the deliberations of the Board.

Yours truly,

EDWARD F. NAUGHTON,
President.

RESOLUTION BY KODIAK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board has given Pacific Northern Airlines an alternative of suspending direct service between Seattle, Wash., and Kodiak, Alaska or suffer possible loss of subsidy; and

Whereas this direct service is a vital necessity to the community (and industry) of Kodiak, Alaska for the following reasons:

1. It was supported by a total of 10,570 passengers between the period March 1, 1964, and March 1, 1965, for a load factor of 72 percent.

2. It was supported by freight shipments during the same period for a load factor of 80 percent.

3. It has afforded the development of a fresh seafood market in the continental United States not possible if circuitous routing via Anchorage, Alaska were required due to the resultant delay and other factors of in-transit handling as well as to the higher air freight rates applied via that routing. One shipper alone, Alaska Ice & Storage Co., has marketed 570,000 pounds of fresh seafood the past 12 months via the present service and rates afforded by Pacific Northern Airlines and by chartered service when space not available by Pacific Northern Airlines.

4. It would require an additional cost to passengers approximately $370,000, based on period named in (1) above, if routing of this traffic had been via Anchorage, Alaska.

5. It is deemed imperative for the prompt, efficient, and scheduled handling of traffic which has been and will be required for the successful reconstruction of the city of Kodiak following the disaster of March 27, 1964; as well as to support the emergency air freight requirements for the contractors, canneries, and the North Pacific Fishing Fleet.

6. It is an essential service for large movements of seasonal cannery workers utilized in connection with the multimillion dollar fishing industry in and around Kodiak Island; and

Whereas Pacific Northern Airlines has indicated that they will comply with the order of the Civil Aeronautics Board and cancel direct service between Seattle, Wash., and Kodiak, Alaska on May 28, 1965, unless order is suspended; and

Whereas we pray that order be suspended for a period to be determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board pending public hearing on the matter; and

Whereas the population figures of 2,600 cited in CAB docket No. 13463 are incorrect, being based on year 1960, and are for the city of Kodiak only and not for the area benefiting and utilizing the direct Seattle-Kodiak service; and

Whereas current population for city of Kodiak is in excess of 4,500, and within a radius of 20 miles of the U.S. post office, 8,000 persons; and

Whereas it is a matter of record that U.S. Naval Station, Kodiak, and other military installations in the Kodiak area have regularly utilized the service between Seattle, Wash., and Kodiak, Alaska, preferring it for the movement of personnel, dependents, and cargo; and

Whereas the citizens of Kodiak vigorously voice their protest to any possible cessation or interruption of direct service between Seattle, Wash., and Kodiak, Alaska, as provided by Pacific Northern Airlines, and believe that the above-stated facts, instead deserve consideration for an increased number of direct flights between Seattle and Kodiak; and

Whereas the present direct flights were inaugurated after a determination of public convenience and necessity to the area which public convenience and necessity is now being totally ignored by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and

Whereas Pacific Northern Airlines has indicated that they are able and willing to accommodate additional traffic requirements by an increased frequency of direct schedules to satisfy the needs of the public during peak season; and

Whereas it is obvious that additional cost to the Post Office Department will be incurred if circuitous routing via Anchorage, Alaska, is necessitated to handle the volume of U.S. mail which recorded at 1,859,288 pounds during period March 1, 1964 to March 1, 1965; and

Whereas this direct service between Seattle, Wash., and Kodiak, Alaska, has provided a vital link for communications with the city of Kodiak and its surrounding environs; air transportation being the prime passenger service available to the community:

We, therefore, the Kodiak Area Chamber of Commerce, respectfully request the Civil Aeronautics Board to reconsider any action which will terminate the direct service between Seattle, Wash., and Kodiak, Alaska, as presently authorized and provided by Pacific Northern Airlines, and if necessary a public hearing be held to further serve the judgment of the Civil Aeronautics Board on this matter, and to substantiate the public convenience and necessity afforded by this service.

Attest:

EDITH S. WILEY,
Secretary.

KODIAK, ALASKA,
April 14, 1965.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Pacific Northern Airlines direct flight Seattle to Kodiak was awarded originally on evidence obtained in a CAB hearing which found that necessity and convenience required this service. CAB now wants to terminate this service without a hearing. The citizens of Kodiak and ourselves should be entitled to a hearing since termination will burden individuals traveling with additional cost and will also greatly affect the economic growth of the Kodiak Island area. Any assistance regarding this matter will be greatly appreciated.

ED METZGAR,
Shelikof Lodge.

APRIL 19, 1965.

E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

CAB order No. E2195 dated March 26, 1965, pages 29 through 34 apparently makes it mandatory for PNA to discontinue direct service between Seattle and Kodiak. Failure of PNA to so do would jeopardize mail compensation back to October 1, 1962, and from today forward. A perusal of CAB order reveals CAB opinion was based on socioeconomic factors as of September 30, 1960, and September 30, 1962, and does not consider substantial economic increases to date, or projection of future growth. Further it is apparent that the Kodiak trading area has had no opportunity to be heard.

Respectfully request your office to intervene and request CAB to continue to approve Kodiak-Seattle service without which our community will suffer grievously. We further request a continuation of present Anchorage-Kodiak service.

Advise.

RALPH S. JONES,
City Manager, City of Kodiak.

(Copies to Senator GRUENING and Representative RIVERS.)

HOLMES JOHNSON CLINIC,
Kodiak, Alaska, April 12, 1965.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
6311 New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: By now you have probably received some comment from Kodiak on the Civil Aeronautics Board's ruling recommending the discontinuance of PNA's direct flight to Seattle.

This, without prior hearing or announcement came as a shock to the people of Kodiak, especially in view of our recent request through the city manager for additional direct service. First reactions were that such a thought was ridiculous in the face of Kodiak's unprecedented growth over the past 2 years and of the high load factors on this flight.

The direct flight carried 11,000 passengers in 1964 and had a 70-percent passenger load factor. It boosts an 80-percent revenue ton load factor. It carries all our outgoing fresh seafood products at a rate of 8 cents and in some seasons can't keep up with the load as it is, some products having to be shipped via Anchorage at a rate of 11 cents. It handles much of our incoming air freight for local businesses such as Sears Roebuck, electricians, plumbers, electronics repairmen, etc. It saves people traveling with small children a tedious stopover between flights as is the case via Anchorage, and it saves $29 in fare. With Kodiak's cost of living already 30 percent above Seattle, what would the discontinuance of this service do?

It is our information that the CAB examiner did not make such a recommendation to the Board but that Northwest Airlines did, and that the Board's action was predicated upon this. I refer you to CAB docket No. 13463, order No. E21955, for details of the recommendations.

Enclosed you will find some progress analyses which I have prepared myself for the benefit of doctors I am trying to interest in practice in Kodiak. You can readily see that now is no time to curtail any transportation to or from Kodiak.

Anything you can do to help us keep our direct service would certainly be appreciated. At least we should have the benefit of a hearing.

Sincerely,

R. HOLMES JOHNSON, M.D.

(Copies to Senator BARTLETT, Representative RIVERS.)

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 24, 1965.*

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Last Wednesday while in Kodiak I was shocked to learn of the CAB's decision on the Pacific Northwest Alaska case docket 13463 which may well eliminate a vital airline service between Seattle and Kodiak. We recognize this service as essential to our continued growth in the development of the Kodiak fisheries as well as the overall development of the Kodiak area. After discussing the service in question with a number of business people in Kodiak as well as with Pacific Northern Airlines, I firmly believe this service is in the best interests of the public and its continuation should not be placed in jeopardy by what appears to be intimidation by the CAB. I respectfully urge that your office investigate this matter and do all possible to assure service to the community of Kodiak. I understand that unless the CAB order is modified, this service may be discontinued on May 28, 1965.

R. C. SWEEZEY.

RESOLUTION 65–12 OF THE CITY OF KENAI

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board in the *Pacific Northwest-Alaska Air Service* case, docket No. 13463, et al., opinion issued March 26, 1965, by obiter dicta, issued potentially, severely damaging statements on air service of the city of Kenai and its service area;

Whereas the city of Kenai had absolutely no prior notice the said case would so seriously affect the community of Kenai and its service area totaling a population of approximately 6,000 people; and

Whereas the industrial development near Kenai and on the Western Kenai Peninsula is of critical concern to the entire State of Alaska, and the apparent basis for the aforedescribed decision was based on incomplete and entirely inaccurate facts (not reflecting growth indicated by the 7,000 people emplaned at Kenai during 1960; while in 1964, 24,000 people emplaned at Kenai): Therefore,

The Council of the City of Kenai resolves:

1. That the Civil Aeronautics Board consider this as a petition to vacate such part or parts of the opinion in the *Pacific Northwest-Alaska Air Service* case, docket No.

13463, et al., decided March 26, 1965, as affect the city of Kenai and its service area;

2. That if the CAB believes it imperative to issue directives ordering a change, other than an increase, in air service to Kenai and the Western Kenai Peninsula, then in that event, the city of Kenai be permitted to offer evidence at a hearing in support of its own needs for an increased, not a decreased, air service;

3. That the "petition to be heard," approved at a regular membership meeting of the Kenai Chamber of Commerce on April 14, 1965, is hereby approved and the statements as set forth therein are hereby adopted and incorporated by reference herein;

4. That copies of this resolution be distributed to all interested Federal, State, and municipal officials with a request for assistance from such officials or agencies to join with the city of Kenai in any presentation mutually affecting their community and our community.

Passed April 14, 1965.

James G. Dye,
Mayor.

Attest:

Frances Torkilsen,
City Clerk.

Kenai, Alaska,
April 23, 1965.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: Will you, please, intervene for us with the CAB in the matter of the reduction of plane flights by Pacific Northern Airlines into Kenai?

As you know, this area is growing rapidly and our airfield is the most active of any in the State, other than Fairbanks and Anchorage. With the added oil activity here, it is essential for our development, and for the development of the entire area, that our plane service be maintained and perhaps stepped up in the not too distant future.

Our Kenai Chamber of Commerce has, no doubt, furnished you with facts and figures of the growth of activity at our airport since the 1960 figures from which, as we understand it, the CAB ruling was made—so won't you, please, go to bat for us in this very crucial matter?

Thank you.

Very truly yours,
Mr. and Mrs. Elmer L. Knudson.

Homer Chamber of Commerce,
Homer, Alaska, April 22, 1965.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ernest: Enclosed to this letter is a copy of our letter to the Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., in which we do protest their decision affecting the air service west of Anchorage in the case, docket No. 13463.

I recall many months ago a statement of yours reading to the effect that penetration has occurred where in the past penetration has been most difficult, that Alaska is now a State. Now we have the call out to you and to the other Members of the Alaskan congressional delegation to protect our rights in air service.

The recent decision does strongly appear to us that we shall be deprived of air travel to Anchorage at a time when we have neither a maintained highway nor a ferry service.

If it is the intent to nullify all the gains that have been made during the past 20 years and more, many of which are attributable to your foresighted action as Governor of the Territory of Alaska, then it looks like our only action can be through the courts.

Something is very wrong in this decision as handed down. Here we have the fastest growing population in the State on the Kenai Peninsula, one of the richest areas in the world for natural resources, an area that is already the economic base of the entire State of Alaska, and a group of five men who make up the CAB tell us we need less air service, none of whom has apparently examined the matter in the field or held any hearings in the field. We have been tried, judged, and convicted without even knowing we were a party to an action.

Why?

Sincerely yours,
Homer S. Thompson,
President.

Homer Chamber of Commerce,
Homer, Alaska, April 21, 1965.

Mr. Alan S. Boyd,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: A resolution was adopted at a special meeting of the membership of the Homer Chamber of Commerce, held April 21, 1965, by unanimous consent, as follows:

"REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

"To: Civil Aeronautics Board.

"Ref: Docket No. 13463 et al, Pacific Northwest-Alaska Air Service case, decided March 26, 1965.

"The membership of the Homer Chamber of Commerce upon review of the CAB decision in the above-named case do hereby protest the said decision as being detrimental to the best interests of the public and specifically the economic welfare of the community of Homer, Alaska.

"This decision came to us as a shock since no notices have been published that the Kenai Peninsula air service was to be a part of subject docket.

"The present air service has improved the economy of Homer, Alaska. Any reduction of service will reduce our economic structure.

"Request that a current study be made in the field, based on current passenger and freight traffic information from the air carriers serving this area.

"We charge that no recognition has been given, that the primary economic base of the State of Alaska is the Kenai Peninsula.

"This action by an incompassionate board, thousands of miles away from the scene of interest can only result in destroying the basis of our economy, much more effectively than the March 27 earthquake.

"Request that the opinion of the CAB as it relates to service west of Anchorage be vacated."

Sincerely,
Homer Chamber of Commerce,
Homer S. Thompson.

(Copies to Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, President; Hon. E. L. Bartlett, U.S. Senate; Hon. Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senate; Hon. Ralph J. Rivers, House of Representatives; Hon. Warren Magnuson, U.S. Senate; Hon. William A. Egan, Governor, Alaska; Hon. Yule Kilcher, Alaska Senate; Hon. Clem Tillion, Alaska House; attorney general of Alaska; Morris Chertkov, executive director, Public Service Commission; Robert T. Murphy, Vice President CAB; G. Joseph Minetti, member, CAB; Chan Gurney, member, CAB; Whitney Gilliland, member, CAB; Francis W. Brown, Chief Examiner, CAB; executive director U.S. Chamber of Commerce; executive director Alaska State Chamber of Commerce; Lars L. Johnson, director, Division of Aviation; Jefferson B. Barry, Commerce Department Economic Development; Elmer Rasmussen, chairman of the board, National Bank of Alaska; Robert A. Baker, president, Matanuska Valley Bank; Dan Cuddy, president, First National Bank of Anchorage; R. G. Follis, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. of California; Robert E. Butler, district manager, Small Business Administration; Edward Foley, Administrator, Small Business Administration; Kodiak Chamber of Commerce; Seldovia Chamber of Commerce; Kenai Chamber of Commerce; Anchorage Chamber of Commerce; Anchor Point Chamber of Commerce; Tustumena Chamber of Commerce; Seward Chamber of Commerce; Soldotna Chamber of Commerce; Homer Democratic Precinct Committee; Homer Republican Club; Portland Chamber of Commerce; Seattle Chamber of Commerce; the Anchorage Daily Times; the Anchorage Daily News; the Cook Inlet Courier; the Homer News; Seattle Post-Intelligencer; Homer, N.Y., Chamber of Commerce; Homer, La., Chamber of Commerce; the Cheechako News; Alaska Medical Association; Alaska Dental Association; Alaska Federation of Labor; City Council, City of Homer; City Council, City of Kodiak; City Council, City of Kenai; City Council, City of Seldovia; Ninilchik Chamber of Commerce; Port Nikiski Chamber of Commerce.)

City of Homer,
Homer, Alaska, May 3, 1965.

Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen: The Council for the City of Homer adopted unanimously the following resolution at a regular meeting April 26, 1965:

"Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board in the matter of Pacific Northwest—Alaska Air Service case, docket No. 13463 issued March 26, 1965 has reached conclusions, which if implemented as suggested by the CAB, will be detrimental to the entire Kenai Peninsula area; and

"Whereas statistics upon which said conclusions are based are at least 3 years old and do not reflect the growth of the Kenai Peninsula since September 30, 1962; and

"Whereas the expanding economy of the Kenai Peninsula area is on the verge of full recovery from the 1964 earthquake with a solid base for rapid growth; and

"Whereas it is necessary that consideration be given to expand air service for both freight and passengers to keep pace with this expanding economy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Homer, That the city of Homer hereby requests the CAB to reconsider its determination in the light of data for year ending December 31, 1964 and with regard to the public need."

Your consideration of this request will be greatly appreciated. If we may furnish any further information, your questions will be given prompt attention.

Very truly yours,
Ralph G. Cowles,
Mayor, City of Homer.

(Copies to E. L. Bartlett, U.S. Senate; Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senate; Ralph J. Rivers, House of Representatives; Wm. A. Egan, Governor, State of Alaska.)

Petersburg, Alaska,
April 12, 1965.

Mr. Alan S. Boyd,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Boyd: Our members feel a grave injustice has been done to Pan American World Airways in the recent decision to eliminate them from southeastern Alaska.

They pioneered aviation in this part of Alaska and their service has been outstanding and we respectfully urge a reconsideration on this decision.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,
Lloyd Jones,
President,
Petersburg Chamber of Commerce.

(Copies to E. L. Bartlett; Senator Ernest Gruening; Representative Ralph J. Rivers;

Gov. William A. Egan; James Walsh, Ketchikan.)

Resolution 759

Resolution of the Council of the City of Ketchikan, Alaska, protesting decision of Civil Aeronautics Board to changes in routes which affect southeastern Alaska

Whereas the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Pacific Northwest-Alaska Air Service case affects southeastern Alaska; and

Whereas Ketchikan in particular would be deprived of competitive service, should this decision hold, which service has been in effect satisfactorily for a number of years; and

Whereas the result would create a reduction of service to the Ketchikan area; and

Whereas the Alaska delegation in Congress has expressed the sentiment of this section of southeastern Alaska: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this council protest the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board in this case and concur with the Alaska delegation in Congress in their protest; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Alan S. Boyd, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, to Senator E. L. Bartlett, Senator Ernest Gruening and Representative Ralph Rivers, also to the President of the U.S. Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, all of Washington, D.C.

Passed and adopted this 7th day of April, 1965.

James G. Pinkerton,
Mayor.

Attest:

Bertha McKay.

The Gateway Borough,
Ketchikan, Alaska, April 9, 1965.

Mr. Alan S. Boyd,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Boyd: The Gateway Borough Assembly has unanimously requested that I write this letter registering our opposition to your recent decision to remove Pan American World Airways from the southeast Alaska routes.

We recognize that a governmental board such as yours is charged with heavy responsibilities and that in making your determinations you must consider factors that are not apparent to the layman. However, we feel that we would be remiss in our obligation of representing the people in our area if we did not object to this decision.

Alaska is faced with serious problems in the way of developing the potential of this tremendous State. Perhaps the greatest need of all is people, and here in Ketchikan where we have always had serious transportation difficulties another need is to improve our facilities, not to limit.

We appreciate the work that the Civil Aeronautics Board is doing to improve air transportation for our country and it is not our desire to add to your problems. Our position is simply that we cannot accept the loss of the people of the Pan American family. These people have diligently worked with us to help our community grow and prosper. Neither can we accept one carrier air service as a step forward in the development of the community we serve.

Sincerely,

Gateway Borough,
Robert W. Ward,
Chairman.

(Copies to President of the Senate; Speaker of the House of Representatives; Senator Bartlett; Senator Gruening; Representative Rivers.)

April 22, 1965.

Re Pan American World Airways, southeast Alaskan service denial.

Mr. Alan S. Boyd,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C.

Gentleman: A recent decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board denying authority for Pan American World Airways, an unsubsidized carrier and pioneer of the route in question, to provide continued service to communities in southeast Alaska while at the same time allowing retention of a subsidized and more recently entered parallel carrier over this route is the basis for presenting to you my point of view. I am a landed resident of Ketchikan, Alaska, and find myself directly and adversely affected by your Board's untimely action. By copy of this expression I advise the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators from Alaska, and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Represetative from Alaska, of this point of view.

I shall not restate the historic and chronological events in which PANAM has established its presence in Alaska. These matters are or should be known to you. I am concerned with the principle enunciated by your authority and its predecessors to the effect that you protect the public welfare and that I should have the right to a choice of service for ingress and egress to and from Ketchikan. Please note that it is axiomatic for unsubsidized service to generally be offered on a sustaining basis. PANAM, within the past several years, has varied its schedule from perhaps three times weekly to daily. I am not aware that even in the days of restricted service this route proved to be sustaining. With the advent of increased frequency and improved quality, and incidentally a vastly improved capability, the status of its being a sustaining service is even more doubtful. Here, then, is the classic example of private enterprise operating in the public service to establish a market for its product.

Not withstanding, in the face of facts quite readily available to your office, the authority of your office and/or that of its predecessors imposed upon this route (i.e., Seattle/Ketchikan via Annette/Juneau) a subsidized, parallel, new entrant carrier to provide a modicum of competition. This, on a route which my admittedly uneducated estimate would lead me to believe lacks immediate sustaining potential. However, the existence of potential is a matter requiring carefully nurtured growth in many directions, of industrial expansion, market development, export, population density, and the ramifications that these and other unmentioned but equally applicable events imply. The facts support the view that PANAM is and was cognizant of the value of Alaskan routes by investing in its future. A decision by your authority unfavorable to PANAM at this juncture to support a contention that all participants must be placed on a sustaining basis is, clear and simple, a legislative evasion of your constitutional authority to act. That PANAM had the foresight to view service to this area as potentially rewarding in the future and having contributed to its development through introduction of service, by whatever means and within such arrangements in the past as might have played a part, is deserving of continued opportunity to exercise its influence in this growing market. This influence is a basic, vital, and direct interest in purveying a commodity so necessary to our area's welfare that to be deprived of that commodity is tantamount to oblivion.

Sir, the principle previously enunciated by your authority and/or its predecessors seems waning. I propose that you revitalize the character of this principle by the continued application equally to the present circumstances and reawaken the point of view that your authority's sole basis for existence is in the public service, which in this instance, means timely actions, justified for the protection of the public welfare. First, reversion to a single carrier is not defensible unless it be favorable to PANAM, the originating carrier who is still an active and fully qualified participant and party to this action. Second, by your action you have denied me a choice of services which you have previously declared to be essential for my welfare. I find that the basic premise upon which you predicate your decision had on both counts acted to the detriment of the public welfare, not counting the decidedly unjust act not to the incumbent carrier against whom your legislative action is directed.

I strongly urge that your interim decision be reviewed thoroughly to the end that my welfare is not jeopardized through loss of transportation service, that advantages accruing in my behalf through competitive, parallel services is not destroyed and that an undeserved injustice is not bestowed disgracefully upon PANAM.

With confidence that wisdom and justice will prevail, I am,

Very truly yours,

Robert Emmert Gray.

Ketchikan, Alaska.

North Tongass Community Club,
Ward Cove, Alaska, April 25, 1965.

Alan S. Boyd,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Boyd: The North Tongass Community Club is a group of people who live on North Tongass Highway north of the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, on Revillagigedo Island, who joined together to promote and bring betterment to our community.

The decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board was discussed at our recent meeting, therefore this letter to you and the Civil Aeronautics Board. We, the residents of said area, ask for reconsideration of your decision to remove Pan Americans routes of States—Ketchikan and Juneau.

Pan American pioneered air travel in southeastern Alaska and to we, Alaskans that have been served by the excellent service of Pan American World Airlines feel that Pan American should be allowed to continue their air route between the States, Ketchikan, and Juneau.

Your decision would leave our capital city of Juneau and Ketchikan wholly without competitive service from Seattle, which we feel is not of the best interest of the people of Alaska. Competitive enterprise is essential in business in an economic sense. We consider it unjust for the board to aim the heaviest economic blow against the one carrier, Pan American, which pioneered States and Alaska service, set and maintained its high standards and moreover did this without Federal subsidy. We ask why should Pan American be penalized after their many years serving Alaska to and from the States, at no cost to the Federal Government but at a great cost they have had and had assumed when they pioneered airflights between the States and Alaska.

We, the members of the North Tongass Commmunity Club, ask that the decision you have rendered be set aside and that a rehearing be afforded at the earliest possible date giving consideration that we in Alaska should continue to be served by Pan American Airlines.

Sincerely yours,

Edward Burns,
President.
Alice R. Brusich,
Vice President.
Mable Smeltzer,
Secretary.
Bonnie Morin,
Treasurer.

(Copies to President of the Senate; Senator ERNEST GRUENING; Senator E. BARTLETT; Congressman RALPH RIVERS.)

STIKINE AIR SERVICE,
Wrangell, Alaska, April 8, 1965.

Mr. ALAN BOYD,
Chairman,
Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOYD: Having read of the Civil Aeronautics Board's ruling to take Pan American off the southeastern Alaska run and allow Pacific Northern Airlines to give all the service we must ask some questions.

First, as we understand it, this is a move to allow Pacific Northern Airlines to gain revenue so its subsidy pay will be cut down. Will this cut subsidy? With subsidized airlines these days why show a profit as long as the Government will continue to pay?

Second, what happens to an American word called "competition"? We have believed this to be what American business thrives on. We have found that the word rapidly replacing "competition" is "complacency." Why provide good service when the pay is the same regardless?

Third, what happens to the jobs involved? From Ketchiken to Juneau wages will be eliminated. These wages are provided by private capital and southeastern needs these wages.

Fourth, where is Government subsidy going to stop? We realize that without subsidy there could not be the airline service we now have, but subsidy was intended as an aid, not a give-away. The case has become the opposite, the more subsidy received, the more needed.

What we are talking of in this letter is taking place on all levels of aviation. We are in business in a small way and operate on private capital. We are competing with a subsidized carrier. As a scheduled carrier they provide service that is very good under difficult conditions. Why then, does the Government again eliminate competition by also supporting their light plane charter operation? This part of the operation is supposedly divorced from the subsidized part of the operation, how can it be, the trips originate from an office supported by subsidy, the maintenance is performed in hangars supported by subsidy, and the wage picture is affected by subsidy. How can private capital try to compete?

We have been underbid on every contract for years by a subsidized carrier, our prices per hour on the type of aircraft have not changed since 1953 when cost of operation has gone up each year. How then, can the contract prices be bid lower each succeeding year and the airlines still show a profit on this part of the operation.

We cannot help but strongly protest the elimination of Pan American in southeastern. Though we are infinitely smaller, we ask when will action be taken to eliminate the independent operators so the subsidized carrier can gain revenue by having all of southeastern to serve?

We urge that you take a long look at this ruling to see if this will cut subsidy costs. Has action of this nature done so before?

Again let us say, we are only asking. We realize there are many things we do not understand about this matter. Please give us some answers, as we feel this action is going to have a very definite effect on the airline service and economy in southeastern Alaska.

Sincerely,

C. L. TRAYLOR,
JOHN A. BAKER

(Copies to Senator ERNEST GRUENING; Senator BOB BARTLETT; Gov. William Egan; James Walsh.)

APRIL 24, 1965.

Refer to B-8-100; docket No. 13463.

Mr. ALAN S. BOYD,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Our members, residents of the city of Petersburg, do hereby object to the recent order by the Civil Aeronautics Board which would suspend Pan American Airways from serving southeast Alaska.

We feel that it is not in the public interest to have but one air carrier serving this part of the State. We feel that it is necessary for the growth and development of our State to have competitive air service.

We hereby petition the Civil Aeronautics Board to set aside their decision and call for a reinvestigation of this situation.

Sincerely,

PETERSBURG CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
LLOYD JONES, *President.*
By BERNICE STOKKE, *Secretary.*

(Copies to Senator E. L. BARTLETT; Senator ERNEST GRUENING; Representative RALPH J. RIVERS; Gov. Wm. A. Egan.)

RESOLUTION 425

Resolution of the city of Sitka, Alaska, protesting the elimination of Pan American Airways flights into Juneau and Annette Island, Alaska

Whereas Pan American Airways has been a pioneer developer of airways travel in Alaska; and

Whereas Pan American Airways has given consistent service of exceptional quality; and

Whereas Pan American Airways is the only nonsubsidized carrier in Alaska; and

Whereas competition is the lifeblood of our commerce in Alaska as elsewhere under our American flag; and

Whereas the recent ruling of the Civil Aeronautics Board canceling the certificate of convenience and necessity for the Juneau-Annette Island-Seattle run of Pan American Airways was unwarranted, arbitrary and not justified by the facts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Sitka, Alaska, That the city of Sitka hereby strongly protests the action of the Civil Aeronautics Board in eliminating airline competition from our sister cities of Juneau and Ketchikan on the route from Juneau to Annette Island to Seattle by its canceling the certificate of convenience and necessity for the Juneau-Annette Island-Seattle run.

Passed and approved this 13th day of April 1965.

JOHN W. O'CONNOR,
Mayor.

Attest:

ELIZABETH B. FREDEROFF,
City Clerk.

PORTLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Portland, Oreg., April 12, 1965.

Mr. ALAN S. BOYD,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Universal Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOYD: At its April 7 executive meeting, the board of directors of the Portland Chamber of Commerce approved the attached joint resolution of the Aviation and Alaska-Hawaii Trade Development Committees regarding the March 26 CAB decision on docket No. 13463 et al.

The Portland Chamber of Commerce is a private nonprofit organization with a current membership in excess of 4,400, representing the bulk of the business community in the fifth largest metropolitan center of the Pacific States.

Sincerely,

D. E. ABRAM,
President.

(Copies to members, Civil Aeronautics Board; Pacific Northern Airlines; Alaska congressional delegation; Oregon congressional delegation; Gov. William A. Egan, Alaska; Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon.)

APRIL 7, 1965.

To: Board of directors.
From: Aviation Committee and Alaska-Hawaii Trade Development Committee.
Subject: CAB decision of March 26, 1965, regarding docket No. 13463 et al, concerning suspension of Pacific Northern Airlines authority to serve Anchorage, Ketchikan, Juneau, and other Alaska communities from Portland.

Requested action: That the chamber strongly protest the elimination of Pacific Northern Airlines Portland services to Alaska and support Pacific Northern Airlines in its appeal to the CAB; and that the chamber welcome that phase of the decision affecting Portland service to Fairbanks.

RESOLUTION —

Whereas the March 26, 1965, decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board (re docket No. 13463) included a ruling that Pacific Northern Airlines' authority to serve Anchorage, Juneau, Ketchikan, and other Alaska communities out of Portland be suspended for 7 years;

Whereas there is a strong and growing commercial community of interest between Portland and the southeast portion of Alaska, that State's lumbering region, particularly with the cities of Juneau and Ketchikan;

Whereas Pacific Northern Airlines has been offering service from Portland to Anchorage, Juneau, Ketchikan, and other Alaska communities with growing success over the past 7 years;

Whereas Pacific Northern Airlines carried 1,243 passengers from Portland to Alaska in 1958, increasing to 3,645 passengers in 1964; the same period incoming mail loadings increased from 8,000 to 23,000 pounds; freight increased from 358,000 to 501,000 pounds; fees paid to the port of Portland rose from $5,000 to $9,859; $700,000 per year is now being generated by Pacific Northern Airlines in passenger and cargo traffic from Portland and the State of Oregon, which should be taken into consideration in assessing Portland's relationship with Alaska;

Whereas the prospects for stepping up the healthy trend of Pacific Northern Airlines' business between Portland and Alaska are extremely favorable, detailed evidence of which is being supplied by the airline to the CAB in the forthcoming appeal;

Whereas Portland's growing need for direct air service to each of Alaska's four main economic centers (Juneau, Ketchikan, Anchorage, and Fairbanks) will become even more pronounced with the pending initiation of direct sea service from Portland;

Whereas under the general terms of the CAB decision, single plane service from Portland to Anchorage and Fairbanks is now authorized: Therefore let it be

Resolved, That the Portland Chamber of Commerce express its approval and appreciation of those phases of the CAB decision affecting Portland air service to Fairbanks (Pan American World Airways); but be it further

Resolved, That the Portland Chamber of Commerce strongly protest the elimination of Pacific Northern Airlines service between Portland and Anchorage, Juneau, Ketchikan, and other Alaska communities.

LEONARD HALL,
Chairman,
Aviation Committee.
R. L. KINGSBURY,
Chairman, Alaska-Hawaii
Trade Development Committee.

MRS. TOMAS O. MONTOYA, SR.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, last week, all New Mexicans were saddened by the death of Mrs. Tomas O. Montoya, Sr., the mother of Senator Montoya.

The Aubuquerque Tribune, in its issue of May 18, published a splendid article on the life of Mrs. Montoya; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in full at this point in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Albuquerque Tribune, May 18, 1965]

Mother of U.S. Solon Succumbs in Hospital

Mrs. Tomas O. Montoya, Sr., of Bernalillo, died today at 9 a.m., in Presbyterian Hospital here after a short illness. She was 70.

Mrs. Montoya was the mother of U.S. Senator Joseph M. Montoya, Democrat, of New Mexico.

Mrs. Montoya was stricken with a severe intestinal ailment about 4 weeks ago and entered the hospital.

She underwent an operation and then left the hospital for her daughter's home here. When she did not respond, she was returned to the hospital last Friday.

Her relatives said she had had heart trouble in recent years, but her death was due to the illness which struck a month ago.

The Senator was here at the time of his mother's death. He had divided his time recently between here and Washington to be at her bedside as much as possible.

It was Mrs. Montoya's great pleasure to see her son sworn in as a U.S. Senator in January at Washington. She spent several weeks at Senator and Mrs. Montoya's home in Chevy Chase, Md., at that time.

Besides the Senator son she leaves, Mrs. Montoya is survived by two daughters, Mrs. Fred Salazar of Albuquerque, and Mrs. Tony Chavez of Santa Fe; and three sons, Tom O. Montoya, of Pena Blanca; A. T. (Al) Montoya, of Placitas, and T. R. (Ted) Montoya, of Corrales.

SON A STATE SENATOR

Al Montoya is a State senator from Sandoval County and practices law here with his brother, Ted. Tom Montoya is a farmer at Pena Blanca. Mrs. Salazar is secretary here to U.S. Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Democrat, of New Mexico. Mrs. Chavez is a secretary at the State capital.

All of the children were in Albuquerque this morning when their mother died.

Six grandchildren and one great-grandchild also survive.

Mrs. Montoya recently recalled that one of the joys of her long life was at midnight election day last November when she learned that her son had been elevated to the senate from the house by the New Mexico electorate. She was with her son here when victory came.

Life wasn't always kind to Mrs. Montoya who had to struggle to rear a large family. She had a rough time during the depression days.

BURDENS INCREASED

In 1936, her husband died and the burdens on the quiet little woman with a strong will become greater.

She vowed that she would see her sons and daughters educated. In her resolve she was bolstered by the courage that flowed from her prayers at the altar of Our Lady of Sorrows Catholic Church in Bernalillo.

Frances De La O—her name before she was married—knew that there was a weapon that could make life a full one for her children. It was education.

The significance of this was etched in her character when she attended a convent at Pena Blanca, where the Montoyas and De La O's put down their ties ages ago.

After she finished her schooling, she became a teacher at Hagen, a coal camp that is now a ghost town. Later the family moved to Bernalillo so that Tom Montoya, Sr., could take a deputy sheriff's job.

TWO-WAY BASIS

Joe Montoya got education on a two-way basis. First, it came in school all day. Then when he was at home his mother tutored him. He went through eight grades in 6 years.

In 1936 he started his political career in the State house of representatives from Sandoval County. He won, and in 1938, stood for reelection. At the time he was in law school. He wanted to come home and campaign. "No," said his mother. Get your education was her advice.

So he stayed in law school and his mother conducted his campaign by writing letters to her friends asking their support. He won again.

As the years passed she saw three other sons and two daughters well educated.

Mrs. Montoya loved her family and visited them but she wouldn't leave Bernalillo.

LIAISON ON TROUBLES

It was in this small town that her friendships were anchored. It was there that the little people came with their troubles.

Through her these problems were funneled to her son as a longtime public official.

"Mother was my brother's best liaison with Bernalillo," Mrs. Salazar said recently. "She had good judgment and her counsel was always listened to by Joe."

Funeral services will be held Thursday at 9 a.m. from the Bernalillo church at which she had worshiped for so many years. Reverend Father Aumen, the new pastor there, will officiate.

A rosary will be held at Strong-Thorne Chapel here at 7:30 p.m. Wednesday.

Burial will be in the family plot at the Bernalillo Cemetery. Mrs. Montoya's husband is buried there as is her daughter, Agneda Montoya.

SPEECH BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY TO FINANCIAL WRITERS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent speech by the Vice President of the United States, Hubert H. Humphrey, my predecessor in the Senate, be printed in the Congressional Record. Mr. Humphrey makes the point that in the rapid change and complexity of our technological society, we tend to ignore some of the very real and meaningful changes that take place in public and national thinking. A good example of just such a revolution is the current acceptance of the notion that the Government can spur and maintain economic growth by using all of the economic levers at its control. We recognized in 1964 that a tax cut, in the absence of any other reason, can be used to spur economic growth, and can succeed. This is a lesson well learned; and I hope Congress will expeditiously pass the excise tax program of the President, so that our 51-month economic expansion can be maintained in the years ahead.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Vice President Hubert Humphrey to Financial Writers, May 21, 1965

In recent decades, we have seen in our society—and throughout the world—not one or two or even three, but an explosion of revolutions in nearly all human activity.

We have become accustomed to a climate of continual change.

Let me cite just two indicators to illustrate the rate of change.

World population is today some 40 percent (over 1 billion) greater than it was in 1950.

World gross national product from 1950 to 1963 is up from $775 billion to $1.3 trillion.

And the U.S. gross national product was 45 percent of that total in 1963.

In this world of change, our responsibilities have grown far heavier than any of us could have imagined.

Basic to meeting those responsibilities is a strong domestic economy.

In building that strong domestic economy, we have undergone in the past few years a revolution in our economic thinking which matches the rate of change in other areas.

Two especially crucial building blocks—upon which our progress since has rested—are the Employment Act of 1946 and the Bretton Woods agreement of 1944.

The first event—the Employment Act—has justly been called the "Magna Carta of economic thought in the United States." It set forth paramount goals to guide our domestic economic policies: the goals of "maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

In accordance with the 1946 act, President Truman established the Council of Economic Advisers. This insured the President expert advice in formulating national economic policy.

The second—the Bretton Woods agreement—created a basic structure for international monetary cooperation.

In 1951, accord between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve restored the freedom of monetary policy to operate in a countercyclical fashion. This event ranks with the discovery in the 1920's—formalized in 1933—that the purchase of securities by the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve had an impact on the reserves of the banking system and, potentially, upon the money supply.

And, culminating in the Revenue Act of 1964, there has been a revolution in fiscal policy which gathered momentum over the past 4 years—a revolution whose most impressive monument is the 51-month-old expansion we now enjoy.

I can think of few better illustrations of our advance in economic thinking than the contrast between this recent milestone and what happened in 1932, when Congress confronted the prospect of a substantial budget deficit.

One prominent Member of Congress rose during debate to declaim that "the House was facing the real test of the moral fibre of the United States." Congress heeded his cry and raised taxes in the firm belief that the deficit would thus be wiped out.

When the deficit not only did not disappear, but became larger—they simply could not fathom what had occurred. Yet surely there is no one—be he liberal or conservative—who would today advocate the policy of that Congressman or fail to understand how raising taxes in a depressed economy could raise, rather than lower, the deficit.

We have learned the danger in one-dimensional economics—economics that seeks to pursue one goal at the expense of all others, or in relying on one economic policy instrument to the exclusion of all others.

We know that to achieve a balanced economy we must pursue four major goals at the same time—full employment, rapid economic growth, price stability, and a strong balance-of-payments position.

And we know that to accomplish this task requires the most sophisticated blend of all our economic policy instruments—tax policy, budget policy, manpower policy, and monetary policy.

That is exactly what we have done over the past 4 years and more—and we have made excellent progress toward all of our four major goals.

We have accelerated the growth of our economy from a 2½-percent average annual rate during the 1953–60 period to a 4¼-percent rate since 1960, and a 5 percent rate since the bottom of the 1961 recession.

We have made great strides in moving toward full employment both of manpower and of plant capacity. We have moved unemployment down from nearly 7 percent in early 1961 to under 5 percent now—and have created over 5¼ million jobs. And we have raised utilization of our industrial productive capacity from 78 percent to 89 percent.

At the same time, we have compiled the best record of price stability of any industrial nation. Wholesale prices have remained stable, while labor costs per unit of output have risen only slightly for the economy as a whole, and have actually fallen in manufacturing.

This has been the reward of rising productivity. For both wages and profits have advanced substantially during this present record expansion. Spendable weekly earnings of an average manufacturing worker (with three dependents) have risen 22 percent and corporate profits have risen 87 percent after taxes.

And, while we still have far to go, we have made much underlying progress toward strengthening our balance-of-payments position.

These accomplishments would not have been possible had we not changed the character and the course of public economic thinking.

That change grew out of our conviction that to pursue our multiple goals two things were required:

We had to spur total economic demand in our economy to move it closer to its full potential, closer to the level of activity at which it would make full use of our resources of manpower and productive capacity.

We had to encourage greater investment in plant and equipment, greater modernization, greater efficiency, greater productivity.

For these were the keys to real economic growth; greater quantity and greater quality; more jobs and better jobs; greater output and lower costs.

Thus, in 1962, we adopted the 7 percent investment credit and the revised depreciation guidelines to spur greater capital investment—and in 1964 cut personal and corporate taxes to spur total demand.

And thus we crossed the great divide in economic policy, deliberately cutting taxes—not because Government expenditures had fallen, not because we had a budgetary surplus, not even because we were in a recession—but because we wanted to create more jobs and speed our economic growth.

That action signaled the acceptance by the Nation at large that Government fiscal policy can—and ought—to play a constructive expansionary role in our economic life.

Now and in the future, we must continue to make careful use of our fiscal instruments to keep the economy moving ahead smoothly. If more fiscal stimulus is needed—and if that need outruns the need for sensible, high-priority Government expenditure programs—then further tax cuts are called for.

This reasoning has already led to the President's request of last Monday for a two-stage excise tax reduction in fiscal 1966, amounting to more than $3½ billion. In addition, both temporary tax reduction and temporary stepups in government spending will also be kept as ready weapons to fight off recession if that should threaten.

Meanwhile, we have combined with our expansionary fiscal policy an increasingly flexible and sophisticated monetary policy—keeping short-term interest rates up to discourage damaging capital outflows abroad, and keeping long-term interest rates down to support domestic spending for all kinds of consumer and producer durable goods that are usually financed by credit.

And the Council of Economic Advisers have developed the wage-price guideposts to encourage responsible wage and price decisions that will lead to price stability.

All of these efforts to help our domestic economy have been vital to our balance of payments—for the fundamental solution to our balance-of-payments problems must always rest upon a healthy, growing, and stable American economy. For thus alone can we maintain and improve our competitive position in markets abroad—thus alone can we increase our attractiveness to both foreign and domestic investment.

But, as you know, the balance-of-payments problem is far too complex for simple solutions—and depends upon too many factors beyond our control. We cannot control the fact that European interest rates are high or their capital markets weak—and these are perhaps two of the most crucial factors in aggravating our recent international deficits. Nor can we control the fact that we live in a world containing many different types of economic systems—the primitive, aid-hungry economies of the less-developed countries, and the centrally controlled economies of the Communist world which engage in international trade on a barter basis.

It is, nevertheless, imperative that we bring recent U.S. deficits to a swift and sure end—and we are, as you know, moving ahead with an intensified program to accomplish just that.

The heart of that program is the voluntary effort by businesses and banks to curb private outflows abroad.

Let me emphasize that we view this program as a temporary measure to buy the time we need for our more permanent measures to take hold—and for developments abroad to take place that will lessen the excessive drain upon our capital.

Let me also emphaize that that program, like the wage-price guideposts, is voluntary. They both stand as excellent examples of the deep conviction of this administration that economic health rests upon creative partnership between Government and the private sector.

In short, we have employed multiple policy instruments to pursue multiple economic goals.

At the same time, we have recognized that all of these efforts would be in vain without fundamental and wide-ranging programs for investment in human beings—our programs for health, education, job retraining, the war on poverty, equality of opportunity, and others. These programs serve human ends—but they serve economic ends as well.

Investment in human beings is a major capital investment—in a more productive economy, in a more just social system.

Today, all of us gain from the vast changes of the past few years in economic thought. For these changes have made possible, in turn, a stronger and more creative American society—a society able to provide both opportunity and compassion.

It is only from the inner strength of such a democratic American society that we will be able to sustain our leadership in a world which needs that leadership.

It is only from that inner strength that we will be able to harness the forces of change and make them work for man's betterment and not his destruction.

"FAITH AND FREEDOM"—ADDRESS BY J. HOWARD PEW

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I know of no more important subjects in our country today than faith and freedom. Faith and freedom are important, because they constitute the very foundations of our national life; and if these pillars of society are ever destroyed, no opportunities for any kind of great or grand society will remain.

I have been very much impressed with an outstanding address, by J. Howard Pew, entitled "Faith and Freedom." The address was delivered by Mr. Pew on February 28, 1964, before the Wichita area meeting of the National Council of United Presbyterian Men. Such eloquent words coming from such a stanch patriot and dedicated Christian layman merit the study and attention of all Americans. In order that his address may be made available to the Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAITH AND FREEDOM

(An address by Mr. J. Howard Pew)

I value my association with this council above that of any organization or institution in which I have participated.

This group—400,000 strong—more than any other, is carrying John Calvin's banner, for Calvin believed the Bible to be the very word of God, inspired and infallible. He was uncompromising in his stand for right principles. He shared, along with the other early reformers the belief that the church must not bind men's consciences; that the church had no scriptural authority outside the ecclesiastical field; that for the church to become involved in all kinds of economic, social, and political affairs, was not only divisive but threatened the very infallibility of the church. He contended that the time and energy of the pastor should not be taken from the important task of saving souls. He constantly lectured that in communicating the truths of the Bible, only the simplest of ideas and language should be employed. And so I like to think of this group as the foremost supporters of those principles and that doctrine which typifies Calvinism.

I have been assigned the task here tonight of discussing with you the subject—"Faith and Freedom."

Faith as used in the Bible means far more than just believing or understanding. St. Paul tells us that faith is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." And so if we would have faith in the biblical sense, we must accept Christ as our Lord and Savior; and then through the working of the Holy Spirit, make our will subject to God's will. Once an individual has achieved faith, then Christian freedom results from the exercise of that faith.

All of our so-called freedoms stem from Christian freedom. Without Christian freedom, no freedom is possible. Freedom therefore is indivisible. Freedom can exist in a state only where the people generally accept honesty, truth, fairness, generosity, justice, and charity as a rule for their conduct. If the people of a state accept bribery, guile, cupidity, deception, selfishness, and dishonesty as a rule for their conduct, then the strong exploit the weak, might becomes right, and anarchy stalks the land. Freedom for the individual under such conditions is no longer possible. But honesty, truth, fairness, generosity, justice, and charity are the attributes of Christianity. Thus, if we would have freedom, we must first have faith in God.

St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, admonishes us to "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

In 1790, John Philpot Curran, the great Irish patriot, enunciated the same principle when in a speech to his constituency he said: "The condition under which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance, which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt."

Liberty, therefore, is a Christian concept, but people must first have faith in God before they can enjoy the blessings of liberty, for God is the author of liberty. Then they must fight for the preservation of that liberty. Their failure to do so is a crime, the punishment for which is servitude.

From the 1st century until the 15th century, liberty was rare, because the people either were lacking in faith, or were unwilling to fight for their liberty. During this period there was little or no material progress. Each generation lived just as did its forebears. Population was controlled by the amount of food that could be produced. A large percentage of the people died of starvation. Then in the 15th century came the Reformation. Under the Reformation men's consciences were freed. Thereafter they were able to exercise their genius, initiative, ingenuity, and resourcefulness. Machines gradually increased the productive capacity of labor on the farms. One hundred and fifty years ago it required 90 percent of the American people to produce sufficient food to maintain our population. Today 8 percent of the American people produce more food than our entire population can consume.

For over a hundred years freedom flourished in our land. When I graduated from college in 1900, America truly was the land of opportunity. Had the Government at that time been disposed to control our economic activities, as it does today, the oil industry to which I have devoted over 60 years of my life, might well have been an entirely different industry than it is. Let me tell you something about the development of the oil industry, and its companion, the motor car industry; and at the same time speculate with you as to what might have been the attitude of a national economic planning board back in the year 1900, if one had existed at that time, toward these industries.

At that time there were being operated in this country some 8,500 motorcars, consuming approximately 85,000 barrels of gasoline a year. That is just about enough gasoline to keep the cars of today on the road for between 1 and 2 minutes. Now let us imagine Mr. Ford, with his great vision of the automobile's future, appearing before that board and asking that in their program for the next decade they provide a few billions of dollars of capital, along with the necessary labor and material, for his industry. The board would have recognized in Mr. Ford a mild lunatic. They would have asked him where he expected to get the gasoline for all those cars; and would have pointed out that neither the gasoline nor the crude oil from which to make it was anywhere in sight—and they would have refused Mr. Ford's request. A sophisticated public would have laughed at Mr. Ford when the board set down genius as insanity and inventive ability as lunacy; and that would have ended all foolish talk about horseless carriages and flying machines.

But fortunately for the 40 millions of families in this country who today derive pleasure and satisfaction from the operation of their cars, there was no such board in the year 1900. And so Mr. Ford, not worrying about where his gasoline was coming from, went right ahead building more cars and better cars, until presently he was turning out over a million cars a year.

Fortunately, too, for the petroleum industry that there was no such board, for they too went right ahead drilling more wells and deeper wells and sometimes finding oil. They brought technology to their assistance in the form of geology and geophysics, and by their aid discovered new oilfields. And so the oil industry, doing each year those things which would have been impossible the year before, was always able to keep just a step ahead of the thirst for gasoline of those multiplying millions of automobiles.

The first telephone was installed on the White House desk of General Grant. After he had talked into his end of the wire and listened to the answering voice coming in from the other end, until he was thoroughly satisfied that the thing really would work, he leaned back in his chair and said: "Yes, it is truly remarkable; but who in the world would ever want to use one of them?" Now, General Grant was quite a man. He won a great war and was twice President. But I submit that that incident justifies the gravest doubts about the wisdom of any economic planning board which he might have appointed—and as President, according to our present-day planners, he would have had to appoint just such a board.

The richest story of them all, I ran across in a report put out by the Patent Office Society. About the middle of the last century, it was proposed in Washington to construct a new building to house the Patent Office. The Congressional Committee called in Mr. Ellsworth, who was then U.S. Commissioner of Patents, and asked his advice. Commissioner Ellsworth counseled against too large or expensive a building, because invention had just about reached its limit. He related the astounding advances that had been made in the mechanical arts during his lifetime, and predicted a cessation of activity in the field of invention—there just wasn't anything else left to invent.

At this point I made a little investigation of my own, and I found that up until Ellsworth's time there had been taken out in this country some 3,327 patents; but that since then almost three millions of patents have been granted—just a little increase of some 90,000 percent. So much for that one Government official who undoubtedly would have been a member of the national economic planning board, if one had existed at that time. But Commissioner Ellsworth was not so illiberal as are most of our modern planners. He didn't believe there could be many more inventions, but in any event he did not propose to suppress them when they did come along.

American industry under freedom has increased the standard of living of the American people in a way which was undreamed of even 100 years ago. But freedom has also been responsible for great progress in the field of medicine. Let me illustrate by telling you the story of Ephraim McDowell.

One hundred and forty years ago Ephraim McDowell was a practicing physician in Danville, Ky., then a small hamlet on the edge of the wilderness. A few days before Christmas he was summoned 60 miles to see a patient, a Mrs. Crawford. The local doctor had told her that she was pregnant; but after 10 or 11 months had passed, her condition became so alarming that Dr. McDowell was called into consultation. He diagnosed her case as ovarian tumor. No surgeon had ever dared operate in such a case, because it was popularly believed that any contact of the outside atmosphere with the interior of the abdominal cavity meant certain death. But Dr. McDowell had long believed such an operation possible; and so he persuaded Mrs. Crawford to let him do it. The operation had to be performed at the doctor's home, where he had all of his surgical equipment. So Mrs. Crawford accompanied him on horseback the 60 miles back to Danville, suffering excruciating pain at every step.

When the village learned of this unheard-of operation, feeling ran high against Dr. McDowell. The people were determined to stop the operation, either by law or by a mob, if necessary. But Dr. McDowell was undaunted. Even though he knew the operation might result in the death of his patient—and certain death to him if his patient died—nevertheless he was prepared to take the risk.

The operation was performed on Christmas morning. When the services in the local church were over, the people gathered in front of the doctor's home and, with a rope around a tree, were prepared to hang him just as soon as the patient died. And then, becoming impatient, they tried to break into the house but were stopped by the sheriff.

All this was before the development of anesthesia, and legend has it that Mrs. Crawford sang hymns to drown out the pain while the doctor worked. Anyhow, despite the yelling of the patient on the inside and the howling of the mob on the outside, Dr. McDowell performed the first abdominal operation in the history of medicine. Mrs. Crawford not only survived the operation, but she lived to be over 80 years of age.

Today the operation for appendicitis alone saves over a million lives per year. What do you think would have been the attitude of a government medical board 140 years ago toward such an operation? And what do you think would have been the status of medicine today if during these last 140 years medicine had been socialized throughout the world? I suspect it would be just exactly what it was before Dr. McDowell performed that amazing operation.

When 18 years of age, Galileo, while attending his devotions at the Pisa Cathedral, watched the caretaker stand on the side of the nave and draw the chandelier toward him; then after lighting the lamp, he released it. Galileo was fascinated as he watched that great chandelier swing in a great arc over the nave. Then, with his pulse, he calculated the elapsed time for each swing and was amazed to find that, as the arc of the swing was reduced, the elapsed time remained constant. This is the principle employed in most of our reliable clocks of today. A clock in which the length and weight of the pendulum have been accurately adjusted, will keep perfect time.

Subsequently, Galileo discovered the telescope, the microscope, the thermometer, and an infinite number of mathematical formulas, and made many scientific discoveries. He was the first man to prove that the earth was a globe and revolved around the sun. He also worked out the equinoxes; that the moon revolved around the earth—in fact, much of our knowledge of astronomy was first discovered by Galileo.

But instead of receiving the universal acclaim which he had earned, the church accused him of heresy. The church felt impelled to take this action because the church assumed the responsibility of all economic, social and political activities. As the church had accepted Aristotle's erroneous concepts of astronomy, it could not accept Galileo's position, as to do so would admit that the church was fallible, and this they would not do; and so it was decreed that Galileo had violated the Holy Scriptures. And then, under threat of the most terrifying forms of the Inquisition, Galileo was compelled to recant and was banished from his country. Thus was ended the usefulness of the greatest scientific mind ever developed in the history of the world.

Today most of our Protestant denominations have lobbyists in Washington, who on behalf of their 30 or 40 millions of members are dictating to our Senators and Congressmen the kind of legislation which should be enacted on almost every conceivable economic, social and political subject. Now, I submit, that unless this is stopped, the time is not too far distant when we will have a Protestant inquisition—20th century pattern—which will rival in effectiveness the Catholic Inquisition of the Middle Ages.

At this point I should tell you that the National Council of Churches is a creature of these denominations; that each of these denominations maintains a social action committee; that these social action committees and the National Council of Churches are constantly putting out statements and making pronouncements on every conceivable subject. Now, I am an old man. For over 60 years I have devoted most of my time and energy to the oil industry; but I would be boasting if I told you that I could speak authoritatively on 10 percent of the problems incident to petroleum. Petroleum is but a small segment of industry; industry a small segment of our economy; and our economy but a small segment of all human affairs. Is it possible for any committee to possess the knowledge and competence to pass judgment on the whole gamut of human affairs? John Calvin thought not. The Wesminster Divines thought not. Our own church fathers thought not. And may I humbly state, I think not.

Most of you will remember what Oliver Goldsmith had to say about the school master in "The Deserted Village":

"While words of learned length, and thund'ring sound,
Amazed the gazing rustics rang'd around;
And still they gaz'd, and still the wonder grew,
That one small head could carry all he knew."

Now the truth is that no planning authority could possibly have foreseen, planned, plotted, and organized such an amazing spectacle of human progress as the world has witnessed right here in this country during the last 100 years. No trust or combination—church, private, or governmental—could have accomplished it. It could have been achieved but only where there was a wide-open invitation to all the genius, inventive ability, organizing capacity, and managerial skill of a great people. Nobody must be barred, no invention rejected, no idea untried. Every one must have his chance; and under our American system of free enterprise and equal opportunity every one gets just that chance. It is our freedom that has brought us to this high state—intellectual freedom, religious freedom, political freedom, industrial freedom—freedom to dream, to think, to experiment, to invent, to match wits in friendly competition—freedom to be an individual. That is our great American heritage.

With so many political witch doctors abroad in the land, teaching communism, fascism, planned and dictated economies, governmental paternalism, and all the other isms, I urge you to guard well that heritage and to turn a deaf ear to all their sophistries. When a people come to look upon their government or their church as the source of all their rights, there will surely come a time when they will look upon that same government or church as the source of all their wrongs. That is the history of all planned, dictated economies. That is the history of tyranny. To each of us is assigned a part to play in the great drama of life; and we can only play our parts with the greatest measure of perfection as free, unhampered individuals. Surely it is not thinkable that in the light which shines through this 20th century, a great progressive people will be beguiled into turning back to the ways of controlled economies and dictated social programs.

I believe that the church is the only institution that can save this country from communism. The reason for this is quite simple: communism is atheistic—the church is Christian; the one is the very antithesis of the other. The church must inculcate in the minds and hearts of its people that God alone is the Lord of Creation. When the church takes its stand that man is a creature of God, it denies the very concept of communism.

Communism, crime, and delinquency are not caused by poverty, bad laws, poor housing, or any other economic, social or political condition. They are caused by sin. The only way to eradicate sin is by the redemptive power of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The church is God's instrumentality to carry the Gospel to man.

Dr. McCartney in one of his great sermons told of an old Saxon king who set out with his army to put down a rebellion in a distant province of his kingdom. When the insurrection had been quelled and the army of the rebels defeated, he placed a candle in the archway of the castle in which he had his headquarters. Then, lighting the candle, he sent his herald to announce to those who had been in rebellion, that all who surrendered and who took the oath of allegiance while the candle still burned would be saved. The king offered to them his clemency and mercy, but the offer was limited to the life of that candle.

We are all living on candletime. While the candle still burns, let us accept Christ as our Lord and Saviour. Let us by our life and witness spread the Gospel. And let us through faith acquire Christian freedom, which alone can make this country a better and a finer place in which our children and our children's children may live and work.

There is a little poem which illustrates what I have in mind far better than any words of mine could. It is entitled "The Bridge Builder," I have long since forgotten the name of its author.

"An old man traveling a lone highway,
Came at evening, cold and gray,
To a chasm deep and wide,
Through which there flowed a sullen tide.
The old man crossed in the twilight dim,
For the sullen stream held no fear for him.
He turned when he reached the other side
And built a bridge to span the tide.

'Old man!' cried a fellow pilgrim near,
'Why waste your strength with your building here;
Your journey will end with the ending day,
And you never again will pass this way;
You have crossed the chasm deep and wide,
Why build a bridge at eventide?'

The builder raised his old gray head,
'Good friend, on the path I have come,' he said,
'There followeth after me today
A youth whose feet will pass this way.
This stream which has meant naught to me,
To that fair-haired boy may a pitfall be;
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim.
Good friend, I am building this bridge for him.'"

NOW IT'S DR. ANDERSON, OF ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] once again has demonstrated his devotion to duty.

At 10 a.m.—Alaska time—yesterday, he delivered a challenging commencement address at the University of Alaska, in Fairbanks. For the benefit of those who may not be aware of the time difference between Alaska and Washington, D.C., I point out that when it is 10 a.m. in Fairbanks, it is 4 p.m. on Capitol Hill.

Yet, despite the long distance and the short time, the Senator was on hand for today's important votes here in the Senate.

Such devotion to duty is only one reason why the University of Alaska awarded him a doctor of laws degree, yesterday. Alaska has come to know the Senator as a stanch friend in time of need.

As he said in his commencement address, during the hearings on statehood and in the months following the earthquake, he "visited Alaska enough to begin to feel like a real sourdough, instead of a mere cheechako."

The degree he was awarded is only a small portion of the thanks Alaska owes this great Senator for his efforts in behalf of statehood and in getting Federal assistance during the dark days following the earthquake.

In his commencement address, Senator ANDERSON challenged Alaskans to take their full part in the development of their State. He said that a bright future of trade with the East and in the exportation of natural resources lies before Alaska. I agree.

Before I ask unanimous consent to have Senator ANDERSON's remarks printed in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to another person who received a degree at the same commencement exercises: The university awarded a doctor of science degree to Max Brewer, the head of Arctic research, and founder of Orlis II, an ice island which just completed a 3-year voyage across the Arctic Ocean. Men and instruments on the drifting ice island were gathering priceless information about the Arctic Ocean—information which will help unlock the mysteries of the Arctic and will help make available great sources of untapped natural resources, for the benefit of all.

The university chose wisely in honoring two men who have done much for Alaska and for their country.

I ask unanimous consent to have the commencement address by the senior Senator from New Mexico printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL PARTNER FOR PROGRESS

(Commencement address by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, University of Alaska, May 24, 1965)

It is a pleasure to be back in Alaska. I appreciate your many kindnesses to me and Mrs. Anderson whenever we have visited you. You may have cold hands but you have warm hearts and I thank you for your courtesies.

During the hearings on Alaska statehood and in the months following the earthquake, I visited Alaska enough to begin to feel like a real sourdough instead of a mere cheechako.

We have been through a lot—you and I—since the March 27 earthquake, fire, and flood. We have worked and worried and argued as the massive job of reconstruction got underway and steps were taken to insure that the State's economy could respond to the immense demands placed upon it. We sought to guarantee that if tax revenues fell short because of the severe blow to your economy, the State's government would receive the revenues it needed to provide the services required of it. At last, a year later, we can say that the economy has been pulled to its feet. The State government is not only alive, but kicking. Reconstruction has been financed and it is well underway.

Alaska—as a State and as a people—took the worst that nature could throw at it—and survived. Now there can be no doubt in any mind that the State of Alaska will endure as long as the Union endures—and that means into the limitless future.

Reconstruction, this great effort, has been remarkable for two things: the cooperation that made it possible, the efficiency that made it work. We are indebted to President Johnson for both.

In the dark days after the disaster, it was the President who determined that reconstruction must be a joint effort of the State and the Federal governments, a full partnership. To bring this about, he created by executive order, the Federal Reconstruction and Planning Commission for Alaska which together with State authorities administered the programing and expenditures of the rebuilding. When the President picked the members of that Commission and your Gov. Bill Egan appointed Joe Fitzgerald to represent your State, a partnership was struck that never faltered.

It was the President, too, who directed the Federal agencies involved in the reconstruction to cut redtape and to speed every action. With my appointment as Chairman, he gave me the authority to see that this was done. There are many civil servants, here and in Washington, who know that when the Commission said, "Do this," it meant, "Do it now." There are many in the Congress who know that when the President said, "I want this for Alaska," he wanted it now.

As a result, on the first anniversary of the earthquake, the Federal Government had committed over $322 million to the job. Of this amount, close to $150 million was in the form of outright grants, $82 million for the replacement and repair of Federal installations, and $91 million in long-term low-interest loans to Alaska businessmen and homeowners.

And as a further result, unemployment is down, construction is up, production is back to normal and the economy is back in business.

The recovery of south central Alaska is of importance in itself; it is also important to Alaska as a whole, for a body with a diseased member is not a healthy body. This is as true in economics as it is in medicine. And this truth is as important to Fairbanks as it is to Anchorage. Without regard to the earthquake, there are still too many sections of Alaska that do not have a healthy economy. Too many communities are in a depressed state relying upon industries which are dying or dead and gone. Too many of Alaska's communities are dependent totally and literally for their daily bread upon decisions made far away in the Pentagon.

It is, in many ways, a cruel hoax that history has played upon Alaska. Here it is, the State of the last frontier, a true and vital and promising frontier; yet too often instead of lively independence, Alaskans are tied to decisions made outside. Instead of a bright and venturesome development of vast untapped resources, Alaskans too often are caught in the dying agonies of gold mining and the inefficiency of canneries with antiquated equipment, fishing boats with outmoded gear. Alaskans too often live with a haphazard, sporadic economy supported by irregular injections of Federal money.

If we are ever to have a prosperous Alaska, it must be the whole of the sum of its healthy parts. Alaska needs, in other words, an integrated and coherent economic system. Only planning and the continued cooperation of the governments concerned can bring this about. The President recognized this when, as the reconstruction effort came to a close, he proclaimed the formation of the Federal Development Planning Committees for Alaska. These two committees, one in Washington and one in Alaska, designed to insure the full cooperation between the Federal executive branch and the State of Alaska's Development Planning Committees and thereby make clear, once and for all, that the Federal Government has a particular and permanent interest in the economic growth and sound development of Alaska and that it shares this interest jointly with the State government. This recognition of interdependence is an important step which the Federal Government has taken, important not only for the future welfare of Alaska, but important for the promise it brings the whole country of benefits flowing from Alaska in the form of resource development and increased tax revenues.

That there is a Federal responsibility and a joint interest in Alaska's future has been recognized by the President and the Congress. There is time to talk about what this will mean as the work of the committee proceeds. But for this day and this occasion, I would like to point out what it does not mean. It does not mean that the Congress has given Alaska a blank check. It does not mean that the Federal Government is going to pay Alaska's way. There is a special relationship, but there is not a special license.

As the record of this Congress has made clear, the Congress will pay it share but Alaska must share in every endeavor.

The Federal Planning Committees are now in operation, and the able Joe Fitzgerald is chairman of the field committee. This committee—sure to be invaluable to the future of your State—is unique in the history of our country. Here a joint Federal, State, local effort must be made to coordinate all economic developments in a State: to see that the capital invested in this State is invested in as efficient and productive a manner as possible, in accordance with the overall and long-range economic development needs of the State. The mission of this committee is exciting; the potential of its work seems unlimited. Such a concept places heavy burdens on the quality of the leadership in Alaska and thus, in turn, upon the quality of education which your university provides.

The field committee must make the studies, coordinate the development and recommend the programs which will give encouragement and direction to the State and its growth. The field committee is here in Alaska and it is Alaska that will provide its leadership. The Federal Government will provide the support but the State must lead the way.

Now I must admit that I have heard some good-natured grumbling here in Fairbanks as citizens survey the reconstruction and new building that is going on in Anchorage and throughout the earthquake belt. I have even heard it said that some feel that perhaps a little earthquake for Fairbanks—with a resultant inflow of SBA loans and OEP reconstruction money—would not come amiss. But Fairbanks need not worry. It has something far better than an earthquake here in its university.

In the long run, the University of Alaska will be more important to central Alaska, indeed to all Alaska, and fully as productive, fully as income generating as any quake. An active university generates new ideas, creates leadership, and produces the excitement, controversy, and confidence which are more powerful than any earthquake, more far reaching than any tidal wave.

To me, if you will excuse an outsider for offering an opinion, the mission of your university—in the heart of Alaska, on the edge of the Arctic and the rim of North Pacific—is threefold:

1. The university has a responsibility to the State to provide the studies and develop the talent needed by business and government if growth is to proceed.

2. The university has a responsibility to central Alaska to provide the cultural atmosphere, the intellectual yeast and the economic benefits which a great university can bring.

3. The university has a responsibility to itself. It should respond to and take full advantage of the special scientific and cultural challenges presented by its location at the gateway to the Arctic and the keystone of the Pacific.

The university is a land-grant college and is a living example of Federal-State cooperation. Mining and mineral studies here are equal in quality to any in the world. Biology and life sciences are well represented. The university's geophysical institute, supported largely by Federal funds, explores the outer atmosphere and the phenomena of space and earth.

The university's laboratory of forest research studies the control of foliage-eating pests and disastrous forest fires so that the harvest from more than 160 million acres of forest in inland Alaska may be brought some day to market. The new water pollution laboratory is almost complete, the Arctic Health Research Center Laboratory is underway and I would not be surprised to have the years ahead bring to the campus centers of radiation and air pollution studies. The university operates the Naval Arctic Research Laboratory at Point Barrow and soon will be in cooperation with the European Space Research Organization Tracking Station to be built outside of Fairbanks.

The university, with its scientific capability, especially in the fields of biology and arctic sciences, is making use of the opportunity which its location presents. While Russia and the Scandinavian countries bordering the Arctic Ocean have long been engaged in such study, the United States has been slow to apprehend the significance and the promise of arctic and subarctic lands under our flag. I am confident that in the years ahead this university will make clear to the world its preeminence in arctic scientific studies.

There are, however, other aspects of the Arctic which could also be profitably studied. The Arctic is rich in resources—and they are untapped. Is there a way to develop them economically? Can new and better mining practices be developed for the exploitation of the resources of the North? Are there practical means of transporting bulk commodities at reasonable prices across the roadless tundra? Can more work be done on easing the physiological and psychological demands made upon man by arctic climates? These are things that a great University of the North should study.

We know that Japan and the Far East lie in Alaska's future. Alaska's resources and the needs of the highly industrialized East must, and in due course will, come together. Pacific trade, growing by great leaps from year to year, will profit Alaska immensely as her fish, metals, timber, and fuels—both coal and oil—go to market. The University of Alaska should encourage these developments. It has need of a capability in Eastern languages, history, and sociology. There should be exchange programs with students and teachers from oriental universities. Alaska businessmen need to know how Eastern businessmen act and think. They need to know about Eastern culture as well as Eastern business so that Alaskans, in the years ahead, will be as comfortable in Tokyo as they are in San Francisco. In this regard, I am pleased to hear that the university will have next year a history institute sponsored by NDEA funds to study the history of Russia in America—a haunting but little known episode—and the equally little known history of the northern Pacific. These are things that an alert university halfway between the Far East and the Far West may claim as its special field.

And through tourism, a rising industry which you must nurture, closer ties will be cemented with the South 48. The marine highway—the ferry system, financed wholly by Alaskans—will bring a host of tourists in their cars up the Inside Passage. While this, of course, is largely a seasonal affair, it will be an important element in the State's economy as travel increases and transportation facilities improve.

In the days after the earthquake we learned that to share the wealth we must share the work. We learned that Federal and State Governments harnessed in partnership with business and industry can do more for Alaska together than each can do separately. We learned the need of leadership—leadership that must come from within the State. The development of this leadership and the provision of the technical and cultural services it needs will mold and make the mission of the University of Alaska.

The future of the State of Alaska depends upon how well you fulfill your mission.

But I have watched you at work, and liked what I saw.

I have no fear for the future of Alaska.

SUPPORT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE FIREARMS ACT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, recently I have received a great deal of mail in opposition to Senate bill 1592, to amend the Firearms Act. I wish to explain, for the RECORD, why I support this bill.

My primary reason for cosponsoring the bill is that we need effective controls on the movement of firearms in interstate commerce. Too often these firearms find their way to juveniles, the mentally ill, drug addicts, habitual criminals, and other unstable persons who may misuse them.

Every year, hundreds of our citizens are killed by weapons in the hands of irresponsible persons. Tightened firearms regulations will, in my opinion, prevent many needless tragedies. All of us know that Lee Harvey Oswald shot President Kennedy with a gun which Oswald purchased through a mail-order catalog. Had there been effective controls on the distribution of firearms, Oswald might not have been able to buy a gun, and President Kennedy might not have been killed.

The bill does not, however, restrict legitimate ownership and possession of firearms. It would simply terminate interstate mail-order traffic of firearms, and would prohibit over-the-counter sale of firearms to person under 21 years of age, except that shotguns and rifles could be sold over the counter to persons 18 years of age or above.

I am acutely aware of the enormous volume of mail in opposition to this proposed legislation. I am persuaded, however, that many of the opponents of this bill are misinformed concerning its provisions. The bill would not hinder the importation or sale of firearms for lawful, sporting purposes, or the importation of antique and unserviceable firearms. Gun collectors and sportsmen need have no fear that this bill will hamper their leisure activity. If I were to find that any provision of the bill would cause unnecessary hardship to responsible sportsmen or collectors, I would support an amendment to correct the bill.

The public should clearly understand that:

Nothing in this bill would prevent a citizen from purchasing a gun at any sporting-goods store or hardware store in his State.

Nothing in the bill would prevent any citizen from taking a gun or pistol across State lines for a lawful purpose.

Nothing in the bill would prevent or restrict the sale and distribution of guns in every State by reputable licensed dealers.

I, too, am a hunter and a somewhat inexpert skeet and trap shooter, and I possess firearms for this purpose. Indeed, almost as long ago as I can remember, I accompanied my father to the duckblinds, and learned to shoot his double-barreled shotgun. I intend to give my son the same training. This bill will not restrict the possession and use of my sporting guns.

The licensing fees provided for by the bill relate to dealers, manufacturers, and importers, not to individual purchasers and owners. These fees are designed to insure that no person shall be permitted to import firearms or ammunition, or to manufacture or deal in these items unless he is a legitimate, reputable dealer, manufacturer, or importer.

Under this proposed legislation, various abuses in the existing Federal Firearms Act licensing system would be eliminated. The hazards and dangers of free-flowing mail-order traffic in firearms would be reduced.

With our ever-increasing crime rate, and with statistics showing that an extremely high percentage of crime is committed by persons bearing firearms, I feel this legislation is very much needed.

POPULATION GROWTH REPORT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the National Academy of Sciences today released the first report of its Permanent Committee on Population Problems. The report, entitled "The Growth of U.S. Population," surveys the major problems in this area, and presents the committee's conclusions and recommendations for further action.

All of the recommendations would be furthered and the solution of the problem would be aided by early enactment of Senate bill 1673, which would create Assistant Secretaries of State and of Health, Education, and Welfare for Population Problems.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the conclusions set forth on pages 22 to 25 of the report entitled "The Growth of U.S. Population."

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCLUSIONS

The freedom to limit family size to the number of children wanted when they are wanted is, in our view, a basic human right. The evidence cited in this report shows clearly that most Americans of higher income and better education exercise this right as a matter of course, but that many of the poor and uneducated are in effect deprived of the right. No family should be fated through poverty or ignorance to have children they do not want and cannot properly care for. Responsible parenthood requires that couples of all social strata have the ability and means to limit births when they wish to do so, in accordance with their personal convictions. In short, this basic freedom for the individual family should be made effective throughout American society.

We are glad to note several important developments in this field since the Academy's 1963 report. The President's pledge in his state of the Union message, that he "will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources," was an enlightened and statesmanlike response to the present situation. The new policy of the Agency for International Development to provide assistance in family planning at the request of foreign governments is a welcome step forward. The recent statement of the American Medical Association, quoted above, shows that the leaders of the medical profession recognize the broad responsibilities that American physicians share in educating their patients in fertility control. The 1964 statement of the American Public Health Association is another sign of the emerging trend toward fuller and more open attention to the problem. Moreover, several public health schools have developed substantial programs in population problems in the past 2 years, and have already assumed places of leadership both here and abroad.

The 1963 report of the Academy concentrated on the population problems of the world. In this report we have turned to domestic concerns in this field. In this connection we make recommendations concerning three major spheres of activity: research, education and training, and services. In our view, these are the most critical importance in connection with the population situation now facing the United States, and the problems and opportunities set forth in this report.

Research

1. Although substantial advances have been made since our 1963 report, there is still a great deal to be done in order to achieve a satisfactory state of knowledge in this field. We therefore urge all appropriate institutions, both private and governmental, to expand their efforts in the whole range of disciplines and professions that contribute to knowledge of population matters, including demography, economics, and other social sciences as well as biology, medicine, and public health. Federal and private agencies should allocate additional funds for studies that promise to illuminate the nature of population changes and that will help in providing solutions for current problems.

2. Basic research into productive physiology should receive increasing support not only for its general contribution to man's knowledge of his own reproduction, but also in order to provide us with new and better methods for controlling fertility. In addition, systematic efforts to assess the effectiveness and acceptability of the various contraceptive procedures that are now available should be supported.

3. Many problems relating to the social, psychological, and economic aspects of family planning require further investigation. For example, experimental programs to bring information and services about family planning to different groups need to be systematically developed and tested in order to find the most efficient procedures; collection of national data at regular intervals on family size, family-planning practices, and related attitudes is needed to supplement other data

of the same type; induced abortions in this country, though illegal, are not insignificant in number, but we have insufficient information about their incidence in different social groups, their cost in health and welfare, and the possibility of reducing them effectively; the economic consequences of spacing births and of establishing families of different sizes call for intensive inquiry.

These are only illustrations of the kinds of subjects that require further research by qualified specialists. Interest in population problems has grown sharply in recent years. It is important that knowledge keep pace with new developments so that training and service programs can be firmly based in sound knowledge. The costs are not great but the potential consequences are.

Education and training

Expansion of the scale and content of instruction in many relevant disciplines and skills should be accelerated to provide the basis for meeting population problems. Among the necessary educational changes are:

1. Medical and health institutions should provide training for all students in the basic aspects of human reproduction. Since in medical practice and in public health programs family-planning discussion and instruction should be considered an essential part of prenatal and postnatal care, the clinical aspects of fertility control should be an integral part of medical education.

2. Population studies should be more prominent in the professional training of biologists, statisticians, economists, sociologists, and psychologists, at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels.

3. A specific need for expanded training noted in the 1963 report is to provide more and better qualified family-planning administrators. The recommendation made there had its origin in the problems of world population growth. The world shortage of such persons remains, although there has been some progress in initiating and expanding educational programs in the United States for foreign personnel. An added reason for expanding this effort is to train administrators for work in the United States.

4. The widespread better understanding of problems caused by excess population growth and irresponsible parenthood would surely make their solution easier and more likely; and every means of promoting better understanding should be employed. Among these are the inclusion of population studies and the principles of responsible parenthood in the curriculums of colleges, universities, and secondary schools, and continued discussion in magazines, the daily press, and on radio and television.

Services

Action by private and public agencies to promote individual or general welfare should be designed to help Americans have only the children they want.

1. Family planning should be an integral part of public health programs and of individual medical care. Specifically, family-planning discussion and instruction should be regarded as an essential feature of prenatal and postnatal care, and of maternal-welfare programs.

2. Nonmedical agencies (private and public) responsible for welfare services should include instruction in effective family planning as an essential component of their welfare programs.

The required expansion of these activities gives critical importance to increasing the pace of training to provide the new skills and expanded staff that will be needed.

In all three spheres—research, education and training, and services—mentioned in the paragraphs above, the Federal Government has increasing responsibility. The committee recommends, therefore, that the Federal Government find a mechanism for facilitating as promptly as possible our programs in population research, education, and public service, perhaps by the appointment of a person at a high national level with specific responsibility for leadership in implementing population programs.

THE WRONG ROAD TO UTOPIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a column by Jenkin Lloyd Jones from the May 15, 1965, edition of the Washington Evening Star. Mr. Jones' column, "The Wrong Road to Utopia," should be of particular interest at the present moment.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE WRONG ROAD TO UTOPIA

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Yes, Virginia, there are such things as bums.

Not deprived persons. Not socially wounded. Not members of a subculture. Not underprivileged or disadvantaged. Just bums.

You can pick them up, but they'll fall flat again the moment you let them go. They work only under the compulsion of hunger. Opportunities don't interest them. Self-improvement is for the birds.

We are beginning to get into deep water because both politicians and our academic sociologists stubbornly refuse to recognize the bum factor. Under the new-think it is heresy to suggest that bums might exist. For such an admission complicates the clear and simple orthodoxy of the moment, namely that all people who are not supporting themselves and their children are victims of a cruel and unfeeling social system.

This orthodoxy appeals to the political mind, for it provides the rationale for vastly enlarged government in the name of humanity. And it appeals for a variety of reasons to that segment of the academic world that carries the gonfalon of social science.

Many sociologists are bleeders for the poor in the abstract, although most of them wouldn't be caught dead spending the evening with a Puerto Rican family in a cold-water flat. And many resent a free market system in which bubblegum manufacturers and comic strip cartoonists usually make more than Ph. D's. They are always alert for ways to tax up the underendowed and tax down the overrewarded in the interest of social justice.

So the dogma, at least until recently, has gone like this: poverty is the result of society's coldness to individuals or groups of individuals. If society will only loosen up with more relief money, more low-cost housing, more special schools, more medical services, more job opportunities, etc., the poor will cease to be poor. They will, in fact, all become self-supporting taxpayers, to the profit of everyone.

You can see that if you hold to this dogma the admission that bums exist becomes a distressing qualification of the dogma itself. And no dogma can tolerate "ifs" or "buts."

But in spite of record employment, and the highest gross national product in history, relief costs keep soaring. In the past 10 years, with U.S. population up 18 percent, the number of persons on relief has risen 42 percent. Many of these are illegitimate children fathered by men who wander from woman to woman, unworried about who will care for their offspring because they know that aid to dependent children payments will.

The new-think explains that these fathers are confused men, many of them automated out of their old jobs, who have been driven into delinquency by the agony of being unwanted. This is a comfortable theory, and suggests even more spending.

But when an effort was made to recruit Los Angeles reliefers to help get in the California truck garden crop this winter, there were few takers. And one Florida grower, who brought jobless New Yorkers down to his farms at his own expense, found to his dismay that most of them took off for the beaches.

So the dogma is being revised a little. The new theory holds that no one should worry if some people never work at all, for the idea that all should labor is old fashioned. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, recently hit at overworking and oversaving. "I say that what the individual can offer no longer can or should determine the measure of his reward," said Patton. "His reward should and must be measured by his need."

And Professor Martin Rein of Bryn Mawr College has come out in favor of "income guarantees unrelated to previous wages earned so that the retired can maintain a standard of living much higher than known during their working years." And he advocates "higher family allowances, even above the guaranteed income level (or the prevailing wage scale) for poor parents with very large families."

Patton must surely remember that it was Lenin who promised "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need." The Communists quickly found this theory so crazy that they inaugurated the cruelest of piecework systems and sent the drones to the "new lands" in Siberia.

Prof. Rein's plan holds little allure for working hard if, upon retirement, you'll get a guaranteed income unrelated to your earnings. But it might put a stop to unclaimed illegitimate children, for every tavern derelict will claim as many as he can to qualify for higher family allowances.

If there were no such things as bums, if everyone were fired by ambition to do his level best, such schemes might be manageable.

But, alas Virginia, there are bums, indeed. Just plain loafing, child-deserting, rent-money-drinking bums. And until we learn to distinguish between them and the upliftable unfortunate, we'll simply decrease the motivation of the weakly motivated. That's not the road to utopia.

THE RISING CRIME RATE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point two editorials which appeared in the May 6 and May 20, 1965, editions of the Gaithersburg, Md., Gazette.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed, as follows:

[From the Gaithersburg (Md.) Gazette, May 6, 1965]

HARD-HITTING SPEECH

Montgomery County's State's Attorney Leonard T. Kardy was the guest speaker at a recent meeting of the Damascus Chamber of Commerce, and he delivered a hard-hitting speech that was a distinct pleasure to hear in this day of sob sisters and apologists for the actions of habitual criminals in our society.

Much of the blame for the increase in crime is traceable to apathy and complacency of the community, states Mr. Kardy. He agreed that criminals should have their day in court, but that we have gone too far the other way in striving to guarantee these men their rights.

The State's attorney pointed out that more than 65 percent of our nonviolent crime is committed by juveniles, many from our best homes and residential areas. He pointed up the necessity to provide youth with preventive medicine to halt this drift into disregard of the law, and laid the responsibility squarely on the shoulders of the parents.

Each parent, each home, says Mr. Kardy, must examine their own efforts and enforce discipline and cooperation between child and family to better our community.

[From the Gaithersburg (Md.) Gazette, May 20, 1965]

An Encouraging Sign

The alarming rise in crime in every part of the Nation is beginning to open the eyes of many officials to the danger of turning criminals loose time and time again on the public, of soft-hearted treatment and rulings which tip the scales of justice toward the offender for fear of violating his rights while completely ignoring the rights of his victim.

We sincerely feel that this type of misguided sympathy for victims of our society (who have no respect for that society) is one of the prime factors in the situation facing us today. In too many cases today, the main deterrent to lawbreakers has been removed as they are given extremely light sentences for vicious crimes, paroled time and time again by well-meaning but unrealistic authorities and boards, or set completely free because of some ridiculous technicality.

We can already hear the outcry that no technicality is ridiculous, that the rights of the individual must be maintained at all costs. Even when the rights of an individual, who is constantly in court for every imaginable outrage, tramples over the rights of victim after victim in his wanton disregard of law and order? Why should a thug definitely proved guilty of the most heinous crimes walk our streets again and again in search of new victims, because of some minor technicality in a warrant or procedure?

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has consistently decried the increasing number of offenders put on probation or sent to psychiatric clinics rather than to jails. He has pointed out the tremendous jump in serious crime since this practice has become prevalent, and the accompanying increase in crime repeaters.

Senator ROBERT C. BYRD declared this week that "the courts have absolutely handcuffed the police department, that some court decisions seem to favor the criminal."

THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES REPORT ON U.S. POPULATION GROWTH: AN IMPORTANT MILESTONE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, today the National Academy of Sciences released officially its report entitled "The Growth of U.S. Population." This penetrating analysis of our domestic problems follows an earlier Academy study on "The Growth of World Population," made public in April 1963.

Once again the National Academy of Sciences has rendered a significant public service.

In its 1963 report, the Academy, concerned by the problem of uncontrolled population growth, suggested that the problem was at least equally grave for the technically advanced nations, as well as for those less developed.

Following its April 1963 recommendation that a committee be established by the Academy "for the purpose of stimulating and coordinating programs directed toward the solution of problems of uncontrolled growth of population," the Academy named a permanent committee on population, headed by Dr. William D. McElroy, of Johns Hopkins University.

The committee, notes Academy President Frederick Seitz, in his introduction to the May 1965 report "has surveyed the problems associated with population in the United States today, giving special emphasis to the state of education, research, training, and public services relative to family planning."

As explained by Chairman McElroy in his preface, the 1965 report:

> Deals primarily with two basic elements of the population problem in the United States: (1) the steady and persistent increase in population, and (2) the condition of high fertility among low-income groups.

The 1965 report makes recommendations concerning research, education and training, and services, which the report terms:

> Of the most critical importance in connection with the population situation now facing the United States, and the problems and opportunities set forth in this report.

In the area of research, the report urges:

> All appropriate institutions, both private and governmental, to expand their efforts in the whole range of disciplines and professions that contribute to knowledge of population matters, including demography, economics, and other social sciences as well as biology, medicine, and public health. Federal and private agencies should allocate additional funds for studies that promise to illuminate the nature of population changes and that will help provide solutions for current problems.

This is a sound recommendation. We know very little about reproductive physiology, and we know all too little about the nature of population changes. More regrettably, we are told that we spend no more than $7 million for research on reproductive physiology; and I venture to suggest that the money actually spent is a great deal less. We shall learn very little if we do not change our ways.

Basic research, observes the report—

> should receive increasing support not only for its general contribution to man's knowledge of his own reproduction but also in order to provide us with new and better methods for controlling fertility.

Such research, says the Academy, should include assessment of the effectiveness and acceptability of the various contraceptive procedures now available.

The report stresses the need to make family planning information available to all, and states:

> It is important that knowledge keep pace with new developments so that training and service programs can be firmly based in sound knowledge. The costs are not great but the potential consequences are.

Turning to education and training, the report cites the need for medical and health institutions to provide training for all students in the basic aspects of human reproduction.

Such training is imperative. How else can an individual seeking advice receive credible advice in this most important of subjects if our medical experts are not adequately informed? Persons requesting family planning information have the right to expect that their family doctor is informed. The doctor has the right to expect that the medical school of his choice is current as to information available in the field of human reproduction.

The Academy report finds need for "widespread better understanding of problems caused by excessive population growth and irresponsible parenthood." Such understanding, notes the report, would make solution "easier and more likely." The report stipulates that "every means of promoting better understanding should be employed."

Means, as defined in the report, include school classes and discussions in magazines and newspapers, and on the radio and television.

We need the broadest based discussion possible if we are to understand fully the implications, both short range and long range, of overpopulation. I am convinced that once the facts are known, married couples are capable of making decisions which will enable them to be responsible parents.

Services, states the report, should be designed to help Americans have only the children they want.

The Academy suggests that, first, family planning should be an integral part of public health programs and of individual medical care, and, second, nonmedical private and public agencies should include instruction in effective family planning.

Perhaps the single most important part of the report on "The Growth of U.S. Population" appears in the concluding paragraph, wherein the Academy of Sciences recommends that the Federal Government have a person "at a high national level" charged "with specific responsibility for leadership in implementing population programs."

Here is the full text of the concluding paragraph of the report and its recommendation:

> In all three spheres—research, education and training, and services—mentioned in the paragraphs above, the Federal Government has increasing responsibility. The committee recommends, therefore, that the Federal Government find a mechanism for facilitating as promptly as possible our programs in population research, education, and public service, perhaps by the appointment of a person at a high national level with specific responsibility for leadership in implementing population programs.

This recommendation by the Academy of Sciences would be carried out by my bill, Senate bill 1676, and by the various House bills previously referred to.

I commend the National Academy of Sciences National Research Council for its report, which, if implemented, can be of vast importance.

In his state of the Union message to Congress and to the rest of the Nation, President Johnson said:

> I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources.

The National Academy of Sciences has, today, illustrated the importance of our implementing President Johnson's words.

On April 1, I introduced proposed legislation to implement the President's declared purpose. The bill, S. 1676, makes possible the coordination and dissemination, upon request, of information on birth control available in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. An Assistant Secretary would head an Office for Population Problems in each Department. My bill also authorizes President Johnson to call, in 1967, a White House Conference on Population.

The junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] have joined me in sponsoring Senate bill 1676. I am proud of my associates and cosponsors.

Similar or identical bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative UDALL, of Arizona; Representative TODD, of Michigan; Representative DIGGS, of Michigan; Representative BROWN, of California; Representative CONYERS, of Michigan; and Representative MOSS, of California.

The individuals, the independent foundations, and other groups now working to solve the population problem cannot do so without help. The Government can help when U.S. policy is made positive, rather than permissive, thereby enabling States, counties, and others to know that birth-control information is available, upon request.

As chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee's Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, I shall hold hearings on Senate bill 1676, to help bring to the attention of the general public the population facts and what they mean to each of us.

We need public discussion. A White House Conference on Population would make possible the widest national dialog.

We need to find out just what we do know. Officials of sub-Cabinet rank, charged with the responsibility of coordinating and disseminating upon request, available information on overpopulation, birth control, and effects on the life of the individual, could help us solve today's problems, thereby insuring the fulfillment of tomorrow's dream. The Great Society can be realized here and in other nations—given the opportunity to flourish.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Academy report, a news release by the Academy, and an article published in the Washington Post of May 25, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report, the release, and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GROWTH OF U.S. POPULATION

(Analysis of the problems and recommendations for research, training, and service by the Committee on Population, National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, Washington, D.C.)

Although the problems relating to size and growth of population are not the same for the United States as for other parts of the world, particularly the less developed countries, they are nonetheless critical.

Pursuant to one of the major recommendations of its 1963 report on "World Population Problems," the National Academy of Sciences appointed a permanent committee on population. As its first undertaking, this committee has surveyed the problems associated with population in the United States today, giving special emphasis to the state of education, research, training, and public services relevant to family planning.

This report presents the committee's conclusions from its study, and its recommendations for further study and action.

FREDERICK SEITZ, *President,*
National Academy of Sciences.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

COMMITTEE ON POPULATION

William D. McElroy, the Johns Hopkins University, chairman.

Bernard Berelson, the Population Council.

Ansley Coale, Princeton University.

Benedict J. Duffy, Jr., Georgetown University.

Karl Folkers, Stanford Research Institute.

Ronald Freedman, University of Michigan.

Seymour Kety, National Institute of Mental Health.

C. L. Markert, the Johns Hopkins University.

John C. Snyder, Harvard School of Public Health.

Howard C. Taylor, Columbia University.

Robert E. Green, National Academy of Sciences, executive secretary.

PREFACE

In its report of April 1963, a panel appointed by the Committee on Science and Public Policy of the National Academy of Sciences warned that the unrestrained growth of world population has a "pervasive and depressive effect on many aspects of human welfare." The report of the panel concluded that "nearly all our economic, social, and political problems become more difficult to solve in the face of uncontrolled population growth"—a conclusion emphasized by the fact that world population has increased by about 130 million since the report was released.

Too many Americans regard the so-called "population explosion" with the mild concern usually reserved for vague crises in foreign lands; all too often we consider the size and growth of population as a problem peculiar to Latin America or Africa or Asia. Unquestionably the crisis is more immediate and more oppressive to the two-thirds of the human race living in the less-developed countries, where poverty, hunger, and disease are commonplace. However, population growth does pose a crucial problem for the United States as well, not only because segments of our own population are expanding rapidly, but because advances in communication and transportation have caused developments in other lands to affect our own lives.

This committee has focused in this report on problems associated with human fertility and its control in the United States, partly because fertility control has strong biological, medical, demographic, and social science components that are in accord with the scientific tradition of the National Academy of Sciences, and partly because the earlier report of the Academy was directed toward fertility control as a world problem. Our own problems in the United States now need immediate attention.

This document, therefore, deals primarily with two basic elements of the population problem in the United States: (1) the steady and persistent increase in population, and (2) the condition of high fertility among low-income groups.

The high birth rate among the impoverished does not constitute a major threat to overall national prosperity, but it is one of the factors that puts that prosperity out of the reach of millions of our citizens. Indeed, the burden of unwanted children among impoverished and uneducated mothers in the United States is much like that experienced by mothers in underdeveloped countries.

Fertility regulation is both a social and a technical problem. The way in which people in various groups in the United States approach the problem of limiting family size will be determined by religious customs, social mores, and economic conditions. Our research effort, therefore, must be directed toward providing an adequate variety of methods and procedures that will encourage universal acceptance of the desirability of planning and controlling family size. Science and technology can and will provide greater knowledge of reproductive processes, and will develop simple, acceptable techniques for controlling reproduction. Scientific studies may also be made of the social, psychological, and economic aspects of family planning among different groups in our society, and also of the most effective means by which family planning services can be made available. But science, despite popular notions, is not a panacea; it is a tool, which wise and dedicated people can use for the betterment of mankind.

We must implement programs of family planning rapidly and wisely. Although more scientific knowledge about human reproduction is needed, there is much that could be done immediately with the knowledge at hand, provided support were available. As suggested in the report of April 1963: "Other than the search for lasting peace, no problem is more urgent."

The Academy-Research Council Committee on Population is gratified by actions already taken to implement certain recommendations of the Academy's earlier report on world population problems. We direct this report on population problems in the United States to governmental and private agencies and to civic leaders, confidently hopeful that effective new steps can be taken to make the benefits of family planning available to all.

WILLIAM D. MCELROY, *Chairman.*

INTRODUCTION

The United States is a land of abundance and progress. Its rate of natural population increase is well below that of most developing countries, and it is slackening at the moment rather than accelerating as it is in most developing countries. Moreover, the technical and economic development of the United States makes it possible to accommodate a growing population much more readily than can most other countries. Even if our numbers increase to 350 million by the end of the century—as the continuation of present fertility and mortality trends implies—we can probably continue to increase the average standard of living of the American population.

By comparison with underdeveloped nations, then, the problem of population growth in the United States seems slight. But this relative view of the U.S. problem may be misleading, for if present fertility and mortality trends persist, our population will surpass the present world population in a century and a half. And in about 650 years, there would be one person per square foot through the United States. In the very long run, continued growth of the U.S. population would first become intolerance and then physically impossible.

But even in the short run, population increases can produce acute social, educational, and economic problems. Our schools and colleges are already being subjected to severe strains because of greatly increased numbers of students and the requirement to maintain proper standards of quality. Despite the overall robustness of our economy, millions of our citizens cannot find work, and the unemployment problem is compounded by automation and by the increasing number of young people entering the labor force. The postwar population boom aggravates such urban problems as slums, delinquency, pollution, and traffic congestion. And a swelling population threatens to consume our outdoor recreation facilities, reduce our nonrenewable resources, and diminish our available living space.

It is clear that rapid population growth will create difficulties in reaching America's noble goals of optimum education for all, universal abundance, enriched leisure, equal opportunity, quality, beauty, and creativity.

HISTORICAL GROWTH OF THE POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES

The population of the United States has grown from less than 4 million at the time of Washington's first inauguration to more than 192 million in 1964. In the early years of the Republic, the increase in population was some 3 percent a year, remaining at about this level until 1860. The rate of increase in the population then steadily diminished until it reached a low point of seven-tenths of 1 percent a year in the decade from 1930 to 1940. The rate of increase has since accelerated, and is now between 1.5 and 2.0 percent (table 1). Between 1790 and 1820, almost all the increase was an excess of births over deaths. Subsequently a rising tide of immigration made a major contribution to growth, especially from 1840 to World War I, although natural increase has accounted for more than 50 percent of the total increase in every decade. As a rough estimate, about half of the population of the United States today consists of the descendants of inhabitants in 1790, and about half consists of more recent immigrants and their descendants.

TABLE 1.—*Population of the United States, 1790 to 1960*

Year	Population (millions)	Percent increase since preceding census
1790	3.9	
1800	5.3	35.1
1810	7.2	36.4
1820	9.6	33.1
1830	12.9	33.5
1840	17.1	32.7
1850	23.2	35.9
1860	31.4	35.6
1870	39.8	26.6
1880	50.2	26.0
1890	62.9	25.5
1900	76.0	20.7
1910	91.9	21.0
1920	105.7	14.9
1930	122.8	15.1
1940	131.7	7.2
1950	150.7	14.5
1960	179.3	19.0

BIRTH RATES AND DEATH RATES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mortality in the early days of the United States appears to have paralleled the experience of Europe in the same period, with crude death rates of perhaps 25 to 30 per thousand, and an expectation of life at birth of less than 40 years. By 1850, the expectation of life at birth was perhaps 42 years. By 1900 it had risen to about 47 years, and today it is 70 years.

The birth rate in the United States in 1800 was about 55 births per thousand population, a rate equaled only by the most fertile of underdeveloped countries. During the 19th century, the birth rate fell steadily (except for a sharp drop during the Civil War, followed by a slow recovery). By the 1870's the birth rate in the United States was comparable to that in England and Wales. The downward trend continued so that by 1900 the birth rate was below 30 per thousand, and by 1930 it had fallen below 20 per thousand. The birth rate of 1800 would have given an average of seven children to each woman reaching age 45, while the average in the 1930's was less than 2.2.

The history of the birth and death rates in the United States until 1930 duplicates the typical experience in western European countries described in the earlier Academy report.[1] The economies in both areas changed from predominantly rural and agricultural to predominantly urban and industrial, and the process of industrialization was accompanied in the United States as in Europe by a decrease in both the death rate and the birth rate. The outstanding difference between the American experience and the experience in Western Europe was that the American birth rate in late colonial and early republican times was much higher than the birth rate in any Westenr European country—55 per thousand as against 35 to 40 per thousand.

The source of the initially high birth rate was probably a tendency for earlier and more universal marriage in the United States. It is probable that the gradual decline in the birth rate between 1800 and 1870 was caused by a gradually rising age at marriage and by somewhat less universal marriage. After the middle of the 19th century, voluntary limitation of family size by contraception doubtless began to play a part in the declining fertility in the United States. After 1890, in fact, age at marriage became slightly lower in the United States, although no major decline occurred until World War II.

By the 1930's, the spread of family limitation in the American population had reached the point where, on the average, women were bearing only a little more than two children—barely enough to replace the parents. Note that the low point reached in the 1930's was a culmination of a decline in fertility that had lasted 130 years, through good times and bad. It is surely an oversimplification to consider the low fertility of the 1930's as primarily a product of the depression.

Had the fertility rates of the 1930's continued until today, the growth of the American population would virtually have ceased. But fertility did not remain at its pre-war level, and the average size of the American family has risen by more than 50 percent—from a little more than two to more than three children. Indeed, the number of children born per woman of fertile age was as great in 1957, the year of the highest postwar fertility, as it was at the turn of the century.

The recovery of the birth rate in the United States during the 1940's and the 1950's was not a simple reversal of the forces that had caused the birth rate to decline to its prewar minimum. The postwar "baby boom" was not a return to the family-building habits of 19th century America. There were two reasons for it. First, among couples who consciously choose the number of children they have, a consensus developed in favor of moderate-size families instead of small ones. In the 1920's and the 1930's, couples with better education and higher incomes married late and had few children, but in the 1940's and the 1950's, young people generally married rather than remaining single, married at an earlier average age than did their parents, avoided childlessness, and rarely stopped with one child. Their preferences appear nearly evenly divided among two, three, and four children. There seems to have been a change in attitude among the more prosperous, better educated segments of our population. The change represents neither a return to the very large family of the last century nor the abandonment of effective contraception, but does indicate a preference for more children than characterized the families of the 1920's and the 1930's.

The other reason for the great postwar increase in births lies in the lack of effective limitation of family size among the underprivileged, relatively impoverished, and less educated Americans. There has been an increase in fertility among the more deprived segments of our population, caused partly by earlier marriage and partly by a decline in sterility.

Nevertheless, there seems little doubt that the rise in fertility in the United States is caused more by the preference for larger families among those who consciously choose the number of children they have than by the high fertility in the impoverished segments of the population. The importance of high fertility among the underprivileged lies not so much in its contribution to the national birth rate as in the difficulties that excessive fertility imposes on the impoverished themselves.

IMPLICATIONS OF AN EXPANDING POPULATION

The sharp rise in fertility in the 1940's and early 1950's produced large increases first in the number of births and then, inevitably, in the numbers reaching certain crucial stages in the family life cycle. There were 2.4 million births in 1935 and 3.8 million in 1947. The number born in 1947 was about 33 percent greater than the number born only 2 years earlier. Since 1947 all the birth classes have been large—more than 4 million in every year since 1954. The increase in the number of children in the 1950's was greater than the increase between 1900 and 1950, and the child population of the United States grew more rapidly (at 3.2 percent a year) in the 1950's than ever before in the history of the Republic.

The upsurge in births caused an extraordinary increase in primary school enrollment in the 1950's and in high school enrollment during the early 1960's. It will be difficult to expand facilities and faculty in our colleges and universities rapidly enough to accommodate the demand in the rest of this decade.

Those who do not or cannot continue their education will enter the labor market. In fact, the number of youngsters entering the labor market in the late 1960's will be at an alltime high, at a period when unemploymen for the unskilled and less-educated is rising, and when automation and other developments are making it especially difficult to provide employment for the unskilled and inexperienced.

The trends in relocation of our population will continue to create social and economic problems. The increase in the population of metropolitan areas has recently been especially marked in the "outer rings." The larger central cities grew very little in the last decade, and in many instances lost population. The "urban sprawl," which appears likely to continue, will multiply the number of local governments that deal with each metropolitan area's problems, will add to traffic congestion and the time spent in the journey to work, and will contribute to the disappearance of open country as the boundaries of the great metropolitan areas continue to approach each other. These metropolitan problems would be difficult enough even if our population were not growing. They are much more acute, however, because metropolitan populations are growing both through migration and because of an excess of births over deaths.

---

[1] National Academy of Sciences, "The Growth of World Population," Washington, D.C., 1963.

The long-term trend of declining fertility that the United States experienced until the 1930's caused an ever-increasing proportion of the aged in our population. The recent recovery in fertility has swollen the proportion of children, but this increase has been at the expense of the proportion of young adults, not of the aged. The proportion of persons over 65 increased from 4.1 percent in 1900 to 8.8 percent in 1960, and is expected to increase still further to about 9.2 percent in 1970. Moreover, because mortality differences between males and females have widened in the older ages, the older population is becoming increasingly female in composition. It is not easy to conceive an adequate role for the aged, especially aged widows, in an urban society where separation from one's parents at marriage is becoming a nearly universal custom. The provision of adequate medical care for the aged exemplifies the problems that will become increasingly serious in the future.

These various short-term problems of population growth and the inevitability of population limitation in the long run should stimulate more thinking and discussion about questions of population policy. Many people assume that population growth is necessary, or at least desirable for business and for economic growth. Presumably, economic policies designed to increase aggregate demand would be a substitute for population increase as a stimulus to economic growth. Whether such policies are possible or desirable is an open question. But these questions need study now, if a decline in population growth is to occur in the near future.

This survey of broad national problems is intended to indicate the range of issues associated with population trends, not to present a complete or systematic statement. This report, as we stated earlier, is concerned primarily with issues associated with fertility and its control in the United States, a subject to which we now turn.

PROBLEMS OF HIGH FERTILITY IN THE UNITED STATES

It is now clear that the overwhelming majority of American couples approve and practice family planning. Until recently there was little direct evidence to support this conclusion, but representative sample surveys—one in 1955 of white couples and one in 1960 of all couples—have provided statistical information on the prevalence of deliberate fertility control in the American population.

In 1960, about 95 percent of couples surveyed favored the idea of family planning at least under some circumstances. Although Catholic couples often specify that the rhythm method is the only acceptable means of birth control, about 90 percent of them approved limiting family size and 80 percent have either used or plan to use some sort of family planning.

In 1955, 91 percent of white American couples who had experienced no difficulty in having children had used or expected to use contraception. In 1960, the number had grown to 96 percent. The increase occurred among couples at all educational levels and of all major religions. No student of American fertility doubts that the proportion of couples using contraception has increased steadily for many years.

Encouraging as it is, the continuing increase in the practice of contraception should not obscure two significant facts: First, some 10 to 12 percent of American couples in the childbearing years do not try to limit births to the number of children actually desired; and second, nearly 20 percent of all couples with unimpaired fertility try to limit family size, but fail because of insufficient motivation or ineffectiveness of the method of contraception used. Moreover, the burden of excess fertility falls in overwhelming disproportion on the underprivileged, especially the uneducated.

In the United States, as in other countries, poverty, ignorance, and a high birth rate are closely related. In the whole population of the United States, the proportion of couples who have not used and do not expect to use contraception is presently about 14 percent. Among white couples in which the wife had no more than a grade school education, the proportion is 28 percent. Among nonwhite couples the proportion is 43 percent. The highest proportion of couples who never employ contraception or who have children beyond the number they intend is found among nonwhites who live in the rural South or who have a rural southern background. On the other hand, the 63 percent of the nonwhites in the United States who have backgrounds other than rural southern have a fertility little different from that of the white population.

The available evidence indicates that low-income families do not want more children than do families with higher incomes, but they have more because they do not have the information or the resources to plan their families effectively according to their own desires. About 17 percent of white couples interviewed in 1960 reported that, before the last conception occurred, either the wife or the husband or both had not really wanted another child at any time in the future. Among the nonwhite couples, 31 percent had unwanted children. Among couples in which the wife's education was grade school or less, unwanted children were born to 32 percent of white couples and to 43 percent of nonwhite couples. Further, in 1960 the last pregnancy was reported as unwanted by 25 percent of the women married more than 10 years and by 45 percent of those with more than three children.

Even when they try to limit family size, the underprivileged often do not succeed. Women interviewed in a national survey in 1960 reported that 11 percent of all their pregnancies began when they were using contraceptives to postpone or avoid pregnancy. This is more than 20 percent of all the pregnancies that occurred after the first attempts to practice family limitation.

In a surprisingly large number of couples, either the husband or the wife has had an operation to prevent further conceptions. In 1960, such operations were reported by 10 percent of all couples in the childbearing years and by 19 percent of those in which the wife was 35 to 39 years old. These operations were reported to be contraceptive in purpose by about 60 percent of all the wives. It is likely that many of these couples might have preferred a less final family-planning solution if a contraceptive method that was completely effective, inexpensive, safe, and relatively easy to use had been available.

Failure to practice family planning effectively may lead couples to resort to illegal induced abortions. We have no reliable data on the number of illegal induced abortions in the United States, but estimates range from several hundred thousand a year to more than a million a year. It is also believed that a large proportion of such abortions involve married women who do not want additional children. Failure to use effective family-planning methods is probably one of the important reasons for resorting to illegal induced abortions despite the health and moral problems that such clandestine abortions involve.

Low-income families have more children than do others, although the difference is perhaps not as great as some people believe. For example, among married women 40 to 44 years old in 1960, the average number of children ever born was 3.4 in families with incomes of less than $2,000 and 3 in families with incomes between $2,000 and $4,000, as against the average of 2.6 for all the women in this age group. The average number of children born in the two low-income groups differed by less than 1 from the average for the higher income families.

If all the families with incomes of less than $4,000 had borne on the average the same number of children as those with higher incomes, the total number of children born to all women 40 to 44 years old would have been reduced by 4 percent and the average number of children born per woman would have been reduced from 2.6 to 2.5.

Even though the larger numbers of children in low-income families have relatively little effect on the average family size, on the total number of children born, or on the U.S. birth rate, it has a profound effect on the underprivileged family itself. It is further true that the higher birth rates in the low-income groups produced over 550,000 extra children by the time the wives were 40 to 44 years old. We know from other surveys that many low-income couples did not want to have these additional children simply because the additional children undoubtedly made it more difficult to provide a decent standard of living for the whole family. The problems imposed on families by excess fertility are not diminished by the realization that such excess fertility does not greatly affect the overall fertility average.

In addition to the significant minority of couples having more children than they want, a much larger number have their children more quickly than they think desirable. In a study of more than 1,100 Detroit mothers having babies in 1961 (but no more than four children altogether), 45 percent reported having at least one of their babies sooner than they preferred. For many mothers, the failure to space their children properly creates health problems and makes it difficult to give adequate care to each child.

Consider the implications of circumstances in which every couple would conceive only children they deliberately chose to have. For the majority of American couples with at least a high school education and enjoying a comfortable income, the result would be that the births they had would be spaced more in accordance with their desires. Couples would successfully terminate their family formation with the two, three, or four children that the vast majority prefer. Such a development in the less-educated sector of our population, which contributes disproportionately to excess fertility, would greatly diminish one of the conditions that perpetuates poverty in the midst of plenty in the United States.

In the opinion of many psychologists, deformation of character and personality in children, culminating, for example, in juvenile delinquency, often results from a feeling of having been rejected by their parents. Parental attitudes and behavior that produce this feeling of rejection are much more likely when children are born as a result of unintended pregnancies.

The likelihood of a successful education is known to be less for children born to parents who themselves are uneducated. The chance for a good education for children in such underprivileged homes is made even worse by excess fertility, which reduces the care and attention each child can receive.

It is evident from this discussion that basic principles concerning family planning can and should be presented early. High school and elementary school courses in general science and biology can emphasize the interrelations between population growth and resources. In addition, biology courses and courses on marriage and family can emphasize that reliable methods of birth control are available and desirable. They can emphasize that bearing too many children represents irresponsible parenthood. Such courses can also help students by identifying the health and social agencies that will gladly supply them with specific birth-control advice consonant with their religious principles.

A recent survey by the U.S. Bureau of the Census indicates that 16 percent of first children born to white mothers are born within 8 months of marriage, and 22 percent within 9 months of marriage. Another study indicates that the rate of premarital conception is highest among women who marry at a very early age. Since the husbands of these premaritally pregnant brides are also usually young, it is evident that many children conceived by teenage brides are unwarranted and will not receive good parental care. Other Government statistics show that the mothers of approximately 41 percent of the 245,000 babies born illegitimately in the United States every year are women 19 years of age or younger. Thus a large proportion of all illegitimate children are progeny of teenage mothers. To reduce the number of such children born to teenage mothers, high school education in family planning is essential.

FAMILY-PLANNING SERVICES AND INFORMATION

The great majority of couples practicing family planning in the United States have learned about it informally from friends or relatives, by reading, or by consulting private physicians. The disadvantaged groups who do not practice family planning effectively often do not have even these informal sources of information, and seldom consult private physicians. Private clinics of the Planned Parenthood Federation, organized Catholic programs to provide information about the rhythm method, and, more recently, programs of some health and welfare agencies have made available to a relatively small number of couples useful information, supplies, and consultation, but organized programs are relatively new, are not available in many places, and do not reach large numbers of people in any State.

Organized public or private programs for family-planning services probably are unnecessary for most American couples, but they may be vitally necessary for the disadvantaged parts of the population that want to limit family size but do not have sufficient information or financial resources. For this sector of the population, organized programs can meet a pressing personal and social need. Even the more privileged parts of the population might benefit from greater public availability of services and information. In 1960, for example, 14 percent of all college-educated wives under 40 reported that their last pregnancy was unwanted.

Until relatively recently the subject of family planning was not discussed freely. Many public and private agencies that might properly provide family-planning services have avoided any activities of this kind, whether by explicit or implicit policy. While this remains true for many agencies, significant change appears to be occurring. There seems to be growing agreement that this is a legitimate and necessary area of public policy, provided there is careful respect for the rights of those who want this service and of those who do not. A recent Gallup poll shows that, irrespective of religious affiliation, about 80 percent of the population favors making family-planning information freely available.

The American Public Health Association in 1964 recognized the importance of population and family planning in relation to health, in a policy statement that reads in part:

"Federal, State, and local governments in the United States include family planning as an integral part of their health programs, make sufficient funds and personnel available for this purpose, and insure such freedom of choice of methods that persons of all faiths have equal opportunities to exercise their choice without offense to their consciences."

A number of States have begun to develop programs consistent with this policy statement, but even in these States the implementation of the program is confined to a minority of local health units. In 1964, in response to a questionnaire from a committee of the American Public Health Association:

Twenty States and the District of Columbia indicated that in one or more of their local health units family-planning clinic services were offered; 24 States and the District of Columbia indicated that they had a specific policy in their health services of referral of women in need of family-planning services to other sources providing such service; altogether 29 States and the District of Columbia either provided the service or made referrals in at least some of their local health units; in 21 States, the health services neither provided the services nor made referrals in any local units.

We do not have systematic data on policies about service or referral in other kinds of private or public welfare agencies, but the data available indicate that many such agencies have policies that prohibit either service or referral.

MEDICAL EDUCATION AND POPULATION CONTROL

The solution of the many problems created by uncontrolled human reproduction will doubtless require the devoted efforts of many individuals and institutions in our society. Among these, the medical profession seems destined to play the major role. And this is as it should be, since many methods for controlling reproduction inevitably fall within the domain of medical practice.

Are physicians adequately prepared during their education in medical schools to play an effective and enlarged role in population control? Apparently not. A close examination of medical school curriculums reveals serious deficiencies in preparing physicians to fulfill heavier responsibilities in helping to control human fertility. The Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association, in recognition of these deficiencies, is currently preparing an outline of curriculums that will serve to emphasize the teaching of human reproduction.

In many medical schools, instruction in the basic science aspects of human reproduction is erratic and often depends upon the interest of a particular person in one department. Unfortunately, there is usually no firm requirement that the subject be learned as thoroughly as such functions as respiration, circulation, and excretion. This inadequate treatment of the problems of human reproduction should be corrected. One possibility is to include a comprehensive treatment of the physiology and anatomy of human reproduction as a primary part of one of the courses offered by a basic science department, such as anatomy or physiology.

A number of clinical departments of obstetrics and gynecology have begun to set up their own science laboratories in order to give students instruction in fundamental aspects of reproduction. Apparently these clinical departments of obstetrics and gynecology are dissatisfied with the research carried on and the instruction given to students during the 2 years devoted to the basic science curriculum. Obviously, instruction in the clinical aspects of reproduction should be more closely correlated with teaching in the science departments, and there should be extensive and close communication between obstetrics and gynecology and that part of the science faculty that is concerned with the same problems of human reproduction.

There is a need to make medical students aware of their responsibility for population control. In many medical schools, obstetrics and gynecology are still regarded as technical surgical specialties and are thus placed near the end of the 4-year curriculum, after the general principles of surgical technique and internal medicine have already been learned. Placing this material so late in training is contrary to the view of many modern teachers of obstetrics and gynecology. Subjects so basic for the understanding of human experience and human suffering should appear early in the curriculum. The present location of the subjects near the end of the curriculum is neither conducive to broadening the student's view nor to encouraging recognition of the population problem as one of the primary elements of human welfare.

The total number of hours assigned to obstetrics and gynecology in many schools seems relatively small, especially if much new material is to be added. Attempts to increase allocated hours are blocked by competitive demands from other departments reinforced by the common view that the physician's principal concerns are the major infectious, neoplastic, and degenerative diseases of the heart, lung, kidney, and nervous system. A reevaluation of the medical curriculum is essential to increasing the attention given problems of maternal and perinatal mortality, abortion, sterilization, contraception, and simple principles of population change.

It is essential in these days that the physician should have adequate experience with the prescription and application of the various types of contraceptive methods. Such experience presupposes organized birth-control clinics and an acceptance of family-planning discussion as a routine part of postdelivery visits in university teaching hospitals. Instruction in the use of these various tools and techniques in medicine in the past was undoubtedly hampered by lack of agreement as to the physician's responsibility in family planning. This is partly due to genuine uncertainty in the physician's mind as to what society expects of him and what is legally acceptable. At the same time there is a general awareness of the problem among obstetricians and, at least for those working in large city hospitals, real interest and considerable concern.

It is important that the genito-urinary specialists in the United States take an increased interest in the population problem. Surgical sterilization of the male, though easier and cheaper than sterilization of the female, is rather rare and is believed by some urologists to carry a great legal risk. Nevertheless, the entire subject of family planning should be an active concern of these specialists, for they can play a role of great importance in the control of human fertility.

There are, however, serious problems that the medical profession and related groups must thoroughly discuss before strong recommendations can be made. These concern such questions as whether to refuse surgical sterilization even if requested and, on the other hand, whether to suggest such procedures even though the patient does not raise the subject. We feel that after delivery all patients should be offered birth-control advice as their right, and physicians must be trained adequately if they are to supply the needed information.

The instruction of medical students in birth-control techniques should be extended to include the specialists and the residents in obstetrics and gynecology. The success of such a program of instruction will depend on the existence of a birth-control clinic or a postdelivery routine that includes family-planning advice. The techniques of prescription and application of birth-control measures are themselves easily and quickly learned by anyone spending the 3 years required to become a specialist in obstetrics and gynecology.

Although serious deficiencies now exist in training medical students and physicians in the problems of human reproduction and in the control of conception, the medical profession is beginning to assume greater responsibility for population control and to provide positive leadership in solving the various problems related to human reproduction. In 1964, the American Medical Association discarded its previous attitude of neutrality on the subject of population control and adopted an enlightened and forthright statement of policy on human reproduction, including family planning. The AMA has summarized its position in the following four points:

"1. An intelligent recognition that the problems that relate to human reproduction, including the need for population control, are more than a matter of responsible parenthood; they are a matter of responsible medical practice.

"2. The medical profession should accept a major responsibility in matters related to human reproduction as they affect the total population and the individual family.

"3. In discharging this responsibility, physicians must be prepared to provide counsel and guidance when the needs of their patients require it, or refer the patients to appropriate persons.

"4. The AMA shall take the responsibility for disseminating information to physicians on all phases of human reproduction, including sexual behavior by whatever means are appropriate."

In line with this last point, the AMA will prepare and distribute to physicians a handbook on all phases, methods, and aspects of reproduction control. This handbook will help to implement the new policy of the AMA that "the prescription of child-spacing measures should be made available to all patients who require them, consistent with their creed and mores, whether they obtain their medical care through private physicians or tax- or community-supported health services."

THE ROLE OF MEDICAL AND PUBLIC HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS

Medical and public health organizations have already had experience in cooperating in "maternal and child health programs" and it seems desirable that birth-control services should be the responsibility of the same groups and should be similarly managed. In a given region, the scope of the activities of the public health department, as the immediate manager of maternal-welfare programs, seems inversely proportional to the level of care provided by maternity hospitals. In most parts of the United States the major role of health departments in maternal welfare seems to be as keeper of the records, inspector of facilities, and maintainer of standards. Only in certain areas and under certain circumstances, where hospital facilities are inadequate or inaccessible, does the health department step in and operate extramural pregnancy and postdelivery clinics. In rural areas and in underdeveloped countries, on the other hand, the active role of health department officials may be much greater.

One critical time at which advice can easily be given and most readily accepted is and will remain the last few months of the first pregnancy and the first weeks immediately following birth. Preliminary instruction can readily be added to the teaching program in "mothers' classes" during pregnancy. A reminder should be offered while the patient is in the hospital and definitive instructions supplied at the time of the postdelivery visit. Since the great majority of American women do give birth in hospitals, this procedure would permit systematic contact with virtually the entire population appearing at the birth of the first child. The advice given during a first pregnancy can be reiterated during subsequent ones. The concept of maternal and family welfare promotion through regular pregnancy and postdelivery visits is an article of faith in both the public health and obstetrical professions. The need is to add family planning as an integral routine part of such welfare programs.

The physician should supply this service. Public health workers should see to it that such services are in fact provided and, further, should add this service to health department pregnancy and postdelivery clinics. Family-planning discussion and instructions must be regarded as an essential part of all pregnancy and postdelivery care; birth-control advice must be included.

The independent birth-control clinic unassociated with a maternity hospital has an important role to play. There are many married women who need a source of gynecological information at times other than during pregnancy or at the birth of a child. This is true for women about to be married as well as for those already married who may be dissatisfied with or apprehensive about the methods of birth control they are currently using. There must be additional, independent sources of information on family planning, especially for those who have delivered in maternity hospitals that do not offer family-planning service. Such additional sources of information should be provided in part by clinics of hospital gynecological and obstetrical divisions. Extramural clinics of health departments may also be necessary for some years to come.

CONCLUSIONS

The freedom to limit family size to the number of children wanted when they are wanted is, in our view, a basic human right. The evidence cited in this report shows clearly that most Americans of higher income and better education exercise this right as a matter of course, but that many of the poor and uneducated are in effect deprived of the right. No family should be fated through poverty or ignorance to have children they do not want and cannot properly care for. Responsible parenthood requires that couples of all social strata have the ability and means to limit births when they wish to do so, in accordance with their personal convictions. In short, this basic freedom for the individual family should be made effective throughout American society.

We are glad to note several important developments in this field since the Academy's 1963 report. The President's pledge in his state of the Union message, that he "will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources," was an enlightened and statesmanlike response to the present situation. The new policy of the Agency for International Development to provide assistance in family planning at the request of foreign governments is a welcome step forward. The recent statement of the American Medical Association, quoted above, shows that the leaders of the medical profession recognize the broad responsibilities that American physicians share in educating their patients in fertility control. The 1964 statement of the American Public Health Association is another sign of the emerging trend toward fuller and more open attention to the problem. Moreover, several public health schools have developed substantial programs in population problems in the past 2 years, and have already assumed places of leadership both here and abroad.

The 1963 report of the Academy concentrated on the population problems of the world. In this report we have turned to domestic concerns in this field. In this connection we make recommendations concerning three major spheres of activity: research, education and training, and services. In our view, these are of the most critical importance in connection with the population situation now facing the United States, and the problems and opportunities set forth in this report.

RESEARCH

1. Although substantial advances have been made since our 1963 report, there is still a great deal to be done in order to achieve a satisfactory state of knowledge in this field. We therefore urge all appropriate institutions, both private and governmental, to expand their efforts in the whole range of disciplines and professions that contribute to knowledge of population matters, including demography, economics, and other social sciences as well as biology, medicine, and public health. Federal and private agencies should allocate additional funds for studies that promise to illuminate the nature of population changes and that will help in providing solutions for current problems.

2. Basic research into reproductive physiology should receive increasing support not only for its general contribution to man's knowledge of his own reproduction, but also in order to provide us with new and better methods for controlling fertility. In addition, systematic efforts to assess the effectiveness and acceptability of the various contraceptive procedures that are now available should be supported.

3. Many problems relating to the social, psychological, and economic aspects of family planning require further investigation. For example, experimental programs to bring information and services about family planning to different groups need to be systematically developed and tested in order to find the most efficient procedures; collection of national data at regular intervals on family size, family-planning practices and related attitudes is needed to supplement other data of the same type; induced abortions in this country, though illegal, are not insignificant in number, but we have insufficient information about their incidence in different social groups, their cost in health and welfare, and the possibility of reducing them effectively; the economic consequences of spacing births and of establishing families of different sizes call for intensive inquiry.

These are only illustrations of the kinds of subjects that require further research by qualified specialists. Interest in population problems has grown sharply in recent years. It is important that knowledge keep pace with new developments so that training and service programs can be firmly based in sound knowledge. The costs are not great but the potential consequences are.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Expansion of the scale and content of instruction in many relevant disciplines and skills should be accelerated to provide the basis for meeting population problems. Among the necessary educational changes are:

1. Medical and health institutions should provide training for all students in the basic aspects of human reproduction. Since in medical practice and in public health programs family-planning discussion and instruction should be considered an essential

part of prenatal and postnatal care, the clinical aspects of fertility control should be an integral part of medical education.

2. Population studies should be more prominent in the professional training of biologists, statisticians, economists, sociologists, and psychologists, at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels.

3. A specific need for expanded training noted in the 1963 report is to provide more and better-qualified family-planning administrators. The recommendation made there had its origin in the problems of world population growth. The world shortage of such persons remains, although there has been some progress in initiating and expanding educational programs in the United States for foreign personnel. An added reason for expanding this effort is to train administrators for work in the United States.

4. The widespread better understanding of problems caused by excess population growth and irresponsible parenthood would surely make their solution easier and more likely; and every means of promoting better understanding should be employed. Among these are the inclusion of population studies and the principles of responsible parenthood in the curriculums of colleges, universities, and secondary schools, and continued discussion in magazines, the daily press, and on radio and television.

SERVICES

Action by private and public agencies to promote individual or general welfare should be designed to help Americans have only the children they want.

1. Family planning should be an integral part of public health programs and of individual medical care. Specifically, family-planning discussion and instruction should be regarded as an essential feature of prenatal and postnatal care, and of maternal-welfare programs.

2. Nonmedical agencies (private and public) responsible for welfare services should include instruction in effective family planning as an essential component of their welfare programs.

The required expansion of these activities gives critical importance to increasing the pace of training to provide the new skills and expanded staff that will be needed.

In all three spheres—research, education and training, and services—mentioned in the paragraphs above, the Federal Government has increasing responsibility. The committee recommends, therefore, that the Federal Government find a mechanism for facilitating as promptly as possible our programs in population research, education, and public service, perhaps by the appointment of a person at a high national level with specific responsibility for leadership in implementing population programs.

NEWS FROM NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES-NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

WASHINGTON.—An overwhelming majority of American couples approve and practice family planning. Nevertheless, the growth of U.S. population is a serious obstacle to the realization of many goals of society and puts the Nation's general prosperity out of the reach of millions of its citizens.

This circumstance has led the Committee on Population of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council to recommend immediate attention by governmental and private organizations and civic leaders to two basic elements of the population problem in the United States: (1) the steady and persistent increases in population upon which the postwar surge in birth rate has been superimposed, and (2) the prevailing high fertility among low-income groups in this country.

In a report issued today on "The Growth of U.S. Population," the committee outlines programs of research, education, and training, and public services related to family planning, as a basis for making "the freedom to limit family size to the number of children wanted when they are wanted * * * effective throughout American society."

Historical growth of the population of the United States

Year	Population (millions)	Percent increase since preceding census
1790	3.9	
1800	5.3	35.1
1810	7.2	36.4
1820	9.6	33.1
1830	12.9	33.5
1840	17.1	32.7
1850	23.2	35.9
1860	31.4	35.6
1870	39.8	26.6
1880	50.2	26.0
1890	62.9	25.5
1900	76.0	20.7
1910	91.9	21.0
1920	105.7	14.9
1930	122.8	16.1
1940	131.7	7.2
1950	150.7	14.5
1960	179.3	19.0

"It is clear," the report states, "that rapid population growth will create difficulties in reaching America's noble goals of optimum education for all, universal abundance, enriched leisure, equal opportunity, quality, beauty, and creativity."

An introductory statement by Dr. Frederick Seitz, President of the Academy, points out that although the problems relating to the size and growth of U.S. population are not the same as for other parts of the world, particularly the less-developed countries, "they are nonetheless critical."

The report cautions further that while the rate of natural population increase in the United States is well below that of most developing countries, and slackening at the moment rather than accelerating as in many of those countries, if present fertility and mortality trends persist, "In the very long run, continued growth of the U.S. population would first become intolerable and then physically impossible."

Of more immediate concern, the report cites the effects of rapid population growth on overcrowded schools and colleges, continuing unemployment, and such urban problems as slums, delinquency, pollution, and traffic congestion, as well as the growing drain upon outdoor recreation facilities, nonrenewable resources, and living space.

The committee's 25-page statement on population growth in the United States, which follows up a 1963 report by the Academy's Committee on Science and Public Policy on World Population Problems, indicates that while most Americans of higher income and better education exercise the basic freedom to limit the size of their families "as a matter of course," many of the poor and uneducated are, in effect, deprived of this right.

In the population as a whole, for example, the proportion of couples who have not used and do not expect to use contraception is estimated from surveys to be about 14 percent. Among groups of below-average income and education, however, the proportion ranges up to 43 percent.

"No family should be fated through poverty or ignorance to have children they do not want and cannot care for," the report states. "Responsible parenthood requires that couples of all social strata have the ability and means to limit births when they wish to do so, in accordance with their personal convictions."

In his preface to the report, Dr. William D. McElroy, professor of biology at the Johns Hopkins University and chairman of the Academy-Research Council's Committee on Population, points out that while "the high birth rate among the impoverished does not constitute a major threat to overall national prosperity, it is one of the factors that puts that prosperity out of reach of millions of our citizens.

"Indeed, the burden of unwanted children among impoverished and uneducated mothers in the United States is much like that experienced by mothers in underdeveloped countries." Dr. McElroy adds that: "Fertility regulation is both a social and technical problem. The way in which people in various groups in the United States approach the problem of limiting family size will be determined by religious customs, social mores, and economic conditions. Our research effort, therefore, must be directed toward providing an adequate variety of methods and procedures that will encourage universal acceptance of the desirability of planning and controlling family size. Science and technology can and will provide greater knowledge of reproductive processes, and will develop simple, acceptable techniques for controlling reproduction. Scientific studies may also be made of the social, psychological, and economic aspects of family planning among different groups in our society, and also of the most effective means by which family planning services can be made available. But science, despite popular notions, is not a panacea; it is a tool which wise and dedicated people can use for the betterment of mankind."

The postwar surge in births in the United States, which has occurred in spite of a steady increase in the proportion of couples using contraception, is attributed in the report to two factors: (1) The apparent preference among couples who consciously choose the number of children they will have for moderate-size families rather than small ones, the latter being the case in the 1920's and 1930's; and (2) the lack of effective limitation of family size among the underprivileged groups.

Nevertheless, there seems little doubt that the dominant factor has been the preference for larger families, according to the committee. "The importance of high fertility among the underprivileged lies not so much in its contribution to the national birthrate (the average number of children born in low-income groups was shown in 1960 to differ by less than 1 from the average for higher income families) as in the difficulties that excessive fertility imposes on the impoverished themselves."

Further, the realization that excess fertility among low-income groups does not greatly affect the overall average does not diminish the hardships for the significant minority of couples who have more children than they want, and also for the much larger number who have children more quickly than they think desirable, it is noted.

The report points out that a circumstance in which every couple would conceive only children they deliberately choose to have, terminating their family formation with the two, three, or four children that the vast majority prefer, "would greatly diminish one of the conditions that perpetuates poverty in the midst of plenty in the United States."

In the opinion of many psychologists, it is noted, deformation of character and personality in children, culminating, for example, in juvenile delinquency, often results from a feeling of having been rejected by their parents. Parental attitudes and behavior that produce this feeling are much more likely when children are born as a result of unintended pregnancies.

To make more effective the basic freedom of individual families to determine the number of children they will have, the Committee urges: (1) more widespread availability of family-planning services and information through private and public agencies; (2) more effective preparation of physicians to assume responsibilities for population control, through reevaluation of medical school training in obstetrics and gynecology and greater attention to curriculums to such problems as maternal and perinatal mortality, abortion, sterilization and contraception, and to principles of population change; and (3) extension of maternal and child health programs of local public health departments to include birth control services.

In research, the Committee calls for an expansion of effort in the whole range of disciplines and professions that contribute to knowledge of population matters, including demography, economics, and other social sciences, as well as biology, medicine, and public health.

It cites a particular need for basic research into reproductive physiology, and systematic efforts to assess the effectivenes and acceptability of the various contraceptive procedures that are now available.

In its recomendations on education and training, the Committee notes, among other needs, a specific need for more and better qualified family-planning administrators. In the area of public understanding, it urges the inclusion of population studies and the principles of responsible parenthood in the curriculums of colleges, universities, and secondary schools, and continued discussion in magazines, the daily press, and on radio and television.

Emphasizing the "increasing responsibility" of the Federal Government in all three areas of its recomendations—research, education and training, and public services—the Committee urges that the Government facilitate U.S. programs in these areas as promptly as possible, "perhaps by the appointment of a person at a high national level with specific responsibility for leadership in implementing population programs."

Members of the Academy-Research Council Committee on Population, in addition to Dr. McElroy, are: Bernard Berelson, the Population Council; Ansley Coale, Princeton University; Benedict J. Duffy, Jr., Georgetown University; Karl Folkers, Stanford Research Institute; Ronald Freedman, University of Michigan; Seymour Kety, National Institute of Mental Health; Clement L. Markert, the Johns Hopkins University; John C. Snyder, Harvard School of Public Health; and Howard C. Taylor, Columbia University. Robert E. Green of the Academy staff serves the Committee as Executive Secretary.

The present study was supported by the Population Council.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 25, 1965]

Right To Set Family Size Seen Denied

(By Jean M. White)

The "basic human right" of freedom to limit family size is being denied to many of the Nation's poor, who thus are forced to bear a heavy burden of unwanted children.

This is one of the conclusions of a report released yesterday by a committee of the National Academy of Sciences.

The higher birth rate among the impoverished, the study emphasizes, is one factor that "perpetuates poverty in the midst of plenty" and puts the Nation's general prosperity out of the reach of millions of its citizens.

NEED FOR PROMPT ACTION

The Committee says the Federal Government must take "increasing responsibility" for research, education, and public services in the field of family planning. The need is for prompt action, the report stresses, and may call for the appointment of a top-level official to head up population programs.

Dr. William D. McElroy, professor of biology at Johns Hopkins University, was Chairman of the Committee that drew up the 25-page report on "The Growth of U.S. Population." It is a sequel to a 1963 report on world population problems.

"No family should be fated through poverty or ignorance to have children they do not want and cannot properly care for," the Committee emphasizes in its conclusions.

The evidence is that low-income, low-education families do not want more children than do families with higher incomes and education, the report notes. Rather, it says, they have more children simply because they do not have the information or resources to control the size of their families.

TO HELP FAMILIES CHOOSE

To help insure that all individual families will have the freedom to choose family size, the Academy Committee made these recommendations:

Family planning should be an integral part of public health programs and individual medical care. Birth control advice should routinely be included in prenatal and postnatal care from the birth of the first child.

Both private and public welfare agencies should offer instruction in effective family planning.

Better training should be given physicians to advise patients on birth control methods.

Schools and colleges should teach principles of family planning and responsible parenthood. They also can help guide students to agencies to supply them with birth control information that does not conflict with their religious beliefs. The instruction must come early, the report emphasizes, because two out of five illegitimate babies are born to women 19 or younger.

In an introductory statement to the report, Frederick Seitz, Academy president, emphasizes that population problems in the United States may not be the same as in less-developed countries, but are "nonetheless critical."

Actually, the rate of natural population increase in the United States is well below that of the developing countries and has slackened recently.

But the growth, the report emphasizes, poses serious obstacles to many goals of society and in the very long run will become "intolerable and then physically impossible" on the crowded earth.

Actually the larger number of children in low-income families has relatively little effect on the national birth rate—the average number of chidren among the poor has been estimated at less than one above that for higher income families. The steady population rise is due more to a conscious preference for larger families.

But, in human terms, the Committee sees a dragging effect on the disadvantaged family already having difficulty providing a decent living.

SOCIAL SECURITY BILL AMENDMENTS APPROVED BY SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a press release announcing the amendments to the social security bill, H.R. 6675, approved today by the Senate Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

May 25, 1960.

The chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, the Honorable Harry F. Byrd, today announced the following action taken by the Senate Committee on Finance:

Approved nomination of Wilbur J. Cohen, of Michigan, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Approved and ordered reported without amendment the bill H.R. 7597 authorizing the Veterans' Administration to transfer up to $1,650,000 from the veterans special term insurance fund to establish the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund in the Treasury authorized last Congress for the benefit of certain disabled veterans. Repayment is to be made to the Treasury with interest.

Approved the following amendments to the social security bill H.R. 6675:

Amends bill so as to extend basic hospital insurance coverage under the transitional provisions for uninsured persons to all Federal employees or retired Federal employees over age 65 who are not covered under the Federal Employees Health Benfits Act of 1959 (still excluded would be those persons who are actually covered under such program).

Deletion of that provision of the House bill which would have limited deduction for medical expenses of taxpayers age 65 and over to amounts in excess of 3 percent of their adjusted gross income (1 percent in the case of medicine and drugs). Under the committee decision, these taxpayers will continue to deduct medical expenses without reference to their incomes.

Deletion of House provision which would have allowed all taxpayers to deduct one-half of the cost of medical care insurance (up to maximum deduction of $250) without regard to the 3-percent limit. Under this committee decision the entire medical care insurance premium will continue to be treated as a medical expense.

The committee will continue with the consideration of H.R. 6675 at the next executive session called by the chairman, the date depending on whether the Senate will be called into morning session to complete action on the voting rights bill.

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 26, 1965, at 9 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 25 (legislative day of May 24), 1965:

Department of the Army

W. Brewster Kopp, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice Edmund T. Pratt, Jr., resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 25 (legislative day of May 24), 1965:

Department of Commerce

Alan S. Boyd, of Florida, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

Civil Aeronautics Board

Charles S. Murphy, of Maryland, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1968.

In the Diplomatic and Foreign Service

The nominations beginning Stanley S. Carpenter to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, and ending Michael G. Wygant to be a Foreign Service officer of class 6, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 1965; and

The nominations beginning Barney B. Taylor to be a consul general of the United

States of America, and ending Elwin T. Vangas to be a consul of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 10, 1965.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture preceding the prayer:

Ephesians 5: 8: *Now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light.*

Almighty God, as we turn to Thee in prayer, we beseech Thee that we may have the sincerity of a true faith and the fidelity of a loving spirit and be partners of the eternal Christ.

Grant that we may enter with Him in the joys that will cheer us and the trials that will teach us to put our trust in Thee.

Inspire us to yield our spirit eagerly to the guidance of Thy spirit that it may be touched to finer issues and trained for that higher service which always carries on faithfully and without fear or foreboding.

Help us to give a more far-reaching and wider expansion to the hopes of humanity, which our finite minds cannot explain and which are awed by a love and light which our hearts cannot fathom or comprehend.

Hear us in His name in whom Thy life and love were humanized that we might see Thy purpose and meaning. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of the Jefferson Construction Co.;

H.R. 1870. An act for the relief of Edward G. Morhauser;

H.R. 2139. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes;

H.R. 2354. An act for the relief of William L. Chatelain, U.S. Navy, retired;

H.R. 3995. An act to transfer certain functions of the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6497. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States; and

H.R. 8122. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 821. An act for the relief of the town of Kure Beach. N.C.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 125. An act for the relief of Armando S. Arguilles;

S. 133. An act for the relief of Faustino G. Dumaplin, Jr.;

S. 313. An act relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

S. 402. An act for the relief of Oh Wha Ja (Penny Korleen Doughty);

S. 409. An act for the relief of Betty Tin-Sang Chan Cho;

S. 442. An act for the relief of Carleen Coen;

S. 449. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Bialoglowski;

S. 450. An act for the relief of William John Campbell McCaughey;

S. 469. An act for the relief of Timoteo A. Tuazon;

S. 516. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes", approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, to provide that such Commission shall not terminate prior to December 31, 1966, and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution;

S. 579. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire;

S. 582. An act for the relief of Aleksandr Kaznacheev;

S. 584. An act for the relief of Ming Chup Chau;

S. 585. An act for the relief of Santiago Woo and Morjin Chee de Woo;

S. 586. An act for the relief of Maria Tsilis;

S. 616. An act for the relief of Miss Choun Seem Kim;

S. 826. An act for the relief of Har Gobind Khorana;

S. 1039. An act for the relief of Andreina Viselli;

S. 1040. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Rafala Monarca;

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jacobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe, and Ramon Jacobe;

S. 1084. An act for the relief of Shu Hsien Chang;

S. 1103. An act for the relief of Kathryn Choi Ast;

S. 1104. An act for the relief of Mirhan Gazarian;

S. 1138. An act for the relief of Lt. Robert C. Gibson;

S. 1196. An act for the relief of Wright G. James;

S. 1197. An act for the relief of Angelino Martino;

S. 1209. An act for the relief of Specialist Manuel D. Racelis;

S. 1388. An act for the relief of David Lee Bogue;

S. 1390. An act for the relief of Rocky River Co. and Macy Land Corp.;

S. 1405. An act for the relief of Jozsef Pozsonyi and his wife, Agnes Pozsonyi, and their minor child, Ildiko Pozsonyi;

S. 1468. An act for the relief of Dorothy Eyre;

S. 1498. An act for the relief of Nikolai Artamonov; and

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution establishing the Commission on Art and Antiques of the Capitol, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 339. An act to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that Senate Resolution 102, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965, transmitted to Congress by the President on March 25, 1965, failed in passage.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS—"OVERSEAS PROGRAMS OF PRIVATE NONPROFIT AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONS"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 354, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 354

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs one thousand eight hundred additional copies of the report of that committee entitled "Overseas Programs of Private Nonprofit American Organizations."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 108]

Andrews, George W.
Ashbrook
Bandstra
Berry
Bonner
Brown, Ohio
Burton, Calif.
Carter
Chelf
Clawson, Del
Daddario
Dulski
Flynt
Gilligan
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Hungate
Ichord
Lennon
Macdonald
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Pool
Powell
Price
Resnick
Reuss
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stubblefield
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis
Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the

State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 7750, with Mr. LANDRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through the first section of the bill ending on line 4, page 1. If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART I

Chapter 1—Policy

> SEC. 101. Section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the statement of policy, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:
>
> "It is the sense of the Congress that assistance under this or any other Act to any foreign country which hereafter permits, or fails to take adequate measures to prevent, the damage or destruction by mob action of United States property within such country, should be terminated and should not be resumed until the President determines that appropriate measures have been taken by such country to prevent a recurrence thereof."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 2, line 2, after "prevent" insert "personal injury to, unlawful imprisonment or detention or loss of life of United States citizens".

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, on reading this bill, I find on page 2 there is the provision that it is the sense of Congress that assistance to any foreign country shall terminate which hereafter permits, or fails to take adequate measures to prevent the damage or destruction of U.S. property within such country by mob action. The section further states that U.S. aid should not be resumed until the President determines appropriate measures have been taken by such country to prevent a recurrence of certain acts against U.S. property. These acts, as the bill is now written, apply to damage or destruction by mob action of U.S. property, within that country. But the section does not protect the U.S. citizens themselves.

What my amendment does is this. It says that this section also will apply to the persons of U.S. citizens. This is how it applies to the persons. I put in the words "to prevent personal injury to, unlawful imprisonment or detention or loss of life, of U.S. citizens."

Therefore, the section will now read both as to the U.S. property damage as well as to the persons and rights of U.S. citizens. Under my amendment, the section will now read this way:

> It is the sense of the Congress that assistance under this or any other Act to any foreign country which hereafter permits, or fails to take adequate measures to prevent personal injury to, unlawful imprisonment or detention or loss of life of United States citizens and the damage or destruction by mob action of United States property within such country, should be terminated and should not be resumed until the President determines that appropriate measures have been taken by such country to prevent a recurrence thereof."

Now what often happens is this. Our U.S. citizens are detained without cause and they are imprisoned or held incommunicado. This has occurred many times. My amendment states that the President then can cancel aid or suspend the aid of a recipient country until the releases of detained U.S. citizens are made and until the President determines that proper measures have been taken by that country to protect the lives as well as property of U.S. citizens. I think Congress should provide for such cases that involve personal injury or unlawful imprisonment or detention or loss of life of U.S. citizens as well as provisions applying to damage to property. The lives, liberties, and security of U.S. citizens in every country wherever they might be, are certainly more important than damage to U.S. property, which certainly should be protected, too.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind concerning the intentions of the gentleman, in offering the amendment to the bill. His intentions are good. He is seeking to protect as many of our citizens and as much of our property as possible.

However, I fear the gentleman would go just a little too far, when he talks about cutting off aid for unlawful arrests and imprisonment. Who is to determine what is unlawful and what is not unlawful?

I do not believe it is our intention, in amending the original law, which provides that in the event of destruction of embassies or property of the United States the President should have the right to cut off aid, to go that far.

When it is said, in the event an individual is unlawfully arrested, aid will be cut off, that is going a little too far. In order to determine whether there is an unlawful arrest it is necessary to have a trial and to have appeals and so on. Heaven alone knows where one will wind up.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. We have had many U.S. cases of our citizens being detained and arrested, and injured abroad. I can point out two specific cases recently of British citizens who were aircraft pilots. They were in two African countries. They were stoned. They were held incommunicado. The consuls and ambassadors were denied access to them, and there had been no trial.

If we are going to protect U.S. property and give a right to the President to determine whether aid shall be given, because of damage to property, how much more important is it to protect U.S. citizens from false arrest, from imprisonment, and from being held incommunicado. One does not need a trial. The President will determine when this situation shall exist in each recipient country.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. It is basic and fundamental in this legislation that the President has the right at any time, whether we suggest it in a preamble or not. The President has a right to discontinue aid. He can do that at any time he pleases. That is inherent in the legislation.

When we stretch this too far, it seems to me perhaps we may not attain the end we seek to attain.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If it is the case that the President has the power to terminate aid anyhow, in any event, including actions with respect to property, why is there a provision only for property and not with respect to liberty and human life as well? If it is necessary to have a provision for property, of course it is necessary to have a provision with respect to human life and liberty, against unlawful detention of our U.S. citizens without access by our Ambassadors or consuls.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I do not wish to labor the question too long. There was a tremendous furor as a result of the destruction of the Embassy in Egypt. That was wrong. The same thing happened in Indonesia. That was wrong.

To overcome those situations, we inserted the language as a warning to the people who are beneficiaries of our aid that they had better be careful or otherwise they will lose our assistance.

When we extend this to a situation which might become very difficult to interpret, I feel we are touching dangerous ground. If our citizens are held incommunicado, after the diplomatic conversations—and it appears as though the government which is the recipient of our aid insists upon refusing to release those individuals, I believe we can do quite a good deal if we wish to. Things have been done heretofore in connection with situations of that type, even going beyond the refusal of aid.

I do not believe that situation has application here. I believe it would cause more harm than do good, although I can appreciate the intentions of the gentleman, which I consider to be highly appropriate.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If the purpose of the provision is to give notice that if these countries permit damage to U.S. property, then aid will be terminated or suspended, do you not think it is just as wise that if our citizens are hurt, killed, or held incommunicado the same suspension of U.S. aid will be done?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, why do we have to write into any law the basic policy that we will take action when a U.S. citizen is killed? There is no doubt on this point. This amendment was designed solely to protect American property overseas. It is an important amendment. The danger here is if we adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we are going to change emphasis from the protection of property and confuse what we are talking about. We will never be complacent about the loss of life. The danger is that there is some complacency about destroying our property. This amendment, in my opinion, destroys the effectiveness of the provision in the bill, which is designed to protect our embassies against mob violence. The committee spent a long time on this amendment. It is the same amendment that is incorporated in the bill reported by the Senate and will meet no opposition in conference. The gentleman's amendment goes entirely too far, I think.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman. Is it not true we have not had any particular problem except in certain isolated instances with respect to personnel?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] mentioned two British pilots who it turned out were not U.S. citizens. I do not know why we should be writing legislation on the floor of the House here to protect citizens of other countries.

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentleman will yield further, is it not also true our own Government acted promptly, with dispatch and firmness, wherever we had a problem arising involving American citizens?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. Is it not true that the reason for this amendment in the bill dealing with property is because we have run across a well-organized plan in which the Communists are involved, and we are trying to advise recipient governments that they cannot tacitly or indirectly let Communists agitate and tear up American property and still expect to get some aid under this bill. That is the purpose of this amendment, is it not?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, it is.

Mr. FASCELL. And that is the difference between trying to protect property and American life.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If we are giving the Communists notice that the aid might be terminated if they tear up property, how much better would it be to give the notice likewise that if they damage or injure our citizens and imprison them or hold them incommunicado or if they cause the loss of life of U.S. citizens, then we give them notice also that the aid may be terminated. I feel if you do it just on property, it leaves out the matter of human life. I might say to you I want prompt action on both the matter of lives and property, and if we are going to say it with respect to property, we should most certainly say it with respect to U.S. life as well.

Mr. MORGAN. Again I say to the gentleman—why do we have to write it into this bill? The President certainly has the authority, the desire, and the determination to protect any American life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter 2—Development assistance

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 8, insert the following:

"Title I—Development Loan Fund

"SEC. 102. Title I of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to development loans, is amended as follows:

"'(a) Amend section 202(a) by striking out "and $1,500,000,000 for each of the next two fiscal years, which sums shall remain available until expended: *Provided,* That any unappropriated portion of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any such fiscal year may be appropriated in any subsequent fiscal year during the above period in addition to the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such subsequent fiscal year: *Provided further,"* and substitute the following: "$1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1965, and $649,292,000 for the fiscal year 1966, which sums shall remain available until expended: *Provided"* '."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to existing law which, if adopted, would reduce the amount of this authorization bill by $130,958,000; essentially a reduction of $131 million in the Development Loan Fund. It may properly be asked how I arrived at that figure. The figure of $130,958,000 is the total amount expected to be in the pipeline, as of June 30 of this year, for the following countries: United Arab Republic, Haiti, Cambodia, Indonesia, Algeria, Ghana, and Congo—Brazzaville.

I say that if you take the amount expected to be in the pipeline at the end of this fiscal year for each of those countries and total them you reach a figure just short of $131 million which my amendment would take from the Development Loan Fund.

Not all of this pipeline money, not all of the money expected to be in the pipeline is development loan money. Over $100 million is. The rest of it is in certain other funds, such as supporting assistance, contingency fund, and other programs.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to make any reduction in the dollar value of this bill, if we are to say to certain countries which have repeatedly flaunted us and our assistance that we do not like that, that we resent their attitudes, then here is the way to do it.

Let me read to the Committee a copy of a letter that was printed in Time magazine dated May 21. It is signed Norodom Sihanouk, Chief of State, Phnom Penh, Cambodia. I shall read that letter published in Time magazine.

> SIR: As an anti-American, I thank you for your rotten article devoted to my person in your issue of May 7. Your insult to a head of state and your odious lies dishonor not only your magazine but also your nation.
>
> I assure you that I would much prefer to die from the blows of the Communists (who are certainly hostile to royalty, but who have no contempt for us) than capitulate before you, who symbolize the worst in humanity; i.e., racism, discrimination, injustice, death, and lies.
>
> (Signed) NORODOM SIHANOUK,
> *Chief of State, Phnom Penh, Cambodia.*

Cambodia is one of the countries that would be affected if my amendment is adopted.

Mr. Chairman, programs for certain of these countries are to be funded under this year's authorization bill. The President does have certain elasticity. Of course, he also has the contingency fund.

Mr. Chairman, all I hope to do through my amendment is to cut off the pipeline.

Mr. Chairman, I must point out to the Members of the Committee that that is my intent, but we cannot be certain that by naming countries specifically they will be denied loans under this Development Loan Fund. I am predicating it upon the basis that the Development Loan Fund is one sum of money. Even if we adopt this amendment, I must say in candor to the Members of the Committee that while I speak as I do, and others may speak as they do, the administration is not bound to cut it from these countries I have named.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, if we use this yardstick in recommending the reduction in dollars, which we do, that the administration would respect what we are trying to do and would act accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, some might say that certain portions of this have already been earmarked, and that is also true. But, against some of those earmarkings there has been little disbursement or there has been very little action of any kind in some cases since 1963 and in many cases since 1962. In one instance, one portion of this deals with an allocation of $55 million for a smelter which, in all probability, will never be financed under the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. Chairman, my point is that we can indicate our strong feelings with respect to those nations that turn from us and in the direction of communism, or turn from us and in the direction of other great powers. We can indicate that we strongly disapprove of that. We can reduce the dollar amount of this bill by almost $131 million and, at the same time for those who favor the legislation, it would not be a blow which would completely wipe it out.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman from Indiana has mentioned a $55 million loan that we made for a smelter. I presume he is referring to the loan agreement with Ghana.

Is it not true that this loan was only dated June 1962, just over two years ago, and is a 50-percent matching loan undertaken with the Export-Import Bank for a $110 million smelter, and that payments thereon were not to begin until January 1965?

Mr. ADAIR. But the point is that the funds have not been drawn against, or if they have been, they have been drawn against in a very small amount. My assumption is, I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, that I personally doubt that that smelter is ever built; at least, built under these financing arrangements.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, payments under the Export-Import Bank part of the loan have started in January of this year. Is it not also true that the loan cannot be drawn down until the product is finished and until it is delivered?

Mr. ADAIR. Drawing against loan is contingent upon the agreement under which the loan is made. There are different types of loan agreements and they specify when the drawings may be made.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, payment is made upon delivery is it not?

Mr. ADAIR. In some cases that is correct; in others, before.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

The whole basis of the development loan was an agreement reached by this House as an answer to the feeling against backdoor spending some 4 years ago. As a result of our rejecting that type of financing, this authorization, this 5-year authorization, was entered into and agreed to by both sides.

This particular section we are now talking about, the development loan section, terminates this year, and while it is true there have been some abuses, and there have been some changes today and since 4 years ago, nevertheless the agreements that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] refers to are agreements that are in the pipeline as a result of contracts entered into several years ago. There is no assistance in this year's program to Cambodia. If we have heard objection to this type of financing, the committee can make our objections effectual at the next go-around of the bill. However, since this has been entered into it does involve long-range commitments. These commitments were conditioned upon the fact that we did not need backdoor spending.

I might say that the people on this side and people on that side of the aisle objected to backdoor spending 4 years ago. This agreement is running out, and I think it would be inequitable and wrong for us to terminate or go back on our word in the last year of the authorization which this body advocated.

It may well be that we should take the action that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] mentioned, and I concur with him and agree with him on the item of Cambodia; but the fact of the matter is this House has given its word and its authorization that we would see these agreements through. The so-called pipeline involves agreements and contracts entered into previously. There have been no new ones entered into with Cambodia either this year or last year. To terminate and go back on our word now would be a breach of faith on something the House has already agreed to—it would not affect Cambodia but it would affect and drastically hurt many of our allies who are complying with their part of the agreements. Adoption of this amendment would seriously impair the credibility of the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I heard the gentleman from Indiana state when he made his remarks that in the pipeline for Cambodia there was a development loan. We examined the pipeline figures presented in the minority report which sets forth the views of the gentleman. Cambodia is listed, but there is no reference to development loans.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I do not think I said that. I said my figure of $131 million basically was reached out of development loan funds. But there were other funds involved, such as contingency funds and supporting funds.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am glad that the gentleman has answered our distinguished chairman. But that is the point. All of these loans are in hard dollars, repayable in hard dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the pending amendment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday in discussing the foreign aid pipeline, I tried to make it clear that we must keep in mind the distinction between unobligated funds in the pipeline and unexpended funds in the pipeline. I pointed out from personal experience how a firm in my district was able to benefit through a contract with Greece where there were some unexpended funds. The company sold a conveyor belt to that country.

I want to mention another example: There is another company in my district that participates in our aid program, the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. That company builds turbines, generators, and other equipment which it takes a long time to manufacture. When a hydroelectric dam or a steel mill is to be built under the aid program, it takes a while before the project is completed. When our country grants a loan to another country, payment is not made to the recipient country, and then to the company manufacturing the equipment in question, until the delivery of such equipment is completed. Therefore, a company like the Allis-Chalmers Co. does not get paid immediately and the development loan funds are not expended until the delivery of the equipment is completed. Now the gentleman from Indiana knows this. Am I accurate in this regard? Am I stating the case properly insofar as unexpended funds are concerned? Does that delivery have to be made before payment is made?

Mr. ADAIR. It depends upon the terms of the development loan agreement. These agreements do vary.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Does the gentleman know of any case where payment has been made under a development loan before a delivery was made?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes. As one example, Chile received a $40 million loan for a development bank in one lump sum, prior to subloans to local borrowers.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. And is that why we have unexpended funds?

Mr. ADAIR. That is one reason. But there are other and more cogent reasons. There is too much in the pipeline that is not being used and agreements are not being drawn and projects are not being completed.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Well, on projects that are not being completed, of course, there will not be any payments, but that is a very small portion of the program. I do want to point out the danger of the gentleman's amendment. When we turn to loans rather than grants, we lengthen the pipeline. But we also gain the repayments of loans. The record of repayment of these loans is very good. Of the assistance given by this country of $110 billion, $30.3 billion consisted of loans and as of the end of fiscal year 1964, repayments of principal and interest on those loans amounted to $11.4 billion.

Loans extended by AID and predecessor agencies amounted to almost $10 billion for development loans, Alliance for Progress loans, supporting assistance loans, and food-for-peace undertakings.

Now of this total of development loans, $2 billion has been repaid. $1.3 billion was in dollars, U.S. dollars, and the remainder $687 million dollars, in foreign currencies.

Defaults on development loans amounted to only $2.5 million and occurred in only four countries. This was one-fortieth of 1 percent in relation to the loans extended. I think this is an excellent record.

I do not believe we should cut the program where we are making a great impact among countries—our allies as well as the developing countries in the world. This would be a mistake. This would be a great mistake and I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. They have not defaulted on these loans for two reasons. In the first place, many of them have a 10-year grace period before any payment is made. In the second place, they are not going to default on these loans as long as we keep pumping the money in back to them to pay on the maturity of the loans—if they can be called loans. But most of them have not had a chance to default.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there were principal repayments of $775 million in American, United States, hard currency dollars. Payments of interest amounted to $558 million again in U.S. dollars.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, every year since we authorized the Development Loan Fund on a long-range basis in 1961, there has been an attack of this kind upon the Fund. We have been successful every year in fighting off the attack. At the end of fiscal year 1966, the present authorization for the long-range Development Loan Fund comes to an end. During the markup of the bill, I told the committee that we should take a new look, make a new approach and try to develop a new type of long-range Development Loan Fund. You will remember that this is a program that is paid back in hard dollars. The Development Loan Fund was established under President Eisenhower in 1957, repayment in soft currency was authorized. In the new authority governing the Development Loan Fund initiated when we rewrote the Mutual Security Act in 1961, we established a dollar repayment type of development loan.

The administration already has authorization for this fiscal year of $1.5 billion. They did not request that amount of money. They came here with a request for a little more than half of the $1.5 billion. They requested $780 million.

Most of this money goes to the countries around the world who are making real progress like Turkey, Colombia, Nigeria, India, and Pakistan. It is a very important part of the program.

The money is screened carefully. It goes only to the most effective governments, which we feel have a chance to stand on their own feet. AID has done a very careful job of screening and intends to do a very careful job of screening this fund.

This would be a very severe cut. It would damage the program.

The author of the amendment is not giving adequate attention to our obligations, to our definite loan commitments. He wants to penalize countries with whom we have firm loan agreements, with whom we have signed contracts, as well as curtailing the new appropriations.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has made a very important point with respect to the long-term commitments, as well as pointing out the fact that the amount of authorization requested is only a little more than half of that which was authorized by the committee and by the Congress.

Is it not true that the committee and the Congress have worked quite hard to shift this program from grants to loans?

For example, in 1953 and 1955, 6 percent of all programs were loans, yet in 1966, 69 percent of all programs will be in loans. The department has worked hard to follow the mandate of the Congress, so in the past few years we have seen a shift in emphasis from grants to loans, and from loans repayable in local currencies to loans repayable in dollars, with a substantial increase in the minimum interest rates on the dollar-repayable loans.

The very same people who helped to make the shift in emphasis now want to turn around and cut off the commitments made under the programs which have been very wisely handled by the administration.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. In addition, we increased the interest rates on the development loans. The loans are repayable at a 2½-percent interest rate and are good, firm loans.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Does it not come down to this: If we are to have a loan program we must fulfill the commitments made with respect to loans?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct. We must fulfill the commitments, where we have firm contracts. We cannot make cancellations of funds now in the pipeline.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Is it not true that if cuts were made along the lines of the Adair amendment, those cuts would not affect contracts already entered into, such as with Cambodia, to which the gentleman objects, but could affect any loans we might now be making to countries such as Korea or other nations which have been making real and constructive progress? Reductions would have to be made to our closest friends and allies who are today making progress. It would effect new loans, not old loans. Therefore, the matter of Cambodia would not be affected by the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows: Page 2, line 9:

TITLE II—TECHNICAL COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Sec. 102. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation and development grants, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 212, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "$215,000,000" and substituting "1960" and "$210,000,000," respectively.

(b) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

(1) Amend subsection (b) by striking out "treatment, education," and substituting "education".

(2) Amend subsection (c) by striking out "1965, $18,000,000" and substituting "1966, $7,000,000".

TITLE III—INVESTMENT GUARANTEES

Sec. 103. Title III of chapter 2 of part 1 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) Amend the introductory clause to read as follows:

"(b) The President may issue guaranties to eligible United States investors—".

(2) In paragraph (1), strike out "$2,500,000,000" and substitute "$5,000,000,000."

(3) Amend paragraph (2) as follows:

(A) In the first proviso, strike out ", and no such guaranty in the case of a loan shall exceed $25,000,000 and no other such guaranty shall exceed $10,000,000".

(B) In the third proviso, immediately after "$300,000,000" insert the following: ", and guaranties issued under this paragraph (2) for other than housing projects similar to those insured by the Federal Housing Administration, shall not exceed $150,000,000".

(C) In the fourth proviso, strike out "1966" and substitute "1967".

(b) Amend section 221(c), which relates to general authority, by inserting after the word "guaranty" the third time it appears, the words "of an equity investment".

(c) Amend section 222(b), which relates to general provisions, by inserting after "(exclusive of informational media guaranties)," the words "and to pay the costs of investigating and adjusting (including costs of arbitration) claims under such guaranties,".

(d) Amend section 223, which relates to definitions, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "and" at the end thereof and in subsection (b) strike out the period and substitute "; and".

(2) Add the following new subsection (c):

"(c) the term 'eligible United States investors' means United States citizens, or corporations, partnerships, or other associations created under the laws of the United States or any State or territory and substantially beneficially owned by United States citizens, as well as foreign corporations, partnerships, or other associations wholly owned by one or more such United States citizens, corporations, partnerships, or other associations: *Provided,* That the eligibility of a foreign corporation shall be determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the United States owners."

(e) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, to read as follows:

"Sec. 224. Housing Projects in Latin American Countries.—(a) It is the sense of Congress that in order to stimulate private homeownership and assist in the development of stable economies in Latin America, the authority conferred by this section should be utilized for the purpose of assisting in the development in the American Republics of self-liquidating pilot housing projects, the development of institutions engaged in Alliance for Progress programs, with particular emphasis on cooperatives, free labor unions, savings and loan and other institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, the construction of homes for lower income persons and families, the increased mobilization of savings and the improvement of housing conditions in Latin America.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the President is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as he shall determine, to eligible United States investors as defined in section 223 assuring against loss of loan investments made by such investors in—

"(1) pilot or demonstration private housing projects in Latin America of types similar to those insured by the Federal Housing Administration and suitable for conditions in Latin America;

"(2) credit institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, such as savings and loan institutions;

"(3) housing projects in Latin America for lower income families and persons, which projects shall be constructed in accordance with maximum unit costs established by the President for families and persons whose incomes meet the limitations prescribed by the President;

"(4) housing projects in Latin America which will promote the development of institutions important to the success of the Alliance for Progress, such as free labor unions and cooperatives; or

"(5) housing projects in Latin America 25 per centum or more of the aggregate of the mortgage financing for which is made available from sources within Latin America and is not derived from sources outside Latin America, which projects shall, to the maximum extent practicable, have a unit cost of not more than $6,500.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued under this section outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $450,000,000: *Provided,* That no payment may be made under this section for any loss arising out of fraud or misconduct for which the investor is responsible: *Provided further,* That this authority shall continue until June 30, 1967."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: Page 5, line 15, after the word "free", insert "non-Communist dominated"; and on page 6, line 16, after the word "free", insert "non-Communist dominated".

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which I hope will be accepted by the Committee. All it does is it says if you are going to set up this new housing project in the Latin American country program, which I incidentally strongly support, and you are at the same time going to make funds available for "the development of institutions engaged in Alliance for Progress programs, with particular emphasis on cooperatives, free labor unions, savings and loan and other institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, the construction of homes for lower income persons and families, the increased mobilization of savings and the improvement of housing conditions in Latin America"; and then on page 6, line 14, paragraph (4), "housing projects in Latin America which will promote the development of institutions important to the success of the Alliance for Progress, such as free labor unions and cooperatives." I say that we should certainly not permit funds to be made available to any union that is dominated by the Communists.

It is common knowledge, the record is replete with evidence of Communist attempts to infiltrate, to take charge of, to take over certain labor union movements in Latin America. I do not think anyone in this House would want the administration or anyone else to have discretion to provide assistance to labor unions if, in fact, it is shown that they are Communist dominated.

I may have some reservations myself as it relates to providing foreign aid money for the purpose of requiring and encouraging the formation of labor unions in the first instance as a necessary adjunct to the use of Alliance for Progress funds. This has gone on all over Latin America. It is common knowledge that one condition for Alliance for Progress funds, among others, is that the labor union movements in those countries shall be encouraged. But that bridge has been crossed. If you are going to do that, as it relates even to labor union-sponsored housing projects, then I say make certain that these labor unions are not Communist dominated. That is all this amendment does, and I should hope the Committee would accept it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman explain what he means by the phrase "non-Communist dominated"?

Mr. CRAMER. Not necessarily. I know what the gentleman's question is. This is common terminology that has been used in other similar efforts; "non-Communist dominated" as it relates to "non-Communist-dominated countries." This is common terminology used in such restrictive foreign aid language. That is where it came from.

Mr. YATES. What does it mean?

Mr. CRAMER. It means exactly what it says. If there are a number of Communists in a union and thus by their number or otherwise they dominate the union—no money. That is what it means. That is what it says—"non-Communist dominated" just like a country if it is "non-Communist dominated" can get aid, but not otherwise. You cannot spell it out further. It would be wrong to attempt to spell it out further. This simply applies the same test to labor unions that is applied in other instances. I cannot imagine how the Committee would not accept it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. YATES. How is the Administrator to know what is a non-Communist-dominated union?

Mr. CRAMER. They do not have any trouble determining what is a non-Communist-dominated country; they will have no difficulty determining what is a non-Communist-dominated union. Now, I hear constant suggestions that the administration be given authority to exercise its discretion. Here it is. It decides whether a union is non-Communist-dominated. If it is, they get the money; if not, they do not. If someone on the floor of the House wants some money to go to Communist-dominated unions, let them vote against the amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do not think money should go to any Communist union, but the terms of reference in this amendment are not that simple. The fact of the matter is that on page 5, line 15, we point out that they must be free labor unions. Therefore, if a union is Communist-dominated it cannot possibly be a free labor union. The language of the amendment is redundant, it is surplusage, and it is not necessary. We are in agreement on the desired net result. I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman define what "free" means? If "free" means the same as "non-Communist-dominated," why would the gentleman object to defining it further with my amendment so there would be no question about it?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Everybody knows what it means.

Mr. CRAMER. What does it mean?

Mr. GALLAGHER. It means non-Communist-dominated.

Mr. CRAMER. It also means everybody may join it, does it not, including the Communists? This amendment defines it further and excludes Communist domination.

Mr. GALLAGHER. No; it means non-Communist dominated. I would imagine that a free labor union means a free labor union not dominated by anyone, including the Communists.

Mr. CRAMER. Suppose it is intended to mean to apply only to non-Communist-dominated unions? If the gentleman wants to make sure it does, and he agrees, he should support my amendment to make sure.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I support the gentleman's intention and the gentleman's intention has the support of this bill. Therefore, it is not necessary.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I understand the word "free" to mean it is not dominated by anyone.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is exactly right. The chairman has made a good point on that, and, Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, what is the purpose of the foreign aid program? Is it to win friends, to keep the peace, and to keep communism from spreading? All we have to do is to take a quick look at the world situation today to realize that if this is the purpose of the foreign aid program it has been a dismal failure.

During fiscal year 1946 through fiscal year 1964 we have distributed over $110 billion of the American taxpayers' dollars and the dollars of still unborn generations among some 110 foreign nations—friends as well as enemies. During the same period of time, the recipients of our aid have purchased over $10 billion of our gold—thereby contributing greatly to our serious gold shortage problem. We have seen many countries go behind the Iron Curtain in that time and many more still receiving our aid—though claiming to be neutral—hue to the Communist line, permit our embassies and our flag to be attacked and desecrated, vote with the Communists more often than they do with us in the United Nations, and interfere with efforts to bring stability and peace to the world.

Each year, the Congress reaffirms its intent that American tax dollars are not to be given to such countries—but no such denial of aid is actually written into law. Thus, Congress abdicates its constitutional control over the purse strings and leaves the final decision up to the President. Nasser tells us to "go jump in the lake," but we continue to provide aid—and $29,973,000 remains in the pipeline from previously authorized and appropriated amounts for aid to the United Arab Republic. Sukarno stated a few months ago:

> We are rich enough to do without American aid. Indonesian resources are so, so rich; our need is only to dig out our own resources. To * * * with American aid.

Yet, $17,193,000 of American dollars remain ready for the use of Indonesia even without the present bill. Ghana and Algeria have embraced Red China and are adding to the troubles of the Congo—but a total of $75.5 million remain from previously appropriated funds for their use in fiscal year 1966.

These are just a few examples of what I consider to be the misuse of American tax dollars. In addition, the entire program is replete with waste, extravagance, and mismanagement.

It has been widely reported by the administration and by the news media that this current foreign aid request has been cut to the "bare bone"—and if you merely look at the total of $2.04 billion provided in this authorization bill you might be inclined to agree. On checking a little deeper, however, one finds that the total is quickly increased to $3,367,670,000 by amounts previously authorized—and this is just the start. This present bill authorizes an unlimited amount for southeast Asia—with the President having full control over what is actually to be spent. In addition, there are other separate foreign aid programs such as the Peace Corps, food for peace, Inter-American Development Bank, International Development Association—bringing the total amount provided for foreign aid for fiscal year 1966 to about $6 billion. Then, of course, the United States spends still another additional $3 billion annually for military expenditures abroad which come under the Defense Department budget. Finally, we have to add the sum of $6.2 billion of unexpended foreign assistance funds previously authorized and appropriated and in the so-called pipeline for use in fiscal year 1966. And, I would remind you, we are providing all of this money at a time when we are faced with a serious balance-of-payments problem, a gold shortage, and a national debt of some $318 billion which greatly exceeds the combined debt of all other countries of the world—and then we are called upon to increase our military expenditures to help protect South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic from Communist aggression.

There are approximately 22 different U.S. agencies involved in giving foreign aid to over 80 countries now—and over 71,000 individuals, including participants, are on the foreign aid payroll. Can such a widespread program result in efficiency and value received for each dollar spent? My answer to that question is an emphatic "No."

Certainly, I feel that some aid to friendly foreign nations is necessary, if provided on a selective basis and at the grassroots level. On the other hand, I feel very strongly that the very survival of the free world depends upon our remaining fiscally sound—and that we cannot continue to attempt to support the world without going bankrupt. I concur completely with the views and recommendations contained in the minority report on this bill, H.R. 7750.

My vote against this bill will serve as indication of my strong protest against giving aid to unfriendly nations and against the waste and extravagance in the present program—as well as my equally strong demand for a completely new look at the entire foreign aid program.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I believe the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] has made the strongest argument for this amendment that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] could possibly ask for. As a matter of fact, it is a stronger argument than the gentleman from Florida made in behalf of the amendment himself.

Mr. Chairman, the fact that we are trying to read into the language of the bill that "free" means "non-Communist," certainly is stretching definitions substantially and I see nothing inconsistent with the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Florida and the statement of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] supports it.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot quite understand the use of definitions of those opposing this amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I know the gentleman's record is known to be violently anti-Communist, as are all of the people in this House of Representatives.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was in committee when this language was prepared and following his leadership on some of these matters we felt that "free labor unions" meant that they would not be Communist dominated and therefore this language as contained in the bill covered not only Communists but anyone who would try to take over a union and keep it from being a free labor union.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do hope that this amendment will be rejected.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, as I see the virtue of the amendment of the gentleman from Florida, it spells out more concretely the position of the House than does the language of the bill. We have to recognize the fact that we went through a period in the United States in the early and late forties where there were necessary efforts made to remove Communist control of unions. We recognize that unions are normal targets for Communist infiltration and to specifically emphasize that we will not provide funds to be used by Communist-controlled unions I think is a logical extension of the position of the Congress and a logical implementation of this bill.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] should be approved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think that the tin miners union in Bolivia, which has its own militia, is a free union, with or without Communist membership?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would presume not but, perhaps the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] might wish to apply his definition.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa has raised a very good point. We want free unions. We want them to be free of Communists and free from rightists. That is the reason why we should have this affirmative language against the establishment of any militiamen, militamen of the right or left, Communists, or extreme rightists.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, our affirmative language as contained in the bill covers it all.

I appreciate the contribution which the gentleman from Iowa has made.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I have not heard whether the gentleman from New Jersey thinks the Bolivian tin miners union is a free union.

Mr. GALLAGHER. No, I do not.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think we should explore all of these matters.

Mr. GROSS. You would not exclude them, however, under the language of this bill.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If they were dominated by any militiamen, they would be excluded.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The language of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] would more specifically exclude the use of funds to Communist-controlled unions.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I have just looked up the definition of "free" and it says, "Unrestricted and unconfined." Communists can join an unrestricted, unconfined union and that is why my amendment proposes to prevent, prevent the moneys contained in this fund from going to unions that are Communist dominated. That is all it does. But the word "free" does not do it.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman wants to do it, he should be applauding the amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman has a lot less confidence in the word "free" than I have. A "free" union means that no one dominates it, including Communists, and including the kind of people who march down in Bolivia who do not benefit from this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Cramer) there were—ayes 52, noes 80.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gallagher and Mr. Cramer.

So the Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 72, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the Committee amended the bill as introduced to extend the highly promising guaranty program for oversea housing, both in Latin America and in other areas of the world.

This program, which was initiated by the Congress 4 years ago, has developed into one of the best examples of assistance in the foreign aid program. Financed through private investment rather than U.S. Government funds, it serves as an excellent vehicle for private enterprise in this country to cooperate with private sectors in other areas of the world. It provides much needed housing on a self-liquidating basis, similar to our FHA program in the United States and serves that segment of the economy which is not in need of subsidized housing through public housing institutions.

On my trips to Latin America, I have visited several of these programs and was impressed that they are providing a meaningful demonstration of the goals of the Alliance for Progress. Nothing means more to people, in all parts of the world, than the ability to purchase and live in their own homes.

The committee this year set aside $150 million from the authority under section 221(b)(2) of the act to continue that type of pilot or demonstration project that has been guaranteed under the program during its initial 4 years. Prior to this year AID had set aside $50 million for guaranties outside Latin America. This new set-aside will provide an expanded program throughout the world and it is hoped that this program, slow in developing over this past year, can be put upon a firm basis this coming year.

AID requested $100 million of guaranty authority for new types of categories to be guaranteed under the Latin American program in section 224. The committee felt strongly that the program, as intended by Congress and developed so successfully to date, should be continued and strengthened. Therefore, the committee increased the authority available under section 224 by an additional $100 million above the AID request to continue to carry out the guaranty of privately sponsored pilot or demonstration projects similar to those insured by the FHA.

It is understood that this continuation of the program under section 224(b)(1) will be supported by not less than this additional $100 million.

It is of the utmost importance that the housing guaranty program as created by Congress be continued on its present basis. The new authority will provide an opportunity to experiment with other approaches to the guaranty program, but the program as now conducted should be continued.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINO

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Fino: On page 7, line 2, strike out "$450,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$425,000,000".

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It merely reduces the authorization in this section of the bill from $450 million to $425 million. This saving of $25 million could be used to support the veterans' facilities that the President wants to close, as he says, for reasons of economy. All Members of the Congress are, of course, greatly interested in this proposed closing of our veterans' hospitals and domiciliaries and the transfer and consolidation of some of the regional offices. The plea of the President was that we must save money and that by shutting down these facilities and by these proposed consolidations, we could save $25 million.

Now that sounds good if you only look at one side of the ledger. But when you look at the other side of the ledger and you look at this foreign aid bill, you will see that here you are providing American dollar guarantees for housing for our so-called allies.

This reaches a point of great disturbance. When we spend money on our own veterans, I say that our veterans not only deserve it but also appreciate it. But when we spend money in South America, Asia, Africa, or any other portion of the world, those people do not appreciate it and they do not deserve it in many instances.

So if all the Members of Congress who have appeared before the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the subcommittee on hospitals, and expressed so much concern about the closing of these hospitals will take heed, I say this is an opportunity to stand up and be heard, an opportunity for you to express your feelings and sentiments, an opportunity for you to say to the President of the United States, "We are taking $25 million off this foreign aid program and giving it to you so that we can continue to keep our hospitals open."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for his amendment to the bill. I cannot think of a better place to save $25 million, and dedicate it to the veterans of this country for their hospitalization and care.

Mr. FINO. Not only that, but they appreciate it.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that we are all touched by the gentleman's concern for the veterans of this country. All of us here today certainly join in that concern with the gentleman from New York. It is too bad that his amendment would not do what he believes it would do, because, under this particular section, what we are talking about is a limit or ceiling on the issuance of guarantees, and this has nothing to do with the appropriation of money.

Therefore, worthwhile as the efforts of the gentleman from New York might appear to be, in actuality they would not accomplish any of the things he has talked about. What would occur is that there would be a reduction of $25 million in one of the most successful programs we have had in stemming the tide of communism in Latin America by providing private initiative, private institutions, private homeownership throughout Latin America. I do not believe I need to dwell on the value of private homeownership in a developing area like Latin America.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. I am very happy that my colleague from Florida has made this statement. It was as a result of many remarks by him to me that I was happy to sponsor this amendment in the committee. I agree that there is no money involved, and this involves the ceiling. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentlewoman. It was her amendment that increased the ceiling for this program.

This was one subject which received very thorough consideration by the committee. The ceiling was lifted because of the tremendous success of the program.

Since the amendment would not accomplish what the gentleman from New York seeks to accomplish, and because it would do damage to a very important part of the program, I believe the amendment should be defeated unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

SEC. 104. Section 252 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended by striking out "in fiscal year 1965" and substituting "in each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966".

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to note that no amendments have been offered to reduce the authorization for the Alliance for Progress. This surely reflects the concern of this House that the United States press forward toward fulfillment of the goals of the Alliance without delay.

Undoubtedly, the tragic and costly conflict in the Dominican Republic has lent emphasis to the need for the Alliance for Progress. We have witnessed in recent days the losses of life, revolution, and the destruction of many of the normal services required by the people in Santo Domingo. The continued existence of the Dominican Republic as a free country has been threatened in recent years by political instability and a lack of adherence to constitutional processes. Inevitably Communist leaders, including those trained outside the Dominican Republic, seek to exploit this instability and the many other problems facing the people of that republic. Whatever the degree of control and influence achieved by them in this recent revolution, the threat of a Communist government emerging from the revolution now appears to have abated.

What now remain are hunger, unemployment, disease, poverty, ignorance—and sometimes—despair. It is these afflictions, common to so many people of this world, to which the Alliance for Progress is addressed. Although the Alliance is less than 4 years old, it has begun to take hold. The idea that governments must act to bring about social reform, broadened educational opportunities and improved fiscal and administrative procedures has won increasing acceptance in Latin America. Economic growth, social justice and the development of strong democratic institutions must go forward hand in hand, primarily through the efforts of the people in these countries themselves but with the margins of help which the United States can provide through the Alliance for Progress. Freemen can, in ways that Marx, Stalin, and Castro never dreamed, meet the just aspirations for a better life for the people of this hemisphere through cooperation, sacrifice, and a willingness to change the ways of the past.

Mr. Chairman, the aims of the people of the Dominican Republic are the aims of people everywhere. They seek to shape their own destiny through the right of self government. They seek peace, stability, and security. They seek increasing economic opportunities for themselves and broadened educational opportunities for their children.

The people of the United States share these same goals. The goals of both peoples are in keeping with the aims of the Alliance for Progress.

That is why I strongly support the actions being taken by President Johnson in the Dominican Republic to restore constitutional government to that nation. That is why the United States must give its full support to the Dominican Republic as it seeks to climb out of the pit of despair and to move along pathways illuminated by the bright hopes of the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, perhaps at this section where we are concerned with the Alliance for Progress it is a time to express that the greatest aid we export is still our ideals.

The tragic events of the past 4 weeks draw all of our attention and all of our sympathy to the people of the Dominican Republic. They have had 4 weeks of conflict, death, destruction, and personal deprivation, including hunger.

I am proud that President Johnson, the U.S. Government, and the people of the United States, acted promptly and decisively in that crisis in the Dominican Republic.

We saved lives by evacuating more than 4,000 foreigners, including more than 2,000 U.S. citizens. When responsible authorities in Santo Domingo said they were no longer able to provide reasonable protection, we moved them out.

We sought to preserve democratic liberties in Santo Domingo. When the public order broke down and civil war and political maneuvering for position produced chaos which skilled Communists tried to exploit as a means to power, we acted to thwart the Communists. We sought a cease-fire. We sought to restore the conditions in Santo Domingo to normal. We sought to find a basis for a single civil government. We sought to restore favorable economic conditions.

We acted within the Organization of American States. For each one of the actions that we have taken to solve the Dominican crisis and to restore normal conditions there, we had the necessary two-thirds majority of the meeting of consultation of the Foreign Ministers of the OAS. For many actions—of a humanitarian nature—we have had unanimity in the meeting of consultation. A majority of the American Republics have sent supplies of food and medicine or medical personnel to help the Dominican people.

This tragedy in the Dominican Republic has given this hemisphere a most valuable tool for keeping the peace in the future. I refer to the Inter-American armed force, which was established by the OAS Meeting of Consultation and which is now on hand in Santo Domingo. This force is under the command of a distinguished Brazilian, General Panasco, and so far, six nations—the United States, Brazil, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicargua—have contributed forces to it. Others will contribute forces too. When their work of keeping peace and order is finished, the IAF will leave the Dominican Republic. But the IAF may stand as a shield of peace and democracy for the generations to come.

Finally, the people of the United States and the Dominican Republic want the same things.

We both want peace, prosperity, and progress.

These desires and hopes of both our peoples are identical with the aims of the Alliance for Progress.

The people of the United States should, and I believe will, give full support to the people of the Dominican Republic in restoring normal conditions and resuming the paths set forth by the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise during this annual debate on the foreign aid legislation to lay before the House a suggestion which I have supported for many years.

That is the separation of the economic and military aid portions of the foreign aid bill. I am a strong advocate of the military program being placed in the Department of Defense's annual request to Congress and this being worked upon by the appropriate authorization and appropriations committees in the defense field in the House and Senate.

This suggestion merely means that military authorities in Congress would be studying this program from beginning to end with the same careful scrutiny and austere standards now given our $50 billion annual domestic defense expenditures.

For the last decade the Department of Defense has had this view that the economic and military items in the foreign aid bill should be separated. This position was never more forcibly presented than in March of this year when Secretary of Defense McNamara testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Secretary McNamara testified:

> I believe it is a mistake to lump together the economic aid and military aid in a single bill. I do believe that it confuses the public. There is no question in my mind but what military aid is far more comparable to the other items of the defense budget than it is to the economic aid, and it ought to be considered in relation to the defense budget.

I have criticized the foreign aid program of our Government in the way it has been directed, and this criticism is felt by millions of Americans and by a large portion of Congress.

It makes sense to me, and to all Americans, I believe, to support with military aid the friendly, freedom-seeking nations on the periphery of the Sino-Soviet bloc. They are under threat of the Communist bloc and they represent the majority of all military assistance in the foreign aid bill.

However, the economic portion of the aid bill is subject to serious question and debate and criticism. We need only to look at one prime example: Indonesia. Every schoolboy knows President Sukarno told the United States where it could go with its aid. This sort of situation puts in doubt the whole aid program.

This creates a distortion of what our aid program has accomplished through the years. There has been in fact much mismanagement and not enough control on our dollars at a time when we need great control on all funds leaving this country. The foreign aid program is a tremendous financial outlay and a great drain on the country's fiscal strength. In this respect, I believe the discussion to curtail all foreign aid in the next several years is well founded, and should be seriously considered by the Congress and the President.

If this should happen, we would still need to help those friendly allies in training and equipping armies for the defense of the free world.

There is no better time than now to separate the economic aid from the military aid in the foreign aid legislation, and I urge that this action be taken by the President and the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter 3—International organizations and programs

SEC. 105. Chapter 3 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 301(c), which relates to assistance for Palestine refugees in the Near East, by adding at the end thereof the following: "Contributions by the United States to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East for the calendar year 1966 shall not exceed $15,200,000."

(b) Amend section 302, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "$134,272,400" and substituting "1966" and "$144,755,000", respectively.

Chapter 4—Supporting assistance

SEC. 106. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended by striking out in the first sentence "1965" and "$405,000,000" and substituting "1966" and "$369,200,000", respectively.

Chapter 5—Contingency fund

SEC. 107. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend subsection (a) as follows:

(1) Strike out "1965" and "$150,000,000' and substitute "1966" and '$50,000,000", respectively.

(2) Add the following new sentence: "In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in southeast Asia such sums as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized by parts I and II of this Act in accordance with the provisions applicable to such programs if he determines such use to be important to the national interest: *Provided,* That the President shall present to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives the programs to be carried out from funds requested by the President to be appropriated under authority of this sentence."

(b) Amend subsection (b) by striking out "this section" and substituting "the first sentence of subsection (a)".

PART II

Chapter 2—Military assistance

SEC. 201. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 503(b), which relates to general authority, by striking out the words "in foreign countries".

(b) Amend section 504, which relates to authorization, by striking out "1965" and "$1,055,000,000" in the first sentence and substituting "1966" and "$1,170,000,000", respectively.

(c) Amend section 505, which relates to to utilization of assistance, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out the colon and add the following: ", or for the purpose of assisting foreign military forces in less developed friendly countries (or the voluntary efforts of personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States in such countries) to construct public works and to engage in other activities helpful to the economic development of such friendly countries. It is the sense of the Congress that such foreign military forces should not be maintained or established solely for civic action activities and that such civic action activities not significantly detract from the capability of the military forces to perform their military missions and be coordinated with and form part of the total economic development effort."

(2) Strike out subsection (b) and redesignate the proviso of subsection (a) as subsection (b).

(3) In redesignated subsection (b), strike out "*Provided,* That except" and substitute "Except"; strike out "or (2)" and substitute ", or (2) for civic action assistance, or (3)".

(d) Amend section 507, which relates to sales, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), insert the following new sentence between the second and third sentences: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 644(m)(2), nonexcess defense articles may be sold under this subsection at the standard price in effect at the time such articles are offered for sale to the purchasing country or international organization."

(2) In subsection (b), strike out the period at the end of the first proviso, substitute a colon and add the following: "*Provided further,* That the President may, when he determines it to be in the national interest, enter into sales agreements with purchasing countries or international organizations which fix prices to be paid by the purchasing countries or international organizations for the defense articles or defense services ordered. Funds available under this part for financing sales shall be used to reimburse the applicable appropriations in the amounts required by the contracts which exceed the price so fixed, except that such reimbursement shall not be required upon determination by the President that the continued production of the defense article being sold is advantageous to the Armed Forces of the United States. Payments by purchasing countries or international organizations which exceed the amounts required by such contracts shall be credited to the account established under section 508. To the maximum extent possible, prices fixed under any such sales agreement shall be sufficient to reimburse the United States for the cost of the defense articles or defense services ordered. The President shall submit to the Congress promptly a detailed report concerning any fixed-price sales agreement under which the aggregate cost to the United States exceeds the aggregate amount required to be paid by the purchasing country or international organization."

(e) Amend section 508, which relates to reimbursement as follows:

(1) After "this part" the first time it appears, insert "have been or".

(2) After "United States Government," the first time it appears insert "receipts received from the disposition of evidences of indebtedness and charges (including fees and premiums) or interest collected".

(3) Strike out "the current applicable appropriation" and substitute "a separate fund account".

(4) Strike out "furnishing further military assistance on cash or credit terms" and substitute "financing sales and guaranties, including the overhead costs thereof".

(f) Amend section 509(b), which relates to exchanges and guaranties, by inserting "(excluding contracts with any agency of the United States Government)" in the second sentence between the last word thereof and the period.

(g) Amend section 510, which relates to special authority, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "1965" each place it appears and substitute in each such place "1966".

(2) In subsection (b), strike out "to the President".

(h) Amend section 512, which relates to restrictions on military aid to Africa, as follows:

(1) Strike out "programs described in section 505(b) of this chapter" and substitute "civic action requirements".

(2) Strike out "1965" and substitute "1966".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORGAN

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which corrects a drafting error.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORGAN: Page 12, line 25, immediately after the quotation marks and before the period, insert the following: "; and strike out 'available for military assistance'".

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be appropriate for the chairman of the committee to explain in a few words the effect of that amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. I would be glad to.

If the gentleman will turn to page 12 of the bill, this was a clerical drafting error. What we are doing is just reinserting the words that were left out.

Mr. ADAIR. So the committee may understand that this is simply a drafting matter and not substantive.

Mr. MORGAN. Not substantive; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART III

Chapter 1—General provisions

SEC. 301. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 605, which relates to retention and use of items, as follows:

(1) In the section heading strike out "ITEMS" and substitute "CERTAIN ITEMS AND FUNDS".

(2) Add the following new subsections:

"(c) Funds realized as a result of any failure of a transaction financed under authority of part I of this Act to conform to the requirements of this Act, or to applicable rules and regulations of the United States Government, or to the terms of any agreement or contract entered into under authority of part I of this Act, shall revert to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to finance such transaction or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose.

"(d) Funds realized by the United States Government from the sale, transfer, or disposal of defense articles returned to the United States Government by a recipient country or international organization as no longer needed for the purpose for which furnished shall be credited to the respective appropriation, fund, or account used to procure such defense articles or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the same general purpose."

(b) Amend section 612, which relates to use of foreign currencies, by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(c) Amend section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance to Cuba and certain other countries, as follows:

(1) Amend the section heading to read as follows:

"PROHIBITIONS AGAINST FURNISHING ASSISTANCE.—".

(2) In paragraph (2) of section 620(e), which relates to the application of the federal act of state doctrine, strike out "January 1, 1966" and substitute "January 1, 1967".

(3) In section 620(l), which relates to the prohibition against furnishing assistance to countries which fail to enter into agreements to institute the investment guaranty program and providing protection against certain risks, strike out "December 31, 1965" and substitute "December 31, 1966".

(4) At the end of such section 620, add the following new subsection:

"(n) Until the President determines that North Vietnam has ceased all efforts to overthrow the Government of South Vietnam, no funds authorized to be made available under this Act (except under section 214) shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than sixty days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965—

"(A) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to North Vietnam—

"(i) any items of economic assistance,

"(ii) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammuntion and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

"(iii) any other equipment, materials, or commodities; and

"(B) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from North Vietnam."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: Page 14, immediately after line 20, insert the following:

"(1) In paragraph (1) of section 620(a), amend the first sentence by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided*, That it is the sense of the Congress that so long as Cuba is exporting communism to any other country it is against the national interest of the United States to furnish assistance to the present government of Cuba or to any other country which furnishes assistance to the present government of Cuba'."

And renumber the following paragraphs accordingly.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the Clerk had read line 6 of page 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Florida was on his feet and seeking recognition.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk reread the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will rereport the amendment.

The Clerk rereported the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Now, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. The objective of it is quite simple but very essential. There should be no question in the mind of anyone sitting in this Legislative body that there is being exported from Cuba communism, particularly after the debacle we have seen and the problems we have seen, and the dying of American boys in the Dominican Republic to try to stave off, as the President himself said, the Communist takeover of that uprising that is Cuban inspired.

Mr. Chairman, there was named not 1, not 10, not 15, not 20, but 65 known Communists in the Dominican Republic uprising, most of whom were trained in Fidel Castro's Communist stronghold in Cuba.

Mr. Chairman, is there any question about the evidence that communism is being exported from Cuba today and that American boys are dying as a result of it?

Mr. Chairman, what are we going to do about it? What are we in the Congress of the United States going to do about cutting off the exportation of communism from the country that is the fountainhead and which will continue to be the fountainhead of communism in this hemisphere, unless we take affirmative, positive steps to do the job that needs to be done in order to get rid of Communists in Cuba itself?

Mr. Chairman, the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs are familiar with the meeting that took place in November of last year, the most significant conclave of Communists from Latin American countries representing more countries than at any time in the history of the Western Hemisphere, the meeting in Havana, Cuba, where they planned this thing—this Latin American Communist campaign.

Mr. Chairman, there are going to be more Dominican Republics. Do not kid yourself. There are going to be more of them because the Communists planned them in November of last year and they are going to hold another meeting in the near future. They announced what their blueprint is.

Mr. Chairman, their blueprint is that any time there is an uprising, any time there is a problem, in the first place, they are going to encourage it, and in the second place, if they do not encourage it, when it happens they are going to come in and try to take it over as a Communist movement. There is not any question about it. They are not kidding about this situation. They have a blueprint, they have a plan, and the Dominican Republic is just the symptom of the disease, the symptom—one symptom—of the disease. Mr. Chairman, what is the disease? Castro's Communist Cuba. Cuba is from where the Communist cancer is spreading.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what does this amendment propose to do? I am sure that many Members on this floor, when the issue was up before this House previously, in 1963, remember that the gentleman from Florida now in the well tried to make it mandatory that trade be cut off and that no aid go to any country that trades with Cuba.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment failed and trade has continued. There are all sorts of loopholes in the present trade policy. Everyone has read where locomotives are going to Cuba, heavy machinery is going to Cuba, and has read where other nations that get our aid are sending equipment and materiel and are trading with Cuba.

Mr. Chairman, the reason that there is a loophole is because of the language contained in the present law, which this proposed amendment is designed to amend and which states as follows:

> No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to the present Government of Cuba; nor shall any such assistance be furnished to any country which furnishes assistance to the present Government of Cuba unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national interest of the United States.

What does my amendment do? It is very simple. It directs, it will help do the job, it will put the Congress on record as saying we want no more Dominican Republics emanating from Castro's Cuban Communist headquarters.

Today I read in the paper where the President has sent FBI agents to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of determining for the OAS and for the entire world to know that Communist activities exist down there; that they emanate from Cuba, thus proving, I hope, to this Congress and to the world that we intend to do something about it. Here is the tool to do it with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. CRAMER) he was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, here is the tool. It is very simple. So what do I say? What does the amendment propose? It amends the present law which reads:

> No assistance shall be furnished under this act to the present Government of Cuba; nor shall any such assistance be furnished to any country which furnishes assistance to the present Government of Cuba unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national interest of the United States.

What does my proviso do? That is all it says:

> *Provided:* That it is the sense of the Congress that so long as Cuba is exporting communism to any other country it is against the national interest of the United States to furnish assistance to the present Government of Cuba or to any other country which furnishes assistance to the present Government of Cuba.

The Congress of the United States has an opportunity now to speak out in no uncertain terms that so far as this body is concerned, and I believe they would be speaking on behalf of the American people, we should not give assistance to any country because it is against the national interest, and we so determine as the sense of Congress that it is against the national interest to provide assistance to any country that assists Cuba and Castro so long as communism is being exported.

There are many more Dominican Republics coming if we don't act now. This is simply one symptom of the disease in the Dominican Republic and communism, Communist Castro-Cuba is the disease, the cancer. Cut it out, and here is your chance to do something about curing the disease.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I should like to ask the gentleman whether he has any knowledge of U.S. assistance to Cuba. The bill does not provide assistance to Cuba. The gentleman's amendment deletes the provision of presidential determination in the act, does it not?

Mr. CRAMER. Only as it relates to the exportation of communism from Cuba. If Cuba is exporting it, yes, we will cut off all aid to all countries that assist Cuba, and that is the intention of it. We suggest no discretion in the matter. Cuba is exporting communism, as in the example of the Dominican Republic. That is the point. That is the objective of this. This is the way you get at the problem.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. In the case, as we now have in the Caribbean, where Cuba has exported military assistance to certain countries the President's authority to meet such threats would be limited. For example, in the Dominican Republic, would the gentleman's amendments preclude the President from giving assistance to a recognized government in the Dominican Republic?

Mr. CRAMER. No. My amendment goes to countries that aid Cuba. That is what it says, any country that gives assistance to Cuba shall not get a cent from the United States. That is all it does.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida has made a very persuasive speech against aid to Cuba and one in which we all certainly concur. No one here wants to give aid or assistance of any kind to Cuba. In fact, there has been no aid or assistance going to Cuba for several years. However, the amendment offered by the gentleman is completely unnecessary.

Section 620 already prohibits aid to the Government of Cuba or to any country that is aiding Cuba. No aid recipients at the present time are aiding Cuba. The sense-of-Congress amendment that the gentleman is advocating is indeed far weaker than the present law and, therefore, I urge that it be defeated. What this amendment does in fact is to take an indirect slap at the United States by trying to say that the President will not have sufficient sense to know when the Communist government comes to an end in Cuba. I have confidence in our President and I think this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I think it is worthwhile to point out that the gentleman is not answering the question. We have written into previous bills language prohibiting aid to Cuba and to countries that aid Cuba. The question is, Is the law being adequately administered and enforced? That is the question before us.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, the law is adequately administered. What this amendment attempts to do is to take a slap at Canada and some of our biggest customers and some of our best allies. In effect, what this sense of the Congress amendment really does is to say that the Congress will make up its mind when the President should make a determination. This House has written into section 620 our full unhappiness and our full displeasure with the Communist regime in Cuba. There is no aid going to Cuba. There is no aid intended and I think this amendment is superfluous.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. But there is aid going to countries that are assisting Cuba. Now it is bad enough if communism stays in Cuba. That is bad enough. But now they are exporting it openly and notoriously and the time has come to take away all assistance to all countries aiding Cuba under these circumstances and this is the sense of the Congress contained in my amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman from Florida has a unique way of saying things that have been going on for years as if they were something new and novel.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, but American boys have not been killed in the process of exportation of Cuban communism and they are being killed today in the Dominican Republic.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That has nothing to do with this amendment and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. CRAMER. It certainly does.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If you want to make a speech along those lines, that is one thing—but we are talking about foreign aid.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GALLAGHER. No, I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

As I was saying, the foreign-aid bill already prohibits all that the gentleman refers to, and his amendment is completely unnecessary, and it is far weaker than the language of the present law.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is incorrect, and he knows he is incorrect. It is stronger.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is unnecessary, since it is already written into the law of the land that no aid shall go to the Government of Cuba or to any country aiding Cuba.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an argument that has taken place on this floor for many years in considering this legislation, our foreign-aid legislation. The gentleman from Florida very cleverly camouflages his real intent and purpose in his amendment. There is no disagreement that all Members of Congress are opposed to communism. We do not want any part of the Government of this country to conduct any relations with or trade with Communist Cuba, and we condemn the exporting of communism from Cuba to any other Latin American country or to any other country. There is no question about this. The amendment is a direct attack upon the authority of the President of the United States to act under the Constitution of the United States in his direction of our foreign policy. It has no other purpose, and it can have no other purpose than to deny to the President his right to act. This is the issue involved here, and there is no other issue involved. Do you, as the Constitution provides, want to grant the right of the President of the United States to reasonably conduct our foreign policy, or do you want to transfer that authority here to the House of Representatives and to the Congress?

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman from Delaware whether we have all forgotten that originally the power was given to the people. We represent the people.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me, to reply?

Mrs. BOLTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. McDOWELL. I do not believe that the gentlewoman, who I know accepts so well her full responsibility as a Member of this body, seriously would question the right of any Member of the Congress to exercise his full authority to represent the people of this country, but I remind the gentlewoman also that the people of this country do elect the President and I believe the people of this country believe in constitutional government for the Congress and for the President.

Mrs. BOLTON. The gentlewoman from Ohio would like to state to the gentleman from Delaware that we do recognize that fact, but we do not sidestep our responsibility.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I should like to point out to my distinguished colleague that it was the gentlewoman who helped to write the language in section 620, which provides for the very things she has been discussing—our firm determination that no aid go to Cuba, our firm determination that any assistance be cut off. The gentlewoman, in conjunction with our distinguished chairman, helped to write the language in section 620.

Mrs. BOLTON. I should like to suggest to the gentleman and to the House that, among other things, we agreed there should be nothing exported by way of communism to South America. It has been constantly exported. It is growing in leaps and bounds in many of those countries. I believe we are sidestepping the responsibility which is ours, not only to the people of this country but also to the whole free world.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I should like to confirm everything the gentlewoman from Ohio has said. I certainly wish to add that the purpose of the amendment is to say it is the consensus of this body to advise with the President in whatever powers he may have.

Finally, I should like to ask the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] to point out in what place in the Constitution, which I hold in my hand, there is delegated unto the President the determination of the foreign policy of the United States?

Mrs. BOLTON. I believe that is one of those things very much misunderstood about the Constitution. I believe the gentleman from Missouri [Dr. Hall], is quite correct in saying that the Constitution does not delegate everything to the President. We still have a responsibility not only to ourselves but also to the free world.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. McDOWELL. In reply to the suggestion that this country has not fully lived up to its obligations in preventing the export of communism from Cuba to other Latin American countries, and I suppose the suggestion that this is a responsibility of the President, does the gentlewoman not believe that the President has fully exercised his responsibility in regard to policy in respect to the Dominican Republic?

Mrs. BOLTON. I believe the President has been very ill advised. Certainly in respect to Cuba we could have done much better.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mrs. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentlewoman.

The fact of the matter is that the argument we are now having has nothing to do with the amendment. All of it is in the language of section 620, if anyone cares to read it. The language of the amendment, indeed, is weaker than the language already in the bill.

Mrs. BOLTON. All I wish to say is that I do not consider it weaker. I believe it is 100 percent stronger.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Without this amendment the present language in the legislation is directed toward Cuba remaining a Communist country. The amendment I have offered provides that it is the sense of the Congress that, now it has been proved communism is not only in Cuba but is being exported to other countries, we should do something about this too.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out a sufficient number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything on this bill. I have not been too happy with some of the things done recently in the name of foreign aid, although I have supported it in the past. But this argument during the last few minutes seems to me to have gotten so ridiculous that somebody ought to set the record straight.

The statement has been made here within the past 5 minutes that it is the fault of the Congress, somehow or other, or of the United States, because Cuba is exporting communism. Then someone asked the question and said, "Well, do you not think that the President exercised his responsibility in the Dominican crisis?" The answer was that, "I think he has been badly advised," which points out what I am trying to say; namely, there is pretty much, on the part of some people, of a dog-in-the-manger attitude. If anything goes wrong in Latin America, it is our fault, and if we try to do anything about it, then the President has been badly advised.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I am very happy that the gentleman will yield to me. I have no intention of letting that ride. Because I have no such intentions, I think that we all had better look at our whole past, particularly in the last few years, with keener eyes and with a deeper understanding of the far-reaching implications of everything we do. I think we have not done so and, as a matter of fact, I was not speaking of this President but I was speaking particularly of the assassinated President, who was very sadly at fault there and knew it and said so.

Mr. HAYS. May I say to the gentlewoman from Ohio that the question was, "Do you not think that the President has exercised his responsibility in the Dominican crisis?"

Mrs. BOLTON. I did not hear the words "Dominican crisis." There was too much noise.

Mr. HAYS. Then, it is a pretty good thing that I am setting the record straight for the benefit of my friend from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think that is splendid, and I thank you.

Mr. HAYS. The record now is presumably that the President did exercise his responsibilities in the Dominican crisis.

It is fine to look at all of the things we have done with great care, but looking at all of the things we have done with great care is not going to prevent things from happening in the future. As far as I am concerned, I am for what the President did in the Dominican Republic. I hope that they do not force any compromise on anybody that is going to put any fellow in power in the Dominican Republic who has gone south with money from the Dominican bank, as the papers allege the man we are talking about now has done. I think we have to look at this whole picture from the overall view. I told the President not 3 months ago that it was fine he was getting the backing he was in the Vietnamese crisis. I said, "I am sure you will get that until about 90 days before the next election." I said that because I was here when we had the Korean crisis. Then the question will be asked about who is killing our boys and this will suddenly become Johnson's war.

While I am on this subject, let me say that I made a Memorial Day speech this past Sunday. This town celebrated it a week ahead of time, and I had no knowledge of what the distinguished Member of the other body who has been vocal in his support of the President was going to say out in Illinois. However, I told these people I was happy that the chief supporter of the President's policy was the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. While I was making that speech, I am told by one of my colleagues that this supporter was in Illinois making a speech saying, "I would like you people to remember that there was not a single American killed in Vietnam during the 8 years of General Eisenhower's administration." Well, that is not exactly true, either. Since I am in the process of straightening up the record, let me say that we got into the Vietnam thing not under the previous assassinated President or this President but under General Eisenhower, and we have been in it since. I am not blaming him. I think General Eisenhower did the right thing by going in there. I would point out to you that we have been in there over 10 years, and as of today our casualties—and I regret every one of them, because I know what heartache this brings to a family—are still fewer than they will be on this coming Memorial Day weekend on the highways.

The French, who were there 10 years trying to reimpose colonialism on the Vietnamese, had 140,000 casualties. So while this is a can of worms and we have not been the most brilliant in the handling of it, at least our method of handling, from the casualties standpoint, has been superior to that of the French.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, as long as we are in the process of allegedly straightening out the record, the gentleman implied that we had not participated or been involved in Vietnam prior to the time of President Eisenhower. I am sure the record will indicate that under Mr. Eisenhower's predecessor we inaugurated our MAAG—Military Advisory Assistance Group—in South Vietnam and contributed substantial economic assistance to South Vietnam under the Truman administration.

Mr. HAYS. That is right; assistance to the French in Vietnam. The point I am making is that when the French pulled out—and I say I thought our decision was the right decision—we decided to step in and carry the whole load. All I am asking is that when the blame is assessed in the next political campaign that everybody go back and read the complete record. I will say to the gentleman that I am not disputing at all what he says.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I do not think it would be fair to leave the remarks hanging as they are concerning our late assassinated President. Let us also include in the record that our late assassinated President, the great John Kennedy, inherited Cuba and Castro.

Mr. HAYS. Oh, yes. It was not under his administration that Castro made his pilgrimage through the United States and appeared before the Press Club with two wrist watches on his hand, one pointing this way and one pointing the other way. When he was asked why he said—and that is when I knew that he was nutty from that day on—he said he did not have to turn his wrist to look at it. Obviously, he would have to turn his wrist to look at either one of them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to get the discussion back on the track of the proposed amendment. I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey what happened under this law that he has referred to so many times and which is supposed to have been so effective? How does it come that the Europeans have been supplying Castro and Communist Cuba with buses, with locomotives, with sugar-processing machinery and all that sort of thing? Why has not this been stopped under the law he cites if it is so effective?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yugoslavia and Canada sent the supplies, countries that do not get aid under the bill. Therefore I might say——

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute, now; the gentleman knows——

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman wanted an answer and I wanted to give him an answer.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman gave me an answer and referred to the Communist countries. I am talking about the non-Communist countries that have been supplying Castro.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the gentleman will let me finish, since when are France and Canada Communist?

Mr. GROSS. I said the non-Communist countries who have been supplying Castro.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Well, the United Kingdom does not get aid. Aid was cut off from them.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr GROSS. Yes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to answer the question, since the gentleman has yielded.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is saying that no non-Communist countries have been supplying Castro with anything of benefit to him?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I did not say that at all.

Mr. GROSS. Then what is the gentleman saying?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am saying that the countries that supplied Castro were Yugoslavia, to some extent, and Canada to some extent, France and the United Kingdom, who sent some buses. They do not get aid from the United States. Therefore, under 620 all countries that have been getting aid do not supply him and do not give any aid or assistance to Cuba under the provisions of 620, which expresses the sense of the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman recall that not long ago we put up a substantial part of $3 billion to prop up the pound sterling, to help the British save the pound sterling from collapse?

Mr. GALLAGHER. This does not have a thing to do with this bill.

Mr. GROSS. It may have nothing to do with this particular law but what I am trying to point out to the gentleman is that this law is not effective. It has not been effective, and the gentleman knows it.

The amendment which has been proposed by the gentleman from Florida would make it effective.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. No. The gentleman has had plenty of time. Let me say something else.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of the secret Communist meeting in Havana last November was brought up a little while ago in speaking of the administration's handling of foreign policy.

Do you know that testimony before our subcommittee revealed how the U.S. Government learned of this meeting in Havana, which was attended by Communists from every Latin American country?

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Government discovered that this meeting had been held through an item in a Bolivian newspaper. With all of our vaunted intelligence, and with these emissaries of the Communists going from every Latin American country to Havana, this administration knew nothing about the meeting until it had been held.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it not a fact that the law to which and about which the gentleman from New Jersey has spoken so highly allows the President to deny aid to nations which allow its shipping to be used in sending goods and materials to Cuba. Is it not true that Greece, a country which receives aid, has ships which have taken aid to Communist Cuba?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and Greece is not labeled as a Communist country.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman will yield further, I think there have been several others. Certainly the gentleman's point that this language has not been efficacious is well taken.

I would like to also make this point, if I may: I assume in writing this bill that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher], and others, have tried to make the language which appears on page 15 with regard to trade with North Vietnam as strong as possible. At least, I do not know why they would not want the prohibition of aid to nations helping North Vietnam as strong as possible. If the point of the gentleman from New Jersey is correct, that the language now in the law dealing with Cuban imports is stronger than the language dealing with Vietnam, why do we not substitute the stronger language for that now appearing in the bill?

Are we going to be weak in prohibiting our aid recipients to aid North Vietnam?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield briefly to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Greece is now complying with the provisions of 620 and, therefore, it is effective.

Mr. GROSS. You hope it is, but the facts are that Communist Cuba is getting help from our so-called free world friends and everyone knows it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if the gentleman wants to get the discussion back on the track, none of this discussion has had anything to do with this amendment. It was all very interesting, but the fact of the matter is that it did not have anything to do with the proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer].

The question was taken and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CRAMER and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 58, noes 133.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter 2—Administrative provisions

SEC. 302. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to administrative provisions, is amended, as follows:

(a) Amend section 622, which relates to coordination with foreign policy, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), immediately after "military assistance" insert "(including any civic action and sales program)".

(2) In subsection (c), immediately after "military assistance program" insert "(including any civic action and sales program)".

(b) Amend section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), strike out "paragraph (3) of" and "of the officers provided for in paragraphs (1) and (2) of that subsection", and substitute for the latter "of one or more of said officers".

(2) In subsection (d), strike out "Public Law 86–735" wherever it appears and substitute "the Latin American Development Act, as amended".

(c) Amend section 625(d), which relates to the employment of personnel, by striking out "twenty" in paragraph (2) and substituting "fifty".

(d) Amend section 626, which relates to experts, consultants, and retired officers, by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(e) Amend section 630, which relates to terms of detail or assignment, by inserting "benefits" after "travel expenses", in paragraphs (2) and (4).

(f) Amend section 635(g), which relates to general authorities, by inserting "and sales" after "loans" in the introductory clause.

(g) Amend section 636, which relates to provisions on uses of funds, as follows:

(1) In subsection (e), strike out "section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U.S.C. 62)" and substitute "section 301 of the Dual Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 3105)".

(2) In subsection (f), strike out "Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes" and substitute "Latin American Development Act, as amended".

(h) Amend section 637(a), which relates to administrative expenses, by striking out "1965" and "$52,500,000" and substituting "1966" and "$53,240,000", respectively.

(i) Amend section 638, which relates to Peace Corps assistance, by striking out all beginning with "; or famine" and substituting a period.

(j) Add the following new section 639:

"SEC. 639. FAMINE AND DISASTER RELIEF.—No provision of this Act shall be construed to prohibit assistance to any country for famine or disaster relief."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMSON OF WISCONSIN

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin: On page 17, immediately after line 2, insert the following:

"(3) At the end of subsection (d), add the following new paragraph:

" '(8) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any officer or employee of the United States performing end-use audit or end-use inspection activities outside the United States in connection with programs with respect to which the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, has responsibilities under paragraph (2) of this subsection, shall be subject to the control and direction of the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, and shall report directly to him on their activities. Each agency of the United States Government shall cooperate with the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, in carrying out the provisions of this paragraph, including but not limited to the submission to the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, of written notification of every assignment of an officer or employee to perform activities referred to in the first sentence of this paragraph. This paragraph shall not apply to the General Accounting Office nor to any officer or employee thereof.' "

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes an extension but a very necessary addition to the authority of the Inspector General, who I think is doing an excellent job. The problem today is that the end-use investigators and the end-use inspectors who are trying to find out whether the money from the American AID program has been used in accordance with the law are working under the Ambassador or the mission chief in the country that is the recipient of the aid. About 3 years ago we had a glaring example which was brought out by the Porter-Hardy committee of an end-use investigator who had found out that American aid money was going into a Russian institution that was being constructed in Cambodia, and because he had the temerity to appear before the committee and testify to those facts, he lost his job. I think that the end-use investigator should be responsible not to the mission chief but to the Inspector General in Washington, D.C., and to the American taxpayer.

The record is replete with countries that received illegal money and improperly used money. One of the worst ones is Cambodia. Cambodia still owes us more than $2 million because of improperly used money. Bolivia owes us $1,400,000. The Dominican Republic owes us $1,471,000 because of improperly used money. The Philippines owe us more than a million dollars. India owes us $1,800,000. Pakistan owes us $1,400,000. Spain owes us $1,300,000.

I attribute much of this to the fact that the end-use investigators are too much obligated to the mission chief or to the ambassador who is trying to curry favor with the nationals of the country in which they are stationed. I think it would be to the great interest of the American taxpayer and to this program if we can tighten up the use of that money and insure that it is being properly used because I am convinced that much of the criticism of this program comes from the fact that money is being spent for lipstick and deodorants and sex stimulants and things of that kind which irritate the American taxpayer.

If my colleagues will read the debate on this bill last year, you will see the references to that and it may seem humorous to some but when it runs into millions of dollars, I think it is certainly unnecessary and reprehensible that it is permitted by this Government.

Just yesterday I pointed out in the report of the Comptroller General of April 29 about AID money going for railroad equipment to build a railroad bed. The equipment cost $543,000 and they sent the equipment over to Turkey after the roadbed had been constructed.

When it was pointed out that they did not need the equipment for construction, the AID Agency insisted that they leave the equipment there for maintenance. But the Comptroller General pointed out that, even so, the Agency files indicate that, for the most part, the equipment may not be needed for maintenance of the project.

This is an incredible situation pointed out by the Comptroller General, who says:

> We found that the Agency's organizational unit responsible for the postaudit of Agency-financed purchases and initiation of any appropriate refund action was not made aware of the ineligibility of the construction equipment questioned in this report.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. First let me say that I agree with the gentleman as to the necessity for end-use determination. I do not believe there is any quarrel about that. I am trying to decide whether the amendment would, by placing the end-use investigator under the direct supervision of the Inspector General, as I understand it, take the investigator away from the chief of mission or from the Ambassador.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. It would make him responsible directly to the Inspector General. It would eliminate his dependence for his position and the assurance of his continuation of his efforts on the mission director or on the Ambassador. I am very hopeful that the chairman of the committee, who instituted the Inspector General, will accept this amendment as a proper extension of that authority.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry to inform the author of the amendment that I rise in opposition.

It is true what the gentleman said; I am the author of the provision in existing law which created the Inspector General. When that office was created by amendment in the AID bill 4 years ago, I fully intended that the Office of the Inspector General be a compact supervisory but nonoperating organization.

Now, if I remember correctly, the Inspector General's office has about 50 employees. The amendment of the gentleman would add the end-use inspectors in each country. We have a program, let us say, in some 80 countries. If we assume there are 3 or 4 end-use inspectors in each country, this would channel into the Office of the Inspector General 250 more employees. I believe this would interfere with effectiveness of the work of the Inspector General.

We created this office to check up on the inspectors, not to do the inspecting. I cannot see how the amendment would improve making use of the end-use inspectors.

The gentleman knows and I know that since Mr. Bell took over as AID Administrator he has made a real effort to keep track of what is going on in the field and have the end-use inspectors work better. I believe they are doing a better job. I believe that the problems of which the gentleman from Wisconsin spoke are being cleared up.

Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. May I read from the testimony in the hearings, on page 956. Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin, the author of the amendment, asked Mr. Bell about this particular problem in committee. Mr. Bell's reply was:

> The Inspector General has all the staff that he thinks he needs and wants, and can hire more any time he wants. Whether or not he has end-use inspectors, I must insist that my mission directors have end-use—it is my responsibility and that of my mission directors to see that the goods go where they are supposed to go. I would feel it incumbent on me to have end-use inspectors.

Would the chairman agree that the basic issue is whether or not we assume the mission director and the Ambassador are trying to run a good, tight, honest program? That is the basic issue. If we so assume, the amendment should be voted down.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GALLAGHER. With respect to the lipstick and other items of interest, to which the gentleman referred, those were found and discovered not by the gentleman by by the AID administration itself. They have since made claims, and are in the process of collecting for those items.

Mr. MORGAN. They were found by the very end-use inspectors who are now under criticism by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Exactly.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I would like to point out to the Committee and our very distinguished Chairman that the report I read from was submitted to this House in 1963 and submitted again in 1964 and it was submitted again on April 29, 1965, because the AID administration failed to do anything for a period of 3 years. The Comptroller General says in that report he will continue to call it to the attention of the Congress. It is only $543,000 of improperly used AID money, but I think that this House can do a lot more than they appear willing to do in order to tighten this program up in the interests both of this program and of the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. MORGAN. I agree with the gentleman that we should tighten up the program, but I am opposed to our moving the end-use inspectors out from under the country missions and putting them under the Inspector General. That is not going to tighten up the program. I think the end-use inspectors are absolutely necessary in their present stations. The mission director and the Ambassador, of course, must use end-use inspectors. You have heard the gentleman from New Jersey read the testimony in which the AID director said he must have end-use inspectors in the field under the mission director in order to discharge his responsibilities. The gentleman will create 250 new jobs under the AID agency if his recommendation is approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Thomson].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter 3—Miscellaneous provisions

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Derwinski: On page 18, line 5——

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORGAN. The Clerk started to read on page 18, line 13, and the gentleman's amendment refers to an earlier part of the bill.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, when the Clerk finished reading he was on line 3, page 17. He was not yet at line 13 on page 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk had read through line 12 on page 18 and commenced to read at the proper place.

The Clerk will read.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Derwinski: On page 18, line 5, strike out "$53,240,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$51,500,000".

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to state I am not going to insist on my point of order, but if the Members on the other side are going to offer any further amendments to this bill they should be prepared at the proper time to offer the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the gentleman from Illinois was not on his feet and offered his amendment at the time the Clerk started reading. The Clerk read through line 12 on page 18. The amendment is proposed to an earlier section, and therefore the Chair rules that the amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk. Page 18, line 13:

Chapter 3—Miscellaneous provisions

Sec. 303. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to miscellaneous provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 642(a)(2), which relates to statutes repealed, by striking out "143," and all beginning with ": *Provided,*" up to the semicolon.

(b) Amend section 644, which relates to definitions, as follows:

(1) In subsection (g), insert ", and not procured in anticipation of military assistance or sales requirements, or pursuant to a military assistance or sales order," after "United States Government" and strike out "as grant assistance".

(2) In subsection (m)(2), strike out "Such price shall be the same standard price" and substitute "Such standard price shall be the same price (including authorized reduced prices)".

(3) Amend the paragraph following the numbered paragraph (3) in subsection (m) as follows:

(A) In the first sentence, insert "and sales" after "Military assistance".

(B) In the second proviso, strike out "by the military assistance program".

(c) Amend section 645, which relates to unexpended balances, by striking out "Public Law 86–735" and substituting "the Latin American Development Act, as amended".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 19, immediately after line 16, insert the following:

"(d) Add the following new section:

" 'Sec. 649. Limitation on Authorization of Funds.—There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,934,195,000 for the fiscal year 1966 to carry out the provisions of part I and section 637(a) of this Act and, notwithstanding section 610 of this Act, shall be utilized as the President may determine to carry out such provisions. All other provisions of this Act authorizing the appropriation of funds to carry out the provisions of part I and section 637(a) of this Act are repealed.' "

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would solve some of the difficulties encountered this afternoon by way of checking up on the use of funds in this foreign handout program. All this amendment would do is cut $1 billion out of the bill. It is just that simple. With that reduction we could begin to get some order out of the confusion that is going on with respect to checking up on how the money is being spent and for what purpose.

The new authorization in this bill is more than $2 billion; $2,004 million plus a few odd thousands. Previously authorized $1.5 billion, and the Alliance for Progress $600 million, for a total of $4,104 million.

I do nothing with the miltary assistance end of this bill which is $1,170 million. Subtracting $1,170 million leaves a total of $2,934,195,000. The adoption of my amendment would take off $1 billion, leaving $1,934,195,000 in the bill, which, added to the estimated $6.2 billion of unexpended funds in the pipeline is more than sufficient.

Mr. Chairman, there are so many faucets in this program of foreign aid that I would not know, and I doubt that anyone else would know, how to reach the separate faucets in order to cut down the flow of cash. So, by force of necessity, we must go to the main stem, to the main valve and twist that down a little bit if we are ever going to phase out this program. No one can tell actually how the money is being spent. Not even the General Accounting Office, as the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Thomson, has so well said, can ascertain how the money is being spent and for what purposes.

Finally, I think it is high time that in the interest of the taxpayers of this country and in the interest of Congress we break up the monopoly that the United States holds on foreign aid. If we phase this program out, get it down to size, and get out of this business, we can uproot the monopoly that we have had for so many years on dissipating the resources of the U.S. taxpayers all over the world.

Let some of the other countries take over and establish foreign aid monopolies. Let them take over the business of dishing out their cash to foreigners all over the world. I am sure the Democrat Members of the House, being the great antimonopolists they are reputed to be, will want to join me in this effort to bust the world's biggest monopoly of dispensing foreign aid that the United States has had for so long and which has cost the taxayers so dearly.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Would the gentleman say that his amendment gives a certain flexibility to the administration in that it permits the administration to decide where it will cut the $1 billion?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, it gives the administration all the flexibility in the world. It can spend and give priority to any program within the limits of the $1,900 million that is left.

Mr. Chairman, I would think that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in justice to the taxpayers of this country, in justice to all of us, would arise and accept this amendment without any argument.

That would be a fine way for him to close out this day.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I know that the gentleman from Iowa and others in the minority have some constructive criticism to make and some guidance for the President.

However, I cannot see just exactly why the gentleman from Iowa selected $1 billion. Using the gentleman's own argument would it not be better probably in order to break this monopoly to probably cut it by $2 billion?

Mr. GROSS. No. It would probably take a little time to end this monopoly. Even in the courts, they go through various stages. I am not a lawyer, but I know that charges have to be filed and the lawyers have to prepare their cases. So I am willing to give a reasonable amount of time and money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I would suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Zablocki] that if he wants the constructive ideas of the minority, that he refer to the minority views in this year's report, in which we set forth what we thought were some worthwhile suggestions.

Mr. GROSS. On the subject of foreign aid, I forgot to remind the gentleman from Wisconsin and the members of the committee that there is another subsidy to the foreigners that was approved the other day in the matter of artificial and rigged coffee prices. Coffee has gone up some 20 cents a pound since the coffee agreement was entered into and the coffee cartel in London took over. You can just figure that up. Each 1-cent-per-pound increase in the price of coffee adds up to $31 million in added cost to American consumers. So, on top of all the rest of this money that is being dished out to the various international lending agencies, and on top of this bill, American consumers of coffee are adding another $500 or $600 million subsidy to the Latin American countries.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I do not see any connection whatsoever between the statement that has been made by the gentleman from Iowa and his pending amendment.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to say is that they can easily live with this $1 billion cut, in view of all of the other subsidies and handouts that are being made available to them.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Sure.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I would like to reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair]. I have carefully read the minority views and I submit that I have found no constructive suggestions in that part of the report. Further, I am not a doctor but it seems to me that if a patient is sick—if the aid program is sick and is suffering from some ailment—we should try to cure him. However, it also appears to me that the suggestions of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is not to operate on the patient but to shoot him.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee feels it would be rather unwise to take out $1 billion at this time.

Therefore, we oppose the amendment and urge its rejection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa talked about the monopoly we have on foreign aid. Does not the gentleman know that several of our allies have foreign aid programs?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and a notable one is the State of Israel that entered into a foreign aid program while we were pouring dollars in there to keep them going, and they used our money.

Mr. JOELSON. Does the gentleman know anything about West Germany's foreign aid program at the present time? Does he know that many of our allies are contributing more as to per capita income to foreign aid than we are?

I do not think the gentleman is accurate when he talks about our having a monopoly.

Mr. GROSS. We subsidize them to carry on these foreign aid programs.

Mr. JOELSON. We are not subsidizing West Germany today. West Germany has a very large foreign aid program as well as several other of our allies which are not receiving a penny in foreign aid.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that this $1.3 billion cut offered by the gentleman from Iowa, of course, is going to cause a great deal of hardship to the economic part of the foreign assistance program. This cut would affect the Alliance for Progress, the Children's Fund, the International Organizations, and of course the old point IV operations which are still being carried on.

I think the amendment should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to direct the attention of the Members of the House to a development in a matter in which we should all be interested.

Mr. Chairman, along with many Members of this House, I intend once again to cast my vote for a foreign aid authorization, in hope that it will strengthen the President's hand in a troubled world.

My conscience tells me to support this legislation even though it may not be widely popular among the people I represent.

But it seems to me that we owe the taxpayers every assurance that their money is being closely accounted for.

Mr. Chairman, much has been made of purported extravagance in the use of foreign aid funds. We rightly insist on the sharpest scrutiny over these expenditures. Yet there is little opportunity for an individual Congressman to ferret out such abuses.

I would rather direct the attention of colleagues to an area in which we certainly can move to prevent abuse—right in our own offices.

On April 22, I introduced H.R. 7572, aimed at making certain that the clerk-hire funds available to congressional offices are paid only to employees on the job here in Washington, or in the Congressman's home community.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Did the gentleman from California obtain unanimous consent to speak out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I was not aware I was speaking out of order.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do not make the point of order. I just present it as a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I thank the gentleman for this concern.

During House Administration Subcommittee hearings on that bill, it was discovered that my proposal might not be needed. For in passing clerk-hire legislation in the 88th Congress, we had adopted a resolution, House Resolution 294, with the following paragraph:

> SEC. 2. No person shall be paid from any clerk-hire allowance if such person does not perform the services for which he receives such compensation in the offices of such Member or Resident Commissioner in Washington, District of Columbia, or in the State or the district which such Member or Resident Commissioner represents.

The terms of that House Resolution 294, 88th Congress, were carried over into the 89th Congress by the passage of House Resolution 7, offered by the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], and passed on the first day of this session.

Mr. Chairman, I understand from press reports that the distinguished chairman of the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], has called upon the Clerk of the House to determine whether the regulations on clerk-hire, as prescribed by both the 88th and 89th Congresses, are being or have been violated by any Member.

I hope the Clerk will undertake such a study, and make known his findings to this body in the very near future.

Where improprieties exist, they should be eliminated. The millions of Americans who tend to regard politicians at all levels with cynicism should come to know that the word "Honorable," appearing in front of a Congressman's name, means exactly what it says.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I seldom like to take the floor twice in one day to make announcements about our space program, but I know it is of great interest and importance to all of you.

Mr. Chairman, NASA—Houston announced today that an astronaut may get out of the Gemini 4 spacecraft during the manned mission scheduled for June 3.

Pilot Edward H. White, if conditions are favorable, will open the right hand hatch of the Gemini 4 spacecraft and float some 25 feet out into space on the end of an umbilical line.

The extravehicluar activity is tentatively scheduled for a total of 22 minutes, beginning the second orbit of the flight over Hawaii with nearly 10 minutes of the activity completely outside of the spacecraft.

NASA delayed the decision until today until final qualifications tests could be completed on the spacecraft, space suit, secondary life support patch and umbilical, although planning for such extravehicluar activities has been going on since the beginning of the Gemini program.

The Gemini program has three primary objectives: Long duration flight, rendezvous and docking and extravehicular activities. NASA associate administrator, Robert C. Seamans, Jr., said:

> We have spent a great deal of time planning for extravehicular activities and the decision to include the activity in this mission came after a long series of carefully planned tests of the equipment especially the life support test packs and training of the astronauts. It was only when we were satisfied that these tests were successfully completed that we made the final decision to go ahead.

The first manned mission in the Gemini program was a three-orbit flight March 23 with astronauts Virgil I. Grissom and John Young. The Gemini 4 mission with James McDivitt as the command pilot is scheduled for 62 revolutions over a 4-day period. The mission with the extravehicular experiment could establish two U.S. "firsts", the longest U.S. space flight and the first extravehicular activity.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter 4—Amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

> SEC. 401. Section 107 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:
>
> "No sale under title I of this Act shall be made to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such sale is essential to the national interest of the United States. No such sale shall be based on the requirements of the United Arab Republic for more than one fiscal year. The President shall keep the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed with respect to sales made to the United Arab Republic under title I of this Act."

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct an inquiry to the chairman of our committee. In view of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that we have very effectively completed a discussion of this bill without accepting any amendments, would the gentleman care to inform the House of the position the House will take if the other body should pass on a two-year authorization as opposed to our one-year authorization?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, if the gentleman took the time to read the majority report, on page 3 he would find some clear language outlining the position of the majority as far as the 2-year authorization is concerned. Today when I spoke on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana dealing with the development loan fund, I indicated that with the ending of the long-term authorizations which run out in fiscal 1966, I felt a new look should be taken at these authorizations. I strongly believe it should be a one-year authorization as far as the bill as a whole is concerned. I can see some justification for long-range authorizations for the lending part of the bill, but I certainly will support legislation providing for annual authorizations.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the chairman for his comments.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I should like to refer specifically to the last section which has been read. While I applaud the recognition of a point which many of my colleagues, as well as myself, have been making, that aid to the UAR under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act must be terminated in the face of increasingly anti-American statements and acts of Colonel Nasser. I am concerned about what might be taken as an ambiguity in the language before us. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a number of questions.

First, with reference to the determination as to what is essential in the national interest of the United States, there is, as I understand, no specific criterion laid down either in the report or anywhere else. I should specifically like to know whether it is the chairman's understanding that this finding will be made public, so that we all may know what is considered essential.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. The determination, of course, will be made by the President. There are certain documents of the President which are not made public. I assume, when and if the President makes any determination under this language, that when the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate are informed, some information might be classified. On the other hand, the fact that a determination has been made will be made public.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I take it from what the gentleman said that this will be a public document. Following that up, will the appropriate Senate committees and the Speaker of the House be consulted in advance of the proposed sale, or be advised of its completion after the fact?

Mr. MORGAN. It has always been the custom for the executive branch, when making a finding of this kind, and there have been a number of cases comparable to that which relates to the United Arab Republic, to brief the committee before a determination is made.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

With respect to the fiscal year that is described, does that mean the current fiscal year or the coming fiscal year?

Mr. MORGAN. That means the coming fiscal year, 1966.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman does not mind, I should like to refer back to section 101, on page 1, beginning at line 11 and continuing to line 7 of page 2.

I certainly commend the committee for the proposed amendment to section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act, which I believe makes clear that Congress is deeply disturbed by the incidents of desecration and destruction of American property by mob violence. I should like to know whether the chairman would agree that much of this mob violence occurs because of acts and statements of some of the leaders of these countries. This reflex action goes beyond the borders of the country.

In essence what we are saying—I ask whether the gentleman would agree—is that while we deplore the acts themselves we also deplore anything which incites them in any manner.

Mr. MORGAN. I agree with the gentleman. I am sure that some of the statements made by leaders of these countries have been responsible for riots and destruction of property.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am glad to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I should like to bring to the attention of the gentleman the fact that at a hearing of the Subcommittee on the Near East, at which there was testimony by the Under Secretary of State for the Near East and the Assistant Secretary of the Agency for International Development, I inquired whether we would be informed prior to the determination of how much assistance we were to give to Egypt, rather than being told after the fact, as was suggested. We were told, if I remember correctly, that we would be advised before any aid was to be given, and that any determination they were to make they would inform us about prior to doing so.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman. Would the gentleman agree that the import of this section, in essence, is that aid under the surplus food program has now come to an end except for some extraordinary reason in the interest of the United States?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the exchange between the distinguished chairman of the committee and the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. I believe that section 401 in the bill does deserve our special attention.

Section 401 amends section 107 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 by adding:

> No sale under title I of this Act shall be made to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such sale is essential to the national interest of the United States. No such sale shall be based on the requirements of the United Arab Republic for more than one fiscal year.

The section also includes a most important provision concerning aid to Nasser:

> The President shall keep the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed with respect to sales made to the United Arab Republic under title I of this Act.

The Foreign Affairs Committee deserves commendation for including this important section. I also want to commend our colleague, Mr. FARBSTEIN of New York, for his part in drafting this language. Ever since I have been in Congress I have been deeply concerned with the fact that the United States aids a country which clearly plans aggression against one of our great democratic friends—Israel. On the floor of the House and in communications to the Secretary of State and the President I have pointed out that our aid to Nasser is inconsistent with our commitment to peace and democracy. This commitment led the Congress to write into the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 a clause which "is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against any country receiving assistance under this Act or any other act."

It is clear from the debate that the intent of the Congress was to deny aid to Nasser. Again in 1964 the Congress amended Public Law 480 to provide that no sales shall be made to any country if the President finds such country is "an aggressor in a military sense against any country having diplomatic relations with the United States." Again the clear intent of the Congress was to deny aid to the United Arab Republic.

Nasser is in violation of both the Foreign Assistance Act and Public Law 480. He has continued to foment strife in the Middle East. His self-admitted determination to destroy Israel has not abated. On the contrary, he has accelerated his arms buildup and still receives substantial quantities of highly sophisticated weapons from the Soviet bloc. Nasser has also employed German scientists to work on missile development to aid in his plans for the destruction of Israel. Nasser has incited other Arab states to join in the establishment of the United Arab Command for the purpose of military encirclement of Israel. He has also worked with other Arab countries toward the diversion of the headwaters of the Jordan River.

In addition to his anti-Israel crusade, Nasser is clearly anti-American. His speeches reflect this sentiment. He has accused the U.S. Ambassador of using economic pressure and has told his people that anyone disagreeing with his anti-U.S. attitude "can drink from the sea."

Mr. Chairman, the existing prohibitions against aid to Nasser have never been implemented. I have time and time again asked the State Department for an explanation of the flouting of congressional intent. All I have received is avoidance of the question. It is time for Congress to unequivocally assert itself on this important issue. Appeasement of Nasser must end.

I hope that section 401 will in fact terminate aid to Nasser and that the President will, in keeping with this section, keep the Congress informed on this issue. The record is plain. It is time for plain action.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported this legislation for 16 years. I have had some doubts about it from time to time and I have some serious doubts about part of it at the moment, but in voting for or against this legislation you have a kind of tough choice to make. If you vote against it, you vote against all of the money for prosecuting the war in Vietnam. On the other hand, if you vote for it—and this choice occurs in nearly every bill—you vote for some things that you probably think are not right and that you do not like. I had thought I would vote against the bill, and I would probably do so, undoubtedly, if it were not for the money in it for Vietnam, which I think is important and necessary. However, if Congress adjourns at a reasonable time this year for the first time in a long time, I do propose as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on State Department personnel, which includes the AID personnel, to hold some rather searching inquiries about the adequacy of some of this personnel. I think some of the decisions they have made in some of the areas of the world about spending this money have been, to put it mildly, unfortunate. I have gotten the definite conclusion that some of these people in the AID program are more interested in maintaining the bureaucracy at its present high level of employment than they are in doing a job. We would gather from some of the hearings we have been having that some of the Government employee organizations are interested in seeing that everybody in AID stays on the job whether they are competent or whether they are not competent. This organization has been in existence for a long time. In the beginning, under the Marshall plan, when we were operating in areas where we were putting people with high industrial competence back to work, I do not think anybody can deny that if it had not been for this program some of the nations of Western Europe at least, who are not behind the Iron Curtain today, would have been behind the Iron Curtain. When we moved into the underdeveloped areas of the world, it seems to me that imagination was lacking and there was too much of the idea down there, "Well, the program is to pour in money and build more dams and create more work, as we did in Europe, so let us do it everywhere."

I said before and I will say again that in the underdeveloped areas of the world it seems to me that the Peace Corps is doing a better job in a great many respects than the AID program because they are attacking the problem that we are supposed to be attacking, in the basic areas of villages and schools and health and things of that kind.

Mr. Chairman, I hope, if we do have some time this fall, if Congress is not in session, that I can get a reasonable number of the members of my committee together so that we may take a look, a long and sweeping look at this program in some of the underdeveloped countries, not necessarily to go there, but to examine the people who are making the decisions here in Washington and to find out why they made some of the decisions that they have made.

Although I have defended this program and fought for it for 16 years I am not one of those who says that everything they have done is perfect. I do think there is a great area that could be improved upon in our AID program outside the military area.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the first trip abroad that I made was with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS]. That was quite a number of years ago and I shall never forget it. I was proud of being a member of a group headed by the gentleman from Ohio. It was a hard working delegation. I know that when the gentleman undertakes the investigation to which he has referred following the adjournment of Congress he will do a mighty good job.

Mr. Chairman, that however is not why I asked for this time. Today is the second anniversary of the signing of the Charter of African Unity. I am chairman, as many of you know, of the Subcommittee on Africa. I have a pride, a very deep pride, as has the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], and I am sure all members of our subcommittee, in the progress that has been made in Africa. Each year has been a year of going forward.

I know that on occasion we read in the newspapers bad news from Africa, but by far most of the news is good. It all adds up to a story of real hemispheric progress.

I am happy to note that the second anniversary of the signing of the historic charter in Addis Ababa falls on the day when we are passing in this Chamber the foreign aid bill with fewer storms than it has ever experienced since I have been here.

In my remarks on May 29, 1963, which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 8, pages 9851–9853. I said that the charter of African unity was to be compared to the Articles of Confederation that loosely bound our States together during the Revolutionary War and the critical period which led to the adoption of the Constitution that perfected our Union.

I stated further that I regarded the all-African charter of unity of such importance as a statement of the common objectives of the African nations and the methods agreed upon for the advancement of the interest of an entire continent that I was including in my remarks the full text of the document. Those interested, then, may refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

In the 2 years of its existence the Organization of African Unity has served well the causes of the independent nations of Africa. One of the challenges that first came to it was the settlement of a border dispute between Algeria and Morocco, and what might have developed into a war between these neighboring countries was averted.

It sought to bring peace and understanding between warring forces in the Congo, and while in this the full objective was not attained it at least was heartening and reassuring to know that the Africans themselves working within the charter of their own organization were undertaking the solution of African problems.

Mr. Chairman, for myself, for the Subcommittee on Africa, and I think I am safe in saying for the full Committee on Foreign Affairs and for the House of Representatives itself, I extend to all the nations of Africa warm congratulations on the second anniversary of their union and sincere good wishes for the future.

It is the policy of the United States, as I understand it, to abide by the decisions of the African states on the sound reasoning that equitable and lasting solutions of African problems can come only from the Africans themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that my colleagues who have little personal knowledge of Africa, as well as those better informed, will find interest in the African economic assistance program for fiscal 1966, as projected in the bill we are about to pass, and a brief sketch of past accomplishments and future plans.

The total program request for economic assistance to Africa amounts to $218 million—$100 million in development lending, $92 million in technical cooperation and $26 million in supporting assistance. An additional $5 million is included in the appropriation for "contribution to international organizations" to continue the presence of essential U.N. personnel in the Congo. The program represents less than a 10-percent increase over fiscal years 1964 and 1965 and substantially less than the $315 million in fiscal year 1962 and $261 million in fiscal year 1963. In comparison with the Latin American region—the United States increased its economic assistance to Latin America from $254 million 5 years ago to an estimated $610 million for fiscal year 1966. U.S. economic assistance to Africa was $264 million in 1961, $46 million more than what is projected for 1966.

While assistance to 32 countries is planned in 1966, two less than in 1965, about 60 percent of the authorized funds are expected to be spent in five countries—Nigeria, Liberia, Ethiopia, Tunisia, and the Congo. Each of these countries is a firm supporter of the Western world, each is important to U.S. interests and for the most part each is characterized by considerable stability.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Of the $92 million proposed for technical assistance in 1966, by far the largest amount will be spent in the agriculture and education sectors; $85 million is required to cover the minimal requirements for carrying forward existing projects leaving just $7 million either for additional costs of continuing projects or for new ones. As of December 31, 1964, there were in effect $85.2 million worth of contracts in 30 countries. Eighty percent of these funds were for university and foundation contracts in the education and agriculture fields. For the five countries receiving most of the aid university contracts in these two fields totaled as follows:

[Dollar amounts in millions]

		Number of contracts
Nigeria	$17.5	11
Ethiopia	10.7	2
Liberia	5.0	4
Tunisia	.8	1
Congo	.4	1

DEVELOPMENT LOANS

The $100 million for development loans proposed in fiscal year 1966 are intended mostly for capital projects, especially in Nigeria and Tunisia. In all at least 30 proposed loans in some 14 countries are to be considered in fiscal year 1966 covering a wide range of activities—local development banks lending to local private investors, navigational aids and other equipment for civil aviation facilities, expansion of roads, railways and communication and construction of college facilities; as of December 31, 1964, interest collected on loans amounted to $28.2 million in dollars and dollar equivalents and principal repayments of $5.1 million.

SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

About $26 million of the total aid request is proposed for supporting assistance in 1966, a continued reduction from previous levels. The bulk is programed for the Congo where the funds will be used to try to maintain security until that country can reestablish the conditions for longrun development.

POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

In the political field major recipients of U.S. aid have weathered serious political storms and have built genuine stability.

First. Nigeria—the world's 10th largest country in population—has built a federation of some 55 million diverse peoples, has converted its form of government to that of a republic and has added a fourth region to its original three regions. Last December, Nigeria weathered its first general election since independence in 1960 and came through the experience stronger than ever, despite an acute period of dissension.

Nigeria has resolved its political conflict by adherence to the rule of law and constitutional processes and has reached the point where Prime Minister Balewa recently was able to say: "The President—Azikiwe—and I have once again shown that the things that bind Nigerians together are stronger than those which separate them."

Second. Ethiopia is another country that has strengthened its government since an abortive revolution in 1961 and has moved ahead to play a leading role in African affairs. This oldest of independent African countries has been governed by Emperor Haile Selassie since 1930, and his leadership has survived both foreign invasion and domestic crisis during the 35 years of his reign. In the last few years, the Emperor has become a leading figure in pan-African matters. His role in the formation of the Organization of African Unity was especially impressive.

Third. Tunisia also has developed a high degree of order and stability which has led to a remarkable level of economic growth in that country. Working quietly and steadily on the improvement of its agricultural economy, Tunisia has put to good use the assistance it has received—principally from France and the United States—and the standard of living of its people is rising—hearings on FAA of 1965, page 101.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROGRAMS

In the economic field a number of African countries appear to be making solid economic and social progress.

First. In recent years, Liberia, Ethiopia, and Nigeria have been able to increase their gross national product by 4 to 5 percent annually.

Second. Agricultural production for the entire continent has risen 25 percent in the past 10 years.

Third. African exports have increased 45 percent in the same period of time.

Fourth. Oil production in Libya and Nigeria has increased sharply in the last 4 years.

Fifth. The U.N. Economic Commission for Africa is one of the most active and most effective of the U.N. regional bodies. Its activities in planning for African development augur well for the future. For example: (a) The ECA fathered the African Development Bank established last year; (b) the ECA is cooperating with African nations in planning regionally integrated programs in such fields as transportation, telecommunications, and industrialization.

Sixth. In education, Africa is making remarkable progress. South of the Sahara in the past 4 years, the number of universities has risen from 24 to 35. Secondary school enrollment has increased from about 800,000 to 1.8 million. (a) Thirty U.S. colleges and universities hold 39 contracts to assist education in 15 African countries. (b) Nearly 3,500 Peace Corps volunteers are now in 19 African countries, and most of them are working in educational activities—from FAA of 1965 hearings, page 102–103.

BLOC AID

Combined Soviet and Communist Chinese offers of aid to Africa—exclusive of the United Arab Republic—totaled about $413 million for fiscal year 1964. The cumulative total of Communist offers to African nations amounts to more than $1 billion although less than one-fifth has been drawn upon by African governments. More than one-half of all Communist aid to less developed countries is currently earmarked for Africa. Free world aid to Africa dropped from $1.77 billion in 1962 to $1.41 billion in 1964. At the same time Communist assistance doubled. At the present time the Soviets have diplomatic relations with 24 African countries—6 new in 1964—and Communist China with 17—7 new in 1964. So far, however, there is no Communist satellite in Africa.

PRIVATE INVESTMENT

U.S. investment in Africa—excluding the United Arab Republic—has increased over fivefold in 10 years. It went from $267 million in 1950 to $1.423 million in 1963. AID points out one program in the field of private enterprise they consider promising. Mr. Hutchinson, in his testimony on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965, page 111, describes it as follows:

> That is, by working with the Small Business Administration we have been able to find a number of small businessmen in the States who have been quite successful in their own businesses here, who have some desire to expand their businesses overseas and are also really pretty highly motivated in terms of wanting to make a demonstration of the American way of life overseas.
>
> We find that there is a very considerable kind and degree of motivation on their part. We have sent two groups of six to eight people each to Tunisia with a view to seeing if they could develop joint enterprises with Tunisian businesses. These would be quite small. The experience has been quite surprising. Out of the first group one man has already come back and obtained his investment survey guarantee and gone into a detailed examination of a little project for millwork with Tunisian partners.
>
> Three of the second group have themselves already organized a Tunisian development corporation. This is an American corporation to which they have contributed capital themselves with a view to investing in Tunisian industry with Tunisian partners.
>
> There are two small industries that they have decided to go into and have selected their partners. There are a number of other specific projects and proposals which we expect they will be going forward with. I won't take the time of the committee to go into them in detail.
>
> Let me say that out of these groups we have already developed a number of projects where we expect only quite small American investment, but these represent joint undertakings with Tunisians to develop a private endeavor. This is a country which hasn't been too sure it was very much interested in the private sector. The response by the Tunisian Government has been very good. In fact, a quasi-governmental agency was willing to pay the travel expenses of this second group over there to make the investigation.
>
> After we get a few of these successfully going in Tunisia, we expect to send another group over and we hope to expand this effort into other countries. It is a type of approach that is new and hasn't been tried. But I think our success in actually getting some proposals and some prospects going has been better with this approach than anything we have tried in the private sector to date.
>
> We wanted to call it specifically to your attention because the idea of the small man going in, particularly in the African situation, where business must by its nature be very, very small, is a dimension that hasn't been in our program before and we think that this may be very significant.

Mr. Chairman, this is the story of success, the story of marvelous and continuing programs of the nations of Africa. The aid we give to Africa will be returned to us a thousandfold in rich new markets opened for our products and our wares and in deep and abiding friendships in a world of freedom. Again our congratulations and good wishes in this happy second anniversary of the Charter of African Unity.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLFF

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WOLFF: On page 20, line 1, strike out "national interest" and insert in lieu thereof "national security".

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, last March this Congress was presented with a difficult decision. The United Arab Republic sought an extension of aid. Although I was opposed to this extension, because of an emergency I voted to give the President the flexibility to extend or not to extend aid, at his discretion, if it best served the interest and security of the United States. My vote was predicated on the belief that as a U.S. Congressman and citizen, the safety and security of our country must remain of paramount importance in all my decisions.

This vote did not then, nor does it now, alter my firm belief that the United Arab Republic has by its actions demonstrated that it is worthy of continued American aid.

I am convinced that Nasser is an ingrate who asks our aid on the one hand and encourages mobs to stone our Embassy on the other. Not long ago he told the United States to "go drink in the sea." I do not believe the American people favor such highhanded treatment from Nasser or any other Communist-dominated dictator of this ilk.

H.R. 7750 has been offered to further amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. I wish to take issue with a section of this bill—namely, chapter 4, amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. Under section 401, the following language is found:

> No sale under title I of this act shall be made to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such sale is essential to the national interest of the United States.

I take exception to the word "interest." It is my belief that the word "security" should be substituted.

It is my belief that Nasser should be denied our help under all circumstances. But I think the criteria to be applied by the President in determining who receives our aid should be our national security, not merely our national interest.

Interest is a broad, general term implying concernment. Security is a sharper, more precise term which means freedom from danger and risk. This is the core of the matter.

I want it made incumbent upon the President not to extend aid to Nasser unless the security—the freedom from danger and risk—of our Nation is directly enhanced by such aid.

Generally, decisions on whether to extend aid to a foreign nation should be a matter determined simply by our national interest. But in cases where the supplicating hands of tyrants are extended toward us, the hands of those who have vilified us, ridiculed us, spat upon our flag, then our national security must be the only meaningful criteria.

I call upon the House of Representatives to support my plea to withhold aid to Nasser and others of his breed except in those cases where our own American national security is directly enhanced by such aid.

It is high time for us to be as pragmatic in the use of our power as our adversaries have been cynical in the use of theirs.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, opposing this amendment, I should in the beginning like to say that I certainly hold no brief for Mr. Nasser. I find his actions just as reprehensible as does the gentleman who just occupied the well. For this reason, I offered in the committee an amendment to the bill that constitutes the language which appears on page 19 which says:

> No sale under Title I of this Act shall be made to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such sale is essential to the national interest of the United States.

Also, Mr. Chairman, in addition to this, there was offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] and others, a provision accepted by the committee, that no such sale shall be based on the requirements of the United Arab Republic for more than one fiscal year.

In addition to this, this section contains a requirement that the President keep the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed with respect to the sales, a requirement of publicity.

It does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the language that we have used "essential to the national interest" is strong language. Perhaps "security" would be stronger. Perhaps it would be somewhat different but to me, the distinction is one without significance.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that I voted twice in 1963 to permit the continuance of the sales to the United Arab Republic. But I now feel that we should have in this bill a specific provision to put Nasser and others of his ilk on notice as to what the intention of the House of Representatives and the Congress, and the people of the United States is in this connection.

I might say also that this language "essential to the national interest" is the same language that appears in the bill at the present time with reference to the prohibition of aid to Cuba and the section relating to Indonesia, so that it is language that has already been accepted by the House and has been used under comparable circumstances.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I agree with the gentleman's definition of the use of the words "national interest" in the bill. May I ask the gentleman, not only is this prohibition in the bill, but is it not his understanding that the only commitments now with respect to aid are to terminating the existing program? There are no funds for future programs.

Mr. MONAGAN. The program has been terminated, insofar as I am informed, and there is no current program in existence at the present time. So that in that sense this provision is academic. The Executive has already acted with reference to this program, but nevertheless I feel this should be here with reference to any future program.

Mr. FASCELL. The administration has made the statement that it would not consider a new programing until there are changes of policy in that country?

Mr. MONAGAN. I think that has been obvious, and that certainly was made clear to the committee in the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated I urge rejection of this amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the interest of the United States is peace in the Middle East. How to achieve peace is difficult. It involves more than the military safety of the United States. It involves the security and welfare of Israel and others. This is a political, economic, as well as military problem. The committee amendment recognizes this and directs the President to do what is necessary to achieve this goal. The amendment unduly restricts the President to achieve what we all want to achieve.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important provisions contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965 is the provision amending section 224 to provide funds for investment guarantees to stimulate construction in Latin America of privately owned housing for low-income families.

As has been said many times here, tens of millions of families in Latin America still suffer privations forced by very low national family incomes; in particular, millions have only the most primitive housing.

Each year, their frustration manifests itself in rebellion and revolution, with such frequency that we have become almost insensitive to their governmental troubles. But Batista and Castro, Trujillo, and Cannano and Imbert, remind us all too painfully, that the aspirations of the sugar cutters of the islands, of the campesino in the highlands of the Andes, or the anger of the slum dweller in Caracas, can be equally fateful for our sons' futures, as what happens in our own land.

We of the United States, from our plenty, have therefore in these past years pledged continuing help to the people of Latin America. We have provided technical assistance for many years. Starting with the act of Bogotá in 1960, and the Charter of Punta del Este in 1961, we have begun a major joint effort, with the Latin Americans, to establish conditions of self-sustaining economic growth. The change in the flow of our assistance has been dramatic. Up to 1960, only one-fiftieth of our aid funds went to Latin America. Now, nearly one-fourth of our assistance is going to Latin America—much more assistance per person in Latin America than in any other part of the world. The Alliance for Progress authorizations support this vital work.

Latin America is hungry for change. Sometimes the peoples and the governments know what they want, but do not know how to achieve it. Sometimes, they know how to achieve change, but lack the capital to carry it out. The Alliance for Progress is struggling to provide both the added margin of capital and of know-how.

The provision of funds for investment guarantees to stimulate construction of privately owned housing, as stipulated in section 224, certainly fits this pattern.

The investment guarantees are meant to attract the margin of capital needed for this vital task.

In fact, it would be most unrealistic for us to attempt to provide the entire capital needed. Were we to try to buy every family a house, or buy every farmer an ox, or buy all the pipe needed for water service in every village of Latin America, or make loans to each small businessman among the more than 200 million people in the hemisphere—to do all this—we would need to allocate well over $100 billion of capital investment during the 10-year period of the Alliance. Instead, we anticipate that well over four-fifths of the total capital required for the factories, the houses, the schools, the water systems and the roads essential for development can be generated by Latin Americans themselves. Substantial parts of the remainder are coming from Europe, from private investors and from the international lending institutions. In the past few years the U.S. assistance to the Alliance has averaged something over $1 billion a year—a sizable sum, but only a small fraction—less than a fifth—of the total new capital formation occurring in Latin America. We should encourage this trend.

One of the key provisions of the Charter of Punta del Este laid down the need for national development planning and programing. Resources are scarce in Latin America. Its gross national product is roughly one-tenth of our own; its population is slightly larger. National planning is designed to determine the resources available for development in each country, to assign priorities for investment and to work out the changes in national policy—taxation, education, manpower training, roadbuilding, incentives to industry—which will assure that the nation grows as quickly as the resources permit.

Recently, the Alliance partners have formed a multilateral group—the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—to pass on the performance, the self-help effort, and the reform programs of each of the countries of the Alliance. The reports of this Committee now show a better focused picture of the Latin American economies, and provide a statistical framework within which we can work out our U.S. lending priorities and strategies.

The facts indicate that, in many places, the Alliance is doing well. In others, we already see the promise of future improvements.

A substantial number of Latin countries have undertaken exactly the kind of self-help measures that are needed. For example, tax reform programs are underway in no less than 11 Latin American countries, and in several of them tax yields have already increased very sharply, so that the people of the Latin American countries are providing more of their resources for their own betterment. Incidentally, the U.S. aid program has provided specialists from the U.S. Internal Revenue Service to help improve tax administration in those 11 Latin American countries.

No less than 10 countries have enacted at least the beginning of land reform legislation, and the activity in this field is greater than at any time in Latin American history since 1900.

The budgets of Latin American countries for public education have risen over 25 percent in the last 3 years.

The major disappointment in the Alliance to date has been in the area of private investment from abroad, including private investment from the United States. The way to increase the inflow of private capital has already been shown by countries like Mexico, Colombia, and Venezuela which have actively encouraged foreign investment and achieved a degree of fiscal and economic stability which the foreign investor requires.

There are also distinct contributions the United States can make to increase the flow of private capital. Now available and being used are AID investment guarantees which insure the private American investor against a variety of risks for ventures in developing countries. Through the investment survey program, AID now underwrites part of the cost of investigating the feasibility of a business venture in Latin America, paying half the cost if the investor decides to go ahead.

President Johnson has recently committed the United States to a redoubled effort in support of Latin America's development aspirations. And the record of Latin American performance well justifies this renewal of our commitment.

Over half the nations of Latin America have completed their past development plans.

Over half have met or surpassed the target of a 2½-percent yearly increase in per capita income.

The institutions which can carry forward progress and change, through Latin America's own efforts, are becoming more numerous and effective.

By mid-1965, U.S. assistance to Latin America, both directly and through the institutions which Latin America now has, will have helped build 326,000 homes; construct 36,400 classrooms; print 11 million textbooks; extend 290,000 agricultural credit loans; build 735 health centers, hospitals, or mobile health units; drill or install over 2,000 wells and water systems; and provide food, under Public Law 480, for 22 million people.

This is an achievement—still, perhaps, small in relation to the total needs—but growing daily. It is growing as the sense of pride and responsibility in Latin America itself grows, as Latin Americans themselves see the effects of their own efforts, and renew their dedication to the task ahead.

In Latin America as elsewhere, we must continue the battle for world order, in which our society and our way of life can thrive best, and in which each nation can work out a better life for its citizens.

I am confident that the Alliance for Progress will continue to prosper and will make the Americas one great community, where every man, woman, and child will be free, healthy, and prosperous. As President Johnson said:

> The Alliance for Progress is of the same faith that enabled us to nourish a new civilization in these spacious continents * * * faith in the power of freedom to achieve the betterment of man.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to advise the Committee that there is at the desk a motion to recommit which will contain two provisions. First, it would reduce the bill by the amount which we mentioned in the debate earlier in the afternoon. That is, by $130,958,000.

The second part of the motion to recommit would add on pages 5 and 6, after the word "free" in each instance, the words "non-Communist dominated".

That is the motion which was proposed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

I might add that the proposed dollar reduction, as we pointed out earlier, does not reach military funds. It is economic, relating to the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has spent well over $200 billion on foreign aid rather than the $130 billion so often referred to in debate. It is true that since World War II, we have spent on direct foreign aid in the neighborhood of $130 billion but when considering the total amount of foreign aid, we must include the billions appropriated for lend-lease during the war and even before World War II. Even the lowest figure mentioned is a fantastic amount, almost beyond human comprehension.

I oppose foreign aid because it is unconstitutional and because if continued, it will wreck the economy of the United States, leaving us at the mercy of our Communist enemies. When we base our foreign relations and human understanding, brotherhood, cooperation, and love on money alone, it is doomed to failure.

We cannot buy security. We cannot buy understanding. We cannot buy the respect of individuals or of nations. We have created with our foreign aid program the dollar image around the entire world. Largely because of our foreign aid program, when peoples in foreign lands think of America they think of dollars. When they see Americans walk down the streets, they think of dollars. Unfortunately, when they see the American flag, they think of our gold and they think of the American dollar. This is the tragic consequence of a foreign policy founded on the American dollar. When our foreign allies and so-called friends around the world see the Stars and Stripes, they do not think of our Bill of Rights, our Declaration of Independence, or of our free enterprise system with high standards of living but they are reminded of our money.

Mr. Chairman, they do not think of our hospitals, schools, libraries, churches, and the opportunities we have created for the underprivileged, but they think of how much they are going to get. Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is largely due to our foreign aid program. I have always believed in food and fiber and medical attention to those in need throughout the world. The people of the United States have always acted with alacrity and with generosity to the cry of the hungry and the distressed. I believe, however, that aid should be administered on a people-to-people basis—through the Salvation Army, International Relief Organization, the Red Cross, and development programs such as those of Firestone in Liberia and U.S. oil companies in Saudi Arabia. I sincerely believe that if a great portion of the billions we have spent on foreign aid had been expended for exploration of space, we would be on the moon today and would be so far ahead of Russia in space that there would be no contest and the world would be looking to this Nation as the nation of the future and not as a nation making a pitiful attempt to catch up with Russia in space. We would be in space for peace and our bases there would be used for peace rather than for slavery and conquest as envisioned by the Soviets.

Mr. Chairman, with only a portion of this money, we could have a Polaris submarine fleet that could control the seas of the world for 100 years. The United States could have intercontinental missiles which could hit any target in the world and which could explode on targets on the moon smaller than the size of New York City. We could have antimissile missiles. We could have supersonic bombers, flying at the speed of 3,000 miles an hour. We could have the largest and most mobile hard core combat troops in the world to be rushed in a matter of hours to any danger spot. We could guarantee the free nations of the world security and freedom from fear. Our country could have over a hundred thousand miles of interstate highways. We could have eliminated pollution in our rivers and have pure air, better hospitals, and schools. Poverty would not be a way of life in the United States. Our unemployment rate would be nearer to that of Germany and Japan where there is no unemployment.

Foreign aid did not make friends of the Soviet Union, one of the greatest recipients of our foreign aid. We are receiving no cooperation from Sukarno, only enmity and hatred. Nasser and Ben Bella lean toward the Communists and treat us with disdain and outright hostility. India condemns our bombing of North Vietnam. China is behind the Iron Curtain and Cuba is in Communist hands—all recipients of our taxpayers' money and all lost to the cause of freedom during our incredible foreign aid program. Even France flirts with Russia and ridicules our efforts for freedom in Vietnam and Santo Domingo. Pennypinching efforts are needed to preserve our gold stocks while it is being permitted to go overseas by the billions.

Mr. Chairman, our foreign aid should be gradually tapered off. As an alternative we need to bolster our defense effort and win the race for space. We need to and we can and must contribute more through our established and respected relief organizations. Our philosophy is founded and based on Christian concepts. We can and must send more missionaries to roll back the tide of atheism and let our friends know of our respect for the worth and dignity of the individual.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the Greek-Turkey loan and would do so today in areas where such a program would stop the spread of communism. Our whole foreign aid program is negative. Its entire objective is negative. It is against something and it is against communism. We need to go from the negative to the positive. We need to sell Americanism and our basic philosophy on a people-to-people basis with the same zeal, with the same initiative and the same know-how that we sell our material products. Should we do this, the cold war would be no contest. We would win hands down. We must be for something. We must and we can turn the wheels of progress forward. We must not turn the clock back to dictators and statism. We must move forward with the modern dynamic philosophy of the United States—a philosophy which carved out of the most underdeveloped continent in the world the arsenal of democracy and the heart and core of freedom. We were not enslaved, encumbered, or pampered with foreign aid. We moved forward with initiative and imagination to create out of the wilderness the highest standard of living in all history.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised to hear the language in the motion to recommit proposed by the gentleman from Indiana. Both of the points he includes have been voted on this afternoon and were defeated by a substantial vote.

I wonder if by putting the two together the gentleman hoped to sweeten his proposition.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. I will say to the gentleman that both parts of the motion to recommit were included because it was felt they were worthy and meritorious and ought to be presented to this body for a vote. Neither part is a sweetener for the other. They are regarded as substantive matters of great importance and I think the Members of this body ought to have an opportunity to vote on them.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McDOWELL. If the gentleman's double-barreled recommital motion is adopted, is the gentleman then going to support the bill?

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman does not expect to vote for the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I stand to express my wholehearted support of H.R. 7750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965.

This bill authorizes the expenditure of $3.3 billion for foreign aid—this is the lowest authorization request the House has been asked to approve in the 17-year history of the aid program, and it is some $12 million below the amount requested by the President. I believe that the Foreign Affairs Committee has done a remarkable job in studying and adjusting the President's request, and in reporting to the House a bill which will enable the United States to carry on its great work in this humanitarian venture, with the least burden on the American taxpayer, with minimal effect on our balance-of-payments deficit, and with full accord given to the principle of withholding assistance from nations which have flouted it in the past.

Mr. Chairman, it is axiomatic that the developing nations simply cannot maintain stability without continued economic growth, and that such growth requires external assistance for its nourishment. Without this help, the economies of these struggling nations would certainly falter, and chaos and communism would very probably ensue. It is not to "buy friends" that we predicate this aid. Rather, it is in recognition of the fact that we have been peculiarly blessed with a bounteous economy, and regard for our less fortunate brothers compels us to share with them our good fortune. In addition, it is clearly in the interest of the free world that we give these nations an alternative to communism—an opportunity to be self-reliant.

I know that most Americans realize these facts, and fully endorse our foreign assistance programs. Some, however, have legitimate misgivings, but I believe that a careful study of the bill before us will go a long way toward alleviating their doubts.

If my own mail is representative of American sentiment—and I believe it is—then those apparent aspects of our foreign aid program which most give people pause, are the feelings that we are involved in a giveaway program, and an indiscriminate one at that, where we are just as anxious to help those who insult us and thwart our goals, as we are to help our friends.

Fortunately, much improvement has been recorded in the administration of aid programs. Much of this is attributable to the able leadership of David Bell, the Administrator of AID; much may also be attributed to the watchful eye of the Congress. As a result of all our efforts, the criticism of the past is simply not applicable to the programs of today. Under the Marshall plan, more than 90 percent of the aid was in the form of outright grants. Today, over 65 percent of our foreign aid takes the form of loans. Most of these loans are long-term loans, which provide a 10-year grace period during which the borrowing country need make no payments. This grace period is crucial, for it gives the developing nation an opportunity to concentrate on basic reforms—such as roadbuilding and housing—which are necessary for long-term progress, but which do not provide the country with immediate profits. As these nations develop their economies, the need for such "soft" loans will diminish, and they will be able to seek future credit from international institutions, or from the Export-Import Bank, on standard, "harder" terms. At that point, our aid will cease, but in the meantime I think it is heartening to know that this aid does take the form of loans. This lightens the burden on the American taxpayer, and enables the recipients to turn to the United States for help with full assurance that our assistance can be solicited and accepted without impairing their own dignity and self-respect.

In some areas, of course, our programs still rely upon grants. These, however, are minimal and worthy beyond doubt. For example, the bill before us now would authorize $210 million for technical cooperation and development grants for fiscal year 1966. These funds would enable developing countries to improve the educational, technical, and professional skills of their people, and to identify and develop the human and material resources basic to sound economic growth. In addition, these funds will be available to assist American hospitals and schools abroad. I do not believe that the wisdom of these grants is open to question. I think they represent a very reasonable investment in a healthier and better world.

Another important fact is that approximately 85 percent of foreign assistance funds is spent right here in the United States. This creates jobs for our people, and advances our productivity. When loans are used to purchase American equipment, the U.S. businessman gains a market and a customer—a customer who will return for spare parts and for new machinery years later. And because this money is spent here at home, the long-term effect on our balance-of-payments deficit is very minor, indeed. I think it is most unfortunate that so few of our people realize how much of these funds is devoted to the purchase of American goods and services.

The bill we are now considering authorizes $1.17 billion for military assistance. As Secretary McNamara so cogently pointed out, we can either let the Communists overthrow friendly governments with impunity, build up our own forces to a point where we can provide U.S. troops for every emergency, or assist friendly nations in developing their own military power so that they will be able to carry their share of the collective defense burden. Like the vast majority of my colleagues, I favor the latter course.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct my attention to the criticism that the United States lacks principle in implementing its aid program, and that once we begin giving assistance we are afraid to cut it off, even if the recipient works to undermine and subvert our own foreign policy. I would like to see even stronger language than that contained in this bill. For example, I agree with the comments made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] that the language in the agriculture assistance section should be strengthened and I support his amendment. But this bill is a vast improvement over previous years. Three separate provisions in this bill go far to blunt the criticism we have expressed through the years. First, it expresses the sense of the Congress that aid to nations which do not take all necessary action to stop mob destruction of U.S. property, should be summarily terminated. Second, aid is prohibited to countries permitting ships under their registries to carry cargo to North Vietnam. Third, the bill amends the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to forbid sales of surplus agricultural products to the United Arab Republic. The President is given authority to waive this only if he determines that such a sale is "essential to the national interest of the United States." I firmly believe that this particular provision is long overdue.

The United Arab Republic is actively engaged in subverting legitimately constituted governments in the Congo and in Yemen. It has continued to employ its resources for the purpose of armsbuilding. It practices secondary economic boycotts against U.S. business firms dealing with Israel and, just last December, Mr. Nasser sneered at the $1.5 billion in U.S. aid that he has received, and invited us to "go and drink up the sea." While we neither expect nor desire subservience from the recipients of our aid, it is equally true that we neither expect—nor will we tolerate—their insults.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965 is an excellent bill. It demonstrates the fairness, the generosity, and the good will of the American people. I believe that it will continue to encourage our allies to take increased initiative in this area; that the world will be better and safer as a result of our efforts; and that the cause of peace and brotherhood will prosper.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I am delighted to yield to our distinguished colleague, the able and brilliant gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I should like to compliment him on his remarks. I associate myself with him in those remarks and I encourage him to continue the efforts he has made to achieve justice in this field in this troubled area.

I am in support of the pending legislation, but I am concerned that our assistance continues to go to a nation which has continued its foreign adventures against its neighbors, including our stanchest ally in the Middle East—Israel.

In 1963 the Congress made it clear that it would not condone continued assistance to nations which engage in or prepare for "aggressive military efforts" against the United States, or against other nations receiving U.S. assistance.

This principle is as sound now as it was then and I think that its retention in the bill before us reaffirms our determination not to support this type of aggression.

Perhaps in the future, we should also look at the increasing importance of indirect forms of aggression by nations such as the United Arab Republic against its neighbors. Modern warfare involves military weapons and political ideology; it may also involve economic repression, and the diversion of natural resources from neighboring countries contrary to reasonable international agreements on the sharing of those resources.

It is no secret that nations in the Middle East, such as the United Arab Republic would like nothing better than to turn the scarce water resources of that region away from neighboring nations which have great need for their fruits and benefits. Such action is contrary to the recognized principle of mutuality of international river systems.

Colonel Nasser's actions in regard to the Jordan waters when coupled with his military efforts on behalf of factions in civil disturbances in the Congo, in the Yemen, and in Cyprus, demands that we keep a careful watch on any U.S. programs of assistance to the United Arab Republic. So long as that nation has a leader more interested in stirring up disorder among his neighbors than in permitting their peaceful development and concentrating on the internal growth of his own country, we can never attain the goal of peace and stability in the Middle East.

I hope that the President in evaluating the quantity and quality of aggressive acts committed by the government of President Nasser, in accordance with section 620(i) of the Foreign Assistance Act, will take into account not only outright military actions, but acts of indirect aggression as well.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Could the gentleman from New York inform me as to the future of the other distinguished gentleman from New York?

Mr. HALPERN. I believe his future is quite apparent.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as the debate draws to a close, I want to speak of today's challenge for tomorrow's world. The less developed world promises to be a continuing challenge to our creative powers as well as a major source of instability in the years ahead. The United States, the leading power and the richest nation in the world, has an immense stake in a process of change in these countries. In the world today the issue is no longer change versus status quo. Change in less developed countries is inevitable.

The only question is: What kind of change? Change cannot be smooth and painless, but we must do what we can to see that it leads toward stable, open societies. That alone is sufficient to focus our attention and effort.

Beyond this interest is our humanitarian concern in improving the standards of life in the poorer two-thirds of the world. It is proper to argue a course of policy on grounds of self-interest, but it would be both unwise and untrue to American tradition to deny its humane foundations. Since material progress is a necessary condition for the kind of change we seek in the less developed countries, economic questions are basic to our relations with them.

President Kennedy recognized this 4 years ago, when he said in his inaugural address:

> Man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life.

President Johnson has shown awareness of the combination of responsibility and self-interest we have toward the less developed world. He stated recently:

> The pages of history can be searched in vain for another power whose pursuit of its self-interest was so infused with grandeur of spirit and morality of purpose.

It is perhaps only through economic programs and by dealing with economic questions that we can influence for the better the kind of change which is to occur in the less developed countries. Overcoming poverty should be the objective of any viable government in the underdeveloped world. Widespread failure to move toward this goal could confront the United States with large-scale political instability with its ensuing threat to a peaceful world.

On the other hand, governments preoccupied with internal development and economic growth—and assisted by us in this task—are less likely to engage in unsettling external adventures and more likely to evolve political institutions and social processes compatible with our own rather than with coercive systems on the Communist model. U.S. assistance for the purpose of economic development is an essential element of any U.S. effort to influence sound political evolution of the emerging nations. In the words of the framers of our own Constitution, therefore, we are seeking "to secure the blessings of liberty" for ourselves and for a dynamic and peaceful world community of open societies.

Mr. Chairman, it is with these considerations in mind that I support the role and purpose of American foreign assistance. Basically, what we are trying to do with foreign aid is to bring about constructive, peaceful change in free societies. Obviously, this cannot be accomplished without the consent and self-help of the countries themselves.

There are real limits on what foreign aid can do. Successful development rests primarily on the determination and the ability of the government and people of the developing nation. Foreign assistance provides an important margin of resources and skills, but it cannot produce development at reasonable cost unless the country is itself making the major efforts.

This simple fact is today fundamental to the development assistance strategy of the U.S. Agency for International Development, as it has adjusted to changed world relationships. It is concentrating assistance in countries where the performance will enable American aid to produce results.

The most hopeful sign for the future is the growing determination of the less developed countries to help themselves and their increasing competence in this task. Today, for every dollar of U.S. bilateral assistance, the 20 major recipients of U.S. aid in Asia, Africa, and Latin America allocate an average of $6 for development from their own limited resources.

In virtually every case, AID is intensifying its efforts to identify needed improvement in the economic policies and programs of recipient countries. It seeks to secure adoption of these improvements through incentive programing, and it seeks specific country commitments to these improvements in return for increased economic aid to raise the country's rate of economic growth.

Another way of putting it is that AID is seeking to help the developing nations to make better use of their own and external resources. To the extent they put their own houses in order, the United States is prepared to bear its share of the total burden and thereby hasten the day when they will no longer need our aid.

Mr. Chairman, part of the problem for the less developed world is that its leaders and informed people are determined to achieve in 10 or 25 years what took us 150 years to achieve. This is not an unreasonable determination in a world brought together by rapid communications. But it is a tremendous undertaking.

I do not suggest that the economic gap can be closed within the next decade or two. But experience in countries such as Israel, Greece, and Mexico has shown that an adequate pattern of income distribution begins to make it possible for people to live decently and for growth to continue with decreasing reliance on external assistance.

The foreign aid program in the future must increase the capacity of the less developed countries to utilize foreign assistance effectively in order to increase their rates of economic growth. Progress has been made in this direction. The governments of many countries are beginning to recognize the importance of development planning and of policies that go with it. But so far the transformation of institutions essential to modernization has taken hold in only some of the countries.

AID has, in the past 3 years, increasingly concentrated its efforts on such institution building and is attempting to utilize the vast private resources of American education, industry, and the professions to reach the operating levels in these nations.

Let us look briefly at some statistics relating to underdevelopment. Per capita GNP in the United States is close to $3,300 a year. By contrast, some 80 less developed countries all have per capita gross national product under $500; all but 11 have per capita gross national product under $300; 33 of them are under $100; and 10 are under $50. Their average is roughly $150 per capita, or one twenty-second the U.S. level.

Most of the less developed countries are rural in nature. Approximately 80 to 90 percent of the people live in rural areas. More than 50 percent of the working male adults in less developed countries are engaged in farming and related pursuits. Most are unskilled and untrained and, therefore, do not make the best use of their land. These same countries, because they are rural and agrarian in nature, merely export raw materials and fail to gain the economic benefits of the higher prices of finished products.

The rate of literacy is low; 35 percent for the less developed nations compared with almost 100 percent for the developed countries.

Mr. Chairman, little by little, foreign aid from the United States, from other bilateral donors and from the multilateral agencies, is helping to raise the low standards and increase the rate of growth and per capita incomes of these countries. Under current assumptions, the aid donors are seeking to increase the rate of growth of per capita income in the less developed countries by the very modest rate of 2 percent a year.

It is clear that economic development will be a central task of foreign policy in the decades ahead. It must stimulate the greatest energy and deepest imagination in our society. This call to a priority task should not go unheeded. It is one that can itself generate commitment in the business community, universities, and voluntary organizations. As I see it, this challenge is an opportunity.

It is a logical consequence of our recognition of our responsibilities in today's world. If we set our sights high, we will raise the sights of the less developed countries in this whole process of economic development as we build tomorrow's world.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been disturbed by the report of the Comptroller's Office, which appeared in the RECORD yesterday during the speech of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON].

In his speech the gentleman quoted from reports of the Comptroller. He quoted the statement by the Comptroller's Office that the AID program had spent dollars in Brazil when they could have spent cruzeiros.

The Comptroller also reported concerning the spending of money for equipment for a project which had been completed.

There were other references which Members can read, if they did not hear the debate yesterday, as shown on pages 11246 and 11247.

This morning, at an executive meeting of our Committee on Agricuture, Mr. Bell appeared before our committee, and I asked him about these statements and the actions reported by the Comptroller's Office about the AID program. He said that he had been advised that these statements had been made. He was, of course, familiar with the Comptroller's reports.

I told Mr. Bell that I felt some answer should have been given, either yesterday or during the debate today, to refute the Comptroller's report, because he indicated there were some inaccuracies in it.

I have been here all day, waiting for somebody to answer this and to tell why the Comptroller would make such statements in criticism. He made them not only in March and April of 1965, but he had made statements in 1964 as well as 1965.

A part of the report which disturbs me says:

> The Agency for International Development has made and is currently making improper payments for ocean shipments of surplus agricultural commodities donated by the United States. * * *

And so on.

When an agency such as AID flouts any criticism like that, and does not care about answering it, I cannot have the confidence I should have in the operation of that agency.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] a minute ago said he had some reservations about this bill. I, too, have supported the foreign aid program for a number of years on the theory that we had to maintain some type of foreign aid program. In the past I have offered amendments which I felt would improve the program, but I have become resigned to the fact, early in the debate, that no amendments were going to be accepted. I had hoped the committee or some member could give me some assurance that there had been corrections made in the administration of the AID program criticized by the Comptroller but there has been no answer to the charges.

The only way I have of showing my feelings about the administration of this program and the fact that we are wasting money which could be saved is to vote against the bill. This is the only way, as I see it, of registering my protest.

I am going to vote against this authorization not because I feel we should not have some kind of an aid program but when these things continually keep coming up every year of improper uses of money and particularly spending American dollars when we could be spending foreign funds which would not be a drain on our dollar reserve, the only way I can express my feeling and also my criticism of the way in which this program is being operated is by voting against this bill. That is the reason why I expect to vote against this authorization bill here today.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes. I yield to my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from Missouri talked to me earlier in the day about these reports. I told him that most of these reports, although recently issued, were based on investigations 1 or 2 years old. If you read through the reports, you will find that the GAO acknowledges that some corrective action has been started on most of them. If you will examine the GAO reports on the Department of Defense, you will find that they find deficiencies in the operation of the Army and the Navy. I would not use criticism by the General Accounting Office as a criterion for voting against the foreign aid bill, because you could apply the same kind of argument to voting against legislation for the Department of Defense. The GAO writes many reports about the waste of money in our Military Establishment and in our defense budget. So the criteria you are using here in opposing this bill I think are not entirely consistent.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the Johnson doctrine of defending American citizens around the world has resulted in a new faith in our country here at home and much needed respect for us abroad.

The President has demonstrated time and again, in southeast Asia, in Africa, and in Latin America that the full might of our Nation will come to the aid of our own citizens in danger, and the freedoms of others threatened by communism.

Floridians take special note of this new approach in American policy. No other State has been as close to Cuba—as close to a Communist takeover, nor seen the wave of refugees escaping oppression. Florida knows also the threat of military action, as we witnessed the offensive and defensive buildup in our State at the time of the missile crisis when thousands of troops and weapons were assembled for any eventuality.

The people of Florida saw the United States stand by while Castro was taking over Cuba. The people of Florida vigorously applaud the actions of President Johnson in preventing a Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic, Had similar action been taken with regard to Cuba during the Castro takeover, Cuba would not be a Communist country today.

Being close to the troubled waters of the Caribbean we understand and appreciate the need for action rather than prolonged discussion. There is time enough to consult, advise, and receive the views of friends. The Organization of American States was notified of the developments in the Dominican Republic, and when the situation worsened the President acted for the U.S. interests. Now that the peacekeeping machinery of the OAS is in operation and a joint military command has been established, we are hopeful a peaceful solution can be found to return the Dominican Republic to democratic government. But we can be sure that if the United States had not acted a new Communist government would be establishing itself on another island in the Caribbean.

Some critics have voiced the opinion we should have awaited joint action rather than our unilateral move. During the naval quarantine of Cuba, the United States acted on her own in the best interest of this hemisphere. And, of course, at that time we were taking action against an established government, Castro, while our landings in the Dominican Republic were at the request of the existing government which indicated it could no longer guarantee the safety of American citizens.

The Johnson doctrine, of course, applies equally to Cuba today. There are some who would try to lead one to believe that this administration has forgotten Cuba. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The President has indicated that we have no intention of living with communism in this hemisphere. Soon after assuming office the President was faced with a crisis over the water supply to our naval base, and he acted quickly to increase our defensive capability and to replace the water supply, while preparing the base for military action and evacuating dependents. This swift action met the situation of the moment, and gave clear proof to Castro that his test of the new President's resolve had been met without hesitation.

The United States and the other members of the Organization of American States do consider the present regime in Cuba a danger to Latin America because of its continuing dedication to the subversion and overthrow of Latin American governments. The United States and other members of the OAS are determined that this danger will be checked and thrown back. That determination is one of the key factors in the actions taken by the United States and the OAS in the Dominican Republic.

In keeping with the continuing goal, or U.S. policy toward Cuba—a truly free Cuba, free of communism—and the kind of threat which the Cuban regime presents to the hemisphere, the United States has followed, and will continue to follow, courses of action designed, first, to reduce the will and ability of the present regime to advance the Communist cause in Latin America through support of subversion; and second, to assist and cooperate with the Latin American nations in strengthening their ability, in both the short and the long term, to resist subversion.

The first part of this U.S. and OAS strategy—the reduction of the will and ability of the Cuban regime to advance the Communist cause—has taken the form of efforts to isolate the regime politically, psychologically, and economically. The core of this program has been the exertion of economic pressure upon the regime in order to maintain and increase its internal difficulties and to limit its potential for external activities.

The administration has, through determined, day-to-day efforts, been maintaining strong pressures on the Cuban economy. All of our allies are cooperating to some extent in the maintenance of these pressures and the cooperation of certain governments is quite good. None permits the exportation of strategic goods to Cuba, and some governments discourage the shipment of industrial items and raw materials that are nonstrategic but which are critical to the Cuban economy. Further, so far as is known, none has granted credit to Cuba, nor, for approximately the last year, guaranteed private credits for Cuban purchases.

Although much of the administration's effort has been aimed at eliciting the cooperation of foreign governments and firms, it has also taken a number of unilateral measures to reduce Cuba's economic ties with the free world. For example, U.S. law prohibits, in the absence of a Presidential waiver, the granting of U.S. assistance to any nation which furnishes strategic goods or economic assistance to Cuba or whose vessels and aircraft carry any equipment or merchandise to or from Cuba. In addition, U.S. Government-financed cargoes cannot be carried from U.S. ports aboard vessels employed in the Cuban trade, and a variety of measures prohibit or restrict the bunkering of vessels in the Cuban trade, especially in U.S. ports or with products of U.S. origin.

In addition, the Cuban assets control regulations prohibit transactions involving U.S. dollars between any party and Cuba. These regulations also prohibit any person or entity subject to the jurisdiction of the United States from engaging in financial or commercial transactions with Cuba.

Total Cuban trade with the free world dropped nearly 80 percent between 1958 and 1963. The temporary increase in free world trade with Cuba in 1964—the result of exceptionally high world sugar prices in 1963 and early 1964—is overshadowed by the expected drop in this trade in 1965 to approximately the 1962–63 levels. Sugar is, of course, Cuba's main earner of foreign exchange, and sugar prices have fallen precipitously, from about 12 cents a pound in January 1964 to about 2.5 cents at the present time.

Cuba's trade with Latin America—the principal target of the Castro regime's subversive efforts—has declined even more dramatically. Total Cuban trade with the nations of the Organization of American States—excluding the United States—was approximately $115 million in 1958 and in the range of $15 million in 1964. All of the OAS countries, with but one exception, adhere to last July's OAS resolution which suspended shipping and trade with Cuba and severed diplomatic and consular relations.

The number of calls by free world vessels at Cuban ports in 1964 was approximately 60 percent lower than in 1962. Moreover, figures for the first 4 months of 1965 indicate more than a 30-percent decline over the same period in 1964.

The free labor unions of the hemisphere are giving important assistance to the OAS governments in this matter. These unions have recently begun a selective boycott at hemispheric ports of vessels of those nations whose ships are in the Cuban trade or whose trade with Cuba has inreased.

Cubana, the Cuban state airline, flies to only two free world countries, Mexico and Spain, on a regular basis. Only one free world airline, Iberia, provides scheduled passenger service—one flight per week—to and from Cuba. In October 1962 4 non-Communist airlines operated about 20 scheduled flights per week to Cuba.

External pressures and the Castro regime's own ineptitude and mismanagement have together kept the Cuban economy from serving as a showcase for communism.

Industry remains essentially stagnant and its products shoddy. The industrial plant and the transportation system—primarily of Western origin—have substantially deteriorated for want of spare parts.

Many basic foods and household necessities are rationed. Rationing allotments are often not met and inferior items substituted.

Cuban labor's enthusiasm for work has diminished. Absenteeism and low productivity continue to plague the regime and reflect labor's resistance to the coercion growing out of enforced production norms, the standardization of wage scales and a military draft rigged to provide cheap labor for the regime.

To keep the Cuban economy operating at minimum levels the Soviet Union, and to a lesser extent the other Communist countries, have been forced to grant Cuba large-scale economic assistance. Communist economic aid in the period 1961–64 is estimated to have amounted to well over $1 billion. This has constituted a sharp drain on Communist, especially Soviet resources, and the end is not in sight. Taking into account Soviet credits to finance Cuba's projected trade deficit with the U.S.S.R. in 1965 and the subsidy Cuba receives on its sugar sales to the Soviets, the U.S.S.R. will probably give Cuba upward of $300 million in economic assistance this year.

The serious economic difficulties which the present regime faces and, according to the best estimates, will continue to face have a definite effect on the political situation of the regime. Frictions and strains are evident within the power structure of the regime as it continues to be incapable of performing on its promises of a better economic life. As popular support of the regime declines, it resorts more and more to repression. The recent wave of arbitrary arrests, the purges among university students—heretofore a specially favored group—all testify to the need of the regime to exert greater control over the population.

The dependence of the present regime on the Soviet Union has created frictions, not only between the regime and Moscow which is trying to exert stronger controls over the uses to which its huge subsidies are put, but also within Cuba between contending pro-Moscow and anti-Moscow factions. These internal political developments, which have been influenced by external economic pressures, suggest that there are cracks in the structure which appears outwardly solid and that these cracks may be widened by frictions and pressures which exist within the system.

In addition to carrying out programs for weakening the Cuban base for subversion, the United States has been assisting and cooperating with the Latin American nations in strengthening their ability to resist that subversion. In the short term, the second part of our strategy has been executed bilaterally and multilaterally through the OAS and through cooperative arrangements with the countries of the Central American isthmus. Although much remains to be done, measurable progress has been made in the field of controls on the travel of subversives to and from Cuba, the transfer of material, funds, and propaganda, internal security, and surveillance of borders and coastline.

The decision of the OAS Foreign Ministers in July of last year, referred to earlier in an economic context, marked a significant step in the political and psychological isolation of the Cuban regime from the rest of the hemisphere. The fact that these actions were taken by an overwhelming vote of the Foreign Ministers testified to the growing awareness of the subversive threat on the part of Latin America. It also clearly demonstrated the decline of the appeal of Castro communism in the hemisphere. Moreover, both of these factors are reflected in the action of Latin American maritime unions against vessels of countries trading with Cuba.

The Cuban regime and the Communist parties in Latin America are currently making a determined effort—in line with decisions taken at the November 1964 meeting in Havana of the Latin American Communist parties—to capitalize on the Dominican situation to recover ground which they have lost over the past 2 years. With good sense and firm determination and with the continuation of present policies toward Cuba, refined and reinforced by lessons learned and actions taken in the Dominican crisis, the United States, and the other members of the OAS will move forward toward the unchanged and unchanging goal of a truly free Cuba.

It may be difficult to warn nations of the dangers of communism when looking at distant Russia or China, but we have only to point to nearby Cuba.

Castro's communism is incompatible with the needs and desires of the people of the Western Hemisphere in their legitimate attempt and desire to better themselves. Within the framework of Latin America, Cuba before Castro was high among economically developed nations. Health standards, education, housing, agriculture and industry ranked at or near the top of the list of Latin American nations. The fall to its present position today can be but further proof of the folly of Castroism.

The actions of this Congress in supporting the President in all these efforts is an indication of the support of the American people and an indication to the rest of the world of our firm resolve that no new front be opened to the Communists in the Western Hemisphere or elsewhere, and that we intend to speed the removal of Castro and his like from the island of Cuba as well.

Those who say we have forgotten Cuba must have their eyes closed, as some of them did when Castro came to power in the first place. It is assuring for the American people to see, through the Johnson doctrine, that their President has his eyes open. We know him by his actions. We remember them by their inaction.

As a further indication of the support being given the President in south Florida, I include four editorials on the Dominican situation to be printed at this point in the Record.

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, May 4, 1965]

Long Overdue U.S. Policy Makes Clear to the World We Will Protect Ourselves

There would appear to be little question today but that under President Johnson's personal supervision the United States has embarked upon a new foreign policy approach which, thought fraught with considerable danger and unpleasant consequences, is one which almost all clear-thinking citizens can welcome as a sorely needed restatement of basic American principles.

Where this new policy will eventually lead us is almost anybody's guess. Our involvement in the Dominican situation on the scale the President has ordered is certain to bring screams of protest, not only from the Communist world, but from certain of our so-called friends and allies who have already labeled our intervention as a return to the era of "gunboat diplomacy."

Yet, as we stated in this space last week, and which evidence produced by our military, diplomatic, and intelligence agencies has confirmed, it was only the quick dispatch of American forces to the Dominican Republic which prevented a Communist takeover in that nation and a much greater loss of life and property than has yet occurred.

As of now, there seems to be little prospect that our military intervention in the Dominican Republic will be of the quickly in and quickly out style. To the contrary, all evidence clearly points to the maintenance of strong American forces in that country until such time as we are assured that law and order have been restored, that a stable and acceptable government is in control of things, and that the withdrawal of our forces will not be a signal for the same Communist elements which tried to seize power before to make another and perhaps more successful attempt.

To those Americans who have had to disgustedly stand by and watch the sequence of events which culminated in the establishment of a Communist base of operations in Cuba, President Johnson's unequivocal statement this past Sunday night that we would not permit the Dominican Republic to go the way of Cuba, came as a refreshing breeze.

But saying this is far easier than doing it, and thus, as in the Cuban missile crisis, Americans will have to wait on future developments before making any final assessment of President Johnson's determination to keep this hemisphere free of any further Communist encroachments.

In the meantime, Mr. Johnson is making every effort to persuade the member nations of the Organization of American States to establish a task force which can go into the Dominican Republic and take over the responsibilities now being carried out by American troops.

These responsibilities are hardly of a minor nature. They involve such grim tasks as burying the dead and caring for the wounded; of bringing in food and medical supplies so that people won't starve or die of neglect: of restoring communications and other essential public services in order to bring back a semblance of normal life to the battle-ravaged city of Santo Domingo; of finding some effective way to reclaim the great number of weapons put into civilian hands by rebel forces at the start of the revolution, and, finally, of reestablishing law and order to the point where the people of the Dominican Republic can freely choose new leaders to guide their own destinies.

This is a large order and it cannot be accomplished overnight. Thus, it seems inevitable that American forces, now that they are in the country, must stay there until we are certain that what these troops were sent in to accomplish isn't frittered away by a premature withdrawal or by bowing to the shrill demands of those who are presently accusing us of armed aggression and unwarranted intervention into the internal affairs of another nation.

This Dominican affair, coming as it did on the heels of our greatly stepped-up participation in the war in Vietnam, provides the Communists and the neutrals with a lot of grist for their propaganda mills, and we would be naive not to expect them to exploit this opportunity to the utmost.

But we have been slandered and vilified before so this will be nothing new or different. The main point Americans should remember is that at long last we appear to have reached the point where protection of our own interests, our own security and that of other free nations are all being considered of greater import than whatever opinion other countries might have of our conduct or our policies.

We sincerely hope that President Johnson meant exactly what he said when he stated Sunday night we "cannot, must not and will not permit establishment of another Communist government in this hemisphere." That is a statement that has been long overdue, and regardless of the consequences its enforcement might bring, we think it is time we meet this threat head on and make it crystal clear to all the world we are not afraid to back up our principles with whatever force is needed to carry them out.

JACK W. GORE.

[From the Palm Beach (Fla.) Post, May 4, 1965]

DOMINICAN DOCTRINE

President Johnson's report to the Nation on the Dominican situation was a heartening one, and no criticism in the U.N. Security Council or indecision on the part of the Organization of American States should be allowed to weaken the firm stand taken.

His statement that the goal of the United States "is to help prevent another Communist state in this hemisphere" should serve as a warning to all concerned that the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine is not dead.

Even though we allowed it to lapse in the Communist takeover of Cuba, the Reds have now been put on notice that the Western Hemisphere is not open to further incursions. With a little further stiffening of the U.S. backbone, perhaps even the Cuban cancer can be eliminated.

When U.S. Marines were dispatched to the Dominican Republic last week, the message was plain: This country is fed up with having its citizens threatened, its Embassies attacked, its interests violated, either by lawless mobs or hostile foreign governments.

Now with the strengthening of U.S. Armed Forces on that embattled island another plain message has been delivered: This nation also is fed up with Red infiltration and aggression in the Western Hemisphere.

Primary purpose of U.S. Marine and Army units in the Santo Domingo area still is protection of the lives of Americans and other foreign nationals. That became necessary when Dominican ability to preserve order and protect lives broke down under Communist-directed mob action.

But now these military forces have a second mission: To thwart apparent efforts of Castro Cuba Communists to turn the Dominican revolt to their own purposes and possibly establish a Red regime in Santo Domingo similar to—if not directly tied to—the one in Havana.

The obvious interest and involvement of the Kremlin and its Cuban puppet was emphasized in their calls for U.N. action to condemn U.S. landings in the Dominican Republic.

Moscow called it another attempt to keep in power a reactionary, an antipopular dictatorship regime which suits the United States, and to suppress the strivings of the people for freedom and independence.

Havana called it a new and insolent aggression against the sovereignty and independence of a foreign country.

Those whose toes are stepped on naturally yell the loudest. And, of course, there are altogether too many who will listen sympathetically.

It seems to be impossible for the United States to undertake a humanitarian action without having the pink-hued neutrals, and even some of our allies, believe Communist charges of sinister political purposes.

Unfortunately, in the past, this presumed reflection of world opinion has been allowed to alter the shape of our foreign policy to the point where we have none worthy of the name. And the inevitable result has been a slow retreat in the face of encroaching communism.

It is time to call a halt to that—with the blessing of the United Nations and the active support of the OAS, if possible; in defiance of both, if necessary.

Pinkish pickets in New York, protesting the Dominican action, carried signs reading: "One Vietnam is too many." One Cuba is too many, too.

[From the Sun-Sentinel, May 3, 1965]

JOHNSON BOLDNESS BARRED RED GRAB

The United States and the free world are about to be forced to sit through act II, scene II, of that tired old Communist road show farce: "Uncle Is a Teenage Imperialist."

In act I, friendly and dashing juvenile lead, Juan Bosch, came on stage as the student prince. There was dancing and singing and gaiety at the palace because the wicked dictator was dead and Juan had come home from school abroad to rule.

All of the subjects frolicked and did as they pleased and the professional troubadors sang Juan's praises outside the realm. But some of his old school chums became a little too exuberant and began filching the silver and annoying the maidens as their companions plotted to move in with Juan and rule the kingdom.

So the mean old captains of the guard marched in and threw the culprits out, telling Juan to begone because the subjects must return to their tasks, or the palace would fall into the hands of the enemy.

Act I ended with Juan sulking in a sympathetic neighbor state and plotting his return.

The second act opened with some of Juan's comrades, who had been mingling with the people, rising up suddenly and attempting to capture the unromantic captains to throw them in the dungeons so Juan could come home.

But to everybody's surprise, Uncle Sam, who was busied battling scoundrels in the distant Orient, sent in forces to aid the beleagured captains. They set down the revolt and the rebels demanded forgiveness, insisting they wanted merely to have Juan in his rightful place in the palace and to set the people free.

That sets the stage for the second scene of the second act. In this, Juan's followers will become emboldened and will demand concessions for putting down their arms. Meanwhile, back in the old university, their colleagues will call for a meeting of the prime ministers of the many nations and they will point an accusing finger at Uncle Sam, claiming that he really didn't want to protect the freedom of Juan's subjects, but actually seized the opportunity to serve his imperialist ambitions.

Some of the prime ministers will agree and will insist that the rebels are the real heroes and should not be punished. Other ministers will fall to arguing among themselves and there will be much confusion and the scene will end with word being received trouble has flared elsewhere. All exit with much confusion.

If this plot seems familiar, it is, because it has become such a part of our real life. It doesn't take much effort to set the scene in Cuba, or West Berlin, or the Congo, or Vietnam—or the Dominican Republic. Only the actors and the costumes change. The play remains the same and there never is a third and final act.

What will happen now is the rebels in the Dominican Republic will insist upon asylum and protection, and will have the audacity to demand concessions for a rebellion that did not succeed.

Already, Russia has called for an emergency meeting of the United Nations Security Council. They want to heap blame upon the United States and President Johnson for supposed aggression by intervening in the Dominican revolt and preventing what surely was intended to have been another Communist takeover under the disguise of an act of liberation.

The truth of the matter, of course, will show that Communists trained the insurgents and instigated the entire affair. But it will be the United States who will be roundly castigated on the world's propaganda network.

The time has come to end this theatrical fantasy and to face the realities of life. All of the shouting in the world is not going to erase the brutal fact that conspirators callously upset the orderly life of a sovereign nation, bringing death to hundreds of people and misery to thousands of others.

For this the rebels should not be permitted to go unpunished and left in a position for a repeat performance at a time and place of their own choosing. Nor should the worldwide Communist conspiracy be left unreprimanded for its role in this heinous affair.

We, the United States, do business with the Soviet conspirators, supplying them with food and materials, while they, in turn, export weapons and death and slavery to the distant points of the earth.

This arrangement should come under the severest review as a result of the Dominican Republic affair that would have been another Communist foothold in the Western Hemisphere, had it not been for decisive action on the part of President Johnson and the muscle of the U.S. Marines.

Indeed, the Communist road company has put on its show just once too often. The long overdue time has come to tell the players to disband and to ring down the final curtain on their hackneyed farce.

WILLIAM A. MULLEN.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Apr. 29, 1965]

THE MARINES HAVE LANDED

Yesterday this newspaper pleaded: "Let us have no second Cuba in the Dominican Republic."

Today it makes no difference whether we said this or whether someone else did. The pertinent fact is that President Johnson has acted swiftly to prevent just such a catastrophe. He has sent a powerful marine unit ashore for the ostensible purpose of protecting American nationals in the hotted-up civil war. One faction in that conflict would return Juan Bosch to power with the help of undisguised cadres of Communists.

It is all very well to argue that we have no real business in Santo Domingo. The same argument was made—much to our woe—in that vacillating venture known as the Bay of Pigs which has cost the United States worldwide prestige and a Red foothold one jump from the U.S. mainland.

We think that Mr. Johnson moved wisely last night.

He was careful to consult the friendly council of the Organization of American States.

He conferred with and responded to the Dominican government in power (though beleaguered) which requested our help.

He brought in the congressional leadership.

It is clear, however, that the Marines are there to stay a bit, for their "assistance will be available to the nationals of other countries."

Well, let them stabilize the situation, not in the selfish name of any entrenched and selfish colonialism but to protect the national interts of two proud peoples in political freedom in the Caribbean.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, May 5, 1965]

THE JOHNSON DOCTRINE

For more than a century the Monroe Doctrine was a keystone of American policy. It proclaimed that the United States would consider any attempt by the European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety" and implied that we would act accordingly to prevent it. There were some who said the Monroe Doctrine was dead when Soviet Russia was suffered to extend its system to Castro's Cuba.

But now in connection with the Dominican Republic trouble a Johnson doctrine has been proclaimed. In his speech explaining the dispatch of U.S. troops there, President Johnson stated the doctrine in these words: "The American nations cannot, must not and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere."

The Johnson doctrine is pointed squarely at the problems confronting this Nation and this hemisphere in 1965 and is admirably suited to dealing with them, just as the doctrine proclaimed by President James Monroe in 1823 was shaped for the problems of that day. Then Russia was seeking to stake out exclusive rights for fishing, commerce and industry along the whole northwest coast of North America; and European nations were conniving under the doctrine of "the divine right of kings" to restore their monarchic rule over newly independent Latin American States that had overthrown Spanish rule. Today, of course, the threat comes from Communist subversion and aggression.

One difference between the doctrines of Monroe and Johnson is that the former was unilateral on the part of the United States alone while Johnson phrases his as a doctrine for "the American nations" and not just this country. But this is more a difference in form than in substance. Throughout the years after 1823 the United States frequently invited the other American republics to adopt the Monroe Doctrine. President Wilson sought to give it a worldwide application. He told the Senate in 1917: "I am proposing, as it were, that the nations should with one accord adopt the doctrine of President Monroe as the doctrine of the world; that no nation should seek to extend its polity over any other nation or people, but that every people should be left free to determine its own polity, its own way of development, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little along with the great and powerful." The other nations did not adopt the doctrine; it would have been a vastly better world if they had.

"The American nations," through the Organization of American States, may or may not adopt the Johnson doctrine. But whether they do or not, the United States must in any event be its chief supporter and bear the responsibility for the upholding of it. The Monroe Doctrine was never a part of international law. Yet it rested, as Elihu Root stated, "Upon the right of self-protection and that right is recognized by international law." So will it be with the Johnson doctrine.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Chairman, the foreign aid program is one of the most successful assets the American economy has going for it.

There are both immediate and long-term benefits from the crop which we are so carefully planting with our foreign aid program today.

To begin, we all agree that the aim of the foreign aid program is to help the weak to become strong; to help the underdeveloped countries of the world to preserve their independence, stand on their own feet and take their place and assume their responsibilities alongside of the other countries in the world which are in their turn, helping others.

Many of those whom we have helped, have gained in economic stability to the point where they have foreign aid programs of their own and are doing their part to assist the less fortunate countries. Japan is an example of this and an outstanding example too.

To illustrate my point, sizable economic aid from the United States to Japan was ended over 10 years ago. More recently, Japan has agreed to repay $490 million of our economic aid grants, and its own foreign aid and reparations program a year ago totalled nearly $300 million. For nearly a decade, Japan has been second only to Canada as the best market for U.S. exports.

You can see the double-barreled effect of this. Not only are they in the process of the actual repayment of the grants which were made to them but they are using our products; assisting our labor, industry, management, agriculture—our economy by importing our merchandise. Since 1950, United States exports to Japan have tripled. They have doubled to Western Europe during this same period of time.

Japan and Western Europe are not the exceptions. There are other equally striking examples, which I could mention, to show that our work has been effective.

You have all heard, many times, that 85 percent of the foreign aid dollar is spent in the United States. In the foreign aid program we are not sending money overseas but we are sending American goods and American services and in doing this, this means business, export orders for factories, farms, railroads, trucking lines—in fact, the American economy.

There are now 129 colleges and universities—including our own University of Tennessee—involved with the foreign aid program through more than 300 technical assistance contracts.

Private American engineering and construction firms are now at work in over 50 countries supervising the design and construction of more than $4 billion in AID-assisted capital projects; irrigation systems, power dams, fertilizer factories, and the like.

Since 1961, AID has enforced a "buy American" policy and has tied the AID dollar to the American economy. This "buy American" policy is tied to anything AID finances for development: machinery, commodities, the services of engineering and construction firms, the services of technical experts of any kind, and so on.

In 1964, American business and industry exported nearly a billion dollars worth of goods to Asia, Africa, and Latin America under the AID program. American shipping lines were paid another $80 million to carry these goods to their destinations.

My congressional district, Memphis and Shelby County, stands at the hub of three States, at the center of a booming economy. And in Mississippi, Arkansas, and Tennessee in the past 3 years, AID-financed commodity procurement contracts have totaled $31,481,614.46.

Before my colleagues in the Mid-South oppose this measure, I hope they have looked at this matter from a strict dollars-and-cents viewpoint. These millions are spent right in our own States, providing jobs for our people.

In Memphis alone, during the past 3 years, AID-financed commodity procurement has totaled $1,381,733.38. Here are the AID contracts authorized in Shelby County, Tenn., since January 1962:

AID-financed commodity procurement, Memphis, Tenn., January 1962 to May 24, 1965

Producer	Commodity	Country designation	Amount
Acetyle Cylinder Corp	Acetylene cylinders	Turkey	$35,020.00
Ely & Walker	Yarns	Republic of Congo	2,999.72
Firestone International Co	Tires and tubes	Turkey, Pakistan, and Republic of Congo.	287,900.31
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co	do	Pakistan	43,249.75
Fruehauf Trailer (division of Fruehauf)	Components, power station	India	9,782.00
General Cable Corp	Not given	Yugoslavia	25,000.00
W. R. Grace & Co	Urea	Vietnam	782,703.69
International Harvester Export Co	Trailers	Pakistan	18,375.00
Layne & Bowler, Inc	Pumps, steel drums	Vietnam	79,277.40
Memphis Hide Co., Inc	Hides	Yugoslavia	36,600.00
Oliver Corp	Spare parts for combines	Turkey	221,29
Velsicol Chemical Corp	Heptachlor	Turkey and Korea	60,604.22
Grand total from Memphis, Tenn., January 1962 through May 24, 1965.			1,381,733.38

In the most immediate sense, the AID program means production orders for American business. Profits, not in the future, but now, today. There are more than 400,000 jobs created by the current AID program. AID-financed orders are handled through regular commercial channels. The business is there to bid on now—and it is reserved for American enterprise. It is the gateway to some great potential future markets.

Because it is tied to U.S. procurement, the AID program is a kind of "welcome wagon" for American products, introducing them into areas that have traditionally traded with somebody else. At the same time, by helping other countries develop and expand their economies, the AID program helps to create more paying customers for American exports. After all, people without money or jobs are not much of a market, whether they are in this country or overseas.

We have already experienced many benefits from our AID program, and, in time, we will reap even greater dividends. In time the countries which we are assisting will be able to take their part in a stable world, economically fit and able. Then we will reap the greatest economic benefits as the new markets which we have helped to develop begin to spend more and more in the United States.

I urge complete and wholehearted support of the President's request for the full authorization for our foreign aid program.

DOLLAR SAVINGS ATTRIBUTED TO ROGERS AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in an effort to follow compliance with a provision in the foreign-aid program which calls for progressive reduction and eventual termination of bilateral economic grant assistance, I again asked for a separate report on savings which can be attributed to this provision this year.

This provision, which I sponsored, and which was adopted by the Congress, marked the first expression of congressional intent that such assistance be terminated.

I am pleased to state that the total savings which may be attributed to this provision amounts to $763 million, and that the number of countries receiving this type of assistance has been reduced by 38.

I ask that the report which I received concerning this provision be included in the Record at this point:

Department of State, Agency for
International Development,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1965.

The Honorable Paul G. Rogers,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Rogers: I am pleased to respond to your inquiry regarding compliance with the Rogers amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (sec. 634(e)).

This section, as you know, directs the executive branch, wherever practicable, progressively to reduce and eventually terminate bilateral grant economic assistance. This directive has been in effect with reference to supporting type assistance since fiscal year 1959, and with reference to technical cooperation type assistance since fiscal year 1962.

Attached are two charts showing the progress that has been made in complying with the Rogers amendment in these two appropriation categories.

With reference to supporting to type assistance, the total request made by the executive branch has declined from $1,047 million in fiscal year to $369 million in fiscal year 1966—a reduction of $678 million. The reduction in the number of countries for which such assistance is programed has been from 41 in fiscal year 1959 to only 13 in fiscal year 1966—an overall reduction of 28 countries.

With reference to technical cooperation type assistance, the total reduction in the appropriation request from fiscal year 1962 to 1966 is $85 million. The reduction in the number of countries has been 10—from 77 in fiscal year 1962 to 67 in fiscal year 1966.

These figures show that there has been substantial compliance with the congressional directive contained in the Rogers amendment regarding the reduction in bilateral grant economic assistance.

I hope this information will be helpful to you, and if there is any way we can be further assistance, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely yours,

William S. Gaud,
Deputy Administrator.

Supporting type assistance appropriation requests since application of the Rogers amendment (sec. 634(e))

Fiscal year	Appropriation request (millions)	Number of countries for which assistance programed
1959	$1,047	41
1960	1,106	42
1961	992	34
1962	610	42
1963	481	22
1964	435	19
1965	[1] 405	14
1966	369	13
Total reduction in request, fiscal years 1959-66	678	----------
Reduction in number of countries, fiscal years 1959-66	----------	28

[1] Includes $70,000,000 special additional request for South Vietnam.

Technical cooperation type assistance appropriation requests since application of the Rogers amendment (sec. 634(e))

[In millions]

Fiscal year	Appropriation request	Amount for Alliance for Progress	Number of countries for which assistance programed
1962	$380	----------	77
1963	435	(100)	80
1964	357	(100)	79
1965	310	(85)	69
1966	295	(85)	67
Total reduction in request: Fiscal years 1962–66	85	----------	----------
Reduction in number of countries, fiscal years 1962–66	----------	----------	10

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the following is my testimony before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on my bill, H.R. 6464, to amend section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949. I call for protection of American business against the Arab economic boycott of Israel. The text of my statement follows:

The question before us essentially is this: Must American businessmen submit to loss of trade, to bring used as a "weapon of war" and impeded in international commerce, and to being dictated to by a foreign government as to where and how to invest. I speak of course of the Arab economic boycott against the State of Israel.

Such boycott has forced the American businessman to choose between the Arab Government and Israel. This is an unwarranted interference with private American interests. As third parties, the American businessman or firm is forced into a political squeeze. In the instance of the Arab boycott, we do not have the situation of one antagonistic country confronting another in recognized economic warfare. Here we have the situation of American business interests being adversely affected, not because they are nationals of either country but only because as third parties, private parties, they seek legitimate commercial objectives in international trade and investment. We have ample documentation to show that not only are those firms involved who directly seek trade and investment outlets in the Middle East, but that firms who deal with such firms are also adversely affected and boycotted. Thus, the boycott stretches not only to one private firm but to second, third, fourth, and even fifth firms who are commercially bound up with the first.

I know you are aware of the humiliating questionnaires to which American firms trading with Arab countries are subjected and the degrading affidavits which they are compelled to sign. There are those who say this is a very simple problem. They say that there is no need for legislation, that the American firm need not submit, but this is easier said than done. American trade, American jobs, American productivity are all involved.

What the American business firms need is the unequivocal backing of U.S. law. We must give the American interests the vehicle whereby they can state they cannot defy the provisions of the Federal statute. We must remember, too, that the Arab nations have shown no constancy in applying this boycott. Wherever they wished, they looked aside. With this act on our books, I have no doubt that the whole Arab boycott would collapse. Blackmail no longer being possible, the Arab nations would accept American trade opportunities and investments lest their economic plight, already manifest, become truly desperate.

The passage of H.R. 6464, I repeat, would give American business the assurance it needs that it has governmental backing in rejecting the sordid and sorry Arab boycott. Thus, we also encourage the expansion of international trade into the entire Middle East and help to lessen the tensions therein and make a valuable contribution to world peace. We declare thereby that Israel is here to stay and that the United States recognizes its international rights to trade freely.

Some have wished to back away from supporting this bill, saying that we would establish a precedent and thus tie the United States hands in dealing with countries antagonistic to her. This is not so. We must recognize the major difference. Such restrictions as we have, for example, against China and Cuba are limited to U.S. citizens, U.S. companies, and products of U.S. origin. Here is a matter of government versus government. We do not impose restrictions on private citizens of foreign countries.

It is true that we do penalize foreign firms that misrepresent and violate restrictions on our own exports. We also penalize ships that trade with Cuba by denying them U.S. Government-financed cargoes. But that is as far as we go.

Let me make it clear we are not asking for Congress to legislate for Israel. We are asking Congress to legislate for the protection of American business and American commerce.

Mrs. **KELLY**. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation before us.

H.R. 7750 authorizes the funds necessary to carry on the foreign aid program for another year and makes a number of amendments to the basic act to improve the operation of the program.

For almost two decades the United States has provided economic and military assistance to foreign countries. Foreign aid has become a major factor in the conduct of our Nation's foreign policy. Through our aid programs we have sought to contain the march of world communism and to assist the underdeveloped countries to economic viability.

As President Johnson so aptly has said, foreign assistance offers "strength to those who would be free; hope for those who would otherwise despair; progress for those who would help themselves."

The duration of the program, the kinds of assistance we provide, and the amount we spend will depend on the progress made in coping with the Communist menace and bringing economic and sociopolitical stability in the less developed countries.

Under past and present administrations, a long succession of studies of the foreign aid program and its impact on our foreign policy, have judged the aid program to be in our national interest.

Neither these surveys nor the executive branch has recommended a dramatic departure from the program as it is currently structured.

We must remember, however, that the House Foreign Affairs Committee conducts a continuous review and analysis of this program. And each year, through suggestions conveyed to the executive branch, and through legislation, our committee attempts to strengthen the program, to improve its operations, and to make sure that its size and direction correspond to our foreign policy requirements at this particular time.

There is one conclusion which our committee has reached over the years, and which is as valid today at it was 2 or 5 years ago; namely, that the military and the economic portions of this program are interdependent, and that both of them must be related at all times to specific objectives of our foreign policy.

With this I fully agree. I believe that separating the economic and the military components of this program simply does not make sense. In my opinion, the program cannot be so divided without the prospect of harm being done to it and to our foreign policy.

I also believe that, for some years to come, the foreign assistance program will continue as a permanent feature of our foreign policy.

This conclusion is dictated by our national self-interest. We cannot, we must not, let our guard down simply because Communist tactics change, and Communist-sponsored revolutions and subversion may at a particular time appear to be abating. While the Communists continue to adhere to their goal of world domination, we must do what we can to prevent them from attaining that goal.

But there is a further reason for this program: The progress of science, of transportation and communications, is bringing the peoples of the world closer together. In a world made small by the concurrent revolutions of the 20th century, we must be able and be willing to continue our programs of mutual assistance for mutual benefit and security.

There is one thing I would like to add: I regret that the oversight and coordination of many programs which bear directly on the implementation of our foreign policy, are scattered among various committees. This state of affairs makes difficult an overall evaluation and direction of these activities.

In particular, I regret that the operation of the Public Law 480 program does not come under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee. The policy embodied in this program, its scope and the various activities it finances, have a major impact on our foreign policy. Also, the shortcomings of this program reflect on the work of our committee—yet we have no effective responsibility or control over it.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to reiterate my strong belief that the foreign aid program is vital to our national security.

The authorization in the bill before us—$3.4 billion—is essential to enable the United States to deal effectively with the present world situation and to promote our national interests abroad.

This, by the way, is the smallest authorization requested by the executive branch, and approved by the Foreign Affairs Committee, in many years.

I hope that in the future, the world outlook will be brighter so that we may be able to make even further reductions in these programs. Until this happens, however, I urge that we approve the full amount recommended in the bill.

I would also like to say that I for one—and I am certain that the chairman and other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee would likewise—welcome any suggestions for the strengthening of this program.

Constructive criticism is welcome and healthy—and it will serve our national interest.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself briefly to some of the improvements in the foreign assistance program which I have sponsored and which are reflected in the bill before the House.

First, with respect to private pilot housing projects in Latin America.

H.R. 7750 contains my amendment which increases from $250 million to $450 million the amount of guarantees that may be issued under this program. I believe this change is required for two reasons:

First, virtually all of the $250 million currently available for this very successful and effective program is used up. Unless additional money is provided, the progress that is being made toward the solution of Latin America's critical housing problem, will be jeopardized.

Second, in the bill before the House today, we are proposing to expand the pilot housing project program to include the building of institutions necessary to the success of the Alliance for Progress—institutions such as cooperatives, savings and loan associations, and other community and regional enterprises. These private self-help associations, such as Father McClellan's Savings and Loan League in Peru, can serve as a bootstrap for economic progress in all of Latin America.

My second amendment relates to the extended-risk guarantee program.

There is $300 million available for this program. Very little of this money has been used to date. Also, the executive branch, through administrative action, has set aside $50 million under this program for worldwide housing guaranties.

My amendment increases that setaside to $150 million. Housing is one of the critical needs not only in Latin America but also in other developing continents. And decent housing is one of the foundations of social and economic progress. We should, therefore, make every effort to encourage home-building as a part of an integrated approach to the conquest of disease, poverty and illiteracy in the free world. This is what my amendment proposes to do.

My third amendment relates to military sales—an activity in which I have been interested for many years, and which has been affected positively by the amendments which I have offered, and which the Congress had adopted, over the years.

One of the apprehensions voiced recently in the press is that the military sales program may be getting too big and may antagonize some of our allies in Western Europe. I do not believe that this program is producing such results. Nevertheless, in order to keep military sales activities under appropriate safeguards and restraints, I have offered an amendment which appears in section 201(d)(2) of the bill and which provides that in making sales abroad, the military authorities must endeavor, to the extent possible, to sell equipment for what it costs the U.S. Government. This is intended to forestall any overly competitive bidding and underbidding in such sales. My amendment further provides that with respect to any sale in which the proceeds are not sufficient to cover the cost of the equipment to the U.S. Government, detailed reports must be made promptly to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the amendments I have just described strengthen and improve the foreign aid program. I have offered them in the spirit of constructive support for this program, and I hope that they will be adopted by the House.

Mr. **NEDZI**. Mr. Chairman, the foreign aid program is working now to insure the future of all of us and of the generations to come. It is a program of foresight, initiative, imagination, trust and courage and a sincere belief that the result of it will be a more stable world of the future.

One of the main goals of our aid program is to make the less fortunate recipient countries self-supporting and independent; able to take their proper place among the nations of the world and to assume their fair share of world responsibility. Well, as proof of the success of our program, we have been able to end economic aid to 26 countries since the program began after World War II. Of that 26, 13 have made so remarkable an adjustment to self-support that they have become our partners in the world foreign aid program and are carrying on foreign aid programs of their own. This is, I think, a highly impressive figure and it will increase as the years go by.

Another positive accomplishment has been the shift in emphasis of our program. Ten years ago, two-thirds of our aid was military—today, two-thirds is economic and most of that is directed toward long-term development, improving the ability of more countries to support their own continued growth.

Foreign aid has made great contributions in the field of health. Reported cholera cases in the less-developed countries dropped from 211,943 in 1950 to 32,827 in 1960 and cholera deaths from 130,481 to 12,806 in the same period.

By 1963, 700 million of the 1.4 billion people who live in the less-developed world's malarious areas were protected by malaria education programs and for more than 300 million of these, the threat of malaria has been completely eliminated. Our aid has financed much of the DDT and equipment for this humane program. In India, for example, malaria which formerly incapacitated 100 million people each year has almost been completely eradicated. Wells for potable water have increased at a rate of 85,000 a year.

We are making strides in the field of health and we are conquering the enemy of disease. This too is a long-range battle but well worth the effort in our continual striving to bring about a better world and a better life in the future.

We are battling on other fronts also, and I mean in such areas as ignorance, hunger, and poverty. Slowly, we are winning in the battle against disease. We are also making progress in the battle against ignorance. Since 1958, the less-developed countries have increased their investment in education an average of 15 percent annually. As an example of this, 2,000 classrooms were built in Brazil in 1964 with 4,500 more slated for completion in 1965 and 1966. In Chile, 72 grade and high schools accommodating 50,000 students were built in 1964 alone. AID-financed contract teams from 11 American colleges and universities are working with the Nigerians to expand facilities and to reshape the Nigerian educational system so that it can turn out skilled technicians at every level from typists to engineers.

In agriculture, tremendous reclamation projects such as the Indus Basin development program in Pakistan will help to greatly increase the yield of wheat in what has been characterized as one of the least productive agricultural areas in the world. With U.S. assistance, Tunisia has become an exporter rather than an importer of fruits and vegetables. Among other things, our assistance helped to establish 24 nurseries which now distribute 2.5 million fruit trees and 50 million vegetable plant stocks annually.

We are working with the governments of less fortunate countries in their agricultural programs to step up production, raising both quantity and quality. Agricultural processes and laws are under revision in many areas. In countries such as India and Pakistan we are cooperating in the establishment of agricultural colleges which are organized not only to train specialists but to transmit new techniques and methods to the field in order that the many can benefit.

One result of this effort has been a demonstrable rise in agricultural output. In Thailand, for instance, rising agricultural output has stayed well ahead of population growth, and important new crops like corn have been successfully introduced.

As agricultural techniques and output improves, the battle against hunger is made easier. Hand in hand with this there is a general rise in the stability of the economies of the underdeveloped nations.

I have already mentioned that 13 of the 26 nations to which we have ended economic aid are now carrying on foreign aid programs of their own. In some cases such as France, Japan, and Western Germany, these are programs of considerable magnitude. And in the same vein, there has been a heartening growth in the economies of many of the nations which are still receiving aid from us under our foreign aid program.

One of the most dramatic examples of this is Taiwan where we will close our economic aid mission on the 30th of June. Since 1954, Taiwan's industrial output has tripled and its total output of goods and services has jumped 45 percent. Exports have risen rapidly. Education and health facilities have expanded. Taiwan is one of our brighter accomplishments, yet 10 years ago it was said that Taiwan would be indefinitely dependent upon the United States. Our assistance has not ended poverty in Taiwan. The average income there is still only about $150 per person contrasted with about $3,000 per person in the United States but what we have done is to put the people of Taiwan in a position where they can solve their own problems. They are now able, as they were not before, to do the things that will lead to a steadily increasing income for themselves and their children.

We can be proud of our efforts in Taiwan. This growth is but one example of the progress which we are making in other countries. In the years since 1950, the less-developed countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America have:

Increased total production at an average of over 4 percent a year.

Increased industrial output at an average of 8 percent annually—except for Latin America which averaged 6 percent—and

Increased the value of their exports from $19 to $29 billion between 1950 and 1962 despite falling world prices for primary products.

We are all familiar with the part which our governmental agencies have played in this development but AID has brought many private resources into the picture. I mentioned the field of education—American colleges and universities are a definite and positive part of our program. As of September 30, 1964, over 100 American universities held more than $230 million in AID contracts for research, surveys, training, and technical assistance. Over $170 million of this amount was for technical assistance by 67 universities in 41 countries.

Since the enactment in 1961 of the Humphrey amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, AID has strongly emphasized assistance for the development of farm credit and marketing cooperatives, credit unions, savings and loan institutions and housing and electrical power cooperatives to help organize capital and individual effort at the grassroots level.

For technical assistance in these fields, the Agency has relied heavily on contracts with private American institutions including the Credit Union National Association, the National League of Insured Savings Associations, the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., the National Farmers Union, the Foundation for Cooperative Housing, and the International Cooperative Training Center.

Private American engineering and construction firms are now at work in over 50 countries supervising the design and construction of more than $4 billion in AID-assisted capital projects; irrigation systems; power dams, fertilizer factories and so forth.

AID contracts with the American Institute for Free Labor Development, spearheaded by the AFL-CIO, have permitted effective labor participation in assistance to Latin America.

Since 1964, through its Partners of the Alliance program, AID has been acting as the catalyst in establishing and sustaining wider private involvement in the Alliance for Progress. Twenty-five active partnerships have developed and more are to follow wherein teams from U.S. communities trave to Latin America to develop, with local counterpart groups, a program of mutual interest based on identified needs and available resources.

The International Executive Service Corps has been formed by industry to assist in providing skilled executives to assist in the development of the less fortunate countries. There are a large number of voluntary agencies which are contributing time, effort, money, and personnel to help to do their part in insuring the success of this program designed for future world progress.

I think we can be proud of our efforts in the field of foreign aid so far. I feel that we can take great pride in the success shown by Western Europe, Japan, and Taiwan and in many other countries where progress has been dramatic.

Our foreign aid program is our way of doing our part to make the future one that we and the generations to come can enjoy and of which we can all be proud.

Mr. **PUCINSKI.** Mr. Chairman, while I applaud the committee's recommendation that no sale under title I of this act shall be made to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such sale is essential to the national interest of the United

States, I believe our sanctions would be much more effective if we declared a complete ban on further sales to Nasser until he demonstrates a civilized attitude toward our own country and renounces his attacks on Israel. I am aware that the U.S. Constitution gives the responsibility of determining foreign policy to the President. But, Mr. Chairman, by giving to the Congress the power of the purse strings, our Founding Fathers said in effect that they want the Congress to look over the President's shoulder.

I cannot conceive of a situation affecting our national interest which would permit continued sales to Egypt in the light of Nasser's arrogant statement that we can jump in the ocean with our foreign aid. More important, Mr. Chairman, the fact that Nasser is accepting aid from the Soviet Union with which to continue his aggression against Israel and the United States, makes it impossible to justify any further aid to Nasser at this time.

I have the highest confidence in President Johnson but I believe the language in the bill puts the President on the spot. I believe we in the Congress should set the policy of no further aid to Nasser until he stops muddying the waters by cutting off the authorization for funds at this time. He will squeal and protest but at least he will know that we here in Congress are determined to deal effectively with those who would wage aggression against us or our allies. Israel deserves this kind of positive help from us at this time. I know of no violence that would be done to our foreign policy by declaring a 1-year moratorium on further aid to Nasser. It would give him a year to consider the folly of his policy toward those who sincerely want to reach a just and peaceful solution in the Middle East. We shall review this entire legislation in another 12 months. If Nasser shows signs of civilized conduct, we can again consider renewing our assistance program to Egypt. But as far as I am concerned, he should have no more of our assistance, at least until he shows he deserves this kind of aid from the American people.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Chairman, the arguments pro and con on the question of U.S. foreign military and economic assistance have undergone some change since the inception of the Marshall plan. Yesterday and today the debate on H.R. 7750 has reflected the change in attitude on both sides. As for myself, I have always felt our foreign aid programs were not only sincere expressions of America's historic humanitarian concern for other people whose fates have not been as favorable as ours, but they have been measurably successful in stemming the onslaught of Communist ideology as well as the assumption of power by men who are Communists.

The humanitarian and anti-Communist impulses, however, are themselves not the only reasons for inaugurating and continuing foreign assistance. We have been, and we continue to be, concerned for the economic foundations of new and developing nations. It is in our own best self-interest to assist these countries in fulfilling their legitimate aspirations for sustained economic growth in order to satisfy the material needs of their peoples and to protect their political independence. These nations, once they are on the road to a balanced and developing economy, will then be able to help smooth out the wrinkles in international trade and add significantly to the economic abundance of everyone. Our own economic well-being, therefore, is contingent upon the economic conditions of these countries.

Should we suddenly end or even phase out our foreign aid programs over a period of 2 or 3 years, the consequences at home would be drastic. We would do well to remember that over 85 percent of all foreign aid money appropriated by Congress is providing the foundation for several hundred thousand jobs in the United States. If these funds were suddenly withdrawn, the unemployment level would soar. For the State of Ohio the impact of foreign aid funds is even more important. Under AID orders in the 6 months from July to December 1964, Ohio's industry was awarded contracts totaling $11,552,335.09, and in the 12 months of the same year the total was $27.3 million. Ohio was second among all the States in the production of goods which were exported under funds administered by AID last year. These funds employ thousands of workers who, we can say with certainty, would otherwise be out of work altogether or only partially employed. These same funds yield rewards for industry in terms of profits and capital investments.

In view of these facts for the State, when we turn to the influence of foreign aid on Cincinnati's economy, we find that in the last 6 months of 1964 industries there received orders totaling $131,003.09, and probably more—the exact figures are not available and therefore the data were developed from partial computations. For the entire year of 1964, Cincinnati industries were recipients of contracts in excess of $270,000.

Taking all of these factors into account, Mr. Speaker, I believe we can fairly conclude that foreign aid is not only desirable but necessary in maintaining freedom abroad and a high level of prosperity at home.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against this foreign assistance legislation. Basically I oppose this program because it seems plain to me that foreign aid has not been accomplishing the objections originally intended. Secondly I do not feel that the $3.4 billion which are expected to be appropriated this year, in view of our regular annual deficits, can be afforded without jeopardizing our economy. I think Congress should reduce the authorization to not to exceed $1 billion. If this was done and the program was terminated or completely overhauled in the next 2 years, I would vote for the bill.

However, Mr. Chairman, in view of the drain of our foreign aid on U.S. gold stocks, I think the time has come to restrict this program

The unexpended balances in the program after June 30 this year will total more than $9 billion.

I do not see how our country with its heavy load of debt and tremendous load of domestic obligations can fight wars and at the same time assist some 70 other countries under foreign aid.

So, as I have said, I intend to vote against the bill on final passage.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enthusiastically support H.R. 7750—a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

No man can deny the fact that foreign assistance has made and is an essential part of our foreign policy. Without the foreign aid program there is serious doubt in my mind that we would be meeting here today. Without this essential program, we would have long since been fighting for survival against foreign invaders in the streets of our cities, towns, and villages.

Under the able leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Honorable THOMAS E. MORGAN, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has thoroughly reviewed our foreign assistance program and with a fine-toothed comb has reduced the authorization request to the minimum necessary for our own international survival.

No Member of the House has devoted more time to this essential program—no Member has the experience and the responsibility as that possessed by Chairman MORGAN. I have complete faith and confidence in his judgment and therefore I respectfully urge the Members of the House to pass H.R. 7750 as recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. It is urgent for the future of America that we join together to support the proven and experienced leadership of Chairman MORGAN.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, although I disagree with a number of parts of the foreign aid bill, I will vote for the measure because, on balance, I feel that its advantages to our Nation outweigh its disadvantages, and also because in these critical days of confrontation between the forces of freedom and the forces of communism in widely scattered parts of the world foreign aid, carefully awarded and well administered, is a basic weapon in the arsenal of freedom.

I have thus put aside some significant reservations I have about this foreign aid bill and deferred to the broader concerns of national security which this legislation is designed to promote.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, during my 3 years of service in the House, I have supported the foreign aid program, each time with a heightened sense that we are getting over our depth and that control has been lost by the administrators of the program and, even more alarming, by the Congress itself. I shall vote for the program again this year, although I shall also vote as in the past for a moderate reduction. Our country has undertaken grave responsibilities and I feel compelled to support our commitments to carry them out.

It should be pointed out that this bill—H.R. 7750—does not represent the total of foreign aid spending by the United

States by far, in spite of its inclusive name—the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965. This bill would authorize $2,197,670,000 for economic assistance and $1,170 million for military assistance. In addition to this, through other legislation, we are budgeting for this fiscal year:

The Peace Corps, $115 million; the food-for-peace program—Public Law 480—$1,658 million; the Inter-American Development Bank, $706 million; the International Development Association, $104 million.

When these sums are added to the funds authorized by H.R. 7750, the foreign aid spending for the fiscal year 1966 totals around $6 billion.

On top of this, after June 30 of this year, there will remain some $9 billion in money previously authorized that has not been spent in the foreign aid program.

We in Congress cannot run this program ourselves, nor should we try, but we are entitled to an accounting of it that we are not getting. We should insist on it but we are not. We are the ultimate guardians of the Nation's resources and we are ultimately responsible to the American people for our stewardship of them.

ECONOMIC AND MILITARY SHOULD BE SEPARATE

Personally, I do not see why the military and economic portions of foreign aid should be lumped together in a single bill. The military budget concerns the vital defense of our country and the free world. It should probably be in the defense budget. The economic portion concerns the political and humanitarian aspects of our world leadership. It does not make sense to me to put them together in such a way that it is almost impossible for us to revise one without jeopardizing the other.

Budgetary problems and the subject of fiscal responsibility are difficult and complex. Every one of us knows how difficult it is to hold audience attention through a labyrinthine discussion of economics, even though the subject matter strikes to the foundations of our society. Yet we must talk about them and weigh the effects of every program we enact upon welfare of the people—on their jobs, their incomes, the value of the money in which they are paid, and on their general security.

GOLD FLOW PROBLEM

There is dispute among experts on the effect of the foreign aid program upon our national credit, the loss of gold, which is the bedrock of our national credit, and on our financial stability. But there is no disagreement that the program has an effect and that the effect is, to a greater or lesser degree, harmful.

We must keep in mind that, while the purpose of foreign aid is to strengthen the free world in its battle against international communism, and to help underdeveloped and backward countries to achieve self-sufficiency, our ability to reach these goals will collapse utterly if our economy collapses. Without a strong America, the battle would be hopeless.

VOTE TO REDUCE EXPLAINED

So my concern for the program and my vote to reduce it, is not an attack on the principles behind it but a protest over the manner in which it is being administered. It is an expression of concern that Congress is not carrying out its responsibility in this area, that it is leaving too much to the discretion of the anonymous functionaries in the dark departmental caverns downtown.

Foreign aid, it was truly said, can never be a substitute for foreign policy. It is but one tool in a varied arsenal. Our commitments abroad, particularly the war in Vietnam and our involvement in the Dominican Republic, are almost certain to require heavy additional, unforeseen expenditures. Our military resources are gravely extended at present and it is likely that Congress will be called on to authorize substantial new spending for defense. Let us not lose sight of the fact that we are running huge budget deficits, and proposing further tax cuts. The American people will make any sacrifice they are asked to make if the reasons are clear and sensible. But they will not tolerate waste and the aimless frittering away of their substance nor should they be expected to.

Let us then exercise prudence and care, with the total picture in mind, as we enact foreign aid and indeed all other programs.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the foreign assistance authorization bill, H.R. 7750, now before this House for its consideration.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have been privileged to participate actively in the hearings and discussions of this year's foreign aid program. From this participation I have had the opportunity to examine the overall assistance effort, as well as the individual country programs and the major categories of economic and military aid.

Although it would be expecting too much to hope for complete agreement among the Members of this House on each and every aspect of the President's program, I believe President Johnson deserves full credit for adhering to his expressed determination to "impose the smallest assistance burden on the American people since the beginning of the Marshall plan in 1948." In carrying out this objective, the President has sent us a foreign aid request for fiscal year 1966 that is both highly selective and at the same time represents the result of careful review and critical analysis.

Therefore, as we debate the pros and cons of the various military and economic assistance programs, it is important that we in Congress also take a cold, hard, and thoroughly businesslike look at each of them. Our final decision should rest on whether or not, or to what extent they contribute to and advance our national interest, and the interest of the other freedom-loving countries of the world.

Certainly, none of us wants any part of a giveaway program that does not advance the cause of our national security. We do not have, never have had, and never will have sufficient resources to be able to afford any wasteful or extravagant programs that do not stand on their own merit by helping to make the world a more secure and a better place in which to live.

On the other hand, who among us can doubt that the military and economic assistance we gave to the war-ravaged nations of Europe, and later to Greece and Turkey, was not a major cause of their stout and successful defense against the threat of Communist takeover during those perilous days after World War II?

Many nations, who once had received large amounts of assistance from us, are today able to stand on their own, and in fact, have now become donors of assistance to less fortunate nations.

Other countries are in what we might classify as a middle position: They continue to receive some assistance from us, but they are steadily moving in the direction of economic independence, and in the not too distant future should be entirely on their own.

There is also a third category, made up largely of the underdeveloped countries of Africa, southeast Asia, and Latin America, which will need substantial amounts of financial, technical, and related assistance for some time to come.

One essential requirement for this third category of nations is that they bend every effort to help themselves, that they be willing and able to make the necessary changes and reforms to enable outside assistance to be effective.

The Alliance for Progress is the name we use to describe this joint economic assistance and self-help effort in the Latin American area. Though not living entirely up to our most ambitious hopes, the Alliance has made solid gains, and gives promise of greater accomplishments in the future life of our good neighbors to the south.

But, as President Johnson has said:

> A vast revolution is sweeping the southern half of this globe. We do not intend that the Communists shall become the beneficiaries of this revolt against injustice and privation. We intend to lead vigorously in that struggle.

With these thoughts in mind, I would urge my colleagues to consider carefully all the aspects of the legislation before us, and weigh the cost of the program against the pressing needs around us.

Then, I am confident that a majority of the Members will cast their ballots in support of the President and in support of meeting our national obligation to do our part in the defense of freedom wherever it is challenged around the world.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANDRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 395, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER**. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. **ADAIR**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER**. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. **ADAIR**. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ADAIR moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 7750) to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendments: Page 2, after line 8, insert the following:

"TITLE I—DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

"SEC. 102. Title I of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to development loans, is amended as follows:

"'(a) Amend section 202(a) by striking out "and $1,500,000,000 for each of the next two fiscal years, which sums shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any unappropriated portion of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any such fiscal year may be appropriated in any subsequent fiscal year during the above period in addition to the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such subsequent fiscal year: *Provided further*" and substitute the following: "$1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1965, and $649,292,000 for the fiscal year 1966, which sums shall remain available until expended: *Provided*".'"

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Page 5, line 15, immediately after "free" insert "non-Communist-dominated".

Page 6, line 16, immediately after "free" insert "non-Communist-dominated".

Mr. **MORGAN**. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. **ADAIR**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 178, nays 219, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—178

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews,
Glenn
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Arends
Ashmore
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callaway
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen,
Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hamilton
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Herlong
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Michel
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Stanton
Stephens
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—219

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson,
Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Barrett
Beckworth
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Halpern
Hanley
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Landrum
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolff
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—36

Andrews,
George W.
Ashbrook
Bandstra
Berry
Bonner
Brown, Ohio
Burton, Calif.
Carter
Chelf
Clawson, Del
Dickinson
Flynt
Green, Oreg.
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Hungate
Lennon
Macdonald
Mathias
Moorhead
Nix
Pool
Powell
Resnick
Roncalio
Skubitz
Springer
Stubblefield
Toll
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis
Wright

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Macdonald against.

Mr. Skubitz for, with Mr. Burton of California against.

Mr. Lennon for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Pool for, with Mr. Hanna against.

Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Bandstra against.

Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Mr. Ashbrook for, with Mr. Nix against.

Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Moorhead against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mrs. Green of Oregon against.

Mr. Carter for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Hagen of California against.

Mr. Dickinson for, with Mr. Roncalio against.

Mr. George W. Andrews for, with Mr. Resnick against.

Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Watts against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Willis with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Weltner with Mr. Chelf.

Mr. **HAMILTON** changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. **ADAIR**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 249, nays 148, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—249

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson,
Tenn.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall

Ayres
Baldwin
Barrett
Bates
Beckworth
Bell
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Clark
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Landrum
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Selden
Senner
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Whalley
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wydler
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—148

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashmore
Baring
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Betts
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Callaway
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Fountain
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McEwen
McMillan
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Morris
Mosher
Murray
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Poage
Poff
Quillen
Race
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Scott
Secrest
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Stanton
Stephens
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Younger

NOT VOTING—36

Andrews, George W.
Ashbrook
Bandstra
Berry
Bonner
Brown, Ohio
Burton, Calif.
Carter
Chelf
Clawson, Del
Dickinson
Flynt
Green, Oreg.
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Hungate
Lennon
Macdonald
Mathias
Miller
Moorhead
Pool
Powell
Resnick
Roncalio
Skubitz
Springer
Stubblefield
Toll
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis
Wright

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.

Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. Lennon against.

Mr. Burton of California for, with Mr. Skubitz against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Pool against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Bandstra for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Miller for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Moorhead for, with Mr. Carter against.

Mr. White of Idaho for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Hagen of California for, with Mr. George W. Andrews against.

Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Flynt against.

Mrs. Green of Oregon for, with Mr. Dickinson against.

Mr. Watts for, with Mr. Chelf against.

Mr. Springer for, with Mr. Willis against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Weltner.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Wright.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT, ETC., FOR ARMED FORCES

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 800) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday night, May 29, to file a report on H.R. 7105, the Export Control Act, including minority and supplemental views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader concerning the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will my friend yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's taking this time for this purpose because I do want to announce some additions to the program. In the first place, we go on as previously announced with the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill tomorrow.

Following that we shall take up S. 800. There will be a rule on this bill waiving points of order on the conference report on that bill, which is the Armed Services Procurement Act. We hope, if we finish the appropriation bill and the conference report that we may take up H.R. 5883, which is the bonding bill scheduled for Thursday. If we can complete those we will expedite the handling of the business for the week.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, and while I have the time, in order that Members of the House may be advised, it is our hope that we will finish the legislative program on Thursday, that we will meet without legislative business on Friday for the purpose of adjourning over until Tuesday, as Monday is a legal holiday.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

U.S. POLICY ON THE SIDE OF DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES

Mr. **FRASER.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FRASER.** Mr. Speaker, as a severe critic of earlier U.S. positions in the Dominican Republic, I want to commend President Johnson for the current policy which places U.S. power and authority on the side of democratic constitutional processes. In the long run we have no other choice because of our belief in the right of people to govern themselves. Yet too often in the short run we yield to other considerations and fail to act decisively when free government is threatened.

Mr. Speaker, if the United States had made its intention to support restoration of constitutional processes in the Dominican Republic explicit at the outset, much of the criticism directed toward our Government would have been avoided. It is, nevertheless, a tribute to the wisdom and understanding of our President that U.S. policy is clearly emerging on the side of the people of the Dominican Republic and their right to govern themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we need to make this support of self-government a long-term commitment. Such a commitment will require a reexamination of some of the current ideas about intervention held within the OAS and elsewhere.

Yet such a commitment is essential if we are to preserve democratic governments in the Western Hemisphere and ultimately throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert a report published in today's issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

WASHINGTON SHIFTS DOMINICAN POLICY

(By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—One of the historic turning points in the foreign policy of the United States may well have been passed in the past few days. The United States now is acting to check communism through the forces of popular, democratic government instead of through military reaction.

Although the change of course has come in the Dominican Republic, it is likely to have a profound effect on the much more important case of Vietnam, where a similar problem exists.

Up until some time last week, President Johnson and his advisers were backing the military junta in Santo Domingo, while claiming to be impartial.

The best friends of the United States in Latin America—those statesmen who represent the forces of constitutional democracy as against fascism of the right or communism of the left—were urgently and even passionately advising him behind the scenes that this was a profound mistake.

POSITION CHANGED

The President then changed his position. His advisers then began the formation of the prospective Guzmán government from men who represent the constitutional tradition and were agreed to by former President Bosch.

In so doing, it seems likely that President Johnson has emerged from his own "Bay of Pigs." If his present decision holds, if his advisers are able to carry through with the Guzmán government they have nearly completed, a period of talking democracy and acting through a foreign military dictatorship to crush it will have ended.

It is considered not too late to recover the rapidly fading respect of the progressive forces in Latin America and elsewhere in the free world. Indeed the dramatic turn of events is likely actually to enhance the American position.

CREDIBILITY RESCUED

From Washington, it also appears that something much more important now is possible. For the credibility of the United States and of President Johnson, when he promised to withdraw from Vietnam as soon as free government was secure, had been severely damaged.

It seemed for a while that American policy in Vietnam might find its graveyard or its vindication in the Dominican Republic, where the issue was more sharply defined for the whole world to see. The direction now has become one of vindication.

There has never been any question here of relaxing the guard against Communist infiltration, either in the Caribbean or in southeast Asia. That remains the first aim of the U.S. policy.

The question was whether a predominantly military action, such as stiffening American military action in Vietnam and using the guns of the Dominican Army to restore order, was enough in itself to check communism without also building a strong middle-ground government and encouraging it to make the reforms which would ease the revolutionary pressures that feed communism.

RISKS COMPARED

In Vietnam the makings of such a government exist, but it has not been a prime object of U.S. policy. President Johnson has looked chiefly to military measures to achieve his purpose. In the Caribbean the ingredients of such a non-Communist government were actually being liquidated by the forces of the military junta.

To the more military minded advisers in Washington the risks of this course seemed less than the risks of working with popular reform governments which seemed vulnerable to the maneuvers of Communists and of radicals who are willing to work with Communists.

There are highly placed political advisers to the President, however, who took the opposite line.

KEY EVENTS

Though in the minority, they have argued that communism feeds on economic unrest, plus the unpopularity of so-called strongarm regimes—or on weak though well-meaning governments (like that of Saigon) which are unable to bring about economic and political reform.

These advisers have insisted that communism can best be thwarted by the maximum emphasis on the kind of people's government that the United States believes in.

Events now appear to have brought the President around to this view.

The events included the mounting criticism of the friends of the United States in the free world, the action of the Dominican military junta in discrediting itself, and a swinging of the pendulum in argument within the highest echelons of the Government here.

It now remains to be seen whether the President can stay on the new course and what its influence on the restraint of communism and the support of the free world will be.

THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM

Mr. **RACE.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RACE.** Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, the senior Senator, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, recently traveled to Reed College in Portland, Oreg., where he debated with the very able senior Senator from that State, WAYNE MORSE. The topic which they debated was one which merits the concern of all Americans—the policy of the United States in Vietnam. Because of the timeliness of this topic, I extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in order to bring this debate to the attention of my colleagues:

DEBATE BETWEEN THE HONORABLE WILLIAM PROXMIRE AND THE HONORABLE WAYNE MORSE, AT THE CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN POLICY IN VIETNAM, SPONSORED BY THE REED COLLEGE PUBLIC AFFAIRS BOARD

Senator MORSE. To understand my position on foreign policy during my 20 years of service in the U.S. Senate, one must recognize that I am a disciple of Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan. Senator Vandenberg was, at one time, the leading isolationist in the Senate. He became, in my opinion, the leading internationalist and the greatest expert on foreign policy in the Senate. He left with us a tenet, "There is no hope for permanent peace until all nations, not just some, not just those we like, but until all the nations of the world are willing to set up a system of international justice through law." Every issue that threatens the peace of the world would be submitted to such a system for a final and binding decision, to be enforced by some international organization such as the United Nations.

This is referred to as the call for a substitution of the rule of law for the jungle law of military force. The major premise of my position on Vietnam is that we should have insisted upon a substitution of the rule of law for the jungle law of unilateral American action in southeast Asia, for we are acting outside the framework of international law. We have walked out on one of the greatest opportunities available to try to lead mankind to a lawful settlement of this threat of peace * * *. Those [lawful] procedures could have been used through a series of agencies. I urged that we try to do it through SEATO. I urged that we try to do it through a reconvening of a 14-Nations Conference, going back to the Geneva Accord Conference of 1954.

When it became obvious that we had passed by any chance of using those agencies for the substitution of the rule of law for unilateral American military action in southeast Asia, I pleaded to take the matter to the United Nations. I have asked for nothing more than Franklin Roosevelt asked for 20 years ago at Teheran and Cairo, when he proposed the establishment of an international trusteeship for all of Indochina. Roosevelt pointed out that there could not be any peace in Asia if the powers were going to resort to a balance of power theory and were going to use military power for the maintenance of peace. He recognized that no longer will war produce peace; all a war will do is produce more war, with an interim period between wars that some people mistakenly call peace. Great Britain blocked Roosevelt at Teheran and Cairo. Great Britain thought it could still hold its colonial possessions in Asia. France, too, thought it might hold its colonies. But Roosevelt answered Great Britain by pointing out that France had milked Indochina for years and Great Britain had no hope of maintaining colonies in that part of the world much longer. Even then, colonialism in Asia was dead, and a new colonialism in Asia, in my judgment, has no possible hope of success, even a form of American colonialism in southeast Asia.

We got into Vietnam in large part because John Foster Dulles, then Secretary of State, thought France should stay in Indochina, and we poured $1¼ billion into France, hoping to keep France in Indochina. But then Dienbienphu occurred. Dulles went to London, and he tried to persuade Churchill and Anthony Eden to commit British troops to help France in Indochina, in return for which he would commit American troops. Then they were to go across the channel and make the offer to France, hoping that this would keep France in the war in Indochina. Churchill turned him down.

Following that, we had the Geneva accord of 1954. France made it clear she was pulling out of Indochina. The Geneva accord of 1954 was consummated, but the United States did not sign it, and the United States succeeded, and I speak advisedly, in getting its first puppet government in South Vietnam, the Diem government, not to sign the accord. We have never signed the Geneva accord of 1954, yet we keep saying through our spokesmen, that one of the reasons we are carrying on military action in South Vietnam is because North Vietnam has been violating the Geneva accord. She has—and so has Red China, and so have the Pathet Lao and Laos. I think there is some evidence that on occasion Cambodia has, too, but that has been no justification for American violation of the Geneva accord.

Articles 16 and 17 of the Geneva accord prohibit, by specific language, the United States or any other country from sending into South Vietnam a single soldier, a single tank, a single jetplane, a single bit of military aid. The International Control Commission, consisting of the Indian representative as chairman, a Canadian representative, and a Polish representative, has found the United States and South Vietnam, as well as North Vietnam, in violation of the Geneva accord time and time again.

If we were going to keep faith with our belief in substituting a rule of law for the jungle law of military might, we should have laid this matter immediately before either a reconvened Geneva Conference (and, interestingly, the Geneva accord makes provision for such a reconvening) or before the United Nations. I would have preferred the latter, for I think others should have asked for a reconvening of the Geneva accord * * * the signatories should have asked for it, and not a nonsignatory. The Geneva accord established Laos and Cambodia; then it drew a line in Vietnam at the 17th parallel to develop what we refer to as North Vietnam and South Vietnam. But, the Geneva accord did not set up separate governments to the north and to the south of the parallel. That is a false assumption that is contained in much of the discussion on the Vietnam crisis.

In the northern part of the country, Ho Chi Minh, a Communist leader during World War II, was an ally of the United States as commander of the guerrilla forces in the war against Japan. The first leader of the government in the south was the French puppet, Bao Dai. It soon became clear that he no longer was going to be acceptable to the Vietnamese who had gone south and to the Vietnamese who were already in the south * * * Ngo Dinh Diem, a Vietnamese who had lived and who had been trained in the United States, became the first leader endorsed by the United States to be placed in charge of not a free government, but a police-state government in South Vietnam.

The governments in South Vietnam have been police-state governments just as the government in North Vietnam has been an enslaved government of communism. These have been military dictatorships; there is much talk about supporting freedom in South Vietnam * * * there has never been any political freedom in South Vietnam as we know it. It has been a totalitarian government of a military policy type from the very beginning.

The Geneva accord has a provision that deals with the matter of the type of government that was to be established by the people of North and South Vietnam, since it was not contemplated when the Geneva accord was signed that there should be a permanent partition of Vietnam into North and South. That was to be left to the people to decide in the election to be held in 1956.

The election was not held. Why? Because the United States of America blocked the election. The United States of America goes down in history as the Nation responsible for the fact that this section of the Geneva accord was never carried out * * * President Eisenhower, in his book, points out our position in regard to that election and said that our intelligence reports showed that if the election was held, Ho Chi Minh would receive 80 percent of the vote in South Vietnam, as well as an overwhelming majority in North Vietnam. Many authorities on South Vietnam would tell you that if an election was held tomorrow in South Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh would receive a large majority of the vote. He is still the most popular figure in all of Vietnam. * * *

Let me give you a statistic or two about the problem that confronts us in South Vietnam. The population is about 15 million, in round numbers, with 500,000 to 750,000 military personnel. How much money has been poured into that military establishment, including the one and one-quarter to France? Six and one-half billion dollars, not including the cost of our own military personnel. What is the top figure given to us by the administration as to the Vietcong military establishment? Between 25,000 to 35,000, the hard-core probably 20,000. Who now controls better than 75 percent of the land area of South Vietnam? The Vietcong—not the forces of the government.

I have a little difficulty understanding why it is necessary to have 28,000 American soldiers in South Vietnam to put down 25,000 to 35,000 Vietcong, with a military establishment of the South Vietnamese Government of at least 500,000. * * *

This brings me to the white paper. There is not anything in the white paper * * * except mention of one ship in which they found about 100 tons of weapons, that has not been known to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the administration for 3 years. The white paper bears out what the administration witnesses testified to before our committee within 3 years before its issuance. The record of that committee is replete with testimony that bears out these conclusions: about 80 to 90 percent of the Vietcong are South Vietnamese and not North Vietnamese; about 80 to 90 percent of the weapons are captured American weapons and not North Vietnamese, Russian, or Chinese weapons. The white paper is so full of holes in regard to its allegations that student after student has torn it apart. (When I refer to students, I refer to authorities on Asia.) In fact, all one need do is read the account of our recognized authorities on Asia, such as Hans Morgenthau, at the University of Chicago, such as Commager, of Amherst, such as these great academic leaders who, as I have said on the floor of the Senate, have forgotten more about Asia than Rusk and McNamara and Taylor and the Bundys and Alexis Johnson will ever know. I would that my President would obtain at least the counter-advice of these recognized authorities on Asia.

Let me point out that Cambodia, the Vietcong, North Vietnam, Burma, Indonesia do not happen to be pro-Chinese. And, in my judgment, they are Communist governments—most of them. What we are doing is driving these Communists of a different stripe right into the arms of Red China. For example, Ho Chi Minh was kept in prison for a year in China. Ho Chi Minh is Russian-oriented, and Russian trained; Ho Chi Minh is a Russian Communist. The great danger is that we are, by our course of action, going to move these countries into the orbit of Red China.

We are violating article after article of the United Nations Charter. So are other countries. There are the commitments required under articles 33, 34, 35, and 51, and other articles of the charter, that place upon us the solemn responsibility of taking threats to the peace of the world to the United Nations for U.N. determination. Why have we not done it? Of course, I am greatly disappointed that others have not done it, too. My plea is that if we continue this unilateral military course of action, we run the great risk of taking mankind to the brink of a third holocaust. That is why you find me pleading in the Senate for us to try to get other countries to come on in with us, to try to carry out the objective of Roosevelt 20 years ago at Cairo and Teheran. I have been pleading for the United Nations to try to set up a trusteeship in South Vietnam for as many years as it may take to make it possible for them to develop a free society. * * *

When I put the question to the Secretary of State in the Foreign Relations Committee, "Why don't you go to the United Nations?" he said, "I do not think it will work." "But will you know until you try?" He replied, "Senator Morse, don't you think Russia would probably beat it and put it in the Security Council?" And my answer was, "Yes, I think so. I cannot be sure, but I think so. But I want to put Russia on the spot. I want to show who it is who is unwilling to use the peaceful procedures by way of the rule of law provided for in the United Nations Charter. But, Mr. Secretary, don't stop with the sections on the Security Council. If Russia follows that course of action, and she might not, then you still can take it to the General Assembly. * * *"

I believe if brought before the General Assembly, a minimum of 85 nations would backup the sending in of a peacekeeping force. You say, "Mr. Senator, do you have any precedent at all?" I want to mention three: does anyone really think that there would not have been a major war years ago in the Middle East if the United Nations' peacekeeping force had not occupied the Gaza strip? Do you really think there would not have been a major war in Africa if the United Nations had not taken the action in the Congo? My last precedent is in Cyprus. Of course the United States and Great Britain got kicked in to the United Nations over Cyprus * * * 10 days before France and Russia showed their hands on the Cyprus issue, I made a major speech in the U.S. Senate calling for a change of American policy and urging that the United States support the United Nation's jurisdiction over Cyprus. At that time the United States and Great Britain were trying to have the Cyprus issue brought under NATO and of course NATO did not have a scintilla of basis for being placed in charge of Cyprus. But the United Nations did. We did not know at the time that Russia and France were busily at work. The State Department apparently did not know it either, but that is nothing new for the State Department; they have that kind of intelligence. They did not know, as we subsequently discovered, that France and Russia were at work around the world and they presented us with an accomplished fact that a huge number of nations were joining them in asking for United Nations jurisdiction. Then, to the everlasting credit of our Government, we changed our course and the U.N. went into Cyprus. I do not know whether it is going to be able to prevent a war or not, but it has so far.

That is the way you build up a system of international law, as every lawyer knows, precedent by precedent, instance by instance.

I think that bilateral negotiations between the United States and North Vietnam are now impossible. We have gone past that time, and now must have multilateral negotiations. A third force, consisting of nonparticipants, must be brought into the picture, a third force based upon a resolution of the United Nations taking jurisdiction that says to the United States and South Vietnam on the one hand, and to the Communist groups on the other hand, "We beg you to now come to an international conference table, in which the other nations not at war will help find a settlement in honor and consistent with security to the participants in this dispute." That is the kind of settlement I want. If the leaders of mankind do not face up to that great moral obligation as well as legal duty, the danger is that we shall move into a massive war in Asia. No one can dispute the ugly fact that I now give you: It is hoped by our Government that Red China will not move, but it is recognized by our Government that if Red China moves we cannot beat her with bombing, conventional or nuclear. We can do great damage. We can destroy her cities and her industrial complex, we can kill millions of her people, but she still will move on the ground and we could not beat her with American troops. The talk is 300,000 to 350,000 American troops to begin with, but that will be just a drop in the manpower bucket. We will have to send 3 million to begin with; half of them will come home in coffins in the first 18 months, and this country will be bogged down in Asia for 25 years. For generations of the future, Asia is going to be controlled by Asia and not by Western powers. I would plead that my Government really put into practice that great moral teaching that the President so often uses, "Come now and let us reason together, sayeth the Lord. Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow. Though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool. * * *"

Unless the nations are willing to sit down at an international conference table to reason together, the great danger is that the United States will become the greatest threat to the peace of the world. A continuation of our conduct in North Vietnam, in my judgment, is certain to lead to war. What we are doing now is shooting fish in a barrel in North Vietnam, against a country with no naval or air force, a country that has not yet moved on the ground. I cannot square it with the principle that I think ought to be morality, that should characterize the foreign policy of my Government.

Senator **Proxmire**. I am here because, on this issue, I feel very strongly; because on this issue, even the Senator from Oregon is wrong. He is wrong in Vietnam. He is wrong about the course that President Johnson and this administration is pursuing. We have used power, let's face it. We have used direct, overt military power. We bomb, we strafe, we burn. That is true. We have attacked in North Vietnam and defended in South Vietnam. War is a dirty business. It is a terrible business and it is a cruel business.

From the first, we have responded to proven aggression. We must recognize, in all fairness, that we have been in Vietnam not just 2 or 3 months. We have been in South Vietnam for 10 years, and for years our presence in South Vietnam has been carefully, painfully designed to avoid military action by American soldiers. Even following the Tonkin Gulf and the Pleiku incidents, the attacks on Americans, we confined our military targets. We limited our retaliations. Most important of all, we have designed our military strategy not to secure unconditional surrender by Hanoi, not to engage China or Russia, but simply and clearly to secure a cessation of aggression by North Vietnam. Yet this restrained, limited policy has been attacked. Senator **Morse** has been attacking our policy in South Vietnam for many, many months—at least for 2 or 3 years. Lately he has been joined by other leading American citizens. Walter Lippmann, perhaps the most brilliant and profound commentator we have on the scene today, agrees that we are losing in South Vietnam and that we should get out. The Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, has said that our policies in South Vietnam involve us in a great danger that the American public does not appreciate and that they should be accompanied, as he feels they are not, by definite negotiations. University professors from coast to coast have been criticizing our positions. At Columbia University they had an all night teach-in on Vietnam, beginning at 11:30 p.m. and going to 8 a.m., with professors speaking in relays against our being in Vietnam. Nobody spoke for the administration. At the University of Michigan the hat was passed and money was raised on behalf of the Vietcong. Our record has been attacked throughout the world. As a matter of fact, Kosygin, the Soviet leader, in talking about the white paper, said "How in the world can the Americans ever categorize their acts in South Vietnam in a white paper? The dirty acts of Americans should be in a black book."

What are these dirty acts? What is this dirty American policy they are talking about? Not only have we restrained our military action, but our efforts in South Vietnam have been very largely constructive and economic. They have been exactly the kind of economic program designed to build the seedbed of democracy, that the Oregon senior Senator was talking about. Our economic assistance in South Vietnam has been well over a billion dollars. Just in the last 2 years, $230 million has been allocated for food for peace for South Vietnam. There is no military threat to North Vietnam in this. It was food to help build the peaceful life. Our agricultural assistance to South Vietnam has not been confined to sending food. We have recognized that the kind of technical assistance used in the Alliance for Progress can be used in South Vietnam, too. We have trained thousands of Vietnamese farmers in the marvels of modern agriculture. We have trained them in irrigation, concentrates, animal husbandry, and insecticides. We have introduced fertilizer, we have introduced corn and potatoes. This constitutes no military threat, but it does build the peaceful life. The economic program can eventually become the seedbed of political freedom. We have helped to equip or build 10 big vocational schools; 7,000 students are actually enrolled. We have built four teacher-training schools; right now we are training 2,000 Vietnamese teachers. The fact is that in the years since 1955, the number of South Vietnamese children going to elementary school has increased from 350,000 to 1,400,000. It is almost a miraculous increase and it would not have been possible without American assistance. This causes no military threat to North Vietnam, but it does build the prospect for peace, and it does provid the seedbed of political freedom. We have established and stocked first aid centers in 12,550 villages and hamlets in South Vietnam. In 5 years, we have cut malaria from an incidence of 7 percent of the population down to less than 1 percent.

These are the kinds of things you do not read about in the newspapers, because they are not spectacular. They do not involve violence, conflict, bombing, or troops. This is what most of America's efforts in South Vietnam have been. We have helped build 1,400 wells to provide clean, fresh water for 750,000 rural inhabitants. We have made fresh water available to one-half million urban dwellers and 35 cities. And this constitutes no threat to North Vietnam. It is building the basis for political freedom and independence. We have built an entire road system. We have financed the purchase of railways and equipment. We have built a big powerplant south of Saigon, not as a threat to North Vietnam but to build for peace. The U.S. Government has built 50 factories in South Vietnam that now employ 13,000 people. We have put a textile industry in South Vietnam, built a national network of seven major radio stations. None of this constitutes a real threat to Vietnam, but is for peace.

Consider this American record and ask, "What does America get out of this?" People talk about America's bad record, people talk about our imperialism—the Communists talk about our imperialism—why have we poured in billions of dollars? Why have we sacrificed hundreds of our young men who have died in South Vietnam? Why have we risked the lives of thousands of others? Do we want Vietnam's money? Do we want oil? Do we want any food? Do we want an economic advantage? Not even the Vietcong can charge us with that. Our hands are clean.

What do we want? What we want is very simple: (1) We want the independence of South Vietnam—what is wrong with that? (2) We want peace and freedom in Asia and in the world, and what is wrong with that? (3) We want to stop Communist aggression, and what is wrong with that? American policy is not reckless. It is not an all-out military policy, just as it is not withdrawal. In this controversy, the real division is not between those who want to withdraw and those who would blast North Vietnam and China off the face of the earth. Our policy is more realistic than either of those. Our policy is to measure and restrain military action, to build for peace, and to stay in South Vietnam for years and years no matter how long it takes to out-work, to out-educate, out-serve, and if necessary, but only if necessary, to out-fight. To pay any price. It has been said this is too much * * * this is too big a burden * * * we cannot afford it. Our responsibilities all over the world are too widespread.

Can we afford it? Is it too big a burden? The fact is that this Nation has just had the biggest tax cut in our history, an $11 billion tax cut. Can we afford it? The defense budget is less this year than it was last year, and less last year than it was the year before. Can we afford it? The President has just submitted the lowest foreign aid program since the beginning of this program 15 years ago. Can we afford it? Bureau of Labor Statistics show unemployment is at the lowest level in 8 years. This is the greatest prosperity in all of American history. We have never had so much income after taxes, even allowing for inflation. Can our will to defend freedom be so feeble that this rich country cannot afford a fraction of what we spend on cosmetics to stand up to communism? And, of course, military and even economic assistance is not enough. All the time it is true that we must press night and day for conditions permitting a basis for negotiations that will bring independence for South Vietnam.

What has been President Johnson's position on peaceful negotiations? I know President Johnson, and I have disagreed with him far more than I have disagreed with my distinguished colleague, Senator Morse. Senator Morse and I both know President Johnson well. He speaks honestly and sincerely when he says that he will go anywhere at any time, see anyone, if he thought it could serve the cause of peace. Until very recently there was simply no evidence that the Communists were interested in negotiating a settlement in Vietnam. Before we began to use our power in the last few weeks, the principal foreign offices in the world said negotiations were impossible. The British Foreign Secretary at the White House recently told the President that the Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko had said in London a few days ago that it was useless to talk about negotiations. The French, who have been the principal agitators for a negotiated settlement, now concede that their explorations have been fruitless; they have been rebuffed by Hanoi and Moscow. The Canadians report that their officials cannot even get in to see the Communist leaders in North Vietnam. Until very recently, if one is talking realism and not some nice theory that we would like to have, there has been only one basis on which we could stop, and that is withdrawal.

If we withdraw, what happens in South Vietnam? Thousands and thousands of brave people who have fought for years would be murdered. What happens in the rest of the world? You do not have to list the rest of the areas of the world, just go to China. Just last week, Mao told the London Observer, "After a Communist victory in South Vietnam, the conflict will be aggravated." The Communists do not look forward to peace after South Vietnam. They say, "This is a beginning. If we win here, then we really aggravate the conflict * * *."

What makes this situation very difficult for Americans to understand, or Americans to defend, is that we are facing a new kind of aggression. These people are not just walking across the border as clearly and simply and obviously as the Hitler march. This is an invisible, subtle, and apparently indigenous kind of aggression. We fall into the trap that this is civil war, and wherever this terrorist infiltration tactic is developed in the future, we will take it to be a civil war. These are the types of terror tactics the Communists have perfected, tactics involving kidnaping of officials, deliberate murder of mayors and leaders of villages, the murder of thousands of Vietnam exofficials. If the Communists win here, if this kind of action can prevail, there is no reason why the Communists should not use it elsewhere—in Asia, in Africa, and in South America.

This is a far crueler, tougher war. It seems as though we are losing or have lost. The fact is that we can win. The military situation is bad. I think it is true that this administration and the last administration were very wrong in not telling us the true situation about how we were losing in South Vietnam. But it is a fact, as every reporter I have heard has reported, that morale in South Vietnam is now rising. Not only do the Catholics and the business communities support our position, but the Buddhists, the students, and the labor people are supporting recent developments in Vietnam. Most promising of all, now that we have shown that we not only have the greatest power in the world, but that we have the will to use it, North Vietnam seems to be taking a different view of negotiation. The New York Times recently reported that diplomats of the nonalined countries said privately that North Vietnamese officials might be willing to agree to a new Geneva conference on Indochina. The indications were private—publicly, the North Vietnamese officials indicated withdrawal of U.S. officials mandatory before negotiation. There were no conditions in the private approach. The British Foreign Secretary declared that there is more hope of negotiation than even a day ago, that there has been a change in the attitude of the Communists toward negotiation. Meanwhile, the President maintains the posture, which he sincerely believes, that this country must persist with all its might to resist aggression in South Vietnam, and to defend freedom there with its military strength. But far from being inconsistent, it seems to me that the posture the President has assumed is essential to finally creating peaceful negotiations. This is the same administration that has made proposals for economic development of all southeast Asia, including perhaps North Vietnam, in the event of peace. This is the same administration which indicated there would be no direct reprisal for the bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, specifically no attack on Hanoi. This is the same administration that directed Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland to say that the United States would be willing to have the United Nations, specifically U Thant, act in negotiations in Vietnam.

It is true we did not go to the U.N. before. We did not go because, as the Senator from Oregon implied, Russia has the veto in the Security Council, and frankly, we could not get a two-thirds vote in the Assembly. U Thant said in a press conference in Ottawa on May 26, 1964, "I feel that the situation in southeast Asia is such that I have my own doubts regarding the competence of the United Nations to undertake the task which is being advocated by some members of the United Nations." The Secretary General of the United Nations said that the U.N. could not act under these circumstances and, it has been clear that when the United States of America clashes directly with countries like North Vietnam and Red China, which are both outside the United Nations, there is no precedent. The precedent of the Gaza strip, the precedents of the Congo and Cyprus are terribly different. This is the same administration that had Secretary of State Dean Rusk give a respectful reception to the proposal of 17 so-called nonalined nations that petitioned us to negotiate. All of this is good. It indicates that we do not have a policy of simply pounding away hoping something will happen. We are carrying an olive branch in one hand as well as arrows in the other. But we have those arrows, and the fact is that vinegar is just as essential as the oil of peace. We stand prepared to continue bombing if defense requires it. Not only do we have a massive, awesome power, but we have the will to use it. The President pledged that we will stay in South Vietnam for 10 or 20 years, if necessary, to stop communism.

This resolution may be as significant as President Truman's resolve in Berlin in 1948, in Greece, in Korea, when against criticism and under very different circumstances, he decided to stand against the Communists. It may be as significant as John F. Kennedy's resolve in October of 1962, when we discovered that the Soviet Union had planted missiles in Cuba. This resolve, which has been so denounced, could stabilize the last great front of Communist aggression, and I predict that this U.S. persistence in South Vietnam will drive Hanoi to the bargaining table. On the other hand, had President Johnson chosen the withdrawal option, and that is the realistic option, peace as well as freedom would be in far greater danger throughout the world. He has chosen the tough course, the painful course, but the right course. You do not need a graduate degree to understand what, basically, is going on: this is aggression. This is the kind of aggression the free world, at its terrible regret, failed to meet in Austria; and the Sudetenland and Manchuria, the kind of aggression that resulted in the violence and death and the agony of 4 long years in World War II. In South Vietnam we are meeting it. We are meeting it with military force, but with restrained force. We meet it with military force at the same time that we're building an economically stronger and better future in South Vietnam, as I documented. And, we meet it with the olive branch of negotiations in the other hand.

Let us not forget that it was not Lyndon Johnson who 4 years ago stepped up our military commitment to South Vietnam. It was the same John Fitzgerald Kennedy who gave the finest speech on peace of this generation at American University in May 1963—the same John Kennedy whose greatest monument is a test ban treaty that begins the first hopeful step toward the control of nuclear destruction of the world. It was the same John Kennedy who, however, recognized that the price of peace and freedom can sometimes be cruel and terrible, that there are times when we must face aggression, and that a cruel and terrible price must be paid. And John Kennedy, with all his intelligence, with all the massive information only the President of the United States can have, saw that South Vietnam is the place that this generation must pay it.

Question: "Why, Senator Morse, in your opinion, has President Johnson not asked Congress for a declaration of war following constitutional procedure, instead of using the last summer's Senate resolution authorization for action in Vietnam?"

Senator Morse. As you know, I have taken the position over and over again in the Senate, that if we are going to make war we ought to first declare it. There is not the slightest justification under the Constitution of the United States for our making war in South Vietnam. Under the Constitution, the President of the United States has the responsibility and power to proceed immediately in the defense of this Republic to meet an emergency which has occurred by way of an attack on the United States, as Franklin Roosevelt did at Pearl Harbor. But, he does not have the right to make war in the absence of the declaration of war. Under article No. 1, section 8 of the Constitution, the power to declare war is vested in the Congress of the United States, and not in the President. * * * I was one of two Senators who voted against what I considered to be but a scrap of paper under the Constitution, when last August the Congress passed a resolution to authorize the President to take whatever steps he deemed necessary to protect the security of this country. The Congress, in my judgment, has the duty to decide whether or not American boys were going to be sent to the battlefield, and they should not send them to die in battle in the absence of a declaration of war. I think that it is a great mistake that we have not had a public declaration.

Moderator Jones. Senator Proxmire, would you like to comment on that question?

Senator Proxmire. The fact is that the Congress of the United States as Senator Morse implied, did act on a resolution last August. The resolution was to give Congress the opportunity to go on record for or against our actions in South Vietnam, including whatever military action the President decided was necessary. That resolution passed 512 to 2. It was greatly to his credit that Senator Morse had the courage to be one of the two men who voted against it. But the fact is that the Congress of the United States was consulted, the Congress of the United States did act, and it seems to me that under these circumstances our course in South Vietnam is clear. Wherever we act in a hostile situation, wherever military force is involved, it is not necessary to always have a declaration of war. This is a bad situation—there have been Americans who have died; the latest count was something like 315 or 320. That is a terrible situation. At the same time, I think we must recognize that under these circumstances, traditionally, we have not required a declaration of war. The action taken by the Congress of the United States was not only overwhelmingly passed, but since that time there has been only one other resolution entered and modified, that by Senator JAVITS. That resolution supported the administration right down the line, simply saying that the administration should at the same time seek negotiations. * * *

Question: Senator PROXMIRE, there seemed to be some confusion in your speech, the same confusion which has appeared in the statements of the Government, concerning whether our goal is to stop aggression or whether it is to stop communism. Most of the aggression, as you call it, is indigenous aggression—80 percent is being done by South Vienamese. If we could get, by force or by agreement, the North Vietnamese to stop assisting the Vietcong, would we then move out of Vietnam and allow the South Vietnamese Communists to take over the country? If not, how do we justify intervening in a civil war on the side of a very unpopular government?

Senator PROXMIRE. We have made it clear that our policy in South Vietnam is designed to stop aggression. As a matter of fact, Adlai Stevenson has said in the United Nations that if North Vietnam will stop its aggression, we will do our best to remove our military presence. Of course there are indigenous Communists in South Vietnam. That is a well-known fact. It is also well known that tens of thousands have infiltrated from the North, including the officer cadre, including the plans, and lately, including most of the weapons. That was not true some years ago, but it certainly is true now without any question. The New York Times has reported that something like 90 percent of the replacements for the Vietcong are coming from the North. At any rate, if the North Vietnamese cease their aggression, then we feel that our military job is done, and the South Vietnamese will be able to handle the situation themselves.

Moderator JONES. Senator MORSE, would you care to comment?

Senator MORSE. I want to point out that, although it is perfectly clear that the primary objective of the administration is to seek to prevent the advance of communism on a unilateral basis, it cannot be done by the United States, because you are dealing here with a population that is involved in a civil war. They (the administration) does not like to talk about a civil war, but if I marched a hundred Vietnamese across this platform, 50 North and 50 South, you could not tell the difference. You are dealing in a war in South Vietnam with a father on one side and some of his sons on the other; brothers on one side and brothers on the other; uncles on one side and some of their nephews on the other. You are dealing with a war among Vietnamese, and the 17th parallel is a perfectly artificial line that divided this country. Our problem is to have them set up their own system of government, whatever they choose. It will probably be some form of communism or socialism or totalitarianism. But, that raises the fundamental issue: whether or not the United States is now going to set itself up on a unilateral basis to police the world against communism. If that is going to be our position, we have neither the manpower nor the resources to do it * * * we are writing our own decline if we start to make that approach. That is why I am pleading for multilateral action. I had hoped SEATO might do this job, but SEATO has become a paper tiger. SEATO countries agree that they would act together in maintaining peace in this area of the world—they wrote in certain words of art in that treaty, known as protocol agreement, in which the signatories thereto considered Vietnam an area of vital concern and of mutual interest. Of course, what your Government is not telling you is that there was a sleeper by way of a side agreement, and if the sleeper was to have a concerted action, there had to be a unanimity among the signatories to SEATO. Where are our SEATO partners? Who are they? Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, Great Britain, and France. You cannot get them to come in to be of assistance to the United States.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan spoke at the Washington Press Club just a few months ago. When asked if Pakistan, into which the United States has poured hundreds of millions of dollars for military buildup, was going to come in and help us, he said: "No. That is a U.S. problem. Our problem is with India." When the Secretary of State was before the Foreign Relations Committee last summer, I made the point that the SEATO allies were not helping us—we were doing it all alone. You could not get help out of France, out of Great Britain, out of New Zealand, you could not get it out of any of them. But he said, "Oh, Mr. Senator, Australia has just doubled its commitment under SEATO to help us in South Vietnam." I said, "Mr. Secretary, you just insulted my intelligence. Now, before you insult the intelligence of the rest of the committee, would you like to have me tell them what that understanding involved?" (He did not know I knew.) "Do you want to deny, Mr. Secretary, that this Australian commitment is to increase its manpower commitment to South Vietnam from 30 men to 60 men, but with the understanding that they won't go near the battlefront? Do you want to deny, Mr. Secretary, that you got a commitment out of them that within the next few months they might make available four to six cargo planes to take material from Australia into South Vietnam?" The sad, ugly fact is that the SEATO nations have left us cold. * * * Tell it to Burma, tell it to Indonesia, tell it to Australia, New Zealand. The fact is that in Australia and New Zealand, the press have been greatly concerned about American escalation in North Vietnam. * * * I never thought I would read in American history of the dropping of napalm bombs on jungle towns, killing civilians—men, women and children. The United States is guilty, and history will so find us guilty and condemn us. I never thought my country would send soldiers into South Vietnam, and have taken the pictures that have been shown us in the Foreign Relations Committee, of American soldiers standing by when the most horrendous brutalities are committed upon the Vietcong. And what's the answer? "Why, the Vietcong uses a reign of terror—they commit atrocities and brutalities upon South Vietnamese." They do. But, we are a party to it when we do not use our force to prevent this kind of violation of the Articles of War. The Secretary of State tried to justify the use of gas on the grounds that it protects women and children. Let me say that the use of gas is a clear violation of the convention of 1925, because it violates the Articles of War. Why was all gas prevented in that treaty? This is the kind of gas that was used in World War I, along with lethal gas, because this gas incapacitates the soldiery and makes them easy to kill while under its influence. My country is trying to alibi that at which it got caught, and we have been caught frequently. Do you think our Government would apologize to Cambodia if that American plane had not been shot down within Cambodia after it had dropped napalm bombs on a jungle town, killing civilians? It is pretty hard for us to face up to ugly realities, but the sad fact is, our hands are not clean, our hands are dripping with blood in Asia, to our everlasting discredit.

Moderator JONES. Senator MORSE, that was a long and extended answer—I am therefore going to alter the procedure for a moment to give Senator PROXMIRE an opportunity to respond.

Senator PROXMIRE. What Senator MORSE has just said is that we cannot stop communism throughout the world. The next thing he said, as I understand it, was that we cannot count on SEATO or others to help us. The implication of that to me is that nobody is going to stop communism. I say we can stop communism, and we will. We have not begun to feel the burden in this country. Now, about this situation of using weapons * * * there is nothing in the world that is perhaps easier to do than to make an attack on the weapons of war; I think it serves a good purpose to do so, and I think it should be done. I agree that we made a tragic and stupid blunder by using gas in South Vietnam. There is no question about that. But let's be fair about it. While it was stupid, and it gave the Communists a propaganda victory, let us recognize the circumstances under which that gas was used. I have a clipping from today's newspaper. "London, April 1, Colonial Secretary Anthony Greenwood told Parliament today that British colonial police used nontoxic gas 124 times in the last 5 years. That doesn't make it right, but I imagine that tear gas could be used here in Portland. You can buy it. Any police force can have it and does use it. When this gas was used, and it was used on three occasions, it was totally ineffective on every single occasion. It was used so that it would not be necessary to use other weapons that are far worse—so that we would not have to use napalm, so that we would not have to use machineguns, so that we would not have to kill people. Civilians were being used as shields, and it was thought necessary to provide some method of saving the lives of civilians so it would be possible to step in and overpower the others. Nevertheless, it was stupid for one other reason. In a military situation, you can count on escalation. We use a gas that is a tear and nausea gas. They—the enemy—use a gas that is a little worse; we use gas which is little worse; and the first thing you know you have bacteriological warfare—you have mustard gas, you have some weapons which, fortunately, have not been used since World War I. It was a bad mistake, but at the same time, I think it should be put in perspective.

Question. "Senator MORSE, assuming that SEATO and the United States do not want to assume the responsibility in southeast Asia, should the United States at any time, along a unilaterial basis, stand against Communist aggression in southeast Asia? If so, where do we draw this line?"

Senator MORSE. We will not know until we take it to the United Nations, first through the Security Council, and then to the General Assembly. I am satisfied that at least 85 nations, and probably not more, would vote to take jurisdiction if given the opportunity to take jurisdiction, because they are scared, too. They know what this great threat in Asia means for all the rest of the world. They know that if you start a massive war with Red China it will not be over for a quarter of a century. I am satisfied, also, that basic in the philosophy of many of our military, is the sincere conviction (but I think dead wrong from every standpoint), that you have got to fight China sooner or later, and this is the time to fight her. I am satisfied that we are following the course of action of a provocateur, and that we are going to step it up until finally China makes a misstep. And when China makes the misstep, get ready for the bombing of China. The first target will be the nuclear installations, but do not forget, they can be rebuilt. It may take 10, 15, or 20 years to rebuild them, but when they are rebuilt, they will be rebuilt with a vengeance, and we will leave a heritage to future generations of American boys and girls of the hatred of the Chinese for the next 1,000 years. That is why I want to take my country out of the unilateral course of action—that is why I want to bring in others to help maintain the peace. China is not going to stop for us, but line up 85 to 90 nations around this world against her, and in my judgment, she will think a long time before she follows a course of action of nonnegotiating an honorable settlement.

I believe that the fundamental purpose of our policy in Asia is to establish an American foothold. * * * It goes right back to Dulles wanting France to get out of Indochina, to his wanting Great Britain to come in with us—back to his refusal to sign the Geneva accord of 1954, although he said we would live up to its tenets—and we have violated one after another ever since. * * * I cannot give you any assurance that, if the U.N. does not take jurisdiction, you are not going to have very serious trouble in South Vietnam, but I will face the ugly question. If we are put to the point where we, and we alone, are going to have to fight a war in Asia, then the first thing we should do is try to work out an arrangement where the people would not be massacred. Then, and only then, would I have the United States withdraw, because South Vietnam is not in the perimeter of America defense. If we got into a war with Russia tomorrow, we would not leave an American boy in South Vietnam any longer than it took to get him out, because South Vietnam is not vital to the United States in time of war. * * * Western nations better face up to the fact that Asians are not going to allow them to stay in Asia.

Senator PROXMIRE. The United Nations is now paralyzed. As Senator MORSE said, we have to go to the General Assembly. The Assembly cannot meet until next September. We have to draw the line against the Communists. We can say, "Take it to the United Nations"—I do wish this were a practical solution, but the fact is that the U.N. is not in session, and will not be in session. The Secretary General has indicated that this was a question that was, in his estimation, probably too big. Furthermore, if we try to get the United Nations involved on the basis of having to take jurisdiction between North Vietnam and the United States of America, there is about as much chance that North Vietnam would stand still for that as there is that the Oregonian is likely to name the Senator from Oregon as mediator in its next labor contract. The fact is that North Vietnam was invited to sit in on discussions by the Security Council at the time of the Tonkin Gulf episode. North Vietnam was urged by the Soviet Union, by the United States, and by members of the Security Council. She flatly refused, and said that she would have nothing to do with it, and would not be bound by any decision of the Security Council. Under these circumstances, how in the world can we get the U.N. involved?

Question: "Senator PROXMIRE, you said that the aggression in South Vietnam is of a subtle kind, and is invisible, and I would agree with you. What can Congress do if the terroristic attacks against Americans in the last few months turn out to be inside jobs by those who disagree with the policy of restraint that you advocate and the President hopes to carry on?"

Senator PROXMIRE. We are acting in North Vietnam militarily. We decided to take overt military action very recently. It has been stated over and over again by President Johnson by Secretary Rusk, by Secretary McNamara, and others, that we have done so because of the infiltration and invasion from North Vietnam. This is not just a pipedream—this is not a guess. It is true that this is a subtle kind of war, but the fact is that the invasion has been documented. The International Control Commission has found that there has been aggression from the north. They have said so—they have found it—it is a fact of life, and this is what we are trying to stop. Furthermore, it is my understanding that the man who planted the bomb to blow up the Saigon Embassy admitted that he had been paid by the Vietcong to do it. It is true that the evidence, under war circumstances, is never the kind of thing that one would like to have in court. However, we do know that there is invasion from the north, and that is what we are trying to stop.

Senator MORSE. There is nothing that stops the United Nations from being called into session from within 10 to 15 days. Just read the charter. It calls for an extraordinary session of the United Nations, and we ought to call for an extraordinary session of the U.N. immediately. As to aggression in South Vietnam, within 3 weeks of the filing of the white paper, witnesses before the Foreign Relations Committee continued to testify that this was primarily a war from witthin in South Vietnam, by South Vietnamese, using American weapons. In recent weeks there have been some weapons coming in from the north, but there is still no showing of any substantial number of North Vietnamese military men out of the North Vietnamese Army. Of course, there has been some training of South Vietnamese up in North Vietnam, but we are the last country in the world that ought to talk about training soldiers of another country. We have been doing it all around the world, and we have been doing it in South Vietnam for a long time.

What we do need to face up to is that, in South Vietnam, we have been guilty, time and time again, of aggression on our part. Take the Tonkin Bay incident. The first propaganda of the administration was that the American ships were 75 miles from those North Vietnamese islands 3 to 6 miles off the coast of North Vietnam, which were bombed by South Vietnamese vessels—vessels which we equipped, which moved with the full knowledge of our Embassy and of U.S. Navy ships in Tonkin Bay at the time. Our administration said they were 75 miles away. Well, if Russia had a destroyer 75 miles from Key West, for example, and Castro sent over a destroyer to bomb Key West, you know what we would do to that destroyer 75 miles away. We would give it one chance to come into port, and if it did not come to port, we would sink it, because we would know that it was there for a cover. The 75-mile issue blew up in their face, because we—the Foreign Relations Committee—got the log of the ships, and when the bombing of the islands took place, that American vessel was within 13 miles of the islands. That is why I say we acted as a provocateur. Of course, our ships were on the high seas, and had the right to be where they were, as far as the high sea laws were concerned. But, we had no right to be there as a cover to those South Vietnamese vessels. Time and time again, we have been participants in a violation of the borders of Cambodia, of the borders of North Vietnam, and, as is usually the case when you get into a dirty war, both sides play dirty. We have been playing dirty along with the Communists.

Moderator JONES. In accordance with the procedures of debate, each Senator will have an opportunity to make a brief summary remark.

Senator PROXMIRE. My good friend Senator WAYNE MORSE is a great Senator and a great debater, but it seems he has failed to distinguish the difference between our action in South Vietnam and that of the North Vietnamese. We are there because we were invited by the duly constituted and recognized Government of South Vietnam, a Government that has been recognized by over 100 nations in the world. Although there have been five successive governments, each one has wanted us to stay, and every element in this Government today has asked us to stay there. On the other hand, the North Vietnamese are there to subvert that Government, to overthrow that Government, to destroy that Government. I think there is all the difference in the world on that basis. Senator MORSE has offered us an alternative, but what an alternative. He has said the U.N. Charter indicates that we can call the United Nations together in 10 or 15 days—but why is the U.N. paralyzed? It is paralyzed because the nations cannot vote. It is paralyzed because the problem of the Russian dues to the U.N. will not be solved until September. I wish it were not so—I wish we were living in a different kind of a world. Oh, how I wish we had an international court of justice, and that we could take the Communists to that court. How nice it would be if we could get 85 nations to join us in South Vietnam. But, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, we cannot even get the SEATO nations to join us in South Vietnam. If communism is going to be stopped, we have to stop it. Finally, the position of the administration in this perplexing, complex, and difficult situation, is that negotiation, and the will to try and hope and pray and work for a peaceful solution through negotiation, is important. But that is not the only important element. When dealing with the Communists, in the kind of real world in which they are operating, you have to have two other legs to this stool, too. One of those legs is the kind of hard, tough, grinding assistance we are developing in Vietnam so she can develop her independence, so that she can have the seedbed of political freedom. The third leg, and the one that is so hard for Americans who live peace to accept, is that of force and power—the force of military muscle and the will to use that military muscle. What the administration is doing is to use our military force, use our economic ability, and at the same time sincerely and honestly work to create a situation in which negotiations will be possible, but negotiations that can permit a free and independent South Vietnam and stop Communist aggression.

Senator MORSE. When my very close friend Senator PROXMIRE talks about our being invited into South Vietnam by the Government of South Vietnam, I would ask him, "Which one?" "When?" No government has been set up by the people of South Vietnam. We saw to it that that did not happen in 1956. We stopped the government from being set up in South Vietnam. We set up our own puppet, and a whole chain of puppets. Senator PROXMIRE says a hundred or so nations have recognized that government. Well, we have spent $100 billion now in foreign aid to some 100 nations and they are not going to offend us very quickly. I want to say that it is pretty difficult for this great power of the United States to find very many people taking positions that they will not recognize a puppet. * * * We never have been called in by a government of the people of South Vietnam. I am for a procedure that will give the people of South Vietnam their own government, not an American-imposed government, which they have had ever since 1954.

The United Nations is in a position to work. Read the charter. Who is responsible for the fact than the U.N. went out of session? It was what Ambassador Stevenson called a procedural vote on article 19, the most substantive vote that could be cast in that general session. That is why the students of the United Nations are severely criticizing the United States for our course of action on article 19, and they should criticize. That is why your Senator led the fight in the Senate against the policy of our Government, backed up by a surprising number of Senators, when I said "You should hold the nose of Russia and France to the grindstone in the United Nations—not let them out of it, and insist on a vote on article 19." But I am talking about an extraordinary session of the United Nations, an extraordinary session called for the nations to carry out their responsibility to keep the peace. I have no doubt what the General Assembly would do if reconvened, if there was any hope of maintaining the peace by the United Nations sending whatever number of divisions of the U.N. troops necessary to enforce the peace in southeast Asia. They would quickly waive any obligations regarding any money if they could get this matter decided; then they could go back to the debate on article 19.

I did not come here, and Senator PROXMIRE did not come here, to ask for agreement. We came believing that what is needed in this country on this critical issue is the thought of the American people—to get the American people away from their dogmas and their slogans. Remember, you, too, have a responsibility of statesmanship. Yours is the responsibility of citizen-statesmanship. Never forget that foreign policy under our constitution does not belong to the President of the United States. That is one of the myths or bubbles that needs to be burst. Foreign policy belongs to you, the people. The President is the administrator of the people's foreign policy, subject to the checks of Congress. We now have to think about American boys and girls 100, 200, 500, and 1,000 years from now. It is my deep conviction that if we follow this course, we will never leave a heritage of freedom to our grandchildren.

Moderator JONES. Thank you, Senator MORSE, and particularly for that final word. It has been our privilege to listen to a discussion of truly historic proportions this evening, for which we thank both of our guests very warmly.

SIGNIFICANT AMENDMENT TO THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Senate adopted a most significant amendment to the voting rights bill. The amendment, sponsored by Senator KENNEDY of New York, will enfranchise thousands of Spanish speaking citizens. Senator ROBERT KENNEDY deserves the gratitude of all those dedicated to equality in voting for directing his great abilities to the passage of this amendment.

This amendment would prohibit the denial of the right to vote in any election of any person because of his inability to read, write, or understand English if he has successfully completed the sixth grade in a public or accredited private school in any State, territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant classroom language was other than English.

The amendment provides:

> No person who demonstrates that he has successfully completed the sixth primary grade in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant classroom language was other than English, shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his inability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter in the English language, except that in States in which State law provides that a different level of education is presumptive of literacy, he shall demonstrate that he has successfully completed an equivalent level of education in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant classroom language was other than English.

Mr. Speaker, Congress certainly has the power to pass this literacy test amendment under the enforcement clauses of the 14th and 15th amendments.

The 14th amendment to the Constitution guarantees that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." In New York State thousands of American citizens have been denied the equal protection of the laws.

New York State requires a prospective voter to take an English language literacy test or to establish his literacy by showing an eighth grade education at a school conducted in English. As a result of this requirement thousands of American citizens of Puerto Rican origin do not register to vote. Senator ROBERT KENNEDY estimated that there are approximately 730,000 Puerto Ricans in New York, of whom approximately 480,000 are of voting age. Less than one-third—about 150,000 are registered to vote. While it cannot be said that all the other 330,000 are not registered because of the literacy test, there is no doubt that a substantial number do not register for this reason.

The New Yorker of Puerto Rican origin has every opportunity to be as well informed a voter as his English-speaking neighbor. There are Spanish-language newspapers, televisions, and radio. The schools in Puerto Rico teach civics and American history. The English-language literacy test is an arbitrary requirement for voting and should be abolished.

I have sponsored legislation throughout my service in Congress to abolish the literacy test completely. In this Congress my bill to eliminate the literacy test is H.R. 2477. I testified at length before the House Committee on the Judiciary on this question. I believe the least we can do in this session is to adopt the literacy test amendment sponsored by Senator KENNEDY of New York.

Unfortunately, this amendment is not included in the voting rights bill which has been reported out by the House. In view of the action taken by the other body, I hope the House will adopt it, and I urge the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to accept the amendment when the voting rights bill is on the floor. I urge all my colleagues to join with me in this fight to bring full rights of citizenship to thousands of Americans who speak Spanish.

COMMUNITY SERVICE SOCIETY AND THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the testimony of Mrs. Barbara Reach before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Mrs Reach is staff associate of the Community Service Society, the oldest and largest voluntary family service agency in the country. We will shortly be debating the administration's Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, and I believe that this testimony will add to our deliberations. Therefore, I urge all my colleagues to read the following testimony:

STATEMENT PRESENTED BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY ON S. 1354; H.R. 5840, APRIL 9, 1965

(By Barbara Reach, committee on housing and urban development)

My name is Barabara Reach and I represent the Committee on Housing and Urban Development of the Community Service Society of New York.

The Community Service Society, founded in 1848, is the oldest and largest voluntary family service agency in the country. It has always combined a program of social action with its direct services to troubled families and individuals. From the earliest years, its workers recognized the influence of housing conditions on the quality of family life and began to attack the slums in which the poor of New York City were forced to live. The committee on housing and urban development was formally organized in 1898. Since then its interests have broadened to include not only the establishment and protection of housing standards, the provision of new and rehabilitated housing for persons of low and middle income, and the organization of humane and efficient means of relocation, but the planning and administration of the whole urban environment in which an ever-growing majority of our citizens live. The committee is therefore a body that can speak with authority on the legislation now being considered.

My comments will be confined to sections of the bill which we consider of primary importance to our work in New York City. I should like to begin by saying that we are glad to see that the administration recognizes the crucial importance of dealing constructively with the many problems besetting our cities. But we feel that in many respects the specific proposals of this bill do not measure up to the magnitude of the urban crisis.

TITLE I

Section 101, authorizing rent supplements for certain families, recognizes a technique which the committee has studied in some detail. We believe that it can be of great value, not as a substitute for existing programs of public and publicly aided housing, but as a complement to them. However, we disapprove of section 101 in its present form.

It limits this aid to persons whose income is too high for admission to public housing but too low for middle-income housing. This group is indeed in need of help; but there is another group whose need is even greater. I refer to the many people whose incomes are so low that they cannot pay even the rents in public housing. Their desperate situation must not be ignored.

We therefore recommend that this section be amended to make all persons who are eligible for public housing eligible for the rent supplement program under certain conditions. These conditions should be that, for the ensuing 3 years, the anticipated number of applications for public housing in the area under consideration exceed the anticipated supply by 10 percent, and that the applicants be in all other ways qualified for the rent supplementation program (under "qualified tenant" subdivision (2)).

We consider this amendment an important one for two reasons. First, as I have already stated, we believe that the housing need of the additional persons thereby included is very great and that it should be met in the present program. Secondly, it would facilitate the integration of families of differing economic status, which this committee considers one of the prime assets of a rent supplementation program. The restrictions now in section 101 would, conversely, aggravate the segregation by income that now prevails in public and publicly aided projects and that has had well-known and regrettable effects on the families living there.

A second recommendation on the subject of eligibility requirements concerns the provisions for the aged. We appreciate the importance of offering special consideration to older persons, but we would suggest that the annual income certification be continued for the elderly until they reach 72, the age at which income certification is no longer required under social security.

We disapprove also of a third provision, which restricts rent supplements to housing built with the aid of FHA insured section 221(a)(3) market-interest-rate mortgages. In our opinion the supplements should be available also for housing built with the aid of mortgages carrying interest below the market rate, and also for the type of limited dividend, limited profit, and redevelopment company housing now included in the New York State housing program.

We recommend adoption of section 103, authorizing the use of urban renewal capital grant funds for rehabilitation grants in certain hardship cases; this fills an obvious gap in existing provisions for rehabilitation. We likewise approve of section 104, which would make various public housing provisions more equitable by extending to handicapped persons certain benefits that are now available only to the elderly.

Section 105 authorizes, for persons and businesses displaced by federally aided mass transportation projects, the same relocation benefits now provided under the urban renewal and low-rent public housing programs. The committee, which has been responsible for several pioneering studies that proved the social and economic importance of sound relocation procedures, is glad to see the present benefits made available on a uniform basis to all those who are forced to make by various Federal activities. This provision corrects an obvious inequity. However, we want also to point out that small businesses in urban renewal areas are given very inadequate recompense, and to urge that the Congress establish higher benefits for them.

TITLE II

In title II, dealing with FHA insurance operations, we are particularly interested in section 203, which authorizes higher mortgage limits for dwelling units with four or more bedrooms. We consider this section of great importance and support it strongly. In many cities large families are among the neediest and at the same time have the greatest difficulty in finding decent housing within their means. The law as it stands discourages the construction of proper accommodations for them, and the proposed change is urgently needed.

Section 204 is intended to encourage rehabilitation of rental housing in urban renewal areas by liberalizing the provisions of section 220. We approve of the new provisions as far as they go, but would suggest a further easing of restrictions. At present, when an owner is to occupy part of the building, benefits are available only if the rehabilitation provides from 5 to 11 units. This requirement is too rigid. For example, in the New Ypork City West Side Urban Renewal area there is now great interest in remodeling brownstones. In some of these, one apartment to a floor is a good arrangement; but in smaller buildings one floor is not enough for family occupancy. We therefore urge an amendment that would make section 220 loans available for buildings with as few as three units.

TITLE III

Turning to title III, Urban Renewal, we are glad that the administration recognizes the importance of this very valuable tool for the revitalization of our cities. However, we are deeply disappointed in the specific provisions of section 302. The increase in authorization for capital grants for this program is in our opinion entirely inadequate. There is a huge backlog of desperately needed projects that are waiting for survey and planning funds. We therefore urge the Congress to increase the authorization to an amount more commensurate with the need.

TITLE IV

The provision of low-rent public housing has been a leading interest of the committee for many years, and we believe that all possible means of increasing the supply should be explored. We therefore approve section 402, which would encourage greater use of existing private housing by facilitating the purchase, purchase and rehabilitation, or leasing of private units. Application of these provisions could add more units to the supply and at the same time bring welcome variety into the low-rent housing program.

The framers of this bill obviously anticipate that a great proportion of public housing units added to the supply in future years will be in new buildings constructed specifically for this purpose; with this prognosis we agree. However, when we study the table presented in the section-by-section analysis on section 403, we find that the number of additional units planned can only be described as grossly inadequate. In all 3 programs—regular construction, purchase, and leasing—the expected total for the entire country is 240,000; in the regular program, the total is 140,000. To anyone aware of the need for public housing, to anyone who knows that in New York City alone there are 100,000 families on the waiting list for public housing, it is obvious that these totals can hardly begin to meet the need.

We furthermore consider it very important that the bill in its final form establish no-hard-fast rule as to how public housing units are to be distributed among the three programs. In New York City, for example, purchase or leasing can be of little use because of the overall shortage of housing. We recommend that the Congress specifically declare that the funds authorized for any State may be directed to whichever program or programs best meet the needs and resources of that State.

Turning to section 403, we note particularly in the section-by-section analysis the statement that housing authorities will be authorized to provide counseling and other necessary services, in cooperation with other agencies, to the tenants of public housing. This is already done to some extent, but we welcome official recognition, which will encourage expansion of the program. We believe that these services can help to bring about what we all hope for: not only better housing for low-income families, but a better life as well.

While discussing low-rent public housing, we want to urge—as we have before—repeal of the existing provision that limits the amount for any one State to 15 percent of the total. This arbitrary figure means that the program cannot be responsive to need, which varies widely from State to State. Furthermore, the provision is particularly prejudicial because the limitation is in terms of money, not of dwelling units. Therefore a State in a high-cost area, like New York, gets proportionately fewer units than States where costs are lower. We consider the limitation inequitable and urge that the Congress amend the present bill to eliminate it.

The construction cost limits per room on public housing were established some years ago and are now unrealistic. They are $2,000 per room, with a possible rise to $2,750 in high-cost areas; the corresponding figures for apartments for the aged are $1,000 higher. The latter figures we consider reasonable, but the other limits should be raised.

We have learned also that there is an administrative ceiling on the total cost of an apartment, regardless of the number of rooms it contains. This of course means that fewer apartments are built for the large families whose need for decent housing is so great. It would be helpful if the Congress would formally state its approval of the construction of large apartments where they are in demand, so long as the cost limits per room are adhered to.

Allocations for the development of open spaces of a public housing site are almost always inadequate. It appears that the importance of a pleasing and healthful environment for public housing families is consistently ignored in budgeting a project, and that site development is given only such moneys as may happen to be left over when construction is completed. This is in no way consistent with the emphasis on urban beautification and improvement shown in title VIII, and betrays a very shortsighted view of the purpose of public housing. We urge that this situation be remedied.

Finally, we would point out that the public housing administration does not now take advantage of the full amount of subsidy authorized. That this practice should be followed when many people cannot afford public housing at prevailing rents is obviously ill advised. Congress should declare specifically that the full amount authorized should be used. Otherwise the persons most in need of decent subsidized housing will continue to be deprived of the help they should have.

TITLE VI

The committee has long realized that the provision of "decent, safe, and sanitary" housing is not enough in itself to create a better life for the tenants. Only too often it has resulted in barren, bleak projects with the atmosphere of a ghetto. We therefore believe that section 603, which authorizes grants for various types of neighborhood facilities, is a very valuable step toward a good urban environment. It would encourage good planning and stimulate local effort.

Section 604, authorizing grants to assist in advance acquisition of land for public works or facilities, is another excellent provision. Advance acquisition has made valuable contributions to orderly planning and growth in other countries, and we urge that this section be kept in the bill.

TITLE VIII

Being concerned, as we are, with the influence of the total urban environment on the lives of city families, we are glad to find that the administration recognizes the value of beauty, amenity, and recreation. Section 804, providing grants for acquiring open-space land in built-up urban areas, could be extremely useful and must be kept in the act. We likewise approve strongly of section 805, which would authorize matching grants for urban beautification and improvement. Both of these valuable sections, like those we have discussed in title VI, could be of incalculable influence in stimulating sound urban planning.

TITLE X

Finally, the committee welcomes and thoroughly approves section 1002. Federal-State training programs have already proved their worth in contributing to the development of sound community planning, and we believe that the increased authorization is well justified.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

Two important matters have been ignored in the framing of this legislation. First, it does not authorize direct loans for rehabilitation, and we strongly recommend adding such a provision. Second, we believe that nonprofit nursing homes should be made eligible for the aids now available to other types of housing. The need for this type of accommodation is already great, and it will inevitably increase with the increase in our elderly population and with the increasing consideration of nursing homes, when medically appropriate, as a less costly alternative to general hospitals. These facilities, once built, can be self-supporting in respect to current operating costs, but there is great difficulty in financing the construction. We therefore urge authorization of either mortgage insurance for low-interest rate loans or a program of direct loans for nonprofit nursing homes.

In conclusion, I wish to add on behalf of the committee that we are greatly encouraged by the administration's recognition that, as the President has well said, "the future of the American city will play the most vital role" in the quest for a better life in this country. This bill authorizes some valuable new approaches to housing and to urban problems in general, and these we welcome. But in its present form the measure is both inadequate and ill-proportioned, giving the most help to those least in need of it and failing to cope with the urban crisis on the scale that the facts demand. If the much-heralded war on poverty is not to dwindle into a minor tactical skirmish, there must be a massive and coordinated attack on the decay of our central cities.

Many millions of city-dwellers are existing in intolerable conditions that are the result of generations of greed and neglect. It will be difficult if not impossible for the poverty program to reach these millions if no change is made in their demoralizing environment. A new and effective Federal program for improving both housing and the whole development of our cities could give them new hope and a real chance for a better life. The situation thus poses an enormous challenge, and we are forced to say that the administration bill in many respects does not meet it. We hope that the Congress will welcome this challenge and seize the opportunity it offers.

CLERGY RESPONSE TO CHARGES ABOUT RECENT SELMA-MONTGOMERY CIVIL RIGHTS MARCH

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, the largest circulation weekly news magazine of the Episcopal Church, the Witness, for Christ and His Church, has published as its story of the week in the May 20, 1965, edition, volume 50, No. 19, a most thorough news report about the clergy response to charges about the recent Selma-Montgomery civil rights march. In addition to very careful and complete reporting by the editors of this Episcopal Church publication, headquartered at Tunkhannock, Pa., the editors have printed an editorial entitled "Fiction Versus Fact."

The highest officials of the churches entrusted responsibilty for preparing the clergy reply to two outstanding churchmen. One is the Rev. W. Rodney Shaw of the Methodist Church who helped insure a thoughtful, spiritual approach to answering the serious charges made against the clergy. The other is a layman of the Episcopal Church, Frederick H. Sontag, a public relations and research consultant of Montclair, N.J., within my congressional district, a long-time leader in the civil rights movement, who initiated and coordinated the clergy effort.

All too often the men and women who actually carry through the difficult assignment of accomplishing such a project must remain without recognition. The editors of the Witness have performed a service by giving credit where it is due. In addition to sharing the Witness magazine article and editorial with the Members of Congress, the press, persons interested in civil rights throughout the Nation, and serious students of our legislative process, I would also like to include a list of the organizations and men and women who in varying degrees made the clergy for Alabama truth project possible.

[From the Witness for Christ and His Church, May 20, 1965]

ALABAMA CONGRESSMAN ANSWERED BY CHURCH GROUP

A fast-moving interfaith religious team effectively began answering the charges of sex orgies, drunkenness and general misbehavior during the Selma-Montgomery civil rights march as they were made on the floor of the House of Representatives by Congressman WILLIAM DICKINSON of Alabama.

The Episcopal Church, through its clergy and laymen, took a leading role in organizing and staffing what is widely regarded as one of the most effective joint interfaith congressional efforts recently. A couple of Episcopal priests, Roman Catholic monsignors and a nun and a Protestant minister flew to Washington from as far away as San Francisco, Kansas City, Pittsburgh, etc., to work together as a team with eastern-based laymen on the joint congressional effort. The all-faith Selma team issued (1) a joint statement on morality, (2) a fact and fiction sheet and (3) released some of the many telegrams from clergy and religious leaders from all parts of the United States and including most major religious groups, defending the civil rights marchers' behavior and answering the Alabama Republican's attacks.

On March 30, Congressman DICKINSON made his first major House speech against the Selma civil rights marchers. Frederick H. Sontag, a public relations and research consultant of Montclair, N.J., a long-time leader in the civil rights movement and a leading Episcopal layman, was deeply concerned that for several weeks afterward no answer to Congressman DICKINSON's attacks were made before the House. When Congressman DICKINSON sent advance notice to his colleagues during April that he would give another major speech with reportedly supporting affidavits, Mr. Sontag decided that the time to clear the good name of the clergy and lay people who participated in the overall civil rights efforts, and especially the Selma-Montgomery march, had come. At the same time he received word from several top prelates that they wanted some action in Washington clearing the name of the clergy, defending their close associate, Dr. Martin Luther King, and taking the civil rights movement off the defensive and back onto the track for a constructive civil rights bill.

On Thursday evening, April 22, a private decision was made that an effort should be attempted. The following day the first quiet exploratory calls were made to obtain the cooperation of some of the Washington area clergy leaders and by Saturday a hard core nucleus of dedicated churchmen and civil rights leaders was in formation. A natural-born clergy leader, the Reverend W. Rodney Shaw of the Methodist Church, was recommended as the operations officer for the clergy civil rights task force. With only 1 hour's notice, Mr. Shaw appeared before a closed door meeting of representatives of nine moderate Republican organizations. At that time a young Episcopal layman, Douglas Weller 3d, executive director of Yale Republican Advance, volunteered to assist in Shaw's office for the next several days.

During the weekend telephone calls fanned out all over the Nation to select the best team which could quickly come to Washington to answer the Congressman's Tuesday speech and then go on the offensive the next day.

By Monday, April 26, the clergy representatives had arrived in Washington with the blessing and support of their superiors and Shaw offered his Methodist Building office as working headquarters for the group. Right across from the Capitol, this was a most convenient and congenial location. Frederick Sontag in the meantime had carefully researched the correct procedures to be followed by the clergy group and these had been approved by civil rights and congressional supporters. After meeting together first Monday noon for joint consultation and sharing of experiences, the clergy group visited with Congressman WILLIAM DICKINSON at his office. He explained why he was making these attacks on the clergy in the march and, under the leadership of Sister Leoline, several of the clergy carefully examined the uncaptioned, unidentified photographs which he claimed would support his case. After several questions about these photographs, Congressman DICKINSON decided the next day not to use them on the floor of the House, perhaps having been shaken in their believability by the clergy reaction. Although the clergy, in a forceful, quiet and dignified session did not change Congressman DICKINSON's mind, there was an exchange of opinion and fact before the next day's attack by the Alabama Congressman. That afternoon and evening the clergy, working in several teams, went over the points made by Congressman Dickinson and then wrote up their own statement of conscience, analyzed the statements made in the Congressional Record against the civil rights marchers by several Congressman and thought through with Episcopal layman Sontag the strategy to be followed for the days ahead.

FORD AND M'CORMACK

On Tuesday morning the clergy group had a 40-minute private interview with House Republican minority leader, Gerald Ford, an Episcopalian, at which time they presented to him the united religious viewpoint and supporting materials about the march. Congressman Ford stated to the group that he doubted that he would be able to contain Congressman Dickinson and he did not offer or promise a defense of the clergy during this friendly and courteous interview.

Having failed to receive assurances of Republicans against Congressman Dickinson's statements of sex orgies, communism and drunkenness, a small group then notified House Speaker John McCormack of their intention not to take Congressman Dickinson's attacks lying down. The clergy group then divided into teams fanning out all over the House office buildings to visit as many Congressmen of both parties as were known to be interested in civil rights and in the time still available who would consider asking challenging questions and bringing out pertinent facts during Dickinson's late afternoon attack.

TEAM MOVES FAST

Then, moving with fast military precision, the press kit of the clergy statements and telegrams were released to the press by Frederick Sontag a couple of hours before Dickinson spoke so that they would be sure to be considered by responsible press media in their coverage of the Dickinson speech. The clergy group then assembled in the House gallery, substantially reinforced by monsignors, priests, nuns, Protestant clergymen and church lay officials.

Speaker McCormack, who was white with anger at advance Dickinson text, decided that he personally would preside during the special order hour-long presentation. This is quite unusual, as normally a regular Member of the House handles the special orders which follow the regular House business. During Dickinson's speech the Speaker continually glanced up at the galleries, where a large group of Washington Roman Catholic friends had joined together to be with the Roman Catholic representatives of the clergy team. Looking furiously down at the floor and turning around sharply in his chair while passing notes, McCormack made clear that he was getting ready for action. In contrast, Minority Leader Gerald Ford sat relaxed, leaning back next to his campaign manager, Congressman Robert Griffin, of Michigan. Halfway through Dickinson's speech, Ford left the floor of the House reportedly to keep another engagement. That was the turning point of the debate politically because one of several men Dickinson had to yield to on the Republican side would have been his own leader. If Ford had taken the opportunity to report to the House of the visit that morning by nine representatives of all the major faiths and to state to the House that there was another point of view sharply contrasting with that of Republican Congressman Dickinson, of Alabama, the day's events would have turned out quite differently. None of the Ford assistants or supporters said anything while Congressman Dickinson spoke. Congressman Hastings Keith asked one question whether Congressman Dickinson could prove his charges.

TELEGRAM FROM SHERRILL

After the debate was all over Republican Congressman William Bates of Massachusetts had read into the Record a telegram by the Reverend Goldwaite Sherrill of Ipswich, Mass., son of the former presiding bishop, who had marched the whole way between Selma and Montgomery, denying wrongdoing and praising the conduct of the marchers. The absence of a single Republican voice, liberal, moderate or conservative, to interrupt Dickinson was a profound disappointment to the clergy, well over half of whom were Republicans. The messages to Republican Chairman Raymond Bliss, an Episcopalian, also had yielded no results.

DEMOCRATS ACT

Now it was the turn of the majority party. Quickly a number of Democrats—William Ryan, of New York; Joseph Resnick, of New York; Barratt O'Hara, of Illinois; Paul Krebs, of New Jersey, and Edward Roybal, of California, defended the clergy and the march and attacked the undocumented, vague Dickinson affidavits.

Using the clergy materials available in the press galleries the Democratic team began to set the record straight. However, in the Senate a Republican voice of conscience in civil rights, Senator Jacob K. Javits, of New York, was doing likewise alone. The next day he would be followed by Congressman Ogden Reid, Republican, of New York. Once the civil rights speeches in the House were over, the clergy and pro-civil-rights Congressmen gathered around Speaker McCormack and a friendly off-the-record session was held.

PREPARE FOR MEETING

The clergy team then returned to the Methodist Building to prepare their press conference the next day. Throughout the planning of this clergy cooperative venture, Frederick Sontag had insisted that the representatives of the churches of the Nation were entitled to present their point of view at a time of their own choosing separated from congressional charges and countercharges. Although one New York Episcopal church official was afraid that the clergy team could not handle the Washington press corps' questions, the church prelates and Frederick Sontag stood their ground and insisted on a press conference. The clergy team carefully went over questions that could be asked, tape-recorded their impressions of their interviews with the Congressmen they had visited, and through quiet prayer and joint meditation, decided the areas of discussion each could cover best the next day.

On Wednesday morning again each clergyman and layman went to worship in their own respective churches and then joined together as a strong united team for their press conference.

PACKED SESSION

The National Council of Churches room was the largest available and it was packed so tightly with reporters, cameramen, and photographers that some press people had to leave because there was no place for them to sit down. For one and a half hours the team fielded the questions of the Washington press corps' finest. The dean of Washington religious editors, United Press International's Louis Cassels, an Episcopal layman, was joined by such veterans as George Herman of CBS news for the Walter Cronkite program; the Huntley-Brinkley NBC camera crew were there, as well as ABC–TV, etc. Soon nationwide Associated Press and United Press International stories were carrying the strong clergy defense of the march, Martin Luther King, other civil rights leaders, and the vehement denial of sex orgies and the like.

TOP COVERAGE

That night before a stirred audience of clergy staying in various Washington homes, the NBC–TV network on the Huntley-Brinkley program showed film of how their own reporter and camera crew had retraced the steps of the march, had compared at each place Dickinson's charges with the statements of the clergy and in the end had found the clergy's position to be correct. CBS–TV news analyst Eric Severeid, after the clergy press conference films were shown, told how once upon a time there was the class of 1946 in Congress and how out of this came a man named Joseph McCarthy whom people did not take seriously at first when he waved unsubstantiated affidavits. Then the CBS commentator reminded his nationwide audience that now was the class of 1964 with a new group from Alabama, Mississippi, etc., with a Congressman named William Dickinson waving similar charges, photographs, etc. Time and Newsweek magazines carried interview stories with the clergy team in their weekend editions.

SHAW AND SONTAG

While the clergy were doing their own talking and rebuttal as well as making constructive civil rights points, Mr. Shaw and Frederick Sontag were talking with some of the responsible press officials who knew Dickinson was inaccurate. Soon the UPI management was challenging Dickinson's statements that their personnel had witnesed sex orgies, including photographer Philip Sandlin, who is not a writer. Honest southern editors and reporters, such as managing editor Robert Craig of the Spartanburg, S.C. Journal and Reporter, told the AP that he had spent the entire march looking for misconduct and had not found any. Dickinson repeated some of his charges in Montgomery the following Sunday, the same day the Montgomery Advertiser, in a signed editorial by Don Wasson, managing editor, stated that he had not proven his case. Captain Wilson Baker, Selma public safety director, told the UPI that he did not witness the immorality charged in Congress by Dickinson. Art Buchwald, the humorist columnist, did a piece about this situation in the thought that some humor might be helpful in bringing the light of day into some of the charges.

Congressman Gerald Ford told the wire services that "as a Member of the House, Congressman Dickinson has the right to make any comment. I believe the comments he made are his responsibility." On the same day that Congressman Dickinson spoke, Ford issued a press release commenting on Vietnam and the next day during a press conference stated that House Republicans would pick up in 1966 the 44 seats they lost in the 1964 election; but he did not take a position for the civil rights clergy.

As a new week was beginning Dickinson was repeating his charges, while Democratic Members of the House of Representatives were beginning to make new statements defending the march and clergy and upholding the overall civil rights effort. Ten days after the Dickinson speech two House Republicans, John V. Lindsay of New York, an Episcopalian, and Silvio Conte of Massachusetts denounced the Alabama Congressman's charges.

As the various clergy returned to their regular assignments, it became clear that the effort to bring the truth to bear against Dickinson's charges was just beginning. Sontag had just received several calls of appreciation for a job well done when he went through Philadelphia and stopped by at the Episcopal diocesan convention. He was shocked to find that clergy and lay people had received reprints of the Dickinson charges with an unsigned transmittal note urging the Philadelphia area Episcopalians to believe Dickinson and to repudiate the work of their own church and highly respected and beloved bishop.

The joint clergy effort answering Dickinson showed that with professional advice and assistance church leaders and groups could work most effectively in Washington following sound and accepted procedures to strengthen the civil rights cause. With so many roadblocks still ahead, the operation described above will probably be a landmark in efficiency, effectiveness, courtesy, and speed. Many others like this will be needed in the years ahead.

[From the Witness for Christ and His Church, May 20, 1965]

EDITORIAL: "FICTION VERSUS FACT"

(Sister Mary Peter, of Chicago, was one of many Catholics who were on the march from Selma to Montgomery. Many of them were asked by the Reverend John Cronin, of the National Catholic Welfare Council, what they thought of the charges made by Congressman William L. Dickinson, of Alabama, which we report on page 3 in this issue. We have read all of the 50 or more telegrams sent in reply and, without exception, they give the lie to the Congressman. Sister Mary's wire stood out because it was different. She said: "We believe what we want to believe. Having itching ears that delight in vicious gossip we make up or frame up what we want others to believe. Malignant fables of sex orgies on the Selma march fool only those of the slanderous segregated mind. I was there, I know." Her wisdom is attested by this fiction-fact statement released by 10 religious leaders, 5 of whom marched the entire way from Selma to Montgomery, including the Reverend Morris Samuel, Episcopalian, of Los Angeles, who was the head of the security detail for the entire march.)

Fiction: Congressman William L. Dickinson, of Alabama, stated (Congressional Record, p. 6333, Mar. 30) that Rev. Norman Truesdell, of Dubuque, Iowa, left the Selma-Montgomery march in disgust over the "immorality" on the march.

Fact: Statement by Truesdell, Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa (daily Congressional Record, p. A1596, Apr. 1): "This (the above charges of Congressman Dickinson) is a blatant lie. I saw no evidence of this alleged immorality. * * * I was not disillusioned, but inspired by the freedom marchers responsible Christian conduct * * *."

Fiction (Congressional Record, p. 6333, Mar. 30): The Congressman stated that Rabbi Richard Rubenstein, of Pittsburgh, left the freedom march in disgust over the "immorality" on the march.

Fact (daily Congressional Record, p. A1819, Apr. 13): Rabbi Rubenstein was not even on the march. He was in Pittsburgh at the time of the march. He had been in Montgomery March 15 and 16, a week prior to the freedom march, and said, "I can testify that the moral conduct of our students was beyond reproach." Rabbi Rubenstein on April 27 wired Bishop John Wesley Lord of Washington as follows: "Representative William Dickinson has incorrectly stated I left Selma-Montgomery march because disgusted immoral conduct of marchers. I was never on march. In phone conversation Representative Dickinson promised correction. To date he has failed to fulfill promise. I was in Montgomery with 130 Pittsburgh college students. Saw absolutely no immoral conduct. Students behavior beyond reproach."

Fiction (Congressional Record, p. 6333, Mar. 30): The alleged text of an alleged circular inviting marchers to a burlesque review each evening is included in Congressman Dickinson's statement and described by him as having been "actually handed out to the marchers by some of those participating in the march."

Fact: No such leaflet or anything remotely resembling it was seen on the march or at any other time by the undersigned nor by any of the many participants in the march questioned on this subject by the undersigned, nor has the Congressman making the charge yet produced any proof that such a leaflet was produced or circulated by the marchers.

Fiction: The above leaflet stated that "tent 9 will be pitched each evening ahead of the march, * * * " (for a burlesque show).

Fact: There was no "tent 9" nor any other tent for entertainment purposes. There were four tents, one for women and one for men, one for food and one for the press. All these tents were under the steady surveillance of the security guard during the night. Many of the tent, cleanup, supply, and other workers (mostly ministers, priests, and seminary students—all male) slept in the food tent (and in the press tent when that was not occupied by reporters). A notarized document substantiating these items, and signed by seminary students who were working with the march is available from the San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, Calif.

Fiction (Congressional Record, p. 6333, Mar. 30): Congressman Dickinson states that "drunkenness and sex orgies were the order of the day" on the road to Montgomery.

Fact: The Birmingham News, March 28, after reporting various alleged immoralities prior to the march, stated, "The charge that similar activity took place at the various campsites during the march to Montgomery could not be substantiated." The Birmingham News had a reporter accompanying the entire march.

A news truck was constantly and immediately in front of the marchers. Cameramen, with long-distance lens, rode up on the bed of this truck and could bring the entire line of march into the focus of their cameras. Helicopters with news cameramen frequently hovered low over the marchers. Reporters and news photographers from major news media, including the Birmingham News, went constantly up and down both sides of the marching line, looking for unusual and newsworthy items. Just the sight of a marcher cooling his feet in a roadside pool was enough to bring a dozen photographers to the scene.

Surely it is obvious that, under the close and continuing surveillance described above, any illicit activity such as the Congressman described as being "the order of the day" would have immediately been spotted by newsmen and have brought a score of cameramen racing to the scene. But, to this day, no picture and no report of any such alleged illicit act on the march has come from any of the many newsmen accompanying the march.

Fiction (Congressional Record, p. 6333, Mar. 30): After alleging that drunkenness and sex orgies were the order of the day, Congressman Dickinson said, "photographs were taken of this, I am told. I have not seen the actual photographs, but they are being processed and compiled."

Fact: The photographs at last being produced by the Congressman as evidence should be closely examined by all to see whether they actually reveal illicit activity or are deemed worthy of attention by the Congressman simply because they show interracial fellowship.

Other photos are of unidentified objects, such as one that shows an ash tray stand with debris piled on the floor at its base. In this debris is a contraceptive device that could have been put there by anyone. The context of the picture gives no clear indication where in the United States the ash tray and the debris are located. Yet we are asked to accept this photo as evidence of debauchery by those on the march.

Fiction (Congressional Record, p. 6334, Mar. 30): The Congressman states that only the Communist party could weld together into one force the many diverse groups he describes as being a part of the march.

Fact: To the charge that the civil rights movement is Communist influenced U.S. Attorney General Katzenbach replied (Associated Press, April 4, 1965) "I don't think think it is true at all * * * Communists and leftwing people have been remarkably unsuccessful in actually influencing any decisions and certainly have not captured any of the leadership."

Signing the statement:

The Reverend Richard F. Dickinson, missionary, United Church of Christ in Japan, studying at San Francisco Theological Seminary, California. Was on night security patrol and marched most of the way to Montgomery. Was in Selma 1 week before the march. Has been in Camden, Ala. the last 4 weeks. (Disciplines of Christ)

Sister Mary Leoline, B.V.M., Kansas City, Mo. She marched the entire way. (Roman Catholic)

James Martin, President of the student body of the San Francisco Theological Seminary. He represents 60 students from that school who worked each day on the tent and cleanup crews. (Presbyterian)

Msgr. Victor G. Moser, pastor of Annunciation Church, chairman of the Kansas City, Mo., council on religion and race. He was in Alabama during the entire march and marched 3 days. (Roman Catholic)

The Reverend Dom Orsini, rector, St. Luke's Church, Pittsburgh, Pa. He marched all the way. (Episcopal)

The Reverend Morris Samuel, director of the parish of E. Los Angeles, and head of the security detail for the entire march.

The Reverend Canon Kenneth Sharpe, National Cathedral, Washington, D.C. He was in Selma 3 days before the march. (Episcopal)

The Reverend William R. Shaw, director of the department of economic life, general board of Christian social concerns of the Methodist Church. He marched the entire way. (Methodist)

Norman Truesdell, a ministerial student at the Wartburg Theological Seminary in Dubuque, Iowa. (American Lutheran Church)

Frederick H. Sontag, Episcopal Layman, who was not in Selma but who researched the material for the above statement.

CLERGY FOR ALABAMA TRUTH PROJECT—LIST OF PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

From Friday, April 19, through Wednesday, April 28, clergy and laymen of all communions from all parts of the country participated in an effort to bring to the attention of Congress, the press, and the people of this Nation the facts regarding the Selma march. Although it is impossible to list everyone who has participated in this voluntary effort, special appreciation is due to:

The general board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church, particularly Mrs. Mary Fraser, Mrs. Carol Ross, and Manuel Espartero who did all the typing, Sam Griffin, Bill Cobun, Andre Parks, and Dale Ridgway who did the multilithing and collating and Rodney Shaw, who worked in the planning and execution group.

The National Catholic Welfare Council, particularly Fr. Cronin, assistant director, Department of Social Action.

The National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice and Mr. Mathew Ahmann, executive director.

Several bishops of the Episcopal Church and canons of the National Cathedral, and the Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity, particularly the Reverend John F. Morris, executive director and Frederick H. Sontag, public relations and research consultant, who played an invaluable role in initiating and executing this project.

The Washington Council of Churches, particularly Virgil Lowder.

Several congressional offices, and several prelates who encouraged and supported this project from the beginning and whose prayers and assistance sustained this effort throughout.

A REPORT ON "THE GROWTH OF THE U.S. POPULATION"

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker this morning the National Academy of Sciences issued a report on "The Growth of the U.S. Population" which showed rapid population growth is an American problem in addition to being a world problem and one which our country can no longer afford to ignore. The international aspects of the population explosion are already well known. It is becoming increasingly clear that all our efforts to improve the world standard of living in order to promote a stable world order could be undone by the fantastically rapid growth in world population. The foreign aid program we will be debating today will do little good if the population explosion is not brought under control.

Because of both the domestic and international aspects of the population explosion I am today introducing a bill which will:

First. State a congressional finding regarding the urgency and importance of the problems associated with the population explosion and declare it the policy of this Government "to more effectively deal with rapid population growth throughout the world."

Second. Authorize the President to call a White House Conference on Population Problems to promote informed discussion and increased attention and activity regarding population growth. Grants will also be made for State meetings prior to the White House Conference.

Third. Establish two new assistant secretaries for population affairs in the Departments of State and of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide the vitally needed high-level coordination regarding both the international and domestic aspects of population growth.

This bill is intended to help fulfill President Johnson's pledge in the state of the Union address to "seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population."

There can be no doubt regarding the seriousness of this problem. At the time of Christ the earth's population was one-quarter billion; by 1830 it had risen to 1 billion; by 1930, only a hundred years later, it was 2 billion; and by today, 1965, it has taken only 35 additional years to add another billion. And in another 35 years, by the year 2000, world population will actually double and reach 6 billion people.

In considering the incredible results of the world population explosion, let us not forget the conclusions of the National Academy of Science's report on U.S. population growth; we in America also have a serious population problem. We are all aware that many parents have families that are larger than they can properly raise. As a result both parents and children face lives of constant struggle and anxiety. We must develop birth control methods that are effective, and acceptable to all.

In addition we must see that such methods are fully publicized. All of us firmly believe that family size is a decision to be made solely and privately by husband and wife. But I also believe that husband and wife should have available the full information necessary to assist them in making informed and responsible decisions about the size of their families.

Both because of the international and domestic aspects, we need increased attention and concern about population growth.

I have already spoken to Chairman WILLIAM DAWSON of the House Government Operations Committee about holding early hearings on this bill. Hearings themselves would be helpful in many ways. Hearings would provide a forum to further the informed and responsible dialog between all religious and social groups which has finally replaced the previous situation of embarrassment and mutual suspicion. This problem is too vital for both our country and the world for us to hide from it any longer. In addition, the hearings would help determine whether the executive branch has the authorization to do all the things necessary in the way of research and dissemination of information and also whether we have the proper coordination regarding population problems among the various executive agencies and with State and local governmental agencies and private groups.

I want to state how proud I am to be associated with Senators ERNEST GRUENING and JOSEPH CLARK and Congressmen MORRIS UDALL, CHARLES DIGGS, JR., and PAUL TODD, who have introduced similar bills.

I want to particularly congratulate Congressman TODD for his determination to greatly increase research about human fertility by both governmental and private agencies. PAUL TODD's vigorous and effective leadership in such a usually sensitive area has gained him a great deal of respect among his colleagues in the House of Representatives.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and early hearings on the population explosion.

SILVER DOLLARS NOT TO BE MINTED—SOUND DECISION

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, during the past week I have on three occasions brought to the attention of the Congress the lack of any justification for issuing silver dollars in the present circumstances. Although the Congress had authorized the expenditure of $600,000 for their manufacture, the circumstances which may have warranted such expenditure last summer have completely changed.

Last July, then Secretary of the Treasury Dillon believed that a large quantity of silver dollars should be coined for issuance in the Western States, where they have historically circulated and where they were then in short supply. Putting new silver dollars into circulation in the West could, he felt, greatly alleviate the heavy demands which were being made on the quarter and 50-cent pieces.

The scarcity of silver dollars in circulation has spread throughout the country, and as the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations found in its studies of the coin shortage, most of the silver dollars that the United States has ever produced are being hoarded. There is now every indication that if the Government were to produce 45 million silver dollars at this time none of those would remain in circulation. In fact, as I pointed out in a statement printed in the May 24 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there was a widespread feeling among bankers, numismatists, and others who are cognizant of the coin situation that the silver dollars would never actually circulate.

Ample evidence of that probability is reflected in the fact that coin publications already contain advertisements offering the silver dollars on a when-issued basis, at premiums of $4 and $5.

The changed circumstances since last summer when the Congress authorized the silver dollars to be made are that they would not in any manner relieve the coin shortage. What we would be doing would be to subsidize speculation, by spending $600,000 to manufacture the coins, and using up a full year's domestic production of silver in the process.

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] also strongly objected to this minting and the Appropriations Subcommittee of which he is a member held hearings on this yesterday.

There can be no quarrel, it seems to me, with the wisdom of the Treasury's decision of yesterday to hold back on the manufacture of the dollars at this time. This decision followed the appropriations hearing and I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], for his perseverance and accomplishment.

The Treasury's decision not to mint the dollars at this time requires no congressional approval. However, the $600,000 appropriation to cover costs of minting the silver dollars will expire on June 30, 1965.

There is another reason why the Treasury's decision seems wise. For a long time the Treasury has had under study the necessity for changing the metallic content of dimes, quarters, and halves, because of our diminishing silver supplies.

Its report on the silver situation which it is obliged to make to the Congress, has been delayed. The Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee in its most recent report on the coin shortage—House Report No. 195, 89th Congress, 1st session—recommended to the Treasury that it delay minting the silver dollars until the Congress had received the Treasury's report and had had opportunity to decide on the new alloys for subsidiary coins.

We also urged the Treasury to make its report to the Congress on the silver and coin alloys at the earliest possible date. As chairman of the subcommittee I would again urge the Treasury to expedite its report.

FULL DISCLOSURE DEMANDED

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, a full disclosure by the State Department and AID officials should be made to the American public on what sums actually go into our total foreign aid program. The State Department has been misleading the American people by claiming that the foreign aid bill is a "barebones" request of only $3.4 billion. In addition to this sum requested in the act for 1965 there are additional requests totaling over $2.5 billion through such programs as the Peace Corps, Public Law 480, Inter-American Development Bank, and International Development Association, plus sums buried in many of the budgets of Federal agencies for some sort of foreign aid program.

Furthermore, after June 30 there will be over $9 billion of unexpended balances available in our foreign aid program. The American people are not being told the complete story on foreign aid. The drain on the U.S. gold stocks is a direct result of the aid program. The contention that the foreign aid program does not have an effect on the U.S. balance of payments, since 85 percent of the dollars made available for foreign aid are reportedly being spent in the United States is a spurious contention. This would be true only if the dollars spent resulted in an increase in exports and, unfortunately, this is not the case. For example, in six countries receiving so-called program loans, expenditures totaled over $567 million in 1964, yet U.S. exports to those same six countries increased only $60 million in the same period. Also, our aid to Latin America has increased since 1956 to 1963 by 300 percent, yet our imports to those countries has declined annually 1 percent per year for that period.

In fairness to the American taxpayer, a clean breast of the total amount of money spent in this program annually should be made and the expenditures should be curtailed to offset our unfavorable balance of payments.

SEVENTH DISTRICT MISSOURI STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 of this year, the first meeting of the Southwest Missouri Youth Advisory Council was held on the Drury College campus in Springfield, Mo. A total of 83 southwest Missouri high schools were represented with a junior boy and girl from each school in attendance. Each school was responsible for the selection of their delegates to this meeting, the purpose of which was to establish a closer liaison between the young people and their Congressman.

Four major topics were discussed during the meeting. These topics were: the draft, aid for higher education, school dropouts, and the Peace Corps and Job Corps programs. I found the discussions and exchange of information to be both enlightening and heartening. The young men and women in attendance demonstrated a real interest and concern over current problems. They were anxious to learn as well as to express themselves.

Following the day's events, a questionnaire was given to each student. The results are most interesting, and I will insert them at the conclusion of these remarks. I am of the opinion, for example, that when the Congress is considering legislation which has a direct bearing on young men and women, we should invite young men and women to appear before congressional committees so that our actions will be based, not only on what the adult community recommends, but also on the recommendations of those most directly affected.

Note, for example, on question No. 19, 80.6 percent of the students believe the primary reason for school dropouts can be attributed to lack of parental supervision. Only 9 percent believe primary responsibility for resolving the school dropouts problem should rest with the Federal Government.

Though most questions sought opinions, a few were on questions of fact, so as to determine whether opinions were based on solid understanding of fact. In this area, one definite weakness became evident. On question 24, for example, almost 80 percent of the students believe the average percentage of profit in relation to sales in private business in the United States is 10 percent or greater. Forty-four percent actually thought the average percentage of profit was 20 percent or greater. I am advised that these results are not very different from other similar tests that have been given to students around the Nation. This suggests, Mr. Speaker, that, while much publicity has been given to the need for more classes in explaining the Communist system, a far greater need exists to give students a better understanding of our own economic system.

The questionnaire and the results follow:

Results of questionnaire given to 7th District Youth Advisory Council, May 1, 1965, at Drury College, Springfield, Mo.

A total of 83 schools were represented, with a boy and girl from each school in attendance.
Following are the questions asked and the percentages of yes and no replies:

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you believe the draft as presently constituted is the most equitable method of insuring an adequate military force for the United States?	65.4	34.6
2. Would you favor a system of universal military training, under which all young men serve a limited period of basic training?	53.2	46.8
3. Do you think that a deferment should be granted to married men under—		
A. The present draft?	74.0	26.0
B. A possible universal military training program?	43.7	56.3
4. Do you believe the Federal Government should guarantee a college education for all qualified high school students?	48.3	51.7
5. In the event that such a Federal assistance program were adopted, do you believe it should be— *Percent*		
A. On a loan basis, with payback to the Government over a specified period of time? 87		
B. On a grant basis with no payback required? 13		
6. Do you believe that private loan programs for college education (banks, savings and loan associations, etc.) for those without adequate financial resources are preferable to Federal aid?	54.5	45.5
7. Do you favor a limited program of Federal assistance for higher education, such as the present National Defense Education Act, under which qualified students compete for Federal assistance with aid going to the most qualified?	63.0	37.0
8. Do you believe college attendance is a matter of individual choice and responsibility with no Federal assistance programs justified?	26.8	73.2
9. Do you believe the Peace Corps, as presently constituted, is a good program?	94.9	5.1
10. Do you believe that students volunteering for the Peace Corps should be assigned to—		
A. Only countries favorable to U.S. policy in the cold war?	22.8	77.2
B. All countries which will accept such assistance?	83.0	17.0
C. All countries, except those clearly alined with the Communist bloc of nations?	43.0	57.0
11. Do you believe that countries which accept Peace Corps aid should be required to pay all expenses of U.S. personnel assigned to them	19.6	80.4
12. Do you believe Peace Corps volunteers should be exempt from the draft?	68.2	31.8
13. Do you believe the Domestic Job Corps, under the war on poverty, is a legitimate Federal function?	84.1	15.9
14. Do you believe that public agencies, which utilize Job Corps volunteers, should be required to pay them the minimum Federal wage of $1.25 an hour?	63.0	37.0
15. Do you believe the Domestic Job Corps is a desirable method of training young men and women for gainful employment in the future?	73.5	26.5
16. Do you believe establishment of the Domestic Job Corps will— *Percent*		
A. Alleviate the school dropout problem? 46.5		
B. Further complicate the school dropout problem? 31.0		
C. Not affect the school dropout problem one way or the other? 22.5		

Results of questionnaire given to 7th District Youth Advisory Council, May 1, 1965, at Drury College, Springfield, Mo.—Continued

A total of 83 schools were represented, with a boy and girl from each school in attendance.
Following are the questions asked and the percentages of yes and no replies:

		Percent	
		Yes	No
17. Do you believe primary responsibility for resolving the school dropout problem should rest with—	*Percent*		
A. The Federal Government?	9.0		
B. The State and local governments?	39.4		
C. The family of, or the individual concerned?	51.6		
18. Do you believe the schools are doing all they can, under their present authority, to minimize school dropouts?		19.4	80.6
19. Do you believe the primary reason for school dropouts can be attributed to—			
A. Financial hardship?	9.7		
B. Lack of ability?	9.7		
C. Lack of parental supervision	80.6		
20. Do you believe that laws adopted by the Congress should—			
A. Be restricted to those clearly constitutional?		68.9	31.1
B. Be restricted only by the test of whether they will solve an alleged need?		58.9	41.1
C. Contain methods of financing, plus termination dates?		72.3	27.7
21. What do you believe is the average percent of profit in relation to sales in private business in the United States today?			
A. 3 percent	4.8		
B. 5 percent	16.4		
C. 10 percent	34.9		
D. 20 percent	26.1		
E. Higher than any of the above	17.8		
22. Do you believe the percent of profit in business should be regulated by—			
A. The Federal Government?	13.8		
B. The law of supply and demand and competition?	86.2		
23. Under the free enterprise system, the profit motive has contributed to job opportunities and our standard of living through incentive, competition, and risk. What do you think constitutes a fair margin of profit?			
A. 3 percent	2.8		
B. 5 percent	14.1		
C. 10 percent	28.9		
D. None	1.4		
E. Whatever market factors and competition will permit?	52.8		
24. Do you think the responsibilities of citizenship are best fulfilled when a citizen—			
A. Joins and actively participates in the political party of his or her choice?	30.3		
B. Remains an "independent" voter and votes "according to the man"?	69.7		
25. Do you believe that—			
A. Prayers should be permitted in the public schools, so long as they are voluntary and nondenominational?	93.2		
B. No prayers should be allowed in the public schools?	6.8		
26. To the best of your knowledge, did the recent Supreme Court decision prohibit all prayers in the public schools, which may be approved by a local school board?		54.2	45.8
27. Do you believe that individual States have the authority, under the Constitution, to set voting requirements, so long as they are applied without discrimination?		74.5	25.5
28. Do you believe new Federal legislation is necessary to insure that no citizen is denied the right to vote?		71.1	28.9
29. Do you believe literacy tests are a proper requirement for voting, so long as they are applied without discrimination?		77.8	22.2
30. Does Missouri have a literacy test for new voters?		17.7	82.3
31. Do you believe the voting age in Missouri should be lowered from 21 to 18 years of age?		38.3	61.7
32. Do you believe that all citizens should be required by law to vote in national elections?		17.1	82.9
33. Do you favor present U.S. policy in Vietnam?		69.9	30.1
34. Do you believe our foreign aid program has been an effective instrument of U.S. policy?		50.0	50.0
35. Do you believe Government service offers an attractive and desirable career?		77.5	22.5
36. Do you believe our present complex society requires a larger and more dominant role by the Federal Government?		40.0	60.0
37. Do you believe the 50 individual States are "archaic" and that the various States should serve primarily as an administrative arm of the Federal Government?		43.0	57.0
38. Do you believe the Federal Government has a responsibility to furnish all persons with the necessities of life, such as food, clothing, shelter, etc., if their own efforts are inadequate?		46.4	53.6
39. Do you believe the Government should permit discontinuance of passenger train service if such service cannot be provided without an economic loss to the carrier?		68.7	31.3

SILVER DOLLARS AND THE SILVER SITUATION

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I too want to join my good friend and colleague from Florida. I was gratified to receive word that the Treasury Department has announced it will not mint any new silver dollars at this time. I was forced to take the floor of the House last Wednesday to denounce the directive to mint, for the first time since 1935, new silver dollars. It was apparent to me that the minting of new silver dollars at this time was sheer folly.

I believe that the decision is a clear vindication of the position which I have taken with regard to the minting of silver dollars at this time. I also believe that it is a vindication of my long fight to relieve the shortage of coins and to insure that the mint does nothing which would aggravate the situation.

The minting of these dollars would have had no effect on the coins available as a medium of exchange in our Western States.

The minting of these dollars would have, however, consumed 35 million ounces of silver from a supply that is rapidly being depleted, adding to the critical shortage of silver that already exists.

There could have been no clearer example of a wrong decision being made at the wrong time to the betterment of no one and to the detriment of all.

But, the about-face by the Treasury Department on the minting of these silver dollars does, by no stretch of the imagination, leave everything coming up roses for our coinage system. We do have a critical shortage of coins at a time when the available supply of silver for the minting of coins will be exhausted within 3 years.

We do have an increasing industrial use of silver at a time when both the silver used for coinage and the silver used in industry are in excess of the total annual free world production of that precious metal.

It is encouraging to me that the problems that are yet to be overcome for our coinage system have not been compounded by this ill-timed and ill-advised directive. But, the problems are still with us. And we must meet these problems head on.

Yesterday, a story appeared in the New York Times announcing that the Secretary of the Treasury will send to the President this week a proposal to reduce or eliminate the silver content in dimes, quarters, and half dollars.

There must be immediate action on such a proposal. We cannot continue to double our production of coins next year as we have done this year, doubling the annual consumption of the dwindling supply of silver used in minting these coins.

We cannot continue to feed the parasites who are drawing off the lifeblood of our coinage system. These hoarders and speculators are just lying in wait for the day that our need of silver for coins will send the market price of that metal up and they can step in for a "quick kill."

We cannot yield to the pressures of special interest groups who call for no change in the silver content of our coins.

And, we cannot merely procrastinate, trying to prolong the life of our present silver supply by making a minor reduction in the silver content of our coins.

Let no one impress upon you that a stopgap measure at this time will solve these problems. We must make a complete change in the metal we use in our coinage system. Silver coinage is a luxury which this country can no longer afford and if we do not face that fact today, here and now, we may be without the means to do so 1 year, 3 years, or 5 years hence.

PROPOSED EXCISE TAX CUTS

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning an editorial appeared in the Washington Post raising doubts that the proposed excise tax cuts on new automobiles might not be passed along to purchasers after the initial 3-percent retroactive tax reduction is made, since the tax is levied on the manufacturer rather than on the individual taxpayer.

During the years that I have been working for the repeal of the tax, similar reservations have been expressed from time to time. In order that the intention of automobile manufacturers would be crystal clear, last year shortly before the excise tax hearings were held by our Ways and Means Committee I wrote to each of the major automobile manufacturers and made a specific inquiry regarding what their policy would be should the tax be repealed or reduced. The replies were unanimous in stating that any tax relief would be passed on immediately to dealers and, presumably, to purchasers. These answers were incorporated in my statement before the committee beginning on page 412, part 3, "Hearings on Federal Excise Tax Structure," July 21-August 3, 1964.

In order to dispel any doubts which may have been raised by the Washington Post editorial of May 25, with permission, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial and the assurances from American Motors Corp., Chrysler Corp., Ford Motor Co., and General Motors Corp., indicating their intended policy of passing benefits from the reduction or repeal of the automobile excise tax to automobile purchasers:

[From the Washington Post, May 25, 1965]

WHOSE AUTO-TAX CUTS?

Who will benefit from the forthcoming reductions in the 10-percent excise tax that is levied on new automobiles? When income taxes are cut, there is no doubt that the consumer benefits by a greater after-tax income and the economy is stimulated by a higher volume of personal expenditures. But where the tax is levied on the manufacturer, as it is on automobiles, the benefits need not be passed on to the consumers.

The automobile manufacturers have promised to refund the first installment of the tax cut—it amounts to 3 percentage points or an average of about $68 per auto—to those who make purchases between May 15 and the time that the tax reduction is enacted into law. But once the law is enacted the automobile dealers are not obliged to pass the tax cuts on to their customers. By holding new car prices at the old levels, they can simply increase profit margins; and profit margins can also be widened by offsetting price reductions on new autos with smaller trade-in allowances on old ones.

The auto dealers' pricing practices will ultimately be shaped by the strength of automobile demand, but they ought not wait upon the sluggish forces of the marketplace. They can gain good will, make an important contribution to price stability, and over the long run increase their profits by announcing now that they intend to pass the full tax cuts on to their customers.

AMERICAN MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, June 24, 1964.

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN: We at American Motors appreciate you efforts over many years to relieve automobile buyers from the burden of discriminatory excise taxes on new cars. The announced plan of the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider complete revision of the excise tax structure perhaps offers the best hope we have ever had to obtain such relief. We, along with the other automobile manufacturers, are anxious to provide the committee with all pertinent information at our disposal that might aid it in achieving sound tax reforms. If called on, we shall be glad to testify at any hearings to be held.

In regard to your specific question on whether a tax "saving" would be passed along to the customer by American Motors, I can assure you that our position has not changed since you last inquired. For several years we have expressed a corporate philosophy we call "progress sharing." This, in summation, simply means sharing equitably the fruits of progress with our stockholders, employees, and customers. We believe strongly in this, and certainly would put excise tax relief in the same category with "progress."

When your letter arrived, a committee of the Automobile Manufacturers Association was in the process of preparing a letter to the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, covering the whole subject of automotive excise taxes. This letter, mailed May 27, contained the following paragraph, which reflects the attitude of the industry as a whole:

"Any excise tax imposed by the Federal Government on new cars is passed through to the car dealer by the manufacturer. This is a matter of long historical record. A review by some of our member companies of the various changes in excise tax rates on U.S. passenger cars which have taken place since 1926 shows that the changes in excise tax amounts were reflected both up and down in the billing prices to car dealers. There is no reason to expect any different treatment of tax changes in the future. Under the intense competitive pressures existing in the retail automobile markets today, and stimulated by a reduced suggested retail price, the reduction in the excise tax on new passenger cars should be reflected in lower prices to the new car buyer."

I hope this answers your question adequately. If we can provide additional information or be of further assistance in any way, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

ROY ABERNETHY,
President.

CHRYSLER CORP.,
June 18, 1964.

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Thank you for your letter of May 22 expressing your views with respect to the Federal excise tax on new passenger automobiles.

I appreciate the concern which prompted your question as to the reduction of tax being passed on to the consumer and Chrysler's attitude in that regard.

If the Congress reduces the Federal excise tax on new passenger automobiles, Chrysler Corp. would reduce its charge covering excise tax appropriately to the dealer. In addition, Chrysler Corp. would reflect the excise tax reduction in the manufacturers suggested retail price label which is affixed to each Chrysler Corp. car for the consumer's guidance, as required by the Monroney Act.

We urge that repeal or reduction of the excise tax be retroactive to the beginning of congressional hearings on this issue to avoid adverse effects upon the economy from tax-induced postponements of car purchases. A practical method of providing legislatively for retroactive refunds to the consumer has been developed by the Automobile Manufacturers Association and will be submitted in the association's statement at the full excise tax hearings later this year. I earnestly solicit your consideration of (and support for) this means of preventing severe sales declines in anticipation of reduced prices resulting from tax reduction.

Sincerely,

F. W. MISCH,
Vice President.

FORD MOTOR CO.,
June 9, 1964.

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN: Your letter of May 22 arrived while I was away from the office and I understand our Washington office indicated to you in my absence that this reply would be forthcoming soon.

We were pleased to learn from your letter that you will be continuing your efforts to reduce or repeal the discriminatory 10-percent excise tax on automobiles.

You asked in your letter if the present position of Ford Motor Co. continues to be the same as in the past on the subject of passing on any reduction in the excise tax to its dealers.

In response to similar inquiries in 1958, I stated that our company would immediately pass on to our dealers the full amount of any reduction in the excise tax. That is still our position. The suggested retail price shown on the price label would also be lowered by the amount that the excise is reduced. We have no doubt that competition for the consumer's dollar would insure that our dealers, in turn, would pass a reduction on to their customers. You realize, of course, that the company has no authority to commit what the dealers' decision on this matter would be, however.

Thank you for your efforts over the years in support of reduction or elimination of the passenger car excise tax.

Very sincerely,

HENRY FORD II,
Chairman.

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, May 28, 1964.

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 22 concerning my views on whether the removal or reduction of the present 10-percent excise tax on new automobiles would be passed along to the customer by the automobile companies.

As you know, our new passenger cars are sold by General Motors to franchised dealers who, in turn, sell to the customer. The price at which this final sale is made is one that is agreed to by the dealer and the customer. The manufacturer is not a party to this transaction and of course the dealer is free to sell at any price agreed to with the customer.

It is for this reason that I cannot speak for General Motors dealers. However, I think that there are good grounds for believing that the savings would be passed along to the customer. In this connection I would like to quote from a letter recently sent by the Automobile Manufacturers Association to Representative Mills, expressing a view to which I fully subscribe:

"Any excise tax imposed by the Federal Government on new cars is passed through to the car dealer by the manufacturer. This is a matter of long historical record. A review by some of our member companies of the various changes in excise tax rates on U.S. passenger cars which have taken place since 1926 shows that the changes in excise tax amounts were reflected both up and down in the billing prices to car dealers. There is no reason to expect any different treatment of tax changes in the future. Under the intense competitive pressures existing in the retail automobile markets today, and stimulated by a reduced suggested retail price, the reduction in the excise tax on new passenger cars should be reflected in lower prices to the new car buyer."

I am enclosing a copy of the full AMA statement from which this quotation is taken. You will note that the association is proposing that Congress not extend the 3-percent increase in the excise tax authorized in connection with the Korean wartime emergency, and is further urging affirmative congressional action to reduce or eliminate the remaining 7 percent of this discriminatory excise tax. In order to minimize the disruption of the market during the period such a reduction is under review by the Congress, the association is suggesting that provision be made in current tax legislation for the retroactive application of the reduction to the date hearings begin on specific legislation.

I very much appreciate your continued active interest in removing this discriminatory excise tax. I hope you will feel free to call on me at any time that I may be of assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

John F. Gordon,
President.

VIETNAM

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I received a letter from the Reverend Patrick Morison, pastor of the Hanna City and Limestone Presbyterian Churches, together with a copy of a letter he had addressed to the President. I asked the reverend if I might use that letter and read it into the Record and I have his approval to do so.

His letter addressed to the President reads as follows:

Hanna City and Limestone
Presbyterian Churches,
Hanna City, Ill., April 19, 1965.

President L. B. Johnson,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: You have received or will soon receive a letter from the Clergyman's Emergency Committee for Vietnam of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. This letter has been circulated among American clergymen to gain their signatures of support. The letter will petition you to seek a peaceful solution to the Vietnam crisis at all costs.

As a Christian clergyman and citizen I oppose this letter for three reasons. First, it vastly oversimplifies a complex cultural, political, and military problem. Second, it assumes that peace is possible if only the United States would pull out of Vietnam and sit down to confer on Communist terms in good faith. This letter contains one of the most arrogant and clerically irresponsible judgments I have ever read: "The United States is actively responsible for the rain of fiery death poured out on a helpless peasantry." Such a perversion of the facts could have been written in Moscow, Peiping, or Hanoi.

Third, the writers of this epistle fail to count communism as an implacable, vicious, cunning, satanic enemy of freedom, democracy, and above all, Christianity. The cruelty, treachery, and conscienceless aggression of communism ought to be obvious to all but the wilfully blind or stupid.

God may indeed use communism to bring judgment upon the West (even our United States), but we cannot make such judgment for Him, and clergymen have no right to "play prophet," speaking authoritatively on that about which they know little and have no revelation. Furthermore, to pervert the picture for purposes of propaganda is dishonest. I am sure our Nation is far from perfect and not always most just, but this does not obligate us to surrender to communism nor to trust it.

Yes, I am dismayed by the war in Vietnam (and in Congo and elsewhere) and I long for peace, but to betray ourselves or allies into Communist tyranny and designs will bring neither peace, nor freedom, nor honor, nor godliness. Only Jesus Christ can bring lasting personal, social, or world peace, He "Who is coming in power and great glory."

Yours truly,

Patrick Morison.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE CHARTER OF AFRICAN UNITY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, here is the text of the message from the Government of the United States delivered today by Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams to the African nations on the second anniversary of the signing of the Charter of African Unity:

On behalf of the Government of the United States, I extend to the Organization of African Unity warmest congratulations on the occasion of the second anniversary of the signing of its Charter. Americans have watched with deep interest and sympathy the steady progress of the OAU in its important tasks of promoting the unity and solidarity of African nations and coordinating their efforts toward achieving a better life for the peoples of Africa. We have every confidence that in the future, as in the initial years, the OAU will continue to play a most useful and constructive role in the affairs of the continent of Africa.

THE PEGASUS B

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report another major success on the part of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the exploration and conquest of space. At 3:35 this morning the Saturn booster placed into orbit the Pegasus B meteoroid technology satellite. This is the ninth straight success of the most powerful operational launch vehicle in the world, a remarkable achievement that bodes well for the future of our entire space program.

The Pegasus satellite exposes more than 2,000 square feet of instrumented panels to register meteoriod impacts in the region near the earth. The 3,200-pound spacecraft, attached to the last stage of the Saturn, is in an orbit with a predicted lifetime of over 3 years—the instruments are designed to operate for about 1 year. The achieved orbit with an apogee of 740 kilometers and perigee of 513 kilometers, is within 1 percent of the planned values—an example of the Nation's increasing capability for high-precision space operations. The total weight in orbit is over 23,000 pounds, making it one of our heaviest successful payloads.

The information we will receive from this mission will be important to our total capability for operations in space, both manned and unmanned.

The actual deployment in space of 100-foot panels was televised by a camera mounted on the booster; I am sure many of you will see it before long on your own TV sets.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the industrial and scientific team responsible for this mission for another step forward in the power and prestige of the United States.

Since preparing these remarks, I have been informed that throughout the day the three television networks will show pictures of the Pegasus B.

PECULIAR TREND OF TEXTILE MILL MARGINS

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I today asked the Federal Trade Commission to determine whether the prices of cotton textiles are being fixed in restraint of trade.

The trend of cloth prices and textile mill margins has been so peculiar since the enactment of last year's cotton legislation that a thorough inquiry is in the public interest.

Text of my letter to the Commission:

The trend of cloth prices and cotton mill margins since the enactment of the one-price cotton legislation of last year is so peculiar that I strongly urge that you make an investigation to determine whether the prices of cotton textiles are being fixed in restraint of trade.

The statistics enclosed herewith, provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, show a steady upward trend in cloth prices despite the drop in cost of raw cotton made possible by last year's legislation. You will note that mill margins jumped sharply when the lower cost cotton became available. There is no indication that consumers have benefited from this legislation, despite official assurances Congress received last year that it would save them more than $700 million.

Clearly, cloth prices have not responded to substantially lower raw material costs. This of course does not necessarily mean that a conspiracy to fix prices exists, but it is highly unusual in a supposedly competitive industry. Consequently, it seems to me that a thorough inquiry would be in the public interest.

I enclose herewith:

1. A table showing cloth and raw cotton prices and mill margins by months beginning with 1962, together with a chart reflecting these same statistics.

2. A copy of a letter dated January 31, 1964, from the Secretary of Commerce to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry giving assurances to the Congress that the proposed cotton legislation would save consumers more than $700 million.

This has special interest for me because I am a member of the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee. We will soon be considering a revision of the present legislation.

Below are copies of two of the documents I enclosed:

Cloth and raw cotton prices and mill margins by months beginning with 1962

[Cents per pound]

	Average for 20 constructions		
	Unfinished cloth prices	Raw cotton prices	Mill margins
1962			
January	60.63	35.78	24.85
February	60.76	35.82	24.94
March	61.07	35.98	25.09
April	61.23	35.85	25.38
May	61.19	36.13	25.06
June	61.24	36.34	24.90
July	61.29	36.19	25.10
August	61.12	35.89	25 23
September	60.93	35.23	25.70
October	60.71	35.08	25.63
November	60.68	35.10	25.58
December	60.67	35.30	25 37
1963			
January	60.55	35.45	25.10
February	60,47	35,66	24.81
March	60.49	35.95	24.54
April	60.26	36.08	24.18
May	60.00	36.16	23.84
June	60.11	35.86	24.25
July	60.28	35.57	24.71
August	60.60	35.33	25.27
September	60.99	35.19	25.80
October	61.34	35.11	26.23
November	62.00	35.27	26.73
December	62.29	35.37	26.92
1964			
January	62.32	35.47	26.85
February	62.37	35.55	26.82
March	62.37	35.58	26.79
April	62.00	35.63	[1] 26.37
May	61.62	35.67	[1] 25.95
June	60.87	35.76	[1] 25.11
July	60.95	35.60	[1] 25.35
August	61.00	27.64	33.36
September	61.02	26.82	34.20
October	61.25	26.80	34.45
November	61.48	26.98	34.50
December	62.58	27.30	35.28
1965			
January	63.24	27.30	35.94
February	63.28	27.26	36.02
March	63.42	27.26	36.16

[1] Does not include the 6.5 cents per pound cotton equalization payment made to domestic cotton users on all bales opened beginning 12:01 a.m. April 11, 1964. USDA made no adjustment for these payments prior to August 1964.

Source: "Cotton Price Statistics," Cotton Division, Consumer and Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

(Extract from hearings on cotton program before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, 88th Cong., pt. II, p. 510, Jan. 28, 29, 30, 31, and Feb. 11, 1964)

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1964.

Hon. Allen J. Ellender,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: It is my understanding that during the course of your current hearings on the need for emergency cotton legislation, the question continues to arise as to whether or not a reduction of 8½ cents per pound in the cost of cotton to domestic mills would be reflected in savings to American consumers of cotton textile products. When similar legislation was being considered by the House Committee on Agriculture, Hickman Price, Jr., then Assistant Secretary of Commerce, testified in behalf of this Department that savings to consumers would amount to about $90 million for each cent of reduction. A reduction of 8½ cents per pound would thus result in a saving to consumers of more than $700 million.

This saving, Mr. Price said, would come with a lag of from 3 to 8 months, the time from first consumption at the mill to ultimate consumer, and would be reflected in either lower prices or higher quality of the merchandise.

Speaking with personal knowledge from many years in the manufacturing and marketing of cotton textiles, I agree that such a raw material cost reduction in the highly competitive textile and apparel manufacturing industries would generate a chain reaction of savings to consumers. It is the best estimate of our Department that these savings would be of the general order of magnitude indicated by Mr. Price.

Sincerely yours,

Luther H. Hodges,
Secretary of Commerce.

REPORT ON LATIN AMERICA

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illniois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the fact that State Department reports on both the policy and details of the situation in the Dominican Republic might lack complete factualness.

Therefore, I insert into the Record at this point as part of my remarks an article which appeared in the Sunday, May 23, Chicago Tribune by Columnist Jules Dubois and a report in yesterday's Washington Daily News by Reporter Hal Hendrix, both of which are on-the-spot reports from professional, competent, and respected journalists:

Report From Latin America: U.S. Meddling in Dominican Republic Seen as Aid to Reds

(By Jules Dubois)

Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, May 22.—Exposure to the political meddling by the White House and the State Department in the Dominican civil war has made it easier for this reporter to understand the instability that has afflicted governments in Saigon for so long.

American diplomacy here has created more and more resentment and made enemies of sincere friends of the United States as Washington contributed to the political turbulence and instability in the midst of what was to have been a final and decisive offensive against the Communists.

Every time the anti-Communist, pro-American forces have had the Reds on the ropes, the United States, wittingly or unwittingly, salvaged the Communists.

The fiction that the overwhelming majority of the people want the 1963 constitution restored is belied by the fact that the rest of the country, where more than 2,500,000 citizens reside, has produced no uprisings in favor of the revolution.

Because former President Juan Bosch and his Communist allies effectively smeared Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin Y Wessin, the United States tried to dump the military man who has been, and who is, the symbol of anti-Communist resistance.

MOVE LAUNCHED TO DUMP HIM

Because Bosch and his Communist allies began to smear Brig. Gen. Antonio Imbert-Barrera, president of the government of national reconstruction—whose formation we encouraged—the United States launched moves to dump him.

The United States tried to replace Imbert with an all-civilian junta handpicked by Bosch. As Wessin said the previous week, the United States was about to hand victory here and throughout Latin America to the Communists on a golden platter.

As one bewildered Latin American Ambassador (whose country has been on our side) said to me: "I cannot understand the thinking of the policymakers in the State Department and much less in the White House, which has been most active in this latest maneuver, in trying to dump Imbert. What does the United States expect to gain from that?"

The Ambassador, who said he has been reporting since 1962 to his government about Bosch's anti-Americanism and his alliance with the Communists, issued a warning. He said that if the White House and the State Department fail to untie the hands of the Imbert Government, American troops will have to finish the fight against the Communists.

Lt. Gen. Bruce Palmer, Jr., commander of American land forces here, said earlier that part of his mission was to prevent a Communist takeover and establishment of a government inimical to the interests of the United States.

COULD NOT HAVE DONE MORE TO RILE REGIME

The team sent here by the White House by President Johnson could not have done more to antagonize the pro-American, anti-Communist Imbert regime.

The loyal Dominican navy and air force, whose support was needed by the anti-Communist infantry, were prevented by the United States from taking action because of a cease fire that had long ago become a ceaseless fire.

Because one pilot may have goofed and his machinegun shell fall onto U.S. positions from which 5,000 troops fired back at him and shot him down, an entire air force was penalized by the U.S. Government. The Imbert Government was deprived of two-thirds of its firepower by order of the United States.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, May 25, 1965]

United States Flounders Into Strange Kettle of Fish

(By Hal Hendrix)

Santo Domingo, May 25.—Washington's mishandling of the Dominican fiasco seems likely to go down in history as second only to the floundering which permitted Cuba to fall under Communist control.

While the Johnson administration is sending high-powered talent here, it appears to be moving toward only a temporary solution, at best.

The administration also seems to have discarded most of its collection of civilian and military intelligence data to satisfy politicians at home.

In attempting to pressure a political solution to the month-old conflict the validity of Washington's original assessment of the situation has become much obscured.

More than 21,000 marines and paratroopers were landed here. Their mission, as announced by President Johnson, was to protect American lives and property, and prevent the Dominican Republic from being taken over by the Communists.

That mission has not changed.

But diplomats and politicians now contend that the rebel movement they earlier said was dominated by Communist and other leftist extremists is not controlled by these elements.

On the scene, it has become obvious the switch in the Washington line was made to justify negotiations with questionable personalities within the rebel movement and others close to it.

CORNERED

With combat between rebel forces and troops loyal to the U.S.-created junta now blocked by existence of the American-controlled corridor, the rebel faction is cornered in a small downtown area.

Reports that the rebels enjoy widespread popular support throughout the island simply are not true.

The United States is obviously catering now to the rebel leaders who boasted about distributing weapons to thousands of civilians, including known Communits, pro-Castroites and ordinary hoodlums, at the outbreak of the rebellion.

This "arms for the people" action has resulted in the deaths of hundreds of Dominicans and the wounding of thousands of others. It has also led to the killing of 19 U.S. servicemen and the wounding of 115 more by gunfire from within the rebel zone.

These "constitutionalists" have been charged with more than 1,000 cease-fire violations—provocative shootings into the American-occupied area.

Official sources say Washington has intelligence reports detailing the extent of Communist and Castroite penetration of the rebel movement.

McGeorge Bundy, President Johnson's top troubleshooter here now, says he does not believe Communists now dominate the movement, headed by Col. Francisco Caamano Deno.

IN BACKGROUND

In fact, Dominican Communists are content to remain in the background at the moment. Well-known Dominican Reds and militant members of the pro-Castro June 14 movement avoid rebel press conferences and generally stay out of sight of newsmen.

But the June 14 movement has infiltrated deeply into the rebel group and its parent Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD). It is in full operation inside the rebel zone, with a new headquarters. It was outlawed before the rebellion began.

As a supporter of Colonel Caamano's "constitutionalist" government, the June 14 movement said in the May 15 issue of its newspaper that "the only path to consolidate a democratic solution is to spread the armed struggle through the country."

The newspaper, parroting the movement's alliance with Castro's Cuba, said the "Dominican imperialists and reactionaries only have the support of the Yankee invaders."

The rebels and their allies have made it known they would welcome a settlement under which Antonio Guzman, Minister of Agriculture under the Juan Bosch government, would become president of a coalition proposed by the United States last week.

Senor Bosch is reported to have suggested Senor Guzman in meetings with U.S. officials in San Juan.

A big question among traditionally anti-Communist and pro-American Dominicans now is why the United States attempts to ram Senor Guzman into the provisional Presidency when it was obvious in advance he would be unacceptable to the anti-Bosch and anti-Communist elements, but pleasing to the rebels.

American manipulators argue that Senor Bosch won the Presidency with about 60 percent of the vote in 1962. But they don't discuss how much of this vote was actually against his opponents. At least 40 percent of the voters still are strongly anti-Bosch.

There is doubt here that Mr. Bundy and others involved in settlement negotiations are fully aware of the backgrounds of some of the constitutionalists and PRD figures they are dealing with.

Washington officials, including Mr. Bundy, contend they are distressed by the lack of capable politicians on the Dominican scene.

There are such capable Dominicans as Dr. Eduardo Read Barreras, former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and now Ambassador to Rome, and former President Emilio de Los Santos. Both have unsullied reputations and are not vulnerable to attack from either side.

It is also puzzling to many observers why the United States is using such emissaries as Dr. Jaime Benitez, chancellor of the University of Puerto Rico, who is well known in this area for his anti-Americanism. He is here now at Mr. Bundy's request.

Disturbing too is the manner in which U.S. diplomats persuaded Gen. Antonio Imbert Barrera and his four associates in the junta to accept the temporary government role, and then attempted to dump them—in an apparent concession to the rebels and the PRD leaders in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, the above reports on the Dominican situation will, I am for sure, arouse the interest of at least a few Members.

•MIZE QUESTIONS BILL "RIDERS"

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Mize] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to appear before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to express my concern about the use of omnibus bills. Often these bills combine new concepts with established programs and thus bring into being a new area of Government spending which probably would not be authorized if the new concept was presented as an individual bill.

I have had a bill drafted which I plan to introduce to ban bills and amendments dealing with more than one substantive matter. I realize that this is a far-reaching reform, but the reception I had before the joint committee indicates to me that many other Members share my same concerns about the abuses in omnibus bills.

During the time that this proposal was in the talking stage as far as my office is concerned, the Topeka (Kans.) State Journal editorialized in favor of this approach.

I appreciate this support by one of the leading and influential dailies in Kansas, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial, "Mize Questions Bill Riders," in the Record:

Mize Questions Bill Riders

Representative Chester Mize, Republican, of Kansas, is on the right track in questioning the fairness and feasibility of omnibus bills and in starting a movement to limit each bill considered in Congress to one substantive matter.

Mize said this week he has asked that a resolution to that effect be drafted while he conducts research to see if such an approach to legislation would be feasible. If it is, he said, he hopes someone in the Senate will join him in introducing the measure.

In question are two types of bills—omnibus bills and bills onto which riders are attached.

An omnibus bill is one which makes a number of miscellaneous provisions or appropriations. The other type usually contains fewer provisions but can be even more deceptive than the omnibus bill.

Granted, these types of bills have at times served worthwhile purposes by making it possible to enact necessary legislation when it was too late, or for some other reason it was impossible, to do it any other way. But often, Mize believes, they have served as expedients to slip through measures which likely would have been killed if they had received the undivided, unclouded attention of Congress.

An example of what he is talking about, Mize said, was the recent education bill, "where the new expanded idea of Federal assistance to public school students and indirect aid to nonpublic schools was tied to the existing programs of aid to impacted areas.

"We saw it in medicare, where compulsory hospital and medical care for the aged was tied to the improvements in the social security system. The same carrot and stick approach will be used in the housing bill, where the accepted programs of FHA financing, college housing and urban renewal comprise the vehicle for a new concept of rent supplements, direct grants for private home rehabilitation and the new cities concept."

The established programs to which new concepts are tied are what Mize calls sweeteners, to make the new concepts seem more acceptable.

Representatives, of course, are concerned primarily with the House. The Senate, however, has a greater problem, Mize said.

"An amendment in the Senate does not have to be germane to the issue as it does in the House," he said. One example was last year when a reapportionment amendment was attached to the foreign aid bill. Recently, a proposal to permit delay of 1964 income tax payments was attached as a rider to the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

Many measures so camouflaged, especially some of the new welfare concepts which are being added to our system with sometimes alarming regularity, probably could not stand on their own feet if they were held up in the light of Congress as separate and distinct bills. It stands to reason that there would be more reluctance to launch new programs when their merits are questionable. But when these issues are tied to programs already on the books, they can often slide through.

Mize points out that the Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization will begin public hearings next month on ideas to improve the operation of Congress. The committee would do well to study Mize's ideas on omnibus bills.

GUN LAWS—SOUND APPROACH BACKED BY NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the National Rifle Association has been wrongfully attacked in some quarters as opposed to all legislation to tighten Federal firearms laws. This is not true. On the contrary, the National Rifle Association is deeply concerned by all questions involving firearms. That is, after all, its reason for existing. The National Rifle Association does recognize the problem and does support sound legislation to restrict the availability of weapons to juveniles and criminals and other irresponsible persons. The Association and millions of other Americans who do not belong to the National Rifle Association do ask, however, that this issue be considered with reason and logic and free of the emotionalism that surrounds a good deal of the debate.

In an editorial published in the May issue of the American Rifleman, the National Rifle Association states its position with forthright clarity. I offer it at this point in the Record as a contribution to the discussion on gun legislation. My own position in favor of sound gun legislation but in opposition to the stringent terms of the administration's bill (S. 1592), was set forth in the Record of May 4, pages 9424 to 9425.

The editorial follows:

This Is Our Stand

The primary purposes of the National Rifle Association of America, as stated in its constitution and bylaws, are:

"To promote public safety, law and order, and the national defense; to educate and train citizens of good repute in the safe and efficient handling of small arms, and in the technique of design, production and group instruction; to increase the knowledge of small arms on the part of members of law enforcement agencies, of the Armed Forces, and of citizens who would be subject to service in the event of war; and generally to encourage the lawful ownership and use of small arms by citizens of good repute."

In support of these objectives, the National Rifle Association stands squarely on the premise that the ownership of firearms must not be denied American citizens of good repute so long as they use them for lawful purposes.

No other organization does so much to educate our people in safety with firearms, in the home and on the shooting range and in the hunting field. No other organization is so vitally concerned with the training of citizens in the use of the basic weapons of national defense, the individual's personal arm. No other organization so strongly encourages shooting for recreation, in every field and with every type of sporting gun. No other organization does more to promote the rights and responsibilities of reputable citizens who own and use firearms.

For these reasons, the National Rifle Association is vitally concerned with efforts in Congress to amend the Federal Firearms Act to provide Federal control of mail-order guns. Since 1959, investigations and hearings have been conducted by the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate. In its interim report, ordered to be printed on August 7, 1964, will be found the following statements:

"As our investigation progressed, it became apparent that a major source of firearms to juveniles and young adults was the mail-order common carrier route. This process involves the ordering of the firearm by common carrier. Present Federal law prohibits the delivery of a handgun by mail except to firearms dealers.

"An overwhelming majority of the 69 respondents to the questionnaire (law enforcement authorities throughout the United States) indicated support of Federal legislation to place enforceable controls over the interstate transportation of concealable firearms, which enter their jurisdictions for delivery to prospective purchasers.

"The need for Federal remedial legislation is apparent. As a general statement, it can be said that all of the witnesses who testified recommended Federal legislation to prevent the shipment and delivery in interstate commerce of mail-order firearms to juveniles under the age of 18 years; that proper safeguards be written into the Federal Firearms Act to preclude shipment of these firearms to convicted felons, narcotic addicts, and chronic lawbreakers; and an increase in the Federal Firearms Act dealers' license fee."

Contrary to claims by the antigun forces, members of the National Rifle Association of America and millions of other law-abiding citizens do not oppose all proposed firearms legislation. They have recognized the problems of some local communities created by the availability of handguns to juveniles, criminals, and irresponsible persons through mail-order purchases. They have supported legislation prepared and proposed by the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency (S. 1975, introduced on Aug. 2, 1963), to establish Federal controls over the transportation of concealable firearms in interstate commerce. They do support properly drawn legislation to outlaw dangerous devices such as bazookas, bombs, and antitank guns. They do support properly drawn legislation to curb the flood of cheap foreign firearms that are being dumped in America. They do support properly drawn legislation to impose heavy penalties for crimes involving the misuse of firearms. They do support the strict enforcement of existing laws at all levels of government.

The National Rifle Association of America supports properly drawn legislation that is proposed to accomplish these purposes, and this is our stand.

TRIBUTE TO HON. JOSEPH MARTIN

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, last night in Newton, Mass., I was privileged to attend the seventh annual achievement meeting of the Newton Chamber of Commerce. This meeting was more than another meeting of a local chamber of commerce to honor a local dignitary. It was a testimonial to a man we all know and respect. It was a meeting that tried to express in some way the almost boundless admiration that Massachusetts and the Republican Party has for this man. I am speaking, of course, of Congressman Joseph W. Martin, Jr., the former Speaker of this House.

I can only speak for myself and express my deep feeling of respect, admiration—yes, even of love—for this outstanding American who for so long has given of himself to this House and to this Nation. Ever since I came to Congress some 7 years ago, and even before, his guidance and counsel has been invaluable—and unrepayable. His example as a Republican and as a Member of Congress has continually guided my actions and my contacts with my colleagues. A few weeks ago in Westfield, Mass., I addressed a group of young students who were participating in a youth conference. The topic of my remarks was "The Public Servant." I do not believe that there can be a better example of a man in the public service than our colleague, Congressman Martin.

At this meeting at which Congressman Martin received the 1965 Achievement Award, the major address was given by my friend and leader of the Republican Party in Congress, Congressman Gerald Ford. I can only say that I wholly concur in the remarks that Congressman Ford delivered last night. I would like to share them with you and the Members of this House who were not fortunate enough to be able to attend this ceremony in honor of former Speaker Joe Martin:

Remarks by Hon. Gerald R. Ford, at the Testimonial for Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Newton, Mass., May 24, 1965

Although this is a nonpartisan dinner, I would like to say that I'm particularly pleased to be here because I understand that the city of Newton casts the largest number of Republican votes of any community in Massachusetts. As the leader of the oppressed minority in the House, it's a pleasure to be in such a friendly environment.

While everyone knows that it was Nathan Hale who said, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country," tonight I would like to add a modern corollary to that famous statement. It is this: "The Republican Party regrets that it has but one Joe Martin to give to our country." All would agree that more Joe Martins would make America even greater.

I feel a special kinship for our guest of honor. Joe Martin once said, "the position of minority leader of the House of Representatives is the most thankless job in Washington. I would not take 10 times $10,000 to return to it." And now I'm the fellow who's trying to fill the giant shoes that Joe wore for so long, with such distinction, dedication, and ability.

But Joe Martin and I have something else in common. We have both been avid amateur athletes. I was once a fair football player at the University of Michigan, and he was once a very good semipro baseball player.

Many of you may not know that Joe has maintained his contacts with baseball through the years. When the great Washington Senators' pitcher, Walter Johnson, ran for Congress, his friend Joe Martin wrote two campaign speeches for him—one to give before labor groups, and the other to give before farmers. Unfortunately Johnson was a better pitcher than politician. He got the two speeches mixed up, delivered the labor speech to farmers and vice versa. Needless to say, he lost the election, which perhaps proves what Joe Martin learned a long time ago: It's easier to be a great Washington Senator than a Member of the House of Representatives.

The man we honor tonight has had the most remarkable record of public service of any person currently active on the political scene. So, if he will forgive me, I would like to turn these remarks into my version of "This Is Your Life."

Joseph W. Martin, Jr., was born on November 3, 1884, the day before Grover Cleveland was elected President for the first time. His father wanted to name him Grover Cleveland Martin. But his mother, a stanch Republican, said, "Grover's a dog's name."

His father was a hard-working North Attleboro blacksmith whose earnings were never more than $18 a week.

Since the family was poor, young Joe started to work outside of school hours at the age of 6. One of his jobs was to brush the flies off the horses while his father shod them. Another job was as a delivery boy for the North Attleboro Evening Chronicle. (Now probably every newsboy dreams of one day becoming the owner of the paper. But Joe Martin was one young man who was to make this dream come true.)

He got his political start by marching in a torchlight parade for William McKinley in 1896. At the time, a family friend told his father, "Don't let that boy go into politics—he's too good a boy."

Joe, who was otherwise a fellow of extremely good sense, did not listen to this sound advice. Traveling by horse and buggy, he campaigned for the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1911, and was elected—age 27.

In 1916 he began attending Republican presidential conventions. This would become a habit of more than 50 years' duration. And today he holds the record—unsurpassed in either party—of having been five times the permanent chairman of national conventions.

His gentle humor has broken many tense moments at conventions, as all of us recall who were at San Francisco in 1956 when a Nebraska delegate tried to nominate "Joe Smith" for Vice President.

But not all moments at national conventions are so supercharged. At his first convention, Joe woke up in the middle of the night to find that a poker game was in progress in his hotel room. And to his astonishment, he discovered that the dealer was none other than the legendary Diamond Jim Brady.

By 1924 Joe was running for Congress, and he's held that office as your Representative ever since.

Those were the days of great orators in the House of Representatives. However, not all Congressmen could keep from wallowing in cliches. Joe remembers that one of the first great speeches he heard began: "I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that politics makes strange bedfellows. Especially since women got into 'em."

Joe was put on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Of course, he really wanted to be on the Post Office Committee. (But not all freshmen legislators could be that lucky.) Interestingly, at that time the Foreign Affairs Committee spent a full week debating such earth-shaking questions as to whether or not to authorize $20,000 for an international poultry show in Tulsa.

The new Congressman began to establish his lifetime reputation as a fighter for New England. But he also learned the pitfalls of his office. After getting a new post office for Fall River, it turned out that the building contract went to a firm in St. Louis. The building was constructed not with Fall River granite, but with Indiana limestone. And to top it all off, the job of night watchman was given to the father of Joe's Democratic opponent.

Yet, despite such temporary setbacks, he kept getting reelected to Congress. A dairyman from Taunton once said, "I vote the straight Democratic ticket, except for Congressman Martin. I always vote for him because my father told me to, 15 years ago." Indeed, Joe Martin had become a vital institution in his district.

Much deserved recognition came often to Joe Martin. In 1936 he was chosen Republican national committeeman from Massachusetts. In 1938 he was elected chairman of the national Republican congressional committee. In 1939 he became the Republican leader of the House. In 1940 he was considered a dark horse candidate for the Presidency, and received 44 votes at the convention. Although he never sought the office, this is what the great Kansas editor, William Allen White, said of him: "He will make * * * if the dice roll right, a liberty-loving President."

When Wendell Willkie was made the 1940 nominee, he begged Joe to become chairman of the Republican National Committee. Putting devotion to party above personal wishes, as usual, Joe accepted the post. As chairman he had the rare distinction of seeing the committee evicted from its building when it was purchased by an organization that hasn't been too friendly to most Republicans. However, although he was far from a wealthy man, Joe took over another building and obligated himself as a personal liability for the $33,000 lease. (Is there any wonder why Republicans love Joe Martin?)

The greatest tribute came to Joe Martin in 1947 when he was first elected Speaker of the House. Next to the President, as most students of government know, the Speaker is the most powerful elective official in the United States.

But what most people don't know is that besides presiding over the House, the Speaker has a great many other duties, such as supervising a Capitol bank with assets of $4 million. The Speaker also has responsibility for four barbershops and a beauty parlor. But Joe, as a confirmed bachelor, told a colleague, "I think I'll let you run the beauty parlor. You are more experienced with the women than I am."

This question of experience with the opposite sex was to change rapidly. For under the new law of presidential succession, Speaker Martin was first in line if anything happened to President Truman. (There was no Vice President when Truman succeeded F.D.R., you will recall.) Of course, the possibility of a bachelor President was a great temptation to the single ladies of this country. Joe Martin was deluged with offers of marriage. (One proposal that particularly amused him came from a woman spiritualist in Clarksburg, W. Va., who wrote that the deceased Wendell Willkie had told her to marry Joe.)

There are a great many reasons for Joe Martin's success. But I would like to mention just two of them.

The first is his adherence to the old New England principle of thrift. Once Joe Martin invited a President of the United States to his office for lunch. He called a caterer for some box lunches and was told that they would cost $2 apiece. Well, this seemed a bit high to Joe, so he shopped around until he found a man who would provide a box lunch for $1.19. I am sure that this makes Joe the only man in American history to entertain a President at such a bargain price. And, of course, Joe has always applied this same principle to the taxpayer's dollar.

Second, Joe Martin is a very likable person. Even those who are his political opponents have come to have a special place in their hearts for him. For example, there is quite a collection of GOP elephants in Joe's office, and one of the most handsome was given to him by Harry Truman. The story behind this is that someone sent it to the White House, and President Truman told his secretary, "Take this up to Joe Martin. I don't want any damned dancing elephants around here."

Joe has served our Nation with great skill. He has been a major force in some of the most crucial decisions of our times. To cite just one instance: During World War II General Marshall came to him and asked for $1.6 billion to manufacture an atomic bomb. Joe's job would be to try to get this money from Congress, largely on faith—for the greatest secrecy had to be maintained. Thus, to a large extent, Joe Martin was responsible for putting through a program that eventually shortened the war and saved millions of American lives.

But speaking to you, in a sense, as a representative of Joe Martin's party, I would also like to say a few words about "Joe Martin—Republican."

When he was first nominated for House leader in 1939, it was said of him: "We are doing more than electing a floor leader. We are choosing a symbol of the Republican Party."

And Joe Martin has been a magnificent symbol of integrity, dedication, honor, and patriotism.

Through the darkest days of Republican Party history, he has played one of the most significant roles in keeping the two-party system alive and functioning.

The dedication of Joe Martin's autobiography reads: "To the millions of Republicans—and to the many Democrats and independents as well—who fought with me through the years to maintain the two-party system of government in the United States."

This has been Joe Martin's greatest fight. And all Americans, regardless of party, are very much in his debt, and owe him a lasting vote of thanks.

From all of us, Joe Martin, thank you from the bottom of our hearts.

ILLINOIS 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to announce today the results of our 18th Congressional District poll. Of 90,000 questionnaires addressed to individuals, some 81,000 ultimately reached their destination. We have received an exceptional return to date of just a shade under 15,000 or 18 percent. Rather than simply taking a random sample of the returns and projecting the figures, we have gone the extra step of tabulating each and every questionnaire, so as to give a most accurate account of the returns.

As we debate the foreign aid bill today, I believe it appropriate to point out that in my congressional district the consensus is overwhelmingly in "favor of a sharp reduction in the foreign aid program." As a matter of fact, in answer to this question, 74.5 percent voted yes, 20 percent voted no, and 5.5 percent undecided. So far as "favoring continuing aid to Communist-leaning countries, such as Egypt, Algeria, and Indonesia." 86 percent say no, 9 percent say yes, and 5 percent undecided. Even on the issue of "giving away or selling for foreign currencies our agricultural surpluses to Communist countries," 72 percent of those returning questionnaires said no;

20 percent said yes and 8 percent were undecided.

On the burning issue of South Vietnam and what to do there, we had six questions and I would call your particular attention to those last six questions in this compilation.

The most lopsided reply came on the question of whether or not my constituents "favor insisting that all members of the U.N. pay their dues or lose their General Assembly vote." On this question 90 percent of my constituents said yes, 7 percent said no, and 3 percent were undecided.

And the question in which we find the least disparity is whether or not my constituents, "favor a further reduced annuity if Congress provided for a voluntary retirement at age 60 instead of 62." Here the results show 45 percent in favor, 45 percent opposed, and 10 percent undecided.

We are now in the process, Mr. Speaker, of further evaluating the returns of our questionnaire, so that on each question we will have a breakdown by occupation, and it may be at a future date we may want to publicize these findings if they are significant.

Mr. Speaker, I include the entire tabulation, by number and percent, for each of the 31 questions asked, in the RECORD at this point:

ILLINOIS 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

MEDICAL CARE

1. Do you favor 60 days of hospital and nursing home care for those over age 65 financed by added social security taxes under a compulsory program?

	Percent
Yes (2,443)	17.0
No (11,162)	76.5
Undecided (967)	6.5

2. Do you favor medical, surgical, hospital, nursing home, and drug benefits for those over age 65 financed by a tax credit or from general revenues for private insurance under a voluntary program?

	Percent
Yes (9,616)	66
No (3,510)	24
Undecided (1,446)	10

SOCIAL SECURITY

3. Do you favor an increase of 5 percent in social security benefits paid for by an increase in social security taxes?

	Percent
Yes (5,176)	35.5
No (8,594)	59.0
Undecided (802)	5.5

4. Do you favor mandatory retirement at age 65 of all those under social security?

	Percent
Yes (4,383)	30
No (9,450)	65
Undecided (739)	5

5. Would you favor a further reduced annuity if Congress provided for voluntary retirement at age 60 instead of age 62?

	Percent
Yes (6,586)	45
No (6,601)	45
Undecided (1,385)	10

EDUCATION

6. Do you favor Federal aid to grade and high schools?

	Percent
Yes (4,309)	29.5
No (9,522)	65.5
Undecided (741)	5.0

7. Do you favor Federal aid for teachers' salaries?

	Percent
Yes (3,110)	21.5
No (10,734)	73.5
Undecided (728)	5.0

8. Do you favor Federal loans for college students?

	Percent
Yes (8,320)	57
No (5,574)	39
Undecided (678)	4

9. Do you favor income-tax credits for parents paying college tuitions?

	Percent
Yes (10,326)	71
No (3,626)	25
Undecided (620)	4

TAXES

10. Do you favor a repeal of the wartime imposed excise taxes on such items as cosmetics, luggage, handbags, jewelry, furs, automobiles, and telephones?

	Percent
Yes (9,668)	66.5
No (4,220)	29.0
Undecided (684)	4.5

11. Do you favor having a balanced budget before further cuts in taxes?

	Percent
Yes (11,401)	77.0
No (2,255)	15.5
Undecided (916)	7.5

AGRICULTURE

12. Do you favor a continuation of the present farm program with respect to price supports, acreage allotments, and marketing quotas on a limited number of crops?

	Percent
Yes (3,147)	21.5
No (9,593)	66.0
Undecided (1,832)	12.5

13. Do you favor a gradual withdrawal by the Government from acreage restrictions for farmers?

	Percent
Yes (10,787)	74
No (2,313)	16
Undecided (1,472)	10

14. Do you favor more Government spending programs to keep so-called marginal farmers in business?

	Percent
Yes (2,031)	14
No (11,045)	76
Undecided (1,496)	10

15. Do you favor giving away or selling for foreign currencies our agricultural surpluses to Communist countries?

	Percent
Yes (2,869)	20
No (10,510)	72
Undecided (1,193)	8

LABOR

16. Do you favor repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to enact right-to-work laws?

	Percent
Yes (4,046)	28.0
No (8,670)	59.5
Undecided (1,856)	13.5

17. Do you favor an increase in the minimum-wage law to $2.00 an hour?

	Percent
Yes (4,471)	31
No (9,298)	64
Undecided (803)	5

18. Do you favor extension of the minimum-wage law to workers not now covered?

	Percent
Yes (8,352)	57.5
No (5,059)	35.0
Undecided (1,161)	7.5

IMMIGRATION

19. Do you favor continuation of our present immigration quota system, based on national origin?

	Percent
Yes (9,025)	62
No (3,917)	27
Undecided (1,630)	11

20. Do you favor changing the present law to permit entry of additional thousands of persons regardless of their individual merit or their national origin?

	Percent
Yes (1,285)	9.0
No (12,344)	84.5
Undecided (943)	6.5

FOREIGN AID

21. Do you favor a sharp reduction in the foreign aid program?

	Percent
Yes (10,898)	74.5
No (2,888)	20.0
Undecided (786)	5.5

22. Do you favor continuing aid to Communist leaning countries such as Egypt, Algeria, and Indonesia?

	Percent
Yes (1,264)	9
No (12,550)	86
Undecided (758)	5

UNITED NATIONS

23. Do you favor seating Red China in the United Nations?

	Percent
Yes (2,424)	16.5
No (11,381)	78.0
Undecided (767)	5.5

24. Do you favor insisting that all members of the U.N. pay their dues or lose their General Assembly vote?

	Percent
Yes (13,157)	90
No (979)	7
Undecided (436)	3

25. Do you favor continuation of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency?

	Percent
Yes (7,086)	48.5
No (4,261)	29.0
Undecided (3,225)	22.5

VIETNAM

26. Do you favor withdrawal of our forces in South Vietnam and take the consequences?

	Percent
Yes (1,999)	13.5
No (11,048)	76.0
Undecided (1,525)	10.5

27. Do you favor an outright commitment of our full air and sea power to quarantine South Vietnam?

	Percent
Yes (8,437)	58
No (3,641)	25
Undecided (2,494)	17

28. Do you favor retaliatory strikes into North Vietnam?

	Percent
Yes (10,217)	70.0
No (2,261)	15.5
Undecided (2,094)	14.5

29. Do you favor going one step further by way of strategic bombing of targets in North Vietnam?

	Percent
Yes (9,595)	66.0
No (2,546)	17.5
Undecided (2,431)	16.5

30. Do you favor support of a guerrilla force in North Vietnam made up exclusively of Asian volunteers?

	Percent
Yes (9,013)	62.0
No (2,966)	20.5
Undecided (2,593)	17.5

31. Do you believe it imperative that we guarantee the territorial integrity of South Vietnam in the name of freedom at any cost?

	Percent
Yes (8,171)	56.0
No (3,839)	26.5
Undecided (2,562)	17.5

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR GRADUAL REDUCTION AND EVENTUAL ELIMINATION OF TAX ON TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. KREBS Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on telephone service.

The telephone excise tax is primarily a temporary wartime tax originally designed to raise funds and curtail use during a critical period. The tax served its purpose in that wartime period but the time has come to reduce and/or remove this tax. You might say that this tax also has a relationship to another war into which we are embarking—the war on poverty—and if repealed, this tax, which hits hardest at the low income groups, could provide additional purchasing power to these families. Figures show that 53 percent of the households with telephone service had incomes less than $6,000 per year and that the food and apparel industries, providers of basic living necessities, are the biggest business excise taxpayers. I might also add that telephone service is the only household utility so taxed.

In Philadelphia, over $11 million in telephone excise tax is paid annually and the people of my congressional district pay over $3.5 million. The reduction and eventual elimination of this tax would provide a much needed and long overdue reduction in the cost of a vital household service for low income families.

Included herewith are a table and fact sheet on this subject:

District	Bell	Independent	Total
1	$1,043,506		$1,043,506
2	3,596,254		3,596,254
3	3,989,326		3,989,326
4	1,388,806		1,388,806
5	1,465,582		1,465,582
6	1,716,400	$317,439	2,033,839
7	2,779,116		2,779,116
8	2,394,204	99,672	2,493,876
9	1,700,508	384,363	2,084,871
10	919,791	420,258	1,340,049
11	1,133,184	142,140	1,275,324
12	648,144	746,995	1,395,139
13	4,118,988	8,201	4,127,189
14	3,049,992		3,049,992
15	719,280	204,335	923,615
16	1,325,472	228,201	1,553,673
17	1,049,352	364,360	1,413,712
18	2,116,440	114,867	2,231,307
19	326,928	1,221,237	1,548,165
20	1,470,344		1,470,344
21	1,086,404	227,516	1,313,920
22	338,724	750,448	1,089,172
23	692,916	527,660	1,220,576
24	403,358	452,798	856,152
25	1,162,840	463,361	1,626,201
26	1,261,872	165,327	1,427,199
27	2,088,996		2,088,996
Total	43,986,727	6,839,178	50,825,905

COMMUNICATIONS EXCISE TAX FACT SHEET

NUMBER OF PEOPLE AFFECTED

Of all U.S. households, 83.9 percent (or 47,246,000) have telephone service.

There are 55 million residence and business telephone customers.

AMOUNTS PAID

In 1964 the amount paid in communications taxes was $994,066,000. Of this the amount in general telephone service was $582,355,000.

Long distance, telegraph, and miscellaneous service was $411,711,000.

The average Federal excise tax paid in 1964 by communications customers was $18.51.

Total taxes—Federal, States, et cetera—paid in 1964 by the telephone industry and customers (includes excise tax) was $3,081,002,000, or an average per customer of $70.78.

EFFECT ON LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Telephone excise tax hits hardest at lower income levels. Bureau of Census figures for 1960 show that of households with telephones (a) 20 percent (approximately 7,800,000) had incomes of less than $3,000 per year; (b) 53 percent (approximately 21 million) had incomes of less than $6,000 per year; (c) only 14 percent (approximately 5,500,000) had incomes of $10,000 and more per year.

BENEFITS OF REPEAL

Removal of the tax means automatic reduction in cost which would—

Increase public purchasing power;

Enable many of the 12 million households without telephones to afford service; and

Stimulate demand for telephones resulting in increased construction and many new jobs.

BUSINESS USAGE

Business usage of telephones represents approximately 47 percent of excise tax total.

The biggest business excise taxpayers are the food and apparel industries—providers of basic living necessities.

STRONG HAND AT THE HELM

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this Chamber and of its Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am privileged to spend many hours each day dealing with the intricate problems of America's relations with her neighbors all over the world. From this vantage point, I view both the comprehensive and the fractional pictures of our foreign affairs. In the course of it all, I am deeply impressed with the direction President Lyndon B. Johnson is giving our foreign policy in the cases of Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

The U.S. Constitution provides that the President shall be the sole organ of the Nation in international affairs. This is as it should be. At the same time, the Congress of the United States has numerous responsibilities in this field which it has performed very well throughout the course of American history. The present time is no exception to this record of executive-legislative cooperation.

To its credit, the recent editorial commentary of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, on May 3, 1965, is both timely and accurate. So that it receives the distribution and attention it so richly deserves, I include it within the scope of my remarks, as follows:

STRONG MAN AT THE HELM

In the Dominican crisis, as in Vietnam, President Johnson is demonstrating that this country has the means, as well as the will, to resist Communist subversion wherever our interests seem to be threatened, just as we found—in dark and dangerous days in Europe and the Middle East a decade and more ago—the ways to contain outright Communist aggression.

To be sure, there still is room for debate about the nature and extent of the national interest; but it is clear enough in the Caribbean, and in Vietnam it has at least been inescapable.

Thanks to the modernization and strengthening of our fleet and of our strategic army and marine forces, begun under President Eisenhower and pushed hard by President Kennedy, flexible, measured responses have been possible in the Cuban crisis, Vietnam, the Congo and, last week, in the Dominican Republic.

But the essential ingredient, the most important weapon in the arsenal of this unconventional warfare, is a President who is alert, wise, and courageous enough to take the difficult decisions—often with unprecedented but imperative swiftness—and be able, at the same time, to keep Congress, the country, and our allies largely with him. On all counts, Mr. Johnson has made high marks.

Last week's crisis showed how terribly difficult it can be. Suppose American lives had not been clearly in danger (in fact, they were), yet a Communist takeover still had seemed imminent. Not even the President may know how he would have met so awkward a situation. But in mincing no words about our larger concerns in his televised remarks, he has made it plain his hands will not be tied in a crisis by mere diplomatic niceties, or by the risk of giving Communist-led mobs new excuses for rock throwing. In short, we do not bear freedom's torch merely to warm our hands.

Congress is finding it difficult to sort out its proper role in the conduct of such operations. But Mr. Johnson seems acutely sensitive to its frustration and has had the wisdom to consult often and promptly without, at the same time, asking Congress to decide matters which are his responsibility.

Similarly, although some believe he might have gone sooner to the Organization of American States with the Dominican crisis, he may have recognized that tacit or partial assent was the most he could expect and that he had to commit the United States first, risking the inevitable protests of members too weak to offend Fidel Castro.

To the people, Mr. Johnson has conveyed an impression both of firmness and prudence. He speaks as one who expects understanding and support and by so speaking, commands it.

Missteps are a constant risk. But there is no safety in delay, compromise, or withdrawal. The challenge of Communist takeover incubates in evolving societies around the globe, nurtured ceaselessly by Moscow, Peiping, or both. Our capacity to counter this threat to ourselves and to peoples emerging from colonialism or native dictatorships is a considerable one; with impressive skill, energy, and insight, without recklessness or bravado, a strong President is putting it to use.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXVI

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the second article in a series on drug addiction in the "New York City in Crisis" series and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 2, 1965.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: HEROIN TRADE, GLOBAL VEINS

(NOTE.—The greatest city in the world is also the gathering place for the largest number of criminal addicts located anywhere in the Western World. Why do half the U.S. addicts live in New York? The answer is simple: because the "stuff" is here. In this, the second of a series of "New York City in Crisis" articles on New York narcotics problems, Paul Weissman traces the course of heroin from an opium bulb to an addict's arm—and after.)

(By Paul Weissman)

Raphael did not like being 15 years old. It was the year his father went back to Puerto Rico. His teachers didn't "like" him and his mother was never home. So one day he didn't say "no." He went to the men's toilet of Patrick Henry Junior High School during the lunch hour when he was supposed to be somewhere else and "popped" his first bag of heroin. It cost him $5 and it made him sick.

Raphael is 22 now. He does not remember whether that first pop was because he was mad or because he felt sick or because he thought it would make him feel good. He is sure that he knew he wouldn't get hooked. And now he was shivering on the corner of 103d Street and First Avenue in Harlem in a pair of tight chino pants, a little Rex Harrison snap brim hat, and a new duffle coat. His eyes were bright and even though he was shivering, nothing bothered him at all.

"H," he said, "is my love, my baby, my sweet tool. I got a good bag of —— this time, baby, I got the best, the most precious, the everything, the only thing. You think I could be anything without 'H?' I'd be a bum, baby."

In the palm of Raphael's brown hand was a strip of folded translucent paper no larger than two knuckles of an infant's pinky. The white powder inside contained three grains of heroin.

No one knows exactly how many tons of heroin Raphael and an uncounted number of other New York City addicts pump into their veins every year. Federal and municipal law enforcement authorities do know that the contraband heroin market has become one of the most lucrative illicit business in history.

The three grains of "everything" Raphael pumps into his left arm four, or five, or six times every day are the end product of a well-organized international drug network that provides enormous profits to every businessman, smuggler, wholesaler, and pusher who has found his way into the hierarchy. It is a well-financed cash business that functions with money that may come from any number of different sources.

It is a business that usually begins somewhere in Turkey where a farmer is waiting for the leaves to fall off a little, white, pagoda-shaped bulb that looks not unlike an exotic tulip. This farmer is licensed by the Government to grow just so many kilos (1 kilo equals 2.2 pounds) of opium. Opium is worth $5 a kilo to a pharmaceutical firm that manufactures morphine for medical use. But because restrictions are lax, the farmer secretly grows a second crop. It is worth $500 a kilo in the black market.

When the leaves fall, the farmer will instruct a worker to delicately knife an incision in each flower and collect the latex-like substance that oozes out. He will have other workers boil it and set it in molds. Raw opium is shipped in reddish brown bricks and it travels in a hundred different ways. A year ago, Iranian police found a shipment of 20 kilos sewed inside the hump of a camel in a desert caravan. The shipment was confiscated, the smugglers executed on the spot.

Though a dozen Middle Eastern countries attempt to stop traffic—frequently with such summary tactics—they are largely unsuccessful. The main black market route is the frontier that separates Turkey from Syria. It is 830 kilometers long and opium can be transported not only by camel but in tractors, agricultural equipment, and private cars. Police estimate 4 to 5 tons were smuggled through the border last year.

The city of Aleppo in Syria is a principal storage center. From there, opium is smuggled to Beirut, capital of Lebanon, a free port with free trade in foreign currency and a legal system that conveniently conceals the identity of bank depositors. In Lebanon, raw opium is converted to morphine base. Because France once had influence in the Middle East, its businessmen have organized sailors, tourists, and ship's captains into purchasing and smuggling rings.

Police believe that most of the heroin that comes to the United State is shipped from Beirut to clandestine laboratories near Marseilles, where morphine base is converted to heroin. A kilo of heroin is worth about $5,000 after processing in France.

It is sold for $8,000 after processing in France to New York and the man who buys it knows he can resell a single kilo of heroin for $16,000 to $20,000 wrapped, untouched in its original package.

A HOPELESS TASK

This smuggling can take place so easily because of the huge traffic flow to New York. In 1964, 37,235 planes and 9,556 merchant vessels entered the port of New York from all over the world. The Federal Narcotics Bureau has fewer than 300 men to protect the city from contraband and admits that even with the entire Army, Navy, marines, and merchant marines at its disposal, all shipments of heroin coming to New York might not be stopped.

In order to buy heroin, a financier usually makes contact with the mafia in New York, which refers him to the proper source. But the deal must be made with cash at a meeting in Milan or Rome, Florence, or even Paris. When the deal is consummated, half the purchase price is paid in cash. A 200-kilo shipment requires an $800,000 deposit. Then an additional $800,000 is deposited in a secret, numbered Swiss bank account.

The enormous quantities of untraceable cash required in such transactions, police believe, can only be "black money" (unreported winnings) from Las Vegas gambling tables or other businesses, most of them illicit but some of them entirely aboveboard.

One of the difficulties police have arresting traffic in heroin is that while merchandise is traveling in one direction, money is going in another. No direct exchange ever takes place. The mafia chieftain or the Las Vegas gambler who has the black market cash to finance a shipment, never sees it and never touches it. Only his money does.

The actual transaction may be as simple as this: Once someone has gone to Europe and put down an $800,000 deposit, he is told to go back to New York; he is told when his package arrives he will be notified; he is told someone will give him the key to a coin locker, a steamer trunk, or even a car, in which the shipment has been secreted in specially built traps; he is told the moment he receives the key he must call the Swiss bank and arrange for the transfer of the second $800,000 payment. Then the transaction is completed. It is a business transaction which almost does not exist at all.

WORK TO BE DONE

But it does. And so Raphael's "everything" is now in New York. But his "nickel piece" has not been "bagged" yet. It is still uncut and still wrapped in brown grocery paper. Now the financier must arrange for distribution of the shipment to the men who have struggled to gain key positions in the immensely profitable narcotics hierarchy that has grown in New York since World War II.

Here is how that hierarchy is set up:

At the very top, is the financier. He talks only to his business agent, never on the telephone and never in restaurants or bowling alleys that he thinks may be "bugged." A private automobile has become a relatively safe business place and so police have begun carefully recording the license plate numbers of all private cars that are owned by people that come in contact with anyone believed to be dealing in narcotics. The names of a world famous actor-singer, a New York nightclub entertainer and a local disc jockey among others, are in these files.

The financier needs only give his business agent less than 2 dozen names of men trusted through long association or blood ties. Only they are permitted to buy in substantial lots. These are known as the "5 kilo" and "kilo" men and they put up $20,000 in cash for every kilo they buy. Each in turn will sell his share to another 2 dozen trusted confidants. A quarter-kilo buyer will pay $10,000, an "ounce man" about $750. It is a business conducted at its highest level only among men who know and trust each other. One contact that leads to a major purchase can be worth $100,000 in quick profit. It is that simple.

As heroin is broken into smaller "pieces" in New York's narcotics hierarchy, the risk becomes greater but so do the profits. There are 15,400 grains in every ounce of pure heroin and before the heroin is "bagged" it will but "cut" from four to eight times. By the time it hits the streets, a kilo that enters the Port of New York can be worth up to $400,000.

An "ounce man" or a "quarter kilo" man puts it there. Somewhere in Harlem or Bedford-Stuyvesant, on the upper West Side of the East Bronx, he has a room in a rundown hotel that for a few days can be used as a "plant." The location may change every week and so will the workers he employs. The factory hands who work in the plant, while they work, get $40 a day. For 8 hours, they stand at a big surgical table and mix heroin with pure milk sugar. Actual dosage depends on how greedy a "cutter" may be, how many successive times the heroin is cut and how carefully a plant handles its packages. Dosage usually, but not always, is one grain that is 10 to 20 percent heroin in a $3 "bag," 3 grains in a $5 "bag." The workers mix it by slowly stirring the dry mixture with a spoon. With a half-ounce cooking scoop, they fill glassine bags, gently, carefully. Then the bags are folded over twice and sealed with Scotch tape. Fifteen $3 bags are wrapped with a rubberband. It is called "half a load" and is usually sold for $25. A load is 25 $5 bags and costs $75. Because heroin can be sniffed as well as injected, workers can become addicted in less than a month and must be replaced.

THE "EVERYTHING"

Raphael is about to get his "everything," because the heroin grown as raw opium in Turkey nearly 5,000 miles away is about to go to New York's retail market. Pushers have been fabricated as the great villains of narcotics addiction, but it is a villainy that has grown largely from society's need to identify its enemy. Most pushers are themselves addicts. They have a connection and so are able to purchase a $75 supply, sell half for $60 (by selling individual lots) and only have to steal a little to support their habit. One problem they do not have is finding customers. It is, obviously, a seller's market.

New York's junk world is almost a microcosm of the international trade in narcotics. A pusher rarely exchanges heroin directly for cash.

"I go to 116th," Raphael says, "and I see a connection. Not just any connection, but one that's got real—. The first time I walk by, I just nod and he nods back and maybe I keep walking for a block or two. When I come back, I hand him maybe a 20 so if the Man (a police officer) sees me, I can say it was a gambling debt. When I come back the third time, he tells me where he's goin' to leave it. It could be a letter box, in a garbage can, anywhere."

(This type of "drop" is similar to those shown not too long ago on a CBS television program. On some occasions—as in some instances on the show—police narcotics agents pose as addicts to obtain evidence against pushers. The CBS program, contrary to a report in yesterday's Herald Tribune, did say that some of the "customers" it filmed were undercover policemen.)

Raphael was sitting on the brown-stone steps of a tenement, tapping his feet as if he were trying to keep warm. He pulled the duffle coat hood over his head and reached into his back pocket for a handkerchief. His eyes and nose were running and he looked as if he had a bad case of the flu.

"I don't know why I got started on ——, man. It's no good. It's no good at all. One of these days I go find my father in San Juan and kick it. I get off. I'm through for good."

Raphael has been off heroin before. He does not believe that his father will help him kick the habit. He thinks that if he goes to Puerto Rico, where possession of any amount is punishable with a 5-year sentence, he will be afraid to use it. In New York, he knows that as long as he does not have more than an "eighth" (one-eighth ounce) at any one time he is only committing a misdemeanor.

WHAT'S NECESSARY

The single "bag" of heroin was in Raphael's hand. He had had a "bag" at home for a "wake up" and now he stood up, shined one scuffed shoe on the back of his pants leg and nodded his head in the direction of his house across the street.

"You want to know about ———," he said, "you got to turn on. Nobody ever got hooked on one little skin pop. You got to share with me."

Raphael did not want dinner and he refused to drink. He was tired of talking and he wanted to go home. The house he lived in smelled as though someone had been cooking in the halls in the morning and urinating in them in the afternoon. Garbage spilled over the pails on the second-floor landing and Raphael kicked an orange juice container down the stairs. He had to open two locks to get inside his one room on the fourth floor. Clothes were scattered everywhere. Burnt wooden matches—a residue of the "cooking" process—littered the floor.

"I do pretty good, man," he said, opening a closet door. Inside were 4 radios and perhaps 20 pairs of pants. Raphael likes tight pants.

"Are you chicken or are you gonna turn on?" he said. "You just gonna sit there?"

He went on for about an hour and then for fully 10 minutes stared out the window at the lights of cars moving below.

"I gotta turn on alone?" he said shrilly. "I thought you was a hep square."

Then Raphael got up and took off his duffle coat. He brought a glass mirror from the kitchen, split the small "bag" of heroin and poured it on the glass. He moved it slowly with his finger as if it suddenly had become twice as much. The world beyond his fingertip ceased to exist.

Then he began a ritual that almost seemed part of a secret religion. First he got a handful of wooden matches from the medicine chest and arranged them on the arm of the chair with the sulfur heads pointing in one direction. He took a leather belt from the closet and draped it over the back of the chair. He took a black wine bottle cap, forced it between the prongs of a hairpin, and carefully slid the white powder from the mirror into the cap. Then he went into the bathroom, and from inside a capped pipe, brought out his set of works: an eyedropper fitted with the nipple from a baby pacifier and a subcutaneous syringe. He put them in a jelly glass filled with water and brought them out. All of these tools were neatly arranged in some special order before he sat down in the chair.

READY TO COOK

Raphael was ready to "cook" now and so he took the eyedropper out of the jelly glass and attached the needle. He tied the belt around his upper arm and wound the leather out of his way. There was sweat on his forehead as he squeezed an eyedropper of water into the bottle cap "cooker," not fast, very, very slowly. Wooden matches gave a hotter flame and now Raphael lighted one with his thumbnail and began to heat the cooker.

Raphael's T-shirt was soaked. He clenched and unclenched his fist to raise the vein in his arm. When it bulged up, he filled the needle in the cooker and slid it very slowly toward the vein. He tried once and missed, then stopped to wipe his forehead with his arm. The second time, the needle went in the vein. Raphael squeezed the bulb very slowly. Stopped. And then sucked blood back into the eyedropper. Another drop, and he began to play with the needle in his arm. In and out. In and out. Two minutes later the syringe was empty and Raphael was leaning back, his eyes closed and his mouth open. Everything was perfect. He was "on the nod."

Addicts and even some medical people talk about "highs" and "euphoria." Dr. Michael J. Saliba Jr., a California physician who has made an extensive study of the physiological effects of addiction, described the sequence of events this way:

"The tiny particles, called Nissl's granules, composing the brain and spinal nerve tissue, normally receive and send out impulses from and to the ears, eyes, nose, tongue, skin, the digestive system, respiratory and circulatory systems, the muscles and the bones.

"When heroin begins to cover up these particles, the individual feels a tremendous exhilaration. The nerve impulses which cause normal apprehensions are the first to be muted. Worries disappear; a pleasant, warm, almost mystical sensation sets in—temporarily. With continued use the narcotic throws the whole sensory apparatus out of line. Pleasing perceptions are magnified, unpleasant ones diminished. An agreeable 5 minutes seems like an hour, Ordinary noises sound like music.

"By the time he takes his second or third dose the narcotic covers over more and more nerve tissue particles. The body's defense mechanisms go to work to replace them. He becomes hypersensitive. The amount of narcotic which muted the original number of Nissl's granules will not cover the new particles. The addict must take more drugs.

A BOMBARDMENT

"Soon there are several hundred times the number of normal nerve tissues particles. He feels under terrible bombardment, as though his head were about to explode, his bones ache, his muscles jump uncontrollably. Intense vomiting and diarrhea begin. Sounds are deafening, taste nauseating."

All of this first began to happen to Raphael years before. He was 15 then, 22 now. At 16, in order to support his habit, Raphael became a "crib cracker" (burglar). He drew a "pen bit," 3 years, and when he got out he was caught again. This time, he was sent to Napanan, a juvenile correctional institution. Later, he was committed to Rikers Island for a year and 8 months. The day he got out, he went back on heroin. He has had himself voluntarily committed to the Federal narcotics hospital in Lexington, Ky., and been detoxified by the board of health at least twice at New York's Manhattan General Hospital. Nothing worked. Each time he got out there was a problem and the solution was heroin. This is how his life—and the lives of tens of thousands of other New York addicts—went.

Raphael was awake now and he wanted to tell about how he became the cat burglar of the East Side. It was not very clear except that two or three mornings every week, he would take a "fix" before he shaved and dressed up to go to work. His work was in the nineties between Park and Madison Avenue.

"Single people live there," he said at one point, "nobody home in the morning."

THE PROBLEM: RESALE

Raphael goes to the east nineties, he says, because he likes nice houses. "They got record players, watches, good clothes, all kinds of things you can sell around here." Raphael has a simple method of operation. He looks for an open door in a brownstone house. If he can get in, he goes to the top floor and knocks on a door. If someone answers he asks for Mr. Smith and then apologizes and goes away. If there is no answer, it takes him less than 10 seconds to pry open a lock with a screwdriver.

"Very few guys can steal like me," he says. "I'm a cat. I'm fast. No cop can catch me and I never get scared."

As soon as Raphael finds something he can carry he leaves the apartment and goes up on the roof. He does not want to go out the same front door he came in. A roof takes him to another building. As soon as he is back on the street he finds a taxicab.

"Nobody ever asks questions, no matter what you're carrying. The only real problem you got is getting what the stuff is worth. Even when you sell it to the neighbors, they try to cheat you. There are just too many junkies out stealing."

Raphael talked all night long about all the great times he had had and all the great times he was going to have and about how awful it was to be a junkie. "They goin' to make it legal some day," he said—it was now 2 a.m.—"and then nobody will have nothing to do for kicks."

He talked about cold turkey and he talked about the pills a doctor gave him before he was taken to court. He talked about "Article IX" (the Metcalf-Voelker law which permits a convicted addict to choose voluntary civil commitment instead of jail under certain circumstances) and he said it was for suckers. "You got to do 5 months and then you get on parole for 3 years," he said. "I can do a year if I get caught and be finished."

He talked about his last prison term when he got a bus ticket to New York and $7. It made him angry to remember that the authorities would not give him the money until he got on the bus. When he was tired of talking about all the cribs he had cracked, he talked again about Puerto Rico and kicking it for good.

"Next week I go to San Juan," he said. "Then I'm through for good."

By 5 a.m. Raphael had fallen asleep, his speech now almost incoherent. He could not decide whether he should plan bigger jobs than crib cracking, and take the risk of a bigger penalty, or go off drugs for good.

He woke up at 9 a.m., tense, nervous, and sweating. "It isn't so bad when you got stuff," he said. "I can wait. I can wait a long time."

GETTING READY

He did. Instead of using the last bag, Raphael carefully shaved, brushed his teeth and began to dress. He wanted to look perfect. When he was dressed, he draped his suit jacket across the back of the armchair and began the ritual of his fix all over again. He did not dawdle now, and when he was finished, he did not shut his eyes.

"Let's go," he said. "I'll teach you how to crack a crib."

On the street, Raphael took a deep breath. "Man, this is my city," he said, "I own it. I got it made. Fifty bucks is all the bread I gotta make today and I'm good for 3 days. I'm gonna cop a mink coat and some diamond earrings. I can feel it. I know it."

At 96th Street, Raphael turned west. "Baby, I'll be back in an hour with the bread," he said. "I'm gonna make a big one, baby, a real big one. This is my day."

An hour later, Raphael had the money from whatever he had stolen. He would use it to buy another supply of heroin, and in doing so in his small way contribute to keeping the international flow of drugs and money going. Like the thousands of other addicts in New York, he probably didn't care how his small transaction fitted into the greater picture. For him it was only another day, another 24 hours dedicated to the search, acquisition, and use of "the best, the most precious, the everything, the only thing."

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXVII

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the third part on drug addiction from the series on "New York City in Crisis."

The present article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 3, 1965, and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—THE CANCER OF NARCOTICS: THESE ARE THE DRUGS

(NOTE.—Even as it is eating away at the heart of New York City, the cancer of dope addiction is spreading outward. Yesterday a countywide raid netted 40 arrests in exurban Suffolk County, and while the estimates of "millions of dollars" of drugs confiscated were obviously highly exaggerated, the police crackdown emphasized the dangers to the entire metropolitan community. Just what are the various drugs that addicts use, and what are the differences among them? Reporter Paul Weissman, in his continuing series on narcotics as part of the Herald Tribune's examination of "New York City in Crisis," today describes the drugs which have made this city the addiction capital of the Western World.)

Addiction to "chemical comforters" has been an American problem for more than a century.

The first drug used was morphine and without more sophisticated pharmacology doctors used it to treat almost everything from arthritis to gunshot wounds. Other opium derivitives were included in nostrums, cough syrups and hundreds of other proprietary medicines.

Thirty years after the Civil War, doctors believed they had a solution to what was becoming a serious program of morphine addiction. They had a new drug called heroin, a synthetic opiate, they thought could be used to wean addicts from morphine. It proved to be five times more addicting than the drug it was meant to replace. Heroin was quickly declared contraband for any purpose whatever in the United States and the first black market developed.

World War II virtually ended America's heroin problem. Without marine or air traffic, drugs were not widely available. The handful of addicts that needed heroin turned to morphine and other, less addictive drugs. In the process, many "matured out," quit drugs and stayed clean.

When the war ended, a new crime syndicate, the Mafia, developed the heroin market. By now, there were also new and more sophisticated "chemical comforters." Here are the major drugs:

Heroin: Black market price: $5 for a 3-grain "bag" containing 20 percent pure heroin. Street names: To Jews, "shmeck"; in Spanish, "lecata" or "caballo"; in Harlem, "smack," "dogee" or "babagna." Also called "H" and "horse," or a four-letter word by which it is known everywhere, that means excrement. The euphemism is "stuff." A contraband drug in the United States. An addictive drug. A depressant.

Heroin is an addictive drug that users must have as often as four, five and six times every day. Painful physical and psychological symptoms accompany deprivation of the drug. Heroin can either be sniffed from a "quill" (folded matchbook cover); "popped," injected under the skin; or injected directly into the vein. The hypodermic used to inject white powder, after it has been heated and dissolved in water, is a "set of works." The drug has a highly euphoric effect.

Barbiturates: Black market price: 10 cents to 50 cents a capsule. Street names: "blue heavens," "yellow jackets," "red devils" and "green hornets." Extremely addictive. Acts as a depressant.

Barbiturates, or "goof balls," are blue, white, yellow or red pills that are often taken by addicts in quantities of 10, 15, and 20 a day. They have such a strong sedative effect that users can sometimes be detected from the scar tissue on their cigarette fingers, because it is not unusual for heavy users to fall asleep smoking and feel no pain. Withdrawal from barbiturates is far more difficult than heroin withdrawal. Death may occur from abrupt cessation of the drug. Barbiturates are usually favored by addicts who must maintain a tremendous pace, one that they are physically and/or emotionally incapable of sustaining. Some 1,500 types of barbiturates are legally sold on prescription in the United States.

Amphetamines: Black market price: 10 cents a capsule. Street names: "bennies," "copilots," "helpers." An addictive drug. A stimulant.

Amphetamines have almost the opposite effect of barbiturates. They are pep pills, occasionally prescribed as an aid to dieting, that produce a temporary sense of elation, relief of fatigue and a feeling of increased ability. Dieters that use them burn off excess energy. Teenagers find they sometimes induce a sense of physical and emotional superiority. Confirmed users are not infrequently "go-go" salesmen or business executives, overstimulated with false energy, who must keep taking more pills to keep going. Heavy users are subject to periodic blackouts. Desoxyn, an aphetamine widely sold on the black market in New York for 50 cents per glass ampule, is used by heroin addicts either alone or as a solvent. The combination is called a "speedball" or "bombita." Amphetamines can be used legally on the advice of a physician and are sold on prescription.

Cocaine: Black market price: $10 per "cap," a small capsule containing two or three grains. Also sold in glassine bags indistinguishable from heroin or wrapped in silver foil. Street names: "C" and "girl." A nonaddictive drug. A sexual stimulant.

Derived from the leaves of the coca plant, cocaine acts as a stimulant on the nervous system. Some scientists believe it increases mental and physical powers, but creates considerable perceptual disturbance that can lead to paranoia. Cocaine addicts frequently carry firearms to respond to stimulation. The drug, a white powder that glistens like small diamonds, is usually crushed and "snorted" as if it were snuff. Heavy users have been known to burn a hole through the nasal septum. Though the drug has become somewhat rare in New York, police who arrest heroin and marihuana sellers frequently find a small supply of cocaine. It is a drug popular with people that frequent after-hours clubs. Cocaine is an illegal drug in the United States.

Marihuana: Black market price: $100 to $150 per pound (wholesale); cigarettes, $1 each. Street names: "weed," "pot" and several hundred others throughout the world. A stimulant. A mild habit-forming drug, if used regularly.

Marihuana, like hashish, originates in various hemp plants grown in almost every part of the world. It is so easy to grow, police have found 16-foot plants in a Bronx backyard and a field of "pot" behind rhododendron plantings on the Merritt Parkway in Connecticut. It is taken for its psychic effect and can be smoked, chewed, ingested, or sniffed.

Some smokers become ill the first time they use marihuana, others notice a lightness, a feeling of power and distortion of time and space. Some confirmed users describe distortions of body sensations with feelings that arms and legs are not attached to the body. In mixed parties, giggling laughter is not unusual, nor are increased sexual drive and a voracious appetite. A favorite cause of intellectuals who disenfranchised themselves from society, and now picked up by college students, is a fight for the legalization of marihuana on the grounds that every individual has the "right" to use drugs if they are not dangerous. A basic objection to the argument is that the drug is dangerous to some individuals, but more important is the basic precept that people should not be permitted to prescribe drugs for themselves. It has also been shown, somewhat conclusively, that young people led to experiment with marihuana frequently need a "bigger kick." They have to give up what hardened addicts call "kid stuff" and try something better: heroin. Marihuana is an illegal drug in the United States.

Cough sirups: Recently, the apparent drug of choice of most New York teenagers. A dozen cough sirups that contain 1 percent codeine per fluid ounce are widely available. "Hydrocan," "Cosanyl" and "Robitussin AC" are the trade names of three of them. Codeine is an addictive narcotic drug that provides a slight "lift." Teenagers frequently use it to wash down goof balls. The law affecting the sale of this dangerous drug requires pharmacists to report sales in a book they must maintain called the "exempt narcotics registry" and limits them from selling more than 4 ounces to one person at one time. A year ago, a bill was introduced in the State legislature that would have made it illegal to sell exempt narcotics to anyone under 21 without a prescription. Pharmacists objected and the bill was defeated. It has been introduced again in 1965 and the Pharmaceutical Society of the State of New York has announced it will support it.

Other drugs: These are rarer in the illicit drug market. Opium is almost never seen. Morphine, still used for medical purposes, is rarely used by American addicts, partly because it does not provide a "lift." Paregoric, camphorated tincture of opium, has been used by heroin addicts during a "panic" (shortage). The camphor can be burned off in the top of a mayonnaise jar, leaving a small quantity of morphine.

Recently, hallucinogenic, or consciousness-expanding drugs have been introduced on the American black market. Some are ancient, others are experimental. LSD 25, mescaline and ololiqui are almost as old as Western culture. Some new derivatives are psilocybin and psilocin. All induce sharp changes in states of awareness, perception, self-perception and communication with others, lending to their vogue among people who experiment with drugs. At present, hallucinogenic drugs are used legally almost entirely for research purposes.

THE 700TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF DANTE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, sometime in the middle of May, 700 years ago, the great Italian poet Dante Alighieri was born. The first glimmers of the Italian Renaissance, the movement that was to sweep Europe in the next three centuries, had barely made an appearance in 1265. Yet Dante was, in many respects, the complete Renaissance man. He had magnificent command of the learning of his time. He turned to the works of the great philosophers of Greece and Rome as well as to the teachings of the church for inspiration. He took an active part in the politics of his time. He was an artist—a poet above all—who has come to be recognized as one of the great masters of the written word in the Western World.

This year, colleges and universities, and other centers of learning throughout the world will commemorate the 700th anniversary of Dante's birth. There could be no more ample demonstration of Dante's stature as a universal poet, as a poet whose words speak to us today as they did to the men of his own time. Indeed, the contemporary relevance of Dante's works and his increasing appeal to the modern world were themes that were stressed at a recent symposium held at the Library of Congress. Here, it was pointed out that the part of Dante's immortal "Commedia" that strikes modern readers with the greatest force is probably the "Inferno." For here we can find the darker aspects of modern civilization and the uglier or more pathetic characteristics of 20th-century man rendered in the vivid 13th-century imagery of a master psychologist.

The "Commedia" was undoubtedly Dante's greatest work. But there are two other works that I would like to single out as worthy of attention and reflection during this year of remembrance. The first is "De Vulgari Eloquentia." In this treatise, Dante set out to establish the Italian language as a literary tongue. It was his hope that this language, as distinguished from local dialects, would become a bond of unity among the Italian people and would make them a nation, no longer feuding among themselves and distinct from other nations. Thus Dante, preceded by a few, and followed by many others, was an apostle of Italian unity.

The second work that I would like to mention is "De Monarchia." Here we find the dreams of Dante the political philosopher, Dante the man of action whose experiences have turned him to political reflection. Exiled from his native Florence by the victory of an opposing faction, and forced to observe during his wanderings the price paid by the Italian city states for their divisions and their feuds, Dante came to dream of unity and of peace, not only for Italy but also for the nations of the world. He envisioned these nations united under a rule of justice in a new Holy Roman Empire. The particular remedy he sought for the troubles of the time in which he lived is not one that we would necessarily endorse today. But the dream of peace and the rule of law remains with us.

On the occasion of the 700th anniversary of the birth of Dante I would, therefore, like to pay homage not only to Dante the poet, but also to Dante the apostle of Italian unity and to Dante the political philosopher.

PROPOSED CLOSINGS OF TWO NAVAL SHIPYARDS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. HUOT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Members of Congress and U.S. Senators testified before the House Armed Services Committee in opposition to the proposed closing of two of our naval shipyards.

An excellent statement was made before this committee by my distinquished New Hampshire colleague, the junior Senator from New Hampshire, TOM MCINTYRE. Under previous permission, Mr. Speaker, I insert Senator MCINTYRE's statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR TOM MCINTYRE BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES ON SHIPYARD CLOSINGS

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify here today on the shipyard closings ordered by the Secretary of Defense last November. As a member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I am especially aware of the outstanding work of this committee in its contribution to the strength and preparedness of our Nation's Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard should be kept open. I submit that (1) the Nation needs the capabilities now at Portsmouth, (2) that the operational disabilities attributed to Portsmouth are inaccurate, (3) that the cost figures comparing navy and private shipyard costs used to support the closing are subject to differing interpretations and do not support the conclusions which were reached, and (4) that the economic impact on the region concerned would cause losses to the Federal, State, and local governments which would far exceed the suggested savings.

I want to make it clear that I shall not suggest that some other Navy shipyard be closed instead of Portsmouth. I have not studied the other bases, and I am not fully familiar with their capabilities. In my testimony I shall mention other yards where the DOD has incorrectly compared them with Portsmouth. My general feeling, which was so well presented in Commander J. J. Meyer's article, "Our Nation's Shipyards," in the November 1964 Proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute, is that we need them all, and that one of the reasons advanced for the closing of Navy yards, the preservation of private yards, is the product of erroneous logic.

Now, I would like to speak to the points I have raised.

1. THE NATION NEEDS THE CAPABILITIES NOW IN PORTSMOUTH

Portsmouth has three major capabilities that are of crucial importance for fleet support. These are submarine design capability, nuclear submarine overhaul capability, and nuclear submarine construction capability. I would like to take these one by one.

Submarine design capability

Portsmouth has the only submarine design capability in the Navy, the only other shipyard having design capability being the General Dynamics Electric Boat Co. in Groton, Conn. The DOD says that if Portsmouth is closed, this capability should be retained and established elsewhere (p. 15 of DOD summary). This involves the assumption that submarine design capability can be easily moved.

Mr. Chairman, with your long experience in military affairs, I am sure you know as well as I that submarine design capability is not a commodity that can be loaded into box cars, shipped to a new location, and set up in a few days. What we are talking about is not primarily machines and buildings. What we are talking about is men, men who have spent long years developing the skills and know-how necessary to design submarines. These men are not available in the labor markets of Philadelphia, or Norfolk, or anywhere else, except in one private shipyard. The Navy cannot take its men and their families, tear them up by the roots, and transplant them to some other place. It would take years to build elsewhere the capability for submarine design we now have in Portsmouth, and in the meantime, the Navy would be wholly dependent on the capabilities of one private firm. It would have no standard for judgment as to whether costs were justifiable or not, and even if it did have, it would have no alternative to using the private firm. This submarine design capability is essential to the fleet. DOD agrees. Portsmouth has it now.

Nuclear submarine overhaul capability

Portsmouth is one of the three facilities on the east coast with capability to overhaul and repair nuclear submarines. The others are in Charleston and in Norfolk. The Chief of Naval Operations requires that there be three naval shipyards on each coast capable of overhauling nuclear submarines. Three shipyards are listed in the summary under the heading "Full Capability—presently engaged in This Type of Work" (table I, p. 6a). One of the very important elements of capability is experience of the men who do the work, so we asked Navy to tell us how long each of the yards had had this capability. Pertinent paragraphs in a letter from Admiral

Brockett, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, dated May 14, 1965, read as follows:

"Portsmouth entered the new construction nuclear submarine program in fiscal year 1955. Developing on this base, it acquired the overhaul capability on June 30, 1959.

"The east coast repair yards were brought in later to suit developing needs as shown below: Charleston, June 1, 1963; Norfolk, January 1, 1965.

The fact that the Department of Defense summary dated November 17, 1964, stated that Norfolk had the capability as of the date of the report, and was "presently engaged in this type of work," we will presume to be a stretching of the truth. However, the length of time required to overhaul a nuclear submarine runs at least 12 months, and it takes 4 years to train a journeyman shipyard worker. While Charleston, with about 2 years of experience, could be considered fully capable of performing such work, Norfolk, which had not had time to do even one-half of the job of overhauling a nuclear submarine, much less develop a competent work force with all the skill and know-how required, could not yet be considered a fully dependable facility.

Even if Charleston and Norfolk are considered to be fully capable of handling nuclear submarine repairs, the Chief of Naval Operations has said that three such yards are needed. I am sure that the Navy, now having gone through the very difficult task of setting up nuclear submarine overhaul capabiltiy in Charleston and in Norfolk, is aware of the complexity and difficulty of doing so, and if there were not an overriding concern for showing dollar savings, would much prefer to keep the facility operating at Portsmouth, instead of dismantling it and trying to convince men to move to some other base.

The 10 year phasing-out period which is planned, is said to be based primarily on easing the economic impact on the community. However, an immediate closing would leave the Navy with only two overhaul facilities for nuclear submarines of the three required, and only one can be called experienced. It seems to me that the delay is at least as much for the benefit of the Navy as for the community.

There are certain advantages in the facilities now at Portsmouth which do not exist elsewhere. Besides the expertise, built up over the years, the extensive experience in experimental development, and capability for expansion for missile support if needed, Portsmouth has covered ways which permit work with no interruption due to bad weather.

Nuclear submarine repair and overhaul capability again, is not the kind of capability that is primarily dependent on machines and facilities. It is primarily dependent on the skills and experience of the men who provide it. Again, we cannot load this capability into boxcars and ship it where we will. Nuclear submarine overhaul capability is needed in three east coast Navy shipyards. Charleston has it, Norfolk has it, and Portsmouth has it.

Nuclear submarine construction capability

Little is said in the DOD summary about need for this capability. It is assumed that there is not enough work to utilize navy yards at capacity, and that with the need to provide work for private yards, it is likely that utilization will drop to something like 50 percent. This covers both new construction and overhaul work. We do not have figures for how much new construction is needed, but we can assume some will be needed. There are only two navy yards now constructing nuclear submarines, Mare Island and Portsmouth. All others are being built in private shipyards. To abolish this capability in a time of international tension would not impress the world with the readiness of the United States to defend its interests and the interests of others seeking peace. Portsmouth has completed five nuclear submarines and is now working on four more. Its capability is fully demonstrated. In addition, the skilled work force in Portsmouth has been given responsibility for work on two experimental deep-diving submarines, the *Albacore* and the *Dolphin*. The yard also built five prototype submarines.

The Navy should have inhouse capability to build nuclear submarines on the east coast. Portsmouth has it.

II OPERATIONAL DISABILITIES ATTRIBUTED TO PORTSMOUTH ARE INACCURATE

In the 22 pages of the Defense Department's "Summary of Study of Naval Requirements for Shipyard Capacity," many reasons are given for the rejection of Portsmouth as one of the shipyards to be retained. However, if the summary is reviewed carefully, it can be seen that Portsmouth is ruled out by stipulation, rather than because of a cost analysis or because of a lack of need for its facilities.

The stipulation consists of two parts:

1. Need for drydocks, and
2. Proximity to ships homeported in Boston-Quonset-Newport area.

Need for drydocks

The number of drydocks needed as standbys for mobilization is not stated in the report. However it can be deduced from the statements on page 10 of the summary as being not more than 12. (Philadelphia and Portsmouth could be closed without a deficit, leaving Boston and New York, having six each. Portsmouth has three and Philadelphia has seven.) Thus, if two yards are to be closed, obviously Portsmouth must be one, not because its capabilities are unneeded, but because it doesn't have enough drydocks.

The deficit, however, is not as bad as it seems. The summary goes on to say that in the event New York is closed, the drydock at Bayonne should be retained. This would leave a possible combination of Philadelphia (7), Portsmouth (3), Bayonne (1), totaling 11, just one short of the magic number 12. If we then take the added capabilities needed which are in the process of being acquired or would have to be acquired to make sure that the Navy's "strategic and operational requirements as expressed by CNO" (p. 6a) are met, obviously other drydocks would have to be added. So, the number of drydocks is not really an insurmountable problem.

Proximity to ships homeported in Boston-Quonset-Newport area

After we deal with the first part of the stipulation ruling out Portsmouth, we find a second. The Chief of Naval Operations has stipulated that the closure of both Boston and New York would be unacceptable. All other possible combinations of closures of two bases, given the stated need for dry docks, automatically include Portsmouth. Thus this means that Portsmouth again is being ruled out by stipulation rather than on the merits.

What is the basis of this stipulation? The Navy has found that "Overhauls at substantial distances from homeports adversely affect morale and reenlistment rates." I am sure that no one would argue with this. Everyone agrees that extended distances would cut the time that men could be with their families when a ship is in for overhaul. However, let us look at just how substantial the distances would be for ships homeported in the Boston-Quonset-Newport areas as compared with the acceptable yards at New York and Boston.

If Boston were kept as the open yard for overhauls, the distance from homeport in Boston would be zero, the distance from home ports in Newport-Quonset would be 75 miles. If New York were kept as the open yard for overhauls, the distance from homeports in Boston would be 215 miles; the distance from Newport-Quonset would be 160 miles.

According to the Chief of Naval Operations (p. 17), these would be acceptable distances from homeports. Now, what would be the distance from homeports if Portsmouth were the overhaul base?

The distance from homeports in Boston would be 50 miles, all super highway. The distance from homeports in the Newport-Quonset area would be 125 miles. These distances are substantially less than the distances acceptable for New York.

Suppose we do abolish the overhaul facilities in Portsmouth, and are able to develop the submarine overhaul capabilities elsewhere, then what? The summary suggests they might be established in Philadelphia. What does that do to submarines homeported in the Boston-Quonset-Newport areas? Submarines homeported in Boston would be overhauled 290 miles away. It seems to me that these distances come close to being substantial enough to adversely affect morale and reenlistment rates. Until such a facility were established in Philadelphia, the nearest Navy shipyard with capability for overhaul of nuclear submarines would be Norfolk, about 600 miles from the Boston-Quonset-Newport area.

Mr. Chairman, the operational disabilities attributed to Portsmouth are not disabilities. The views of the DOD summary do not take the whole picture into account. Instead they tend to pick out elements which would rule out Portsmouth. This kind of reasoning seems to me an attempt to justify a decision rather than an attempt to weigh the facts before arriving at a conclusion.

III. COMPARISON OF PRIVATE AND NAVY SHIPYARD COSTS

It is obvious that a naval shipyard costs money. The DOD, (p. 13) estimates an average saving of $15 million on closing a shipyard because of fixed overhead and upkeep costs. However, the Department also states that if it were to increase the conversion, alteration and repair work done in naval shipyards from the present level of 65 percent to the former level of about 80 percent overall savings to DOD would be between $10 to $15 million annually (p. 12). The Department says that a healthy, competitive, private shipyard construction industry is desirable to produce the lowest cost to it. It further states that if the past average price differential of 16.2 percent in favor of private shipyards continues, use of private shipyards is more economical.

This brings up a question we need to ask. Is the 16.2 percent differential the result of a "healthy competitive private industry?" In a very well done article in the November 1964 U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, Commander J. J. Meyer, Jr., USN, points out that we do not have a healthy industry now. In fact, (p. 43) private industry incurred losses on 5 of the 14 new construction ships on which the Anderson report was based, and earned only one-half of 1 percent profit on a sample of 79 ships for which repairs and alterations were contracted.

What will happen when there are fewer naval shipyards than now and the private shipyards need not bid against reasonable competition? I cannot but imagine that their prices will go up, and we, the Congress and the taxpayer, through the Department of Defense, will start paying substantially more for work done in private shipyards than is now being paid in Navy yards.

It seems quite obvious that private shipyards are not healthy, that they are tailoring their bids in order to get work to stay open, not in order to make a profit, and any analysis that assumes that cutting down on Navy shipyards will cure their illness, is just not facing the facts.

Recent statements of Nicholas Johnson, our Maritime Administrator (Navy, Mar. 1965, pp. 12–51) in commenting on the large subsidies for shipbuilders (ranging from 53 to 55 percent) and to ship operators, suggest the possibility of spending U.S. money in foreign shipyards because the product will be cheaper and better. Are we being asked to shutdown Navy shipyards so we can spend money overseas for merchant ships?

In the costs of our naval shipyards, we include items private yards do not need so that we can have the flexibility to meet fleet needs. When a ship comes in for overhaul, work on new construction is frequently interrupted at some expense in order to get the ship back into shape and out to sea again. In emergencies, the entire resources of the yard are brought to bear without regard for the added costs for interruptions of lower priority work. Despite these considerations, despite the fact that the naval shipyard must keep on the payroll its highly skilled work force at times when there is little work to do because it is known from experience that they will be needed, the cost differential is only 16.2 percent in private shipyards. Furthermore, if work is increased in the naval shipyards, even up to 50 percent, the fixed costs do not rise, and the cost differential would not only drop, it would probably be reversed.

If we destroy our in-house capabilities to do this kind of work, and depend on private yards to do it, we will find ourselves paying as much or more for the basic work without the flexibility needed for quick overhauls and emergencies.

Now, what about these cost figures which compare private yards with navy yards? The Anderson report breaks these into two main categories: construction and conversion, and repairs and alterations. I will deal mostly with the part relating to submarines, which is of particular concern to Portsmouth. In the summary (sec. 1, p. 3), the construction costs of several types of ships are listed. The list is as follows:

	Percent by which average private shipbuilders' costs were less than naval shipyard costs to the—	
	Department of Defense	Government
Nuclear attack submarines (SSN 589 class)	10.0	15.2
Nuclear ballistic missle submarines (SSBN 598 class)	12.4	20.3
Guided missile frigates (DLG 9 class)	16.4	18.7
Attack aircraft carriers (CVA 59 class)	25.4	31.4

I assume it is from these figures that DOD comes up with the 16.2 percent average differential between the costs charged at private shipyards and the costs at naval shipyards. These figures are quite impressive. However, let us look at the basis for the figures. In the nuclear attack submarine class, 28 submarines were authorized during fiscal years 1955–62. For various reasons, all but five, were excluded from the sample. Of the five, only one was built in a naval shipyard, Mare Island. The other four were built in private shipyards. While we can assume that four submarines built in private shipyards gives adequate basis for figuring an average cost, it is hardly likely that we can assume that we have reached a valid average cost figure with one submarine built in a navy yard. Mr. Chairman, the use of averages in such a way reminds me of the story of the man who nearly drowned, crossing a river that averaged only 4 feet deep. In the nuclear ballistic missile submarine class, 29 were authorized during fiscal years 1958–62, of which only five form the sample used to compare costs. Of these, two were built in naval shipyards, one at Mare Island and the other at Portsmouth. This is a better sample, but hardly one which warrants the conclusions drawn in the report and in subsequent actions by DOD.

But there is another fact which is mentioned in the Anderson report (p. 4 of sec. 1). That is that the percentages used are based on shipbuilders' costs and not on total end costs to either the Government or DOD. These total end costs include "noncomparable" design and engineering costs as well as many types of Government furnished material and equipment, and are over and above the shipbuilders' costs by amounts ranging from $20 to $80 million. Let us take a look at how these total end costs compare.

[Dollars in thousands]

	Total end costs		Percentage by which private yard costs are lower (or higher)
	Naval shipyards	Private shipyards	
Attack nuclear submarines (SSN).	$50,541	$50,282	0.5 percent lower.
Ballistic missile nuclear submarines (SSBN).	111,970	131,275	15 percent higher.
Guided missile frigates (DLG).	61,012	46,400	31 percent lower.
Attack carriers (CVA).	218,832	181,082	20 percent lower.

Even with the lower utilization of Navy yards and the fixed high overhead costs, the total end cost of nuclear attack submarines is almost the same, and the total end cost of nuclear ballistic missile submarines is 15 percent lower. In my experience, one-time and noncomparable costs have a way of recurring. At any rate, the size of the sample and the extreme difficulty of finding comparable costs make the Anderson report an extremely shaky basis for taking steps which may cripple the ability of the Navy to mobilize the fleet support which is necessary in the event of mobilization.

Now, I would like to turn to the overhaul and repair section of the Anderson report. The ships used in the sample are essentially commercial types of ships, including ammunition ships, oilers, attack transports, and cargo ships, and some landing ships. The kind of work used in the study was limited to underwater hull work on these types of ships. No warships were included. In other words, the work compared was relatively simple work which does not require the skilled journeymen who make up the backbone of the Navy shipyards. The DOD recognizes this in their summary (p. 12) which indicates that in many cases it is cheaper to perform such work in-house rather than contracting it out. This is especially true of ships like nuclear submarines, which require the kind of security and safety measures for which few private yards are willing to bear the expense.

A further element is worthy of consideration. In many overhaul jobs, the full extent of the work to be done cannot be determined until the overhaul work is well underway. In a Navy shipyard, if the work is needed, it is done, and it is done quickly and efficiently. In a private yard, new contracts have to be drawn up and negotiated, and must, in legal terms, state all the work which is necessary. If further work is found to be required, further contract negotiations must then be undertaken.

What is the effect of these renegotiations? In the sample of 79 ships reviewed by the Anderson report, the original profit margin in the contracts was 0.4 percent. In the final cost to the Navy, after renegotiations, the profit margin was 4.5 percent, an increase of over 20 percent (p. 39, sec. 3). The amount of money the Navy had to pay out for the additional profit alone amounted to about $1 million, or well over $100,000 for each ship. This kind of ballooning of costs does not occur in a naval yard.

The quality of the overhauls done by private and Navy shipyards is a difficult thing to measure; however, on a sample of 175 ships, the average length of time in service before the next overhaul was needed was 21.3 months for those done in Navy yards and 20.1 months for ships overhauled in private shipyards. For only three types of ships of 15 in the sample was the length of time in service shorter after a Navy yard overhaul, and the maximum was 3 months. For three types the time was the same, and for nine types the length of time in service was longer after the Navy yard overhaul, ranging up to 7 months longer than for comparable ships done in private yards (exhibit 13, sec. 3).

Impact on economy

The DOD summary recognizes that the Portsmouth Shipyard has an impact on the economy of the area. It doesn't show how important it is. Mr. Thomas Prentiss, coordinator of the seacoast regional plan of the States of New Hampshire and Maine, recently spelled out the impact of such a closing in his testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate Committe on Banking and Currency. He made these points:

The naval shipyard is the largest single employer in northern New England, that is, north of Boston. It employs an average of 8,000 workers and has an average annual payroll of $65 million. Each such job creates another job in local production, and these two jobs generally sustain six people. Thus 16,000 people will be out of work, and 48,000 people of the some 170,000 people in the Portsmouth region are affected—or almost one-third of the population. About 80 percent of the 170,000 live in New Hampshire and about 20 percent in Maine.

Neither New Hampshire nor Maine has the resources to absorb this kind of impact. In a report of "Regional Development Needs of the New England Economy," Elizabeth M. Heidbreder, an analyst in the Legislative Reference Service, brings out the following information:

1. In per capita income in 1963, both States are below the average for the United States, which is itself below the average for New England.

2. Manufacturing industries have provided less jobs than before for New England, the 1964 loss being 10,700 jobs. Textile jobs decreased 144,700 in the decade ending in 1959, and 13,300 more were lost between 1960–63. In less than 15 years, New England has lost nearly 170,000 industrial jobs.

As you can see, we do not have the number of jobs in industry that can absorb the number of people who will be affected, much less the kinds of industries that will employ them in the skills that they have learned over the years.

Again, it is very hard for us here to imagine the impact on the community there, so I would like to use a couple of examples with which you gentlemen may be better acquainted.

The Charleston, S.C., metropolitan area includes about 253,000 people. Imagine, if you will, several industries employing a total of 12,000 men with payrolls of about $100 million moving out of town, and 12,000 others being thrown out of work because of the lost payroll—a total of 24,000 unemployed. Adding dependents, 72,000 persons will be affected.

Or, take the Boston metropolitan area, which includes about 2,595,000 people. Imagine several industries employing a total of 116,000 people with payrolls of $943 million moving out of town, and 116,000 others being thrown out of work—a total of 232,000 unemployed. Adding dependents, 696,000 persons would be affected.

I know these examples seem extreme. However, it is worse than it seems. The working population is approximately one-third of the total population, and the magnitude of the impact can be seen when we realize that nearly one-third of the work force is being put out of work, and the remaining two-thirds is being expected to absorb them.

Some of you can remember, as I can, the depression and the terrible effects of those years on all our citizens. During the worst year of the depression, one out of four workers was out of work. The entire resources of the United States were brought to bear in that situation of critical need. As a result, slowly and painfully and expensively the Nation began its climb back to full productivity. However, it is well to remember that even in 1941 with the war clouds gathering, unemployment was still almost 10 percent. It took 9 years and a war economy to eradicate the effects of the depression.

If all the shipyard workers stay in the Portsmouth area, our unemployment will be one in three substantially worse than the worst year of the depression. If half the shipyard workers accept employment outside the area, then our unemployment will be approximately 21 percent, or about what it was nationally in 1934.

Can you imagine the Federal resources that will have to be poured into the area if this happens to us? The Appalachia program will be relatively insignificant.

But we are not asking for a tremendous infusion of Federal funds. We are asking for the continuation of facilities and capabilities which are needed for the defense of our Nation. DOD says it can save between $16 and $19.8 million annually by closing the shipyard. I believe that within a year, we will be able to show that the Navy will save money if it keeps Portsmouth open as well as having the best nucelar submarine construction and overhaul yard in the Nation.

Improvements at Portsmouth

The Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., is working very hard to improve the cost-effectiveness of the shipyard. They have organized a board of governors with 39 area members from New Hampshire, Maine, and Massachusetts, 26 shipyard members, and 14 community members from the immediate area, and in addition, an advisory council. One of the main efforts of the committee is to help management in a program of cost-reduction, and encourage workers to improve their productivity, both in effectiveness and in efficiency.

This program has just been begun, but it and efforts over the last year are promising to bear fruit. Even under the fiscal year 1964 cost-reduction program, the yard reduced costs by $5,308,600—over $3 million more than the goal of $2,132,400. This was not the best showing, 4 of 11 yards showing greater savings, but it is an indication of real improvement.

The present efforts of the committee are reaching the workers in a very effective way, and the months to come should show dramatic improvement.

Several examples of the kind of service I mean have been brought to my attention.

1. A regular overhaul of the SS *Angler* was completed last winter ahead of schedule and at lower than average cost.

2. The main motor was replaced in the U.S.S. *Blenny* this spring. Portsmouth got the job with a bid which was about three-fourths the amount bid by another yard and requiring two-thirds of the time. The ship was delivered on schedule and for less cost than bid.

3. The SS *Sea Leopard* required replacement of main battery propulsion cables. Portsmouth got the job on the basis of a bid about two-thirds of the next lower bid and for about two-thirds the time. The submarine was delivered on time despite some additional work which had to be done and at a cost lower than that bid.

These and other jobs done have resulted in expressions of customer satisfaction which have brought much gratification to the personnel of the shipyard and point the direction for the future.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reemphasize the fact that I am urging the retention of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. I am not asking that another yard be closed instead. No other yard has the depth of specialization on nuclear submarines which Portsmouth has, and Portsmouth—by deliberate design over many years—does not have certain capabilities which other yards do have.

Mr. Chairman, the skilled craftsmen at Portsmouth are the real backbone of the yard. These men and women have saved through their cost reduction program almost one-third the sum DOD estimated would be saved if the entire yard were closed. And these outstanding workers have only begun.

There is no question but that we need Portsmouth. The Navy yard provides a livelihood for many of our people. But, this is not a one-way street. The fleet needs Portsmouth. It needs its submarine design capability, it needs its nuclear submarine overhaul capability, and it needs its construction capability. Most of all it needs the skilled and dedicated men and women of its work force.

Together, the community and the shipyard have served the fleet well. We will serve it better in the future.

Thank you for this opportunity to bring to your attention the reasons Portsmouth should be retained.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEY-CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS, INC.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there has now appeared on the American scene a new and important professional society, the American Association of Attorney-Certified Public Accountants, Inc.

Some 80 years ago at Saratoga Springs, N.Y., a small group of lawyers organized a new professional society in the United States. That became the American Bar Association, now numbering more than 100,000 members.

To meet the developing needs of our expanded modern economy, there also came into being, somewhat later, a professional group now known as the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

Then, as our business economy and tax systems became more and more complex, it became evident that the public interest is best served by the joint skills of the two professions. Accordingly, many dedicated men and women, giving generously of their time and talent and industry, achieved competence in both professions and attained the dual degree, as lawyer and as certified public accountant.

In October 1964, at Kiamesha Lake, N.Y., this new professional society, the American Association of Attorney-Certified Public Accountants, Inc., was created—by a group of men representing several existing statewide associations and dual practitioners from all parts of the United States, all of them dedicated to their profession. It was organized to safeguard and advance the professional interests of all men and women in America who are qualified as both lawyer and certified public accountant. Only those so qualified are admitted to membership. I venture the prediction that the years ahead will record that the organization of this new society will be remembered as a monumental contribution to professional life in the United States in the interest of the public welfare.

Recognition by the legal profession and by the accounting profession of the high public interest in the joint skills of the two professions brought into being the National Conference of Lawyers and Certified Public Accountants. After a long period of careful study that conference in February, 1951 approved a joint statement of principles. Later in 1951 the statement was approved by the Board of Governors and the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association and by the Council of the American Institute of Accountants, the latter, by change of name, now being the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

The statement of principles so adopted stresses the paramount public interest:

> Many problems connected with business require the skills of both lawyers and certified public accountants and there is every reason for a close and friendly cooperation between the two professions. In many cases, therefore, the public will be best served by utilizing the joint skills of both professions. The principal purpose is to indicate the importance of voluntary cooperation between our professions, whose members should use their knowledge and skills to the best advantage of the public.

The regulations of the U.S. Treasury Department admit to practice both lawyers and certified public accountants; and the Tax Court of the United States likewise admits members of both professions to practice in the Tax Court.

It is estimated that there are more than 2,000 persons in the United States who hold both degrees—the law degree and the CPA degree. They constitute a rather select society in American professional life. Those who have thus achieved competence and recognition in both professions are the finest exemplars in the tradition envisioned by that statement of principles of the National Conference of Lawyers and Certified Public Accountants, and the regulations governing practice in the U.S. Treasury Department, and the rules of practice in the Tax Court of the United States.

The right to practice law and the right to practice as certified public acountant are governed by the laws of the several States. Before either of these coveted rights is granted, the applicant is carefully investigated and screened for good character and is required to pass satisfactorily a rigid written examination on technical competence.

Thus, it is evident that the joint skills essential to the competent practice of law and accountancy come neither by chance nor even by superior talent alone. They are the fruits of long and diligent study, application and training, achieved by industry and self-denial, the better to serve the public welfare. Painstakingly, this dedicated group—this group of lawyer-CPA's of America—have established a magnificent tradition of competent service. But what they have done can be done by any one who is willing to pay the price. That price is long hours of hard work. Those lawyers of America who have not yet qualified themselves in accounting may well emulate their achievement and strive to augment their number. The business public, the public of the Nation, will applaud their industry and their skills.

Indeed, the American Bar Association has a laudable program of continuing education of the bar. That program includes the acquisition of competence in the fields of taxes and of accounting. There is ample evidence of recognition of the need for lawyers to achieve accounting skills; here are two examples of that recognition:

The American Bar Association Journal, in August 1962 at page 736, editorially reported:

> Louis Brandeis observed that the lawyer who does not know anything of economics and accounting is a public enemy.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (New York), in 1961, in its formal opinion in the case of *United States* v. *Kovel,* 296 F. 2d 918 at 922, said this:

> Accounting concepts are a foreign language to some lawyers in almost all cases and to almost all lawyers in some cases.

Even so, formal admission to the practice of law and to the practice as certified public accountant is not the end of the road; it is only the beginning of a professional lifetime of self-discipline and restraint. In the public interest, both are governed by stern rules of ethics. Those of the American Bar Association are known as the canons, and the canons are paralleled by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' Rules of Professional Conduct.

The nature, the scope, and the purpose of the canons may best be seen by these authoritative quotations:

> Canons must be viewed not as a bill of rights for the bar, but, rather, a codification of the more important limitations on legal practice broadly deemed necessary for the protection of clients.

So spoke the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, New York, in 1954, in *Consolidated Theatres* v. *Warner Bros.*, 216 F. 2d 920, 52 A.L.R. 2d 1231 at 1240.

Our bar associations are "dedicated to uphold the integrity of the bar and the fulfillment of its public responsibilities." So wrote Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., then president of the American Bar Association in the July 15, 1962, issue of American Bar News.

> The controlling consideration should be the public service, and the right to win the rewards of the profession should be conditioned on fitness to render the public service. The standard of public service is the standard of the bar, if the bar is to live.

So spoke the distinguished Elihu Root to the American Bar as long ago as 1920 and 1922.

And here is a direct quotation from the preamble to the Canons of Professional Ethics of the American Bar Association:

> The future of the Republic, to a great extent, depends upon our maintenance of justice pure and unsullied. It cannot be so maintained unless the conduct and the motives of the members of our profession are such as to merit the approval of all just men.

These rudimentary principles, in the finest tradition of both professions, are stressed and applied in accounting matters by the statement of principles of the National Conference of Lawyers and Certified Public Accountants, in these words:

> Frequently the legal and accounting phases are so interrelated and interdependent and overlapping that they are difficult to distinguish. In many cases, therefore, the public will be best served by utilizing the joint skills of both professions.

It is in that tradition that America's new professional society, the American Association of Attorney-Certified Public Accountants, will serve the Nation.

LAWS RESTRICTING IMPORTATION, INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION, AND TRANSPORTATION THROUGH THE MAILS OF CONTRACEPTIVE DEVICES, INFORMATION, AND ADVERTISEMENTS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Scheuer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced two bills to repeal the archaic Federal laws restricting importation, interstate transportation, and transportation through the mails, of contraceptive devices, information, and advertisements.

Despite the fact that time and scientific advances have made overpopulation one of our great concerns for the future of the world and of this Nation; despite a major change in the attitudes on birth control and family planning over the last centry, exemplified by a 1963 Gallup poll indicating that 74 percent of the American people favored making birth control information available to anybody requesting it; despite all this, the "Comstock" laws adopted in 1873 remain unchanged.

Dr. Luther Terry, the Surgeon General, in a speech to the World Health Organization in Geneva on May 12, 1965, predicted that, at the present rate of growth, world population would almost quadruple in the next 70 years. There will be 12 billion people in the year 2035. Dr. Terry urged WHO to increase its research on population growth and stated that the United States would increase its program and "will take steps to make the results of its research fully available to countries requesting assistance."

The last three Presidents of the United States have urged that we make population control information and scientific and technical aid available abroad to governments requesting such assistance. And now, the changing flow of public opinion is being reflected at the State level. In the last several years, Colorado, Indiana, and Kansas have repealed their "Comstock" laws. Similar legislation is being considered in other States. Colorado, Kansas, and Minnesota have recently passed laws providing for programs of State assistance in family planning.

The 18th-century economic philosophy depended on war, famine, and pestilence to serve as population control measures.

We in the National Congress have dedicated ourselves in measure after measure to fight poverty, eradicate disease, and achieve world peace. If we anticipate any measure of success, we must now begin to prevent worldwide overpopulation.

I believe that it is possible to do this without offending the religious and moral scruples of any members of our community.

I am suggesting today only a small measure—the elimination from our law books of two anachronistic statutes that are at total variance with our domestic and foreign policy on family planning and population control, and which have rarely been enforced, since in today's world they are hardly enforceable. Unenforceable laws only encourage contempt for the law.

Court decisions have severely restricted the applications of these laws. Nevertheless, they still have some effect. They help to create a confusion among timid public officials as to what our Government policy is, or should be.

I respectfully urge that we act now to conform our laws to our current practices, and to the national and international consensus that family planning and population control are indispensable to the very world peace, world order, and world plenty, which we all seek.

WHAT THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 MEANS TO OHIO

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Love] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. James H. Pelley, professor of educational administration at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, has been extremely interested in elementary and secondary education for many years.

Earlier this month Dr. Pelly participated in a conference sponsored by the higher education department of the Ohio Education Association. The purpose of this conference was to begin planning Ohio's participation in the

Federal aid program for elementary and secondary schools—indeed, an important beginning to this breakthrough in major financial assistance to education.

In the belief that Dr. Pelley's remarks may be helpful elsewhere throughout the country, I feel his speech should be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 MEANS TO OHIO

Even a preliminary analysis of this historic act prompts one to agree with the sentiment expressed by President Johnson when he signed the bill, seated on a crude wooden bench by the old one-room junction school, and flanked by his first teacher, Mrs. Katie Deadrich Lovey. He said on this occasion, "As President, I believe deeply that no law I have signed, or will ever sign means more to the future of our Nation."

He stated also that he had chosen this time and place for the signing ceremonies because, "I do not wish to delay by a single day the program to strengthen this Nation's elementary and secondary schools."

I believe this spirit of urgency should attend our deliberations today. This act (Public Law No. 59–10) becomes operative after July 1, and the necessary appropriations may be anticipated soon thereafter. The increased educational opportunities provided by the act are to be in effect for the coming school year, beginning in September.

While specific guides are not now available, many necessary steps are apparent for communities and States if full benefits of the act are to be made available to children and youth. The spirit of the act encourages local initiative and imagination in devising needed programs, as opposed to prescription by the U.S. Office of Education.

Any single person would be presumptuous, indeed, if he attempted to tell such an audience what this intricate and imaginative new law could mean to a great State like ours. I am convinced that the law will mean only what our educational leaders and citizens, working together will make it mean. This is a basic reason why it would be wrong, indeed, to sit idly by marking time while waiting for directives to be developed by the U.S. Office of Education. To be sure, certain basic guides for administration of the act will emanate from the Commissioner of Education, but, by far, the most important planning should be done at the community level and the State level.

The provisions of the act have been presented to you, and you have seen numerous briefs on the various titles, although the real meaning of these provisions cannot be really known by anyone at this time.

The challenge to one assigned to speak for 30 minutes about this complex act is not what to say but what to leave out. The printed testimony before the Senate committee runs to 3,287 pages.

In trying to be highly selective in how best to use this time, I have established two main purposes:

1. To interpret the philosophy, intent, and potentialities of the act.

2. To stimulate thinking and action on how to organize and plan to implement the act in Ohio.

I will not take time to review the law, title by title. Many helpful summaries have appeared in various publications. Dr. Holt has just concluded a series of regional meetings where the superintendents have received informative briefing on the various titles. Let me say, however, that no one should feel complacent in his understanding because of attending a meeting, or having read, however carefully, a document describing the act. The complexities, the hidden meanings, and the innate possibilities are such that only through prolonged study, experience, and experimentation will we gain understanding of the real meaning of this historic piece of legislation.

INTERPRETING THE ACT

First of all, we err in our thinking if we fail to appreciate that we have not one act, but five distinctly different ones represented in the five major titles. Each title has different purposes; the funds are distributed by different formulas; the various titles will be administered by different divisions of the Office of Education; and there will be different kinds and degrees of involvement by the State educational agency.

To be sure the titles all have in common the improvement of educational opportunities in elementary and secondary schools. My suggestion is, however, that to plan effectively for the implementation of these programs, we should do our thinking and organizing around the five distinctly different titles, providing, of course, for whatever essential coordination their tangential interrelationships may indicate.

ORIGINAL ACT ONLY A BEGINNING

In contemplating the implications of this act, the future is more important than the present. Its real significance is not in the amount of money to be made available for the coming school year—important as $50 million may be in supplementing our State and local endeavors.

Anyone who knows the temper of the President, or who reads history, knows that the current allocations are only a small beginning in the breakthrough in Federal responsibility for major financial support of education in this country.

We have a sobering responsibility to plan, and to plan wisely, how to relate the local district and the State to a new partnership in which the Federal Government will be contributing untold billions of dollars for generations on end.

To be sure there will be continuing modification in administration procedures, new formulas, increased allocations, and broadened purposes. However, it appears obvious that in the precedent setting initial plan, it is highly desirable to develop sounds plans based on certain validated principles. This will be easier than undoing unsound plans and substituting new ones.

ACT WILL STIMULATE INVENTION

Another reason why the act is more important than the amount of money may suggest is the effect that it will have in stimulating new and imaginative programs. In fact, the scope of potential programs under the various titles, transcends the imagination. One may safely predict that there will immediately emerge countless novel innovations to meet needs for which our traditional programs have been inadequate. This new act may well be the greatest stimulus to inventiveness and adaptability in the history of American education.

LEADERSHIP OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO BE STRENGTHENED

An immediate tangible benefit of the act to Ohio will be to virtually double the operating budget of the State department of education. This can mean a doubling of staff and services and leadership.

This expansion has been urgently sought since the creation of the State board of education, but the necessary budget has never been made available from State sources. This belated tooling up of the State department of education is potentially one of the great educational milestones in our State. The planning essential to this development should challenge the entire professional fraternity of the State, together with boards of education and other interested lay citizens.

The entire cost of this development will be borne by the Federal Government during the first 2 years; subsequently, grants will be on a matching basis, with the Federal share ranging from 50 to 66 percent.

ACT REPRESENTS MANY COMPROMISES

I do not commend this act to you as a perfect law, nor do I think that any of its most ardent supporters, including the President, would do so. I do believe that it is the best law that could be enacted at this time. My view is that a bill on the books is better than a thousand in the hands of a bill writer. Those who have vainly championed a basic general Federal support bill, and this has been attempted since 1870, understand the practical difficulties in this approach.

We have had to settle here for a categorical aid bill and one which compromises some of our traditional concerns about some very basic principles, including preservation of local control, and separation of church and state. We can only hope and trust that these principles are not seriously compromised or threatened. The answer will depend upon the extent to which citizens at the State and local levels engage in responsible planning. It is for them to provide the flesh and the life blood for the act which at present is only a skeleton.

STATE AND LOCAL CONTROL TO BE PRESERVED

No responsible citizen advocates Federal control of education. Various supporters of the act have inveighed against it including the President, Secretary Celebrezze, Commissioner Keppel, Senator MORSE, and Congressman POWELL. The real threat of Federal control, however, stems from local apathy. Whenever a vacuum is created through abdication of State and local responsibility, then the needs of children will be met by Federal programs and Federal agents. This is a pattern which seems to operate like Gresham's law. Yet there are some who would advocate that we wait until the U.S. Office of Education tells us what we are supposed to do in developing the State plan for implementing the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965.

To be sure there will be certain basic guides to insure that the intent of the act is being met. These, however, might best be developed from the ideas generated at the local and State levels. In any case, the spirit of the act is clear in encouraging the utmost initiative in local and State planning. The prohibition of Federal control is specifically stated in section 604, which provides "that nothing contained in the Act will be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by any educational materials by any educational institution or school system."

NEW RELATIONSHIPS WITH NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 has ushered in a new era in relationships with nonpublic schools. Whether the provisions are good or bad and for whom is yet to be demonstrated.

Certainly one good thing, in my view, is the new necessity to communicate and to plan together for the educational welfare of all children. In this context we should find "more to unite us than to divide us." All Americans must be equally concerned about preserving the separation of church and state as they must be concerned about providing the best possible educational opportunities for all youngsters of whatever race, religion, or socioeconomic status.

We must not be complacent in assuming that all the old controversies about aid to private and parochial schools were resolved through the passage of this law. My own view is that there are numerous ambiguities as to what the law means, what was intended, and what is made possible. One who reads the testimony at the hearings is struck by the conflicting interpretations. I personally listened to the debate on the floor of the House and heard the unresolved issues and conflicting views as to what this law really means in terms of such matters as what is "special" and what is not, as applied to services that are to be extended to nonpublic schools. The important point to understand is that a wide range of problems are to be resolved, at the district and State levels, about how the benefits of this act are to be extended to children attending nonpublic schools. These issues should not be left to the vicissitudes of local pressures. Duly constituted representative bodies comprised of responsible leaders from public and nonpublic schools should reason through these highly controversial questions and present guide lines for local adaptation.

THE FORMULA FOR ALLOCATION IS NOT THE FORMULA FOR EXPENDITURES

One major source of misunderstanding stems from the inclination to confuse the formula for distributing funds under title I with a formula for spending these funds in the local district.

The distribution formula is based upon an objective statistic that happens to be available through the Census Bureau, and in no way limits or defines eligible beneficiaries of the act. To be sure this title of the act, where over $1 billion is allocated for fiscal 1965, is designed to equalize opportunities for educationally and culturally disadvantaged youngsters.

In his explanation of the bill to the Senate, Senator WAYNE MORSE stated with reference to title I of the act:

"The programs must be directed toward the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in areas of high concentration. Other pupils in schools having such programs may benefit since there is no intent to label the individual child as deprived, but the main focus of attention is to be on the educationally deprived child."

Such terms as "disadvantaged" and "educationally deprived" are used interchangeably in the official interpretations of the law. Handicapped youngsters are specifically included as beneficiaries under title I. The suggested programs presented in the hearings cover such a range of possibilities as to make clearly evident that programs will extend far beyond this relatively small group in extreme poverty who constitute the basis in the formula for fund allocations by counties.

Certainly the law does not contemplate that the children of poverty are to be segregated, designated, or stigmatized in a manner to further undermine their self-respect. Neither the pauper's oath or any means test should be applied to any child or his parents in establishing eligibility for admission to programs under title I. I believe that only general indexes of poverty and educational deprivation will be used to justify programs. Many children other than those in abject poverty will properly be included in the various programs.

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS TO BE DEVELOPED

The term "compensatory education" has only recently crept into our educational terminology, but it is certain to command more of our attention. There is a valid concept which the term implies—that certain youngsters are handicapped by their environment and require special adaptations in the educational program if they are to have equal educational opportunity. Compensatory education refers to whatever changes are needed in the usual program to compensate for the cultural handicaps that may have caused certain youngsters to be disadvantaged or handicapped. It means tempering the wind to the shorn lamb. There is a tardy realization that youngsters with language deficits, restricted experiences, impaired health status, antisocial attitudes, and stunted intellectual devolopment are truly handicapped—just as the partially sighted, the deaf, or the cerebral palsied.

Unfortunately, the concept of compensatory education is so new that experiences and research findings are lacking for the design of efficient programs. We have available only the crudest indexes of cost and returns for money spent.

Evaluations of the foundation-supported programs under the great cities school improvement projects have been very sketchy. There is urgent need for research and experimentation with which the universities should assist. This evidence is urgently needed in designing the programs that are to be supported under title I of the act.

Some helpful ideas may be gained from the experience in California with programs supported by the McAteer Act. This was the first State-supported program of compensatory education, and the evaluations from the 24 experimental programs are now being completed. A recent report of special interest summarizes the results of these special programs in San Diego.[1]

IMPLEMENTING THE ACT

There should be established immediately a coordinated State planning body with task forces for each of the five major titles, and related to similar local bodies and special interest groups.

This structure should include all segments of the profession, appropriate State and local agencies (private and public), and interested lay citizens.

Staff time and resources for servicing these planning groups should be provided by the Ohio Education Association. However, many other agencies should contribute to the work and to financing the studies. Through planned division of labor, the State department of education, the State board of regents, the universities, and other agencies can all play their indispensible roles.

COMPREHENSIVE SURVEY NEEDED

There is the immediate need to launch a comprehensive statewide survey to determine:

1. The number, location, and kinds of disadvantaged pupils.
2. The types of programs indicated to meet specific needs.
3. The requirements of the indicated compensatory programs in money, staff time, and special facilities.

Guidelines for such studies should be developed to enable counties and individual districts to compile such data. This information will be basic to development of district programs and the State plan.

The special report issued on April 22, by the NEA division of Federal relations urges many forms of "advance action" in preparation for implementing the various titles.

These include such activities as—

1. Determine the most vital needs of educationally deprived students in the community.
2. Determine how programs could be coordinated with those of other Federal acts, including the Economic Opportunity Act.
3. Survey the resources and needs for library and supplementary educational services.
4. Survey the status of the textbook and instructional materials supply, and determine priorities of need.

These are indicative of the kind of studies that should be launched immediately in every community.

TEACHERS SHOULD BE INCLUDED

The Department of Classroom Teachers of the NEA issued a special bulletin to all local association presidents on April 27. In this "call to action" these significant thoughts are expressed: "That those individuals who work most closely with the children—the classroom teachers—should play a major role in assisting in the development and implementation of the many possible programs provided in the school Federal aid measure.

"Local and State associations are urged to work closely with appropriate school officials—school superintendents and administrators, school boards, and the State education departments—and the community as a whole, in formulating and improving educational programs."

These statements clearly suggest the importance of including teachers in the deliberations to develop both the local and State plans.

MANUAL FOR LOCAL STUDIES NEEDED

An abbreviated manual should be developed for use by local committees in organizing and conducting the studies that are necessary for effective implementation of the act.

Most local leaders feel inadequate at present to initiate this obviously needed activity. In view of the short time remaining in the current school year, committees should be constituted that will function during the summer months. I cite, as a good example of what local committees should be doing, the work that has been progressing for several weeks in Cincinnati. A broadly representative committee, drawing upon the resources of the department of research, has been busy studying the provisions of the act, collecting essential data, and laying plans for initiating the new programs. A special telecast to all teachers was presented by the administration and members of the committee.

All districts should be engaged in similar work, but most of them, lacking resources of a large system, do not know how to proceed.

NEED TO ESTABLISH PRIORITIES

Because of the scope of the potential programs is so broad and the funds so inadequate to cover the possibilities, it would appear essential to establish priorities under each title.

This will not be easy, in view of conflicting interests, but the alternative is to dissipate funds on fragmentary programs. An example may be cited in title III, where Ohio is to receive something less than $5 million for establishing supplementary educational centers and services. Obviously, this will not reach to all communities of the State except in a perfunctory way. It would be difficult to expend this sum on five centers. Some States are thinking of multicounty intermediate districts to serve schools of an area. The desirability for discriminating use of the funds from title II would also seem apparent. Roughly one-third of the elementary and secondary schools of the Nation are without libraries.

This act might well provide the impetus for the long-needed reorganization of the intermediate district in Ohio. Examples may be seen in Iowa and Pennsylvania to indicate the usefulness of properly constituted intermediate units which might be supported with funds under titles II, III, and IV. Services might include countywide or region audiovisual centers, textbook and library servicing, data processing, and countless other specialized services which individual districts cannot efficiently provide.

---

[1] "Pilot Project in Compensatory Education: A Report to the State Advisory Committee on Compensatory Education," submitted by San Diego city schools, Jan. 5, 1965.

The Los Angeles Science Center and the proposed space-age planetarium for Cleveland are examples of imaginative kinds of new facilities that are made possible under title III.

I conclude this paper with a statement which eloquently presents the rationale of title I of the act. This is quoted from the testimony of Marion Sweet, president of the Philadelphia Teachers Association, before the General Subcommittee on Education:

"I wish that you could come with me into classrooms with 40 to 48 children, most of whom are badly in need of individual instruction, care, and attention. I wish that you could come with me into classes of children, most of whom are hungry, not so much for education as for food, many of whom are ill clad, nearly all of whom live in ghettos, are educated in ghettos, and look forward with little hope or expectation to a life or a future beyond the confines of that ghetto. You could come with me to meet children to whom home and society have already done so much harm that they need remedial care and help.

"You could come with me to meet children who, for the first time, in the first grade will handle their first book. You can meet children for whom the home supplies nothing for school and for whom the teacher must find the extra pencils, the paper, the carfare for trips, et cetera. You will meet children from homes dilapidated, cold, and rundown, and visit with them in schools where plaster drops from the ceiling; broken windows go unfixed; adequate toilet facilities are nonexistent; and broken and faulty heaters endanger their health.

"When I was a very young teacher, I once had a class memorize the lines on the Statue of Liberty: 'Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door.'

"But after 1 year of teaching in the Philadelphia public schools, I no longer could bring myself to expect of these children that they be emotionally moved by these lines. They, themselves, could not identify with this promise, and they were not strangers in this land. This is a promise this Nation made to strangers. Can this Nation afford to do less for the children within its doors? They are the tired; they are the poor; yet they are the promise of this Nation."

THE YOUTH FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Labor announced its intent to put into operation a youth farm labor program for the coming summer. With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD copies of the correspondence between Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz and myself concerning this program.

APRIL 1, 1965.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: First, I want to express my deep gratitude for the forthright and courageous stand you have taken on the question of the Bracero program and the further importation of foreign laborers to do agricultural work.

As you know, I have fought the Bracero program ever since I first came to Washington as a Congressman. This year, I have been following with intense interest your efforts to resist the demands of the large growers and others that the Bracero program be revived. My own concern has been expressed in the numerous statements I have made on the subject on the floor of the House and the newspaper accounts I have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Enclosed are two recent statements I made for the RECORD on March 26 and March 29. I am also enclosing a copy of my bill, H.R. 2422, to extend minimum wage protection to farmworkers. I believe my bill contains many of your recommendations on the subject.

Again, I would like to compliment you on the tremendous job you have done with this problem.

Second, I would like to discuss a related matter that seems to be looming over the horizon. Recently, efforts within the Department of Labor to form a Youth Farm Labor program have been brought to my attention. Apparently work on this project has gone quite far, although it has not been finally approved. I urge you to consider the consequences that implementation of this program would have.

According to my information, it is now planned that approximately 156,000 youths will be recruited with the aid of the Department of Labor for summer employment on farms this year—4,000 are to come from college campuses, between 3,000 and 5,000 from large cities, the remainder from communities throughout the Nation. I understand that many of those youngsters will be placed on farms near their residences, but that many will be transported hundreds and even thousands of miles. I am also informed that about 25,000 youths will be processed for farmwork through Manpower Development and Training Act projects.

The conditions of substandard housing, hygiene, wages, and other working conditions in the agriculture industry are too well known to bear repeating in this letter. However, I would like to point out that for a decade the bracero program was used to supply farms with a source of cheap labor. The use of foreign farmworkers, because they came from the lower income group and because they were used to low pay and poor working conditions, and because they felt that they were lucky to have any jobs at all, was an ideal way to keep working conditions in the farm industry in the miserable, depressed state that it is in even today.

In my judgment, the use of youths on farms will have the same effect. They too will come from the lower income groups. They too will be used to low pay or no pay. They too will feel lucky to have any jobs at all. Further, it is incomprehensible to me that so long as there are millions of unemployed adults with family responsibilities that low-wage jobs for youngsters would be subsidized by the Government.

The end result of this Youth Farm Labor program could be to raise a crop of domestic braceros in place of the vanished foreign braceros. I do not believe you would want this.

With every good wish, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 14, 1965.

Hon. HENRY P. GONZALEZ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GONZALEZ: Thank you for your letter of April 1, regarding the Department's program to recruit agricultural workers. Mr. Ganz of the Department's Manpower Administration has discussed the matter with Mr. Kaufman of your office.

First, let me assure you that the prime goal is to provide job opportunities in agriculture for unemployed adults under the highest labor standards and the best working conditions possible under existing legislation and authority. Toward this end, the Department is concentrating its major effort to recruit adult workers for farm jobs as close as possible to their places of residence.

The various youth recruitment programs to which you refer will be used merely as supplements if the adult recruitment program does not fulfill all the needs. These, too, will be administered under the maximum standards permissible. I am certain you will agree that this plan is infinitely preferable to resorting to the importation of farmworkers to fill unmet needs.

I will welcome any information and assistance in recruiting adult farmworkers who may be interested in jobs under appropriate standards and working conditions.

Sincerely,
W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

THE SAN ANTONIO RIVER BARGE CANAL

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, soon after my first election to the Congress of the United States, I proposed that studies be made of the feasibility of improving the San Antonio River from the city of San Antonio to the Gulf of Mexico, about 158 miles away. The San Antonio Chamber of Commerce, the business community, and the people in and around the Alamo city were captivated by the idea and have been working toward this goal ever since.

The navigation studies which I urged resulted in the resumption of studies which actually were begun in 1917. In that year the Corps of Engineers made the first study to canalize the San Antonio River. However, the greater need for flood control along the course of the river led to suspension of work on the navigation studies in 1948. Now it appears that the Corps of Engineers will soon complete the economic, engineering, and related studies. I am hopeful that the results of these studies will favor the development and improvement of the San Antonio River in the interests of San Antonio and all of south Texas.

I will continue to make full reports of the progress of this project to my colleagues in the House. I will now introduce for the RECORD, with unanimous consent, a speech by Col. John E. Unverferth,

district engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, delivered at the San Antonio Chamber of Commerce Installation Ceremonies, May 18, 1965, reporting on the work being done on the San Antonio River canal:

REMARKS BY COL. JOHN E. UNVERFERTH, DISTRICT ENGINEER, BEFORE THE SAN ANTONIO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, SAN ANTONIO, TEX., MAY 18, 1965

Mr. Chairman, Congressman GONZALEZ, Lieutenant Governor Smith, other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for that pleasant introduction. It is always a delight for me to be in your historic city either for business or pleasure. I am speaking, too, for the employees of the Galveston district who, while discharging their duties through the years, have appreciated the kindness and cooperation of the good people of San Antonio.

My remarks will deal primarily with a résumé of the Corps of Engineers' current study concerning the feasibility of improving the San Antonio River for a navigation channel to San Antonio. We are a long way from having a shovel in hand, but we are making progress.

Dating as far back as 1917, the Corps of Engineers has made several studies of the feasibility of canalizing the San Antonio River. The study authorization, approved in 1938, pertains to a navigation study of the San Antonio River.

In response to the 1938 resolution, an interim report on the Guadalupe River was prepared in 1939. The report recommended improvement of the lower Guadalupe River for navigation to Victoria, and construction of the Canyon Dam Reservoir for regulation of streamflow and to control headwater floods. These projects are nearing completion at this time.

A preliminary examination report on the San Antonio River was prepared in 1946. The district engineer recommended that a survey of the San Antonio River be undertaken to determine a plan of improvement and an estimate of cost, and that the report be combined with the report of survey on the Guadalupe River. Since a navigation channel via either the Guadalupe or San Antonio River would serve the San Antonio trade area, the Chief of Engineers directed that a combined study be made of both rivers to determine their economic feasibility. During the period 1946–48 detailed studies were made of barge canal routes in both rivers. The greater urgency at that time for flood control in the two basins led to suspension of further work on the navigation studies in 1948. However, a favorable interim report on flood control was submitted in 1950, leaving completion of the navigation aspects for a later report. Due to the Korean war and resultant shortage of general investigations funds in the early 1950's, and the lack of local interest, further studies of both the Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers were deferred.

Soon after his election, your Congressman, the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ, began pressing for resumption of the suspended navigation studies. Consequently, an initial appropriation of $17,500 was secured for resumption of the studies in fiscal year 1963, and subsequent funds have been appropriated for continuing the study to date.

With the cooperation of Congressman GONZALEZ, the San Antonio River Authority and many others, a public hearing was held at the Gunter Hotel in San Antonio in May of 1963. The hearing was attended by 500 people who were enthusiastic about canalization of the San Antonio River. At this hearing, the manager of the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority supported the investigation of the San Antonio River for navigation to the city of San Antonio, and made no request for a study of the Guadalupe River for navigation.

After the hearing we cranked up our program for the survey investigations of the San Antonio River to insure an orderly pursual and completion of the economic, engineering, and related studies.

Our current economic investigations are comprehensive in scope, and will evaluate the proposed project under current conditions and under conditions which may be expected to occur during the economic life of the project. For economic analyses, this is considered to be a period of 50 years after the waterway project is in operation.

The major economic study involves the appraisal of navigation benefits which could be expected to accrue from the proposed canalized waterway to San Antonio. Detailed investigations and studies are being made to develop present and future estimates of commodities and tonnages which can be accepted as sound prospective commerce on the proposed waterway.

To determine the commodities and tonnage of the waterway, a field traffic survey was made in mid-1964. Four of our men canvassed 87 Texas counties and 2 New Mexico counties which the San Antonio River Authority considers to be the commercial tributary trade area to the proposed waterway. Over 600 contacts were made by these men. Undoubtedly, some of you were among those contacted at your place of business. We have completed the tedious task of screening and rating the information obtained in the field survey. With this information we have made a preliminary determination of the prospective annual tonnages and the savings in transportation cost creditable to the San Antonio Waterway.

To clarify this, we have determined the cost of shipping a commodity between two points by considering the cost of shipping via the proposed waterway versus the cost of shipping the commodity by other modes of transportation, using present-day shipping rates. This is called a rate study. If the shipment is cheaper by some mode of transportation other than the waterway, the commodity is not accepted as prospective waterway traffic. If the shipment is cheaper via the waterway, the commodity is accepted as prospective waterway traffic, and the difference in cost of transportation is creditable as a benefit. The total of all savings in transportation costs constitutes the greatest percentage of benefits to be considered in the economic justification of the waterway.

The economic justification of any requested improvement is determined by a comparison of the estimated benefits that would be derived from the improvement versus the estimated cost of the improvement, both on an annual basis. When we speak of costs, we mean all costs, whether Federal or local. If the estimated annual benefits for a proposed improvement exceed the estimated annual costs, we consider the project economically justified, and worthy of adoption and construction by the Federal Government.

Preliminary engineering studies of the proposed waterway have been completed, giving consideration to a plan of improvement for a canalized waterway from near San Antonio to a connection with the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in San Antonio Bay.

Preliminary studies indicate that the length of waterway between these two points would be about 158 miles, and would require 17 locks and movable gated dams to overcome approximately 420 feet of river fall. To adequately provide for barge operation for projected prospective commerce during the 50-year life of the project, the waterway tentatively would have a bottom width of 125 feet and a depth of 12 feet. On the basis of these features, we have determined the estimated annual charges to be considered in the preliminary analysis of the economic justification of the proposed waterway.

We have reached a checkpoint in our studies and are now arranging for a meeting with representatives of the Office, Chief of Engineers, and our Southwestern Division at Dallas. Our preliminary studies will be reviewed to determine further courses of action related to detailed engineering and economic studies, which will definitely establish the economic justification of the waterway project. It is anticipated that we will have a decision in these matters during the early part of this summer. Subsequently, local interests as represented by the San Antonio River Authority, will be advised of our findings.

We are planning to continue our current studies to completion. Additional economic studies will include further analyses of the accepted prospective waterway traffic. An estimate of the waterway transportation benefits will be made on the basis of current barge line-haul costs versus current rates of competing overland carriers. The barge line-haul costs will be determined by navigation specialists in the Office, Chief of Engineers.

A traffic consultant will be employed to furnish the rates of competing carriers. Personnel of my office will make a rate study to determine the savings in transportation costs creditable to the waterway. In accordance with a recent directive from the Chief of Engineers, an estimate of the waterway transportation benefits will be made on the basis of projected water-compelled rates. In developing the projected rates or charges, consideration will be given to all data and factors that are likely to modify current rates to take account of the competitive situation anticipated with the waterway in being, and foreseeable technological developments applicable to the several transport media.

We are also required to make an economic base study of the tributary trade area of the proposed waterway. The purpose of this study is to present an economic analysis of the past, present, and future level of economic development of the tributary trade area.

The study will include comparative historical data and projections for the several economic indicators for the United States, the State of Texas, and the tributary trade area. Studies will be made of population growth, personal income, employment, agriculture, manufacturing and other related economic indicators of the area. The economic base study will provide a sound basis of economic trends and index factors for projection of the current acceptable waterway traffic over the life of the proposed improvement.

A study will also be made of the natural resources of the tributary trade area. Consideration will be given to the development of these resources, their production, existing and potential markets, and present methods of distribution, to determine whether full development of the resources would provide additional prospective waterway traffic.

Without dwelling on specifics and details of the engineering studies to be completed, I shall enumerate some of the major studies:

1. Subsurface investigation of the foundation materials at lock and dam sites and the determination of materials to be encountered in construction of the waterway.

2. Lock size formulation study to determine the most feasible and economical size of lock to be provided from the standpoint of handling maximum prospective tonnage and minimum amount of water for lock operation.

3. Channel size formulation study to determine the most feasible size of channel required for barge operation.

4. Channel alinement studies to determine the most feasible route either via the river

channel or by a combination of river channel and river cutoff alinements.

5. Studies concerning highway and railroad bridge modifications or relocation to provide for passage of barge navigation through the bridges.

6. Studies concerning the relocation of utility lines, including pipelines, powerlines, telephone lines, and other utility crossings.

7. A study of the lands required for the waterway, including a gross real estate appraisal of the rights-of-way, spoil disposal areas, severed lands, lock and dam sites and highway rights-of-way to provide access to the lock sites.

8. Design studies of the various locks and dams including detailed estimates of first costs of these structures and of other construction features of the waterway.

9. A study of the water resources of the drainage area adjoining the proposed waterway, including analysis of the water supply required for lock operation and such losses as evaporation from the water areas between locks, probable seepage losses at lock sites and accidents and operating contingencies at the lock structures.

In planning a canalized waterway project for the San Antonio River, one of the major questions to be resolved concerns the adequacy of the water supply and the water requirements for navigation on the canalized waterway. The operation of navigation would necessitate supplying water at the head of navigation or along the course of the river as may be required to meet the various uses and losses. The size, lift, and location of the locks of the plan of improvement will be considered with a view to minimizing the water requirements.

A preliminary estimate of the water required for maximum tonnage movement on the waterway, including water losses, indicates that on the basis of a lock 84 feet wide, 600 feet long, and 30-foot lift, about 980 acre-feet (or 319 million gallons) of water would be required for daily operation of the waterway. Since a large portion of the water supply for operation of the waterway will be derived from return flows from the city of San Antonio, it appears that a water storage reservoir will be required upstream of the proposed turning basin to assure a dependable source of water supply. Our studies will definitely include a thorough investigation of the various means of obtaining an adequate water supply.

Certainly, local agencies lend a hearty hand in a successful navigation project. Some projects have been abandoned because of the lack of local cooperation. If the canalization of the San Antonio River is authorized and funds are appropriated, some local interests will have to—

1. Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required to include suitable areas for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments.

2. Hold and save the United States free from damages that may result from the construction and maintenance of the project.

3. Provide and maintain, at local expense, adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal basis.

4. Provide and maintain, without cost to the United States, depths in berthing areas and local access channels serving the terminals commensurate with the depths provided in the related project areas.

5. Accomplish without cost to the United States such alterations as required in sewer, water supply, drainage, and other utility facilities.

6. Provide, as may be required, a proportionate share of the cost of railroad and highway bridge alterations over existing channels.

7. Contribute in cash or equivalent work a share of the construction cost if such contribution is required because of special or local benefits.

Before closing, I would like to reiterate that if we continue our studies of the San Antonio waterway, it is presently scheduled that they would be completed in fiscal year 1968. A report on our study will probably be submitted to our division engineer in Dallas by about mid-1969. Subsequently, the division engineer will issue a public notice concerning submission of the report and the findings of the study. Issuance of the public notice means that the studies have been completed at this level and the report is under consideration by higher authority.

I presume you would like to know what action local interests can undertake to advance our studies. At this time, we shall have to delay any action until we know what decision will come from the pending meeting of higher officials this summer.

It is a pleasure to be with you tonight and to inform you of the status of our studies of the San Antonio River waterway. I wish to express both my personal and official thanks to all who have made this meeting possible, and also to thank you for your attention.

LAUNCHING OF THE KENT STATE UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF URBAN REGIONALISM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I call to the attention of this body the successful launching of the Kent State University Center for the Study of Urban Regionalism on May 21 and 22, 1965.

Under the leadership of Kent State University's president, Dr. Robert I. White, leaders in Government, education, and metropolitan planning gathered to learn and to teach about the problems of urbanization in the northeastern Ohio area and the Nation.

One of the highlights of the conference was an address delivered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency Administrator, Dr. Robert C. Weaver. Dr. Weaver emphasized the importance of local cooperation with State planning programs. He was highly praiseworthy of Kent State for opening its center on regional planning as the means to a brighter future for orderly development of northeastern Ohio.

Dr. Weaver strongly emphasized the importance of injecting plans to develop and maintain existing natural beauty as an integral part of orderly regional development. President and Mrs. Johnson's beautification program will undoubtedly find great support in this program.

The presence and contributions of the Senator from Maine, EDMUND MUSKIE, were immense. He spoke eloquently of the need for careful utilization of existing resources in an urban region. He spoke strongly of the need for massive water and air pollution control and abatement programs for the northeastern Ohio area and others throughout the Nation. Senator MUSKIE pointed out that if techniques and controls are not developed to reuse water now being polluted and wasted that our use of water by 1970 would far exceed the available supply.

Senator MUSKIE and Dr. Weaver proved once again that they are true champions for the development of the Great Society concept of rendering life of the urban dweller as pleasant and ordered as is humanly possible.

Tom Vail, editor-publisher of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, spoke in like terms of the needs and desires, aspirations and hopes of an urban region such as ours in northeastern Ohio. His eloquence and substance added further to this auspicious launching of the Kent State University Center for Urban Regionalism.

The foresight and imagination which Kent State University's president, Dr. Robert I. White, and his hard-working staff have invested in this project from its inception can mean nothing but success from both the standpoint of its academic and practical or operational success. The people of northeastern Ohio will stand to benefit greatly from the commitment of a great university to the problems of our great urban region of northeastern Ohio.

I wish to include at this point in the RECORD the important remarks of Senator EDMUND MUSKIE and Dr. Robert C. Weaver which were delivered at the Kent State University Conference on Urban Regionalism which signaled the opening of this historic endeavor:

THE URBAN CRISIS AND THE QUEST FOR THE GREAT SOCIETY

(Address by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE before the Conference on Urban Regionalism, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, May 22, 1965)

I am glad to have this opportunity to speak to this conference and to join in commemorating the formal establishment of Kent State's new center for urban regionalism.

The crisis created by the emergence of an urban American constitutes the most important single problem in the field of intergovernmental relations today. It contains the greatest threat to our traditional Federal-State-local relations. Yet, it provides us with the best opportunity to implement President Johnson's ideal of a "creative federalism."

Historians tell us that the old frontier was closed by 1890. But 20th century developments tell us we have a new metropolitan frontier, and the quest for the Great Society is, in large measure, a search for the good life on this frontier.

Let us look at the nature of the metropolitan frontier in human terms. About 2,600 years ago, the prophet, Isaiah, capsuled the problem with this warning:

"Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no more room, and ye be made to dwell alone in the midst of the land."

As we approach the end of the 20th century, Isaiah's prophetic warning must be our challenge.

Our sprawling urban areas can be made stimulating homes for the human spirit. They can provide the environment for the good life. But unless we devote more of our creative energies to solving our galloping urban problems of housing, education, transportation, pollution, recreation, indifference, and others, our cities can choke human growth and entomb the human spirit.

At the heart of our urban dilemma is the phenomenal population growth.

Its impact on housing alone staggers the imagination. In New York, for example, with its massive housing program, 1.25 million residents live in substandard homes. There are 600,000 New Yorkers who are eligible for, but cannot get into public housing. Since 1950, about 800,000 middle-income residents have vacated New York for the suburbs. This, despite the evidence that many would prefer to stay if apartments were larger and less expensive, if schools were better, if streets and parks were safer, and if transportation were less cramped and painful.

Air and water pollution are problems which I have come to know in great detail. They are a threat to our health, to our prosperity, and to our civilization itself; and they are most pronounced in metropolitan America.

We know that smog can be a killer, but do we also realize that air pollution causes $11 billion in property damage a year, and that long-term low- to medium-level air pollution contributes to and aggravates a host of crippling diseases?

Water pollution is an even more severe problem. Within just 15 years, our demands for water will outrun our supply by at least 85 billion gallons a day. By the year 2000, the daily demand is expected to be 350 billion gallons greater than the supply. This means that we must accelerate our efforts to clean up fouled water and to reuse it, not only for swimming, for fishing, for drinking, but for industry as well.

Statistics are one way of describing the urban dilemma, but behind every decision and program to improve our metropolitan areas must be concern for people, for children playing on a dirty, sunless sidewalk; for families living in crowded flats; for the office girl walking home at nights; for the student seeking broader educational opportunities; for the businessman driving his car over snarled highways or riding a commuter train; for boys looking for a lot big enough to play baseball, or for a clean pond to swim in; for citizens looking for leadership; and for many others.

There was a Maine lobsterman who was asked if he was afraid of the atomic bomb. "The only thing I'm afraid of," he said, "is people, and there ain't any around where I work."

People are the problem, and also the reason for our concern and the purpose of our efforts. These problems must be our own, because most of us live in urban regions, and many more of us will in the years to come.

With this greater urban concentration will come a greater dispersion of this population over a wider and wider area. During the decade of the fifties, regions classified as urban by the Bureau of the Census increased from 12,000 to 25,000 square miles in area—and almost one-fifth of that area was accounted for by your own northeastern Ohio urban complex. By 1980 your region will experience a 26-percent population expansion and most of the increase will occur in the outer fringe suburbs.

In 1960, there were 212 regions in the United States classified as standard metropolitan statistical areas. Two-thirds of our citizens lived in these areas, and were served by 18,442 local governments.

After analyzing this national trend, one authority recently predicted that "by the end of the century, the United States will possess at least five supermetropolises which will have the general complexity and geographical extent of the present-day metropolitan area of New York."

The dimensions of this future growth stagger the imagination. To you of this area, however, it must appear only as a national projection of your own experience of the past decade and a half. For northeastern Ohio, with its five standard metropolitan statistical areas and its aggregate population of more than 3¾ million, is, in fact, in the process of joining one of these five supermetropolises.

I do not have to burden this audience with a long explanation of all the dimensions of this urban crisis.

You are aware of the problems of numerous overlapping and competing jurisdictions of local government, the average number of independent units of government per metropolitan area is 87. There are 1,060 in the Chicago area, and 1,400 in the Greater New York region.

You are aware of the disparities between the costs and the benefits of governmental services among local governments in urban areas.

You are aware of the imperfect performance of such major governmental functions as urban transportation, water supply, sewage disposal, air pollution control, and so on, due to the spread of population beyond the jurisdiction of individual governmental units.

You are aware of restrictive State constitutional provisions that inhibit the easy adaptation of local government to meet present and prospective needs.

And I am sure you are aware of the lack of effective coordination among the many Federal programs that directly affect urban areas.

Yet, awareness is not enough. Central to all these problems is the fact that the metropolitan area has become, in effect, a new kind of community. But it is a community whose members have little or no "feeling of belonging." Wolf von Eckhardt has warned that comprehensive regional planning is useless if it remains a "theoretical exercise confined to study groups, commissions and boards with insufficient political and popular support to make it effective." Unless we can generate a genuine sense of regional loyalty in terms of joint resolve, common effort and shared resources, the pressures to make our urban areas wards of the Federal Government may well become irresistible.

The traditional concept of intergovernmental relations has two dimensions. One presupposes three levels of government—Federal, State and local, with separate powers and personnel and with independent constituences and decisionmaking processes.

The second stipulates that many governmental activities are shaped by all levels of government and involve each in significant and continuing responsibilities.

Most politicians and many academicians tend to accept one or the other of these views. Yet the record reveals that both are accurate descriptions of the remarkable 176-year history of American federalism.

The urban crisis challenges us to create effective metropolitan planning agencies without divorcing them from the meaningful political bases which have been the foundations of American federalism.

The genius of the American system of government has been that it has enabled us to preserve freedom and, at the same time, deal effectively with our problems.

We have done so in the framework of the Federal system which was established 176 years ago.

The metropolitan area is a problem which does not fit into that framework. We must find a way to govern it which, again, will preserve freedom and, at the same time, deal effectively with the problem.

Some students of our society believe the growth of supercities will erase the traditional distinctions among city-county-State and Federal responsibilities.

It seems to me important to maintain these distinctions while expanding areas of intergovernmental cooperation.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, concluded from a study of metropolitan areas that a single areawide government whose boundaries are coterminous with the scope of a particular service is neither likely nor necessarily appropriate. This Commission further stated:

"In many situations, it appears more likely that ad hoc, or function by function, arrangements among existing local units will assure that these functions will be performed more efficiently on an areawide basis. Such arrangements will require allocating the costs of services among the independent units on a fair and equitable basis."

I spoke earlier of America's old and new frontiers. Timely cooperation and tough-minded individualism were the keys to survival on the 19th century's Western frontier. They have equal relevance to meeting the dangers threatening us on the 20th century's metropolitan frontier. The experience of your area, in my opinion, indicated that cooperation, as well as independence, can be a dynamic attitude as well as a method of procedure. The balancing of local demands for autonomy against the regional need for coordination and planning is always difficult to achieve, but you are on the right road.

You have found the middle road between the extremes of "standpatism" and a federated metropolitan government by the establishment of regional planning commissions in four of your five standard metropolitan statistical areas.

You have blended the political know-how of elected local officials with the professionalism of the planners and the engineers in the design of these commissions.

And, you here, by creating this new center for urban regionalism and by launching a regional advisory council, will, I am sure, balance the interests of each of these five urban areas with the interests of the northeastern area as a whole.

The combined activities of the regional planning commissions, your center, and its advisory council incorporate the essential elements of a dynamic, voluntary approach to solving your regional problems. These public and private agencies have assumed the responsibility for research, long- and short-range metropolitan planning, technical advice and assistance, and the necessary political leadership. They will strengthen immeasurably the cooperative ideal in this metropolitan area. But they will also provide a broader opportunity for Ohio's traditional individualism to express itself.

The State government also bears a responsibility for strengthening the basis of regional cooperation. As a matter of fact, the ultimate responsibility for easing and resolving these problems rests primarily with this level of government. Nearly a decade ago the Council of State Governments stated the following in a report to the Governors' Conference, of which I was then a member:

"Although the roles of local governments and the National Government are indispensable, the States are the key to solving the complex difficulties that make up the general metropolitan problem. To achieve adequate results the State governments—the legislative and the executive branches, and the people—need to exert positive, comprehensive and sustained leadership in solving the problem."

States have tended to react to the urban crisis in a haphazard fashion. Few have led. Some, by continued inactivity, have been obstacles to corrective action. The fiscal, jurisdictional research and planning needs of large urban centers have commonly been ignored or, when treated, handled on a piecemeal basis. The advisory commission on intergovernmental relations reports that metropolitan areas receive less State aid annually than nonmetropolitan areas—an average of $9 per capita less.

Such neglect has led to a more direct, and often more responsive, Federal-local collaboration. This alarmed the defenders of States rights more than it has encouraged the proponents of States responsibilities.

Ohio's response is better than that of many other States. Your legislature has enacted many permissive measures, including provisions for interlocal agreements, voluntary transfer functions, and the coordination of States water resources. These constitute an arsenal of weapons for use by local units of government in their attack on some of the metropolitan area problems. The recently created State legislative committees on urban affairs, and their interest in the proposed strengthening of your laws on municipal incorporation and annexation, are other encouraging developments. But these are only beginnings.

All State governments should establish a special unit to give continuing attention, review, and assistance to the States urban areas.

Most States need to expand their financial and technical assistance to metropolitan jurisdictions in the fields of urban planning, urban renewal, building code modernization, and local government organization and finance.

Most States should establish a special unit to give continuing attention, review, and assistance to the States urban areas.

Most States need to expand their financial and technical assistance to metropolitan jurisdictions in the fields of urban planning, urban renewal, building code modernization, and local government organization and finance.

Most States should take stronger financial and regulatory action to secure and preserve open land in and around urban centers.

And nearly all States should take legislative or administrative action to resolve those disputes among local units of urban government which cannot be settled at the local level.

The Federal Government must also assume its full share of the urban burden. The national character of many metropolitan questions makes this mandatory. More than 50 Federal programs are now operating in our urban areas and most of them have been enacted since 1950. The future is not likely to reverse this trend. The rapid urban growth, new technologies and fragmented responsibilities for local government in urban areas that I have described are making these Federal programs increasingly interdependent, and their impact on other objectives of the urban community is becoming more pronounced. Authority and effort are needed in Washington—as well as in the States and metropolitan areas—to assure that each of these programs contributes not only to its more limited program goal but also to the general goal of orderly urban development. Three current case studies indicate that Washington is responding to this challenge. First, for more than 2 years the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations has been examining the questions of Federal-State-local relations, including the vexing problems of our metropolitan areas. Last month we held a week of hearings on a bill introduced this year and which 39 Senators cosponsored. This proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965 is of paramount importance to you here and to all the other metropolitan regions of the country.

Title 4 of the bill merits your special consideration, since it establishes a national urban assistance policy. It prescribes full consideration of all viewpoints—national, regional, State and local—in planning urban development programs and projects. Each Federal administrator, in this framework, would be obliged to coordinate his efforts with those of other Federal agencies. And his plans must be part of—or consistent with—local and regional planning objectives.

Another section of this title stipulates that applications for grants and loans under certain urban programs would be reviewed and commented upon—but not vetoed—by an areawide planning body composed of elected officials of the general units of local government. This provision is designed to strengthen metropolitan planning and to assist Federal agencies in their evaluation of grant applications. It will not protect the integrity of local and regional planning objectives from subversion by a fragmented and uncoordinated Federal approach to urban development.

A second case study in Federal responses to metropolitan problems is covered in the proposed Water Quality Act of 1965, which I was privileged to introduce in this session. The bill has now passed both Houses of Congress. It increases grants for the construction of municipal sewage treatment works and provides financial assistance to municipalities and other bodies for the separation of combined sewers. Of special concern to metropolitan areas such as yours is the provision that the grants may be increased by 10 percent for projects which are part of a comprehensive regional plan. This incentive approach has already worked well in the "open space program." It will strengthen our attempt to curb water pollution and I am convinced that the device should be extended to other Federal programs.

A third proposal would create a broad instrument for dealing with the urban crisis at both the national and grassroots levels. The Federal Government's reaction to the emergence of a metropolitan America—like that of the States—has generally been disjointed, sporadic, and unplanned. Most of the efforts to date relate to specific programs or to local planning.

For this reason, I supported and worked for President Kennedy's proposal for the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs in 1961 and subsequent years. I am also cosponsoring President Johnson's proposal to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This legislation is needed to improve the administration and coordination of the principal Federal programs which provide assistance for housing and the development of the Nation's urban communities.

It will help promote interstate, regional, and metropolitan collaboration.

It will provide better technical assistance and information, including a clearinghouse service, to these units of State and local government.

I believe this department is a necessary instrument in our struggle to achieve a more measured metropolitan development.

No one of these proposals for Federal action will alone solve the urban crisis. But when combined, they offer a meaningful answer to the task President Johnson set before us in his State of the Union message when he charged us "to break the old patterns, to begin to think, work, and plan for development of entire metropolitan areas."

There are many who deem these measures drastic or undesirable. May I simply remind them what we have at stake in the urban crisis.

About 70 percent of our population lives in metropolitan areas. According to the latest figures available, 78.6 percent of all the Nation's bank deposits are in metropolitan area banks; 70 percent of the Nation's assessable property lies within the boundaries of metropolitan areas; 76.8 percent of value added by manufacture originates in metropolitan areas. These regions account for 67.2 percent of the country's manufacturing establishments: 73.8 percent of all industrial employees and 78.5 percent of all manufacturing payrolls.

I suggest that the measures we propose do not exceed the problems we face. Each of the 135 million Americans who lives in a metropolis is entitled to a meaningful life in a healthy environment. The potential is there; we must realize it.

Our concern is for preservation of human dignity in a democratic society. I should like to conclude by reading to you the oath taken by citizens of another and earlier democratic society no less concerned with the fate of human dignity in a metropolis.

"We will never bring disgrace to this our city, by any act of dishonesty or cowardice. Nor ever desert our suffering comrades in the ranks; we will fight for the ideals and sacred things of the city, both alone and with many.

"We will revere and obey the city's laws and do our best to incite a like respect in those above us who are prone to annul or set them at naught; we will strive unceasingly to quicken the public's sense of civic duty, thus in all these ways we will transmit this city not only not less, but greater, and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us."

So vowed the Athenians long ago. We might well renew that vow as a preclude to renewing our cities.

Order and Beauty in Megalopolis

(Address by Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Conference on Urban Regionalism, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, May 21, 1965)

It is really rather exciting to be in on the birth of an idea—in this case, the concept of a special center for the study of regional development. Such centers are still very rare and our technology is still primitive. But there is no doubt whatever about the essential need for such centers, and for such meticulous attention to the problems of metropolitan growth and change.

And I am impressed by the scale of your thinking concerning the role of such a regional center. Not only will the center serve as a clearinghouse for data gathered throughout the region and a junction for the most effective use of available university resources, but it will also become the focus for a badly needed joint effort of Government, business, labor, and education on the complexities of regional growth. And I agree fully with your president, Dr. White, who has said that "Megalopolis carries a challenge. It is a testing ground of the strength and adaptability of American democracy."

This challenge is immense. And there are already real questions as to whether our democratic institutions are rising to meet it with anything like the speed that the situation demands. The President posed the challenge well in his historic message on the cities:

"Between today and the year 2000, more than 80 percent of our population increase will occur in urban areas. During the next 15 years, 30 million people will be added to our cities—equivalent to the combined population of New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Baltimore. Each year in the coming generation, we will add the equivalent of 15 cities of 20,000 each."

Furthermore, the President told us, "In the remainder of this century—in less than 40 years—urban population will double, city land will double and we will have to build in our cities as much as all that we have built since the first colonist arrived on these shores. It is as if we had 40 years to rebuild the entire urban United States."

Urbanization—the growth of urban areas—has been going on in this country for a long time. But for many years it was possible to ignore urban growth, or at least to take a laissez-faire attitude toward it. There was then very little realization that this growth represented the emergence in this country of a new frontier—a frontier of intensive development comparable in its challenges and opportunities to the old frontier of extensive development.

Most of you here are familiar with the long catalog of problems which have emerged as a result of urbanization: The migration of low-income families to the centers of cities; the migration of moderate- and higher-income families to the suburbs; the movement of business to the suburbs; racial discrimination in housing, schools, and public facilities; unemployment, aggravated by the spread of automation; the skyrocketing cost of replacing and expanding schools and other essential physical facilities; the impossible tangle of traffic and transportation needs.

Every one of these involves a host of immediate needs for those who live and work in urban areas. City and county budgets—even with the help available from the Federal Government—are strained to the utmost in attempting to meet the needs that exist now.

The very thought of the needs that will exist tomorrow sometimes seems overwhelming. Yet it is essential that we do look to the needs of tomorrow if we are to succeed in meeting them better than we have those of today.

This is why the metropolitan and regional planning activities that are going on throughout the Nation are so important to the future of our country. That is why this center will fulfill not only a vital regional need, but also a vital national need.

We believe strongly that planning for urban regions cannot be left exclusively to the technicians—be they city planners, highway engineers, economists, or other specialists. The development of metropolitan areas must be guided by responsible local leaders—elected officials and others. At the same time the technical planning needs to be tied closely to comprehensive planning carried out under local and regional auspices.

In this context, your own region does indeed pose a challenge. As in most fast-growing regions, governmental arrangements are still primitive or nonexistent, for the most part, and there are still great gaps in our knowledge both of the factors of growth and their consequences.

The Federal role is to help local enterprise—private and public—fill these gaps. In your own region, we are helping do this through a special grant for urban planning assistance aimed at developing information on the interrelationships between land use and transportation. Federal funds have been supporting the study-design phase of this program, and soon work will be starting on the planning itself. This is a landmark undertaking, in the context of our usually too slow reactions to the pace of urban growth. The very fact that 7 counties, comprising a region where more than 2 million persons live and 140 municipal and township governments exercise authority, can get together and come up with any plan at all is an achievement.

And it is an achievement that holds out the promise to dozens of similar regions throughout the country that they, too, can surmount their local rivalries and join in planning for their future. In this respect, the work of your Tricounty Regional Planning Commission has also offered a prime example of intergovernmental planning coordination. Tricounty has four 701 urban planning assistance projects completed or underway.

This is exactly the sort of metropolitan—or even megalopolitan—effort that the Federal Government is now attempting to stimulate. President Johnson, in his message on the cities, proposed several new programs which will "* * * require sound, long-range development programs as a condition of Federal assistance. Wherever it can be done without leaving vital needs unmet, existing programs will also be keyed to planning requirements."

In the new housing and community development legislation now being discussed on Capitol Hill, several new programs have been proposed which have as their foundation conformance with areawide comprehensive planning. The proposed programs for providing sewer and water facilities are a case in point. These badly needed community facilities should be planned for broad metropolitan areas to permit all local governments to realize the economies of scale which accrue through such large-scale development.

Likewise, the program for advance land acquisition would demand conformance with metropolitan planning, to permit the most rational ordering of fast-dwindling urban land resources. This program would encourage communities to plan their public works needs in a more orderly fashion, and thereby maximize the efficiency of local development.

Programs for mass transportation and open space already require conformance with comprehensive areawide planning. And in July of this year, the planning requirements of the Federal Highway Act will take effect. No funds will be approved after that date for highways in any urban area of more than 50,000 population unless there is an established comprehensive transportation planning process for the whole urban area. Such planning must be a cooperative effort of local communities and State highway departments.

Tomorrow Senator MUSKIE will undoubtedly tell you about the so-called Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965 which would refine still further planning requirements regarding Federal aids to local development. This measure would require that projects aided by Federal funds be consistent with local planning objectives and that any applications for Federal aid for urban renewal, hospitals, air pollution, and so forth be reviewed and commented upon by the officially designated metropolitan planning agency for the region. This act would also favor city and county governments over special service districts as recipients of Federal aids.

Some planners, perhaps dismayed by the pace of urbanization, have called for a broader Federal role in planning per se. I am very strongly inclined to resist such proposals. I feel that the physical planning of land uses and determination of the scale and the detail of development should be kept as close as possible to the people most intimately involved. In our Federal system, the State government is the repository of legal authority for municipal powers. The Federal Government should, as it does, offer incentives and aids to State and local governments for the initiation and execution of policies and programs which have clearly discernible national implications. The orderly development of our metropolitan growth is just such a task. The Federal Government will continue to establish national policy objectives and programs to achieve those objectives. It will continue to provide financial and technical assistance to State and local governments which need and desire such help.

But I would much prefer to see many more centers for urban regionalism, such as this one you are launching at Kent State, than a proliferation of Federal planning. A center such as yours offers the opportunity for local, including county, and State governments to coordinate planning with business and leading institutions. The Federal role in this process is to establish broad policies and offer financial aids. Out of such a partnership of the several levels of government, private business and education can come a tremendously useful and historic example of coordinated action for rational regional development.

As the President has said: "Whatever the scale of its programs, the Federal Government will only be able to do a small part of what is required. The vast bulk of resources and energy, of talent and toil, will have to come from State and local governments, private interests, and individual citizens."

Earlier today you have heard speakers discussing economic planning and techniques for regional development. You also heard Mr. Wittenberg talk about space for living in Megalopolis. I have already spoken to the point of a more rational economic order and governmental pattern in our regional development, and now I would like to direct your attention more to Mr. Wittenberg's point.

You notice that I have titled this talk "Order and Beauty in Megalopolis," and perhaps that strikes a rather discordant note for some of you. We are not very used to talking about beauty as a corollary of urbanization. Our experience has been, in fact, quite the contrary—urbanization has meant, usually, a despoliation rather than an enhancing of nature. But something unique is happening in our urban history—for the first time, a President of the United States has sent to Congress a special message on, of all things, "Natural Beauty."

In that message, the President outlined the several ways in which urbanization and regional growth were "depriving many Americans of the right to live in decent surroundings." The waste and inefficiency of sprawl, the proliferation of junkyards and roadside clutter and the fouling of our air and water were all cited as the symptoms of our careless growth.

The President's answer to this problem is "a new conservation." And he said:

"We must not only protect the countryside and save it from destruction, we must restore what has been destroyed and salvage the beauty and charm of our cities. Our conservation must not be just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its concern is not with nature alone, but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just man's welfare, but the dignity of man's spirit."

As an early step to mustering a national effort to foster this "new conservation," the President has called a White House Conference on Natural Beauty. This conference will summon over 800 of the top experts in landscape design, architecture, citizen action, government, business, education and city and regional planning to Washington next Monday for 2 days of discussion. The conference is aimed directly at the development of action programs and means for implementing the broad objectives laid out in the President's message. In his own words, the conference "will look for ways to help and encourage State and local governments, institutions, and private citizens in their own efforts."

I could think of no better forum than this to bring this message to your notice. You are now embarking on a major effort to develop a higher order of development throughout this great megalopolis. I urge you to keep constantly in the forefront of your thinking the necessity to grow with beauty, as well as with efficiency and economy. There is an even greater need for more research into the form of great regions than there is for study of a region's viable functions. And the two, as our greatest architects have long since demonstrated, are really inseparable.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency will be putting even greater stress on the need for more natural beauty, better building design, and a higher caliber of sound planning in the future. In this fast-growing northeastern Ohio region, you can certainly see the ravages of uncontrolled development, and should therefore be able better to appreciate our renewed emphasis on these programs. Your lake is strangling to death on pollution and misuse. Your streams and rivers, like those in most of the rest of the Nation, are becoming increasingly fouled. And you need only look at your major cities—Cleveland, Youngstown, Akron, or Canton—and their environs, replete with junkyards, road clutter and the accumulations of industrial neglect, to see what the nature of the need is for "a new conservation" in your own region. You will also see in these great cities examples of beauty which afford prototypes of future growth.

In the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, the administration has made several recommendations for expanding the usefulness of existing programs affecting natural beauty and for new programs as well. For instance, the open space program, which has already made over 360 grants to State and local governments for acquisition of over 135,000 acres, would be extended to built-up city areas.

This will enable States or localities to acquire land in cities, and then develop such land into neighborhood parks, play areas, pedestrian malls, or where possible, redevelop waterfronts with the aid of a proposed program of matching grants for urban beautification. Tied closely to this new program would be an improvement program, providing Federal funds for tree plantings, park improvements, and renovations or the landscaping of small urban spaces.

Another proposed program would permit localities to receive grants for special demonstration projects aimed at furthering natural beauty in the city. Such demonstrations could be paid for entirely by Federal grants. A maximum of innovation and experimentation would be encouraged.

All these proposed programs are designed to bring a higher order of amenity into city neighborhoods and downtown areas, including waterfronts.

The President has said that the urban problem is really "people and the quality of lives they lead." We have for too long ignored or simply not worked hard enough at, the critical problems of ugliness in our cities, towns, and landscape. Our lives can have no quality without beauty, the opportunity for repose, and to enjoy nature not only in the great national parks but in the most congested city neighborhoods as well. Our urban waterfronts must be rehabilitated and brought to life. Cities must be forced to turn toward the water and not away from it. It is a resource that is irreplaceable, and no premium is too high to place on its ultimate value.

To implement the President's broad objectives for greater natural beauty, we need not only a stronger national effort and awareness of the problems, but we also need a great deal more knowledge on which to base our programs. The President, in his natural beauty message, called for a community extension program to bring university resources to bear on problems of the community. And he also called for funds to implement the program, passed in 1964, for training of local government employees under State educational facilities.

The latter program is particularly essential if we are to relieve the critical shortage of skilled persons needed to serve local government in planning and related work. The training which would be available under title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 would train technical and professional employees of local government in community development responsibilities. And matching grants would also be made to assist State and local research in connection with community development problems, such as housing programs and needs, public improvement programing, code problems, efficient land use, and urban transportation.

Hopefully the Congress will see fit to follow the President's recommendation and fund this program as soon as possible. I know that many of you here today have been very interested in title VIII, and realize full well how valuable a tool it can be in generating the manpower and technology which we need so desperately if we are ever to develop megalopolis with order and with beauty.

The role of great universities in regional development cannot be underestimated. We have already seen, in Berkeley and Cambridge, how university complexes can generate economic development. And now we have a veritable nationwide competition, with Pittsburgh, Dallas, Denver, Cleveland, and other cities all jockeying for position. Most of these new university-oriented complexes are aimed at further developing our scientific and technological skills. Too few have been directed, as is your Center for Urban Regionalism, at the very real difficulties, physical, social, and esthetic, besetting metropolitan areas themselves.

In closing, I would return to the words of Dr. White, who said recently that "Megalopolis presents a challenge not only for socioeconomic reasons, but also for cultural reasons; both need exploration and discussion."

I fully agree, and that is why I have chosen to speak on esthetics and beauty as well as economics and political organization. Recently, the London Economist commented on the creation of a new Greater London Council, which will plan the development—on a much more comprehensive and sophisticated scale than anything we have seen yet in this country—for an area seven times larger than that under the jurisdiction of the old and now extinct London County Council. The Economist was shedding no tears for the old council, which it obviously regarded as inadequate to the task, although it handled a much broader area with much stronger powers than anything in the United States. But it did pass out some bouquets to the old planning body, and it is rather interesting to see what they said:

"The true distinction of the London County Council has been to lead the nation in municipal patronage of the arts."

The council, the writer went on, will be best remembered for the Royal Festival Hall, Kenwood concerts, and the "true architectural distinction of the Alton housing estate at Roehampton."

Hopefully, as we in this country develop a more sophisticated and effective means of shaping our metropolitan growth, with the aid of centers such as this one, we will not lose sight of such an achievement. There can no longer be any argument that if our objective is "the quality of lives" our people lead, then we must pay stricter attention to the arts, to architecture and to the joys of natural beauty. With these elements built directly into our thinking, we can see that growth becomes a vehicle to move us nearer a truly Great Society, rather than a juggernaut which can crush not only our own chances for decent living but those of our children as well.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. Pool, for May 25 through 28, 1965, on account of hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities held in Chicago.

Mr. Del Clawson (at the request of Mr. Arends), for the balance of the week, on account of official business attending hearings in Chicago, Ill., as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Hull, for Thursday, May 27, and Friday, May 28, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. Flynt (at the request of Mr. Stephens), on account of official business.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Arends), for the balance of the week, on account of official business attending hearings in Chicago, Ill., as member of Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Randall, for Wednesday, May 26, and Thursday, May 27, 1965, on account of official business in district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Vanik (at the request of Mr. Krebs), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matters.

Mr. Talcott (at the request of Mr. Quillen), for 1 hour, on June 3, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Brademas (at the request of Mr. Krebs), for 30 minutes, on May 27, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Rogers of Florida to include with his remarks made in Committee today certain miscellaneous material and tables.

Mr. Philbin.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Quillen) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Conte.

Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Morse.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Krebs) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Huot.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. Hechler.

Mr. Denton.

SENATE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 125. An act for the relief of Armando S. Arguilles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 133. An act for the relief of Faustino G. Dumaplin, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 313. An act relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 402. An act for the relief of Oh Wha Ja (Penny Korleen Doughty); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 409. An act for the relief of Betty Tin-Sang Chan Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 442. An act for the relief of Carleen Coen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 449. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Bialoglowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 450. An act for the relief of William John Campbell McCaughey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 469. An act for the relief of Timoteo A. Tuazon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 516. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, to provide that such Commission shall not terminate prior to December 31, 1966, and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 579. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 582. An act for the relief of Aleksandr Kaznacheev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 584. An act for the relief of Ming Chup Chau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 585. An act for the relief of Santiago Woo and Morjin Chee de Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 586. An act for the relief of Maria Tsilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 616. An act for the relief of Miss Choun Seem Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 826. An act for the relief of Har Gobind Khorana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1039. An act for the relief of Andreina Viselli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1040. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Rafala Monarca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jacobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe, and Ramon Jacobe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1084. An act for the relief of Shu Hsien Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1103. An act for the relief of Kathryn Choi Ast; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1104. An act for the relief of Mirhan Gazarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1138. An act for the relief of Lt. Robert C. Gibson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1196. An act for the relief of Wright G. James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1197. An act for the relief of Angelina Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1209. An act for the relief of Sp. Manuel D. Racelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1388. An act for the relief of David Lee Bogue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1390. An act for the relief of Rocky River Co. and Macy Land Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1405. An act for the relief of Jozsef Pozsonyi and his wife, Agnes Pozsonyi, and their minor child, Ildiko Pozsonyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1468. An act for the relief of Dorothy Eyre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1498. An act for the relief of Nikolai Artamonov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution establishing the Commission on Art and Antiquities of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6497. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States; and

H.R. 8122. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 339. An act to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 26, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1152. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 16, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Santa Rosa Wash, Ariz., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 189); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1153. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics) transmitting a proposal to transfer two motor whale boats (hull Nos. 22417 and 23671) to the U.S.S. Alabama Battleship Commission, Mobile, Ala., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1154. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1155. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of excessive interest costs incurred on certain income tax refunds, Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1156. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary procurement of air passenger service on scheduled commercial airliners from Japan and Korea to the United States, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1157. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of loose management in budgeting and financial reporting for certain educational exchange activities, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1158. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report of the Federal water resources research program for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1159. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Maj. Derrill deS. Trenholm, Jr., U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 354. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs entitled "Overseas Programs of Private Nonprofit American Organizations"; without amendment (Rept. No. 367). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report on oversea programs of private nonprofit American organizations. (Rept. No. 368.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 431. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases; with amendment (Rept. No. 369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CORMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7707. A bill to authorize the appointment of crier-law clerks by district judges; without amendment (Rept. No. 370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 398. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 237, a bill to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 371). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 399. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 485, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 372). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 400. Resolution waiving points of order against conference report on S. 800, an act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 373). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee of conference. S. 800. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 374). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 2452. A bill to extend the benefits of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 8419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual to deduct from gross income the expenses, not exceeding $300 a year, paid for transportation to and from his place of abode and his place of business or employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 8420. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8421. A bill to expand and improve existing law and to provide for the establishment of regulations for the purpose of controlling pollution from vessels and certain other sources in the Great Lakes and other navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8422. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 8423. A bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code to provide for extension of terms of patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 8424. A bill to provide severance pay to certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 8425. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 8426. A bill arranging for orderly marketing of certain imported articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 8427. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 8428. A bill arranging for orderly marketing of certain imported articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 8429. A bill to nullify certain rules of the Federal Communications Commission relating to the Citizens Radio Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 8430. A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 8431. A bill to cover into the competitive civil service of the United States the positions of employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 8432. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Conservation Act with respect to the disposal of land and interests in land acquired pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 8433. A bill to provide for the rights of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8434. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to give to Peace Corps volunteers returning from duty assignments abroad the same favorable customs treatment given other persons in the service of the United States returning from such assignments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 8435. A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 8436. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possession of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 8437. A bill to provide feed grain program benefits to cooperating farmers affected by flood or other natural disaster; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 8438. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the excise taxes on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8439. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 8440. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to remove the prohibitions against importing, transporting, and mailing in the U.S. mails articles for preventing conception and advertisements with respect to such articles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 8441. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over nonprofit cooperatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 8442. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the maximum amount of the lump-sum death payment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 8443. A bill to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 8444. A bill to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 8445. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8446. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 8447. A bill to amend section 2678 of title 28, United States Code, relating to attorney fees under the Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 8448. A bill to amend the Bank Merger Act so as to provide that bank mergers, whether accomplished by the acquisition of stock or assets or in any other way, are subject exclusively to the provisions of the Bank Merger Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 8449. A bill arranging for orderly marketing of certain imported articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 8450. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program under which supplemental agricultural workers can be recruited for temporary employment in the continental United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 8451. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to eliminate the prohibition against the importation of drugs, medicine, and other articles for the prevention of conception; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 482. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the power of the President to make treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.J. Res. 483. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the popular election of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 419. Concurrent resolution relative to population growth and requesting the creation of a Presidential Commission on Population; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. Con. Res. 420. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 421. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to bringing the Baltic States question before the United Nations and the conduct of free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 422. Concurrent resolution calling for free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 8452. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Argumedo-Ortiz and Margarita Ortiz de Argumedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 8453. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret G. Bremner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8454. A bill for the relief of Dr. Riccardo Ricciardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 8455. A bill for the relief of Erdem Ahmet Tuncsiper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 8456. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Malliris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8457. A bill for the relief of Robert G. Mikulecky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 8458. A bill for the relief of Mr. Cvetko Grdovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 8459. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleuteria A. Lactaoen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8460. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ayako Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8461. A bill for the relief of Nadir Spahi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 8462. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bela Szwimer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN ANDREWS:

H.R. 8463. A bill for the relief of Alden Jo Daniel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

218. Mr. SHRIVER presented a resolution of the Outdoor Writers of Kansas, Thayne Smith, president, adopted May 14, 1965, at Wichita, Kans., stating opposition to S. 1592 since its obvious intent can only be considered as but a prelude to complete elimination of article II, the constitutional right to keep and bear arms, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tabulation of Results of a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we have just completed an experiment in the First Congressional District of Alabama in order to learn more about the opinions of the district's citizens regarding important national and international issues of the day.

We have been overwhelmed by the tremendous number of persons who took the time to respond to a written questionnaire which we mailed to every home in the district. More than 16,000 persons responded.

This is a great tribute to the First District because it shows that our people want to make their ideas on important issues known to their elected representative in Congress.

In order that representative government can be effective it is important that elected officials know the views of the voters. This is one way that I can be informed as I proceed to serve the First District.

I want to call particular attention to 2 of the 10 issues raised in the questionnaire. Of those responding to the questionnaire fully 86.2 percent oppose President Johnson's proposal to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and thus they favor continuing the State authority to enact right-to-work laws.

On the other hand, 73.5 percent of those responding believe that our national security is at stake in the conflict in Vietnam, giving support to the administration in its determination to help South Vietnam resist outside aggression from the north.

Following is the complete tabulation of results of the questionnaire:

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you favor "medicare" for the aged financed by an increase in social security taxes?	20.5	79.5
2. Would you approve of a Federal law repealing State "right to work" laws?	13.8	86.2
3. Should the Federal Government undertake a program for controlling pollution in lakes, rivers, and streams?	75.9	24.1
4. Do you believe that our own national security is at stake in the Vietnam conflict?	73.5	26.5
5. Would you favor a change in our immigration laws to base a person's admittance to the United States on skills rather than on country of birth?	51.2	48.8
6. Do you feel any State should have the right to apportion 1 house of its State legislature on factors other than population if a majority of the State's voters agree?	74.0	26.0
7. Do you support Federal aid to education?	45.6	54.4
8. Would you support a constitutional amendment to provide for a 4-year term for the U.S. House of Representatives with ½ of the House Members elected every 2 years?	74.4	25.6
9. Do you favor the proposal to give a tax credit to individuals for the costs of higher education?	74.1	25.9
10. Would you support a program of Federal rent subsidies to low- and middle-income families?	18.2	81.8

United Nations Should Conduct Free Elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask the United Nations to request the Soviet Union to withdraw all Soviet troops, secret police, agents, columnists, and all controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and also to return to their homes all Baltic exiles and deportees from Siberia prisons and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union and that free elections be held in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Twenty-five years ago on the coming 15th of June, the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were overrun by the Red army and I am looking forward to the enactment of this resolution to return their freedom to these democratic and peace-loving nations.

Christian Endeavor Annual Citizenship Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, there is much publicity today given to youths who are called wayward and delinquent and others who find themselves in serious trouble with the law. However, a refreshing bit of news came across my desk this week and I feel that I should share the essence of it here with my colleagues.

The International Society of Christian Endeavor recently announced the award recipients in its annual citizenship awards program. This contest received hundreds of entries, showing that there is indeed a large number of our young people who are interested in practicing good citizenship.

One of the individual award winners is a young lad from my hometown of Evansville, Ind. The boy, Gary W. Haire, is only 17. His interest and his activities, however, show that he is indeed, a mature citizen of this country. He is active in both church and school affairs.

His winning entry, published first in his high school paper, was a cartoon showing a drunken driver saying "Pardon me, I didn't know I was loaded."

For his efforts Mr. Haire will receive a cash award and a grant which will enable him to attend the Society of Christian Endeavor's international convention in Dallas, Tex., this year.

I am very pleased that such a young man comes from my district. But I am even more pleased to learn that such young people are being recognized for their efforts in good citizenship, helping to allay the belief that our young people are not being trained to become good citizens.

Congressional Modernization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, 1965, our colleague, the Congressman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], testified before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

The problem of congressional reorganization is a great challenge, not only to that committee but, also, to the Congress itself and it is gratifying to all of us to realize that we have taken it upon ourselves to be our own critics in a constructive sense. One of the problems will be to maintain our momentum and to retain a judicial and dispassionate attitude toward all proposals for change.

We have recently made some important improvements in our procedures. I believe that more are necessary and I am confident they will be effected.

Representative MONAGAN's statement made a great contribution to enlightened discussion of this problem and I include this statement with other remarks:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN S. MONAGAN, DEMOCRAT, OF CONNECTICUT, PRESENTED MAY 11, 1965

(Before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, Old Supreme Court Chamber, U.S. Capitol)

I do not come before you today as a belittler of Congress. To me it is not a "sapless branch." Nor is the Chamber in which I serve a "house out of order." It is a viable, active, and responsive political organism and the greatest instrument of free government in the history of the world.

Unfortunately, one of the products of our free press has been a spate of uninformed and unrealistic criticism of Congress. Even Pageant magazine last November turned an inquiring eye on Capitol Hill and sandwiched its notorious rating of Congressmen between articles on "Kissing After Marriage" and ads explaining how to remove hemorrhoids.

Certainly Congress has its failings as does every human organization. Its procedures could well be upgraded in many instances, but this is different from not being an effective instrument of the public will. To get a proper comparison, one need only look at the other parliaments in the world and decide how many are more truly representative than ours. It is one thing to say that our practices may be improved. It is quite another to attack the adequacy of the institution. The former claim is justified. The latter is not.

Of course, procedural reforms have importance, but I do not attach to them the same significance as do some impatient commentators. Our forms have a protective function and the winnowing legislative process is a guarantor of better laws than action by simple fiat. Surely under our system the will of the people is made effective when it is expressed with sufficient strength and that is the proper measure of popular government.

In view of the jaundiced view of Congress expressed by many, I suggest that it is particularly significant that these hearings result from voluntary action on the part of Congress itself and represent a sort of examination of conscience which is solid evidence of the strength of this institution.

I should like to make one other generalization which to me seems important. It is that the proper relation must be maintained between the legislative and the other branches of our Government. For example, recent years have witnessed a marked increase in the lawmaking activity of the Supreme Court and it may be questioned whether this body, not subject to periodic election, has always been well advised in its lawmaking. Objection may also be made to usurpation of power by executive agencies. The solution of this imbalance, of course, is not rulemaking but a virtue advocated by Mr. Justice Frankfurter and called judicial restraint.

It is important to point out that Congress is not stuck in a mud bog of indifference. I need only point to the passage in the current House of rules changes covering the 21-day callup from the Rules Committee and the provision concerning the unanimous-consent requirement for sending bills to conference, as well as the creation of a steering committee. These were reforms urged by Senator CLARK and Representatives REUSS and BOLLING in their books. Thus, what these commentators have described as major roadblocks to effective operation have been eliminated by voluntary action.

When the current congressional redistricting changes are added to these procedural reforms it appears that most of the objections of these critics have been removed—or will have been removed in a period of 2 or 3 years.

I should like also to emphasize the mercurial character of press and editorial comment on Congress which in the 88th Congress in the brief space of 2 years ran the gamut from hurling epithets like "do nothing" and "lackluster" to showering praise as one of the most effective Congresses in history. This inability to understand the natural and calculated restraints of our system does not help in reaching a fair appraisal of the work of Congress.

I certainly do not mean to say that no reform is possible. In this area, modernization is essential in government as elsewhere if we are to keep up with the increasing and changing demands that are placed upon us.

With salary increases for Members and staffs, and the provision of a legislative assistant in the House, much help has been given in moving toward efficiency, but further steps are necessary. Expert accountants should be provided to put appropriations bills in proper context by informed comment on carryovers, cost increases, and other important elements. Departments should be required to make a clear separation between operating expenses and capital investments. Reports on appropriations bills should more clearly state the impact of each bill on current and future budgets.

Another reform needed for effective operation is the elimination of the capacity of one Member to prevent committees from sitting while a particular Chamber is in session.

I feel, too, that a reasonably adequate staff of each committee should be made available for minority members. This practice is now followed in some committees, but it is not universal and it should be followed everywhere. The capacity of the minority to examine and criticize should not be abridged, but should be preserved as a basic strength of our system.

Another frequent preventive of efficient operation which should be removed is the requirement that the previous day's Journal should be read. In these days of modern printing, this rule is no longer practical and serves merely as a convenient instrument of delay.

While I do not favor required public disclosure of private finances—since I consider it an invasion of privacy and the creation of a presumption against public servants—I do feel that improvement is badly needed in the area of conflict of interest. Here increased clarity is vitally important. What is a "conflict of interest"? In what cases does it arise? When is a Member of Congress going beyond the bounds of propriety?

A review of this field of law is necessary. The provision of proper guidelines after free and open discussion will benefit the Congress and the public.

This is a brief category of possible reforms. Of course, there are many others, not a few of which are appropriate and useful. Each witness will have his own list.

One other change is vital I think. It is the setting of a limitation on the inordinate time spent in our campaigns. This is more true, of course, of presidential compaigns, but it is also characteristic of senatorial campaigns as well.

I hope that this Committee will consider the suggestions which I have made and that through weaving together these proposals and those made by others, we may be able to improve the operation of our fundamentally sound institution—the Congress of the United States.

Firearms Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, much discussion has been generated by S. 1592 and H.R. 6628, the controversial firearms control legislation.

I have taken a position in opposition to this legislation on the ground that it was oppressive and unrealistic, particularly that provision of the bill which would absolutely prohibit the purchase of firearms from mail order houses by individuals. I believe this provision would discriminate against gun owners and collectors in smaller cities and rural areas.

Previous legislation introduced in the Congress would permit mail order sales and require the purchaser to register when securing firearms in this manner. I believe this legislation to be beneficial to the general public rather than S. 1592 or H.R. 6628 which flatly prohibits such sales.

Since the introduction of S. 1592 and its House counterpart, my office has been overwhelmed by mail from outraged sportsmen who sought the opportunity to express their opposition to this legislation. For this reason, on May 14, I sponsored a public hearing in Exeter, N.H., on firearms control. Over 300 interested sportsmen attended this hearing to voice their views. Those in attendance presented both their own personal views and the views of organizations to which they belonged. I would like to point out that these people were not unaware of the problems caused by the unregulated traffic in firearms. They were aware of the needs for some regulation to check the sale of firearms to minors and felons. They were, on the other hand, concerned that S. 1592 as written placed undue restrictions on legitimate responsible firearms users. For example, the bill makes no allowances for unserviceable antique weapons. It makes no exceptions for the transportation and sending of weapons to or by law enforcement officers. And, as previously pointed out, it places an absolute embargo on the shipment in interstate commerce of firearms to individuals.

The 300-plus people in attendance at the hearing expressed nearly unanimous opposition to S. 1592 as now drafted. I share this opposition and express the hope that the respective committees charged with the responsibility of dealing with this legislation will see fit to incorporate responsible amendments and revisions which will make this legislation acceptable to legitimate firearms users.

Orderly Marketing Legislation—Act Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House a bill to provide orderly marketing which I trust will provide a new solution to the hardships being experienced by the shoe industry and other domestic industries currently being burdened down by the steadily growing, and extremely dangerous flood of foreign imports that are coming into this country.

The bill is designed to provide some relief from the inadequacies of present trade treaty and trade laws which have made possible the influx of large quantities of goods of many descriptions. These imports are, as I predicted at the time of the enactment of the trade bill and the reciprocal treaty bills endangering the prosperity and stability, not only of the shoe industry, but of many other American industries as well.

Unless some way is found before long—and the hour is late—to curb the very disturbing flow into this country of these goods and products, irreparable damage will be done to the shoe industry and to the many other industries that are feeling the sharp, crushing impact of cutthroat foreign competition.

I hope that this measure will be promptly considered and acted upon by the Congress, and I hope that when it goes into effect that it will permit the industries concerned to avoid the destructive, unfair competition presently imposed upon them by the operation of existing trade laws.

Personally, I have never been impressed by the difficulty of this problem which stems to my mind from ill-advised policies of this Government which are allowing foreign industries to take over, not only a large portion of our foreign markets but an increasingly large part of our domestic market as well, in some instances as much as 25 percent.

If proper safeguards had been written into the trade laws responsible for this unfair, cutthroat competition, we would not now be facing the serious situation that is developing in the shoe industry, and in other domestic industries.

I trust that this legislation will be considered at an early date by the House and passed so that the affected industries and their faithful workers now confronted with the prospect of diminished prosperity and disappearing employment will be spared from these dread evils, and so that our American economy may go forward, as it should and can, to higher levels that will insure increased prosperity, larger employment opportunities, and well-being for business, for the workers, and for the American people.

I hope Congress will soon attack these menacing conditions across a broad front with effective measures to furnish relief to the aggrieved industries and workers and our great free economy which is facing such dire and dangerous threats from cheap foreign imports.

The 275th Anniversary of Philadelphia's 21st Ward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the special June supplement of the Review, the community newspaper of Philadelphia's 21st ward, which is celebrating its 275th year in 1965.

Amid buildings constructed long before the Declaration of Independence, the people of Roxborough, Manayunk, and Wissahickon have preserved a community as unique as the one that saw the British march up the ridge early in the morning of May 20, 1778.

Although the little village of Roxborough, which once consisted of a few houses scattered down the road, is now fully grown, one can still see signposts of the past. For instance, Roxborough is one community where you can still see a horse on the street. Many riding stables serve patrons who like to gallop up and down the trails of the Wissahickon.

It is true that there are now more houses and people in the community, which was once known as Roxborough Township. There are also more churches and schools. Television, automobiles, and the Schuylkill Expressway have brought a new era to the formerly isolated ridge of land between Wissahickon Creek and the Schuylkill River.

Yet the 21st ward is still an exciting place. Although concrete has covered the fields and pastureland, and shopping centers and parking lots have come to the vales and valleys of Roxborough, Shawmont, and Wissahickon, the unusual loyalty of the people of the 21st ward for their community is one signpost of the past that will never come down.

Joe Martin Testimonial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most moving tributes ever paid to a Member of this body was rendered to our beloved former Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, by the people of his district at a Newton, Mass., Chamber of Commerce achievement dinner in that city last night.

Your eloquent words, Mr. Speaker, were a moving tribute to a man with whom you have shared the burdens of public service throughout most of your lifetime. The humorous, kindly, generous words of the Vice President enthralled audience of 800 persons, who sat spellbound as these warm messages came to them by way of a telephone transmission making the first public use of Early Bird, the communications satellite.

We from Massachusetts, who have special reasons to know and love JOE MARTIN, are indebted to everyone who made this occasion such a dramatic success, particularly our minority leader, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, who flew to Massachusetts to deliver a keynote speech.

His words are a rare chronicle of a unique career in public service. They are a valuation summary of the distinctive lifetime of our friend, from birth in North Attleboro to these years of crowning achievements.

Because this biographical address of Congressman FORD will serve a valuable historic purpose, Mr. Speaker, I place it in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks:

TESTIMONIAL FOR JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., NEWTON, MASS., MAY 24, 1965

(By GERALD R. FORD)

Although this is a nonpartisan dinner, I would like to say that I'm particularly pleased to be here because I understand that the city of Newton casts the largest number of Republican votes of any community in Massachusetts. As the leader of the oppressed minority in the House, it's a pleasure to be in such a friendly environment.

While everyone knows that it was Nathan Hale who said, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country," tonight I would like to add a modern corollary to that famous statement. It is this: "The Republican Party regrets that it has but one JOE MARTIN to give to our country." All would agree that more Joe Martins would make America even greater.

I feel a special kinship for our guest of honor. JOE MARTIN once said, "The position of minority leader of the House of Representatives is the most thankless job in Washington. I would not take 10 times $10,000 to return to it." And now I'm the fellow who's trying to fill the giant shoes that JOE wore for so long, with such distinction, dedication and ability.

But JOE MARTIN and I have something else in common. We have both been avid amateur athletes. I was once a fair football player at the University of Michigan, and he was once a very good semipro baseball player.

Many of you may not know that JOE has maintained his contacts with baseball through the years. When the great Washington Senators' pitcher, Walter Johnson, ran for Congress, his friend JOE MARTIN wrote two campaign speeches for him—one to give before labor groups, and the other to give before farmers. Unfortunately Johnson was a better pitcher than politician. He got the two speeches mixed up, delivering the labor speech to farmers and vice versa. Needless to say, he lost the election, which perhaps proves what JOE MARTIN learned a long time ago: It's easier to be a great Washington Senator than a Member of the House of Representatives.

The man we honor tonight has had the most remarkable record of public service of any person currently active on the political scene. So, if he will forgive me, I would like to turn these remarks into my version of "This Is Your Life."

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., was born on November 3, 1884, the day before Grover Cleveland was elected President for the first time. His father wanted to name him Grover Cleveland Martin. But his mother, a stanch Republican, said, "Grover's a dog's name."

His father was a hardworking North Attleboro blacksmith whose earnings were never more than $18 a week.

Since the family was poor, young JOE started to work outside of school hours at the age of six. One of his jobs was to brush the flies off the horses while his father shod them. Another job was as a delivery boy for the North Attleboro Evening Chronicle. (Now probably every newsboy dreams of one day becoming the owner of the paper. But JOE MARTIN was one young man who was to make this dream come true.)

He got his political start by marching in a torchlight parade for William McKinley in 1896. At the time, a family friend told his father, "Don't let that boy go into politics—he's too good a boy."

JOE, who was otherwise a fellow of extremely good sense, did not listen to this sound advice. Traveling by horse and buggy, he campaigned for the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1911, and was elected—age 27.

In 1916 he began attending Republican presidential conventions. This would become a habit of more than 50 years' duration. And today he holds the record—unsurpassed in either party—of having been five times the permanent chairman of national conventions.

His gentle humor has broken many tense moments at conventions, as all of us recall who were at San Francisco in 1956 when a Nebraska delegate tried to nominate "Joe Smith" for Vice President.

But not all moments at national conventions are so supercharged. At his first convention, JOE woke up in the middle of the night to find that a poker game was in progress in his hotel room. And to his astonishment, he discovered that the dealer was none other than the legendary Diamond Jim Brady.

By 1924 JOE was running for Congress, and he's held that office as your Representative ever since.

These were the days of great orators in the House of Representatives. However, not all Congressmen could keep from wallowing in cliches. JOE remembers that one of the first "great" speeches he heard began: "I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that politics makes strange bedfellows. Especially since women got into 'em."

JOE was put on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Of course, he really wanted to be on the Post Office Committee. (But not all freshmen legislators could be that lucky.) Interestingly, at that time the Foreign Affairs Committee spent a full week debating such earth-shaking questions as to whether or not to authorize $20,000 for an international poultry show in Tulsa.

The new Congressman began to establish his lifetime reputation as a fighter for New England. But he also learned the pitfalls of his office. After getting a new post office for Fall River, it turned out that the building contract went to a firm in St. Louis. The building was constructed not with Fall River granite, but with Indiana limestone. And to top it all off, the job of night watchman was given to the father of JOE'S Democratic opponent.

Yet, despite such temporary setbacks, he kept getting reelected to Congress. A dairyman from Taunton once said, "I vote the straight Democratic ticket, except for Congressman MARTIN. I always vote for him because my father told me to, 15 years ago." Indeed, JOE MARTIN had become a vital institution in his district.

Much deserved recognition came often to JOE MARTIN. In 1936—he was chosen Republican national commiteeman from Massachusetts. In 1938—he was elected chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee. In 1939—he became the Republican leader of the House. In 1940—he was considered a dark horse candidate for the Presidency, and received 44 votes at the convention. Although he never sought the office, this is what the great Kansas editor, William Allen White, said of him: "He will make * * * if the dice roll right, a liberty-loving President."

When Wendell Willkie was made the 1940 nominee, he begged JOE to become chairman of the Republican National Committee. Putting devotion to party above personal wishes, as usual, JOE accepted the post. As chairman he had the rare distinction of seeing the committee evicted from its building when it was purchased by an organization that hasn't been to friendly to most Republicans. However, although he was far from a wealthy man, JOE took over another building and obligated himself as a personal liability for the $33,000 lease. (Is there any wonder why Republicans love JOE MARTIN?)

The greatest tribute came to JOE MARTIN in 1947 when he was first elected Speaker of the House. Next to the President, as most students of government know, the Speaker is the most powerful elective official in the United States.

But what most people don't know is that besides presiding over the House, the Speaker has a great many other duties—such as supervising a Capitol bank with assets of $4 million. The Speaker also has responsibility for four barbershops and a beauty parlor. But JOE, as a confirmed bachelor, told a colleague, "I think I'll let you run the beauty parlor. You are more experienced with the women than I am."

This question of experience with the opposite sex was to change rapidly. For under the new law of presidential succession, Speaker MARTIN was first in line if anything happened to President Truman. (There was no Vice President when Truman succeeded F.D.R. you will recall.) Of course, the possibility of a bachelor President was a great temptation to the single ladies of this country. JOE MARTIN was deluged with offers of marriage. (One proposal that particularly amused him came from a woman spiritualist in Clarksburg, W. Va., who wrote that the deceased Wendell Willkie had told her to marry JOE.)

There are a great many reasons for JOE MARTIN'S success. But I would like to mention just two of them.

The first is his adherence to the old New England principle of thrift. Once JOE MARTIN invited a President of the United States to his office for lunch. He called a caterer for some box lunches and was told that they would cost $2 apiece. Well, this seemed a bit high to JOE, so he shopped around until he found a man who would provide a box lunch for $1.19. I am sure that this makes JOE the only man in American history to entertain a President at such a bargain price. And, of course, JOE has always applied this same principle to the taxpayer's dollar.

Second, JOE MARTIN is a very likeable person. Even those who are his political opponents have come to have a special place in their hearts for him. For example, there is quite a collection of GOP elephants in JOE'S office, and one of the most handsome was given to him by Harry Truman. The story behind this is that someone sent it to the White House, and President Truman told his secretary, "Take this up to JOE MARTIN. I don't want any damned dancing elephants around here."

JOE has served our Nation with great skill. He has been a major force in some of the most crucial decisions of our times. To cite just one instance: During World War II General Marshall came to him and asked for $1.6 billion to manufacture an atomic bomb. JOE'S job would be to try to get this money from Congress largely on faith—for the greatest secrecy had to be maintained. Thus, to a large extent, JOE MARTIN was responsible for putting through a program that eventually shortened the war and saved millions of American lives.

But speaking to you, in a sense, as a representative of JOE MARTIN'S party, I would also like to say a few words about "JOE MARTIN—Republican."

When he was first nominated for House leader in 1939, it was said of him: "We are doing more than electing a floor leader. We are choosing a symbol of the Republican Party."

And JOE MARTIN has been a magnificent symbol of integrity, dedication, honor and patriotism.

Through the darkest days of Republican Party history, he has played one of the most significant roles in keeping the two-party system alive and functioning.

The dedication of JOE MARTIN'S autobiography reads: "To the millions of Republicans—and to the many Democrats and Independents as well—who fought with me through the years to maintain the two-party system of government in the United States."

This has been JOE MARTIN'S greatest fight. And all Americans, regardless of party, are very much in his debt, and owe him a lasting vote of thanks.

From all of us, JOE MARTIN, thank you from the bottom of our hearts.

Fire Commissioner Hink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I announce the death of our beloved fire commissioner, George E. Hink, of Philadelphia, on May 23, 1965. The Members of Congress from Philadelphia have been fully aware of the merits and competence of this man who was truly a dedicated fireman's fireman, an excellent person, and a dear friend. We will miss him greatly.

George E. Hink entered the fire department in 1921 and his interest in the workings of the department was such as to warrant early promotion. He rapidly rose to deputy commissioner, which position he held with honor until the retirement of Commissioner Frank L. McNamee just about a year ago. He was credited with saving foreign-flag ships which caught fire while in port in Philadelphia. He experienced some fearsome fires and had some brushes with disaster during his long career. His advice was sought and his wisdom was shared by members of the department, and his recall from this earthly scene creates a loss which will be felt by his host of associates and friends, as well as by his bereaved family, to whom we offer sincere sympathy and condolences.

Eternal rest give unto him, O Lord, and let the perpetual light shine upon him. May his soul rest in peace.

Republicans: Another Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a recent statement by our distinguished colleague from the State of Maine, Representative Stan Tupper, the full text of which appeared in the Portland Sunday Telegram May 16, 1965.

Congressman Tupper, in his comprehensive and forceful statement, has placed in proper perspective the problems of the Republican Party; moreover, he advances some provocative proposals for the party's course in the future.

I wish to commend the gentleman from Maine for his contribution to the cause of strong two-party government.

If the Republican Party is to correct the damaging imbalance that exists in the strength of our two-party system, there must be abrupt and bold changes made within the minority party; another year may be too late.

We now have at best a one-and-a-half party system in Washington, with the specter of one-party government in the Nation increasingly before us. The responsibility for this serious imbalance rests squarely with the Republican Party.

If honest with ourselves, Republicans must admit that our party has abjectedly failed to capture the imagination of the voters for well over three decades. Our victories have nearly always been victory of the individual rather than of party. The only Republican presidential victory since 1928 was a reward to a war hero. General Eisenhower could have just as easily been elected as a Democrat, and often gave the impression that he wished he had been.

While it grieves me to say so, the Republican Party is still looked upon by the average run-of-the-mill voter as the party of the wealthy, rather stuffy and lacking in imagination. Despite the considerable efforts of a handful of Republican governors, Senators, and Congressmen to change this unfortunate image, it still persists.

It is disquieting to read comments scorning the idea that there is danger of the Republican Party declining to a splinter party status simply because it has managed to survive in the past. This is but wishful thinking; with little better than 20 percent of the registered voters now preferring the Republican Party, we face the ultimate loss of many of these loyal partisans unless we give them a better reason to vote Republican.

It is possible that a number of congressional seats from hitherto Republican districts, but lost to Democrats in the 1964 election, will be restored to the GOP in 1966, but it would be folly to assume that gaining back that which we should never have lost is an indication of progress. On the contrary, it could be the final coup de grace to the Republican Party if these seats are not won back by Republicans in 1966.

There are those who loudly profess that Democratic promises, platforms, programs, and policies encompass solutions to all problems. Currently this is called government by "consensus." We need not dwell upon what has happened in other nations, in other times, when debate and dissent lessened to a point where it was finally stilled, and consensus became tyranny or dictatorship.

Certainly the motives of President Johnson should not be impugned, for he ir merely using his vast skills of persuasion to bring his legislative programs to fruition. With dynamic leadership from the White House, it is most difficult for constructive dissent from the minority party to make much of an impact. Yet, difficult as the job may be, Republican voices must be heard and associated with reason rather than reaction.

Both political parties must be pluralistic, with the broadest possible base of responsible support. I say "responsible" support, for inclusion of fringe groups of the far right or left disgust ordinary rank and file members whether they look upon themselves as liberal or conservative.

We need no better example than the election of 1964 when the conservative wing of the GOP defied all logic in carrying out their ill-fated crusade. Rather than to consolidate their forces with those Republicans less conservative in their political orientation, they immediately laid out the welcome mat for support from far right reactionaries. Support from the political shadows responded and the rest is history. The inclusions of extremists into the thinking of the Republican Party produced an almost unparalleled election disaster.

The postelection proclamations by diehard rightwingers included such nonsequitor statements as "27 million Americans can't be wrong." They point with pride to the statistic that the Conservative Party gathered only about 3 million votes in 1960, and in 1964, under the auspices of the Republican Party, they polled 27 million. Of course they neglected to mention the fact that they temporarily captured the Republican Party, and they fail to note the disastrous results of that act. Republicans cannot take much comfort from a 27-million vote when the Democrats had 43 million in the same election.

The ultraconservative elements that cannot accept the positions and platforms of an imaginative and responsive party should abandon the Republican Party. They would be happier and the Republican Party and the Nation would be better for it. Sincere and constructive conservatism must always have a place in the Republican Party, but that type of ultraconservatism that is nonconstructive, unreasoning, and fanatical in its approach must never again find a home within the Republican Party. By accommodating the radical right, comprising programs and platforms for the sake of hefty campaign contributions, we are keeping millions of people away from the Republican Party.

In charting a new course for the Republican Party we must take a closer look at groups by and large hostile to the GOP, and determine how we can change this hostility to support. The association of the Democratic Party with organized labor, and hence the bulk of working men and women in the United States today, has proven to be of inestimable value to the Democratic Party. As Republicans we must ask ourselves, Do we as a party deserve the support of labor on the basis of past performance?

When labor was engaged in its struggle to achieve recognition, the bulk of Republicans felt themselves to be of the then middle or merchant class. Many Republicans viewed labor's early efforts with scorn and distaste, and pointed to the early strikes and violence that often ensued as examples of irresponsibility. Unfortunately, there are some Republicans today who characterize themselves as being against labor unions.

It is impossible to deny that the enormous strides of our present economy are due in a large measure to the impetus given it by labor through the increased earning power of the American workingman.

If the Republican Party is to flourish again, it must now seek active support from organized labor and establish close and meaningful liaison with them. We must realize that labor is not merely a group identification, but rather citizens, families, children, and leaders. Any party that seeks a majority position must have a clear identification with all the major segments that it strives to lead.

As a Republican Congressman endorsed by organized labor in 1964, I have found labor support tremendously helpful—contrary to what many Republicans believe, labor does not expect 100-percent allegiance to their goals, but merely an open mind and a general sympathy with the problems of workingmen.

The Republican National Committee should now establish a labor division within the national committee. State Republican organizations should institute committees in every State headquarters to work closely with labor organizations. Republican State committees, and State and local officeholders should meet with labor leaders to establish a viable relationship. This new contact and interest with organized labor need not be at the expense of traditional Republican concern for business; rather it should be the purpose of Republicans to return the party to a position of having contact with the entire economic community. The goal of our policy should be to seek a balance of interest, and the improvement of the relationship between labor and management.

Another area where concerned Republicans must devote time and energy is in the task of attracting intellectuals to our party. The wholesale desertion of the intellectual community has arrested the growth of Republican philosophy and the enlistment of youth in the Republican ranks. Educators to a large extent are oriented toward a progressive philosophy and the Democratic Party. To the Democrats great benefit, a large proportion of today's youth is instructed in our schools and colleges by Democratic teachers and professors. Yet the one-party orientation of this academic group can work to the benefit of Republicans, for to a great extent these intellectuals have become Democratic foot soldiers. As their members grow, their individual influence declines. If these intellectuals were given an opportunity to join the vanguard of a responsible, forward-looking Republican Party, the GOP would find an increasing number of intellectual enlistments. This would alleviate the lack of intellectualism from which our party has suffered in the past.

Some Republicans have in the past been fearful of the inclusion of responsible positions for young members of the party. All too often the youthful enthusiasm of our younger members has been derailed by the elders in the party. We should remember that youth seeks challenge and opportunity. Republicans must provide that challenge and that opportunity. It is axiomatic that the area of greatest opportunity lies in the minority party. The need for innovation and experiment that are inherent in a party out of power can be a highly persuasive argument for the enlistment of new members.

The main goal of a minority party is the preparation to assume the mantle of the majority at some future time. The assumption of leadership is the legitimate aim of any constructive political minority. It is, however, most important to remember that a minority that seeks to lead must present such constructive and imaginative proposals that they will be worthy of the majority position by force of logic and reason alone.

There is today a type of thinking that concludes that the Republican Party's only chance of regaining power will be as a direct result of a foreign policy failure or a great economic disaster. Republicans should repudiate this negative form of thinking and strive to gain strength through their own efforts, for this is the only lasting and legitimate source of power. Indeed the new Republican Party must call for a militant initiative.

In the months ahead we must move the party to the people rather than again attempting to bring the people to the party. The Republican failure in 1964 can be traced directly to the efforts of the ultraconservatives for forcing their doctrines upon the electorate. We need not experiment with this further; the rejection was devastating and complete.

The hallmark of Democratic success in the past 25 years has been their vigorous legislative efforts in behalf of social and economic betterment.

Sadly, Republicans as a minority party have sought to check the Democratic proposals with little in the way of constructive alternatives of their own. When individual Republicans have sought to initiate new forms of social legislation or supported Democratic proposals, they have been decried as "me too" Republicans. This is an exercise in silly semantics. We are all Americans first and Republicans, Democrats, and independents secondly. Everyone must out of good conscience stand for what is good, right, and just for his country and put party behind his nation's needs.

Some others say that Republicans are in desperate need of issues. I would reply that there are a great many issues in need of Republican solutions. Since the establishment of the Republican Party, certain basic beliefs have prevailed. One of these is the belief that the individual States should have a more significant role to play. The steady erosion of State governmental powers is of considerable concern to many Republicans. Republican State legislators have a significant contribution to make to their State and Nation by working toward better State management and State fiscal responsibility. Republicans have had considerable success in the management of governmental affairs in the past and certainly the need is no less today. Republican State legislators should take the initiative in these programs.

In the area of foreign policy, it should be evident to all but the naive that the foreseeable future is fraught with challenge and danger. The responsibility for war is usually put upon the failure of policy. Republican Members of Congress have a duty to offer alternative policies and constructive dissent to the majority to insure that every alternative of policy is explored to its fullest extent.

As our Nation is changing so do the requirements of our society. Modern technological advances create better living, but we should also be alerted to some of the unfortunate byproducts of these changes.

An ever-increasing number of people will be concerned with environmental pollution. We are reaching for the stars but choking in our air on earth.

Automation challenges our aspiration of full employment.

Our cities are in desperate need of rebuilding and reorganizing and the near future is crowding in upon them.

There is and will continue to be increasing public interest in the right of privacy and the privilege of the individual to dissent in what promises to be a future of increasing uniformity. The dignity and privacy of the individual are germane to Republican philosophy.

It is difficult for me to remember a major Republican address without references to protecting the dignity of the individual. We have always claimed a special interest in individual rights, and yet at a time in our history when there is the greatest assault ever against the dignity of the individual, the Republican Party is strangely quiet. We can scarcely open a newspaper without reading of the wholesale use of lie detectors on employees and prospective employees, of the most flagrant invasions of privacy through wiretaps and listening devices, peepholes in washrooms, mail covers by our postal department, etc.

Both parties are apparently resigned to this abhorrent drift, and unless leaders speak up, harassment of the individual and invasions of his privacy will grow worse. The Republican Party should make an immediate study of the problem, and as a party protest loudly and incessantly against this "big brother" concept.

If Republicans do not, we will have to admit that we do not really mean what we have been saying for so many years.

Civil liberties will remain in the forefront of social concern for some time. Although the legal apparatus for equal rights is nearly erected, the moral fulfillment remains.

In a world of exploding population and decreasing food production, the incongruity of our own peculiar farm program remains unsolved. This is an economic tragedy.

While we have been quick to respond to dramatic space challenges by the Soviets, we have been lax in meeting the challenge in the maintenance and development of our merchant marine and oceanographic exploration. Only a few years ago we held a predominant position among the nations of the world in both merchant marine and fishing fleets. In both cases we have fallen far and fast.

Increasing concern is felt throughout the free world in regard to our gold drain. New thoughts and programs have to be devised quickly. We cannot hope to cure such a major financial disease as this with emergency first aid.

Our ever-expanding population will shortly demand new and sweeping programs for the betterment of the individual. Thus far we have approached the educational needs of the Nation in a piecemeal manner. The factor common to every great civilization has been the height and breadth of its education.

It is with these and other problems that the Nation will concern itself in the years ahead. These problems will require intelligent action accompanied by bolder Republican thought.

To serve the principles of democracy, this Nation cannot operate with a party and a half. It therefore becomes necessary for the Republican Party to revitalize itself. Thoughtful Americans of both political parties realize the importance of two vigorous contending parties.

The orientation of the Republican Party during 1964 centered upon the ultraconservative sector of the political spectrum; as a result the party lost ground and political vitality.

It is apparent that another course is needed.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this beatitude, Matthew 5:9: *Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.*

Almighty God, at a time of high and holy memory we worship and bow down in humility and in longing, acknowledging that hitherto Thou hast led us through days of darkness and confusion.

We recall with praise and gratitude the heroism of men and the fortitude of women in a time of terror and trial, enduring with valor, suffering with patience, and many giving their last full measure of sacrifice and devotion that a better day might dawn for humanity.

Grant that upon our minds and hearts and that of men everywhere a nobler spirit and a wider vision may come to rule our thoughts into the ways of peace and righteousness and good will and a love that fulfills itself in the friendship and fraternity.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 199. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 111]

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Ashbrook
Bandstra
Berry
Bonner
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Clawson, Del
Conyers
Flynt
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey, Ind.
Hathaway
Hébert
Holland
Landrum
Lennon
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McCarthy
Mathias
Pool
Powell
Price
Randall
Resnick
Roncalio
Scheuer
Shipley
Sisk
Skubitz
Springer
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not more than 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8370, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 29 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and Members, once again we bring you the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for the coming fiscal year.

As Members have heard me point out in recent years, sometimes it helps us to realize what a problem we face in dealing with this subject to know that only about 7 percent of the American people are directly engaged in agriculture. Viewed another way, what we are doing here is dealing with a program which is perhaps the most important to the American consumer of all programs which come before the Congress.

The bill provides funds for the general operations of the Department, including various activities such as research, disease and pest control, extension, soil and water conservation, marketing services, meat and poultry inspection, agricultural credit, crop insurance, the Commodity Credit Corporation, Public Law 480 and other foreign assistance programs.

The bill includes total appropriations of $5,692,537,000 for these purposes in the coming year, a reduction of $122,597,000 in the budget requests which total $5,815,134,000. The amount proposed is $1,134,511,200 less than appropriated for fiscal year 1965.

BUDGET AND MANPOWER CONSIDERATIONS

For the second straight year the Department of Agriculture received a major budget reduction. While total new obligational authority proposed for the entire Federal Establishment is approximately the same for 1966 as for 1965, the 1966 budget request for the Department is more than $1 billion less than appropriated for fiscal year 1965.

In view of this extremely tight executive budget, further reductions by the committee have been nominal. The principal committee reductions have been in the administrative expenses of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the barter program, the Farmers Home Administration, and food stamp program. It was felt that some of the increases requested could be foregone and further cuts could be made in the interest of closer fiscal administration.

One of the factors considered by the committee in preparation of the accompanying bill was the large number of employees already employed by the Department and the need to reduce to a minimum further expansion of its payrolls, particularly in Washington. As of the end of February 1965, the paid employment in Washington and in the field was 96,589, including 2,250 temporary and 16,985 part-time and intermittent employees. These figures include 24,469 for the Forest Service, which is not provided for in this bill.

The increases recommended by the committee for the coming fiscal year in certain of the regular continuing programs of the Department will permit an increase of 300 man-years for increased meat and poultry inspection, 200 man-years to meet the additional workload of new and expanded programs of the Farmers Home Administration, and 60 man-years to enable the Federal crop insurance program to expand into 100 additional counties next year, as contemplated by basic law. Thus of 1,006 additional man-years requested, the committee has approved a net of only 539. These three major increases, plus small increases for certain other programs, are partially offset by proposed personnel decreases in several agencies. For example, through improved efficiency, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service expects to reduce its personnel by 191 man-years next year. None of the manpower increases allowed in this bill should require any expansion of the total number of employees in Washington beyond the total provided for fiscal year 1965.

COST-PRICE SQUEEZE

Since World War II, the economic position of the agricultural producer had declined steadily. While the gross national product of the Nation has increased from $214 billion in 1945 to $622 billion in 1964, while annual per capita nonfarm income has increased from $1,164 to $2,181 during this period, while average gross hourly earnings for factory workers have gone up from $1.02 to $2.54, and while the cost of food has gone down from 22.7 to 18 percent of consumer income—compared to 50 percent or more in much of the rest of the world—the farmer's share of the consumer food dollar has declined from 52 to 37 cents, and his return on labor, management, and investment has decreased from 21.2 percent to 8.2 percent.

Many factors have contributed to this constantly increasing economic squeeze on the farmer. Numerous freight rate increases on farm products approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission since 1946 have doubled transportation costs. Minimum wage guarantees and bargaining rights have doubled labor costs. Average farm wage rates have increased from 42.7 cents per hour in 1945 to 90.4 cents in 1964. Increased interest on farm debt and increased taxes on land have also contributed significantly to farm expenditures. Farm machinery, motor vehicles, building materials, and other items necessary for farm production have increased by 100 to 150 percent.

INCREASED FARM INVESTMENT NECESSARY

In addition to increased wages and other expanded production costs, there has been a significant increase in interest on farm debt and taxes on farmland. This is due to several factors.

First, the average investment required to provide a minimum living on the farm has increased nearly fivefold, from $11,487 in 1945 to $54,791 today. Commercial farms must have modern equipment, pesticides, fertilizers, and seed to meet present day competition. They must also have sufficient land to justify the use of machinery and equipment and to produce a sufficient quantity of output to provide a reasonable income at reduced margins of profit. Modern production requirements have increased farm debt from $7.6 billion in 1945 to $33 billion in 1964.

Second, the cost of farmland continues to increase due to urban and industrial expansion, speculative investment by nonfarm purchasers, and the increase in size of farms as mentioned above. It should be noted, however, that current values of such land are not based on earnings from agricultural production, since net farm income as related to investment has gone down from 21.2 percent in 1945 to 8.2 percent in 1964.

COMMERCIAL FARMER ESSENTIAL TO CONSUMER

There are some who suggest from time to time that price supports and other farm programs should be abandoned and that the large commercial farmers should be left to compete on world markets with foreign low-cost agriculture.

A careful review of the facts outlined above reveals the fallacy of such proposals. A full understanding of the place of agriculture in the national economy makes it apparent that commercial producers cannot sell at low world price levels commodities which are produced at much higher American levels of cost. Such producers cannot buy at retail prices and sell at wholesale prices and stay in business very long. The real losers would be the consumers they supply and labor and industry for which agriculture is one of the biggest markets. They must have some form of minimum price guarantee, which is adjusted to the level of production costs they must meet.

Department of Agriculture reports indicate that about 27 percent of the Nation's producers—those with annual gross sales of $10,000 or more—account for some 80 percent of the U.S. agricultural production. These nearly 1 million commercial farmers are the ones to which the consumers must look for the dependable and plentiful supply of high-quality and low-cost food and fiber.

Despite the fact that surplus quantities of certain commodities have been produced in recent years because of the efficiency of agricultural production, it is important to note that supplies on hand are sufficient to meet domestic needs for only a short period of time in the event of a national emergency. For example, the 900 million bushels of wheat now on hand would meet domestic needs and dollar exports for about 1 year or, if necessary, they would meet domestic needs alone for nearly 2 years if exports were discontinued. The 1.2 billion bushels of corn on hand represent only a 3 to 4 months' supply for domestic use and export. The 13.6 million bales of cotton in stock would meet the normal annual domestic demand of 9 million bales, plus 1 year's export supply. For dairy products, the 5.2 billion pounds is only 5 percent of a full year's supply.

SMALLER FARMS MUST BE PRESERVED

Those who advocate the abandonment of farm price supports, also suggest that the 2.5 million small farmers (those with annual gross income of less than $10,000) should be guaranteed a minimum income under some form of welfare program until such time as they can be retrained and absorbed into other occupations.

Such suggestions are obviously undesirable. The elimination of small family farms as a part of our national existence would seriously increase our social and welfare problems in every urban area in the United States.

Further, with a surplus of labor in most metropolitan centers, the opportunities for small farmers to earn a living in nonfarm activities are extremely limited, if not practically nonexistent. Retraining of farm people for other lines of work is at best a long-range effort. This offers no solution to the problem in the immediate future, particularly for the large number of farm dwellers who are beyond the age where retraining is feasible.

CONTINUATION OF FARM PROGRAMS NECESSARY

It is apparent, therefore, that the only practical approach to the farm problem is to continue programs which will make it possible for the present 3.5 million farmers to earn a living on the farm. Minimum price supports, adequate short- and long-term credit, continued research and technical assistance, and other farm programs must be continued if American agriculture is to maintain its place in the Nation's economy and if the American consumer is to continue to enjoy the bountiful supply of nutritious, healthful, and inexpensive food now available to him. It is interesting to note that three times as many people are engaged in processing and marketing of farm products as in the production of such commodities.

During his appearance before the committee on March 19, 1965, the Secretary of Agriculture summarized the present agricultural situation as follows:

> It is time to set the record straight, and here are basic facts: The consumer should know that since 1950 the cost of medical care has jumped 63 percent. Our consumers are paying 52 percent more for professional services than they did in 1950, and 38 percent more for transportation. Yet, farm prices—the prices that farmers receive from what they sell—are lower now than in 1950. While Americans are paying 63 percent more for medical care, 52 percent more for professional services, and 38 percent more for transportation, our farmers are receiving 15 percent less for their products than they did 15 years ago.
>
> What if the farmer were charging 63, or 52, or even 38 percent more? We would be eating less, and at the same time would be shifting money now being spent for the products of factories and for services into food.
>
> Rather than the consumer-taxpayer subsidizing the farmer, the contrary is true.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Those who want to end commodity programs point out that today many farmers with adequate resources—land, capital, and equipment—enjoy an adequate income, and therefore do not need the income support of farm programs. Yet, fewer than 400,000 farmers earn a parity of income—an income equal to the wages of skilled labor. Over 2.5 million farmers do not even earn the minimum wage.
>
> To me these facts simply mean that farm income is today very inadequate, for only about 1 out of 10 farmers get close to parity of income; most farmers do not even begin to earn this level of income.
>
> Further, if commodity programs were discontinued, the decline in farm income would be so drastic as to pull even the most efficient farmer to below poverty income levels.
>
> The impact would not be felt by farmers alone. The massive industrial complex which stands behind the modern farmer would be hit just as hard, if not harder.

BENEFITS TO GENERAL PUBLIC

The many programs of the Department of Agriculture benefit all segments of the national economy. The Department conducts as many or more services for the consumer and general public as any other Federal department. Such items as meat and poultry inspection, grading and inspection of other food items, marketing and utilization research, human nutrition and home economics research, school lunch and special milk programs, food stamp and direct distribution programs, and the various foreign assistance programs have direct benefits to consumers, businessmen and the general public. Expenditures for soil and water conservation and related research are an investment in our future natural resources, which benefits the entire Nation rather than farmers alone. Rural electrification and telephone programs benefit all rural consumers as well as farmers. Commodity Credit Corporation price-support expenditures include interest, transportation of commodities, and warehouse storage charges, which do not go to farmers and ranchers.

Figures furnished by the Department of Agriculture indicates that about 61 percent of all funds expended in 1964 were for programs which provided substantial benefits to nonfarm people. The comparable figure for 1965 is 67 percent.

GENERAL DEMAND FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FINDINGS

The demand for information developed by the research programs of the Department of Agriculture has grown significantly through the years. Such information is being used more and more by nonfarm people in connection with the operation of their homes and properties and the choice of their food and clothing.

Much of the information on these subjects carried throughout the Nation in magazines, newspapers, periodicals, as well as on radio and television, comes from Department of Agriculture bulletins, technical publications, and other releases. Many of the new developments in processing, packaging and marketing food products adopted by private organizations come from patents obtained by the Department and made available to all who may be interested.

About 11 million copies of popular research publications are distributed by the Department each year. The agricultural press, with a circulation of 22 million, and the specialized publications of trade organizations and industry regularly carry USDA research reports for their readers.

Industry representatives learn of scientific developments through USDA-sponsored conferences and meetings, and through research reports and consultation with scientists. For example, about 5,000 visitors obtain technical information at Agricultural Research Service utilization laboratories each year.

Like farmers, consumers also turn to Department publications for research information. To meet consumer demands for research knowledge, the Department makes information available to press associations, newspapers, and magazines, and freelance writers. Research reports also go to women's page and food editors weekly, and the Department works closely with consumer organizations. Consumers are also reached by radio and television, motion pictures, and exhibits.

Despite this popular acceptance of USDA research findings and the wide use of such information, the general public frequently fails to understand and support the agricultural programs of the Department. The consumers fail to appreciate the reasons why they have the finest and lowest cost food of any nation on earth.

The record of the Department in this field is even more remarkable when it is realized what a small portion of Federal research funds are used for agricultural research. In 1935—just 30 years ago—approximately one-half of the Federal research budget went to the Department of Agriculture. In 1965, agricultural research represents only 1.5 percent of total Federal research expenditures.

For less than 6 percent of your national budget you are taking care of the basic things, including the protection of the health of the American people. Yet, of this less than 6 percent, a large percentage goes to school lunch, to the food stamp program, to meat inspection, and many other things that are required in order to be sure that the food we all eat is nutritious.

I might say at this point many questions have been raised about the food stamp plan. Your committee will offer an amendment later to restore funds for the food stamp plan. It is my personal opinion that this food stamp money is not apt to be fully used by the Department of Agriculture. But I do know many, many people are very much interested in the program. It has proven to be sound and the recipients are required to pay about two-thirds of the cost of the food received. So while the funds are not apt to be fully required, I do feel in those cases where it is desired and where it can be done that it will be in the public interest to do so.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Did the gentleman say it will help us be certain that our food is wholesome, or did I misunderstand him?

Mr. WHITTEN. You know, the term "wholesome" is a broad term. I just say that we spend tremendous amounts of money and the efforts of many people in the attempt to see that the food we buy in America is determined to be nutritious and wholesome.

Mrs. BOLTON. Speaking especially feelingly this morning, may I say that we had boiled eggs this morning for breakfast and they tasted so of fish because the chickens had eaten it and because they are fed so many funny things that we had to change the menu.

Mr. WHITTEN. Right now I think we have direct control over a good many things in Government, including agriculture, but I do not know that the Government is yet ready to get into that field. We certainly have not tried to here. However, I must say that taste is one thing and health is another. We do try to see that the food is nutritious and that the health of the consumers is protected, even though the gentlewoman might not like the taste of some things as much as others. I can only say that the Department makes every effort to see the program is properly run and that all of the protection possible is given.

Mr. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

COMPETITIVE EXPORT SALES NECESSARY

Mr. WHITTEN. For the past 15 years, the committee has done everything possible to encourage and require exportation of U.S. agricultural commodities and has continued to insist that such commodities be offered continuously in world markets on a competitive basis. During those years when U.S. commodities have been kept competitive, export sales have increased substantially and the pressure of surpluses has been removed from the domestic markets.

Despite unlimited authority to sell competitively in world markets, the Department's failure to sell competitively in the early 1950's caused CCC commodity inventories to increase from $1 billion as of June 30, 1952, to $5 billion as of June 30, 1955. During this period, CCC holdings of cotton increased from $418,000 to $1.2 billion.

In 1955, at the insistence of this committee, the first cotton was offered for sale abroad for dollars on a competitive basis and 1 million bales were sold in a few weeks. Subsequently 7 million bales were sold soon after offered. Then in 1956, despite this most satisfactory experience, the Department took steps to again hold U.S. cotton off world markets. This caused Congress to enact the Export Sales Act of 1956 requiring sales for dollars to regain and retain the U.S. historical share of world markets.

Notwithstanding this legislation, the Department in 1958 again refused to offer cotton at competitive prices, which the Comptroller General ruled to be a violation of the 1956 Export Sales Act. Cotton exports again dropped—from 7.6 million bales in 1956 to 2.8 million bales in 1958. This action cost the CCC and the American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars and did great damage to U.S. cotton producers.

In 1959, under increased pressure from Congress, competitive sales were reinstituted and exports again increased—to a level of 6.5 million bales in 1959. Despite the outstanding success of the competitive sales program each time it has been used, however, the Department continues to favor the export "payment-in-kind" approach, which has not been effective and which has been extremely costly to the Government.

The history of our export programs clearly demonstrates that the payment-in-kind program is not a satisfactory substitute for competitive sales abroad. Like most exporting nations of the world, we should sell what we produce and don't need for what it will bring in the world markets. Past experience has shown that, when buyers have the opportunity to support world prices by their bids, markets throughout the world are strengthened and commodities flow freely through the normal channels of trade. Loss of markets to our competitors has proved the dangers of an artificial price umbrella over world markets fixed by a governmental agency.

The Export Sales Act of 1956 referred to above also requires the Secretary of Agriculture to establish an export goal at the beginning of each year and, in the opinion of the committee, requires him to announce such figure to the public. No such goals have been announced in recent years, despite the provisions of the law. This has had a depressing effect on U.S. exports. While the historical U.S. share of the world cotton market is around 6 million bales annually and while the law requires the export of this amount, cotton exports dropped to 3.3 million bales in 1962, 5.66 million bales in 1963, and 4.4 million bales in 1964. If the United States had maintained its fair share of world markets for the last 3 years supplies on hand would be almost 5 million bales less.

In view of these factors, the committee insists that the Department, first, return to offering commodities for sale on a competitive bid basis; second, make payment-in-kind payments from commodity stocks in lieu of cash payments, and, third, conform to the Export Sales Act of 1956 by announcing to the world the quantity of cotton the United States will sell each year on world markets. The same policy would be good for other commodities. These exports should be from private stocks and handled through private channels where possible and from Government stocks where necessary. The Commodity Credit Corporation should maintain the right to determine when and how much to offer at various times during the year to reach the total goal. The committee is convinced that only in this way can American agriculture and the cotton industry be protected and enabled to retain its export business.

During October 1956, the committee discussed these matters with numerous business representatives and importers in Europe. The opinions and information gathered fully supported the position taken through the years by the committee on competitive sales and advance announcement of U.S. offerings. Excerpts from the report of this study made in 1956 are quoted below:

LOSS OF U.S. MARKETS IN EUROPE

We found a general concern among these people about the loss of U.S. markets in Europe since World War II. The men from Belgium pointed out that American exports of cotton to their country have decreased from 60 percent of total imports before the war to 3 percent at the present time. Others pointed out a similar situation in most countries of Europe. We found that the U.S. products are preferred at comparable or slightly higher prices because of better quality and more dependable deliveries, but that in recent years, U.S. prices have been held too high to compete in world markets despite the natural preference for U.S. products.

According to our information, the loss of U.S. markets in Europe is due to: First, refusal by the United States until recently to sell competitively; second, the improved transportation and communications with all parts of the world since the last war, making trade with the Near East, Africa, and South America easier; and third, the increased quantity and improved quality of products from other countries.

NEED FOR UNITED STATES TO REENTER WORLD MARKETS

In all cases, the business representatives contacted were realistic and practical and very adept at presenting their own points of view. At the same time, we found them fully aware of the U.S. problems and pleased with U.S. efforts to get back into world trade on a competitive basis. It was generally agreed that world trade will never return to normal as long as large amounts of U.S. surpluses are hanging over the market. It was pointed out that the general practice in recent years has been to buy in small amounts and to keep consumer inventories at a minimum. This has had the undesirable effect of putting importers and fabricators on a hand-to-mouth basis of operation. Normal long-range purchasing practices have been virtually discontinued.

During these meetings, it was found that foreign traders in cotton are most anxious that the United States give the world assurances that it will continue to produce and offer in world markets not less than 5 to 5½ million bales annually. They want to know that the United States will be a firm source of supply. At present, they are afraid this country is cutting acreage back so far it will not have the cotton to sell. They are especially fearful that the new soil-bank plan will lead to further cuts in U.S. acreage. If our Government will recognize this, it will mean additional cotton acreage for U.S. farmers. This is highly essential to U.S. farmers and to the world cotton trade as well.

We were told that the world has a real interest in American production for export because American varieties are much more consistent and the world is glad to deal with American exporters and American people. They know the average American export firm is solvent, that if commitments are made, delivery will be made. On the other hand, all world traders are skeptical of having to import supplies from other countries, because those engaged in export trade from other countries are not always solvent and dependable, and the quality of the product may vary greatly.

SHOULD ANNOUNCE ANNUAL EXPORT QUOTAS

It was also found that trade groups feel that the United States should accept the best competitive bids at whatever price received. They feel that the Secretary of Agriculture should announce at the beginning of each year the approximate quantity of each commodity which the United States plans to offer during the year for export at competitive prices. They pointed out that the two factors which every dealer must know are quantity available and potential demand.

In recent years, the quantity element has been very uncertain in all world markets because of U.S. policies. They feel that annual announcements of U.S. exports would provide considerable stability to world markets. They also feel that such plan would result in higher returns to the United States for commodities sold than would efforts to control prices directly.

It is our belief that the Department of Agriculture should announce that it intends to produce and offer in world markets on a competitive basis from 5 to 5½ or 6 million bales of cotton annually. Under this plan, purchasers would regulate the price through the amount of their bids and the United States would avoid much international criticism. This action might also result in higher returns for U.S. cotton. We are of the opinion, further, that this same approach should be considered with regard to other farm commodities.

SALES PROGRAM MUST BE STRENGTHENED

In view of the factors outlined above, in 1956, this committee created a special position of sales manager and directed the Department to set up a sales organization within CCC to undertake a more aggressive sales program. The committee was convinced that this $14.5 billion Corporation could not continue to purchase increasing quantities of commodities each year under its price support operation, unless more attention was given to the sale of commodities on hand.

Pursuant to this action, a sales organization was established within the CCC and a sales manager was appointed. It was never permitted to operate freely, however, and its potential was never realized. Further, several years ago it was transferred to the Foreign Agricultural Service where it was brought under those who deal with international pressures. Its effectiveness has been extremely limited, due to numerous layers of supervision, and because of certain international policies which frequently ignore the interests of U.S. agricultural producers.

In the opinion of the members of the committee it is absolutely imperative that U.S. commodities be kept on world markets at competitive prices. American agriculture is dependent on the export market for an outlet for the production from 1 out of every 4 acres of U.S. cropland. Further, agricultural exports account for 20 to 25 percent of our foreign exchange earnings each year, a significant factor in relation to our present balance-of-payments deficit.

The committee recommends therefore, that the Secretary reorganize and strengthen the Department's sales program by first, bringing in additional directors for the Commodity Credit Corporation who have had prior business and industrial experience, and second, relocating the sales manager in the departmental structure to give him more independence of action and less exposure to restrictive international influences.

THE GREAT PESTICIDE DEBATE

The committee took particular note of the increasingly serious pesticide problem in its report last year. It added $250,000 to the budget to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to collaborate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other agencies in working out necessary rules and regulations to protect our sources of food and fiber—for which pesticides are an essential tool of production—while at the same time protecting the public health. Also, an additional $27 million was provided last year to undertake a major research program on pesticides, including the study of biological and other alternative means of insect control.

Further, believing that we should not permit anyone or any group to burden our source of food and fiber with the unknown, and believing that we could not afford to force the homeowner, home gardener, the florist, and those engaged in agriculture to prove that their tools and work materials do not cause that for which even the best researchers, physicians, and scientists do not know the cause, the committee had an objective study made by its staff of investigators on the effects, uses, control, and research of agricultural pesticides.

The report on this special staff study, which is included in part I of the hearings on the 1966 agricultural budget, does much to put this entire question in the proper perspective and to counterbalance many of the fears and misconceptions concerning pesticides. The report is based on interviews with over 185 outstanding scientists and 23 physicians, including officials of the American Medical Association, and university medical school faculties.

The committee is pleased to note that progress is being made in efforts to coordinate the programs of all agencies involved and to develop a realistic and practical approach to the establishment of levels of pesticide residues which can be safely observed without adverse affect on public health. A press release of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare dated April 9, 1965, gives definite indication that this difficult problem is being resolved in a satisfactory manner. The essence of the HEW press release is as follows:

> Pesticide residues are detectable in the American food supply by today's highly sensitive analytical methods, but the amounts of such residues are insignificant from a health standpoint, according to findings announced today by the Food and Drug Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
>
> FDA made public the results of the latest of its continuing "total diet" studies undertaken to discover the quantity of pesticides in all kinds of food and drink consumed daily. Through the tests FDA is able to evaluate broadly the results of all efforts made to keep pesticide residues below legal tolerance levels. The studies also provide clues as to which pesticides may be getting into the food supply in excessive amounts.
>
> Pesticide levels found in the test samples were generally less than 1 percent of the safe legal tolerance. Many of the most commonly used pesticides were not found at all.

CONTINGENCY RESEARCH FUNDS

As in previous years, numerous Member of Congress, interested individuals, and representatives of various organizations appeared before the committee in support of funds in the 1966 budget as well as to request additional research on important and meritorious projects not included therein. While the committee has not been able to fund all of the additional special requests, it has again included $1 million for the contingency research fund to meet as many of these needs as the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service may approve. The Administrator is requested to review the committee hearings and give consideration to all such requests in final allocation of this fund.

There is an urgent need for additional mechanization research in California as the result of the discontinuance of the bracero program. The problem of the date industry, which must depend on imported labor to climb to the tops of the palm trees for pollination and harvesting purposes, is an example. Unless these essential processes can be mechanized, the future of the American date industry is threatened. This matter deserves special attention and should have a high priority in use of the contingency fund.

Another problem which merits special consideration is the serious threat to our poultry and turkey producers from the Bluecomb disease. Losses to the poultry industry are estimated at $10 million annually.

A new threat to the corn producing areas of the Nation known as maize dwarf mosaic also must be given careful consideration in establishing priorities under this research fund. According to testimony presented to the committee, this disease has caused crop losses ranging from 5 to 70 percent in Illinois. Kentucky, Indiana, Tennessee, Missouri, and Arkansas have also reported serious infestations. Officials in Ohio estimated that corn producers in that State alone lost over $5.8 million in 1964 due to the disease.

Overcrowding at the Barley Laboratory at Madison, Wis., has reached the point where action should be taken soon to expand these facilities. The Administrator should use whatever contingency funds may be necessary to prepare final plans for such expansion, and for inclusion of construction funds in the next annual budget for the Department.

The committee takes great pride in the tremendous growth of interest in and attention to soil and water conservation and restoration which has taken place throughout the Nation in the past decade. To meet the need for basic data and improved techniques, in 1958 Congress established a National Sedimentation Laboratory to study problems of sedimentation associated with erosion of agricultural lands and stream valley systems. In view of the continuing increase in soil and water conservation and watershed projects in all areas of the country, attention should be given to further expansion of this national research station. The present Laboratory is an excellent one with a competent staff. However, present facilities are inadequate to provide the Laboratory space and special equipment needed to meet the highly diversified problems of the areas of various soil types throughout the country.

Also some consideration should be given to a bee breeding center. The dependence on this insect for an important part in crop pollination makes it necessary that the supply of such insects be maintained.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

The bill includes $114,394,000 for the next fiscal year for research, a decrease of $8,205,000 under 1965 and a reduction of $2,498,000 in the budget estimate. The reduction below 1965 and 1966 recommendation is computed as follows:

1965 appropriation	$122,599,000
Deduct: Net reduction in research	−625,000
Add: Net increase in construction	5,245,000
Deduct: Increase in transfer, section 32	−12,825,000
Net reduction under 1965	−8,205,000
1966 appropriation recommended	114,394,000

The amount proposed for the various research programs of this agency includes increases of $1,875,000, which are more than offset by a decrease of $2,500,000 due to discontinuance of lower priority lines of research at certain locations. The increases allowed include $855,000 for staffing and operating new and expanded research laboratories, $575,000 for health-related tobacco research, $345,000 for research on molds and their control, and $100,000 to initiate animal research at Clay Center, Nebr.

The net increase for construction of facilities includes $6,394,000 for pesticide research laboratories for which planning funds were approved in the 1965 bill at College Station, Tex., Gainesville, Fla., and Stoneville, Miss. It also includes $2,760,000 for construction of six cotton research laboratories, for which planning funds were provided last year. In addition, construction funds are included for a water pollution laboratory at Durant, Okla, $450,000; a poultry research laboratory in Delaware, $450,000; and alterations and improvements at the Beltsville Research Center, $339,000. The above increases are partially offset by the deduction of nonrecurring construction funds provided for laboratories authorized in the appropriation bill for 1965.

Section 103(a) of the Agricultural Act of 1964—Public Law 88-297—included a directive to the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake a special cotton research program designed to reduce the cost of producing upland cotton in the United States to make it more competitive with synthetics and low-cost foreign production. Acting under this authority, a broad research program was developed and proposed by the Department to cover the various production factors involved and to provide certain additional research facilities needed for the new and expanded work.

On the basis of such a program, an additional $1,400,000 was appropriated for fiscal year 1965, including the sum of $240,000 for the planning of six new laboratories. It is understood that plans will be completed for all six proposed facilities during the next fiscal year. However, the 1966 budget included funds for construction of only two—a cotton disease laboratory at College Station, Tex., and a pilot ginning laboratory at Mesilla Park, N. Mex. Failure to provide funds for all facilities would be considered as breaking faith with the Congress on this program. Accordingly, the committee has included funds for all six facilities as originally proposed by the executive branch and as approved last year by Congress.

The amount recommended under this heading will permit present soybean production research to be carried forward on a regular basis. It also provides for the continuation of research on clothing and housing and wholesaling and retailing.

For plant and animal disease and pest control, the committee recommends an appropriation for fiscal year 1966 of $71,119,000. This is a decrease of $50,200 below 1965 and is a reduction of $2,041,000 in the budget request.

The amount approved includes the following increases: $500,000 for control of the cereal leaf beetle; $200,000 for plant and animal quarantine inspection at ports of entry; $520,000 for the eradication of hog cholera; and $250,000 to conduct a field survey in the Republic of Mexico to determine the extent of the existence of screwworms and their effect on U.S. programs. These are offset by nonrecurring decreases of $1,520,000.

The bill as recommended includes $2,806,200 to maintain a barrier zone to prevent screwworms from migrating from Mexico into Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and adjacent States. The barrier zone became fully operable in March 1964. During calendar year 1964, there were a total of only 240 cases of screwworms in screwworm-freed areas of the United States, all of which occurred in the States of Texas and New Mexico. There have been no instances of continued or spreading infestations. However, the threat of reinfestation is indicated by the fact that there were a total of 4,564 cases in northern Mexico during this same period.

The recommended appropriation also includes $2,500,000 for the continuation of the fire ant eradication program. This serious pest makes farm and pasture lands unusable in certain areas of the country due to numerous mounds ranging up to 24 inches high, which damage farm equipment and interfere with grazing of cattle. Further, there is a public health hazard involved due to the painful stings which cause severe lesions on the body of persons attacked. There have even been a few deaths reported.

A limited survey in 1957 placed the number of acres infested by fire ants at approximately 24 million. Later surveys showed an estimated 33 million acres infested as of March, 1965. Unless control and eradication measures are continued, the spread of this pest to additional areas of the country can be expected.

The committee is disappointed that local agencies and individuals in some areas have not cooperated more fully in the fire ant eradication program. Such cooperation is essential to successful control of this pest. In approving $2,500,000 for the coming year, the committee expects the fullest possible cooperation from such local interests in the future, perhaps through the State governments in the areas affected.

The threat to the Nation's crops, forests, and ornamentals from invasion by foreign plant pests and diseases continues to increase. During 1964, approximately 178 million travelers entered the United States, an increase of 3 million over 1963. A comparison of travelers baggage, carriers, and interceptions for 1964 and 1954 is as follows:

	1964	*1954*
Volume (excluding Canadian traffic):		
People entering United States (millions)	178	120
Baggage (millions of pieces)	32	8
Carriers—all types (millions)	28	15
Contaminated interceptions (thousands)	450	180

The growing dangers inherent in modern modes of transportation and the ever-increasing volume of travel and commerce between all parts of the world have placed an increased responsibility and workload on those responsible for enforcement of quarantine regulations through inspections at ports of entry. Funds expended for plant and animal quarantine inspection have increased from $3.9 million in 1954 to $10.5 million in 1965.

Several years ago the committee called on the Department to work out arrangements with the international carriers whereby travelers destined for the United States would be given advance information on foods and other materials which are prohibited from entering the United States. While some steps have been taken in this direction, the committee feels that present practices are insufficient. Notice on taking passage should be such as to justify automatic fines for any person found to have such materials in his or her possession on arrival.

Accordingly, the Secretary is requested to give effective notice to all carriers as to prohibited materials for insect control purposes, with the understanding that the carriers will be held responsible to make certain that travelers do not arrive at U.S. ports with such materials in their possession. Further, consideration should be given to charging back the cost of such inspection by the Government to those carriers who fail to give the required notice to travelers on their conveyances, where such travelers are found to have prohibited materials in their possession.

An appropriation of $2 million is proposed for the coming fiscal year for the purchase of foreign currencies to finance oversea research designed to benefit American agriculture and to develop and expand foreign markets for U.S. agricultural commodities. In view of a balance of around $9 million of prior year funds available for this purpose, the amount approved for the coming year has been held to the 1965 level.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

The Cooperative State Research Service was established by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1462 dated July 19, 1961, and supplement No. 1, dated August 30, 1961, under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953. The Service carries out, first, administration of the Agricultural Experiment Stations Act of August 11, 1955—Hatch Act of 1887, as amended; second, payments under section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to State agricultural experiment stations; third, grants to nonprofit institutions for support of basic scientific research under the act approved September 6, 1958; fourth, grants for cooperative forestry research under the act approved October 10, 1962, and grants for facilities under the act of July 22, 1963.

An appropriation of $51,695,000 is recommended for this program for fiscal year 1966. This is an increase of $1,698,000 over 1965 and a decrease of $672,000 in the budget estimate. The increases include $1,940,000 for payments to States under the Hatch Act and $1 million for additional cooperative forestry research under the McIntire-Stennis program. These increases are partially offset by a budgeted decrease of $1,242,000 in funds for grants to States for construction, alteration, and improvements to research facilities.

In addition to amounts recommended above, $400,000 is proposed to be transferred from section 32 funds for grants for basic scientific research, as authorized by law.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Cooperative agricultural extension work was established by the act of May 8, 1914, as amended by the act of June 26, 1953, and the act of August 11, 1955. The legislation authorizes the Department of Agriculture to give, through the land-grant colleges, instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics and related subjects and to encourage the application of such information by means of demonstrations, publications, and otherwise to persons not attending or resident in the colleges. Extension educational work is also authorized under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946.

State and county extension work is financed from Federal, State, county, and local sources. These funds are used within the States for the employment of county agents, home demonstration agents, 4–H Club agents, State specialists, and others who conduct the joint educational programs adopted to local problems and conditions.

The committee recommends the full budget estimate of $86,335,000 for fiscal year 1966 for the various programs of this agency. This is an increase of $1,228,000 over fiscal year 1965, of which $881,000 is available for payments to States under the Smith-Lever Act, and $347,000 is required for retirement and employees' compensation costs for the additional extension agents covered by the increased payments to States.

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

The Farmer Cooperative Service was established following the enactment of the Farm Credit Act of 1953—Public Law 202, August 6, 1953—which transferred the research and technical assistance work for farmers' marketing, purchasing, and service cooperatives, under the Cooperative Marketing Act of 1926 from the Farm Credit Administration to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Service conducts research, advisory and educational work with cooperatives on problems of organization, financing, management policies, merchandising, costs, efficiency, and membership to help farmers who are members of such organizations improve the operations of their business. It cooperates with the Extension Service, land-grant colleges, banks for cooperatives, State departments of agriculture, and other agencies to bring about better understanding and application of sound cooperative principles and practices. It also advises other Federal agencies on problems relating to agricultural cooperatives.

The fiscal year 1965 appropriation level of $1,141,000 is again proposed for the next fiscal year. This is a decrease of $100,000 in the budget request. The agency is to be commended for the fine program it has been conducting. The committee feels that the present level of funds will permit the continuation of this program at an adequate level.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Soil Conservation Service was established by the act of April 27, 1935. It assists soil conservation districts and other cooperators, watershed groups, and Federal and State agencies having related responsibilities in bringing about physical adjustments in land use that will conserve soil and water resources, provide for agricultural production on a sustained basis, and reduce damage by floods and sedimentation.

An appropriation of $105,373,000 is recommended for the coming fiscal year for technical assistance to soil conservation districts, communities, and other cooperators, and for other related activities under this heading. The amount proposed is an increase of $1,140,000 over 1965 and is $1,270,000 over the budget request.

The sum recommended includes an additional $770,000 to provide technical assistance to 25 new districts expected to be organized during the next fiscal year. Soil conservation assistance is required by an increasing number of soil conservation districts each year, and some financial provision must be made to service new districts as they are organized.

The proposed appropriation also includes a restoration of $500,000 to partially offset the personnel reduction necessitated by partial absorption of increases in salary costs and other operating expenses. The budgeted amount would have resulted in a decrease of 140 man-years of technical services to existing districts in the coming year. The committee action will restore half of this proposed reduction. Considerable testimony was presented to the committee as to the need for an increase in assistance to present districts rather than a decrease as proposed by the budget. As of June 30, 1964, only 33 percent of the operating units in soil conservation districts had received planning with technical assistance through the Soil Conservation Service. It is estimated that the soil conservation and watershed needs of the country will be a continuous problem, with increasing population and expanding water needs of the future. It is to be noted that we are losing a million acres a year now to urbanization, highways, and similar uses.

The 1966 budget included a statement indicating that changes in the law would be proposed at a later date to establish a revolving fund and charge back a portion of the technical assistance costs involved in installation of practices. This proposed change in the basic law under which this program operates has not been enacted into law. The committee is therefore recommending the full appropriation needed to carry on this program under present legislation.

The most serious threat to the future of the soil and water conservation programs of this agency is the budget proposal to reduce the agricultural conservation program by $100 million for next year. If this reduction were adopted, funds transferred to the Soil Conservation Service for technical assistance in the installation of ACP practices would be reduced by about $3.5 million, 530 soil conservation technicians would be eliminated, and over one-third of the conservation work on the watershed projects would be eliminated or substantially curtailed. The committee recommends the restoration of the full $220 million program announced for the 1966

ACP, which will prevent these serious reductions in the Soil Conservation Service and the Nation's soil and water conservation programs.

The watershed improvement programs of the Department of Agriculture were initiated by the authorization of planning and works of improvement on the original 11 major watersheds covered by the Flood Control Act of 1944. In 1953, this committee provided $5 million in the 1954 Appropriation Act, without a prior budget estimate, to authorize 62 small "pilot" watershed projects to promote national interest in small upstream watershed control. These pilot projects were a tremendous success.

The following year Congress enacted Public Law 566, 83d Congress, which placed this program on a permanent basis. Also, under authority of section 8 of this same act (as amended) loans to local organizations were authorized to help defray a portion of the local share of the cost of watershed protection and flood prevention projects. These programs are now financed through two appropriations included in this bill for Public Law 566 projects designated as "Watershed Planning" and "Watershed Protection," and through a separate appropriation, "Flood Prevention," which covers the 11 original major watersheds.

For the watershed planning appropriation, the committee recommends $5,721,000 for the coming year. This is the full budget estimate and is a continuation of the program level provided for fiscal year 1965. As of June 30, 1964, a total of 2,137 applications for planning assistance had been received. Of the 1,887 considered suitable for planning, 1,002 had been approved for planning, plans had been completed on 617, and 875 remained to be planned.

An appropriation of $64,171,000 is proposed for the watershed protection program for the next fiscal year. This is an increase of $3,151,000 over 1965 for river basin surveys and works of improvement on Public Law 566 projects. The decrease of $3 million will continue the loan program at the 1965 level of $4 million.

The full budget estimate of $25,417,000 is recommended for the flood prevention watershed projects for fiscal year 1966. The reduction of $900,000 below 1965 is due to the fact that supplemental funds provided last year for emergency soil conservation measures resulting from severe fires in California are not required again in this bill.

The committee has deleted language limiting the purchase of land in the Yazoo-Little Tallahatchie watersheds. It would further point out that the intent of the Congress in the language affecting these watersheds in Public Law 712, 80th Congress, was to authorize the use of funds for these districts up to such line as the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service might agree their respective responsibilities reached.

For the Great Plains conservation program, the bill includes the full budget estimate of $14,864,000 for the coming year. This is a continuation of the 1965 program. During fiscal year 1964, five additional counties were designated for participation in the program, about 4,500 farmers and ranchers applied for program assistance, 3,719 new contracts covering approximately 5.4 million acres were signed, making a total of nearly 34 million acres placed under cost-share contracts.

The resources conservation and development program, which was authorized by section 102 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962—Public Law 87–703—provides for technical assistance in planning and carrying out land conservation and land utilization projects in selected areas. Although the Soil Conservation Service is responsible for administering the work of this program, it is carried on cooperatively with other Federal agencies and departments, State and local agencies, and sponsoring organizations. Other agencies of the Department of Agriculture share in the work of these projects in accordance with their regularly assigned functions. Governing bodies of soil conservation districts, in cooperation with other interested committees or groups, are expected to provide local project sponsorship. These projects will usually be in areas where acceleration of conservation activities is required to provide additional economic opportunities to the residents of a single district, or parts of several adjoining districts, or other geographic planning units within a land resource area.

For the next fiscal year, an appropriation of $2,813,000 is proposed, an increase of $1 million over 1965 and a reduction of $1,490,000 in the budget request. The amount approved includes $410,000 for investigations and planning, $639,000 for resource development, $764,000 for technical services, and $1 million for loans and related expense.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

The Economic Research Service was established by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1446, Supplement No. 1, of April 3, 1961, under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, and other authorities. The Service develops and carries out a program of economic research designed to benefit farmers and the general public. The findings of this research are made available to farmers and others through research reports and through economic outlook and situation reports on major commodities, the national economy, and the international economy.

The sum of $11,072,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1966, an increase of $150,000 over 1965 and a decrease of $294,000 in the budget request. The increase includes additional funds for research projects on financial management of family farms, water management and use, and export outlook projections. In view of the critical problems of American agriculture in these three areas, some additional funds for field study appear to be justified.

STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

The Statistical Reporting Service was established by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1446, Supplement 1, of April 3, 1961, under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, and other authorities. The Service was created to give coordinated leadership to the statistical reporting research and service programs of the Department. It provides a channel for the orderly flow of statistical intelligence about the agricultural economy of this country. The primary responsibilities of this Service are the nationwide crop and livestock estimates, coordination and improvement in the Department's statistical requirements, and special surveys of market potentials for agricultural products.

The full budget estimate of $13,595,000 is proposed for next year, an increase of $1,729,000 over the 1965 appropriation for this agency. The additional funds are provided for the purchase of a large-scale computer, which is essential to the long-range improvement of crop and livestock estimates. Rental of computer time on an irregular basis from various organizations in and around Washington has become a very inefficient method of operation and can no longer be depended upon for this purpose—where accuracy and speed of release of information are of paramount importance.

The budget proposes to eliminate funds for programs assigned to the agency by Congress in previous years, including cut flower surveys and certain seed reports. It also proposes to reduce the frequency of cattle-on-feed reports in certain areas. In the opinion of the committee, these activities are essential and should be continued.

CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

The Consumer and Marketing Service, formerly called the Agricultural Marketing Service, was established November 2, 1953, under authority of section 161, Revised Statutes, Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 and other authorities.

The bill for the coming fiscal year includes a recommended appropriation of $75,852,000 for consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs, an increase of $2,100,000 over 1965 and a decrease of $585,000 in the budget estimate. The proposed increase will provide 300 additional meat and poultry inspectors for next year, which will expand the present force of inspectors to approximately 6,000. It will also provide in excess of $52.5 million for these two regulatory functions. The meat and poultry inspection workload continues to grow each year due to increased consumer demands, the expansion in the number of meatpacking and poultry processing plants, and the increase in number of cities in which such plants are located.

Federal payments, authorized by section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, are made under cooperative agreements between the U.S. Department of Agriculture, State departments of agriculture, bureau of markets, and similar State agencies for the conduct of eligible marketing service activities on a matching fund basis. The States contribute at least half of the cost and perform the work with State personnel.

The full budget estimate of $1,500,000 is recommended for the coming fiscal year, the same amount as provided for fiscal year 1965.

The special milk program is aimed primarily at increasing the consumption of fluid milk by children. Nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, all nonprofit summer camps and child-care institutions devoted to the care and training of children, are eligible to participate in the program.

From its inception in fiscal year 1955 through fiscal year 1962, the program was financed through advances from the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Agriculture Act of 1961—Public Law 87-128—approved August 8, 1961, changed financing to a direct appropriation beginning June 1, 1962. In 1965 one-half of the funds required were provided by a direct appropriation and one-half were provided by transfer from section 32 funds.

For fiscal year 1966, the committee proposes a direct appropriation of $100 million to cover the entire cost of this program. This is the full budget request. The indicated increase of $48,500,000 is due entirely to the change from partial section 32 financing to a full appropriation basis.

For the school lunch program the committee proposes a direct appropriation of $155 million for fiscal year 1966, plus a transfer of $45 million from section 32 funds for the purchase of meats and other foods needed to provide balanced school lunches. This is an increase of $8,600,000 over 1965 and is a reduction of $2 million in the budget request.

For the past several years, the funds provided for this program have been computed at an average rate of 5 cents per meal for the estimated number of meals to be served during the budget year. The amount proposed for the coming year represents an average Federal payment of 5 cents per meal for an estimated 3 billion meals. This covers both the cash payment and regular section 6 food purchases.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

The Foreign Agricultural Service was established March 10, 1953, by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1320, Supplement 1. Public Law 690, approved August 28, 1954, transferred the agricultural attachés from the Department of State to the Foreign Agricultural Service. More recently, the Secretary has assigned to the Service, by transfer from other agencies of the Department, responsibility for the barter and stockpiling program, general sales management for Government-owned surplus commodities, ocean transportation functions related to the export of commodities under U.S. programs, and activities relating to developing, evaluating, and reviewing the program for donations of food abroad through voluntary agencies, pursuant to title III of Public Law 480.

The primary function of the Foreign Agricultural Service is to help American agriculture in maintaining and expanding foreign markets for its products. It maintains a worldwide agricultural intelligence and reporting service to assist the U.S. agricultural industry in its export operations through a continuous program of analyzing and reporting foreign agricultural production, markets, and policies. It helps to develop foreign markets for U.S. farm products through administration of special export programs and through helping to secure international trade conditions that are favorable toward our products.

For the next fiscal year, the committee recommends the full budget estimate of $20,574,000, a decrease of $205,000 below 1965. The amount approved contemplates a decrease of $285,000 due to financing of market development activities in Brazil from the special foreign currency appropriation next year. This is partially offset by an increase of $80,000 to strengthen the agricultural attaché service in Chile and on the OECD staff in Europe.

In addition, language is included in the bill to permit the conduct of market development work in excess foreign currency countries with foreign currencies from any source, rather than being limited to those generated by Public Law 480 sales.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

The Commodity Exchange Authority administers the Commodity Exchange Act of September 21, 1922, as amended. The objectives are to prevent commodity price manipulation and market corners; prevent dissemination of false and misleading crop and market information affecting commodity prices; protect hedgers and other users of the commodity futures markets against cheating, fraud, and manipulative practices; insure the benefits of membership privileges and contract markets to cooperative associations of producers; insure trust fund treatment of margin moneys and equities of hedgers and other traders and prevent the misuse of such funds by brokers; and provide information to the public regarding trading operations and contract markets.

For this agency, the bill for fiscal year 1966 carries $1,169,000. This is the full budget request and is the same amount as appropriated for 1965. The Authority's responsibilities include the supervision of 17 commodity exchanges designated as contract markets, more than 400 brokerage firms registered as futures commission merchants, and about 750 individuals registered as floor brokers.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service was established by the Secretary of Agriculture on June 5, 1961, under the authority of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended—5 U.S.C. 133z.

The committee proposes an appropriation of $111,714,000 for the coming year for the operating expenses of the various programs administered by this agency. The amount recommended is an increase of $3,162,000 over 1965 and a reduction of $26,636,000 in the 1966 budget request.

An increase of $5 million is allowed to finance workload in county offices in 1966 which was covered in 1965 from available funds carried forward from 1964. This is partially offset by a decrease of $1,838,000, which results from increased employee productivity and contemplates a man-year reduction of 191 in fiscal year 1966.

The budget proposed to transfer $21,108,223 from CCC financing to a direct appropriation basis. The major portion of the proposed decrease is due to the committee's recommendation that the activities involved continue to be financed from CCC transfers during the coming year.

The committee takes note of the announced changes being considered by the Department in connection with skiprow planting of cotton. In the opinion of a majority of the committee, the adoption of such changes would be a definite step backward, since it would result in a failure to fully utilize the results of extensive research in this area.

The committee calls on the Department to continue the administration of the 1965 cotton loan program on the same basis as in 1964. To provide for disbursements by county offices would result in a large increase in personnel, inconvenience to the farmer, and greatly increased risk to the Government since county employees are not under bond. The fact that they would be personally financially responsible would mean nothing in most cases. This matter has been before the committee repeatedly in prior years.

For the sugar act program, the budget estimate of $95,000,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1966, a decrease of $1,000,000 below funds provided for 1965.

Payments are made to domestic producers of sugarbeet and sugarcane who comply with certain special requirements. To finance these payments, a tax of 50 cents per hundred pounds is imposed on all beet and cane sugar processed in or imported into the United States for direct consumption. During the period 1938–64, collections of $2.2 billion from excise taxes and import taxes have exceeded payments by $541.5 million. Estimated collections through fiscal year 1966 of $2.4 billion will exceed estimated payments by $557 million.

The full budget request for a $220,000,000 appropriation is recommended for 1966 to make payments earned under the 1965 agricultural conservation program authorized last year. Amounts due under this program are legal commitments and funds must be provided to pay all contracts entered into under the program announced the previous year.

The committee also has restored the 1966 program authorization to the regular level of $220,000,000—plus $30,000,000 for administration under the appropriation "expenses, ASCS." Nearly every budget submitted for the past 10 years has proposed a reduction in this amount. It has been necessary for Congress to restore such budget cuts each year.

In the opinion of the majority of the members of the committee, the funds expended through this program return to the Nation the greatest possible conservation benefits. Further, this program provides the best possible means of meeting local conservation needs in all areas of the country. It is far more effective than many other approaches adopted in recent years.

Conservation practices under this program are developed initially at the local level by ASC State and county committees, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Federal Forest Service. Representatives of the land-grant colleges, the Farmers Home Administration, State conservation committees, and other State and Federal agricultural agencies also participate in these determinations.

The recommendations of these groups are used as the basis to formulate joint recommendations to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service in Washington. From these recommendations, the various agencies of the Department in Washington develop and recommend to the Secretary of Agriculture a national program. State and local people then develop their local programs within the structure of the national program approved by the Secretary. No practices are adopted and put into effect in any State or county unless approved by the local conservation groups.

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to extend conservation reserve contracts expiring in December 1962, for the calendar year 1963. A total of $6,150,000 was appropriated in fiscal years 1963 and 1964 to liquidate such contracts covering approximately 700,000 acres. No further funds are needed for this purpose, since this feature of the program has not been extended beyond 1963.

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 also authorized the Secretary to carry out a pilot program to determine how land not needed for crop production can best be used for conserving and developing soil, water, forests, wildlife, and recreational resources.

The pilot cropland conversion program has been offered in 41 counties of 13 States, involving differing geographic and agricultural situations. In addition, offers have been made to enter into a limited number of agreements in other States and counties to convert cropland to recreational enterprises only. About 2,800 agreements involving 129 thousand acres of cropland have been entered into in about 128 counties in 37 States.

The appropriation act for 1965 appropriated $15 million for the 1964 and 1965 programs. The committee recommends the sum of $7,500,000 for fiscal year 1966, which will continue the program at the 1964 and 1965 level.

An appropriation of $140 million is provided in the bill to meet conservation reserve contract commitments in 1966. This is $54 million below 1965 and is a reduction of $10 million in the budget estimate.

The decrease in this program is due to a reduction in annual rental payments as the result of the expiration of 40,316 contracts covering 3,237,494 acres previously withheld from production. Payments under this program will continue through 1973 on a diminishing basis.

The emergency conservation measures appropriation provides special funds for sharing the cost of emergency conservation measures to deal with cases of severe damage to farm and rangelands resulting from natural disasters. The criteria under which assistance may be made available are set forth in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act—16 U.S.C. 590(h).

Funds are allocated for use only in those counties designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as disaster counties. Assistance is made available to treat new conservation problems which, first, if not treated will impair or endanger the land; second, materially affect the productive capacity of the land; third, represent damage which is unusual in character and, except for wind erosion, is not the type which would recur frequently in the same area; and fourth, will be so costly to rehabilitate that Federal assistance is or will be required to return the land to productive agricultural use.

The budget estimate of $4 million is proposed for next year for this purpose. The decrease of $10 million is due to a nonrecurring supplemental enacted this spring to treat farm and rangelands damaged by recent floods in the Far West.

RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

The Rural Community Development Service has been established as a new agency of the Department. It includes the activities of the former Office of Rural Areas Development established June 16, 1961, to provide for general staff coordination of the rural areas development activities of the Department. In addition, it will undertake to facilitate the effective extension into rural areas of assistance programs of other Federal agencies which do not now effectively reach rural areas because of the administrative difficulties of communicating with the dispersed rural population. It will work with local organizations and leaders in helping them to locate and use the facilities of private, State, and other Federal agencies in developing the economy of rural areas, particularly those of low income.

The committee recommends $500,000 for fiscal year 1966 for this program, an increase of $368,000 over 1965 and a reduction of $250,000 in the budget request. The increase will be used to establish new field offices, in addition to the three now in operation, to provide leadership and coordination for the Rural Community Development activities of the Department. These field offices will serve as contact points for applicants for rural development projects and help to channel requests to existing local, State, and Federal agencies and institutions; make contact with sources of financial and technical assistance; follow through the difficult phases of project development; assist in establishing new industrial and commercial establishments; and assist in the establishment of adequate training programs.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Internal audit, inspection, and investigations activities are carried out by the Office of the Inspector General which was established by the Secretary of Agriculture's Memorandum No. 1503 dated June 25, 1962, and No. 1524 dated December 21, 1962. The Office is responsible to the Secretary for assuring that existing laws, policies, and programs of the Secretary are effectively complied with on every level of administration in accordance with the intent of the Congress and the Secretary. It insures prompt and appropriate corrective action in those areas in which deviation from established law, policy, procedure, rules, or regulations has developed; and conducts internal audit, inspection, and investigative activities within the Department and coordinates and correlates them with various investigative agencies of the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

The bill includes $10,416,000 for the coming year, an increase of $300,000 over 1965 and a decrease of $545,000 in the budget request. The increase is provided to meet the necessary field audit and investigative needs of the expanding food stamp program. Language is also included to permit the temporary employment of experts and consultants as needed to evaluate the adequacy and quality of audits and inspections made by this Office.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

The Office of the General Counsel, originally known as the Office of the Solicitor, was established in 1910 as the law office of the Department of Agriculture, and performs all of the legal work arising from the activities of the Department. The General Counsel represents the Department in administrative proceedings for the promulgation of rules having the force and effect of law; in quasi-judicial hearings held in connection with the administration of various programs and acts; and in proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission involving freight rates and practices relating to farm commodities, including appeals from the decisions of the Commission to the courts. He serves as General Counsel for the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. He reviews criminal cases arising under the programs of the Department for referral to the Department of Justice.

The committee proposes an appropriation of $4,139,000 for fiscal year 1966, an increase of $100,000 over 1965 and a reduction of $90,000 in the budget request. The increase is provided to meet the additional legal work related to the food stamp program, Packers and Stockyards Act, and programs of the Farmers Home Administration and the Forest Service. Appropriations for all of these agencies have been increased in recent years, with corresponding increases in their demands upon this Office for legal assistance.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

The Office of Information was established under its present name in 1925 as a consolidation of functions formally organized as early as 1889, to coordinate in the Department the dissemination of information useful to agriculture as directed by the act establishing the Department of Agriculture in 1862.

The Office has general direction and supervision of all publications and other information policies and activities of the Department including the final review, illustrating, printing, and distribution of publications; clearance, and release of press, radio, television, and magazine materials; maintenance of central files of news and general illustration-type photographs; and the preparation and distribution of exhibits and motion pictures. The Office publishes the Yearbook of Agriculture, the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Department Directory, and the Department List of Publications; handles the details of distributing farmers' bulletins allotted to Members of Congress; and services letter and telephone requests for general information received in the Department. Under the Department's working capital fund, the Office also produces visual informational materials, such as motion pictures, art, and graphics materials, and still photographic work for the Department and other Government agencies.

The full budget estimate of $1,689,000 is recommended for this office in 1966. This is a continuation of the program level authorized for fiscal year 1965.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

The Library, pursuant to the Department's organic act of 1862, and under delegation from the Secretary, "procures and preserves all information concerning agriculture which can be obtained by means of books." Under the act establishing the Department, the Library also serves as the National Agricultural Library.

The Library makes available to the research workers of the Department and the State agricultural colleges, as well as to the general public, the agricultural knowledge of the world that is contained in published literature. The Library collects current and historical published material and organizes it for maximum service to the Department and to the public through reference services, loans of publications, bibliographical services, and photo reproductions of library material. It issues a monthly Bibliography of Agriculture in which is listed the agricultural literature of the world. The book collection approximates 1.2 million volumes.

The 1965 appropriation for salaries and expenses of $1,599,000 is proposed again for fiscal year 1966, a reduction of $266,000 in the budget estimate. In view of the planned construction of a new library at Beltsville during the coming year, the committee feels that further increases in staff and library services should be deferred.

An appropriation of $7 million is also included in the bill for the construction, equipping, and furnishing of a new library building at the Beltsville Research Center. Architectural plans are scheduled for completion in September 1965. The construction contract will be let shortly thereafter, with completion scheduled for the fall of 1967. It is expected that the amount provided herein will be the full and complete cost of this facility, exclusively of planning funds previously appropriated.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

The Office of Management Services provides consolidated management support services to certain agencies and offices of the Department. It was established by Secretary's memorandum No. 1529, dated January 29, 1963, to provide greater economy and effectiveness in the rendering of management service through improved utilization of manpower and management techniques, increased specialization of professional skills, and more extensive use of timesaving equipment.

The consolidated management support functions include budget and finance, personnel and related programs, administrative services, and information work. The organization structure of OMS is based upon these functions with operating divisions providing the services for the following agencies and offices: Office of the Secretary, Office of Budget and Finance, Office of Hearing Examiners, Office of Management Appraisal and Systems Development, Office of Personnel, Office of Plant and Operations, Rural Community Development Service, Office of Information, National Agricultural Library, Office of the General Counsel, Office of the Inspector General, Farmer Cooperative Service, Commodity Exchange Authority, Cooperative State Research Service, Economic Research Service, and Statistical Reporting Service.

The 1965 appropriation of $2,483,000 is recommended again for next year. This is a decrease of $96,000 in the budget estimate. Since the programs of the agencies served by this office have been held at or close to the 1965 level, no increase is required for their administrative service support.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

The Secretary of Agriculture, assisted by the Under Secretary, the Assistant Secretaries, and members of their immediate staffs, directs and coordinates the work of the Department; formulates and develops policy, maintains relationships with agricultural organizations and others in the development of farm programs; and maintains liaison with the Executive Office of the President and Members of Congress on all matters pertaining to legislation and policy to insure effective performance of the agricultural programs of the Department.

The following activities are also included under General Administration:

Personnel administration and service is carried on by the Office of Personnel, the staff agency with responsibility for the personnel management program of the Department.

Budgetary and financial administration and service is carried on by the Office of Budget and Finance, the staff agency with responsibility for functions relating to overall administration of the budgetary, fiscal, and related affairs of the Department.

General operations are carried on by the Office of Plant and Operations, a staff agency exercising general staff management direction of the housing of the Department's activities; the lessening of commercial space and management of real property; procurement activities; purchasing, warehousing, utilization and disposal of administrative and operating supplies and equipment.

Management appraisal and systems development functions are carried out by the Office of Management Appraisal and Systems Development which was established by Secretary memorandum No. 1477 of December 8, 1961. The Office is responsible for the general direction, leadership, and coordination in the department of management appraisals, systems design, automatic data processing, operations research, and related management techniques.

Regulatory hearings and decisions include the work of the Office of Hearing Examiners and of the Judicial Officer. The Hearing Examiners carry out the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act relating to the holding of hearings—5 U.S.C. 1006, 1010. Hearings are held in connection with prescribing of new regulations and orders, and on disciplinary complaints filed by the Department, or on petitions filed by private parties asking relief from some action of the Department.

The National Agricultural Advisory Commission was established pursuant to Executive Order No. 10472, approved July 20, 1953, amended by Executive Order 10937, approved May 3, 1961. In its advisory functions, the Commission is concerned with the broad fields of agricultural policy and administration, both as they affect the U.S. farmer and the national economy.

The committee was disturbed recently by the failure of the Department to keep informed adequately on legislative bills and reports introduced and to make certain that the Department is properly represented at hearings and other meetings at which proposed legislation and other matters of vital interest to agriculture are considered. While the congressional liaison office is doing its best, more definite arrangements to meet this responsibility should be made by the Secretary and means should be adopted to make certain this responsibility is fully carried out.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The Rural Electrification Administration was established by Executive Order 7037 of May 11, 1935, to make loans for extension of central station electric service to unserved rural people. It was continued by the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, and became part of the Department of Agriculture on July 1, 1939, under Reorganization Plan II. On October 28, 1949, Public Law 423 amended the act to authorize loans for furnishing and improving rural telephone service.

Electric and telephone construction loans are self-liquidating within a period not to exceed 35 years at 2-percent interest.

The full budget estimate of $350 million is recommended for electrification loans for 1966, including a contingency reserve of $65 million. This is a reduction of $15 million below electrification loan funds authorized for 1965.

The need for electrification loan funds is indicated by the greatly increasing need for electric energy. Forecasts by the electric utility industry show that the country's energy output will grow from

860 million kilowatt-hours (kwh) in 1962 to 1.5 trillion kilowatt-hours in 1970, and to 3.1 trillion kilowatt-hours in 1980. The growth rate will quadruple the country's total output in the next 20 years. The forecasts indicate that all of the electric systems in America—cooperatives, private and public—will need more than $140 billion of new capital for expanded plant facilities to meet the growing demand for service by 1980, or an average annual investment of 7 percent of plant. For the REA-financed rural systems the need for new capital will grow accordingly.

The consumer density on REA-financed electric systems is 3.3 consumers or meters to the mile as compared to 33.2 for the class A and B commercial utilities. Their annual gross revenues average $460 per year per mile of line, while annual gross revenues per mile of class A and B utilities is $7,164. The rural electric systems have built 1.5 million miles of distribution lines in this country. This is one-half of the distribution line mileage in the industry, but it serves only 8 percent of the consumers and grosses only 5 percent of the revenue of the industry.

For the telephone loan program, the bill includes an authorization of $97 million for 1966, the full budget estimate. The committee has included a separate contingency reserve of $7 million within the total amount approved—a practice which has been found very useful in previous years.

Since the inception of the rural telephone program in fiscal year 1950, loans have totaled over $1,078 million. During this period the percentage of farms with telephone service has increased from about 38 percent to an estimated 79 percent. There is a continued interest in modern telephone service in areas where present facilities are inadequate and do not meet the needs for modern communications.

Telephone loan applications on hand at the close of fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964 totaled $56.4 million, $58.3 million, and $84.7 million, respectively. New applications received during fiscal year 1964 totaled $102.1 million with a steady and gradual increase in the average monthly rate of incoming applications. During the first 5 months of fiscal year 1965, incoming applications were received at an annual rate of about $108 million. With loans of $97 million during fiscal year 1965, applications remaining on hand at the close of fiscal year 1965 will probably total about $96 million. It seems quite certain that applications received in fiscal year 1966 will reach $105 million. With a $96 million carryover of unapproved applications, this will provide more than $200 million in applications for consideration during the fiscal year 1966.

For the administrative costs of the REA program, the full budget estimate of $11,934,000 is proposed for 1966. This is the same amount as appropriated for 1965.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Pursuant to the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, a direct loan account was established in fiscal year 1962. Collections of principal and interest on loans outstanding are deposited in the direct loan account and are available for principal and interest payments on borrowing from the Secretary of the Treasury and for making additional loans for (a) farmownership, (b) soil and water conservation, and (c) operating purposes. Such loans may be made only in such amounts as may be authorized in annual appropriation acts.

As of the end of fiscal year 1965, it is estimated that this account will have a balance on hand of $72,748,550. Estimated collections in fiscal year 1966 of $346,851,450 will provide a total of $419,600,000 for 1966 loan purposes.

The bill includes loan authorizations for the coming year of $340 million, of which $40 million is provided for real estate loans and $300 million is included for operating loans. The operating loan authorization is the same amount as approved for 1965. Of this amount $50 million has been placed in a contingency reserve as in previous years. The real estate loan figure of $40 million is $20 million less than provided for 1965. The reduction contemplates the greater use of insured loans through the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund to meet the real estate loan need. Legislation is now pending in Congress to increase the annual limit on insured loans from $200 million to $450 million.

For rural housing for domestic farm labor, the new program of financial assistance is authorized by section 516 of the Housing Act of 1949, as recently amended—Public Law 88-560.

The committee has agreed to an appropriation of $2 million for the coming year to enable the Department to undertake this new program on an experimental basis. It recognizes the serious shortage of farm labor to do "tedious" and "stoop" work on the Nation's farms. It feels, however, that no funds should be provided to any applicant in excess of 50 percent of the development costs and that grants should be limited strictly to nonprofit associations or public bodies of a similar nature. Grants to individuals or private organizations must not be permitted. The committee recognizes that, unless this program is kept under very close supervision, it could result in the use of Federal funds for the benefit of private landowners.

The rural renewal program was authorized by section 102 of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962. The program provides technical assistance to locally initiated and sponsored demonstration projects. Loans are made to local public agencies or groups for rural renewal development projects specifically related to conservation and land utilization. To be eligible for designation as a rural renewal area, the locality must be one of chronic underemployment on farms and unemployment in the surrounding communities and where agriculture or forestry contributes substantially to the economy.

The committee recommends that the funds for this purpose be continued at the 1965 level of $1,200,000, a reduction of $1,800,000 in the budget request. As of March 31, 1965, an unobligated balance of over $1 million was available for future activities under this program.

The rural housing for the elderly revolving fund was authorized by the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962, approved September 28, 1962. The act authorizes appropriations for a revolving fund to finance the program. It also authorizes loans from the revolving fund to private nonprofit corporations and consumer cooperatives to provide modest rental housing and related facilities for elderly persons—age 62 or over—of low or moderate income in rural areas. These are direct loans, repayable in not more than 50 years. The interest is comparable to housing loans for the elderly in urban areas, which is currently running 3¾ percent.

An appropriation of $2,500,000 is proposed for 1966, a reduction of $2,500,000 below 1965 and the budget request. As of March 31, 1965, slightly over $8.5 million was available in this account to meet future needs.

For salaries and expenses the committee recommends an appropriation for 1966 in the amount of $42,733,000. This is an increase of $1,500,000 over 1965 and reduction of $1,959,000 in the budget estimate.

In addition, the committee has restored language in the bill which authorizes the use of not to exceed $500,000 of the funds available for the various new programs administered by this agency for the employment of temporary personnel to meet unusual or heavy workload increases.

New responsibilities in the field of financing shifts in land use, recreational enterprises, rental housing for senior citizens in rural areas, farm labor housing, assistance to disadvantaged rural youth and under other authorities of the Farmers Home Administration require new skills and additional manpower, particularly at the field level. With low-income farm borrowers, it is particularly important to provide good technical supervision and assistance coupled with needed credit, if the borrower is to become successfully established. The complicated financial management problems of many applicants require more skill and more effort today than formerly was the case.

During the past 30 years hundreds of thousands of farm families have used the lending programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration and its predecessor agencies, to equip, improve, operate, and buy family farms. In every instance the families that borrowed funds from the Farmers Home Administration had exhausted the credit available to them from conventional credit sources. Repayment of principal and interest to date totals $5.8 billion. The balance of the amount outstanding has not yet fallen due. For current programs the amount of principal written off is less than 1 percent.

In view of the outstanding record on this agency, it is appropriate to review briefly the history of its programs.

The Department's present supervised credit program began in the midthirties. In those days the agency was known as the Resettlement Administration—1935–37—and later as the Farm Security Administration—1937–46. The Farmers Home Administration succeeded the FSA in 1946.

The original programs initiated in 1937 included direct farmownership loans, and soil and water loans. In 1946 the following loan programs were added: insured farmownership and soil and water loans, and farm-operating loans. In 1949, direct rural housing building loans, repair and improvement grants, and emergency loans to meet natural disasters were added to the agency's program. Insured soil and water loans were authorized in 1954. Watershed protection loans were initiated in 1956 and flood-prevention loans were started in 1960, both by allotment from the Soil Conservation Service.

Legislation enacted by the Congress in the past 4 years has greatly broadened the scope of the Farmers Home Administration. Not only have services to family farmers been increased, but a substantial expansion has taken place in the development of services related to rural community development and rural poverty. Farm labor housing loans were authorized in 1961, insured loans for rental housing for the elderly were added in 1962, and direct loans for rental housing for the elderly and rural renewal loans were initiated in 1964.

Two new categories of loans were added to the agency's program this year, including resource conservation and development loans—by allotment from Soil Conservation Service and economic opportunity loans—by allotment from Office of Economic Opportunity. Also, it is proposed to initiate the farm labor housing program next year under amendments to the Housing Act adopted last year.

The committee is proud of the outstanding record made by this agency and takes pride in having taken part in its accomplishments. It is pleased to have contributed to the broadening of the scope of the programs of this agency to cover "rural" areas as well as "farm" areas, so as to provide credit for those in rural areas who were not covered by either Federal Housing Agency loans for urban dwellers or Farmers Home Administration loans for those living on farms. The committee also takes pride in its part in providing watershed and flood-prevention loans needed to strengthen the soil and water conservation programs of the Nation.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is a wholly owned Government corporation created February 16, 1938, to carry out the Federal Crop Insurance Act. Its purpose is to promote the national welfare by improving the economic stability of agriculture through a sound system of crop insurance and providing the means for research and experience helpful in devising and establishing such insurance.

Crop insurance offered to agricultural producers by the Corporation provides protection from losses caused by unavoidable natural hazards, such as insect and wildlife damage, plant diseases, fire, drought, flood, wind, and other weather conditions. It does not indemnify producers for losses resulting from negligence or failure to observe good farming practices.

The committee recommends a total of $11,616,000 for administrative and operating expenses during the next fiscal year, $7,478,000 by direct appropriation and $4,138,000 from premium income. This represents a net increase over 1965 of $500,000, one-half the budget request, all to come from premium income. The amount of appropriated funds is retained at the 1965 level, a reduction of $1 million in the budget estimate.

The amount recommended for 1966 is based on an expansion of crop insurance into 100 counties during the next year, and some increased participation in present counties.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Corporation was organized October 17, 1933, under the laws of the State of Delaware, as an agency of the United States, and was managed and operated in close affiliation with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. On July 1, 1939, it was transferred to the Department of Agriculture by the President's Reorganization Plan I. On July 1, 1948, it was established as an agency and instrumentality of the United States under a permanent Federal charter by Public Law 80–806, as amended. Its operations are conducted pursuant to this charter and other specific legislation.

The Commodity Credit Corporation engages in buying, selling, lending, and other activities with respect to agricultural commodities, their products, food, feeds, and fibers. Its purposes include stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices; assisting in the maintenance of balance and adequate supplies of such commodities; and facilitating their orderly distribution. The Corporation also makes available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of such commodities.

The Corporation is managed by a board of directors appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, who is, ex officio, a director and chairman of the board. In addition, it has a bipartisan advisory board of five members appointed by the President to survey the general policies of the Corporation and advise the Secretary with respect thereto.

Personnel and facilities of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, ASC State and county committees, and other USDA agencies are used to carry out Corporation activities.

The Corporation has an authorized capital stock of $100 million held by the United States and authority to borrow up to $14.5 billion. Funds are borrowed from the Federal Treasury and may also be borrowed from private lending agencies. In connection with loan guarantees, the Corporation reserves a sufficient amount of its borrowing authority to purchase at any time all notes and other obligations evidencing loans made by lending agencies or certificates of interest issued in connection with the financing of price-support operations. All bonds, notes, debentures, and similar obligations issued by the Corporation are subject to approval by the Secretary of the Treasury as required by the act of March 8, 1939—15 U.S.C. 713a–4.

The full budget estimate of $2,300 million is included in the bill to restore a portion of the capital impairment of the Corporation for fiscal year 1964. This is a reduction of $374 million below the funds appropriated in fiscal year 1965. The best information available to the committee at this time indicates that this amount will be adequate to finance price support operations during the coming fiscal year. It is realized, however, that the exact amount required next year will be determined finally by the volume of production, weather conditions, market prices, and other uncertain and uncontrollable factors which cannot be accurately predicted at this time.

The committee has approved budget language which will avoid increasing future appropriation requests by accumulated interest charges on realized losses not restored currently. This change will have the effect of terminating at the close of each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1965, interest on borrowings from the Treasury in an amount equivalent to the realized losses sustained by the Corporation (1) during the fiscal year 1965 and succeeding fiscal years, and (2) in prior fiscal years, for which the Corporation has not been reimbursed by appropriation. Interest would continue to be charged on borrowings for losses sustained during a particular fiscal year but not after the end of that fiscal year. This would limit interest expenses to borrowings for current operations and would avoid increasing future appropriation requests by interest charges resulting solely from deferral of reimbursement to the Corporation for realized costs and losses applicable to past operations.

The committee wishes to point out again this year that a major portion of the funds expended by the Commodity Credit Corporation for price support and related activities go to nonfarm groups, including warehousemen, transportation companies, exporters, consumers, and others. A review of the major elements of cost for the past 6 years shows that the percentage of CCC payments to nonfarm groups has run around 60 percent on the average.

The committee recommends the proposed budget limitation of $36,650,000 for the Corporation's administrative expenses during the coming year. This amount is $701,000 less than provided for 1965. This reduction has been made possible by increased productivity of employees paid from these funds.

Despite salary increases and other increased costs, the officials of the Corporation and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service have been able to reduce personnel during the past 2 years. This is a most commendable accomplishment.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

A number of statutes provide for the facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to be used in carrying our programs for the exportation of surplus agricultural commodities and authorize appropriations to reimburse the Corporation for costs incurred in connection with such programs.

Prior to fiscal year 1962, the Corporation was reimbursed for the costs of these activities by appropriations subsequent to incurrence of the costs. Beginning in the fiscal year 1962, the Congress added funds to place these activities on a pay-as-you-go basis, appropriating for estimated costs in fiscal year 1962. Subsequent bills have included funds for each ensuing fiscal year on the same basis as for other programs of the Department.

The bill includes a total appropriation of $1,658 million for, first, sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies pursuant to title I of said act; second, commodities donated for emergency famine relief to friendly peoples pursuant to title II, and, third, longterm supply contracts pursuant to title IV. The committee has approved the full budget estimate, which is $659,453,000 below the funds appropriated for 1965.

To permit more flexibility in financial administration of this program, separate amounts for each purpose have not been provided for next year.

The rate at which expenditures are made under these programs is influenced by such unpredictable factors as international negotiations, economic conditions abroad, availability of shipping space, and the processing of documents. Also, these programs are affected by major farm legislation, and the effect of new legislation cannot be foreseen at this point.

For the international wheat agreement the full budget estimate of $27,544,000 is recommended for the coming year, a reduction of $54,294,000 below the appropriation for 1965. This decrease results from a 5 cent reduction in the estimated export payment rate, and the elimination of nonrecurring interest expenses in 1965.

For the bartered material for supplemental stockpile the committee proposes an appropriation of $30 million for fiscal year 1966, a decrease of $62,860,000 below funds provided for 1965, and a reduction of $22,500,000 in the budget request.

Information which has been brought to the attention of the committee causes some concern about the type of transactions conducted under the barter program. The Secretary should review this activity thoroughly during the coming year to make certain that it is receiving the closest possible administrative supervision and audit. The use of funds provided through this appropriation should be given close scrutiny and curtailed wherever possible.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The Administration supervises, examines, and provides facilities and services to a coordinated system of farm credit banks and associations making loans to farmers and their cooperatives. Services and facilities furnished by the Administration facilitate the operations of the several agencies and their progress toward farmer ownership. Typical services are: custody of collateral for bonds and debentures, assistance in financing and investments, credit analysis, development of land appraisal standards and policies, preparation of reports and budgets, and preparation and distribution of information on farm credit. All expenses of these activities are paid by assessments collected from the banks and associations of the farm credit system.

Since December 4, 1953, the Administration has been an independent agency under the direction of a Federal Farm Credit Board—12 U.S.C. 636. The Administration, originally created by Executive Order No. 6084 on May 27, 1933, was transferred to the Department of Agriculture on July 1, 1939, by Reorganization Plan No. 1.

The amount of loans made by the Farm Credit banks and associations continued in an upward trend and reached a new peak during the past year. A net total of $5.9 billion in credit extended to agriculture in the year ended June 30, 1964, compares with $5.3 billion for fiscal 1963. The 12 Federal land banks in the year ended June 30, 1964, made loans amounting to $852 million as compared with $682 million in fiscal 1963. Production credit associations made $3.7 billion in short- and intermediate-term loans to farmers in the 1964 fiscal year compared with $3.4 billion in fiscal 1963. The banks for cooperatives made $1.06 billion in loans to farmers' marketing, purchasing and business service cooperatives during the year ended June 30, 1964, about $115 million more than in the 1963 fiscal year.

Due to the increased use of credit by farmers and their cooperatives, the total amount of loans outstanding among all Farm Credit banks and associations reached a new peak. Outstandings amounted to $6.9 billion on June 30, 1964, as compared with $6.3 billion a year earlier. The amount outstanding was at peak levels for each group of banks.

The full budget estimate of $2,990,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1966 an increase of $59,000 over 1964. The increase is provided to cover part-year vacancies in 1965, which will be filled for a full year in 1966.

NATIONAL FOOD COMMISSION ON FOOD MARKETING

The National Commission on Food Marketing is a temporary, bipartisan Commission created on July 3, 1964 (Public Law 88-354), to conduct a broad-scale study of the marketing structure of the food industry. Originally a report was to be submitted to the President and the Congress by July 1, 1965. Legislation to extend this date to July 1, 1966, has been proposed. The Commission automatically ceases to exist 90 days after the final reporting date.

As set forth in the authorizing legislation, the duties of the Commission are to study and appraise—

First. The actual changes, principally in the past two decades, in the various segments of the food industry;

Second. The changes likely to materialize if present trends continue;

Third. The kind of food industry that would assure efficiency of production, assembly, processing, and distribution, provide appropriate services to consumers, and yet maintain acceptable competitive alternatives of procurement and sales in all segments of the industry from producer to consumer;

Fourth. The changes in statutes or public policy, the organization of farming and of food assembly, processing, and distribution, and the interrelationships between segments of the food industry which would be appropriate to achieve a desired distribution of power as well as desired levels of efficiency;

Fifth. The effectiveness of the services, including the dissemination of market news, and regulatory activities of the Federal Government in terms of present and probable developments in the industry; and

Sixth. The effect of imported food on U.S. producers, processors, and consumers.

An appropriation of $750,000 is recommended for the next fiscal year for the activities of this organization. This is a decrease of $750,000 in the budget estimate and an increase of $50,000 over 1965 operations.

The Department of Agriculture has been studying marketing margins and other phases of the food industry for a number of years. At the present time it has over 1,000 employees in the Economic Research Service conducting economic research on agricultural production, marketing, and distribution. A complete description of the information available from the research projects of this agency is contained in the hearings on the 1966 budget—part 4, pages 518–539. This data indicates that studies are now going on within the Department on every possible aspect of the price spread between the farmer and the consumer. A total of 22 separate research projects in this area were conducted by the Department's economic research agency between March 1964 and February 1965. Six projects were completed during this period. Ten special publications on this subject were issued during this period by the Economic Research Service and four were published by State universities. Eleven articles were carried in USDA periodicals, four speeches and papers were presented, and 10 radio and television programs were given.

The Department's reports on studies of farm-retail spreads for food products covered beef, pork, lamb, poultry, butter, eggs, fruits and vegetables, bread and wheat, and other items in the farm-food market basket. Such reports also covered the various cost factors involved, including labor, transportation, and corporate profits.

The committee agrees that the National Commission on Food Marketing can make a contribution to the farmer-consumer relationship, by using the information already available to arrive at conclusions and judgments, and by making these final determinations available to the general public. It feels, however, that a small and highly skilled staff can accomplish this desirable result within the amount of funds recommended for this activity in the bill for 1966. The Department should cooperate fully in bringing together all available information for the use of the Commission. To the extent necessary, it should temporarily assign personnel to the Commission to assist in developing and assembling the basic data required.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for doing the fine job that he always does with this appropriation bill. In connection with the food stamp money, I am certainly delighted to hear the gentleman say that he is going to offer an amendment to restore the amount of money to the budget figure of $100 million. But the statement that concerned me was the gentleman's statement that he did not feel that the entire amount of money may be utilized by the Department. I know that I have been trying to get several counties in my district who need the benefits of that program, and I have always been told by the Department that there was a shortage of funds. So I am delighted to hear the gentleman will offer an amendment to give the Department the full amount of their request.

Let me state that I certainly wish to compliment this committee in making additional funds available for tobacco research. I know any effort to materially reduce our tobacco support price program would destroy the economy of all the tobacco producing States.

I have approximately 20,000 growers in the district that I am privileged to represent. Most all are small growers who would not be in a position to realize any cash income from their farm efforts without this support price program.

This program has worked well over a period of years without any cost to the Government. We should concentrate on research with the view of finding some of the answers instead of attempting to destroy a program that has worked so well over a period of years.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not know that we should push the Department too rapidly. We do provide some funds for them to get some specialists to help advise them to enforce rules and regulations in connection with food stamps, in order to make sure that they do not spend those stamps for something that is not contemplated by the act. We have to have a good enforcement program policy to go along with an expansion program. Otherwise a few bad cases could ruin what might be a good program.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PURCELL. On page 23 of the committee report which deals with the Statistical Reporting Service—that is the place concerning which I should like to ask my question.

Page 23 of the committee report deals with the Statistical Reporting Service. My question deals with the last sentence in this section concerning cattle-on-feed reports. This sentence reads, "In the opinion of the committee, these activities are essential and should be continued," referring to the Statistical Reporting Service.

It is my understanding that the committee believes there should be no reduction in the number or frequency of cattle-on-feed reports as they have been issued through the current fiscal year.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct.

Mr. PURCELL. My question is, Is my understanding correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is the intention of the committee.

Mr. PURCELL. If the gentleman will yield further, may I ask one further question?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes.

Mr. PURCELL. The committee has included in the bill the sum of $2.8 million for the maintenance of barriers on the Mexican border for the screw-worm eradication program. The Department requested $5.5 million.

Is it the feeling of the committee that the sum approved of $2.8 million will be sufficient to maintain the barrier zone at its very effective present level of control?

Mr. WHITTEN. I certainly think that the money contained in the bill will be adequate to carry on an effective barrier zone. We also have some funds in the bill with which to keep up spot checks in order to be sure that the program is working.

We had some misgivings about the idea of undertaking a program of screw-worm eradication in Mexico, with Mexican cattle and cattle of the United States being in a competitive position. But, certainly, when we found only 240 screw-worms last year in this whole area, apparently the screw-worms are eradicated. For this barrier zone, it is the opinion of the committee that these funds are ample to take care of the job.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman very much and I hope the gentleman will forgive me for not being an expert in agriculture. However, my attention has been drawn and I have been requested to ask the gentleman a question relative to the appropriation which is found on page 54 of the committee report under "Agricultural conservation program."

The appropriation last year was $225 million. The Bureau of the Budget requested or estimated the sum of $220 million, which the committee approved.

The question as I understand it from those who have written me, and in particular the California Seed Association through its president—their request is to know whether this reduction of $5 million is primarily intended to be for administrative expenses, or does it in any way represent a curtailment of the existing or proposed programs?

As the gentleman knows we have water and erosion problems in the West which are of particular importance to us.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the program we announce each year establishes the program level for the next year. Once it is announced, we are committed to the program. It is a case of the Government owing money and we are going to pay off what we owe. This is our guess as to the amount which will be required for this purpose. This does not reduce the proposed program at all. The 1965 appropriation included an extra $5 million to meet unpaid prior year commitments.

Permit me to mention this one thing further to the gentleman. We have all received many, many letters from people interested in the Soil Conservation Service.

Back earlier a recommendation was made to the Congress to charge back $20 million to the participants. That was a recommendation but there was never any legislation on the matter insofar as I have been able to ascertain. No one has ever introduced the bill, and the full amount including the $20 million was before our committee. Let me assure the gentleman that the committee provided the funds that were before it. The agitation was about legislation which was never introduced.

We have tried to meet that program here. May I say further that our committee only a few weeks ago provided in the supplemental bill $10 million to the west coast where we pay up to 80 percent of the cost in the effort to redeem and reclaim land. We did the same thing with reference to the Appalachia program.

The agricultural conservation program for next year has been restored back to that of recent years' levels. It is our belief that it is a lot more sound to have the participation of 1.2 million people in trying to keep the land intact than coming in with a program such as the Appalachian program in order to restore damaged and eroded land. In other words, it is better to spend a little bit as we go along in trying to keep the land intact as best we can.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman very much and I think the gentleman has made it very clear. Our fear was that certain southern programs and midwestern programs would be continued at such a rate that they would be so continued at the expense of certain western programs.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is not true and, certainly, this does not effect them at all. The basic law provides a formula for distribution.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding and I want to thank the gentleman and the other members of the committee for a very fine job which they have done on the bill itself.

I have a question about the appropriation for the Rural Electrification Administration.

I realize that the gentleman's committee has included in the bill the exact amount asked by the Bureau of the Budget; but in view of what is said by the committee with respect to continuing and increasing needs in this area, I wonder if the gentleman, who is interested in the subject as I am, feels that this amount of money plus the contingency reserve provided will be adequate to meet the general requirements of the Rural Electrification Cooperatives.

Mr. WHITTEN. I believe so. We try to set that ceiling high enough so there will be money in each State for bargaining by the local co-ops to get reasonable rates and terms. Now, there are funds pending that the Bureau of the Budget can release from last year's contingency. I am told there are many reasons why they should go ahead. I do not know about that of my own knowledge. However, it is not the intent of the committee that they hold those funds when they are needed to meet the growing needs of the REA program.

Mr. MILLS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I was going to make a point referred to in the colloquy of the chairman with the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. As the gentleman says, and as pointed out in the supplemental, that item came to about $10 million, a substantial amount for those Western States, and his home State of California was included.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for the outstanding job he has done once again in bringing this bill before the House. I am greatly appreciative of the profound knowledge the gentleman in the well has with reference to agricultural problems, and I think I can speak for all Members of the House when I say that the gentleman in the well is recognized as one of the outstanding and highly respected Members of this body. I have a question about an appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ICHORD. I am very much interested in the Soil Conservation Service appropriations. I observe on pages 52 and 53 of the committee report the comparative statement that the committee has upped the appropriation over the budget estimates for conservation operations in the amount of $1.27 million.

I ask the gentleman from Mississippi, is that as a result of rejecting the so-called revolving fund?

Mr. WHITTEN. The revolving fund, as I said earlier, was merely a recommendation to the Congress to change the law. These recommendations never got off the ground. I do not know of anyone introducing the proposed legislation.

The gentleman's State is one reason for this action to put this money back in here. Missouri for many years had a prohibition against organization of soil conservation districts in the State. A few years ago that restriction was removed. Any State similarly situated is entitled to come into the national program. So most of the additional funds are put in there to take care of new districts.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for explaining that point. I further note that the committee has reduced the resource and conservation development item $1.49 million.

I would point out to the gentleman from Mississippi, there are 22 applications for resource, conservation and development, pilot programs. I feel very strongly that the soil conservation service will not have a chance to operate on or approve these applications.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, this matter is one of judgment. This is a new program. But the committee did not mean to eliminate any specific project that the department might have in mind to approve. We have not approved these project by project. But you can imagine when we come in here and our colleagues are looking to us to hold the appropriations in this bill in line with other departments, you can see somewhat the problem we have on our bill, especially when our bill was cut a billion dollars before it came to us. So our action was not taken as in any way restricting these projects. I just would like to express that under the circumstances we are trying to do the very best we can and match these matters with other things that were in this bill.

But I do want to assure the gentleman we had no intention of cutting down any project in which he or any other Member might be interested, and I am sure this subject will have the consideration of this committee in its further deliberations.

Mr. ICHORD. Of course, you have 10 projects in existence at the present time under operation, but this will eliminate, as a matter of fact, the likelihood of future programs being approved.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, with $1,400,000 less they cannot do as much as if they had the full amount of money. But by the same token, our action is not the end of this bill. It goes to the other side of the Capitol and then to conference.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. A moment ago reference was made to the Rural Electrification Administration. I will say to the gentleman in the well of the House, who has always been a champion of this program—I know this to be true because I was the administrator of REA—and I can assure this body that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will do everything he can to protect that program.

But I would like to make this observation and I would be interested in the observation of the gentleman. It has been traditional in that program that the administrator refrain from political activity.

I am happy to see on the floor the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. He was one of those who admonished me to follow the tradition of that program. But in recent years the administrator has involved himself not only in congressional campaigns but in campaigns for State senator in one district. The Hatch Act and the Corrupt Practices Act have been violated within the agency in the way of solicitation of political funds from employees within the agency. I want this to be a matter of record, and I am sure the gentleman now in the well will agree with me, that the great value of this program and its very effectiveness has been in the bipartisan support that it has had, and I am sure the gentleman would endorse my statement when I say that we should try to keep it that way.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say this subject was developed in the hearings and the present administrator made it quite clear in the record what actions he had taken in answer to questions. I remember he said he would be clearly out of place if he used his position in any way politically, but that he was in Class A classification where he is subject to being hired or fired without regard to civil service. He expressed himself on his own time in a political way and I am hardly in a position at this time to say one way or the other.

Mr. NELSEN. I understand that but in the act itself when I came into the agency, I was admonished by counsel in the agency that the administrator should not involve himself in campaigns. Now I speak with some authority because the administrator was in my own district and I should send him a thank you note because I got a pretty good plurality.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say I am not an authority on many things. Certainly the gentleman is informed and has knowledge on his own as to exactly what is and what is not appropriate. But I can only say the present administrator in all candor spelled out what was the situation and should there be anything beyond what is right, I am sure the appropriate authorities can act on it.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, in considering the appropriations for agriculture I would like to remind my colleagues, although I doubt that any of us need reminding, of the great amount of time, effort, study, and real experience that went into the reports and recommendations made by the subcommittee headed by our good friend, JAMIE L. WHITTEN.

It is always a pleasure for me to testify before his committee on the needs of farmers and ranchers in Montana because I know he understands the many problems of the men and women of our Nation who make their living from the soil and provide this country with the greatest agriculture abundance in the world and help feed and clothe the needy in many other countries.

Soil and water conservation in Montana and the Great Plains area is, of course, vitally important not only now but to future generations and I am always reminded of Chairman WHITTEN's speech here when I first came to Congress. I remember well and vividly his remarks in 1961 in which he pointed out that the thin layer of crust on the earth's surface was necessary to produce the food to feed, actually, the world. Since that time, I have been most interested in the betterment of the soil and water conversation services in which the chairman is so well versed and interested.

Funds for these programs are included in these appropriations, and there is also some very interesting reading in the reports of the hearings on soil and water conservation. In fact, I would recommend these reports as a liberal education in agriculture.

In addition to soil conservation, the committee has looked into all aspects of the farm and ranch picture and the many and complex problems with which our farmers and ranchers are confronted.

The committee in these reports included the results of a very thorough investigation they had conducted into the problem of meat imports, a matter of considerable concern to Montana, one of the leading beef, lamb, and mutton producing States. The statistics, data, and other information the special investigating committee produced is well worth reading, and I would like to especially commend the chairman and the entire subcommittee for the most thorough and excellent job they have done in considering this appropriation and especially compliment Chairman WHITTEN again for his thorough and sympathetic knowledge and understanding of the farm problem.

We are indeed fortunate to have a man of such knowledge and experience as chairman of this committee, and I would like to join in thanking Chairman WHITTEN for the long hours and real effort that went into the report on this bill.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STALBAUM. I wish to join in commending the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Agriculture for the excellent job he has done in presenting this bill and the report to the committee.

There is one appropriation item which I should like to bring to the chairman's attention, for comment. The item relates to the school milk program.

I note from the report that in past years some $51.5 million has been appropriated, and an equal amount has come from section 32 funds, so that the net total available for the school milk program in the country has been $103 million. This year the committee has recommended to the Congress $100 million, or a reduction in the total of $3 million.

I further point out for the RECORD, in deference to the chairman, that this was the full amount requested in the budget, when sent to the committee.

I note from page 26 of the report that there will be an increase in the number of schoolchildren enrolled of more than 1 million for the coming year. It would seem that if the program were to continue, even at a constant level, the appropriations might well have been increased rather than decreased.

Mr. WHITTEN. I say to the gentleman that two or three things are involved. The gentleman might be surprised to learn it, but I represent a rather large dairy district.

The section 32 funds, from which the $51.5 million came last year, have been set aside by law to take care of surpluses, and to support prices by going into the market and buying up surpluses. It has reached the point that section 32 purchases in this instance were getting to be a regular market for milk, rather than a strengthening of prices in regard to surpluses.

The committee went along with the budget request, but there are some circumstances involved which make many people wonder whether the milk program is as sound as the school lunch program.

I say to the gentleman that the Government reimburses nearly as much for the one little glass of milk as it does for the whole school lunch. So long as the Government is spending $100 million, and so long as the dairy interests—and I have plenty of them—are getting nearly as much contribution for that little glass of milk, as there is for the whole school lunch program, I question whether they should raise the point.

Mr. STALBAUM. Do I correctly understand from the gentleman's statement that it is hoped, through this appropriation—I note there has been an increase in the school lunch program appropriation—there will be a transfer of certain amounts from the school milk program over to the school lunch program, which I agree is a better program?

Mr. WHITTEN. We really are not trying to do that. We went along with the budget request in each instance. And I say to my friends that we are not doing badly when $100 million is being set aside to become a regular market for milk. Under the circumstances, it seemed to us that to exceed the budget request was just a little more than we should do.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first I wish to call your attention to the overall figure in the bill which now is in the neighborhood of $5.7 billion and, according to our report, reflects a decrease compared to last year of roughly $1.1 billion.

Now, let us not get overly excited about this apparent saving in the cost of running the Department compared to last year. We need only to think back to the early part of this year, when the first supplemental appropriation bill was presented to the Congress in the amount of $1.7 billion. We subsequently enacted a $1.6 billion supplemental appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. In that one big area of restoration of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation, there will be, at the end of this fiscal year, a carryover, because of that supplemental appropriation, of some $800 million to carry on the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in local currency sales of our surpluses around the face of the globe.

I would call your attention to a language change proposed here which would make the interest on these borrowings of the CCC for these price-supported commodities payable on a current year basis. This will reflect itself in a decrease in interest costs to the Department of Agriculture, for example, if this language is adopted, of $196 million in 1964 and $204 million in the current fiscal year. In other words, when the CCC takes title to some of these commodities around the country and does not dispose of them over a period of years, of course, the interest has to be paid on those borrowings, which accumulates to the point sometimes where it is rather ridiculous. However, whether the language stays in or comes out, I did want to bring the committee's attention to that particular figure.

Then on page 7 of our report we have some enlightening figures. I would call particularly to your attention the increase in the cost of the feed grains program from $646 million to $883 million in this current fiscal year.

I would also call to your attention particularly the increase in the cotton equalization payments from $63 million in 1964 to $483 million in 1965. Remember, that was that great wheat-cotton bill that got jammed down our throats a short while ago. This gives you an idea of the kind of an increase in cost involved in that one program.

May I also point out in the item of the Commodity Credit Corporation loan, purchase, export and related programs the figure of $1,238 million for 1964 and then an insignificant figure of $121 million for 1965. Really, this change is due primarily to changes in loans held by banks. In 1964 loans held by banks at the beginning of the year were $834 million and at the close of the year were $377 million. So the effect of the expenditures in 1964 is that it was up $457 million. To take the reverse figure juggling, in 1965 at the beginning of the year loans held by banks were $377 million. At the end of the year they were $835 million, or a supposed decrease of $458 million. It really gets involved in some real good figure juggling on a close analysis.

May I direct your attention, if I might now, to the figures also in the report with respect to employment in the Department of Agriculture. These figures I will give you today are a little bit more up to date because they carry a date of April 30 as against February, which is contained in the report.

Permanent full-time employment was 77,587; temporary full-time employment, 4,851; part-time employees, 18,443. That makes a total of 100,881. Now, add to that, if you will, cooperative extension agents, 13,741 and ASC county committee employees, 15,546, and you have a total for the U.S. Department of Agriculture employees of 130,168.

We have heard an awful lot about the exodus from the farm, with from 100,000 to 140,000 farmers leaving the farm every year. It seems a little bit of a paradoxical situation that all the time the farmers are leaving the farm, nonetheless the employment in the Department of Agriculture goes up. There are some legitimate areas for this, for example, in the field of meat inspection. I did not vote for that legislation several years ago, but obviously a majority of the Congress did require meat inspection for that meat which travels in interstate commerce. So this year we have an increase in 1 year of 300 additional meat and poultry inspectors with a budget request of 330. There is nothing we can really do about it, because the law says it is what we have to have in order to inspect the meat if it is going in interstate commerce. I will say, however, that the committee has been rather distressed at this rapid increase in the number of people necessary to do this work. We have been bringing pressure to bear on the Department to consolidate their meat and poultry inspection in order to get the most out of each employee.

In the area of research I made mention in the HEW bill several weeks ago that this is a great sacrosanct area; for research—anything goes. For general research activities in the Department you have $187 million; cooperative State research better than $50 million; economic research better than $11 million, a total of $248 million, or practically a quarter of a billion dollars in the name of research in the Department of Agriculture. Of course, this benefits everyone in the country.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIZE. The gentleman's committee heard considerable testimony on the importance and necessity of the establishment of a National Grain Marketing Research Laboratory. I notice that you did not provide any funds even for planning such a facility. Did the committee go into the subject pretty carefully, as I hope they did?

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman, of course, made a very eloquent presentation to the subcommittee, as did some of the other members interested in this particular project. As the gentleman well knows, we are besieged with requests for this facility and that facility, and for a little expansion here and a little expansion there. But there is some limit to what we can approve. We try to go along with a request here and with a request there. We hope that the gentleman will continue in his efforts because I think he made a very good case for his project.

Mr. MIZE. I thank the gentleman; I shall be back next year.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I did want to make mention, too, before I go further with this overall cost figure of running the Department and what is involved here, that in 1960 direct Government payments to farmers totaled $693 million in this feed grains area, payments under price supports, and so forth. In 1964 those direct payments to farmers had come to $2.2 billion. By 1965, this year, it is $2.5 billion in direct payments to the farmers. While parity is declining and they say net income is going up, surely it is going up because of the largess of the Government and because of direct payments to the farmers.

Incidentally, I will be offering an amendment at the appropriate time to limit payments of this kind under the Wool Act, Feed Grains and Wheat Act, to no more than $25,000 or $30,000. There may be some opposition to it, even at these astronomical figures. I urge my colleagues to think about it seriously when we get to that amendment.

Now, I mentioned research. We have research programs going to utilization and production of all the feed grains and all the basic crops, plant and animal diseases, pest eradication, and so forth. We have programs for eradication of brucellosis, hog cholera, scrapie, screw-worm, sheep scabies, sinusitis, trichinosis, and tuberculosis. And for plant disease and pest control we have the boll weevil, cereal leaf beetle, citrus blackfly, fire ant, gypsy moth, Japanese beetle, khapra beetle, soybean cyst nematode, witchweed and maize dwarf mosaic.

For each of these programs we have got to sit there as members of this subcommittee and listen to the arguments in support of increasing amounts of money to eliminate these diseases and these pests that plague the country. I am happy to say that in some areas we are seeing some very strikingly good results.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. You did not have a request for funds for research on the rhinocerous beetle, did you?

Mr. MICHEL. I do not recall that one. Certainly if there is a problem there, I am sure that there is some project in the bill for that.

Mr. GROSS. They want some money under the foreign aid bill for that kind of research.

Mr. MICHEL. It may be that in foreign affairs they do have that problem. That is what we are trying to do, to keep those problems from coming to our shores.

Mr. GROSS. I just wanted to be sure if you were going to spend some money on that research project that we would not be spending it under some other department of the Government somewhere else.

Mr. MICHEL. I will have to agree with the gentleman. We do not want a duplication of effort.

Also I would like to say a word or two about the tremendous work being done in soybean research.

Mr. Chairman, on page 15 of the report, it is pointed out that the amount recommended by the committee for agricultural research will permit present soybean production research to be carried forward on a regular basis.

Mr. Chairman, let us take just a moment's time to consider the remarkable growth of the soybean industry during the last quarter century, and its practical meaning:

To the United States: It shifted our country from dependence on imports to the largest exporter of fats and oils in the world. Give major credit to the soybean:

To the American farmer: It means an annual cash income of more than $1.5 billion, and a profitable market for the output of more than 30 million acres of cropland—without Government controls.

To the consumer: It has meant freedom from reliance on uncertain import supplies to meet oil and fat needs, and abundant supplies at reasonable prices of a most important, healthful, high-energy food—soybean oil.

To labor: It has brought millions of man-hours of work at good wages.

We in Illinois are proud to be a hard working factor in the growth of this great industry in storing, transporting, processing, and of course growing the soybean.

Mr. Chairman, I will extend my remarks in more detail on this subject.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I am very happy to note that on page 15 of the committee report on this appropriation bill that the sum of $100,000 is provided in order to initiate the animal research center at Clay Center in Nebraska and this amount is included in the appropriation bill.

I want to compliment the gentleman's committee and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the chairman of the committee, for your awareness of research in regard to agriculture.

As the gentleman from Illinois knows, I filed a statement with the gentleman's committee in regard to this research project at Clay Center, Nebr. This project consists of 10,000 acres which the U.S. Department of Agriculture recently took over from the military in order to set up an animal research center and eventually, as I understand it, to expand this research into other areas.

The request from the Department was for $600,000, $300,000 for development of land research, and $300,000 in order to get started on the construction of the buildings and facilities in this area.

I am sorry that we did not get the entire $600,000, but I am glad that the gentleman's committee recognized the importance of this new research center at Clay Center, Nebr., and did make this initial appropriation.

I would also like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that our animal research station at Fort Robinson, Nebr., in the northwestern part of the State is being phased out, and their activities will be transferred under the plan of the Department to Clay Center, Nebr.

Therefore, this initial appropriation is not entirely new spending because of the savings that will result at Fort Robinson.

I hope the committee in its wisdom will grant to us additional appropriations in the future.

Mr. MICHEL. I want to say to the gentleman from Nebraska that we appreciate the good statement that he gave to the subcommittee. The gentleman from Nebraska sees that his program has gotten started, and we shall certainly treat his project and other programs that are meritorious with sympathy before our subcommittee. I again thank the gentleman for his contribution in helping us to do what we believed to be the right thing.

Mr. Chairman, in the area of soil conservation I believe the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has pretty well allayed the fears that many of us have received from our districts, and I am glad to say that the subcommittee did not see fit to set up any kind of a revolving fund or cut out here or there where we really had no authority to do so and that we have kept abreast in that all-important area of soil conservation.

Mr. Chairman, I also am somewhat concerned about the Rural Community Development Service.

The Rural Community Development Service has been established as a new agency in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It succeeds the Office of Rural Areas Development. It provides for general staff coordination of the rural areas development activities of the Department. In addition, it will undertake to facilitate the effective extension into rural areas all the assistance programs of other Federal agencies which are applicable to these areas.

The request was for an appropriation of $750,000. In addition, a transfer of $378,500 from the Area Redevelopment Administration is requested, subject to the extension of the Area Redevelopment Administration Act.

The size of the appropriation request is nominal. But what the Department intends to do with this money is of major consequence. And if this new agency expands according to the program mapped out for it, the size of the appropriation will be of major consequence sooner than you think.

It behooves every Member of Congress to understand what the rural areas development program really is; how the RAD program has been sold to the public and the Congress; and what the consequences are liable to be if the Rural Community Development Service is authorized to intervene between every Government aid program and the local applicants on every issue that comes along, whether it be agricultural, municipal, or industrial.

Mr. Chairman, I have some further remarks on this subject that will appear in my extension of remarks.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like, if I might, to amplify again or in part what the chairman said with respect to the food stamp program and direct distribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we now find in the food stamp program some 386,000 persons participating and that the participants here are contributing a certain amount and are then getting a certain amount in stamp equivalent. However, I find that the spread here is such that a person can contribute as little as 15 percent in cash and receive 85 percent in stamps, or could contribute as much as 85 percent in dollars or cash and receive the equivalent of 15 percent in stamps.

This is the high and low of this program. In other words, if someone put up $2 they could get the equivalent of $10 in stamps, or if they put up $18 in cash they could get the equivalent of approximately $30 in stamps.

I just added up a few figures to give the Members a little idea of what is involved in here in this direct distribution and food stamp, school milk and school lunch program. In this fiscal year, 1965, of course we have $60 million for the food stamp plan, $197 million for direct distribution to the needy persons alone, another $136 million for direct aid to schools, $37 million in aid to institutions, or a total of $430 million of direct distribution of food over and above the regular school lunch and school milk programs. Both of these combined are $255 million.

So you are really talking about $700 million of distribution of agricultural surplus commodities, some of those not even in surplus.

In the year 1966 the projections are they will be increased because in this bill under the food stamp plan there is $100 million, and to needy persons where they contribute nothing, $225 million, direct distribution to schools $136 million at this current level, and $37 million to institutions at the same level, or a total figure of a half-billion dollars. So we are not selling ourselves short, by any means, in this program.

I may say in this past year a good part of that for schools and for institutions was in connection with meat, beef, frozen beef, and roasts, to institutions and to our schools. This program is in 1,664 counties around the country, and represents some $5.8 million, a slight decline from better than $6 million last year.

Incidentally, the direct distribution of items here involve dry beans, butter, corn meal, flour, grits, nonfat dry milk, rice, and rolled wheat.

These are purchased from the Commodity Credit Corporation; and, under section 32, canned beef, frozen beef, to schools, and in 1964, turkeys, lard, peanuts, apples, cranberries, date pieces.

So I think we are doing pretty much in this particular area.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if funds were included in the bill providing for the funding of six new Laboratories, one of them to be located at Mesilla Park, N. Mex.?

Mr. MICHEL. That is true. I have forgotten the page.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Page 15.

Mr. MICHEL. We have addressed ourselves to that particular problem. Some of these specific areas are not mentioned, but the gentleman will find a specific reference to the Laboratory.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It is the intention of the subcommittee that these laboratories be constructed and funds were included in the bill for that purpose?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Information came out on the floor, later confirmed, that five or six of these pilot areas were in certain congressional districts. I would like to know, during this last year, if this program has been administered along strictly political lines, or whether some of this money has gone into certain congressional districts?

Mr. MICHEL. As I recall the testimony in subcommittee, I did not include any specific questions of the witness that would disclose whether or not political partisanship was being practiced. I do recall some time ago some very pointed questions were asked in this area. I am at a loss to give the gentleman an honest answer because I simply do not know. The gentleman serves on an agricultural subcommittee. If he knows of any instance I would like to have that specifically brought to our attention so it can be corrected as best we can.

Mr. LATTA. In Ohio the pilot plant shown on page 129 of the record, as of March 31 only two counties, Lucas and Cuyahoga, were included. Then we come on to the plants of April 1, 1965, and Hamilton County was added. My district borders on Lucas County, we have a few hungry people there in Ottawa who have made inquiry about this program. To date they have not done that, of course. The information should be supplied here in the RECORD. I think this is something that certainly your committee ought to look into because you are appropriating the funds. I was listening very carefully and I think the gentleman mentioned $100 million was being appropriated for this.

Mr. MICHEL. The bill, as it is before you, is $75 million. But there will be a committee amendment offered, I understand probably by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] to bring that up to the total budget figure of $100 million. Personally, I think we are moving a little too fast in this area because I do not know for sure that they can use all of the $60 million they have this year judiciously.

I do think in defense of the Department officials who are administering this program that they do want to do it right, and you can only move so fast. As a matter of fact, we gave some money, I believe, for an increase in the Inspector General's Office of the Department to make absolutely sure that in some of these areas there is no chicanery and that it is being done and administered correctly.

Mr. LATTA. So on the basis of new information furnished the committee since the time you reported this bill, there is a need for this additional $25 million?

Mr. MICHEL. I am given to understand from several sources that there are enough applications on file that conceivably $100 million could be used. I personally rather doubt it, but if there is any measure of doubt that any one section of the country is being discriminated against in favor of another, I then would rather resolve the thing and say, Look, here is all the money that can possibly be spent, now let us get on with the program and administer it properly.

Mr. LATTA. I would like to move on to one other subject, and that is the matter of the cereal leaf beetle.

Mr. MICHEL. There is a $500,000 item in here, I believe, for the cereal leaf beetle.

Mr. LATTA. On page 50 of the hearings in answer to a question by you, is there an increase in the budget this year for the cereal leaf beetle, the reply by Dr. Rodenhiser was, "Not for research."

Mr. MICHEL. I think we are at that point where we do not need more research in this area. What we really need is eradication. We can only research these things so far and then we have to do something about implementing the research. Personally I am at that point where we have given them money before for research, and I think now is the time to let us get on with the business of eradication.

Mr. LATTA. That is a real problem out in Ohio and Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. And in Michigan.

Mr. LATTA. And it is spreading. I think a little more attention should be given to this problem than has been given to it in the past by the Department of Agriculture. I know that come harvest time for wheat or oats, we are going to have a real problem out there. The same thing with corn. I wish your committee would urge a little more research because in answer to some of the questions you put on this subject, they have not come up with an answer other than the importation of some wasps or something of that nature, and I do not think that is going to solve the problem.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman's point is well taken and I assure the gentleman we will do the best we can.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. I think it was brought out one time here that the ratio of employees of the Department of Agriculture to farmers in the country was at least equal or perhaps greater than 1 to 1. I wonder if the gentleman can give us any information as to what the ratio is currently?

Mr. MICHEL. I do not have the ratio exactly of the number of employees to the number of farmers. I believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], several years ago offered an amendment, which was adopted on a voice vote, which provided that in no case should the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture exceed the number of farmers. I believe the point was very well taken at that time.

Mr. HOSMER. I believe the amendment was only a 1-year amendment. I am fearful that the current administration has built up the employment rolls of the Department of Agriculture above a 1-to-1 ratio.

The committee does not have any information on this point?

Mr. MICHEL. Not specifically, no.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to move on to one or two other items now.

In the Rural Electrification Administration we do have $350 million for loans, with $65 million to be retained in a reserve. This represents a $15 million reduction from last year, but in my opinion certainly the amount will be adequate to meet all of the needs of the REA. The committee has recommended the full budget estimate of $350 million for electrification loans for 1966. Of this amount $65 million has been placed in a contingency reserve for use by the Administrator during the fiscal year if deemed necessary by the Bureau of the Budget for the orderly development of the program.

I want to make it crystal clear that I too favor orderly development of the REA program as do all members of our committee as well as this body. I do not believe that orderly development necessarily results from supplying an agency with all the funds requested from the executive branch. REA has never been required to itemize its requirements or to justify its requests for funds with any detailed breakdown of the intended use of such funds. REA requests lump-sum authorizations from our committee and justifies its need on the basis of what it estimates its borrowers will request.

In effect, they say "Here is the amount of money we need. We think our borrowers will apply for $800 million so on this basis, we'll need about $400 million. You will just have to trust our judgment as to how these funds are to be handled."

Do not take my word for it, gentlemen. Just turn to their justifications on pages 394 and 395 of our hearings and read it for yourself.

I do not believe that orderly development or an orderly program results from any such loose estimates of the need for public money by a Government agency. REA may be right. But on the basis of the information they furnish Congress they cannot be provided right or wrong. This basically is where I part company with REA—to me it is bad Government fiscal policy—and one that Members cannot honestly justify with their conscience or their constituents.

I am glad to report that in the field of rural telephone service there is an increase of some $27 million to beef up telephone lines to rural communities around the country. The total now in the bill is $97 million, and $7 million of that will be retained in a reserve.

In this item, perhaps, in the future there will have to be some corrective measures taken, but in my memory of the days on the farm, there were 8 or 10 or 12 party lines, which were adequate. Of course, that was old fashioned. Today we all expect something better. Those of us who live in the cities, I suspect, all want single party lines. That is the trend on the farm, to bring the service down from four party or two party lines to single party lines, in some instances. On the subject of REA I shall have some further remarks in my extension.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to close with one or two observations on the sales of commodities under Public Law 480 agreements with certain countries abroad.

In this bill, Members will find $1,658 million for the Commodity Credit Corporation. That is quite a reduction, from last year. Again I would call your attention to that supplemental request which provides, practically, for a $800 million carryover in the new fiscal year.

With respect to the United Arab Republic, no authorizations to utilize the remaining funds in the 3-year agreement—signed in October 1962 to cover the 3 fiscal year period, 1963 through 1965—have been issued by the Department of Agriculture, since the action of the Congress on the CCC supplemental appropriation bill last February.

Members will recall the anti-Nasser amendment at that time. While derided in some quarters and applauded in others, apparently it has had a salutary effect.

Nothing is known beyond this as regards Public Law 480 agreements. The total value and commodity composition of the title I agreement is shown in a statement which I will insert in the RECORD:

STATUS OF PUBLIC LAW 480 AGREEMENTS WITH SELECTED COUNTRIES

United Arab Republic: No authorizations to utilize the remaining funds in the 3-year agreement signed in October 1962 to cover the 3-fiscal-year period—1963 through 1965—have been issued, since the action of the Congress on the CCC supplemental appropriation bill last February. Nothing is known beyond this as regards Public Law 480 agreements. The total value and commodity composition of the title I agreement is shown in the attachment.

Commercial exports from the United States to the UAR during fiscal year 1964 totaled $3.5 million. These were agricultural commodities.

In addition to wheat and flour the most important commodities imported in terms of quantity and value have been corn, edible oil, and tobacco.

Yugoslavia: A title IV, Public Law 480 agreement for approximately $53 million worth of wheat (approximately 700,000 metric tons) was signed in March 1965. It is possible that additional title IV agreements may be concluded. No title I agreements are expected to be considered or concluded.

The title IV agreement concluded last year provided, in addition to about 400,000 tons of wheat, 115,000 bales of cotton, and 36,000 metric tons of edible oil.

Yugoslavia's commercial purchases of agricultural commodities from the United States during calendar year 1964 totaled approximately $15 million.

Poland: There has been no request from the Polish Government for a title IV agreement. The Poles are apparently debating whether the 5-year payment terms, which can be offered under title IV, are of sufficient interest to induce them to consider a title IV agreement. No title I agreement is contemplated.

Two title I agreements with Poland were concluded last year. The first one provided for conversion of the local currency payments into dollars over a 3-year period. It consisted of the following commodities:

Poland

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Commodity	Approximate quantity	Export market value	Estimated CCC cost
Wheat	325,000 metric tons	$21.0	$31.8
Rice	10,000 metric tons	1.4	1.9
Cotton	34,000 bales	4.8	8.3
50 percent ocean transportation.		3.0	3.0
Total		30.2	45.0

The second title I agreement provided for conversion of the local currencies into dollars over a 40-year period. It consisted of the following commodities:

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Commodity	Approximate quantity	Export market value	Estimated CCC cost
Wheat	150,000 metric tons	$9.7	$14.7
Edible oil	45,000 metric tons	10.8	10.8
Cotton	40,000 bales	5.7	9.8
Tobacco	1,500 metric tons	2.6	2.6
50 percent ocean transportation.		1.9	1.9
Total		30.7	39.8

In addition Poland was required to purchase commercially from the United States during 1964 at least 200,000 metric tons of corn or other feed grains; 66,000 bales of cotton; 5,500 metric tons of edible oil or tallow; 10,000 metric tons of rice, plus additional commodities from the United States to bring the total commercial purchases up to at least $30 million. Poland's actual commercial purchases of agricultural commodities from the United States totaled $44 million during calendar year 1964.

Indonesia: No Public Law 480 agreements are in effect and none is in prospect. U.S. commercial exports of agricultural commodities to Indonesia in fiscal year 1964 was $3 million. Corn was one of the important items.

CURRENT STATUS OF UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC AGREEMENT, TITLE I, PUBLIC LAW 480

The current multiyear title I, Public Law 480 agreement with the United Arab Republic was signed on October 8, 1962. The agreement, as originally consummated, provided for the shipment of $390 million worth of agricultural commodities over a 3-year period, covering fiscal years 1963, 1964, and 1965. There have been five amendments to the agreement to provide additional commodities raising the total export market value of the agreement to $431.8 million.

The original agreement is as follows:

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Commodity	Approximate quantity (thousand metric tons)			Export market value	Estimated CCC cost
	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1964	Fiscal year 1965		
Wheat and/or flour in grain equivalent	1,100.0	1,600.0	1,750.0	$275.8	$425.4
Corn	100.0	200.0	200.0	24.0	24.0
Vegetable oil	30.0	32.5	35.0	22.9	22.9
Tallow	30.0	37.5	45.0	12.7	12.7
NFD milk	.6	.6	.6	.3	.6
Frozen poultry	.6	.7	.8	1.5	1.5
Ocean transportation (estimate)				52.8	52.8
Subtotal				390.0	539.9

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Approximate quantity, fiscal year 1964 (metric tons)	Export market value	Estimated CCC cost
1st amendment:			
Tobacco	1,000	$1.6	$1.6
Dry edible beans	1,000	.2	.2
Ocean transportation (estimated)		.1	.1
Subtotal		1.9	1.9
2d amendment:			
Tobacco	11,000	17.7	17.7
Ocean transportation (estimated)		.6	.6
Subtotal		18.3	18.3
3d amendment:			
Corn	100,000	5.5	5.5
Butter/butter oil/ghee	2,000	1.5	3.3
Cheese	1,000	.8	1.1
Ocean transportation (estimated)		1.2	1.2
Subtotal		9.0	11.1
4th amendment:			
Frozen poultry	1,200	.8	.8
Ocean transportation (estimated)		.1	.1
Subtotal		.9	.9
5th amendment:			
Beef	12,000	9.5	9.5
Ocean transportation (estimated)		2.2	2.2
Subtotal		11.7	11.7
Total		431.8	583.8

Mr. Chairman, with respect to Yugoslavia, a title IV, Public Law 480, agreement for approximately $53 million worth of wheat—approximately 700,000 metric tons—was signed in March 1965. It is possible that additional title IV agreements may be concluded. Title IV is different from title I, where we give things away for local currencies. Title IV involves long-term dollar sales.

With respect to Poland, there has been no request from the Polish Government for a title IV agreement. That would be an agreement for long-term dollar sales. The Poles apparently are debating whether the 5-year payment terms which can be offered under title IV are of sufficient interest to induce them to consider a title IV agreement. No title I agreement is contemplated.

Mr. Chairman, unless there are questions, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, more soybeans are needed even though 31 million acres were harvested in 1964. It is the third ranking U.S. cash crop in acreage and in value. The consistent acreage increase has barely kept pace with domestic and foreign demand. Soybeans and soybean products have been the leading U.S. agricultural export for dollars for 2 years. Mr. Glenn Pogeler, president of the Soybean Council of America, is enthusiastic about the potential markets which are being actively developed in foreign countries. He believes a billion bushel crop of soybeans can be sold annually within 5 years. The United States supplies over 90 percent of the soybeans and soybean products entering world markets today. An increase in U.S. acreage is expected for 1965 but this cannot be anticipated year after year as in the past. When our acreage maximum is reached, only increased yields will provide more soybeans. The hundreds of thousands of farmers in the 30 producing States feel the economic pressure of a yield ceiling. Production is limited on each acre by a lack of research information.

The soybean production research program under existing funds and with limited personnel had 2.1 scientist man-years for each $100 million of harvested crop value in 1964. That included all soybean production research scientists in the United States—Federal, State, and those in private industry. The ratio continues to decrease as scientist numbers are maintained while crop production increases.

The yield problem has been present for years. We are a decade behind if additional research workers were to be hired tomorrow. The majority of men employed at present are engaged in research on problems requiring an immediate answer. There are more problems of this nature which cannot be investigated because of lack of personnel. The following list of personnel and projects is necessary to achieve the essential short- and long-range goals of soybean production research. The list is not in order of priority.

First. A plant breeder is needed to improve seed quality in the production area midway between where the northern and southern varieties are grown. Producers in this belt across the United States have special quality problems. A plant breeder assigned to the area would search for genetic resistance to factors affecting quality.

Second. Three plant breeders are needed to develop adapted varieties for specific production areas ranging from the Eastern Shore to Louisiana.

Third. A microbiologist is needed to continue and expand rhizobium research. Superior strains of nodulating bacteria should be identified and a successful method of introducing the strains should be developed.

Fourth. A physiologist is needed to work in the field of mineral nutrition. The addition of plant nutrients has not broken the yield plateau reached several years ago.

Fifth. A pathologist is needed to determine the physiological factors involved in disease resistance.

Sixth. An agronomist is needed to determine the best cultural practices for producing soybeans. No one has this responsibility in ARS today.

Seventh. Several scientists are needed to insure continuity and assist in expansion of present work in soybean investigations. In time these men would assume the responsibilities of senior scientists who will reach retirement age soon. There are nine key positions held by men over 55 years of age or with more than 25 years of service. The restriction in number of scientists for the past decade, while new areas of need have arisen, has not permitted any employment in depth for key positions.

Eighth. Two scientists are needed to develop principles and practices for economic control of weeds in the Corn Belt area to reduce production costs. The soybean industry has repeatedly stated that weed control is a major, recognizable, production problem.

Ninth. Two nemetologists are needed to study nematodes which influence soybean production, ascertain the varying effects of nematodes on soybeans and work with a plant breeder to develop resistant varieties.

Tenth. An agricultural engineer is needed to develop recommended application techniques for herbicides and nematocides.

Eleventh. A team of scientists is needed to determine the optimum soil-water-soybean plant relationship. The efficiency of availability of water in varying quantities at different plant growth stages should be studied.

It is difficult for administrators to employ permanent personnel on the basis of funds granted for 1 year. Additional funds in the amount of $465,000 were allotted by Congress last year for only 1 year. If the committee recommendation that the $465,000 be made available on a permanent basis, two-thirds of the recommendations I have made can be adopted. It is imperative that the $465,000 be made a part of the permanent budget so that progress planned now can be accomplished.

Crops protection research branch and soybean investigations need more manpower for soybean production research. The increase in research is needed to insure continuance and expansion of the economical credits the soybean crop has achieved.

Mainland China's sales of soybeans are increasing. The production of urea to replace soybean meal as a source of protein in ruminant animals is rising at a rapid rate. The protein from an estimated 35 million bushels of soybeans was replaced by urea in livestock feed last year. Other nations raise competing oilseed crops and can provide livestock protein from competing sources. Cost of production must be minimized for the soybean crop in the United States to meet competition in the world markets.

Tables showing the harvested acreage of U.S. crops, value of U.S. crops, change in crop acreages from 1960, crop yield changes for the last decade, and CCC crop inventory for December 31, 1963 are included at this point to depict the increasing importance of the soybean crop to our Nation. It cannot continue in this role under the present research program.

Commodity Credit Corporation crop comparisons

Crop	CCC inventory value Dec. 12-31, 1963	CCC inventory value compared to value of 1963 harvested crop [2]	Comparison of CCC soybean value to other crops stored
	Thousands	*Percent*	*Bean inventory value* [1]
Wheat	$1,970,623	93.0	3,127.0
Corn	1,046,096	23.0	1,668.0
Cotton	987,674	[3] 39.0	1,575.0
Sorghum (grain)	649,313	114.0	1,036.0
Barley	36,469	10.0	58.0
Oats	11,286	2.0	18.0
Flaxseed	9,493	11.0	15.0
Peanuts (shelled)	9,447	[4] 4.0	15.0
Rice (rough)	8,140	2.0	13.0
Rye	891	3.0	1.4
Soybeans	627	.03	1.0

[1] Source: USDA, ASCS "Report of Financial Condition and Operation," Dec. 31, 1963.

[2] Source: USDA Crop Reporting Board, Statistical Reporting Service, "Crop Values," 1962 and 1963.

[3] Value of cotton lint used for comparison.

[4] Value of peanuts, picked and threshed, used for comparison.

A decade of yield changes, U.S.-harvested crops

Crop	Average yield per acre			Yield increase in decade (percent)
	Unit of quantity	1950-54	1960-64	
Grain sorghum.	Bushel	19.4	42.4	119
Cotton	Pound	297	476	60
Corn	Bushel	39.4	62.1	58
Rice	Pound	2,411	3,725	55
Peanuts	do	889	1,354	52
Wheat	Bushel	17.3	25.4	47
Tobacco	Pound	1,292	1,880	46
Oats	Bushel	33.9	43.8	29
Potatoes	Hundredweight.	151	192	27
Hay	Ton	1.43	1.75	22
Barley	Bushel	27.8	33.9	22
Soybeans	do	20.3	24.0	18
Flaxseed	do	8.7	9.6	10
Sugarbeets	Ton	15.5	17.1	10

Mr. Chairman, production costs can be most effectively lowered by increasing yields. The net profit per acre can be doubled for the farmer producing the average U.S. soybean yield if he raises just 6 more bushels per acre. The net return for the 22.8 bushels per acre produced in 1964 is estimated at $15 per acre. The crop is second choice for most farmers because of the lower profits compared to corn, cotton, or more specialized crops. Soybean acreage will probably expand only as long as financial inducements are offered to restrict production of more profitable crops which are in abundant supply.

The whole U.S. economy will benefit from additional research to increase yields for soybeans—a crop produced for immediate consumption. The estimated demand for a billion-bushel U.S. soybean crop within the next 5 years requires almost 50 percent more production. Higher yield potentials must be realized to meet that demand. The existing yield barrier cannot be penetrated 2 bushels per acre by research knowledge attained in the past 4 years. Scientists are needed to identify and eliminate the factors limiting yields.

Mr. Chairman, the year 1964 marked Cooperative Extension's 50th year of service to the Nation. In developing the Cooperative Extension Service, the United States invented a unique partnership between the Federal Government and the Land Grant College system that has played an important role in making this Nation the best fed, the best clothed, and the most affluent people on the face of the earth.

Historically, the Extension Service has been known for 4-H Club work, home economics education, the education of adult farmers in production and management, for taking the lead in organizing most of the agricultural cooperatives in the Nation and, in short, for being in the forefront of nearly every significant development in the nonmetropolitan area of our Nation for the last 50 years.

Today it is adjusting rapidly to keep up to date with the changing problems and the merging interests of rural and urban people. In my district, which includes both a metropolitan area and significant commercial farming areas, I have been noting many program innovations. Peoria County has a significant new program that utilizes businessmen as leaders in giving young people from the rural areas a chance to study employment opportunities in agricultural industry and to understand the preparations required. In other programs industry representatives are kept up to date on research so that they can help pass on up-to-date technological information as people make purchases. For example, the farm adviser meets regularly with hardware dealers of the area and services them with information. I have also had called to my attention that the educational program includes much more depth for specialized audiences. For example, specialized producers are taking part in short courses that involve 12 to 14 hours of instruction, as contrasted with an afternoon meeting being spent on the subject a few years ago. These programs include, among many others, an outstanding program in farm and family business management with emphasis on credit. I note too that some staff members have been reassigned so that they have the opportunity to specialize and work across county lines in support of these more intensive programs. A significant dimension has been added in home economics through work with disadvantaged families.

Another notable change in recent years has been in area improvement and development work. Local people are asking Extension staff members to help them plan for the development of community and human resources. Marshall-Putnam County, for instance, through such an approach has developed a comprehensive overall economic development plan, and

Lee County has a community development program underway.

I cite these examples from my district to indicate that the extension service is making major adjustments within its present resources to keep the program pointed at the significant problem of the day. The hearing pointed out that similar adjustments are occurring throughout the Nation.

The increasing specialization demanded by programs of these types has resulted in extensive upgrading of the Extension staff. Because of increased competition by industry and governmental agencies for these kinds of people, one of Extension's great needs is to keep salaries competitive enough to hold the better personnel in the organization. It is most serious to lose a person to another organization after years of training and developing the individual, because Extension failed to stay competitive by a few hundred dollars. The salary increase problem is being aggravated because many of the present Extension staff are enrolled in graduate study. A survey of all States showed a 67-percent increase in the number of Extension workers holding the master's degree in 1962 as compared to 1956. The same study revealed that a total of 393 State extension staff members were on study leave, an increase of 30 percent as compared to the number on study leave in 1958. An additional 1,818 were enrolled in 1962 for college credit courses while on the job—a 238-percent increase in the past 4 years. These developments make the request for salary increases the highest priority item in the Extension Service total request of $72,800,000 before us.

Federal appropriations to provide the Federal share of funds to the States have lagged behind the general pay raises which have preceded the salary bill now before the Congress. In discussions and committee reports, both Houses of Congress have acknowledged the importance of competitive salary levels for Extension agents. I believe that these funds should be made available so that Extension can retain its more competent personnel and so benefit from their additional education and experience.

I also wish to point out the importance of area development personnel. The need for these funds develop from two major sources: First, an overriding need for increased specialization on the part of all Extension staff members in order to continue as top experts in their field. For example, State Extension specialists must be intimately associated with the research of the various departments at the university. They must spend more time in preparing teaching materials and aids than at any point in history, which means that they will have less time to serve in the field. Second, the field staff needs to be further developed in order to provide increased specialization. This is being done within the resources of Extension to a considerable degree, but Federal funds are needed to spur this effort onward and to permit Extension directors to make the kinds of changes that are needed to do the job effectively today.

The second phase of this relates to area and community development, a major Federal Government program in recent years. Each time a law is passed by Congress which calls for community action or community development plans, the job of the Extension agent is increased because local people turn to him for help. The role of assistance is assigned to him by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the land-grant college system. All of this is resulting in a greatly increased role for the county Extension agent. However, some of this work is not most effectively done at the county level, but needs to be done on employment or trade areas. We cannot continually assign more duties to the field staff without accepting the responsibility to help provide the modest increases in staff that is needed to maintain high quality work.

In line with this increased responsibility, we must recognize the significant work being done in home economics with disadvantaged families. This work proves that Extension can do the educational work related to the programs passed by the Congress in recent years to carry on various types of community action programs and to enhance human development. Education for living is conceded to be one of the major aspects of the problem. The increase which has been requested should be given to the Extension Service to help meet the increasing demand on the present staff.

In agriculture it is generally recognized that the problems of maintaining and developing the family farm during the latter half of the 20th century rests not so much with its production efficiency, but with problems of marketing and utilization. Again Extension has been making adjustments to meet this need. In my home State funds have been shifted to increase the numbers of marketing personnel at the State level. In addition, specialized area personnel who work with both production and marketing have been added from funds shifted from other phases of the program. The Federal Government does much research in the fields of marketing and utilization. It is a small investment in these Extension personnel to help get this information out and get it used.

I am pleased with the adjustments that I have been seeing take place in the Extension Service in order to keep the staff involved in some of the most critical problems of our day. I sincerely hope this group will see fit to spur these developments onward by providing this modest increase to the Cooperative Extension Service of our Nation. The Extension system is generally recognized by adult educators as America's most successful venture in adult education. Extension education is clearly the envy of the world, and it is one of the U.S. innovations most frequently copied by other nations.

Mr. Chairman, since REA is a lending agency it is not as easy for them to present an item by item budget as it is for some agencies who have a project-by-project budget. But REA and the co-ops it finances have been in business for a good many years. Between them they should be able to come up with a budget of proposed expenditures with some degree of accuracy and some basis in fact that would permit them to conduct an orderly program and at the same time give the Congress a frank and fair, clear picture of their proposed activities.

The President, in his budget message on REA this year, stated:

> It is expected that the Rural Electrification Administration will put additional emphasis on the negotiations of reasonable contracts under which REA-financed systems purchase power from other supplies. Such contracts will reduce the need for generation and transmission loans.

Even though there have been fewer controversial generation and transmission loans made in the past year which, I might add, was due to the constructive efforts of the Appropriations Committees of this Congress, there is still room for improvement. If the committee continues to police the Administrator's action and maintain a firm position against unnecessary generation and transmission loans, much more of the controversy of the past few years can be eliminated.

One conclusion that can be drawn from our hearings this year is the fact that REA, having been partially thwarted in its program of unneeded expenditures of loans for generation and transmission projects under the third criterion, have come up with a new approach—a new party line for justifying the very same programs a large segment of the Congress has opposed. This new party line is called parity of rates and service.

I mention it now because if we sit back and accept this new parity argument in silence for the next 2 or 3 years, one day Congress will wake up to the fact that by its acquiescence it has permitted the whole concept of the REA program to be changed from one designed to bring electricity to persons in rural areas not receiving central station service to one designed to bring electricity to customers of REA borrowers at a price comparable to electricity purchased by urban dwellers, irrespective of the economic or legal facts involved. If the REA program is to be changed this extensively, then Congress should do the changing—not the Administrator.

There is very little one Member of Congress can do except to point out the new trend of this program. I do not want the REA to get any idea that it can pull the parity wool over our eyes, for this is an insult to one's intelligence.

Let me comment briefly on the brunt of the Administrator's new approach to the REA program, just to put it on the record:

First. REA has committed itself on a new strategy. It will apparently justify its future program on the basis of parity of rates and service between rural and urban persons. Parity will become the clothesline upon which REA will hang the details of its program. Thus, the subsidies granted to REA by Congress to bring electricity to unserved rural persons will now be extended to subsidize consumers' rates on a basis comparable to those of urban customers supplied by electric companies and municipalities. This is almost a reverse twist on the old public power yardstick when TVA and Bonneville rates were used as yardsticks for private company rates. REA is planning to stay in business, and use its subsidies until borrowers under its program have the same rates as cities.

Second. The area coverage commitment of Congress, the provision granting 2-percent money for borrowers to extend their facilities beyond the "cream" areas and pick up the more isolated, the more financially difficult customers to justify, is now extended to provide service and rates for these consumers comparable to city dwellers.

In short, parity extends the area coverage concept from one of making electricity available to one of making price comparable. In what section of the REA Act do we find this authority?

Third. Last year's House committee report stated that REA loan funds should not be used for power generation loans where feasibility is based solely on cheaper rates resulting from lower interest rates than those paid by investor companies unless essential to get area coverage at reasonable rates. I think I made it clear last year that area coverage was different from exclusive service areas. The REA Administrator has gone a step further. REA has taken this House report language designed to prohibit unnecessary generation and transmission loans at the taxpayer's expense as a committee directive to continue 2 percent money for generation and transmission loans as a means of bringing parity rates to REA consumers.

There is no telling how far REA will go beyond the scope of the 1936 act through use of the parity argument. Only time will tell. My purpose today is to bring these facts to your attention for no other reason than that at some date in the near future we might look back and review the extent REA has taken this parity argument into a whole new program.

The whole purpose for the new parity concept, in my opinion, is the fact that the Appropriations Committees have put up some roadblocks against the Administrator's unwarranted use of the third criterion to justify generation loans, and he is seeking a new way to slide around Congress and accomplish his own ends.

The parity argument is merely a red herring by which the Administrator hopes to take attention away from the third criterion criticism, and give the appearance that generation and transmission loans are now being made under the old standards of cost and service. This is a typical REA rationalization, and I am sure that the Congress sooner or later will fully understand its sweeping implication and do something about it.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee have also put up some roadblocks against the improper investments of borrowers' general funds in various securities. Some improvement has been made, but there is still a seriously large number of cooperatives that are not complying with the regulations. At this point I wish to include an insertion starting on page 459 of the hearings indicating those REA borrowers with general funds in excess of 20 percent of plant:

REA borrowers with general funds in excess of 20 percent of plant, as reported by borrowers in descending order of percent as of Dec. 31, 1964

	Percent
Kandiyohi Cooperative Electric Power Association, Willmar, Minn	57.6
Winnebago Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Thompson, Iowa	55.8
Oahe Electric Cooperative, Inc., Blunt, S. Dak	51.7
Tricounty Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., Napoleon, Ohio	47.3
Tri-County Electric Cooperative, Leesburg, Va	43.9
Bartholomew County REMC, Columbus, Ind	42.4
East Central Electric Association, Braham, Minn	42.3
Umatilla Electric Cooperative Association, Hermiston, Oreg	42.2
Southern Indiana Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., Tell City, Ind	42.1
Truckee Public Utility District, Truckee, Calif	40.3
North Central Electric Cooperative, Inc., Attica, Ohio	40.2
Norris Electric Cooperative, Newton, Ill	38.2
Shelby Electric Cooperative, Shelbyville, Ill	37.6
Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association, Danube, Minn	37.3
Rural Electric Division, city of Bryan, Bryan, Tex	36.7
Darke Rural Electric Cooperative Inc., Greenville, Ohio	36.7
Taylor County Rural Electric Cooperative Corp., Campbellsville, Ky	36.7
Newton County REMC, Kentland, Ind	36.3
Hawkeye Tri-County Electric Cooperative, Cresco, Iowa	36.2
Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative, Cornell, Wis	36.1
Morrow Electric Cooperative, Inc., Mount Gilead, Ohio	35.4
Plymouth Electric Cooperative Association, Le Mars, Iowa	35.1
Excelsior Electric Membership Corp., Metter, Ga	35.1
Dunn County Electric Cooperative, Menominee, Wis	34.8
Johnson County REMC, Portland, Ind	34.5
Allamakee-Clayton Electric Cooperative, Inc., Postville, Iowa	34.4
Seward County Rural Public Power District, Seward, Nebr	34.2
North Western Electric Cooperative, Inc., Bryan, Ohio	34.1
Clay Electric Cooperative, Inc., Flora, Ill	33.6
Clearwater-Polk Electric Cooperative Inc., Bagley, Minn	33.2
Edgecombe-Martin County Electric Membership Corp., Tarboro, N.C	33.1
Wood County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Quitman, Tex	32.5
Eau Claire Electric Cooperative, Eau Claire, Wis	32.3
Mountain Electric Cooperative Inc., Mountain City, Tenn	32.2
Teche Electric Cooperative, Inc., Jeanerette, La	32.1
Upson County Electric Membership Corp., Thomaston, Ga	31.7
Orange County REMC, Orleans, Ind	31.1
North Alabama Electric Cooperative, Stevenson, Ala	31.1
Taylor County Electric Cooperative, Medford, Wis	30.6
Woodbury County Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Moville, Iowa	30.6
South Crawford Rural Electric Cooperative, Denison, Iowa	30.5
Alamo Power District No. 3, Alamo, Nev	30.3
Nobles Cooperative Electric, Worthington, Minn	30.2
Rural Electric Convenience Cooperative Co., Auburn, Ill	30.2
Richland Cooperative Electric Association, Richland Center, Wis	30.0
Midwest Electric, Inc., St. Marys, Ohio	30.0
The Minnesota Valley Electric Cooperative, Jordan, Minn	29.9
Morgan County Rural Electric Association, Fort Morgan, Colo	29.8
Carroll Electric Cooperative, Inc., Carrollton, Ohio	29.7
Johnson County Electric Cooperative Association, Cleburne, Tex	29.3
Goodhue County Cooperative Electric Association, Zumbrota, Minn	29.2
Illinois Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., Princeton, Ill	29.2
Tri-County Electric Cooperative, Rushford, Minn	29.1
Rock County Electric Cooperative Association, Janesville, Wis	28.8
Brown County Rural Electrical Association, Sleepy Eye, Minn	28.8
Baldwin County Electric Membership Corp., Robertsdale, Ala	28.8
Illini Electric Cooperative, Champaign, Ill	28.6
Laclede Electric Cooperative, Lebanon, Mo	28.4
Upshur Rural Electric Cooperative Corp., Gilmer, Tex	28.3
Calhoun County Electric Cooperative Association, Rockwell City, Iowa	28.3
Lyon Rural Electric Cooperative, Rock Rapids, Iowa	28.1
Marion Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., Marion, Ohio	28.0
Ida County Rural Electric Cooperative, Ida Grove, Iowa	27.8
Littlefield Electric Cooperative, Inc., Littlefield, Ariz	27.8
Southwest Central Rural Electric Cooperative Corp., Indiana, Pa	27.7
Elkhorn Rural Public Power District, Battle Creek, Nebr	27.6
Frontier Power Co., Coshocton, Ohio	27.4
South River Electric Membership Corp., Dunn, N.C	27.4
Cedar-Knox County Rural Public Power District, Hartington, Nebr	27.4
Hot Springs County Rural Electric Association, Inc., Thermopolis, Wyo	27.0
LaGrange County REMC, LaGrange, Ind	26.9
Edgar Electric Cooperative Association, Paris, Ill	26.9
Union Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., Marysville, Ohio	26.5
Blue Earth-Nicollet Cooperative Electric Association, Mankato, Minn	26.5
Fayette Electric Cooperative, Inc., LaGrange, Tex	26.4
Knox County REMC, Vincennes, Ind	26.3
Southwestern Minnesota Cooperative Electric, Pipestone, Minn	26.2
Federated Rural Electric Association, Jackson, Minn	26.2
Clark Electric Cooperative, Greenwood, Wis	25.7
Mountrail Electric Cooperative, Inc., Stanley, N. Dak	25.7
Capital Electric Power Association, Clinton, Miss	25.7
Lafayette Electric Cooperative, Darlington, Wis	25.4

REA borrowers with general funds in excess of 20 percent of plant, as reported by borrowers in descending order of percent as of Dec. 31, 1964—Continued

	Percent
Deep East Texas Electric Cooperative, Inc., San Augustine, Tex	25.2
Piedmont Electric Membership Corp., Hillsboro, N.C	25.2
The C. & W. Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Inc., Clay Center, Kans	25.0
McLeod Cooperative Power Association, Glencoe, Minn	24.7
Farmers Electric Cooperative, Inc., Greenfield, Iowa	23.8
Grundy County Rural Electric Cooperative, Grundy Center, Iowa	23.6
North Central Missouri Electric Cooperative, Inc., Milan, Mo	23.5
Traverse Electric Cooperative, Inc., Wheaton, Minn	23.5
East Illinois Power Cooperative, Paxton, Ill	23.5
Wayne-White Counties Electric Cooperative, Fairfield, Ill	23.5
Naknek Electric Association, Inc., Naknek, Alaska	23.3
Okanogan County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Winthrop, Wash	23.3
Greene County Rural Electric Cooperative, Jefferson, Iowa	23.3
The Western Cooperative Electric Association, Inc., Wakeeney, Kans	23.0
T.I.P. Rural Electric Cooperative, Brooklyn, Iowa	23.0
Corn Belt Electric Cooperative, Inc., Bloomington, Ill	22.9
Grand Valley Rural Power Lines, Inc., Grand Junction, Colo	22.7
People's Cooperative Power Association, Rochester, Minn	22.4
Farmers Electric Cooperative Corp., Newport, Ark	22.4
Butler Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., Hamilton, Ohio	22.2
Agralite Cooperative, Benson, Minn	22.2
Lincoln-Union Electric Co., Alcester, S. Dak	22.1
Glades Electric Cooperative, Inc., Moore Haven, Fla	22.1
Newberry Electric Cooperative, Inc., Newberry, S.C	22.0
Gascosage Electric Cooperative, Dixon, Mo	22.0
Tri-County Electric Cooperative Association, Inc., Lancaster, Mo	22.0
Harrison County REMC, Corydon, Ind	22.0
D.E.K. Rural Electric Cooperative, Estherville, Iowa	21.9
Central Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, Iola, Wis	21.6
Lyon-Lincoln Electric Cooperative, Inc., Tyler, Minn	21.6
Troup County Electric Membership Corp., La Grange, Ga	21.6
Harmon Electric Association, Inc., Hollis, Okla	21.4
The Nemaha-Marshall Electric Cooperative Association, Inc., Axtell, Kans	21.4
Marshall County REMC, Plymouth, Ind	21.4
Coastal Electric Cooperative, Inc., Walterboro, S.C	21.3
Delaware County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Delhi N.Y	21.3
The Tippah Electric Power Association, Ripley, Miss	21.3
Buchanan County Rural Electric Cooperative, Independence, Iowa	21.3
Harrison County Rural Electric Cooperative, Woodbine, Iowa	21.3
Grant Electric Cooperative, Lancaster, Wis	21.1
Firelands Electric Cooperative, Inc., New London, Ohio	21.1
Burke-Divide Electric Cooperative, Inc., Columbus, N. Dak	21.1

REA borrowers with general funds in excess of 20 percent of plant, as reported by borrowers in descending order of percent as of Dec. 31, 1964—Continued

	Percent
Wild Rice Electric Cooperative, Inc., Mahnomen, Minn	21.1
Runestone Electric Association, Alexandria, Minn	21.1
Trempealeau Electric Cooperative, Arcadia, Wis	21.0
Guernsey-Muskingum Electric Cooperative, Inc., New Concord, Ohio	21.0
Central Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., Artesia, N. Mex	21.0
Cam Wal Electric Cooperative, Inc., Selby, S. Dak	20.8
Wayne County Public Power District, Wayne, Nebr	20.8
The Brown-Atchison Electric Cooperative Association, Inc., Horton, Kans	20.8
Coles-Moultrie Electric Cooperative, Mattoon, Ill	20.8
Laurens Electric Cooperative, Inc., Laurens, S.C	20.7
Kaufman County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Kaufman, Tex	20.6
Butler County Rural Public Power District, David City, Nebr	20.6
Wells Electric Association, Wells, Minn	20.6
Escalante Valley Electric Association, Inc., Beryl, Utah	20.5
Paulding-Putnam Electric Cooperative, Inc., Paulding, Ohio	20.5
Delta Electric Power Association, Greenwood, Miss	20.5
The D.S. & O. Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Inc., Solomon, Kans	20.5
People's Electric Cooperative, Inc., Ada, Okla	20.4
Sam Houston Electric Cooperative, Inc., Livingston, Tex	20.3
Redwood Electric Cooperative, Clements, Minn	20.3
Adams-Marquette Electric Cooperative, Friendship, Wis	20.2
Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., Finley, N. Dak	20.2
Southeastern Illinois Electric Cooperative, Inc., Eldorado, Ill	20.2
Logan County Cooperative Power & Light Association, Inc., Bellefontaine, Ohio	20.0

Mr. Chairman, what is disturbing in this respect is the fact that I pointed out the tax liability of some REA cooperatives to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue over a year ago and I am sorry to say the IRS has been stalling all this time with no definite report in sight. When I get letters from my constituents telling me how the IRS is hounding them it does make one's blood pressure rise when we realize the IRS would not even move on a flagrant case of tax evasion involving huge sums of money. I certainly hope these remarks will serve to light a fire in the Treasury Department.

Mr. Chairman, national recognition of the importance of rural community development began 10 years ago under the Eisenhower administration. The Department of Agriculture initiated a pilot program in rural development under the direction of the Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service. By 1960 the program had expanded to about 200 counties in 30 States. It was a commendable program of helping people in low farm income areas to more effectively help themselves to improve their farm and community income opportunities.

THE BIRTH OF RAD

In 1961 Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman undertook to expand these pilot projects into a nationwide program under the heading of rural areas development program. The concept was expanded to provide Federal assistance to all rural areas—farm and nonfarm. Emphasis was placed on the formation of local RAD committees to promote the planning and implementation of community development projects, most of which involved assistance from one of the many different Federal programs available. Where similar community, or countywide development organizations already existed these were frequently treated as the RAD committee. In some areas the newly formed RAD committees resulted in unnecessary duplication of community service organizations.

DEPRESSED AREA PROGRAMS HELPED

Passage of the Area Redevelopment Act in 1961 provided the silver spoon for the also new RAD program. The RAD program leaders encouraged the use of local RAD committees as a mechanism for applying for financial assistance through the ARA program. There are now more than 850 counties and areas designated for rural development assistance in ARA. This act will expire June 30, 1965, unless extended by Congress. Of course, the RAD program leaders have already "hitchhiked" a ride on the more recently enacted Appalachian bill and the Economic Opportunity Act—through the transfer of funds and authority—in the process of extending their control over Federal programs in rural America.

SOMETHING FOR ALL

In 1963 Assistant Secretary of Agriculture John A. Baker compared the RAD program to a "cafeteria line." He said:

> Local RAD committees can move down this line selecting Federal activities that can help them in carrying out the RAD program. Allow me to give you the recipe content of some of the newer additions to this cafeteria menu line.

He then proceeded to review the various Federal aid programs, all of which would in fact be available without the Office of Rural Areas Development. The USDA Agriculture Handbook No. 245 entitled "Rural Areas Development Handbook—Pegs for Rural Progress," is devoted almost entirely to listing all the agencies of the Federal Government along with the many financial and technical assistance benefits that are available.

MISLEADING CLAIMS OF THE RAD PROGRAM

Assistant Secretary Baker submitted a résumé of RAD activity, for the Appropriations Subcommittee with examples of projects being undertaken. There is no easy way of verifying the accuracy of this information. According to the report, there are more than 9,000 projects which have been completed, ostensibly through the results of more than 2,000 RAD committees throughout the country. However, the following observations suggest reservation on the value of this report as justification for a sixfold increase in appropriations for the next fiscal year:

CREDIT THE ARA

Nearly half of the projects reported as completed are in ARA—Area Redevelopment Act—designated areas where direct subsidy is the motivating force far more than the actions of a RAD committee. A major share of the example described under the State summaries were projects for Area Redevelopment Act depressed area assistance.

PRE-RAD PROGRESS

Of the total projects completed, Texas and North Carolina by themselves account for more than 2,200. Local community development oranizations had become well established in these States long before the USDA-type RAD program came along. A similar situation exists in many other States, more especially in the Southeast.

REPETITION

In respect to the project examples described State-by-State in the subcommittee hearing report, the examples given for at least nine of the States were identical to the examples reported a year ago in the Senate agricultural appropriations hearings. Repetition existed in a number of other States, along with some minor revisions. Could this mean that new projects worth reporting are that scarce?

STATE AND LOCAL REACTIONS

Information has been received from responsible representatives of various organizations in a number of States, excerpts of which follow. The identity of the State and source of information is purposely withheld:

> Long before the Federal program came into being [our State] through its extension service embarked on a program of organizing area associations throughout the State * * *. When the Federal programs came into being our State leaders decided to mesh these programs with our area and the community development programs already in existence rather than set up similar organizations and therefore duplicating efforts. In doing this, most of the statistics reported out of (our State) on the behalf of RAD or Area Redevelopment Act are statistics of our area associations committee projects and activities. You might say that the Federal boys are taking credit for much that already existed and many accomplishments which would have taken place even if the Federal programs had not been in existence.
>
> The majority of these projects would have been instituted regardless of whether or not RAD was organized in the State, or particular county where project was developed.
>
> The projects as reported in number probably are doubtfully worthy of the name in many instances but quite respectably in others.
>
> The figures constitute a rather heroic count in most counties. I suspect that agents report all extension activities, such as fertilizer demonstrations, etc., as RAD progress.
>
> Of the projects being implemented by the local committees, I do not know of any that actually originated in a RAD committee session.
>
> Starting as far back as 1945 our chamber of commerce in cooperation with the University's Agricultural Extension Service and other agricultural leaders, initiated a program of rural area development * * *. Since that time, of course, the need for RAD committees in all counties has been presented to the individual counties as a must because, as you and I know, orders have been handed down from Washington through the extension directors that each county have such a committee * * *. As far as our State's report as to accomplishments, this report could have been written any time during the past nearly 20 years, and in many instances, I am sure would have been more impressive. The big difference here, I believe, is that prior to this particular report, accomplishments had been made by leadership in the respective counties working on their own and without the assistance and guidance, financially or otherwise, from Washington other than the educational leadership provided by the agricultural agencies * * *. I am not saying that there is not a need for capital in some areas, but in most instances, I firmly believe the capital is available through the resource already at hand without the establishment of a new agency solely for this purpose.

Is this the kind of foundation on which we are asked to appropriate a sixfold increase in funds? If we do, you will see the doors—which are already ajar—begin to open on a whole new bureaucracy. A bureaucracy with elaborate plans but without a program of its own. Based upon testimony before the subcommittee I want you to know what this rural areas development program is, what its successor, the Rural Community Development Service does and where it appears to be headed—if we provide the money to open the door.

RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

Late in 1964 the Secretary of Agriculture expanded the Office of Rural Areas Development and renamed it the Rural Community Development Service. To begin with, the primary function of this agency, like its predecessor, has been to promote and expedite the implementation of Federal programs primarily related to agriculture. But it has no intention of stopping there. During 1964 three field offices were opened in different parts of the country to serve as informers, expediters, and clearinghouses for all Federal program assistance in the areas. This outreach service to all of the hard-to-reach areas of the country is the bottomless pit for which the Rural Community Development Service is seeking funds.

THE JOB OF RCDS

The subcommittee endeavored to learn more about the specific responsibilities of the Rural Community Development Service. The chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], noted the separate program responsibilities of the respective agencies of Agriculture, such as Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration, and Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, each with its own representatives in the local areas, and asked these questions of the Administrator of the program, Robert G. Lewis:

> Where do you fit into this picture; what new service can your agency provide? * * * How much authority do you have? Can you veto anything? Is it your responsibility to clear these proposals that they may have in local communities?
>
> Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the President and of the Secretary and of me as Administrator of this Agency, is certainly not to slow anything down but to speed up and expedite. The coordination function is not one of vetoing or giving orders to other agencies, but it is an extension of the Secretary's responsibility to coordinate the work of the respective agencies. * * * We have the responsibility for viewing the overall community development objective and need. Each of these other agencies has a specialized program and, of course, as they should, they concentrate on their specialized responsibilities, and it is true that they can be asked by the Secretary or told by the Secretary to look out for the overall community development effects and very substantially they do.
>
> They meet together in a technical action panel both at the State level and at the county level but there is a need for somebody who will keep at this job full time to watch the progress that is being made after the respective agencies agree as to what they should do about coordinating, and there is a need for somebody who can follow through after the meeting in between meetings to insure that the coordination does get carried out.

With the remarkable services of the Extension Service along with the local representatives of FHA, SCS, and so forth, and their coordinated efforts through their own technical action panels, I fail to see the need for additional coordination by the Rural Community Development Service.

WHO'S COORDINATING WHOM?

The subcommittee chairman went on to inquire how the Rural Community Development Service would participate in considering and applying for a new water system for a community. Mr. Lewis' reply was:

> Well, sir, this process of analyzing the community problem is performed by the local people through their Rural Area Development Committee comprised of local leaders and assisted by the Extension Service with its information and educational functions, and our function in that process is to coordinate the technical guidance from action agencies of the Department of Agriculture, and to bring information, on a coordinated basis, the actions of other Departments that might have a responsibility—to be sure in the first place they recognize their responsibility and carry it out.

To the extent that I understand this answer, the decisions would be made and carried out entirely by the local people in collaboration with the Department agencies responsible for administering the particular aid programs without any need for involvement of the RCDS.

WHERE'S THE AUTHORITY?

Along this line I asked this question:

> Does the Rural Community Development Service make any loans; provide any cost-share assistance; administer any programs enacted by Congress?

The reply was:

> No; these are carried out by the various action programs by this and other Federal agencies.

My question:

> What new functions have been assigned to the Rural Community Development Service?

The answer:

> The new functions assigned to the new agency, in addition to those assigned to the Office of Rural Areas Development which the new agency has absorbed are primarily those of providing outreach for all Federal agencies other than those located within the Department of Agriculture.

OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

I think we need to know more about how much help the other Federal agencies want and need from the Department of Agriculture in carrying their programs to the local areas. In answer to a question along this line the RCDS representative said:

> Requests have been received for assistance in serving rural people from a number of agencies. Included among these are the manpower development and training program, the Job Corps, community action and headstart program of the Economic Opportunity Administration, the programs in the House and Home Finance Agency. Assistance has been given to the Small Business Administration and to the health and welfare agencies. Assistance will be made available whenever rural needs are found which can be fulfilled by Federal, State, or local programs.

Mr. Lewis, the RCDS Administrator, told the subcommittee:

> The Office of Economic Opportunity, as many of the other Federal programs, are not getting effective action out in the country, and there are some good reasons for that. Rural people live in small numbers. They are harder to reach. It takes more, different phone numbers in order to reach the influential people in the community, and so we find that the other Federal agencies do not themselves, through their own resources, adequately get into the rural areas.

The RCDS representatives even consider themselves better qualified to deal with the people in rural areas. They say that the Department of Labor employees and Health, Education, and Welfare people often do not know how to approach and gain the confidence of rural people. They are going to help rural people register for employment and job training. They want to make sure that the applicants are psychologically prepared for the aptitude and placement tests.

OUTREACH

My question:

> How prevalent are these hard-to-reach areas which are lacking in equal opportunity for assistance through Federal programs? Where are they? How many counties are without any Federal offices of any kind? How many are without Extension agents?

The answer:

> Hard-to-reach areas for the most part are low-income areas. More than 600 counties have median family income below $3,000. Generally these counties are concentrated in the Southeast, but some exist in almost every State in the Nation. The number of counties without any Federal offices is approximately 100. There are 50 counties not serviced by an Extension agent.

My question:

> If the Vermont field representative's office has become a focal point for requests for rural development assistance, is not the number of such busy focal points limited only by the number of field offices made possible by appropriated funds?

The answer:

> Until enough appropriated funds are available to make a reasonable coverage of the country with field offices, those areas where field offices are available will tend to have more outreach activity of the various services of the Federal Government than areas not served by a field office located close by. The objective of the RCDS and its field representatives will be to build up channels through which request can be made by local leaders to existing local, State, and Federal agencies and institutions. Rural CDS field representatives will not be needed in every rural community.

This I doubt very much—if they plan to have the field representatives perform all the duties that have been outlined for them—page 326, part 4 of hearings. They will be extension agents, information specialists, industrialists, Peace Corps specialists, employment and training agents, psychologists, and so forth.

APPROPRIATION

My question:

> It appears that your nearly sixfold increase in based almost entirely on the projected demand for 650,000 new job opportunities in rural areas per year. Is it therefore logical to assume that increased funds should be provided the RCDS each year so long as the demand for new jobs in the rural areas remains high?

The answer:

> The financial support required for RCDS goes beyond the demand for new jobs in rural areas, important as that factor is. In addition, there is the need to provide coordination, leadership, and liaison services to rural areas in providing the same access to benefits of Federal assistance programs available to urban communities. Consideration will be given to the needs of the RCDS each year in light of this and other budgetary needs of the department.

The appropriation request would provide for opening up new field offices with a limited staff in 20 States. The criteria or rating for employing the coordinators has not yet been determined. If these become schedule C appointments, the value of this direct channel to the State and local areas becomes even more meaningful to the administration.

DIRECT CHANNEL TO THE LAST HOMESTEAD

Confirmation on the extent to which the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, intends to administer the Government's programs throughout the countryside may be found in his own words—before the Lawrence County Water Festival, Lawrenceburg, Tenn., May 15, 1965:

> We have established a new agency—the Rural Community Development Service—to bring a new emphasis into the work of the Department of Agriculture. The top priority of this new agency will be to help the other departments and agencies of the Federal Government to stretch the reach of their services all the way to the remotest rural settlement or homestead—where all too often they have never reached at all before, or have offered less service to rural people than to those who live in urban areas. The Rural Community Development Service will help to plan and coordinate the programs of the entire Federal Government so that they will make a maximum contribution to the fullest development of all the resources—both natural and human—of the entire rural community.
>
> In short, we are transforming the Department of Agriculture to fit the needs of rural America. We are not picking and choosing just those problems that are easy, familiar, or traditional.

DUPLICATION OF SERVICES

I do not know how the other agencies and departments feel about this superimposition of services and responsibilities. But I should think it would be quite an insult, to say nothing of the added cost of confusion that would inevitably result. Listen to this series of services that the RCDS intends to coordinate:

> RCDS will endeavor to coordinate the activities of all agencies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other Federal departments so as to focus heightened efforts upon development of new products and new markets; to help farmers find ways, through cooperatives and individually, to reduce their production, processing, and marketing costs and increase their efficiency; to secure better access to training, information, technical guidance, and improved technology; and to secure the necessary credit on reasonable terms so that the family farmer can obtain and operate an efficient production unit with sufficient capital, land, and managerial skill to fully employ his talents.

In specific reference to the Extension Service one of the RCDS representatives said:

> The Extension Service provides education leadership on all aspects of community development, including education about Federal programs. However, what is needed from the RCDS is staff service to the Secretary of Agriculture in developing plans and procedures whereby operating agencies can perform the new outreach service to rural people. The Extension Service is not a strictly Federal agency. The county agents report to the land-grant colleges, not to the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture has only limited and prescribed authority to direct the Extension Service to perform services for the Federal Government. But because the Extension Service has great talent and information resources, we expect it to be very helpful in helping to get better information to rural communities about the outreach of Federal programs.

The cooperative extension service has a long history of experience in providing organizational leadership as well as educational. In fact, most of the $1 billion requested increase in appropriations for the Extension Service is for the purpose of making payments to States to strengthen work with organized groups on resource development problems of communities.

If there is one section or group of the country where the people usually know where to go to get something done it is the farmer who goes to a farm adviser, or county agent in his own county. The county extension personnel are readily accepted by the people. This is not true in the cities. I do not care from what agency of Government—city people want some kind of assistance. They are just completely stranded. They do not know where to start.

In behalf of the other agencies of the Department of Agriculture which are active on the local scene, another member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] had this to say:

> Well, I am sure that a good many of the Extension Service offices and many of the others are going to be surprised to hear that they have not been working together or that they are not coordinating because I do not know of any agencies that work better together. As a matter of fact, I have had occasion to work with them a good many times, and I recall the many, many meetings scattered all over rural communities in which you will find the county agent was there and the FHA supervisor was there, and the Forest Service was there and, yes, you can go on and include them all, whether it is the watershed people or the soil conservation people, and they are all there at the same meeting.
>
> Just what you are going to do to improve such a combination is what puzzles me.

To which the witness, Mr. Lewis, agreed in part:

> There has been a great deal of coordination, and we aim to make it better.

The RCDS also intends to duplicate the services of chambers of commerce and other private enterprise organizations in the community. The service not only will "help rural communities to achieve the conditions suitable for locations of new business," but "also to seek actively to promote specific business development opportunities."

It is more than unfortunate that we should be asked to appropriate public funds—the taxpayer's money—to hire public servants to perform functions which the private sector of the economy ought to—and are doing.

THE ULTIMATE GOAL?

The outreach ambition of the RCDS and the Secretary of Agriculture has no intention of stopping short of a completely separate channel, or direct line of control from the Department's Washington headquarters to every local community throughout rural America. It is obvious that the Department is not content with the limited authority and control that it has over the State and local extension services and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service committeemen. The Department believes that the only sure way of correcting this is to bypass them by establishing its own direct line of control.

After all, since the business of farming is becoming a proportionally smaller sector of the total industry, the Secretary of Agriculture may consider that adjustments are in order to bring the wayward and growing nonfarm industry of rural America into his Department. Perhaps the next target in the Secretary's drive to "transform the Department of Agriculture" will be, as he has suggested, to change the name to the Department of Rural Affairs.

In the process, what has happened to the vitality of the community, the initiative of individuals, and the organizations that represent them in a truly competitive private enterprise economy?

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I placed into the RECORD the results of our 18th Congressional District questionnaire. I have a further breakdown today of the four questions relating to agriculture, and under unanimous consent I insert the tabulation, broken down by occupation, in the RECORD at this point:

Agriculture

12. Do you favor a continuation of the present farm program with respect to price supports, acreage allotment and marketing quotas on a limited number of crops?

Occupation	Yes		No		Undecided	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grand total	3,147	22	9,593	66	1,832	12
Salaried employee	560	16	2,489	73	367	11
Businessman	388	20	1,381	72	153	8
Professional	353	18	1,376	69	251	13
Retired	426	21	1,277	63	346	17
Other	60	17	217	61	77	22
Housewife	137	17	484	61	173	22
Hourly employee	658	26	1,518	60	368	14
Farmer	531	37	808	57	82	6
Student	34	37	43	47	15	16

13. Do you favor a gradual withdrawal by the Government from acreage restrictions for farmers?

Occupation	Yes		No		Undecided	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grand total	10,787	74	2,313	16	1,472	10
Businessman	1,608	83	208	11	106	6
Salaried employee	2,653	77	469	14	294	9
Professional	1,527	77	257	13	196	10
Retired	1,454	71	330	16	265	13
Other	246	70	43	12	65	18
Hourly employee	1,760	69	487	19	297	12
Housewife	549	69	102	13	143	18
Farmer	932	65	396	28	93	7
Student	58	63	21	23	13	14

14. Do you favor more Government spending programs to keep so-called marginal farmers in business?

	Yes		No		Undecided	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grand total	2,031	14	11,045	76	1,496	10
Businessman	161	8	1,646	86	115	6
Salaried employee	454	13	2,749	81	213	6
Professional	206	10	1,573	80	201	10
Farmer	230	16	1,088	77	103	7
Student	13	14	69	75	10	11
Housewife	96	12	539	68	159	20
Other	47	13	241	68	66	19
Retired	322	16	1,396	68	331	16
Hourly employee	502	20	1,744	68	298	12

15. Do you favor giving away or selling for foreign currencies our agricultural surpluses to Communist countries?

Occupation	Yes		No		Undecided	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grand total	2,869	20	10,510	72	1,193	8
Housewife	88	11	613	77	93	12
Retired	254	13	1,561	76	234	11
Businessman	368	19	1,445	75	109	6
Hourly employee	468	18	1,869	74	207	8
Farmer	317	22	1,010	71	94	7
Professional	452	23	1,375	69	153	8
Salaried employee	829	24	2,340	69	237	7
Other	55	16	237	67	62	17
Student	28	31	60	65	4	4

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for agreeing to restore to the food stamp program the full budget amount of $100 million. However, at this time I would like to discuss another very important item in the bill. Should the National Commission on Food Marketing make the study Congress assigned to it, or merely dust off some old reports and issue them in new bindings?

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations, in acting on nearly $6 billion of budget requests for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies, made cuts of $122½ million, or about 2.1 percent, in reporting this appropriation bill. But it cut the National Commission on Food Marketing by 50 percent, from $1,500,000 to $750,000.

There are 10 Members of Congress on the 15-member bipartisan Commission; 5 Members of the House and 5 Senators. The public members include the board chairman of J. C. Penney Co.; the Republican National Committeeman from New Mexico who is one of the Nation's largest cattle raisers; the dean of agriculture of one of our great State universities; a former Member of Congress, Fred Marshall, who was for years a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations; and, as our chairman, a former chief justice of the California Supreme Court. It is something of a shock to all of us, I am sure, to learn that in the opinion of the Committee on Appropriations, we are apparently only one twenty-fifth as reliable as the bureaucracy in the Department of Agriculture in estimating our agency needs for the coming fiscal year, since the Department was cut only 2 percent and we were cut 50 percent.

The committee slashed our funds in half on the assumption that our staff was twice as big as necessary because the work they were doing for us had already been done by the Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service.

If these assumptions were correct—and they are not—then there would be no reason for our Commission's existence and no purpose to be served by having us do the work Congress twice instructed us to do. Members of Congress are far too busy to be willing to waste their time and effort on an unnecessary assignment—particularly one which requires countless hours of study into the biggest industry in the Nation, the $63 billion food industry. If all we were supposed to do in this study was to review the statistics prepared over the years by the Department of Agriculture, Congress should never have passed two laws setting up the Commission and authorizing us to spend $2,500,000 to do the study. The House Committee on Agriculture already does the work of reviewing the departmental studies on farm prices versus retail prices, and has published excellent reports on these statistics. Yet it was the Committee on Agriculture which initiated the legislation for the creation of the National Commission on Food Marketing and has strongly supported our efforts to get at the underlying facts.

Our Commission was created last July, but was not set up fully and ready to function until early this year. The House reviewed all of that history last month when it passed the bill just signed into law to extend the life of the Commission until July 1, 1966. We received $700,000 to cover our expenses in this present fiscal year—covering a period of about 6 months. We have asked for $1,500,000 to continue at present levels of activity through the coming fiscal year. We will then need about $300,000 the following year, after the Commission expires, for printing of reports, and so forth.

Under this appropriation bill today, we would have to fire half of the staff of top economists so carefully and laboriously built up over the past 6 months. The Committee on Appropriations advises us to borrow staff people from Agriculture. Are we to infer that Agriculture is so overstaffed that it has 20 top economists sitting around doing nothing? Who is to do their work at Agriculture if we borrow them for our Commission?

Mr. Chairman, the congressional members of the Food Marketing Commission have discussed this budget cut and we are in agreement that it would not be worth our time or trouble to try to do this job if the Appropriations Committee is to veto the judgment of the entire Congress, and of the 10 Members of Congress directly on the firing line on this study. Do you want us to do this job or not?

Let us acknowledge that there is a wide spread between the prices the farmer receives and the prices the consumer pays in the grocery stores. All of us know that. We are not trying to plow old ground on that—we are trying to find out why the spread is so large and is widening; we are using the techniques of public hearings, private conferences, and the subpena. The Committee on Appropriations seems to think all we have to do is review some statistics, and reissue them in new bindings.

That would not tell us, however, whether Safeway and A. & P. and Kroger, for instance, are deliberately using their economic power to push down cattle prices at the farm level by the manner in which they make their beef purchases; the statistics would not tell us how the feed companies manage or dominate poultry production; the statistics on retail margin—and we have those from Federal Trade—do not answer the questions about the costs of overstoring, or whether the profits are in toys, hardware, paper goods or other high margin nonfood items, or whether the so-called convenience foods are for the convenience of the shopper or for the profits of the processor, or both.

We have not prejudged this investigation. I am sure the House would not want us to. Congressmen PURCELL, ROSENTHAL, and CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. MAY, and myself, and Senators MAGNUSON, MCGEE, HART, MORTON, and HRUSKA are all anxious to get to the facts, wherever they lead.

Whether an amendment is introduced to the bill today to restore the funds depends upon the attendance when the bill is opened to amendments under the 5-minute rule. The Committee on Appropriations does not have a valid excuse for making this 50-percent cut in our little item, in a $6 billion bill which represents only a 2-percent cut in the huge Department of Agriculture. My colleagues on the Commission join me this afternoon in pointing out that we have only 1 year in which to complete this study, and we must have competent staff if we are to be true to ourselves and to our responsibilities to the Congress in making this study.

I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas [PURCELL].

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas who has done such a remarkable job in these hearings.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's yielding.

Mr. Chairman, 7 weeks ago this body passed, under suspension of the rules, H.R. 5702. H.R. 5702 has now become law, extending the life of the National Commission on Food Marketing 1 year. A report of findings and conclusions will be made to the Congress and the President on July 1, 1966.

Seven weeks ago we voiced overwhelming support for the need for a thorough, impartial study of the marketing structure of this Nation's food industry. Now we are being asked to support an appropriation of only one-half of the amount requested by the Commission for fiscal year 1966.

The five House members of the Commission, indeed all the members of the Commission, actively supported the budget request of $1.5 million for 1966 to complete this study. The bill before this body contains just $750,000, only $50,000 more than was appropriated for one-half of fiscal year 1965. The issue seems clear—do we or do we not want to know the hows and whys of maintaining an efficient, competitive food industry which compensates producers adequately and is equitable to consumers?

I will not weary my colleagues with the assertion that the $1.5 million requested for the Commission for 1966 constitutes an austere budget. Rather let me state that it is a practical budget. It provides for a minimum of personnel and related costs. It provides enough flexibility to insure that no reasonable avenue of study or exploration will be overlooked.

The Commission's budget request of $1.5 million can be oversimplified as follows:

About 45 percent for staff; about 30 percent for studies and data collection by others; about 10 percent for hearings; about 8 percent for publication of the myriad of hearing records, technical studies, and the Commission's interim and final reports; and about 7 percent for administration.

To be more specific—the $1.5 million request provides $69,000 for a maximum staff of 45 full-time people. Of these, 31 are professionals. Of these, seven are responsible for the meats and poultry area. All Commission studies in beef, pork, lamb, broilers, turkeys, and eggs—retail sales of more than $20 billion—are being coordinated by seven men. These seven men are investigating, preparing, and participating in hearings. They are supervising and coordinating special studies by other Federal agencies, such as the Federal Trade Commission, Census, and the Department of Agriculture. They are working on special studies to be carried out by expert temporary employees or under contract, and they will do some specific inquiries themselves. In between all this, they are working closely with individuals and groups in industry who are voluntarily working up data and reports for Commission use. This is not overstaffing—indeed it is an onerous burden we have asked these seven men to carry, and other areas of staff work in the Commission are comparable.

The Commission's budget is in controversy primarily in the area of work by other people. This is where flexibility, of which I spoke earlier, is essential. Our budget provides $450,000 for about 30 man-years of professional work on food marketing problems by others not on our regular staff. We have significant work underway in several Federal agencies and will, we hope, have more. Contributions can be made by individual experts and firms having special competence or data which we can use. My colleague has gone into this in some detail.

Hearings are an essential part of our fact-gathering mission. Six hearings are being held in fiscal year 1965—in Cheyenne, Forth Worth, Washington, D.C., Atlanta, Omaha, and McAllen, Tex. We have budgeted $143,000 for hearings in fiscal year 1966. These will be held all over the Nation, and will cover several commodities and all aspects of food marketing, from producers to consumers. We cannot envision a meaningful final report without adequate contact and exposure to the whole marketing complex—on the ground.

Mr. Chairman, the House members of this Commission reviewed the $1.5 million request carefully before it was submitted to the Congress and have now re-reviewed it in the light of the committee recommendation. We believe it is a reasonable level of financing for the 1 year remaining to the Commission, and hope some relief will be forthcoming. We do not consider this request exhorbitant. In the language of the producer, it will provide a bountiful harvest. In the language of the consumer, it is a bargain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman for taking this time to advise the House on the development of the work of the Food Marketing Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Members of the Committee that the Commission, under the very able chairmanship of Judge Gibson and its executive director, Dr. Brandow, has in my opinion been doing a very fine job. We have been working diligently and hard. We have an enormous task to perform and one which I believe will render invaluable service to the American farmers and consumers and to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all Members of Congress are aware of the fact that we could not perform this function diligently and properly without adequate funds and the necessary staff. They have worked very hard and have performed ably. Also, I am sure that the Congress does not intend in any way to prevent us from completing the job in the fine fashion in which it has been started by limiting the funds available to it for its operations.

Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt for a moment that the Committee on Appropriations in its wisdom, at the appropriate time, will see to it that we are not prohibited from finishing the job.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Missouri for taking this time and thank her for the service which she has rendered to the Commission.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, my able colleagues and fellow members of the National Commission on Food Marketing, have made an excellent presentation outlining the general feeling of the Commission members and the various farm and business and consumer groups on the committee's reduction by one-half of the funds requested for the second and final year of the Commission's life.

Now, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to page 48 of the committee report where the justification for this cut has been presented. May I begin by saying that what the committee has outlined here in the way of work already done by the Department of Agriculture, much of it under this committee's guidance and leadership, does actually exist and is being used to great advantage by our Commission and its staff. As a matter of fact, were not these preliminary studies already in existence the task of the Commission to fulfill the duties with which it has been charged would have been much more difficult. However, we would be very remiss if we let this statement stand in the legislative record of this House without challenge and detailed explanation as to why it is not a valid reason for this cut in funding of the Commission. To let it go unchallenged and unexplained would create the very serious misunderstanding that the Food Commission is engaged principally in dusting off some studies now lying idle in desks or file drawers of Government agencies.

As you have noted in the report, the committee called particular attention to the large amount of work the Department of Agriculture has done in measuring the spread in prices paid by consumers and prices received by farmers. Now, if the work of the Commission were primarily a study of costs and margins certainly this budget action would be properly justified. But, I must point out, without in any way disparaging the work of the Department, the National Commission on Food Marketing must assert its need for far more information than the Department can now provide. Certainly, the Commission does intend to interpret much of its own work in terms of the price spread between consumers and producers but, I would again point out to this body that the Commission's duties as expressed in Public Law 88–354 are much broader than the calculation of price spreads.

The Commission has been instructed to study and appraise changes that may be basically altering the nature of competition in the food industry, the balance of market power among groups within it, the efficiency of processing and distribution, and the way in which benefits are shared among consumers, producers, and the various segments of the industry itself.

One of the first needs for information, therefore, is data showing what is happening to the firms comprising the food industry. To what extent is business in the various segments of the industry becoming concentrated in the hands of a few? Is vertical integration increasing or decreasing, and in what food lines? How are mergers affecting the number of effective competitors in national and local markets? Answers to such questions are best obtained by detailed analysis of data from the Bureau of the Census, from special studies by the Federal Trade Commission, and only in part from the Department of Agriculture. The opportunity to develop new and revealing information on these points is especially good because data from the 1963 Censuses of Manufactures and Business are now becoming available for study.

The Commission needs to know how the changes in size and number of firms affect competitive behavior in the food industry. For example, do the large retail chains obtain higher margins and prices in localities where they have a large share of the market? Data from the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Agriculture are too limited to be conclusive; only a broad study by the Commission will give the answer. Another example: the use of retailers' brands is a key element in the competition between retailers on the one hand and food processors—including farmer cooperatives—on the other. No agency of Government, including the Department of Agriculture, can now supply the Commission with information on the volume of different foods sold under retailers' labels or how prices, quality, and merchandising methods for the different brand types compare.

One of the great blind spots about the food industry has been the manner in which firms do business with each other, negotiate prices, and arrange for continuity of supplies. Are prices competitively established? Do buyers and sellers have alternatives that make the system open and competitive? Is market power used to impose onerous terms upon other parties to transactions? The need to investigate such questions presumably was the reason why the Commission was given power to subpena witnesses and to require submission of data. Except in a few commodities for which it has regulatory powers, the Department of Agriculture has little information on such questions and no special power to obtain it.

Answers to the foregoing questions would help greatly in judging whether price spreads between farmers and consumers are reasonable or excessive. But to do this, the Commission needs information on the costs and profits that comprise the price spreads. The Department of Agriculture has done a great deal of work in measuring spreads between farm and retail prices but has much less information on the way in which the spreads break down into labor costs, container costs, transportation, profits, and the like. In practically all cases, individual expenses of retailing are lacking. Individual costs of processing are not available for a number of commodities. Only for farm foods collectively are estimates of major expenses and profits available. The Commission needs much more complete information than is now available on the costs and profits making up price spreads for individual foods.

The Commission recognizes that even where the Department of Agriculture has information of use to the Commission, the Department may be put to considerable expense in order to assemble the information in a suitable form.

A great amount of data, already at hand, have been provided without cost to the Commission. The Commission has adopted the policy that wherever its request requires a substantial amount of work separate and apart from an agency's regular function, it will reimburse for the cost of that work.

This relationship is desirable, the Commission believes, to give it a free hand in obtaining information it needs. Otherwise, it would be at the mercy of the availability of personnel in offices that are the original source of data.

Because the Commission is not satisfied just to rework existing reports and statistics, much of the information it wants is not now readily to be found. Much of it will come not from research agencies, but from action agencies that are not in the business of assembling and publishing research data.

For example, a number of questions about livestock marketing raised at our two livestock hearings can be answered only by digging out data on size and volume of operations of livestock slaughterers, both nationally and regionally. It happens that a wealth of raw data are collected by the Department of Agriculture incidental to its regulation of markets by the Packers and Stockyards Division, and its sanitary inspection of slaughter conducted by the Meat Inspection Division. To compile these data requires programing the original records and running special tabulations by data processing.

This service involves a cash cost, and it is a cost that bears no relation to the market and slaughter inspection of the operating agencies. It should be borne by the Commission, and the Commission has assured the Department of Agriculture that it expects to bear it.

The American consumer wants quality food and the producer expects to be paid for producing high quality products. Yet the marketing system is a maze of Federal grades, private grades, absence of any quality standards, various private and processor labels, and so on. The Commission has considered asking that some impartial quality checks be made on selected foods, on a sample basis. We would want official Federal graders of the Department of Agriculture to do this. Almost all the Department's grading is done as a service to the trade, on a fee basis. It is a trust fund operation, and the Department has no appropriated money with which it could provide the special service for which we might ask. If the Commission cannot reimburse, it cannot obtain the Department's participation.

In the marketing of fluid milk, a wealth of data are collected by the administrators of Federal milk orders as a part of their administrative activities. The Commission would find some of those data useful in its inquiry into the marketing of milk. The administrators of milk marketing orders are paid not from Federal funds but from assessments on local milk distributors. It would be manifestly unfair for the Commission to ask that personnel be assigned to tabulate milk data without reimbursing for the special costs.

Perhaps no complaint reaches the Commission more often than that the methods by which farm products are procured by processors or retailers are unfair in one respect or other. A special study of procurement and sale methods employed by processors of fruits and vegetables in several areas is being considered. This too would clearly involve extra cost not related to any ongoing research of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, these are but a few examples of many that I could cite of the type of information that we need, not only from the Department of Agriculture, but other agencies of Government. At end of my statement I will include a breakdown of certain studies that have been requested, including the nature and objectives of these studies, and the breakdown on the cost of them requiring reimbursement.

In conclusion, may I say that it seems most significant to me that Congress chose to establish an independent agency to conduct this study of the $70 billion food industry. Obviously, we cannot properly restrict our inquires to those areas and details on which the Department of Agriculture or any other permanent agencies happen to have information. We must have the means of drawing upon information from all sources so we can use our staff to develop data not available elsewhere. The Commission's success may well depend crucially on how imaginative and resourceful it may be in digging into areas and subjects that have not been dug into before. Given so responsible an assignment and so short a life, the Commission ought not to be handicapped by a curtailment of the funds it needs for the task.

Work Being Done for the National Commission on Food Marketing by the Federal Trade Commission

The first of the six duties assigned to the National Commission on Food Marketing is to study and appraise the actual changes taking place in the marketing structure of various segments of the food industry, especially in the past two decades. This requires a detailed description of changes in the number and size of firms, the extent to which business concentration is increasing or decreasing, the role of mergers, the extent of vertical integration, the ease of entry by new firms, and other aspects of market structure.

This work is being done for the Food Commission by the Federal Trade Commission. The FTC will use data in its own files, will draw upon information from the Bureau of the Census—including new data for 1963 just now becoming available—and will utilize other sources within the Federal Government. The FTC is familiar with all sources of data and with problems of assembling it. The FTC will, in addition, supply data on profits, price margins, and such other aspects of performance of the food industry.

This work is being done by FTC under two study outlines, one in food retailing and one in food manufacturing. The contract cost of the food retailing study is $29,512, and the cost of the food manufacturing study is $106,914. In addition, the Food Commission is obtaining special tabulations on national and local market structure from the Bureau of the Census for the use of FTC in doing its work. Outlines of the studies are attached.

Concentration, Integration, and Diversification in Food Manufacturing

I. NATURE AND OBJECTIVES OF STUDY

The study will describe the structure of food manufacturing including an analysis of market concentration, product differentiation, and the condition of entry. The study will pay particular attention to the place of large multiproduct "conglomerate" firms in the structures of product industries and analyze the role of mergers in extending the dominance of these firms into more and more areas of the food industry. The study will also analyze interrelationships between product industry structures and competitive behavior, particularly rates of return, attributes of nonprice competition, and conduct as revealed by the investigation and case files of the Commission. (Attached is an outline of the subjects covered by the project.)

II. SOURCES OF DATA

The study will rely primarily on data already in the Commission's files but will use data from: the 1963 Censuses of Manufacturers, the Internal Revenue Service, various surveys of product markets, and industry trade journals.

III. PERSONNEL AND COSTS

This study can be completed in 14 months if staffed as follows:

1 economist (GS–15)	$19,203.33
1 economist (GS–13)	14,087.50
1 attorney (GS–12)	11,958.33
1 accountant (GS–12)	11,958.33
1 economist (GS–9)	8,423.33
1 statistical assistant (GS–7)	7,058.33
2 clerk-typists (GS–5)	11,666.66
Estimated personnel costs	84,355.81
Overhead (22 percent)	18,558.28
Machine tabulation	4,000.00
Total	[1]106,914.09

[1] This project is scheduled to begin Mar. 1, 1965, and will be completed by Apr. 30, 1966. This will require an allocation of $30,588 for fiscal 1965, and $76,326 for fiscal 1966.

Concentration, Integration, and Diversification in Food Manufacturing

I. The purpose and introduction to the report.

(a) The purpose of the report.

(b) The place of food manufacturing in the American economy.

1. Its growth in output and employment.

2. The relationship between its growth and population distribution, consumer incomes, agricultural output and the organization of grocery distribution.

(c) A brief history of food manufacturing emphasizing the growth and development of four principal sectors: canning, baking, dairy and meat packing.

1. The early history.
2. The effects of the two world wars.
3. Changes occurring in the post-World War II period.
4. Current and future trends.

II. The organization and structure of food manufacturing.

(a) The extent of grocery manufacturing markets.

(b) Economies of scale in production.

1. Plant.
2. Multiplant.
3. Multiproduct.

(c) Economies of scale in distribution.

1. Advertising.
2. Product-line diversification.

III. Industry concentration trends.

(a) Changes in numbers of firms.

(b) Trends in overall concentration; 4, 8, 20, and 50 largest food manufacturers.

1. Trend in the size distribution of sales, assets, and profits.
2. Percent of concentration trend explained by increasing diversification of firms.
3. Percent of concentration trend explained by industry growth rates.

(c) Trends in product market concentration.

1. Value added by 4, 8, and 20 largest producers in 1947, 1954, 1958, and 1963.
2. Distribution of employment and shipments by degree of concentration in 1947, 1954, 1958, and 1963.

IV. Diversification and conglomeration in food manufacturing.

(a) Description of the character of the conglomerate firm in food manufacturing. Sketches of several leading conglomerates. Résumé of several conglomerate-dominated product areas including some which have only recently become dominated by large conglomerate firms.

(b) Analysis of the increasing conglomerate character of the 50 largest food manufacturers 1954–64.

(c) Analysis on a product-by-product basis showing the increasing number of top ranking seller positions occupied by 50 largest food manufacturers 1954–64. Also estimate on a product-by-product basis the brand shares controlled by 50 largest firms.

(d) The importance of conglomerate firms in the sale of new products developed after World War II.

V. Role of mergers in the growth of food manufacturers: 1950–64.

(a) Number and asset size distribution of food manufacturing mergers.

(b) Characteristics of acquiring firms.

(c) The contribution of mergers to the growth of large firms and to increases in the sales, assets, and profits concentration in overall food manufacturing and in three-digit industry groups.

(d) The contribution of mergers in extending the dominance of large conglomerate firms to new product areas and to product areas previously dominated by relatively specialized firms.

(e) The contribution of mergers to extending the participation of large advertisers to more and more food product areas.

VI. The condition entry in manufacturing.

(a) Economics of scale in plant operation as a barrier to new entry.

(b) Large scale advertising as a barrier to new entry: concentration of advertising expenditures and advertised brand sales; the cost advantage of large scale advertising; barriers to prime-time network television advertising.

(c) Direct distribution as a barrier to entry.

(d) A review of structural conditions faced by minor-brand producers and private-label suppliers. Summary of patterns of buyer-seller concentration found in FTC freezer, canner and frozen orange juice industry studies and a review of entry conditions in these industries.

(e) Characteristics of new entrant firms and smaller established firms in food manufacturing industries.

(f) New entry in food manufacturing effected through backward vertical integration by grocery retailers and wholesalers.

VII. Behavior and performance.

(a) Profits to net worth and sales classified by firm size, size of advertising expenditure and age of firm.

(b) Advertising expenditures and other attributes of nonprice competition.

(c) Antitrust action in the food manufacturing area.

1. The relationship between types of product industry structures and types and frequencies of antitrust violations.
2. Summary of food industry pricing practices and FTC price discrimination litigation over last decade—the problem paced by increasing conglomeration.

CONCENTRATION AND INTEGRATION IN FOOD RETAILING

I. NATURE AND OBJECTIVES

The study will deal primarily with the changing market structure of grocery retailing in recent decades—including concentration, vertical integration and barriers to entry—and analyze several of the most significant factors responsible for these changes, particularly the rise of the supermarket, the advantages of large-scale organization and mergers. The study will also analyze certain aspects of market performance in food retailing as reflected in marketing margins, promotional expenditures, and profits. (Attached is an outline of the subjects covered by the project.)

II. SOURCES OF DATA

The study will rely on information already available in the Commission's files, public sources and the Bureau of the Census.

III. PERSONNEL AND COST

The study can be completed in 6 months if staffed as follows:

1 economist (GS–15)	$8,230
1 attorney (GS–11)	4,325
1 economist (GS–9)	3,610
1 statistical assistant (GS–7)	3,025
2 clerk-typists (GS–5)	5,000
Estimated personnel costs	24,190
Overhead (22 percent)	5,322
Total	[1] 29,512

[1] This project is scheduled to begin Mar. 1, 1965, requiring an allocation of $19,674 for fiscal 1965 and $9,838 for fiscal 1966.

MARKET STRUCTURE, CONDUCT, AND PERFORMANCE IN FOOD RETAILING

I. Introduction.

(a) Nature and purpose of study.

(b) Place of food retailing in the economy.

1. Share of consumer's dollar—significance of this statistic.
2. Resources devoted to food retailing—assets and employees.
3. Contrast size of food retailing with other segments of retailing and economy.
4. Significance of retailing to farmers, processors and consumers.

(c) Emergence of large-scale retailing.

1. Birth and early growth of chains.
2. Development of voluntary and cooperative groups.
3. Integration of retailing, wholesaling and manufacturing functions.
4. Rise of the supermarket; (a) origin and growth; (b) the discount house.

II. Concentration in food retailing.

(a) The nature and measurement of market concentration.

(b) Relative growth rates of various size retailers.

(c) Expanding role of voluntary and cooperative chains.

(d) Changes in number of retailers—compared with population changes.

(e) Concentration of sales among food retailers in local markets—show changes in concentration between 1948 and 1963 in a large group of metropolitan areas.

(f) Concentration of purchases in local, regional and national markets.

(g) Some causes of increasing concentration.

1. Economies of large stores—made inevitable demise of many small stores.
2. Economies of large firms—contrast concept of "firm" and "store": (a) relationship between size and profits; (b) relationship between size and gross margins.
3. Shopping center problems and other barriers to entry.
4. Advantages of vertical integration and relationship between horizontal and vertical size (dealt with in detail under IV below).
5. Advantages of large-scale buying (dealt with in detail under VII below).
6. Advantages of conglomeration (dealt with in detail under V below).

III. Vertical integration.

(a) The nature and measurement of vertical integration.

(b) Early manufacturing by retailers.

(c) Nature and extent of vertical integration—changes over time.

(d) Changing patterns of vertical integration—particularly during and since World War II.

(e) Causes of vertical integration.

1. Economies of coordinated production and marketing.
2. Market structure reasons for integration.

IV. The conglomerate character of food retailers.

(a) Nature and measurement of firm conglomeration.

(b) Differences in absolute size among retailers.

(c) Multimarket character of large retailers—show increasing conglomeration of 20 largest retailers.

(d) Potential economic significance of conglomerate retailers.

(e) Contrast significance of conglomeration for corporate and affiliated chains.

V. Role of mergers in changing structure.

(a) Pre-1948 mergers in retailing.

(b) Post-1948 retail mergers.

1. Size distribution of acquired retailers.
2. Size distribution of acquiring retailers.
3. Importance of mergers to the growth of large retailers.
4. Types of retail mergers: (a) Horizontal—in retailing and in buying; (b) geographic market extension.
5. Contribution of mergers to retail concentration.
6. Reasons for retail acquisitions: (a) as viewed by buyers; (b) as viewed by sellers.

C. Acquisition of manufacturing operations.

1. Nature of acquired units.
2. Nature of acquiring retailers.
3. Contribution of acquisitions to growth.
4. Reasons for acquisitions.

(d) Mergers involving voluntary and cooperative groups.

1. Mergers among groups.
2. Acquisition of manufacturers by groups.
3. Contribution of mergers to growth.
4. Reasons for acquisitions.

(e) Competitive significance of mergers and acquisitions.

1. Horizontal acquisitions: (a) Contribution to concentration in selling; (b) contribution to concentration in buying.
2. Geographic market extension mergers: (a) Impact on potential competition; (b) impact on entry; (c) contribution to increased conglomeration of large retailers.

VI. Market conduct.

(a) Introduction—analysis of conduct restricted largely to data available in the Commission's files.

(b) Buying power of large buyers—this discussion will involve an analysis of all the Commission cases and consent orders in which large buyers allegedly received preferential treatment.

(c) Loss leader selling—the evidence available in the Commission's files on this subject will be reviewed.

(d) Subsidized expansion and overbuilding of supermarkets.

1. Theory of conglomerate firm's ability to subsidize entry and entrench itself.
2. Relationship between market position and profits.
3. Use of conglomerate derived power.
4. Contrast with independents, voluntary and cooperative chains.

VII. Industrial behavior.

1. Costs of distribution: (a) Changes in gross margins since 1920's; (b) gross margin by size of retailers; (c) comparison of particular cost items; (d) analysis of factors responsible for increasing distribution costs.
2. Profitability of food retailers: (a) Profits as a percent of sales; (b) profits as a percent of net worth; (c) relationship between profits and size; (d) relationship between profits and market position.
3. Relationship between market structure and gross and net margins.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I am glad to yield to a fellow Commission member, the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am sure all of you have been impressed with the statements that have been made by those of us who serve on the Food Marketing Commission. I was highly pleased when the President of the United States recommended to the Congress that this Commission be created. If he felt this study was necessary and the necessary information was not available as the Committee on Agriculture Appropriations seems to indicate it is, within the Department of Agriculture, there certainly would be no need for him to recommend that this Commission be created. Since it has been created, and I feel it is a high honor to serve as one of the five Members of the House, appointed by the Speaker, along with other distinguished members, I feel we have gotten our teeth into something that is going to be of really great benefit to the producers and to the consumers of America. I have been impressed with the work and the sincere way in which all of the members of the Commission have taken hold of this thing. I am particularly impressed with the House Members. I am also impressed with the Senate Members and especially impressed with the five members appointed by the President of the United States headed by the distinguished retired Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of California, Judge Gibson.

This is such a technical subject that it took some time to assemble a competent staff. We have, in my opinion, and I have been in a position to know being on the Civil Service Committee for 9 years, as I say, I am in a position to know people and their capabilities. I am certain that we have a very highly trained and capable staff. I would regret to see the work of this Commission handicapped because there is not a clear understanding on the part of the Appropriations Committee as to what we are trying to do. I know it would be a great disappointment and a letdown to the President of the United States if this money is not restored so that this Commission can continue its work and make its decisions and offer its conclusions.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I will ask permission to insert at this point telegrams that I received from interested groups, for example, from the National Grange who urge that the full appropriation be granted and the National Council of Farm Cooperatives and many others who are very much interested. They know the importance of this work and indeed would be very disappointed if we are not able to complete this important study which is going to be of so much benefit to the people of the United States. Certainly, we want to uphold the President of the United States who felt the urgency of this study and recommends that it be given the money which it needs to do its job.

These are the telegrams referred to:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 26, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The National Grange earnestly supports demands to restore Food Commission funds to agriculture appropriations bill. The enormous job which has been assigned to the Commission demands adequate funds for agencies who will be responsible for the development of the necessary information required by the Commission.

HARRY L. GRAHAM,
Legislative Representative, the National Grange.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 25, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge that every effort be made to restore the full budget of $1.5 million recommended by the administration for fiscal 1966 activities of the National Commission on Food Marketing. This matter is of greatest significance for long-range farm income and a healthy, efficient food marketing system.

The work of the Commission should be far broader than price spread study. There is urgent need for a searching and comprehensive investigation which will provide deeper understanding of the complex factors, including market structure and relative bargaining power, which determine prices, affect farm income, and set the future course for the food industry.

KENNETH D. NADEN,
Executive Vice President, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to see that this bill includes an appropriation of $2 million to begin the program of rural housing for domestic farm labor.

The lack of adequate housing has been one of the prime difficulties in recruiting and holding an adequate supply of domestic farm labor, and this appropriation is an important step in the right direction.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, this bill provides only one-fifth of the amount which had been authorized for this program and less than half of the $5 million appropriation which had been requested by the Department of Agriculture. I would hope, therefore, that this question could be reviewed at an early date and that consideration will be given to providing the full amount which has not only been requested but which is urgently needed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I wish to say at this point—and I rise only so that the record may be more complete—the Appropriations Committee feels that the National Commission on Food Marketing has a very excellent membership. We anticipate this Commission will render a great service. I know I speak for all members of the committee when I say that we strongly support them.

I do believe we should point out that the members of the staff of the Commission who were before our committee were unaware that there are now 1,000 employees doing this research work in the Department of Agriculture, and that they have been doing this type of research for many years.

I quote from the report:

> At the present time it has over 1,000 employees in the Economic Research Service conducting economic research on agricultural production, marketing and distribution. A complete description of the information available from the research projects of this agency is contained in the hearings on the 1966 budget—part 4, pages 518–539.

We further said:

> The Department should cooperate fully in bringing together all available information for the use of the Commission. To the extent necessary, it should temporarily assign personnel to the Commission to assist in developing and assembling the basic data required.

I say again that I do not know where one could find finer people than the members of this Commission. But research and activities of this kind in Government are so numerous as to be beyond my knowledge or anyone else of whom I know.

A few years ago we were asked for a quarter of a million dollars to provide a cold storage research unit at Peoria, Ill. It happened that I had been at Eglin Air Force Base, where they had a unit large enough for several boxcars, and I asked them whether they would be willing to use that facility. They said they surely would be. When inquiry was made of the Air Force, the Air Force said, "Sure, but why not use the one at Fort Belvoir, which is convenient?"

We point out that all of this information is available, in the hope that the Commission can bring the information together, simplify it, and get ahead with the job. I assure all Members that the committee does mean to support the Commission in the discharge of its duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, earlier it was brought out that the item for resource conservation and development of the Soil Conservation Service was reduced $1,490,000 from the administration's request of $4,303,000 to $2,813,000. This is almost a 35-percent cut. I realize the committee has its budgetary problems but the size of the cut in the budget for the Soil Conservation Service concerns me greatly. This is the item that provides technical assistance to local sponsors in planning and carrying out land conservation and land utilization projects in selected rural areas. It was authorized by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

Since this program was authorized 3 years ago the Congress has provided funds for only 10 pilot projects in 10 States. The administration has proposed that sufficient funds be appropriated for fiscal year 1966 to continue these 10 pilot projects and initiate 10 more. To do this, the administration proposed an appropriation of $4,303,000 for 1966. The Committee on Appropriations reduced the administration's request by $1,490,000. Personally, I do not believe we can spend money for a more worthwhile purpose.

Resource conservation and development projects are initiated and sponsored by local people to provide additional economic opportunities through accelerated conservation, development, and multiple use of natural resources. These are self-help projects that aid materially in making a better life in rural America. They provide new employment and other economic opportunities to local people. The work plans are developed with technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service and help from other cooperating Federal, State, and local agencies. The projects average two to three counties in size.

These projects are carried out with the cooperation of several governmental units. They are sponsored by governing bodies of soil and water conservation districts, county government, municipal government, and other local groups of citizens. Local leadership is the key. It organizes and directs the technical and financial resources of all participants to carry out the project plans.

All segments of the community—rural, surburban, and urban—can coordinate their activities toward a unified approach in meeting local problems and improving resource use. Often, the very act of taking stock of resources and planning together for their use stimulates people to carry out measures on their own.

I do not intend to offer an amendment today, but I hope the Senate committee looks at this cut closely. Thirty-five percent is a large cut for such a vital and important program. I think we should provide the funds to start at least 10 more projects in other States during the coming year.

I am informed that already the Department of Agriculture has applications for 22 projects. My congressional district is included in these applications. The "Top of the Ozarks" project covers Dent, Texas, and Shannon Counties in Missouri. It is sponsored by the three soil and water conservation districts which cover this area, by the three county courts, and the three extension councils. These groups have joined together in developing and filing an application for assistance in planning a better economic future for their community.

I am advised that this application is considered a sound proposal. The Governor of Missouri has concurred in it. Many local groups are supporting the application. It will mean much to the future development of this rural area. I am sure the same is true for similar areas in other States.

Encouraging and assisting the conservation and development of land and water resources so that people can continue to live in rural areas and small towns is the soundest investment that can be made.

The avalanche of mail that has reached Members of Congress in support of appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service to assist local soil and water conservation districts is evidence that this work has widespread support throughout the Nation.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us can be viewed with pride and satisfaction or with disgust and disappointment, depending on what our own individual interest may be. Strangely enough, the consumer is the one who may regard this bill with satisfaction, while the farmer will probably register some disgust. In fact, it can be said with some degree of validity that this bill has greater appeal and is of greater interest and importance to the consumer than it is to the actual farmer and the producers of food and fiber. For within these appropriations rests the assurance that the consumers in the United States will have an ample supply of food at a cost which, when related to the average income, is cheaper than it is anywhere else in the world, while to the farmer, the bill offers little or no assurance that his economic plight is going to be improved. This, of course, is true because moneys are provided herein to sustain the existing farm programs, leaving the farmer with an income potential that is comparable to the depression days of the 1930's.

This is the rather astonishing revelation that has come to a new member of the subcommittee. It has been a great experience to have had the opportunity to serve with the very able and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], as well as the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. All have displayed with distinction a knowledge that can be acquired only by years of dedication, study, and interest in the problems of agriculture. Farmers and consumers alike are fortunate indeed to have had the benefit of their services over the years. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULL] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] have likewise added greatly to the committee in its many and varied considerations.

I think it is well that we take a few moments to discuss the interests of the consumer as well as the farmer in the legislation that is before us. To begin with, what are some of the items in this appropriation that is of such great interest and benefit to the consumer? I shall try to identify but a very few of them.

May I first refer to page 52 of the committee report, title I, "General Activities." The first item we notice therein is Agricultural Research Service. Under this title, we find such items as general research, plant and animal disease and pest control, cooperative State research service, the Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, which has such items listed under it as watershed planning, watershed protection, flood prevention, the Great Plains conservation program, resource conservation and development, Consumer Marketing Service, agricultural conservation program, a cropland conservation program, conservation reserve program, emergency conservation measures, and a good many others.

And what have all of these got to do with the consumer? And how does he derive either any benefit or a direct interest in the money, that are expended for each of these many and varied programs?

It is within the scope of these programs that we in America have achieved the very enviable ability to produce food and fiber in not only sufficient quantity and excellent quality to take care of all of our own needs and demands, but also in such quantities that we are able to supply the needs of a great number of the rest of the nations of the world. Let me very briefly identify a few of them—for instance, the number of research projects that produce the new varieties of grain, the new strains of cattle, hybrid corn, or those that have prevented or eradicated the many and varied plant and animal diseases and pests.

I want to say to this House with all of the emphasis I can muster that if it had not been for the activities in the field of research in each one of these fields over the years, we as a nation would not have been in a position today to even raise our own needs of food and fiber. While it certainly is true that the results of research have a direct relationship to the production capacity and income of the farmer, it is just as true, and in my estimation, even more important, that they provide the assurance to the consumer that these foods are going to be available at a price he can pay. It is common knowledge to anyone who has been in the farming business for a number of years that there are many kinds of pestilence that constantly threaten production of any and all farm commodities. Let me recall very briefly, if you will, the experience that has been a threat to wheat farmers for as many years as I can remember; namely, the problem of rust.

We can go back all the way to the 1920's, and certainly it was true in the 1930's, that the rust epidemics were so bad that many burned entire fields of wheat because they were not worth harvesting. Now, had our research people not been able to produce new rust-resistant varieties, and to have done so consistently and periodically with the cycles that are characteristic of rust, this Nation would not be producing any wheat today. The same is true of almost every crop you can think of, and whether it be hybrid corn, a new variety of apples, hybrid chickens or turkeys, all of them have been responsible for the ability to improve the production that is so essential to today's supply of food and adequate diet that is available to every citizen of the United States.

It follows logically, and of equal importance, to note the work that has been done in the matter of conserving our Nation's soil. And whether it be the watershed planning programs, flood prevention, resource conservation and development, or the many other soil conservation programs, each of them is responsible for maintaining and improving the fertility and productiveness of the greatest natural resource we have; namely, a productive soil. A nation's growth, progress, and strength will never be any greater than its ability to supply its people with food and fiber, the very vital essentials of life. Often this asset is overlooked and not properly evaluated.

We might look for a moment at the conservation reserve program, which is generally known throughout the country as the soil bank, and has been labeled as a program whereby you pay someone for not raising something. However, there is another phase of this program that is equally worthy of our consideration, namely, that this is land that has been put aside because we do not need it at the moment, and so we conserve its fertility and its productive capacity for the day when we will need it—and that day may not be too far away, as we look at the continuous increase in population and at the same time note the continuous demand for land to provide adequate space for the housing, transportation and all of the many requirements that the increased population needs.

And so we see that every one of these programs bear great importance to the future well-being of this Nation and all of its people. Certainly the same can be said for adequate credit being provided through the Farmers Home Administration in order that the respective production units can be adequately financed, so they can meet the ever-increasing burden of necessary investments and production costs in order to keep up with the scientific developments that again have the effect of providing increased productive capacity.

Of equal importance is the special school milk program, the school lunch program, and yes, the consumer protective marketing and regulatory program, each of them making sure that there is adequate and proper distribution of foods, readily available to everyone, giving assurance that we will continue to be the best-fed Nation in the world. It is for these reasons that your committee has given long and tedious deliberation to each one of these appropriations, in order that we may strengthen, rather than weaken this Nation's productive capacity, and to provide production stability so that we will not be faced with the dangers of having our food supply curtailed or crippled by the unavoidable causes of nature that can bring disaster to the production of so many of our very vital crops.

It is for this reason that your committee saw fit to restore the hundred million dollars of moneys to the agricultural conservation program, because it is a program that deals specifically with the improved production capacity of a good many farms that would not be accomplished without the aid and the assistance of this kind of a program.

The results of research and conservation programs are so in evidence by the fact that it takes only 18 percent of the average family income in this country to adequately feed our people, whereas in many other countries, Russia, particularly, this same ratio is as high as more than 50 percent of the total average family income. This has been brought about because of research that has increased production by better yielding and better quality products. All of this has been accomplished in spite of the cost-price squeeze that is so well identified on page 3 of the committee report, which indicates the extent to which the cost of production has consistently gone up, and yet the prices received by the producers have just as consistently been going down, ever since 1945.

What a significant wealth this provides to this Nation and to its many people, whether we consider it from the standpoint of the supplies of food that we have and our ability to produce them, or we consider it from the standpoint of the available knowledge that is in our possession in order that we might be able to combat the many hazards that will come in the way of food production as we look to the years ahead, remembering that our demands are going to be greater, our resources are going to be smaller, and possibly the problems in connection with production are going to be even greater than those we have witnessed, experienced, yes, and conquered, up to this day.

The full scope of these results to the consumer, however, are not recognized until we begin to explore what these conditions might have been under other circumstances. Many of us remember the realities prior to World War II, and the events that have taken place since. I recall only too well when, prior to World War II, we then had the same problems that we have now, large surpluses of grains, of dairy products and food items in general, that were giving us great storage and production problems that had necessitated various control programs. World War II came along, and it was only a very short time until we found ourselves in exactly the reverse situation.

Let me again take wheat as an example of what I mean. In 1940 we had great supplies of wheat, as we have now. We filled commodity credit bins all over the country and were wondering what in the world we were going to do for additional storage space. Within a matter of less than 3 years, we not only had used up all of our supplies, we had increased our production capacity by removing all restrictions, and encouraged farmers to produce to capacity. I remember conducting meetings in which we were requesting wheat farmers to sweep out their granaries and bring to the market any amount that they might have, whether it be 5 bushels or 500 bushels, and offered to pay them 30 cents a bushel bonus just to deliver that wheat.

It might be well for us to very briefly recall, too, the ration stamps and how it was necessary to have a ration book with you at the store in order to buy meat, butter, sugar and many of the other essential food commodities. But possibly even more significant was the price of those commodities on the market at that time. Many of you, I am sure, remember that wheat was in excess of $3 a bushel, barley was $2.50, flax was high at $7.50, beef on the hoof was 35 cents a pound, but, you know, I do not recall hearing anybody complain that farmers were getting too much money even in those days; in fact, they were rather continuously encouraged to produce a little more at any cost. And so we see that these programs of research, of soil conservation and of providing an adequate knowledge of production abilities are actually a guarantee that we are not going to be faced with the problem of having to ration food or pay excessive prices, prices that might well be almost double of what they are in the market today.

These are but a few of the many fine returns that have resulted from research and conservation programs. This is not to say, however, that all moneys appropriated in these bills are necessarily well spent, for there is great opportunity for a duplication of effort, a waste of money in unnecessary programs that might much better be spent to explore new fields and problems that continually develop.

While the committee has done its very best in making these evaluations at this time, it should be kept in mind that a reassessment is always in order to make sure that the research and conservation dollar expenditure is most productive. To do so is truly in the best interests of the consumer and farmer alike.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. Yes, I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to say at this point, Mr. Chairman, that I do not know when I have seen a more able Member of Congress come to the Committee on Appropriations than the gentleman from Minnesota. It has been my pleasure to work with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the gentleman from Kentucky, and the other new Members on the Democratic side this year, all of whom have contributed greatly. But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota is making a very excellent presentation which clearly demonstrates the knowledge he exhibited throughout the hearings. I want the RECORD to show that the gentleman has and will continue to make a great contribution to American agriculture and to America, including the consumers.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my chairman for those very kind, gracious, and flattering remarks.

But, Mr. Chairman, what about the farmer? What assurance does he have that he will be amply rewarded for the work and the effort that he has put into this great national productive unit? I said at the outset that he might be inclined to view this expenditure of money with some disgust and some disappointment, and frankly, I think justifiably so. For the committee report, the many statistics that are contained in the hearings, some of which have been procured by testimony, others that have been procured by research and diligent work on the part of the committee staff, all indicate that the farmer's income has consistently gone down to the point where he is now faced with conditions that are comparable to the depression days of the 1930's. It matters not which of the many studies and analyses that have been made of the subject we use, whether it be taken from the Department of Agriculture's Farm Income Situation, or the Survey of Current Business as prepared by the U.S. Department of Commerce, or if it be taken from the Economic Indicators as prepared by the Joint Economic Committee, and I could go on and list a good many more, every one of them shows that the net income is down and that the farmer's return for his labor, management, and investment has decreased consistently. Our report indicates that the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar has dropped from 52 to 37 cents since 1945, and that his return on labor, management, and investment has dropped from 21.2 to 8.2 percent. This is further substantiated when we look at the extent to which farm indebtedness has grown during recent years, now having reached the point of where it amounts to $2.86 for every dollar of net income, which is serious when we consider the fact that it is more than 50 cents higher than it was in 1929, just before the crash and the great depression.

While there are large amounts of money appropriated to the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purposes of carrying out price-support programs and existing crop-control programs, they do not indicate that there is going to be any improvement in the farmer's income. In fact, in the analysis as prepared by the Department of Commerce, they state that the Department of Agriculture estimates the prices received by farmers for crops are likely to average lower in 1965 than in 1964, as further changes are made in Federal programs, with increases in various Government payments which will offset some of the revenues lost, as a result of lower market prices.

Obviously, this presents a problem that is worthy of our most serious consideration today, as we are concerned with appropriating the money to be expended in connection with these programs for fiscal year 1966. During the lifetime of farm programs, we have spent many billions of dollars seemingly to no avail, because the farmer's economic problems today are just as grave as they were 30 years ago at the beginning of these many farm programs.

While it is not the prerogative of your committee to change any of these items which are legislative matters, for we are confined to appropriating the moneys necessary with which to carry out the programs that are in existence and those that are to come, it still becomes a point for us to consider, whether or not adequate return is received for the moneys expended. It is my opinion, and I am sure one that is shared by a good many farmers, that we have not been getting our money's worth for these expenditures in recent years.

This is evidenced throughout the entire committee report showing the many inequities of farm income when compared to income in every other category of our populace and business enterprises. Whatever comparison one may want to make, they all come out exactly the same, whether we look at the farm income tax returns, which incidentally show that more than 34 percent of these returns show a net loss, as compared to a profit, or if we look at existing markets or price supports, all of them show an economic return for the farmer's efforts that is down substantially—and I cannot help but think what a calamity it would be if other segments of our Nation had experienced comparable reductions in income. Every other segment of our society has continuously enjoyed increases in income, which accounts for the increased cost of the things a farmer has to buy that are essential to his livelihood and operation needs. Yet, there are those who want to imply that there is a substantial degree of inefficiency when related to the production of food. This is one of the greatest fallacies that has been perpetrated on the American Nation in a good long time. The facts are that agriculture has been able to continue and even to expand its production capacity with a continuous reduced income, the increased food prices being accountable only to the cost of manufacturing and processing and marketing. Yet many of the same people who are prone to be critical of farm programs and farmers in general found it necessary to make responsive increases in their cost of operation, but continued to expect that farmers would produce in greater quantity for less.

The sad part of this story is that much of this economic distress that is so prevalent on farms today has actually been perpetrated by Government programs, policies, and expenditures. Government regulations have been somewhat responsible in varied degrees for minimum wages, limited workweek, even freight rates, taxes, interest, inflation, and many other factors, all of which increase the farmer's cost of production. Government has played an even greater role in establishing the present farm price structure by reduced support prices, curtailed production, and accumulated surpluses that are a constant depressing factor on prevailing market prices. Government as well has, through varied programs and huge expenditures, encouraged production by improved farming practices, irrigation projects, shifting of crops into areas that formerly did not produce such crops, and even more important, Commodity Credit sales on the domestic market have had a direct influence in curtailing market prices. That this is true is certainly emphasized by the Secretary's admission that these sales were necessary in order to make the present programs work. It is no wonder that the farmer may regard the appropriations in this bill with disgust when he recognizes that these moneys permit such actions to take place, making it more important to have the programs work than to permit a reasonable market price to prevail, which the program was designed to accomplish in the first place.

If this sounds like doubletalk, it is only because this is what such actions actually are.

Within the realm of these varied Government activities as they relate to production costs and available prices we certainly find a substantial Government responsibility for the deplorable conditions that prevail today. These facts set forth very clearly the responsibility of Government to accomplish an improved income and economic opportunity for the producers of food and fiber, by virtue of conditions that it has played a significant part in creating.

It was generally accepted in the 1930's that 75 percent of parity of income was then inadequate, and I am sure that it is just as inadequate today, more than 30 years later. It was the prime purpose in establishing the Commodity Credit Corporation and commodity credit loans at that time to raise the market prices by using this means of keeping excess commodities off the market, thereby permitting orderly marketing with supply and demand functioning to improve prices. Under the present system, as I indicated earlier, the Commodity Credit Corporation now actually uses its stocks and authorities for purposes of depressing the market and preventing the normal market response to supply and demand. Such policies can only place further responsibility directly on Government for the prevailing undesirable price conditions.

It is no wonder that farmers are further disturbed when they then note that because of these conditions there are further Government suggestions that we now remove more than 2½ million families from farms into other occupations, seemingly because other occupations are more profitable and would provide a better income for these individuals.

Their only justification for making these suggestions seems to be that we are going to get rid of small, inefficient family operations, expecting that we can produce the same amount of food on larger operations for less money. This is a rather unique suggestion, when we note the history of present-day agriculture around the world, with Russia having by far the highest percentage of cost for food of the average family income of any nation in the world, and that this is also where we find the largest farms, with the greatest direction and regulation by government.

We might do well to give some sincere thought to the many further problems that would come to rural areas were such a suggestion to become a reality. The movement of 9 million people into other occupations and metropolitan areas would create a very resounding effect on the entire makeup of our country in the future. It would generate many unthought of problems to rural communities, local units of government, such as the township, the county, the school district, and even States, which in turn would have further far-reaching effects on educational systems, churches, employment and unemployment problems, welfare, retraining costs, and many others.

I have sincerely felt that all of these items are of such importance to the future of our entire Nation that it is imperative that we give thought to them as we continue to appropriate moneys for Government activities that are so directly related to the future of every segment of our populace and every sector of our country.

While I heartily recommend this bill to the House, and commend the committee for its deliberations, wisdom, and judgment in establishing the appropriations at these levels, I do so only with the hope that future appropriations may find expenditures of these moneys serving an improved purpose with better results to rural America.

May I further encourage every Member of this House and every citizen with either a consumer or an agricultural interest to read and study the committee report as well as the committee hearings, for they contain information with which we must be conversant if we hope to accomplish the previously stated objectives in the future.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, today the House is considering one of the most important appropriations measures of this session—the agriculture appropriations bill.

American agriculture provides jobs for 12 million people and profits for hundreds of thousands of businesses. Farming alone employs 6.1 million workers—more than the combined employment of the transportation, public utilities, steel, and auto industries. The farmer and his family spend about $40 billion a year for goods and services, and their products make possible an $80 billion a year food industry.

Farming uses more petroleum than any other industry and one-third as much steel as the auto industry. Agriculture's assets of $230 billion are about equal to two-thirds of the current assets of all U.S. corporations; or about three-fifths of the market value of all corporation stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

This massive industry also provides the American people the greatest bargains in the history of food marketing. The average American family spends less than 19 percent of its take-home pay for food. We pay 72 percent more for medical care than we did in 1950, 52 percent more for professional services, 37 percent more for housing, and 38 percent more for transportation; but we pay the farmer 15 percent less for his products than we did in 1950. In addition, last year this efficient industry, composed of only 8 percent of the American people, provided agricultural exports worth over $6 billion, thus contributing a net of $2.3 billion to our trade balance situation.

In view of these figures, it is obvious that American agriculture represents the greatest success story of all time. Yet, the people directly responsible for this success, the people on America's family farms, are not receiving their fair benefit from this abundance. The per capita income of Americans on farms is less than two-thirds of that received by nonfarm people—about 63 percent. The cause is obvious—farm production expenses have followed the rising trend of our overall economy, while farm receipts have languished at levels reminiscent of the 1930's.

In 1947 farm production expenses averaged 57.6 percent of cash receipts. Last year this figure was 80.1 percent and rising. The 1933 figure was 80.9 percent. While retail food prices have increased 29 percent in the past 16 years, net farm income has gone down 29 percent. In the last 4 years the costs of farm production increased more than $3 billion. The $700 million increase in realized net farm income reported by the Department of Agriculture during the last 4 years is actually in terms of inflated dollars—not real dollars. The real dollar increase, in terms of 1960 dollars, was only $200 million—far below the great increase enjoyed by other segments of the economy. The number of farmers reporting a net loss increased from 29.8 percent in 1962 to 34 percent in 1963. Only 15.4 percent of the business and professional group showed a net loss for 1963.

The evidence of the cost-price squeeze as revealed in the committee report on this bill would stagger the confidence of any corporation executive. I quote from that report:

> While the gross national product has increased from $214 billion in 1945 to $622 billion in 1964, while annual per capita nonfarm income has increased from $1,164 to $2,181 during this period, while average gross hourly earnings for factoryworkers have gone down from 22.7 to 18 percent of consumer income, compared to 50 percent or more in much of the rest of the world, the farmer's share of the consumer food dollar has declined from 52 to 37 cents, and his return on labor, management, and investment has decreased from 21.2 percent to 8.2 percent.

The report goes on to note that from 1945 to 1964, average farm investment went up 377 percent, farm debt went up 334 percent, and net income as a percent of investment went down 61.3 percent. Farm indebtedness increased $12 billion, from $26.2 billion to $38.3 billion in the last 4 years alone.

These figures are necessarily cold and stark, but the problems created are human. A constituent of mine, a farm wife with seven children, expressed the common plight of America's family farmers. She and her family run a 240-acre grain and dairy farm, a $100,000 investment. They produce between $15,000 and $20,000 in gross sales per year which brings a net profit of $3,000. In her own words, "We do our job 100 percent, our return is 75 percent."

For another viewpoint, I include at this point in my remarks the Grain Terminal Association "Daily Radio Round-up" for May 19:

Daily Radio Roundup

> A farmer who runs his own spread is called a "sole proprietor" in official Government lingo. In 1963 there were 3.2 million of these sole farm proprietors filing income tax returns with the Federal Government. Only 8 percent of them had adjusted gross incomes of $10,000 or more for the year of 1963. And it is shocking to learn that only 6 percent of that higher income group reported net incomes, after expenses, of $10,000 or more.
>
> Let's see how many farmers we're talking about here. Eight percent of 3.2 million sole proprietor farmers is 256,000. That's the number of farmers who had adjusted gross incomes in the $10,000-and-above category. But only 6 percent of them reported a net income of $10,000 or more. That's only 15,360 farmers.
>
> We're informed by the Budget Bureau that these high-production farmers are among the best in the Nation. It says they are all making money. No need to worry about them. But apparently the Budget Bureau people haven't been doing their homework on the Internal Revenue reports. When only one-half of 1 percent, or 1 out of 200 farmers, made a net income of $10,000 or better, despite their huge investments in land, management, and equipment, something is very, very wrong.
>
> Well, Congress is going to take a look at food marketing to see if there is too much margin between the farm and the consumer's dinner table. Maybe there's something there. Maybe not. Last year farmers received 37 cents out of each dollar consumers spent for food at retail. Believe it or not, they used to receive 51 cents. That was back in 1947.
>
> This marketing study is an important thing. It is being made by the National Commission on Food Marketing, and it will be a whopper of a study. Congress created the Commission last year at President Johnson's urging. It is made up of 15 people—5 Senators, 5 Representatives, and 5 people from the public.
>
> A real hard-rock study of food marketing has been needed for some time for many reasons. One of them is to find out just how many food marketing corporations are getting into farming itself.
>
> We doubt very much, however, that it will be able to raise the 37-cent share that the farmer gets from the consumer's food dollar. There are many reasons why the farmer's share is down. We all know that. But it doesn't take a college economist to discover the main reason which is simply that farm prices are down—way down from what they were back in 1947.
>
> The radish farmer gets less per radish. The wheat farmer gets less per bushel. The dairy farmer gets less per gallon. The livestock farmer gets less per pound.
>
> Meanwhile, the consumer pays more for the finished food product than he did back in 1947. So naturally the farmer's share is down. It couldn't be otherwise.

> A study commission has no authority to force the food industry to trim its charges, and there is no real evidence that those charges are out of line. But even if those charges could be trimmed a few million here and there, would it be of any benefit to farmers? We doubt it. What farmers need are better prices for what they produce and sell. This food marketing study is a good thing, we're sure, but what concerns the farmer most are the prices he receives at the tailgate of his truck.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Department of Agriculture will get its money from this bill. But will the Department do its job? It has always been my understanding that this Department was created for the benefit of farmers in the overall economy. Yet last week the Secretary of Agriculture revealed that the benefits from $2 of every $3 spent by the Department go to groups other than farmers. It was earlier revealed by the Secretary that at least one function of the Department was being conducted in a way so as to promote other Government programs, not to benefit the farmer.

Every year Congress dutifully appropriates money to the Department, presumably to benefit our farmers. For every dollar spent in 1948 for the stabilization of farm prices and income, $25 are spent today. In 1933 there was 1 USDA employee per 203 farmers; today there is 1 per 32 farmers. What are all these people doing? It is obvious that they are not helping the farmers. We do know that some of them are engaged in formulating import policies which allowed $31.1 billion worth of supplementary agricultural products to be imported at the same time that we were spending $23.4 billion to stabilize domestic prices for these same competitive crops. We also know that in 1963 some USDA employees were organizing Federal irrigation projects which produced $189 million worth of cotton while the CCC was realizing a loss of $171 million on the cotton program. Also in 1963 the soil bank program cost the Government $311 million while forage crops irrigated by Federal projects were valued at $266 million. It obviously requires many great minds to formulate the intricate CCC grain policies in which one arm sells Government grain stocks at low prices to raise money for the Bureau of the Budget while the other arm is forced by law to buy wheat on the resulting low grain market. The plan to cut appropriations from one of the few successful Government programs—the soil conservation program—also requires astute planning. Perhaps the money is being used to hire part-time employees to fill in while departmental executives are scattering around the country to explain to farmers why they have now been declared geographically disadvantaged; enough scattering to increase the average annual travel expenses almost $14 million since 1960 over the 1953–60 average. I must say it takes a certain degree of administrative genius to be able to remove agriculture from the Department of Agriculture.

I did not rise to protest appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. On the contrary, I wholeheartedly support any assistance to America's farmers. Certainly the concept of subsidies is not an exclusive privilege of agriculture. Extensive subsidy programs aid business, labor, homeowners and tenants, veterans, foreign countries, and others. What I do protest is the misuse of these funds. The benefits simply are not reaching the intended recipients. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will consider this today and later, when the farm bill is presented.

There are those who would allow rural America to become dominated by larger and larger farms. The President's Budget Director stated early this year, that 2½ million farmers of America would have to leave their farms and seek their livelihood in other occupations. The President's budget message to the Congress this year stated: "Farming alone cannot be expected to provide a decent living in the future for more than 1 million farm families, even with Government assistance." These are ominous statements which show little regard for the welfare of some 30 percent of the U.S. population living in rural communities of up to 2,500 and on the farms surrounding them.

Let me at this point quote a statement which reads like a prediction of things to come if we stop to consider the full impact of present policies and trends in this great Nation of ours:

> Economic causes are generally regarded as decisive. There was a trend prior to the fall of the Empire toward the development of large estates, with the progressive concentration of wealth in the hands of the few. Small-scale farmers, unable to compete with the large plantations, began migrating toward the cities, causing excessive urbanization and consequent unemployment. Periodic land distribution failed to arrest this trend and ultimately there developed a great expanse of abandoned agricultural lands. Increased relief for the poor in the cities necessitated heavier taxation, which in turn drove greater and greater numbers into the ranks of those receiving relief.
>
> Heavy taxation became almost prohibitive to industry. There were, moreover, inequalities in assessment and collection. The wealthy people often avoided paying their share, the poor were unable to pay, so the burden inevitably fell with proportionately greater weight on the middle class. Consequently, there was a progressive curtailment of the latter class and the development of an ever-widening gap between the rich and the poor.
>
> Another reflection of the economic strains in the Empire was the depreciation of the currency. And with the decline in its purchasing power, commerce dwindled at an alarming rate. Merchants were further discouraged when the Government impressed shipowners into grain trade where profits were small.

Much as it may sound like a description of the United States of America, 1984, the preceding statement is actually a quote from the Encyclopedia Britannica analyzing the decline and fall of the Roman Empire in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to make inquiry about the status of some documents involved in the feed grains program since it was inaugurated back in 1961. This program has provided that incentive payments to farmers be not in cash, but payment in kind, that is directly from Government stocks of grains. But in the operation of the program instead of the farmers actually receiving Government stocks and thus truly getting a payment in kind, the Department of Agriculture has seen fit to go through a different procedure under which the Secretary of Agriculture assists the individual farmer in marketing these payment-in-kind certificates.

So that as a matter of fact, immediately upon the farmer receiving the cash the Secretary of Agriculture takes the farmer's payment-in-kind certificate with the understanding that the farmer sell an equivalent amount of corn in order to get the money back into the Treasury to replace money earlier paid to the farmer.

Well, the truth is that this has been going on only partially. To call the program a payment-in-kind program is a partial fiction because we have had a steady accumulation of these payment-in-kind certificates on the desk of the Secretary of Agriculture. As of April 30 the combined feed grain value of certificates issued for the crop years 1962, 1963, and 1964 that have never been retired is $1,671,125,685.

Today if the Secretary of Agriculture would sell all the Government holdings in feed grains in order to retire these feed grain certificates, he would still have a sizable quantity of certificates left over. In other words, we have more "in kind" certificates than we have "in kind."

I inquire of the committee if any thought was given in your proceedings to appropriating enough cash to take these unprocessed certificates out of circulation so that the Secretary of Agriculture would no longer have the opportunity to sell certificates in massive quantities at a low price.

Government feed grain stocks would be sold normally by the Secretary of Agriculture at not less than 105 percent of support prices plus carrying charges. To redeem these certificates, however, the Secretary can sell at market price regardless of its level. So he theoretically can market all of the corn he now holds at 100 percent of support level—not 105 percent—and thus depress the market price of the corn.

So I raise the question to the members of the committee if any consideration has been given to this problem. The fact that these certificates have not been fully processed and retired each year and this gigantic warehouse full of payment-in-kind certificates keeps building up year after year in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture should be a matter of concern.

I wonder if any member of the committee can shed some light on this?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois, that the committee gave no attention to providing funds to meet the problem which the gentleman has described. I have no reason to differ with the gentleman's statement as to the facts because I had been unaware of them and have not had the problem called to my attention. Taking the facts to be as presented by the gentleman, were that many certificates floating around or remaining in the hands of the Department, I can see a problem really could be created. I was one of those who went along at the outset with a feeling of some misgivings, and may I say there are not too many farm laws about which I do not differ in certain respects. But we were trying to get participation in programs and trying to keep the nonparticipant from reaping a bonanza and there was some need to put feed grains and other commodities on the market so as to keep the thing in balance.

I can only say to the gentleman that in view of his statement I would be glad to join with my colleagues and have an investigation of this matter. It really involves ascertaining the facts at some early date, so as to see what was the effect, and what remedy may be provided. I have done that consistently in the years I have been chairman, of course with the cooperation of the minority on the committee.

The circumstances described, I can see, could lead to serious results if the power were improperly used.

Mr. FINDLEY. I might say to the gentleman that the expectation is that by the end of the new crop year we will have an accumulation of unretired certificates valued at about $2.5 billion. It looks like the problem is getting worse instead of better.

I thank the gentleman for giving this his attention.

Mr. WHITTEN. If I may, I wish to point out one other thing. In our report we called on the Department, when making payment in kind, to make it mean what it says.

Mr. FINDLEY. As a matter of fact, it is a misnomer. It cannot accurately and properly be called a payment-in-kind program. It is only partially so. It is getting out of hand.

Mr. WHITTEN. I say, we call on them to restore that program to a payment-in-kind basis.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. The gentleman mentioned the fact that the release price would be 105 percent of support, for example, on corn. Is it not true that with respect to offgrade commodities—I do not know how that determination is made—those can be sold at much lower prices? Our office did some checking on the Commodity Credit Corporation offices throughout the United States. We found that some grain sold for as low as 19 percent of parity, and other grain at 40 or 50 or 60 percent of parity. Much of this is very good feed, in spite of the fact that it may be offgrade. The integrated operator can buy this, in competition with the farmers on fixed cost. It is a terrible problem for the small family farmer. I am sure the gentleman has reviewed that problem.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, there are several aspects of this year's agricultural appropriations bill which deserve the attention of all concerned about the future of the American farmer.

At the outset, let me say that the reduction of over $1 billion in this year's budget is certainly a step in the right direction. But let us never overlook the most important fact which is behind every effort on behalf of the American farmer and rancher, namely the imperative need to preserve the family farm.

I must admit that the President's budget message statement that "in the future farming can be expected to provide a decent living for only about 1 million farm families" gave little reason for optimism about the administration's plan for our American farmers. It is indeed frightening to think what would happen to the economy of my State, South Dakota, or the national economy for that matter, if more than 2.5 million farmers were forced off the land and sent to the city to join the ranks of the unemployed.

It is therefore with great assurance that I read in the committee's report that "the elimination of small family farms as part of our national existence would seriously increase our social and welfare problems in every urban area in the United States" and "it is apparent, therefore, that the only practical approach to the farm problem is to continue programs which will make it possible for the present 3.5 million farmers to earn a living on the farm."

At the same time, however, there are several other portions of the bill which need special consideration.

One of the most important of these areas is the appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service and the agricultural conservation program. The committee is to be commended for its wise action in restoring funds for these programs. I sincerely hope that this action will be sustained.

The decisions of the committee to restore these funds and refuse to follow the dictates of the State Department and the Bureau of the Budget seems to indicate that Congress at last may be realizing that the agricultural appropriations bill should be for the good of the farmer and the good of this country, instead of for the good of the Budget Bureau and the freetraders who would leave the American producer with little or no protection for his livelihood.

As I stated in testimony before the committee on this subject, any reduction of funds from the current level will not only set back the efforts of conservation practices by decades, but will threaten an already lagging rural economy.

According to facts released by the South Dakota State Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, from January 1, 1960 through December 31, 1964, South Dakota's farmers and ranchers paid land improvement contractors over $13.3 million for moving 66 million cubic yards of earth to install engineering-type conservation practices. During this same period, farmers and ranchers cooperating with their soil and water conservation districts to develop a conservation program on their land, planted 27,500 acres of trees and purchased $12 million worth of seeds and materials to carry out their programs. All figures combined show that the impact upon South Dakota's economy is nearly $35 million in 5 years—a capital investment in South Dakota's two basic natural resources—soil and water.

But South Dakota's land and water resources are more than year to year economics. They are the space and setting for future growth which meets the goal of using each acre to its fullest capabilities and treating each acre according to its needs.

The result of reducing funds for the conservation program would be the collapse of the entire movement. It is estimated that if these funds are not kept at the current spending level and if the new revolving fund program is established, there will be a 40- to 50-percent decrease in participation.

The reasons for this are relatively simple. With rural income lagging, and with the parity price at the lowest level in 31 years, the farmer cannot meet the required 50-percent share of the cost of conservation programs and will simply not apply for assistance. Thus, a reduction of funds and the establishment of the new revolving fund technique would penalize the smaller farmers who can least afford the assistance, but who are most in need of the aid.

Another significant reason why the funds must be restored to the current level is the fact that the work of the soil and water conservation movement is far from completed. A recent survey indicates that districts are short 1,518 man-years of SCS technical assistance needed to meet the existing backlog of applications for such help.

But the aspect of a cut in funds that is most frightening is the fact that the reduction would have a snowballing effect. In other words, abandonment of the Federal Government's traditional policy of providing technical assistance would be taken as a cue for others. The action no doubt would be followed by decreased State and local appropriations and contributions to this work, which now amounts to approximately $44 million a year. To slow the program down at this time is unthinkable.

The effect of not sustaining the committee's action or not continuing the present program would be to charge the American farmer for technical assistance which is now being provided by the Federal Government to the people of many foreign countries. Evidently, the administration is very willing to spend billions of dollars abroad to encourage production and conservation so foreign agricultural goods can be imported back to the United States and drive down domestic prices, but at the same time it is unwilling to maintain the present level of assistance to the American farmer.

It seems apparent that those who propose to cut funds for conservation practices fail to realize that the farmer is an underprivileged group in the Great Society, and any reduction is another serious threat to the backbone of our entire national economy—the prosperity and progress of our rural areas, in particular the well being of our farmers who are so dependent upon effective conservation practices and assistance.

The entire future of the soil and water conservation program is at stake, and soil conservation district leaders and their followers are extremely alarmed at the threats a reduction poses to this movement. The future of this program is at stake right now before this body, and it is for this reason that I urge and strongly recommend that the appropriations for both the Soil and Water Conservation Service and the agricultural conservation program be kept at the 1965 fiscal year level.

I should also like to express my concern over the appropriations which have been earmarked for some of the agricultural research projects abroad. More than $500,000 is directed for Nasser's Egypt, the very dictator who recently told our Government to "go drink sea water." Another quarter million is slated for research projects in Communist Yugoslavia, and among the 70 contracts that have been concluded with Communist Poland, one for research on the physiology of the Colorado beetle. It is extremely unfair to the American taxpayer and the American farmer to be more concerned with beetle research behind the Iron Curtain than with the agricultural problems that plague us here at home. It is unfair to the farmer to pump a half-billion dollars into a tyrant's agricultural program in the Middle East and then claim that, in the interests of economy, we should attempt to cut funds for conservation practices in the United States.

The third area of concern over the present bill is with regard to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The CCC will receive over two-thirds of this year's appropriation, or more than $4 billion. There have been many reports recently and much concern registered over the dumping of grains upon the market by the CCC to lower prices. It is a sad commentary upon our farm program when the Secretary of Agriculture openly admits that the feed grain stocks held by the CCC were dumped on the market last year to hold prices down. I have sponsored legislation which would prohibit the CCC from selling grain at less than 125 percent of the amount they have invested to halt this flagrant violation of the farmer's right to receive decent prices for his crops. I sincerely hope this matter will be given just and immediate attention.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support this appropriation bill, H.R. 8370, which we are considering today. I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the committee for the manner of presenting this measure. I am pleased that manpower considerations have restricted hiring, especially here in Washington. The farmer is caught in a cost-price squeeze, and his investment is some five times what it was in 1945. Smaller farms must be preserved, but we must recognize the value of the commercial farmer. As much as I find it desirable to get the Government out of the farming business, I see no alternative except to continue most of our farm programs. The export market cannot be forgotten. The extension service, the Soil Conservation Service, and the ASCS are indispensable. Seldom do I fear we do too little, but I am concerned that this recommended reduction is, perhaps, excessive as compared to other agency appropriations. Last year we appropriated $1,134,511,200 more for the Department of Agriculture than we are appropriating this year. Yes, I do disagree with certain acts of the Department of Agriculture and some of their programs, but in spite of this I support this bill and hope all Members will do the same.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] for the excellent statement he made a few moments ago. I want to join with him in saying that despite the billions of dollars which have been pumped out by Congress, supposedly to stabilize the economy of agriculture, the result has been to stabilize at around 75 percent of parity, and the American farmer will always be in trouble at 75 percent of parity.

What I really arose to do was to ask a few questions concerning the some 40 pages of research projects in foreign countries which are to be found listed in fine print in the hearings.

The gentleman made some reference to the amount of money being spent upon research by the Department of Agriculture. How much was that amount?

Mr. MICHEL. Specifically the amount of foreign currency research?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether it is foreign currency. This I should like to ascertain.

Mr. MICHEL. If it is the item of foreign currency for research, that is a $2 million item.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the 40 pages of research projects active under Public Law 480 agreements. What are those?

Mr. MICHEL. As I understand it, under each of our Public Law 480 agreements, there is a provision that 2 percent of the amount can be convertible currency upon our demand, for uses of this kind. That is the way most of these research projects came about, through the convertibility which the Department has by way of Public Law 480 agreements.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot help wondering why I find here thousands upon thousands of dollars for research projects in Great Britain.

What in the world are we doing spending that kind of money on so-called agricultural research in the British Isles?

Mr. MICHEL. Well, the explanation we get as laymen is that in some areas of the country research can be carried on only in particular climate zones or under certain environmental conditions. I will grant you that the publishing of some of these particular titles of research projects is very embarrassing to the Congress and more so to the individual members of this committee but it is asked for and it is disclosed for the benefit of the public and we have to do the best we can to live with it.

Mr. GROSS. In Turkey we are spending $29,361 for the development of an odor-measuring device or instrument.

Mr. MICHEL. Of course, the gentleman will remember some time ago that the bean producers in the State of Michigan wanted some research done to see what we could do about taking the gas out of beans so that they would be more edible. I think it was probably a very legitimate request. This is a request which closely parallels that kind of thing.

Mr. GROSS. If they are successful in developing an accurate odor-measuring device in Turkey, they might make it available to the other body so they will not have to buy fragrant air bombs by the case.

In Switzerland there is a study of the chemistry and structural nature of the bonds formed between formaldehyde and cellulose and formaldehyde-treated cottons to provide basic information needed to improve the utility of cotton fabrics. That calls for $64,902. Is not Switzerland, whose finances are in far better shape than those of this country able to carry on its own research? Why is the U.S. Government spending our taxpayers' money on this sort of thing?

Mr. MICHEL. Of course, the gentleman appreciates, I am sure, that this is not for the sole benefit of Switzerland or for the countries in which the research is engaged in, but it is really to inure to the benefit of the citizens of the United States by way of getting a better deal for the particular specialists in that field, to enable them to do it at a lesser cost than what they can do it for at home.

Mr. GROSS. You do not say anything about that in your hearings.

Mr. MICHEL. I think we could probably put a better explanation in for each one of these items, but I do not think we have that time.

Mr. GROSS. Is this to develop better fabrics so that they can import them into the United States and displace our textile workers and industry?

Mr. MICHEL. I think the real intent and purpose is to do just the opposite, namely, to utilize more of our domestic cotton for export to these countries than we do.

Mr. GROSS. Why do you suppose we would be spending $75,276 in Spain for a study of food consumption in relation to family income in the rural population in

Spain? I cannot believe the Government of Spain does not already have this information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. In connection with the first point, and so that there will be no misunderstanding in the RECORD, these are foreign currencies which, other than being used for these projects, would be kept in those countries. So we are using foreign currencies that we would not otherwise use. These funds are already generated.

With regard to Great Britain, we have a total of 10 projects and each of them develops additional basic information on cereal grains to improve their acceptance by industry. In addition to the two projects on disease of sheep, scrapie, there are other projects to find nontoxic oxidant products which may be used in a wide range of foodstuffs.

The point I wish to make is our research people agree with these areas we have worked on and agree that it is to our benefit, and we are using money that we do not think we would have any other use for at all.

Mr. GROSS. It is our money, is it not? Incidentally, I note there are listed some 24 projects in Britain.

Mr. WHITTEN. It was our money when through foreign aid we made the money available over there. It is our problem after we have done that through foreign aid to try to get something out of it. That is what these research projects are for.

Mr. GROSS. In Poland, we are carrying on research in the amount of $20,265 for——

Mr. WHITTEN. Those are foreign currencies. Let us keep the record straight in terms of dollars. These are not dollars, but in foreign currencies the amounts the gentleman refers to.

Mr. GROSS. It is still our money that is being spent for purposes that I say are unjustified.

Mr. WHITTEN. But it is under an agreement that we cannot bring those currencies back; we have to use them there.

Mr. GROSS. In Poland an investigation on blood groups in a new racial group of the "Zlotnicka pig." That is in the amount of $20,556.

Another in Poland: "Secretion of anterior pituitary hormones and ovulation in small ruminants"—whatever that is. That comes to $52,456.

I suppose that if this research is worth anything we get it back in canned hams from Poland, better and more salable hams, to destroy the market for American farmers.

In Japan, there is an "Investigation of crosses of Saccharomyces rouxii isolated from the soybean fermentations, shoyu and miso, and an evaluation of their fermentative abilities in these fermentation processes, as a basis for increasing the use of soybeans and wheat in fermented foods."

Here we may be contributing something over $44,000 to produce a new brand of liquor in Japan.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MICHEL. I am not prompted by the gentleman's mention of liquor, but rather his mention of soybeans. The gentleman's district, I am sure, produces just as many soybeans as we do in our district. It is one of the best export crops in the country. Last year alone we sold to Japan $100 million worth of soybeans. Why? Because under this research we have been able to learn to grow the kind of soybeans which the Japanese prefer.

Mr. GROSS. The Japanese seem to be pretty well stocked with scientists, and I think they ought to spend their own money for research.

Mr. MICHEL. But they are doing the research for us to grow better beans.

Mr. GROSS. They are not going to spend their money for research if we are willing to dish out our money for that purpose.

Mr. MICHEL. But it is to our benefit, is it not? Would the gentleman prefer that we exported $50 million worth of soybeans next year or $100 million worth?

Mr. GROSS. Do we have to pay for the research in order to sell them beans, probably at bargain prices?

Mr. MICHEL. It was a very worthwhile expenditure. They are doing the research in a laboratory in my hometown. And I can enumerate another one, if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. GROSS. In Israel, there is this research item "Establishment and maintenance of seeded dryland range under semiarid conditions."

The gentleman does not want to tell me that they do not know how to seed dry land over in Israel; that we have to provide them the money to carry on a research project costing $101,000 so they will know how to plant seed on dry land? I give them credit for more intelligence than that.

Also in Israel: "Performance and scientific design of sprinklers used for irrigation."

Do you mean to tell me that the people of Israel do not know how to make a sprinkler that will serve their needs?

Mr. Chairman, this is loaded.

In Belgium we have this item: "Search for lytic ezymes of microbial origin with activity on cell walls of bacteria actinomycetes, molds, and yeasts to provide a basis for the development of new fermentation processes for the increased utilization of cereal grains."

I would not be surprised to learn that is research for the purpose of making beer in Belgium.

In Brazil we have: "Structural and physiological characteristics associated with adaptability of cattle in tropical and subtropical areas."

Also in Brazil: "Biology and breeding of honey bees, $27,531." I thought we had long since spent all the money we were going to spend on the love life of the bees. But here we are again.

In Chile there is a study on the effect of growth regulators in pine meristems. That calls for $31,406.

In Colombia, a biochemical study of vinegar flies. That is $31,000.

In Colombia again, basic studies of physiological changes in the transition from juvenile to mature stage in certain forest trees.

What is the change from juvenile to mature stage in certain forest trees? Some of the experts on forestry explain that one.

In Egypt, improving and evaluating the Fayoumi and Dandarawo fowls. It is costing us $131,000 to tell Nasser how to develop chickens in Egypt.

Also in Egypt, induced sterility of males of the Mediterranean fruit fly. That is a $84,790 research project.

In India, an investigation on milk and the meat potentialities of Indian goats. That is $100,000. Why, they had goats in India before we had goats in the United States. The Indians must have known a century or more ago the potentiality of goats for producing milk and whether they are good to eat. But we are over there spending $100,000.

Mr. Chairman, I give up and yield back the balance of my time—no, wait a minute.

Here is the rhinoceros beetle about which I inquired earlier this afternoon. Here, after all, we have a research project in India in the amount of $82,155 on the rhinoceros beetle. I am glad to know that so I can try to cut it out of the South Pacific Commission's appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, our friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has a wonderful time with these matters. But I would repeat for the RECORD again that these are foreign currencies which have been generated under the foreign aid program and this bill carries funds to restore capital impairment under foreign programs for sales under Public Law 480. These research projects are financed from foreign currencies and not American dollars. They use foreign currencies that otherwise we would have no use for. It has been decided that this research is to our advantage.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Mediterranean fruit fly, I believe we spent about $10 million trying to eradicate it from the State of Florida.

Then there was the situation with reference to the foot-and-mouth disease problem wherein we spent $150 million trying to clean it out of Mexico in order to keep it from coming over here.

I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that these diseases and insects we do not want in this country should be studied in these other countries where they already have the problem and where we can use the local currency already owned by this country and which we cannot bring back home in any event.

So, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa is barking up the wrong tree insofar as value received is concerned, in my judgment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I believe a little simple addition would show that there are 40 or 50 research projects in France. I have been under the impression that we no longer have counterpart funds in France.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman from Mississippi will bear with me just for 1 second more——

Mr. WHITTEN. Could I answer that question first?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. WHITTEN. We have provisions in these Public Law 480 agreements to convert excess foreign currency to currencies of other countries to perform this research. Under this arrangement they can take rupees, for instance, in India and purchase French francs so we can have the work done in France where they have the scientists. They can take these excess foreign currencies and purchase the currency of these other countries where they can get the job done and they know how to do it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment with respect to what the chairman just said. One can surely have a lot of fun about the question of virility or sterility in flies, but the way to really eradicate, for example, the Mediterranean fruit fly or, as a matter of fact, the screw-worm down in the Border States is by producing and reproducing sterile male flies or worms as the case may be. That is the way we are getting the job accomplished.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. But let me repeat my question to the gentleman from Mississippi and find out this: Are you saying to me that although we cannot convert the currencies of this country, we cannot get any dollars or currencies, that they can convert them for research projects which we will finance in France, many of them dealing with the improvement of milk and all this sort of thing? There were dairy cows in France before there was ever a dairy cow in the United States.

Does the gentleman mean to tell me they are getting rupees for the payment of these research contracts?

Mr. WHITTEN. I used rupees by way of illustration. Any research that is done in any country where we have no counterpart funds or excess local currency is financed by requiring certain excess currency countries to buy up the currency of the country in which we can do the research. But the currency of the country where it is done has been converted from the other country.

Mr. GROSS. I hope that is right. Why do we not get some rupees from France to pay for the troops we have stationed in France?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do the best I can with this bill and I think the gentleman does the best he can with his foreign aid bill. The point is that we do use these funds to the best possible advantage.

Mr. GROSS. But you do approve these research contracts, and I think we are spending good, hard American dollars for a lot of this stuff despite what the gentleman says.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wish the gentleman would take my word for it, because he is as wrong as he can be about it.

Mr. GROSS. All right. We will find out.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee once again brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture.

We recommend the sum of $5,692,537,000 for fiscal year 1966. This is $1,134,511,200 less than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1965, and $122,597,000 less than the budget estimates for fiscal year 1966. This bill provides the necessary funds for the operations of the Agriculture Department's activities.

More than half of the total amount appropriated in this bill applies directly to benefits for the consumer. As the direct result of the research and control programs provided for under this bill, the people of this country can buy food with confidence, knowing that it is among the safest, cleanest, and most wholesome food in the world.

This bill contains money both for agriculture and services for consumers. We are sharing our abundance with our children and our needy. Funds are provided for in this bill for our school lunch, milk, food stamp, and direct distribution of food to the needy programs.

Agriculture in this country has advanced more in the past 50 years than in all the prior years in our history. Today 1 farmworker in the United States supplies food and fiber for 28 people. Eight were supplied by one worker in 1920. As population increases our per capita food demands increase. All of the people in the world today know that American agriculture is one of the best examples of abundant production and proof of a successful democratic system of government.

Adequate provisions are made in this bill for an expanded tobacco research program. While much good tobacco research has been done, more remains to be done. One of the most urgent needs at this time is improvement in quality and we must have an expanded program of study of the chemical constituents of tobacco in all types. Because of the implications to the health of the consumer from the use of tobacco with insecticidal residues, there is a continuing and urgent need for safer and yet more effective methods of control of insect pests of tobacco. Tobacco is a $10 billion industry and is produced in 21 States. Some 700,000 farm families produce tobacco and this commodity pays into the Federal, State, and local communities the sum of $3.3 billion annually in taxes. The Commonwealth of Kentucky is the second largest producer of tobacco in our country. Tobacco is the fifth largest income-producing crop to American farmers. In January of last year, the Surgeon General's report on "Smoking and Health" was released and in testifying before congressional committees shortly after the report was released, Dr. Terry agreed that there should be more tobacco research. In Kentucky and in all of the other States producing tobacco, the people are very much concerned over reports which have a tendency to point the finger of suspicion toward tobacco and if tobacco is harmful to the health of our people, all of the States producing tobacco and the industry generally want to do something about it. For this reason, the expanded program for tobacco research is underway. It is imperative that this research include studies of the factors which may be detrimental to health and ascertain as soon as possible those quality factors and other characteristics which will preserve the desirable characteristics of tobacco and eliminate any factors which might be detrimental to health. In order to be successful with our expanded program of research for tobacco, we must have the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, private industry, and our tobacco producers. We must find the answer to this problem as quickly as possible in order to prevent economic ruin for our producers, substantial losses of revenue to our Government, and eliminate any doubt as to injury which might result to the health of our people.

Our research program for tobacco includes funds for this program at a number of locations in our country and one of the locations is the National Tobacco Research Laboratory at the University of Kentucky in Lexington, Ky. We recommend a total of $1,530,843 for expenditures at this particular laboratory.

Mr. Chairman, the bill as submitted to our committee contains several reductions which are not justified at this time and certainly are not to the best interests of agriculture. In some instances insufficient funds were provided for certain services in the Department of Agriculture and one example is conservation operations under our Soil Conservation Service. Here the budget estimates provided for $104,103,000 and our committee recommends $105,373,000. The sum recommended includes an additional $770,000 to provide technical assistance to 25 new districts expected to be organized during the fiscal year 1966. We also recommend restoration of $500,000 which can be used to partially offset the personnel reductions necessitated by partial absorption of increases in salary costs and other operating expenses.

We further recommend the regular authorization of $250 million for the agricultural conservation program instead of the $150 million proposed. Our agricultural conservation program is of special value in enabling low-income farmers to carry on needed conservation work and in doing so to improve their farming operations and their income levels. We all know that poor land breeds poverty and poverty, of course, leads to neglected land. In the year 1964 our people benefited from $500 million worth of conservation work based upon a public investment through the agricultural conservation program of only half that amount. Our farmers matched the public's investment from their own resources.

We recommend the sum of $218,359,000 for our Soil Conservation Service. This is $4,391,000 more than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1965.

Our Soil Conservation Service was established in 1935 and its major aim and purpose is to assist soil conservation districts, communities and other cooperators, watershed groups, and Federal and State agencies having related responsibilities in bringing about physical adjustments in land use that will conserve soil and water resources, provide for agricultural improvements and reduce damage by floods and sedimentation.

We recommend that $155 million be appropriated for our school lunch program. Since the passage of the National School Lunch Act in 1946 providing for cash and food assistance, the national school lunch program has grown from 4,545,000 children participating in fiscal year 1947 to more than 17 million in the current year. Total enrollment of children in all elementary and secondary schools for 1965 is estimated to be 48 million. Enrollment for 1964 was 46,935,000 children. Our school population is increasing by leaps and bounds and the demands made upon our school lunch program increase each year. No program in this bill is more important than the school lunch program.

In our bill today we recommend the establishment of a Rural Community Development Service as one of the new agencies in the Department of Agriculture. This agency includes the activities of the Office of Rural Areas Development which was established in 1961 to provide for general staff coordination of the rural areas development activities of the Department. The new agency, in addition, will undertake to facilitate the effective extension into rural areas of assistance programs of other Federal agencies which do not now effectively reach rural areas because of the administrative difficulties of communicating with the dispersed rural population. This agency will work with local organizations and leaders in assisting them to locate and use the facilities of private, State, and other Federal agencies in developing the economy of rural areas and particularly those where we have low income. We recommend $500,000 for fiscal year 1966 for the Rural Community Development Service.

We recommend that the amount proposed in the budget estimate for our rural electrification program of $350 million be approved. This includes a $65 million reserve authorization. The Rural Electrification Administration will go into the fiscal year 1966 with $287,600,000 worth of applications on file. We must keep in mind in considering our REA request that the consumer density on REA financed electric systems is 3.3 consumers to the mile and the gross revenues will average $460 per year per mile of line. As you know, Mr. Chairman, this is extremely low. Our rural electrification systems have built 1.5 million miles of line and this is over half of the distribution lines in the industry, but it serves only 8 percent of the consumers and the rural electrification systems gross only 5 percent of the revenue of the industry. Our rural electrification systems generally are known for good dependable service and for the American farmer no program in agrculture has proved more beneficial than this program.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that every Member of the House has an opportunity to read the Ecuador story which begins in page 451 and extends to page 453 of part 4 of our hearings for fiscal year 1966. Here the International Development Agency entered into a contract with the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association for technical assistance in developing cooperative rural electrification in Ecuador. A number of managers of co-ops in this country were sent to Ecuador to make the initial studies and surveys for the purpose of determining whether or not cooperative rural electrification was feasible. In my home State of Kentucky the co-ops were interested in Ecuador and, upon being informed that the program would be approved for Ecuador, offered to furnish a number of items which were in surplus for the particular co-op such as small transformers, surplus line material and other items which were obsolete for that particular co-op but still serviceable and fully adequate for the rural electrification program in Ecuador. In December of this year some 2,000 families will be served by the Santo Domingo co-op and here, Mr. Chairman, we have an expenditure of foreign aid funds which can be approved by the people of our country; not squandered funds but money invested in a project to serve people; funds used in a country where poverty is rampant and producing results for the people.

In submitting the budget requests for fiscal year 1966 the Department of Agriculture recommended to our committee certain proposed new legislation which would, if introduced and enacted, place meat inspection on a self-financing basis; finance, through fees and charges, up to 50 percent of the technical assistance in the Soil Conservation Service; place poultry inspection on a self-financing basis; place tobacco graders and warehouse inspectors on a voluntary basis with fees to be charged for such services and proposing a direct loan account for REA. So far none of this proposed legislation has been introduced and, to be quite frank with you, Mr. Chairman, none of this legislation should be approved at this particular time.

For our Agricultural Research Service we recommend the sum of $187,513,000.

Our Extension Service is one of the great services in our Department of Agriculture and has many achievements to its credit. Here our county extension agents and our home demonstration agents carry the word to our farm people and, Mr. Chairman, these dedicated, well qualified people know what they are doing. For this Service, we recommend $86,335,000.

For our resource conservation and development projects we recommend $2,813,000. This is an increase of $1 million over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1965.

We recommend that the sum of $48,433,000 be appropriated for our Farmers Home Administration.

For Agricultural Marketing Service we recommend $422,452,000.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the amounts carried in this bill we must keep in mind that the bill, as presented to our committee, was approximately $1 billion less than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1965 and further, we must remember that the benefits to be received are not only to be received by the farmer but by all the people in this country.

Our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, again this year I must register my longtime and strong opposition to continuation of the present farm program with particular respect to price supports, acreage allotments, and marketing quotas on certain crops. Among these latter crops I especially object to the Government loaning money and supporting the price of tobacco. The total appropriation in this bill exceeds $5.6 billion and I have long taken the position that agriculture should be restored to a system of supply and demand. So, as in previous years, I shall vote against the Department of Agriculture appropriation.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is truly "Mr. Conservation." He has worked ceaselessly and tirelessly to conserve our water and soil. My distinguished and able colleague has been devoted and dedicated to the cause of agriculture and conservation which is so essential to the future well-being and security of all the American people, both rural and urban. It has been my honor to serve with the gentleman from Mississippi for more than 16 years and I know of his great accomplishments for the future of our country. Earlier this year widespread concern developed that the appropriation for soil and water conservation might be reduced. Mr. Chairman, I had no real fear that our soil conservation program would be adversely affected by any reduction in appropriation because I knew the gentleman from Mississippi and I am proud to say that I know him well.

Mr. Chairman, only a few years ago the piedmont Southland and the West was eroding with every wind that blew and every rain that fell. Our rivers were red with soil and our hillsides barren. Erosion was taking its toll. Our farmers were moving to the urban areas and our rural areas left to the hoot owl, briers, and broomsage. Today, due to the soil and water conservation program, there is a different picture and a new day. Today our hillsides are covered with pine forests, grasslands, and our rivers are virtually clear. A cattle industry is thriving in the South where once the tenant farm and boll weevil cotton was the order of the day. The greatest single crop grown in the South today is pine trees, bringing millions to the farmer and jobs and opportunity to our people.

Mr. Chairman, in South Carolina we owe much to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the Soil Conservation Service. Mr. WHITTEN, with all of his national responsibilities and duties, keeps his door open to the grassroots conservationist from every section of our country.

The Honorable John McAllister, president of the South Carolina Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, and a truly dedicated delegation of conservationists from South Carolina found Mr. WHITTEN in his office early in the morning a few days ago and discussed at length conservation, agriculture, and the consumer. My constituents and the Honorable Mr. McAllister returned to South Carolina confident and reassured by the courtesy and understanding of my colleague and friend [Mr. WHITTEN], the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Chairman, as the Nation becomes more urbanized and our population grows, our city friends and the consumer, in general, will realize the foresight of those who made possible the conservation of our water and our soil. Our friends in the city depend on food and fiber for their livelihood and it is important that food and fiber is available to them at prices they can afford. Soil and water conservation has assured the future of America. Today we enjoy abundance and even oversupply but the day will come when we will need this reserve of good soil and pure water. I hope that day will never come, but should this Nation and our allies be again plunged into world war, we have the reservoir and reserve of soil and water to meet any emergency. Our production of food and fiber can be virtually doubled overnight to meet emergencies at home and abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this House will reject all crippling amendments to this appropriation and will pass this agricultural appropriation by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture and to all the members of the committee for the fine job they have done on this appropriation bill. I am particularly grateful for their attention to the problems of soil and water conservation on the farmlands of America. The committee's action in restoring the agricultural conservation program to the level of $220 million for fiscal year 1966 is of great importance to the flood-damaged croplands and pasture of the Pacific Northwest. The provisions for financing the valuable work of the growing number of soil conservation districts in the United States is of the highest priority. I also congratulate the committee for the recognition given to the need for increased watershed improvement programs. These programs are of great value to Oregon, as to every part of the Nation.

Although the bill does not contain funds for greatly needed soil and moisture research facilities, I am pleased to hear the assurances of our colleague from Mississippi that the committee's action in no way indicates a lack of awareness of this problem. Because of the critical need for expanding the program of soil and moisture research in the nonirrigated grainlands of Oregon, I hope that this program can be implemented in the very near future and that the laboratory proposed for Pendleton, Oreg., can be constructed.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 8370, the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

It is with particular interest that I support this bill because it provides for a Federal poultry research laboratory in Delaware, and also provides for other agricultural research facilities in other States. The Delaware facility would supplement the research of the poultry facilities in Athens, Ga., and State College, Miss., where the primary emphasis is on reducing losses from condemnation of broilers, and its research work will be of value to poultrymen all over this Nation.

Broiler raising is a major source of income in the Delaware-Maryland-Virginia area. The Delaware State Grange reported in the May 1965 issue of the Diamond State Granger that the poultry business is the biggest business in the Delmarva area, and has more people on its payroll than the five largest corporations on Delmarva combined, and adds:

> It is an expanding industry that now raises nearly a billion pounds of meat a year for sale in northeastern city markets and has the capability of adding a second billion pounds a year within the next 25 to 30 years.

Despite the rapid progress and efficiency of production, the profit margins in the poultry industry have been reduced to low levels due to a number of factors. Genetic studies indicate that as much as two-thirds of the variation in productive performance is due to nongenetic physiological and environmental factors, and research here can confidently be expected to pay major dividends. This new research laboratory will be devoted to basic and applied research and, as I have indicated, the scientific findings will be generally applicable throughout our country and will be useful to poultrymen everywhere.

I testified in support of this research facility in April 1963, and again in April of this year, before the Subcommittee on the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

I commend this proposal to this House with the hope that the distinguished Members of this body will favorably consider and support it.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, in support of this measure, I would like to commend the committee for the thorough job they have done. Long hours of hard work were necessary to present this measure to the House, and I feel they are to be congratulated for an outstanding job.

I would particularly like to express my appreciation that funds are included for small, but very important programs in my district. Funds are included to continue the research program on shade tobacco, which is of tremendous importance to the growers of this leaf in my district, and also to begin the tung tree research program at Monticello, Fla. Both were very much needed by their respective industries.

I appeared before the committee to urge funds for these programs, and I personally am most appreciative that they were included.

I would also like to express appreciation for the continuance of the fire ant and screw-worm eradication programs.

All of these contribute tremendously to the agricultural economy of my district, and I appreciate the committee including them in this measure.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the restoration of the full $100 million requested in the President's budget for the financing of the food stamp program.

This program has been highly successful in those pilot counties in West Virginia and the Nation in which it has been given a test. In the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia, the food stamp program has produced good results in Logan and Wayne counties which are among those counties where it has been tested.

Unless the full $100 million requested in the President's budget is voted, the extension of the program in fiscal 1966 cannot be accomplished in four additional West Virginia counties. Looking forward to the fiscal year 1967, Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that the program can continue at its programed level in order to extend its application in Lincoln County. Lincoln County, situated in southwestern West Virginia, borders Wayne and Logan Counties, where the food stamp pilot program is already in effect. I certainly hope that it may be possible to work toward extending this program to Lincoln County after next fiscal year.

The food stamp program has proven its worth in restoring dignity to those in need, and in protecting the free enterprise system through the use of private grocery stores and distribution points at which the stamps may be used. I certainly trust that this program will be continued and expanded.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Special fund: To provide for additional labor, subprofessional and junior scientific help to be employed under contracts and cooperative agreements to strengthen the work at research installations in the field, not more than $2,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this head for the previous fiscal year may be used by the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service in departmental research programs in the current fiscal year, the amount so used to be transferred to and merged with the appropriation otherwise available under "Salaries and expenses, Research."

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join with many of my colleagues here today in congratulating the able gentleman from Mississippi and his colleagues on the subcommittee for bringing in this particular bill.

I would like to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, a fact I think that perhaps we all know, the population of the world increased 2 percent last year, but food production increased only 1 percent. I have been told that since the dawn of civilization until the present time the population of the world has amounted to its approximately present 3 billion people, but by the turn of the century the population of the world will probably be 6 billion people.

The American consumer and the people of the world have a stock in a prosperous American agriculture, and I am very proud of the positive accomplishments of agriculture in America, and particularly I am proud of the work of this great committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill which includes total appropriations of approximately $5.7 billion for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year 1966. It should be emphasized, as is so well illustrated in the committee report, that about 67 percent of the total estimated expenditures of the Department of Agriculture in 1965 were for national and international purposes, rather than for a direct subsidy program to the American farmer. Only 33 percent of the estimated expenditures in 1965 should really be charged to the agricultural producers of America. The housewife in our Republic has the best bargain for her food basket of any other housewife in the world. While the farmer's share of the consumer food dollar has declined from 52 cents to 37 cents, from the year 1945 to the present, the cost of food has gone down from 22.7 percent to 18 percent of consumer income, and this may be compared to 50 percent or more in much of the remainder of the world.

Since becoming a Member of Congress, I have constantly maintained that our agricultural programs are the best investments that we make for the future of America. In my home city of Gainesville, Fla., I am very proud of all of the various agricultural agencies that deal directly with the problems of the farmer. We have in a central office in our Federal Building at Gainesville, the headquarters for the State ASCS Committee, Soil Conservation Service, and the Farmers Home Administration.

I have always been pleased with the cooperation that each of these agencies extends to the other, and their unified approach to the problems of Florida agriculture has meant much to the progress of our State. Also in my home city of Gainesville, Fla., we have the headquarters for the Florida experiment stations on the campus of the University of Florida. Also on campus we have the College of Agriculture and the headquarters for the great extension service that through the county agents and 4-H Club work has revolutionized country living and agricultural production. I wish time would permit me to mention individually the scores of individuals who are outstanding in these various fields of agricultural development.

As we know, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service—ASCS—has the primary responsibility for the action programs of the Department of Agriculture. I believe that since this Service is concerned with programs affecting farmers directly, and creating, because of the very complexities of the services, some controversy, it has, I think, an even tougher job than a Congressman. All we have to do is pass the laws, while they have to administer them, explain them to the farmers and get their cooperation. It has always amazed me that this agency can do its work with so little criticism and complaints. When they do have complains, I can say that they are handled in the most honest, conscientious, and courteous way possible.

In my State of Florida it has been an inspiration to work with the State ASCS committee. Members are: Chairman, Emery Williams; vice chairman, Stuart Simpson; and Martin Roberts. Their conscientious State executive director is Mr. O. P. McArthur. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, if you searched the country over you could not find a better organization.

One unique part of ASCS is the farmer committee system. The State committee is appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. The farmer-elected county committees are responsible for local administration of national programs, such as acreage allotments and marketing quotas. Tobacco, peanuts, and cotton are commodities under these programs which are of great importance to my area. The ASCS committees also administer the agricultural conservation program—ACP—which has such an outstanding record of accomplishment through cost sharing with farmers. It is the responsibility, chiefly, of this program to conserve the natural resources on the farmlands of America. I am pleased with the fact that the committee has kept this program at the $250 million level, and has restored the cuts that were made by the Bureau of the Budget. If these cuts had not been restored, it is my opinion that millions of acres of soil in America would become irreparably damaged. At the present time we are losing 1 million acres of our soil each year to urbanization and to the interstate highway systems. The conservation of soil is one of the best investments that we can make for our country. I want to salute Mr. Tommy Ford, of Bryceville, Fla., the State chairman of our soil conservation officials, and all of his cohorts who have worked so diligently during the past few months to bring to us in Florida the need for the restoration of these soil conservation funds.

In the Eighth District of Florida, 1,876 farmers have completed conservation practices under the 1963 agricultural conservation program receiving $457,000 of cost-sharing assistance. This program increases the rate of application of essential conservation work on the land. The combined results of many years of conservation activities under the ACP have benefited both urban and rural populations in terms of protected and increased water supplies, new recreational areas, assured soil resources, and new and improved wildlife habitat.

Since the beginning of the program in 1936, farmers have been contributing their time and money toward the achievement of the conservation goals for their farms and for the Nation. However, the economic situation of many farmers has not permitted the desired rate of progress, and much remains to be accomplished. The agricultural conservation program emphasizes the most needed types of conservation measures in each county, and aids the farmer in meeting his conservation goals.

A wide variety of conservation practices is performed under the agricultural conservation program. Among the principal practices performed in the Eighth District under the 1963 ACP, are the following:

Conservation practices	Unit	Extent
Establishment of enduring vegetative cover for erosion control, watershed protection, land-use adjustment, or wildlife feed or habitat.	Acre	13,200
Improvement of enduring vegetative cover to extend its lifespan for erosion control, watershed protection, or land-use adjustment.	do	6,900
Establishment of annual cover crops for erosion control, water absorption, land-use adjustment, or wildlife feed or habitat.	Acres treated	38,200

Another major program administered by ASCS is the feed grain program which has been so effective in cutting our costly surpluses and increasing farm income. This program has meant more than $20 million to the farmers of my State. This is only a sample of the many programs administered by this agency and the work it has been doing for the farmers of Florida and the Nation.

The key to ASCS success, and I might add the key to all of the other successes of the agricultural programs in my district, has been the dedication of the employees, and particularly in the work of the ASCS, the dedication of the committeemen to serve the farmers of our country.

I think it is very important now that with the new directives that have been issued by the Department of Agriculture concerning the selection of committeemen, that nothing must take priority over the ability to do the job and to get the cooperation of all the farmers in working together to solve their problems. We must not have any quota system in the selection of these committees, and we must not select a man merely because of his race, color, or creed. I suggest to the Department of Agriculture that unless great care is taken, the ASCS programs which have been administered so effectively in the past, will face almost unsolvable problems unless representative committeemen are elected in the future as they have been in the past.

I should like to express appreciation to the Subcommittee on Appropriations, headed by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] for many items in the appropriations bill which are of specific interest to my constituents.

All of the food distribution programs, in the amount of hundreds of millions of dollars, mean better health to thousands of people in the Eighth District of Florida. These programs include commodities distributed to the needy through the direct distribution program, and through the food stamp plan, the school lunch program, and the school milk program.

The great REA cooperatives in our area have received adequate financing for the extension of electric facilities and rural telephones. There are long-range programs in this bill providing for the improvement of forestry resources, our agricultral and forestry research, plant and animal disease and pest control, soil and water resource protection, meat and poultry inspection, and for many other needed programs.

I noticed with particular appreciation the net increase for construction of pesticide research laboratories in the amount of $6,394,000. Included in this sum is an amount which provides for one of these laboratories in my home city of Gainesville, Fla. The items of $2,806,200, to maintain a barrier zone to prevent screw-worms from migrating from Mexico into Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and adjacent States, is of particular interest to our cattlemen, because this same program has made it possible for us to conquer the screw-worm in Florida. We must constantly be on the alert for the threat of reinfestation.

I suggest to our colleagues that they read in detail the excellent report from the committee, which outlines in detail many interesting developments in agriculture, which I shall not take the time to enumerate. Again, I say this is an excellent bill, I intend to support it, and I believe it deserves the overwhelming support of the members of the Committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses of the food stamp program pursuant to the Food Stamp Act of 1964, $75,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 16, line 19, strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been concurred in by the committee.

You will note in the report that in the event an area institutes the food stamp program, the direct distribution of commodities will be eliminated. There is some question as to how many areas will go on the food stamp program. But if they do not, the money will not be expended. Should they wish to go into this program, the recipients pay two-thirds of the cost and it would be an improvement over other programs.

I trust the Committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I want to extend my thanks to the subcommittee chairman and to the members of the committee for offering this amendment to restore the full amount of the appropriation for the food stamp plan. My own community, Minneapolis, is involved in the decision that the Committe of the Whole will make in deciding whether or not to accept this amendment. Last fall Minneapolis was approved by the Agriculture Department to start distributing food stamps, but a snarl in the State law prevented it until a special law was passed by the State legislature last week. With the acceptance of this amendment many communities throughout the country will be enabled to participate in the food stamp plan which is proving to be so useful and so helpful to many low-income families and families that have to exist on welfare and relief grants.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for agreeing to restore to the food stamp item the full budget amount of $100 million. As I made clear in my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday, I think it was a grave mistake to cut this item by 25 percent when it is one of the most important programs in the entire bill as far as our needy families are concerned. Just remember, we have been spending $200 million a year in the direct distribution program, in giving away surplus food to the needy—just handing it out—such things as dried eggs, lard, peanut butter, beans, cheese, butter, cornmeal, powdered milk. The food stamp program gets far more good food into the stomachs of hungry people—better food—fresh food instead of dried and powdered foods—and the recipient pays most of the cost of his food, rather than getting a 100 percent handout. So the food stamp plan costs less and does far more.

Cutting the program back from $100 to $75 million would have meant either canceling the start of projects in 25 new areas scheduled to come into the program in the coming fiscal year, or else a cutback in the 110 projects in operation during this fiscal year. Now I can say very candidly, Mr. Chairman, that I would rather see the program abandoned—as successful as it is—rather than have it cut back so far that it was no longer economically worthwhile for poor families to participate. If the $75 million figure were to be retained in this bill, then any additional projects added in the coming year would have to be financed at the expense of the poor people already in the program—they would pay the same amount of money each month for their food stamps but get substantially less in the way of bonus coupons. This would be impractical and self-defeating. Therefore, the inevitable result of a $25 million cutback would be in the cancellation of 25 of the 28 projects I listed in Monday's RECORD. I am glad that the committee amendment removes that prospect.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last world and rise to enthusiastically support this amendment that has been accepted by the Committee on Appropriations. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that McDowell County in the Fifth District of West Virginia was the first county where a pilot plant was started in the United States. It has been completely successful.

I am most hopeful that the Members of the House will overwhelmingly adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture and for general administration of the Department of Agriculture, including expenses of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission; repairs and alterations; and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, $3,553,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001): *Provided further*, That not to exceed $2,500 of this amount shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NATCHER: On page 27, line 17, strike out "$3,553,000" and insert "$3,848,000".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted the amount set forth on page 27, line 17 of the bill, will be increased from $3,553,000 to $3,848,000, the full amount requested for activities under general administration.

As the Members of the House know, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides that no person in the United States shall be excluded from participation in programs receiving Federal financial assistance on the ground of race, color, or national origin or be discriminated against in any way under such programs. That portion of title VI which applies to non-discrimination in federally assisted programs provides in part as follows:

SEC. 601. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

SEC. 602. Each Federal department and agency which is empowered to extend Federal financial assistance to any program or activity, by way of grant, loan, or contract other than a contract of insurance or guaranty, is authorized and directed to effectuate the provisions of section 601 with respect to such program or activity by issuing rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability which shall be consistent with achievement of the objectives of the statute authorizing the financial assistance in connection with which the action is taken. No such rule, regulation, or order shall become effective unless and until approved by the President.

Each department of our Government is required by the civil rights law to take steps to insure that this objective is fully carried out. At the time the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Joseph M. Robertson, appeared before our subcommittee in behalf of the amount requested for the operation of general administration, our subcommittee very carefully examined all of the requests made which compiled the overall figure of $3,848,000. It developed during the hearings that, at the present time, one Assistant to the Secretary is working full time in carrying out title 6 of the Civil Rights Act for the Department of Agriculture and he is assisted by a secretary. In addition to this Assistant to the Secretary, it developed that there are a number of other people in the Department of Agriculture who are working, in addition to their other duties, on assignments which are of assistance in enforcing this provision of title 6 of the Civil Rights Act. All down through the Department, certain personnel are actually performing the necessary field work and investigations that are required to see that the provisions of the act are fully complied with.

In presenting the request for the $295,000, the Assistant Secretary informed our subcommittee, in his general statement, that the policy direction and supervision of procedural requirements of title VI would be provided by the Secretary's Office and the increased fund request of $295,000 would be set aside and used for any additional costs which might be incurred over and above regular expenses to comply with title 6, and that some of the funds might be made available to various agencies in the Department to help them pay any additional out-of-pocket costs which they might have to incur under title VI. Further, the Assistant Secretary informed our subcommittee that it was not certain as to just how much additional work would be required in this area and that the $295,000, if not necessary, would return to the Treasury at the end of the year.

Mr. Chairman, acting upon the testimony presented to our committee and understanding that a number of agencies in the Department were carrying out their obligations under title VI and that this work seemed to be scattered throughout the Department, we agreed to fund the necessary amounts for the Assistant to the Secretary and the secretary to the Assistant for the fiscal year 1966. It seemed to a majority of the members of our subcommittee that, under the present system of operations in the Department, the provisions of title 6 of the Civil Rights Act were being fully complied with and that the additional $295,000 was not necessary. The testimony concerning this $295,000 appears on page 285 of part 3 of the hearings and extends through 294.

Since reporting our bill to the full committee and approval by the full committee, we have been informed that the $295,000 will be necessary notwithstanding the fact that a number of agencies in the Department are complying with title VI insofar as supervision and investigations are concerned and the full-time Assistant to the Secretary is working on this assignment and will be necessary during fiscal year 1966 and that if not all of the $295,000, a portion of same will be necessary. The unused portion will revert to the Treasury.

The duty of complying with the provisions of title VI is a responsibility of the Department of Agriculture and if the other departments of our Government are to have adequate funds to carry out their responsibilities under this title, then certainly the same treatment should be extended to the Department of Agriculture.

After carefully considering the statements made concerning the need for the full amount, the majority of the members of our subcommittee believe that this amount should be restored to the bill and that the amendment before the House should be adopted.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, a member of our Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of the amendment and to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee for their attention to governmental fundamentals.

They deserve commendation for reexamining the scope of the administrative functions of the Department of Agriculture and for sighting opportunities for long-range economies through the changes recommended here.

I would ask that Members of this House recognize the meritorious action of the committee in taking a hard second look, and out of that examination arriving at a recommendation that the Department be given funds providing for new patterns of administrative spending.

As members of the Appropriations Committee, we have been assured that prudence will govern use of the funds and that any moneys not actually needed to get the results sought will be conserved.

Mr. NATCHER. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, and I hope the amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the reading of the bill we rather hurriedly passed by the emergency conservation measures. I wonder if the chairman of the committee would yield for a question or two on this.

I note in this bill there is $4 million for that item. I wish to point out in our own State of Minnesota we suffered great disasters from flood and tornado, and we already have a $2 million request which has come in to the Department of Agriculture. I might further mention that the $10 million which was authorized for the west coast is not available for use in our State if it is needed on the west coast. I further understand in this fiscal year there may be some doubt as to whether or not there are adequate funds to meet these emergencies. I wonder if the chairman can give me some assurance that something can be done if necessary to take care of this great disaster?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I say to the gentleman that on another committee I have had called to my attention the terrible disasters which have hit that section of the country and the stories in the daily press have certainly recounted the tragedies which have occurred. They do have this $4 million, plus other moneys, available for this type of emergency problem—under certain procedures where requests are made by the Governors. My own recommendation would be to call on the Bureau of the Budget in this matter. I think it would be done whether we asked them to or not. I am sure they will make a thorough study of this area and will submit a supplemental request in order to see that we do the job right. We will do whatever we can by way of the Federal Government giving assistance in order to restore the land to what it was before the floods and storms. I assure the gentleman that this committee has always supported that kind of a program and always will.

Mr. NELSEN. In the flooded area in Minnesota I have driven through most of it. It has been a most devastating tragedy. The tornadoes followed shortly after the floods and we find places where farms are completely destroyed and machinery and cattle and houses and barns and everything are gone. It is a very tragic situation.

I thank the chairman of the committee for giving me this assurance, and I expect we can depend on you to give us all of the assistance possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The CLERK. Page 31, line 15:

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: Page 32, line 2, after "*Provided*", insert the following: That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1966 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to either the United Arab Republic or Indonesia under the provisions of title I of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is a coincidence that yesterday this body dealt with the foreign aid authorization bill and now—the very next day—we are dealing with an appropriation bill for foreign aid; in truth, not exactly the same foreign aid program as yesterday but very much the same in scope.

The Public Law 480 program currently is expending about $2.8 billion each year which approximates the amount of money invested in the far better known, much more publicized foreign aid program with which we dealt yesterday.

The reference to Public Law 480 is under title III of this bill. The effect of this amendment would be to disqualify during the next fiscal year the Governments of Indonesia and the United Arab Republic, better known as the Egyptian Government, from benefiting under just one title of the Public Law 480 program. The program consists of four titles.

Title I is the one which is most widely used. It is the so-called "funny money" sales provision under which we enter into agreements to transfer commodities to recipient governments in exchange for currencies whose use is very restricted. For the most part, these sales are donations.

The other three titles deal with donations to charitable organizations for distribution in foreign countries, donations on a government-to-government basis, to meet disaster or relief conditions and hard currency sales.

This amendment would not affect any of these last three titles, just the first. It would have the beneficial effect, in my opinion, of serving notice to Nasser and to Sukarno that we resent the insults which both heads of states have directed our way in recent months; that we are putting on record our desire to shut them off from this form of foreign aid, which for all practical purposes amounts to a donation just as surely as if we wrote out a check to either Sukarno or Nasser.

I might say in anticipation of an argument which may be presented that should the situation change within either of these countries during the fiscal year—should there be a beneficial change in leadership—the President would have ample authority under the foreign aid authorization which passed the House yesterday as well as under the other provisions of Public Law 480 to extend help with food commodities out of our surplus stocks and otherwise. So this would not unduly tie the President's hands. It would mainly have the very beneficial effect of serving notice upon these heads of state that we resent the insults to our property, the insults to our flag, and the insults to the name of America which they have sent our way in recent months.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi withdraws his point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first, may I say to the Committee that our committee has been assured that there are no such sales contemplated by the Department to either the United Arab Republic or Indonesia under the provisions of title I. We were given that assurance and, of course, neither I nor members of our committee are in favor of any such sales. Second, may I say that if this amendment were adopted the Department could still go ahead with gifts under title II and sales under title IV.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the foreign policy of this country is complex enough that we do not need to try to redirect it, as much as we might like on occasion, through an amendment offered on the floor on this bill which just barely touches upon the problem. In other words, this amendment if adopted would not stop sales. It would stop sales under only one title of the bill. It would stop sales that the Department says they have no intention of carrying out anyway. If adopted, the amendment would amount to only a slight slap on the wrist, and I believe it should be deferred. Again I am opposed to sales or gifts under all titles.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that this amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The CLERK. Page 32, line 17:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Reimbursement for net realized losses

To partially reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained but not previously reimbursed, pursuant to the Act of August 17, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 713a–11, 713a–12), $2,300,000,000: *Provided,* That after June 30, 1964, the portion of borrowings from Treasury equal to the reimbursed realized losses recorded on the books of the Corporation after June 30 of the fiscal year in which such losses are realized, shall not bear interest and interest shall not be accrued or paid thereon.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASEY

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASEY: On page 33, immediately before the period at the end of line 2, insert the following: ": *Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the payment of charges for storage of any agriculture commodity belonging to the Commodity Credit Corporation which charges have not been determined by competitive bidding."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment, quite patently, would require extra work on the part of the employees of the Department. They would have to make a finding as to what part had been made by competitive bidding and what part had not. Since the present law does not require competitive bidding, it would require different duties from that required under existing law. For that reason, I think the amendment is legislating in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not mind saying that I consulted with the Parliamentarian and I do not think my argument would be sustained anyway and there is no use in taking the time of the Committee in this regard.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas concede the point of order?

Mr. CASEY. No, sir; I do not concede the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is strictly a limitation on the use of these funds and I ask the Chairman to rule at this point that it is germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment directed to page 33, line 2, which reads as follows: "*Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the payment of charges for storage of any agricultural commodity belonging to the Commodity Credit Corporation which charges have not been determined by competitive bidding," to which amendment the gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order that this imposes additional substantive duties on the Commodity Credit Corporation, and with that contention this occupant of the chair is in complete agreement and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to think that we are going to put a little burden on CCC to call for competitive bidding. Here is a GAO report and if any of the members of the committee have not read it you ought to read it. You and I and every taxpayer of this country own a piece of over 7 million bales of cotton and have a loan on additional bales totaling 13.5 million bales. You are eventually going to pay the storage on all of it.

The increase from last year was 45 percent, and I would say after this crop year it will increase probably the same amount or to about 19 million bales.

It is conservatively estimated because they do not take competitive bids on storage it is costing you and me an additional $25 million a year. Let no one tell you these warehousemen are being underpaid. If they are, why are they offering rebates to get the cotton in their warehouses?

This report states that just three warehouses paid in excess of $3 million to producers and ginners to induce them to put cotton in their warehouses.

The Commodity Credit Corporation knows this. They think it is all right. I do not think so.

They negotiate and agree on a price they are going to pay for storage, noncompetitive, and they move it out only at the request of the warehouse. When they do move it, it goes to competitive bidding. You have one warehouse, and I believe it is in the Chairman's own State, where a man got some on competitive bidding, and he is storing it for 10 cents a bale, while on a noncompetitive basis we are paying almost four times this amount.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Does not the gentleman know that these rebates and the kickbacks, or the lack of charge for storing, can be made up by simply humidifying the cotton when it comes in? Cotton is sold by the bale, and by humidifying it up to well below legal limits during storage it easily gains over 35 percent in weight, and when it goes out it is sold at the humidified price, and the water is weighed with it.

Mr. CASEY. There are a lot of things I do not know about this agricultural business, and I am the first to admit it. But I do know on cotton storage when you do have some of it offered for competitive bidding they store it for less than what you are paying now. It is just good commonsense. It is my business and your business to see that we get the best possible deal.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We have long been promised that a farm bill will come before the House. I hope the gentleman will keep his amendment handy, and if ever there is a farm bill he will offer it where there will be no question of it being in order.

Mr. CASEY. I assure the gentleman I am going to continue to write an amendment that I hope is germane to some of these bills, and that will accomplish this purpose.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly in accord with the desires of the gentleman from Texas. But I think the membership should have some understanding of what is involved in this storage problem.

In the first place, in times past they called on the Department and storage centers to offer commodity storage on a competitive basis. Here is what is involved in it. It is quite a scrap between the port warehouses and the inland warehouses. The price system is no good in areas where they produce commodities and where there is no warehouse.

I can show you where this country lost a million dollars when they tried to store commodities on the ground in some years. The producers who have the benefit of a farm program have to have a warehouse receipt showing it is properly stored. The Department is trying, when it is essential for the operation of the Department and the program, to have storage in the area of production. So it is a matter of competition between the inland warehouses where they need to have it available at certain times, where it is cheaper to keep it, and until they can tell and know just where the commodity is going to go. Is it to go to the Atlantic coast or to the Pacific coast? It is going to the gulf or to the Great Lakes? There are many reasons to keep it where it is as long as they do not have any need for the space. Then, when it is moved out, you need to move it to a port in the orderly movement and where it is to be sold. I agree with the gentleman's desire that, where you send it to large centers and it has already been determined just where you are going to move it, consideration should be given to competitive bidding.

But if you open this up, you will be spending all sorts of money on freight rate charges, hauling it this way and that way, because some place happens to be open at the moment.

The gentleman's point is well taken. We ought to do all we can to pull the storage charges down. This thing has been investigated repeatedly. But simply to require competitive bidding could prove disastrous and tremendously expensive.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASEY. The gentleman knows I appreciate his observation and I also want him to appreciate that I did not expect them to take the lowest bid without taking into consideration the freight charges.

If it cannot be stored elsewhere cheaper, then leave it where it is, but give us a chance; will you?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am certainly trying to work out that problem myself. We have had this investigated three or four times.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to see it worked out, too.

Mr. WHITTEN. But a broad approach here, I think, would do harm.

Mr. CASEY. I have been trying to push you on this in a gentlemanly manner and I cannot get anywhere. You have heard the old story about getting the mule's attention and I hope it has gotten through.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have tried just as hard as I can to get this matter corrected, but up to now I have not succeeded.

Mr. CASEY. I know you have a lot on your hands and I appreciate your efforts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Limitation on administrative expenses

Nothing in this Act shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided,* That not to exceed $36,650,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further,* That $945,000 of this authorization shall be available only to expand and strengthen the sales program of the Corporation pursuant to authority contained in the Corporation's charter: *Provided further,* That not less than 7 per centum of this authorization shall be placed in reserve to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for use only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided further,* That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHEL: On page 33, line 24, after the word "hereof", strike the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further:* (a) That none of the funds herein appropriated may be used to formulate or carry out price support programs during the period ending June 30, 1966, under which a total amount of price support payments in excess of $30,000 would be made to any person as (1) incentive payments made under the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1781 et seq.); (2) feed grain diversion payments and feed grain price support payments made under the provisions of the Act of May 20, 1963 (77 Stat. 44 through 47); (3) domestic wheat marketing certificates, wheat export certificates, and wheat diversion payments issued and made pursuant to the provisions of the Act of April 11, 1964 (78 Stat. 178 through 183); (b) That for the purposes of this proviso the term 'person' shall mean an individual, partnership, firm, joint stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate or other legal entity, or a State, political subdivision of a State, or any agency thereof."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the reason for my introducing this amendment is to provide a limitation on some direct payments for the voluntary programs, feed grains, wheat, and wool. First of all, may I say I struck on this figure of $30,000 not by accident. As a matter of fact, I was thinking more in terms of $25,000 when one of my good friends, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] suggested that we give and take a little bit and settle for a salary that the Member of Congress gets—why should we show discrimination and let the Members of Congress get more than some poor farmer out in the hinterlands.

So that is the reason for my settling on the limitation of $30,000.

This amendment goes to those programs that are strictly voluntary—whether the farmer wants to get into the program or whether he does not want to get into the program and simply limits that payment which he can get.

Personally I have no objection to bigness or to an industry growing or to a farm becoming bigger and expanding. But it seems to me we ought not to be having the Federal Government encourage the corporate farms and whatnot from becoming even bigger giants. So I take this medium here for imposing somewhat of a reasonable limitation on these expenditures particularly at a time when we are talking about preserving the family-sized farm and the lowly downtrodden small farms in this country.

Well then why not do something about it here by imposing this kind of limitation. And rather than transgress further on your time, I will just say I think it is a very simple amendment. Although there are some technicalities involved here—it does not go to or address itself to those crops and those commodities which are under a strict controlled mechanism where by law we have said you can plant this and cannot plant that. Those commodities will not be affected, only those in which there is a voluntary approach.

I would submit that my amendment falls within the Holman rule as a retrenchment in an appropriation bill and I would ask your support of my amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Does the gentleman have information as to how many individual farmers this might affect in the different commodity areas?

Mr. MICHEL. I do not have that information, because in the course of the regular hearings, whenever we have asked the Department to submit the names, or a complete list of those making more than *x* amount of dollars, they always come back with the remark, "Oh, this is a monumental problem. It is inconceivable. We would have pages and pages of testimony and particular farms and fractions of farms. We could not supply it."

Mr. DOLE. Do I correctly understand that, if a person is a farmer and raises more than one commodity, his payments would be totaled up for all commodities and the payments could not exceed the figure of $30,000?

Mr. MICHEL. That is correct, under the voluntary commodity programs.

Mr. DOLE. Only the voluntary programs, or all programs?

Mr. MICHEL. The feed grains, the wheat, and the Wool Act are under voluntary programs. Frankly, all of the others are strictly control programs.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Before the gentleman finishes, since there will probably be a point of order made, would the gentleman explain why anybody should be against such an amendment as he proposes, if he understands any sensible reason why?

Mr. MICHEL. Frankly, I do not. I am certain the point of order will not lie against my amendment.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Would the gentleman's amendment have the effect, by indirection, of limiting the size of farms in the United States?

Mr. MICHEL. I do not know that it would. My point is that if a person can make a go of it by expanding in a voluntary way through the private free enterprise system, without the largess of the Government being bestowed on him, then of course that person can get as large as he wants. When we get to the point that the Government is encouraging bigger and bigger industry in farms, we should put a stop to it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am sure the gentleman realizes that there has never been an American procedure to penalize bigness for the sake of bigness itself. As long as there is paid a subsidy or a price control based on units of production, any amendment such as that the gentleman proposes must have the effect of limiting the size of farms. I doubt that we really wish to do that.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman can take his position. I have my own.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to read, if I may, the first part of the amendment, as I make the point of order against it:

> *Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated may be used to formulate or carry out price support programs during the period ending June 30, 1966, under which a total amount of price support payments in excess of $30,000 would be made to any person.

I respectfully submit that this not only would require some new duties but also would require the opening up of individual accounts. This makes it quite clearly subject to a point of order.

I might point out that subsection (b), where the definitions are given, would require a determination and also would call for special duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair correctly understand that the gentleman from Mississippi has stated his point of order against the pending amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order. I submit, Mr. Chairman, it falls strictly within the Holman rule on retrenching, as a limitation. The Department of Agriculture has all kinds of statisticians. We appropriate money for them. They have the wherewithal to make any kind of determination we see fit to legislate. In this sense, it is a retrenchment, in my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] offered an amendment addressed to page 33, line 24, which amendment was read and against which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] raised the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair has read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. The Chair is of the opinion that even though any limitation imposed upon an executive agency may add to the burdens of that executive agency, a limitation of an appropriation is in good order. The Chair, therefore, would say to the gentleman from Illinois that in the opinion of this occupant of the Chair, he has offered an amendment which is in form a limitation. But in addition thereto, he has added language which defines a person, and in the opinion of the Chair that language is legislation on an appropriation bill and is therefore out of order.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 33, line 24, after the word "hereof", strike the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further:* That none of the funds herein appropriated may be used to formulate or carry out a feed grain program during the period ending June 30, 1966, under which the total amount of payments made to feed grain producers under section 16(h) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and section 105(d) of the Agriculture Act of 1949, as amended, would be in excess of 20 per centum of the fair market value of any acreage diverted under section 16(h) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, what I have done here in this amendment is, in effect, really to restate what is currently in the legislative act that will expire in this crop year. As a matter of fact, several years ago, when the feed grains bill was up for consideration, I offered an amendment which would have limited these direct payments to one-fifth of the land value. In other words, from the figures they were talking about in direct payments to farmers to keep their land idle, it would have paid every one of us to go out and mortgage ourselves to the hilt so that we could get a piece of land and get into this program and get it all paid off by the Government itself in 5 years' time. What I did at that time when the legislative bill was up for consideration was to offer an amendment to limit those payments to one-fifth of the land value. It is in the law now, but it is my understanding there have been some people who have been opposed to it and think maybe it is too much of a limitation. My point is let us reassure ourselves that this will stay in the law by putting this limitation on this appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. Does my friend from Illinois mean he is extending the present law with respect to payments on feed grains?

Mr. MICHEL. Of course, one cannot legislate on an appropriation bill, as the chairman well knows.

Mr. MAHON. Is that not what we would really be doing here? And since the Committee on Agriculture is presently holding hearings on new legislation, would it not be wiser to permit that to proceed?

Mr. MICHEL. It would be wiser if the gentleman would see it my way and have no question about retaining this particular provision. But it is my understanding from the grapevine they have already thought this was a good section to delete from the legislative bill.

Mr. MAHON. I have no such understanding. I believe, though, we can trust the legislative committee to give this problem thorough consideration. Since it has been in the law, we might anticipate something along this line will come through, but we might withhold putting it in the agricultural appropriation bill at this time.

Mr. MICHEL. I see the gentleman is standing or sitting next to his good colleague from Texas, whom I am sure will treat what we say here very seriously.

I should hope that in those legislative deliberations they will see it my way and extend that provision of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] press his point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. The existing law expires this year, as I understand it. Whether it will be extended or not I do not know. The proponent of the amendment says this extends existing law. That statement of itself means that it is legislation. Quite definitely you cannot extend existing law without its being legislation. On that basis, I respectfully submit that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the basic legislation determines the limit according to the average yield of the land. This would determine the limit according to the sales value of the land, whether that be speculative or productive. And it would cost an additional $9 million to make these appraisals. This is $9 million worth of additional duties placed upon the Secretary of Agriculture and does represent legislation upon an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel] desire to address himself to the point of order?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to say again that this is a strict limitation. It does not call for an increased expenditure of funds by one iota. It is strictly a retrenchment, a reduction of expenditures, and falls within the Holman rule.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Keogh). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel] offered an amendment directed to page 33, line 24, which amendment was read by the Clerk, and to which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] directed a point of order on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair has carefully read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois and even though a limitation, as was stated before, on an appropriation bill, may impose additional burdens on the executive branch of the Government; and even though it might be estimated that the cost of those additional burdens may run to any amount, the Chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is, in fact, a limitation on an appropriation bill and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, some limitation certainly should be, and I am sure will be, considered by the Committee on Agriculture when they write any new legislation. While the Chair has held that the amendment is a limitation on an appropriation bill it will become effective only upon the passage of a new farm act and this matter will be dealt with at that time.

May I point out why, in my judgment, we should prevent tying this amendment to a bill which has not yet been reported to the House? As pointed out by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith], this provision would say that no payment should be made, or no funds be used to make a payment in excess of 20 percent of the fair market value of any acreage diverted.

Certainly for us to tie onto this bill an amendment to forthcoming legislation, a provision that would require in every case the Department of Agriculture to go out and hire an appraiser to determine the value of every foot of land that was offered under the bill—a bill not yet even brought out by the legislative committee—I respectfully submit would be a bad way to legislate.

I would hope this amendment is defeated so that we would not require these expensive and arduous duties to be performed by the Department. Let us wait until the legislation is before us. If the committee does not recommend such provision—I assume they will—then the Congress can work its will on the legislation in such a way to keep down this terrific amount of extra expenses.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Michel) there were—ayes 41, noes 105.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk. Page 34, line 1:

Public Law 480

For expenses during fiscal year 1966, not otherwise recoverable during such year, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under titles I, II, and IV of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1701–1709, 1721–1724, 1731–1736) $1,658,000,000, to remain available until expended for (1) Sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies pursuant to title I of said Act, (2) commodities disposed of for emergency famine relief to friendly peoples pursuant to title II of said Act, and (3) long-term supply contacts pursuant to title IV of said Act.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been reading reports of the way American wheat is piling up at ports in India, apparently by the shiploads, and is becoming unusually expensive from the standpoint of demurrage paid because of the inability to unload.

Is the gentleman from Mississippi aware of this situation?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa that I do remember reading about this situation some time ago in the daily press. Beyond that I do not have any knowledge of the situation to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know whether the Commodity Credit Corporation will bear the added expense of this overloading of Indian ports with wheat?

Mr. WHITTEN. One of the expenses we have in the Commodity Credit Corporation is that the law requires that 50 percent of all of these products be carried in American bottoms, which greatly increases the freight charges. This, of course, is designed to maintain our merchant fleet in favorable competition with foreign bottoms. I do not know whether that purpose is accomplished or not, but I did read of such charges in the press some time ago.

Mr. GROSS. Is this wheat sold for country currencies; in other words, rupees?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sure if the country involved is India it is bound to be rupees.

I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I shall pursue the matter and see what the facts are in an effort to prevent it from happening in the future.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. It seems to me there must be a lack of proper administration on the part of the Department of Agriculture in permitting too many ships to load and depart for India.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we have very many different phases of this. There is involved the question as to when the Commodity Credit Corporation turns loose title to it and when it gets into the enforcement aspects carried out by the foreign aid group. That is the real question which is involved. I have heard that in certain instances in some foreign countries they have piled grain right on the ground and have done such a poor job that half of the aid which we have given them has not reached them. However, I do not have personal knowledge of this.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

International Wheat Agreement

For expenses during fiscal year 1966 and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1641-1642), $27,544,000, to remain available until expended.

Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile

For expenses during fiscal year 1966 and unrecovered prior years' costs related to strategic and other materials acquired as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural commodities or products and transferred to the supplemental stockpile pursuant to Public Law 540. Eighty-fourth Congress (7 U.S.C. 1856), $30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Mr. **DINGELL**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: On page 35, after line 2, insert the following new paragraph:

"*Price support programs for tobacco*

"No part of any funds appropriated by this Act for the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used by such Corporation to carry out any price support program for tobacco."

Mr. **DINGELL**. Mr. Chairman, the Surgeon General of the United States not long back received a report from an advisory committee constituted by the President of the United States to examine into the problem of smoking and health. A number of findings were made in connection with this report which are indeed remarkable. It was found in this report, for example, that for persons who smoked less than 10 cigarettes per day, the death rates are 40 percent higher than for nonsmokers; 10 to 19 cigarettes per day, the death rates are 70 percent higher than for nonsmokers; 20 to 39 cigarettes per day, the death rates are 90 percent higher than for nonsmokers, and more than 40 cigarettes per day, the death rates are 120 percent higher than for nonsmokers.

It was also found in this report in connection with other problems involving the circulatory system, the throat, and as regards all the human organs, the heart, the lungs, stomach, nonsmokers fared significantly better than did the smokers, and that the death rate for smokers was enormously higher than the death rate with nonsmokers.

I am asking my colleagues in the House to support my amendment, which says that the Federal Government has no business engaging in supporting prices, in conducting market-making programs, which would benefit a substance which is obviously as harmful to our people as is tobacco.

I can see no reason why the Federal Government should authorize or appropriate money for a program of this kind.

Heavy smokers have 30 times the death rate of nonsmokers. Indeed, it was found and quoted in this report that the earlier you start smoking the sooner you will die, and that one-third of America's 35-year-old men will not live to be 65 if they smoke more than a pack of cigarettes a day.

It was found for those who smoke in the 40 to 60 age bracket is the real danger.

The American Medical Association recently issued a pamphlet stressing the hazards of smoking.

What I am asking my colleagues to do today is to exercise wisdom and prudence, and withdraw support of the Federal Government for tobacco programs. If people wish to raise tobacco, if they wish to smoke, let it be done without Government support.

Mr. **CUNNINGHAM**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **DINGELL**. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. **CUNNINGHAM**. The gentleman and I serve as members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is going into this problem of labeling cigarettes, the health angle, and so forth. The price of cigarettes has gone up from 25 cents to 30 cents a pack recently. I do not suppose anyone coming from the tobacco region knows why that is?

Does anyone in the producing area know, and if this has any relation to price supports?

Mr. **DINGELL**. I have no knowledge of the question. I am not a smoker, myself, and I expect to live longer for that reason. Perhaps some of my colleagues can answer the question.

Mr. **CUNNINGHAM**. Could anybody from a tobacco State give the reason for the increase in the price? Evidently no one does.

Mr. **NATCHER**. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, tobacco is produced in 21 States and has been a major agricultural commodity throughout the years. It is the fifth largest income-producing crop to farmers. This commodity provides some $3.3 billion in taxes to our Federal, State, and local governments and is a $10 billion industry.

While much good tobacco research has been done, more remains to be done. Our tobacco industry has reached the point where more basic fundamental research needs to be done in production, quality, utilization, and distribution. One of the most urgent needs at this time is improvement in quality. Research in the chemistry and physiology of tobacco has increased since the establishment of the Tobacco Research Laboratory, and we must have an expanded program of study of chemical constituents of tobacco in all types. Because of the implications to the health of the consumer from the use of tobacco with insecticidal residues, there is a continuing and urgent need for safer and yet more effective methods of control of insect pests of tobacco.

An expanded program of research is necessary today for tobacco. It is imperative that the money appropriated be used to include studies of the factors which may be detrimental to health and ascertain as soon as possible those quality factors and other characteristics which will preserve the desirable characteristics of tobacco and eliminate any factors which might be detrimental to health. One of the most urgent needs in all types of tobacco is improvement in quality.

In order to be successful with our expanded program of research for tobacco, we must have the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and private industry. We must find the answer to this problem as quickly as possible in order to prevent economic ruin for our producers, substantial losses of revenue to our Government, and possible injury to the health of our people.

In testifying before the Tobacco Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture on January 29, 1964, Dr. Luther L. Terry, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, stated in part as follows:

The third research category is how to make smoking safer. There are a number of approaches which are feasible and definitely need increased support. We need to know much more about the substances in tobacco smoke which produce the health hazards. Until we know more in this area, we will be handicapped in our efforts to remove the hazard. It is difficult to design a method of removing something if you don't know what it is. For example, you know substances in tobacco smoke can account for only a small portion of its cancer-producing power. We have no real clues as to what it is in tobacco smoke that influences coronary artery disease; if indeed it does. This would seem to be a fertile field for research, such as that proposed in the resolution now before this committee. In this specific context, I am sure the committee will realize that I must speak with some caution and reservations, since I am not an agricultural or horticultural expert. I still feel, nevertheless, that I can wholeheartedly support additional research of the types which the resolution would authorize and direct.

Dr. Terry also stated:

It is well known that strains of tobacco differ quite widely in various constituents. It is well known the levels of some of these constituents influence the amount of hazard dose or potentiality hazard dose substance in tobacco smoke. I would give a great deal to know whether the types of tobacco used for pipes and cigars have anything to do with the lesser hazards associated with these modes of tobacco use. If tobacco behaves as other vegetables, I am sure that the amount of some of its constituents will vary with the conditions of the culture, soil, climate, fertilizer, and other agricultural practices. This suggests, however, another area of research. Any vegetable material, when burned under the conditions prevailing when tobacco is smoked, will produce hazardous substances. Coal, oil, paper, even spinach, all produce benzopyrene, a potent cancer-producing substance when burned.

The efficiency of the combustion process makes a marked difference in the amount of this chemical in the smoke. As a matter of fact, most of the cancer-producing compounds identified in cigarette smoke are not present in the native tobacco leaf, but are formed during the burning process. These facts suggest that it will not be enough simply to develop better strains of tobacco and better methods of cultivation; we must also develop better methods of preventing the formation of these substances during the burning of tobacco, as well as of removing

> by filtration or other means the hazard dose substances that are formed. Both of these areas are promising after news for further development and have the potential of making smoking safer. It is quite well known that cigarettes can now be produced which yield quite low amounts of tars and nicotine, either by selection of the types of tobacco, by filters, or other means. It is relatively easy to measure this quantitatively. What isn't so well known or so easy to measure is the biological significance to man of the substances which do come through. Tobacco smoke is an exceedingly complex mixture of many different substances. It is not the amount of tars and nicotine produced that counts, it is the type and amount of hazard dose substances that get into a man that is important.
>
> In summary, Mr. Chairman, the action which I have outlined has the common purpose of avoiding or minimizing the intake of hazard dose substances by the American people. Action on many fronts is urgently needed. The Public Health Service intends to do what it can. This important and complex problem also calls for appropriate action by other Federal agencies, by State and local agencies, by nongovernmental organizations, and by the tobacco industry.

Mr. Chairman the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan should be defeated.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, this amendment would destroy completely the oldest industry in America—the tobacco industry. The tobacco industry grew up with this Republic. The first export market for tobacco was at Jamestown. This is an effort to destroy the livelihood of hundreds of thousands of our citizens. It is an effort to destroy an $8 billion industry. During the life of this tobacco program it has only cost the Government $38 million. During that time the Federal Government and the State governments have collected in taxes on tobacco more than $52 billion.

When we relate the $52 billion to the $38 million, we can see how negligible our losses have been.

As my dear friend from Kentucky, BILL NATCHER, has pointed out, we did summon the Surgeon General before our committee at the very next meeting after he filed his report. He was the first witness we called. He stated emphatically that he was in favor of more far-reaching research in the field which we were then discussing. He was the first witness.

The last witness we called was the Director of the Cancer Research Institute at Bethesda. He joined the Surgeon General in recommending more research, which was tantamount to an admission on their part that the Surgeon General's report was not substantive evidence and would not justify the action which is contemplated by this amendment.

I wish to compliment the gentleman from Kentucky upon his splendid effort in this particular area. Additional money was provided for research in a laboratory in Kentucky, built and paid for by the taxpayers of that great State, which is one of the greatest tobacco-growing States in the Union.

The field is being explored. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on cancer research. Why should anyone come in at this late date in an effort to destroy this industry?

I mean that this amendment if adopted would put all those in the tobacco-growing areas into bankruptcy. To destroy the price support program and to destroy the control program would mean that tobacco growers would plant the face of the earth in tobacco. Tobacco would be far more plentiful than it is now. Tobacco would be cheaper than it is now. Cigarettes would be cheaper and necessarily more readily available. The amendment would defeat the purpose for which it was offered.

I plead with you now to act with some degree of intelligence. Let us veto this proposition and defeat this amendment.

According to the figures presented by the author of the amendment, I am in the 120-percent category. I have smoked cigarettes for many long years, and I am certain that I smoke at least two packages of cigarettes a day. If his figures and calculations are correct, my time has long past. All of these statistics and percentages are based upon speculation and conjecture rather than upon scientific discoveries and findings. The Surgeon General's report has already caused irreparable damage to the tobacco industry. I do not know of anyone who has ever contended that smoking contributes to the cause of good health, but about 75 million people in this country smoke cigarettes. Cigarette smoking must contribute something to the comfort of the smoker. People continue to smoke and will continue to smoke notwithstanding either State or Federal laws which might prohibit or make unlawful the use of tobacco either in cigarettes, cigars, or other tobacco products. All of these people who smoke certainly cannot be fools.

Simply because some people do not smoke certainly does not justify the destruction of the tobacco industry. Our State of North Carolina produces more cigarette tobacco than any State in the Union, and we manufacture more cigarettes than any other State in the Union. If we are to destroy the tobacco industry, why not destroy all the distilleries and the breweries and every other industry at which the accusing finger has been pointed?

Many years ago I remember reading a poem—if it could be dignified in such fashion, it goes something like this:

"In this day of indigestion,
It's oftimes a serious question,
As to what to eat and what to leave alone.
For every microbe and bacillus
Have a different way to kill us,
And that both in time will claim us for their own.

"Drinking water is just as risky,
As the so-called deadly whisky,
And it's oftimes dangerous to breathe the air.
The clams we eat in chowder,
Make the angels shout the louder,
For they know that we will soon be there.

"Some little bug will get you sometime,
Some little bug will creep behind you sometime,
He will get into your gizzard;
If you get rid of him, you are a wizard,
Some little bug will get you sometime."

Seriously, this is an important amendment. If adopted, it will destroy the livelihoods and the property and fortunes of hundreds of thousands of our people. I hope, therefore, that the amendment will be defeated by an overwhelming vote. I still hope that we will soon embark upon a broad and comprehensive research program and most of all I hope our scientists will soon discover some way to prevent and to cure cancer and all other dread diseases.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Burley tobacco in my district is a very great industry, as it is in many sections of the United States. Tobacco is a great industry.

I share the same feelings as the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, that this amendment would destroy this industry. I do not believe that tobacco should be singled out on the floor of the House this afternoon in this way.

As for myself, I have never smoked, but at the same time I do not feel that I am the judge or the jury as to the health of the American people or that this amendment is in the proper proportion. I am definitely opposed to the amendment, because it would destroy an industry and throw thousands and thousands of people out of work. It would destroy many farmers in my area and in the Appalachian region, as well as in other regions of the United States.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Tobacco is an $8 billion industry in the United States. It is an industry with powerful and influential allies in the Halls of Congress. Unfortunately it is an industry that has shown blatant and persistent disregard for the health and well-being of our citizens.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has just proclaimed that if the U.S. Government were to discontinue subsidizing the tobacco industry, that industry would be destroyed.

In the interest of the health of the American people, I wish that Mr. COOLEY's statement were true. If, as he says, an entire industry is dependent upon Federal subsidies—made possible by taxpayer's money—for its existence, then I say that that industry has no reason for being.

By refusing to subsidize the tobacco industry, we will eliminate one of the most plaguing inconsistencies in our national policy. What we are faced with now is a Government that is willing, on the one hand, to spend money on research to prove to the American people that smoking is a major cause of disease and an unequivocable health hazard and, on the other hand, a Government that is willing to expend funds to protect the tobacco industry from possible financial loss.

I ask my colleagues, whose health is our greatest concern, the health of our citizens or the health of a special interest group? The health of our citizens is the only acceptable answer. Therefore, this distinguished body has but one alternative: to support the amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL and let the tobacco industry fend for itself.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated. I realize that through the press and in various and sundry hearings there has been much argument as to various effects of tobacco. I think all of us will agree that this is really a very complex subject and one on which there are many differences of opinion. What action the country should take is certainly not something that would be easy for us to determine. I do think, however, we can all agree here that by adopting an amendment like this, it would not bring about a reduction in the production of tobacco. It would merely say that those hundreds of thousands and millions of people engaged in the production of it shall not receive anything like a fair return. The result of this would merely be to make many other areas of this country like Appalachia.

May I call attention again to the fact that this amendment does not prohibit the production, the sale, or anything else connected with tobacco. As the chairman of the legislative committee pointed out, it would make it more readily available, probably, if people tried to grow more of it. As it is now, there are stronger limitations on the amount of tobacco that can be produced. The limitation is there so that they can receive price support. All of us will agree, however, if this amendment is adopted and you knock out the price supports, it would increase the production of tobacco above what it is now, because producers will be attempting to get enough to live on. So I say that, whatever your feelings are as to what the Congress should do, we certainly should not take this precipitous action here which would have the absolutely opposite effect, in my opinion, to that which is desired by the author of the amendment.

I hope we will defeat the amendment.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I think the author of the amendment is unaware of the fact that there are many types of tobacco grown in the United States which are not used in cigarettes. I represent a district where several thousand farmers are growing tobacco as a cash crop and none of it goes into the manufacture of cigarettes but, rather, into cigars and chewing tobacco or wrappers and fillers. I am certain the gentleman from Michigan would not want to deny the farmers of Wisconsin the opportunity to produce tobacco that does not go into cigarettes.

I hope that this amendment will be defeated, because I certainly do not want my constituents to be inadvertently injured by an amendment which is designed for some other purpose. So I caution the Members and urge them to vote against this amendment.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

I am not a producer or consumer of tobacco, but I represent more than 2,000 tobacco farmers who earn most of their cash income from the sale of tobacco.

People will continue to consume tobacco products, and will continue to do so regardless of what is done on the floor of this House today. The amendment is wrong in principle and is discriminatory against one class of farmers. If we are going to penalize the tobacco farmers, then we perhaps should penalize and help destroy other segments of our economy.

I agree that use of tobacco is a very complex subject to evaluate. One can secure a professional opinion that the use of tobacco is harmful, and at the same time obtain professional advice disclaiming such opinions.

Research is now underway, and a Tobacco Research Laboratory has been established. The tobacco industry has shown good faith, and we should not be too eager to destroy an $8 billion industry in the United States.

I further agree that if this amendment is adopted it would certainly not cause a decrease in the use of tobacco or related products, because the amendment does not curtail the production, marketing, or sale of tobacco.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The CLERK. Page 35, line 9:

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FOOD MARKETING

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the National Commission on Food Marketing, established by Public Law 88-354, approved July 3, 1964, $750,000.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to publicly thank the Attorney General of the United States for his decision Saturday to permit Florida celery farmers additional time to employ offshore farm labor in the harvest of their crops.

Under this decision no new workers will be imported—500 already in the country and working in celery will be permitted to stay until June 1. This will enable farmers to salvage a large part of the crop, with a market value of approximately $2.7 million.

Emergency action was needed in this situation, with crops already ripe in the fields and the labor being readied for repatriation. The Attorney General was most cooperative and understanding of the problem.

Under Public Law 414 the Attorney General is charged with the responsibility of administration of the immigration laws, and thus he is required to act on importation and repatriation of agricultural workers. By practice of the Justice Department, the Secretary of Labor has been consulted as to the availability of domestic farmworkers.

I am certain that our experience this year has proved the need for new procedures in the administration of Public Law 414. Full consideration must be given the views of the Department of Agriculture on the need or justification for offshore farm labor.

With the advise of the Secretary of Agriculture, spelling out the actual condition of the crops and the requirements of harvest, the Attorney General would be in a better position to determine the proper course of action for his Department to take. The Department of Labor seems to depend on statistics rather than actual field conditions, and, of course, simply is not competent to render agricultural opinions on the maturity of a crop or the kind or number of people necessary for its harvest.

The Labor Department should be encouraged to improve efforts to recruit and train domestic unemployed workers to perform the jobs needed on the farms, and I will continue to support their budget requests for these efforts. Our farmers prefer to hire our own citizens, and have met every reasonable request to do so, including the payment of a minimum wage, set by the Labor Department, incentive pay for productive workers, social security, unemployment compensation, housing, and even transportation to and from distant States.

The Appropriations Committee in its Report No. 272 stated that:

> Timely availability of labor under current circumstances cannot be assured with the domestic farm labor program we have had in the past.

Experience clearly demonstrates the need for a change in procedures. Now is the time for action, so that the problem can be met before the next crop season.

The growers of Florida, and their domestic employees, thank the Attorney General for his personal time and attention and for his help in salvaging a large portion of this year's celery crop and urge his use of the Department of Agriculture to help in the administration of Public Law 414.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman and associate myself with his remarks. But I would also like to express the hope, perhaps a forlorn hope, that the Attorney General will realize, as the Secretary of Labor has not, that California, too, has an equally serious problem and we will not, I hope, be in a situation where Florida has been granted relief while California has not been.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I understand that some 37 States will be affected. I am sure that if the Department of Agriculture will transmit the knowledge that it has to the Attorney General and not just to the Secretary of Labor, maybe we will get the full picture which obviously we have not been getting.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I should hope so. Certainly a desirable precedent has at last been established.

The CLERK. Page 36, line 20:

SEC. 506. Not less than $1,500,000 of the appropriations of the Department for research and service work authorized by the Acts of August 14, 1946, July 28, 1954, and

September 6, 1958 (7 U.S.C. 427, 1621–1629; 42 U.S.C. 1891–1893), shall be available for contracting in accordance with said Acts.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: Page 37, after line 2, insert the following section:
>
> "SEC. 507. No part of any funds appropriated by this Act may, in any fiscal year, be used, directly or indirectly, to make payments to any person, partnership, or corporation in an aggregate amount in excess of $50,000 in connection with any price-support program or combination of programs for price support or stabilization, irrespective of whether such payments are on account of loans, purchases, or subsidies or are otherwise authorized."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, you will be interested to know that the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation publishes a list of recipients of price support loans which runs to 13 closely typed pages.

Mr. Chairman, many of those recipients receive amounts like $128,000, $180,000, $173,000, $122,400, $542,687, and $171,077.76.

Mr. Chairman, when the price support program was set up back in the early days of the New Deal, when my father was a Member of Congress, we were told that the purpose of this program was to help the small farmer.

Mr. Chairman, I have voted for many years for these price support programs and I consider myself by reason of my votes for these programs to be a friend of the farmer, even though I say to my colleagues that over these many years in which I have been supporting these programs I have feared that I was supporting the large producer and not the person who should be the principal beneficiary of this program.

Mr. Chairman, if this Congress really seeks to help the small farmer I believe it should and indeed must support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment says that no person, corporation, or partnership shall receive from one or from an aggregation of price support programs in excess of $50,000.

Mr. Chairman, I do not view this as being an excessive limitation on the number of persons who shall derive benefits and I do not believe $50,000 in price supports is an unfair limitation to impose upon a farmer.

Mr. Chairman, I can see no justification whatsoever for a farm price support program which would afford to a single producer $524,000. That is not growing for sale or for consumption. That man is growing for storage. I say it is wrong for this Congress to authorize funding of programs which are going to help the big man who is fully capable of finding his place in the marketplace, who is fully competent to meet the competitive thrust of American industry and of American merchandising today.

Mr. Chairman, I say that these price support programs should be limited to those who need the support of the program. I say we should make these price support programs apply to the family farmer. If we are going to do that, I say we can best justify it by screening out that small number of producers who derive excessive benefits from the programs and limit the programs to those who really have need of Government support. If this Congress does this, we will merit the thanks of the American farmer because we will stop the continued conglomeration of farms into larger and larger producer units. Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues that if we do this we will have earned the thanks of the American consumer and no longer will dissipate the taxpayers' dollars into the pockets of large producers but will put them into the hands of the small farmers whom we seek to support through our price support programs.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in support of the amendment which has been offered by my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote in favor of this appropriation but I have some grave reservations about the future course of our farm program and believe that we should consider some major changes immediately.

I agree with the goals outlined by Mr. Freeman in his text before the House Committee on Agriculture speaking in support of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. My reservations are that I believe we should state flatly now that our agricultural programs are not working and we should look at the problem and make a fresh start.

The farm community of the 1960's and 1970's is far different than the community of the 1930's and 1940's when our present farm policy evolved. The new types of equipment, the fertilizers, insecticides, and weedicides have changed production drastically in the last 10 years. These items are available to the well-financed large corporate-type farm complexes and are very effective there. They are not as effective in the small family farm. These items provide great productive capacity on the large commercial farms enabling them to receive large subsidy payments while providing only a trickle to the small family farmer. The payment of subsidies under these circumstances without production controls has led to the creation of large surpluses and imbalance of income whereby a small percentage of our farmers receive the great bulk of our farm subsidy payments.

For example, the family farmer must farm "fence to fence" to maintain a bare existence and he cannot participate in voluntary soil bank programs. Whereas the large commercial farmer through use of new techniques and equipment can both maintain his past production and participate in the soil bank program, with the result that we have not reduced surpluses or controlled production or substantially aided the small farmer.

We should recognize that we are not aiding the small family farmer or the American consumer by a mere continuation of our past programs. Statistic after statistic show the flight from the farm to the city and statistic after statistic indicates how firmly the total agricultural production in the United States is moving into the hands of a smaller and smaller group of large industrial farming complexes. While the present parity—subsidy programs without production controls—may have worked in the past, they have outlived their usefulness. They give us neither control of our production nor do they support the type of farm that needs help. The agricultural production of our country is the envy of the world and the despair of the Communist nations. Our farmers have literally revolutionized the concept of growing food and fiber. We have developed a system of production which is the envy of the world. We should not permit this wonderful operation which we have developed through the resourcefulness of our heritage of both people and resources to become a plague.

I believe we must break with the mold of the past. We must develop farm policies which are meaningful for the 1960's and 1970's and beyond.

As an example, one great flaw in our present program is that the Federal Government continues to price U.S. cotton out of the market and we are now paying subsidies at more than one level in the cotton producing and manufacturing process.

As recently stated in the Washington Post on May 2, 1965:

> World cotton consumption is increasing at the rate of about a million bales a year, and if this country were not pushed out of the world market by a policy that relegates it to the role of a high priced residual supplier, our balance-of-payments position might be strengthened by as much as $350 million.

I

I would propose, therefore, that we move to a system of income supports. A tepid and timid move in this direction has already been made for wheat, and a successful income support program for wool producers has been operating since 1964. Income guarantee supports would move our agricultural programs from a program of price parity to a program of income parity. We then should support directly our family farmer to certain predetermined levels. These levels could be worked out, for example, at a percentage return on investment, plus a fair return for his labor with a reasonable upper limit guarantee of supports at a determined figure of say $25,000 to any single farm family producer. Then farm products could move to the marketplace and rise and fall with supply and demand with each farmer earning according to his abilities and farm capacity but with support being given to the low-income farmers.

II

A determination be made of our domestic and overseas needs for the next 10 years. The needs of our society should be set forth as clearly as possible and we should then move to fill the needs.

III

The type of farm operation that we hope to encourage should be of major interest. If we hope to maintain the values we speak of, then the emphasis on our programs should be on the cultural, and conservation of soil and water aspects of the program, and not on the production aspects of the program. Our farmers should be rewarded for saving our soil and water resources—for this is the staff of our life. With a program of income supports that starts to deemphasize the goal of allout production every year, we would gradually build our soil and water resources on the farms of America to last forever.

IV

A program of consumer education should be started. That would make agricultural production and food meaningful in terms of the foods we eat and wear. Plus the added advantage of the natural flow of commodities to the marketplace unhindered by artificial barriers.

V

A program of immediate support for raising the minimum wage of our migratory workers to $1.25 per hour, with decent standards of housing, education, and sanitation.

VI

The developing of the idea that the most valuable weapon we have in our battle against the tyranny of communism is food and clothing. That we start to utilize our food programs in such a way that people of the world will know that the only war we seek is man's ancient war against ignorance, poverty, and disease.

We in the United States should be eternally grateful to the American farmer for the tremendous contribution of know-how in farming. The farmers of the United States have lifted the specter of starvation from our backs and have shown the way to the rest of the world. With this contribution in mind, I believe that it is possible for us to save the values that we wish in farming and provide to the consumers of America the objectives which the Secretary of Agriculture enumerates.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman. I will tell my friends from the farm States that the day of reckoning is not far off. The city people are sick and tired of having farm programs coming before the House which do not protect the small farmer; that ignore the wishes of the consumers. The day is coming shortly, Mr. Chairman, when Members of Congress from city districts will no longer be able to support price support programs because of exactly the type of abuse I have cataloged to this body today.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi press his point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. This amendment would require the keeping of books, it would require substantive additional duties on many people because many producers produce many different crops. This would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard, I would point out this is very simple. I am sure the gentleman from Mississippi knows no duties are imposed upon any persons by this. It says:

> No part of any funds appropriated by this Act may, in any fiscal year, be used, directly or indirectly, to make payments to any person, partnership or corporation in an aggregate amount in excess of $50,000 in connection with any price support program or combination of programs for price support or stabilization.

This is really a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] offered an amendment to page 37, line 2, which is a new section, and reads as follows:

> No part of any funds appropriated by this Act may, in any fiscal year, be used, direclty or indirectly, to make payments to any person, partnership or corporation in an aggregate amount in excess of $50,000 in connection with any price support program or combination of programs for price support or stabilization, irrespective of whether such payments are on account of loans, purchases, or subsidies or are otherwise authorized.

To which amendment the gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair is of the opinion that since the amendment is directed to funds appropriated by the pending act, the phrase "in any fiscal year" is not applicable, nor in fact is it necessary. But the Chair is further of the opinion that this is an express limitation on the funds appropriated by the pending bill, and holds that the amendment is in order, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the price support program that we have in existence provides for coverage of total production. It provides for loans to mature. The whole basis for the program is that the producer is eligible if he comes within the provisions of the program. I respectfully submit this limitation would in effect limit the amount of production that is under the farm program, and would cause the Government to lose more money.

Going to the merits of the matter, may I point out to my friends from the city areas, who are consumers, and I am no more a farmer than you are—I am not a producer, I am a consumer—but those of us who are consumers must realize that about 1 million farmers produce for us consumers about 80 percent of the production in the United States. About 1 million people make available to us at a cost of about 17 or 18 percent of our consumers' income the finest foodstuffs and fibers that any nation has ever known.

I say to you, if you want to enact a relief program, if you want to provide for a program of payments to people on a relief basis, you might have some justification for limiting the payments as proposed. But as long as you have a farm program based on total production, any time you try to put on a limit and say that those up to a certain point are in the program and all the rest are outside of the program, you flood the market and break the prices and it is going to cost more money.

Another way to look at it—and this is not a threat or anything like that—but it is just like saying that your minimum wage laws and your bargaining rights should be limited only to those plants that have eight people. It is like saying that if you have a large plant that a wage contract should not exist there.

It is your big commercial operator who has increased his investment tenfold who supplies 80 percent of all that we consume. If you take that producer out from under the farm program, you will be hurting us consumers. At the same time, you will cost yourselves money because you would be paying up to $50,000 to this group over here that does not have as much to do with supplying us, and leaving outside the program the big producers that do supply us.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues defeat this amendment because I think it is not good for either the farmer or the consumer.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. MAHON. I am unalterably opposed to the limitation amendment. It is wrong in principle and would be damaging to producer and consumer alike. Also is it not true that this is the situation. Here it is now May 27. The farmers have made their plans for this year. Many of them have already planted their crops and they did so with a certain understanding of what the rules and regulations are.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman's point is well made. However, it goes much deeper than that. That is a matter of obligation or contract. I am just saying that this approach would cost a whole lot more money because it would put under it only those who are under $50,000 gross production and would keep out of it the big segment of producers and it would leave the Government with all the costs. I suggest it is basically unsound.

Mr. ALBERT. I think it comes down to this. If we do not like the philosophy of the farm program it is one thing, but to say here that we should remove from the program all production over a certain amount would mean that such production would go into the market and all the rest would go into Government warehouses.

Mr. WHITTEN. It would hurt the consumer, it would break the farm program, and it would cost the Government a whole lot more money.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out briefly that the figures that the gentleman from Michigan used really do not warrant the conclusion he developed. He includes in his amendment loans and guarantees. A lot of the benefits that are available under the farm programs are loans and guarantees. Of the money that is being loaned and guaranteed on the 1964 crop of corn and beans—hardly a dime of it will result in a cost to the U.S. Treasury. The farmers secured loans in the fall. During the marketing year, probably now or in April or March, they sell the beans or corn and receive more than the loan and pay it off with interest. Those loans and guarantees are included in the limitation in the amendment. If you are going to put a limitation on, why limit it to farm loans? We do not limit the Small Business Administration loans to $50,000. We do not limit the number of houses that a builder can sell with FHA guaranteed loans to a cumulative total of $50,000. Payments for houses are guaranteed at the bank just the same as payments on farm commodity loans have a guarantee that the money will be paid. We do not have such a limitation on most other segments of our economy so why should we have that type limitation here?

These programs are supply and demand programs? We are trying to make supply balance with demand. If we prevent the bigger farmers from helping to balance supply, they will increase their supply and then the family farmers must reduce their supply even more. In other words, whenever we drive some of the bigger operators out of the program, we are in fact putting a bigger burden on the family farmer, because he has to absorb more of the reduction.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. The point the gentleman is making can perhaps be best emphasized by the fact that within a short time this committee will be debating whether to increase the legal minimum at which the Commodity Credit Corporation can release stocks which it has acquired under the price support program.

The implication here is that when the Commodity Credit Corporation makes a loan, we lose money. The present law requires they cannot release those stocks at less than 105 percent of the loan rate plus carrying charges.

I further point out that this seems to me to limit the benefits which could be paid to a farmer, which might inure because of the wheat certificate program. The domestic wheat certificate does not involve Federal funds but in fact is part of the price of wheat as paid by the processor for domestic food purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman is helping to point out that this is a very complicated question which cannot be dealt with in a simple amendment such as proposed. That should be done in a legislative act. If we pass this amendment, we will be picking out the farmer and saying, "You are the only one upon which there is going to be a limitation on loans and guarantees." I urge rejection of the amendment under consideration.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my good friend from Iowa and also the remarks of the distinguished Members who have spoken in opposition to the amendment.

The American farm program in recent years has been designed to encourage the widest possible participation of all producers, and particularly it is needful to involve the participation of the commercial farmers. The program suggested by the amendment strikes at the very heart of this policy. It would drive outside the present attempt to control American production some of the largest producers. Not only would it be inequitable to them, by punishing bigness, but beyond that it would threaten the entire validity of our present farm program.

As another comment the implication of the amendment is that some American farmers are receiving $50,000 for their profit. But the amendment relates to payments to them. As many Members from agricultural areas well know, the income to many of our commercial farmers is 2 or 3 percent of investment. That is what the amendment approaches, and not profit. It does not approach net returns, but relates to the payment received from Government programs.

I urge that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NELSEN

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NELSEN of Minnesota: On page 37, line 3, insert: "SEC. 507. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department who, as such officer or employee, participates or has been found to have participated in partisan political activities in violation of the Hatch Act or the Corrupt Practices Act."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. As I understand the amendment—and I have not seen it—it would be an ex post facto law, in that it has to do with prior actions.

It would call for determinations wholly beyond the determination of the Department of Agriculture, and definitely it would impose additional duties. For that reason it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. NELSEN. On the point of order, it would seem to me there would be nothing wrong with an amendment to this bill that would require employees of the Government to abide by the laws of the land. I desire that the Chair permit me my 5 minutes in order to speak on my amendment, and if the Chair will permit, he could then rule on the point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I withhold my point of order.

Mr. NELSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, back in 1961 reports came to me from employees of the Rural Electrification Administration, that the solicitation of political funds was being carried on quite extensively in that department. I called this to the attention of the proper authorities, and finally the Civil Service Commission in effect said, "Put up or else." I brought the information to the attention of the investigators of the Civil Service Commission. Last October I received a letter from the Civil Service Commission stating that they had documented my charge indicating that one person was in violation of the Hatch Act and three at the administrative level were in violation of the Corrupt Practices Act. Later the Federal Bureau of Investigation was brought into the act, and to this day there has been nothing resolved. This has been going on and on.

I might add it has been disappointing to me as a former administrator of the REA program that we do nothing about the fact that the administrator of that agency involves himself in congressional races and goes out on fundraising dinners, even for a State senator in one of our States. When I was administrator of the agency I was on the hot seat before a Government Operations Committee and was admonished by the committee that the law provides that the administrator shall not participate in politics—and I did not. So my purpose, of course, is to bring this to the attention of the House because in my judgment rural America never had a better program than rural electrification. It has had bipartisan support.

This has been a great program and has been one of the best ever enacted by the Congress of the United States. I do not like to see that agency become a partisan collection agency for any political party, and I do not wish to see the Administrator become the pawn of any politician, whether he be Republican or Democrat.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] having assumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year 1966, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 8370, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment as follows:
>
> On page 32, line 2, insert the following: "No part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1966 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to either the United Arab Republic or Indonesia under the provisions of title I of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended."

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 187, nays 208, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—187

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashmore
Ayres
Baldwin
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bingham
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dowdy
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Farbstein
Findley
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Herlong
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
Saylor
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stanton
Stratton
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Younger

NAYS—208

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Cooley
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Green, Pa.
Grider
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Greigg
Griffiths
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harris
Hardy
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Irwin
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Leggett
Love
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Powell
Purcell
Race
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
St Germain
St. Onge
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Watts
Whitten
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—38

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Berry
Bonner
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Fino
Flynt
Fogarty
Gallagher
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Landrum
Lennon
Lindsay
Mathias
Miller
Pool
Price
Randall
Resnick
Roncalio
Skubitz
Springer
Stafford
Steed
Toll
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Brown of California against.

Mr. Lennon for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Roncalio against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Price against.

Mr. Hansen of Idaho for, with Mr. Randall against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Miller against.

Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Until further notice:

Mr. George Andrews with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Stafford.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Hagen of California with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Weltner.

Messrs. ROOSEVELT, MAILLIARD, FULTON of Tennessee, HICKS, PATTEN, and MACDONALD changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 354, nays 41, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—354

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callan
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clark
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilbert

Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—41

Bell
Bow
Brock
Broomfield
Cahill
Cameron
Clancy
Corbett
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Findley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fulton, Pa.
Gibbons
Goodell
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Harvey, Mich.
Hosmer
Jacobs
McCarthy
McClory
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Minshall
Pelly
Pike
Reinecke
Rogers, Fla.
Saylor
Smith, Calif.
Utt
Watkins
Wolff
Wydler
Younger

NOT VOTING—38

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Berry
Bonner
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Flynt
Fino
Fogarty
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Kirwan
Landrum
Lennon
Lindsay
Mathias
Miller
Pool
Price
Randall
Resnick
Roncalio
Skubitz
Springer
Stafford
Steed
Toll
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hansen of Idaho for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Price with Mr. Hagen of California.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. White of Idaho.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. George Andrews with Mr. Weltner.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in connection with the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. BOW reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMEND SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 402, Rept. No. 378), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 402

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7847) to amend the Small Business Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AUTHORITY OF DOMESTIC BANKS TO PAY INTEREST ON TIME DEPOSITS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 401, Rept. No. 377), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 401

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5306) to continue the authority of domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight Tuesday, June 1, to file a report to accompany the bill H.R. 8464.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS, 1966

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 400 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 400

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill (S. 800) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles,

and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and all point of order against the conference report are hereby waived.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith]. Pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution merely makes in order the consideration of the conference report on the military procurement bill, S. 800.

Mr. Speaker, it becomes necessary to adopt this rule in order that the conference report may be considered. This becomes necessary, Mr. Speaker, because the amount arrived at in conference exceeds the amount of the authorization.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What the gentleman is saying is that the conference report will be subject to a point of order in the absence of a rule waiving points of order, because I must assume there are items which are not authorized by the House in the conference report. Is that correct?

Mr. COLMER. In reply to my distinguished and able friend from Iowa, let me say that he is only partially correct. He is usually correct in toto.

Mr. GROSS. Well, thank you.

Mr. COLMER. It is necessary to waive points of order because the amount exceeds the amount of the authorization. It is not my understanding, however—and I may be in error, but, if so, I will yield to someone who can correct me—that there are items that were not in the bill. That is not my understanding.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, may I simply say that I am in agreement with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer]. My understanding of it is that the House passed a bill adding certain items, some frigates, which cost more money than carried in the committee bill. The Senate did not include those, but they added something else to it. When they went into conference, they each got what they wanted. This rule is necessary to waive points of order in order that we may adopt the conference report on the bill. And I suggest that we adopt the rule and the conference report.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 800) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 374)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 800) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

"SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1966 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

"Aircraft

"For aircraft: For the Army, $344,500,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,915,800,000; for the Air Force, $3,550,200,000.

"Missiles

"For missiles: For the Army, $253,700,000; for the Navy, $364,000,000; for the Marine Corps, $13,000,000; for the Air Force, $796,100,000.

"Naval vessels

"For naval vessels: For the Navy, $1,721,000,000, of which amount $133,600,000 is authorized only for the construction of two nuclear powered submarines and $150,500,000 is authorized only for the construction of a nuclear powered guided missile frigate.

"TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

"SEC. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1966 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

"For the Army, $1,406,400,000;

"For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $1,439,200,000;

"For the Air Force, $3,103,900,000, of which amount $150,000,000 is authorized only for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory and $7,000,000 is authorized only for the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft;

"For Defense agencies, $495,000,000.

"TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 301. Outstanding tonnage balances remaining in law for construction of Navy ships are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 302. The distribution of the assignments and contracts for construction of warships and escort vessels for which appropriations are authorized by this Act and hereafter shall be in accordance with the requirement of the Act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503), that the first and each succeeding alternate vessel shall be constructed in the Government Navy yards: *Provided*, That, if inconsistent with the public interests in any year to have a vessel or vessels constructed as required above, the President may have such vessel or vessels built in a Government or private yard as he may direct.

"SEC. 303. The assignment of naval ship conversion, alteration, and repair projects shall be made on the basis of economic and military considerations and shall not be restricted by requirements that certain portions of such naval shipwork be assigned to particular types of shipyards or to particular geographical areas or by similar requirements.

"SEC. 304. Section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, or after December 31, 1962, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the research, development, test, or evaluation of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, or after December 31, 1963, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for any research, development, test, or evaluation, or after December 31, 1965, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of tracked combat vehicles, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such dates.'

"SEC. 305. No funds may be appropriated after June 30, 1966, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for use as an emergency fund for research, development, test, and evaluation, or procurement or production related thereto unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after that date.

"SEC. 306. (a) Section 8074 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

" '(c) The Military Air Transport Service is redesignated as the Military Airlift Command.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall become effective January 1, 1966."

And the House agree to the same.

L. Mendel Rivers,
Philip J. Philbin,
F. Edw. Hébert,
Melvin Price,
O. C. Fisher,
Porter Hardy, Jr.,
William H. Bates,
Leslie C. Arends,
Alvin E. O'Konski.
Managers on the Part of the House.

John Stennis,
Stuart Symington,
Henry M. Jackson,
Howard W. Cannon,
Leverett Saltonstall,
Margaret Chase Smith,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 800) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

BACKGROUND

Procurement

Navy (Aircraft)

The Senate modified the aircraft portion of the Navy program. The Senate cut all

10 of the E-2A aircraft from the Navy procurement program. This totaled $99.8 million. It is true that the E-2A has experienced radar performance and reliability problems. Modifications, however, are now being made to correct these deficiencies and reports indicate that this aircraft performed very well in exercise "Silver Lance." In view of what has become an urgent operational need for the E-2A, the conferees agreed that all 10 of these airplanes should be returned to the program.

The Senate recedes.

Navy (Naval Vessels)

Fast deployment logistic ships (FDL): Several changes were made in the naval vessels portion of the bill. The Senate deleted two of the four fast deployment logistic ships (FDL) involving $64.2 million. The conferees agreed that in view of the fact that the characteristics of this new type ship have not been completely refined and because the ultimate procurement program has not yet been estimated, the two ships proposed by the Senate would be adequate for this fiscal year.

The House recedes.

Motor gunboats (PGM): The Navy requested 10 motor gunboats (PGMs). The Senate allowed only five of these gunboats, cutting the procurement by $21 million. The conferees agreed that the 5 gunboats should be returned to the program in order to provide the Navy with all 10 ships capable of performing counterinsurgency, patrol, blockade and reconnaissance missions.

The Senate recedes.

Nuclear-powered attack submarines (SSN): The Navy requested four attack submarines (SSNs). The Senate added two more submarines for a total of six on the basis that this would restore the attack submarine construction program to the rate that had been projected in earlier years. After extended discussion by the conferees and further consideration of the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were unanimous in their recommendation of a program of six submarines, the two submarines added by the Senate were agreed to by the House.

The House recedes.

Nuclear-powered frigate (DLGN): The House added a nuclear-powered guided missile frigate (DLGN) at a cost of $150.5 million. The Navy had originally requested this ship but the Office of the Secretary of Defense did not permit it to be included in the program. It was and is the position of the House that the addition of the DLGN was on the basis of a real Navy need for such a ship but also for the reason that, as the House report states: "The committee feels * * * that the Department of Defense has both procrastinated and vacillated in its approach to nuclear-powered surface ships."

It is also the position of the House committee that the will of the Congress should be expressed to the end that greater and more rapid progress be made in the field of nuclear-powered surface ships for our Navy. After discussion of this matter by the conferees, it was agreed that the DLGN should remain in the program.

The Senate recedes.

Air Force (Aircraft)

The House deleted $5 million from the industrial facilities portion of the Air Force aircraft program. Subsequent to this cut the Department of Defense furnished information not made available to the committee at the time of its original consideration of this program. The Department of Defense in its later furnished information stated that an attempt is being made "to achieve lower procurement costs through a continuing program of updating Government owned equipment which has become technologically obsolete. We encourage the services to budget 5 percent of the value of their active inventory for this purpose—representing turnover of equipment only every 20 years. In the fiscal year 1966 budget the Air Force request of $27.5 million for this purpose is equal to only 3.5 percent of the inventory value. Reduction of this request will hamper our efforts to reduce procurement costs through modernization of our production techniques."

On the basis of this additional information, the House conferees agreed that the $5 million should be returned to the program.

The House recedes.

Air Force (Missiles)

In its consideration of the Air Force missile program, the House Committee cut $25 million from the missile support equipment and facilities program. Additional information subsequently furnished by the Department of Defense indicates that this cut could generate problems within the missile program of the Department of Defense and the conferees agreed that it should be returned.

The House recedes.

Research, development, test and evaluation

The bill passed by the Senate reduced the requested research and development budget by $44 million, all of which was to be taken from the military sciences budget activity. The Senate then added to the amount requested $82 million, to be applied only for the development of the advanced manned strategic aircraft (AMSA), for a net addition to the budget of $38 million.

The bill as it passed the House reduced the research and development budget by $121.3 million. The House added $7 million to the amount requested for the advanced manned strategic aircraft. Thus, the action by the House reflected a net reduction of $114.3 million to the total amount requested for research, development, test and evaluation.

The bill passed by the House contained restrictive language for the $150 million authorized for the manned orbiting laboratory (MOL). This restrictive language was accepted by the Senate in conference.

Both bills included restrictive language for the amounts added for the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft. In conference the Senate receded and accepted the House language which added only $7 million above the amount requested. The total amount of new obligational authority, $22 million, is available only for the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft. Both the House and the Senate continue to support the development of a follow-on manned bomber. However, the conference committee agreed that the additional $22 million in new obligational authority is about the maximum that could be expended wisely and effectively during the coming year on the basis of the program approved by the Department of Defense to date.

The House reduced specific program elements in arriving at the recommended reductions. However, it recognized that in a rapidly changing environment the military services must be allowed the flexibility to cope with changing conditions and requirements. Therefore, it was recommended that the reductions could be taken in program areas other than those indicated and could be on the basis of military priorities of each department.

Army

The House reduced the amount requested for Army research, development, test, and evaluation by $31.6 million. The Senate reduced $8.5 million from the amount requested. The Senate recedes and accepts the House reduction. Thus, the amount authorized for Army R.D.T. & E. is $1,406,400,000.

Navy

The House reduced the amount requested for Navy research development, test and evaluation by $33.4 million. The Senate reduced $10 million from the amount requested. The Senate recedes and accepts the House version. Thus, the amount authorized for Navy R.D.T. & E. is $1,439,200,000.

Air Force

The House reduced $50.9 million from the amount requested and then added on $7 million for the advanced manned strategic aircraft, for a net reduction of $43.9 million. The Senate reduced the amount requested by $8.5 million and then added on $82 million for the advanced manned strategic aircraft. The Senate recedes and accepts the House version. Thus, the amount authorized for the Air Force R.D.T. & E. is $3,103,900,000.

Defense agencies

The House reduced the amount requested for research, development, test and evaluation by the Defense agencies by $5.4 million. The Senate reduced $17 million from the amount requested. The Senate recedes and accepts the House version. Thus, $495,000,000 is authorized for research, development, test and evaluation for Defense agencies.

TITLE III

The House added six new sections to the bill. Each of them is described and the rationale explained below:

Section 301. Repeal of tonnage: The Vinson-Trammell Act and subsequent acts created tonnage which now is in excess of 3,300,000 tons. From every practical standpoint, the enactment of section 412(b) has rendered existing tonnage authorizations meaningless. Bookkeeping on this tonnage is expensive.

Section 302. Alternate ship provision: Section 301, in addition to repealing outstanding tonnage also repealed the alternate ship provision of the Vinson-Trammell Act. It is considered desirable that this provision be preserved.

The Vinson-Trammell Act applied only to "warships." Since that act, escort vessels have become an important part of the Navy. The House committee, therefore, in reenacting the alternate ship provision modified it slightly to include "warships and escort vessels." In this year's bill alone the change will embrace 10 destroyer escorts at a price of $279.1 million.

Section 303. 65/35: Today at least 35 percent of all conversion, alteration and repair of naval ships must, under Appropriations Committee language, be performed in private shipyards. This section would eliminate this requirement.

The Navy and the Secretary of Defense strongly support this new section.

The Secretary of the Navy in a letter to the committee stated, among other things, that: "Cost studies show that there is no economy in contracting out conversion, alteration, and repair work (CAR) to private yards. In fact, annual savings can be achieved under present cost differentials by increasing the amount of conversion, alteration, and repair work assigned to naval shipyards. If all factors involved in these assignments were to permit an increase from the current statutory level of 65 percent to a somewhat higher level, it is estimated that an annual savings of several million dollars could be achieved. This results from the fact that the naval shipyards which must be maintained for strategic and operational reasons have a high fixed overhead cost which continues regardless of workload assigned."

Section 304. Inclusion of tracked combat vehicles in 412(b): This section will require procurement authorization for "tracked vehicles" in addition to aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. For fiscal year 1966 about $200 million would have been involved.

Section 305. Emergency fund: Each year Congress makes available to the Department of Defense an Emergency Fund for Research and Development. It has varied between $125 and $150 million. The House committee believes that this emergency fund should be authorized in the same fashion as all other funds for research and development.

Section 306. Changing name of MATS: The House committee believes that MATS is too important to be designated as a "service". Military Airlift Command is both descriptive of its true function and provides a recognition of its vital missions. The cost of making this change is estimated at be $173,800. This change in name is to be effective as of January 1, 1966.

The Senate recedes with respect to these six new sections.

SUMMARY

The bill as presented to the Congress by the President totaled $15,297,200,000 (of which $6,558,800,000 was for research, development, test, and evaluation). The bill as it passed the House totaled $15,303,400,000 (of which $6,444,500,000 was for R.D.T. & E.). The bill as it passed the Senate totaled $15,283,800,000 (of which $6,596,800,000 was for R.D.T. & E.).

The bill as agreed to in conference totals $15,402,800,000 (of which $6,444,500,000 is for R.D.T. & E.).

The agreement arrived at by the conferees is $99,400,000 more than the bill as it passed the House, $119,000,000 more than the bill as it passed the Senate, and is $105,600,000 above the bill as it was presented to the Congress by the President.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
F. EDW. HÉBERT,
MELVIN PRICE,
O. C. FISHER,
PORTER HARDY, Jr.,
WILLIAM H. BATES,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on S. 800, the authorizing legislation for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels and for research and development carried on by the Department of Defense.

The bill authorizes the procurement, for the 3 services, of 2,294 aircraft, over 38,000 missiles for all 3 military services and 62 new ships for the Navy. The bill also authorizes the conversion of 12 ships.

The bill as presented to the Congress by the President totaled $15,297,200,000—of which $6,558,800,000 was for research, development, test, and evaluation.

The bill as it passed the House totaled $15,303,400,000—of which $6,444,500,000 was for R.D.T. & E.

The bill as it passed the Senate totaled $15,283,800,000—of which $6,596,800,000 was for R.D.T. & E.

The bill as agreed to in conference totals $15,402,800,000—of which $6,444,500,000 is for R.D.T. & E.

The agreement arrived at by the conferees is $99,400,000 more than the bill as it passed the House: $119 million more than the bill as it passed the Senate: and is $105,600,000 above the bill as it was presented to the Congress by the President.

From the foregoing figures, it is clear that the difference between the Senate bill and the House bill was very small, indeed, only $19.6 million.

In view of this, there was very little room for negotiation.

In addition to the very small difference between the two bills was the added complication that some of the internal differences represented quite large amounts.

For example, the Senate had added two attack submarines at a cost of $133.6 million and the House had added a nuclear-powered guided missile frigate at a cost of $150.5 million. Also, the Senate had deleted 10 E-2A aircraft—these are the large airborne warning aircraft—involving $99.8 million.

This aircraft has, in the past, had certain difficulties with its electronics.

It appears that these difficulties have very recently been rectified and the aircraft are of such importance that they should be in the bill; so the Senate agreed to their reinsertion. I might point out that had this aircraft been operational in South Vietnam, our losses of 105's and other aircraft might well have been very much smaller.

And lastly, in the research and development area—and this is a little bit complicated—the House was $152.3 million below the Senate version. But the Senate had added $82 million for the advanced manned strategic aircraft—the follow-on bomber—while the House had added only $7 million for this aircraft. The Senate receded on this.

So, here the conferees of both the Senate and the House found themselves with a very small area of total difference between the amounts of the two bills but with very large internal items in disagreement.

The House conferees were, of course, insistent that the nuclear-powered guided missile frigate remain in the bill—$150.5 million. And the Senate was equally insistant that their two additional attack submarines remain in the bill—$133.6 million. Actually, both the Senate and House positions were very soundly based since the Joint Chiefs of Staff were unanimous that the submarines be added, and with respect to the frigate, were virtually unanimous, with only one dissenting vote. So the top military people all agreed these ships should be in the bill even though Mr. McNamara did not want them. I might also state that, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy also supports both the submarines and the nuclear frigate.

After extended negotiations, we simply found it impossible to arrive at an agreed amount which did not exceed the larger of the two bills, that is to say, the House bill.

In view of the foregoing, we obtained the rule which was considered immediately prior to the consideration of this conference report.

DETAILED SUMMARY

Here is, in detail, exactly what the conferees agreed upon.

The Senate deletion of 10 Navy E-2A's at $99.8 million was reinserted in the bill.

The Air Force industrial facilities in the amount of $5 million which the House deleted is now back in the bill.

The Air Force missile support equipment in the amount of $25 million which the House deleted is now returned to the bill.

The request of the Department of Defense was for four fast deployment logistic ships. The Senate permitted only two at $64.2 million and the House in conference agreed with the Senate that only two of these ships should be included in the program.

The Department of Defense had requested 10 motor gunboats. The Senate allowed only 5 but agreed in conference to all 10 of these gunboats.

The original request for attack submarines was four. The Senate added two at a cost of $133.6 million and the House agreed to these two additional ships.

The House had added to the bill a nuclear-powered guided missile frigate at a cost of $150.5 million. The Senate agreed to the addition of this frigate.

In the area of research and development, the amount granted by the House was $152.3 million below that granted by the Senate. The Senate agreed to the House figure.

The foregoing figures are those specifically agreed to in the conference.

In addition, the House will recall that the committee had added certain nonmonetary amendments to the bill. All of these amendments, which are briefly described below, were agreed to by the Senate.

SECTION 301. REPEAL OF TONNAGE

The Vinson-Trammell Act and subsequent acts created tonnage which now is in excess of 3,300,000 tons. From every practical standpoint, the enactment of section 412(b) has rendered existing tonnage authorizations meaningless. Bookkeeping on this tonnage is expensive.

SECTION 302. ALTERNATE SHIP PROVISION

Section 301, in addition to repealing outstanding tonnage, also repealed the alternate ship provision of the Vinson-Trammell Act. It is considered desirable that this provision be preserved.

The Vinson-Trammell Act applied only to "warships." Since that act, escort vessels have become an important part of the Navy. The House committee, therefore, in reenacting the alternate ship provision, modified it slightly to include "warships and escort vessels." In this year's bill alone the change will embrace 10 destroyer escorts at a price of $279.1 million.

SECTION 303. SIXTY-FIVE-THIRTY-FIVE

Today at least 35 percent of all conversion, alteration, and repair of naval ships must, under Appropriations Committee language, be performed in private shipyards. This section would eliminate this requirement.

The Navy and the Secretary of Defense strongly support this new section.

The Secretary of the Navy in a letter to the committee stated, among other things, that:

> Cost studies show that there is no economy in contracting out conversion, altera-

tion, and repair work (CAR) to private yards. In fact, annual savings can be achieved under present cost differentials by increasing the amount of conversion, alteration, and repair work assigned to naval shipyards. If all factors involved in these assignments were to permit an increase from the current statutory level of 65 percent to a somewhat higher level, it is estimated that an annual savings of several million dollars could be achieved. This results from the fact that the naval shipyards which must be maintained for strategic and operational reasons have a high fixed overhead cost which continues regardless of workload assigned.

SECTION 304. INCLUSION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES IN 412(b)

This section will require procurement authorization for "tracked vehicles" in addition to aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. For fiscal year 1966 about $200 million would be involved.

SECTION 305. EMERGENCY FUND

Each year Congress makes available to the Department of Defense an emergency fund for research and development. It has varied between $125 and $150 million. The House Committee believes that this emergency fund should be authorized in the same fashion as all other funds for research and development.

SECTION 306. CHANGING NAME OF MATS

The House committee believes that MATS is too important to be designated as a "service." Military airlift command is both descriptive of its true function and provides recognition of its vital missions. The cost of making this change is estimated to be $173,800. This change in name is to be effective as of January 1, 1966.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have one question to ask of the gentleman. Were all amendments adopted in the conference germane to the bill?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Every one of them. They were contained in either one of the bills of the respective bodies.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I should like the Record to show my disagreement with the elimination of the 65-35 split in allocating conversion alteration and repair work between naval and private shipyards. I have studied a number of cost studies and reports and believe, contrary to what the Defense Department contends, that the facts show such work can be done more economically in the private than in the Navy yards.

Beyond the question of economy is the need from a defense standpoint to maintain the skills and facilities in both private and public yards. The reason for the dispute, in my opinion, is the low level of new construction and modernization activity in both the naval and merchant vessel categories—a trend which results in a continuing and progressive deterioration of our strength on the ocean vis-a-vis our principal protagonist, Soviet Russia.

Ocean tonnage is and will continue to be vital to our national defense for a long time to come. There is enough work that needs to be done to keep all of our yards—naval and private—busy. If this is done an arbitrary split becomes unnecessary.

I am told that the Navy's plans and projections for fiscal 1966 are such that the dollar volume of work allocated to private yards will be approximately the same during 1966. I certainly hope so and shall watch with interest. I hope that at least the equivalent volume can be placed on competitive private bids in 1966 and subsequent years. If not, the private shipyards in Oregon and their employees will be out of business and out of work.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIENHOA INCIDENT

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make the following statement in keeping with the promise of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Speaker, today the House Armed Services Committee received a secret briefing by Lieutenant General Martin, the Inspector General of the Air Force who headed up a team of experts to investigate the incident in Vietnam which I discussed here on May 18, 1965.

I wish to take this opportunity to report to all Members of this body that the committee was impressed with the thoroughness of the investigation which is being conducted by a team of experienced and highly qualified personnel.

It was apparent from the briefing which we received that they were leaving no stone unturned in their efforts to determine the cause of this most unfortunate incident.

However, as of this moment, final determinations have not been arrived at and the investigation is being continued.

Extensive safety surveys are underway at all of the bases in Vietnam, concentrating on the handling and loading of munitions, to insure that maximum practicable safety precautions are observed.

There were 27 U.S. Air Force personnel killed and 76 injured, 20 U.S. Army personnel injured, and 1 Vietnamese killed; 12 U.S. aircraft were destroyed and 6 damaged. Two aircraft of the Vietnamese Air Force were destroyed, 30 damaged.

There was no evidence which would indicate an overt attack initiated the accident sequence.

There was no evidence that sabotage played a part in this incident. However, it has not been completely ruled out.

The security of the base was and is considered satisfactory.

There was no evidence to indicate that poor maintenance was responsible for the accident.

An engine starter may have caused an accident of this type and is still under suspect.

The delay fuses installed in some of the bombs when the accident occurred may also have caused the accident and remains in the suspect area. A special laboratory type analysis of these fuses is currently underway. In the meantime, the use of such fuses has been suspended.

Under the circumstances, I wish to again reiterate that this is no time for speculation or for any discussion of military matters which could give aid and comfort to our enemy and possibly harm to our military people who are fighting and dying for us in Vietnam.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to concur in the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] in regard to this investigation. The Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has listened to a presentation of this matter and I feel that the statement which has been made by the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, is a very fair and important statement.

THE RIGHT REVEREND WILLIAM F. CREIGHTON, EPISCOPAL BISHOP OF THE WASHINGTON DIOCESE

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, as an Episcopalian I rise to defend the Right Reverend William F. Creighton, Episcopal Bishop of the Washington diocese, against what was said about him and his May 17 speech last week by two of my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers], who are both also of the Episcopal faith.

In that speech, Bishop Creighton expressed his opposition to the current rule in the District of Columbia which denies children of an unemployed father the benefits of Federal aid to dependent children payments, although children similarly situated are eligible for such payments in every one of the 50 States of the Union. In making his point, the bishop had something to say about a Member of the other body—some reference or other to bleeding hearts and little children. For this, the bishop was berated for expressing "personal venom," and for departing from the standard of "those who speak from a position in society which clothes them with a high degree of immunity." The bishop was told that "he should keep his nose out of it."

At the risk of sounding like just another organization man, I am for the bishop. I am very proud that he does concern himself with social issues like the care of the children of the unemployed, and that he and his Suffragan Bishop, Paul Moore, Jr., have identified themselves with the forces in this community—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—who are concerned with bringing about better treatment for children who are condemned to poverty through no fault of their own.

Perhaps the bishop's figure of speech was not the most felicitous he could have chosen. But I would point out that when I last looked at the Constitution it was Members of Congress who are given legal immunity for what they say in debate, not bishops.

As far as I am concerned, Bishop Creighton is a gentle and saintly man. We should be glad to hear from him.

BETTER HOUSING FOR MIGRANT WORKERS

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, one of the pressing needs of our migrant farmworkers, upon whom the farmers of many of our States depend to harvest their seasonal crops, is better housing. These workers have low incomes, move from locality to locality with the maturing crops, and must depend upon the local housing supplied them in the areas in which they are temporarily employed.

In many States, and particularly in my own State of Michigan, the season is short—lasting at the most 6 to 10 weeks—and the independent farmers themselves are in no financial position to construct housing for labor for their own particular crop. For example, one grower may harvest strawberries, another cherries, another blueberries, another pickles, and another apples. To assist in building housing to meet the need of such an agricultural district, Government help is required. Without it, the consequence is inevitable: The farms will become corporate instead of family, and encompass enough land and enough different crops to make it economically feasible to the corporation to construct such housing.

I believe better housing is urgently needed for our migrant workers. But I also believe the family farm should not be replaced with the corporate farm in order to provide it. This is why we must have Government assistance.

Enabling legislation to provide this assistance was passed last year, and the appropriation before us, I am happy to say, does include a $2 million provision to further the housing grant program which had previously been authorized. This program is to be run through State and local governments and nonprofit organizations by the Farmers Home Administration.

I do want to note, however, that the Department's original request was for $5 million. I had hoped that this request would have been granted in full by the committee, in view of the obvious need both to the workers and to the family farms employing them.

I make these remarks today in the hope that when funds for this program are next considered the appropriation will be better balanced with the need.

VICE PRESIDENT SALUTES CHAIRMAN PATMAN

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include a speech delivered by Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to celebrate National Small Business Week without honoring one of our colleagues who I personally feel has done more for small business than any other man in this country. I, of course, refer to the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas.

Let me assure you that my view of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] small business achievements is shared by the administration. I think this can be best illustrated by a greeting extended from the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, to Chairman PATMAN when the two met yesterday at the Small Business Administration's Small Business Subcontracting Conference here in Washington. I would like to quote the Vice President's greeting:

> And here's WRIGHT PATMAN, the man who has done more for small business than any other person in America.

In my short tenure as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have come to wholeheartedly concur in the expression of the Vice President.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, WRIGHT PATMAN is standing up for small business by speaking out against those who would exempt bank mergers from antitrust laws. Of course, we all know that antitrust laws enable the small businessman to compete effectively against large business. Without such laws, small business could not survive.

I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of Chairman PATMAN's speech given yesterday to the Small Business Subcontracting Conference in which he speaks out against exempting bank mergers from antitrust laws. I commend this address to my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN WRIGHT PATMAN, DEMOCRAT, OF TEXAS, AT THE SBA SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL, MAY 25, 1965

I am very glad to be here to participate in the SBA Small Business Subcontracting Conference. In my opinion, the 1961 amendment to the Small Business Act providing small business set asides in large Government contracts was a new lease on life to small business. I had the privilege of serving as chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business as well as on the Banking and Currency Committee to which, of course, is referred small business legislation, so I fully realize the importance of small business subcontracts. I am hopeful that small business will enjoy an ever-growing share of Government business.

At the same time, however, small businessmen, as well as everyone else interested in small business problems, must be aware of all other developments that bear upon competition and free enterprise, not just small business alone. My own efforts involve two basic needs of free enterprise: (1) An adequate supply of business credit at reasonable rates of interest; (2) strong antimonopoly laws and vigorous but fair enforcement of such laws.

While I suppose that my views on monetary reform are no secret, I would like to share with you my concern over current moves to weaken the antimonopoly laws.

Monopolies have been like a plague upon mankind throughout our history. Unchecked, they inevitably lead to a police state as individual initiative and freedom of choice fall by the wayside. Also, competitive free enterprise will disappear. The only excuse for permitting a monopoly to exist is where competitive free enterprise would be simply unworkable; the local telephone company, power company, or gas company are obvious examples. Such industries are frequently exempted from the antimonopoly laws as regulated public utilities. Their franchise, territory, quality, and quantity of service and even their charges and profits are subject to constant Government regulation because they are public service utilities. Since there is no element of free competition to spur on such a monopoly to meet public needs, Government must see that these needs are met.

Now the banking industry is definitely not a regulated industry. I am happy to report that at present there is a great spirit of competitive free enterprise among our banks in most communities, although I am disturbed by the fact that we have today exactly one-half the number of banks we had some 30-odd years ago. Banking is not a regulated industry; banking is a supervised industry. The States and the Federal Government share in the chartering of new banks, examination of their loan portfolios; establish merging and branching rules; and supervise banking matters in general, particularly with respect to liquidity and solvency. But banks do not enjoy territorial monopolies like public utilities do, although some would like that, I am sure. They do, however, enjoy a franchise to create money on a 10-to-1 ratio—$10 in loans for every $1 in reserves—and this is certainly a tremendous responsibility as well as a privilege. And in this sense banks are truly public utilities. But bankers are not told how much interest they can charge on loans. And bankers are not told what is the maximum profit they can earn. So, although banks enjoy a monopoly, a precious franchise to create money both for the Government as well as for the people of the United States, banking is still a free enterprise industry. I would like to see it stay that way, and I am sure that most people will agree.

This is why I am disturbed by the flurry of activity on the part of big eastern banking interests and their Washington lobby to exempt banking from Justice Department administration of our antimonopoly laws. Banks are already exempt from regulation by the Federal Trade Commission and by the Securities and Exchange Commission. And, as I stated a moment ago, banking is a competitive industry, and not a regulated monopolistic industry. I cannot believe that those who at this very moment are lobbying frantically for this antimonopoly exemption really want banking to be regulated like a public utility. Do these people want fixed prices and fixed profits for banking? Does freedom from vigorous but fair antimonopoly enforcement mean that much to these people? I, for one, would prefer to preserve free enterprise in banking.

I do not believe that the proponents of this legislation have really thought this thing through. Such a drastic exemption from the antitrust laws can only be justified for a fully regulated industry. I certainly oppose this for banking, and I am truly surprised that certain banking interests are pursuing this course. Such a move opens the door for further erosion of our free enterprise system. Now this is not to say that I would close the door to all consideration of improvements of our antimonopoly administration. We must always strive for modernization and efficiency with minimum disturbance to business, while always recognizing that the broad public interest must be served first. As a matter of fact, I would certainly expect the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am chairman, to look into during the 89th Congress the general question of competition in the banking industry. Not only should we examine merger policy, but also branching, new bank charters, chain banking, interlocking directorates, and possibly other questions.

Our committee has a full schedule at present and these are not matters that you should rush into. Fundamental changes in public policy must be subjected to the utmost scrutiny and careful consideration. We have no emergency in the banking industry, although not everything is, of course, as it should be.

Superconcentration in banking can only hurt the small business which depends upon bank credit to survive. Recently I was informed of a case out west involving a long-established plumbing contractor who lost his line of credit when a holding company took over the local bank. This is not just an isolated case, I assure you.

So, I think all businessmen—whether a banker or a nonbanker, big business or small business—must be informed on serious matters such as this so that through extreme haste drastic changes are not wrought in our free enterprise system for which we all may be sorry.

ANTIDUMPING ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 44th anniversary of the enactment into law of the U.S. Antidumping Act of 1921. It provides a significant time for me and many of my colleagues to salute the fair and equitable concept of a law designed to deal with the problem of unfair competition from dumped imports without resorting to the use of tariffs or quotas.

In keeping with the moderate tenor of the original act, I have the privilege today of introducing an amendment to this legislation which contains provisions of a type that have long been necessary.

Amended previously in 1954 and the last time in 1958, there has been significant evidence in recent years that certainty in the administration of the act, so essential to both the domestic and importing communities, has been less than what Congress might have expected.

The 1965 Antidumping Act Amendment which I am pleased to introduce today has a number of purposes. It seeks to clarify standards to be applied by the Treasury Department and the Tariff Commission in their respective "dumping" and "injury" determinations. It is designed to tighten loopholes which have been discovered and exploited over the years. It would assure fairer, more effective procedures in the administration of the act, and it proposes to accommodate some opposition views. Finally, it would ratify recent Treasury regulations on its dumping functions where these are not inconsistent with the act as it would be amended.

In order to meet the needs adequately and have wide appeal among industry and labor, as well as broad bipartisan support by Members of Congress, reconsideration has been given to the antidumping amendment which was introduced in the 1st session of the 88th Congress by 27 Senators and 50 Representatives and the modified bill which was introduced in the House during the 2d session by 59 Congressmen. In addition, provisions of the proposed legislation have been compared with the revised Treasury antidumping regulations, and the Tariff Commission's injury determinations over the past couple of years have been evaluated. It is clear, as a result of this work, that responsible antidumping legislation is required to provide meaningful relief against dumping and to ensure the effective operation of the act.

I should like to make clear that the 1965 amendment to the Antidumping Act represents a merging of the proposals embodied in the amendments introduced during the 1st and 2d sessions of the 88th Congress, with a number of proposals which add to, modify, or delete various provisions.

Until about mid-1963, the Tariff Commission, in administering the "injury to industry" provisions of the Antidumping Act, had properly applied antitrust concepts in determining what were the relevant product and geographic markets, and therefore what constituted "an industry." Consequently, there was no need to provide standards on this score for the Tariff Commission in the bill introduced in April 1963.

Similarly on the question of what constituted "injury," no cases had been decided by the Commission to indicate what antitrust concepts would not continue to be used. However, starting with the Wire Rod cases in June 1963, the Tariff Commission, whose composition had changed since the early cement cases, began to whittle away at the antitrust analogies which the Commission had used previously. This process continued in the Titanium Dioxide case late in 1963, and in a number of cases in 1964. In general, the Commission substituted principles based on concepts of the escape clause rather than principles based on unfair trade concepts which have evolved under the antitrust laws.

Because of this new development, and after some extensive review and consideration, I introduced on April 14, 1964, a modified and broadened version of the predecessor bill. The intent of this legislation was not only to provide guidelines for Treasury but also to establish standards for the Tariff Commission to determine whether industry or labor was being injured by dumping. For the first time, injury could have been found to labor as well as industry.

A comparable bill was not introduced in the Senate during the 2d session. Initially, the Senate was heavily preoccupied with the civil rights legislation. Later, then-Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY recommended that during the remainder of that session, it would not be feasible to introduce and make a determined effort in behalf of a similar bill in the Senate. While expressing his continuing interest, he explained:

> The Senate could take no final action on questions relating to dumping until the House has acted. As a Member of the Senate concerned with the serious problem of dumping of commodities in the United States, I find this renewed interest by Members of the House most hopeful toward achieving congressional action.

In order to return the Tariff Commission to a reasonable approach in its antidumping deliberations the 1965 bill would provide specific standards for the Tariff Commission to guide it in its "injury" and "likelihood of injury" determinations. Such provisions would enable all parties to predict with greater certainty the outcome of potential cases. Also, they should help to alleviate widespread discontent in both domestic and importing communities by providing greater certainty in the administration of the law, so essential to the expansion of legitimate international trade. I would like to review the specific proposals:

First. Reflecting commercial realities, the 1965 bill requires that in measuring the effect of dumping on a domestic industry, consideration must be focused on the relevant geographical and product markets in which the dumped imports and domestic producers compete. It would prevent the Tariff Commission from assuming a nationwide market when the facts show, to the contrary, a fragmentation of markets along regional lines. The boundaries of a product market would be delineated to clarify that other lines of commerce in which one or more members of a domestic industry may be engaged—but which are outside the scope of competition with dumped imports—are not to be considered by the Commission in weighing the impact of dumping upon a domestic industry. On the whole, these definitions aim to reverse the recent tendency of the Commission to consider the overall health of domestic industries, dogmatically supposed to be nationwide, before deciding whether to find injury as a result of dumping.

Second. In view of the Tariff Commission's inability to agree on what constitutes material injury, specific standards are proposed which are not inconsistent with the provisions of GATT.

Four tests would be established relying on the above definitions of industry.

One test is whether dumped imports of the class or kind in question have captured 5 percent of total domestic sales of the relevant product in the competitive market—unless clear and convincing evidence shows that the domestic industry would not have increased its sales in the absence of dumping. This 5 percent figure is reasonable, drawn from antitrust cases dealing with partial foreclosures of regional markets.

Another test is whether dumped imports contribute to a price decline affecting 50 percent or more of the relevant domestic merchandise supplied to the competitive market area. Particularly in an already highly profit competitive market area where profit margins may be small even a small amount of imports at dumped prices can trigger a price break from which recovery is a slow process. Prices unfairly depressed in one market readily spread to adjacent market areas in a type of "ripple" effect.

The third test recognizes that the interests of domestic labor cannot be separated from those of domestic industry in the face of dumped imports. Injury would be found where dumped imports contribute to a 5 percent or greater decline of labor directly employed in the competing industry. The fourth test is in part a catchall for any other anticompetitive effects such as disruption of markets, patterns of trade, or reasonably expected business results.

Third. As did the 1964 bill, the proposed legislation aims to clarify several other points important to the determination of injury.

Where the dumped imports from several sources are simultaneously complained of, Treasury should send all affirmative findings to the Tariff Commission together, rather than piecemeal, in order to permit appraisal of the total impact of such imports.

The presence of factors other than dumping should not prevent the Tariff Commission from recognizing the injury contributed by the dumping at prices below fair value.

Fair value, nowhere defined in the act and variously interpreted by Treasury over the years, would be based on existing terms in the act in order to increase certainty in the act's application.

Predatory intent, almost impossible to prove, would be deemed irrelevant and it would also be clarified that an importer cannot defend the injurious dumping of his merchandise in U.S. markets merely by showing that he is meeting competition of other imports.

To prevent the provision of the act recognizing "likelihood of injury" from becoming meaningless, the bill would clarify that "reasonable likelihood," not "clear and imminent" injury should be the standard.

With regard to the need to tighten loopholes and provide fairer, more effective procedures, the 1965 bill carries over a number of provisions contained in both the 1963 and 1964 bills:

First. Evasive use of a "dummy" export subsidiary in order to thwart the proper operation of the act can be curbed more readily by Treasury.

Second. Treasury would be given solid legal basis for the necessary flexibility it needs to determine the foreign market value of merchandise produced in Communist or state-controlled economies.

Third. To curb long drawn out Treasury investigations, a 6-month time limit would be established—with an "escape valve" if needed. Excessive delays hurt importers as they do American industry and labor. Cement dumping investigations at Treasury averaged 17 months; one took more than 3 years. Some reduction in the time period involved by Treasury has been accomplished but it is reasonable to set such a time limitation.

Fourth. If full reports were published containing the facts or reasoning relied on by Treasury and the Tariff Commission, a body of law could be developed on which business decisions could be based.

Fifth. Publication of proposed determinations would give interested parties an opportunity to correct any fallacies or supply additional information. This is analogous to safeguards in the Administrative Procedure Act.

Sixth. At any oral hearing both importers and domestic industry would have right to counsel, to present evidence, confrontation, and cross-examination.

Seventh. The confidential evidence used against them should be available to parties involved in the form of a supplemental statement not to be published or further disclosed except to a reviewing court for analysis of the agency finding.

Eighth. Judicial review would be assured to both importers and complainants at the conclusion of a proceeding—consistent with principles of the Administrative Procedure Act and inherent in our system of government.

Treasury's recurring problem of trying to pin down actual foreign prices to use in its determination of whether "dumping" exists would be given an assist by several new provisions:

First. In order to ascertain foreign market value, published or list prices would apply in the absence of proof of sales at a different price.

Second. In deciding on the "usual wholesale quantity," sales at a fair price freely arrived at in the open market would be the test. This would exclude: (a) Sales with quantity discounts not freely available to all purchasers; (b) transactions between related parties; and (c) transactions involving exclusive dealing arrangements.

Third. Section 202 allowances for differences in quantity discounts or circumstances of sale—on sales to the United States as compared with sales for home market consumption—must reflect differences in costs involved which are actually taken into account by the seller in setting his price.

Fourth. There has long been controversy over when the volume of sales in the exporter's home market are inadequate to form a basis of comparison with sales to the United States. The bill would make it clear that Treasury should only resort to sales in a third country if no vendor sells in the home market 15 percent or more of his total sales of such merchandise to all markets other than the United States.

In an attempt to meet opposition views, a number of provisions have been included in the 1965 modified amendment which should indicate the basic fairness and good faith of this legislation. Specifically, I have reference to the following provisions:

First. To speed up court action judicial review by the U.S. Customs Court which was contained in the 1963 bill was deleted and appeals would go directly to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

Second. The court is authorized only to continue, not to initiate, the withholding of appraisement.

Third. The importer is given a right to review data at the Tariff Commission equal to that which complainant would have had at the Treasury level under the 1963 proposal.

Fourth. Treasury would be specifically charged not to disclose the costs of manufacture used in justifying quantity discounts, nor the costs of production when Treasury uses a constructed value formula.

Fifth. The proposal in the 1963 bill to make the forfeiture provisions in section 592 of the Tariff Act of 1930 expressly applicable to false statements in dumping cases is omitted in the 1965 bill.

Sixth. Refusal to supply essential information requested by Treasury would have resulted in a conclusive presumption of dumping in the 1963 and 1964 bills, whereas the present proposal is merely to resolve all doubts relating to requested information against the person refusing to furnish it.

Seventh. Treasury would be able to dismiss, within 15 days of receipt, any unsupportable complaint, easing the workload on the Department and the impact of the act on importers.

Eighth. Recognizing the importer's desire to avoid lengthy dumping investigation by promptly amending his pricing practices, the 1965 bill would ratify recent Treasury regulations allowing termination, but would require assurance that dumping would not be resumed, and would also clarify that the provision is limited to situations where only insignificant quantities were involved.

The 1965 bill would ratify and approve the revised Treasury antidumping regulations announced on December 4, 1964, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of the act as amended. This would embody such provisions as the following which make concessions to complaints of importers about the administration of the act:

First. Domestic industry's complaint must present detailed data reasonably available as well as suggestions concerning specific avenues of investigation.

Second. Names of foreign producers suspected of dumping would be included to make it clear that other shippers or producers in the country of export were not involved.

Third. Retroactive application of dumping duties, vigorously complained of by importers, are in large part eliminated, except in situations where close relationship of ownership or control between importer and foreign supplier makes it likely that they knew dumping was involved.

Fourth. Warranty by foreign exporters to reimburse U.S. importers for dumping duties on certain shipments will be recognized.

Obviously, the improved Treasury regulations, while welcome, are necessarily limited in scope. Certain inadequacies and loopholes in the present act can only be remedied by legislation. Moreover, Treasury regulations would not, of course, provide the Tariff Commission with the needed statutory guidelines in its determinations of injury to domestic industry.

I know that many of my distinguished colleagues share my feeling that such legislation must be forthcoming soon if a meaningful solution to this troublesome problem is to be achieved, and if we are to avoid jettisoning our dedication to responsible reciprocal trade. As the Kennedy round of negotiations presses forward, it is of considerable importance to have authoritative observations and recommendations presented at hearings of the Committee on Ways and Means in advance of any international negotiations on dumping.

Guidelines which would result from such hearings and subsequent legislative action in the House and Senate should prove beneficial in reaching a workable and constructive solution. In this way, our negotiators would be armed with a clear expression of the intent of Congress, rather than proceed with an inadequate or ill-conceived concept of what this country should press for in these negotiations.

A few days of hearings should be held at a suitable time on proposals for improving our antidumping legislation—with testimony delivered by knowledgeable representatives of manufacturers, importers, and labor, as well as by relevant officials of the Government. This would be a forward step in helping to make the Antidumping Act more effective and in clearing up the misconceptions and half-truths that abound as to the true nature of the Antidumping Act and some of the proposals advanced for its improvement.

Fairminded men of good faith, I am confident, will be able to discern the merits of this moderate and constructive amendment which many of my colleagues are joining me in introducing today. The overriding value of the certainty and end to confusion which is a major objective of the bill should emerge to the long-range benefit of all parties concerned. To assure this end—that international trade be conducted on a fair and equitable basis—it is my conviction that hearings should be held at the earliest feasible date. The extent of growing industry and labor support for the proposed provisions certainly justifies proceeding to hearings.

As I pointed out previously, the 1963 bill was sponsored on a broad bipartisan basis by 50 Representatives and 27 Senators. The 1964 bill, not introduced on the Senate side, had the broad bipartisan support of 59 Members of the House. This widespread desire for corrective action must not go unheeded.

I sincerely hope, therefore, that all those who share my concern, in the House and in the Senate, and on both sides of the aisle, will sponsor and vigorously support a bill like the one which I and many of my colleagues are introducing today. In modifying and superseding the legislation which so many Representatives and Senators introduced during the 88th Congress, I am convinced that enactment of this revised amendment to the Antidumping Act at the earliest practicable date will prove salutary and in accord with our national interest.

ANTIDUMPING ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Betts] may extend his remarks at this point.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, awareness of the need for legislation to improve the operation of the Antidumping Act has been with us for some time now. During the 88th Congress I was one of 10 members of the Committee on Ways and Means who introduced proposed amendments in the first and second sessions. Just as disturbing developments in a number of Treasury Department and Tariff Commission decisions subsequent to the initial introduction of the 1963 bill prompted modifications to be included in a 1964 bill, so too has the increasing uncertainty and controversy in this vital area of commercial relationships made imperative the continuation of these efforts through further clarification of basic standards.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Herlong], has just outlined those provisions which we feel are necessary now to assure that the original purpose of the 1963 and 1964 amendments will be achieved. Many of you know of the extensive efforts undertaken by the gentleman from Florida, Representative Herlong, to assess the views and thoughts of his colleagues in preparation for the 1965 modifications.

With the further clarification of standards, tightening of loopholes, as well as accommodation to include various suggestions about modifying other provisions, all those who have supported the 1963 and 1964 bills and many other Members in addition will be able to lend their endorsement in the knowledge that they are helping to provide the congressional action sorely needed to deal with the continuing problem of injurious dumping of foreign goods in this country. I should like to stress again what I said on April 14, 1964, as a cosponsor of the antidumping bill:

> If this unfair international trade practice is allowed to go on unheeded by us who are in a position to help, we will be turning our backs on a most serious threat to the fundamental principles inherent in our private enterprise system—the right to compete fairly. This problem, which has been with us for a long time, I am sure will not disappear of its own accord. Any alleviation will require our best efforts.

Similarly, as I stated in the House at that time, there is a need to face up to a practical view of the requirements of our own industries and not be mesmerized by any unrealistic theories of international trade espoused by those who do not have to meet a payroll, show a profit for their investors, or finance the modernization necessary to meet even more aggressive competition expected from domestic and foreign products in the days ahead:

> In carrying out our congressional responsibility to provide guidelines for the administration of a law so vital to our domestic economy as one concerned with injurious dumping—

As I pointed out over a year ago—

> we are particularly aware of the press of foreign countries to have U.S. markets laid open to their exports while retaining their own measures to limit entrance of U.S. exports. I mention this not in a spirit of protectionist fervor, but in an effort to state what I am sure is discernible as to the underlying realities of international trade. As the GATT trade negotiating sessions in Geneva approach, it is important to recognize that great care will be needed both in the negotiations on tariff rates and in any agreements reached on nontariff barriers. We must not allow one of the keystones in the basic superstructure of our import laws, the Antidumping Act, to be eroded away. This would render meaningless any care taken in the negotiations with respect to tariff reductions.

I trust that many Members on both sides of the aisle share this belief and will lend their efforts in this session to assure that the intent of Congress is clear prior to any international negotiations at which we may become committed to ground rules that are unpalatable and unworkable.

I appreciate this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to express my concern and my desire to help achieve the objective of curbing injurious dumping by again joining with my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Herlong], in introducing this vital measure.

ANTIDUMPING ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thompson] may extend his remarks at this point.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my support for this important legislation. As one who introduced the earlier versions in 1963 and 1964, it is a pleasure to once again join with a number of my fellow members of the Committee on Ways and Means and other colleagues on both sides of the aisle who believe in furthering, not restricting, the cause of fair international trade.

This effort to improve the administration of the U.S. antidumping law has been and will continue to be one of vital concern. When the late gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Francis E. Walter, introduced and vigorously championed the first of the 50 bills with identical provisions sponsored in the House during the

1st session of the 88th Congress, he hardly could have guessed at the ever-increasing support developing among his colleagues. And yet, our committee has not yet been able to take up this subject which so earnestly merits its attention. There have been a great number of pressing problems on our agenda, but it is my sincere hope that as soon as feasible, the time be found to properly attend to this area of serious concern shared by so many of our colleagues. As I stated in this House in connection with the introduction of the 1964 bill, and it applies to the 1965 bill as well:

> Anyone who studies this antidumping bill and understands its purposes will realize that many of its provisions—especially those designed to improve procedural fairness—will inure as much or more to the benefit of foreign manufacturers and importers as it will to American industry and labor.

The record of this 89th Congress can be enhanced by decisive action to provide statutory standards and remove the uncertainty and confusion which act as a restraint on long-range business planning and must be overcome if our country is to achieve the high level of economic growth and the full employment to which we aspire.

ANTIDUMPING ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I share the conviction of my distinguished colleagues as to the need for enacting the proposed 1965 amendment to the Antidumping Act. The unfair competition from dumped products not only injures American industry, but hurts American labor as well, and tends to disrupt the U.S. balance of payments.

There is a real need, therefore, for the 1965 amendment which proposes to tighten loopholes and assure equitable, more effective antidumping procedures. As has been emphasized, the bill provides also for the establishment of clearer standards for the Tariff Commission in its determinations of injury to industry and labor, and guidelines for the Treasury Department in its investigations of likely or suspected dumping.

It is imperative that we take steps to curb this unfair trade practice. I have introduced both the 1963 and 1964 bills toward this end, and do not think it is asking too much that those who would import into U.S. markets be subject to the same basic concepts of fair competition to which our domestic producers are subject. The curtailment of injurious dumping would provide a useful assist to the expansion of legitimate international trade. I hope that this bill, which is aimed at such beneficial purposes, receives the enthusiastic support of many Members on both sides of the aisle.

ANTIDUMPING ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I add my earnest support to the remarks of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. [THOMPSON], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER]. As a fellow Member with them on the Committee on Ways and Means and having introduced the proposed 1963 and 1964 amendments to the Antidumping Act, as they did, I share their strong feeling about the need for enactment of the modified 1965 version which each of us is introducing today.

The situation which faced us in the 88th Congress has not abated; the domestic producers and labor in my State of Massachusetts, as in the Nation, are just as vulnerable to dumping today as they were previously, and are understandably frustrated if relief is denied because of technicalities, or if relief is so slow in coming as to be no relief at all. As I stated to the House at the time of the introduction of the 1964 bill:

> In years past, the mere existence of the U.S. Antidumping Act, awesome in its complexity and little understood overseas, had the effect of making potential dumpers into the U.S. markets think twice before acting. Today the commercial sophistication of those exporting to this country has risen to the point where they now understand and can take advantage of any loopholes in the Antidumping Act, as well as any inconsistencies in its administration. Therefore, it is of extreme importance that greater certainty be provided through the adoption of improved and clarified provisions of our antidumping statute.

Mr. Speaker, the increasing number of Americans who daily are affected by international trade—both those in industry and in labor—will be aided by the enactment of this 1965 antidumping legislation which I am pleased to cosponsor at this time.

ANTIDUMPING ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the five distinguished colleagues of mine on the Committee on Ways and Means who have just indicated their views about the need to enact the remedial antidumping legislation which each of us is introducing today.

As a recently appointed member of the committee, may I say that I would be most interested in hearings held on this subject, having participated in the introduction of both the 1963 and 1964 bills which were forerunners of the legislation being offered to the Congress today.

The remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON], regarding the need for certainty in the application of the U.S. Antidumping Act strikes a note for me to which, I believe, most businessmen will be responsive. Where the administration of a statute does not allow an estimate of what practices will be within the law, or in violation, needless confusion and anxiety can be expected to arise. Men of good faith will hesitate to act out of fear of violating an uncertain law, while those less principled in fair competition will be emboldened to take their chances. In view of the increasing significance of imports entering the U.S. marketplace, both domestic producers and importers have a justifiable interest in knowing what they can expect under the antidumping law. A better idea of the "rules of the game" can be expected to further the fair and equitable competition to which our free enterprise system is dedicated. I am pleased to join in the introduction of this bill.

ANTIDUMPING ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is imperative for us to act decisively to help curb the injurious dumping of foreign products in this country; thus, I am very glad to join in introducing the 1965 Antidumping Act amendment.

When I introduced my first bill in August 1963 as a new Congressman, it was on the subject of antidumping. It was an antidumping amendment which my distinguished predecessor, the late Representative Francis B. Walter, had originally introduced and which he considered to be of the highest priority. It is clear that subsequent developments in this important area of commercial policy have required this newly modified version of the earlier legislation and justify the establishment of more specific statutory standards if relief against dumping is to be meaningful.

Mr. Speaker, in my district there are cement and steel plants, among others, that employ many workers. These industries have made numerous attempts to obtain relief from dumped imports by resorting to the normal administrative channels—by filing dumping complaints with the Treasury Department, and by showing injury at the Tariff Commission. They are indicative of but two of a wide variety of industries that have sought to obtain administrative relief. Many have become discouraged and disheartened over the years as they arduously pursue the costly and lengthy proceedings involved.

It is significant to me that, of more than 350 investigations in the last 10 years, special dumping duties to remove the unfair advantage of dumping have been imposed in only 11 cases. It is no wonder that over 30 organizational groups, large and small, representative of both industry and labor, have supported the drive in recent years for legislation to assure that injurious dumping will be dealt with effectively.

I earnestly hope that many colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join in supporting this important and constructive effort by introducing an identical bill to the one which is being cosponsored by a number of us today.

ANTIDUMPING ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with a number of my distinguished colleagues in sponsoring this needed amendment to the U.S. Antidumping Act.

The impact of injurious dumping on American industry and labor, and the threat of future dumping in particular, emphasizes the need for an effective act if the economic well-being of our industries and workers is to be given the attention it deserves.

This legislation, designed to curb unfair price discrimination, will tighten a number of existing loopholes in the 1921 Antidumping Act. Though the act is basically sound, it is sorely in need of amendment at this time. The legislation being proposed, I feel, is a reasonable and constructive approach and will neither violate our international commitments under GATT nor conflict with the basic principles of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

As one who has been interested in this problem for some time, Mr. Speaker, and as one who has introduced antidumping legislation in the past, I plan to urge that hearings be held during this 89th Congress, and I look forward to eventual enactment of this amendment which is of considerable importance to industry and labor in Massachusetts as well as to the economic interests of the United States itself.

THREATENED BOYCOTT GAINS MOMENTUM

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, not long ago I warned the Members of the House of an impending nationwide boycott of Japanese goods. As I said, fishermen and affiliated unions, under an organization called the Congress of American Fishermen, were preparing to tie up Japanese ships and boycott Japanese imports in retaliation of the Japanese fishing fleet's netting of American runs of red salmon on the high seas.

How serious this can be, Mr. Speaker, is pointed up by the fact that the Seafarers' International Union of North America and other affiliated unions this morning, in convention in Washington, D.C., unanimously passed a resolution urging the Government of Japan to prevent the Japanese fishing fleet from entering North Pacific Ocean waters now that the Bristol Bay red salmon are congregating prior to migrating to Alaska's coastal waters, and further urging the U.S. Government to enact legislation to prevent a recurrence of this and similar fishery problems.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, these unions' resolution states that should Japan persist in her efforts to take American salmon, these unions will support a boycott of Japanese goods.

Mr. Speaker, we are on the brink of what can be a disastrous international trade boycott and I urge our State Department to renew its efforts to obtain Japanese cooperation. Otherwise, as I have said in the past, I will support our fishermen in their efforts to conserve this valuable fishery resource.

NATION ON WHEELS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, an indispensable element in the strength and prosperity of the America we know today is our unparalleled system of highway transportation. No other nation in history has been so truly a nation on wheels.

Over the past half century we have made an enormous public investment in highways to enable us to enjoy the mobility we have today. And we are continuing this commitment to provide our citizens with the best highways in the world.

Our Federal-aid highway program has been the basic instrument in carrying out this national policy. Through many years of successful Federal-State partnership, this program has created the safe, efficient and economical transportation network that has served our economic growth, social progress, and the national defense.

But our roads and streets can serve more than utilitarian needs. They can serve the needs of the spirit as well. They can open our eyes to the beauty of America, as well as her vitality.

For this reason, I welcome President Johnson's leadership in proposing new legislation to enhance the scenic and recreational potential of our highways, through the Federal-aid program. This is a cause that is inspiring Americans in all parts of the country who yearn to do away with the unsightly vistas that all too often mar the view of the motoring public. They will form a large and enthusiastic army of support for the President in this endeavor. They, too, want to be proud not only of the strength and prosperity of our country, but her beauty as well.

BILL TO REDUCE TAX ON LONG-TERM CAPITAL GAINS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to reduce the tax on long-term capital gains realized by individuals who have to sell their property in order to make room for Federal reservoir projects. The bill would provide capital gains treatment for property sold under the threat of Federal condemnation proceedings. It would be of particular benefit to persons in the Kaysinger and Stockton Reservoir areas.

The capital gains exclusion, under the bill, would be increased from 25 to 50 percent for persons in this category. As an example, a man who, under the present capital gains formula, pays a tax of $100 on a $1,000 profit, would pay only $50 under the rate proposed by HALL.

I believe property sold under the threat of Federal condemnation should be treated differently for tax purposes than when the seller has a free choice. Many persons selling under the threat of condemnation are giving up not only their property, but their means of earning a living.

I submitted another bill earlier this session that would permit persons whose property is sold under the threat of Federal condemnation to take advantage of the capital gains exclusion by reinvesting in any kind of property.

Many farmers who are forced to sell their property in reservoir areas, especially those in advancing age, might prefer to enter into retirement to some other part-time occupation. Under present law, they can take a capital gain only if they reinvest in like property. This restriction also adds to the farm surplus problem, because a farmer, who might otherwise retire, is under economic pressure to reinvest in a farm, even if it be on marginal land.

I commend this additional equitable and just consideration to the committee and all colleagues.

CLAY-LISTON FIGHT

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I said last night that I would not pay 29 cents to see the Liston-Clay fight—and what a fraud it was. When Clay's manager said he did not even know what kind of punch was thrown until after he looked at the video tapes or movies, and when the former heavyweight champion Joe Louis said he thought Clay was backing away and on his toes when he threw the punch, and when the referee had to be told by the editor of Ring magazine that the fight was all over after the official timekeeper already counted to 12, I submit that it was all a disgrace to boxing.

Since this is a national problem, one involving interstate commerce and one with which, it is quite clear, our States are not able to cope—we ought to have a congressional investigation leading possibly to the establishment of a national commission on boxing if the sport is to be preserved.

Do you realize that in the two Liston-Patterson fights and in the Liston-Clay fight last night, we had altogether a total of some 5 minutes and 16 seconds of championship boxing with gate receipts aggregating something in excess of $12 million. I submit that this constitutes a $12 million fraud on the American people, and something ought to be done about it.

OKLAHOMA STATE LEGISLATURE HONORS REPRESENTATIVE TOM STEED BY DESIGNATING SECTION OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAY 40 BETWEEN SHAWNEE AND OKLAHOMA CITY AS THE "TOM STEED EXPRESSWAY"

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution from the Oklahoma State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body is well aware of the tremendous contributions of my fine colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] to improvement of life in America. He is a toiling member of the House Committee on Appropriations, a public servant dedicated not only to the prevention of waste in government expenditures but, more importantly, a builder of vision dedicated to raising the sights of all Americans and pushing back the horizons of mankind.

TOM STEED is beloved not only in this House of Representatives but in the State of Oklahoma by all who know him. They know his extraordinary qualities.

Recently, the Oklahoma State Legislature honored our colleague by designating a portion of Interstate Highway 40 as the "Tom Steed Expressway." The portion so designated lies between the cities of Shawnee and Oklahoma City, one of the most heavily traveled segments of highway in the State of Oklahoma. I am happy to enclose a copy of the concurrent resolution adopted in the Oklahoma State Legislature which accomplished this fine purpose:

RESOLUTION BY OKLAHOMA STATE LEGISLATURE

(Concurrent resolution relating to highways: Designating a portion of Interstate 40 to be named for the Honorable TOM STEED, U.S. Representative, and directing distribution)

Whereas the Honorable TOM STEED has served Oklahoma with great dignity in the U.S. House of Representatives since 1948; and

Whereas this dedicated Oklahoman has been so instrumental in the development of not only his own Fourth District but the entire State as well; and

Whereas this honored and respected member of our outstanding congressional delegation is always contributing to the improvement of the State, it is proper therefore to designate that segment of Interstate 40 between Shawnee and Oklahoma City as the Tom Steed Expressway in tribute to the service of the Honorable Representative TOM STEED: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 30th session of the Oklahoma Legislature (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

SECTION 1. That the section of Interstate 40 between Shawnee and Oklahoma City is hereby designated as the Tom Steed Expressway.

SEC. 2. It is further directed that the secretary of the senate forward a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the Honorable TOM STEED, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Adopted by the senate the 13th day of April, 1965.

RALPH W. GRAVES,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of represenatives the 14th day of April, 1965.

J. D. MCCARTY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

THE WORLD'S SERIES—IN CHICAGO

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] about the "fakeroo" or the fiasco last night, but let us forget about boxing for a while and get to that clean sport of baseball.

I take this opportunity today to invite you [Mr. GROSS] and the other Members of this august body to come to Chicago in the early part of October for that great sport, that great game, baseball, to see the world's series in Chicago.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Ever since I have been a Member of this House I have heard the gentleman who comes from Chicago on this floor invite the Members of the House to attend the world's series in Chicago. I believe I have yet to see that realized.

This is a completely premature statement. Though we are in about the 8th place, Boston is in the American League, and we have an opportunity, too.

Incidentally, I believe there is method in the madness of the gentleman, since he has one of the best restaurants in Chicago. He invites us all to go there, but he hands us the tab when the meal is over.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. How could you have the world's series in Chicago when it is going to be in Detroit? Detroit just beat Chicago in two games in the last 2 days. The Tigers took the White Sox twice and more to come.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman must be talking about the Cubs?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Oh, no—the Chicago White Sox. They take on the Yankees Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, when we expect to increase our lead in the American League.

LAW DAY, 1965

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include two addresses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, since 1958, the first day of May has been designated as Law Day, a day in which we pay tribute to the great legal foundation of our Nation and to those honorable men of the law who serve such a vital role in our society.

This year two notable Law Day addresses have been brought to my attention and I wish to share them with my colleagues. On April 30, 1965, Hon. Edward Clark spoke to the student body of the Texas Southern University Law School on the topic, which is this year's Law Day motto, "Uphold the Law—A Citizen's First Duty."

On May 6, 1965, Judge Joe W. Sheehy, chief judge of the Federal District Court of the Eastern Division of Texas, spoke on the importance of law to our society and way of life.

I include these two addresses in the RECORD and I commend them for their valuable messages and meaning for all citizens:

LAW DAY ADDRESS

Each year since 1958, May 1 has been designated by Presidential proclamation as Law Day, U.S.A. The purposes of this observance are to foster among the people of this Nation an increased respect for the law; to increase public understanding of the place and significance of the law in American life; and to point out the contrast between the rule of law in the United States and the rule of force and fear under communism and like ideologies.

The date of May 1 was very aptly chosen for the day of this observance. May Day has been celebrated in some form or another in nearly every civilization the world has thus far produced. It originated in ancient Egypt as joyous commemoration of the conclusion of the cold and barren winter season and the resurgence of life in the spring.

In the 20th century, May Day has seen the sinister spectacle of armed troops and tanks passing in review in Red Square, while massive formations of jet bombers scream overhead. This Nation's antidote to the Communists' boisterous May Day celebration is a quiet day of recognition and reverence of the place of law in our society.

What better contrast can be made between the rule of law and the rule of men than that which is vividly portrayed in the respective observances of the United States and the Communist world on May Day?

The Communists flaunt their military might; the United States pays tribute to the significance of the rule of law in our form of government.

Law is the strongest link between man and freedom. By strengthening the rule of law we strengthen freedom and justice in our country, and contribute to the ultimate goal of "equal justice under law" for all mankind. Law has proven to be the only foundation upon which man can base his freedoms.

Man's capacity for justice has made the rule of law possible; but his inclination for injustice has made it necessary. Without the rule of law, the administration of justice inevitably falls victim to the arbitrariness and capriciousness of the human beings who are the administrators. It is thus our duty to broaden an understanding of the rule of law and its importance to ordered liberty.

We can remain free only so long as we cherish freedom and understand its responsibilities We must never take for granted the privileges we enjoy only because of the rule of law in this country. It is therefore the goal of Law Day to set aside one day each year on which we will reexamine the concept of the rule of law and then once again rededicate ourselves to this principle.

"A government of laws—not of men." This slogan has always been the watchword of democracy. It is this concept which distinguishes the American governmental philosophy, which sets us off from the totalitarian regimes of the past and present.

By the rule of law, of course, we refer to the idea that law is superior to the desires of any individual or group within the society, regardless of their status or official position in the government. All persons are seen as equals before the law, and anyone, rich or poor, can avail himself of the protection of the law in the exercise of his rights. Likewise no one is above the law. No officer of the government can lawfully use his authority unless the law permits.

In the United States, of course, the law to which this supremacy is attached is the Constitution, along with the Federal and State legislative enactments which are promulgated within the authority granted by that document. The people can change the authority of the Government by changing the Constitution or enacting new legislation. But as long as the law remains in existence, it must be obeyed by one and all alike. It cannot be subverted to the will of any individual or dominant class. When the will or ambitions of any particular individual or group come in conflict with the law, it is the law that must prevail.

The doctrine of the supremacy of law has reached its highest state of development in the United States. Our unique constitutional system in which the separation of powers is accomplished and the rights of individual citizens are defined has resulted in the elevation of law to an unparalleled position of supremacy as a component of our democracy.

The termination of the supermacy of law in this country would be the most direct path to self destruction. The rule of law and the institutions by which it is made effective is our protective barrier against anarchy on one hand and dictatorship on the other. However, the supremacy of law can be maintained only so long as it is undergirded by public understanding and confidence in the courts.

Each and every citizens has a duty to contribute to that support. We all recognize that law is basic and vital to our system of government. Unfortunately, in the rush and hurly-burly of our daily life few of us ever give much thought to the part which law plays in our everyday affairs. We take for granted many of the privileges which we enjoy only because of the rule of law. But law is as much a part of our daily life as the air we breathe. It affects not only those of us who have sought and found justice in the courts, but also all of us who enjoy its freedoms in our business and social life.

Few if any of us ever inquire as to what would happen if the rule of law were to be abolished. But the significance of the rule of law pervades every aspect of our life. The law stands as a constant guardian of the right and privileges which we hold sacred.

Because of the rule of law, to quote the eloquent words of the English philosopher, Burke, "The poorest man may, in his humble cottage, bid defiance to all the forces of the Crown. It may be frail; its roof may leak; the storm winds may enter it at will; but the King of England cannot enter. With all of his forces, he dare not cross the threshold of that ruined tenement uninvited."

But, the rule of law does more than insure against highhanded action on the part of rulers. It insures justice between man and man—no matter how powerful the one and humble the other. A man with $5 in his pocket can call to account the corporation with $5 billion in assets, and the two will be heard as equals before the law. But the law has not stopped here. It has moved to meet the needs of the times. Today the law also plays an active part in the effort to build a society within whose framework the ultimate potentialities of man may someday be achieved.

Under the protection afforded by the rule of law, our ideals of freedom, justice, and ordered liberty have flourished in this country for the last two centuries. With but one exception, the Civil War, our laws and our adherence to them have enabled us to live together in orderly peace and freedom. Under such a system we have grown to be the most powerful and yet the most just nation in the world.

The lowest person in our country enjoys a greater degree of social justice, more protection of life, liberty, and property, and a broader opportunity to pursue happiness, than has ever been provided for the common man under any other system in recorded history.

This did not come easily; the rights of man have evolved slowly, and the evolution continues. It is necessary that it do so. In the words of a great American lawyer, "The law must be stable, but it must not stand still." The basic philosophy of our law will always remain the same.

The right of property, of equal justice before the law, of equal rights of all citizens, protection from lawlessness—all of these are fundamental. But there are many challenges still to be faced and many areas still open to progress. We are now in one of those periods when the law, moving as it often must against centuries of custom and tradition, is undergoing a revolutionary advance in the field of human rights. There will be years of adjustment. But the marvel of our system of government under the rule of law is that such progress can be accomplished through our political and legal processes.

The structure of our system is such as to provide a vehicle for achieving the changes that are necessary, and correcting wrongs which may occur, without resort to violence, force, or the great upheavals which characterize every significant change under totalitarian regimes.

Vast changes have been achieved in accordance with, and by the means, of our due process of law.

Law is not only the protector of our established rights, but also the means for achieving further progress toward our social and political ideals. The tremendous advances of the freedom and liberty of man in this country have all been accomplished through our adherence to the concept of the rule of law, and it is to this concept that we must also look in order to preserve our great heritage.

So today, it is well that we ponder both the past and the future. Where will the American dream be in the year 2000? It is estimated that by that year our population will total more than 400 million people. And if the past half century is any guide to the future, then the citizens of that time will be living in a world of untold scientific wonders. But what of man's freedom? What of representative government and religious liberty? And what about our priceless heritage which we have crystallized into what we call the American way of life? If we are to insure the survival of these ideals, we must continue our dedication to the rule of law. As was observed by the French philosopher, Montesquieu, "The deterioration of any government begins with a decay of the principles upon which it was founded."

Today, the most serious challenge to our principle of government is communism. In meeting this challenge it will be essential that we rely upon the rule of law as a major weapon in defeating the evils of the Communist ideology. It is obvious that there is no military solution to the Communist threat. Communism is a way of life—a philosophy—it cannot be suppressed by force any more than the desire for freedom can be suppressed by force.

In fact, the fatal defect of the Communist ideology is that it relies on force and fear to maintain its authority. To suggest that we can conquer communism by force of arms is only an adoption of the very tenet which we find to be most defective and offensive in that ideology. Any ultimate victory over communism and the forces of totalitarianism in general, must come from an awakening in all men of a desire for freedom and liberty, coupled with the demonstration that such rights can be preserved. This can only be accomplished under a rule of law.

The rule of law is the antithesis of communism. It recognizes that men have rights as individuals, and that both the individual and the government are subject to the law. The rule of law means order, stability, and the greatest possible degree of human freedom. Communism on the other hand enthrones society rather than the individual; the state is all powerful, and the law is no more than the policy and whim of the dominant group. There is constant turmoil, fear, and no individual freedom. Only under the rule of law can the freedom of man prevail.

Ideas, ideals, and moral standards are all important in our all-out struggle with communism. Judge Learned Hand, one of the greatest jurists of this century, has told us that "Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women. When it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it. No constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it.

Thus as we have long espoused freedom and justice for man as the promise of the free world, we must also espouse the rule of law as the creative means to achieve and maintain freedom and justice between nations, as well as within nations.

We Americans have seen an orderly society emerge on this continent where the rule of law governed relations between men.

Hopefully the time will come when the rule of law will supplant force in governing relations between nations.

But if we are here merely to give lip service to the meaning of Law Day, then it would probably be better if we had not come. "If tyranny is to triumph, then freemen need only to do nothing."

It is vital that we continue to cultivate our reverence for the law and the courts—not the men who come and go in the courts, but the practical system by which the law is administered. If we lose the law, then we lose our civilization.

Unless we pledge ourselves to preserve, portect, and advance our system of law, then the future generations who will pay the ultimate price for our failure, will denounce and dishonor us.

The responsibilities which you and I and our generations face today may even be greater than the responsibilities of the generation which survived Saratoga, Valley Forge, and Yorktown.

Our Republic needs patriots today as it has never needed them before. Not the Fourth of July patriot, the superpatriot, or the professional patriot, but the ordinary American who is not ashamed to demonstrate his love for his country and its political heritage, and who, despite the cost to him in time, money, and perhaps even his blood, will do his duty to improve and strengthen his Nation.

If our way of life is to survive, our generation must take up the yoke which has so proudly and sucessfully been borne by our predecessors.

In the history of nations, freedom has always perished when the rule of law has yielded to the rule of men. Such change has occurred when the courts no longer remain independent or the laws are no longer just or fairly administered.

Without justice there can be no peace within a nation; without peace there can be no freedom. So we must be certain that our system for the administration of justice works, and as Americans we must be rededicated to the task of making freedom the dynamic force that it is now, and ever should be. If we do not fail in this responsibility, then freedom for ourselves and future generations will be preserved.

The Meaning of Law Day

(An address by Edward Clark to the students of Texas Southern University Law School, Apr. 30, 1965)

Today has been designated Law Day, U.S.A., 1965. It is a day for celebration, a day for recognition of past accomplishments, a day for planning for the future. But most of all, it is, or should be, a day for rededication to the ideals of government through law.

This Nation was founded upon the concept of government by and through law. The great precepts of such a government were set forth in the Declaration of Independence, elaborated in the Constitution and its amendments, and reiterated in the constitutions of the several States. Under the fundamental law, the Nation has grown and developed through the great body of State and Federal statutory and common law. A democracy maintains itself by law. Respect for law is vital to the democratic way of life.

The motto for this year's Law Day is "Uphold the law—a citizen's first duty." As lawyers and lawyers-to-be, it is a motto worthy of adoption—not just for this day or for this year, but for all time to come. If those who work with the law do not believe in it, abide by it, respect it, and strive to uphold it, others cannot be expected to do so. Lawyers necessarily set the examples there—be it good or bad. It was in recognition of that fact that the tradition of an annual Law Day was established. Law Day honors lawyers, but it also places upon lawyers great obligation. That obligation, however, should be a welcome one for it carries with it tremendous opportunity to be of service to one's country and to one's fellow man, to be a leader in the continuing development of this Nation and to contribute to a better way of life for all mankind.

You have chosen to be scholars of the law. Be the scholar always, true to the dreams and enthusiasm that fill your hearts today. A scholar is not necessarily or even best typified by the academician in an ivory tower. The scholar is one who is skilled in the pursuit of truth, courageous in its acceptance, and adequate in persuasive power in whatever area he works.

The brightest pages of human history are those written by the scholar in politics. By politics is not meant vulgar pursuit of position in power but that greatest of all sciences—the government of men—the upbuilding of the Nation. Love of country has been described as "the noblest emotion in the human mind. Synthetic in its nature, it takes from every passion its purer portion. As passionate as love, it is more unselfish. As tender as friendship, it is more enduring. With religion's faith it hath yet a broader charity. Under its sacred influence, the partisan becomes the patriot; the soldier, the hero; the scholar, the statesman; the prophet, the seer."

In a nation whose public life is not permeated with scholarship functions at low level, there is something wrong with both its administrative machinery and with its scholarship. Great wars and great battles mean nothing save for the ideas behind them. It matters little which army wins unless an idea has been established or destroyed.

The military battleground, however, is not the only or even the major arena in the conflict of ideologies. In the Halls of Congress, in the houses of all State legislatures, in every county and municipal administrative body, the struggle between one idea—one concept—one goal—and another is constant. The same is true of the courts, the council tables of industry, every institution, every organization which is truly alive and growing. Either positively or negatively, by action or inaction, by advocacy or acquiescence, everyone contributes at least minutely on one side or the other in some of these continuing conflicts of ideas.

The training which you are receiving here is fine equipment for active participation in any area and particularly in the most significant internal problems which face the Nation at the present time. These are times of great and perilous change, but if we allow partisan passion to control our actions and our minds, then we shall lose far more than we can ever gain. You as lawyers will be in a position that is both lofty and perilous. Your education, your technical skills, your higher mentality will enable you to command attention, to assume leadership in the movement for equal rights for the citizens of this country. The very same qualities—those which qualify you to become lawyers—officers of the court—place upon you responsibilities to your profession and to your Nation, responsibilities summarized in the motto for Law Day—"Uphold the law—a citizen's first duty."

The quest for equality and justice under law is not new. It has been a constant struggle during the history of this Nation. It was stated as a "self-evident truth" in our Declaration of Independence "that all men are created equal." Our Constitution was adopted "to * * * establish justice * * * and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." The major and most fundamental feature of the form of government established in that Constitution was that it be a government of law.

Are these concepts irreconcilable? I think not. Unquestionably those of us who believe in the democratic process have been criticized by many both within and outside this country because prejudice and injustice, oppression and discrimination still exist in this land. The critics forget, however, that nowhere on the face of the earth are a man's individual liberties held more sacred than in the United States of America.

The American Nation has not achieved in full the lofty ideals which it has set for itself, but criticism should not be meted out without concessions as to the great strides that have been made in the past century, the even greater accomplishments of the past decade.

It was only a little over a hundred years ago that human slavery was abolished in this Country. As late as March 1861, the Congress of the United States, in an attempt to appease the Southern States, proposed as the 13th amendment to the Constitution a provision reading:

"No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere, within any State, with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of said State."

Did you know that that proposed amendment was ratified by three States, Illinois, Ohio, and Maryland?

The Civil War, as you do well know, not only eradicated that proposed amendment but brought into the Constitution the three great amendments which have become the foundation of the rights and liberties of the citizens of the several States: the 13th, abolishing slavery; the 14th, insuring equal application of the law and due process of law to all citizens against any infringement by the States; the 15th, guaranteeing the right to vote to all, regardless of race or color or creed.

The vision—the ideal—the goal of equality, justice, and liberty was again embodied in our fundamental law.

Realization has been tortuously slow. For that, we, the American people, cannot help but accept our full measure of censure. We must bear the stigma for failing promptly to insure that the rights and prerogatives of citizenship were extended to all citizens; for denying to many the dignity of freemen; for neglecting to implement the intent of those great amendments.

We must agree that any man who has been denied his full measure of citizenship is justified in being impatient, but we cannot concede that his impatience, or even his denial of right, licenses him to disregard the very laws that insure his personal freedom.

Few and painfully slow though they were, some forward steps were taken during the period from 1765 to 1954. During that time of seeming inaction, the basic concepts underlying the great accomplishments of the past decade were solidified. Men, working together to solve their common problems, forget their differences of race, religion, and heritage. During this time, a resurgence of the concept of protection of individual rights and liberties occurred. Men became increasingly aware of their obligations to mankind.

The leaders were lawyers, and the basic advances were produced by the courts, in the orderly process of democratic change rather than by bloody revolution. Schools have been desegregated. Discrimination in interstate transportation, in employment, in union membership, in a dozen aspects of life has been made unlawful. Businesses which hold themselves out to serve the public have been made to live up to their representations. Congress is working today on legislation designed to implement the intention of the 15th amendment, to insure that all citizens who so desire may exercise the right to vote their convictions.

Unquestionably progress has been made, but perfection has not been achieved. You and I may never see the full attainment of this goal, even in this country, for we must always remember that man is a frail and imperfect being. It is difficult for us to shuck off the strains of our mortality. Yet in our dual nature, we also possess that most sublime of all attributes, the ability to visualize perfection and to desire it. It is the gulf between a visualization and attainment with which we must contend, for we are bound up as human beings and Americans in the struggle for equality and justice under the law, and as lawyers in the equally important goal that our attainment must come about through the orderly processes inherent in our democratic system.

You, as lawyers, may be asked not only to advise but to participate in the struggle for equal rights, not only to be an advocate but to be an actor in the movement. Those lacking in perceptiveness, in wisdom, in the basic sense of responsibility, and in true understanding of the fundamentals of our Government, may try to force you into rash actions, into using excesses for moderation. There may also be those who envy your position, your education, your superior grasp of the situation; they may try to discredit or destroy you. Others who bitterly oppose the struggle may do all in their power to render you ineffective, to debase, and scandalize you.

Remember, however, that without our democratic system of government, the struggle, if it could take place at all, would be futile. Only in a government of law is equality meaningful, is justice attainable, or civil rights desirable. There can be no victory other than under the law.

As lawyers, you know the law's capacity for change. The Anglo-American system is certainly not perfect, being administered by men, but over the long run, it has proven that it is best adapted to meeting the needs of freemen, balancing the rights of the individual against the rights of society as a whole. And although it is men who administer the laws, it is the laws themselves which govern us. Let it always be so.

I beg you, therefore, to remember that you are lawyers before you are citizens, and that you are Americans before you are members of any minority, or any special interest group, of any movement. None of us would be anything without the American democracy under which we live and to which we owe so much.

There will be times when you will be tempted to ally yourself with any source of aid or assistance. Do not fall into the trap which those who do not love our American system have set. Avoid all who pervert our democratic heritage, who would defile our traditions of orderly and reasoned movement, for a small and often temporary gain. "Uphold the law—a citizen's first duty."

This does not mean that you should not protest injustices with all the eloquence, with all the means at your disposal. Protest, the act of making your displeasure known, is an essential right of freemen, guaranteed by the first amendment to our Constitution. It is a powerful and persuasive weapon, when wisely and judiciously used within the law. But remember that the act of protest itself is but a means to accomplish a goal, and not an end in itself. Protest blindly made, or made for no good purpose, is not only foolish but detrimental to the cause for which you fight.

Furthermore, protest must be tempered with reason. The rights of the individual or of a group of individuals are not limitless. There is the greater right of the general public to orderly peace and freedom. Remember always that liberty is not absolute but must be exercised in recognition of the rights of others. Otherwise, liberty becomes license. "Uphold the law—a citizen's first duty."

This does not mean that, when there is a conflict between two precepts of law, you should not take a reasoned stand on the side of the law which you deem to be correct. As lawyers, you know that there are vast and complicated inconsistencies in the law. There is nothing wrong with siding with a Federal concept against an opposite one held by a State so long as the opposition is carried on within the framework of the very laws which allow and protect our right to differ.

But we cannot depart from the basic belief in the supremacy of the rule of law. We are not—we cannot be—free to choose any expediency to further our goals. As Mr. Justice Stewart recently said in one of the demonstration cases:

"The constitutional guaranty of liberty implies the existence of an organized society maintaining public order, without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of anarchy."

Implicit in that statement is the motto of Law Day—"Uphold the law—a citizen's first duty."

This does not mean that the lawyer cannot attempt to make a new law. As you well know, our common law heritage demands that the law evolve and modify to meet the changing demands of society. It behooves a lawyer to advance his cause in the best possible manner and if, to win a case, he must create a new concept of law, well. If the courts agree with his advocacy, he has not only carried the day but served his calling in his profession. But the method by which he accomplishes his goal is vital, for if he avoids the measured safeguards of the law to win his point now, his opposition may defeat him by the same unlawful means the next time.

Seek not therefore, merely Pyrrhic victories. Seek lasting gains even though you must compromise, mediate, conciliate. Remember that you can do more good for yourself with the man who likes you and respects you than with one who mistrusts and disbelieves you. Remember, that the man who may oppose you is also human, with all the hopes and desires, all the joys and fears, all the trouble and happiness that you have.

Above all, remember that you are an American. Reverse racism can be as damaging, in the longrun, as racism. Even as we should avoid denying a man's rights which under the law he should possess because of his race or creed, so should we avoid giving a man rights or privileges he should not otherwise have except for his race or creed. If we seek to foster the rights of Americans, it should be because they are Americans, not because of the color of their skins.

Without respect for and obedience to the law, we can accomplish nothing but the downfall of this great Nation. With respect and obedience, we can go forward toward the goals which we have set. Anarchy is too high a price to pay for any concept. The very means we use to gain a small measure of liberty by destroying the liberties of others may someday be turned on us to enslave us.

Therefore, we must seek equality and justice, but we must seek them under law, and not outside the law. We must give credence to the fact that, as lawyers and as citizens, our first duty is to uphold the law, to work within its framework and not against it, to oppose all those who would for any reason seek to deny liberty to act within the law to any man.

"Give us, O God, the strength to build
The city that hath stood too long a dream,
Whose laws are love, where ways are
brotherhood
And where the sun that shineth is God's
grace for human good."

REPRESENTATIVE O'KONSKI PROPERLY OBJECTS TO REPUBLICAN PARTY CONTINUING TO BE MINORITY PARTY—TWO-PARTY SYSTEM BEST

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend a fellow representative of the opposition party, Hon. Alvin O'Konski of Wisconsin, for a forthright statement he made to this body last Thursday.

In the Congressional Record, it was entitled, "High Interest Rates—Opium for the People."

In his remarks, he criticized his own party—and the Democratic Party, too, for that matter—but particularly his own for the image they have in the public mind. I shall not discuss the whole speech, which makes remarkably fine reading, but I shall mention the fact that he challenges the minority party to represent people instead of interests, big business interests, and people against greedy financial interests.

For some time, I have been thinking that the reason the Republican Party is the eternal minority party is for the reasons that my good friend from Wisconsin enumerates. Alvin O'Konski is the exception to the rule. Time and time again through the years I have watched this Republican from Wisconsin vote against monopolistic interests in favor of the small businessman, in favor of the veteran, in favor of social security, and farm programs that help the rural areas of the country.

And now he comes out boldly, clearly, forthrightly, in favor of low interest rates and an adequate money supply so that those who need credit availability are not hurt by the lack of it.

I believe if more Republicans followed the course that Alvin O'Konski has, Democrats would not outnumber them 2 to 1. I believe in the two-party system. I believe it to be a cornerstone of American democratic processes. When one party becomes a weak minority, the whole country suffers.

Alvin O'Konski of Wisconsin knows this as I do. By his remarks of last Thursday, he shows he is willing to face the wrath of the greedy Wall Street banking interests that would fleece the pocketbooks of all the people by raising interest rates when they are already too high.

Congressman O'Konski also challenges Chairman William McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve System not to end our long period of prosperity—

we are in our 52d month, to be exact—by tightening credit.

I say if more Republicans were to echo Alvin O'Konski's remarks, we would not have such a weak minority party. We would have what America needs—a strong, vibrant opposition party. It would keep a sharp, watchful eye on the Democratic Party. It would not permit us to become overconfident, insolent, or indolent. Fortunately for the country, these ailments in no way afflict the present Democratic Party. But, if we have a permanently incapacitated Republican Party, anything could happen to the American body politic.

To avoid running any such risks as I have just mentioned, I would much rather see the Republicans fare better than they have the last several elections, and I say to them in all sincerity that if they do as Alvin O'Konski has done—show courage, fight monopoly, greed, and concentrated financial and economic power—then we will all be the better for it.

I would like to see a host of Republicans come out in favor of interest rates the people can afford, low interest rates, and adequate credit for their needs. This would help in the long fight against the powerful bankers' lobby led by the American Bankers Association.

I wonder whether my Republican colleagues in the House will hail Alvin O'Konski or the bankers' lobby. I wonder whether my colleagues, in what appears to be the permanent minority party, will join the fight against high interest rates and tight money and help their constituents who need low interest rates and adequate credit.

I plead with my Republican colleagues to show good sense and join up with Alvin O'Konski for the benefit of the Republican Party and their country.

MERGER POLICY ADVOCATED BY AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to participate in a small business subcontracting conference sponsored by the Small Business Administration here in Washington on Tuesday.

Since I feel that the administration of our antimonopoly laws is of vital importance not only to small business but to the economy as a whole, I am bringing to the attention of my colleagues my remarks at this conference.

Before any hasty, ill-considered action is taken to exempt the banking industry from the antitrust laws, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues several points contained in my statement which follows:

> I am very glad to be here to participate in the SBA small business subcontracting conference. In my opinion, the 1961 amendment to the Small Business Act providing small business set-asides in large Government contracts was a new lease on life to small business. I had the privilege of serving as chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business as well as on the Banking and Currency Committee to which, of course, is referred small business legislation, so I fully realize the importance of small business subcontracts. I am hopeful that small business will enjoy an ever growing share of Government business.
>
> At the same time, however, small businessmen, as well as everyone else interested in small business problems, must be aware of all other developments that bear upon competition and free enterprise, not just small business alone. My own efforts involve two basic needs of free enterprise: (1) an adequate supply of business credit at reasonable rates of interest, (2) strong antimonopoly and vigorous but fair enforcement of such laws.
>
> While I suppose that my views on monetary reform are no secret, I would like to share with you my concern over current moves to weaken the antimonopoly laws.
>
> Monopolies have been like a plague upon mankind throughout our history. Unchecked, they inevitably lead to a police state as individual initiative and freedom of choice fall by the wayside. Also competitive free enterprise will disappear. The only excuse for permitting a monopoly to exist is where competitive free enterprise would be simply unworkable; the local telephone company, power company, or gas company are obvious examples. Such industries are frequently exempted from the antimonopoly laws as regulated public utilities. Their franchise, territory, quality, and quantity of service and even their charges and profits are subject to constant government regulation because they are public service utilities. Since there is no element of free competition to spur on such a monopoly to meet public needs, government must see that these needs are met.
>
> Now the banking industry is definitely not a regulated industry. I am happy to report that at present there is a great spirit of competitive free enterprise among our banks in most communities, although I am disturbed by the fact that we have today exactly one-half the number of banks we had some 30-odd years ago. Banking is not a regulated industry, banking is a supervised industry. The States and the Federal Government share in the chartering of new banks, examination of their loan portfolios; establish merging and branching rules; and supervise banking matters in general, particularly with respect to liquidity and solvency. But, banks do not enjoy territorial monopolies like public utilities do, although some would like that, I am sure. They do, however, enjoy a franchise to create money on a 10 to 1 ratio—$10 in loans for every $1 in reserves—and this is certainly a tremendous responsibility as well as a privilege. And, in this sense, banks are truly public utilities. But bankers are not told how much interest they can charge on loans. And, bankers are not told what is the maximum profit they can earn. So, although banks enjoy a monopoly, a precious franchise to create money both for the government as well as for the people of the United States, banking is still a free enterprise industry. I would like to see it stay that way, and I am sure that most people will agree.
>
> This is why I am disturbed by the flurry of activity on the part of big Eastern banking interests and their Washington lobby to exempt banking from Justice Department administration of our antimonopoly laws. Banks are already exempt from regulation by the Federal Trade Commission and by the Securities and Exchange Commission. And, as I stated a moment ago, banking is a competitive industry, and not a regulated monopolistic industry. I cannot believe that those who at this very moment are lobbying frantically for this antimonopoly exemption really want banking to be regulated like a public utility. Do these people want fixed prices and fixed profits for banking? Does freedom from vigorous but fair antimonopoly enforcement mean that much to these people? I, for one, would prefer to preserve free enterprise in banking.
>
> I do not believe that the proponents of this legislation have really thought this thing through. Such a drastic exemption from the antitrust laws can only be justified for a fully regulated industry. I certainly oppose this for banking, and I am truly surprised that certain banking interests are pursuing this course. Such a move opens the door for further erosion of our free enterprise system. Now this is not to say that I would close the door to all consideration of improvements in our antimonopoly administration. We must always strive for modernization and efficiency with minimum disturbance to business, while always recognizing that the broad public interest must be served first. As a matter of fact, I would certainly expect the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am chairman, to look into during the 89th Congress the general question of competition in the banking industry. Not only should we examine merger policy, but also branching, new bank charters, chain banking, interlocking directorates, and possibly other questions.
>
> Our committee has a full schedule at present and these are not matters that you should rush into. Fundamental changes in public policy must be subjected to the utmost scrutiny and careful consideration. We have no emergency in the banking industry, although not everything is, of course, as it should be.
>
> Superconcentration in banking can only hurt the small business which depends upon bank credit to survive. Recently I was informed of a case out West involving a long-established plumbing contractor who lost his line of credit when a holding company took over the local bank. This is not just an isolated case. I assure you.
>
> So, I think all businessmen—whether a banker or a nonbanker, big business or small business—must be informed on serious matters such as this so that through extreme haste drastic changes are not wrought in our free enterprise system for which we all may be sorry.

EXEMPTING FIRST $1,800 OF ANNUITIES, ETC., FROM INCOME TAX

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which would exempt the first $1,800 received annually from annuities, pensions, or retirement benefits from the Federal income tax.

Very soon we shall eliminate several billion dollars in excise taxes. I shall vote in favor of this measure because I know that this action will serve to stimulate our economy and as a result produce thousands of new jobs annually.

However, too many of our retired citizens have little or no purchasing power because their pensions and annuities are inadequate for today's cost of living. What are we going to do for these deserving American citizens?

My bill deserves the support of every Member of this House because it would enable millions of older Americans to buy goods and services which are presently beyond their means.

Even more important, we who are still enjoying our productive years have a deep obligation toward our senior citizens. There are so many better tax sources that we can explore. I say that we should give our retirees a decent break.

Only yesterday, I received a letter from a lady in Jersey City who has given much of her life to the education of our children. More than 40 years, as a matter of fact, and I am proud to be numbered as one of her former students.

Miss Loretta McCrystal wrote and told me what her annual pension amounts to. I will not repeat it here because it is not something this kindly lady would want made public, but, in my opinion, it is totally inadequate compensation for her years of service to the cause of public education. Miss McCrystal enclosed in her letter a petition signed by many other retired teachers. I would like to insert this petition at this point in the RECORD:

Representative DOMINICK DANIELS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We the undersigned would appreciate it if you sponsored a bill in Congress to revise the law which makes teachers' pensions subject to income tax.

We would like this present policy changed and a minimum of $1,800 and upward subject to income tax.

This plea is in line with President Johnson's crusade against poverty.

We as teachers find it a hardship to pay this tax as most of us have less than $3,000 of a pension, the amount set by President Johnson as the poverty class maximum.

As we feel you are a friend of the teachers, we look to you for help in this matter.

Sincerely,

Loretta McCrystal, Ruth Everett, Rose M. Sylvester, Florence Muller, James Quinn, Bert Greenspoon, Helen A. Tracy, Gladys M. Johnson, Ida C. Hillman, Edith Louise Roenicke, Grace Harriett Marshall, Grace Crooks Gallagher, Helen Kruse, Elsa B. Grothusen, Loretta Keenan, Frances Nolan, Lua R. Crawford, Elizabeth L. Burke, Matilda Royal, Marion Buckenmaier, Emily E. Gartlan, Edna D. Siegfried, Anna L. Rickyard, Genevieve Loughran, Jean A. Reiner, Agnes Donovan Florence H. Macracken, Dell Riordan, Hazel Gibson, Ellen L. Crowley, Maud E. MacPhee, Genevieve E. McCloskey, Ora B. Smith, Elizabeth F. Berkowitz, Catherine Joyce, George A. DeLamates, Emma S. Hubert, Katherine R. H. Vance, Katherine Foley, Frieda W. Keegan, Minnie B. Rittgers, Etta C. Meyers, Mary Fehl, Margaret O. Cassell, Frances D. Spingarn, John Thomas Eckert, Margaret M. Scanlan, Lauretta J. Pitchford, Grace D. Cook, Magdalene Schlicht, Edith McFadden, Elizabeth C. Hoar.

Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong with our rich productive society when we have to get our tax revenues from the inadequate pensions and annuities of our senior citizens. The petition of Miss McCrystal and the other retired teachers certainly ought to spur efforts toward obtaining tax relief for our retirees. Simple justice demands prompt action on my bill.

THE GROWING INFLUENCE OF CONGRESSMAN SLACK

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a column from the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed West Virginia colleague, Representative JOHN M. SLACK, JR., was elected to the House of Representatives along with me in 1958. After he was sworn in, he was assigned to two committees in 1959. He had the wisdom and determination to show he would rather switch than fight, and switch he did to the powerful House Appropriations Committee during his second term in the House. That decision was a fortunate one for the State of West Virginia, for his power and influence have grown steadily as he has risen in seniority on the Appropriations Committee.

I have made frequent references in the past, Mr. Speaker, to the good fortune which West Virginia possesses in its two fine U.S. Senators. Further reference to this outstanding service in the other body is made in the column which I am including with my remarks. But today I wish to concentrate on the superb legislative accomplishments of Congressman SLACK. In a body which can ring with oratory and occasional demagogery, he practices the art of the quiet word, the thorough digging required by committee work, and the dedicated service which is the mark of an able representative. When our colleagues speak of Congressman SLACK, there is a single adjective which always come through: "respected."

Mr. Speaker, the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette of May 25, 1965, included an article which well summarizes the achievements of several members of the West Virginia congressional delegation, and more particularly refers to Congressman SLACK's accomplishments and measures his stature.

The article follows·

HARRY HOFFMANN'S POLITICS: ROLES IN CONGRESS BLESSING TO STATE

Early in 1963, when there was considerable talk and pressure to have Representative JOHN M. SLACK, JR., seek the Democratic nomination for Governor, this column reported that he would not be a candidate because "the man just doesn't have time to be running for Governor."

Our point was that, as a high ranking member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee and chairman of some important subcommittees, SLACK had reached the point where he could be of greater service to the people of West Virginia by staying in Congress than he could in a 4-year term in the Governor's office.

We were reminded of this by a letter sent to members of the Associated General Contractors of West Virginia this week by Executive Secretary Eugene H. Brown, who cited the far-reaching effect of Federal aid and federally financed construction projects on the economy of West Virginia, and the growing influence of our Representatives in Congress on the State's development.

With respect to the Third District Representative, Brown had this to say:

"Congressman SLACK is a dedicated and highly respected workhorse on appropriations and he continually becomes more valuable to the leadership, and as a result, more influential in his efforts to get things done for West Virginia. He is now the 15th ranking member of the 50-member House Appropriations Committee, which since it must originate all money legislation, is considered by observers to be the most powerful committee of all, save perhaps the Rules Committee."

Reviewing the committee assignments of all West Virginians in Congress as an indication of the State's "enviable and strategic strength in Washington," Brown made this observation:

"Only a few States have representation on both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees and the Senate and House Public Works Committees. The value to West Virginia in having Senator BYRD on the Appropriations Committee (and Senator RANDOLPH on the same committee for public works appropriations) cannot be overemphasized.

"These Senators are in a position to guide and help projects for West Virginia. They have the respect of their fellow Senators, and it is through their efforts that a number of important public works projects are being developed.

"Senator RANDOLPH is a key figure in the Nation's public works. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, he oversees all Federal-aid highway legislation. (It was through Senator RANDOLPH's efforts that the 160-mile Highland Scenic Highway from Gormania to Richwood was authorized, and Senator BYRD continues to advocate the proposed Allegheny Parkway.)"

Brown was writing for a group that, on the subject of Federal aid, thinks primarily of the highway programs—the interstate, the regular ABC, the forest roads, the new scenic highway, the Appalachian road system.

But he also gave a recitation of other programs to provide a nutshell realization of the extent of Washington's influence on West Virginia's economy:

"The great locks and dams along the Ohio and Kanawha and Monongahela Rivers, the big flood control dams such as Sutton, Bluestone, Summersville, Justice, East Lynn, West Fork, Birch River, all require the expenditure of millions of construction dollars.

"Soon, major projects will be let in the $24 million State parks program being undertaken under an ARA grant and loan. At least one and perhaps two new national recreational areas are proposed in pending bills. The expanding U.S. Soil Conservation program provides numerous small earthfill structures for flood control, water supply, and soil conservation purposes.

"There are a dozen or more pending low-rent housing projects being financed by self-liquidating bond issues. Several airport projects are proposed with matching FAA funds. There are seven or eight new Federal buildings and post offices to be built in the smaller cities of the State, a dozen or more new post offices in cities small and large, several new social security buildings, an addition to the mines building at Mount Hope, the development of the Naval installation at Sugar Grove, the new $8 million training school for boys at Morgantown.

"A number of college buildings, both public and private, some partially financed by Housing and Home Finance Administration loans and bond issues, are pending. A half dozen or more major hospital projects partially financed with Hill-Burton money are ready to go. Communities throughout the State are seeking to build new sewer and water system projects with planning funds coming from the Community Facilities Administration.

"Even the field of private housing is not without its Federal influence since most of the new housing in cities of the State is financed with loans guaranteed by FHA. The several active urban renewal projects in the State are contributing measurably to the construction potential. Also, many private industrial projects can be related to defense spending or other Government purchases."

This is a lot going for one State from the Federal level, but, as Brown points out, one shouldn't get the idea that West Virginia is receiving more than its proper recognition in Washington. The State suffered through many lean years, particularly in the area of defense spending, and the recognition that first came with the Kennedy administration is now being furthered through the war on poverty and the emphasis on regional development. Indeed, it has been so extensive that West Virginia faces a real problem in financing the Federal-aid projects.

But, be that as it may, Brown finds that West Virginia occupies an increasingly favorable position insofar as it is possible for our delegation in Congress to make it so. And as he points out, the effectiveness of our representatives is "due to their strategic committee assignments and in no small way to the seniority system under which the Congress operates its committees."

Brown, as the executive secretary of a group that wants to keep on the good side of anyone who is in office or who may be in office, is in no position to be making a political pitch. But, just on the basis of his factual report to his association members, it is evident that JOHN SLACK made a decision beneficial to West Virginia when he cast his political future to the Washington scene, and that it will be in the best interest of West Virginia if JENNINGS RANDOLPH is reelected to the Senate next year.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the golden anniversary of Kiwanis International.

For 50 years this organization, with its affiliates all over the United States, have given great service to the national community. It is only reasonable that a commemorative stamp be issued for this organization which has done so much to further the greatness of our Nation.

I wish to include a resolution sent to me by the president of the Northern Hills Kiwanis, of Cincinnati, Ohio, urging that the U.S. Post Office issue such a commemorative stamp:

CERTIFIED COPY OF RESOLUTION

This is to certify that at a meeting held on April 27, 1965, of the board of directors of the Kiwanis Club of Northern Hills, a corporation, incorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio, of said corporation, pursuant to its bylaws, at which meeting a quorum was present, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, to wit:

"Whereas we consider recognition worthy and an important part of 50 years of service to the communities of America; and

"Whereas other service organizations, such as the Lions and Rotary Club have received recognition from the Post Office Department in the form of a commemorative stamp in past years: Therefore

"*Resolved*, First, that it is the consensus of this meeting that Kiwanis International should be given like consideration from the Post Office Department, by issuing, a commemorative stamp to celebrate its golden anniversary, and said commemorative stamp should clearly indicate the 50th anniversary of Kiwanis, and display or otherwise indicate Kiwanis service to local, State, and National governments; and

"*Resolved*, Second, that it is the consensus of this meeting that we present this resolution to our elected officials and urge they exercise all possible influence to promptly obtain a commemorative stamp."

In witness whereof, the undersigned president and secretary of said corporation, have set their hands and affixed its corporate seal this 27th day of April, 1965.

ROBERT E. AUSTIN,
President.
——— ———,
Secretary.

COMPASSION AND JUSTICE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the reason for which I have asked for time today is not a partisan matter. It is a matter of compassion and justice, involving two disabled veterans—a man and his wife—both of whom served their country and were wounded while in service. At the same time, it does bring home the lesson of a cannibalistic Government. I refer to the case of Wilford Metcalf, of Del Rio, in Cocke County, Tenn., which is in my district.

The Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture is to trying to collect $1,717.52 from this Tennessee mountaineer. In a letter to me explaining his plight, which I will soon read, Mr. Metcalf asked me to explain his case to President Johnson. I thought I could do this by calling attention to it in a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman. But, I have now received a reply from the Secretary, in which Mr. Metcalf's dilemma is mostly ignored. I feel now that this attention must be sought by bringing this matter up on the floor.

Metcalf has asked me to try to work out an honorable solution with the proper persons. I like his attitude. It would seem to me that he is trying desperately to do what is right and just. He is asking no dole or handout. He has vacated his farm and is now living in a rented house while the matter is in dispute.

One of the interesting points, a vital point, of this case is that the Government is suing Mr. Metcalf for an amount almost twice that of which he paid for his farm. Another is that it cuts right to the heart and shows the duplicity of a bureaucracy, which claims to have the welfare of every citizen uppermost in its conscience. Nevertheless, here is an example of a poor man, certainly one that should be a prime target for the antipoverty program, being harassed when he is trying to be independent and making his own way.

Let me read you Mr. Metcalf's letter:

MAY 1965.

Hon. JAMES H. QUILLEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed is two letters that I got from the Government. They are threatening to put me in court over something that they are wrong about and I am right about. The Government claims I owe them $1,717.52 when by rights they should owe me, but I can't law with the Government and I wouldn't if I could help it. You lose even if you win when you try lawing with Uncle Sam. That's the reason I ask you to try to present my side of the case to the Government because I can't law with them. I can barely feed and take care of my family and I can't spare any money to fee lawyers to fight with the Government. This is my side of the story and it's true and any of my neighbors will tell you or anyone else that I am telling the truth. My wife and I were married at the end of World War II. We are both disabled veterans and if it hadn't been for our small pension we couldn't raise our younguns. We bought a mountain farm for $800 and we have struggled to live. It has been hard but has also been rewarding as Preacher Pat Davis says. We ain't complaining as we raised our younguns and have et good as most mountain folks. We raised our hogs for meat and growed most of what else we had other than coffee, sugar, salt and the like. We ain't had to buy much so we don't need too awful much money til now that the Government is after us. After we bought our farm, I registered my deed and my deed plainly calls for my property line to go to the top of the mountain. I sold some of my timber and while we were a cutting it, the ranger he comes by and says I am on Government property. I quit cutting and when the Government threatened me a few years ago I writ Senator Kefauver and asked him to explain my side of the story and to get me out of having to law with the Government. There just ain't no way for a poor man like me to win when he laws with the Government. Like I said before, I lose even if I win. Well, Senator Kefauver took up my argument and presented my side and I thought it all taken care of and I left laying on the ground what timber was there when the ranger come by and I still claim the line runs to the top of the mountain but I can't afford to law over a little strip of mountain land so I am willing to lose the timber I done cut when by rights the Government ought to pay me for the ranger stopping me and causing me to lose that little dab of timber I done cut and is still a laying there on the ground just rotting.

This big bill of $1,717.52 staggers me. Do you realize how much that is? My whole farm ain't worth that much, less the little dab of timber that was cut. Why my farm doesn't have a passable road into it so I moved over to the road where I could send my youngins to school and I go back and work my farm. Will you try to get the Government just surveys and uses what deed and talk to the oldtimers here about the property line. Sometimes I think the Government just surveys and uses what deeds and lines that is to their best advantage rather than taking a broad and fair look and trying to reach the right decision. I can't afford to pay a man to survey and I understand the Government has their own surveyors so try to get them to survey this and take into consideration that me and Eliza own what our deed calls for.

If they won't do that then you have my permission to trade with the Government. I will take the $1,717.52 and give them my whole farm. I can take that and buy a better place out on the road. I don't have money to fight this case so please do for me what you can. Right now I ain't got the money to hardly buy clothes for my family, much less fight with the Government.

I read in the paper that Congress was and the President was fighting poverty. That's good and I am for it, but tell the President if he has any poverty left over from some other place to please send it down here. It's better than us mountain folks has been used to. Mr. Congressman this Government lawyer, Mr. G. Wilson Horde, just gave me 30 days to do something about this. I sure would be much obliged to you if you would take my case up real soon. I ain't had a good night's sleep since this Government lawyer writ me.

I am much obliged to you for your time and trouble.

Your friend,

WILFORD METCALF.

DEL RIO, TENN.

P.S.—Eliza says and she is right that if it takes it to settle this that we will give the Government the 55 acres if they will get off our backs. We bought this land in good faith and the Government has never surveyed or established a line that anybody knows about. If you need me I will come up there.

After I received Mr. Metcalf's letter, which now has received wide publicity across the country, I asked Mr. Freeman to have the line resurveyed, using Mr. Metcalf's deed or deeds other than those previously used. At this point in the RECORD, I read my letter of May 13, 1965, to the Secretary of Agriculture:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1965.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed is a copy of a letter from one of my financially hard-pressed constituents and a deciphered copy of the same letter that may be helpful to you.

This case involves property in the Cherokee National Forest in Cocke County, Tenn.

Without knowledge of the case other than the letter, it appears that two disabled war veterans, Mr. Metcalf of the Army and Mrs. Metcalf of the Navy, are being threatened with a lawsuit. From the letter, it is plain to see that my constituents are endeavoring to avoid, at great sacrifice, a legal action with the U.S. Government.

In his letter, Mr. Metcalf has asked me to try to work out an honorable solution with the proper persons. I like Mr. Metcalf's attitude. It would seem to me that he is desperately trying to do that which is right and just. I am firmly of the opinion that if you and I cannot work this out to the satisfaction of all, then we have betrayed our individual trusts.

As you know, Congress and the President are making all efforts to fight poverty and I am firmly of the opinion it would not further the antipoverty program to bring a legal action against a poor mountain farmer in such a trivial case as this.

From personal knowledge of land surveys and titles in mountainous east Tennessee, I realize it is ever so easy to make an honest error; therefore, I doubt the survey as it now stands. I would like to humbly request you to take Mr. Metcalf's suggestion and have this line resurveyed, using Mr. Metcalf's deed or deeds other than those previously used.

If we cannot solve this small problem of $1,717.52, then we had better forget about winning any war against poverty, particularly in the Appalachian region.

I would appreciate your giving this your prompt attention, as my constituent has not been sleeping since threat of this action.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. QUILLEN.

My reply to Mr. Metcalf is self-explanatory, and I read it for the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1965.

Mr. WILFORD METCALF,
Route 2,
Del Rio, Tenn.

DEAR WILFORD: Since receiving your recent letter, I wrote the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, outlining your plight and requesting that an honorable solution be worked out to your problem. I also requested that the property be resurveyed. Attached is a copy of the letter I wrote to Secretary Freeman.

The newspapers picked up the story of your plight and carried it all over the United States.

I received a letter from George Kenny, which is attached. It is self-explanatory. It appears that he served in the military with you.

Secretary Freeman replied to my letter of May 13, as per the attached. The letter is not too encouraging, and is what can be expected from this big Government.

I am writing Secretary Freeman again, strongly demanding action in resurveying and relief in your case.

I read the article in the Newport Plain Talk with a great deal of interest, and I want to do everything in the world I can to be helpful to you.

I think it is a shame and a disgrace that this big Government of ours should run over our citizens who are trying to struggle out a living, despite many hardships and obstacles, in a decent way.

My heart goes out to you and your family, and I will continue to follow through and do everything I can.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. QUILLEN.

This resurveying point, requested in my letter to the Secretary, was completely ignored, and the machinery rolls along to bring this poor mountain farmer into court with a staggering bill, far more than his whole farm is worth.

Could not the resurvey that I requested be charged to the antipoverty program?

I now read Secretary of Agriculture's reply to my original letter to him to show that the name of the Chief of the Forest Service is typed as the author of the letter, but was signed by M. M. Nelson. Obviously, the Secretary did not give me the courtesy of a personal reply, nor is there any indication that he has personally taken command of this matter:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1965.

Hon. JAMES H. QUILLEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. QUILLEN: Your letter of May 13 to Secretary Freeman in behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Wilford Metcalf, or Del Rio, Tenn., has been referred to the Forest Service for reply.

This case involves a question of title. The Government's title to this land was approved by the Attorney General of the United States in an opinion dated March 14, 1936, at the time the lands were acquired by the United States.

Local Forest Service officials discovered the timber cutting on the area in dispute on July 31, 1961, while surveying property lines in preparation for sale of Government timber. In investigating the claim they determined the volume of timber cut and its appraised value at the time of cutting.

Mr. Metcalf has a deed dated December 18, 1950, which he believes covers the land at issue. Since this conflict in ownership could not be settled, this case was handled under regular procedures and referred to the Department of Justice for appropriate action.

We are informed that the Department of Justice referred the case to the U.S. attorney in Chattanooga, Tenn., on April 23, 1965. We are sure that U.S. Attorney Reddy or his assistant, G. Wilson Norde, will be glad to discuss this matter with Mr. Metcalf as indicated in their letter of April 28 to him, copy of which you furnished to us. You may be sure that any Forest officers the U.S. attorney calls for will also be available for discussion of this matter.

We appreciate your concern for Mr. and Mrs. Metcalf. These cases are unpleasant and do not give us any personal satisfaction in our day-to-day work. Nevertheless, we are obligated to discharge our responsibility to protect the lands and resources in record ownership by the United States.

We trust that this reply will be helpful to you. If we can be of further assistance, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD P. CLIFF,
Chief.
By M. M. NELSON.

I have again called on Secretary Freeman to look into the matter and have requested that proceedings in this suit be postponed immediately until a complete investigation has been made. This is most important, as Mr. Metcalf is due to go to court any day now, since on April 28, the Department of Justice gave him 30 days in which to pay the bill.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1965.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I received a letter from Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service, and signed by M. M. Nelson, in reply to my letter to you of May 13, 1965, in regard to Mr. Wilford Metcalf of Del Rio, Tenn.

I did not realize when I wrote you that my letter would be mostly ignored, as I wrote you in good faith about a case which has a lot of merit.

In the first place, I asked you to have the line resurveyed, using Mr. Metcalf's deed or deeds other than those previously used. This point in my letter was completely ignored, and the machinery rolls along to bring this poor mountain farmer into court with a staggering bill, far more than his whole farm is worth.

I would like to request that proceedings in the suit be postponed immediately until a complete investigation has been made. This is most important, as Mr. Metcalf is due to go to court any day now .

I would like for you to review my letter again, together with the enclosures which I made available, and give the requested relief to Mr. Metcalf, as he is in dire need of help.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. QUILLEN.

I would hope by calling to the attention of Mr. Freeman, the Congress, and the President, justice will win out and the Government steamroller will not crush the will and independence of a man who has served his country well.

Many persons and many organizations have questioned the value of the antipoverty program. Some have charged it is nothing more than a political octopus reaching out and sucking up votes in return for pretending to care for the plights of unfortunate individuals. Here is a chance for the administration to show it is truly interested in helping a citizen that is in trouble, who is poor but also proud. Certainly Mr. Metcalf thought his trying to make his own way deserved the Government's compassion, as well as someone living in the less unfortunate areas of our big city.

What is the purpose of all we are trying to do if the Government cannot take a direct approach but takes away with one hand what it is giving out with the other? From the letters I have received, most Americans must feel this way. They are not on the Government's side in this case, they are fighting for Mr. Metcalf, and so am I.

Just for the RECORD, I would like to insert five of the newspaper stories that have appeared across the country. One is from the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago Tribune Press Service, May 17, 1965, by Willard Edwards:

VET IN POVERTY WAR AREA GETS U.S. THREATS TO SUE

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, May 17.—Wilford Metcalf, a disabled war veteran who tills a small mountain farm in eastern Tennessee, was reading about President Johnson's war on poverty the other day when he got two letters from the Government.

The first informed him that he had been a trespasser on Government land, had cut timber valued at $1,717 on it, and would be sued if he didn't pay up within 30 days. This amount was twice the purchase price of his entire farm.

The second letter from the U.S. attorney, J. H. Reddy, announced that 5 acres of mountain land which Metcalf thought he had owned was actually part of the Cherokee National Forest. It was on this land that the timber had been cut. Metcalf was ordered to relinquish his claim or face Federal action.

Metcalf wrote about his plight to his Congressman, Representative JAMES H. QUILLEN, Republican of Tennessee. In simple but appropriate "mountain folks" phraseology, he expressed himself on the woes of the little man about to be crushed by a Government steamroller.

"I read in the paper that the President was fighting poverty," Metcalf wrote. "That's good and I am for it but tell the President if he has any poverty left over from some other place to please send it down here. It's better than us mountain folks has been used to."

DEEDED "TO TOP OF MOUNTAIN"

When he married his wife, Eliza, at the end of World War II, Metcalf said, he had a small pension and he bought a mountain farm for $800. He registered his deed which stated that his property went "to the top of the mountain." Cutting and selling a little timber, in addition to farming, was about the only way he could survive but he wasn't complaining.

"It has been hard but it has also been rewarding as preacher Pat Davis says," he wrote in his letter to QUILLEN. "We ain't complaining as we raised our younguns and have et good as most mountain folks. We raised out hogs for meat and growed most of what else we had other than coffee, sugar, salt and the like. We ain't had to buy much so we don't need too awful much money til now that the Government is after us."

NO CHANCE TO WIN

"There just ain't no way for a poor man like me to win when he laws with the Government. This big bill of $1,717 staggers me. My whole farm ain't worth that, much less the little dab of timber that was cut * * * sometimes I think the Government just surveys and uses what deeds and lines is to their best and advantage. * * *

"You have my permission to trade with the Government. I will take the $1,717 and give them my whole farm. I can take that and buy a better place out on the road. I don't have money to fight this case. Right now I ain't got the money to hardly buy clothes for my family, much less fight with the Government.

READY TO YIELD LAND

"Eliza says that we will give the Government the 55 acres if they will get off our backs. We bought this land in good faith and the Government has never surveyed or established a line that anybody knows about. If you need me I will come up there."

Quillen forwarded Metcalf's letter to Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman with the tart suggestion that legal action against a poor mountain farmer was a poor way to carry out the antipoverty program in the Appalachian district.

"If you and I cannot work this small problem out," Quillen wrote Freeman, "then we have betrayed our individual trusts. And we had better forget about winning any war against poverty."

Another is from the Knoxville Journal, Wednesday, May 19:

COCKE FARMER WAITS MOVE BY GOVERNMENT

(By Tom Sweeten)

NEWPORT, May 18.—Wilford Metcalf has rented temporary housing for his family of five while he waits for the Federal Government's next move in a dispute over 55 acres of rugged forestland in the mountains of Cocke County.

The farmer has received national publicity because of the Federal Government's threats to take him to court if he doesn't relinquish claim to the acreage and pay the United States $1,717.52 which it maintains is the value of timber he has cut from the land.

Metcalf's farm is near Nough, a community a few miles off U.S. Highway 25–70. It can be reached by following a narrow, winding road leaving the main highway at Del Rio, about 14 miles east of Newport. Nearby, Rag Mountain climbs to an elevation of 3,654 feet. The area is a few miles outside the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

Metcalf, a disabled war veteran, has asked his Congressman, Representative JAMES H. QUILLEN, for aid. He requested QUILLEN to "tell the President if he has any poverty left over from some other place to please send it down here. It's better than us mountain folks has been used to."

Metcalf, father of four, bought a 150-acre farm 15 years ago for $800. Calling it a farm, however, is more like describing a small, muddy pond as a lake. There are only about 20 acres of the entire area that can be tended for crops and pasture, according to a U.S. Department of Agriculture study.

He said the bill of $1,717 "staggers me. My whole farm ain't worth that much, less the little dab of timber that was cut."

G. Wilson Horde, assistant U.S. attorney at Knoxville, wrote Metcalf April 28: "It has been brought to my attention that yourself and Harrison Messer, Cecil Lindsay, and George Stokely were responsible for trespassing on the land of the United States, and more particularly, the Cherokee National Forest land, and cutting 96,760 board feet of timber with a stumpage value of $1,951.45 without authority from any forest officer.

"It is my understanding that you left, at the request of the forest ranger, 9,150 board feet of the above timber with a stumpage value of $233.93 on the ground. This is excluded from the net claim of 87,610 board feet with a stumpage value of $1,717.52."

Horde said all four men were individually and collectively responsible for the damages and if a certified check were not received within 30 days suit would be filed.

A second letter on the same date to Metcalf from Horde, acting for J. H. Reddy, U.S. attorney for East Tennessee, pointed out the 55 acres Metcalf claimed had been acquired by the U.S. Government in 1935 from the Tennessee Land Co. It suggested Metcalf could relinquish the claim within 30 days or suit would be filed to quiet title.

"The timber we cut brought only $1,000 in the whole 10 years," Metcalf told the Knoxville Journal.

He said the Government reached its value of the timber by measuring the stumps remaining from the cutting and making other computations.

The dispute stems from the property line. Metcalf said his deed states his property went "to the top of the mountain" on the south, while the Government claims the line is near the foot of the mountain. Metcalf wants QUILLEN to try to get a new survey made.

"Three years ago the Government surveyed and stopped me from removing any more timber, at which time I wrote the late Senator Estes Kefauver and had not heard any more from them until last week," he added.

Metcalf added that he bought the property from Leonard James on December 18, 1950, with the understanding the line ran to the top of the mountain.

Compounding the situation, Metcalf explains, is the fact that the original deed, between Tennessee Land Co. and a man named Fulton had burned when a fire destroyed the Cocke County Courthouse.

"I logged this mountainside in 1937 even before I bought it," he recalled.

An overlay by the Soil Conservation Service, dated November 17, 1955, shows the property of Metcalf extended to the top of the mountain.

Metcalf said his home formerly was at the north end of the farm, but that the children had to walk 5 miles through woodland to a road where the school bus ran. They moved nearer the center of the farm, where most of his pasture land is.

He provided for his family by cutting and selling the timber and farming the few acres that could be tended.

Besides his wife, Eliza, there are four children: one son, Paul, 14; three daughters, Vernell, 13; Vonda, 8, and Freida, 5.

Another is from the Knoxville News-Sentinel, May 18, written by J. W. Davis of the Associated Press:

"PAY $1,717 FOR TIMBER": U.S. BILL "STAGGERS" COCKE COUNTY FARMER

(By J. W. Davis)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—The U.S. Government is trying to collect $1,717.52 from a Tennessee mountaineer who says he is so hard up that poverty looks good to him.

The money represents timber that the hill man cut—on his own farm, he say. The Government claims it was on National Forest land.

Representative JAMES H. QUILLEN has taken up the case with the Department of Agriculture, which runs the Forest Service. QUILLEN wrote Secretary Orville L. Freeman:

"If we cannot solve this small problem of $1,717.52, then we had better forget about winning any war against poverty."

POVERTY BETTER

QUILLEN got the poverty angle from a letter, laboriously handwritten but forceful, that the mountaineer, Wilford Metcalf of Del Rio, Cocke County, Tenn., wrote him, saying:

"I read in the paper that Congress was and the President was fighting poverty. That's good and I am for it, but tell the President if he has any poverty left over from some other place to please send it down here. It's better than us mountain folks has been used to."

G. Wilson Horde, assistant U.S. attorney at Knoxville, wrote Metcalf on April 28 that he had 30 days to meet the Government claim. So time is running out.

MORE THAN FARM'S WORTH

Metcalf asked QUILLEN to try to get the Government to run a new survey to make sure just who owned the land where Metcalf cut the timber.

Metcalf also wrote:

"This big bill of $1,717.52 staggers me. Do you realize how much that is? My whole farm ain't worth that, much less the little dab of timber that was cut.

"I aint had a good night's sleep since the Government lawyer writ me."

Another is from the Kingsport Times, Wednesday, May 19, written by United Press International:

POVERTY WOULD BE IMPROVEMENT

WASHINGTON.—Representative JAMES QUILLEN, Republican of Tennessee, said Tuesday he was hopeful the Federal Government would be lenient with Wilford Metcalf, a constituent who says he's so poor ordinary poverty would be an improvement.

Metcalf, according to a letter he sent to QUILLEN, is a farmer who can barely feed and take care of his family. He is being sued by the Government for $1,717.52. The money represents the value of the trees chopped down by Metcalf and three other men.

A U.S. attorney in Knoxville says the trees were on national forest land and belonged to the Government. Metcalf says he always believed the 55 acres in question were part of his farm.

Metcalf wrote QUILLEN and asked him if he would try to get the Government to survey the property line, look at his deed, and talk to the "oldtimers here."

"If they won't do that then you have my permission to trade with the Government," he said. "I will take the $1,717.52 and give them my whole farm," which he says cost $800 when he and his wife bought it.

"I read in the paper that Congress and the President was fighting poverty," Metcalf continued. "That's good and I am for it, but tell the President if he has any poverty left over from some other place to please send it down here. It's better than us mountain folks has been used to."

On Monday QUILLEN wrote Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman to see if the two men could not "work this out to the satisfaction of all."

QUILLEN said Tuesday he was fairly optimistic that the Federal Government would be reasonable in considering Metcalf's problem.

And one is from the Newport Plain Talk, Thursday, May 20, the paper printed in Mr. Metcalf's home county:

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SAYS LOCAL FARMER CUT TIMBER FROM PARK LAND—DEMANDS PAYMENT—WILFORD METCALF HAS DEED FOR 86-ACRE BIG CREEK FARM—GOVERNMENT CLAIMS 55 ACRES BELONGS TO PARK

A 48-year-old Cocke County World War II veteran may be taken into Federal court in the next few days to answer charges as to why he cut timber from the mountain side on his farm in the Eighth Civil District of Cocke County.

Wilford Metcalf of the Big Creek section of Cocke County, approximately 20 miles northeast of Newport, appeared in the news when he received a letter from G. Wilson Horde, assistant U.S. attorney, U.S. Department of Justice, Knoxville, Tenn., claiming that 55 acres of the 86-acre farm located in a deep valley in a remote section of the county above the Del Rio community on Cane Mountain, is Government property. The land in question on which the timber was cut according to Mr. Horde is a part of the Cherokee National Forest and said land having been acquired by the U.S. Government in 1935 from the Tennessee Land Co.

The attorney general's letter written to Mr. Metcalf on April 28, 1965, stated, that 96,760 board feet of timber with a stumpage value of $1,951.45 was cut without authority from any forest officer, and that 9,150 board feet of the above timber with a stumpage value of $233.93 was left on the ground. This was excluded from the net claim of 87,610 board feet with a stumpage value of $1,717.52. The $1,717.52 is the amount of damages claimed by the United States from Mr. Metcalf.

A second letter from Attorney Horde of the same date gave Mr. Metcalf a choice of two ways to settle the matter.

"You can, by agreement, submit the necessary instruments relinquishing any claim to the land to this office, or it will be necessary that a suit be filed in the district court at Greeneville, Tenn., to quiet title."

A Plain Talk reporter and photographer visited the Metcalf mountain farm and in an interview, Mr. Metcalf denied knowing that the property in question belonged to the Government and stated "I purchased the property from Leonard James on the 18th of December 1950. This was originally the old Tucker farm. My deed calls for 86 acres more or less and it was my understanding the line ran to the top of the mountain. Three years ago the Government surveyed and stopped me from removing any more timber, at which time I wrote the late Senator Estes Kafauver and had not heard any more from them until last week."

"I wrote to Congressman JAMES H. QUILLEN last week and told him about the Government ordering me to relinquish the land or face Federal action. I have not heard from QUILLEN yet and did not know anything had taken place until a reporter came up here late Monday afternoon." It has been reported that QUILLEN forwarded Metcalf's letter to Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman with the tart suggestion that legal action against a poor mountain farmer was a poor way to carry out the antipoverty program in the Appalachian district.

Mr. Metcalf told this reporter that he paid $800 for the farm in 1950, which only has 20 acres of tillable land. "I hope to settle this matter honorably, however, I don't have $1,717.52 but I want to be honest. I would be willing to give this farm in payment of the claim. I purchased this land in good faith in order to be near my parents who were sick." The parents have since died.

Mr. Metcalf told the reporters that he cut the road leading from the road level down into the valley to his home which is a distance of about three-quarters of a mile. The narrow road hewn out of the hillside is hardly passable on foot. Huge boulders and washed-out gullies and steep grade made it impossible for any type vehicle to gain access to the little mountain home some 1,100 feet below. When reporters arrived Mr. Metcalf was assisting a neighbor planting tobacco and left his work and walked down the steep mountain trail with the reporters and appeared eager to point out the land in question. He said, "My daddy raised all 13 of us children to be honest and I would not try to cheat anyone. My record stands open."

He seemed proud when he showed reporters his honorable discharge from the U.S. Army dated December 26, 1945, after serving 3½ years in the European theater during World War II.

The Metcalf family is presently living in a 4 room house which he purchased about 4 years ago. Mr. Metcalf explained he moved into this new location in order for his children to be able to get to school without having to climb the rough trail leading out of the valley to the main road. He said that he returned to his farm at least once a day to milk and said his main source of income is a tobacco crop.

Mr. and Mrs. Metcalf have four children, Paul 14, Vernell 13, Vonda Ann 8, who attends Del Rio School and Freida, who will be 6 years old in June. Mrs. Metcalf is the former Eliza Turner. Mr. Metcalf attended Del Rio Grammar School and received 2 years at the Cocke County High School.

Mrs. Metcalf who had been reading a recent issue of the Newport Plain Talk said "we get all the news from your paper and would not want to be without it. It is the only newspaper we get and we certainly do enjoy it."

The three older children were in school when we visited the Metcalf family on Tuesday morning.

In conclusion, this is an example of antipoverty in reverse, and I call your attention to a sentence in Mr. Metcalf's letter to me, which I previously read:

> Tell the President if he has any poverty left over from some other place to please send it down here. It's better than us mountain folks has been used to.

And the man lives in the heart of the Appalachian area.

THE DOMINICAN CRISIS AND THE INTER-AMERICAN SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, just a few moments ago I obtained a copy of this evening's Washington Star, and on the front page of the Star are two stories of particular relevance to the remarks that I shall make in a few moments.

The first is a report of a background briefing, attributed to key U.S. officials without further identification, in which they seek to explain the conduct of the United States in the Dominican Republic, and indicate that criticism is uninformed. In the course of this particular report it is stated:

> The critics have attacked the American actions on three main grounds: (1) That the OAS should have been consulted and there should have been no unilateral U.S. intervention; (2) there was no need for such a large force as the more than 20,000 marines and paratroopers sent to the Dominican Republic; (3) the intervention was impulsive.

On the same page there appears a report of an interview conducted by Secretary of State Rusk in which he told the news conference "that the question of a standby military force for the OAS would be discussed by a meeting of Foreign Ministers of the hemisphere which convenes here tomorrow."

I bring these stories to the attention of the House because they have relevance to the remarks I will make.

I would like to go into a little bit of background of this matter. I speak on behalf of some of our colleagues, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

We have been, as many Americans have been, deeply concerned with the situation in the Dominican Republic, and have conscientiously sought to analyze the situation in a constructive way which might contribute to the national good. As a part of this effort, the statement which we have prepared was taken by myself and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] yesterday, to the Department of State where we gave a top official of the Department an opportunity to review it.

It is highly coincidental that the report which appears in this evening's Star followed so closely on the heels of the meeting of last evening at the Department of State. But I would like to point out clearly that if the anonymous State Department officials were referring to my colleagues and myself in this statement of justification, they missed the mark. First, we have not criticized, nor do we intend to criticize, the administration on any of the grounds set forth in the story in this evening's Star which I quoted for the RECORD. We do not state that the OAS should have been consulted. We do suggest that the OAS should have been informed.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts on this report, and join with him in his remarks. I think the key point he is alluding to here, in the first place, is not criticism of the actions that the administration took in regard to the Dominican Republic, but a criticism of how they were carried out. Specifically he is alluding to the failure, which in my judgment was indefensible, to inform the OAS of the action that the United States was planning to take with regard to the landing of troops in the Dominican Republic.

I would ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he could not comment on information which I believe he has touching on the point of whether or not the U.S. Government informed the OAS before taking action. It is my understanding that our Government did not do so.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. In this regard I can only say that our statement that the OAS was not informed before the operation got underway was based on a reliable report by a top official of the U.S. administration.

Mr. REID of New York. Has there been any report that led you to believe there was any substantive reason why we should not or could not have informed the OAS particularly in light of the fact that President Kennedy not only was able to inform the OAS with regard to certain projected actions relative to the Cuban missile crisis but was able to obtain actual agreement? Is there any reason that you know of why we could not at least have picked up the telephone?

Mr. MORSE. In this regard, let me say to the gentleman that an explanation of the failure was made but it did not seem to me to be a satisfactory explanation. However, I point out to the gentleman that in my view, the two situations are somewhat different—the October 1962 missile crisis and the present Dominican situation. However, I do feel strongly, as the gentleman does, that it would have been proper and feasible to have notified the OAS before the troops landed.

The second criticism to which the administration has responded is that there should have been no unilateral U.S. intervention. In this regard, let me make it clear that we do not dispute the necessity of the intervention. We agree that the United States, indeed any nation, would be justified in extending protection to their own citizens who are in danger in foreign uprisings. We also agree that in view of the statements made by the President as to the imminence of a Communist takeover, our action, the action of the United States, was a necessary response.

Third, the administration claims that its critics have attacked American actions on the ground that there was no need for such a large force of more than 20,000 marines and paratroopers in the Dominican Republic. We do not criticize the number of troops. Rather we criticize the failure of the administration properly to explain to the American people and to the world why that number was necessary.

Last, a criticism which is referred to in this article is that the intervention was impulsive. It is not our suggestion that the intervention was impulsive. Quite to the contrary. We indicate that the action was justified and certainly immediate action was essential if the lives of American citizens were to be protected.

So with this background, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with the House the thoughts of the five Members, my four colleagues and myself, on the Dominican crisis and more especially on the effect that the Dominican crisis will have on our inter-American system and our relations with our sister Republics in the Western Hemisphere.

I will also discuss what are, I believe, hopefully constructive recommendations which have, in part, been endorsed by the Secretary of State, and the devices whereby the Organization of American States can be strengthened so as to avoid the kinds of situations we are presently experiencing.

The current Caribbean crisis has two vitally important aspects. The first is the search for a stable, progressive, democratic, and independent government in the Dominican Republic. This aspect is dramatic and well-publicized.

The second and equally important aspect of the Dominican crisis has been less publicized. It is the impact of the crisis on the Organization of American States and the future of collective security in the hemisphere.

The drama and pace of events in the Dominican Republic must not be allowed to obscure the most vital long-range need of the hemisphere—an international structure within which the growing political and economic strength of the Latin American nations can accrue to the benefit of the hemisphere as a whole. The greatest immediate test of U.S. statesmanship is whether it can prevent preoccupation with the crisis of the present from undermining its commitment to the future of the hemisphere.

The Inter-American Conference of the Organization of American States, which was to have met last week in Rio de Janeiro, and has been postponed, will nonetheless convene in the wake of the Dominican crisis whenever it does meet. That crisis and the part that the United States was required to play in it will inevitably affect the progress in inter-American relations which has been so painstakingly promoted over the past 30 years, unless the administration acts to make a new, lasting, and unequivocal commitment to a mutual system of hemispheric defense.

At the Conference, and in preparations for it, the administration will have an excellent opportunity to embrace the concept of an OAS strong enough to remove any reason for future unilateral action in the hemisphere on the part of any American nation. The fundamental principles of the inter-American system demand the true commitment of all to collective security. Never should the OAS be treated as an instrument which any of its members can use or ignore at its own convenience.

The United States and all nations are justified in extending protection to their own citizens endangered in foreign uprisings. The first phase of U.S. operations in the Dominican crisis reflected this just concern.

Neither the United States nor any nation of the Organization of American States can afford the establishment of another Communist dictatorship in this hemisphere—nor can any member of the OAS afford to stand idly by while an effort is made toward that end. Its quick action in the face of potential Communist conquest in the chaos of the Dominican revolt demonstrates that the administration understands this. And even though their position has occasionally been obscured, the Latin American nations also know that the spread of communism cannot be tolerated in this hemisphere. Their votes and their comments in the OAS have reflected a genuine understanding of the need for action in the Dominican crisis.

But on the other hand the administration can help to build the strength of the inter-American system only if it fully appreciates the depth of and the reasons for the equally genuine Latin American concern over recent U.S. actions in the Caribbean. The most valuable asset in hemispheric relations is the capacity to see ourselves as others see us—to view our policy from Latin eyes. From this perspective there are at least five legitimate concerns over U.S. policy in the Dominican Republic or, more particularly, over the implementation of U.S. policy. Each may directly effect the confidence with which Latin governments will greet U.S. professions of support for collective security in the hemisphere.

First. The failure to inform the OAS of U.S. intervention before it was underway was an insensitive oversight. The administration has repeatedly stressed that time was precious and that it could not afford to wait for an OAS decision. Let it be agreed that this made OAS agreement to the U.S. action impractical before the fact.

Although President Kennedy was able to secure OAS support for the naval quarantine in the 1962 Cuban missile crisis in less than 24 hours, it is clear that the administration could not have waited this long in the current crisis. But, at the very least, it could have informed the OAS of its intentions before they were implemented. The OAS could have been told that we were going to send the marines in, that we would prefer to wait for an OAS decision but time did not allow, and that we hoped that a force authorized by the OAS—which in all likelihood would have included U.S. forces—could assume responsibility at the earliest possible moment.

This course might not have been fully satisfactory either, but it would have provided evidence of our good intentions. The course the administration followed seemed, to many Latin Americans, tantamount to saying to the rest of the hemisphere that we did not really care what they thought.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Would not the gentleman agree there were perhaps two courses of action we could have followed: One, we discussed the importance of informing the OAS of the action we were going to take; and a second possible course in addition to the first would have been to request the OAS to send observers with our forces as they went ashore. This could have been done very promptly.

Mr. MORSE. I think either one of the suggestions of the gentleman would have been a more correct course of action.

The difference between notification and nonnotification may seem subtle to many but it is of paramount importance in maintaining the psychological atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence within which real political and economic progress is possible throughout the hemisphere.

Second. The vast number of U.S. troops used seems disproportionate to the need. The latest reports indicate that there have been 23,000 U.S. troops in Santo Domingo.

Latin Americans understandably tend to equate the contemporary U.S. actions with U.S. intervention in the Caribbean area earlier in the century—intervention broadly resented throughout Latin America. The United States landed sizable contingents of troops in Panama in 1903, in Cuba in 1906, in Mexico in 1914, in Haiti in 1915, in the Dominican Republic in 1916, and in Nicaragua in 1927. On some occasions the troops remained for many years. But there were fewer U.S. forces used in all of these episodes combined than in the current Dominican crisis.

It has not been made clear why a force of this size is necessary. Perhaps the immediate threat demanded it; perhaps the administration has desired to deter other Castro-backed efforts through a determined demonstration of purpose. Some, but certainly not all, of the 23,000 were required to facilitate the withdrawal of the 4,000 civilians evacuated from the island during the first phase of U.S. operations. In any event, further clarification of the need of a U.S. presence in such numbers is essential. Without a persuasive explanation, Latin American fears will persist. We must always remember that the exercise of North American military strength which serves as a protective shield for the hemisphere may, to Latin Americans, be reminiscent of a paternalism which they had hoped had ended long ago.

Third. The U.S. presentation of the imminent dangers of Communist capture of the Dominican revolution has not been sufficiently documented to gain full and unquestioning support. Latin Americans frequently believe that the United States is unduly anxious to ascribe Communist direction to any popular manifestations of the social and economic revolution in which the entire continent is absorbed. It is vital, therefore, for the United States to document with precision the evidence which proves its case in any instance where it either asks for multilateral action or feels it must act alone in the face of Communist efforts in the hemisphere.

The implementation of administration policy in the Dominican crisis has created questions in Latin America—questions which more careful explanation could have avoided. The suddenness with which the purpose of U.S. intervention was changed from protecting U.S. lives to preventing a Communist takeover inevitably raised some doubts in Latin minds. Identification of 58 Communists in the rebel movement, including some with Cuban training, certainly justifies the need for concern, but it does not serve as proof to skeptical eyes of the need for a massive intervention by the United States.

It is neither necessary nor possible to convince all who doubt U.S. motives or wisdom of the factual basis of our policies. But the public presentation of the case should be made—and it should be full, consistent, and unemotional.

Fourth. U.S. policy has regrettably been accompanied by occasional tendencies toward the patronizing attitude to which the Latin American have become understandably sensitive through the long history of hemispheric relations. Particularly in times of stress U.S. spokesmen must be doubly careful not to use ambiguous language which may lead to misunderstanding.

During the Dominican crisis official U.S. pronouncements have permitted two unfortunate interpretations: First, that because of Latin insufficiencies, only the United States can adequately protect the hemisphere and its peoples; second, that there is something noble about U.S. intervention.

Two examples will suffice. First, when Ambassador Harriman, one of our Nation's most highly respected statesmen, left Santiago, Chile, on May 7 he was reported to have said:

> President Johnson should never again be put in the position of having to act unilaterally to protect the security of the hemisphere against Communist subversion.

The choice of language was unfortunate because it allowed, by inference, unintended criticism of the Latin Americans—in the sense that they had somehow placed the U.S. President in this unenviable position. What appears to be an effort to fix blame is one of the most common obstacles to agreement when crises occur. In inter-American relations the result can be disastrous.

On May 3, at the AFL–CIO building, the President nostalgically referred to a favorite quotation of his childhood from the 19th century Massachusetts Senator, George Frisbie Hoar. The passage read:

> I have seen the glories of art and architecture, and mountain and river; I have seen the sunset on the Jungfrau, and the full moon rise over Mont Blanc. But the fairest vision on which these eyes ever looked was the flag of my country in a foreign land.

The President, no doubt, meant only to convey his pride in the willingness of U.S. boys to risk their lives in a just cause. But the statement, in the immediate context of the Dominican crisis, may give rise to the fears and fearsome memories of Latin peoples. To them the thought of the U.S. flag in a foreign land is vividly reminiscent of the gunboat diplomacy of U.S. policy in the first part of this century. Today's pride in country has little in common with the less restrained nationalism of a less complicated age, but we must not assume that this is clear to all.

Fifth. The administration has unintentionally encouraged the impression that it has only limited confidence in the OAS, even after the Organization had assumed significant responsibility in the Dominican crisis. After landing its forces the United States encouraged the OAS to act. The OAS did act by sending a special mission to Santo Domingo to work for stability, but subsequent actions may have led many Latin Americans to question the depth of U.S. sincerity in encouraging the OAS to undertake responsibility in the crisis.

First. On May 14, in the U.N. Security Council the United States voted in favor of a U.N. mission to the Dominican Republic. In the eyes of many Latin Americans, including most of the members of the OAS mission, there was no need for a U.N. mission because the OAS had assumed responsibility. A U.S. abstention at the U.N. might have been better evidence of the faith of our Government in the regional defense system of the hemisphere.

Second. On May 16, the United States, without prior consultation with the OAS, sent its own mission to the Dominican Republic to seek stability. While the presence of Messers. Bundy, Mann, Vance, and Vaughn no doubt underscored the determination of the administration in finding a just and lasting settlement of the crisis, it also may have further undermined the effectiveness of the OAS mission.

After the arrival of both the U.N. and U.S. missions, the OAS mission resigned.

The Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations have all sought to strengthen the machinery of the OAS to deal with the subtle but very real threat which Communist subversion presents to the hemisphere. The Dominican crisis, by demonstrating the need for greater speed in the reaction time of the Organization, may in one sense have had a positive effect in this direction. But the implementation of U.S. policy, as described above, may have had the opposite effect by raising serious doubts in Latin America over our sincerity when we plead for a strengthened system of collective security.

We feel confident that the people of the United States will support the administration at the forthcoming Inter-American Conference in its efforts to minimize the long-range effects of the unilateral U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic and to maximize the opportunities to build a stronger inter-American system.

If the United States is passive and apathetic toward proposals to strengthen the capacity of the OAS to meet threats to hemispheric security through collective action, the Latin American nations may lose all confidence in U.S. intentions. The results would be catastrophic. Every aspect of U.S. relations within the hemisphere would be subject to the most profound suspicion and distrust. Most importantly, the United States might deny itself the opportunity to be identified with the broad social and economic revolution throughout the hemisphere and might no longer have the opportunity to encourage that revolution in directions which conduce toward stable and progressive democracy.

If, on the other hand, the United States welcomes proposals to strengthen the capacity of the OAS to meet threats to the peace of the hemisphere through a system of mutual security, the adverse effects of the Dominican situation may be minimized and the capacity to meet future crises increased. Many Latin Americans construe U.S. policy in the Dominican crisis as a lack of commitment to the multilateral approach to problems in the hemisphere, as a lack of confidence in our Latin American partners. The United States must leave no doubt that its commitment to the multilateral approach is unabated and unqualified. We must embrace the concept of a much-strengthened OAS with the capacity to act, to act swiftly, and to act decisively.

The Inter-American Conference will afford an extraordinary opportunity to do so. In fact, the Conference was originally called at the initiative of Latin governments to discuss changes to strengthen the OAS in the field of economic matters. The meetings of the OAS Ministers on the Dominican crisis have indicated clearly that the Latin Americans desire to strengthen the Organization so that no nation will feel required to act alone to preserve hemispheric security. In fact, the process of changing the U.S. "presence" in the Dominican Republic to an OAS "presence" may be a natural prelude to further institutional steps to strengthen the Organization.

The United States should welcome and support OAS reforms which might include the following:

First. The Foreign Ministers could be required to meet at least annually and not only under crisis conditions. At present they meet in emergencies or in very infrequent Inter-American Conferences. The last regularly scheduled Inter-American Conference was in 1954.

Second. The existing Inter-American Peace Committee could be given expanded authority to act to avoid the use of force between members through the peaceful settlement of disputes. At present this Committee, which operates only to moderate between members in dispute, cannot even do this without the approval of both disputing parties. It might be beneficial to make its operations more flexible by permitting its involvement upon the approval of any single member, by encouraging its involvement in situations where disputes can be anticipated and by providing it a modest operating budget.

Third. A new permanent Security Committee could be created to act with speed and authority in any instance where elements external to the hemisphere, a dispute between members, or events within any member's territory directly jeopardize the security of the hemisphere. The existing Peace Committee serves only to encourage the peaceful settlement of disputes between two members. There should also be a permanent committee which represents the OAS Foreign Ministers, and which, working in conjunction with the Secretary General, can claim jurisdiction in any crisis which threatens the security of the hemisphere. It could act in advance of a full meeting of the Foreign Ministers and subsequently could supervise the execution of their decisions. Such a committee might have obviated the U.S. conclusion that the OAS could not have acted with sufficient speed to prevent a calamity in the Dominican Republic.

Fourth. The Secretariat of the OAS could be greatly strengthened in authority and function, including the right of the Secretary General to help initiate limited action in the peacekeeping field in advance of a meeting of Foreign Ministers. At present the powers of the Secretary General and the Secretariat are extremely limited. The requirement for speed, which was so evident in the Dominican crisis, suggests greater authority for the permanent staff to act in conjunction with a new Security Committee in anticipation of early approval by the Foreign Ministers. Obviously the office and person of the Secretary General must retain the full confidence of each member that his actions will be in the interest of all.

Fifth. A small, permanent OAS peacekeeping force could be created for use in disputes between members or, even more importantly, in cases where elements alien to the hemisphere threaten the security of any member. Such a force would have been ideal in the Dominican crisis; and an OAS force formed to replace U.S. troops in Santo Domingo can be a natural predecessor to a permanent force. The force would best be fully internationalized and on a standby basis under OAS command. The force would be under the ultimate command of the OAS Foreign Ministers, but the Secretary General and a new Security Committee, under the revised structure described above, might be given the authority to order its limited use where time was of the essence and the Foreign Ministers had not had the opportunity to meet.

Sixth. Long-range OAS reform could reflect a separation of economic and political issues. A plethora of bureaucratic institutions serves no useful purpose, but the artificial centralization of vastly complex and essentially distinct programs may work to the disadvantage of each. The present highly centralized OAS structure may not distinguish adequately between political and economic concerns. Many Latin Americans advocate separate and major OAS structures for each, and the United States should welcome moves in that direction. If a decentralization of OAS functions were to come about it might be possible and desirable to take the centers of OAS economic and social activities out of Washington and establish the appropriate institutions in Latin America itself.

Not all, and perhaps none, of these major changes can be fully explored and given effect at the Inter-American Conference. But the hemisphere has a new opportunity to make a new commitment to the principles of mutual security and multilateral action. For the United States the opportunity is a necessity because it has risked not only its prestige but the hemisphere's capacity for collective security through its necessary response to recent actions in the Caribbean.

The long-term interests, as well as the short-term interests, of the United States favor a new national commitment to a strengthened OAS. The relations within the Western Hemisphere in the next two decades will provide a continuing test of the capacity of the United States to lead nations in the throes of social and economic revolution in the preservation of their freedom. The challenge facing this country is whether we are prepared to welcome the growing independence and political maturity of the developing Latin nations as a new source of strength within the Western World.

The United States cannot shut its eyes to reality and to the future as well. It must encourage change and the progress of others.

It must recognize that a vital and thriving and strong Latin America is an impetus to an even more vital and thriving and strong hemisphere. If we choose to embrace the future we will seek hemispheric institutions which reflect the potential strength of the Latin nations. We must encourage the day when mutual hemispheric security provides precisely that. To hasten that day, we must seek common policies on common problems through dedication to the common cause of all who cherish freedom.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I heartily concur in what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said and want to associate myself with his very constructive and responsible remarks in this critical area of our national life and of the life of the international community, particularly the life of the Western Hemisphere, and compliment the gentleman for the really outstanding job which he has done in bringing these matters and problems and positive suggestions to the attention of the House.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

NEGRO VIOLENCE AGAINST WHITES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, in last Sunday's Washington Post there were three stories printed under a single heading, all dealing with incidents in which mobs of Negroes, armed with switchblade knives, nail-studded boards and rocks, attacked whites in widely scattered areas of the Nation. One of these attacks was upon a policeman while he was performing his duty.

I have waited patiently for someone to take the floor and urge Federal marshals be sent to New York and Milwaukee and New Orleans to protect these victims of mob rule. But those who shed crocodile tears over the violence stirred up by outside agitators in Alabama and Mississippi are strangely quiet now that the shoe is on the other foot.

I have waited patiently, too, for those Members, particularly in the other body, who have been so vocal in their cry for larger and larger sums for larger and larger police forces to repel some of these attacks. None of them have, as far as I know, deplored the manhandling of this policeman in New York mentioned in the first story. It causes one to wonder what the purpose of higher police budgets is if, at the same time, these mobs are encouraged to take to the streets and obey only those laws that suit their whim and fancy.

The professional agitators in CORE, the NAACP, SNIC, and SCLC and others have predicted another long, hot summer of their racial violence. If these three stories are harbingers of what is to come, I will sincerely regret it but I will be, at the same time, glad these pigeons are not coming home to roost because of any action I have taken.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the three stories I have mentioned.

Mob Attacks Policeman, Frees Arrested Negro

New York, May 22.—A chanting, shouting mob of 200 Negroes surrounded and attacked a white policeman in the Bronx last night and released a Negro prisoner the policeman had apprehended. A white grocer who tried to help the policeman was stabbed in the back and critically wounded.

Four persons were arrested as a result of the assault and later attacks on other policemen and detectives stemming from the incident.

The mob surrounded Patrolman Philip Siegel, 43, and hit him with a pop bottle before his prisoner fled from the scene.

Later, two detectives and a patrolman, seeking witnesses, were attacked by two men and a woman, who were arrested.

The trouble started when Siegel spotted two Negroes breaking the window of a shop and caught one of them after a chase.

He took the youth back to the furniture store and telephoned police station for a patrol car.

Soon the mob milled around Siegel and began chanting, "Let him go."

When the policeman tried to put handcuffs on the suspect, he was struck from behind and shoved to the ground. The suspect started to run. Siegel drew his gun, fired a warning shot in the air and again caught the suspect.

Once again the mob closed in on Siegel and chanted, "Why did you shoot?" and "Let him go."

One of the mob, armed with a soda pop bottle, stepped forward and told Siegel, "we're going to take him away from you."

He hit Siegel on the hand with the bottle and the prisoner broke free and fled.

Siegel, his gun pointed at the mob, was backing away when he heard a voice behind him saying, "All right, officer, I'm with you."

"I didn't turn because I wanted to keep facing the crowd," Siegel said.

He explained that the voice was that of the grocer, Enrique Negron.

As police reinforcements arrived on the scene, the mob scattered and Negron was found sprawled on the sidewalk with a stab wound.

Edward Collins, 18, whom the policeman identified as one of his attackers, was among the arrested, charged with felonious assault.

Milwaukee

At least 50 persons looked on without helping as youths armed with a switchblade knife, a nail-studded board, and a chunk of concrete beat three motorcyclists Friday night, police reported yesterday.

Samuel Hicks, 43, suffered a broken jaw and was knocked unconscious during the attack. Donald Peterson, 29, was cut and bruised and his wife, Margaret, 23, was also bruised.

The victims are white. They said the four teenage boys who attacked them were Negro.

New Orleans

A fist fight between a group of young whites and Negroes at a bus stop in New Orleans early yesterday resulted in the fatal stabbing of one of the white men.

Frederick Riehm, 21, New Orleans, died in a hospital a short time after being stabbed in the chest.

The white teenagers said they were in a car with Riehm and drove past a bus stop where six young Negroes were standing when, they said, one of the Negroes threw a rock through the car's rear window. They got out of the car and the fight followed.

ARMED FORCES SPECIAL HOSTILE FIRE DUTY PAY

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was on objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for payment of special hostile fire duty pay for members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in Vietnam and the waters adjacent thereto.

The guerrilla warfare in Vietnam knows no specific geographical confines. Enemy infiltration deep into the South Vietnam interior is not unusual and the resulting dangers do exist throughout the entire area. Ships operating in adjacent waters are always subject to attack, as well.

Although we grant exemptions from income tax to those military personnel serving anywhere in the Vietnam theater, we currently provide combat pay only to those on the "firing line." It is interesting to note that, in comparison, the State Department pays all its personnel serving in Vietnam a 25-percent base pay bonus and is considering a raise to 50 percent. This is the maximum authorized payment which indicates that the State Department considers the entire Vietnam theater to be a maximum danger zone. Accordingly, it is only fitting that the Congress move rapidly to favorably act on my bill. Its passage will serve well to appropriately compensate our service personnel there and bolster the morale of their families at home.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each member of the Armed Forces of the United States shall receive special pay for duty subject to hostile fire, as provided in section 310 of title 37, United States Code, for any month in which he is entitled to basic pay and serves in Vietnam, or the waters adjacent thereto described in Executive Order 11216, dated April 24, 1965.

Sec. 2. The provisions of the first section of Act shall cease to be effective as of the date the President by Executive order determines that the Armed Forces of the United States and members thereof are no longer engaged in combat in Vietnam and the waters adjacent thereto.

A SALUTE TO SMALL BUSINESSMEN

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the President has proclaimed this week as Small Business Week. The American small businessman is as important today, in this era of industrial giants, to the growth and stability of this country's economy as he has ever been in the development of our American resources. The American small businessman represents one of the few remaining vestiges of individualism, while, at the same time, contributing to the greater national efforts as a partner in the free, competitive enterprise system.

We are all aware of the problems which are besetting the small business community and threatening the very existence of the small businessman. The Select Committee on Small Business of the House, on which it is my privilege to serve, is working to determine what are the needs of our small businesses and to join in their efforts to meet these needs in the rapidly changing structure of the local business communities.

The small businessmen are not, however, merely caught up in individual concerns and self-preservation. They have come forward to offer, on an international level, the daring, initiative, and inventiveness which have made them a moving force in the development of this country in a cooperative program holding great promise.

The foreign aid program has placed increasing emphasis on the role that can be played by private firms in our assistance efforts for economic development around the world. By sharing the experience that we have gained, on a person-to-person basis, we can impress upon the people of the developing nations the singular importance of the individual's efforts in building a stable government and a sound economy.

This past year, some of our American small businessmen picked up this challenge and very successfully.

Working with the Small Business Administration under an interagency agreement, AID brought together a number of small businessmen. Two groups, of six to eight each, went to Tunisia. Their mission was to see if they could find opportunities for the small businessman of Tunisia in the development of his country and to join with the Tunisians to develop joint small business enterprises.

The results were surprising and encouraging. The groups and AID were surprised to find ready acceptance for a neophyte program which, in all of the years of our economic assistance programs, had never been tried before. They were encouraged by the immediate action taken through this cooperative effort.

Out of the first group, one man has obtained an investment survey guarantee and proceeded with a detailed examination of a project for millwork with his Tunisian partners.

Three of the second group have organized an American-Tunisian small business development corporation and intend to invest in two established small Tunisian manufacturing concerns. This is an American corporation to which these three have contributed their own capital.

All of this was accomplished in a country which had not previously been interested in developing the private sector. And, when the second group went to Tunisia, a quasi-governmental agency there was willing to pay their travel expenses.

The possibilities and promise which this program holds have opened new avenues heretofore unexplored in implementing foreign assistance. In talking with these groups after they returned from Tunisia, AID officials have developed a number of projects to encourage private endeavor among the Tunisians. These projects will require only a small American investment, but will retain the spirit, engendered by these small businessmen, of a joint undertaking with the Tunisians in a small business venture.

This international cooperative effort is only one illustration of the contributions that are being made today, nationally and internationally, by the small businessmen of this country.

There are 4.6 million small businesses in the United States. They make up more than 95 percent of our business population, account for about 40 percent of our business activity, and provide employment for 30 million of our people.

In western Massachusetts, the small businessman is an important and respected member of his community and plays an active role in community planning and activities. He is essential to the employment of the people of that area, to the economy of the State, New England, and the country. Massachusetts prides herself in a highly diversified business economy, an economy that could not do without the small businessman and his contribution, whether it be the manufacture of a precision component or a heavy machine part, which serves daily to maintain and stimulate that economy.

There could be no healthier sign of the progressive outlook of the small businessmen across the country than their efforts in the Tunisian project. I, for one, will work for a program for the small businesses of this country which will insure they will not be lost to us, but will continue to grow and prosper.

I join with my colleagues on the Small Business Committee, and in this Congress, in a salute to the small businessmen of this country.

FOR CLOSER TIES

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, for several months Massachusetts has been engaged in a Partners of the Alliance effort with the Colombian Department of Antioquia. A team of Massachusetts citizens visited Antioquia last December and came back with a series of recommendations for Massachusetts help in further encouraging the tradition of self-help, local initiative, and private participation in the development process in that region of Colombia.

The program in Massachusetts is directed by Anthony Faunce, of Lincoln, Mass., a director of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce. He is assisted by a committee of leading citizens from all aspects of Massachusetts life. Among the members of the executive committee is Charles J. Lewin, editor of the New Bedford Standard-Times.

Following a meeting of the executive committee in Boston last week, Mr. Lewin's paper included a thoughtful, enthusiastic editorial about the prospects of the Massachusetts-Antioquia partnership. I would like to call his editorial of May 23 to the attention of the House by including it in the Congressional Record:

For Closer Ties

Initially, Senator Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and Representative Morse, Republican, of Massachusetts, became interested in a Partners of the Alliance program for Massachusetts, an effort designed to increase personal understanding of and cooperation in the achievement of the goals of the Alliance for Progress. Senator Saltonstall, Republican, of Massachusetts, also lent his support.

The "partners program" is aimed at developing long-term relationships between political subdivisions in the United States and those in Latin America, with emphasis on private-sector cooperation.

A group of leading Bay State citizens was invited to serve on the executive committee of a Massachusetts-Antioquia Partners of the Alliance program. Antioquia, a department of Colombia, was chosen because of its similarity to Massachusetts in its industrial and urban patterns.

Last December, the executive committee's survey team, headed by Dr. Martin Lydon, president of Lowell Technologicial Institute, made a 2-week visit to Antioquia. As a result, it has produced an interesting report and certain initial conclusions.

How can Bay Staters help Antioquians?

By developing vocational education materials with the use of Bay State products, and making them available to CARE, the Peace Corps, etc., which already are working in the area.

Massachusetts manufacturers of recreational equipment, including soccer balls, children's records and indoor games, might be willing to contribute some of this material, or Bay State service organizations could develop programs to collect some of these items.

On a long-range basis, Antioquia's School of Administration and Finance, located in Medellin, the capital—population 700,000—can use planning assistance and advice in bringing the emerging technological phase of its program into balance. To develop a plan for acquisition of "teaching machinery," the survey team recommends sending an expert in technical education to Medellin to assess needs and availability of modern equipment.

In addition, books, drafting materials and professional guidance in collecting volumes for mechanical, electrical, and textile engineering libraries are required, and the Bay State could supply all of these from private sources.

There is great need for exchanges of persons at all levels, possibly starting with junfor executives. The recommendations call for a 1-year visit by Antioquians, to observe our "tradition of social responsibility and action on the part of the business community."

In the Uraba region, a rapidly developing agricultural area, there is "drastic need" for health, sanitational, and nutritional assistance. The survey team suggests that when local residents indicate a willingness to carry out recommendations made by Massachusetts experts in this area, the Bay State "partners program" be ready to turn its resources to solution of these pressing problems.

The report concludes, "If we are to do a job of the quality we desire, we must mobilize our many resources and create public awareness of the advantages to be gained by Massachusetts from such participation * * * including an increased understanding of an area of the world that will be crucial to our future security."

The partners program has shown us the way toward closer ties with our new neighbor, Antioquia. It is up to all of us in the Bay State to find the means of achievement.

WELCOME BACK SENATOR RUSSELL

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, since early February the Senate—and indeed the entire Congress—has felt the absence of Senator RICHARD RUSSELL. During the past months this respected gentleman has been sorely missed on the floor of the Senate, in his Armed Services Committee, and on all aspects of the Washington scene.

Therefore, I know that the entire Congress was tremendously pleased when this week the Senator from Georgia returned to our midst. It is wonderful to see this great man looking and feeling well, and reassuring to know that he is back to continue his long tradition of leadership and high service to Georgia and to America.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of his countless friends and admirers, I want to say to Senator RUSSELL "welcome back."

THE LATE FATHER E. A. CONWAY, S.J.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved to hear of the death on Monday of Father E. A. Conway, S.J. News of his death came as a great shock to those of us who have worked with him in the cause of world peace. As early as 1943 he joined with religious leaders of other faiths to produce an interfaith declaration of the principles for a postwar world. Since that time he continued to support and share in ecumenical efforts for peace, international cooperation, and a world order based on law. In this respect, his years of hard work and intense devotion to the cause of peace were forerunners of Pope John's encyclical and ecumenical efforts.

I first met him when I was a freshman Congressman. By that time Father Conway had spent almost two decades working for world peace and I was delighted to work with him in this effort. As part of his concern for peace he founded and became the director of the Center for Peace Research on the campus of Creighton University in Omaha, Nebr.

Both scientists and civic leaders recognized his knowledge and understanding of the complex technical, political, and moral aspects of nuclear disarmament and they sought and welcomed his advice and leadership. President Kennedy, in 1962, appointed him a member of the General Advisory Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament, in recognition of his contribution to the creation of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

A year ago, at the time of a testimonial dinner in his honor here in Washington, he was widely praised for his long service to the cause of world peace. Some of the articles which appeared in the Catholic press at that time related historical items about the peace movement and his activities which will interest everyone concerned with peace issues. Consequently, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include excerpts from an editorial in the June 13, 1964, issue of America:

> To be a frontline campaigner for world peace and disarmament without falling into mere pacifism or succumbing to discouragement is no mean achievement. In our book, this is the distinction of Father Edward A. Conway, S.J., who has devoted 20 and more years to the apostolate for a warless world. And that, no doubt, is one of the many good reasons why the Catholic Association for International Peace offered a dinner in his honor in Washington, D.C., June 2, 1964.
>
> Only 3 days before this event in the Nation's Capital, death came to a long-time friend of Father Conway, Dr. Leo Szilard, the Budapest-born atomic scientist who, just 25 years ago, in a laboratory at Columbia University, completed the experiments that led to the unleashing of the terrible energy within the uranium atom.
>
> Dr. Szilard later described that fateful moment of discovery: "We turned the switch, we saw the flashes, we watched them for about 10 minutes—and then we switched everything off and went home. That night I knew the world was headed for sorrow." It was March 3, 1939.
>
> If war comes again, that same knowledge can destroy the earth. For 20 years Dr. Szilard and Father Conway joined their voices in a sustained cry of warning.
>
> But Father Conway's work for international peace antedates the nuclear age. He was one of the chief initiators, in the autumn of 1943, of the "Pattern for Peace," a statement endorsed by high Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leaders as expressing the minimum requirements for a just and durable peace. Historians of the peace movement in this country, we are sure, will describe this authoritative document as marking a turning point in American public opinion; it prepared the way for creation of the United Nations. Father Conway was associate editor of this Review, 1948–52, having previously served on the staff of the NCWC social action department. There is no more dedicated promoter of the peace ideals of Pius, John, and Paul in this country.

BEAUTIFICATION OF NATION'S HIGHWAYS

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to introduce, at the request of President Johnson, four bills to preserve and enhance the beauty of our Nation as seen from its major highways. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, is introducing identical bills at this time and he will advise when hearings will be held on this legislation.

President Johnson has launched a major conservation and beautification program. On the basis of existing legislation he has directed the Secretary of Commerce to undertake a "new and substantial national effort to landscape our highways and provide places of relaxation and recreation wherever our roads run." In a directive to the Secretary of Commerce, the President said:

> As you know, I believe the beauty of America is an important part of our heritage. For our own sake and for that of future generations, we must preserve and enhance the beauty of our countryside and provide facilities for relaxation and recreation.

To achieve these goals and "to make sure that the America we see from these major highways is a beautiful America," the President directed the Secretary to take the following steps through the resources of the Federal aid highway program:

Require that landscaping be made a part of all projects on the Federal aid interstate, primary, and urban highways. These requirements should be an addition to the usual measures now taken for erosion control.

Encourage the States to acquire land or easements adjacent to highway rights-of-way where necessary to preserve and enhance the beauty of our countryside in both rural and urban areas.

Request the States to provide more rest areas adjacent to the highways for convenience, safety, relaxation, and recreation.

Broaden the study now underway on the needs for scenic roads and parkways to include the goal of maintaining and enhancing the beauty of America.

Encourage the States in their maintenance operations on public highways to bring about increased beautification of these roads.

Request the States to organize and work closely with civic groups and garden clubs in their efforts to encourage the improvement of the appearance of private properties adjoining public roads.

These are important first steps, and they are being carried out enthusiastically by the Department of Commerce's Bureau of Public Roads and the various State highway departments. They are, however, only first steps. The President, in his budget message and in his message on natural beauty, noted that additional steps would require new legislation. The four bills the President has proposed, and which I am honored to introduce, will insure that we see a more beautiful America from our highways:

The first would control billboard advertising along our interstate and primary highway systems.

The second would remove automobile junkyards and other places where scrap, garbage, and trash is stored from view from our interstate and primary highways.

The third would require that 3 percent of Federal aid highway funds be used for the preservation and enhancement of natural beauty of land along our highways.

The fourth would provide that a portion of the funds now used for secondary roads be used for the construction of scenic and recreational roads and roads leading to scenic and recreational areas.

The everyday driving of millions of Americans provides their major opportunity to see our Nation. The legislation proposed by President Johnson will insure that the America they see is a beautiful America, uncluttered and unspoiled. It will insure that we and future generations will be able to use our highways for relaxation and recreation as well as for safe, efficient, and economical transportation.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT—A THREAT AS WELL AS A CHALLENGE

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Sweeney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to an address delivered by Mortimer Riemer, one of the Nation's most noted labor attorneys, who recently addressed the Labor Law Institute of the Ohio State Bar Association.

Mr. Riemer appropriately describes the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as both a threat and a challenge, pointing out that the act itself threatens the accustomed way of doing things in labor-management relations and challenges both employers and unions alike to rid the American labor scene of the evils of discrimination, based upon race, color, or creed.

Mr. Riemer most ably, in his address, points out numerous court decisions which forbid policies of job exclusion based upon race. It is interesting to note that these decisions of the courts and the National Labor Relations Board place emphasis upon the need for greater cooperation in local action in this field.

I commend Attorney Riemer on his remarks as contained in this address and urge that the labor and managerial leadership of America take note of the same.

Mr. Riemer's address follows:

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

(By Mortimer Riemer)

TITLE VII AND UNION UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964[1] was enacted to eliminate from our national life discrimination in employment. It creates new Federal rights and uses formal and informal remedial procedures to help erase the scar of discrimination.

Discrimination by labor organizations on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin is prohibited by title VII. Discrimination on these grounds is not prohibited, however, when there are bona fide occupational qualifications. Likewise, employment practices that are established pursuant to a bona fide merit or seniority system are also exempt (sec. 703(a)).

The public accommodations provisions contained in title II apply retroactively and it was so held by the Supreme Court on December 14, 1964 in *Hamm* v. *City of Rock Hill* (379 U.S. 306, 85 S. Ct. 384). Title VII, however, does not apply retroactively, contrary to some of the other provisions of the Civil Rights Act. It becomes effective on July 2, 1965, although certain administrative provisions have gone into effect already.

If title VII does not apply retroactively, neither does it go into effect full blown on July 2, 1965. Under section 701(e) there is a 3-year gradual inclusion provision similar to the one found in the section dealing with employers (sec. 701(b)).

The ban on job discrimination is first made applicable on July 2, 1965, to a union if, first, it maintains or operates an exclusive hiring hall—apparently without regard to the number of members in the union itself; or, second, the number of its members is (a) 100 or more during the first year after the effective date, (b) 75 or more during the second year after such date or 50 or more during the third year, or (c) 25 or more thereafter—42 U.S.C.A. 2000e–(e). Thus, it would appear that if on July 2, 1965, a union operates an exclusive hiring hall, or if the aggregate number of its members is 100 or more, the ban on job discrimination is fully effective. The entire act is not fully effective until 1968. Apparently the act does not apply to employers or unions with less than 25 employees or members. This latter figure will effect broad coverage since most unions have 25 or more members. Of course the union must be the certified representative of employees, or acting as the representative or seeking to do so.

This timetable was deliberately chosen to permit all parties ample time to adjust their present practices in order to bring these practices into line with the provisions of the bill. It expresses a congressional policy to allow a period in which there could be an accommodation to the rigid standards of the Civil Rights Act.

In addition to the requirements concerning the minimum number of members, there must, of course, be the effect on interstate commerce in such a fashion that a labor dispute would hinder or obstruct the free flow of interstate commerce. It is provided in section 701, title 42, United States Code Annotated, section 2000e (d), (g), and (h) that a labor organization means (1) one that is engaged in an industry affecting commerce, and it is deemed to be engaged in an industry affecting commerce when it operates an exclusive hiring hall and meets the numerical standards referred to before, and provided further that by the term "industry affecting commerce" it is understood to refer to an activity in which a labor dispute would hinder or obstruct commerce or the free flow thereof, as defined in the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. These commerce standards will exclude from the coverage of the act the small businessman and many offices.

Affirmative action, such as preferential treatment, need not be accorded to members of a minority group in order to cure existing imbalances (sec. 703(j)). Such treatment might constitute the type of discrimination which is prohibited by the act, a fact which will undoubtedly create problems in view of the demands made by civil rights groups for this kind of action. In Cleveland, and elsewhere, action has been demanded which could conceivably constitute a violation of section 703(j). The particular provision recites that "Nothing contained in this subchapter shall be interpreted to require any * * * labor organization * * * to grant preferential treatment to any individual or to any group because of the race, color, religion, sex or national origin of such individual or group on account of an imbalance which may exist * * * in comparison with the total number or percentage of persons of such race, color, religion, sex or national origin in any community, State, section, or other area, or in the available work force in any community, State, section, or other area" (42 U.S.C.A. 2000e–2(j)).

At the time of the debate on the legislation, counsel for the AFL–CIO pointed out that the proposed statute would "not require racial balance on the job," and "would not give to any race the right of preferential treatment in hiring or terms of employment." This limitation, providing that preferential treatment need not be granted on account of existing number or the percentage of employees on the job, even though it may express an imbalance compared to community standards, is important. It is to be remembered that title VII applies only where there is discrimination "on the ground of," or "because of" such factors as race or color. If members of one race, because of "relevant" differences such as superior skill, greater experience, higher seniority, or any other legitimate employment qualification should wind up with a disproportionately larger number of jobs on a particular project, this would not constitute a violation of the act. This is consistent with the Steele and Tunstall line of cases that a collective-bargaining agreement honestly negotiated may affect employees differently in the manner and degree in which the terms are applicable. But if the terms are based upon relevant differences and not "because of" or "on the ground of" race or color the differences are not unlawful.[2]

In *Ex parte Ford* (D.C. Mo., 236 F. Supp. 831, 51 L.C. 51, 244), a case decided before the effective date of the statute, the district court held that the act does not require preferential treatment to any person or group because of race or color. In this case a sit-in and lie-in to support the demand made upon a bank that it hire four Negroes was conducted. The Supreme Court's decision in *Hughes* v. *Superior Court* (339 U.S. 460 (1950)), upheld a State injunction against picketing intended to induce a store to hire only Negroes until their proportion in the work force equalled that in the store's clientele, an objective which would have contravened a judicially declared policy against racially discriminatory hiring. This suggests that picketing whose ultimate aim is a political or social result validly declared to be against State policy or contrary to this statute, will not receive first amendment protection.

---

[1] Public Law 88–351; 78 Stat. 240, cited Civil Rights Act of 1964.

[2] *Steele* v. *L. & N.R. Co.*, 323 U.S. 192, 202 (1944); *Tunstall* v. *Bro. of Lo. Firemen*, 323 U.S. 210 (1944); *Ford Motor Co.* v. *Huffman*, 345 U.S. 330, 338 (1953); *I.A.M.* v. *Street*, 367 U.S. 740 (1961).

Under section 703 of the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C.A. 2000e–2(c) it becomes an unlawful employment practice for a union (1) to exclude or expel from membership or discriminate against any individual "because of his race, color, religion, sex or national origin"; (2) to limit membership or to refuse to refer for employment any individual "because of such individual's race, color, etc."; or (3) to cause or tend to cause an employer to discriminate in violation of this section.

The recitation of prohibited practices on the part of a union has a familiar ring. It may be said that this section codifies or incorporates into statutory language what has been laid down from time to time by many courts as a rule of law expressing public policy. Courts have traditionally protected an individual's right to earn a livelihood from abuse by a union or an employer relying upon the law of torts and the public policy of the State.[3]

The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Simkins* v. *Moses H. Cone Memorial Hospital* (323 F. 2d 959, cert. den'd., 376 U.S. 938 (1964)), held that two private nonprofit hospitals in North Carolina which had participated in the federally assisted Hill-Burton hospital construction program, could be enjoined from denying staff privileges to Negro physicians. The court held that:

"Exclusion of Negro physicians from practice in hospitals on account of their race denies them opportunities for professional improvement."

This case would seem to stand for the proposition, and it has been so interpreted, that the recipient of a Federal grant-in-aid is forbidden to adopt a policy of racial exclusion which denies professional opportunities to members of the excluded group and it need not be limited to professionals. The same theory was followed by the Federal district court in Illinois in *Todd* v. *Joint Apprenticeship Committee* (223 F. Supp. 12, vacated and remanded, 332 F. 2d, 243, cert. denied, 85 S. Ct. 880 (1965)). Although the judgment in Todd was vacated and remanded by the seventh circuit on the ground that the courthouse project had been completed and the issues were moot, it nevertheless developed an important principle and is a decision that cannot be ignored for the issues raised remain unresolved.[4]

In *Todd* v. *Joint Apprenticeship Committee*, the General Services Administration entered into an agreement for the construction of a Federal courthouse and office building in Chicago. The steel work was subcontracted to Bethlehem Steel Corp. Bethlehem under its collective-bargaining agreement with Local No. 1 of the International Iron Workers, had agreed to hire only men certified to it by the union. Ronald Todd and two other Negroes applied to Bethlehem for employment as apprentice ironworkers. Todd and the others were qualified and Bethlehem expressed its willingness to hire them upon their being indentured and presented by the union. Todd's application for membership was not approved by the apprenticeship committee. A class action was brought alleging in substance the discriminatory denial of a job opportunity in violation of the Federal Constitution. Named as defendants were the local, the apprenticeship committee, Bethlehem Steel, the regional administrator of General Services Administration, the regional director of the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Apprenticeship Training, and the Chicago Board of Education. The district court found that the union and its apprenticeship committee did discriminate against Negroes, resulting in their exclusion from work as apprentice ironworkers on the Federal job.

In the Todd case the union, by way of defense, argued that the allegations if true, established an unfair labor practice under the Taft-Hartley Act, and hence the court was without initial jurisdiction. It would seem reasonably certain that sections 8(a)(3) and 8(b)(2) of the Taft-Hartley Act are violated if workers denied union membership because of race, are then denied employment because they are not union members. This defense was rejected, however, by Judge Campbell of the district court.

Despite this rejection an intriguing question, nonetheless, is created by title VII, and that is how to coordinate policy and the Civil Rights Act with other agencies and statutes in this area. There are at least four groups which are involved: the Department of Justice, the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity, the National Labor Relations Board, and the newly created five-member Equal Employment Opportunity Commission established by section 705 in the Civil Rights Act. I suggest also as another statutory complexity the bill of rights of members of labor organizations, section 101 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, 42 U.S.C.A. 411, et seq., with its guarantee of equal rights and privileges with protection of the right to sue, subject to reasonable exhaustion procedures, and the jurisdiction of the district courts.

As an example of what may be expected, consider the following. On July 1, 1964, the NLRB decided *Independent Metal Workers* (147 NLRB No. 166, *Hughes Tool*), declaring certain discriminatory union practices to be unfair labor practices under the act. Title VII was enacted 1 day later and at a time when certainly everyone in Washington knew what was going on. Sometimes the Board's antennas are woefully short. This case illustrates at least two things: The National Labor Relations Act does provide a more direct remedy than is offered by title VII, and the independent jurisdiction of the Board and its "resistance to coordinating efforts with other Federal agencies." This resistance has a long history and goes back many years. But, as many know, the relationship between the Board, the Department of Labor, and other Federal and State agencies in this area has not always been one of mutual esteem and cooperation.

In the Independent Metal Workers case, its locals 1 and 2 were certified as the bargaining representatives of employees at the Houston plant of Hughes Tool Co. Local 1 represented white employees; local 2 the Negro employees. Category I covered white jobs for which local 1 was the collective-bargaining representative, and category II covered the Negro jobs for which local 2 was the collective-bargaining representative. Hughes Tool and local 1 executed a collective-bargaining agreement creating six new apprenticeships in category I, white jobs. If a Negro employee bid for one of these jobs the company left his name off the list of employees who had applied. Local 2 inquired as to the reason, and the company replied that the employee was not eligible. Thereupon, the employee asked local 1 to intercede on his behalf which it refused to do, and unfair labor practices were then filed with the Board.

The Board held that the union had discriminated against the employee because of his race, in violation of its duty of fair representation, and declared it an unfair labor practice under section 8(b)(1)(A) of the act.[5] The Board also found violations of section 8(b)(2) and 8(b)(3) and rescinded the certification of Independent Metal Workers. The innovation, however, is that the Independent case extends the duty of fair representation to a case of racial discrimination. Chairman McCulloch and Member Fanning agreed with the rescission of the certification and joined with the majority in holding that the union violated section 8(b)(1)(A) on the different ground though, that the refusal of a certified union to process a grievance because of race was a violation of 8(b)(1)(A).

Chairman McCulloch and Member Fanning criticized the majority for invoking the principle of a breach of the duty of fair representation to support its holding of an 8(b)(1)(A) violation. It was pointed out that conflicts would arise because of the creation of a separate agency (evidently they knew what Congress was going to do the next day), "to handle the task of eliminating employment discrimination by unions and employers based on race," and that this was a problem to be resolved by Congress and not by the Board. There has been a good deal of comment both critical and laudatory of the Board's decision in Independent.[6]

On and after July 2, 1965, the conduct found unlawful by the Board in Independent would also be an unlawful employment practice since the conduct limits an employment opportunity or adversely affects the status of an employee "because of" his race, 42 U.S.C.A. 2000e–2(e)(2). Title VII provides the statutory mechanism devised by Congress capable of providing relief to minority groups excluded from union membership. Thus, on that latter date, it will be possible for an employee who had been discriminated against "because of" race, to take his case to the Labor Board or to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission created by the Civil Rights Act.

Congress did not add racial discrimination to the list of unfair labor practices in the National Labor Relations Act. It can be argued, therefore, that Congress believed that the National Labor Relations Act did not extend to cover racial discrimination in employment. Section 703 (a) and (c) of the Civil Rights Act creating unlawful employment practices, are comparable to sections 8(a) and 8(b) of the National Labor Relations Act establishing unfair labor practices. But in enacting section 703 (a) and (c) of the Civil Rights Act, Congress may have believed that the Board was not the best agency to handle complaints of racial discrimination. There is support for this in the enforcement provisions in section 706(g) which call for a trial de novo and not initial reference to an administrative agency.

Neither section 8(b)(1)(A) nor section 7 of the Taft-Hartley Act says anything about the right of fair representation. The legislative history of the Wagner Act and of its subsequent revisions in 1947 and 1959 is equally silent and discloses no congressional purpose to add fair representation to the list of union unfair labor practices. The Supreme Court still regards it as an open question (*Humphrey* v. *Moore*, 375 U.S. 335, 344 (1964)).

Congress wanted to remove the uncertainty resulting from the Labor Board's failure to decide whether racial discrimination was an unfair labor practice. During the congressional debates on the Civil Rights Act, the Department of Justice reported: "To what extent racial discrimination is covered by the National Labor Relations Act is not entirely clear."[7]

---

[3] See, *James* v. *Marinship*, 23 Cal. 2d 721, 155 P. 2d 329; *Williams* v. *Intl. Bro. of Boilermakers*, 27 Cal. 2d 586, 165 P. 2d 903.

[4] 50 Cornell L.Q. 75.

[5] See, Cox, "The Duty of Fair Representation," 2 Vill. L. Rev. 151 (1957); Sovern, "The National Labor Relations Act and Racial Discrimination," 62 Col. L. Rev. 563 (1962). (NOTE.—Administrative Enforcement of the Right of Fair Representation: The *Miranda* Case," 112 Penn. L. Rev. 711 (1964).)

[6] A case note, 78 Harv. L. Rev. 679 (1965) collects many of the cases and comments on this issue of fair representation.

If we follow the reasoning in favor of a uniform labor policy, however, it can be argued that since Congress in the Civil Rights Act enacted specific procedures to handle problems of racial discrimination, the Board should stay out of the field. Professor Sovern has argued that in section 8(b) (1) (A) of the act, Congress indicated clearly its intent to leave unions free to set their own rules concerning eligibility for membership.[8] Of course, this was written before enactment of the Civil Rights Act and at a time when Sovern was urging the Board to fill the gap and to exploit the act "to its utmost." Nevertheless, he admitted that it required "a stretching of existing doctrine" for racial discrimination to support a section 8(b) (1) violation of the Labor Act.[9]

Under Civil Rights Act, section 706, 42 U.S.C.A. 2000e–5, a rather complex timetable is established for the processing of a charge by an aggrieved individual. Following a written charge, either by the aggrieved individual or by a member of the Commission, of an unlawful employment practice, an investigation is commenced. If the investigation develops reasonable cause to believe that the charge is true, the Commission endeavors to eliminate the unlawful employment practice. If this has occurred in a State which has a State or local law prohibiting the same conduct, upon the local authority receiving notice of the alleged unlawful conduct, no charge may be filed with the Federal Commission by the aggrieved person for 60 days after proceedings have been commenced under the State law. Unless earlier terminated, the 60-day period may be extended to 120 days during the first year. In case the charge is filed by a member of the Commission in a State having such a law, the Commission shall before taking any action, notify the State and give it 60 days to act under the State law.

A charge filed by an aggrieved person must be filed within 90 days after the alleged unlawful employment practice occurs except that the time may be extended to 210 days where there is a State or local law prohibiting the practice in order to permit local action.

It is possible for an aggrieved employee to institute a civil action. Such an action can be brought in the U.S. district court (sec. 706(f)). Under proper circumstances the court will appoint an attorney and authorize the commencement of the action without payment of fees, costs, or security. It would appear that under section 706(g), 42 U.S.C.A. 2000e–5(g), a district court could order affirmative action which would include reinstatement with or without backpay, provided, however, that no order of the court shall require the admission of an individual to union membership if the individual was refused admission for any reason "other than discrimination on account of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin." The type of relief to be granted, the allowance of attorney's fees, and questions of back-pay are all in the discretion of the court. But if the complainant loses, the "prevailing party" is the employer who may be allowed a "reasonable attorney's fee" from the poor complainant.

Union conduct may be an unlawful employment practice as well as an unfair labor practice covered by the Civil Rights Act, and the National Labor Relations Act. We face concurrent jurisdiction with varying remedies for conduct which may be in violation of two Federal statutes. In view of the Board's holdings in the second *Miranda* case (140 NLRB 181 (1962), en'f. den., 326 F. 2d 172, and *Independent Tool*), there may be competing agencies to remedy the same conduct.

It seems reasonably clear from the legislative debates, that with respect to union racial discrimination which constitutes an unlawful employment practice, jurisdiction should be confined to the provisions of the Civil Rights Act and not to the Labor Board. The Board will have enough to do if it can establish its jurisdiction and provide effective remedies in the nonracial areas entrusted to it by Congress.

It is no surprise, however, because of the rather complicated timetable and the necessity for following strict procedures, that civil rights groups have urged recourse to the National Relations Board.[10] The contrast between Labor Board and Civil Rights Act procedures, it has been suggested, counts against rather than for the exercise of jurisdiction by the Board. Manifestly, it was the desire of Congress to make maximum use of voluntary compliance, confidential mediation, and State judicial machinery. These time-consuming methods failing, Congress supplied Federal judicial remedies rather than administrative remedies. If the Civil Rights Act provides less efficient remedies than the Board offers, the choice of sacrificing speed and uniformity in order to emphasize cooperation in local action, was a choice deliberately made by Congress and will be respected by the courts.

It has been said that, "When Congress has legislated, the problems of supremacy are not resolved; some of them only begin."[11]

How true this is in Ohio which has laws against discrimination administered by its civil rights commission (Revised Code, secs. 4112.02 to 4112.08, inclusive). Under the Revised Code, the Ohio Civil Rights Commission may obtain from common pleas court an enforcement order by filing a petition in court. Therefore, in Ohio the procedure under title VII of the Federal statute requires initial recourse to the Ohio commission.

Congress chose deliberately to try the conciliatory procedures of local law. In section 708 of the Civil Rights Act it is provided that nothing in title VII relieves any person from any liability or duty established by existing or future State law unless the latter permits or requires an act made unlawful under title VII. This would eliminate the preemption argument.

There is an alternative procedure also permitted under title VII when the charge of an unlawful employment practice is initiated by a member of the Commission, with the Commission. The act provides for a five-man commission. The Commission will be able to hear charges based on a sworn statement. In Ohio, no charge may be filed by the aggrieved person before the expiration of 60 days after proceedings have been commenced under Ohio law to permit local authorities to remedy the practice by State action. If this fails, the Commission may attempt further voluntary compliance during a 30- to 60-day period, failing which the aggrieved person may then file an action for relief in Federal court (sec. 706).

The Attorney General of the United States is empowered under title VII to bring a civil action for preventive relief whenever he has reasonable cause to believe that any person is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to the act. This was the subject of great debate in Congress and bitterly opposed. It was generally viewed as strengthening the act to grant this power to the Attorney General to initiate civil action in the appropriate U.S. district court when he had reasonable cause to believe that a person or group of persons was engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to the full enjoyment of any of the rights secured by the act (42 U.S.C.A. 2000a–5(a), 42 U.S.C.A. 2000e–6(a)). A good deal will depend, therefore, on the attitude of the Attorney General.

In 1947 and later in 1959, it was said that the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin amendments opened a Pandora's box of problems for the lawyer practicing in this area. That was true. Now we have an interpretation placed upon section 7 of the act by the Board in the Independent case, 29 years after section 7 was first enacted into law. In addition, in Ohio, two statutes, one Federal and one State, deal with the subject of unlawful employment practices "because of" race, color, or religion. On top of that, the Labor Act, as presently administered and interpreted by the Board, will treat like conduct as an unfair labor practice. All of these statutes will have to be balanced and an accommodation struck for a reasonable and meaningful interpretation to assure that the purpose of the Civil Rights Act will be carried out.

On April 13, at an address at Brown University, AFL–CIO president George Meany said that full compliance with the new equal-employment section of the Civil Rights Act would be sought. He stated that the AFL–CIO was ready to use boycotts and strikes wherever necessary against any employers who refused to comply with it. Secretary of Labor Wirtz has said that it would require the full cooperation of the labor movement and employers, together with the Government, to make the equal employment law work.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is both a threat and a challenge. It threatens the accustomed way of doing many things. It may be the last best chance for both employers and unions to remove the evil of discrimination. This is the challenge that both must accept and which will not permit employers or unions the luxury of a divided point of view if it is to succeed.

KEYSTONE DAM: WHAT IT MEANS TO OKLAHOMA AND TO THE NATION

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, one of the largest and most important units in the Arkansas River development program, Keystone Dam, was dedicated Saturday, May 22.

This $127 million structure, begun 8 years ago, lies just below the confluence of the Arkansas and Cimarron Rivers about 15 miles west of Tulsa. The 4,600-foot dam, earthfill with a concrete spill-way, rises to a height of 121 feet. Two pet cocks, each 27 feet in diameter, will provide water for two 35,000-kilowatt hydroelectric power generating units. The reservoir will have a storage space of 1,879,000 acre-feet.

---

[7] Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 6, pp. 7206–7207.

[8] "The National Labor Relations Act and Racial Discrimination," 62 Colum. L. Rev., 563 (1962).

[9] Sovern, ibid. 593.

[10] The NAACP filed a brief amicus in the *Miranda* case (326 F. 2d 172). Judge Medina said: "Amici curiae appear to assume that it is in the public interest to have such controversies channeled into the Board, where the remedy of reinstatement with back pay may be afforded, rather than leave them for decision by the courts. We are not so sure of this."

[11] Henkin, "Voice of a Modern Federalism," in "Felix Frankfurter, the Judge" (Mendelson Ed. 1964).

At the dedication ceremonies a significant address was given by Mr. Elmer B. Staats, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I herewith enter in the Record the full text of the remarks of Mr. Staats on what Keystone Dam means to our State and Nation:

Keystone Dam: What It Means to Oklahoma and to the Nation

(By Elmer B. Staats)

Mr. Chairman, Governor Bellmon, Senator Monroney, Senator Harris, Congressman Steed, Congressman Belcher, Congressman Edmondson, and friends. I am greatly honored to be invited to participate in these ceremonies to dedicate Keystone Dam. This is a proud day for Oklahoma, for Arkansas, and indeed for the entire Southwest.

Keystone Dam is well named. Webster's Dictionary defines a keystone as "the stone found at the crown of an arch regarded as binding the whole." Indeed, the entire plan for development of the land and water resources of the Arkansas River Basin turns on what has been achieved here.

It means bringing under control devastating floods and ruinous siltation of the river.

It means more electric power for a rapidly growing area.

It means more and better recreation—fishing, swimming, and boating—for an expanding population.

It means that water will be controlled to make navigation possible from Tulsa to the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico.

In a broader sense we are dedicating here today yet another manifestation of the vigor and determination of the people of the Southwest to develop its land, forest, and water resources for the benefit of its people and for the benefit of the entire country.

Achievements like Keystone Dam do not come easily. This is a day to acknowledge the vision, the toil, the preservance, and the faith of all those who made this dam and reservoir possible, and with it the success of the whole Arkansas River project. And many of them are here today, as they should be.

We pay tribute today to many people and many organizations who have made this possible. But one man above all should be singled out for special mention—one whose efforts to develop the land, forest, and water of his beloved State are well known. I refer, of course, to the late Senator Robert S. Kerr. It is fitting that his name will be carried on one of the important dams downstream, the Robert S. Kerr lock and dam.

While Bob Kerr is no longer with us, you are fortunate in having a delegation in the Congress that is carrying forward the fight for Oklahoma resource development. And I should add a footnote to recognize the able assistance given to your State by your former State engineer, Don McBride.

This is also a time to acknowledge the contribution of President Johnson, who knows firsthand the value of water to the development of the Southwest and the Nation. For it was his timely action last year in requesting additional funds for the Arkansas River project which kept the program on schedule and which now assures its completion in 1970. Additional funds requested in the President's budget for next year will bring construction work on the overall project past the midpoint—to about 55 percent completion.

It is a further tribute to the skill and accomplishments of the Army Corps of Engineers for the effective management of this tremendous enterprise. Construction of the Arkansas River project has required, and continues to require, painstaking scheduling of the many thousands of complex activities involved in 18 locks and dams, the bank stabilization work, and the major reservoirs located at Oologah, Eufaula, and here at Keystone. I am sure you will join me in saying to them, "Well done."

One hundred and thirty-three years ago Washington Irving, one of America's most famous writers, visited this spot. In his book, "A Tour on the Prairies," he records that on October 15, 1832, "We came upon a well-worn Indian track, and following it, scrambled to the summit of a hill from whence we had a wide prospect over a country diversified by rocky ridges and wavy lines of upland, and enriched by groves and clumps of trees of varied tuft and foliage. At a distance to the West, to our great satisfaction we beheld the Red Fork rolling its ruddy current to the Arkansas and found that we were about the point of junction."

Today, three generations later, we stand above the junction of the same two rivers. The intervening years have changed the scenery appreciably. The Red Fork is now known as the Cimmaron River and the beautiful blue waters of Keystone Lake have replaced the muddy red waters described by Washington Irving.

The changes which have occurred are not the result of mere chance. And the blossoming of the Akansas River Valley is only now beginning. The major benefits and potentialities for future growth still lie ahead.

These benefits are demonstrated by new investment and job opportunities for many thousands of individuals in the area. They are demonstrated by additional industries, the opening up of new resources, civic improvements, and a healthier tax base.

To illustrate a few of these effects, we need only point to the large number of cities and communities along the Arkansas River which have undertaken or plan terminal and port facilities to coincide with the future navigation of the Arkansas River.

One could mention such cities as Pine Bluff, Little Rock, Dardenelle, Fort Smith, Russellville, Muskogee, and Tulsa. Navigation on the Verdigris and Arkansas Rivers from Catoosa to the Mississippi—a distance of some 450 miles—and the port facilities to handle the expected traffic in petroleum and petroleum products, coal, iron and steel, wheat, and other commodities and products will bring new growth and prosperity to the cities and the areas they serve. And let us not forget the volume of public and private developments associated with new water-related recreational facilities, new park areas, and water supply to serve an expanding population and the tourists who will come to this area.

Nor should we overlook the potential additional development of other resources of this region which will inevitably result from the opening up of additional transportation facilities and improved water supply opportunities.

New industrial plants will locate here and existing plants will be expanded to utilize your mineral resources. They will include cement mills, rubber factories, iron and steel works, chemical plants, paper mills, glass factories, and a host of other plants and service establishments.

As a nation we have come a long way since the days of the Dust Bowl, which many of us experienced firsthand in the early 1930's. That—perhaps more than any other single factor—dramatically demonstrated that government had to play a major part in resources conservation and development.

The Soil Conservation Act of 1935 has played a major role in saving the soil and water on the upstreams of our major rivers.

With the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938, the Corps of Engineers embarked on a nationwide flood control program.

With the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, the Department of Agriculture extended flood protection and multiple-purpose development to the small watersheds of the Nation.

With the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, the reclamation program in the 17 Western States was increasingly directed toward the use of water for multiple-purpose development in addition to irrigation.

The Tennessee Valley Act of 1933 is known throughout the world for what it has done for the Tennessee Valley.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of last year will provide vast new areas for recreation and open spaces for the enjoyment of all our people—particularly those from our large cities.

The Congress acted also last year to preserve wilderness areas—to preserve these for generations to come.

I could add to this list by reciting many other actions on the part of the Federal Government, your State government, and by local governments in recognition of the growing national concern about water. That concern is further expressed in the $1.5 billion being spent this year by the Federal Government for water resources—a fivefold increase in 25 years.

OUR GROWING WATER NEEDS

But the job is by no means complete. Last September, at the dedication of Eufaula Dam, President Johnson spoke in glowing terms of the part played by it in the development of the Arkansas River. However, he went on to say that we "would like to look beyond the celebration of today to the challenge of tomorrow." In keeping with the President's thought, the dedication of Keystone Dam provides a fitting occasion to take stock of the results of our water resources programs and policies and to review our goals for the future.

It has been estimated that by the year 1980 we will require withdrawals of 559 billion gallons of water per day compared with 300 billion gallons per day at the present time. And this requirement is expected to increase to nearly 900 billion gallons per day by the year 2000 along with an expected population of about 300 million. While a major use of water today is for irrigation of agricultural land, the large increases in future years will be in the use of water for steam electric power generation, for manufacturing, and for municipal use. It now requires about 50,000 gallons of cooling water to produce 1,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity; about 25,000 gallons to produce a ton of steel; over 50,000 gallons per ton of pulp and paper production; 10,000 gallons per automobile; and more than 750 gallons per barrel of product in oil refining.

Each one of us uses about 150 gallons of water each day. The demand will increase with more air conditioners, more automatic laundry washers, more cars to wash, more backyard swimming pools, more lawns to water—and just plain more people.

IMPORTANCE OF POLLUTION CONTROL

The world has only a fixed supply of water—not one drop has been added since creation. The answer then is that we must learn to reuse the water we have and to keep it usable by controlling pollution.

Water pollution has become a major national problem. We must find the answers and we must find them soon.

In many of the Nation's rivers and streams the quality of water is rapidly deteriorating. The amount of waste being dumped into our rivers—even with the waste treatment now provided—is the equivalent of the untreated sewage of 75 million people. Of the communities of the United States having sewer systems, nearly 20 percent still discharge untreated waste into the Nation's waterways.

To this must be added the enormous wastes produced by modern industries and the return flow from agricultural use containing increased salt, fertilizers, and pesticides.

Here in the Arkansas River Basin you are not strangers to the problems of water pollution. As you well know, thousands of tons of salt each year enter the Arkansas River. During periods of low water flow, the salt concentration of the river reaches a very high level. Even with the dilution provided by Keystone Lake, the waters discharged from the Keystone Dam will not meet the standards recommended by the Public Health Service for municipal water supply. The Public Health Service and Corps of Engineers are jointly making a comprehensive study of the salt pollution problem in the Arkansas River Basin. We do not now have a solution, but it is certain that it must be found.

The Congress is now considering a major bill to help reverse the deterioration of our water supply. This bill has the strong support of the President. I am speaking of the proposed Water Quality Act of 1965. It would establish a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and initiate a new 4-year program of grants for projects which will demonstrate new methods for controlling waste discharges. It will also provide for a higher level of Federal grants for waste treatment projects. This legislation is critically needed and it deserves your full support.

PROGRESS IN DESALTING WATER

To help meet our growing water needs we must also call upon science, industry, and Government to join forces in finding new and cheaper ways of converting salt water for human and industrial use. Laboratory research and pilot plants, assisted by the Federal Government, are helping to show the way. President Johnson only last year decided that developments showed such progress that he directed the Department of the Interior and the Atomic Energy Commission to lay plans for a major new program to advance desalting technology.

Additional funds have been requested to get this program underway.

Spurred on by the President's interest, private industry is now devoting new and added efforts to this subject. Ten years ago our best efforts resulted in a cost of $4 per thousand gallons of desalted water. Today that cost has been cut to roughly $1 and is going down.

Three years ago Buckeye, Ariz., became the first town to have all of its water supplied by its own demineralization plant, turning out 650,000 gallons of water daily at a cost of 63 cents per thousand gallons.

Next month, Port Mansfield, Tex., will stop buying costly bottled drinking water when it completes a new facility to provide 250,000 gallons of fresh water—once too brackish to use.

This administration is confident that, with progressive and imaginative action on the part of Government and industry, desalted water will be an important and, in some cases, the only source of new water supplies in many areas. Here is a challenge worthy of the industrial know-how of the Southwest to find a way to use the brackish water which is present in so much of this area.

UNMET NEEDS ARE MANY

There are many other unmet needs, but our time today is short. I can only highlight a few:

The need for better planning of our river basins. We must bring about a better understanding of the water resource needs of these basins to assure that scarce water will meet its highest and best use. No one understood this better than Bob Kerr. As chairman of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources he emphasized the need for careful and long-range planning for each of our river basins. On President Johnson's recommendation, the Congress will soon enact water resources planning legislation which will authorize permanent Federal-State river basin planning commissions.

Nothing so well illustrates the need for careful planning than flood control. Floods in the Pacific Northwest on last Palm Sunday resulted in the loss of 40 lives and more than $500 million in property damage. It could have easily been twice that much had it not been for the Federal, State, and local flood control systems in the Pacific Northwest. For the Nation as a whole, flood damage loss averages $700 million annually. This is a shocking statistic. We can and should build additional flood control structures but experience has shown that this is not the key to solution of the flood problem. The main reason underlying the current flood problem is that we continue to build in the flood plains—areas which are subject to flooding—without adequate planning. In Tennessee, 30 municipalities have adopted some form of regulation to assure appropriate use of flood plain lands. Maricopa County in Arizona, where Phoenix is growing by leaps and bounds, is effectively working on flood plain regulations to complement flood control measures to reduce future flood damage. The Corps of Engineers stands ready to offer similar assistance to all communities. I urge you to take advantage of it.

There are many ways that we can conserve water. We must learn to line our irrigation canals which transport water just as a housewife must learn to replace the washer in the leaky faucet.

We cannot afford to develop our water projects without realizing the great value they have for recreation and for fish and wildlife development. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act passed last year will add vastly to our recreation areas through a special fund financed from admission and user fees at recreation areas, the sale of surplus real property, and a fuel tax on motorboats. About 60 percent of this money will be spent by the States for recreation development, the rest by the Federal Government for Federal recreation areas. With the enactment of the pending Federal Water Project Recreation Act, the Congress will for the first time make recreation and fish and wildlife a full partner in multiple-purpose water resource development and make it possible for the Federal Government to help increase recreation development around Federal reservoir projects—to provide more picnic grounds, more parks, more boating, more fishing—to take advantage of the recreation opportunities made possible by the construction of dams such as Keystone.

CONCLUSION

On Monday, the White House Conference on Natural Beauty will convene in Washington. Leaders from all over the Nation will participate.

Natural beauty has many aspects ranging from billboard control, highway beautification, preserving open spaces in cities, and many others. But of one thing you can be certain—the need to preserve our rivers, our lakes, our seashores, and to provide clean water for our future generations—will be high on the agenda.

Last week the administration recommended to the Congress the establishment of a National Water Commission to look into the future—for the next 50 years—and chart the course as to our water supplies and our water needs. This Commission would be concerned with problems and opportunities in major regions of the country—the Great Lakes, the Northeast, the Southwest, California, and the Colorado River Basin. This proposal comes none too soon, for as we look back on the events of the past 35 years, we realize that these efforts, however important and however crucial, are only the beginning.

As we look ahead, we must understand and appreciate more than ever before the critical need for sound policies and careful planning to guide our major water resources developments. We must deal not only with problems of efficient use of local and regional water supplies, but we must also deal with the interrelations of water problems among the various river basins. If we are to assure that the Nation achieves the most efficient use of its limited water resources, we must face the full implications of our growing population and increasing urban and industrial requirements and adapt our present policies and programs to the requirements of the future.

Again, let me thank you for inviting me to participate in the dedication of the Keystone Dam. It has been a genuine pleasure to meet so many of you, to renew old acquaintances, and to share in your enthusiasm and justifiable pride in the developments which have occurred here and in the entire Arkansas River Basin.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The United States is the most mobile nation in the world. It is also the nation most generously endowed with natural beauty. When we put these two facts together, we see the wisdom of President Johnson's emphasis on highway beautification in his program for conservation and beautification.

The America Americans see is largely the America they see as they drive our 3½ million miles of roads and streets. Their recreation is largely that which is within their reach because of the family automobile. Indeed a large part of their recreation is driving itself.

Too often, however, the America they see little resembles the land of beauty and grandeur that God gave to us. It is blighted with waste and carelessness—from our indifference to our heritage. It is marred by dumps and junkyards, scarred by careless construction, cluttered by billboards and other eyesores.

The American people are expressing an increasing outrage over the problem of roadside "uglification." They are expressing their conviction that the time has come to reverse this trend. They are expressing their desire to live in a society that not only is great because of its material progress but that is great also because it is beautiful.

The legislation introduced today, at the request of President Johnson, will help produce such a Great Society. I will gladly support this legislation, and I hope that the Congress will quickly enact it.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S GOAL OF A MORE BEAUTIFUL AMERICA

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

North Carolina [Mr. Taylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that legislation has been introduced to help achieve President Johnson's goal of a more beautiful America.

I am confident I voice the sentiments of many Members when I say I welcome this opportunity to support the President's effort to preserve our country's natural beauty and to repair the damage that has been done either through indifference, carelessness, or neglect.

Many of us have long been perturbed over the unsightliness that has been allowed to mar our countryside. We have seen once-beautiful areas deteriorate into appalling unattractiveness. We have seen lovely open spaces turned into billboard jungles and roadside junkyards. We have permitted the breathtaking handicraft of nature to be desecrated by manmade ugliness.

What is particularly tragic is that the depredation we have countenanced has been unnecessary and has served no purpose. Highways and the roadsides flanking them do not have to be unattractive, and many of the new roads being constructed as part of the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System attest to this fact. Our roadbuilders have demonstrated that highways can be beautiful. Unfortunately, however, adequate steps have not been taken in the past to protect them.

There is no doubt in my mind that most Americans are deeply concerned over what has happened to our roadsides, and want to see an end to the destruction of natural beauty. The legislation now before us will go a long way toward satisfying their desire.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to register my wholehearted endorsement and support of President Johnson's highway beautification program, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

This is something new for this so-called Nation on wheels which depends so largely upon the automobile for its livelihood and for its fun and recreation.

Up to now, we have been involved in a mad rush to build highways in a frantic effort to catch up with the flow of traffic which got such a head start on us during the war years.

We have been so intent on providing the best roads in the world that we paid little or no attention to the blight that has been growing up along many of these roads.

But with the program President Johnson has now laid before us, we have an opportunity to erase some of that blight, to transform our Federal highways, at least, into the kind of byways that harmonize or blend in with or enhance the natural beauty that lies along the Nation's roads.

I agree with the President that "the beauty of America is an important part of our heritage."

But I would like to emphasize that his highway beautification program makes sense from an economic point of view as well.

The Federal Government is investing around $4 billion a year in highways in its interstate and secondary road programs.

And it behooves us to protect that investment. If we allow our roadsides to become despoiled there is no question that the value of the roads themselves will deteriorate.

Driving for pleasure has become this Nation's No. 1 pastime. American motorists travel 130 billion miles a year on pleasure jaunts and spend some $20 billion annually on these vacation travels.

There is an added benefit to be gained in this effort. I understand the national bill for gathering up trash along the highways is reckoned in the millions and millions of dollars.

If, through the program President Johnson is asking us to enact, we are able to beautify and tidy up these Federal highways, it naturally follows that that bill for gathering up trash, paper, beer cans, and the like along the roads is bound to decline. Look at it this way: If you are standing in a heap of rubble, you have no hesitancy about throwing away an old wrapping or package. But if you are in the spotless drawing room or parlor of a well-kept home, you would not dream of flicking ashes on the floor.

I would remind you, too, that tourism is one of the Nation's fastest growing businesses. The President's highway beautification program is a logical step in the development of this phase of our economy. We would do well to adopt it in its entirety.

COMPELLING NEED FOR HOUSE CONCURRENCE ON TREATIES

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, at the time our great Constitution was adopted there were reasons why the President was empowered to make treaties with the advice and consent of the Senate rather than with the concurrence of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. I am sure that these were, for the time, sufficient reasons. But whatever these reasons were, conditions have changed and changed so significantly, I believe, that they now require a change in our treatymaking power.

There are compelling reasons, there is a compelling need, for this great power to be vested today in the Congress of the United States. An example of this is provided by the coffee agreement which came before us in the Rules Committee the other day. There was a good bit of murmured complaint among the members that they were being called upon to implement an agreement made without our concurrence.

Such agreements can be made without our concurrence. Yet they cannot have substantial effect without the support of the House of Representatives. Indeed, today, the Government of the United States can enter into no treaty of great substance without legislative and financial implementation, and this means the support of the Members of the House of Representatives.

I think it would be better for the country to require the President to seek the advice and consent of both Houses of the Congress. This expression from both bodies would be a far greater expression of the will of the American people. And it would commit both Houses to the effective implementation of the treaty.

I believe this expression of the will of the people can be effected by a majority vote of the Members present in each body. And I believe a majority of each House should be able to act freely in such a vital matter as the making of treaties.

The problems of this world are too vital, too crucial, to allow a minority of one-third plus one in either House to prevent the Government of the United States from giving a clear answer after reasonable debate. The fate of the League of Nations was sealed, I believe, by the filibuster, which enabled the opponents of the League to delay and delay the decision until the climate of opinion in the country had changed from eager support of the League to a general apathy and confusion as amendments were debated and politics was played with the vital issue of peace and war.

Today the nature of the crises we face in the world are such that this country may have to give a prompt answer to some great challenge to the peace of the world. And if such a time should come I believe it would be imperative that the President have the advice and consent of the Congress of the United States through an expression and a commitment from both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I have therefore introduced and commend to my colleagues a joint resolution proposing the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

> The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to make treaties; provided a majority of the Members of each House present concur in giving such advice and consent, and provided that each House by a majority of its Members present shall determine the rules by which it shall be governed in giving its advice and consent to the making of treaties and executive agreements requiring the concurrence of the Congress.

BLIND-AID PROGRAMS

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit residence requirements in State programs of aid to the blind supported by Federal participating funds.

My sponsorship of this measure is neither a courtesy gesture, nor a casual action on my part. Rather, it is a reflection of my firmly held conviction that residence laws in blind-aid programs retard rehabilitative opportunities of blind persons. They deny to blind persons, I believe, the chance to seek for a livelihood and a better life throughout the entire Nation.

Over the past several years, it has been my privilege to become acquainted with a considerable number of blind men and women. Therefore, in speaking about these people and their problems and needs, I am speaking from personal knowledge when I state, with all the emphasis at my command, that there is no other group of our fellow citizens who are doing more to help themselves than are our fellow citizens who are without their sight.

Learning of their aspirations, becoming aware of their courageous efforts, I have worked with these people to the best of my ability to help them. I have not worked for them, I have worked with them, to help them as they have worked and tried to help themselves.

I have introduced and worked for the adoption by Congress of bills to guarantee to blind persons their right to organize, to protect them in their right to join organizations of their own choosing.

I have introduced and worked for the adoption by Congress of measures to give statutory minimum wage protection, not alone to blind workers in sheltered workshops, but to all physically handicapped people employed in such places.

The bill I am introducing today is but another effort by me to help blind persons realize the goals and hopes they have so often expressed to me—the chance to live on the basis of equality with others, to work as others do, in jobs for which they are qualified by ability and training; to earn a decent living, not in a sheltered, protected environment, but as full and equal competitors in the open labor market of our economy—supporting themselves, paying their family bills from their labors.

These are the goals, I believe, for the vast majority of blind persons—and I am sure you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that these goals are worthy of every help that we can give that they may be fulfilled.

My bill would be such a help—it would serve to remove laws which act as barriers to block the way of blind men and women who would seek employment for their talents, but are unable to find such employment in their home State.

If such a person is a blind-aid recipient, however, it is very difficult—in fact, it is almost impossible—for him to look for work in another State.

Unable, under the laws of many States, to qualify for assistance if he is unsuccessful in finding a job, he risks possible starvation by going to a new State, by venturing to improve his lot. So, many of them stay where they are, probably on the welfare rolls for the rest of their lives.

This is the problem: A blind-aid recipient, receiving a monthly subsistence grant of aid, hardly enough to keep body and soul together, is not able to save sufficient money to live on for several weeks, or even several months, in another State while he remains there looking for work.

In most of the States, he would not be able to apply for and receive public aid to live on during this time because of his inability to meet the residence requirements.

If he does risk it, if he does go to another State and somehow manage to live while seeking work, and then, unsuccessful and discouraged, goes back to his home State—he may then find, if he applies for blind-aid in his home State, that he no longer meets the residence requirements in his home State, that he has forfeited his claim upon the State by leaving it, and remaining away, even though briefly.

What are these blind people to do, Mr. Speaker, what would you do under these circumstances? The answer of course—many of these people stay in their home States, remain on relief the rest of their lives, when they could be working, when they could be gainfully employed, paying their own way, paying taxes.

I believe that State residence laws in blind-aid programs are obstacles to rehabilitation and because of this, they should be prohibited.

Time and time again Congress has expressed its determination that programs of public assistance should be more than subsistence programs, meeting the basic needs of people in want; they should also serve to promote the restoration of aid recipients to lives of economic independence and self-sufficiency.

This, I think, was made very clear in the 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act when self-care and self-support were made purposes of the federally supported State programs of aid.

Again, in the public welfare amendments adopted by Congress last year, vigorous endorsement to rehabilitation in public welfare was given, and specific statutory steps were taken to implement the earlier asserted self-care and self-support purposes.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the proposal I am offering today to prohibit State residence laws in blind-aid programs would, I believe, encourage and assist many blind people, now aid recipients, to gain employment and independence.

These laws now act as restraints upon the ambitious and energetic.

As they make their valiant struggle to achieve full and equal citizenship in our Nation's life, these residence laws act as insurmountable roadblocks in their way.

I believe they should be removed.

My bill, enacted into law, would remove them.

INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, just about income tax paying time the President, in a televised appearance, indulged in a little pleasantry to the effect that Uncle Sam taketh away with one hand what he bestoweth with the other. The Congress is presently doing exactly that, and the element of pleasantry is completely lacking. What we are doing is to raise the social security tax while we are reducing excise taxes. The question is, how will the two changes operate in the case of the individual taxpayer?

Reduction in excise taxes get the most publicity. What they will amount to in terms of dollars saved depends entirely on what specific purchases the individual makes, and on how successful the Government is in preventing the excise tax reduction from being added to sales profits. If the seller succeeds in adding excise tax reductions to his sales price, the individual will save nothing. The probability that this will happen amounts to almost a certainty in some cases. Assuming, however, that the reduction does stick, as far as prices are concerned, the amount depends on what the individual buys. Low-income families will save little because they buy few of the commodities on which excise taxes are assessed. Such families buy few automobiles, electric appliances, and pieces of jewelry, on which excise taxes amount to an appreciable sum. Middle-income families vary a great deal in the amount of such purchases.

To do any guessing about such purchases is hazardous. Nevertheless, here is a try. Take a family—the standard average family of four—with an income of $7,500 a year, earned, which seems to be somewhere near the national average. Such a family might buy one $3,000 auto, one major appliance, and say $1,200 of items like cosmetics, jewelry, luggage, and so forth, in the course of 3 years. Make it an average of $1,500 per year for all purchases subject to excise taxes. If all excise taxes are eventually removed, that would mean a maximum saving of $150 per year. In the present uncertain state of the excise tax bill, immediate savings might be less than half that amount.

Now consider social security taxes on the same family. In 1966 social security taxes will be collected on $5,600 of earned income, and the rate, including medicare, will be increased five-eighths of 1 percent. The result will be an increase of $59.60 in social security taxes. The $7,500 income family will just about break even in the two changes—excise and social security—in 1966. In 1967 there will be another slight increase in social security rates, and in 1970 the rate will go up to slightly over one-half of 1 percent over 1966. At the same time it will be collected on $6,600 of earned income. By that time, any saving from excise tax reduction will be wiped out.

Now take another income group. Take the same old average family of four with an earned income of $5,600 a year, so chosen because that is the maximum on which social security is assessed. It is probable that such a family would buy not more than half the goods in the luxury class as the $7,500 income family would buy. It would hardly save $50 per year in excise taxes. Yet that same family would have the same increase in social security tax as the $7,500 income family; namely, $59.60. After 1970, this $5,600 family would be subject to the same increase in rate, but not, of course, to the increase in the amount of earned income on which the rate is assessed. In other words, the $5,600 family will not benefit at all from the two changes.

Finally, consider the so-called poverty border line income of $3,000 per year. Luxury items purchased by this family would be minimal, confined possibly to telephone and cosmetics. Excise tax payments would be small, I hesitate to guess what. But increase in social security taxes in 1966 would be $21.75, and in later years still more. Not a chance for such a family to break even on the two changes.

Within these three income groups lie at least half the families in the United States. Furthermore, they are the families that could be expected to increase their total purchases of goods and services if they had the wherewithal to do so. Families in the upper income brackets do not limit their purchases because of tax burdens. If the total national economy is to be stimulated by increased individual expenditures, it must be done by the lower income families. They must be given more money to spend, and we will not do it by cutting excise taxes and raising social security taxes.

There is a way to do it, however, and I have called attention to it on several occasions. It is to restore the $1,000 exemption to the income tax law, where it was before the World War, and where it was supposed to be placed after the war. The Revenue Act of 1964 touched practically every consideration in the income tax law except the amount of personal exemption. To loosen money in the hands of those who would spend it if they had it, we should do what we failed to do in 1964, and put that personal exemption back to $1,000, where it belongs. It would give us three changes this year instead of two, but the total result of all three would put money in the pockets of those who need it most. Let us see how it would work for the same three income groups.

The $7,500 family, with four exemptions and with the standard deduction, would wind up with a taxable income of $2,750 instead of $4,350, and the tax saving would be a definite $295.

The $5,600 family would pay $146.40 tax instead of $415.20, a saving of $268.80.

The $3,000 family would presumably pay $42 tax under the present exemption scheme. With exemptions increased, it would of course pay nothing. The saving would be small, but worthwhile.

For the higher income groups the saving resulting from exemption changes would not increase in proportion to the increase in income. The $25,000 family, for instance, would save $580, only about twice as much as the $7,500 family.

One more thing is of importance in this general situation. The cost of living is slowly but surely inching up. A few pennies here and a few pennies there are subtracted from the buying power of the low-income groups.

Restoration of the $1,000 personal exemption is the necessary final step in a most desirable revision of the revenue law which is being made in this session of the Congress. We must not close this session until we have made it.

SECRETARY WIRTZ CALLS FOR REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b)

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished Secretary of Labor, the Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, testified on Monday before the Special Subcommittee on Labor in support of repeal of section 14(b) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947.

As usual, the testimony of Mr. Wirtz was thorough, instructive, and most articulate. I wish every Member of Congress could have been present to hear the Secretary's analytical treatment of this issue which too often is clouded by irrelevant and emotional arguments.

Secretary Wirtz has made an outstanding contribution to the discussion of this issue, and I urge that all of my colleagues take the time to read his statement.

Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent I place the Secretary's statement, as presented to the House Special Subcommittee on Labor, at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF W. WILLARD WIRTZ, SECRETARY OF LABOR, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, ON H.R. 77 AND RELATED BILLS TO REPEAL SECTION 14(b) OF THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, MAY 24, 1965

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, President Johnson recommends, in his message of May 17 to the Congress, repeal of section 14(b) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

I am before you in support of this recommendation and in support, accordingly, of H.R. 77 and the parallel provisions of the several other related bills this subcommittee has under consideration. To the extent that these bills include additional provisions, separate consideration will be appropriate.

The issue involved here is exceedingly important. Its determined legislative consideration has been long deserved and too long denied. I hold strongly the view I represent.

I take account, at the same time, of the fact that public debate on this issue has so often been so extreme and even irrelevant as to commend its deliberately restrained presentation here.

The real issue involved is not widely understood. This is partly because a complicated interrelationship of statutory provisions is involved: the effect of repealing section 14(b) has to be traced through the resultant change in the effect of other provisions in the 1947 act. It is partly because the real issue has been submerged beneath a phrase about "right to work"—although no such right is either recognized or advocated by those who lean on this phrase. The issue has also been cast falsely in terms of individual liberties—when what is involved is only the effect which any group decision has on the position of a member who disagrees with it.

Unfortunately, a good many of the reactions to the section 14(b) issue are today the product of these accumulated misunderstandings, and "14(b)" has become another point of polarization of "antilabor" and "prolabor" attitudes which were more understandable during an earlier period of raw labor-management antagonism—now less prevalent than before.

Because the case for repeal of section 14(b) emerges most clearly and strongly in a completely factual and dispassionate statement of what is actually involved here, my testimony is deliberately cast in these terms.

I

It is essential, first, to make clear what the issue really is and what is not.

It is not whether anyone is to have a "right to work." Neither the continuance of section 14(b) nor its repeal gives anyone a right to work—or takes such a right away.

To whatever extent there are issues of freedom involved here—and there are whenever any law is under consideration—the principal issue is whether an employer and the representatives of his employees are to be free to make an agreement of their own choosing.

The late James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor during President Eisenhower's administration, said this of the State laws which section 14(b) provides for and which its repeal would eliminate:

"They call these "right-to-work" laws, but that is not what they really are * * *. In the first place, they do not create any jobs at all. In the second place, they result in undesirable and unnecessary limitations upon the freedom of working men and women and their employers to bargain collectively and agree upon conditions of work."

The real issue here is whether a company and a labor union should or should not be permitted—so far as the law is concerned—to agree that all employees of the company who are represented by the union should share the expenses of maintaining the union and having it represent them in their dealings with the employer.

Section 8 of the Labor-Management Relations Act establishes the general rule that companies and unions may make such agreements. But section 14(b) provides that the States may prohibit such agreements, and 19 of them do so.

Here, in more detail, is the way the section 14(b) issue arises:

The Labor-Management Relations Act (the Taft-Hartley Act) today permits, protects and encourages, but does not in any way require, the representation (where interstate commerce is involved) of employees by unions for the purpose of bargaining with their employer.

The law provides that if a majority of a proper grouping of employees decides to be represented by a particular union, that union then represents all employees in the grouping. If there is any substantial dispute about representation, this question is settled by an election (with secret balloting) which is open to all the employees and is conducted by the Government (the National Labor Relations Board).

If a union is selected by a majority of the employees, they then decide, within the union, what bargaining demands are to be be made upon the employer for inclusion in a collective bargaining agreement.

Unions typically propose that it be agreed that all employees represented by the union should be or become members of it. The central argument is that all who receive the benefits of union representation should contribute to its support, particularly its financial support. The most common proposal to achieve this end is a so-called "union shop" agreement, which provides that all employees represented by the union must become and remain members of it, as a condition of their continued employment.

Some employees may oppose this view. Even though they are by law represented by a particular union, they object to being members of it, either because they would prefer a different union, or because they are opposed to being members of this or any other similar kind of organization. Their reasons may be financial or they may be based on broader principles.

Employers hold a variety of views about the union shop. Some are opposed to it. Some consider it a good idea. Some are indifferent.

The issue involved in this legislation arises only when a union and an employer would—if there were no legal question—agree to a union shop. The question is whether they are to be permitted to enter into such an agreement.

The Labor-Management Relations Act establishes in section 8 a general rule: That such agreements are permissible. This section specifically permits a company and a union to enter into an agreement requiring that all employees represented by the union pay union initiation fees and dues as a condition of continued employment. This is the only feature of union membership which can be insisted upon. Other forms of union security (for example, a "closed shop") are not permitted.

But section 14(b) provides for exceptions to this general rule by State action:

"Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law.

The effect of section 14(b) is, accordingly, that individual States may, by their own laws, prohibit all forms of union security agreements.

In 19 States today, there are legislative or constitutional prohibitions on such agreements. These are the so-called right-to-work laws.

If section 14(b) is repealed, the general rule established in section 8 of the Labor-Management Relations Act will then prevail in all States. The State laws prohibiting these agreements will be inoperative. The result will be that whether there is a union shop in any particular case will depend on the private decision made within the union, and (ii) the private agreement made between the union and the employer.

This is a recital of what is familiar to the members of this subcommittee. It is less well understood by the general public, and unbiased understanding is a necessary element here in dispassionate and constructive solution.

I turn now to the specific arguments for the repeal of section 14(b).

They are in two groups.

II

The decision about whether there should be a union shop agreement in a particular collective bargaining contract is a proper subject for private decisionmaking—by agreement between the union and the employer.

This is the general rule recognized in section 8 of the LMRA today, and in 31 of the 50 States.

The question here is not whether union shop agreements should be required by law. I would urge, if that were the issue, that they should not be: for the point is that this is a matter which should be left to responsible private decisionmaking—to be resolved one way or the other in private collective bargaining.

The repeal of section 14(b) is not—as some have attempted to suggest—a proposal to "make the union shop mandatory." It would not in itself require anybody to join a union. It is a proposal that the parties to the bargaining in a particular case be permitted to settle this issue as they deem mutually satisfactory.

An agreement by a company and a union that all employees represented by the union should share the expenses of representation is a reasonable decision.

The union represents, by law, all employees in the unit, and is required by law to represent them all fairly and equitably in collective bargaining and in the handling of grievances. All employees in the unit are beneficiaries of these procedures.

There has been broad and bipartisan recognition of this basic equity. Senator John F. Kennedy said in 1960:

"I join with the late Senator Taft in thinking that, where the union is the collective bargaining representative of all employees in an establishment, the payment of dues is justifiable as a fair means of sharing the expenses of collective bargaining among those who receive its benefits."

In a case involving the provisions of the Railway Labor Act permitting the union shop, the Supreme Court noted that this form of union security is aimed at "free riders," and that the purpose is "to force employees to share the costs of negotiating and administering collective agreements and the costs of the adjustment and settlement of disputes." *I.A.M.* v. *Street*, 367 U.S. 790 (1961).

The fairness of this principle has been recognized by thousands of American companies and local and international unions who have entered into over 100,000 union shop agreements covering about 13 million employees. These are responsible employers; and the unions include those which have stood most strongly for individual freedoms.

Union security provisions make a very real contribution to union responsibility and to industrial peace. The resultant assured continuation of the union's majority status removes one of the most serious sources of bitter labor-management suspicion and conflict. Without such a clause, union energies better devoted to making a cooperative bargaining relationship work for the mutual benefit of the employer and employees are likely to be drained off in abrasive defensive efforts—guarding against willful attrition, continuous organization of newcomers, watchfulness against antiunion solicitation. When the bargaining representatives' need to struggle for existence is past, its opportunity to strive for accommodation is bettered.

Since the making of a union shop agreement is a reasonable decision, it should not be prohibited by law unless there is some other overriding public policy consideration; and there is no such contrary public policy consideration.

This is recognized in the establishment in section 8 of the LMRA of a general rule that such agreements are permissible.

Thirty-one of the States, including those in which there is the largest experience with collective bargaining have taken this same position.

The argument that union shop agreements violate the freedom of individual employes has no substantial basis.

This argument has been made almost entirely by representatives not of employees but of some employers. There appeared recently a full-page newspaper advertisement opposing repeal of section 14(b) on the ground that this is necessary to protect individual worker freedoms. Of the 35 members of the committee sponsoring this advertisement, 23 are company presidents or board chairmen, and none are representatives of employees.

The view of American workers themselves was clearly recorded during the period between 1947 and 1951 when a union shop agreement could be entered into only after a secret union election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board. Over 97 percent of the 46,146 elections which were conducted went in favor of the union shop, and 91 percent of the almost 6 million employee votes cast in these elections were in favor of the union shop (1952 annual report of the NLRB, p. 306). Congress abandoned this election procedure as being pointless.

There is no violation of freedom in a minority's having to accept a majority's fair judgment fairly arrived at. There is no "right" of a minority to endanger the freedom of a majority of the employees to protect the security of the bargaining representative that gives them a voice in the shaping of their wages, hours, and conditions of employment.

You, Mr. Chairman, have effectively emphasized the point that "antiunionism does not justify the violation of the basic freedom of individuals to determine by majority vote the goals and policies of the group." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 28, 1965, p. 8666).

The view of a few who oppose belonging to a union or to any other organization as a matter of conscience or religious principle must be accommodated to the obligations of living together, and is respected to the fullest practical extent in section 8 of the LMRA.

Judge Learned Hand was above all a champion of individual liberties, but when a petitioner sought to invalidate a union shop agreement on the ground that union membership offended the employee's religious scruples, Judge Hand replied, for the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit:

"The first amendment gives no one the right to insist that in the pursuit of their own interests others must conform their conduct to his own religious necessities. A man might find it incompatible with his conscience to live in a city in which open saloons were licensed; yet he would have no constitutional right to insist that the saloons must be closed. He would have to leave the city or put up with the iniquitous dens, no matter what economic loss his change of domicile entailed. We must accommodate our idiosyncrasies, religious as well as secular, to the compromise necessary in communal life; and we can hope for no reward for the sacrifices this may require beyond our satisfaction from within, or our expectations of a better world. *Otten* v. *B. & O. R.R. Co.*, 205 F. 2d 58 (C.A. 2, 1953)."

Section 8 of the Labor-Management Relations Act is so worded that it permits only that employees may be required, as a condition of continuing employment, to pay union dues, and initiation fees. Section 8 says specifically that even where a union shop is agreed upon, the only basis for terminating a covered worker's employment is "the failure of the employee to tender the periodic dues and the initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership." The employee cannot be required to attend union meetings, to accept union discipline, or to engage in union ritual. He is required only to pay his way like everyone else.

In *NLRB* v. *General Motors*, 373 U.S. 734, at 743, the Supreme Court has stated specifically that "If an employee in a union shop unit refuses to respect any union-imposed obligation other than the duty to pay dues and fees * * * the employee may not be discharged for nonmembership even though he is not a formal member."

The present law includes broad safeguards against an individual's being required to support a union whose practices conflict with public policy or with his own political views or his interests.

The Labor-Management Relations Act contains specific prohibitions against unfair union labor practices in collective bargaining, and against such abuses as requirements of excessive union dues or fees.

The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act assures internal union democracy.

The Corrupt Practices Act provisions against improper influencing of the public election laws are made specifically applicable to unions in Section 304 of the Labor-Management Relations Act. Furthermore, the courts have limited the political use of union funds under union security agreements when the funds come from workers who object to such use. *Railway Clerks* v. *Allen*, 373 U.S. 113 (1963).

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination by labor unions on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin; and the National Labor Relations Board has revoked a union's certification as a bargaining representative on proof of discrimination in admission to membership on the basis of race.

The issue underlying the question of whether section 14(b) should be repealed is not, therefore, whether there is to be a "right to work." It is whether there is to be a right to decide.

The question is whether the free, private collective bargaining process is to be trusted with the union security issue just as it is with respect to other issues—for example, on seniority rules—which have an infinitely larger practical effect on individual interests and rights.

III

The right to agree—on this union security issue—should be established as the uniform national policy so far as interstate commerce is concerned.

Every other provision of the National Labor Relations Act applies uniformly in all States. Indeed, the Congress has specifically recognized in other areas that national uniformity is important and that differing State practices have a negative effect. Thus 14(c) provides that the Board is not to narrow its assertion of jurisdiction. The deliberate judgment of the Congress, confirmed by Supreme Court decisions, is that the ground rules of labor relations should be uniform throughout the country.

The explicit departure from this principle in the original adoption of section 14(b) represented, originally, a considered decision to search out the lessons of experience which State experimentation with different approaches to this problem would supply.

A congressional decision in 1947 to endorse that experimentation is an appropriate basis for the wholly consistent decision to act now on the lesson of that experimentation. Congressman Ayres has very properly pointed out, in urging repeal of section 14 (b), that "There comes a time when experience brings about a review of some sections of what might be considered a very fair law." (Congressional Record, Apr. 28, 1965, p. 8849.)

One of the lessons of this experience is that the lines of distinction between the applicability of Federal and State law have been hard to draw. Two years ago—and 16 years after section 14(b) was added to the law—the Supreme Court held (in *Retail Clerks* v. *Schermerhorn*, 375 U.S. 96) that State authority in the union security area begins only with the actual negotiation and execution of a union security agreement, that picketing to obtain a union security agreement which violates State law remains the exclusive domain of the Federal law, and that State enforcement is limited to the execution and application of union security agreement.

The Court's description of the elements which led to this conclusion is relevant to the broader evaluation of section 14(b):

"Congress, in other words, chose to abandon any search for uniformity in dealing with the problems of State law barring the execution and application of agreements authorized by section 14(b) and decided to suffer a medley of attitudes and philosophies on the subject." (Douglas, J.).

The period of profitable experimentation with this issue has run now for 18 years since the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. The results of these experiments are clear. In 31 of the States, containing over 70 percent of the Nation's population, the decision has been made to permit the private parties to settle the union security issue. The strong trend of collective bargaining determination is in favor of increased union security. And the trend of political decision in the States is to accept the general rule of free decisionmaking set out in section 8 of the Labor-Management Relations Act.

The broader lesson of these 18 years is that the legal ground rules covering the freedom to agree on union security as part of the private collective bargaining process should be the same throughout the country. The alternative, it is now clear, is a disruptive competition between the States carried on in the form of efforts to attract industry by representations of a legal climate allegedly less conducive to unionism and union wages and working conditions.

No right to work State has advertised its attractions in terms of an assurance to workers that they need not belong to unions. At this point that facade is dropped. The message that goes out, often with no attempt at subtlety, is directed exclusively at employers: "If you come here you will be assured by law that no union will present you with a bargaining request for a union shop."

It is a related, and exceedingly important, point that leaving this matter to separate determination in the various States has given rise to continuous and increasing antagonism.

President Johnson emphasizes in his May 18 message recommending repeal of section 14(b) that he does so "with the hope of reducing conflict in our national labor policy that for several years has divided Americans in various States."

You, Mr. Chairman, have pointed out that repeal of this provision "would remove from the political arena the prospects of recurrent and divisive debates." (Congressional Record, Apr. 28, 1965, p. 8666.)

This issue—of whether the private parties to collective bargaining are or are not to be free to decide the union security issue as they see fit—should be settled once and for all. It has cluttered up the political processes in almost every State in the Union, and it will continue to do so as long as the Federal law invites such controversy.

It is high time to put an end to fruitless and acrimonious political controversy by adopting the rule of uniformity of policy on this point which has been adopted with respect to every other point in the Nation's Labor Relations Act.

I urge that the right to decide this issue be returned to American labor and American management.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE HEARING ON PROPOSED CLOSING OF BROOKLYN NAVY YARD

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last, while I was confined to the National Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Md., I caused the following statement to be submitted to the House Committee on Armed Services:

Testimony of Hon. John J. Rooney, 14th District, New York, Before the House Committee on Armed Services May 24, 1965

Since the time a couple of weeks ago your distinguished Chairman at my request kindly set this hearing for today I had fully intended to be present in person and to submit my testimony in opposition to Secretary McNamara's proposed closing of the New York Naval Shipyard. However, illness required my admission to the National Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Md., on Friday, May 21, and I am still confined there this morning as this committee meets to make inquiry into the closing of this naval shipyard. The following is the statement I had prepared for today:

Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished House Committee on Armed Services, first, I would like to thank Chairman Rivers for granting me and other Members of Congress whose districts are so drastically affected by the decision of Secretary of Defense McNamara to close certain defense installations this opportunity of appearing before this committee.

The subject of these hearings is of extreme interest to me. The New York Naval Shipyard is physically located in my congressional district in Brooklyn, N.Y. As you know, I introduced House Resolution 343 on April 15, 1965, calling for this committee to conduct an investigation and study with respect to all the aspects of the proposed closing of the New York Naval Shipyard.

Mr. Chairman, the Brooklyn Navy Yard was established on February 23, 1801—164 years ago. It is the third oldest—Portsmouth, 1800; Boston, 1800—and the proudest of all the naval shipyards. It is inconceivable that this mighty yard, the "Can Do Yard," which built such great ships as the battleships *Arizona, Missouri, Iowa,* and *North Carolina,* and the aircraft carriers *Franklin D. Roosevelt, Independence, Saratoga, Constellation, Bennington, Bonhomme Richard,* and *Kearsarge,* will be closed simply because the Secretary of Defense has swung his so-called and alleged economy ax. The cost comparisons of private versus naval shipyards, which the Secretary has relied upon, are, indeed, questionable and I for one am certainly not convinced that the closing of this defense facility will result in any economy in military spending or that naval construction needs can be met more cheaply at other shipyards. In fact, there is every indication that private costs will zoom drastically once Navy competition and the yardsticks it sets are eliminated.

Reports, studies, and estimates by our own Government auditors in the General Accounting Office have long been ignored by the Navy. Official Federal reports have been thrust aside and irrelevant material and invalid arguments have been presented in an endeavor to support Mr. McNamara's order. The Brooklyn Naval Shipyard is a military establishment with technical and engineering know-how, trained manpower with experience and a reputation that is well known. Mr. Chairman, our naval shipyards are a vital and integral part of our Navy's capability and strength, and I wholeheartedly endorse a recommendation and conclusion made by a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services which was established for the express purpose of studying the utilization of naval shipyard facilities and which was chaired by you a few years back. That recommendation was that "a continuation of the existing naval shipyard support complex is essential to our national defense." Further, you will recall, the subcommittee emphasized its conviction that "any effort to reduce or abolish this essential support would only result in detracting from the total capability of our naval force with a consequent impairment of our national security." How can Mr. McNamara justify the closure of these defense facilities at the expense of our national security and the economic well-being of the communities involved? Mr. McNamara could close up enough military missions abroad with all their entertainment and expensive goings on to more than make up for the alleged savings, which will never be achieved.

Mr. Chairman, my community and the surrounding area will be the hardest hit economically by this stroke of Mr. McNamara's pen. An estimated $1.25 billion worth of business in the tri-State metropolitan area of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut is generated by the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and its closure will result in a loss of business for the city of New York alone in an amount estimated at $250 million.

Even though the Government has promised to find every displaced man a job somewhere—maybe Seattle, maybe Pascagoula—many of these employees have deep roots in the community—homes with mortgages, children in school, and other obligations. They cannot and should not be forced to give up all they have worked for over these many years. Furthermore, the proposed yard closure would mean a real and direct loss to the Government of its investment in the displaced skilled manpower since these men have been trained to use their abilities as a part of seasoned composite shipyard teams capable of handling vital naval ship repair, conversion, and construction work.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot in this short period of time present to this committee all the substantive evidence, the arguments, and the statistics as to why I feel that this committee should investigate the closure of the Brooklyn Navy Yard. But let me emphasize that this yard, now known as the New York Naval Shipyard, and its skilled craftsmen have been commended by the Department of the Navy time and time again for their performance and versatile capabilities. Only last year a letter of commendation was sent to the yard from the Chief of the Bureau of Ships reporting as follows: "It has been easily recognized by the Bureau's staff that the employees of the New York Naval Shipyard at all levels have been constantly alert to the need to effect reductions in shipyard costs." The yard was 1 of 2 of the Navy's 11 shipyards to have attained savings of over $10 million in fiscal year 1964. As a matter of fact, the Navy's auditors' report stated that the Brooklyn yard ranked first with more valid savings than any other shipyard for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964. How can a recommendation such as this be ignored and thrust aside?

Mr. Chairman, I vigorously urge this committee to carefully scrutinize not only the so-called savings which Mr. McNamara contends will be made by his closure orders, but also his alleged justification for the removal of such a vital shoreside component of our naval power. Will the truth become known too late?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXVIII

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the way New York's police deal with the narcotics problem.

The article is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 4, 1965.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: THE POLICE WAR ON DOPE—FRUSTRATIONS—PATIENCE

(NOTE.—The narcotic addict's tale is not an unfamiliar one—but the story of the policeman who chases him down is rarely told. To many people the addict is a weak but sympathetic figure, but the policeman who would arrest him is brutal and unthinking. Reporter Pual Weissman spent 2 weeks with the New York Police Department's Narcotics Division for the Herald Tribune's "New York City in Crisis" investigation. In this, the fourth of a series of articles on the city's narcotics problem, he describes a day in the life of two narcotics squad detectives.)

(By Paul Weissman)

At 1:15 p.m., on this day, a muscular, peripatetic, 32-year-old Korean war veteran whose job it is to lock people up in the city of New York, walked into part 30 of New York State Supreme Court to obtain a search warrant. His name is Vincent Albano, and he is a detective assigned to the Narcotics Bureau of the New York Police Department.

It was in the middle of a long day for detective Albano. He went on special duty at 7 a.m., in Brooklyn, because the Reverend Milton A. Galamison was picketing the board of education. At 11 a.m., he testified before a grand jury in a case where an arrest had been made last week. At noon, he returned to narcotics bureau headquarters at Old Slip Station on South Street.

Now detective Vincent Albano was in court because he wanted to investigate the home of an alleged narcotics peddler. To an outsider it seemed simple enough. But there are only three ways any officer can legally make a search in New York: incidental to an arrest; with the permission of the occupant of the apartment, who the officer knows will later deny he gave permission; or with a search warrant signed by a supreme court judge.

Detective Albano and his partner, detective John Orlick, wanted to search a Harlem apartment, so they were seeking a warrant. In order to get it they had to show there was probable cause to believe narcotics were being sold at that address.

But probable cause in a New York court can frequently be harder to show than actual guilt. Albano, this time, had a witness. The man, a paid police informer, swore that, "Yes, he had bought marihuana on two occasions at that apartment. Yes, he had made the purchases from the owner of the apartment."

Was the witness reliable? the judge had to know.

Detective Albano said the man had provided information that led to two narcotics arrests. Though no one in the police department knows whether an informant becomes "reliable" after he contributes to 2 arrests, 10 arrests or 30. Albano got the warrant.

He wasn't finished in court yet, because a police officer in the city of New York must also be something of a lawyer. He had to be sure the piece of paper the judge signed said he had the right to search day or night, and that it specifically gave him the right to search the person of John Harrison (an alias). If the paper didn't, whatever he found would be ruled inadmissible as evidence when the case went to trial.

AN UNLISTED PHONE

Police officers are not paid overtime, but Albano and Orlick were in Harlem that night at 8 p.m. They stopped at the West 123d Street station. Orlick is 45 and has two sons and he is neat, soft-spoken, and cautious. He could be mistaken for a corporation counsel lawyer.

"A lot of people think we like this work," he was saying. "But how can you like taking chances? How can anybody like taking chances with his life?"

A few minutes later, he said: "You know, I really don't mind taking the risk. I don't mind it because we're trying to accomplish something."

What?

The question genuinely embarrassed him, because that answer didn't come in words.

"I don't know what," he said. ,

Albano is 32, relaxed, gregarious and open. He looks like a halfback and, like his partner, lives in Queens and keeps his phone unlisted to protect his family. Five years after he joined the force he became an undercover agent for the narcotics bureau. That was in 1962. He made some important arrests and a few months later Inspector Ira Bluth, head of the narcotics bureau, teamed him with John Orlick.

"Junkies?" says Albano. "They're the happiest people in the world when they have stuff. You got kids? You got a wife? You got a mortgage? A junkie ain't got no worries. He doesn't care about anything as long as he can cop."

The two detectives rode in Albano's black sedan through Harlem. Orlick was dressed in a carefully creased business suit, starched collar, and topcoat. Albano wore a tan raincoat over a new sport shirt. At 116th Street and Madison Avenue, the car stopped for a red light. Forty people were hunched stoop-shouldered on the corner.

"Yeah, they're waiting for a connection," said Albano. "They know the guy is coming with the stuff. All they gotta do is stand there until he shows up."

The two detectives were powerless to do any more than watch. If somebody actually sold heroin while they were watching, it would still be difficult to prove in court. A defense attorney would simply ask how, from 20 yards away, at night, the detective knew heroin was traded. The attorney would also point out police had no right to search for evidence unless they had been absolutely certain a crime was committed.

"You see that scene," Albano said. "That's one of the reasons this city is filled with people that swear you can buy heroin anywhere. But do they have any idea what it takes to make an arrest?"

The light changed and Albano turned the car on to Madison Avenue. He drove past the apartment house on West 146th Street twice and then parked a block from the building. Orlick craned his neck to scan the rooftops through the back window of the auto. The rooftop was the place he figured a peddler would post a lookout.

To avoid attracting attention, Albano decided he would leave first, go into the apartment house and walk up the stairs to the roof. Orlick would leave a few minutes later, walk two doors past the house, then go up the stairs of another building and cross the rooftops to meet his partner. They knew that the apartment they wanted was on the top floor and hoped they would be able to look down into the apartment from this vantage point before exercising their warrant. They did not want trouble.

"OK, that's it John," Albano said as he got out of the car. He pushed a flashlight down into his coat pocket and turned down his collar. Then he shifted the Colt police revolver from its belt holster to his topcoat pocket and started up the street.

Orlick was out of the car a moment after his partner was out of sight. He looked like a businessman on the prowl in a tough neighborhood.

"Sometimes they can spot you when you wear old clothes," he said. "When you're dressed like this, maybe you get taken for a John. It doesn't make much difference either way." Walking past the crowded bar on the corner bothered him. "Talk it up," he said. "say something about girls."

John Orlick did not look at the house numbers as he passed the building his partner had gone in. He walked past it and past the next door and then turned in as if he had been in this house before. He quietly walked up five flights of stairs, thinking it would be very nice if no tenants decided to go out for a stroll right now. The iron door to the roof opened easily and Orlick stepped outside. He climbed over the 3-foot brick parapets to get to the building where his partner waited.

BEING CAREFUL

Albano was in place and snapped his flashlight once.

"Careful," he whispered, "this one's soft. You'll go right through someone's ceiling if you're not careful."

The apartment they had the warrant for looked out on an airshaft. By walking carefully along the edge of the roof to the other side of the shaft, they were able to look inside. The window was less than 20 feet away and inside was a room that glowed from an orange bulb. Albano could see two men sprawled on the sofa watching television. They were taking long, deep drags on a cigarette they passed between them. Albano thought it was marijuana.

"That's the place," he said. "Let's wait until a customer shows up."

Albano's reason was simple enough. Under the no knock law, a police officer with a warrant may enter an apartment with anyone who is admitted by its occupant. Otherwise—since he cannot use illegal methods to unlock a door—he must knock, identify himself as a police officer, and risk giving a suspect the opportunity to flush evidence down the toilet or throw it out the window.

The two detectives walked carefully back to the other side of the airshaft, opened the iron door to the building and crouched on the landing above the apartment. The stone floor was spattered with dry blood, wooden matches and the burnt cap of a wine bottle: all signs of heroin addiction. In one dirty corner there was a half-burnt glassine envelope. Orlick ducked on to the roof once to muffle a cough. Each time there was the sound of someone entering on the street five floors below, the two detectives flattened against the wall so they could not be seen from the stairs.

"I don't like this," Orlick whispered 20 minutes later. "We could have been made on the street."

"The name of the game is patience," Albano said, and they waited some more.

Twice the front door slammed and someone started up the stairway. Each time the two detectives braced themselves to rush the door of the apartment when it was opened. Both times the visitors were going to a different apartment. No one climbed to the fifth floor.

Then a door slammed on the fifth floor, someone came out, and Orlick peered through a crack in the staircase. "It's not the right apartment," he said as if he were worried. Seconds later, a huge German shepherd scampered up the stairs. The dog stopped in front of Albano and began to growl. The detective was blocking the door to the roof. Both men had their guns ready when a man in a duffle coat came up the stairs. He looked at the two men, said nothing, and took the dog on the roof.

Albano took a deep breath to ease the tension. "That blows this one," he said, "what do you say we call it off?"

"We got the warrant," Orlick said, "we might as well go in."

WATCHING TELEVISION

"OK," his partner said, "but the minute I knock the —— is going to fly right out the window."

Orlick thought he might be able to do something about that. He decided to go back to the parapet on the other side of the airshaft—opposite the window—before Albano knocked on the door. He thought it was possible that if he shined his flashlight in the face of anyone who tried to throw evidence out of the window and threatened to shoot, it might just deter one of the men in the apartment from throwing away the stuff.

As soon as Orlick was gone, Albano walked down the flight to the door of the apartment. With his badge in one hand and his revolver in the other, he knocked on the door. There was no answer and he knocked again.

"This is the police," he yelled this time.

There was still no answer and so Albano leaned on the door and it opened. Two men were sitting on a cellophane covered couch in the living room watching television.

"What do you want?" one of them said, starting to jump up.

"Don't get excited," Albano said. "I'm a police officer. Are you John Harrison?" The man nodded and started to get up. Albano lightly pushed him back on the couch.

"What kind of police brutality is this?" the other man said. He was tall and sick looking. His eyes were watery and he was angry.

"This is a search warrant," Albano said, holding it in front of John Harrison's face. "Read it."

"I haven't done anything," Harrison said. "I'm a workin' man. Why you cops got to beat up a workin' man?" No one had touched him, except for the initial push.

Then Orlick came in, his face red as a beet, and he was holding two grocery bags. "I got the stuff," he said. "I knew it would come out the window. The big guy. He threw them out the window."

Orlick emptied the two bags on a filthy pink bedspread in the next room. One had eight 1- by 3-inch jewelers' manila envelopes inside and the other had 24. There were five bags of a white powder wrapped in postage-size glassine bags.

"It could be heroin or it could be cocaine," Orlick said. "Put the cuffs on those two creeps and let's see what else they've got here."

Orlick snicked off the Scotch tape on one of the manila envelopes. Inside was what looked like dried-out green grass, chopped very fine: marihuana.

"You want to give us a statement?" Albano asked Harrison.

"I want to talk to my lawyer," he said.

Handcuffed together, the two prisoners sprawled on the sofa and glared at "This Is the Week That Was."

They watched the television, almost indifferent to the two detectives.

Albano, meanwhile, searched 20 pairs of shoes in the corner of an adjacent bedroom and went through a dozen hats and the pockets of some coats in the closet, the two men watched the television.

"Man, that Nancy Ames," one of the prisoners said. "Oh, man, that Nancy Ames."

Albano found four dozen sweaters in the closet but no contraband. "They all got something," he muttered. "With this guy it's sweaters."

There was a black telephone in the bedroom and a pink Princess phone in the living room under a picture of John F. Kennedy that Harrison said had been a Christmas present. It kept ringing and for a while the two detectives ignored it. Then Albano took the phone off the hook. "Let 'em think someone's still home," he said.

There were four rooms, a kitchen and a bathroom in the apartment, and in a small room opposite the front door, John Orlick found what he was looking for. He had figured it was the "smoking room" when he first looked. It had one chair inside, a naked red bulb in the ceiling and two pictures of ocean liners leaning against the wall. He noticed tape on the linoleum that covered the floor in one corner of the room. He lifted it up and there, hidden in the floorboards, was one more grocery bag.

"I suppose this—isn't yours either," he said, showing the bag to Harrison. There were 36 bags of marihuana inside. "Nothing," he yelled at Harrison. "You got nothing here and you don't know nothing."

Now Albano and Orlick were looking for a gun—it would give them another charge against the men. They also wanted more contraband. They searched closets, faucets, tore up linoleum, tapped the walls for hidden traps, and searched under the bathtub. It was hard, dirty work.

A knock at the door stopped Albano. He opened it, gun drawn. A woman dressed in a housecoat and wearing a stocking cap was standing there. She did not look at all surprised to see two white men in the apartment.

"What do you want?" Albano said.

"This is my son's apartment," she said. "I just came in to get a mop."

Albano told her he was a police officer and her son was in serious trouble.

"Why don't you bastards arrest the bums who are out of a job?" she said and then she left the apartment, without looking for the mop.

The two detectives found nothing more in the apartment. They searched Harrison and his friend. In Harrison's wallet they found a $10 ticket for a ring from Dollar Pawnbrokers, Inc.; Bambu cigarette papers made in Spain; a membership card in Uptown at the Downstairs and a business card from Whitey's Hideaway in Montreal. Harrison, it turned out, was employed by a steamship line and held a dock pass signed by a Coast Guard ensign good until 1969.

ANYTHING CAN HAPPEN

Orlick got a pair of shoes for Harrison and checked his friend's coat before he handed it to him. He had to unlock the handcuffs, give John Harrison his coat and then remanacle him to his friend.

"How are we going to take them out of here," Orlick said. He was thinking about Harlem again.

"I'll get the car and pull it up right in front," Albano came back. "This is no place to go walking around the streets."

After Albano left, Orlick marched the prisoners down the stairs at gunpoint. He watched every door and when he reached the main floor he motioned them into an alcove so that they could not be seen from the street. The prisoners were amused but there was sweat on Orlick's upper lip. He did not want trouble at all.

A minute later Albano was back.

"There's a crowd outside," he said, drawing his gun again. Then to the prisoners: "Very easy. Take it very easy. Just don't start any trouble."

With guns drawn, the two detectives led their prisoners to the back of the car. The prisoners did not say a word. Neither did any of the 20 or 30 people watching. Albano said: "They don't look at you that way up here unless they mean trouble. You got to take it s-o-o-o easy. You got to be afraid of everything that can happen."

It was 10 o'clock when Orlick and Albano arrived at the 32d precinct with their prisoners. They now had been working for 15 hours but it would be 2 a.m. before the prisoners were booked, because there is that much paperwork before a prisoner can be arraigned. Orlick's eyes were red and his back ached. Albano decided to call his wife.

"They never get used to it at home," he said. "They just never get used to it."

"I'll get the coffee," John Orlick said. "I'm gonna need seven cups of coffee before we're finished."

While his partner was gone, Albano attempted to induce Harrison and his friend to explain where they had gotten the stuff. "I'll be glad to tell you after my lawyer gets here," Harrison said brightly. He was not too tired to put any one on.

When Orlick came back, the two detectives filled out a blue and white arrest card for each prisoner, pedigree reports, UF 61 complaint forms, property clerk vouchers for the contraband they had seized, a property clerk disposition form and a request for laboratory analysis of the contraband. Orlick, who is an expert printer, made three sets of fingerprints of each prisoner—one each for State, city, and Federal files. Then the two detectives had to "back up" each set of fingerprints with the prisoners' history and pedigree and the circumstances of this particular arrest. Most detectives figure that five arrests at one time is easily a night's paperwork.

HE WANTS A LAWYER

All police forms have a space for listing whether or not a prisoner is a narcotics user. Both Harrison and his friend said they weren't. The ineffectiveness of treatment methods for addicts was apparent by the questions on the forms:

"Any previous treatment? If so, where? How many times?"

The arrests were recorded in the 32d precinct's logbook and the case numbers phoned to headquarters with the information that the prisoners would be charged with possession of narcotics. The penalty for felony is 5 to 15 years. (A felony is charged when an ounce of marihuana or more is involved. With heroin, one-eighth of an ounce is felony possession.)

At 1:22 a.m., the two prisoners were taken down to the first floor of the 32d precinct and booked. Paperwork had occupied the two detectives for more than 3 hours.

"I want my phone calls," Harrison said.

"Give us the numbers," the lieutenant on the desk told him. "We make the calls."

"But I want to talk to my girl," he said, "she's goin' to worry about me."

"Your mother knows you were arrested," Albano said. "She can tell her."

The prisoners were locked in a detention pen at the 32d precinct. Orlick and Albano then went home, but only briefly. They would have to be back at 7 a.m. to pick the two men up and escort them to part 1B of criminal court for first arraignment. Orlick planned to go directly to criminal court and "get on line early" to avoid waiting through an entire day's calendar—sometimes 200 cases—before his prisoners were called.

In the morning the arraignment went quickly. A lawyer met the prisoners and arranged the bail. It was small, $500.

The two men were free by 10 a.m. Nobody followed them and nobody worried about what they were going to do next.

"All I can do is follow the letter of the law and lock them up," Vince Albano was saying outside the courtroom. "What am I supposed to do, solve the narcotics problem in the city like a one-man army? Bringing them into court is no better than dropping them in a sieve. Somebody's got to pick up the ball after that."

Nobody counted how many hours Detective Vincent Albano or his partner, Detective John Orlick, worked on this case or any other one last year, but between them, the 2 detectives made 110 narcotics arrests.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXIX

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following articles are a part of the series "New York City in Crisis," appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

These articles deal with dope addiction and appeared in the Tribune on April 5, 1965.

The articles follow:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—CITY COURTS: A REVOLVING DOOR FOR DOPE ADDICTS

(In New York, the dope addiction capital of the Western World, much of the drama of narcotics is played out in the courtroom. In this, another in a series of "New York City in Crisis" articles on addiction, reporter Paul Weissman examines the role and performance of the courts in the fight against narcotics.)

(By Paul Weissman)

The 35-year-old runt wearing dirty brown corduroy pants sidled up to Detective Vincent Albano in the well of part 2A of New York criminal court. The runt had just handed the judge an affidavit that said his attorney was busy in another courtroom, and his case was postponed for the ninth time. He was no more than 4 foot 11 and now he was giggling as he tugged at the sleeve of the officer who had arrested him for possession of narcotics 5 months ago.

"You never get me," the runt said. "This time I got good lawyer and as long as I don't pay him, he knows how to beat the jail."

Albano turned very slowly. He was smiling. He might have been talking to a long lost friend. It was an act. Every detective hopes that a man faced with a "pen bit" will turn informer, name his supplier and hand police a bigger case. New York police occasionally pay informers, but their primary weapon is that they are in a position to seek "consideration" from the district attorney on behalf of prisoners about to be sentenced. Unlike Federal agents, they are not permitted to carry informers on the payroll.

"Buddy," Albano said, "lawyer or no lawyer, I'm going to punch your ticket. You don't get off this time. I'm going to put you on the trolley upstate and you won't get off for 3 years."

The two men kidded each other for a minute and then the runt, who was giggling as he talked either because he was "high" or because he was glad the judge accepted the affidavit, started to walk away.

"Stay loose, man," he called to Albano.

"Stay loose," Albano called back, knowing the man already had another narcotics charge as well as a charge of possession of burglar tools pending against him.

In another part of the courtroom, Albano's partner, Detective John Orlick, hefted his big tan attaché case onto a table covered with the overcoats of a dozen uniformed patrolmen. Three dozen 3- by 10-inch manila transfer envelopes were in the case and 10 more were tucked in the file flap. Each envelope contained the formal complaint against a narcotics offender whom Orlick had arrested but whose case had not yet been concluded.

This was a small part of the scene on the fourth floor of the criminal court building in New York City where 8,389 addicts faced justice last year. Because of crowded calendars and a hundred problems with the law, fewer than 200 defendants indicted on felony charges were actually brought to trial verdict in supreme court (where felony cases are heard). A large majority pleaded guilty to lesser charges. Those charged with misdemeanors had their hearings before a judge.

The fourth floor is one more "scene" in the world of the addict. It is the one that represents organized society and to most addicts who are arrested, a courtroom is like going through the looking glass into a wonderland that might have been devised by the Marquis de Sade.

"That's the real jungle, man," says one addict. "That's where you learn nobody means what he says."

Part 1B, arraignment court, is where every addict is brought the morning after he is arrested. On an average, 100 to 200 cases are heard daily, 7 days a week. A detective must pick his prisoner up at 7 a.m. in the precinct where he was booked, place him in a basement detention cell while he files a complaint, then takes his prisoner "around the horn:" fingerprints, photo, and back to the detention cell. An addict, whom many persons contend is a sick person, is treated like any other criminal. Before the case is called, the arresting officer places his prisoner in the detention pen behind the courtroom, then brings him out on time to keep the calendar moving.

If a defendant has no counsel, the judge will call out for "legal aid," and an attorney will come forward. The lawyer then has a few moments to talk to his client, question the arresting officer and examine the complaint while the next prisoner stands waiting with the officer who arrested him.

INTERESTED SPECTATORS

An addict's friends frequently come to court and they may be "high" or "on a nod." Judges ignore them. Defendants who can afford counsel may pay from a rockbottom $250 to several thousand dollars.

Two weeks earlier, Albano and Orlick had exercised a search warrant on West 146th Street, and arrested John Harrison (an alias) and a friend. Orlick had seen the friend toss two grocery bags out the window before the arrest. The detective retrieved them and found them to contain marihuana. Under a taped piece of linoleum in one room of the apartment a second cache of marihuana was found.

The prisoners were arraigned the next day—and released on $500 bail. With their attorney, they were back in court this day, and so were Orlick and Albano. The defendants weren't there very long. The attorney made a motion for adjournment, saying he had not had time to examine the complaint, and the adjournment was granted. That was all.

Outside the courtroom, as the two detectives waited for still another case to come up in still another court, Orlick said: "That's some lawyer he got. He doesn't even want to start the runaround until he has to. The next time we come in it's either going to be a motion to controvert the warrant or a motion to suppress the evidence. But that's the way it goes here.

Detective Orlick was touching at the heart of the dispute between law enforcement officers and some proprietors of the law—at what is in fact one of the agonizing dilemmas of modern jurisprudence. Prosecutors and enlightened police officials are deeply concerned with the protection of the rights of defendants. But they are even more concerned with the rights of the victims of criminals. They contend that when lawbreakers are permitted to gain endless delays and even escape punishment, then the law has failed to protect the public at large.

JUSTICE'S SLOW COURSE

The debate is even more complex when it approaches changes in the law and their effect on an urban environment. Legal decisions in higher courts that affect search and seizure frequently involve "hard" case situations where police clearly ignored the rights of an individual. But a higher court ruling in any case affects all other cases in all courts in its jurisdiction. Crime fighting, police say, involves far different legal problems in New York, with its sprawling ghettos and miles of apartment houses, than in a rural community, where a man's home and lands are virtually his domain.

The tremendous volume of cases handled—and the relative pressures this volume places on prosecution, defense, and judge—is a major factor in the slow course of justice in New York.

The result has been, in most prosecutors' views, that legal safeguards have resulted in New York in a series of roadblocks to justice, which a defense attorney can use to prolong a client's case almost indefinitely.

A competent attorney can make motions to inspect grand jury minutes, for a bill of particulars, to controvert a search warrant, or to suppress a confession. When he is finished, if his client has enough money, he can follow the same appeal procedure through the entire appellate courts of this State and the Federal court system. While every defedendant has—and should have—such rights, the practical effect is to slow the legal system to a halt.

One motion made automatically by an attorney in virtually every narcotics case involves the suppression of evidence; if it is successful, the prosecution ends up with virtually no case at all.

The fourth amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees rights against unreasonable search and seizure. What is reasonable? Most of New York's criminal court judges are unwilling to decide. In the view of many top prosecutors—though they will not state this for the record—it is easier for a judge to find for a defendant than risk a reversal in a higher court.

To counteract this, Manhattan District Attorney Frank Hogan frequently appeals, on behalf of the people, to higher courts, and has had reversals won against listless judges. But these are small victories.

Though Albano and Orlick have a prima facie case against John Harrison and his friend, there is little chance the defendants will ever be punished. A competent defense attorney will cross-examine Orlick this way regarding the fact that he "saw" the friend throw two grocery bags that contained marihuana out the window—if, after the delays and postponements the case ever comes to trial.

"Officer," he will say, "did you lose sight of those grocery bags at any time?"

"HE'S GOTTA WALK"

Orlick will answer yes, he did. He will explain he was on a sixth-floor roof opposite the window and that it was dark. The fact that he recovered the bags immediately will not be of consequence, because the next question is simple enough:

"Were there any similar grocery bags in the alley?"

Detective Orlick will say truthfully that there were others, filled with garbage, and he will not be able to establish that the bags he saw John Harrison's friend toss out the window were the same ones he picked up in the alley a few minutes later.

"That guy's gonna walk," Albano said derisively as he stood in the courtroom hallway twisting his pinky ring. "He's gotta walk. And you know what's gonna happen with Harrison, if we get a conviction? Sure. He walks, too. First offense. Bang, says the judge. Suspended sentence. You think it's easy to lock criminals up in the city of New York."

There are other cases.

One day a few years ago, a drug addict entered his home and found two Narcotics Bureau detectives interrogating his wife.

"We know there's a gun here," one of them said. "Now, where is it?"

The officers searched the kitchen, the living room and the bedroom. They didn't find a gun. But under the bed there was a "deck" of heroin and a set of "works" (syringe and cooker). The husband admitted the contraband was his and was placed under arrest.

Any novice would know that the arrest was illegal. But these detectives knew there was no gun. They were putting on an act. They were actually in the apartment at the express invitation of the wife who had gone to police to complain that her husband regularly assaulted her, stole welfare money intended for the children's food and used narcotics in the house.

She had begged officers not to reveal her identity. "When he gets out," she said, "he'll kill me."

"Of course, if the case arose today," says Assistant District Attorney Irving Lang, who supervises prosecution of most narcotics cases in Manhattan, "the case would have to be dismissed."

The reason is simple enough: As a result of recent decisions in higher courts, the heroin found by the detectives would be inadmissible as evidence. Other decisions might make it necessary for the prosecution to introduce its informant—the wife in this case—as a witness.

"We just couldn't endanger the wife, that's all there is to it," says Mr. Lang.

Fifty years ago, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Cardozo asked: "Is the criminal to go free because the constable has blundered?"

The question he might have asked today is whether lawbreakers should go free because of inadequacies and complexities of both the judiciary and the law?

There is still another question in relation to the law and the addict. A large majority of drug users, psychiatrists say, are childish, immature people. The judiciary to an addict is society's father figure. It can be stern or it can be understanding, it can punish, and it can excuse. Instead of presenting a consistent point of view, the courts, for the addict, seem to be a gigantic game of chance. If he happens to have the right combination, with a little luck, nothing much may happen to him.

POLITICAL FACTORS

The inadequacies of the criminal courts, where misdemeanors are tried, are not all legal ones. The large majority of judges hold their benches as a result of appointment, political friendships, and political debts. Their advance may be based largely on political consideration. The result is that most judges are put in a position where they must bend over backward to protect defendants.

The unwritten rules are simple enough: listen to public opinion, trust in God, and do not offend minority factions.

One of the ways judges avoid being unpopular is to refuse to jail drug users and drugsellers, unless the drug is heroin. First offenders invariably receive a suspended sentence.

Not long ago, one judge, faced with two New York University students caught with $500 worth of marijuana in their car, handed down just such a sentence.

"Don't you think if a dozen college students were sentenced to the penitentiary for 3 years," a reporter asked, "three-quarters of the 'pot' users in New York would become frightened enough to quit?"

The judge thought for a long time. "We've always felt a suspended sentence was a strong deterrent. It's a terrible thing for a responsible person to have on his record," he said. "Maybe," he added a moment later, "it isn't strong enough. Maybe it isn't. But then, who's going to pick the examples? Are you? Is the district attorney? I'm certainly not going to do it. Not for smoking 'pot'." (Aids to Manhattan District Attorney Frank Hogan have put the dilemma much the same way.)

There are other judges and other sentences. Another judge, faced with a defendant arrested for possession of 3,000 barbiturate tablets, said: "A synthetic narcotic? Is that such a bad drug?" It was the man's second offense; his first sentence had been suspended. This time he got 30 days. The judge apparently did not know barbiturates can be more addictive and more dangerous than heroin.

Some police officers shudder whenever they see as many as a dozen different judicial nameplates in New York courtrooms. They know they will be abused, attacked as liars, and maligned in front of the prisoners they have arrested. "You say you saw that man throw a bag of heroin away, officer?" one judge will ask. "You expect this court to believe that?"

If police know the courtroom procedure of particular judges, so do defense attorneys. Frequently the defense will move for postponement simply because a particular judge is scheduled to hear a case. Many police officers feel, as a result, that New York's judges will not back up law-enforcement officers simply because they do not believe the tired, sullen defendant standing in front of them is a criminal.

THE SAME ENDING

"Once a year," says one detective, "I'd make it a rule that every criminal court judge walk alone from river to river at 1 a.m. on 125th Street. If he makes it, then he knows enough about what goes on in the streets of this city to sit for another year."

The situation has become so serious that Justice Miller, of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, wondered not long ago whether, in fact, justice had not become a tool of the lawbreaker.

"There seems to be," he said, "a judicial tendency in recent years to a rather mawkish exaggeration of the rights of criminals with too little concern for the protection of the public. We should not lightly," he added, "attribute wrongdoing to the police who, after all, are not enemies but rather protectors of society."

But the credibility of an arresting officer is only one element of a narcotics case. Because such offenses involve a possession crime, at the heart of each one is not whether the defendant is guilty or innocent but how the arresting officer obtained the evidence.

"No one is trying to abandon the fourth amendment," says Assistant District Attorney Irving Lang. "What we do want are decisions that recognize reasonable search and seizure."

The problem is that present search-and-seizure laws, say police, do not take into account the facts of crime fighting in an urban environment. The same laws that protect a man's farm in an isolated area also cover the basement of a tenement house in which someone has placed a bed. It is, courts have ruled, a home. Though neighbors may complain—as in one recent case—that addicts are using basements for a "shooting gallery," police cannot enter the premises without a warrant. In order to get it, someone must sign a complaint. Few citizens in New York sign such complaints.

Legal maneuvering may go on endlessly in most cases, but the large majority end in the same way.

This one was the last case Albano and Orlick had on that day and as they started toward the supreme court on the 11th floor of criminal court, where felony cases are tried, Irving Lang joined them.

"You want to see delay? Watch this," someone said. The defendant, dressed in a blue business suit, was a typical small-scale user-seller, except that unlike most addicts he was fat, not thin and emaciated. The charge was violation of section 1751 of the penal law, possession of narcotics. Orlick and Albano, with a warrant, had arrested the man in his apartment and found $500 worth of narcotics.

He had had nine postponements, and today, his lawyer was complaining that he in fact had been ready to go to trial all along.

A DAY'S WORK

"Every lawyer that screams for a trial, I'm ready to give a trial," the judge said. "Stand back, gentlemen."

As the lawyer murmured "Wait a minute," the judge instructed his court attendant to have 50 jurors at 12:30.

Ten minutes later, the defense lawyer found Irving Lang. No, Mr. Lang did not think the case should be postponed. But under the circumstances, he would accept a plea. As in the huge majority of cases that do not go to trial, the plea was to "attempted felonious possession."

It had happened a hundred times before, and now the court clerk was standing in front of the defendant reading a statement that explained to the defendant that a plea of guilty was equivalent to conviction by a jury of the charge of which he was accused. It sounded as though he were reading the back of a parking ticket. The sentence that goes with "attempted felony possession" is 5 years.

"It's a good sentence," says Irving Lang.

Outside the courtroom, Albano and Orlick, who had spent 4 hours in the criminal court building that morning and still had a full day's regular duty ahead of them, unhooked the badges from their lapels and pulled on their coats.

"Listen," said a third detective, who joined the group, "whatever you do, don't say we criticized any judges. All they have to do is think an officer is critical of them and he's ruined in their court for good."

Albano, who believes it is a policeman's job to lock people up that break the law, shrugged as if it were no different than any other day's work.

"We pick up the dirt from the streets," he said, "and we throw it into a washing machine. It gets churned up and soft-soaped, then in 30 days or 60 days or once in a while, a year, it's back out on the street. No matter how often you throw it in the machine, it always comes back the same way: still dirty. What do we do? Arrest 'em again. Then maybe they kill somebody and we can lock 'em up and not worry about what's going to happen with 'em for a while. You think the public cares? Not for a minute, until somebody breaks in and bats them over the head. Then they get mad. They get real mad at the police."

Irving Lang puts the same thing another way:

"There is," he says, "need for an agonizing reappraisal of the relationship between the rights of society and the rights of society's enemies."

New York City in Crisis—The Penalties on Dope Arrests

Section 1751 of the penal law is basic to the prosecution of narcotics cases in New York State. Prosecutors believe that in principle it provides adequate penalties for narcotics pushers and sellers, and yet gives judges sufficient scope of punishment in dealing with convicted felons.

These are its provisions:

For actual sale of heroin or marijuana, first offense: A minimum sentence of 5 years and a maximum of 15 years. A judge who decides to inflict a maximum penalty on an offender may sentence him to 7½ to 15 years. A special provision in the law provides for a minimum penalty of 7 years for sale to minors. A convicted seller is eligible for parole after serving two-thirds of his minimum sentence.

The State's law presumes intent to sell if a person is arrested with certain quantities and the penalties are identical with those for the actual sale.

These quantities are 100 or more marihuana cigarettes; 1 ounce or more of heroin, morphine, or cocaine; 2 or more ounces of raw or prepared opium.

Felonious possession, involving lesser weights, is circumscribed by another section of the law. The quantities are 25 or more marihuana cigarettes; one-eighth ounce of any mixture containing 1 percent or more of heroin, morphine, or cocaine or one-half ounce of raw or prepared opium.

Penalties for felonious possession, first offense, are a minimum of 3 years and a maximum of 10.

For second and third offenses in all felony cases the law provides a simple rule: the minimum becomes half the previous maximum sentence and the maximum doubles. It means a second offense for felonious possession provides a judge with a scope of sentence between 5 to 20 years.

Anyone convicted of three narcotics felonies is subject to a mandatory life sentence.

The law in actual practice is something else. Because no legal distinction is made between small scale user-sellers and wholesalers who turn huge profits in heroin, neither prosecutors nor judges feel justified in thinking in terms of maximum penalties for all convicted criminals. Smaller fry are permitted to plead to a lesser charge, technically called "attempted felonious possession," which automatically cuts the scope of sentencing in half.

But most convicted first offenders, in practice, are not even sentenced to 18 months. Unless it is proven they are large sellers, the charge is invariably suspended. Other defendants, in order to ease crowded court calendars, are permitted to take their cases out of supreme court, where all felonies are heard, and plead guilty to misdemeanor charges. Sentencing then takes place in criminal court.

Conviction of a narcotics misdemeanor—technically possession of lessen than felony weights—permits the judge to sentence a defendant up to a year or send him to the penitentiary for an indefinite sentence (3 years). A second narcotics misdemeanor carries a mandatory 6-month minimum sentence, but even that can be suspended.

In misdemeanor narcotics cases, a suspended sentence is invariably the case for all first offenders. Addicts can and have gotten as many as 10 suspended sentences, because judges are convinced they are actually in the process of quitting drugs and have suffered temporary relapses that led to their arrest.

Those that are sentenced are remanded to the department of corrections and sent to a city jail or State prison. First felony offenders, if they are under 30, may be sent to Elmira Reformatory for up to 5 years.

Under the 1963 Metcalf-Voelker law, a narcotics offender arraigned for a misdemeanor or first offense, may elect to be treated under article IX of the State mental hygiene law. Thus, if he is certified by a doctor as an addict and he meets certain requirements in the law, in lieu of prosecution, he may be sent to a special State hospital.

When the hospital certifies he is ready for parole—usually after 3 or 4 months—the addict is instructed to report to a parole officer or special center at regular intervals. The full term of commitment and parole, by law, may not exceed 36 months. If the addict violates parole, he is subject to prosecution under the original charge. If he does not, the record of his arrest is destroyed.

But in practice, article IX, most experts say, does not work. Less than 10 percent of arrested addicts seek civil commitment. Others ignore it when arrested for lesser charges on which they may get a suspended sentence. They seek civil commitment only when they believe they are liable to longer prison terms. It is easier, addicts say, to serve a 30-day or even 6-month jail sentence than to get "hooked by the parole board" for 3 years.

Within the courts, though the law is clear as to who is eligible for commitment, judges are not. Addicts are arbitrarily accepted or rejected.

It is also a felony to conspire to sell narcotics, forge a doctor's prescription, or hire a child under 16 to transport morphine, cocaine, heroin, or opium.

Sale or possession of barbiturates, for the first offense, is a misdemeanor. The second offense is a felony. Sale or illegal possession of amphetamines is a misdemeanor.

It is also a misdemeanor to possess a hypodermic syringe without a license or to possess amphetamines in any form except the original prescription capsule in which they were issued.

Under Federal law, illegal possession of any quantity of narcotics or cocaine is punishable with a sentence of from 2 to 10 years for first offenders. Judges have the discretion to suspend sentence or permit parole when a first offense is involved. Second and third convictions carry a mandatory sentence of from 5 to 20 years and 10 to 40 years, without parole.

Possession, and, in fact, sales of narcotics come under Federal law when the arresting officer is an agent of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, an agency of the Treasury Department. Conviction under Federal law for sales of naroctics means a mandatory minimum sentence of 5 years, first offense, and 10 years for second offenders.

Virtually the same penalties for possession or the sale of marihuana were written into Federal law in 1938 when Congress enacted the Marihuana Act.

On the Federal level, illegal sales of amphetamines and benzadrine are controlled under the Pure Food and Drug Act.

Physicians who legally administer narcotics, along with druggists, manufacturers, and wholesalers, must purchase an opium tax stamp with the approval of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the agriculture appropriation (H.R. 8370) before the House today poses a very serious and difficult problem.

It combines in one bill funds to support important public programs and funds to continue the ill-advised, harmful, and unnecessary practice of subsidizing private enterprise on our farms.

I cannot too strongly condemn the practice of combining such disparate programs in one bill. It faces the legislator with the impossible situation: deciding whether to vote for thoroughly objectionable programs just to continue needed programs or to vote "nay" and throw out the baby with the bath.

I voted for this bill today because it provided funds for the school lunch program, Public Law 480, the food stamp plan, and a number of beneficial conservation and development activities that are indispensable to our national health and welfare.

I am deeply troubled that in doing so, I was also voting to continue the deplorable programs of subsidies and supports that burden our taxpayers, weaken our farm economy, and belie the economic principles upon which our Nation is based.

If I had been given an opportunity to vote on the subsidy program alone, I would have voted "nay." I want to serve notice that wrapping such objectionable programs in the same bill with programs that are generally beneficial will not always serve to get them passed.

The cost to the American people of the farm subsidies in this bill total more than $4 billion.

Many of these subsidies were initiated originally as temporary measures to cope with emergency conditions. The emergency has passed—in some cases more than 15 years ago—but the program lingers on and the cost to the taxpayer and the consumer is tremendous.

Unfortunately, large segments of farming community have come to depend upon the subsidies administered through the Commodity Credit Corporation, acreage diversion programs, price support, and loan-purchase arrangements. These alien concepts of support and subsidy are becoming so embedded in the economy of our agricultural community that to stop them suddenly could result in economic disaster.

But we will never free ourselves of this burden by placidly voting new subsidies each year. We must have programs that are aimed at returning our farm economy to sound self-sufficiency—and we must start them now.

I recognize that the total appropriation in this bill is more than $1 billion less than the appropriation for 1965 and I commend the Agriculture Department and the House Agriculture Committee for their excellent efforts to hold the line on costs.

But I want to point out that the programs for which this appropriation is made today do not reflect any new departures that would attack the concept of subsidization. Nor is any such planning evidenced in the proposals for the omnibus farm bill now being studied by the Agricultural Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the very idea of subsidies is distasteful to Americans. I am sure that it is as alien to the farmer as it is to all other Americans. We can and must develop programs that will return our farm communities to economical operation—and we must do it soon.

HUDSON RIVER—A NEW CONSERVATION CHALLENGE

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado, Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL, has announced that hearings on my bill to establish a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway—H.R. 3012—will be held on July 9 and 10. I am pleased to learn that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alaska, RALPH J. RIVERS, chairman of the National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee, will hold these hearings in Westchester and Putnam Counties along the Hudson. It is most appropriate that the committee consider this bill right at the site of the majestic Hudson Gorge and Highlands.

In preparation for the hearings, a group of citizens have formed into a voluntary organization known as the Citizens Committee for the Hudson River. One of the members of the executive committee of this organization, Mr. Irving Like, has prepared an excellent study of the history of the Hudson.

Mr. Like, who played an important role in establishing the Fire Island National Seashore, is one of New York's most active and respected conservationists and I think that his study deserves the widest possible attention.

Over the next few days, I would like to bring to the attention of this House and the Nation certain important sections of this paper. The first part follows:

HUDSON RIVER: NEW CONSERVATION CHALLENGE—PART I

In the White House message on natural beauty to the Congress, delivered February 8, 1965, the President said, regarding rivers:

"Those who first settled this continent found much to marvel at. Nothing was a greater source of wonder and amazement than the power and majesty of American rivers. They occupy a central place in myth and legend, folklore and literature."

The President went on to say:

"Yet even this seemingly indestructible natural resource is in danger."

And then he sounded the alarm:

"But the time has also come to identify and preserve free flowing stretches of our great scenic rivers before a growth and development make the beauty of the unspoiled waterway a memory."

The President mentioned only two rivers by name. One was the Potomac and the other was the Hudson. He said that he hoped a program would be devised which would clean up these rivers so that they could be used for boating, swimming, and fishing, protect their natural beauties by the acquisition of scenic easements, zoning, or other measures, and provide adequate recreation facilities. He described rivers such as these as:

"They are potentially the greatest single source of pleasure for those who live in most of our metropolitan areas."

THE HUDSON RIVER

The beauty of the Hudson River is legendary. It has been called the Rhine of America, and its hymns of praise are countless, perhaps best sung by its best known biographer, Carl Carmer in his book "The Hudson."

Ever since its discovery in 1524 by Giovanni da Verrazano, the Hudson has played an important part in the history of America. Its place, names, patroons, castles, Revolutionary War engagements, Robert Fulton's first steamboat in 1807, Washington Irving's immortal literature, its bustling trade, gateway to the Mohawk and the west of Canada, tourist steamers, West Point, Hyde Park, all bespeak a colorful panorama of Americana that every schoolboy is weaned on.

The great scenic values of the Hudson highlands region and their park and recreation potential were early recognized by the Congress of the United States when, on August 19, 1937, it approved a compact between New York and New Jersey which earmarked this area for permanent park purposes (c. 706 50 Stat. 719).

The Department of Interior made this comment on the compact legislation, in a letter on July 28, 1937, to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives:

"The proposed legislation is in harmony with the act of June 23, 1936 (49 Stat. 1894, Chapter 375). * * * Palisades Interstate Park is the first park in which two States have united for joint action. It represents a cooperative enterprise of unparalleled success. The attendance in the park is greater than in any other park in the United States. * * * We also believe that the provisions of the compact will be of inestimable value to the future of this great cooperative undertaking."

In its publication entitled "60 Years of Park Cooperation, 1900–60," the Palisades Interstate Park Commission calls this park the most notable example in the United States of interstate cooperation for conservation of scenery and promotion of outdoor recreation.

The Palisades Interstate Park Commission was the agency charged with the responsibility of carrying out the objectives of the compact. It was vested with the power to and charged with the duty of selecting and locating such mountainous lands along and adjacent to the west bank of the Hudson River in Rockland and Orange Counties, as soon as it shall deem it feasible and advisable, and which are proper and necessary for the purpose of extending the limits of the park (New York State conservation law, sec. 747), and to lay it out in such manner that it shall form a continuous park along the entire Hudson River front up to a point south of the city of Newburgh (sec. 748).

Between 1900 and 1937, New York State spent a total of $22,764,735.36, New Jersey, $3,291,415.37, and private donors, $17,799,999.57, or a grand total of $43,856,150.32, for interstate park purposes, prior to the adoption of the compact (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 75th Cong., 1st sess., p. 8040). Many millions more have been appropriated and donated since the adoption of the compact, all on the premises intended by the States, the Congress, and private philanthropy, that a permanent park was being created and developed that would eventually embrace all of the lands defined in the boundaries of the compact region, and would serve the burgeoning population of the metropolitan area. These expectations have been evolving toward realization over the years. Park holdings have continued to grow, struggling within fiscal limitations to keep up with an exploding population. Since 1945, park attendance has grown from 2,353,300 annual visitors to 7,016,100 in 1963.

The Palisades Commission in its annual report of 1963 stated (p. 7) that it was prepared to increase park facilities by acquiring land and constructing developments and access thereto to meet the burgeoning public demand, subject to the availability of State appropriations. It said that its then park capacity was 100,000 persons and that broad outline planning existed which could increase the instant capacity of the park to approximately 300,000 persons by the expenditure of some $60 million for land, developments, roads, parkways, and coincidental rehabilitation and modernization over the next 15 years provided prices and other variables remained reasonably constant. The Commission concluded its section on future park development, noting:

"The continuing problem is not so much what to do as how to finance the program so as to be ready in time to cope with the rapidly expanding demand for facilities for 1-day trippers from the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area."

Recent developments in the lower Hudson River Valley have made it a focus of great controversy and interest, and have once again evoked tributes to its beauty and majesty, and warnings of its fate unless imaginative action is taken to protect and realize its enormous value.

On January 18, 1965, recognition of the Hudson River problem and opportunity was given legislative form by the introduction in the House of Representatives of H.R. 3012 by Congressman RICHARD L. OTTINGER. This bill, in recognition of the unique scenic beauty as well as the natural, historical, archeological, recreation, fish and wildlife values of the lower Hudson River Valley and Highlands, called for the establishment of a Hudson Highland National Scenic Riverway. Mr. OTTINGER said:

"Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish the Hudson Highland National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York. It is my sincere hope that this bill will be enacted as a part of a new conservation effort—an effort not only to protect and develop old resources, but to create new ones; not only to save our wilderness areas, but to preserve the green spaces and the scenic river valleys near our metropolitan areas.

"The bill I have introduced sets up a mechanism for a regional plan of conservation and development. It emphasizes the interest for local planning and zoning and at the same time permits the Federal Government, through the Secretary of the Interior, to preserve areas of scenic, historic and recreational value; to assist in the abatement of water pollution and the protection of pure water, and to rehabilitate blighted and decaying areas.

"Mr. Speaker, at the present time, no single agency has a really clear idea of what specific conditions prevail along banks of the Hudson, what lands can be bought or reclaimed, who owns available lands, etc. Along the Hudson, several communities daily dump millions of pounds of raw sewage into the river in a continuing monument to the bad planning of the past hundred years. Shell fish are already gone. Oysters disappeared generations ago. The shad are diminishing and the whole striped bass fishing industry is threatened. Some 60 years ago, when the towering world-famous Palisades were first threatened by quarry operations, men of foresight and wisdom began a crusade to preserve this valley for posterity. Out of many joint efforts and generous contributions, we have the network of parks which supposedly were to protect for all times the valleys and the shores.

"Last November, the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Natural Resources, chaired by the Honorable R. Watson Pomeroy, held hearings to receive recommendations as to the future of the Hudson Valley. The testimony of witness after witness demonstrated that life along the river must be subjected to plan, change, and control. A program that encompasses the many separate interests and the public interest is dictated by necessity.

"I believe that the bill I have introduced here today will lead to such a program."

On February 16, 1965, New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Natural Resources on the Hudson River Valley reported:

"The Hudson River constitutes one of the greatest natural resources of the State of New York. The river and its valley have long been recognized as one of the outstanding scenic beauties of the world.

"In recent years the growth of population and the expansion of industrial, commercial, and urban areas have had an ever-increasing effect on the river and its shores. In many cases the result has been a deterioration or even a destruction of the scenic grandeur or other natural resources.

"These influences have been gradual and generally have occurred in diverse areas, so that there was no concentration of attention on them. Some local communities have initiated programs to arrest the deterioration, but these efforts have been isolated and generally in older cities and towns which have expanded away from the river. Also, the legislature became concerned about the contamination and pollution of the river and enacted some laws in an endeavor to reduce the pollution."

The joint committee called for further extensive study and investigation aimed at the protection of the Hudson River and its shores.

Subsequently, Senator R. Watson Pomeroy, chairman of the joint committee, introduced in Albany legislation seeking to establish a lower Hudson River Valley Heritage Commission to study ways and means of preserving and enhancing the Hudson River and its valley.

On March 4, 1965, the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway bill, S. 3186, was introduced in the Senate of the United States by Senators KENNEDY and JAVITS.

Senator KENNEDY said regarding this bill:

"Consideration of this bill is essential because of pending encroachments on the Hudson and a heightened national awareness of the need to preserve those areas constituting our national heritage. The shores of the river have been threatened by a plan to erect a pumped-storage hydroelectric plant at Storm King Mountain. Housing developments are located where they diminish the majesty of the Palisades. Trails, paths and vistas that now delight the eye are threatened by the unnatural encroachment of man. We have an opportunity to act now; to save this area; we may not have another opportunity."

And Senator JAVITS stated:

"The enactment of this legislation will give us a chance, for the first time, to demonstrate what can be done to save our urban river areas from blight. This is a great opportunity to use the Hudson—which has such potential for recreation and scenic preservation—for pleasure, and not for pollution, for conservation as well as commerce. The Hudson Valley is one of the most beautiful, most unique areas of its kinds in the United States. Before its natural magnificence is destroyed forever, let us act together to make the valley a model of conservation, recreation facilities and redevelopment which could be followed in other dense population areas of the Nation."

On March 20, 1965, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller announced the establishment of the Hudson River Valley Commission under the chairmanship of Laurance S. Rockefeller to develop plans and make recommendations for the best use and conservation of the Hudson River as a natural resource.

On April 1, 1965, the Hudson Highlands Committee of the New York State Council of Parks reported to Mr. Laurance S. Rockefeller, chairman of the State council of parks, on the preliminary study that had been made by the committee on the lower Hudson River. The committee said in its report:

"The Hudson River—from its Palisades, through its Highlands Gorge, to its clean headwaters in the Adirondack Mountains—is one of the most majestically beautiful rivers in the United States. Its priceless and irreplaceable beauty is being destroyed by uncoordinated, piecemeal exploitation and neglect. This misuse of a great resource can be stopped only if people find acceptable and effective ways of controlling and guiding use programs toward compatibility, for the greatest public benefit."

The committee said:

"We realize that the river has many values and potentialities that must be recognized in formulating plans for their protection and compatible development. In our study of the Palisades-Highlands section of the river we have identified areas of major value (a) for scenic, historic, recreational, and cultural interest, (b) for residential and institutional purposes, and (c) for commerce and industry, as set forth in the attached report. We suggest consideration of the possibilities of acquiring title to lands, easements, or other suitable interest in the areas of scenic and recreation value and that the possibilities of more effective zoning for the residential and institutional, and commercial and industrial areas be explored."

The fact that the conservation and enhancement of the scenic, recreation, and historic values of the lower Hudson River Valley was a major issue of concern to various public agencies, officials, and private individuals and organizations was long apparent. On November 20, 1964, a representative of the Department of the Interior, testifying before the New York State Joint Legislation Committee on Natural Resources, said:

"The scenic grandeur of the Hudson is well known throughout the world; and whatever plans are proposed which might alter the landscape of this area are, of course, not only of interest to the citizens of New York State but to the people of this Nation as a whole."

And then, on December 13, 1964, the Department of the Interior's Secretary, Stewart L. Udall, was reported by the New York Herald Tribune as exploring the idea of designating the Hudson River in the vicinity of the scenic highlands, as a national scenic riverway, and that he had spoken to the President about it.

Then, on January 6, 1965, the Department of the Interior, speaking through its Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, reiterated:

"The scenic grandeur of the Hudson River is, of course, well known. It is recognized that whatever plans are proposed which might alter the landscape of this area are of widespread concern. It is also evident that there are complex technical, economic, and scenic questions involved in consideration of the various alternative uses to be made of the water and land resources associated with the urbanized lower Hudson River."

On March 22, 1965, the Department of the Interior issued a statement, saying:

"The Department of Interior is prepared to render whatever assistance it can to the State, to local governments, and other interested organizations, so that the values of the lower Hudson may be conserved for the benefit of the American people."

On April 6, 1965, the White House stated: "As you know, the President has expressed personal interest in the resources of the Hudson River Valley. * * * The bills to establish a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway are now being reviewed in the executive branch. These proposals would have substantial physical, economic, and social impact upon this section of the Hudson River and would involve the responsibility of the Federal, State, and local governments."

Along with these developments in Washington and Albany, citizen action has sprung up intended to save the Hudson River. The Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference has dramatized and vigorously fought the danger of incompatible development in the Hudson River Highlands area and has urged a program of long-range permanent protection.

BRAZIL SUPPORTS U.S. POLICY, PAYS TRIBUTE TO EDITOR CHARLES J. LEWIN

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Keith] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, this country—like it or not—has a heavy burden to bear in many parts of the world today. American lives have been spent in foreign lands, as well as millions of American dollars. Too often, the only thanks we get is in the form of a mob demonstration against our policies, a riot in front of an American embassy or the by now familiar slogan, "Yankee Go Home."

Most of us realize, of course, that we are not in a popularity contest with student mobs or Communist-led demonstrators, and we know that gratitude for our efforts, for the blood that is shed and the money that is freely given, is of little consequence if we achieve our ultimate goal—peace and at least the promise of prosperity for all people, and the right of those people to choose for themselves the form of government under which they can live peaceful and productive lives.

It is gratifying, however, when friends in an hour of need come forward with open signs of their friendship and support. Such was the case in New Bedford, Mass., last weekend when the distinguished Ambassador from Brazil, Juracy Magalhaes, reaffirmed his country's support of our position in the Dominican Republic and our efforts to prevent the birth of another armed Communist camp in Latin America.

Symbolic of Brazil's friendship and respect for the United States was the presentation of a singular award to the editor of one of this country's finest newspapers, Charles J. Lewin, of the Standard-Times.

On behalf of his country, Ambassador Magalhaes presented Mr. Lewin the Lauro Muller Medal, an award given only once before in the United States—to Harvard president, Dr. Nathan W. Pusey—and is given only to those who have proven to an outstanding degree their good will and friendship.

As the longtime editor of a highly regarded newspaper, one whose influence in public affairs is felt far beyond the limits of its circulation, "Charlie" Lewin has many friends and admirers in Washington and throughout the country who will be interested in learning of this award and who can confirm his leadership and many individual contributions to journalism and to the promotion of many worthy civic causes.

With the permission of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of an article from the Sunday Standard-Times of May 23, reporting the presentation of the Lauro Muller Medal, and the accompanying comments of the Ambassador at this point in the Record:

Honored at Dinner Here: Envoy Says Brazil Supports United States

Referring to himself as "an old friend of this country," Brazil's ambassador to the United States, Juracy Magalhaes, reaffirmed his country's support of U.S. foreign policy, during a luncheon in his honor yesterday. In an obvious reference to U.S. actions in the Dominican Republic, Ambassador Magalhaes told guests at the Wamsutta Club, "Brazil is trying to support your policy in the Organization of American States, in the United Nations and in the whole world."

The ambassador and Mrs. Magalhaes and their party took time from a hurried tour of Greater New Bedford to preside at the luncheon in their honor, given by Mayor Harrington.

MEDAL PRESENTED

Attending the early afternoon luncheon were the mayor, Dr. Marcio M. Bueno, honorary consul of Brazil in New Bedford; Vasco A. Villela, consul of Portugal in New Bedford; Charles J. Lewin, editor and general manager of the Standard-Times, and representatives of the Portuguese community here.

Highlight of ceremonies at the Wamsutta Club was the presentation of the Lauro Muller Medal to Mr. Lewin by Ambassador Magalhaes on behalf of his country.

The medal, awarded by Brazil to those who have proved themselves believers in friendship, is given in memory of a former secretary of state of Brazil.

The Lauro Muller award went to Mr. Lewin as a representative of the American press, and is only the second time such a medal has been granted. Harvard University President Nathan W. Pusey is the only other recipient, as a representative of American education.

Secretary Muller, who served in that position from 1912 to 1918, was the grandfather of Dr. Bueno, whose family selects the recipients.

NOTES FRIENDSHIP

In accepting the medal, Mr. Lewin noted the friendship that has grown between the two countries. He noted the landing yesterday of 1,250 Brazilian troops in the Dominican Republic, emphasizing that the peacekeeping force will be under command of a Brazilian.

"This is indicative evidence," Mr. Lewin said, "of the respect that the people of this country have for the Government of Brazil."

Following the luncheon, Ambassador and Mrs. Magalhaes and their party left for the home of Dr. Bueno, where they received an estimated 300 to 400 guests in an atmosphere international enough to contain Greater New Bedford residents of all national origins.

Mr. Magalhaes was appointed to his diplomatic position last July, following a distinguished career both in government and in private enterprise.

HOLDS MAJOR-GENERAL RANK

He is a native of Fortaleza, Caera, and was graduated from the Brazilian Military Academy. He also has studied in various military colleges both in Brazil and in the United States, and holds the rank of major-general (Reserve).

Active in political life since an early age, he was the Federal intervenor, state of Bahia, and was elected governor of that state in 1935. He resigned in 1937, and was elected to Congress in 1946. He represented Bahia in the House of Representatives until 1950, taking part in drafting of the present Brazilian Federal Constitution.

Ambassador Magalhaes returned to private enterprise in 1950, and is now on leave of absence to serve in his diplomatic capacity.

He is holder of many Brazilian decorations.

WIFE LOVES UNITED STATES

Mr. and Mrs. Magalhaes have a son, Jutahy, an industrialist in Brazil and Legislative Assembly president, and five grandchildren.

"I love your country, your people," Ambassador Magalhaes said yesterday. "I feel that I am doing my part to help relations between our two countries."

Mrs. Magalhaes also expressed her interest in and appreciation of the United States. She especially enjoys life in Washington, terming it "hectic, but wonderful."

Other members of Ambassador Magalhaes' official party who toured the city yesterday were Ignacio Barros Barreto, a lawyer with Inter-American Development Bank, and Mrs. Barreto; Henrique Valle, Jr., third secretary at the Brazilian Embassy, and Mrs. Valle.

ORDERLY MARKETING ACT OF 1965

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Keith] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I have joined today with several of my colleagues from the New England States in filing legislation designed to protect American industry from the economic undermining that comes with excessive imports. Titled "The Orderly Marketing Act of 1965," this bill provides industry, labor, and the Government a new and useful mechanism for protecting domestic industry without resorting to undue protectionism.

This proposal would allow us to bring into balance our trade policies, which too often in the past, and currently, have favored foreign industry at the expense of our own and have resulted in severe economic dislocation in many cases and the loss of thousands of jobs.

It is a rational and reasonable bill because it allows foreign competitors to share in the growth of our economy, yet it enables us to check the flow of imports when they become excessive and when they become destructive to our own economy. This bill also would make more readily available to industry and labor trade adjustment assistance, which has been an important principle of the Trade Adjustment Act, but which has also been virtually inaccessible to affected industries because of, in my opinion, overly stringent requirements of qualification under that act.

The alarming rate of increase of shoe imports dramatized the need for this type of legislation, and the shoe industry has been primarily responsible for bringing this need to the attention of my colleagues and myself. But the relief provided for industry in this bill is not limited to the shoe industry. Any domestic industry or labor group can seek aid under this proposed program if conditions warrant such help.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to give this bill serious consideration. Industries throughout the country, particularly those with high labor input, where low-wage foreign competition is most prevalent, can use the relief and assistance it will provide.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GRIDER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for May 27, 1965, on account of official business.

To Mr. KIRWAN (at the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI), for Thursday, May 27, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. STEPHENS) on account of official business.

To Mr. ASPINALL for the period after 5 p.m. Thursday, May 27, 1965, until June 1, 1965, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to: Mr. FUQUA, for 30 minutes, on May 27.

Mr. WAGGONNER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN), for 10 minutes, on May 27, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FINO and to include a statement.

Mr. WAGGONNER to revise and extend his remarks on his special order today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. NELSEN to include extraneous matter in the remarks made in Committee of the Whole on agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. KASTENMEIER (at the request of Mr. Dow) and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $392.

Mr. MICHEL (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN) during debate on H.R. 8370 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN) during debate on H.R. 8370 and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN) during debate on H.R. 8370 and to include extraneous matter.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.

Mr. TALCOTT in two instances.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mr. MICHEL.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Dow) and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POWELL.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. FUQUA.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. DENT.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 199. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of the Jefferson Construction Co.;

H.R. 1870. An act for the relief of Edward G. Morhauser;

H.R. 2139. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes;

H.R. 2354. An act for the relief of William L. Chatelain, U.S. Navy, retired; and

H.R. 3995. An act to transfer certain functions of the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of the Jefferson Construction Co.;

H.R. 1870. An act for the relief of Edward G. Morhauser;

H.R. 2139. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes;

H.R. 2354. An act for the relief of William L. Chatelain, U.S. Navy, retired;

H.R. 3995. An act to transfer certain functions of the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6497. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States;

H.R. 8122. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 436. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 27, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1160. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of four bills designed to help make our Nation's roads and highways to the enjoyment of nature and beauty (H. Doc. No. 191); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

1161. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of violations of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1162. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of additional costs incurred under the dairy products price-support program by purchasing butter outside the general areas of production, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1163. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of loss of revenue resulting from inadequate negotiations for communication services between Alaska and the U.S. mainland, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1164. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of additional overpayments of rentals for automatic data processing machines at Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md., National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1165. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide an increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1166. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relative to premium pay under specified conditions to certain employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1167. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 28, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a modification of the John Day lock and dam, Columbia River, Wash. and Oreg., authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act approved August 12, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

1168. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 13, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations on a modification of the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kans., authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act approved August 12, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 7042. A bill to amend section 402(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 376). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 401. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 5306, a bill to continue the authority of domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors; without amendment (Rept. No. 377). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 402. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7847, a bill to amend the Small Business Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 378). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 3157. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits; with amendment (Rept. No. 379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 7954. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to conform to the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, London (1960); with amendment (Rept. No. 380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 8464. A bill to provide, for the period beginning on July 1, 1965, and ending on June 30, 1966, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 8465. A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 8466. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of insurance premium finance companies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 8467. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8468. A bill to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing duty-free treatment for certain corkboard insulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 8469. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 8470. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 7-percent increase in all annuities and pensions payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 8471. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over nonprofit cooperatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 8472. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the tax on long-term capital gains realized by individuals with respect to property condemned by a governmental unit or sold as a result of the threat or imminence of such condemnation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8473. A bill to make the birthday of Abraham Lincoln a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 8474. A bill—Orderly Marketing Act of 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 8475. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 8476. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 8477. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 8478. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the retailers excise taxes, certain manufacturers excise taxes, the taxes on admissions, dues, communications, and transportation of persons, and certain other excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8479. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8480. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on communications services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 8481. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 8482. A bill prohibiting use in the commission of certain crimes of firearms transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on th Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 8483. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct Crooked Creek Dam and Reservoir on the Crooked Creek in Boone County, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 8484. A bill to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of members of the Armed Forces on a change of permanent station; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 8485. A bill to encourage the needy blind to enroll in rehabilitation programs by prohibiting State residence requirement in assistance to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 8486. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over nonprofit cooperatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 8487. A bill to broaden the purposes for which Federal-aid secondary highway funds may be used; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 8488. A bill to broaden the purposes for which Federal-aid secondary highway funds may be used; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 8489. A bill to provide for the control of outdoor advertising along certain Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 8490. A bill to provide for the control of outdoor advertising along certain Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 8491. A bill to provide for the control of junkyards along certain Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 8492. A bill to provide for the control of junkyards along certain Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 8493. A bill to provide for landscaping and scenic enhancement of Federal-aid highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 8494. A bill to provide for landscaping and scenic enhancement of Federal-aid highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 8495. A bill to promote the orderly replacement and expansion of the nonsubsidized merchant fleet and the commercial fishing fleet of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 8496. A bill to amend section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 8497. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the area of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 8498. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 8499. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 8500. A bill to amend the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959 to permit certain veterans to receive pensions under title 38 of the United States Code, as in effect on June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUOT:

H.R. 8501. A bill arranging for orderly marketing of certain imported articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 8502. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Canton Federal reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 8503. A bill prohibiting use in the commission of certain crimes of firearms transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 8504. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Feed Grain Act of 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 8505. A bill arranging for orderly marketing of certain imported articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8506. A bill to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase the duty on prepared and preserved mushrooms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 8507. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 8508. A bill to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to increase the permissible State and local matching of Federal funds used for construction of facilities for public community colleges and public technical institutes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8509. A bill prohibiting use in the commission of certain crimes of firearms transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 8510. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 8511. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 8512. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 8513. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 8514. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 8515. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 8516. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 8517. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 8518. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLENN ANDREWS:

H.R. 8519. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 8520. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 8521. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 8522. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 8523. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 8524. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 8525. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 8526. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 8527. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 8528. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 8529. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 8530. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 8531. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 8532. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 8533. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 8534. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 8535. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 8536. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 8537. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 8538. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 8539. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 8540. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 8541. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 8542. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 8543. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 8544. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8545. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 8546. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 8547. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 8548 A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8549. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 8550. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 8551. A bill to amend the Antidump-Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 8552. A bill to amend the Antidump-Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 8553. A bill to amend the Antidump-Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 8554. A bill to amend the Antidump-Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 8555. A bill to amend the Antidump-Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 8556. A bill to amend the Antidump-Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 8557. A bill to amend the Antidump-Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 8558. A bill to amend the Antidump-Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 8559. A bill to amend the Antidump-Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 8560. A bill to amend the Antidump-Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 8561. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 8562. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 8563. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Alabama:

H.R. 8564. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 8565. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 8566. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 8567. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 8568. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 8569. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 8570. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 8571. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 8572. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 8573. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 8574. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 8575. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 8576. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8577. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 8578. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 8579. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 8580. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 8581. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 8582. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 8583. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 8584. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 8585. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 8586. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 8587. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 8588. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 8589. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 8590. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 8591. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 8592. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 8593. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 8594. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 8595. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 8596. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 8597. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.J. Res. 484. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 485. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 486. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.J. Res. 487. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. Con. Res. 423. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Con. Res. 424. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the legislative branch of Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. Con. Res. 425. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. Con. Res. 426. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," at the 25th class reunion of the Harvard class of 1940 in Cambridge, Mass.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. Con. Res. 427. Concurrent resolution designating the month of June as Community and Natural Beauty Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

283. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

284. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the election of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 8598. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Cracchiolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8599. A bill for the relief of Benito Ferranti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8600. A bill for the relief of Georgia Christos Manolakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8601. A bill for the relief of Paraskevi and Christos Basile Manolakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 8602. A bill for the relief of Miss Veronica Guitelen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 8603. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jean J. Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 8604. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Desolina Giannone (nee Delucchi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.R. 8605. A bill for the relief of Miyoko Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 8606. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Rosario DiBella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 8607. A bill for the relief of Miss Lydia M. Rahman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 8608. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antoine Arrege; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8609. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro A. Sevidal, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 8610. A bill for the relief of Mansueto R. Dimailig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 8611. A bill to provide for payment of interest on overtime compensation owing to employees of the Alaska Railroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8612. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Duarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8613. A bill for the relief of Wieslawa Drzewiecka Pawlowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 8614. A bill for the relief of Miss Rajka Soda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1965

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1965)

The Senate met at 9 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mankind: Standing in the midst of swift social currents and lurking evil forces whose hideous cruelty stabs our anguished sympathies, we confess that the world in which our lot is cast is too much for us if we front it alone.

Because there is no solution of the world's ills save as it springs from the enthronement of Thy righteous will in the hearts of men, we pray for ourselves—Create within us clean hearts, O God, and renew right spirits within us.

Give us to see that the pride of nations, their covetousness, their greed, their assaults upon the rights of others, are the very evils that lie in wait to corrode our own souls.

"Breathe on us, breath of God,
  Fill us with new life anew,
That we may love what Thou dost love
  And do what Thou wouldst do."

In the dear Redeemer's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself one-half minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceeding of Tuesday, May 25, 1965, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 210

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 210 and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Maryland to the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to strike out the two commas and the words "other than aliens and persons in active military service and their dependents".

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time does the Senator from Maryland yield himself?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The amendment would remove from the provisions of section 4 the words "other than aliens and persons in active military service and their dependents." This provision has to do with the tally or computation of the 50 percent of persons voting or registered.

When these words were included in the original bill, it was not realized that the Census Bureau would be confronted with the troublesome question of determining the facts in regard to these figures. So the principal reason for adopting the amendment is to avoid very troublesome questions which might arise in litigation under the act with respect to the correctness of the determinations of the Bureau of the Census. The Bureau of the Census has no published figures on military personnel, dependents, and aliens. Estimates and projections would have to be made particularly with respect to the military dependent figure. The reliability of these estimates and projections can be expected to be attacked in the courts. One problem with all of the categories is that exact figures concerning them are not available on a voting age basis.

While the necessity for computing and excluding figures for these categories is liable to be very troublesome, not much is to be gained by requiring this to be done. According to our best estimates, there are only eight counties which would be covered by the bill with this change that would not be covered without the change. Two of these counties are in Alaska—election districts Nos. 12 and 17; three in North Carolina—Craven, Cumberland, and Hyde Counties; and two counties—Nottaway and Prince George, as well as the independent city of Hampton in Virginia. Thus, the actual effect with respect to coverage will be minimal.

The House bill does not contain an exclusion for military personnel, their dependents, and aliens. The amendment would thus remove an unnecessary point of difference with the House bill.

At present, the Bureau of the Census does not have figures for the number of aliens, military personnel, and dependents resident in each State on November 1, 1964. The collection of these figures will take time and until they are collected and buttressed with substantial proof, the Director of the Bureau of the Census will, as an honest civil servant, not be prepared to certify to the population figures required to set this law in motion. Thus, the whole voting mechanism which we are seeking to establish here will be held up pending the collection of these really unimportant figures.

The Senate, on Monday, adopted an amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], which calls for a study by the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General to determine the extent of discrimination in voting against military personnel. This study will indicate whether there are appreciable numbers of military personnel resident in our States who are denied the right to vote. Pending the completion of that study, it would be premature and unnecessary to exclude military personnel from the number of persons considered eligible to register to vote.

If the numbers of military personnel, dependents, and aliens are to be deducted from the population figures, equity would demand that those persons who are voting in the State by absentee ballot should be added. Roughly speaking, the two figures should cancel each other out.

For these reasons, I ask that the Senate adopt the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nominations of 586 second lieutenants in the Regular Air Force, 843 officers for appointments in the Regular Army in grades not above that of major, and 1,078 appointments and promotions in the Navy and Marine Corps in grades not above that of lieutenant commander. These lists contain the names of distinguished military graduates of the ROTC and graduates of the three military academies.

Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

John C. Aarni, Jr., and sundry other cadets, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Ralph W. Adams, Jr., and sundry other cadets, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Richard D. Bayer, and sundry other midshipmen, U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Thomas R. Dooley, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army;

James L. Abbot III, and sundry other midshipmen (Naval Academy), for appointment in the Navy;

Robert R. Butterfield, and sundry other U.S. Miliary Academy graduates, for appointment in the Marine Corps; and

Paul R. Aadnesen, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Wilbur J. Cohen, of Michigan, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission be considered en bloc.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for the RECORD, will the distinguished majority leader inform the Senate whether these nominations have been cleared with the minority?

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 30 seconds. I have submitted certain questions to be answered by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., who is slated to be Chairman of the Commission. I favor the confirmation of his nomination and the four other nominees to the Commission. Also, I invite attention to the fact that the questions submitted to Mr. Roosevelt and answers will appear in the record of the hearing, which is not yet before the Senate. In evaluating the work of the Commission, these answers will be important.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission are considered and confirmed en bloc.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Public Health Service be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself as much of the 1 hour allotted to me as may be needed to complete my remarks.

I have spoken only twice on the pending measure. The first time was on the opening day of debate, when I invited attention to the results of the undue haste which had been involved in reporting the bill to the Senate. This had resulted in some false statements in the report of the committee.

In that report it was stated that three good counties of Florida were included within the provisions of the bill, when they should not have been. I have shown by the record that those three counties, of Gadsden, Jefferson, and Union, should never have been included in that classification, because in each case they were not subject to the charge that less than 25 percent of their nonwhite citizens of voting age had been registered for voting. My second speech was on the poll-tax question.

I have listened to the debate throughout the 5 weeks. I have participated only through colloquies; but I desire, before the debate ends, to state my unqualified opposition to the bill and to this method of approach to this serious, critical, vital question.

There has been much debate on the unconstitutional aspects of the bill, in which I completely concur; but I shall not waste the time of the Senate at this late hour in the debate to discuss those unconstitutional aspects. There has been much talk about the poor policy that is involved in the four corners of the bill. I shall devote my time today only to discussing a portion of the unutterably poor psychology which is involved in this sort of approach to a human question, a question that cannot be properly solved by this type of bill.

Mr. President, I note in yesterday's Washington Star a column by Mr. David Lawrence. I so completely agree with statements contained in that article that I ask unanimous consent that the column of Mr. David Lawrence published in yesterday's Washington Star be printed at this point in the RECORD. The article is entitled "Vote Bill Recalls Tragic Era."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTE BILL RECALLS TRAGIC ERA

On the day the voting rights bill becomes law, a Federal dictatorship will begin. Some States will, for all practical purposes, be driven out of the Union. They will not be able—as is the privilege of all other States—to enact and enforce certain laws unless the Attorney General of the United States, or perhaps subsequently a Federal court, declares that such State laws may be permitted to operate.

One provision of the pending bill specifies that certain States shall not be allowed to prescribe the qualifications for their own voters if the U.S. Attorney General determines that a "test or device" has been used during the 5 preceding years for purposes of discrimination in individual cases.

The phrase "test or device" is defined as any requirement that, as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting, a person must "demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, demonstrate any education achievement or his knowledge of any particular subject, possess good moral character, or prove his qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class."

The Federal Government, therefore, becomes the judge of whether certain State laws—although duplicating statutes existing in several other States of the Union—shall be permitted to operate at all in what might be called suspicious States.

While there is a provision for court review, the whole issue turns on the circumstance that what is lawful in one State of the Union could be judged unlawful in some other State—based wholly on suspicion of alleged abuse or misuse of power.

Hitherto, whenever the Constitution has been violated, the courts have been in a position to punish the guilty individuals, including State officials. But this is the first time that a whole State is to be deprived of its constitutional right to set voter qualifications, even though these may be identical with State laws in other parts of the country which are being left untouched. The phrase "equal protection of the law" becomes a mockery so far as the Federal Government is concerned.

What is happening today is reminiscent of the tragic era of 100 years ago, when Congress disregarded the doctrine of Abraham Lincoln about an "indivisible union," and actually expelled from the Union certain of the Southern States. The whole theory of the Lincoln administration was that there was no right of secession and that the Southern States were a part of the Union, though in rebellion. Indeed, after the War Between the States was over and peace had been proclaimed between the North and the South by President Lincoln, the 13th amendment to the Constitution—abolishing slavery—was submitted in the usual way and the legislatures of the South ratified it.

One year later, however, when the 14th amendment was submitted and the same legislatures in the Southern States rejected it, Congress threw those Southern States out of the Union, denied them seats in Congress and prescribed by law a set of conditions before they could be readmitted to the Union.

New legislatures thereupon were set up, and Federal troops were used to coerce them into "ratifying" the proposed amendment. When the required number of States, including those in the South, had voted for "ratification," Secretary of State Seward was doubtful about the legality of the process and hesitated to proclaim the amendment as having been adopted. Congress, however, by resolution, ordered him to do so anyway.

> The action naturally was protested, and efforts were made to get the Supreme Court of the United States to pass on the issue of improper procedure in the "ratification" of a constitutional amendment. But the High Court declined to hear any case on this point, contending that it was a "political" matter. Not until the recent reapportionment cases did the Supreme Court consent to hear or decide what it called political cases.
>
> Since the voting rights bill which is about to become law deprives certain Southern States of the right to set voter qualifications and puts them indefinitely under supervision by the U.S. Department of Justice and the courts, efforts will be made, of course, to get the Supreme Court to pass judgment on the constitutionality of such a procedure.
>
> Meanwhile it is surprising that so many men in Congress who are familiar with constitutional law have hesitated to come out in the open and criticize what is being done, though privately many of them express grave doubts about the constitutionality or the wisdom of such coercive legislation. For if the precedent is set and the Supreme Court upholds it, a Federal dictatorship can—by mere act of Congress—operate to deprive any State or group of States at any time of any rights or privileges specifically delegated to the States under the explicit words of the Constitution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this article is written not by a southern zealot, either from the House or Senate, not by a racist, but by a person who is trying to assay honestly the unfortunate aspects of the bill from its unconstitutional import and the unfortunate effect which it will have. I am sorry to say that my distinguished friends who have thrown themselves into this battle with ardor and zeal, thinking that they will get a worthwhile bill, are destined to be seriously disappointed with the results which will accrue.

I read a few short paragraphs from Mr. David Lawrence's column. They read:

> On the day the voting rights bill becomes law, a Federal dictatorship will begin. Some States will, for all practical purposes, be driven out of the Union. They will not be able—as is the privilege of all other States—to enact and enforce certain laws unless the Attorney General of the United States, or perhaps subsequently a Federal court, declares that such State laws may be permitted to operate.
>
> One provision of the pending bill specifies that certain States shall not be allowed to prescribe the qualifications for their own voters if the U.S. Attorney General determines that a "test or device" has been used during the 5 preceding years for purposes of discrimination in individual cases.

Mr. President, I read the closing statement in the article:

> For if the precedent is set and the Supreme Court upholds it, a Federal dictatorship can—by mere act of Congress—operate to deprive any State or group of States at any time of any rights or privileges specifically delegated to the States under the explicit words of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I shall not weary the Senate by a long argument on the constitutional aspects of the bill. However, I do state in the very beginning that Mr. Lawrence analyzed this subject from an objective standpoint. Mr. Lawrence is by no means to be considered a racist. He sees the objections which are so deeply engrained in the bill and which cannot help, at least in my opinion and in his, but create a Federal dictatorship. I shall endeavor in my talk to show the result of such an approach.

Some people say, "The United States of today is not the United States of the Reconstruction period." Of course, that is true. People say that the bitterness, the hatred, the violence, the night riders, the Ku Klux Klan, and the violence which erupted at that time cannot erupt because this is a different age and a different time. I wish that statement were true. However, it so happens that human nature is still the same. The deep-rooted feeling of Americans that local and State governments should prevail, as the Constitution requires, in certain vital fields, still exists in many hearts. Despite the good intention of those who sponsor the bill, this deep-rooted feeling will come forth as surely as we are standing here in the Chamber of the U.S. Senate today.

This feeling will erupt in violence, for which we shall all be heartily ashamed. We shall all deplore this as not being in accord with what was intended by the authors and sponsors of the bill.

Florida is not affected by the bill in any serious way. Therefore, I believe that I am able to discuss this matter from a standpoint that, in many respects, is objective. There is no poll tax in our State. We have no literacy test. We have no counties with less than 25 percent of the Negroes of voting age registered with the exception of Liberty and Lafayette Counties, which I shall mention in a moment. The three counties which were mentioned in the report, Gadsden, Jefferson, and Union, as being in that classification were clearly shown by the report of the Secretary of State which I had printed in the RECORD on an earlier occasion in this debate, not to be within that classification.

The only two counties which could be even remotely affected are the two small forest-product counties of Liberty and Lafayette.

I want the RECORD to show, as small as the effect of the bill would be on my State, that as a predicate for what I am about to say, there are in Liberty County, according to the census of 1960, only 240 nonwhites of voting age.

In Lafayette County there are 152 nonwhites of voting age. There are less than 400 nonwhites of voting age in these two counties. That would be much less than the average size of one precinct in a State which has more than 2,000 precincts. Furthermore, these are forest products counties. The Negro population does not live in towns because there are no sizable towns in those counties. The Negro population is scattered through the forests, living in small villages and camps. The standard of education there is very low, and it is easily understood why the Negro citizens have lagged in voting registrations in those two particular counties.

Mr. President, I believe that the Senate knows that the State of Florida has grappled with this problem of voting rights for our citizens. We eliminated the poll tax in 1937. We never had a literacy test in modern times. We have welcomed Negroes to the voting booths. More than 300,000 Negroes are now qualified to vote. Most of them do vote.

The State of Florida, through its Senators and Representatives and the submission of the 24th amendment to the Constitution, knocked out the poll tax requirement for all Federal elections. I am happy and proud that the Florida legislature, when it came to ratifying that amendment, did so by a vote of 105 to 3 in the House, and by a vote of 36 to 6 in the State Senate.

We have tried to grapple with these problems. We have maintained relative calm, relative understanding, relative peace and tranquility in our State between the races.

It is from the standpoint of a Senator speaking for a State such as Florida that I want to say what I foresee will, in the future, result from the enactment of this particular coercive and unconstitutional legislation.

It happens that within the past few weeks there has appeared within an authoritative journal—The Florida Historical Quarterly, of April, 1965—a scholarly article on the subject "Curbing of Voter Intimidation in Florida, 1871," written by a member of the faculty of the University of Florida, Ralph L. Peek, who is a highly skilled man. This article is written in an objective way, and, incidentally, is authenticated by 94 notes which appear to show the source of the records from which he takes his information.

I shall not encumber the RECORD by having the 15 pages of this article printed in the RECORD, although I believe that it is well worthy of the serious consideration of every Senator. However, I wish to read certain things that appear in the article which clarify the background and the terrible story of the murder, the burnings, and the court trials, which were such a travesty, that occurred in the State of Florida in 1871 and 1872 as the result of the passage of the Reconstruction Act followed by the Voting Act of 1870, exactly on the same subject as this measure.

Let me read the first paragraph:

> The National Republican administration by early 1870, was aware that large-scale intimidation of Negro voters throughout the South was effectively curbing Negro voting and hurting the party. Consequently, legislation was proposed to protect Negro rights by enforcing the 15th amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. President, do we learn anything from history? Has anybody ever turned back to see if this program has ever been tried before, what the effort was, and what the result of the effort was?

I know the Senate will pass the bill, but I hope Senators will recall that at least one voice was raised to point out that exactly the same path was trod before, and the results were disastrous to the very objectives that those who passed it had in mind.

I am not questioning the good objectives of those who passed the act of 1870 and the other reconstruction acts. They thought they were angels of mercy, bringing balm to reconcile the differences and bring good feeling between the two races. The results showed so exactly the opposite that I had hoped that those who proposed this measure would realize that they are not breaking new ground. They are treading the same paths that resulted so disastrously and that resulted possibly in the election of one man as U.S. President, and had put in his place a man who may not have been elected on the basis of actual returns, on the promise that troops would be withdrawn from the South. I refer to the selection of Hayes over Tilden, who was announced as having won the election by one quarter of a million votes, which was a great many votes.

This article shows that Representatives and Senators in those earlier days were treading the same path which the well-meaning sponsors of the bill are treading today; and remember that this is a documented article, written by a scholarly man, from a completely objective point of view, writing about one of the most disastrous periods in the history of my own State, of which we are terribly ashamed, and which we do not want to see duplicated in the States particularly affected by the problems and against which this bill is directed. Continuing to read:

> On February 21, 1870, Representative John Bingham, of Ohio, introduced a bill that was supposed to protect voting rights wherever they were being denied. Administration spokesmen testified that intimidation and violence were keeping Negroes from the polls in several States, and that Federal "force" legislation was needed to protect civil rights in States where politicians refused to accept the new status of the Negro and were unlikely to act to protect him.

Digressing for a moment, that sentence could have been uttered to apply completely to the well-intentioned people who sponsor this action at this time—

> These proponents of Federal action—

And party politics entered into it—

> claimed that a conspiracy in the South was seeking to destroy the Republican Party through the use of violence and terror. Senator Oliver P. Morton, of Indiana, whose appeal was characteristic of the Republican position, called for a law giving the President power to extend the protection into every State, whether or not the Governor requested it, in order that "the lives of loyal men might be protected in the States formerly in rebellion." The provisions of the bill were characterized as a declaration of fundamental constitutional principles and a guarantee of political equality for the Negro. Debate on the bill was extremely limited in the House.

How characteristic of our present situation—

> Democrats were allowed only an hour and a half to present their arguments. Debate in the Senate was bitter and more prolonged, extending until the latter part of May. The bill finally passed and was signed by President Grant on May 31, 1870.

We are retreading the same steps here. In May of 1965, we are going to try exactly the same procedure; and it may even be that President Johnson will sign the bill on May 31, 1965.

Continuing to read:

> The law was described by the Tallahassee Weekly Floridian as an insult and an outrage to southerners and its authors were denounced as "fools and madmen." The 15th amendment, which became law on March 30, 1870, was also "a useless piece of legislation," the paper stated: it granted no rights not already enjoyed by the Negroes, it interfered in the rights of the States to regulate suffrage, and the manner in which it was adopted was illegal.
>
> The Enforcement Act of 1870 contained 23 sections, which aimed at outlawing any denial of the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Mr. President, I shall not continue to read from this enlightening article. I hope Senators who are students of this vital question will take the time to read the article, because it shows what the hopeless failure of passage of that act was and how it resulted in bitterness which has rarely been equaled in our country as between people of the white and Negro races.

To select two or three quotations helter-skelter from the 15-page pamphlet, here is one that speaks about Gadsden County, to which I have already referred, where the Negro population is still greater than that of the white:

> Six individuals were indicted for preventing persons from voting in the Gadsden County election of November 8, 1870. Among these were former Acting Gov. Abraham K. Allison, who, on March 30, 1871, pleaded not guilty. He was convicted on April 3, but a motion was granted for a new trial when it was learned that one of the jurors, David Ellis, was not an American citizen. On April 6, Allison was reindicted for "combining and confederating with others to prevent persons and citizens from voting," and the case was continued to the next term of court. On February 9, 1872, Allison pleaded not guilty a second time, but 3 days later, he was found guilty and was sentenced to serve 6 months in the Leon County jail and to pay a fine of $550. The Weekly Floridian bitterly pointed out that no other verdict could have come from a jury that was composed only of men who could take the ironclad oath.

I digress long enough to say that one of the sections of the bill of 1870 had prescribed that a judge could require that the oath be ironclad; that is, that jurors, or prospective juries, would take an oath that they had not participated in what was called the Act of Rebellion, or the Civil War, so that jurors were composed largely of freed slaves and carpetbaggers mentioned in this article.

Continuing reading:

> A petition calling for Allison's pardon was circulated in Gadsden County and with the signatures of many leading Conservative and Radical citizens it was transmitted to President Grant. Allison, however, served his full sentence despite these efforts.

The Democratic Party then was called the Conservative Party, and the Republican Party was called the Radical Party. How things have changed. How the positions of the two parties and the party leadership have changed on this particular question.

Mr. President, without unduly burdening the Record, let me read one other paragraph:

> In January 1871, U.S. Deputy Marshal J. W. Childs served warrants on four Columbia County men, charging them with violation of the Enforcement Act on the night before the November 1870 election. Childs and a deputy sheriff were forcibly resisted and were prevented from making any arrests. Several bystanders refused to aid the Federal officers, saying that they would "have nothing to do with the damned Radical Enforcement Act." A few days later, Childs returned with a squad of soldiers but the men that he was seeking could not be found.

I believe I should add that up to and including the 1876 presidential elections, Federal soldiers with fixed bayonets were stationed throughout Southern States at the principal polling places.

I happen to know something about that because I have heard my father—who, as a youth, was a Confederate soldier, badly wounded, and never regained his health—tell of the fact that in the first three presidential elections in which he participated, Negro Federal soldiers stood with fixed bayonets guarding the ballot boxes in the polling places.

I invite attention to these incidents, not in an effort to inflame people into thinking about events which embittered the Nation so greatly—because, so far as I am concerned, in my State we have long outgrown those prejudices, as the Record will clearly show—but in order to state for the Record what I believe will be the result of this legislation.

We cannot by coercion, by using unconstitutional means, go into States where the feeling is so deep, where the racial barrier is up, where the gulf is so great, and expect that the Federal Government through that kind of coercion, whether through sending troops—as has recently been necessary in the opinion of the Executive—into certain Southern States, whether by sending in examiners and registrars, as the pending bill would provide; whether by the taking over of judicial functions by the Attorney General as the pending bill would provide; whether by the naming—either by the courts or by the Attorney General—of poll watchers to be present while the votes are cast and while they are being tabulated, to be observers named by the Attorney General—by way of giving those observers rights and privileges which have never heretofore been given, even in Reconstruction days, to any individual official of the U.S. Government—we cannot expect, through such actions, to obtain good results. The bitterness and, I fear, the violence which will follow in the States where the problem is so great, will, I believe, make every Senator who supports the pending bill realize later the futility of his actions and the fact that not only have his good objectives not been attained, but tragic consequences of the kind he had not expected have followed.

Mr. President, let me read another short statement appearing in the article:

> On April 3, 1871, County Clerk John Quincy Dickinson, reportedly one of the last Republican leaders in west Florida, was killed in Marianna as he was returning from work. A former Union soldier and Freedmen's Bureau agent, he had many bitter enemies because of his activities in connection with the sale of lands for delinquent taxes in Jackson County.

It is unfortunately the case that so-called carpetbaggers in county government, State government, and through many parts of the Southland, acquired great estates through the purchase of land for delinquent taxes, because they had a little money in their pockets for that purpose and the South was prostrate at that time. Here is an authenticated, documented incident of the kind of thing which occurred. Incidentally, if anyone reads the article, he will find that not one, but perhaps a dozen officers, from sheriffs to deputy marshals, and various other county courthouse officials, were killed in the course of the 2 years' tragic effort to enforce a law which should never have been enacted.

Mr. President, to conclude, let me quote another paragraph appearing later in the article, which shows the reason for the bitterness and the violence:

> Sentiment in Florida was overwhelmingly against the enforcement program. One observer denounced it as oppression and a "subversion of the principles of Republican government * * * the rights of the people," and an unwarranted concentration of governmental power. Ambrose Hart called "the conduct of the U.S. Government in interfering with the local affairs of this State * * * the most monstrous proceeding that has yet come under my notice." Conservatives denied that the Ku Klux even existed in Florida.

The Ku Klux Klan existed in Florida. It was responsible for much of the violence which occurred. I ask Senators to remember that during the troublous days through which we are passing, that organization which operates in the nighttime and which does violence to the principles which all of us hold dear, and which breaks down the enforcement of law and order, has reappeared in various parts of the South, and is gaining in strength.

I greatly fear that this misdirected step taken in the effort to straighten out these difficulties will only encourage such organizations, and further encourage such acts of violence which will only bring us to realize that, after all, we cannot coerce people into doing what they must learn through experience is the right thing for them to do—and what we have learned for a long time in Florida is something that we should do and which we are now doing.

Mr. President, enactment of the pending bill would be a tragic mistake. There is no question about it. I wish the RECORD to show that that is the way I feel about it, and that in voting against the bill I shall be voting not only against a measure which I believe to be hopelessly unconstitutional, but I shall also be voting against a proposal which I believe is so clothed with tragic consequences to the people whom it is most expected to help that I must raise my voice against the imposition of such an intolerably coercive act upon people who do not believe in this kind of approach, and will never accept it.

There was a deliberate political connotation in the act referred to; and let us note reference to that. Continuing to read the article about the Ku Klux Klan, here is another paragraph:

> President Grant ordered the Secret Service to investigate Ku Klux depredations in the South. Agents infiltrated southern communities, taking jobs, and joining local secret organizations.

Mr. President, need I remind the Senate that that is exactly what is taking place today? The FBI has recently been infiltrating the Klan. We know of the tragedy which occurred in Alabama, and none of us deplores that tragic event more than I do. None of us hopes more than I do that strict enforcement of the law will follow. But, let us note, that path has been trod before by the Federal Government and its agencies.

Continuing reading:

> Agent J. J. O'Toole reported from Jasper that a number of men from Hamilton County were members of an armed band which beat to death a Lowndes County, Ga., Negro named Thompson "because he was too good a Negro." Secret Service Chief Hiram Whitley reported that such organizations were trying to keep Negroes and others from exercising their civil rights.

Mr. President, this is not a new step. This is a step that has been taken before by conscientious people in Southern States, many of whom have solved this problem—and they are the States which have the greatest proportion of the Negro people—and they are still in the process of solving it. They are trying to solve it.

As I said the other day, one house of the Alabama Legislature passed a resolution submitting to the people of Alabama a constitutional amendment abolishing the poll tax. The special session of the legislature adjourned, however, without favorable action having been taken by the other house of the legislature. But that shows how things are going.

When the 38th State, South Dakota, ratified the 24th amendment to the Constitution, the Georgia Legislature was sitting, and one house of that legislature had approved the ratification only an hour or two before final ratification took place in South Dakota.

Why is it that people are so hurried that they forget the facts of history and forget that human nature is still human nature, and forget that in this great melting pot, where millions of white Americans and nonwhite Americans live together, and until recent days in relative peace and quiet, that they insist on causing this kind of troublemaking, coercive, unconstitutional effort to centralize the Federal effort and to make people do what they ought to do, and what they will eventually do through experience and learning how to get things done peacefully?

Mr. President, I close by showing the political connotation in my State of the effort that was a part of the enactment of the voting rights legislation of 1870:

> Florida Republicans had barely won their victories in 1870 and 1872. It would seem that the enforcement acts had been utilized by the party not only to curb violence and intimidation but also as devices to maintain the slim Republican supremacy in Reconstruction Florida.

This is a very informative article. I wish Senators would read it. I wish they would understand that facts of history are against getting any reasonably good results from an act of this coercive nature. It is bound to result in bitterness. It will result in violence. That will be the result, just as sure as we are here.

I pay tribute to my friends of the opposition. They, no doubt, believe they are right. However, they are very much mistaken if they think any good results will be attained in the way of better race relations and better understanding between the white and nonwhite populations in the relatively few States where this question is still active.

Let us go to the next point.

I shudder to think of what will happen in those few States where the problem of full Negro participation in voting is still a serious one as the result of the passage of this coercive legislation. The revival of the Ku Klux Klan recently enhanced acts of violence. The bitterness which has forced political turnovers in some of the other States indicates what we may expect and what always happens when Americans are subjected to force from their central government and are deprived of local self-government, particularly by means which they deeply resent and deeply feel are unconstitutional.

What Florida suffered immediately following the repressive acts of Reconstruction speaks loudly from the biographies of the four Senators who represented Florida in the first years of Reconstruction.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will read this too, because it shows what happens with this kind of approach.

The two Senators sent from the State of Florida in good faith in December 1865, elected by the legislature after the adoption of the 15th amendment, not only nationally but by ourselves, after our approval of that amendment, were both refused their seats. They were Wilkinson Call and William Marvin. Wilkinson Call later came to the Senate in a more peaceful day, and William Marvin became Governor of our State.

They were both refused their seats because of the continuing effort by men of the Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner stripe to enforce the Federal will upon the beaten Southern States and to make citizens there conform to what men of the Stevens type thought they should conform to.

The first Senator to succeed through our class 1 seat was Adonijah S. Welch who was seated June 17, 1868. He was followed by Abijah Gilbert who was seated March 4, 1869. The first Senator to take our class 3 seat was Thomas W. Osborn who was seated June 18, 1868. He was succeeded by Simon B. Conover on March 4, 1873.

Mr. President, these are the men who came to this sacred tribunal to represent the State of Florida in reconstruction days. They had been elected under the reconstruction legislation which I have mentioned only in part up to this time. The Biographical Directory of the American Congress, covering the period from the beginning of the Continental Congress in 1774 to January 3, 1961, gives among other facts the following data about these four Senators.

They may have been very fine men. I do not know. Their names and their deeds are buried in the past. But let us see whether they could have possibly truly represented the State of Florida.

Thomas Ward Osborn was born in New Jersey. He entered the Union army in 1861 as a lieutenant and became a captain and a major, and finally a colonel in 1865, just before the end of the war. He was appointed Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Refugees and Freedmen—and, of course, the freedmen were the freed slaves—for Florida in 1865 and 1866, and settled in Tallahassee. He was a member of the State constitutional convention. He was elected as a Republican to the U.S. Senate—I quote this, because this is such a travesty upon the actual situation which resulted at the end of the war, which had been fought to keep the Union together and to keep all States in the Union—"upon the readmission of Florida," and served from June 25, 1868, to March 3, 1873. He served as U.S. Commissioner at the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia in 1876. He moved to New York City and died there.

So far as our State was concerned, he came in as a Federal Army officer and he served long enough to be a U.S. Senator for one term. He left our State. Then he went back to the north, and died there.

He may have been a good man. But he was a carpetbagger. He was no more representative of the people of Florida than anyone could be under such facts. That is the kind of thing that happened under the legislation which I have mentioned.

The second gentleman whom I have mentioned is Simon Barclay Conover. He was born in New Jersey. He was an Army surgeon in the Civil War. He was assigned to Lake City, Fla., in 1866. He resigned from the Army "upon readmission of the State into the Union" and was appointed State treasurer, and immediately elected a member of the Republican National Committee. He was elected as a Republican to the U.S. Senate and served from March 1873 to March 1879. He did not run for reelection. He moved to Port Townsend, Wash., shortly thereafter, and died there.

Mr. President, I do not think I need to make any comment about this situation, but it is clear that this kind of legislation had a political connotation, besides an unconstitutional connotation, and that it was wholly against the thinking and desires of the people who lived in Florida and who had brought Florida up to that state. Those who came to the Senate under this legislation, which we are trying now to duplicate, were not representatives of our State.

The third gentleman—and so far as I am concerned, they may all have been distinguished gentlemen—was Adonijah Strong Welch. He was born in Connecticut. During the Civil War he served as a field officer in the 2d Regiment, Michigan Volunteer Cavalry.

That means that he was either a major, a lieutenant colonel, or a colonel. He moved to Florida in 1865. He was elected as a Republican to the U.S. Senate and served from June 25, 1868, to March 3, 1869. He declined renomination and moved to Iowa and later to California, where he died.

I shall not make any comment about that gentleman. Perhaps he was a distinguished gentleman, but he certainly was not a Floridian and not a representative of Florida, but instead he was a Federal Army officer, as was the case with all three of those whom I have named.

The fourth was Abijah Gilbert, who was born in New York. He moved to St. Augustine, Fla., in 1865. He was too old to have been in the war, but he came there as soon as the carpetbagger days began. He was elected as a Republican to the U.S. Senate in March of 1869 and served until March 1875. He retired and moved back to Gilbertsville, N.Y., where he died.

I am glad to see my distinguished friend the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in the Chamber, because it is evident that the people of his good State were contributing in a temporary way at that time to the problems we had in Florida.

Since that time citizens of that great State have contributed vastly and in a permanent way to Florida, because following 1877, Hayes was elevated to the Presidency over the Governor of New York, Governor Tilden. I shall always believe Tilden was really elected President—and I make this statement advisedly, for I cannot determine what the facts are. A distinguished commission of 15, by a majority and minority vote of 8 to 7, determined that Tilden had been defeated and that Hayes had been elected. But one of the factors which played a great part in the determination was the promise of President Hayes to remove Federal troops from the States of the South, which he did as soon as he became President.

Mr. President, it was a very long time, from 1865 to 1877, to have that type of legislation—legislation such as we are considering here today—to disturb the public, to defeat the promise of good areas such as our State was, to take that long to find out that the Reconstruction approach was wrong and that the voting approach taken in 1870 by an act in many respects quite similar to the pending bill was destined to failure, and that it brought with it, not settlement of the problem, but great disaster, violence, murder, deaths, and all kinds of criminal acts, which no one who wishes to do the right thing could ever feel were appropriate.

I invite attention to what has happened in Florida since 1877. Our State went back from the Civil War time until 1877, when again we took back the handling of our own business. We took back the passage of our own voting laws. We took back the naming of our own officials. Federal troops were withdrawn. Federal observers at the polls were withdrawn. Now we are trying to put some Federal observers back in those several States which, unlike Florida, are deeply affected by the pending legislation. At once we began to get citizens who came not merely to serve as Senators from Florida for a few years, as carpetbaggers, but who have come to help us make a great State. We have made a great State.

The great State of New York—and I again see my distinguished friend the Senator from New York in the Chamber—has contributed in a vast way by sending to us many good people who did not come to reform us, to evangelize us, or to impose their will upon us, but who came to become good citizens of the State of Florida, and they have been excellent citizens.

They have come from every other part of the Union. Instead of having, as we had then, some 250,000 to 300,000 people, we now have 6 million people. We are a prosperous and a great State. We have moved far in the field of civil rights. We have moved far in the direction of having peace prevail between our citizens of different color. We have moved a great distance toward joining what I believe is a majority trend in our Nation. The two races must find a peaceful way to live together, with full rights as American citizens, but that way will not be found by the imposition of coercive and unconstitutional laws.

Mr. President, I see that my time is approaching an end. I say in closing that, in my judgment, any measure which seeks to bypass the courts, and to knock out of the picture, to a great extent, one of the three separate branches of government which our Constitution enthroned and expected to keep there, is wrong. Any legislation which seeks to give to one executive officer, the Attorney General in this case, the power by his finding to pass down a decision which is not appealable to the courts, and which controls the voting practices and the voting destinies of millions of people in our Nation in their own States is wrong and is doomed to failure.

Any legislation which gives to the Attorney General and the courts in distant places the right to send in poll watchers to make sure that we do the right thing in certain States of the South—and Florida does not happen to be one of them, Mr. President, for which I am very thankful—is doomed to bitterness, misunderstanding, and the violence which follows. If Senators will stop to think for a moment, they will see what is happening in States where the Federal arm has already gone in and asserted itself through the sending of marshals, soldiers, and Assistant Attorneys General, and through the bringing of every conceivable sort of suit to force people to do what they are going to do only when they realize that it is the right thing to do and that they must do it in order to preserve the American way of living among the people of that State.

Mr. President, it is a horrible mistake that the Congress of the United States is about to make. I do not know whether the courts will uphold the proposed legislation or not. From the very great display of emotion and applause given by members of the Supreme Court who were present at a recent joint session in the House of Representatives, it may well be that the present Court will uphold it. That does not touch the question. The question is whether the people in their minds and hearts will accept this kind of approach, or whether, instead, they will become embittered, driven to violence, and driven to clandestine organizations, such as those which are now appearing.

They are being driven to taking the law into their own hands. I do not for a moment give any support to any of that type of reaction. I believe I know something about human nature. I have seen it at work for a long time. I have held public office for a long time as a State senator, as Governor, and in the Senate for 19 years. I am a native of the South. I am the son of a Confederate veteran. I am the grandson of two Confederate veterans, all three of whom were wounded in the war. I never heard one word of bitterness out of any of those three as to the war itself, but they resented to their dying day the fact that instead of a peaceful effort being made to bring back together the people of this Nation, which would have been done under Lincoln, we were forced by the machinations of such men as Thaddeus Stevens, Charles Sumner, and others to go through the horrible experience of Reconstruction, which put a blot upon our whole country, a blot upon my own State, a blot upon other States in the Southland, and as great a blot upon the records of all those who attempted to force that type of legislation upon us, which they must have known was unconstitutional.

A brave President of the United States told them it was unconstitutional. He vetoed the Reconstruction Act and other similar acts.

While he was impeached, the effort to convict him failed by only one vote. Emotionalism and sentiment in this whole field was so rife at that time that almost anything could be accomplished. I glory in the spunk and independence of a bare majority of the Senate who at that time said, "We are going to have constitutional government instead of mere emotional handling of this vital and difficult question." To some of them it meant the end of their public careers. My hat is off to those particular Senators.

I appreciate the Senate giving me this opportunity to state my own convictions in this regard. I hope I am wrong. I hope that the proposed legislation will not run in accord with history. I believe that history shows that it is doomed to failure. The Constitution shows that it is hopelessly unconstitutional. We know that millions of people will resent it. We know what the reaction is likely to be of too large a number of people. Resenting an encroachment upon their private lives, local affairs and States which they think is unconstitutional and coercive and an overcalling of their own rights and privileges, too many of them will resort to violence.

Let it be distinctly understood that when a bill becomes a law, so far as I am concerned, I ask my people to obey it, and I ask the people of the United States to obey it. That was what was urged in 1865 and the years following. But the fact remains that the law was not obeyed. The fact remains that it brought an unparalleled course of violence upon our whole country. It did not result as the well-intentioned people who were behind the legislation intended.

So far as I am concerned, I want to have the Record show clearly that just as I went home last year, following the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and within 3 days made a statement in my home county at a Fourth of July celebration, requesting the people of Florida to obey that law, even though they disliked it, and to confine themselves to the courts or to legislative efforts, but by no means to violate or defy it, so I shall do when this bill is passed.

There are not enough people who will listen to that voice of reason, whether it comes from me or from thousands of others, but who instead will, just as was done in Reconstruction days, take the law into their own hands. Everything that has happened in recent months shows that clearly, whether it has happened in Alabama or Mississippi, or in other Southern States; whether it has happened in Harlem—and I observe again on the floor of the Senate the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits]—or in Cleveland or Chicago. The fact remains that this kind of legislation promotes bitterness, promotes violence, promotes anything but the peaceful solution which we all so ardently desire.

We in Florida have learned how to get along together. I received about half of the Negro votes in the recent election. That is an indication of the voice of reason asserting itself in that regard.

I wish to make it very clear that the bitterness will come out, just as it has come out in the States that are so seriously affected. Let us remember that in some States there are numerous counties in which the nonwhite population greatly exceeds the white population, in which the nonwhite population pays little in taxes, owns little property, has little education, has little ability to cope with the problems of government, and is easily swayed by others, just as in Florida the freed slaves were swayed by Federal officers, resigned from the Army, who came into our State and then went immediately to the U.S. Senate.

That is not a fertile field for bringing about understanding and peace, but is, instead, a field which, I am as sure as I am standing here, will result in violence, discord, and anything but the type of American calm and peacefulness which all of us hope for.

It is in that spirit that I am stating for the Record my reason for opposing the bill, in spite of the fact that I voted in earlier days, to eliminate the poll tax in Florida. I was supposed to have sounded my death knell in politics at that time. For 13 years I offered in the Senate the 24th amendment, before the rest of the Senate was willing to say that it was the constitutional way, the real way to approach the problem, and agreed with me to submit the amendment, which is now in the Constitution.

I am perfectly willing to fight for the rights of voters, but I want the fighting to be done under the colors of the Constitution of the United States. I want it to be done with some regard for the feelings of the people affected, and without any effort to tell millions of people, living in sovereign States, "You must comply whether you wish to do so or not, because the Attorney General of the United States says you must do it," or "because the Civil Service Commission of the United States has appointed registrars to override your own voting legislation."

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this debate is now in its fifth week. Since it began, those of us who continue to have faith in the Constitution, those of us who regard it as a living symbol of democracy and freedom, have been pleading and fighting for its life. We have been pleading and fighting for its continued existence in debate on the bill itself and on amendments thereto.

We have recognized the wisdom of Senator William E. Borah, of Idaho, who was so aptly known as the lion from Idaho—one of the greatest men I have had the privilege to know in the Senate and, indeed, a giant among men—when he warned:

> When the people lose control of their Constitution, they have already lost control of their Government.

On the other side of this debate have been those who would leave the Constitution at the crossroads as a thing of another day, as a relic of bygone years that has served its purpose well, but that now has no place in this modern space age.

Mr. President, the hour is late, but there is yet time to stretch forth a hand to save the principles on which this Nation was conceived and founded. There is yet time to save the Constitution and the liberties and freedoms embodied therein. The hour is late, but there is yet time to halt this headon rush to the destruction of the basic rights of the individual States and the liberties of the American people to satisfy the demands, the clamor, and the expediency of the day.

Never in my more than 40 years in Congress have I seen a measure come before this body that has had such built-in potential for the destruction of our constitutional system and the breakdown of law and order as the pending bill.

I make this statement with firm and deliberate conviction.

I say this while I devoutly believe that every qualified American should have the right to vote.

I say this as one who has a deep concern over our lack of direction and as one who believes that more than ever in these troublesome times does this Nation need a strong and steady rudder to its Ship of State.

I say this because the enactment of S. 1564 would undermine the very foundation upon which the orderly conduct of our Government and our political and social institutions are founded—the Constitution of the United States—the rudder of our Ship of State.

Mr. President, the cry of expediency has been relentlessly sounded and today, I am sorry to say, its altars are filled with communicants. If Congress, if you and I as Members of it, in panicky response to this expediency, to the demonstrations and to the emotional hysteria of the day, shows its willingness and even eagerness to yield to the demands of every group or movement that takes to the streets, where will this road lead us and where can the line ever be drawn again?

Thomas Jefferson once said that "delay is preferable to error."

We have had much debate on S. 1564 and on the many amendments thereto. We have seen many figures and have been presented many statistics. When I think about statistics, I am reminded of what that great English statesman, Benjamin Disraeli, said about statistics. Disraeli, who did more to build the mighty British Empire than anyone else, declared:

> There are statistics and statistics and statistics, and then there are ordinary lies.

Have we stopped for a moment to think about the serious and long-range implications of the drastic steps we are being asked to take under the expedient banner of civil rights and the popular phraseology of voting rights?

Until now, we have had a government and a society based upon respect for law and adherence to the Constitution. Now we are being asked to pass a bill to conform to those who say they will obey only those laws of their own choosing. We are being asked to let the bars down, to mock the Constitution, and to let the cry of the mob and the demonstrators take the place of sober legislative deliberation.

As we know, Mr. President, our Constitution provides two methods for its own amendment: by a vote of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress, or by a Convention called on application of two-thirds of the States, and, in each case, ratification of any proposed amendment by three-fourths of the States. The 24 amendments thus far adopted to the Constitution of the United States have followed this prescribed procedure.

Now, however, a new method of amending the Constitution is proposed. This proposal by the proponents of S. 1564, by its very language and intent, suggests amending the Constitution by the mere act of passing a bill through Congress and having it ratified by a simple majority of the members of the Supreme Court of the United States. Under this method proposed by the proponents of S. 1564, the amending process requires ratification by only five men, instead of the legislative bodies or conventions of the people of three-fourths of the States, as prescribed in the Constitution itself. The proponents of this proposal are saying to us, "Now that we have laid the Constitution to rest, we shall have no regard for its own last will and testament, and we shall at our own will decide how to distribute the last vestiges of its remains."

With one fell swoop, Mr. President, the proponents of S. 1564 would amend the Constitution of the United States by nullifying section 2, article I, which gives the States the right to set voter qualifications.

With one fell swoop, the proponents of S. 1564 would amend the Constitution of the United States by nullifying section 9 of article I, which provides that "no bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed" by punishing States or political subdivisions for an alleged act that took place before enactment of their bill.

With one fell swoop, the proponents of S. 1564 would amend the Constitution of the United States by nullifying section 2 of article III, which provides "that the trial of all crimes shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed" by requiring submission to a three-man court in the District of Columbia under circumstances of punishment far exceeding those defining a crime.

With one fell swoop, the proponents of S. 1564 would amend the Constitution of the United States by nullifying the very provisions of the Constitution that provides for its amending process, article V, by amending the Constitution without the two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress and the ratification of three-fourths of the States, as required by it.

With one fell swoop, the proponents of S. 1564 would amend the Constitution of the United States by nullifying article VI, which again provides that "in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial" for the same reason that it nullifies section 2 of article III.

With one fell swoop, the proponents of S. 1564 would amend the Constitution of the United States by nullifying article VIII, which provides that "excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted" by punishing the people of a State for 5 years hence for some act that may have taken place 4 years and 11 months ago.

With one fell swoop, the proponents of S. 1564 would amend the Constitution of the United States by nullifying article X, which provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people," by usurping the rights of the States to set voter qualifications which, not being delegated to the United States by the Constitution, were clearly reserved to the States respectively.

With one fell swoop, the proponents of S. 1564 would amend the Constitution of the United States by nullifying amendment XVII, which provides, as does section 2 of article I, that "the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures" by invading this right and controlling the State's machinery regarding its local, State, and Federal elections.

Mr. President, the history of the Constitutional Conventions shows that the framers of the Constitution, those who brought this Nation into being, were deeply concerned about making certain that the Constitution could not be changed at the whim and caprice of a politician or by the expedience and thirst of a political party. They labored tirelessly to make certain that there would be a proper means for amending the Constitution, but, at the same time, insured that it be so devised that any amendment would clearly reflect the will of an overwhelming majority of the people and not a few at any given time in control of the Government.

In his Farewell Address, George Washington cautioned to resist "the spirit of innovation" upon the principles of the Constitution, "however specious the pretexts." He said that "facility in changes upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion"; and that in any event, should a "modification of the constitutional powers" be necessary, it should be made "by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates."

"But let there be no change by usurpation," he warned.

Mr. President, once we have introduced this new method of changing the Constitution—this change by usurpation—into our way of government, the cornerstone and basis of our society of laws will crumble like sand. What then will happen to the checks and balances and built-in safeguards against rash and impetuous action which have repeatedly in the course of our Nation's history proved the wisdom of our Founding Fathers? What then will prevent this same thing from happening again and again every time a mob or demonstration presses its demands upon the Congress? What then will protect us from future demagogues on any issue whatever who, through manipulation of mass emotion and hysteria, force the enactment of measures which similarly flaunt our basic constitutional provisions? What then will happen to our constitutional rights—to the Constitution itself—and what then will be the course toward which our Government and our country will be directed?

These are the questions that I ask each and every one of us to seriously and conscientiously ponder. I ask Senators this as an American. I ask Senators this in appreciation of those before and in concern for those ahead. I ask Senators to take a long look at the road ahead and see where all of this may lead us. I would remind the Senate that delay is preferable to error. The easy course today may be appeasement and even surrender to the emotional demands for legislation which clearly repudiates the Constitution; but may I say that we do this at an exorbitant and dangerous cost to the generations of Americans who will come after us and we breach a trust to those who came before us—who gave us our constitutional system—and to those who have given their lives to preserve it. For, when we leave a system of government of laws for a government of men in response to the clamor and expediency of the day, we give open invitation to the dangers and possible destruction of which we have been warned.

Two thousand years before the Virginia Convention of 1788, where this abiding truth was to be more eloquently expressed, Aristotle warned of the dangers that arise when a government of laws is corrupted by a government of men. In his "Politics," Aristotle praises the rule of the law and says this:

> Therefore, he who bids the law rule may be deemed to bid God and reason alone rule, but he who bids man rule adds an element of the beast; for desire is a wild beast, and passion perverts the minds of rulers, even when they are the best of men. The law is reason unaffected by desire.

The law is reason unaffected by desire, Aristotle declared—unaffected by mass hysteria and emotion, by demonstrations and sit-ins, by political thirst and political power and, above all, by expediency.

Mr. President, every Member of the Senate knows, regardless of his personal feelings on the subject, that the Constitution clearly reserves to the States the authority to establish qualifications for voting. This authority is expressly provided in article I, section 2, and confirmed in the 10th and 17th amendments of the Constitution. Under this reserved power the States have for 175 years determined the rules and requirements for voting by their citizens. But now in this bill the Federal Government proposes to usurp this authority and take over the function of establishing voter qualifications. If Congress can so blatantly ignore and nullify a specific, unqualified provision of the Constitution in this instance, what other parts of the Constitution can ever again be regarded as inviolate?

Not only would this bill usurp the constitutional powers of the States, but it would do it under a formula designed so that only certain selected States will be brought within its application, and other States excluded. The Attorney General of the United States admits this. He admits that while the bill is supposed to be a bill for the entire United States, it just so happens that the standards set forth in the formula of the bill apply only to a few States. The Attorney General admits that it just so happens that these States are, as he put it in his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, a part of the "old Confederacy." I submit, Mr. President, that these are indeed weird standards by those who are supposed to represent all of the people of the United States, and the Attorney General's own testimony puts us on guard as to the real purpose and meaning of the bill before us.

The bill would give one Federal official, the Attorney General, the power of decision in regard to which States may or may not enforce their existing voter qualification laws, and which are to be taken over by Federal registrars. The bill would prevent any State seeking relief from arbitrary enforcement action by a Federal officer from going into any U.S. court, other than the District Court for the District of Columbia. This unprecedented restriction is an insult to the integrity of the Federal judges in the Southern States, and impugns the honor of the entire Federal judicial system. The bill would by legislative fiat determine and declare that the right to vote is being denied in four States because they collect a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. It would provide that if the constitutionality of poll taxes is sustained by the courts, the Congress shall then be empowered to override the court's decisions and regulate the payment of poll taxes in the four States involved. Provision by provision, the bill goes on in the same harsh, punitive and discriminatory way.

I may say, Mr. President, that in my last speech on the bill I discussed the matter of the poll tax. What an inconsequential, vanishing phenomenon it is today. As I said, in my State of Alabama the poll tax is $1.50. We cannot go back for more than 1 year in the collection of it. The maximum, therefore, is $3. Every cent of the dollar and a half goes to the public schools for the education of the youth of the State of Alabama.

The bill is entitled "A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes."

The truth is, Mr. President, that S. 1564 was not drafted with the idea of dealing with a constitutional problem. I contend it was drafted primarily for "other purposes," that is, to satisfy the mass demonstrations blocking our streets and highways, and to stop the invasion of public buildings with lie-ins and sit-ins. The bill pretends to be "appropriate legislation" to prevent the voting rights of citizens of the United States from being denied or abridged by States on account of race or color. It pretends that under the 15th amendment Congress has the power to fix and regulate voting qualifications in the individual States. It pretends to justify any action by the Congress on the basis of the appropriate legislation clause of the 15th amendment.

In fact, Mr. President, S. 1564 can pretend no such thing. History shows that the 15th amendment does not justify any such contention that Congress has any such power under the 15th amendment. The history of the 15th amendment and the debates and the proceedings in Congress at the time it was adopted make clear beyond the shadow of a doubt that the proponents and sponsors of the amendment had no intention of giving Congress the authority to fix and regulate voting qualifications in the individual States. The 15th amendment simply declares that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged," by either State or Nation, "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude," and it gives Congress the power to enforce this provision for impartial suffrage by "appropriate legislation." There is an assumption only of the potential right to vote. There is no assumption of a vested right to vote. The potential right to vote can become actual only by a law of the State, or in a territory by a law of Congress. There is no mandate that the actual right shall be conferred in either case. The only mandate is that, in conferring it, the grant must be impartial among all citizens. The plain import of the amendment, therefore, is that when the right to vote is granted, it must be impartially granted; but it is always competent to the State to declare that "when."

As we see, Mr. President, it is abundantly clear that the 15th amendment was not intended to give Congress the power to strike down State literacy tests, to set voter qualifications, or to regulate State poll taxes. A long line of Supreme Court decisions have confirmed that the power to set voter qualifications, by the language of the Constitution, rests with the States and confirm that neither the 14th nor the 15th amendment gave the Congress the power to change this by legislative fiat.

The proponents of S. 1564, however, argue that in some States, literacy tests and other means are used to exclude Negroes from voting in violation of the 15th amendment and, therefore, that this legislation is necessary to protect certain constitutional rights. They argue then that we must destroy the Constitution in order to preserve it.

I contend again, however, that there is a lawful and orderly way to accomplish any desired result through amendment to the Constitution in accordance with the procedures outlined in article V. I contend again that it is not necessary to destroy the Constitution or any provision of it in order to preserve it, and that if it is, a requiem at this time would be more appropriate than a vote at this time.

In one of my last speeches on the bill I cited not one, not two, not three, not four, not five, but a number of cases which guarantee that a person shall have the right to vote regardless of race or color. It is a matter of going into court and having these statutes enforced.

Fenet, the French statesman, in making a report for the revision of the law of France and the adoption of a civil code, and having in mind the failure of the French Revolution in its effort to take leave of past thought and achievement and to set up a new social and governmental system based upon supposedly new ideas, gave expression to a maximum which should not be forgotten. It recites:

> It is better to preserve what it is not necessary to destroy.

I ask you to think of this maxim for a moment—

> It is better to preserve what it is not necessary to destroy.

For this is the basic proposition that must be resolved in your minds and in your hearts before a vote is cast on the proposal before us. It is better to preserve the freedoms and the liberties the Constitution guarantees us, as long as it is not necessary to destroy it.

It is an endless process, Mr. President, to preserve liberty.

Liberty cannot be forced by the bayonet nor granted by the rash act of a legislature. True liberty is gained through the orderly process and can only be preserved by it. This has always been and always will be.

The overriding issue at stake here is whether we are going to uphold the orderly process, or whether we are going to succumb to those who teach civil disobedience and call for demonstrations and street scenes to provide it.

The question is whether we are going to take the low, dangerous road of appeasement and expediency, or the high road of reason and orderly process.

The question is whether we are going to continue to live by the Constitution, or whether we are going to abandon it to meet the demands of the hour.

The question is simply whether we are going to nullify and amend the Constitution by statute, or whether we are going to adhere to the provisions of it that provide the orderly way for change.

And this is the question, Mr. President, that each of us must answer before we cast our vote on S. 1564. For this legislation, by its enactment, would nullify and repudiate vital provisions of the Constitution and destroy many of our legal institutions.

The Constitution of the United States has often been called "a divinely inspired creation." I think the hour is here for us to pause and rededicate ourselves to it and to "pledge our lives, our fortunes, and sacred honor" to preserve it. And in the solemn moment that we do, we take renewed meaning of the wisdom and warning expressed in that immortal Farewell Address in 1796:

> Should a modification of the Constitution be necessary it should be made by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation.

Mr. President, the United States is a constitutional system of government.

It was by the Constitution that it took life.

It has been by the Constitution that it has survived.

It will be by abuse of the Constitution that it dies.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

A Nevadan wrote those words nearly 100 years ago. They became the 15th amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Nevada was the first State to ratify this amendment, and it has been a part of the Constitution since 1870. Yet today these historic words are the focal point of one of the major issues before Congress—and before the people.

Without question this amendment has not only been ignored but brazenly abused in some areas of our Nation. Its basic guarantees have been willfully denied to the Negro of the South and to other racial groups elsewhere. Efforts to correct this flagrant wrong in State and Federal courts and at local government levels have failed. Now Congress has turned at last to the second paragraph of the 15th amendment: "The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Our duty is clear. We in Congress must take every necessary step to guarantee the right to vote to every American equally. This is why the voting rights legislation proposed by the President and now before the Senate will be enacted.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] on his own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me at this time.

PROBLEMS OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to a column that was published last evening in The Evening Star. Since the subject is not germane, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed to speak on the question at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGEE. The column by Mr. Charles Bartlett is entitled "Problems in 'Casting' Dominicans." The burden of Mr. Bartlett's article is that many of the reports of the crisis in Santo Domingo have stemmed from efforts on the part of some making those reports to pick out the "good guys" and the "bad guys" and contrast them with one another, when, as Mr. Bartlett aptly points out, neither are all good or all bad, and one is not clearly distinguishable from another.

It is in the pattern of that complexity that the American people have been asked to formulate their judgments in regard to what is transpiring in the Caribbean. In the conclusion of his column, Mr. Bartlett writes—

> Preconceptions of American clumsiness in Latin affairs persist from the days before 1958 when few of the problems and realities had been recognized. The crisis in Vietnam has encouraged an hypothesis that reporters may be more perceptive than the officials on the scence.
>
> But the lesson of Fidel Castro, on whom many of us erred, was that the United States cannot afford to be mistaken on the nature of the men who seize power in neighboring republics. This lesson should inspire deep patience with the President's wariness in forming a coalition to govern this pulverized country.

Mr. President, there are those of us who can criticize and freely criticize. We ought always to be able to do so in this country, and we can even criticize with the luxury of not being responsible for our criticisms. We can criticize with sincerity, and if we are wrong, there is no major disastrous consequence.

But the President of the United States and those directly responsible to him cannot enjoy that luxury. They must be right, if possible, the first time. That is the essential difference between critics and those who carry the frightful burden of decisionmaking both in the Dominican Republic and in Vietnam, as they seek the wisest possible courses of action that will survive the tests of the future and the reflections of hindsight.

Therefore, I would hope that we could do a great deal more than we have been doing until now to get before the people of our country the real complexities and the contradictions and the befuddlements of the many overlapping and intertwined issues in both of those areas of the world in order better to understand the need for the kinds of decisions that we ultimately make.

The attitude, all too prevalent, that any person who runs casually through those torn countries can make a better judgment and a better decision than someone whose neck is really on the block and who has to bear the consequences of the decision, is one of the failings that we find in our midst at this time. I should like to believe that we could find a way to correct some of the misstatements that have been made or some of the partial statements that are being made at this time.

I have encouraged the Secretary of State to consider accepting questions in a more public way than he has until now from whomever he designates, or whatever segment of our critics would seem appropriate, and to respond to those questions in a better way, more than merely in print—preferably in one of the communications media of the air, on radio, TV, or both—in order that the difficulties involved can be eliminated and the separation of fact from fiction can likewise be more accurately made. Such a course would contribute a great bit in the sense of public information, and thus public understanding, of what is transpiring in both of those areas.

I am firmly convinced, after pursuing the subject as closely as one can from this position, that the President has followed the problem with extremely great patience and insight, and that our policies are beginning to show their real substance and strength. But it will require a little more time than some of the quick reactions that we have been reading about or are being told about would allow for. So I call special attention of the Members of this body to the column by Mr. Bartlett in the Evening Star of yesterday, and I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed intact following my informal remarks.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star
May 25, 1965]

PROBLEMS IN "CASTING" DOMINICANS

(By Charles Bartlett)

The roots of the discord between the Johnson administration and segments of the press over the crisis in the Dominican Republic are tangled and deep.

The Government officials in charge of the Dominican nettle do not cloak their anger and dismay at the tendency of some important reporters in Santo Domingo to portray the United States as the suspicious party, the rebels as the heroes, and the junta leaders as the villians in the messy situation.

The anger is goaded by instances in which these reporters appeared to be stretching isolated instances to support a contention that U.S. policy is aimed in fact at crushing the rebels and installing rightwing authority.

This is a shortcut that some have urged and that President Johnson has doggedly resisted. It is the answer that is no answer but it attracted those whose concern with the larger consequences was dwarfed by the drama on the scene.

This outlook infected many Americans in Santo Domingo, particularly those who had watched American boys fall to snipers. One wrote last week, "If the fools who sit and deliberate what must be done and how wicked intervention is could see their own blood spilling out, they might decide that drastic action is necessary."

Johnson's need to avoid the trap of this emotionalism led him to supplant the diplomats on the scene with John Bartlow Martin and to direct Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to put the U.S. forces under a general "who didn't wear his stars too heavily." The President has reflected an awareness throughout the crisis that he must justify his intervention by installing a broad-based government.

His show of support for Gen. Antonio Imbert Barrera was criticized as a move to impose a strong man. Some insist that he was only diverted from this course by the flurry of press criticism. Imbert performed the useful function of replacing Gen. Wessin y Wessin, and some, including Martin and the papal nuncio, believed he might become a rallying point. When this possibility faded, the President dispatched the Bundy-Vance mission.

In covering these developments and the subsequent moves to establish a coalition weighted toward the rebels, the reporters who flew into Santo Domingo were seriously handicapped. They were largely strangers to the incredibly complex Dominican scene and they could not be kept closely informed on the delicate maneuverings that were underway.

The most insidious myth that confronted them was the idea that the contenders could be divided into good and bad men. All the major figures on both sides have been badly warped by the long dictatorship and they defy any ready classification.

Juan Bosch had the opportunity, for example, to become a heroic figure by asserting his leadership in the chaos created by his followers. But his courage failed him and he remained in Puerto Rico. He must now defend his self-respect by denouncing the United States.

Rafael Fernandez, a Bosch favorite whose death last Wednesday added new bitterness to the crisis, will almost certainly become a martyr. He was a promising and popular individual. But curiously he served as deputy director in the Trujillos' secret police in the period after the dictator's assassination when these police was imposing brutal revenge in many quarters. Later assigned to the Dominican Embassy in Spain, he became involved with a Communist cell. It is difficult to gage such men.

Preconceptions of American clumsiness in Latin affairs persist from the days before 1958 when few of the problems and realities had been recognized. The crisis in Vietnam has encouraged an hypothesis that reporters may be more perceptive than the officials on the scene.

But the lesson of Fidel Castro, on whom many of us erred, was that the United States cannot afford to be mistaken on the nature of the men who seize power in neighboring republics. This lesson should inspire deep patience with the President's wariness in forming a coalition to govern this pulverized country.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

I believe it is a fair summary to say that instead of devoting a little time to the application and enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which fully covers many fields, including voting rights, the pending bill was put together hurriedly, without caution, because of the pressure of the marchers. It is a bill that was introduced as a matter of political expediency. It has had that tone and tenor all the way through.

Another aspect of the matter relates to the far-reaching provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which was a revolutionary act. There has not been enough time since its passage for people in many areas of the country to adjust to it and for the rank and file leadership at the various political levels of government really to understand how it applies to them, what their duties are, and what they can do as a practical matter to stand behind the law of the land. Whether the people like the law or not, almost everyone is willing to abide by it.

It is a double tragedy that even though we already have that law, and this rush order, as I have already mentioned, has been given to meet the marchers' demands, even without allowing time to apply the law, the actual provisions of the proposed law invade some of the most sacred and most important and essential parts of the Constitution of the United States.

I come quickly to the part that I believe is most vital; that is, the part that invades the provisions of the Constitution with reference to voter qualifications. The bill provides for a downgrading and a degrading of voter qualifications; an outlawing of some of the most vital and essential parts of voter qualifications, including one on which there should not be any real difference of opinion; that is, a simple literacy test.

I am impressed by the fact that the Senate in 1 week passed a bill with reference to extending the educational processes in the Nation, even in the elementary schools, and only a few weeks later, by a meat-ax method, is considering a bill to abolish literacy tests in large areas of the country, even to the extent of the ability to read and write.

I have also noticed in all that has been said, from the White House, from the Attorney General's office, from the floor of the Senate by the proponents of the measure, and in the press, that nothing has been said about the responsibilities of citizenship with respect to voting. That has not been emphasized. Everything that is emphasized relates to rights—so-called rights. Nothing is said about obligations. Everything is said about rights; nothing is said about responsibilities.

Nothing has been said to the people about self-improvement in matters of citizenship. Nothing has been said about the lessons to be learned from self-denial in order to improve oneself as a citizen. Nothing has been said about the underlying principles of self-control and self-improvement.

I believe in citizens voting and exercising their basic privileges. But I believe that in order to protect those persons, there must be some kind of regulation, some kind of control, some kind of qualifications established to regulate the voting privilege. It is not a right; it is a privilege. In one of his writings on self-government, the great Woodrow Wilson, a man of strong moral courage and intellectual capacity, and having a spiritual reservoir that lent strength and judgment to his every act, said:

> Self-government is not a mere form of institutions, to be had when desired if only proper pains be taken. It is a form of character. It follows upon the long discipline which gives a people * * * the habit of order and peace and common counsel and a reverence for law which will not fail when they themselves become the makers of law.

Any comment by me upon those marvelous words of wisdom from the pen of that truly great man would be superfluous. I shall only say that he summed up in those words the meaning of self-government. It depends upon a form of character that results from processes of self-denial. That should be the watchword today, rather than the general idea that everyone's salary will be increased, everyone's welfare payments will be increased, and that poverty will be abolished without any attempt at self-help.

The abolishment of qualifications for electors, of literacy tests, and of other requirements that I have mentioned is a myth. It is a myth that will lead us down the road to self-destruction.

The worst feature of the bill is that it undertakes to suspend the Constitution. It does not meet head-on the contention that the qualifications of voters must be valid; that the literacy tests are valid. The courts have recognized their validity. A former Attorney General can be quoted to that effect, and so, I think, can the present Attorney General. The bill does not meet that proposition head-on but seeks to suspend the Constitution of the United States. Under the guise of enforcing one provision, the bill proposes to suspend the Constitution in other particulars. One provision of the Constitution cannot be suspended on the ground of enforcing another. The bill sets the most dangerous of precedents for the future by providing that the Constitution, including the 15th amendment, can be enforced by letting Congress write the remedy. I verily believe we have already written that remedy by the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The operation of the remedy must be through the judicial processes, through the courts. The courts must be kept open. The pending bill literally would close the doors of the courts to a large segment of the citizenry of our country. It is essential that in a republican form of government the courts remain open to the people. We propose, in effect, to close even the Federal court with the exception of this small avenue of remedy which would be available in the courts of the District of Columbia. The District of

Columbia is more than 1,000 miles from the place where the litigation may arise.

I believe that it is absolutely essential to due process of law that the courts remain open. The due process of law, mentioned in the 14th amendment, is essential in a republican form of government. The courts must be kept open to the litigants, to the people, and to the Government.

It is essential in a republican form of government that, under due process of law, the legislative processes of the various States be kept open. The pending measure would literally close the door on the State legislatures which might be affected by the application of the bill.

It is unthinkable. It is unheard of. I do not believe that it would be tolerated here for 10 minutes on any subject except on a voting rights bill.

The pending measure demonstrates the sadness of the situation that we have got into in our country. It illustrates what can happen when there is an emotional wave engendered by the marchers and the groups with political demands of expediency, even before there was an opportunity for the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to begin operation.

Perhaps I am too strict in my interpretation of the Constitution. I do not believe that I am. However, one of the minor atrocities of the pending bill is that, sailing along here under the guise of enforcing the 15th amendment, we launch out into a wholly different territory and argee to what I call the New York State amendment. On the other hand, we propose to go into a State in which there is no charge of any kind of racial discrimination and dip down into the net very deeply, to check the qualifications they have established for citizens to register and vote and their literacy tests. In the pending measure, we undertake to overrule the great State of New York on an extraneous matter to this bill, on a subject that is irrelevant to the 15th amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. President, only by the broadest stretch of the imagination could the matter be related to any part of the Constitution as it pertains to voting rights. If the amendment pertaining to the State of New York were to be upheld, it would mean that the Constitution would be gone and that there would no longer be any provision of the Constitution relative to voting qualifications that would have any meaning whatsoever.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. **STENNIS.** Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I believe there is an error there.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** If the Senator will suspend, the Chair will check the time.

Mr. **STENNIS.** I thank the Chair. I thought I had 32 minutes remaining.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator used 28 minutes of his time on yesterday and 15 minutes today, which leaves exactly 17 minutes.

Mr. **STENNIS.** I thank the Chair very much.

Mr. President, for the second consecutive year the Senate has seen fit to invoke cloture on a measure which presents grave and far-reaching constitutional issues. The debate limitation thus imposed will prevent full and adequate consideration of the proposal now before the Senate, even though that proposal reflects a philosophy foreign to many traditional concepts of constitutional government in this Nation. I believe that S. 1564 is unreasonable, unwise, and unnecessary legislation. However, even if one assumes that the purposes of S. 1564 may be worthy, the means adapted thereby of securing those purposes are not only beyond the power granted the Federal Government but are directly contrary to a number of our most treasured constitutional principles.

One of the truly great constitutional authorities in the history of our Nation, the late Dr. Edwin S. Corwin, who edited the fifth edition of "The Constitution of the United States of America"—U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953—stated in the Introduction to that publication that the effectiveness of Constitutional law as a system of restraints on governmental action in the United States depends on four doctrines which he listed as:

> (1) The doctrine or concept of federalism; (2) the doctrine of the separation of powers; (3) the concept of a government of laws and not of men, as opposed especially to indefinite conceptions of presidential power; (4) and the no longer prevalent substantive doctrine of due process of law and attendant conceptions of liberty.

An examination and analysis of S. 1564 reveals that it clearly violates each of these doctrines, which Mr. Corwin stated will determine the effectiveness of constitutional law as a restraint on Government action. Because the passage of S. 1564 by Congress will constitute a rejection of these doctrines, what we now decide will have implications far beyond the matter of securing the right to vote. For if Congress can ignore basic constitutional principles for one reason, it can likewise ignore these principles for any reason it desires. Acceptance of such a philosophy by Congress, if upheld by the courts, would mean that there are no longer any restraints on governmental action; the respective States would be reduced to mere administrative units, and the rights of citizens would no longer be inviolate against governmental interference.

The doctrine of federalism, as known in the United States, presupposes the existence of a central government, composed of autonomous political entities, or "States," which have joined together for common purposes. The Central Government is delegated such powers as the States may determine necessary, and the remaining powers, or residual powers, continue to be vested in the States. Within the realm of these delegated and reserved powers, each government is sovereign; the powers of one may not be assumed or denied by the other. The authority of the Central Government is supreme, of course, in areas of common jurisdiction, but there is no Federal supremacy in the absence of authority specifically delegated to the Federal Government.

This is the plan of government set forth in the Constitution of the United States, with the powers of the Central Government clearly defined.

The proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965, now pending in the Senate, violates and casts asunder the doctrine of federalism. Although the Constitution clearly and without question provides that the respective States have the sole and exclusive jurisdiction to establish voter qualifications, both for the Federal and State elections, S. 1564 would deny to certain States the power to exercise this constitutional authority.

The specific provisions of the Constitution dealing with this power are so unequivocal, and the Supreme Court interpretations thereof so explicit, that it would hardly seem necessary to consider them. Indeed, even the proponents of S. 1564 acknowledge the exclusive jurisdiction of the States in this field, but nevertheless advance the argument that the Congress has the power to "suspend" the exercise of that power under the guise of enforcing the 15th amendment. Granted that the Federal Government is delegated certain authority under that amendment to prohibit the denial or abridgment of the right to vote on account of race or color, that provision of the Constitution cannot be given a favored position to the extent of abrogating other valid and equally important provisions.

I know the Milligan case has been cited and explained in this debate before, but it is such a fine, shining light of constitutional government that I pay my great respects to it and the court that announced it 99 years ago this month. The case arose during the Civil War, in the State of Indiana, where a man charged, in effect, with treason was arrested and tried by a military court without a jury, found guilty, and sentenced to be hanged. His lawyer sued out a writ of habeas corpus which reached the Supreme Court of the United States. That court held that even in time of war, even in time of rebellion, when the lifeblood and very existence of the Nation was in doubt, in any area of the Nation where civil courts were still open the man was entitled to be tried by the civil court. He was entitled to a trial by jury, rebellion or not, guilty or not, and the Constitution could not be suspended even in time of war, when the very existence of the Government itself was challenged and in doubt. That case, from that time until now, has been a tower of strength, light, and guidance for the courts and for the Congress. But if we pass this bill and it should be upheld, then that great principle would be placed in the rubbish can, on the dump heap, and trampled upon, until there was no life in it, unless, at some saner time and saner moment it should be revived by some court or some Congress.

Mr. President, may I ask how much time I have left?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Mississippi has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. **STENNIS.** I thank the Chair.

Because the Court in Ex parte Milligan expressed so forcefully the principle that no provision of the Constitution may be suspended, let me quote briefly from that decision:

> The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism, but the theory of necessity on which it is based is false; for the Government, within the Constitution, has all the powers granted to it, which are necessary to preserve its existence.

Let me emphasize, Mr. President, that the Court stated that no provision of the Constitution may be "suspended during any of the great exigencies of government."

Those are the Court's words, not mine, and I emphasize them.

Although the petitioner in Ex parte Milligan was charged with an offense against the United States during time of war, the Supreme Court held that the constitutional right of trial by jury could not be suspended—it could not be temporarily taken away from an accused.

I say what is proposed here is a dangerous doctrine. Long after the issue of voting rights is settled or adjusted, or whatever term one might want to use, this dangerous, deadly precedent will be here, stirring the Congress and the courts in the future. It is an obliteration of the protective features of the Constitution of the United States. The right of trial by jury is not written in any clearer or plainer language in the Constitution of the United States than it is in the matter of voter qualifications—certainly, those that are reasonable—and the most reasonable of all is the requirement of a simple literacy test.

To continue with my statement, the same principle applies to any provision of the Constitution, for a temporary suspension of a constitutional right is the same as a denial of that right. If any section may be suspended for a week, or a month, or a year, it may be suspended in perpetuity and thus forever denied.

The effect of S. 1564 is to "suspend" the constitutional authority of the respective States to prescribe qualifications for voting. This assault on the powers of the States is a direct violation of our Federal system of government; it is a basic assault on the most delicate of all Federal-State relationships, for if the States are not allowed to regulate and control the election of their public officials, and by indirection establish the qualifications of electors in Federal elections, the States will be reduced to mere nonpolitical administrative units. The last vestige of State political sovereignty will thus be destroyed.

Just as the passage of S. 1564 will destroy the Federal nature of our government, it will likewise trample on the doctrine of the separation of powers. Our system presupposes the tripartite nature of government—that there are three distinct functions of any government: the legislative, executive, and judicial. To insure that a grant of limited power does not become absolute power, our Constitution delegates authority and responsibility among these three branches of government, each with certain checks on the other. The Congress may not delegate its authority, nor may the legislative powers be assumed by the executive or the judiciary. Likewise, the executive may not assume judicial powers, nor may the courts perform executive functions. Subject only to the constitutional system of checks and balances which each branch has over the other, such as the power of the Senate to confirm Presidential appointments or the judicial power to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional, no branch of government may be given nor may it assume authority not inherently appropriate of being exercised by that particular branch.

S. 1564 proceeds on an assumption which is contrary to this doctrine of separation of powers, however, by giving to the Attorney General legislative and judicial authority and by delegating to the Federal judiciary certain powers which are inherently executive in nature. Sections 3 and 5, for example, give the Attorney General and the Federal District Court in the District of Columbia the power to veto a State legislative enactment. Never before in the history of this Republic has an executive officer of the Federal Government been given power to either approve or disapprove an act of a State legislature, but this bill would do so. It is just as incomprehensible that a Federal court be given the power to review a State law as a condition precedent to that law becoming effective. No case or controversy would be presented to the court, nor would there be an adversary proceeding, but, under the terms of this bill, a State or political subdivision subject to section 3 or 4 must either ask the Attorney General's permission to change a voting law or it must come all the way to the District of Columbia and ask the Federal district court for permission to enact any new law dealing with voter qualifications or procedures.

I think the pending bill is the greatest slam against the Supreme Court and the entire judicial system than anything that has been seriously presented to this body in a generation. It takes powers away from the judiciary. It takes powers that belong to the judiciary and to the legislative branches and vests them in the executive. It closes the doors of the courts in large areas of the country and states that they are not qualified to pass on these cases, when almost every one of these judges was selected by the Department of Justice itself, in large part—certainly approved by it and by the Senate.

This proposed law transgresses the lines between the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, time and time again, with reckless abandon. With all deference to those who wrote it, it reads in places as though a schoolboy had written it insofar as having respect for constitutional provisions and separation of powers are concerned.

It is inconceivable to me, Mr. President, that anyone, and especially anyone with legal training, could propose the enactment of sections 3, 5, and 8(b), which so clearly violate the principles of federalism and the separation of powers outlined by the Constitution of the United States. To do so under the guise of the power of Congress to enact "appropriate legislation" under the 15th amendment is to give that article a position of superiority to other constitutional principles. Certainly, Congress may enact appropriate legislation to enforce the protection afforded by the 15th amendment, but it cannot do so in a manner directly contrary to and inconsistent with other provisions of the Constitution.

One of the most precious concepts of English jurisprudence, Mr. President, is the principle that society should be ruled by a government of law and not of men. As our strongest weapon against communism, we advance and promote the rule of law; to take pride, and justifiably so, that no man should be given power to act arbitrarily or without restraint. Yet the pending bill would grant to the Attorney General of the United States the power to make determinations and to take action not subject to appeal or judicial review.

Section 4(b) specifically provides that a determination by the Attorney General or the Director of the Census under that subsection, or under section 6 "shall be final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register." Both sections mentioned require factual and subjective determinations, but power is given to two individuals to make those determinations, free of any review or restraint. It is no salvation for the constitutionality of this provision to state that the power thus granted will not be abused, for as Chief Justice John Marshall so clearly stated:

> The constitutionality of a measure depends, not on the degree of its exercise, but on its principle. (*The Providence Bank* v. *Billings et al.*, 29 U.S. 514 (1830).)

A government limited only by the discretionary exercise of power by individual holders is not a government of law but a government of men. Under the bill now being considered, the Attorney General is given such power—restrained only by his discretion.

The fourth principle mentioned by Dr. Corwin as a determining factor on the effectiveness of restraint on governmental action was "the no longer prevalent substantive doctrine of due process of law and attendant conceptions of liberty." By this statement, Dr. Corwin meant the increasing disposition on the part of the Supreme Court to invalidate legislation, not on substantive grounds but rather in terms of governmental infringement with the basic liberties protected by the Constitution. In other words, the Court is now disposed to look to the real effect of legislation; if basic liberties are infringed, the statute will be struck down.

I submit, Mr. President, that S. 1564 clearly violates the meaning of the due process of law clause. While the Court has extended the protection of that clause to embrace many basic liberties, it is now proposed that the Congress take from certain States their unquestioned constitutional authority to prescribe voter qualifications. This action would be taken, not after a judicial determination and a finding of guilt, but on the basis of an arbitrary statistical formula and a factual determination of conditions which had existed in the past. This is a clear denial of due process, which the learned Daniel Webster defined as "a law which hears before it condemns; which proceeds upon inquiry, and renders judgment only after trial." Under section 4 of the bill, there will be no hearing; there will be no inquiry; and there will be no trial. But judgment will be pronounced against certain States upon passage of the bill—a judgment that those States are automatically guilty, not on the basis of present acts but on the basis of facts which existed during the month of November 1964. Not one charge need be brought against those States, nor a scintilla of evidence presented; without trial or hearing or judicial proceeding of any kind, these States would be automatically found guilty. There is no consistency, Mr. President, with such a law and the requirements of due process.

There are many other sections of the bill, in addition to those I have briefly discussed today, that raise serious constitutional questions. Section 9, for example, recites that evidence has been presented to Congress that the poll tax requirements of certain States violate the constitutional right of citizens to vote. On the basis of that evidence, a directed verdict is sought from the Supreme Court, notwithstanding the sworn testimony of the Attorney General that he does not possess evidence to prove such a case. In addition, section 4 would deny to the affected States the right to seek judicial relief in the appropriate Federal courts, but instead would require those States to present their case in the District Court for the District of Columbia. This constitutes nothing less than an indictment against every court in the land except the appointed tribunal in Washington.

Endless time could be devoted to a discussion of the unconstitutionality of these and other provisions of the bill, Mr. President. Because those of us opposed to the bill have been denied this opportunity, however, let me summarize my objections to S. 1564 in this manner:

First, it presumes the guilt of certain States, not on the basis of evidence presented in a judicial proceeding that those States are presently violating the 15th amendment, but on the basis of an arbitrary statistical finding of facts which existed in the past; second, on the basis of that presumption, certain constitutional provisions are suspended so as to deny the rights of the States to establish voter qualifications and requirements. First, the presumption is invalid, and second, Congress does not have the authority to suspend any provision of the Constitution at any time for any reason. Herein lie the fatal defects of this proposal.

Mr. President, there is only one issue before the Senate. It is not whether 51 Senators believe this bill is necessary to secure the voting rights of all citizens; nor is it a question, in the abstract, of whether the Congress cannot enforce the 15th amendment. The only question is whether this bill, S. 1564, incorporates methods which may be considered "appropriate legislation" under section 2 of the 15th amendment. If it exceeds the grant of authority to Congress under that section, or if it conflicts with other specific constitutional provisions which might be given equal weight, it is not appropriate legislation and is unconstitutional.

In plain and simple language, Mr. President, I can only conclude that it is a bad bill. It proposes that which is far beyond the power of Congress to enact under the 15th amendment. It violates many principles of our constitutional system, and it would deny to certain States their historic and inherent rights under the guise of protecting other rights.

Still, we are told that we must enact the bill because there is a great need for new voting legislation. But need is not the test of constitutionality, and great social, economic, or political crises do not provide legislative authority not granted by the Constitution. I am reminded of the great wisdom of the Supreme Court when it stated in *A.L.A. Schechter Poultry Corp. et al.* v. *United States*, 295 U.S. 495, 55 S. St. 847, 79 L. Ed. 1570 (1935), that:

> Extraordinary conditions may call for extraordinary remedies. But the argument necessarily stops short of an attempt to justify action which lies outside the sphere of constitutional authority. Extraordinary conditions do not create or enlarge constitutional power. The Constitution established a national government with powers deemed to be adequate, as they have proved to be both in war and peace, but these powers of the National Government are limited by the constitutional grants. Those who act under these grants are not at liberty to transcend the imposed limits because they believe more or different power is necessary.

I urge the Senate to heed these words, Mr. President. Look not at extraordinary conditions which existed in recent weeks, but look to the Constitution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me, on my own time?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I commend the Senator from Mississippi on the fine and able speech he has just made, in the course of which he made reference to the case of Ex parte Milligan.

I have long believed that the speech which Jeremiah S. Black made before the Supreme Court of the United States representing Milligan was the most magnificent speech in all of Anglo-Saxon judicial procedures—and I use the word "Anglo-Saxon" because I include England, Scotland, and Wales along with the United States.

Let me say that magnificent as Mr. Black's speech was, the Senator from Mississippi has assuredly, in his speech today, proved himself worthy in every way to be associated with Jeremiah S. Black, in the latter's speech made on behalf of Ex parte Milligan.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Alabama very much for his most generous words. He is very capable and knowledgeable on this subject. He made an excellent speech today.

It is a great tragedy that judgment has already been made. The decision has been rendered. No more testimony can be heard.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 25 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, now that we are operating under the time limitation of cloture, I will summarize my opposition to this unconstitutional and unwarranted bill. At the same time I will comment on the recent additions or amendments that have been added to it.

At the outset, however, I want to reiterate the fact that neither in this speech nor in any of the debate thus far have I once expressed opposition to the right of any qualified person to vote. I just think that voter qualifications should be set by the State, not the Federal Government.

I have opposed this measure quite actively from the start. This includes speeches, floor amendments, and proposals made before the Judiciary Committee to cut back at least some of the extreme provisions of the bill. Briefly summarized, my opposition arguments follow:

First. The bill is unconstitutional because the right to vote is not derived from the Constitution; it is a State matter. This bill is predicated purely and simply on the false premise that the Federal Government can take over the question of voting.

Second. The bill is designed to punish the South and the South only. This is regional and punitive legislation—not national legislation. Congress should concern itself with matters on a national basis.

Third. Under the Constitution Congress can pass no bill of attainder; that is to say it cannot point a finger at any single individual or any State and say that you are guilty. The Constitution states that this must be done by the courts. Nevertheless, this bill does exactly that in unmistakable terms.

Fourth. Congress can pass no ex post facto law under the Constitution. Yet this bill is definitely ex post facto because it is based on what took place in the presidential election of November 1964. No intent or fact of discrimination is required. It goes into effect through a cold mathematical formula of 50 percent in registration or voting, thereby punishing States, counties, and cities for something of which they had no knowledge at the time it took place. Innocence is thereby turned into guilt by an ex post facto retroactive law.

Fifth. The bill places ministerial or administrative functions on a pinnacle above the courts. The Attorney General is given an enormous amount of power, and the South is placed at the mercy of his discretion. This is somewhat similar to Reconstruction days when arbitrary Federal officials regulated both personal and property rights in the South. The bill can lead us into another "tragic era."

Sixth. Our lines of distinction between legislative, executive, and judicial functions of government are completely obliterated by this confused measure. It is as though our accepted principles in these fields were all thrown together in one ball and then tossed out the window. All of this is in the interest of punishing the South for an outburst of emotionalism occasioned by mass demonstrations purposely put on for the purpose of getting this bill. The precedents that this can establish are untold and may never be rectified. We are acting in the heat of passion and are casting aside our most treasured gifts of the past—our bastions of safety and balance—the precious heritage of a balanced form of government.

Seventh. The yoke of bondage imposed by this bill, which would send in Federal examiners to run State and local registrations and oversee elections, cannot be thrown off properly by compliance. There is a 5-year moratorium on State laws in court proceedings and examiners appointed by the Civil Service Commission can remain rather indefinitely in the discretion of the Attorney General. The recent amendment of May 25 affords an escape clause fortunately, but litigants must go to the District of Columbia and shoulder the burden of proof in court.

Eighth. Congress, under the present poll tax provisions of the bill, is attempting to constitute itself a factfinding jury without sufficient evidence before it. It is imploring the Supreme Court to outlaw poll taxes as a prerequisite of voting when the Court has stated already that a State may impose poll taxes as a prerequisite of voting if it so choses. This is unconstitutional both in substance and in procedure. It should be beneath the dignity of Congress to stoop to such a ridiculous level.

Ninth. The bill will foster and promote a denial of the equal protection of the laws. Side by side in at least two States there will be counties in totally unequal status as to literacy tests and other election procedures that have been approved in the Supreme Court.

On this subject I will allot myself additional time and go into more detail.

As originally drawn, it would appear from available statistics that the bill would apply to 6 Southern States, Alaska, and 34 counties in North Carolina. The Judiciary Committee added the 20-percent provisions on line 10 of page 6 which would appear to release Virginia and Alaska as States from the bill because, I understand that Virginia's voting-age Negro population is 18.9 percent of the total voting-age population. At the same time, the bill would cover several cities and counties in Virginia where less than 50 percent of the voting-age population voted last November in the presidential election, and wherein more than 20 percent of the adult population is nonwhite. I simply point this out with no malice whatsoever to the great Commonwealth of Virginia, but merely to show that this bill if enacted into law will not only punish merely a section of the Nation, the South, but it can cause great confusion and inequalities within a single State when one county or city is affected and the examiners move in, while another and perhaps an adjacent county or city would not be touched.

The fundamental thing to consider, however, is that the machinery of the bill starts into motion not on the basic premise of discrimination, which could happen anywhere in the United States, but it starts by virtue of mere percentages and the fact that a test or device was maintained. Once the bill becomes applicable by these cold and unjust standards, then it appears that a State or political subdivision is presumed to be guilty until it gets down on its knees and comes into the Federal courts in the District of Columbia and proves its innocence or the nonapplicability of the law.

This is a plain reversal of our theory of justice that there is a presumption of innocence until guilt is proved beyond a reasonable doubt. At the same time, it is asking too much of a State to ask it to bow down and conform to the most peculiar judicial procedures set forth in the bill. The Judiciary Committee changed the court structure part of the original bill considerably, but it still leaves an unbalanced and hard to understand court procedure authorized by the bill. I question the soundness of these procedures, and I most seriously question tampering with the jurisdiction of a U.S. district court in one part of the Nation and leaving the other courts of similar jurisdictions untouched because the bill purposely does not apply to them. For example, no declaratory judgments or injunctions against enforcement can be issued in any court except in a District Court for the District of Columbia, or a court of appeals, according to section 14(b), page 20—star print.

This is designed expressly and obviously to avoid southern Federal judges; men who have been confirmed by the Senate, and who can be impeached if they deserve it. Moreover, if a State or subdivision wishes to contest the applicability of this bill to it under section 4(a) in district court in the District of Columbia, it has to allege and prove nondiscriminatory practices in voting for a period of 5 years or resort to the 50-percent escape clause under the May 25 amendment on page 19, and in that case, the court retains jurisdiction for 5 years. While the South is the chief target of this bill, many other sections of the country might not be pleased with the precedents of this provision as well as several other provisions in the bill.

I wish to point out specifically that in section 12(d), page 18 of this bill, the Attorney General can go into any appropriate U.S. district court for injunctions and preventive relief, well armed with the stringent provisions of the bill, and at the same time, citizens and political entities other than the United States cannot. They must come to the District of Columbia for this type of relief. This is arbitrary, rank discrimination. If a Federal court is good enough for the United States, it is good enough for its citizens and for aggrieved States and their political subdivisions. I trust that the Senate will correct this proposed injustice—this condemnation by the United States of its own Federal court system and structure, and I submitted amendments to no avail to accomplish this purpose, drafted and redrafted several times as the bill was substituted by another substitute.

I opposed the three civil rights bills passed in 1957, 1960, and in 1964. It was my view after the long battles of those 3 years, in which I was engaged most actively, that the field of voting rights was one of the most heavily covered fields involved.

Law after law has been written and passed and then revised to fit the alleged needs of the moment. As a matter of fact, I was somewhat curious to see how far the Supreme Court would apply what had been written into law, and how vigorously the Attorney General and the various civil rights organizations would utilize all the many and powerful legal remedies that Congress had given them. I did not have the time to draw any sound conclusions after the 1964 act, however, because the instant bill was thrown at us without sufficient use of existing law and without a bona fide effort to try it out and come back to Congress and show that it would not work. This is the sad but true case in this type of legislation.

I knew that some important Federal cases were pending on the scope of existing law and the authority to bring entire States into court to abolish discriminatory practices wherever they exist. The agitators, however, seemed to prefer the course of national publicity rather than the course of resorting to the courts and exhausting remedies under existing law.

The ink had hardly dried on two printed decisions of the Supreme Court on March 8, 1965, giving a very powerful and widespread effect to existing laws on voting rights, when S. 1564 was introduced. This bill was introduced on March 18, apparently in the attitude that the Supreme Court decisions allowing a whole sovereign State to be sued to protect the voting rights of Negroes were not sufficient.

These cases give very powerful methods of using the courts and not Federal registrars or examiners to settle voting rights matters. I speak of the two cases, *U.S.* v. *Mississippi et al.* No. 73 380 U.S. 128, and *Louisiana et al.* v. *U.S.* No. 67 380 U.S. 145, both decided March 8, 1965, in the Supreme Court.

Let me quote from the concluding paragraph of our Mr. Justice Black's opinion in the Louisiana case:

> It also was certainly an appropriate exercise of the District Court's discretion to order reports to be made every month concerning the registration of voters in these 21 parishes.

In other words, the court could enforce nondiscrimination in 21 parishes and in other parishes as well if discrimination existed.

I do not cite these cases in any sense that I approve or endorse them. I cite them to show that present law can be broadly applied, in a manner that appears constitutional to the Supreme Court, and in such a way that it will not completely tear down our traditions of government and our form of government.

The present bill would do just that, and the Supreme Court would have great difficulty in not someday agreeing with my statement here today. If this bill passes and the Court does otherwise, it will be abolishing the reserved powers of the States to establish voting qualifications and it will be approving powers for Congress far beyond the contemplated scope of the Constitution.

It should be noted that the Supreme Court, on March 8, did not abolish literacy tests. It merely stated that the discriminatory use of these tests as between whites and Negroes has to stop and whole States can be brought in as defendants to bring this into reality.

The present bill condemns literacy tests, in fact it suspends them. The Supreme Court for years has affirmed these tests as a reasonable exercise of a State's authority under the Constitution to determine the qualifications of voters.

In the case of *Lassiter* v. *Northampton County Board of Electors,* 360 U.S. 45 June 8, 1959, the Supreme Court upheld North Carolina's literacy test laws requiring that a voter "be able to read and write any section of the Constitution of North Carolina in the English language."

The Court condemned literacy tests that have been employed as "a device to make racial discrimination easy," but found that this was not the case in North Carolina.

I quote from the Court's opinion:

> The States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the rights of suffrage may be exercised.
>
> Literacy and illiteracy are neutral on race, creed, color, and sex as reports around the world show. In our society where newspapers, periodicals, books and other printed matter canvass and debate campaign issues, a State might conclude that only those who are literate should exercise the franchise.

It seems to me that this bill flagrantly and directly violates the recognition that the Court gave expressly in this case only 6 years ago the right of a State, and not the Federal Government, to determine the qualifications of voters. This right is stated clearly in article I, section 2 of the Constitution, and the 15th amendment does not diminish it to the extent that Congress, and certainly not a Federal agency, can set the qualifications for voters in State and local elections. We might observe also that the Lassiter case is not in line with the amendment adopted May 20 allowing Puerto Ricans in New York to vote despite the fact that they cannot read or write the English language.

According to this bill, whenever the Attorney General moves in on the 50-percent rule set forth in section 4(b), page 6, then the rights of a State cease. The drafters of the original bill made an attempt to stick to constitutionality on line 8 of page 5 of that bill, when they required a Federal examiner to determine whether an unregistered person had the qualifications prescribed by State law. But then they added the words "in accordance with instructions received under section 6(b)."

Section 6(b) on page 7 of the original bill authorized the Civil Service Commission to issue regulations governing examiners hearing cases. It provided that the Commission, after consultation with the Attorney General, shall "instruct examiners concerning the qualifications required for listing."

In other words, under the original bill, the Commission and the Attorney General could determine voter qualifications, which the Constitution says that the States can determine. Outwardly section 6(b) appeared to be only a procedural section, but any intelligent lawyer could readily see that adding the word qualifications in line 22 changed it from merely procedural to substantive, as well, and I thought that it was unconstitutional. I appeared before the Judiciary Committee against this bill, and I told them that this provision was quite flagrantly unconstitutional. They changed the section and deleted the specific language that I opposed. I tried unsuccessfully to have the Senate further amend the bill to make it unmistakably clear that State law must be followed.

The Commission may now instruct examiners under section 8(b) on State laws not inconsistent with the Constitution and the laws of the United States with respect both as to qualifying to vote and as to loss of eligibility. Thus, by administrative action, arbitrary rulings can be made on the constitutionality of State laws. This merely adds to the hopeless confusion of the bill. Under this provision, examiners become judges and the Commission becomes a Supreme Court issuing rules and orders on the constitutionality of State laws. If it be the intent of the bill to appoint judges, it should so state. I want the lawyers of the Nation to join me in noting that administrative officials carrying out regulations are not judges, and they and their superiors should not be clothed with judicial powers. Also, I would like to ask where there are any provisions spelling out what constitutes due process of law in the many matters in the discretion of the Attorney General under this bill. Since the bill is one to enforce the 15th amendment, I am afraid that the drafters forgot about due process of law under the 5th and 14th amendments. Future litigation will probably show what I am talking about in this instance.

Another section showing that the rights of a State cease when the examiners move in is section 5, page 7. Here a State would be relatively helpless even as to the power of its State legislature. If any new law on voting, substantive or procedural, is enacted after the examiners move in, it cannot go into full effect until it is approved in the District Court for the District of Columbia unless the Attorney General, after being consulted, enters no objection. This, to me, is outrageous. The Federal judiciary of one single jurisdiction and the Attorney General are to act as a third branch of a State legislature. At the same time they are to have veto power somewhat similar to that of the Governor of a State. This unconstitutional provision is contrary in every respect to the reserved powers of the States and to the separation of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our Government.

I expect that someone would have been thrown out of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 bodily, if he had even suggested that a State legislature could not effectuate its laws without the approval of a Federal court and an officer of the Federal Government. Montesquieu and John Locke would probably throw up their hands in disgust in trying to understand wherein the proposal would fit into the doctrine of separation of powers as between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of Government. I asked the Judiciary Committee to delete this section. They modified it slightly instead. Senator ERVIN of North Carolina and I both tried in vain to amend the bill by eliminating this unjust review of a change in State law.

The Judiciary Committee added a provision on page 6, line 16, of the bill, making the bill applicable whenever 25 percent of the voting age persons of a race or color in a State are not registered. The Attorney General has the discretion of asking for a population survey on which enforcement would rest. In other words, Federal machinery and Federal personnel can take over the administration of registering and voting in a State merely because 25 percent of the members of a race did not register. This is arbitrary legislation. It accuses a State of guilt by blaming it without even a formal charge of discrimination. The bill itself presumes discrimination. Laws in this country are not supposed to do that. This blanket indictment of a race of people and a State, at the same time is tantamount to a bill of attainder, which is prohibited under the Constitution.

The committee also added a provision to the already onerous original bill authorizing "poll watchers" or persons representing the examiner to be present to observe balloting procedures and voting tabulations. At the same time, the committee put in added criminal penalties for coercion under persuasion and intimidation as well as for election fraud. The substitute bill—amendment No. 124—authorized court-appointed poll watchers. On the floor an amendment passed authorizing an unlimited amount of poll watchers appointed by the Attorney General.

To me, this is extending the arm of the Federal Government entirely too far in State affairs. In a purely local or State election, Congress, in this bill, is presuming that there is sufficient Federal jurisdiction in a heretofore State controlled field to supervise it by Federal law and to send people to the penitentiary for violating Federal law. Criminal laws must be strictly construed. I doubt the constitutionality of the Federal Government going this far down into local affairs with criminal penalties. Moreover, I think that the principle is wrong, clearly wrong.

I am not certain that the present voting rights laws in the civil rights bills are constitutional. For reference, I refer to an article in the March 1963 edition of the "Yale Law Journal" by the noted editors entitled "The Federal Referee Plan and Alteration of State Voting Standards," especially at page 777 and the footnotes and cases cited. There, able legal scholars raised questions concerning what Congress had even done by that time, and they stated:

> Although Congress may have some power to affect voting qualifications in Federal elections, as to State elections only the right to be exempt from discrimination comes from the Federal Constitution.

This bill is not a bill to exempt persons from discrimination. It is a bill to punish States and subdivisions without proof of discrimination.

The whole theory of this bill contradicts the concept that under the Constitution of the United States as stated clearly in article I, section 2, the States reserved the power to establish the qualifications of voters. This concept has been approved time and again by the Supreme Court. In the case of *McPherson* v. *Blacker,* 146 U.S. 1, at page 35, 1892, opinion by Mr. Justice Fuller, the Supreme Court stated this doctrine in unmistakable terms.

The McPherson case was decided in 1892. Forty-five years later the Supreme Court reiterated this doctrine in a case which I have already cited on this floor in the poll tax debate but which is so much in point against this whole bill that I cite it again—*Breedlove* v. *Suttles,* 302 U.S. 277, 1937 at page 283:

> Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States and, save as restrained by the 15th and 19th amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate (citing six previous Supreme Court decisions).

The language of the Breedlove case is diametrically opposed to the whole purpose of this bill and to its many unconstitutional and unusual provisions.

I have also mentioned before another case decided in the Supreme Court only a little over 2 months ago, but its language is also so appropriate for general opposition to this bill that I reiterate it. In *Carrington* v. *Rash,* 380 U.S. 89, March 1, 1965, Mr. Justice Stewart, in the majority opinion, stated:

> Texas has unquestioned power to impose reasonable residence restrictions on the availability of the ballot. There can be no doubt either of the historic function of the States to establish, on a nondiscriminatory basis, and in accordance with the Constitution, other qualifications for the exercise of the franchise. Indeed, "the States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the right of suffrage may be exercised."

The above quotation brings the longstanding position of the Supreme Court up to date. In view of this, it is most difficult for me to understand how and why Congress, in a wave of mass demonstration emotionalism, feels that it can arrogate unto itself something that was never taken away from the States in the first place and attempt to use it in so abusive a manner.

There is one major and basic thought in my mind that has occasioned the certainty with which I have opposed, and am opposing, this bill: That is that our Government was not established with the thought in mind of taking away from the States the control of the right of suffrage. This basic concept was not altered sufficiently by the 15th amendment to warrant this bill.

In the Federalist Papers—Federalist No. 52—we find a discussion of why article I, section 2, giving suffrage control in Federal elections as to qualifications of electors to the States, was placed in the Constitution. The following quotation is most important:

> The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government. To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the Convention.

In other words, our Founding Fathers considered the point of this bill and decided against it because they felt that the States would object. I might add to that the thought that the Constitution in my opinion would not have been ratified had a uniform voting qualification been in it or had any arbitrary control over the power of State legislatures been given the Federal Government in the field of voting qualifications.

That is definitely one side of the coin, and it should be considered here and now.

On the other side we hear the various arguments that the 15th amendment superseded this concept. The history of that amendment shows otherwise, and moreover the 17th amendment was adopted after the 15th amendment and used the same language as article I, section 2 of the basic Constitution. I have checked some of the legislative history of the 15th amendment and I find that the Senate added to the words "race or color" a provision to ban discrimination based on "nativity, property, and education."

When this provision reached the House of Representatives a rollcall vote ensued and on February 15, 1869, the House refused by a vote of 133 to 37 to accept this version—Congressional Globe, 40th Congress, 3d session, February 15, 1869, page 1226. In turn the Senate receded from its amendment, and the debates in the Senate show that it was aware that it was yielding to the House on this point, particularly as to "education"—Globe, page 1639.

Therefore, under no theory of reasoning should it be said that Congress, which submitted the amendment to the States for ratification, intended that it include a ban on literacy tests in voting which had been expressly deleted.

In the instant bill Congress is now ignoring this history if the bill becomes law. It is also saying that what the States did not authorize us to do, we are now doing. Also, it is saying that despite the fact that our Founding Fathers discussed the principle of this bill and decided to leave voting matters to the States, we are now going to cast all this aside and take over the field both as to jurisdiction and as to substance.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is with a profound respect for the principles of government on which this Nation was founded that I oppose, and shall vote against, this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this period in the Senate's consideration of the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 can best be described as anticlimatic. If the final result of the Senate's work on this bill was ever in question since its dramatic presentation by the President, all doubts were removed by the vote on cloture. The time of debate is now limited, and the formality of a final vote for passage is nearly at hand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from South Carolina may proceed.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the debate in the Senate has been signally unproductive. Few, if any, votes have been influenced by it. In fact, from all appearances, little attention has been paid to the debate. The news media has disseminated little of the substance of the debate, so that the real issues involved in the bill are known and understood by the public hardly at all.

It would be naive to hope to change either the seemingly oblivious disposition of the Senate to pass the bill, or to hope to make any appreciable progress toward fostering public understanding of the bill in the remaining hours of debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order. The Chair respectfully requests that Members of the Senate and their staffs retire from the Chamber if they must hold conferences.

The Senator from South Carolina may proceed.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is not unlikely, however, that bills of similar import will again, in the future, ride to the Congress on a tidal wave of emotion or simulated crisis. In such an event, it is just barely possible that some may recall the tragic experience which will inevitably flow from passage of this bill, and heed the warnings which here fall on deaf ears.

The question now before the Senate is not merely an issue of good laws and bad laws, which is usually the crux of legislative decisions. Bad laws are passed by all legislatures from time to time, and—in our time, more than most. The Congress has passed laws which were bad because they were impractical; laws which were bad because they were inequitable; laws which were bad because they were extravagant. Congress has even proposed constitutional amendments which were bad laws, and some of them have been adopted.

The proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 is a bad law, but its significance is by no means hinged on this particular defect. As I have said, all legislatures pass bad laws, for legislation is the product of fallible human judgment.

The real significance of the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 lies in the fact that the crux of the issue it presents to the Congress is not a question of good versus bad law, but rather a question of whether the rule of law itself will prevail or be repudiated. The peculiar evil of this bill lies in the denial of the very concept of a government by laws which its passage will involve.

Ultimate sovereignty, insofar as earthly matters are concerned, rightly rests with the people. This fact was recognized when our forefathers freed themselves from the rule of the English Crown. Thereafter, in a comprehensive exercise of their sovereignty, the people, acting through their several States, chartered a central government and reposed in it certain specified powers. The charter itself was given the status of the supreme law, and provides the basis for all the other laws by which the Nation is to be governed.

The Constitution is the only basis upon which this or any other Congress can claim the right or authority to enact legislation. Except for the Constitution, what we do here is both presumptuous and usurpative of the sovereignty of the people.

Moreover, the Constitution is the sole source for differentiation between a government of laws and a government of men. It is on this major distinction that self-government, order, and justice depend.

The Constitution grants power to the Congress to pass good laws as well as bad laws, so long as the laws enacted are not inconsistent with the Constitution itself. Although bad laws have ill effects on the operation of our society, often thwart justice, and impose inequities upon the people, they do not, so long as they are consistent with the constitutional authority of Congress, impinge upon the concept of a government of laws.

The effect of passage of the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 will be to suspend the Constitution. Obviously, Congress has no authority to suspend the Constitution, for its only source of authority is the Constitution itself; but it is equally clear that Congress, as to this issue, at this time, with the concurrence of the Executive, and the anticipated complicity of the Supreme Court, does have the power to ignore or suspend the Constitution.

The contest on this proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 has been demonstrated throughout the debate, and, by the Senate's action on amendments, has been a rather one-sided contest between power on the one hand and argument of constitutional issues on the other. There has been, and, indeed, can be, no serious argument that this bill is consistent with the Constitution of the United States.

The Congress has no authority, under the Constitution, to usurp the judicial-review authority of the judiciary. The function of judicial review is vested in the judiciary. The constitutionality of the very laws which Congress would invalidate through passage of S. 1564 has been sustained repeatedly by the Court.

The Congress has no authority under the Constitution to abrogate the equal status of statehood by reducing some to a new, unnamed, but inferior, status. There may be and are differences of opinion as to the scope and magnitude of authority encompassed in the concept of statehood under the Constitution; but whatever it may be, it is singular, invariable, and unchangeable by any act which this or any other Congress might pass.

The Congress has no authority under the Constitution to place a prior restraint upon the enforcement of acts of State legislatures enacted pursuant to powers reserved exclusively to the States under the Constitution. The Constitution grants Congress no veto power over acts of State legislatures.

Undeniably, however, these are the powers which Congress purports to exercise in the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The bill purports to invalidate the imposition of literacy tests as a qualification to voting in certain statistically selected States. The imposition of literacy tests as a qualification for voting has repeatedly been sustained by the courts as a constitutional exercise of State power under the Constitution.

Under this bill, Congress purports to decide which States could, and which States could not, impose literacy tests as a prerequisite to voting, thereby denying to some States, while leaving intact in others, a specific and important power.

This bill would impose a condition of prior approval by a court or the Attorney General on enforcement of State laws dealing with voting rights and procedures.

By such an act, Congress would assume to itself a power of veto over acts of State legislatures and the same time delegate that power to specific courts, and even to an appointed official, the Attorney General.

This bill, if passed, will be one act of Congress which is entirely an exercise of power rather than an exercise of authority. The exercise of such power is incompatible with the Constitution, and the passage and enforcement of this bill is only possible to the extent that the Constitution no longer applies or is "suspended."

The suspension of the Constitution which will be occasioned by the passage of the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 would not be a mere temporary hiatus. The passage of this bill would involve not just putting the Constitution aside for a moment while the Senate engages in a rollcall vote while the House concurs, and while the President affixes his signature. On the contrary, the suspension of the Constitution which would follow from the passage of this bill would perisist throughout the life of this legislation, and beyond. So far reaching is the impact of this proposal, that its effect could probably never be erased from the society of our posterity.

Underlying the position of the proponents of this legislation is the inescapable implication that the suspension of the Constitution is justifiable on the basis of very extraordinary circumstances. This is but another way of saying that the demands of expediency cannot otherwise be comfortably fulfilled.

No circumstances, however turbulent, or however pressing, can justify the suspension of the Constitution by legislative fiat. If the concept of a government of laws has any validity, the concept must be able to withstand the onslaught of the most turbulent circumstances. Almost any concept of government can survive the tranquil and harmonious times. The real test of the rule of law comes from its ability to withstand the strains and pressures on the high end of the spectrum.

If, therefore, it is concluded that a government of laws is inadequate to withstand the requirements of difficult circumstances, the principle itself is invalid.

The truth of the matter is that there is no inadequacy in a government of laws.

If there is need for the Congress to have the power to pass legislative judgment on the constitutionality of State laws, there is a means consistent with the Constitution to accomplish this end.

If there is justification for creating the entity of a second-class statehood, it can be accomplished without violating the Constitution itself.

If the need of Congress to have a veto power over acts of State legislatures can in fact be sustained, there is a constitutional means to that end.

The alternative to suspending the Constitution, and the alternative to a rejection of a government of laws, is found in article V of the Constitution, itself; for the alternative to suspension of the Constitution is to amend the Constitution.

The Nation has witnessed an almost unparalleled display of political power by the proponents of the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965. They have moved with dispatch, they have proved invulnerable to argument, and they have brooked no delay. In a Senate which was formerly, but lamentably, no longer, the most deliberative body in the world, they have imposed cloture and terminated debate even in the complete absence of the treat of filibuster. They have brought this proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 to a final vote in this formerly most deliberative body in the world before the other House, known for its dispatch, could even get the bill reported from committee.

One would presume—with far more validity than have the presumptions incorporated in the bill before us—that the basis of all political power in the United

States resides in the people, themselves, as does sovereignty. It would follow, therefore, that the political power displayed by the proponents of the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 is but a reflection of the political will and determination of the people of the Nation. Apparently, those who support the provisions of S. 1564 have the requisite political strength to amend the Constitution of the United States to authorize Congress to exercise the power which it now clearly disposes to usurp.

Admittedly, amending the Constitution is no easy matter. In the first place, it requires a two-thirds vote in Congress to propose an amendment. This requirement should pose no difficulty to the proponents of the proposed voting rights act, for they have already mustered in the Senate 70 votes to impose cloture on the bill. Certainly this was a sufficient formidable display of strength.

For ratification of an amendment, the affirmative concurrence of three-fourths of the States is necessary. In view of the fact that the bill singles out only five States and portions of two others for punishment and demotion, and in view of the wide and enthusiastic support which surely must underlie the most impressive power display we have witnessed in the Senate there should have been no difficulty in securing the adoption of an authorizing amendment to the Constitution.

Even if the process required a full year's time, it could have been consummated—had it begun when this bill was presented—without permitting any intervening election to take place prior to the reform.

The constitutional amendment process was rejected, however, if it was ever even considered. Perhaps the proponents of this legislation are aware that political power is a fleeting thing which crests like a wave, only to subside again. They may reason with logic that emotions cool with time. Or perhaps they recall a lesson from "The Prince," that politicians should strike while the iron is hot. It gives one cause to wonder, however, how many recall Lord Acton's observation that "power tends to corrupt; absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely."

It may be that this "suspension" of the Constitution will prove neither permanent nor fatal. A century ago, there was a similar rejection of the rule of law following years of bloody fratricide. The Constitution survived. Fortunately, however, the judiciary remained at that time committed to the integrity of the Constitution and the rule of law. There is little basis for hope that rescue of the Constitution will come from that quarter in our time.

It is quite possible that should this suspension prove fatal to the already damaged Constitution and the rule of law, their passing will go unnoticed for awhile, and only later will observers attempt to fix the time of death, locate the body and reconstruct the crime. Should such an attempt be made, surely this spot will be the focus of attention.

Here, in what was formerly the most deliberative legislative body, will be the final resting place of the Constitution and the rule of law; for it is here that they will have been buried with shovels of emotion under piles of expediency, in the year of our Lord, 1965.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, Benjamin Franklin stated at the completion of the work of the Constitutional Convention of 1787:

> We have given this country a republic if it can keep it.

I say in all solemnity, and in all sincerity that if the pending bill is to be a prototype of the legislation which the American people can expect from the Congress in the future, we will not be able to keep the Republic which the Founding Fathers gave us. The Founding Fathers were perhaps the best qualified men who ever lived to write a Constitution. They had studied the long and bitter struggle of man for the right of self-government and for freedom from governmental tyranny. They had found these tragic words inscribed upon each page of that history:

> No man or set of men can be safely trusted with unlimited governmental power.

This discovery inspired them to write a Constitution which specified the powers that the Federal Government was to take, the powers which the States were to retain, and the rights which the citizens were to have even against Government.

The bill before the Senate does offense not only to constitutional safeguards but also to the essential elements of fair play. The Founding Fathers did not merely define the powers the Federal Government was to take. They wrote into the Constitution specific limitations upon the powers of the Federal Government. One of those limitations appears in section 9 of article I of the Constitution. It states in plain words that Congress shall not have the power to pass a bill of attainder or an ex post facto law.

A bill of attainder is a legislative act which imposes punishment upon named individuals or ascertainable groups of individuals without judicial trial. The bill condemns five States as a whole and parts of two other States without notice, without an opportunity to be heard, without evidence, and without a trial. By an artificial and deceptive triggering process, it declares that 5 States and substantial portions of 2 other States are guilty of violating the 15th amendment. Thirty-four counties of the State which I have the honor, in part, to represent are condemned by this artificial and deceptive formula of violating the 15th amendment upon the pretext that the election officials in them use literacy tests to deny citizens the right to vote on the basis of their race or color. That is the condemnation made by the triggering process of the bill. The condemnation is made despite the fact that records assembled by U.S. Civil Rights Commission show that during recent years 997 of every 1,000 persons of both races who took the literacy test in North Carolina were judged literate and were registered.

The administration, through its representative, the Attorney General, demands the passage of the bill. The Attorney General came before the Senate Judiciary Committee and admitted that the Department of Justice had no evidence that any of the 34 counties of North Carolina are engaged in violating the 15th amendment. A tragic day has been reached in the history of the Nation when its chief law officer comes before a committee of Congress and demands that 34 counties of my State, which he admits to be innocent, be adjudged guilty of a violation of the Constitution.

When the Attorney General is asked why he advocates a bill of this type, he says that the judicial processes are too slow and cumbersome. In other words, he advances as the only argument for the passage of the bill the excuse which a mob gives when it denies a man a fair trial in a court of justice and lynches him.

That excuse goes along very well with the provisions of the bill, because the bill would lynch provisions of the Constitution, which every officer of the Federal Government is bound by a solemn oath or affirmation to support.

I believe that every qualified citizen of every race ought to enjoy the right to vote, and that any election official who wilfully denies him such right ought to be punished. For this reason, I offered amendments which would have made it possible to secure the registration of qualified citizens in all areas of the country without substantial delay in a manner consistent with constitutional principles and the essentials of fairplay. Unfortunately for good government these amendments were defeated.

When the Constitution divided the powers of government between the Federal Government, on the one hand, and the States, on the other, it declared, by section 2 of article I and section 2 of article II of the original Constitution, and by the 10th amendment, and by the 17th amendment, that the power to prescribe qualifications for voting belongs to the States, not to Congress. According to every decision handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States from the beginning of the Republic to this hour, the power which those provisions of the Constitution give to the State to prescribe qualifications for voting include the power to establish and to use a literacy test as one of the qualifications for voting.

The able and distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] suggested a moment ago that the bill might well be deemed an affront to the Supreme Court of the United States. There is substantial foundation for this suggestion.

The bill would rob seven States of their power to establish and use literacy tests without notice, without an opportunity to be heard, without evidence, and without a trial. It would do so notwithstanding the fact that every decision handed down by the Supreme Court on this subject, from the day George Washington took his first oath of office as President of the United States to this very second, has declared that the power to prescribe qualifications for voting, including the power to prescribe a literacy test, belongs to the States under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

This being so, the proponents of the bill lay themselves open to the charge that they have no confidence whatever in the judicial stability of the Supreme Court. I say this because the bill cannot be adjudged valid by the Court unless it repudiates every decision it has made on the subject.

The proponents of the bill also lay themselves open to the charge that they manifest little confidence in the intellectual integrity of the Supreme Court. This is true because the second section of article I of the Constitution and the 17th amendment state in simplest words that in order to be eligible to vote for Senators and Representatives in Congress persons must possess the qualifications of electors of members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. It would have been impossible for the Founding Fathers and those who drafted and ratified the 17th amendment to have selected clearer words in which to express that all the States of the Union, including Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia, have the power to prescribe who shall vote for Senators and Representatives in Congress within their borders by prescribing the qualifications of those eligible to vote for members of the most numerous branches of their respective legislatures.

The pending measure would ignore those plain words of the 2d section of article I and the 17th amendment and deprive seven States of the power which these plain words vest in them to determine the persons eligible to vote for Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Another principle which was written into the Constitution by implication, and, which has been declared by the Supreme Court again and again in matters involving the powers of newly admitted States, is that the Constitution of the United States creates a union of States of equal dignity and power.

The pending measure would ignore that constitutional principle and declare that 7 States are not States of equal dignity and power with the other 43 States. Consequently this is a bill to make the constitutional angels weep. The legislative physicians who have concocted the strange nostrum contained in the bill are unwilling for their States to take their own medicine.

Hence, the bill is cleverly designed to exempt their States from its provisions. It is to be used as an instrument of chastisement for selected areas of the country which it is now politically profitable to chastise and which are without protection against the injustices embodied in the bill unless the Constitution of the United States is still a living document affording them the protection which the pending measure would deny to them.

No action taken in connection with the consideration of the pending bill illustrates in a more glaring manner the attitude which this bill expresses toward constitutional government than the action of the Senate in respect to the amendment designed to rob the State of New York of its constitutional power to prescribe literacy in English as a test for voting in that State.

The constitution of the great State of New York declares in the plainest words that no person within its boundaries should be allowed to vote in any Federal or State election unless he is literate in the English language. That was a constitutional principle written in the organic law of the State of New York by the people of New York State.

The validity of that provision under the Constitution of the United States had been assailed on at least two occasions—once in the courts of the State of New York, and a second time in the Federal court sitting within the State of New York. The first of these challenges, the one in the State court of New York, raised the question that the 15th amendment—the amendment which provides that no State shall deny or abridge the right of any citizen to vote on account of race or color—invalidated that provision.

The challenge in the New York court and also in the Federal court raised the question of whether the provision of the constitution of the State of New York which required literacy in the English language as a prerequisite for voting violated the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Both of those courts declared that nothing in the 15th amendment invalidated the provision of the New York constitution which required literacy in the English language as a prerequisite for voting.

As was expressly pointed out in those judicial decisions, a Puerto Rican who is literate in Spanish but not in English is not denied the right to vote by the New York constitution on account of his race or color but, on the contrary, is denied the right to vote by the New York constitution on account of his illiteracy in English. Consequently, they rightly held that the 15th amendment had no application whatever to the New York constitution.

Both decisions held that the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States did not invalidate the requirement of the New York constitution that a person be literate in English to qualify for the right to vote in New York. Such holdings were eminently sound. The equal-protection-of-the-laws clause of the 14th amendment does not apply to any State law which applies in like manner to all persons in like circumstances. The New York constitution applies in like manner to all persons illiterate in the English language.

During the debate on that amendment, I called attention to the decision of the Supreme Court of New York, 221 N.Y.S. 2d 262, the decision of the Court of Appeals of New York, affirming the decision of the Supreme Court of New York, and the decision of the three-judge Federal court sitting in New York . The decision of the Court of Appeals of New York is reported in 7 N.Y. 2d 762, and the opinion of the three-judge Federal court is reported in 199 F. Supp. 155 (1961).

These decisions make it clear, beyond peradventure of doubt, that New York State has the power to require literacy in English as a prerequisite of voting; and that it has that power under the Constitution of the United States. Moreover, it is elementary that the Congress, which does not have the power to amend the Constitution of the United States, or the constitution of New York, by one of its acts, had no power to adopt the amendment proposed in the Senate to outlaw the New York literacy test.

Notwithstanding the Constitution of the United States, which gives the State of New York the power to prescribe literacy in English as a prerequisite to the right to vote, and notwithstanding all of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States placing that interpretation upon the Constitution of the United States, and notwithstanding the decisions of the highest court in the State of New York, the court of appeals, and the three-judge Federal court sitting in New York, that New York State had the power under the Constitution to prescribe literacy in English as a prerequisite to the right to vote, the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, incorporated that amendment in the bill.

When the Constitution of the United States was drawn, it divided the legislative powers of government between the Congress on the one hand, and the legislatures of the States on the other. Under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States construing that separation of governmental powers, it has been held what ought to be self-evident—that the States of the Union have the same legislative power in the fields assigned to them by the Constitution as the Congress has in the fields assigned to it by the Constitution.

Notwithstanding the plain words of the Constitution and the clear decisions of the courts construing those plain words, that the States have the right to prescribe the qualifications for voting, including a literacy test, and that they have the constitutional power under section 4 of article I of the Constitution to designate the procedures for voting in Federal elections in the absence of express congressional legislation on the subject, the bill before the Senate provides that in seven States legislative acts adopted by those States in the plain exercise of their constitutional power cannot be made effective until they are approved by an executive officer of the Federal Government, the Attorney General of the United States, or by a Federal court sitting in the District of Columbia.

This offends the Constitution, because it robs those States of their undoubted power to pass laws and make them immediately effective.

It is also an offense to the constitutional principle that the powers of the Federal Government itself are divided among the Congress, the President, and the Federal courts.

I say this because the bill would vest in the Attorney General what is in essence judicial power.

If Congress can vest power in the Attorney General to pass on the validity of an act of a State legislature before it can become effective in one case, it can vest that power in the Attorney General in all cases. If Congress can vest that power in the Attorney General in respect to 7 States, it can vest that power in the

Attorney General with respect to all 50 States.

There are more strange things about the bill than time permits me to discuss, but the strangest thing is that the proponents of the bill admit that those of us who oppose it are on sound constitutional ground when we say that the Constitution of the United States gives the States power to prescribe literacy tests.

They also admit that we are on sound constitutional ground when we say that Congress cannot abolish by congressional act any of the powers conferred upon the States by the Constitution.

They say, "We are not doing that. All we are doing is to suspend the power of seven States to use literacy tests as qualifications for voting. We admit that the power to do so is vested in these seven States by the Constitution."

If Congress can suspend any power vested in Alabama by the Constitution, it can suspend any power vested in Kentucky by the Constitution. If Congress can suspend any power vested in Mississippi by the Constitution, it can suspend any power vested in the State of Michigan by the Constitution. If Congress can suspend power vested in North Carolina by the Constitution, it can suspend power vested in all 50 States by the Constitution. I deny the theory which underlies the bill; namely, that Congress can suspend any provision of the Constitution. This theory is utterly inconsistent with the Constitution and utterly repugnant to the reasons which gave it birth.

Mr. President, as a practicing lawyer, and as a judge, I have spent the major part of my life in the administration of justice. Consequently, I have reason to entertain a high opinion of the place of the courts in the life of our Nation. Indeed, I believe, the administration of justice to be the most sacred function of government.

During debate on this subject, I read to the Senate a provision of the constitution of North Carolina which declares that courts shall always be open. I also read to the Senate a great passage from the speech of Jeremiah S. Black, counsel for the petitioner in Ex parte Milligan, concerning the intention of the American people that courts of justice should always be open for the administration of justice.

The pending bill is absolutely incompatible with devotion to the rule of law or respect for the judicial process.

Although Congress has created 91 Federal district courts in the United States and given them virtually identical jurisdiction in all other instances, this bill provides that only one of the 91 Federal district courts, to wit, the District Court of the District of Columbia, can exercise jurisdiction in cases arising under the provisions of the pending bill.

Mr. President, the judicial process was invented by man in his most exalted and most enlightened hour. Its purpose was to repeal the law of the jungle, and establish in its place the law of civilization. The judicial process was invented by man for one purpose and one purpose only—to enable government to perform in a just manner its most sacred task, the administration of justice. The judicial process contemplates that no person, natural or artificial, shall be condemned and punished for alleged wrongdoing without notice, without evidence, without an opportunity to be heard, and without a judicial trial.

The pending bill scarcely pays lipservice to the judicial process. It says to each State and to each political subdivision condemned by the triggering device: "You are condemned without notice. You are condemned without evidence. You are condemned without an opportunity to be heard. You are condemned without a judicial trial."

After condemning the State or political subdivision without notice, without evidence, without an opportunity to be heard, and without a judicial trial, the bill then makes false obeisance to the judicial process by saying, in substance, to the condemned State or political subdivision: "While all the other 90 Federal district courts in the United States are closed to you and denied power to harken to your plea, you may journey anywhere from your location, be it 250 or 1,000 miles distant, to the District Court of the District of Columbia, and exonerate yourself from your congressional condemnation if you satisfy such court of two things:

"First. That you have not violated the 15th amendment in the past, or if you have, you have fully corrected your past violations.

"Second. That you will not violate the 15th amendment at any time during the foreseeable future."

The bill withholds the substance of the judicial process from those it condemns without notice, evidence, opportunity to be heard, and a judicial trial. I do not know of a worse offense which can be committed by a legislative body than to do what the pending bill would do with respect to the judicial process, to take a process which was created to do justice and pervert it, distort it, and prostitute it, so that justice cannot be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I do not object.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 22, line 22, insert after the words "clause (a)" and before the period, the following: "and to petition the Attorney General to request the Director of the Census to take such survey or census as may be appropriate for the making of the determination provided for in this section. The District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to require such survey or census to be made by the Director of the Census, and it shall require him to do so if it deems the Attorney General's refusal to request such survey or census to be arbitrary or unreasonable".

Mr. HART. Mr. President, last night I suggested a modification of the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. It was done in complete good faith. It was assumed that there would be available census information that would be required in order that that opportunity would be meaningful.

We discovered, however, that that census information would not be available. The amendment now offered provides a means of making available census information so that the "good" county may obtain release from any examiner who might be sent in by the Attorney General. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself a minute on my own time. It will be noted that the structure of the amendment continues the general structure of the bill, which vests the fundamental administration of the various aspects of it in the Attorney General of the United States.

However, it does give very complete and effective court sanction. It provides for two types of petition to the Attorney General, one asking for a termination of procedures which are the general purpose of the bill, and also seeking the necessary survey or census which will qualify a subdivision for the purpose of starting a suit. It gives complete authority to the court in order that that be done.

Therefore, the structure of the administration of the bill is preserved, and the substance which is sought by the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is effected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Michigan has offered the amendment. It was necessary to do so in order to perfect the modification of my amendment that the Senator had offered yesterday. The idea is that the Attorney General ordinarily would have his finding final for the determination that a certain percentage of Negroes are registered or are not registered. However, in the event that there should be a dispute about the matter, and there should be reason to feel that the Attorney General might be arbitrary about declining a request for a census, we now would give the court discretion. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Michigan has offered this amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds. I merely wish to point out that the technique used with respect to the Attorney General and his request to the Director of the Census is the very same technique which is contained in the bill in section 4(b) with respect to the so-called 25 percent triggering mechanism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, No. 124, offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Senator before he begins his speech, so that he may address himself to this subject?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. It has to do with the poll tax, to which the Senator has given a great deal of thought and attention. The poll tax, as I understand the bill, is to be outlawed as a condition to voting because it is discriminatory, allegedly, under the 15th amendment, and is discriminatory because, as I understand the argument, Negroes are on a lower economic level than white persons in many of the States affected.

Would not the same argument be equally applicable to a sales tax or excise tax, in exactly the same way? Would not those also be regarded as discriminatory under the 15th amendment in the same way that the poll tax is said to be discriminatory?

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina is exactly correct. The poll tax does not discriminate because it is levied against the black and white, the rich and poor, regardless of their economic level. There is no discrimination. It is levied on everyone.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Assuming that a person has less money than another person, and therefore it is argued that the poll tax is discriminatory, would not that same argument apply to a sales tax or excise tax in exactly the same way?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has put his finger on a very important point. The Senator is correct. We are entering an era of absolute government, of a strong centralized government. The bill is a major step in that direction. It would destroy the system of government that we now know. We are destroying it under the whiplash of Martin Luther King and others of that ilk.

ARTICLE I, SECTION 2, OF THE CONSTITUTION EXPRESSLY RESERVES UNTO THE STATES THE EXCLUSIVE AUTHORITY TO PRESCRIBE VOTING QUALIFICATIONS, SAVE ONLY AS LIMITED BY THE PROHIBITION OF THE 15TH, 19TH, AND 24TH AMENDMENTS

Mr. President, the exclusive right to prescribe voting qualifications was expressly reserved unto the States by article I, section 2, of the Constitution, wherein it states:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The clear, cogent, unambiguous language thereof is neither subject to misunderstanding nor susceptible to misinterpretation by fairminded men. It was clearly comprehended by its authors and has been accepted for 177 years since the ratification of our Constitution as an absolute reservation unto the States of the power to prescribe voter qualifications, save only as limited by the subsequent adoption of the 15th, 19th, and 24th amendments. And I submit, Mr. President, that the proponents and advocates of this amendment are mocked at every turn by the clear and cogent language of article I, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States; the deliberations related thereto by the Constitutional Convention of 1787; the debates and treatises concerning its ratification; its subsequent consideration from time to time in the debates of the Congress, and 177 years of unbroken legal precedence.

Mr. President, I would like to take this occasion to enlighten my friends and colleagues as to the clear meaning, force and effect of article I, section 2, of our National Constitution. In doing so I should like to discuss, among other things, its historical origin and subsequent history, the legal precedences related thereto, and its connection with related sections of the Constitution.

It is an established canon of constitutional construction that no one provision of the Constitution is to be separated from all the others, to be considered alone, but that all the provisions bearing upon a particular subject are to be brought into view and to be so interpreted as to effect the great purposes of the instrument—volume 16, American Jurisprudence, second edition, Constitutional Law, section 66.

Thus in order to fully comprehend the true force and effect of article I, section 2, I would like to impress upon my colleagues the necessity of being ever mindful throughout this discussion of the importance of its relationship with article I of the Bill of Rights. Now I know that the presence of the 10th amendment in our National Constitution is a constant source of extreme discomfort and frustration to many of my distinguished friends and colleagues, but I hope they will not be unduly offended if I take this occasion to reacquaint them with the clear mandate of its language.

Article X states:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

I submit that upon thoughtful consideration of the plain language of article I, section 10, there are several facts that became immediately and patently obvious on its face. I would draw your special attention to the fact that it is quite apparent that it is not in any sense a grant of power to the Congress of the United States or to anyone else, but simply a prerequisite set forth in the Constitution for the creation of a new government. It is a requirement that the "House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year." Certainly that was no relinquishment of power from the States, nor a delegation of power to the United States, nor a prohibition, but a simple command. In addition to the foregoing command, section 2 vested, in those persons in each State who qualified to vote for members of the most numerous branch of their State legislature, a right to vote for Members of Congress. This was clearly not a delegation of power by the States, because the States never had the power to vote in the first place, and the inhabitants of the States never had the right to vote for Members of Congress for the simple reason that there was no Congress in existence. No, it was not a delegation of power but a direct provision for the establishment of a new government which vested a right in a defined class of persons to vote for Members of Congress, or those qualified under State law to vote for members of the most numerous branch of their State legislatures. It is likewise clear that section 2 contains an implied prohibition on the States against establishing qualifications for the electors of members of their own legislatures which are different from those which they established for electors for Members of Congress and vice versa. This is an implied restriction upon the powers of the States and in no sense a delegation nor a grant of power.

Now, Mr. President, this brings us to the question as to what powers, if any, are vested in the Congress of the United States in relation to article I, section 2. While it is perfectly obvious that section 2 contains no specific grant of power to the Federal Government whatsoever, I would concede that under the necessary and proper clause of article I, section 8, the Congress is vested with the implied authority to assure that the States elect Members of Congress every second year; that those persons qualified to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the respective State legislatures are given the right and opportunity to vote for Members of Congress, and that the States make the same provisions for qualifications of electors of Members of Congress as they do for the electors of the most numerous branch of their respective legislatures. While I never underestimate the ingenuity of the proponent of this type legislation when it comes to misconstruing the clear meaning of the Constitution, I assume that there are none so bold or confused as to seriously contend that the implied powers vested in the Congress by the necessary and proper clause of section 8 of article I include the power to prescribe to the States who they should qualify to vote for the members of their respective legislatures.

The historically accepted and legally established fact that the authors of our National Constitution intended article I, section 2, as an absolute reservation unto the States of the exclusive power to prescribe voting qualifications is not only patently obvious on its face, but is thoroughly corroborated by the situation existing prior to the convening of the

Convention; by the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention itself, and the debates connected with its ratification within the respective States.

The fundamental principle of constitutional construction is that effect must be given to the intent of the framers of the organic law of the people adopting it. This is the polestar in the construction of constitutions—16 Am. Jur. 2d Constitutional Law, section 64.

As a corollary to that principle we find in section 88 that:

> The rule is well established that in the construction of a constitution recourse may be had to proceedings in the convention which drafted the instrument.

The question as to whether or not there should be a national suffrage for the election of Representatives and Senators was the subject of intense debate in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and the question as to whether the States or the Federal Government should determine the qualifications of electors of representatives was an issue which was squarely placed before the delegates and argued at length on the floor of debate. The contest evolved between those delegates who desired a uniform qualification for electors to be prescribed in the Constitution itself; those who wished the power to prescribe voting qualifications to be vested in the Congress, and a prevailing faction which believed that the Constitution should prescribe that the electors for Members of Congress should be the same as those qualified in the respective States to vote for members of the most numerous branch of their State legislatures.

The issue was resolved on August 6, 1787, when Morris of Pennsylvania moved to strike from article IV, section 1, of the existing draft, the words:

> The qualifications of the electors shall be the same, from time to time, as those of the electors, in the several States, of the most numerous branch of their own legislatures.

His stated purpose was "in order that some other provisions might be substituted which would restrain the right of suffrage to freeholders." Morris also argued that another "objection against the clause, as it stands, is, that it makes the qualifications of the electors of the National Legislature dependent upon the will of the States." Colonel Mason of Virginia argued in favor of the clause, stating: "A power to alter the qualifications would be a dangerous power in the hands of the Federal Legislature." Other advocates of the provision warned that the authority to prescribe voting qualifications was jealously guarded by the States and would not be voluntarily relinquished by them. The motion to strike was defeated, with seven States voting to retain the sentence; Delaware to strike it; Maryland being divided, and Georgia absent. It is, therefore, an uncontroverted historical fact that it was the unanimous understanding of the delegates to the convention that article I, section 2, vested in the respective States the exclusive authority to prescribe voting qualifications, and there exists not one scintilla of evidence to the contrary.

As stated in *Transportation Co.* v. *Wheeling,* 99 U.S. 280:

> Support to that view is also derived from one of the members of the Federalists, which has ever been regarded as entitled to weight in any discussion as to the true intent and meaning of the provisions of our fundamental law.

We find in 16 Am. Jur. 2d., Constitutional Law, section 89, that:

> It is an accepted principle that in the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States recourse may be had to the Federalists, since the papers included in that work were the handiwork of three eminent statesmen, two of whom had been members of the Convention which framed the Constitution.

In issue No. 52 of the Federalist Papers, the States were given assurance that they would continue to exercise exclusive authority to establish voting qualifications:

> To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the Convention.
>
> The provision made by the Convention appears, therefore, to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every State, because it is conformable to the standard already established, or which may be established by the State itself.

A review of the debates in the ratifying convention of the respective States bears out the universal acceptance of this interpretation and are entitled to great weight by every principle of constitutional construction.

In the Massachusetts convention there was a "doubting Thomas." Dr. John Taylor, from the town of Douglass, who feared that section 4 might give Congress power to prescribe a property qualification for voters in the sum of 100 pounds. He inquired of Rufus King whether this could not be done to keep Members of Congress in office. Mr. King was one of the more distinguished statesmen of that period, a leading member of the Federal Convention. Answering, he said:

> The idea of the honorable gentleman from Douglass transcends my understanding; for the power of control given by this section extends to the manner of election, not the qualifications of the electors.

In the Pennsylvania convention James Wilson, a leader in the Federal Convention, said:

> In order to know who are qualified to be electors of the House of Representatives, we are to inquire who are qualified to be electors of the legislature of each State. If there be no electors of them: if there be no such electors, there is no criterion to know who are qualified to elect Members of the House of Representatives. By this short, plain deduction, the existence of State legislatures is proved to be essential to the existence of the General Government.

This negatives any idea that Congress could, under section 4, deal with qualifications.

With respect to section 4, Mr. Wilson says:

> If the Congress had it not in their power to make regulations, what might be the consequences? Some States might make no regulations at all on the subject. And shall the existence of the House of Representatives, the immediate representation of the people in Congress, depend upon the will and pleasure of the State governments? * * * We find, on examining this paragraph (sec. 4) that it contains nothing more than the maxims of self-preservation.

In the Virginia convention, Wilson Nicholas, one of the delegates, said:

> If, therefore, by the proposed plan, it is left uncertain in whom the right of suffrage is to rest, or if it has placed that right in improper hands, I shall admit that it is a radical defect; but in this plan there is a fixed rule for determining the qualifications of electors, and that rule the most judicious that could possibly have been devised, because it refers to a criterion which cannot be changed. A qualification that gives a right to elect representatives for the State legislatures, given, also, by this Constitution, a right to choose Representatives for the General Government.

The Virginia debates do not show any dissent.

In the North Carolina convention, a delegate, John Steele, referring to Representatives, said:

> Who are to vote for them? Every man who has a right to vote for a representative to our legislature will ever have a right to vote for a Representative to the General Government. Does it not expressly provide that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the most numerous branch of the State legislature? Can they, without a most manifest violation of the Constitution, alter the qualifications of the electors? The power over the manner of elections does not include that of saying who shall vote. The Constitution expressly says that the qualifications which entitle a man to vote for a State representative. It is, then, clearly and indubitably fixed and determined who shall be the electors; and the power over the manner only enables them to determine how these electors shall elect—whether by ballot, or by vote, or by any other way.

Now, there are those, Mr. President, who admit the exclusive authority of the States under article I, section 2, to prescribe the voting qualifications, but audaciously suggest that the term "qualification" was not intended by the authors of our Constitution to include the payment of a poll tax or other tax as a prerequisite for voting. Now if this contention appears unusual and erroneous on its face, it is rendered sheer nonsense by the provisions of the State constitutions existing at the time of the Convention. As stated in 16 Am. Jur. 2d, Constitutional Law section 87:

> It is settled that in placing a construction on a constitution or any clause or part thereof, a court may look to the history of the times and examine the state of things existing when the constitution was framed and adopted, in order to ascertain the prior law, the mischief, and the remedy.

Each delegation had before them the the provisions of their own State constitutions requiring the payment of poll taxes and property taxes as a prerequisite qualification to the right to vote for members of the most numerous branch of their respective legislatures. They had before them the fact that the New

Hampshire constitution, of 1784, had a requirement for the payment of a poll tax and that the constitution of Massachusetts, adopted in 1780, required the possession of a freeheld estate as a prerequisite to suffrage. They had the constitution of 1777 of New York State which required that a man must be either a freeholder or a taxpayer of New York or Albany in order to vote. They had the constitution of New Jersey of 1776, which required that a man possess an estate of 50 pounds as a qualification for voting.

They had the constitution of Pennsylvania of 1776, requiring that a voter for the legislature must be a taxpayer; the constitution of Maryland, which required that a voter of the State legislature must be a freeholder of 50 acres or the possessor of 50 pounds; the constitution of North Carolina of 1776, requiring that a voter for the most numerous branch of that State legislature be a freeholder or a taxpayer, and they also had the constitutions of South Carolina and Georgia, which had similar requirements for voting.

If there remained any doubt whatsoever as to whether the term "qualification" as used in article I, section 2, encompasses the requirement of the payment of taxes as a prerequisite to voting, it was forever resolved in the affirmative by the adoption of the 17th amendment in 1912. The 17th amendment, providing for the popular election of U.S. Senators used the identical language of article I, section 2:

> The electors in each State should have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

The above-quoted language of the 17th amendment was adopted after more than a century of experience with the suffrage provisions contained in the Constitution and also after there had been ample time to observe the operations of the newer poll taxes which were imposed in the Southern States between 1875 and 1908.

Continuing from the ridiculous to the absurd, past proponents of anti-poll-tax legislation have repeatedly advanced the astounding proposition that the Congress is specifically delegated the power to regulate State voting qualifications by the terms of article I, section 4, wherein it states:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Not only does this unusual theory fly in the face of the plain and patent meaning of article I, but even the most partisan view of the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention, ratification debates, and the subsequent legal precedence relating thereto, can produce one shred of fact to recommend it.

The words "times," "places," and "manner" cannot be remotely associated or confused with the plain meaning of the word "qualification" as used in section 2 of article I. No degree of strained construction nor the most ingenious imagination can conjure up a conflict between these two sections.

At the Massachusetts Ratifying Convention, in answer to an inquiry as to whether Congress may prescribe a property qualification for voters under the provisions of section 4 of article I, Mr. Rufus King, a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, replied:

> The idea of the honorable gentleman from Douglass transcends my understanding; for the power of control given by this section extends to the manner of elections, not the qualifications of the electors.

These two sections were explained before the North Carolina Convention in the following words by John Steele:

> Can they, without a most manifest violation of the Constitution, alter the qualifications of the electors: the power over the manner of elections does not include that of saying who shall vote. The Constitution expressly says that the qualifications are these which entitle a man to vote for a State representative. It is, then, clearly and indubitably fixed and determined who shall be the electors; and the power over the manner only enables them to determine how these electors shall elect—whether by ballot, by vote, or by any other way.

Madison explained article I, section 4 to the Virginia Ratifying Convention as follows:

> It was found impossible to fix the time, place, and manner of the election of Representatives in the Constitution. It was found necessary to leave the regulation of these, in the first place, to the State government, as being best acquainted with the situation of the people, subject to the control of the General Government, in order to enable it to produce uniformity and prevent its own dissolution.
>
> And, considering the State governments and General Government as distinct bodies, acting in different and independent capacities for the people, it was thought the particular regulations should be submitted to the former and the general regulations to the latter. Were they exclusively under the control of the State governments, the General Government might easily be dissolved. But if they be regulated properly by the State legislatures, the congressional control will very probably never be exercised.

It is perfectly obvious that the advocates of such a theory either fail to understand, or refuse to accept when it does not suit their purpose, the distinction between substance and procedure, a distinction clearly drawn in *Newberry* v. *U.S.* 256 U.S. 232 (1920). They would have us accept the unbelievable proposition that "manner" does not refer merely to the procedure incident to elections, but to the substance as well. To accept that premise is to agree with what the entire thrust of the Constitution refutes, that the Central Government could impose uniform franchise qualifications upon the States.

In view of the foregoing, and especially in light of the subsequent ratification of the 17th amendment, it is readily apparent that article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States of America was intended to vest in the States alone the authority to prescribe qualifications for voters. This view has been firmly established by an unbroken line of legal precedence.

In ***Ex parte Yarbrough,*** **110 U.S. 651** (1884), the Court said after quoting section 2, article I:

> The States in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualifications for voters for these eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress. (at 663.)

The Yarbrough case contains a thorough discussion of the power vested in Congress to prescribe the manner of holding elections under article I, section 4. In that case Yarbrough and others were prosecuted for interferring by physical attack with the exercise of the right to vote of certain qualified voters in an election of a Member of Congress from Georgia. The Court upheld the power of Congress to pass legislation prohibiting such violence under the provisions of section 4 of article I, but made it clear that the protective shield of the Federal Government could only be invoked as to those electors already found qualified by State law. The same conclusion has reached in the case of ***U.S.*** **v.** ***Munford,*** CCED Va., 16 Fed. Rep. 223 (1883). The same conclusion is reached in the case of ***United States*** **v.** ***Classic,*** 313 U.S. 299 (1941), in which the Court points out that section 4 of article I is supplemented by Congress power to pass implementing legislation under the "necessary and proper" clause of article I, section 8. The Classic case cannot be interpreted in any way to imply an authority of the National Congress to regulate State qualifications for voting.

THE POWER VESTED IN CONGRESS TO ENACT APPROPRIATE LEGISLATION PURSUANT TO THE PROVISION OF THE 15TH AMENDMENT IS NARROWLY CONFINED TO THE NEGATIVE AUTHORITY TO PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATORY STATE ACTION AS CONTRADISTINGUISHED FROM THE EXPRESS GRANT OF CONGRESSIONAL POWER "TO MAKE ALL LAWS WHICH SHALL BE NECESSARY AND PROPER" TO REGULATE INTERSTATE COMMERCE AS ENUMERATED IN ARTICLE I, SECTION 8

In their desperate reach for some semblance of legality upon which to base this mockery of the Constitution, the proponents of this legislation seek to equate the broad regulatory power vested in Congress by the interstate commerce clause of article I, section 8, with the narrow, negative authority to prohibit State action under the terms of the 15th amendment. Testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee in regard to this same bill, the Attorney General sought to justify the sweeping provisions thereof by citing ***Gibbons*** **v.** ***Ogden,*** **9** Wheat. 1, and its broad description of the congressional power to regulate interstate commerce, as well as ***Atlanta Motel*** **v.** ***United States,*** **379 U.S. 241.**

Even to the most casual student of the Constitution, such an equation is immediately absurd, not only from a comparison of the clear, obvious, patent language of the two provisions, but also by an analysis of the judicial decisions relating thereto.

Section 8 of article II of the Constitution is that provision wherein the express powers vested in Congress are enumerated.

The section begins:

> The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce * * * among the several States * * *, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers * * *.

Thus Congress is expressly granted the absolute, exclusive, affirmative, "necessary, and proper power to regulate" this area of commerce. No such regulatory power is vested in Congress in regard to voting qualifications, such power being expressly reserved to the States by article I, section 2 of the Constitution.

In Gibbons against Ogden, Chief Justice Marshall stressed the word regulate, stating:

> We are now arrived at the inquiry—what is this power? It is the power to regulate; that is to prescribe the rule by which commerce is to be governed.

As stated in the Constitution of the United States of America, Annotated, 1964 edition:

> This clause serves a twofold purpose: it is the direct source of the most important powers which the National Government exercises in time of peace; and except for the due process of law clause of amendment 14, it is the most important limitation imposed by the Constitution on the exercise of State power.

Nowhere in the Constitution is there to be found an express, implied, or reserved power in the States to regulate interstate commerce.

Contrariwise, as previously discussed, the States are vested by article I, section II, with the exclusive, expressly reserved authority to prescribe voting qualifications, save only as expressly limited by the prohibitions of the 15th, 19th, and 24th amendments.

The 15th amendment prohibits any State from denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color and gives Congress the power to enforce the same by appropriate legislation. It does not vest in the Congress the power to preempt or usurp the constitutional authority of the States to prescribe and regulate voting qualifications. The 15th amendment, like the 14th amendment, merely prohibits the States from discriminating on account of race or color, as stated in *Ownby* v. *Morgan,* 256 U.S. 94, wherein the Court stated:

> Its function is negative, not affirmative, and it carries no mandate for particular measures of reform.

The fact that the authors of the 15th amendment intended to vest in Congress legislative authority negative rather than affirmative in its nature, prohibitory rather than regulatory in its scope, is obvious from the patent language thereof. Mr. Justice Storey, discussing the 15th amendment in "Story on the Constitution," 1891, volume 2, page 719, said:

> There was no thought at this time of correcting at once and by a single act the inequalities and all the injustice that might exist in the suffrage laws of the several States. There was no thought or purpose of regulating by amendment, or of conferring upon Congress the authority to regulate, or to prescribe qualifications for, the privilege of the ballot.

This view has been consistently upheld by the courts. In the case of *United States* v. *Reese, et al.,* 92 U.S. 214, 1875, the Supreme Court said:

> The 15th amendment does not confer the right of suffrage upon any one. It prevents the States, or the United States, however, from giving preference, in this particular, to one citizen of the United States over another on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

In *United States* v. *Cruikshank,* 92 U.S. 542, 1875, the Court stated:

> In *Minor* v. *Happersett,* 21 Wall. 178, we decided that the Constitution * * * has not conferred the right of suffrage upon any one, and that the United States have no voters of their own creation in the States. In *United States* v. *Reese, et al.,* supra p. 214, we hold that the 15th amendment has invested the citizens of the United States with a new constitutional right, which is exemption from discrimination in the exercise of the elective franchise on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. From this it appears that the right of suffrage is not a necessary attribute of national citizenship; but that exemption from discrimination in the exercise of that right on account of race, etc. is. The right to vote comes from the State; but the right of exemption from the prohibited discrimination comes from the United States.

Consequently, every case decided on the subject since 1875 has affirmed what the clear language of the 15th amendment indicates; that the "power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation" simply confers upon Congress the very limited, negative power to prohibit discriminatory state action rather than any affirmative authority to interfere with, regulate or preempt the right of the States to establish and administer voting qualifications.

In 1890 the court held in *Davis* v. *Beason,* 133 U.S. 333, that the suffrage law of the territory of Idaho denying the vote to any person "who is a bigamist, a polygamist or who teaches, advises, counsels or encourages any person or persons" in regard thereto; is not open to any constitutional or legal objection."

The principle of Minor against Happersett, U.S. against Cruikshank, and U.S. against Reese was explicitly reaffirmed in *McPherson* v. *Blockner,* 146 U.S. 1, 1892 The Court, discussing the Constitution, said:

> It recognizes that the people act through their representatives in the legislature, and leaves it to the legislature exclusively to define the method of affecting the object. Ibid., page 27.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In short, the appointment and mode of appointment of electors belong exclusively to the States under the Constitution of the United States.
>
> Ibid., page 35.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The right to vote intended to be protected refers to the right to vote as established by the laws and Constitution of the State.
>
> Ibid., page 39.

Having ratified and reaffirmed the foregoing premise, the Court then concluded:

> But we can perceive no reason for holding that the power confided to the States by the Constitution has ceased to exist because the operation of the system has not fully realized the hopes of those by whom it was created.
>
> Ibid., page 36.

As stated in *Pope* v. *Williams,* 193 U.S. 621 (1903):

> The privilege to vote in any State is not given by the Federal Constitution, or by any of its amendments.

In upholding a Maryland statute requiring a declaration of intent to become a citizen of that State 1 year prior to registration, the Court stated that:

> The Federal Constitution does not confer the right of suffrage upon any one, and the condition under which that right is to be exercised are matters for the States alone to prescribe, subject to the provisions of the Federal Constitution.

Also see *Mason* v. *Missouri,* 179 U.S. 328.

The Mississippi literacy test provided for in our State Constitution was upheld in the case of *Williams* v. *Mississippi,* 170, U.S. 213, 1898, and the constitutionality of a similar provision of the Louisiana Constitution was approved by the Fifth Circuit in *Trudeau* v. *Barnes,* 65 F. Second, 563, 1933.

The literacy requirement of the Constitution of North Carolina has been upheld as a constitutional exercise by that State of its power to prescribe voting qualifications as late as 1959, in the case of Lassiter against Northhampton County Board of Elections. Mr. Justice Douglas delivering the opinion of the Court, discussed the Courts former precedents concerning the right of a State to prescribe voting qualifications in view of the provisions of the 14th and 15th amendments:

> The States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the right of suffrage may be exercised, *Pope* v. *Williams,* 193 U.S. 621, 633; *Mason* v. *Missouri,* 179 U.S. 328, 335, absent of course the discrimination which the Constitution condemns. Article I, section 2 of the Constitution in its provision for the election of Members of the House of Representatives and the 17th amendment in its provision for the election of Senators provide that officials will be chosen "by the people." Each provision goes on to state that "the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." So while the right of suffrage is established and guaranteed by the Constitution (*Ex parte Yarbrough,* 110 U.S. 651, 663–665; *Smith* v. *Allwright,* 321 U.S. 649, 661–662) it is subject to the imposition of State standards which are not discriminatory and which do not contravene any restriction that Congress, acting pursuant to its constitutional powers, has imposed. See *United States* v. *Classic,* 313 U.S. 299, 315. While section 2 of the 14th amendment, which provides for apportionment of Representatives among the States according to their respective numbers counting the whole number of persons in each State (except Indians not

taxed), speaks of "the right to vote," the right protected "refers to the right to vote as established by the laws and constitution of the State. *McPherson* v. *Blacker*, 146 U.S. 1. 39.

Dealing specifically with the constitutional authority of the States to require literacy tests as a prerequisite to voting, Justice Douglas said:

> We do not suggest that any standards which a State desires to adopt may be required of voters. But there is wide scope for exercise of its jurisdiction. Residence requirements, age, previous criminal record (*Davis* v. *Beason*, 133 U.S. 333, 345–347) are obvious examples indicating factors which a State may take into consideration in determining the qualifications of voters. The ability to read and write likewise has some relation to standards designed to promote intelligent use of the ballot. Literacy and illiteracy are neutral on race, creed, color, and sex, as reports around the world show. Literacy and intelligence are obviously not synonymous. Illiterate people may be intelligent voters. Yet in our society where newspapers, periodicals, books, and other printed matter canvass and debate campaign issues, a State might conclude that only those who are literate should exercise the franchise. Cf. *Franklin* v. *Harper*, 205 Ga. 779, 55 S.E. 2d 221, appeal dismissed 339 U.S. 946. It was said last century in Massachusetts that a literacy test was designed to insure an "independent and intelligent" exercise of the right of suffrage. *Stone* v. *Smith*, 159 Mass. 413–414, 34 N.E. 521. North Carolina agrees. We do not sit in judgment on the wisdom of that policy. We cannot say, however, that it is not an allowable one measured by constitutional standards.

What better example could be given of the negative application of the 15th amendment than that found in the case of *Guinn* v. *United States*, 238 U.S. 347, 1915, and *Myers* v. *Anderson*, 238 U.S. 368, 1915, both cited by the Attorney General before the Senate Judiciary Committee. In the Guinn case, the Court held that the grandfather clause attached to the literacy test provision of the Oklahoma constitution was violative of the prohibitions of the 15th amendment. Discussing the effect of the 15th amendment, Chief Justice White said that:

> The amendment does not take away from the State governments in a general sense the power over suffrage which has belonged to those governments from the beginning.

And:

> It is true also that the amendment does not change, modify, or deprive the States of their free power as to suffrage except of course as to the subject with which the amendment deals and to the extent that obedience to its command is necessary.

The Court further held that only the offending portion of an invalid constitutional provision would be struck down when severable from the remaining part. The same basic principles were involved in the Myers case which was decided on the same day. The Attorney General correctly stated the decisions of these cases when he told the House Judiciary Committee:

> The "grandfather clauses" of Oklahoma and Maryland were, of course, voting qualifications. Yet they had to bow before the 15th amendment (transcript, p. 39).

They had to "bow to" the 15th amendment rather than be "supplanted by" some Federal regulation.

The negative application of the 15th amendment is further demonstrated in the cases *Smith* v. *Allwright*, 321 U.S. 649 (1944) outlawing the Texas White Primary Law, and *Terry* v. *Adams*, 345 U.S. 461 (1953), invalidating discrimination against Negroes practiced by the Jaybird Democratic Association, a club consisting of all white voters in a Texas county which operated independently of State laws.

As correctly stated by the eminent constitutional authority Charles Bloch, testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 29:

> The theory of this bill and of the Attorney General who presents it is that if in the opinion of Congress a State imposes standards which are discriminatory, or applies legal standards (test and devices) discriminatorily, Congress may, by statute, divest that State of its constitutional power of determining the conditions upon which the right of suffrage may be exercised; may substitute its own conditions, and may do all of that retroactively.
>
> The Constitution gives the Congress no such power over any State of this Union, North or South, East or West, Republican of Democrat (transcript I, p. 257).

As stated by the honorable attorney from Macon, Ga., when you expand the principle upon which this bill is based to its logical conclusion, then you have destroyed our republican form of government and made a mockery of the Constitution upon which it stands.

THE DECLARATORY JUDGMENT SUITS PROVIDED FOR UNDER SECTION 4(A) AND SECTIONS 5 OF THE BILL ARE NOT JUSTICIABLE CAUSES UNDER ARTICLE III SECTION 2 OF THE CONSTITUTION AND THE STATES ARE LIKEWISE PRECLUDED FROM BRINGING A CAUSE OF ACTION IN THEIR OWN BEHALF OR AS PARENS PATRIAE TO CHALLENGE THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE ACT OR TO ENJOIN THE ENFORCEMENT THEREOF

In the case of *Muskrat* v. *United States*, 219 U.S. 346 (1911), quoting Miller on the Constitution, judicial power as used in article III, section 2, was defined as "the power of the court to decide and pronounce a judgment and carry it into effect between persons and parties who bring a case before it for decision." The meaning of the terms "cases" and "controversies" determine the extent of the judicial power, as well as the capacity of the Federal courts to entertain jurisdiction.

In *Georgia* v. *Stanton*, 6 Wall. 50, the State of Georgia brought an original suit in equity against the Secretary of War and others to enjoin the enforcement of the Reconstruction Acts, "setting forth the political rights of the State, and of its people to be protected." The State contended that the enforcement of the acts divested Georgia "of her legally and constitutionally established and guaranteed existence as a body politic and a member of the Union." The Supreme Court refused to entertain jurisdiction of the cause for want of jurisdiction, holding that for a case to be presented for the exercise of the judicial power, the rights threatened "must be rights of persons or property, not merely political rights, which do not belong to the jurisdiction of a court, either in law or equity."

As stated by Justice Nelson:

> That these matters, both as stated in the body of the bill, and in the prayers for relief, call for the judgment of the court upon political questions, and, upon political rights, not of persons or property, but of a political character, will hardly be denied. For the rights for the protection of which our authority is involved, are the rights of sovereignty, of political jurisdiction, of government, of corporate existence as a State, with all its constitutional powers and privileges. No case of private rights or private property infringed, or in danger of actual or threatened infringement, is presented by the bill, in a judicial form, for the judgment of the court.

Also see *Mississippi* v. *Johnson*, 4 Wall. 475 (1867).

The rule of the Stanton case was reaffirmed and extended in *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447 (1923), in which the complainants alleged "that the act is a usurpation of power not granted to Congress by the Constitution—an attempted exercise of the power of local self-government reserved to the States by the 10th amendment"; and further alleged "that the plaintiff's rights and powers as a sovereign State and the rights of its citizens have been invaded and usurped—its constitutional rights are infringed by the passage thereof."

On the basis of the foregoing allegations Massachusetts sought to enjoin the administration of the act in its own behalf and as parens patriae for its citizens. The Supreme Court refused to accept jurisdiction on the ground that the cause was not justiciable, in that a State cannot maintain a suit either to protect its political rights or as parens patriae to protect citizens of the United States from the operation of a Federal law.

Concerning the right of a State to sue in its own behalf to protect its political rights, the Court said:

> In that aspect of the case we are called upon to adjudicate, not rights of person or property, not rights of dominion over physical domain, not quasi-sovereign rights actually invaded or threatened, but abstract questions of political power, of sovereignty, of government.

Dealing with the right of a State to bring suit as parens patriae for its citizens, the Court stated:

> It cannot be conceded that a State, as parens patriae, may institute judicial proceedings to protect citizens of the United States from the operation of the statutes thereof. While the State, under some circumstances, may sue in that capacity for the protection of its citizens (*Missouri* v. *Illinois*, 180 U.S. 208, 241), it is no part of its duty or power to enforce their rights in respect of their relations with the Federal Government. In that field it is the United States, and not the State, which represents them as parens patriae, when such representations become appropriate; and to the former, and not to the latter, they must look for such protective measures as flow from that status.

Also see *New Jersey* v. *Sargent*, 269 U.S. 328 (1926), and *Arizona* v. *California*, 283 U.S. 423 (1931).

Thus, by a clever and diabolical scheme, the pretended judicial remedy held out in section 4(a) and section 5 is rendered a mere negatory, superfluous legislative mirage when viewed in light of article III, section 2 of the Constitution, and the States are likewise completely and absolutely precluded from challenging the constitutionality of the act, or enjoining the enforcement thereof, either in their own behalf or as parens patriae for their citizens.

I have been literally astounded to hear the name of Lincoln invoked on this Senate floor in behalf of this punitive legislation. For it was Lincoln who thwarted the efforts of the congressional radicals to impose this very kind of legislation upon the South. His personal greatness precluded vengeance or malice ever entering into his political differences with the South.

How can the name of Lincoln be raised in support of this abject submission to mob might when it was he who counseled his people at Springfield:

> There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law.

In his second inaugural address he advised Americans against a policy of vengeance toward the South but rather counseled "let us judge not, that we not be judged," and directed this warning to the advocates of a harsh reconstruction of the South: "Blood cannot restore blood, and government should not act for revenge." No, Lincoln was too big to join the rabble-rousing demagogs in the street. He declined the cheap popularity of waving the bloody shirt. Lincoln asked—

> With malice toward none; with charity for all, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds.

I remind those who sponsor this legislation to outlaw literacy tests in the name of Lincoln that the Gettysburg Address speaks of a government "of the people, by the people, for the people", not of the ignorant, by the ignorant, for the ignorant. I point out that it was the founding father of the Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson, who said:

> If a nation expects to be both ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be.

Mr. President, in closing I should like to mention a story related by Senator John F. Kennedy in his famous book, "Profiles in Courage." He told how the great Senator from Mississippi, L. Q. C. Lamar, was directed by the State legislature to vote for the Bland Silver bill, which was extremely popular in my State. But after studying the issue he decided that the best interests of the Nation would not be served by this legislation. In announcing his vote on this same Senate floor, he said:

> Between these resolutions and my convictions there is a great gulf. I cannot pass it * * *. Upon the youth of my State whom it has been my privilege to assist in education I have always endeavored to impress the belief that truth was better than falsehood, honesty better than policy, courage better than cowardice. Today my lesson confronts me. Today I must be true or false, honest or cunning, faithful or unfaithful to my people.

Carrying his campaign for reelection to a hostile electorate he fearlessly stated:

> I prize the confidence of the people of Mississippi, but I never made popularity the standard of my action. I profoundly respect public opinion, but I believe that there is a conscious rectitude of purpose, a sustaining power which will support a man of ordinary firmness under any circumstances whatsoever.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The liberty of this country and its great interests will never be secure if its public men become mere menials to do the bidding of their constituents instead of being representatives in the true sense of the word, looking to the prosperity and future interests of the whole country.

But as our late President said:

> The stories of past courage can define that ingredient. They can teach. They can offer hope. They can provide inspiration. But they cannot supply courage itself. For this each man must look into his own soul.

With this in mind, I close my remarks to the Senate with the words of Lincoln:

> Let us have faith that right makes might and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair). The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, before the Senator from Illinois leaves the Chamber—I see that he is about to go—I should like to say a word in his presence. I had hoped that I could precede him and not follow him, because, considering the historic role which he has played in the framing of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, it would have been far more appropriate for the minority leader to have been the anchor speaker, as it were, on this side of the aisle. But I was absent from the Chamber when he started his speech, and hence it has worked the other way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks might precede the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I pay tribute to the fact that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] again, as in 1964, has been, with the majority leader, the architect of the civil rights bill. The Democratic Party has endeavored to stand before the country as a champion of civil rights, and we honor it. It is no depreciation of that honor to say that I take peculiar pride in the fact that a Senator from Illinois should have carried out for my party in the most practical way known to Senators, the historic tradition of Lincoln, who was essentially the father of our party, by fashioning legislation and, what is even more important, having it passed. I am pleased to voice on behalf, I know, of every Senator on this side, whether or not he voted for cloture, the satisfaction which we all take in the historic service rendered by our leader in a field so uniquely apposite to the origins of our party and to its greatest figure in all history.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have expressed the desire to speak at this time, because I believe it is necessary, in the final hours of debate on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, to make very clear the legal basis upon which we have proceeded, so that what we have fashioned may have the very best opportunity actually to become operative law, and so that the courts, when they come to pass upon these questions, may have before them, as vividly as possible, the very essential basis upon which, in my view, we have proceeded.

The fundamental basis for the bill is the factual finding of Congress that there have been such widespread denials of the fundamental right to vote in so many broad areas of the Nation as to require the application of remedies in order to implement the 15th amendment. These remedies go beyond the remedies which we prescribed in the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, and are without the delays which have been incident to the local proceedings which we prescribed in previous statutes.

What I have said is not in derogation of the courts or the essentiality of their function. It is merely the adoption by the Congress of a means apposite to its purpose and to the purpose required by the 15th amendment, because there is one endemic fact in this situation which is not mentioned too often, and that is that the denial of the right to vote is irremediable.

If the courts remember nothing else, I hope they will remember that. The denial of the right to vote is irremediable. Therefore, the duty of Congress is not only to secure the right to vote for every citizen, but also to secure it consistent with constitutional means at the earliest possible moment, because once lost, the individual no longer has the right to determine whether A, B, or C shall rule him, or if a constitutional amendment is involved, what constitutional provision shall bind him in a particular State. Having once lost that right, that elected official rules just the same, and that constitutional amendment, or any other subject of a referendum, is the law just the same, binding him as it binds everyone else. But he has irremediably lost his right to say anything about it.

It is upon that ground that I base my deep conviction that what we have done in the bill, which I hope very much the Senate will now pass, is constitutional.

Mr. President, by way of summarizing—because it is important to summarize some of the factual bases upon which we have acted—let us remember that the Senate Chamber has reverberated not only with cries of unconstitutionality but also with cries of injustice, that is, that we are penalizing and punishing States or subdivisions of States for the sins of their fellows.

In the first place, that argument impliedly admits that there are sins and deprivations of voting, as indeed there have been.

In the second place, it fails to answer the proposition that we can only make general law and fashion it to the utmost extent humanly possible to enable the innocent not to suffer with the guilty. But at the same time, we must have some rough measure of justice so that if the innocent have to go to a little trouble—for example, in a declaratory judgment suit—we cannot for that reason eliminate the remedies which are available to those who are being bound unjustly.

As the minority leader has well said, let us understand that Negroes who are denied the right to vote not only pay taxes but bleed and die like the rest of us in the many wars and struggles of the United States and spend their blood and sweat in building up our country just as those whose skins are white.

Let us look at the figures which, after all, in the final analysis, are a summary of the long history of abuses and deprivation of rights which make the passage of the measure now before the Senate so necessary; and, it is sad to say, on the part of any American, it is a sordid history.

For example, in the States of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina, in varying degrees of intensity, the percentage of Negroes of voting age, registered in 1964, generally speaking, was under 40 percent. In Mississippi, it was as low as 6.7 percent; in Alabama, as low as 23 percent; in Louisiana, 32 percent; in South Carolina, 38.8 percent; in Georgia, 44 percent.

Let us remember that those who talk about the bad counties and the good counties completely overlook the fact that every State controls all of its counties. If in New York, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, or Pennsylvania a particular county was discriminating against Negro citizens in the matter of voting, the State would take care of that. The examiners who would investigate in that State under the bill would not have to be examiners of the United States; they would be examiners of the State—and they would go quickly.

Under these circumstances, I cannot see how the interposition of the United States to protect the constitutional rights of its citizens, when the State will not protect them, can be denied.

The facts and figures with respect to individual counties are almost beyond belief in showing the tragedy of this situation and the way in which the constitutional safeguards of every citizen have been nullified. A recent survey entitled "Voting in Mississippi," contained in a report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights dated May 18, 1965, to which I refer, shows that in Chickasaw County, 1 Negro out of 3,054 over 21 years of age is registered; In Humphreys County, out of 5,561 Negroes, none are registered; in Lamar County, out of 1,071 Negroes, none are registered; in Walthall County, out of 2,499 Negroes over the age of 21, only 4 are registered.

Compare that with the registration of whites in the same counties: In Chickasaw, 72 percent of the white citizens as against 0.003 percent of the Negroes; in Humphreys County, 68.3 percent as against 0 percent; in Lamar County, 88.6 percent as against 0 percent; in Walthall County, 100 percent as against 0.46 percent.

The figures are so disparate that they entitle us, in the bill, to base our action upon triggering mechanisms far more liberal than anything that is justified by the general national averages of registration and voting. But, if anything, we stretch a point in order to do our utmost to encourage southern communities to do what they should have decades ago.

Next, let us consider the poll tax, about which we had such a struggle. In Mississippi, Negroes earn one-third the average wage of white persons, but the poll tax is the same for both. We feel strongly that the courts will invalidate the poll tax because it represents a real economic burden upon what should involve no economic burden—the right to vote.

There is a host of cases decided as recently as the period between 1955 and 1964 in counties of Mississippi, as to which we have an up-to-the-minute report, in which the sheriff or some other official has refused to accept the poll tax and thereby has deprived an individual Negro of his right to vote.

Next is the question of tests and devices, which are dealt with in the bill, and as to which the Civil Rights Commission has found discrimination, first, in the choice of matter to be written or interpreted; second, in the judgment of interpreters, including the application of the so-called "letter-perfect" rule—that is, if one does not spell correctly the month in which he was born, his application to register is thrown out; third, and in the rendering of assistance to whites in answering questions, but not to Negroes. Think of the situation, for example, in Mississippi, where whites are asked to interpret the following provision of the State Constitution:

> The Senate shall consist of Members chosen every 4 years by the qualified electors of the several districts.

Negroes are asked to interpret sections of the Constitution dealing with tax exemptions for corporations, the judicial sale of land, eminent domain, concurrent jurisdiction of chancery and circuit courts, and habeas corpus.

What about deprivation going back for a century, which inhered in segregated schools resulting in a median education level of the sixth grade for Negroes in Mississippi, as compared with an 11th grade median for whites? What about the situation in the schools of Virginia, which incidentally is a poll tax State, where voting in many counties, which are detailed clearly on page 39 of the report of the majority group in the Committee on the Judiciary who support the bill, is as low as 4 percent for Negroes.

In Prince Edward County, Va., the schools were closed entirely, merely to defy the Supreme Court in the matter of school desegregation. That decision kept those schools closed to Negro children for 3 years.

In Yazoo County, Miss., as recently as 1962, $2.92 was spent on the education of every Negro child as compared with $245.55 for the education of each white child.

Then there is the intimidation by public officials; there are the bombings, the shootings, the burnings, the beatings; and quite apart from them, the denial of surplus food to Negroes who persist in their attempt to register, as in Humphreys County, Miss.; or the boycotting of Negroes who had the temerity to register by cutting off their bank loans and their grocery store credit.

The circumlocutions engaged in since the passage of the 1957 Civil Rights Act have endeavored to "skin" the Federal law in order to make it ineffective.

Mr. President, this sad, tragic, and sordid record is an effort to invalidate the constitutional rights of Americans. This is the responsibility of all of us. It is no less my responsibility than it is that of any Senator who may oppose the legislation, or of any group; and what is occurring now goes to what will occur in the future. It is for that reason that our responsibility is collective; that our effort to deal with the problem must also be collective.

I understand they are also the views of Senators from States who say, "Most of the counties of my State do not discriminate; they register Negroes with the same liberalism that they register whites. Why do you bother with them?"

We bother with them just as we may have to bother with New York; just as my distinguished junior colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and I felt that justice required, whether it would help or hurt me politically, or the candidate I favor in the New York mayoralty campaign, or anybody else, that American citizens such as those from Puerto Rico, who studied in American-flag schools, but who happened to study Spanish should be entitled to vote.

The same thing applies to Negroes who have not received the education to which they were entitled. This is our responsibility. If the registrars of county A have been discriminating, while in county B they have not, that does not absolve the registrars in county A. This is still our responsibility.

If it takes some trouble for the good counties to get themselves out from the provisions of the bill, and they have to come to the District of Columbia to sue, that is our responsibility.

So, Mr. President, I welcome, at long last, some direct line of action by which the majesty and power of the United States will be exercised to give to all its citizens what everyone has agreed, time and time again, is, of all the rights provided by the Constitution, the most unquestioned and most elementary—the right to vote. If this bill does not accomplish that purpose, I feel certain that I shall be joined by many other Senators—I hope a majority, in standing on the floor of the Senate and proposing perhaps another law, until our goal is achieved. But do it we will, and do it we must. If the motto of the United States is "In God We Trust," which means that in God's morality we trust, is really true, and we really believe in it, we will implement it with our votes, our strength, our voices, and our resources.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Illinois yield to himself?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on yesterday we considered two groups of amendments offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator in charge of the bill. These were offered as technical and clarifying amendments. The first group was strictly technical and clarifying, and to those I had no objection.

Not having seen the amendments up to that time, I was in no position to determine whether some of them went further, and were actually amendments of substance. On further examination, I discovered that in the second group there were at least two amendments that I thought were substantial in character.

The first of these is reported on page 11484 of the RECORD of yesterday. One of those amendments proposed to strike the words "test and device" and to substitute in the place of those words, in the plural, "tests and devices." That would enlarge the jurisdiction of the court, for one thing, if a matter were pending, and it would put an additional burden of proof on the State or subdivision, as the case may be, in order to defend its case.

The second amendment provides for relief that was infinitely broader than that originally provided. I thought that particular concept placed an additional burden on the State.

One more amendment refers to page 4, line 1, and page 7, line 24, of the substitute. There the word "or" was changed to "and". The effect of that change was to prohibit any relief to a State or political subdivision unless and until the court finds that the State or subdivision has successfully met two tests instead of one of two alternative tests.

This amendment has the effect of changing the provision and increasing, to a considerable degree, the burden of proof that is reposed upon the State or subdivision.

Inasmuch as the matter was not closed by a motion to reconsider and a further motion to table the reconsidering motion, the matter is open.

So this morning, after a conference with the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and the ranking Republican member of it, I think it is fair to say they will proceed with a House bill—meaning the text of a House bill—and at some point in the House proceedings, a Member of the House will move to strike out the Senate text and substitute the House text. Then there will be a conference, at which time I assume these matters can be worked out, because they will be within the frame of the conference.

I wished to make a short legislative record. I have conferred with the manager of the bill [Mr. HART]. He is fully aware of the situation. I know of no good reason, at this late hour, why there should be a motion to reconsider and a motion to table, since Senators closely identified with the bill have been fully advised of the premises, including Members of the House.

Now to say a word or two about the pending measure, but more particularly about the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute: I like to think what we have done as another step toward the ultimate solution of one unsolved problem of the Constitution. We have talked much about the Founding Fathers, and apparently they did a great and noble work, but we know also that the Constitution is a very interesting mixture of compromises. The New England shipping interests had one interest, and the Southern States at that time had quite another interest. In the one case they wanted to be sure that the very fruitful and productive shipping enterprise would not suffer; and, on the other hand, those in the agricultural States of the South wanted to be sure, having set a foundation for a fruitful agriculture, that it would not be destroyed or unduly limited.

Out of that came two compromises. The first was with respect to the composition of the Senate. They agreed that the House should be selected on the basis of population and that every State, large and small, should have two Senators, and could not be denied its Senatorial representation without its consent.

The second compromise was with respect to the "importation of persons." It is a rather interesting commentary that the Constitution of the United States does not use the word "slave." It does not use the word "slavery." It does not use the words "slavery as an institution." It does not use the word "enslavement." Consequently, they wrote into the Constitution, as a matter of compromise, that the "importation of persons" should not be prohibited until the year 1808, but that Congress could levy a capitation tax not to exceed $10. That left the institution of slavery free to proliferate for another 20 years before the country had to come to grips with the institution itself, and with those who wished to expand it into every State of the Union.

When the Constitution-makers met, there were approximately 700,000 slaves in the Colonies. Of course, that represented quite an interest. I presume that the outlook in those days was considerably different from the attitude we profess today. But the compromise was settled, and for another 20 years the aristocracy of slavery could continue and, at long last, was left for another generation to deal with the problem.

We did deal with it finally, because in the efforts to expand it, and in the efforts on the part of others to eliminate it, there finally came secession. After secession came conflict. As Lincoln so nobly stated, in his second inaugural:

> While the inaugural address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to saving the Union without war, insurgent agents were in the city seeking to destroy it without war—seeking to dissolve the Union, and divide effects, by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war; but one of them would make war rather than let the Nation survive; and the other would accept war rather than let it perish. And the war came.

It was not until victory had been achieved in 1865 that it finally became possible to implement the Emancipation Proclamation and to put upon the statute books the 13th amendment, which brought slavery to an end as an institution in this country.

But, it was not enough. It became clearly discernible, shortly thereafter, that the rights of nonwhite citizens were being denied in many cases. They could not appear in town. They could not serve on juries. They could not vote. There were many other things they could not do. Out of those difficulties came the 14th amendment. Two notable provisions are therein contained. The first is the equal protection of the laws, and the second is the dual citizenship which that amendment confers upon every citizen. Regardless of color, regardless of where he lives, every American citizen has a twofold citizenship capacity. First, he is a citizen of the State wherein he resides. Second, he is a citizen of the United States.

But apparently the 14th amendment was not adequate to the situation and, therefore, in 1868, there was proposed the 15th amendment, which was finally approved in 1870. That amendment provided that a citizen of the United States shall not be denied or have his right to vote abridged by the United States, or by any State. The second section of the amendment provided that Congress should have appropriate authority and the power to implement and carry out the provisions of the amendment with appropriate legislation.

Mr. President, it was that vehicle, the 15th amendment, which assured to our citizens that neither the United States nor a State shall deny or abridge the right to vote. That became the foundation for what we tried to do to cure a situation which was all too manifest and all too evident in this country, and has been so for a long time.

The so-called Commission on Civil Rights has not been going through the country, particularly in certain States, amassing tables and evidence and providing the documents to establish the inhibition upon the right of citizens to vote. Sooner or later, we had to go further than what had been accomplished up to that time.

I well remember—having participated in the matter—the Civil Rights Act of

1957. We thought it was a start. We soon learned that it was only a start.

We enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1960. We sought to go a little further, but it was not enough.

I had a particular hand in shaping the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I thought perhaps that the Act would be something of a remedy, but on the basis of experience it has proved to be inadequate to solve the problem that still faces the country.

Therefore, we began our deliberations early, in order to take another step to solve this unsolved problem of the Constitution. What the Founding Fathers did was to say that the "importation of persons"—and of course everyone knew who they meant—should cease in 1808.

But, what were we going to do about the 700,000 slaves who were in the United States on the 17th of September, 1787?

What were we going to do about the proliferation of those persons in the next 20 years before the "importation" had to come to an end?

They could not roll around in orbit. They were human beings. They had souls. They had character. They were expected to surrender their young men for military duty. They were expected to pay taxes. The Federal tax collector recognizes no color when it comes to collecting money from the citizens for the support of the Government. Consequently, it became something of an incandescent issue—and it will remain so, Mr. President, until it is accurately, adequately, and sufficiently solved.

That is the problem now before the Senate this very afternoon, to go ahead at long last, if possible, to find the ultimate solution for an unsolved, residual problem which the Constitution makers handed down to us when they said the "importation of persons" must cease. But, they gave no guidelines as to what to do about them when they were here.

Mr. President, it has taken 100 years to catch up with the problem. We must keep up with it, if we are to carry out still another provision in the Constitution.

The Constitution makers did not idly pen the Preamble—one of the noblest statements I know—which legally is not a part of the Constitution, but as a guideline and as a statement of noble purpose, it is.

Too often we forget a phrase in the Preamble that has received all too little emphasis and all too little consideration. That is the phrase, "to insure domestic tranquillity."

Accordingly, when they started in the Preamble, they said:

> We the People of the United States, in Order to * * * insure domestic Tranquillity * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

That makes it the responsibility of Congress. Whether "domestic tranquillity" has been assured or not can be left to the judgment of observers who look at the contemporary scene.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There have been demonstrations in Maryland, in Alabama, in Chicago, and in California. Everywhere in the Union there have been demonstrations. These people are not content to suffer these indignities any longer.

It is easy to say, "Suppose you do this for them. They will not exercise the right to vote anyway."

That begs the question and makes exactly no difference. It will not make a bit of difference if no colored person in the United States votes after this law is inscribed upon the statute books. The essential point is that he is entitled to this right. If he refuses or fails to use it, that is his business, and not ours.

It must be there, if it is to be meaningful and purposeful under this free system of government.

After long labor we brought the bill here, in good faith. Then the distinguished majority leader and I managed, after further consultation with the Department of Justice and with our various staffs, to bring in a substitute that we thought was an improvement on the first bill.

Under the Senate's mandate, we reported back on the 9th day of April, a bill, and were ready to proceed then to have the Senate work its will and impress its conviction upon the handiwork that we had brought in. It had been a long and difficult labor.

First, we held meetings in the regular Judiciary Committee room, and later the committee met in my office. Then we met in the majority leader's office. We had as good brainpower as could be assembled. We had the help of very able people, people skilled in this field. We addressed the subject with as much patience as we could summon and still have regard for the deadline when we were to come back to this Chamber and say, "This is the handiwork that we have produced."

This subject has engaged the attention of the Senate for 46 days, including Saturdays and Sundays. That is a long time.

I am delighted, indeed, that the Senate rose to the occasion yesterday to impose cloture on the consideration of the bill and the speeches, because there was little to add to whatever had already been discussed, or with respect to the amendments that had been proposed. I hope the bill will be passed by the Senate in due course by a resounding vote, and that without delay the House of Representatives can then go through the same process, and that out of conference there will come a good, practicable, enforcible, and equitable measure. That is the thing for which we have been striving.

Mr. President, this Chamber has rung for a month and a half with a discussion of constitutionality. I can only express the hope and belief that the bill is constitutional. But it remains for those who sit in the big marble palace across the plaza to make the final determination, although I do not for one moment set anything in the way of any Member of this body to protest its constitutionality if he so desires.

On 11 occasions in more than 30 years I have held up my hand and taken the oath, in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, to uphold and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States. I meant to do it. I mean to continue to do it. I mean to do it according to my rights. Others may disagree with me. That is their perfect right. How often has it been said to me, "How could you consistently nominate the candidate of your party in San Francisco, notwithstanding the fact that he failed to vote for cloture and failed to vote for the Civil Rights Act of 1964?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

That was his privilege. He had doubts about the constitutionality of title II. He had doubts about the constitutionality of title VII. He was fully entitled to his viewpoint. He had held up his hand and taken the oath to uphold the Constitution. If he felt that that bill in 1964 contravened the Constitution of the United States, then he had not only a right, but I think also a duty to his conscience, to vote as he did.

Therefore, that question gave me no difficulty whatever.

However, I cherish other ideas. I believe that what we have wrought is constitutional and will stand up before the Supreme Court of the United States. If not, there is a separability clause, and the act may still stand if one section or another may finally be found to be unconstitutional by the highest tribunal of this land. I believe it will stand up in the light of day.

I earnestly hope that this afternoon the measure will receive a resounding vote in the Senate, and that it can be sped on its way for ultimate action in the House of Representatives, and in conference committee, so that at long last the signature of the Chief Executive can be affixed and it can be inscribed upon the parchments of the laws of the United States of America.

It has been long in the doing.

As I think back now, it is 100 years since, by the force of arms, the matter of secession and all the ancillary matters finally had to be adjudicated.

The arbitrament of the sword is a bloody business. But, as Abraham Lincoln said, "Woe unto him from whom the offense comes."

Perhaps it had to be that way. Who shall say, as he undertakes to evaluate and appraise the destiny of man, and particularly the destiny of great nations?

That is rooted in the golden tapestry of the history of this Republic.

Now we have a further opportunity, not surpassed by those who occupied this body and the other body a hundred years ago, when they wrote the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments into the organic law of the country.

We are not dealing here momentarily with a constitutional resolution. Where a Federal office is involved, that question was taken care of by the 24th amendment, introduced and sponsored and nurtured by a great Member of this body, Senator HOLLAND, of Florida. It was a partial step only, and it did not cover State and local elections. Until they are covered, that problem of the Constitution, which was something of a bitter legacy, because it was unsolved, may yet be resolved and be taken care of in our day and time. The sooner, the better.

I am inclined to believe that as this right is not only restored but safeguarded for people regardless of race and regardless of color, it will mean, of course, that we retrieve what I believe to be a pledge that is somehow woven into the whole fabric of this free Republic.

This may yet be an epochal day in the life of this country.

I am delighted that I could have a small part in this situation.

I remember that when the Emancipator and Stephen Douglas were finishing their seventh debate, at Alton, Ill., I believe, Abraham Lincoln said:

> Now that this is over, our voices may be muffled, and we will pass off the scene. But I hope it might be said of me that I made a few telling remarks in the cause of civil liberties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I could not think of anything pleasanter than to have some humble citizen meet me in the street and say to me, "You made some telling marks in the cause of civil liberty in your time and generation." That would be enough for me.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, I commend the distinguished minority leader for the remarks which he has made and for the many contributions which were his in the drawing up of the proposed legislation which has been finally presented to this body. He deserves great credit. There are those whom he will meet in the street who will say to him with great accuracy, "What you have wrought has been worth while and what you have wrought has been in the best interests of the Republic."

Mr. President, a very fine editorial appeared in the Missoulian on April 22, 1965, praising the distinguished minority leader for his statesmanlike work on behalf of the pending voting rights bill. While recognizing fully the indispensable role of partisan politics in our system of government, the editors of the Missoulian noted that the ability to rise above partisanship on issues of great national consequence was the quality which distinguished our great public servants. They rightly praise Senator DIRKSEN, who has on so many occasions put the good of his country before all else.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial referred to be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Missoulian, Apr. 22, 1965]

DIRKSEN'S CRITICS ARE OFF BASE

Some Republicans in and around Washington criticize Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, for his collaboration with the administration on the voting rights bill.

These critics charge that DIRKSEN by cooperating with the administration on the Civil Rights Act last year and by assisting in the draft of the voting rights bill is stripping the Republicans of every issue.

What DIRKSEN's critics seem to forget is that in both instances the Illinois Senator was right. Although highly sensible to the necessity and values of intelligent scrutiny of the dominant party's activities, DIRKSEN, like many another enlightened lawmaker before him, places right above rank partisanship.

Too many of our legislators, both State and national, put party first, Main Street second and the general good last. We have witnessed far too much of that in both Washington and Helena.

The party system is necessary and basically good; but, like many another good, partisanship can be carried to the extreme. When it militates against the general welfare and when it is practiced for its own sake, partisanship ceases to be a virtue.

There's nothing wrong either with keeping an eye on and an ear tuned to Main Street. Any legislator who neglects to do so won't be in office long.

But the lawmaker has a dual function: He represents the county, district or State which elected him and he must legislate for the State or Nation as a whole. Too many lawmakers, unfortunately, put the pork barrel ahead of the general welfare.

We don't condemn legislators for party loyalty or for taking care of the needs of their constitutents, but right and the general good must take precedence over party and pork.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I call for the yeas and nays on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, offered by myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the basis of what information I can gather, it appears to me that we are perhaps growing close to hearing the final speakers. It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will have some brief remarks to make and that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] will speak at greater length; others may wish to do so. It would appear at this time that there is a fairly good possibility of a vote on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, in the vicinity of 3 o'clock today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, three times since 1956 Congress has enacted laws designed to guarantee the right to vote. I voted for all of these bills. Now we find that further measures are necessary to do the job. This time Congress intends to make sure it is done.

To insure action, the Senate invoked cloture on civil rights for the second time in its history. I voted for cloture, as I always have on civil rights measures. As a cosponsor of the administration's voting rights bill, I intend to vote to pass this bill.

The major differences in this year's measure and the laws enacted in 1957, 1960, and 1964 are that the present proposal provides administrative as well as judicial machinery to prevent vote discrimination, and applies to all elections. Under existing voting laws, prevention or correction of vote discrimination lies with the courts. Herein is the difficulty. The court procedures have proved lengthy, cumbersome, and, unfortunately, in some instances have themselves been used to thwart the objective of the laws. Of prime importance is the fact that many elections have passed since 1957 in which citizens seeking the right to vote through court action have been prevented from doing so because their cases have not been finally decided in time.

My purpose here is to review briefly the present Federal voting laws and the new measure now before Congress.

Article I of the Constitution leaves to the States the responsibility of setting qualifications of their citizens to vote, restricted only by the specific prohibitions in several amendments to the Constitution. The 14th amendment guarantees the equal protection of the laws to all citizens; the 15th amendment prohibits the denial of the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and gives Congress power to enforce this right through appropriate legislation.

Prior to 1957 Congress enacted several laws to enforce and insure numerous civil rights, particularly the right to vote. Under these statutes, an individual who was unlawfully deprived of his right to vote could file suit in the courts to secure that right.

In 1957, Congress acted further to authorize the U.S. Attorney General to seek Federal district court orders to prevent discriminatory denials of the right to vote, and also sought to protect that right from interference through intimidation, threats, or coercion by officials or any other person. The law also provided for an Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights in the Justice Department and established the U.S. Civil Rights Commission to investigate voting discrimination.

By 1960, experience indicated that additional voting legislation was needed. The Justice Department had encountered extreme difficulty in obtaining information necessary to develop cases under existing legislation, and, in fact, between 1957 and 1959 had filed only one voting rights case. In the 1960 law, Congress required that Federal voting records be kept for 22 months and be open for inspection by the Justice Department. It further authorized the Attorney General to request the district courts to make a finding of a "pattern or practice" of vote discrimination where they had determined that there were individual denials of the right to vote. In the areas covered by such a finding, the court could then appoint Federal voting referees to determine the eligibility of voters and register them. To date, in only one case has a district court appointed a Federal referee.

In 1964, as a result of continuing discrimination in voter registration and lengthy court delays, Congress added to existing laws that first, all voting standards must be applied equally; second, applications cannot be rejected for immaterial errors on registration forms; third, literacy tests where used must be in writing and a sixth-grade education presumes literacy unless found otherwise by the courts; and fourth, in certain instances, three-judge courts can be requested to hear voting cases with appeal direct to the Supreme Court. It further instructed that voting cases be heard promptly by the courts.

Have these laws proven really effective? The answer is "No."

Congress has held out unlimited opportunity to State and local officials to correct voting abuses. It rested initial judicial relief in the local Federal district courts. Although progress has been made in some places, these procedures have proven inadequate in the hard-core areas of voting discrimination.

I give you two examples from the Attorney General's testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee. In 1961 the Justice Department filed a voter discrimination suit in Clarke County, Miss., where 76 percent of the white population but not one of the 2,998 Negroes was registered. Effective court relief was not granted, so that by August 1964 Negro registration was only 2.2 percent, or 64 Negroes.

When the Attorney General filed a voting suit in Dallas County, Ala.—where Selma is located—64 percent of voting age whites but only 1 percent of the Negroes were registered. After 4 years of litigation only 383 of about 15,000 voting age Negroes were registered. It took 13 months for that voting case to come to trial, and the first court-ordered relief, which proved ineffective, came 2½ years later.

Thus today we are still faced with lengthy and costly court procedures to tackle the multitude of State voting requirements devised specifically to perpetuate voting discrimination.

The greatest discrimination, as indicated by Federal voting statistics showing low, and in certain instances nonexistent, Negro voting participation, is found in areas where complicated literacy tests and other devices are required and where considerable latitude is given to local registrars in administering the tests. Hence, the voting legislation now before Congress goes to the heart of this problem.

The bill before the Senate suspends literacy tests and other devices under certain circumstances and provides for Federal examiners to register voters in States or political subdivisions which come within the following criteria:

First. Where the Attorney General determines—maintained on November 1, 1964—any test or device as qualification for voting and in which less than 50 percent of voting age residents were registered or voted in the presidential election last November. In addition more than 20 percent of the population in such areas must be nonwhite.

Or, second, where the Director of the Census, in a survey requested by the Attorney General, finds that less than 25 percent of any race is registered.

The automatic coverage of literacy test areas will apply immediately to Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and some parts of North Carolina and Virginia. The second criteria will cover particular areas of some States which do not use literacy tests.

The bill further provides, however, that any State automatically covered which contends that its requirements are not being, and will not be, used to discriminate because of race or color can file suit for exemption in the Federal district court for the District of Columbia. If the Attorney General agrees he can consent to the exemption, but in such cases the court will retain jurisdiction of the case for 5 years to make sure that there is no future discrimination. Subdivisions within a covered State which have more than 50 percent of the nonwhite population registered can request the District of Columbia court to terminate Federal listing procedures in that specific area. The bill, therefore, attempts to look to the present and future, rather than to the past.

The bill also provides that whenever the Attorney General files a voting discrimination suit under any law, the court shall appoint Federal examiners in the area involved for as long as it determines is necessary to end the discrimination. In such cases, the court can also suspend use of literacy tests if they find them used to discriminate.

The Federal examiners may accept applications from persons who are not registered and who, where the Attorney General so requires, have tried but been prevented from registering by local officials within the previous 90 days. In determining whether a person is eligible, the examiner will apply all State requirements which are not inconsistent with the Constitution and Federal laws. If a covered State wishes to change its requirements from those existing on November 1, 1964, it must get approval from the District of Columbia District Court. Here again, the Attorney General can consent to the changes if their purpose or effect will not be to discriminate.

A Federal registration can be challenged by local officials under certain conditions, and the challenge will be heard by a Federal hearing officer. The hearing officer's decision can be contested in the appropriate Federal appeals court. The challenged party, however, will be permitted to vote pending final decision in the case.

When the Attorney General receives complaints up to 20 days before an election that federally registered persons have not been placed on the voting lists, he shall seek a court order to require local officials to enroll these voters. The Senate adopted an amendment, which I supported, authorizing the Attorney General to appoint Federal poll watchers in covered areas to insure that everyone eligible to vote is permitted to do so and that their votes are properly counted. Also, when a registered voter contends within 24 hours after an election that he was not allowed to vote, provision is made for the courts to permit the person to cast his vote and have that vote counted in the election totals.

Both civil and criminal penalties are provided. They cover anyone who attempts to intimidate, threaten or coerce anyone from voting, local officials who fail to enroll federally registered persons on the voting lists or fail to permit them to vote or count their votes, or obstruct in any way officials from carrying out their duties under this act. Criminal penalties are provided against anyone altering or destroying voting records or conspiring to violate or interfere with this law.

The greatest difference of opinion arose over the anti-poll-tax provision. Only four States—Alabama, Mississippi, Virginia, and Texas—still require payment of a poll tax in State and local elections. The poll tax was abolished for Federal elections by a constitutional amendment passed by Congress in 1962. I supported this action.

The administration's bill did not contain a poll tax section. The Attorney General testified that he did not believe he had sufficient evidence to prove that the poll tax itself violated the 15th amendment and recommended against including an outright ban of the tax in this bill. The Senate Judiciary Committee, however, adopted a simple amendment abolishing the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. A substitute bill offered by the bipartisan Senate leadership for the committee-reported measure contained a poll tax section which noted that Congress had evidence that the required payment of the tax had been used in some States to discriminate and instructed the Attorney General to file suit immediately to test this condition of voting. The Attorney General supported this provision.

A further amendment was offered during Senate debate which, first, contained a finding by Congress that the poll tax requirement violated the 14th and 15th amendments, and second, banned the poll tax as a precondition of voting. This amendment was defeated. I voted against this amendment because I do not believe that Congress has the constitutional authority to abolish by law the poll tax in State and local elections.

I then voted for a revised poll tax provision containing a finding by Congress that this tax had been used in some areas in violation of the Constitution and instructing the Attorney General to seek a Supreme Court test of the tax. This amendment passed.

Let me make it very clear that I am against requiring payment of a tax as a prerequisite of the right to vote. But I believe that the procedure adopted by the Senate was the correct way, short of a constitutional amendment, to legislate on this question and get the poll tax issue before the Supreme Court for decision.

In this voting rights bill, we have tried to provide an effective method to reach the continuing problems of voting discrimination. I believe it is a strong, but fair bill. It still holds out to those States which wish to end their discriminatory practices the opportunity to do so. State voting requirements, even literacy tests, which are fair to all citizens and will not have the effect of disenfranchising parts of the population in violation of our constitutional guarantees could still be used. But the Congress is saying clearly this time that we will not tolerate further violations of the Constitution no matter what form they take. We are prepared when necessary to institute immediate Federal action to get qualified citizens registered to vote and be sure they are not denied this most basic right.

I have said consistently that I think the right to vote is at the very heart of our way of life and system of government. We hoped before now that we had seen to it that everyone entitled to vote would be able to do so. We were too optimistic. We are determined to correct the situation. The right to vote is fundamental and it must be guaranteed.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, with the passage of the voting rights bill of 1965 the Senate of the United States has again demonstrated its determination to fulfill its collective oath to promote and defend the Constitution of our Nation. And we can rightly congratulate ourselves on the placing of another milestone in the path toward equality and human dignity.

It is an unfortunate fact, however, that this milestone is a long distance from the end of the road and immense labors and further suffering lie ahead. And it is another hard fact that this milestone was placed at a great cost in human endeavor and with the sacrifice of American men and women who gave full measure of their devotion to the ideals of their Nation and to the brotherhood of man. One of these Americans whose conscience sent him to demonstrate by his presence a conviction that no right could be abridged for one American without depriving all Americans of their birthright was from the State of Wyoming. His ashes rest there now. The Reverend James Reeb was one who gave his life for this cause. He was but one of many. These lives were a testament to a faith in a nation and a faith in humanity. And so is this bill.

That these lives must be sacrificed, that this bill must be enacted is a sad commentary upon the state of the Nation. Yet it is at the same time a cause for increased pride that there are Americans willing to so be a witness for their convictions and that the machinery devised to create a government of the people can still function to move us toward that goal.

As President Johnson noted when he spoke to us on March 15, the battle will not be over when this bill is passed. We have provided a new tool for the building of a united nation. Now that tool must be applied—with similar instruments for justice—to the job at hand. The work will be long and hard. There will be setbacks and failures. There will be frustrations and discontent. But the job must be done. The job will be done.

As many have noted, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the end of a great Civil War which determined that our Constitution applied to all citizens and that the requirements of citizenship did not include the condition of race or color. The man who led the Nation in that time of turmoil and hardship has left a legacy of thought and action that has sustained us through the perils of more recent times. I would echo Abraham Lincoln in saying:

> Let us discard all this quibbling about this man and the other man, this race and that race and the other race, being inferior and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position. Let us discard all these things, and unite as one people throughout this land, until we shall once more stand up declaring that all men are created equal.

We will stand up here today to declare that all men have equal access to the ballot and therefore an equal voice in their government. And this is indeed cause for pride and for praise. For we have set the record straight, have cut through the snarls of evasion and subterfuge to give some of our citizens the rights previously denied them. And with these rights they can acquire for themselves—through the democratic process that has made us strong—the benefits of full membership in the Great Society of Americans. With this fundamental right—equal representation—there has been removed a debilitating limit upon their opportunity.

But we in the Senate, in the Congress, and across America will have to stand up and be counted again and again. We may not in our lifetime attain that for which we labor. Yet in the trying, in the achievement we make along the way is the story of our Nation and an ideal that has carried us for almost 200 years. Let us continue on from this point with pride in what we have accomplished, with awareness of what still must be done and with determination to finish the job.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, we will soon be voting upon a major piece of legislation which will affect the voting procedures and customs of these United States. It is disheartening to realize that this type of legislation would need be considered by the Congress of the United States, for this is a republican form of government based upon the right of every eligible and qualified citizen to vote. That right is inherent in our form of government. It is protected in our Constitution and it should not be denied anyone.

Time and time again legislation has been before the Congress which is proposed with the view toward bringing the right to vote to all citizens. I am ashamed, and all Americans should be ashamed, that this right has not been one of those cherished rights guaranteed to all citizens, regardless of race or color.

Throughout my career in public life, as well as private, I have done everything possible to see that the constitutional right of a person to vote was granted. For the most part, this guarantee has been considered the responsibility of the respective States, and I have always championed that cause. But, Mr. President, we have now had called to our attention substantial evidence which, in my judgment, clearly shows that all qualified persons have not been given the right to vote and that in some areas discrimination against the Negro people is a reality which cannot reasonably be denied. This reflects upon the whole Nation, and it cannot be tolerated any longer. Action must be taken which will give to all qualified citizens, regardless of the color of their skin, the right to register, to vote, and to have that vote counted.

The question that exists once we have determined that there is need for further Federal legislation to bring about the right to vote to those qualified is what type of legislation is desirable and constitutional for this purpose. The 15th amendment of the United States Constitution says:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.
>
> SEC. 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly recognized the power of Congress to deal with racial discrimination in voting. In the Bowman case, the Supreme Court ruled:

> If citizens of one race having certain qualifications are permitted by law to vote, those of another having the same qualifications must be. Previous to this amendment (15th amendment) there was no constitutional guarantee against this discrimination—now there is. It follows that the 15th amendment has invested the citizens of the United States with a new constitutional right which is within the protecting power of Congress. That right is the exemption from discrimination in the exercise of the elective franchise on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. This, under the express provisions of the second section of the amendment, Congress may enforce by appropriate legislation.

No statute confined to enforcing the 15th amendment exemption from racial discrimination and voting has ever been voided by the Supreme Court. Article I, section 2, and the 17th amendment to the Constitution permit the right of the States to fix the qualifications for voting.

However, the 15th amendment outlaws voting discrimination, whether accomplished by procedural or substantive means. Thus, when a State exercises power wholly within the domain of State interest, it is insulated from Federal judicial review. But such insulation is not carried over when State power is used as an instrument for circumventing a federally protected right. Thus, so long as State laws or practices erecting voting qualifications do not run afoul of the 15th amendment or the provisions of the Constitution, they stand undisturbed. But when State power is abused, it is subject to Federal action by Congress, as well as by the courts under the 15th amendment. That was expressly affirmed in the Lassiter case when the Supreme Court ruled that "the suffrage is subject to the imposition of State standards which are not discriminatory and which do not contravene any restriction that Congress act in pursuance to its constitutional power as imposed"—360 U.S. 51.

Congress is now considering legislation which has come to us in several different forms at various times. In my judgment, portions of it have been unconstitutional, even though the intent and spirit have been correct. The purpose of the legislation has always been the same, and that is to grant to all citizens of the United States a right to be free from enactment or enforcement of voting qualifications or prerequisites to voting or procedures, standards or practices, which deny or abridge the right to vote on account of race or color.

After long study and thought and a great deal of concern, because I do not like to tamper with the functions of a State, I have come to the conclusion that this bill in its present form is constitutional and needed. I think the amendments which have been adopted have been helpful. In my judgment, when we took from the bill that provision which would have tampered with the States' right to levy poll taxes, we eliminated the last unconstitutional barrier in the bill. We have improved the bill immeasurably by broadening its purpose so that, not only would a person have the right to register and vote, but he would have the right to have that vote counted. For a vote which is cast under the democratic process is of no value unless it is counted.

I concede to the critics that this is a tough bill. It is one which will bring results. Unfortunately, however, it is a bill which is needed because some of our States and their officials have abused the rights of American citizens and have discriminated against American citizens solely because of their race and color. If this bill seems harsh, it is only harsh on those who have violated the spirit, purpose, and the intentions of this free country. For those who have not discriminated and for those who have not held prejudices, it will bring them the assurance that all citizens will have an equal right to vote. This bill is geared to stop the discrimination against our Negro American citizens, and it is for that purpose that I support the legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as the Senate debate on the pending bill continues in a limited way, I desire to reemphasize, once again, my opposition to this unneeded, uncalled for, unconstitutional measure. I wish to review the basis on which this bill was conceived, prepared, and guided to this stage of its enactment.

I believe that every public official, and particularly every U.S. Senator, should adhere to a philosophy of government that is deeply rooted in the concepts of Anglo-American law and justice.

The cornerstone of our Republic is, of necessity, the Constitution. This living document is the culmination of over 700 years of man's struggle to attain a government responsive to the will of the governed. A high price has been paid for those principles which were acquired—from Runnymede to Bunker Hill—principles that have found their distillation in the U.S. Constitution. This organic charter is the plumbline against which every act of the Government must be measured. Legislation should be carefully examined in all its particulars, and also against the backdrop of our historical experience over these many years.

When we enter into a detailed examination of the pending bill and attempt to square it with our Constitution, then study it in historical perspective, we see only a grotesque proposal, a distortion of everything we know to be true.

When I took my oath of office to protect the Constitution, I did so without reservation or any implied deference to the Presidency or the judiciary in legislative matters. For myself, I accept full responsibility for acting upon legislation which should apply to all of the United States with equal weight and with impartiality. I completely reject the role of carbon copy for executive expedience and, further, I reject the argument that we may legislate with impunity and leave the question of constitutionality entirely to the courts. Any Member of Congress who endorses an unconstitutional measure with the idea of passing the responsibility on to the judiciary violates his oath of office.

I have no doubt that legislation such as this voting rights bill, which will doubtless be enacted into law, will mark another step toward the demise of representative government. If the Senate rushes headlong into the passage of unconstitutional legislation merely because the President demands it, can representative government endure? When a large group of U.S. Senators permit their names to be used as cosponsors of a bill which does violence to the organic law of this country, without first carefully studying that bill, I believe that representative government is in a moribund state, awaiting only its own burial.

We can have responsible government and respect for recommendations of the President without being subservient. When a case in law is brought to court, the first question in interpreting the law is, "What was the intent of Congress?" In other words, what did Congress think about the subject? In the present case, all that can be said will be that the Congress has not thought at all. Many Senators have rubberstamped a vicious proposal merely to please the President and an entourage of demagogs which prevailed upon him to take the lead.

Under the cover of legislative protection for voting rights, we have witnessed the spectacle of the President of the greatest Nation on earth turning our assembled leaders into an incited throng.

We have witnessed the Justices of the Supreme Court, the arbiters of the highest tribunal in our land, giving their handclap approval to a proposal before it is enacted.

We have heard the President tell of his dreams for power and how this power would be used by him. In a highly emotional address, we heard him say:

> I will let you in on a little secret: now that I have this power, I intend to use it.

And we have seen this power used to force passage of the bill now before the Senate.

Under the guise of enforcing the 15th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, we have witnessed the adoption into this bill of extraneous matter, calculated to affect the political balance of one of our great eastern cities. We have seen the U.S. Senate rushing to enact a bill, which would actually affect only some six member States, in clear violation of all our cherished legal principles.

And all this has been done in the name of democracy.

Regretfully, I can excuse the ignorance of demonstrators whom we have recently seen and heard chanting in the streets, "Freedom and democracy now," but I cannot excuse Members of Congress for their participation in shredding the very marrow of our Republic. Do Senators really believe that they can support unconstitutional and punitive legislation, directed at a few Southern States, without ultimately losing the political freedom of their own States?

There is carved on the facade of the New Senate Office Building the words:

> The Senate is the living symbol of our Union of States.

There is also carved within the Senate Chamber, above the niche which frames the desk of our presiding officer, the motto: "E Pluribus Unum"—"Out of Many, One," referring to the Union of the States. With the passage of this bill, which affects only six Southern States, and 34 counties in another, that motto will be dead. Not since Reconstruction has the Senate permitted this Union to be so perverted and subjected to such a diabolical attack.

There are those who claim that Congress has abdicated its responsibility as the Nation's legislator. There is much merit to that view. If Congress is relegated to the position of merely acting as go-between for the Members' constituents and the bureaucracy, there is no one to blame but the Members themselves. They are saying here today on this bill that they do not accept the responsibility for determining the constitutionality of the measure, and they are also saying that they do not accept the responsibility of knowing what they endorse. For myself, I do not propose to let the President do the thinking for 180 million Americans. For a man who so often pleads "Come, let us reason together," he shows a strange determination to force his will upon all the rest of us.

If the United States were a tight little island with a homogeneous population, we could perhaps have government by edict, or Cabinet decision, but this is not the case. This is a Union of States, a Nation of continental proportions within which we have brought together many diverse religious, ethnic, and social groups. We must accommodate all these people insofar as we are able, and this can best be done under a government of dual sovereignty. This is the premise upon which our State governments retained their sovereign rights to legislate on matters of a local nature.

The social order of Harlem cannot be forced on the South by this bill in 1 year, or in a thousand years. The structure of our Government, I repeat, was built to accommodate as many diverse groups as possible, and, if we are to retain any semblance of social, political, or economic order in this country, we must continue to recognize the right of local self-government to a large degree.

The demagogs have discovered that because of the strategic position of the bloc vote, they can, by mob action, in an obscure community in Alabama, change our laws and trespass on the Constitution of the United States. Where was the call to "Come, let us reason together," when the leaders of the mob violated court orders prohibiting the march from Selma to Montgomery, Ala.? Where was the call to "Come, let us reason together," when our President ordered out military forces of this Nation to conduct a pointless and disgusting march? I say "pointless" because the demonstration was to achieve voter registration which, in fact, was well underway. I may further ask, why was not the power of the Presidency used to mediate and conciliate instead of intimidate by the use of military force?

I have called upon the people of my State—all 4 million of them—to obey the laws of this Nation, including the distasteful Civil Rights Act of 1964. I did this without becoming nervous over the political consequences, and I do not understand why those in this Government with greater responsibilities than mine cannot do the same with equal vigor and courage.

This Nation is becoming one of almost complete lawlessness from one ocean to the other, and I am sure this condition is greatly aggravated by the National Government's condoning of social strife, street demonstration, and civil disobedience. The principle of redress of grievances has never been so distorted. Can there be respect for law and order when local authority is usurped by U.S. military forces, when our legislatures are suspended in the passage of legislation, when our military is ordered to chaperon a howling, chanting mob in the pursuit of excitement?

It is true that many Negroes have not always had all the advantages of some whites in this country. But we are doing the Negro a great disservice by leading him to believe that all his difficulties are the white man's fault, and that the passage of a few obnoxious pieces of legislation will remedy the problems and evils which beset him. We constantly hear the chant "freedom," but never a murmur about "responsibility"; we hear incessant demands for jobs, but not a word about "capability"; we hear demands for equality, but not one word about the requisites of citizenship.

Mr. President, as I have often stated, this bill violates every sacred legal principle cherished by the American people. It violates the Magna Carta; it violates the petition of rights; it violates the Declaration of Independence; it violates the Constitution of the United States, as well as the Bill of Rights.

As I previously stated, it violates the principles so eloquently enunciated in the Declaration of Independence. There is a striking and shocking similarity between the evils contained in this bill and those charges which were made against King George III in the Declaration. I call the Senate's attention to those specific charges:

> For suspending our own legislatures * * *.
>
> He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.
>
> He has made judges dependent on his will alone * * *.
>
> He has forbidden his Governors to pass laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his assent should be obtained.
>
> For depriving us, in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury.
>
> For transporting us beyond the seas to be tried for pretended offenses.

Every evil with which that 18th century tyrant was charged is embodied in the voting rights bill in one form or another. Many Senators are familiar with the provisions of this bill that prohibit legislatures from passing any law on the subject of voting rights when that State is covered by the proposed measure. The State legislatures cannot exercise their constitutional power to count and qualify their citizens in the exercise of the franchise. The Federal Government will be in effect suspending the State legislatures in those few States affected by the pending legislation. State officials will be required to come to Washington to be tried for the conduct of their State offices by alien judges. These State officials will not have the benefit of trial by jury, nor will other individuals who are prosecuted for violations of this act be granted jury trials. The State officials will be hailed before these unfamiliar judges in Washington—a place "unusual, uncomfortable and distant from the depository of their public records." As I said, the parallel is shocking, to say the least.

I repeat, trial by jury has been abandoned; the right to trial in the local community put in jeopardy. The right of people to enact some laws through their own legislatures has been suspended, the right of State officials to enforce local laws superseded. The right of trial in duly constituted courts has given way to special courts set up in Washington, D.C., which are weighted in favor of the Government.

The grievances that our people have today against their Government are beginning to compare with the complaints of those who sought redress at Runnymede and Bunker Hill.

They are taxed beyond endurance for the support of the shiftless in this country, and for foreign governments alien to our democratic principles. The rights of private property have been abridged in the name of equality; the freedom of choice and privacy have been invaded by the Federal Government in the name of "equal protection" and "due process." Our Government has no right to interfere with the citizens of this country beyond providing and insuring an equal opportunity to all Americans. The Government has no right, under the Constitution or any other legal concept, to force American citizens into the role of sterile sameness; conversely, "equal opportunity" does not mean preferred treatment. There is no doubt that this bill now being rushed to passage in this Chamber would accord preferred treatment to Negroes who happen to live in certain Southern States.

Under the pending bill, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, and part of North Carolina are denied the right to enact legislation for the establishment of further voter qualifications, or other legislation dealing with elections. This is a clear violation of article I, section 2 of the Constitution, and the reaffirmation of that right in the 17th amendment.

Based upon the fact that less than 50 percent of the people of voting age in these States failed to vote in the 1964 presidential election, the Constitution is being suspended in these States. Yet some States that did not come up with the magic 50 percent vote in the November election are exempt from the provisions of this bill, ostensibly because the States so exempted, or excluded, do not have literacy tests. It becomes painfully obvious then, that discrimination is being practiced to wipe out discrimination. This absurd formula was proposed for the sole purpose of punishing these few Southern States because of their apathy in the last presidential election.

(At this point Mr. MONTOYA took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if this were not so, why would not these provisions be made to apply equally to all 50 States of this Union? There are more than 63 percent of the people of voting age in Louisiana registered. It is no secret that in the Presidential election of 1964, many qualified voters in Louisiana were not enchanted, to put it mildly, with either party's candidate and simply refused to go to the polls. I do not see how anyone could deny them the right not to vote if they so chose.

Many more people in my State voted in the Governor's election, which preceded the Presidential election by several months. When the people of a State are offered only two choices, neither of which are acceptable to some, surely there is a right to stay away from the polls. If volume voting and huge percentages are in themselves the subject of admiration, we should look with the greatest of admiration upon the Soviet Union and other "Peoples' Republics." It is, of course, widely known that every Communist election rolls up a vote of usually 99.8 percent, all for the unopposed candidates on the ballot.

The people of these unfortunate nations are constantly called upon to rubberstamp the party's edicts at frequent referendums.

As I said before, representative government in this Nation is at stake if we continue to encourage this type of political participation. When a proposal is submitted to the Senate, I do not go and take a poll in my State to see if it is the popular thing to do. I was elected to this office to represent the people, and I feel that in most cases I have access to more information pertaining to the particular proposal than they have. I represent them to the best of my ability, acting according to what I feel constitutes the best interest of the people of my State and the Nation as a whole. If the time should come when they feel that I do not represent their best interests and their wishes, it will be their responsibility to make a change.

Practically every newspaper of importance and practically every political writer has condemned this bill in such terms as "illogical," "immoral," "perversion," and "punitive."

These comments have come from many who have been longtime friends of the civil rights movement. We have exactly the same situation this year as we had with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Senators who were able to get amendments through, which exempted their States from coverage of the bill, were then eager to support its passage. Senators will recall that the FEPC provisions of last year's bill do not apply in States which have their own FEPC laws, regardless of whether these laws have ever been enforced, or will ever be enforced. It is an old northern custom in Congress to respond to every complaint by the Negro with sectional and punitive legislation directed solely at the South. Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner would feel comfortable in this body today. After almost a hundred years, we find the Senate adopting proposals that were rejected in 1869.

In an earlier speech, I discussed in some detail the House and Senate debates at the time of the adoption of the 15th amendment. Proposals almost identical in language to some of the provisions of this bill were completely and unequivocally rejected by the 40th Congress, purely upon the realization that constitutional power of determining the electorate rested in the States. The Reconstruction Congress, even in the heat of the vengeful feeling then rampant, recognized this. Amendments to the original resolution which called for such additions as property requirements, age, length of residence, criminal record, and the like were rejected because the authors of that amendment did not wish to disturb this historic right of the States nor to upset the political balance which has been so carefully drawn by the framers of the Constitution.

The 15th amendment simply declares that:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude.

The amendment further provided that Congress shall have the power to enforce this provision. This amendment changed the existing law in one respect only; it denied to the States the right of preventing citizens from voting on account of their race, color, or previous condition of servitude. At the time of the adoption of this amendment, there were 17 Northern States which denied the right to vote to Negroes. This was placed in their constitutions and that was the reason why the 15th amendment was adopted—and for no other reason.

This amendment superseded those laws and those laws alone.

The proponents of this bill have been unable to offer any evidence to the contrary, and particularly have they been unable to cite one court decision in support of their position. Of course, there is a Federal constitutional right of every citizen to vote, provided he is qualified by State law, applied equally and without discrimination. This is the most succinct and the best statement that can be made about the 15th amendment and its legal application to citizens of this country. This interpretation of the amendment was first pronounced in *United States* v. *Reese*, 92 U.S. 214, October 1875, the landmark case in this field. In that decision, the Supreme Court declared that the 15th amendment did not give anyone the right to vote. It merely prevented the States from enforcing their old laws which prohibited Negroes from voting.

Every decision of the United States Supreme Court and other inferior Federal courts has reaffirmed this interpretation.

Now it is claimed by the Attorney General that he recognizes the right of States to qualify their voters, but that the pending bill does not interfere with this historic right. He contends that this law would merely suspend State laws in States covered by the bill. As has been said many times in the past 4 or 5 weeks, there is no provision in the Constitution which permits Congress to suspend any valid State law, any time, anywhere. The pretext which the Attorney General urges or uses is that in the Supreme Court decision of Louisiana against United States, decided on March 8, 1965, the Court suspended the qualification laws in Louisiana because they had been unfairly administered. What the decision of the Court actually did was to affirm the three-judge district court's issuance of an injunction to prohibit the State of Louisiana from applying its new voter qualification test, or, in the alternative, to reregister all voters on an equal basis, utilizing that test.

In other words, the Court did not suspend anything; it enjoined, under its constitutional powers, the enforcement of a State law which the Court found, upon the basis of evidence, could be used to perpetuate a condition of discrimination in the State. It held that 21 parishes, which had been found guilty of discrimination, could not apply the literacy test until such time as the Court might change its order, or until all voters in these parishes were reregistered on an equal and impartial basis.

If the administration's sole purpose is to rid all States of racial discrimination in elections, all it need do is to appoint referees or examiners to fairly and impartially administer State literacy tests all over the United States. This plainly is not the object of this administration. It wants to suspend the literacy tests in order that thousands upon thousands of illiterate persons may be herded to the polls en bloc.

I do not see how anyone can condone forcing a State to abandon its requirement for literacy. How in the world can an illiterate person be expected to go into a voting machine booth and comply with the instructions for the operation of the machine, pull the appropriate levers, and determine the summation of constitutional amendments which are to be voted upon? In order to give an opportunity for all of our people to vote, Louisiana has a requirement that no person may remain in the voting machine booth longer than 3 minutes. When there are long slates of candidates and many constitutional amendments to be voted, and perhaps water and sewerage bonds to pass upon, even the literate voter must act with haste and good judgment. If anything but chaos comes out of the operation of the bill to be enacted, I will be greatly surprised.

Mr. President, as I said before, the passage of laws such as the pending voting rights bill can have no other effect than to further chip away at the respect for law and order, which is already in a bad state in this country. By passing this bill, the U.S. Government will be saying, in effect, that local laws do not have to be respected by anyone desiring to break them.

In this day and age, when the police power of the State is taxed to the utmost, we are doing a great disservice in furthering the principle of civil disobedience. Make no mistake about it—that is exactly what we are encouraging. This bill is a direct result of so-called civil disobedience in Selma, Ala. The people who are responsible for the situation in Selma, Ala., conducted their lawlessness week after week in open violation of every concept of public safety and good order. Ultimately they were victorious in getting the U.S. police and military forces into the dispute.

To go back a little, I hope Senators will not forget that this peaceful little community was posing no threat to anyone. The justifiable complaints which were filed in Federal Court were quickly adjudicated on the basis of evidence, and those complainants were duly and properly registered on the voting rolls of Alabama. All of this was settled quietly and peacefully in a duly constituted court of law. The problem arose, however, when the Negro agitators came into the community even after the adjudication of these grievances and conducted their street demonstrations supposedly for the purpose of achieving that which had already been granted. Of course, the real purpose was not to get people registered. It was to bring to bear national public opinion which had been distorted by these demagogs, on the State of Alabama and this local community, in order to displace the laws of that State. Most of their demands had been met, I was informed, but they did not leave; they continued to parade up and down the streets with their senseless chants of "freedom now."

I would like to call the Senators' attention to an article written by Arthur Krock in the New York Times of April 1 of this year, entitled: "In the Nation: the Zeal Which Persecutes." In this article, Mr. Krock discusses Martin Luther King's refusal to obey the Federal court order temporarily restraining his group from marching from Selma to Montgomery, and he quotes King as saying:

> There are two types of law, just and unjust. I think we have a moral obligation to obey just laws and disobey unjust laws.

Anyone with a passing acquaintance with the philosophy of Western civilization must know that this question of what is justice and what is injustice has been, and continues to be, a most profound mystery. Mr. Krock is quite right when he says that this attitude of King's is "the road to anarchy." We may never achieve Plato's kingdom, but like him, we should not cease in the attempt. The road to that end does not, however, lie in tacit governmental endorsement of the conduct of a mob dedicated to the destruction of law and order by sheer physical presence. Those who constantly plead the moral law over man's written law are always convinced that they alone possess this divine inspiration. If, indeed, King and his fellow rabble-rousers had been the recipients of some transcendental experience we would be able to recognize their works by some divine attributes.

What in effect has been their work? It is the breakdown of law and order; the setting of man against man and complete contempt for the orderly administration of justice. The leaders of these unfortunate people are never satisfied until some hapless person is badly injured or killed in the strife engendered by their actions.

With the assistance of the U.S. Government, these false prophets soar like carrion crows above the battlefield of human rights. In their unbridled zeal to right an alleged wrong, they eagerly persecute the innocent.

Mr. President, I have always held the view that all citizens should have the right to vote, provided their registration is permitted under State laws, properly applied and without discrimination. I venture to say that those who vote for the pending bill will regret their action in years to come. From lax law enforcement and a deviation from constitutional government, anarchy will follow. In time tyrannical government will engulf our cherished freedoms.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 1 minute.

HISTORIC DAY FOR ALL AMERICAN CITIZENS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, today marks a historic date in the life of the American people. I am confident that the Senate will overwhelmingly pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which is designed to guarantee the right to vote to American citizens, regardless of their race or color.

Congressional passage of this proposed legislation will complete a series of landmark acts to protect and secure the basic constitutional rights of all Americans. The Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964 have done much to assure Negro American citizens the equal protection of the laws guaranteed them by the U.S. Constitution.

Yet, today, many American Negroes are still trying to obtain the most basic right of American citizenship—the right to vote and to share in the election of public officials. For more than one hundred years this basic right has been denied to large segments of the American citizenry, solely because of the color of their skin.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 will secure that right. It will be passed by the Senate by an overwhelming margin, because there is broad agreement on the part of the American people that to deprive the American Negro of the right to vote is to deprive all of us of the essence of our heritage and democracy. This bill will be passed because the vast majority of the American people share the feelings of President Johnson, who recently said:

> Every American citizen must have an equal right to vote. There is no reason which can excuse the denial of that right. There is no duty which weights more heavily on us than the duty we have to insure that right. * * * It is wrong to deny any of our fellow Americans the right to vote in this country.

This bill will be passed because the conscience of America now demands that this precious right be secured for all Americans.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 3 minutes.

ALASKANS TREASURE THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I shall vote for S. 1564, the voting rights bill.

This will be the third major piece of legislation to pass the Senate since the days of reconstruction. I am proud to say, Mr. President, that I have cast my vote in favor of each of these bills.

I am proud, too, that my name is listed as a cosponsor to this most important bill. For too long the direction and intent of the 15th amendment has been blocked. For too long, in too many sections of our country citizens, under one pretext or another, have been denied their legal right to vote because of the color of their skin and for no other reason.

The 15th amendment to the Constitution is a simple one. It is short and it is to the point. It states, in its entirety:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.
>
> The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

This amendment passed the Congress in 1869. It was ratified by the States in 1870. Today, 95 years after its ratification, it is time to see that it is enforced. The bill before the Senate today is the "appropriate legislation" needed to see that this is done.

In casting my vote for this measure, I should like to say again and as clearly as I know how that it does not have application to Alaska. The bill before us today would, in no way, affect the operation of registration or election procedures in Alaska. As originally introduced, this bill would, under some interpretations, include my State within its purview. I am happy to see, however, that it has now been amended to make plain that Alaska is not to be covered.

The bill before us today provides for the appointment of Federal registrars to insure the registration of those who have been denied this right by reason of their color or race. These registrars are to be appointed in any State or subdivision whenever two determinations have been made. These determinations are specified in section 4(b) of the bill.

The first must be made by the Attorney General. He must determine whether the State or political subdivision maintained on November 1, 1964, a test or device as a prerequisite for voting.

As Alaskans know, the Alaska State constitution provides that voters must be able to "read or speak" English. The words "or speak" were deliberately added at the time of Alaska's constitutional convention to insure that Alaska natives—Eskimos, Indians, or Aleuts—who might not be able to read but yet were able to speak English would be assured of their right to vote.

I have asked the Attorney General this question:

> Does the term used in the Alaska constitution constitute a "test or device"?

His reply to me, dated May 14, was a flat "Yes."

> The Alaska constitutional requirement is a "test or device" within the meaning of section 4(c) of the act.

The second determination which must be made before the act takes effect is to be made by the Director of the Census. He must certify two things.

First, that less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age other than aliens and persons in active military service and their dependents were registered as of November 1, 1964, or voted in the presidential election of November 1964.

Second, that according to the 1960 census, more than 20 percent of the persons of voting age were nonwhite.

I have asked the Director of the Census whether Alaska comes within the terms of one or both of these criteria. His answer to me was a flat "No." In figures supplied by the Bureau of the Census to the Judiciary Committee, it was stated that 74 percent of Alaska voting age residents other than aliens, military men and their dependents, voted in the November election.

Early press stories indicated that but 48.7 percent of Alaskans of voting age took part in the last election. This figure, however, did not take into account the more than 30,000 military personnel, to say nothing of their dependents, living in my State. With these persons excluded from the calculations, there is now no doubt of any kind that more than 50 percent of Alaska voters voted in the presidential election.

The Bureau of the Census informs me that Alaska is also excluded from coverage because fewer than 20 percent of its population is of nonwhite racial origin. The Bureau estimates that but 18.6 percent of Alaska's voting age population is nonwhite.

It is clear. There can be no doubt. The Federal Government has no need to send registrars to Alaska. Under the terms of the bill we are passing today, the Federal Government has no authority to send Federal registrars to Alaska.

Mr. President, Alaska does not discriminate against its citizens nor does it infringe upon their precious right to vote. Alaskans worked and strove to obtain the right held by all American citizens to vote in national elections. Alaskans value their right to vote. And they support the efforts of our President and the Congress to see that this most precious right is extended, as promised in the Constitution, to all American citizens. I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the moral issue of voting rights, regardless of race or color, is indeed indisputable.

The Constitution of the United States is quite clear upon the matter. The citizen's right to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." This principle, the Constitution makes clear, is to be enforced by appropriate legislation.

And that is what we should be doing here. Whenever American citizens, of any race or any color go forward at registration time, or on election day, they should be treated alike. If they are not, justice demands that we do what is necessary to see that certain persons, in certain areas, do not do injustice. It is, of course, the constitutional duty of our Federal Government to see that voting rights are not abridged anywhere, not in just a few States and a few counties. The measuring of justice by percentages, and percentage limitations, Mr. President, in my opinion, does violence to such justice.

What is needed, then, is not voting rights legislation to mete out punishment for past sins; that is legislation which looks backward. What is needed is forward-looking legislation, legislation designed to eliminate any future discriminatory practices. In my opinion, it is most regrettable that the bill is aimed toward past discrimination, instead of being aimed at prevention of existing and future abuses. Federal examiners should, of course, be appointed to register citizens where discrimination is shown to exist, and to administer voter qualifications in a nondiscriminatory manner.

Mr. President, the mathematical guilt formula to be so unjustly hung upon several States and counties, is arrived through the highly questionable assumption that literacy tests and lower voter participation always means discrimination. Other objective, basic assumptions that lack of participation in certain elections may be due to a strong one-party system, voter apathy toward one or more candidates, or even bad weather, are completely ignored.

Proponents of the pending measure contend the several States and counties affected under the bill, since in very general terms this is where a tendency toward voter discrimination has occurred in past years, demonstrates that the bill hits at the heart of the problem.

The guilt formula approach, as I have stated previously, is arbitrary, and itself most discriminatory. Grave constitutional questions are brought forth by this bill. Clearly, its guilt formula is not appropriate to further the implementation of the 15th amendment. Clearly, it is not constitutional to ban States that do not discriminate from using a literacy test as a requirement for voting. Clearly, the elimination of such constitutional voting requirements in some States and political subdivisions, with like requirements remaining intact in others, declared innocent by the arbitrary percentage formula of the bill, is bad logic and bad law. It is apparent, Mr. President, that the sheer momentum of this measure has brushed aside any serious consideration of constitutional arguments.

And what of the precedent for the future. Such precedent concerns not only those States to be found guilty by this bill, but all States. As I have once before noted, if this Congress can now legislate to punish one section of the country, to abolish admittedly constitutional State laws, then a subsequent Congress can do likewise to other parts of the country, and to other States, and to other provisions of our Constitution.

Mr. President, it is my feeling that it is incumbent upon us here in the Senate, in pursuance of our sworn duties, to see that constitutional provisions guaranteeing equal protection of the laws are carried out to the fullest extent possible. Whenever a case arises, where a person in a State is denied this constitutional right of equal protection of the laws, we must act to eliminate such denial. We have the right and the responsibility to do so.

This right and responsibility however, does not give to us the power and the responsibility of negating equitably enforced and equitably applied constitutional State laws.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me say I believe legislative establishment of guilt, as embodied in the pending measure is not only unjust, but most unwise. Let us hope the implementation of this measure, if it is to be passed into law, will be most judicious.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], No. 124, as amended and modified, for the committee substitute. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 18, as follows:

[No. 95 Leg.]

YEAS—78

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty

Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Symington
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—18

Byrd, Va.
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Hill
Holland
Jordan, N.C.
Long, La.
McClellan
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond

NOT VOTING—4

Bible
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church

So the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute, as amended and modified, for the committee substitute for the bill was agreed to.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute, as amended and modified, for the committee substitute for the bill, was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill, as amended by the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill, as amended by the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are about to vote on final passage of what will be the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The Senate has labored for many weeks considering this most difficult legislation and I believe has admirably met its obligations in drafting a bill which should meet a pressing domestic need. The issues in this case have been, as in all cases in this area of legislation, highly sensitive. The problems in this bill have been particularly difficult because of the constitutional questions raised by many in this body.

I cannot permit a vote on this bill until I first give credit to those who most justly deserve it. I pay special tribute to the distinguished minority leader, Mr. DIRKSEN—without him we would not have a bill. Mr. President, it is fortunate indeed that this body is graced with such an able minority leader—one whose constructive cooperation in this vital area of our duties is so freely given. His contributions are a matter of public record and speak more eloquently than any words from me.

I pay a similar high tribute to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] who has rendered a singular service not only to the Senate but to the country by the manner in which he has directed and managed this legislation these past weeks. He has not only contributed a keen legal mind in untangling and resolving the difficult and technical problems that have arisen but has also demonstrated again the calmness of manner and sensitivity of feeling that all of us in this body have come to know him by. In spite of his strong convictions in favor of the bill, he never forgot that those opposed felt equally as strongly and he respected their feelings, their viewpoints, and their arguments, as he directed this bill to passage.

In addition, the able assistance of many other Senators has contributed to making this bill the effective piece of legislation it is. In particular the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] should be cited for particular commendation.

I believe also that those who opposed the bill so effectively, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the distinguished Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS], the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the distinguished Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], and other Senators who were so constructive in their opposition, are likewise entitled to commendation.

In conclusion, I owe thanks to the Senate as a whole for the contributions all viewpoints have given to molding the many refinements of this bill. It is my hope and belief that this legislation will meet the needs of the country as a whole and redeem the promises of the Constitution to all citizens.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the pending measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 19, as follows:

[No. 96 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—19

Byrd, Va.
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Hill
Holland
Jordan, N.C.
Long, La.
McClellan
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower

NOT VOTING—4

Bible
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church

So the bill (S. 1564) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Voting Rights Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. No voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the Attorney General institutes a proceeding under any statute to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment in any State or political subdivision the court shall authorize the appointment of examiners by the Civil Service Commission in accordance with section 6 to serve for such period of time and in such political subdivisions as the court shall determine is appropriate to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment (1) as part of any interlocutory order if the court determines that the appointment of such examiners is necessary to enforce such guarantees or (2) as part of any final judgment if the court finds that violations of the fifteenth amendment justifying equitable relief have occurred in such State or subdivision: *Provided,* That the court need not authorize the appointment of examiners if any incidents of denial or abridgment of the right to vote on account of race or color (1) have been limited in number and have been promptly and effectively corrected by State or local action, (2) the continuing effect of such incidents has been eliminated, and (3) there is no reasonable probability of their recurrence in the future.

(b) If in a proceeding instituted by the Attorney General under any statute to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment in any State or political subdivision the court finds that a test or device has been used for purposes of denying or abridging the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color, it shall suspend the use of tests and devices in such State or political subdivisions as the court shall determine is appropriate and for such definite and limited period as it deems necessary.

(c) If in any proceeding instituted by the Attorney General under any statute to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment in any State or political subdivision the court finds that violations of the fifteenth amendment justifying equitable relief have occurred within the territory of such State or political subdivision, the court, in addition to such relief as it may grant, shall retain jurisdiction for such period as it may deem appropriate and shall order that during such period any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting different from that in force or effect at the time the proceeding was commenced shall be submitted to the Attorney General. If the Attorney General files objection with the court within sixty days after such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure has been submitted by the chief legal officer or other appropriate official of such State or subdivision to him, such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure shall not be enforced unless and until the court finds that it does not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color; except that neither the court's finding nor the Attorney General's failure to object shall bar a subsequent action to enjoin enforcement of such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure.

Sec. 4. (a) To assure that the right of citizens of the United States to vote is not denied or abridged on account of race or color, no citizen shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his failure to comply with any test or device in any State with respect to which the determinations have been made under subsection 4(b) or in any political subdivision with respect to which such determinations have been made as a separate unit, unless the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in an action for a declaratory judgment brought by such State or subdivision against the United States has determined that the effects of denial or abridgment, if any, of the right to vote on account of race or color have been effectively corrected by State or local action and that there is no reasonable cause to believe that any test or device sought to be used by such State or subdivision will be used for the purpose or will have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color: *Provided*, That a final judgment heretofore or hereafter rendered by any court of the United States, determining that denials or abridgments of the right to vote on account of race or color through the use of such tests or devices have occurred anywhere in the territory of any such plaintiff, may be introduced in any such declaratory judgment action brought within five years of such final judgment as prima facie evidence of the facts found by the court, except that notwithstanding this provision the judgment shall retain whatever legal effect it would have under exising law.

An action pursuant to this subsection shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court. The court shall retain jurisdiction of any action pursuant to this subsection for five years after judgment and shall reopen the action upon motion of the Attorney General alleging that a test or device has been used for the purpose or will have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color.

If the Attorney General determines that he has no reason to believe that any such test or device is being used for the purpose of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, he may consent to the entry of such judgment.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply in any State or in any political subdivision of a State which (1) the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1964, any test or device, and with respect to which (2) the Director of the Census determines (A) that less than 50 per centum of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964, and (B) that according to the 1960 census, more than 20 per centum of the persons of voting age were nonwhite; or, (3), notwithstanding the foregoing (1) and (2), the Director of the Census determines, by a survey made upon the request of the Attorney General that the total number of persons of any race or color who are registered to vote in any State or political subdivision is less than 25 per centum of the total number of all persons of such race or color of voting age residing in such State or political subdivision.

A determination or certification of the Attorney General or of the Director of the Census under this subsection or under section 6 or section 13 shall be final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

(c) The phrase "test or device" shall mean any requirement that a person as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (1) demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, (2) demonstrate any educational achievement or his knowledge of any particular subject, (3) possess good moral character, or (4) prove his qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class.

(d) For purposes of this section no State or political subdivision shall be determined to have engaged in the use of tests or devices for the purpose of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color if (1) incidents of such have been limited in number and have been promptly and effectively corrected by State or local action, (2) the continuing effect of such incidents has been eliminated, and (3) there is no reasonable probability of their recurrence in the future.

(e)(1) Congress hereby declares that to secure the rights under the fourteenth amendment of persons educated in American-flag schools in which the predominant classroom language was other than English, it is necessary to prohibit the States from conditioning the right to vote of such persons on ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter in the English language.

(2) No person who demonstrates that he has successfully completed the sixth primary grade in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant classroom language was other than English, shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his inability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter in the English language, except that in States which State law provides that a different level of education is presumptive of literacy, he shall demonstrate that he has successfully completed an equivalent level of education in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant classroom language was other than English.

Sec. 5. Whenever a State or political subdivision with respect to which the prohibitions set forth in section 4(a) are in effect shall enact or seek to administer any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting different from that in force or effect on November 1, 1964, such State or subdivision may institute an action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for a declaratory judgment that such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure does not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, and unless and until the court enters such judgment no person shall be denied the right to vote for failure to comply with such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure, unless such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure has been submitted by the chief legal officer or other appropriate official of such State or subdivision to the Attorney General and the Attorney General has not interposed an objection within sixty days after such submission. Neither the Attorney General's failure to object nor a declaratory judgment entered under this section shall bar a subsequent action to enjoin enforcement of such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure. Such an action shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court.

Sec. 6. Whenever the Attorney General certifies (a) that a court has authorized the appointment of examiners pursuant to the provisions of section 3(a); or (b) unless a declaratory judgment has been rendered under section 4(a), with respect to any political subdivision named in, or included within the scope of determinations made under section 4(b) that (1) he has received complaints in writing from twenty or more residents of such political subdivision alleging that they have been denied the right to vote under color of law on account of race or color, and that he believes such complaints to be meritorious, or (2) that in his judgment (considering, among other factors, whether the ratio of nonwhite persons to white persons registered to vote within such subdivision appears to him to be fairly attributable to violations of the fifteenth amendment), the appointment of examiners is otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint as many examiners, who shall to the extent practicable be residents of such State, in such subdivision as it may deem appropriate to prepare and maintain, by examining applicants pursuant to section 7, lists of persons eligible to vote in Federal, State, and local elections. Such examiners, hearing officers provided for in section 8(a), and other persons deemed necessary by the Commission to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act shall be appointed, compensated, and separated without regard to the provisions of any statute administered by the Civil Service Commission, and service under this Act shall not be considered employment for the purposes of any statute administered by the Civil Service Commission, except the provisions of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1181), prohibiting partisan political activity: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized, after consulting the head of the appropriate department or agency, to designate suitable persons in the official service of the United States, with their consent, to serve in these positions. Examiners and hearing officers shall have the power to administer oaths.

Sec. 7. (a) The examiners for each political subdivision shall, at such places as the Civil Service Commission shall by regulation designate, examine applicants concerning their qualifications for voting. An application to an examiner shall be in such form as provided by section 8(b) and in addition shall contain allegations that the applicant is not registered to vote, and such additional allegations, including an allegation that within ninety days preceding his application the applicant has been denied under color of law the opportunity to register or to vote or has been found not qualified to vote by a person acting under color of law, as the Attorney General may require.

(b) Any person whom the examiner finds, in accordance with instructions received under section 8(b), to have the qualifications prescribed by State law not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States shall promptly be placed on a list of eligible voters. A challenge to such listing may be made in accordance with section 8(a) and shall not be the basis for a prosecution under section 11 of this Act. The examiner shall certify and transmit such list, and any supplements as appropriate, at least once a month to the offices of the appropriate election officials, with copies to the Attorney General and the attorney general of the State, and any such lists and supplements thereto transmitted during the month shall be available for public inspection beginning on the last business day of the month and on the forty-fifth day prior to any election. The appropriate State or local election official shall place such names on the official voting list. Any person whose name appears on the examiner's list shall be entitled and allowed to vote in the election district of his residence unless and until the appropriate election officials shall have been notified that such person has been removed from the examiner's list in accordance with subsection (d): *Provided*, That no person shall be entitled to vote in any election by virtue of this Act unless his name shall have been certified and transmitted by the examiner to the offices of the appropriate election officials at least forty-five days prior to such election.

(c) The examiner shall issue to each person whose name appears on the examiner's list a certificate evidencing his eligibility to vote.

(d) A person whose name appears on the examiner's list shall be removed therefrom by an examiner if (1) such person has been successfully challenged in accordance with the procedure prescribed in section 8, or (2) he has been determined by an examiner to have lost his eligibility to vote under State law not inconsistent with the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

Sec. 8. (a) Any challenge to a listing on an eligibility list prepared by an examiner shall be heard and determined by a hearing officer appointed by and responsible to the Civil Service Commission and under such rules as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe. Such challenge shall be entertained only if filed at such office within the State as the Civil Service Commission shall by regulation designate within ten days after the listing of the challenged person is made available for public inspection, and if supported (1) by the affidavit of at least two persons having personal knowledge of the facts constituting grounds for the challenge, and (2) a certification that a copy of the challenge and affidavits have been served by mail or in person upon the person challenged at his place of residence set out in the application. Such challenge shall be determined within 15 days after it has been filed. A petition for review of the decision of the hearing officer may be filed in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the person challenged resides within fifteen days after service of such decision by mail on the moving party, but no decision of a hearing officer shall be overturned unless clearly erroneous. Any person listed shall be entitled and allowed to vote pending final determination by the hearing officer and by the court.

(b) The times, places and procedures and form for application and listing pursuant to this Act and removals from the eligibility lists shall be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Civil Service Commission and the Commission shall, after consultation with the Attorney General, instruct examiners concerning applicable State law not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States with respect to (1) the qualifications required for listing, and (2) loss of eligibility to vote.

(c) Upon the request of the applicant or the challenger, the Civil Service Commission shall have the power to require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence relating to any matter pending before it under the authority of this section. In a case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena, any district court of the United States or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business, or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a hearing officer, there to produce pertinent, relevant, and nonprivileged evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

Sec. 9. (a) In view of the evidence presented to the Congress that the constitutional right of citizens of the United States to vote is denied or abridged in certain States by the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a condition of voting, Congress declares that the constitutional right of citizens of the United States to vote is denied or abridged in such States by the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a condition of voting. To assure that such right is not denied or abridged in violation of the Constitution, the Attorney General shall forthwith institute in such States in the name of the United States actions for declaratory judgment or injunctive relief against the enforcement of any poll tax, or substitute therefor enacted after November 1, 1964, which, as a condition of voting, has the purpose or effect of denying or abridging the right to vote.

(b) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of such actions which shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court. It shall be the duty of the judges designated to hear the case to assign the case for hearing at the earliest practicable date, to participate in the hearing and determination thereof and to cause the case to be in every way expedited.

(c) During the pendency of such actions, and thereafter if the courts declare the requirement of the payment of a poll tax to be constitutional, no citizen of the United States who is a resident of a State or political subdivision with respect to which determinations have been made under subsection 4 (b) and a declaratory judgment has not been entered under subsection 4(a), during the first year he becomes otherwise entitled to vote by reason of registration by State or local officials or listing by an examiner, shall be denied the right to vote for failure to pay a poll tax if he tenders payment of such tax for the current year to an examiner at least forty-five days prior to election, whether or not such tender would be timely or adequate under State law. An examiner shall have authority to accept such payment from any person authorized by this Act to make an application for listing, and shall issue a receipt for such payment. The examiner shall transmit promptly any such poll tax payment to the office of the State or local official authorized to receive such payment under State law, together with the name and address of the applicant.

Sec. 10. (a) Whenever the Attorney General receives at least twenty days prior to any election a complaint in writing signed by twenty or more persons of voting age who are residents of a political subdivision alleging that persons who have been listed in accordance with the provisions of section 7 have not been placed upon the official voting lists by the appropriate local or State election officials he shall institute an action to require that such persons be placed on the official voting lists and be permitted to vote. Such action shall be filed in the appropriate district court which shall have jurisdiction thereof and upon request of the Attorney General shall be determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28, United States Code and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court. The relief in such action shall, upon request of the Attorney General, include the appointment by the court of such persons as may be necessary to observe, at such places as the court may order, whether persons entitled to vote are permitted to vote and have their votes counted and the court may in its discretion impound all ballots cast in such election until such time as all persons whom the court has ordered permitted to vote, and who are refused or denied the opportunity to vote, have the opportunity to vote on election day or the day following. The remedy provided by this section shall not preclude any other remedy available under State or Federal law.

(b) Whenever an examiner is serving under this Act in any political subdivision, the Attorney General may assign one or more persons, who may be officers of the United States, (1) to enter and attend at any place for holding an election in such subdivision for the purpose of observing whether persons who are entitled to vote are being permitted to vote, and (2) to enter and attend at any place for tabulating the votes cast at any election held in such subdivision for the purpose of observing whether votes cast by persons entitled to vote are being properly tabulated. Persons assigned by the Attorney General pursuant to this subsection shall be appointed, compensated, and separated without regard to the provisions of any statute administered by the Civil Service Commission, and service under this Act shall not be considered employment for the purposes of any statute administered by the Civil Service Commission, except the provisions of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U.S.C. 118i), prohibiting partisan political activity.

Sec. 11. (a) No person acting under color of law shall fail or refuse to permit to vote any person who is entitled to vote under any provision of this Act, or fail or refuse to count such person's vote.

(b) No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any person from voting or attempting to vote or intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any person from exercising any powers or duties under section 3(a), 6, 8, 10, or 12(e).

Sec. 12. (a) Whoever shall willfully and knowingly deprive or attempt to deprive any person of any right secured by section 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, or 10 or who shall willfully and knowingly violate section 11, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, within a year following an election in a political subdivision in which an examiner has been appointed (1) fraudulently destroys, defaces, mutilates, or otherwise alters the marking of a paper ballot cast in such election, or (2) fraudulently alters any record of voting in such election made by a voting machine or otherwise, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(c) Whoever conspires to violate the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or willfully and knowingly interferes with any right secured by section 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, or 11 shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(d) Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by section 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, or subsection (b) of this section, the Attorney General may institute for the United States, or in the name of the United States, an action for preventive relief, including an application for a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order, or other order, and including an order directed to the State and State or local election officials to require them (1) to permit persons listed under this Act to vote and (2) to count such votes.

(e) Whenever in any political subdivision in which there are examiners appointed pursuant to this Act any persons allege to such an examiner within twenty-four hours after the closing of the polls that notwithstanding (1) their listing under this Act or registration by an appropriate election official and (2) their eligibility to vote, they have not been permitted to vote in such election, the examiner shall forthwith notify the United States attorney for the judicial district if such allegations in his opinion appear to be well founded. Upon receipt of such notification, the United States attorney may not later than seventy-two hours after the closing of the polls file with the district court an application for an order providing for the casting or counting of the ballots of such persons and requiring the inclusion of their votes in the total vote before the results of such election shall be deemed final and any force or effect given thereto. The district court shall hear and determine such matters immediately after the filing of such application. The remedy provided in this subsection shall not preclude any remedy available under State or Federal law.

(f) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether a person asserting rights under the provisions of this Act shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

Sec. 13. Listing procedures shall be terminated in any political subdivision of any State (a) with respect to examiners appointed pursuant to clause (d) of section 6 whenever the Attorney General notifies the Civil Service Commission, or whenever the District Court for the District of Columbia determines in an action for declaratory judgment brought by any political subdivision with respect to which the Director of the Census has determined that more than 50 per centum of the nonwhite persons of voting age residing therein are registered to vote, (1) that all persons listed by the examiner for such subdivision have been placed on the appropriate voting registration roll, (2) that there is no longer reasonable cause to believe that persons will be deprived of or denied the right to vote on account of race or color in such subdivision; and (b), with respect to examiners appointed pursuant to section 3 (a), upon order of the authorizing court. A political subdivision may petition the Attorney General for the termination of listing procedures under clause (a) and to petition the Attorney General to request the Director of the Census to take such survey or census as may be appropriate for the making of the determination provided for in this section. The District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to require such survey or census to be made by the Director of the Census and it shall require him to do so if it deems the Attorney General's refusal to request such survey or census to be arbitrary or unreasonable.

Sec. 14. (a) All cases of criminal contempt arising under the provisions of this Act shall be governed by section 151 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1955).

(b) No court other than the District Court for the District of Columbia or a court of appeals in any proceeding under section 8 shall have jurisdiction to issue any declaratory judgment pursuant to section 4 or section 5 or any restraining order of temporary or permanent injunction against the execution or enforcement of any provision of this Act. The right to intervene in any action brought under the authority of this Act shall be limited to the Attorney General and to States, political subdivisions, and their appropriate officials.

(c) (1) The terms "vote" or "voting" shall include all actions necesary to make a vote effective in any primary, special, or general election, including, but not limited to, registration, listing pursuant to this Act, or other action required by law prerequisite to voting, casting a ballot, and having such ballot counted and included in the appropriate totals of votes cast with respect to candidates for public office and propositions for which votes are received in an election.

(2) The term "political subdivision" shall mean any county or parish, except that where registration for voting is not conducted under the supervision of a county or parish, the term shall include any other subdivision of a State which conducts registration for voting.

(d) Whoever knowingly or willfully gives false information as to his name, address, or period of residence in the voting district for the purpose of establishing his eligibility to register or vote, or conspires with another individual for the purpose of encouraging his false registration or illegal voting, or pays or offers to pay or accepts payment either for registration or for voting shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both: *Provided, however,* That this provision shall be applicable only to elections held for the selection of presidential electors, Members of the United States Senate, and Members of the United States House of Representatives.

(e) In any action for a declaratory judgment brought pursuant to section 4 or section 5 of this Act, subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend the District Court for the District of Columbia may be served in any judicial district of the United States: *Provided,* That no writ of subpena shall issue for witnesses without the District of Columbia at a greater distance than one hundred miles from the place of holding court without the permission of the District Court for the District of Columbia being first had upon proper application and cause shown.

Sec. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 16. The Attorney General and the Secretary of Defense, jointly, shall make a full and complete study to determine whether, under the laws or practices of any State or States, there are preconditions to voting, which might tend to result in discrimination against citizens serving in the Armed Forces of the United States seeking to vote. Such officials shall, jointly, make a report to the Congress not later than June 30, 1966, containing the results of such study, together with a list of any States in which such preconditions exist, and shall include in such report such recommendations for legislation as they deem advisable to prevent discrimination in voting against citizens serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Sec. 17. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Sec. 18. No examiners shall be appointed pursuant to section 6 as a result of a determination made pursuant to clause (3) of section 4(b) until thirty days prior to the first primary election or general election in calendar year 1966, within the territory of any State which has adopted any amendment to its State constitution, or enacted any law, subsequent to November 1, 1964, and prior to March 1, 1965, under which all persons desiring to vote in any election held in such State are required to reregister.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the able was agreed to.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I call up an amendment to the title of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the title as proposed to be amended.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 1, it is proposed to amend the title so as to read——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the title. [Putting the question.]

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, all through this vote, various individuals have been running up and down the aisles. I could not hear the recapitulation of the list of Senators voting, and I could not hear the motion of the Senator from Michigan, which was voted on, and I still do not know what it was. Probably it was not significant, but it seems to me the dignity of the Senate requires, on a vote which has followed 5 weeks of labor, that we have quiet in the Senate so that we may hear, and that Senators and others be quiet so we can hear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's point is well taken. The clerk will read the title as proposed to be amended.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 1, it is proposed to amend the title so as to read, "A bill to enforce the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the title.

The amendment was agreed to.

TRIBUTES TO SENATORS IN CONNECTION WITH VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if we may have order, I am sure Senators will be interested in a query I wish to make of the majority leader.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds to other business, with respect to the passage of the voting rights bill, which has just occurred, may I, as one of his colleagues, pay high tribute to Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan, the Senator in charge of the bill, who piloted it through its various parliamentary stages not only with skill and great learning as a lawyer, but with the taste, warmth, and kindness for which he is famous in this body. I know I bespeak the praise of all my colleagues.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, speaking on behalf of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to pay tribute to the outstanding efforts which have been put forth in the Senate during the past few weeks by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. I believe that all Senators recognize that he spoke not only with extraordinary comprehension, thoroughness, and an understanding of the complexities of the voting rights bill, but he also spoke from his heart. He carried the burden for many of us who shared his opinions. All Senators must recognize his great contribution in this important matter.

I certainly wish to include in my expression of appreciation—and I know that I speak for several members of the Judiciary Committee—the great depth of understanding and tolerance that we received from the distinguished majority and minority leaders.

Let me also express our appreciation to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who conducted the committee's work, not only during the open hearings but also in executive session when we were considering amendments to the bill, in a most judicious manner despite his different feelings and understandings of the issues before us. Also to the other members of the Committee on the Judiciary who stood in opposition to many of the points which were raised and voted on during the past few weeks, I wish to state our regard and appreciation. As a member of that committee, I, for one, found their efforts only to be constructive, pertinent, and relevant. I believe that this is a great example of the functioning and the working of the Senate, and I sincerely believe the Members of this body deserve the appreciation of all.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] for the excellent way in which he handled the legislation which has just been passed.

I know of no period in my service in Congress when I have observed any Member of Congress handle important and controversial legislation with the intellectual approach, the ease of manner, and with such ability as the Senator from Michigan has manifested in this instance.

The manner of his performance set the tempo of the entire debate, which has been one of intellectual discussion of important legislation. His mild manner and friendly tone in handling the legislation has been a blessing to the entire Senate and made it much easier for all Senators to work and cooperate in debating and passing the legislation.

I know that even Senators who opposed the legislation will join me in appreciation of the excellent manner in which the Senator from Michigan has handled himself and the legislation which was before us.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as a junior member on the Judiciary Committee during the period when this legislation was brought before the committee, during debate on the floor, and in my brief participation during this "baptism of fire" to observe the workings and the legislative abilities of a number of very distinguished Senators, I should like to take this opportunity to say that the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], during the entire time of consideration of the bill, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate, was an outstanding leader.

I should also like to take this opportunity to commend the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his tenacious and untiring efforts in behalf of this legislation.

Let me also take this occasion to pay tribute to the leaders in the debate who took a position other than my own; namely, including the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. As the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] pointed out, he was most fair at all times, both during the hearings and in executive session.

During debate on the floor of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], I felt, was admirable in his fairness during debate, as were the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. President, I consider it a great opportunity to serve in the Senate, and to observe the process of legislation in its highest form and in its highest traditions being molded and brought to fruition, aimed always, in my judgment, toward the special interests of all the people of our great Nation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I join my colleagues from Massachusetts, Tennessee, and Maryland, in their commendation of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

During the long weeks when the bill was under consideration, both in committee and on the floor, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] really showed his mettle.

The Senator from Michigan is a man of character. He is a man of tolerance. He is a man of quiet competence. Some of us are perhaps a little more public relations minded than the Senator from Michigan, but there is no Member of this body who goes through his set duties with such complete unselfishness, such dedication, such integrity, and yet such quiet force as PHILIP HART, of Michigan.

I am proud to be his colleague in this body.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, speaking as one who vigorously opposed the bill, let me say that I believe that Senators who handled the bill did so with great courtesy and with consideration for the bruised feelings of those who could not agree with them.

I pay particular tribute to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for pinch-hitting as our leader at the request of and in the place of our distinguished senior leader, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I wish to pay tribute to the patient, tolerant, considerate, scholarly, and wise contributions made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. I thought he did a remarkable job. I wish to express my indebtedness to him, and also to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the majority whip, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and other Senators.

Whether some of us are able to be pleased with the vote after the long debate—and I am not—I am certainly pleased with the fact that the debate was carried on with the courtesy, cordiality, and understanding which I believe should always characterize these vigorous debates in the Senate.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, my colleague from Michigan, Senator HART, has received well-deserved praise today for the masterful way in which he managed Senate passage of the voting rights bill.

This measure was extremely complicated. His sure knowledge of its provisions and its intent was readily apparent in the manner with which he handled the many amendments which were offered.

And through it all, his tone and manner were gentlemanly and understanding.

But the greatest tribute to Senator HART is yet to come.

This will be when the Voting Rights Act of 1965 becomes law and when its provisions go to work to insure the constitutional right of every citizen—the right to vote—freely and without discrimination.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Senate and the country are indebted to the President, the Attorney General, and several of our colleagues for the historic action the Senate has just taken in approving the voting rights bill.

I would like to pay a personal tribute to the floor manager of the bill, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

We are colleagues of the so-called class of 1958. I have appreciated his qualities of heart and mind for more than a decade. I have known him to be a thoughtful, intelligent, articulate man of sincerity and compassion. Over the past 5 weeks he has revealed these qualities to the Senate and the country in a way which establishes him firmly as an outstanding Senator. I am proud to know him and to follow him in the course he has led so well these past weeks.

EQUAL VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the people of the State of Washington share with the great majority of Americans a jealous regard for their own right to vote. They are no longer willing to tolerate the denial of this right to any of their fellow citizens.

As we complete the historic process of insuring universal sufferage to all Americans through the passage of the voting rights bill, I should like to place in the record three items which symbolize the strong feelings of the citizens of Washington:

First is Resolution 20205 of the Seattle City Council, urging the Federal Government "to enforce the right of self-government" where "the essentials of self-determination are being abridged."

The second items is a newspaper article published in the Skagit Valley Herald which describes the gathering of petitions with over 400 signatures by a volunteer group of women, deeply concerned over the voting rights issue, aided by clergymen and their parishioners throughout the Skagit Valley, expressing support for President Johnson's demand that all Americans be given equal voting rights.

The third item is a resolution of the Democratic Central Committee for Walla Walla, urging Senators and Representatives of the State of Washington "to vote completely and fully in accordance with President Lyndon B. Johnson's voter registration bill, that all people be given the right to vote in every election, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin."

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Seattle City Council, the article from the Skagit Valley Herald, and the resolution of the Democratic Central Committee for Walla Walla be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it resolved, That we, the Democratic Party of Walla Walla County, Walla Walla, Wash., abhor barriers to eliminate the right to vote, for any people and believe firmly in the Constitution of the United States, which states in part in amendment 14—"that no State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Be it further resolved, That we stand for lawful demonstrations if they be for protest against violence, injustice, prejudice, or American values: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge you, our Senators and Representatives of the State of Washington, to vote completely and fully in accordance with President Lyndon B. Johnson's voter registration bill, that all people be given the right to vote in every election, regardless of race, color, creed or national origin.

WALLA WALLA DEMOCRATIC
CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
JEANNE BOND.

Resolution presented by:
JEANNE KOCH, *Secretary.*

MOUNT VERNON, WASH.,
April 13, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: You have been sent previously the voting rights petition referred to in the enclosed article. I thought you would be interested to see the publicity it generated in the local paper.

Yours very truly,
JANET THIESSEN.

[From the Skagit Valley Herald, Apr. 8, 1965]

"VOTING RIGHTS" PLEAS IN MAIL

Petitions carrying well over 400 signatures are on their way to Washington, D.C., as an expression of the Skagit Valley's support for President Johnson's demand that all Americans be given equal voting rights.

A group of women, concerned over the voting rights issue, circulated the petitions and also collected funds to help civil and voting rights workers. So far, $37.33 has been collected. It will be sent to organizations which are collecting money for the James Reed Fund. The fund will help the family of the clergyman killed in Alabama and also will aid other families of civil rights workers who have suffered as a result of such activities.

Clergymen and their parishioners throughout the Skagit Valley have helped the petition and fund drives. The four clergymen shown in the adjoining photo and others added their support to the voting rights movement. Among the others the Reverend William Forbes, pastor of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Mount Vernon; the Reverend Richard Boyd, pastor of Anacortes First Methodist Church, and Methodist clergymen throughout the valley.

The petitions were sent to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON. Letters reporting the petition and fund drives also were sent to Senator HENRY M. JACKSON and Congressman LLOYD MEEDS.

The women's group will continue to collect signatures for additional petitions as well as funds for the Reeb campaign.

CITY OF SEATTLE,
OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER,
Seattle, Wash., April 7, 1965.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed herewith is copy of resolution of Seattle City Council, relating to the right to vote, which you will find self-explanatory.

With best personal wishes.

Very truly yours,
C. G. ERLANDSON,
City Comptroller.

RESOLUTION 20205

Whereas the right to vote under reasonable and easily met regulation is essential to citizenship in any democratic government constituted under the principle of "government of the people, by the people, for the people"; the 15th amendment of the U.S. Constitution makes this clear:

"AMENDMENT XV

"SECTION 1. The rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

and

Whereas there are no laws more important than the laws that preserve and promote self-determination; the very foundation of our Government is built upon quicksand if integrity is not practiced in the drafting and administration of such laws; our inheritance bequeathed to us by our Founding Fathers is thrown away if any form of privileged rule is allowed to exist for too long: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Seattle, That all State and local governments be urged to recognize, maintain, and protect the right of every individual to vote; be it further

Resolved, That the Federal Government be urged, after reasonable notice to any local government within the United States that the essentials of self-determination are being abridged, to step in if those abridgements are not correct within a reasonable time, not to govern but to enforce the right of self-government; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson, U.S. Senators WARREN G. MAGNUSON and HENRY M. JACKSON, and U.S. Representatives THOMAS M. PELLY, LLOYD MEEDS, JULIA B. HANSEN, CATHERINE MAY, THOMAS S. FOLEY, FLOYD D. HICKS, and BROCK ADAMS.

Adopted by the city council this 5th day of April 1965, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its adoption this 5th day of April 1965.

CHARLES M. CARROLL,
President pro tempore
of the City Council.

Filed by me this 5th day of April 1965:

Attest:

C. G. ERLANDSON,
City Comptroller and
City Clerk.

I concur in the above resolution:

By ———— ————,
Deputy.

CLARENCE F. MASSART,
Acting Mayor.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to make inquiry of the majority leader concerning the program for the remainder of the week, and also for the forepart of the coming week, before Senators leave the Chamber.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question just raised by the distinguished minority leader, the order of business at the moment is the Interior appropriation bill, H.R. 6767. It is anticipated, with luck—and I do mean luck—that it will be followed by H.R. 7717, the NASA reorganization bill, or S. 1648, the public works bill.

Upon completion of those two measures, it is anticipated that the foreign aid bill will be laid before the Senate and made the pending order of business so far as major legislation is concerned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Montana.

H.R. 806, TEXTILE FIBER PRODUCTS IDENTIFICATION ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commitee on Commerce be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 806.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 806.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 806) to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act to permit the listing on labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senate made a mistake in the bill by referring to the United States Code as section 76. The House, being alert in its duties as usual, picked up the error, which was discovered, I believe, by some good House lawyers. It should be corrected to United States Code 70. That is the only correction. It is a very important bill for the textile industry, and I ask for the passage of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 159, H.R. 6767, the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6767) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to H.R. 6767 be agreed to en bloc; that the bill, as so amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment; and that no points of order against legislation in an appropriation bill be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

On page 2, line 9, after the word "Management", to strike out "$46,080,000" and insert "$52,080,000".

On page 5, line 18, after the word "shops", to strike out "$105,761,000" and insert "$106,448,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $85,000 of this appropriation shall be made available to the San Carlos Apache Indian Tribe for maintenance of law and order."

On page 6, line 5, after the word "law", to strike out "$42,756,000" and insert "$42,796,000".

On page 6, line 12, after the word "contract", to strike out "$32,855,000" and insert "$36,296,000"; in line 16, after the name "South Dakota", to strike out "Utah, and Wyoming" and insert "and Utah", and in line 25, after the word "Reclamation", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

"*Provided further*, That not to exceed $558,000 shall be for assistance to the Dunseith, North Dakota, Public School District No. 1, for construction of an addition to the Dunseith Public School: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $450,000 shall be for assistance to the Tularosa, New Mexico, School District No. 4, for construction of junior high school and high school facilities."

On page 7, line 11, after the figures "203", to strike out "$16,900,000" and insert "$17,605,000".

On page 10, line 15, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$32,228,000" and insert "$32,546,00".

On page 11, line 9, after the word "rights", to strike out "$26,077,000" and insert "$26,368,000".

On page 12, line 4, after the word "offices", to strike out "$2,450,000" and insert "$2,465,000".

On page 12, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "ninety-four passenger motor vehicles" and insert "one hundred and twelve passenger motor vehicles of which ninety-four shall be".

On page 12, line 20, after the word "including", to strike out "$1,400,000" and insert "$1,440,000"; on page 13, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$99,000,000" and insert "$79,576,350"; in line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$21,600,000" and insert "$23,098,500"; at the beginning of line 7, to strike out the word "and"; in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$12,000,000" and insert "$19,785,150"; in line 8, after the word "Service", to insert "and (4) not to exceed $1,100,000 shall be available to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife:"; in line 13, after the word "through", to strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)", and in line 14, after the word "proportionately", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

"*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the condemnation of any land for Grand Teton National Park in the State of Wyoming."

On page 17, line 21, after the word "earthquake", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$5,200,000".

On page 18, line 17, after the word "activities", to strike out "$71,100,000" and insert "$72,480,870".

On page 20, line 8, after the word "substitutes", to strike out "$31,541,000" and insert "$31,891,000".

On page 22, line 1, after "(74 Stat. 337)", to strike out "$6,945,000" and insert "$7,595,000".

On page 22, line 25, after the word "law", to strike out "$21,218,000" and insert "$22,268,000".

On page 23, at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "$1,905,000" and insert "$2,080,000".

On page 23, line 22, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That in addition, any unobligated balance as of June 30, 1965, of the amount appropriated under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation."

On page 24, line 7, after "(78 Stat. 197)", to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$5,600,000"; in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$300,000"; in line 9, after the word "and", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$400,000", and in line 11, after the word "of", to strike out "$3,750,000" and insert "$4,900,000".

On page 25, line 16, after the word "Refuge", to strike out "$35,324,300" and insert "$36,814,300".

On page 25, line 22, after the word "therein", to strike out "$5,115,500" and insert "$7,943,700: *Provided*, That lands or interests therein needed for the Wildlife Research Center, Jamestown, North Dakota, may be acquired by purchase, or by exchange of lands of approximately equal value."

On page 28, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "$4,425,000" and insert "$4,487,000".

On page 28, line 25, after the word "only", to strike out "$4,450,000" and insert "$4,454,400".

On page 30, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$175,000" and insert "$200,000".

On page 31, line 18, after the word "lands", to strike out "$160,671,000" and insert "$163,833,000".

On page 32, line 7, after the word "law", to strike out "$32,939,000" and insert "$38,777,000".

On page 33, line 14, after the word "amended", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$20,000"; and at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "$70,000" and insert "$80,000".

On page 34, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "one hundred and one" and insert "one hundred and fourteen", and in line 17, after the word "vehicles", to insert "of which one hundred and one shall be".

On page 37, line 13, after "(42 U.S.C. 2004a)", to strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$14,450,000".

On page 38, line 17, after "(5 U.S.C. 2131)", to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$888,000".

On page 39, line 25, after the word "publications", to strike out "$18,468,000" and insert "$19,211,000".

On page 40, line 9, after the word "until", to strike out "expended:" and insert "expended and"; and in line 10, after the word "States", to strike out "institutions." and insert "institutions:".

On page 42, line 12, to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$35,000."

On page 42, after line 12, to insert:

"VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"*Construction, Corregidor-Bataan Memorial*

"For planning and constructing a memorial on Corregidor Island, and other expenses, as authorized by the Act of August 5, 1953, as amended (36 U.S.C. 426), $1,400,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 42, line 24, after "$25,000," to insert a comma and "to be available from January 1, 1965."

At the top of page 43, to insert:

"TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA

"For grants to the State of Alaska as authorized by section 44 of the Alaska Omnibus Act (75 Stat. 151), as amended, $6,500,000."

On page 43, after line 4, to insert:

"FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMITTEES FOR ALASKA

"*Salaries and expenses*

"For necessary expenses of the Federal Development Planning Committees for Alaska, established by Executive Order 11182 of October 2, 1964, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $174,000."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield, I should like to ask him a question. I have been called from the Chamber. I have one question that I should like to ask him, if he will be tolerant at this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I correct in my understanding that the sum placed in the budget for the acquisition of lands in the Everglades National Park in an amount of $1,125,000, I believe, which was deleted in the House action, was replaced in the bill by the Senate committee and is now in the pending measure?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. I hope that at last our unrelenting friends in the House may realize that the State of Florida has performed its full obligation and has transferred its 850,000 acres, has given $2 million for the rounding out of the acreage, and that up to now not 1 dime has appeared in the general appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior to carry out the commitment of Congress and of the National Government for the supplying of the additional $2 million to acquire lands within the park.

I thank the Senator for his diligence in this matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee, as indicated on page 1 of the report, considered budget estimates in the amount of $1,241,549,500, including indefinite appropriations of receipts, for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior and for the related agencies listed on page 2 of the report. Excluded from this bill are the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The committee recommends definite appropriations of $1,092,518,770. This is $46,652,470 more than the House allowance; and is $10,796,730 less than the budget estimates.

The committee recommends the following major increases over the House allowances:

Bureau of Land Management, $6 million to permit an accelerated soil and moisture conservation program on public domain lands administered by that Bureau; Bureau of Indian Affairs, $4,873,000 which provides additional school facilities and needed funds for the Lower Two Medicine irrigation project, the request for which was received after the House of Representatives considered this bill; payment to the Alaska Railroad revolving fund, $2,200,000, which will provide the full authorized amount for earthquake damage repair; Geological Survey, $1,380,870, which will include the engineering needed for expansion of the Field Center at Denver; Fish and Wildlife Service, $7,144,000; Forest Service, $9,010,000; and the Division of Indian Health, $5,450,000.

It is the committee's opinion that the changes which are recommended will provide activities tending to develop the resources of the country and to increase the level of the Nation's economy.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield first to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has the Senator finished with his statement on the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. My colleague from Arkansas has an amendment which he desires to offer. He will be on the floor shortly. He has an amendment that is important to our State which he wishes to offer, in which I join with him. There are a number of things in the bill that are very important to my State. I appreciate the cooperation that we have received from the committee, and that which the distinguished chairman, Senator HAYDEN, is now giving to my colleague and me.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for yielding to me. I note that there is contained in the bill a provision which is apparently unchallenged. It is the same as the budget estimate and the House allowance. The committee recommends $4 million for the preservation of the Fire Island National Seashore.

This is one of the most extraordinary beautiful and extended beaches in the possession of the United States, off the coast of New York, the most congested of all areas in our country. I am very grateful to the chairman of the committee for letting us get started with its development. It will be a blessing not only to the 35 million people who live along the seashore between Washington and Boston, but also to the millions of people who live in New York and its suburbs, who so urgently need its preservation for recreation.

Former Senator Keating and I worked very hard to bring this about. Although he is no longer a Member of the Senate, I know it will be gratifying to him to learn that this is being so very well implemented and started at once. It will also be pleasing to my colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment on page 10, line 15, to change the figure of "$32,546,000" to "$32,596,000". The $50,000 would be used as planning money for a little park and garden below Greers Ferry Dam, which has recently been completed, and which was dedicated by our late President Kennedy shortly before he died. The amount has been discussed with the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Interior. The Budget Bureau has prepared a letter addressed to the committee chairman, which he will receive tomorrow or the next day, approving the inclusion of that amount in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have been so advised.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 15, it is proposed to strike out the numeral and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$32,596,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am especially pleased with the Department of the Interior appropriations bill, as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Included in this bill are funds for two projects which I had the pleasure of recommending to the subcommittee, and which were not included in the original budget request. The projects which I refer to are the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge master plan and the cooperative fisheries research unit in Oklahoma.

I would like to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and to the members of his subcommittee, for recognizing the needs for both these facilities. With the $400,000, not in the budget and not in the House bill, which the committee has provided in this bill, the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge will begin major improvements on its scenic roads and highways, which have been neglected because of lack of money. This construction will constitute the first step in renovation of this beautiful, natural facility under the Department of Interior's master plan of improvement.

The committee also has provided $40,000 for the establishment of a cooperative fisheries research unit at Oklahoma State University, which was in the House bill, but was not in the budget. Again, I would like to express my appreciation to the chairman and to the subcommittee for recognizing the need for this facility in Oklahoma. Funds for the establishment of this project have been requested on many occasions, and my distinguished colleague [Mr. MONRONEY] has joined with me in recommending this item.

This research facility will be located at one of our great land-grant colleges, and will be in the center of one of America's fastest growing water recreation areas.

There is no doubt about the benefits to be derived from the improvements on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife refuge and the establishment of the cooperative fisheries research unit.

Therefore, I respectfully urge the Senate to concur with the recommendations of the committee in providing funds for these very worthy projects and on final passage of the bill.

I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding to me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to commend Chairman Hayden and my other colleagues on the Interior Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee for the fine job they did in evaluating the multitude of items contained in this year's Interior appropriations bill.

The subcommittee has been most understanding in its consideration of the problems being faced by the Great Lakes' declining fishing industry. As Senators will note from the chart that I have placed in the rear of the Chamber, a continuation of the present serious drop in income from commercial fishing on the lakes could result in the death of this segment of the Midwest's economy by 1975. The subcommittee took this information into account in setting aside $400,000 for an accelerated development program. The full committee took the highly unusual step of adding an additional $30,000 to this amount in recognition of the appalling losses that have taken place over the past 2 years.

These funds will be used primarily to initiate research studies which will enable commercial fishermen on the lakes to more fully utilize the lesser value fish that have largely replaced the historically valuable species which formed the backbone of the industry in years past. However, such research must be considered merely the first step in a steadily accelerating program if the industry is to survive.

For example, in fiscal 1964, $20,000 was provided for the design of an all-purpose biological research vessel. This floating laboratory will permit extensive study of the Great Lakes to keep abreast of the rapidly changing environment and its effect on acquatic life. However, despite the fact that plans are in existence, and have been for some time now, no funds have been requested for the construction of the vessel. Since the plans were first drawn up the estimated cost of the vessel has inflated from $425,000 to $550,000. Without an early appropriation of funds the cost of constructing the vessel will increase still further. Without any appropriation of funds the $20,000 spent on planning will have been thrown to the wind.

Countless other areas of study could be profitably pursued if funds were available. For example, there is a great need for the measurement and description of the effects of accumulations of various chemicals, nutrients, and pesticides on the basic productivity and fish producing capacity of the Great Lakes. I could go on and detail the need for the development of more effective and economical fishing methods, detailed economic analyses of present production, processing, marketing, and distribution costs, development of institutional markets, and so forth. But I think that it is obvious to all who have looked at the chart in the rear that much more work must be done if the Great Lakes fishing industry is to be saved. I hope Congress will appropriate additional funds for that work next year.

I would now like to turn briefly to the $150,000 included in this bill by the Appropriations Committee for research and recreation management in the boundary waters canoe area. As a sponsor of the amendment which added this amount to the bill, it was my understanding that $75,000 of this amount was to be used for wilderness research, aimed specifically at the problem of maintaining natural communities of forest cover. The committee report allocates this $75,000 for recreation research. I assume that this term is meant to cover wilderness research. However, I wanted to make the record clear during floor discussion of the Interior appropriations bill that this money was intended for wilderness research. If there is any doubt on this matter, I hope it can be cleared up in the conference report.

I thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his great help to the Great Lakes area.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the chairman. I wish to point out briefly, in respect to the Great Lakes fisheries, that the committee added to the bill $430,000. All of us believe that revitalization of that once great fishery is essential, and the appropriation will start that work well along its way.

The committee also approved an appropriation of $300,000 for disaster research under Federal aid for fishery research and development, in addition to $100,000 voted by the House for oyster disease research in the four mid-Atlantic States.

Words of commendation have been spoken for the chairman of the committee. I wish to agree with what has been stated and to enlarge upon it.

I should like to utter words of praise. I am a member of the subcommittee. Day after day the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was in attendance at those hearings. He never failed. The hearings were long, thorough, complete, and exhaustive. He demonstrated a surprising knowledge of every issue that came before the committee. He dealt fairly and equitably not only with the entire West, with which the bill deals chiefly, but also in behalf of the entire Nation. We all owe him a great debt of gratitude.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I associate myself with the remarks of my senior colleague from Alaska, and voice my appreciation and gratitude to the chairman and the other members of the full committee and the subcommittee. We know the importance to Alaska of appropriations for the Department of the Interior. Alaska is a young State which was left behind during the 50-year interval between the time the State of the chairman was admitted in 1912 and the happy event which took place in 1958. During that perid of nearly a half century, all the great changes wrought by invention, including the coming of the automobile, which brought the highway system, the coming of the airplane, which brought the airways system, and the development of hydropower, took place. During that period, Alaska was a stepchild in the family of the United States and was often omitted and neglected.

Those of us who have been sent to the Congress to represent the State of Alaska are conscious of the fact that we have a great deal of catching up to do. We greatly appreciate the efforts of the chairman of the full committee in helping us to achieve that goal. It will not be achieved overnight, but we hope that with the sympathetic attention and solicitude that we have seen exhibited, we may achieve that goal.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to express my sincere thanks and appreciation for the inclusion of an item of $329,000 in the appropriation bill for the Fort Larned National Historic Site located in Kansas. The project was authorized by Congress last year, and it is the first Federal national historic site established in our State.

The item of $329,000 will be helpful in extending that program, based upon recommendations from the National Park Service.

I wish the chairman and the members of the committee to know that we greatly appreciate it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I note on page 21 of the report, in a reference to the appropriation for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, funds have been provided for several new hatcheries. For several years bills have been introduced by myself, my colleague [Mr. MORTON], and by all of my colleagues from Kentucky in the House of Representatives asking that a trout hatchery be constructed along the Cumberland River, or at some site in eastern Kentucky, because it has been found that the waters and area are appropriate for a trout hatchery.

I am aware that no funds have been provided in the bill. I know that the chairman is fair and that next year he will give consideration to this request.

Mr. HAYDEN. We shall be glad to consider it.

COAL RESEARCH

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, referring to the funds made available for coal research, my State of Kentucky, after West Virginia and Pennsylvania, is the largest producer of coal in the United States. We have been quite modest in our demand for funds for coal research, although we have been very fortunate in other areas, including the Appalachian bill. But we hope that consideration will be given next year to providing of funds for coal research in Kentucky.

Mr. President, I am very glad that the committee included among the forest research items $40,000 for planning the building to be constructed at the Berea, Ky., Land Restoration and Forest Research Center. I did call to the attention of the committee the need for these facilities needed to carry out the expanded strip mine reclamation work being conducted at the Berea Center which, as the Senator from West Virginia knows so well, is important to his State and mine and to much of the Appalachian region. Mr. Robert Montgomery, deputy commissioner of the Kentucky Department of Natural Resources, also appeared before the committee in support of this item. I hope very much that it will be retained in conference with the House, so that this work can be carried out effectively and not delayed.

With the additional funds and personnel secured in recent years, which I believe it is fair to state I first urged, the Berea station is rapidly becoming a center of experience and knowledge which can contribute a great deal to the efforts toward reclaiming, restoring, and utilizing these hill lands which have been stripped for coal, and for which special provision was made in the Appalachian Regional Development Act. I am very hopeful that the work at the Berea Land Restoration and Forest Research Center will be fully coordinated with, and will contribute effectively to the efforts being undertaken through the Appalachian program.

I thank the chairman of the committee for the kind treatment that he accorded us.

Mr. HAYDEN. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I express appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for his consideration of many of the problems that confront us in the Western public lands States, especially those that are served mostly by the appropriations provided in the bill.

I am happy to observe that the Senate Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to increase the appropriation to provide watershed and range management research funds for the Forestry Sciences Laboratory in Logan, Utah, and to provide funds for additional facilities at the Ouray Wildlife Refuge in Utah, and that the committee has made other specific recommendations.

I regret that one or two items that we felt were of extreme importance are not included in the appropriation. Nevertheless, I express appreciation for the consideration we have received, and hope that the committee will consider next year the urgent need of additional funds for the Springville National Fish Hatchery, for which a request was made this year, and also for additional funds for the Bureau of Land Management for range rehabilitation, funds which are critically needed in the Western States.

I congratulate the chairman of the committee who manages this bill with great skill and consideration. We believe that the appropriation does serve us well.

HORSEMEAT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I invite the attention of the Senate to a situation where it appears that for a period of over 1 year there was widespread distribution of horsemeat for human consumption in a three-State area. To make the matter worse there is a suggestion that many of these animals were diseased or disabled.

On Sunday, May 9, the New York Herald Tribune published an article entitled "Meat Scandal's Enormity Unfolds," written by Mr. Jerome Zukosky, in which he outlines the distribution of horsemeat in that area.

I shall insert the full article for the information of the Senate since it portrays a glaring failure of the Meat Inspection Service as administered by the Department of Agriculture in that for a period of over a year horsemeat—some of which may have come from diseased animals—had been distributed for human consumption as Government-inspected boneless beef.

Allegedly some of this horsemeat was sold to our schools and some to our Armed Forces while the remainder was sold to the American housewives.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEAT SCANDAL'S ENORMITY UNFOLDS

(By Jerome Zukosky)

The story of how meat unfit for human consumption got into frankfurters, bologna, salami and other processed meat food—the Merkel horsemeat scandal—is blossoming far beyond its starting point last December when 20 tons of tainted meat was found in Merkel's Jamaica, Queens, meat products factory.

Far more New Yorkers than at first ever suspected they were eating Merkel meats had in fact bought—in luncheonettes and supermarkets, under non-Merkel labels, for example—the output of the Merkel plant whose capacity is one of the largest in New York City.

The plant, which shut down at the end of 1964, was taken over and operated by members of the Goldman and Lokietz families, veteran provision-makers here in November, 1963. According to evidence dug up by District Attorney Frank S. Hogan's staff, large quantities of contaminated and trash meat, much of it produced by animal food factories, went into the hot dog, bologna, and salami which that factory—and others that have so far not been named—turned out 24 hours a day, 5 days a week all during 1964.

SUMMATION

Frank H. Connelly, a slim 30-year-old assistant district attorney heading the investigation, swore out an affidavit late last month for Supreme Court Justice Irwin H. Davidson that sums up briefly what investigators have so far adduced in their effort "to determine whether there has been in existence a conspiracy to sell for human consumption falsely labeled meat from diseased animals including horses and from animals which died from causes other than slaughter."

The evidence so far, Mr. Connelly swore, "indicates that from the latter part of 1963 to the end of 1964 quantities of such meat, falsely labeled as Government inspected boneless beef, were sold to various meat processing concerns * * * one of which was Merkel, Inc.," which "received large quantities of such meat at weekly intervals." Mr. Connelly swore that the meat "was used in the sausage products" made by Merkel during the entire period.

"Through the use of such meat, which was purchased at prices considerably below the prevailing prices for boneless beef and through commercial bribery and bribery of public officers said Merkel, Inc. was able to achieve a position of dominance in the sale of sausage products in the New York area," Mr. Connelly said in the affidavit. According to information supplied by Merkel officials to a business service, Merkel sales had risen to about $25 million a year from about $12 million a year when the former owner, a New Orleans firm, sold the plant, largely on credit, to the Lokietz-Goldman group.

REASONS

Four wholesalers supplied the meat; both before late 1963 and this year they have used various brands to supply the schools. Officials of three of the firms, interviewed in their offices last week, were asked why they had unanimously chosen Merkel products in competitive bidding for the sausage orders. None of the wholesalers has been identified in any way with the meat scandal.

"Merkel was good, they were aggressive, they had competitive prices and good service," said Nathan Schweitzer, Jr., owner of Nathan Schweitzer & Co., Inc., one of the city's largest purveyors of meats, poultry, game, butter, and eggs. "If I had to do it over over again, I'd choose the same way," he said.

"We have to go to Boston or Philadelphia to fill board of education orders now," said Dan Buchsbaum, of Aaron Buchsbaum & Co., a 90-year old wholesaler in Manhattan. He said Merkel operated one of the largest plants here that was federally inspected, a requirement of the board of education, and thus could fill large orders as fast as the weekly bidding system required; other large local producers use a city inspection service. The city also requires each winning wholesaler to post another Federal inspector at its plant to check every box of meat sent to the schools. And the city itself, at a facility called the Central Annex Kitchen, in Long Island City, also checked the quality of the food.

Nothing had occurred, the wholesalers and several school food purchasing officials said, to arouse their suspicisons that Merkel hot dogs, for example, were not made solely of beef and pork. Once the raw meat was ground up at the Merkel plant, they said, it was impossible without chemical analysis to know what went into the franks.

MYSTERY

One mystery in the case is how, allegedly for more than 1 year, the seven Federal inspectors at the Merkel plant managed to miss the tainted meat, which investigators said contained not only horsemeat but inedible organs of cows.

"That is a good question," said Clarence H. Pals, a veterinarian and director of the meat inspection service of the Department of Agriculture, reached by telephone in Washington. Dr. Pals said his agency's inspection of the "boneless beef" seized in December at the Merkel plant showed it to be full of horsemeat that contained such filth as hairs and a manure-type soil and came from animals that had not been inspected before or after death for possible disease. The meat, however, had been frozen "and we were not able to recover any organisms," Dr. Pals said.

Federal regulations, Dr. Pals said, prohibit the use of uninspected horsemeat for human food and prohibit the use of any horsemeat at all with other meats.

Two of the Federal inspectors at the plant have been indicted on State charges of obstructing justice; all seven have refused to waive immunity before the grand jury and have not been asked to testify, but only the two indicted inspectors have been suspended by the Department of Agriculture, whose conduct in the case has been sharply criticized by District Attorney Hogan.

How the tainted meat flowed to and out of the Merkel plant is the subject of continuing Federal and local investigations and presentation of evidence before grand juries here. In addition, the FBI is understood to be investigating the shipment of 185,000 pounds of canned hams last December from the Merkel plant to the Brooklyn Army Terminal for use of the Armed Forces; the hams were rejected because of excessive water in them, an investigator said.

INDICTMENTS

Mr. Connelly charged in his affidavit that the source of Merkel's supply of diseased meat was Charles Anselmo, a meatbroker in the Gansovoert market who lives in Dobbs Ferry, N.Y. Described by Federal authorities as a loan shark and bookie, Anselmo was accused by a Federal grand jury of forging Federal meat inspection tags for boxes of boneless beef shipped to Merkel and was also indicted by the local grand jury for conspiring with Norman Lokietz, president of Merkel and also indicted to use the mislabelled meat. Mr. Lokietz has also been indicted on perjury charges, as have his son Sheldon and Samuel Boldman, Merkel's vice president and a principal owner along with Mr. Lokietz of the Merkel operation. All the defendants have pleaded innocent to the charges.

Where did the meat come from?

During 1964 on a regular basis and for cash, a Wisconsin mink rancher and mink food manufacturer named Orlan Lea delivered meat to Anselmo, Mr. Connelly alleged. Mr. Lea appeared for 2 hours last week before the local grand jury and spent more time before the Federal jury. From August 1963 to December 1964, a Utica animal food packer conspired with Anselmo to ship meat from diseased animals, the local grand jury charged in a second and separate indictment of Anselmo. And last week, Federal authorities indicated yet another "animal" food producer, this one in northern New Jersey, also shipped to Anselmo meat unfit for humans and revoked the firm's Federal meat inspection license.

Assistant U.S. Attorney Neil Peck, in charge of the Federal investigation here, said the "inquiry is nationwide." Further Federal developments in the case are expected this week.

So far, four meatbuyers—for First National Stores, Shop-Rite supermarkets, and

Food Fair stores—have refused to waive immunity for the local grand jury and have not testified. A meatbuyer for Dan's Supreme Supermarkets, Inc., a Hempstead-headquartered firm, has been indicted by Mr. Hogan on charges of perjury; the grand jury, the indictment said, was trying to find out whether Norman Lokietz paid bribes to get his products onto store shelves. Mr. Lokietz was again indicted last week, for bribing a meatbuyer for the A. & P. chain, whose officials—including, it is understood, those at the very top of the company—first led District Attorney Hogan to the meat case early last year.

The officials came to Mr. Hogan with suspicions of meatbuying practices in their firm. Among many suppliers that were checked out as part of a rather routine investigation was the Merkel firm.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, according to the article the bulk of this horsemeat distributed in the New York area was through Merkel, Inc., whose chief supplier of this meat was a Mr. Charles Anselmo, a meat broker living in Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.

The article quotes Mr. Frank H. Connelly, the assistant district attorney heading this investigation, as describing Mr. Anselmo as a loan shark and bookie.

Allegedly during 1964 "on a regular basis" and "for cash" a Wisconsin mink rancher and mink food manufacturer named Mr. Orlan Lea was delivering this horsemeat to Mr. Anselmo.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an advertisement that had been placed in the Wisconsin newspapers by Mr. Lea, the mink rancher who was alleged to have shipped some of this meat to Mr. Anselmo. Ultimately some of the horsemeat was sold for human consumption.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Farmers: We pay for dead or disabled cows and horses suitable for mink feed. If dead, call at once and receive highest prices. Prompt service 7 days a week. Lea Bros., Mink Ranch, Alma Center, Wis.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it appears that seven Federal meat inspectors were at the Merkel plant throughout 1964, the year in which this mislabeled horsemeat was being distributed to the consumers. As the writer of the newspaper article points out, it is a great mystery how for more than 1 year these seven Federal meat inspectors failed to detect the difference between horse meat and good beef.

These seven inspectors refused to waive their immunity when asked to testify before the grand jury during the investigation. Two of the Federal inspectors have been indicted under State charges of obstructing justice, and those two inspectors were removed from the Federal payroll.

But the other five inspectors, who refused to waive immunity, are still on the Federal payroll and inspecting meat as though nothing had happened.

New York is not the only area where horsemeat was being sold for human consumption. Reports are that it has also been distributed in parts of Pennsylvania and Ohio. The irony of the situation is that instead of vigorously denouncing this illegal practice, officials of the Department keep trying to play it down. When the question was raised that some of the illegal meat may have been mule or burro meat imported from Mexico, the Department issued a vigorous denial by pointing out that it was only horsemeat.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Mr. George L. Mehren, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, dated April 30, 1965, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., April 30, 1965.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Williams: In your recent letter you referred to a newspaper article by Mr. Thomas W. Talbot, dated February 17, 1965, and set forth quotations from that article. The article concerned a case which arose in the State of Pennsylvania involving distribution of falsely labeled meat, which was represented as boneless beef.

An extensive investigation of this matter has been completed, and after review by the General Counsel's Office was forwarded to the Department of Justice on March 12 for institution of appropriate action. Pending the completion of such action as may be instituted by the Department of Justice, you will appreciate that we are not in a position to discuss the details developed in the course of this investigation. Nevertheless, I feel free to state that there are a number of substantial misstatements of fact in the quoted article. For example, a statement that most of the meat involved was mule meat or burro meat is without foundation. In fact, a few spot check laboratory tests have been run and in each instance confirmed the fact that the meat in question was horse meat.

The statute applicable is the so-called Horse Meat Act which is set forth at page 198 of the compilation of regulations governing meat inspection which is enclosed for your information and which sets forth the Meat Inspection Act beginning at page 186 thereof.

If there is any further assistance or information which we are in a position to furnish, please feel free to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,
George L. Mehren,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have always been a strong supporter of our meat inspection. I was a cosponsor with Senator Aiken and former Senator Humphrey of the bill which extended the Federal inspection service to poultry. Our meat inspection service was established for the purpose of guaranteeing to the American housewife that all meat sold for human consumption would be of good quality from healthy animals. There can be no excuse for the fact that for a period of over a year these seven inspectors in the Merkle plant did not discover the difference between a horse and a cow.

To accept this as an excusable accident would mean that our whole red meat inspection service is a farce, and under those conditions the housewife has no protection and the farmers' market for good beef is gone.

However, that is not the case. Our red meat inspection service will work if the inspectors are honest and qualified men. Someone is responsible for this fiasco wherein horsemeat was illegally marked and sold as boneless beef, and it is the responsibility of the Congress as well as the Department to find out who. Congress has a responsibility to determine whether our meat inspection laws as presently written are adequate to protect the American consumer.

For this reason I am joining the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] in submitting a resolution, the purpose of which is to authorize the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to conduct an investigation to determine the extent of the illegal sale of this horsemeat and to place the responsibility for the failure of our meat inspection service.

This investigation by the Agriculture Committee can and should be conducted in a manner that will not interfere with any action that the Department of Justice may be taking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 109) authorizing a complete study and investigation with respect to inspection, shipment, sale, and distribution for human consumption of meat and meat products, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

S. Res. 109

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the inspection, shipment, sale, and distribution for human consumption of meat and meat products, for the purpose of determining—

(1) whether such meat and meat products have included meat from diseased animals, animals dying from causes other than slaughter, or falsely labeled horsemeat, or any contaminated, adulterated, or unwholesome meat or meat otherwise unfit for human consumption;

(2) whether such shipment, sale, or distribution has involved violations of the Federal Meat Inspection Act or any other Federal laws;

(3) whether such laws have been properly and adequately enforced and, in particular, whether any such shipment, sale, or distribution has involved illegal or improper activities on the part of officers or employees of the Government; and

(4) whether amendments to such laws or other legislation is necessary or desirable for the purpose of protecting the health and welfare of consumers of meat and meat products.

Sec. 2. The Committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, through January 31, 1966, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the commitee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Seventy Tons of 'Irish Beef' Seized as Horsemeat," originating in Baltimore, and published under date of January 17, 1964.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Seventy Tons of "Irish Beef" Seized as Horsemeat

Baltimore, January 17, 1964.—"Boneless beef from Ireland" with a counterfeit stamp of Government inspection probably is horsemeat from Mexico, Federal officials said today, after confiscating 70 tons in Baltimore.

Dr. Harold H. Pas of the Meat Inspection Division said in Washington that shipments also have turned up in Ohio and Pennsylvania.

He said there still were "many loose ends" in the investigation before a report is made to the Justice Department for possible prosecution.

"One thing is certain," Pas said of the meat, "it is not going to be distributed as food—unless it is fed to dogs."

Dr. Otto Schrag, director of meat inspection in Baltimore, said his attention was called to the meat by a local processor who had bought it from a Pennsylvania dealer. He said the processor became suspicious of the stamp "U.S. inspected and passed."

Schrag said investigation indicated the meat entered the United States legally from Mexico last November. He said it was packed in cartons in Pennsylvania indicating it was "boneless beef" from Ireland.

He said the Baltimore processor had paid 37 or 38 cents a pound for the meat, which was intended to be made into hot dogs and sausage.

"If it is horsemeat," said Pas, "there will be court action taken."

Conviction for false labeling and stamping of meat is subject to a maximum fine of $10,000 or 2 years in prison on each separate count or both.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the Senator from Delaware in the sponsorship of the resolution that would authorize the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or a duly constituted subcommittee thereof to investigate the extent to which horsemeat has been sold under the guise of beef, and the reasons why no detection was made of those sales for a period of more than 1 year.

The record thus far discloses that sales were made in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. Three cities in Ohio were the recipients of shipments of horsemeat under the pretense that it was beef.

To me, misconduct involved in the subject matter to be investigated is of such grave character that Congress cannot allow it to take its normal course, as has been presently indicated.

The reports that have come to my attention show that certain companies, which have brazenly and willfully indulged in this practice, committed a wrong upon the consuming public, upon their competitors in business, and upon the honor of our commercial system.

One company that was involved in purchasing horsemeat at a price that was considered below the prevailing price of boneless beef, and which through commercial bribery and bribery of public officials, was able to achieve a position of dominance in the sale of sausage products in the New York area, Merkel, Inc., through this practice was able to increase its sales from a level of $18 million to a level of $25 million in 1 year. Manifestly, when the company was selling horsemeat under the pretense that it was beef, it was able to undersell its competitors.

The full light of a congressional investigation should be thrown upon this subject. Future perpetrators should be warned that, through the severity of the course of action with reference to the present scandal, they will be dealt with severely by the responsible authorities of the Government.

Why this vicious practice was able to continue without detection by expert meat inspectors of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for practically a year must be fully revealed.

Innocent retail and wholesale merchants must be removed from the cloud of suspicion. In Massillon, Ohio, luckily the meat inspector found that the product was horsemeat. Thus, the innocent company which purchased the product was spared the odium that would have fallen upon it if it had sent this horsemeat into the market to be sold for hamburgers and human consumption.

The participants in the fraud, both public and private, must likewise be exposed. If there are weaknesses in our present laws, or in the practices of the Department of Agriculture, they must be remedied.

I commend the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] for his interest in this matter. I am glad to join him in sponsoring the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio. I certainly hope that the committee will get to the bottom of this matter and find out who is responsible. There is no question that there were many innocent participants who perhaps handled some of this product in the belief that it was beef. However, I believe that it can be traced down and the responsibility placed exactly where it belongs.

INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER—WHITEWASH REPORT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last week and again this week I referred to the fact that there was a certain report written by a staff member of the Committee on Rules and Administration wherein an attack was being launched on the part I had played in pushing the Baker investigation.

What were described as excerpts from this report were subsequently leaked to the press.

It is true that this was not a committee report but only a statement that had been prepared by a disgruntled staff member.

A week ago last Monday, May 17, I invited members of the Committee on Rules and Administration to come to the floor of the Senate and spell out any criticism or any charges or allegations they might wish to make.

I asked the committee members to repeat the charges in my presence and in the presence of the full Senate. Unfortunately most of them decided—I shall not say to run—but they were not here. The few committee members who were present sat silent and refused to answer.

Since that time I have obtained a copy of this so-called secret report. I have read it very carefully. It is a most fascinating document, one in which I believe Senators will be interested. Since there seems to be a reluctance to discuss the report by those to whom it has been attributed, out of my thoughtfulness for them, I shall take it upon myself to review it for them. However, I promised certain Senators who wanted to be present when I discussed the report that there would be a quorum call before doing so.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Mondale in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 97 Leg.]

Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dominick
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Mansfield
McClellan
McNamara
Mondale
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Case, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fong, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Gore, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Holland, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New

York, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Miller, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Mundt, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Russell of South Carolina, Mr. Russell of Georgia, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair). A quorum is present.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the "yeas" and "nays" on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, for the past several weeks the press has been full of accounts of a personal attack launched upon me, an attack supposed to be based on a confidential report that had been prepared by a staff member of the Senate Rules Committee. The staff member who is responsible for this attack takes delight in describing himself as the spokesman for the Democratic members of the committee.

While thus far not one single Democratic member of the committee has had the courage to accept the responsibility for this attack, only one has had the decency to repudiate the allegations. When the Democratic members failed to repudiate the report which had been conveniently leaked to the press, on Monday, May 17, I publicly challenged them to come to the floor of the Senate on the following day, Tuesday, May 18, and in my presence and in the presence of the full Senate either to support the attack in their own names or else to repudiate it.

Never before in the history of the Senate can I recall where a Member of the Senate refused to accept such a challenge.

Rather than accept the challenge they either ran out or sat silent through the 2 hours during which I entreated them to stand up like men and repeat the criticism, if any, to my face or to have the common decency to repudiate the attack upon my integrity which was being carried on in their names. Instead they just sat silent and refused to answer.

Mr. President, I respect the right of any U.S. Senator to keep silent when he is challenged to back up remarks that have been attributed to him just as I respect the constitutional right of a witness before a congressional committee to take the fifth amendment. In both instances the same inference is drawn; the inference is clear.

On Monday, this week, still not hearing anything from any member of the committee, I met with the majority and minority leaders and suggested they be given one more opportunity either to repeat and accept the responsibility for these allegations which have been leaked to the press in their names by a staff member or to repudiate them.

I regret very much that we have been unable to get any answer. At this point I wish to thank both the majority and minority leaders, who are now in the Chamber, for their cooperation in trying to help clear up this controversy in a manner calculated to save the necessity of the steps that I am taking here.

The irony of the situation is that even today not one Democratic member of the committee can be quoted as having uttered one single word of criticism of me personally. They have been careful on this point. All of these allegations have been appearing in the papers through the leak to the press by a hatchet man who refers to himself as the spokesman for the Democratic members of the committee.

Why has this been done by six Senators who under normal conditions would like to be considered honorable men? Why is the administration so determined to discredit me for having exposed the influence-peddling activities of Bobby Baker and his associates?

The answer is very simple. They are desperate. The decision has been made by the hierarchy of the Great Society that John Williams has got to be stopped—discredited and destroyed if necessary—before the Baker investigation embarrasses this Great Society any more or before the case reaches any higher.

Why would they take such desperate measures at this time?

They are determined to save Bobby Baker from legal prosecution at all costs. As part of the plan they will make one last effort now to divert attention from Bobby Baker's escapades by launching a personal attack against the one who first exposed his activities.

How would this help clear Baker?

Very simple. The grand jury which is considering the Baker case is now in session, and the plan is that by filling the press with serious charges against the character of some of the witnesses who appear before the committee and who testified against Baker and then by launching a personal attack upon me, they hope to raise questions in the minds of the jurors and raise enough doubt about the credibility of some of the evidence to minimize the seriousness of the charges against Baker.

The decision has been made. Baker is to be cleared at all costs.

Oh, yes, they are going to issue a public spanking for Bobby Baker. This is to impress the public, but at the same time this public spanking is being administered we find the White House in a sanctimonious attitude making a grandstand play in launching a new code of ethics for Government officials.

But codes of ethics mean nothing as long as the administration itself continues to condone and defend the influence-peddling as practiced by Bobby Baker right here under the dome of the U.S. Capitol.

Instead of prosecuting Bobby Baker, as would have been done long ago had it been any other man of lesser connections, they are actually making a national hero out of him. His vending-machine business, which is entirely dependent upon contracts with plants operating on Government defense contracts is flourishing as never before. The defense contractors, reading the handwriting on the wall, not only are continuing their connections with Baker but are welcoming the chance of expanding their business with Baker to show the White House whose side they are on. To make sure that the defense contractors get the message clearly the Defense Department on October 2, 1964, about 1 year after Baker's resignation and after the investigation had been launched, issued a special confidential security clearance for Bobby Baker's Serv-U Corp. This was necessary in order that he might be eligible to go into defense plants dealing with defense contracts of our Government.

I ask unanimous consent that this confidential security clearance, signed by Mr. Robert E. Bonn, Chief, Operations Division, Security Office, Department of the Air Force, in which he clears Bobby Baker's company for defense work, be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Headquarters, Western Contract
Management Region, U.S. Air
Force, Mira Loma Air Force
Station,
Mira Loma, Calif., July 20, 1964.

Serv-U Corp.
Englewood, Calif.

Gentlemen: Reference is made to the request by a procuring activity of one of the military departments that your organization be given, with respect to your facility located at 717 South Hindry Avenue, Englewood, Calif., a security clearance authorizing the receipt and use, by each facility, of classified information required in connection with precontract negotiations or contract performance. Reference is also made to your executed Department of Defense Security Agreement (DD Form 441).

You are hereby advised that, with respect to the above-named facility, security clearance of a type indicated in brackets has been granted to your organization by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, by authority vested in the Secretary of the Air Force—[Confidential.]

This letter of notification is effective only so long as the Department of Defense Security Agreement between your organization and the Government is effective. It does not obligate any procuring activity of any of the military departments to do business with or enter into any contract with your organization.

This is not a notification that your plant either has or has not sufficient protective measures for safeguarding classified information necessary for the performance of a classified contract. Such a determination will be made by the Department of Defense following a physical inspection of your facility.

Reproduction of this letter of notification in any form, except for the necessary records of your organization or unless requested by competent military authority, is not authorized.

The fact that your organization has qualified for, and has been granted a security clearance may not be used for advertising or promotional purposes.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. BONN,
Chief, Operations Division,
Security Office.

By direction of the Secretary of the Air Force.

Copy to: RWEOC/Mr. Stacy

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, what has happened to the old-fashioned slogan: "Honesty is the best policy"? How can this administration possibly defend a Senate employee who, in the brief span of 4 years, while serving as secretary to the majority in the U.S. Senate and drawing a salary of $19,000, used his position to pyramid his net worth from $114,944 in January 1959, to $2,166,886 on February 1, 1963, an increase in his net worth of more than $2 million in only 4 years?

That was all accomplished while drawing a Government salary of around $19,000 a year and during a period of negligible income tax payments.

I now have a copy of this so-called secret document from which these allegations have been leaked to the press. It is a most interesting document. Frankly, the correspondence which some of the majority members of the committee had with this staff member while he was in North Carolina writing the report is even more interesting.

First, let me say that while the report makes no specific charges against me personally—and I have read it carefully—it does by numerous innuendoes and by guilt-by-association tactics represent one of the most damnable attempts at character assassination ever witnessed in the Senate.

A reading of the report makes it clear that back of all of this controversy is a diabolically clever plan to divert the attention of the American people from the real issue of this investigation; namely, what kind of influence-peddling were Bobby Baker and his associates carrying out in his office under the dome of the Capitol?

By directing attention to the controversy between the Democratic members of the committee and myself they hope to sweep the Bobby Baker case under the proverbial political rug. If they succeed it will represent one of the greatest hoaxes ever perpetrated on the American people. I am determined that it shall not succeed.

I have the report. Over the next several days I shall expose this brazen attempt for exactly what it is; namely, another batch of political whitewash.

The report is very mild in its criticism of Bobby Baker. The Democratic majority almost apologizes for having to criticize him at all. Fully half of the report is devoted to boasting about what a great job the Committee on Rules and Administration has done in investigating this case. I could do it much more briefly if they wished me to do so. The other half is directed toward an attack on the character of the witnesses who testified or who presented evidence against Bobby Baker.

I shall not delay the Senate today with a full discussion of the report, but beginning next week I shall take this report apart, section by section, and analyze it for the Senate. I will show it up for what it truly is; namely, another whitewash job.

It is a sad day in America when we see men in high posts in our Government defending the influence peddling activities of men like Bobby Baker, and at the same time launching a vicious attack upon those who exposed his corrupt influence peddling activities.

I can now understand how private citizens throughout the Nation would be reluctant to step forward to expose a corrupt public official.

If a Member of the Senate cannot fight back what hope is there to stop this kind of moral decay in our country?

I have great respect for our form of government and for the majority of the people, Democrats and Republicans, whether they are in or out of the Senate. But when a corrupt public official is protected by the administration in power it represents a reflection on all public officials. In this case the integrity of the U.S. Senate itself is on trial, not JOHN WILLIAMS.

If this procedure and these tactics that were evidenced in the last week and as contained in this report, represent the moral and ethical standards of this Great Society then God help America.

Today I shall confine my remarks to only a few paragraphs of the report. First I shall read from the fourth paragraph of part I of the report. I shall take the time later to discuss the report in greater detail. I shall not do it all now, but I do wish to show how ridiculous some of these so-called leaked charges are when analyzed.

Much has been said about the first page of the report wherein it is stated that:

> Contrary to * * * statements by Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS——

and so forth and so forth, giving the intimation and interpretation throughout the country that my statements had been erroneous or, to put it in plain language, that I was a liar. I find that in the leaking of the report they did not leak the true language. In fact, I find that I have company in being called a liar. One group that it so designated along with me includes most of the public press.

I read the exact language of this fourth paragraph on page 1 of the report:

> At this point it is to be noted that contrary to stories appearing in the public press and statements by Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS and others, the commmittee's decision to terminate hearings for taking testimony and to make its first report to the Senate was made upon condition that the committee could still hear pertinent evidence, if any, thereafter discovered.

Here they are insisting that when other Members of the Senate and I recognized the final report, which was filed on July 8, 1964, as having concluded their operations, every one except the Committee on Rules and Administration was wrong, apparently. Other Members of the Senate accepted it as the final report; the press carried it as such; but we are now being told that the committee had no intention of stopping the Baker investigation last July. How ridiculous.

What is the record? On July 8, 1964, the committee filed its final report.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], who is conveniently absent from the Senate again this afternoon as he was the other day, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

This statement accompanied the report of the committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> JULY 8, 1964.
>
> Mr. JORDAN, of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, submitted the following:
>
> The Committee on Rules and Administration, which, pursuant to Senate Resolution 212, agreed to October 10, 1963 (as supplemented by Senate Resolution 221, agreed to November 1, 1963, Senate Resolution 291, agreed to February 10, 1964, and Senate Resolution 319, agreed to April 29, 1964), was authorized and directed to make a study and investigation with respect to any financial or business interests or activities of any officer or employee or former officer or employee of the Senate, having concluded such study, submit the following report to the Senate thereon together w'th recommendations.

I repeat the last lines of this letter: "having concluded such study, submit the following report to the Senate thereon together with recommendations."

Clearly, this was their final report.

A couple weeks later, or on July 27——

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. What the Senator says is absolutely factual.

A statement in the report is as follows:

> At this point it is to be noted that, contrary to the stories appearing in the public press, statements by Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS and others, the committee's decision to terminate the hearings for taking testimony and to make its first report to the Senate was made on condition that the committee would still hear pertinent evidence if any thereafter were discovered.

That is untrue; it is incorrect; it is not borne out by the record. The facts are as they have been stated by the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

I remember the situation very vividly. A meeting was held by the Committee on Rules and Administration. The majority members decided to close the investigation. We ended with a considerable row on the floor of the Senate a few days later. As evidence that the majority intended to close the hearing, the chairman of the committee had prepared a release stating that the hearings were being closed, and even stated how the vote came out. I obtained a copy of that release. I placed it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I propose to insert it in the RECORD again today.

The record fully bears out that the intent of the majority was to end the investigation.

It is also true that prior to that time, in vote after vote, they had refused to call witnesses. Some of those witnesses might have had some very valuable evidence to present. It was repeatedly emphasized that no accusation was made against anyone whom a member asked to appear as a witness. But it was necessary to get all the facts so that we could see whether witnesses should be called and what the true situation was.

This long record of refusing to call a single witness requested by the minority, in violation of the written rules and the action they did take, proves that the distinguished Senator is correct, that his statement of facts is accurate, and that the statement that they had no intention of terminating the hearings is totally false, intended to deceive the public; and, worst of all, the report states in plain language that the statements made by Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS were not correct. I believe that those statements should be retracted. Up to the present hour they have not been.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The point is that they claim in this report that they had not closed the first hearings of the committee last July. Everybody else had recognized them as being closed. The press and most of the editorial comment in the press was that they had closed the hearings too soon. The editors, too, are in this same category with others, which includes every Member of the U.S. Senate who was on the floor of the Senate and voting on July 27 either to accept or to reject the recommendations of the committee because all had the clear understanding that the committee was done. There can be no contradiction on that point.

The statement here which I have just read and which appears in this new report is absolutely false, and the Democratic members of the committee know it.

The Senate even voted on July 27 as to the acceptance of their recommendations. At that time the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] offered a substitute for the committee's proposal which would have established a Select Committee to handle future investigations. That substitute was debated by the Senate and adopted. So we were voting and acting on a final report.

Later, on September 1, 1964, I outlined the fact that there had been an overpayment on the stadium performance bond insurance by around $35,000 and produced a check to prove it. After my disclosure that I had the check the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on September 10, 1964, offered Senate Resolution 367, which reopened the investigation and authorized the committee to resume an investigation into these allegations and any others that might be presented to them. The Senate even gave them more money to conduct the investigation. So there was absolutely no question but that they had closed one phase of the investigation and reopened another.

So the record is clear—it is the majority members of the committee who are in error, not JOHN WILLIAMS.

To be kind, in recognizing how they could have become so confused and recognizing how much foot dragging had been done in performing the investigation, it could be that they truthfully had such a slow pace in making these disclosures that they did not even recognize the fact when they stopped on July 8. There was scarcely any change in their pace.

Anyway, the Senate officially recognized that the committee had closed its investigation. Every Senator, including the majority leader and the minority leader, recognized that fact. If there is any question about it, I should like to yield to either one of them or to any other Member of the Senate, because I know that that was what was done. Let us settle this point now.

The report by the chairman last July 8 had stated that having concluded their work under these resolutions, they were submitting their report and recommendations.

That is from the statement of the chairman of the committee accompanying the report. This shows the utter ridiculousness of this report.

Mr. President, I cite a couple of other errors in this report. As I have said, I shall not try to go through the entire report today, but I wish to go over to page 36. Really, this is a most fascinating report. As one who likes to read mysteries, I get quite a kick out of reading it. I intend, that in the days to come, someone else will get a kick, likewise. I read from page 36 of the report. This deals with the $35,000 overpayment by Mr. McCloskey on an insurance bond. This was the famous "goof":

> Let it be said in the beginning of this review an appraisal of McCloskey's testimony and that of his associates that, when considered in the light of subsequent events, it was unfortunate that the committee did not examine him before it filed its first report on July 8, 1964.

I pause in reading the report to say that that is the understatement of the year.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The records of the committee will show that a motion was made to call Mr. McCloskey prior to that time, and that all the majority members voted against the motion and all the minority members voted for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true, and in this particular statement they are now saying that they made a mistake when they did not call him—and what a mistake.

Mr. CURTIS. And what a mistake.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They got caught.

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly they were caught.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Before the first investigation closed, the committee discussed the question of calling Mr. McCloskey. On that day I gave the reasons why I believed he should be called. I believed that we should not only obtain his version of the facts that were then before the committee, such as the alleged payment of money to Baker, but also we should find out if there were any other questions which would come within the scope of the investigation about which he would have knowledge.

There was quite a discussion. I stated many reasons why I thought he should be called at that time, and moved that he be called. Nevertheless, it was voted that he should not be called.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true. I am well aware of the fact that the minority members tried to get the committee to call Mr. McCloskey, but the majority members were not going to embarrass Mr. McCloskey. He was the finance chairman of the Democratic Party—a very important man.

I continue to read from this new report of the committee, and this next phrase is very important—

> If there is one irrefutable fact concerning this Reynolds-McCloskey controversy, it is that this committee had no knowledge or even intimation from any source that Reynolds would testify to the charges he later made or, to put it another way, that the McCloskey Co. had paid Don Reynolds Associates $109,205.60 and not $73,631.28.

In other words, they say that they had not had any knowledge or even any intimation prior to my speech on September 1, 1964, at which time I produced the check, that there was any question as to an overpayment. That is not true.

Let us now examine that record to find out what the fact is.

When we had the debate on the floor of the Senate on July 27, 1964, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 13, page 17030, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] had just pointed out how, during that investigation, repeated attempts had been made to have Mr. McCloskey called before the committee to testify on the stadium payments. I shall read the colloquy; Senators may then judge for themselves whether or not, from the statement in the report, the committee had any hint or intimation that there may have been some question about the $73,000 check prior to my speech on September 1. What I am about to read is a colloquy that took place in the Senate on July 27, 5 or 6 weeks prior thereto, and the discussion was with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN].

> Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I concur in what the Senator from Nebraska stated. Mr. McCloskey should have been called. It would have been far better.
>
> There is one other missing link which may have only supported the other testimony or it may have raised other questions. Some of the canceled checks were in the committee hearings and I have them before me.
>
> The committee has also the canceled check by which Bobby Baker got his $4,000. The committee has the canceled check for $1,500 that Mr. McLeod received. But what the committee does not have and which the committee should have and which I hope it will still try to obtain, is a copy of Mr. McCloskey's check to Mr. Reynolds as payment for this stadium insurance. I think it would be very important to have that information.
>
> Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I think Mr. Reynolds' record shows what the amount is. The report shows what he paid for the performance bond. But I shall not argue that point.
>
> Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It shows that Mr. Reynolds was to get $73,631.28 from Mr. McCloskey.

> He paid Hutchinson, Rivinus & Co., who handled the insurance for Reynolds, $63,599.72. That left a difference for his commission of $10,031.56. Out of that $10,031.56 he wrote a check for $4,000 to Bobby Baker and two checks to Mr. McLeod, one for $1,000 and one for $500.
>
> While it may be merely routine, I should like to see the $73,631.28 check to see if that is exactly what was paid. I would suggest that even now the committee could obtain a copy of that check. It may be interesting.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] chairman of the committee on Rules and Administration, is again absent from the Chamber. He was here a few moments ago, but when he learned what the subject of discussion was to be this afternoon he left. I say again that I respect his right to sit silent through this debate, just as I respect a witness before a congressional committee who exercises his constitutional right to take the fifth amendment, but I respect even more a person who will stand up and answer questions when they are asked of him.

Here was a clear notice on July 27, 1964, for the committee to get the check. It was emphasized that they should get the check to see if that was the exact amount. Every member of the committee knew that there was suspicion that there had been an overpayment. Why did not the committee obtain the check? Or had the committee found out about it, and was it afraid to produce the check? It is evident that their claim in this new report that the committee had no intimation of an overpayment by Mr. McCloskey is not true. The record clearly shows otherwise. For months prior to this discussion the members of the committee had kept emphasizing that the $73,000 payment was correct. They insisted that they had checked with Mr. McCloskey when this same question arose back in March 1964.

I quote from the committee hearings of March 23, 1964, as appears in part 25, page 2131. Here a staff member of the committee, Mr. Meehan, told the committee about a telephone conversation he had had with Mr. McCloskey on this very point. Mr. Meehan said:

> Mr. McCloskey stated that later, when he obtained the contract for constructing the stadium, he recalled his conversation and did purchase his performance bond through Don Reynolds. He recalled the approximate total premium paid by him was about $73,000; that, of this amount, about $10,000 was commission for, as he understood it, Reynolds and Baker. Mr. McCloskey said it was his option to purchase this performance bond through anyone he preferred, and there was nothing unusual about this.

Mr. McCloskey told him it was $73,000; that was all.

On this same date, March 23, 1964, on page 2133, Major McLendon, chief counsel to the committee, made this statement to the committee:

> Mr. McCloskey stated that later, when he obtained the contract for construction of the stadium, he recalled this conversation, and did purchase his performance bond through Reynolds. He recalled that the approximate total premium paid by him is $73,000, and that of this amount $10,000 was a commission to go to Reynolds and Baker, as he understood that.

Here Mr. McLendon kept insisting that the committee accept this telephone conversation with Mr. McCloskey and not call him as a witness. The committee refused a request by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and other minority members of the committee to have Mr. McCloskey appear before the committee to testify under oath as to the amount paid for this insurance bond. The Democratic members ignored such a request. Again, on the floor of the Senate on July 27, after they had filed the report, I urged that even at that late date they get this particular check to see if there had been an overpayment. But no; the committee said it was not interested. They had all the answers they wanted, and they did not think I could get the check.

It was not until September 1 that I made this disclosure on the floor of the Senate supported by the $109,205.60 check, and afterward, on September 10, 1964, the majority leader submitted his resolution. That resolution, Senate Resolution 367, directed the committee to go back and do its job all over again and to reopen the hearings.

I point this out to show the continuity and to refute entirely the contention that there is any truth whatever in the claim made in this report that the committee had no hint or intimation that a question had been raised about the $73,000 check. That question had been raised all over the lot for weeks and months prior thereto, and they ignored the warnings.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. This whitewash in the Baker case has been a most diabolical, clever scheme from the start. Not only did the committee refuse to call McCloskey, so that he could be asked about the transaction; the record shows that committee counsel, Mr. McLendon, never asked Reynolds the amount he billed McCloskey for the bond or how much McCloskey paid. At the time that question was asked, it was assumed that there would be a preliminary appearance by Don Reynolds, and that he would be recalled in open session. But that proposal was voted down. However, an examination of the record which has been made shows that the question propounded by Mr. McLendon was:

> What was the amount of the premium?

It is understood that the amount of the premium was $73,000. What was the commission? Some $10,000. That is understood. Very cleverly one might have thought it was the height of incompetence on the part of an investigating lawyer—Mr. McLendon—to avoid asking how much McCloskey paid or the amount for which he was billed. It was after that testimony was presented behind closed doors that Mr. Meehan and Mr. McLendon reported back that McCloskey said the amount was $73,000, and that the commission on the transaction was $10,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. That is the amount shown by the records we had then. Later, when it was rumored that there was an overpayment, I asked the committee to help to obtain the check and to call McCloskey to determine the facts. The minority members of the committee supported that position, but the Democratic members of the committee flatly refused to agree to do so. The information would not have been available today had I not been able to subsequently produce the check.

I shall now discuss another point in this report.

The report refers several times to a great mystery and to how I obtained a copy of the $109,205.60 invoice sent by Mr. Reynolds to Mr. McCloskey.

Based on this report this is a great mystery and one which certainly should be solved. The report is very critical of me for not having told them from what source and when I obtained a copy of this invoice.

Why was it left out of my September 1, 1964, speech?

This was one of their allegations of evidence withheld. Again I shall point up the sheer stupidity of these allegations that leaked out on this subject. I should like to quote from the report itself; then I will prove its absurdity.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before commencing to quote?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the most interesting thing about the Baker hearings was the flexibility of the individuals responsible for conducting the hearings. It was interesting to note the flexibility with which the rules of the game were changed from time to time for a purpose. The purpose was not what is good for the Senate. The purpose was not what was good for the people of the country to know. The purpose was, What was good for the majority, and what was good for those who conducted the investigation.

The fact that the committee at all times operated in such a way as to make sure that the investigation could never be a thorough one is demonstrated by the very flexibility of the procedure pursued.

For example, certain witnesses took the fifth amendment. I am personally of the opinion that some members of the staff, and perhaps some members of the committee, knew in advance which witnesses would take the fifth amendment and which witnesses would not. There was some comment on that subject from time to time. That left only those witnesses who would not take the fifth amendment.

In at least two instances, witnesses whose testimony under questioning could be damaging to Baker and to those involved in the subject matter of the resolution were not called at all. A telephone conversation was enough in one case. Interrogatories were enough in another. The two individuals who might have supplied some of the most interesting testimony were not called at all.

Whenever the minority wanted to call a witness, they were voted down, usually by 6 to 3. Whenever reports were received, the minority was not advised that there were confidential reports in the file of the case until some later date.

Eventually we found out, or we think we found out, what may have been in the file. Moreover, when it was to the advantage of those who were not really interested in an all-out investigation to leak derogatory statements in the press about witnesses or about the senior Senator from Delaware, this was unhesitatingly done.

The committee veered around from the beginning. In the case of Reynolds, for example, there seemed to be a time when the committee was most anxious to have him testify in open hearings. Later they did not want to have him testify in open hearings. Therefore, we had a highly anomalous situation in which one witness would come in and testify if his testimony served the purpose of the majority. Then they would want an open hearing following the executive hearing. However, if the testimony of the witness did not serve the purpose of the majority, or proved embarrassing in some respects, there would be a decision, "Let us not have an open session." There was no consistency. There was no determination to say, "We shall examine all the witnesses in private hearings, in closed session. Then we shall examine all the witnesses publicly."

Instead of that, the committee picked and chose and decided which witnesses it would hear publicly and which witnesses it would not like to hear publicly. The committee decided which investigations would never be revealed to the public, or which investigation reports the members of the committee were allowed to read in privacy.

The committee majority staff greatly outnumbered the minority staff, which consisted of merely a counsel and one investigator. The reports submitted by the majority consistently ignored many of the essential elements of the investigation. Finally, in the last draft of the report, which was the subject of the debate in the last committee session, about 80 percent of the report consisted of attempts by counsel for the committee—if, in fact, and I believe it to be a fact, he was the operating draftsman of the report—to destroy the testimony of Reynolds or to place the senior Senator from Delaware on trial for the heinous offense of having revealed the whole skulduggery in the first place.

Bobby Baker has dropped from the role of being star of the proceedings in the dramatis personae, almost to being an extra in the cast. Not very much is said about Bobby Baker, although what is said is full of pious platitudes on the part of those who made the report.

Various witnesses who might have produced more evidence, had the motion of the minority prevailed, were not called. In the last committee session, as is now public knowledge, I moved that all derogatory references to the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that were violative of the rules or customs of the Senate be stricken. Rather than permit that motion to be debated, there was a motion to adjourn which, of course, is not debatable. Therefore, if and when the Committee on Rules and Administration meets again, I point out that the pending business is my motion to strike out those derogatory remarks.

I have a feeling that Senators on the other side may regret their unwarranted and shameful attack on the senior Senator from Delaware. I am inclined to speculate that when the committee does finally meet, after it has received its full instructions from either inside or outside of this Chamber, there will probably be a strong effort, and, of course, a successful one, to eliminate all references to the senior Senator from Delaware, perhaps on the theory that the senior Senator from Delaware has been heard quite a lot as it is. However, I suspect that the reason given will be a highly pious one, and that the majority will say, "We never intended to impugn the motives or intentions of the senior Senator from Delaware. Let us strike this out. Let us not argue about it. Let us agree to knock it out."

They will take a new position.

It will be interesting to see whether the committee adopts a report which deals with things as they happened, or whether we shall receive another rather flatulent draft full of pompous utterances which mean nothing and serve no cause save the cause of evasion. It will be interesting to note whether the committee will, at long last, realize that it is the butt of humor of every cartoonist in the country, the laughingstock of the press, and surely the most 8-fingered, 24-toed production which has ever been spawned by a legislative body.

Are they tired of being laughed at? Are they tired of being the butt of ridicule and the object of scorn? Will they, at long last, decide to pull up their collective socks and present a straightforward factual report? Will they recommend real reflection? Will they really publicly do something effective in the interest of the Senate and of the people? Will they exert any pressure to see that the majority and minority parties agree to set up a Senate Committee on Ethics, or Ethics and Standards, and see that Members of the Senate serve on it?

I conclude in the tradition of the soap operas: "Continued until the next meeting of the Rules Committee. Wait and see."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. I thank him for his effort to have the remarks referred to stricken. I had been hoping he would have been successful in his efforts because I do not enjoy being forced to defend my record. But it is like taking a dip in the ocean. It is cold at first, but once one gets in he enjoys the swim. Now that I have gotten in I am going to enjoy tearing this report apart and showing what a sham it is. When I am through I shall have shown who was telling the truth and who was not.

I want to go back to the discussion of the $109,000 invoice Don Reynolds sent to McCloskey & Co. The committee makes a great point of the fact that when I made my speech in September 1964—the first one—I did not put the invoice in the RECORD, but I did release the check. I did not realize that the committee was interested in this point until I read this report. I believe it was about the 10th or 11th of September that I put the invoice in the RECORD. According to this report there is something mysterious about this delay. The report devotes five pages to questioning where WILLIAMS obtained the invoice and why he did not put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before. According to the committee report this is the biggest mystery of all. Apparently they can hardly wait to get the answer. Well, I have the answer, but first I want to read from this report to show how much emphasis the committee put on the question as to where I obtained the invoice. I quote from page 33 of the report:

> In this connection it is important—

Note that—it is important—

> to note that Reynolds was apparently afraid of the invoice he sent to McCloskey for the $109,205.60, because he either did not give a copy to Senator WILLIAMS or the Senator forgot to put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 1, 1964—

Here the committee refers to Mr. Reynolds as being afraid or me as having forgotten to put it in the RECORD. After reading the committee's comments I will explain when and from what source I obtained this invoice, and in fairness to Mr. Reynolds he did not have the slightest idea where it came from.

Oh, the majority emphasizes the importance of this invoice. I cannot understand why the members did not ask me about it because the answer is so simple.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senate directed the Rules Committee to investigate, and they refused to investigate. They said, "JOHN WILLIAMS did not say."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That remark is all too true. Apparently all the Rules Committee did was to spend the quarter of a million dollars it had for the investigation, then sit back and wait for me to do the job. I wish to read further from the report about this invoice. This is a most important point—or at least according to the committee it is. The committee devotes nearly five pages to discussing the point that they did not know where I got it; and with all of their investigating staff they could not find out. Do not forget that there were former, present, and future FBI agents, and hopeful judges on that staff.

Let me read further from the report.

> It has been noted that Senator WILLIAMS did not put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Reynolds' invoice to McCloskey at the time he first disclosed this transaction in the Senate on September 1, 1964.

Take notice just how very important this point is. I read further from another part of the report:

> It was not until September 10, 1964, that Senator WILLIAMS produced the Reynolds' invoice to McCloskey. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 17, page 21912 * * *. It does not appear where Sen-

ator WILLIAMS obtained a copy of the invoice, but it is significant that he produced it only after McCloskey made the public statement that he paid Reynolds the exact amount of Reynolds' invoice, no more and no less.

Having all the resources of the FBI and the Rules Committee investigating staff, the committee should not have found it so difficult to learn from where I obtained the invoice. Frankly, if only they had called me I would have told them; or they could have read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and they would have found that it came from the newspapers. It was printed on the reverse side of the financial page of the Philadelphia papers. I am sure it appeared in most other newspapers throughout the country. So the committee would have saved much money if it had asked me, or perhaps if it had read the newspaper accounts they would have seen it. If the committee members had read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD they would have found out from where I got the invoice, because I also put Mr. McCloskey's statement commenting on the check in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There was no mystery about this invoice or its source. Besides what if there had been—what difference would that make? Or is the committee more interested in the source of my information than in the documents themselves.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Is there anything of which the Senator is aware which would have stopped the committee or the FBI or any individual from asking McCloskey and getting him to tell the truth about the invoice?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly not.

Mr. SCOTT. But there was no obstacle preventing him from telling the whole truth.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Nor was there any reason why he should not have been called as a witness.

Any committee that had a quarter of a million dollars with which to investigate should have been able to find out some answers themselves. Here is the original newspaper article. Yet the committee took five pages to build up a great mystery as to how I located a document that had appeared in nearly every newspaper in the country. This is typical of the rest of the investigation this committee has done. They have been busier trying to build a defense for the accused than in getting the facts.

Mr. SCOTT. The question might be asked, Why did not the minority of the committee find out? I suggest to the Senate that the minority's counsel and the minority's investigator were under the orders of the majority and its group of investigators and task force; and the minority were permitted to investigate only those things assigned to them by the majority. Therefore, the minority had no opportunity to go into it. The whole committee had to take the statement of the majority of the committee and the majority staff that Mr. McCloskey had been talked to on the telephone.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct, if they had wanted it, they could have obtained it earlier. The fact is, they did not want the answers. Based on this report the majority did not have the slightest idea from where this information came. They treated it as a great mystery. I merely took it out of the newspapers, commented on it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and made no bones about it. Anybody who wanted to know which paper it appeared in could have asked me—or read the RECORD—or better still, they could have asked Mr. McCloskey. If this is an example of their talents it is little wonder they did not find anything else wrong with Mr. Baker. Here is something right under their noses; yet they made a wholesale investigation and still did not find it even though it had appeared in all the papers.

Truthfully, I think the committee knows better. They know the source of this invoice. They just want to create the impression that someone was holding back some evidence. Just why anyone would ever consider holding evidence from this committee is something I cannot understand. Just give them the evidence for they will not use it anyway unless they are forced to do so.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. This was after the majority voted solidly not to call Mr. McCloskey as a witness. The motion was made by the minority, and McCloskey, under the written rules, should have been called. There should not have been any difficulty at all. Yet, in violation of the rules and in violation of every tradition of the Senate, they refused to call McCloskey.

Now, as the Senator has pointed out, they waste the taxpayers' money alibiing page after page about "If it only had known something," when they closed their ears to any testimony that was embarrassing to the politically powerful and refused to call witnesses requested by the minority.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; and their anxiety as to where I got the information from is only a smokescreen. Of course, if they ever found out the identification of a real source of information they would really throw the book at that individual.

But I can assure them that unless I want them to know the identity of a real source they will never get it.

I now wish to invite attention to another point, but will yield first to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I cannot believe that the majority on the committee would let itself in for this ridiculous series of mistakes, in backing and filling, and changing the rules in the middle of the game, unless some mastermind were guiding them.

I must admit that I do not know who the mastermind is, but it does require stringpulling. It does take some kind of——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Arm twisting.

Mr. SCOTT. Arm twisting, and a series of conferences back and forth, doing one thing today and doing the opposite tomorrow. No one is going to do one thing today and another thing tomorrow, unless someone else is saying to him, "You do it," because it runs counter to ordinary horsesense, which every Senator possesses 100 percent, or at least 50 percent.

I admit that I am really very much puzzled as to how any committee ever got itself into this kind of mess, and why the committee cannot find some way to get out of the mess. But, so long as they wish to stay in the mess, as Senators we are left to seek to puzzle out the solution.

To me, the whole situation is like a man milking a cow. He believes that he is through and takes the pail away, when he notices that the cow is not through, so he rushes back with the pail. I do not know how long we in the minority are going to have to lay down an extra pail and rush back, after we believe that the cow has finished "giving down," as the saying goes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, there is much more in this report that is interesting upon which I need to comment.

For example, much is made of the $109,000 check, and the date and source of its being obtained. Based on this report the committee insists they had neither a hint nor an intimation of any overpayment prior to my September 1, 1964 speech. I will show the inaccuracies of this claim.

All of the accusations and insinuations I am going to answer. It is not enough merely to say they are not true. I am going to document with dates and exhibits to prove my statement. I will document the record point by point as we proceed because it is very important to me that we not leave these innuendoes hanging.

Likewise, if later the majority members of the committee recover their nerve enough to face me on the floor of the Senate I will be here waiting—and I can assure them I will not remain silent to their questions or comments.

Yes, if there are many other phases of the report which need full, frank, and complete discussion, I assure all Senators that they are going to get exactly that in the days ahead. As one Member of the Senate who has tried to keep this investigation on the proper track, I am determined that it is not going to be whitewashed while I remain silent. In fact, I do not believe that the Baker case could be covered up even if they wish to do so. I do not believe there is a rug in Washington big enough to cover it up.

Therefore, I shall conclude tonight and only say—I will be back later. I realize the hour is late, and I wish to give the Senate an opportunity to proceed with its business. There are many more angles to this controversy which will be brought to light and continued at a later date.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, we will now close with the announcement that there are more and more interesting developments to follow.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6767) making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in our action today in giving final approval to the Interior appropriations bill, the Senate has, I believe, adopted a progressive and positive approach to the further preservation and development of a large share of the natural resources in the West.

I would note that this bill includes a total of $19 million for soil and watershed management on the public lands of the West. This sum will provide impetus to a vitally important program of halting the erosion of our soil and the waste of our precious water resources. It will also begin a restoration of these resources as well as the program of eliminating abuse.

As far as my State of Wyoming is concerned, this bill provides $188,000 for construction at the Saratoga Fish Hatchery and $60,000 for a badly needed study of elk management to be carried out by the U.S. Forest Service Laboratory at Laramie. Also in this bill are funds which will allow us to continue our predator control program on a realistic basis and to proceed with other development programs for additional recreational and agricultural benefits throughout the public lands of Wyoming. And, Mr. President, I should note that the State of Wyoming is almost one-half federally owned.

Particularly I wish to note that this budget contains the initial appropriation for the development of the Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area, which will provide unlimited recreational opportunities in an extremely scenic area where the high plains meet the mountains. The development of this recreation area is another indication that we are making progress in our attempts to keep our development of the scenic and recreational potential of our Nation ahead of the rapidly increasing demands of an expanding and affluent population.

In sum, Mr. President, this bill represents positive, constructive, and timely action to make the best use of our natural resources and to fulfill the Federal obligations to those areas in which it is one of the dominant landholders.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the action of the committee which I want briefly to note is its inclusion of land and water conservation funds to acquire the magnificent Sylvania tract in the westernmost part of Michigan's Upper Peninsula. This action was recommended by the Budget Bureau. This was approved by the Budget Bureau; both the Interior and Agriculture Departments support it without reservation.

As the committee notes, if the tract is not purchased now, in all probability there will not be another chance. I do hope this item can be retained in the conference.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, while Senators are streaming into the Chamber, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the pending business and turn to Calendar No. 232 and consider three items in sequence. They have been cleared on both sides and are ready for action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HIRING OR RENTING PROPERTY FROM EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREST SERVICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1689) to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "thereby", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That the aggregate amount to be paid permanent employees under authorization of this subsection, exclusive of obligations occasioned by fire emergencies, shall not exceed $20,000 in any one year."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (a) of the Act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the Act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502), is amended to read as follows: "(a) To hire or rent property from employees of the Forest Service for the use of that Service, whenever the public interest will be promoted thereby: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount to be paid permanent employees under authorization of this subsection, exclusive of obligations occasioned by fire emergencies, shall not exceed $20,000 in any one year."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, what is the subject matter of the bill? I cannot fathom it from the numbers being read.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The subject matter of the bill is to remove the existing prohibition against renting such property for use by the Forest Service by an employee from whom it is rented, and to increase the maximum rental.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Montana for his explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 243), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1689), to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502), having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with an amendment.

This bill, with the committee amendment, would amend the law authorizing the Forest Service to rent property needed by it from its employees whenever the public interest will be promoted thereby so as to—

(1) Remove the existing prohibition against renting such property for use by the employee from whom it is rented, and

(2) Increase the maximum total rentals which may be paid to all permanent employees in any one year from $3,000 to $20,000.

This legislation was requested by the Department of Agriculture. In certain situations, such as those where there is only occasional need for the property, it is to the advantage of the Government to rent property from its employees. At isolated posts, the employee who is to use the property may be the only one who has such property available for rent, and may also be the only employee available to perform the work for which the property is to be used. In addition, some property, such as horses, may be safe only if used by owner, or may be of such type that the owner is unwilling to rent it for use of another. The $3,000 limitation on the amount to be paid all permanent employees in any year was established in 1931 and is no longer adequate.

The bill, as introduced, would have removed the $3,000 limitation completely. The committee has recommended an amendment to increase the limit to $20,000 rather than remove it.

VALIDATE CERTAIN PAYMENTS MADE TO EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREST SERVICE

The bill (H.R. 6691) to validate certain payments made to employees of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 244), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 6691), to validate certain payments made to employees of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

This bill would validate overpayments made through mistakes to southwestern firefighter crewmembers in 1961, 1962, and 1963.

Overpayments were made in 1,421 cases totaling $32,472. The average overpayment is $22.85, but actual overpayments range from $3.10 to $99.84. A great many of the persons to whom overpayments were made were Indians identified only by name, tribe, and crew number. Collection would be difficult and costly; and the Forest Service estimates that it would be unlikely that more than 10 percent of the overpayment could be recovered. The Forest Service has now established a uniform wage rate, changed travel instructions, and required the use of a simple uniform system of job titles; and the Comptroller General has advised that he will evaluate the adequacy of the control measures in future reviews.

The overpayments were as follows:

(1) $27,844.53 was overpaid to 1,004 firefighters in 1961 because Arizona wage rates were inadvertently paid to firefighters from New Mexico (instead of New Mexico wage rates which were 20 cents lower). Firefighters from both States worked, slept, and ate together and were mistakenly paid from the same wage rate tables.

(2) $3,211.07 was inadvertently overpaid to 349 firefighters for traveltime in excess of 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Travel in trucks is paid as worktime and firefighters are usually moved from camps in trucks. Firefighters moved from camp in Greyhound buses were inadvertently paid for worktime instead of traveltime. In another case 69 Zuni Indians were allowed travel pay for transportation from Gallup, rather than from Zuni, as it should have been.

(3) $1,403.70 was overpaid to 64 firefighters through failure to take proper account of regional differences in job definitions.

(4) $12.44 was overpaid to four firefighters as a result of using the wrong wage rate.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 7031) to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join with our distinguished committee chairman in support of H.R. 7031, the National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act. The distinguished Senator from Alabama is to be complimented for his foresight and thought in authoring this measure which, when enacted into law, will play a major role in bringing meaning into the lives of thousands of deaf young people and helping them to become constructive and useful citizens in their communities.

H.R. 7031 is a worthwhile, constructive, and much-needed measure. But it is only a first step in what hopefully could be a complete and comprehensive program in meeting the educational needs of those who are deprived of the sense of normal hearing.

I make particular reference to the recommendations submitted in February of this year by the Advisory Committee on the Education of the Deaf in its report, "Education of the Deaf." This Advisory Committee, appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in March 1964, is composed of a panel of 10 distinguished citizens headed by Dr. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., president of the University of Connecticut, and formerly a distinguished official of the Office of Education during the Eisenhower administration.

As pointed out in the committee report on the pending bill, the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee merit immediate attention so that, where feasible, legislation might be enacted, or appropriate administrative action undertaken. The committee has urged the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to soon "make available his analysis of the Advisory Committee's report, and to include with his analysis a summary of the administrative actions to be taken and legislative proposals to be supported in the general area covered by the 'Report on Education of the Deaf.'"

It is recognized, of course, that upon further deliberation, on recommendations by the Advisory Committee, it may be seen fit by Congress to modify them. However, the recommendations are of sufficient import to the 200,000 to 250,000 Americans who are deaf, that their consideration and action upon them, where appropriate, should not be delayed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Advisory Committee recommended:

PLANNING

1. That the Congress of the United States be requested to authorize the appropriation of funds for a program of planning grants to the States, similar to the program of mental retardation planning grants, to be used to assist and encourage the States to develop individual State plans for the education of the deaf. A part of the funds thus appropriated should be reserved to the Commissioner of Education to facilitate regional and interstate planning.

2. That the Commissioner of Education convene a national conference of Federal, State, and local governmental and professional leadership to consider effective ways to encourage the development of State plans for the organization of educational and auxiliary services for the deaf.

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

1. That the Office of Education inaugurate a 5- to 10-year demonstration program involving the establishment of special facilitative services for deaf students at cooperating colleges and universities throughout the country designed to enhance the likelihood of academic success of deaf students therein. Emphasis in the program should be initially on fields of study not generally available to deaf students, such as engineering, architecture, and the professions, but not to the exclusion of liberal arts curriculums.

2. That a similar demonstration program be undertaken at a number of junior colleges throughout the country which are designated as "area vocational education schools" by the Commissioner of Education. Emphasis in selection should be placed on those institutions serving areas in which substantial numbers of deaf students are to be found, but where no residential vocational education schools are contemplated under section 14 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

3. That similar facilitative services for deaf students be provided on a continuing basis in the residential vocational education schools approved by the Commissioner of Education under section 14 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and that sufficient funds be included to finance them.

4. That the Office of Education consider in the light of its continuing evaluation of the foregoing demonstration programs whether the vocational and advanced technical educational requirements of deaf students are being adequately met, or whether there is a need for federally supported regional vocational education schools and a national technical institute exclusively for the deaf.

5. That the Office of Education prepare, distribute, and publicize informational materials designed to stimulate through State adult education programs the offering of classes for the adult deaf; and that State educational authorities seek the participation of organized groups of adult deaf and their leaders in initiating such programs.

GALLAUDET COLLEGE

1. That the Federal Government continue to support Gallaudet College in its efforts to maintain and improve its status as a liberal arts college to serve the Nation's deaf.

2. That the budget of Gallaudet College be increased in support of the following measures: (a) An increase in the number of course offerings in the natural sciences and the social sciences to make possible a wider range of electives; (b) a program of orientation that will permit new faculty members, at full pay, to devote at least 3 months to achieving a deeper understanding of the educational deprivation which the students have inevitably suffered because of their handicap, and to learning effective communication with the deaf; and (c) a liberalized leave policy to encourage faculty members to pursue programs leading to the doctoral degree.

3. That any plans for future growth of Gallaudet take into account the possibility of more deaf students studying in colleges for the hearing, with special help; and that, particularly if the recommendations of the committee with respect to postsecondary education of the deaf are accepted and put into practice, the college authorities proceed with particular caution in expansion planning until the recommended demonstration program has been evaluated, possibly raising its admission standards somewhat as a control on application pressures if they develop in the meantime.

4. That Public Law 420, 83d Congress, be amended to increase the number on the board of directors to 20, that the board seek to elect new members from a broader geographical base, that all board members serve for fixed terms of perhaps 5 years, that the board strive to increase alumni representation, and that the president of the college should serve as an ex officio, nonvoting member of the policymaking board.

FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

1. That a continuing national advisory committee on the education of the deaf be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

2. That assistance be provided to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in carrying out his responsibilities for the coordination of the several educational and related program activities that have bearing upon the education of the deaf, both directly and indirectly. It is recommended that there be within the Office of the Secretary a position recognized as primarily concerned with the education of the deaf.

RESEARCH

1. That the Division of Handicapped Children and Youth, Bureau of Educational Research and Development, Office of Education, be designated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as the central point of focus and planning for Federal research efforts in the education of the deaf.

2. That a panel be convened to develop a proposed program of comprehensive research into the problems of education of the deaf; and that, subject to the panel's concurrence, such proposal contemplate major emphasis on programmatic research utilizing a broad multidisciplinary approach, and involving support of two or more research centers, preferably in university settings.

3. That the panel be furnished, for the above purpose, necessary full-time staff assigned to sole responsibility of serving the panel in its initial identification and planning endeavors; and that funds be made available to the panel to permit it to enlist the aid of consultants as it deems necessary for this purpose.

4. That the panel invite the cooperation of other elements of the Department which support research related to or in the education of the deaf.

5. That the panel take note of the several unmet research needs set forth in the committee's report in developing its plan.

6. That the proposed program developed by the panel not be constrained by budgetary considerations, but that it represent the combined judgment of the panel on the scope and emphasis of the program and on the level of effort needed; and that it be phased in accordance with the probable increase in competent research personnel attracted to the field.

7. That the panel specifically consider the desirability of a program of research and fellowship grants, supported by Federal funds, as a method of attracting competent young people to the area of research in the education of the deaf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 245), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to enter into an agreement with an institution of higher education for the establishment, construction, equipping, and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf for the purpose of providing a residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for successful employment. A 12-member National Advisory Board on the Establishment of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf would be appointed by the Secretary to review proposals from institutions of higher education which desire such an institute, to make recommendations to the Secretary concerning such proposals, and to make such other recommendations concerning the establishment and operation of the National Technical Institute as may be appropriate. The Commissioners of Education and of Vocational Rehabilitation would be ex officio members of the Board.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

There are approximately 3,000 deaf students above the age of 16 who leave or graduate from State and local schools and classes for the deaf each year. A large number have indicated their intense interest and desire for further educational opportunities. Dr. Leonard M. Elstad, president of Gallaudet College, the only institution for higher education for the deaf in the world, in his testimony reported that over 600 student applications were received and reviewed this year. He reported that 275 of these students will be admitted in September 1965.

The other 325 students who could not meet the entrance requirements of the college, by the very act of submitting an application expressed their desire for further education. This number coupled with some 75 to 100 annual withdrawals from the college at various levels from freshmen to seniors, in addition to numerous other deaf persons among the unemployed or underemployed who desire further training, indicates that well over 400 students each year would be eligible for a program that could be offered in a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

The recent report on the "Education of the Deaf" prepared by the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf in 1964, appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare stated that "five-sixths of our deaf adults work in manual jobs as contrasted to only one-half of our hearing population." If the door to further educational opportunity is not opened for the group who could not be admitted to Gallaudet College, including other qualified students, they have almost no other alternative than to join the ranks of the nonskilled labor force.

Population and enrollment

The Office of Education estimates that there are 37,000 school-age seriously hearing impaired children in our country. According to the American Annals of the Deaf (January issue, 1965), 83 public and private residential schools are attended by approximately 18,400 deaf students. About 12,300 attend 355 public and private special day schools and classes for the deaf. It is estimated that 6,000 additional students not accounted for by the American Annals of the Deaf are either in public school classes that do not provide necessary special education services for these children or they are not in school at all.

Special problems in education of the deaf

Dr. S. Richard Silverman, director of the Central Institute for the Deaf and professor of audiology at Washington University Medical School in St. Louis, in his testimony before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor on April 27, 1965, described the educational problems brought about by severe hearing impairment. A portion of this statement was as follows:

"For the persons we are here concerned with, the essential and primary channel for receiving the acoustic symbols we call speech is either absent or severely restricted. All the skills of communication that depend on learning over this channel are adversely affected. From infancy to early school age, the chief mode of communication for the normal hearing child is auditory. The child hears and learns to talk from what he hears. Furthermore, he not only learns how to communicate; he also learns what to communicate. For a child who does not have the daily experience of listening to language, its acquisition is indeed difficult, if not impossible for some, even with instruction. * * * the teacher is confronted with the task of communicating language to a child in the absence of the sensory system considered to be essential for its acquisition.

"The educator, therefore, must seek ways to manipulate information so that it can be transmitted over whatever sensory system or combination of systems are available—such as vision, touch, and residual hearing. At the same time, we are concerned about the content of what we communicate—language and subject matter, as it is influenced by the demands of society and the child himself."

A young child who has a substantial or total hearing loss, acquired at birth or before the normal age for learning language through hearing, has a serious educational handicap. Every attempt has been made by educators of the deaf to accelerate the acquisition of reading, language, and communication skills by deaf children. For the most part, the objective has been to teach the basic language and communication skills well enough at the elementary level so that these children could go on with their education or further vocational training in our colleges, universities, and vocational training facilities for normal hearing students.

Philosophically, this goal would appear to be a reasonable one. Many educators have been convinced that this kind of preparation is the best way for the deaf child to become a full participant socially and economically in a hearing world. Numerous individual success stories can be and have been produced to support this theory. However, the facts reveal that for the general deaf population this has not been achieved.

Most residential schools for the deaf offer programs that provide for the equivalent of an eighth grade education. Very few of the specialized day school programs go beyond this level. Students desiring more than this are expected to enroll in regular high school and other vocational schools for the hearing. This is a commendable objective and its practice should be encouraged wherever and whenever possible. However, because of the serious communication problem involved, a relatively small percentage of these children can really communicate well enough to do this.

A NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

The establishment of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf would, by providing a broad flexible curriculum, be able to meet the many and varied special needs of able young deaf adults who seek the opportunity for further education and training. Adequately trained staff members, who are resourceful, flexible, and imaginative would be required for the successful operation of a technical training program.

Size of the Institute

Since the estimates that have been made regarding the number of students who would be able to profit from a specialized program indicate that at least 400 students each year could qualify for enrollment, provision should be made initially to enroll at least 200 students each year with adequate planning for necessary future expansion. The special needs of individual students for program planning purposes would be determined following complete physical, psychological, audiological evaluations, and a program of orientation and guidance counseling. The goals established for some students could be accomplished in 1 year. The objectives for others might require 2, 3, or even 4 years to complete.

Program objectives

The principal objective of the Institute should be the employment of the student upon completion of a prescribed educational and training program. The environment of the school, the curriculum, and general living conditions, along with health and recreational services, should be designed to help the student achieve a high degree of personal development and a sense of social responsibility. The educational and training program should be supplemented by varied civic and social group activities to provide the proper environment for developing concepts of responsible citizenship and social competence.

The focus of effort of the entire faculty on behalf of the students attending the Institute should be directed toward the goals of successful employment and preparation for full participation in community living.

Location

The National Technical Institute for the Deaf should be located in a large metropolitan industrial area so that it could be designed to serve the special needs of deaf youth from any community in the Nation. The area should also have a wide variety of nationally representative types of industrial activities in order to make it possible for the student to return to his home for eventual employment. The Institute should be affiliated with a major university for the administration of its program. This would facilitate securing the medical, audiological, psychological, and psychiatric services needed to supplement appropriate guidance and counseling services provided by the staff of the Institute.

The community where the Institute is located should be able to offer a variety of opportunities for training and experience in a wide range of modern industrial settings. The community should be one that would generally be receptive to a program of this nature and be sympathetic with training needs of the deaf.

Curriculum

The curriculum of the institute should be very flexible so as to permit a variety of adaptations to meet the needs of individual students without the absolute necessity to conform to traditional accreditation standards, such as course credits, fixed period scheduling and other curriculum restrictions. Courses of study should be available to meet the needs of students attending the Institute. Upon successful completion of a prescribed curriculum, each student should receive a certificate or other formal recognition that would attest to what has been accomplished. The standards and quality of training offered in all areas will have to be high enough to meet the usual requirements as recommended by labor, industry, and professional associations, including certifying and licensing agencies.

The program offered should be broad enough to include a basic or preparatory curriculum of a remedial nature in such subjects as English, reading, science, and mathematics as may be required to prepare deaf students to take the postsecondary courses intended to increase their educational and work skills to enable them to become qualified candidates for employment at levels commensurate with their ability and training. A supplementary curriculum including such courses as humanities, government, history, and economics should be offered to properly prepare students for living in a modern urban society. A comprehensive supporting curriculum in such subject areas as physics, chemistry, biology, and higher mathematics, should be offered where required as prerequisites for training in technical areas.

The course work offered in preparatory, supplemental, and support curriculums should follow a logical sequence in preparing students for training and experience in a wide variety of technologies. The following suggested technological programs are illustrative of some of the kinds of training opportunities that should be made available to deaf students:

Automotive technology: Mechanics and body repair, shop service operations, automotive refrigeration, internal combustion engines, diesel engine technology.

Aviation technology: Mechanics and engine repair, unit assembly work, drafting.

Building and construction: Carpentry, plumbing, equipment repair, architectural drawing.

Paramedical and chemical technology: Chemistry, microbiology, anatomy and physiology, quantitative analysis, dental prosthetics, optical instruments, embalming.

Engineering technology: Engineering graphics, technical math, physics, and chemistry, general metals, technical drafting, engineering fundamentals, surveying, water-sanitary technology, technical report writing.

Business: Accounting, business machines, typing, office management, data processing, computer operation, programing.

Commercial art: Basic design, basic drawing, advertising, dress design.

Electronic engineering technology: Electronics fundamentals, technical math and physics, radio and television repair, industrial electronics, technical drafting.

Technical graphic arts: Lithography, engineering graphics, technical drafting, offset, equipment maintenance and repair.

Mechanical and metals technology: Machine shop, welding, air conditioning, sheet metal work, refrigeration, tool and die, ornamental metal work.

An enrichment curriculum should be made available to those students who have the ability and desire to pursue further professional training in other institutions of higher learning. Such courses as literature, history, psychology, sociology, foreign language, philosophy, and political sciences could be offered in the Institute itself or arrangements for study in these areas could be made for the student in other regular university programs.

Essential to the overall program would be the opportunity for continued instruction in communication skills. These would include work toward improving speech and speech reading skills in addition to a continuing support program of auditory training.

Administration

The Institute should be directed by a person who has had professional training and experience as an educator of the deaf. He should be qualified to recruit and direct a competent staff that would be able to organize all the resources of a community and other institutions of higher education in the area in order that the needs of students to be enrolled could be served. All staff members, including counseling, placement, psychological, and instruction specialists, should be adequately trained to deal with deaf students from all types of schools and educational backgrounds. These personnel should know and understand deaf students thoroughly, including their special education and social problems.

Under the provisions of the bill, the governing body of the institution of higher education, subject to the approval of the Secretary, would appoint an advisory group to advise the director of the Institute in formulating and carrying out the basic policies governing its establishment and operation. Because of the Federal support for the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, it would be anticipated that congressional representation would be included in the membership of the advisory group among those who are designated as members of the public familiar with the needs of educational services for the deaf.

Placement officers on the staff of the Institute should provide for initial placement and followup services directly as well as through appropriate liaison with community vocational rehabilitation agencies throughout the Nation.

As a byproduct, in providing this kind of expert service, the Institute could serve as a practice teaching center for the training of special guidance and rehabilitation counselors of the deaf.

One of the responsibilities of the placement guidance and counseling staff should be to maintain continuous liaison with personnel in all schools and classes for the deaf, vocational rehabilitation agencies, and industry, in order to keep these individuals informed and up to date on all pertinent activities of the Institute and to keep the Institute informed about the employment needs of industry.

Standards for admission

Admission to the Institute should be based on a complete comprehensive evaluation of each student's potential for successfully completing one of the courses of study offered at the Institute. The information needed for this purpose as a part of the application process should include a review of medical, psychological, and audiological records; academic achievement and school progress reports; and recommendations from teachers, school principal, and others who are acquainted with the student. Wherever possible, personal interviews with potential students at the Institute, at home, or in school should be made by the appropriate staff members of the Institute.

A period of orientation, evaluation, and counseling at the Institute in order to properly prepare the new student for full participation in the program, should be available to those who need it.

Research

In addition to serving as a practice teaching center for the training of teachers, instructors, and rehabilitation counselors the Institute will serve as a research facility for the study of educational problems of the deaf. The Institute will be an excellent proving ground for the development of new and better educational teaching techniques. Such information will be useful to all programs where deaf children are taught.

During the hearings the question was raised as to whether the language of S. 1650 and H.R. 7031 authorized the Institute to conduct research.

Physical facilities

The Institute should have a sufficient number of flexible classroom accommodations to handle at least 50 groups or classes simultaneously; dormitories for 600 residential students equipped with recreation room, social center, reading and study areas; laboratory and shop facilities for all technological and occupational programs; a special library and instructional media center; group auditory training equipment available in all classroom and other meeting or assembly areas; an auditorium adequate to accommodate the entire student body and staff at one seating; and a completely equipped guidance and counseling and psychological services center.

PROGRAMS FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE DEAF

The National Institute for the Deaf is a most worthwhile, constructive, and long overdue measure. However, the committee regards it as only a step in what should become a comprehensive program to meet the educational needs of the deaf.

The Advisory Committee on the Education of the Deaf appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant to an authorization contained in the 1965 appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare submitted a detailed report to the Secretary early in February 1965. The report contained a careful analysis of the problems of education of the deaf and made a number of constructive recommendations for both administrative and legislative action.

The committee hopes that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will soon be in a position to make available his analysis of the Advisory Committee's report, and to include with his analysis a summary of the administrative actions to be taken and legislative proposals to be supported in the general area covered by the "Report on Education of the Deaf."

COSTS

Because of the nature of the legislation it is impossible to specify exact costs on an annual basis. However, the committee anticipates that approximately $200,000 will be needed for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, as a planning year budget. Costs for construction, equipping, and operating of the Institute over the first 4 years will amount to approximately $13,500,000. Annual maintenance and operation costs once the construction and equipping expenses are met will require an appropriation of approximately $2 million per year.

HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Health held hearings on May 17, 1965, on S. 1650, a companion bill to H.R. 7031.

The bill was supported by testimony from witnesses representing the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Council for Exceptional Children, the Mount Carmel Guild, Gallaudet College, and the Central Institute for the Deaf. In addition, statements were received from numerous schools and associations for the deaf in support of S. 1650. A partial listing of the supporting statements includes the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, the National Fraternal Society of the Deaf, the Georgia Association of the Deaf, Inc., the Illinois Association of the Deaf, the Council on Education of the Deaf, the Nebraska Association of the Deaf, and the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf.

Statements were also received from superintendents of the following State schools for the deaf: West Virginia, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Rochester, N.Y., North Carolina, Indiana, Florida, Kansas, Arkansas, California, North Dakota, Washington, New York, Nebraska, Arizona, Hawaii, Idaho, and Maine.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF ACT (H.R. 7031)

Section 1: This section provides that the legislation may be cited as the "National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act."

Section 2: This section authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for the establishment and operation, including construction and equipment, of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf as a residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for employment.

Section 3: This section defines, for purposes of the legislation, the term "Secretary" to mean the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The term "institution of higher education" is defined to mean an educational institution in any State or the District of Columbia which admits as regular students only graduates of secondary schools or the equivalent, is legally authorized to provide postsecondary education, provides an educational program leading to a bachelor's degree, includes one or more professional or graduate schools, is a public or nonprofit private institution, and is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner of Education. The term "construction" includes construction and initial equipment of new buildings, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings and equipment thereof, and acquisition of land, and includes architect's fees but not off-site improvements.

Section 4: This section provides that any institution of higher education may submit a proposal for an agreement to establish and operate a National Technical Institute for the Deaf in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary.

Section 5: Subsection (a) of this section authorizes the Secretary, after consulting the National Advisory Board on Establishment of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf created by section 6 of the legislation, to enter into an agreement with an institution of higher education for the establishment and operation of such National Technical Institute for the Deaf, giving preference to institutions in metropolitan industrial areas. Subsection (b) requires that the agreement contain certain provisions, including prevailing wage assurances and that the Board of Trustees or other governing body of the institution, subject to the approval of the Secretary, appoint an advisory group to advise the Director of the Institute with respect to basic policies for its establishment and operation. The subsection also provides that the governing body of the institution of higher education shall make an annual report to the Secretary. The committee would expect that under the terms of the agreement the report should contain such information as may be requested by the Secretary. Subsection (c) provides for recapture of Federal payments if any facility aided by Federal funds under this legislation ceases to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed within 20 years after it is completed.

Section 6: This section provides for the establishment of a National Advisory Board on Establishment of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, to consist of 12 persons selected by the Secretary from among leaders in fields related to education and training of the deaf and other fields of education and from members of the public familiar with the need for services provided by the Institute. The Commissioner of Education and the Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation would be ex officio members of the Board. The Board would review and make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to proposals from institutions of higher education which offer to enter into an agreement for the construction and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf, and make such other recommendations to the Secretary concerning the establishment and operation of the Institute as may be appropriate. The Board would cease to exist after the Secretary enters into the agreement.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Legislative Clerk. H.R. 6767, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, 1966.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are detained on official business, and if present and voting would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 98 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—23

Aiken
Bayh
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McCarthy
McGovern
Miller
Morse
Nelson
Neuberger
Pearson
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Tydings
Young, N. Dak.

So the bill (H.R. 6767) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the

Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

STEERING COMMITTEE FOR TV STATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a great deal has been written in recent months about the responsibility of a broadcast licensee meeting the needs of his community programwise.

I was in Bellingham, Wash., recently, and I had an opportunity to visit channel 12, KVOS–TV and I was informed of the system that they followed in determining the community needs. Generally speaking, it is a steering committee made up of the leaders of the community who meet periodically with management to discuss ideas on what the people in their coverage area of the station were interested in. This steering committee is made up of 5 permanent members and 8 to 10 rotating members. The station's programs during the past month are reviewed and ideas for future programing are discussed. Minutes of the meeting are prepared and circulated for further discussion.

The management of KVOS–TV are to be commended for this constructive effort and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the results of two such steering committee meetings, one held in February and one in April 1965, as an indication of the efforts of one station to meet the programing needs of its television community.

There being no objection, the results were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KVOS–TV CHANNEL 12 STEERING COMMITTEE

The meeting was held April 21, at the Leopold Hotel, room 206.

Permanent members present: Ross Glover, of the audio visual department of the Bellingham schools; Dr. Harvey Bunke, president, WWSC; Nix Lidstone, manager, Bellingham Chamber of Commerce.

Rotating members present: Ray Smith, director of vocational education, Bellingham schools; LaVern Frieman, Whatcom County extension agent; LeRoy Freeman, chairman, Whatcom County Democratic Central Committee; Rev. Lyle Sellards, head of the United Student Christian Foundation; Harry Fulton, Whatcom County planner; Rev. Joe Walker, Garden Street Methodist Church; Glen Hallman, Whatcom County sanitation officer.

KVOS–TV staff members present: Dave Mintz, Dick Dailey, Marian Boylan, and Duayne Trecker.

REVIEW

Duayne reviewed the specials presented on channel 12 in the past months since the previous steering committee meeting including, February 25, "The Seventh President," a film and live show on the inauguration of Harvey Bunke as president of Western Washington State College. On March 11, "Congressional Review," a live question and answer session with Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, who was visiting Whatcom County at the time. March 18, "Report from Olympia," a program filmed at the legislature on the general activity of the session, with particular attention paid to questions affecting Bellingham and Whatcom County, especially college appropriations and the tax-break bill which will effect expansion at the Intalco plant. March 25, "Prescription for America," a discussion with two representatives from each side of the elder care and medicare issues. April 8, "Look Mom, No Desks," a report on the current status of Sehome High School and the difficulty in financing an additional $500,000 worth of equipment and furniture for the new school. Participants included Douglas Blair, school board chairman, Dave Mintz, school board member, Gordon Carter, superintendent of Bellingham schools, and Harlan Jackson, assistant superintendent of schools. On April 15, "The Color of Black," a filmed interview with James Farmer, national director of CORE, the Congress of Racial Equality. This program was filmed on April 4, at the KVOS studios, following an address by Farmer to students at Western Washington State College.

FUTURE PROGRAMING

On April 22, a program titled "Road to Redress" will be shown. The program will feature filmed highlights of the peace march sponsored by the American Friends Service Committee held in Bellingham on April 17. It will include interviews with counter-peace marchers, sound-on-film excerpts from the speech by Dr. Giovanni Costigan of the University of Washington, and a live question and answer session at the end of the program with Dr. Fred Ellis, one of the cosponsors of the march. The interview of Mr. Justice Douglas performed during his stay at Western Washington State College, has been tentatively set for May 13.

REVIEW

Dave Mintz reviewed the purpose of the steering committee for those who were attending for the first time. KVOS has for years sought out from opinion makers in the community, ideas on what they felt people in our coverage area wanted to know about. As a result, he said, there are five permanent members and eight or nine rotating members. All of the things talked about in the steering committee meetings have been investigated and those feasible have been followed through on the air. The station plans to present Dr. Neuzil's "Way Out There," science series once again this summer, as a result of suggestions from the committee. In addition, the public discussion programs which are conducted on channel 12 special are also taped and made available to local radio stations, so they will get the widest possible circulation.

AGRICULTURE

Stan Sleeth, KVOS-TV's farm director, reviewed some of his past programs including "Harvestore," filmed on a Whatcom County farm recently concerning mechanization in modern agriculture. One reason for this program was the result of a suggestion at a previous steering committee that people living in the urban areas need to appreciate their rural heritage as well as know what goes on in modern agriculture. Stan's plans for the summer include the International Plowing Match, which comes up the first week in May, at Lynden, and visits to various farms during the crop season. Stan will be attending Washington State University working on his master's degree this summer and is attempting to work with Washington State University in sending some teachers to KVOS to see what they can learn about TV for the purposes of educating teachers in the area of ETV. Dave Mintz suggested that if the program works out, we will encourage the teachers to produce one live ETV program a week during the summer months to be presented on Friday mornings on our normal In School Viewing time period, or any number of mornings that the college wants to work out. The same offer of available time to teach teachers how to use TV was made by Dave to President Bunke, of Western Washington State College.

EDUCATION

KVOS presented a live program in cooperation with the Bellingham public schools on the school district's conservation workshop for fifth and sixth graders. Ross Glover reported the station had helped Richard McClure, of Roeder School. McClure, who was the on-the-air talent, explained to parents and to the children in the half-hour show the purposes of the sixth grade study and some of the things that they should expect to see and do while on the tour of the Lake Whatcom wilderness site. The show consisted of films and slides of the site, and of wildlife samples and live studio programing where McClure outlined some of the basic species of trees, and told by the use of charts what the children should wear and equipment they should bring for the tour. Mr. Glover also reminded the committee that KVOS has furnished a half hour of daily time for several years to the Bellingham schools, and that the programs are pitched largely to the elementary level and correlate with the school's curriculum.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Nix Lidstone, of the chamber, explained that his organization is currently in the midst of what they call the ABCD program, which stands for area business community development and means essentially an increased awareness of the importance of the chamber of commerce and support both moral and financial. He said this program ties in generally with industrial development and community growth, which we are now experiencing. He said that the city and area must control this growth instead of "letting it get hold of us." Mr. Bunke said he could foresee a series of programs on channel 12 titled perhaps "City in Transition," to deal with the economic aspects of Bellingham's growth, educational and cultural areas as well as industrial and employment. Bunke said, "Suddenly this place is on fire." He continued that he felt this would be a good time to mount this wave of movement to help lend direction through a series of programs.

Mr. Hallman said along with that could be added the recreation plans for the area. Lidstone said the area is currently a year and a half behind in its leadership and development program compared to other large areas and that we will have to hurry to take the direction needed and to develop some of the resources such as recreation before they are lost into private ownership. Based on this discussion, a program has been set to report to the people of Whatcom County on the ABCD drive.

CONTROVERSIAL

Reverend Walker asked the question, "How do we as a society react to controversial issues?" He was answered by Mr. Lidstone who said, "By bringing it out in the open: A subject ceases to be controversial if discussed openly." He then pointed out that it was going to be necessary for people in this area to be prepared for the impact of future growth. Mr. Fulton suggested that the University of Washington community development program has encouraged self-study and analysis in 15 or 16 different fields for several smaller communities in the city.

ACTION GROUP

There was discussion about civil rights groups such as CORE, SNIC, NAACP, Southern Leadership Conference, etc. Mr. Lidstone suggested a program could possibly be done entitled "Tempo of Our Times." He pointed out that, to handle such a program, logic would have to prevail and not emotion. He felt that to find out what the basic purposes of these organizations are, what they do, what their influence is, would be a good program. Rev. Mr. Walker then added that people will always say, "What does this have to do with Bellingham?" and, at that point, Mr. Lidstone said, "People will wonder why a march for Alabama when the Lummi need help right here."

ANTIPOVERTY

Reverend Walker said the antipoverty program is being utilized both with the Lummi Indians and the Nooksack Indians. Mr. Hallman added that a migrant labor center in Lynden is being established. He suggested we tie this together in an agricultural program. He pointed out that $40,000 in Federal money is to be granted and some of the programs should be concentrated on Canadian Indians who come down to work in Whatcom County. Reverend Walker said the Methodists in this area have contributed $20,000 for a chapel and meetinghouse on the Mission Road in Whatcom County, as a project for the Nooksacks. It is a denominational project, he pointed out. However, Mr. Lidstone added that it might be a good focal point for the beginning of a program on "Tempo of Our Times." Mr. Freeman said that 4–H groups in the county were working with migrant Mexican workers and Mr. Hallman added this is why a migrant center will be helpful. Reverend Sellards said that there was a tutoring project of the Lummi Indians on a one-to-one basis by students at Western Washington State College. He said that the program had apparently, at this point, been highly successful because the college students had no axes to grind or monuments to build, simply an interest in the Lummi Indians and a desire to see them better themselves. This program is being carried out at the very low age group. KVOS plans to do a program involving the migrant labor center in Lynden, as a result of this discussion.

COLLEGE FEES

The situation on increased college fees was discussed by Dr. Bunke, who said that possibly fees could be used as a basis for a program to show other problems existing in the college in terms of the financial crisis facing schools, the incredible competition for faculty, etc. Mr. Hallman pointed out that UBC was having similar problems and it was suggested and agreed that, to do such a program, it would be desirable to get representatives from both schools to discuss mutual problems. Mr. Freeman said he thought it would be good to hold a program entitled "Postmortem on the Legislature," and to get the State legislators from both parties together from the 41st and 42d districts to speak for themselves and to face one another. Dave said KVOS would go along and even place an ad in the paper and on the air, asking people to write in questions about the legislature. It was then suggested that Scott Barron, who is chairman of the county Republican Party and Mr. Freeman could get together and sort out the questions and present them to the legislators on this program.

Mr. Fulton said that Bellingham's water supply was one part of a whole program in relation to the aluminum plant in relation to agricultural irrigation and an overall water supply problem could be a program in itself. Mr. Lidstone said he had attended a meeting of the Wheel and Keel Club, in Bellingham, at which Mr. Fulton had presented a report of recreational land availability in Whatcom County. Lidstone said, "I was shocked to find that we have nothing left, really, of our recreational area. He said Fulton's description, lets one know how little land is really left available for park sites and how few park sites we will really have in ten years, if we don't take action immediately on securing these sites for future use.

CROSS-STATE HIGHWAY

Mr. Freeman suggested some sort of a program employing motion picture film of a horse pack trip, which is to be made in August along the route of the north cross State highway in Washington State. Trips of this nature are made periodically throughout the summer months by various interest groups and KVOS–TV was invited to go along on the August trip. The highway is under construction from both sides of the Cascades from the Okanogan country up the Methow Valley on the east and up the Skagit Valley on the west. Bureau of Public Roads is providing the basic financing on this route which will provide a new access to the Puget Sound Basin from the agricultural areas of the Cascades upon its completion. Duayne Trecker plans to make this trip and to do a subsequent program.

TECH SCHOOL DOCUMENTARY

Duayne said that the Tech School program is about half filmed, but some of the film will have to be reshot because of a faulty camera in the last filming. When finished, this 30-minute program will be used as a channel 12 special, but will be self-contained and can be used by service clubs and the Bellingham schools in any way they choose.

KVOS–TV CHANNEL 12 STEERING COMMITTEE

KVOS–TV's Steering Committee met at the room 206 on February 24, 1965.

Permanent members present: Mayor John Westford, Chamber Manager Nix Lidstone, and Ross Glover of the Bellingham public schools.

Rotating members present: Glen Hallman of the county health department; Ray Smith, director of vocational education in the Bellingham schools; Capt. Charles Gold, Bellingham water superintendent; Dr. Manfred Vernon, chairman of the political science department, WWSC; and Roy Freeman, chairman of the county Democratic Central Committee.

KVOS–TV staff members present: Dave Mintz, Dick Dailey, Marian Boylan, and Duayne Trecker.

RECAP OF ACTIVITIES

Duayne went over programs on channel 12 special from mid-November to mid-February. These included channel 12 press conference with Dr. Harvey Bunke, "A Professor Looks at His College," "Three U's for B.C.," Lynden Christian High School's Christmas Concert, a preview of the 1965 legislature, a viewpoint on governments, concerning Vietnam, "The Natural World of Poetry," "So More Will Live" (heart campaign) "Intalco: A Visit From Paris," channel 12 press conference with Lloyd Meeds of the Second Congressional District.

For the benefit of those who had not attended a previous steering committee meeting, Duayne and Dave explained how the committee operates, that KVOS is looking for programing ideas that will be of benefit to this community. An interview with Justice William O. Douglas, of the U.S. Supreme Court, was filmed with Andy Anderson doing the interview and is to air in March. The program on the inauguration of Dr. Bunke, as president of Western, is to be done Thursday, February 25. Duayne explained that Count de Vitry, chief executive officer of the Intalco Aluminum Co. of France, was gracious enough to come to the KVOS studios for an interview about Intalco, when he visited the Intalco site on the 27th of January. Pathe Newsreel photographer and other press members following the entourage also came to the studios to film the filming.

PEACE MARCH

The student peace march demonstration on Vietnam, which started at the college and terminated with the arrest of 47 participants, was discussed by all those in attendance at the committee meeting. After hearing strong statements from Mayor Westford and Mr. Lidstone, the consensus was that we would do no program on the peace marchers, at least at this time. The possibility of a program dealing with the basic freedoms will be given management study in the following weeks.

ALASKA FERRIES

Mr. Lidstone discussed the problems involved in getting a legislative memorial for this project to urge Congress to pass legislation which would make the Alaska Ferry System part of the Federal Interstate Highway System. He talked about creating an interest in the community (there is plenty in Bellingham) but at the same time, attempting to encourage Alaskans to do the same. He pointed out that the basic problem in Alaska is that the State treasury is too low to do anything at this time, and added that it will be up to the Alaskans to make the formal request to Congress for the extension of the service before Congress will take legislative action and make Bellingham a southern terminus for the ferry route.

RECREATION FACILITIES

Mr. Hallman suggested a program on recreation in Whatcom County. He said there has been a county park board formed by resolution of the county commissioners which will consist of a six- or seven-man commission to make a study. As a result of having passed two statutory amendments allowing for development of parks and conservation in this State, Hallman suggested obtaining films from the Soil Conservation Service and the U.S. Forest Service. This could be an adjunct to also discussing water resources in the area. In discussing this, Hallman thought it was necessary that the program show recreation facilities in Whatcom County and potential sites. In general discussion it was pointed out that there would be some taxes involved for Whatcom County, but that matching funds would be available from the State of Washington.

BELLINGHAM TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Ray Smith, of the vocational education department, told of the school district's efforts to get PTA's to hold their monthly meetings at the tech school this year in order to display to the public the role of the school and its activity in the community. Smith pointed out that some 80 percent of our youngsters are not now going to college and someone must make them employable. He said this is one area where the Bellingham Tech School is coming into great use and its growth has been dynamic. Smith pointed out that the school district has recently allocated more money for the tech school for an expansion of the buildings in addition to a Federal grant doubling the technical school equipment; i.e., heavy machinery, lathes, drill presses, and the like. This equipment has been recently received and is being installed. Dave Mintz suggested we might use the tech school story to point out the fact that not all persons are able to go on to college for one reason or another, and possibly even involve a college spokesman who would point to the need for schools such as the Bellingham Tech School.

BELLINGHAM SCHOOLS

The change in grade systems contemplated by Bellingham schools was suggested as a good topic for channel 12 special. The public schools, when the new high school is opened, will go to either an 8–4 or a K–5–3–4 grade system instead of the present 6–3–3–. The Bellingham school board has decided to make the change (probably the K–5–3–4 system). There will naturally be a lot of questions in the community as to how this will affect children and what difference it might make in their class attendance, in grading, and the like. We thought such a program might well be done this fall as a sort of a groundbreaker for the community on the new high school which will open the following year.

SENIOR CITIZEN'S CENTER

Glen Hallman related that the Whatcom County Health Department in conjunction with other social agencies will soon open a senior citizen's center. It will be partially supported by funds from the county commissioners and other welfare agencies. Its time and activities will center on elderly persons looking for sparetime entertainment, hobbies, instruction, and avocations. Hallman's suggestion of a channel 12 special on this matter will be looked into in the future.

WATER

There was general consensus that a program on Bellingham's water supply and the good points on the water system might be appropriate sometime this spring. A study ordered by the State health department on the purity of the city's water is now being finished and nothing should be done until after that report is made public.

COLOR TV

A discussion was held about color television. Ross Glover suggested that perhaps a channel 12 special might be devoted to this subject. Dave Mintz said the fall of 1967 appears to be the soonest that KVOS-TV might go color. He noted, however, that a lot of questions on some of the technicalities of color have been coming in. Such a program, if done, could be put on the air sometime in conjunction with the fall programing of 1965 making use of the station engineering and management personnel under questioning by the department of public affairs.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 179, Senate bill 1648.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 3, line 15, after the word "facilities", to insert "including related machinery and equipment,"; on page 4, at the beginning of line 16, to insert "direct grants-in-aid authorized under this section, and Federal public works projects"; on page 5, line 1, after the word "share", to strike out "(including assumptions of debt)"; in line 3, after the word "project", to insert "(including assumptions of debt)"; in line 10, after the word "of", to strike out "such grant-in-aid" and insert "the applicable Federal"; at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "limitation on" and insert "requirement as to"; in the same line, after the word "the", to strike out "use of supplementary grants" and insert "amount or sources of non-Federal funds"; in line 14, after the word "the", to strike out "grant-in-aid" and insert "Federal"; in line 15, after the word "funds", to strike out "so allocated" and insert "provided under this subsection"; on page 6, line 18, after "(e)", to strike out "No" and insert "Except for projects specifically authorized by Congress, no"; in line 23, after the word "State", to insert "or Federal"; in line 24, after the word "State", to insert "or Federal"; on page 7, after line 5, to insert:

> SEC. 102. Not more than 15 per centum of the appropriations made pursuant to this title may be expended in any one State.

After line 8, to strike out:

> SEC. 102. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $250,000,000 annually for the purpose of this title.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

> SEC. 103. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

On page 8, line 2, after the word "facilities", to insert "including related machinery and equipment,"; in line 18, after the word "lenders", to strike out "on reasonable terms,"; in line 19 after the word "terms", to strike out "more favorable to the Government"; in line 20, after the word "which", to strike out "would" and insert "in the opinion of the Secretary will"; on page 9, line 7, after "(b)", to strike out "Subject to section 701(5), the maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than forty years after the date such loan is made" and insert "Subject to section 701(5), no loan, including renewals or extensions thereof, shall be made under this section for a period exceeding forty years, and no evidence of indebtedness maturing more than forty years from the date of purchase shall be purchased under this section"; in line 14, after the word "than", to strike out "(i)"; in line 20, after the word "less", to strike out "(ii)"; in line 24, after the word "*Provided,*", to strike out "*however,* That annual appropriations for the purpose of making and guaranteeing loans shall not exceed $170,000,000" and insert "That annual appropriations for the purpose of purchasing evidences of indebtedness, making and participating in loans, and guaranteeing loans shall not exceed $170,000,000"; on page 10, line 6 after "(d)"; to strike out "No" and insert "Except for projects specifically authorized by Congress, no"; in line 11, after the word "State", to insert "or Federal"; in line 12, after the word "State", to insert "or Federal"; in line 25, after the word "facilities", to strike out "including, in cases of demonstrated need," and insert "including"; on page 13, line 7, after the word "lenders", to strike out "on reasonable terms,"; in line 8, after the word "terms", to strike out "more favorable to the Government which would" and insert "which in the opinion of the Secretary will"; on page 14, line 5, after the word "than", to strike out "(i)"; in line 10, after the word "plus", to strike out "(ii)"; in line 17, after the word "facilities", to strike out "including, in cases of demonstrated need," and insert "including"; on page 17, line 17, after the word "outstanding", to insert "under this Act"; on page 18, line 1, after the word "market", to insert "yield"; after line 7 to strike out: "TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE".

In line 16, after the word "include", to insert "project planning and feasibility studies, management and operational assistance, and"; on page 19, line 5, after the word "grants", to strike out "for economic planning staff and" and insert "to defray not to exceed 75 per centum of the"; in line 7, after the word "expenses", to strike out "to" and insert "of"; in line 9, after the word "hereof", to strike out the colon and "*Provided, however,* That no such grant shall exceed 75 per centum of the aggregate cost of the undertaking for which the assistance is rendered, or of the administrative expenses of any qualified organization in any one year."; at the top of page 20, to strike out:

> (e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 annually for the purposes of this section.

After line 2, to strike out: "RESEARCH".

At the beginning of line 4, to strike out "Sec. 302." and insert "(c)"; in line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "study" and insert "study, training,"; in line 8, after the word "research", to strike out "designed"; in the same line, after the word "to", to insert "(A)"; in line 11, after the word "the", to strike out "Nation and in the formulation" and insert "Nation, (B) assist in the formulation"; in line 14, after the word "solutions", to strike out "of" and insert "to"; at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "conditions" and insert "conditions, and (C) assist in providing the personnel needed to conduct such programs. The program of study, training, and research may be conducted by the Secretary through members of this staff, through payment of funds authorized for this section to other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purposes, or through grants to such individuals, organizations, or institutions, or through conferences and similar meetings organized for such purposes. The Secretary shall make available to interested individuals and organizations the results of such research."; on page 21, after line 6, to strike out: "information".

At the beginning of line 8, to strike out "Sec. 303." and insert "(d)"; after line 22, to insert:

> (e) The Secretary shall establish an independent study board consisting of governmental and nongovernmental experts to investigate the effects of Government procurement, scientific, technical, and other related policies, upon regional economic development. Any Federal officer or employee may, with the consent of the head of the department or agency in which he is employed, serve as a member of such board, but shall receive no additional compensation for such service. Other members of such board may be compensated in accordance with the provisions of section 701(10). The board shall report its findings, together with recommendations for the better coordination of

such policies, to the Secretary, who shall transmit the report to the Congress not later than two years after the enactment of this Act.

On page 22, after line 11, to insert:

SEC. 302. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 annually for the purposes of this title.

On page 24, line 2, after the word "reservations", to insert "or trust or restricted Indian-owned land areas"; in line 4, after the word "Interior", to insert "or an appropriate State agency"; in line 11, after the word "removal", to insert "curtailment,"; in the same line, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, to strike out "employment," and insert "employment"; in line 12, after the word "or", to strike out "is about to cause" and insert "threatens to cause within three years of the date of the request"; in line 14, after the word "unemployment", to strike out "or underemployment"; in line 15, after the word "the", to insert "unemployment rate for the"; in line 16, after the word "to", to strike out "become eligible for designation under the other provisions of this Act within three years" and insert "exceed the national average by 50 per centum or more"; in line 20, after the word "of", to strike out "this section" and insert "subsection 401 (b)"; in line 21, after the word "area", to strike out "may be"; in the same line, after the word "designated", to strike out "at any time"; in line 22, after the word "this", to strike out "subsection" and insert "paragraph"; in line 23, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "and"; on page 25, line 6, after the word "on", to strike out "the date of the enactment of this Act" and insert "or after April 1, 1965"; on page 26, line 6, after the word "persons", to insert "except for areas designated under subsection 401(a)(3), which shall have a population of not less than one thousand persons"; on page 27, line 7, after the word "or", to strike out "under consideration for designation"; in line 19, after the word "termination", to strike out "or"; in line 22, after the word "such", to strike out section." and insert "section, or (4) be made in the case of any designated area where the Secretary determines that an improvement in the unemployment rate of a designated area is primarily the result of increased employment in occupations not likely to be permanent."; on page 32, after line 19, to strike out: "ESTABLISHMENT AND COORDINATION".

After line 20, to insert:

ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONS

SEC. 501. The Secretary is authorized to designate appropriate "economic development regions" within the United States with the concurrence of the States in which such regions will be wholly or partially located if he finds (A) that there is a relationship between the areas within such region geographically, culturally, historically, and economically, (B) that with the exception of Alaska and Hawaii, the region is within contiguous States, and (C) upon consideration of the following matters, that the region has lagged behind the whole nation in economic development:

(1) the rate of unemployment is substantially above the national rate;

(2) the median level of family income is significantly below the national median;

(3) the level of housing, health, and educational facilities is substantially below the national level;

(4) the economy of the area has traditionally been dominated by a single industry;

(5) the rate of outmigration of labor or capital or both is substantial;

(6) the area is adversely affected by changing industrial technology;

(7) the area is adversely affected by changes in national defense facilities or production; and

(8) indices of regional production indicate a growth rate substantially below the national average.

On page 33, after line 22, to insert:

REGIONAL COMMISSIONS

SEC. 502. (a) Upon designation of development regions, the Secretary shall invite and encourage the States wholly or partially located within such regions to establish appropriate multistate regional commissions.

(b) Each such commission shall be composed of one Federal member, hereinafter referred to as the "Federal cochairman", appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and one member from each participating State in the region. Each State member may be the Governor, or his designee, or such other person as may be provided by the law of the State which he represents. The State members of the commission shall elect a cochairman of the commission from among their number.

(c) Decisions by a regional commission shall require the affirmative vote of the Federal cochairman and of a majority, or at least one if only two, of the State members. In matters coming before a regional commission, the Federal cochairman shall, to the extent practicable, consult with the Federal departments and agencies having an interest in the subject matter.

(d) Each State member of a regional commission shall have an alternate, appointed by the Governor or as otherwise may be provided by the law of the State which he represents. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an alternate for the Federal cochairman of each regional commission. An alternate shall vote in the event of the absence, death, disability, removal, or resignation of the State or Federal cochairman for which he is an alternate.

(e) The Federal cochairman to a regional commission shall be compensated by the Federal Government from funds authorized by this Act at level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. His alternate shall be compensated by the Federal Government from funds authorized by this Act at not to exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS-18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and when not actively serving as an alternate for the Federal cochairman shall perform such functions and duties as are delegated to him by the Federal cochairman. Each State member and his alternate shall be compensated by the State which they represent at the rate established by the law of such State.

(f) If the Secretary finds that the State of Alaska or the State of Hawaii meets the requirements for an economic development region, he may establish a Commission for either State in a manner agreeable to him and to the Governor of the affected State.

On page 35, after line 21, to strike out:

SEC. 501. (a) The Secretary is authorized to invite and encourage the several States to establish appropriate multistate regional action planning commissions for the purpose of—

At the top of page 36, to insert:

FUNCTIONS OF COMMISSION

SEC. 503. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, each Commission shall with respect to its region—

In line 4, after "(1)", to strike out "advising" and insert "advise"; in the same line, after the word "and", to strike out "assisting him" and insert "assist the Secretary"; in line 7, after "(2)", to strike out "initiating" and insert "initiate"; in the same line, after the word "and", to strike out "coordinating" and insert "coordinate"; in line 10, after "(3)"; to strike out "fostering" and insert "foster"; in line 13, after "(4)", to strike out "advising" and insert "advise"; in the same line, after the word "and", to strike out "assisting him" and insert "assist the Secretary"; in line 18, after "(5)", to strike out "promoting" and insert "promote", in line 20, after "(6)", to strike out "preparing" and insert "prepare"; in line 23, after the word "agencies", to strike out "and"; after line 23, to strike out:

(7) receiving, reviewing, and commenting on all tentative plans or proposals concerning multistate regional economic development, and transmitting such plans and proposals with appropriate comments and recommendations to the Secretary and the heads of other interested Federal and State agencies.

(b) As used in this Act, the term "region" refers to any area within the United States which includes two or more designated or potential economic development districts in two or more contiguous States.

(c) The State members of such commissions shall be as determined and appointed by the Governors of the States concerned. The President shall appoint the Federal member or members of such commissions, if any, who shall report through the Secretary and be compensated at a rate not in excess of that authorized by section 701(10) of this Act.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(7) develop, on a continuing basis, comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs and establish priorities thereunder, giving due consideration to other Federal, State, and local planning in the region;

On page 37, after line 18, to insert:

(8) conduct and sponsor investigations, research, and studies, including an inventory and analysis of the resources of the region, and, in cooperation with Federal, State and local agencies, sponsor demonstration projects designed to foster regional productivity and growth;

At the top of page 38, to insert:

(9) review and study, in cooperation with the agency involved, Federal, State, and local public and private programs and, where appropriate, recommend modifications or additions which will increase their effectiveness in the region;

After line 5, to insert:

(10) formulate and recommend, where appropriate, interstate compacts and other forms of interstate cooperation, and work with State and local agencies in developing appropriate model legislation; and

After line 9, to insert:

(11) provide a forum for consideration of problems of the region and proposed solutions and establish and utilize, as appropriate, citizens and special advisory councils and public conferences.

At the beginning of line 14, to strike out "(d)" and insert "(b)"; at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "(e)" and insert "(c)"; at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "(f)" and insert "(d)"; on page 39, after line 2, to insert:

(e) Each regional commission may, from time to time, make additional recommendations to the Secretary and recommendations to the State Governors and appropriate local officials, with respect to—

(1) the expenditure of funds by Federal, State, and local departments and agencies in its region in the fields of natural resources, agriculture, education, training, health and welfare, transportation, and other fields related to the purposes of this Act; and

(2) such additional Federal, State, and local legislation or administrative actions as the commission deems necessary to further the purposes of this Act.

At the beginning of line 16, to change the section number from "502" to "504"; on page 40, at the beginning of line 16, to change the section number from "503" to "505"; in line 20, after the word "programs.", to insert

"Such assistance shall include studies and plans evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such regions, and research on improving the conservation and utilization of the human and natural resources of the region."; on page 41, line 10, after the word "of", to strike out "enactment of this Act," and insert "establishment of a commission,"; in line 12, after the word "commission", to strike out "may" and insert "as approved by the Secretary shall"; in line 13, after the word "Government", to strike out "on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may approve"; after line 22, to insert:

Administrative powers of regional commissions

SEC. 506. To carry out its duties under this Act, each regional commission is authorized to—

(1) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the conduct of its business and the performance of its functions;

(2) appoint and fix the compensation of an executive director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the commission to carry out its functions, except that such compensation shall not exceed the salary of the alternate to the Federal cochairman on the commission and no member, alternate, officer, or employee of such commission, other than the Federal cochairman on the commission and his staff and his alternate, and Federal employees detailed to the commission under clause (3), shall be deemed a Federal employee for any purpose;

(3) request the head of any Federal department or agency (who is hereby so authorized) to detail to temporary duty with the commission such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as the commission may need for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status;

(4) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or local government or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;

(5) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating State government for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for, or continue in, another governmental retirement or employee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel, and the Civil Service Commission of the United States is authorized to contract with such commission for continued coverage of commission employees, who at date of commission employment are Federal employees, in the retirement program and other employee benefit programs of the Federal Government;

(6) accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible;

(7) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation;

(8) maintain an office in the District of Columbia and establish field offices at such other places as it may deem appropriate; and

(9) take such other actions and incur such other expenses as may be necessary or appropriate.

On page 44, after line 2, to insert:

Information

SEC. 507. In order to obtain information needed to carry out its duties, each regional commission shall—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable, a cochairman of such commission, or any member of the commission designated by the commission for the purpose, being hereby authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath;

(2) arrange for the head of any Federal, State, or local department or agency (who is hereby so authorized, to the extent not otherwise prohibited by law) to furnish to such commission such information as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency; and

(3) keep accurate and complete records of its doings and transactions which shall be made available for public inspection.

At the top of page 45, to insert:

Personal financial interests

SEC. 508. (a) Except as permitted by subsection (b) hereof, no State member or alternate and no officer or employee of a regional commission shall participate personally and substantially as member, alternate, officer, or employee, through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or otherwise, in any proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, or other particular matter in which, to his knowledge, he, his spouse, minor child, partner, organization (other than a State or political subdivision thereof) in which he is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employer, or any person or organization with whom he is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee, or any person or organization with whom he is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective employment, has a financial interest. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than two, years, or both.

(b) Subsection (a) hereof shall not apply if the State member, alternate, officer, or employee first advises the regional commission involved of the nature and circumstances of the proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, or other particular matter and makes full disclosure of the financial interest and receives in advance a written determination made by such Commission that the interest is not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of the services which the Commission may expect from such State member, alternate, officer, or employee.

(c) No State member of a regional commission, or his alternate, shall receive any salary, or any contribution to or supplementation of salary for his services on such commission from any source other than his State. No person detailed to serve a regional commission under authority of clause (4) of section 506 shall receive any salary or any contribution to or supplementation of salary for his services on such commission from any source other than the State, local, or intergovernmental department or agency from which he was detailed or from such commission. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(d) Notwithstanding any other subsection of this section, the Federal cochairman and his alternate on a regional commission and any Federal officers or employees detailed to duty with it pursuant to clause (3) of section 10 shall not be subject to any such subsection but shall remain subject to sections 202 through 209 of title 18, United States Code.

(e) A regional commission may, in its discretion, declare void and rescind any contract or other agreement pursuant to the Act in relation to which it finds that there has been a violation of subsection (a) or (c) of this section, or any of the provisions of sections 202 through 209, title 18, United States Code.

On page 47, after line 11, to insert:

Annual reports

SEC. 509. Each regional commission established pursuant to this Act shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report each fiscal year to the Congress with respect to such commission's activities and recommendations for programs. The first such report shall be made for the first fiscal year in which such commission is in existence for more than three months. Such reports shall be printed and transmitted to the Congress not later than January 31 of the calendar year following the fiscal year with respect to which the report is made.

At the top of page 48, to strike out:

TITLE VI—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATOR

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION

After line 3, to strike out:

Administrator for economic development

SEC. 601. There shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an Administrator for Economic Development in the Department of Commerce, who shall receive compensation at the annual rate applicable to level V of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. The Administrator shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary may assign.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"SEC. 601. (a) The Secretary shall administer this Act and, with the assistance of an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, in addition to those already provided for, shall supervise and direct the Administrator created herein, and coordinate the Federal cochairmen appointed heretofore or subsequent to this Act. The Assistant Secretary created by this section shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the

Senate and shall be compensated at the rate provided for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. Such Assistant Secretary shall perform such functions as the Secretary may prescribe. There shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an Administrator for Economic Development who shall be compensated at the rate provided for level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule who shall perform such duties as are assigned by the Secretary.

"(b) Subsections (d) and (e) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 are hereby amended by adding the positions established by subsection (a) hereof."

At the top of page 56, to strike out:

(b) Any appropriations available to the Secretary for the purposes of the Area Redevelopment Act on or after the date of enactment of this Act shall be available for the purposes of this Act.

At the beginning of line 5, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "In the event that the Administrator required by this Act to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall not have entered upon office on the effective date of this Act,"; in line 9, after the word "act", to strike out "in such office" and insert "as Administrator under this Act"; in line 11, after the word "following", to strike out "said" and insert "the"; in line 12, after the word "date", to insert "of this Act"; at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)"; after line 16, to insert:

(d) Notwithstanding any requirements of this Act relating to the eligibility of areas, projects for which applications are pending before the Area Redevelopment Administration on the effective date of this Act shall for a period of one year thereafter be eligible for consideration by the Secretary for such assistance under the provisions of this Act as he may determine to be appropriate.

On page 58, line 4, after "(a)", to strike out "To the fullest extent" and insert "Where"; in line 5, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "shall" and insert "may"; in line 23, after the word "transferred", to strike out the comma and "with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget,"; on page 61, line 23, after "(40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5)", to strike out the comma and "and every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be"; and on page 64, after line 7, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 715. All financial and technical assistance authorized under this Act shall be in addition to any Federal assistance previously authorized, and no provision hereof shall be construed as authorizing or permitting any reduction or diminution in the proportional amount of Federal assistance to which any State or other entity eligible under this Act would otherwise be entitled under the provisions of any other Act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level is vital to the best interests of the United States, but that some of our regions, counties, and communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment; that such unemployment and underemployment cause hardship to many individuals and their families, and waste invaluable human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas and regions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their public works and economic development; that Federal financial assistance, including grants for public works and development facilities to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing development should enable such areas to help themselves achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies and improved local conditions: *Provided,* That such assistance is preceded by and consistent with sound, long-range economic planning; and that under the provisions of this Act new employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing public works and other facilities and resources rather than by merely transferring jobs from one area of the United States to another.

TITLE I—GRANTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

SEC. 101. (a) Upon the application of any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public nonprofit organization or association representing any redevelopment area or part thereof, the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is authorized—

(1) to make direct grants for the acquisition or development of land and improvements for public works, public service, or development facility usage, and the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of such facilities, including related machinery and equipment, within a redevelopment area, if he finds that—

(A) the project for which financial assistance is sought will directly or indirectly (i) tend to improve the opportunities, in the area where such project is or will be located, for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities, (ii) otherwise assist in the creation of additional long-term employment opportunites for such area, or (iii) primarily benefit the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families or otherwise substantially further the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964;

(B) the project for which a grant is requested will fulfill a pressing need of the area, or part thereof, in which it is, or will be located; and

(C) the area for which a project is to be undertaken has an approved overall economic development program as provided in section 202(b)(10) and such project is consistent with such program;

(2) to make supplementary grants in order to enable the States and other entities within redevelopment areas to take maximum advantage of designated Federal grant-in-aid programs (as hereinafter defined), direct grants-in-aid authorized under this section, and Federal public works projects for which they are eligible but for which, because of their economic situation, they cannot supply the required matching share.

(b) Subject to subsection (c) hereof, the amount of any direct grant under this section for any project shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of such project.

(c) The amount of any supplementary grant under this section for any project shall not exceed the applicable percentage established by regulations promulgated by the Secretary, but in no event shall the non-Federal share of the aggregate cost of any such project (including assumptions of debt) be less than 20 per centum of such cost. Supplementary grants shall be made by the Secretary, in accordance with such regulations as he shall prescribe, by increasing the amounts of direct grants authorized under this section or by the payment of funds appropriated under this Act to the heads of the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of the applicable Federal programs. Notwithstanding any requirement as to the amount or sources of non-Federal funds that may otherwise be applicable to the Federal program involved, funds provided under this subsection shall be used for the sole purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to specific projects in redevelopment areas under such programs above the fixed maximum portion of the cost of such project otherwise authorized by the applicable law. The term "designated Federal grant-in-aid programs," as used in this subsection, means such existing or future Federal grant-in-aid programs assisting in the construction or equipping of facilities as the Secretary may, in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, designate as eligible for allocation of funds under this section. In determining the amount of any supplementary grant available to any project under this section, the Secretary shall take into consideration the relative needs of the area, the nature of the project to be assisted, and the amount of such fair user charges or other revenues as the project may reasonably be expected to generate in excess of those which would amortize the local share of initial costs and provide for its successful operation and maintenance (including depreciation).

(d) The Secretary shall prescribe rules, regulations, and procedures to carry out this section which will assure that adequate consideration is given to the relative needs of eligible areas. In prescribing such rules, regulations, and procedures the Secretary shall consider among other relevant factors (1) the severity of the rates of unemployment in the eligible areas and the duration of such unemployment and (2) the income levels of families and the extent of underemployment in eligible areas.

(e) Except for projects specifically authorized by Congress, no financial assistance shall be extended under this section with respect to any public service or development facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State or Federal regulatory body, unless the State or Federal regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it agrees to undertake.

SEC. 102. Not more than 15 per centum of the appropriations made pursuant to this title may be expended in any one State.

SEC. 103. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

TITLE II—OTHER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Public works and development facility loans

SEC. 201. (a) Upon the application of any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public nonprofit organization or association representing any redevelopment area or part thereof, the Secretary is authorized to purchase evidence of indebtedness and to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land and improvements for public works, public service, or development facility usage, and the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of such facilities, including related machinery and equipment, within a redevelopment area, if he finds that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will directly or indirectly—

(A) tend to improve the opportunities, in the area where such project is or will be located, for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities.

(B) otherwise assist in the creation of additional long-term employment opportunities for such area, or

(C) primarily benefit the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families or otherwise substantially further the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964;

(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available from private lenders or from other Federal agencies on terms which in the opinion of the Secretary will permit the accomplishment of the project;

(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of other available funds for such project are adequate to insure the completion thereof;

(4) there is a reasonable expectation of repayment; and

(5) such area has an approved overall economic development program as provided in section 202(b)(10) and the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program.

(b) Subject to section 701(5), no loan, including renewals or extensions thereof, shall be made under this section for a period exceeding forty years, and no evidence of indebtedness maturing more than forty years from the date of purchase shall be purchased under this section. Such loans shall bear interest at a rate not less than a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the average maturities of such loans, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum, less not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum per annum.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section and section 202: *Provided,* That annual appropriations for the purpose of purchasing evidences of indebtedness, making and participating in loans, and guaranteeing loans shall not exceed $170,000,000.

(d) Except for projects specifically authorized by Congress, no financial assistance shall be extended under this section with respect to any public service or development facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State or Federal regulatory body, unless the State or Federal regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it agrees to undertake.

Loans and guarantees

SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary is authorized (1) to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans (which for purposes of this section shall include participations in loans) to aid in financing any project within a redevelopment area for the purchase or development of land and facilities (including machinery and equipment) for industrial or commercial usage, including the construction of new buildings, the rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied buildings, and the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of existing buildings; (2) to guarantee loans for working capital made to private borrowers by private lending institutions in connection with projects in redevelopment areas assisted under subsection (a)(1) hereof, upon application of such institution and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided, however,* That no such guarantee shall at any time exceed 90 per centum of the amount of the outstanding unpaid balance of such loan; and (3) to contract to pay, and to pay annually, for not more than ten years, to or on behalf of private business entities amounts sufficient to reduce by 2 percentage points the interest paid by such entities on loans which are obtained from non-Government sources, which are not guaranteed by any Government agency, which provide for annual amortization of principal, and the proceeds of which are used for purposes for which the Secretary is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness or make loans under this section: *Provided, however,* That subject to limitations in annual appropriation Acts, the annual cost of new contracts approved in any one year shall not exceed $5,000,000.

(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

(1) Such financial assistance shall not be extended to assist establishments relocating from one area to another: *Provided, however,* That such limitation shall not be construed to prohibit assistance for the expansion of an existing business entity through the establishment of a new branch, affiliate, or subsidiary of such entity if the Secretary finds that the establishment of such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary will not result in an increase in unemployment of the area of original location or in any other area where such entity conducts business operations, unless the Secretary has reason to believe that such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary is being established with the intention of closing down the operations of the existing business entity in the area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations.

(2) Such assistance shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public (including Indian tribes), which have been approved for such assistance by an agency or instrumentality of the State or political subdivision thereof in which the project to be financed is located, and which agency or instrumentality is directly concerned with problems of economic development in such State or subdivision.

(3) The project for which financial assistance is sought must be reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within the redevelopment area wherein it is or will be located.

(4) No loan or guarantee shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or from other Federal agencies on terms which in the opinion of the Secretary will permit the accomplishment of the project.

(5) The Secretary shall not make any loan without a participation unless he determines that the loan cannot be made on a participation basis.

(6) No evidences of indebtedness shall be purchased and no loans shall be made or guaranteed unless it is determined that there is reasonable assurance of repayment.

(7) Subject to section 701(5) of this Act, no loan, including renewals or extension thereof, may be made hereunder for a period exceeding twenty-five years and no evidences of indebtedness maturing more than twenty-five years from date of purchase may be purchased hereunder: *Provided,* That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Secretary as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor.

(8) Loans made and evidences of indebtedness purchased under this section shall bear interest at a rate not less than a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the avearge maturities of such loans, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum, plus such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Secretary may determine to be consistent with its purpose.

(9) Loan assistance shall not exceed 65 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities (including machinery and equipment), and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project, and shall, among others, be on the condition that—

(A) other funds are available in an amount which, together with the assistance provided hereunder, shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost;

(B) not less than 15 per centum of such aggregate cost be supplied as equity capital or as a loan repayable in no shorter period of time and at no faster an amortization rate than the Federal financial assistance extended under this section is being repaid, and if such a loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing such Federal financial assistance: *Provided, however,* That, except in projects involving financial participation by Indian tribes, not less than 5 per centum of such aggregate cost shall be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or area organization which is nongovernmental in character, unless the Secretary shall determine in accordance with objective standards promulgated by regulation that all or part of such funds are not reasonably available to the project because of the economic distress of the area or for other good cause, in which case he may waive the requirement of this provision to the extent of such unavailability, and allow the funds required by this subsection to be supplied by the applicant or by such other non-Federal source as may reasonably be available to the project;

(C) to the extent the Secretary finds such action necessary to encourage financial participation in a particular project by other lenders and investors, and except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (B), any Federal financial assistance extended under this section may be repayable only after other loans made in connection with such project have been repaid in full, and the security, if any, for such Federal financial assistance may be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing other loans made in connection with the same project.

(10) No such assistance shall be extended unless there shall be submitted to and approved by the Secretary an overall program for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision

thereof, that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located, nor prevent the Secretary from requiring such periodic revisions of previously approved overall economic development programs as he may deem appropriate.

Economic development revolving fund

SEC. 203. Funds obtained by the Secretary under section 201, loan funds obtained under section 403, and collections and repayments received under this Act, shall be deposited in an economic development revolving fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund"), which is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States, and which shall be available to the Secretary for the purpose of extending financial assistance under sections 201, 202, and 403, and for the payment of all obligations and expenditures arising in connection therewith. There shall also be credited to the fund such funds as have been paid into the area redevelopment fund or may be received from obligations outstanding under the Area Redevelopment Act. The fund shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, following the close of each fiscal year, interest on the amount of loans outstanding under this Act computed in such manner and at such rate as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the average maturities of such loans, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum, during the month of June preceding the fiscal year in which the loans were made.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION

SEC. 301. (a) In carrying out his duties under this Act the Secretary is authorized to provide technical assistance which would be useful in alleviating or preventing conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment (1) to areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this Act, and (2) to other areas which he finds have substantial need for such assistance. Such assistance shall include project planning and feasibility studies, management and operational assistance, and studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such areas. Such assistance may be provided by the Secretary through members of his staff, through the payment of funds authorized for this section to other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purposes, or through grants-in-aid to appropriate public or private nonprofit State, area, district, or local organizations. The Secretary, in his discretion, may require the repayment of assistance provided under this subsection and prescribe the terms and conditions of such repayment.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to defray not to exceed 75 per centum of the administrative expenses of organizations which he determines to be qualified to receive grants-in-aid under subsection (a) hereof. In determining the amount of the non-Federal share of such costs or expenses, the Secretary shall give due consideration to all contributions both in cash and in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to space, equipment, and services. Where practicable, grants-in-aid authorized under this subsection shall be used in conjunction with other available planning grants, such as urban planning grants authorized under the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, and highway planning and research grants authorized under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962, to assure adequate and effective planning and economical use of funds.

(c) To assist in the long-range accomplishment of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary, in cooperation with other agencies having similar functions, shall establish and conduct a continuing program of study, training, and research to (A) assist in determining the causes of unemployment, underemployment, underdevelopment, and chronic depression in the various areas and regions of the Nation, (B) assist in the formulation and implementation of National, State, and local programs which will raise income levels and otherwise produce solutions to the problems resulting from these conditions, and (C) assist in providing the personnel needed to conduct such programs. The program of study, training, and research may be conducted by the Secretary through members of this staff, through payment of funds authorized for this section to other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purposes, or through grants to such individuals, organizations, or institutions, or through conferences and similar meetings organized for such purposes. The Secretary shall make available to interested individuals and organizations the results of such research. The Secretary shall include in his annual report under section 706 a detailed statement concerning the study and research conducted under this section together with his findings resulting therefrom and his recommendations for legislative and other action.

(d) The Secretary shall aid redevelopment areas and other areas by furnishing to interested individuals, communities, industries, and enterprises within such areas any assistance, technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance, information, or advice which would be useful in alleviating or preventing conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas. The Secretary may furnish the procurement divisions of the various departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the Federal Government with a list containing the names and addresses of business firms which are located in redevelopment areas and which are desirous of obtaining Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies or services, and designating the supplies and services such firms are engaged in providing.

(e) The Secretary shall establish an independent study board consisting of governmental and nongovernmental experts to investigate the effects of Government procurement, scientific, technical, and other related policies, upon regional economic development. Any Federal officer or employee may, with the consent of the head of the department or agency in which he is employed, serve as a member of such board, but shall receive no additional compensation for such service. Other members of such board may be compensated in accordance with the provisions of section 701(10). The board shall report its findings, together with recommendations for the better coordination of such policies, to the Secretary, who shall transmit the report to the Congress not later than two years after the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 annually for the purposes of this title.

TITLE IV—AREA AND DISTRICT ELIGIBILITY

Part A—Redevelopment areas

Area Eligibility

SEC. 401. (a) The Secretary shall designate as "redevelopment areas"—

(1) those areas in which he determines, upon the basis of standards generally comparable with those set forth in paragraphs (A) and (B), that there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. There shall be included among the areas so designated any area—

(A) where the Secretary of Labor finds that the current rate of unemployment, as determined by appropriate annual statistics for the most recent available calendar year, is 6 per centum or more and has averaged at least 6 per centum for the qualifying time periods specified in paragraph (B); and

(B) where the Secretary of Labor finds that the annual average rate of unemployment has been at least—

(i) 50 per centum above the national average for three of the preceding four calendar years, or

(ii) 75 per centum above the national average for two of the preceding three calendar years, or

(iii) 100 per centum above the national average for one of the preceding two calendar years.

The Secretary of Labor shall find the facts and provide the data to be used by the Secretary in making the determinations required by this subsection.

(2) those additional areas which have a median family income not in excess of 40 per centum of the national median, as determined by the most recent available statistics for such areas;

(3) those additional Federal or State Indian reservations or trust or restricted Indian-owned land areas which the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior or an appropriate State agency, determines manifest the greatest degree of economic distress on the basis of unemployment and income statistics and other appropriate evidence of economic underdevelopment;

(4) upon request of such areas, those additional areas in which the Secretary determines that the loss, removal, curtailment, or closing of a major source of employment has caused or threatens to cause within three years of the date of the request an unusual and abrupt rise in unemployment of such magnitude that the unemployment rate for the area can reasonably be expected to exceed the national average by 50 per centum or more unless assistance is provided. Notwithstanding any provision of subsection 401(b) to the contrary, an area designated under the authority of this paragraph may be given a reasonable time after designation in which to submit the overall economic development program required by subsection 202(b)(10) of this Act;

(5) notwithstanding any provision of this section to the contrary, those additional areas which were designated redevelopment areas under the Area Redevelopment Act on or after April 1, 1965: *Provided, however,* That the continued eligibility of such areas after the first annual review of eligibility conducted in accordance with section 402 of this Act shall be dependent on their qualification for designation under the standards of economic need set forth in subsections (a)(1) through (a)(4) of this section.

(b) The size and boundaries of redevelopment areas shall be as determined by the Secretary: *Provided, however,* That—

(1) no area shall be designated until it has an approved overall economic development program in accordance with subsection 202(b)(10) of this Act;

(2) any area which does not submit an acceptable overall economic development program in accordance with subsection 202 (b)(10) of this Act within a reasonable time after notification of eligibility for designation, shall not thereafter be designated prior to the next annual review of eligibility in accordance with section 402 of this Act;

(3) no area shall be designated which does not have a population of at least one thousand five hundred persons, except for areas designated under subsection 401(a)(3), which shall have a population of not less than one thousand persons; and

(4) except for areas designated under subsections (a)(3) and (a)(4) hereof, no area shall be designated which is smaller than a "labor area" (as defined by the Secretary of Labor), a county, or a municipality with a population of over two hundred and fifty thousand, whichever in the opinion of the Secretary is appropriate. (c) Upon the request of the Secretary, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and such other heads of agencies as may be appropriate are authorized to conduct such special studies, obtain such information, and compile and furnish to the Secretary such data as the Secretary may deem necessary or proper to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section. The Secretary shall reimburse when appropriate, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act, the foregoing officers for any expenditures incurred by them under this section.

(d) As used in this Act, the term "redevelopment area" refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Secretary as a redevelopment area.

Annual Review of Area Eligibility

SEC. 402. The Secretary shall conduct an annual review of the eligibility of all areas designated or in accordance with section 401 of this Act, and on the basis thereof may terminate or modify the designations of such areas in accordance with objective standards which he shall prescribe by regulation. No area previously designated shall retain its designated status unless it maintains a currently approved overall economic development program in accordance with subsection 202(b)(10). No termination of eligibility shall (1) be made without thirty days' prior notification to the area concerned, (2) affect the validity of any application filed, or contract or undertaking entered into, with respect to such area pursuant to this Act prior to such termination, (3) prevent any such area from again being designated a redevelopment area under section 401 of this Act if the Secretary determines it to be eligible under such section, or (4) be made in the case of any designated area where the Secretary determines that an improvement in the unemployment rate of a designated area is primarily the result of increased employment in occupations not likely to be permanent. The Secretary shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the classification of any area.

Part B—Economic development districts

SEC. 403. (a) In order that economic development projects of broader geographical significance may be planned and carried out, the Secretary is authorized—

(1) to designate appropriate "economic development districts" within the United States with the concurrence of the States in which such districts will be wholly or partially located, if—

(A) the proposed district is of sufficient size or population, and contains sufficient resources, to foster economic development on a scale involving more than a single redevelopment area;

(B) the proposed district contains two or more redevelopment areas;

(C) the proposed district contains one or more redevelopment areas or economic development centers identified in an approved district overall economic development program as having sufficient size and potential to foster the economic growth activities necessary to alleviate the distress of the redevelopment areas within the district; and

(D) the proposed district has a district overall economic development program which includes adequate land use and transportation planning and contains a specific program for district cooperation, self-help, and public investment and is approved by the State or States affected and by the Secretary;

(2) to designate as "economic development centers," in accordance with such regulations as he shall prescribe, such areas as he may deem appropriate, if—

(A) the proposed center has been identified and included in an approved district overall economic development program and recommended by the State or States affected for such special designation;

(B) the proposed center is geographically and economically so related to the district that its economic growth may reasonably be expected to contribute significantly to the alleviation of distress in the redevelopment areas of the district; and

(C) the proposed center does not have a population in excess of two hundred and fifty thousand according to the last preceding Federal census.

(3) to provide financial assistance in accordance with the criteria of sections 101, 201, and 202 of this Act, except as may be herein otherwise provided, for projects in economic development centers designated under subsection (a)(2) above, if—

(A) the project will further the objectives of the overall economic development program of the district in which it is to be located;

(B) the project will enhance the economic growth potential of the district or result in additional long-term employment opportunities commensurate with the amount of Federal financial assistance requested; and

(C) the amount of Federal financial assistance requested is reasonably related to the size, population, and economic needs of the district;

(4) subject to the 20 per centum non-Federal share required for any project by subsection 101(c) of this Act, to increase the amount of grant assistance authorized by section 101 for projects within redevelopment areas (designated under section 401), by an amount not to exceed 10 per centum of the aggregate cost of any such project, in accordance with such regulations as he shall prescribe, if—

(A) the redevelopment area is situated within a designated economic development district and is actively participating in the economic development activities of the district; and

(B) the project is consistent with an approved district overall economic development program.

(b) In designating economic development districts and approving district overall economic development programs under subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary is authorized, under regulations prescribed by him—

(1) to invite the several States to draw up proposed district boundaries and to identify potential economic development centers;

(2) to cooperate with the several States—

(A) in sponsoring and assisting district economic planning and development groups, and

(B) in assisting such district groups to formulate district over all economic development programs.

(c) The Secretary shall by regulation prescribe standards for the termination or modification of economic development districts and economic development centers designated under the authority of this section.

(d) As used in this Act, the term "economic development district" refers to any area within the United States composed of cooperating redevelopment areas and, where appropriate, designated economic development centers and neighboring counties or communities, which has been designated by the Secretary as an economic development district.

(e) As used in this Act, the term "economic development center" refers to any area within the United States which has been identified as an economic development center in an approved district overall economic development program and which has been designated by the Secretary as eligible for financial assistance under sections 101, 201, and 202 of this Act in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000,000 annually for financial assistance extended under the provisions of subsections (a)(3) and (a)(4) hereof.

(g) In order to allow time for adequate and careful district planning, subsections (a) and (f) of this section shall not be effective until one year from the date of enactment.

TITLE V—REGIONAL ACTION PLANNING COMMISSIONS

Establishment of regions

SEC. 501. The Secretary is authorized to designate appropriate "economic development regions" within the United States with the concurrence of the States in which such regions will be wholly or partially located if he finds (A) that there is a relationship between the areas within such region geographically, culturally, historically, and economically, (B) that with the exception of Alaska and Hawaii, the region is within contiguous States, and (C) upon consideration of the following matters, that the region has lagged behind the whole nation in economic development:

(1) the rate of unemployment is substantially above the national rate;

(2) the median level of family income is significantly below the national median;

(3) the level of housing, health, and educational facilities is substantially below the national level;

(4) the economy of the area has traditionally been dominated by a single industry;

(5) the rate of outmigration of labor or capital or both is substantial;

(6) the area is adversely affected by changing industrial technology; and

(7) the area is adversely affected by changes in national defense facilities or production; and

(8) indices of regional production indicate a growth rate substantially below the national average.

Regional commissions

SEC. 502. (a) Upon designation of development regions, the Secretary shall invite and encourage the States wholly or partially located within such regions to establish appropriate multistate regional commissions.

(b) Each such commission shall be composed of one Federal member, hereinafter referred to as the "Federal cochairman", appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and one member from each participating State in his region. Each State member may be the Governor, or his designee, or such other person as may be provided by the law of the State which he represents. The State members of the commission shall elect a cochairman of the commission from among their number.

(c) Decisions by a regional commission shall require the affirmative vote of the Federal cochairman and of a majority, or at least one if only two, of the State members. In matters coming before a regional commission, the Federal cochairman shall, to the extent practicable, consult with the Federal departments and agencies having an interest in the subject matter.

(d) Each State member of a regional commission shall have an alternate, appointed by the Governor or as otherwise may be provided by the law of the State which he represents. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an alternate for the Federal cochairman of each regional commission. An alternate shall vote in the event of the absence, death, disability, removal, or resignation of the State or Federal cochairman for which he is an alternate.

(e) The Federal cochairman to a regional commission shall be compensated by the Federal Government from funds authorized by this Act at level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. His alternate shall be compensated by the Federal Government from funds authorized by this Act at not to exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS–18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and when not actively serving as an alternate for the Federal cochairman shall perform such functions and duties as are delegated to him by the Federal cochairman. Each State member and his alternate shall be compensated by the State which they represent at the rate established by the law of such State.

(f) If the Secretary finds that the State of Alaska or the State of Hawaii meets the requirements for an economic development region, he may establish a Commission for either State in a manner agreeable to him and to the Governor of the affected State.

Functions of commission

SEC. 503. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, each Commission shall with respect to its region—

(1) advise and assist the Secretary in the identification of optimum boundaries for multistate economic development regions,

(2) initiate and coordinate the preparation of long-range overall economic development programs for such regions,

(3) foster surveys and studies to provide data required for the preparation of specific plans and programs for the development of such regions,

(4) advise and assist the Secretary and the States concerned in the initiation and coordination of economic development districts, in order to promote maximum benefits from the expenditure of Federal, State, and local funds,

(5) promote increased private investment in such regions,

(6) prepare legislative and other recommendations with respect to both short-range and long-range programs and projects for Federal, State, and local agencies,

(7) develop, on a continuing basis, comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs and establish priorities thereunder, giving due consideration to other Federal, State, and local planning in the region;

(8) conduct and sponsor investigations, research, and studies, including an inventory and analysis of the resources of the region, and, in cooperation with Federal, State, and local agencies, sponsor demonstration projects designed to foster regional productivity and growth;

(9) review and study, in cooperation with the agency involved, Federal, State, and local public and private programs and, where appropriate, recommend modifications or additions which will increase their effectiveness in the region;

(10) formulate and recommend, where appropriate, interstate compacts and other forms of interstate cooperation, and work with State and local agencies in developing appropriate model legislation; and

(11) provide a forum for consideration of problems of the region and proposed solutions and establish and utilize, as appropriate, citizens and special advisory councils and public conferences.

(b) The Secretary shall present such plans and proposals of the commissions as may be transmitted and recommended to him (but are not authorized by any other section of this Act) first for review by the Federal agencies primarily interested in such plans and proposals and then, together with the recommendations of such agencies, to the President for such action as he may deem desirable.

(c) The Secretary shall provide effective and continuing liaison between the Federal Government and each regional commission.

(d) Each Federal agency shall, consonant with law and within the limits of available funds, cooperate, with such commissions as may be established in order to assist them in carrying out their functions under this section.

(e) Each regional commission may, from time to time, make additional recommendations to the Secretary and recommendations to the State Governors and appropriate local officials, with respect to—

(1) the expenditure of funds by Federal, State, and local departments and agencies in its region in the fields of natural resources, agriculture, education, training, health and welfare, transportation, and other fields related to the purposes of this Act; and

(2) such additional Federal, State, and local legislation or administrative actions as the commission deems necessary to further the purposes of this Act.

Program development criteria

SEC. 504. In developing recommendations for programs and projects for future regional economic development, and in establishing within those recommendations a priority ranking for such programs and projects, the Secretary shall encourage each regional commission to follow procedures that will insure consideration of the following factors:

(1) the relationship of the project or class of projects to overall regional development including its location in an area determined by the State to have a significant potential for growth;

(2) the population and area to be served by the project or class of projects including the relative per capita income and the unemployment rates in the area;

(3) the relative financial resources available to the State or political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof which seek to undertake the project;

(4) the importance of the project or class of projects in relation to other projects or classes of projects which may be in competition for the same funds;

(5) the prospects that the project, on a continuing rather than a temporary basis, will improve the opportunitities for employment, the average level of income, or the economic and social development of the area served by the project.

Regional technical and planning assistance

SEC. 505. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide to the commissions technical assistance which would be useful in aiding the commissions to carry out their functions under this Act and to develop recommendations and programs. Such assistance shall include studies and plans evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such regions, and research on improving the conservation and utilization of the human and natural resources of the region. Such assistance may be provided by the Secretary through members of his staff, through the payment of funds authorized for this section to other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purposes, or through grants-in-aid to the commissions. The Secretary, in his discretion, may require the repayment of assistance provided under this subsection and prescribe the terms and conditions of such repayment.

(b) For the period ending on June 30 of the second full Federal fiscal year following the date of establishment of a commission, the administrative expenses of each commission as approved by the Secretary shall be paid by the Federal Government. Thereafter, not to exceed 50 per centum of such expenses may be paid by the Federal Government. In determining the amount of the non-Federal share of such costs or expenses, the Secretary shall give due consideration to all contributions both in cash and in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to space, equipment, and services.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 annually for the purposes of this section.

Administrative powers of regional commissions

SEC. 506. To carry out its duties under this Act, each regional commission is authorized to—

(1) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the conduct of its business and the performance of its functions;

(2) appoint and fix the compensation of an executive director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the commission to carry out its functions, except that such compensation shall not exceed the salary of the alternate to the Federal cochairman on the commission and no member, alternate, officer, or employee of such commission, other than the Federal cochairman on the commission and his staff and his alternate, and Federal employees detailed to the commission under clause (3), shall be deemed a Federal employee for any purpose;

(3) request the head of any Federal department or agency (who is hereby so authorized) to detail to temporary duty with the commission such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as the commission may need for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status;

(4) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or local government or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;

(5) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating State government for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for, or continue in, another governmental retirement or empolyee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel, and the Civil Service Commission of the United States is authorized to contract with such commission for continued coverage of commission employees, who at date of commission employment are Federal employees, in the retirement program and other employee benefit programs of the Federal Government;

(6) accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible;

(7) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation;

(8) maintain an office in the District of Columbia and establish field offices at such other places as it may deem appropriate, and

(9) take such other actions and incur such other expenses as may be necessary or appropriate.

Information

SEC. 507. In order to obtain information needed to carry out its duties, each regional commission shall—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony,

receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable, a cochairman of such commission, or any member of the commission designated by the commission for the purpose, being hereby authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath;

(2) arrange for the head of any Federal, State, or local department or agency (who is hereby so authorized, to the extent not otherwise prohibited by law) to furnish to such commission such information as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency; and

(3) keep accurate and complete records of its doings and transactions which shall be made available for public inspection.

Personal financial interests

Sec 508. (a) Except as permitted by subsection (b) hereof, no State member or alternate and no officer or employee of a regional commission shall participate personally and substantially as member, alternate, officer, or employee, through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or otherwise, in any proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, or other particular matter in which, to his knowledge, he, his spouse, minor child, partner, organization (other than a State or political subdivision thereof) in which he is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee, or any person or organization with whom he is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee, or any person or organization with whom he is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective employment, has a financial interest. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

(b) Subsection (a) hereof shall not apply if the State member, alternate, officer, or employee first advises the regional commission involved of the nature and circumstances of the proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, or other particular matter and makes full disclosure of the financial interest and receives in advance a written determination made by such Commission that the interest is not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of the services which the Commission may expect from such State member, alternate, officer, or employee.

(c) No State member of a regional commission, or his alternate, shall receive any salary, or any contribution to or supplementation of salary for his services on such commission from any source other that his State. No person detailed to serve a regional commission under authority of clause (4) of section 506 shall receive any salary or any contribution to or supplementation of salary for his services on such commission from any source other than the State, local, or intergovernmental department or agency from which he was detailed or from such commission. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(d) Notwithstanding any other subsection of this section, the Federal cochairman and his alternate on a regional commission and any Federal officers or employees detailed to duty with it pursuant to clause (3) of section 10 shall not be subject to any such subsection but shall remain subject to sections 202 through 209 of title 18, United States Code.

(e) A regional commission may, in its discretion, declare void and rescind any contract or other agreement pursuant to the Act in relation to which it finds that there has been a violation of subsection (a) or (c) of this section, or any of the provisions of sections 202 through 209, title 18, United States Code.

Annual reports

Sec. 509. Each regional commission established pursuant to this Act shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report each fiscal year to the Congress with respect to such commission's activities and recommendations for programs. The first such report shall be made for the first fiscal year in which such commission is in existence for more than three months. Such reports shall be printed and transmitted to the Congress not later than January 31 of the calendar year following the fiscal year with respect to which the report is made.

TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION

"Sec. 601. (a) The Secretary shall administer this Act and, with the assistance of an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, in addition to those already provided for, shall supervise and direct the Administrator created herein, and coordinate the Federal cochairmen appointed heretofore or subsequent to this Act. The Assistant Secretary created by this section shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall be compensated at the rate provided for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. Such Assistant Secretary shall perform such functions as the Secretary may prescribe. There shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an Administrator for Economic Development who shall be compensated at the rate provided for level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule who shall perform such duties as are assigned by the Secretary.

"(b) Subsections (d) and (e) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 are hereby amended by adding the positions established by subsection (a) hereof."

Advisory Committee on Regional Economic Development

Sec. 602. The Secretary shall appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Regional Economic Development which shall consist of twenty-five members and shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, State and local governments, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Secretary shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the carrying out of his duties under this Act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

Consultation with other persons and agencies

Sec. 603. (a) The Secretary is authorized from time to time to call together and confer with any persons, including representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and government, who can assist in meeting the problems of area and regional unemployment and underemployment.

(b) The Secretary may make provision for such consultation with interested departments and agencies as he may deem appropriate in the performance of the functions vested in him by this Act.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

Powers of Secretary

Sec. 701. In performing his duties under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to—

(1) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(2) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

(3) request directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this Act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Secretary;

(4) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with loans made or evidences of indebtedness purchased under this Act, and collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him in connection with such loans or evidences of indebtedness until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(5) further extend the maturity of or renew any loan made or evidence of indebtedness purchased under this Act, beyond the periods stated in such loan or evidence of indebtedness or in this Act, for additional periods not to exceed ten years, if such extension or renewal will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan or evidence of indebtedness;

(6) deal with, complete, renovate, improve modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by, him in connection with loans made or evidences of indebtedness purchased under this Act;

(7) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action, prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to him in connection with loans made or evidences of indebtedness purchased under this Act. This shall include authority to obtain deficiency judgments or otherwise in the case of mortgages assigned to the Secretary. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Secretary as a result of loans made or evidences of indebtedness purchased under this Act if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute, in the name of the Secretary, deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real or personal property or any interest therein acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be exercised by the Secretary or by any officer or agent appointed by him for that purpose without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney;

(8) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in sections 201, 202, 301, 403, and 503 of this Act;

(9) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, purchasing, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made or evidences of indebtedness purchased under this Act;

(10) employ experts and consultants or organizations therefor as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), compensate individuals so employed at rates not in excess of $100

per diem, including travel time, and allow them, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed: *Provided, however,* That contracts for such employment may be renewed annually;

(11) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any United States district court, and jurisdiction is conferred upon such district court to determine such controversies without regard to the amount in controversy; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Secretary or his property. Nothing herein shall be construed to except the activities under this Act from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28, United States Code, and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316); and

(12) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Savings provisions

SEC. 702. (a) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the Administrator or any other officer of the Area Redevelopment Administration in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties under the Area Redevelopment Act, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of the provisions of this Act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such taking effect, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the Secretary or the Administrator or such other officer of the Department of Commerce as may be appropriate.

(b) Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this Act, all powers and authorities conferred by this Act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. All rules, regulations, orders, authorizations, delegations, or other actions duly issued, made, or taken by or pursuant to applicable law, prior to the effective date of this Act, by any agency, officer, or office pertaining to any functions, powers, and duties under the Area Redevelopment Act shall continue in full force and effect after the effective date of this Act until modified or rescinded by the Secretary or such other officer of the Department of Commerce as, in accordance with applicable law, may be appropriate.

Transfer of functions and effective date

SEC. 703. (a) The functions, powers, duties, and authorities and the assets, funds, contracts, loans, liabilities, commitments, authorizations, allocations, and records which are vested in or authorized to be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 29(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act, and all functions, powers, duties, and authorities under section 29(c) of the Area Redevelopment Act are hereby vested in the Secretary.

(b) The President may designate a person to act as Administrator under this Act until the office is filled as provided in this Act or until the expiration of the first period of sixty days following the effective date of this Act, whichever shall first occur. While so acting such person shall receive compensation at the rate provided by this Act for such office.

(c) The provisions of this Act shall take effect upon enactment unless herein explicitly otherwise provided.

(d) Notwithstanding any requirements of this Act relating to the eligibility of areas, projects for which applications are pending before the Area Redevelopment Administration on the effective date of this Act shall for a period of one year thereafter be eligible for consideration by the Secretary for such assistance under the provisions of this Act as he may determine to be appropriate.

Separability

SEC. 704. Notwithstanding any other evidence of the intent of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that if any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this Act or its application to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provision of this Act or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

Application of Act

SEC. 705. As used in this Act, the terms "State", "States", and "United States" include the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Annual report

SEC. 706. The Secretary shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this Act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Such report shall be printed and shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3 of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made.

Use of other facilities

SEC. 707. (a) Where practicable in carrying out the provisions of this Act the Secretary may use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, but only with their consent and on a reimbursable basis. The foregoing requirement shall be implemented by the Secretary in such a manner as to avoid the duplication of existing staffs and facilities in any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government. The Secretary is authorized to delegate to the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government any of the Secretary's functions, powers, and duties under this Act as he may deem appropriate, and to authorize the redelegation of such functions, powers, and duties by the heads of such departments and agencies.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act.

(c) Funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be transferred between departments and agencies of the Government, if such funds are used for the purposes for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated.

Appropriation

SEC. 708. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Appropriations authorized under this Act shall remain available until expended unless otherwise provided by appropriations Acts.

Penalties

SEC. 709. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any financial assistance under section 101, 201, 202, or 403 or any extension thereof by renewal, deferment or action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Secretary, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Secretary, in the administration of this Act (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or (2) with intent to defraud the Secretary or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Secretary, or without being duly authorized draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (3) with intent to defraud participates or shares in or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, grant, commission, contract, or any other act of the Secretary, or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Secretary which might affect the value of securities, or having such knowledge invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans, grants, or other assistance from the Secretary, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

Employment of expediters and administrative employees

SEC. 710. No financial assistance shall be extended by the Secretary under section 101, 201, 202, or 403 to any business enterprise unless the owners, partners, or officers of such business enterprise (1) certify to the Secretary the names of any attorneys, agents, and other persons engaged by or on behalf of such business enterprise for the purpose of expediting applications made to the Secretary for assistance of any sort, under this Act, and the fees paid or to be paid to any such person; and (2) execute an agreement binding such business enterprise, for a period of two years after such assistance is rendered by the Secretary to such business enterprise, to refrain from employing, tendering any office or employment to, or retaining for professional services, any person who, on the date such assistance or any part thereof was rendered, or within one year prior thereto, shall have served as an officer, attorney, agent, or employee, occupying a position or engaging in activities which the Secretary shall have determined involve discretion with respect to the granting of assistance under this Act.

Prevailing rate of wage and forty-hour week

SEC. 711. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects assisted by the Secretary under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5). The Secretary shall not extend any financial assistance upon section 101, 201, 202, or 403 for such a project without first obtaining adequate assurance that these labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this provision, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5

U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Record of applications

SEC. 712. The Secretary shall maintain as a permanent part of the records of the Department of Commerce a list of applications approved for financial assistance under section 101, 201, 202, or 403, which shall be kept available for public inspection during the regular business hours of the Department of Commerce. The following information shall be posted in such list as soon as each application is approved; (1) the name of the applicant and, in the case of corporate applications, the names of the officers and directors thereof, (2) the amount and duration of the loan or grant for which application is made, (3) the purposes for which the proceeds of the loan or grant are to be used, and (4) a general description of the security offered in the case of a loan.

Records and audit

SEC. 713. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records, as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this Act.

Conforming amendment

SEC. 714. All benefits heretofore specifically made available (and not subsequently revoked) under other Federal programs to persons or to public or private organizations, corporations, or entities in areas designated by the Secretary as "redevelopment areas" under section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act, are hereby also extended, insofar as practicable, to such areas as may be designated as "redevelopment areas" or "economic development centers" under the authority of section 401 or 403 of this Act: *Provided, however,* That this section shall not be construed as limiting such administrative discretion as may have been conferred under any other law.

SEC. 715. All financial and technical assistance authorized under this Act shall be in addition to any Federal assistance previously authorized, and no provision hereof shall be construed as authorizing or permitting any reduction or diminution in the proportional amount of Federal assistance to which any State or other entity eligible under this Act would otherwise be entitled under the provisions of any other Act.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

There being no objection, the committee amendments were considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the legislation before us today is of vital personal interest to millions of Americans in all sections of the Nation. It is an urgent matter which, I am confident, a large majority of the Nation wants to see enacted as soon as possible.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is of such vital interest because it brings a new hope to the unemployed, the partially employed, and the impoverished who are located in areas of the country which have been bypassed by progress and prosperity.

Unfortunately, the problem of our depressed areas is somewhat like the problem of poverty-stricken individuals: Unless one is poverty-stricken oneself, it is difficult to comprehend and know the full impact of poverty. To an extent, the problem is partially hidden because of the overall economic well-being of the Nation. Thus, in our more prosperous areas it may be difficult to understand the sense of hopelessness and frustration that manifests itself in the areas where economic development and job opportunities are restricted.

To demonstrate the scope of the problem, let me cite some figures used by Secretary of Commerce Connor in his testimony before the Public Works Committee several weeks ago.

The Secretary noted that the Nation's 100 hardest hit unemployment areas—in 28 States—had an annual average unemployment rate in 1964 of 13.6 percent, or more than 2½ times the national average. In six States we find areas with unemployment rates running more than 18 percent. This is at a time when our national unemployment rate is at its lowest point in 7 years.

In our hardest hit rural areas the census figures show that the 100 poorest counties had median family incomes ranging from $1,260 to $1,766 per year, or nearly 70 percent below the national average of $5,600.

Here we have entire counties where the majority of people are trying to exist on incomes below the poverty level.

Figures such as these should help to bring home the idea to those who have not had an appreciation of the magnitude and seriousness of the problem of area economic distress.

How do we deal with this nagging and vexing problem, a problem, incidentally, that would still be with us, but to a somewhat lesser degree, even if the national unemployment rate were reduced another 50 percent. We observe that in several European economies where there is practically full employment on an overall basis, the depressed areas problem continues to exist because of technological changes, shifts in demand, changing patterns of trade and so on. In a growing and dynamic economy we must face up to this problem, as it cannot be wished away, and the usual monetary and fiscal policies designed to strengthen the economy cannot be expected to do the whole job.

Therefore, I believe we must act along the lines suggested by the President in S. 1648, which he transmitted to Congress on March 31 of this year.

The bill proposed by the President was referred to the Committee on Public Works, which held hearings in April, and also obtained the views of the Banking and Currency Committee, which held its own hearings on titles II and IV of the bill. I would like to commend the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, Senator ROBERTSON, for his cooperation in this matter particularly with regard to the dispatch with which his committee handled the titles II and IV.

I also want to call special attention to the great work of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization which held hearings on titles II and IV. Senator DOUGLAS is properly known as the father of the original Area Redevelopment Act.

The principle purposes of S. 1648, as amended, are to:

First. Provide a means by which certain areas which are lagging behind the general economic growth of the Nation can be helped to improve their physical and social structure and thereby stimulate economic growth.

Second. Make available both direct and supplementary grants to government and nongovernment nonprofit agencies in order to improve the physical resources of these lagging areas so as to increase opportunities to stimulate economic growth.

Third. Provide loans to government and nongovernment nonprofit agencies in order to make available funds needed as the required local share for public works grant-in-aid programs and the local share of funds necessary for grants for facilities related to area economic development needs.

Fourth. Provide loans to profit organizations for facilities, including equipment and machinery, and the guarantee of loans for working capital purposes, in order to make it possible to expand economic development in areas qualifying under the act.

Fifth. Provide technical assistance to any area determined by the Secretary of Commerce to be in need of such assistance in planning or in working at preventing or alleviating conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment.

Sixth. Provide grants and loans and other forms of assistance to areas facing economic disaster as the result of the closing or curtailing of employment at a major source of employment in an area in advance of such closing or curtailment.

Seventh. Encourage the establishment of multicounty development districts so that grants and loans can be utilized for broader geographic application and thus help depressed areas by linking them with more healthy areas.

Eighth. Encourage the establishment of multistate economic development regions where applicable criteria are met, and provide such regions with funds to establish development commissions including up to 100 percent of administrative and staff costs.

S. 1648 responds, I think, to basic problems and needs of our economically disadvantaged areas and of the broader economic regions it is designed to help develop. In large measure it draws on the experiences and lessons of the original area redevelopment program and the accelerated public works program. The approach to development planning of multistate regions is patterned after the program recently developed for Appalachia. Our anticipations for that program are high, just as they are for this program. The predecessor programs to Appalachia and this bill have made significant contributions to the well-being of a number of areas.

Let me cite the examples of an APW project and an ARA project in my home State of Michigan which I believe help make the case for the public works and economic development program. Last year in the Public Works Committee, during the hearings on the first Appalachia bill, we heard of a good example of the multiple effects a public works project can have on the economic life of a small town. It concerned Harbor Springs, Emmet County, Mich. Harbor Springs, population 1,500, is a resort town. It received two APW grants totaling $122,000 for sanitary sewers and an interceptor sewer, and matched these grants with $122,000 of its own funds.

Apart from giving a year's employment to 20 men on the construction site, this project brought the following results: 1½ miles of new streets were built along these sewers, seven new homes were started or completed; a new subdivision, dormant and failing for 2 years because of the lack of sewers, became eligible for FHA insurance and 10 lots were sold; a new restaurant, a new drive-in restaurant, and a new motel were started, and the local appliance dealer estimated that he will be able to sell 50 garbage disposals and 10 washing machines. All of this new activity in a town of just 1,500 population.

This story illustrates aptly the point that the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] had made on a number of occasions, that even though the APW program had as its first consideration the relief of unemployment at a time when national employment rates were high, many of the projects financed under that program will have long-run effects, contributing more to an area than the short-term employment they were designed to provide.

The example of an ARA project in Michigan I want to give you concerns a tourism development in the northern part of the Lower Peninsula of Michigan.

Shanty Creek, a year-round lodge in Antrim County, Mich., started out in late 1962 with approval of an $890,500 ARA loan to help build a lodge, a golf course, fishing and boating facilities, private trout stream, and heated swimming pool, several ski slopes with tows and lifts.

Today, Shanty Creek Lodge has assets of $2.5 million, and employs 90 workers on a year-round basis. In the first year and a half of operation, the lodge, I am told, attracted so many patrons that many had to be turned away. They went to other resorts in the area which helped to boost the business of food and lodging facilities in nearby communities.

The lodge management is planning further expansion of housing and sports facilities to make Shanty Creek even more attractive to visitors. Recently $800,000 in private investment was put into the project for this purpose.

Impact of the money being spent by customers and employees of the project is readily apparent in the area. Business has gone up an average of about 15 percent in the nearby town of Bellaire. Bank deposits are increasing. Two years ago, there were seven vacant stores in the Shanty Creek area; today there is one.

A new supermarket has been built; its owners are already talking about expansion.

The architect for Shanty Creek has opened an office in Bellaire, with nine employees. A bakery and a barbershop, each with two employees, have opened for business. Local contractors have almost more business than they can handle. One construction company has increased employment from 10 to 40 workers.

Shanty Creek's opening in Bellaire has stimulated other projects. These include a food processing firm, a lumber company, a tool manufacturer, and two other small factories. Together, these 5 projects are generating more than 200 job opportunities in the community. Local business leaders report that, in addition to the direct efforts of these projects, ARA's participation in the community's development efforts has helped generate a new feeling of hope and optimism throughout the area.

Under the Public Works and Economic Development Act, Mr. President, we shall be able to continue to assist worthy development projects of the kind I have just cited; projects with an assist from the Government have come into being in areas of need years before anything could have happened without this assistance. Projects such as I have cited did not come into being at the expense of another area or of other industries. The new jobs created by these projects, represent, insofar as I can determine, net increases in employment and income, and they came into being in areas most in need of new job opportunities.

Thus far I have talked mainly of the meaning of this program to individual areas of unemployment and low income. I would like now to deal briefly with the regional planning and programing aspect of this bill. The regional planning provisions of the bill are quite new in concept and follow generally the plan embodied in the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

While the Appalachian region is only beginning to implement its program, the great value of the 2 years which went into developing that program is that it identified and outlined a new approach to economic development problems common to two or more adjoining States.

Under S. 1648, States may join together to form regional development commissions to further projects and programs which are best planned across sizable geographic areas and which no local unit or group of units within one State can do alone or without regard to the effect of their efforts on a similar area in adjoining States.

The Appalachia experience has produced a workable mechanism for a Federal-State partnership which can develop a program and implement it. The Public Works Committee, therefore, recommended the regional commission plan that was created in the Appalachia Regional Development Act as the instrument to be used by other regions.

The regional approach to the problem of area economic development embodied in S. 1648, Mr. President, provides a very strong and much-needed adjunct to the other provisions of the bill.

Title I of this bill, public works and development facilities, is designed to increase the amount of Federal funds being expended both for general improvement of the physical structure of an area, and for specific improvements related to projected economic development. One of the greatest handicaps a community, area, or region can suffer when economically disadvantaged is the inability of its physical plant and public services to support existing industry, or new development.

If a community, for example, has an inadequate water treatment and distribution system, it can hardly hope to induce industrial development which would further tax the existing facilities and possibly lead to breakdown in the system.

This type of investment cannot adequately be measured in terms of jobs created or new factories constructed. But the purpose here is not the immediate employment gain that such facilities will produce. The primary purpose is to create developmental facilities that will contribute to the economic underpinning of the community that can make it more capable of supporting additional population and of making the most of its natural advantages.

The grants that would be made under title I are not to be limited to traditional public works, but are meant to include physical properties which will have a bearing on long-term industrial and commercial growth.

Examples of projects which should be eligible under this title, as well as projects for which public facility loans would be available under title II when they are directly related to economic development needs, are waterworks and waterlines, sanitary and storm sewers, industrial parks, police and fire stations, research centers, tourism facilities, industrial streets and roads, waste treatment facilities, area vocational schools, airports, and watershed protection and flood control projects.

Examples of public facilities which, if indirectly related to economic development, could be eligible for grants under section 101—and loans under section 201—would be streets primarily related to residential development, water and sewage facilities related to residential development, hospitals, vocational education facilities, community centers, and in some circumstances, library and similar buildings.

There is a critical need in many, if not most, of the areas that would be eligible under this program for these types of facilities if they are to ever have the chance of getting back into the mainstream of American economic life. I want to emphasize that the funds to be provided under the public works provisions of this act are not merely to be substituted for funds available under existing programs. It would be contrary to the purposes of this act if other Federal agencies cut back the amounts of funds which would have gone to eligible areas if the additional funds under this program were not available. Further, the present policy of loaning the local share where communities are unable to make a one lump-sum payment should be continued.

The bill as originally introduced called for an annual authorization of $250 million for direct and supplemental grants for public and development facilities.

In testifying before the Senate Public Works Committee, a number of witnesses, including several Members of Congress expressed doubt as to whether this sum would be large enough to meet the tremendous backlog of needs of the underdeveloped areas.

Many, but not all, of the APW projects left unfunded because of exhaustion of authorization will be eligible for consideration under the Public Works and Economic Development Act. There will also be many projects of the type previously financed under the ARA program. These are public facility projects that have a direct tie-in with a new employment-creating enterprise.

The Public Works Committee also amended the bill to permit supplementary grants for direct Federal projects that have been authorized by Congress.

On the basis of estimates on backlog and new projects, the committee determined that $400 million would be the minimum necessary to fund title I. Senator RANDOLPH offered an amendment for $500 million. There was sympathy for increasing even to that figure. However, committee studies indicate that there is a backlog of $250 million; that new applications will total $250 to $300 million, of which $100 million will be able to be handled in the year application is made.

Further, there needs to be some standby authorization in the event of sudden loss of employment in a number of areas over the year period. Annual backlog would be $250 million, new grants in any year, $100 million, and reserve, $50 million.

Title III of S. 1648 authorizes a program for technical assistance and planning assistance to areas having substantial need for such assistance that would be useful in alleviating or preventing conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment. This title provides for a research program aimed at better understanding of the causes and conditions of area and regional economic distress, and an information program designed to provide better economic development know-how to local, district, and regional development groups.

The Public Works Committee amended this title so that technical assistance may include the undertaking of training programs, as well as studies. The committee also took into consideration the fact that some areas would be handicapped by the lack of funds for project design and advanced planning. It also noted that the administration's proposed bill did not provide for a specific authorization for a research program. In light of these considerations the committee recommended that the authorization for title III be raised from $20 to $25 million, which moneys would be used to help finance the research and information sections as well as the section on technical assistance.

Past programs, such as ARA and APW, went only part of the way in attempting to help areas solve their economic development problems and certain complaints we have heard about these programs were made mainly because they were not strong enough and broad enough to do an adequate overall job.

S. 1648 goes far to fill the gaps that prevented certain programs from being as effective as they might have been.

I look forward to seeing real inroads made on area unemployment and underemployment through this measure. I see a great impact being made on both regional economies and the national economy through the implementation of this bill.

I urge the Senate to act favorably on this important measure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I want to compliment the able chairman of the Public Works Committee for the very effective presentation he has made of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. I have carefully reviewed the record of the hearings and the report filed by the Committee on Public Works and I believe every member of that committee has done an outstanding job in bringing this piece of vital legislation to the floor.

The Senator from Michigan was kind enough to request the views of the Banking and Currency Committee on titles II and IV of the bill. These titles deal with the loan programs and the criteria for designating eligible areas and are similar in scope to the original Area Redevelopment Act which was approved by the Banking and Currency Committee and the Congress in 1961. I believe our committees achieved an unusual degree of cooperation on this bill and I would hope the practice of consulting with other committees receives wider use. The Senator from Michigan, who has joined with me in cosponsoring this bill, has made an important contribution not only to the bill but to the practices and procedures by which the Senate conducts its business.

THE ORIGINAL AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

Economic stagnation in the midst of general prosperity has long been a paradox in our society. The rapid shifts in 20th century technology have left many communities and regions grappling with the cruel facts of economic hardship. Perhaps a present-day Adam Smith would argue that the citizens of these regions should cheerfully accept the discipline of the "invisible hand" and live out their remaining years in abject but silent poverty. Any attempt to interfere in the natural workings of the economy, according to this ancient theory, would only lead to the inefficient allocation of industrial capital.

But a modern nation can no longer afford such a callous solution, for in the long run, the growth of our vast and complex economy depends upon the health of all its regions and communities.

This ancient prescription—which reminds me of the similar practice of treating patients by bleeding them to death—also ignores the sizable investment depressed communities have already made in basic public facilities such as schools, roads, hospitals, and the like. This investment, or social capital, would go to waste if we permitted our depressed communities to decline indefinitely. At the same time, new and duplicating facilities would have to be constructed elsewhere to accommodate the residents who have been forced to move.

Thus, a crude policy of laissez faire does not lead to economic efficiency, it promotes inefficiency and waste. While such a policy is concerned with the profit and loss statements of corporations, it ignores the balance sheet of the community at large. It is futile to apply such a narrow accounting standard to the complex problems of a modern economy.

For many years some argued that those who find themselves in an economically distressed area should pack their bags and move to another city where jobs were supposed to be more plentiful.

But how are those other towns and cities to provide the housing, the social and municipal services, the retraining and financial assistance needed to launch these individuals upon a new and productive career? We may as well attempt to meet and solve the problem where it is rather than trying to shift the whole burden to our overcrowded and underfinanced cities.

For all of these reasons I have therefore advocated a Federal program of assistance to economically distressed communities and areas ever since 1955 when the Joint Economic Committee issued a report on the subject. It took 6 years of long and tedious work to enact an economic development bill. The effort was temporarily set back by two vetoes by President Eisenhower, but finally, in May of 1961, success was realized when President Kennedy signed into law the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. I am proud to have been the sponsor of this bill and to have played a part in securing its passage.

The original Area Redevelopment Act was basically a loan program. It authorized $100 million in loans to communities for public works designed to improve a community's economic potential;

It authorized $100 million in loans to businesses expanding into areas of chronic unemployment;

And it authorized $100 million in loans to firms expanding into areas of underemployment and persistent low income.

In addition, $75 million in grants was authorized for public works projects that promised to enhance the communities' economic base.

And finally, the act authorized an annual appropriation of $14.5 million for retraining workers in depressed areas and

$4.5 million for providing such areas with technical assistance.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

In many respects, the Area Redevelopment Act was an experimental program. It did not have the funds or resources to conduct a massive assault upon all the problems of depressed areas. But it made a valuable start and within the limitations of the act, it achieved notable results.

Mr. President, based upon the Area Redevelopment Act's experience, the net cost of creating a new job is about $800. The net cost includes all expenses not recovered, such as the grant portion of the program, technical assistance, losses on loans, and the like. I think this is a remarkable testament to the value of the program. For $800 we obtain a productive taxpaying worker who is an asset and not a liability to his community. For $800 we can restore a sense of dignity and purpose to a man who might otherwise be forced to live out his remaining years in sustained and demoralizing idleness. If this is all we achieved, the $800 would be well spent—but there is more. The Federal Government is no longer burdened with welfare payments or unemployment compensation benefits. Instead, the Government collects several hundred dollars a year in income taxes from the worker and his employer. It is clear that within a year or two, we will recapture our entire $800 investment. After that the returns are pure profit to the Nation.

Very few business firms are able to recoup their investment within a year or two.

Another substantial though largely unheralded achievement of the Area Redevelopment Act is the effect of the program upon local planning. Before a community is eligible for funds, it must develop an overall economic development program. For many areas, and particularly the smaller communities, this represents the first time community leaders have gotten together to examine their common problems, and settle upon a course of action. One Tennessee paper commented:

> Even if our county never received one penny of loans or grant money from ARA, I am convinced that by starting our overall economic development program, we have benefited—benefited in a concentration of interest that has led to a great deal of local initiative that might otherwise have taken years to get started.

OFFSHOOTS OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT PROGRAM

In addition to these accomplishments, the Area Redevelopment Act was also the pioneer and forerunner of many other Federal programs designed to foster local and regional economic growth.

For example, the Area Redevelopment Act contained a modest program for training unemployed workers. The start made under the Area Redevelopment Act led to the passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. This act has achieved broad, bipartisan support and has been a notable success. Training has been approved for nearly 320,000 trainees. The program was extended and strengthened in the current session of Congress.

Second, the original Area Redevelopment Act contained a provision to stimulate economic development by constructing needed public works. The experience gained under this provision led to the Accelerated Public Works Act 1 year later. This act provided nearly $900 million to speed construction of essential public works in labor surplus areas. Although the funds for this program are nearly exhausted, a sizable backlog of essential public works still remains.

Third, we have recently enacted the Appalachian program—a program to help generate economic development on a regional basis. ARA's own experience has confirmed the need for this type of regional aid, for ARA soon found that the lack of modern public facilities was a major obstacle to the orderly economic development of any area. Because the ARA program alone did not have the authority or funds to do the job adequately, the States in the Appalachian region, where the lack of public facilities and the adequate transportation was most apparent, banded together to urge the formation of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission. It was the work of this Commission which ultimately led to the passage of the recent Appalachia Act as a means of providing these basic needs. Other bills to aid regions have since been proposed in anticipation of similar programs in the future for other regions with severe economic problems. This bill offers benefits on a regional basis without county-by-county restrictions.

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE PROGRAM

The present bill combines the best features of the original Area Redevelopment Act, the Accelerated Public Works Act, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act. It also contains several notable improvements over the earlier ARA program.

Under the present bill, depressed areas can combine into economic development districts or into even larger regional groupings. These larger areas would then prepare a comprehensive plan to improve the entire economy. Under this approach, it would be possible to assist the more economically viable sections of the region on the assumption that a growing employment center will contribute to the growth of the entire region. In effect, it encourages the Appalachian method for other large regions plagued by chronic unemployment such as the Upper Great Lakes or southern Illinois. I might add that many of the citizens of southern Illinois pioneered in the multicounty approach under the original ARA program, although the single-county criteria contained in the original act did not include incentives for action on a regional basis.

The new bill also makes it easier for severely depressed communities to participate in the program. Under the original Area Redevelopment Act, communities had to put up 10 percent of the cash for a business loan which could not be repaid before the Federal portion. This often proved to be a stumbling block in raising the needed funds. The new proposal reduces the percentage to 5 percent and authorizes concurrent repayment. The Secretary of Commerce can even waive the 5-percent local contribution in extreme cases.

Also, the new bill authorizes financing on a scale more nearly equal to the task. For example, the original Area Redevelopment Act authorized $300 million in business and public facility loans over a 4-year period or an average of $75 million per year. The proposed bill authorizes $170 million per year, or more than double the original amount.

TITLE II OF THE BILL

Before I conclude, Mr. President, I would like to briefly describe sections II and IV of the bill since I chaired a Banking and Currency Subcommittee which held an informal review of this portion of the bill. Title II provides the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make $170 million a year in loans or guarantees. There are three principal programs under this $170 million authorization:

First, the Secretary could make loans to communities for public works type projects designed to enhance a community's economic base. The projects would have to be directly related to economic development and could include waterworks and water lines, sewers, industrial parks, police and fire stations, research centers, tourism facilities, industrial streets and roads, and other works as well. The interest rate for these loans would be at 3⅝ percent under present borrowing costs. The rate is tied to the Federal borrowing cost less one-half of 1 percent.

Second, the Secretary can make loans to business firms expanding into depressed areas. The Federal share is limited to 65 percent and the local community must put up 5 percent, although this may be waived in extreme cases. Under present borrowing costs the interest charged on these loans would be 4⅛ percent. This program has proven to be most successful under the Area Redevelopment Act although some communities had trouble meeting their share of the loan which, as I mentioned previously, was 10 percent. The new act will thus be a substantial improvement and will not deny assistance to the very communities that need it the most.

Third, the Secretary can guarantee working capital loans made to firms expanding into depressed areas. Private banks would continue to supply the loans for this purpose, but the Government would insure their repayment. Experience under the Area Redevelopment Administration's program often indicated that a shortage of working capital was a major stumbling block in building new industry. Some banks were unable to supply the needed credit because of the assumed risk. This provision, therefore, will be of substantial assistance to firms attempting to get started in depressed areas.

In addition to these three programs in title II, for which the Secretary could allocate $170 million, section 202 of the bill contains a method for promoting economic development in depressed areas, hitherto unused in this country, although it has been used effectively in Europe. In effect, it is an interest rate reduction payment of 2 percent on the total cost of new plant and equipment for non-Government borrowers expanding into depressed communities. Many firms have no particular difficulty in borrowing money, hence the direct loan program of ARA was not especially appealing. However, with an interest rate subsidy, these firms would have an incentive to expand into a depressed area.

The bill provides authority to enter into contracts of up to $5 million per year in interest rate subsidies; however, this amount would encourage $250 million of private investment in depressed areas. So, for very little expenditure, a tremendous amount of leverage and of new investment is achieved.

TITLE IV

Title IV of the bill deals with the criteria by which depressed areas will be declared eligible or ineligible for financial assistance. Basically, the earlier unemployment criteria contained in section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act is retained. That is, an area would have to experience unemployment substantially above the national average to qualify. In addition, areas with median incomes below 40 percent of the national average would qualify.

There are several improvements in the designation portion of the act which should result in better administration.

First, as I mentioned a while ago, areas can combine to form larger multicounty districts. When this is done, certain development centers in the district would be eligible for assistance if they would promote the overall growth of the area, even though they could not qualify on their own. As an incentive to induce economic development on a wider scale, the section authorizes an additional $50 million yearly for such multicounty areas.

Second, the proposed bill would permit the termination of areas on the basis of annual rather than monthly statistics. Under the original act an area's continued eligibility would depend upon monthly employment statistics. The resulting fluctuations and in-again, out-again designations made it difficult to proceed on an even basis.

Third, the bill has language which will permit a depressed area to retain its eligibility despite an increase in employment if the Secretary determines such an increase is not likely to be permanent. In other words, if a community achieves a temporary high level of unemployment due to a one-time construction project, it could retain its eligibility. The Senator from Minnesota is to be given the credit for this noteworthy improvement.

Fourth, the bill permits assistance to areas which may not qualify at the moment but will soon do so in the future due to an impending base closing, plant relocation, or other economic disaster. Such areas could not be designated under existing law until it became clear that it would suffer or had suffered an employment loss of such magnitude that its unemployment rate exceeded the national average by 100 percent for a full year. However, it is just as important to prevent these areas from becoming depressed as it is to improve those areas already depressed.

The proposed bill would permit Federal assistance as soon as it can be established that the requisite unemployment level would probably be reached within 3 years without such assistance.

Mr. President, I am proud to be the sponsor of this important legislation along with Senator McNAMARA. Our economy has reached an alltime high, and each month sees another record broken. And yet despite this progress, many communities have been left behind and have been isolated from the general prosperity experienced by the rest of the country.

One out of every five Americans lives in an area of poor economic opportunity. One out of every four American counties has serious economic problems.

To the citizen of such an area the meaning of economic distress is made a part of his everyday life. It means no job and what is even worse, no immediate prospect of a job. Those of us who can recall the great depression which started in 1929 will remember the debilitating sense of hopelessness and despair which was common across the country. Those out of work and walking the street felt degraded and dehumanized—like a wornout piece of machinery which had served a useful purpose and was then cast out upon a scrap heap.

Today, we have managed to solve some of the greater problems of our economy, but the haunting sense of helplessness and despair which is felt by the unemployed still exists in our land. We have succeeded in removing and restricting it to some of the smaller towns and isolated regions of America. But it still exists. Poverty and want are still a way of life for all too many Americans.

It is time we launched an all-out attack upon the paradox of want in the midst of abundance. The war on poverty attempts to rescue individuals from the vicious cycle of poverty which is often transmitted from generation to generation. The bill before us today, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, is an effective complement to the war on poverty. It attempts to provide the economic resources, and the jobs needed to rescue these Americans from a life of misery and want.

And so let us renew the commitment we made in the Full Employment Act of 1946 to assure that every American who wants to work can do so. Let us pass this bill and bring not only work, but a meaningful life to the people who live in depressed areas. Let us give every American the chance to live and work in his community without being dependent upon handouts or charity.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the measure, I would like to express my endorsement of the Public Works and Economic Development Act, now under consideration, as reported by the Senate Public Works Committee under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. This skillfully designed bill, much improved by the committee, will enable the economically distressed areas of this Nation to obtain much needed assistance in attacking the underlying causes of poverty, unemployment, and lack of opportunity.

I would especially like to commend to the Senate the machinery contained in this bill for attacking unemployment and economic distress on a regional, multi-State basis. Under the provisions of title V of the act, multi-State, regional development commissions can be established to determine the causes of depressed economies and to make recommendations to the various agencies of the Federal Government and to State and local governments and to private individuals and organizations, for utilizing their funds and resources to attack the conditions contributing to economic distress.

The Ozarks region, encompassing parts of eastern Oklahoma, western Arkansas, and southern Missouri, is one such region suffering from chronic underdevelopment, and I am happy to say that the committee in considering the regional aspect to the bill under title V recognized the need for regional action in this area. As I pointed out in my position as temporary chairman of the hearing considering this region, its problems are almost as great as its potential. It will take a unified effort on the part of private enterprise and local, State, and Federal agencies if these problems are to be overcome and this potential realized.

We must marshal all of these forces, and we must have funds to do comprehensive planning. The time to start this task is now, today, because we are now on the last lap of the vast $1.2 million Arkansas River project which will bring barge traffic and lower freight rates to the Ozarks region by 1970.

The Ozarks region is a land of opportunity. It is a beautiful and scenic area, but it is hampered by outdated highways and inadequate transportation facilities. It is rich in natural resources, but, because of high freight rates and other factors, these have not been fully developed. It is populated by hardy, hardworking people, but, because of lack of jobs, many of its citizens live in poverty. Therefore, Mr. President, I am especially happy to report that the committee, in its careful deliberations on the Public Works and Economic Development Act, has recognized the needs of this region, and has recommended to the Senate the passage of this bill which will open the door to economic development and equal growth opportunity for this tristate Ozarks region, too long partially isolated from the mainstream of American progress.

Mr. President, I think the Senate will vote on many legislative matters before it again has the opportunity to enact legislation with nobler purposes than those contained in the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is the amount of the authorized appropriation included in the bill?

Mr. McNAMARA. $665 million annually.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator whether the bill is a second area redevelopment bill on a little larger scale?

Mr. McNAMARA. No; the program embodied in the bill is a combination of the best aspects of the ARA, APW, and Appalachian program. It applies to underdeveloped areas in the country, or areas similar to these embraced in the Appalachian bill. The same aid available under ARA and APW.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the $650 million the entire annual authorization included in the bill?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes; the figure I stated is the annual authorization.

Mr. HOLLAND. How many years does the bill cover?

Mr. McNAMARA. Five years on title I; indefinitely on the remaining titles.

Mr. HOLLAND. As to the portion of the bill covered by the $650 million annual authorization, how many years are covered?

Mr. McNAMARA. Four hundred million dollars of the six hundred sixty-five million dollars is limited to a 5-year period, the remainder is indefinite.

Mr. HOLLAND. Two billion dollars in that period?

Mr. McNAMARA. The amount is broken down on page 19 of the report. Part of the authorization is limited to 5 years, that is $2 billion, the rest is indefinite.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is the entire amount authorized by the bill, and over what period of time?

Mr. McNAMARA. Six hundred sixty-five million dollars annually.

Mr. HOLLAND. Over how many years?

Mr. McNAMARA. Title I, over 5 years; the remainder is indefinite. Titles II and III were handled by the subcommittee of which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is the chairman.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senate is entitled to know what is the entire authorization covered by the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield, although I do not have the floor.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As the Senator from Michigan has said, the authorization for public works facilities under title I is $400 million a year for 5 years. The remaining figure of $265 million a year is of indefinite duration.

However, I point out that these are merely authorizations; they will have to be passed on by the appropriate subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations and by the Committee on Appropriations itself.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I correct in my present understanding that the bill would authorize appropriations of $2 billion within the next 5 years under one title, and appropriations of $265 million a year indefinitely under other titles?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; but the money would not be automatically appropriated or spent; it would have to be approved by the Committee on Appropriations. This is purely an authorization bill. The distinguished Senator from Florida is a member of the Committee on Appropriations and will have ample opportunity to review this program.

Mr. HOLLAND. All I can say is that to have a bill of this amazing size and this great length, 64 pages, brought up at a time like this, when few Senators are in the Chamber, with the Senate preparing to adjourn, without Senators having had an opportunity to see the report and examine it is, in my judgment questionable procedure. I hope that no Senator will insist on a voice vote on this measure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will insist on a yea-and-nay vote. I could not allow this vast sum of money to be authorized by the Senate without further discussion.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLARK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Earlier today, I came close to missing an important yea-and-nay vote. I should like to express publicly to my friends on both sides of the aisle my gratification for their assistance in making it possible for me to be present and to record my vote before the result was announced. I am deeply grateful to all of them.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that a certain title of the bill was to do for certain parts of the country what the Appalachia bill will do for the Appalachian region?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the bill indicate what areas of the country would be covered?

Mr. McNAMARA. No. The bill establishes the criteria under which an area would be eligible for regional assistance and provides for a study.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would those studies be made throughout the country?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, yes, but of course in those regions eligible under the bill's provisions.

Mr. ELLENDER. At whose request?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under titles I and II the public works would be built and the loans for business and public facilities would be made in communities and areas which suffer from high and persistent unemployment, where the percentage of unemployment is vastly in excess of the national average. If over the preceding 3 years the unemployment was 50 percent more than the national average, that area would qualify. If it were over 100 percent, or double the national average for 1 year, it would qualify. Also areas which suffer severe underemployment and low income would be designated.

But the aid would be confined to those areas. In the rural areas, the difficulty is not so much unemployment, but underemployment and the resulting low income levels. Therefore counties where the average income was less than 40 percent of the national average would be eligible for assistance under this new program.

A great many counties in the State of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana would be eligibile under the low-income test. It is intended to reach the poor counties of the country, where people have irregular employment.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount authorized for that purpose is $265 million a year?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is authorized in title II $170 million for loans for public works facilities and for industrial and commercial loans. Also there are guarantees for working capital loans and there is an annual subsidy of 2 percentage points which would help induce private investment of $250 million a year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator from Illinois be able to tell us what connection, if any, this program has with the accelerated public works program?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The bill really inherits the accelerated public works program and area redevelopment program.

Mr. ELLENDER. So it is a combination of both?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. Will the Area Redevelopment Administration, the Appalachia program, and all the others be phased out with passage of the bill, or will they remain in effect, superimposed upon this bill?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Area Redevelopment Act would expire; the Appalachia program would continue.

Mr. DOMINICK. Is the Appalachia program included in the bill?

Mr. McNAMARA. No, but it is coordinated with this bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. So this bill is superimposed upon the Appalachia program?

Mr. McNAMARA. It is apart from it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Does it spread the Appalachia program over the country?

Mr. McNAMARA. In certain areas of the country that may be eligible. To be eligible, restrictions are spelled out. They are tighter than in the Appalachia program.

Mr. DOMINICK. How much subsidized interest does the bill contain?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Five million dollars a year, increasing to $10 million in the next year and $15 million in the third year. Since there is a 2-percent interest subsidy, this would make possible an investment of $250 million a year. This provision is designed to induce sound firms, of large and medium size, to go into an area. This would, in effect, substitute private financing with an interest rate subsidy for direct Government financing of industrial and commercial facilities. This kind of program has been widely used on the continent of Europe, and has been successful. We believe it has application in this country.

Mr. DOMINICK. What does the Senator mean by his statement that strong firms would go into a place and receive a subsidized interest rate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Our primary aim—I feel certain that the Senator from Colorado would not differ with it—is not to subsidize firms so much as to bring sound firms into somewhat decayed areas so as to provide employment and production. It is really an attempt to have private industry move in and do the job.

Mr. DOMINICK. Do I correctly understand that it is intended to have different interest rates for different firms in various parts of the country?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; the interest rate would be set up by the private lenders, but there would be a deduction of 2 percent from that interest rate to be paid by the Government.

Mr. DOMINICK. They would be different firms, selected firms?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No firm would get a greater subsidy for interest payments than any other firm. Naturally, the number of capital investments subsidized would depend upon private lenders and there would be a $250 ceiling on the amount that could be subsidized in any 1 year.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is entirely possible, though, that the capital investment program could have one company come into one area and receive a subsidized interest rate, and another company in competition with that company go into another depressed area and not receive it. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suppose that theoretically that is possible. However, practically, I do not believe that it is probable.

Mr. DOMINICK. Why is it not practically possible?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a provision that capital investments are not to be made in industries in which there is overinvestment.

Mr. DOMINICK. What about the administrative expenses? I note that there is some provision in the report—which I frankly never saw until 3 minutes ago—that administrative expenses are not open ended.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are to be met out of the appropriation for the Department of Commerce.

Mr. DOMINICK. This is all administered under the Department of Commerce?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. It would be subject to the control of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with that subject.

Mr. DOMINICK. Is there any indication in the report—which I have not had an opportunity to see—as to how many counties in the country would be included within this program?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is no specific mention of number of counties. The standards for designation are set forth clearly in title IV of the bill. They are similar to the standards in the Area Redevelopment Act program. However, the new standards are, as the Senator from Michigan has said, more severe in this act than they were in the original 1961 Area Redevelopment Act.

As I have said, the rural counties are eligible when the average income is less than 40 percent of the national average income. The intent is to provide for the counties in which the farmers and rural residents are extremely poor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Eligible for what, if I might ask?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Eligible for public works, eligible for business loans—eligible for all of the aids under this act.

Mr. DOMINICK. I share the feeling of the Senator from Florida that it is late in the day to take up a bill of this magnitude which most of us know nothing about.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, these reports have been available in the Chamber for some time. I believe that there has been sufficient notice that the bill was to be brought up. I do not decide when these matters are brought out. The Policy Committee decides those matters.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Colorado is a very able member of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am not on it any longer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are sorry to have lost the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am sorry not to be on the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The report on S. 1648 was made on the 14th of May. It has been lying on the desk for 10 days. It has been on the calendar for some time. The report was put on the calendar on May 14.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] for his conduct of the hearings on this subject.

I have been examining the report. I have been very much interested because the Area Redevelopment Act, Senate bill No. 1 of the 87th Congress in 1961, has been, I believe, one of the most beneficial acts passed by Congress in the field of economics in the history of our Nation, so far as my State is concerned. While the Area Redevelopment Act is being phased out, the pending measure would continue some phases, and particularly loans and grants to small towns which would have been denied such assistance.

Those towns would be able to build waterworks and sewer systems. Some have already been built. There have been some hepatitis cases in small towns in Texas which were without any sewerage. The bill has enabled those towns to obtain a sewage disposal system. I feel that, with as much vision as went into the No. 1 recovery act of the Kennedy administration in 1961, this measure would carry forward a number of the best features of the Area Redevelopment Act.

The major portion of the money would be used for the public and would not enter into the economics of it. The private business figure shown here, $400 million annually, is exclusively for public works and grants. That is the major portion.

I thank all those who have advanced this project, primarily the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who has helped to carry the project through with assistance in the field of public loans and grants. I know of small towns and subdivisions which are badly in need of water and sewerage facilities. The applications for loans and grants have been lying there. The bill would provide that those towns would be considered on a proper application for the period of 1 year. This bill means the difference between whether one town is going to die or live on and be a part of the viable economy.

I hope that the Senate will consider that this is one bill which, instead of providing money to go into one big profit missile or space contract, enables the people in smaller cities and towns to share in the economy and build their towns to the point that they will be able to pay taxes and assist in building up their entire economy.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding is that the community facilities administration is now existing, functioning, and able to take care of the specific kind of loans and needs mentioned by the Senator from Texas. Am I correct?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator from Florida is correct so far as loans are concerned. However, this bill would go beyond loans.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Community Facilities Administration also makes grants, does it not?

Mr. McNAMARA. No. The Community Facilities Administration does not make grants.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who is a cosponsor of the bill. He has labored long and hard, not only on this problem, but also on Appalachia and similar problems.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I know that many questions have been asked on the floor about the purpose and the provisions of the bill. I believe that I can explain briefly what is in the bill.

The bill came before the Committee on Public Works some weeks ago. There were long and comprehensive hearings. At the end of the hearings, the bill was modified, and, I believe I am correct in saying, the bill received the unanimous vote of the committee, including Democrats and Republicans.

What is contained in the bill? I believe that the bill embodies two programs with which we are familiar. The first section, which would authorize $400 million annually for a period of 5 years, is actually an extension of the accelerated public works bill.

At the end of the 2-year period which was authorized and funded for the administrative public works program, it is correct that some $2 billion of applications from areas which have been classified as depressed areas were on file and had not been funded or approved.

This $400 million a year, or whatever amount the Appropriations Committee approved, would be to fund the accelerated public works projects. That is my judgment of the bill.

The second section of the bill, which the Senator from Illinois has explained, is, I believe, an extension of the Area Redevelopment Act. It is the program under which loans are made to businesses and in some cases to communities, to construct what are called facilities which indirectly assist in the location of industry.

So I would have Senators remember that the second section is fundamentally an extension of Area Redevelopment Act with emphasis on loans for encouragement, and not relocation, of industry in these depressed areas.

The third section is a new concept which is based somewhat on the Appalachia concept. Senators will remember at the time the Appalachian bill was passed a good number of Senators, including the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan and Mr. Fulbright], the Senators from Oklahoma, the Senators from New York, the Senators from New England, the Senators from Minnesota, all said some sort of economic development program should be established for groups of States that had similar problems and needs.

So the last two provisions of the bill would provide funds for study by the States which might consider their needs and problems similar to an attempt to develop, if they desire to do so, a program which might be similar to the Appalachia program.

So when we subtract the $400 million authorization for the public works program, there is left, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] have said, some $265 million authorized for the two programs, extension of Area Redevelopment Act and a study program as to the propriety of various States moving together to establish a State-Federal program for the solution of common economic problems.

Mr. MUSKIE and Mr. HRUSKA addressed the Chair.

Mr. COOPER. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie].

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator has given an excellent thumbnail sketch of the bill and purposes, covering the so-called extension of the accelerated public works program. In this bill the projects are provided for in a reasonable and rational way to encourage the economic development process. Criteria are much tighter under this bill than under the accelerated public works program.

Mr. COOPER. That is right; the accelerated public works program is considered to be an emergency program. The emergency program provided for grants regularly up to 50 percent. In some cases the grants went to 75 percent in the accelerated public works program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall the accelerated public works program bills, the authorization was for $950 million.

Mr. COOPER. $900 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. This program is for $2 billion to cover a period of 5 years.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could the Senator tell us how much of this amount to be appropriated every year would go for grants instead of loans?

Mr. COOPER. Under the first section, the entire $400 million would go for grants, but they must be matched by the local municipalities or subdivisions.

Mr. ELLENDER. None would be loans?

Mr. COOPER. Under the first section they would be grants, but they would have to be matched.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the maximum amount to be provided by way of grants out of the total cost of the program?

Mr. COOPER. If the $400 million is authorized and if appropriations of $400 million were approved, it would mean each year $400 million would be available for grants. The actual amount, however, to be available would be determined by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. What would be the contribution made by the local communities?

Mr. COOPER. 50 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it fixed at that amount, or is it graduated? Under the old programs, as I recall, grants were based on the capability of the locality to furnish its own funds. If the community was able to put up 20 or 25 percent, up to 50 percent, the Government matched it.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. Under the old program the Administrator of the accelerated public works program made decisions as to the amount of the grants, which ranged from 50 percent to 75 percent. Under this bill the Administration would have that discretion, except that he could give grants up to 80 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Up to 80 percent?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. There are two types of grants. One would cover grants not now covered under existing Federal programs. As to those, the Federal Government will put up anywhere up to 50 percent. As to grants which supplement existing programs, for example, Hill-Burton hospital aid program, this bill would provide for grants to supplement grants for which projects might be eligible under existing programs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean under the total bill, or the accelerated public works program?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes; the total Federal contribution, including the grants under this program and the grants under the current program, cannot exceed 80 percent.

Mr. COOPER. The same determination would be required of the Administrator. He would have to find that the municipality or the recipient could not provide the 50 percent. In that event, the Administrator would have discretion to increase the grant up to 80 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the Hill-Burton Act, the Government can pay up to 80 percent. Has that been changed?

Mr. McNAMARA. It has not been changed.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the maximum the Government can contribute toward construction under the Hill-Burton Act?

Mr. MUSKIE. It can go up to 80 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought so.

Mr. MUSKIE. But whenever the Federal grant in some other program is as high as 80 percent, it would not be eligible for any assistance under this program. If a Federal grant under some other program were less than 80 percent, this program could be used, with supplementary grants up to 80 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. What would prompt the Federal Government under the Hill-Burton Act to make a contribution of as much as 80 percent? Would it not be based also on the capability of the location where construction will take place to contribute its share, as well as the need?

Mr. MUSKIE. Actually, as I understand it, the Federal contribution under the Hill-Burton program would vary, depending upon the kind of facility being built. If it is a general hospital, under the Hill-Burton program, I believe the maximum grant then applies, but under special kinds of facilities, the Federal contribution would vary. In addition, States depend upon the number of projects available in their States for the Hill-Burton program will vary in percentages depending upon how many projects and priority the State assigns to them. So that I do not believe we can use a flat across-the-board percentage as descriptive of the Hill-Burton program.

Mr. ELLENDER. What prompted the committee to make it possible to supplement moneys under the Hill-Burton Act to assist in the construction of hospitals?

Mr. MUSKIE. We did not concentrate on hospitals——

Mr. ELLENDER. No, I know that, but it is possible, is it not?

Mr. MUSKIE. It is possible.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is possible for a municipality, let us say, or a community, to obtain money from both the Hill-Burton as well as the accelerated public works?

Mr. MUSKIE. I can explain the theory to the Senator, in this way——

Mr. ELLENDER. I am wondering why it was done. Why do we not relegate this to public works other than hospitals? We have a special program already in operation. It is working well, I understand.

Mr. MUSKIE. First of all, the provision is the same as in the Appalachia bill which the Senate approved a short while ago, so that the principle, we thought, that since it was applicable to the undeveloped counties in Appalachia, which was approved by the Senate, it could also be applicable to other areas of the country in like circumstances.

The theory behind it is that once an area or community begins to go down hill economically, the resources available to it for taking advantage of its existing Federal programs are less than if it is a normal community not deteriorating economically. It is the theory that those communities then should get this extra boost permitted under the formula approved under the Appalachia bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yet the Hill-Burton Act as now written already provides contributions by the Government of up to 80 percent of the construction cost.

Mr. MUSKIE. I do not know what the percentage is.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my recollection of it, but——

Mr. MUSKIE. But, in the event there is an 80 percent grant under Hill-Burton, not 1 nickel will be available under this program.

Mr. McNAMARA. The total Federal grant cannot exceed 80 percent no matter what the program is.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky what is the maximum amount of percentage of money the Federal Government grants now for the construction of an interstate highway?

Mr. COOPER. Ninety percent.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Ninety percent, then the maximum that could be granted under this bill for any public project is 10 percent less than being granted by the billions of dollars to build highways; is that not correct?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I believe that the questions the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] have brought out clearly the provisions of this first section. As the Senator from Maine has pointed out those grants, which are made to a municipality or an area which the Administrator determines, will have a definite effect upon increasing the industrial and employment opportunities of that particular municipality or area, whether it be grants for facilities or land. But if in making that determination it is found that the community needs certain facilities such as sewage and water facilities, and other facilities, and the project is worthwhile, then we would be unable, if the community could not meet its 50 percent share, to make supplementary grants up to 80 percent. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the foreign aid bill we provide grants and loans for what the people in the State Department call "the infrastructure"; namely, public facilities which are necessary in order to help production in that particular locality or area and this is to provide the same opportunities for depressed areas in this country that we now provide under foreign aid for other nations; is that not correct?

Mr. COOPER. I believe that the word "infrastructure" is appropriate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a complicated word.

Mr. COOPER. It is the same phrase used in the military programs. The infrastructure in France is to build roads and airports.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, these commissions would not be substitutes for interstate compacts, would they?

Mr. MUSKIE. No, they would not be a substitute.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be the Federal chairman who would have the final say?

Mr. MUSKIE. That would be the Federal cochairman, and also the State cochairman.

Mr. AIKEN. The Federal cochairman would have to approve it. In other words, three separate States could not go on a tangent, without approval of the Federal chairman?

Mr. MUSKIE. On voting, approval is required of the Federal cochairman and also a majority of the States, or if there are only two State cochairmen, then one of them.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. What would they be authorized to do? Make recommendations only?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes; that is all the regional commissions can do; namely, develop programs and make recommendations for legislative authorization.

Mr. AIKEN. No authority whatsoever for making assessments on the States?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It is these States that qualify under the criteria listed on page 33—that is, the rate of unemployment substantially above the national rate, the median family income below the national income, housing, et cetera.

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. Eight criteria.

Mr. AIKEN. Those eight criteria—I am sorry I have not read this before. I read it only hurriedly now.

Mr. MUSKIE. These criteria are similar to that applied to the Appalachia group.

Mr. AIKEN. The expenses of these commissions are to be paid, how?

Mr. MUSKIE. By the Federal——

Mr. AIKEN. The Federal Government?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Federal Government, for the first 2 years and then the cost is divided equally between the Federal Government and the States with the States deciding the division among themselves.

Mr. AIKEN. They are not intended in any way, these commissions, to take the place of interstate compacts?

Mr. MUSKIE. No. Absolutely not.

Mr. AIKEN. Then there is nothing in here which exempts any number of States who desire to form an agreement, association, or compact on their own, which does not meet the criteria here? They would be required to get Federal approval?

Mr. MUSKIE. This does not prohibit it. In addition, the States are not eligible under the criteria, there is authorization for a study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator will proceed.

Mr. AIKEN. I was just wondering, we apparently have a shortage of labor in this area and I hope that it continues for awhile.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there has been some discussion apparently as to what type of programs would be eligible for grants under section 101 as well as under section 201. There is a rather full set of illustrations on page 9 and the top of page 10 of the report. If the Senator from Maine will permit me I should like to read those passages.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. I wanted to ask, in order to be sure, if a group of States entered into an agreement which does not fully comply with the conditions here—and this is not an agreement anyway—this is a commission—if they entered into an agreement, there is nothing in this bill which would exempt them from the requirement that they obtain approval of Congress?

Mr. MUSKIE. Absolutely not.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator from Vermont has the floor, and the Senator from Illinois is seeking recognition.

Mr. HRUSKA. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Title I is the one which is comparable to the Accelerated Public Works Act. Is that the way it is interpreted?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes; that is an extension and modification of the Public Works Act.

Mr. HRUSKA. In concept and in theory.

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Title II is interpreted as the Appalachia Act?

Mr. MUSKIE. No. It is more accurate to say that it is an extension of the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mr. HRUSKA. In the Area Redevelopment Act there is a limitation on the annual appropriation, as I understand.

Mr. MUSKIE. There was an authorization under that act of $455 million for 4 years.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is stated in subsection (c) that the authorization for the appropriation is indefinite in term. Is that a departure from the previous concept of the Area Redevelopment Act? I believe it to be.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Area Redevelopment Act was limited to 4 years so that we could have some experience under it, to test it and to review it again in 4 years, to determine whether it was worth continuing. I believe it was a 4-year authorization.

Mr. HRUSKA. Inasmuch as this is indefinite, it will not come back to Congress for review.

Mr. MUSKIE. It will be reviewed for appropriations each year.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is not what I am talking about. I am talking about the authorization.

Mr. MUSKIE. That is correct. I point out that it is subject to the annual appropriation process. That is not the question the Senator has asked, of course.

Mr. HRUSKA. The whole program would not come before the Senate automatically for review and reassessment in the light of the experience that gathered in the meantime. Is that correct?

Mr. MUSKIE. There is no provision for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO LIMIT DEBATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to consult with all the Members of the Senate, but I should like to propound a unanimous-consent request, and I hope the Senate will approve it. The hour is growing a little late. We have had a long, hard 2 days.

I ask unanimous consent that 1 hour of debate be allowed on any amendment to the bill, to be equally divided between the mover of the amendment and the majority leader or whomever he may designate, and that a vote on the passage of the bill occur at not later than 4 o'clock in the afternoon on Tuesday next, and that paragraph 3 of rule XII be waived.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand the problem that the majority leader is trying to resolve with his proposal. We have indeed had 2 long, hard days.

However, today we have sat here for 4 or 5 hours discussing the bill in a rather desultory manner in order to accommodate Senators who did not happen to be here, ready to vote.

Tomorrow morning I must leave the city. The bill is of great interest to me. I serve on the subcommittee and on the full committee before which the hearings were held. We have worked very hard on this bill. It is before us. The yeas and nays have been ordered on it. It seems to me we are changing directions at a very late hour merely because some Senators have come forward to say this did not accommodate their time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will yield, if there is any responsibility, it is mine, and I am not doing it to take care of any particular Senator. I am doing what I think is best in the position in which the Senate has placed me, to try to bring about an accommodation, which I believe is best suited to the occasion, and that is to vote not later than 4 p.m. on Tuesday next, not tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment to propose to the bill, which will deal with the Interstate Highway System. I am perfectly agreeable to have the unanimous consent request agreed to, but I would like to have it understood that the amendment I propose will not be objected to on the ground of germaneness.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would not object to it.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, that it might be excepted, as amendments usually are, from the germaneness provision.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask if the unanimous-consent request of the majority leader includes any time on the bill itself or merely allows 1 hour on each amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. One hour on each amendment, the vote on the bill to be had not later than 4 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday next, with plenty of time in between, which could be considered time on the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope that the request will be so modified as to indicate that a sufficient amount of time could be reserved for the bill itself. I do not know what the intention of the majority and minority leaders may be with respect to recessing or adjourning the Senate for the Memorial Day interval, but there should be ample opportunity given to discuss the bill as a whole.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would 4 hours on the bill be adequate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I add that to the request, to allow 4 hours of debate on the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I ask the distinguished majority leader when the time limitation would start?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Tomorrow.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I assume that the unanimous-consent agreement would include a provision that no Senator, because of the time for voting being set at 4 o'clock on Tuesday, would be cut off from offering an amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course not.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Could the majority leader respond to a question asked by another Senator as to what the leadership intention is with respect to the Memorial Day recess?

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I have the request acted on first?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is the intention of the leadership with reference to the hour at which the session next Tuesday would begin?

Mr. MANSFIELD. At 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. HOLLAND. That would leave no time, except 4 hours on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Except that time would be available all day tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then it is the intention of the leadership to have the agreement go into effect when we conclude the transaction of morning business tomorrow. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. And extend throughout the day tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it understood, as a part of the unanimous-consent request, that the germaneness rule will not apply to the amendment I shall propose?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—is it the intention of the leadership to have the votes come regularly at the end of each argument on the amendments tomorrow, or to have all the votes come next Tuesday at 4 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It might be possible to have one or two votes tomorrow. However, after the hour of 2 o'clock tomorrow I should say that we ought to postpone votes to the following Tuesday.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be present tomorrow, but I know that many Senators are expecting to get away early in the day tomorrow. If there is to be any sizable number of amendments to be offered, there ought to be some understanding on that score.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have endeavored to answer the Senator's questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Thursday, May 27, 1965, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That, in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him, except the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Ordered further, That, on the question of the final passage of the said bill, debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Ordered further, That the Senate proceed to vote on final passage of the bill not later than 4 p.m. on Tuesday, June 1.

PROGRAM FOR SESSIONS OF THE SENATE OVER THE MEMORIAL DAY WEEKEND—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. Each Senator has received a notification that, so far as the Memorial Day holiday is concerned, it will extend from the conclusion of business tomorrow until noon on Tuesday, June 1. There will be a pro forma meeting on Friday.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow it stand in adjournment until 9 o'clock on Friday morning, May 28, for the purpose of having a pro forma meeting; in other words, "in and out," without the transaction of any business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have requested the distinguished majority leader to indicate that I have an amendment on which there is general agreement. It would strengthen the bill in that it would do away with any possibility of a plant being removed from one region to another. I feel that we could vote on the amendment tomorrow, and I hope that I shall be privileged to have the attention of the Senate in connection with the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope that the Senator is successful.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, under those circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I object, unless the Senator is not trying to withdraw the yeas and nays for the final passage of the bill. Is he?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no. But there is no use of encumbering all the discussions with the yeas and nays at this time. A request for the yeas and nays can be made at any time later.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection if that is the intention of the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The order for the yeas and nays is rescinded.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY UNTIL NOON ON TUESDAY, JUNE 1

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the pro-forma meeting on Friday next is concluded, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, first, I wish to thank the able chairman of the Public Works Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], for the fine work which he has done upon the bill.

I should like to make some supplementary remarks tonight on the bill as a whole so that we may proceed as speedily as possible tomorrow with amendments. I appreciate the marvelously cooperative work which the Senator from Michigan and the whole Public Works Committee have carried out. But I should like to point out some of the direct economic advantages which have come from the Area Redevelopment Act.

The careful studies which the Administrator of that act has made indicate that approximately 70,000 direct jobs have been created by that act. Assuming a multiplier of 1.65, which is the multiplier used by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, that would mean a total of 46,000 additional jobs, or a grand total of 116,000 jobs created under the Area Redevelopment Act program. The group of businessmen and bankers on the northeast coast have estimated that a multiplier of 2 is better than the one now used of 1.65. If that is so, that would mean the direct and indirect creation of 140,000 jobs. But I shall not use that figure, but will use instead the conservative figure of 116,000 jobs.

Let us carry out some assuptions to see what has happened. The average earnings of the people placed in jobs under the Area Redevelopment Act program, would probably be around $4,000 a year, which would be roughly $80 a week. With 116,000 jobs created, that would mean a total increase in payroll of $464 million. That is the increase in income to individuals. This has operated to increase governmental revenues on a Federal, State, and local basis, and to decrease expenditures on a Federal, State, and local basis.

Now I should like to make some very conservative estimates of these savings.

First, as to the increase in income, if the average earnings are $4,000, of which approximately $1,200 would be taxable, or the amount in excess of $2,800, the average Federal income tax would be about $200 per person. Two hundred dollars multiplied by 116,000 would be equal to $23 million a year. So, in all probability, there has been an increase of $23 million a year in Federal income taxes. At the same time, there has been an increase in the Federal income tax paid by corporations each year and this has been assumed to be approximately $30 million. So that the total increase in Federal revenues has been approximately $53 million each year.

In addition, there has been an increase in State and local taxes of an undetermined amount, but a very real amount, because the people with more money in their pockets naturally buy more, subject to a sales tax and State income taxes, and this would increase State revenues. People would have more money to pay the taxes on their homes, and that would increase local revenues as well. But I am not counting that in.

It is safe to say that well over $50 million a year would be paid in increased revenues to the Federal Government alone, not to mention State government and local government receipts.

This is most conservative. On the other hand, there would be a decrease in expenditures. Virtually all those people previously were unemployed. The vast majority were either on relief or were receiving unemployment compensation. I have made a most conservative estimate that at least 80,000 of the 116,000 were in receipt of unemployment compensation payments. The average benefits under unemployment compensation amount to approximately $36 or $37 a week, or $1,800 a year. Therefore, there has been a saving in unemployment compensation, which I estimate as $144 million a year; namely, 80,000 people multiplied by $1,800 a year. One thousand eight hundred dollars means $36 a week for 52 weeks.

In addition, there has been a saving on general assistance. Assuming that this also amounts to about $800 a year, and assuming that 10,000 of these previously unemployed people were recipients of relief, that would mean a saving of $8 million a year.

Thus we have a total of close to $200 million a year in savings to Federal, State, and local governments.

I emphasize that the total amount loaned up to March 31, 1965, over 4 years, for industrial and commercial loans amounted to $175 million. The public facility loans and grants as of that same date amounted to $93 million. Then with allowance for technical assistance and training, the total costs as of March 31, 1965, were $306 million. That was for a period of more than 4 years, whereas the savings to the Government alone would amount to approximately $200 million a year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The figures which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has stated are extremely impressive. I wish to make sure that I understand how much additional was paid in income taxes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We make an estimate that those who were employed and were previously unemployed received approximately $80 a week, which is approximately $26 below the average for manufacturing, or $4,000 a year, and of that amount $2,800 would be nontaxable; $1,200 would be taxable. With a payment of about 16 percent tax rate, $200 in Federal income tax would be paid per person, not received by the Federal Government previously, and that would amount to $23 million a year for the 116,000 persons.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the amount paid in personal income taxes of $23 million, added to the savings in unemployment compensation of $144 million, added to the savings in relief costs——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of $8 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of $8 million, totals close to $200 million a year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Included in that should also be the fact that corporations and employers would be doing business there, and therefore the profits which they might make would be subject to taxation. We estimate that that would be about $30 million a year. Then there would be State and local taxes, which we have not included.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I point out to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the costs which he was talking about are very largely interest repayable loans.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. They were not grants, but primarily loans.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. These were loans repayable with interest. What is the record of ARA firms in paying back such loans?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall supply that for the RECORD. The losses in the first year were appreciably more than they would have been for bank loans, but the record has steadily improved.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Secretary of Commerce testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency that the record of repayment on loans was most impressive, especially considering the circumstances under which the loans were made, and that he felt, as the Senator from Illinois has said, that the record is improving.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The figures which the Senator from Illinois has placed in the RECORD are eloquent testimony to the fact that this is an excellent investment. It is an investment that is paying for itself over a period of years, and paying for itself rapidly. First, because, as the Senator has pointed out, more taxes are paid; second, because relief and unemployment compensation is less; third, because the loans that are made are very largely being repaid with interest, and are being repaid promptly. That is the kind of information that has not been brought out previously as to the effects of the ARA program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. Now I should like to supply the figures as to the delinquencies as of March 31, 1965. At that time, the loans disbursed amounted to $96,500,000. Loans foreclosed amounted to $808,000.

Mr. PROXMIRE. $808,000 as compared with $96 million—less than 1 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. Loans in foreclosure amounted to $1,550,000, or total foreclosures of $3,358,000—approximately 2½ percent.

In addition, $9 million in loans were delinquent, although only a small part of this amount will result in losses. I think one can safely estimate that the vast majority of the loans, amounting to close to $100 million, will be paid back. I do not believe that the losses will be appreciable for this type of program.

So on the basis of grants of $93 million and losses of not more than $10 million on loans, the total cost to the Government would not greatly exceed $100 million, and the revenues of the Government should be improved by at least $200 million a year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the return is 2 to 1.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not only is the return 2 to 1; the gains are annual gains. The losses are total losses for the 4-year period.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the ratio is 2 to 1 a year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The gains are really much more than the amount of money expended. The amount of money does not take into account the human part of the program, namely, the restoration of self-respect, the aid to the local communities in preventing them from dying, and the greater utilization of such structures as churches and schools and of telephone services, utility services, and the rest.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is the most impressive feature of all. The very fact that additional people will pay taxes and there will be additional economic development is most encouraging for the country as a whole. These are the areas that are dying, that are extremely sick. These are the areas where the future is almost hopeless.

In addition to the statistical assistance that we can see, there is a very real, human opportunity for people to live in communities they know and love, communities where they are acceptable and have had their family ties; perhaps where their families have lived for generations. This is the kind of human assistance that cannot be measured in statistical terms, but is, nevertheless, immensely important.

When that is added to the monetary return to the Federal Government in a ratio of 2 to 1 a year, the record the ARA has developed is remarkable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it justifies the existence of the program. I have become a little fed up with the rather captious criticisms that have been made of it. It has been a marvelous human investment and a paying economic investment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On that very score, is it not true that the arguments that have been made that this is merely borrowing employment from some other area of the country has little validity in the economy in which we are operating?

Most areas of the country are close to full employment. In the Wisconsin area, the heavily populated southeastern part has virtually no real unemployment. On the other hand, in the northern part of the State there is heavy unemployment. The fact that additional jobs can be provided without endangering in a significant way other parts of the country means that this program provides an overall gain in employment. It is not a question of borrowing jobs from one area against another as a matter of unfair or subsidized competition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wisconsin is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Illinois yields the floor, I should like to ask him one or two further questions, because he is the author of the bill.

Is it not true that this is a conservative refinement of the ARA and of the accelerated public works program in a real sense?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true. The standards are much stricter than they were in the original accelerated public works program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that fewer counties would probably be able to qualify under the rural criteria. The other criteria were more lenient. Under this stricter, more conservative bill, which requires counties to have an income of less than 40 percent of the national average, fewer counties throughout the country—and I am positive fewer counties in Wisconsin—would be able to qualify.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To qualify, they would have to be areas of need.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that grants must be tied to specific developments?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; grants would be made on much stricter terms than under the accelerated public works program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Accelerated public works were made for a much broader range of purposes. ARA also made grants up to 100 percent. This bill would make grants only up to 80 percent.

The accelerated public works program provided $450 million a year for 2 years and ARA about $75 million over 4 years, or $19 million a year, for a total of about $470 million if the two were combined. This bill provides $400 million for public facility grants which is less.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Furthermore, ARA loans authorized by Public Law 87-27—the Area Redevelopment Act—were about $300 million. While loans under this bill would be $170 million annually, they would be interest bearing and fully repayable.

Also, there is a change—the interest rebate factor—which involves overwhelmingly private enterprise money. This provision provides for a modest $5 million a year investment by the Federal Government, but it will encourage $250 million of investment funds, and they would be private enterprise funds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; a 2-percent interest subsidy would make possible the unlocking of $250 million a year in capital investment. On a 10-year basis, that would be a total investment of $2.5 billion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois has performed an outstanding service in this field for many years. He has had to fight his way up the hill many times to have this program enacted.

First, what I like about the bill is that it is national in scope as compared with the Appalachia bill, which was confined to a limited area.

In the second place, it stresses private enterprise and private development. It does not provide for a gigantic federally controlled and directed public works program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe that the overwhelming involvement, the public decisions, are made at the local level; the judgment and discipline of the marketplace at the local level is at work here.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Basic investment decisions will be left up to the private sector of our economy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Primarily so. However, of course, there are grants for infrastructure or development facilities.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But the whole purpose of the grants is to create a climate which would be otherwise unattractive to private enterprise, attractive to private enterprise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The purpose is to have the initiative and incentive and the planning come up from the bottom, from the local communities.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The opposition on the part of conservative people on the ground that this would interfere with private enterprise and would be some Government activity misses the point. The new jobs would be created by individual American enterprise—much of it corporate enterprise—and would be subject to all the disciplines and all the energizing and initiative factors involved in private individual enterprise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin, who has been one of the most valuable committee members and one of those who helped the most in forming the bill, if some of our best witnesses were bankers.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. In fact, the Secretary of Commerce, who is one of the best known and one of the most highly successful businessmen in the national business community, has had a chance to study the measure carefully and has given it his unqualified support and endorsement.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I want to say briefly that I am very happy that S. 1648 is nearing passage in the Senate. It is a very important bill.

A great deal of credit is due to a number of my colleagues, whom I highly commend. Among others there are the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the senior Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. McNamara], and very particularly, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], who has never ceased to work for and urge this kind of legislation, from which useful projects will put people to work not merely at the site of the project but also in the factory, in transportation, and on the arteries in between.

I am very happy to have been one of the numerous cosponsors of this project, as was my colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett]. I point out that for a good many years I have urged the resumption of accelerated public works. I have previously introduced amendments and bills to bring this about.

This is a bill in a somewhat modified form which would not go quite as far as I should like to have it go, in view of the fact that our experience has shown that when the accelerated public works project was before us, the funds originally appropriated and authorized for this purpose, some $880 million, quickly vanished for worthwhile expenditures, and at the time and subsequent to the expiration of those appropriations, some $100 million of worthwhile projects, fully matched and ready to go, had to be abandoned. Many of those projects will be resumed now.

I believe that it is particularly gratifying, however, that the bill in its original form has now been amended. The original version of the bill did have an appropriation of $250 million annually. That amount has now been increased to $400 million.

I should say that I consider these sums to be not expenditures but investments in the finest sense of the word. Their use would create worthwhile needed projects, and would put people to work.

Much as I applauded the President's war on poverty, I felt then and feel now that it was not sufficiently implemented to do the job of putting the people to work and putting them to work now. Much of the war on poverty has not been a long-range project, then and now, particularly in view of the fact that we are at the height of a prosperity never before equaled in the history of our Nation and that we have continuous unemployment.

I also applaud the fact that the original version of the bill has been changed to include Alaska and Hawaii, which, in the original draft, were omitted because of the fact that they were not areas which were contiguous to the States. That has been changed by amendment.

I was glad to listen to the words of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], who has supported this legislation very ably and effectively.

I believe that this is an important step. I believe that this session of Congress will be noted for its fine and rapid achievements. We have passed bills that will be of tremendous value. There are still many more such measures ahead.

I am confident that this Congress will go down as one of the most productive Congresses in history and that the moves that have been taken are largely and almost wholly in the public interest.

L.B.J. VIETNAM POLICY UNANIMOUSLY SUPPORTED BY ON-THE-SPOT EXPERTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there are few more expert among the journalistic fraternity than Thomas B. Ross, correspondent of the Chicago Sun-Times.

Mr. Ross has covered the State Department and been a specialist for the State Department in foreign affairs.

Mr. Ross was sent recently by the Chicago Sun-Times to Vietnam. He has been there since May 1. On last Sunday, May 23, he filed what to me was a very interesting report on Vietnam.

I should like to quote from it briefly. Mr. Ross considers the reaction in Vietnam to our building up of troops and forces and launching air strikes in Vietnam, and states:

> Nevertheless, in the virtually unanimous view of officials and observers here, there was no acceptable alternative to the major U.S. buildup which began in February along with launching of airstrikes on North Vietnam.
>
> "The clock stood at 1 minute to midnight," a high-ranking official here observed, and the only other course of action was an abrupt and humiliating withdrawal.
>
> That, in the judgment of every experienced observer this reporter has been able to contact in this area, would have led eventually to complete Communist Chinese domination of southeast Asia.

Mr. Ross is not a man who is ingrained with campaigning for military action. He is dispassionate, and an objective, competent reporter.

Allow me to repeat that last short sentence. It reads:

> That, in the judgment of every experienced observer this reporter has been able to contact in this area, would have led eventually to complete Communist Chinese domination of southeast Asia.

Mr. Ross goes on to say:

> Critics of President Johnson's Vietnam policy may abound in Washington and elsewhere in the United States, but they are all but impossible to find out here.
>
> A Titoist solution may seem feasible on the American campus, but this reporter has been unable to locate a single resident American—soldier, diplomat, journalist, or scholar—who thought it was a possibility in the current climate of militant expansionism in Peiping.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Chicago Sun-Times of Sunday, May 23, 1965, entitled "United States Courts a Showdown in Vietnam," written by Thomas B. Ross, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UNITED STATES COURTS A SHOWDOWN IN VIETNAM

(By Thomas B. Ross)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Although the United States has been striving since Korea to prevent the involvement of American soldiers in a war on the Asian mainland, the U.S. establishment here is now seeking just that as a solution to the grim impasse in Vietnam.

High civilian and military officials alike are hoping for a direct confrontation between U.S. combat troops and the Communist Vietcong before the end of June.

The design is to draw the Communists into a "reverse Dienbienphu"—a decisive defeat which will force them to sue for peace. The French, of course, had the same idea in 1954 only to be routed by the Communist-dominated Vietminh nationalists and compelled to abandon their colonies in Indochina.

But U.S. military men insist there is scant similarity between the French position at Dienbienphu and the American position today.

The French decided to make their stand in North Vietnam at a point at which the Vietminh commanded the high ground and were operating over relatively short lines of supply.

In South Vietnam today the Vietcong find themselves at the end of a long precarious line of supply which is under heavy bombardment by U.S. planes. And U.S. forces are deployed in the coastal flatlands in terrain favorable to their sophisticated weaponry and with a mighty armada of war and supply ships supporting their rear.

U.S. POSITION AT LOWEST EBB

There are now at least 70,000 U.S. military men in the southeast Asian theater—close to 45,000 in Vietnam and the rest in the surrounding waters and Thailand.

Even so, the U.S. position, in a territorial sense, has never been at a lower ebb. The Vietcong control more of the countryside than ever before and the United States, like France before it, is largely tied down in static defense of key installations and urban centers.

The Government commands so little open ground and covets what it has so jealously that, as one U.S. Air Force general complained: "This is the first war where we've had to rent battlefields."

In these last-ditch circumstances, the strategy of confrontation is as much a counsel of despair as it is of hope. It is in effect an admission that the plan of counterinsurgency, promulgated with such promise by President John F. Kennedy in 1961, has failed and that the war must be won by direct force of U.S. arms.

It also represents a challenge to the original admonition of Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor that it would be foolhardy for the white man to pit himself against the yellow man on Asian soil.

Nevertheless, in the virtually unanimous view of officials and observers here, there was no acceptable alternative to the major U.S. buildup which began in February along with launching of air strikes on North Vietnam.

"The clock stood at 1 minute to midnight," a high-ranking official here observed, and the only other course of action was an abrupt and humiliating withdrawal.

That, in the judgment of every experienced observer this reporter has been able to contact in this area, would have led eventually to complete Communist Chinese domination of southeast Asia.

POLICY PLEASES AMERICANS IN VIETNAM

Critics of President Johnson's Vietnam policy may abound in Washington and elsewhere in the United States, but they are all but impossible to find out here.

A Titoist solution may seem feasible on the American campus, but this reporter has been unable to locate a single resident American—soldier, diplomat, journalist or scholar—who thought it was a possibility in the current climate of militant expansionism in Peiping.

And so, the growing American presence in Vietnam is viewed here with great satisfaction and with a conviction that the United States cannot now be forced out by military means. If there is to be a withdrawal, the belief here is that it will come through the pressure of American public opinion, reacting to frustrating stalemate and mounting casualties.

This view is clearly shared by Peiping which has been predicting openly in party publications that the U.S. Government, prodded by popular discontent and the "bourgeois intellectuals," will abandon Vietnam.

The nagging question is how the Communists will seek to accelerate this "historic inevitability."

Key U.S. military men are speculating that the Vietcong will attack U.S. forces late in June. Several battalions of regular troops have been infiltrated into the central highlands from North Vietnam in the last few months and U.S. intelligence analysts believe they must make a move sometime during the current monsoon seasons.

U.S. bombing raids have seriously damaged Vietcong supply routes and it is felt the Communists must strike decisively with what they now have or withdraw for replenishment. Their capacity for sustained combat on a conventional level is not rated as very good.

This has led many officials, particularly civilians, to doubt that the Vietcong will risk an open showdown. For 20 years they have prosecuted a successful guerrilla war by committing their forces only when they were clearly dominant.

Their central tactic is to overwhelm isolated, undermanned outposts and then to dissolve into the jungle or the rice paddies when superior Government strength moves into position.

SELECTIVE KILLERS

They operate under tight discipline and with consummate political calculation. Rape is unheard of among them and, although they resort to terror when all else fails, they are highly selective in their assassination. An ineffectual province or district chief will be spared. An efficient one will be killed. The tax collector, nemesis of the peasant who must often pay both the government and the Vietcong, is likely to be the first to go.

The Vietcong are also masters at the arts of friendly persuasion, when it serves their purpose. During one recent incursion in the central highlands, their first act was to relieve the local women of the chore of sweeping the marketplace. Then, to the delight of the townspeople, who are without radio, television, movies, or any other notable diversion, they provided 2 hours of well-rehearsed entertainment.

Through such a combination of ingratiation and terror, the Vietcong have achieved a high degree of immunity. They move freely throughout most of the country with little fear that the local populace will betray them to the Government.

FAILURE OF NATIVE LEADERSHIP

In many areas, when wounded, they boldly resort to hospitals run by the U.S. aid mission, confident that their identity will be concealed. In the last few weeks, they are known to have used Nha Trang, a Government-held seashore resort 200 miles northeast of Saigon, as a rest and recreation site for whole companies of guerrillas from nearby units.

The Government's great difficulty in acquiring intelligence on the Vietcong is matched by its inability to respond quickly to what information it does obtain. This represents a failure of leadership, a direct outgrowth of the calculated efforts of the French to prevent the formation of a native class of commissioned and noncommissioned officers.

The deficiencies of leadership are also reflected in the inadequate performance of the Vietnamese army. The fighting qualities of the Vietnamese foot soldier have often been called into question.

But, in fact, his American advisers are convinced he will perform competently, even bravely, when properly led and, particularly, when he is operating in or near his native locale.

However, the army has yet to demonstrate that it can exercise any enduring control in the countryside beyond the provincial and district capitals. This has led to a decision—at least for the immediate future—to shelve the rural pacification program.

The focus of the war has thus been shifted from counterguerrilla activity to a more traditional form of combat, replete with fire bombs and supersonic aircraft, in short, the United States is seeking to substitute a type of warfare in which it excels for one in which it has proven somewhat amateurish.

It is still much too soon to tell whether sophisticated weapons and conventional ground troops can succeed where counterinsurgency has failed. In fact, there is some evidence of popular resentment to the expanding use of napalm, a development which is not surprising if one has observed a hospital ward full of bleeding women and children seared from head to toe.

BOMBINGS BOOST GOVERNMENT MORALE

But, nevertheless, the massive bombing runs begun in February have had a decisive effect on the morale of the Government and the army. Prime Minister Phan Huy Quat, a reserved intellectual normally given to cautious statement, has blossomed into a veritable warhawk.

Even within the Buddhist hierarchy, which had been flirting with neutralism, the bombings have produced a marked swing toward pro-Government and pro-American sentiment—a "complete turnaround" in the view of a leading political analyst.

And, particularly in the Mekong River Delta, which comprises the lower third of South Vietnam, there are the first faint signs that the villagers and the peasants are beginning to look upon the Government, rather than the Vietcong, as the likely victor.

This, of course, is critically significant amongst a populace which is ideologically neutral, yet relatively well off by Asian standards.

Although 40 percent of its babies die in their first year and the annual per capita income is just a shade over $100, South Vietnam manages to feed its 15 million citizens better than most of its neighbors feed theirs.

This is a result of the great fertility of the Mekong Delta which is producing 5 million tons of rice—and exporting 300,000 tons of it—each year despite the pronounced disruptions of the war. If peace came to Vietnam, that crop could be doubled, perhaps quadrupled within a year, in the estimation of U.S. economic advisers in the field.

These men, serving with great courage in exposed rural areas, are held in high esteem by the Vietnamese people who, on the whole, show little resentment to the growing American presence in their country.

THE CRITICAL TEST AHEAD

The critical test of whether the new white man is to be accepted as a friend or resented as the colonial successor to the French will likely come in the areas of massive U.S. troop concentrations.

The original Army advisers here were well schooled in the modern doctrines of psychological warfare, even though they sometimes seemed to bark out their lines like a military command: "Win the hearts and minds of the people, and that's an order, sergeant."

On the other hand, the marines and paratroopers recently landed see their mission in old-fashioned terms: "Kill Vietcong."

With little thought for local sensibilities, the marines guarding the Da Nang Airbase openly refer to the primitive village within their lines as "Dogpatch."

When a visiting American asked a guard for the real name of the town, the marine replied with conviction: "It's Dogpatch." Other marines within earshot nodded agreement. It took a call to the command post to produce the correct name, Tong Vu Su, which, as any marine knows, means Dogpatch in Vietnamese.

The adult villagers in and around the marine encampments are conventionally inscrutable and withdrawn, though they have learned to hang out signs which read: "O.K. Laundry. Done Quickly and Carefully."

The children are enthusiastic and vocal. "Hello, Hello," they shout at every passing jeep. "You No. 1. Vietcong No. 10. Give me 5 P's (5 piastres, about a nickel)."

The marines are responding with normal GI generosity—too much so in the view of the local bulldozer operators, who recently conducted a brief strike to protest the fact that the town peddlers were taking in 300 piastres a day, 10 times their own wages. An order by the brigade commander brought the peddlers under control, but the marines have refused to stem the flow of money to the children who have become their tacit allies in a life-and-death friendship.

CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR OFTEN A TIPOFF

On their regular patrols of the surrounding Communist-controlled territory, the marines are constantly subject to Vietcong ambushes, usually in the small villages.

The adult townspeople can generally be coerced by the Vietcong into silence and a convincing display of normal activity. But the children, whether unconsciously or by design, repeatedly give evidence in their behavior of impending danger. So alerted, several marine patrols have withdrawn or made for cover in time.

At some point in the next few weeks, in the expectation of many high-ranking military men, one of these patrols may make contact with the advance patrol of Vietcong battalion. Then, the great confrontation may be at hand.

But even if this should not materialize, some climax to the Vietnam war seems to be in the offing. Ambassador Taylor and his principal advisers are convinced that North Vietnam is hurting desperately from the relentless U.S. airstrikes. Should the Vietcong call off their expected monsoon offensive, it would only confirm these men in their conviction that the Communists will be forced to the conference table before the end of the year.

If they are wrong in their calculations, if the Vietcong can endure despite the pounding of their supply lines and their staging areas, then the prospect is for a war that will drag on for several more years.

And in that event it will not be decided in the jungles and rice paddies of this pathetically beautiful country. It will be decided in the United States by a rich and comfortable people who must judge the extent of their interest in saving a poor and desperate nation.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Certain Shipments Insured by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association and Export-Import Bank

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on shipments to Yugoslavia, insured by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association and the Export-Import Bank, for the month of April 1965; to the Committee on Appropriations:

Amendment of Section 2634 of Title 10, United States Code, Relating to Transportation of Certain Motor Vehicles

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of members of the Armed Forces on a change of permanent station (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation liquidation fund, for the quarterly period ended March 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Research Progress and Plans of the Weather Bureau

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research progress and plans of the U.S. Weather Bureau, for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Activities and Transactions Under Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the quarterly period ended March 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Title XIII: War Risk Insurance of Federal Aviation Act of 1958

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Title XIII: War Risk Insurance of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Extension of Provisions of Title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, Relating to War Risk Insurance

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Section 204 of Communications Act of 1934

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 204 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize a contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Amendment of Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, To Authorize Additional Appropriations

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Provision of Certain Authority for U.S. Information Agency

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Amendment of Administrative Expenses Act of 1946

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty station within the continental United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary procurement of air passenger service on scheduled commercial airliners from Japan and Korea to the United States, Department of Defense, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on loose management in budgeting and financial reporting for certain educational exchange activities, Department of State, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs resulting from the failure to furnish available parts to a contractor engaged in the production of ¾-ton trucks, Department of the Army, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inadequate management of special purpose ammunition pallets resulted in unnecessary procurement actions, Department of the Navy, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improper use of funds appropriated for operation and maintenance expenses, U.S. Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improper payment of port charges on shipment to Colombia of food donated under title III of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Agency for International Development, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on failure to adequately consider the financial advantages of purchasing over leasing automatic data processing systems used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive payments of temporary lodging allowances to uniformed personnel on the Island of Oahu, Hawaii, Department of Defense and Department of the Treasury, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive interest costs incurred on certain income tax refunds, Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use appropriated funds for the payment of medical care of temporary and seasonal employees and employees located in isolated areas who become disabled because of injury or illness not attributable to official work, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Maj. Derrill deS. Tenholm, Jr., U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Col. Eugene F. Tyree, U.S. Air Force, retired (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Robert J. Becker, U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT AND HEARINGS ON VOTING IN MISSISSIPPI

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report and hearings on voting in Mississippi (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PREMIUM PAY UNDER SPECIFIED CONDITIONS TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for premium pay under specified conditions to certain employees in the postal field service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SEVERANCE PAY TO CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide severance pay to certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK LEGISLATURE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK RESOLUTION No. 90

Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to condemn anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and to take steps to prevent further persecutions of, and acts of terrorism and confiscation against, Jews residing therein

Whereas the people of the State of New York and of the United States are deeply shocked by reports appearing in the press and elsewhere concerning the continued oppression, persecution and tyranny of the Government of Soviet Russia directed toward Russian Jewry residing in Soviet Russia; and

Whereas many acts of terrorism, confiscation and persecution have already been committed against such Jewry and even more serious acts are threatened; and

Whereas such acts have resulted, unjustly and unwarrantedly, in the confiscation of property and in the deprivation of rights, privileges and immunities possessed by the Jewish people in that country; and

Whereas the Government of the United States, because of its humanitarian interest in the various peoples of this country and their interest in and relationship to the persecuted Jews of Soviet Russia, should register emphatic protest with the Russian Government with a firm request that it should cease and desist in its program of persecution; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has on other occasions intervened and interceded in behalf of persecuted minorities in other countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the President and the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully memorialized to condemn anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and that the Secretary of State of the United States of America be and he hereby is respectfully memorialized to lodge an official protest on behalf of the Government of the United States with the Russian Government against the concerted attack presently being continued directly and indirectly, by the latter government toward Russian Jews residing in such country and that the Department of State be and it hereby is respectfully memorialized to employ its best diplomatic efforts in an attempt to persuade the Russian Government to desist from any further persecutions and acts of terrorism and confiscation complained of in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Secretary of State of the United States and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to do everything possible to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

By order of the assembly:

JOHN T. KENNAN,
Clerk.

In senate, May 12, 1965. Concurred in, without amendment.

By order of the senate:

GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN,
Secretary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

ENROLLED SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 35

A concurrent resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, unless Congress shall sooner have submitted such an amendment, to provide for the election of the President and Vice President in a manner fair and just to the people of the United States; directing the Secretary of the Senate to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the several Members of the said bodies representing this State therein

Whereas under the Constitution of the United States, presidential and vice-presidential electors in the several States are now elected on a statewide basis, each State being entitled to as many electors as it has Senators and Representatives in Congress; and

Whereas the presidential and vice-presidential electors who receive the plurality of the popular vote in a particular State become entitled to cast the total number of electoral votes allocated to that State irrespective of how many votes may have been cast for other candidates for elector; and

Whereas this method of electing the President and Vice President is unfair and unjust in that it does not reflect the minority votes cast; and

Whereas the need for a change has been recognized by Members of Congress on numerous occasions through the introduction of various proposals for amending the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 30th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

SECTION 1. That application is hereby made to Congress under article V of the Constitution of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an article of amendment to the Constitution providing for a fair and just division of the electoral votes within the States in the election of the President and Vice President.

SEC. 2. That if and when Congress shall have proposed such an article of amendment this application for a convention shall be deemed withdrawn and shall be no longer of any force and effect.

SEC. 3. That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the several Members of said bodies representing this State therein.

Adopted by the senate the 12th day of April, 1965.

Robert M. Murphy,
Acting President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 12th day of May, 1965.

J. D. McCarty,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

CERTIFICATION

State of Oklahoma,
County of Oklahoma, ss:

I, Basin R. Wilson, secretary of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of Enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 35 as the same was adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the 30th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, the original hereof being on file in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Oklahoma.

Witness my hand and the seal of my office at the State capitol this 19th day of May 1965.

Basil R. Wilson,
Secretary of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 7597. An act to establish the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund in the Treasury and to authorize initial capital to operate insurance programs under title 38, United States Code, section 725 (Rept. No. 246).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

H.R. 3708. An act to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging" (Rept. No. 247).

By Mr. BAYH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 45. A bill for the relief of Maj. Raymond G. Clark, Jr. (Rept. No. 248);

S. 69. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Genevieve Olsen (Rept. No. 249);

S. 97. A bill for the relief of Lt. Raymond E. Berube, Jr. (Rept. No. 250);

S. 134. A bill for the relief of Lloyd K. Hirota (Rept. No. 251);

S. 263. A bill for the relief of Honorata A. Vda de Narra (Rept. No. 252);

S. 304. A bill for the relief of W. J. B. Daniel (Rept. No. 253);

S. 321. A bill for the relief of Leo M. Mondry (Rept. No. 254);

S. 572. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Wolverton (Rept. No. 255);

S. 919. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired) (Rept. No. 256);

S. 1008. A bill for the relief of Ottilia Bruegmann James (Rept. No. 257);

S. 1068. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Starr (Rept. No. 258);

S. 1267. A bill for the relief of Jack C. Winn, Jr. (Rept. No. 259);

H.R. 1867. An act for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles (Rept. No. 260);

H.R. 2299. An act for the relief of Robert L. Yates and others (Rept. No. 261);

H.R. 3051. An act for the relief of Vermont Maple Orchards, Inc., Burlington, Vt. (Rept. No. 262);

H.R. 3074. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Stevens (Rept. No. 263); and

H.R. 3899. An act for the relief of C. R. Sheaffer & Sons (Rept. No. 264).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2037. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to provide for certain international affairs programs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 2038. A bill for the relief of Miu-Ling Chung Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S.2039. A bill for the relief of Yasuo Tsukikawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JORDAN of Idaho:

S. 2040. A bill for the relief of Dr. Dean H. Gosselin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 2041. A bill for the relief of Aubrey Kenneth Foster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2042. A bill to amend section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 2043. A bill to terminate the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGovern when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. McGovern):

S. 2044. A bill to amend section 13(b) of the act of October 3, 1962 (76 Stat. 698, 704), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. Scott, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Morton, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Tower):

S. 2045. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 2046. A bill for the relief of Adele Romanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 2047. A bill to require the publication of all tax rulings which affect the revenue in an amount of $100,000 or more; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gore when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. Long of Missouri):

S. 2048. A bill to designate the Joanna Dam and Reservoir proposed for construction on the Salt River near Joanna, Mo., as the "Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir"; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Symington when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S.J. Res. 87. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ervin when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. Lausche) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 109) authorizing a complete study and investigation with respect to inspection, shipment, sale, and distribution for human consumption of meat and meat products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Williams of Delaware, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to expand the National Defense Education Act, providing grants and stipends to encourage the training of students and teachers for work in international affairs.

The bill, which would add less than $3.5 million to the appropriation request for the National Defense Education Act in fiscal year 1966, would amend the National Defense Education Act to:

Provide grants to colleges and universities to aid in the establishment and operation of international affairs programs to train individuals for oversea business or government work, for work in the United States in international affairs, or for teaching or research work in international affairs;

Provide stipends for students undertaking advanced training in order to teach international affairs in colleges; and

Provide grants to colleges to help in the establishment of short-term or regular session institutes on international affairs for high school teachers, with stipends for those participating in the program.

Mr. President, I also intend to introduce this bill as an amendment to the pending higher education bill.

This legislation is required to meet the growing national need for expertise in international affairs. The bill grew out of a Library of Congress survey of 32 U.S. universities and colleges, conducted several years ago at my request, which emphasized the need for expanding and improving programs in international affairs studies on high priority.

A greater number of students, teachers, businessmen, professional people, and government officials must be better prepared to deal with the growing challenges and opportunities in the international field. The increasing responsibilities inherent in U.S. free world leadership require additional efforts to improve the quality and expand the scope of international affairs studies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2037) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to provide for certain international affairs programs, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A BILL TO TERMINATE THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to transfer the jurisdiction and functions of the Indian Claims Commission to the Court of Claims upon the expiration of the life of the Commission on April 10, 1967. The bill provides that the three commissioners of the Commission would become commissioners of the Court of Claims with the same rights and tenure as other commissioners of that court. It empowers the Court of Claims to dispose of all claims transferred. The court may dissolve any appeal pending on the date of transfer, and deal with the cases as if they were within the original jurisdiction of the court, including in such original jurisdiction, the jurisdiction vested in the Indian Claims Commission and transferred to the court. The bill confers the necessary power on the chief judge of the Court of Claims to insure that the transfer is accomplished in a smooth and orderly fashion.

The Indian Claims Commission was created for a term of 10 years by the act of August 13, 1946, chapter 959, 60 Stat. 1049. The purpose of the act was to dispose of all the accumulated claims of Indian tribes. Congress allows 5 years for the tribes to file their claims and gave the Commission another 5 years to dispose of the claims. The 10-year period expired on April 10, 1957. It was extended for 5 years to 1962 and for another 5 years to April 10, 1967. On that date, April 10, 1967, the life of the Commission will expire unless Congress renews it, or otherwise provides for the claims cases.

Under this bill, the Commission would be allowed to expire and the cases would be turned over to the Court of Claims. After 18 years the Commission still has pending 380 out of an original 563 cases. The Commission dismissed 116 cases, and it may be fairly assumed that these included claims with obviously no merit. The Commission has rendered 73 awards, a substantial number of which were based on compromise agreements bebetween the United States and the tribal claimant. Even if we treat the settled cases as if they had been fully litigated before the Commission, the Commission has averaged only four awards per year, or if the first 5 years of the Commission's life are not counted, it has averaged less than six awards per year. Even at the higher average it will be the year 2028 before the Commission has completed its 5-year assignment.

The Commission has not fulfilled the function contemplated by Congress. When Congress gave the Commission 5 years to do the job, it also gave the Commission broad powers and discretion so that it could move the cases. Congress never intended these cases to be handled as formal lawsuits in which the Commission would play the part of a court, wait for the parties to produce their evidence and decide the case on whatever record might be brought to the Commission's attention.

Congress directed the Commission to establish an Investigation Division and Congress directed the Investigation Division to "make a complete and thorough search for all evidence affecting each claim" and to submit that evidence to the Commission and make it available to the parties. The idea back of this was for the Commission to inform itself on all claims, to bring the parties together, resolve conflicts, and work out practical determinations of the cases. This was to be done regardless of whether the tribes had attorneys. This emphasis on investigation and then determination of the facts and merits is reflected in the report of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs on the bill which became the Indian Claims Commission Act. That report stated in part—Senate Report No. 1715, 79th Congress, 2d session, page 5:

> This bill, as amended, proposes to create an Indian Claims Commission to investigate and determine the facts and the merits of Indian tribal claims against the United States existing prior to the passage of the act, and to report its findings with appropriate recommendations to Congress.
>
> The Commission would be composed of three Commissioners, appointed by the President with advice and consent of the Senate, and would be equipped with the usual powers of a factfinding commission to hold hearings and to examine witnesses. The Commission is directed to establish an Investigation Division and to make a complete and thorough search for all evidence affecting claims before it through the investigations in the field and in Government records.
>
> The interests of the Indian claimants in the investigations and determinations of the Commission are amply protected by the provisions of the bill requiring notice to all possible claimants, and notice and opportunity for hearing to all interested parties before making findings on any claim, and authorizing representation by attorneys.

The Commission has not fulfilled the investigatory and administrative functions as intended by Congress. It created an Investigation Division but it is largely a paper organization. After over 18 years of operation, the Commission's Investigation Division has not yet performed the statutory mandate to "make a complete and thorough search for all evidence affecting each claim." Instead, the Commission proceeded as if it were a court. It adapted its procedures to those of the U.S. district courts and even adopted substantially the same rules as those governing the Federal district courts. These rigid procedures and the lack of an effective, independent investigation of the facts in each case, precluded the possibility of the speedy determination of the cases intended by Congress.

The Commission has had 18 years. Its performance is a disappointment to the Indian people. It has not measured up to what Congress intended. An entire generation has passed since the claims were filed. The day will come when the Commission's affairs must be wound up. When that day comes, its docket and functions certainly will be transferred to the Court of Claims. That step should be taken now.

The Court of Claims is a mature, judicial body with long and deep experience in Indian claims cases. Before there was an Indian Claims Commission, all Indian claims were handled by the Court of Claims. Under the Indian Claims Commission Act, the Court of Claims is the appellate court for the Commission. The court is geared to handle the business of the Commission. A new court building is now under construction. There are 5 judges of the court and 17 commissioners. Under the bill, the 3 commissioners of the Indian Claims Commission would be transferred to the court, making a total of 20 commissioners. In the hands of the court, the claims cases stand a much better chance of effective disposition than they now have.

At present, there are 36 appeals from the Commission pending before the Court of Claims. In recent testimony before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, the Chief Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission explained that appeals were a cause of delay. Transfer of the cases to the Court of Claims in large measure would eliminate duplication of work and loss of appeal time, as well as the need for review resulting from the dissatisfaction of the parties with the actions of the Indian Claims Commission. Of course, review is necessary. Under this bill, the decisions of the Court of Claims would be subject to review by writ of certiorari, the same as other cases in that court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2043) to terminate the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McGovern, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THE 1965 ANTIDUMPING ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and Senators McCarthy, Carlson, Ribicoff, Bennett, Morton, Bayh, Bible, Clark, Dominick, Ervin, Hruska, Kuchel, Lausche, Moss, Mundt, Hickenlooper, Pearson, Randolph, Yarborough, Tower, and Talmadge, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921.

When the U.S. Antidumping Act was signed into law in 1921, almost 44 years ago to the day, our Nation was entering into an era of ever-increasing foreign trade interests and aspirations. Now, in the midsixties, it is clear that earlier problems have not faded away of themselves, but in many cases have continued to grow in complexity as advances in transportation and communication have forged forward to shrink distances and weld the nations of the world steadily and irrevocably into a much more closely knit fabric than ever before.

As the barriers to international trade are lessened—both those of a natural and those of manmade origin—and the highways of world commerce become crowded with an increasing volume of participants, it is a corollary that the "rules of the road" be clarified, so that all will know where they stand, what they can expect, and what will be expected of them in turn. I can think of no more appropriate words, therefore, to describe our efforts today to clarify the standards for application of our Antidumping Act than were delivered by Vice President Hubert Humphrey, then our distinguished colleague, when he initiated this legislative drive as the original sponsor in the Senate of the 1963 antidumping bill. In his accompanying remarks on April 14, 1963, he stated:

> The amendment I introduce today does not alter the philosophy or purpose of the Antidumping Act in any way. Its only purpose is to make the act more effective in achieving its original purpose and to help insure that international trade will be conducted in a fair and equitable fashion.

Later that year, on August 27, he reminded his colleagues in the Senate:

> This is not a problem that will disappear of its own accord * * *. I further hope that both Congress and the Executive branch will begin to take constructive steps to reach a solution that is not protectionist, but does provide for sound and equitable antidumping procedures that will foster international trade conducted in a responsible fashion. I do not claim this will be an easy or a self-evident task. But I do feel that it is becoming a task which we cannot afford to postpone much longer.

Two years have now elapsed and I say that it is time to get on with the job. Let there be no doubt of our resolve to continue this unfinished business. The increasing flow of international commerce, particularly after the GATT negotiations are concluded, will require the fair and effective operation of the U.S. Antidumping Act. Not a tariff or quota provision, the act is merely designed to assure a price floor on imports, tied not to U.S. prices, but to their own home market prices. In other words, if the foreign supplier sells his product cheaper to the United States than in his own home market—or to third countries, if sales in his home market are an inadequate basis for comparison—and then only after the Tariff Commission finds that this "dumping" injures a U.S. industry, a special dumping duty is determined by Treasury which in effect brings the price to the United States back up to the foreign price level. For all practical purposes, what the act says to the importer is that if an American industry is injured, the unfair advantage of the margin of dumping should be neutralized.

The basic unfairness of dumping is often due to the fact that the dumping price need not be related to costs of production. The "dumper" may be happy to unload his surplus production in any market—except his own—at any price he can get, or he may be deliberately pricing his products low to capture sales, knowing that he can raise his prices once competition is driven out. It is no wonder that GATT does not prohibit antidumping laws, and that all major trading nations enforce them.

The overriding purpose of this bill is to clarify the standards which the Treasury Department and the Tariff Commission are to apply in administering the Antidumping Act, and to make clear that the act is still what it was originally intended to be—not protectionist legislation—but an integral part of our laws dealing with unfair trade.

There is no reason why manufacturers of foreign merchandise for consumption in the United States should not be required to observe the same standards of fair and equitable trade that competing domestic sellers must observe. Yet, in recent years, the Tariff Commission has erroneously assumed that the Antidumping Act can be brought into play, if at all, only to afford to some dying domestic industry a measure of protection against competition from abroad, and has time and time again refused to find injury to an industry, even when a number of domestic producers have in fact sustained considerable injuries resulting from the unfair trade practice of dumping. Thus, the bill seeks to elaborate the standards by which injury is to be recognized under the Antidumping Act in the spirit of the antitrust and other unfair trade laws as they have been developed by the courts and administrative agencies.

There are also procedural purposes behind this bill, in that it would require both the Treasury Department and the Tariff Commission to adhere to reasonable and consistent practices in determining whether dumping has occurred; and, if so, whether it has caused or is likely to cause injury to a domestic industry. I believe it significant that some of the views in opposition to certain features of the 1963 and 1964 amendments have been taken into consideration and accommodated where practicable.

In my judgment, the proposed modifications are in keeping with the moderate, constructive tenor of the 1963 and 1964 bills. Moreover, representatives of both domestic and foreign interests have been outspoken in expressing their concern about various aspects of the way in which the Antidumping Act has been administered. Therefore, I feel that continued and increased bipartisan support should be enlisted to make the U.S. Antidumping Act a model of fairness, efficiency, speed, and certainty.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] and the other cosponsors of this important legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for 2 additional weeks so that other colleagues who desire to do so may join as cosponsors. I also ask unanimous consent that the full text of this legislation be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The following Representatives are introducing an identical bill in the House today:

Thomas G. Abernethy, of Mississippi.
Glenn Andrews, of Alabama.
William A. Barrett, of Pennsylvania.
William H. Bates, of Massachusetts.
James F. Battin, of Montana.
Lindley Beckworth, of Texas.
Jackson E. Betts, of Ohio.
Edward P. Boland, of Massachusetts.
William G. Bray, of Indiana.
James T. Broyhill, of North Carolina.
James A. Burke, of Massachusetts.
Omar Burleson, of Texas.
Laurence J. Burton, of Utah.
Elford A. Cederberg, of Michigan.
Frank M. Clark, of Pennsylvania.
Del Clawson, of California.
Harold R. Collier, of Illinois.
William M. Colmer, of Mississippi.
Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts.
Glenn Cunningham, of Nebraska.
Willard S. Curtin, of Pennsylvania.
Paul B. Dague, of Pennsylvania.
Dominick V. Daniels, of New Jersey.
John H. Dent, of Pennsylvania.
Edward J. Derwinski, of Illinois.
Harold D. Donohue, of Massachusetts.
W. J. Bryan Dorn, of South Carolina.
John Dowdy, of Texas.
Thaddeus J. Dulski, of New York.
Robert F. Ellsworth, of Kansas.
Robert A. Everett, of Tennessee.
O. C. Fisher, of Texas.
James G. Fulton, of Pennsylvania.
Don Fuqua, of Florida.
Kenneth J. Gray, of Illinois.
H. R. Gross, of Iowa.
Seymour Halpern, of New York.
William H. Harsha, of Ohio.
Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio.
David N. Henderson, of North Carolina.
A. S. Herlong, Jr., of Florida.
Craig Hosmer, of California.
W. R. Hull, Jr., of Missouri.
James Kee, of West Virginia.
Hastings Keith, of Massachusetts.
Carleton J. King, of New York.
Delbert L. Latta, of Ohio.
Alton Lennon, of North Carolina.
Rodney M. Love, of Ohio.
Richard D. McCarthy, of New York.
Robert McClory, of Illinois.
Joseph M. McDade, of Pennsylvania.
James D. Martin, of Alabama.
D. R. (Billy) Matthews, of Florida.
Chester L. Mize, of Kansas.
John S. Monagan, of Connecticut.
Arch A. Moore, Jr., of West Virginia.
Thomas E. Morgan, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas G. Morris, of New Mexico.
Charles A. Mosher, of Ohio.
Ancher Nelsen, of Minnesota.
Robert N. C. Nix, of Pennsylvania.
Leo W. O'Brien, of New York.
Alvin E. O'Konski, of Wisconsin.
Thomas M. Pelly, of Washington.
Claude Pepper, of Florida.
Philip J. Philbin, of Massachusetts.
Roman C. Pucinski, of Illinois.
James H. (Jimmy) Quillen, of Tennesee.
William J. Randall, of Missouri.
Charlotte T. Reid, of Illinois.
Howard W. Robison, of New York.
Byron G. Rogers, of Colorado.
Fred B. Rooney, of Pennsylvania.

JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania.
HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania.
ROBERT T. SECREST, of Ohio.
HENRY P. SMITH III, of New York.
HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of West Virginia.
SAMUEL S. STRATTON, of New York.
CHARLES M. TEAGUE, of California.
CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas.
JAMES W. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas.
JAMES B. UTT, of California.
JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR., of Louisiana.
J. IRVING WHALLEY, of Pennsylvania.
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi.
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, of Mississippi.
CHARLES H. WILSON, of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 2045) to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2045

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 201 of the Antidumping Act, 1921 (19 U.S.C. 160), is amended to read as follows:

"DUMPING INVESTIGATION

"SEC. 201. (a) Whenever the Secretary determines in accordance with the procedure prescribed in section 212 that foreign merchandise of a class or kind has been sold at any time after the date six months preceding the date of complaint, or is likely to be, sold at less than fair value, he shall so advise the Commission. Whenever the Secretary, from invoices or other papers or from information presented to him, is advised by a complaint or complaints filed simultaneously that such sales have been made, or are likely to be made, of merchandise from more than one foreign source or country, and if such sales have in fact been made, or are likely to be made, he shall so advise the Commission, but not until his investigation as to all such foreign sources or countries is complete. The Commission shall determine within three months thereafter whether a domestic industry or labor in the United States has been, is being or is likely to be materially injured (or, in the case of any industry, is prevented from being established) by reason of the sale at less than fair value of merchandise from one or more foreign sources or countries.

"(b) Material injury to a domestic industry shall be established, and the Commission shall make an affirmative determination, when it finds that the foreign merchandise determined to have been sold at less than fair value and supplied to any competitive market area—

"(1) has amounted to 5 percent or more (in units sold or in gross receipts from the sales under consideration) of domestic merchandise of the same class or kind sold by the domestic industry and supplied to the same competitive market area, during any three of the months from six months before the initiation of the investigation by the Secretary to the conclusion of the Commission's investigation, unless clear and convincing evidence is presented that had such sales of foreign merchandise not been made, the domestic industry would not have increased its sales during the three months involved; or

"(2) has been a contributing cause of a decline in the prices at which 50 percent or more (in units sold or in gross receipts from the sales under consideration) of domestic merchandise of the same class or kind supplied to the competitive market area has been sold by the domestic industry, during any month from six months before the initiation of the investigation by the Secretary to the conclusion of the Commission's investigation; or

"(3) has been a contributing cause of a decline amounting to 5 percent or more (in man-hours worked or in wages paid) of direct labor employed by a domestic industry in producing merchandise of the same class or kind supplied to a competitive market area, during any three of the months from six months before the initiation of the investigation by the Secretary to the conclusion of the Commission's investigation, compared with the average monthly level of such employment during the year ending on the date the Secretary's investigation began; or

"(4) has been a contributing cause of any anticompetitive effects in any competitive market area.

"(c) The Commission shall render an affirmative determination of likelihood of injury when it finds a reasonable likelihood that an injury cognizable under subsection (b) of this section will occur by reason of sales of foreign merchandise at less than fair value.

"(d) The Commission shall make the determinations required by this section without regard to whether foreign merchandise was sold with predatory intent or at prices equivalent to or higher than prices of foreign merchandise of the same class or kind. The Commission, after proceeding and hearing under the provisions of section 212, shall notify the Secretary of its determination, and, if that determination is in the affirmative, the Secretary shall make public a notice of his determination and the determination of the Commission. For the purposes of this section, the Commission shall be deemed to have made an affirmative determination of the Commissioners of the Commission voting are evenly divided as to whether its determination should be in the affirmative or in the negative. The Secretary's dumping finding shall include a description of the class or kind of merchandise to which it applies in such detail as he shall deem necessary for the guidance of customs officers.

"(e) Whenever, in the case of any imported merchandise of a class or kind as to which the Secretary has not published a dumping finding, the Secretary has reason to believe or suspect, from the invoice or other papers or from information presented to him, that such merchandise has been, or is likely to be, sold at less than fair value, he shall forthwith publish notice of that fact in the Federal Register and shall authorize, under such regulations as he may prescribe, the withholding of appraisement reports upon such class or kind of merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, not more than one hundred and twenty days before the question of dumping has been raised by or presented to him until the further order of the Secretary, or until the Secretary has published a dumping finding relating to such merchandise.

"(f) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'at less than fair value' means that either the purchase price or the exporter's sales price of foreign merchandise, as defined in sections 203 and 204, is less than its foreign market value (or, in the absence of such value, less than its constructed value), as defined in sections 205 and 206.

"(2) The term 'domestic industry' means domestic vendors who supply directly or indirectly to the competitive market area merchandise which is of the same class or kind as foreign merchandise sold at less than fair value and supplied to the same competitive market area.

"(3) The term 'competitive market area' means any geographical area of the United States to which the foreign merchandise determined to have been sold at less than fair value has been supplied in competition with domestic merchandise of the same class or kind.

"(4) Domestic merchandise which is reasonably interchangeable in use with a class or kind of foreign merchandise shall be deemed to be 'of the same class or kind' as such foreign merchandise. Two or more units of foreign merchandise shall be deemed to be 'of a class or kind' whenever reasonably interchangeable in use with one another."

SEC. 2. Section 202 of the Antidumping Act 1921 (19 U.S.C. 161), is amended to read as follows:

"SPECIAL DUMPING DUTY

"SEC. 202. (a) In the case of all imported merchandise, whether dutiable or free of duty, of a class or kind as to which the Secretary has published a dumping finding as provided for in section 201, if either the purchase price or the exporter's sales price is less than the foreign market value (or, in the absence of such value, than the constructed value) there shall be levied, collected, and paid, in addition to any other duties imposed thereon by law, a special dumping duty in an amount equal to such difference. If both the purchase price and the exporter's sales price are less than the foreign market value (or, in the absence of such value, than the constructed value), such special dumping duty shall be an amount equal to the greater difference. This subsection shall apply to imported merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, not more than one hundred and twenty days prior to the receipt of a complaint by the Secretary, and as to which no appraisement report has been made before such dumping finding has been published.

"(b) In determining the foreign market value for the purposes of this title, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the amount of any difference between the purchase price and the foreign market value (or that the fact that the purchase price is the same as the foreign market value) is wholly or partly due to—

"(1) differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the fact that the wholesale quantities, in which such or similar merchandise is sold or, in the absence of sales, offered for sale for exportation to the United States in the ordinary course of trade, are less or are greater than the wholesale quantities in which such or similar merchandise is sold or, in the absence of sales, offered for sale in the principal markets of the country of exportation in the ordinary course of trade for home consumption (or, if not so sold or offered for sale for home consumption, then for exportation to countries other than the United States), except that no allowance shall be made for such differences unless they were actually considered and taken into account by the vendor in establishing his price,

"(2) other differences in circumstances of sale affecting the cost of doing business, to the extent that such differences were actually considered and taken into account by the vendor in establishing his price, or

"(3) the fact that merchandse described in subdivision (C), (D), (E), or (F) of section 213(3) is used in determining foreign market value,

then due allowance shall be made therefor.

"(c) In determining the foreign market value for the purposes of this title, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the amount of any difference between the exporter's sales price and the foreign market value (or that the fact that the exporter's sales price is the same as the foreign market value) is wholly or partly due to—

"(1) differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the fact that the wholesale quantities in which such or similar merchandise is sold or, in the absence of sales, offered for sale in the principal markets of the United States in the ordinary course of trade, are less or are greater than the wholesale quantities in which such or similar merchandise is sold or, in the absence of sales, offered for sale in the principal markets of the country of exportation in the ordinary course of trade for home consumption (or, if not so sold or offered for sale for home consumption, then for exportation to countries other than the United States), except that no allowance shall be made for such differences unless they were actually considered and taken into account by the vendor in establishing his price,

"(2) other differences in circumstances of sale affecting the cost of doing business, to the extent that such differences were actually considered and taken into account by the vendor in establishing his price, or

"(3) the fact that merchandise described in subdivision (C), (D), (E), or (F) of section 213(3) is used in determining foreign market value,

then due allowance shall be made therefor."

SEC. 3. Section 204 of the Antidumping Act, 1921 (19 U.S.C. 163), is amended by inserting "and profits" immediately after "(2) the amount of the commissions", and by striking out "and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(4) an amount equal to the expenses and profits of the exporter in the foreign country (unless (A) the exporter is the foreign manufacturer or is owned or controlled by the foreign manufacturer, or (B) the foreign market value includes such expenses and profits), and (5)".

SEC. 4. Section 205 of the Antidumping Act, 1921 (19 U.S.C. 164), is amended to read as follows:

"FOREIGN MARKET VALUE

"SEC. 205. (a) For the purposes of this title, the foreign market value of imported merchandise shall be the price, at the time of exportation of such merchandise to the United States, at which such or similar merchandise is sold or, in the absence of sales, offered for sale, in the usual wholesale quantities (as defined in section 213) and in the ordinary course of trade—

"(1) in the principal markets of, and for home consumption in, the country from which exported, so long as at least 15 percent of the total sales (excluding sales to the United States) of such or similar merchandise by any vendor who supplies any of those markets are sales for home consumption in that country, or

"(2) if paragraph (1) is inapplicable, in the principal markets of that country (other than the United States and the country of export) which is, for any vendor in the country of export whose sales are under consideration, the largest consumer of such or similar merchandise sold by that vendor, plus, when not included in such price, the cost of all containers and coverings and all other costs, charges, and expenses incident to placing the merchandise in condition packed ready for shipment to the United States, except that in the case of merchandise purchased or agreed to be purchased by the person by whom or for whose account the merchandise is imported, prior to the time of exportation, the foreign market value shall be ascertained as of the date of such purchase or agreement to purchase. The price at which such or similar merchandise is sold or offered for sale shall be deemed to be seller's list or published price in the absence of conclusive evidence that the merchandise was actually sold or offered for sale in the usual wholesale quantities and in the ordinary course of trade at a different price. In the ascertainment of foreign market value for the purposes of this title no pretended sale or offer for sale, and no sale or offer for sale intended to establish a fictitious market, shall be taken into account. If such or similar merchandise is sold or, in the absence of sales, offered for sale through a sales agency or other organizations related to the seller in any of the respects described in section 207, the prices at which such or similar merchandise is sold or, in the absence of sales, offered for sale by such sales agency or other organization may be used in determining the foreign market value.

"(b) If any of the imported merchandise is manufactured or produced in a country or area in which, in the opinion of the Secretary, the method of establishing prices is not realistically related to cost or profit factors, the Secretary shall determine the foreign market value in any manner he deems appropriate, such as by reference to (1) the price at which such merchandise is sold or offered for sale for exportation to countries other than the United States from such country or area, (2) the foreign market value of merchandise of the relevant class or kind in appropriate non-Communist countries, and (3) the constructed value of merchandise of the relevant class or kind in appropriate non-Communist countries."

SEC. 5. Sections 208 and 209 of the Antidumping Act, 1921 (19 U.S.C. 167, 168), are amended by striking out "finding" each place it appears in each such section and inserting in each such place "dumping finding."

SEC. 6. The Antidumping Act, 1921, is amended by redesignating sections 212 and 213 as sections 213 and 214, respectively, and by inserting after section 211 the following new section:

"PROCEDURE

"SEC. 212. (a) INITIATION AND CONTINUANCE OF ANTIDUMPING PROCEEDING.—

"(1) INITIATION OF PROCEEDING.—An antidumping proceeding shall be initiated by the Secretary at the earliest practicable time after receiving a complaint. The Secretary shall consolidate in a single antidumping proceeding all complaints received together regarding the same class or kind of merchandise regardless of the number of importers, exporters, foreign manufacturers, and countries involved. The Secretary shall make reasonable effort to give notice of the initiation of an antidumping proceeding to all known interested parties and shall publish such notice in the Federal Register. The notice shall identify the date and nature of the complaint.

"(2) DISCONTINUANCE OF PROCEEDING.—The Secretary may not discontinue an antidumping proceeding unless (A) he is satisfied that promptly after the initiation of the proceeding, the dumping (if any) of imported merchandise of the class or kind under investigation has been terminated by revisions in price or by cessation of sales of such merchandise to the United States, (B) he has received bona fide assurances from the exporter that dumping will not be resumed, and (C) he concludes that the quantities of merchandise involved in the sales of imported merchandise under investigation are insignificant.

"(b) DISMISSAL DECISION.—The Secretary may decide within fifteen days after receiving a complaint that there is no evidence to support it supplied by the complaint and no evidence to support it available to the Secretary from customs forms or other sources, and that any differential between the prices at which the imported merchandise and domestic merchandise of the relevant class or kind are offered for sale in the United States cannot reasonably be attributed in whole or in part to the possibility that either the purchase price or the exporter's sales price of a class or kind of foreign merchandise has been, is, or is likely to be less than the foreign market value (or, in the absence of such value, than the constructed value). If the Secretary so decides he shall forthwith notify the complainant of his dismissal decision, together with the reasons therefor and such of the supporting information of the character required by subsection (c) of this section as is available to the Secretary, without initiating an antidumping proceeding or publishing any document in the Federal Register. For purposes of subsection (j) of this section such decision shall be considered a negative dumping determination, published as of the date the complainant is notified.

"(c) PROPOSED DUMPING DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall obtain sufficient information to enable him to prepare for each antidumping proceeding at the earliest practicable time a proposed affirmative or negative dumping determination which he shall publish in the Federal Register and make reasonable effort to send to all known interested parties. Where complaints have been consolidated in a single antidumping proceeding, the Secretary may prepare and publish a proposed negative dumping determination as to a country or countries prior to the preparation and publication of any proposed affirmative dumping determination in such consolidated antidumping proceeding. Each proposed affirmative or negative dumping determination shall indicate the specific data (such as manufacturers, dates, prices, discounts, quantities, home consumption, cost of containers, taxes, duties and commissions, as well as delivery, selling, advertising, technical service, and other expenses, but not including confidential costs used in ascertaining constructed value in the absence of foreign market value or costs of manufacture used pursuant to sections 202(b)(1) and 202(c)(1)) used by the Secretary and his computations and reasoning in arriving at and applying the concepts used in this title (such as foreign market value, such or similar merchandise, purchase price, exporter's sales price, and constructed value). If, in a particular antidumping proceeding, the disclosure of some of the detailed information required by this subsection would, in the judgment of the Secretary, impede his obtaining similar information in the future, he may so declare in his proposed negative or affirmative dumping determination and omit that information. If the Secretary does withhold such information, however, he shall prepare for the use of the complainant a supplementary statement of the information required by this subsection which has been so withheld, and the reasons for so withholding. The information in such supplementary statements shall not be published or otherwise be made public by the complainant, subject to such sanctions as may be established by the Secretary by regulation, but may be considered by a reviewing court as if otherwise a part of the record.

"(d) ANTIDUMPING HEARING.—The Secretary shall accord an antidumping hearing by permitting any interested party to communicate in writing with the Secretary regarding a proposed affirmative or negative dumping determination within thirty days after its publication in the Federal Register. This communication may include such matters as factual or legal argument, additional factual information in the form of affidavits or other documents, and requests for informal conferences or an oral antidumping hearing. The Secretary may call for an oral antidumping hearing on his own motion, or on the request of any interested party. Any denial of a request for an oral antidumping hearing shall be in writing with reasons. Notice of an oral antidumping hearing, or denial of a request for one, shall be given to all known interested parties and shall be published in the Federal

Register. Notice of an oral antidumping hearing shall state the time and place of such hearing, and summarize or refer to the Federal Register publications of the notice of the initiation of the antidumping proceeding, and the proposed affirmative or negative dumping determination. All interested parties will be accorded at an oral antidumping hearing the rights to counsel, to present evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and fair disclosure of the facts. A transcript shall be made of all oral antidumping hearings, and the Secretary may prescribe such regulations as he deems necessary for their fair and orderly conduct. The record in an antidumping hearing shall consist of the notice of initiation of an antidumping proceeding, the proposed affirmative or negative dumping determination, any written communications between interested parties and the Secretary regarding the proposed affirmative or negative determination (unless the Secretary has made a judgment regarding a given document, or part thereof, under the standard of subsection (c) of this section, which shall then be made available only to interested parties and a reviewing court), the transcript of any oral antidumping hearing, the affirmative or negative dumping determination, and any other relevant documents the Secretary chooses to include on his own motion or the request of any interested party after having heard the parties to be affected.

"(e) DUMPING DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall prepare an affirmative or negative dumping determination and shall publish it in the Federal Register. The Secretary shall make reasonable effort to send copies to all known interested parties. The contents of the affirmative or negative dumping determination shall comply with the standards for a proposed dumping determination contained in subsection (c) of this section. In addition, it shall contain the Secretary's reply to any new facts or arguments advanced during the antidumping hearing pursuant to subsection (d) of this section. The Secretary shall make his affirmative or negative dumping determination at the earliest practicable time after receiving a complaint or complaints, but in no event more than six months after such date, unless, within the said six months, he shall have submitted a report to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate stating the reasons why a longer period is required within which to reach such dumping determination and the estimated extent of such longer period.

"(f) FAILURE OR REFUSAL TO FURNISH REQUESTED INFORMATION.—Whenever in any antidumping proceeding the Secretary decides that an importer, exporter, or foreign manufacturer has failed or refused to furnish information which the Secretary has requested and deems necessary to make his proposed dumping determination pursuant to subsection (c), the Secretary shall resolve all doubts relating to such information against the person failing or refusing to furnish it, and shall base his proposed dumping determination upon information from other sources, including, but not limited to, the complaint.

"(g) INJURY PROCEEDING.—An injury proceeding shall be initiated by the Commission at the earliest practicable time after receiving an affirmative dumping determination from the Secretary. The Commission shall make reasonable effort to give notice of the initiation of an injury proceeding to all known interested parties, and shall publish such notice in the Federal Register.

"(h) INJURY HEARING.—The Commission shall accord an injury hearing by permitting any interested party to communicate in writing with the Commission regarding an injury proceeding. This communication may include such matters as factual or legal argument, factual information in the form of affidavits or other documents, and requests for informal conferences or an oral injury hearing. The Commission may call for an oral injury hearing on its own motion, or on the request of any interested party. Any denial of a request for such oral injury hearing shall be in writing with reasons. Notice of an oral injury hearing, or denial of a request or requests for one, shall be given to all known interested parties and shall be published in the Federal Register. Notice of an oral injury hearing shall state the time and place of such hearing, and refer to the Federal Register publication of the notice of the initiation of the injury proceeding. All interested parties will be accorded at an oral injury hearing the rights to counsel, to present evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and fair disclosure of the facts. A transcript shall be made of all oral injury hearings, and the Commission may prescribe such regulations as it deems necessary for their fair and orderly conduct. The record in any injury hearing shall consist of the notice of initiation of the injury proceeding, the transcript of any oral injury hearing, the injury determination, and any other relevant written communications or documents the Commission chooses to include on the request of an interested party or its own motion after having heard the parties to be affected.

"(i) INJURY DETERMINATION.—The Commission shall obtain sufficient information to enable it to prepare an injury determination for each injury proceeding, shall publish its injury determination in the Federal Register, and shall give notice thereof to the Secretary. The Commission shall make reasonable effort to send copies to all known interested parties. Each injury determination shall fully indicate the specific data used by the Commission, and its computations and reasoning in arriving at and applying the concepts used in this title. If, in a particular injury proceeding, the disclosure of some of the detailed information required by this subsection would, in the judgment of the Commission, impede its obtaining similar information in the future, it may so declare in its injury determination and omit that information. If the Commission does withhold such information, however, it shall prepare for the use of any interested party a supplementary statement of the information required by this subsection which has been so withheld, and the reasons for so withholding. Such supplementary statements shall not be published or otherwise be made public by any interested party, subject to such sanctions as may be established by the Commission by regulation, but may be considered by a reviewing court as if otherwise a part of the record. The Commission shall render its injury determination within three months, after receiving an affirmative dumping determination.

"(j) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any interested party shall be entitled to seek judicial review in the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals of (1) any negative dumping determination, within thirty days after its publication in the Federal Register, and (2) any affirmative dumping determination and injury determination, or any dumping finding, within thirty days after the publication of the Commission determination or dumping finding. Such judicial review shall be on the records made in the antidumping hearing and Commission hearing, shall be in accordance with section 10(e) of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1009(e)), and shall be independent of that provided in section 516 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1516). Any reviewing court may, in its discretion, order the continued withholding of appraisement reports as to the merchandise in question, pending the outcome of its appeal. The United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals shall establish rules of procedure necessary to effectuate this subsection."

SEC. 7. The section of the Antidumping Act, 1921, redesignated as section 213 by section 6 of this Act is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of paragraph (4) the following new sentence: "In determining what is the usual wholesale quantity, the Secretary shall exclude from his determination (A) all sales at a quantity discount which was not freely available to all purchasers at the time the sales in question were made; (B) all transactions between persons who are related to one another in any of the ways described in section 207; and (C) all transactions pursuant to any agreement or arrangement for exclusive dealing, such as, but not limited to, an exclusive distributorship or an exclusive requirements contract.", and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(5) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Treasury or any person to whom authority under this title has been delegated.

"(6) The term 'antidumping proceeding' means the inquiry by the Secretary pursuant to this title to decide upon an affirmative or negative determination.

"(7) The term 'complaint' means a communication to the Secretary from any customs officer or other person setting forth reasons why an antidumping proceeding should be initiated or a withholding order entered, along with such supporting information as the Secretary may by regulation require and as is reasonably available to the complainant.

"(8) The term 'complainant' means any person or persons outside the customs service who files a complaint with the Secretary.

"(9) The term 'withholding order' means the order entered by the Secretary pursuant to section 201(e) authorizing the withholding of appraisement reports.

"(10) The term 'dismissal decision' means the decision of the Secretary to dismiss a complaint pursuant to section 212(b).

"(11) The term 'affirmative dumping determination' means a determination by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 201(d).

"(12) The term 'negative dumping determination' means a decision by the Secretary not to render an affirmative dumping determination.

"(13) The term 'Commission' means the United States Tariff Commission.

"(14) The term 'injury proceeding' means the inquiry by the Commission to decide upon an injury determination.

"(15) The term 'injury determination' means a determination by the Commission pursuant to section 201, whether such determination is in the affirmative or in the negative.

"(16) The term 'dumping finding' means the notice published by the Secretary pursuant to section 201(d) of his affirmative dumping determination, and the injury determination of the Commission."

SEC. 8. Section 406 of the Act of May 27, 1921 (19 U.S.C. 172), is amended by inserting "Puerto Rico and" immediately after "The term 'United States' includes."

SEC. 9. The antidumping regulations of the Treasury Department in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act are ratified and approved, except insofar as they are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 10. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of this section, the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to all merchandise as to which no appraisement report has been made on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) The amendments made by this Act shall not apply in the case of any article if—

(1) before the date of the enactment of this Act the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate has made public a finding of dumping with respect to a class or kind of merchandise which includes such article, and

(2) such finding of dumping is in effect with respect to such article on the date it is entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption; except that in the case of any such article exported from the country of exportation on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, the special dumping duty applicable to such article shall be computed under section 202(a) of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended by this Act.

(c) If the question of dumping with respect to any class or kind of foreign merchandise has been raised by or presented to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate before the date of the enactment of this Act and either such question is pending on such date before the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, or the question of injury by reason of the importation of such merchandise into the United States is pending on such date before the United States Tariff Commission, then in applying the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended by this Act—

(1) if such question of dumping is pending before the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate on such date, the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall make his affirmative or negative dumping determination at the earliest practicable time, but in no event more than six months after such date, or

(2) if such question of injury is pending before the United States Tariff Commission on such date, the Commission shall be treated as having received the affirmative determination of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate on such date.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have been looking forward to this opportunity to join with the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and many others of my distinguished colleagues in introducing this sorely needed amendment to the Antidumping Act.

Senator HARTKE and I, together with 25 of our Senate colleagues, were cosponsors in the 1st session of the 88th Congress of S. 1318, which sought to provide essential reforms in the administration of the act. Subsequent to the introduction of that bill, which focused exclusively on the Treasury Department's administration of "dumping" investigations, an increasing number of Tariff Commission decisions created considerable confusion in the interpretation of the basic "injury" concepts. Thus, a more comprehensive version of our proposal was introduced in the House of Representatives in 1964 in order to add statutory standards for the Tariff Commission based on analogies to our domestic unfair trade laws and their interpretation by the courts.

A fair, effective antidumping act is urgently needed. An ever-present threat of injury from unfair dumping of foreign surplus products in our domestic markets hangs over the heads of countless American industries and thousands of American workers. Many American companies have already suffered severe damage from this foreign dumping. Profits have been cut, jobs lost, and our balance-of-payments position harmed. The steel industry in my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has been particularly affected.

For these reasons, I have joined today as principal cosponsor with my distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] in introducing an amendment to the Antidumping Act. The legislation would stop foreign suppliers from dumping their surplus products into our markets at prices below those they charge in their own home markets.

Our Antidumpting Act is not designed to prevent foreign manufacturers from selling in the United States at prices below those charged by domestic producers. Manufacturers in this country have never feared legitimate competition. The act does seek to curb, however, injury to U.S. industry from a foreign supplier dumping his product into this market at a price below what he charges in his own home market. Whereas many oversea nations would not dump their products into markets of their neighboring countries for fear of ruining those markets, the distant United States, with relatively few import restrictions and well-developed markets, is often considered a lucrative target.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the backbone of our economic strength as a Nation is our vigorous free enterprise system. Industries large and small, that ask only a chance to compete fairly, operate under the time-honored principles of freedom of enterprise and fair play. The artificially low pricing which characterizes dumping clearly makes it an unfair trade practice and I share the view that, in establishing standards for the guidance of the Tariff Commission, it is most appropriate to draw upon the principles evolved by the courts under the U.S. antitrust laws. The foreign supplier selling in the United States is, therefore, asked no more than to comply with the same type of ground rules to which U.S. domestic industries themselves are subject.

The dispassionate, down-to-business approach of this bill, aimed at clearing up existing confusion and uncertainty in the administration of this basically sound act, should appeal to fair-minded men. It represents a careful effort to clarify standards, tighten loopholes, provide fairer, more effective procedures for the administration of the act, while also recently revised antidumping regulations that are not inconsistent with the U.S. Antidumping Act as it would be amended. In addition to incorporating a large number of provisions contained in S. 1318 and last year's House bill, as well as deleting some others, this bill improves upon last year's House bill in several significant areas. I would not attempt to characterize one as more important than another. In truth, each provision, designed to alleviate particular shortcomings experienced by one or more industries, may be of vital interest and concern to many today as well as in the future. These modifications, however, do deserve special mention.

First. Great confusion has resulted from the inability of the Tariff Commissioners to agree on basic concepts such as what constitutes "industry," "injury," or the "likelihood of injury." Using antitrust analogies, our bill would spell out guidelines for determining the scope of the domestic industry affected by the dumping complained of, the competitive market area, and what products would be considered competitive and, therefore, logically involved in the investigation. Using these definitions, the bill sets forth various tests for determining whether material injury, not inconsistent with the provisions of GATT, exists or is likely to exist. Such an injury finding would result if dumped imports capture 5 percent of total domestic sales, or are a contributing cause of: First, a price decline affecting 50 percent of domestic sales; second, a 5-percent decline of labor; or third, any anticompetitive effects.

It should be pointed out that the injury tests require a causal connection between the unfair trade practice of dumping and the resulting injury to a domestic industry. These provisions should restore some certainty into an area of the act in which neither the domestic nor importing communities are able to make a reasonable estimate as to what standards will govern the next case. Congress, when it transferred the "injury" determination in antidumping cases from the Treasury to the Tariff Commission in 1954, did not set up any criteria for the Commission to follow. The Commission, of course, has been given guidelines for its "injury" determinations under the "escape clause" in trade agreements legislation, including the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Although the Commission has on occasion borrowed from the "escape clause" standards, it is absolutely clear that they have no relation to the separate and distinct Antidumping Act which deals with an entirely different cause of injury—dumping, as opposed to the increase of imports resulting from trade agreement concessions.

Mr. President, I feel that the Tariff Commission's extended "trial period" since 1954 has shown that where the members of a six-man Commission are often irrevocably divided on basic concepts of the act, the result becomes chaos and confusion for the business community. I suggest that it is time for the Congress to provide some statutory standards—as it often has done with respect to the "escape clause" in trade agreements legislation—and thereby restore some order and meaning to the determination of "injury" under the antidumping law.

Second. Another important area on which our bill focuses is the problem that Treasury, as well as domestic industry, has in trying to determine the actual pricing practices of producers in a foreign market. Obviously, Treasury does not have the same power over foreign suppliers as that which it can exercise over domestic producers. Under the circumstances, Treasury often is left no alternative but to accept claims of foreign suppliers as to the existence of conditions, practices, and policies which are not easily verifiable and which are used to explain away the existence of any margin of dumping found to exist. Thus, it is proposed that published or list prices shall apply in the absence of proof of sales at a different price. Also, in determining the usual wholesale quantities as required by the act, Treasury would exclude sales at quantity discounts not freely available to all purchasers, as well as transactions between related purchasers or involving exclusive dealing arrangements. Furthermore, allowances for differences in quantity discounts or circumstances of sale on sales to the United States, as compared with the foreigner's home market sales, would be limited to differences in costs involved which were actually taken into account by the seller in setting his price. These provisions would curtail a number of opportunities now available for circumventing the act.

Third. Similarly, because of the Treasury Department's great dependence in a dumping investigation upon information voluntarily supplied by importers, foreign manufacturers and exporters, if they should refuse to make data available to Treasury, the administration and objectives of the act may be wholly frustrated. Under S. 1318 and the House bill of 1964, a refusal to file information requested and not available from other sources could be made the basis for a conclusive presumption of dumping which would automatically send the case to the Tariff Commission to determine whether the dumping caused injury. Our bill, however, would accommodate anticipated objections and merely resolve all doubts relating to the requested information against the person refusing to furnish it. This would remove the severity of the earlier proposals and give Treasury flexibility to determine the margin of dumping on the basis of other available information.

Fourth. Recognizing the importer's desire to have the chance to discontinue a dumping investigation by prompt curtailment of his dumping practices, the Treasury Department included such a provision in its revised regulations which went into effect in January of this year. The previous bills did not deal with this subject. Our bill, however, would ratify this regulation but adds the requirement that firm assurances be given by the exporter that dumping would not be resumed and that the application of the regulation be limited to cases involving insignificant quantities of dumped imports. This latter requirement is necessary to cope with a dump-and-run situation, in which large quantities of different products could otherwise be dumped sporadically since each different product would be considered a new case, rather than a continuation of a previous dumping practice. Dumping could also occur as a one-shot proposition; for example, this could take place in government contract bidding on a product to be made to specifications.

Finally, in concluding this review of the principal modifications contained in our bill, I believe it is significant to point out the provision of the bill which would ratify all of Treasury's recently revised antidumping regulations which are not inconsistent with the act as it would be amended. Several significant concessions which were made by Treasury to the importing community will, in effect, be included within the scope of the newly modified legislation. I am referring particularly to the revisions which would require more detailed complaints, more specific notices of investigations, elimination in large part of the retroactive application of dumping duties, and the recognition by Treasury of a warranty by foreign exporters to reimburse U.S. importers for dumping duties on certain shipments.

These latter provisions have removed the basis for a number of the most strenuous objections by the importing community to the administration of the Antidumping Act. Ratifying these provisions in the 1965 amendment provides an excellent example of the good faith and the constructive approach with which this bill has been drawn. It aims to do the job that is necessary if we want a fair, effective Antidumping Act.

To summarize, Mr. President, my bill would in no way prevent foreign manufacturers from selling in the United States at competitive prices. Nor would it alter the basic philosophy of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. It would, however, curb international price discrimination against American manufacturers and workers in our home markets.

Drawing upon principles evolved by the courts under U.S. antitrust laws, my amendment would ask foreign suppliers selling in the United States to comply with the same type of ground rules that guide U.S. domestic industries. The unfair double standard where our companies are bound to obey certain laws that do not apply to foreign suppliers would be eliminated.

The great majority of our industries ask only the opportunity to compete fairly. They cannot do this when confronted with the artificially low pricing which characterizes dumping.

I have consistently advocated tightening of the Antidumping Act, and am urging prompt consideration of this amendment which would do just that.

Mr. President, I believe this effort to amend the Antidumping Act merits strong bipartisan support now, and for that reason, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from Indiana in sponsoring this bill.

DU PONT TAX FAVORITISM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Finance Committee held hearings on March 17 and 24 of this year on the tax aspects of the divestiture of General Motors common stock by E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. and Christiana Securities Co. This divestiture has now been completed. There is, of course, some stock yet to be disposed by certain individuals and entities named in the court order.

The divestiture operation, which for the most part proceeded in an orderly manner under the terms of the special relief bill approved by the Congress in 1962, was marred by a last-minute change in a Treasury ruling. This change, negotiated and issued in secrecy, and contrary to the clear intent of the Congress, resulted in a loss of revenue, by the Treasury's own admission, in the amount of some $56 million.

In my view, the change in rulings was an unfortunate instance of secret tax favoritism. There is nothing that can now be done about it. The horse is out of the barn, so to speak. Perhaps we can profit by this mistake. One clear lesson to be learned from this episode is that major Treasury tax rulings ought to be in the public domain.

I have, therefore, introduced a bill to require the prompt publication of all rulings issued by the Treasury Department where revenues will be affected in the amount of $100,000 or more in any fiscal year.

We have very properly safeguarded the taxpayer's private business by treating in a confidential manner the information contained in tax returns. But the Treasury Department has carried this, in some instances, to extremes, and the Internal Revenue Service, for its own mysterious reasons, seems to feel that rulings which affect publicly held corporations, and which directly or indirectly affect perhaps millions of stockholders as well as the general taxpaying public should also have the veil of secrecy drawn around them.

This is unhealthy, and I want to see this situation drastically altered. There is already too much hanky-panky involving corporate insiders. The Federal Government ought not to aid and abet in the many maneuvers of insiders against the general public and even often against their own stockholders.

I do not want to review the Du Pont-GM case in detail, but the part of this transaction involving the Christiana Corp. so well illustrates the need for the bill I have introduced that a partial review seems in order.

Briefly, here is what happened in the Du Pont case.

First, the Congress in 1962 enacted a relief bill to reduce the taxes of Du Pont and Christiana stockholders in the event the Federal court in Chicago ordered a passthrough type or divestiture of GM stock. Subsequently, the court did so.

Second, in passing the Du Pont bill, it was the clear understanding of the Congress that, in the event of a required distribution of GM stock by Christiana, there would be a pro rata distribution. The Internal Revenue letter rulings issued Du Pont and Christiana in 1962, at their request, very properly specified that any distributions under the relief bill must be pro rata.

Third, under the 1962 rulings, Du Pont made three distributions as follows: July 1962, 23 million GM shares; January 1964, 17 million GM shares, January 1965, 23 million GM shares.

Christiana also made two pro rata distributions under its 1962 ruling as follows: November 1962, 4.4 million GM shares; January 1964, 4.4 million GM shares.

With the continuing rapid rise in the price of GM stock, there was a consequent increase in tax liability of members of the Du Pont family and others to whom GM stock was distributed, even under the generous terms of the relief bill. This was particularly true of Christiana stockholders whose stock was acquired at a low price. Christiana officials requested that the rulings be changed to allow a non-pro-rata distribution. If permitted, such a change would allow a very large reduction in the overall tax consequences to Christiana individual stockholders of Christiana's third and final distribution of some 8.4 million shares of GM stock. The desired reduction in tax liabilities would be brought about by funneling more GM shares into tax-exempt organizations, many of them responsive to members of the Du Pont family. This would, of course, have two very tangible results:

(a) A smaller number of GM shares would be distributed to individual Christiana stockholders, thus relieving them of much of the tax burden of the entire transaction.

(b) Christiana shares turned in to the company on the exchange would be retired, thus making each outstanding share of Christiana stock more valuable without immediate tax consequence to the owner of the stock.

Fourth. Mr. Robert Knight, former General Counsel for the Treasury Department, was called in as a consultant to negotiate the arrangement.

Fifth. The Treasury then modified its rulings in December 1964, to allow some non pro rata distribution by Christiana, the amount depending on the price of GM stock at the time of Du Pont's third and final distribution.

Now, the ruling given Christiana in 1964 was an absolute reversal of the 1962 ruling in essence and effect, although in form it was a somewhat dressed up, bogus modification. Its result, as Secretary Dillon has correctly stated, was a loss of revenue to the Government in the amount of $56 million. The change was made possible by the fact that a fair and firm Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Mortimer Caplin, who had issued the 1962 ruling and who had withstood a great deal of pressure in issuing it, had left the Treasury and had been temporarily replaced by an Acting Commissioner. In this interim period the ruling was changed.

The reasons given by former Secretary Dillon for changing the 1962 ruling are so flimsy, his reasoning so specious, his conduct so strange and at such variance with announced regular procedure, and the results such a blatant handout of public money to a very few people who do not need it, that I believe if he and other officials had known that this secret new ruling was to be made public, immediately upon issuance, then that ruling would not have been made.

Mr. President, there is nothing like the glare of publicity to preserve and promote the rectitude of public officials and to keep uppermost in their minds the public good, rather than private gain for a few.

For the benefit of some of my colleagues who may not have followed this case closely, let me illustrate the lack of logic in the Treasury.

The Congress passed a private relief bill for the Du Pont Co. and/or stockholders. The language of the bill was necessarily loose because the situation from which relief was being granted had not at the time of enactment of the law occurred. If I may say so, this is not a proper way to legislate, but I have said this so many times that a repetition is useless.

The intent of the Congress was crystal clear. And that intent was understood by the Treasury and by the Du Ponts.

What the bill did, briefly, was to allow the Du Pont Co. to distribute GM stock to its own shareholders in the form of a special dividend, but with the tax greatly reduced. The bill went one step further and provided that if Christiana decided to pass on to its shareholders the GM stock it received from Du Pont the same light tax treatment would apply.

Now, the basic question about these Treasury rulings is whether the Congress, and particularly those sponsoring and supporting the bill, contemplated that Du Pont and Christiana, if they chose to take advantage of the generous terms of the relief bill, would be allowed to use the relief bill for part of the transaction, and, if they found some existing law which would allow them to cut a corner here and there, to use both their private bill and existing general law.

Commissioner Caplin decided that the Congress intended that the terms of the relief bill be followed, if the court permitted, and that the Du Pont interests could not maneuver to suit themselves by using the relief bill in part and existing general law in part.

The specific point involved in the rulings in 1962 was whether Du Pont and Christiana could make special exchange offers so as to funnel much of the GM stock through tax-free transactions, and still have no shareholder receiving GM stock pay more than the light, modified capital gains tax imposed by the relief bill.

It was decided that the terms of the bill must be followed altogether, if at all, and the 1962 ruling letters for Du Pont and Christiana specified that there would be no special exchange offers—in other words, distributions of stock must be on a pro rata basis. Du Pont accepted the ruling, as did Christiana, although Christiana noted its right to raise the question later. Any taxpayer, of course, has this right, noted or not.

Another condition was laid down to the effect that Christiana could not be merged into Du Pont in order to reduce the revenue to be realized.

The sponsors and supporters of the Du Pont private relief bill understood the situation. Their understanding is clearly shown by their citing of various revenue figures—revenue which could only be realized if the divestiture followed the lines laid down in the 1962 rulings.

When the bill was before the House Ways and Means Committee, and when it was passed by the House, General Motors common stock was selling at about $45 per share. Various Members of the House stated their understanding of the revenue which would be raised by the bill. Among these were Congressmen Mills, Byrnes, Knox, and Baker. All are or were tax specialists. They used a revenue estimate of $350 million. Assuming knowledge and not ignorance, they must have known that revenue in that amount could be realized only if Christiana was not merged into Du Pont, and only if there was a pro rata distribution of GM stock under the terms of the relief bill.

When the bill was before the Senate in the fall of 1961, the chairman of the Finance Committee used the same revenue estimate, although he noted that GM stock had gone up to about $48 and that more revenue would result at that price. He also went further and broke down the revenue estimates to show just what would be received as a result of the Du Pont portion of the operation and what would come from Christiana's distribution to its stockholders. The figures he used were, of course, based on Christiana not being merged with Du Pont and on a pro rata distribution being followed throughout—Congressional Record, volume 107, part 16, page 21026.

Largely through the efforts of the senior Senator from Illinois and myself the bill was not passed by the Senate immediately, as its sponsors had hoped. It went over until the following January.

The price of GM stock kept climbing. By January 1962, when the Senate finally passed the relief bill, GM stock was selling at about $55, and on that basis the estimate of revenue to be derived from terms of the relief bill has increased to some $470 million.

My colleagues in the Senate understood these facts in January 1962, as the record shows. They understood that GM stock was selling at $55 and that if the terms of the relief bill were followed, including pro rata distributions throughout, some $470 million would be realized in revenues.

Hear the words of some of the distinguished members of the Finance Committee in 1962–63, as appearing in the Congressional Record:

VOLUME 107, PART 15, PAGES 20319–20323

"Mr. Mills. The stockholders will over this period of 3 years, within which the divestiture will have to occur, will pay a capital gains on the stock received in the amount of approximately $350 million.

"Mr. Byrnes. Tax revenues from divestiture if H.R. 8847 is enacted would amount to $350 million."

"Mr. Knox. In helping these people we will not cause the Treasury to suffer any revenue loss. The Treasury would take in about $350 million under the bill against about $330 million under a possible three-pronged flexible program of divestiture.

"Mr. Baker. The Treasury will receive approximately $350 million in revenue as the result of this legislation."

VOLUME 107, PART 16, PAGES 21026–21055

"Mr. Byrd. If the court orders Christiana to distribute its stock to its shareholders, the revenue will be increased by $136 million.

"Mr. Williams of Delaware. As defined in the bill it would bring $350 million revenue.

"The revenue estimate which was supplied is that, if enacted, this bill would bring in about $350 million. Broken down, it amounts to $64 million from the Christiana Corp.—which, by the way, is $61 or $62 million over and above what it would pay under existing law; $136 million which would be paid by the Christiana stockholders if distributed under a court order; and $150 million from the Du Pont stockholders as a result of the capital gains tax which will be levied against the individual stockholders on distribution. That is a total of $350 million.

"Therefore there is no quarrel with the fact that this bill would provide $350 million of revenue."

"Mr. GORE. With respect to the bill which the Senator from Delaware supports, we find the statement:

"'A distribution under H.R. 8847 would yield tax revenues of about $350 million.'

"Mr. DOUGLAS. If Christiana distributes its portion of General Motors stock to its stockholders, the stockholders will pay capital gains tax on the difference between the original cost and the present value, or will pay roughly 25 percent on a capital gain of $46.50, or, roughly, $11.50 a share. (These figures clearly envision a pro rata distribution.)"

VOLUME 108, PART 1, PAGES 179–200

"Mr. BYRD. On the other hand, if the court orders Christiana to distribute its stock to its shareholders, the revenue will be increased by $136 million, so that the total will be $369 million."

"Mr. BYRD. If the bill in the form the Senate Finance Committee recommends is passed, it will bring into the Treasury $450 million of new taxes.

"Mr. KERR. The fact is, and the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma is, that if the bill is enacted, the Federal Government will receive in the neighborhood of $450 million of additional taxes in 3 years.

"Mr. KERR. There is no advantage in the passthrough.

"Mr. DOUGLAS. There certainly is.

"Mr. KERR. Not a bit, because if the Department of Justice fails in its efforts to secure an order from the court requiring the sale by Christiana of its General Motors stock, under the bill that stock would be passed through to the Christiana stockholders; whereupon they would have to pay the same identical capital gains tax that Christiana would have to pay if the court ordered Christiana to sell the stock, which is what the Department of Justice is seeking.

"Mr. KERR. If the court does not order a passthrough, or permits it, but orders the sale by Christiana of this stock, the same tax will be paid by Christiana that would be paid under the circumstances referred to by the Senator from Illinois.

"Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The estimated revenue under the bill as reported last September was $350 million. That was due to the fact that there was a $45 price on General Motors stock. Since the bill was reported the price of General Motors stock has advanced from $45 to $55 a share, and for that reason we are using an estimate of an additional $100 million revenue that would accrue.

"Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said that the Senator from Iowa had not taken into consideration that under the bill if the distribution is made, there would be an additional $150 million collected from the respective stockholders of Christiana.

"Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The difference in the revenue under the terms of the bill and the bill which the Senator from Illinois and I opposed at the last Congress is that that bill would have provided only about $60 million revenue whereas this bill would provide about $470 million."

VOLUME 108, PART 1, PAGE 367

"Mr. MCCARTHY. It is estimated that the Treasury would collect approximately $450 million of revenue over a period of 3 years.

"If the bill is not enacted, Du Pont will be moved to resort to certain procedures and practices which may not be sound. They might have the effect of distorting the operations of the two corporations and of distorting the investment portfolios or holdings of many persons and corporations, and of affecting some institutional purchasers who are large holders of General Motors stock."

VOLUME 108, PART 1, PAGES 449–466

"Mr. GORE (continuing to read from Mr. Greenewalt's testimony):

"'A distribution under H.R. 8847 would yield tax revenues of about $350 million.'

"Who would pay the taxes under H.R. 8847?

"Mr. KEFAUVER. I know the Senator has discussed this point, but I will appreciate it if he would outline it again.

"Mr. GORE. H.R. 8847 contemplates a passthrough and provides the guidelines and the tax consequences of a passthrough under which the taxes would be paid not by the Du Pont Co. but by the stockholders, and most of it by the individual stockholders of Du Pont and Christiana.

"Mr. SMATHERS. The most logical way to accomplish the divestiture would be to distribute the shares of General Motors common stock which the Du Pont Co. owns on a pro rata basis to Du Pont's more than 210,000 common stockholders.

"The Treasury at the same time will receive substantial revenue from distribution of these General Motors shares to the Du Pont stockholders. On the basis of current market value of about $55 per share for General Motors, fewer than one-third of the Du Pont stockholders will be subject to taxes, approximating $470 million at the time of distribution—$470 million will go into the Treasury of the United States.

"There has been much discussion with respect to the Christiana Securities Corp., the largest corporate shareholder of Du Pont owning about one-third of the outstanding stock. This company is comprised of some 7,000 stockholders. If the pro rata distribution is made by the Du Pont Co., Christiana will receive about 20 million shares of General Motors stock. Some 1,800 stockholders of this company, many of them members of the Du Pont family and others with substantial long-term holdings will be subject to a greater tax than would be paid by them if the divestiture is carried out under existing law.

"If the court directs Christiana to distribute some or all of this stock to its individual shareholders, they would be treated in the same manner as any individual investor in Du Pont."

VOLUME 108, PART 1, PAGES 703–729

"Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Greenewalt advised the committee that if H.R. 8847 is not enacted, the Du Pont Co. will use other methods than a pro rata distribution. * * *

"Instead, I repeat, we have a question of simple justice. I believe the fairest method of diverstiture would be a pro rata distribution to Du Pont stockholders.

"But whether Christiana distributes the stock or sells it, the revenue to the Treasury will be about the same.

"Mr. KERR. If they passed through to the individual stockholder, the stockholders would have to pay a capital gains tax, would they not?

"Mr. DOUGLAS. Under the bill they would pay a modified tax.

"Mr. KERR. They would pay a capital gains tax in the same identical amount.

"Mr. DOUGLAS. No; not in the same identical amount.

"Mr. KERR. In the same identical amount that Christiana would pay if Christiana should sell under a court order.

"Madam President, I repeat what I said the other day—namely, that under the provisions of the bill the Treasury Department will receive approximately $430 million in taxes within 3 years.

"Mr. WILLIAMS. Under this bill the Government would collect $470 million in taxes."

Logically enough, the position of the Treasury Department in 1962 was that pro rata distribution was clearly indicated by these revenue estimates. Now, in 1965, believe it or not, the Treasury, in effect, took the strange position that, since $470 million was the highest revenue figure mentioned in debate, the Du Ponts should be allowed to do as they pleased once that amount of revenue was assured. This is precisely the deal that Robert Knight, selected by Secretary Dillon and who served without pay, secretly negotiated on behalf of the Treasury with the Du Pont lawyers and lobbyists.

On March 26, 1962, it should be recalled, both Du Pont and Christiana requested rulings from the Treasury. Favorable rulings were given, but it was specified by Commissioner Caplin that the rulings would be null and of no effect if Christiana were to be merged into Du Pont or if non pro rata distributions were made.

The able senior Senator from Delaware seemed, in 1962, to understand this point quiet well. Indeed, the distinguished Senator gave precise revenue estimates based upon the price of GM stock. In 1962 he stated:

> The estimated revenue under the bill as reported last September was $350 million. That was due to the fact that there was a $45 price on General Motors stock. Since the bill was reported the price of General Motors stock has advanced from $45 to $55 a share, and for that reason we are using an estimate of an additional $100 million revenue that would accrue.

In 1965 the senior Senator from Delaware seemed to join Secretary Dillon in defense of this giveaway to the Du Pont family on the specious ground that the Congress never intended that more than $470 million be collected from the Du Pont divestiture. If we had passed the bill in the fall of 1961, when revenue estimates of $350 million were being used, in debate, I wonder if Secretary Dillon and the senior Senator from Delaware would now say that the Treasury rulings should have been relaxed and the Du Ponts allowed to do as they pleased at such time as it was clear that $350 million in revenue would be realized.

The effects of this change in Treasury rulings may be difficult to follow if one is not familiar with the transaction. The result of the ruling change is spelled out in an exchange in the hearing on page 44 which I read:

> Senator GORE. Would the Senator yield?
>
> The simple fact is that Christiana Corp. was under court order to distribute its holdings of General Motors stock.
>
> If the distribution was on a pro rata basis, which was the ruling of the Treasury Department in 1962, then each stockholder, individual, or foundation, would receive his pro rata share of the distribution, according to his holding of Christiana stock.
>
> The price of General Motors stock, as has been cited here, has more than doubled. Therefore, if the holders, the individual taxable holders, of Christiana stock received a large distribution, they would owe a large tax. The tax-exempt corporation would owe no tax in any event. So this change of ruling was given in order that a non pro rata distribution could be made. Therefore, these millions of shares, which otherwise would have been required to be distributed to the taxable stockholders, were funneled into the nontaxable stockholders, which relieved the taxable stockholders of Christiana of the necessity of paying that tax—$56 million. And they received the benefit, however, just the same, because the Christiana stock that was turned in to Christiana Corp. was retired, thus enriching the remaining individual stockholders of Christiana Corp.
>
> Now, Mr. Secretary, is that not the case?

> Secretary Dillon. Senator, except for the use of the word "funneled," which I would not agree to——
>
> Senator Gore. You select your own word.
>
> Secretary Dillon. I think that I have never heard a more lucid explanation of what actually took place.
>
> Senator Douglas. I congratulate you, Mr. Secretary.
>
> Senator Gore. Thank you.

It is clear what happened. It is clear why it happened. It is not altogether clear as to what individuals in the Treasury should receive credit from the Du Pont family for the $56 million in 1964 Christmas present. Former Secretary Dillon, Mr. Knight, Mr. Harding, the then Acting Commissioner, and the present Commissioner, the then Chief Counsel of Internal Revenue, Sheldon Cohen, all ought to share in whatever awards are given out for service well beyond the call of duty to the rich and privileged.

Like any organization, the Treasury Department has certain regular procedures it follows in getting its business done. This is very necessary. But in this case, there is not a trace of that regularity.

The distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, in defending Secretary Dillon on the Senate floor on February 4 of this year, inserted in the Record a copy of the Secretary's memorandum of February 21, 1961. This will be found on page 2018, and I will not burden the Record by reading all of it.

Among other things, this memorandum, addressed to heads of bureaus and others, including the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, states:

> In the event you feel that a matter raises questions of policy of such importance as to require determination at a higher level, please in the first instance consult with the Under Secretary, or in his absence, the General Counsel. I request that, in the normal course, you dispose of all such matters within your respective offices.

The Secretary had stated earlier in the memorandum that he did not want to get involved in determining individual tax liability.

Now, this would indicate to me that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue was to be responsible for the administration of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. If he felt that some particular matter was too important or difficult for him to handle, then he should seek advice further up the ladder, going to the Under Secretary rather than the Secretary himself..

Strangely enough, however, we find that the Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Bertrand M. Harding, according to his own testimony, was not having any difficulty carrying out his duties with regard to this matter. But he got a call from a lawyer in New York, Mr. Robert Knight, telling him that the Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, had asked this lawyer to come down and straighten out a problem for him, a problem with which he was having no difficulty and about which he had requested aid of neither the Secretary nor the Under Secretary. That seems odd to me. It surely is at variance with the Treasury's own policy as laid down by Secretary Dillon.

Stranger yet was the fact that the New York corporation lawyer, Mr. Robert Knight, first learned of his possible selection as special consultant on the matter by way of a telephone call from a Washington lawyer for the Du Pont interests, Mr. Clark Clifford.

There are many unresolved questions in my mind about the conduct of former Secretary Dillon and others in this matter.

The conduct of the New York lawyer, Mr. Robert Knight, also surely raises questions. In 1962, when he was General Counsel of the Treasury, Mr. Knight assisted Commissioner Caplin in arriving at certain conclusions concerning congressional intent with regard to the ruling issued Du Pont and Christiana in that year. But, in 1964, after being selected by Mr. Dillon, rather mysteriously it seems to me, after his selection had been suggested to him—to Mr. Knight—by Mr. Clark Clifford, an attorney for the Du Ponts, he completely reversed the rules of logic he had applied in 1962. This I consider curious, indeed. Where is the protection of the public interest to be found in this odd, secret proceeding?

The first Treasury ruling was issued to the Du Pont Co. in letter form, dated May 28, 1962. This ruling very properly was issued on the understanding that the type of divestiture of GM stock by Du Pont would be a pro rata distribution.

Christiana was not satisfied with the type of ruling offered by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Mortimer Caplin, and as a result, even though a ruling had been requested on March 26, the same date as the request by the Du Pont Co., it was not until October 18, 1962, that a letter was finally issued.

It was brought out during committee hearings that there was a great deal of wrangling and maneuvering during this period. The pressure on Commissioner Caplin was heavy. Indeed, at one point it got so heavy that the Commissioner offered to go to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to determine more precisely the congressional intent on just exactly what type of distribution the Congress had in mind when it voted the private relief bill for Du Pont stockholders. This offer was refused by the Du Ponts. There would have been no question as to the answer had the matter been publicly aired in 1962.

You see, Mr. President, the key factor here was how much tax the most affluent members of the Du Pont family would pay. There was not so much concern on their part about the average stockholder in the Du Pont Co. They were willing to accept the law as to them. But the really important Du Pont family members held their stock through Christiana. This was the key.

This brings me to Mr. Crawford Greenewalt, a leading member of the family. Indeed, he was president of the Du Pont Co. Thus far I have discussed only Government officials, but a word must be said of Mr. Greenewalt's conduct.

Mr. Greenewalt made a great many representations while he was trying to get the Congress to give him a private tax relief bill. Among other things he did was to write a letter to the Senator from Delaware, so the Senator could insert the letter in the Congressional Record, and use it in debate to support passage of the bill. In this letter, Mr. Greenewalt showed how he, personally, owning most of his Du Pont stock through Christiana, would really have to pay more in taxes under the relief bill than he, personally, would have to pay if the divestiture proceeded under the terms of existing law. He made this statement to me when he called at my office and other Senators told of such statements to them.

Mr. Greenewalt began his letter to Senator Williams, and it will be found on page 77 of the hearings, by stating that I, Senator Albert Gore, had "made a statement which is not based upon the facts of the case."

He then went on to state just what the "facts" were. Included in this detailing of the "facts" as to just how he would operate under the relief bill, was the statement that Christiana would sell a sufficient number of General Motors shares to pay its tax under the bill, and:

> Under a distribution by Christiana of the remaining shares—since my cost basis for Christiana is essentially zero—I would pay capital gains tax on the full market value of the General Motors stock received.

He stated further:

> It is clear then that my personal tax bill would be more than twice as great under H.R. 8847 than it would be if the divestiture were carried out under present tax laws.

This surely does not show a contemplation of operating partially under the relief bill and partially under existing law. There was no hint of a last minute change from a pro rata to a non pro rata distribution.

Mr. Greenewalt went even further to state that he owned about 55,000 shares of Christiana and that his total tax under H.R. 8847 would be about $1,400,000. These figures all assumed a market price of $55 per General Motors share, which was the price when the bill finally passed the Senate early in 1962.

Now, the key to Mr. Greenewalt's calculations was the fact that the distribution would be pro rata under the terms of the relief bill, not under the terms of then existing law which would have allowed a number of other maneuvers, including merging Christiana into Du Pont and a non pro rata distribution by way of an exchange offer of Christiana stock for General Motors stock.

And yet, by March, only some 2 months later, Christiana was contending that the Du Ponts should be allowed to do as they pleased and reduce the taxes of Mr. Greenewalt and other Christiana stockholders. They kept up their running fight with Commissioner Caplin until October when, faced with the necessity for proceeding with a distribution, they accepted a letter ruling which required them to distribute pro rata. Of course, they did not give up at this point. They evidently had the idea that they could come back later and do better when Commissioner Caplin had left. This, unfortunately, proved to be correct.

Commissioner Caplin left IRS on July 10, 1964, and in August Christiana was back. This time there was only an Acting Commissioner and they hoped to fare better. They did.

Secretary Dillion, as I have said, even though the Acting Commissioner testified that he was having no difficulty with this problem, called in the former General Counsel, a corporation lawyer from New York, to negotiate the deal.

A modified ruling was issued. Running counter to all the rules of logic, including the rules they had applied in arriving at the decisions reached by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in 1962, those in authority suddenly found that Christiana should, after all, be allowed to exchange its GM shares for its own shares in such a way as to reduce the tax liability of the Du Pont family members.

So a modified ruling was issued on December 15, 1964, which bilked the Government of $56 million.

Now, I advert to the secrecy that surrounds such rulings.

I learned, early in December 1964, that a change in the ruling was in the making, and I feared that the result would be pretty much as it was. I tried to stop it. At least I wanted the matter discussed. But I met the official cold shoulder.

I thought the chairman of the Finance Committee would be listened to, and I, therefore, asked him to ask IRS for a report on the whole transaction. The chairman's letter was dated December 18, 1964. His letter merely asked for a report on what had happened. But it was not until January 15, 1965, that the chairman finally received a reply. And that letter could have been written and staffed in 2 or 3 days without any strain whatsoever. Of course, it was delayed long enough to prevent any interested Senators from making any effort to stop this raid on the Treasury. Furthermore, this letter was furnished under provisions of law which require it to be treated in confidence. I was unable to discuss this question in detail in public.

I then asked the chairman to call the Finance Committee together to consider this matter in executive session. I am grateful to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia for doing so. Senator BYRD then called public hearings and now the sordid deal is public. But the damage has been done; the money is gone; confidence has been shaken.

I would like to prevent this kind of thing in the future. And the best way to prevent it is to have rulings made public.

There is no reason why rulings involving millions of dollars should be negotiated in secret and kept secret.

The present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, I am sorry to say, does not understand this.

Commissioner Cohen, in testifying before the Finance Committee on March 24, stated that in applying for a ruling the taxpayer "bares his financial soul." The implication seemed to be that a ruling itself contained material which could not be published. But after some questioning, Mr. Cohen finally admitted that there was no legal reason for not publishing ruling letters such as those issued in connection with the Du Pont divestiture. But, according to Mr. Cohen, "it is violative of our procedure" to publish such rulings.

This Du Pont-Christiana case is ample proof of the fact that those procedures should be changed—and by law. I have introduced such a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2047) to require the publication of all tax rulings which affect the revenue in an amount of $100,000 or more, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

NAMING CANNON DAM AND RESERVOIR IN MISSOURI

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last year, Missourians and the Nation lost one of the great statesmen of our time—the Honorable Clarence Cannon. His memory will not soon fade from the minds and hearts of the people of northeast Missouri so ably represented by him in the Halls of Congress, for his deeds and devotion are deeply etched in this rural countryside.

He dedicated his life and talents to the service of the people and he carried out his duties with abundant energy and his characteristic modesty.

For over four decades he represented the Ninth District of Missouri and for nearly two of those decades he bore the added responsibilities of chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

Construction will begin soon on a multipurpose dam and reservoir—the first in north Missouri—in Ralls County, only a few miles from Clarence Cannon's farm home in Lincoln County.

Mr. Cannon's standard as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee was that public investment must be recovered with ample margin of benefit to the people; and when the project now known as Joanna Dam was proved to have met this standard, Mr. Cannon became its champion and saw it through to approval by the Congress.

It was suggested by a number of leaders in his district that this project bear his name as a token of appreciation from the people for his outstanding record as a public servant. Mr. Cannon humbly declined the honor during his lifetime.

Because this project will contribute to the development of Missouri, and because of his dedication and interest in the prosperity and progress of our State, on behalf of my colleague, Senator EDWARD V. LONG of Missouri, and myself, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to rename the Joanna Dam the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir, as a permanent memorial to the memory of our honored and beloved colleague, a great American and a noble Missourian, the Honorable Clarence Cannon.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2048) to designate the Joanna Dam and Reservoir proposed for construction on the Salt River near Joanna, Mo., as the "Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir," introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. LONG of Missouri), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Joanna Dam proposed for construction at or near mile 63 of the Salt River near Joanna, Missouri, and the Joanna Reservoir to be created by such dam, authorized to be constructed by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1180), shall be known and designated hereafter as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to as the Joanna Dam and Reservoir shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which I believe will restore some semblance of majority rule to the process of apportioning State legislatures and will return the Federal judiciary to its proper function.

Since entering the political thicket in the case of Baker against Carr, the Supreme Court has wandered so far and wide that today even a solid majority of a State's voters cannot by referendum choose to have one house of the State legislature based on considerations other than population. In fact, the doctrine of the recent Lucas decision would appear to nullify even a unanimous decision of the voters to give minority interests more representation than the population would warrant. When the governed can no longer govern through their own consent, action to correct this situation is compelling.

In spite of my strong feeling that we must not shirk our duty of extracting the court from its own confusion through a constitutional amendment, I have frankly stated my reluctance in this undertaking. I hesitate to change the Constitution, for it is our political heritage, and each change affects not only our generation, but also posterity. It is doubly disconcerting when it is not the Constitution which is deficient, but the interpretation of that document by a majority of those who presently sit on the Supreme Court.

Before committing myself to a particular solution, I have carefully reviewed the expert testimony presented during hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments. Because the subcommittee chairman, Senator BAYH, wisely sought and received the testimony of the widest possible cross section of constitutional experts, I believe the best solution is now available.

However, before introducing a joint resolution reflecting this solution, I should like to point out what I consider to be deficiencies common to some of the measures already introduced: Senate Joint Resolution 2, Senate Joint Resolution 37, Senate Joint Resolution 38, and Senate Joint Resolution 44. The basic objection is the failure of these resolutions to deal with the important constitutional issue involved: the role of the Supreme Court. Our efforts should be directed toward developing a sound principle of judicial power, rather than concentrating on how to allow one house of a State legislature to be apportioned on other factors than population.

If we agree, as I firmly believe, that the Court should not have entered the political arena in the first place, then our first step is to establish some constitutional guidelines to reduce the expansion of judicial power over the process of apportioning both houses of a State legislature. Yet, each of the amendments already proposed in the Senate would leave one house of the State legislature to the harsh mercies of the Federal judiciary.

There are a number of additional difficulties in the proposals presently under consideration by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments. The language of Senate Joint Resolution 2, sponsored by Senator DIRKSEN, for instance, seems to preclude judicial review of the apportionment which is expressly authorized under the amendment. Some sponsors of this amendment have already asserted that they had no intention of precluding judicial review, and that clarification is necessary.

As drafted, the Dirksen amendment also fails to limit the extent to which "other factors" may supplant population considerations in apportionment of one house of the State legislature. In fact, the proposed amendment expressly states that nothing in the Constitution shall prohibit apportioning one house of a bicameral legislature upon factors other than population. Presumably, the guarantees of article IV, section 4 would be cast into doubt by this language. Consequently, a temporary majority could apportion in such a way as to give it 99 percent of the votes in that house, or enact any other proposal that is contrary to our Republican form of government.

Further, the Dirksen amendment contains no definition or limitation regarding what "other factors" may be used to apportion a house of the legislature. For example, can the "other factors" be race, taxes paid, assessed value of property, density of population? Clearly, this catchall phrase warrants our careful scrutiny; and further, such imprecise language is not suitable for a proposal designed to amend the U.S. Constitution.

It also greatly troubles me that each of the resolutions before the subcommittee allows the apportioning of one house to be decided by referendum once every 10 years. Thus, a bare majority of those voting in the referendum—which might be far less than an actual majority of eligible voters—could require that almost all seats be located in rural areas, or almost all seats be located in a single urban area, or that all seats be elected at large.

The referendum concept contains numerous pitfalls. Voters could be blackmailed into accepting a less than satisfactory apportionment proposal simply by the failure to offer them a better or more satisfactory proposal. Another problem exists in determining what proportion of the electorate is required to approve a proposal. In what elections may the referendum be considered? During a national election or during a special primary? This could greatly affect the size of the vote cast in the election.

Mr. President, to eradicate the existing distortion of the judicial institution, and to obviate some of the practical problems contained in other proposed amendments, I introduce a joint resolution.

This amendment is designed to limit the judicial power over apportionment to the enforcement of the amendment itself. It would affirmatively require that one house be based on population considerations. Apportionment of the other house, however, would be left to the wisdom of the State as long as the State abided by the mandate of article IV, section 4 of the Constitution, which is reiterated in my proposed amendment: That a republican form of government be guaranteed.

I wish to emphasize that this proposed amendment would not carry us back to the days before Baker against Carr, when so many State legislatures were shamefully apportioned on the basis of obsolete census data. I have always been an active opponent of malapportionment. Indeed, the States might not have lost the right to apportion if they had met the responsibility. This proposed amendment would require that State apportionment decisions be made by those who should be charged with the responsibility—the legislatures of the States themselves. Once every 10 years they must consider the most recent census data in apportioning the State legislature.

Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge with appreciation the expert testimony of each of the witnesses before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, and especially that of J. Harvie Williams of the American Good Government Society. I am confident that this joint resolution will receive the careful consideration of all the members of the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee during our deliberations.

I read my proposed resolution for the information of the Senate.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity affecting the composition or structure of a State Legislature, except under this Article of Amendment and under the Constitutional provision by which the United States guarantees to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government.

"SEC. 2. The most numerous branch of the Legislature of a State shall be composed of members elected within single-member districts containing as nearly as practicable equal numbers of electors having the qualifications requisite under its law; or, if the legislature so directs, equal numbers of inhabitants, citizens, or citizens over twenty-one years of age, as enumerated in the most recent census of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 87) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, introduced by Mr. ERVIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 213

Mr. CARLSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance System, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 214 AND 215

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, two amendments to H.R. 6675, the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

The first amendment would make social security trust funds available to pay for rehabilitation services for disability insurance beneficiaries likely to be returned to gainful work through such help. The provisions would be administered by State vocational rehabilitation agencies within the framework of the present Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program.

The second amendment would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make disability determinations in those cases which can be promptly adjudicated on the basis of the medical and other evidence readily presented by the applicant from existing sources.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendments and brief explanations of them be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance; and, without objection, the amendments and accompanying explanations will be printed in the RECORD.

Amendment No. 214 is as follows:

On page 266, between lines 22 and 23—insert the following new section:

"PAYMENT OF COSTS OF REHABILITATION SERVICES FROM THE TRUST FUNDS

"SEC. —. Section 222 of the Social Security Act is amended by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

" '*Costs of rehabilitation services from trust funds*

" '(b) (1) For the purpose of making vocational rehabilitation services more readily available to disabled individuals who are (A) entitled to disability insurance benefits under section 223, or (B) in a period of disability under section 216(i), or (C) entitled to child's insurance benefits under section 202(d) after having attained age 18 (and are under a disability), to the end that savings will result to the Trust Funds as a result of rehabilitating the maximum number of such individuals into productive activity, there are authorized to be transferred from the Trust Funds such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to pay the costs of vocational rehabilitation services for such individuals and of so much of the expenditures for the administration of any State plan as is attributable to carrying out this subsection; except that the total amount so made available pursuant to this subsection in any fiscal year may not exceed 1 percent of the benefits under section 202(d) for children who have attained age 18 and are under a disability or under section 223, which were certified for payment in the preceding year. The selection of individuals (including the order in which they shall be selected) to receive such services shall be made in accordance with criteria formulated by the Secretary which are based upon the effect the provision of such services would have upon the Trust Funds.

" '(2) In the case of each State which is willing to do so, such vocational rehabilitation services shall be furnished under a State plan for vocational rehabilitation services which—

" '(A) has been approved under section 5 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

" '(B) provides that, to the extent funds provided under this subsection are adequate for the purpose, such services will be furnished, to any individual in the State who meets the criteria prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1), with reasonable promptness and in accordance with the order of selection determined under such criteria, and

" '(C) provides that such services will be furnished to any individual without regard to (i) his citizenship or place of residence, (ii) his need for financial assistance except as provided in regulations of the Secretary in the case of maintenance during rehabilitation, or (iii) any order of selection followed under the State plan pursuant to section 5 (a) (4) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

" '(3) In the case of any State which does not have a plan which meets the requirements of paragraph (2), the Secretary may provide such services by agreement or contract with other public or private agencies, organizations, institutions, or individuals.

" '(4) Payments under this subsection may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

" '(5) Money paid from the Trust Funds under this subsection for purposes of providing services to individuals who are entitled to benefits under section 223 or who are within a period of disability under section 216(i) shall be charged to the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, and all other money paid out from the Trust Funds under this subsection shall be charged to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund. The Secretary shall determine according to such methods and procedures as he may deem appropriate.

" '(A) the total cost of the services provided under this subsection, and

" '(B) subject to the provisions of the preceding sentence, the amount of such cost which should be charged to each of such Trust funds.

" '(6) For the purposes of this subsection the term "vocational rehabilitational services" shall have the meaning assigned to it in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, except that such services may be limited in type, scope, or amount in accordance with regulations of the Secretary designed to achieve the purposes of this subsection.' "

The explanation accompanying amendment No. 214 is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 214

One of the objectives of the social security disability program is to promote the rehabilitation of disability beneficiaries. The social security law includes a number of provisions designed to further this objective, among them one that declares it to be the policy of the Congress that applicants for disability benefits be referred to the State vocational rehabilitation agencies for vocational rehabilitation services, so that as many of them as possible may be restored to productive activity.

Arrangements under which applicants for disability benefits are referred to the State rehabilitation agencies have been helpful in leading to their rehabilitation, but there is more to the problem than getting people referred to the appropriate agency. The States, for example, give first priority to those disabled persons who show relatively good potential for rehabilitation. A person who is younger and whose disability is not as severe as that of one who is eligible for disability benefits under social security very often represents a better investment of rehabilitation resources than does the latter. Because, as a group, social security beneficiaries are given a relatively low priority by the State agencies, and because of limitations on funds and therefore on the extent of services that can be offered by the agencies, some beneficiaries who could profit from rehabilitation services do not get them.

A proposal similar to the one under discussion here has been recommended by both the 1948 and the 1965 Advisory Councils on Social Security. As pointed out by the 1965 Council: "The expenditure of social security funds is clearly justified so long as the savings from the amount of benefits that would otherwise have to be paid exceed, or at least equal, the money paid from the trust funds for rehabilitation costs. It is wasteful and shortsighted for the social security system to be paying benefits to disabled persons if a lesser expenditure of funds would assure their return to work."

The experience of certain insurance carriers in providing rehabilitation services for workers entitled to workmen's compensation tends to support the conclusion of the 1965 Advisory Council that enactment of the proposal would result in lower benefit costs under social security. Furthermore, any provision which would result in an increased number of disabled workers who are rehabilitated would benefit not only the individuals involved but also society in general. For the rehabilitated individual, the gain would not only be in increased income but also in the satisfaction flowing from his restoration to a useful economic role in society.

In order to help avoid the possibility of the legislation resulting simply in the substitution of Federal funds for State funds, as well as to avoid neglect of non-OASI beneficiaries whose rehabilitation is not financed wholly from Federal funds, the funds provided under the proposal would be allocated among the States in accordance with their ability to use the funds effectively and generally under the same rehabilitation plans now used by the States under the Vocational Rehabiliation Act. The success of the States would, of course, be subject to continuous evaluation.

Under the legislation, there would be continuing evaluation of the effects of the rehabilitation expenditures and any needed adjustments made in selection criteria and administration so that the savings to the trust funds from the reduction in benefits paid out and the increased taxes paid on the earnings of people returned to work would equal or exceed the cost of the rehabilitation services.

On page 266, between lines 22 and 23—insert the following new section:

"FACILITATING DISABILITY DETERMINATIONS

"SEC. —. (a) Subsection (b) of section 221 of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof ', other than individuals referred to in subsection (g) (4)'.

"(b) Subsection (g) of such section 221 is amended to read as follows:

" '(g) In the case of—

" '(1) individuals in a State which has no agreement under subsection (b),

" '(2) individuals outside the United States,

" '(3) any class or classes of individuals not included in an agreement under subsection (b), and

" '(4) any individual with respect to whom the Secretary, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, finds that a determination of disability or of the day on which a disability ceased may be made (A) on the evidence furnished by or on behalf of such individual from sources of information as to examination and treatment which are designated by such individual, or (B) on the evidence of remunerative work activities performed by such individual,

the determinations referred to in subsection (a) shall be made by the Secretary in accordance with regulations prescribed by him.'

"(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect in any State which has an agreement with the Secretary under section 221 of such Act when the Secretary finds that the implementation of section 221(g) (4) of such Act can be effectuated with respect to individuals in such State without impeding the efficient administration of the disability insurance program of such Act in such State."

The explanation accompanying Senate amendment 215 is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 215

Under present law, generally, disability determinations must be made by State agencies under agreements with the Secretary. Since, however, under a provision of this bill, disability benefits are to be provided after a shorter period than is required under present law, there will be a need to develop and adjudicate disability claims more rapidly than at present. Moreover, since determinations of eligibility for benefits will, under a provision of this bill, be made solely on the basis of total disability, i.e., without regard to whether the individual's disability can be expected to be of long-continued and indefinite duration or to result in death, some basic changes will need to be made both in the scope of development and in the adjudication of these claims. To assure prompt payment, initial evaluations should be made at the earliest feasible time and with as little delay as possible. This can be accomplished by having certain clear-cut determinations made directly on the basis of readily available evidence by trained disability evaluation personnel of the Social Security Administration, while the more borderline and difficult cases would be sent to contracting State agencies for further development and evaluation. The contracting State agencies would undertake to obtain additional evidence as necessary, including the purchase of independent medical examinations and workups of applicants to determine functional capacity and vocational capabilities. In addition, in cases initially adjudicated by the State agencies the Secretary would be authorized to terminate entitlement to disability benefits without further State action in clear-cut cases of recovery.

The proposed change is based on past operating experience acquired under the program during those occasions when the volume of claims backlog in an individual State agency reached a level requiring emergency action to assure more prompt disposition of pending cases. In these situations a temporary agreement modification was effected with the State to permit determinations to be made by the Secretary instead of the State agency in cases where a decision could be reached on the basis of evidence presented by the applicant. This modified procedure has been used effectively in the past on a selected basis, where unusually heavy workloads have developed, to expedite the processing of claims. Under the proposed change, the Secretary will be authorized to make a determination of disability only if the information submitted by the sources that the individual states treated him or examined him (e.g., his attending physician, the hospital) is sufficient to make such determination. If any additional information is needed (e.g., an examination by a medical or vocational consultant designated by the Secretary) the case will have to go to the State agency.

This change would also permit benefits to be terminated promptly (after a trial work period where appropriate), without the need for State action, when evidence is received by the Secretary that a beneficiary has returned to gainful work.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 216

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, there is great concern among units of local government—primarily cities, counties, and towns—that in the implementation of section 404 of title IV of this bill, their responsibility and authority will be undermined. Title IV deals with the establishment of economic development districts.

The fact is that the bill as drafted does not allow these local units to play their proper role in the establishment of these districts. This was discussed in committee. The bill was not amended, but language was written in the report as follows:

> Before the Secretary approves the establishment of any economic development district as provided under section 403, which in most cases will consist of several counties, municipalities, or other political jurisdictions, steps should be taken to obtain concurrence of the appropriate local governmental authorities in the counties, municipalities, or other political jurisdictions when such jurisdictions are wholly within the proposed economic development district.

Merely writing language into the report is not satisfactory. The effectiveness of this approach has been questioned by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and by other groups. They feel strongly that the bill should be amended to give units of general local government a preference as recipients of financial assistance under S. 1648, and where they are not the actual recipients, to give these units an opportunity to comment on any proposed development plan or application for financial assistance.

I, therefore, send to the desk a series of five amendments which I feel will strengthen the bill, and give local government units an opportunity to play the role they are equipped and entitled to play in the implementation of S. 1648.

Amendment No. 1 would require the Secretary of Commerce, pursuant to regulations established by him, to designate groups of elected officials of units of general government and, where appropriate, State officials, as economic planning and development groups in the absence of substantial reasons justifying the designation of some other body.

Amendment No. 2 would require that units of general local government have an opportunity to comment and make recommendations on any proposed economic development program submitted by an economic and planning development group where such unit of government was not represented thereon.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4 would require the Secretary to extend financial assistance under titles I and II, respectively, to units of general local government in the absence of substantial reasons justifying a different recipient.

Amendment No. 5 contains a definition of "unit of general local government."

Mr. President, I have been a county official myself, and I understand the concern of officials serving at that level of government about the provisions of this bill. I have worked with city and town officials also, and I understand their dissatisfaction with the bill as brought to the floor. They should have full opportunity to express their views on the implementation of all phases of the programs authorized in this bill which in any way touch their jurisdictions. They should be able to state their preference as to recipients of financial assistance under the proposed act. These provisions should be written into the law—not just recommended in the language of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON MODIFICATION OF JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER, KANS. (S. DOC. NO. 27)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a favorable report from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a modification of the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand—Neosho—River, Kans., authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act approved August 12, 1958.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON MODIFICATION OF JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, COLUMBIA RIVER, WASH. AND OREG. (S. DOC. NO. 28)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a favorable report dated August 28, 1963, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a modification of the John Day lock and dam, Columbia River, Wash. and Oreg., authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act approved August 12, 1958.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF INTERIM REPORT ON LAFAYETTE AND BIG PINE RESERVOIRS, WABASH RIVER BASIN, IND. (S. DOC. NO. 29)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a favorable report dated April 13, 1965, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Lafayette and Big Pine Reservoirs, Wabash River Basin, Ind., in partial response to resolutions of the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate, adopted May 9, 1949, and May 6, 1958.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on March 4 I introduced for myself and Senators FANNIN, BENNETT, JORDAN of Idaho, YOUNG of North Dakota, ALLOTT, THURMOND, SCOTT, and DIRKSEN, S. 1387, which would authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and other revenues lost by such governments by reason of certain actions on the part of the United States in connection with recreation.

By mistake, the name of Senator DOMINICK was omitted.

I ask unanimous consent to have him named as a cosponsor at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in addition to the 20 Senators listed as cosponsors of

S. 1483 at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors of this bill, to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, at its next printing:

Senators Bass, Bayh, Burdick, Case, Douglas, Fong, McCarthy, McGee, McGovern, McIntyre, Long of Missouri, Metcalf, Morse, Murphy, Muskie, Pastore, and Ribicoff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities, I am delighted that this bill, which I believe contains the best elements in all related legislation introduced during the 89th Congress and during recent years to benefit the arts and humanities throughout the United States, was unanimously approved on May 25 by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Pending finalization of the report on this bill, there will be additional opportunity for all Senators to join as cosponsors of S. 1483 at its next printing, if they so desire. I would suggest that any Senators so desiring communicate with my office to this effect.

The following Senators are already listed as cosponsors of the bill: Senators Brewster, Byrd of West Virginia, Clark, Dodd, Gruening, Hartke, Inouye, Jackson, Javits, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Kennedy of New York, Miller, Mondale, Montoya, Moss, Neuberger, Randolph, Tydings, Williams of New Jersey, and Yarborough.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Mr. McGee, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Williams of Delaware, Mr. Dominick, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Moss, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Ribicoff be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1766) to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of Mr. McGee be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1792) to provide assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and other personnel, and in improving capabilities, techniques, and practices in State and local law enforcement and prevention and control of crime, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FLOYD R. GIBSON TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 3, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Floyd R. Gibson, of Missouri, to be U.S. circuit judge, eighth circuit, vice Albert A. Ridge, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DONALD FRANK TURNER TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 10, 1965, at 10 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Donald Frank Turner, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice William H. Orrick, Jr., resigned.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], and myself, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS OF FRED J. NICHOL TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR SOUTH DAKOTA, AND IRVING HILL TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Tuesday, June 8, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Fred J. Nichol, of South Dakota, to be U.S. district judge for South Dakota, vice George T. Mickelson, deceased; and

Irving Hill, of California, to be U.S. district judge, Southern District of California, vice William C. Mathes, retiring.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and myself, as chairman.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 800) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels; and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of the Jefferson Construction Co.;

H.R. 1870. An act for the relief of Edward G. Morhauser;

H.R. 2139. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes;

H.R. 2354. An act for the relief of William L. Chatelain, U.S. Navy, retired;

H.R. 3995. An act to transfer certain functions of the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, May 26, 1965, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 339. An act to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6497. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States; and

H.R. 8122. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H.R. 7750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 26, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 339) to provide for the establishment of the Agate

Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Patriotic poem by William E. Archey, of Sherrard, W. Va.

THE DESPERATE PLIGHT OF THE HUNGARIAN PEOPLE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is deep and abiding anxiety among the people of Hungarian descent in the United States for the plight of their countrymen who still feel the heavy hand of Russian Communist domination in their European homeland. The heroic efforts of the Hungarian people in the bloody revolution of 1956 will long be remembered by the free peoples of the world as an unequivocal assertion of their desire for freedom and self-determination, and a testament to their bravery in the face of insurmountable odds. But today they continue to pay the toll for rebellion in the face of tyranny, and this toll is being exacted in a manner calculated to annihilate the Hungarian people and their culture, should it be allowed to continue.

Mr. President, the loss of Hungarian lives during the last 20 years has been overwhelming. Through war, liquidation, deportation, and mass exile, the population was decimated to the point where gradual extinction would result without the stimulus of a large and healthy new generation to rebuild the national population, and with it, the national spirit and cultural unity. However, there has been no resurgence in the Hungarian population. Where lifesaving new blood was needed to rebuild the war devastated Hungarian population, the growth rate was but 2.1 in 1962, the lowest in the world. The birth rate today is lower than the death rate in the major cities of Hungary, an ominous omen of the gradual extinction which must necessarily follow if this condition is allowed to continue.

Mr. President, this destruction of the Hungarian peoples can be traced directly to the fact that surgical abortions are encouraged by the present Hungarian Government, a policy which was invoked by an edict in 1956. Surgical abortions in Hungary today outnumber live births by two to one. When people find themselves faced with intolerable tyranny, when they face only economic deprivation and the memory of a struggle for independence once lost, when they are encouraged by a totalitarian government to so limit the future generation, one can see what a temptation it might be to save unborn children from similar suffering.

Mr. President, since the bloodletting in the city streets and the country lanes of Hungary 9 years ago, the United Nations has repeatedly adopted resolutions condemning the brutalities perpetrated there upon a freedom-loving people. Yet the decimation of the Hungarian populace continues. Americans of Hungarian descent, many of whom fought in the revolution of 1956 to regain their stolen freedom, urge their adopted nation to call upon the imposed government of their homeland to repeal the edict which is slowly destroying the population of Hungary and nibbling away at the proud cultural heritage which has been theirs for centuries.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am pleased that Senators have chosen to make comments today regarding the continuing effort of Hungarians and other Eastern Europeans to realize a measure of individual freedom and independence. It is particularly fitting that these remarks come as the Senate nears the end of debate on a historic voting rights bill.

We have debated for more than a month the right of minorities in the United States to enjoy an electoral voice in our governmental process. Our concern is perhaps justified, but what about the right of Eastern Europeans for representation through the vote?

Even as the Senate has debated the voting rights bill, there has been a barrage of speeches from protagonists and antagonists of the administration's Vietnam and Dominican policy. I am pleased that the bulk of the comment has been in support of the administration's action on both fronts. And yet, again the paradox emerges. What about Eastern Europe? Why are voices stilled on the right of these peoples to fight for their independence?

The administration, despite its firmness and determination in support of the American commitment against Communists in Santo Domingo and southeast Asia, is making utterances on the subject of "building bridges" to Communist-controlled Eastern Europe.

Mr. President, as these paradoxes unfold, I think it well to comment on the captive nations in the light of American conduct elsewhere in the world and in the Congress.

The Senate concerns itself properly with voting rights and civil rights, but what about these issues in Eastern Europe? The World Federation of Hungarian Freedom Fighters, headquartered in New Jersey, points out that even as the Congress debates the human rights of Americans, there is a "minority" of something like 98 percent of the Hungarian people who do not have the basic human rights of self-government, freedom of travel, freedom of speech, equal justice under law, freedom of religion, freedom to grow in a competitive economy, and freedom from the control of foreign troops.

In Hungary today the people are governed by a Communist hierarchy comprised of about 2 percent of the population. The Communist Party, as the government, controls the people. There has been no shred of evidence since the end of hostilities in 1945 to indicate that the captive peoples of Europe, or Cuba for that matter, would willingly embrace the political or economic philosophies of communism. But the fact remains that in Hungary and other captive countries, the people have no choice. The will of the 2 percent—the Communists who rule and control—is enforced in Hungary by a Soviet Army of some 80,000 troops. Thus is compliance with the "law" assured in Hungary.

The civil right of freedom of religion is virtually unknown in Hungary. There is a partial agreement between the Vatican and the Hungarian Government which was designed to be a compromise to preserve some religious life in the nation. On December 9, however, Father Laszlo Emody, Roman Catholic priest, was sentenced to 5 years in jail because he committed the grave sin of providing children with religious education. This, the Communist government decreed, was contrary to the law.

And what about the civil right of freedom of speech? The Hungarian Freedom Fighters tell us that the slightest non-Communist criticism of political personalities or of the programs of the Communist Party is punishable by long prison terms.

And what about the civil right of social, religious, or political gatherings? Again, we look to the words of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters who tell us that the freedom of assembly does not exist. They point out that the Hungarian Boy Scout Federation was disbanded in 1948. Protestant and Catholic social organizations, Freemason lodges, and private associations are still victims of the Communist regime and are still forbidden.

And the civil right to compete in a relatively unrestricted economy? Again, the freedom fighters:

> All sectors of the Hungarian economy have been forceably nationalized.

We learn also that at present 92 percent of the arable land is managed either under the cooperative system or as part of large national farms.

The world is today witnessing a massive commitment by the United States to maintain the integrity of the non-Communist world, but what about the world of Eastern Europe that has no wish to be Communist?

It seems to me an untenable paradox that the President, who importunes the Congress to appropriate $700 million to prosecute an undeclared, but necessary, war in southeast Asia, could at the same time draft plans for the "building of bridges" to nations which are governed by the Communist apparatus against which we are already fighting.

Mr. President, one of the most cleverly peddled pieces of propaganda associated with the long history of the cold war is that by pouring the materialistic products of our private enterprise economy into Communist nations we can somehow increase the political power of the populations. Those who sell this thesis in the market of public opinion are laboring under a very false major premise: That in Communist nations, the people govern.

In the United States, popular dissatisfaction with an administration or with a Member of Congress leads to the ouster of the offending party or person. If the same were true in Eastern Europe, there would not be a Communist government in any of the captive nations. In not one nation is there popular support for the government, but there is military support—from the Soviet Union. The people do not govern in a Communist country. The credentials for political perpetuity in Eastern Europe and other Communist satellites are not political, but military.

In Hungary the 2 percent of the population which is Communist makes the decisions, produces the leaders, genuflects to the Soviet heirarchy and governs in concert with the Red Army. By sending items of trade and commerce to these countries, we are doing little more than throwing bones to people who otherwise might be able to organize into an effective resistance against the Communist dictatorship which governs them. By supposedly "building bridges" we are aiding the governments of these people, not the people themselves, and in aiding the governments, we tighten Communist control over the people we seek to help.

As the Hungarian Freedom Fighters put it:

> One principle should guide our negotiations with the Hungarian Government: the cultural and economic aid in question should benefit the people of Hungary. It should not in any way assist the Communist government in consolidating its power.

The only way the United States can bring about some easing of the burden of the captive peoples of Eastern Europe by the building of bridges is to demand hard concessions from the Communist governments.

There has been considerable speculation in recent months on the effect the so-called Sino-Soviet split is having on the monolithic aspect of communism. A distinguished student of international affairs and Sino-Soviet studies, Kurt London, of George Washington University, had a comment on the possible breakup of the Communist camp which would, of course, include the satellite states, in an article written for the spring issue of the George Washington University magazine.

Mr. London holds no brief for the theory that communism is forsaking its old plan for world domination. Says Mr. London:

> I hold that the present disarray of the movement might be of a transitory nature and that we cannot, without great risk to ourselves and the free world, assume the Communist problem has left us. Gradually, a new type of communism, under whatever name, may develop with the support of both the U.S.S.R. and Red China—either in combination or as schismatic camps. So long as the Soviet Union's great power continues to support Marxism-Leninism, be it orthodox or reformed, and so long as Red China remains in the throes of revolutionary ardor, we cannot anticipate an end to the struggle for the world.
>
> I do not mean to imply that disintegration and erosion are impossible, but they seem to me unlikely in the near future. We must never forget that the history of international communism has demonstrated an astounding resilience, that the movement has rolled with the punches, and that its many oscillations have not had a truly destructive effect upon it. Communist history was, is, and will be full of surprises, and the greatest mistake we could commit is to look upon a crisis of the Socialist camp, such as the Sino-Soviet conflict, as something final and irrevocable. Nothing is final in communism until it collapses.

Unless meaningful economic pressures can be brought to bear on the governments of Eastern European countries, the only mechanism for change in the Communist states will be revolt. The world had a graphic picture of the futility of that course in October of 1956. Then the Hungarian people revolted, fully expecting assistance from the West, but while they fought and died, the U.N. and the West talked and vacillated. We were still talking when Russian tanks crushed the revolt, ending the first and only instance of freedom of expression the Hungarian people have had since the end of World War II.

Mr. President, the people of Eastern Europe have peace today, if peace is defined as absence from war. They have the type of peace granted the inmates of a penitentiary, but they do not have freedom of choice, freedom of action, freedom of religion, freedom to assemble, or freedom of speech.

I believe that as we approach the 9th anniversary of the gallant effort of Hungary to uproot communism, we should rededicate ourselves to securing for the Hungarians and other Eastern Europeans and to Cuba at least a measure of those human values for which we are fighting in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic and for which we are debating in the Senate.

HUNGARIANS UNDERSTAND THE MEANING OF LIBERTY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am pleased to join other Senators in paying tribute to the strivings of the Hungarian people for independence from the tyranny and oppression of communism.

Communism was uprooted once in Hungary—in October 1956. Then, after 11 years of Soviet occupation and 7 days of mortal combat, the people of Hungary won independence. But the free world did not respond with sufficient vigor; and on November 4, 1956, the Communists began their brutal reoccupation.

Since that time, and for nearly 9 years now, the lifeblood of the Hungarian nation has been ebbing away. In the 2 years preceding 1956, Hungary's population had a natural increase of 229,000. That is a growth rate of 12.6 percent. But by 1963, the rate had declined to 2.1 percent. Communism is slowly strangling Hungary.

Yet, in the face of this slow death of a nation, there has been, in recent months, talk of "normalization" of American relations with the rulers of Hungary.

Mr. President, I welcome any step that promotes cooperation between the peoples of America and Hungary; but it would be worse than disturbing to see any normalization that would serve only the one-sided purposes of Hungary's present dictatorial, Soviet-oriented power structure.

I suggest that before there can be any normalization of American relations with Hungary, there must be normal conditions inside Hungary.

Freedom is normal for Hungary. Witness the age-old struggle of her people to defeat tyranny. Witness that continuing struggle.

But there is no freedom in Hungary; and I do not propose to have America reward oppression by granting it a warm coverlet of normalcy.

Let us look at today's Hungary. Let us see whether Hungary is free and normal.

The Hungarian people still are governed by communistic, dictatorial power, based on a one-party system.

Hungary still is surrounded by an Iron Curtain of barbed wire, watchtowers, and mines. Last year, 111 persons lost their lives from, or were seriously injured by, exploding mines in the border zone.

A law forbidding border crossings still is in force. Those who make a desperate attempt to reach the West without a government-granted passport are sentenced to years in prison.

Freedom of religion still is limited. Last December, a Roman Catholic priest was sentenced to 5 years in prison, because he provided his children with religious education.

Freedom of speech is nonexistent. The slightest criticism of the communistic regime brings long prison terms.

No social, religious, or political gathering can be held, unless convened upon instruction from the government. Freedom of assembly does not exist.

Hungary still is controlled by Soviet armed forces, recently modernized with tactical nuclear weapons. The Soviet forces in Hungary are so positioned that they can occupy all strategic points within 30 minutes.

No, Mr. President, there does not appear to be much that is normal about today's Hungary. Freedom would be the choice of the Hungarian people, if they had a choice.

Those valiant people last expressed their free choice in October 1956—in the Hungarian revolution.

I am proud to be among those Americans who remember the Hungarian revolution and the principles of freedom and dignity which it proclaimed. I hope the Senate and our Nation will keep faith with those principles, and will always work to achieve freedom for the Hungarian people.

SOIL, GOD, AND MAN

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, this week is being observed as Soil Stewardship Week. This is a nationwide observance which places emphasis on man's obligation to God as a steward of the soil, water, and related resources.

This is the 11th consecutive annual Soil Stewardship Week sponsored by the Nation's 3,000 local soil and water conservation districts and their national association. During the period of May 23 to 30, observances are being held in literally hundreds of thousands of churches of all faiths.

I think it fitting for the Senate of the United States to pause a moment in its deliberations to observe Soil Stewardship Week and pay tribute to its sponsors. This includes the 45 soil conservation districts in my home State of South Carolina.

The men who serve on the governing bodies of these local units of State government deserve our praise for the leadership they are providing in our home communities for keeping before the people the relationship between soil, God, and man. They are performing a great patriotic service. I think the Senate should take this occasion to say "Thank you." Our soil is our strength. The water that sustains us demands constant vigilance.

Soil conservation districts have distributed material on "Challenges of Growth" to the clergy of all faiths to assist them in leading the congregations they serve to an appropriate observance of Soil Stewardship Week. The foreword in the material distributed was written by Rev. Lewis W. Newman of the Southern Baptist Convention at Atlanta, Ga. He states:

> It is a genuine pleasure to serve a group that proclaims over and over again, "The earth is the Lord's."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Reverend Newman's statement placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Foreword

Life is a series of challenges. From the first uncertain steps of a little child to the last few faltering steps of an old person, life is one challenge after the other. Many of these cannot be avoided. Some must be met individually, while others will be met by groups or by the Nation. Many of these challenges may be reduced to responsible stewardship.

For the people of God, stewardship of natural resources is based upon the word of God. The Bible plainly sets out that ownership of the resources is God's. Stewardship, including use and conservation, is man's responsibility.

Let us remember that as people committed to the idea of conservation, although we are confronted with challenges such as lack of understanding, desire for profits at the risk of destruction, and distorted values that overlook the worth of the individual, we do not have to face these challenges alone. God will help His people.

It is altogether fitting that we should set aside a week when we express unto God our gratitude for His blessings upon our land and our willingness to be faithful to our stewardship. Soil Stewardship Week provides this occasion. The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts renders a great service to many churches with materials for Soil Stewardship Week.

It is a genuine pleasure to serve a group that proclaims over and over again, "The earth is the Lord's."

Lewis W. Newman,
Member, Soil Stewardship Advisory Committee to the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

WELCOME AND TRIBUTES TO SENATOR RUSSELL OF GEORGIA ON HIS RETURN TO THE SENATE

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, Monday, May 24, 1965, was an important day for the U.S. Senate. On this date, on both sides of the aisle, friends and colleagues of the senior Senator from Georgia, Richard Russell, were united in welcoming him back after his courageous and successful battle against serious illness.

As one of the most junior Members of this august body, I wish to add my sincere words of welcome to one who has served the people of Georgia and of the entire Nation for almost one-third of a century. The distinguished Senator's wise counsel, his fine judgment, and his extensive knowledge were sorely missed by all. Among other tributes, I read a story from the Atlanta, Ga., Times which states:

> One of Georgia's proudest, most revered warhorses is back in action.

May I note that this "warhorse" is one dedicated to the cause of peace. His perceptive leadership of the Senate Armed Services Committee has helped build our Nation to a position of military superiority—a posture of great strength from which we are able to continue in our search for a world free from strife.

I am sure the people of Massachusetts and millions of Americans join me in saying we are glad to have Senator Russell back and in good health, and we admire his courage and dedication to the Senate and to this country.

NEBRASKA NEWSPAPERS SUPPORT STATE'S RIGHT-TO-WORK LEGISLATION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Nebraska is 1 of the 19 States which has a right-to-work law. In 1946, by initiative vote, the people of my State amended our constitution to provide for the right to work. The legislature adopted legislation to implement the expressed will of the people.

Now that vote is being threatened by a determined drive in the Congress to enact Federal legislation which would override the majority expression of Nebraska voters.

In recent days, a number of Nebraska newspapers have reaffirmed their support of our constitution and our law. The Norfolk Daily News, for example, said:

> To Nebraskans, the right-to-work law seems a simple enactment of the law of individual freedom.

The Lincoln Journal wrote:

> In Nebraska, the compulsion for defeat of this measure is particularly intense.

The Scottsbluff Star-Herald declared:

> If the President's action for repeal is successful, then the labor coat in Nebraska might well be sackcloth and ashes, in mourning for a freedom sacrificed to presidential ambition and lust for power.

The Omaha Ledger wrote:

> It will be a sad day if pressures brought to bear by labor union bosses can take away this right.

Similar expressions have appeared in several other outstanding newspapers. This editorial survey clearly reflects the overwhelming sentiment in Nebraska. It also reflects the convictions of this Senator.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record, some of the editorial comment on this important subject.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Norfolk Daily News, Apr. 17, 1965]

Right-To-Work Fight Ahead

The news from Washington is that President Johnson is awaiting a lull in the press for enactment of his main legislative program to put the stress on the repeal of section 14b of the Taft-Hartley law. This is the provision which permits States to give the right to work to workers whether or not they belong to a labor union. Labor leaders on the national scene are said to be making every effort to have this right taken away from the States.

The reason that the union leaders are so urgent in their demands for repeal is not that it has any particular effect on the relations between employer and employee. Such relationships go on about the same whether or not there is a 14b in Federal law.

The right-to-work law affects rather the relationship of the individual to his union. It gives him greater freedom to express and fight for his own views of union policy. In a union strongly dominated by its leadership, individuals are discouraged from fighting for their own views which may be contrary to the program of the leadership, by the fact that if they become offensive to the officials or majority of the union, they may be suspended from union membership and thus lose their right to hold their jobs.

Under Nebraska's law, which the leadership hopes to nullify, these members, though dismissed from the union, could still hold their jobs. To meet the charge that the right-to-work law enables employees to enjoy the advantages of union activities without sharing the cost, labor contracts in right-to-work States usually contain a provision that nonunion members must pay the equivalent of union dues into the union treasury.

To Nebraskans the right-to-work law seems a simple enactment of the law of individual freedom. Those who believe this could make their views effective by letting their Senators and Representatives know how they feel.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Evening Journal & Nebraska State Journal, May 19, 1965]

The Right To Work

One of the fiercest attacks on States rights and individual rights ever witnessed in this Nation is about to begin in Congress.

This is the effort to abolish the Federal provision allowing States to adopt "right-to-work" laws. President Johnson signaled the all-out attack when he included the scrapping of right-to-work laws in his special labor message to Congress.

If the topheavy Democratic Congress goes along with the President, unions throughout the Nation will be able to negotiate closed shop or union shop contracts requiring workers to belong to a union in order to hold a job. (Under a closed shop agreement a worker must belong to the union before being hired; under a union shop agreement a worker must join the union within a designated period, usually 30 or 60 days, after being hired.)

Nebraska is 1 of 19 States having right-to-work laws which forbid closed shop or union shop contracts.

Congressional adoption of the President's proposal—which technically would repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—would wipe out one of the last vestiges of State control over labor relations. With this breach of States rights it would be only a short time until the States would become virtually powerless in labor affairs.

More tragically, repeal of the right-to-work provision would be one of the strictest denials of human freedom ever enacted in this country.

It would open the way for requiring that a worker, in order to hold a job, would have to belong to an organization and contribute to its financial support even if he did not care to belong to it and even if he were diametrically opposed to its policies and to the way its finances were spent.

On the basis of this invasion of human rights alone President Johnson's proposal to scuttle the right-to-work principle should be defeated.

In Nebraska the compulsion for defeat of this measure is particularly intense. The State's right-to-work provision, guaranteeing a degree of freedom to workers and employers that is denied in many States, has been a prime inducement to industries seeking new locations.

Repeal of section 14(b) will not automatically require Nebraska workers to belong to a union. Contracts requiring union membership would have to be negotiated with employers before the action would be effective. But this in itself could create intense labor strife in the State as union leaders pressed for closed shop and union shop contracts.

Abandoning the right-to-work principle is not the route to labor harmony or increased benefits for workers. The full political force of Nebraska will have to be rallied in order to help beat down this attack on individual freedom and to preserve the right to work.

[From the Scottsbluff (Nebr.) Star-Herald, May 20, 1965]

Labor Leaders To Get Payoff

President Lyndon B. Johnson is a man of many coats, but when he dons the garment of union labor he indicates a preference in quality and coloration that's been amazingly consistent over the past few years.

There are those, and we are numbered among them, who fail either to understand or to appreciate the basis for his choice.

Our inclination to criticize the presidential taste is rooted no doubt in the fact that, as Nebraskans, we have already chosen a labor coat of different cut and style and aren't likely to take kindly to an attempt from Washington to dictate a fashion rejected in this State many years ago.

The Nebraska labor coat carries the label "right-to-work," by virtue of constitutional law approved by Nebraskans under permission expressly granted by section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The President says this is a bad situation, that the laboring man should be compelled to join a union as a condition of employment, and that the offensive section 14(b) should be repealed by the Congress. If the President has his way, the right-to-work principle adopted in Nebraska and in 18 other States, including neighboring Wyoming, will be destroyed.

Why Mr. Johnson should be permitted to operate as a labor fashion designer may never be known, but the reason for his move in this direction, started officially Tuesday, is as plain as the nose on your face.

Mr. Johnson is preparing to pay the union labor leaders for the votes they delivered to him last November 1964, in the general election.

One of the things the labor leaders demanded and got, as a price for their support, was a promise to initiate legislation to deprive the States of the right to ban compulsory union membership.

If the action is successful, and we'd guess it will be, considering the President's record of success and the makeup of the Congress, the laboring man in the United States will be consigned into the hands of the union labor leaders whether he likes it or not.

His right to make a free choice will be obliterated, while people in high places, with the approval of the President, will prepare to divide up the areas and the crafts and the workers who represent the raw material in the labor mill, into regions of influence and power. Ours will become a labor government, as a consequence, and free enterprise may exist in name only.

Then, the labor coat in Nebraska might well be sackcloth and ashes, in mourning for a freedom sacrificed to presidential ambition and lust for power.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Public Ledger, Apr. 30, 1965]

The Right To Work

In the weeks to come, Congress is to be a battleground over what have come to be known as the "right-to-work laws" on the books in 19 of our 50 States. At issue is section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. It reads: "Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or territorial law."

It may be useful to put this whole issue in historical perspective. What this language says is a simple reaffirmation of a human right which is established as part of Western civilization. Right to work was acclaimed by law in France as early as 1791, and virtually every country in Europe actually used the term as a legal phrase in subsequent years.

After the Civil War in our own country, the Supreme Court handed down right-to-work decisions invalidating laws which denied those who had supported the Confederacy the right to engage in their chosen professions.

Fifty years ago, in 1915, Justice Hughes declared in *Truax* v. *Raich:* "It requires no argument to show that the right to work for a living in the common occupations of the community is of the very essence of the personal freedom and opportunity that it was the purpose of the amendment (14th) to secure."

At the end of World War II, right to work was invoked against a California State law which denied fishermen of Japanese ancestry their right to work at their occupation of fishing in coastal waters.

In modern times, right to work simply means that a man is free to become an active, dues-paying union member if he wishes, but that he cannot be forced to pay union dues to an unwanted union bargaining agent in order to make a living. Both historical precedent and the Constitution affirm a freeman's right to work.

It will be a sad day if pressures brought to bear by labor union bosses can take away this right. Clearly the Congress needs to hear from all kinds of voters on this issue.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, May 22, 1965]

Future of 14(b)

As in several other congressional battles this session, the fight over repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is likely to be detemined in the House of Representatives.

There organized labor has what Columnist Victor Riesel describes as a "razor thin" margin which might be overcome by a determined fight on the part of defenders of State right-to-work laws.

Columnist Arthur Krock sees the administration as about 10 votes short, a prospect which foreshadows some intensive White House "persuasion" if President Johnson is genuinely determined to redeem his campaign promise to organized labor.

The guessing is almost unanimous that Mr. Johnson will indeed fight to a finish, that he could not do otherwise in view of the explicit nature of his promise, and that the few soft words which expressed his intention in his message to Congress were meant to lull opponents rather than to discourage those to whom the President feels that he is politically obliged.

This appears to be one instance in which the President's strenuous efforts for "consensus" will not work. Either right-to-work statutes will continue in the 19 States which have them under the permission of 14(b) or they will be wiped out by congressional action repealing 14(b).

If 14(b) goes, compulsory unionism will be a fact of life in all the 50 States.

If 14(b) goes, what many Americans feel strongly to be their basic individual rights will go with it.

If 14(b) goes, States rights will be virtually extinguished in the field of labor-management relations.

These and other broad matters are sure to be debated before the fate of 14(b) is determined.

But to many citizens the most appalling aspect of the fight over 14(b) is that in spite of whatever solid constitutional arguments are advanced, and no matter how logical and high minded may be the debate, the outcome is likely to depend on White House manipulation of a few votes in the House of Representatives.

And this will not be because the President is known to have flaming convictions on the subject, but because he owes a political debt.

[From the Alliance Daily Times-Herald, May 21, 1965]

Nebraska Should Keep Its Right-To-Work Law

A bevy of 19 bills to remove or amend section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act are pending in the special House Labor Subcommittee and they are expected to begin getting some serious attention now that Congress has received President Johnson's message on the subject.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz told a recent convention of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union that it is part of his job to press for repeal of what is sometimes called the right-to-work law.

The same group was told by George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, that unions must be freed from statutes that curb their efforts to improve the lot of workers. He said his organization hopes to get repeal of section 14(b) this year.

Big labor had inveighed against 14(b) since the labor law's enactment in 1947 but in recent years it realistically hadn't done very much about it. Now the AFL–CIO Executive Council believes it has the votes in the new Congress.

The labor leaders count 221 hard votes for repeal in the House of Representatives, with 218 needed to send the bill to the Senate where they have always been confident of passage.

The Democratic Party platform last year called for outright repeal of 14(b). President Johnson in his state of the Union message stated flatly: "As pledged in our 1960 and 1964 platforms, I will propose to Congress changes in the Taft-Hartley including section 14(b)." What remained was the matter of priority.

The AFL-CIO early in January called all its affiliated brass to Washington for a 4-day lobbying job on the new Congress. But it soon became evident that the administration itself wasn't going to be hurried, that "first things," in the White House view had to do more directly with the Great Society.

Now with the education bill signed into law, with medicare sliding down a clear track, with voting reforms assured (in large outline), with a water pollution bill approved, the administration is ready to give labor the opportunity to collect its bill for support of the Johnson-Humphrey ticket and the Democratic sweep in Congress last year. For its part, labor feels easier about pressing for repeal now that its public image has been improved with avoidance of a long strike in steel.

Union shop contracts between employers and unions require workers to join a union within a specified period, usually 30 to 60 days after being employed. Repeal of 14(b) would, in effect, take away from the States the right to enact laws forbidding union shop contracts and would make such laws inoperable where they now exist. Nineteen States today have right-to-work laws.

One of these 19 is Nebraska and this newspaper trusts that this State's Washington delegation will fight to keep the right-to-work law on our statute books. The Nebraska law does not prevent a worker joining a union; it merely says that a worker need not join a union to hold his job. This is a personal right that should be protected for every American. It is a States rights issue from which the Federal Government should stay removed.

The Johnson administration won its great majority in the 1964 election by championing civil rights for the Negro. This is good. But the L.B.J. men look silly now attempting to take civil rights away from working people who don't happen to want to belong to a union.—G. K.

[From the Nebraska City (Nebr.) News-Press, May 7, 1965]

LET'S KEEP IT

News stories keep saying that Congress is expecting to take up changes in the Taft-Hartley law any day now, with repeal of the right-to-work section the No. 1 object of organized labor.

This, by the way, is when we discover if big union labor really owns the White House. Big labor is boasting that it elected Mr. Johnson and it will see that he puts the heat on Congress to knock out the famous section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

Big labor may have had a big part in the election of President Johnson, but so did a lot of other folks, including a majority of Nebraskans and Iowans. So, Mr. Johnson is the President of all the people.

The issue in the Taft-Hartley repealer is compulsory unionism, a state of being that is as un-American as the election laws in Soviet Russia or Red China. The American way is precisely the opposite—freedom of choice on the part of the working man to join a union or not. He need do neither in Nebraska in order to hold his job.

Nebraskans voted the right-to-work guarantee provided in the Taft-Hartley law into their constitution. The majority was a comfortable one, and we have lived with the law for a good many years. We have labor unions in Nebraska and we have nonunion working men and women.

Nebraskans are going to have their eyes on their Senators and Representatives in Congress when and if this Taft-Hartley repeal comes up for a vote. We are 100 percent sure that three of our five men will vote the way Nebraskans voted. The other two may need some encouragement from home.

SENATE CONFIRMATION OF FUTURE DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on Monday last, the Senate passed S. 313, a bill which provides that any successor to J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the FBI who is nominated by the President must be confirmed by the Senate. The Senate is to be commended for the dispatch with which this important legislation was passed following its approval last week by the Judiciary Committee. At the same time, it is hoped that every effort will be made to give this important legislation early and favorable final action.

The Senate is often called upon to give its advice and consent to the appointments of district court judges, members of small agencies and commissions, postmasters and second lieutenants. Yet, the Congress has no voice in the appointment of the Director of one of the most important agencies of our Government. In the past this has been no particular problem, for in our time Mr. Hoover has filled this job with unparalleled dedication, competence, and longevity. He has become a legend in his own lifetime in the area of effective law enforcement.

However, if and when Mr. Hoover should decide to step down or is for some reason unable to continue as Director, the problem of finding a suitable replacement will have to be faced. In light of the importance of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the sensitive position which it occupies in our system of government it is imperative that the greatest care and consideration be given the selection of the Director.

This bill will insure that the appointment will be given careful consideration not only by the executive branch but also by the legislative. The public airing of the appointment will serve to keep the position of Director and the FBI itself on a high level. This is imperative if the Bureau is to continue to serve the American people in its current exemplary manner.

Its functions in apprehending those accused of breaking Federal laws, investigating for other agencies in the Government, preventing subversion and generally protecting the public interest can be effectively accomplished only if it enjoys the confidence of the people.

The high regard in which Mr. Hoover is held will increase the difficulty of selecting his successor. It is vitally important that this selection be made in such a manner that there will be no question in the minds of the American people that the present high standards will be fostered and maintained.

THE SITUATION IN HUNGARY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there have been a number of articles in the American press recently which convey the impression that conditions are now very much improved under the Kadar regime in Hungary, and that the regime even enjoys considerable popular support.

For example, in the New York Times Sunday Magazine of last December 27, there was an article by Mr. David Binder entitled "Ten Million Hungarians Cannot Be Wrong." The general argument of this article was that Hungarians are satisfied with the Kadar government, and that some even call him "the best Hungarian leader in 500 years."

I do not know where Mr. Binder gets his facts or his quotations. For my own part, I find it difficult to believe that the Hungarian people have so soon forgotten their heroic revolution of October 1956, have forgotten the scores of thousands who were massacred by the Soviet tanks and by the Communist execution squads, have forgotten the despicable role played by Kadar as the chief Soviet quisling and as their puppet Prime Minister.

Recently I had a discussion with some of the leaders of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation. These people, who represent the ideals of the 1956 revolution, told me that it is untrue that there has been any basic change in Hungary or in the attitude of the Hungarian people toward the Kadar dictatorship.

They say that the only change is that the regime is now employing more subtle, more refined techniques of tyranny.

The federation has proof that the Hungarian people are still deprived of their basic freedoms, and that there are still many hundreds of political prisoners. The federation also points out that only last December a new labor law was promulgated in Hungary, further abridging the already seriously abridged rights of labor, and that priests are still being imprisoned for teaching religion to the children.

But I think the most telling answer of all to those who now talk about Hungary as though it were some kind of Communist paradise is the fact that surgical abortions in Hungary now outnumber live births 2 to 1, and that the reproduction rate of 2.1 is lower than the death rate. This is how the Hungarian people manifest their enthusiasm in the regime and their hopes for the future.

I have often said that I thought we made a serious error in consenting to the removal of the Hungarian question from the agenda of the U.N. General Assembly. I have said that this will inevitably encourage the Soviet tyrants to believe that they can get away with murder and genocide in any country, that the free world, although it may wax indignant at the moment, will, with the passage of a few years, forget its indignation and come to accept solutions imposed by Soviet bayonets as the status quo.

I still believe that the peoples of the captive nations of Europe have not made peace with the tyrannies that oppress them, that they remain dedicated allies of the free world, and that their sullen hostility to their regimes and the memory of the Hungarian revolution constitute the chief deterrents to Soviet aggression in Europe.

It is in our interest to encourage the desire for freedom, the will to resist, and hope in a brighter future. But I am afraid we do not do so when we describe the tyrants as heroes, when we so easily forget their crimes, or when we further relax our trade barriers and give these countries favored-nation treatment.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope that the administration will review its policy in Eastern Europe, keeping these things in mind.

THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NATURAL BEAUTY ENDORSEMENT OF THE PRINCIPLE OF THE DOUGLAS AUTO BURIAL AND BEAUTIFICATION FUND

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I endorse the recommendations issued yesterday by a special panel of the White House Conference on Natural Beauty, dealing with the problem of automobile junkyards. The panel recommended:

> A portion of the revenue resulting from the proposed removal of the excise tax should be preserved, or a new tax should be imposed on the industry, to alleviate some of the public problems which are caused by the use of autos.

This is exactly the proposal I made on Monday, when I introduced Senate bill 2019, which would divert 2 percent of the excise tax on new car purchases into a special automobile burial and beautification fund, which would be used to help get rid of auto junk piles.

I am glad to see this principle endorsed by the White House Conference panel.

I am also pleased that the President is proposing action to end the unsightly auto junkyards along the interstate and primary highway system. Although this is a limited action, it is a step in the right direction.

I believe, however, that a much broader program is required if we are to rid the Nation of the rusting scrap heaps that are a disgrace to America. My bill would use revenues from the present excise tax on autos to solve the junk auto problem once and for all. In effect, the tax will represent a user charge on those who buy and use autos. In this way, every new car will carry with it the funds for its ultimate burial.

Once again, I urge Congress to act on my proposal before the excise tax on autos disappears forever. Otherwise, it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to raise the revenue needed in order to deal with the junk auto problem.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on this subject from the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURIAL INSURANCE

That's what a proposal by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, would amount to. It would pay for the interment of the rusty auto corpses that disfigure the beauty of our national landscape.

The Senator proposes a 2-percent excise tax on all new car purchases, so that "whenever a person buys a car, the cost of its ultimate disposal will be included in the purchase price."

The tax would average $50 per car and produce $400 million a year. This would be set aside in a special fund to rid the Nation of ever-growing auto junkpiles.

The Senator's idea is timely for two reasons:

The auto-junkpile problem is so acute that it figured prominently in this week's White House Conference on Natural Beauty.

Congress now is considering the present 10 percent excise tax on autos. Proposals range from complete removal of the tax to President Johnson's plan to reduce it to 5 percent by 1967. Retaining at least 2 percent as auto "burial insurance" at this juncture would be comparatively painless.

America is becoming more urban, more crowded. It needn't necessarily be less beautiful. But it will be unless we start treating our landscape with the same prideful care we give our living rooms. Senator DOUGLAS' proposal is a step in that direction.

GAINS IN SOUTHERN COLLEGES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an article from the May 31 edition of U.S. News & World Report. The article deals with the growth of advanced college-education facilities in the South, and sets forth in a most succinct way the tremendous gains being made.

I am particularly pleased by the references to the Texas Medical Center, the Baylor University College of Medicine, and the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest.

As Dr. Lloyd Berkner, director of the research center, says:

> The coming of science-based industry and the massive flow of people from the farm to the city * * * is the greatest social revolution of our time.

Mr. President, I am proud of the way my State is moving to meet the challenge of education for the future; and I commend the article to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, May 31, 1965]

IN THE NEW SOUTH: THE WAY THE COLLEGES ARE CHANGING

Many youngsters in the South used to go North in search of a good college education. Now they can go to school near home.

Reason: Southern colleges and universities are improving.

It's part of the change that is sweeping the South.

Now you can add colleges to the list of things that are growing and improving in the changing South.

An areawide campaign to step up the quality of education in southern universities and colleges is beginning to show results.

Standards are being raised. Faculties are being enlarged and salaries increased. Spending for higher education is going up year after year.

This change, spurred in part by the growing industrialization and rising prosperity of the South, has significance for the entire Nation.

It comes at a time when colleges all over the country are becoming overcrowded, and growing numbers of high school graduates are looking for places to get a higher education.

GO NORTH NO MORE

Fading, as southern colleges improve, is the notion long held by some southern families that to get the best in education their youngsters must go North to college. Northern youngsters now are being attracted to southern schools in increasing numbers. More and more universities in the South are acquiring prestige to rival that of previously better known institutions in other parts of the country.

All this, and more, shows up in surveys of educational trends in the South.

Winfred L. Godwin, director of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), reports that progress in the South is showing up at every level, from grade school through postgraduate study.

"The South is joining the national drive for better education," he says.

"We're getting aggressive political leadership under pressure from all our people—businessmen, bankers, farmers and everyday folks—to give our youngsters a chance at a really first-class education here in their home region.

"It's a terrific strain, economically, but we are clear about the need, and we are moving."

The area supporting the Southern Regional Education Board includes the 11 States of the Civil War Confederacy, plus the border States of Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Oklahoma.

In that 15-State area, in 1964, all State appropriations for colleges and universities totaled more than $600 million for the next 2 years.

That was an increase of 29 percent over 1962—and 1962 appropriations had been almost double those of 1960.

A BILLION A YEAR

Add Federal aid, and you find that total spending for higher education in the entire area has run well above a billion dollars every year since 1960.

You see the results on almost every campus. New laboratories in modern designs of concrete and glass are rising among old buildings of traditional brick and limestone. Everywhere are throngs of students.

Undergraduate enrollment in the area has more than doubled in 10 years—up to 1.2 million by 1963, and still rising.

New 2-year "community colleges" and vocational schools are growing fast, and are expected to reach a total enrollment of 3 million by 1966.

Ten years ago no such community colleges were in existence.

Florida pioneered in this type of school, and its system still serves as a model for most Southern States and other parts of the Nation as well.

HIGHER DEGREES

To many educators, the most significant change in southern education is the growing interest in graduate study.

Says a Texas professor: "We've got to remember that students are not seeking degrees of doctor of philosophy just to qualify for teaching these days—although that's important. They are also developing creative talents which will help industry bring more jobs and new ideas to our economy."

Economists agree, however, that the South is still not turning out enough students with advanced degrees. In the Dallas-Fort Worth area, for instance, 200 persons with Ph. D. degrees are now employed—and only 44 of them did their graduate study in the region.

In the United States as a whole, 15 out of 1,000 college graduates go on to earn doctoral degrees. But in the southern and border States, only 5 out of 1,000 go on to acquire doctorates.

That picture may be changing, according to Dr. James L. Miller, Jr., research director of the Southern Regional Education Board.

Before 1950, says Dr. Miller, there were only 13 really well-established graduate programs in the entire southern region, and they had awarded 96 percent of all Ph. D. degrees in the region up to that time.

Between 1950 and 1963, he finds, 28 different universities awarded more than 75 Ph. D. degrees each. Universities in Texas alone granted more than 400 in that period.

This means, according to Dr. Miller, that "the traditional southern dependence upon eastern and midwestern graduate schools for new faculty" is being reduced and the steady migration northward of our best faculty people is being cut down."

Even greater effort to boost graduate schools is necessary, in the opinion of some southern educators.

Dr. Lloyd Berkner, director of the newly established Graduate Research Center of the Southwest, in Dallas, says: "The coming of science-based industry and the massive flow of people from the farm to the city in this region is the greatest social revolution of our time. The South and Southwest must create jobs in science-based industries. Unfortunately, this has just been recognized in the last few years. We are facing a crisis."

ROLE OF RESEARCH

In part, the crisis is laid to the recent location in the South and Border States of huge new Federal research centers. Young scientists at these centers demand the chance to continue their education.

The University of Alabama, as one example, has opened at Huntsville a full-scale branch—offering undergraduate and graduate courses—for people working at the Redstone Arsenal and the George C. Marshall Space Center.

A survey showed that, at the Huntsville branch, 16 percent of the students had their tuition paid by the Army Missile Command, 32 percent by the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, 38 percent by contractors in the missile and space industry—and only 14 percent paid their own way.

The University of Tennessee has announced that it is opening a branch at Tullahoma that will accommodate young scientists working for the U.S. Air Force at the Arnold Engineering Development Center.

The University of Florida, at Gainesville, now is offering courses leading to graduate degrees in engineering by closed-circuit television to other parts of the State. More than 300 engineers employed by Government agencies and space industries around Cape Kennedy are studying under this system.

At Newport News, Va., NASA is cooperating with three universities in the State—the University of Virginia, the College of William and Mary, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute—to establish the Virginia Associated Research Center. Students working on research projects for NASA at the Center will be given academic credit toward advanced degrees.

STRONG MEDICINE

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is also helping to spur higher education in southern and border States.

In the past 10 years, HEW grants have gone to build, or modernize, medical schools and hospitals throughout the region. And an increasing proportion of research grants from the National Institutes of Health has been going in recent years to southern universities and medical schools.

NIH announced in February of this year that it was setting up a vast new Environmental Health Center in the research triangle area of North Carolina. The triangle is land set aside for research and research-oriented industry. It is located about midway among the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Duke University at Durham and North Carolina State University at Raleigh. All three institutions cooperate in a research institute in the triangle.

The Texas Medical Center, in Houston, is recognized as one of the finest in the United States. It has reached this status in large measure through its association with Baylor University's school of medicine, medical scientists say. NIH grants have helped Baylor a lot in recent years.

Ten years ago Baylor received only $200,000 in NIH grants. In 1964 it received more than $9 million.

FUNDS FROM INDUSTRY

Along with the increase in Federal grants and State appropriations, southern universities are beginning to attract more funds from industries in the area for research institutes.

These institutes are usually joint enterprises involving more than one university or college, such as the Research Triangle Institute in North Carolina.

Almost every southern and border State has at least one research institute in operation or well along in the planning stage at this time.

In February of this year, Florida State University, Louisiana State University, and seven Texas universities announced that they were joining with the Southwest Research Institute to form a new combined research organization, Gulf Universities Research Corporation. Estimated cost of the first 5 years: $25 million.

One big advantage of these research institutes, according to George R. Herbert, director of the Triangle Institute, is that they are serving local business and industry directly. This means increased financial stability and academic independence he says.

THE SALARY GAP

While most southern educators agree that there is an education renaissance under way in the region, they also see some continuing problems.

Teachers' salaries from grade school to graduate school lag behind the rest of the Nation. Most States have raised salaries, as have most privately endowed institutions. But the gap persists.

Triangle Institute's Mr. Herbert believes the gap to be closing, however. It works this way, he suggests:

"As educational opportunities increase, more bright young people will be attracted to college. Many of them will become teachers. With these bright young teachers on hand, research-minded industry will increase its interest in the South. That will increase job opportunities. And as more people have better jobs, they will insist on better schools for their children. And so the whole educational establishment will be upgraded."

Many observers say that is what is happening in the South now.

As one college administrator in the South put it:

"We are abandoning the traditional double standard by which southern institutions are compared only with others in the South. Now they stand comparison with those anywhere in the Nation."

PROTECTING THE PUBLIC INTEREST IN PUBLICLY FINANCED RESEARCH

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the following very sensible point is made in an editorial which was published this morning in the Washington Post:

> When a private business enterprise contracts and pays for research and development work, there is seldom if ever any question about its right to the patents that may emerge. The same principle should apply in the case of Government-sponsored research. There is no good reason why the taxpayers should be expected to pay $15 billion a year for research and then turn over to the adequately compensated contractors exclusive patent rights.

Many times before, we have seen instances in which private interests have, with enviable vision, recognized an area which, if exploited, would reap rich rewards for the exploiter. This is desirable in the areas which are the proper province of the entrepreneur. But in areas where public funds are involved, where the taxpayers' dollars have laid the groundwork or have paid the whole bill, private interests should not reap a windfall profit at the expense of the public purse.

Yet we saw the communications satellite giveaway, by which technological knowledge developed through the expenditure of public funds was turned over to a monopoly which is to be the sole body to be allowed to make use of this knowledge in the field of satellite communications.

Today, the same thing is happening in another field, where private interests foresee a future of enormous windfall profits, by a public subsidy to private interests, in the form of Government-financed research to which private companies will acquire monopoly patent rights. They raise no end of phantom arguments in an attempt to mask their real interest. They say this subsidy is needed in order to encourage research. If this is true, and if private companies will not engage in research unless the Government subsidizes them, then something is profoundly wrong somewhere. I always thought that competition and the desire to make greater profits by discovering new and better products were among incentives which stimulated private industry to engage in research.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] for the great public service he performed in pointing out, in his speech of May 19, the efforts made in the executive branch of the Government to give away to private contractors the Government's rights.

It is true that there are areas of knowledge which are so unexplored that private companies might be unwilling to undertake research, because the cost would be too great in relation to the probability of profits. In such instances it is proper for public funds to be expended—but for the public good, not for the sake of private gain. One possibility here is to give the private company an exclusive right, for a limited period of time, if the company has made a substantial financial contribution to the research and development, and if the exclusive right will promote the utilization of the development and will also promote the public welfare. This approach has been utilized by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] in an amendment which he has offered to House bill 2984, the Health Research Facilities Amendments of 1965.

In this struggle between the public interest and those who seek a public subsidy to enrich private coffers, the stakes are immense. The Federal Government every year becomes more involved in the financing of scientific research. This being the case, it is the responsibility of Congress to protect the public purse, rather than to construct private pipelines from the Public Treasury to private recipients.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hassle Over Patents," which was published on May 26 in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 26, 1965]

HASSLE OVER PATENTS

The long smoldering dispute over the patenting of discoveries made in the course of federally financed research and development work has flared up again. Senator LEE METCALF, in a speech on the floor of the Senate, accused several high administration officials of "lobbying" on behalf of certain business groups. These groups believe that the patent rights to ideas developed with Federal funds should be awarded to the contracting business firm or nonprofit institution.

"Lobbying" is a pejorative, often imprecise term, and there is little point in attempting to plumb the Senator's charges. But there is much that should be said and done about the failure of the Government to articulate a clear policy in this troublesome area.

Some Federal agencies, notably the Atomic Energy Commission, follow a clear and consistent rule. Except in cases where the research contractor already holds patents in closely related areas, all patents issuing from Federal contracts automatically revert to the Government. But other agencies are permitted by law to waive the patent claims of the Government.

The battle now being waged, both in the Congress and within the administration, is over which policy shall prevail. Senator RUSSELL B. LONG insists that the patents growing out of Federal contracts belong to the public, and he has attached amendments to several important bills which uphold that principle. The patent law bar, industry groups and many universities are ranged on the other side. They contend that the prospect of owning patent rights provides an important incentive to solve problems quickly. And they raise the question of whether the Government has the right to patents where the contracting researcher draws upon a previously acquired expertise.

In October 1963, the late President Kennedy issued a patent memorandum which purported to provide guidance for Government agencies. But that document and the Patent Advisory Panel subsequently formed appear only to have confused matters.

Patent policy issues can be complex, but not so esoteric as spokesmen for the patent bar claim when they chastise laymen for speaking out. When a private business enterprise contracts and pays for research and development work, there is seldom if ever any question about its right to the patents that may emerge. The same principle should apply in the case of Government-sponsored research. There is no good reason why the taxpayers should be expected to pay $15 billion a year for research and then turn over to the adequately compensated contractors exclusive patent rights.

To be sure, the rights of the owners of "background patents" should be protected when they engage in Government contract work. But aside from that exception, all patents developed under Federal contracts should revert to the Government, and the Government in turn should make the patented knowledge freely available to all potential users.

SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S POLICY ON VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, recently I received a resolution adopted by the 18th District Convention of the American Legion, Department of Texas, in which the actions of our President in defense of freedom and in opposition to Communist tyranny and aggression are fully supported.

I concur in the view of the Legionnaires; and, in order that other Senators may share the view of these dedicated Texans, I ask that a copy of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 4: AFFIRM SUPPORT OF PRESIDENTIAL ACTION IN VIETNAM

Whereas U.S. Advisory Forces are in southeast Asia, especially concentrated in South Vietnam; and

Whereas they are under continual harassment by communistic infiltrated forces; and

Whereas President Johnson, upon request by the Government of South Vietnam, has taken necessary action in bombing supply lines and troop concentrations in North Vietnam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, 18th district, Department of Texas, fully endorses the action taken by President Johnson in response to the request of the South Vietnam Government; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the Office of the President of the United States and with courtesy copies to each U.S. Senator of Texas; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the Department of Texas and the national convention.

Eighteenth district resolution committee,
EARL BASKETT, *Chairman.*
Members:
JAMES D. O'DANIEL.
W. L. THOMAS.

Date May 2, 1965, action approved.

By vote of the 18th district convention.

——— ———,
Adjutant, the American Legion, Department of Texas.

RECOGNITION OF EASTERN (GREEK) ORTHODOXY

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I wish to advise the Members of Congress that the State Legislature of my State of Idaho recently unanimously adopted a resolution to recognize Eastern—Greek—Orthodoxy as a major religious faith in the State. Approximately 30 States have now done so.

Rev. Father Constantine Palassis, of Idaho and eastern Oregon, and members of the Orthodox Church were the moving forces in bringing to the attention of the members of the State legislature the need for such a resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask that a letter written to Members of the U.S. Congress by the Voice of Greek Orthodoxy in America, giving some pertinent information and background on Eastern Greek Orthodoxy, also be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 6 BY JUDICIARY AND RULES COMMITTEE

A resolution recognizing the Eastern Orthodox Church as a major faith in the State of Idaho

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:

Whereas it has come to the attention of the members of the Legislature of the State of Idaho that, whenever mention is made or matter is printed concerning the major faiths, usually only Protestants, Catholics, and Jews are referred to as constituting the major faiths of the State; and

Whereas the Eastern Orthodox Church, by reason of its long and illustrious history, should be included in the meaning of any recognition of the major faiths: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Eastern Orthodox Church is hereby recognized as a major faith in the State of Idaho, and official references to the major faiths shall be deemed to and will include the Eastern Orthodox Church; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit suitable copies of this resolution to the Most Reverend Archbishop Iakovos, Archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America, Primate of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese, to the Reverend Father Constantine S. Palassis, of Idaho and eastern Oregon, and to all news media of the State of Idaho.

THE VOICE OF GREEK
ORTHODOXY IN AMERICA,
Washington, D.C.

Re the four major religious faiths: Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox, and Jewish.

To the MEMBERS OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JORDAN: In the consideration of two major issues before the U.S. Congress—civil rights and public school prayers—references at the hearings and in debates have been made to only three of the four major faiths, with Orthodoxy, known as the Eastern (Greek) Orthodox faith, being the forgotten faith.

To correct this misconception of only three major faiths—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish—we of the Voice of Greek Orthodoxy in America give you this background information.

1. The Greek Orthodox Archdiocese reveals that there are approximately 7 million Eastern Orthodox in America. Statistics show that there are 60 million Protestants, 40 million Roman Catholics, and 5¼ million Jews in America. Thus by statistics alone Orthodoxy is one of the four major faiths.

2. Twenty-seven legislatures have passed laws requiring that, in reference to major faiths, Eastern Orthodoxy should be included. Your State may be one.

3. The Armed Forces in 1955 changed their regulations to permit Eastern Orthodox identification in the servicemen's records and their identification (dog) tags. Prior to that time there were only three designations—Protestant, Catholic, Jew.

4. Eastern Orthodox chaplains were permitted for the first time in 1951 although the Eastern Orthodox strived all through World War II for that cherished right.

5. President Eisenhower was the first President to invite an Eastern Orthodox to give a prayer at the 1957 inaugural, thus bringing our four faiths together.

6. Many State and city public functions and inaugurals now have four faiths attending.

7. Appointments to high office by Presidents and Governors were being considered only on the three-faiths basis but President

Eisenhower and President Kennedy began including Eastern Orthodox for Presidential appointments. More of this is needed.

8. Eastern Orthodox have been erroneously designated as either Catholic or Protestant. History reveals that Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism separated in A.D. 1054, and Protestants broke away from the Roman Catholic Church in the 16th century. Therefore Eastern Orthodox, Protestants and Roman Catholics are three distinct faiths.

9. Senate and House bills were introduced to refer to Orthodoxy as a major faith.

Thanking you for the privilege of sending you this brief background which we hope you will keep handy and make use thereof, I am,

Respectfully yours,

SAM REVITHES,
National Treasurer, The Voice of Greek Orthodoxy in America.

OBJECTION TO PROPOSED REVISION OF SKIP-ROW .COTTON PLANTING REGULATIONS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, recently I received from the Tom Green County, Tex., Crops Committee a letter of protest about the Department of Agriculture proposals to revise skip-row cotton planting regulations.

I share the view of the crops committee that the regulation change is unwise and unwarranted; and in order that other Senators may share the committee's views, I ask that a copy of the letter the committee has sent to the Department of Agriculture be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN ANGELO, TEX.,
May 15, 1965.

DIRECTOR FARMER PROGRAMS DIVISION,
ASCS-USDA
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We protest the proposed change in the rules for measuring cotton when planted in a skip-row pattern.

Skip-row planting originated in Tom Green County in the 1920's. Some of the land in this area has been planted in skip-rows since it was first put in cultivation.

The proposed change will be a hardship on the producers in this county. It will create much confusion and make it almost impossible for a producer to adequately plan his planting.

The present rule has not increased cotton production in this county, and production figures prove it. Skip-row planting means the difference of whether we make a crop or not.

We request that the proposed change not be made and the present rule be continued in effect. It is necessary to the economy of this area.

Yours truly,

Tom Green County Crops Committee: W. B. Block, Sonora Route, San Angelo, Tex.; John Schriever, Jr., Eola, Tex.; Frank Culley, Route 3, Box 131, San Angelo, Tex.; J. H. Sims, Route 2, Miles, Tex.; H. E. Hurst, Route 3, Box 387, San Angelo, Tex.; L. J. Seidel, Route 2, Miles, Tex.; Walter Fuchs, Wall, Tex.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY HOLUM DEDICATES JAMES RIVER DAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 23, 1965, the people of the Huron, S. Dak., area joined in the dedication of an important new dam on the James River, near Huron. This project will provide municipal water, recreation, and wildlife benefits for the people of central South Dakota.

On hand for the major dedication address was one of South Dakota's most distinguished sons, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Kenneth Holum.

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent address by Assistant Secretary Holum be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY KENNETH HOLUM, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT, AT DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF THE JAMES DIVERSION DAM, HURON, S. DAK., MAY 23, 1965

Three years ago this coming September, I sat down with the mayor of Huron to sign the water-service contract that was necessary before we could begin construction of the James River Diversion Dam.

I had no idea that day that I would have the honor of participating in its dedication. It is an honor; not because of the size of the structure—for it indeed is small compared to Grand Coulee, Hoover, Glen Canyon, or even Oahe Dam—but because of what it represents to people like you and me who have learned the value of water conservation through personal experience here on the drouthy plains.

Most of you present today are products of the James River Valley; so am I. We have seen the "Big Jim" in all its moods, ranging from springtime floods that engulfed our farm lowlands, to the virtual dry, useless stagnation of late summer and fall—and we have despaired.

President Lincoln once commented that "the Almighty has His own program."

Our program here is to put our God-given resources of earth and water to the best possible use for mankind's advancement. This I believe—whether it is in South Dakota or California—is in harmony with the Almighty's plan.

This dam was built at the request of Huron to supplement that city's water supply. And, by the way, we are exploring the possibilities of constructing another dam in the vicinity of Mitchell to meet that city's water needs.

We were happy to respond to the appeal by the mayor of Mitchell and his city council, and the urgent request for swift action by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN. Though this request came to us only a couple of weeks ago, the Bureau of Reclamation already has a reconnaissance study underway, at my direction.

The James River Dam and Reservoir will not only double Huron's water supply, it will provide a great source of recreation for the entire area as well as some mighty fine fishing. Eventually, and I hope soon, this facility will become a feature of the Oahe Unit—that half-million-acre irrigation project, which will mean so much to the economy and welfare of this State.

Five recreation areas will be developed under an agreement with the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks. Two will be here, one on each side of the dam, and the other three along the reservoir at several-mile intervals upstream. Shady picnic areas and boat ramps will provide facilities for lots of fun and relaxation.

Four more areas are being set aside for wildlife habitat along the reservoir. These will be feeding and nesting areas for ducks and pheasants, and feeding areas for deer.

For many people here today, I am sure this is all like a dream come true. The benefits of this development will accrue not only to us and our children, but our children's children as well.

A community without an ample supply of water is one that is headed for economic stagnation and an end to its growth. I am reminded of a remark made a long time ago by an engineer, advising the city of Los Angeles when it was considering going far back into the mountains for a water supply. The cost was considerable, and there was much hesitation. Finally, the engineer said: "If you don't obtain this water, you won't ever need it."

Well, Los Angeles went after that water, and then more, and more, and you can see the results today.

To grow and prosper, an area must develop its land and water resources. In South Dakota we have come only part way in this job. While we are realizing the great benefits of power generation from Missouri River mainstem dams, in addition to recreation, we can do much more and must, if the economic potential of this area is ever to be attained. I'm talking, of course, about putting the water to work on our productive farmland. I'm talking about the proposed Oahe unit and what it can do to open the doors of economic opportunity in our State, where they have been closed to a narrow slit in the past decade or two.

To get a glimpse of what the Oahe unit can do, let's look at some of the things that have happened in areas similar to this. In 1956, a study was made on the North Platte project in western Nebraska and southeastern Wyoming, which is a 350,000-acre project, first irrigated in 1908. The lands extend over a distance of 110 miles, from Guernsey, Wyo., to Bridgeport, Nebr.—an area like the Oahe unit.

In terms of products sold off the farm, the irrigated land on this project produces 13 times more per acre than the adjacent dryland farms. Only 10 percent of the four-county area is irrigated. But that 10 percent is responsible for 91 percent of the total income payments in the area. It supports 27 times as many people, and provides 40 times the income, as adjacent prairie areas of equivalent size.

Property tax revenues in Scottsbluff County, which has irrigation, are 20 times greater than in Banner County, which adjoins it, but has little irrigation. I don't need to remind you, I am sure, what this means in terms of schools, roads, and other civic improvements.

During the drought years of the 1930's, population of the irrigated area increased 18 percent. In the adjacent dryland areas it decreased 12 percent. Similar contrasts can be drawn on project after project throughout the West. It is the story of reclamation.

Past experience with irrigation in eastern South Dakota, and farm management studies of potential irrigation on the Oahe unit, show that the most profitable irrigated land-use pattern would consist primarily of the same crops now being raised in this area, but they would be raised in different proportions.

Likewise, we would raise the same types of livestock we have now. But, instead of shipping them out of the State to be fattened, we would fatten them on our own farms here in South Dakota, and the livestock products would be processed right here in our own State.

What does the Oahe unit mean to South Dakota? Let me give you a capsule idea:

The gross value of crops sold after irrigation development would triple, from $8 million to $24 million.

Estimated annual value of livestock and livestock products sold from irrigated farms would nearly quadruple from $22 million to about $82 million.

Annual gross farm income would be about $108 million compared to about $32 million, without irrigation—an increase of $76 million, or four times. Cash farm outlay would increase by some $42 million, representing purchases of supplies and equipment, wages for labor, and other items which keep the wheels of commerce moving.

The estimated total farm investment would increase by nearly $143. million and farm wages would increase by over $3 million annually.

South Dakota State University studies show that irrigation would reduce farm income variability to 30 percent of what it is on dryland farms. Stating it in another way, this is a 70-percent increase in stability of farm income, and is in addition to the estimates of increased farm returns to labor and management, ranging from 40 to 100 percent per farm.

This is why your Oahe Conservancy Subdistrict board and manager, and others like them, are working so hard to make the Oahe unit a reality. And, when you consider the many related benefits, such as municipal water supplies, recreation, fish and wildlife, flood control, and pollution control, the picture looms bigger still.

Construction of the Oahe unit can bring a new era of prosperity to South Dakota. Irrigation is only part of it. Stabilized output of agricultural products and the confidence that comes from knowing that year after year there will be a steady flow of products, will attract processing industries. There will be more retail business and commercial activity, more construction of highways, store buildings, plants, warehouses, schools, and churches. All these, in turn, will make jobs for more people. More people, more activity, more property, make for a broader tax base. All these things are the result of developing natural resources.

Water resource development is long-range work in which a great deal of planning and study are involved. The Oahe unit fits this category. It takes considerable time to study, plan, and build large projects. In the case of Oahe, much of the study effort is completed. The Bureau of Reclamation will have its revised report on my desk this summer. There are many steps a project must go through before congressional authorization. I will not go into all these details.

However, I do want to say that reclamation law requires repayment of certain reimbursable costs of reclamation projects. Contracts between local groups that will operate and use the project, and the United States, must be successfully negotiated and executed. These contracts must be ratified by a vote of the residents within the districts, which are parties to the contracts.

Through the work of the Oahe Conservancy Subdistrict you have come a long way. Work is going forward on not only the master contract covering the entire Oahe unit, but on the so-called participating contracts as well between the subdistrict and the two newly formed irrigation districts on the lake plain.

Formation of the two new irrigation districts was a great stride forward last winter. To take the next step, however, and all those that must follow, will require the continued interest and support of potential irrigators in the irrigation districts. More than this, it will require the steady support of all the people of this area.

This dam and reservoir mark the beginning of a new era in the James River Valley and in South Dakota. In the future there will be huge conveyance works consisting of large canals, reservoirs, and pumping plants bringing enormous quantities of water from the Missouri River to the area to enrich the lives of thousands of farm families and town folks as well.

We all look forward to that time. And today, as we dedicate this dam and reservoir to the prosperity, welfare and enjoyment of the people in this community, let us also dedicate ourselves to the great unfinished task of resource development and conservation that lies before us in our own State and elsewhere throughout the Nation.

Two thousand years ago the poet Horace wrote of building "a monument more lasting than bronze."

Today, in conservation works such as these, we can speak of building our own lasting monuments—monuments to man's intelligence—for the bountiful benefits which flow from these wise investments in developing our resources will enrich the lives of Americans for generations to come.

A LITTLE BAND OF SOBER MEN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Little Band of Sober Men," which was published in the May 1965, issue of Fortune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LITTLE BAND OF SOBER MEN

"No government can be long secure without a formidable opposition," wrote Benjamin Disraeli, and rarely has there been more need of that commodity than in the United States today. For it remained for Lyndon B. Johnson not only to capture the votes last November, but apparently to capture just about everything else. In a sensational way he has preempted the issue of prosperity and is giving the country the "full dinner pail" and the "two cars in every garage" that Republicans once promised. What's more, as the article on page 97 makes plain, he has likewise got a goodly number of businessmen to go along with his "new economics" of growth, full employment, and the good life for all.

Yet it is precisely in euphoric times like these, when consensus is on every lip, that the country most needs an intelligent if not a formidable opposition to serve at least as auditor of the books and watchdog of the public business. And we are glad to discover that at least on one recent occasion Republicans lived up to their responsibility and opportunity. We refer specifically to the part which a small group of them played in that great congressional springtime festival—the hearings on the President's Economic Report and the annual report of his Council of Economic Advisers.

At the conclusion of these hearings the heavily weighted Democratic majority of the Joint Economic Committee filed a report that in effect bangs a rubberstamp on just about everything in the President's message. But six Republicans, including men of such diverse views as Senator JAVITS, of New York, and Representative TOM CURTIS, of Missouri, refused to be mesmerized. Their minority report is by no means a masterpiece of English prose: it is badly organized, hastily written, includes internal dissents, and in some instances is subject to varying interpretations. But, on net balance, it is a constructive and needed document. In this instance, at least, Republicans have used their critical faculties without turning reactionary. They got back into the dialog.

REWRITING HISTORY

Not the least important contribution of the minority report is its insistence on keeping the record straight and its refusal to allow the administration to rewrite history on its own terms. After over 4 years of enormous economic expansion, it is tempting for any government to claim that "we planned it that way," and advocates for the Johnson administration have not been above this temptation. Yet, as the minority report makes clear, the recovery of the economy from its 1960 levels to those of 1965 was brought about by many complex forces, including the resilience of American business itself, and things did not always go according to schedule. This is specifically true of the great tax-cutting experiment of 1964, which the President has claimed marks a turning point in domestic economic policy, as may well be the case. But no one is quite sure even today about the exact effects of tax cutting and more certainly the experiment worked in ways unforeseen by the Council of Economic Advisers, and by almost everybody else.

During the great tax debate, members of the council and Government spokesmen argued that the stimulating effect of the tax cut would be nullified if Federal expenditures were held down. However, Republicans conditioned their support of the experiment on trying to do just that, and in the end this position more or less prevailed. In the opinion of the minority report this was just as well, for "if the tax cut had been accompanied by large increases in Federal spending on the order of the previous 3 years, it is likely that the Nation would have experienced a serious inflationary overheating of the economy."

TOOLS AND WORKMEN

While events turned out fortunately in 1964, the future is not one great rosy glow. Despite some efforts at economy, the Republicans point out, the present boom since 1961 has been accompanied by continuous and big deficits in the Federal administrative budget. It has also been fed by a relatively easy money policy, with an expansion of bank credit by some 8 percent per year, and a rapid rise in total money supply including time deposits. All this could give rise to inflationary pressures now and a slowdown later when "the underlying expansionary forces in the economy are becoming less pronounced." This is the more likely because in early 1966 the administration's budgetary policy will turn more restrictive with a sharp raising of social security taxes.

The Republicans now take for granted what many of them had long disputed; namely, that fiscal and monetary policies have a large part to play in promoting high levels of output. But do Washington officials have sufficient knowledge to manipulate the new tools they hold in their hands? There is, for instance, merit in the concept of the "full-employment budget," which tells us not what Federal expenditures and revenues actually were this year or last, but what they might have been if the economy were running at full capacity with unemployment down to a theoretical target of 4 percent. Yet Henry Wallich, of Yale University, has shown that this concept is also filled with statistical pitfalls. A change of only 1 percent in the unemployment standard might mean a difference of $4 to $5 billion in the full-employment surplus and would upset all calculations.

A hardheaded and modern fiscal policy should take account of these difficulties. It should recognize that as the economy grows so will Federal receipts, and hence there will be room for prudent tax reductions, and further tax reform to encourage business and individual incentives. But tax cutting should be linked with economy within the Federal Establishment, and the fiscal stimulus cannot be turned on and off like a water tap. As Walter D. Fackler, of the University of Chicago has pointed out, there will always be serious lags in policy decisions. The danger is that by the time these decisions are carried out the need has often passed, and the effects are frequently perverse. The overriding aim of budget policy should be truly to stabilize the economy, not to destabilize it by lurches this way and that.

NO FAVOR TO LABOR

The Republicans emphasize that the economy may run into production bottlenecks well before unemployment is reduced to the 4 percent of the labor force, and they warn against taking this overall target too literally. More significantly, they challenge the prevailing view in Washington that unemployment is mainly caused by the lack of effective aggregate demand in the economy which Government spending or tax cutting can remedy. The causes of unemployment are multiple and include, among other things, maladjustment in wages.

In the view of the Council of Economic Advisers, excessive wage increases are bad principally because they tend to push up prices and so cause inflation. The minority report cuts deeper when it says that "any action which raises wage costs too rapidly tends to eliminate job opportunities. This is particularly true in the case of teenagers when the lowest wage is set above their worth to an employer. * * * High wage rates have an unfavorable effect on some of those who need jobs the most." Senator Javits registered a dissent on some of these views, emphasizing that racial discrimination and other factors are crucial in explaining unemployment. But he also states that the impact of the minimum-wage laws should be taken into account in devising effective retraining programs.

The Republicans do not have the courage to demand a reduction in the power of trade unions to force up wage rates year after year no matter what the condition of employment and unemployment may be. But they do call for freeing up the labor market and suggest many possible reforms for making it more flexible—more emphasis on training and education by industry and Government alike, better statistics, and better information services on where job opportunities exist. The minority report recognizes that the technological revolution will, of course, have adverse consequences for certain classes of workers. It stresses, however, that demand for labor is rapidly rising in the service industries—particularly "home services." And on balance, it holds with the view of Prof. Yale Brozen, of the University of Chicago, who has said: "The primary effect of automation is not a reduction in the number of jobs available. Rather it makes it possible for us to do many things which otherwise could not and would not be done."

THE OPEN WORLD

In emphasizing that deficit spending is not only cure for unemployment at home, the Republicans have made a contribution toward alleviating some of the country's pressing economic problems abroad. For it cannot be doubted that hot pursuit of the full-employment goal through persistent deficits and relatively easy money has played a part in causing the gap in the U.S. foreign balance of payments. The report cites the opinion of the National Industrial Conference Board to the effect that the U.S. economy has "been very nearly flooded with liquidity." Such liquidity, of course, encouraged the outflow of U.S. funds overseas, which in late 1964 completely upset the calculations of the administration as regards the U.S. foreign position.

This position cannot be entirely rectified by direct Government action for restraining capital outflow. Such measures at best paper over a basically unsound situation, and if they work, entail hidden costs on the free economy. Says the report: "The whole approach to controls, whether voluntary or not, over U.S. loans and investments is wrong because it tends to subvert actions dictated naturally by market conditions. Rather than working against the market, the administration should try to work with it."

Specifically, the Republicans call for making investment opportunities more attractive within the United States, for reviewing foreign aid, and for prudent monetary restraint. They warn that controls could well signal "the beginning of the end for the dollar as the world's leading reserve currency * * * and the beginning of the end of the more open world which the free nations have so laboriously constructed since the end of World War II."

By holding up the ideal of his open world and by emphasizing the need for maintaining the free market both at home and abroad, these Congressmen have served their country well. They have not written a classic document, but they have set a precedent that their party might follow if it is to play the role of a constructive opposition. The report is "liberal" in the sense that it accepts many of the goals which the President has set forth for America—the maintenance of a high employment and production economy not least. It is also "liberal" in the sense that it accepts the critical role of government in achieving these ends. But whereas the administration has been long on optimism and at times euphoric, the Republican statement strikes a soberer tone. It makes plain that along with our present prosperity there are clouds, somewhat bigger than a man's hand, on the horizon, and it displays a welcome skepticism as to just how far the Federal Government can manage, and ought to try to manage, an economy as big and diverse as that of the United States.

SENATOR YARBOROUGH'S SPEECH ON MENTAL RETARDATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in recent years, this Nation has made substantial progress in the treatment and cure of mental illness. The impetus for these efforts was furnished by the late President Kennedy, whose genuine interest and activity brought to bear the national pressures for our endeavors in the prevention and cure of mental illness and retardation. This is not to say that our country has been lacking in loyal and competent doctors and workers in this field, for there are many people who have dedicated their lives to the care of the mentally retarded. However, it is only in recent years that the coordinated attack of various levels of government, hospitals, and private agencies has been instituted to effectively assault the problems of mental health.

Among the active supporters of increased assistance for research, treatment, and new teaching techniques is the Honorable Ralph Yarborough. As a member of the Senate Health Subcommittee, he has been in the forefront in securing enactment of legislation which will lead to the rehabilitation of our afflicted citizens, thus providing for them the opportunity to become as self-sufficient and productive as possible.

On May 14, Senator Yarborough spoke to a statewide convention of the Texas Association for Retarded Children in Amarillo, Tex. In his remarks, he briefly outlined our objectives in creating a brighter future for the mentally handicapped. He not only pointed out significant figures evidencing this problem but also the substantial increases which have been realized in the rehabilitation process.

The senior Senator from Texas is to be commended for his meaningful remarks and for his constructive leadership in conquering the complex and difficult problems of mental health. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator Yarborough's speech, "The Objectives and Role of the Federal Government in the Field of Mental Retardation," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Objectives and Role of the Federal Government in the Field of Mental Retardation

(By Senator Yarborough, of Texas)

One of the many debts which this Nation owes to the late President John F. Kennedy, is his keen sensitivity to the problems of mental retardation and his firm belief that our Nation could achieve and should achieve a level of excellence which could conquer the previously neglected problems in this area.

On October 31, 1963, I was privileged to attend the White House ceremony for the signing of the Mental Retardation Act of 1963 by President Kennedy since I had been a cosponsor of the bill and had worked for its passage. On that significant occasion, President Kennedy stated:

"It was said in an earlier age that the mind of a man is a far country which can neither be approached nor explored. But, today, under present conditions of scientific achievement, it will be possible for a nation as rich in human and material resources as ours to make the remote reaches of the mind accessible. The mentally ill and the mentally retarded need no longer be alien to our affections or beyond the help of our communities."

Reflecting the faith and vigor of President Kennedy, this Nation has begun an assault on the complex and difficult problems of mental health. This effort which we have undertaken is something which all Americans can be proud of, and each of you here tonight is involved in a major step forward to conquer problems which have been largely neglected in the past.

Our objectives in the field of mental retardation, as I see it, are threefold:

First, we should strive toward the goal of complete understanding of the mentally retarded—this includes the causes of it, the manifestations of it, and, of course, the best way to care for the mentally retarded person himself.

Second, we should seek to provide educational facilities and opportunities for these handicapped children so that they will be able to be educated to their highest capacity. This goal will provide this child himself with a more rewarding life, as well as improving his value in our society.

Third, complete support and necessary assistance should be given to research programs aimed at the prevention and cure of mental retardation.

The nearer we can come to accomplishing these goals, the more complete our victory will be, and the greater our society will become, for this is no small problem we are facing. In this Nation today there are about 5 million handicapped people who need special education. Unless we are fortunate enough to make major breakthroughs in prevention by 1970, the number will grow to 6 million. Half will be children. Our present needs require 200,000 teachers who are specially trained, classroom space, as well as a comprehensive approach and program of instruction. More than $1 billion is spent each year for the special care of mentally retarded children and adults. In terms of lost productivity the cost to our society goes into many more billions.

In 1963, with the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Act, the Federal Government made the most significant attack on mental retardation that had ever been made.

This bill promises to expand our knowledge, provides facilities to determine the cause of retardation, establishes university-related treatment clinics and permits the construction of community centers for the care of the retarded. With this act, the division of handicapped children and youth of the U.S. Office of Education was created.

Education of the handicapped is one of the major elements in our war on poverty, as it is only through education and training that we can help the handicapped to become self-sufficient and productive. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity has estimated that one-third to a half of all mentally retarded persons can be made relatively self-sufficient by new techniques of training and rehabilitation.

In fiscal year 1964, 7,500 mentally retarded individuals were rehabilitated in the United States, an increase of 27 percent over the previous year. For fiscal year 1965, it is projected that another 8,750 will be given vocational rehabilitation. These are essential components of the war on poverty, and for the future of any mentally retarded person.

The Federal work in this field so greatly begun by President Kennedy is being ably carried out by our fellow Texan, President Lyndon Johnson.

In June 1964, President Johnson delivered the following remarks on mental retardation:

"We have made progress. But our efforts have only begun. We will continue until we find all the answers we have been seeking, until we find a place for all those who suffer with the problem."

Since 1958 it has been my privilege to serve on the Senate Public Health Subcommittee under the leadership of Senator Lister Hill, of Alabama, who has done more for public health and for hospitalization than any other legislator in the history of America.

It is hoped that we will continue to progress toward those goals which I outlined; that we will soon achieve a thorough understanding of the cause and manifestations of mental retardation; that we will soon have the teachers and the facilities to educate the handicapped; and, finally, that the cure and prevention of mental retardation will be found.

The fact that you are here tonight proves that you are concerned and willing to fight this problem in our Nation. You are the leaders in this field in Texas, and many of you, in the Nation. I hope I have shown that your Federal Government is willing to fight so that in the near future we can all be proud that we were on the frontlines of the forces which defeated the problem of mental retardation.

RETENTION OF TEXAS RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, recently several powerful editorials concerning retention of the Texas right-to-work law have been published in newspapers and magazines in my State.

I fully agree with the principles stated in these editorials. In order that other Senators may be advised of the depth of Texas feeling on this matter, I ask that the editorials be printed at this point in the Record.

Included are editorials from the San Angelo Standard-Times, the Houston Chronicle, the McCamey News, the Ozona Stockman, and the magazine Texas Parade.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the San Angelo (Tex.) Standard-Times, May 19, 1965]

Work-Right Repeal Bars Freedom Choice

The brevity of President Johnson's remarks relative to repeal of section 14(b) relating to the right to work in effect in 19 States would indicate he may have had some second thoughts since he promised labor leaders he would ask for it. He has done that and can cite his effort when questioned. Perchance the lack of emphasis itself would antagonize labor or cause a bit of cooling off relative to the leadership now provided.

With 19 States cleaving to right-to-work legislation and finding it beneficial in these instances, it would seem the President takes a calculated risk even in bringing the matter to the floor of Congress. While Johnson must be looking at the votes union labor can provide on the one hand, there is a pretty fair percentage that regards the right to join a union or not to join a union as a civil right as important as those for which the President has been promoting in the voting rights of minorities.

It is incompatible with a free society for business or the working force to be saddled with compulsory unionism. We believe it robs a man of one of the guarantees of our Constitution—freedom of choice, even freedom of conscience.

President Johnson has proved well-nigh irresistible in the program he has submitted to Congress. Perhaps he has even timed his approach to the repeal issue to the point where legislation of higher priorities will bar a chance to get at this phase of the Democratic platform.

At any rate, it is a long lane that has no turning, and the repeal move could represent a turn where opposition from 19 States could curb this proposed reform. It could prove embarrassing for the President in the right-to-work States where this freedom has been preserved. We are glad to see beforehand the action of the house states affairs committee at Austin in adopting a resolution calling on Congress to turn down any repeal move.

[From the Ozona (Tex.) Stockman, Mar. 18, 1965]

A Basic Freedom

The unions' all-out campaign to force repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which permits the States to adopt right-to-work laws if they so wish, could lead unknowing people to believe that this provision is a deadly weapon aimed straight at the heart of organized labor.

Anyone who believes that would do well to read the section. It says: "Nothing in this act (Taft-Hartley) shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or territorial law."

To make that seem, in any way, an antilabor provision, requires some massive twisting of plain language. It simply says that, in States which take advantage of 14(b), each worker will have the right to join a union as he chooses, and in either case he can keep his job. No one can make him join—and no one can prevent him from joining.

If that is not a basic freedom, what is?

[From the McCamey (Tex.) News
Mar. 11, 1965]

Legislative Swindle

Some of the slickest brains in Congress are working overtime trying to solve a difficult political problem. What the legislative wheeler and dealers want to do is to fulfill the President's campaign promise to big labor that he would repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, but do it without attracting the attention of the people to the loss of another individual freedom.

Now in the legislative hatchery is one so-called compromise bill supposedly aimed at protecting the legal and civil rights of individual workers—more are expected. But look out. The real purpose of these measures is to provide a smoke screen for repealing 14(b), the 44-word section of the Taft-Hartley Act, which gives the States the right to legislate and enforce voluntary union membership.

Such bills are a sly effort to swap nothing for something. And here's why:

Enforcement of title VII of the Civil Rights Act on 1964 will prevent discrimination among workers on account of race, color or creed.

Enforcement of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1947, and the Supreme Court ruling in the Allen case in 1964, will prevent the use of compulsory dues for political purposes.

Enforcement of the Landrum-Griffin Act of 1959 will prevent a union from fining or penalizing a member for exercising any legal or civil right guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

The amazing thing about these "compromise" efforts is that while they claim to be concerned about the civil rights of the individual they would actually repeal a civil right of the first magnitude: the worker's freedom to join or not to join a union. To camouflage the repeal of 14(b) under the guise of offering protections already established by law, reflects a shocking political cynicism. And this attitude is particularly revolting when we consider that every Congressman knows that the one effective control over the political and financial abuses practiced by labor bosses on rank and file workers is voluntary union membership—in short, the right to work.

Every Congressman should also realize at this late date that an impressive majority of his fellow citizens believe in voluntary union membership, and that with them this is an article of faith, with which there can be no compromise or negotiation. Surely, if Mr. Johnson, himself, fears to move boldly against 14(b) lest he tarnish his image as "President of all the people," most any Congressman would do well to tread softly and tiptoe out of any involvement in this nothing-for-something swindle.

[From Texas Parade magazine, May 1965]

Is Our Right-To-Work Law In Danger?

From the dawn of recorded history until these early months of the Great Society it has not been required by law that any worker in Texas belong to or pay dues to any organization to hold a job. On the contrary, there has been a right-to-work law in Texas which specifically forbids any such requirement.

Texas' present right-to-work law followed an earlier measure, known as the Manford Act which established the right of the State to regulate labor unions. It was named after its sponsor who later was speaker of the house and who, after a number of difficult chores in government, is now a member of the Texas Board of Insurance.

Today, Texas is 1 of 19 States with right-to-work laws forbidding membership in a union as a requisite for holding a job. Other States with similar laws: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and Wyoming. Total population of the right-to-work States is about 50 million.

Texas Parade would find it difficult to charge any one of these 19 States with being antiunion. Nor could they be saddled with a "probusiness" label because they are among the 50 States which have no law requiring an employer to hold membership in a local, regional, or national chamber of commerce, a manufacturers' association, or other business group.

The national union bosses have another idea about the whole thing. The Meaneys, the Reuthers, the Hoffas, and the Caseys have been fighting a losing battle to get States such as Texas to repeal their right-to-work laws. So now they are making a big push in the National Congress to get section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act repealed. This section of the law passed in 1947 guarantees the right of States to pass and enforce State right-to-work laws.

As sentiment can now be measured among the lawmakers of Texas, the right-to-work laws of this State do not appear to be in danger of repeal by the current legislature. But the law in this and all other States could go out the window overnight if a majority in the National Congress should yield to the pressures and threats of the union bosses.

The rights of States are eroding rapidly before the floods of centralized power in Washington. And the union bosses are riding pretty high in the saddle right now. Texans have no cause to remain complacent about the security of their right-to-work laws. On the contrary, union leaders are taking on new hope that this check on their power will be removed, freeing them from any real responsibility to their members.

This threat comes from a Congress that is going to extremes in guaranteeing human rights. It is hard to see any difference between denying a person employment because of color, religion, race, or sex, and denying a person employment because he will not join a union. But Congress often sees issues the hard way.

The arguments for and against compulsory unionism have been summed up something like this:

For: Union security and the strength of the union depend upon universal acceptance of membership.

Against: It is a simple historical fact that the unions have vastly increased their economic and political power in the last 30 years. Today any one of a number of unions can tie our economy into knots in a matter of hours.

For: Majority rule is a democratic principle and thus the minority should be required to support the majority.

Against: The so-called free-ride argument ment because our labor laws, enacted through the demands of unions themselves, already require the minority of employees who are not members of a labor union to accept the terms and work under the contracts of the majority. Does the fact that one political party is dominant require complete support from the minority party? Hardly.

For: Since the union negotiates for the benefit of all workers, all workers should be compelled to contribute to the cost of maintaining the union activities.

Against: The so-called free-ride argument is fundamentally unsound because a labor union is a private organization. All through our society we have voluntary organizations which carry on activities which benefit a great many who do not contribute any financial or other support. If we enforce compulsory unionism because of this argument why should not an individual be forced to support his community United Fund, join his chamber of commerce, his parents and teachers association, and all the movements that benefit his community?

For: Right-to-work laws depress wages and stifle economic progress in the States which have them.

Against: Latest figures from the U.S. Department of Labor show that the right-to-work States lead the rest of the Nation in the creation of new jobs in business and industry, in wage rate improvement in industrial jobs, and show a greater gain in producing new wealth and personal income than in non-right-to-work States.

These and other arguments in favor of an individual's right to belong or not belong have long prevailed in Texas. How much longer they will be reflected in the laws imposed upon this State is an issue now before a Congress that so far has not shown a deep concern for the principle of States rights.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, May 20, 1965]

LEAVE SECTION 14(b) UNTOUCHED

President Johnson handed his long-awaited labor message to Congress on Tuesday, following his request on Monday for an excise tax cut of nearly $4 billion. Some people evaluate these two proposals as one White House prescription; give business a health stimulant, then give labor equal dosage.

The President urged repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which reads:

"Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in a State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or territorial law."

These 44 words give 19 States, including Texas, the right to ban compulsory labor contracts which insist that a worker join a union to keep a job. Their repeal means compulsory unionism and an end to the right-to-work law.

Capitol Hill is now braced for its stiffest political hurricane of the season, labor's forces in Congress militantly mixing it with defenders of the 44 words. And the stakes are higher than most people realize.

Unions have spent "countless millions" since 1947 fighting section 14(b). Also, the money lost in union dues not paid by millions of workers in States with right-to-work laws amounts to hundreds of millions. Even so, money is no measure of the manpower expended on this 18-year running battle.

If these 44 words are repealed, as Mr. Johnson has urged, "with the hope of reducing conflicts in our national labor policy," labor will be able to funnel millions of dollars into politics and unionization drives. And its manpower can be diverted from the fight against right to work into precincts.

The Chronicle believes in Texas' right-to-work law and opposes repeal of section 14(b). We see no merit in nationwide uniform labor laws that favor a special interest group. If a worker prefers to join a union, that's his choice. Fine. But we cannot agree that all workers should be forced to pay a union fee to hold a job. That eliminates the individual's right to choose.

The right-to-work laws of 19 States are experiments for the working man in 50 laboratories of social change. They do not discriminate against unions, because such tactics are illegal.

Union labor has earned and deserves a strong, rightful place in a free society. But it should not have 100 percent control of who gets and holds a job. To have that much power is too one sided to be healthy in the long run for organized labor and too discriminatory against nonunion workers.

We hope Congress will maintain section 14(b).

BIG BROTHER—INVASIONS OF PRIVACY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, my "big brother" item for today is an editorial from the Richmond News Leader, entitled "The Great Coverup."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT COVERUP

Any definitive list of the country's 10 most frustrated men surely would include the name of EDWARD V. LONG, a Senator from Missouri. For the past many months, as chairman of a Senate committee investigating invasions of privacy, the Senator has been trying assiduously to get information from Federal agencies on what their investigators are up to. And all the Senator has received is the royal runaround.

Mr. LONG did manage to get some limited material from the Post Office Department, about which we have commented earlier. He finally wrung from the Department an admission that certain first-class mail is in fact opened for the Internal Revenue Service, but he failed altogether in his effort to get a list of 24,000 "mail covers" over the past 2 years. (A mail cover is a surveillance and a listing of all the mail a person receives, according to return addresses.)

When the Long committee sent its chief investigator to Boston, in an effort to get information on postal surveillance activities there, "our man was tailed, trailed, and photographed by a squad of Federal agents in that city."

The committee's problems in dealing with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have proved more maddening still. Secretary Celebrezze will not even answer the Senator's letters. Lower level bureaucrats are evasive, noncommittal, uncooperative. Last week the Senator wrathfully subpenaed some of the HEW officials to appear before his committee today, but he has little hope of getting much out of them.

There is a constitutional problem in all this, arising from the wise tradition that separates the powers of legislative, executive, and judicial branches of Government; plainly the Post Office Department, the Welfare Department, and other agencies are part of the executive branch. Yet the problem is not as difficult as the bureaucracy insists. The Congress has no power to trespass upon true executive prerogatives, but the Congress surely has power to find out how public appropriations are spent. And if public funds are being spent to invade the privacy of American citizens, as Senator LONG soundly suspects, the Congress has both the right and the power to get the facts.

"If it takes a year, so be it," said Mr. LONG last week. "If it takes 2 or 3 years, so be it. But one day or the other, this committee will get the information."

We wish him all the luck in the world. When big brother is watching the people, some one—preferably the elected Congress—had better keep an eye on big brother.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL HOLCOMB, FORMER MARINE CORPS COMMANDANT AND ITS FIRST FOUR-STAR GENERAL

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, one of the Nation's outstanding fighting men died this week at his home in New Castle, Del. He was Gen. Thomas Holcomb, Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps from 1936 to 1944 and the first marine ever to wear the four stars of a full general.

General Holcomb, who was 85 at his death, was a native of New Castle and a member of one of that town's pioneer families.

He led the marines through their buildup prior to World War II and in their fighting from Guadalcanal to Tarawa.

His life as a marine was testimony to the military philosophy he once expressed:

> Fashions in warfare changes as everything human changes, but the principles of warfare never change and the old soldierly virtues are the same that they have always been—courage and discipline and loyalty.

General Holcomb was a marine for nearly 44 years. Although he reached the mandatory retirement age in 1943, President Franklin D. Roosevelt announced he was continuing General Holcomb as Commandant of the Marine Corps in recognition of his outstanding service in that capacity. General Holcomb was retired on January 1, 1944. Because he had been specially commended for his performance of duty in actual combat, he was advanced one rank on the retirement list in accordance with a newly passed act of Congress. He thus became the first marine ever to hold the rank of general.

In a letter to General Holcomb, the late Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox, said:

> You will be the first officer of the corps to hold the rank of general—the highest rank in our Armed Forces. I know of no other officer to whom that distinction more fittingly belongs.

During General Holcomb's tour of duty as Commandant, the Marine Corps expanded from 16,000 men to about 300,000 men and women. The general was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for his outstanding work as Commandant in April 1944.

On March 9, 1944, the President nominated General Holcomb for the position of U.S. Minister to the Union of South Africa. The nomination was confirmed by the Senate on March 20, and General Holcomb served as Minister to the Union of South Africa until his retirement on June 15, 1948.

General Holcomb was a man of diverse interests. In line with his military service, he was a noted marksman and won many medals on military and civilian levels.

His duty tours included many years in China and he had a deep knowledge of that country. He was an American who had a speaking knowledge of more Chinese dialects than most Western scholars.

In the years since his retirement in 1948 from his post as Minister to South Africa he maintained a deep interest in history, reading in depth on the events of World War II and military history in general.

His reputation for achievement, however, rested chiefly with the marines and their readiness in the World War II fighting. In the uncertain days leading up to the war it had been his responsibility to see that the marines were ready to defend their country in any eventuality.

The first major test came at Guadalcanal. And here the world learned again that the marines' reputation for toughness and discipline was well deserved.

General Holcomb was born in New Castle in August 5, 1879, and joined the Marine Corps in 1900.

In World War I, he commanded a battalion of the 6th Regiment and won the Navy Cross, the Nation's second highest decoration for valor. A list of other medals and decoration includes the Silver Star Medal with three Oak-Leaf Clusters; the Purple Heart Medal; the Expeditionary Medal, China; the World War I Victory Medal with Aisne, Aisne-Marne, St. Mihiel, Meuse-Argonne, and defensive sector clasps; the Army of Occupation of Germany Medal; the American Defense Service Medal with base clasp; the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with one bronze star, Guadalcanal; the American Campaign Medal; the World War II Victory Medal; the French Legion of Honor; the French Croix de Guerre with three palms; the Naval Order of Merit, first class (Cuban award), 1943; the Knight Grand Cross (Netherlands), 1944; and the French Fourragere.

We, in Delaware, were especially proud of General Holcomb, and I know the Nation shares this pride. We express our sympathy to his son, Franklin P. Holcomb, of Paris; his four grandchildren; his nephew, Thomas Holcomb II, of New Castle; and the niece with whom he made his home in New Castle, Mrs. Paul Warley.

CENTENNIAL OF WILLIAM E. BORAH: RESOLUTION OF IDAHO STATE SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I have received from the officers of the Idaho State Society of Washington, D.C., a resolution expressing their desire to initiate and participate in activities to observe this centennial year of one of Idaho's most illustrious lawmakers ever to have served in the U.S. Senate, William E. Borah.

So that others may be aware of this worthwhile tribute to be paid by the Idaho State Society to a man so well and so firmly fixed in the history of Idaho and the Nation, I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the first official meeting of the 1965–66 officers of the Idaho State Society of Washington, D.C., duly convened at Washington, D.C., on the 2d day of April 1965, and considered the matter of participating in the observance of the William E. Borah Centennial on June 29, 1965; and

Whereas the date of the centennial and the desirability of the society's participation in the observance was announced at the annual meeting of the membership on the 26th day of March 1965; and

Whereas the members of the Idaho State Society of Washington, D.C., have expressed the desire to participate in activities to honor William E. Borah and to share in the observance of the centennial; and

Whereas Idahoans wish to mark a significant milestone in memory of one of Idaho's most illustrious lawmakers ever to have served in the Congress of the United States: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Idaho State Society of Washington, D.C., pledges to initiate plans for an observance in Washington, D.C., and to cooperate in furthering those activities designed to cause a fitting and appropriate observance to be held in commemoration of the William E. Borah Centennial on June 29, 1965.

WADE B. FLEETWOOD,
President, Idaho State Society of Washing, D.C.

LEE ANNA RUTTMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Idaho State Society of Washington, D.C.

COTTON LEGISLATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the president of the Texas Cotton Association, Raymond S. Tapp, recently called to my attention a most worthwhile editorial published in the Dallas Morning News.

The editorial writer asks the vital question:

> Is cotton on its death bed?

In order that other Senators may share the views of both President Tapp and the Morning News, I ask that the letter and editorial be printed in the RECORD.

I hope the reading of these wise remarks will spur the Senate to greater efforts in the vital job of writing meaningful legislation which will come to grips with the problems besetting the cotton industry. We owe this great American industry no less than our careful attention and our best efforts.

There being no objection, the letter and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TEXAS COTTON ASSOCIATION,
Waco, Tex., May 20, 1965.

Senator JOHN TOWER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Enclosed is a very apropos lead editorial from the May 18 Dallas Morning News. I hope it will help open the public's eyes as to what is happening to a once great industry and a primary source for equalization of balance-of-payments dollars.

The economy of the Southwest will suffer greatly unless we can obtain legislation that will allow cotton to be marketed through normal channels of trade at competitive prices. This can be accomplished if the following three suggestions are followed in any new cotton legislative program: (1) Payments must be made directly to the producer without discrimination for operational size and efficiency in order to maintain a healthy farm income, but in a manner that does not deny the function of price. (2) The price of American cotton must be left free to respond to world marketing mechanisms without any attempt at price edict by the Government. (3) Our present 16-million-acre minimum must be maintained and additional acreage allotted as we regain our export markets. This type of legislation would help regain our foreign markets, discourage expansion of synthetics and foreign cotton production, therefore greatly improving and securing the farm economy of this area.

We hope you will help us secure the type of legislation we so badly need for the survival of the cotton industry.

Very truly yours,

Raymond S. Tapp,
President, The Texas Cotton Association.

[From the Dallas Morning News, May 18, 1965]

Last Illness?

Is cotton on its deathbed? Many who know the crop best fear that it is. If cotton is dying, Texas and the Nation are losing great economic assets. If cotton is breathing its last, it is being killed by its friends, so-called, murdered with your money, by your representatives.

Last year, cotton brought Texas farmers $650 million—a sum that economists say is multiplied several times as the lint and fiber flow through the economic life of this State. U.S. farmers received $2.5 billion for the versatile fiber and its equally useful seed. This does not sound like a crop on its deathbed, does it?

But that revenue represented a drop of $111 million in Texas farm income, a decrease of $237 million for the United States. And each year more of the dwindling revenue comes out of the Federal Treasury, while fewer farmers grow fewer acres of cotton.

Furthermore, Representative Harold Cooley, Democrat, of North Carolina, has just introduced a bill that would cut the minimum acreage of cotton by 2 million acres—about one eighth. This has other provisions that immediately caused outraged protests from many in the cotton industry, although it has some features that would improve the present cotton legislation. On the whole, the Cooley proposal is geared to the same philosophy that has created the present cotton crisis, in the opinion of most Dallas authorities who have analyzed it.

Representative Cooley's bill may be no more than a trial balloon. Surely, say cotton men, Congress will not enact such a monstrosity. But almost everything Congress has been doing for 30 years has headed toward destruction of the American cotton industry and has aided its competitors—foreign growers and makers of manmade fibers everywhere. And, unfortunately, the cotton industry has been a house divided on legislative matters, and still is.

Significantly, and almost simultaneously with the Cooley action, the world's greatest cotton firm has further reduced its cotton operations. Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, a multimillion-dollar corporation that has been a leader in enlightened enterprise and service to the grower and user of cotton, has announced a series of reductions in offices and personnel.

There can be but two reasons for this. The first is the Federal program of curtailing cotton. The second is the Federal system of financing cooperatives—of giving the producer-owned organizations every advantage in raising, processing, and selling cotton at the expense of investor-owned firms.

This is done with the consent of Congress, of course. It is done with money raised through taxation. It is done with the best of intentions of helping the farmer, and in many cases it does. But, in the long run, it is giving a monopoly to a federally supported organization, and killing the competition which is needed and beneficial in any economic system.

This has been going on since 1933. It may be too late to stop now, but the News does not believe it is. There seems to be a chance that members of the cotton industry can develop a new spirit of compromise and cooperation in legislative objectives, and unite in asking Congress to develop a sound program. But something must be done very soon, at the grassroots level and in Washington.

REPORT ON THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the National Observer of May 17 published an informative, on-the-scene report reviewing the chaotic events in Santo Domingo which led to the President's decision to dispatch American combat forces to that embattled city. I ask unanimous consent that this report, by Peter T. Chew, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the National Observer, May 17, 1965]

A New Latin American Policy—How Communists Were Thwarted in Dominican Republic

(By Peter T. Chew)

Santo Domingo.—This half-mad city of 300,000 persons headed for a complete nervous breakdown late last week as Dominicans ravaged each other again despite the presence of 30,000 U.S. military men and a commission from the Organization of American States (OAS).

With the explosiveness of a .50-caliber machinegun burst, everything blew to bits in one chaotic 24-hour period. When it was over, the cease-fire had been broken by both the Communist-led rebels of Col. Francisco Caamano Deno and the junta forces of Gen. Antonio Imbert Barreras.

As this was being written, an old propeller-driven P–51 Mustang of the Dominican Air Force, which is controlled by the Imbert "government of national reconstruction," was circling in the midafternoon sun like an angry bee, while rebels, six blocks away, "brrupppd" at it with machineguns and automatic rifles. Then the plane dove into another strafing run on rebel-held Radio Santo Domingo, which had been blasted off the air in earlier attacks.

When the week was over, the already chaotic situation here had grown immeasurably more so. But despite the confusion there is ample evidence that the U.S. mission here hasn't changed; nor its determination flagged.

A weary official of the U.S. Embassy here, his nerves obviously grown raw, put it this way:

"With his move into the Dominican Republic, President Johnson has adopted a new policy for Latin America—a Johnson policy, a Johnson doctrine, call it what you will—even though they are denying this in Washington. He has put the Communists on clear notice that we have at last drawn the line."

The official said that Mr. Johnson had served equally clear notice on the OAS to face up—and face up fast—to the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere and create a political and military force capable of moving quickly into such situations in the future.

If the OAS fails to do so, then the United States will not hesitate again and again to employ its awesome power unilaterally—and devil take the threadbare charges of gunboat diplomacy.

"For the first time since the end of the Second World War, your country has moved in the first second of the first round," said one Latin American diplomat in Santo Domingo delightedly.

The OAS men here are working long hours, but it is hard to determine if they are effective hours, and with each passing day more American soldiers and Dominicans are being killed and wounded. Here again, despite the perplexities of the political turmoil, it is obvious that the five-man OAS Commission has been shaken by what it has seen and heard.

Whether the small United Nations mission appointed Friday will find similarly is anyone's guess. It is supposed to report on the situation. The United States didn't want the U.N. here, and the rebels did, the OAS having shown signs of finding against the rebels.

WELCOMED BY AMBASSADORS

During the 36 to 48 hours before the marines landed on April 28, this city witnessed a reign of terror unique in recent Latin American history. "There isn't a single Latin American ambassador who doesn't thank his God that the marines came when they did, whatever their governments may be saying," says one Latin American diplomat. As it was, half a dozen Latin American embassies alone were violated by the wild mobs.

When the OAS Commission members returned to Washington to report to their organization on May 7 and 8, they met behind closed doors at the Pan American Union. In one exchange, a dubious member asked if there had really been much evidence of Communist infiltration and danger to lives.

The Colombian member of the Commission—whose own country is having troubles with Communist guerrillas—replied emotionally:

"My answer is yes. This was not a situation where there are riots or guerrilla activities where constitutional authorities and law exist. In this case there is no state. What happens then when blood is shed in the streets? What should the inter-American system do when a country collapses?

"Let's be frank. What happens when an American nation is so close to Cuba? Should we sit on the balcony and watch for the end of the tragedy? International communism is on the attack. There have been many revolutions in the Americas. We have had them in my own country, and I do not believe that a revolution justifies intervention by the inter-American system. This has not been my argument."

U.S. officials are quietly bitter because U.S. newspapers, many of whose reporters here appear to have become emotionally involved with the rebel cause despite the evidence of its Communist domination, gave little space to the OAS meeting. Typically, however, the OAS had made the transcript of the meeting available to the press on a Saturday night, an awkward time, and it was in Spanish.

DETAILS WERE LACKING

On the other hand, State Department men here 2 weeks ago were apparently allowed to reveal only the names of the Communists on the rebel side, while the specifics of who did what during those first hours of the revolution were released in great details in Washington.

Consequently, Mr. Caamano and his aid, Hector Aristy Pereira, who guides his every move, were able to make many telling points with American newsmen. This has now changed, and there is evidence enough for everyone to have a little. Until the rebel radio was knocked out, for example, all one had to do was listen to bring back memories of Fidel Castro. All week long it had excoriated U.S. Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett as a fiend, a liar, and far worse. The radio has charged U.S. marines and men of the Army's 82d Airborne Division with atrocities.

But with the passage of time, the true story is getting out. And if the United States has suffered a short-range blow to its image, its show of power should prove a long-range success with now unmeasurable implications. For the ambassadors of every country are filing reports to their governments. In the relative calm of his air-conditioned embassy here one day last week, a high-ranking Western diplomat said:

"In a matter of hours, this city was turned into a civil-war battlefield, in which the city was subjected to an incredibly stupid air bombardment by the Elias Wessin y Wessin forces, and a naval bombardment. Then the rebels handed out 20,000 modern automatic weapons to their mobs who proceeded to wreak their vengeance upon their enemies.

"Floors of hospital corridors were covered with injured and dying. There was no light, no heat, no power. Doctors were operating without anesthesia. All law, order, government authority was completely gone.

"If this horror—this reign of unorganized terror—had gone on for many more hours and your marines had not come, then several extra thousand people might have been killed. These tigres, as they call themselves—young punks who would kill you for a ham sandwich—were whizzing down the street in cars shooting in all directions. It was a typical civil war—crude and cruel and insanely stupid.

"Twenty armed men came clumping up the stairs of this embassy and I dismissed them. It was all very unpleasant. Communists? The rebels are up to their necks in them."

REBELS SOUGHT VISAS

Many of the rebels, he said, sought visas from him in the past in order to make their way to Cuba and Iron Curtain countries, and he had refused to grant them. They had managed to get out anyway.

The Western diplomat, who fought as a high-ranking officer in the Second World War, said many of the street fighters of the rebel side had shown evidence of the most sophisticated urban guerrilla warfare training. It's not the sort of training that the rag-tag Dominican armed forces, whence many of the rebels came, ever receive.

Had President Johnson not moved so swiftly, many Americans at the embattled little Embassy—and hundreds of others who elected to stick it out here and not evacuate—might well have been killed.

ATTACK ON THE EMBASSY

The Embassy had been informed by both loyalist and rebel leaders that they could not guarantee the safety of Americans or any other foreign nationals. One short hour after U.S. marines raced up to the Embassy in truck and Embassy cars that had met them at the helicopter field beside the Embajador Hotel, a large force of rebels attacked the Embassy. And for 5 straight days and nights before and after the marines' arrival, the Embassy came under heavy fire.

Ambassador Bennett, a tall, sensitive man who speaks with a soft, Georgia accent—"he's hardly the 'hawk' type, he's much too subtle for that," says an aid—knew that the Dominican powder keg was due for a blow. U.S. intelligence had put together a fat dossier on Communists, and the Ambassador had reports that Juan Bosch, from his exile in Puerto Rico, was working closely with them in an attempt to regain power.

Mr. Bennett seized his last clear chance to fly back to Washington and report, and he was there when the revolution against the military-backed government of Donald Reid Cabral broke out on Saturday morning, April 24. Mr. Bennett flew back here on Wednesday, April 28. And as he drove into town from the port of Haina, where he'd been dropped by a Marine helicopter from the heli-carrier *Boxer*, he met U.S. refugees streaming down the road in cars from the Embajador Hotel. There they had been terrorized by a rebel band who had fired bursts over their heads and through the lobby.

THE MARINES LANDED

Time and time again that day he reported to Mr. Johnson on the phone that he didn't want the marines to come ashore unless they absolutely had to. Finally, at 5:14 p.m., Mr. Johnson gave the order for them to land.

The Ambassador is known to be appalled at criticism that the United States overreacted to the crisis, and that it should have expended precious hours consulting all members of the OAS. "An ambassador's first duty is to his citizens," he has said repeatedly in recent days. "Did they want me to wait until the coffin was already prepared?"

Mr. Bennett is also of the belief that Gen. Wessin y Wessin—a leader of the junta that removed Bosch from the Presidency—is not the beast that he has been painted.

Many Americans, and other nationals who lived through the first terrifying days before the marines arrived, are thankful that Wessin, although defeated in battle by the rebels, was able to hold them up at all. The Communists, and many people in the streets, have made much of the number killed by Wessin in air raids on the Duarte Bridge area, and the results were undoubtedly bloody. But many there do not think it compares with the numbers killed by roving bands of rebels with guns.

The best information now is that Caamano would personally like to seek a compromise with the present Imbert junta—or even come across the lines and defect, but that he is now literally a prisoner of the Communists.

Some sources emphasize that none of the prominent political followers of Bosch who were in on the original coup of April 24 are now in the rebel ranks, men like Rafael Molena Urena having sought asylum in Latin American embassies.

In fact, during the first 24-odd hours of the coup, Caamano himself took refuge in an embassy. His name didn't figure prominently until Tuesday, April 27, by which time most Bosch leaders had fled and the Communists had moved neatly into the vacuum.

A SHADOWY FIGURE

U.S. officials here invariably describe Hector Aristy as a shadowy figure, and an opportunist. Some believe he has been a Communist all along. They say of Bosch that he is probably not a Communist, but that he has been playing the Communist game for too long.

A widely held theory here is that Bosch could never summon the courage to return during this crisis. Another theory holds that he may yet be the winner. He has kept his leftwing credentials first class by denouncing the marines as sort of an institutionalized McCarthyism. But he has not rushed to join the rebels either, for whatever the degree of Communist control, the taint is there.

Bosch attained power in this country's first honest election, and here lies part of the tragedy of this situation. Ironically, Bosch had the backing in that election of the military, but after his election he tried to reform their varied forms of graft. At the same time, he gave encouragement to leftists. And General Wessin, himself a puritanical type of man not given to the usual corruption, genuinely believed Bosch was setting up the country for a Communist takeover.

Bosch, say officials here, was a victim of his own mercurial personality, and a dangerously divisive influence on the country. He injected a high degree of racism into his successful campaign for the Presidency. He kept using the term, tutum pote, which means the white wealthy upper class suppressors of the poor colored peoples.

He's a man of lower-middle-class background, a scholar with a rapier-like wit and scorn. These are not Dominican traits. He left many welts on assorted hides, and he absolutely refused to sit down at a table and heal old wounds.

So far, no single, charismatic Communist figure has arisen on the rebel side. Believed to be high in the Communist leadership, however, are the Ducoudray brothers—Juan Ducoudray Mansfield and Felix Servio Ducoudray, Jr.—long-time Communist leaders in this country. At a lower level is an old friend of Fidel Castro, Rafael Pichirilo Mejia, who is now leading a large armed band.

Mejia was helmsman of the *Gramma*, the converted yacht that carried Castro and 80-odd followers from Mexico to Oriente Province in Cuba. After graduating from all the best guerrilla schools and serving Castro in various capacities, this tough little Communist returned to his native Dominican Republic when Bosch came to power and served in his administration. When Bosch went into exile, Mejia and other Communists fled the country. In the intervening years, he became a gun-runner and smuggler, using the proceeds to support Red subversion.

Reports have it that he was aboard the *Santo Domingo* when that freighter was sunk last week in the Ozama River after delivering arms to the rebels on the west bank. When the 82d Airborne sank the vessel, Mejia must have escaped, because he has been seen around the rebel sector in recent days.

Obviously, not everyone in the rebel camp is a Communist; indeed, Communists are probably a minority. But this was true also in the Cuban (and Russian) revolutions. It is a question of the influence they can bring to bear.

Around rebel headquarters you see carbon copies of Fidelistas—complete with fatigues and beards—among the Caamano bodyguard.

Officially, the United States is maintaining a neutral stance between the Imbert and Caamano regimes until such time as the OAS can take effective political action. Unofficially, of course, the Imbert group, which is located physically within the U.S.-protected international zone—represents the friendlies and the rebels are unfriendlies.

Throughout the week, it appeared that the OAS might be making some progress, and Friday some 250 Honduran troops and a few Costa Ricans arrived. And despite continuous sniper fire and sporadic firefights between U.S. soldiers and rebels, between rebels and loyalists, and between rebels and rebels, there has been a cease-fire of sorts.

Then, on Wednesday, a large rebel group attacked a loyalist motor pool in force, technically breaking the cease-fire. The Dominican Air Force, consisting of a handful of P-51's, AT-6 trainers, and British-made Vampire jet fighters, thereupon apparently decided it was free to have at the rebels again.

The air force is located at San Isidro Air Base which is guarded by the 82d Airborne.

A JOINT OPERATION

The tower at San Isidro is a joint United States-loyalist-Dominican operation. When a loyalist plane wants to take off, a Dominican in the tower clears it. On Thursday afternoon, two P-51's and three bomb-carrying AT-6's streaked off the field and attacked the rebel radio station.

One of the P-51's started its strafing run just as it swept low over the U.S. Embassy, its guns making a frightening racket. Ambassador Bennett and his staff dived under their desks. U.S. marines guarding the Embassy grounds opened fire on the fighter, not sure of its intentions.

Enraged by the attack on his station, Caamano produced for U.S. newsmen the body of a child killed in the attack, and charged the Imbert people with breaking the cease-fire.

Well, it wasn't much of a cease-fire anyway. Every afternoon last week, for example, snipers in a construction gang on a building overlooking a U.S. marine position would fire a few bursts, then melt into the street crowd. The marines, armed with M-14 rifles and binoculars, stalk and kill the snipers in return.

Unarmed Dominican civilians travel back and forth into the international zone—through marine and airborne checkpoints where they are frisked for weapons. Thus rebels can move about freely without arms and spot U.S. positions.

In the international zone, the native Dominicans go about their business amidst the gunfire as though nothing were happening. On Thursday, they appeared to enjoy watching the strafing runs.

In the corridor, and along the perimeter, U.S. troops are distributing food and clothing to all comers. And all the while, a battery of six mean-looking 105-millimeter howitzers—conspicuously emplaced in front of the Hotel Embajador for all to see—are pointed toward the 8-square-mile rebel sector. They could pulverize rebel town in a few days of firing if they had to.

With or without a token OAS force, it's a good bet those guns will be in place for a long time to come.

THE ROLE OF THE U.S. MERCHANT FLEET

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on May 12, Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, delivered an excellent address before the Propeller Club, in Newport News, Va. Mr. Hood stated that the decline of certain segments of the U.S. merchant fleet "has reached a point where we are now faced with the danger of losing control over the orderly movement of our foreign commerce—if, indeed, this control has not already been lost."

I could not agree with him more.

It is becoming more and more apparent that the future of the American merchant marine depends on a healthy climate in which labor, management, shippers, investors, lending institutions, and the general public alike will have sound reason and positive justification for renewed faith and confidence in the future of American-flag shipping.

We have had our seminars and symposiums, our debates and roundtable discussions. Now, as Mr. Hood has declared, "talk must soon be replaced by positive action—otherwise our maritime strength will decline even further."

At a point in our history when the American merchant marine carries less than 10 percent of our foreign commerce, I am certain that all Senators will be interested in the entire text of Mr. Hood's timely remarks. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR A PROGRAM

The role of the U.S. merchant fleet in the national scheme of things is a timely topic.

Timely because the predominant share of the transport of our foreign commerce has been surrendered to ships of other nations. This has progressed to the point where the American merchant marine carries less than 10 percent of this trade. The transport of oil, bulk commodities and tramp cargoes in U.S. bottoms has faded drastically. This decline has reached a point where we are now faced with the danger of losing control over the orderly movement of our foreign commerce, if indeed this control has not already been lost.

Timely because, as V-E Day on May 8 reminded us, 20 years have passed since World War II, the era when much of our present fleet was built. It is bad enough that we carry so little, but worse that much of what we do carry is in old ships built in World War II days.

It is timely, too, because of current recognition of the pressing requirement to revitalize our merchant marine as evidenced by new interest and discourse at the highest levels of Government and industry. Most experts agree that the scope of our merchant marine must reflect the dynamics of present-day commerce. However, there is considerable disagreement as to the kinds of changes that are needed and as to the emphasis to be placed on the various segments which comprise the maritime industry.

And, the topic is critically timely to those of us in the shipbuilding industry, for it has been proposed that ships for the U.S.-flag merchant marine might be built in foreign shipyards as a means of eliminating shipbuilding subsidies. This "trial balloon," as it has been characterized by many, comes at a time when practically every other maritime nation of the world is moving to strengthen their shipping and shipbuilding activities in their own self-interests.

The mere suggestion that the U.S. Government might sanction the building of ships for the subsidized merchant fleet in foreign shipyards has caused our counterparts around the world to "rub their hands together" with gleeful anticipation. Even though our Secretary of Commerce publicly asserted on March 3, 1965, that because of the balance-of-payments problem, the policy of the administration is to require ship construction in this country, the foreign trade journals continue to applaud the "build abroad" proposal suggested by the Maritime Administrator on February 9, 1965. In fact, even in this country, few periodicals mention the March 3 statement by the Secretary, and the earlier February 9 statement continues to receive notoriety.

The situation also has a comical flavor. The Japanese are fearful that if, as a matter of U.S. policy, ships for the U.S. fleet were to be constructed abroad, European shipyards would obtain most of the contracts. And, the European nations, particularly those in the Common Market, are fearful that the Japanese, because of their lower prices, will receive all of the business. It can be reasonably predicted that these fears are already being expressed in trade discussions and through diplomatic channels. And, the Norwegians are now attributing the financial plight of their shipyards to our Government's restrictions on foreign lending by U.S. banks.

Japan, as you know, is the leading shipbuilding nation of the world. In 1964, her shipyards cornered 40 percent of the world shipbuilding market. In addition to benefiting from wage rates well below one-half the level of wages in the United States, Japanese shipyards are supported by their Government to the extent of 10 percent of the actual cost price of each ship. This support, it is said, includes a subsidy on steel plates used in connection with export shipbuilding contracts plus favorable credit terms arranged under Government sponsorship and guarantees. Profits earned from export sales are also largely tax free.

These competitive advantages have prompted the Common Market countries to respond in kind. More subsidies and more liberal credit and financing terms are in the offing. Starting in 1967, it is recommended by the European Economic Community that member nations grant their shipyards a subsidy amounting to 10 percent of the actual value of newly built ships. There are indications that this 10-percent figure might be increased later. There are also reports that a separate subsidy of 5 percent on ship repairs may be proposed. France and Italy already provide direct subsidies of 15 to 20 percent to stimulate the shipyard industries.

It is important to note that all of this is taking place at a time when there are those in this country who advocate the elimination of shipyard subsidies. Other maritime nations obviously consider their shipyards of sufficient national importance to warrant greater support, and we appear to want to make it even easier for them to do so.

At this point, I should remind you that U.S. taxpayers have spent nearly $1 billion since 1945 in rehabilitating war damaged foreign shipyards and in defraying costs of mutual security contracts awarded many of the same yards. In addition, I should remind you that since the close of World War II, more than 1,000 merchant vessels totaling 18 million gross tons have been built in foreign shipyards for American interests. In the same period, U.S. shipyards delivered 581 ships totaling 7.4 million gross tons to American interests.

Against the background of what is taking place in Europe, it was interesting to read the other day that a Swedish ship operator had characterized ship construction subsidies as "formidable weapons in the hands of American owners." Rather than formidable weapons, ship construction subsidies—and also ship operating subsidies—represent nothing more, and nothing less, than payments to offset the difference between U.S. and foreign wage scales. The Joint Economic Committee of the Congress recently noted that the only Federal statutes using the word "subsidy" are those dealing with ship construction and ship operations. The term is also rarely used in Executive orders and Government regulations.

Perhaps by calling a spade a spade—by changing the designation of ship construction and ship operating subsidies to "labor equalization payments" or to some other appropriate term—many of the roadblocks associated with maritime problems in this country will take on an entirely different connotation. Then, indeed, "labor equalization payments" will be "formidable weapons" in terms of correcting the deficiencies in our merchant fleet, in preserving our shipyards, and in meeting the ever-growing threat of the Russians on the high seas.

But, the attainment of these goals will require more than just a change in name. A healthy environment must be created in which labor, management, shippers, investors, lending institutions, and the general public alike will have sound reason and positive justifications for renewed faith and confidence in the future for American-flag shipping. This climate, however, will not be created by contradictory suggestions from Government sources that our ships might or might not be built abroad. Nor will it be created by any official hemming or hawing. It will not be created by window dressing or tricks of legerdemain. Nor will it be created by begging the issue of subsidies.

In point of truth, an effective maritime effort would not be possible without protective measures such as ship operating and ship construction subsidies. The focus of those who endorse revitalization of the American maritime industry while reducing subsidies has been blurred by not recognizing this fundamental reality. There is no way we can legislate away or wish away the differences in wage levels which are an inherent economic fact among nations of differing affluence. Nor is there justification to singling out the maritime industry generally or the shipyards in particular and concluding they are less efficient and more expendable than other segments of our economy.

To begin with, the issue is primarily that of maintaining the high level of well-being of our citizens. Even a minimal extent of research quickly demonstrates that with surprisingly few exceptions U.S. products and services cost more than those of other nations. Just because many American industries and service firms receive indemnification from direct price competition with foreign concerns by indirect, oblique, obscured means, while the maritime industry receives direct open support with subsidy payments, is no reason to ignore this commonplace, basic fact of international economics. It is no reason to claim that ship operators and shipyards receive unique and special privileges.

The facts are simple. First, if we want a maritime industry, we must have protective measures. Secondly, the size and quality of the fleet and our shipyards is a direct function of the extent of these programs. Thirdly, we must have an extensive merchant marine capability as a matter of national interest and security. In our own self-interests, any other conclusions are inconceivable.

A reasonable and effective program predicated on a firm and precise statement of national policy enumerating the benefits that accrue to our country and the American people through the existence of a well-balanced, modern merchant marine and an efficient and active supporting private shipyard industry is long overdue. In terms of a reasonable and effective program, I should like to add the following suggestions to the dialog which began with the Maritime Administrator's speech on February 9.

The basic question is not whether subsidy payments or programs of equivalent purpose are needed. The question is the most effective way to allocate the subsidy expenditures. It can be easily demonstrated that the best value is obtained by replacing old ships with new ships. One new modern ship has the capacity of several old ones, and requires a smaller crew than one of the old ships replaced. Larger size, higher speed, automated controls and cargo handling gear make this advantage possible. Accordingly, the new ship substantially reduces the labor time and cost of delivering a ton of cargo. This is the essence of automation—capital investment to increase productivity.

The wisdom of investing in automation is well known and widely publicized in the manufacturing industry. What is not well known is that the same approach with our merchant fleet will in many instances yield remarkable financial gains, and at the same time give us modern ships plus an advantage to ship operators, shipyards and the public.

A review of potential benefits with respect to bulk carriers well illustrates the point. It is estimated that 15,000–55,000 deadweight ton vessels and 35,000–25,000 deadweight ton vessels could serve potential markets and could be built at a total construction subsidy cost to the Government of $232,500,000. Based on a useful life of 25 years, the average annual cost over the life of the ships would be less than $10 million. Also, due to the high degree of automation possible, operating expenses for such vessels are said to be minimal. In other words, with a relatively modest annual expenditure, our maritime capability could be greatly improved by adding a badly-needed bulk carrying capability to our merchant fleet.

We have heard much talk lately about the sad state of our bulk fleet and its inability to handle the bright prospects for carrying bulk cargoes in the future. However, four applications for construction-differential subsidies involving nine bulk carriers have long been awaiting decisions. Three of these have been pending since November 1963, and one since August 1964.

Another application for an operating differential subsidy has been on file for almost 10 years. Talk must soon be replaced by positive action—otherwise our maritime strength will decline even further.

Clearly, the central problem is the need for funds to finance the replacement of vessels in the merchant fleet. The need has never been greater. But, the need continues to be delineated by a lack of appreciation of the problems and dangers involved. To resolve this circumstance, several approaches are possible.

We have frequently advocated the establishment of a Presidential Advisory Commission on Sea Power Superiority. It has been our view that a commission of distinguished citizens, from both public and private life, could review all of our sea power resources, including the marginal condition of our maritime capability, and recommend to the President of the United States the actions necessary to ensure that the Russians do not achieve their objective of controlling the trade routes of the seas.

A Presidential advisory commission could accomplish much in terms of assigning needed national priorities to the correction of the deficiencies which exist in our merchant fleet. It might well chart a program pointed toward a point in time—in the not too distant future—when U.S.-flag shipping will carry more than 10 percent of our own trade and commerce.

On the legislative front, the Congress might also help in upgrading the assignment of appropriate priorities to our national maritime effort. It might well authorize the establishment of a Joint Commission of Government, Industry and Labor authorities to undertake immediately a review of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to bring it into line with the needs not only of today, but of the critical 5- to 10-year period ahead.

Second to the assignment of priorities is the availability of sufficient funds. The cost of any program to counter the increasing Russian threat on the high seas will not be cheap. But, it certainly would be far less than the cost of winning the race to the moon—now estimated at upward of $20 billion. And, the cost of winning the race on the oceans would cost a fraction of that amount.

Federal payments for subsidized ship construction, between 1950 and 1964, averaged about $40 million annually and it is not difficult to understand why we have been steadily falling behind.

A construction reserve fund for nonsubsidized shipping operators, tramp operators, and Great Lakes operators would provide a great stimulus for rejuvenation of a large segment of our merchant marine which has received little or no attention or encouragement. Overage, uneconomic ships in these services are badly in need of replacement. Senator BARTLETT, of Alaska—a vigorous champion of a modern, well-balanced merchant marine—has introduced legislation to create a vessel replacement capital reserve fund "to promote the replacement and expansion of the U.S. nonsubsidized merchant and fishing fleets." It is not yet known whether or not this measure will be officially supported, but it has strong endorsement from labor and industry spokesmen.

Senator BARTLETT's inclusion of the needs of the fishing fleet in his bill suggests a whole new panorama of developments. Many new ocean sciences are only beginning to emerge. Oceanography, for example, has captured the imagination of many persons and companies, and we are told that future opportunities are almost limitless. But, our basic maritime research and development endeavors have failed to keep pace and leave much to be desired. In the present fiscal year, approximately $10.8 million are available for maritime research programs, and of that amount $6.5 million is allocated for operation of the Nuclear Ship *Savannah*. Yet, by comparison, Department of Defense expenditures for research, development, tests and evaluations of aircraft total nearly $900 million.

In other words, for aircraft research our Government is sponsoring the expenditure of almost 200 times more money than for merchant ship research. Surely, the vast sums of Federal money spent over the last decade for aircraft research and development—and supporting facilities—have made it possible for our airframe industry to remain competitive on a worldwide basis in spite of our higher wages and higher material costs. It should not be too difficult to prove that Federal support of a comparable magnitude would have made it possible for our merchant marine—and supporting shipyards—to be competitive on a worldwide basis.

There are many exciting possibilities for new concepts in sea transportation. Hydrofoils, ground effects machines, high-speed submarine cargo lines, oceangoing barge trains, nuclear-propelled vessels, and specialized unit cargo load ships are some of these. Our shipyards are equal to the challenges ahead. Who can say what the condition of our maritime and shipbuilding industry would now be had research and development in this field received the attention given to the aircraft industry? But, it can be stated with certainty that the U.S. airlines would today be in dire straits if national policy necessitated their using a large proportion of converted flying fortresses of World War II vintage.

FUTURE RELATIONS WITH CHINA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, recently I had the pleasure of addressing the National Conference on the United States and China, held here in Washington, D.C., at the International Inn. On that occasion, I noted that it is in our national interest to open at least limited contacts with mainland China.

Red China is the most populous nation in the world. She occupies a highly significant position in Asia, and is developing a nuclear capacity.

The problem posed by China will not be solved by burying our heads in the sand. I believe that one day we must undertake the patient—and no doubt frustrating—effort to establish international, economic, and cultural ties with China.

Several days ago the House Foreign Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific published a report in which the subcommittee urged that consideration be given at the appropriate time to "the initiation of limited, but direct, contact with Red China, through cultural-exchange activities." Recently, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States unanimously recommended a similar approach.

I commend the House subcommittee for its forthright stand. Although it is essential that the United States continue to oppose aggression and subversion, it is also essential that we maintain an open mind on the China problem and possible new U.S. initiatives.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article and a fine editorial, from the Washington Post, on the action recently taken by the House Foreign Affairs Committee's subcommittee. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a thoughtful article, written by Max Freedman, on a recent China study made by the respected American Friends Service Committee.

There being no objection, the articles and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 16, 1965]

House Unit Favors Easing Peiping Relations

A congressional subcommittee has cautiously but clearly recommended that the United States start thinking about improving relations with Red China.

It specifically recommended consideration of U.S.-Red Chinese cultural exchanges "at an appropriate time."

The Far Eastern subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in a report released today, made clear that it implied no relaxation of U.S. efforts to contain Chinese aggression or subversion.

But the subcommittee of five Democrats and four Republicans suggested that the United States indicate both to China and other countries that U.S. opposition to some of the things China is doing does not imply permanent U.S. opposition to reasonable relations with China.

The caution with which the subcommittee dealt with this subject is suggested by its tendency to present the more daring suggestions by quoting witnesses' statements rather than making them itself.

Yet even the formal recommendations of the subcommittee went far beyond the conventional opposition to anything connected with Red China.

"The United States," said the subcommittee, "should give, at an appropriate time, consideration to the initiation of limited but direct contact with Red China through cultural exchange activities with emphasis on scholars and journalists.

In general the subcommittee walked a delicate line between suggesting efforts to improve U.S.-Chinese relations and opening itself to any suggestion of being too soft on communism, or of undermining confidence in the U.S. commitment to resist Chinese aggression.

It warned against "any sign of American moves to establish trade and diplomatic relations with Red China."

The subcommittee offered a number of other suggestions, all of them in the direction of easing tensions with the Communist world.

It urged that such steps be combined with strong evidence that the United States would not relax its opposition to Communist aggression or subversion. And so it recommended increased efforts to discourage free world trade with North Vietnam under present circumstances.

The gist of the report was that the committee was endorsing the administration's policy, which President Johnson has summed up with the phrase "our hand is out, but our guard is up."

Since the current and earlier administrations have felt it necessary to move cautiously toward easing restrictions on relations with Communist countries for fear of adverse Congressional reactions, the report is expected to be welcomed, privately if not publicly, by the administration.

The subcommittee recommended consideration of U.S. recognition of Outer Mongolia, a Communist state between China and Russia. Nationalist China has strongly opposed such a U.S. move.

The subcommittee also suggested expansion of U.S. trade with Eastern Europe to loosen that area's dependence on Russia.

It suggested more cordial relations generally with East European countries that show some independence of Russia.

And it suggested that the United States should not make overt efforts to exploit the Soviet-Chinese split.

The subcommittee reported that limited escalation of the war in South Vietnam has not pushed the Russians and Chinese together, but has widened the breach.

But Secretary of State Dean Rusk told the subcommittee that "it seems to me that if Peiping can demonstrate in southeast Asia that Peiping's doctrine of communism, of militant communism, is the correct one and the successful one, this will almost certainly bring about a greater unity of the Communist world behind the point of view of Peiping."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 23, 1965]

Relations With China

The House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific has taken a cautious but courageous step in becoming the first congressional group to publish a report urging that, "at an appropriate time," consideration be given "to the initiation of limited but direct contact with Red China through cultural exchange activities."

The subcommittee, headed by Congressman Zablocki of Wisconsin, suggests that priority on these cultural exchanges go to scholars and journalists. It does not urge an opening up of trade relations with China at this time, and it does not delude itself into thinking that there will be any softening of China's anti-Americanism during the next few years. What the subcommittee desires is to encourage every opportunity to increase each country's knowledge of the other, and to make it more evident that it is not the United States which is isolating China, but China itself which is discouraging such contacts.

The subcommittee report also urged that the United States consider recognition of China's neighbor, Moscow-oriented Outer Mongolia. The Congressmen were aware, however, that when the United States tried to do just that a few years ago Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist China, which would like to reclaim Mongolia as its own should it ever retake the mainland, forced the administration to back down.

It is understood that the subcommittee members were emboldened by testimony from Roger Hilsman, the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs under President Kennedy, and that their report might have been even bolder had not a few of the members pleaded digestion difficulties in their home constituencies.

Nevertheless, the subcommittee certainly has taken a significant step away from the ostrich head-ducking that has come to characterize Chinese-American relations.

The subcommittee's action follows a recent resolution here by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce calling for an opening of the "channels of communication" between the two countries. A national conference sponsored by the American Friends Service Committee also attempted to focus attention on Chinese-American relations.

It is only through the leadership of such impeccably respectable groups as these that an administration in Washington can be persuaded to note that perhaps the old "China Lobby" really is dead and that this country now can afford to take whatever realistic steps toward China it deems necessary in order to further our national interests.

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 24, 1965]

Future Relations With China

(By Max Freedman)

Nothing is harder, in the midst of a war, than to look beyond the immediate struggle to the problems and hopes of the long future. Yet precisely this look into the future has been attempted as a brave act of public service by the American Friends Service Committee (the Quakers) in its proposals for a new policy toward China.

Quite plainly there can be no immediate change in our policy while China disturbs the security of Asia. The Quakers with all their faith in the persuasive power of good will, are not blind to political realities. Their analysis contains some of the shrewdest comments on Chinese problems that have yet been presented for public consideration. Even among officials who dissent from their assumptions and principles, this report by the Quakers has won a most respectful hearing.

At the very center of their analysis, the Quakers have put two troubling questions. Are we satisfied with our present policy? Do we wish to continue it indefinitely?

No further discussion is needed by those who are satisfied with things as they are. But for many others these matters are by no means completely closed issues and they would welcome further discussion. It is to them that the Quaker appeal is addressed.

The Quakers ask us to weigh the gains and penalties of our policy of nonrecognition, of a trade embargo, of mutual hostility, and of armed resistance. Without denying that such a policy had its origins and its justification in the threat of Chinese aggression, the Quakers ask whether we have nothing better to expect than another generation of armed antagonism and military struggle.

The policy of ranging China and the United States as mutual enemies, disputing the position of the paramount power in Asia, merely exposes the cluster of small states in southeast Asia to the tensions and upheavals of a cruel struggle for power between two armed giants.

To break this fatal deadlock in which our policy has so long been imprisoned, the Quakers propose that we begin the long journey to the restoration of normal relations with China, in all areas from the diplomatic to the cultural.

But they concede that the stumbling block is Formosa. With their horror of brutality and persecution, the Quakers are the last people to tolerate the transfer of the people on Formosa to the savage reprisals of Peiping.

A definite and binding agreement to protect the safety and freedom of the Formosans must therefore be the first essential principle to any Chinese settlement. Perhaps such a settlement will no longer appear remote and utopian if Peiping is recognized as the government of one United China; if Formosa is granted a large measure of local autonomy and protected in its human freedoms; if the American 7th Fleet is withdrawn from those waters; and if Peiping becomes a member of the United Nations and no longer suffers any discrimination in the world community.

This clearly is a most formidable list of speculative possibilities, and any approach to China on these principles is not practical for the United States in the visible future. All the same, if we take the easy course of seeking refuge in bleak negations palatable to us if only because of their long familiarity, then we doom ourselves to an endless entanglement with the China problem in its present dangerous form.

The emergence of China as a nuclear power, still with a small and primitive capacity, but one capable of ruthless expansion in the next decade, gives a tragic and urgent emphasis to the necessity of no longer treating China as an outlaw state. Perhaps China will obstinately resist all overtures, but can anyone really argue that we have tried and exhausted all available policies?

We have been no more eager to reach an accommodation with China, in a significant and fundamental sense, than we were to come to terms for many years with Russia after its revolution. Our hostility did not break Russia's power then, and it has not yet broken China's power now.

The Quakers see a useful check on potential Chinese aggression by the presence of an international force in the threatened lands, with the United Nations taking an increased role in southeast Asia.

Beyond all doubt, the Quakers are far ahead of general American opinion but there would be much support for their position in Asia, notably in Japan and India. They have, meanwhile, given us all a valuable lesson in the art of discussing public questions without self-righteousness and with a brave freedom from old dogmas.

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION IN CONNECTICUT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, 20 years ago this month the fighting in the European theater of World War II came to an end. The end of that terrible war marked the beginning of enormous new responsibilities for the Veterans' Administration. In the State of Connecticut, those responsibilities have been met very well. Through the Hartford office alone, more than $70 million is disbursed annually to administer veterans programs. The man overseeing the activities of the Veterans' Administration in Connecticut is Col. Edward W. O'Meara. Colonel O'Meara and his staff are charged with care of the records of more than 235,000 Connecticut veterans. The programs that Colonel O'Meara administers vitally affect the lives and well-being of ex-GI's, as well as the lives of their widows and their children. Colonel O'Meara is no stranger to such responsibilities; he was the first manager of the social security office in New Britain.

Furthermore, Ed O'Meara is an old and valued friend. When Governor of Connecticut, it was my privilege to appoint him a member of my military staff. Everything Ed O'Meara does, he does well.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "State VA Part of Largest Business Firm in United States," published in the New Britain Herald of May 18, 1965, and describing the fine work of Colonel O'Meara and the Veterans' Administration in Connecticut, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE VA PART OF LARGEST BUSINESS FIRM IN UNITED STATES

(By Arthur E. McEvoy)

Twenty years after VE day and the end of World War II the Veterans' Administration, through its Hartford office, is disbursing more than $70 million annually in Connecticut to administer many programs for the benefit of men and women who were in the military service in two world wars and their dependent survivors.

In the New Federal Building in the capital city, around which the activities of the VA in Connecticut revolve, many functions affecting the lives of ex-GI's, their widows, and children are carried out by the staff of Col. Edward W. O'Meara, regional manager.

SERVICES LISTED

These include compensation payments, pensions, educational allowances, grants to paraplegic veterans of $10,000 toward building or buying a home and benefits to widows and minor children. The extent of the transactions may be visualized by the number of checks issued in April. In that month checks went to 42,479 living veterans and 13,973 to widows, widows and children, or children alone. Of the latter figure, 6,582 went to the World War I account and 6,401 to World War II beneficiaries.

In a display case in the main corridor of VA regional headquarters is a newspaper article saying "Today, the biggest business organization in the United States is not General Motors or A.T. & T., but the Veterans' Administration. Veterans and their immediate families comprise almost half the total U.S. population and the VA has some 22 million 'customers' in its active files."

UNIQUE SYSTEM

The Hartford office has records of 235,000 of the 350,000 veterans in Connecticut. In a forest of steel cabinets are their military history, data on medical examinations and treatments, as well as two-way correspondence. A unique filing system installed as an experiment for possible use throughout the Nation enables members of the staff to find a folder enclosing any veteran's record with a minimum of time and effort.

Specialists fill many posts in the Hartford office. A tour discloses the desks of physicians, lawyers, construction experts, occupation experts, loan administration agents, insurance underwriters, and accountants, a cross section of the professional fields. Other employees vital to the operation are flexo-writer operators, stenographers, dictaphone operators. In addition are many requiring special skills or understanding.

GOOD MORTGAGE RISKS

In the Loan Guarantee Division are approximately 95,000 mortgage loans which the office has guaranteed amounting to about $1 billion. "Evidence of how our veterans have taken care of their mortgage obligations is indicated by the remarkably low loss ratio which is three-tenths of 1 percent," said Colonel O'Meara, adding, "This, I think anyone would say, is an extraordinary record."

Versatile machines speed the work and make possible swift handling of an enormous amount of business transacted. By means of a telecommunication system about 520 messages are sent out monthly and about 525 received. The office can and does "speak" with all VA installations in the country through a series of relays.

SUPERVISES ESTATES

The mail desk handles about 70,000 pieces of mail a month, 40,000 incoming and 30,000 outgoing. Of those received, about 7,000 are processed by a mechanical locator index that looked to this writer like a small scale ferris wheel. A push of a button brings within reach of the operator's hand the addresses of many thousands of veterans in the State.

Many unanticipated problems are handled by the chief attorney's office which also exercises supervision over estates amounting to $9 million of some 6,300 incompetent veterans as well as beneficiaries and minor children.

During the fiscal year 1964, $72,500,000 was expended in Connecticut to carry out various functions of the regional Hartford office. This undertaking was accomplished by a staff of 118 whose working space and appurtenances occupy 30,500 square feet, the entire first floor of the Federal Building.

Colonel O'Meara, who heads this big operation, is no stranger to New Britain. He was the first manager of the social security office in this city.

RETENTION OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Nueces Canyon Chamber of Commerce, headquartered at Camp Wood, Tex., recently endorsed the proposition that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act be retained. I fully share the view of the chamber. In order that other Senators may be advised of how Texans feel on this most important matter, I ask that a letter to me from the chamber president be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUECES CANYON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Camp Wood, Tex., May 20, 1965.
Hon. JOHN TOWER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOWER: The Nueces Canyon Chamber of Commerce has endorsed the proposition that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act should be retained to the end that the right-to-work laws of Texas can be continued.

This action was taken by unanimous vote of the chamber membership at the last regular meeting held May 4, 1965, and the undersigned was instructed to notify you of this action and to request your cooperation in this matter.

Thanking you in advance for a reply at your earliest convenience, I am,

Respectfully,
HORACE KELLY, *President.*

THE MESS IN VIETNAM—XV; AN EX-U.S. OFFICIAL "TURNS STATE'S EVIDENCE"

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, books of great pertinence and value to an understanding of what is going on in Vietnam and in southeast Asia generally are now coming off the presses. Considering the great lack of reliable information about why and to what extent the United States is engaged and the omission of many pertinent facts from official pronouncements, these books are a distinct contribution to public information, and they deserve reading.

Recently, I had printed in the RECORD reviews, from "The Nation," of David Halberstam's book entitled "The Making of a Quagmire," and of Malcolm Browne's book "The New Face of War." Mr. Halberstam was for 3 years the correspondent of the New York Times in Vietnam; and Mr. Browne was there as the correspondent of the Associated Press, and is still there. Both these books revealed tellingly the efforts to suppress the bad news from Vietnam and to give the American people the rosy picture which has, up to date, been part of the official line. Both of these newspaper men were Pultizer Prize winners, because of the excellence of their reporting of events in Vietnam.

We now have a book written by a Government official, the Public Affairs Officer in South Vietnam—John Mecklin, whose book, entitled "Mission in Torment," has just been issued by Doubleday. In the May 29th issue of "The New Republic," this book is admirably reviewed by I. F. Stone, the knowledgeable editor of "I. F. Stone's Weekly." He entitles his review, appropriately: "An Official Turns State's Evidence." I recommend to all Senators the reading of this review; but even more important is the reading of the book itself. I ask unanimous consent that the review be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

An Official Turns State's Evidence

(By I. F. Stone)

The most important battle in South Vietnam was the fight to let the American people know what was going on. Two reporters who shared Pulitzer prizes for their part in it, David Halberstam, of the New York Times, and Malcolm W. Browne, of the Associated Press, have recently published their accounts of this battle between bureaucracy and press.

Now in "Mission in Torment," we have the story as seen from the other side. John Mecklin, a Time staff man, took leave of absence to serve as Public Affairs officer of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon from May 1962 to January 1964. The story he has to tell is not peculiar to Saigon. The same struggle goes on in Washington. Covering the Pentagon, the State Department, and the White House is a continual rassle between reporters trying to get the news and press officers putting out the Government's party line. If the latter had their way we would all sound like American equivalents of Pravda and Izvestia; too many do. "In Saigon in 1963," Mecklin writes, "the newsmen were regarded as enemies not only by local authorities but also by the American Mission." In this, Washington often seems to differ only in degree from Saigon.

Mecklin charges that the newsmen were rude, self-righteous, and humorless, but he substantially confirms their indictment. Where Halberstam and Browne complain of a constant effort to mislead the press, Mecklin pleads in extenuation that the higher-ups believed their own falsehoods. "The root of the problem," he says, "was the fact that much of what the newsmen took to be lies was exactly what the Mission genuinely believed, and was reporting to Washington. Events were to prove that the Mission itself was unaware of how badly the war was going, operating in a world of illusion. Our feud with the newsmen was an angry symptom of bureaucratic sickness." The defense is more damning than the newsmen's accusations. All governments lie, but disaster lies in wait for countries whose officials smoke the same hashish they give out.

Mecklin lets us see that even this was not the whole story. There were falsehoods the officials believed and falsehoods they told deliberately. "To the best of my knowledge," Mecklin writes, "no responsible U.S. official in Saigon ever told a newsman a really big falsehood. Instead there were endless little ones." When the newsmen didn't fall for them, Washington complained. "There was a patronizing holier-than-thou tone in the official attitude toward the press," Mecklin relates. "We repeatedly received cables from Washington using expressions like 'tell the correspondents' to do so and so or 'explain how they were wrong' to write such and such. This was like trying to tell a New York taxi driver how to shift gears." This also goes on in Washington where Johnson sometimes seems to think the Constitution made him not only commander-in-chief of the Nation's Armed Forces but editor-in-chief of its newspapers.

In one of his last dispatches as a Time correspondent in Saigon in 1955 after Diem had been in office 9 months, Mecklin quoted an unnamed "prominent American journalist" as saying after his first interview with Diem, "Sort of a screwball, isn't he? His eyes don't even focus." By the time Mecklin got back to Saigon 7 years later, U.S. information policy was designed to make sure that nobody else's eyes focused properly on Vietnam either. Mecklin's book reveals that the notorious State Department Cable No. 10006, of February 21, 1962, which the Moss subcommittee of the House on Government Information Policies later exposed, was regarded within the bureaucracy as liberalizing press relations. This basic directive was drafted jointly by Arthur Sylvester at Defense and Robert Manning at State; it reflects the animosity to a free press characteristic of both departments. "It was 'liberal'," Mecklin comments wryly, "In the sense that it recognized the right of American newsmen to cover the war in Vietnam, but it was otherwise little more than codification of the errors the mission was already committing." Conveniently, the text was classified but the Moss subcommittee was allowed to reveal that newsmen were to be advised against "trifling criticism of the Diem government" and not to be taken along on military activities likely to result in "undesirable stories."

This is not ancient history. The old habits march on. Misinformation is still the hallmark of the Government's information policy. Two examples may be cited, one minor, one major. The minor one concerns the replacement of General Harkins by his deputy, General Westmoreland. Every few months, it would seem, Harkins would issue a statement saying that victory "is just months away"—this was his prediction, Mecklin recalls, the very day Diem was overthrown. His deputy and successor seems to be the same type. But when Westmoreland stepped into his old commander's shoes, the tired Army mimeograph machines ground out the same old tripe. "Like Harkins two years earlier," Mecklin notes, "Westmoreland's press notices described him as a 'no-nonsense' officer."

A major example concerns the State Department's recent white paper. The Mecklin book, like Browne's, rebuts its central thesis. "Like everything else in Vietnam," Mecklin writes, "statistics on infiltrated material and personnel from the North were highly debatable. There was no question that significant Chinese and North Vietnamese supplies had been smuggled. * * * But the vast bulk of Vietcong weapons and equipment were American." Mecklin also has "no doubt that several thousand Vietcong officers and other trained personnel had infiltrated from the North" but he adds that "the overwhelming majority of their forces were recruited locally." The white paper was intended to prepare public opinion for the bombing of the North. Mecklin says that by destruction of factories and training camps in the North "the Vietcong would be weakened, but probably not much more than the efficiency of the Pentagon would be reduced if the air conditioning were shut off." For Mecklin the talk of bombing supply routes "made even less sense" because most of the smuggled supplies were moved on foot or in sampan. In a graphic simile Mecklin writes, "As the French discovered so disastrously at Dienbienphu, air attacks on coolie jungle supply routes is like trying to shoot a mouse hiding in a wheatfield from an airplane with a rifle."

Two hitherto undisclosed scenes stand out in the Mecklin book. One was an interview with Kennedy on April 29, 1963, when the President asked him, "Why are we having so much trouble with the reporters out there?" Mecklin thought there would be less trouble if officials were more candid. He wanted Kennedy to put a stop to "excessively optimistic public statements" in Washington and Saigon and the habit of "complaining" to editors and publishers "about unfavorable stories" from reporters in the field. Mecklin says he found Kennedy "skeptical but willing to try."

One wonders whether Mecklin was not naive. We know from Halberstam's book that Kennedy himself tried to persuade the publisher of the New York Times to transfer him out of Saigon. Six months later Kennedy was to issue the biggest optimistic whopperoo of the war—the McNamara-Taylor statement at the White House, October 2, 1963, that all was going so well in Vietnam we could withdraw 1,000 men by the end of the year and complete "the major part of the U.S. military task" by the end of 1965. The desire to primp up the face of truth was not confined to the lower echelons. Mecklin forgets to mention that speech by Carl Rowan, now again in charge of Vietnamese "information," about the public's "right not to know" which the Moss subcommittee protested. Nor the way this echoed Kennedy's speech to the publishers after the Bay of Pigs on the need for greater "restraint" in covering undeclared wars.

Another White House scene on which Mecklin lifts the curtain for the first time was a special meeting of the National Security Council on September 10, 1963, when the Buddhist crisis was about to bring down Diem. The Bay of Pigs made Kennedy aware of how wrong the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the CIA could be. Had he lived longer, he might soon have come to feel the same way about their advice on Vietnam. Mecklin was invited to be present to hear a report from a special two-man mission Kennedy had hurriedly sent out to Saigon for a fresh look at the state of the war and of popular support for Diem. The mission was composed, Mecklin relates, of a Pentagon general and a senior Foreign Service officer, "both relatively unknown, though experienced Vietnam hands." Each reported separately. Their reports turned out to be so different that when they finished, President Kennedy asked, with that dry wit which made him so winning, "Were you two gentlemen in the same country?"

Mecklin writes that security regulations prohibit him from reporting anything further about the meeting. He does say that while every other agency thought the time had come to reform, or get rid of, the Diem regime, "the Pentagon, unpersuaded that the war had been affected by the Buddhist upheaval, continued to agitate for no real action at all," while the CIA "was more or less of the same opinion." This should be read with Halberstam's and Browne's accounts of how stubbornly deaf General Harkins and the top CIA man in Saigon, Richardson, remained until the very end when their junior officers in the field tried to tell them what was going on. The lack of congressional or popular control over these huge military and intelligence bureaucracies allows them to go on being wrong with impunity. Each "mistake" leads on to a bigger one.

Yet Mecklin would drag us further into the Asian morass. He advocates the use of combat troops to take over the war in South Vietnam, he believes the national interest requires it and he thinks the war can be won in no other way, though it may take many years and many men. At one point he talks of the need for an army of 1 million men. I wonder how he reconciles this with his observation that we have been losing because we have not won the peasant over to our side. The peasant, Mecklin says, in the most perceptive passage in his book, is aware "if only intuitively" that the United States is in Vietnam for "global strategic considerations, not because of sympathy for the Vietnamese people." To step up the bombings north and south as we have been doing, and to follow this with combat troops as we have begun to do, means to burn up much of Vietnam for those global strategic considerations. This is unlikely to endear us to the least intuitive peasant in Vietnam or anywhere else.

SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, during the period May 23–30, churches of all denominations throughout the United States are observing Soil Stewardship Week. This annual observance is sponsored by the Nation's 3,000 local Soil and Water Conservation Districts. "Challenge of Growth" is the theme of this year's Soil Stewardship Week observance.

In the great society of mankind, each of us has a God-given purpose for being. In our time, each among us fulfills a mission on the long progression toward the ultimate design of our Maker.

To each among us, God has assigned a share in the expanding brotherhood of stewards. It is a membership of service, dedicated to the husbandry of the lands and the waters, the forests and the ranges, and the fish and the game he has placed at our disposal. In these times of great growth, we tend to take for granted, or to forget, man's dependence on two indispensable resources—soil and water. An observance such as Soil Stewardship Week may well serve to create a more widespread awareness of the fact that soil and water are the essence of our being—that from soil we came, and by soil we live, and to the soil our earthly forms return.

The challenge of growth was underscored by Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, in a statement he issued in connection with Soil Stewardship Week observances. He said:

> Never in our Nation's history has growth posed so great a challenge as it does today—growth of population, of great urban concentrations, of demands upon our natural resources, of infringements upon the beauty of the rural landscape. One result of this dynamic growth is to shrink the broad and bountiful land, and to call for a more dedicated stewardship on the part of all Americans.

I commend Mr. Williams on his fine statement; and I request unanimous consent that his full statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE ADMINISTRATOR: STEWARDSHIP AND GROWTH

Every American is a steward of the land whether he lives in the city or the country. Each has a vested interest in the land—each is dependent upon it and each is responsible for its care.

During Soil Stewardship Week, May 23–30, we are reminded that conservation of the land is a daily concern, every day of the year.

The theme of soil stewardship this year is "The Challenge of Growth." Never in our Nation's history has growth posed so great a challenge as it does today—growth of population, of great urban concentrations, of demands upon our natural resources, of infringements upon the beauty of the rural landscape.

One result of this dynamic growth is to shrink the broad and bountiful land, and to call for a more dedicated stewardship on the part of all Americans.

A beautiful countryside stems from a prosperous soil and clean-running streams. We have accomplished much to preserve the beauty and prosperity of our land and to restore it where the soil and waters have been mistreated or uncared for. We must not falter in our dedication and our resolve to carry on the job—to spirit it forward at a greater pace in keeping with the compelling requirements of the Nation.

The Soil Conservation Service and the soil and water conservation districts have a special responsibility for care of the land. What account can we make of our stewardship?

With the cooperation of an interested and farsighted Congress, the soil and water conservation program has made significant advances. SCS conservationists have worked for more than a quarter of a century with local district supervisors and with farm and ranch cooperators to bring life, vitality, and beauty to much of the rural landscape.

These workers can point to land that now flowers where once it lay barren; to earth that holds firm where once it washed or blew away; to livability on land that once was unlivable. But not all the land. We have progressed; we have not yet arrived.

In resource conservation, each success is a benchmark. We can never be satisfied until all the land is used within its capability and assured that it will continue to be used wisely through enduring application of sound soil and water conservation practices.

This is a constant task, as constant as the need of living things for nourishment. The conservationist is concerned with keeping the land alive. He knows that the land too often has died for lack of care.

The ugly menace of erosion and depletion continues to scar much of our land, to rob us of our essential topsoil, to scourge our streams and reservoirs, to undermine the foundation of our existence. A recent interpretive report of the National Inventory of Soil and Water Conservation Needs lists soil erosion as the dominant conservation problem on private rural land in the United States.

Conservation problems, the report tells us, still are inadequately treated on 62 percent of the cropland, 73 percent of the non-Federal pasture and range, and 55 percent of non-Federal forest and woodland.

To these rural needs must be added the mounting problems of soil and water conservation in and around the Nation's rapidly expanding urban developments.

Every American, as a conservationist in his own right, would do well, I think, to look hard at the scarred earth where it has been stripped and left to erode, to examine the streams and lakes that are clogged with sediment, to note where the beauty of the countryside has been sacrificed. The Nation could not afford this to happen, but it did happen. It happened because stewardship of the land was wanting; because as keepers of the land the people failed in their service.

The margin of life is thin, indeed, under our feet. Our most productive soil is a shallow layer spread over an inhospitable landmass. When it is gone it cannot be replaced. When it has gone, as history tells us, nations and entire civilizations have declined and vanished.

We know what it takes to protect the life-giving soil and to keep the water running clean, as we build a greater America. We know that growth can be accomplished without destruction of the basic resources upon which our prosperity and future depend. This, indeed, is our stewardship responsibility.

The immediate need is to conserve. Prevention is our first responsibility. It is, by far, the least costly of the alternatives.

Prevention is the soul of the program of the Soil Conservation Service. And as we work to prevent destruction and loss of our most precious natural resources—which includes the beauty of the lanscape—we build.

D. A. WILLIAMS.

"THREE-STAR EXTRA"—A DISTINGUISHED RECORD OF BROADCAST JOURNALISM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on April 19, a voice that has been familiar for some two decades to the American radio audience told a disappointed audience:

> I have the duty to announce tonight to our many thousands of valued listeners that, effective May 28, "Three-Star Extra" will terminate these broadcasts.

Dismayed as I was at hearing Ray Henle's decision to terminate his award-winning "Newspaper of the Air," I nevertheless realize that after some 4,000 broadcasts, Ray and his distinguished staff of analysts, reporters, and editors deserve to be relieved of the pressures of day-to-day broadcasting.

"Three-Star Extra," which leaves the air on Friday night, claims the distinction of being the oldest news-program broadcast at the same hour, over the same network, by the same sponsor. Ray Henle and two of his newsmen, Ned Brooks and Fred Morrision, have been with the program since its inception in 1947. It has been supported all this time by the same sponsor—the Sun Oil Co.

During "Three-Star Extra's" existence, the program reporters have frequently uncovered private actions and public actions that were, or could prove to be, harmful to Americans. In 1947, "Three-Star Extra" found that a small group of State Department officials were keeping German scientists out of the United States—a decision that threatened to put them into Russian hands. The result of this disclosure was that top echelon authorities ordered the scientists admitted, and the U.S. space program received a big boost. In another development that had world effect, "Three-Star Extra's" probing in 1954 helped to disprove Kremlin representations that Outer Mongolia was a bona fide sovereign state. Armed with the facts, the United Nations voted against letting this Communist puppet become a member.

"Three-Star Extra" has in recent months devoted many minutes of many broadcasts to telling the truth about the deplorable Otto Otepka affair, in which a much decorated State Department security evaluator is being stretched over a political rack for having the courage to tell a Senate committee the truth about security lapses in the State Department.

For its diligence in ferreting out and reporting the truth, "Three-Star Extra" has been cited many times. Among the prominent citations are the Dupont Award and five Freedom Foundation George Washington Medals of Honor.

Heading "Three-Star Extra's" staff of 19 is Managing Editor Ray Henle. He has covered the Washington scene for more than 40 years. He also covered the presidential campaigns of Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy; he reported the birth of the United Nations; and he described the coronation of Queen Elizabeth. In 1956, he was personally selected by Mr. Hoover to interview him on the acclaimed telecast "A Conversation with Herbert Hoover." In his broadcasts, Mr. Henle has been ably assisted by Managing Editor Morrison, National Affairs Editor Brooks, and David Wills, "Three-Star Extra's" foreign-affairs expert. They were, in turn, backed up by other renowned and respected reporters, including Victor Riesel, Gerald Waring, John Barnes, Edward Tomlinson, Bill Henry, Jim Simpson, Frank Forrester, John F. Lewis, James Galbraith, C. William Cardin, and the program's announcer, Hugh James.

Mr. President, I ask that Ray Henle's closing script of April 19 be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have been privileged to know Ray Henle during the past 2½ years; and this personal relationship, together with my keen interest in his five-night-a-week newscasts, has given me great confidence in both the man and the program. I deeply regret that "Three-Star Extra" is to leave the air. But, even as the program ends, I know that the outstanding broadcast journalists who have made it the meter by which other news broadcasts are judged will find a full measure of success in meeting new deadlines and in assuming new responsibilities.

EXHIBIT 1

"THREE-STAR EXTRA"

I have the duty to announce tonight to our many thousands of valued listeners that, effective May 28, "Three-Star Extra" will terminate these broadcasts.

The decision to do so stems from my desire to be relieved from the pressure of day-to-day broadcasting with the tensions of meeting deadlines 5 nights a week.

I have been at radio news microphones now steadily for 20 years over the airwaves—18 of them as editor in chief of NBC's "Three-Star Extra," sponsored by Sun Oil Co. And for 14 years prior to that as the Washington correspondent of the Pittsburgh Post Gazette.

The time is here to give more leisure time to other interests which have engaged me only to such extent as my editorship of this newspaper of the air permitted. Naturally, this job came first and we have endeavored to discharge it with the zeal for good reporting and with reasoned comment and interpretation.

For some years I have been a member of the advisory board of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Palo Alto, founded by former President Hoover. Some of my time henceforth will be devoted to this great institution, and I shall have other interests alined with journalism.

As I say, "Three-Star Extra" has been on the NBC network for Sun Oil Co. for nearly 18 years. There is no other network news program which has been broadcast at the same hour, over the same network, for the same sponsor that length of time. And when it is remembered that Sun Oil Co. sponsored Lowell Thomas for 15 years prior to the advent of "Three-Star Extra," it becomes clear that there has been nothing like this for constancy in presenting a news program of high caliber such as Mr. Thomas presented first, and such as we hope we have given you all these years.

From both NBC and Sun Oil Co. our staff has received nothing but the finest cooperation and encouragement. Tonight I think you will be interested to hear a letter I have received from Mr. Robert G. Dunlop, president of Sun Oil Co., after my decision to retire as editor in chief was accepted. I will ask Ray Michael to read this.

"I am sure you know from your many contacts with members of Sun Oil Co. management how highly we regard all that you have contributed to our company through your fine handling of NBC's radio news program, Three-Star Extra, with its excellent staff of seasoned specialists and reporters.

"It has been our privilege to sponsor this program, for we feel that over these past 18 years you have, as a result of your character and competence, added distinction and luster to our corporate name.

"Your decision to engage now in less exacting pursuits is one that engenders mixed feelings. We shall miss you; but on the other hand you have earned respite from the daily demands that today's world places upon those who seek and report the significant news and its background."

For that letter from Mr. Dunlop we are deeply grateful.

I might say it originally was our intention to announce our termination at a somewhat later date, but the news, as it inevitably will, got into the public prints, and consequently I am doing so tonight.

Let me emphasize, however, that your Three-Star Extra will be coming your way until May 28, and during these 6 weeks we shall hope to present some interesting material flashing back to the historic times during which we have been broadcasting, in addition, of course, to presenting the news that is.

COLD WAR GI BILL WILL PROVIDE EDUCATED CITIZENS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, now that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has recommended that the cold war GI bill, S. 9, be reported favorably to this body, it is extremely important that we recognize the economic and social significance of providing an opportunity for thousands of dedicated veterans to become useful, educated citizens. These veterans have protected us from the threat of communism and disorder; and now it is time for us to act on their behalf.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter in support of the cold war GI bill. The letter is from Terry L. Thomas, of Dallas, Tex., and is dated May 18, 1965.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DALLAS, TEX.,
May 18, 1965.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am interested and enthusiastic about your "GI cold war bill." It is evident that the administration is taking measures to raise the education standards, and I, among others, feel that this bill is one of the best measures proposed to increase the number of more highly educated citizens. Most veterans who have not completed their advanced education, or desire further advanced education, have families or many more responsibilities and financial burdens than young men fresh out of high school. Most veterans are more mature, realize the importance of advanced education and have a special drive and will to finish their advanced schooling. Many veterans may never get to finish their education unless they can get some financial assistance. This is why I feel your bill is so important.

Could I receive more details of the bill, its problems and progress toward passage?

Yours truly,

TERRY L. THOMAS.

TIPS IN WAGES FOR SOCIAL SECURITY PURPOSES

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, one of the matters which is being dealt with in the pending medicare bill is the problem of whether tips should be included in wages for social security purposes. Section 313 of H.R. 6675, which is the version of the bill that was passed by the House, provides that tips should be so included.

In my judgment, this provision is a needed reform, an improvement which will result in more equitable retirement benefits for thousands of waiters and waitresses and others who receive substantial tips as part of their incomes.

Mr. David Siegal, who is president of the New York City Joint Executive Board of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, AFL-CIO, submitted an excellent statement to the Senate Finance Committee which describes the reasons why this reform is needed and refutes the arguments which those who oppose it have made. I think this statement deserves wider attention, so I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL JOINT EXECUTIVE BOARD
OF NEW YORK CITY,
New York, N.Y., May 10, 1965.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the 70,000 members of the Local Joint Executive Board of New York City, Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, AFL-CIO and of the 12,000 captains, waiters, waitresses, busboys and other dining room employees represented by Dining Room Employees Union, Local No. 1, an affiliate, we urgently appeal to you to approve section 205 of S. 1, as passed by the House of Representatives. Section 205 proposes to right a wrong which has harmed tipped employees for many years. This type of employees tips count as wages for withholding tax purposes but don't count as wages for social security purposes. As a result, upon retirement these workers qualify for social security benefits substantially inferior to those of other workers who pay the same taxes. The difference in the rate of benefits may mean the difference between economic survival and destitution in old age. The same applies to the survivors, the widows and the orphans, when the head of the family dies.

In connection with this appeal we respectfully wish to bring to your attention the following:

1. The opposition to this bill comes almost entirely from employers. However, a considerable number of employers have expressed support for this bill out of a sense of fairness toward their employees.

2. A small number of employees have been induced to write to your committee in opposition to the bill. This is the result of a propaganda campaign launched by the National Restaurant Association and similar employer groups. This propaganda is a mixture of deception and coercion.

For instance, waiters are warned that if the bill passes they will have to pay higher income taxes. This is not true. The only difference will be that waiters will pay taxes on tips on a pay-as-you-go basis as they now do on the wage portion of their earnings. Waiters and other tipped employees are also told that under the provisions of section 205 they will have to empty their pockets in the presence of proprietors or managers, every night before going home; another glaring untruth.

Consequently isolated expressions of employees' opposition should not be regarded as representative of waiters and other tipped employees as a class.

3. The opposition to this bill is based on a complaint of too much bookkeeping and excessive cost. As to bookkeeping the complaint is grossly exaggerated. Surely a bit of bookkeeping is no reason to deprive so many workers of such vital benefits. As to cost, the additional social security taxes involved will be no higher and no lower than every other employer pays. As a matter of fact employers of tipped employees have enjoyed an advantage over other employers for many years.

4. The suggestion has been made by the opponents that waiters be treated as self-employed persons. This is a contradiction in terms and an absurdity. Waiters are not self-employed; they work for employers who pay them wages, regulate their hours of work, hire or fire them, and decide their conditions of employment. The ridiculous attempt to classify them as self-employed has only one purpose—to shift the entire cost of social security on the employees.

5. Tips have been recognized as wages for social security purposes for certain categories of waiters for several years. These are waiters whose tips are fixed in an agreement between the employer and the guest and are paid by the guest to the employer and by the employer to the waiter. Why not cover all waiters?

Hundreds of thousands of waiters and other tipped employees throughout the country look up to your committee for justice in this matter. You have it in your hands to help these workers and their families enjoy the blessings of our democratic society as they meet its obligations. Please undo this injustice and grant to these hard working citizens the same rights as are enjoyed by all other American workers under the Social Security Act. Approve section 205 of S. 1.

Sincerely,

David Siegal,
President, Joint Board.
A. Susi,
Secretary-Treasurer, Joint Board.
David Siegal,
President, Local No. 1.
E. Sarni Zucca,
Secretary, Local No. 1.

CENTENNIAL OF CONNECTICUT DENTAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the end of this month marks the completion of the centennial year of the Connecticut State Dental Association. During this year the Connecticut State Dental Association has sponsored many dental education and health programs calling attention to the importance of oral health. During these 100 years the people of the whole Nation have benefited greatly from the accomplishments and contributions of Connecticut dentists.

Although I will have the honor of greeting the convention which will mark the completion of the centennial celebration indicating a century of progress, I would like to take time today to honor the Connecticut dental profession with these remarks.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleague in recognizing the achievements of the Connecticut State Dental Association.

Connecticut dentists have long distinguished themselves and their profession by their contribution to dentistry and to humanity.

Dr. Horace Hayden, of Windsor, Conn., was a cofounder of the first dental college in the United States in 1840, and was a leader in establishing the first national dental association and the first dental journal in the world.

Dr. Horace Well, of Hartford, has been acclaimed for his discovery and use of anesthesia in 1845.

Dr. Alfred C. Fones, of Bridgeport, has been hailed as the father of dental hygiene. Dr. Emmeline Roberts Jones, of Danielson, was our Nation's first woman dentist.

I congratulate the Connecticut State Dental Association and each of its members upon their 100th anniversary and I wish them another century of distinguished service to the people of Connecticut and the United States.

OAS SHOULD FORM HEMISPHERIC POLICE FORCE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we should begin work now for the establishment of a multinational police force to protect freedom throughout the Western Hemisphere. Already a skeleton force has been organized in the Dominican Republic. Working through the Organization of American States, we should now urge that a permanent peacekeeping unit be formed.

I first recommended the establishment of such a force in October 1963, when uprisings plagued the Dominican Republic and Honduras. Our problems in the Dominican Republic today underscore the need for a permanent police force.

The organization I envision would be equipped to move rapidly to protect popular, democratic governments against military takeovers. The force would be employed:

First, when requested by a popularly elected government to protect its own internal security; and, second, at direction of the ruling body of the Organization of American States.

Each member of the Organization of American States would be requested to designate a small contingent of troops and equipment to be available on short notice. Command of this international force would rest with OAS.

The President's action in the Dominican Republic, I believe, has successfully stopped the threat of a Communist takeover in that country. However, it is the stated intent of Cuban Communists and their friends to continue efforts throughout Latin America to disrupt and eventually replace popular governments.

A quick-acting hemispheric police force, ready on a moment's notice at the call of a nation in need, would effectively reduce this threat.

I would urge that the President instruct our delegates to the Organization of American States to begin discussions now within that body leading to the establishment of this force.

THE DOMINICAN CRISIS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record two truly remarkable articles by Virginia Prewett, Washington Daily News columnist on Latin America and winner of the Maria Moors Cabot Gold Medal for outstanding hemisphere coverage in 1964.

I believe that the appearance of these articles, which bear the hallmark of unmistakable authenticity, is most timely. Indeed, I think they constitute the most effective answer that has yet been made to those reckless critics of the administration who, instead of giving their Government the benefit of the doubt, lashed out frenetically at imaginary failings and errors.

Among the false charges that were made were these:

That the President intervened against the "constitutional" rebels in favor of an unpopular military clique, that the President had acted without informing the OAS, that Under Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann had masterminded the Dominican landing.

Miss Prewett, in her series of articles for the Washington Daily News, refutes these charges and sets forth an hour-by-hour log of the events that led to the decision of intervention.

I hope that my colleagues will all find the time to read Miss Prewett's highly informative articles.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Inside Story: The Order To Land the Marines

(By Virginia Prewett)

At 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, April 28, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson and five of his top advisers were discussing Vietnam at the White House. An urgent message from the Dominican Republic interrupted him.

There was silence in the little, newly decorated green west wing lounge as the President scanned the slip of paper. He sat in his favorite high-backed deep-cushioned chair, his long legs stretched out by the hassock he often props them on. On the wall nearby hung a new decoration that he proudly shows visitors—the pictures of five Presidents with whom he has worked, mounted in one frame.

ADVISED

With him were Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Special Assistant for National Security McGeorge Bundy, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, Assistant Secretary of State George Ball, and Special Assistant Bill Moyers.

The President told them that all the nine top U.S. officials in our Santo Domingo Embassy requested urgent military assistance to save American lives in the Dominican Republic.

Earlier messages had warned that Santo Domingo city was engulfed in anarchy. About 1,000 American men, women, and children, gathered for evacuation at the Hotel Embajador at the city's edge, were cut off from the escape route via the little Caribbean port of Haina, 9 miles away. The U.S.S. *Boxer* and other naval ships had been lying off Haina since Sunday, April 25.

THE MARINES

President Johnson and his advisers now discussed sending in U.S. Marines to protect the stranded Americans.

At 6:30 the President gave an order that made April 28, 1965, one of the world's historic dates, comparable in drama to October 22, 1962, the day of the Cuban missile showdown. He sent in the Marines. President Johnson immediately started a series of statements and speeches to assure the world he sent them to save lives. He revealed that a Communist apparatus had been spotted surfacing in the anarchy. He stated his goal: to restore peace and help establish democratic government in the Dominican Republic.

The great majority of Americans, say the public opinion polls, heard and approved. But the image of Marine landings has been used in anti-American propaganda for over half a century.

Latin American nationalists use it. Nazis used it before World War II and the Communists before and since. Most Americans, if they think about it, disapprove of the Caribbean landings of the 1920's, when Calvin Coolidge said: "The business of the United States is business."

Woodrow Wilson's still earlier Marines missions in the Caribbean to counteract German plotting during World War I and to try to help along democracy afterward were blurred by the later use of the Marines in "Dollar Diplomacy."

OUTLAY

Two criticisms greeted the Johnson action on April 28. There was outcry in the unfriendly segment of the U.S. press that the President did not amply consult our Latin American allies in the Organization of American States. Senator ROBERT KENNEDY echoed this in a public statement comparing President Johnson's action with those of his late brother, and faulting President Johnson.

Next, the President was accused of intervening to help an unpopular military clique, headed by Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, against constitutional rebels favoring the deposed President Juan Bosch.

The administration had to endure these charges for the moment. Refuting them would have hindered chances of progress in the fast-moving Dominican situation.

CHARGES REFUTED

But Mr. Johnson's firefighting team confounded the critics first by attempting to get General Wessin to step out in the interest of a coalition. Again, Mr. Johnson refuted the charge of favoring the military clique by sending a top team to Santo Domingo to try to negotiate a coalition headed by Antonio Guzman, a former member of Bosch's Cabinet.

Nevertheless, as U.S. efforts to help settle tangled problems of personalities and power in the tragic country continued, a world debate rolled on about the intervention itself.

Speculation returns again and again to Mr. Johnson's reasons for intervening. And the impression rolls on, often cited as a fact, that he did not bring the Organization of American States into the crisis.

MANN'S ROLE

As a corollary, President Johnson is charged with being overpersuaded by his former Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, the present Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Thomas C. Mann.

The left-of-center Americans for Democratic Action, who do not like Mr. Mann because he is supposed to have favored sending U.S. military help to the Cuban exile brigade battling at the Bay of Pigs, have officially demanded Mr. Mann's resignation for supposedly masterminding the Dominican landing.

The charge is false.

The answer to these continuing questions should not be lost to history as a new black legend of U.S. intervention hardens now in 1965. The story can now be told.

At its briefest, it is this:

The immediate reason for landing the marines was to save American lives. The growing danger of a second Cuba on the island of Hispaniola reinforced the President's determination.

MANN'S FATE

But Mr. Mann was not even present at the meeting when President Johnson and his advisers first considered landing the Marines. And incidentally, the untrue ADA attack has guaranteed Mr. Mann will be in U.S. Government as long as Lyndon B. Johnson is President.

Moreover, the charge that the United States acted without the knowledge of the other member states of the OAS is not so.

The White House and the U.S. State Department, long before the order to land Marines was given, had established contacts with Latin American Embassies over the situation. The machinery of the OAS had already been set in motion, at U.S. request. Not only were the Embassies in Santo Domingo of South American countries notified, the Washington Embassies were as well.

President Johnson, when he ordered in the Marines, also ordered all Latin American Embassies in Washington to be notified as quickly as possible of the landing and of the U.S. request for an OAS meeting at the earliest possible hour. By 10 that night, all were notified.

The day-by-day log of events as they affected the White House will tell the story.

THE INSIDE STORY: KNOWN REDS SPOTTED DURING ARMS HANDOUT

(By Virginia Prewett)

Trouble broke in the Dominican Republic at 3 p.m., on Saturday, April 24. Army officers seized their chief of staff and Santo Domingo's most powerful radio station proclaimed a coup against President Donald Reid Cabral.

Former President Juan Bosch was not mentioned.

The White House was informed. Coup threats had been frequent since Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin and other officers deposed Juan Bosch in September 1963. But General Wessin did not move that Saturday.

At 5 a.m. Sunday, the White House was told the revolt was serious. At 7:10, Sr. Bosch, by radio from Puerto Rico, named Jose Rafael Molina Urena "constitutional president" for his cause. General Wessin now acted. Crowds around the centrally located presidential palace shouted for Sr. Bosch. At 10:30 a.m. President Reid Cabral resigned.

NAVY MOVES

At 8:45 Sunday morning, President Johnson from Camp David ordered U.S. Navy units to move near Santo Domingo and lie offshore, out of sight.

This was no novelty. When the longtime Dominican dictator, Rafael L. Trujillo, was assassinated in May 30, 1961, the then Vice President Johnson, acting for President Kennedy in his absence, sent U.S. Navy ships to stand off Santo Domingo.

President Kennedy himself sent them there in December 1961, when Trujillo's surviving family threatened to retake power.

President Johnson learned on Monday, April 26, that Santo Domingo's city manager around 11:30 a.m. called to urge our Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett: "Do something about your people for God's sake!" Rioting and fighting had spread. The Pepsi Cola plant, an American symbol, was burned and bottles were stolen for Molotov cocktails.

At noon Monday, the Embassy began warning all Americans to gather for evacuation at the Hotel Embajador, on the city's outskirts. About 2,500 Americans were in Santo Domingo—diplomats' families, business residents, tourists.

At 5 p.m. Sunday, the Dominican Air Force joined General Wessin. On Monday, they bombed the presidential palace and strafed the rebel-held end of the strategic Ozama bridge.

On Monday, the rebel radio broadcast the names and addresses of the pilots' families. The pilots' wives and mothers were taken to the Ozama bridge as hostages against further strafing.

On Monday, our State Department discussed the situation with the Brazilian and Chilean diplomats.

A cease-fire was arranged for from 11 a.m. till 2 p.m. on Tuesday, so the 1,170 Americans at the Embajador could be taken by bus to Haina port and evacuated.

LUCKY

Soon after 8 a.m. Tuesday, an armed rabble burst into the Embajador. They had been given rifles and tommyguns by defecting army men. They sprayed bullets over the heads of prostrate Americans inside and outside the hotel. By luck, no one was shot.

The later cease-fire held long enough for the Americans to reach Haina, 9 miles away.

That same morning, Colombia's OAS Ambassador, Emilio N. Oribe, called on Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America Jack Hood Vaughn. They discussed bringing the OAS into the crisis.

White House approval was prompt. And at Tuesday noon, the U.S. alternate representative to the OAS, Ward Allen, called an urgent meeting of the Peace Committee.

The Committee, composed of the United States, Argentina, the Dominican Republic, Colombia and Nicaragua, discussed calling an emergency foreign ministers' meeting.

ENVOYS CONCERNED

When President Johnson checked reports later, he saw that Mr. Vaughn had also briefed the Venezuelans. At 7 p.m., he learned, the Costa Rican Embassy asked U.S. aid in evacuating Costa Ricans. During the day, the Embassies of both Peru and Ecuador called our State Department to express concern about their nationals. They stressed the need to protect their nationals and to protect law and order in Santo Domingo.

A little later, L.B.J. learned with relief that the first thousand or so evacuees were safe aboard American vessels. New refugees were filling the Hotel Embajador.

General Wessin's men were attacking heavily. In the late afternoon, Molina Urena and 15 rebels, including Col. Francisco Caamano Deno, called on Ambassador Bennett and asked him to help arrange a settlement. Mr. Bennett tried, but the move failed.

Around Tuesday midnight, Molina Urena took refuge in an embassy. Col. Caamano left the front of the stage. He did not reappear as rebel chief until April 30.

On Wednesday morning, President Johnson learned more arms were passed out indiscriminately.

REDS EFFICIENT

"I never saw such efficiency," read an eyewitness report. "Thousands of rifles were distributed in what seemed minutes." Known communists were spotted in the operation, which bore the earmarks of para-military planning.

President Johnson had known for months that Castroite Communists planned to take over the expected action against Sr. Reid Cabral. Now they were surfacing. The TV took on "a Castro tone." Shouts of "paredon" (To the firing wall!) were increasing in the tumult.

At 10:30 a.m. Wednesday, our OAS Ambassador, Ellsworth Bunker, briefed the OAS Council.

Around noon came more messages. Colombian Ambassador Jesus Zarate reported from Santo Domingo: "It is now a question of Communists versus anti-Communists."

A bank had been looted, police stations overrun. Thousands were dead and wounded.

YANKS CUT OFF

The Americans at the Embajador were cut off from Haina. Soon after 1 p.m. Wednesday, the President learned the crisis was worsening.

In the afternoon, Col. Pedro Benoit, in charge of military ground forces, warned he could not protect the Americans. Police chief Col. German Despradel said the same.

At 5:30 p.m., when President Johnson was discussing Vietnam problems with Dean Rusk, Robert McNamara, George Ball, McGeorge Bundy and Bill Moyers, came the plea for military assistance.

After discussing landing marines, L.B.J. sent out calls to other officials. They included Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance, Ambassador Bunker, Mr. Vaughn, Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann, CIA Director William Raborn, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Earle Wheeler—the full team.

The hard and historic decision had to be made.

CONNECTICUT JOINT RESOLUTION SUPPORTS ADMINISTRATION POLICIES IN VIETNAM AND DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I take great personal pride in bringing to the attention of my colleagues a joint resolution of the legislature of my home State, Connecticut, which records its strong "approval of the decisions of the President to use our armed strength with restraint yet firmness until such time as the peoples of those areas may be able to resolve their own futures in peace, and that we further express our admiration for the members of our own Armed Forces who are serving far from home under difficult and perilous conditions."

Because resolutions like this deserve the attention of all Americans, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD Connecticut House Joint Resolution 179, supporting U.S. policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

In these difficult days when our actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are under attack by the Communist propaganda apparatus and by a small number of vociferous critics at home, it is indeed heartening to hear the steady, although unsensationalized, voices of approval which represent, I am convinced, the opinions of the overwhelming majority of Americans.

Although these acts have not been characterized by fanfare and although they have received relatively little attention from the press, I am confident that the joint resolution adopted by the Connecticut State Legislature supporting the administration's policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, and similar resolutions which have been endorsed by citizens' organizations and student bodies in various parts of the country far more truly reflect the thinking of our citizens than the noisy and highly publicized manifestations of opposition.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 179

Resolution supporting U.S. policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic

Resolved by this assembly:

Whereas there has been criticism of the actions of the President of the United States in defending the cause of freedom in South Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic; and

Whereas such criticism, however well-intentioned, may tend to create abroad a false impression that the people of the United States do not support their Chief Executive in his attempt to assist the people of South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic against subversion and aggression: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Connecticut General Assembly, do hereby record our strong approval of the decisions of the President to use our armed strength with restraint, yet firmness, until such time as the peoples of those areas may be able to resolve their own futures in peace, and that we further express our admiration for the members of our own Armed Forces who are serving far from home under difficult and perilous conditions; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerks of the senate and house of representatives be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Secretary of Defense of the United States.

——— ———,
Clerk of the Senate.

——— ———,
Clerk of the House.

HOMER CROY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I know that all Missourians and many other citizens throughout the Nation were saddened to learn of the death, yesterday, of the famed novelist and long-time Missouri resident, Homer Croy, who died in New York, at the age of 82. Homer Croy gained his fame as a novelist and screen writer, but most especially as a chronicler of the 19th century West. He was one of the first students of the University of Missouri School of Journalism, the first such institution in the Nation. The author of many fascinating and adventure-filled novels, he was, in real life, equally as colorful and as interesting an individual as Molly Brown, Jesse James, or the other true-life or fictional characters that peopled his books. Certainly this fact is attested by the interesting article published today in the New York Times—some of it in his own words. Although his passing certainly means a great loss to Missouri, we are warmed by the knowledge that his place in the literary history of America is secure.

I ask that the New York Times article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 26, 1965]

HOMER CROY DIES; NOVELIST WAS 82—ALSO DID BIOGRAPHIES OF WILL ROGERS AND JESSE JAMES

Homer Croy, the novelist, died Monday evening in his home at 150 Pinehurst Avenue. His age was 82.

In 1926, Mr. Croy wrote "They Had To See Paris," which became Will Rogers' first talking picture. He was the biographer of Judge Isaac C. Parker, the famous hanging judge of the Old West, and one of the leading biographers of Jesse James.

"My parents were those old-fashioned people we used to hear so much about, but now are rarely ever mentioned—poor but honest," Mr. Croy once said. "I was born on a farm near Maryville, Mo., the year the Brooklyn Bridge was built.

"My parents came to Missouri in covered wagons. My father put the first plow into the prairie sod. I worked on our farm all my early life."

In "Country Cured," published in 1943, Mr. Croy told many of the details of that early life. Of this autobiography, a reviewer wrote:

"The author has traveled from Maryville to New York, Paris, and Hollywood, but the farm has always been his refuge and his substance. Like all farm boys, he portrays his early hatred of physical labor and love of good victuals."

Mr. Croy studied a vest-pocket dictionary as he rode a farm horse into Maryville. Soon he began writing articles for farm journals. Then he entered the University of Missouri, "where I became the first student in the first school of journalism in the world," he said.

He failed English in his senior year, but went to New York anyway, and took a job with the Butterick Publications, under Theodore Dreiser, who was then editing three women's magazines.

PRAISED BY CRITIC

The young writer turned out many magazine stories. "Now and then a good one, but for the most part they were about what you think," was how he put it. "Eventually I turned out a novel, and after a terrific struggle, got it published. They paid in postage stamps."

In 1914, Mr. Croy went on a trip around the world, sending back articles for American magazines. He also had a motion-picture camera with him, and an operator. The start of World War I in Europe, on August 4, 1914, found him in Calcutta.

Mr. Croy cabled the Universal Film Co. for money but was stranded for several weeks because of war conditions. Finally a friend, Mae Belle Savell, whom he had notified of his financial straits, managed to get a money order sent to him. He came home and, the next year, married Miss Savell.

Mr. Croy was known at first as a humorist. He was fond of giving himself titles like "Two-Gun Croy, the law north of 125th Street," and once said that the reason Mr. Dreiser had hired him originally was because he knew that Washington, Mo., was where they made corncob pipes.

But when, in 1923, his novel "West of the Water Tower" achieved substantial success, it was called by a critic "a serious, realistic work which has something of the spirit of Hardy [Thomas Hardy] and Dreiser. But Croy's outlook is more hopeful. He sees life without illusion and yet accepts and approves it."

JESSE JAMES LEGENDS

Among the many other books Mr. Croy wrote was "Jesse James Was My Neighbor" (1949), in which he drew upon his intimate knowledge of the James legends gleaned as a cub reporter on the St. Joseph (Mo.) Gazette. In 1953 he wrote "Our Will Rogers," a full-length biography of the cowboy humorist.

Mr. Croy's novel, "Family Honeymoon," was dramatized as a stage play by Owen Davis, and later turned into a motion picture starring Fred MacMurray and Claudette Colbert.

Tall, gangling, bald, and mild mannered, "a gentleman from Missouri who wears a Windsor tie and has a twinkle in his calm eye," was as accurate a description of Mr. Croy as ever given.

Mr. Croy was for many years one of the bread-and-butter writers of the Saturday Evening Post.

He leaves his wife, Mae, and a daughter, Carol. A funeral service will be held at 1 p.m. Thursday at Frank E. Campbell's, Madison Avenue and 81st Street.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, yesterday President Johnson submitted to Congress a report, prepared by the Federal Council of Science and Technology, on the Federal water resources research program for the fiscal year 1966. The report is available to the public, upon request. It is a progress report of the committee, established by the Council, to review Federal agency activities in water research.

I ask unanimous consent that President Johnson's letter accompanying the report be printed in the RECORD.

The letter was addressed to the President of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 25, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Even before there was a United States, people of this land were using and developing its water resources. Over the years the nature of the problems has changed and the size and scope of the solutions has increased but our technology has kept abreast of the needs.

Today far greater demands are pressing upon both our water resources and the technology required to meet our varied water needs. Our streams and groundwater resources must meet the needs of nearly 200 million people for food, fiber, and industrial processing. At the same time we have expected our streams to carry off the waste products of our homes, industries, and farms. We must also protect our people from damaging floods such as those which have recently occurred along the upper Mississippi River.

A projection of our population growth over the next few decades could lead to the conclusion that very serious water shortages might be expected over much of the Nation in the not far distant future. Pollution has already caused serious problems in many of our streams and lakes, and, with a growing population, pollution problems could extend to almost all of our water sources.

Such predictions must not come true. Our scientists and engineers will find solutions to meet these problems as they develop, if we maintain a continuing and effective research program. Earlier this year, I transmitted to you legislation expanding and extending one aspect of the water research program—desalting. Today I am pleased to transmit a report summarizing the Federal water resources research program for fiscal year 1966 prepared by the Committee on Water Resources Research of the Federal Council of Science and Technology.

The program is not large but it is vital. The total proposed expenditure for the 1966 fiscal year is only $101 million, less than one percent of the total national expenditure on water supply, water control and waste treatment. But the Committee is at work on the preparation of a long range research program of incalculable importance to our future. I am asking the Chairman of the Federal Council to press forward on the development of this plan.

We must be sure that our research effort is adequate to guarantee sufficient water for all our future needs. On this there can be no compromise. We must, also, strive through research to find a better basis for minimizing the damaging effects of water and to preserve and protect the natural beauty of our streams and lakes for the health and enjoyment of all our people.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

HELICOPTER SERVICE BETWEEN SAN JOSE, PALO ALTO, AND SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on May 24, Trans World Airlines filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board an announcement of an agreement with San Francisco and Oakland Helicopter Airlines to enlarge services between the San Francisco Airport and Palo Alto and San Jose.

This marks a big step forward on the part of our large trunk carriers to become actively interested in partnership arrangements for the bettering of service between outlying communities of metropolitan areas and our terminal airports.

I consider this one of the most forward-looking actions taken by a trunk line in helping to develop VSTOL air services where badly needed to improve general airline service. By his action in joining with the helicopter company, President C. C. Tillinghast, Jr., will not only aid and expedite transportation to and from the major airport, he will also assist in developing an entire new concept in short-haul transportation by air.

Thus, instead of letting the helicopter service go down the drain, and thereby fail to make use of the experience already gained, TWA is moving to be a helpful partner to this presently struggling means of transport. I congratulate President Tillinghast and TWA on their forward-looking action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the complete announcement of this new aviation service.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO HELICOPTER LINE TO LINK TWA FLIGHTS WITH BAY AREA COMMUNITIES

Scheduled helicopter service between San Jose and Palo Alto, Calif., and the Trans World Airlines passenger terminal at San Francisco International Airport will be inaugurated early this summer by San Francisco and Oakland Helicopter Airlines, Inc. (SFO).

Announcement of the proposed service, filed May 24 with the Civil Aeronautics Board, was made by TWA President Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr., and M. F. Bagan, president of SFO.

The new service, upon CAB approval of the agreement and of SFO's application to serve the San Jose airport, will provide convenient direct connections to and from TWA domestic and international flights.

SFO will schedule a minimum of 10 round trips each weekday over the new route and 10 on weekends with twin-turbine 26-passenger Sikorsky S–61 equipment. The one-way fare to Palo Alto will be $7.50; to San Jose, $9.50.

Flight time to Palo Alto, about 20 miles by freeway from San Francisco International Airport, will be 8 minutes. The 35-mile trip to San Jose will be flown in 15 minutes.

Palo Alto and San Jose are southeast of the San Francisco Airport, in Santa Clara County, the fastest-growing region in the bay area, with a heavy concentration of electronics and defense industry activity.

In addition to the Santa Clara County operations, SFO will reschedule some of its existing East Bay scheduled helicopter and hovercraft services to TWA's terminal area to complement its service pattern. This new distribution of helicopter services within the San Francisco terminal complex will benefit travelers from Oakland, Berkeley, and points in Contra Costa and Marin Counties with a broader choice of convenient connecting services.

Mr. Tillinghast said that "In the interests of fostering development of new and improved services for the traveling public, and at the same time contributing direct support to the helicopter industry where expansion into new markets is justified, TWA has agreed to guarantee SFO's break-even costs for the new Peninsula operations to the extent that they are not covered by operating revenues.

"This partnership marks another forward step in the implementation of TWA's policy of assistance to helicopter operators during this crucial stage of their development," he said.

TWA flies about 900,000 passengers a year in and out of San Francisco International Airport on flights serving 69 other U.S. cities and direct polar route flights to and from Europe. Currently, TWA schedules an all-jet pattern of 25 daily arrivals and departures at San Francisco.

CBS REPORT SHOWS NEED FOR STRENGTHENED TRAFFIC-SAFETY EFFORT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the night before last 30 million Americans took a driver's test. It is to be hoped that the rest of the Nation did better than the 2,000 drivers in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Los Angeles whose test scores are known. Only 4 percent of the tested drivers in these four cities received scores in the "excellent" category. Forty-two percent failed.

We owe a real debt of gratitude to the Columbia Broadcasting System for bringing the traffic-safety problem into our homes. Monday night's "CBS News Report" will stand as a landmark in television news reporting and public service. I hope the CBS "National Drivers Test" will be repeated, on an annual basis, because it serves as a deadly reminder to all of us that there is room for a tremendous amount of improvement in the driving skills of the American people. The Shell Oil Co., in sponsoring this program, showed managerial courage and enlightenment that are too rare in our country today, for the show emphasized, not the zip and power and getaway of today's automobile and the amount of fuel it uses, but the awful consequences of the misuse of automobiles by individuals. And, of course, the work of the National Safety Council, which long has advocated improved driver-training programs, cannot be overlooked.

As we approach the Memorial Day weekend and the coming July 4 weekend, we should stop to consider a number of the aspects of the traffic-safety problems that were brought out by the CBS show.

The high failure rate should stimulate us to do something about better driver-education and training programs; but it should not lull us into a false sense of security, in the belief that the problem is really the "nut behind the wheel," and that if we can solve that aspect of it, we shall have dealt adequately with the traffic-safety situation. That simply is not the case.

Last April 5, the very able Federal Highway Administrator, Rex Whitton, told the Greater New York Safety Council:

> We recognise that no single attack—to the exclusion of all others—can possibly solve the problem. We need a balanced program, giving attention to the driver, the vehicle, and the roadway, and to the interaction of these three elements.
>
> But I think that the majority of drivers, most of the time, are performing as well as

> we can reasonably expect. The real difficulty for drivers is that, all too often, the road and traffic situation facing them is just more than they can handle. In fact, an analysis we recently made of accident data showed that traffic accidents are a general problem occurring throughout the driving population, and that it is wrong to assume that most highway accidents can be blamed on a small group of careless or dangerous drivers.
>
> In view of this fact, our best efforts should be directed toward making the highway system safer for all drivers—to help every person behind the wheel avoid accidents. The danger of pursuing the phantom of the bad driver problem is that undue concentration on the supposed bad drivers too often takes our attention and energy away from what we can and should be doing to make our roads and streets safe for all drivers.

Let us face up to this fact, once and for all. There is no question that driver performance can be improved. But the oft-repeated claim that "driver error" or "driver failure" is responsible for 80, 85, 90, or even 98 percent of all accidents, simply does not give us an answer to the problem.

And there are those who would have us believe that in order to reduce the number of accidents, we need but improve driver performance.

A look at the record shows this is not the case. Studies, by the Bureau of Public Roads, of actual operations on completed sections of the Interstate Highway System show that they have a fatality rate of 2.8 deaths per 100 million vehicle-miles of travel, compared with a rate of 9.7 on the older highways in the same traffic corridors. If driver failure accounts for most traffic accidents, how is it, then, that essentially the same drivers have less than one-third as many fatal accidents on one highway as they do on another? Obviously, there is more to solving the traffic-safety problem than improving driver performance, alone.

At the same time, improved driver performance is a good and logical place to start. As the results of the CBS test indicate, there is a definite need in this area. I intend to introduce, soon, proposed legislation to provide Federal assistance to aid State and local governments in the establishment and betterment of driver-education and driver-training programs. The assistance would be directed toward the acquisition of vehicles, training facilities, and equipment, and other physical items needed, as well as the strengthening, through experience and scientific research, of the effectivenesss of training techniques.

In the many areas, driver-education programs have been limited or nonexistent, due to the lack of needed facilities, including qualified instruction, vehicles, and associated training aids. The legislation I shall propose will help the States meet this need.

There is also need for an incentive plan for State motor-vehicle inspection. Vehicle inspection is important, in order to have improved highway safety. Annual or semiannual examination of vehicle features closely related to safe operation is justified, in order to offset the tendency of many carowners to neglect vehicle-maintenance responsibilities. Periodic inspection of motor vehicles assures the average highway user of having a reasonably sound vehicle, properly equipped, for the major portion of his driving. It is not unusual for inspection authorities to find one-third or more of the vehicles with one more reasons for rejection, most of which have potential for contributing to an accident. Aside from its value mechanically, motor-vehicle inspection is a far more efficient means of checking certain legal safety requirements than could possibly be achieved through traffic-law enforcement. Perhaps among all its values, the psychological value of making drivers more mindful of the importance of maintaining their vehicles and their equipment in safe operating condition is not to be overlooked. I shall propose legislation to help States initiate and support motor-vehicle-inspection programs. The inspection would be performed at stations or garages officially operated or specifically designated and certified for that purpose by the State. By advance agreement with the States, Federal participation in the cost of the motor-vehicle-inspection incentive plan would be established as a share of the initial cost, and would terminate after an agreed period of time, following which the program would operate on a self-sustaining basis.

In addition, we need to accelerate highway-safety research and administration. Federal assistance to State and local agencies, universities, national associations of State officials, private research organizations, and others, will help attract to the study of highway-safety matters research talent that is desperately needed. Federal aid of this type is proper, in view of the interstate character and serious national implications of the traffic-safety problem. I shall introduce proposed legislation to provide such aid.

We also need to develop needed standards in such areas as traffic law, driver licensing, motor-vehicle inspection, traffic-control devices, accident reporting, driver training, and the like. There should be review and evaluation, conducted at the Federal level, of all existing standards affecting highway safety. Following this review, Federal aid should be made available in order to organize and support the necessary cooperative work required to accomplish needed improvements in existing standards. This would also encourage the States to participate in the development of improved guides, and to apply them, as well.

These are just some of the areas, Mr. President, in addition to driver improvement, which require our attention and Federal assistance. The traffic-safety problem is a national problem, requiring national attention by the Federal Government.

Turning now from the driver, the road, and the guides and standards which apply to him, let us look at the vehicles themselves. We cannot safely ignore the cars that carried 48,000 people to their deaths last year.

In his New York address, Highway Administrator Whitton pointed out:

> The vehicle needs continuing safety improvement, too—safer occupant "packaging"; safer function design; better maintenance for safer operating.

A start in this direction has been made under Public Law 88-515, which requires passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet such reasonable passenger-safety standards as the Administrator of General Services shall prescribe. In a statement to my Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, which is studying the Federal role in traffic safety, acting GSA Administrator Knott listed the following safety devices which will be required on all Federal passenger vehicles, except, of course, military vehicles:

1. Anchorage for seat-belt assemblies.
2. Padded dash and visors.
3. Recessed dash instruments and control devices.
4. Impact absorbing steering wheel and column displacement.
5. Safety door latches and hinges.
6. Anchorage of seats.
7. Four-way flasher.
8. Safety glass.
9. Dual operation of braking system.
10. Standard bumber heights.
11. Standard gear quadrant P-R-N-D-L automatic transmission.
12. Sweep design of windshield wipers—washer.
13. Glare-reduction surfaces.
14. Exhaust emission control system.
15. Tire and safety rim.
16. Backup lights.
17. Outside rearview mirror.

According to Mr. Knott:

> This initial standard is only the beginning of the work required to improve the safety of automotive vehicle passengers. It will be kept under continuous review and revised to provide for greater passenger protection as further developments are proven to be feasible. Additional measures are under consideration. They include the design of seats to prevent neck injuries from whiplash, antiskid devices, improved means of driver visual communications, and the relocation or change in gas tanks to prevent fire after collision.

Mr. President, the question is whether there is a way by which we can assure the installation of these devices in all cars—not just those purchased by the Federal Government. Proposed legislation has been introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], who—both as Governor of Wisconsin and now here in the Senate—has led a courageous fight for traffic safety. His bill would require that all automobiles include as standard equipment the GSA-approved safety devices.

It is interesting to note that the legislature of the State of Hawaii 3 weeks ago adopted a resolution calling on the Federal Government to regulate automobile design, in the interest of traffic safety.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

Concurrent resolution relating to the safety of motor vehicles

Whereas, the tragic toll of death and crippling injury which accompanies today's use of the automobile is appalling to heart and mind; and

Whereas, the continual rise in number of injuries and now the increasing rise in number of deaths due to motor vehicle accidents constitutes a disheartening testimony to the limited success of past traffic safety efforts and an ill harbinger of tragedies yet to come; and

Whereas, of the three major elements in a traffic accident—the driver, the road, and the vehicle—the most difficult of these to control and improve are the driver and the road, yet these have been the subject of our traffic safety efforts while little effective attention has been paid to either the accident-producing or injury-producing characteristics of the automobile; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States, in a pioneer effort to secure safer automobiles, has directed the General Services Administration to develop and promulgate commercial safety standards applicable to passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased by the U.S. Government; and

Whereas, the design and production of safer automobiles is a nation-wide problem requiring the participation of the Federal Government, which, it should be noted, has been and is now participating in the regulation of the design of other transportation vehicles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1965 (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide for Federal regulation of automobile design and to support the research necessary to establish effective design standards; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, President of the Senate of the United States, the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the members of Hawaii's delegation to Congress.

Adopted, May 4, 1965.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support the efforts of Senator Nelson and his bill. I commend the Legislature of the State of Hawaii for being the first to recognize the need for Federal standards in this area.

To speed the process, however, and encourage the automakers to take voluntary action, I shall propose to the excise-tax-repeal bill an amendment which would condition the auto-excise-tax repeal, after the initial 3-year reduction to the 4-percent level, on whether or not there has been obtained from the automotive industry satisfactory assurance that GSA-approved safety-standard equipment will be made standard equipment on all new cars manufactured in this country. I am also asking appropriate Federal agencies for a complete report on the applicability of these standards to imported automobiles, with a view to introducing appropriate proposed legislation to improve them, also.

I have estimated that the auto-excise-tax-cut schedule in the House bill will reduce the cost of automobiles in the amount of $68 the first year, $67 in the following 2 years, and $90 in the last 2 years. Can Detroit meet the GSA standards at a cost of less than $100? I would not be surprised to find that that could be done and I am certain that the American people would be willing to forgo saving that amount, in order to help save their lives.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I point out that the CBS show of Monday night proved that the American people are vitally interested in traffic safety. The old adage that "safety does not sell" no longer prevails. I hope that is the lesson Detroit learned on Monday night. The automakers, too, are being tested. Let us hope they pass.

A DECADE OF SERVICE AND GROWTH

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, readers and advertisers recently helped the management and staff of the Columbia Basin Herald, of Moses Lake, Wash., blow out the candles on that newspaper's 10th birthday cake.

Publisher Ned Thomas, a good friend of mine, invited the readers and advertisers to visit the plant on the newspaper's anniversary. He thought they should see the growth which has taken place since the day, 10 years before, when the newspaper jumped from the weekly field into the daily classification.

The growth of the Columbia Basin reclamation project and the growth of the Columbia Basin Herald have been great during this 10-year period. Each has contributed to the other.

Those who visited the plant liked what they saw.

But they also treasure the 10th anniversary edition of the Columbia Basin Herald for what Ned and others wrote.

I ask unanimous consent of this body that an editorial and one of the articles published in the special edition be printed at this point in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our First Decade Is Behind Us: Now for Another

This is the first issue of the Herald in its second 10 years of daily publication. Yesterday was the anniversary of that great day, March 28, 1955, when the conversion was made from twice a week to daily.

It's perhaps a time to reminisce. Elsewhere on this page are excerpts from editorials which appeared in the Columbia Basin Herald on its last day as a semiweekly and on its first day as a daily. The nine members of the staff who lived through that experience and are still with us have their personal recollections. Being in on the birth of a new daily is an opportunity which comes to few people, and they cherish the thrill.

The last 10 years will go down in history as those when Larson Air Force Base flourished and died. The Boeing Flight Center was built, operated full tilt for 7 years, and abandoned. A concrete blockhouse was built for Spokane Air Defense Sector, and then it too was abandoned. Three Titan I missile complexes were built, put in operation and then deactivated. Strategic Air Command took over the base from Military Air Transport Service, and now SAC has been ordered to leave and close Larson next year.

The Columbia Basin project, meanwhile, has been growing steadily. In 1955 there was water available to 251,282 acres. This year there are 482,391 acres eligible for water, nearly doubling the acreage in the 10 years. The rate of farm development has been even swifter. Where many farm units were not broken out in the earlier years, today 90 percent of the farms eligible for water are actually being farmed.

Cities and towns in the upper Columbia Basin have shot up in the decade. Moses Lake, Ephrata, Soap Lake, Quincy, Warden, and Othello in particular have grown apace. The towns of George and Royal City have been born. Schools and other public buildings have multiplied. And Bid Bend Community College at Moses Lake has come into being.

What do the next 10 years hold in store?

Development of the project must be stepped up. Federal appropriations have slowed it to a snail's pace. But there are powerful forces at work to bring an end to this stalling, to pick up the tempo and bring water to the more than 500,000 acres still to be brought under ditch. Ten more years could see the project well on its way to completion.

Our economy will be tied even more closely in the next 10 years to agriculture. The era of large military payrolls and construction work is just about over. The basin will have to adjust to this. It also can capitalize on it by using the fine facilities at Larson to lure new industries and to expand its educational plant.

As the basin project continues to grow it will spawn more and more industries. The era of agricultural processing already is here. Two new potato processing factories are being built in the Moses Lake area this year, supplementing similar plants already in operation at Warden, Othello, and Quincy. A second sugarbeet refinery, complementing the Utah-Idaho plant near Wheeler, can be expected to be established within the next 10 years. Plans for processing other crops also must come, as the production is here.

These plants breed other industries—carton plants, shops for servicing motors and air conditioning, pelleting operations, and many others.

They will be different, these next 10 years, but they will be interesting and challenging. And by reliance solely on the land and what it produces, they should be solid ones.

When the Columbia Basin Herald Became a Daily 10 Years Ago

When the Columbia Basin Herald became the Columbia Basin Daily Herald on March 28, 1955, it ended 19 months of twice-a-week publication.

In the last semiweekly issue, put out on Friday, March 25, the Columbia Basin Herald editorialized thusly:

"Frankly, it will be a relief. Our volume of business has increased so with the semiweekly, especially in the last 5 months, that it was too much for the staff to handle adequately. We've been working overtime, night and day, and under pressure for so long that it had begun to tell. That's the main reason, for example, that the Herald has been coming out late for the last several issues.

"The last 2 weeks, of course, have been sheer pandemonium. New members of the staff, total strangers to us and to Moses Lake, have been piling in to build up our staff for the daily. All have had housing problems, have had to get acquainted with us and their new jobs.

"New machinery has been arriving rapidly and installation often has interrupted our already overloaded production schedules. On top of that, last weekend we moved practically every piece of machinery in the place, except the press, to make for a more streamlined operation. This has caused temporary confusion, but in the long run it will make for a smoother flow of work.

"To accommodate all the new editorial, advertising and circulation hands, we've doubled our front-office space. Last week the carpenters knocked out a wall separating the old space and the new, and remodeling went right ahead while we worked. Desks arrived in time for the new people, but chairs didn't and it's still a case of getting down to the office early enough to get something to sit on. Remodeling continued this week, but we're in the new space and are able to spread out enough so we aren't tripping over one another. The painters gave us a brandnew interior finish Monday night.

"A lot of new gadgets have arrived and are taking some getting used to. There's the Associated Press teletype machine, on which we'll receive our wire news. There's another kind of teletype machine, with a keyboard built for newspaper use, for receiving news from our new Ephrata news bureau. There's the Associated Press machine on which we'll receive perforated tape to be fed through the typesetting machines. And there's the attachment on one of the Intertype machines which sends the tape through and sets type automatically.

"There also has been the cutover to dial telephones, complicated by the fact that we're going from three phone lines to four, and from five instruments to nine.

"But to get back to the semiweekly, which dies with this issue. It's been an interesting experience, but we're not sorry at its passing. When we went from once to twice a week (and that was only 19 months ago) we knew it was an interim step, that it would last only until business built up to the point where daily publication would become possible. We wouldn't recommend it as a permanent thing.

"A semiweekly is neither fish nor fowl, neither weekly nor daily. There aren't any comic strips, for example, made for twice-a-week publication. Newswise, you act something like a daily, but not quite. You carry no wire news. All the news is local—it has to be gotten and written by your own staff, with no Associated Press news to help fill up the holes. It all comes right out of your hide, like you were putting out two weekly papers instead of one.

"With the daily, we'll be beefed up for the faster operation. Everyone will have a particular job to do, and he'll concentrate on it. The editor won't also be writing sports and the women's editor won't also be covering the weather and the hospital, as in the past. We've set up rigid deadlines and we intend to stick to them, so the paper will get out on time every day.

"It's not without a bit of nostalgia, of course, that we approach this big step in our progress. We're going to try our best to retain the personal touch that goes with weekly and semiweekly journalism. But we're looking forward eagerly to next Monday when we'll become the first daily newspaper in the heart of the Columbia Basin.

"Off with the old and on with the new."

And in the first issue of the Columbia Basin Daily Herald, these editorial comments appeared:

"We're going to do our level best to give the basin the kind of daily it deserves and needs. As the first daily to be spawned in the northern and central areas of the basin, we at last are able to become an adequate medium of news reporting, analysis, and editorial influence which only the written word can provide.

"Up to now the herald has been, at times, rather provincial in its outlook, inasmuch as an overwhelming proportion of its subscribers have been residents of the Moses Lake area. Now we are reaching out, seeking to serve the residents of Ephrata, Soap Lake, Quincy, Warden, and Othello as well. So our outlook now will be broader and wider in scope.

"We only hope to play a part, for example, in bringing about a closer and warmer feeling between Ephrata and Moses Lake. Friendly rivalry has existed for years between these two communities, and that's healthy. By running full news reports daily from both cities, we hope to foster a better understanding, which should put an end to some of the bitterness which still persists.

"It isn't often that a daily newspaper is born. To those of us on the staff of this lusty infant it's a historic event, an experience which comes to a precious few persons in their lifetimes. We sincerely hope the product of our work, our talents, and our souls will prove to be the medium of expression the Columbia Basin needs and deserves."

INTERNATIONAL CONVOCATION ON THE REQUIREMENTS FOR PEACE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, a short time ago, a most significant and important 4-day international convocation to examine the requirements for peace was held in New York City. The convocation took as its guide the encyclical letter of Pope John XXIII, "Pacem in Terris"—"Peace on Earth." I became deeply interested in this convocation during its planning stage, and was a participant in its fruition.

Among the principal sponsors of the convocation were the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, and the Johnson Foundation. During the planning stage, the Johnson Foundation provided invaluable assistance. I was privileged to work, in association with Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, president of the center, and Mr. Leslie Paffrath, president of the Johnson Foundation, on the development of this meeting. The very careful preparation helped, I believe, to insure the success of this meaningful and valuable gathering.

At the convocation were assembled an impressive group of outstanding world leaders from many fields: public life, the sciences, the humanities, to mention but a few. Among the distinguished participants from our own country were: Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey; Chief Justice Earl Warren; Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations; Associate Justice William O. Douglas; Senators J. William Fulbright, Eugene McCarthy, and George McGovern; and Representative William Fitts Ryan.

The convocation was, I believe, of value in many respects. As I noted at the roundtable discussion concluding the convocation, several points are to be made about the encyclical, as related to the world situation confronting us:

One is that the validity of the encyclical of Pope John has been established here, as never before. We have followed his framework of order, of justice, and particularly of freedom; it has provided both our foundation and our roof, a shelter for most of the ideas that have emerged here.

Our problem is, what do we do about it? One important matter is the revision of the Charter of the United Nations. There are geographical-area problems too. We have to translate our thoughts into actions in Africa, the Congo, Asia, Vietnam. There is the question of China, with the new difficulty presented by the Foreign Minister of China when he said that peaceful coexistence with the United States is out of the question. How does one resolve that statement with the plea of the other Marxists for peaceful coexistence?

Finally, there is the question of Germany and of Berlin. It is only with the relaxation of tensions that the reunification of Germany can be hoped for.

I have long been an advocate of such an easing of tensions, to help a unified and nonmilitarized German nation to emerge.

Perhaps the greatest single benefit of the convocation was that a variety of viewpoints could be freely expressed in an atmosphere of thoughtful attention. Such free discussions are essential to peace on earth, and are in accord with our abiding resolve to achieve that goal.

One purpose of the convocation was to provide a continuing forum for further free interchange of opinion, as a means of increasing understandings and developing constructive ideas. The sponsors of the convocation are proceeding with this concept firmly in mind.

As indicative of the scope and impact of the convocation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, at the conclusion of my remarks, a list of various participants from our own Nation and from other countries; pertinent editorials and articles from the Providence Visitor, the Catholic Standard, and Sign; and excerpts from a memorandum on worldwide reaction to the convocation, prepared by the Santa Barbara, Calif., Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

There being no objection, the list, editorials, articles and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Participants from our own country were: Eugene Burdick, professor of political science, University of California; Abram J. Chayes, former legal adviser to the State Department; John Cogley, staff director, Center's Study of the American Character; Norman Cousins, editor, Saturday Review; James Farmer, national director, Congress of Racial Equality; Jerome Frank, professor of psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University Medical School; Hudson Hoagland, executive director, Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology; Paul G. Hoffmann, director, United Nations Special Fund; H. Stuart Hughes, professor of history, Harvard University; Robert M. Hutchins, president, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions; Philip C. Jessup, judge, International Court of Justice; Herman Kahn, director, Hudson Institute; George F. Kennan, permanent professor, Institute for Advanced Studies; Edward Lamb, president, Lamb Industries;

Henry A. Luce, editorial chairman, Time, Inc.; Marya Mannes, author and critic; Walter Millis, staff director, Center's Study of War and Democratic Institutions; Hans J. Morgenthau, director, Center for the Study of American Foreign and Military Policy, University of Chicago; A. J. Muste, secretary emeritus, Fellowship of Reconcilation; Fred Warner Neal, Professor of International Relations and Government, Claremont Graduate School; Leslie Paffrath, president, the Johnson Foundation; James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union; Linus Pauling, Nobel Prize laureate;

Gerard Piel, editor and publisher, Scientific American; R. Paul Ramsey, Harrington Spear Paine professor of religion, Princeton University; Elmo Roper, public opinion analyst; Bayard Rustin, executive secretary, War Resisters League; Stanly K. Sheinbaum, economist, center staff; George N. Shuster, assistant to the president, University of Notre Dame; Carl J. Stover, executive director, National Institute of Public Affairs; Paul Tillich, John Nuveen Professor of Theology, University of Chicago; and Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, founder, Women Strike for Peace.

Participants from other countries included: A. O. Adebo, representative of Nigeria to the United Nations; Robert Albert Gaston Buron, chairman, National Committee on Productivity, Republic of France; Lord Caradon, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom; Abba Eban, Deputy Prime Minister of Israel; N. N. Inozemtsev, deputy chief editor of Pravda; Alberto Lleras Camargo, former President of Colombia; Mikhail Dmitrievich Millionshchikov, director, Kouzchstov Institute of Atomic Energy; Pietro Nenni, Deputy Prime Minister of Italy; Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, Governor of Maharashtra, India, and former President of the United Nations General Assembly; Alex T. Quaison-Sackey, representative of Ghana to the United Nations and President of the 19th General Assembly:

Luis Quintanilla, former president of the council, Organization of American States; Abdul Monem Rifa'i, representative of Jordan to the United Nations; Adam Schaff, member of the Central Committee, United Workers' (Communist) Party of Poland; Carlo Schmid, Vice President of the Bundestag of the Federal Republic of Germany; Paul-Henri Spaak, Vice Premier and Foreign Minister of Belgium;

Kenzo Takayanagi, chairman of the Constitutional Revision Commission of Japan; Vida Tomsic, member of the Committee for Foreign Affairs, Federal Assembly of Yugoslavia; Arnold Toynbee, historian; U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations; Barbara Ward, economist and author; Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, judge, International Court of Justice; Yevgenzi Zhukov, director of the Institute of History, Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union.

[From the Providence Visitor, Feb. 26, 1965]

Convocation in New York

Last week in the new Hilton Hotel in Manhattan, some 70 speakers, all of world renown, discussed the problems of world peace for 2½ days before 2,000 registered listeners. Among the speakers were scientists, philosophers, theologians, educators, politicians, and diplomats; there were Protestants, Jews, unbelievers, and a few Catholics; there were Democrats, Republicans, Socialists, Communists, and political neutralists. They came from nations all around the world and included such personages as Paul-Henri Spaak, Vice Premier of Belgium and former Secretary General of NATO; U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations; and Hubert Humphrey, Vice President of the United States.

Possibly the only common bond in this extraordinary spectrum of world representation was its appreciation of Pope John XXIII's encyclical "Pacem in Terris." Though all speakers would not agree on all points of the encyclical, all are of the opinion that "Pacem in Terris" provides the best basis for reconciliation of conflicting views and for a possible meeting of minds between the East and the West. Many of the distinguished speakers at the convocation spoke of Pope John and his encyclical in lavish terms. Hubert Humphrey had this to say: "We honor Pope John XXIII on this occasion not because he demonstrated that perfect peace can be achieved in a short time. We honor him because he raised our hopes and exalted our vision. It is the duty of our generation to convert this vision of peace into reality." And Robert Hutchins termed "Pacem in Terris" "one of the most profound and significant documents of our age." This high estimate of the encyclical is not something new. From its first appearance it was hailed around the world, even in Russia. In the United States, Walter Lippmann commented that at last the Western World has a charter and basis for its liberties.

The paradox of all this is that almost all of this opinion is non-Catholic. The reception of "Pacem in Terris" in Catholic circles has been moderate to cool, just as in the case of its predecessors, "Rerum Novarum" of Leo XIII and "Quadragesimo Anno" of Pius XI. Private comment at the convocation, moreover, noted in some cases that Catholic participation in the convocation was disappointing.

This is a strange inversion of order. What we, as Catholics, should be preaching to others from the housetops is being taught to us by non-Catholics. For this, in a sense, we should be grateful; but in another, ashamed. We may take some consolation in the fact that at the New York convocation a goodly representation came from our own diocese and included Bishop McVinney, and that our own Senator Pell was an active figure in its preparation and program.

The failure of Catholics to heed their papal encyclicals is cause for concern, since it points to a defect of faith. Pope John, echoing his predecessors, warned us in his "Mater et Magistra" that the social teachings of the church are an integral (necessary) part of the Catholic faith. Those whose faith lacks or denies it, obviously, cannot be considered fully Catholic.

Further analyses of the failure of our schools, press, and pulpits to teach Catholic social doctrine are necessary, but so are positive programs of practical implementation of the doctrine. From the convocation we may take a tip. We have thunder in our ideological arsenals; we should let it be heard before it is stolen from us.

[From the Catholic Standard, Feb. 26, 1965]

All Men of Good Will

In April of 1963 Pope John gave the world an Easter present. It was his encyclical letter "Pacem in Terris," addressed not only to Catholics but to all men of good will. "Pacem in Terris" was a statement of the meaning and purpose of a free society. Pope John offered a magnificent and an updated understanding of the institutions and forces of which make up our modern world.

Pope John's statement of principles must be put into action. This will require a great deal of study and cooperation. The international convocation on "Pacem in Terris," held in New York and sponsored by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, is a step toward this study and cooperation.

The convocation brought together governmental and nongovernmental leaders from Western, Soviet bloc and uncommitted nations. The talks at the convocation were to be based on the principles suggested by Pope John's encyclical.

We cannot expect a sudden turn of events in world policy as a result of the convocation. Tensions in the Middle East and in Africa will continue to exist. There is no sign that the war in Vietnam will suddenly cease to exist. Communist nations will continue in their own ways even though Communist representatives came to the convocation.

What we can hope and pray for is that the world leaders, as a result of the convocation, will realize in a practical and urgent sense what good Pope John saw: The world is becoming more and more one community and it is looking to become one ordered society.

Pope John based his vision not on any negative reason such as the fear of nuclear warfare. His encyclical took a more positive approach. Pope John saw the deepening acceptance of the sacredness of persons, the growing worldwide social and economic interdependence, the rise of the workingman and of the new nations, the new dignity of women, the growth of communication, the dissolving of barriers, and the reshaping of once rigid ideologies. Pope John called for the society based on truth, justice, charity, and freedom.

Pope John's vision calls for strength—not merely strength in weapons but strength in man himself. As Senator Pell, of Rhode Island, pointed out to the convocation, "Strength resides also in the fiber of mankind, in the human spirit—it is imperative that we develop this strength whose potentials are shared by all of us and develop it for the building of a lasting and honorable peace. The alternative as we well know can mean annihilation." If the Pacem in Terris convocation has helped the world leaders to realize the importance of the human spirit, it will have been a success now and a step on the ladder to a true world peace in the future.

[From Sign magazine, February 1965]

A Summit for Peace

(By Edward Wakin)

On Holy Thursday, 1963, Pope John XXIII issued an unprecedented encyclical addressed not only to the world's 500 million Catholics but to "all men of good will." Just before Christmas, 1964, the first president of the United Nations General Assembly from Black Africa demonstrated that the Pope's worldwide audience was still listening. He agreed to address the opening session of an international convocation to discuss peace on earth in terms of that encyclical, peace on earth.

The convocation, which takes place this month, is possibly the most extraordinary response in this century to a papal message. Even the Communists—whose leader could once ask how many legions the Pope had—have responded. The convocation, as appropriate a legacy as Pope John could wish, can be called his summit meeting for peace.

The road from Rome to the New York Hilton, where the meeting takes place, has been a winding one. It has led to a foundation in Wisconsin and a "thinking man's" shelter in California, and it is being traveled by world figures of many faiths and philosophies. Communist, capitalist, and Socialist, influentials and intellectuals, and churchgoers and atheists are gathering to confront the challenge of an epochial encyclical.

The invitations for the February 18–20 convocation went out from Santa Barbara, Calif., under the signature of Robert Maynard Hutchins, president of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. This controversial figure, who has been described as a "natural intellectual resource" for 40 years, directs a controversial center which has been described as a shelter for intellectuals. Considering the source, the invitations represent the ultimate in secular recognition from America's thinking establishment.

The unusual ingredients of the convocation and the international prestige and power of its participants have literally been brought together by the spirit of the encyclical and its author. Mr. Hutchins explained that the encyclical was the starting point for the convocation, "because, as its worldwide reception showed, it states principles by which men of all faiths and philosophies profess to live and asks the questions they know must be answered, if the world is to have a chance of survival."

President Johnson responded with a special message to the center praising the convocation: "I have no doubt that such a discussion, under private auspices, of the problems of peace will provide a major contribution to the greatest single problem of our time." In accepting an invitation to participate, Alex Quaison-Sackey, the African president of the U.N. General Assembly, replied to the center: "I share your hope that it will prove an important contribution to better international relations and that the discussion of the principles of peace on earth will result in a better understanding of the need for coexistence and cooperation among nations."

The immediate acceptances guaranteed a summit convocation. They included Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, U.N. Secretary-General U Thant, Chief Justice Warren, Mayor Willy Brandt of West Berlin, Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan, judge of the International Court of Justice and president of the 17th U.N. General Assembly, Author Barbara Ward, Historian Arnold Toynbee, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson. There was talk of arranging an appearance by Pope Paul as well as President Johnson.

Imbedded in the encyclical promulgated by Pope John is a reference to such a convocation: "It can happen, then, that a drawing nearer together or a meeting for the attainment of some practical end, which was formerly deemed inopportune or unproductive, might now or in the future be considered opportune and useful."

It all began in a personal response that would have pleased the pontiff. While the Pope lay dying, Dr. Fred Warner Neal, professor of international relations at Claremont Graduate School, suggested to Frank K. Kelly, an active Catholic layman and center vice president, that Santa Barbara's Catholic churches hold interfaith meetings in which Pope John's writings would be read.

Before the meetings could be held, Pope John died and a memorial service was held instead, with 800 Californians of all faiths in attendance. Then Professor Neal, who is a consultant to the center, sent a memorandum suggesting a convocation based on the encyclical. A major supporter of the convocation was Seniel Ostrow, a Jewish businessman who is a member of the center's board. The board approved with enthusiasm. As Frank Kelly recalled in a testimonial to Mr. Ostrow: "I saw the spirit of Pope John—the spirit of reconciliation, hoping to bring all people together with understanding and love."

The groundwork for the convocation was laid at a preliminary conference last spring, under the auspices of the Johnson Foundation in Racine, Wis. Around the same table sat Vatican, Western, Asian, and African officials, Soviet and Iron Curtain diplomats, U.S. Senators, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leaders, presidential consultants, and world-famous scholars. Pope John, who liked "to make complicated things simple," would have enjoyed hearing a Communist diplomat, Dr. Marian Dobrosielski, tell the conferees that even Communists agree with his conclusions—while rejecting his philosophy.

The preliminary meeting laid these fundamental issues before the convocation: universal acceptance of coexistence; settlement of conflicts by negotiations and the creation of mechanisms for peaceful social and political change; disarmament; creation of mutual trust among nations; elimination of racism; international cooperation in aiding developing countries; further development of the United Nations.

Pope John would have approved enthusiastically, for these issues parallel those raised in an encyclical which has been called "the symphony of peace." Its theme has been expressed in these words: "Peace among all peoples requires truth as its foundation, justice as its rule, love as its driving force, liberty as its atmosphere." But in the final analysis, Pope John pointed out, "there can be no peace between men unless there is peace within each one of them; unless, that is, each one builds up within himself the order wished by God."

In the four movements of the pontiff's symphony, peace is considered in the harmony between individuals, between individuals and political groups on the one hand and the whole community of men on the other. Philosophically, the encyclical is built on the natural law.

In his authoritative commentary on the encyclical, Father Peter Riga has delivered a challenge to Catholics in particular. He quotes Charles Peguy's remark that the reason so many Catholics do not have dirty hands is because they have no hands. They have not been involved in the modern world with all its problems. Pope John's encyclical called upon Catholics to become involved.

Thus, it is not only portentious that a secular organization has organized this worldwide summit meeting in a New York hotel. It is also ironic. The first papal encyclical not limited to Catholics may have had more response among non-Catholics. If so, the reasons may lie in the spirit of Pope John and the importance of the subject and also in what Father Riga has called "the Catholic ghetto mentality which has been prevalent since the Reformation."

As the convocation opens, four position papers help to light the way—by a Protestant theologian, a rabbi, a scientist taking a humanist view of the encyclical, and Thomas Merton. The latter's memorable essay, which contains many cogent observations, makes this point in particular: "It is the attitude of openness prescribed by peace on earth that must form our thinking as Christians in time of crisis, and not the closed and fanatical myths of nationalistic or racial paranoia. Only if we remain open, detached, humble in the presence of objective truth and of our fellow man, will be be able to choose peace." (The four essays are being published in a pamphlet by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions and can be obtained by writing to the Center, Post Office Box 4068, Santa Barbara, Calif.)

The convocation is also a climatic venture for the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, a courageous hybrid conceived in Ford Foundation money and dedicated to a proposition embodied in two words hanging framed in Dr. Hutchins' office: "Feel Free." The center has become America's leading enterprise in intellectual worrying, its staff of consultants implemented by visiting firemen who uninhibitedly examine America's basic institutions.

Since bold confrontation has become a way of life at the center's bucolic Santa Barbara setting on Eucalyptus Hill, the convocation on peace suits its turbulent life of dialog. The convocation is an ultimate confrontation with mankind's basic differences and its very survival.

The center's style is illustrated by a question once put to America's most famous Jesuit intellectual (Father John Courtney Murray) by an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States (William O. Douglas)—"How would you like to have your confessional bugged?" As with things spoken on Eucalyptus Hill, it was bold and to the point. The topic was the first amendment and the controversy over hiding microphones in jury rooms.

From its beginning in 1952 with a $15 million Ford Foundation grant, Dr. Hutchins' organization has sailed on troubled waters. As the Fund for the Republic, it charged into the controversy over civil liberties in the midst of the McCarthy period. Its stand in favor of intellectual freedom and political dissent brought much abuse and criticism, including a public remark by Henry Ford that the fund was guilty of bad judgment. Dr. Hutchins' admirers were heard to quip that at least he hadn't built the Edsel.

In 1957, the fund, whose Ford money was not renewable, shifted gears. It changed its emphasis from grantmaking, moved its headquarters from New York, and set up its thinking-man's shelter in bucolic Santa Barbara as the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Dr. Hutchins then put the enterprise to work on a sustained effort to define and clarify the basic issues confronting America. The first six targets were the corporation, the trade union, the common defense, the political process, religious institutions, and the mass media.

Out of center discussions, about 150 pamphlets, occasional papers, transcripts, and reports have resulted, with more than 4 million copies distributed. In addition, some 70 books have been triggered by its think sessions in Santa Barbara. From coast to coast, supporting members are being sought to keep its $1 million annual budget underwritten for many years to come.

More than 500 scholars and experts have crossed swords with the center's consultants and staff, who include such influential Catholics as Father John Courtney Murray, S.J., George N. Shuster, and John Cogley. They contribute as individual Americans with a Catholic point of view to an organization that is secular. Only 3 of the center's 26 board members and 3 of its 19 staff members are Catholics.

As a staff member, Mr. Cogley, in particular, has played a significant part in center activities in recent years. He directed the study of religious institutions and prepared one of three working papers for the preliminary conference on the peace-on-earth convocation. In characteristic Cogley and center style, he discussed boldly the encyclical as a guide to coexistence. Mr. Cogley observed that the Pope seemed to be saying that Catholic-Communist collaboration is "not forever unthinkable" in practical matters, though the two views of life are incompatible and call for safeguards. He argued that "the Johannine version of theism, Christianity, and natural law, nevertheless, in the interests of world peace and mankind's needs, provided for a mode of genuine coexistence between the Communist and the Christian world."

As Mr. Cogley noted in an article in the Commonweal, the convocation must confront the gulf between the Catholic and the Communist view of life and man's ends. Can their two visions of peace be reconciled? Can other religious and antireligious visions of peace on earth be reconciled as well? In his essay, Thomas Merton pointed out that Pope John sought to clear the air, morally, psychologically, and spiritually. The convocation is an important step in this direction. Then tourists, traveling salesmen, and business conventions can once again raise the roof at the New York Hilton, but—hopefully—the unprecedented "Pope John summit meeting" can help to make the world safer for them and the rest of a troubled mankind.

[From Time, Feb. 26, 1965]

THE REQUIREMENTS OF PEACE

In a time of swords, men dream of plowshares. For much of mankind the dream has seldom been as fervent—or as elusive—as it is today. History's greatest tyranny enslaves half the globe; science and technology offer not only the promise of poverty and hunger conquered but also the threat of civilization destroyed. Each day, from Selma to Saigon, brings evidence that man exists in a climate of risk. Last week the United Nations, which had earlier designated 1965 as International Cooperation Year, reached a stalemate and adjourned for 6 months.

These overtones of violence and disorder gave all the more meaning to a unique, 3-day meeting last week at the New York Hilton Hotel. There, under the auspices of Educator Robert Hutchins' Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, scores of statesmen, diplomats, theologians, and philosophers met to discuss the means and methods of bringing peace to the world. The participants included Protestants, Buddhists, agnostics and atheists; but the framework for their thinking was the vision of world order contained in Pope John XXIII's encyclical "Pacem in Terris" (Peace on Earth).

The relevance of that vision was summed up by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY at the opening session. "John XXIII presented to the world a public philosophy for a nuclear era," said HUMPHREY. "It represents not a utopian blueprint for world peace, presupposing a sudden change in the nature of man. Rather, it represents a call to leaders of nations, presupposing only a gradual change in human institutions. It is not confined to elaborating the abstract virtues of peace, but looks to the building of a world community governed by institutions capable of preserving peace. We honor Pope John XXIII on this occasion not because he demonstrated that perfect peace can be achieved in a short time. We honor him because he raised our hopes and exalted our vision. It is the duty of our generation to convert this vision of peace into reality."

"Time presses," declared Robert Hutchins in his opening address. "It is time to open a new conversation about the requirements of peace, on a level somewhere between apathy and panic—and this side of the irrelevance of propaganda."

The conversation took place three times a day, and it involved an exotic mixture of personalities. On the dais waiting to deliver their addresses, Protestant theologian, Paul Tillich, sat with that outrider of neutralism, Nobel prize-winning chemist, Linus Pauling. At another panel, Kremlinologist George Kennan, onetime Ambassador to Russia and Yugoslavia, clashed with Dr. Adam Schaff, the leading Marxist theoretician of Poland.

In the audience of more than 1,500, television's Steve Allen was wedged one afternoon between two intent nuns; U.S. Communist boss, Gus Hall, amiably discussed the significance of a speech with his neighbor, a Catholic priest. The meeting also proved a magnet for pacifists and peace marchers; sprinkled heavily throughout the listening throng, they cheered at every hint of banning the bomb.

The broad generality of the topics discussed inevitably produced more cross talk than consensus on the panels. Just as inevitably, many of the grand remedies for world ills brought out in the discussions were familiar nostrums that had been heard to often before—George Kennan, for example, attempted to revive Poland's old Rapacki plan to denuclearize central Europe, while ever-hopeful Harold Stassen proposed an arms-free zone on each side of the Bering Strait. Nonetheless, the convocation served the useful purpose of providing an intellectual workshop for a far- and free-ranging discussion of some central ideas and issues that must be faced before any form of peace on earth is won.

LAW

"'Pacem in Terris' reflects the view that men will never live in peace until they have the opportunity to obtain justice under law," declared U.S. Chief Justice Earl Warren. There were no dissenters. Obliquely and directly, a wide variety of panel speakers agreed that the basis of any orderly world community is the rule of law—law viewed not negatively as a social defense against evil but as a positive force for social order. Phillip Jessup of the International Court of Justice argued that law today is not only a series of prohibitions but "the mechanism by which society has created devices for people to work together for common ends." Internationally, this kind of positive law includes the great treaties as well as lesser but equally essential agreements that nations have created in order to solve such housekeeping issues as mail delivery and preventing the spread of infectious disease.

SOVEREIGNTY

The development of international law, Warren noted, lags behind the perfection of domestic law. The major reason is a lack of consensus on the meaning and scope of sovereignty. Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan of Pakistan, an International Court Justice, and Mexico's Luis Quintanilla, onetime Minister to the United States, both agreed that traditional concepts of jealously guarded sovereignty should give way to greater acceptance of reduced national autonomy and greater acceptance of international obligations. Said Quintanilla: "Anything happening in any corner of the earth affects sooner or later the entire international society in which our nations grow. Human solidarity, until recently a vague moral inspiration, has become actual interdependence."

An even sharper attack on old-fashioned nationalism came from political theorist Hans Morgenthau, who pointed out "the discrepancy between our cerebral modes of thought and action and the unprecedented novelty of the circumstances in which we now live. The present age has made the idea of the nation-state as obsolete as feudalism was made obsolete 200 years ago by the invention of the steam engine. We must face the atomic age with a transformation of the whole way our Government thinks and acts." In rejoinder, Potestant theologian Paul Ramsey of Princeton warned that immediate abandonment of the nation concept was hardly practical, and certainly not in accord with the ideas of "Pacem in Terris."

COEXISTENCE

Another barrier to East-West concord is a fundamental philosophical disagreement about the meaning of peaceful coexistence. Poland's Schaff, the most articulate of the five Communists who spoke at the convocation, described the term grandly as a "noble competition for the minds and brains of the people" between rival ideologies. Both Kennan and Belgium's Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak answered that it is hard for the West to consider the competition "noble" so long as the Reds deny personal liberty and depend on rule by coercion.

Historian Arnold Toynbee defended "missionary work" in the ideological struggle but insisted that man should have freedom to listen and choose; thus the right to propagandize fell well short of enforcement by military might. Arkansas Democrat J. **William Fulbright**, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, agreed that an ideology is "a source of strength and creative action" for men and nations, but found a measure of hope in the fact that within recent years Russia and the United States have shown a tendency to "cut their ideologies down to size." If this spirit continues, he said, both powers may become "more interested in solving problems than in proving theories."

Caught in the ideological struggle between East and West—and deploring it most loudly of all—have been the neutral nations of Africa and Asia. In a sharply worded formal statement for the convocation's record, ex-President Alberto Lleras Camargo of Colombia chided many of these hand-wringing bystanders for making a contribution to peace that adds up to zero. Said he: "Too often we apply a very high standard of performance to those powers that have done most to comply with their national and international obligations, even as we acquiesce in the fact that a huge part of the world is governed without any respect for the rights of human beings or nations. This hypocritical tendency of some of the nonnuclear countries has done a great deal of damage to the cause of peace. Countries which speak of nonalinement in this fight between the two great powers give up the quest for the triumph of human rights and jeopardize the right of nations to be free."

INSTITUTIONS

To keep ideological struggle within nonwarlike bounds, a number of panelists suggested that the world needs considerably more than its present, inadequate peacekeeping machinery. Zafrulla Khan accused both East and West of neglecting the possibilities of new instruments and institutions for promoting and enforcing world law. "There has been a tendency to attach disproportionate value to the method of direct negotiations," he said, adding that other peacekeeping methods proposed by the U.N. Charter—such as arbitration and judicial determination—"have not been used often enough in major disputes."

Talk of new peacekeeping machinery led several participants—including Secretary General U Thant—to propose a thorough reform of the U.N. Abram Chayes, onetime Legal Adviser to the U.S. State Department, argued that the U.N. simply does not have the resources to handle the problems put to it; Britain's U.N. representative, Lord Caradon, grumbled that "nobody brings things to the U.N. until they're in such a hell of a mess that there is no advantage to anyone any more." To Mexico's Quintanilla, the U.N. is now only "a rather queer and timid scheme of what eventually could become a positive world government." Among his proposals for reform: expansion of the Security Council from 11 member states to 25 or more, a General Assembly membership proportional to population, police powers for the International Court to enforce its judgments. A more universal proposal for institutional change came from Kenzo Takayanagi, chairman of Japan's Constitutional Revision Commission. Every nation, he argued, should adopt a version of the Japanese Constitution's article 9, which abolishes war as a sovereign right and prohibits armed forces.[1]

Much was left unsaid during the 20 hours that the convocation was in session. Apart from endorsing multilateral rather than bilateral programs of foreign aid, panelists failed to make clear how the billions of U.S. assistance dollars might be most hopefully channeled into making weak economies more productive. References to disarmament tended toward simplism, and did no more than echo the general pleas made in "Pacem in Terris."

What emerged, finally, from the days of debate was a universal yearning for a stable world order, and a sense that the way to achieve it was through that durable yet ever-changing product of man's self-governing instinct, the rule of law. Nuclear strategist, Herman Kahn, described it as "the way that the world is moving." But even universal rule of law, noted the World Court's Jessup, was only a step forward in man's march through history, and would not resolve every conflict between man and man. The world must be wary, he said, "of the old hawkers' cries, offering something that will cure 'the twitch, the pitch, the pain, and the gout—all pains within and all pains without,' The rule of law is not a panacea, nor is it something already achieved."

[From Time magazine]

THE LASTING VISION OF POPE JOHN

The document that inspired the convocation is one of the great encyclicals of the century. Unusually long for a papal pronouncement—more than 15,000 words—"Pacem in Terris" was issued by John XXIII on April 11, 1963, less than 2 months before his death. It was the last of his eight encyclicals, the first in history addressed not only to the bishops and laity of the Roman Catholic Church but to "all men of good will."

What the Pope said to the world is not in itself radical or revolutionary; many of the ideas put forward by John had been articulated by his predecessor Pius XII. What gave these ideas freshness and new life is the warm, open Johannine spirit—the willingness to reach beyond the frontiers of Catholic doctrine and bring the church into dialog with the modern world. Perhaps more important, they were ideas whose time had come round at last. The encyclical appeared in a season of relaxing world tensions and at the moment in history when the Christian churches had entered an era of good will—the ecumenical century.

---

[1] Despite the article, Japan has a 250,000-man self-defense force, partly trained and equipped by the United States, its partner by treaty in maintaining peace in the Far East.

Rights and duties: "Pacem in Terris" methodically progressed from a discussion of the rights and duties of individual men to the relations of state with state. These relations, argued the Pope, must be based on truth, justice, love and, above all, freedom. Specifically, he condemned racial discrimination, strongly affirmed the right of religious liberty, and passionately deplored the arms race.

Pope John addressed atheists as well as believers; yet "Pacem in Terris" is an unmistakably theistic work. This is hardly surprising in a papal pronouncement, but it clearly sets the encyclical apart from such purely secular documents as the United Nations "Universal Declaration of Human Rights." Time and again, Pope John argues that the rights of men and governments stem not solely from human consent but from the design of the Creator.

How is God's design to be known? In answer, Pope John turned to a cherished concept of Catholic philosophy: natural law—man's instinctive but God-given knowledge of right and wrong. It is the law of nature, he argued, that man has the right to life, education, private property and has the duty to cooperate with others in building an orderly world. Today, said the Pope, the moral order demanded by natural law also requires a supranational public authority—a world government.

Concise and limpid: Natural law dictates the relationship between men and nations. But these relationships must be ratified and established by human law, and Pope John applauded that fundamental of Western democracy, government by constitution. Rejecting government by coercion, the Pope endorsed the explicit definition of the rights and duties of governments and citizens in every nation's basic law, including a charter of fundamental human rights written "in concise and limpid phraseology."

When "Pacem in Terris" was published, the immediate response was an astonishingly broad chorus of praise. Grateful for John's favorable comments on the U.N., Secretary-General U Thant hailed the Pope's "wisdom, vision, and courage." Abandoning its traditional policy of nonresponse to papal words, the U.S. State Department heralded "Pacem in Terris'" emphasis on human liberty. Equally delighted by the encyclical's denunciation of colonialism, Europe's Communist press crowed so loudly about John's "opening to the left" that the Vatican was forced to reemphasize the church's unaltered rejection of communism.

But there were critics. Social Philosopher Will Herberg noted that the Pope's sketch of 20th century trends inexplicably ignored the spread of totalitarianism. And a number of Christian thinkers have noted that in dealing with the crucial issue of disarmament and world peace, Pope John said little more than "ban the bomb." An American Jesuit describes John's vague generalities on coexistence as "a lump of suet in a pudding."

Nonetheless, as the convocation made clear, "Pacem in Terris" remains—in the words of Robert Hutchins—"one of the most profound and significant documents of our age." What it offers to men facing contemporary risks and realities, said Economist Barbara Ward, is "a glimpse of how the world might look under the governance of love."

[From Time magazine]

A Limit to Hope

"It is understandable," declared Protestant Theologian Paul Tillich, "that a conference like this meets widespread skepticism, perhaps by some in the conference itself." He challenged both the encyclical and the possibility of realizing its dream of world order.

Tillich pointed out that the ideas behind "Pacem in Terris," being stricly Western and Judaeo-Christian, are alien to religious traditions that do not consider the dignity of man as an ultimate value, and should not be forced onto the rest of the world willy-nilly. As for the sweeping condemnation of war, "Pacem in Terris," said Tillich, did not consider the problem of resistance to violations of human dignity. "There are situations," he warned, "in which nothing short of war can defend or establish the dignity of the person."

Effective authority, Tillich said, needs power, and the conflict of authority with authority leads, inevitably, to the use of force. "But when is coercion a just expression of power, when an unjust one?" Old criteria—the medieval concept of the just war, for example—no longer serve in an age of possible atomic conflagration, and the many laws that apply to men can only obliquely serve as guides to the proper conduct of nations.

These problems led Tillich to conclude that there is a definite limit to hope for peace on earth as prescribed by Pope John. Men must "distinguish between genuine hope and utopian expectations." Genuine hope is found in such factors as the atomic threat that has imposed on mankind a common destiny, the conquest of space that makes neighbors of distant nations, international cooperation in science and medicine.

Out of this limited cooperation may emerge what Tillich called "communal eros"—the love of men for other nations. But, he said, "there is no hope for a final stage of history in which peace and justice rule. History is not fulfilled at its empirical end; but history is fulfilled in the great moment in which something new is created, in which the Kingdom of God breaks into history conquering destructive structures of existence. This means that we cannot hope for a final stage of justice and peace within history; but we can hope for partial victories over the forces of evil in a particular moment of time."

[From Life magazine]

A Search for Something More Than a Community of Fear

(By John K. Jessup)

The guest list would have done credit to a U.N. charter meeting or a state funeral: the Secretary-General of the U.N., the president of the Assembly and two former presidents; the Vice President and Chief Justice of the United States, an associate justice and four U.S. Senators; Belgium's Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak; the Italian Deputy Prime Minister, Pietro Nenni; leading officials from Russia, Poland and Yugoslavia; two justices of the World Court; historian Arnold Toynbee and Theologian Paul Tillich; all told, 2,000 delegates from 20 nations of the Communist, neutralist, and Free Worlds.

If the dramatis personae were impressive, the subject matter of the 3-day "Pacem in Terris" convocation was even more so. The participants aimed to explore the requirements of a durable world peace through panels covering the rule of law, peacekeeping institutions, a solution to Europe's territorial dilemmas, the problems of neutralists and non-nuclear nations, the terms of coexistence, and the implications of the papal encyclical for U.N. policy. The approach to these great issues was a series of panel discussions conducted by the most prestigious delegates.

Was all this too ambitious even for so august an assemblage? In his opening address, Vice President Hubert Humphrey thought not, "Pacem in Terris," said he, offers "a public philosophy for a nuclear era." The Pope did not write "a Utopian blueprint for world peace, presupposing a sudden change in the nature of man. Rather it represents a call to action to leaders of nations, presupposing only a gradual change in human institutions * * * the building of a world community." The audience was highly receptive to this kind of hopeful talk. Consisting mainly of intellectuals, clerics, and foreign affairs experts, it was conspicuously short of representatives from the Pentagon and Red China. As a group, it was a little too quick to applaud any mention of world government, banning the bomb, and stopping the war in Vietnam. But this was very much in the "Johannine mood," and the author of "Pacem in Terris," who was very much a yea-sayer for peace, would no doubt have heartily approved of this convocation.

Not all the participants found Pope John's underlying assumptions so congenial. Some of them skipped, some of them explicitly rejected his premise that God is the creator of all men. Others accepted the premise but not all of the Pope's reasoning. The eminent Protestant theologian-philosopher Paul Tillich threw cold water on certain utopian expectations he found in the encyiclical. Its "determining principle"—that justice is based on the equal dignity and rights of every individual—is only agreed on, said Tillich, in "Western, Christian-Humanist culture, but not essentially beyond it." Other cultures and religious traditions do not value these concepts so highly, and furthermore "there are situations in which nothing short of war can defend or establish the dignity of the person." The papal encyclical had deemphasized the old Catholic distinction between just and unjust wars, deploring all of them; but it contained no adequate discussion of the use of coercion in the just exercise of power.

PEACE THROUGH FEAR

Tillich brought up the question, which the Pope had not, of whether human nature is even capable of peace on earth. Man's will being hopelessly ambiguous, he said, one should not address an encyclical to "all men of good will" (as the Pope did) but to all men, since there is bad in the best and good in the worst. Finally, Tillich distinguished between Utopian hopes of a world ruled by peace, justice, and love, which must await the end of history, and more realistic hopes for a world community capable of avoiding self-destruction. He named several grounds for such genuine hope, including the "community of fear" created by the horrors of nuclear war itself. This negative ground, he said, at least makes the conflicting powers conscious that there is such a thing as "mankind with a common destiny."

Belgium's Paul-Henri Spaak developed this negative ground for hope a step further. A major reason why men have fought wars throughout history is that one side or both could look forward to victory. The bomb has removed that reason; neither side can expect to "win" in a nuclear war, argued Spaak, a point on which all thinking men agree, and on which even Khrushchev had expressly concurred with the Pope. Thus there need not be a nuclear war despite man's natural bellicosity. In a similar tribute to the deterrent effect of mutual terror, Luis Quintanilla, Mexico's onetime minister to the United States, nominated the bomb for the Nobel Peace Prize.

As the panelists got down to work on such practical matters as German reunification and foreign aid, the question about war and human nature went underground for a while. But it surfaced again in the final session when Novelist Eugene Burdick complained that he had heard too little discussion of whether man is really a peaceloving or even a rational creature. He was answered first by psychiatrist Jerome Frank, who pointed out that while man is indeed a bundle of hostilities, modern war is an elaborate social institution that has to be taught to each generation and can be untaught as well. The problem, thought Frank, is not how to create total peace on earth, but how to make the world safe for man's natural aggressiveness by limiting the scope of his conflicts.

When Burdick persisted in his doubts about human nature, he was reminded that Tillich had already answered him: man is both good and bad, addicted at once to violence and to self-preservation; or as another panelist put it, "both killer and saint."

The consequence of this duality of man's nature for the preservation of peace was crystal clear, said Lawyer Grenville Clark, coauthor of "World Peace Through World Law"; the nations must grant powers to a supranational body sufficient to curb the destructive impulse of any one nation; and such powers "can only be honestly described as those of government"—i.e., a world government.

WORLD GOVERNMENT

The need for world government, and its corollary, the obsolescence of sovereign nations, were a recurrent theme throughout the 3 days of discussion. Several participants quoted the papal encyclical (which called for "public authorities * * * on a worldwide basis") as having at least made the subject respectable.

Even Herman Kahn, the Rand Corp.'s tough-minded nuclear strategist, felt that "a rather bad world government might be better than no world government." Political scientist Hans Morgenthau of the University of Chicago, while not expecting sovereignties to be abolished overnight, thought statesmen should think of themselves as "nothing more than the caretakers of a bankrupt national regime which they have to transform, slowly, into a new one."

Some of the statesmen present were willing to go pretty far in this direction. Spaak, long well known as a prophet of political unity in Europe, further advocated the general renunciation not only of nuclear war, but of all wars whatsoever, including "wars of national liberation" and wars "in defense of democracy." Quintanilla, speaking in the session on the rule of law, was for reforming the U.N. in the direction of world government by making its membership universal, enlarging the Security Council and abolishing the veto, weighting Assembly votes to represent populations, and giving the organization a monopoly of nuclear force. At the same session, the chairman of the Constitution Revision Commission of Japan, Kenzo Takayanagi, reported that his commission had decided not to recommend any change in Japan's famous "pacifist" clause, article IX of the Constitution, which renounces Japan's sovereign right to wage war and possess armaments. Japan should keep article IX, he said, in the hope that it will be a model for future constitutions and the amendment of old ones. (At the end of the meeting, Host Robert Hutchins announced he would spend the rest of his life lobbying for a U.S. constitutional amendment like article IX.)

PIECEMEAL PEACEKEEPING

Such radical talk naturally met counterargument in several panels from the more cautious spirits, the believers in "piecemeal" peacekeeping. Sovereignty and nationalism drew a kind word from Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, of the World Court, who pointed out that only a fully sovereign nation can make a firm treaty, or even cede part of its sovereignty to the authority of world law. His U.S. colleague on the World Court, Phillip Jessup, emphasized the coral-like way in which law grows; the fact that much international behavior, such as air routes, mail and weather information, is already governed by a network of law, which can and does grow; and that "leg over leg the dog went to Dover."

Another spokesman for the piecemeal approach was Abram Chayes, former counselor to the State Department, who pointed to the sad record of the 19th Assembly as a poor omen for U.N. Charter revision and said "we are lucky to have the charter we have" and had "better work with it." Lord Caradon, British Ambassador to the U.N., took a more hopeful view of the U.N. as it is, but also pleaded eloquently for more respect for the disinterested motives of its secretariat. But Secretary General U Thant himself, in the address winding up the conference, said "in all frankness" that the peacekeeping provisions of the U.N. Charter are "somewhat out of date," that the anachronism was responsible for the U.N.'s current constitutional crisis, and that the U.N. faces a "great debate" over the distribution of peacekeeping functions between the great and small nations.

The small nations, as represented in the panel on non-nuclear powers, showed less interest in reforming the U.N. than in getting more aid through it. Nigerian, Jordanian and Yugoslav spokesmen emphatically agreed that they preferred this multilateral source of aid to bilateral aid from a great power, on the ground that the latter carries the smell of cold war bribery, whether there are strings on it or not. (There are no strings on U.S. aid to Latin America through the Alianza program, said Colombia's Alberto Lleras Camargo.) British Economist Barbara Ward, chairing this panel, said of all underdeveloped nations that "the sense of their own nationhood has simply got to be the starting point of any type of world order." It appeared from this panel's discussion that nationalism is a new virtue in young, poor countries, but in old, rich ones is an obsolete vice—as Nigeria's Chief Adebo put it, "simply deplorable."

In the next day's panel the old, rich countries had more say on the terms of coexistence. It was chaired by Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who opened up the subject of conflicting ideologies. "A national ideology, or coherent system of values, is a source of great strength and creative energy," said FULBRIGHT, but also of "appalling danger," since it tends to impose on others "the tyranny of abstract ideas." He proposed that both the United States and U.S.S.R., in order to make their peaceful coexistence less precarious, should subordinate their respective ideologies to "the human requirements of a changing world."

THE COMMUNIST TWIST

The Communist spokesmen on this and other panels (Yevgenyi Zhukov, the leading Soviet historian; M. N. Inozemtsev, a top Communist Party theoretician; and philosopher Adam Schaff of Poland's CP Central Committee) agreed in part with the Senator's tolerant overture, but gave it a disturbing twist of their own.

Schaff claimed to speak not as a Polish Communist but as a member of "the worldwide republic of eggheads." He agreed that peaceful coexistence is a necessity; but now that war can no longer settle things between great nations, their ideological conflict—"a noble and rational rivalry"—must now grow more intense, and also more mutually influential. He took a Socialist pride in descrying a growing American tendency toward economic planning, and in return predicted the gradual political democratization of Polish communism.

The Russians declared that states with different social systems can and must coexist, but only on the basis of sovereign equality and noninterference; there can be no coexistence between "oppressor and oppressed." U.S. libels to the contrary, said Inozemtsev, Marxism does not advocate the export of revolutions. But it also opposes "the export of counterrevolutions" (i.e., outside support of resistance to Soviet-approved rebellions), and that, said both Russians, is why the Soviet people are "gravely concerned" about the U.S. role in the Congo and Vietnam.

Thus, went the Russians' logic, "wars of liberation" are still legitimate exceptions to the Soviet opposition to war, as they were in Khrushchev's last speeches. Zhukov gaily invoked the American war of independence to validate current Communist revolts, which he said are just as historically irreversible. But this analogy fell rather flat, and the "coexistence" panel wound up considerably short of agreement, except on FULBRIGHT's plea for mutual tolerance and "the cultivation of a spirit in which nations are more interested in solving problems than in proving theories."

Prudently, the sponsors of the convocation had disowned from the start any intention to reach an agreement. The illumination of issues and the stimulation of further dialog was their goal. And there was plenty of reason for further dialog, not least among the Americans present. Two Americans, former Ambassador George F. Kennan and Nobel Prizeman Linus Pauling, launched much more vitriolic attacks on U.S. policy than the rather circumspect Russians.

Kennan demanded a wholesale change in our European policy, even to the point of military disengagement in Germany, and a revision of our assumptions, which are the basis of NATO, about Soviet aggressive intentions.

Pauling found the United States wholly responsible for the war in Vietnam. Pauling's indignation threw a strange light on another suggestion in his speech, which was echoed later by his fellow scientist, Hudson Hoagland. It was that since the language of science is more truly international than that of politics, and quicker to bypass ideological road blocks, scientists should have a larger say in questions of peace and war. This brief hint of an international technocracy gave Pauling's hearers an additional reason, besides the horror of nuclear war, to hope that the world's present political leaders will not fail their peacekeeping responsibility.

NEW MEANS OF CHANGE

The convocation produced two other ideas that may cast a more lasting illumination. One came from Arnold Toynbee and was supported in a separate discussion by Jerome Frank. They suggested that a new means of effecting social change may already be at large in the world, a way of appealing to the conscience rather than the fears of those in authority—namely, nonviolent resistance. Gandhi used it to overthrow the British raj in India, and Martin Luther King won his Nobel Prize by proving it could work in America as well. It was perhaps underemphasized that nonviolent resistance, to be effective, must choose an adversary with a conscience, and that some governments are not so equipped. But even so, as Frank pointed out, the Gandhi-King example may have a permanent influence on accepted definitions of manliness, which for thousands of years has been associated with readiness to fight. Some day it may be thought that "if you resort to violence then you are a coward."

GLOBAL GREAT SOCIETY

The other illumination was best expressed by Abba Eban, deputy prime minister of Israel. He declared that after millennia of national histories, mankind has now entered "the first era of global history"; and he proposed that all heads of state, large and small, devote 1 week of their working year exclusively to the problems of "the human nation" instead of their own. He gave them an agenda: Overpopulation, malnutrition, illiteracy, gross inequality of incomes, and the repair of the physical damage man has done to his planet since creation.

Eban's plea for a great society of mankind won a standing ovation from the audience. It expressed a conviction heard earlier from others, that when nations collaborate on joint projects for human betterment transcending their own parochial interests, they are likelier to understand each other and less likely to go to war.

Eban's speech also reflected the ecumenical spirit which imbued this whole convocation, the spirit which Pope John XXIII released throughout the Catholic world, and which is still expanding today through other churches, chanceries, and faiths.

MEMORANDUM FROM THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

I. THE WORLDWIDE SCOPE OF THE RESPONSE TO "PACEM IN TERRIS" CONVENTION

Among the indications are:

(1) The Pope's discussion of the convocation at a gathering in St. Peter's Square in Rome—an assembly of 20,000 pilgrims from all parts of the world—was the leading item on thousands of radio and television newscasts.

(2) The largest diocesan newspapers in the United States—the Pilot, published by Cardinal Cushing in Boston; the New World, published by the Archdiocese of Chicago; the Tidings, published by Cardinal McIntyre in Los Angeles; the Long Island Catholic, reaching hundreds of thousands of Catholics in the New York area; the National Catholic Reporter, published in Kansas City but distributed nationally; the Catholic Register, published in Denver but also distributed in churches across the country; the Catholic Star Herald, the weekly with the largest circulation in southern New Jersey; and other large Catholic papers—gave the convocation unprecedented coverage, many devoting two full pages of text and pictures. The Pilot, in a front-page dispatch from Rome, said the conference was receiving extensive discussion in Catholic and Communist papers around the world, as well as in general publications of all kinds. Our Sunday Visitor, a weekly magazine distributed in Catholic churches throughout the United States has carried two articles, highly favorable.

(3) The Johnson Foundation reported that their clipping service had sent more than 1,400 separate news stories. They reported many editorials and bylined articles by columnists, and declared: "In the whole batch, there are perhaps three or four somewhat negative comments."

(4) Presbyterian Life, a magazine published by the Presbyterian Church, with a circulation of 1,141,000, declared that "rarely, if ever, has there been such a coruscating assemblage of first-rate minds under one roof."

(5) The Christian Century, another leading Protestant publication, carried an article that concluded: "While it may indeed be that today the main hope for peace lies negatively in the fear rampant in the minds of men, the fact that areas of agreement did appear in the course of this convocation suggests that more positive motivations may come to play a role."

(6) Time, Life and Newsweek gave substantial attention to the conference. An article by Roland Gammon is in preparation for This Week, which claims a circulation of 14 million. Reader's Digest also is considering an article. The New Yorker's March 6 issue contained an article about Fred Neal and the convocation in positive terms. Pageant magazine is coming out with an article on the center and its importance to the world—an article now scheduled for the May issue.

(7) With the cooperation of Life, pocket book editors are working on a paperback book about the convocation, designed to hit newsstands this spring.

(8) The Saturday Review is going to have a 10,000-word special section in an early issue on the major statements made at the convocation, and Norman Cousins will call for continuing discussion of these statements in meetings to be held in many parts of the United States.

(9) America, a magazine read by all the Catholic bishops and leading clergy of the United States, glowingly endorsed the convocation in an editorial in its March 6 issue, declaring: "The convocation performed a notable service to peace."

(10) The Christian Peace Conference, headed by clergymen from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, France, India, Soviet Russia, Uruguay, East Germany, and other countries, sent a letter of congratulations and asked for copies of all papers delivered at the convocation. This organization has its headquarters in Prague.

II. INTEREST IN FOLLOWUP MEETINGS EXPRESSED BY LEADERS IN MANY FIELDS

The letters received—ranging from the comments of the President of the U.N. General Assembly, in his note dated March 2, to the letter from the president of the American Library Association, declaring that he would do everything possible to give currency to the ideas put forth at the convocation—show that there are strong currents of excitement running in many places.

Arnold Toynbee said: "I felt that it was very much worthwhile and that it was going to lead on to other things." The president of the University of Windsor, Ontario, said: "I have been attending various symposia, congresses, conferences, and conventions for the past 30 years, in a wide variety of contexts, public, academic, and religious. Your convocation was by all odds the most impressive such gathering I have ever had the privilege of attending. I was deeply impressed and stimulated throughout the sessions * * *." Like other university presidents who wrote to you, he said he was astonished by the interest he had found in continuing the discussions.

William Baggs, editor of the Miami News, has reported that he has received more than 200 letters from persons seeking films or booklets or other material growing out of the convocation. J. Duane Squires, chairman of the department of social studies at Colby Junior College in New Hampshire, wrote you: "I am preparing a résumé of the conference to be used in the New Hampshire press, and I have already been invited to speak about the gathering to several meetings in this vicinity."

The Chatauqua Association, the National Association of Catholic Colleges, and a number of student groups have already made inquiries about the possibility of getting material in film or printed form for meetings. Peggy Kerney McNeil, president of the Trenton Times newspaper, said in a letter dated March 5: "We at the Times want to do anything we can to continue the great work you've begun. Please tell us all you can."

In an article printed on the front page of the Rochester diocesan paper, the Catholic Courier, Rabbi Herbert Bronstein of Temple B'rith Kodesh wrote: "What was the tremendous power that brought thousands of people surging into the hall of the U.N. General Assembly, among them easily recognizable statesmen of East and West, former presidents of the United Nations, leaders of the American civil rights movement, clergy of all faiths and denominations, scholars and scientists? What was the power that drew all these races, religions, all ages and tongues, and all political ideologies together? The example of Pope John XXIII against the fatalism and cynicism of our time * * *" Rabbi Bronstein also wrote to you and said he wanted to organize meetings in the Rochester area to carry on the work.

James W. Bush, Jr., of Boston College wrote * * * to say that the college, Fairfield University, and the College of the Holy Cross were sponsoring a conference on Pacem in Terris * * *.

* * * * *

The New York Times said: "The encyclical has the rare capability of providing a common ground on which people of all kinds—priests and rabbis, pacifists and Communists, philosophers, and nuns—can consider moral and religious problems beyond the thicket of sectarian and doctrinal differences. This capability is an outgrowth of one of the late Pope's most important points—that differing ideologies are not a barrier to coexistence, and that coexistence does not mean giving up beliefs or the surrender of any side to any other."

WOOL TEXTILES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is a common rule of politics that foreign trade and domestic economic stability are often difficult to reconcile; and it is an uncommon experience of political life when a practical plan to bridge the gap between these often divergent forces is advanced.

Such a plan was put forward this week by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] in the form of Senate bill 2022, the Orderly Marketing Act of 1965, which I am proud to cosponsor.

All of us, I am sure, would like to live in a comfortable world in which the various national economies would be perfectly complementary, and in which trade would mean equal opportunity for each trading partner. We have, to be sure, taken several steps toward this ideal goal, through the Trade Expansion Act; but no one can deny that in this country there are some critical pockets of economic distress, resulting from inequitable trade; and, unfortunately, one of them is in my own State.

I refer in particular to the wool-worsted textile industry, in which production declined by some 10 percent last year, while imports accounted for approximately 20 percent of the American market. Since 1950, approximately 50 woolen-worsted plants in Rhode Island have gone out of business; and we have lost over 10,000 jobs in the last 6 years.

The Muskie bill is designed to provide just the kind of relief we in Rhode Island need. The bill will establish a well thought-out, systematic way in which import controls can be invoked, in the event of substantial and persistent invasion of American markets by products from abroad; and the bill will do so without denying reasonable prospects for foreign competitors to participate in the future growth of the American market, provided they do not cause economic disruption.

Specifically, the Muskie bill provides that an industry may be eligible for relief action in the ratio of imports to domestic production has increased by 50 percent or more during the preceding 5 years, and by 10 percent during the immediately preceding calendar year.

This formula is clearly relevant to the woolen-worsted industry, in which imports accounted for 12.5 percent of the U.S. market 5 years ago, but now account for nearly 20 percent, as I have said. In other words, in this industry, there has been a 62-percent increase in the ratio of imports to the total domestic market.

Obviously, the ratio of imports to dwindling domestic production would be even steeper.

We who represent this beleaguered industry have been trying long and hard to reverse the flood of import competition which has caused our economy such grief. I hardly need mention the outstanding efforts of my senior colleague, Senator PASTORE, who has done such outstanding work as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Textiles.

My own special concern for the industry has been from the viewpoint of a former Foreign Service officer and as a member of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee. Recently, I sought to put forward what I hope is a constructive suggestion for resolving the wool-worsted crisis through forthright action in the diplomatic field. In brief, my proposal was that the United States set a deadline for convening a multilateral conference to work out a world marketing plan, and a second deadline at which we would begin to initiate unilateral import restrictions, if there had not been any progress at the multilateral level. I spelled out that proposal at a recent meeting of the Rhode Island Textile Association; and I ask unanimous consent that the text of my speech there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Department of State has taken cognizance of my proposal; and in this connection I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Assistant Secretary of State Douglas MacArthur II, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Department's continuing concern with this matter, although I am, naturally, sorry that the Department is not able to be more immediately receptive to my proposal for deadlines for negotiation. I note with interest that there is to be a United States-Japanese Conference on Wool Textiles in Tokyo during the week of June 7; and I hope the Conference will lead to a palpable relaxation of the import problem. All of us will be awaiting with interest the outcome.

The problem is so serious, and the resolution of it of such great consequence to my constituency, that I believe we should leave no stone unturned until our industry receives the protection it deserves. I hope the Department of State will continue to press for every avenue of relief; but in the event its efforts do not bear fruit, we must, perforce, pursue other channels. It is in this spirit that I have cosponsored the Muskie bill, and will work for its enactment.

EXHIBIT 1

REMARKS BY SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL AT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE RHODE ISLAND TEXTILE ASSOCIATION, APRIL 19, 1965

I am honored to have this opportunity to address the Rhode Island Textile Association. Your organization represents a most influential cross section of the economic leadership of our State, and I therefore welcome occasions like this in which you and I can have the closest possible exchange of views.

I will be frank to say, at the outset, that I do not presume to represent myself as an expert on your industry. My senior colleague, JOHN PASTORE, has done a wonderful job and deserves most of the credit for implementing the seven-point relief program which has brought so many benefits in the past 3 years. He has worked with immense diligence and effectiveness, and his command of the field is preeminent. I salute him for his work and look forward to supporting him in it for a long while to come.

I hope you will consider my remarks today as those of an informed nonexpert who has your interests very much in mind and who wants to work in partnership with you to help you achieve in the realm of public policy what you need to succeed and thrive as a competitive enterprise.

I acknowledge at the outset that this is often easier said than done. We have heard a lot of talk recently about how Congressmen and Senators should obtain rich benefits for their respective States and districts. I noted with interest in this regard Governor Chafee's letter to the Woonsocket Call the other day regarding the woolen-worsted situation. I am delighted to know that we have his full and vigorous support in coping with this problem.

Obviously, each of us in Congress wants the best that can be won for our home State, and we devote vast amounts of time and energy to bring some of these benefits home. Often, when the benefits do arrive they arrive like icebergs—with only a small portion of the accomplishment revealed and the vast underpinning of hard work lost from view.

With regard to the woolen-worsted situation, I want to assure you at the outset that I for one will continue to bend every effort to ease the lot of the Rhode Island industry—whether by an international quota agreement or unilateral import restrictions or any other action. I would be less than honest, however, if I did not say that we must balance our determination to win regional relief by a realistic understanding of our prospects. So often our success is in direct proportion to the degree to which our interests coincide with those of several other regions or States. When that coincidence is lacking, it's often much more difficult to get our way in the Federal system. I would deceive you if I were to pretend that this is not the case.

We had a remarkable demonstration of the efficacy of multiregional coincidence of interests in the formulation and implementation of the 1961 seven-point textile relief program, instituted by President Kennedy and continued by President Johnson. That comprehensive program touched all segments of the vast textile complex—from the cotton farms of Louisiana to the mills of Maine. All in all, about one-third of the Congress was directly affected—about 40 Senators and approximately 130 Members of the House.

The results that have flowed from that program have been dramatic indeed.

The one-price cotton law which was signed last year and which we will work to continue far beyond its scheduled expiration in 1966, has been cited as the most important factor in a general resurgence of strength in the textile industry triggered by the administration program. Consumption of U.S. cotton is expected to increase over a million bales in the 1964–65 crop year, testimony to the fact that U.S. mills will use cotton when they can get it at competitive prices.

I am well aware also of current interest in a special subsidy for dyers, printers, and finishers, providing these processors do not already benefit from the one-price subsidy. I will do everything I can to promote consideration of this proposal.

Another factor is the new, rapid depreciation schedules on textile equipment and the 7-percent investment credit, which last year was improved to provide that claiming of the credit would not reduce the depreciation basis of a new asset.

The result of these reforms has been a recordbreaking infusion of the new investment in plants and equipment in the industry as a whole. Capital expenditures, which averaged $414 million in the 1950–60 period stood at $750 million in 1964 and might go as high as $950 million in 1965. The 1964 expenditures stood at 13 percent of the industry's net worth, the highest of any major industry.

Still another factor has been public and private investment in research and development and training in the textile industry. In the research realm, new fabrics, fibers, and processes are being produced—particularly in such areas as manmade fibers and stretch fabrics.

In this general regard, I want to commend the industry in Rhode Island for its initiative in establishing your own textile training center. I was pleased to attend the opening of this center last January, and I wish it all success.

I hope also that the industry will continue to give its attention to retraining and improvement of our existing skilled labor pool. In this connection, I want to remind you that I serve on the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower and stand ready to render you any assistance or service I can in this area.

In this regard, it is interesting to note that since its inception in 1962, the Manpower Development and Training Act has resulted in approved training courses for 1,197 Rhode Islanders with a dollar commitment of $2,195,996 through January of this year. During approximately the same period of time, the Area Redevelopment Act has brought our State approved training for 1,225 persons with an expenditure of $949,815.

The Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower recently held hearings on the Manpower Act amendments which would extend this valuable program to June of 1969. April 13 brought final House action on this measure, and I expect President Johnson to sign this act shortly. This could bring to Rhode Island over $1,600,000 in Federal matching funds on a 90-to-10 basis for training programs.

Up to January of this year, training was approved for 120 automatic spindle weavers under the Area Redevelopment Act. Under the Manpower Act, training was approved for 24 loomfixers and 12 loomfixer apprentices. The courses in loom fixing ran 24 weeks.

One final factor that stems from the Government's comprehensive textile program is the international cotton marketing agreement which was reached in 1961. Under its terms, the United States has negotiated 18 bilateral agreements with cotton textile producing countries, binding them to reduce shipments if the importing country makes a finding of market disruption.

These agreements have led to restraint in several lines of products, although I understand not all. At any rate, imports of textiles in 1964 were down approximately 6 percent below 1963 levels; according to the American Textile Manufacturers Institute. And what seems most encouraging is the fact that U.S. exports rose by at least 10 percent over 1963 levels.

Now I realize all too fully that only a portion of the Rhode Island textile industry participated in these encouraging trends and that many of you, because you are so heavily concentrated in the woolen-worsted sector, did not benefit at all.

The facts and figures on woolen worsteds are not happy ones. Some of the key points, from the Government point of view, seem to be as follows:

Production of raw wool in the United States declined by about 16 percent in 1964 from 1961.

Mill use of raw wool dropped to its lowest level since 1958.

Wool's share of total fiber consumed by U.S. textile plants has dropped to 4½ percent as against 6½ percent 4 years ago.

Production of woolen and worsted fabric declined by some 10 percent in the first half of 1964 from 1963 levels.

Imports now account for about 20 percent of the U.S. woolen market, as compared with 12.5 percent 5 years ago and less than 5 percent 10 years ago.

Seventeen more wool textile mills closed their doors in the first 10 months of 1964, joining a casualty list of 117 since 1956.

One important consequence of these unpleasant facts was that many woolen mills were realistically shifting to manmade fibers—production of which increased by 25 percent during the 1963-64 marketing season, or 10 times the rate of growth of wool production. It seems to me that this is an inevitable trend and one to which Rhode Island mills should adapt whenever possible—as I know many of you are.

In a sense, the plight of the wool-worsted industry reflects the fact that its influence is not as pervasive as the more comprehensive cotton elements of the textile industry which I have already described. But this does not mean that the industry is without friends in high places.

I am sure you are all aware of President Johnson's pledge, when he visited Providence last fall, to keep wool textile and apparel imports at reasonable levels. He pledged the efforts of the administration to convene a multination meeting to work out an international marketing agreement, like the one now regulating cotton trade.

I can assure you that the administration is still committed to this goal even though results have not yet been forthcoming. As recently as last December, at the meeting of the International Wool Study Group in London, the United States restated its plea for convening such a regulatory conference.

The reason why our efforts have not borne fruit is simple. The other nations involved are not willing to participate. Whereas a substantial group of countries had a direct interest in negotiating the international cotton agreement for their own good, the list of wool exporting nations is much narrower and their control of the market much tighter.

The principals involved are the United Kingdom, Italy, Japan, and Hong Kong, and I am informed that at least two of these exporting areas have stated flat opposition to a regulatory conference.

As a former Foreign Service officer, I can well appreciate our Government's desire to control the wool import problem by multilateral agreement rather than by national action. The multilateral agreement protects us in advance from retribution. There is no doubt that this is a much tidier and safer mechanism for our diplomats.

Looking at the problem from my present vantage point on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, however, I am not indefinitely sympathetic to the sensitivities of the diplomatic corps. It seem to me that we have just about exhausted our capacity for a tidy, diplomatic solution, and that you here on the homefront have had to pay far too high a price to tolerate further dabbling at diplomatic niceties.

What I propose is this: It seems to me that the United States should serve notice to the wool-exporting nations that we cannot continue to tolerate the extremely difficult position in which our domestic industry now finds itself. We should invite these nations, one last time, to sit down and work out a reasonable international marketing agreement, specifying a definite date to convene the conference—such as next July 1. Then we should serve notice that if reasonable progress has not been reached toward such an agreement by another fixed date—say October 1—we should take steps to invoke unilateral quotas and restraints.

I have no special insights as to whether such an approach would work, and, given the rather limited base of power for wool textiles, which I have already described, I can make no guarantee that we can commit the Government to such a "get tough" policy. But I promise that we will never stop trying.

Alternatively, perhaps the executive branch can be persuaded to move directly to unilateral quotas without making the one final effort to a diplomatic solution. I would certainly support this move too, if it has any chance of success.

At any rate, I want you to know that I share what I know must be your belief that we already have been asked to bear too much and that we can wait no longer for effective relief. There is, after all, no substitute for new orders and more business for Rhode Island plants.

EXHIBIT 2

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1965.

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: The Under Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter to him of April 30, 1965 concerning the wool textile import problem.

I was very much interested to read your address before the Rhode Island Textile Association and have noted your suggestion that the administration set a cutoff date to its efforts to find a multilateral solution to the problem of import competition in wool textiles.

The Department certainly appreciates the importance of the wool textile industry to the economy of New England and in particular to the State of Rhode Island. As your statement recognizes, we have been making repeated efforts over the last few years to find a multilateral solution to this problem. The United States first raised this issue at the seventh plenary of the International Wool Study Group in London in December 1962, and since that time, the Department has raised the matter repeatedly in bilateral discussions with senior government officials of the major wool textile exporting countries. Several high-level missions have been sent abroad for this purpose.

More recently, as reported to you in Mr. Lee's letter of February 5, 1965, the President personally raised this problem in his discussions with Prime Minister Sato during the latter's visit on January 12 and 13, 1965. As a result, Japan has now agreed to a joint government-industry meeting in Tokyo during the week of June 7, which will give the United States an opportunity to review with Japanese Government officials the effect of imports on the U.S. wool textile market and to present our case for an international wool textile conference. This will be the first United States-Japanese meeting of this kind, convened specifically for the purpose of reviewing this problem.

As you are aware, the Governments of the other principal exporting countries have been reluctant to discuss this matter and have not agreed, as of this time, to participate in an international conference. In the light of this, the Department finds it difficult to project the progress of our efforts to find a multilateral solution to this problem and hence does not consider it desirable to set a specific deadline to discussions at this time.

The Department realizes that some of those affected by competitive imports of wool textiles find the idea of unilateral U.S. action attractive but continues to believe that a solution to this problem must be found through the multilateral approach. In 1964 U.S. imports of wool textiles amounted to approximately $234 million. Unilateral action with respect to this trade would, under GATT rules, lay the United States open to retaliatory action or payment of compensation to the countries affected by such a move on an equivalent amount of trade, for example, through withdrawal of tariff concessions. Conceivably unilateral action might even endanger the existence of the long-term cotton textile arrangement. It is for this reason—to avoid injury to other segments of the U.S. economy, including possibly large segments of the U.S. textile industry—that the Department considers a multilateral approach as serving best the national interest as well as the interest of the U.S. textile industry as a whole. We will continue our efforts to that end.

If there is any additional information which we can furnish on this matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

MILWAUKEE SUCCESS IN JOBS-FOR-YOUTH PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Nation's high schools and colleges will recess for the summer in several weeks and more than 10 million young persons will join the labor market in search of summer jobs.

It is not easy for these young folks to find summer jobs. Most of them have little or no experience and there are many more applicants than there are jobs to fill.

I am happy to report that a group of civic leaders in Milwaukee have recognized this problem and have done something about it. A plan of action—worked out by a business leader—was implemented by the youth committee of the social development commission with help from other civic groups and community leaders.

The result of these efforts was the creation of Youthpower, Inc., a private enterprise, nonprofit, job placement house operated by and for 16- to 21-year-olds. The plan for the firm came from Elmer Winter, a brilliantly successful Milwaukean and president of Manpower, Inc., a Milwaukee-based international company specializing in temporary clerical, business, and industrial help.

In 1963, its first year in operation, Youthpower processed 4,700 job applications and filled 1,276 jobs. Salaries ranged from 50 cents an hour for yard work to $120 a week for driving a truck. Despite the salary differential or the range of work provided, job satisfaction was high among both the young workers placed and the employers and supervisors who hired them.

A detailed description of Milwaukee's summer job placement program was given in an article by Mary Ann Robertson, which appeared in the May 1965 issue of Better Homes & Gardens magazine.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place the article, entitled "Found: Summer Jobs for Teenagers," in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUND: SUMMER JOBS FOR TEENAGERS

(By Mary Ann Robertson)

It isn't easy for young people to find summer jobs—and the problem gets tougher all the time. This summer an avalanche of teenagers will be unleashed on the job market. Youth, energy, ambition they have in abundance. What they lack, obviously, is experience. It's the old dilemma: If you don't have experience, you can't get a job—and if you can't get a job, you can't get experience.

What's the solution? One answer might lie in the experience of Milwaukee—a city that saw the problem and met it head on. At a meeting of the youth committee of the social development commission in April of 1963, civic leaders were told that no less than 14,000 unemployed teenagers would be thrown on the Milwaukee area job market that summer. The businessmen were urged to suggest ways of findings jobs for the young people.

The plan that was adopted came from Elmer Winter, president of Manpower, Inc., a Milwaukee-based company specializing in temporary business and industrial help, and chairman of the Voluntary Equal Employment Opportunity Council in Milwaukee. He suggested the formation of Youthpower, Inc., a private enterprise, nonprofit, job clearinghouse to be operated by, and for, 16- to 21-year olds.

After winning the quick approval of the social development commission's youth committee, Winter enlisted the support of The Other 98—a youth service group dedicated to publicizing the activities of the nondelinquent 98 percent of Milwaukee's young people.

On June 1, 1963, Youthpower, Inc., opened its doors for business. Manpower, Inc., had provided office space, furniture, telephone service, and supplies. The young organization had its own president, vice president and public relations director, and office manager. Altogether the staff of volunteer workers numbered over 80.

Thanks in large measure to extensive advance newspaper coverage, the immediate response to Youthpower was overwhelming. Nearly 750 young people filed into the Youthpower office the first day. By the end of the summer, total number of applicants reached 4,700, and total number of jobs filled, 1,276.

Youthpower operated much like any other job placement agency, in miniature. However, no fee was charged for the job placement service, and wages were left to employer and teenager. Salaries ranged from 50 cents an hour for yardwork to $120 a week for driving a dairy truck.

Finding the teenage applicants was no problem—but finding enough jobs to go around was. Rather than waiting for jobs to materialize, the eager staff contacted prospective employers by phone, letters, and personal calls—and mailed out 10,000 postcards to homeowners.

What kind of jobs did Youthpower uncover? Out of the 1,276 total jobs filled, 292 were housework-babysitting; 273 lawnwork-handyman; 194 sales jobs; 119 office work. The miscellaneous other 398 jobs ranged from blending spices to helping Milwaukeeans clean up their flooded basements after a rainstorm.

To equip teenagers for specific work areas, Youthpower sponsored several training programs, such as the sales clinic where young people learned selling techniques and met with prospective employers. Over 90 applicants for sales jobs were hired on the spot by 14 sales companies participating. Other highly successful training experiments were the baby sitting clinic and a hostess helper training clinic.

One of the most interesting aspects of the Youthpower idea is its flexibility. The basic plan is adaptable to any size community, with or without a manpower office. Principal requirements for setting up a Youthpower-type job clearinghouse are:

1. A group of adult sponsors: This could be a manpower office, or a civic club or service organization, a local business firm, or PTA group. Main responsibilities of the parent group would be to enlist the support of the business community; provide an office, office supplies, telephone service, and financial assistance to cover costs of advertising and mailings. Once the project is underway, the teenagers can and should assume responsibility for operating the job bureau.

2. A capable staff of volunteer workers: Enlisting young people to man the job bureau should begin as far in advance of opening day as possible—before they make other plans for the summer. Most likely source of workers will probably be the high schools and colleges—so it's essential to win the cooperation of school authorities. In Milwaukee, many volunteers were signed up through "The Other 98"—a teenage service group. College students interested in business administration, personnel work, public relations, and advertising make particularly effective workers. Other sources of volunteers: sororities and fraternities, school clubs, religious youth organizations, community organizations such as Junior Achievement and Y-Teens. Once recruited, volunteers should participate in a training program to familiarize them with office procedure and wih Youthpower objectives.

3. The backing of the community: Obviously, the more backing the project has, the more new job areas it can open up for teenagers. Make sure the business leaders of the community are contacted while the project is still in the planning stage. Seek their counsel at the outset—and keep them posted every step of the way via meetings, letters, mailings, personal contact—and personal "thank you's" whenever they hire a teenage worker.

In winning the support of the community at large, local newspapers—as demonstrated by Youthpower's experience—can be of inestimable value—and it should be simple enough to enlist their help. Newspaper editors are exposed every day to the consequences of teenage idleness, restlessness, and rootlessness. And most of them will bend over backward to support any community effort to solve the problem. In Milwaukee, radio and television interviews and public service announcements gave added impetus to the project. Other ways to alert the community: mailings to businessmen and homeowners calling attention to specific jobs teenagers can fill; a "speakers bureau" of young volunteers to address civic clubs, women's clubs, PTA groups, etc.; advertisements in daily and neighborhood newspapers.

While the Youthpower experiment in Milwaukee represented community-wide effort to meet the problem of teenage unemployment during the summer, the basic idea could be carried out successfully on a much more modest scale—confined, say, to a single school or neighborhood. Why not suggest it at your next civic club or PTA meeting? Certainly it's more constructive than worriedly wondering "what the younger generation is coming to."

WISCONSIN WINS ONE-MAN, ONE-VOTE FOR COUNTY BOARDS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a short while we will begin floor debate on a proposal to amend the Constitution to allow States to get around the U.S. Supreme Court's "one person, one vote" ruling. This proposal would enable rural areas to continue to dominate State governments by permitting one house of State legislatures to be apportioned on a basis other than population.

I am opposed to this amendment because I think it is a step backward. It seeks to perpetuate rural domination of State legislatures and thus deprive the millions of Americans who have participated in the mass migration to urban areas of an effective voice in their government.

I am proud to report, therefore, that while there are some in Federal Government who are looking backward, the State of Wisconsin has moved boldly ahead in the field of apportionment and is now applying the "one man, one vote" concept to county government. The motto of Wisconsin is "Forward" and my State is living up to its motto. Having already completed reapportioning the congressional and State senate and State assembly districts, the Wisconsin Legislature recently overhauled the State's 115-year-old system of county board representation.

The fight for reapportionment in Wisconsin was not an easy one, however. Although the State has traditionally been several years tardy in reapportioning congressional districts to bring them in line with Federal census results, it has eventually done so. This has not always been true of apportionment for the State senate and State assembly, unfortunately.

The legislature was forced to act following the 1960 census by former Attorney General John W. Reynolds. Reynolds took the legislature to court and continued the court battle after he was elected Governor in 1962. Reynolds won his court battle and Wisconsin's legistive districts were reapportioned by the State supreme court.

The current reapportionment of the county boards was also forced by the supreme court. The court, acting on a suit brought by two editors of the Milwaukee Sentinel, gave the legislature until November 1 to come up with a plan that establishes "a substantial equality of population among supervisory districts." The change will not only equalize representation on the boards, but will also cut down the size of the boards which in some counties had become unwieldy.

My purpose in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate is to illustrate a key point that I think has been forgotten in the apportionment controversy.

The point is this: Wisconsin has accepted the Supreme Court's ruling and has acted.

The Wisconsin experience is typical. Wisconsin has been a rural oriented State for most of its history. Only in recent years has industry replaced agriculture as the top revenue producer and only in the past few years have cities and urban areas held a majority of the population.

In Wisconsin, as in all similarly situated States, there was an understandable reluctance on the part of the legislature to, in effect, vote itself out of power by reapportioning so that legislative districts truly represented the electorate.

The legislature therefore needed the prodding of the courts. The U.S. Supreme Court fulfilled its function by interpreting the Constitution in this matter and ruled that the "one person, one vote" principle should apply. Many other State supreme courts have ruled similarly.

We on the Federal level, who by and large are not affected, should follow this example instead of attempting to disrupt the separation of powers by seeking an amendment to thwart the "one person, one vote" ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Thursday, May 27, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 26 (legislative day of May 24), 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Wilbur J. Cohen, of Michigan, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

The following-named persons to the position indicated:

To be members of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

Eileen Hernandez, of California, for the term expiring July 1, 1965.

Richard Graham, of Wisconsin, for the term expiring July 1, 1966.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., of New York, for the term expiring July 1, 1967.

Samuel C. Jackson, of Kansas, for the term expiring July 1, 1968.

Rev. Luther Holcomb, of Texas, for the term expiring July 1, 1969.

Eileen Hernandez, of California, for the term of 5 years expiring July 1, 1970.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. For appointment:

To be senior surgeon

Paul D. Pedersen

To be senior assistant surgeons

Alan I. Levenson
Amos C. Lewis

To be senior assistant sanitarian

William P. Wollschlager

II. For permanent promotion:

To be assistant pharmacist

Douglas O. Sharp

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Need for Uniform State Residency Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House a highly informative article written by our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER, which appeared in the Michigan Law Review of February 1963.

The gentleman from Iowa, Congressman SCHMIDHAUSER, then professor of political science at the State University of Iowa, conducted a penetrating study of the various State residency requirements for voting and the effect they have upon our highly mobile population.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, which has recently completed its study of the voting rights bill, I would like to point out to the House that there are other factors besides that of race which disenfranchise a large number of potential voters. The gentleman from Iowa, Congressman SCHMIDHAUSER, estimated that, under our universal suffrage system, some 8 million citizens in 1960 were unable to meet the various residency requirements set up by State statutes and, thus, were denied the right to vote.

As our population continues to show a tendency toward greater mobility, the necessity increases for a uniformity among our State residency requirements. The gentleman from Iowa, Congressman SCHMIDHAUSER, is to be commended for bringing this vital problem to our attention and to all of those who are interested in rectifying this inequity within our system.

The article follows:

[From the Michigan Law Review, vol. 61, No. 4, February 1963]

RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTING AND THE TENSIONS OF A MOBILE SOCIETY

(By JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER) [1]

("No man can boast of a higher privilege than the right granted to citizens of our State and Nation of equal suffrage and thereby to equal representation in the making of the laws of the land. Under our Constitution that right is absolute. It is one of which he cannot be deprived, either deliberately or by inaction on the part of a legislature." [2]

The spirit of contemporary appellate decisionmaking in the field of voting rights is daring and realistic. This spirit is perhaps best exemplified by the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Baker* v. *Carr*.[3] While deliberate deprivations of voting rights assume a variety of forms, the most blatant have been grounded upon racial discrimination. The 1961 report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights indicates that in approximately 100 counties in 8 Southern States most Negro citizens are prevented from voting.[4] Economic considerations also have been recently invoked to provide a basis for disenfranchisement. In Virginia in November 1962 approval was sought, albeit unsuccessfully, of a State constitutional amendment rendering persons who were not freeholders of land ineligible to vote on bond issue referendums for new schools, streets, libraries, and other local improvements.[5] Most of the deliberate efforts at invidious restriction of suffrage have received searching analysis by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. But one of the most striking examples of denial of voting rights because of legislative inaction, that arising from outmoded State residency requirements for voting, was omitted from the long list of "problems still unsolved" which was compiled by the Commission in 1961.[6]

It is the purpose of this article to determine the extent to which persons otherwise qualified to vote are disenfranchised by the complex of State residency requirements and to assess the practical and constitutional aspects of any statutory prospects for change.

What are the dimensions of the problem of disenfranchisement through the operation of State residency requirements? Two salient factors are involved: the restrictions imposed by the particular State residency requirements and the mobility of the population of the United States. Certainly the restrictive nature of State residency requirements for voting would not seriously affect voting participation if Americans were not inveterate movers.

Geographic mobility has intensified at a comparatively steady rate in every decade since 1900. Historical census data indicate that the percentage of persons who do not live in the State of their birth has in 1960 increased by 5.7 percent over the percentage of such persons in 1900. The shift is much more striking among nonwhites than among whites. The percentage of nonwhites who do not live in the State of their birth has increased by 12.2 percent (27.7 percent of the Nation's population in 1960 as compared with 15.5 percent in 1900). For whites the increase is modest—4.7 percent (26.1 percent of the Nation's population in 1960 as compared with 21.4 percent in 1900). Demographically, the highest percentage of persons living in States in which they were not born is found in urban settings (29.4 percent), the next highest in rural nonfarm areas (22.1 percent), and the lowest in rural farm areas (12.1 percent). These and subsequent migration data were derived from Census Bureau sources partially reproduced in the two charts and the map. [See charts I and II. Map not printed in the RECORD.]

---

[1] Professor of political science, State University of Iowa.

[2] *Asbury Park Press, Inc.* v. *Woolley*, 33 N.J. 1, 11, 161 A. 2d 705, 710 (1960).

[3] 369 U.S. 186 (1962).

[4] See 1961 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Report, bk. 1, 5.

[5] See Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1962, p. B–1, col. 6; id. Nov. 27, 1962, p. A–16, col. 1.

[6] 1961 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Report, bk. 1, 5–6.

CHART I.—*State of birth of the native population, by color, for the United States, urban and rural, 1960, and for conterminous United States, 1900 to 1960* [1]

Area, census year, and color	Total native population	Percent distribution				
		Total native population	Born in the United States			Born in U.S. outlying area, at sea, etc.
			In State or residence	In different State	State of birth not reported	
UNITED STATES 1960						
Total	169, 587, 528	100	70. 3	26. 4	2. 7	0. 6
Urban	116, 773, 631	100	66. 6	29. 4	3. 2	. 8
Rural nonfarm	39, 589, 369	100	75. 7	22. 1	1. 8	. 3
Rural farm	13, 224, 528	100	86. 9	12. 1	. 9	. 1
White	149, 543, 638	100	70. 7	26. 2	2. 4	. 7
Urban	102, 311, 633	100	67. 5	28. 8	2. 8	. 9
Rural nonfarm	35, 592, 497	100	74. 6	23. 2	1. 8	. 3
Rural farm	11, 639, 508	100	85. 9	13. 1	. 9	. 1
Nonwhite	20, 043, 899	100	68. 0	27. 2	4. 5	. 3
Urban	14, 461, 998	100	60. 4	33. 7	5. 5	. 4
Rural nonfarm	3, 996, 872	100	85. 5	12. 3	2. 1	. 2
Rural farm	1, 585, 020	100	93. 9	5. 2	. 9	----------
CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES						
All classes:						
1960	168, 805, 716	100	70. 4	26. 3	2. 7	0. 6
1950	139, 868, 715	100	73. 5	25. 2	1. 0	. 3
1940	120, 074, 379	100	77. 1	22. 4	. 2	. 2
1930	108, 570, 897	100	76. 2	23. 4	. 2	. 2
1920	91, 789, 928	100	77. 4	22. 1	. 3	. 1
1910	78, 456, 380	100	78. 0	21. 6	. 4	. 1
1900	65, 653, 299	100	79. 1	20. 6	. 3	. 1
White:						
1960	149, 181, 384	100	70. 8	26. 1	2. 4	. 7
1950	124, 382, 950	100	74. 0	24. 8	1. 0	. 3
1940	106, 795, 732	100	77. 3	22. 3	. 2	. 2
1930	96, 303, 335	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1920	81, 108, 161	100	77. 1	22. 4	. 3	. 1
1910	68, 386, 412	100	77. 2	22. 3	. 4	. 1
1900	56, 595, 379	100	78. 2	21. 4	. 3	. 1
Nonwhite:						
1960	19, 624, 332	100	67. 5	27. 7	4. 5	. 3
1950	15, 485, 765	100	69. 8	28. 8	1. 1	. 3
1940	13, 278, 647	100	75. 9	23. 5	. 2	. 1
1930	12, 267, 562	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1920	10, 681, 767	100	80. 0	19. 5	. 4	. 5
1910	10, 069, 968	100	83. 2	16. 3	. 4	----------
1900	9, 057, 920	100	84. 2	15. 5	. 3	----------

[1] Adapted from U.S. Bureau of the Census, "U.S. Census of Population: 1960, General, Social, and Economic Characteristics, U.S. Summary," Final Report PC(1)-1C (1962). Table is reproduced with the permission of the Bureau of the Census.

CHART II.—*Residence 5 years prior to census date, by color, for the United States, urban and rural, 1960, and for conterminous United States, 1960 and 1940* [1]

Residence 5 years prior to census date and color	Total	Percent distribution					
		United States, 1960				Conterminous United States	
		Total	Urban	Rural nonfarm	Rural farm	1960	1940
TOTAL							
Population 5 years old and over	159, 003, 807	100. 0	100. 0	100. 0	100. 0	100. 0	100. 0
Same house	79, 331, 022	49. 9	47. 9	48. 7	71. 4	49. 9	(2)
Different house in the United States	75, 185, 793	47. 3	48. 9	49. 0	28. 0	47. 2	(2)
Same county	47, 461, 137	29. 8	31. 3	29. 0	19. 2	29. 9	(2)
Different county	27, 724, 656	17. 4	17. 6	20. 0	8. 8	17. 4	13. 0
Same State	13, 583, 173	8. 5	8. 1	10. 7	5. 9	8. 6	7. 6
Different State	14, 141. 483	8. 9	9. 4	9. 3	2. 8	8. 8	5. 4
Abroad	2, 002, 822	1. 3	1. 5	1. 0	. 2	1. 2	. 3
Place of prior residence not reported [3]	2, 484, 170	1. 6	1. 7	1. 4	. 4	1. 6	. 9
WHITE							
Population 5 years old and over	141, 472, 113	100. 0	100. 0	100. 0	100. 0	100. 0	100. 0
Same house	70, 912, 796	50. 1	48. 3	48. 1	72. 9	50. 2	(2)
Different house in the United States	66, 704, 903	47. 2	48. 6	49. 6	26. 5	47. 1	(2)
Same county	40, 863, 788	28. 9	30. 2	28. 8	17. 5	28. 9	(2)
Different county	25, 841, 115	18. 3	18. 4	20. 9	9. 0	18. 2	13. 4
Same State	12, 762, 949	9. 0	8. 7	11. 1	6. 0	9. 0	7. 9
Different State	13, 078, 166	9. 2	9. 8	9. 7	3. 0	9. 2	5. 5
Abroad	1, 834, 946	1. 3	1. 5	1. 0	. 2	1. 3	. 3
Place of prior residence not reported [3]	2, 019, 468	1. 4	1. 6	1. 3	. 4	1. 4	. 9
NONWHITE							
Population 5 years old and over	17, 531, 694	100. 0	100. 0	100. 0	100. 0	100. 0	100. 0
Same house	8, 418, 226	48. 0	45. 0	54. 5	59. 5	47. 9	(2)
Different house in the United States	8, 480, 890	48. 4	50. 8	42. 6	40. 0	48. 5	(2)
Same county	6, 597, 349	37. 6	39. 9	31. 1	33. 0	37. 7	(2)
Different county	1, 883, 541	10. 7	10. 9	11. 5	7. 0	10. 8	9. 4
Same State	820, 224	4. 7	4. 1	6. 7	5. 3	4. 7	5. 6
Different State	1, 063, 317	6. 1	6. 9	4. 9	1. 7	6. 1	3. 9
Abroad	167, 876	1. 0	1. 1	. 9	. 1	. 9	. 1
Place of prior residence not reported [3]	464, 702	2. 7	3. 1	2. 0	. 4	2. 7	1. 2

[1] Adapted from U.S. Bureau of the Census, "U.S. Census of Population: 1960, General, Social, and Economic Characteristics, U.S. Summary," Final Report PC(1)-1C (1962), table 71. Reproduced with the permission of the Bureau of the Census.

[2] Persons living in the same house in 1935 and persons living in a different house in the same county or quasi-county (cities of 100,000 or more and the balance of their counties) in 1935 not tabulated separately.

[3] In 1960, comprises persons who moved but for whom place of residence in 1955 was not reported. In 1940, comprises persons for whom migration status was not reported.

These three basic sources of demographic information underscore the following salient features concerning interstate mobility: (a) Such mobility has increased steadily since 1900; (b) the rate of increase has been more intense for nonwhites than for whites; and (c) geographically, interstate mobility is most characteristic of urban dwellers, is next highest among rural nonfarm dwellers, and least significant among rural farm dwellers. With respect to intrastate and interstate mobility, the census data indicate that (a) nearly half of the urban and rural nonfarm dwellers moved to a different house in the 5 years prior to 1960, (b) over 17 percent of such urban and rural nonfarm dwellers moved to a different county during the same time period, (c) rural farm dwellers experienced a markedly lower rate of movement, (d) nonwhites generally had a somewhat higher rate of movement than whites, and (e) nonwhites from rural farm areas experienced a markedly higher rate of movement than whites. In short, the foregoing demographic information suggests that the persons most likely to be adversely affected by rigid State residency requirements for voting are those caught up in the two major historic streams of domestic migration—from farm and small town to city, and from the South to other regions of the United States.

Given an intensive rate of geographic mobility in the 1960's, what is the precise nature of State residency laws affecting voting? Modern laws of this genre are surprisingly uniform in regard to their theoretical bases despite considerable diversity in the details of such legislation. In general, State residency requirement laws concerning voting have reflected two fundamental assumptions which were especially important in 19th-century America. First, liberal democracy, while presupposing the accessibility of voting facilities, requires that adequate safeguards be devised to inhibit corruption of elections. Harsh 19th-century experience with "floaters" and the organized voting of transients[7] continues to influence strongly the development of residency provisions relating to the exercise of suffrage. For example, the major concern underlying the voting registration recommendations of the National Municipal League is the desire to thwart voting fraud.[8] Secondly, State residency requirements for voting reflect 19th-century conceptions of federalism which, in practical effect, embody State dominance of the voting process regardless of whether the officers to be filled are National, State, or local. A rationale which has often been invoked to reinforce arguments for State control of voter registration requirements is the notion that a voter should have roots in the community of sufficient permanence to insure adequate familiarity with local candidates and issues. This concept of the "enlightened" voter has relevance for State and local elections, but has been subjected to increasing criticism because it is not germane to presidential elections.[9]

Specifically, the requirements for a minimum term of residence within a State, varying from 6 months in 12 States to a high of 2 years in 4 States, present the greatest difficulty to the mobile who wish to vote in elections for national legislators or presidential and vice-presidential electors. In a few instances, fairly lengthy county, district or precinct requirements also bar voting.[10] The complex of these residency requirements for voting constitutes, quantitatively, the single greatest impediment to voting by those desiring to do so. The American Heritage Foundation has systematically analyzed the causes of nonvoting in several recent presidential and congressional elections. For 1960, the foundation indicated that approximately 104 million adult citizens were of voting age at the time of the November elections. Of these, it estimated that 8 million were mobile adults unable to meet State, county or precinct residency requirements set by State statutes.[11] (See chart III.)

Chart III.—*Residence required by States for country, State, county, and district (or precinct) in 1962* [1]

Required duration of residence	Place where voter must reside for period indicated			
	In the United States [2]	In State [3]	In county	In district (or precinct)
Years:				
2		4		
1		34	3	2
Months:				
12		3		
6		12	9	6
4			2	1
3			3	5
1				1
Days:				
90			7	1
60			6	5
54				1
40			2	1
30			5	16
15				1
10				5
No requirement	53		17	8
Total	53	53	53	53

[1] Informational source: The Council of State Governments: The Book of the States 1962-63, p. 20 (1962); chart form source (with minor revisions): Goldman, "Move—Lose Your Vote," 45 National Municipal Rev. 6, 7 (1956).

[2] States require that the voter shall have been a citizen of the United States for at least 90 days.

[3] Included in these figures are the requirements for voting in Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The American Heritage Foundation emphasizes the impact of residency laws upon what it calls our better educated and more responsible citizens—people with the initiative and character needed to pull up stakes and seek advancement in a new community. Many are educators, lawyers, clergymen; others are business executives.[12] Disenfranchisement by State residency requirements may, however, have a greater effect upon nonprofessionals, particularly those who through occupational necessity are condemned to ceaseless geographical movement. Perhaps the plight of the migratory farmworker in America best exemplifies this type of disenfranchisement:

"Migratory farm laborers move restlessly over the face of the land, but they neither belong to the land nor does the land belong to them. They pass through community after community, but they neither claim the community as a home nor does the community claim them." [13]

Technological changes have brought forced mobility to skilled as well as unskilled workers. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz has stated that, in 1962, 35,000 persons were being "pushed out of their jobs" by the development of automated industrial processes.[14] Similarly, the movement of economically distressed farmers to urban centers and of ethnically disadvantaged Negroes from the South provides additional evidence that disenfranchisement by State residency requirements is not the unique burden of the middle-class professional.

Viewed from the perspective of the State legislatures, residency requirements for voting are part of a complex of residency provisions governing a wide variety of matters. Not only is voting contingent upon particular State residency requirements, but so also are public office holding, the use of some State courts, the practice of many professions, the securing of public financial assistance, and public medical, psychiatric, child welfare, and adoption services.[15] State legislatures derive their authority to impose residency requirements for voting not only from the provisions of their respective State constitutions but also from the Federal Constitution. But the problems basic to the task of rendering State residency requirements for voting more equitable to the mobile are political as well as constitutional. Consequently, the occasional suggestion that Congress assume responsibility to correct the situation[16] has been treated as being both political and constitutionally impractical. Indeed, the immediate efforts to permit voting by movers were made with seemingly full acceptance of the notion of State primacy in the field. Whether this approach actually meets the test of practicality and whether it constitutes the only constitutionally acceptable course are the questions to be answered.

There is little doubt that the major efforts to alleviate the disenfranchisement of the mobile in the 1950's and early 1960's have been predicated upon the assumption that State action was the only feasible solution. In 1953, the Connecticut Legislature passed a law permitting former Connecticut residents to vote for presidential and vice-presidential electors for 15 months after they had moved from the State or until they had fulfilled the residency requirements of the State to which they had moved, if this occurred within 15 months. In the same year, Wisconsin adopted a different approach by passing legislation permitting new residents—who would have been eligible to vote in the State from whence they came had they remained there until election day—to vote for presidential and vice-presidential electors.[17] By 1959, several additional States had adopted laws embodying either the Connecticut or Wisconsin approach. These inceptions of State legislative activity underscored one of the characteristic practical shortcomings of dependence upon State action—lack of uniformity.

In its initial consideration of the voting problems of the mobile in 1952, the Council of State Governments did not deal with positive legislation but chose to attack possible national intervention in the matter. Consequently, by the time the council made a formal recommendation in 1956, the contradictory approaches made by Connecticut and Wisconsin were being appraised by their sister States. The council adopted a resolution supporting the Connecticut plan. In 1955 the National Congress adopted a concurrent resolution suggesting that the States meet the problem, but the resolution did not specify which of the two solutions it deemed best.[18] Finally, in August 1962, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws adopted a proposed uniform act embodying the essentials of the Connecticut plan. Section 1 of this uniform act provides:

"Each citizen of the United States who, immediately prior to his removal to this

---

[7] Yates, "Residence Requirement for Voting: Ten Years of Change," pp. 1–2, a paper delivered at the 1962 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Sept. 5–8, 1962, at Washington, D.C.

[8] Harris, "Model Voter Registration System," July 27 (National Municipal League 1957).

[9] Ogul, "Residence Requirements as Barriers to Voting in Presidential Elections," 3 Midwest J. Pol. Sci. 254–56 (1959).

[10] For complete information, see chart III.

[11] Byrne, "Let's Modernize Our Horse-and-Buggy Election Laws," in the Center for Information on America 4 (1961).

[12] Id. at 5. But Census Bureau information indicates that the largest group of migrants comprise "operatives and kindred workers," the second largest consists of craftsmen and foremen, and the third professional and technical personnel. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Mobility of Population of the United States, April 1958 to 1959, No. 104, at 23 (1960).

[13] Report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, Migratory Labor in American Agriculture 3 (1951).

[14] Des Moines Register, Oct. 21, 1962, p. 3–B.

[15] Note, 12 Wyo. L.J. 50–51 (1957).

[16] See, e.g., Goldman, "Move—Lose Your Vote," 45 National Municipal Rev. 6, 46 (1956).

[17] See Ogul, supra note 7, at 258–259.

[18] Id. at 257–62.

State, was a citizen of another State and who has been a resident of this State prior to a presidential election is entitled to vote for presidential and vice presidential electors at that election, but not for other offices, if (1) he otherwise possesses the substantive qualifications to vote in this State, except the requirement of residence [and registration]; and (2) he complies with the provisions of this act." [19]

Even before the drafting of the proposed uniform act by the Commissioners, several States had modified their residency requirements for voting in accordance with the Connecticut or Wisconsin model. Prior to 1950, a number of States had adopted return-to-vote clauses designed to modify residency requirements to permit intrastate movers to cast ballots in their former precincts. The comprehensive study by Yates [20] indicated, however, that no State had used the return-to-vote clause to alleviate the problem for interstate movers. After 1950, several significant statutory approaches were utilized to meet the growing problem of interstate movers and to render voting easier for intrastate movers as well, and the period between 1950 and 1962 was one of intensified although nonuniform activity. Six States have reduced their State, county or precinct time-of-residence requirements for voting.[21] Twelve States have added or extended return-to-vote clauses affecting intrastate movers.[22]

Eight have adopted a suspension of their State residency requirement for voting for presidential and vice-presidential electors (the Wisconsin approach).[23] Two States adopted a return-to-vote clause (actually by absentee ballot) applicable to movers who had left their States.[24] One State has adopted both the Wisconsin and Connecticut approaches.[25] With respect to the espousal of the Connecticut approach by the National Conference of Commissioners for Uniform State Laws, the immediate prospect for uniformity appear to be dim. In fact, three of the adoptions of the Wisconsin approach were made in November 1962, only 3 months after the Commissioners had indicated support of the alternative plan.[26]

Against this backdrop of nonuniformity and strong emphasis upon States rights conceptions of the status of residency requirements for voting, persistent advocacy has developed for a larger role for the National Congress in these matters. As early as 1952, the National Institute of Municipal Clerks advocated action by Congress to alleviate the voting problems of interstate movers.[27] By the late 1950's and early 1960's, increasing emphasis was placed upon the need for national rather than State action with respect to voting residency requirements affecting congressional and presidential elections. Professor Goldman, writing in the National Municipal Review, argued:

"Congress, for example, could direct that no citizen shall be denied the right to vote in a congressional election for failure to meet a residence requirement. To prevent fraud or indiscriminate voting behavior, Congress could make special provision for adequate identification of recently arrived voters in a community." [28]

In particular, the clash of constitutional views which emerged in debates over proposed civil rights legislation in Congress stimulated extended debate in the law journals. From these exchanges a body of doctrines justifying extension of national influence has developed.[29]

What are the salient constitutional issues? Senator ERVIN, of North Carolina, recently summarized the traditional States rights arguments.[30] He argued that "the States alone possess the right to establish qualifications for voting." [31] This derives from article I, section 2, and the 17th amendment which specifically provide that the electors for Representatives and Senators "in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature." Senator ERVIN cited an 1879 Supreme Court decision [32] as evidence that the Court was committed to this viewpoint soon after the Civil War. Supporters of Senator ERVIN's position occasionally invoke the historic experience of residents in Federal enclaves scattered throughout the States as verifying contentions of exclusive State control of the qualifications of presidential and congressional electors. Furthermore, the two major proposals for alleviating the effect of rigid State residency requirements for voting which emerged in the first full-scale congressional consideration of the problem were predicated upon the assumption that State primacy in the matter of voting qualifications was unquestioned.

In 1961 consideration was given to the residency requirement problem in hearings before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee.[33] Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee, proposed adoption of a constitutional amendment providing that:

"The residence requirement for voting for President and Vice President shall be residence within one of the several States for a period not to exceed 1 year. A qualified voter changing residence from one State to another shall be entitled to vote for President and Vice President by absentee ballot in the State from which he moves for a period of 2 years after the change of residence, provided he is not qualified to vote in another State within that period." [34]

Senator Keating, of New York, proposed an amendment which would lower the State residency requirements for presidential and vice-presidential electors to 90 days.[35] The fact that both Senators Kefauver and Keating felt that a constitutional amendment was necessary purportedly substantiated (or judiciously sought to avoid) the claims of advocates of State primacy regarding voting qualifications. In terms of the prospects of voluntary and uniform State action to meet the problem, Senators Keating and Kefauver were strong in their expressions of disbelief in the practicality of relying upon State action.[36]

What, if anything, can be said for direct congressional action through ordinary legislation? Pragmatically, the prospects for adoption of a constitutional amendment patterned after those proposed by Senators Kefauver and Keating are exceedingly slim. Similarly, the possibilities for voluntary uniform State action are slight. Not only is the nonuniform and rather sporadic experience of the past decade discouraging, but also, because residency requirements for voting are often written into the State's fundamental law, meaningful change can be accomplished in many States only through amendment of the State constitution. Advocates of State activity argue on the authority of article II, section 1, clause 2,[37] and *McPherson* v. *Blacker*,[38] that State constitutional requirements for a minimum term of residence have no limiting authority in situations where a State legislature prescribes lesser requirements for those voting for presidential and vice-presidential electors.[39] Yet the strong resistance to this interpretation that developed at recent Governors conferences portends extended political debate and prolonged litigation should an attempt to implement this approach be made. In short, the practical and constitutional difficulties inherent in State activity suggest that a thorough appraisal of the alternative of direct congressional action via ordinary legislation might be appropriate.

Direct congressional action would meet the need for uniformity and could also incorporate provisions which would embody full recognition of the fact that modern America is a highly mobile society. Professor Goldman has specifically recommended that "Congress develop some system of reward for those States adopting reciprocal arrangements to allow recently moved voters to exercise the franchise in presidential elections without undue delay upon arrival to the new residence." [40] Because concern about possible fraud has been a prime topic in every serious discussion about the possibility of minimizing residency requirements, Goldman has also suggested that modern identification techniques be adapted to the registration and voting process. In order to provide an effective and nationwide system, Congress should, he concluded, create a National Board of Elections.[41] These suggestions, if properly implemented, would render State residency requirements more flexible and yet sufficient to inhibit fraud.

What constitutional justification can be found for such congressional intervention? Perhaps the boldest and most direct invocation of constitutional scripture can be made with respect to section 2 of the 14th amendment. Vitalization of this provision would inhibit the setting of residency requirements for voting by the States by reducing a State's representation in the House of Representatives when the right to vote "is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime." [42] The historical record of the adoption of this amendment and the literal interpretation of the penalty clause underscore the fact that this embodies the most direct of Federal constitutional limitations upon the powers of the States.[43]

---

[19] "Uniform Act for Voting by New Residents in Presidential Elections," in 71 Annual Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws 1 (1962).

[20] See Yates, supra note 5, at 4–7, 14–15.

[21] Alabama, Louisiana, New Jersey, North Carolina, Rhode Island, and Tennessee.

[22] California, Delaware, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Tennessee.

[23] California, Idaho, Massachusetts, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, and Wisconsin.

[24] Connecticut and Vermont.

[25] Arizona.

[26] Washington Post, Nov. 11, 1962, p. E–3, col. 1.

[27] Ogul, supra note 7, at 256.

[28] Goldman, supra note 14, at 46.

[29] See, e.g., Kirby, "Limitations on the Power of State Legislatures Over Presidential Elections," 27 Law and Contemp. Prob. 495–500 (1962).

[30] Erwin "Literacy Tests for Voters: A Case Study in Federalism," 27 Law and Contemp. Prob. 481 (1962).

[31] Id. at 483.

[32] *Ex parte Clarke,* 100 U.S. 399, 418 (1879).

[33] Hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments concerning the nomination and election of the President and Vice President and on qualifications for voting of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961).

[34] S.J. Res. 14, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961). See hearings, supra note 31, pt. 1, at 13.

[35] S.J. Res. 90, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961). See hearings, supra note 31, pt. 1, at 23.

[36] Hearings, supra note 31, pt. 1, at 34, 275–77.

[37] "Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors."

[38] 146 U.S. 1 (1892).

[39] Lugg, "Memorandum Concerning Election Laws," in 71 Annual Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws 10 (1962).

[40] Hearings, supra note 31, pt. 2, at 349.

[41] Id. at 349–50.

[42] Cf. Everett, "Foreword," 27 Law and Contemp. Prob. 327, 328 n. 4 (1962).

The considerations in the Slaughter-House cases [44] which impelled Mr. Justice Miller to reject John Archibald Campbell's argument that the relationship of individuals to the Nation had been fundamentally altered at the expense of the States no longer obtained. Indeed, the fact that Mr. Justice Field and his fellow dissenters in Slaughter-House have long been recognized as more successful prophets, as to the due process and equal protection clauses, than Mr. Justice Miller suggests that implementation of the penalty clause of the 14th amendment would be consistent with contemporary developments in Federal-State relations.

The prospect that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment may be invoked as a limitation on State power to set voting qualifications has received extensive consideration as a result of the recent congressional debates over poll tax and literacy test provisions. It is pertinent to note that the clause was first invoked for this purpose in *Pope* v. *Williams*,[45] a 1904 case involving a complicated State residency requirement for voting, and that the possibility was commented upon favorably by the Court even though the circumstances did not warrant application in that case.

In the oral argument for plaintiff in that case, the contention was made that:

"On the transfer of residence from one State to another a citizen of the United States is vested 'with the same rights as other citizens of that State.' * * * This necessarily includes the right not to be arbitrarily discriminated against in the acquisition and enjoyment of political rights, because of his removal from another State. The statute may, therefore, properly be held also to be repugnant to the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States." [46]

In reply, the attorney for the State of Maryland argued:

"Tests, qualifications, disqualifications, denials, abridgments, distinctions, inequalities, may still lawfully be made at the pleasure of the States, provided only they do not discriminate against the Negro.

"If they apply equally, impartially and uniformly to white and black citizens alike, they are not condemned by the letter or the spirit of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments. They may perhaps cost the States a reduction in their congressional representations in the proportion in which the number of adult males disfranchised in such State legislation bears to the whole number of its adult male population. But this is the only legal consequence, and there is not warrant for the contention that the Federal judiciary can also declare such legislation absolutely void." [47]

Mr. Justice Peckham, in ruling against the plaintiff, did not see fit to utilize the equal protection clause, but left no doubt that the clause could be invoked against State voting regulations of a discriminatory nature. He speculated:

"The question might arise if an exclusion from the privilege of voting were founded upon the particular State from which the person came, excluding from that privilege, for instance, a citizen of the United States coming from Georgia and allowing it to a citizen of the United States coming from New York, or any other State. In such case, an argument might be urged that, under the 14th amendment of the Federal Constitution, the citizen from Georgia was by the State statute deprived of the equal protection of the laws." [48]

In the modern context, the unusually long residency required for voting in several of the Southern States may well constitute invidious discrimination against poor whites and Negroes who by occupational necessity are forced to migrate seasonally. This sort of discrimination, properly documented, could provide a judicially acceptable basis for invocation of the equal protection clause as a limitation upon State authority to set voting qualifications.[49] But where the impact of rigid and long residency requirements does not fall in a manner suggestive of ethnic, class, or economic discrimination, public policy alternatives predicated upon assumptions of congressional supremacy in the field of voting rights deserve full consideration and effective implementation.

Electoral procedures which makes citizenship participation difficult affect not only the rate of participation but often influence the partisan direction of balloting. Thus the ethnic, occupational or political groups which have, and realize that they have, only a very limited ability to influence elections and subsequent public policy often are oriented toward the minority political party within their State. When a longstanding majority party enacts statutes which render voting more difficult, it serves not only to enhance its own position but to weaken the sense of public obligation of some elements in the citizenry and to render more difficult the development of effective two-party competition.[50] These latter elements are traditionally considered foundations of the democratic process.

The Supreme Court, in *United States* v. *Classics*,[51] recognized that Congress had a constitutional obligation to protect the integrity of elections for Representatives to the House of Representatives. The salient commitment of Classic is that those elements in such electoral processes which are integral fall within proper congressional authority under article I, section 4, and article I, section 8, clause 18. Specifically, the majority wrote:

"While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States * * * this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution, to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution 'To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper to carry into Execution the foregoing Powers.' " [52]

Similar interpretative justification for congressional intervention can be found regarding voting for presidential and vice-presidential electors in *Burroughs* v. *United States*.[53] There the Court held that the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 could be applied to such electors.

Indeed, Congress has successfully invoked not only the constitutional provisions directly referring to elections, but also the war power and its power to govern Federal territory. In a 1942 act,[54] for example, Congress granted members of the Armed Forces the right to vote for Members of Congress and presidential and vice-presidential electors without fulfillment of various State registration, residency, or poll tax requirements. The validity of this act has not been tested constitutionally [55] Similarly commentators argue that Congress may, if it desires, draft legislation insuring that residents of enclaves under exclusive Federal jurisdiction may vote for Federal officers in elections regulated by authorities of the State surrounding the enclave.[56] That the Congress has already assumed such authority is found in the statute relating to the voting rights of persons living within the jurisdiction of Shenandoah National Park in the State of Virginia.[57] The statute provides:

"Persons residing in or on any of the said lands embraced in said Shenandoah National Park shall have the right to establish a voting residence in Virginia by reason thereof, and the consequent right to vote at all elections within the county or city in which said land or lands upon which they reside are located upon like terms and conditions, and to the same extent, as they would be entitled to vote in such county or city if the said lands on which they reside had not been deeded or conveyed to the United States of America." [58]

In the final analysis, the solution of the problem of the mobile voter lies not in speculation over alternative modes of constitutional interpretation. Justification for uniform legislation can be derived from a variety of constitutional, statutory and judicial sources. Clearly, impediments to such congressional action are political rather than constitutional. Yet the tensions of our mobile society have themselves pointed toward bolder Federal activity in the field of voting rights. To the extent that urbanites achieve greater representation in the State legislatures and the National House of Representatives, their self-interest renders politically feasible the establishment of a national policy governing residency requirements for voting. The political repercussions of *Baker* v. *Carr* and its progeny give promise of swift developments in this direction.

Memorial Day Should Be Time for Honoring the Memory of America's Heroes—West Virginian William E. Archey Offers Helpful Thoughts on Significance of This Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Sunday, May 30, will be Memorial Day

---

[43] See Bonfield, "The Right to Vote and Judicial Enforcement of Section Two of the Fourteenth Amendment," 46 Cornell L.Q. 108 (1960), for an excellent case for utilization of this provision.

[44] 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 36 (1873).

[45] 193 U.S. 621 (1904).

[46] Id. at 627.

[47] Id. at 631.

[48] Id. at 634.

[49] For a contemporary statement of the argument that this clause may be invoked in voting discrimination cases, see Kirby, supra note 27, at 496.

[50] For an excellent analysis of the relationship of State election laws and political behavior, see Campbell, Converse, Miller & Stokes, "The American Voter," 266–89 (1960).

[51] 313 U.S. 299 (1941).

[52] Id. at 315.

[53] 290 U.S. 534 (1934).

[54] Act of Sept. 16, 1942, ch. 561, 56 Stat. 753, repealed and replaced by Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955, 69 Stat. 584, 5 U.S.C. secs. 2171–2196 (1958).

[55] Kirby, supra note 27, at 500.

[56] Gerwig, "The Elective Franchise for Residents of Federal Areas," 24 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 404 (1956).

[57] 56 Stat. 322 (1942), 16 U.S.C. sec. 403c–1(h) (1958).

[58] Ibid. See also Gerwig, supra note 54, at 421 n. 69.

1965. It is a time of pleasant holidays and recreational travel for millions of Americans, but for each of us it should also be a time for reflection.

On a hundred battlefields, American fighting men have given the last full measure of devotion in order to preserve the way of life which we enjoy. Their sacrifices have bought freedom for the United States. It is appropriate, therefore, that we pause on this occasion to consider the turmoil which besets the world, and to ponder our role as citizens in gaining the long-sought goal of lasting peace.

We echo the words of William E. Archey of Sherrard, W. Va., who in 1952 wrote the following lines:

> We pray for nations, to live in peace,
> for them, to do Thy will;
> God bless our land, our flag so grand,
> May it endure, 'till time stands still.

Now, in a letter just prior to another Memorial Day, Mr. Archey offers additional poetic praise for those who have died in the defense of liberty. He writes that we owe a special tribute of respect to the memory of President John F. Kennedy who fell in service to our country. He points out that Mr. Kennedy's life should be an inspiration to all for the betterment of mankind in an atmosphere of selfless devotion to the public good.

Mr. President, I commend William E. Archey for putting into words these thoughts that are in the hearts and minds of so many of us as we approach another Memorial Day.

Test Pilot W. L. (Lou) Everett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the recent tragic death of a courageous and talented test pilot who was involved in development of a revolutionary new aircraft occurred amid circumstances which afforded a maximum of publicity.

This accident occurred on April 27, 1965. A review of data on this aircraft indicates that it is a sound flight concept and that the plane should be further developed as a valuable addition to our air strength.

The U.S. Army, General Electric Co., and the Ryan Aeronautical Co., have made an intensive investigation of the plane's integral systems and its performance data previous to April 27. The conversion from fans for vertical flights to jets for horizontal flight had been made by these planes more than 1,000 times. At the time of the April 27 failure, the pilot was checking the cockpit prior to converting the aircraft from conventional jet flight to the fan-powered mode used for vertical flight and hovering.

The plane involved had logged more than 36 hours of flight time requiring 45 conversions from fans to straight jets.

I share with the Ryan Co., and the family and friends of W. L. "Lou" Everett their sense of loss, and with the rest of the Nation deeply appreciate the contribution to the future of America's aircraft development that his career represented.

Federal Government and Illinois Partners in Crime and Vice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to tell the Members of this House how the Federal Government and the government of the State of Illinois are partners in filth behind a false front of morality. I refer to the fact that gambling remains illegal in Illinois so that it may be the preserve of the mobs who thus finance their many criminal ventures—including the political protection that keeps all varieties of crime and vice free from extermination. Illinois' all-stifling crust of crime is the illegitimate offspring of gambling, by government, although this is one case where it is the sire who is receiving the support money.

To me, Mr. Speaker, it is disgusting that our Nation and States can be so ignorant of the cancer that immature government antigambling legislation has allowed to grow in the tissues of our body politic. The extent of this web of filth is fantastic.

Last year, the parimutuel turnover in Illinois came to $425 million. Testimony before the McClellan committee pegged off-track betting $50 billion annually, as about 42 percent of illegal gambling, making the Nation's illegal gambling total about $120 billion. On a population basis, Illinois would have $6.6 billion of this. No wonder Illinois is a dream come true for the mob. They get 10 percent of the gross turnover. The people of Illinois have no one to blame but the duly elected State and Federal Governments who allow gambling to remain illegal and uncontrolled.

Only government controlled and regulated gambling will take essential gambling revenues out of the slimy coffers of the underworld. Until then, the State and Federal Governments will be partners in drug syndicates and prostitution rings just as if those governments were consciously bankrolling perversion and filth. This cocomplacency in crime has made the two governments joint financers of filth, joint fingers on the Chicago killer's trigger or addict's dope needle.

I urge my fellow Members of Congress to mobilize themselves in favor of government-run gambling so that they may overcome this cruel perversion of the relationship between morality and government. A national lottery in the United States would be a forward step in the right direction.

Independence of Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, May 25, the small Arab kingdom of Jordan celebrated its 19th anniversary of independence. On this memorable occasion, we want to extend belated felicitations to His Majesty, King Hussein.

Its future, which once was bleak indeed, now appears among the brightest in the Middle East, and we should take this opportunity to recall both its past and present achievements.

Jordan's position on the crossroads of the ancient world has provided it with an extensive and well-documented history. Today, while archeologists excavate the origins of the city of Jericho, which extend back to, at least, 6000 B.C., the modern traveler is also able to visit the beautifully preserved and impressive sites of the Roman League of Ten Cities—the Decapolis—at Jerash, Philadelphia—the modern Amman—and other places. Lest it be thought that the flourishing civilization which existed in Jordan is derived solely from the nearly 1,000 years of European rule, mention must be made of the Nabataean Kingdom. Located in southern Jordan, this Arab State developed a distinctive blend of Arab and Greco-Roman elements into a culture which has provided Jordan with one of the most overwhelmingly beautiful ruins of the ancient world: Petra. Dubbed "the rose-red city, half as old as time" by its rediscovery in the 19th century, it contains some of the very finest examples of Greco-Roman architecture anywhere in the world. And, the archeologists inform us that the people of this astounding kingdom developed and maintained a system of irrigation canals and conduits in the southern desert of Jordan which far exceeds in extent and workmanship anything which we in the 20th century have as yet constructed for such parched regions of the world.

After long periods of administration by various foreign powers, from the Romans through the Ottomans and, most recently, the British, Jordan finally was allowed to follow its own path after May 25, 1946. The immediate postwar period in Jordanian history was not the most stable imaginable, for the country was involved in serious internal and external issues which unfortunately adversely affected its political and economic development.

Just over 12 years ago, on May 5, 1953, a new king was formally enthroned, Hussein. Heir to the glories of the Hashimite family, the new King was determined that his country would become one of the most stable and progressive states in the Middle East. With the vigor and vision of youth, he undertook, once his internal position was secure, to demonstrate that enlightened constitutional monarchy could provide the citizens of Jordan with an increasingly prosperous and meaningful life.

With American and British assistance, King Hussein set out on a series of industrial and agricultural programs which would increase the national income and provide a better standard of living. It is a pleasure to report that the Government's programs have been extremely successful: Jordan's annual increase in gross national product is running at approximately 10 percent, one of the highest in the world; in contrast to most of the Middle Eastern countries, the land reform program has been outstandingly well implemented, and land ownership is widespread; the 5-year development program is proceeding apace, with new factories and industries providing increased employment in such varied pursuits as mining, textiles, flour, and processed foodstuffs. In sum, it is fair to say that Jordan's economic development is one of the most pleasant items of news to report from the Middle East. In fact, the political and economic stability which Jordan has experienced under King Hussein has nearly eliminated the widespread opposition to the monarchy which for so long plagued the attempts of the Government to improve any facet of Jordanian life.

It is appropriate, therefore, that we as Americans, who have generously assisted the Jordanians in their attempt to achieve economic and political progress, today recognize the effort which this country's courageous King and people have themselves expended toward the same goal. We wish them every success for continued progress in the future.

Student-Teacher Achievement Is Outstanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this method of calling to the attention of the Congress a most outstanding program entitled "Student-Teacher Achievement Recognition (Star) Program."

In this program, deserved recognition is given for scholastic achievement, and it is my considered judgment that more such programs should be instituted. In this day and age, we need the best minds that we can possibly find, and those with great ability should be encouraged.

We recognize and encourage the athlete with plaudits and scholarships, but too often we neglect the top student. This should not be so, and the star program is helping to overcome this neglect.

I was most pleased that the star student selected from my district was Miss Beth Roady, daughter of my warm, personal friends, Dr. and Mrs. Elston "Steve" Roady, of Tallahassee, Fla.

She had been selected as the star program winner in my district, with 11 other outstanding students named from our other Florida congressional districts. From their number, a State star student was selected.

One of the outstanding aspects of this program is that it pays well-deserved tribute to the teachers of these fine students.

Each of these students select a teacher who has had the most influence on their academic career. In the case of Miss Roady, this teacher was Mrs. Laura Neubauer, sixth-grade teacher at Frank Hartsfield School in Tallahassee. She is an outstanding example of the dedicated teacher, and I was deeply pleased to see this recognition paid to both of them.

Each of the district winners were guests at a State banquet followed by a week-long tour of Florida. It was a thrilling experience, and the recognition given them will encourage other bright students to achieve their full potential.

I think this is a program worthy of note. Miss Roady is an example of the fine young Americans who have the ability, and should be encouraged and recognized. Our future will depend upon how well we train those who come behind us, and I feel that the star program does this.

I commend it highly, while extending warm congratulations to Beth Roady and Mrs. Neubauer.

Congressional Trainees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, some Members of Congress have introduced bills to allow a Member to use part of his clerk hire allowance to employ two high school graduates who are enrolling or enrolled in college, for a 3-month summer period for not more than a total of $1,500 or $750 each. As a member of the committee that is studying this proposal I am enthusiastically in full support of it.

If I had any doubts as to the value from all angles of this summer trainee program my doubts were washed away by the success story of one of my own students whom I placed upon my summer payroll for 3 months each summer, although it meant losing the balance of the year's base pay allowance.

Kassian Kovalcheck, son of Mr. and Mrs. Kassian Kovalcheck, of Irwin, Pa., was a summer employee of mine for the past 2 years. I thought I saw a great deal of potential in this fine young man for future success. His work for me was outstanding and I realize that my first impressions were quite accurate. In addition, I was very pleased to note that Kassian was recently awarded a $2,000 graduate assistantship to Indiana University for the study of speech and a $2,250 graduate assistantship to the University of Illinois.

Many of you will remember his father, Kassian, Sr., a great football star for the University of Pittsburgh. Young Kassian did not distinguish himself athletically, as did his father, but it must certainly be recognized that he distinguished himself academically.

His experience here on the Hill was undoubtedly a valuable one in his development, and I am sure it will play a role in his future. We should encourage more young men like Kassian to come to Washington and work for the legislative branch during their free summer months. I therefore ask all Members to consider the proposals before the Congress with respect to summer trainees and to act favorably thereon.

"Prizefight" Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, professional boxing, or "prizefighting" needs fumigation.

The American public—not just sports fans—has been "suckered" by the "prizefight" racketeers for many years.

The news media, principally, and a few miserable profiteers who deal in human misery, have succored the "prizefight" business.

Amateur boxing, maybe, but "prizefighting" certainly does not qualify as a sport. "Prizefighting," for the combatants, is a miserable pursuit. Promotion of "prizefighting," as a business, is a wretched racket.

For years, I have expected the news media to expose the "prizefight" racket. The news media are quick and eager to expose every other facet of human activity—especially human frailties. Books, TV documentaries, newspaper exposes, and radio commentaries have investigated and reported—in breadth and depth—about "city hall," dope, Republicans, labor unions, honor-code violations, Selma, ad infinitum. But, all the news media continue to promote and glamorize the "prizefight" game and to lionize the pugs.

The reason for this seeming anomaly has just occurred to me. The news media derive enormous profits from this depraved and fraudulent business.

Without intensive news media promotion and excessive coverage, the prizefight racket would succumb quicker than the most recent heavyweight challenger. If the news media would keep the reporting of prizefighting in proper proportion and perspective, it would quickly wither and die and not be attractive to promoters and racketeers. How can an otherwise reputable industry continue to promote and subsidize such a totally unworthy endeavor?

Is there an area wherein the news media fail more completely to measure up to the standards we expect of other businesses and professions in our society? There certainly are better ways to entertain people and to earn a profit.

I urge Congress to refrain from enacting any regulatory legislation now. I suggest that the news media may wish to salvage their reputations and demonstrate that they can act responsibly in the public interest and forgo the paltry dollars gained at the expense of battered men and a gullible public.

If the news media can expurgate themselves, the absolution would be much more effective than if prizefighting were made subject to Federal regulations.

Mr. Speaker, if the news media can demonstrate their responsibility and capacity for restraint in this area, I would prefer to give them a chance before we impose Federal regulations and controls on the prizefight business.

Other sports have rectified their problems, even scandals, intramurally without Federal intervention. Boxing might do the same if the news media would perform selflessly in the public interest.

National Issues Poll for 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as in past years, I am inserting in the RECORD the results of the annual national issues poll for the 13th District of Illinois. This 1965 questionnaire was circulated to postal patrons in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois. To date, more than 27,000 people have responded to the 1965 questionnaire, a higher response than in previous years.

In my letter to constituents enclosing a tabulation of the poll, I made the following comments which indicate my conviction that the questionnaire is a most helpful device in the continuing effort to make representative government work properly:

> The response to the 1965 national issues poll has been excellent. To date more than 27,000 returns have been received—compared with 19,000 returns in 1963 and 24,000 in 1964—and completed questionnaires are still being received every day. I am grateful for your willingness to participate and for the deep interest it demonstrates in the affairs of our country. While it is not possible to acknowledge individually all comments made on the completed questionnaires, I want you to know that I have read them with great interest.
>
> According to the latest census figures, the 13th District ranks first in the Nation in family income, first in least unemployment, and tied for first in the number of years of residents' education. The unique nature of the district, coupled with your keen and knowledgeable interest in national issues, makes the results of this national issues poll, as shown on the reverse side of this letter, most interesting.
>
> For representative government to work effectively, there must be a continuous two-way flow of information between Washington, D.C. and the district. Toward this end, the poll is well worth the time, effort, and cost if it is informative, stimulates discussion and thought, points out topics where a lack of information exists, and encourages comment and communication from residents of our 13th District. Certainly, the response this year indicates that the poll has served its purpose.
>
> Thank you again for your time and effort in considering and responding to these important national questions. I look forward to hearing from you in the future on matters of mutual concern, and assure you that your letters will always be welcome and your views thoughtfully considered. By calling on me in my capacity as your link between Illinois and the Federal Government in Washington, D.C., you will assist me in providing the type of representation that our district desires and deserves.

The results follow:

RESULTS OF 1965 NATIONAL ISSUES POLL

1. Civil rights—Do you favor legislation:

(a) To permit Federal registrars to register citizens denied the right to vote because of their race? Yes, 67.8 percent; no, 29.1 percent; no answer, 3.1 percent.

(b) To make the Civil Rights Commission permanent? Yes, 42.2 percent; no, 47.9 percent; no answer, 9.9 percent.

2. Do you favor revision of immigration laws to gradually eliminate the "national origin quota system" and substitute priorities based on needed skills and relationship to U.S. citizens and resident aliens? Yes, 68.4 percent; no, 27.6 percent; no answer, 4.0 percent.

3. Vietnam—Do you favor:

(a) The present U.S. program of stepped-up military and financial assistance? Yes, 48.5 percent; no, 28.7 percent; no answer, 22.8 percent.

(b) An intensified military effort using troops and assistance from other free southeast Asian nations in cooperation with U.S. forces? Yes, 62.7 percent; no, 21.1 percent; no answer, 16.2 percent.

(c) A negotiated settlement for withdrawal of U.S. troops and assistance and establishment of a neutralist government? Yes, 33.7 percent; no, 46.2 percent; no answer, 20.1 percent.

4. Do you favor continued U.S. aid to Indonesia and the United Arab Republic? Yes, 7.6 percent; no, 86.2 percent; no answer, 6.2 percent.

5. Do you favor U.S. trade with Communist bloc nations of:

(a) Food, such as the 1964 wheat sales? Percent yes, 50.1; percent no, 46.4; percent no answer, 3.5.

(b) Industrial and consumer goods? Percent yes, 31.7; percent no, 61.8; percent no answer, 6.5.

6. A bill providing additional Federal assistance for health care for the aged will undoubtedly pass Congress this year.[1] Of the major proposals under consideration, do you favor:

(a) "Medicare"—administration's King-Anderson bill financed by social security taxes? Percent yes, 22.9; percent no, 59.3; percent no answer, 17.8.

(b) "Eldercare"—Herlong-Curtis (American Medical Association) bill? Percent yes, 46.9; percent no, 32.2; percent no answer, 20.9.

(c) "Bow bill"—provides tax deductions and tax credits for purchase of private health insurance? Percent yes, 47.8; percent no, 28.3; percent no answer, 23.9.

7. Do you favor President Johnson's proposal for Federal rent subsidies to low income families in lieu of additional public housing? Percent yes, 25.3; percent no, 66.7; percent no answer, 8.

8. Many education bills are pending in Congress.[2] Do you favor:

(a) Administration proposal for preschool training of youngsters in urban and rural slum areas? Percent yes, 49.2; percent no, 41.7; percent no answer, 9.1.

(b) Administration proposal of $1 billion of aid to elementary and secondary schools allocated by the number of students whose family incomes are under $2,000? Percent yes, 45.6; percent no, 43; percent no answer, 11.4.

(c) Administration proposal for Federal aid to private schools? Percent yes, 21.2; percent no, 67.1; percent no answer, 11.7.

(d) Administration proposal of $70 million for Federal scholarship grants to 140,000 needy first year college students? Percent yes, 52; percent no, 28.1; percent no answer, 9.9.

(e) Return of 2 percent of Federal income tax collections from each State to that State, earmarked for education but without Federal involvement? Percent yes, 69.7; percent no, 20.5; percent no answer, 9.8.

(f) Ayres' bill providing each family a tax credit of up to $100 per year for the amount of State and local school taxes or a tax credit of $50 per year for each child in school up to a maximum of $200? Percent yes, 61.8; percent no, 25.4; percent no answer, 12.8.

(g) Permitting tax deductions and/or tax credits for partial costs of college education expenses? Percent yes, 80.6; percent no, 14; percent no answer, 5.4.

9. Do you favor repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which now permits States to enact "right to work" laws? Percent yes, 19.2; percent no, 69.6, percent no answer, 11.2.

10. Do you favor Federal legislation to tighten control of the sale and purchase of firearms? Percent yes, 68.4; percent no, 29.9; percent no answer, 1.7.

11. Do you favor the proposed change in length of term from 2 years to 4 years for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives? Percent yes, 61.7; percent no, 34.4; percent no answer, 3.9.

The Heritage of a Kitchen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, if a gentleman named George Washington Arbaugh were alive today and visited the Washington region, he might find the rolling hillsides of Maryland and Virginia, from which his forefathers came, a familiar sight, but I trust that the thing which would catch his eye the fastest is a kitchen.

---

[1] H.R. 6675, which passed the House on April 8, incorporated mainly the features of (a) above.

[2] NOTE.—H.R. 2362, which passed the House on March 26, included features (a), (b), and (c) above. An average of the responses to these three parts is as follows: Percent yes, 38.7; percent no, 50.6; percent no answer, 10.7.

You see, this kitchen, which Mr. Arbaugh constructed more than a century ago, is a long, long way from home. Mr. Arbaugh built his home in 1860 in the Shasta Valley of Siskiyou County under the shadow of California's spectacular Mount Shasta. Today the kitchen of this home is located in the new Museum of History and Technology here in Washington.

The Smithsonian Institution selected this historic old room to exemplify for eastern citizens the days of the California gold rush. Under the direction of C. Malcolm Watkins, the Smithsonian's curator of cultural history, and his wife, Joan, the Smithsonian did a magnificent job in recapturing the authentic flavor of the Old West.

When discovered through the combined efforts of the California State society, one of its most active members, Washingtonian Ralph Lorimer, and Mrs. Calla Lukes, a Siskiyou County historian, artist and community leader who conducted an untiring search for a proper historic kitchen, the old Arbaugh home had been abandoned for approximately 30 years. White face cattle grazed by Siskiyou County rancher Robert Wells wandered in and out of the old building, but the tongue and groove pine board walls and ceilings had withstood the rigors of time and weather and the original blue paint still showed on the interior.

Two specialists in construction and restoration of old buildings, George H. Watson and Charles H. Rowell, who have installed all the period rooms of the Museum's Institute of History and Technology, flew to California and took the kitchen apart bit by bit, numbering every board as it came out so that it could be reconstructed in exactly the same manner when moved to Washington.

The kitchen had never been modernized so everything was as it had been more than a century ago when it first was built. None of the original furniture survived, but Mr. and Mrs. Watkins researched the area, talked to many old time Siskiyou County residents and with information thus gathered accurately reconstructed the kitchen's interior with appropriate substitute furniture, utensils and stove, all of which were used in California during the third quarter of the 19th century. So complete is the exhibit that a pair of the original "Levi's" made by Levi Straus in San Francisco during the gold rush days hang on a nail in the wall.

May I commend to my colleagues in the House of Representatives this fine exhibit and urge them to stop by the Smithsonian and take a look at this bit of the Old West. As a period room, this kitchen is unique among exhibits in eastern museums.

This kitchen will help bridge the gap between the past and the future and I am sure that George Washington Arbaugh, truly a 19th century pioneer, would be proud of the way the Smithsonian is trying to tell the people of the 20th century and even the 21st century a little about the life which he lived.

Arbaugh was typical of the men who with their families turned their backs on the comforts of home and went west in search of many riches, land, water, and, of course, gold.

Born in Alabama in 1822, Arbaugh grew up in this land. He and his bride of 2 years moved west to California in 1850. He fought Indians and outlaws. He prospected throughout Shasta County and in the Trinity Alps. He tried his hand in the ferry business before he settled in the Shasta Valley of Siskiyou County in 1855 and turned his efforts to farming. He acquired the Wayside Ranch for grazing of cattle and raising of grain and much of the original ranch holdings remain in the Arbaugh family.

A member of this large family is Mrs. Calla Lukes, Arbaugh's great granddaughter and an active resident of the Siskiyou County community of Etna. I was proud to escort this wonderful lady as she snipped the ribbon to officially open the Smithsonian exhibit a short time ago.

Mrs. Lukes, who has done so much to find the proper kitchen, wanted to see the completed job so she traveled here to Washington where her daughter, Rita Brunner, lives. Mrs. Lukes was properly proud of her pioneer heritage and of her great-grandfather who had done so much for the settling of Siskiyou County a century ago.

She called to my attention a passage from a statement made by George Washington Arbaugh many, many years ago:

> The sum of my political view is comprised in a strenuous desire to mete out equal justice to all men, not being biased by any consideration of selfish interest or self-aggrandizement. I hold that the principles of truth and honor are as rigidly binding upon, and apply as well to, the conduct of government affairs as those of individuals; and that the laws of the country should be so framed that the greatest good may accrue to the greatest number.

This is the type of man who made our country strong. This is the type of man who will keep our country strong today and in the future. It is fitting that a bit of his heritage may be preserved so our children may marvel at the hardships which these people underwent in order to make our Nation great.

Let us measure up to the sturdy example set by these mighty men.

H.R. 1047

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 1047, a bill which would amend section 102(a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944. This would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to eradicate ragweed.

Ragweed is a plant which is injurious to the health of many persons and also impairs their economic self-sufficiency.

Therefore, I earnestly urge that the Department of Agriculture recommend a study to review the most efficient means of destroying this plant in all areas of these United States.

Approximately 10 million Americans suffer from ragweed. They lose about $140 million a year in wages from the effects of this plant. No conclusive data exists to support the theory of hereditary transfer of the allergy although the data does lean toward evidence of allergic family background. It costs each sufferer approximately $100 per year for medication—$60 for injections and from $20 to $40 for other medication. In addition, many serious illnesses do result from this allergy especially bronchial asthma which kills 4,000 persons a year and it has been found that 1 out of 3 hayfever sufferers develop this serious illness. Other serious respiratory diseases and complications may result. The Air Pollution Control Board of the Department of Health of the State of New York considers hayfever to be a major public health problem.

Ragweed is found in every State in the United States. About half the States can be found to have "no refuge areas"—no place in the State where sufferers can find relief. Ragweed is found to be most prevalent in the North Central and Northeastern States followed by the Southern, Great Plains, Intermountain, Pacific Coast States, and Hawaii. There is little beneficial use for this plant and by far it is more unbeneficial. Uses are to cover bare lands and the seeds of the plant are eaten by some birds. The ragweed season reaches its peak in July, August, and September. This plant grows in disturbed soil along roadsides, edges of gardens, and in vacant fields and lots.

There are three methods of control. Herbicides is most effective, however the drift of the chemical spray is known to cause crop damage in farm areas. Cultivation and crowding out of ragweed by planting thick vegetation as grass, alfalfa, clover, and others will stifle ragweed which is not a competitive plant. This method is very much recommended along with the third method, that of cutting. If the ragweed plant is cut before flowering this will eliminate the pollen which is the cause of the allergy. The soil will not be disturbed—mowing will disturb the soil and cause the dormant pollen to germinate and expand plant growth—and the pollen in the air will be controlled. Niagara Falls, N.Y., has a program whereby all citizens are responsible for cutting the ragweed on one's property. If this is not done, then the city will do the cutting and add the bill for this service to the person's taxes.

I believe the most proper and just method of eradication would be and could be carried out by the Department of Agriculture. The taxpayer-consumer is deserving of this service in view of the generous appropriation authorized for the Department of Agriculture today.

REA Encroachment—Is the End in Sight?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the past three decades have marked a most unprecedented growth in the size and power of the Federal Government. This growth has been accompanied by an ever increasing encroachment by the administrative agencies upon the prerogatives of the legislative branch even to the extent that the executive has developed a most adept, a most professional ability to circumvent the power granted to the Congress by the Constitution. Today, success in a Washington bureaucracy seems to be measured in terms of its devious ability to thrive, grow, and to perpetuate itself, by administrative actions that bypass and encroach upon the power of the Congress.

The Rural Electrification Administration provides a good example of just such an agency. REA's major objective appears to be aimed at changing its program from the one established by Congress and designed primarily to bring electricity to unserved persons in rural areas into a program involving a full-fledged urban and industrial utility operation and responsibility. Without arguing the merits of whether this reorientation is good or bad, whether it should or should not be done, Congress—not REA—should make this decision, after full hearings, open discussion, and arrival at a consensus that has fairly considered and weighed all points of view.

REA over the years has continuously waged a cold and often successful war to thwart the congressionally approved standards in the 1936 act.

Like all cold wars, it has been long in duration. The strategy has been designed to secure a gradual but steady attrition of congressionally approved REA standards, with the aggressors carefully calculating their actions so as to obtain their objective with a minimum of exposure and without provoking a full-scale counterattack.

THE INSURGENTS

The insurgents in this cold war are not those persons in rural areas who joined together in the cooperative device to supply themselves with electric power. They are not the local cooperative members. The aggressors, rather, are the directors and administrators of the REA program in Washington, and their allies, whose primary objective is to use the Rural Electrification Administration to perpetuate and expand their own bureaucracies even at the expense of sacrificing the objectives of the original program.

Thus, the real problem today is not the basic program itself but the emoluments created by the extreme actions of a Federal agency designed to insure its continued growth and existence. For example, REA now seeks to serve urban as well as rural persons by promoting a concept of exclusive service areas. This can only result in the inevitable assumption of a utility responsibility for electric power in such areas. REA seeks new area development duties which have to do with broad problems of economic stability and growth. It openly espouses a desire to weaken or remove the congressionally established standards throughout its program even at the expense of an increase in interest rates and continually expands its activities in an effort to justify a growing annual payroll which now tops the $11 million mark.

The major objectives of REA's campaign have been aimed at eliminating administratively the "rural area" and "unserved persons" provisions in the enabling legislation and the congressionally accepted "cost and availability of power" yardsticks for generation and transmission loans that accompanied Senate approval of the 1936 act.

Although a rural area was clearly defined by the Congress as one not included within the boundaries of a village having a population in excess of 1,500, REA developed the incidental argument as a means of sidestepping this provision. This philosophy contended that REA could loan funds for a generating plant to supply electricity to a town in excess of 1,500 population if such service was deemed incidental to supplying electricity to unserved persons in the surrounding legitimate rural areas.

ANOTHER PROVISION

REA also contrived a way to bypass the "unserved persons" provision of the act through its "once a recipient always a recipient" policy. Here, REA contends that a borrower not having central station service at the time of its first REA loan continued to be a person without central station service eligible for generation and transmission loans even though its wholesale power was being furnished from another source. Assuming that such policy was desirable, it was a congressional—not an agency—decision. To do so administratively was a clear cut encroachment on the language of the act.

The basic congressionally accepted requirements for generation plants has always been that loans could be made only if there is no adequate and dependable source of power available to meet the consumer's needs or that the rates offered by existing power sources would result in a higher cost of power for consumers than the cost from facilities financed by REA.

This policy was honored by all administrators down to the present.

Claude Wickard, REA Administrator under both the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, contended that "For REA to deviate from this policy—either by refusing to make loans or by making those that do not meet the requirements—would obviously be contrary to the will of the people as expressed through the Congress."

The present Administrator, however, a few months after taking office, changed the generation and transmission ground rules by adding, without congressional approval, a third criterion to REA's policy. This change, which had no basis in law, authorized generation and transmission loans "to protect the security and effective use of REA-financed systems." Although the REA Act does require the Administrator to certify the security of a loan, nothing in the act even implies that this responsibility should be expanded to include the borrower. The effect of this new criterion was to weaken the standards governing generation and transmission loans by permitting other factors to be included as justifications.

This single action brought to a culmination the rural electrification program as Congress has known it for nearly 25 years and substituted a comprehensive generation and transmission program covering all uses of electricity and all types of customers. As a result, loans for generation and transmission facilities took an increasing percentage of the annual loan authorizations.

FULL IMPACT

The increase, however, does not give the full impact of the third criterion. This did not become apparent until it became evident last year that the third criterion was being used to encroach further upon the "unserved person" and "rural area" limitations in the 1936 act. In this instance, the Administrator broke off contract negotiations being conducted with power companies—as directed by the fiscal year 1964 Appropriations Committee's reports—when the companies refused to support the establishment of exclusive service areas within their State. He then approved a generation and transmission loan on the basis that exclusive service areas were a prerequisite of a reasonable contract. Thus he used the third criterion, a policy without basis in Federal law, to force the application of a policy that was contrary to the laws of the State under which the co-op operated.

This encroachment by the REA Administrator on the laws and policies of Congress, on the affairs of the States, and the operations of power suppliers within the States is the major REA problem today.

Although congressional committees have made some attempts toward checking this gradual undermining by the REA of congressional standards only firm action can now stem the tide. As a lending agency, REA's broad authority emanates from the legislative committees of Congress but there is no regular monitoring or accounting to these committees for its actions. REA goes scot free, without checks or balances, except for its annual appearance before the Appropriations Committee for authorization of borrowing from the Treasury.

"REA encroachment—is the end in sight?" Obviously, "No," at least not until the Congress takes a firm stand and stops the administrative rewriting of the law by this agency. There are some constructive steps that can be taken:

First. Item justification: With the exception of REA, Federal agencies primarily involved in power programs present their annual request to the Appropriations Committee on a line item basis. This gives Congress an opportunity to consider and specifically approve their construction programs. To the contrary, REA makes a lump-sum request which is justified by a vague type of survey among its borrowers. In other words, the financier decides how much he will provide for loans on the basis of how much the bank mortgagees decide they can spend. By requiring REA to present a line item budget to the Appropriations Committee each year for all loans over, for example, $2,500,000, would give Congress the same control over this agency's lending activities that it exercises over Federal power construction agencies and would tend to reduce REA's presently increasing encroachment on congressional prerogatives. It would also give the Nation's farmers and their elected representatives a chance to check diversion of the Department of Agriculture's efforts to purposes unrelated to agriculture and rural areas.

CRITERION ELIMINATION

Second. Elimination of the third criterion: The Appropriations Committee could correct this matter and at the same time strengthen generation and transmission standards by prohibiting funds from being used for generation and transmission loans unless they result in lower cost power to consumers. This administrative edict, the third criterion, offers no advantage to the farm user of electricity and negates the longstanding congressionally accepted standards that generation and transmission loans be limited to instances where power is inadequate or where rates can be reduced.

The third criterion was set forth by its proponents as being necessary to eliminate unfair provisions in borrowers' contracts and to insure territorial protection. Territory, however, is a State—not a Federal matter—and many States, without REA interference, have made substantial progress in working out equitable territorial arrangements. As for wholesale contract provisions, every effort should be made to insure their reasonableness, particularly in view of Congress support—and the Budget Bureau's endorsement—of the negotiated contract in preference to construction of generation and transmission facilities.

REA over the years has always taken into consideration the reasonableness of proposed contracts in considering generation and transmission loan applications. This was done without a third criterion. Unfortunately, this criterion has become a club in the Administrator's hands which he has used to become involved in matters beyond his authority and a means by which he subtly operates his program contrary to the direction of Congress.

Third. Judicial review of REA loans: Legislation could be enacted to provide for judicial review of the Administrator's decision either by amendment to the REA Act or by amendment to the Administrative Procedures Act. This would provide an aggrieved party, either a cooperative or a power supplier, with an avenue in the courts for review of any generation and transmission loan decision made by the REA.

Regardless of what Congress may choose to do, one thing is certain—REA's abuse of the law and its encroachment upon congressional prerogatives must be stopped. The longer such activity is permitted to continue, the more difficult it will become to correct.

Professional Boxing Stinks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, professional boxing stinks.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. FRED R. HARRIS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma.

Rev. Dean W. Miller, minister, Palm Desert Community Church, Palm Desert, Calif., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, before the mountains were brought forth or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God. A thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past and as a watch in the night. Against the background of Thine everlastingness, grant us insight and vision, that we may behold things seen as temporal and things unseen as eternal.

Bless these, Thy servants, assembled in this hallowed Senate Chamber. Help them to weigh the clamoring demands of the times in the light of eternal truth. Give Thy servants the sturdy faith that amidst the perplexing and confounding evils of our day, Thou canst wrest good out of evil, and that all things work together for good to them that love Thee and serve Thine eternal purpose. Spirit of God, descend upon their hearts and guide them as they lead this Nation in the ways of righteousness and peace.

"God of justice, save the people from the
clash of race and creed,
From the strife of class and faction,
Make our Nation free, indeed.
Keep her faith in simple manhood
strong as when her life began,
Till it finds its full fruition in the
brotherhood of man."

We ask it in the name and spirit of Jesus Christ, who affirmed, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God." Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1965.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FRED R. HARRIS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HARRIS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 26, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 22, 1965, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 701) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreements, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes.

REORGANIZATION PLANS NOS. 3, 4, AND 5 OF 1965—MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NOS. 193, 194, AND 195)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, embodying three reorganization plans. Without objection, they will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and appropriately referred.

The messages were referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1965, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization of the locomotive inspection activities of certain personnel employed by or attached to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I have stressed that we must reorganize and modernize the Government's organization structure in order to focus responsibilities, increase efficiency, and meet present day needs more effectively. The reorganization plan, which accords with recommendations made to me by the Interstate Commerce Commission, supports these objectives. It will make possible necessary changes in the organization and administration of the Commission's railroad safety operations.

The Commission's ability to organize and carry out most effectively its responsibilities for railroad safety is now severely limited by certain anachronistic provisions of the locomotive inspection statutes. These provisions go back to an earlier period before steam locomotives were replaced almost completely by diesel engines. At that time locomotive boilers were temperamental and dangerous and special measures were required to enforce adequate safety standards. Present law specifies in detail the method of appointing locomotive inspectors, the functions to be performed by them, and the organization structure for administering inspection activities. While these provisions may have been suited to conditions 50 years ago, they are clearly inappropriate today.

Progress in railroad technology has not eliminated the need for locomotive inspection. Locomotive inspection is still essential for the safety of employees, passengers, and cargo. The Interstate Commerce Commission, however, properly should not be held to account for the performance of this important function as long as it lacks authority to make those changes in organization and operations which it deems necessary to meet current safety needs and to promote maximum economy and efficiency. The primary purpose of the accompanying reorganization plan is to terminate outdated arrangements which now stand in the way of the most effective management of the Commission's railroad safety program.

Organizational flexibility is at present restricted by the statutory requirement that there be 50 locomotive inspection districts and at least 1 inspector for each such district. The number of inspectors and districts cannot be adjusted to accommodate to changes in workload or other relevant factors.

Locomotive inspection is rigidly separated from related railroad safety activities performed under the Interstate Commerce Commission. The locomotive inspection statutes restrict inspectors of locomotives to the inspection of locomotives only and prevent the inspection of locomotives—except brakes and safety appliances—by other Commission railroad safety personnel. Thus, the Commission is prevented from making the most effective utilization of its total staff of locomotive and train inspectors. In order to eliminate the present uneconomical duplicate visits to railroad yards and otherwise to promote the most economical and effective administration of its railroad safety responsibilities, the Commission should have the authority to assign staff to duties for which they may be qualified by training and experience. The reorganization plan will make this possible.

Organizational flexibility is hampered further by the provision for Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of a Director and two Assistant Directors of Locomotive Inspection. Originally, these officials were to be selected with reference to their practical knowledge of the construction and repair of boilers. Later amendments broadened their responsibilities to embrace all parts of the locomotive and tender. These clearly are not policymaking positions, warranting Presidential appointment. As is now the case with other comparable positions where appointments should be based primarily on professional and technical qualifications, personnel supervising locomotive inspection functions should be appointed under the classified civil service.

By eliminating the present cumbersome restrictions on inspection districts, the duties of locomotive inspectors, and the appointment of the Director and Assistant Directors of Locomotive Inspection, the plan will make it possible for the Commission to utilize its personnel more efficiently, integrate the work performed by locomotive inspectors with that performed by other Commission railroad safety inspectors, and take full advantage of recent improvements in the organization of the Commission's central office and field activities.

Upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan:

First. All functions of the Director of Locomotive Inspection, the Assistant Directors of Locomotive Inspection, and district locomotive inspectors will be transferred to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Suitable powers of delegation with respect to the functions so transferred will be conferred upon the Commission.

Second. The position of Director of Locomotive Inspection, the two positions of Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection, and all positions of district locomotive inspector will be abolished. The Commission will be required to appoint to a position under the classified civil service, as provided in the reorganization plan, each person who immediately prior to the taking effect of the plan held the office of district inspector of locomotives; such appointments will be deemed to be made without any break in service.

Third. The function of dividing the territory comprising the several States and the District of Columbia into 50 locomotive boiler-inspection districts will be abolished.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. I have also found and hereby declare that, by reason of the reorganizations made by the reorganization plan, it is necessary to include in the plan the provisions contained in section 5 thereof. The rates of compensation thereunder are those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable positions in the executive branch of the Government.

The statutory authority for the exercise of the functions to be abolished by section 2(b) of the reorganization plan is contained in section 4 of the act of February 17, 1911, chapter 103, 36 Stat. 914, as amended.

The reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will produce some immediate savings and significant long-range economies. The latter will result from future improvements in the organization and administration of the affected functions made possible by the plan. Since the plan will open the way for the more effective utilization of safety inspection staffs of the Interstate Commerce Commission, it will yield a significantly increased measure of safety inspection activity for each dollar spent for this purpose. It is, however, impracticable to specify or itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the reorganization plan.

Under the accompanying reorganization plan, all essential Government railroad safety services to the traveling public and employees will continue to be performed. The plan provides urgently needed modernization of the organization and procedures in the Interstate Commerce Commission's railroad safety program. I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 27, 1965.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1965, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganizations of various committees and other similar bodies.

The strength and vitality of our democracy depends in major part upon the Federal Government's adaptability, on its capacity for fast flexible response to changing needs imposed by changing circumstances. If we are to maintain this capacity, we must have a government that is streamlined and capable of quickly adjusting and readjusting its organization and operating procedures to take up and surmount new challenges.

As government grows more complex and programs increasingly cut across traditional agency lines, we must exercise special care to prevent the continuance of obsolete interagency committees and other coordinating devices which waste time and delay action and the undue proliferation of new committees. Interagency committees are a valuable and often indispensable means for facilitating coordination, but we should be sure that a committee is the most efficient way to accomplish a given task and that it is structured to meet current needs effectively.

At my direction, guidelines for the management of interagency committees have been established. I have recently asked the heads of departments and agencies to give their personal attention to a complete review of all the interagency committees in which their agencies participate to determine which ones might be eliminated, consolidated or otherwise reorganized. We will take appropriate action to obtain essential improvements in the organization and use of those committees which have been established by the executive branch.

The reorganizations accomplished by the reorganization plan transmitted herewith will enable us to take similar action with respect to a number of committees which have been established by statute. In many instances the statutory provisions creating these committees are very specific as to membership and describe in detail the functions to be performed. These provisions are rarely sufficiently flexible to permit the membership or role of the committees to be accommodated to changing circumstances or to permit their termination when they have outlived their usefulness.

The accompanying reorganization plan will abolish nine statutory committees. In each case the responsibility for providing suitable arrangements to assure effective consultation and coordination is placed in a specific official. Wherever the continuing need for and usefulness of a committee has been demonstrated, I would anticipate the establishment of a successor committee along the general lines of the body now provided by law. Certainly prompt action will be taken to create successor committees to such bodies as the Board of Foreign Service and the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. But we will have the flexibility promptly to make such changes in functions and membership as might be required to eliminate overlapping and duplication and to adjust to the development of new programs and shifts in executive branch responsibilities.

A number of the committees affected by the reorganization plan are advisory to the President or have functions which are closely related to responsibilities already vested in the President. The functions of those committees will be transferred to the President by the reorganization plan. The functions of the others will be transferred to the appropriate individual agency heads.

The management and control of interagency committees have been a matter of growing concern to both the executive branch and the Congress. The taking effect of the reorganization plan will contribute significantly to better management of interagency committees and will assist efforts to simplify and modernize coordinating arrangements within the executive branch.

Executive Order No. 10940 of May 11, 1961, provides for the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to consult with that Committee on matters of general policy and procedure arising in the administration of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 and to consider certain recommendations of that Committee, 42 U.S.C. 2546(b). To require the Secretary by law to consult with a committee established by Executive order is clearly anomalous. The plan abolishes the relevant functions of the Secretary with respect to consulting and considering the recommendations of the President's Committee. The reorganization plan does not otherwise affect the Committee; it has no effect upon Executive Order No. 10940. The statutory authority for the exercise of the functions to be abolished by section 13(b) of the reorganization plan is contained in section 7(b) of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, 75 Stat. 574.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1965 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

Although the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not of themselves result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will in the future allow the performance of the affected functions at lower costs and in a more timely manner than at present. It is, however, impracticable to specify or itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the reorganization plan. I recommend that the Congress allow the accompanying reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 27, 1965.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4 OF 1965

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, May 27, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 203, as amended.)

ABOLITION OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES, COUNCILS, AND BOARDS

Part I

SECTION 1. TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS. All functions of each of the following-named bodies, together with all functions of the Chairman and of other officers of each thereof, are hereby transferred to the President of the United States:

(a) The National Housing Council, provided for in section 6 of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 (61 Stat. 955) as affected by (i) section 502(a) of the Housing Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1283; 12 U.S.C. 1701c); (ii) section 603 of the Housing Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 440; 12 U.S.C. 1701i); and by (iii) section 615 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 317; 12 U.S.C. 1701i–1).

(b) The National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, provided for in section 4 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, 59 Stat. 512, as amended (22 U.S.C. 286b).

(c) The Board of the Foreign Service, provided for in section 211 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, 60 Stat. 1001 (22 U.S.C. 826).

(d) The Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service, provided for in section 212 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.S.C. 827).

(e) The Civilian-Military Liaison Committee, provided for in section 204 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, 72 Stat. 431, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2474).

SEC. 2. PERFORMANCE OF TRANSFERRED FUNCTIONS. The President may from time to time make such provisions as he may deem appropriate authorizing the performance of the functions transferred by the provisions of section 1 of this reorganization plan by any other officers of the executive branch of the Government or by any agencies or employees of that branch.

SEC. 3. ABOLITION OF BODIES. (a) Each of the bodies referred to in paragraphs (a) to (e), inclusive, of section 1 of this reorganization plan is hereby abolished.

(b) The President shall make or cause to be made such provisions as may be necessary with respect to the winding up of any outstanding affairs of the bodies abolished by the provisions of section 3 of this reorganization plan.

Part II

SEC. 11. TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS. (a) There are hereby transferred to the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission all functions of the Advisory Council on Group Insurance, provided for in section 12(a) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, 68 Stat. 742 (5 U.S.C. 2101(a)).

(b) There are hereby transferred to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration all functions of the Loan Policy Board of the Small Business Administration, provided for in section 4(d) of the Small Business Act, 72 Stat. 385 (15 U.S.C. 633(d)).

(c) There are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior all functions of the advisory board provided for in section 2(a) of the Act of August 20, 1937, 50 Stat. 732, as amended (16 U.S.C. 832a(a)), commonly referred to as the Bonneville Power Advisory Board.

(d) There are hereby transferred to the Attorney General all functions of the Awards Board provided for in section 3 of the Atomic Weapons Rewards Act of 1955, 69 Stat. 365 (50 U.S.C. 47b).

(e) The transfers made by subsections (a) to (d), inclusive, of this section shall be deemed to include all functions of the Chairman and of other officers of the respective transferor bodies referred to in those subsections.

SEC. 12. PERFORMANCE OF TRANSFERRED FUNCTIONS. Each officer to whom functions are transferred by the provisions of section 11 of this reorganization plan may from time to time make such provisions as he may deem appropriate authorizing the performance of the functions so transferred to him by his subordinate officers, employees, or agencies.

SEC. 13. ABOLITIONS. (a) Each of the bodies the functions of which are transferred by the provisions of section 11 of this reorganization plan is hereby abolished. Each officer to whom functions are transferred by those provisions shall make such provisions as may be necessary with respect to the winding up of any outstanding affairs of the body or bodies the functions of which are so transferred to him.

(b) The functions vested in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the provisions of section 7(b) of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, 75 Stat. 574 (42 U.S.C. 2546(b)), are hereby abolished.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1965, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for certain reorganizations relating to the National Science Foundation.

The plan contains two reorganization measures. First, all committees provided for in section 8 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 would be abollished. That section provides that there shall be a committee for each division of the Foundation, having not less than five members who are appointed by the National Science Board for 2-year terms. Section 8, as affected by section 23(b)(3) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962, 76 Stat. 1255, directs each such committee to make recommendations to and advise and consult with the Director of the National Science Foundation with respect to matters relating to the program of its division. Originally the Foundation had three such committees, corresponding to its three divisions. With the growth of the Foundation, five additional divisions have been established; consequently the Foundation, in accordance with the requirements of section 8, now has eight divisional committees. This multiplication in the number of committees has proved cumbersome. For example, three committees are now concerned with scientific personnel and education matters instead of the original one committee, even though one committee is all that is required to meet the Foundation's needs in this area. The elimination of the various statutory divisional committees will simplify the structure of the Foundation and improve its administration.

The second reorganization measure contained in the accompanying reorganization plan would empower the Director of the National Science Foundation to delegate functions vested in him by law or delegated to him by the National Science Board. The expanding responsibilities of the Foundation and the Director indicate that it is necessary that the Director clearly have such authority.

Upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan, the National Science Foundation will institute such new arrangements, in lieu of the divisional committees now required by law, as it deems appropriate. Such new arrangements may include the establishment of committees under section 6 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 and such other devices for obtaining advice as may be available to the Foundation.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

The reorganization plan will permit more effective management of the affairs of the National Science Foundation. It is, however, impracticable to specify or itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the reorganization plan.

The statutory authority for the exercise of certain functions which would be abolished by section 1 of the reorganization plan is contained in section 8 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, 64 Stat. 152.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 27, 1965.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5 OF 1965

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled May 27, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 203, as amended.)

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SECTION 1. ABOLITION OF COMMITTEES. There are hereby abolished all functions of the (divisional) committees provided for in section 8 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 152; 42 U.S.C. 1867), all functions with respect to the appointment of committees under that section, and all committees now existing under that section. The Director of the National Science Foundation shall make such provisions as he shall deem necessary respecting the winding up of any outstanding affairs of the committees abolished by this section.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO DELEGATE. The Director of the National Science Foundation may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the National Science Foundation of any of his functions (including functions delegated to him by the National Science Board).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

BIRTHDAY TRIBUTES TO VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is a most happy and auspicious occasion. It is the birthday anniversary of the Vice President of the United States, who now sits in the hallowed chair before us. We are delighted that his health is as good as ever, that his vitality is unbounded, and that his mental quickness is undiminished. He has performed arduous duties which have been his lot since leaving the ranks of the Senate. I take this occasion to extend to him my best wishes, not only for a happy birthday, but for many happy birthdays to come.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Speaking on the minority side of the aisle, I join with most sincere affection and respect in wishing for our Vice President many happy returns of the day. The difficult decision which you encountered on an earlier occasion in your life, Mr. Vice President, and, regrettably, perhaps somewhat erroneously, made, in joining your party rather than ours is, I am glad to say, quite irrelevant on a happy and auspicious occasion such as this, where festivity preempts the field, and where politics is irrelevant. I have heard many of my wife's friends, the wives of Senators, speaking with her in glowing terms about your good and gracious and lovely wife, Mrs. Humphrey, and the gracious and helpful manner in which she has always conducted herself in the wives' organization. Surely every Senator has the same happy thought as to the manner in which you have conducted yourself in the second highest responsibility which the people of the United States can repose in a man. From all of us, a fond and affectionate respect and best wishes on your birthday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I saw in this morning's newspaper two statements which were attributed to the Vice President, with one of which I wish to associate myself; about the other, I wish to express some doubts. One statement in the press quoted you, Mr. Vice President, as saying that you had reached the age of 37. I do not wish to associate myself with that part of the statement. I did, however, see the quotation of your statement that you intended to call your mother and congratulate her; and I would like to be a cosponsor of that call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I join other Senators in extending congratulations to my Vice President on this milestone in his life, and to join all of his friends in the Senate in wishing him many happy birthdays in years to come.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I associate myself with the majority leader, the minority leader, and other Senators who have spoken in extending congratulations on our Vice President's birthday anniversary. It has been a pleasure to have been associated with him for many years as a Senator, and now it is a privilege to serve under his leadership and guidance in his capacity as Presiding Officer of this body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am delighted to join other Senators in expressing my best wishes to the Vice President on his birthday. It is difficult for me to realize that this Vice President has birthdays. Vice President HUMPHREY does not seem to grow older; he is the personification of youth. He has been to me as ageless as laughter, good humor, and wisdom. I think he is to most of the country.

The word associated with birthdays—"happy"—is a word that we associate also with the distinguished Vice President of the United States. If anyone has brought happiness to public life, and hope and optimism for the future, it is Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, now Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY.

He has brought to public life something else that is too rare a commodity—a delightful sense of humor. It is always in good taste; it never offends. It is something that has helped America as well as this great body to enjoy life.

We are all well aware that few Vice Presidents in the history of this Republic—perhaps none—have discharged the duties of their office with greater distinction than has Vice President HUMPHREY in the brief time that he has served in that office.

I am delighted to join my colleagues in wishing him a very happy birthday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, like my colleagues, I take great joy in the fact that the Vice President is a happy Vice President. To a happy Vice President and a very dear friend, I wish a very happy birthday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues and to join in wishing the Vice President many happy returns of the day, not only for his own sake and that of his family, but for the United States. We are proud of your conduct in your new capacity and wish you many happy years of success.

Someone referred to you recently as "the happy warrior." That is an old slogan that was associated with another great American. We are very happy that you are referred to in the same manner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

IN THE ARMY

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, in the Army, and in the Navy and Marine Corps, which were on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET, 1966, FOR DISASTER RELIEF (S. Doc. No. 30)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1966, in the amount of $35 million, for disaster relief (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO BEAUTIFICATION OF THE NATION'S HIGHWAYS

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation, as follows:

A bill to provide for the control of junkyards along certain Federal-aid highways;

A bill to broaden the purposes for which Federal-aid secondary highway funds may be used;

A bill to provide for landscaping and scenic enhancement of Federal-aid highways, and for other purposes; and

A bill to provide for the control of outdoor advertising along certain Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 27

"Concurrent resolution to place the Louisiana Legislature on record as opposing passage of S. 1592, proposing amendments to the Federal Firearms Act by placing unreasonable and unwarranted restrictions on the sale, possession, and use of firearms by sportsmen and other reputable citizens

"Whereas a bill has been introduced in the U.S. Senate by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut (S. 1592), which would prohibit all mail-order sales of firearms to individuals, and would permit such sales only between licensed importers, manufacturers, and dealers, and place severe and unreasonable restrictions upon reputable citizens who wish to order recreational firearms by mail; and

"Whereas the Dodd bill (S. 1592), if passed and written into law, would give the Secretary of the Treasury, or his agent, virtually unlimited authority to regulate the sale of firearms by dealers, which could result in the institution of stringent controls and prohibitions over such sales; and

"Whereas the founders of the United States of America, in the very first amendment to the Constitution, provided assurances of freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, and of peaceable assembly, and in the second amendment they made it possible to defend these freedoms by providing that the rights of people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed; and

"Whereas any firearms legislation at the Federal level restricting the purchase of firearms by responsible citizens would be a dangerous infringement of these articles of the Bill of Rights and could lead to administrative decisions imposing such a burden on the sale, possession, and use of firearms for legitimate purposes as to completely discourage and eventually exclude the private ownership of all guns and firearms of any kind whatsoever; and

"Whereas such restrictive regulations as are contained in the Dodd bill (S. 1592) against firearms sales could have a crippling effect on the economy of the multi-million-dollar-a-year sales and services business associated with recreational use of firearms in the State of Louisiana, and would only result in the further loss of American liberty, add to the workload and responsibility of our law enforcement and police forces, and inconvenience and penalize law-abiding citizens; and

"Whereas easy accessibility of firearms does not contribute significantly to the crime problem of the United States, and the target for preventative legislation should be the crime, not the tool used by perpetrators of crime; and

"Whereas Federal excise taxes on sales of firearms and other forms of revenue from special licenses and stamps for recreational hunting provide many millions of dollars annually for the conservation and preservation of wildlife of all kinds; and

"Whereas if honest citizens should be required to register every gun, regardless of the purpose for which it is to be used, it would provide the Federal Government with a national inventory of privately owned firearms which inventory would be under the control of and in the possession of a very small group of officials; and

"Whereas the passage of S. 1592 would greatly curtail the use of firearms by the youth of our Nation for recreational and sporting purposes and thus prevent many of the young people of the Nation from learning the use of firearms under supervision and control thereby creating a dangerous situation in later years whereby there would be a great number of inexperienced adults using firearms; and

"Whereas it is in the great interest of the national defense against enemy invasion that the people of the United States be familiar with and accustomed to the use of firearms; and

"Whereas history has shown that in some areas it was partially through such registration of weapons and the control of all such weapons by a very small percentage of the populace that the democratic form of government was lost; and

"Whereas public hearings on S. 1592 will be held May 19–21, 1965, by the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of which the author of the bill, Senator Thomas J. Dodd, is the chairman, and

"Whereas there is an increasing agitation in Washington, D.C., to pass bills to control the ownership, possession, and use of firearms, which are cardinal rights of citizens of the United States of America: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Louisiana Legislature does hereby go on record as opposing the passage of S. 1592 (the Dodd bill), and urges and requests that each and every member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States actively oppose and vote against the passage of the said S. 1592: be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of senate shall transmit, without delay, copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each of the two Houses in the Congress of the United States, the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and to each member of the Louisiana delegation in Congress.

"C. C. Aycock,

"*Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.*

"Vail M. Deloney,

"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 24

"Concurrent resolution to request the Congress of the United States to give priority to the planning for improvements necessary to make the Red River navigable to Shreveport and to provide funds therefor

"Whereas the Red River is one of the largest rivers in the State; and

"Whereas the Red River flows into the Atchafalaya River which then flows into the Mississippi River, thus constituting a complete waterway for navigation from the Gulf of Mexico to the city of Shreveport, but many improvements are needed on the Red River in order to make it navigable; and

"Whereas it is of vital importance to the economy and development of the Red River Valley and the people thereof that navigation be opened up on the Red River from Shreveport to its juncture with the Atchafalaya and the Mississippi Rivers: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana (the House of Representatives thereof concurring)*, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby urge and request the Congress of the United States, and particularly the Public Works Committee and the subcommittees thereof, to take such immediate steps as are necessary to give serious consideration and high priority to the planning for such improvements on the Red River and funds therefor as are necessary and essential to make this river navigable from the city of Shreveport to the point at which it flows into the Atchafalaya River and on to the Mississippi River, thus providing a navigable waterway for shipping by water from the city of Shreveport to the mouth of the Mississippi River at the Gulf of Mexico; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution shall be transmitted without delay by the secretary of the senate to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress, the chairmen of the Public Works Committee of the two Houses of Congress and to each Member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress.

"———— ————

"*Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.*

"Vail M. Delony,

"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to take action necessary to transfer ownership of land purchased by the Federal Government under the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1937 to the various States in which located, to be used for educational purposes

"Whereas the lands purchased by the Federal Government under the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1937 constitute a great portion of the surface of the many States in which these lands are located, and in Colorado cover in area approximately 625,000 acres in the counties of Weld, Baca, Prowers, and Otero alone; and

"Whereas the limited use and present administration of these lands by the Federal Government constitute an economic waste in the fact that only a small part of the potential revenues from these lands are being collected, and the failure of these lands to return proper revenues results in an irreparable loss to the people of the various States in which these lands are located; and

"Whereas these lands have been a burden to the Federal Government from the standpoint of administrative costs; and

"Whereas the granting of title to these lands to the various States in which located for the benefit of their public school systems would serve as a permanent source of income for such States and their public schools, thus making a concrete contribution by the Federal Government to the cause of education: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 45th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein)*, That the Congress and the President of the United States are hereby respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to transfer ownership of lands purchased by the Federal Government under the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1937 to the various States in which located, to be used, or the income therefrom to be used, for educational purposes; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"Robert L. Knous,

"*President pro tempore of the Senate.*

"Allen Dines,

"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Legislative Resolution 47

"Whereas inasmuch as the present box car shortage has been with us for several years and that it appears to be getting worse instead of better, and inasmuch as it is having a depressing effect on grain markets and thereby on farm income in that export markets are being threatened, if not lost, because we are unable to move grain into export positions fast enough to satisfy shipping movements and thus grain may be more readily bought from other nations; and

"Whereas the available box car supply is totally inadequate; and

"Whereas often months lapse before grain can be moved for which orders for export have been received; and

"Whereas the shortage of cars has a serious depressing effect on the grain trade, and consequently on our agricultural economy; and

"Whereas middle western railroads are building cars but that these cars find their way to eastern and southern U.S. area railroads and are retained there because it is cheaper, under existing levels of per diem rates, to rent a car than it is to own one: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 75th session assembled:*

"1. That Congress be requested to enact legislation which will authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to set the per diem rates at a point that there will be an incentive to all railroads to construct or to purchase rolling stock rather than to rent them from other railroads;

"2. That printed copies of this resolution be sent by the clerk of the legislature to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member of Congress from Nebraska, to the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

"Philip C. Sorensen,

"*President of the Legislature.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to authorize the sale or transfer of the Broadview Heights Veteran's Administration Hospital to the State of Ohio for use as a State hospital for mentally retarded children

"Whereas the members of the 106th General Assembly of Ohio are fully cognizant that the Broadview Heights Veterans' Administration Hospital is situated on a 66-acre tract, 3 miles west of Brecksville, Ohio, in the heart of the populous Cleveland-Akron metropolitan area; and

"Whereas the Broadview Heights Veterans' Administration Hospital is superbly equipped with all the modern facilities for the care and treatment of patients, including an excellent medical library, a clinical and research laboratory, a surgical unit, a complete radiology service, and approximately 300 full-time employees comprising a complete team of professional, technical, administrative, and other personnel supplemented by a visiting staff of consultants who are outstanding in their specialties; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration has decided to curtail the operation of a number of such hospitals and Broadview is destined by this action to be shut down and its excellent facilities to lie fallow, unproductive, and unused; and

"Whereas the State of Ohio's need for such patient care and research facilities for mentally retarded children as exist at Broadview is immediate and immense: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the members of the 106th General Assembly of the State of Ohio respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to authorize the General Services Administration to negotiate with the Governor of the State of Ohio and the department of public works for the sale or transfer of the Broadview Heights Veterans' Hospital to the State of Ohio for the purpose and use as a hospital for mentally retarded children; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the pages of the journal and that the clerk of the senate transmit a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the President of the United States; the Vice President of the United States; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and to each Senator and Representative from Ohio in the Congress of the United States.

"ROGER CLOUD,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"JOHN BROWN,
"*President of the Senate.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 460

"Concurrent resolution directed to the West German Government to dispense with the limitations on the prosecution of capital crimes

"Whereas the limitations provision observed by the West German Government places a limitation on the prosecution of capital crimes which will prevent the ultimate apprehension and trial of Nazi war criminals responsible for horrible atrocities during the preceding World War II; and

"Whereas these crimes are offenses against humanity and not limited to any country or people; and,

"Whereas many residents of Florida were affected by these atrocities, either personally or through relatives and friends; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Florida desires to have all persons responsible for the extreme atrocities and genocide punished; and

"Whereas there is no limitations period for the punishment of capital crimes in the State of Florida, United States of America; and

"Whereas it is appropriate that West Germany should remove their limitations provisions; and

Whereas it appears to the Legislature of the State of Florida that those charged with the above crimes are tried by juries composed of the German people which gives the accused his fairest forum; and

"Whereas this limitations provision becomes effective May 8, 1965: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida,* That the Legislature of the State of Florida hereby urges the West Germany Government to extend its limitations provision applying to Nazi war atrocities for an indefinite period and make appropriate provision for the complete and ultimate prosecution of all persons responsible therefor; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Chancellor of the West German Government, the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, and to members of the Florida delegation in Congress.

"Approved by the Governor, May 14, 1965.

"Filed in office of the secretary of state, May 14, 1965."

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 454

"Resolution to compensating the Philippine Scouts for their services rendered in World War II

"Whereas the Philippine Scouts units serving with the U.S. Army rendered heroic and invaluable services in behalf of the United States of America and the free world during World War II, and suffered particular hardship and cruelties in the early days of that conflict when their homeland was overrun by the hostile forces of the common enemy; and

"Whereas the Philippine Scouts served side by side with American troops and conducted themselves with great valor and distinction in the campaigns in the Philippine Islands, and particularly in the battles on the Bataan Peninsula and at the Island of Corregidor; and

"Whereas during these campaigns and prior thereto the Philippine Scouts were compensated pursuant to pay scales fixed by the Government of the United States with levels of remuneration substantially lower than those prescribed for other soldiers serving with the U.S. Army, with the result that the compensation received by these brave men was not commensurate with the extraordinary service they rendered; and

"Whereas action taken by the Congress of the United States, through enactment of Public Law 607 of the 77th Congress on June 16, 1942, to raise pay scales applicable to the Philippine Scouts to levels of equality with those of other soldiers serving with the U.S. Army were never fully effectuated in respect to services rendered by those men in the early campaigns in the Philippine Islands; and

"Whereas many important and prominent personages, including the former commander in the Philippine area, the late General Douglas MacArthur, have commented upon and urged that appropriate actions be undertaken to effect the long overdue adjustments in compensations earned by the men who served in the Philippine Scouts during those critical days; and

"Whereas there is presently a bill in Congress to provide benefits for members and survivors of members of the Philippine Scouts on the same basis as such benefits are provided for other members of the Armed Forces of the United States and their survivors: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California,* That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to enact the pending bill into law to compensate those Philippine Scouts who served in World War II for the lesser wage and salary amounts paid them at that time; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Armed Forces Committee is strongly urged to schedule an early hearing on the pending bill so that action may be taken on the bill as soon as possible; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California.

"JAMES D. DRISCOLL,
"*Chief Clerk of the Assembly.*"

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 21

"Resolution Relating to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962

"Whereas it is necessary that training and retraining opportunities be opened as fully as possible to older workers, including the provision for on-the-job training in advance of layoffs in order that unemployment be reduced: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly),* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to increase the present funds allocated to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2571 et seq.) in order to expand the present opportunities for training of older adults and to increase the present level of training allowances for persons enrolled in such programs and to continue financing this program entirely with Federal funds; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"RESOLUTION 197

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress to appropriate an additional $600,000 for the Economic Engineering Survey of the so-called All-American Canal

"Whereas the United States has assumed an obligation with its good neighbor, the Government of Canada, to contribute its full share toward the successful operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway-Great Lakes shipping route; and

"Whereas the only existing navigable facility connecting Lake Erie and Lake Ontario is the Canadian-owned Welland Canal which is being sorely pressed to meet present and projected shipping needs; and

"Whereas the construction of an alternate ship canal in western New York State would make a major contribution to the welfare of the United States as well as Canada; because

"1. In the event of breakdown or destruction of the existing Welland Canal, the commerce of the entire Great Lakes area of the United States and Canada west of Lake Ontario would be denied access by water transportation to the St. Lawrence Seaway and international shipping lanes;

"2. It would provide a more secure inland route for the movement of iron ore in the event of war;

"3. It would ease the strain on congested rail facilities and east coast ports in the time of emergency; and

"4. It would allow the construction and repair of oceangoing vessels in the more secure areas of the Great Lakes; and

"Whereas the construction of a new and modern canal built to the lock specifications of the Poe lock now being built by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers at Sault Ste. Marie, would contribute greatly to the prosperity of commerce, industry and agriculture, not only in those States bordering the Great Lakes, but throughout the entire Nation; and

"Whereas the commerce of the State of New York would be enhanced by the benefits accruing from the building of a new canal; and

"Whereas the construction of the canal would stabilize employment, provide job security and expand job opportunities; and

"Whereas the President and Congress of the United States in their wisdom and foresight approved, in 1962, a $1,825,000 economic-engineering survey of a new Lake Erie-Lake Ontario Canal; and

"Whereas the Congress has appropriated to date $650,000 in survey funds; and

"Whereas the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has publicly stated that the saturation point on the Welland Canal, including its twinnedlock improvements, will be reached by 1980–85; and

"Whereas the period of construction of a new canal would take from 5 to 7 years and thus require that the building phase commence in the early 1970's; and

"Whereas there exists a definite need to move the economic-engineering survey along to a speedy completion so that actual construction might begin at the earliest possible date: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* (*if the assembly concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States immediately to provide an additional $600,000 in study funds for use by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to advance the necessary survey and plans for the canal, as aforesaid; and, be it further

"*Resolved* (*if the assembly concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted as follows: To the President of the United States; to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress; and to each Member thereof from the State of New York; to the Governor of the State of New York; to the Commissioner of Commerce of the State of New York; to the chairmen of the port authorities of Buffalo, Rochester, Oswego and Ogdensburg; to the Governor and State legislative leaders of the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin and Minnesota.

"By order of the senate.

"George H. Van Lengen,
"*Secretary*.

"In assembly May 12, 1965. Concurred in without amendment.

"By order of assembly.

"John T. McKennan,
"*Clerk*."

A resolution adopted at the convention of the Texas Councils of the League of United Latin American Citizens, at Lubbock, Tex., on May 7–9, 1965, commending the fruitful efforts of the equal employment opportunity program for the Navy Department for Latin American citizens in this country; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The memorial of Don Snider, of New Windsor, Md., remonstrating against the appropriation of additional money for the war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Blair County Game, Fish and Forestry Association, Inc., of Riggles Gap, Pa., protesting against the enactment of any laws that provide for the licensing of firearms by legitimate firearm owners; to the Committee on Commerce.

Three resolutions adopted at a convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington, D.C., relating to a minimum wage proposal for the District of Columbia; home rule for the District of Columbia, and health and welfare proposals for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The petition of Sidney O. Sampson, Robot Education Systems, Inc., favoring the enactment of legislation to exempt tips from taxation under the Federal income tax laws; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Sparks, Nev., favoring the enactment of legislation to establish a Great Basin National Park in eastern Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by Albuquerque Typographical Union No. 304, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1781, relating to the employment of strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Council of Veterans' Organizations of Greater Dallas, relating to the closing of McKinney Veterans' Administration Hospital, and the Veterans' Administration regional offices at Lubbock and San Antonio, Tex.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Shawnee District Council of the AFL–CIO, endorsing the principles of Senate bill 1781, relative to the hiring of strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Port Angeles, Wash., Local 956, International Typographical Union, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1781, to prohibit the employment of strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Danville Typographical Union No. 230, of Danville, Ill., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1781, relating to the employment of strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Thief River Falls, protesting against the removal of mail from certain Soo Line trains; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee, of Lapwai, Idaho, relating to the appropriation of funds for anthropological research and studies of ancient burial grounds and lands along the Snake River; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of the South Carolina voter education project, of Columbia, S.C., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1564, the Voting Rights Act of 1965; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

H.R. 6755. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes (Rept. No. 266).

ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY ACTIVITIES, 1964—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 265)

Mr. HART. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report entitled "Antitrust and Monopoly Activities, 1964," pursuant to Senate Resolution 262, 88th Congress, 2d session, together with the individual views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska].

I ask unanimous consent that the report together with the individual views, be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT OF PEACE CORPS ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 267)

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original bill (S. 2054) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes, and submitted a report thereon, which bill was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. Monroney):

S. 2049. A bill to amend subsections (b) and (c) of section 116 of title 28, United States Code, so as to realine the counties comprising the territory of the U.S. district courts for the eastern and western districts of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Harris when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. Monroney) (by request):

S. 2050. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Harris when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 2051. A bill to clarify the tax status of American Indians; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2052. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leonardo M. Cabanilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. Harris):

S. 2053. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Canton Federal reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Monroney when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2054. A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 267).

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he reported the above bill, which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

REALINEMENT OF COUNTIES COMPRISING THE TERRITORY OF CERTAIN U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, in Oklahoma we have three judicial districts for U.S. district courts. These are the northern, eastern, and western districts. Court for the eastern district is held principally at Muskogee, Okla., court for the western district is held principally at Oklahoma City, Okla., and court for the northern district is held principally at Tulsa, Okla.

Judges in the eastern and western districts are unanimous in their opinion that these two districts should be realined so that five counties in south central and southwestern Oklahoma would be transferred from the eastern district to the western district. The counties involved are Jefferson, Stephens, Grady, Garvin, and McClain. All are situated much closer to Oklahoma City than to Tulsa.

Because of this proximity to Oklahoma City and the advantages to attorneys and litigants through accessibility and monetary savings, county bar associations in the five counties involved have passed resolutions endorsing this realinement of the two districts. There is a unanimity of opinion on this proposal.

Therefore, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], I introduce a bill to realine the eastern and western judicial districts of Oklahoma, moving the five counties to the western district, and I ask that it be printed in the Record at this point, and that the bill be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2049) to amend subsections (b) and (c) of section 116 of title 28, United States Code, so as to realine the counties comprising the territory of the U.S. district courts for the eastern and western districts of Oklahoma, introduced by Mr. Harris (for himself and Mr. Monroney), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsections (b) and (c) of section 116 of title 28, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"EASTERN DISTRICT

"(b) The eastern district comprises the counties of Adair, Atoka, Bryan, Carter, Cherokee, Choctaw, Coal, Haskell, Hughes, Johnston, Latimer, Le Flore, Love, McCurtain, McIntosh, Marshall, Murray, Muskogee, Okfuskee, Okmulgee, Pittsburg, Pontotoc, Pushmataha, Seminole, Sequoyah, and Wagoner.

"Court for the eastern district shall be held at Ada, Ardmore, Durant, Hugo, Muskogee, Okmulgee, Poteau, and S. McAlester.

"WESTERN DISTRICT

"(c) The western district comprises the counties of Alfalfa, Beaver, Beckham, Blaine, Caddo, Canadian, Cimarron, Cleveland, Comanche, Cotton, Custer, Dewey, Ellis, Garfield, Garvin, Grady, Grant, Greer, Harmon, Harper, Jackson, Jefferson, Kay, Kingfisher, Kiowa, Lincoln, Logan, McClain, Major, Noble, Oklahoma, Payne, Pottawatomie, Roger Mills, Stephens, Texas, Tillman, Washita, Woods, and Woodward.

"Court for the western district shall be held at Chickasha, Enid, Guthrie, Lawton, Mangum, Oklahoma City, Pauls Valley, Ponca City, Shawnee, and Woodward."

Sec. 2. This Act shall become effective sixty days after the date of its enactment.

DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY JUDGMENTS IN FAVOR OF MIAMI INDIANS OF INDIANA AND OKLAHOMA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], I introduce, by request and for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Indians of Indiana and Oklahoma.

The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and the Miami Indians of Indiana, jointly, as representatives of the Miami Tribe as it existed in 1818, were awarded a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Dockets No. 67 and No. 124 for inadequate compensation for lands ceded in Ohio and Indiana by the treaty of October 6, 1818, 97 Stat. 189. The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma was awarded a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Docket No. 251 for inadequate payment for lands in Kansas ceded by the treaty of June 5, 1854, 10 Stat. 1093. The awards in dockets Nos. 67 and 124 and docket No. 251 are on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the "Miami Tribe of Oklahoma" and draw interest at 4 percent per annum. The Miami Tribe of Indiana was awarded a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Docket No. 124-A for inadequate compensation for lands ceded in Kansas by the treaty of June 5, 1854, 10 Stat. 1093. The money is credited to the account of this group and draws interest at 4 percent per annum. The amount is also shown in the enclosed tabulation, which I shall submit at the close of my remarks for the Record, dated April 6, 1965, from John A. Carver, Jr., Under Secretary of the Interior, to the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, President of the Senate.

In contrast to the Miami Indians of Indiana, the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma is organized as a single political entity under a constitution and bylaws adopted pursuant to the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act of June 26, 1936, 49 Stat. 1967. The constitution and bylaws provide for a tribal governing body authorized to speak and act in behalf of the tribe on all matters of interest to the tribe and to prescribe eligibility requirements for membership in the tribe.

The bill I am introducing today will permit the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to decide how they will program their judgment funds derived from docket No. 251. The proposed bill will also authorize a per capita distribution of the judgment payable in docket No. 124-A to all persons, except the members of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, who can trace their ancestry to either of the 1895 rolls or the 1889 Eel River roll. The proposed bill will also authorize a per capita distribution of the judgment payable in dockets Nos. 67 and 124 to all persons who are on or can trace their ancestry to the 1889, or either of the 1895 rolls, or the "Western Miami" roll of June 12, 1891, which roll identifies Miamis living in Oklahoma as of that date. Persons of Miami Indian ancestry who are members of the organized Miami Tribe are not excluded from participation in the dockets Nos. 67 and 124 award. Finally, the proposed bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to reserve a portion of the funds to meet litigation expenses, exclusive of attorney fees, in future cases which are pending before the Indian Claims Commission for these groups.

Mr. President, in conclusion, may I add that the chief of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, Forest D. Olds, has indicated unqualified support of this bill on behalf of the tribe. An identical measure, H.R. 7466, was introduced in the House on April 14, 1965, by the Honorable Ed Edmondson, of the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] as a cosponsor of this important proposed legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for 1 week so that other Senators who desire to do so may join as cosponsors. I also ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill and Mr. Carver's letter, mentioned earlier, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be retained at the desk as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma, and the text of the bill and the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2050) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Harris (for himself and Mr. Monroney), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2050

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall take the necessary steps to provide for the distribution and use of the money appropriated to the Miami Indians of Indiana and Oklahoma in satisfaction of judgments awarded by the Indian Claims Commission in dockets numbered 67 and 124, 124-A, and 251 as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 2. The funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma that were appropriated by the Act of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 747), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket numbered 251, together with the interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, shall be advanced or expended in accordance with plans adopted by the governing body of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The persons entitled to share in any per capita payment authorized by the governing body and approved by the Secretary shall be all individuals who are enrolled members of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, as organized under the Oklahoma Welfare Act (49 Stat. 1967).

Sec. 3. For the purpose of determining entitlement to the judgment awarded in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 124-A to the Miami Indians of Indiana and appropriated by the Act of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 747), the Secretary shall prepare a roll of all persons of Miami Indian ancestry who meet the following requirements for eligibility:

(a) They were born on or prior to, and living, on the date of this Act; and

(b) Their name or the name of an ancestor from whom they claim eligibility appears on the roll of Miami Indians of Indiana of June 12, 1895, or the roll of "Miami Indians of Indiana, now living in Kansas, Quapaw Agency, I. T., and Oklahoma Territory," prepared and completed pursuant to the Act of March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 903), or the roll of the Eel River Miami Tribe of Indians of May 27, 1889, prepared and completed pursuant to the Act of June 29, 1888 (25 Stat. 223). No person whose name appears on the current tribal roll of the Miami Tribe of

Oklahoma shall be eligible to be enrolled under this section.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of determining entitlement to the judgment awarded in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 67 and 124 and appropriated by the Act of May 17, 1963 (77 Stat. 43), the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare a roll of all persons of Miami Indian ancestry who meet the following requirements for eligibility:

(a) They were born on or prior to, and living on, the date of this Act; and

(b) Their name or the name of an ancestor from whom they claim eligibility appears on any of the rolls cited in section 3(b) of this Act, or on the roll of the Western Miami Tribe of Indians of June 12, 1891, prepared and completed pursuant to the Act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 1000).

SEC. 5. Applications for enrollment must be filed with the Area Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Muskogee, Oklahoma, on forms prescribed for that purpose. The determination of the Secretary regarding the eligibility of an applicant shall be final.

SEC. 6. The funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Miami Indians of Indiana that were appropriated by the Act of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 747), to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 124–A, and the interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, shall be distributed to the individuals whose names appear on the roll prepared pursuant to section 3, and in accordance with the instructions contained in sections 8 and 9, of this Act.

SEC. 7. The funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the "Miami Tribe of Oklahoma" that were appropriated by the Act of May 17, 1963 (77 Stat. 43), to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 67 and 124, and the interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, shall be distributed to the persons whose names appear on the roll prepared pursuant to section 4, and in accordance with the instructions contained in sections 8 and 9, of this Act.

SEC. 8. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary shall distribute a per capita share payable to a living enrollee directly to such enrollee, and the Secretary shall distribute a per capita share payable to a deceased enrollee directly to his heirs or legatees upon proof of death and inheritance satisfactory to the Secretary, whose findings upon such proof shall be final and conclusive.

(b) A share payable to a person under twenty-one years of age or to a person under legal disability shall be paid in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary determines will adequately protect the best interests of such persons.

SEC. 9. (a) Prior to making any distribution of the funds credited to the Miami Tribe or Nation and the Miami Tribe of Indiana or approving any expenditures of the funds credited to the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, pursuant to this Act, the Secretary is authorized to reserve in the Treasury of the United States a part of such funds sufficient, in his judgment, to meet the litigation expenses, exclusive of attorney fees, of the remaining cases which each has pending before the Indian Claims Commission.

(b) The funds reserved shall be available for appropriate withdrawal by the Secretary.

SEC. 10. The funds distributed under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to Federal or State income taxes, and any costs incurred by the Secretary in the preparation of the rolls and in the distribution of per capita shares in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall be paid by appropriate withdrawals from the judgment funds.

SEC. 11. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The letter presented by Mr. HARRIS is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Indians of Indiana and Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and that it be enacted.

The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and the Miami Indians of Indiana, jointly, as representatives of the Miami Tribe as it existed in 1818, were awarded a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Dockets Nos. 67 and 124 for inadequate compensation for lands ceded in Ohio and Indiana by the treaty of October 6, 1818 (7 Stat. 189).

The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma was awarded a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Docket No. 251 for inadequate payment for lands in Kansas ceded by the treaty of June 5, 1854 (10 Stat. 1093).

The awards in dockets Nos. 67 and 124 and docket No. 251 are on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the "Miami Tribe of Oklahoma" and draw interest at 4 percent per annum. The amounts are shown in the enclosed tabulation.

The Miami Tribe of Indiana was awarded a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Docket No. 124–A for inadequate compensation for lands ceded in Kansas by the treaty of June 5, 1854 (10 Stat. 1093). The money is credited to the account of this group and draws interest at 4 percent per annum. The amount is also shown in the enclosed tabulation.

The Miami Tribe or Nation was paid an annuity under the treaty of October 6, 1818, as well as under subsequent treaties. Following the treaty of November 28, 1840, a segment of the tribe moved to Kansas. However, a large number of tribal members, in addition to those who had special permission under treaties and acts of Congress to remain in Indiana, did not migrate to Kansas but remained in Indiana and adjacent States. Consequently, during the period of 1846 to 1854, the tribal annuities were made to those Miami Indians in Indiana and those in Kansas on separate payrolls. Most of the Kansas Miami Indians now constitute the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma.

In 1859, the Secretary of the Interior, without consulting or obtaining the consent of the Miami Tribe, recognized 73 individuals in Indiana as being of partial Miami Indian blood. Thereafter, the individuals were allotted lands of the reserve in Kansas and received a portion of the annuities belonging to the Miami under articles 2 and 4 of the 1854 treaty. The individuals were subsequently stricken from the roll, and Congress by the acts of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 1000) and March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 903), appropriated money to pay to the Miami Indians the sums taken from the funds of the respective bands. It also compensated the western Miami for lands allotted to the 73 persons. Inasmuch as the judgment awarded in docket No. 124–A includes additional compensation to the Miami Indians of Indiana for their share of the annuities which were commuted in 1854, the Indiana Miami roll of June 12, 1895, and the "Indiana Miami living in Kansas" roll, both of which were prepared to distribute money to the Indiana Miami pursuant to the act of March 2, 1895, have been designated in the proposed bill for establishing eligibility to share in the docket No. 124–A award.

The roll of the Eel River Miami Tribe of 1889 has also been designated as a basis for establishing eligibility for enrollment for the purpose of sharing in the judgment awards in dockets Nos. 67, 124, and 124–A. The records indicate that the Eel River Miami were a part of the Miami Tribe at all times. Separate rolls listing the individuals affiliated with the Eel River Band were prepared for the purpose of making annuity payments in accordance with the treaties of August 3, 1795, August 21, 1805, and September 30, 1809. The last separate roll found for them was prepared in 1889 for the purpose of distributing the funds paid in commutation of those treaties. Not all of the names on that roll were listed on the 1895 roll of Miami Indians of Indiana. Therefore, so as not to preclude the Eel River Miami and their descendants from sharing in the judgments, the Eel River roll also has been specified in the proposed bill as a basis for establishing eligibility to share in the funds appropriated to cover the awards.

In contrast to the Miami Indians of Indiana, the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma is organized as a single political entity under a constitution and bylaws adopted pursuant to the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967). The constitution and bylaws provide for a tribal governing body authorized to speak and act in behalf of the tribe on all matters of interest to the tribe and to prescribe eligibility requirements for membership in the tribe.

The proposed bill will permit the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to decide how they will program their judgment funds derived from docket No. 251. The proposed bill will authorize a per capita distribution of the judgment payable in docket No. 124–A to all persons, except the members of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, who can trace their ancestry to either of the 1895 rolls or the 1889 Eel River roll. Finally, the proposed bill will authorize a per capita distribution of the judgment payable in dockets Nos. 67 and 124 to all persons who are on or can trace their ancestry to the 1889, or either of the 1895 rolls, or the "Western Miami" roll of June 12, 1891, which roll identifies Miamis living in Oklahoma as of that date. Persons of Miami Indian ancestry who are members of the organized Miami Tribe of Oklahoma are not excluded from participation in the docket Nos. 67 and 124 award.

The history of the Indian claims cases has shown that the lack of availability of funds for litigation expenses slows down the work necessary in establishing Indian title and determining the extent of financial liability. The proposed bill, therefore, authorizes the Secretary to reserve a portion of the funds to meet litigation expenses, exclusive of attorney fees, in future cases which are pending before the Indian Claims Commission for these groups.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the presentation of this bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, Jr.,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

(Enclosure.)

Miami Tribe (Dockets Nos. 67 and 124–A, and 251) judgment funds

[Balance as of Dec. 10, 1964]

14X7417: Awards of Indian Claims Commission, Miami Tribe of Oklahoma (includes awards from dockets Nos. 67 and 124, and 251):	
Net award, dockets Nos. 67 and 124	$4,647,467.67

Miami Tribe (Dockets Nos. 67 and 124–A, and 251) judgment funds—Continued

[Balance as of Dec. 10, 1964]

Net award, docket No. 251	$349,193.59
Total of awards, Miami Tribe of Oklahoma	4,996,661.26
Deductions from award principal:	
Attorney fees, dockets Nos. 67 and 124	467,746.76
Attorney expenses, dockets Nos. 67 and 124 pending	-------------
Attorney fees, docket No. 251	34,919.36
Total	499,666.12
Balance of award on deposit in U.S. Treasury as of Dec. 10, 1964	4,496,995.14
14X7917: Interest and accruals on interest, awards of Indian Claims Commission, Miami Tribe of Oklahoma:	
Interest accrued through June 30, 1964	219,679.51
Deductions: Attorney expenses, docket No. 251	5,701.27
Total	213,978.24
Total cash on hand in U.S. Treasury as of Dec. 10, 1964, dockets Nos. 67 and 124, and 251	4,710,973.38
14X7418. Awards of Indian Claims Commission, Miami Tribe of Indiana:	
Net award, Docket No. 124–A	64,738.80
Deductions:	
Attorney fees	6,473.86
Attorney expenses	1,908.10
Total	8,381.96
Balance of award on deposit in U.S. Treasury as of Dec. 10, 1964	56,356.84
14X7918: Interest and accruals on interest, awards of Indian Claims Commission, Miami Tribe of Indiana: Interest accrued through June 30, 1964	6,285.97
Total cash on hand in U.S. Treasury as of Dec. 10, 1964, docket No. 124–A	62,642.81

CANTON IRRIGATION PROJECT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Canton Dam project on the North Canadian River was authorized by Public Law 761, 75th Congress, in 1938. Its construction was begun in 1940, suspended during World War II, and completed in May 1948, at a cost of $10,552,000.

It is located in Blaine County, 3 miles north of Canton and about 75 miles west of Oklahoma City.

The reservoir, behind the rolled earthfill embankment, controls a drainage area of 12,500 square miles and has a storage capacity of 386,000 acre-feet.

The Flood Control Act of 1946 authorized 69,000 acre-feet of storage in the reservoir for irrigation of downstream lands, but the necessary improvements by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to permit utilization of the storage have not yet been developed. The 1948 Flood Control Act provides for 38,000 acre-feet of storage for municipal water supply. Pending development of irrigation features, the reservoir is operated to provide 276,700 acre-feet of flood control storage, 88,700 acre-feet for water supply and 20,600 acre-feet for conservation and sedimentation reserve.

Operation of the reservoir has proven beneficial from the standpoint of both flood and drought conditions. About 144,000 acres of land along the North Canadian River downstream from the dam are benefited from the storage of floodwaters in the reservoir. During the eight floods that have occurred since the project was completed, reservoir releases were held to bankfull flows or below in the channel immediately downstream from the dam. Flood damages prevented to date are estimated at $4,774,180. In addition, revenues amounting to $126,800 have accrued to the project from the leasing of lands in the reservoir area. Annual payments of $148,550 are received from the city of Oklahoma City under terms of two contracts for temporary rental of storage space to augment the municipal water supply. Full benefits from low-flow and emergency water supply releases have not as yet been evaluated.

The extent of public interest in Canton and a measure of its value from the standpoint of recreation are demonstrated by attendance records. Over the past 12 years, attendance has averaged 638,000 visitors annually.

Overall, the benefits accruing from the project have, in the 17 years of operation, exceeded the construction and operation costs invested by the Federal Government.

The bill which I introduce today, joined by my colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], will authorize the construction and operation of the irrigation of 16,000 acres of land in Blaine and Canadian Counties with water from the North Canadian River impounded in the Canton Reservoir.

Representative JED JOHNSON, JR., will introduce an identical bill in the House.

A project feasibility report was completed by the Bureau of Reclamation in August 1951 and was formally reviewed in the first part of 1952 by Federal and State agencies in accordance with requirements of the Flood Control Act of 1944. The feasibility report, entitled "Canton Project, North Canadian River Basin, Okla." was transmitted to the Congress on June 10, 1954, and was subsequently printed in 1954 as House Document No. 445, 83d Congress, 2d session.

More than 11 years have elapsed since the project feasibility report was prepared, and even more time has passed since the engineering, water supply, and economic studies were made; hence a "reappraisal" has been prepared for the primary purpose of determining current project feasibility and bringing studies up to date so as to reflect changes in basic data, construction costs, and economic and other factors that have had a bearing on the project during the past decade or more.

The people of the project area in 1945 evidenced their desire for the project by formation under the laws of Oklahoma of the Canton irrigation district, a responsible organization that has continuously supported efforts to obtain project authorization. This district, which is empowered to execute an irrigation repayment contract, is still existent.

A water right for the project has been established. The Secretary of the Interior on July 13, 1939, made application for withdrawal of unappropriated waters of the North Canadian River. This application was accepted by the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board. It was recognized by the Oklahoma district court in decree No. 99028, December 1939, adjudicating water rights of the North Canadian River. This withdrawal has been modified by subsequent partial releases made by the Secretary of the Interior at the request of the State of Oklahoma. The project right is subordinate to the prior right of the city of Oklahoma City, which is significant in determination of the North Canadian River flows which can be stored for project use.

Hydrologic studies still show that a reasonably dependable water supply of quality suitable for irrigation could be provided for the project by regulation of the North Canadian River flows in the Canton Reservoir, provided the necessary irrigation storage capacity is maintained for the project.

The Bureau of Reclamation, with recognition of the authorization of the Canton Reservoir construction, and at the request of local interests and the State, developed plans for irrigation of the potential Canton project lands.

On the basis of decisions reached in conferences between the corps and the Bureau of Reclamation, the corps, as part of construction of the Canton Dam and at a cost of about $100,000, constructed the outlet works determined by the Bureau to be desirable for delivery of Canton Reservoir to a gravity canal which would extend to the potential project lands.

Early planning by the Bureau was on the basis that construction of the reservoir with about 400,000 acre-feet of storage capacity insured that the approximate 69,000 acre-feet then deemed required to provide an adequate water supply for the contemplated irrigation, would be available to the Canton project without cost to the irrigators. This conformed to the viewpoint of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board and the project interests.

The plan provides for construction of works to convey and distribute water from Canton Reservoir for irrigation of 16,000 acres of land along the North Canadian River in Blaine and Canadian Counties, and for necessary drainage. The principal works include the irrigation outlet works at Canton Dam, a main earth canal about 46 miles long with a maximum capacity of 300 second feet at the point of diversion at Canton Dam, laterals for distribution of water from the canal to the project lands, and drainage facilities.

The irrigation plan for the 16,000-acre project is identical to the one presented in House Document No. 445. However, construction costs have increased in the intervening years; and the current estimated cost of the irrigation system is $6,355,000.

Operation, maintenance, and replacement costs under current prices are now estimated at $85,000 annually for a 16,000-acre project on the basis of a full water supply for irrigation. This is $5.30 annually per acre and is comprised of $5.20 for the irrigation distribution system and $0.10 for the irrigation outlet works at Canton Dam.

Payment capacity on the basis of a full supply of irrigation water is summarized from farm budgets tabulated below on a per-acre basis.

Farm budget summary based on full irrigation water supply

Item:	*Per acre*
Increase in—	
Gross farm income	$44.93
Farm expense	22.41
Net farm income	22.52
Family living allowance	------
Equity allowance	.83
Family labor and wages of management	5.17
Payment capacity	16.52
Contingency (15 percent)	2.52
Payment capacity after allowance for contingency	14.00
Project O.M. & R. cost	5.30
Amortization capacity	8.70

It was estimated that the benefits of irrigation over a 100-year period will average about $34 per acre per year. Total irrigation benefits for a 16,000-acre project are $544,000 annually.

The investment cost for the project is estimated to be $9,696,900, which includes interest during construction as well as the construction cost of the irrigation works. In addition, it includes a share of the cost of the dam and reservoir allocable to irrigation based on irrigation storage that would be provided.

Annual project costs consist of amortizing the net Federal investment cost over a 100-year period at 2⅞ percent interest, plus the annual operation and maintenance cost.

The benefit-cost comparison is as follows:

Total annual irrigation benefits	$544,000
Total annual project costs (irrigation)	$377,800
Benefit-cost ratio	1.44

The delay in developing the project has already resulted in loss of considerable economic benefits to a fine agricultural area. Further delay will constitute a further waste of valuable water resource that is capable of providing over a half million dollars benefits annually.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2053) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Canton Federal reclamation project, Oklahoma, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. HARRIS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 217)

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment to S. 1446 the Wild Rivers Act. The effect of this amendment would be to add to the national wild rivers system State designated and administered wild river areas.

Inclusion of such nationally significant waterways, administered under State authority, would effectively bring the States into compatible partnership with the Federal Government. The preservation of selected rivers recommended by the Governors of the several States and the President and approved by the Congress would be enhanced and the national conservation purposes of the Wild Rivers Act thus furthered.

In submitting recommendations for State-administered wild river areas the Governor of the State would present to the President his recommendations for such inclusion in the national wild rivers system. His recommendations would be supported by a general plan which would assure the President and the Congress that the purposes of the act would be effected in perpetuity. The President would review State proposals and make known his recommendations to the Congress for legislative designation of the wild river area within the national wild rivers system.

Funds appropriated to the States from the land and water conservation fund would be made available to the State for the acquisition of property, rights, or easements necessary for the purposes of the act. Such authorization will provide the financial means of State action and is in full accord with the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act which we passed in the last Congress. This is a logical extension of the Federal-State-local partnership required in the "new conservation" advocated so eloquently by President Johnson for the preservation and restoration of natural beauty throughout our land.

In my State of Maine this approach will, I feel sure, ameliorate the deadlock between Federal and State interests for the preservation of that most beautiful and wondrous wilderness area, the Allagash River, the greatest such remaining area in the Eastern United States. I feel equally sure that many of my colleagues here will be cognizant of similar application within their own States where the preservation of scenic wilderness waterways is impeded by alternate positions in the States and the Federal bureaucracy, albeit that their end intentions are the same.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 217) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR JOINT RESOLUTION TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 85, which I introduced on Monday, be held at the desk for an additional 3 days, until the close of the session on June 3.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. NELSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. MURPHY be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1566) to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, at the next printing of the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey and Mr. PELL be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1807) to provide for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the extent and means of resolving the critical shortage of qualified manpower in the field of correctional rehabilitation, at the next printing of the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] may be added as cosponsor to S. 1858, to promote the replacement and expansion of the U.S. nonsubsidized merchant and fishing fleets, at the next printing of the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1858, to promote the replacement and expansion of the U.S. nonsubsidized merchant and fishing fleets, at the next printing of the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr DOMINICK] be added as cosponsors of the bill, S. 1596, to promote the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by modernizing practices of the Federal Government relating to the inspection of persons, merchandise, and conveyances moving into, through, and out of the United States, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1229) to provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, Mr. HALEY, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. SKUBITZ were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 821) for the relief of the town of Kure Beach, N.C.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 806. An act to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act to permit the listing on labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product.

H.R. 6691. An act to validate certain payments made to employees of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; and

H.R. 7031. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

RESOLUTION RELATED TO THE AUTHORITY OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. CARLSON. The State Corporation Commission of Kansas unanimously adopted a resolution in regard to Senate bill No. 218, which is now pending in Congress.

This bill, as approved, would authorize the Federal Power Commission to take jurisdiction over matters that many, including the State corporation commission, believe should be left in the hands of the States.

I share this view and ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

(In the matter of the amendment of section 201(f) of part II of the Federal Power Act)

Whereas there has been introduced in the 89th Congress Senate bill 218 which would amend the Federal Power Act with reference to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and would provide that Federal regulation of matters relating to the transmission and sale of electric energy should not extend to those matters primarily of local concern and subject to regulation by a State regulatory body; and

Whereas the State Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas is of the opinion that the public interest is best served by legislation amending the Federal Power Act to remove jurisdiction from the Federal Power Commission those aspects of the transmission and sale of electric energy which are primarily of local concern and subject to effective State regulation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is urged to enact Senate bill No. 218 which would amend section 201(f) of part II of the Federal Power Act, or any other bill which would accomplish the same objectives: *Provided*, However, there is effective State regulation of the transmission and sale of electric energy; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized by forwarding copies of this resolution to the Kansas congressional delegation; to the Senate Commerce Committee; to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; and that copies be sent to the Federal Power Commission and the several State regulatory commissions; to the Secretary of the National Association of Railroads and Utilities Commissions, and to the electric companies operating in the State of Kansas.

The commission hereby adopts the foregoing resolution.

Commissioners:

WILLIAM L. MITCHELL, *Chairman*.
JAMES O. GREENLEAF.
HARRY G. WILES.

Dated at Topeka, Kans., this 17th day of May 1965.

RAYMOND B. HARVEY,
Secretary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FRANCE AND DE GAULLE IN PROPER FOCUS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, U.S. policy in the Dominican Republic has now been called into question by President de Gaulle, who declared yesterday:

> The French Government is convinced that the foreign political and military intervention currently in progress in Santo Domingo, in continuing, can lead only to the extension both on the spot and in the whole of that region of the world of disturbances disquieting for international peace.

This statement is part of a consistent pattern followed by President de Gaulle, who has also criticized our proposals to help defend freedom and self-determination in South Vietnam and made dire predictions about the fate of NATO, from which beginning in 1969 any one of the 15 member nations may withdraw on 1 year's notice.

I have recently been in Paris on a mission as a delegate to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference and was there faced with questions about President de Gaulle's charge that the United States and the Soviet Union were trying to establish separate hegemonies with the implication that these threatened the national integrity of individual states. The whole pattern of the French President's pronouncements recently has been to nettle the American people and to undercut U.S. diplomatic and military efforts around the globe. It is therefore vital, considering France's importance to the security and freedom of Europe, President de Gaulle's historic services to the freedom and stability of France, and the historic and close Franco-American friendship and alliance, that the matter be put in proper focus.

I believe that our country must stand behind the following propositions:

First. Now that our actions in the Dominican Republic have been assimilated into the authority of the OAS and are being taken in common with other OAS members with the objective of helping to maintain security, self-determination, and free institutions for the Dominican people, these actions are proper and vital to the peace and freedom of the Western hemisphere and fully in accord with the American regional system, which is consonant with and recognized by the United Nations Charter. We must and should, therefore, remain constant in this policy as it has developed.

Second. We are in South Vietnam struggling side by side with a people that shows every evidence of wishing us to do so, at the invitation of their government, to defend their country against aggression carried out through the fomenting of internal guerrilla war by North Vietnam, aided and abetted and supported by both Communist China and the Soviet Union. It is our traditional policy to counteract Communist subversion disguised as so-called wars of national liberation. Laying aside for the moment proper debates over means, tactics, and scale of our effort in Vietnam, this policy is absolutely essential to the peace, security, and freedom of the United States and the free world.

Third. Notwithstanding President de Gaulle's own feelings about Europe for the Europeans, the people of the United States have the right to believe that it is the preponderant sentiment of the peoples of Europe that their own economic, social, and political integration, in association with the United States and Canada through NATO and the growing instruments of the Atlantic community, represents their surest guarantee of peace and well-being and constitutes the basic foundation of the security of both Europe and North America and of international peace and freedom throughout the world.

Fourth. France is an essential, vital element in Europe, because of its capacity, its strength, its position, and its traditions. France has too much at stake to withdraw from or reject the instruments of security, including NATO, which have been fashioned since the end of World War II at such tremendous cost and through such great effort and struggle. The American people have the right to believe, therefore, taking into account France's historic and traditional concern for world peace, self-determination and freedom, and even considerations of strict self-interest, that France will not disrupt its own security or the Security of the Atlantic community by withdrawing from NATO or undertaking any other truly decisive disruptive act.

Fifth. We must continue to give the greatest consideration to the views of President de Gaulle and of France, fully understanding and respecting the historic role of the French President and that of the nation he heads, evaluating

French ideas and suggestions—no matter how provocatively put forth—not only in their form, but in their substance.

On the basis of these propositions I see the possibility of an entirely viable relationship between the United States and France, and as one Senator, I shall do everything I can to forward and secure that relationship and that historic friendship and alliance.

BURKE MARSHALL OPPOSES DIRKSEN APPORTIONMENT AMENDMENT AS DESTRUCTIVE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, pending at the present time before the Committee on the Judiciary is a constitutional amendment to provide that the States may elect one house of their legislatures on some basis other than population. This is the well-known Dirksen amendment. There has been much testimony pro and con about that amendment.

One of the most persuasive appearances, in my judgment, was by Burke Marshall. Burke Marshall was President Kennedy's expert on civil rights. He is recognized throughout the Nation as a man who understood the implications and problems of civil rights very well. He particularly understood the difficulty of enforcing effective civil rights legislation in view of our federal system.

In fact, he wrote a great book entitled "Federalism and Civil Rights." It is a very short book, but a most informative one. Burke Marshall has been vigorously against the so-called Dirksen-Mansfield apportionment amendment on the ground that it would interfere and interfere seriously with civil rights.

I should like to quote briefly from his testimony. He said:

> Those who are concerned about increased Federal activity in seeking solutions for the immense difficulties the cities face in education, health, welfare, housing, and poverty should recognize that it has been the apparent inability of the States effectively to act that breeds the Federal programs now in process. We have seen this happen most clearly in the field of voting, where the abuse of State police power and the refusal in some States to correct discrimination against Negroes in registration and voting has inexorably led to Federal legislation, and the exercise of Federal power, in 1957, 1960, 1964, and now in the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In the case of urban problems, the absence of effective State action has been at least in part—I believe in large part—an inevitable result of 60 years of history in which a small minority of the population of the States could elect and control their legislative houses.

Mr. Burke Marshall points out the concentration of Negro Americans who live in the cities. It is these people who would have their franchise diluted and reduced if the Dirksen amendment were to go into effect. That is why this is a central civil rights issue.

Burke Marshall also points out:

> In the first place, none of the proposed amendments explicitly bars racial considerations as a factor in determining the apportionment of representation in a State legislature. I assume that it is not the intention of the proponents of the amendments thus to dilute or eliminate the effect of the 15th amendment. Nevertheless, even if this is made clear, the choice as to method of apportioning under the amendment would necessarily be given in the first instance in some States to legislators who have been put in office by an electorate that has excluded large numbers of Negroes. This is certainly true now at least in Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Further, the effect of past discrimination in other States, whether or not Negroes can now get registered, has been the cause of disproportionate underrepresentation of Negro population.

In my judgment, it would ignore reality to believe that race would not be a major factor, if not the controlling factor, in any referendum on the apportionment question in several of our States for a considerable time to come.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excellent statement by Burke Marshall, given before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF BURKE MARSHALL BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, MAY 14, 1965

I appreciate the opportunity to testify in opposition to the proposals to amend the Constitution to permit the States to abandon the principle of equality in selecting the Members of one House of their legislatures. I shall try to be as brief as possible in stating my reasons.

I am an attorney presently engaged in the private practice of law. From February 1961, until January of this year, however, I was Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice. The briefs filed expressing the views of the United States in the reapportionment cases originated in that Division and accordingly the position taken by the United States, supporting the constitutional views later adopted by the Supreme Court, was initially my responsibility. In addition, the major efforts of the Division during the past 4 years have been directed at insuring the Negro citizens of some of the States that they would be given the right freely to register and to vote and accordingly to have a proportional voice in their State and local governments. I believe that the proposed amendments to the Constitution which are before this committee would seriously undercut those efforts, and it is to that aspect of the matter that I would like principally to direct the committee's attention.

It seems to me that the proposed amendments carry a very heavy burden from the outset because they are the first serious proposals that I know of to amend the Constitution to eliminate, rather than to enhance, rights that are protected against State action by the Constitution, particularly the 14th and 15th amendments, and are in that sense guaranteed by the Constitution to the people.

Only the most compelling reasons could justify this kind of dilution of the right to equal protection of the laws which is now a right of all our citizens. What has happened since the decisions of the Supreme Court in *Baker* v. *Carr, Reynolds* v. *Simms,* and the other reapportionment cases, certainly does not furnish any such reasons. Those decisions have not created any constitutional crisis. Rather they have provided a stimulus for long-overdue corrective action by the States that at least moves in the direction of making their legislative bodies working institutions of government, capable of dealing with the problems of this century and the urbanization of our society.

All of the available history rather argues against any tampering with the Constitution in this respect. For the fact is that, until the Federal courts finally intervened, following *Baker* v. *Carr,* to protect the right to equality in voting which is guaranteed by the 14th amendment, a crisis in our Federal system was brewed by a failure on the part of the States to meet their responsibility in dealing with our society as it exists in fact, not in fancy. Those who are concerned about increased Federal activity in seeking solutions for the immense difficulties the cities face in education, health, welfare, housing, and poverty should recognize that it has been the apparent inability of the States effectively to act that breeds the Federal programs now in process. We have seen this happen most clearly in the field of voting, where the abuse of State police power and the refusal in some States to correct discrimination against Negroes in registration and voting has inexorably led to Federal legislation, and the exercise of Federal power, in 1957, 1960, 1964, and now in the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In the case of urban problems, the absence of effective State action has been at least in part—I believe in large part—an inevitable result of 60 years of history in which a small minority of the population of the States could elect and control their legislative houses.

Amending the Constitution so as to permit this history to be repeated does not make any sense. It is dangerous in the long run for the continued viability of the States and the Federal system. In addition, it is specifically dangerous to the minority groups, particularly Negroes, who most drastically feel the impact of the urban problems which I have mentioned. In fact, the proposed amendments seem to me to endanger very seriously our entire effort to give these groups an effective political voice in asking their States for help.

In the first place, none of the proposed amendments explicitly bars racial considerations as a factor in determining the apportionment of representation in a State legislature. I assume that it is not the intention of the proponents of the amendments thus to dilute or eliminate the effect of the 15th amendment. Nevertheless, even if this is made clear, the choice as to method of apportioning under the amendment would necessarily be given in the first instance in some States to legislators who have been put in office by an electorate that has excluded large numbers of Negroes. This is certainly true now at least in Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Further, the effect of past discrimination in other States, whether or not Negroes can now get registered, has been to cause disproportionate underrepresentation of the Negro population.

Thus the initial decision itself in these States, whatever the amendments say, will be made with racial history in mind. And at least until the Voting Rights Act of 1965 has been passed and given a substantial period of time in which to work, the electorate in passing on the system of apportionment in any referendum would be an unrepresentative electorate. In my judgment, it would ignore reality to believe that race would not be a major factor, if not the controlling factor, in any referendum on the apportionment question in several of our States for a considerable time to come.

Further, some of the proposed amendments, including that suggested by Senator Dirksen, fail to make any provision, and perhaps cannot effectively do so in any event, for reviewing decisions about apportionment that are made by the legislatures in power at the time that the amendment becomes ratified. Decisions that will affect, and intimately affect, the lives of future generations will thus be made by legislatures which are now malapportioned and in which Negroes are grossly underrepresented.

Finally, there are many ways in which racial considerations can enter into these decisions without violating a prohibition against discrimination.

Apportionment on any but a population basis, for example, has always discriminated against city dwellers, and this fact proportionally deprives Negroes of political voice more than any other identifiable group. In 1960, over 72 percent of Negro Americans lived in urban areas. There is every indication that this percentage is increasing, and increasing rapidly. In Alabama, for example, the percentage of nonwhites living in urban areas went up 23 percent between 1950 and 1960, while those living in rural areas went down almost 20 percent. In Mississippi, the comparable figures were 27.6 percent increase and a 17.7 percent decrease; in North Carolina, 26.4 percent as against 2.5 percent; in Louisiana, over 200 percent as against 8.6 percent. Of all the Southern States, only Florida showed any increase in the nonwhite population in rural areas, and that increase was slightly over 1 percent as against 71.3 percent in urban areas.

If it be assumed that the discrimination permitted by the proposed amendments may be based on other factors than giving rural voters a greater voice than urban voters, there are available many other ostensibly nonracial criteria which would result in depriving Negroes more than whites of a voice in their government. If property qualifications are used, for example, only three out of eight nonwhite households owned their own homes in 1960, as compared to five out of eight white householders. These are national figures; the disparity would be much greater for the Southern States. In terms of education, in 1960 the median school years completed for whites was 10.9, while the comparable figure for nonwhites was 8.2 years. The 6.7 percent of whites in the country have had less than 5 years of elementary school, but this was true in 1960 of 23 percent of the nonwhites. Similar disparities can be found in any educational standard that is chosen. And they can be multiplied in terms of any economic, social, or even regional interests, not related to population, which might be used as a test of representation.

It is to be noted that the use of property, educational, or other objective criteria for apportionment purposes cannot really be answered by tampering with the language of the proposed amendments so as to appear to prohibit racial discrimination. At the least, efforts to preserve white political supremacy in some States would lead to endless litigation over the methods of apportionment chosen. The gerrymandering of Tuskegee, Ala., which was the object of the court's opinion in *Gomillion* v. *Lightfoot*, is only the most blatant of racially motivated political action. More probably, however, whatever language was proposed could not in fact prevent the devising of some methods of apportionment which would in effect deprive the Negro minority of a real political voice.

Nor is this a matter which is in any sense cured by the requirement that the method of apportionment be submitted to the people by way of referendum. We have seen again and again in the States I have referred to, and in others, the lengths to which the majority of voters will go—even complicating very seriously the methods by which they become registered themselves—to find ways of keeping Negroes from gaining any political voice. It is for this reason that the Constitution thus far has prohibited the majority, even through democratic means, from depriving members of a minority group of their right to be treated fairly under the law. Further, as I have already pointed out, in several States the electorate that would in fact approve any apportionment system in the next few years will be an electorate which is already in imbalance because of existing or past racial discrimination in reigstering and voting.

These are some of the specific problems which are clearly discernible in the proposed amendments. But in conclusion, I would like to point out that the question goes far beyond mere technical underrepresentation of this one segment of the population. The question is whether or not the States will have political systems capable of action to meet the most urgent problems of our society, of which the most pressing and most difficult is that of low-income Negroes and other nonwhites living in the blighted and congested parts of the urban centers. However the language of these proposed amendments is changed, they plainly contemplate the possibility of a malapportioned house in every State legislature which will at the very least have veto power over welfare, economic, educational, and civil rights measures aimed at remedying urban problems, and particularly the condition of the urban Negro. And if our experience in past years means anything, it is unrealistic to expect responsiveness to these needs by a legislative body whose members owe little or no political allegience to the people in need of help.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, my good friend, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, knows of the respect in which I hold him. I do not want now to encumber the Record with a long colloquy on a highly controversial issue which the Senate and House of Representatives will face later.

I simply say to the Senator that, in our society, we must place our trust in the people. It is the people at the ballot box who must, in the final analysis, make many of the very basic policy decisions which confront them.

It has seemed to me, therefore, that if a constitutional amendment were to place the right in the people to make a decision at the ballot box with reference to the manner in which they would desire to apportion their legislative branch, the ends of our type of society would be very well met, and the people themselves would be making the choice.

People make mistakes on occasion, but not very often. Therefore, it has seemed to me, I say to my friend, that giving the people in each State a continuing right on election day to make their decision with respect to the reapportionment problem is in the very essence responsive to the type of society which our Founding Fathers envisioned.

I make this comment obviously in no spirit of rancor, but because I do want to point out that when we debate as he sees the light, my able friend—who has devoted himself to principle record here—I and others will have an opportunity to debate at close range whether Congress should recommend a constitutional amendment to the people and have the people in each State make that decision.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from California. He has hit upon the crux of this debate. Last year, it was the analogy of State government with the Federal Government and the Senate; the so-called Federal analogy. This time it will be whether the people should decide the matter in a referendum.

The position of the Senator from Wisconsin is very simple on this matter. The fact is that the Senator from California and I have responsibility as Senators. It seems to me that we must pass on the merits of legislation and whether it should be submitted in a referendum to the people or not. We could have a referendum which would enable the people to pass a national lottery, to legalize gambling, or legalize selling of harmful drugs. We could say leave it to the people, pass the buck, let the people decide these and all issues. Why not? Can we walk off and forget our duty? Do we have no responsibility once we submit an issue to the people? Do we approve or anything?

I believe that the Senator from California knows that even if the people can act, we are given the responsibility under the Constitution to express our own position on the merits of these matters. And we cannot get off the hook by simply saying let the people decide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when a Senator must decide how to vote on a matter which runs so completely counter to a principle in which he deeply believes—the principle that every man should have an equal vote—then he certainly has a right to stand on the floor of the Senate and fight as hard as he can for his beliefs, whether or not the issue is also to be put before the people in a referendum.

I also remind the Senator from California, and I am sure that the Senator from California knows, perhaps in the history of California, that a referendum can be worded in such a way and promoted in such a way in the newspapers, on the television, on the radio through the use of an enormous amount of money, that people can be deceived.

I have great faith in the people. I would not be a U.S. Senator today if I did not have. We must realize that on a matter as complicated as this, and as removed from their immediate interest—since it is not a matter of taxation or war—people can be deceived. It is a duty, a fundamental, inescapable duty for Members of Congress to vote on the merits of the matter.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on the latter part of my friend's comment, I completely agree. I must say, alas, that the techniques of deception and deceit are constantly available to those in our society who would try to mislead, whether the problem be an issue on the ballot in a State or in a presidential campaign, or, indeed, in a senatorial campaign.

I speak now as a Californian. The record of the people of my State in passing judgment on multitudes of issues deemed by them to be serious is an excellent record. While occasionally deception has done its work effectively and successfully, the people in the long run have been able to rectify the errors which may have crept into their votes in prior elections.

This is a very crucial issue. I would not equate it with many of the other problems which we have before us, all of which are important. This is a fundamental question concerning the form of government in the several States.

I look forward—as I am sure will be the case when the issue is pending—to spending time on open and constructive debate with my friend in order, in the public interest, to attempt to find out specifically the arguments in favor of the proposal, as well as the arguments that are not in favor of the proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from California is one of the most reasonable as well as one of the ablest Members of the Senate. With respect to these basic matters—and this is a basic, fundamental, and most important principle—I would never vote to deny people the right of religious freedom, the right of freedom of speech, the right of assembly or to abridge other basic rights on the ground that I would leave the decision to a referendum in all of the 50 States. And I would be basically reluctant to vote for a denial of the right to equal representation of each man—black or white, rich or poor, literate or illiterate—in his own State legislature.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S PROMPT ACTION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC SAVED LIVES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has been criticized on our intervention in Santo Domingo, and there has been a great deal of confusion about it. One of the clearest reports on the instant situation which preceded the President's action was written by Virginia Prewett in the Washington Daily News. I read from that article briefly:

> At 5:30 p.m., a unanimous request had come from our nine-man diplomatic country team in the Dominican Republic requesting immediate military assistance to save the lives of a thousand Americans in the Embajador Hotel.
>
> "That cuts it," said President Johnson. "I'm not going to have the American people wake up tomorrow morning and find a hundred of our people dead down there because I didn't do anything."

This is a fine and concise report on the incidents leading up to the President's decision on Santo Domingo which I think should be called to the attention of the Congress and the American people, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

L.B.J.'S PROMPT DOMINICAN REPUBLIC ACTION SAVED AMERICAN LIVES

(NOTE.—This is the last of three articles in which Virginia Prewett, prize-winning Washington Daily News columnist on Latin America, gives a behind-the-scenes report on how President Johnson decided to send U.S. forces into the Dominican Republic. Miss Prewett received information from a high source, who cannot be identified.)

(By Virginia Prewett)

When President Johnson between 5:30 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. on April 28 quickly telephoned or called in the Nation's top officials about landing marines in the Dominican Republic, a conversation was being held between our Embassy there and the Washington message center.

News was relayed to the President that the Embassies of El Salvador, Argentina, Guatemala, and Ecuador had been fired on. The U.S. aid mission had been raided. The evacuation zone around the Embajador Hotel had been broken into again.

At 5:30 p.m., a unanimous request had come from our nine-man diplomatic "country team" in the Dominican Republic requesting immediate military assistance to save the lives of a thousand Americans in the Embajador Hotel.

THAT CUTS IT

"That cuts it," said President Johnson. "I'm not going to have the American people wake up tomorrow morning and find a hundred of our people dead down there because I didn't do anything."

He took the position that if he did not act, he risked immediate blood guilt for the Americans. The vision of another Cuba was strong in his mind.

He said later of the moment: "We know there are evil forces everywhere—in this country and everywhere else. But here in the United States they're not in control. At that moment, in Santo Domingo, they were in control."

Mr. Johnson ordered multiple messages to go into effect at 6:30 p.m. The marines were to land. The first pathfinder group did land in LCT's at Haina seaport not long afterward. By 7:50 p.m., 405 marines were ashore.

SETTLEMENT SOUGHT

With the military order, Mr. Johnson stressed his urgent hope for a cease-fire and a settlement of Dominican differences.

He also called for congressional leaders to meet with him at 7:15 p.m.

When he issued the landing order, he directed the area officers of the State Department's American Republics Division to notify all Latin American ambassadors that many Latin American embassies and diplomats in the Dominican Republic had called on the United States for help, that the U.S. Marines were landing to save American and other lives, and that the United States urgently requested an OAS meeting the next day.

REDS SPOTTED

The congressional leaders stayed with the President until 9 p.m. When they asked about Communist influence, Mr. Johnson told them that the Communist apparatus had been spotted emerging.

At first two known members of the Communist apparatus were spotted seizing strategic command of groups or objectives, then nine were spotted, and more and more. During the day the pro-Castro talisman cry of "Paredon" (to the wall) had multiplied as mobs sacked, looted, and killed.

After 6:30 p.m., nine State Department area chiefs for Latin America were called to their offices. Their instructions were to telephone the President's message to every Latin American Ambassador. This the nine diplomats did. Not only OAS members, but also Jamaica and Trinidad were called.

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, has critically compared President Johnson's procedure with the Latin Americans with that of his late brother during the Cuban missile crisis.

WHEN J.F.K. SPOKE

On October 22, 1962, President Kennedy spoke to the Nation at 6:30 p.m., announcing his intention to order a naval quarantine around Cuba. That night he had the Latin American Ambassadors notified and, like Mr. Johnson, called an OAS meeting for the next day. After the meeting officially approved his action, he ordered U.S. Navy units, already in position, to impose the quarantine.

President Kennedy could do this because the United States had the initiative in this crisis. This permitted him to control the timing.

President Johnson, in contrast, was at the mercy of timing imposed by the wild mobs in Santo Domingo. If he had announced he meant to send in marines the next day, it virtually would have invited a mob attack on the Embajador Hotel—and the emergence of a regime of some kind controlled by Communists.

REASONS DISCUSSED

On Thursday, April 29, at 10:30 a.m., the OAS met and Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker reviewed the landing and the reasons for it. The OAS asked the Papal Nuncio in Santo Domingo to arrange a ceasefire. Late that night the OAS called an emergency foreign ministers' meeting and approved establishment of an international safe haven in the Dominican Republic.

On April 30, the special meeting sent Secretary General Jose Mora to Santo Domingo. The next day the OAS named a special five-man peacemaking team and sent it to Santo Domingo on a U.S. military plane.

Acting at its swiftest, the OAS thus managed to get its peace team in 4 days after the crisis peak when a thousand Americans were in danger at the Embajador.

The OAS simply did not have the machinery or the precedents to go in quickly and protect the foreign nationals. The hope is that it will develop the needed muscles out of the Dominican crisis.

CONTRADICTIONS SHOW

A significant feature of the U.S. press criticism of the order to land the marines is that it comes from the same spokesmen who most vociferously and tenaciously defended the Castro regime. "Anti-war" crusaders condemn the order to land the marines in one breath and call for Cuba-type revolutions throughout Latin America in the next.

But what President Johnson recalls is that thousands of American lives were in danger. He sees a new and vicious subversion creeping into the Western Hemisphere, the kind we are fighting in Vietnam.

If he had to do it over, he would land the Marines again.

Important in the story is the fact that U.S. forces in Santo Domingo have evacuated many more nationals of the other countries than our own countrymen.

MANY MOVED OUT

In all about 2,000 Americans were moved out. And more than 2,500 citizens of 45 other nations.

They include people from Canada, China, Europe, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Bulgaria—the world. Latin Americans evacuated include

Argentines, Bolivians, Brazilians, Chileans, Colombians, Costa Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, Ecuadorans, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Haitians, Panamanians, Nicaraguans, Mexicans, Peruvians, Uruguayans, Venezuelans, and Jamaicans.

These are the people you might ask whether Mr. Johnson should have sent in the marines.

DESPERATE NEED FOR U.S. GOVERNMENT COUNTERINSURGENCY COMPETENCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one matter that I am sure has concerned all Members of Congress has been the success of the Communists in South Vietnam with their subversive tactics. Recently an excellent parley took place at Airlie House in Virginia, attended by university professors, business leaders, officials of the Federal Government, journalists, and others, to discuss our experience with counterinsurgency

Max Freedman wrote an article on this subject, which was published in last night's Washington Star. I quote from the article:

> At present the men working on counterinsurgency are found in marginal positions in various departments and agencies of the Government. They are usually remote from the centers of power, and their advice and assistance often are ignored until the troubles have burst upon us. They lack the power and prestige inside the bureaucracy which come only from an established commitment, a large budget, and a purpose which visibly commands the support of the President.

He goes on to say——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I quote further from the article:

> The important point is that the Communists boast that they have discovered a new kind of warfare in subversion, while we have been haphazard and meager, furtive and underhand, in our response to that challenge. The panel wants this inadequate U.S. policy to be replaced by a visible, vigorous, and enduring commitment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Max Freedman, which seems to me to support the Freedom Academy which many of us have supported or something much like it, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARLEY STUDIES FUTURE U.S. POLICY

(By Max Freedman)

For 3 days the recent conference at Airlie House in Virginia had drawn about 100 people into an examination of the major problems in world affairs. The participants came from universities and from business, from the Federal Government, from journalism, and from other disciplines. Divided in their training and experience, they were united in their determination to confront the problems that will face the United States in the next 10 years in its "Strategy for Peace," the theme of the conference.

This Airlie conference, as distinct from the recent gestures and demonstrations on university campuses, was not concerned with the mere expression of academic anxiety and protest. Its discussions all had a practical purpose—to make scholarship relevant to the actual agenda of the Government and to set that agenda in a larger perspective than it is usually possible for harassed officials to achieve.

Nowhere was this purpose better realized than in the report of the discussion group on Asia. The chairman was Dr. Kenneth Young, formerly Ambassador to Thailand and now the president of the Asia Society. Its rapporteur was a scholarly officer from the Air Force, Col. Edward Foote, now working with the Council on Foreign Relations.

In its report, which will be published some time from now, the panel assumed that the problems of subversion and sabotage and insurrection will fill the next 10 years and present new challenges to the United States. It believes the time has come for the U.S. Government to abandon the concept of counterinsurgency and to accept a new philosophy that gives a much higher priority to Communist subversion.

Perhaps it is true that counterinsurgency has had its day because it is essentially a negative doctrine. It waits for the Communists to make their thrust and then tries to counter the trouble. It does not anticipate the trouble, try to avert it by a process of self-help in the threatened area, quickly mobilize diverse forms of U.S. aid, and seek to pluck out the Communist mischief at its roots. All these criticisms may be valid but it would be unjust to bury the doctrine of counterinsurgency without some praise for its services. It is easy to recall the stubborn skepticism and entrenched opposition that met the pioneer efforts of men like Walt Rostow of the State Department as they pointed to the more dangerous character of Communist subversion. If we now can move beyond counterinsurgency, it is only because of the foundation for success already achieved.

At present the men working on counterinsurgency are found in marginal positions in various departments and agencies of the Government. They are usually remote from the centers of power, and their advice and assistance often are ignored until the troubles have burst upon us. They lack the power and prestige inside the bureaucracy which come only from an established commitment, a large budget, and a purpose which visibly commands the support of the President. Yet Vietnam, and the unrest in the Dominican Republic, clearly show that subversion is a greater threat than direct military aggression.

The panel recommends that a new agency be established, preferably in the Executive Office of the President, to direct and manage the campaign, to forestall subversion and defeat it. The establishment of such an agency would in itself be a powerful weapon in the U.S. armory. It would embody the long-term commitment of the United States to deny easy victories to subversion. It would mobilize the scattered energies of U.S. officials and give them concentrated purpose. It would give the threatened nations the assurance of American help before the subversion had actually done its mischief. Wise planning of this kind involves a smaller and cheaper U.S. effort than large-scale intervention after the troubles have occurred, as in Vietnam.

The important point is that the Communists boast that they have discovered a new kind of warfare in subversion while we have been haphazard and meager, furtive and underhand, in our response to that challenge. The panel wants this inadequate U.S. policy to be replaced by a visible, vigorous, and enduring commitment. The Communists would then know that we have at last accepted the challenge of subversion with the same firmness and constancy shown by the United States years ago when it responded to the more open challenges of aggression. The Airlie House report will certainly be studied by many offices of the Government and not least in the White House.

CEILING PRICE FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS IN COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, once again I join many others in requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to act within his own regulatory authority to increase the ceiling price at which Commodity Credit Corporation agricultural products can be sold.

Under section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 this agency of the USDA could not sell any wheat for unrestricted use at less than 105 percent of the county loan rate. In the case of feed grains, CCC must sell for the county loan rate plus carrying charges. I am confident that should the Secretary increase this present ceiling to 110 or 115 percent our farm population would reap financial benefits before the year's end. Such a move, it is generally agreed, is within the discretionary power of the Secretary.

Mr. President, several weeks ago I introduced a bill which would provide that the sellout price be increased to 125 percent. The percentage in that proposed legislation may be too great, but it was introduced in the effort to further protect the farmers price in the open market. My measure included feed grains and all agricultural commodities under the control of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The purpose of this legislation was not to hamstring the CCC, but, rather, was intended to provide another source of strength for the market and provide the farmer with more flexibility within the marketplace.

Although I understand that the CCC presently is not selling any wheat for unrestricted use, there has been some evidence that in past years some surplus wheat has been dumped into the market at a time when such action was not unrelated to farm referendum votes. Certainly such actions should be restricted, if not halted, and this purpose would be served if the sellout price could be increased as proposed by my bill or in accordance with action taken by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, to repeat, I urge the Secretary of Agriculture to seriously consider using his own broad power to issue an increase in the ceiling on CCC commodities. Such a move on the part of the Secretary would give the farmer an opportunity for increased income in a freer market.

MEDICARE REVOLT?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Ohio State Medical Association claiming to represent some 10,000 Ohio physicians and surgeons, by a vote of 77 to 71 recently adopted a resolution urging physicians and surgeons not to participate in the forthcoming medicare program, so-called. This action is a disgraceful violation of the public trust and of the obligation of the medical profession to the public. It is sheer stupidity. I am confident that the great majority of doctors in Ohio will disregard the fiat of the 77 doctors who voted for this absurd resolution. I understand that the medical societies of Arizona, Louisiana, and Texas have taken similar positions.

Mr. President, medicare will be enacted and will be a reality regardless of the opposition of the political doctors who control the house of delegates of the American Medical Association and many State medical associations. Apart from the fact that it borders on blackmail, their attitude is completely out of character for professional men of integrity.

Doctors in the past, as a rule, have not been too particular as to how they got paid—just so they were paid. Witness the large number of collection agencies employed by physicians and surgeons in pursuit of uncollected medical bills owing, and the fact that the legislatures of most States of our Union have given preference to the physicians and surgeons when it comes to collecting those claims by garnishment proceedings.

If any Senator has reservations about the intensity with which the medical profession approaches its fee-setting and collection problems, I suggest that they read any issue of the magazine, Medical Economics—a publication received by practically every physician in the country. However, many doctors have apparently developed "instant religion," and for them money issued by the U.S. Government will no longer be considered legal tender.

When I say these doctors have developed "instant religion," I mean just that. The doctors who are so concerned over Federal payments for medical care provided to 18 million older people have no qualms whatsoever about accepting funds under the Kerr-Mills program—and they come directly from the taxpayer, the Federal employee health insurance programs, the health program for dependents of members of the armed services, and similar plans. Also, many of these doctors did not suffer pangs of conscience over the Federal Government's direct or indirect contributions toward the costs of their medical education. These same physicians exhibit no hesitancy over practicing medicine in medical facilities built with Hill-Burton Federal funds. However, in all fairness, it must be conceded that the various positions assumed by the medical profession during the past several years have not been characterized by logic, equity, and good will.

A number of conscientious and informed members of the medical profession have expressed concern over the deterioration in public respect and regard for doctors. This is directly attributable in large part to the activities of the political doctors who rule the American Medical Association. The image of the healer is too often overlayed with the image of the heel. This will be the predominant image if the stupid plan of a doctors' boycott, or strike, ever became a reality. Such a situation would be intolerable; and Government would have the responsibility of acting promptly and decisively in such a situation.

I admire and have confidence in the qualifications and integrity of a majority of the physicians and surgeons of our country, and of the State of Ohio. Very definitely, the political doctors of the AMA and of the Ohio State Medical Association do a disservice to these fine professional men and women, and misrepresent their views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, unfortunately the delegates, so called, of the Ohio State Medical Association and of the American Medical Association are political doctors who really do not represent the many fine physicians and surgeons.

For example, a few years ago the Ohio State Medical Association took a referendum of all physicians and surgeons in Ohio, asking the question: "Do you desire to be included under social security coverage?"

Of some 8,000 physicians and surgeons in my State who responded to that question, 68 percent stated that they desired to be included. But, of course, the political doctors in the State house of delegates quashed the information and never reported the results of the referendum.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Medicare Revolt" which was published in the Wall Street Journal of May 21.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 21, 1965]

Medicare Revolt?—Many Doctors Declare They Won't Participate in U.S. Health Plan: Their Resistance Might Upset Handling of Patient Claims, Rekindle Old Controversy—But Most MD's Will Cooperate

The revolt against medicare by the Nation's physicians may be far more serious than scattered reports indicate.

A surprising number of doctors declare they won't participate in the program, leaving patients to seek their own reimbursements for medical bills from the Government. A few even say they will not accept new patients coming to them under the program.

It's not likely that such resistance to medicare will kill, delay, or force major changes in the bill, which is expected to become law soon; nor is it likely that the program could be rendered ineffectual once it has begun. But the budding "nonparticipation" movement could inconvenience many medicare patients and confront any insurer handling medicare with major problems in administration.

Dr. Robert England, a physician practicing in Carlinville, Ill., holds views typical of those doctors vowing nonparticipation. "I don't plan to refuse to treat anybody," he stresses. But neither will he bill any Government-appointed medicare insurer for services or accept payment from such an organization. Instead, his elderly patients will have to pay their own bills as usual and then wrestle with the insurer for their compensation.

WON'T TAKE NEW PATIENTS

A Wall Street Journal survey of scores of physicians from coast to coast discloses that roughly 25 percent intend to follow Dr. England's course—or, in the case of a few, take even stronger measures. "I know I won't take any new patients under the program," declares Dr. Walter Sackett of Miami. "I think it's detrimental to good medical care, will destroy the physician-patient relationship, place medical treatment in the Government's hands, and increase the cost of medicine."

The survey is far from scientific, of course, and doesn't indicate precisely how many of the Nation's 178,000 full-time practicing physicians will refuse to cooperate in medicare. But it clearly indicates a far deeper trend toward nonparticipation than had previously been thought to exist—and suggests that the doctors' revolt may grow even wider in weeks to come.

Disaffection among doctors has been reflected lately in heated debates over resolutions, brought before local and State medical societies, calling for nonparticipation in the medicare program. In most cases these resolutions have been voted down, with many doctors opposed to medicare voting against them because of fear that such actions would be misinterpreted as threatening a doctors' strike.

However, the Ohio State Medical Association recently passed a nonparticipation resolution by a 77–71 vote, causing an open split in the organization. The Arizona Medical Society has taken a similar stance, and it's possible that more such resolutions will follow when the medicare bill assumes its finished form.

AMA PRESIDENT'S POSITION

Dr. Donovan F. Ward, president of the American Medical Association, has been urging medical groups to delay voting on such measures till then, saying that earlier action would be premature and might turn public opinion against the profession. "I would think it good strategy not to let anyone know what's going to take place in the event medicare is adopted," he recently told the Oklahoma Medical Association.

The Oklahoma group decided to defer action on a nonparticipation resolution "because the Washington situation is still fluid," a spokesman says. Other State groups, including New Jersey's, also are waiting to see what shape medicare finally takes. The Ohio group plans to press a vote for nonparticipation as a national policy when the AMA house of delegates meets June 20.

The issue could easily rekindle the nationwide controversy touched off 3 years ago by a group of physicians in the Point Pleasant, N.J., area. At the time, 44 doctors there signed pledges that they would not participate in any Government medicare-type program, and more than 2,000 physicians in other parts of the country quickly signed similar pledges, recalls Dr. Bruce Henriksen, a leader of the Point Pleasant revolt and still a strong advocate of nonparticipation. The movement drew widespread criticism from legislators, other physicians, and medical groups. The doctors involved were protesting against all such programs, including those operated under the King-Anderson law, a much more limited piece of legislation than the proposed medicare bill.

It's likely that much of the hullaballoo over nonparticipation represents a tactic by which many doctors can openly demonstrate just how strongly they oppose medicare. But if a significant number of those who now say they won't participate hold to their views when the program starts, a king-sized monkey wrench may be put into medicare's machinery.

TERMS OF BILL

In the version of the bill already passed by the House, medicare would aid eligible persons over 65 in paying hospital and nursing home expenses, and offer them the option of buying low-cost, federally backed health insurance to cover many medical services by physicians. As the legislation now stands, a doctor's patient would have the choice of asking the doctor to bill the medicare insurer directly, or of paying the bill out of his own pocket and filing a claim for reimbursement himself with the insurer. Either way, the medicare insurer involved would pay a specific amount determined by a schedule of fees set up to cover a variety of services.

The mechanics of how a claim is to be made are still to be worked out. However, health insurance carriers usually require forms and statements from physicians testifying to the precise nature of the services performed and the necessity for them; insurers say this is vital to prevent abuses and payments for unnecessary care, both of which can send costs—and premium rates—soaring.

The medicare bill as drawn up now states only that a "receipted bill" from the physician need be submitted for a patient to get reimbursement. Doctors assume this will have to be some sort of Federal form they will have to fill out, requesting data comparable to that sought by private insurers now. So, presumably, patients of many a nonparticipating doctor may be stuck with filing claims supported by nothing more than the usual cusory bill (often stated under the catchall "for services rendered").

Can the medicare insurer honor such a bill? It could cover all sorts of ineligible services or unnecessary treatments. On the other hand, how can the insurer refuse payment to an eligible oldster who may have gotten the same care as a neighbor who collected compensation? Some private insurers suggest that the forms doctors willingly fill out for patients now could be easily used, with little or no change, in filing medicare claims—but whether nonparticipaters would consent to do this is doubtful.

Some physicians who say they are willing to cooperate with medicare hint that the program could create problems that may push even more physicians into nonparticipation. Dr. William Rial, of Philadelphia, foresees a "new mountain of paperwork" that will force many doctors to throw up their hands and refuse to process it. "A lot of that goes on now in public assistance cases," he notes. "You get a $1.50 visit and it takes more than $1.50 of my secretary's time to fill out the forms."

WILL CASELOADS GROW?

Others predict a sharp increase in caseloads, burdening many doctors whose waiting rooms already are crammed with patients. "Many old people who have nothing wrong with them will want to consult a doctor. Many will seek the doctor's attention just because they want to talk to somebody," predicts Dr. Nathan Cotlar, a Houston physician who expects to participate in medicare.

"I've got all the work I can handle now," says a Pittsburgh doctor. "I may have to consider moving to another position, like a veterans hospital, where I wouldn't be so pressed for time."

The position of the nonparticipating doctor appears unassailable both legally and ethically under AMA codes. There's nothing in the medicare bill requiring doctors to cooperate with any medicare agency that may be set up or even to see medicare patients. And in the wake of the New Jersey doctor's "revolt" 3 years ago, the AMA House of Delegates pointed to the ethical principle that a physician "may choose whom he will serve." The AMA body then declared that a doctor "should not dispose of his services under terms or conditions which tend to interfere with or impair the free and complete exercise of his medical judgment and skill"—a statement which has suggested to some doctors that participation in medicare may be a breach of ethics in itself.

A Pittsburgh physician says: "I've had some experience with socialized medicine when I worked under a union program. I finally gave up the practice because I felt the restrictions placed on me interfered with good medical judgment. I think I'd turn away medicare patients because as the program now stands it would interfere with my judgment."

To the great majority of doctors, however, nonparticipation is an unrealistic doctrine, though many remain opposed to medicare in theory, they intend to cooperate fully with the program. Says Dr. Henry I. Fineberg, executive vice president of the Medical Society of the State of New York: "I think this talk of physician nonparticipation is unfortunate. Regardless of the outcome in Congress, we are sure that the primary concern of New York physicians will continue to be the welfare and health of their patients, including the elderly—regardless of their ability to pay. Physicians are citizens as well as doctors and will, of course, cooperate with whatever laws are enacted."

A Detroit physician, Dr. I. Walter Silver, puts it a different way. "This is a lot of hurrahing about nothing," he says, "and I'm not putting on any armor to go out and joust with windmills."

Some doctors suggest that the flare of resistance to medicare will burn out quickly, and that nonparticipating physicians will, sooner or later, adjust themselves to filling out the Government forms and sending in bills. One doctor in Orange County, Calif., notes that physicians in his area reacted to county medical aid programs for the elderly and indigent in the same way many M.D.'s are now reacting to medicare. "At first, they said they'd refuse to take money from the county; truth is, when they started seeing the patients, they started sending in the bills. The same thing is going to happen here again," he predicts.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the indulgence of the Chair and my colleagues for an opportunity to briefly review some of the circumstances which have existed in this country so far as national disasters are concerned in recent months. I fear that I shall transgress the 3-minute time limitation, although I shall try to keep my remarks brief, but I ask unanimous consent to be allowed a few additional minutes to make my presentation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How many minutes does the Senator from Indiana request?

Mr. BAYH. Whatever I may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Indiana is recognized for an unlimited amount of time.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Chair. I shall keep my remarks brief.

Last year and in recent months, the country has experienced national disasters, such as those in Alaska, the Northwest section of the country, and encompassing more recently six States in the Midwestern area.

My State was inundated by floods and tornadoes.

The President of the United States, Senators, Representatives, and the Governors of the several States involved toured the stricken areas. I had the opportunity to join the President of the United States with my Senate colleague, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], as well as members of the congressional delegation from Indiana to tour the affected areas of my State.

I later returned to the affected areas. I believe it is fair to state that I have had an opportunity to visit almost all of the disaster areas which were affected by the extremely damaging tornadoes on Palm Sunday, April 11.

In Indiana, the tornadoes rent asunder houses and churches. Industries, farms, and cities were not spared by this horrible force of nature.

Approximately $200 million is the estimated loss in Indiana. One hundred and thirty-eight lives were claimed.

Although the Alaskan disaster has been called the worst disaster we have ever had, I point out that this one brief storm, claimed more lives than the Alaskan earthquake.

In Indiana, 1,369 persons were injured. An additional 337 were injured seriously enough to require long-term hospitalization. A total of 3,875 families suffered losses because of the force of the tornadoes.

Our Governor, Roger D. Branigin, aptly likened the scene of destruction to Hiroshima after it had been struck by an atom bomb.

Because of the severity of the storm and subsequent floods, and the recognition of need on the part of many Senators, some 30 of us joined in studying a comprehensive approach to revising the Nation's disaster laws.

Several days ago a measure was introduced to try to improve Federal disaster relief provisions. There is a great need for improvement in these provisions.

We have kept in almost daily touch with the agencies involved. The President has also expressed his great interest in the situation. The Office of Emergency Planning has been given the specific assignment of forwarding the study. The Bureau of the Budget has asked for reports, which are now in the process of being made. The Committee on Public Works, the distinguished chairman of which, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], is now present in the Chamber and is about to present another vital piece of legislation to the Senate, has taken a lead in requesting that reports be given to the committee which will further study the bill.

I believe that we are fast approaching the time when the reports will be submitted, and it will be time for Congress to act. This legislation is designed to ease the burden of all those who have been and will be, through no fault of their own, subjected to severe loss, damage, and hardship due to acts of nature.

In the meantime, let me briefly point out that there are existing laws which we have been trying to use in the affected areas to ease the burden of those whose property has been damaged.

For example, we have asked the Secretary of Agriculture to reopen the feed grain program so that the farmers in the affected area might have an opportunity to comply with the program which had already been closed. I believe that the closing date was March 26 in our State, also in Illinois, Michigan, and other Midwestern areas affected by these sudden tornadoes. The tornadoes which struck Indiana came on April 11, about 2 weeks after the closing of the program.

I received a letter about a month after the tornadoes had struck in Indiana stating that our request had been denied, and that it had been denied because the Secretary was fearful that it would not accomplish the purposes of the program but would turn the feed grain program into a relief program.

I believe that this attitude is wrong. It is a misjudgment, because we made the request for the very reason that we felt that it would not only help those in the affected area but would also help to achieve the objectives of the program. First, it would provide considerable financial assistance to farmers in need; and second, and perhaps most important of all, as we look at the farm program, it would help to reduce production.

I do not direct this criticism at the Secretary of Agriculture in person, but rather I direct it to those who are advising him. The content of his letter is indicative of the fact that those who are advising him did not even realize that the land which had been flooded and affected by the tornadoes would be in production this year.

As a result, we shall have increased production. This production will be achieved at a considerably higher cost.

I therefore say to the Secretary that I believe it would be in the best interests of the Department as well as all of us if he would root out those who are giving him this erroneous advice, or at least shake them into reality.

Most of us realize that when land has been flooded or ravaged by tornadoes, it costs more to put it back into tillable condition. Consider the silting that exists after a flood, and the real clearance problem involved, with parts of barns, houses, and shattered glass strewn all over the fields. We have had penal inmates brought into the area to help clear up the debris. The cost of putting the land into production has been tremendous.

I was in one of the affected areas and talked with one farmer who destroyed five tractor tires while plowing only 20 acres.

I do not need to tell the Presiding Officer what a tractor tire costs, but it ranges upwards of $100. To have one repaired often costs almost $50. Therefore, this is an extreme burden to place on the farmers; yet, the Secretary did not let them have the opportunity to let the land lie idle so that they could clear it in a more efficient manner and at the same time keep it out of production.

I should like to point out also that there are grant provisions in the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service under which farmers may get assistance for damaged fencing. The ASCS led the farmers of Indiana to believe that they could obtain relief to restore and replace fences which had been destroyed by the tornadoes. They were urged to come in and apply, so that when the funds were made available they could receive relief. Yet yesterday they were informed that the provisions of the Act were to be applied so restrictively that they would not be able to receive any benefit from such grants.

It may be difficult for some of my colleagues in the Senate, who have not had the opportunity of living on a farm, to realize what a burden it is to replace or repair fencing. It involves more than what is seen while driving along a highway. In one county in Indiana alone 300 miles of fencing was destroyed by one tornado. Three hundred miles of fencing was destroyed, yet the provisions of the act would not be administered with sufficient flexibility or compassion to provide what I feel would be just compensation for this loss.

In the bill to broaden disaster relief which we have introduced, we went to great lengths not to put the Federal Government in competition with insurance companies, and to use normal existing financial institutions so far as possible. For that reason the bill which we introduced did not provide outright grants to individuals, but rather long-term low-interest loans. No farmer ever insures fences. It is not possible to obtain insurance on fences. Therefore there is no danger whatever of the Federal Government competing with the insurance companies.

I should like personally to invite the Secretary of Agriculture to come to Indiana. I intend this afternoon to write a letter to the Secretary inviting him to come out to our State, to show him that he is getting poor advice.

We are confronted with a great need. The rubble-strewn fields and the destroyed barns and fences all indicate to me a need to administer these measures in a manner which is consistent with the best interests of the public involved.

I have one last complaint that I should like to make. This, too, concerns the Secretary of Agriculture. The Farmers Home Administration has gone to great lengths in urging farmers to take advantage of the 3-percent interest disaster loans, which provide 1-year loans for operating expenses, for seed, and fertilizer, 5-year loans for machinery and equipment and other capital goods, and up to 20 years for replacing buildings and other real property.

The number of loans that have been granted to farmers in Indiana can be counted on one hand. The Department of Agriculture has not used existing provisions of the Disaster Act to help the farmers to meet this great personal need that exists in Inidana. The program has been administered in such a way as to give the impression that the administrators are looking for excuses not to use the provisions of the act.

Again I say that this is not a personal attack on the Secretary of Agriculture, because I know him to be a man of great compassion and a man who wishes to help people when it is necessary.

I make this critical statement, not with respect to him personally, but to call his attention to the fact that he has been sold a bill of goods; he has not been given a true picture of the great need that exists in the Midwestern States. I call upon him to administer the disaster provisions of the agricultural statutes based on the facts, in order to help solve the problems that confront many of our citizens.

I close by thanking the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, for his patience, and also for his interest in this subject. I also recognize the fact that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has been one of the leaders in this area. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] also have joined in this effort. This is not a solo effort. It is a recognition on the part of the majority of the Members of the Senate that we need to look into this problem and to revise our disaster relief laws.

In the next few days we shall be asked to consider foreign aid authorizations and appropriations of more than $3 billion, which will be sent to areas around the world. Frankly, although in the past I have been a supporter of foreign aid and a Senator who has felt that a well administered foreign aid program is in the best interests of this country, it will be very difficult for me this year to vote more than $3 billion in funds needed in other nations unless we in Congress recognize that we must take care of some of our own people who are affected by terrible disasters in this country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Indiana on an excellent speech. He is dead right. He took the leadership in trying to draft new disaster legislation. He called a meeting of Senators from the Midwest, from the devastated States. He drafted legislation, introduced it and followed through on it.

I give one quick example in support of the Senator to show how ridiculous the present law is. Farmers can obtain loans for conventional building purposes from the Farmers Home Administration for 33 years at 4 percent. However, when it comes to floods and tornadoes, the best terms that a farmer can get are 20 years at 3 percent interest. That interest rate is less, but the terms are such that the payments have to be bigger, because the amortization period is shorter. What a travesty! The payments are bigger on the disaster relief loans than they are on conventional farm borrowings.

That is one reason why the disaster program is not being used by farmers, and is one of the reasons why the distinguished Senator from Indiana is absolutely right in calling for a reform of our disaster legislation.

LABOR'S POLITICAL ACTION PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in Wisconsin recently a distinguished Wisconsin labor leader, Carl W. Griepentrog, made an excellent speech on labor's participation in politics. Unfortunately this subject has been too little considered, and the intellectual justification for it has been rarely offered. Mr. Griepentrog made a remarkable speech. He explores the history of labor's political activity. He provides an excellent intellectual justification. I ask unanimous consent to have his remarks printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN STATE AFL–CIO COPE FUND-RAISING CONFERENCE

We are assembled here this evening to raise funds which will help finance organized labor's political action program. In doing so we are lending our support to the most controversial and the most misunderstood activity the labor movement is involved in.

This lack of sympathy for the labor movement's political action program is not confined to observers and commentators outside the movement. The critical view of our political action program reaches into the labor movement itself to a substantial degree. Those of you who have served as COPE committee members at the local union level know what I am talking about.

Every union member, by definition, agrees to the need for collective action at the bargaining table. But it is not true that every union member sees the same compelling need for collective action in the political arena. The feeble response we get to our COPE dollar drive campaign each year serves as constant reminder of this fact.

Why it is that this is still true in the face of the evidence, I will never understand. Personally, I look upon politics as the "right arm" of collective bargaining. An effective political action program is just as vital as an effective picket line. When the economic scabs start stealing our jobs we are indignant. Our survival as a significant force in our economy requires us to be just as indignant when the political scabs steal our right to fully represent our members, when they enact laws which require us to represent "free riders," when they delay enactment of needed social legislation, when they enact tax laws which soak the poor and pamper the rich, when they seek legislation which would subvert the "one man, one vote" principle.

We need to instill in our members appreciation of the fact that politics is not like the four seasons, coming and going as the months pass by. We need to instill in our members the realization that politics effects our lives every day in every way. The very air we breathe and the water we drink; the schools our children attend and the roads we drive on; the cost of living and the cost of dying; all are influenced by what transpires in city, county, State, and national legislative bodies.

And surely, after Governor Reynolds' gruesome experience with the refusal of Republican State senators to approve dozens of key appointments, we are all thoroughly aware of the impact of administrative agencies on our daily lives.

I know that, in part at least, lack of sympathy for the American labor movement's political action program stems from lack of understanding. Because of this, even at the risk of treading already familiar ground I would like to take this opportunity to restate the case for organized labor's commitment to political action.

BACKGROUND

To begin with, when we discuss labor's role in politics we should be aware of the fact that we are engaged in a strictly American pastime.

For instance, European unions have always been deeply involved in politics. They have tended throughout their history to place a great deal more emphasis on legislated solutions than negotiated solutions. Vacations are legislated. Medical care is legislated. Holidays are legislated. Pensions are legislated.

In contrast, American unions have tended to place a great deal more emphasis on negotiated solutions.

Historically, the American labor movement has tended to play down political action and play up collective bargaining.

Don't misunderstand me. I am not saying that labor's interest in political action is of recent origin. On the contrary, American trade unionists have had an interest in politics for at least 135 years.

As far back as 1828 organized workers in Philadelphia were supporting candidates for city, county, and State office.

In 1834 and 1836, Ely Moore, president of the National Trades Union, was elected to Congress from New York.

Between 1866 and 1872 the National Labor Union strongly urged union participation in politics and in 1872 nominated candidates for President and Vice President of the United States.

When the Knights of Labor was flourishing back in the 1880's trade unionists supported hundreds of candidates for public office.

Samuel Gompers, the first president of the AFL, made an unsuccessful try for election to the New York constitutional convention in 1893.

In 1906 the AFL announced its famous policy of "rewarding friends and defeating enemies."

Every 2 years the AFL, under Gompers' leadership, published a congressional voting record.

The AFL endorsed Bryan in 1896 and 1908; Wilson in 1912 and 1916; Cox in 1920, and Robert La Follette in 1924.

Back in 1922 trade unionists in this State and in Minnesota even formed an alliance with farmers.

However, in spite of this evidence of political activity, it is still fair to say that unions in the United States, at least from the founding of the AFL in the 1880's through the early post-World War II years, did not place heavy emphasis on political action.

Labor historians and labor economists tell us that there is a reason for this. European unions and unions in other parts of the free world are products of a class-conscious society. Workers have been thrown into a natural political alliance because they are members of a particular class and will remain so throughout their lives.

American unions are the product of a society in which class consciousness is almost nonexistent. The common interest of American workers is their job. Workers are drawn together not by class consciousness but by job consciousness. Therefore there is no ready-made foundation for a common political alliance. The political affiliation of American trade unionists has been determined by inheritance, by religion, by whether you were born on a farm or in the city, by a dozen different forces—but not by class.

Samuel Gompers recognized this fact when he founded the American Federation of Labor. Early attempts to form a national federation of trade unionists had failed because leaders had tried to transplant the European variety of trade unionism in American soil.

Gompers succeeded, where others failed, because he realized that job interest, not class interest or political interest, was the binder which would hold together a national federation of unions.

If Gompers was right three-quarters of a century ago, why isn't he right today? Why should organized labor be placing so much emphasis on political action today? Is there any reason why we should discard our historic emphasis on collective bargaining? Should we now seek legislated solutions at the expense of negotiated solutions?

As I see it, we are not faced with an either/or choice. We don't have to choose between negotiated solutions and legislated solutions. No responsible trade union leader is advocating formation of a labor party and no responsible trade union leader is suggesting that we relax our vigil on the collective bargaining front.

But the facts of life make it crystal clear to me that the labor movement must apply at least as much skill and effort to political action as it applies to organizing and negotiations.

Let's just take a look at the record.

Workers have had the right to organize and bargain collectively throughout the history of this Nation. Even so, our Government has recognized this right for no more than a few short years.

Back around the turn of the 19th century when workers were first beginning to organize, the Government was openly hostile to unions. Workers who chose to organize were held by the courts to have engaged in an unlawful "criminal conspiracy" in restraint of trade.

By 1842 the courts had rejected the criminal conspiracy doctrine in favor of money damages against workers who combined to improve wages and working conditions. Then in 1871 the view that the techniques of unions constituted a "prima facie tort" emerged. The courts held that if there was "intentional infliction of harm" the activities of a union could be restrained. Since by definition a strike is calculated to get more out of an employer than he will give willingly, the effect of this doctrine was to severely hamper trade unions.

Toward the latter part of the 1800's courts began to use their injunctive powers to restrain unions and, when the Sherman Antitrust Act was passed in 1890, courts brought unions under the provisions of this legislation.

In 1914 Congress enacted the Clayton Act. Labor hailed this law as the "Magna Carta." Its purpose, among others, was to free unions from the Sherman Antitrust Act on the grounds that labor is not a commodity or article of commerce.

Unfortunately, the courts didn't see it this way, and many courts continued to apply the Sherman Act to unions. Employers were able to obtain injunctions, restraining concerted activities on the slightest pretext.

Some relief was finally obtained in 1932 when Congress enacted the Norris-La Guardia Act. The use of injunctions in labor disputes was finally outlawed, and yellow-dog contracts were made unenforcible.

Nevertheless, our Government still had not specifically affirmed the right of workers to form and join unions of their own choosing.

An attempt was made in 1933 when the National Industrial Recovery Act was passed. This law was short lived, as you may recall. The U.S. Supreme Court struck it down in 1935.

Congress came back again in 1935 with another attempt in the form of the Wagner Act, which the Supreme Court sustained in 1937.

Finally, after 150 years of strife and turmoil, with the Government aiding and abetting the employer's fight against unions almost every step of the way, our Government clearly affirmed the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively.

Just 10 short years later, Congress enacted the Taft-Hartley Act. Now I don't propose to debate the merits of this legislation at this time. That's a subject in itself. However, I think it is safe to say that this law was not passed to strengthen unions.

In my mind there is a clear lesson in this recitation of history. It took 150 years to clearly establish the right of workers to form and join unions and bargain collectively and just 10 years to substantially reverse that trend.

Under the circumstances, organized labor must jump into the political arena with both feet. When hard-won gains can be lost so easily and so quickly, it is foolish for trade unionists to turn their backs on politics.

The truth of the matter is that today labor unions are regulated from the cradle to the grave by local, State, and National legislative bodies and administrative agencies. We couldn't turn our backs on politics now if we wanted to. The labor movement of yesterday, today, and tomorrow is largely a product of law and politics. We would further imperil our own existence if we choose to isolate ourselves from politics.

So far I have been talking about labor-management law. There is also the equally important area of social legislation.

Not too many years ago the AFL was opposed to workmen's compensation laws, unemployment compensation laws, minimum wage laws and a whole host of regulatory social legislation. This opposition stemmed not from opposition to the principle of the legislation but suspicion of Government action on any subject.

In the eyes of trade unionists of the early 1900's, the Government couldn't be trusted to administer social legislation fairly.

However, as time passed, union members and leaders gradually recognized the futility of attempting to solve industrial injury problems and unemployment problems at the bargaining table. The need for minimum wage legislation became apparent as unions realized that negotiated benefits were being restrained or threatened by unorganized firms paying substandard wages.

We have also learned that it is not possible to negotiate full employment. We know that many problems arising out of technological change cannot be solved at the bargaining table.

Believing that the problems of workers are the problems of unions, we have fought for free public schools, we have fought against child labor, we have advocated reduced hours, we have sought retirement benefits which are national in scope, we have, to make a long story short, supported many measures which have benefited all workers, member and nonmember alike.

These are the reasons why organized labor is in politics to stay. We need to be in order to preserve our right to organize and bargain and we need to be because collective bargaining cannot solve all the problems workers are confronted with.

PROCEDURE

When we speak of labor's political action program and the degree of or lack of support for it, precisely what is it we are talking about?

One of the fundamentals of our political action program is our registration and get-out-the-vote campaign.

Union members are citizens first and members second. We recognize our obligation to make our form of government succeed. In a world so desperately threatened by totalitarianism it is shocking to realize that in presidential elections as many as 40 million Americans don't bother to vote. Many of them, all too many, sad to say, are union members.

You might think that there would be little or no opposition to this phase of our activities. From a philosophical point of view there isn't. Very few union members oppose a registration and get-out-the-vote campaign in principle. But in practice?—that's another matter.

Next to the low degree of citizenship participation in politics is the incredibly low level of understanding of important issues. This is one of the most serious defects in American political life today.

It isn't just the act of voting itself which fulfills a citizen's responsibilities. A voter must also be informed. This is why, in addition to our registration and get-out-the-vote campaigns we also conduct educational programs on legislative issues by means of our newspapers, pamphlets, and conferences.

In the absence of labor's voice on the issues of the day, I doubt if there would be a proper balance to the views expressed on major issues. The business community has its spokesmen. The farmers have theirs and the doctors have the AMA.

We believe that labor's advocacy of legislative action in various fields makes possible the debate which is so vital to the health and vigor of a democracy. Stifle union political action and we cut off a significant source of information and opinion.

There is more to our political system than getting out the vote and understanding the issues. We have a representative form of government. We are required to elect men and women who will represent us in the councils of government. It isn't possible in a complex society to maintain the direct representation which characterized the old town meeting. It follows, then, that representatives must be elected who are capable of exercising independent judgment and reflecting the will of the people.

This doesn't just happen. It takes money and hard work. With television playing such a prominent role in political campaigns, the cost of winning an election—or losing—has skyrocketed. This is why we collect COPE dollars. And this is why we are meeting here today. The dollars are needed to buy TV time, campaign buttons, and the literature for candidates we support.

Registration and get-out-the-vote campaigns, education on the issues, and financial support for endorsed candidates—these are the three legs which make up labor's political action program. Like a three-legged stool, labor's political action program will not stand up with one leg missing.

Some critics complain that we are too closely identified with the Democratic Party. This is understandable when you consider the fact that COPE very seldom endorses Republican candidates. It is also understandable when you take note of the fact that some prominent labor leaders are closely identified with the Democratic Party.

There is a reason for this and it has nothing to do with allegiance for allegiance' sake. We do not support Democrats because they are Democrats. We support candidates who support the views we believe in. We cannot be held accountable for the fact that more Democrats than Republicans support labor's position on social, economic, and political issues.

In essence, I am saying that our political action program is issue oriented. We study the issues. We take a stand on the issues and let the chips fall where they may.

No, ladies and gentlemen, we are not too deeply involved in politics. If anything, we are not involved deeply enough.

An enormous and disproportionate share of our Nation's wealth continues to accrue in the hands of a very small portion of our population. Over half of all corporate wealth in the United States is controlled by 100 large corporations. The poor grow poorer, by comparison, every day. The schools which our children must attend continue to be starved for funds. Our streams are rapidly becoming conduits for industrial, commercial, and residential waste, and our lakes are turning into cesspools of raw and partially treated effluent. The promise of equal opportunity for all remains largely unfulfilled.

All of these matters, in addition to labor-management legislation are, in my opinion, of profound concern to the labor movement and require our presence in the political arena.

Many of our citizens, including some union members, as I have already stated, disapprove of what I am suggesting. Some disapprove because they don't believe that unions have a place in a free society at the workplace or in the community. Others are willing to concede that unions have a useful purpose to serve at the workplace but not in the political arena. Usually both groups feel as they do for about the same reasons, prominent among which is the belief that individualism and unionism are contrary philosophies. Our free society will fail if we don't make ample provision for individual initiative and achievement, they say. Unions, they continue, sound the death knell for individualism. I couldn't disagree more. Nothing could be further from the truth. Individualism is a cruel hoax and an illusion if you have no voice in society. I ask you. How much do you or I have to say about even the most trivial aspects of the affairs of State, local, and Federal Government if we do not present a united, organized front? Do you think for 1 minute that any progressive legislation would be enacted, even if each of us individually supported such legislation, if we did not do so in an organized fashion?

We live in a world in which only the voices of the organized are heard. You don't believe me? Then where is the voice of the unorganized 3.5 million unemployed? Where is the voice of the unorganized poor? Where is the voice of the unorganized aged? Where is the voice of the unorganized Negro, Indian, Puerto Rican, or oriental who suffers indignities and humiliation every day? Do I need to say? Isn't the answer obvious?

No. Those who call themselves individualists and oppose organized labor's political action program do not stand as defenders of a great cause. Cut away the trimmings and you'll find that they really stand for selfishness with a capital S. What they really want is freedom to feather their own nests. The idea of sharing our great wealth with those who have no share is repulsive. The poor must pay the penalty for failure. There must be a reward for success.

We in the labor movement can't buy this point of view. We must become the voice for those who have no voice. We have done a pretty good job of providing a voice for workers on the job. We have created an industrial democracy which parallels our political democracy. We have provided many organized workers with a modest share of the economic pie. But there is much which remains to be done.

As the late President Kennedy said:

"All this will not be finished in the first 100 days.

"Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet.

"But let us begin."

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. HART. Mr. President, following passage of the voting rights bill yesterday several Members spoke kind words of me. I was not in the Chamber at the time but have read their words in the RECORD. To each who spoke I now express my thanks. It made wonderful reading, even though I saw the excess which friendship built into the remarks.

And I want also to thank every Member for bearing with patience and understanding the weeks of discussion and development of the voting rights bill. It is to the distinguished authors of the bill, the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, and the minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN, that all of us owe thanks. Even though we may not be able to voice it, I hope they sense our appreciation for their leadership, leadership which was never harsh but at all times effective; leadership, in short, in its finest meaning.

BANK MERGER LEGISLATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement made today by Mr. Paul R. Fitchen, executive vice president of the New York Clearinghouse Association, to the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. Fitchen has had 40 years of experience in banking and is the operating head of a banking agency that daily handles checks totaling $4½ billion or more.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PAUL R. FITCHEN

I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before this subcommittee in support of S. 1698, a bill which is of substantial importance to the sound development of the banking system of this country and to the banking public. This bill has the firm support of the New York Clearinghouse Association, an organization formed in 1853 primarily to facilitate the clearance of checks and the settlement of balances among New York member banks, but which has also throughout its history taken an active interest in the development of sound banking and has been called upon by State and Federal regulatory authorities in recent years to undertake particular studies for their benefit.

S. 1698 has been incorrectly characterized by some as a measure to exempt bank mergers from all antitrust laws. This characterization is an obvious distortion of the bill which makes clear that the antitrust legislation governing bank mergers is that adopted specifically with reference to banks in the Bank Merger Act of 1960 and is to be applied by the specialized Federal banking agencies responsible for the soundness and growth of our banking system.

It is not my purpose to review the merits of the Supreme Court's decisions in the Philadelphia Bank and the Lexington Bank cases which have created the need for the present bill. I do, however, want to stress that these decisions must be ranked among the most controversial antitrust decisions and that, in view of the virtually unanimous contrary understanding prior to those decisions of the respective roles of the Federal banking authorities and of the Department of Justice in respect of bank mergers, they have caused considerable confusion over matters which most persons believed had been carefully studied and resolved at the time of the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

As a result of the Philadelphia Bank and Lexington Bank decisions we are presented today with an anomalous and unsatisfactory system of regulating bank mergers. The Federal banking agencies charged with responsibility for the successful functioning and development of the Nation's banking system—the Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—are required by the Bank Merger Act to consider at length the proposed merger or acquisition of any insured bank, and the approval of whichever of these agencies has primary responsibility for the surviving institution must be obtained before any such merger or acquisition can occur.

In acting upon a proposed merger or acquisition, these banking agencies are explicitly charged with determining "the effect of the transaction on competition (including any tendency toward monopoly)" in addition to the several other considerations peculiar to banking which are set forth in the act, and "in the interests of uniform standards" the agency charged with reviewing the proposal must obtain the views not only of the two other Federal banking agencies but also of the Attorney General, who is thus afforded a full opportunity to present the Department of Justice's views on the competitive consequences of the transaction. Yet, despite this considered determination, which must fully take into account probable competitive consequences and which is made by an agency with specific expertise in the structure and functioning of the banking industry, a merger or acquisition duly approved under the Bank Merger Act may today be challenged by the Justice Department under the Clayton Act, the Sherman Act, or both—and this challenge may come years later when the relief sought will be the breaking asunder of the institution formed by the duly approved merger or acquisition.

It is clear to me that such a system would never have purposely been created by the Congress. Having reached this undesirable posture through two surprising Supreme Court decisions which were wholly unforeseen when the Bank Merger Act was enacted, there seems every reason to rectify the situation.

I respectfully submit that the agencies which regulate banking are more competent to judge competitive factors in banking than an agency which seeks to regulate competition in many other lines of endeavor. For example, although a merger of two banks eliminates one competitor from the market, it may well, and often does, greatly enhance competition between the banks in the area through the greater competitive strength of the resulting institution and the challenge to the other competing banks to meet it. As was shown in a study published in 1964 by the New York State Banking Department, entitled "Branch Banking, Bank Mergers, and the Public Interest," the public has almost always benefited from recent mergers in my State.

New York City banks are in direct competition with banks all over the country and to some extent with banks in foreign countries. We therefore believe in encouraging competition between banks both in New York and elsewhere because only through competition can we in New York maintain our position in the financial world.

The application of the general antitrust laws, particularly to mergers and acquisitions, is fraught with difficult economic questions and many uncertainties at best. To have these laws applied to an industry as unique and as subject to State and Federal regulation as is banking, by enforcement agencies and courts having little experience with or responsibility for the functioning of our banking system, greatly compounds these difficulties. The confusion is complete when one tries to reconcile why Congress has directed the Federal banking agencies reviewing proposed mergers to consider several important factors affecting the public interest and the soundness of the banking system in addition to the probable competitive consequences of the transaction, whereas the courts are now able to reverse an approval of a banking agency on the basis of the latter factor alone. If this situation goes uncorrected, the Congress, by default, will have given to an unspecialized enforcement agency what in practical effect will often amount to a veto over bank mergers which qualified and experienced Federal banking agencies find to be in the public interest and without offsetting adverse effects on competition.

The regulatory system which the present bill would reinstate—and which corresponds to that which (prior to the Philadelphia Bank and Lexington Bank decisions) most persons thought existed—appears to me unquestionably superior.

Banking has long been regarded as quasi-public in nature and so affected with the public interest that extensive governmental regulation is necessary. Thus, entry into banking is regulated not only by the normal competitive demands of the marketplace but by State and Federal banking authorities which grant charters for new banks only if convinced that the public interest dictates; and the establishment of branches is similarly restricted. Banks are also subject to close, continued, and detailed examination and surveillance by State and Federal banking authorities and are subject to legal lending limits, reserve requirements, restrictions on rates of interest paid for time deposits, restrictions on engaging in activities such as underwriting and on making investments, restrictions on directorships, and a host of other regulations. And although banks are free to select their customers and, within limits, to set the interest rates they charge, they are necessarily responsive to Federal monetary and other policies affecting the national economy and well-being.

A bank is simply not in the same category as a food processor or a chemical manufacturer, and the economic soundness and probable consequences of a bank acquisition or merger cannot be judged in the same manner. Banking is far more akin to the communications, railroad, airline, and marine shipping industries in respect of each of which the approval of a merger by the Federal agency charged with responsibility for regulating that industry exempts the merger from later attack under the Clayton or Sherman Acts. These agencies, like the Federal banking agencies, are in turn given the authority to disapprove mergers and acquisitions which are not found to be in the public interest, and the applicant companies generally have no recourse to the courts to ask that the unfavorable determinations of these regulatory agencies be reversed.

The Federal banking agencies, as specialized regulatory bodies, are in a far better position to make what should ultimately be the controlling determination in respect of a proposed merger or acquisition—will it be in the public interest, taking into account the relevant considerations set forth by the Congress in the Bank Merger Act? These agencies are directed by men appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, who are selected because of their competence in banking or related matters. They have developed permanent staffs with an experience and understanding of the banking system unparalleled in our Government and they have the ability and the responsibility to make complete statistical and qualitative analyses and studies of proposed mergers. They are acutely aware of current trends and problems in commercial banking and of its interrelationhsip with other segments of the financial industry, and they bring to bear in their determinations an expertise born of a continuing responsibility rather than one developed largely for the purpose of attacking the proposed transaction and built upon analogies to the economics of, and competition in, wholly unrelated industries.

The desirability of assigning this role to these agencies was recognized, of course, at the time that the Bank Merger Act was adopted and was clearly reflected in the directive to those agencies to test proposed bank mergers by the several criteria enumerated in that act rather than by considering probable competitive effects alone. I want to emphasize again most vigorously that the Bank Merger Act and S. 1698 are not antitrust exemption statutes. They simply place the final determination of the favorable or unfavorable competitive aspects of a bank merger in the hands of the expert bank regulatory agencies.

The Federal banking agencies have, of course, placed considerable importance on probable competitive effects in reviewing proposed mergers and acquisitions under the Bank Merger Act. I believe it is fair to say that this factor has been of paramount importance in their determinations.

Further, it should not be overlooked that under the Bank Merger Act banks must justify an acquisition or merger as being in the public interest. Thus, where no affirmative public benefits can be shown, a bank merger may be disapproved upon a finding of probable adverse competitive consequences which would not be sufficient to cause the transaction to violate the Clayton or Sherman Acts.

The state of competition in the banking industry at the present time certainly does not indicate that the banking agencies, in approving bank mergers during the considerable period of time when such mergers were not challenged by the Justice Department because of the assumed inapplicability of the Clayton Act, permitted mergers which affected competition in banking adversely. It is true that there have been a considerable number of bank mergers since World War II. But given the very high degree of diffusion of the banking industry in 1945, the need for larger banking units to provide adequately the more extensive public banking services required and to meet the larger credit requirements and business needs of commercial customers, and the increasingly high degree of competition from nonbank financial institutions, these mergers and acquisitions appear not only to have been desirable but probably to have been essential to the sound development of our banking system as we know it today. If this development had been thwarted by the application of generalized theories of competition to an evolving banking system whose needs the courts and enforcement agencies were not directed, and were ill equipped, to evaluate, the injury to banking and to the public could, I submit, have been great.

I can speak with most familiarity of banking in New York City and, to a lesser extent, New York State. There have probably been as many bank mergers in New York City since 1946 (there have been 43 such mergers) as in any other community of the country, and yet I know of no place in the world today where banking competition at all levels is more intense, and the resultant extent and variety of banking services provided to both retail and wholesale customers is so great, as in New York City. Over 60 commercial banks serve New York City through more than 700 offices, and the competition among them is intense.

To illustrate the extent of this competition, New York City banks have consistently charged materially lower interest rates on short-term business loans than banks outside the city. For the first quarter of 1965, for example, the average rate charged by New York City banks was 4.74 percent, while that reported for banks in 19 large cities averaged 4.97 percent, in 7 northern and eastern cites other than New York averaged 5 percent, and in 11 southern and western cities averaged 5.27 percent. Similarly, although published statistics are not available, it is generally believed that rates on personal installment credit extended by New York City banks are as low, and in most cases are lower, than elsewhere in the country.

Banking in New York City has not become unduly concentrated in the hands of its largest banks. As of the end of 1963, in all but 3 of the 15 most populous cities of the country (on the basis of the 1960 census), the 5 largest banks held a greater proportion of assets, deposits, and loans than did the 5 largest banks in New York City. Further, in the area in which, under State law, New York City banks may have branches—New York City and the adjacent counties of Nassau and Westchester—there are now over 80 banks with approximately 1,050 offices. It may interest the subcommittee to know that as of December 31, 1960, the five largest New York City banks had 59 percent of the branches in this area and that as of March 1965 this percentage had declined to 57 percent.

Banks have not been deterred from securing charters or opening initial branches in New York City. Since 1960, 21 banks have opened their doors in New York City for the first time, including 4 newly chartered banks, 2 large suburban banks which opened branches in the city, and 15 foreign banks which established branches pursuant to amendments to the New York banking law which were sponsored by the New York Clearinghouse Association and which authorized them to provide a full range of banking services through such branches. Further, the growth in assets experienced by the moderate and smaller sized State and National commercial banks in New York City during the past 5 years has kept pace with that of the larger banks of the city.

In competition for customer patronage New York City banks have expanded their services and facilities aggressively. Branch offices have been opened at a rapid rate not only in Manhattan but in the four other boroughs of the city and, since authorized by State law in 1960, in the adjoining counties of Westchester and Nassau. In New York City alone the number of commercial banking offices increased from 609 in 1955 to 718 in 1964, and 55 offices have been opened by New York City banks in Westchester and Nassau Counties since 1960. Competition for deposits led New York City banks to become innovators in the widespread use of time certificates of deposits and other means for stimulating deposits, including many designed to appeal to small businesses and individual depositors. Intensive campaigns for saving deposits have been instituted and rates paid are the highest permitted by Federal Reserve regulations. Competition in consumer, automobile, real estate, and business loans has been similarly intense and has prompted increased efforts by New York City banks to provide better and more extensive services to the public.

That the mergers of New York City banks approved by the Federal agencies did not impair competition is, however, but part of the picture. The Banking Department of New York, in its report on "Branch Banking, Bank Mergers, and the Public Interest," which I previously mentioned, has concluded after a study of the effects, other than competitive effects, of 205 bank mergers in New York State (including 18 in New York City) from January 1, 1951, through December 31, 1961, that: "the great majority of bank mergers in New York State have been, on balance, beneficial to the interests of the public both in terms of their immediate and overall effects, including the longer range effects, although some mergers have had detrimental effects, on balance" (p. 29).

The supporting findings underlying this conclusion confirm the desirability of permitting bank mergers when the bank regulatory authorities responsible for the banking system conclude, after giving full consideration to competitive and other factors, that such transactions will benefit the public interest. The study found that, judging these mergers in terms of whether they produced banking benefits to the public, but without attempting an analysis of competitive consequences, the mergers produced immediate overall beneficial effects to the public in 87 percent of the cases examined and resulted in beneficial changes of bank policies in 95 percent of the cases. Most of the mergers found to have had overall detrimental effects occurred prior to the passage of the New York Omnibus Banking Act which set forth criteria for approvals of mergers (including consideration of competitive factors) similar to those contained in the Bank Merger Act, and no consideration was given to individualized beneficial factors such as the solution of management succession problems.

More specifically, these mergers were found generally to have resulted in new services being provided to the customers of the acquired bank, to have increased the ability of the acquiring bank to service larger borrowers and to have opened the way for added competition through the elimination of the statutory home office protection of the acquired bank. Although few changes in service charges, interest rates, and loan policies were found to have occurred in the case of mergers, the study found that such changes as did occur on balance benefited the public and resulted in lower charges and rates and more liberal loan policies.

The foregoing remarks concerning the effect of bank mergers in New York City and New York State are not, of course, submitted in order to justify any particular merger or to suggest that any banking agency—State or Federal—will be infallible in its judgments in respect of bank mergers or acquisitions. I do submit, however, that the State and Federal banking agencies charged with the responsibility for administering our banking laws are conscientious and skilled professionals whose understanding of the banking system and its needs uniquely qualifies them for this function, and whose past record, independent for the most part of the Department of Justice and the courts, clearly demonstrates an ability and will to perform this function in a manner consistent with maintaining vigorous competition while at the same time authorizing mergers and acquisitions beneficial to the banking public. Under these circumstances, it seems clear that the confused regulatory scheme which was brought into existence by the Philadelphia Bank and Lexington Bank cases should be rectified.

I would like to address myself to one further and important deficiency in this present regulatory system which, even standing alone, would warrant adoption of the present bill. The Bank Merger Act wisely established a system which prohibits bank mergers and acquisitions without prior approval but which insures finality to the transaction if it is thus approved. The two merging banks and the public could, until the Philadelphia Bank and Lexington Bank cases, proceed with the assurance that the transaction, and their actions taken in reliance on it, would not be upset at a later date.

This stability, so highly desirable in banking where public confidence in institutional dependability is of great importance, vanishes to the extent that the Clayton Act or the Sherman Act can later be invoked to challenge the completed transaction and require the complete divestiture by one bank of another. That such a disruptive event can occur long after the merger or acquisition in question is eloquently illustrated by the now famous Du Pont-General Motors decision by which Du Pont was forced to divest itself of its interest in General Motors almost 40 years after that interest was acquired. Thus, even if not immediately challenged by the Department of Justice because of the Department's preoccupation with other matters, its current view of the law or otherwise, a bank merger could be challenged under the antitrust laws at a later date when the Department's interest may shift, later cases delineate new legal criteria or, perhaps, a subsequent merger or other event draws attention to the acquiring bank.

Further, even if the Department of Justice challenged a bank merger through the prompt initiation of judicial proceedings, the considerable delay usually involved in a de novo trial on the merits (with possible appeals) of so complicated a question as whether a proposad bank merger violates the antitrust laws would often of itself necessitate abandonment of a proposed merger or acquisition which, it must be remembered, will have been pending for a considerable time prior to its submission to, and the review and determination by, the Federal and, in most cases, State banking authorities.

To illustrate the periods of time involved, the merger of Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Hanover Bank was approved by the Federal Reserve Board in September 1961, almost 9 months after the boards of directors of the two banks agreed upon the merger in principle. Litigation of that merger under the antitrust laws commenced immediately, but it was not until March 1965—or about 3½ years later—that the trial court rendered its decision. Proceedings before the trial court on the issue of relief are still pending and no appeals have, of course, as yet been taken. It is questionable how many banks could hold a pending merger in abeyance for even a portion of what is now over 4 years after the merger was first agreed upon without jeopardizing important customer and correspondent relationships in the interim, disrupting the staffs of the two banks, hampering plans for development and adversely affecting the value to stockholders of their investment.

The lack of finality in bank mergers and asset acquisitions is not a problem confined to mergers which were consummated before the Philadelphia Bank and Lexington Bank decisions, although the invoking of so radical a remedy as divestiture would seem particularly harsh and inappropriate in those situations in view of the prior understanding of the finality of approvals by the banking authorities under the Bank Merger Act. Equally important, this current lack of finality will have highly undesirable consequences in the future for banks contemplating a possible merger and will, I believe, be a serious deterrent to bank mergers or acquisitions which would be of public benefit.

In concluding, I would like to emphasize to the subcommittee that the New York Clearinghouse Association and its 11 member banks believe strongly in the necessity for preserving a vigorously competitive banking system. The high degree of competition in banking has been a major factor in the economic progress of this country and is essential to the vitality and growth of a banking system which can adequately meet the expanding needs of the public. I believe you will find that bankers in New York City are as vitally interested in fostering efficient and competitive banking as are the Congress and the State and Federal banking agencies.

We do not support the present bill because of any belief that banking should be immune from regulatory controls designed to insure the continuance of this high level of competition. On the contrary, we endorse the emphasis which was placed on the preservation of competition in the Bank Merger Act, and we support this present proposal because we believe that a regulatory system providing for the sound application of these controls in respect of bank mergers by banking agencies uniquely qualified to administer them is the best and soundest means of assuring that such competition is maintained.

THE NORTH AMERICAN FISHERIES: A CHALLENGE AND A PROMISE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, from April 30 through May 5, the National Fisheries Institute, a trade organization representing the fresh and frozen industries of the U.S. fisheries, called together the first North American Fisheries Conference. It was an unqualified success. The United States, Canada, and Mexico were the official participants, but the agenda also included speakers from as far away as England. Government officials, and private citizens, scientists, and laymen, and members of the fishing industry all presented their views of the present situation and the future promise of the North American fisheries.

Many times individuals have testified on the sad plight of the U.S. fisheries. We in the Congress have heard time and time again of the precipitous decline of this industry at various hearings. The conference was in many ways a unique session. Here the industry took a long hard look at itself. No holds were barred, no punches pulled. The industry and the conference participants were honest to themselves, positive in their outlook, and determined to see the entire American fisheries competing successfully in the world market. The agenda was taut and reflected excellent planning. All aspects of the industry were covered, from international conservation and regulation through marketing and distribution.

Those in attendance at the conference were, indeed, priviledged to hear Donald L. McKernan, Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, present a summary of the various papers. Because I feel that this conference was of such importance to all concerned with the future of the North American fisheries, I ask unanimous consent that Director McKernan's remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> I have been given the honor of summarizing the papers presented at the Conference. This could be done quite simply by saying "very good" or "excellent." Some, of course, might even say "poor" or "lousy." I am not going to take the easy way out, because I have found the past 3 days' discussions in the general sessions so stimulating and so thought provoking that the opportunity of having the last word about subjects so close to our hearts has stimulated me throughly.
>
> In discussing the future of North American fisheries resources we have quite properly considered first the North American fishery potential. In this consideration Dr. Peter Larkin reviews some of the background of world fisheries production, compares this with current and potential North American production, and points up clearly some realistic concepts in achieving and sustaining this potential.
>
> The next series of speakers, Drs. Kask and Chapman, posed both questions and answers relating to the key issues raised by citizens industry, participants, politicians, and governments. If, as Dr. Larkin states, the potential of food production from the sea is far greater than now realized, Dr. Kask asks how can this potential be reached? How can the countries of North America participate more actively in utilizing the resources of the world ocean? What problems face these countries in reaching their goals, and what measures need be taken to improve the possibilities for success in increasing fish production at a profit? Obviously, such a discussion of the potential resources of the sea and our thoughtful inquiries as to how we can achieve improved production leads next to the problems of harvesting, processing, and marketing.
>
> Dr. Schaefer has discussed the role of the study of the oceans in the harvest of the resources, and Mr. Basil Parkes has added both constructive and practical suggestions about future improvements in fish harvesting. He also raises, from a practical point of view, the urgent need for effective conservation regulations and enforcement on an international basis.
>
> But our questions have probed far beyond this point, and so have our inquiries in this meeting. After considering the resources, the role of which a study of the oceans can play in improving harvesting these resources, and ways of improving our present fish-harvesting methods, Mr. E. Robert Kinney discussed the need for and possibilities of keeping the catch in good quality. He also raised the question of processing fish better and in more ways which will make it attractive to the consuming public. But even the processed product must be marketed, and Minister Sharp, the Fish and Seafood Promotions Division of the National Fisheries Institute—including speakers from various segments of the industry—and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall have examined, and in an optimistic vein I might add, the potential markets within our own countries and abroad and the need for opening these markets more widely.
>
> One can only conclude from the discussions of marketing that opportunities are present and, if one is not careful, we might be lulled into a false sense of security. Dr. Kask, on the other hand, points out in the early questions raised by him that, despite the potential resources available, the consumption of fisheries products in our countries has remained low and has failed to keep pace with the increased consumption of meats and poultry.
>
> Several speakers mentioned the developing international scene, and Minister Robichaud as well as Mr. Jackson have raised the unique and urgent problems posed by man's race for the resources of the sea. Jackson pointed out the unique role which he believes FAO can play in resolving the conflicts arising among fishermen of various nations harvesting common resources.
>
> I am impressed by the breadth of our discussions, the penetrating questions raised by our speakers, and the imaginative, although sometimes embarrassing questions which have been raised but by no means completely answered as a result of our discussions.
>
> I should like, in the few minutes allotted me, to discuss more fully the general course of these discussions as I have followed them, and while I presume I should act as a mere reporter, I do not find it possible in my heart to refrain from adding my own views. Thus, I hope I will be forgiven if my reporting and summation of this Conference is shamelessly colored by some of my own prejudices. My only excuse is that perhaps by this means I can bring together what seems to me to be the mainstreams of thought brought to this Conference by our previous distinguished speakers and perhaps make the various discussions tie together into a recognizable picture.
>
> One must accept the consensus of our speakers that there is an unused potential

of fish products in the world ocean and that it is probable we can increase the fish catch near the shores of our respective countries, using existing methods and available gear, by a factor of from two to four times the amount of fish now being produced by our industries. It has been pointed out that this potential increase in catch is not a certainty but only a possibility—a possibility which can only be achieved with certain changes occurring among the habits of our people, policies of our Government, and action by our industry.

It was pointed out by Dr. Larkin that our North American fishery potential will largely depend upon what the consumers decide. He believes there to be a substantial demand for seafoods but that the full potential can be achieved only if the consumer wants it. Dr. Larkin further points out that the concepts of fisheries management are rapidly changing from those which in the past were considered the maximum sustainable yield alone to a more sophisticated approach to conservation and management which considers the maximized economic yield or the greatest value of production from the least effort within prevailing circumstances.

I agree with Dr. Larkin that there is a great potential in the world ocean and that the North American Continent is in a favorable position with regard to the fisheries productivity. It seems quite obvious that our quite specific and unchanging tastes in fisheries products have limited the catch to a very few of the available species. At some time in the future when we have learned to efficiently catch and process our latent resources in a usable yet new form, prepare them for customers who have been conditioned to demand new products, products from herring, codlike, and flounder species now lying fallow on and over the edge of the Continental Shelf, then and only then is it likely that our fishermen will be encouraged to turn their efforts to these species.

There can be no question about the demand. I believe that the greatest fisheries market in the world exists within our three countries. In fact, there is little question but what the United States by itself is the world's most important fisheries market, dollarwise, at least.

We in the United States are importing 62 percent of the fisheries products we consume in North America. If we can learn how to efficiently harvest and process the underutilized species adjacent to our coast, we can increase the consumption of our domestically produced fish. I believe this can be done without reducing the imports; it can be done by increasing the consumption of fish within the United States. To date we have been unsuccessful in increasing the per capita consumption of fish and some of our speakers have raised questions about this lack of success and others have pontificated about how we might overcome our difficulties.

Dr. Kask raises some of these important questions. He asks, "Why, when world fish production has more than doubled in 1950, have the North American fish producers barely held their own in spite of the fact that effective demand for fish products has continued to increase?" Second, he has asked, "Why hasn't the per capita consumption of fish improved along with the consumption of bread, meat, poultry, eggs, and cheese?" Third, "Is one of our problems the overadministration of our resources?" That is, the basic administration of the States are overlaid with the administration of the Federal Government and international commissions. He summaraizes this question by asking, "Are we doing the right things with the increasing funds we are spending?" And, fourth, "Can we justify the increasing costs of national research programs in the face of the lagging developments of North American fisheries?" These are important questions. They touch upon the heart of the problem. He might also have asked whether our present systems of dealing with developing international fisheries problems are entirely adequate, and he might have gone further and asked, "Are our concepts of and mechanisms for the conservation and utilization of the living resources of the sea adequate for the future?"

Dr. Chapman, in discussing these questions, does so somewhat indirectly. Perhaps he purposely avoids the direct questions asked by Dr. Kask. He addresses himself to the general question of "Politics and the marine fisheries." He discusses in some depth the problems involved in the full use of the living resources of the sea. Just as Dr. Kask's primary question involved the broad question as to why the United States and Canada, especially, have not increased fish production in spite of the fact that there was an effective and increasing demand for fisheries products in their countries, so Dr. Chapman has approached this broad question from the standpoint of what he calls "institutional problems," barriers our society has raised to the more full use of the fishery resources off our coast. His paper points out, among other things, that the manifestation of our problem is the inability of fisheries products to compete with other products, such as the red meats, poultry, etc., mentioned by Dr. Kask, for the consumer's dollar. A number of these institutional problems are proposed as major barriers to the increased domestic catch. State laws which discourage the development of new fisheries and inhibit the efficient growth of existing fisheries are listed as being a major cause. The countrywide question of sportsmen versus commercial fishermen, and the inefficient versus efficient fishermen both tend to inhibit the opportunities of American fishermen. It was pointed out that many of these conflicts are forms of gear conflict, wherein a less efficient user of the resource wants to prevent a more efficient user from gobbling up the allowable catch, whatever that may be. While Dr. Chapman's contention seems to be that the recreational fisherman must always win out, I am not so certain of this conclusion. I would wonder whether the public interest in some areas does not lean toward making the healthful food products of the sea available to all citizens rather than to a selected few. Obviously, these resources can best be made available to all citizens through the medium of efficient, modern, commercial fishermen. Nevertheless, Dr. Chapman's point that these are problems is well taken.

It is also true that the critical conflicts for the use of species of fish are few, and if reason rather than emotion were applied to the problems, solutions could easily be found.

Dr. Chapman points out that State fisheries research agencies and the academic institutions, as well as the Federal organization of ocean research, all leave much to be desired in bringing together information which could bear upon more logical conservation regulations and upon the more efficient capture of fish. He presents a rather bold and new approach to the Federal organization of fishery research in recommending a Department of the Oceans, composed of various civilian agencies having an interest in the sea. He points out that this civilian agency would provide for the civilian sector a function parallel to that which Navy's oceanographic program provides for defense. He points out essentially that the National Science Foundation is well suited to adequately promote the ocean activities of academic institutions, but what is needed is a Cabinet-level organization within the Executive to stimulate the coordination and development of research and use of the ocean's resources for the civilian economy.

Dr. Chapman does not for one instant question, as Kask does, the present expenditures of funds for research. He expresses the belief that the expenditures are too low and that State fisheries research agencies as well as academic fishery research groups should be strengthened both in staff and financing. His answer to Kask's question about the justification of present expenditures of research is that we need more research, and if more dollars are spent along these lines we might expect dramatic results such as have occurred in agriculture during the past century. He also tends to answer the question raised by Dr. Kask about the success of present fishery management efforts by indicating that there needs to be a general overhaul of this function within the States, a greater use of research results, and a willingness of State legislatures to leave to the specialists the job of conserving the resources.

He considers that, if we are to compete in the American food market, the cost per ton of fish must be reduced by the greater application of science and technology, along with overhauling and eliminating State laws which have no factual basis nor conservation effect. He would strengthen State and academic fisheries organizations, and would reorganize the ocean research and development in the Federal establishment.

Lastly, he has little sympathy for the proposition by many that the jurisdictional fisheries limits of the United States should be extended. His view, quite obviously, is that the American fishing industry—with the proper application of money, brains, and existing scientific and technological information—can compete successfully with fishermen from any other country for fishery resources on the high seas and ought to start doing so.

Dr. Milner B. Schaefer, in discussing ways in which the study of the oceans—oceanography—can contribute to the increased catch of fish, quotes optimistically from a recent National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council publication to the effect that we could double our fish catch within the next 10 to 15 years and quadruple the oversea fisheries within the next decade. He develops the thesis that oceanographic research is one of the essential elements in realizing these potentials and he lists five ways in which oceanographic knowledge will assist in increasing the harvest of the sea. First, he points out that until recently, fishing grounds were discovered in almost a haphazard fashion, at least by trial-and-error means, but that a knowledge of the ocean currents and ocean environment may well lead to the rapid location and development of rich, new fishing areas.

Second, he points out that even in areas where commercial fisheries have long been exploited, systematic studies of current systems may well lead to major new discoveries. He uses as an example the discovery and delineation of the standing stock of some 2 to 4 million tons of anchovy, which he claims could sustain a harvest of perhaps a half million tons a year or more off the southern coast of California. He cites other examples on both coasts to indicate that careful, systematic oceanographic studies in existing fishing areas have provided information leading to the development of more efficient use of these resources or to the discovery of entirely new resources not understood to have been present in abundance previously.

Third, Dr. Schaefer points out that a knowledge of fish behavior in relation to ocean conditions and properties in the ocean environment can lead to more efficient capture. There is no question about the fact that fish being cold-blooded animals react more specifically to their environment than do warm-blooded animals of the sea or land

and that a knowledge of such simple parameters in the sea as temperatures has been shown to be a tactical advantage to fishermen. He points out that albacore fishermen off the North Pacific coast and cod fishermen in the North Atlantic have used the distribution of temperatures in certain layers of water to find concentrations of fish. Dr. Schaefer cites the almost obvious relationship between harvestable fish and aggregations of food supply as being a useful tool which fishermen might in the future use to improve fishing operations, although he recognizes these relationships have not been well developed.

Fourth, Dr. Schaefer recognizes that a knowledge of the oceans is giving us information on predictability and that variations in ocean conditions provide a forecast of expected good or poor runs of fish in many circumstances. He believes that a knowledge of the oceans will provide a basis for rational management of heavily exploited fisheries and this cannot be debated. Obviously, if we can predict the large and small runs in advance of the fishing season or trip with sufficient accuracy, conservation regulations can be tailored to the size of the runs and commitment of funds and labor held to an optimum.

Dr. Schaefer's view, in summary, is that, with the proper application of ocean science, fishing can be put on a more efficient basis, leading from the hunting economy of the past toward a system of fish husbandry in the future.

The discussion by Mr. A. B. Parkes, a vessel operator from Hull, England, was refreshing. The British have had a history of long and successful experience fishing the eastern North Atlantic in the east with constant and intensive competition from their neighbors in Europe. In addition, they have developed distant-water vessels to fish the north and northwest Atlantic. Thus, their experience is of great value to us, especially at this time when many of us in North America are contemplating the construction or reconstruction of major segments of our fishing fleets, and, what is more important, some of us are looking to the North Atlantic. Unlike some of the preceding speakers, Mr. Parkes sounds a word of warning with his discussion of the efforts of the British to develop the most efficient vessels and more efficient gear in order to maintain their harvest from the sea; he points out that the catch per unit of effort of the trawlers has declined 30 to 40 percent in recent years despite the improvement in ships and gear. One must recognize that the British developments in fisheries in recent years have been somewhat different from those in Japan and the Soviet Union. The British, rather than develop new fishing grounds and new fishing methods in other parts of the world, have tended to remain on their well-known and established grounds, expending their energies toward making their fishermen, vessels, and equipment more efficient. In this respect, I consider them to be perhaps the most advanced fishing nation in the world.

Mr. Parkes has done us the great favor of discussing the development of the distant-water trawlers of several types, including stern-ramp trawlers, and he points out that there soon will be in the general neighborhood of 20 or 25 of these in operation. His discussion of the experiments in icing, freezing, superchilling, and filleting aboard these new vessels indicates quite clearly the systematic efforts of the British industry to maintain a competitive position on the North Atlantic fishing grounds and on the world market. He points out that one of their concerns is whether or not these new classes of large vessels can find enough fish in the North Atlantic to enable the ships to work profitably. With the size of the ship under consideration, vessels from 210 to 250 feet in overall length, a minimum of about 12 tons per day must be caught while on the fishing grounds before breaking even. This is an important statistic and one which gives us much food for thought. Mr. Parkes points out that the British are not the only people who are developing these long-range, efficient trawlers; France, Belgium, Holland, U.S.S.R., and West Germany, among others, are rapidly developing distant-water factory trawlers to maintain their competitive position on North Atlantic fishing banks.

The degree of consideration of economics of these large vessels is indicated by his discussion of the questions before them at the present time to determine how much processing equipment must be placed on these vessels. He speculates that the answer may well be to install no more processing facilities for the production of fish blocks and/or fillets than those which can be kept approximately 90 percent employed continuously while on the fishing grounds. His logic is inescapable. The heavy expense of labor and equipment makes it mandatory that on the fishing vessels the equipment be kept in almost continuous operation.

Mr. Parkes states that it is becoming increasingly difficult to find commercial quantities of sizable and edible fish of the types in popular demand. He states that many of the grounds around the coasts of Europe, which were prolific as recently as 30 years ago, are now commercially barren. He states categorically that the cause is overfishing and the failure to take precautions to allow small fish to pass through the nets. He points out that there can be no worthwhile harvest in the long run if there is not good husbandry of the available stock. His picture of conditions in the North Atlantic—at least the Northeast Atlantic—is pessimistic. He states that management is virtually absent. The industry has received warnings from the scientists, but effective international control is wanting. He suggests that there is urgent need of international control of the fishing effort and pleads for effective international enforcement of conservation measures. Essentially, Mr. Parkes says that the increased efficiency of the larger vessels and better gear is simply being used to maintain the previous level of catches. In doing so, he describes some new techniques that the British are using, with sounding and sonar devices as well as trawler speedometers and other electronic equipment of very modern design.

Mr. Parkes emphasizes throughout his discussion the need for more effective international control of fishing intensity and the need for more effective measures of conservation and enforcement. Without these, he sees little future in the fishing industry on those stocks of fish which have been the basis for the major catches of fish throughout the world. He puts it this way: "Let us hope that our effectiveness as fish killers does not for long continue to outpace our effectiveness as fish conservers." Mr. Parkes has sounded a familiar warning, one with which we can concur. I am sure that I speak for those of us from the three North American countries at this Conference in believing that, in addition to the development and full use of new resources of the sea, there is great potential benefit from effective conservation programs to conserve and sustain the economic optimum yield from our fisheries resources.

Moving now to the matter of processing the catch once it is aboard our vessel and reaches our port, Mr. E. Robert Kinney points out that with the tremendous number of trained engineers and scientists in North America one can look toward new knowledge upon which to base new food products for the consumer of tomorrow. This paper, as have some others, points up the urgent problem caused by the exploding human population on the earth and the ultimate need to look to the sea for food. Mr. Kinney points out that in considering the resources of the sea we must become internationally minded and that our research on fishery resources is minimal at best. He points up the responsibility of the processor to watch carefully new developments. The case is made that fish supplies only about 1 percent of the calories needed for food by our population. As he sees it, the fishing industry must compete more successfully and it can do so by improving present methods, developing new products, controlling and reducing labor costs, and recognizing the market for convenience. He goes on to discuss these in more detail, pointing out that the industry must upgrade its products in order to get more of the consumer's food dollars. He thinks that the fishing industry must become more imaginative and creative and that they must watch new developments—such developments as the radiation of seafoods, freezing with liquid nitrogen, and freeze drying—and keep a close watch on the development of fish protein concentrate. There is the thought expressed that the industry itself spends too little for research and that most of the research done by industry is in the general field of quality control rather than in evaluation of developments made possible by basic research efforts of scientists throughout the world. Mr. Kinney points out that in order to keep competitive we must increase production efficiency, and he believes that this can be done by automation and production efficiency through design and construction of new equipment and new methods.

It was pointed out that the future will bring computers into the fish production lines, with automated filling and dispensing equipment controlled by these computers and with more uniformly high-quality products of uniform formulation of texture, color, and flavor. This he sees as the channel to the greater consumption of fish in North America and greater profits. He makes a plea for positive attributes in our marketing and thinks that the fishing industry must in the future give the consumer, at some greater cost to the industry, more products, more convenience, more nourishment, and more flavor for her money. He concludes, optimistically, that if the industry is wise enough to utilize fully the research available from our own and sister industries, the rewards in profits and growth will be great.

Speakers on the marketing panel projected their thinking into the future so far as marketing was concerned, and presented their views on potential markets and profits if full advantage of opportunities are grasped. The discussion primarily related to the developments in the markets for fish and shellfish within the United States, although there was a recognition, albeit not a great one, by these men of the opportunities for oversea marketing development. It was pointed out that within the last 10 to 15 years the marketing of seafood products has been revolutionized. A decade or so ago, the bulk of the products, except for a few canned or solid products, was sold on the seacoasts, and relatively little fish was consumed in the Midwest. There, most of the population was unaware of the advantages of fish on the menu.

Mr. John Mehos pointed out that today from one end of the country to the other a large variety of fish and seafood items are to be found on the menus of hotels and restaurants and other mass-feeding establishments. Everywhere, homes and restaurants serve sea products—domestic as well as foreign—from every corner of the country and globe. While the domestic consumption of fish has not increased substantially in the United States, he points out that the value of fisheries products consumed in the United States has increased substantially. Ten years ago the retail value of fish and shellfish products was about $900 million and today it has reached about $1.3 billion, an increase of over $400 million within the past 10-year period. It was pointed out that, although this appears fine on first glance, another look shows the expenditures by our citizens for food increased 60 percent, which was half again as much as the increase for fish and seafood products. In examining population growth and comparing this with the increase in total supply of fish and seafood, it was shown that the total supply consumed in the United States just about kept pace with the population growth. This corresponds very well, of course, with the constant rate of consumption of between 10 and 11 pounds per capita in this country. I would add that if one looks closer, and considers the change in the value of the dollar during the past 10 years, we can scarcely be complacent about the increase in sales of fisheries products during the past 10 years.

It was also shown that the amount of imported products consumed in the United States has gone up tremendously. In 1953, the value of fishery products imported into the United States was approximately $200 million. In 1963, the imports were valued at $400 million—an increase of 100 percent. Shrimp was used as a specific example. In 1950, the United States and Mexico produced practically all of the shrimp consumed in the United States. Today, 20 percent of the consumption comes from over 48 countries other than the United States and Mexico. Data show that to a considerable degree the increased imports occurred subsequent to the development of frozen fillets and fish sticks and blocks. With the tremendous increase in the consumption of such products as fish sticks, fish portions, breaded shrimp, and other frozen products, there has been a radical change in the type of fishery product consumed in the United States. In addition, it was pointed out that there has been a radical change in the method of marketing. The revolution in marketing fisheries products has altered significantly the kind of product consumed in the home, the packaging of the products, and the distribution throughout the country. Mr. Eric Turnill talked about looking into the future and visualizing the marketing prospects in the years ahead. He concludes, much as did Mr. Kinney, that there will be approximately a 23-percent increase in our population by 1975, or about 230 million people in this country alone, not counting the rate of increase in our neighboring countries—Mexico and Canada. But Mr. Turnill also points out that there will be a great deal more money in the pockets of each family, and that the spare money is increasing at a faster rate than the basic income. To him this means that Americans are going to be in a position to spend more money for food and they are going to want better, higher-priced, and more convenient foods to serve. He foresees that the American housewife of the future will buy more precooked portions of shrimp, lobster, crab, halibut, salmon, and other products which may be produced in the future.

He estimates, and I assume his statistics to be correct, that Americans will probably spend 75 percent more for foods in 1975—just 10 years from now—than at the present time. He also points out, and it seems quite logical, that people will be spending more for food away from home at hotels, restaurants, clubs, and drive-in restaurants. He foresees that the housewife will buy almost completely in self-service supermarkets. Mr. Turnill predicts, on the basis of Bureau statistics, that there will be more than 5½ billions of pounds of fish and shellfish available to sell in 1975. Since the statistics come from our Bureau, I take them to be correct by definition. On the other hand, these statistics are only true if we continue to sell fish at the same low rate as today. He then concludes that in the next 10 years the size of our market will increase by 25 percent; that Americans will have 75 percent more money to spend on food; that we are going to have more products to market than at the present and that the important point for the American fishing industry to remember is that the housewife must be presold before she shops, and this will be tough to do because there will be more competition for the consumer dollar than at present.

Dr. Wendell Earle presented a stimulating discussion of "Marketing at a Profit." The thrust of his argument was that, while there were bound to be changes in marketing practices in the next few years, these will not be of a radical nature but will involve further evolution in the growth of the frozen and convenience foods markets. Dr. Earle is critical of present-day practices and he quotes a speaker who wrote of marketing men persisting in marketing a product as though the population was made up of "white Protestant, middle class, young, suburban corporation executives and their wives," when in fact present-day markets are composed of many quite distinct groups, each becoming a separate market in itself.

His picture of the great numbers of Americans who do not eat fish at all, or very seldom, strikes at the heart of the marketing problem of the fishing industry.

I would say Dr. Earle accuses us, and I judge us guilty, of utter complacency after hearing his arguments. His answer to the industry's problem is that we need more outstanding products and an advertising program of a different order of magnitude than that now underway. Here Dr. Earle is not talking about increasing the industrywide promotion allowance from $50,000 to $100,000 per year. He talks in terms of $500,000 per year. I think he is way too low.

I am well aware of the advertised brands expenditures for advertising canned and frozen fish, but since the fishing industry is still essentially composed of small businesses, it seems obvious that they must join with the larger components of the industry and support a significant program. I don't believe this is being done now and obviously neither does Dr. Earle.

Dr. Earle raises another very significant point when, in again quoting a colleague, he points out that profits come from three sources in the food chain: the markup on commodity, improvements in production efficiency, and increases from marketing services. He believes the fishing industry is neglecting the profits to be gained by marketing services and his arguments seem sound to me.

In summary, Dr. Earle presented stimulating arguments which tend to corroborate the consumption statistics: we are not doing a very good job of marketing our products; we are overlooking profitable ways in which to improve the marketing of our product; and we as yet are not putting one-tenth enough effort (money) into industrywide promotion. With these arguments before us, there is little wonder that the per capita consumption of fish remains constant in the United States and Canada, at least.

Mr. Murray Wheeler, with Mr. Frohman, reviewed some of the excellent advertising and promotion work that has been done over the past year, and I must confess that his report was most encouraging. There can be no question but what well-supported promotion and advertising will sell high-quality fishery products. My résumé of this section of the marketing presentation is that there is a great enthusiasm, a tremendous opportunity—an opportunity which requires two things: a greater quantity of high-quality fisheries products for the market and increased support by the fishing industry of marketing promotion and direct advertising. I am reminded here of the oft-repeated poem about the codfish. I believe our marketing experts who have spoken during the course of this Conference mentioned the promotion activities of the poultry and dairy people. What they meant to say is that we in the fish business could do a great deal more crowing. I think we can too, especially when I think of the poem about the codfish and the hen.

> "The codfish lays a thousand eggs,
> The homely hen lays one,
> But the codfish never cackles
> To tell you what she's done.
>
> "And, so we scorn the codfish,
> While the humble hen we prize.
> Which only goes to show
> That it pays to advertise."

I suggest if we can't put more money into industry advertising, that as a last resort we attach airhorns to the airbladders of codfish. At least we will make more noise.

Minister Sharp discussed, in general, the advantages of increased trade among all nations, and especially among American nations. He pointed out that about $1 of $5 Canada earns comes from exports. It was quite clear from his discussion that Canada is very dependent upon trade, and her trade in fisheries is very large.

The Minister discussed the Kennedy round tariff negotiations now underway in Europe. He was cautiously optimistic that this would be successful after periods of disappointment and trials. It was his view that these talks would lead eventually to an improved trade climate among nations and he saw fisheries trade expanding as a result.

While the preceding gentlemen talked primarily about domestic markets, Secretary of the Interior Udall talked about the developing world markets and the challenge the U.S. fishing industry faces in competing for the world markets of tomorrow. He pointed out that the international trade in fisheries products is growing, and growing rapidly. It was noted that the volume of world exports in 1963 was almost three times as great as in 1948, and was 60 percent larger than in 1958. North America and Europe combined bought about 83 percent of the total volume of world imports of fish in 1963. In contrast, Africa, Latin America, and Asia together—these, of course, are countries with a relatively low purchasing power—accounted for only 14 percent of the world import totals. Secretary Udall recognizes that the current negotiations, called the Kennedy round tariff negotiations, will undoubtedly pose some immediate economic hardships on our domestic fishing industry, but, provided the fishing industry accepts the challenge, it is his view that a reduction in trade barriers will make possible new opportunities for overseas trade by the American fishing industry. He views the increased world harvest of fish as a possible means of meeting the problems of hunger throughout the world. With the recent accumulation of scientific information about the sea, it seems obvious to him that our industries—the industries of the three countries here at this Conference—can be made ready for ocean development programs, translating scientific knowledge into an ever-increasing harvest of mineral, food, and water resources from the sea.

In order to make this vast potential food resource available to hungry people, we in our three countries must develop more highly sophisticated systems of trade and aid—systems which require international cooperation as well as cooperation between Government and private business. He believes that fish can play a decisive role in these programs through the development of private trade as well as through oversea aid, such as food for peace and other programs. Secretary Udall believes that as developing countries achieve economic growth, active markets for fisheries products develop. He points out that industry must develop new kinds of products—those based upon new technology, such as freeze drying, irradiation, and reduction products along with conventional, economic canned and cured products as being the kinds of use in developing markets in rapidly developing countries. He looks upon fish protein concentrate as providing great opportunities for industry in this country. He believes that we are on the threshold of marked improvement in both developing a fish protein concentrate as well as finding uses of it in human diets. He looks upon this as a way of bringing into commercial use many species of fish now entirely or partially unutilized. In summary, Secretary Udall believes that the American fishing industry has a tremendous challenge to develop world markets for fishery products. He, like a number of our speakers on the panels over the past 3 days, sees improved technology and increasing efficiency as the key to successful competition on the world market.

There were two additional papers of great interest and concern to the Conference. The first of these was by Mr. Robichaud, Minister of Fisheries for Canada. Mr. Robichaud's message at this Conference involved a most stimulating discussion of the need for conservation and wise management of world fishery resources. He warns us that the mobile fleets of large fishing countries pose a serious challenge to the somewhat inadequate world organization for conservation of international fisheries research and regulation. He points out that although there are some outstanding examples of the conservation of fishery resources, examples in which both the United States and Canada participate, there are storm clouds overhead brought about by the increasing competition for common resources. His discussion of various fisheries commissions in which Canada participates leads him to conclude that, in order to meet the challenge, some kind of mechanism much broader than the regional commissions now in being must be developed in order to safeguard the living resources of the sea in the future.

Mr. Robichaud sees an important role for the fisheries activities of FAO to play in gathering comprehensive statistics of all fisheries and stimulating the exchange of scientific information on a very broad basis. He emphasizes that the rapid expansion of world fisheries will continue; that this creates an urgent need for strong unified conservation efforts; and that we of the Americas face a great challenge. He points out that if we meet this challenge effectively, future generations will benefit. But, if we fail, our generation will share the blame. Minister Robichaud expresses Canada's determination to play her part in winning the battle for international cooperation in fishery conservation.

Mr. Jackson has spoken to us this afternoon about the role of FAO in world fisheries. I need not repeat his summary of the explosive character of world fisheries today, but I should mention that Mr. Jackson quite clearly lays out the imbalance in the harvest of fish by a very few countries. For example, he points out that nearly one-third of the world catch in 1963 was taken by 2 countries—Peru and Japan—and that two-thirds of the world catch was taken only by 10 countries out of some 220 countries in existence today. He presents some other interesting statistics to show that there is an imbalance in the catch of food from the sea, not only in the amount taken by a few fishing countries but by the distribution of fish catch.

Mr. Jackson points out that world fisheries are in the midst of a technological revolution. The catch has increased, vessels are increasing in number and in size, the number of products and their distribution has increased exponentially in the last few years. This, however, is happening only in few places; the overwhelming majorities of nations and people have been left far behind. This results in 95 percent of the world catch being taken by about 20 percent of the countries.

Mr. Jackson also deals with the international trade problem. His general arguments are much the same as those of Secretary Udall. He points out, for example, that if one considers the live weight equivalent of the fisheries catch, one-third of the total world catch was entering international trade 7 years ago, and in 1962, the figure had risen to about 40 percent. Another way of putting this is that for every 5 tons of fish caught now, 2 of these are exported. A surprising statistic came from Mr. Jackson. He estimates that the volume of fish and fishery products traded internationally is now of about the same order of magnitude as the international trade in meat. He points out, quite rightly, that fisheries differ from agriculture and meat production in that for the most part the fisheries stocks of the world are common property of mankind and, therefore, they are highly international in nature.

After reviewing the general kinds of work that FAO does, Mr. Jackson strongly implies, and it is an implication that I am perfectly willing to acecpt, that the FAO fisheries group is wholly inadequate to accomplish the task before them. Their problems of dealing with regional fisheries bodies and technical assistance of various kinds, and attempting to be responsive, not only to the needs of the developing countries, but to others by bringing together scientists as well as scientific information for the developed countries, poses a task far beyond the capability of their present staff. He has pointed out that there are moves on foot, and I am pleased to be able to say that the U.S. Government has been in the forefront of these moves, to upgrade fisheries and provide adequate tools for this potentially important international organization. He believes that FAO's role should be one of leadership through service, and he has summarized some of the duties of this organization as he sees it. My own view is somewhat similar to that of Minister Robichaud's. In the future, fishing countries must look to some kind, or kinds, of international organization, broader than those now in being, to provide a common forum for fishing nations to wisely consider conservation measures for the living resources of the sea. I am not sure that FAO is, in fact, one of these organizations of the future, but I insist they should have the opportunity to develop along these lines.

I have tried thus far in summarizing the Conference to more or less highlight the papers of preceding speakers; inserting what appeared to me to be pertinent comments; to others they may have seemed impertinent. Now I should like to attempt to summarize the Conference in my own words.

Turning to the resource, it seems quite obvious that there is ample opportunity for a twofold to tenfold increase in the sustainable catch of fishery resources from the world ocean and from the seas surrounding our shores. The question raised by several of our distinguished speakers is how to achieve this increase economically; by what means; and several have pointed out that this can only happen when products and a market for those products have been found.

There is no simple answer to the disturbing questions raised by Dr. Kask. It seems quite obvious that the fishing industries of at least Canada and the United States have not kept up either with other food-producing industries in our countries or with many important fish-producing nations of the world. It has been shown that the reasons for this are complex. They involve the political, economic, and social customs and regulations of our countries. The rules under which we can fish and sell our products have been so manipulated that we are handicapped in relation to other fishing nations in developing the most efficient kinds of gear and harvesting the resources to the maximum extent possible, consistent with proper conservation.

Several speakers have pointed out that the resources off our coasts were being utilized by large fleets from foreign lands. One speaker has told us, in a sense, to get off our pants and start fishing before we lose our industry. It has been suggested that the organizations of our Government—Federal and State—are not completely adequate to handle the problems of complex international fisheries of tomorrow, and that certain changes ought to be made in order to improve our chances. I do not quarrel with these views nor for the need for change. However, I am not certain that we have considered all the roadblocks to increased production nor the changes in our fisheries which are taking place. For example, there is a move towards the consolidation of the small, independent fishing unit within our own country, and I presume the same thing is happening in Canada and Mexico.

The problems of the small, independent operator—be he fisherman or processor—have been pointed out by at least one of our speakers in the last 3 days, and it seems to me that whether it is good for the country, good for the fisherman, or good for the processor, there are some business advantages in the larger units within the industry. The larger entrepreneurs have more capital for adequate investment, for carrying large inventories, and for withstanding the shock of fluctuating supply and demand which is so characteristic of the fish business.

The consensus of our Conference seems to be that we need better and more diversified products. These seem to be developing slowly in the form of fish portions, shrimp products, fish protein concentrate, and others. Most of our experts did not think we were doing nearly enough to develop new products nor to improve the quality of those we now sell.

Some speakers were optimistic about the marketing potential, but neither Dr. Earle nor I am very happy. We see our countries falling hopelessly behind other fishing nations in catching, marketing, and in the consumption of fish—despite the rosy picture of fish sticks and portions, shrimp products, canned tuna, and another one or two products.

I conclude that we must gain markets in relation to other protein foods and we must begin looking aggressively toward world markets if we are to prosper as an industry. We've obviously been looking inwardly for too long.

Ample warning has been sounded by several of our speakers about the need for additional knowledge of the fishery resources of the ocean, better regulation of the catch and the effort, especially on those common grounds fished by many nations, and the need for effective international control and enforcement. One need only to reflect briefly upon the course of this Conference to recognize that competition for the markets is going to be greater in the future than they have been in the past. More adequate rules which safeguard the resource and give ample opportunity for marketing ingenuity are needed on an international basis. These are not the things we can solve today, although it seems obvious that much thought is being given, not only in our three countries, but throughout the world on those problems of international conservation of resources and international cooperation at the marketplace. If I may be allowed to sum up the results of this Conference in a few simple sentences, I would say that within the hearts and minds of the fishing industries of Canada, Mexico, and the United States there is hope, there is optimism, but there is caution. Our guests have shown us that opportunities are present, but that serious barriers to the development of the full use of the resources of the sea by fishermen of all nations exist. There is optimism for improved fishing and that the harvest from the sea can help make the world a better place in which to live. There is also a feeling that too rapid development, with a lack of adequate research and understanding of the sea and its inhabitants, may well lead us to deplete our resource and destroy our hopes and aspirations.

I would echo the hope of those who have spoken here that the thoughts and ideas which have been expressed over the past 3 days may be made available to us so that we may reflect upon them again and again. And out of these reflections we must urge actions by our respective governments, in cooperation, with the industries of our three countries, leading toward strong and prosperous North American fishing industries, harvesting our share of the bountiful food resources of the sea in a manner consistent with the highest conservation principles; making these products available to our own citizens, for the profit of our businessmen and for the strength of our governments, but also for the long-range welfare of mankind everywhere.

FINANCIAL PRESSURES ON VETERAN POINT TO NEED FOR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the educational plight in which the veteran of cold war service in this Nation's Armed Forces finds himself has been created and fostered by the Government, and it continues to take a heavy toll of that large group of able men and women. The cold war GI bill is needed now if the injustices of the past are to be converted into the intellectual and cultural assets of the present and future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached letter from Mr. Joseph Falati, Jr., of 1519 Annunciation Street, New Orleans, La., and dated May 10, 1965, in support of the cold war GI bill (S. 9) be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
May 10, 1965.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I wish, again, to take time to thank you for all you are doing in behalf of those who have served after the expiration of the GI bill.

It is only by passage of this bill that many who have served since 1955 will be able to complete their education and see it clear to buy a home.

Before I was drafted in 1956, I attended night school. But now, with a wife and five little girls to care for, I find it financially impossible to continue.

Please advise me of anything I can do to assist you. I am writing to my Congressman, Hon. RUSSELL LONG, and to my Representative, Hon. HALE BOGGS, to support your bill. I am also encouraging my many friends, who are also in the same boat, to do likewise.

With best wishes, I am,
Very truly yours,
JOSEPH FALATI, Jr.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND THE REVISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, last week the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure continued its diligent and scholarly work on what is one of the most significant tasks now confronting a congressional committee—the revising and updating of the Administrative Procedure Act. Under the able chairmanship of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the subcommittee has received testimony from many expert witnesses and its staff has been painstakingly studying the intricate problems involved.

I have submitted to the subcommittee a brief statement on the measures pending before it, and would like to share with Members of the Senate some of the information in it with the thought that it might be helpful to others interested in this important area of the law. I have cosponsored two of the measures considered by the subcommittee: S. 1160, to clarify and protect the right of the public to information, and S. 1758, to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys before Government agencies. It is my belief that these measures are meaningful and significant for the protection of constitutional rights. Based on sections of the omnibus bills to revise the Administrative Procedure Act, they were approved by the Senate last year, and I hope that they will receive as prompt consideration this year.

I also introduced a third measure which is pending before the subcommittee. This bill, S. 1879, is an omnibus measure to recodify the Administrative Procedure Act. It is similar in principle to S. 1336, but embodies a slightly different approach on certain matters. It was introduced so that the subcommittee could have both measures before it during the hearings.

S. 1160 and S. 1758, as well as the omnibus bills, are directed essentially to different aspects of the same problem—the individual's right to be informed. This involves his right to access to information in Government departments and agencies; his right to an attorney who knows what information will affect his interest; his right to notice and confrontation; and, in fact, his right to be informed what his rights and privileges are.

The issues and problems involved in this monumental task of revision of the Administrative Procedure Act are complex and innumerable. While I am not now wedded to particular language, I shall study carefully the different opinions presented to the subcommittee. I do, however, wish to register my support of the efforts to amend the act to take into account the experience under it since 1946, the increase in the number of agencies and the broadening of the scope of Government activities. I am sure that any draft reported by the subcommittee will be the product of the most careful study.

A noted legal scholar has said that liberty is wedged in the interstices of procedure.

The studies by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee over the last 10 years and the investigation by the Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee have dramatically illustrated the threats to individual rights and liberties which may be posed in the name of the administrative process. Studies and hearings have documented, for instance, such administrative threats to the right to privacy as lie detectors, psychological personality tests, mail censorship, employment questionnaires, interviews for personnel clearance, and many other practices. Complaints received by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee show that Government employees, Indians, the mentally ill, military personnel, indigent defendants, and many other citizens from every walk of life have found to their sorrow that substantial liberties may become wedged in the vise of administrative procedures. As a result of administrative failings, wrongdoing, neglect, or delay, the lives of these people, their reputations and their employment prospects, have sometimes been damaged beyond repair. As we have dealt with these cases, I have been shocked to find how often the redtape of our bureaucracy, the maze of procedures, the written and unwritten precedents, the rules, the regulations, and the myriad policy statements can defeat the unwary citizen, who has been led to believe that under our system, the individual has a voice in the administration of his Government, and that the administrative rules will take into account his particular needs and demands.

Because we believe in the consent of the governed, each citizen expects that public administration in this country will be imbued with that spirit of rationality and fairness which is basic to our traditions. And he has a right to expect this. Whenever he deals with the agencies of his Government, or whenever he is affected by their rulings, he has a right to expect that decisions affecting his welfare and interests will be made rationally, fairly, and efficiently, with a minimum of cost to him and to other taxpayers.

The thousands of complaints received by our subcommittee amply demonstrate that this is not always so. Furthermore, it is not only the unwary citizen who is often vanquished by the requirements of administrative procedures. It is often the attorney, supposedly initiated into the secrets of the administrative maze, who is attempting to represent his client. It is often the Member of Congress seeking to prod a weighty, lethargic bureaucracy into action, attempting to acquire simple facts from a department, or undertaking to guide a bewildered constituent through cumbersome procedures and mountains of regulations. I feel sure that many in this body share my frustration in this respect.

There is, I have sometimes found, inherent in the Federal administrative process of today a tyranny more subtle than any danger to our liberties which our Founding Fathers might have envisaged. It is self-generating and, in view of the rapidity with which Congress has multiplied the number of Federal activities it is, to a great degree, unavoidable, for each new agency requires countless hundreds more rules and regulations. As Congress has been the creator of these administrative bodies, so it has a duty to see that in performing their assigned tasks they do not, in the process, violate or threaten rights which are sacred to a free people.

Congress has attempted to minimize these threats by stipulating that there be in the decisionmaking, rulemaking process some semblance of organization, reason, due process, and fairplay. It did this on a grand scale in 1946 when it enacted the Administrative Procedure Act. But the great expectations of Congress have not been entirely fulfilled. As so often happens when an entire new system is created, there were procedural gaps. In some cases, the intent of Congress has been circumvented or distorted or ignored.

A case in point is the freedom of information section of the Administrative Procedure Act. Through this provision, Congress meant to guarantee that the public's right to information would be respected. Instead, this section has been cited frequently by Government officials as authority for withholding information from the Congress, the press, and the public.

Far from "taking the mystery out of administrative procedure," therefore, this section has been used to increase it. This is not entirely the fault of the executive departments and agencies. The terms of the statute were less than precise and left considerable leeway for administrative discretion.

Access to information about the activities of Government is crucial to the citizen's ability to cope with the bigness and complexity of Government today. It is his grasp of the facts about those Government activities which affect not only the general welfare, but his particular interest as well, which is the counterweight which tips the scale in his favor.

There is no validity therefore to the frequently heard argument that this proposal impinges on executive privilege, for it would not affect the proper exercise of authority of the President and department heads. Certainly, the exceptions go very far in meeting the objections of the departments regarding administrative problems, confidentiality, privacy, and national security. Even these stated exceptions, however, cannot be relied on to withhold information from Congress. If, indeed, this proposal might entail a bit more paperwork, require a little more time on the part of our civil servants, I think the principle involved here far outweighs these considerations.

I have cosponsored this legislation for several years, and have found solid and widespread support for it, especially in my State. In this connection, I have received hundreds of letters from newspaper editors and publishers, owners of radio and television stations, businessmen and lawyers, and many other citizens with no special interest beyond their determination that Government officials shall not deny, distort or delay Government information.

The value of the individual's privacy in our society can have meaning only as long as we have a free society, and we shall enjoy such a society only as long as the Congress, the press, and the public have complete access to information about the activities of the executive branch of our Federal Government. Everything in our common law heritage and the history of our Constitution demands that this be recognized as a "right to know," endorsed by Congress, that it not be a privilege granted at the passing whim of Government officials. Congress has a duty to safeguard this right and to see that the administrative procedures of our Government respect it. S. 1160 will go far to achieve these ends.

I would also like to give my support to section 6(b) of S. 1336 which provides that any person who is a member of the bar of the highest court of a jurisdiction may represent others before any agency. This section is identical with S. 1758, which I have cosponsored. In addition to the myriad rules and regulations, many agencies have established special enrollment procedures for those attorneys who must represent a client before the agency. Even if an attorney has only an isolated matter before one of these agencies he must complete a complicated application form, swear to its accuracy, pay a substantial enrollment fee, and then wait several weeks before he can represent his client.

If a person must appear before an agency he should have the right to be represented by the attorney of his choice. However, the formal enrollment procedures and the attendant trouble and delay often discourages many highly qualified attorneys from taking a single case before the agencies. Such unnecessary formalities have some earmarks of an unspoken conspiracy between the agency and the attorneys who habitually practice before it to restrain the practice of law before the agency.

The studies of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights have shown that the right to counsel in administrative proceedings is often less highly regarded than it is in criminal cases. There have been, in fact, instances wherein the right has been qualified to such an extent by rules promulgated by the agencies that the individual is denied effective representation.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I have been concerned about possible deprivations of due process where the Federal Government exercises any control over the choice of counsel; a Federal limitation on the choice of counsel abrogates the right to counsel itself.

This legislation would recognize that a license to practice in State or Federal courts would be proof of an attorney's qualifications to practice before an agency tribunal. Moreover, it would be recognition of the right of the individual to make his own choice as to who will represent him and would make the client sole judge of an attorney's qualification for representing him before an administrative board. Whether a hearing is considered to be investigative or adjudicative, the individual's property rights are necessarily involved, and due process requirement in the fifth amendment demands that close scrutiny be given the conduct of the proceedings.

A few distinctions between S. 1879 and S. 1336 are worth noting. I have introduced in several Congresses the Code of Administrative Procedure drafted by the American Bar Association, and it has received substantial recognition in the process of revising the Administrative Procedure Act.

As I have indicated, S. 1879, the code, and S. 1336 to a large degree now recommend the same or very similar changes in the present act. Both would dispense with many of the exceptions which were written into the present law, exceptions which have proved to be either meaningless or unfortunate. Evidently this time we can expect to have a general statute which will truly have general application. The definition of rules will be limited to statements of general applicability. This is certainly a proper change. Rulemaking has been described as legislative in its nature and legislation should have a general rather than a particular objective.

Both bills have improved on the act in dealing with rulemaking, and accord the public more than an illusory right to be heard. Provision has been made to insure that petitions for rules, if they are not granted, will have at least the courtesy of a prompt and specific denial. This section also provides a procedure for issuing temporary rules that seems a workable compromise between the needs of the agencies and the public.

The bills attempt to free the members of the various agencies from the burden of deciding a host of cases that are now largely brought before them. Both bills allow a wide delegation of the decisionmaking power to hearing examiners, and, on review, to appeal boards. In theory, this should free the agency members themselves to deal primarily with broad questions of policy and, to the extent possible to deal with them through the rulemaking process. As for the process of adjudication itself, it would now provide for the more liberal use of subpenas, greater use of discovery, and more effective pleading, to name only a few of the significant changes. There is also language designed to make the declaratory order an available and effective instrument. Much was hoped from the use of such orders under the Administrative Procedure Act; the new language should insure that such orders will become of increasing importance.

The section on judicial review in both bills represents, I believe, an advance over the present law. Both state more clearly the very narrow limits within which administrative discretion is not reviewable. Moreover, both bills—with S. 1879 doing more—revise the present law with respect to standing to seek review. S. 1879 does not qualify the right to seek review by requiring, as does S. 1336, that one be adversely affected in fact.

The new subsection on the form of judicial review is also an improvement over the similar provision in the Administrative Procedure Act. Both bills are in agreement on this matter, as on most of the other issues of substance involved in judicial review.

There are, of course, a number of differences between S. 1879 and S. 1336. Many of them are no more than stylistic. S. 1879 is an altogether new version of the present statute. S. 1336 maintains much of the language and framework of the original statute, but revises and rearranges it. S. 1879 thus is free from the existing language, but there are advantages to refashioning the present law in the manner of S. 1336.

Although the major differences between the two bills are few, three of them are worth noting in detail. First, the code takes a stricter line than S. 1336 in dealing with the separation of functions. The code provision applies to agency members; the provision in S. 1336 does not. Agency adjudication has by now become litigation of major importance. S. 1336 forbids the decisionmaking officers at the lower level from talking informally to third persons about the facts in a case before them, while the code forbids such consultation on issues both of fact and of law. S. 1336 gives agency members complete freedom to consult outside the record as to issues of both fact and law; the code applies to agency members as it does to the other decisionmaking officers of the agency.

A revision similar to section 1009(g) of S. 1879—proceedings in excess of jurisdiction—should also be considered. There was similar language in one of the earlier versions of S. 1336. We are all aware of the doctrine of exhaustion of remedies, but this is to prevent a party from going through long and expensive proceedings when—to quote the language of S. 1879:

> The proceeding itself or the action proposed to be taken therein is clearly beyond the constitutional or statutory jurisdiction or authority of the agency.

Such an issue is one of law and since it is ultimately one for the courts to decide, the bill makes it possible for them to dispose of it sooner rather than later. The code, according to the drafters would restore rights that were formerly recognized as a matter of law. The law today is uncertain at best. In revising the Administrative Procedure Act we have an opportunity to establish and clarify the law in a way to benefit both the agencies and the public. S. 1879 is designed to give relief in those instances when agency action is clearly ultra vires.

The provision in S. 1879 gives a party to an informal adjudication the right on request to receive a statement of reasons in support of the agency's decision. This is also a matter which should be seriously considered in any redraft of S. 1336. It relates to the individual's right to know as do most of the provisions in these measures.

The drafting and enactment of a good revision of the Administrative Procedure Act will improve the administration of the business of government.

More important, it will provide greater protection for the rights of the individual whenever he deals with the Federal Government.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMER ASSOCIATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the spring conference of the Massachusetts Consumer Association, held in Framingham, Mass., on May 15, adopted three resolutions which I believe will be of interest to the Members of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions dealing with the truth in packaging bill (S. 985), the proposed legislation dealing with the authority of the Federal Power Commission to regulate interstate electric power companies (S. 218), and the Massachusetts truth in lending bill, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolutions Adopted by Massachusetts Consumers Association, May 15, 1965, Spring Conference at Framingham, Mass.

Whereas present law, both State and Federal, does not assure consumers of truth in labeling and packaging of products; and

Whereas deceptive packaging and marketing of products makes it impossible for consumers to make intelligent choices in retail markets; and

Whereas Senator Hart has introduced legislation at the Federal level and hearings are now being held on this subject: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the annual spring conference of the Massachusetts Consumers Association, That full support of this association for Senator Hart's bill, S. 985, be conveyed to every member of the Massachusetts congressional delegation with a request for a vote and support for this piece of consumer protective legislation.

Whereas the Senate Commerce Committee is currently considering S. 218, a bill which would deprive the Federal Power Commission of its existing authority to regulate interstate electric power companies; and

Whereas this bill would end effective regulation of the Nation's major electric utilities, which are growing more and more interstate in nature; and

Whereas S. 218 would turn back the clock to pre-1935 days and would weaken one strong source of effective regulation of electric utilities, the FPC: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Consumer Association is on record in opposition to S. 218; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senate Commerce Committee and to Senators Edward M. Kennedy and Leverett Saltonstall.

Whereas there is no regulation in this Commonwealth adequate to protect consumers in retail installment sales contracts and rates; and

Whereas consumer studies and the reports of the Massachusetts Consumers Council have revealed widespread consumer abuses and complaints in the field of consumer credit; and

Whereas individuals and groups from both our major political parties have filed legislation to correct these abuses and the Committee on Banks and Banking of the Massachusetts General Court has reported an excellent committee draft of this legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That each member of the Massachusetts House and Senate be requested to vote for and support H. 3900 and H. 3901, two bills which will establish comprehensive regulation of retail installment sales and force the full disclosure of true annual interest charges now being hidden from the public.

ADDRESS BY CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN TO THE AMERICAN LAW INSTITUTE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the annual meeting of the American Law Institute is one of the oustanding events in the legal world. I have made it a practice to attend as many of these sessions as I could, and still participate in the regular functions of Congress.

It was my privilege to hear the Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, address the institute at its opening session. I commend his address to all Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed at this point in the Congressional Record, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address Delivered by Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, at the Annual Meeting of the American Law Institute, May 18, 1965

I am happy to welcome the members of the American Law Institute this morning. It is always a pleasure for me to attend this meeting and participate at least to some extent. I note that your agenda is once again a very full one. I am very pleased to see that it includes both a continuation of last year's discussions on the diversity of citizenship phase of the study on the division of the jurisdiction between State and Federal courts and the commencement of discussions on the Federal question jurisdiction. As I stated to you last year, the judicial conference and the entire judiciary should be very grateful to the institute for undertaking this monumental study. We look forward eagerly to its completion.

It has been my custom in the past in reporting to the American Law Institute to give you an overall picture of the workload in the Federal courts as we near the close of another court term.

The number of cases brought to the Supreme Court continues at approximately the same level. In fact, it is remarkable how constant the dockets and the work of the Court are. This year, for example, there are 2,520 cases as against 2,557 at the same time last year.

The Court's regular appellate docket has risen only from 1,129 last year to 1,176 during the current term. The miscellaneous docket, on the other hand, which is largely made up of applications by indigent prisoners seeking correction of what they consider unfair convictions, dropped from 1,428 to 1,344 cases.

The Court has thus far disposed of 1,918 cases on both dockets this term as against 1,915 at a comparable point at this date last year. It has heard arguments in 122 cases in a period of 177½ hours as compared with 144 cases in 225 hours last term.

The Court is well along with its work in this term. It has heard arguments in all cases which were ready to be heard and these cases will all be disposed of before the end of the term.

The criminal caseload in the district courts has remained fairly stable. During fiscal year 1964, 29,944 criminal cases were brought in the district courts as against 29,858 in the prior year. There was a slight increase last year in the number of prolonged criminal trials but criminal dockets, generally, are current.

The district courts are facing increasing difficulty in disposing of their civil litigation. During the first 9 months of the current fiscal year, ending March 31, 1965, the number of civil cases filed was 50,142 and the number terminated 47,815, leaving the pending caseload at the end of March as 74,522, the highest figure on record. These filings and terminations compare with 48,789 civil cases filed in the first 9 months of the last fiscal year and 45,714 terminated. Not since 1960 has the number of cases terminated exceeded those filed. In fiscal year 1960, 59,284 cases were filed and 61,829 were terminated, leaving the ratio of terminations to filings at 1.04. By 1963, this ratio had declined to .98. In that year, 63,630 cases was filed and 62,379 were terminated. The ratio for the first 9 months of the current year has dropped to .95.

A number of the courts of appeals are also facing increased difficulty in disposing of their current workload. The caseload for all courts of appeals on March 31 of this year was 20 percent higher than on the same date in 1964, with 4,711 pending as against 3,902 pending a year ago. During the first 9 months of this fiscal year, 4,945 cases were filed in the courts of appeals as compared to 4,459 in the comparable period of 1964 and 4,014 cases were terminated in both 9-month periods.

The heaviest number of filings in any circuit during the first 9 months of this fiscal year was in the already overburdened fifth circuit. Although nine judges are authorized in this circuit, one vacancy has existed for more than 13 months and another for over 6 months. Thus, seven judges have had to meet the fastest expanding caseload in the country. I am happy to say that their fellow judges in other parts of the country, despite their own crowded calendars, have been willing to serve in the fifth circuit for short periods of time to assist in carrying a share of the intolerable burden in that circuit. Over a 6 months' period in this fiscal year, 17 judges from other circuits sat in the fifth circuit. The judicial conference last September and again in March of this year took note of this situation and urged the Congress to create four temporary judgeships for the circuit.

Year after year, I have had to report to you the ever increasing workload of our Federal courts and the backlogs which have accrued in the judicial process. It had been my expectation that with the authorization of 73 new judgeships in 1961, we would by this time have seen a substantial decline in these serious backlogs. I must admit to disappointment and grave concern, however, that we have made so little progress in conquering this situation. This is not a problem solely for the judges. Every member of the bar, every practitioner in our courts share this responsibility.

This year, it has become necessary for the judicial conference of the United States to recommend to the Congress the creation of new judgeships. These 42 positions, which include the temporary judgeships recommended for the fifth circuit, were agreed upon only after most careful analysis of the statistics compiled for each district and for each circuit by the administrative office for the use of the judicial statistics committee of the conference. The conference was satisfied with the demonstration of need, and for that reason has recommended this additional judgepower. I must, however, express to you my feeling of alarm that our solution to the mounting workload of the courts seems to depend so largely on the creation of additional judgeships.

The time has now come when we must probe more deeply than we have in the past and with a much higher degree of inventiveness into the diagnosis of the problems of judicial administration to assure that our system is responsive to the demands of the age in which we live. We must utilize the aids, devices, and techniques which this generation has developed, as do the other professions, so that we can assure to our people the prompt and effective administration of justice to which they are entitled. This is the responsibility of the entire legal profession—professor, practitioner, and judge. The need for action is immediate and urgent. I hope and urge that the bar associations of the country and the learned societies will devote their talents and efforts to seeking a solution to this critical problem. We cannot afford to go on pyramiding judgeships periodically without making our judicial system responsive to and part of the times in which we live.

Years ago—even a half century ago—before the advent of the judicial conference and before provision was made for circuit conferences of judges, it was not unheard of that a judge might serve his entire tenure without meeting a brother judge of a neighboring State or district in his circuit. The judicial conference and the circuit conferences broke down this isolation, and in recent years the seminars we have conducted for new judges have served a most useful purpose in this respect. The first of these seminars was held in 1962 in Monterey, Calif., and three have been held since that time. Another seminar for newly appointed judges will be held in June of this year in Denver, Colo.

The same problem which once existed among judges has until recently been true of our referees in bankruptcy. As a result, there has been a marked lack of uniformity of procedure among the referees. This lack of uniformity extended beyond the requirements of local conditions to all phases of administration. Last year we held our first seminar for referees in bankruptcy. These seminars are conducted by experienced referees who speak from practical experience and deal entirely with matters of procedure and administration within the framework of the Bankruptcy Act. This first seminar, followed by a second a month ago, has already begun to promote greater uniformity of administration. The published proceedings have been made available to all referees who have not yet attended these seminars, but it is our hope that in due time we will have an opportunity for the older and more seasoned referees to meet with the newer referees with the end result that better service can be afforded to the public in spite of variations in local laws and conditions.

Much work has been done by the Judicial Conference of the United States in the field of pretrial procedures, in the trial of complicated cases, the trial of multiple cases emanating from a common cause, statistics, court administration, the implementation of the Criminal Justice Act and Rules of Practice and Procedure by Chief Judges Biggs, Murrah, Johnsen, Hastings, and Senior Judge Maris, and their committees. But for most of them it has been a slow and hard grind in order to make progress. Really I believe the time has come when the bench and bar should join with vigor in finding ways and means to keep us current with our work. We do not want to change established principles of decisionmaking, but it stands to reason that if courts fail to keep pace with the workload, further inroads on the judicial process will be made through administrative procedures that will water down the rights of our citizens to their day in court.

I am pleased to be able to report significant progress on the part of several advisory committees which have been studying and working on revisions of the Federal Rules of Practice and Procedure. Five of the advisory committees have been working over a period of nearly 5 years on this important task and four of them are about to send the products of their labors to the Standing Committee of the Judicial Conference on the Rules of Practice and Procedure.

The Advisory Committee on Civil Rules and the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules have made a thoroughgoing study of the existing civil and criminal rules. Their recommendations were circulated, as were those of the other committees, at least twice to the bar generally and to scholars throughout the country, and the comments received have been given the fullest study and consideration by the committee members.

The Advisory Committee on Admiralty Rules has prepared amendments to the civil rules designed to merge the admiralty procedure into the civil procedure.

A complete set of appellate rules has been prepared by the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules and these rules are also designed to reach the standing committee when it meets this summer.

It is probable, therefore, that the reports of these four advisory committees will reach the judicial conference and the Supreme Court for consideration later this year.

At the close of the last session of Congress, legislation was enacted authorizing the promulgation of Rules of Practice and Procedure under the Bankruptcy Act. The Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules, which has also held several meetings over the past years, now has a new charter for action which will require it to make a new start in some areas of its activities.

Earlier this year, at the request of the judicial conference, I appointed members to an advisory committee to study the possibility of adopting uniform rules of evidence in Federal courts. This committee, under the chairmanship of Albert E. Jenner, Jr., of Chicago, is, like the other advisory committees, broadly representative of the legal profession across the country. Prof. Edward W. Cleary, of the University of Illinois, will act as reporter for this committee. Their labors are certain to be long and arduous, but they are fortunate in having available to them the results of the studies of the American Law Institute in formulating its Model Code of Evidence and the subsequent work of the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. A few States have also made extensive studies in this area, which will be available to the committee.

The bench and bar are deeply indebted to our colleagues on these advisory committees. They have given fully and conscientiously of their time and efforts to the work of the committees. This has involved many hours of controversy and long hours of study of the many comments which have been received from all parts of the country on the proposed revisions of the rules.

On August 20, 1964, the President signed the Criminal Justice Act, a statute which will have profound implications for the administration of justice in this country. There are two major innovations in this statute. First, when defendants are financially unable to employ counsel of their own, the court must appoint counsel for them as early in the proceedings as possible, which means in most cases when the defendant is first brought before the U.S. commissioner. Heretofore, counsel was rarely appointed in Federal criminal proceedings until arraignment in the district courts.

This will be a new burden on the U.S. Commissioner and raises serious questions as to the ability of many commissioners to cope with this added responsibility.

The commissioner system is as old as the Republic. It was established by the first Congress. It has grown and developed differently as the Nation has expanded, so that today the functions and activities of the commissioner lack consistency, as do the qualifications of the commissioner himself. A recent survey showed that of the approximately 1,100 commissioners, only about two-thirds were lawyers.

Proceedings before a commissioner have generally been informal, conducted without a stenographic record, and without counsel being present. The commissioner's only compensation has been through small fees which he has collected. Once the Criminal Justice Act becomes operational, the question arises whether the proceedings before the commissioners will not have to become formal and be adequately reported and, if so, whether our commissioners are qualified and competent, especially the one-third who are not lawyers, to conduct formal hearings.

Undoubtedly, the passage of the Criminal Justice Act will bring to light many inadequacies in our commissioner system. I believe our experience may well demonstrate the need for a thoroughgoing study of the system not only to assure the effective administration of the act at the commissioner level but also to assure that the position of U.S. Commissioner is a meaningful one viewed in the light of current needs.

The second major innovation of the Criminal Justice Act is the provision for at least partial compensation for assigned counsel in criminal cases. It also provides for the appointment and compensation of expert witnesses. The judges of each district have been required by the act to make appropriate plans for the disbursement of public funds for this purpose and the circuit councils are given supervision over the program. This requirement places a difficult administrative burden upon the courts and the successful discharge of this new function will require the active cooperation of the bar. The act must be administered in a manner that will be both fair and adequate to the defendant as well as equitable to the members of the bar. This act poses a real challenge to our profession because we have had no similar experience. It cannot be the problem of the courts alone. The local bar associations must participate both in the making and administration of the plans. The members of those associations must each accept a measure of responsibility, and it should not be delegated to those in our profession who are willing to accept the partial compensation because they find difficulty in making a living otherwise. To permit this would convert the objective of affording legal assistance to indigents to that of affording assistance to indigent lawyers.

Recently, the President sent to the Congress a challenging message calling upon the Nation for a renewed and increased effort to combat the problem of crime and delinquency. As lawyers, we should accept this challenge as being particularly directed toward us. The judicial branch of the Government is necessarily involved in every aspect of this effort because criminal cases are processed through the courts and because the judiciary is deeply concerned with effectiveness of our correctional system.

In furtherance of the President's message, the Attorney General and I discussed the desirability of reorganizing Federal corrections into an administrative system which would have jurisdiction over the entire Federal correctional process from beginning to end, including the training of all correctional personnel, both those in correctional institutions and those engaged in supervision in the community.

To me, this is a challenging idea and one that seems to offer an opportunity for a vast improvement for dealing with people convicted of crime in Federal courts. A correctional agency thus broadly organized should participate with other agencies in Government, including particularly the National Institute of Mental Health, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and, of course, the U.S. judges through the Judicial Conference of the United States in continuous practical research and development in the correctional field.

More and more, modern legislation has been giving the sentencing judge opportunity to adopt flexible programs to meet the particular needs of the individual before him, programs which combine the facilities and techniques now under separate administrations.

More and more, institutional administrators and probation officers have felt that the ultimate success of their work depends upon their understanding of and coordination with what is done in other phases of the correctional process.

Perhaps most important, we are realizing that the hope for continued progress in corrections rests on the development of programs of research and evaluation which will create and test against alternatives a large number of techniques to be matched with the individual offender.

We are proud of the advances recently made in corrections. The Judicial Conference Committee on the Administration of the Probation System, the Bureau of Prisons, and the Parole Board have been imaginative in their response to the development of knowledge and technique. The steps which they have taken lead logically to the creation of a unified Federal correctional service.

Continuous research and development is the lifeblood of a successful correctional system. This requires continuous experimentation, constant research. It is important in any system which is created that the research and development be separately organized within the correctional system so that its personnel will not be diverted from their research functions and become involved in daily operations. Its work must, of course, be closely integrated with the system.

An important advantage which would result from a unified service would be the strengthening of the professional character of correctional personnel. The new system would break down and eliminate the present administrative barriers and distinctions and it would require intensive basic training.

Proper training programs are a vital part of any correctional system. They would result in making the services of our probation officers of even greater usefulness to our district court judges.

By providing promotion from and to institutional and field positions and by transfers from one part of the country to another, new opportunities would develop for the infusion of knowledge, the gaining of experience and the rewarding of excellence with responsibility equal to ability.

Another function which a unified service can uniquely perform is the administration of new correctional techniques which plainly cut across traditional lines. We have long known that the presentence investigation is invaluable to institutional classification and treatment and to the Parole Board in making its decision. We have also known, and acted on the knowledge, that prerelease planning and counseling are essential to community-based treatment. These simply illustrate the inevitable interdependence of the parts of the process. It is new programs, such as work-release and halfway houses, which bring this interrelationship to the forefront. You can easily see how difficult it would be to place and administer these hybrids in a system which drew lines between the institution and the community.

It goes without saying that the services of all personnel now engaged in one or another part of the Federal correctional field would be needed in the operations of a unified system. The functions they now perform would be continued, and often expanded, but for the first time all functions would be conducted on a coordinated basis and within the concept of a career service.

The renewed interest of the Department of Justice in improving our corrections system has been most gratifying. I hope the judiciary will play its proper role in achieving these necessary and important changes.

We note a tendency today to blame the courts and the rulings of the courts for the vast amount of crime. Thinking persons, and especially lawyers, know that this is not the fact. They know that crime is inseparably connected with factors, such as poverty, degradation, sordid social conditions, the weakening of home ties, low standards of law enforcement, and the lack of education. The courts, law professors and lawyers everywhere have a deep responsibility, however, to see that the rules which guide our criminal trials are fair, adequate and capable of efficient administration. We of the legal profession must consider this as one of our major responsibilities, as must every bar association, national, State or local.

Every lawyer has taken an oath to dedicate himself to the preservation of the rule of law. He must, therefore, realize that it is his responsibility not only to perfect procedures in the law but as a citizen to see that the conditions that give rise to crime, vice and violence are not permitted to exist in his community.

No nation, regardless of its general economic prosperity can continue to prosper unless its citizens in all walks of life are dedicated to law observance, not merely by the other fellow, but by all. In a free society such as ours, this is the only secure foundation upon which we can build our home and business lives. Otherwise, we build upon sand.

There are other things that I could properly discuss with you, but time is precious and you have your own agenda to which I must now leave you, with the knowledge that your discussions will, as usual, be purposeful. I hope they will also be satisfying to you and contribute to the better administration of justice throughout the land.

LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION LAW IGNORED BY ICC

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a matter which has been of concern to me and to many others. It involves the Interstate Commerce Commission and the operation of the locomotive inspection law. That law, as we know, provides that there shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a director of locomotive inspection and two assistant directors. Following the provisions for these appointments, their respective duties are defined and spelled out in this public law.

From information made available to me, it appears that offices of these Presidential appointees have in effect been stripped of their authority and their autonomy, and have been relegated to a status not contemplated or provided for by law. To me, this is not in keeping with either the spirit or the letter of the congressional act, and is not in keeping with the significance Congress placed on railroad-equipment safety, in providing specifically that these should be Presidential appointees, requiring Senate approval.

More than a year ago, in an order dated April 6, 1964, the Interstate Commerce Commission reorganized various bureaus. In so doing, the management and technical direction legislatively assigned to the Director of Locomotive Inspection, his assistant, and the district locomotive inspectors, were transferred to regional managers of the Commission itself and/or the office of the Managing Director of the Commission and the Commission's Bureau of Safety and Service.

Such a transfer of authority and direction is clearly in direct violation of the Locomotive Inspection Act, which was enacted by Congress to assure the greatest possible safety to the shipping and traveling public and to engine-service employees on the Nation's railroads.

The Locomotive Inspection Act provides that there shall be appointed, by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Director of Locomotive Inspection and two Assistant Directors, who shall have general superintendence of the inspectors.

In precise language, the act instructs the Director of Locomotive Inspection as to his duties and responsibilities.

The act also defines the relationship between the Director of Locomotive Inspection and the Interstate Commerce Commission, by providing that the Commission shall, first, furnish the Director with such legal, technical, stenographic, and clerical help as he may require; second, set his salary and the salary of his assistants in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949; third, appoint district inspectors, after civil service examination, questions for which were prepared by the Director; fourth, review appeals from the Director's findings or orders; and fifth, review rules and regulations drafted by the Director.

It is obvious that the act intends and provides for an autonomous Director, with powers, duties, and responsibilities in keeping with the importance of this area of Federal regulation. But the Commission's reorganization order derails the legislative intent, and wrecks the possibility of economic and efficient administration by the Director of Locomotive Inspection.

What does the Commission have to say for itself, when questioned about the changes? I am advised that the Director of Locomotive Inspection has complained to no avail, and that representatives of the highly responsible and reputable Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, as well as railroad labor generally, also have complained. They are told to go to court if they do not like the new way of doing things.

A court appeal, with its attendant delays and expense, should not be necessary, in a situation in which the executive and legislative intent are clear and unequivocal.

I remind the Interstate Commerce Commission, the oldest of the independent agencies, that it is a creature of Congress; that its members are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; that its budget is subject to scrutiny by this body; and that it is not free to disregard the law.

ENDORSEMENT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ACTION ON THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, with American troops now being withdrawn in large numbers from the Dominican Republic, it is well for us to realize and appreciate the good they have done there, and the good services rendered mankind by our President when he decided, on April 28, that the Marines and paratroopers should go to Santo Domingo.

Mob rule was the situation in Santo Domingo. Foreign embassies, including our own, had been fired upon. The lives of many—again including Americans—were in jeopardy, as the cry of "Paredon," or "To the wall," caught on with the mobs.

Mr. President, Virginia Prewett, who writes for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, is an acknowledged authority on Latin America. She is a prize-winning reporter. In a series of articles which concluded yesterday, she has detailed the chaos in the Dominican Republic and the wisdom of President Johnson's decision to intervene. I ask unanimous consent that the concluding article in Virginia Prewett's series, from the Washington Daily News of May 26, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, May 26, 1965]

L.B.J.'S PROMPT DOMINICAN REPUBLIC ACTION SAVED AMERICAN LIVES

(By Virginia Prewett)

When President Johnson between 5:30 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. on April 28 quickly telephoned or called in the Nation's top officials about landing marines in the Dominican Republic, a conversation was being held between our Embassy there and the Washington message center.

News was relayed to the President that the Embassies of El Salvador, Argentina, Guatemala, and Ecuador had been fired on. The U.S. aid mission had been raided. The evacuation zone around the Embajador Hotel had been broken into again.

At 5:30 p.m., a unanimous request had come from our nine-man diplomatic country team in the Dominican Republic requesting immediate military assistance to save the lives of a thousand Americans in the Embajador Hotel.

THAT CUTS IT

"That cuts it," said President Johnson. "I'm not going to have the American people wake up tomorrow morning and find a hundred of our people dead down there because I didn't do anything."

He took the position that if he did not act, he risked immediate blood guilt for the Americans. The vision of another Cuba was strong in his mind.

He said later of the moment: "We know there are evil forces everywhere—in this country and everywhere else. But here in the United States they're not in control. At that moment, in Santo Domingo, they were in control."

Mr. Johnson ordered multiple messages to go into effect at 6:30 p.m. The marines were to land. The first pathfinder group did land in LCT's at Haina seaport not long afterward. By 7:50 p.m., 405 marines were ashore.

SETTLEMENT SOUGHT

With the military order, Mr. Johnson stressed his urgent hope for a cease-fire and a settlement of Dominican differences.

He also called for congressional leaders to meet with him at 7:15 p.m.

When he issued the landing order, he directed the area officers of the State Department's American Republics Division to notify all Latin American ambassadors that many Latin American embassies and diplomats in the Dominican Republic had called on the United States for help, that the U.S. Marines were landing to save American and other lives, and that the United States urgently requested an OAS meeting the next day.

REDS SPOTTED

The congressional leaders stayed with the President until 9 p.m. When they asked about Communist influence, Mr. Johnson told them that the Communist apparatus had been spotted emerging.

At first two known members of the Communist apparatus were spotted seizing strategic command of groups or objectives, then nine were spotted, and more and more. During the day the pro-Castro talisman cry of "Paredon" (to the wall) had multipled as mobs sacked, looted, and killed.

After 6:30 p.m., nine State Department area chiefs for Latin America were called to their offices. Their instructions were to telephone the President's message to every Latin American ambassador. This the nine diplomats did. Not only OAS members, but also Jamaica and Trinidad were called.

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, has critically compared President Johnson's procedure with the Latin Americans with that of his late brother during the Cuban missile crisis.

WHEN J.F.K. SPOKE

On October 22, 1962, President Kennedy spoke to the Nation at 6:30 p.m. announcing his intention to order a naval quarantine around Cuba. That night he had the Latin American ambassadors notified and, like Mr. Johnson, called an OAS meeting for the next day. After the meeting officially approved his action, he ordered U.S. Navy units, already in position, to impose the quarantine.

President Kennedy could do this because the United States had the initiative in this crisis. This permitted him to control the timing.

President Johnson, in contrast, was at the mercy of timing imposed by the wild mobs in Santo Domingo. If he had announced he meant to send in marines the next day, it virtually would have invited a mob attack on the Embajador Hotel—and the emergence of a regime of some kind controlled by Communists.

REASONS DISCUSSED

On Thursday, April 29, at 10:30 a.m., the OAS met and Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker reviewed the landing and the reasons for it. The OAS asked the Papal Nuncio in Santo Domingo to arrange a cease-fire. Late that night the OAS called an emergency foreign ministers' meeting and approved establishment of an international safe haven in the Dominican Republic.

On April 30, the special meeting sent Secretary General Jose Mora to Santo Domingo. The next day the OAS named a special five-man peacemaking team and sent it to Santo Domingo on a U.S. military plane.

Acting at its swiftest, the OAS thus managed to get its peace team in 4 days after the crisis peak when a thousand Americans were in danger at the Embajador.

The OAS simply did not have the machinery or the precedents to go in quickly and protect the foreign nationals. The hope is that it will develop the needed muscles out of the Dominican crisis.

CONTRADICTIONS SHOW

A significant feature of the U.S. press criticism of the order to land the Marines is that it comes from the same spokesmen who most vociferously and tenaciously defended the Castro regime. "Antiwar" crusaders condemn the order to land the Marines in one breath and call for Cuba-type revolutions throughout Latin America in the next.

But what President Johnson recalls is that thousands of American lives were in danger. He sees a new and vicious subversion creeping into the Western Hemisphere, the kind we are fighting in Vietnam.

If he had it to do over, he would land the Marines again.

Important in the story is the fact that U.S. forces in Santo Domingo have evacuated many more nationals of other countries than our own countrymen.

MANY MOVED OUT

In all about 2,000 Americans were moved out, and more than 2,500 citizens of 45 other nations!

They include people from Canada, China, Europe, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Bulgaria—the world. Latin Americans evacuated include Argentines, Bolivians, Brazilians, Chileans, Colombians, Costa Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, Ecuadorians, Salvadorians, Guatemalans, Haitians, Panamanians, Nicaraguans, Mexicans, Peruvians, Uruguayans, Venezuelans; and Jamaicans.

These are the people you might ask whether Mr. Johnson should have sent in the Marines.

THE BEAUTIFY AMERICA CAMPAIGN—LETTER FROM ARVID D. IDEEN

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the campaign to beautify America, to enhance our land for our benefit and for the benefit of those who come after us, can be intensified greatly if America will pitch in. Last week, when volunteers scoured the Potomac River and its banks for litter, we had a good example of the type of citizen effort which can be effective.

The Lions Clubs of Wyoming, too, have joined this effort, with a "let's litter less" program aimed at every citizen of our State and every visitor. Their campaign is a public-relations effort to make people aware of the need to decrease litter. The State is cooperating in a very real way. The State Penitentiary, for instance, is constructing large highway signs to be displayed on major rights-of-way entering Wyoming; and the campaign is intended to be carried, also, into the two great national parks within our borders—Yellowstone and Grand Teton.

Mr. President, I think this is a very commendable effort by the Lions Clubs of Wyoming. To illustrate its scope, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Arvid D. Ideen, chairman of the program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASPER MOUNTAIN LIONS CLUB,
Casper, Wyo., May 25, 1965.

The Honorable GALE MCGEE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MCGEE: The Lions of Wyoming have started a "let's litter less" program which will be supported by approximately 2,500 Lions representing 60 clubs around the State of Wyoming. This litter program is the result of a proclamation at our State Lions convention in Rawlins in 1964 and I was selected as the chairman for this program.

I have enclosed a sample of the bumper stickers that will be utilized in this program. We also have 500 window display posters and 150 highway signs to be displayed. The penitentiary is making large signs, 18 feet long, to be displayed on the major roads entering the State of Wyoming. We hope to distribute 40,000 book matches in Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Park areas through cigarette vending machines. This will bring the litter program to the attention of the citizens of Wyoming and the many tourists which we anticipate this year.

We of the Lions Club feel that the quotation of John F. Kennedy—"I don't think there is anything that could occupy our attention with more distinction than trying to preserve for those to come after us this beautiful country which we have inherited."—is very appropriate in our campaign.

The Governor of the State of Wyoming, Clifford P. Hansen, is going to give a proclamation to the citizens of the State of Wyoming which will be read at the Lions convention in Cody, Wyo., May 27, 28, and 29.

The International Lions president, Claude DeVores, will be the main speaker Thursday evening in Cody. The International Lions Club represents 800,000 people in approximately 126 countries. It is the largest service organization in the world. We, the Lions of Wyoming, feel deeply flattered that the international president has taken time to come to the State of Wyoming, which is one of the smallest Lions districts in Lionism.

If you have any suggestions or contacts that could be made in connection with our "let's litter less" program, I would appreciate your advising me accordingly.

Your very truly,
ARVID D. IDEEN.

MELVIN RUDER, NORTH DAKOTA NATIVE SON, WINS PULITZER PRIZE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, another North Dakota native son has achieved fame. He is Melvin Ruder, a native of Manning, N. Dak., and now the editor and publisher of the Hungry Horse News at Columbia Falls, Mont. Mr. Ruder was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for general reporting in giving outstanding local coverage to the disastrous Montana floods of last year.

Mr. Ruder was graduated from Bismarck High School and then went on to the University of North Dakota to earn his bachelor and masters degrees in journalism and sociology.

He is the winner of several National and State awards for editorial excellence and service to his community. I believe he exemplifies the excellent caliber of persons we rear on the North Dakota plains. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article from Newsweek magazine of May 17, 1965, and another from the May 1965 issue of the University of North Dakota Alumni Review.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek magazine, May 17, 1965]

PRIZE FOR HUNGRY HORSE

Melvin H. Ruder was out in a barn last week, covering a high-school conservation tour sponsored by the Columbia Falls, Mont., Grange, when a neighbor burst upon him exclaiming, "Mel, your wife is calling * * * Mel, you won a prize." Ruder—who is publisher, editor, reporter, photographer, and general factotum of his own little weekly, the Hungry Horse News (circulation: 4,271)—did not wait for the rest. He raced to the nearest phone. "The Pulitzer," he shouted at his wife. "The Pulitzer, did I win it?"

Ruder had indeed won one of journalism's most sought after awards. The 50-year-old Ruder, who founded his paper in 1946 with the aid of a GI loan, was awarded the $1,000 prize for general local reporting for his coverage of a flash flood last June in nearby Flathead Valley. Renting an airplane, and then driving a car along the railroad tracks ("The road was washed out"), Ruder helped warn 400 families. "I lost money on the flood edition," said Ruder. "We just forgot all about advertising."

[From the University of North Dakota Alumni Review, May 1965]

MEL RUDER, 1937 GRAD, WINS PULITZER PRIZE

Melvin H. Ruder, 50-year-old publisher of the Hungry Horse News at Columbia Falls, Mont., has been awarded a Pulitzer Prize for general local reporting in outstanding coverage of a disastrous flood last June.

A native of Manning, N. Dak., Ruder received his bachelor of arts degree in journalism and his master's degree in sociology from the University of North Dakota. He taught journalism at the university for 2 years before editing the Westinghouse Corp. publications.

The Pulitzer Prizes, named for the late Joseph Pulitzer, who founded the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and later bought the New York World, have been awarded annually since 1917 by trustees of the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. Winners are chosen by a 14-member advisory board.

Ruder was graduated from the University of North Dakota in 1937 with a B.A. degree, and with an M.A. degree in 1942. He is editor and publisher of the Hungry Horse News of Columbia Falls, Mont., a 12-time winner of National Editorial Association Awards. Ruder served as editor of the University of North Dakota News Service in 1938–40 and as assistant professor of journalism in 1940–41.

He was president of the Montana State Press Association in 1957–58, and is currently on the executive board. He is also a member of the Columbia Falls School Board. At homecoming last fall, Ruder was one of six outstanding alumni selected for the Sioux Award honor.

CONSERVATION OF THE POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, an increasing number of national organizations are currently directing their attention to the Potomac River.

Although these groups have long been concerned with the conservation of the Potomac, their interest has now been greatly reinforced by President Johnson's message on national beauty.

In the May issue of the Izaak Walton magazine, the article entitled "Opportunity on the Potomac," presents a clear, concise statement of what is involved in planning for the development of the Potomac River basin.

As this article points out, the nationwide significance will not be the benefits which will accrue to the Potomac region, but rather the example it will provide for other river basins. A successful plan for the Potomac must be developed and carried out jointly by the Federal, State, and local governments.

Such intergovernmental cooperation is the key to successful river basin planning. I am confident that Secretary Udall recognizes this fact. His recent invitation to the Governors of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, and the Chairman of the District of Columbia Commissioners is a welcome step toward such cooperation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that "Opportunity on the Potomac" be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPORTUNITY ON THE POTOMAC

For decades, the Potomac River has flowed under the nose of Congress as a horrible but accurate example of stream conditions all across America; conflicting resource pressures within its watershed are symbolic of those facing every major drainage basin in the United States. Much of the Potomac is terribly polluted—cleanup action has been slow. Real estate speculators would destroy the natural beauty of its banks, and the Corps of Engineers has been trying for years to straitjacket the river with a series of major dams under a plan which conservationists believe is based on narrow and outmoded principles. In many respects, then, the Potomac is little different than other streams—except that its association with Washington has brought continuing national public attention.

Today, it appears that because of this nationwide interest the Potomac will soon become a positive example of what America's rivers ought to be. President Johnson set the guidelines in his message on natural beauty:

"The river rich in history and memory which flows by our Nation's Capital should serve as a model of scenic and recreation values for the entire country. To meet this objective I am asking the Secretary of the Interior to review the Potomac basin development plan now under review by the Chief of Army Engineers, and to work with the affected States and local governments, the District of Columbia, and interested Federal agencies to prepare a program for my consideration.

"A program must be devised which will: (a) Clean up the river and keep it clean, so it can be used for boating, swimming, and fishing; (b) protect its natural beauties by the acquisition of scenic easements, zoning, or other measures; (c) provide adequate recreational facilities; and (d) complete the presently authorized George Washington Memorial Parkway on both banks.

"I hope action here will stimulate and inspire similar efforts by State and local governments on other urban rivers and waterfronts, such as the Hudson in New York. They are potentially the greatest single source of pleasure for those who live in most of our metropolitan areas."

The Department of the Interior is already hard at work to implement the President's directive. Locally, conservationists believe that for the first time a truly comprehensive plan will be prepared for the Potomac from mountain headwaters to its mouth on Chesapeake Bay. Presumably, consideration will be given for the first time to recreational and other opportunities afforded by the Potomac estuary—a forgotten part of the river under the corps' plan. It is expected that the Potomac will indeed be cleaned up, and that major portions of its wild stretches will be permanently preserved. It is hoped that adequate public access to the river will be planned from mountains to bay, so that the Potomac may become a major recreation resource for a heavily populated region.

But the President's program for the Potomac will be most important for its nationwide significance—not for the benefits which will accrue to the Potomac region. Mr. Johnson's words seem to express a clear hope that State and local governments will assume primary responsibilities for action on the Potomac—that his Potomac River program will not be a Federal program, but rather an outline for coordinated local, State, and Federal efforts under Federal guidance.

The Potomac cannot become a national model for river preservation and beautification if the Federal Government undertakes the major job. It will stand as a model only if States and localities elsewhere are shown by example how they can implement similar programs on other streams—just as it will stand as a model only if the entire river and all its potentials are fully considered.

For too long have the natural values of America's rivers been effectively overlooked or even forgotten by the several States. With rare exception, the only massive river planning in this country has been done by Federal agencies (generally for limited purposes not including preservation of beauty), with the States watching in near apathy if at all.

The President's program for the Potomac provides an outstanding opportunity to change all this. It deserves the assistance and close attention of conservationists everywhere.

NAVAL MUSEUM IN NAVY YARD

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the fact that what happens in and to the city of Washington is of national concern was once again demonstrated when the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] introduced legislation to make a portion of the Washington Navy Yard a naval museum.

The bill, S. 1927, has great merit. It not only calls for a museum, but also for plans to develop recreational facilities and to beautify the Anacostia waterfront.

Certainly the Nation's Capital is the proper place for a naval museum. Not only is the Washington Navy Yard the site of our first naval installation, but it is only fitting that the proposed museum be in the same city as the Nation's great historic documents.

I welcome the opportunity to cosponsor this bill in the interest of preserving that historic site for future generations.

John McKelway, in the Evening Star's "The Rambler" column, has written an interesting article on the history of the yard. I join in Mr. McKelway's hope that the bill will receive favorable consideration, for it would not do to see the yard razed—leaving the ghost of its first commandant homeless.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, which appeared May 14, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RAMBLER: MISSED THE COMMODORE

(By John McKelway)

Tried to find the ghost down at the Washington Navy Yard with little success.

He has not been seen since the name of the yard was changed to the "Naval Gun Factory." It apparently upset him. And he may have been altogether forgotten when they changed the name again, to the "Naval Weapons Plant."

But today the original name has been restored, and the Rambler had an idea the commodore might be up and around again and willing to comment on the Bartlett bill.

The other day, Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, Democrat, of Alaska, introduced a bill to preserve certain areas of the Navy Yard once it is no longer needed for national defense purposes. The land apparently would pass to the Secretary of the Interior and he would come up with a plan, setting it aside as a historic site.

The work of the yard has diminished over the last 10 years, after a series of fights to "save the gun factory" and today it is a peaceful place, filled with a few marines and civilians, and possibly a great number of spies and a large collection of old cannons.

Gradually, various Government agencies have been setting up shop in the old factory buildings and BARTLETT may be worried the Commodity Credit Corporation, or some such agency, may have its eyes on—well, the commodore's old home.

One of the old buildings dates back to 1801 and the main gate and the commandant's home were built about 1804.

During the Rambler's visit, he noticed more parking places are available today, and no tough-looking security guards asked to see what credentials he had.

Some marines were drilling down near the Anacostia, and the Rambler watched them awhile before paying his first visit to the new U.S. Naval Historical Display Center. It is still being worked on but it does furnish an interesting introduction to naval history. It should get better.

Oddly enough, the most interesting building in the yard is one in the northwest corner, unmarked, its windows bricked up, surrounded by a fence.

The building belongs to the Central Intelligence Agency, and it is all very mysterious. Maybe they are holding the commodore in there for questioning, or something.

The commodore?

This was, and maybe still is, Commodore Thomas Tingey, first commandant of the Navy yard.

An Englishman, who had served some time in the British Navy, he later turned up in what Navy the United States had and distinguished himself. He was picked out to set up the yard in the new Washington.

The rambler always has had an affection for the commodore. In the early days, Tingey discovered his civilian workmen, under a contract to build 50 gunboats, were spending too much time in surrounding grogshops during morning whisky breaks—a forerunner of today's coffee breaks.

The commodore purchased 100-barrel lots of whisky and had it served to the men on the job as "refreshments." Work progressed.

Commodore Tingey was to stay with the yard and see to its expansion for 29 years.

He apparently considered the yard his own, more or less, and he saw to its restoration after the British swept in and burned most of the buildings, 1814.

He died in 1829, in his home in the yard, and was buried in Congressional Cemetery. But in 1853, the daughter of the then commandant reported Commodore Tingey was frequently seen strolling around the house, or in some of the darker spots of the installation, dressed in a long-white nightshirt, gold-braided tophat, long pigtails and a spyglass under one arm.

The Rambler hopes the Bartlett bill will move. Commodore Tingey deserves no less. And the hopes of maybe catching a glimpse of him should assure a good turnout at the yard if it is ever set aside as a big museum of naval history.

Crowds might even fall off at the Smithsonian.

TRIBUTE TO SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the designation by President Lyndon B. Johnson of the week of May 23 through May 29 as National Small Business Week offers an excellent opportunity for recognition of the contribution which the Small Business Administration has made toward sustaining the strength of our Nation's economy.

On April 9, 1963, I spoke at some length here in the Senate on the interrelationship of free enterprise, small business, and Federal aid to small business. I pointed out the importance of adequate funding for the Small Business Administration, as an investment in the future of America, and that the Congress has long recognized that assistance to small business constitutes a contribution toward the success of the private enterprise system rather than an encroachment upon that system.

These facts are equally true today. It is equally true, also, that lipservice tribute to the value of small business in the American economy is simply not enough, for the number of firms doing business in the American economy is nearing the 5-million mark. Of the total number of those firms, over 95 percent are small. In fact, the great bulk of American business is made up of undeniably small enterprises—those without any paid employees other than the owners. Only one out of four businesses has more than three paid employees.

Each year thousands of firms are formed in the United States and begin operations, and thousands are discontinued. These actions are a result of natural forces generated by our American economy in its adaptation to changing demands for goods and services and to the changes in our Nation's position in the world economy.

Congress, in enacting the Small Business Act, recorded its conviction that a strong and prosperous small business community is a basic element in a free and competitive society.

The mission of the Small Business Administration is to aid, counsel, assist, and protect the small business community. That mission is of ever-increasing importance as our Nation moves into action on levels never previously explored in an effort to reach its full productive capacity, to reach a higher employment peak, and to insure a wider range of economic opportunity for all of our citizens.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I was pleased to support the recent appropriation of $100 million for additional capital for the Small Business Administration's revolving fund at the time the second supplemental appropriations bill for 1965 was before the committee for action. I am gratified at the favorable action by the Congress in appropriating this sum, for, as I have stated in the past, what the Small Business Administration needs is adequate resources to do the job which it was designed by Congress to perform. The returns to the Nation are marked in terms of increased employment, increased profits for small businesses, and, at the end of the cycle, increased tax revenues.

PROPOSED ALLEGHENY PARKWAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as the introducer of S. 6, a bill to establish the Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Maryland, and to authorize connecting parkway roads and trails to permit greater utilization of adjacent national forests and resources, I wish to place in the RECORD a newspaper article published in the Sunday Gazette-Mail, Charleston, W. Va., State magazine on May 23, 1965.

Harpers Ferry National Historical Park is a scenic, fitting, and nationally significant area for inclusion in the proposed 620-mile parkway, conceived as a scenic highland route arising in Maryland, traversing the eastern panhandle of West Virginia and winding on through 360 miles of eye-appealing West Virginia hillsides southward through Kentucky to the Cumberland Gap at the Tennessee border.

This bill is under consideration at present in relation to the President's program which would allow West Virginia and other States to use one-third of their annual Federal aid for secondary farm-to-market roads for the development of scenic and recreational programs. The anticipated economic value from increased tourism to the areas contiguous to the parkway is well presented by this news item on Harpers Ferry.

I am hopeful that the President's program will be speedily adopted by the Congress, and that priority can be given to the beginning of engineering studies on the Allegheny Parkway.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEIR HEARTS ARE IN THE HIGHLAND—EASTERN PANHANDLE SEEKING TO LURE HARPERS FERRY VISITORS INTO WEST VIRGINIA

(By Ron Wilson and Walt Whittaker)

The Civil War and a long series of floods periodically have wrecked the business center of Harpers Ferry, the town made famous around the world by John Brown's raid.

But in the last 10 years a modern industry, tourism, has made the town named after Robert Harper more prosperous than ever before.

Located on the edge of West Virginia at the intersection of the Shenandoah and Potomac Rivers, strategic Harpers Ferry suffered from attacks and occupations by Yankee and rebel alike. Near the end of the war, as many as 60,000 Federal troops at one time occupied the town of 3,000.

As a tourist brochure describing the hamlet in the Civil War reads, "At the end of the war, Harpers Ferry was a ghost town with mills, armory, arsenal, and many other buildings destroyed. It was never fully to recover."

The floods, 26 of them since 1810, continually took their toll. Major catastrophes in 1936 and 1942 almost wiped out the lower part of the town.

Then, following the most recent flood in 1955, the National Park Service set the little town back on its feet with the establishment of the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park. Through Project 66 and a half million dollar budget, the Park Service hopes to recreate the original Harpers Ferry by next year.

And now the area, according to a motel operator, is "jumping" and is likely to keep right on prospering despite the recent closing of the Civil War Showcase.

The showcase, an exhibit of Civil War paraphernalia, closed this year when a principal owner was killed in an automobile accident. His estate, including the showcase, was sold at auction. The three-building-exhibit occupies a strategic military position that became the scene of bloody fighting by both rebel and Union forces.

Joseph R. Prentice, head of the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, suggests that the showcase was having economic problems. "The many things they did there," he explains, "had too big an overhead."

He also thinks many tourists would not stop to patronize the place because of the location of the entrance on a turn at the peak of a ridge.

"It was in a very dangerous place," he says. "A car had to cut across in front of oncoming traffic and enter a road, the destination of which he couldn't see."

Mrs. John Newcomer, co-owner with her husband of the Cliffside Motel in Harpers Ferry, says the showcase belongs to a group of businessmen in Frederick, Md.

She believes the men are trying to sell it to the State for use in the Job Corps.

"You see, the State must either furnish the grounds, or the Federal Government has to own them, before a Job Corps camp can be set up."

According to Mrs. Newcomer, the showcase had a good year in 1964. A constant stream of tourists still go down the quarter mile of dirt road to find it.

"It's a shame it's closed," she claims, "because it could have been built up into a really nice tourist attraction."

However, she does not believe the showcase closing will have much effect on the rising tide of tourists pouring into the area. Mrs. Newcomer, whose motel began in 1939 with 8 cabins and has grown into a profitable 32-cabin business, explains, "This area is what they call jumping. Over weekends it's impossible to find any rooms in this area."

But, sadly, the major part of tourists move south through the Shenandoah Valley rather than on into West Virginia.

Some business leaders, not too happy over tourists disregarding their area, met in Romney last year to form Potomac Highlands of West Virginia.

Through Potomac Highlands the businessmen—representing the State's 10 eastern counties—hope to attract the tourists drawn in by Harpers Ferry. They, hope, also to encourage other tourists to visit and spend money in their area.

To attract these tourists, Potomac Highlands has embarked on an ambitious campaign to advertise the section comprised of Jefferson, Berkeley, Morgan, Hampshire, Mineral, Hardy, Grant, Tucker, Pendleton, and Pocahontas Counties.

Part of the campaign is a 6-week advertising contract with a national magazine, now underway, and in metropolitan newspapers.

Potomac Highlands is printing about 200,000 brochures, listing three attractions, plus the history, of each county. The bruchures will include articles describing the best places for hunting and fishing. They will be financed through membership dues. The State department of commerce will match $3,800 for other advertising.

After a 2-month membership drive, Potomac Highlands has collected $5,700 through membership fees and is planning an operating budget for the first year of $18,000.

But the organization has its problems. According to George Stickler, area extension agent at Moorefield, who has been a guiding force behind it:

"Our biggest problem has been to get people to understand what we are trying to do. We are trying to get an organization off the ground that should have been gotten off the ground 20 years ago."

The organization has been criticized because it "hasn't done anything." But Stickler points out that tangible results will not begin to show until after the advertising campaign has gotten underway. It is expected to go into full swing early this summer.

Another problem could develop if an adequate replacement is not found for Stickler, who has accepted a job elsewhere and will leave in the summer.

Berkeley and Jefferson Counties already are members of the Shenandoah Valley, Inc., and some observers in the Harpers Ferry area believe these counties may not actively support Potomac Highlands. They note the tie of the area to the north-south flow of tourists and the existence of two of the State's three racetracks in Charles Town as evidence that they may not need Potomac Highlands.

Some, like Prentice, believe tourists will not move on into West Virginia because of the absence of a good east-west road through the area.

The Harpers Ferry Park head says, "West Virginia isn't getting the tourists it should because of its roads. They are winding and they aren't scenic."

He says Senator ROBERT BYRD is ahead of his time in proposing the Appalachian Scenic Highway to compete for tourists now going south. A major number of the 800,000 tourists coming each year to the Harpers Ferry Park, he says, are now going on south toward Skyline Drive and other areas more easily accessible by automobile.

Prentice explains that it is a "phenomenon of our time" that a tourist will drive for 2 or 3 hours to visit an attraction for 30 minutes. Because of this driving pattern of the tourist, he believes West Virginia will never get a major share of the tourists until it revamps its road system.

At the same time he points out what he feels to be the real economic future of West Virginia.

He says the large urban complex extending from Boston to Alexandria needs a periodic change of environment and that this need will become greater as the population increases. The need will also become greater as the workweek becomes shorter, giving the traveling public more leisure time to travel.

These urban people want to go, he says, 100 miles or more from their own area. And West Virginia is the only State ideally located for their needs.

But until the type of roads are built that will get tourists into and out of West Virginia rapidly, the great majority of them will continue to stop at Harpers Ferry, then move south, he believes.

Meanwhile, Harpers Ferry is glad that people are at least going as far into West Virginia as its area. With groups such as Potomac Highlands and better transportation facilities, perhaps tourists will go even farther.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 1648.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions.

MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the hour set for the vote on Senate bill 1648 be changed from 4 o'clock p.m. to 5 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, June 1, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Thursday, May 27, 1965, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That, in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill except an amendment by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Ordered further, That the Senate proceed to vote on final passage of the bill not later than 5 p.m. on Tuesday, June 1.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from West Virginia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, it is proposed to strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> (1) Such financial assistance shall not be extended to assist establishments relocating from one area to another or to assist subcontractors whose purpose is to divest, or whose economic success is dependent upon divesting, other contractors or subcontractors of contracts theretofore customarily performed by them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from West Virginia yield to himself?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The amendment which has been read to the Senate relates to a subject which has been discussed by me with the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and with other Members, both majority and minority members of the committee.

In effect, the amendment would tighten the provisions of the bill against the transference of jobs or job opportunities from one area to another when there is a possibility that work in the form of production contracts might be transferred as a result of assisting an employer in a designated area who intends to undertake a work contract being performed in another area.

The measure before the Senate is a vital piece of proposed legislation. It would clearly prohibit the relocation of production facilities which would result in the transfer of job opportunities. But it is my opinion that it does not specifically mention the possibility of the transfer of work contracts, which could also result in a relocation of job opportunities. Therefore, it is important that we provide a specific prohibition against that possibility.

My amendment must not be construed as one which would prohibit a benefiting company, either now or in years to come, from bidding for or taking on contract work as such. The amendment which I offer is intended solely to prevent aid to firms whose principal purpose in developing or improving their production capabilities is to obtain work contracts now or in the past consistently and customarily performed by other known firms. It is not intended to prohibit the assisted firm in the future from bidding on contracts which are now being performed by some other firm, but only to prevent the establishment or the expansion with Federal assistance of firms which are immediately and initially dependent on the pirating of such contracts.

Mr. President, we recall that not only in connection with the Appalachian Regional Development Act, but in other legislation before the Senate, charges have been made of pirating industry—that a plant in a certain State or an area of a State was brought into another State or an area of that State because certain inducements were offered in the location of the plant at its new site as against the location at the old site. We in Congress must be very careful that nothing is incorporated in this legislation which would be an incentive to or would influence in any degree those who would pirate a plant from one section of the country to another.

The various areas of the country are jealous of their economic status. In West Virginia, where we are attempting to attract new industry and to expand industries which are there, we are quite conscious of our responsibility to go out to other sections of the country and interest operators of various enterprises in bringing plants and/or factories into West Virginia. But West Virginians want that done as an expansion of job opportunities. We are not interested in pulling a plant from another State into the State of West Virginia at the expense of employment opportunities in other States. If it involves a voluntary action of the management, of course, of a company to relocate in a State, that is a question of economics and managerial judgment.

I wish it emphasized here today that the amendment is meant to tighten the provisions against the transference of jobs or job opportunities. For that reason I have offered the amendment, and I trust that there is unanimity within the leadership of our Committee on Public Works.

If I may have the attention of the capable chairman of our Committee on Public Works, I should like to have him comment on the position he takes with others on this question.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the primary purpose of this measure is to create new jobs and not to merely shift jobs from one locale to another. We want a net gain in employment. I have had an opportunity to examine the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and have discussed it with others concerned with this problem.

We had discussion on this matter in the committee and our report provides some good guidelines in this connection. The discussion of this problem appears on page 13 of the report (S. Rept. No. 193).

The Senator's amendment would merely add further insurance that there will be no shifting of job opportunities in the operation of the program. I am concerned with this problem, as I know many other Members are. I am sure that the Senator's amendment is acceptable.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I know that the Senator from Michigan is zealous in his efforts to provide a continuing favorable climate for the employment of people at plants in Michigan. I am sure that, if expressions on the subject were made by other Senators in the Chamber, we would see that they feel the same in relation to their States.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding me time to speak on an unrelated subject.

Yesterday the Senate passed the bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior. It was passed so swiftly that I did not have an opportunity to do that which I should do or feel remiss that I had not done. Although I speak for myself, I am confident that I express the feeling of all members of the Senate committee, and, indeed, all members of the full committee. I thank Paul Eaton, the professional staff member assigned to that subcommittee, for his invaluable assistance during consideration of the bill. He not only has total recall; he has immediate total recall. At all times he was most helpful and understanding, and the work of the committee would not have progressed as swiftly and as well as it did were it not for the services of Mr. Eaton.

I thank the Senator from Michigan.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Senate will vote next Tuesday on S. 1648. This action will be in fulfillment of a pledge given during our consideration of the Appalachian Regional Development Act earlier this year. At that time, I associated myself with our esteemed majority leader, with the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and with expressions from the administration, in support of early Senate action to bring relief to other economically deprived regions. Action will be consummated by this body and the pledge will be fulfilled. I commend the principal sponsors of this legislation, the diligent senior Senator from Michigan and the capable senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who has for so long been in the forefront of economic development legislation. I salute the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], for his cooperation with the Public Works Committee and for his expeditious manner of treating titles II and IV in the committee of which he is chairman.

It is significant to emphasize and draw particular attention to the third of the purposes of the act enumerated on the first page of the committee report. This purpose is, and I quote, to "Provide loans to Government and non-Government nonprofit agencies in order to make available funds needed as the required local share for public works grants-in-aid programs and the local share of funds necessary for grants for facilities related to area economic development needs."

Mr. President, the provisions of title II of the pending measure would make available loan funds for municipalities or counties to meet their requirements for matching the grant funds provided under title I. Thus, if a town qualifies for a 60-percent or an 80-percent grant for construction of a sewage treatment or water treatment facility and cannot from other resources raise the necessary 40-percent or 20-percent matching funds, the community would be eligible for a loan under the provisions of title II. This is an extension of the practice which prevailed under the accelerated public works program.

The provisions of titles I and II are particularly relevant to the needs of the State of West Virginia, which has very pressing requirements for water and sewage treatment facilities which cannot be fully met by the recently enacted Appalachian Regional Development Act. Senators will note the record of the hearings of the Committee on Public Works, in which, on pages 28 and 29, are listed the 100 areas of highest unemployment in the United States.

Ten of these—10 percent of the areas of highest unemployment—are counties in West Virginia, with unemployment rates in 1964 ranging from 12.2 percent in McDowell County to 20.2 percent in Clay County. West Virginians, therefore, have a vital interest in the enactment of this measure, and it was for this, among other reasons, that I introduced in committee the amendment which raised the authorization of grant funds under title I from $250 million annually to $400 million.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is a measure combining major elements of the area redevelopment and accelerated public works programs. The bill includes provisions to encourage the establishment of multistate economic development regions and provides administrative and technical assistance funds to establish development commissions for other regions of the country similar to Appalachia and the Appalachian Regional Commission.

This legislative package, if passed by the Congress substantially as reported by our committee, admittedly would not be easy to administer. And, in its early stages, I can visualize local and State governments having difficulties in processing and clearing applications.

Even though, under the amendment I sponsored, the public works authorizations were raised from $250 million a year to $400 million annually for 5 years, I visualize that this phase of the program will be vastly oversubscribed with applications.

When the accelerated public works program ran out of funds and authorization for expenditures in December 1963, there were approximately $710 million in unprocessed applications on file with accelerated public works regional and national units. Only about $426 million worth of those unprocessed project applications were adjudged to be active, pending, eligible, and approvable under the criteria of eligibility and the regulations of the accelerated public works organization. It is estimated that under the criteria for eligibility and other provisions of the new Public Works and Economic Development Act not more than $250 million of those accelerated public works project applications still on file would be active, eligible, and approvable.

So, I believe it is accurate to observe that the criteria for public facility grants are more restrictive under the new legislation than was the case under the Accelerated Public Works Act, but are slightly more liberal than were public facility grants under the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I am proud that I have voted for all the legislative proposals which created the Area Redevelopment Administration and the accelerated public works program. Both have been of immense value in providing jobs for unemployed men and women, strengthening our economy, and creating vitally needed improvements in communities throughout the Nation.

Both of these highly successful programs were enacted to help to deal with unemployment and the economic decline of certain areas of the Nation that accompanied changing economic patterns, automation, and modern technology that arose since World War II. In a sense, both were experimental. We have learned much since their original enactment, and the benefit of that experience is now embodied in the Public Works and Economic Development Act now before the Senate.

The fact is that amidst unprecedented prosperity there is economic stagnation in many areas of the Nation. Many communities and regions have been unable to come to grips with changing economic conditions in this space age of change and challenge. We cannot afford to disregard this problem and consign these regions to perpetual economic deprivation. Not only would this be a callous solution; it would be a foolish waste of immense capital investments already made in these areas—schools, roads, hospitals and innumerable other public and private facilities. As a nation, we cannot permit these economic sores to fester on the generally healthy condition of our national economy.

The present bill combines the best features of the original Area Redevelopment Act, the Accelerated Public Works Act and the Appalachia Regional Development Act. In addition, several improvements have been made over the earlier programs. In the bill under consideration distressed areas can combine into multicounty and multistate economic regions. Grants and loans can be utilized for broader geographical application and thus help depressed areas by linking them with more healthy areas. Also, it does not restrict these programs to county and local boundaries which no longer have any real economic meaning in this modern age.

This bill makes it easier for depressed economic areas to participate financially in the program. It also authorizes financing on a scale more nearly equal to the task. There are many other new items in the bill which would give our States and communities the tools with which they will be better equipped to fight economic stagnation and poverty.

Mr. President, there are some who would say this is a giveaway, that it is state socialism and a further manifestation of the welfare state. Such claim is absurd. The fact is that when we provide legislation of this kind, we are doing no less to strengthen our Nation than when we vote for appropriations for our armed services. Furthermore, this is no giveaway. As the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has so ably pointed out, the return in revenue and the saving in expenditures to Federal, local, and State governments as a result of this legislation will more than pay for its cost. At the same time we will have created new capital improvements and have given millions of our people the opportunity to maintain a decent standard of living. More jobs mean more taxes for our good "Uncle" and for local and State governments. More jobs mean fewer people on the welfare rolls and receiving unemployment compensation. More jobs mean more profits for businessmen.

Mr. President, the bill will help to assure every American who wants to work the opportunity to do so. It is an extremely effective additional weapon in the war on poverty. It will aid in ending the haunting sense of helplessness and despair which is felt by the unwillingly unemployed men and women of our Nation. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this proposed beneficent legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] under the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, two things in the bill trouble me. I shall deal first with one which I have already discussed with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], who has treated me with his usual cooperative courtesy. That question involves a problem faced by New York and other States which inhere in the 41,000-mile limitation of the Interstate Highway System.

We are discussing the helping of areas which need redevelopment assistance. That is a problem with which I have the greatest sympathy, even though we in New York pay a large part of the taxes and frequently do not get back what we pay. I have been sympathetic with this problem and worked with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and was a cosponsor of the original 1961 Area Redevelopment Administration Act. The Interstate Highway System is also an important illustration of what can be done to improve communities which need this kind of assistance.

I have been urging upon the Senator in charge of the bill the idea of including language in the bill which would require consideration of extending the 41,000-mile limitation.

An important issue involved is the issue of making up for the fact that, in New York, we built many roads which could qualify under the Interstate Highway System—notably the Thruway—before the interstate highway program went into effect. We have never received equivalent benefit from the Federal Interstate Highway System because we had the foresight to contract roads in advance of the time when the program went into effect.

In other States, including our State, the interstate mileage allocation is very restrictive, considering the needs for development. Even in a State like New York, which some claim is a wealthy State as these things go, there are 30-odd areas which could qualify for ARA assistance as and which might well be eligible for qualification under the bill. For example, I make reference to S. 1056, which I introduced together with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], on February 9, 1965. That bill deals with extending the Interstate Highway System.

With that in view, and following my discussion with the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Michigan, I desire to propound to him, if I may have his attention, two inquiries.

Is it the intent of the Committee on Public Works to follow up closely the making of a study by the Bureau of Public Roads, which I am advised has been or is being currently undertaken on the desirability of extending the Interstate Highway System?

Mr. McNAMARA. We shall follow it very closely. We have already discussed it quite recently. I shall make reference to that later in my remarks.

Mr. JAVITS. So, if I may characterize the answer of the Senator, we have every reason to expect that this will not remain a mere promise, but that such a study will be made, through the cooperation of the committee which will contact the Bureau within a measurable period of time to see that the study is being made.

Mr. McNAMARA. Studies are being constantly programed. We occasionally receive requests from certain Senators for special attention to certain areas. If we were to receive such a request from the Senator, we would forward it to the Bureau.

Mr. JAVITS. And the committee would get behind the request?

Mr. McNAMARA. We would see that the study was made.

Mr. JAVITS. Very good. The other question is, Does the committee expect the Bureau of Public Roads to submit recommendations to it on the extension of the interstate highway program as the result of the program to which we have just referred?

Mr. McNAMARA. According to testimony the Senate Public Works Committee has received from the Bureau of Public Roads, the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System scheduled to be completed in 1972, already is running $5.8 billion short. Efforts are under way to meet these increases in highway costs so that the existing program can be completed approximately on schedule.

Any increase in the program before 1972 obviously would compound the financial problem.

But more specifically on the Senator's question, about the Bureau of Public

Roads conducting a study of highway needs, I would like to point out that the Bureau needs no congressional authorization or instructions to conduct studies of this nature. The Bureau has ample authority to study these matters and is indeed studying them all the time.

I would like to direct the Senator's attention to hearings on cost estimates for completion of the Interstate Highway System which were held before the Subcommittee on Public Roads on March 30 and 31. I asked Mr. Rex Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, whether his Bureau was looking forward to the day when the existing program would expire and whether it was making preparation for it. I read a section of the testimony beginning with Mr. Whitton's reply to that question:

> Mr. Whitton. We are making studies now to see what the continuing highway program ought to be. I would say we are directing our efforts toward a continuing program that we think will be necessary due to the development of the country and the development of traffic and the development of industry. We see no immediate end to a highway improvement program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield myself such additional time as it may require to complete the colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. Let me quote further from the hearings:

> The Chairman. Are you saying in those remarks that you are anticipating continuation?
>
> Mr. Whitton. We are anticipating a continuing highway program; yes, sir.
>
> The Chairman. No question about continuing the highway program. The question is, How are we going to pay for it?
>
> Mr. Whitton. That is what the study will develop.
>
> The Chairman. Then you are prepared in your plans and anticipations to face this termination in 1972?
>
> Mr. Whitton. Yes, sir. We are making a study, or hope to make it, we are starting it, at least, to determine what a continuing highway program should be, and how it ought to be financed.

Thus, the Senator from New York should readily see that the Bureau already has actively engaged in studying the country's highway needs.

There is a separate section established in the Bureau for the purpose of looking ahead and taking into consideration all these needs.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as the Senator has mentioned, if we want some thing for our particular section of the country, the committee will inquire into it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I have an additional 5 minutes, or I take it out of my own time?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator may continue under the time allotted to me.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I would like to stress the urgency of a study. The distinguished chairman has mentioned that this is under way. Since the Interstate System of Highways began, great progress has been made in the development of that system in the country. In our own State of Kansas, within a short time, a stretch of 400 miles across the entire State will be open for travel.

When the study to which reference has been made is undertaken, I hope thought will be given to this other phase of the problem. A substantial part of Highway No. 70, is a toll road. Persons using that road can use it free of tolls through Missouri, but once past the Kansas line they must pay a toll.

I am not suggesting today that something should be done to take care of that situation, but in the future I believe some provision should be made to make the cost of traveling the same throughout the country. I hope the study will also include that phase of the problem.

Mr. McNAMARA. The real problem is not the need for roads or requirements for them, but, How do we pay the bill? We are already well over $5 billion in debt to complete the 41,000-mile system of highways. The Senate must consider how we are to pay for it. This is one of the most urgent considerations.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is one other phase of this matter to which I should like to direct the attention of the chairman, and that is the so-called antipirating provisions of the bill, reference to which is contained mainly in the committee report, as to what the committee expects of the Secretary of Commerce in the administration of the bill.

I should like to read into the Record, because I think it is critically important to have this expression as a part of the legislative record as we pass this measure, which I hope will be passed, the prohibition against relocation, which appears at pages 13 and 14 of the report:

> PROHIBITION AGAINST RELOCATION
>
> The committee in discussing the general purpose of the act expressed its strong belief that no value is gained by shifting existing work from one area to another under this program. The grants and loans provided for in S. 1648 should be used to expand our job market. Thus the Secretary should make every effort to determine that assistance is not extended under this act so as to result in a transfer of work or a relocation of facilities. It has long been a recognized policy of the Government to preclude the use of Federal funds in any form for assisting the relocation of industries, or plants, or work from one locality to another, or for financing subcontractors who relocate for the purpose of transferring jobs previously performed in another area by other subcontractors or contractors.
>
> The Secretary's task in administering this portion of the act will be difficult at best. The intention here is that economic development should not be used as a guise to obtain Federal assistance in order to obtain a competitive advantage that provides no general benefit to the Nation.
>
> The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is not intended to authorize the use of Federal funds for grants, loans, guarantees, subsidies, purchases of indebtedness, or assistance of any kind for programs, projects, facilities, or purchases to be used by or for highly mobile, intensely competitive industries, such as the apparel or garment trades within the textile industry, in which substantial unemployment and abnormal unused plant capacity exists, and in which labor turnover is high and the prior possession of a specific skill or training is not typically a prerequisite for obtaining employment. The act is not intended to give a competitive advantage to one area over another where it would lead to industrial dislocation.

The committee makes it very clear that it does not expect that the bill will be used for the purpose of raiding business where it is now. The report expressly refers to the apparel or garment trades within the textile industry, in which substantial unemployment and abnormal unused plant capacity exist, and in which labor turnover is high, and the prior possession of a specific skill or training is not typically a prerequisite for obtaining employment, as being precisely an industry in which the antipirating policy should be followed.

I should like, if I may again engage the attention of the manager of the bill, to have from him a reaffirmation of this intention, particularly as this bill contains what I consider to be a very objectionable and unhappy provision, which I fought before, without success, providing for loans and guarantees to obtain machinery and equipment, as contained in line 25, page 10, and line 1, page 11, of the bill.

Unless it is coupled with a very strong policy declaration on our part that the bill shall not be used for pirating industry, notwithstanding the very eloquent statement contained in the committee's report, it could certainly be used for that purpose, considering the latitude granted under the section of the bill providing for loans and guarantees for machinery and equipment.

Mr. McNAMARA. I believe it is quite clear, as the Senator has said in his remarks, that it is definitely spelled out in the report. In addition, we have just now adopted an amendment to the bill, offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], which emphasizes that and ties it down unquestionably.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield myself 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the manager of the bill to refer to the words of the bill, in lines 3 and 4 on page 12, which now read—as amended by the Randolph amendment:

> Such financial assistance shall not be extended to assist establishments relocating from one area to another or to assist subcontractors whose purpose is to divest or whose economic success is dependent upon divesting other contractors or subcontractors of contracts theretofore customarily performed by them.

Are these words defined as to their intent by the recitals in the committee report on pages 13 and 14 under the heading "Prohibition Against Relocation"?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is the very purpose of this language.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for his time and courtesy.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I have amendment No. 1 at the desk, and I ask that it be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed, on page 10, line 5, to change the period to a comma and to insert the following:

> For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966 and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The purpose of this amendment is to limit the authorization for title II to the same duration of time as title I.

I intend to submit another amendment a little later, amendment No. 3, which would impose a similar time limitation on the authorization for title III.

This limitation in time is already contained in title I. It is already contained in the Appalachia measure, after which this bill is patterned.

The purpose of having the authorization expire periodically is so that the program as a whole will return to the Congress for later assessment, reappraisal, and reconsideration.

S. 689, which was introduced on January 26, 1965, and which is now pending in the Government Operations Committee, would establish that general policy in subsequent legislation.

I feel that it is sound policy; and for that reason that this amendment to title 2 is submitted.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield briefly?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I have checked this with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] and as chairman of the subcommittee who handled this title he advises me that he has no objection. Therefore, Mr. President, I move adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 3 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. The Senator from Nebraska proposes the following amendment:

> On page 22, line 13, change the period to a comma and insert the following: "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the purpose of amendment No. 3 is to achieve for title 3 what the amendment the Senate has just adopted will do for title 2. The same reasons and the same considerations apply thereto.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, for the same reasons which have been indicated earlier, the chairmen of the two committees have no objection to acceptance of the amendment, and I ask that it be adopted.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. The Senator from Nebraska proposes the following amendment:

> On page 11, line 4, after the semicolon, insert the word "and".
>
> On page 11, beginning with the semicolon on line 12, strike out all through the period on line 24.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this is the provision which provides that the Secretary shall be authorized "to contract to pay, and to pay annually, for not more than ten years, to or on behalf of private business entities amounts sufficient to reduce by 2 percentage points the interest paid by such entities on loans which are obtained from non-Government sources, which are not guaranteed by any Government agency, which provide for annual amortization of principal, and the proceeds of which are used for purposes for which the Secretary is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness or make loans under this section: *Provided, however,* That subject to limitations in annual appropriation Acts, the annual cost of new contracts approved in any one year shall not exceed $5,000,000."

Mr. President, we have had some experience under the Area Redevelopment Administration Act, in which subsidies for this type of business met with a sorry reception at the hands of communities where the subsidy of business was practiced.

All of us can sympathize most earnestly and sincerely with the establishment of businesses which will result in the formation of new jobs. But it comes with poor grace and a great deal of resentment to those businesses in a given area when they witness the formation of a competing business in their own area, which will have a subsidy from public funds. This is one form of subsidy. Assume a situation in which perhaps the newly founded business would find it necessary to borrow money at 6 percent. The Secretary would be authorized to pay the equivalent of 2 percent of that interest, thereby giving a net interest rate of 4 percent to the newly formed business.

Mr. President, consider the plight and feelings of the man who has put his own money on the line, who has established his own line of credit in a bank and must pay the 6 percent. It does not sit well with him to not only have a new direct line of competition with a man who is being subsidized, but that man is being subsidized in part by the taxes which he has to pay.

To use a homely illustration, a man making broom handles, for example, in the States of Nebraska or Missouri——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this man making broom handles has a little factory employing 12 or 14 persons. Along comes a man who would get the benefit of the provisions of the bill. The broom handle manufacturer finds himself paying 6 percent interest, whereas the new man will have a head start of 2 percent and so will pay only 4 percent.

It is that situation which I believe is unwarranted and certainly would work a greater hardship than any corresponding benefit which would be obtained.

If that business will not be able to make a go of it at the rate of 6 percent, it would not help any to have a reduction to a rate of 4 percent as in the hypothetical instance which was given.

There are other alternatives for handling the situation. It was pointed out in the supplemental views in the committee report that one way to handle the problem would be for the Federal Government to insure the loans made by private lending agencies. However, in the short time allowed for preparation of the bill, it was not possible to work out any proper reference in this regard. It could be done, and it would achieve the same purpose; namely, where credit would be guaranteed by the Government, each man could get a lower rate of interest. We would not get into the discriminatory subsidy which is provided under the present bill.

That language is found on page 37 of the committee report and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of that page, beginning with the words "section 202(b)(8)," in the fifth paragraph of that page and the two succeeding paragraphs.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> The GAO recommended that in section 202(b)(8), a fixed charge (subject to change

with experience) should be added to the interest costs on the business loans to cover operating costs of the program. There was considerable support for the recommendation of a fixed charge in our committee.

Section 202(a) (3) of the bill provides authority for the Secretary to pay to or in behalf of private business entities, amounts sufficient to reduce by 2 percentage points, interest paid on loans obtained from nongovernmental sources.

If the purpose of this section is to draw capital into areas which have economic possibilities which the administrators of the program are convinced will support long-term employment, a Federal insurance program to insure the loans made by private lending institutions would perform the same function at no cost to the Government. Such insurance could draw capital from central money markets to an area selected for assistance as has been demonstrated in the FHA program.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time. It is my expectation to call for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, this provision in the bill is designed as an experiment, the objective of which was well described in the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce before the Committee on Banking and Currency. I read his language on page 11 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

> In addition, the new interest rate rebate provision would provide a new means of bringing more stable and promising business enterprises, which are able to obtain private financing, into depressed areas.

What is proposed is not a subsidy for a business but an inducement for strong and stable businesses to move into an undeveloped area. It is geared not to any supposition as to what may be the need of business for assistance, but rather to what may be the needs of the area for assistance by strong and viable companies.

On page 15 of the same hearings there is found colloquy which I had with Secretary Connor on this point. I was interested, as I am sure all members of the committee are, in the validity of the device which is included in the bill.

I said this to the Secretary:

> The rationale that you gave on page 5 of your testimony for this provision is that some incentive is absolutely essential to attract the sounder and more viable firms into the areas where new industry is most needed.
>
> Now, no one can quarrel with that objective—certainly not I. It isn't going to help an undeveloped economic area to bring in weak economic units and weak industries to try to build it up. So I wonder if you could build up the record with further comment.
>
> Is this one of the incentives which would indeed attract sounder and more viable firms? What are the reasons why sounder and more viable firms are not as likely to go into these undeveloped areas as we would like to see?

I quoted my question, because I believe my question reflects some of the same concern which the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has reflected in his comments. Secretary Connor's reply was:

> Secretary CONNOR. Senator Muskie, a large national manufacturing organization, for example, in considering its expansion plans, has many alternative choices as to where it can locate one new plant and then another and so forth. And it is usual that as part of its planning activity it would be taking various sections of the country into consideration and making comparative judgments as to the relative advantages and disadvantages of locating new plants in many different sections.
>
> Now, in one of these, shall we say, underdeveloped parts of the country, there are some obvious economic disadvantages for such a company locating its plant there. And in the competition with other communities or localities that have a greater infrastructure in depth, or better transportation facilities, or are in a physical location that is closer to the market, one of these redevelopment areas might well lose out in the competition unless there is some kind of added incentive.
>
> The experience in several European countries, particularly Belgium and West Germany, is that if there is some public need for assisting and giving incentives for the location of new industries in locations where there are some problems such as higher rate of unemployment, than an incentive of this kind can be instrumental because a company in looking at the competitive advantages and disadvantages can be attracted to an area where there is, say, a labor surplus and some other advantages that would be helpful in the long run, if it can get some incentive that would offset the immediate economic disadvantages of such an area. We think this is a good experiment to try. We, of course, are not sure of its success because it never has been tried, but after looking at the various types of incentives that would bring these stronger, large national corporations into these areas where their help is needed most, we think this has a reasonably good chance of success.

I then asked the Secretary whether there were other kinds of incentives that were considered to achieve the same objective. The Secretary's reply was:

> Secretary CONNOR. Well, other kinds have been considered, Senator MUSKIE, but the ones considered would involve greater financial outlay by the Federal Government. We think that this leverage effect that we obtain from the use of the 2 percentage points with the company putting up its own money will do at least as effective a job as the others and at least cost to the Federal Government.
>
> Senator MUSKIE. Did you test this out as an incentive—the objective I don't quarrel with, the purpose I don't quarrel with, the need I don't quarrel with, but I am wondering whether the incentive will work. Have you tested it in any way?
>
> Secretary CONNOR. We have had discussions. Of course, something like this can be tested only in the facts of a particular situation by a company that is considering its location in one of these redevelopment areas in competition with an area where greater public services and facilities are available.

I have quoted from the hearing record because I think this makes the best case that can be made for this provision of the bill. It is an experiment worth trying.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska has raised the alternative, which is included in the supplemental views of the minority, that of an insurance program. This does not meet the need which this device is designed to serve, because the companies we are discussing do not need credit insurance to obtain credit. We are talking about companies that can get credit on their own, because they would not qualify under the industrial loan provisions of the bill. There is no appeal to them under any of the other provisions of the bill, nor under the proposal the Senator from Nebraska has advanced.

The only device we have to deal with this particular problem is the one that is before us. It is the one which was considered with others, as the Secretary said, by the Department in preparing the legislation. This was the one involving the least cost to the Government and which, at the same time, would serve the objective.

The cost to the Government is reflected in the fact that if it works, an expenditure of $5 million will generate $250 million in private funds to stimulate their movement into these underdeveloped areas.

There has been a great deal of discussion about the claim that the Federal Government cannot create prosperity. I agree. The Federal Government can help stimulate the private sector to move into those areas.

After considering everything carefully, in the light of the argument presented to us by the Secretary, we also felt that it was an experiment worth trying. That is why we bring it to the Senate and urge its adoption.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true also that Secretary Connor was able to give a specific example of how this idea has worked. I asked him whether it would work with a big corporation such as General Motors, and whether it would be an incentive to General Motors. He said:

> Secretary CONNOR. You mentioned General Motors and in the public announcement they made about the location of one of their plants in Antwerp, Belgium, it was noted that one of the factors they took into consideration, although no indication it was the determining factor, nevertheless the location of the plant in Antwerp took into consideration this 2-percent incentive.

That statement by the Secretary is found at page 38 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

This is something that has been tried by American corporations, as the Secretary said, in countries overseas.

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. In addition, I point out also that the Secretary comes from the field of big business. In our discussions he spoke as a businessman operating a big company, and the question was raised with him whether in that capacity he thought this was a worthwhile incentive to try to attract a viable company. His answer was in the affirmative.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I have a comment to make with reference to the Secretary's statement at page 15. I shall not read all of it, because the Senator has read it: "If it can get some incentive that would offset the immediate economic disadvantages of such an area."

I emphasize the word "immediate." That is the word that concerns me. Does this mean that the company will get a 2-percent subsidy for as long as it is operating, or is there a limitation?

Mr. MUSKIE. The limit is 10 years.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sorry that our good friend from Nebraska has disturbed the happy harmony which has characterized our proceedings up to this moment by striking a body blow at one of the essential features of the bill. The inducement of meeting 2 percent of the interest cost on investments in depressed areas is one of the most vital features of the bill. It would result in a potential maximum investment of private capital with a minimum of Government expenditure. The 2 percent interest inducement means that for an expenditure of $2 million we can hope to induce $100 million of private investment. The proposal would be authorized for 5 years at $5 million a year. We believe $5 million would induce $250 million of investment. Carried out over 5 years, it would mean a potential investment of $1.25 billion in depressed areas. This is really the most economical way to get a large volume of private capital to start producing and to employ people in areas where there is high and persistent unemployment.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BASS. I should like to ask a question of the Senator in charge of the bill. I should like to find out if there is to be a vote on the pending amendment today, and, if so, at what time.

Mr. MUSKIE. We are pressing for as early a vote as we can.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In view of the commitment made yesterday, when we have the vote, it will be the last vote.

Mr. BASS. The commitment was that the Senator would try not to have any votes after 2 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. There will be a little flexibility.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the second point I would like to make is that the proposal is designed to encourage investments made by private capital rather than by public expenditure. It would offer inducement for banks and other private lenders to extend loans to private industry which wishes to expand into areas of high and persistent unemployment or low income. This will be done entirely in the private sector.

There is good precedent for this procedure in the program which was carried out in the construction of post offices, originally by the Eisenhower administration, but continued under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations; namely, that instead of appropriating for the construction of post offices, a rental program was carried out which guarantees an income for a stated period of years. As a result, the building of post offices has been greatly speeded up. There may be some incidental disadvantages of the program, but it has certainly speeded up investments.

The next point I should like to make is that these inducements for loans will draw into depressed areas not merely marginal firms but well-established firms—firms with a good production record and a good earnings record. They will not be fly-by-night concerns in any way. The failure record should, therefore, be very low.

Finally, if we turn down the proposal, we shall be driven to the alternative of having to greatly increase public loans financed out of the Federal budget.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is a sincere defender of private enterprise. I am surprised that he should sponsor an amendment which would throw us more and more into the public sector by requiring Government loans rather than loans from private enterprise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain material on the foreign experience of West Germany and Belgium, which is very favorable, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, together with such incidental material as I have.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE WITH THE INCENTIVE OF SUBSIDIZED INTEREST ON BANK LOANS TO INDUSTRY EXPANDING IN REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

The interest subsidy to bank loans has been used by Belgium, Luxembourg, and West Germany among European countries as a device to encourage expansion and modernization of industry in redevelopment areas. This incentive to private enterprise has been most intensively used by the Government of Belgium.

It should be noted, however, that interest subsidies in West Germany amount to 3 percent per year toward the normal amount of interest to be paid to the banks, and are extended for 3 years. In West Germany as in other Common Market countries, interest subsidies are part of a whole package of redevelopment measures and policies. Other credit measures also include direct low-interest loans and Federal guarantees for loans. The subsidy to banking institutions in Luxembourg in order that they may offer loans at lower interest rates is patterned after the Belgian act.

As in West Germany, Belgium makes use of variety of measures to achieve its economic growth and redevelopment objectives, but the assistance to private enterprise through a Government contribution to the rate of interest paid on bank loans is given greater emphasis here than in other countries. Belgium is unique in that it applies its incentives to economic expansion and establishment of new industries on a general, countrywide basis as well as for the development of certain designated areas. The 1959 acts had in mind a general toning up and modernization of Belgian and Belgian-located industry to make it more competitive internationally, and particularly in the Common Market. The differences between the general act and the regional act are mainly a matter of degree and restriction, with industry which expands in redevelopment areas receiving more liberal treatment. For example, the general act provides a Government contribution in the rate of interest of 2 percent under most conditions. The regional act, however, provides for a maximum of 4 percent contribution to interest rates on bank loans extended to industries expanding or modernizing in redevelopment areas. On top of this, additional help may be given in times of a national recession, when the minimum rate may be fixed at 1 percent. The interest subsidy may be extended to 8 years in development areas and up to 5 years under the general act.

How effective has the interest subsidy device been in Belgium—particularly in its effects on strengthening the economies of its redevelopment areas whose designation criteria are generally parallel to ours? Dr. L. C. Klaasen of the Netherlands Economic Institute has attempted an appraisal of the effectiveness of Belgian regional policy, but he points out two difficulties: (1) the additional advantages given by the regional act are not substantially greater than those available countrywide under the general act, and (2) the acts are of such recent date that no major structural changes can be expected from them as yet. However, the available data do indicate worthwhile results.

Certain data measure only the effects of both the general and regional programs in their entirety. Accordingly, the effects of the interest subsidy are inseparable from the other regional measures including Government guarantees of loans, direct Government financing, industrial building program, and tax exemptions. It is interesting to note, however, that the areas of greatest unemployment in Belgium received relatively the greatest additional employment in industries receiving financial support under the general and regional acts.

Under the regional act, a total of 507 applicants were approved for low interest rates between the enactment of the law in July 1959, and October 1962 (an effective period of about 2 years). Of these, three-quarters (382) were located in the Flemish provinces and one-quarter (125) in the Walloon provinces. Capitalwise, of the total involved ($128 million) 63 percent was invested in the Flemish and 37 percent in the Walloon provinces. The amount of capital per applicant, however, was much larger in Wallonia than in Flanders ($380,000 against $210,000). This latter fact is understandable in that Flanders not only has a higher unemployment rate than Wallonia, but is traditionally more agricultural and less industrial.

The conclusions indicated by the rather brief experience of the Belgian Government with subsidized interest rates on bank loans to industries locating in redevelopment areas may be summarized as follows: The incentive has been quite widely employed by Belgian industry. A total of 507 industries have used it to expand in eligible areas over a period of a little more than 2 years. In considering this volume of use, and without suggesting a direct relationship, it is helpful to remember that the United States has over 20 times the population of Belgium.

What other countries have programs with provisions similar to the 2-percent interest return proposed in EDA?

The redevelopment area programs of Western European countries contain a wide variety of incentives to encourage the location of new industry. These range from tax credits and accelerated amortization to outright capital grants. Two countries—Belgium and West Germany—extend interest rate subsidies somewhat similar to the EDA proposal.

The Belgian plan was aimed at both (1) modernizing Belgian industry better to compete in the Common Market, and (2) expanding industrial jobs in redevelopment areas. Accordingly, the government's contribution nationwide is 2 percent, and in distressed areas specific aid is given in the form of an additional contribution of 2 percent. Still further, during a period of recession, industry expansions (new or existing) in distressed areas are eligible for additional interest subsidy to a minimum of 1 percent. (In Belgium, the interest subsidy may be combined with Government guarantees for loans.) The period of interest support varies from 5 to 8 years.

In West Germany also, interest subsidies are extended for loans to industrial investments in redevelopment areas. They amount to 3 percent per year toward the normal amount of interest to be paid to the banks. The interest subsidy is extended for 3 years.

(Beside the interest subsidy, other devices in West Germany include low-interest investment loans, short-term working capital loans, and Federal guarantees for loans.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I presume the committee record is quite long. Perhaps it contains all the items which indicate a favorable experience in Western Europe with this type of program. I do not know that the conditions in Western Europe are parallel to the economic, industrial, and labor conditions here. But I do note the answer of Secretary Connor on page 38. He said:

> You mentioned General Motors and in the public announcement they made about the location of one of their plants in Antwerp, Belgium, it was noted that one of the factors they took into consideration, although no indication it was the determining factor, nevertheless the location of the plant in Antwerp took into consideration this 2-percent incentive.

That is a nebulous statement. The 2-percent subsidy was there, but there is no judgment or conclusion that it was that which caused them to locate the plant in Antwerp, Belgium.

Furthermore, try to transform the $5 million annual authorization for this subsidy into a maximum of what it could produce if all of it were devoted to this 2-percent subsidy and coming out with a multi-billion-dollar figure is wishful thinking in its greatest degree.

There is no showing that that result is likely to be achieved.

What about the man who might already be in the business of making broomsticks in the area? We would say to him, "We are glad you are here. You are furnishing jobs. You operate a regional industry. But we are going to bribe a great big corporation to come in here with new equipment and a new plant. We are going to pay that big corporation to be your competitor."

Mr. President, it is one thing to make new jobs; it is another thing to engage in practices of pirating industry by closing up a factory in one area for the purpose of establishing it in another, as could be done under the bill.

It is still a third thing to have a subsidy which would establish large corporations, plants, and businesses with that subsidy, and would drive out businesses going now in that area and in competition with that big corporation.

I believe that in the absence of a showing that it is something more than an experiment, and in view of the experience we have had under the Area Redevelopment Act——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. The preponderance of the evidence and the record shows that we would do well to stay away from the practice of subsidizing plants. It is a subject which is discretionary. Undoubtedly, it would result in a great deal of unsatisfaction and unhappiness. We may have a large firm qualify for a subsidy, but a medium-sized firm, a small firm, or one just starting business could not qualify. The smaller firms would not receive help.

I am for private enterprise, but not only for the big operator. There are some who advocate the advancement of the big companies, such as General Motors, but I believe that American industry is composed in larger degree of the sum of many smaller industries which, under these circumstances, would not be favored and, in fact, would be harmed.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] are detained on official business.

The pair of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The regular order is called for. On this vote, 25 Senators voted in the affirmative, 39 Senators in the negative. The amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Chair withhold the announcement of the final vote for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The result of the vote has already been announced.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I did not hear the announcement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I withdraw my demand for the regular order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has entered the Chamber. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the regular order be rescinded. I observe the Senator from Vermont in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that that is not in order; the vote must stand.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 99 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Case
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Javits
Kuchel
McClellan
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Scott
Stennis
Talmadge
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—39

Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Proxmire
Randolph
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Tydings
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—36

Aiken
Allott
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Church

Cooper
Eastland
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Hill
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McGovern
Miller
Mondale
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Neuberger
Pell
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Symington
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. HRUSKA's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, a century ago Joshua Chamberlain, military hero of the War between the States, president of Bowdoin College and Governor of Maine expressed his philosophy of government in these words:

> A government has something more to do than to govern, and to levy taxes to pay the governors. It is something more than a police to arrest evil and punish wrong. It must also encourage good, point out improvements, open roads of prosperity and infuse life into all right enterprises. It should combine the best minds of the State for all the high ends for which society is established and to which man aspires. That gives us much to do.

These eloquent words could today serve as a fitting preface for the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 which we now consider. This act indeed—encourages good—points out and opens roads for economic improvement and enhanced prosperity—infuses life into right enterprises—and brings together the best minds of the State, at all levels of government and occupation to work together for all the high ends—economic and social to which man aspires.

This act is the logical culmination of the effects of significant economic and social forces which have acted upon our society over the past two decades. These forces, perhaps revolutionary in perspective, have improved the American standard of economic and social living and the pattern of national economic growth. These forces, too, have brought into focus the important truths that all Americans, in all places, throughout our land are entitled to an equality of opportunity—whether that opportunity be for justice, for political representation, for education, for health, for outdoor enjoyment, for the use of resources, or for economic enhancement.

Equality of opportunity for all men, I suggest, is the underlying theme of our major legislative efforts in this decade of the 1960's. For in this land of plenty, in the midst of our affluence, we are confronted with the paradox of unemployment, poverty, and misery—the products of unequal economic opportunity.

For some years, many States have recognized the uneven nature of economic operations and developments as functions of opportunity. In my own State, for example, we organized in 1955 the Department of Economic Development, to coordinate our industrial and recreational development programs. In 1957 this was followed by the Maine Industrial Building Authority, to guarantee industrial building loans. Both of these programs represent efforts by Government to provide the means—the opportunity—the catalyst—by and through which local communities can utilize local initiative and local resources to solve their economic problems. I am proud that both of these measures were enacted while I was Governor of Maine. Progress has been good in these State-oriented programs but a great need has remained. Thus it was both logical and necessary for the Federal Government to become a partner with the States in this search for economic opportunity for all people. This came to pass in the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 which I was pleased to cosponsor.

In its few years of operation, ARA has been of immense assistance to large areas which need help—help, I might add, not forced upon anyone—but requested, in partnership with local endeavor—viably used and still required. The record for Maine in this regard is worthy of brief comment and example.

ARA projects have been active in nine Maine counties. One of these is Aroostook County in the extreme northern tip of Maine. An area as large as Connecticut and Rhode Island combined, with a population of about 100,000, Aroostook is a largely underdeveloped area. It is rich in natural resources, but concentration in a single industry—potato farming—has made the county's economy subject to violent fluctuations of the potato market.

ARA has proven its promise and great potential for economic development by expanding economic opportunity in Aroostook County. ARA has approved $11.5 million in industrial loans to industries in Aroostook. As a result of this, 3,015 direct jobs have been created or projected for this area. The average cost per job is $3,900 and the average annual total income resulting from this direct effort is over $10 million.

Moreover, these loans have helped to diversify Aroostook's industrial base in wood products, potato processing, and the establishment of a broad-based sugarbeet industry of great potential to Maine's future economy.

About 1,200 jobs have been created elsewhere in Maine through ARA-assisted projects and more than 700 people have completed ARA training programs. The total impact in jobs is over 4,000, providing an annual income of more than $14 million.

One of the more dramatic events in the life of ARA also happened in Maine. As a result of the shutdown of two textile mills in Lisbon Falls, Maine, during the summer-fall of 1964, this community was confronted with a sudden high rise unemployment situation affecting about 80 percent of its total work force of 1,150. To meet this crisis, President Johnson ordered a Federal task force to this community to assist them in their time of need. Out of this force of 10 or more Federal agencies, the main economic thrust, giving greatest relief to this chaotic situation, came from ARA in the form of a loan to a corporation which bought the largest of the two mills and reopened it at about 50 percent of its former work force.

Here indeed was opportunity created.

There are many more promising prospects in a variety of Maine industries. Pending at this time, but unfunded, because of the exhaustion of ARA funds are nearly $6 million worth of these "opportunity" projects.

The passage of this bill, S. 1648, will assure the continued availability of opportunity to many Maine communities and other areas throughout our land. As we consider its substantive content, I would urge all Members of this body to think of this bill in terms of opportunity—not handouts—of opportunity for the broad economic growth of the underdeveloped communities of our country; and—of opportunity for the impoverished family to hold their heads high and for a man, his wife, and their children to rise in stature among their peers through their own productive capacities.

For opportunity is precisely what this bill offers—just as opportunity is the essential hallmark of our American way of life.

The committee in its consideration of this bill focused considerable attention on those sections pertinent to regional and local planning and development action. Much will yet be said on these points, but briefly let me conclude my remarks with emphasis on the new "economic development district" and "development" center concepts.

We must remember, that in establishing a national regional economic development program we are dealing with different regions of the country. Each of these regions has a different economic and resource base, and each has a different need in terms of development programs. In many ways New England has the most cohesive and coordinated set of States in the Union. But even here there are divisions. The States and their component parts are not all homogeneous in terms of economic and development program need. We forget this division at our peril.

That we have not forgotten this basic fact is evident. Section 403 provides for the encouragement of local area development through multicounty economic development districts by authorizing a 10-percent increase in development facility grants for projects in such districts and by emphasizing the need for coordinated district planning and programing.

In addition the bill also makes eligible for assistance development centers which are not distressed in themelves but where economic investment will contribute to the alleviation of high unemployment and low income in dependent surrounding areas.

These two elements of the bill are excellent commonsense clauses. They recognize the basic fact that you cannot build our national house of economic enhancement and stability from the roof down but from the foundation up—and indeed from the individual grassroot bricks of that foundation.

We have had important experience with this concept in rural Aroostook County, Maine, where loans to community developments in centers such as Presque Isle could not stand alone but where economic stimulation was provided to surrounding low-income rural areas through the development of agricultural product processing facilities.

The other provisions of this bill are designed to work in harmony with the loan concept.

Title I of the bill, in a way, is an extension of the accelerated public works program which is out of funds. There is an important distinction though between this program and accelerated public works. The Accelerated Public Works Act was designed to help ease a general unemployment problem facing the Nation at the time it was passed. Funds for public works projects were made available to areas suffering the highest rates of unemployment.

Under S. 1648, the principal purpose is to increase the amount of Federal funds being expended both for general improvement of the physical structure of an area for specific improvements related to projected economic development. The idea is to assist the areas of need to improve and strengthen physical facilities, or infrastructure, so that they may be better able to support long-term economic development.

The criteria for the approval of public facility and development facility projects under S. 1648 are more restrictive than they were under accelerated public works because, as I have just noted, the principal test to be applied in this new bill is the contribution the project will make to the long-term well-being of an area; not as it was under accelerated public works, the temporary relief of unemployment.

Some of the kinds of public facility projects to be financed under titles I and II of this bill—title II provides for loans for these facilities—can be partially financed under existing programs and others cannot. I have a partial listing of these projects with a notation as to whether or not partial financing is available under other programs. Without objection, I would like to place this listing in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the listing was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. Public works and development facilities "directly" related to economic development

Type of project	*Existing grant-in-aid program*
Water works and water lines related to industrial and commercial development.	None.
Sanitary and storm sewers related to industrial and commercial development.	Do.
Industrial parks (land development and utilities)	Do.
Police and fire stations related to industrial and commercial development.	Do.
Research centers related to industrial and commercial development.	Do.
Tourism facilities	Do.
Streets and roads related to industrial and commercial development.	50 percent from Bureau of Public Roads if on Federal aid highway system.
Waste treatment facilities relating to industrial and commercial development.	Up to 30 percent from PHS.
Area vocational schools	50 percent from Office of Education:
Airports	50 to 75 percent from FAA.
Watershed protection and flood prevention related to industrial or commercial development.	30 to 100 percent from Soil Conservation Service.

II. Public works and economic development facilities "indirectly" related to economic development (projects improving the "climate" of a community)

Type of project	*Existing grant-in-aid program*
Water works and water liens related to residential development	None.
Sanitary and storm sewers primarily related to residential development.	Do:
Streets primarily related to residential development	50 percent from Bureau of Public Roads if on Federal-aid highway system.
Waste treatment facilities not related to industrial or commercial development.	Up to 30 percent from PHS.
Hospitals related to community or district economic development	44 to 66 percent from PHS.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, even though some of these projects can be assisted through grants under existing programs the idea behind S. 1648 is to provide additional assistance to projects that are located in areas of economic distress.

In the majority of eligible areas grants of up to 50 percent will be available. In the hardest hit areas, supplemental grants of up to 30 percent will be made. In no case will a project be entitled to more than 80-percent grant assistance under the bill.

The supplemental grants, incidentally, can apply to those projects receiving a grant under this program as well as to projects receiving direct grants under other programs.

Let me give an example of how this works. If a community waste treatment facility were entitled to a 30-percent grant from the Public Health Service, an additional 20-percent direct grant could be made under S. 1648. If that facility were located in a severely distressed area it could apply for an additional 30 percent under the supplemental grant provision of title I. The total Federal money in that project then would be the maximum 80 percent.

On the other hand if an airport project were entitled to a 75-percent grant from the FAA, only an additional 5 percent could be granted under the Public Works and Economic Development Act. Never can the total be greater than 80 percent and only the hardest hit areas would be entitled to an amount greater than 50 percent.

Under title II of S. 1648 loans can be made for public facility and development facility projects, and loans and working capital guarantees can be made for promising industrial and commercial projects. There is also a provision that enables the Secretary of Commerce to contract to pay to, or on behalf of businesses, a portion of the interest costs which they incur in financing their expansions from private lending sources.

Much of this title reflects an extension of the better features and experiences of the area redevelopment program, which is about to phase out. It is a very important part of this act since it provides the only direct financial assistance for privately financed industrial and commercial enterprises. These are the facilities that provide the permanent employment we are seeking to create under this legislation.

Title III also represents an extension of the Area Redevelopment Act program and incorporates some of the excellent provisions for technical assistance, planning, and research we have in the Appalachian regional program.

Title IV sets forth the eligibility requirements for the designation of redevelopment areas and development districts—groupings of counties and/or a labor market areas wishing to join together in an economic development effort. The criteria for area eligibility under S. 1648 follow quite closely the standards that were established for eligibility under the Area Redevelopment Act.

The provisions and standards for the establishment of multi-State regions are combined in title V. In this title is the recognition that the Appalachian regional experiment, even though just getting started, offers a means to deal with chronic depression problems extending across State lines. This title encourages and assist States in getting together to work jointly on common problems. An authorization of $15 million annually, which I consider modest relative to the amount of work to be done, as authorized to help economic development regions in planning, in undertaking technical assistance programs, and to help finance their administrative expenses.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the Public Works Committee [Mr. MCNAMARA] for the manner in which he has developed and moved this legislation. I also would like to compliment the ranking majority member of the Public Works Committee [Mr. RANDOLPH] and ranking minority member [Mr. COOPER], both of whom have made major contributions to making this a bill that will have great impact on improving our depressed areas.

I have had the unique experience of sitting on both of the committees which handled this bill. I would like to congratulate Senator DOUGLAS, the principal sponsor of S. 1648 and the father of the Area Redevelopment Act, whose work on the Banking and Currency Committee in considering this bill was most important. The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. ROBERTSON] also deserves congratulations for making it possible to move this bill so rapidly to the Senate.

Our Nation has evolved greatly from the Jeffersonian concepts of an agrarian social base. Today many of our greatest economic problems center in urban or rural areas. The basic premise of national economic dependence upon strong, viable, and individual local economies is still valid.

As strong as our local foundation is built so will our national economic house stand, today, tomorrow, and for years in the future. The emphasis provided in S. 1648 on this basic fact convinces me that this is strong, good legislation. I urge its enactment.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of May 23, 1965, entitled "ROBERTSON for Reelection."

This fine editorial refers to our colleague, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I heartily endorse not only the timeliness of the editorial, but also its substance, and wish to add a few words.

From my experience with the Senator from Virginia, observing his record, I do not believe the Nation has a finer or more effective champion of our great free enterprise system in all of its best features, it being one of the foundation mudsills of our great system of Government.

I certainly hope he will offer for reelection. I am confident he will be reelected if he does.

Having served for many years in the House of Representatives, and as a member of the Ways and Means Committee and a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and for the last several years and presently as the chairman of that important committee, I believe he knows the economy of this country as well as does any other Member of Congress, and better than most of us. He knows it from the standpoint of his own State, and he knows it from a national viewpoint.

He has been a guardian of the Treasury and a champion of sound fiscal affairs during all those years. We look to him for guidance in that field.

Furthermore, he is full of energy and vigor, turning out an unusual amount of work week after week and year after year.

He has the respect and esteem as well as the dedication of every one of his fellow Members of the Senate. We appreciate him for his fine services, and, even more than that, for his stanch character. The editorial not only is a tribute which I feel for him, but I believe it expresses that of all the people and of his colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, May 23, 1965]

ROBERTSON FOR REELECTION

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON's third full term as U.S. Senator from Virginia expires next year. The Times-Dispatch herewith urges him to offer at that time for another term.

Senator ROBERTSON is vigorous and alert, both physically and mentally. He is one of the most knowledgeable and articulate men in the Senate. His mind is clear and his physique excellent. He is the same crack shot and expert fly-fisherman that he was 40 years ago.

During his service in the Senate of almost 20 years, he has built up much seniority, and he is one of that body's most influential Members. It would take any successor a long time to acquire the influence and knowledge which he commands. Before going to the Senate, he served in the House for 14 years.

Senator ROBERTSON is chairman of one of the most important Senate standing committees—that on Banking and Currency—and also of one of the most important joint committees of the Senate and House, the Joint Committee on Defense Production. Both committee chairmanships are posts of exceptional influence.

In addition, he is fifth ranking member of the all-important Senate Appropriations Committee, as well as chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office, and a member of the Subcommittees on Defense and Supplementals, Agriculture and Related Agencies, Independent Offices, and Public Works.

All of which places him in a most strategic position to have an impact on pending legislation. In fact, his subcommittees alone give him a voice in passing on about 96 percent of total Federal budget expenditures.

That voice, we are happy to say, is exercised on behalf of conservative principles in the spending of public funds. Senator ROBERTSON, we need hardly point out, is strongly and irrevocably opposed to the Government's continuing in times of peace and record-breaking prosperity to spend far in excess of income, year after year.

He is also against the extreme policies that are being demanded by the Johnson administration and by many in Congress on behalf of "civil rights."

While it might appear that in view of the present lack of fiscal responsibility in Washington, and the absence of sanity in the administration's racial program, Mr. ROBERTSON has not been able significantly to influence the course of events, this is not necessarily true. There is no telling what effect his vigorous and informed expositions on the floor of the Senate have had. On matters of banking and currency, and in discussing constitutional questions, he has been particularly impressive.

And in pushing for the adequate development of the James river, Senator ROBERTSON has been extremely helpful. His support for this project, so essential to Virginia, has been of crucial importance in bringing it to its present promising posture.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I heartily subscribe to all the good things the Senator from Mississippi has said, and said well, about the Senator from Virginia. They are all true. He is one of the bedrocks of conservatism in the Senate, the Congress, and the country. Too much cannot be said along those lines.

I accentuate what the Senator from Mississippi has said about the vigorous energy and the outdoor character of the man. I have had an opportunity to see him in the field. I do not think there is a better quail shot in the country today. So far as being a fisherman is concerned, I have seen him entice mountain trout from overhanging rocks with skill that surpasses my powers of description. I consider him one of the great sportsmen of our country. He is one of the authors of the Robertson-Pittman Act, under which Americans have been assured enjoyment of the great outdoors and for their children and their grandchildren after them.

He is a real gentleman and a real Chesterfieldian Virginian.

I hope the editorial to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred states that he is going to be a candidate. If he is, I am sure no one will have the temerity to run against him and that we will have him back here with us.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. Incidentally, this is the birthday of Senator ROBERTSON, and I know I express the good wishes of every Member of the Senate.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I wish to associate myself with everything that has been said by the distinguished Senators from Mississippi and Florida about our distinguished colleague, WILLIS ROBERTSON.

It has been my pleasure to have formed a warm friendship with WILLIS ROBERTSON since coming to this body. I have had the honor and pleasure of fishing and hunting with him in many fields and streams. I have never seen a man as rugged as he is for his age.

He still does push-up exercises each morning. I have had him almost walk me down in fields where we hunted quail. It is difficult to keep up with him and match his stamina on fishing expeditions.

In addition to being an avid sportsman, he is one of the great men of America. He is a distinguished lawyer. He has the courage of a lion. He believes that the Constitution says what it means and means what it says. He is the foremost Bible scholar in the Senate, and one of the most learned historians I have ever known.

He is truly an outstanding American, and a great Senator. It would be a great loss to the U.S. Senate if he were not among us, and Virginia would not be nearly so ably represented.

It is my hope, and I believe the hope of millions and millions of Americans, that WILLIS ROBERTSON will be a candidate for reelection. If he is, I believe he will be overwhelmingly reelected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am honored to be able to join my colleagues in saying what has been said and will be said about the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

I have had the pleasure of serving in both the House and the Senate with the distinguished Senator. I know of no one who is more able, no one who is more cooperative, no one who is more understanding. I make that statement without fear of contradiction, because while every chairman of a committee is cooperative, no chairman is more cooperative in speeding legislation to the floor, regardless of his personal views about it, than is the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

It is a point of pride with him that when legislation is referred to his committee, he does his best to see that it is given expeditious, fair, and judicious consideration, and reported to the Senate for debate and disposal, regardless of the personal views he may have with respect to a particular piece of legislation under consideration.

His contributions to his State and to the country have been many, and as majority leader of the U.S. Senate, I thank him for the tolerance, courtesy, and consideration he has shown to me and to every other Member of this body.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to associate myself with what has been said about Willis Robertson. I have not had the pleasure of fishing and hunting with him, but I have had the distinct stimulation of being in disagreement with him on many occasions. I believe I have come out the better for it, because his counsel is wise. We act as chairmen of committees that have much to do with the economy of the United States.

Sometimes there is a little overlapping of jurisdiction, but Willis is always courteous and gentlemanly, and we sit down and work out what we believe will be in the best interests of the country.

The Senator from Virginia is vigorous. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] mentioned his strong right arm, like that of a heavyweight fighter.

I have not felt his arm lately, but I am sure it is stronger than those of two other heavyweight fighters who performed up in Maine the other day. I would be willing to put him in the ring with either one of them at any time.

But, Willis, I wish you a happy birthday and good, long life. I am sure that the people of Virginia are going to reciprocate and give you a resounding vote of approval for the fine work you have done in your many years in the House and the Senate, during many of which I have served along with you.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am very happy to join Senators today in paying tribute to the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson].

I have had an opportunity during the past 7 years to serve with him on the Committee on Appropriations, and I assure the Senate that all the glowing words which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has said about him are entirely true.

There is no man in the Senate who has a better awareness of the significance of the various facets of the economy than the Senator from Virginia. He knows the effect of what we are doing. Many times, in a very courageous way, he has invited the attention of the Senate, and particularly of its committees, to the significance of the actions we were taking in committee. I am sorry to say that in some instances his advice has not been heeded as much as it should have been. At any rate, I am happy to have the opportunity to pay my own tribute to him, and to thank him for his courtesy and his help in the course of the conduct of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNamara in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am happy to join the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and other Senators in paying our respects to the Senator from Virginia on the occasion of his birthday.

Under the leadership of the Senator from Virginia, I have served as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and also as a member of the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office of the Committee on Appropriations.

First, the Senator from Virginia is a very able and competent man. He is a distinguished Phi Beta Kappa, a real scholar of the economy, as well as of the Bible. He is exceedingly fair. Sometimes we have been in opposition, and sometimes we have been in agreement with him; but whether with him or against him, he has always given every consideration to the views of those who serve with him.

He is also able to lighten some of the tedious moments of debate on complicated and difficult problems with a very delightful and saving sense of humor. The Senator from Virginia possesses a remarkable sense of humor because he never repeats the same joke. I do not understand how he does it. His stories are always delightful to hear.

The Senator from Virginia is also known as a guardian of the Public Treasury. He has done a magnificent job in that respect, both in the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Let me point out that the people of Wisconsin have been deeply impressed with the Senator from Virginia. He visited Wisconsin and spoke before our bankers association in Milwaukee, and he made a deep impression upon them.

I am very happy to have the honor to serve with the Senator from Virginia. I congratulate him on his birthday.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am happy to join in this tribute to the distinguished Senator from Virginia. I know of his skill in the field and in the stream. I have not had the pleasure of fishing or hunting with him, but I have covered the same territory after he has left it, and I know that his success has diminished my potential for success in whatever waters he was fishing—whether in the countryside or in the Senate.

I have enjoyed serving under his chairmanship of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I came to the Senate 5 or 6 years ago and found the Senator from Virginia to be always courteous, thoughtful, and willing to give a young Senator a share of the legislative load to carry, whether his views were consistent with his, or were in disagreement. I wish to express my personal appreciation to the Senator from Virginia for the thoughtfulness and cooperation which he has given me while I have been in the Senate.

I wish him many, many long years of continued, successful public service.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I promised to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, and then to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Mississippi and other Senators in paying my respects to a very great Member of Congress. By that I mean the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson].

It has been my great pleasure, through the years, to serve with him as a Representative, and also as a Senator at the present time. I served with him in the House, where he was an acknowledged leader on matters of taxation by being a member of the most important Ways and Means Committee of that distinguished body.

He came to the Senate a considerable number of years before I did, and when I reached here, he had already become the leader of this august body in taking his part in the role of writing appropriations and banking and currency legislation.

I serve on the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office of the Committee on Appropriations with the Senator from Virginia. I have never seen a man able to go from the price of a postage stamp and the delivery of a first-class letter on to what the cost of a Coast Guard cutter should be. He speaks with great erudition. From there he can go to a discussion of a hotrod automobile for the Secret Service and how much it would cost.

The junior Senator from Virginia is truly a versatile man. No one dares to try to match him in the art of telling a story, or the lore of the ways of hunting and fishing.

I join my colleagues in congratulating the Senator on this very happy occasion of celebrating his birthday.

Mr. STENNIS. I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the young man who sits behind me in the Chamber.

No mention has been made of his age. I do not suppose he will mind if I tell the Senate that today he is only 78. I understand that there are only two Senators who are older than he.

Mr. President, I have occasion to visit with him frequently in the baths in the Old Senate Office Building. He keeps in trim by taking his "daily dozen." I hope for him much success. I express the hope that many of his colleagues will do what he does; namely, go out and take exercise every day. I am sure it would mean a longer life for them.

In addition to his "daily dozen," I know how my colleague dearly loves to spend as much time as possible behind his bird dogs cutting across the beautiful fields of Virginia. I know that he keeps his shooting eye in on both quail and ducks, and only regret that neither he nor I can find the time we were once able to spend out in the open.

I hope my good friend can continue to find time for hunting for many years to come, however, because on occasion I have been so fortunate as to share in the birds knocked down by his sharp eye and steady hand.

I fully agree with the editorial from which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] quoted. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] should be returned to this body with an overwhelming election victory next year.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have been hunting with the Senator from Virginia many times, and he never failed to walk me down. I do not leave until it grows so dark I can see the flash of a gun. I do not know how much longer he stays. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest to Senators that all of us can be nunc pro tunc. I wish to include my happy birthday wish to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

I have served under him as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I can attest to his youth, his mettle, and his spirit.

There is no man with whom I would rather disagree than the Senator from Virginia, because he is so very pleasant, kind, and understanding about it. He is also a great sportsman.

Today, I certainly join in paying tribute to him, as one who serves with him, who has observed his sterling qualities, and has come to admire him greatly.

I wish him a happy birthday, as we say in my faith, until 120.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks that have been made by my colleagues concerning the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, WILLIS ROBERTSON.

To those who have referred to his fishing, and to his hunting of quail, I am happy to say that my State of West Virginia is one of the States in which our colleague most often casts his fishing line and shoots the quail.

I have enjoyed serving in this body with Senator ROBERTSON. I sat with the Committee on Banking and Currency for a period of about 2 years. I marveled at his ability, his fairness, and his courage. I have sat at prayer breakfast with him, and I have marveled at his tremendous knowledge, not only of the Bible, but also of history.

I marvel even more at his ability to quote the Scriptures and the lines and words of great men. I congratulate the people of the State of Virginia on their good judgment in having elected WILLIS ROBERTSON year after year to serve them in the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

If I may be permitted to choose a bit of verse which I believe epitomizes my thoughts on this man and the thoughts which have been expressed by other Senators today, it would be that poem which was written by J. G. Holland some years ago entitled "Wanted":

> God, give us men. A time like this demands
> Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
> Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
> Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
> Men who possess opinions and a will;
> Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
> Men who can stand before a demagog
> And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking.
> Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
> In public duty and in private thinking;
> For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,
> Their large professions and their little deeds,
> Mingle in selfish strife, lo. Freedom weeps,
> Wrong rules the land and waiting justice sleeps.
> God give us men.
> Men who serve not for selfish booty,
> But real men, courageous, who flinch not at duty.
> Men of dependable character; men of sterling worth.
> Then wrongs will be redressed and right will rule the earth.
> God, give us men.

I think of WILLIS ROBERTSON as such a man. May this be a happy birthday for him, and may he long serve the people of Virginia and the Nation.

Mr. STENNIS. Very well said indeed. I thank the Senator. I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am very happy to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from West Virginia, and others. It is one of the blessings of the State of Maryland that we are juxtaposed to and border on the great Old Dominion State of Virginia.

I can remember my father telling me of WILLIS ROBERTSON many years ago. Since I came to the Senate he has gone out of his way to be kind to me, a freshman Senator. Even today he took 15 minutes out of his busy schedule to meet with a constituent and me to give us advice.

To me he epitomizes all those things which the great Virginian, Robert E. Lee, stood for in his lifetime. I hope that Senator ROBERTSON will be here for many more years.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, this is a very delightful way to celebrate my 78th anniversary, which includes 49 consecutive years in public office.

I must plead guilty to the soft impeachment of age which has been attributed to me by my good friend and colleague, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Not long ago, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] took me on a fishing trip in Georgia, to a very delightful lodge. Over one of its doors was a sign which read: "More people die of worry than from overwork, because more people worry."

Mr. President, so long as I can have the friendship of the Members of this body, all of whom—as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has said—are younger than I am, except two, and will treat me as though I were their age; so long as I can have the friendship evidenced by my loyal friends in Virginia, who have urged me to be a candidate for reelection next year, I am not going to die of worry.

I thank my friends in the Senate. I shall always cherish their high tributes, although I recognize that they are really exercising the privilege of painting the lily.

Mr. STENNIS. Do not discount our words. We mean every one of them.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with order number 238, and that they be called in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed to state the items referred to.

MAJ. RAYMOND G. CLARK, JR.

The bill (S. 45) for the relief of Maj. Raymond G. Clark, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Major Raymond G. Clark, Junior, United States Army, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $1,285.23, representing the amount of overpayments of longevity pay which the said Major Raymond G. Clark, Junior, received for the period from May 19, 1950, through June 30, 1963, while serving as a member of the United States Army, such overpayments having been made to the said Major Raymond G. Clark, Junior, as a result of his being erroneously credited, for pay purposes, with service for certain periods during which he was enrolled as a temporary member of the United States Coast Guard Reserve. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Major Raymond G. Clark, Junior, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provision of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 248), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would relieve Maj. Raymond G. Clark, Jr., U.S. Army, of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $1,285.23, representing the amount of overpayments of longevity pay which he received for the period from May 19, 1950, through June 30, 1963, while serving as a member of the U.S. Army, such overpayments having been made as a result of his being erroneously credited, for pay purposes, with service for certain period during which he was enrolled as a temporary member of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve. Provision is made that in the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved; and section 2 of the bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Maj. Raymond G. Clark, Jr., the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of the bill.

MRS. GENEVIEVE OLSEN

The bill (S. 69) for the relief of Mrs. Genevieve Olsen was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Genevieve Olsen, of Ogden, Utah, the sum of $3,375, in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries resulting in permanent partial disability which were sustained by the said Chester J. Olsen on October 10, 1953, while he was performing duties as an employee of the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by an agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 249), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The bill would authorize payment of the sum of $3,375 to Mrs. Genevieve Olsen, of Ogden, Utah, the widow of Chester J. Olsen, in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries resulting in permanent partial disability sustained by Chester J. Olsen on October 10, 1953, while performing duties as an employee of the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

LT. RAYMOND E. BERUBE, JR.

The bill (S. 97) for the relief of Lt. Raymond E. Berube, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lieutenant Raymond E. Berube, Junior, United States Navy, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $797.27, representing the amount of overpayments of basic pay received by the said Lieutenant Raymond E. Berube, Junior, for the period July 1, 1960, through June 30, 1964, such overpayments having been made as a result of his having been erroneously credited for pay purposes with military service previously performed as a midshipman in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lieutenant Raymond E. Berube, Junior, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 250), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve the claimant, Lt. Raymond E. Berube, Jr., U.S. Navy, of liability to repay to the United States the sum of $797.27, the amount of overpayments of basic pay received by him for the period July 1, 1960, through June 30, 1964, which overpayments were made as a result of his having been erroneously credited for pay purposes with military service previously performed as a midshipman in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

LLOYD K. HIROTA

The bill (S. 134) for the relief of Lloyd K. Hirota was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lloyd K. Hirota, of Aiea, Hawaii, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $782.93, representing overpayments of salary which he received as a civilian employee of the United States Army, Office of the Quartermaster, at Honolulu, Hawaii, for the period from October 10, 1954, through June 16, 1962, such overpayments having been made as the result of administrative error in establishing his salary rate when he was erroneously promoted from grade GS–3y to grade GS–4x, effective as of October 10, 1954. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Lloyd K. Hirota, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 251), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve Lloyd K. Hirota, of Aiea, Hawaii, of liability to repay to the United States the sum of $782.93, the amount of overpayment of salary resulting from an administrative error, and to pay him the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayment.

HONORATA A. VDA DE NARRA

The bill (S. 263) for the relief of Honorata A. Vda de Narra was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed (1) to accept any application filed within one year after the date of enactment of this Act by Honorata A. Vda de Narra of the Republic of the Philippines for the payment of insurance benefits previously authorized under section 602(d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 (now repealed), and (2) to pay to the said Honorata A. Vda de Narra any insurance benefits the Administrator determines would have been payable to her under such section had she made application for such benefits within the time period prescribed by section 602(d)(5) of such Act, the said Honorata A. Vda de Narra not having been officially notified by the Department of the Army until January 29, 1958, of the death of her son, Florentino A. Narra, who died on March 1, 1942, while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 252), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs (1) to accept any application filed within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act by Honorata A. Vda de Narra of the Republic of the Philippines for the payment of insurance benefits previously authorized under section 602(d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 (now repealed), and (2) to pay to the said Honorata A. Vda de Narra any insurance benefits the Administrator determines would have been payable to her under such section had she made application for such benefits within the time period prescribed by section 602(d)(5) of such act, the said Honorata A. Vda de Narra not having been officially notified by the Department of the Army until January 29, 1958, of the death of her son, Florentino A. Narra, who died on March 1, 1942, while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 304) for the relief of W. J. B. Daniel was announced as next in order.

Mr. FANNIN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 321) for the relief of Leo M. Mondry was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ROBERT L. WOLVERTON

The bill (S. 572) for the relief of Robert L. Wolverton was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Robert L. Wolverton, of Fenton, Missouri, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $1,260.23, representing overpayments of salary which he received as a civilian employee of the United States Army, Corps of Engineers, St. Louis District, Missouri, for the period from September 24, 1962, through December 28, 1963, such overpayments having been made as a result of administrative error in establishing his salary rate at the maximum scheduled rate of the grade to which he was appointed, in violation of section 801 of the Act of October 28, 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1131), which provides that all new appointments shall be made at the minimum rate of the appropriate grade. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Robert L. Wolverton, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 255), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve Robert L. Wolverton, of Fenton, Mo., of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $1,260.23, representing overpayments of salary which he received as a civilian employee of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Louis district, Missouri, for the period from September 24, 1962, through December 28, 1963, such overpayments having been made as a result of administrative error in establishing his salary rate at the maximum scheduled rate of the grade to which he was appointed, in violation of section 801 of the act of October 28, 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1131), which provides that all new appointments shall be made at the minimum rate of the appropriate grade. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, it is provided that full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

LT. COL. WILLIAM T. SCHUSTER, U.S. AIR FORCE (RETIRED)

The bill (S. 919) for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lieutenant Colonel William T. Schuster, United States Air Force (retired), is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $4,153.83, representing the amount of overpayments of longevity pay received by the said Lieutenant Colonel William T. Schuster (retired), for the period from December 27, 1941, through August 31, 1960, as a result of administrative error in the computation of his creditable service for pay purposes. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Lieutenant Colonel William T. Schuster (retired), referred to in the first section of this Act, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 256), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired), of liability to the United States for $4,153.83. The amount represents overpayments of longevity pay received by Lieutenant Colonel Schuster. Overpayments were received during the period December 27, 1941, through August 31, 1960. They resulted from an administrative error in the computation of his creditable service. The bill allows for credit in the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer for the amounts involved. The bill authorizes refund to Lieutenant Colonel Schuster of amounts received or withheld from him because of the overpayments.

OTTILIA BRUEGMANN JAMES

The bill (S. 1008) for the relief of Ottilia Bruegmann James was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the limitation on the time within which applications for disability retirement are required to be filed under section 7(b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2257(b)) is hereby waived in favor of Ottilia Bruegmann James, a former employee of the Department of the Army, and her claim for disability retirement under such Act shall be acted upon under the other applicable provisions of such Act as if her application had been timely filed, if she files application for such disability retirement within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act for any period prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, benefits payable by reason of the enactment of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to waive the limitation on the time within which applications for disability retirement are required to be filed under the Civil Service Retirement Act in favor of the claimant, a former employee of the Department of the Army.

Official records disclose that Mrs. Ottilia Bruegmann James, a Department of the Army employee with over 29 years of Federal civilian service, resigned from her last permanent position on February 28, 1961, to accompany her husband, an Army warrant officer, to Honolulu, Hawaii. While in Hawaii she held a series of temporary appointments, with several weeks of unemployment between positions, at Headquarters, U.S. Army, Hawaii, from May 22, 1961, to July 27, 1963.

Mrs. James underwent an operation for a brain tumor on January 10, 1964, at the U.S. Army Tripler General Hospital in Hawaii and is considered incapacitated for future employment. On March 4, 1964, she applied to the U.S. Civil Service Commission for disability retirement benefits. Her claim was denied by the Commission on May 21, 1964, on the ground that an applicant for disability retirement must file for these benefits within 1 year following separation from the last period of permanent employment (70 Stat. 750 (1956), 5 U.S.C. 2257(b) (1958)). The temporary appointments held by Mrs. James in Hawaii did not come within the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Enactment of this legislation would waive the 1-year statute of limitations governing the filing of disability retirement claims and permit the U.S. Civil Service Commission to determine whether Mrs. James was entitled to disability retirement benefits at the time of her last period of permanent employment provided she applies for such benefits within 60 days of the enactment of this legislation. As the present bill pertains to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, the Department of the Army defers to the views of that agency.

FRED E. STARR

The bill (S. 1068) for the relief of Fred E. Starr was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized and directed to provide for the transportation of the household goods and personal effects of Fred E. Starr, a former employee of the Department of the Air Force assigned to Headquarters, Pacific Air Force, Hawaii, from his last oversea duty station, Honolulu, Hawaii, to his permanent residence in Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin, and to pay, out of any funds available for the payment of transporting household goods, any unpaid storage charges which may be due on such household goods and personal effects at the time of shipment.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Fred E. Starr, the sum of $1,095.28 in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for expenses incurred by the said Fred E. Starr in storing the household goods and personal effects referred to in section 1 of this Act prior to the shipment thereof authorized by this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1068 is to provide for the shipment at Government expense of the household goods and personal effects of Mr. Fred E. Starr, a former Air Force civilian employee at Headquarters, Pacific Air Forces (PACAF), Hawaii, from Honolulu, Hawaii, to his permanent residence in Menomonee Falls, Wis.; to pay any unpaid storage charges which may be due on such property at the time of shipment; and to reimburse Mr. Starr the sum of $1,095.28, representing storage charges paid by him.

JACK C. WINN, JR.

The bill (S. 1267) for the relief of Jack C. Winn, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Jack C. Winn, Junior, of Roswell, New Mexico, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $721.25, representing overpayments made on the date of his release from active duty in the United States Army on April 18, 1958, as a result of administrative error in the computation of payments due for accrued leave and excess leave. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Jack C. Winn, Junior, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 259), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve Jack C. Winn, Jr., of Roswell, N. Mex., of liability to repay the sum of $721.25, representing overpayments made on the date of his release from active duty in the U.S. Army on April 18, 1958, as a result of administrative error in the computation of payments due for accrued leave and excess leave.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 1867) for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ROBERT L. YATES, AND OTHERS

The bill (H.R. 2299) for the relief of Robert L. Yates, and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 26), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve 10 individuals who are present or former Air Force civilian employees at Brookley Air Force Base, Ala., of all liability to refund to the United States certain amounts representing overpayments of compensation. The overpayments were the result of administrative error in adjusting the rates of pay at the time of reclassification of the positions from the wage board system to positions under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

VERMONT MAPLE ORCHARDS, INC., BURLINGTON, VT.

The bill (H.R. 3051) for the relief of Vermont Maple Orchards, Inc., Burlington, Vt., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 262), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize and direct the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of the Vermont Maple Orchards, Inc., Burlington, Vt., arising out of participation in the St. Eriks Fair, Stockholm, Sweden, during the summer of 1963. An amount not to exceed $2,671.21 may be allowed in full and final settlement of the claim.

MAXIE L. STEVENS

The bill (H.R. 3074) for the relief of Maxie L. Stevens was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 263), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to pay to Maxie L. Stevens the sum of $1,519.54 in full settlement of his claim for medical expenses and transportation associated with medical treatment related to his employment by the U.S. Weather Bureau on Wake Island.

C. R. SHEAFFER & SONS

The bill (H.R. 3899) for the relief of C. R. Sheaffer & Sons was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 264), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation to pay C. R. Sheaffer & Sons the sum of $3,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses and losses incurred in vacating premises at the municipal fish wharves within the southwest urban renewal area at the direction of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

AMERICAN BANKING—SOUND AND UNIQUE—ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR HARRIS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma spoke at the State convention of the Oklahoma Bankers Association, on May 7, in Tulsa. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] is a member of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and has taken an active part in the Senate banking inquiry. He speaks with insight and authority on the Banking Industry and on governmental regulation of this industry. I believe the portion of his speech dealing with the banking industry will be of interest to all Members of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BANKING—SOUND AND UNIQUE

Everybody agrees that the American system of private banks is sound and unique. No changes should be made in the laws or administration of this system without a great deal of study and serious thought.

On direction of the U.S. Senate, the permanent Senate Investigating Subcommittee, of which I am a member and of which Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, is chairman, is now conducting a banking inquiry.

While the inquiry may be embarrassing and at times painful for those in the industry, I believe the overall effect will be wholesome, because already there are indications of needed improvements in banking laws and procedures.

Our able chairman has made it clear from the very first that we are seeking, not sensationalism, but hard suggestions and indications where proper improvements may be made. Furthermore, he has followed a rigid policy of discussing in public only those banks which have been closed, so as not to cause harm to any bank still in operation.

Hearings were resumed this week, and I think it is possible the inquiry will continue through this session and even into the next one.

And, before it is finished, I look for the inquiry to focus further on so-called money brokers, on attempts by some unsavory characters to enter the banking industry and, also, to inquire into the operations of certain savings and loan associations.

As a result of our hearings thus far, there are obvious areas where improvements are in order. I want to emphasize that these are tentative and no final decisions have, of course, been reached. Many of these points were included in my "Report to Oklahoma Bankers" issued last month.

All of the banks which have failed, or are teetering on the brink of failure, which the committee has examined in detail to date, either were newly chartered banks or banks in which ownership had recently changed hands.

Therefore, it is on these situations my recommendations to date are focused.

Without question there is real room for improvement in the operation of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. I think there has been justified criticism of his rather openhanded chartering of new banks. Our testimony reveals that there has been rather lax examination procedures on applications for new charters, some sad experiences in connection with which have already caused tighter requirements in that office.

There has been a lack of cooperation on the part of the Comptroller of the Currency with the Federal Reserve Board, FDIC, and the Justice Department, although, since our hearings began, improvements have been made in this regard. In one particular case of a now closed bank, for example, the Comptroller possessed evidence of gross and criminal misconduct by a bank official, but did not furnish this information to the Justice Department or to the lending Federal Reserve Board or to the insuring Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation until 12 months after the violations were committed, 9 months after the examination revealed them and 8 months after the regional comptroller had recommended that the matter be turned over to the Justice Department. This was a case involving a bank newly chartered by the present Comptroller.

It is imperative that the presently vague criteria for establishing a new bank be better defined and stated and that standardized, publicly announced, quasi-judicial hearings and procedures be established so that all parties concerned may testify for or against the granting of a new bank charter.

Testimony before the committee clearly reveals that in another case of a newly chartered bank which failed, such a hearing would probably have revealed evidence which would have caused the charter to be denied.

Tighter examinations and surveillance by the Comptroller's office is definitely indicated for a beginning period after an existing bank has changed hands. Sad experiences in this regard, also, have already caused that office to institute some improvements in this area.

Our hearings already indicate other areas of the banking laws need tightening. False statements to secure a loan from a bank insured by FDIC should be a violation of Federal law, just as it is when the statement is furnished to a federally insured savings and loan institution. False statements in an application for a bank charter should be more easily prosecuted under new criminal laws written and included in the U.S. Banking Code.

Further, there must be some limitation and restriction upon the newly developed practice of so-called money brokers furnishing deposits to a bank under certificates of deposit. This is a questionable, dangerous, and growing practice which has been involved in the recent failure of several banks. In some areas of the country, our evidence reveals, many banks needing deposits or compensating balances, have yielded to the temptation of paying high and sometimes exorbitant fees to money brokers for deposits. The inevitable result of the payment of such fees is the banks making loans, which would normally be classified as unbankable and too risky, in order to get a greater than usual return to keep up with the greater than usual amounts they are having to pay for deposits.

Unless this practice of money brokers is limited and restricted, unless there is some curtailment, licensing, or supervision of those engaged in the practice, the whole thing is likely to spread to other banks and other areas of the country, as they take up the practice in order to meet the increased competition for deposits.

I think we need laws to prohibit the bulk of beginning capital in a new bank being money borrowed on a pledge of the new bank's stock. We have been investigating a situation where a group of people got control of eight banks with an initial investment of only $2,000, making all of the acquisitions or getting a new charter on borrowed money, sometimes at 100 percent of the value involved and always by pledging the bank stock as collateral for the loan.

In this instance, as some of the notes became due and couldn't be paid, the whole house of cards fell, taking down with it some of the banks, leaving the others in a precarious position.

One further thing. I feel that we should not yet accept the suggestion some have made for a greater centralization of Federal bank authority in some kind of agency which would combine the powers now reposed in the Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

These agencies are doing a better job of working together now than they previously were, and further improvements will be made, I am certain. I think that there is real strength in our system of diverse banking jurisdiction.

But further, and most important, our system of private banking in America is overwhelmingly sound. In 1964 and thus far in 1965, only 11 of the 14,000 private banks have had to close their doors.

We want to make improvements where indicated, but the system, itself, has proved to be sound and strong, developed through long experience and in response to the needs of our people, and ought not to be substantially altered on the evidence now at hand.

The American system of private banking is sound and unique. I want to work with you to help keep it so.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consulting with the calendar committee members on the other side of the aisle, and with their approval, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 237, H.R. 3708.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3708) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Works with amendments on page 14, after line 24, to strike out:

> (c) The Secretary shall make no grant or contract under this title in any State which has established or designated a State agency for purposes of section 303(a)(1) unless such agency has approved such grant or contract.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

> (c) The Secretary shall make no grant or contract under this title in any State which has established or designated a State agency for purposes of section 303(a)(1) unless the Secretary has consulted with such State agency regarding such grant or contract.

On page 16, after line 2, to strike out:

> (c) The Secretary shall make no grant or contract under this title in any State which has established or designated a State agency for purposes of section 303(a)(1) unless such agency has approved such grant or contract.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

> (c) The Secretary shall make no grant or contract under this title in any State which has established or designated a State agency for purposes of section 303(a)(1) unless the Secretary has consulted with such State agency regarding such grant or contract.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 247), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE AND EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill provides for an Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under a Commissioner on Aging, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Ten objectives are listed, including income, health, housing, research, and employment. (See sec. 101 of section-by-section analysis.)

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to States for (i) community planning and coordination of programs for older citizens, (ii) demonstration projects, (iii) training of special personnel, and (iv) other programs to carry out the purposes of the act; to make grants and contracts with public or nonprofit agencies, organizations, institutes, or individuals for study, development, demonstration, and evaluation projects; and to make grants and contracts with any public or nonprofit agency, organization, or institution for specialized training of personnel.

The duties of the Administration are to—

(1) serve as a clearinghouse for information related to problems of the aged and aging;

(2) assist the Secretary in all matters pertaining to problems of the aged and aging;

(3) administer the grants provided by this act;

(4) develop plans, conduct and arrange for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging;

(5) provide technical assistance and consultation to States and political subdivisions thereof with respect to programs for the aged and aging;

(6) prepare, publish, and disseminate educational materials dealing with the welfare of older persons;

(7) gather statistics in the field of aging which other Federal agencies are not collecting; and

(8) stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services for the aged and aging.

There is established an Advisory Committee on Older Americans consisting of the

Commissioner as Chairman, and 15 persons appointed by the Secretary who are experienced in or have demonstrated particular interest in special problems of the aging.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I point out one change made by the committee. In my judgment, it is a change which would be very important to the States. It would require consultation in respect to activities carried out under the bill with the State authorities. It would not be a veto, but State authorities would be fully informed and given an opportunity to participate in what studies, et cetera, are being made. I think that is a distinct improvement in the bill.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it is a source of great satisfaction to me that the Senate today has given unanimous approval to the Older Americans Act of 1965.

This is a great day for the more than 18 million Americans who are 65 and over.

The bill we have approved today differs only slightly from the version approved March 31 by the House of Representatives. Hopefully, the House will accept the Senate amendments without a conference and the act can go quickly to the White House for the President's approval.

The Senate action today climaxes an effort that dates back to the first National Conference on Aging, convened by President Harry S. Truman in 1950.

Further, it follows through on the recommendation by the 1961 White House Conference on Aging.

Extensive examination has been made of the problems of our senior citizens beginning with the 86th Congress by the Special Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, of which I was chairman. It was continued by the Special Committee on Aging, which I directed in the 87th Congress and which continues its useful work today.

All of these studies and public hearings pointed to the need for a high-level agency, within the Federal Government, exclusively concerned with the problems of the elderly, and for a program of grants-in-aid for State programs on aging.

I should like to pause here to pay tribute to the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island. His dedicated and skillful handling of this legislation in the House has made final approval possible.

For several years now, Congressman FOGARTY and I have jointly introduced legislation to achieve the purposes of this act.

It is worth noting, I believe, that this bill—a major piece of legislation—is unusual in that it originated within the Congress rather than as a recommendation from the administration.

While it now has administration support, its origin, concept, and development took place entirely within the Congress.

It is worth noting too, that this legislation has attracted widespread, bipartisan support, as the 394-to-1 vote in the House and the unanimous action of the Senate attests. A total of 23 Senators joined me in cosponsoring the Senate version of this measure.

As I noted earlier, the Senate has made only minor changes in H.R. 3708, the bill approved by the House. These amendments would remove the requirement that State agencies must approve grant programs or contracts with public and nonprofit organizations for research and demonstration projects and specialized training of personnel.

However, the bill stipulates that the Secretary must consult with the State agency before authorizing these grants or contracts.

I believe this will prove to be a satisfactory arrangement.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 has a dual purpose:

First, it will establish an Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

Second, it will authorize a 5-year program of Federal grants to the State and to public and private nonprofit agencies for research, training, community planning, and demonstration projects relating to aging.

The bill also creates a new position of Commissioner on Aging, appointed by the President and subject to confirmation by the Senate, to be head of the Administration on Aging. In addition, the act provides for an Advisory Committee on Older Americans consisting of 15 citizen members who have experience and interest in the special problems of the aging, with the Commissioner on Aging as Chairman.

An important result of this act will be to erase the stigma of welfare from the problems of older people, by removing the function from the Welfare Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and giving it coequal status as a separate Administration.

The functions of the Administration on Aging are defined in the act as follows:

First. Serve as a clearinghouse for information related to problems of the aged and aging.

Second. Assist the Secretary in all matters pertaining to problems of the aged and aging.

Third. Administer the grants provided by this act.

Fourth. Develop plans, conduct and arrange for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging.

Fifth. Provide technical assistance and consultation to States and political subdivisions thereof with respect to programs for the aged and aging.

Sixth. Prepare, publish, and disseminate educational materials dealing with the welfare of older persons.

Seventh. Gather statistics in the field of aging which other Federal agencies are not collecting; and

Eighth. Stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services for the aged and aging.

The act also encourages the establishment of State agencies on aging by providing grants to the States, the District of Columbia, Virgin Islands, Guam, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa. Title III authorizes $5 million in fiscal 1966 and $8 million in fiscal 1967. In order to qualify for these grants, a State plan must be submitted to the Secretary which includes the following:

First. A single State agency.

Second. Financial participation by the State or communities in the projects and activities under the plan to insure continuation after termination of Federal financial support.

Third. Programs and activities to carry out the purposes of the act, including furnishing services to public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations.

Fourth. Methods of administration including personnel standards on a merit basis.

Fifth. Approval of projects of public or nonprofit agencies or organizations.

Sixth. State reports.

The $5 million authorized for the States will be allocated in the amount of $50,000 to each State, with the remainder distributed under a formula based on the ratio of the population aged 65 or over in such State bears to the national population aged 65 or over.

These grants to States require State participation for each project in an amount equal to 25 percent of the cost of the project in the first year, 40 percent the second year, and 50 percent the third year.

Under titles IV and V, grants and contracts may be authorized by the Secretary with public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, institutions or individuals for demonstration and evaluation projects and for specialized training of personnel to carry out the purposes of the act. For these purposes, $1.5 million in fiscal 1966 and $3 million in fiscal 1967 is authorized.

I believe the Federal Government in cooperation with State and local governments should assist the older people to attain the full and free enjoyment of the objectives contained in the act, as follows:

First. An adequate income in retirement in accordance with the American standard of living.

Second. The best possible physical and mental health which science can make available and without regard to economic status.

Third. Suitable housing, independently selected, designed, and located with reference to special needs and available at costs which older citizens can afford.

Fourth. Full restorative services for those who require institutional care.

Fifth. Opportunity for employment with no discriminatory personnel practices because of age.

Sixth. Retirement in health, honor, dignity—after years of contribution to the economy.

Seventh. Pursuit of meaningful activity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreational opportunities.

Eighth. Efficient community services which provide social assistance in a coordinated manner and which are readily available when needed.

Ninth. Immediate benefit from proven research knowledge which can sustain and improve health and happiness.

Tenth. Freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives.

Senate approval of H.R. 3708 is an impressive step toward achieving these objectives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 3708) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my personal appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and other members of the calendar committee for clearing the bill for consideration this afternoon.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DODD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am privileged to receive communications from citizens from all over the United States calling to my attention developments in education and items of interest to education.

Today, I should like to share with the Senate a speech which was delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Connecticut last May 15 to the annual convention of the Massachusetts Vocational Association which is, in my judgment, of interest and importance to all Senators.

Education and juvenile delinquency are interrelated subjects. The quality of the education we offer our young people I believe to be inversely correlated with juvenile delinquency rates. The better the schools do the jobs, the less work our other social agencies will have to do. But until the day arrives when each of our schools can be raised to the standards now set by the best, it will be necessary for us to invest heavily in services to the child in trouble.

Certainly, Senator DODD points out the services we are beginning to provide under the authorities of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act are very important in this total context. Physical and mental health of children, as he suggests in his stimulating address are areas needing more attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] to which I have referred be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD AT THE MASSACHUSETTS VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONVENTION, NORTH DARTMOUTH, MASS., SATURDAY, MAY 15, 1965

I am pleased and privileged to be here today with those who have made a national and even an international reputation in the vital field of vocational education—the members of the Massachusetts Vocational Association.

You and I are really in the same field, that of helping our young people to build constructive, decent, fruitful lives.

Your primary task is to prepare them for a productive place in society, and your success in that is widely known and heralded.

My field, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, is to try to find ways of preventing boys and girls from being already warped and destroyed by the time they come to your classroom—and I wish that I could claim the success that you have enjoyed.

But we are making progress in many directions.

A variety of youth programs centered around the school dropout is now underway.

Today I wish to speak about a vitally critical area that has up to now received far less attention—the very young, the preschool and primary school child.

Ten years ago, a group of social scientists made a study and ventured some predictions that should have a stunning impact on contemporary society.

The subject of this inquiry was a large number of 6-year olds who were starting school in a Bronx slum.

Its object was to predict the future for the youngsters.

What kind of people would they have become 10 years hence?

Would they be climbing toward productive lives or on their way to prison?

The factors in this study were the child's family and neighborhood; and for most of the slum first-graders these factors were uniformly bleak—an unknown or absentee father; a delinquent or overly permissive mother; a vice infested neighborhood; grinding poverty on the outskirts of plenty; and the total absence of authority, discipline, and good example, lacking even the elemental germs of culture or worthy endeavor.

On the basis of all measurable influences the sociologists made individual forecasts on the fate of each child and foretold for most a useless and futile life of degeneracy and crime—unless something in the picture changed.

Ten years passed.

The sociologists checked out their tragic prognoses and sadly pronounced them to be incredibly accurate.

By the age of 16 almost every one of the designated innocents of a decade before was well advanced from promiscuity into hardened criminality.

There were 3 deviations; 3 out of 200 were spared.

And when the sociologists inquired as to why, they found that in each case their predictions were upset by the unexpected intervention of an outside influence—a concerned and dedicated grandmother who took over the child's upbringing just in time to cheat the grim pattern of predictability from claiming another foreordained victim.

Surely this episode confronts our people with some jarring questions that do not yield to the comfortable formulations of old.

If these children could be scientifically consigned to prison as infants because of the inheritance they received from society, what light is thus thrown on the theological dogma of free will, or upon the political concept of free choice, or upon the judicial doctrine of due process of law, in its broadest sense?

To say the least, they seem largely inoperative when environmental circumstances sink below certain levels of decency.

And if we are to proceed with our war on crime, against what or whom is it to be mounted?

Against conditions which breed criminals with almost infallible mathematical precision?

Or against the youths whose essential crime is that they are the faithful products of their environment, just as much as is the Irish girl in the convent or the Oxford don who wears tweeds, speaks the King's English and conducts learned inquiries?

The questions answer themselves.

Against this sombre background, the familiar remedies—more dogs, longer nightsticks, stiffer sentences, more foot patrolmen, are revealed as non sequiturs.

They are necessary, to be sure.

But necessary for what?

Not to win a war against what we like to think of as an alien condition called crime, but rather to defend society from the retribution of its own undisownable product.

We can go on multiplying canine corps and radio patrols until the squad cars outnumber the 6 years olds, and still the streets will not be safe nor the prisons sufficient.

Or we can do something else, we can stop reproducing this monstrous byproduct of our civilization with which the police are desperately grappling.

The only practical answer, the only intelligible answer—even leaving aside such considerations as idealism and charity—is for society to perform the role of the intervening grandmother for all those 6 year olds who have no interested grandmother, or anyone else who cares enough about them to introduce love, direction and discipline into their lives.

Social science is able to do far more than to accurately predict the degeneration and imprisonment of infants who have not even reached the age of reason.

If society can diagnose a towheaded boy as an inevitable criminal on the day he enrolls in the first grade, then it can also meet him at the school door with the means of deliverance—whether it be a social worker, or a psychologist, or a "big brother," or a grandmother.

One of the gravest weaknesses of our society is that its redemptive organs, its saving forces, do not begin to function in most places until too late, until the child has already been warped into a chronic rebel or an incipient lawbreaker.

This need not be so; it is preposterous that it is so.

If free will, free choice, and equal justice are to have full meaning the community must take on some overseeing role in the life of every child likely to have been abandoned at birth, so far as life's essentials are concerned.

The Commissioner of the District of Columbia, Mr. Walter Tobriner, recently requested that the law for Washington be changed to require doctors to report to authorities on gunshot wounds and the physical abuse of children.

That this should have to be proposed in our Nation's Capital in the year 1965 is of itself a dismal commentary on the heedlessness and irresponsibility of adult society.

But, things being as they are, can we not go further than the good Commissioner?

Why cannot we set up machinery for periodic physical and emotional checkups from birth on for children enduring those conditions so neatly categorized by the unerring crime forecasters?

The skilled eye can usually perceive whether there is something physically or mentally wrong.

We are told that a child experiences about half of his mental and emotional growth during his first 5 years of life.

Yet this is the very period when the child is beyond the scope of our civilized institutions and is at the mercy of chance—the chance that he will be granted the blessing of good and enlightened parents.

For many an infant, this supreme gamble of life is lost; far better for them to have been born orphans and to have had their parents selected and their environment watched over by an adoption agency.

We must lift the veil that shrouds those early years.

Many communities require an annual inspection of automobiles to protect the public safety.

How about children?

Public policy has begun to move in this direction.

This summer the Federal war-on-poverty program, working in cooperation with hundreds of communities, will conduct preschool clinics for 500,000 youngsters, aged 4 and 5.

The children involved will be primarily slum children who are already so far behind their contemporaries in the rudiments of civilization as to be virtually counted out in the race of life at its outset and unable to meet the meager demands of the first grade.

This effort seeks to bridge the cultural gap and the health gap that yawns so incredibly between the underprivileged and the average.

Its directors are prepared to find that a high percentage of these preschool youngsters are suffering from malnutrition and hearing and eyesight failures which can be corrected.

Others will be unable to use or to understand the language sufficiently to know what is going on in a primary school classroom.

Still other tortured little souls will be emotionally unable, for a hundred dark and unknown reasons, to adapt to the classroom atmosphere without extensive remedial training.

I regard this program as one of the most intelligent and promising enterprises of our time, and I hope that every community will give the fullest cooperation.

But it faces great odds.

How much of the crimes against childhood can be undone in a few weeks of summer school?

How many of the children who most need this training will not attend, through parental neglect?

But it is an important step forward toward the assumption by society of its rightful responsibility toward the child and I hope and expect that it will lead toward the more comprehensive approach I have suggested today.

And I suggest further that every school, beginning with primary schools, have a unit concerned solely with the total health of each child in its care, with ready access to whatever mental and medical assistance that is needed.

Would that such concern and care had been available to Lee Harvey Oswald and a million like him who today roam the streets in bitterness and hatred.

What better investment can we make than that which heals the sick and the disturbed child—and prevents the adult invalid or psychopath?

Thankfully, under legislation begun by President Kennedy and carried forward by President Johnson, we have begun to build and to staff mental health cilnics in hundreds of cities for the public at large.

But how much more thorough we should be when it comes to children, in their precious, formative years, who do not know enough to go to a clinic, who do not know yet that they are sick, or that they have been robbed in infancy of that which we rightly declare to be the birthright of everyone.

The new clinics could serve hand in hand with the school facilities I have recommended, facilities financed in part through Federal aid, which has at last come to the assistance of our school systems.

There are two predictable objections to reforms of this kind:

One, we don't have the money.

Two, we don't have the right to meddle with a child's upbringing until a total catastrophe has occurred.

To the first objection I say that we must find the money. And if self-preservation remains man's primal instinct, we will find it, either for more and more prisons and police and perhaps even neighborhood pillboxes, or for remedial programs which fight the variable conditions instead of the constant effects.

And if we are really economy minded, we shall choose the latter, for the cost of curing a child is far less than that of caging a criminal.

We have already found the money for many other worthy programs.

We have already decided as a nation, for instance, that we will finance the medical and mental care of our aged.

Now, in the venerable tradition of first things last, I say again, how about the children?

The second objection, that society has no supervisory role over children until the time they enter reform school, is a foolish sentiment that the people of this country entertained and discarded long ago.

We faced this issue when we were trying to outlaw child labor and establish a minimum age for leaving school.

The self-styled moralists of those days, and the strange spokesmen for the dignity of the family, argued that only the father had the right, a divine and inherent right, to decide the fate of the child and to determine whether his 8-year-old should be schooled, or put to work in mine or factory, or regularly horsewhipped, for that matter.

In time, the American people decided that this was Old World nonsense, that society had a stake in and a responsibility to each child, that freedom was safe only in enlightened hands, and that children had some rights, too.

And besides that, our forefathers had broken with the concept of divine rights as far back as 1776, when they came out for human rights.

That view holds true today—and it must be extended to protect the abused and exploited youngsters of our day.

There must be a way for society to judge whether parents are fulfilling, by any civilized standard, their minimal trust, and a way of intervening, as did the grandmothers, in time to salvage the future of the child.

We all recognize this, of course.

The principle is firmly established in the law.

It is the application of the principle that is wanting.

We must stop waiting until flagrant abuse knocks us over the head, until the child stands in the prisoners dock, or lies in the hospital emergency room, before we assert our interest.

We must perfect our ways of uncovering these tragic miscarriages of trust, so easy to perceive.

I have described one approach, which I hope will receive consideration.

The concept that society must find effective methods of intervening to reverse the tide of disintegration that is engulfing large segments of our people is really at the heart of the practical and unpretentious social revolution of our time. This revolution finds its most ambitious and hopeful expression in the great programs of reform, rehabilitation and education proposed by President Lyndon Johnson.

But its guiding thought has for many years been the motivation of groups such as the Massachusetts Vocational Association—helping young people to help themselves through education.

Vocational education, in particular, is one of the keystones of our national effort to fight poverty, unemployment and crime.

Few satisfactions can equal that of teaching boys and girls the skills that will sustain them throughout life and enable them to be productive citizens, contributing greatly to the life of their communities.

And few endeavors reap such a harvest of public good.

So many things go hand in hand in our attempt to redeem our American civilization from the demoralization that threatens it.

Building up our schools.

Cleaning up our slums.

Curing our emotionally disturbed.

Ending discrimination.

Opening up opportunity.

Curbing the filth in our movie theaters and on our newsstands.

Controlling the insane traffic in guns and drugs.

Elevating the level of our popular art—television.

Improving the administration of justice.

Caring for neglected children—so many good things to be done.

And we are doing them.

And none is more important than the calling to which you have dedicated your lives.

Teach a boy a trade and you have given him something upon which he can fashion the building of his life.

And so it has been an honor for me to be with you today and to discuss these good causes with pioneers who have for many years been blazing the trail to that greater America for which we all hope and work and pray.

Thank you.

THE UNDECLARED WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my colleague in the House, Mrs. EDITH GREEN, has made a penetrating and eloquent statement in a discussion in explanation of a recent vote, on which she voted against the President's bill providing for a $700 million military appropriation to conduct his undeclared war in South Vietnam.

Of course, the bill was but a vehicle that the President used, by his own admission, to obtain a vote of confidence from the Congress of the United States in support of his unconstitutional war. Representative GREEN has made a statement as to why she voted against the appropriation. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. EDITH GREEN REGARDING ADDITIONAL $700 MILLION MILITARY APPROPRIATION REQUEST MAY 1965

Cloaked in the disguise of a military appropriation bill—this House was asked to approve—and did approve—this Government's policy of escalating the war in southeast Asia. Six of my colleagues and I dissented.

Since it is conceded by everyone, including the President, that the $700 million was not the issue at hand, then at a minimum, surely, in this body which the Speaker refers to as the greatest deliberative body in the world, there should be full discussion of what this resolution does mean while there is still time, hopefully, to resolve these tragic affairs before we bring down upon our heads the wrath of the world and shatter the frail edifice of world peace.

To my colleagues and my constituents I want to say that for many, many months now I have searched for every possible excuse to support my Government in the policies it is pursuing in Vietnam—and I have supported it. In spite of the shaky logic of the domino theory, I have done my very best to believe in it; in spite of the fact that the people of South Vietnam have been subjected to one unpopular and unstable dictatorship after another, I have done my best to believe we are defending their freedom; in spite of the fact that we have violated the Geneva accords, I have done my best to believe this was justified because the North Vietnamese did also; even though I know that two wrongs do not make a right; in spite of one humiliating military defeat after another, I have done my best to believe all the optimistic reports about our really winning the war over there; in spite of all the evidence of internal discord and revolt against the governments we maintain in power, I have done my best to believe this is what the Vietnamese people really want us to do—but my fellow Americans, there is a point beyond which credibility simply will not stretch—and it is that somehow by waging a wider war—we pursue a policy of peace.

This vote represented—in my opinion—a vote for that delusion. It could not have been a vote for $700 million, for the President himself said this was available in any case. It could not have been a vote to show our united determination to halt Communist aggression, for if more than a decade of effort, more than 400 American lives, more than $3 billion expended does not show this, then how can $700 million demonstrate it?

One of the things the vote could mean, though, is what in fact everyone knows it will be interpreted to mean and that is congressional approval for the continued bombings of North Vietnam and commitment of thousands and thousands of American troops to a war the justice and wisdom of which has been questioned inside and outside this Nation by citizens and friends of unimpeachable loyalty. I think it also clearly means the relinquishment by Congress of its constitutional authority to declare war, for if the President can direct bombing raids on North Vietnam by simple Executive fiat, why can he not direct similar action against any other nation at any other time?

Why bother to ask? Once the bomb is dropped, it can always be pointed out that rightly or wrongly—legally or illegally—we are in a war and that American lives are at stake and that it would be disloyal to not approve funds for the war.

I cannot in good conscience lend myself to that kind of devious usurpation of congressional power—and for the purpose of continuing a course of action which I believe will only reap at best, decades of hostility, enmity and distrust of my countrymen by the peoples of Asia or, at worst, utter catastrophe for my Nation and the world.

Yet but an hour and a half debate was allotted for discussion of a measure which profoundly affects the future of our country—and the world, and less than 15 minutes of that time was given to those who might have reservations—who might have questions—who might disagree. I find it impossible to understand why an admittedly unnecessary appropriation request need be mantled in a cloak of urgency and secret meaning with full, free and frank discussion of its merits denied.

The high point of these whole implausible proceedings was the speech of one of my colleagues who, in one breath, demanded withdrawal of Government funds to an educational project, because some of the participants criticized administration policy in Vietnam and then—in the next breath—he admiringly quotes Senator Vandenberg's statement that "every foreign policy must be totally debated, and the loyal opposition is under special obligation to see that this occurs," and this in the context of demanding for himself and others of the minority party a voice in foreign policy decisions. His exact quote is: "These teach-ins are a protest against the national policy of our country. It seems to me that when we have individuals conducting these teach-ins and acting as leaders in these groups, that it is not in the best interests of the national security of our country for our Government to subsidize this kind of operation by financing projects in which these same people play a prominent role." I can see we are all going to have an absorbing year if we follow the advice of the gentleman from Wisconsin—making certain we don't subsidize free inquiry, but only subsidize thought control.

And yet, I wonder if any policy, domestic or foreign, which its supporters here in this House are unwilling to risk to the judgment of free and inquiring minds can prove anything except on the part of its advocates, an abysmal lack of confidence in its strength. Surely a policy in which one believes deeply can stand examination and discussion.

Mr. MORSE. I congratulate the Representative from my State. I agree with every observation that she has made. In my judgment, in due course of time, history will sustain her. In due course of time, American historians will write about this major mistake that the President of the United States made when he asked for support of the bill and sought this vehicle for obtaining a vote of confidence of the Congress that should never have been extended to him. I am proud to be associated in the Congress with the Representative from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a telegram which I have received from a committee group of Wayne University in Michigan signed by David Wineman, chairman, professor of political science, Wayne University, in support of the position which the senior Senator from Oregon has taken in opposition to America's undeclared war in Asia.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETROIT, MICH.,
May 16, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The following declaration was adopted by the Detroit teach-in of May 15 attended by approximately 300 persons:

1. Power should not be America's way of dealing with small nations.

2. Our Government must adopt a policy of self-determination of nations without qualification.

3. We demand the $50 billion now spent by the United States on armaments be used to eradicate poverty at home and abroad with no strings attached.

4. We specifically recommended that the suspension of bombings of North Vietnam be permanent and that the United States immediately seek negotiations to end the war in Vietnam without qualifications as to time, place, or participants, including the national liberation front and withdraw all foreign troops from that nation in accord with the Geneva agreement.

5. We deplore the administration's failure to send a representative to the national teach-in.

DAVID WINEMAN,
Chairman, Detroit Teach-in, Cosponsored by the Wayne Chapter, University's Committee on Problems of War and Peace, and Wayne Student Committee To End the War in Vietnam.

Mr. MORSE. While I am commenting on this subject, I wish to say that it still is not too late for the President to recommend a declaration of war. It is not too late for the President to get back within the framework of the Constitution of the United States. It is not too late for the President of the United States to suggest that we keep our commitments under the United Nations Charter and lay this whole threat to the peace of the world before the United Nations for his jurisdiction.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the Dallas Morning News, a Texas newspaper, entitled "Brinkmanship" be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Apr. 29, 1965]

BRINKMANSHIP

President Johnson is understandably annoyed with the critics of his Vietnam policy—primarily because he is right and they are wrong. Liberal isolationists at home and myopic defeatists abroad—from Walter Lippmann to Charles de Gaulle—have been urging the President to back down, to negotiate with the enemy at almost any price. On Monday Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, called the President's policy "immoral and godless."

What these people object to is the policy of brinkmanship, honed to a fine art by Eisenhower's Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, but practiced to some extent by four presidents, both Republican and Democrat, since World War II. Dulles, defining brinkmanship, once said: "You have to take chances for peace just as you must take chances in war."

The President's statement, "From Munich until today we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and brings more destructive war," is a variation on the same theme.

Former President Truman followed this advice by going to the brink with success to stop Stalin in Libya, Turkey, the Dardanelles and Greece, to break the Berlin blockade, to save at least half of Korea. The major foreign-policy disaster during his term of office was the loss of China, which might have been prevented if Truman had not avoided brinkmanship. In fact, if we had been willing to take the risk then, there might have been no Korean war and no problem today in Vietnam.

Ike obtained an armistice in Korea by going to the brink, by threatening to bomb Red China beyond the Yalu. He saved half of Indochina by coming to the aid of the beleaguered French with an airstrike, risking 7th Fleet brinkmanship in the defense of Quemoy and Matsu and saved Lebanon by sending in the Marines.

There were foreign-policy losses, too, under Eisenhower. But they resulted from a refusal to go to the brink, a decision to remain passive during the East German revolt in 1953, the Hungarian uprising of 1956, Red China's seizure of Tibet in 1959 and Castro's take-over of Cuba the same year.

Perhaps the best example of brinkmanship and the resulting coldwar victory for the United States was the show of force by the late President Kennedy during the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962—a risky eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation which might have led to World War III, but instead sent the Russians home with their tails (and missiles) between their legs.

Surely these numerous tests of the brinkmanship policy should have taught us a few lessons. Among them are these: (1) The Communists have been successful in expanding their empire only by the use or threat of force, when we have been passive;

(2) they have been repelled only by our use or threat of force; (3) protest without action has got us nowhere, and (4) the alternative to brinkmanship is slow surrender.

The liberal isolationists and defeatists were wrong when they attacked brinkmanship under Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy, and they are wrong today. They have failed to learn the lessons of history which teach, as the President put it so well Tuesday: "To stand firm is the only guarantee of lasting peace." What they cannot seem to realize is that defeat in South Vietnam or anywhere else, as the President warned, "would deliver a friendly nation to terror and repression. It would encourage and spur on those who seek to conquer all free nations that are within their reach."

Mr. MORSE. That editorial from Texas raises a serious question as to the wisdom of our course of action in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Let's Talk," from my hometown newspaper in Eugene, Oreg., the Eugene Register-Guard, which I assure the Senate is not considered a Morse newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LET'S TALK

Apparently the United States will join other nations in a conference, probably at Geneva, to talk about the integrity of the borders of Cambodia. Cambodia is worried about this matter and wants the conference. But since Cambodia has kicked the United States out of its country, and since the United States left without protest, it's a little hard to see what this Nation can contribute to any discussion of a place where it isn't wanted.

Nonetheless, the United States definitely should take part. For Cambodia is far from the burning issue in southeast Asia. A conference of the nations that met at Geneva in 1954 to reorganize the former French territories in southeast Asia would not talk long about Cambodia. Sooner or later, and probably sooner, the talk would shift to Vietnam. Thus, a meeting called ostensibly to talk about a minor problem could be a device for backing into discussions of Vietnam, where the controversy carries the seeds of world war.

Since April 7, President Johnson has had the country on the record as willing to talk—anyplace, anytime, with anybody—about ways to end the killing. And talk we must. It is no sign of weakness to seek an honorable peace.

The alternative to talk is total war, not just against North Vietnam but against the real power, Red China. That we do not want. But neither do we want all southeast Asia to be swallowed up by a nation that boasts it is bent on conquest.

Negotiation is not the same as surrender. This is a point that was overlooked last weekend at the all-night rally at the University of Oregon. One group there appeared to advocate turning all Vietnam over to the Red Chinese. Period. Another, more realistic, urged that we explore ways to stop the killing.

Also, it is perfectly reasonable, as Senator Morse said at the rally, that we try to interest other nations, also, in this major threat to world peace. The trouble has been thus far that other nations have been disinclined to help in stemming Communist aggression while Uncle Sam was willing to do it alone.

The meeting at Geneva might be this Nation's chance to throw some of the responsibility to its critics.

Mr. MORSE. The editorial went so far as to say:

> Also, it is perfectly reasonable, as Senator Morse said at the rally, that we try to interest other nations, also, in this major threat to world peace. The trouble has been thus far that other nations have been disinclined to help in stemming Communist aggression while Uncle Sam was willing to do it alone. The meeting at Geneva might be this Nation's chance to throw some of the responsibility to its critics.

I highly commend the Eugene Register-Guard for at least lifting its journalistic blinders slightly and letting a few rays of light and truth creep into its journalistic policy. It is very encouraging, indeed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Curry Democratic Central Committee Backs Morse's Views on Viet," written by Ruth Brewer, and published in the Coos Bay, Oreg., World of April 28, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CURRY DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE BACKS MORSE'S VIEWS ON VIET

(By Ruth Brewer)

GOLD BEACH.—An apparent grassroots movement supporting Senator WAYNE MORSE on his stand against the war in Vietnam gained strength this week when the Curry County Democratic Central Committee unanimously agreed to go on record as approving the Senator's views.

To his knowledge, this is the first such action taken by a county central committee, according to Charles Brooks, MORSE's administrative assistant in Oregon, who was reached by telephone this week.

Prior to agreeing to notify MORSE of the committee's stand, members held a lengthy discussion on the Vietnam war, the dangers involved and damage to prestige of the United States as the results of actions in Asia.

The full text of a speech delivered last Friday, April 23, in Eugene by MORSE was read to the committee by chairman Bruce Manley.

On the basis of past knowledge, MORSE's fight to get the United States out of the situation, helped by such Senators as GRUENING, of Alaska; FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas; CHURCH of Idaho, and others, and contents of the Eugene talk, the committee appeared unanimously in agreement from the beginning of the discussion.

"Senator MORSE has been carrying this almost alone * * * he needs all the support he can get, and it's time he realizes that he has it," was one comment.

While it was generally thought that many persons in the country do not keep up with the situation in Asia through the news, and actually avoid trying to understand the complicated matter, "the man on the street is changing his views," another stated.

"If we are trying to impress Asiatics, we aren't doing it * * * they will resent a police state administered by the United States as much as if it were administered by one of the Red countries. (Asiatics) are just interested in putting rice in their bellies and don't care who runs the shoestore down the street," was the opinion of another member of the committee.

It was felt that public opinion is going toward the Senator's views, though few of the news media had given their support. One of those mentioned as having come out in favor of MORSE's opinions was the World, which has supported him editorially.

Though, in the opinion of one, Democrats taking an open stand "might split the party," it was felt that after such action, others who share the same sentiments would soon make themselves heard, and regardless of any repercussions, the seriousness of the issue warranted the action.

Though the cry of "communism" might soon be raised in speaking out, "let them cry," declared one member. "If there is one thing I abhor, it is communism. I stand for this country and freedom, and it is my duty and privilege to speak out * * * we are not containing communism, we are helping it (by loss of friendship among the nations of the world due to the Viet situation)," he concluded.

Senator MORSE is to be notified of the committee action.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received from one Karl S. Landstrom a letter dated May 10, 1965, expressing his disagreement with my position on the undeclared war in Asia, and also commenting, by way of criticism, that he did not think I had called enough attention to communications of criticism that I have received. Perhaps Mr. Landstrom has not been diligent in reading the remarks of the senior Senator from Oregon; but I would not want him to feel slighted. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Landstrom's letter of criticism of the senior Senator from Oregon be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ARLINGTON, VA.,
May 10, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I believe your position in regard to the South Vietnam problem is entirely wrong.

It is disturbing to me, as a graduate of the University of Oregon, and at one time a student in commercial law under your own tutelage, and as one who remembers your service at the university as dean of the law school, to note that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7 you inserted, with apparent approbation, a letter from a University of Oregon professor who threatens nonpayment of her Federal income tax as a means of producing a change in the administration's policy in Vietnam. Surely you do not endorse so-called peaceful civil resistance to the point of violation of the law.

It would be interesting, I think, if you would insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of the communications that you must be receiving which disagree with your views and support the views of the administration and the vast majority of Members of Congress in the handling of the matters in South Vietnam.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

KARL S. LANDSTROM.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Landstrom says, in part:

> It is disturbing to me, as a graduate of the University of Oregon, and at one time a student in commercial law under your own tutelage, and as one who remembers your service at the University as dean of the law school, to note that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7 you inserted, with apparent approbation, a letter from the University of Oregon professor who threatens nonpayment of her Federal income tax as a means of producing a change in the administration's policy in Vietnam. Surely you do not endorse so-called peaceful civil resistance to the point of violation of the law.

I am surprised that Mr. Landstrom should think that because I respect the right of citizens to petition their Government, I agree with all phases of their petition. So I replied to him, saying:

Inserting letters in the Congressional Record, contrary to your false implication, does not carry any approbation on my part of any point of view expressed by the writer. The letters do show the great concern of a cross section of the American people in regard to the warmaking aspects of American policy. I insert the letters because I think people who are opposed to the administration's policy are entitled to petition their Government and make known their disagreement with our foreign policy in Vietnam. I intend to continue to insert letters of protest in the Congressional Record.

If you will check my insertions in the Record, you will find some of them do not disapprove of the United States conducting an undeclared war in South Vietnam. My mail for months has run around 200 to 1 in support of my opposition to our undeclared war in Asia.

I am inserting in the Record, your letter and my reply so that you will not feel slighted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my complete reply to Mr. Landstrom be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

May 14, 1965.

Mr. Karl S. Landstrom,
Arlington, Va.

Dear Mr. Landstrom: You certainly are welcome to disagree with my viewpoint on the undeclared war and thereby the unconstitutional war which the Johnson administration is fighting in South Vietnam.

I am enclosing tearsheets from the Congressional Record covering my two speeches in opposition to the President's recent request for a vote of confidence on his course of action in South Vietnam.

Inserting letters in the Congressional Record, contrary to your false implication, does not carry any approbation on my part of any point of view expressed by the writer. The letters do show the great concern of a cross section of the American people in regard to the warmaking aspects of American policy. I insert the letters because I think people who are opposed to the administration's policy are entitled to petition their government and make known their disagreement with our foreign policy in Vietnam. I intend to continue to insert letters of protest in the Congressional Record.

If you will check my insertions in the Record, you will find some of them do not disapprove of the United States conducting an undeclared war in South Vietnam. My mail for months has run around 200 to 1 in support of my opposition to our undeclared war in Asia.

I am inserting in the Record your letter and my reply so that you will not feel slighted.

Very truly yours,

Wayne Morse.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain other letters, articles, and editorials, which I have received, dealing with Vietnam, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Apr. 26–May 2, 1965]

A Sound Instinct Against Asian War

A massive public discontent with American policy in Vietnam, uncrystallized but nonetheless real and persistent, has made it necessary for President Johnson, Secretary of State Rusk, and Secretary of Defense McNamara to explain themselves once again.

The President at his news conference Tuesday was aware that millions of Americans are haunted by an instinctive if often inarticulate sentiment that our country has taken the wrong course in Asia. Their instinct, we think, is far sounder than his rationalizations. We hope it will continue to make itself felt until the course is changed. The President wisely refused to join some of his subordinates in smearing his critics as appeasers. He appears to invite honest debate, and should be taken at his word.

The rationalization of his policy rests upon a distortion of history and an obscurity of purpose. It demonstrates confusion as to where we have been, and a hazy ambiguity as to where we are going.

Like the Secretaries of State and Defense, President Johnson describes the situation in Vietnam as a simple one of armed aggression by one nation against another, which we have a duty to resist. It is in fact an infinitely complicated case of civil war, growing out of the determination of Asians to throw off the chains of white colonialism, a civil war in which we are involved on one side and the Communist powers on another.

The indigenous Communist-led nationalist movement which now governs North Vietnam began its revolution over 20 years ago, while Indochina was under Japanese rule during World War II, and continued it against the returned forces of France, finally defeating the French decisively in 1954. It called off the war under the terms of an international agreement which provided for military neutralization, independence, and self-determination.

Under the Geneva accords, North and South Vietnam were set up as temporary political zones, each to be cleared of foreign military forces and then to decide its own future in supervised free elections. The elections were never held because the United States promptly established an anti-Communist government in Saigon and started building it up with military and economic aid as an outpost of American influence. Thereafter, the Hanoi regime began organizing and helping to supply Communist-led insurgents in the South.

Despite 10 years of massive American aid, successive governments in Saigon were unable to gain the loyalty of their people; today the Communists control more than half, perhaps 70 percent, of South Vietnam. They collect taxes, they export rice, they govern, they wage guerrilla war. The United States, having done everything possible to help South Vietnam win its own war, is now in process of taking over and fighting the war itself, at the risk of world war with China and Russia.

To say that all this is identical with the situation in Hitler's Europe, and that any reluctance to deepen our military involvement amounts to appeasement, is to misunderstand both history and the nature of revolutionary forces in ex-colonial lands. The United States has no strategic interest that requires it to hold a land base in Asia; the President has repeatedly disavowed any territorial ambitions in Vietnam. Neither have we any responsibility to act as a global policeman, putting down revolution wherever it occurs, getting into every war that comes along. We can help free nations build the economic and social conditions which immunize them against Communist revolution, but if they do not do the job themselves we cannot do it for them by waging war.

Admittedly changing our course in Vietnam presents enormous difficulties at this late date, but it must be done if sanity is to prevail. We cannot get out tomorrow, we cannot cut and run in precipitate retreat. We can and should, however, make peace and disengagement our long-range objective instead of simply accepting the drift to ever-widening war.

The President's reaffirmation of willingness to enter unconditional discussions is welcome, along with his assurance that active diplomatic efforts are being made "every day" to get talks going. Regrettably missing is any hint of ultimate objectives or terms of a peaceful settlement that would show we are ready to accept something else than total surrender of the other side. Talks about what? They are not likely to occur if, in addition to rejecting even a pause in the air bombardment, we give reason to believe that all we want to talk about is the end of North Vietnamese intervention but not an end of our own intervention.

The essential principles of the 1954 Geneva accords, adapted with due recognition of what has happened in the interval, offer a basis for a fair and reasonable settlement. If the President made them the clear objective of his policy, instead of inventing twisted rationalizations for a war policy, he would have the American people overwhelmingly on his side.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, May 9, 1965]

Advertisement Sponsoring End of War in Vietnam

The sponsors of this advertisement: Rev. Milton Andrews, Rev. Charles Asplin, Rev. Harold Bass, Rev. Herbert Dimock, Rev. John Gill, Rev. Blaine Hammond, Rev. Herbert Lazenby, Rev. George McCleave, Rev. Chadbourne Spring, Rev. Bernard Turner, Rev. Peter Weller, the American Friends Service Committee, Pacific Northwest Region, and the concerned citizens whose names are listed below join 16,916 Protestant clergymen (New York Times ad, Apr. 18); 2,700 clergymen of all faiths (New York Times ad, Apr. 4); 800 faculty members of colleges and universities in the New York City area (New York Times ad, Feb. 28); U.S. Senators Morse, Gruening, Church, McGovern, Aiken, Clark, and others; U.N. Secretary General U Thant; the leaders of 17 nonalined nations; and the many thousands of individuals and leaders around the world who have already spoken out in calling on President Johnson to end the war in Vietnam by peaceful negotiations now.

We believe the only conditions under which such negotiations are possible are (1) cessation of bombing raids on North Vietnam, and (2) a cease-fire with the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

We believe the people of Vietnam are as entitled to peace and the opportunity to secure and better their lives economically and socially as are people everywhere, so that the United States must take the lead in bringing peace as quickly as possible to that land, which has known no rest from war for over 25 years.

We, therefore, call on the President to seek an end to the fighting through immediate peaceful action rather than through rhetoric or show of force.

(If you agree with the views stated above, one direct action you can take is to add your name to this advertisement and mail the page to: President Lyndon Johnson, the White House, Washington, D.C.)

Mr. and Mrs. Lester Achenbach, Norm Ackley, Jeff Acorn, Joseph Airo-Farulla, Jeff Acorn, Mr. and Mrs. John Affolter, Holly Adiele, Selma Waldman Adkins, Joeylyn Airo-Farulla, Blair Allen, Gerald Allen, M. J. Allen, Ray Allen, Mrs. W. B. Allen, Bill Allison, Mark H. Anderson, Ruth Anderson, Chuck Angell, Alfred S. Arkley, Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Arkley, Mr. and Mrs. T. R. Astley, P. J. Ater, Gilbert Allen Atkinson.

Eliot Backup, Elizabeth Bagshaw, Mr. and Mrs. Charles M. Bailey, Jackie Barish, Arthur Barnett, Virginia Barnett, Harvie Barnard, Hermine Basnight, William Basnight, Ethel Bass, B. C. Baxter, Rozette Baxter, D. H. Beach, Margie Bell, James R. Bennett, Mrs. Jean Bennett, Mable Bennett, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Bennett, Fred Berg, J. Lennart Berggren, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Bernstein, Richard Beyer, Audrey Bickford, Mr. and Mrs. Charles M. Bierley Jr., Marilyn Bierman, Mrs. L. D. Bishop, Jacqueline Blanchard, B. Blasko, Lorne Blucher, Walter Boggess, Ruth Bonnevie, S. V. Bonnevie, Edward Bostetter, David C. Botting, Diana Bower, Ted Bower, David Box, David Boxer, Julie Boxer, Helen Bradley, Charles F. Brady, Franz A. Brodine, Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Brotman, John Broussard, Emmy Buck, Mrs. Stimson Bullitt, John Bundy, Mr. and Mrs. John Burdick, Pat Burks, Stephanie Born, Lillian W. Burns, Joost A. Businger.

David H. Campbell, Caroline Canafax, Leo Canafax, V. E. Carol, Harold Carson, Beth F. Carter, Victor Case, Delbert E. Castle, Pearl Castle, Jeremy Caughlin, Pat Cawthon, William C. Chambers, Carla Chotzen, Walter Chotzen, Mrs. W. G. Christen, William B. Christie, Mrs. Annabelle B. Christie, Mrs. W. T. Clark, Henry Leland Clarke, Julia Newbold Clarke, Charles Coe, John Collins, Victor Cook, Cecelia Corr, William Corr, Lida Coryell, Prof. Giovanni Costigan, Andrew J. Crane, James Carlisle Crane, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth G. Crane, Mr. and Mrs. Michael B. Crane, Beatrice S. Crouse, Paton B. Crouse, John Crow, Ruth Crow, Virginia Crow, William Crow, Mrs. C. E. Cunningham, Juliet Cunningham.

Michael Dailey, Robert Dale, Mrs. A. R. Dannhauer, J. Robert von Dassow, Elaine Davenport, John Davies, Mary Davies, W. J. Davis, Anne Dawson, Jeffrey Dawson, B. W. De Vault, W. A. Dickinson, Altura A. Dodd, Donald A. Dodd, Lorraine Donegian, Ann A. Drury, Roy Dubisch, David Dunham, Jackie Dunham.

Steven Easterson, Al Edelman, Carol Edelman, Roger Cushman Edwards, Mr. and Mrs. N. Ekroth, Lois B. Elkinton, Richard J. Elkiton, Dr. Frederick E. Ellis, Robert J. Ellrich, Ruth Emerson, Jo Erickson, Ray Erickson.

J. Kaye Faulkner, Mrs. John E. Fawcett, Mr. and Mrs. John Fiedler, Mel Fielding, Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Fiege, Lillian Fiest, Laurie Fish, Mr. and Mrs. A. A. Fisher, Edison S. Fisk, Evelyn M. Fiske, Robert G. Fleagle, A. C. Fleishman, Denis Flood, M. Fogelstedt, Mr. and Mrs. David Fogerty, Jane, Forste Robert Forste, David C. Fowler, Sol Frankel, Richard Frazer, Barbara Frazier, John Frazier, Hazel Fritz.

Vivian F. Gaboury, Barbara Gamble, Robert Garfias, Francis M. Garton, Sidney Gerber, Mary T. Gibson, Evalyn P. Gill, Louise Blue Givens, James Gladfelter, Harry Glickman, Josephine Godsey, Dr. and Mrs. Morris Gold, Dr. Samuel Goldenberg, Henry Goodman, Ruth Goodman, Mrs. Carol Goodrich, J. Goodrich, Diana Gordon, Louise Gosho, Alex Gottfried, Sue Gottfried, Mr. and Mrs. W. J. Granby, Norman Grant, Genevieve Grant, Gordon Griffiths, Mary Griffiths, Eva Gruber, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Gwinn.

Claus Halberstaedter, Oliva Halonen, Taimi Halonen, Roberta Hammer, Ellen Hanly, John Hanly, Orvel Hansen, Mr. and Mrs. Wesley M. Hansen, Isabel Harlock, Ray Harlock, Marita Harris, John Hart, Ben Harwood, Sylvia Havlisch, Mary O'Neill Hayes, John Healy, Lonnie Healy, Ralph Heino, Mrs. E. W. Helander, Martha Hennen, Marjorie Herford, Ernstine Herr, Dr. George B. Hill, Theodore M. Hiltner, Mrs. Francis Hoague, Irwin Hogenauer, Mary Hopkinson, Hazel Horder, Florence Hornig, Grace Howard, Eric W. Hoyte, Virginia B. Hoyte, Wanda Hubbard, Hildur Josephine Hughes, Mr. and Mrs. William R. Hughes, Irene Hull, Walter Hundley, Katherine Hunter, Mr. and Mrs. George Hurley, Raymond Immerwahr.

Dorothy Jackins, Robert L. Jackson, Roger Jackson, Sue Jackson, Mr. and Mrs. Vernon Jackson, Ann Jacobson, Charles James, Etta Marie James, Larry James, Dr. and Mrs. Charles M. Janeway, David Javorsky, Karen Johansen, Alice Johnson, Leif Johnson, Michael R. Johnson, Sharon M. Johnson, Robert S. Johnson, Robert S. Johnson, Ruth Johnson, Mrs. Robert B. Jones, Shelia Jones, Mildred Joyce.

Howard Kaminsky, Annette Kaplan, Helen Karr, Milton Karr, Prof. and Mrs. Max Katz, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Kauffman, Dr. Abraham Keller, Mignonne Keller, Dr. and Mrs. Ward Kennedy, Martha Kennen, Harold Kerney, Robert H. Kerr, Robert W. Kessel, Rev. Eugene Kidder, Dorthy M. Kistler, Elmer C. Kistler, Joan Klyn, Mark S. Klyn, Camille Knatvold, Arthur Kobler, Virginia Kobler, Rev. J. C. Kone, Anci Koppel, Carol Ann Koppel, Jane Krahl, Robert Krahl, Frank Krasmowsky, Aki Kurose.

Kathy Ladd, Dr. Arthur Lagawier, Lee Landrud, Margery D. Lang, Guy Lares, Lillie Larsen, Mrs. Harold Laughlin, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Levine, Helen Levin, Arthur N. Lewis, Charline Lewis, Paul Lichter, Don Little, Marian Lobasc, Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Lobl, Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Lockwood, Dr. and Mrs. Ernest Loeb, Patricia Loken, Eugene V. Lux, Lillian C. Lux, Timothy Lynch.

Dr. Sylvia Maccoll, Dr. W. A. Maccoll, Dr. Donald F. Magee, Mrs. S. Manarolia, Mr. and Mrs. David A. Manning, Betty Jean Martinson, Mr. and Mrs. Christ Martinson, Judith W. Matchett, Robert S. Maynard, Deta McEvoy, Mr. and Mrs. E. C. McIntosh, Marguerita McIntosh, Irene McMahill, David C. Meekhof, Mrs. Sophie K. Meld, Ramona Memmer, Barbara Mercer, Lyle Mercer, Flora Merrill, Mr. and Mrs. Charles A. Metcalf, Stephen L. Michael, Mrs. Alida J. Michael, Dr. and Mrs. Ward C. Miles, Ronald Moe, Mrs. J. B. Mohler, Sally Moore, Wallace Moore, Mr. and Mrs. James Morland, Arval Morris, Rosemarie Morris, Mr. and Mrs. Edgar A. Morrison, Mrs. James B. Morrison, Mr. and Mrs. Michael Mottelson, Mrs. Grace B. Moulton, Bill Murphy.

John Neal, Mr. and Mrs. David Nicholson, Mr. and Mrs. Ray C. Nicholson, Anna E. Nilsen, John R. Norton, Kae Norton, Ted Norton, L. K. Northwood, Olga Northwood, Elizabeth P. Nunn.

Eugene Oliver, Jo Ann Oliver, Marian C. Olson, Robert S. Olsen, Gerald Oppenheimer, Mildred Oppenheimer, Elizabeth Orians, Gordon Orians, Simon Ottenberg, Eleanor Owen, Charles Ozure.

Douglas Palmer, Ida Palmer, Jo Patrick, Mrs. Edith Patten, Fred Van Patten, Dorothy Patterson, Rev. John Paulson, Mr. and Mrs. Clayton A. Paulson, H. Pedersen, Mrs. Ruth Peoples, Rodney J. Peterson, Ruth Peterson, Mrs. A. H. Phillips, Sanford Pinsker, Mr. and Mrs. Carl O. Pisk, Bernard Poll, Orobelle Poll, Ruth Pool, Mr. and Mrs. Viggo Povlsen, Mrs. J. C. Price, V. Price, Garth Putnam, Kay Quinn.

Marjorie Rabbit, Miriam Rader, Sylvia Ragan, Dee Wardall Raible, Jarold W. Ramsey, Constance Raphael, Dan Raphael, Conner Reed, Mary T. Reed, Richard J. Reed, Robert Reed, D. E. Reinhardt, Margo Reinsch, Robert E. Renk, Clint Reynolds, Isabelle Reynolds, Mr. and Mrs. Paul M. Rice, James G. Richard, Lorna Richards, Edith Rigg, Ron Ringdahl, Eugene F. Robel, Thorun Robel, Mr. and Mrs. R. A. Rocz, Kathleen Bollefson, Violet Roraback, Mike Rubicz, Steve Rubicz, Mrs. Rose Rudnick, Mr. and Mrs. John J. Runnings.

Selma Sachs, Roger Sale, Richard Saling, Brian M. Scheffer, Linda Scheffer, Victor B. Scheffer, Beth Scheffer, Agnus Schmoe, Ken Schmoe, Dorothy Schroeter,, Mrs. Alice E. Schwartz, Dr. and Mrs. Lawrence Schwartz, Mr. and Mrs. William Schwartz, Rose Scott, Alan Selker, Lisa Selker, Lule D. Sellards, Mrs. Louise Shaffrath, Mrs. Joanne Shaw, Stanley T. Shaw, Clara Shaw, Eleanor Siegl, Henry Siegl, Edward Singler, Joan Singler, Edith R. Smith, Edward Smith, Edward A. Smith, Ellen McComb Smith, Mr. and Mrs. Norman C. Smith, Mrs. Watson Smith, Martha M. Smyser, Howard B. Snyder, Margaret Snyder, Edith Soden, Joseph Sommers, Soren Sorenson, Thaddeus H. Spratten, Eleanor Springer, Claire Stafford, Marietta Stark, Roger B. Stein, Edward H. Steinberg, Elva Steinborn, Elaine Steinbrueck, Mr. and Mrs. John Stenhouse, Robert G. Stephens, Joseph Stevens, Mr. and Mrs. John Stanhouse, Robert G. Stephens, Josephine Stevens, Mr. and Mrs. John R. Strickland, Mr. and Mrs. J. D. Strittmatter, Lucy M. Stoy, Lucy N. Stoy, Robert F. Stoy, Mr. & Mrs. Jack I. Sussman, Grace Suzuki, Mrs. Ruth Swanson, Tom Sykes.

Ronald Tierandsen, Tacoma Friends Meeting, Calvin Y. Takagi, Ken Takashima, Helen Talbott, Mary G. Tally, Dr. Souren Tashian, Margaret Terrell, Donald W. Thayer, Sarah Thiel, Mr. & Mrs. Robert Thode, Jack P. Tingstad, Dr. Richard Tinker, A. W. Tinsley, Hazel Tinsley, Barbara Tomlinson, Ralph Toporoff, Imogene Truman, George T. Tsutakawa, Dean M. Tuell, Jane Turner, Maurine Tuttle.

Betty Lou Valentine, Mr. and Mrs. T. J. Van Ermen, Mr. and Mrs. John Van Horne, J. M. Van Houten, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Viggo.

Jean Wilson Wagner, Ella Wald, Fern Wales, Mary Frances Wallace, Rev. Robert Waller, Vera Waller, Mr. and Mrs. John Ware, Colleen M. Waterhouse, Leslie Warner, Tom Warner, Lars Watson, Lucille Watson, Carol R. Weller, Leonard Wessels, Carl West, Helen West, Frances Wester, Mr. and Mrs. A. G. Westman, Doris G. Westman, Winifred E. Weter, John H. Whittenbaugh, Dorothy Wittington, Michael Wiater, Karen Wilkie, Dorothy R. Willard, John W. Willard, Ford Williams, Ida Williams, Mrs. Margaret Williams, Philip Williams, Vivian Williams, Mr. and Mrs. Russell L. Willman, Marjorie M. Wilson, Patricia Wilson, Dr. William S. Wilson, Mrs. Lawrence Windoffer, Alice Woodmansie, Edward Woodmansie, William Wooten.

Dr. and Mrs. S. R. Yarnell, Marion Yurman, Richard Yurman, Barbara Zepeda, Julian Zepeda, Dean F. Zuck, Joyce Bennett, Dr. Thomas A. Billings, Clara Fraser, Ruth Fawcett, Margaret Kelly, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth A. Kirkpatrick, Walter B. Laffer II, Ruth Little, Dorothy W. Melland, Marie Severtson, Charles Valentine, Richard

W. Wilkie, Patricia L. Woll, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Yellin, William C. Berleman, Bud Havlisch, Donald A. Fox, David McClary.

(This ad paid for by the above signers.)

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 9, 1965]

A REPLY TO SECRETARY RUSK ON VIETNAM

In his address on April 23 before the American Society of International Law, Secretary of State Dean Rusk attacked academic critics of the administration for talking "nonsense about the nature of the struggle" in Vietnam. He continued: "I sometimes wonder at the gullibility of educated men and the stubborn disregard of plain facts by men who are supposed to be helping our young to learn—especially to learn how to think." This abusive language suggests that the administration wants to silence its critics.

This suggestion is confirmed by insinuations from other administration spokesmen about the loyalty of such critics. Precisely in this time of crisis, however, the academic community has both a right and an obligation to point out hazards and inconsistencies in our military and diplomatic policy.

It is easy to see why the Secretary of State is angry. The reasons have nothing to do with "gullibility" in the academic community. He is angry because the facts and wider considerations brought up by these critics have contradicted so many official pronouncements. It is not the scholars but the leaders of the administration who have shown a "stubborn disregard of plain facts."

"PLAIN FACTS?"

For example, on March 25, 1965, President Johnson said, "We seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954—a reliable agreement to guarantee the independence and security of all in southeast Asia." But the "plain fact" is that the Geneva agreement did not provide for a division of Vietnam into two nations. On the contrary, the agreement spoke of the two parts of Vietnam as "regrouping zones" and said that "the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." It provided that "general elections shall be held in July 1956, under the supervision of an international commission." No such unifying elections have been held. The Saigon regime, with U.S. approval, refused. Ever since, the United States has insisted that Vietnam remain divided.

On April 7, 1965, the President gave another description of the administration's goals. He said, "Tonight Americans and Asians are dying for a world where each people may choose its own path to change," and further on: "Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam, and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves—only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way." The "plain fact" is that the scale of American intervention is incompatible with the goal of self-determination. North Vietnam has, to be sure, intervened by helping the Vietcong. But at every stage of the war the scale of American intervention has been far greater. The manner of combat shows that we have saturated South Vietnam with every kind of military equipment the terrain allows. We airlift troops and supplies continually. We drop napalm on civilian populations intermingled with guerrillas. We burn and defoliate crops and forests. We have resorted to incapacitating gas. An intervention as massive as this does not furnish a choice to the people. It deprives them of one.

"STUBBORN DISREGARD OF PLAIN FACTS?"

If American actions in Vietnam are defensible, administration attempts to defend them should square with the "plain facts." Self-deception about American intervention can be a greater peril than discriminating protest. Only by recognizing the ambiguities of the situation can we reach accord with the deepest levels of the American conscience and with the common conscience of mankind. The administration may have contrived the discreet silence or the grudging lipservice of some foreign governments and of some U.S. Senators, but the hazards and inconsistencies of the present policy are widely recognized both at home and abroad.

The situation in Vietnam raises serious moral questions, not merely diplomatic and tactical ones. As a nation we hold immense power. To permit it to be used in reckless and barbarous ways is to imperil the entire basis of American leadership.

Let us make known to the Government and to our compatriots that we oppose the disastrous policy of continued bombardment of North Vietnam. Continuation of the present policy makes it impossible for Americans and Russians to talk further about peaceful coexistence and encourages all Communist nations to close ranks in opposition to the United States.

World opinion does not support U.S. military operations in Vietnam. Throughout the world these operations appear increasingly to be a campaign in the self-interest of a Western power rather than in the interest of that stricken Asian nation. Indochina has been macerated by 20 years of anticolonial, nationalist and Communist warfare. The United States has the military might to defeat the Vietcong. But unless we show immediate restraint, and show humane imagination in bringing interested parties to the peace table, we risk the loss of the respect and sympathy of men and nations far beyond the present theater of war.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

Citizens must speak out on issues of national policy. We will not be intimidated by charges of gullibility or disloyalty.

We demand that the administration return to the "plain facts" and make an earnest attempt to obtain a negotiated peace. Reiteration of the phrase "unconditional discussions" is not enough, especially because the condition is attached to it that the rebel forces in the civil war are not to appear at the conference table. Peaceful intentions can be made plainer than this. We must arrange for an immediate cease-fire and offer to negotiate with the principal combatants, including the Vietcong; we must cease our air raids on North Vietnam; we should use the good offices of the United Nations in bringing about these ends and; we must assure the world that we will not use nuclear weapons in the pursuit of victory or in the "pursuit of peace."

ANDOVER NEWTON THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

Walter H. Clark, psychology of religion.
Harvey G. Cox, theology and culture.
Vincent deGregoris, religious drama.
J. Leslie Dunstan, missions.
Frances W. Eastman, religious education.
Wesner Fallaw, religious education.
Nels F. S. Ferre, theology.
S. Maclean Gilmour, New Testament.
Norman K. Gottwald, Old Testament.
John H. Scammon, Old Testament and Hebrew.
Earl J. Thompson, Jr., church history.
Joseph C. Williamson, theology.

BOSTON COLLEGE

Eugene Bushala, classics.
Edward J. Collins, history.
Sister Terese Anne Donovan, history.
John M. Von Felsinger, psychology.
John L. Heineman, history.
Edgar Litt, political science.
Raymond T. McNally, history.
Allen Wakstein, history.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

William J. Alston III, physics.
Saul Bernstein, social work.
William P. Bryan, chemistry.
Amiya Chakravarty, physics.
Bernard Chasan, physics.
Robert S. Cohen, physics.
Paul Deats, Jr., theology.
Alvin L. Denman, human relations center.
Anthony J. DeVito, modern languages.
L. Harold DeWolf, theology.
John Endicott, chemistry.
Frank Giese, modern languages.
Sonja K. Gross, chemistry.
Robert H. Hamill, chaplain.
Kenneth Haygood, education.
George E. Hein, chemistry.
Walter L. Holcomb, theology.
Wayne B. Jones, theology (registrar).
Frederick Koss, social science.
John H. Lavely, philosophy.
Jean Lennox, biochemistry.
Paul Liacos, law.
Robert E. Luccock, theology.
John L. Maes, theology.
Dorothy Meckel, modern languages.
Banks McDowell, law.
Ronald M. Milburn, chemistry.
William Clifton Moore, theology.
Walter G. Muelder, theology.
Paul Nash, education.
Freda G. Rebelsky, psychology.
Miriam M. Ritvo, human relations center.
Eugene C. Roemele, law.
Julius A. Roth, sociology and anthropology.
Donald T. Rowlingson, theology.
S. Paul Schilling, theology.
Armand Siegel, physics.
Peter E. Siegle, education.
John F. Smith, chaplain.
Robert H. Sproat, English.
John Stachel, physics.
Robert L. Treese, theology.
Marx W. Wartofsky, philosophy.
James B. Whipple, education.
Charles R. Willis, physics.
Alvin D. Zalinger, sociology.

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY

Herbert H. Aptekar, social work.
Joseph S. Berliner, economics.
Leo Bronstein, fine arts.
David Buchsbaum, mathematics.
Oscar P. Chilson, biochemistry.
J. Cobb, psychology.
Helen Codere, anthropology.
Joseph L. Cohen, biochemistry.
Lewis A. Coser, sociology.
George Cowgill, anthropology.
Jean Danner, biochemistry.
Betty Davidson, biochemistry.
Samuel James Davidson, biochemistry.
P. Diamandopoulos, philosophy.
Robert O. Doyle, physics.
James Duffey, European languages.
Kenneth Feigenbaum, psychology.
Gordon Fellman, sociology.
Joachim Gaehde, fine arts.
David S. Gil, social work.
Ray Ginger, history.
Eugene P. Gross, physics.
Allen Grossman, English.
Thomas C. Hollocher, biochemistry.
Joseph W. Infelburg, biology.
David Kaplan, anthropology.
Nathan O. Kaplan, biochemistry.
Jacob Lauren, fine arts.
Harris I. Lehrer, biochemistry.
S. S. Lehrer, biochemistry.
Lawrence Levine, biochemistry.
Denah Lida, European languages.
Farnsworth Loomis, biochemistry.
Heinz Lubasz, history.
Robert A. Manners, anthropology.
Stephen Miller, social work.
Robert Morris, social work.
William T. Murakami, biochemistry.
Joseph S. Murphy, political science.
Richard Onorato, English.
Robert Perlman, social work.
Arthur Polansky, fine arts.
Thomas E. Ragland, biochemistry.
Jessica E. Reimann, biochemistry.
Karl Reisman, anthropology.

Benson Saler, anthropology.
Stanley N. Salthe, biochemistry.
Gordon Sato, biochemistry.
Morris S. Schwartz, sociology.
John Scott, social work.
Violet M. Sieder, social work.
Richard Silverstein, biochemistry.
Mitchell Siporin, fine arts.
Philip E. Slater, sociology.
Morris Soodak, biochemistry.
Mark Spivak, sociology.
Maurice R. Stein, sociology.
Arnold Strickon, anthropology.
Sahl Swarz, fine arts.
Norbert I. Swislocki, biochemistry.
Marie Syrkin, English.
Jerome H. Targovnik, biochemistry.
Helen Van Vunakis, biochemistry.
Eugene Walter, sociology.
Rolad C. Warren, social work.
Alex Weingrod, anthropology.
Robert S. Weiss, sociology.
Kurt H. Wolff, sociology.
Irving Kenneth Zola.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Allan Clark, mathematics.
William Crossgrove, German.
Alan Howard, mathematics.
Michael Rosen, mathematics.

CLARK UNIVERSITY

Charles Blinderman, English.
Abraham Blum, psychology.
Walker Crockett, psychology.
Gerald N. Grob, American history.
J. Fannin King, romance languages.
J. Richard Reid, romance languages.
Mordecai S. Rubin, romance languages.
Morton Weiner, psychology.

COLLEGE OF THE HOLY CROSS

Charles A. Baker, French.
William Van Etten Casey, S.J., theology.
Thomas M. Coffee, sociology.
Joseph F. Donahue, S.J., theology.
John H. Dorenkamp, English.
Joseph M. Fallon, S.J., sociology.
Aldo Fortuna, English.
James A. Gross, economics.
Leon E. Lewis, English.
Frank Petrella, Jr., economics.
Paul Rosenkrantz, psychology.
Donald F. Traub, philosophy.
John H. Wilson, English.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

L. H. Noda, biochemistry.
Donald E. Olins, biochemistry.
Milton J. Rosenberg, psychology.
Melvin V. Simpson, biochemistry.
Andrew Szent-Gyorgyi, cytology.
Arnold Wishnia, biochemistry.

EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

Carl Edwards.
Hubert L. Flesher.
Joseph Fletcher.
L. G. Patterson.
Charles Smith.
Owen Thomas.
William Wolf.

GODDARD COLLEGE

Frank T. Adams, Jr.
Donald M. Barnes, history.
George Beecher, education.
Corinne Elliot.
Vincent Erikson, anthropology.
Francis Fay.
Wilfred G. Hamlin.
Jerome Himeloch, sociology.
Erland Jacobsen, literature.
W. Allen Last, chemistry.
Laurent LaVallee, economics.
Corinne W. Mattuck.
Robert Mattuck, literature.
Arthur Mitzman, history.
Steven J. Noren, philosophy.
William E. Osgood, librarian.
Buryl Payne, psychology.
Thomas R. Whittaker, literature.
Thomas Yamamoto, art.
David York.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

James Luther Adams, divinity.
Stephen L. Adler, physics.
Henry D. Aiken, philosophy.
Charles M. Allen, Jr., chemistry.
William L. Alworth, chemistry.
Harold Amos, bacteriology.
W. French Anderson, bacteriology.
John S. Ansow, English.
Joan Argetsinger, biology.
Ralph Baierlein, physics.
Gerald Barnes, philosophy.
G. Octo Barnett, medicine.
Jonathan Beecher, history.
Ursula Beliugi, social relations.
Marshall Berman, government.
A. Bienenstock, engineering.
Richard Bienvenn, history.
A. Blumenthal, cognitive studies.
Dwight Bolinger, romance languages.
Raoul Bott, mathematics.
Boyce W. Burge, medicine.
Mary E. Burge, American civilization.
Frank P. Casa, romance languages.
David F. Cavers, law.
David Wade Chambers, history of science.
Jon Clardy, chemistry.
Richard A. Cone, biology.
Ian Cooke, biology.
Stephen Coutts, chemistry.
Frank Cross, Near Eastern languages.
Richard D'Ari, biology.
P. J. Dart, biology.
Bernard D. Davis, bacteriology.
Julian Davies, bacteriology.
David Denhardt, biology.
Howard Doldfine, bacteriology.
Donald Dubin, bacteriology.
Leonard M. Faltz, bacteriology.
Ann E. Farnham, bacteriology.
Ned Feder, biology.
Robert R. Fenichel, applied physics.
Sam Fillenbaum, cognitive studies.
Gordon Finley, social relations.
Stephen J. Fischer, education.
Michael Fried, fine arts.
W. H. Furry, physics.
E. Furshpan, medical school.
George Gaylord Simpson, archeology.
F. W. Gehring, mathematics.
Barry Gewen, American civilization.
Stephen J. Gewirtz, mathematics.
Walter Gilbert, physics.
Stephen Gilman, romance languages.
Owen Gingerich, astronomy.
David M. Gitlitz, romance languages.
Harvey R. Glasser, Russian research center.
Eugene Godfredsen, astronomy.
Rabbi Ben-Zion Gold, Hillel adviser.
Howard Goldfine, bacteriology.
James Gordon, general education.
Luigi Gorini, bacteriology.
Martin Gouterman, chemistry.
Joseph C. Grannis, education.
Ann Graybiel, biology
Walter Grossman, history.
Jean Harrison, biology.
Chester W. Hartman, psychiatry
Jay Hauben, physics.
Nicholas L. Heer, Middle Eastern studies.
Stephen Heinemann, biology.
D. Heller, medical school.
Kenneth J. Hertz, mathematics.
Steven Hess, romance languages.
Mahlon B. Hoagland, bacteriology.
K. Hoffman, mathematics.
Charlotte Hogsett, romance languages.
Richard A. Holt, physics.
Mathilda Holzman, psychiatry.
Donald Hubbard, education.
H. Stuart Hughes, history.
Garrett M. Ihler, biology.
William Irvine, astronomy.
Kurt Isselbacher, gastroenterology.
Robert M. Jackson, romance languages.
R. V. James, engineering.
R. V. Jones, engineering.
Wolfgang Kalhofen, astronomy.
Leon R. Kass, chemistry.
Stanley N. Katz, history.
Gordon D. Kaufman, divinity.
Myron Kaufman, chemistry.
Jerry L. Kazdan, mathematics.
Roger Kelleher, medical school.
Steven L. Kleiman, mathematics.
Jerome H. Klotz, statistics.
Mike Konrad, biology.
E. Kravitz, medical school.
Lawrence B. Lapson, astronomy.
John H. Law, chemistry.
David Layzer, astronomy.
Jeana D. Leventhal, bacteriology.
David H. Levey, economics.
Pavel Machotka, social relations.
Martin Lubin, pharmacology.
Michael Manove, mathematics.
Gerald Marsden, education.
Paul Martin, physics.
Ann Matthysse, biology.
Jo Ann D. Medalie, psychiatry.
Jacques Mehler, cognitive studies
Everett Mendelsohn, history of science.
Martin Micheren, biology.
Stanley Milgram, social relations.
Henri E. Mitler, astronomy.
Edwin E. Moise, education.
Clarence L. Morgan, medical school.
Barrington Moore, Jr., Russian research center.
David Morrison, astronomy.
W. H. Morse, medical school.
David Mumford, mathematics.
Leonard Nash, chemistry.
Franz Nauen, history.
Peter Neumeyer, school of education.
Pearn P. Niller, applied physics.
Frederick A. Olafson, education
William E. Palke, chemistry and physics.
Philip Pearle, physics.
Martin Peretz, government.
Edward Pincus, visual arts center.
Gerald Platt, social relations.
Mordea Jane Pollock, romance languages.
Mary C. Potter, cognitive studies.
W. M. Preston, physics.
Charles Price, university preacher.
Mark Ptashne, biology.
L. F. Quigley, Jr., school of public health.
David L. Ragozin, mathematics.
Benito Rakower, school of education.
Lillian Randall, rad. grad. ctr.
Jonathan F. Reichart, physics.
Edward Rendall, medicine.
James L. Rice, Slavic languages.
Herbert Richardson, divinity.
Anne Roe, education.
Constance H. Rose, romance languages.
Larry Rosenberg, psychiatry.
Judy F. Rosenblith, psychiatry.
Robert A. Rosenthal, cent. res. & devel.
Robert A. Rothstein, Slavic languages.
Susan Rubin, romance languages.
Jon Rubinstein, history.
Rose Sabaroff, education.
Carl Sagan, astronomy.
Israel Scheffler, education.
Bartholomew P. Schiavo, history.
L. H. Scott, history and literature.
Richard Sennett, American studies.
Victor W. Siedel, medicine.
Raymond Siever, geology.
David S. Sigman, chemistry.
B. F. Skinner, psychology.
Rev. Reginald Smart, chaplain.
Frank Smith, cognitive studies.
H. Warren Smith, chemistry.
Joseph L. Snider, physics.
Sergei P. Sorokin, anatomy.
P. A. Sorokin, sociology.
Bessie Sperry, education.
John Spiegel, social relations.
Max L. Stackhouse, divinity.
Peter Stansky, history.
Jeffrey Steinfeld, chemistry.
W. Stolz, mathematics.
Stephen Strom, astronomy.
Marsha H. Swislocki, romance languages.
Kenneth Taylor, history of science.
Karl Teeter, linguistics.
Ruth D. Terzaghi, applied physics.
Abigail Thernstrom, government.
Stephen Thernstrom, history.

Allan Tobin, biology.
Stephen V. Ullman, mathematics.
Dorothy V. Vivian, romance languages.
Lise Vogel, fine arts.
Thomas von Foerster, physics.
Ruth Wald, biology.
George Wald, biology.
Donald Wallach, biological chemistry.
William P. Weber, chemistry.
Charles A. Whitney, astronomy.
D. V. Widder, mathematics.
George Williams, divinity.
Thomas H. Wilson, physiology.
David E. Wolfe, anatomy.
Peter N. Wolff, medicine.
James P. Wright, astronomy.
Danny Wulff, biology.
Lawrence Wylie, social relations.
Linda Zak, romance languages.
Robert Zevin, economics.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Marcia K. Allen, biology.
Joseph Altman, psychology.
Warren Ambrose, mathematics.
Donald Appleyard, city planning.
Michael Artin, mathematics.
Elliot Auerbauch, laboratory nuclear science.
Maria L. Bade, biology.
Alan H. Barrett, electrical engineering.
Eugene Bell, biology.
Aron Bernstein, physics.
T. Bever, modern languages.
Carl J. Black, humanities.
Stephen L. Bloom, mathematics.
Rev. Myron Bloy, chaplain.
Frank Bonilla, economics.
George S. Boolos, philosophy.
David Botstein, biology.
Richard N. Boyd, philosophy.
Joseph Brenner, medical department.
Gene M. Brown, biology.
Manuel Blum, electrical engineering.
Harold H. Carter, chemical engineering.
Jule G. Charney, meteorology.
M. Chessman, meteorology.
Noam Chomsky, modern languages.
Stephan L. Chorover, psychology.
Jared L. Darlington, res. lab. electronics.
John M. Dolan, res. lab. electronics.
J. R. Dennett, mathematics.
Robert M. Dowben, biology.
Murray Eden, electrical engineering.
Robert Fabry, res. lab. electronics.
Franklin M. Fisher, economics.
Maurice S. Fox, biology.
Harold Freeman, economics.
Bernard Frieden, city planning.
Theodore W. Gamelin, mathematics.
Vincent Giambalvo, mathematics.
Steven N. Gilborn, humanities.
Marcus C. Goodall, res. lab. electronics.
Roe Goodman, mathematics.
Glen E. Gordon, chemistry.
David Gordon, physics.
Annamaria T. Gorini, biology.
Bernard S. Gould, biology.
R. Graham, mathematics.
John C. Graves, humanities.
Richard Greene, biology.
Charles G. Gross, psychology.
Leon Gunther, physics.
A. R. Gurney, Jr., humanities.
Theodore Gurney, Jr., biology.
Morris Halle, modern languages.
Alfred E. Harper, nutrition.
Hyman Hartman, biology.
Alan Hein, psychology.
Richard Held, psychology.
Rev. Robert C. Holtzapple, chaplain.
Thomas H. Jackson, humanities.
William D. Jackson, electrical engineering.
Elizabeth W. Jones, biology.
J. Katz, philosophy.
S. J. Kayser, modern languages.
Gyorgy Kepes, architecture.
R. Kirk, modern languages.
M. Kudlick, mathematics.
K. Kushner, mathematics.
G. Lakoff, modern languages.
Elizabeth Landers, modern languages.
Emmet Larkin, humanities.
Paul Lee, humanities.
Thomas A. Lehrer, economics and political science.
Mark Levensky, humanities.
Cyrus Levinthal, biology.
Klaus Liepmann, humanities.
Francis E. Low, physics.
Salvador E. Luria, biology.
Kevin Lynch, city planning.
Boris Magasanik, biology.
Kenneth Manly, biology.
Michael B. Marcus, mathematics.
Stephen Marglin, economics.
Paula Menyuk, research laboratory electronics.
Travis R. Merritt, humanities.
Franco Modigliani, economics and management.
Philip Morrison, physics.
Philip M. Morse, physics.
Walle J. H. Nauta, psychology.
A. C. Newell, mathematics.
W. O'Neill, modern languages.
Robert Pendelton, mathematics.
Norman Pettit, humanities.
Louise Pfeiffer, psychology.
Norman A. Phillips, meteorology.
Rabbi Herman Pollack, chaplain.
P. M. Postal, modern languages.
Hilary Putnam, humanities.
H. Putz, mathematics.
J. Ravin, mathematics.
Daniel B. Ray, mathematics.
Harold Reiche, humanities.
Helen R. Revel, biology.
Phillip W. Robbins, biology.
J. Robinson, mathematics.
Ronald Rolfe, biology.
Steven Rosencrans, mathematics.
Bruno Rossi, physics.
A. K. Roy, mathematics.
Rev. John Russell, Jr., chaplain.
Herbert D. Saltzstein, psychology.
Leo Sartori, physics.
David L. Schalk, humanities.
R. W. Sekuler, psychology.
Karl Shell, economics.
Abner Shimony, humanities.
Irving Singer, humanities.
I. M. Singer, mathematics.
Marc J. Shulman, biology.
Malcolm Skolnick, physics.
Huston Smith, humanities.
Norton Starr, mathematics.
Arthur Steinberg, humanities.
Marvin Stodolsky, biology.
Benjamin K. T'sou, research laboratory electronics.
John James Ucci, mathematics.
John Vierter, research laboratory electronics.
Patrick D. Wall, biology.
William B. Watson, humanities.
Burton White, psychology.
George W. Whitehead, mathematics.
Hurd C. Willett, meteorology.
John W. Winchester, geology and geophysics.
George Wolf, nutrition.
Victor Yngve, electrical engineering.
William H. Youngren, humanities.
Richard Zatorski, research laboratory electronics.

NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

Richard Arnowitt, physics.
Perry A. Bialor, sociology-anthropology.
Roger Brightbill, psychology.
Wendell R. Brown, education.
Henry H. Crapo, mathematics.
Alan N. Cromer, physics.
Ellen N. Dunlap, mathematics.
Theodore N. Ferdinand, sociology-anthropology.
Mitzi Filson, library.
Walter L. Fogg, philosophy.
Marvin H. Friedman, physics.
Norbert L. Fullington, history.
Michael J. Glaubman, physics.
Stephen J. Golburgh, education.
Roberta Gordon, modern languages.
Joseph D. Gresser, chemistry.
Edward A. Hacker, philosophy.
Ruth Harmon, education.
Walter Hauser, physics.
Masanori Higa, education.
John Kazantzi, English.
Frank F. Lee, sociology-anthropology.
Lila Leibowitz, sociology-anthropology.
Milton Leitenberg, biology.
William F. Luder, chemistry.
Antonio L. Mezzacappa, modern languages.
Harold Naidus, chemistry.
Irene A. Nichols, education.
John D. Oberholtzer, physics.
Saul Rogolsky, education.
Norman Rosenblatt, history.
James Ryan, modern languages.
Eugene J. Saletan, physics.
Freda Salzman, physics.
George Salzman, physics.
Ina Samuels, psychology.
Bertram Sharf, psychology.
Gilbert A. Schloss, English.
Donald Shelby, economics.
Robert L. Stern, chemistry.
Harold L. Stubbs, mathematics.
H. Ti Tien, chemistry.
Michael T. Vaughn, physics.

SIMMONS COLLEGE

Donald S. Dunbar, psychology.
Tilden G. Edelstein, history.
David Emerson, physics.
Richard Freedman, English.
Henry J. Halko, history.
Ruth C. Hawthorne, history.
Manfred Klein, German.
Lawrence L. Langer, English.
Ruth S. Leonard, library science.
Joseph T. Leverich, mathematics.
William M. Manly, English.
Josephine F. Milburn, government.
Carroll F. Miles, government.
Margaret B. Milliken, English.
George W. Mitchie, English.
Mary K. O'Brien, nursing.
Sumner M. Rosen, economics.
Richard C. Sterne, English.
Wylie Syther, English.
Roy M. Tollefson, government.

SMITH COLLEGE

Louis Cohn-Haft, history.
Robert J. Fabian, mathematics.
Philip Green, government.
Bruce Hawkins, physics.
Murray Kiteley, philosophy.
Paul Lauter, English.
Alice Lazerovitz, philosophy.
Bert Mendelson, mathematics.
Michael Rice, physics.
Peter Rowe, government.
Ramon Eduardo Ruiz, history.
J. Diedrick Snoek, psychology.
A. H. Spees, physics.
Melvin Steinberg, physics.
Francis Stienon, astronomy.
Donald Trumpler, mathematics.

TUFTS UNIVERSITY

Reilly Atkinson III, physics.
Marston Balch, drama and speech.
Ernest Cassara, religion.
Carl Cohen, mathematics.
John Cornwall, economics.
Mary Jane Cramer, sociology.
Dorothea J. Crook, psychology.
Morris A. Cynkin, medical school.
William Dameshek, medical school.
Allen E. Everett, physics.
Sanford Freedman, psychology.
Morris Friedkin, pharmacology.
Sol Gittleman, German.
Hilde Hein, philosophy.
Roslyn B. Henning, classics.
Dennis V. Higgins, English.
Franklyn D. Holzman, economics.
David Isles, mathematics.
Leonard Kirsch, economics.
Madeline Kovach, German.
Melvin J. Krant, medical school.

Norman Krinsky, pharmacology.
George F. Leger, mathematics.
Zella Luria, psychology.
Lewis F. Manly, economics.
Bernard McCabe, English.
Nancy Milburn, biology.
Robert L. H. Miller, religion.
Kivie Moldave, medicine.
Thornton B. Ratz, psychology.
Gene Reeves, theology.
Douglas W. Reynolds, art.
H. Ronald Rouse, mathematics.
Gerhard Schmidt, biochemistry.
Edwin Schur, sociology.
Robert Schwartz, medical school.
Newlin R. Smith, economics.
Gary M. Spackey, French.
Manfred Steiner, medical school.
Walter J. K. Tannenberg, medical school.
Jack Tessman, physics.
Robert H. Webb, physics.
John C. Wells, German.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

Max M. Allen, psychology.
Curt F. Beck, political science.
J. David Colfax, sociology.
Douglas P. Crowne, psychology.
Maurice L. Farber, psychology.
Amerigo Farina, psychology.
R. C. Gosselin, mathematics.
Jerrold Heiss, sociology.
David A. Ivry, finance.
Seth Leacock, sociology.
Charles H. McCaghy, sociology.
Dennison Nash, sociology.
Charles A. Owen, Jr., English.
G. N. Raney, mathematics.
H. Reschovsky, mathematics.
Kenneth Ring, psychology.
A. Robert Rollin, psychology.
Joy S. Roth, zoology.
Julian B. Rotter, psychology.
William A. Wilson, Jr., psychology.
Elliott S. Wolk, mathematics.
David Zeaman, psychology.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

Horace W. Briggs, political science.
Robert V. Daniels, history.
Denez Gulyas, sociology.
Samuel B. Hand, history.
Robert L. Hoffman, history.
Richard E. Leidberg, chaplain.
William Metcalfe, history.
Anthony Molho, history.
Edward Rossman, Romance languages.
Daniel Scheans, anthropology.
Thomas J. Spinner, Jr., history.

WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE

Bernard Howard, mathematics.
Bruce C. McQuarrie, mathematics.
Romeo L. Moruzzi, electrical engineering.
Philip Shakir, mathematics.
David Todd, chemistry.

YALE UNIVERSITY

Robert P. Abelson, psychology.
Layman E. Allen, law.
James Appel, psychology.
Richard J. Andrew, biology.
James Appel, phychology.
Wendell Bell, sociology.
Bernard J. Bergen, sociology.
Merton C. Bernstein, law.
Harry J. Benda, history.
John M. Blum, history.
George Braverman, biochemistry.
Abram Chipman, psychiatry.
Dorothy D. Ciarlo, psychology.
Michael Cole, psychology.
Barry E. Collins, psychology.
Robert M. Cook, sociology.
Alice Cornelison, psychiatry.
Sheila Counce-Nicklas, biology.
Robert S. Crowder, psychology.
Robert A. Dahl, political science.
David J. Danelski, political science.
Gaylord D. Ellison, psychiatry.
Thomas I. Emerson, law.
Edmund Fantino, psychology.
Harry Fein, psychology.
Yasuko Filby, psychology.
John P. Flynn, psychology.
J. G. Gall, biology.
Arthur W. Galston, biology.
Frank T. Gardner, psychiatry.
Fred Gault, psychology.
Joseph Glick, psychology.
David Goldberg, psychiatry.
Harry Gollub, psychology.
Laurence Gould, psychology.
Leroy C. Gould, sociology.
M. M. Haith, psychology.
George A. Huaco, sociology.
Michael Kahn, psychology.
Kenneth Keniston, psychology.
Bill Kessen, psychology.
Charles A. Kiesler, psychology.
Daniel L. Kline, psychology.
E. E. Krieckhaus, psychology.
Theodore Lidz, psychiatry.
Robert J. Liston, psychiatry.
Staughton Lynd, history.
James A. Mau, sociology.
James D. Millikan, philosophy.
Ronald N. Morris, pharmacy.
George D. Mostow, mathematics.
Pauli Murray, law.
Nea M. Norton, psychiatry.
R. C. W. Prescott, psychiatry.
Charles A. Reich, law.
Charles E. Rickart, mathematics.
Julian M. Sturtevant, chemistry.
Josiah Thompson, philosophy.
Roy C. Treadway, sociology.
Cynthia M. Wild, psychiatry.
Mary C. Wright, history.
George Wolf, psychiatry.

OTHERS

Sigmund Abeles, Wellesley College.

S. P. Colowick, Vanderbilt University.

Flora Donham, Philip Donham, Irvin Doress, Cardinal Cushing College.

Alexandra Eliot, Samuel Friedman, University of Michigan.

H. Gintis, Suffolk University.

Kenneth Greenblatt, Jerome Grossman, H. L. Holcomb, Cambridge Electron Accelerator.

Sidney Kaplan, University of Massachusetts.

Hedda Korsch, Wheaton College.

Allen Kropf, Amherst College.

Carole Labrousse, Wellesley College.

Joan Levin, Emmanuel College.

Hilde Geiringer von Mises, Wheaton College.

Jane Marcus, Thomas O'Donnell, Pine Manor Junior College.

Ruth Anna Putnam, Wellesley College.

Mark Rich, Trevor Robinson, Frederick L. Schuman, Williams College.

Rebecca H. Shankland, Wheaton College.

Susan Raymond Vogel, Wellesley College.

Henry T. Yost, Amherst College.

(Institutional affiliation listed for purposes of identification only.

If you approve of this statement, reprint it in other newspapers and write or wire: President Lyndon B. Johnson, White House, Washington, D.C.

(The cost of presenting this statement is approximately $6,500. A major portion of this amount was contributed by the names listed above. Further contributions toward the cost of this and subsequent advertisements are needed. Checks, payable to the Greater Boston Faculty Committee on Vietnam, may be sent to Post Office Box 543, Central Square Station, Cambridge, Mass., 02139. Prof. Everett Mendelsohn, secretary; Prof. Cyrus Levinthal, treasurer.)

Portland, Oreg., *May 19, 1965.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building.

Honorable Sir: Congratulations to you and Senator Gruening for your courage. Perhaps one day when another book is written on Profiles in Courage, you will both be included. How sad that their aren't more Senators who have the courage to speak out against the policy being pursued by our Government.

We are grateful to you and want you to know that you have our support.

Sincerely yours,

Rose M. Schulz.

Portland, Oreg., *May 21, 8965.*

Senator Morse: There are a lot of words on radio and in papers about you being against the U.S. involvement in the "Goldwater war" in Vietnam, and the mess in the Dominican Republic.

If you are sincere, and if you are quoted correctly, it seems to me you should make a lot of professional politicians mad by proposing a constitutional amendment forbidding Americans from fighting on foreign soil—volunteers excepted.

At 65 I don't care what happens to any government. The cocksure ignorance of politicians has made a mess of the world, and proves that the rarest work of God is an honest politician. We Oregonians are also aware that "Salem and Washington, D.C., are the only insane asylums on earth run by their own inhabitants."

How about giving the constitutional amendment some thought? And words? Please don't bother to reply.

Respectfully.

E. P. Cichy.

Portland, Oreg., *May 12, 1965.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Much like the boy in the USO advertisements, I picture you back in Washington wondering "Does anybody know I'm here?" Although I am a high school student, underage, and therefore, do not "count," I am very aware of your opinions on Vietnam (as is nearly everyone else). I know you are there. I am listening (even though the Oregonian does not quote you with enthusiasm) and I am proud that you represent my State.

Out of protest more than anything else, and because I do not want to support action that I am uninformed on, I have not made up my mind to one course of action or another on Vietnam. The reason? Because the American people have not been told the facts about Vietnam. I cannot believe that we are being dealt fairly with. There is a silence between those vast and diverse areas and the people—people who are being asked (or should be asked, somewhere along the line) in some measure to determine their fate. If the American Government steps into a country to maintain the status quo, rotten and corrupt as it may be, is it not, or should it not be, the American people who are stepping in? And if the responsibility is ours, does not the American Government have a responsibility to us? We are becoming the servants to a vast government machine whereas the Government should never be a machine and should always be the servant to the people. We are losing sight of our own system of freedom, in a grave sense. But is all this ideological banter set aside for wartime conditions. Indeed: Whose war? I don't recall it coming up before your august body of Representatives and Senators, do you, Senator Morse?

As I have said, I do not know what to advocate in Vietnam merely because I do not know enough. But I do know this. I feel that the job you are doing, is a bangup one, and I wouldn't trade you for all the hawks in the country. You are the loyal opposition, you and Senator Church (I was born in Idaho) and precious few others, and you are vital. I know you are there, and I am proud.

Yours truly,

Miss Megan Taylor.

P.S.—This was not an assignment for an unimaginative social studies teacher. I just had to say it.

Klamath Falls, Oreg.,
May 17, 1695.

Dear Congressman: I include myself among many responsible citizens who are deeply concerned about our Government's policy in Vietnam. One serious source of dissatisfaction is the absence of any detailed assessment of the feelings and attitudes of the South Vietnamese regarding U.S. aid and also regarding the Vietcong.

President Johnson has assured us that the South Vietnamese desire our presense and detest the Vietcong. The only support for this viewpoint is the President's assertion that it is so. Unfortunately, we have not been given sufficient proof of this and there are, on the contrary, many good reasons for doubting its validity. I do not think, for instance, that the continued existence of the guerrilla movement in South Vietnam is adequately explained by Vietcong terrorism.

It seems to me that we were not helping either the South Vietnamese or ourselves by our armed intervention in Vietnam. For both practical and moral reasons it is unwise for us to continue our present policy. We could support the interests of democracy far more effectively by ceasing our bombings and leading in the negotiations to set up a viable and independent state in South Vietnam. The money we are now using to support the war could, if used differently, provide a means for the growth and development of South Vietnam.

I urge you to call for an immediate cessation of the bombings. I believe the United States could do far more for the Vietnamese and for our own prestige by taking the lead in a call for negotiations.

Respectfully,
Serena A. Weaver.

Greater Portland Council
of Churches,
Portland, Oreg., May 20, 1965.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The Greater Portland Council of Churches is morally concerned with the Vietnam situation. We want you to know of this concern. It is rooted in our calling as Christian people to "seek peace and pursue it." We recognize also our responsibility to "do justly and love mercy." Our concern, therefore, is peace with justice. We wish to express our interest in the true needs of the people of southeast Asia, our hope for the most helpful and constructive American policy toward that region, and our concern about the continuing escalation of what you recently termed "a real war" in Vietnam.

We believe that American aims should be stated positively in terms of backing "the revolution of rising expectations" which characterizes the desires of Asian peoples along with African and Latin American peoples. We do not feel that our country has emphasized sufficiently our basic sympathy with the development of political, economic, and social justice in southeast Asia. In this connection, we urge that our Government support the Mekong Delta project now underway, which promises so much for the wellbeing of southeast Asia, in amounts comparable to our military expenditures in the area. This would confirm U.S. concern for a constructive alternative to present trends. It would be incontrovertible evidence of our peaceful aims for the region. It would contrast with any who seek to exploit or seize these areas for their own purposes. In connection with our special concern for South Vietnam, we would note that its future depends on making it viable in terms of integral relationships with the entire region.

We hold with all thoughtful and discerning men who prize freedom that communism is a grave hazard and a most exploitative form of social organization.

However, we are forced to accept the fact that to present the American case as basically that of fighting and containing communism is too limited and too negative a rationale for our foreign policy, and especially for our significant presence in southeast Asia. We are further aware of how little this interests and appeals to many peoples of southeast Asia, whose attention is fixed on other pressing concerns. Thus, we recoggnize the necessity of our Government's prudential use of the working concept of coexistence with governments in Asia which are not patterned after our own. We accept the fact that southeast Asian countries will evolve their own forms of government with which we must work, even though they may bear little resemblance to Western democracies.

We believe that our country must move beyond unilateral action in Vietnam before the escalation and expansion of war involves the overt intervention of Communist China and increases the hazards of nuclear war. We reject unqualifiedly any and all proposals for the preventive or preemptive bombing of China as an aspect of the present situation. Since negotiation is inevitable either during war or at the close of war, and protracted conflict extends the suffering, escalates fear and hatred born of war, and deepens the tragic aftermath of war into which communism can most successfully move, we urge the ceaseless exploration and use of all avenues of negotiation. We support your announced intention of "unconditional discussions," which we realize must include the Vietcong, which is composed of both North and South Vietnamese. We understand the impossibility and inadvisability of our policing the internal affairs of countries around the world. We believe that we should work energetically for the creation of an Asian International Armed Police Force for protective purposes in Vietnam to supplant our forces at the earliest possible moment. We are painfully aware of the difficult role the United States has been taking, and which to Asians and other colored peoples of the world can be so easily misconstrued. To secure the order and security with justice of that entire region now demands that we, in concert with other nations, find alternate, long-range solutions commensurate with the serious needs and great possibilities of that area.

We want you to know, Mr. President, that we keep you continually in our prayers, asking our God to sustain you in the midst of your heavy responsibilities, and to do in His power, mercy, and grace what we are unable to do in preserving peace in our troubled world.

Sincerely yours,
William B. Cate,
Executive Secretary.

Hermiston, Oreg.,
May 19, 1965.

Wayne L. Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We wish to commend you on your stand against President Johnson concerning his interventionist foreign policy. We believe that if the United States continues to pursue this policy the results will be catastrophic. We find that by talking to people that there is more opposition than the polls show. We hope that you, Senator Gruening and Representative Green will keep hitting at Mr. Johnson where it hurts.

Sincerely yours,
Chas. Snively.
Lois Snively.

Eugene, Oreg., *May 21, 1965.*

Dear Senator Morse: We profoundly support your efforts to alter U.S. policy in Vietnam. We equally urge you to do anything in your power to halt our appalling intervention in the Dominican Republic.

Sincerely,
Conrad D. Miller.
Laura J. Miller.

Portland, Oreg., *May 21, 1965.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: In response to a letter which recently appeared in the Journal, I am writing to let you know my attitude toward your stands on Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of your position.

Please know that I shall continue to urge my friends and acquaintances to listen to your excellent points of view. Your insight and courage is greatly admired.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Don Harold Killian.

Norman, Okla.,
May 8, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is to commend you for continuing to urge a negotiated settlement in Vietnam.

The widening of the war has only made matters worse by increasing the risk of another world war.

Truly yours,
Margaret E. Salmon.
Edward J. Goodman.

Madison, Wis.,
May 11, 1965.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for having the courage to vote against the $700 million Vietnam appropriation.

Sincerely yours,
Ruth H. Myrland.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
May 15, 1965.

Dear Senator Morse: I am inexpressibly grateful for your voice of opposition to America's disastrous and cruel foreign policy, particularly regarding Vietnam. I find the thought extremely frightening, that if not for you and the Alaskan Senator, there would be virtually no official questioners of the lie the American people are being indoctrinated with. I pledge to work with you for the peace and justice the people of this earth deserve.

Sincerely,
Ira Chaleff.

Santa Fe, N. Mex.,
May 14, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable Sir: I want to be counted among those who are desperately against our action in Vietnam and intervention in other parts of the world.

The stand you have consistently taken is deeply appreciated by many Americans. The Congress is really our only hope to stop the American madness, but according to a Quaker visitation made in Washington early in April (259 calls), "the Congressmen are disturbed about Vietnam but none appeared to be interested in taking any initiative,"—Gretchen Tuthill, who headed up the visitation for the American Friends Service Committee.

It is our responsibility, as the represented, to inform you that many of us feel that the work done by Senators like you and Messrs. Gruening, Church, McGovern, Gaylord Nelson, etc., is the only means possible to retrieve our country from the mess it has built up for itself under the leadership of the

President and his advisers in the Pentagon and State Department. When a handful of men has this much power, our form of Government loses even its resemblance to a democracy.

If the Congressmen are to represent the people, as they are sworn to do, they must restrain the hand of America, or the future can be only a horrible question mark. Nobility really means great power in a hand that withholds its use.

May your leadership continue to be strong and inspired.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. Monica Kernberger.

Rochester, N.Y.,
May 10, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: I support wholeheartedly the statements you have made recently with respect to our stupid, shameful involvement in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

Your counsels of sanity, of morality, are to be vigorously applauded. For the sake of the worlds future, I know that you will continue to advise as intelligently, as wisely, as you have in the past.

Very best regards,
Roger E. Lamb.

Lawrence, Kans., *May 16, 1965.*

Dear Senator Wayne Morse: Please add my voice to yours in opposition to the present Vietnam policy. You are not alone in speaking against those who now will not even deign to speak at all. It is no doubt the nature of "hawks" to fly above the "herd," but I hope Mr. Bundy is not so far away that you can't be heard.

Respectfully,
Joseph F. Wetzel.

Fairfax, Va., *May 17, 1965.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: At this dangerous time when U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam and elsewhere seems to be succumbing more and more to impulsive and irresponsible action, your courageous, rational and balanced public statements are a beacon of hope.

I want you to know that you have earned the deep admiration and gratitude of Americans in all parts of this country.

Sincerely,
Myrtle Brickman.

Boulder, Colo.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your courage in acting on behalf of the best principles of American democracy and humanitarian thought in voting against endorsing our rash policy in Vietnam and, at least by indirection, in the Dominican Republic.

For years we have known you to be a man of courage and high principle but this action must have been unusually difficult even for you. However, I hope you realize that the huge majorities in both Houses of Congress by no means reflected any such preponderance of support in the Nation. Many people we know have very grave doubts about our policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic and some of us are sickened to realize that our country would use its massive armed might to force political decisions on other peoples.

Thank you and best wishes for many more years in the U.S. Senate.

Sincerely,
Russell Olin.
Carol Olin.

Old Bethpage, N.Y., *May 17, 1965.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I have recently read some of your remarks to the Senate on the President's request for more funds for Vietnam. I must advise you that your comments were masterful. I have long admired you and your courage and wisdom but this speech was the finest.

Isn't there some way we can stop the President from leading us in this terrible path to future war? I have written letters to all my Congressmen and Senators but it seems of little avail. Letters to the President seem futile, but still I write.

Keep up your wonderful work, for even though you may not receive the praises of the press you know that millions of ordinary people applaud you and wish you success. If there is some way that I can help I would deem it an honor to hear from you.

Very sincerely yours,
Robert G. Bach.

Chapel Hill, South Hadley, Mass.,
May 17, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have just now seen excerpts from your two speeches in the Senate on May 5 and 6. I am writing to express my deep gratitude for what you said there and for the great courage it took to express such views in the present atmosphere in the United States.

In tone and style, attitude and actions, President Johnson has generated this atmosphere. He has built upon the condititioning of 20 years of the cold war. And in the past 4 months he has undermined 150 years of American effort to build a world of international law and comity. He has returned to the insufferable self-righteousness and truculence in foreign affairs of President Theodore Roosevelt. The Johnson corollary to the Monroe Doctrine strikes at the heart of the inter-American system, flaunts treaties, charters, and the pledged word of the United States. In Vietnam he has done the same things, but with the infinitely greater danger of total war with China and perhaps the Soviet Union. He has destroyed the detente painfully and partially inaugurated by President Kennedy and former Premier Khrushchev. He has violated his own spoken word even as he uttered it to the people of the United States and to the world. Whatever his intentions his actions have widened the war, drawn America in deeper to that tragic situation, and alienated other governments and peoples throughout the world. He has acted unilaterally, arbitrarily, and intransigently; he has defied petitions and criticisms from the Senate and from many responsible persons in the academic world. He has profoundly frightened millions of people and brought not only the good faith but even the sanity of the administration into question. And he has surrounded himself with a group of advisers who are obsessed with fear of communism and the belief that it can be contained and defeated by the use of American military power and the threat of nuclear war.

I honor you for your heroic efforts to correct this appalling situation, and I beg you to continue in these efforts. Humanity and history will confirm and reward you.

Sincerely yours,
David P. Leonard.

Kingston, N.J., *May 12, 1965.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I was in the Senate gallery last Thursday, the sixth, just at the end of Senator Dirksen's speech, in which he attacked you, not by name, for refusing to support the President on Vietnam. I thought your reply to him, that you would let nothing stop your criticism when you saw something wrong, was right, and that your entire course has been right; I am writing this to thank you for what you have been doing. I am one of those thousands in New Jersey who is unrepresented in the U.S. Senate, and I am glad to see that you and a few others are giving me a little bit of what the English used to call "virtual representation."

One thing more, Senator. I hope that in all your attacks on this evil, and, what is worse, stupid and shortsighted policy you will not neglect to propose alternatives. The President's offer of a TVA for southeast Asia in his Johns Hopkins speech is not only the most constructive thing he has done, it is the only constructive thing he has done. I hope that you will not advocate that we ignore the people there, but that we start trying to help them and stop trying to rule them by force.

Yours sincerely,
Robert D. Bulkley, Jr.

P.S.—I'd appreciate copies of a few of your speeches on this, and being put on your mailing list.

California State College
at Fullerton,
Fullerton, Calif., May 11, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I support your honest and courageous stand against the current U.S. policy in Vietnam.

I feel we should withdraw immediately and unconditionally.

I would appreciate receiving any printed material that fully expounds your views on this matter.

I realize that it is physically impossible to answer each inquiry individually, but academic inquisitiveness leads me to pose the following question: If a secret ballot were taken in the Senate regarding Vietnam policy, what, in your opinion, would be the probable outcome?

Sincerely,
J. E. Morrow,
Assistant Professor of Psychology.

Long Island, N.Y.,
May 17, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We strongly support your courageous stand in opposition to the administration's war against the people of Vietnam. It is our opinion that the United States should seek a negotiated settlement of that war, based on the 1954 Geneva agreement and leading to the withdrawal of all U.S. Armed Forces and military aid from southeast Asia. But even if negotiations should prove impossible or should end in failure, we feel that the United States should withdraw its military forces anyway. The time has come to end this reckless policy of military adventurism before it's too late.

Respectfully,
Philip Oke.
Mrs. Raymond Oke.

Somerville, Mass.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: I am grateful to you for being the only articulate person in protesting the President's policy in Vietnam.

Sincerely,
P. G. Mitchell.

(No reply needed.)

WOODMONT, CONN., *May 16, 1965.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I write in support of your recent criticisms directed against the Johnson administration's foreign policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. I endorse wholeheartedly your negative vote on the Vietnam appropriation and regret that more representatives of the people did not show similar courage in opposing the measure. I fear that we in America are rapidly reaching the point where criticism becomes equated with subversion and where consensus politics becomes a substitute for hard thinking.

May I urge upon you the need for an immediate Senate investigation into the conduct of the war in Vietnam and into our invasion of the Dominican Republic. Such an investigation should be publicly held and constructive critics of the administration both within and without the Government should be heard. Too often the mask of national security is used to hide the failures of bureaucratic decisionmaking. Too often a veil of secrecy has hidden the narrowness of vision and the inbreeding of ideas which afflicts the executive branch of our Government in the conduct of foreign policy.

May your voice remain loud in opposition as long as reason lives in Washington, D.C.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL E. PARRISH,
Graduate Student, Yale University.

PORT CHESTER, N.Y.,
May 18, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was very reassuring to read of your intervention in the Senate about foreign policy.

We are greatly impressed by your eloquence and clarity which is a consequence of maturity and knowledge. Senators like you are the hope of all Americans. A policy of arrogance, aggression, compulsive possessiveness only spells disaster. The American people are not Texas cattle to be branded with these characteristics. We voted for President Johnson because we thought he would continue the policies of the late great President Kennedy. Yet, it seems Barry Goldwater is in the Presidency. We live in times in which none of us can remain indifferent. The greatness of this country is due to the free enterprise of ideals and ideas. Why should we change now?

Very sincerely yours,

E. A. GOMEZ, M.D.
GERDA GOMEZ

BOSTON, MASS.,
May 18, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I Congratulate and thank you for the fight you are waging against an expanded war in Vietnam.

I would only amend your remarks in one slight respect. You say that China moves in on the ground, we will have to send 300,000 troops. But Walter Lippmann writes in a recent column that there is plenty of talk in State and Defense these days about sending 350,000 troops to South Vietnam, regardless of what China does. In this they are consistent. We can only have our way in South Vietnam at the cost of a massive military occupation of the country. The alternative is a government in which the Vietcong will play a large part, a government that will demand U.S. withdrawal, a government that will begin to normalize relations with the North and with China.

The greatest danger of a U.S. occupation in Vietnam, in my judgment, is not that it will bring about war with China or even Russia, but that it will bring, as the Algerian war did in France, the destruction of freedom and of democratic institutions at home. We are already on this road; we will go much farther.

Sincerely,

JOHN HOLT.

ELLENSBURG, WASH.,
May 14, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I often discuss with my family and friends what should or should not be done about the escalation of the war in Vietnam. All give you credit for your great courage in speaking out on the Vietnam situation. It is the least I can do to inform you, that in truth, you have many, many backers in this area. If only there were some way we could speak a little louder.

This is the country of all of us—not just those in high offices. Mr. Rusk intimates we shouldn't object to what is going on and that we should consider the "real facts."

What are the real facts in regard to Vietnam and Santo Domingo? It is very frustrating to always have to be guessing what they are. We talk among ourselves and make statements as to what we think is back of all the fighting, but come up with no real facts. We wonder if, other than communism, they are racial, religious, political, plain showing of strength, or all of these together. We wonder if President Johnson is making all final decisions and/or is being dictated to by certain officials, special interests or leaders of other countries who may have something to gain politically or otherwise. If we were told the facts as events happen we would not come up with wild assumptions for which we could possibly be very wrong.

We and the press talk of freedom, the free world, the American way, and the right of all people to choose their leaders. Isn't there some way we can continue to make these expressions have real meaning. I, myself hope that some unknown event will arise or some minds be prodded into working out some kind of peace before use of the atomic bomb.

I would appreciate knowing of any source of information that would give some truths in regard to our deep involvement in Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. BERTHA FIEGE.

HARVARD COLLEGE OBSERVATORY,
Cambridge, Mass., May 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing just to add my voice to those who praise you most highly for your continued opposition to the U.S. war in Vietnam. Thank God for you and Senator GRUENING; I sincerely hope others will soon join you. Keep it up, and good luck.

Sincerely,

DAVID MORRISON.

COPENHAGEN F, DENMARK,
May 16, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I agree with the Danish papers, the London Guardian, and the London Observer: the United States must negotiate with the Vietcong. I completely agree with the statement printed in the New York Times by my fellow academics in the Greater Boston faculty group, "A Reply to Secretary Rusk on Vietnam," and with their conclusion, "We must arrange for an immediate cease-fire and offer to negotiate with the principal combatants, including the Vietcong; we must cease our air raids on North Vietnam; we should use the good offices of the United Nations in bringing about these ends, and we must assure the world that we will not use nuclear weapons in the pursuit of victory or in the pursuit of peace."

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR FORER.

Senator MORSE: I strongly support your courageous, strong stand against the U.S. action in Vietnam. All of Denmark does, too, from what I can read in the newspaper.

Above is a carbon of a letter mailed to President Johnson.

Your speeches give courage to us all.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR FORER.

PLYMOUTH, MICH.,
May 15, 1965.

Senator MORSE: Thank you, Mr. Senator, for all you said at Detroit Town Meeting on channel 4, WWJ, Tonight.

When you left the Republican Party I felt very sad, but I have since learned why and have become an Independent too.

Keep on pounding out the truth. We surely need it. I feel better tonight. Most of the time I am torn as to what to believe—how must it be for our young people? I hope they keep it up on the college campuses of our country.

It was wonderful telling us again about our Senator Arthur Vandenburg. God bless him.

Sincerely,

MARGARET PIERCE
Mrs. Frank J. Pierce.

ASHFIELD, MASS.,
May 17, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I must write to congratulate you on your stand vis-a-vis the $700 million war appropriations bill rammed through Congress by the President. It is inconceivable that this should be done at a time when we have, as well as the rest of the world, so many social ills and problems which need immediate attention.

My son has just registered for the draft and I can envision 18 years of careful attention, love, direction, and guidance, as well as money, going into a square box. Having fought almost 4 years in World War II, narrowly missing extinction several times, I am fed up with this myopic megalomania for war displayed by men in positions of power in this country. Like you, I refuse to acquiesce to this concentrated drive toward war. Would, however, that I could do more.

In the recent past I have given up a well-paying job in a munitions factory (so-called defense) in order to pursue work toward a doctorate. Hopefully there will yet be time to practice what I have spent 2 years trying to acquire an educational background which is acceptable at the college level.

Meanwhile, my very best wishes to you and the few others who are courageously waging the battle for human survival.

Sincerely,

DONALD FITZGERALD.

P.S. 1.—May I have a copy of your speeches May 5 and 6?

P.S. 2.—Please put my name on the list of subscribers to your campaign needs. Also, would you pass this on to TED KENNEDY. Thank you.

PRINCETON, N.J.,
May 17, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your noble and responsible speeches in the Senate on May 5 and May 6 regarding our foreign policy in Asia set you apart from your colleagues as a true Senator, a true leader. Everything I have read in my past 10 busy years as a mother of five has led me to the conclusion that in your line of reasoning is the only path to a world of hope for our children and their counterparts all over the planet.

I do not intend to stop reading and learning and I do not intend to stop writing my Representatives and my President, urging them to take heed of your longer sighted and wiser view of our changing world. Impatience and political expediency and military might cannot bring about the "better world" we must arduously work toward for those who come after us. President Johnson seems to want to create a world in his own image as a kind of personal "7 days wonder."

My husband, a busy physician, joins me in sending you best wishes and gratitude.

Very sincerely,
Mrs. Alfred T. Halt.
Marie J. Halt

May 16, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: May I express, belately, my appreciation and admiration for your stand against President Johnson's request for $700 million for further military requirements in Vietnam. Today a similar message shall be forwarded to Senators Gruening and Nelson for having joined with you in this action. I regret that I can't number myself among your constituents, and I shall so inform my own Senators who are either in accord with President Johnson's increasingly arrogant foreign policy or lack the courage to publicly denounce it—in any case neither of them represent my position in this matter.

President Johnson's rapid resort to and expansion of the old style "gunboat" diplomacy has led me to finally accept the proposition that he deliberately misled the American people in the last campaign when he argued that a difference existed between himself and Goldwater with reference as to what actions were necessary and proper in troubled areas like Vietnam. Either he deliberately misled us, or he has been, in an amazingly short time, completely sold on the position taken by the "war hawks." Apparently no "dove" can reach him now.

It would seem that the only action left to those voters feeling as I do is to do what apparently we should have done last November—refuse our vote for either candidate. If the mule kicks you once, it is the mule's fault; but if it kicks you the second time, it is your own fault.

Sincerely yours,
Ann V. King
Mrs. G. Barr King.
Spokane, Wash.

Farmington, Pa., *May 19, 1965.*

Dear Senator Morse: We want to thank you and express our appreciation for your courageous and lonely fight during the Vietnam crisis. We were grateful for what you expressed on May 5 and 6 when the $700 million appropriation measure was considered. We simply want to support and encourage you in your stand and we hope for both a growing awareness of the wrongness of our Government's position and a militant pursuit of peace.

Sincerely,
Michael and Shirley Brandies.

Moyland, Pa.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: May I send my devout thanks for your determination for morality and reason in our Vietnam policy.

I am deeply worried. Surely there seems to be a juggernaut under way carrying the administration and with it all of us to the brink of mad actions. What do you suggest that citizens do to reverse the disastrous policy of the United States in Vietnam? The President fails to listen to friends abroad or reasoned advice from Congress, the press, and educators.

Should those who are concerned use their bodies to stand in the path of this mad policy? I picketed with the religious group at the Pentagon last week. Should we come again and stay longer?

Very urgently,
Robert Anthony.
May 19, 1965.

St. Agnes School,
Albany, N.Y., May 18, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Congratulations to you for a heroic defense of the only realistic and safe foreign policy I've heard mentioned near the White House for Vietnam.

Keep up the good work. We're on your side and we'll do our best where we live to help people understand how valuable our stakes really are in Asia and how important it is that we change our present bankrupting war for a more humane method of containing communism.

Respectfully yours,
Eseter J. Langworthy.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
May 19, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Yesterday I was privileged to see a film dealing with Vietnam which you made for a Yale protest group. I can not help but admire your courage in standing up to the administration, the Pentagon, and the State Department, and thereby presenting the viewpoint of a substantial portion of the American people. I sincerely wish that there were more Senators and Congressman with your perspective and conviction to a sound and moral foreign policy.

I fervently believe that continuation of the war in Vietnam can only result in creating a deep hatred for the United States and with it a misunderstanding of the truly democratic principles on which this country was built and in which the vast majority of Americans believe.

May I offer my support in your continued efforts of opposition.

Very truly yours,
Louise Schneiderman.

Freeport, Maine,
May 18, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations, my heartiest congratulations on your two prophetic and magnificent speeches in the Senate, May 5 and 6. I agree with you absolutely, nor could what you have said be better expressed. Yours is patriotism of the highest and wisdom beyond dispute. I am writing in the same vein in a couple of newspaper columns here in Maine.

God be with you.

Sincerely,
David L. Ghaham.

Automotive News,
Detroit Mich., May 18, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Senator Wayne Morse: I commend you for your efforts to keep the United States from drifting into war in the East.

Is it not possible to have a full-fledged debate in Congress as to what our foreign policy should be?

How can we citizens help?

Sincerely,
Robert M. Finlay.

May 18, 1965.

Sen. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Just a short note to say that I approve of your stand on Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. It is good to know that some representatives of the American people have not been cowed by the dictatorial methods of the Johnson administration. We are not supporting freedom in the civil wars that exist in these two countries.

As a Johnson supporter for the presidency—politically, financially, and morally—I feel that I was deceived into voting for what I believed was a policy of intelligence and moderation. Now our foreign policy is applauded by the John Birch Society, the American Nazi Party, A.C.A., Richard Nixon, Joseph Alsop, Barry Goldwater and the rest of the far right.

This country needs an antipoverty campaign—in the State Department, the Pentagon, and the CIA. There is a poverty of intelligence, ideas, justice, humility, and moral values.

Keep up your wonderful fight for a truly free world and the rights of all mankind.

Sincerely yours,
Lee Horvitz.
Monroeville, Pa.

Society of Brothers,
Farmington, Pa.

Dear Senator Morse: With this letter my wife and I want to express our gratitude and respect for how, and with what courage you have spoken out protesting against what is going on in Vietnam.

In these last weeks we have been following very closely and with great interest the happenings and atrocities going on in the world. We are deeply troubled how much hate and violence there is and how rapidly it is increasing. So little respect is paid to individual lives, and life seems to be considered unimportant and worthless by so many men.

We read in the Congressional Record from your speech on May 5. It moves us deeply to know that you stand for justice and world peace and we support you fully in this. It is so very important that that kind of voice as yours and that of the Senator from Alaska, Mr. Gruening, are heard. Again we want to thank you and ask that you do not feel alone, and continue to express what you feel is right.

We greet you warmly.

Yours,
Allister and Judy Marchant.

Stockton, Calif.,
May 14, 1965.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I would like to express my gratitude to you for the stand you have taken on Vietnam. I realize what terrific odds you are facing when the machine is all oiled up ready to explode at any moment.

To me I don't seem to understand why anyone would want to push us into another war. As the saying goes, "we win the wars but lose the peace." I am sure that the people of the world must think we Americans a very vicious nation. To my way of thinking our troops should be brought home as one boy's life isn't worth the entire strip. The reason I speak is, I lost a brother in the first war and that was supposed to be the war to end wars.

Was I wrong in my way of thinking about the Dominican Republic, as I thought the President said he was only sending in the Marines to get our American people out of danger. Now we are not only there but we are telling them who they should put in power.

I wonder what this Nation would do if De Gaulle or any other foreign nation came over here with their troops and said "you can't have Senator Morse in the Senate," just what would we tell them? I am sure you know the answer. I am sure if the President keeps on going the way he has been he will go down in history as a very much hated man. Along with him the same goes for Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara. When I mention to some people the things I have put in this letter they say I am either a Communist or a John Bircher and I can assure you I am neither.

Anyway Senator Morse I want you to know that you have made many, many, friends and may God bless you for your stand on the affairs of our people.

Cordially yours,

Charles T. Cox.

May 16, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have been meaning to write you for a long time to advise and agree with you in your position on Vietnam. Keep up the good work.

Further, I just want to say I have high admiration for you and regard you as a man of great wisdom, courage, and honesty.

With all best wishes for your continued good health and good work.

God bless you.

Very respectfully,

I. C. Kremen, M.D.

Palo Alto, Calif.

St. Luke's Methodist Church,
Columbus, Ohio, May 17, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Every thoughtful, well-informed and fairminded man agrees with you that the war in Vietnam is stupid and unnecessary.

I am back of you 100 percent.

Yours respectfully,

Charles B. Whitman,
Pastor, St. Luke's Methodist Church, and Lieutenant Colonel.

Bryn Mawr, Pa.,
May 19, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to express admiration and appreciation for your courageous stand against the U.S. increasingly dangerous and clearly illegal military involvement in Vietnam. Such reports as I have read of your speeches on the Senate floor convince me you are one of only two Senators brave and honest enough to make clear the lack of justification for this country's aggression against North Vietnam, and its virtual military occupation of South Vietnam.

I would appreciate being sent any copies of your fine statements on Vietnam which you may have available. My address makes it clear I am not one of your constituents; but it seems to me that the Vietnam crisis goes far beyond the boundaries of any one State. Your recent speeches against the $700 million carte blanche which President Johnson virtually extorted from both Houses were greatly to your credit.

I wonder if you feel yourself as poorly covered by the mass media as I think you are. To me, there is a systematic elimination or distortion of all anti-Vietnam criticism. Senator Gruening's excellent speech to the students who protested in Washington, D.C., went almost completely unnoticed by the press.

You may be interested to know that citizens not in your home State are following your courageous battle and are hoping that your stand for sanity and frankness will at last convert some of your rubberstamping colleagues to sense and fairness.

To me, the invasion of the Dominican Republic, with all the incredible lies and evasions that flowed from top U.S. officials—this put the Johnson administration into a very fearful perspective. I keep pinching myself to convince myself I'm not dreaming: for Barry Goldwater, not Lyndon Johnson, seems to have won the presidential election.

To me you are a "profile in courage," and your prophetic condemnations of President Johnson's antidemocratic policies will in the future be seen as the patriotic cries against political folly that they so clearly are.

Yours truly,

Richard C. Kohler.

May 18, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse.

My Dear Sir: I want to thank you for your speech and actions of last week, May 5 and 6.

There weren't too many voices raised with respect to Vietnam, unfortunately.

The conscience of Congress seems to have fallen apart.

May I have a copy of your speeches of both May 5 and 6?

Thank you.

Stanley Rosenberg.

San Bernardino High School,
San Bernardino, Calif., May 19, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I would appreciate your sending me documented material expressing your stand on the Vietnam situation and the Dominican fiasco.

I am an ardent follower of your sane approach to world affairs in an age where the majority of this Nation's leaders are wildly flaying blindly at the so-called Communist threat.

Respectfully yours,

John R. Scott.

May 17, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We would like you to know that we stand firmly behind your Vietnam position. Keep up the good work.

Jonathan H. Harris,
Robert Maltz,
Harvard Graduate School of Design.
Leonard Oshinsky,
Harvard Law.

Colorado Springs, Colo.,
May 19, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am not a constituent of your State, but must tell you I wholeheartedly agree with your views on the war in Vietnam and admire your courage in expressing them. The average citizen opposing the administration's policy in Vietnam feels so powerless to do anything. At least we feel we have a spokesman in you. If copies of your speeches in the Senate May 5 and 6 opposing the President's $700 million request for Vietnam are available, I should very much appreciate receiving three copies so I may distribute them to friends.

Sincerely,

Nancy D. Kent
Mrs. D. R. Kent.

Committee on Economic and Social Relations of the Mennonite Church,
Goshen, Ind., May 19, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: On May 4–6, 1965, a number of religious leaders were in Washington engaged in a consultation on Vietnam. We called on a number of Senators and Representatives and also had a conference with the Vice President. I think we were scheduled at one time to have a meeting with you, but due to the debate in the Senate on the President's request for an appropriation of $700 million in support of the Vietnam program, you were engaged in that debate and the meeting with you was not held.

I wish to say that a number of us were in the Senate on Wednesday afternoon when you made your eloquent speech objecting to the President's proposals. I wish to congratulate you for the stand which you have taken, and I do hope that your influence and those of others who share your viewpoint may have their influence in shaping American foreign policy in the direction of peace. I would be happy to have you keep me informed of any developments which should be shared with an informed citizenry.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Guy F. Hershberger.

New York, N.Y.,
May 21, 1965.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I support an immediate ceasefire in Vietnam, and application of Mr. U Thant's formula for negotiations.

Very sincerely,

Michael Geller.

Trenton, N.J.,
May 21, 1965.

Dear Senator: Please keep up your wonderful work. We admire your courage and foresight. I agree, we should not be in Vietnam or the Dominican Republic.

Best wishes,

John A. Kinczel, M.D.

Yakima, Wash.,
May 20, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Regarding the recent $700 million President Johnson requested for the Vietnam war, we find words inadequate to express our thanks and deep admiration for your brave "nay" along with Senators Gruening and Nelson.

The Pentagon computers are unable to measure the future hatred and distrust mankind will hold for the people of the United States. This Vietnam war is truly one of the gravest mistakes this country ever made.

Sadly and sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. M. E. Herr.

Mount Vernon, Wash.,
May 19, 1965.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations for your opposition to the President's policy in Vietnam and your vote against his $700 million appropriation for that policy. How sad that those who agree with you are in such a minority.

I am sick at heart over the course of criminal folly that our Government is pursuing in Asia, and, yes, in South America, too. What can a small private citizen do, besides writing frequently to the President, Senators and Congressmen?

Keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

Colleen Dickinson.

Rutherford, Calif.,
May 20, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: After listening to an interview given by you to ABC and broadcast by shortwave on May 20, I am proud of the stand you have taken against the administration regarding our policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

I agree with you and wish there were more people like you in Washington to guide and keep our foreign policy on the right track.

I feel that the President of the United States is being misinformed by the Pentagon and the State Department.

Please, Mr. Senator, keep on informing the American people of what is going on. The administration does not. They tell us half the truth.

Let's hope that some day they will realize their mistakes. I hope it will not be too late.

I am a naturalized citizen of the United States, born in France, and served in the U.S. Navy during World War I; was always proud of what America stands for.

I am now a little apprehensive of what our foreign policy is leading us to. Three wars in one generation is tiresome and our foreign policy might lead us to another war worse than the others, in which half our population might be wiped out. Think of it, Mr. Senator.

I regret that the two Senators from California have remained silent on this subject.

Thank you, Mr. Senator, for this wonderful interview, and God bless you.

Respectfully yours,

Edmund A. Mandin.

Power, Mont.,
May 20, 1965.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: We are sick and tired of the hypocrisy of the U.S. Government and ashamed of its actions which smack of Hitler tactics and imperialism, hidden and abetted by our elected representatives.

We would like to know by what right you OK'd the $700 million for President Johnson to spend on wars and aggression? We are doing what Hitler Germany and Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany did, spending billions of dollars for wars of aggression to keep people enslaved. Under the name of "freedom" we go around the world killing, torturing, maiming, and destroying people's property—what a tragedy. It is time we faced up to what is wrong with an economic system that can't stay alive without wars.

We blame others for exactly what we ourselves are doing. No matter what we say to justify our immoral actions, they will not be justified.

We are the only active colonial power today outside of Portugal. We should stop and view ourselves as others see us. If we have the right to control southeast Asia, Russia should have the same right in South America. If it is unthinkable for us that the Russian military might should control South America, then how can we think it is right for us to do this in southeast Asia?

The present governments of Russia and China are not so brutal or ruthless. Drew Pearson attests that the Chinese method of conquering does not consider killing but mainly infiltrating with their people in business contact. Russia's method is similar. If we can't compete with them in peaceful competition, what we are doing will be the end of everything. How foolish and insane can we be? It's time to take stock of ourselves, not of others, before we commit the ultimate blunder.

Sincerely,

Harold and Rosina Woodhouse.

West Orange, N.J.,
May 20, 1965.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is to tell you that I admire your willingness to express your unpopular views on our position in Vietnam, and I agree with your stand.

I do not like to differ with our Government's views but I think it is my obligation to say when I think we have made a mistake. I hope that our right to criticize constructively will never be abridged. There are some disturbing signs that criticism is unwelcome, but I am trying to teach my children to speak out for what they think is right. Thank you for setting the good example.

Respectfully yours,

Ruth E. Goodman.

Denver, Colo.,
May 18, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to commend you on your courageous stand against the war in Vietnam.

I join with you and many other people in the United States who are hoping for a cease-fire to stop the brutal killing of all people involved.

Thanking you,

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Anne K. Robinett.

Carmel, Ind.,
May 20, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I am not one of your constituents, but I want to commend you for your stand against our military intervention in Vietnam and our dangerous escalation of the war there.

You have shown admirable courage in opposing the administration's inexplicable foreign policy, especially in the face of President Johnson's efforts to silence the opposition.

I only wish there were more Senators and Representatives to join in your protests. At least your voices are heard.

Yours truly,

Mrs. R. B. Smith.

The Lasater Ranch,
Matheson, Colo., *May 21, 1965.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: May we congratulate you on your recent addresses to the Senate, on May 5 and 6, on the matter of our foreign policy.

We stand ready to help you in any way we can. Please call upon us.

Sincerely,

Mary and Tom Lasater
Mr. and Mrs. Tom Lasater.

Melody Farm,
Washington Court House, Ohio,
May 21, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Mr. Senator: Since I heard you say on the television, "We shall not be silenced," I have wanted to write my approval of your opposition to our actions in Vietnam.

Someday you may be nominated as one example of a profile in courage.

I would like the names of the other Senators who voted against the bill to grant extra moneys to carry on the undeclared war.

Sincerely,

Wilbur W. Kamp.

Sun Valley, Idaho, *May 19, 1965.*

Dear Senator Morse: This is just a note to add to the many you must receive expressing my support of your strong and lonely stand on Vietnam.

Thank you,

Mrs. Nan Harris.

Euclid, Ohio, *May 19, 1965.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want to thank you for doing all in your power to stop the senseless killing of American troops in Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

Contrary to international agreements, the United States has introduced many new weapons like naplam, and white phosphorous bombs and increased the number of American troops to a point where there are now almost twice as many American soldiers as there were estimates of Vietcong soldiers only 1 year ago.

In Santo Domingo, American troops are again engaged in aggression and violation of international agreements. American troops again outnumber the native insurgents and while they publicly cry for a cease-fire allow the rightwing generals to bomb and attack and mass troops from areas controlled by American troops.

We are fast becoming the most-hated nation in the world while the American people allow the military to tell lie after lie and supress our own reporters at the scene.

Not once in recent history have Americans troops been used to protect democratically elected governments from military purges and coup d'etats. Only when a military dictatorship is threatened by democratic insurgents who might have the backing of the Communists, do we intervene.

Very truly yours,

Melvin L. Dahlmann.

New York, N.Y.,
May 21, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I have been meaning to write to you for some time and now must postpone the writing no longer.

I wish to congratulate you on the position you have taken on Vietnam and on the reasons you have put forward for taking that position.

It seems to me your views are not given the circulation on the radio and in the press which they deserve.

I consider the last presidential campaign the biggest hoax practiced on us in my lifetime. Only my friends who voted for Goldwater are happy today.

I offer you my best wishes for the future.

Sincerely,

Howard Rickert.

Woodland Hills, Calif.,
May 24, 1965.

Dear Senator Morse: Both my wife and myself would like to convey our great admiration for your honesty and courage for standing against the current Vietnam policy. We also are very much against it and wish there was something we could do as citizens.

Keep up your marvelous efforts.

Sincerely,

Victor and Marilyn Feldman.

THE FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH
OF COLUMBUS, OHIO,
May 20, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: From the bottom of my heart, thank you for your tireless and courageous insistence upon providing leadership for what small loyal opposition exists in the consensus society our beloved maximum leader has created.

It must seem sometimes that you have "lived out your life talking to scorning men," as Vanzetti said, but those of us who shudder from the insane escalation of this new hip-shooting Barry Johnson deserve a voice also.

Trust for us is, of course, irrevocably destroyed in Latin America; no change in policy can undo that catastrophe. We have succeeded in making certain that the Vietcong government will indeed be Communist—as we always said—and that Laos and Cambodia will follow.

Thank you, sir, for your voice of sanity amidst the cries of "Ave Caesar."

Sincerely,

REV. J. FRANKLIN CHIDSEY.

EXCELSIOR, MINN., *May 19, 1965.*

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: It is obvious to me, as I believe it is becoming clear to many if not most Americans, that our foreign policy has reached a new depth of immorality, illegality and senselessness during recent months.

Our involvement in Vietnam has been of doubtful value and legality, to say the least, from the beginning. Our present formula of retaliation against and hypocritical offers to negotiate with the North is absurd and may lead to disaster. Yet now our activities in the Dominican Republic occasion nothing but outrage and horror on the part of thoughtful citizens. Our actions there have been cynical, from the start of the present disturbance, and are now being proved unbelievable folly from any point of view.

Worse, however, is the bludgeoning that the people are being subjected to by your office. This treatment, so far, has been in the form of a stream of "information" that is, in fact, a compound of evasion, wistful prognostication and patent lies. We feel buried under the weight of platitudes and half-truths to the point where our urge to protest is suffocating; as, apparently, our Congress is now stifled. It is this suppression of dissent under the guise of "consensus" that will bring us either to ruin on foreign ground or to a dangerous reaction at home; or, more likely, to both.

Like millions of others, I suspect, I am quite disturbed by the pretensions and apparent megalomania of our executive. Our present expansionist foreign policy will succeed in doing nothing but isolating this country and eventually, one fears, bringing us to a level of frustration where the only solution will be an explosive, annihilating one.

Social revolution is necessary, desirable, and will continue to occur throughout the world despite the icy hysteria and armed evangelism of this administration. Our late President had recognized such a reality and had begun to deal with the world rather than to browbeat and subject it to his will. Anything else, such as our present policy, seems madness.

Yours,

ALLEN F. HARRISON.

FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
Redding, Calif., May 18, 1965.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have my vote of confidence for your vote of "no confidence" in the program of mounting military requirements in Vietnam.

Keep up the position.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. HAWTHORNE.

GARDENA, CALIF., *May 17, 1965.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your efforts on behalf of the American people is greatly appreciated. We admire your courage and stamina to stand by your convictions with regard to our foreign policy. Although we are unable to vote for you we would like to thank you for representing our opinion.

Yours truly,

DOROTHY and ARTHUR Y. KOBAYASHI.

AMHERST, MASS.,
May 21, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I applaud your courageous remarks on our foreign policy. But I fear that we are being headed toward a showdown with China, and protest will become more and more difficult or unpatriotic. Please continue to speak out against U.S. militarism in Asia and in Latin America. Your voice is essential.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN A. ALLEN.

FRESNO, CALIF.,
May 20, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for your stand in the opposition to our Government's policy in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

We have no business in committing our troops and planes in either of these places. I am sure that you have more support in your stand than is readily visible. Please continue in your outspoken opposition to this insane and dangerous policy.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. HANS E. FRANOSCH.

PARIS, ILL.,
May 19, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You may never see this letter but at least it can be added to the ones in the basket marked "for." I appreciate the stand you have taken on our foreign policy, you are right all the way. It is hard to believe that you and Senator FULBRIGHT are the only ones who believe as you do but what holds them back. I feel sorry for Mr. Johnson, he inherited this mess and in trying to get out of it he seems to get in deeper every day. However he did not inherit Santo Domingo.

They say the good we do lives after us, maybe so but there can be no question about the mistakes we make, they grow and grow. Our country is suffering from the mistakes of John Foster Dulles and Joseph McCarthy. I believe that we should recognize China and that China should be admitted to the United Nations. Communism in Russia has changed and it will change in China but our present policy will not help bring that about. If we are the country we think we are we do not have to be afraid of communism.

If we are the Christian nation that we like to think we are, we should take care of our needy at home and feed hungry children the world over to the very limit of our ability and forget guns and bombs.

Yours sincerely,

MAE L. EADS.

NORWICH, CONN.,
May 23, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I join those nonconstituents who appreciate your courageous stand on Vietnam, and I have so notified Senator RIBICOFF and Senator DODD.

With much gratitude,

CLIFTON W. GRAY, Ph. D.

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY,
Fort Collins, Colo., May 19, 1695.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courageous opposition to recent American policy in Vietnam. At a time when the President is attempting to stifle free expression of opinion your stated position becomes not simply a critique of foreign policy but a defense of democracy here at home; everyone, whether or not he agrees with you, must be in your debt.

Your characterization of our Government as "drunk with military power" is most apt. Would that more officials of our Government had your appreciation of the fact that one does not win friends among people by dropping bombs on them.

Sincerely yours,

IRWIN WALL.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
May 16, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: I, with many of my colleagues, admire your firm stand for consistency, justice, and commonsense in opposing our administration's policy in Vietnam. We take courage from you, and continue to speak up for a peaceful settlement through negotiations with the belligerents involved—and this includes the obvious * * * the Vietcong—whom we are fighting and shooting, not only the North Vietnamese whom we are bombing.

Do not fail us, the Nation, and the world by backing down now—continue to speak for your earlier proposals.

With admiration and respect for you.

Sincerely yours,

S. MEDORF, M.D.

SEPULVEDA, CALIF.,
May 17, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you on your courage and good commonsense on your views on Vietnam. Especially for your courage to speak out against the overwhelming majority who do not share your views.

I'm sure there are many average housewives like myself who agree with you, but how can we be heard?

I thank you so much. I would be very proud if you were our Senator from California.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. HILARY WEAVER,
Mother of Three.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
May 20, 1965.

Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I am one of the many millions who worked hard and voted for you in the last election. Most of us did so because we felt so strongly that Senator Goldwater's foreign policy proposals were dangerous, immoral, likely to achieve the precise opposite of their professed intentions.

Why do you insist, by your bombings in Vietnam, and invasion of the Dominican Republic, in proving just how wrong Barry Goldwater was?

We already believed it before the election. We are more convinced now than ever. I, and many others I know who supported you, are determined to work against, and vote against, any public official regardless of party, who supports this incredibly inflammatory and discredited policy that assumes our military might obliges us to slaughter people worldwide (and get many of our sons slaughtered in the bargain) in the hypocritical guise of aiding self-determination.

Very sincerely yours,

Hugh MacColl.

Senator Morse: Allow me to express my sincere gratitude to you for your position on foreign policy. Please keep up the good work.

Hugh MacColl.

Chapel Hill, N.C., *May 20, 1965.*

Senator Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I feel sure you will be interested in this clipping from the Durham Herald of today showing that a spokesman for the State Department excuses the bombing of North Vietnam on the ground of necessity.

As I recall it, this was the excuse of the Germans in their illegal invasion of neutral Belgium in 1914.

Yours truly,

Phillips Russell.

North Vietnam Bombing Termed as Necessity

A U.S. State Department official here Wednesday afternoon gave a direct reason for our bombing of North Vietnam—necessity.

Turner Shelton, special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, gave the explanation during a public lecture at Duke University. His topic was "The Situation in Vietnam."

"Let us speak in simple candor," Shelton said. "These bombings are not pleasant; they are not by choice, they are of necessity."

Evidently alluding to the American criticism of our Vietnam policy, particularly from segments of the academic world, Shelton said, "We cannot obscure the facts by engaging in wishful thinking."

Calling attention to American men and women who have been killed in Vietnam, Shelton then added, "In self-defense, we are bombing bridges, roads, and ammunition dumps in a totally reasonable effort to prevent the men and supplies causing the deaths of American and Vietnamese alike from reaching the south."

Noting the Communists' reaction to our bombings, Shelton said, "The fact that all this is so distressing to the Vietcong Communists gives the lie to their claim that they are an indigenous South Vietnam group engaged in civil war."

Asserting that we and the South Vietnamese "are engaged in the pursuit of the basic right of self-defense," Shelton added that "It is an action totally consistent with the spirit of America."

America has pledged itself to aid the South Vietnamese, Shelton said.

"This is a great and worrisome responsibility, but it is the responsibility that goes with America's tremendous power," he asserted.

Downey, Calif.,
May 18, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We wish to commend you for the commonsense attitude you take regarding our military intervention in troubled areas, and for your courage in forthrightly opposing this.

We unalterably oppose the deplorable trend which seems to say that only brute force can preserve our way of life. If this be so, then democracy is already lost—why pour blood over the corpse?

And if it would achieve good results, why are we then not using it in our own benighted South?

This inconsistent pattern of behavior would seem to indicate that we are willing to defend our freedom on others' soil and at the expense of their land and people; hardly a noble stand for a great nation.

Please continue to use your gifts to get us back on a more American (as we would like the word to signify) course of action. We are behind you.

Sincerely yours,

John N. von Raaphorst.
Nan von Raaphorst.
Mrs. J. N. von Raaphorst.

San Gabriel, Calif.,
May 20, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: May I commend you for your courage to vote "no" on President John's request for $700 million more. It is good to know that at least a few want to take a second look and may wish to try to solve problems by other means than the military or war. Keep up your courage.

Sincerely,

Rolland Thompson.

Menasha, Wis.,
May 25, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have wanted to write to you for a long time to commend you and thank you for your fearless expression of your views on our current wars.

I think that you have done our Nation a service in showing the world that our militaristic path is not approved by all of the people.

In admiration and gratitude,

Ebbe Berg.

Denison University,
Department of English,
Granville, Ohio, May 22, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want to commend you for your two speeches in the Senate, on May 5 and on May 6, in which you severely criticized American involvement in South Vietnam. Our involvement there is indeed cruel, for Asians now and, as you point out, for Americans in the future. In my opinion there can be no justification for our intervention in what is essentially a civil war—as substantially the war is in the Dominican Republic—and I think we ought to withdraw immediately from both Vietnam and from the Dominican Republic—withdraw militarily, that is, for I think we ought to give nonmilitary aid to the emerging countries, where there is a need and whether they profess to be our friends or not. The Biblical injunction, "If thy enemy hunger, feed him," seems more appropriate now than ever.

Our country, which at one time was looked up to as an inspiration for social revolutionary movement, is now considered, and rightly, the enemy of such movements. I personally am dismayed by that, and I am disheartened that there is so little resistance at home to our quite immoral foreign policy. But resistance to our intervention in Vietnam does seem to be growing, and I find it especially encouraging that young people are more and more employing the techniques of civil disobedience in order to make their "No" more profound.

Sincerely yours,

James Missey.

Bellwood, Ill.,
May 24, 1965.

Dear Senator Morse: Just a note of approval of your good, sound political policies. Keep up the good work. Wars only bring misery.

Sincerely,

John Skojoue.

Michigan Technological University,
Houghton, Mich., May 23, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thanks for your reports, May 14, 1965, which are always welcome and for including a copy of the Record—"The undeclared war in Vietnam." Very good, and double thanks for your fine, revealing statements. Keep up the good work.

Best regards,

Milton E. Sherer.

Memphis, Tenn.,
May 22, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I believe you were one of three Senators who had the courage not to support the recent supplemental military appropriation to assist in covering the cost of our amplified operations in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic. It is certainly difficult for a citizen at this time to obtain sufficient information on which to base a valid opinion. Our conventional news sources have presented conflicting stories. If we can believe "The Invisible Government" by David Wise and Thomas B. Ross published last year, there is evidence that our foreign relations have sometimes been complicated by intrigues originating within our governmental security agencies, and outside of diplomatic control.

Certainly if the executive branch of our Government receives the impression that they will get automatic support for any hasty venture, then indeed our position is perilous. Your vote against such a mandate was therefore wise.

At times like these, our international image depends to a considerable extent on the quality of our ambassadors. Their appointment is subject to senatorial influence. I lack detailed knowledge of most of Latin America but I do have friends who are familiar with Colombia. One of our former ambassadors there made little attempt to know the people or their language at a time when his English equivalent was studying Spanish and touring through outlying areas. More recently, however, we have done much better. In maintaining this improved record our Senators will be well advised to set up certain basic criteria of competence for such appointees.

Yours very truly,

C. W. Sheppard.

Stanford University,
Stanford, Calif., May 21, 1965.

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I thought you'd be interested in seeing the enclosed copy of a letter which appeared in this morning's San Francisco Chronicle.

H. H. Fisher is an emeritus professor of history at Stanford and for a number of years was the head of the Hoover Library on War, Revolution, and Peace and Hoover Research Institute, now designated as the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace.

Sincerely,

David S. Jacobson.

The Real Role of Vietnam Teach-ins

Editor: The teach-in debates are good for what ails us—complacency at the top and conformity below. We cannot afford complacency in times like these and conformity atrophies the precious right of dissent. Debates are less useful, however, if they focus exclusively on the hot local issues and we lose sight of the larger questions of which the local issues are symptoms.

Have we, for instance, lost sight of the most vital national interest thus ignoring the consequences of our repudiation of our treaty commitments to the global and regional organizations we took a leading part in creating in order to lessen the dangers of war?

Have we lost sight of recent shiftings in the alinements of nations and assumed that communism has become so menacing that the United States has the duty to prevent its further establishment in Asia or Latin America regardless of our agreements and the wishes and policies of friendly governments?

We claim that we are not only protecting our own national security which every nation has a right to do, but are protecting the national security of all nations not under Communist rule, which they have not asked us to do. Many of the presumed beneficiaries would feel more secure if we were not so trigger happy. And the Communists naturally allege that we are not protecting but endangering general security just as imperialists are supposed to do.

Conflicts of national security interests are not new; and they have led to war when one country has followed the advice of its practical realists who believe in the efficacy of preemptive violence. After two wars of mounting scope and destructiveness, world opinion seems to have recognized that in one matter there could no longer be a conflict of national security interests. The overriding security interest of all mankind has come to be the prevention of a third world war in which for the first time man has the nuclear chemical and biological weapons to impose an eternal peace on this contentious planet.

Global and regional peacekeeping arrangements are now in some disarray when, perhaps, we need them more than ever. The basic issue at this moment is do we serve the security interests of ourselves and the rest of humanity by adding to this disarray by repudiating our commitments to these organizations? Resort to armed intervention in violation of treaties, which we have loudly condemned ever since the Germans tore up that "scrap of paper" and invaded Belgium in 1914, has always been done to force an opponent to mend his ways and come to the conference table, preferably to surrender unconditionally. We are violating, and not in the exercise of the right of self-defense, our pledges to both the United Nations and the Organization of American States "to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state." The effect, regardless of our motives, can only unify our enemies, shake the confidence of our friends, discourage collective security with us and stimulate collective self defense against us.

We take this risk because, so we are told, the Communists must be stopped at all costs from expanding in Latin America and taking control of all Asia, and there is no one else who can do the job. The administration does not seem to recognize that the conditions in Western Europe, where containment was so successful, do not exist in the developing countries of Asia and Latin America. Nor do the bipartisan supporters of our present policies seem to suspect that the splits between Russian and Chinese and other styles of communism can have any bearing on the world conspiracy or on how to deal with it. Nor is any significance attached to the appearance in several developing countries of single party dictatorships using Communist totalitarian and organizational methods but not Communist ideology, as the most effective way to achieve modernization. The spread of polycentrism, this loosening of alinements is bound to be a growing obstacle to Communist ambitions unless we continue to help the national Communist Parties to minimize their differences with each other while we cause our allies to exaggerate their differences with us.

As the President has said, there is a job to be done and there is no one else who can do it. In this he is certainly right, but he is mistaken in his priorities.

He has acknowledged that it is not just a matter of trying to contain communism by force. His excellent proposal of multilateral development aid is a necessary part of the job. But another part of the job has, under present circumstances, a higher priority. This is first, to recognize that the security of the world's most powerful nation is linked with the security of both friendly and unfriendly nations, and secondly, that in the long run, the security which is the common interest of all peoples can be strengthened only if we, the strongest, uphold and use the global and regional institutions of peaceful change and pacific settlement.

H. H. Fisher.

Palo Alto.

Chicago, Ill.,
May 17, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We wish again to commend you for your courage and for your forthright speeches in the Senate on May 5 and May 6. It must feel lonely to take such a stand in the Senate which, in abdicating its powers to declare war is surrendering to an aggressive President and leading our country to destruction.

We sincerely hope enough Americans will support your position so that we may yet be saved from a worldwide holocaust.

Please send us copies of your most recent speeches in the Senate.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,
Dr. and Mrs. Alfred Stein.

The Vale Methodist Church,
Fairfax, Va., May 21, 1965.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for those good statements in the Senate May 5 and 6.

You are most intelligent and courageous. God bless your worthy endeavors.

Sincerely yours,
Everett Dorr.

P.S.—Have you seen this statement by James P. Warburg?

New York, N.Y.,
May 22, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you very much indeed for having sent me the reprint from the Congressional Record as I am on your mailing list.

That reprint covers your speeches on Vietnam starting with the one you delivered before the Senate on May 5, 1965.

Although I am not a resident of Oregon and consequently not your constituent, I am indeed delighted with both your courtesy in sending me material covering your speeches and legislation you sponsor, as well as with the views you hold and express particularly on Vietnam and foreign affairs issues in general.

As I spent considerable time in southeast Asia generally and in Vietnam particularly throughout 1963 I am in fullest agreement with both the views you so forcefully express and fight for as well as with the conclusions you have reached about the eventual outcome of the war in Vietnam.

It is regrettable to note therefore how little support of your views you have found so far in the Senate and it is equally to be regretted how the President on the advice of a small coterie of people around him bypasses the United Nations and the Geneva accords and instead of attempting to settle the conflict by negotiations around the conference table with all concerned (and that, of course, means also the Vietcong and Red China) rather escalates the war.

There is now no longer any doubt in my mind that eventually all of southeast Asia will be drawn into this conflict on Vietnam and who knows if an expanded war covering most of southeast Asia may not be the start of world war III.

Once a war has been escalated—and soon it will be fought by 70,000 American men on Vietnamese soil—it will be hard to stop it. Is there no way that public opinion in this country can be aroused to a point that it may bring the White House to think twice before it is too late?

Am really so much in agreement with the views you expressed on Vietnam in your various speeches and for which you are fighting so valiantly that I would like to ask you to kindly let me have eight more copies of the reprint from the Congressional Record to which I referred on the preceding page, so that I may forward same to a number of friends and acquaintances of mine.

Please continue to let your office send me everything on Vietnam—i.e., not only reprints of your speeches before the Senate but also of talks you give before universities and other gatherings.

Thank you for your courtesy and with all good wishes to you personally and for the wonderful fight you are carrying on, I remain,

Yours sincerely,
George H. Cord,
Journalist.

Merzifon, Turkey,
May 14, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: It must be difficult to maintain a position such as yours over Vietnam and the Dominican Republic in the face of the apparently widespread support for these policies in Congress and the Nation. If you were as concerned with consensus as the President seems to be, you would have to tailor your ideas accordingly but you seem more concerned with the correctness of your ideas than their popularity—it's good to have you where you are, raising the intelligent objections to this new American indulgence that ought to be raised.

I doubt that the President has all the support for his policies that it may appear he has at first glance. Consensus has some unpleasant connotations and one is that it's a fine companion for apathy. Consensus seems to be assumed wherever there are no contrary voices to be heard which is a negative definition of a term that ought only to be used when positive agreement can be found. The lack of objection from an essentially passive public that tends away from stringently independent thought has perhaps led Mr. Johnson to suppose he has backing where merely silence prevails.

My very secondhand appraisal of the American situation may be wrong though from here it appears that the public is hardly as aroused as it ought to be. The Turkish viewpoint—at least of the man on the street whom I come into contact with—seems quite opposed to what is being done by the United States particularly in Vietnam but in Latin America as well. It looks very frankly like what it is, unwarranted intervention in the national affairs of sovereign nations and others can only wonder when America will decide that their country needs our help. In Vietnam we've a spectacular military playground that seems easily capable of geometrical expansion. Where our notion of international proprietorship has come from I don't know, perhaps it's the old adage that power corrupts.

I am in the Peace Corps here and trying hard to be proud of my country as well as understand it. There are plenty of people here, Turks and Americans, who support you in your proposals. I simply thought I'd write to support and encourage you in your opposition to the foolhardy and immoral turn foreign policy has taken.

Very truly yours,

Thomas DeMers.

San Rafael, Calif.,
May 17, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: My profound gratitude for your courageous "No" vote on President Johnson's demand for $700 million and a "blank check" re the mounting Vietnam and Dominican fiascos. But for you and your small number of brave and honorable colleague dissenters, the resemblance of Capitol Hill to the old Reichstag would be more horrendous than it is.

Respectfully,

Sam Henzel, M.D.

Leesburg, Va.,
May 23, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: My congratulations to you for the forthright stand you are taking on the actions of our Government in Vietnam. I am utterly sick over what our country is doing in building up the hatred of the world. Your consistent stand has been most heartening. I trust you will continue to lead the opposition against our very dangerous policy.

Sincerely,

Agnes Sayler.

Rio de Janeiro, GB, ZC 07 Brazil,
May 22, 1965.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations for your courageous criticisms of the Government policy in Vietnam.

Let me assure you, as an American living abroad, that the United States is breeding a horrible hatred among the peoples of the world. Our actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are no less than infamous.

Yours truly,

Allen Young.

P.S.—U.S. residence: Glen Wild, N.Y.

Riverdale, N.Y.,
May 24, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I was heartsick that your efforts and your brilliant speech of May 5 opposing the President's $700 million request for Vietnam, failed to stop the Senate's ratification.

I believe with you that continued escalation of the war in Vietnam by our Government, can only lead to disaster for us all.

Will you and your colleagues continue to try to persuade the President to stop the bombing, seek a cease-fire, and press for negotiations without conditions with all concerned, including the Vietcong—before it is too late.

Gratefully yours,

Gertrude Gottlieb.

West Hartford, Conn.,
May 24, 1965.

Senator W. Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing you in appreciation for the courageous stand you have taken regarding U.S. policy in Vietnam.

As many others have stated, "We have Barry Goldwater in the White House." President Johnson seems to be committed to the same reckless foreign policy that Barry Goldwater advocated in last year's campaign. He appears to desire a "blank check" to commit the United States to any military action he desires. He has already put the power to wage war in his own hands, rather than place it in the hands of the U.S. Congress, as our Constitution requires. The recent White House suggestion that Congressmen not voice their objections to U.S. foreign policy in public is a massive strike against our system of government.

Americans must stand up and reject the Johnson foreign policy. Although we are now in a minority, I know that some day this country will honor you and your distinguished fellow Senator, Senator Gruening, of Alaska, for standing up against these illegal acts of President Johnson.

Sincerely yours,

Paul Basch.

Greenfield, Ind.,
May 22, 1965.

Dear Senator Wayne Morse: I appreciate your passionate plea for the Senate to retain its valuable control over warfare. Let us all work to convince enough Americans that we can have a candidate in the next presidential election who will actively promote a foreign policy run to promote freedom everywhere.

May I please have a copy of your comments on May 5 and 6?

Very sincerely,

Mrs. Kathryn Parnell.

St. Augustine, Fla.,
May 23, 1965.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: While there is still time, I want to express my respect, and admiration, for your undaunted courage; standing for what is right—nearly alone, among the lame ducks—and southern fossils.

It is indeed tragic, that the President is taking the advice from the wrong people—the military. It is horrible to contemplate; that we who thought we voted for peace, got more war; and more gunboats.

There should never be any interference, in another country's civil wars; except by the United Nations; the brutal dictators we have supported in the past, doesn't speak well of our democracy.

I wish you, and Senator Gruening, more power, and more strength; and peace for all of us—before it is too late.

Yours sincerely,

Agnes Aanes.

Great Falls, Mont.,
May 20, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have wanted to write to you for a long time to commend you for your fearless stand on U.S. involvement in southeast Asia. Unfortunately, yours is an unpopular position with too many Congressmen and the White House. I only hope that serious, global tragedy does not confirm the wisdom of your position.

While unafraid (if one can be) to go to Vietnam himself, and this is quite possible, I am willing to go to be of service to our young Americans there. However, on a national scale I do fear a ground war of attrition with the Communist Chinese or, what is worse, a nuclear war on a worldwide basis. Please continue to speak your mind despite the reactionary trend in Washington.

As a Catholic I would like to go on record as saying that in no way is William F. Buckley, Jr., a spokesman for the Catholic Church. Though I disagree vehemently with his ideas, I must grant his liberty to express them. However, there is little danger of his not doing so, his wealth, power, prestige and magazine enable him to; but, his Catholicism being well known, by some he may be regarded as one of the Catholic Church's spokesmen despite the fact that his ideas do not reflect current thinking in the church and still less the teaching of the gospels.

Eventually the Bolte legislation will reach the Senate and I do hope that you will vote in favor of that legislation.

With all due respect to Senator Robert Kennedy's feelings on the sale of mail-order guns, personally I do not think this sale is a serious menace to national well-being. Stolen guns do far more damage and even worse is the slaughter we can expect a week from now on the highways over the Memorial Day weekend.

In conclusion, I am troubled by our Latin American position which seems to always favor reactionaries driving the masses of impoverished people in these lands into the eager arms of the Communists. This bothered me some years ago but I naively thought things would improve.

Having expressed some of my thoughts, I again want to commend and thank you. Continue your courageous fight against bad thinking.

Respectfully yours,

Father Thomas J. Endel,
U.S. Air Force.

CASTRO'S SUBVERSION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on Cuban Independence Day, May 20, 1965, I spoke in the Senate, as did my colleague from Colorado [Mr. Allott] and other Senators, to point out the desperate condition of freedom under the present Castro government. I placed in the Record that day the first part of the American Security Council's report on Castro's inspired subversion, dealing with subversion in the United States.

The second portion of that report, dealing with such subversion, is now available. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record and thus be available for study by Members of Congress and the American people in general.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Castro's Subversion in the United States—Part II

At a recent State Department briefing on Latin American affairs, the briefing officer concluded his remarks with the observation that the Communists had a chance to make a showcase out of Cuba but they had failed miserably. This conclusion was first offered by President Kennedy 3 years ago and it remains today as the accepted State Department attitude toward Castro and Cuba. Such an attitude fails to take into account that communism has never been a social or economic success anywhere; but as a showcase from which to spread subversion, it has done admirably—and Cuba is an excellent example.

Our Washington report of last week illustrated the point by outlining the activities of the Cuban General Directorate of Intelligence. However, Castro's greatest success against the United States has been in the area of agitation and propaganda.

Sad to say, almost all his field workers here are U.S. citizens. They are citizens who follow the Moscow, Peiping, or Trotskyite line. They range all the way from hard-line Communists to soft-line dupes.

A 2-year investigation by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security into the activities and membership of the now defunct Fair Play for Cuba Committee, organized in April 1960, proved that FPFCC had been heavily infiltrated by known Communists and fellow travelers. Some of the ads it ran on behalf of Castro were actually financed in large measure by the Cuban Government. Following State Department's issuance of travel restrictions to Cuba on January 16, 1961, many Fair Play for Cuba Committee members traveled illegally to Havana and, upon their return to this country, gave lectures on behalf of the Castro regime.

One of these was James Jackson, a member of the national committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Another was James O'Connor, whose lecture were advertised in the Communist Daily Worker, as were the lectures of at least a dozen others. Jean Pestana, Rose Rosenberg, and Helen Travis—all identified as Communists before the House Committee on Un-American Activities—were indicative of the Cuban guest list which numbered in excess of 150 U.S. citizens in a 2-year period.

The best known member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee was President Kennedy's assassin—Lee Harvey Oswald. He formed a chapter of the organization in New Orleans in April 1963 and discontinued it in September following his failure to reach Cuba.

The FPFCC was a Communist front. Its effect on the American public was negligible. But through its activities and the close contacts some of its members formed with the Castro regime, there grew up in its midst other more militant groups. The most important of these was the Progressive Labor Movement.

PLM was organized in January 1962. Its president, Milton Rosen, and vice president, Mortimer Scheer, had both been expelled from the Communist Party for disruptive activities. In December 1962, PLM attempted to send a group of "students" to Cuba and failed because the Canadian Government refused clearance to a Cuban plane to pick them up. A year and a half later, PLM succeeded.

On June 25, 1963, 59 so-called students, ranging in age from 18 to 36, left for Cuba in defiance of the State Department ban on such travel. Some of the 59 were attending college; others were graduates; some were dropouts; and 1 was a college professor. They traveled to Cuba via Paris, Prague, and Havana. All expenses, including transportation and living expenses while in Cuba, were paid for by the Cuban Government. Each traveler donated to PLM's Permanent Student Committee for Travel to Cuba $110. The air fare alone cost the Castro regime $30,000.

While in Cuba, a number of the so-called students made statements attacking U.S. policies, particularly in the field of civil rights and aid to South Vietnam. Some of these statements were beamed around the world and reprinted in Communist publications.

In June, 1964, the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba arranged air transportation to Cuba for 84 students. The reservations were made by PLM members Yvonne Marie Bond and Morton B. Slater, with Wendie Nakashima Rosen assisting. The over all direction appears to have been supplied by west coast editor of PLM publications, Lee Coe. Prior to his association with PLM, Coe was active for over 20 years in the Communist Party of the United States. Mrs. Rosen, the wife of Jacob Rosen, had traveled to Cuba with the 1963 group. Her husband, brother of Milton Rosen, president of PLM, made the trek in 1964. This time not only did the Castro government pay for the entire trip, but it also gave each visitor $10 a week spending money.

Again concealing their destination, the students proceeded in two groups to Paris, then Prague, and finally Havana. Leader of the enthusiastic contingent was Edward Lemansky. Lemansky's own testimony will serve as an indication of why Castro has been willing to pay out in excess of $75,000 to bring certain U.S. citizens to Cuba. As to his political identity, Lemansky stated, "I identified myself as a member of the Progressive Labor Movement, which is a Communist organization, a Communist movement."

As to the declaration signed by 61 of the "students" while they were in Cuba, Lemansky admitted to participating in its drafting. The declaration said in part: "We, the undersigned young North Americans visiting Cuba, offer these statements of support for the people of South Vietnam in their just fight for liberation from the imperialist oppression directed by our Government. Today our Government is unleashing one of the most brutal and criminal wars in history. All over the world—in Spain and Portugal, in South Africa and Latin America—the United States supports racist and reactionary regimes which oppress the people, and that the intransigence of U.S. imperialism forces the people to take up arms in order to gain and defend their liberty."

The essence of this declaration was widely broadcast throughout the world.

Most of the Cuban travelers returned to the United States in mid-August. On August 15, many of them joined with members of the May 2 committee formed at Yale University in March 1964 to demonstrate against U.S. support of South Vietnam. The demonstrators got violent and some were carted off to jail. The May 2 committee's purpose is to protest against U.S. policy in Vietnam. Its organizers include members of the Communist Party and the Progressive Labor Movement.

On April 15, 1965, Milton Rosen, PLM president, announced from the Albert Hotel in New York City, the founding convention of a new Communist Party paralleling the Chinese Communist line—110 delegates attended. A declaration proposed by the PLM national steering committee said in part: "The most hated government in the world today is the Government of our country * * * the initials U.S.A., which once stood for hope, have replaced the crooked cross of Nazi Germany as the symbol of tyranny and death."

One of PLM's vice presidents and its Harlem leader is William Epton, arrested last August after the Harlem race riots on charges of advocating criminal anarchy.

PLM has three offices in New York City and boasts of six others scattered across the country—one in Berkeley, Calif. PLM publishes leaflets, booklets, and a quarterly magazine, and it expects to bring out a weekly soon. Its political thrust is aimed at disrupting civil rights progress and stirring race hatred. Its members were active in the recent Berkeley campus revolt and they can be expected to be active in similar undertakings on other campuses (WR 65–4). Victor Riesel in a recent column quoted a top Government security official as saying: "They (PLM) are a very successful and militant band of young revolutionaries and have had ample money since the first day they went into business. * * * They don't just pass resolutions. They're zealously working for a revolution." The question is how much of their financial support is coming from Cuba?

The pro-Castro, pro-Peiping Communist movement in the United States has its man in Havana. He is Robert F. Williams. In May 1959, Williams was removed from his position as head of the Union County, N.C. branch of the NAACP for advocating violence as a means to gain social justice for his race. In August 1961, he fled the country following a racial clash which he instigated in Monroe, N.C. Against him was placed a charge of kidnaping, which was recently dropped. Williams escaped to Canada with his family and, on October 3, 1961, the Castro government granted him "political asylum" (WR 63–2). From that day to this, he has been spouting race hatred while offering instructions in terror tactics on his program "Radio Free Dixie" broadcast over Radio Havana and beamed into the Southern States. Williams also writes a monthly pamphlet called the Crusader. Every edition is devoted to the hatred of, and the eventual revolutionary overthrow of, the white man. Publication and distribution costs are taken care of by the Cuban regime. No figures are available on the number of copies distributed each month in the United States, but it is known that Williams' followers have made a point of handing them out to civil rights groups.

Lest anyone dismiss Williams as just another fanatic rabble rouser, it should be noted that when he traveled to Red China in August 1963, he was not only greeted by Mao Tse-tung and other high-ranking Chicom officials, but Mao also made his first official policy pronouncement in 6 years. As a result of his statement, Moscow charged that Peiping "was guilty of racism and was triyng to set the colored races against the whites."

In the winter of 1963, followers of Williams organized the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM). Today, they have branches in six key cities. It is they who distribute the Crusader and are in direct contact with Williams. Some of them made the trip to Cuba in the summer of 1964.

When they returned, recruitment was stepped up. They are known to have infiltrated the Black Muslims and the Malcom X group. RAM's fronts include the Afro-American Youth Council, the Afro-American Student Organization, and in Detroit they set up UHURU, which means "freedom" in Swahili.

RAM's manifesto advocates organized violence and the formation of guerrilla bands. Like PLM, it follows the theories and tactics of the Chinese Communists. Its present membership is small and selective and it refers to itself "as a movement composed of hard core, young, intelligent, militant, Afro-Americans seeking worldwide black revolution."

Until recently, the Communist chain of command could be traced directly from the Kremlin to the party here. Today, whether it be the recently formed W. E. B. DuBois clubs taking their cue from Moscow, or the Progressive Labor Movement taking its from Peiping, the impetus and driving force for both is channeled out of Cuba. Politically, financially, psychologically, militarily—Havana is the directing agency for Communist agitation and propaganda in the United States. It is the secured outpost of both Moscow and Peiping in our hemisphere.

In the aggregate, we can say the threat to our own security from Castro himself is nonexistent. But he is the agent of a world force that does threaten our survival. As its agent, his followers have been at work here; they are at work now. Because our security agencies are competent to handle such as PLM and RAM is no cause to ignore them. If nothing else they prove the folly of considering Castro a failure. It is we who have failed in allowing him to perpetuate his regime in treating it as a nuisance and not a genuine and continuing threat to the entire hemisphere.

TAX CREDITS FOR HIGHER EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and I and 33 other Senators have cosponsored a bill that is before the Committee on Finance to provide tax credits for a portion of the costs of higher education. In my opinion, this is one of the most important bills that will be before the Senate. It will most certainly come up for a vote during this session.

One of those who have been supporting the bill is Dr. Oliver C. Carmichael, Jr., of South Bend, Ind. Dr. Carmichael was formerly president of a university and is now a member of the boards of trustees of other universities. Dr. Carmichael has received a letter dated March 1, 1965, from Mrs. Raymond Nelson, wife of the clerk of the District Court of Anoka County, Minn. The letter ably expresses the problems that the forgotten people of American politics, the middle-income people, have in trying to give their children or their neighbor's children an opportunity to obtain a higher education.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOKA, MINN.,
March 1, 1965.

DR. OLIVER C. CARMICHAEL, JR.,
South Bend, Ind.

DEAR DR. CARMICHAEL: May we give you some fuel for the "fire" in support of the Ribicoff bill proposing tax credits for families who are supporting young people in college? Your stand came to our attention in reading the publicity about the seminar of Education Writers Association held at Atlantic City.

We would strongly favor this bill for the following reasons: One of the major concerns in America today is the development of responsible community citizens. In order to be effective in today's world, it is becoming more and more necessary to have a college background. For a great many people, college is only a status symbol or a means for earning a more lucrative living. These goals are not wrong in themselves, but if we stop at these horizons, we are missing the real purpose of education, which is to develop more useful citizens with a sense of loyalty and responsibility to their communities.

At the present time, there must be many families in a situation similar to ours who are thwarted in providing their children with a college education for the above-mentioned purpose.

My husband is a local county elective official. As such, he is adequately but not highly compensated. Our income is about $10,000 a year. Because we are very much interested and involved in the community, we lend hearty financial support to its needs, such as building a new hospital, church, financing local charities. Because my husband is a public official, much is expected of him. We have four children who, according to school aptitude tests, are all "good college material." Because of their father's position in the community they have all been reared to value the importance of giving time and effort to community projects. Yet, on $10,000 per year it is going to be difficult to finance college educations for four children, only 2 years apart. Our pledges for building a hospital and church amount to several thousand dollars, given sacrificially, and with a view to setting an example for our four future citizens. We are told by the schools that an income of $10,000 per year would not qualify the children for scholarships since there are those who are needier, even though these, our children, are top students. In other words, we have the "material" to be educated, we have provided an atmosphere in the home for these children to prepare themselves for higher education and yet, financially, because of our community responsibilities, we feel the "squeeze" as much as those with much lower incomes who do not feel the responsibility to their communities, of which we know there are many. It would be a great help to those of us in the $10,000 to $15,000 income bracket to be allowed a tax credit while we are bearing the burden of providing our youngsters with a college education with a view to training them for better and more willing community service. Hope something can be done to further this. How can we help?

Sincerely yours,
MRS. RAYMOND NELSON,
Wife of Clerk of District Court of Anoka County.

LEONARD HORN, COLORADO LIVESTOCK MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently the Denver Post published an excellent article entitled "Award-Winning Colorado Cattleman Maintains Hectic Pace," written by a good friend of mine, Monk Tyson. The article relates to an award to another good friend of mine, Leonard Horn. Mr. Horn is a rancher, a businessman, a community supporter, and a person who believes in progress. The award, which is a recognition of him as livestock man of the year, and which he recently received from Colorado State University, is well deserved. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEONARD HORN OF WOLCOTT: AWARD-WINNING COLORADO CATTLEMAN MAINTAINS HECTIC PACE

(By Monk Tyson)

WOLCOTT, COLO.—It is a difficult chore to catch up with Leonard Horn. But Colorado State University managed to corral him long enough this year to hang an honor on his hide.

The 55-year-old cattle rancher was chosen Livestockman of the Year by CSU. The honor is based on success in his business and service to his community and industry.

Horn and his wife, Dorothy, operate the 2,000-acre V Eleven Ranch near this western Colorado village. They raise 500 to 700 Hereford cattle on the ranch and on Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service grazing allotments. They also raise quarter horses.

Horn estimates one-half of his time is devoted to work on a variety of boards and committees related to livestock and grazing range. While he's away, the V Eleven is run by Mrs. Horn.

He might finish today's work with cattle and horses, tonight grab a bite to eat and catch a plane to Washington, or drive his car to some experimental grazing plot in the Rocky Mountains. If the trip takes him through or near Denver, Horn often stops to confer with officials of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association and the American National Cattlemen's Association.

His cattlemen friends say that dropping out of high school after completing the 10th grade didn't stop Horn's education. He's well informed on legislative matters concerning lands and is a member of CCA's Federal lands committee. He is chairman of that organization's range improvement committee. He has an intimate knowledge of grasses and other forage plants on grazing ranges.

Horn spends considerable time working on State, regional, and national boards and committees connected with BLM and is a member of the Secretary of Agriculture's Multiple-Use Committee on National Forests. He is chairman of ANCA's public lands committee.

None of these pays a fee or salary and only two of them pay per diem expenses. But Horn never complains.

"If people are going to run the Government, they have to work at it," says the soft-spoken rancher. "More ranchers should serve on committees. And that applies to people working in all industries. I have very strong feelings about this."

Horn was born at the village of McCoy, "just over the hill" from Walcott. His father, the late Arthur Leonard Horn, and his mother came from Bailey, Colo.

Horn's childhood was spent in the saddle. While working as a cowboy he homesteaded a piece of land near Wolcott. He sold the homestead and purchased the George Watson ranch in 1938.

"I've had some tough times," said Horn. "But I was always too busy to realize that I was hard up. I always had plenty to eat during the depression, thanks to beans and buckskin (venison)."

While venison is considered a great meat delicacy by many, Horn said that during the depression he looked forward to the day when he would not have to depend on it for food. Big herds of deer roam the Eagle and Colorado River country and gather by the hundreds to feed on his haystocks when deep snow blankets the hills and valleys.

Horn jokingly recalled that he had money—$5—"about half of the time" during the depression. So did his neighbor, Earl Boore.

"When Earl had the $5 I'd get the best of him in a horse swap," he said. "He'd give me $5 to boot in a swap. Later on, Earl would get a horse that I wanted. I'd trade and give $5 to boot.

"We didn't dare spend the money. It would have ruined our horse-swapping deals."

During his 2 years of high school Horn was a diligent student in Spanish. His ambition was to manage a ranch in Argentina for a big packing company. He never made it. His duties as a cowboy caused one delay after the other—until he became so well established in ranching that going to South America would have been a poor prospect.

Mrs. Horn has a son, Dick Reese, by a previous marriage. He is a sophomore at CSU. Horn has two daughters by a previous marriage. They are Mrs. Don (Jean) Gates of Meeker and Mrs. William (Jo) Monroe, of Lakewood.

"I just can't be optimistic over the immediate future of cattlemen," he observed. "Importation of foreign beef is still our biggest problem. Foreigners can raise cattle for a fraction of what we pay to raise them.

"And there are too many noncattle businessmen in the business in this country—some for tax writeoffs, some for hobbies and some who just have desires to be cattlemen whether they succeed or not."

He believes noncattle businessmen prevent natural fluctuations in prices and disrupt a bona fide cattleman's ability to anticipate market prices and trends.

As far as a large price spread between the cattle raiser and the grocery store is concerned, Horn said: "I'm puzzled over it. I guess there are many factors that I don't understand—such as labor costs, processing, and packaging."

PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT, ETC., FOR ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 800) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of May 25, 1965, p. 11666, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this is the conference report on legislation to authorize appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces.

A tabulation that I propose to insert in the RECORD at the end of my remarks shows that the Department of Defense sought authorization of $15,297,200,000 for these purposes; that the Senate version of S. 800 authorized $15,283,800,000; the House authorized $15,303,400,000; and the conferees have agreed on an authorization figure of $15,402,800,000.

I should like to say a word or two about the significant differences in the versions of the bill and the manner in which these differences have been reconciled by the conferees.

In aircraft procurment the Senate had reduced the Navy total by $99.8 million, the amount that had been requested for 10 E–2A aircraft. The E–2A aircraft has had some technical difficulties and as a result the Department of Defense canceled the 1965 procurement and stretched the procurement authorized in earlier years over a long period. The Senate deletion of this procurement reflected a committee desire to review progress on solving the technical problems before approving additional procurement. The committee was informed by the Secretary of Defense that there is reason for increased confidence in the success of the E–2A improvement program and the Senate conferees agreed to the restoration of funds for this procurement.

In the authorization for the construction of naval vessels the Senate eliminated 2 of 4 fast deployment logistics ships, for a reduction of $64.2 million; 5 of 10 motor gunboats, for a reduction of $21 million; and added $133.6 million for 2 nuclear-powered attack submarines, for a net addition of $48.4 million. The House had added 1 nuclear-powered guided missile frigate for $150.5 million.

The conferees have agreed on a program of only 2 fast deployment logistics ships for the next year, the restoration of the 5 motor gunboats deleted by the Senate, and retention of the Senate addition of 2 nuclear-powered attack submarines and the House addition of a nuclear-powered guided missile frigate.

Neither the two additional nuclear-powered attack submarines nor the nuclear-powered guided missile frigate was requested by the Department of Defense.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff had been unanimous in their recommendation that nuclear-powered attack submarines be constructed at the rate of six for this year, and the Navy strongly supports a requirement for a nuclear-powered guided missile frigate to provide more air defense for the nuclear-powered carrier task force.

In research and development the Senate had provided an additional $82 million for the Air Force in an attempt to encourage the accelerated development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft, the so-called follow-on manned bomber. The House bill provided an additional $7 million for this purpose.

The Senate addition of $82 million was intended to provide the amount for this development that had been requested by the Air Force in its original budget submission for fiscal year 1966. With the passage of time and the absence of a decision to proceed to the program definition phase, it is clear that all of the $82 million added by the Senate could not be effectively expended during fiscal year 1966.

There is some indication that the additional $7 million in authorization might be applied to this development. Acceptance of the lower figure by the Senate conferees should not be construed as any change in the committee's conviction that the accelerated development of a new manned bomber is highly desirable. Congress has done practically everything within its power to encourage the Department of Defense to proceed faster with this development, and without repeating the arguments for a new bomber, I merely remind the Senate of General LeMay's concern that the B–52 fleet would fall apart before we get a replacement for it.

Disregarding the amount added for the accelerated development of a new bomber, the House had reduced the amounts sought for research and development by $77.3 million more than the Senate reductions. The Senate had reduced R.D.T. & E. by $44 million and the House had cut $121.3 million from these programs. The Senate conferees acceded to the House reductions partly from the realization that the Secretary of Defense can apply amounts provided in his emergency fund to any research or development project that urgently needs more money. The amount of the reduction in R.D.T. & E. is less than 2 percent of the total authorization requested.

The House bill contained six general provisions not considered by the Senate. Perhaps the most significant of these provisions is the one intended to discourage the inclusion of the so-called 65–35 provision governing the allocations of conversion, alteration, and repair work on naval vessels between public and private shipyards.

The Secretary of Defense has asked that this 65–35 provision not be included in the appropriations act this year because of his objective to provide a greater workload for the lower number of public yards that will be operated in the future.

The Senate Committee on Armed Services had not addressed itself specifically to this problem during hearings on the authorization bill, but the House conferees were unyielding in their insistence that the bill include language directing the assignment of conversion, alteration, and repair work on the basis of economic and military considerations, rather than on the basis of a 65–35 distribution. For himself, the Senator from Mississippi desires to point out, however, that if the Committees on Appropriations desire to do so, they can recommend continuation of the 65–35 distribution in the appropriations bill notwithstanding the adoption of this provision in the authorization act.

Another general provision to which the Senate conferees have agreed is the one redesignating the Military Air Transport Service as the Military Airlift Command, effective January 1, 1966. The House conferees were strongly convinced that a change in designation from a service to a command for our military airlift forces would elevate their status and enhance their prestige and the Senate conferees have agreed to the change with a deferment of the effective date until the first of next year in an attempt to keep the cost involved as low as possible.

The other general provisions retained under the conference agreement would: First, repeal archaic tonnage balances for the construction of Navy ships; second, continue the provision for alternating the construction of vessels between public and private yards, unless the President deems this procedure to be inconsistent with the public interests; third, subject "tracked combat vehicles" to the requirement of an annual authorization; and, fourth, require authorization for any amounts appropriated to the Secretary of Defense for use as an emergency fund for research and development.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana. I know this is a matter in which he is interested.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, in the past 3 fiscal years with the assistance of my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi, and others, we were able to place in the Department of Defense Appropriation Acts the following language:

> Of the funds made available in this act for repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels, at least 35 per centum shall be available for such repair, alteration, and conversion in privately owned shipyards: *Provided*, That if determined by the Secretary of Defense to be inconsistent with the public interest based on urgency of requirement to have such vessels repaired, altered, or converted as required above, such work may be done in Navy or private shipyards as he may direct.

Mr. President, I am now informed that on at least four occasions the intent of this provision has been violated. I am not permitted to go into the details, but there appeared on page 743, part 2, of the House Department of Defense Subcommittee hearings a quotation which would indicate that work was given to certain Navy shipyards not to meet urgent fleet requirements but to prevent the dissipation of valuable employee skills—something that was not included in the escape clause that I have just quoted.

As the Senator knows I personally objected to the provision that we are now discussing. That provision was included in the House bill as section 303. It reads:

> SEC. 303. The assignment of naval ship conversion, alteration, and repair projects shall be made on the basis of economic and military considerations and shall not be restricted by requirements that certain portions of such naval shipwork be assigned to particular types of shipyards or to particular geographical areas or by similar requirements.

In the report which accompanied the bill from the House, there appeared this language:

> The Armed Services Committee has always felt that this (the 65-35 provision) constituted an unreasonable restriction on the freedom of action, military and economic, of the Navy in executing its ship conversion, alteration, and repair program. In the past, the chairman and members of the Armed Services Committee have vigorously opposed it on the floor. This amendment is designed to preclude by specific language the insertion of such limiting language in any future legislation.

In view of the language that is now in the conference bill, as well as the quotation I have just made from the Armed Services Committee report, I ask my good friend from Mississippi this question:

As the Senator from Mississippi knows, the Committee on Appropriations has recommended and the Senate has included the so-called 65-35 formula for the allocating of naval ship repair, alteration, and conversion work between the naval and private shipyards in the DOD Appropriation Acts for fiscal years 1963, 1964, and 1965. I note the conferees agreed to a House amendment that seeks to limit the right of the Appropriations Committee to recommend, and the Senate to include a limitation in the DOD appropriation bill providing for the 65-35 formula. Does the Senator from Mississippi agree with me that this House amendment cannot so restrict the rights of the Committee on Appropriations to recommend and the Senate to include the 65-35 formula in the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1966 if the facts developed during the consideration of this bill justify the continuation of the 65-35 formula?

Mr. STENNIS. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana. I have consulted with members of the staff who are fully familiar with all the facts. They are of the opinion that the limitation could be put in an appropriation bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. It would come within the purview of a limitation?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. It would come within the purview of a limitation on the dollars the Appropriations Committee writes into the bill. I am advised that there are precedents for that by persons competent to pass on the question. I made the comment in the conference that I felt it was correct, as a member of the conference I felt that we had a right to vote for a limitation if the facts justified.

This is a policy question, to a degree. It is a proper subject for legislation, but that does not preclude the Appropriations Committee from putting the limitation in if the committee thinks the facts justify it.

Until the Senator from Mississippi got fully into this matter, he felt the facts did not justify a change in the 65-35 formula, but the facts that prevail now are somewhat different from what they were when the original limitation was put in. I believe that a wise and discreet administration of these funds under the language of this bill would work out all right and perhaps be acceptable generally, but we think the Appropriations Committee has jurisdiction under the conditions we have already described.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am assuming the Appropriations Committee will be able to make a case. If it cannot make a case, the situation will be somewhat different.

Mr. STENNIS Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wished to make it clear that, although the language remains in the bill, the Appropriations Committee would not be precluded from placing in the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal 1966 the language we have heretofore incorporated.

Mr. STENNIS. I think that is correct. It would come under the idea that the Appropriations Committee does have power to make a limitation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. It is rather sad to me that this matter should have developed as it did with the elimination of the fixed 65-35 percentage on alteration, repair, and conversion built into the authorization at this time.

As the Senator knows, we in New York are suffering from the proposed closing of the Brooklyn Navy Yard. It is a very valuable and experienced facility, and has served the Nation well. We feel that a factor in the decline in work at this yard was the fact that we had these fixed percentages. I, too, would like to reserve the right to study it in terms of practicality with respect to the elimination of the 65-35 ratio.

My judgment, with the Senator from Mississippi, is that we ought to try it out on that basis instead of restricting the authorities within a fixed percentage.

Had that been the case, there would have been much more flexibility for considering the defense desirability of the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

I am glad to see now the facts developed—and I would like to ask this in the form of a question—because the managers said they now realize that the fixed overhead required by the needs of the country in these fixed installations is a factor which exists, so why not take advantage of it in the matter of repairs.

I am not going to argue the question of points of order or anything like that. We will get into that at another time if necessary. But I am assured by the Senator from Mississippi, with the distinction he has in this field, that he will take a new look at the picture with perhaps some different concept of the facts, based on the experience of the conference report and contemporaneous requirements.

Mr. STENNIS. May I reply to that point at this juncture?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator from New York understands that the Senator from Mississippi is merely saying now he thinks the Appropriations Committee has the power to impose limitations. I am not announcing what my position may be. That will depend on what the facts will develop later.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; I gathered, however, that the Appropriations Committee will regard the question with the possibility of a different point of view.

Mr. STENNIS. I think so; and if there is any abuse of discretion or substantial change in the facts, the Appropriations Committee can enter into the picture.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator, with his usual open mind, will recall that when we had a colloquy about the E-2A Hawkeye early warning aircraft when S. 800 was on the floor on April 6, during which I called attention to the fact that there had been some new developments, affecting the performance of this aircraft, practically contemporaneously with consideration of this bill, and the Senator said he would look into it. I am pleased that the Senator and his colleagues, upon a consideration of all the relevant facts, determined to include funds for the Hawkeye.

Mr. STENNIS. We went into that question and were happy to find some developments, which were not very substantial, but were of the type which would clear the way for further substantial developments in this field, and put it back in the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from New York on behalf of all the conferees, both House and Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation comparing the amounts authorized and appropriated for the purposes of this bill in 1965, with the amounts requested in 1966, the amounts approved by the Senate and the House, and the amounts agreed to in conference.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative tabulation on S. 800

[In thousands]

	Authorized, fiscal year 1965	Appropriated, fiscal year 1965	Requested, fiscal year 1966	Senate	House	Conference
Procurement:						
Aircraft:						
Army	$443, 600	$442, 200	$344, 500	$344, 500	$344, 500	$344, 500
Navy and Marine Corps	1, 854, 900	1, 936, 258	1, 915, 800	1, 816, 000	1, 915, 800	1, 915, 800
Air Force	3, 663, 000	3, 563, 737	3, 550, 200	3, 550, 200	3, 545, 200	3, 550, 200
Missiles:						
Army	282, 600	233, 900	253, 700	253, 700	253, 700	253, 700
Navy	660, 100	660, 100	364, 000	364, 000	364, 000	364, 000
Marine Corps	13, 100	2, 600	13, 000	13, 000	13, 000	13, 000
Air Force	1, 730, 000	1, 730, 000	796, 100	796, 100	771, 100	796, 100
Naval vessels: Navy	1, 996, 000	1, 930, 076	1, 501, 100	1, 549, 500	1, 651, 600	1, 721, 000
Subtotal	10, 613, 300	10. 398, 871	8, 738, 400	8, 687, 000	8, 858, 900	8, 958, 300
Research, development, test, and evaluation:						
Army	1, 345, 045	1, 340, 045	1, 438, 000	1, 429, 500	1, 406, 400	1, 406, 400
Navy	1, 378, 060	1, 372, 760	1, 472, 600	1, 462, 600	1, 439, 200	1, 439, 200
Air Force	3, 140, 100	3, 112, 000	3, 147, 800	3, 221, 300	3, 103, 900	3, 103, 900
Defense agencies	500, 215	498, 715	500, 400	483, 400	495, 000	495, 000
Subtotal	6, 363, 320	6, 323, 520	6, 558, 800	6, 596, 800	6, 444, 500	6, 444, 500
Total	16, 976, 620	16, 722, 391	15, 297, 200	15, 283, 800	15, 303, 400	15, 402, 800

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, let me add one further word, partly of a personal nature. I am satisfied that a further presentation of the facts now existing will show that the authorization bill for hardware, ships, and related military equipment is sufficient for a sound and solid military program.

By that, I do not mean to imply that it closes the door on further authorizations for this year, or appropriations that have not been set forth and outlined because of the increasing drain upon military supplies and resources for the war in Vietnam. It is steadily increasing. I believe that it will continue and will require additional authorization.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is an integral part of the broad-scale effort which the American people have determined should be made to deal with the great changes that are taking place in America today as a result of the increasing complexity, sophistication, and maturity of our society. Consequently, we are moving forward on many fronts: education, medical care for the elderly, water and air pollution, the war on poverty—the list could go on for pages.

Through this Economic Development Act, Congress is saying to all the people of America that it is the view of their elected representatives that no community or town, no matter how small, shall be allowed to fall victim to a changing technology, to be left in the backwash of the advance into new frontiers of social and economic development. Each community or region, if it desires to help itself, will receive assistance in this direction from the Federal Government, acting in cooperation with the States. Grants and loans for public works and development facilities, loans for the purchase or development of land and facilities for industrial or commercial usage, the guarantee of certain loans, partial payment of interest charges on certain loans, technical assistance, research, and information will be available to areas which meet the certification requirements of low income or high unemployment.

It is my fervent hope that the eligibility requirements will be such as to afford assistance to those many small communities partially dependent upon industry but primarily agricultural in nature, whose unemployment rate is kept low because of outmigration. I believe that these communities will be aided through the low-income provision. I shall watch the administration of the act closely with this in mind.

In a recent letter from Mr. Henry C. Sullivan, chairman of the Collingsworth County Overall Economic Development Planning Board, it was pointed out that the chairman of the Texas Industrial Commission, Mr. Harry W. Clark, expects that if present trends continue, the roughly 800 small communities in Texas will be reduced to 600 by the early 1970's. I hope that this does not happen so long as I am a Member of the U.S. Senate. This bill is the way to see that such a grim destiny does not come to pass. It would provide grants and loans for waterworks and sewage disposal systems, the surest guarantee of survival of small towns.

I believe that the carefully reasoned eligibility requirements worked out by the committee should be given a chance to work.

I am particularly pleased that the ARA approach is being retained in this bill. ARA, in the few short years of its existence, has meant a great deal to my State. As of January 31, 1965, a total of 134 projects involving almost $10 million have been approved for Texas, creating over 3,200 new jobs. Through waterworks, public buildings, or other grants, whole towns have been revitalized. Through industrial loans, new industries have lifted smaller cities from depression to rapid growth.

With the passage of this bill, we provide for this Nation another of the building blocks to a Great Society in which all regions of the country share the fruits of economic progress and not the despair of being left behind on the great adventure upon which we are all embarked.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the mayor of Brady, Tex., Mr. John Rudder, dated May 10, 1965, as well as a résumé from pages 61 to 63 of the hearings on the Public Works and Economic Development Act, 1965, which shows how an eligible area obtains benefits under the proposed Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

We receive many inquiries from constituents saying that they cannot find out how the act will work, and this summary of 31 points will give them that information.

There being no objection, the letter and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[A letter from the mayor of Brady, Tex.]

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Brady, Tex., May 10, 1965.

Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Knowing that you are always interested in what the people back home think of various Government programs, we want to let you know what the ARA program has meant to the economy of McCulloch County.

On May 14 and 15, 1961, Mr. B. C. Broad, manager of McCulloch Electric Cooperative, and Mr. George Purcell, manager of the Brady Chamber of Commerce, attended a Rural Area Development Conference in Washington, D.C., where the ARA program was outlined. However, at that early date we were not eligible to participate in the program. In the latter part of 1961 we were made eligible on the basis that our unemployment had been above the national level for 3 years.

We called a meeting of every segment of our economy. We all agreed that we had lost 24 percent of our population in the past 10 years. What we needed was to provide work or part-time work for our small farmers and ranchers so they could remain on the farm. This group formed a county building program and developed our own OEDP. In this plan we not only found out what we needed but made a long-range plan to solve the problems. The various State agencies approved this OEDP program and it was also approved in Washington, D.C., by the ARA.

Some of our people had started a local industry in Brady. This industry had great promise but had run into financial trouble. The Small Business Administration was about to foreclose. We formed an industrial foundation and approached Spencer Safford Loadcraft, Inc., of Augusta, Kans., to make application for an ARA loan to purchase the property and take over the existing industry. We personally raised our 10 percent and a local savings and loan made a loan for 20 percent and ARA approved a loan for 65 percent. Total amount of this loan was a little over $300,000. After 1 year this company had 350 people working, however, at present the employment is down some due to a lack of contracts.

The city of Brady had just voted bonds for about $1½ million to build a lake. Our sewer system was about to be condemned by the health department and was inadequate to handle the load. Our water distribution system had to be improved and enlarged. We were granted two grants under the Public Works Acceleration Act for about $350,000. We also secured two good small industries which were financed by personal capital.

Today the population of Brady is about 1,000 more than it was in 1961. We have a new modern motel, a new restaurant, and a new apartment house. These were financed by private capital. We have made over $600,000 improvements in our school system and two of our rural communities have drilled water wells and put in water systems.

The city of Brady has developed a long-range plan for the city. We feel that none of this would have been accomplished had the ARA program not sparked us and gave us some help both financial and technical.

Part of the ARA program was not practical for us but when we worked out our own OEDP it was practical because it was a program developed by our people for our people and the help we got through the ARA made it possible for us to develop a working program.

We are asked many times why we were for the ARA program. Our answer is that we are for it because it has helped our county which had to do something or we would have continued to lose population.

We have faith that the money loaned to our industry will be paid back 100 percent and the grants we received made it possible for us to vote a like sum in bonds to build a new modern sewer and water system. Without the 50-percent grant we could not have done this job.

We would like to see the good parts of the ARA program continued as it has proven it has merit and will help any rural community not only to exist but put them in a position to add a lot to the welfare and economy of our Nation.

We want to thank you and your staff for your help and thank our Government for having faith in our community.

Sincerely,

JOHN RUDDER, *Mayor*.

Brief Step-by-Step Résumé of How an Eligible Area Gets Benefits Under the Proposed Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965

(Tentative and subject to changes in the act and revised administrative requirements)

1. If the area had previously been eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act and had an approved overall economic development program (OEDP) under that act, it will be eligible to submit projects for approval immediately.

2. Pending projects under the Area Redevelopment Act will automatically be reviewed by EDA and reactivated without further action on the part of the community.

3. Pending projects under the Accelerated Public Works Act will have to be resubmitted.

4. If an area had not previously been eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act, it will be necessary for the area to prepare an OEDP and submit it to the Administrator for Economic Development for approval. Assistance will be available from EDA upon request.

TITLE I—GRANTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

5. Public Works and development facilities projects may be submitted by any community, governmental organization, or private nonprofit organization from an eligible area.

6. Projects should be submitted to EDA on forms which will be made available.

7. EDA will publish a book indicating which areas are eligible for 80-percent grants, which for 70-percent grants, which for 60-percent grants, and which for 50-percent grants. Communities will be able to guide themselves accordingly.

8. When an applicant wishes to apply for supplementary grant for a project for which the basic grant is coming from another agency, the applicant will fill out a supplemental form to EDA at the same time the project is submitted to the other agency. Announcements of approval will be made simultaneously with the announcements of approval from the other agencies. Funds will be transferred to the other agencies in the amount of the supplementary grant.

9. Applicants will be required to justify all projects on the grounds that the projects will either directly or indirectly tend to improve the opportunities for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial facilities; or will assist in the creation of additional long-term employment opportunities; or will substantially further the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Applicants will also have to demonstrate that the project will fulfill a pressing need of the area and that it is consistent with an approved OEDP.

10. Where a supplementary grant is requested the applicant will have to certify that funds are not available locally for the required community share without a supplementary grant.

TITLE II—OTHER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

11. Application for loans for public works and development facilities will be handled on the same basis as grants and will require the same justification.

12. Application for business loans may be from public or private borrowers and should be made directly to EDA on appropriate forms provided.

13. Applications for guarantee of working capital loans will be made a part of the application for the business loan as appropriate.

14. Applications for interest rate subsidies will be made directly to EDA by the borrower on appropriate form which will be available from EDA.

15. Applications for loan guarantees or interest rate subsidies will be required to exercise a certification of nonrelocation on appropriate EDA form.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION

16. Communities requiring technical assistance in carrying out their economic development programs will make application directly to EDA in accordance with published instructions similar to those now available for the Area Redevelopment Act program.

17. States, district organizations, and communities wishing grants-in-aid for economic planning staff and admininstrative expenses shall submit requests directly to EDA on appropriate forms to be made available. Detailed budgets and justifications will be required.

18. Eligibility of areas eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act on the date the new bill is enacted will automatically be considered eligible for benefits under the new act. Specific instructions will be given to these communities at a later date on the maintenance of their eligibility.

19. Those areas which will become eligible under the new act which have not heretofore been eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act will receive a communication from EDA explaining how to prepare an OEDP and to qualify for designation under the new act.

20. When the new area has submitted an OEDP and it has been approved it will become eligible for benefits under the new act.

21. EDA and State officials will work together to establish tentative boundary lines for districts under part B of title IV.

22. State and EDA representatives will work with representatives of local communities to establish district development organizations.

23. When district development organizations are established, requests for grants-in-aid will be submitted to EDA on appropriate forms to be provided.

24. When these grants are approved the district organization will arrange to prepare their district development plan and submit it for approval.

25. One year after the date of enactment of the act or whenever the district development plan is approved, whichever comes later, the district will become eligible for benefits under part B of title IV. These will be administered in the same manner as projects submitted under title I and title II.

TITLE V—REGIONAL ACTION PLANNING COMMISSIONS

26. The Secretary of Commerce will, upon enactment of the bill, notify Governors of the provisions of title V regarding regional action planning commissions.

27. Representatives of the Governors and EDA will meet informally to agree upon preliminary general boundary lines for regions.

28. After this agreement the Governors will submit a formal request for recognition of the region, and a temporary budget for initial operation, accompanying this request with appropriate justification in terms with the purposes of the act.

29. After review and/or modification, the Secretary will approve the establishment of the regional planning commission and its initial budget and the President will name the Federal cochairman.

30. The Governors will name their representatives to the regional planning commission; the commission will organize itself and submit a detailed annual budget.

31. The Secretary will approve the budget and make the funds available for the commission to organize itself.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the order of May 26, 1965, that the Senate adjourn until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order of May 26, 1965, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 28, 1965, at 9 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 27, 1965:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning John C. Aarni, Jr., to be second lieutenant, and ending Furman E. Thomas, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 23, 1965.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Thomas R. Dooley, to be captain, and ending Raymond A. Sanders, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 19, 1965.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning James L. Abbot III, to be ensign in the Navy, and ending Timothy J. Vogel, to be ensign in the Navy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 5, 1965.

◆

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of the Scriptures: Psalm 112: 6: *The righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance.*

Almighty God, on Memorial Day we approach a time that brings back not only a strange medley of memories, praises, sorrows, and disappointments, but of dreams and hopes and better days.

For some of us Memorial Day makes scenes which are vivid and horrible and which, we pray God, we will some day be able to forget, for mankind has suffered much, hoped much, and dreamed much, but the new age and better world that we expected has been wholly inadequate and is still without imperishable remembrance.

Those brave men and women, who fought those wars of the past, revealed an incredible heroism; they did not fear or falter or fail; they fought many great wars but we were guilty of making a little peace that did not touch the reverent imagination of humanity or become forever memorable in the annals of history.

May our vision of a lasting and enduring peace continue to grow and abide and prove its immortality for Thou hast created mankind not for failure but for victory and we must adjust our thinking and living to fit that eternal faith and hope and love.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 21, 1965:

H.R. 7064. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended; and

H.R. 7855. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of small patrol cutters for the Coast Guard.

On May 22, 1965:

H.R. 66. An act to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced;

H.R. 3043. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4338. An act to authorize the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to rent certain property in the District of Columbia for certain office purposes; and

H.J. Res. 195. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the American Legion National Convention of 1966, to be held in Washington, D.C.; to authorize the granting of certain permits to the American Legion 1966 Convention Corp. of the District of Columbia on the occasion of such convention, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 806. An act to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act to permit the listing on labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product;

H.R. 6691. An act to validate certain payments made to employees of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; and

H.R. 7031. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6767. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1564. An act to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 1689. An act to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502).

KURE BEACH, N.C.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H.R. 821, "An act for the relief of the town of Kure Beach, N.C.," with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 2, line 12, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the majority leader the program for the rest of this week and next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the minority leader will yield to me, I am pleased the gentleman made this inquiry at this time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to advise that we expect to finish up the legislative business for the week today and have a meeting tomorrow for the purpose of being able to go over until Tuesday. It will be my purpose after announcing the program to ask permission to do this.

Monday is Memorial Day holiday. There will be no session if my request is granted.

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day. Also on Tuesday the 1966 appropriations for State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies. Also on Tuesday, H.R. 3584, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act amendments, with an open rule and 2 hours of debate.

For Wednesday, H.R. 8371, to reduce excise taxes.

For Thursday and the balance of the week, H.R. 4623, further amending the Reorganization Act of 1949, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate, and H.R. 8464, to provide a temporary increase in the public debt ceiling for the period July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966.

This program is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite possible we may have additions to announce to the program sometime next week.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO TUESDAY, JUNE 1

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader will yield, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I did not quite understand the distinguished majority leader as to whether raising the debt ceiling is going to come to the House before the tax reduction bill or whether the tax reduction bill is going to come before the raising of the debt ceiling.

Mr. ALBERT. The tax reduction bill is coming up on Wednesday. The other bill later. There is no significance in the sequence. It is just a matter of when the bills are reported and rules are granted.

Mr. GROSS. I do not care to take the time of the House at this time, and I am sure the Speaker would not indulge me all of the time necessary under a reservation of objection, but I could argue a long time with the gentleman about the relationship of a debt increase to a cut in taxes.

Mr. ALBERT. I am sure the gentleman could.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

UNIFORM POLICIES WITH RESPECT TO RECREATION AND FISH AND WILDLIFE BENEFITS AND COSTS OF FEDERAL MULTIPURPOSE WATER RESOURCE PROJECTS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1229) to provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multipurpose water resource projects, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist upon the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, ROGERS of Texas, HALEY, SAYLOR, and SKUBITZ.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 193)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1965, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization of the locomotive inspection activities of certain personnel employed by or attached to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I have stressed that we must reorganize and modernize the Government's organization structure in order to focus responsibilities, increase efficiency, and meet present-day needs more effectively. The reorganization plan, which accords with recommendations made to me by the Interstate Commerce Commission, supports these objectives. It will make possible necessary changes in the organization and administration of the Commissioner's railroad safety operations.

The Commission's ability to organize and carry out most effectively its responsibilities for railroad safety is now severely limited by certain anachronistic provisions of the locomotive inspection statutes. These provisions go back to an earlier period before steam locomotives were replaced almost completely by diesel engines. At that time locomotive boilers were temperamental and dangerous, and special measures were required to enforce adequate safety standards. Present law specifies in detail the method of appointing locomotive inspectors, the functions to be performed by them, and the organization structure for administering inspection activities. While these provisions may have been suited to conditions 50 years ago, they are clearly inappropriate today.

Progress in railroad technology has not eliminated the need for locomotive inspection. Locomotive inspection is still essential for the safety of employees, passengers, and cargo. The Interstate Commerce Commission, however, properly should not be held to account for the performance of this important function as long as it lacks authority to make those changes in organization and operations which it deems necessary to meet current safety needs and to promote maximum economy and efficiency. The primary purpose of the accompanying reorganization plan is to terminate outdated arrangements which now stand in the way of the most effective management of the Commission's railroad safety program.

Organizational flexibility is at present restricted by the statutory requirement that there be 50 locomotive inspection districts and at least 1 inspector for each such district. The number of inspectors and districts cannot be adjusted to accommodate to changes in workload or other relevant factors.

Locomotive inspection is rigidly separated from related railroad safety activities performed under the Interstate Commerce Commission. The locomotive inspection statutes restrict inspectors of locomotives to the inspection of locomotives only and prevent the inspection of locomotives (except brakes and safety appliances) by other Commission railroad safety personnel. Thus, the Commission is prevented from making the most effective utilization of its total staff of locomotive and train inspectors. In order to eliminate the present uneconomical duplicate visits to railroad yards and otherwise to promote the most economical and effective administration of its railroad safety responsibilities, the Commission should have the authority to assign staff to duties for which they may be qualified by training and experience. The reorganization plan will make this possible.

Organizational flexibility is hampered further by the provision for Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of a Director and two Assistant Directors of Locomotive Inspection. Originally, these officials were to be selected with reference to their practical knowledge of the construction and repair of boilers. Later amendments broadened their responsibilities to embrace all parts of the locomotive and tender. These clearly are not policymaking positions, warranting Presidential appointment. As is now the case with other comparable positions where appointments should be based primarily on professional and technical qualifications, personnel supervising locomotive inspection functions should be appointed under the classified civil service.

By eliminating the present cumbersome restrictions on inspection districts, the duties of locomotive inspectors, and the appointment of the Director and Assistant Directors of Locomotive Inspection, the plan will make it possible for the Commission to utilize its personnel more efficiently, integrate the work performed by locomotive inspectors with that performed by other Commission railroad safety inspectors, and take full advantage of recent improvements in the organization of the Commission's central office and field activities.

Upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan:

1. All functions of the Director of Locomotive Inspection, the Assistant Directors of Locomotive Inspection, and district locomotive inspectors will be transferred to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Suitable powers of delegation with respect to the functions so transferred will be conferred upon the Commission.

2. The position of Director of Locomotive Inspection, the two positions of Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection, and all positions of district locomotive inspector will be abolished. The Commission will be required to appoint to a position under the classified civil service, as provided in the reorganization plan, each person who immediately prior to the taking effect of the plan held the office of district inspector of locomotives; such appointments will be deemed to be made without any break in service.

3. The function of dividing the territory comprising the several States and the District of Columbia into 50 locomotive boiler-inspection districts will be abolished.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. I have also found and hereby declare that, by reason of the reorganizations made by the reorganization plan, it is necessary to include in the plan the provisions contained in section 5 thereof. The rates of compensation thereunder are those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable positions in the executive branch of the Government.

The statutory authority for the exercise of the functions to be abolished by section 2(b) of the reorganization plan is contained in section 4 of the act of February 17, 1911, chapter 103, 36th Statutes at Large, page 914, as amended.

The reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will produce some immediate savings and significant long-range economies. The latter will result from future improvements in the organization and administration of the affected functions made possible by the plan. Since the plan will open the way for the more effective utilization of safety inspection staffs of the Interstate Commerce Commission, it will yield a significantly increased measure of safety inspection activity for each dollar spent for this purpose. It is, however, impracticable to specify or itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the reorganization plan.

Under the accompanying reorganization plan, all essential Government railroad safety services to the traveling public and employees will continue to be performed. The plan provides urgently needed modernization of the organization and procedures in the Interstate Commerce Commission's railroad safety program. I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 27, 1965.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4 OF 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 194)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1965, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganizations of various committees and other similar bodies.

The strength and vitality of our democracy depends in major part upon the Federal Government's adaptability, on its capacity for fast flexible response to changing needs imposed by changing circumstances. If we are to maintain this capacity, we must have a government that is streamlined and capable of quickly adjusting and readjusting its organization and operating procedures to take up and surmount new challenges.

As Government grows more complex and programs increasingly cut across traditional agency lines, we must exercise special care to prevent the continuance of obsolete interagency committees and other coordinating devices which waste time and delay action and the undue proliferation of new committees. Interagency committees are a valuable and often indispensable means for facilitating coordination, but we should be sure that a committee is the most efficient way to accomplish a given task and that it is structured to meet current needs effectively.

At my direction, guidelines for the management of interagency committees have been established. I have recently asked the heads of departments and agencies to give their personal attention to a complete review of all the interagency committees in which their agencies participate to determine which ones might be eliminated, consolidated, or otherwise reorganized. We will take appropriate action to obtain essential improvements in the organization and use of those committees which have been established by the executive branch.

The reorganizations accomplished by the reorganization plan transmitted herewith will enable us to take similar action with respect to a number of committees which have been established by statute. In many instances the statutory provisions creating these committees are very specific as to membership and describe in detail the functions to be performed. These provisions are rarely sufficiently flexible to permit the membership or role of the committees to be accommodated to changing circumstances or to permit their termination when they have outlived their usefulness.

The accompanying reorganization plan will abolish nine statutory committees. In each case the responsibility for providing suitable arrangements to assure effective consultation and coordination is placed in a specific official. Wherever the continuing need for and usefulness of a committee has been demonstrated, I would anticipate the establishment of a successor committee along the general lines of the body now provided by law. Certainly prompt action will be taken to create successor committees to such bodies as the Board of Foreign Service and the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. But we will have the flexibility promptly to make such changes in functions and membership as might be required to eliminate overlapping and duplication and to adjust to the development of new programs and shifts in executive branch responsibilities.

A number of the committees affected by the reorganization plan are advisory to the President or have functions which are closely related to responsibilities already vested in the President. The functions of those committees will be transferred to the President by the reorganization plan. The functions of the others will be transferred to the appropriate individual agency heads.

The management and control of interagency committees have been a matter of growing concern to both the executive branch and the Congress. The taking effect of the reorganization plan will contribute significantly to better management of interagency committees and will assist efforts to simplify and modernize coordinating arrangements within the executive branch.

Executive Order No. 10940 of May 11, 1961, provides for the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to consult with that Committee on matters of general policy and procedure arising in the administration of the Juvenile Deliquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 and to consider certain recommendations of that Committee—42 U.S.C. 2546(b). To require the Secretary by law to consult with a committee established by Executive order is clearly anomalous. The plan abolishes the relevant functions of the Secretary with respect to consulting and considering the recommendations of the President's Committee. The reorganization plan does not otherwise affect the Committee; it has no effect upon Executive Order No. 10940. The statutory authority for the exercise of the functions to be abolished by section 13(b) of the reorganization plan is contained in section 7(b) of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, 75 Stat. 574.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1965 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

Although the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not of themselves result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will in the future allow the performance of the affected functions at lower costs and in a more timely manner than at present. It is, however, impracticable to specify or itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the reorganization plan.

I recommend that the Congress allow the accompanying reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 27, 1965.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5 OF 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 195)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1965, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for certain reorganizations relating to the National Science Foundation.

The plan contains two reorganization measures. First, all committees provided for in section 8 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 would be abolished. That section provides that there shall be a committee for each division of the Foundation, having not less than five members who are appointed by the National Science Board for 2-year terms. Section 8, as affected by section 23(b)(3) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962, 76 Stat. 1255, directs each such committee to make recommendations to and advise and consult with the Director of the National Science Foundation with respect to matters relating to the program of its division. Originally the Foundation had three such committees, corresponding to its three divisions. With the growth of the Foundation, five additional divisions have been established; consequently the Foundation, in accordance with the requirements of section 8, now has eight divisional committees. This multiplication in the number of committees has proved cumbersome. For example, three committees are now concerned with scientific personnel and education matters instead of the original one committee, even though one committee is all that is required to meet the Foundation's needs in this area. The elimination of the various statutory divisional committees will simplify the structure of the Foundation and improve its administration.

The second reorganization measure contained in the accompanying reorganization plan would empower the Director of the National Science Foundation to delegate functions vested in him by law or delegated to him by the National Science Board. The expanding responsibilities of the Foundation and the Director indicate that it is necessary that the Director clearly have such authority.

Upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan, the National Science Foundation will institute such new arrangements, in lieu of the divisional committees now required by law, as it deems appropriate. Such new arrangements may include the establishment of committees under section 6 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 and such other devices for obtaining advice as may be available to the Foundation.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

The reorganization plan will permit more effective management of the affairs of the National Science Foundation. It is, however, impracticable to specify or itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the reorganization plan.

The statutory authority for the exercise of certain functions which would be abolished by section 1 of the reorganization plan is contained in section 8 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, 64 Stat. 152.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 27, 1965.*

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 114]

Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Ayres
Baldwin
Bates
Berry
Bonner
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cramer
Farnum
Fino
Flynt
Grider
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Hull
Hungate
Lennon
Lindsay
Madden
Mathias
Miller
Morgan
O'Hara, Mich.
Ottinger
Pool
Price
Purcell
Randall
Resnick
Roudebush
Scott
Secrest
Skubitz
Stafford
Steed
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 383 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

VIEWING OF "YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS," AT 25TH CLASS REUNION OF HARVARD 1940

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 426) expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," at the 25th class reunion of the Harvard class of 1940, in Cambridge, Mass.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that this does not set any precedent, that we are not going to show this film as a commercial film throughout the country, but that this will be the one and only time it will be shown?

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the gentleman that the language of the resolution states specifically that this picture will be made available for viewing at a private showing to the class of 1940, graduates of Harvard University, their wives and their families.

Mr. BOW. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I understand why this is being done at Harvard. The point I would like to make crystal clear is that this is not a precedent that will be followed in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON RES. 426

Whereas the graduates of Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, of the class of 1940, will be observing the twenty-fifth anniversary of their graduation during the days of June 13–June 17, 1965; and

Whereas the late beloved President of these United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was a member of the class of 1940 and was held by his classmates in deep bonds of respect, loyalty, and affection; and

Whereas the class book memorializing this occasion is dedicated to John Fitzgerald Kennedy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), That it is the sense of Congress that the United States Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make the film prepared by it on the late President Kennedy "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," available for viewing at a private showing to said Harvard University class of 1940, in the city of Cambridge, Massachusetts, on or about the days of June 13–June 17, 1965.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BONDING PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LABOR LAWS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 393 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 393

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5883) to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 393 provides for consideration of H.R. 5883, a bill to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 5883 would amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act to provide for a fidelity bond—to provide protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on his part directly or through connivance with others—in place of the provision for the "faithful discharge" bond presently required. The present provision requiring the labor organization to obtain its bond from a corporate surety which holds a grant of authority from the Secretary of the Treasury as an acceptable surety for Federal bonds is amended to allow the labor organization to make "other bonding arrangements which would provide the protection required." Such other arrangements must first be approved by the Secretary of Labor and would include arrangements with foreign sureties and at a comparable or lower cost. This gives to the Secretary of Labor, under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, discretion similar to that he now has under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with regard to bonding arrangements.

The bill would also amend the act to provide that the surety company reports required shall be made public, shall be available for inspection and examination, and shall be available to State agencies.

A new section is added to the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act requiring each surety which has issued any bond required by the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act or the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to file with the Secretary of Labor a report, signed by two responsible officers, which lists and describes its bonding experience under each of the acts for the preceding fiscal year, and which specifically shall include: Gross and net premiums, total claims paid, total contingent claims, administrative and legal expenses incurred in connection with the processing of such claims, and amounts recovered by way of subrogation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 393.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a very important piece of legislation that the House is going to consider today and I believe it is highly unfortunate that once again we are witnessing, in effect, a short circuiting of the legislative process in that this bill is being brought to the floor of the House without any current hearings. The last hearings on this subject were those that were held by the 88th Congress in October 1963.

Mr. Speaker, there may be those in this House who interpret the results of the election of last November as a mandate of the administration to get everything for which it asks.

On the other hand there may be those who feel that we ought to go through the formality of holding hearings and bringing up to date the information that the House ought to have before it acts on a very important measure of this kind. I think the gentleman from New York has stated what the purport of this is. Very simply it would water down, it would dilute, it would weaken the present bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Disclosure Act of 1959, and substitute for the standard of faithful performance which is required when the bonds are obtained for union officials, it would substitute therefor another standard of fraud and dishonesty. You would have to prove fraud and dishonesty on the part of union officials before you could recover under the bond, whereas now he is held to a higher standard of faithful performance of his duties under the language of the bond that may obtain at the present time.

I think the reason is clear, and it is referred to in the minority views offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, joined in by other Republican members of that subcommittee.

Section 501 provides that the union agent who handles funds shall be held to the standard of a fiduciary. That is the language of section 501. The section that precedes the section to be amended by this bill charges us with handling responsibility. That section says that the officers, agents, shop stewards, and other representatives of a labor organization occupy positions of trust in relation to such organization and its members as a group.

That is the standard set out in section 501. Then follows the language of 502 (a), which the majority is seeking to amend here today.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it is a coincidence or not, but just a few days before we are called upon to handle this bill on the floor of the House I came across an article appearing in the New York Times of May 21, 1965, the headline of which was "Meany Charges Witch Hunting in U.S. Studies of Union Funds." The article went on to say that Mr. Meany has accused the Labor Department and their investigators of "witch hunting and harassment" in checking into the financial records of unions. I do not know whether we will be launching into a campaign to generally relax the provisions of our labor laws or not. I have looked at the 1963 hearings. There are no hearings subsequent to that time. But I ask, where is the pressure from the rank and file of the labor unions for this amendment? Where is the laboring man of America? Where is his voice reflected in these hearings saying we ought to water down the bond of the man who handles his union dues? I think the omission of that kind of evidence in the record is highly significant.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, does the present bill in the gentleman's judgment weaken or strengthen the protection of the rank and file union members?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Mississippi I cannot see that it does anything but weaken, water down, and dilute these provisions. It substitutes for the higher standard of faithful performance a standard requiring proof of fraud and dishonesty, before there can be a recovery on the bond.

Mr. COLMER. I am constrained to agree with the gentleman's conclusion.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I call attention of the Members of the House, because I think it is not irrelevant, to the fact in this same article to which I referred, a Labor Department official stated that in the year ending June 30 the Department of Labor received 51,090 union official reports, and in that same period investigators found violations in about half of the complaint cases. I think 70 were resolved by voluntary compliance, but there were 66 convictions and 9 acquittals of present or former union officers or employees for embezzlement or failure to keep proper records.

So I think we are dealing not with just something shadowy here. We are dealing with a problem of real substance. We ought to remind ourselves that union funds—and I do not know what they run to in terms of millions of dollars—but it is big business, not just peanuts that we are talking about. I think we ought to have a little concern—as the gentleman from Michigan and his colleagues on the committee pointed out—we ought to have a little concern in this body for the protection of the rank and file union member and not simply bow to the wishes and voices of a few officials who argue that it is going to be more expensive to give this protection.

I want very quickly to point out one other thing and this was alluded to by the gentleman from New York, that under the proposed amendment this is going to make it possible for foreign surety companies to provide bonds for labor union officials; that instead of just drawing these surety companies from a list of domestic companies approved by the Secretary, that foreign insurers will now be brought into the business.

Has anybody stopped to think what the possible impact might be on our balance of payments? Maybe this is not important—I do not know—but I think that maybe it would have been proper if hearings had been conducted on this bill in this session of the Congress to have gone into the balance-of-payments aspect of the question and decide whether or not foreign sureties, if we are going to have them, would have some further adverse impact on this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are others better qualified than I in this legislative body who are going to speak so I am not going to take any more time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I just want to satisfy the gentleman on the question of balance of payments that all financing, for instance, to Lloyds of London are made to banks here in dollars and there is no loss of dollars to the United States. So there is no question of the balance of payments being affected.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am very grateful to the gentleman from California for making this statement to me now. I certainly could not get it as a result of reading the bill or the report or the 1963 hearings. I think perhaps there will be other questions left unanswered in the minds of a great many Members and this is all because of the lack of hearings.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. With reference to the answer made by the gentleman from California, I can only observe that surely he does not base his answer on anything in this bill. Under the bill, a labor organization can go to the Secretary of Labor and seek approval for "some other bonding arrangement," and if it is approved the union would be exempt from the bonding requirements of the existing act. There is no limit in the bill as to what that "other binding arrangement" might be. There is no requirement, certainly not in this legislation, that says funds must remain in this country, and I would be interested in knowing the basis for the assurance by the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. I think the comment he made and the observation he made reinforces the point I sought to make that that question is left unanswered as far as the record is concerned.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, even the gentleman who just addressed the House, the gentleman from Michigan, would say that section 502(a) as presently written is not necessarily perfect. Maybe we ought to talk about some amendments to this particular section of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959. We are making a very important basic and fundamental change here today and I do not think we are going about it in the right way or with the proper degree of information and knowledge that we ought to have. I think we are going to end up, if we adopt this particular amendment, in weakening rather than strengthening the protection that the Congress intended the rank and file of the union members to have when this bill was enacted in 1959.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. DELANEY. I call your attention to page 2 of the report where former Secretary of Labor Goldberg, testifying in the Senate hearings had this to say:

> I think our experience during the last 2 years has proved very effectively that the Landrum-Griffin bond is not the proper type of bond.

He goes on further to state:

> We ought to have a simple honesty bond of the type which is exacted with respect to all banks, various financial trusts, and which has been found effective and adequate on handling of funds in other cases in a businesslike way.

That is what the Secretary stated.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. I have read the report. I was aware that in 1961, almost 4 years ago, he made that statement.

Frankly, with all due respect to Mr. Justice Goldberg, since he had come freshly, as he did at that time, from a position as counsel for a labor union, I can see how he might have felt and testified as he did.

Let me point out again that the statement is 4 years old. I should like to know what the experience has been since that time.

If the figures I have just read to the House, which purport to be figures from the Labor Department spokesman, are true, we have a problem of some magnitude.

Before we change the bonding requirements in section 502, since it seems to me we are getting the cart before the horse, we ought to change the language in section 501, which says he shall be a fiduciary. In most States, as is true of my own State of Illinois, that means a man is held to the standard of the prudent investment rule. He must prudently handle, as a fiduciary and trustee, funds which come to him from someone else.

Until we change the fiduciary standards set forth in the law in that section, I do not believe we ought to change the terminology or the language on the bond.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 20a(12) OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RE INTERLOCKING DIRECTORATES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 392 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 392

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5241) to amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate the necessity for prior approval of the Commission for a person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one carrier when such carriers are in a single integrated system of carriers lawfully operated under common control, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 392 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 5241, a bill to amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate the necessity for prior approval of the Commission for a person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one carrier when such carriers are in a single integrated system of carriers lawfully operated under common control, and for other purposes.

The bill would make it clear that the prohibition against the holding by "any person" of the position of officer or director of more than one carrier, without prior approval of the Commission, applies to the holding of such positions by different members, officers, employees, or directors of the same firm, copartnership, corporation, association, or joint stock association, or to the representation of a person on the board of directors of more than one carrier through an agent or nominee.

The filing and processing of formal interlocking directorship applications entail considerable time and expense both for the applicant and the ICC. During the period 1960 through 1963, a total of 851 such applications were filed. Only about 2 percent of these applications involved positions in unaffiliated carriers and the time and money consumed in filing and processing approximately 98 percent of these applications could have been saved if legislation such as H.R. 5241 had been enacted. Also, a considerable reduction in recordkeeping expenses would have been realized.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 392.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5241 proposes to amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act to—

First, eliminate the necessity for prior Commission approval for a person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one railroad where the carriers are part of a single integrated system, lawfully operated under common control; and

Second, it would make clear that the prohibition against the holding by "any person" of the position of officer or director of more than one railroad applies to the holding of such positions by different members of the same firm and would require obtaining prior approval of the Commission in such instances.

In other words, with respect to the second objective of the measure, if you have two attorneys from the same law firm, one serving as a director for one railroad and the other member of the same firm serving as a director of another railroad that is not commonly controlled, then under this proposal, it would make it clear that prior approval of the Commission would be required and necessary.

The effective date of the measure is January 1, 1966.

With respect to the first objective of the bill, there seems to be unanimous agreement on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the railroads on the desirability and advisability of eliminating the necessity of having to come to the ICC for prior approval before a person can be an officer or director in two or more railroads that are under common control. In fact, whenever such application is made to the ICC, approval is forthcoming as a matter of course.

There is unanimous agreement with the ICC point of view that the requirements of application and process in such situations casts an unnecessary administrative burden upon both the Commission and the carriers.

Hence, the ICC has recommended in 2 consecutive years that the law be amended to eliminate this unnecessary administrative work to save considerable time and expense for both the applicant and the Commission without an adverse effect on the public interest.

Out of a total of 851 interlocking directorship applications that were filed during the period 1960–63, only 2 percent of these applications involved positions of unaffiliated carriers; hence, the time and money involved in processing 98 percent of these applications could have been saved if the act were amended, as well as reducing recordkeeping expense.

There is opposition from the industry to the recommendation of the ICC in this measure making it necessary for approval to be gotten from the Commission before a second member of the same holding company, brokerage firm, or other noncarrier may hold a similar position as director or officer with another carrier not under common control.

Such opposition has been expressed by the Association of American Railroads, the Transportation Association of America, and American Short Line Railroad Association.

Their reasoning is that it is too restrictive in nature, that its need has not been shown, and it would make it more difficult to obtain capable and talented men as officers and directors since such personnel are frequently found as directors, officers, and partners in the same noncarrier organization. Hence, if such an organization were to be represented on one railroad, this proposal would serve as an obstacle to having anyone else from the same organization serve as another railroad officer or director. It could conceivably impede the efforts of the railroads to obtain the services of the best qualified individuals.

In the course of the record of hearings that was developed, Mr. Harry J. Breithaupt, Jr., of the law department of the Association of American Railroads, furnished the committee with a report on the legislative history of section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act and concluded with this paragraph—page 107 of the hearings:

> There appears to be no evidence of any present-day abuse resulting from the fact that under the existing statute different representatives of the same firm or corporation may serve as officers or directors of different railroads without prior Commission approval; and, therefore, there appears to be no occasion for amendment of the act in that regard.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BONDING PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LABOR LAWS

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5883) to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5883, with Mr. UDALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I arise to explain the purpose of H.R. 5883, to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

The bill proposes the substitution of a "fraud or dishonesty" bond for the presently required "faithful discharge of duties" bond under section 502(a).

The question has arisen as to whether or not the proposed substitution would diminish the protections given to union funds, and whether or not the fraud and dishonesty bond would sufficiently cover the violations of section 501(a) of the act.

Solicitor of Labor Charles Donahue, in a letter to the gentleman from California, Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, chairman of the General Subcommittee on Labor, presented the well-considered views of the Labor Department favoring the bill and the proposed substitution of bonds. He stated in part:

> It is and has been the position of the Department that the bond required by section 502(a) need not cover all violations of section 501(a). This position is expressed in an interpretative bulletin promulgated by then Secretary of Labor Mitchell shortly after the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act was enacted which states in part:
>
> "The bonding requirement in section 502(a) relates only to duties of the specified personnel in connection with their handling of funds or other property to which this section refers. It does not have reference to the special duties imposed upon representatives of labor organizations by virtue of the position of trust which they occupy, which are dealt with in section 501(a), and for which civil remedies for breach of the duties are provided in section 501(b). The fact that the bonding requirement is limited to personnel who handle funds or other property indicates the correctness of these conclusions. They find further support in the differences between sections 501(a) and 502 (a) of the act which sufficiently indicate that the scope of the two sections is not coextensive."

The committee endorses the soundness of that interpretation.

The bond which is substituted is the same type of bond which is now required under section 13(a) of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, as amended.

The words "to provide protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on his part directly or through connivance with others" are the same as under section 13(a) of the latter act.

The committee can see no reason why officers and other representatives of labor organizations who handle funds other than those of welfare and pension plans should be bonded differently from those who handle such funds. There has been no testimony suggesting that the "fraud or dishonesty" bond provided under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act has failed to protect those funds and, as previously stated, there is no reason to think that such a bond will not protect equally as well any funds other than welfare and pension plan funds.

There is no justification for requiring an expensive 25 percent surcharge for "faithful performance of duty" bonds which extra charge fails to secure any defined increase in protection as intended under the present act. In actual practice there are few instances where a loss cannot be attributed to dishonesty or fraud.

Under the bill as reported by the committee, the present provision requiring the labor organization to obtain its bond from a corporate surety which holds a grant of authority from the Secretary of the Treasury as an acceptable surety for Federal bonds is amended to allow the labor organization to make "other bonding arrangements which would provide the protection required" by section 502(a). Such other arrangements must first be approved by the Secretary of Labor and would include arrangements with foreign sureties and at a comparable or lower cost. This gives to the Secretary, under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, discretion similar to that he now has under section 13(e) of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with regard to bonding arrangements. It is not the intention of the committee in giving discretionary power to the Secretary, to sanction self-insurance on the part of labor organizations.

Section 211 of H.R. 5883 adds a new section which requires each surety which has issued any bond required by the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act or the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to file with the Secretary a report, signed by two responsible officers, which lists and describes the bonding experience under each of the acts for the preceding fiscal year, and which specifically shall include: Gross and net premiums; total claims paid; total contingent claims; administrative and legal expenses incurred in connection with the processing of such claims, and amounts recovered by way of subrogation.

The surety company reports shall, like the other reports required under the acts, be made public, shall be available for inspection and examination, and shall be available to State agencies inspecting same.

I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the distinguished chairman of the General Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, such time as he may consume.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5883 which seeks to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

The bill has four parts.

First. It would change the present provision for a "faithful discharge" bond and substitute a bond "to provide protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on his part directly or through connivance with others." This refers to the bond required of every officer, agent, shop steward, or other representative or employee of any labor organization, or of a trust in which a labor organization is interested, who handles funds or other property thereof. This is a substitution of a normal, commonly used, commercial fidelity bond for the unusual and uncommon bond required by the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act. The new substitute would be the same type of bond now required by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

Second. The bill would amend section 502(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act to allow a labor organization to make "other bonding arrangements which would provide the protection required" when approved by the Secretary of Labor. This is the same provision that exists in section 13 (e) of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

Third. A new section is added to the act requiring surety companies to file reports with the Department of Labor which will show their experience with the class of bonds required by Federal law.

Fourth. The reports filed by the surety companies are to become public information.

Each one of these amendments has its own justification and rationale. I shall demonstrate this as I take each one in order.

The purpose of the amendment to section 502(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act is twofold. It is to provide protection for the funds of labor organizations and to conserve those funds by preventing an unwarranted frittering away due to excessive and undue costs resulting from the vague nature of a "faithful discharge" bond.

Former Secretary of Labor, now Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Arthur Goldberg stated:

> We ought to have a simple honesty bond of the type which is exacted with respect to all banks, various financial trusts, and which has been found effective and adequate on handling of funds in other cases in a businesslike way and that type of bond we submit we should have in this case, too. The words "faithful performance of duties" are vague and indefinite in character. We have found that the bonding companies will bond under those words only at a very high rate of premium. If we should use and extend to all trusts, even those in which labor organizations are interested, the well-known fraud and dishonesty bonds as we would provide for in this bill, then we would be giving adequate coverage at a reasonable cost to the fund, rather than coverage at excessive costs.

The bond which we would require is the same type that protects the much greater assets of pension and welfare funds under existing law. We see no reason why the two areas of concern should not receive identical protection. There was no testimony to the effect that this would provide inadequate coverage. Neither the Justice Department nor the Labor Department saw any threat to adequate protection of these assets. The Labor Department endorses our objective and favors the bill. If the protection is in practice the same, and we believe it is, then it is a shameful waste of the assets that we seek to protect to require an imprudent and unnecessary expenditure of union funds through excessive and unduly priced bonds.

The question has been raised as to whether there exists today a 25-percent surcharge of the "faithful discharge" bond over the rates for a common fidelity bond as proponents claim. In a letter dated May 17, 1965, Mr. Frank Kleiler, Director, Office of Labor-Management and Welfare-Pension Reports, wrote:

> We do understand that there is a 25-percent surcharge in the rates for coverage under a bond required by section 502(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act over the rates that are charged for an identical amount of insurance written in connection with a bond under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

The proponents of this measure claim that there is a concrete, present, demonstrable waste of the assets of labor organizations today because of the present provision of the law. The 25-percent surcharge provides no realized added protection. Quoting Mr. Kleiler once again, "While we are aware of certain claims having been filed against sureties for losses due to embezzlement under bonds required under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, we have no specific knowledge of claims having been filed against such sureties for losses which would not have been covered by the usual fidelity type of bond."

The opponents of this measure assert that there is added protection. They claim that it is conceivable that under some situation the funds of a union might be preserved under the present bond, but not by a fidelity bond. It is conceivable. But we are not talking about what is conceivable. We are addressing ourselves to a present and real loss of union funds. The office responsible for enforcement of this provision states that they have heard of no cases where a fidelity bond would not have provided adequate protection and coverage. But meanwhile, while we await some conceivable, hypothetical future case in which a union may collect for a loss possible only with the present type coverage, many thousands of dollars are going down the drain.

Yes, the opponents of this measure will argue that there is some added undefined protection. Witnesses from the surety company industry, however, have something else to say on this subject. A representative of the Association of Casualty and Surety Companies said:

> When you had the passage of the Landrum-Griffin you substituted for that fixed standard (a fidelity bond) this amorphous thing called faithful performance of duty in an area where it had never been used in that broad aspect before.
>
> The term I think was taken by the draftsmen, perhaps unwittingly from the procedures and the kind of coverage which historically had been available to public officials. It was the common and ordinary broad coverage which was available to people who are required as officials of State and Government to be bonded—faithful performance of duty.
>
> In that area, of course, when you had a public official his duties were known. They were fixed by statute. They were fixed by the customary practices of the office, by the common law definition of what the faithful performance might be, but when you

> took it into the area of this type of bonding for labor union officials you had no fixed standard anymore. In this area we don't know what it means.

At this point, I asked the witness the following question:

> The reason for the higher rate is the underwriting. In other words, if, as you very well said a few minutes ago, you are required to underwrite something and you are not sure as to its implications, you are going to charge more money so as to safeguard yourself against this uncertainty?

The witness responded that this was exactly accurate. He then stated:

> We can only guess as to what faithful performance coverage means in the frame of reference of the duties of an official of a union.

Mr. Charles Donahue, Solicitor, U.S. Labor Department, stated on this subject:

> The words "faithful performance of duties" are vague and indefinite in character. We have found that the bonding companies will bond under those words only at a very high rate of premium.

My colleague on the General Subcommittee on Labor, the gentleman from Illinois, brought this entire point to a head with this question:

> I have been listening to this testimony all day today and I am still trying to find out this point. What in your judgment is faithful discharge of duties as applied to bonds for labor unions?

The vice president of Niagara Fire Insurance Co. stated:

> I believe it has already been made abundantly clear that the faithful discharge of duty is not definable.

Mr. Chairman, the opponents of this measure ask us to continue along this same path while unions continue to pay 25 percent extra for a vague and unrealized alleged benefit. A survey of 122 national and international unions found not a single faithful discharge claim had been filed. Six affiliated departments of the AFL–CIO reported that not a single faithful discharge claim had been filed. And the Surety Association of America has not been able to cite a single claim for a violation of faithful discharge of duties by a union officer.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we bring this section of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act into line with the more realistic and advantageous provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act and bring to an end this shameful waste of money belonging to labor's rank and file.

The bill also seeks to amend section 502(a) to end this virtual monopoly among bonding companies eligible to provide the required bonds. Presently a grant of authority from the Secretary of the Treasury is required. The bill would allow the labor organization to make "other bonding arrangements which would provide the protection required" when approved by the Secretary of Labor. This is the same provision that exists under section 13(e) of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. Though the Treasury list of acceptable sureties includes 231 companies, most of these are financially unable or undesirous of handling the large bonds required of unions. The small group remaining hold a virtual monopoly in this area due to the narrow language in section 502(a). This monopoly is bad per se. It is bad because of its undue power. It is bad because it creates a great possibility of collusion. It is bad because there is power to disqualify the duly elected officers of labor organizations.

The Secretary of Labor has used his authority under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act carefully and cautiously, assuring the utmost protection. The same prudence will be shown in the administration of this provision.

The bill adds a new section 211, to the act requiring surety company reports, and requires that such reports shall be made available to the public. This will allow interested persons the opportunity to see the basis upon which their premiums are set. Since we require the bonds by act of Congress, we should provide the opportunity to affected persons to assure themselves that they are not being unfairly treated or taken advantage of.

Mr. Chairman, this will bring two significant laws protecting the assets of union members into harmony. It would not impair the protection afforded. It would conserve the assets of labor organizations by eliminating the cause of excessive and unjustifiable costs. And, finally, it would require the reporting of certain information which will allow interested persons to discover whether their resources are being depleted unjustifiably through undue rates on bonds required by their National Government. I urge support of H.R. 5883 as reported from the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Chairman, I shall ask in the House to include excerpts from the hearings of October 16 and 24, 1963, for further support of this legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. First, I would like to commend the gentleman on his statement and say that I am going to support this legislation. I understand that there are claims which have been made to the effect that it might be possible for fraud or collusion to take place. There is nothing in this act or any other act of Congress that would prevent a prosecution against any member of a union or a bank or anyone else who is charged with a fidelity of funds from being prosecuted if he is guilty of any illegal act; is that correct?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. There is not any question about it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to point out in respect to that question by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that in section 501(c) of this act there is provision for a criminal prosecution which carries up to a $10,000 fine and a 5-year jail or prison sentence for an act of dishonesty in violation of the public relations section, and that is not disturbed in this proposal now pending before us.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Someone might say, why did we put it into the original act, and I believe the answer is that the draftsman perhaps unwittingly took it from the precedents and the kind of coverage which historically has been available to public officials. It was the common and ordinary broad coverage which was available to people who are required as officials of a State or local government to be protected for the faithful performance of duty. Those duties are well defined in the law of each instance. This is not true of the application "faithful performance" to labor officials.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman is reporting a lot of information on this, and I do not propose to contest those facts but, having had no hearings on this bill since 1963, I do not know where he is getting the information. I have had no opportunity to cross-examine witnesses. The gentleman is making statements I presume he is going to document later.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will state categorically that the chairman of the subcommittee asked witnesses——

Mr. GRIFFIN. When?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The witnesses that previously appeared before the committee, whether there was any change, whether any other plans had been made, and we received assurances there were none; therefore it was obviously a waste of time to have them come back.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman personally made those inquiries?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I did.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. There is a question about a part the gentleman spoke of.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The first part of the bill?

Mr. DOWDY. The first part of the bill. I think when we passed this Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1963 the words "faithful discharge of duties" were included in the bill.

I believe that on any claim brought under a bond for failure to faithfully discharge duties recovery could only be had of any provable pecuniary loss. I cannot conceive of anything else that a bonding company would be responsible for. It is this particular first part or first section of the bill that I am afraid of.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I just say to the gentleman the problem is that those words, as the insurance company officials as well as public officials said, are not definable. There is no definable way in which they can be applied. Therefore to be safe, because after all insurance companies are in business for a profit, they charge this extra 25-percent premium because they do not know what this thing means. I do not think you or anybody else wants to write a law which requires something to be done when everybody tells us they do not know what it means, and if they do not know what it means, certainly the people who wrote it in the first instance did not know either.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. I do not recall the exact phrasing of the bond that I made when I was a district attorney in Texas before I came to the Congress, but it was along the line of faithful discharge of duties because I did not handle any money.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. As I said to the gentleman, for public officials it is different. There we know precisely what it means. We do not know what it means when it is applied to labor union officials.

Mr. DOWDY. I do not have any feelings about these surety company reports and providing the making of them public but if that is included in the bill, certainly by that information being made available to the public, if there is too high a charge for a bond for faithful discharge of duties, that should be corrected.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not know how we could correct it. We have no power to correct it. They can charge all they want to. They charge 25 percent extra for this bond and they admit, themselves, there have been no claims under the act.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield briefly to my colleague.

Mr. DENT. I just want to say that one of the reasons the committee took into consideration the language which was just alluded to by the gentleman who preceded me in questioning the gentleman from California now in the well of the House, was the fact that because of this language the cost of the bond is prohibitive. For instance, under a regular bond that can be obtained now under the Pension and Welfare Act and other surety proposals in private enterprise or otherwise, bonds for coverage of $40 million worth of assets would amount to $500,000 worth of bonding. As it is now, under this act, to cover $40 million worth of assets, because of the language contained in the act, you have to purchase bonds up to the amount of $7.5 million which is entirely out of proportion and out of reason.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman I include at this point in the RECORD excerpts from hearings on bonding provisions of Federal labor laws—H.R. 4669, 4670, and 4671—October 16 and 24, 1963:

MR. DAVID Q. COHEN, ASSOCIATION OF CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANIES

Mr. Cohen. When you had the passage of Landrum-Griffin you substituted for that fixed standard this amorphous thing called faithful performance of duty in an area where it had never been used in that broad aspect before.

The term I think was taken by the draftsmen, perhaps unwittingly from the procedures and the kind of coverage which historically had been available to public officials. It was the common and ordinary broad scope coverage which was available to people who are required as officials of State and Government to be bonded—faithful performance of duty.

In that area, of course, when you had a public official his duties were known. They were fixed by statute. They were fixed by the customary practices of the office, by the common law definition of what the faithful performance might be, but when you took it into the area of this type of bonding for labor union officials you had no fixed standard any more.

Mr. Pucinski. What does faithful performance mean? How do you now define faithful performance?

Mr. Cohen. I think Mr. Mayer is quite right. In this area we don't know what it means.

Mr. Roosevelt. The reason for the higher rate is the underwriting. In other words, if, as you very well said a few minutes ago, you are required to underwrite something and you are not sure as to its implication, you are going to charge more money so as to safeguard yourself against this uncertainty.

Mr. Cohen. Exactly, Mr. Chairman. You stated it.

Mr. Pucinski. Then, Mr. Cohen, if I understand you correctly after this entire colloquy, you really don't know what you are insuring this union for or against. The underwriters have set a fee on a bond that they themselves are not quite sure what it covers and they are strictly in the dark on this whole question.

Is this what we are concluding?

Mr. Cohen. We can only guess as to what faithful performance coverage means in the frame of reference of the duties of an official of a union.

MR. HAROLD GIBBONS, VICE PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS

Mr. Daniels. Do I understand you correctly that there are only four or five bonding companies who could write the type of bonds that your unions needed?

Mr. Gibbons. I am saying that there are some 231 companies listed who are eligible to write. That is the No. 1 figure. No. 2, of those 231, there are a large number of them that are simply not large enough companies to write a half million dollar bond.

Mr. Daniels. About how many bonding companies would be excluded because they do not have the assets?

Mr. Gibbons. Our insurance total is $109 million, the policies we were seeking. That excluded over, say, 50 percent of them, that is one problem.

Mr. Daniels. So of the 231 you have now eliminated approximately 111 companies.

Mr. Gibbons. Now, I would reduce the balance down to maybe a handful which I would guess, and the committee has it in their files here, the telegrams are available for your scrutiny, I would say there were not over a half dozen companies who were big enough, and who made it a practice or had a desire to write this type of business.

No other segment of the community is required to deal exclusively with sureties on the U.S. Treasury list without some safety valve proviso.

The U.S. Treasury list for surety companies was originally established for the purpose of providing reputable guarantors for specific performance of Government contracts. But in this instance, the law provided for an alternative type of arrangement; 6 U.S.C. 15 provides: * * * "the amount of such bonds required to be furnished."

At least there they have an alternative if they faced the same problem as we faced. Similarly, each of the States where corporate surety bonds are required for the performance of public contracts, the alternative of collateral in the form of bonds, cash, certified checks, is authorized.

However, under section 502(a), the Secretary of Labor is without discretion to accept any form of collateral as an alternative to bonds issued by a corporate surety on the U.S. Treasury list.

No bank, no insurance company, or other corporate entity is required to write "faithful discharge of duty" bonds for any of their officers or employees. It was at a surcharge of 50 percent of the premium and now it is 25 percent. We are not critical of the surety companies charging 25 percent, but there can be no basis for even a 25 percent charge because nobody knows what the phrase means.

Solicitor of Labor Charles Donahue, after 2 years of day-to-day experience in the administration of Landrum-Griffin bonding concludes:

"The words 'faithful performance of duties' are vague and indefinite in character. We have found that the bonding companies will bond under those words only at a very high rate of premium."

Former Secretary of Labor Mitchell stated in the first annual report of the administration of the act:

"Although many facets of the section were susceptible to differing interpretations, neither the act nor the legislative history supplied specific guidance or direction. For terms like 'faithful discharge,' where legal meaning was sought there was a paucity of case precedents on the subject."

The only parallel for the faithful discharge of duty bonds for labor union officers was the faithful performance bond of public officials, which conditioned that the principal would perform the duties of his office as defined by law.

On this basis, surety companies had standards which they could apply in establishing the liability for the mishandling of public funds.

The experience of labor unions disclosed that out of a survey of 122 national and international unions, not a single faithful discharge claim has been found. Six affiliated departments of the AFL–CIO reported that not a single faithful discharge claim had been filed.

To this date, John F. Fitzgerald, of the Surety Association of America, has failed to cite one single claim for violation of faithful discharge of duties by a trade union officer.

The prime objective of the bonding section is to protect the membership against defalcation by its officers. Any arrangements which will meet this test should be approved on the basis of objective standards promulgated by the Secretary.

MR. CARROLL YOUNG, VICE PRESIDENT, NIAGARA FIRE INSURANCE CO., NEW YORK, N.Y.

Mr. Pucinski. I have been listening to this testimony all day today and I am still trying to find out this point. What, in your judgment, is faithful discharge of duties as applied to bonds for labor unions?

Mr. Young. I believe it has already been made abundantly clear that the faithful discharge of duty is not definable.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to clarify a point made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT]. Under section 502 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosures Act of 1959, which requires bonding, there is a maximum liability or bonding requirement of

$500,000. So when the gentleman from Pennsylvania refers to figures above that amount, it should be clear he is not talking about any requirement under this act.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield.

Mr. DENT. Why does the gentleman not take a look at page 59 of the report? You will see there under those particular provisions of the act, 15 members of the executive boards of the international unions were required to be bonded for $500,000 each, or a total of $7.5 million, whereas under the requirement of the bonding features of the Welfare and Pension Act, they would be required to carry $500,000 total bond for assets up to $64 million, as against $7.5 million of bonds for assets up to $40 million.

It is in your own report.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the bill before us does not change the limit of liability in any way.

I should like to turn now to the merits of the bill before us.

Lawyers in this body—and a good many Members of the House are lawyers—will understand the term "fiduciary responsibility." When the 1959 labor law was being drafted and considered by the Congress, we could have limited the liability or responsibility of a union official handling union funds merely to a responsibility not to steal the funds himself and not to be guilty of fraud. However, Congress was aware of the fact that compulsory unionism is allowed in most States, and since workers can be required to pay union dues in order to hold their jobs, it was concluded that union officials who handle funds have a quasi-public responsibility. So, the Congress decided wisely, in my opinion, to impose upon union officials handling union funds a higher degree of responsibility, that of a fiduciary.

Bonding companies, over the years, have been accustomed to writing the two forms of bonds that we are discussing here today. One is a simple fraud and dishonesty bond; obviously this coverage is cheaper, though it is only 25 percent cheaper than coverage under a faithful discharge of duty bond.

For many years, the officials of fraternal organizations, such as the Elks, the Masons, and other lodges, have been bonded for the faithful discharge of duties. In other words, they must comply with the general bylaws of the organization in the handling and disbursing of funds.

Local government officials, local municipal officials, and county officials, as the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has already pointed out, have been bonded for many years, not merely to protect the public against stealing and fraud on their part but also for the faithful discharge of their duties in the office.

Now, we come to the question of what additional protection is provided by the coverage of a bond providing for faithful discharge of duties as opposed to a bond merely for fraud and dishonesty.

Let me pose some cases, some of which are not altogether hypothetical.

Suppose a union official is required by the bylaws of his union to deposit funds at they come into his hands in a bank? Suppose he is precluded from keeping more than a certain amount of funds in his personal possession? Suppose he disregards the bylaws of his union and leaves large sums of money in his desk, and suppose the funds are stolen? He did not steal them. He was not guilty of fraud. But the funds are gone.

Under section 501 of the act, which imposes a fiduciary responsibility under the act upon union officials, he is liable. And, the bonding company is liable under a faithful discharge of duties bond. However, if the pending bill should pass, the bonding company would not be liable, and the union members would be limited in their recourse to a suit against the union official. If the union official was "uncollectible," if all of his property were in his wife's name, the union members could obtain a judgment and nothing more.

Suppose that the union bylaws require that a union official, the treasurer of the union, cannot delegate his responsibility; that he cannot turn funds entrusted to him over to a subordinate or somebody else who had not been elected to office?

Suppose he disregards his responsibilities. Suppose he does entrust those funds to a subordinate and that subordinate absconds with the funds. The official who is bonded did not steal the funds. He was not guilty of fraud. He will be liable under section 501, which imposes a fiduciary responsibility on him. The surety company would be liable under the existing law because the loss would be caused by failure to faithfully discharge his duties. However, if this bill is passed, and the required bond covers only losses caused by fraud and dishonesty, the bonding company would not be liable. Only the union members would be out.

Let us make no mistake about this bill. Those who vote for this bill are not voting for or against the management of small companies or big companies. Employers in general could not care less what happens to this bill. However, a vote for this bill will be a vote against rank and file union members; it will be a vote against the protection they have now under the 1959 Act.

Now, suppose that the bylaws of a union provide that a union official shall not employ his wife or any relatives on the union payroll, and suppose the union official does give his wife a job. No funds would have been stolen, and this could happen without the involvement of fraud. He might be liable under section 501, but would the surety company be liable on a simple fraud and dishonesty requirement?

I wish to call attention to another situation. In 1963, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed a district court judgment against officers of Teamsters Local 107 of Philadelphia requiring them to repay $24,921 in local funds used to pay legal fees incurred in the defense of civil and criminal actions against them. It enjoined the payment of their union salaries until the judgment was satisfied or a bond filed. An article in the New York Times referring to legal funds from the Teamsters' treasury used to pay for the legal defense of high officials in various criminal actions says that some sources "have estimates ranging from several thousand dollars up to $1 million."

Suppose a union board uses union funds to pay the legal fees of an official of the union who is charged with a crime. I wonder if such an unauthorized use of funds would be covered under a simple fraud and dishonesty bond. Such a loss would be covered under a faithful discharge of duty bond.

I think most of the Members know that most of the pressure for this bill has come from the Teamsters Union. There may be lip service support coming from some of the other unions, but they do not seem to be so interested in it. I have not received any particular pressures from companies.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Two years ago a representative of the Surety Association of America did come in and testify on this bill when we had hearings on it. They indicated no particular objection one way or another to what coverage Congress might provide in the bond for union members. The surety companies writes both types of bonds. It is true that the premium of one may be a little higher than the other, but they did not take a position on it or oppose the bill on that ground. The association did oppose it on the ground that the reporting requirements of the bill involve Federal regulation of surety companies, even though it is very limited. They pointed out that, historically, the regulation of insurance companies has been left to the States.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman has cited a series of hypothetical propositions.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Does the gentleman consider the payment of legal fees for Teamster officials as hypothetical?

Mr. PUCINSKI. In every instance that the gentleman mentioned he said, "Supposing this happens, supposing that happens," so properly, I think I may describe his proposition as hypothetical. Using his own language, I should like to ask the gentleman this question. Can the gentleman tell me with any assurance or certainty—and if he can I wish he would cite me his authority for his reply—that the hypothetical situations which he has raised here in his dissertation would, indeed, be covered by the present bonds in existence dealing with faithful discharge?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes, I will.

The gentleman has asked me a fair question and I would like to answer it. In 1963 when we did have hearings on this bill—and we have not had any since then—there appeared before our committee a Mr. Fitzgerald, who is the secretary of the Surety Association of America. He was questioned at length along these lines by the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Illinois, and I read verbatim some of his testimony:

> Faithful performance of duty coverage has been available for many years. While it may not be possible to predetermine precisely the application of faithful performance of duty coverage to a given situation, such coverage is not, therefore, so indeterminate that the nature of the coverage cannot be understood or an appropriate rate established for it. In my opinion, it is no more indefinite or uncertain than insurance based upon negligence or legal liability.
>
> The courts have defined the failure to perform duties as "anything which the law does not excuse." There are a multiplicity of cases largely in the public official area applying the duty to faithfully perform to varying circumstances and this whole body of law is available to companies and to labor organizations in order to determine the application of faithful discharge of duty coverage to specific circumstances.
>
> Perhaps one or two examples would help to clarify the application of this coverage to situations in which dishonesty is not involved. For example, a secretary-treasurer of a labor organization is by constitutional provision made personally responsible for the funds and other property of the union. A subordinate of the secretary-treasurer causes loss through dishonesty.
>
> The secretary-treasurer is liable under the faithful discharge of duty requirement for the acts of his subordinates by reason of the duties imposed upon him by the constitution and therefore, recovery could be had under his bond for his failure faithfully to discharge his duties even though he was not personally dishonest.

He goes on with several other examples. I hope that will answer the question of the gentleman.

Now, does he have any others?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I submit that the gentleman has not answered the question. The gentleman has cited testimony. Can the gentleman tell me with any certainty, and cite authority of any case that has been prosecuted under this language? Can the gentleman tell us of any hypothetical situations that were covered by the present bonds?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I have been quite busy with many matters. I would assume that if we are going to bring a bill like this to the floor we would hold hearings and delve into some of the questions the gentleman has raised today. Of course, the committee has not done that. And, I will be very frank to say that I have not had time to go out around the country and make personal inquiries. But if the gentleman is satisfied that because I cannot point to an exact case which has actually been litigated that, therefore, these protections are only hypothetical and are not meaningful, then I just respectfully disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. May I refer the gentleman to page 15 of the hearings of 1963 and refresh the gentleman's recollection? The hearings, I believe, were rather substantial on this matter. On page 15 we have the testimony of Mr. David Q. Cohen who is the manager of the Fidelity and Surety Department of the Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 110 Williams Street, New York City, and is also a member of the bar, and on page 18, when I asked the gentleman what does "faithful performance" mean. I asked him, "How do you now define 'faithful performance' "?

The reply from Mr. Cohen was:

> I think Mr. Mayer is quite right. In this area we don't know what it means.

May I refresh the gentleman's recollection further?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No, I decline to yield further at this time. I appreciate that contribution for the RECORD but I must decline to yield further.

I would like to refer to other testimony by Mr. Fitzgerald who testified before the committee, representing the American Surety Association, concerning coverage of the bond. On page 109 of the hearings held in 1963 he stated as follows:

> Mr. FITZGERALD. Every case has to be decided on its own merits and its own facts. I would not want to put myself up as the arbiter of the industry, to specify what loss would be paid and what loss would not be paid. I can only go on the basic principles that are involved, which relate to the failure of an official of a union to perform his duties faithfully. If this investment was a failure to perform faithfully as set forth in the constitution or regulations or the procedures of the organization, or as required by law, there would be a liability.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Now may I also remind the gentleman that in the further testimony of Mr. Cohen, reading from page 18 of the transcript of the hearings, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] asked the following question of Mr. Cohen:

> Mr. PUCINSKI. Then, Mr. Cohen, if I understand you correctly after this entire colloquy, you really don't know what you are insuring this union for or against. The underwriters have set a fee on a bond that they themselves are not quite sure what it covers and they are strictly in the dark on this whole question. Is that what we are concluding?
>
> Mr. COHEN. We can only guess as to what "faithful performance coverage" means in the frame of reference of the duties of an official of a union.

So, I submit that no matter how sincere the gentleman from Michigan is, and he is sincere and I certainly respect his sincerity in telling this House that the members of these unions are paying a 25-percent additional premium for insurance, they do not know what it means and do not know what it covers.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Even though the gentleman in his own mind is not satisfied as to the outer reaches of this coverage, even though he does not believe that there are definite boundary lines for this coverage, is the gentleman willing to concede that the coverage and protection provided under a faithful-discharge-of-duty bond is good protection and represents more protection than will be provided by a simple fraud-and-dishonesty bond?

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman will yield further, on the contrary; I believe if the gentleman from Michigan will read the language of the bill he will see what we say in the proposed amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Now, I refuse to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. May I answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield further if the gentleman will answer that question.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Does he concede that?

Mr. PUCINSKI. No; on the contrary.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The present language in the act now gives that member of a union less protection than the language that we are proposing today.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is that why the surety companies charge 25 percent more for a faithful-discharge-of-duty bond?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. The colloquy just concluded between the gentleman from Michigan and myself brings up a very significant point. There has been testimony before our committee by officials of surety companies and associations who clearly and frankly admitted to the committee they have no idea what it is they are bonding. They have not been able to ascertain or determine what "faithful discharge" means. But they are charging thousands of local unions throughout America a 25-percent additional premium simply because they do not know what it is they are supposed to be insuring against.

There has been a great deal of talk about big unions. I do not think that the big internationals are particularly concerned one way or the other with this proposition. They have the money, and they will meet these costs. But there are in this country 75,000 local unions, small unions, with limited resources, which have found it to be an extreme hardship to pay this additional premium ranging from 25 to 50 percent more than straight honesty bonds. These are the people we want to help, and I suggest to the gentleman from Michigan that the bill before us will strengthen the protection of local union funds for their members.

The bill now reads "every officer, agent, shop steward, or other representative or employee of any labor organization—other than a labor organization whose property and annual financial receipts do not exceed $5,000 in value—or of a trust in which a labor organization is interested, who handles funds or other property thereof, shall be bonded for the faithful discharge of his duties."

That is the bill as it is on the books today. We are proposing to take this mystery language, "for the faithful discharge of his duties" out, and put in its place this language which is clear and concise: "to provide protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on his part directly or through connivance with others."

There is a serious question if many of the hypothetical situations the gentleman from Michigan has cited would be covered under the language in the bill as it now stands. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the language proposed in H.R. 5883 would actually give the rank and file membership of labor unions greater protection for their union funds than the vague language in the present bill. My colleague cannot state with any certainty that the examples he cited are covered in the present law. But I can assure him most of them would be covered under the bill I propose here today.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The reason we have a bond is to protect the fund; is that right?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You have no objection then to making this read "to provide protection against loss of any funds entrusted to his care"? If you will do that I can go along with the bill, because that will protect the funds.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think that is the language we have in our proposal.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You say "against loss by reason"—and so forth. It is hard to prove fraud, it is hard to prove dishonesty, but it is not hard to prove that the funds are not there. If you will change this to provide against loss of any funds entrusted to his care you will cover the whole waterfront.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If my colleague will permit a consultation with the legal staff, I will answer him later on. I would like to study his suggestion before I can reply.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have talked with representatives of the unions who came to me, and I asked them: "Do you have any objection or do you think this provision here would still protect your funds?" They said they were assured it would. I said, "If a man made a poor investment as a matter of judgment, if he was negligent, if he was incompetent," are you covered?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Nor are they covered under the present language of the bill. When a union official now uses poor judgment, his union or any member has the right to recover through a civil suit, and there is nothing in the present "faithful discharge" bond that would cover recovery of funds spent through bad judgment unless it can be proven that such bad judgment constitutes lack of faithful discharge of his duties.

The language we are proposing here is identical to the language which now protects helath, welfare, and pension funds of unions, totaling in excess of $70 billion in the United States. All we are doing here with H.R. 5883 is imposing the same kind of provisions on union funds that we now have on the books to protect health, welfare, and pension funds, totaling in excess of $70 billion.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I just want to say to the gentleman from Missouri I do not think you want, in all seriousness, to propose that we try to write legislation which will protect against errors of judgment? We do not require that, even in the case of a fiduciary or anybody else. The funds might still be gone and under the language you have proposed, it might be the result of error in judgment. We certainly do not want to write legislation requiring a bond against an error of judgment because in that case the premium would be impossible. We would have no way to enforce that, would we?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not agree with the gentleman. The purpose of the bond is to protect the funds and if the funds are gone, you have the bond to protect you. I have had some experience with bonds in municipalities and I know what it takes to get money back. But if you have your bond covering the loss, regardless of what it is, and if you make your bill read that way, you will not have any trouble in getting the bill passed. But where you are only providing for fraud or dishonesty, you get into a lot of litigation and you can never prove it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to call the attention of my colleague to the situation. Under the existing law, if there is a breach of a fiduciary relationship by virtue of bad judgment or a bad investment and one that is free of any fraud, collusion, conspiracy, connivance or knowledge thereof, or otherwise, and where it is an honest mistake, we now provide, and have laws that provide, under section 501 for a civil action against that union official. Now if there is an act of dishonesty on the part of a union official in the handling of these funds, under section 501(c) we provide for a criminal penalty and that person can be tried and prosecuted and is subject to either a fine of $10,000 or being sent to the penitentiary for 5 years. We do not disturb that provision. That provision continues in the bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. As I understand the argument of the gentleman from Illinois, he is suggesting that under section 501 of the act we impose a fiduciary responsibility on union officers and union members and that there would be a civil action against that person under those circumstances which would not be covered. Does it bother the gentleman at all that perhaps a claim against a union official might not be collectible? Does this protect the union members?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, as much as it bothers me that in this country there are thousands of bankers who are covered by the same procedure and every day we read in the press of a banker or an employee of the bank going south with $200,000 or $300,000 and there is no more recovery of those funds than there is under this act. At least in this act we provide a prison term for a person who commits a dishonest act and he may be sent to jail for 5 years.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That may be fine but it does not get the money back to the members of the union.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Now wait a minute. If it is an act of dishonesty, collusion, fraud, connivance, or conspiracy, the bond that we propose would cover every penny of the loss of that money. The gentleman, if I understood his question correctly, raised the question of an honest mistake. Is that what the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman was telling us a few moments ago about a sort of liability that was imposed under section 501.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct. Under section 501, a union may sue to recover any losses that accrue as the result of an honest mistake by one of its officials. But if there is any element of dishonesty or fraud, no matter how remote, such dishonesty triggers the responsibility of the bonding company and there is full recovery of losses under the bonding procedure I propose.

Mr. GRIFFIN. And he was then impressing us with the fact that there was a civil action possible against the official.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct, if it is strictly a matter of an honest mistake devoid of any fraud or dishonesty. The language I propose in this bill gives the rank-and-file members greater protection than existing law. Let me assure the gentleman I would not be introducing this bill if I was not deeply concerned about protection of the rank and file.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I do not know what situation the gentleman is talking about himself, but I am assuming he is talking about a situation that would not be covered by a simple fraud or dishonesty bond; otherwise he would not be mentioning it. I only point out that you are satisfied with a judgment in a civil action against the official and you are not concerned that it may not be collectible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] 2 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am puzzled here and have asked for this time in order to ask my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, a question.

I had always understood, although I am not an insurance attorney, that insurance companies based their premiums upon experience in the particular field.

Yet I heard my colleague, the gentleman from California, stand up here and cite, supposedly, the wonderful experience that the unions have had in this particular field.

At the same time, I hear from him and other members on that side of the aisle arguments that the premium is too high; that is, the 25-percent additional.

. I should like to ask my colleague from Michigan about this, for I do not understand it. If the experience is so good, it would seem to me that the premium should be quickly lowered by the insurance companies.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman has asked a good question, and I should like to answer it in the following way: In 1959, following the passage of the act requiring bonds for labor union officials for the first time, the surety companies looked into the rates that were then in effect for faithful discharge of duty bonds which were written for the officers of fraternal organizations. They believed that a fraternal organization was somewhat in the same order of things as a labor organization. At that time the surcharge for a faithful discharge of duty bond for the officer of a fraternal organization was 50 percent more than the charge for a simple fraud and dishonesty bond.

After several years of experience under the act, and findings, as people have said—in which I concur—that in general the experience has been good, that the number of defalcations and embezzlements and actions on the part of union officials has been relatively small, and perhaps even less than for bank officials, which may well be demonstrated, the surety companies were requested by the AFL–CIO to review their rates. At that point, on the basis of experience, the rate was reduced from a 50-percent surcharge to a 25-percent surcharge. At the same time they reduced the rates that were in effect for treasurers or officers of fraternal organizations.

It may be that over a period of time further experience will justify a further reduction of the additional premium, but even if it remains at 25 percent the additional protection which the union members are getting as a result of this bond is worth much more than 25 percent.

I wonder if I have answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. The gentleman has. I was going to ask a second question, which the gentleman has almost answered. If the good experience continues, would the gentleman agree with me that it would be reasonable to expect the insurance companies to continue to lower the premium?

Mr. GRIFFIN. It would be reasonable to expect that, yes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. May I call the gentleman's attention to a letter received by the committee on May 25, 1965, from the Surety Association of America, signed by Mr. J. F. Fitzgerald.

Mr. GRIFFIN. When the gentleman refers to the "committee," I wish he would keep in mind the fact that I am a member of the committee, also, and I have not received any such letter, though I do not deny that the gentleman has received one.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am sure Mr. Fitzgerald would be happy to send a similar letter.

Mr. GRIFFIN. No doubt the gentleman is going to report that the 25 percent surcharge is still in effect. I am aware of that.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Shall I report it, then?

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] reported it earlier.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In reply to the gentleman who asked the question earlier, then, as of May 25, 1965, 6 years after the bill was passed, they are still charging the local unions 25 percent more for services they do not know they provide.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman is incorrect, because they reduced the rates several years ago from a 50-percent surcharge to a 25-percent surcharge.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. The gentleman is proving that the rates charged by the surety companies are not consonant with the experience, and this has convinced me more than ever that the bill is necessary. I believe he has proved a valid point.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the gentleman feels that way, that is his privilege.

I should like to conclude this portion of the debate by reiterating this statement, which I will reiterate everytime I have an opportunity to do so: a vote for this bill is not a vote for any surety company or any corporation or management of any kind. A vote for this bill is a vote against the rank and file union members of America.

And do not give me the argument that we should pass this bill because we have only limited coverage under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. I was not in favor of limiting the bonds under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. Many may regret the day, if scandals ever come to the front, concerning what has happened to some of the funds for which we do not have protection for the rank and file union members.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for the remaining time on this side.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I only rise because I have talked to some of the Members who have asked me what we were doing in this legislation. In order that my word be kept and that the RECORD be clear, let me say what we are doing or intending to do or attempting to do here.

Subsection (a) of H.R. 5883 would change the present requirement that bonds furnished under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act be of a "faithful discharge of duty" type and would change that to require that they be of a type of bond which would provide protection against loss due to fraud or dishonesty. Other than fraud or dishonesty, how can any reasonable person demand that a bond cover more than that from an official? If you want to cover more than that, I would suggest you go into the field of banking where 531 banks in the last year had 2,000 individual cases of internal bank fraud.

In the entire picture of bonding we know that this particular feature was so unfair in the beginning that the rates charged by the American bonding companies was $2.78 as compared to 17 cents per 1,000 prior to the passage of this act. It was only because of pressure that they established a figure of a 50-percent surcharge, and only because of the introduction of this legislation did they reduce it to a 25-percent surcharge.

The loss ratio is something we all ought to take into consideration here. In all of the labor unions covered in the United States the loss under this particular act covering even the faithful discharge of duties requirement, beyond the fraud and dishonesty, was $2.25 on the average for all the local unions in the United States compared to $725 per average loss for the banks in the United States.

None of us here are suggesting that you go further in demanding better protection for depositors, because you have better protection built in by the U.S. Government, which reduces the cost of the bonds for the banks. Otherwise the bonds would be prohibitive.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House, H.R. 5883, dealing with an amendment to the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, will eliminate what appears to be a gross inequity in the present law. It does not appear that the real intent of the original act is being carried out. Bonding costs appear to be out of proportion when compared to other areas where bonds are required. I, therefore, support this bill, and if any abuses arise in the future the Congress can act to make any changes that may be necessary.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say in regard to this bill that after hearing the pros and cons in the last Congress and this one, I have decided to support H.R. 5883. I believe this language will adequately protect union members, and the faults of carelessness and ignorance should be a problem which union members can find remedy within their own organization. Fraud and dishonesty are really the evils for which legal recourse is necessary.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 5883. I am convinced that there is no reason to continue any distinction between the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act insofar as their bonding provisions, particularly in view of the great additional cost to the unions under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act provisions.

The words "faithful performance of duties" are vague and indefinite in character. The evidence is uncontradicted that the bonding companies will bond under those words only at a very high rate of premium. Moreover, and what to me is most important, this high premium rate fails to provide for any increase in protective coverage. Therefore I submit that this inequity should not be permitted to continue.

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5883. I have read the report of the committee on this bill and I have carefully followed the views that all my distinguished colleagues have presented.

Nowhere, in my study of this legislation, did I find any evidence that the fraud or dishonesty bond provided under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act has, in any way failed to protect those funds nor have I seen any evidence that would support a conclusion that such a bond will not provide the same protection for union funds other than welfare and pension plan funds.

It is most significant to me that the total amounts of moneys included in welfare and pension plan funds far exceeds any of the accumulated union funds. Certainly, if the "fraud or dishonesty" bond provides adequate protection under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, how then can it be said that such will provide inadequate protection under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act?

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the experience of the last several years has indicated a clear and definite need to amend the bonding provisions of existing Federal labor law. As one who has long advocated this position, and the amendments included in this bill, I rise in its support.

These amendments in no way imply that there is no further need for bonding. They in no way diminish present coverage or requirements.

Rather, Mr. Chairman, these amendments we are considering today—amendments which would substitute a fraud or dishonesty bond for the presently required faithful discharge bond—correct certain deficiencies which have been pointed out by those charged with the administration of the law. Attorney General Katzenbach, Labor Secretary Wirtz, Solicitor of Labor Donahue, and former Labor Secretaries Mitchell and Goldberg have all testified, at one time or another, that these amendments are needed and that they are in order.

Very briefly, this bill would eliminate the discriminatory treatment presently imposed on labor unions in respect to the bonding of officers charged with the responsibility of handling union funds. By providing greater flexibility, it would make bonding provisions more realistic, more effective, and more workable.

Mr. Chairman, these amendments deserve our support and I urge that this bill be passed today.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5883

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 502(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 is amended by striking out "for the faithful discharge of his duties" and substituting therefor the following: "to provide protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on his part directly or through connivance with others", and by inserting before the period at the end of such subsection the following: ": *Provided,* That when in the opinion of the Secretary a labor organization has made other bonding arrangements which would provide the protection required by this section at comparable cost or less, he may exempt such labor organization from placing a bond through a surety company holding such grant of authority".

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 205 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act is amended by striking out "and 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "203, and 211".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "or 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "203, or 211".

(c) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "or 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "203, or 211".

(d) Subsection (b) of section 207 of such Act is amended by striking out "or the second sentence of section 203(b)" both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the second sentence of section 203(b), or section 211".

SEC. 3. Title II of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SURETY COMPANY REPORTS

"SEC. 211. Each surety company which issures any bond required by this Act or the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act shall file annually with the Secretary, with respect to each fiscal year during which any such bond was in force, a report, in such form and detail as he may prescribe by regulation, filed by the president and treasurer or corresponding principal officers of the surety company, describing its bond experience under each such Act, including information as to the premiums received, total claims paid, amounts recovered by way of subrogation, administrative and legal expenses and such related data and information as the Secretary shall determine to be necessary in the public interest and to carry out the policy of the Act. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the Secretary finds that any such specific information cannot be practicably ascertained or would be uninformative, the Secretary may modify or waive the requirement for such information."

Mr. ROOSEVELT (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 1, lines 7, 8, and 9, strike out all of line 7 following the word "loss," all of line 8, and the word "others" in line 9, and insert "of any funds or property entrusted to his care".

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as we said before, in my opinion, the only reason for a bond is to insure against loss of funds. It is very hard to get a conviction for fraud and dishonesty, particularly where sympathy and a few other things enter into the picture. I have had some experience with municipal bonds, and I know whereof I speak. I think if we will simplify this to the *n*th degree and say we want to provide protection against the loss of any funds or property entrusted to his care, I think that gets the job done. We do not get into a lawsuit, we do not bring about a lot of scandal into the union. If the money is not there, the bonding company pays off.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DENT. Let us say that a man is entrusted with $10,000 of union dues and he is bonded. Somebody takes the money.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was going to bring that up. Let us say this man collects the money. He is on his way home with the money. He is held up and the money is lost. The bond will cover that. If he takes the money home and it is stolen out of his safe, the bond covers that.

Mr. DENT. Not under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Oh, yes; it says against loss of any funds or property entrusted to his care. That covers the waterfront. If the money is burned up it is still covered by the bond. All I am trying to do is to protect the funds of the people who pay their good money into the union treasuries. And some of them pay for the reason that they are forced to belong to the union, and that is the only reason.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I can appreciate what the gentleman is trying to do, but I think perhaps the gentleman from Michigan would agree with me that the gentleman from Missouri is not right. The gentleman is really weakening the guarantees that we are trying to put into this bill.

Let me call your attention to what we say in the bill: "to provide protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on his part directly or through connivance with others."

We have already covered the part that the gentleman wants to cover by the language which we do not disturb. We say "who handles funds or other property thereof."

I congratulate the gentleman for his effort, but what I fear is that to limit this bond as the gentleman proposes only "to any funds or property entrusted to his care" would be wrong, because you could have a tremendous number of cases where this man would not be responsible.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Every member who handles money is bonded, is he not?

Mr. PUCINSKI. We have already covered that; "who handles funds or other property thereof." What you are doing now is limiting his responsibility and limiting it only to the "funds or property entrusted to his care."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. PUCINSKI. He has broader responsibilities.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. All I am trying to do is to protect the funds. I do not care about the discharge of his other duties, if he does something else. I am looking after the money. That is the only thing I am looking after. The only way you are going to hold him on any bond is if you can prove that there is fraud or dishonesty.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Or collusion or connivance.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Or connivance. You have to prove that. All I am saying is that for prima facie evidence, if the money is not there, it should be replaced. That is why we have a bond. That is my only point. I think that is the simplest way to do it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. You already have that in the bill now.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If you already have it, you do not have to pass the bill.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We have it in the bill—"who handles funds or other property."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. What do you do in that case?

Mr. PUCINSKI. We bond them.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The only way you can protect him is if he loses the money by acts of fraud or dishonesty or collusion or connivance——

Mr. PUCINSKI. Or conspiracy.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is right. But the funds are not protected except in those instances. That is what I am trying to say.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me make very clear what this amendment would do. This amendment does not ask in any way for insurance. It asks for a flat guarantee across the board. If you want to write a flat guarantee then you had better set up a special deposit insurance type of organization and get the whole of the U.S. Government behind it. What the gentleman's amendment does is to say that no matter how it disappears, no matter if it is a loss because of bad judgment, no matter what the circumstances may be, if the money is not there any more, there is a guarantee that the money will be replaced. That is not insurance. And I do not even know of a compilation of insurance companies which could take on that kind of a risk. Certainly, the premium for that kind of protection would be just out of the question. I think it falls on its face just by looking at it and examining it.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

It seems to me that when we had the Landrum-Griffin bill before us our purpose was to assure that there would not be pilferage of the money of labor organizations. This language "for the faithful discharge of his duties" seems to be so broad, I am wondering how they ever got a bond from a bonding company at any price. And to require not only bonding but insurance against robberies and loss and fire, I know of no area in which that is required in the banking laws or anywhere else of a particular bank officer.

Mr. Chairman, while I certainly do not wish to do anything to weaken the investigatory powers and the control over the handling of the funds of these organizations, it seems to me that this language "to provide protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on his part directly or through connivance with others" is a fairly adequate coverage to require.

I know that there are many of us here who would not desire some person to come back 3 years after we had made some little investment and look over our shoulder and say, "Well, you were mighty careless." We very seldom exercise 20/20 prevision. Usually we have excellent hindsight.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that if this act as it is now written is unduly burdensome it can be corrected. The new language seems to have been subscribed to by each of the Secretaries of Labor we have had since Secretary Mitchell. We should amend the act in the spirit of fairplay.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman and I think he has stated the case very clearly for everyone to understand.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate that what we are trying to do is to save that extra 25-percent premium because of the vagueness, because we do not know what the coverage is, and we want to make it something that we do know about. We want to protect against fraud and dishonesty and we want to protect against conspiracy. That was the purpose in the beginning. That is all we are now proposing to do, and we want to do it in the interest of orderliness and bringing it in line with existing legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the rejection of the proposed amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps it might be a clever maneuver for those who oppose the pending bill to support the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones], because if it were adopted, I am sure most, if not all, of the people who are for this bill as it came from the committee would then vote against it. However, in all honesty I must oppose the gentleman's amendment even though I know he offers it with the best of intentions and the utmost good faith. I would have to agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] in saying that if the bond were written as the gentleman from Missouri has suggested, we have no idea what the premium would be. I can assure you that it would be a lot more than the premium now charged for a faithful-discharge-of-duty bond. The proposed amendment would provide an absolute guarantee against any loss for any reason, and that could be very expensive.

It is well to keep in mind that in the insurance industry, the surety industry, there are certain words and terms of art that have established meaning in the industry insofar as the courts are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, "the faithful discharge of duties" is an established term of art which has meaning in the industry. Bonds using these words have been written for many years for local public officials and for the officers of fraternal organizations. The rates for a faithful-discharge-of-duties bond are established; we know what such a bond costs. And, clearly, it would provide union members considerably more protection than they would have under the bill reported by the committee, covering only simple acts of fraud and dishonesty.

I was rather surprised to hear the remarks of my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] who spoke earlier, and who is such a good lawyer. Surely, he could not have been on the floor earlier when I talked about some of the coverage provided by faithful-discharge-of-duty bonds that would not be provided in the situation of a simple dishonesty bond.

For example, the Federal court has held that union funds cannot be properly used to pay certain legal defense costs of high officials of the Teamsters Union in connection with civil or criminal actions brought against them. The court has found this is not a proper use of funds.

A New York Times story dated May 12, 1964, says:

> Some sources have given estimates ranging from several thousand dollars up to a million dollars.

If this bill is passed there may be a legal right on the part of union members to recover funds used for such purposes, but will the union members be able to collect? If the bond covers such a loss, they can go to the bonding company and the bonding company will pay off.

What if fraud is interwoven and you end up with a judgment against them under another section, but action has not been taken, and apparently under this bill the union members would not be able to collect.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I may say to the gentleman as far as the particular case he mentioned is concerned—and he mentioned what he read in the newspaper—I also read in the newspaper that there is litigation pending which was brought by members of the organization to recoup those funds for the union. The gentleman, I think, in his statement is missing the entire point.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman is pointing to the fact that the union members have a suit pending. I believe that in some cases the courts have held they are entitled to recover. But, who are they going to recover from? That is what I would like to ask the gentleman, if we pass this bill.

Mr. WHITENER. If the gentleman will read the language proposed, and I am not an advocate of the Committee on Education and Labor, or any other interested group, the amendment clearly says that if there is connivance with others, and if there is connivance the recovery will be from those who received the funds. It seems to me that the bonding companies are writing a blanket coverage so broad that even their most astute counsel could not possibly anticipate what they have obligated the sureties to do under existing law.

I realize the gentleman has pride of authorship in the legislation being amended, and I commend him for the fine work he has done on that matter. At the same time, I think the record shows that we do have a situation which needs correcting, and this bill will correct it by eliminating an inequitable condition which results from the failure of the existing act to define the bonding requirements. The proposed amendment will do that and no more.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to answer a few of the things that have been mentioned.

First of all, the gentleman from Missouri said that in order to collect under this proposed law there would have to be a conviction for fraud or dishonesty, and the jury might not convict. The fact is you do not need a criminal conviction. The law books are replete with cases where there have been no civil actions, although bonding or insurance companies are required to make good.

It is as a result of a civil action that you get recovery against the bonding company or insurance company. We even have arson cases where after a defendant is acquitted of arson, there is a civil case for arson and the insurance company is stuck. So that I think you are mistaken when you feel there has to be a criminal conviction before there can be recovery against the bonding company.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Can you tell me of any insurance company that would pay off unless you could prove fraud or dishonesty?

Mr. JOELSON. Of course, you might have to sue them civilly but you do not have to get a criminal conviction.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But you have to go into court to prove the fraud or dishonesty.

Mr. JOELSON. You have to go into court even under your amendment if the insurance company wants to contest it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Under my amendment you would only have to prove the loss and you would not have to prove any fraud or dishonesty.

Mr. JOELSON. With regard to the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] about union officials using union funds for their own personal expenses, I think this too would be covered under the pending change in the law because that would amount to fraud and dishonesty. If a union official uses union money to build himself a home or to pay his own bills, that is fraud and dishonesty and would be covered.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Would the gentleman agree that it is covered now under the faithful discharge of duty bond?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes; and it will continue to be covered.

Mr. GRIFFIN. You are speculating and hoping that it will be covered after we amend the bill.

Mr. JOELSON. I am not speculating at all. As a fairly competent attorney, I am sure that what you referred to is taken care of. The law books are replete with cases and instances like that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. UDALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R 5883) to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, pursuant to House Resolution 393, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members in favor of taking the vote by the yeas and nays will rise and remain standing until counted. [After counting.] Thirty Members have risen; not a sufficient number.

The ayes and noes were refused.

The question was taken.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 20a(12) OF THE INTERSTATE ACT RE INTERLOCKING DIRECTORATES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5241) to amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate the necessity for prior approval of the Commission for a person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one carrier when such carriers are in a single integrated system of carriers lawfully operated under common control, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5241, with Mr. NEDZI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], will be recognized for 30 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act having to do with interlocking directorates in the railroad industry.

This bill is one merely to clarify the present law to make it unnecessary for any company, under such circumstances, to have to go to the Interstate Commerce Commission to obtain approval, when a member of the board of directors may be serving on the board of one railroad and at the same time serving on the board of another, when both are under one common control and management. That is all the provision would do.

Under the present law it is necessary, when a person serves on the board of railroad A and at the same time serves on the board of railroad B, as an example, when both railroads are under a common control and under single management, as a matter of law, to go to the Interstate Commerce Commission and obtain authority or permission.

As an example, the experience has been, for about 4 years, if we can go back, that there were some 851 interlocking directorship applications. Experience has proved that as a matter of course they are approved, but this requires processing and requires the time of the Commission and its personnel. In order to save time and money involved in processing the applications, when they are uniformly granted, the bill would merely amend the law to eliminate this requirement.

There is no opposition to this proposal. As a matter of fact, it is recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is one of their proposals that has been recommended in a series of bills by the Commission. The committee held hearings. They were brief, but we did develop it there and we found that it is a desirable proposal. We feel it is a good procedure. So the committee, after consideration of the proposal, unanimously reported the bill.

There is a second proviso in the bill that has some differences of opinion on it. That would be the proviso which would require a director serving on one board of directors of a railroad and a member of the same organization or firm—for example, a law firm—serving on another railroad where there is not the common control and management, it would require him to go to the Commission and obtain the authority to serve under this circumstance.

Being perfectly candid about it, some of the railroad industry do not like this. They think it is an unnecessary requirement. They would prefer not to have to do it, and they asked that it not be required. The committee considered this second proviso in the bill. An amendment was offered by one of the members to delete that provision, but the committee, by a rather substantial vote, refused to adopt the amendment. The committee felt, after hearing the Interstate Commerce Commission and the other information which was presented to it, that this proviso should be required. Consequently, we have adopted the recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission in this respect and bring it to the attention of the House. There is not a lot of opposition to it but it is just that some of the railroads would rather not and would prefer not to do it. Actually, most of them, as I understand it, would be willing to accept the second proviso, although they are not in wholehearted accord with it, in order to get relief from the first proviso contained in the bill. That is, simply, the understanding I have of the proposal.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Does the gentleman know what the definition of "control" is?

Mr. HARRIS. Do you mean as far as the Interstate Commerce Commission is concerned?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Yes. Or the general definition of "control"? What I have particular reference to here is this: I am not trying to be difficult but just trying to have this situation clarified. Suppose that there were a pending merger and apparently this merger were completed and there was apparent control but nevertheless there was objection to this control such as in the case of the control of the New York Central Railroad at the time of the desired merger with the Pennsylvania Railroad. Suppose the question of the completion of the merger is still up in the air in the sense that although there may be apparent control, nevertheless there may still be a lawsuit as to whether or not there is sufficient ownership to amount to control. Do I make myself clear, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HARRIS. I think I understand what the gentleman has in mind, but this certainly could not in any way affect that kind of a situation. There could be no common control in a situation like that until the merger had been completed and became effective.

Now, we can give you another type of example which would explain what we are talking about. As an example, let us take in my own part of the country the Missouri Pacific. The Missouri Pacific has for many years had the majority control, that is, most of the control, of the Texas Pacific. It is all under one management and it has been for all these years. The Texas Pacific is one of these roads which was chartered by the Federal Government, if I recall it correctly. The combined roads have been for many years under one ownership and under the control of the same group of directors. This is the kind of a situation we have in mind. The Texas Pacific does have a board of directors. It always maintained it over the years. It has consisted of some of the same people who were members of the board of directors of the Missouri Pacific. But each time, each year, they have to go to the ICC and get permission to do it. Generally it is automatic, but you have to process the papers, it requires a lot of man-hours and a good deal of expense and it is all unnecessary. That is the kind of situation we have in mind.

But where there is a merger of two companies, the situation is different. We can take as an example of what the gentleman perhaps has in mind, the case a few years ago when the C. & O. purchased controlling stock in the Baltimore & Ohio. That was before the ICC for a number of years. After that merger was permitted under the regulations of the ICC and with ICC approval, then everything was regular and in order.

This does not in any way affect any merger nor interfere in any way with a pending merger.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. This is a very simple proposal. We obtained the rule primarily on the basis that there was this difference of opinion in railroad thinking on the question of two members of one organization or firm or association serving two different railroads that were completely separate and apart from each other. The committee thought that the Commission ought to pass on that kind of case, and therefore we bring the bill to you with a unanimous report of the committee and recommend it for your approval.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there was some disagreement in the committee over how far this bill should go. However, as it finally came from the committee this bill would amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to, first, eliminate the necessity for prior approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission for a person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one carrier when such carriers are in a single integrated system of carriers lawfully operated under common control; and, second, to make it clear that the prohibition against the holding by "any person" of the position of officer or director of more than one carrier, without prior approval of the Commission, applies to the holding of such positions by different members, officers, employees, or directors of the same firm, copartnership, corporation, association, or joint stock association, or to the representation of a person on the board of directors of more than one carrier through an agent or nominee.

The committee felt that there was a justification for this. The first sentence of the section that I have read requires persons desiring to serve as officer, director of more than one carrier to file an application and obtain approval from the Commission. This is true, even though the carriers involved are affiliated members of the same system of carriers. Where railroads are under lawful common control, they form essentially a single system. In this circumstance, the holding of intrasystem interlocking officer positions and directorships is a natural aid to coordination of operations, and the Commission has long approved such applications as a matter of course. And in this instance the Interstate Commerce Commission has requested and approved the course which the committee has taken on this bill. Nevertheless, the filing and processing of formal applications for such authority entail considerable time and expense both for the applicant and the Commission which could be saved without adversely affecting the public interest. Now, Mr. Chairman, in order to give the members of the committee some idea as to how large this is, a total of 851 interlocking directorship applications were filed during the period covered by the Commission's annual reports from the 74th through the 77th of such reports to Congress, July 1960 through July 1963. Since only about 2 percent of these applications involve positions in unaffiliated carriers, the time and money consumed in filing and processing approximately 98 percent of these applications could have been saved if the section were revised as recommended. Moreover, a considerable reduction in recordkeeping expenses would have been realized.

Mr. Chairman, this is the testimony of the Interstate Commerce Commission which is by law looking after the public interest and they have indicated that this bill is in the public interest. That is the reason the committee has brought this bill to the floor of the House today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a great number of our colleagues have expressed some concern, rather deep feelings, and other people whom I have noted here and throughout the country and through the press, over the debauchery in the boxing profession as a result of what happened the other evening. There have been a good many who have approved and have requested that this matter receive attention.

Mr. Chairman, I have thought a great deal about it. I am one of those who believes that there should be some way of restoring integrity to this great national pastime in which our people have throughout the years expressed some interest and in the days when there were such eventful occasions which occurred, and there was so much interest in this national type of entertainment and which stood so high in the minds of our people. It is a very popular sport. I have decided that there is a way to do it.

About 15 years ago we had another problem affecting interstate commerce and communications; so, by direction of the committee there was developed an approach to it. Going back and recalling that experience I have asked the staff to provide what I believe is an approach to it, and I am today introducing a bill which proposes to establish and describe the duties of a Federal Boxing Commission for the purpose of insuring that the channels of interstate commerce are free from false and fraudulent descriptions or depictions of professional boxing contests.

This proposal is very simple. It is not lengthy. It would provide, first, for a Federal Commission on Boxing, the members of which to be appointed by the President of the United States. It would add a staff under civil service laws that would help it to carry out its functions. It would arm the Commission with powers to make recommendations to carry out the purposes of the act. For the purposes of investigation the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act would be applicable. In order that the Commission may carry out its duties, it would provide for the Commission to exercise continuing surveillance over the field of professional boxing; but it would then give the Commission the authority and the power to determine that in such circumstances it may investigate and find that if anything questionable is about to occur, as apparently must have been when the Massachusetts commission learned there was something apparently wrong and cancelled the professional bout causing them to move into another State. In such a case, and in the event there might be effected collusion or bribery, and so forth, and there would result national racketeering or even terrorism, extortion, threat, coercion, intimidation, and so forth, the Commission could prevent the event being carried by television or radio or wire services in interstate commerce.

I believe this would provide the vehicle by which, if we were faced again with a situation that has been presented to this country in the last few days, we would have a regulatory agent or body set up with legal authority to act. Therefore, I am dropping this in the hopper today and I announce to the Members of the House that if it is referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce it is my purpose to schedule hearings at a very early date and go into this matter thoroughly to determine, No. 1, if this is the right approach and, No. 2, if there is a better way to do it, or there might be some modification of this proposal.

I may say that early in the session our colleague from Illinois, the ranking Republican member of the committee, was interested in this subject, and he approached me about going into it and making some study of it. The gentleman was visionary, he evidently had some intuition or something, and I probably should have acceded to his request or suggestion, but did not do so.

But this will give us an opportunity to do something about it and I, for one, intend to see what can be done about it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has mentioned that I had a conversation with him some 2 months ago. At that time I gave my considered opinion that a great part of professional boxing was a national disgrace and I told him so in his office. I believed it then and I believe it more this afternoon.

I believe that our committee has jurisdiction in the area of sports. This is interstate commerce. That fact has already been adjudicated on a number of occasions by the Parliamentarians of both bodies.

The great Committee on the Judiciary has taken jurisdiction at times where the question of monopoly was involved and that is a very, very limited part of the whole field of sports.

In the conversation I had with the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in his office some 2 months ago, I referred not only to boxing but I referred to several other problems of sports generally that I felt this committee ought to go into before something developed that would be harmful generally to the whole area of sports.

I would like to talk in these few minutes about only two of these. I know of no subject on the sports pages of the last year that has been given more space than the discussion that has been given to the question of baseball franchises and the moving from one city to another of a baseball club. This is just one part of it. We are now on the verge of watching one great team move from one city on Lake Michigan to a city in the South. All of this may be perfectly all right. But I believe it would be helpful for us to go into this question of baseball franchises. Has the time come when this country is big enough and affluent enough and powerful enough and economically sufficient so that every city of any consequence in the country can have a major league baseball franchise?

This is another and a second question to be considered.

May I say I do not have any preconceived notions about this. I just believe it is important. What is happening on this question of franchises now? They are trying to form, as I understand it, a third league if this can be done.

There is a third problem, I think, in the field of baseball that is all important. Historically, and probably for the good of baseball, it has been owned by people. It has been owned by persons who were personally responsible for the activities and the economics of baseball in the particular community. Now what has happened in the last year? Well, we have had one of the great baseball teams of this country passing out of the ownership of individuals into a corporation. One large corporation, CBS, owns this team. I repeat: I have no preconceived notion about this but I think we ought to know: Is this for the good of baseball? Is this what baseball ought to do and to be? Should a baseball team be owned by a private corporation whose primary business is something else other than baseball?

Just yesterday I read in the newspapers, in an adjoining city only 40 miles away, the controlling interest in the Baltimore baseball team has passed over to a beer company; 27 percent of the stock, as I understand it, has passed into the hands of this company.

I have nothing against the beer companies. I only ask: Is this for the good of baseball, to have a beer company own a baseball franchise?

I am not familiar with the situation in St. Louis. Perhaps Mr. August Busch owns the franchise entirely separate from his beer company. That is a different problem, if he does. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the facts to know whether Anheuser Busch owns the St. Louis Cardinals. If they do, is this good for baseball? Is this the direction in which baseball should be going?

One team is owned by a television company, which undoubtedly is going to get an exclusive right to the television programing of that particular team. Is it right that a beer company should own a team, or perhaps a second beer company should own a franchise in one of the big leagues, in order that it may have advertising outlets on TV and radio for that particular city? Is this for the good of baseball? That is the question, in my opinion.

Let me go on to football for a moment, if I may. There are two leagues. As I understand it, they are trying to form a third league, the Continental League.

We come back to the problem of whether every big city in the country should have a major league football franchise. Perhaps they all should.

It seems to me, if our committee has jurisdiction over these particular problems, at least once in awhile we ought to have a hearing to look into them, to see what is good for boxing, baseball, and football. If that is our job, we ought to be doing something about finding out the direction in which boxing, baseball, and football are going.

This is something about which I feel strongly. As I said to the chairman in his office some 2 months ago, I feel this is something we ought to do before something happens—like what happened at Lewiston, Maine, the other night.

I am happy the chairman has introduced a bill, so that our committee can at least consider the field of boxing and can go into these problems to determine what is in the best interests of these sports.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5241

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 20a(12)), is amended to read as follows: "After December 31, 1965, it shall be unlawful for any person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one carrier subject to this part, except carriers which are lawfully operated under common control or management, or for any director, officer, or partner of any firm, corporation, or partnership to hold the position of officer or director of any such carrier when any other director, officer, or partner of such firm, corporation, or partnership holds the position of officer or director of another such carrier except where the carriers are lawfully operated under common control or management, unless such holdings have been authorized by order of the Commission, upon due showing, in form and manner prescribed by the Commission, that neither public nor private interests will be adversely affected thereby."

SEC. 2. This Act shall take effect on January 1, 1966.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have no authority from my chairman for what I am about to say.

I have listened with delight and with a real thrill to the discussion of boxing, baseball, and other sports by the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and the distinguished and learned ranking minority member, the gentleman from my own State of Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

In respect to all these sports, that which they seek to determine is not a local or a national but a world's championship. Hence if we are to have an investigation, it would seem to me that is in the field of foreign affairs.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the very wise statement the gentleman has made, and certainly the spirit in which he has made it.

This event, if we can call it an event, which was perpetrated on the American people went far beyond the bounds of this country. It was a rather amazing thing that the wonderful and fine media we have in this country, which we have made available for our people, were taken advantage of by closed circuit television on a commercial basis—commercial meaning $5 and $7 tickets for everyone—for the people of the United States.

But they went far beyond that—and I am sure this is what the gentleman had in mind—they went far beyond that and used the facilities of this wonderful instrument which is called the Early Bird, the communications satellite, and beamed from there the program all over the world in order to make it free to all the people in all the other countries of the world whereas our people in this Nation had to pay $5 to $7 to see it on closed circuit television. I think the gentleman has a pretty good idea with his suggestion.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I do congratulate the gentleman and his committee. I can assure him of the full cooperation of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. As a people we Americans are proud of our reputation as good sportsmen, and certainly this week's fiasco has hurt our image.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I certainly would like to congratulate the senior member of our delegation from Illinois, whom we all love very dearly, for this great idea. I wonder if we can carry it just a step further. With regard to this fiasco which occurred the other night, I do not know whether the country can stand another crack at it, but perhaps these two men ought to meet in some gymnasium, with no money charged for it. They owe it to the boxing fans to put on a legitimate fight and see what happens. Perhaps then we might beam it to the world again but without charge. I think we ought to have this in some gymnasium which would only be open to television and radio and with not a penny charged to anybody. They certainly owe that much, if they want to save the boxing profession. In the event they do not do that, I think the gentleman's suggestion is a very good one.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. It might be that we should return to the era of the bare-knuckle gladiators. They did not use boxing gloves in the glorious days of Figg, the first of the champions, but fought with bare knuckles and occasionally with clubs. Maybe we ought return to that. If my good friend and colleague from Illinois would permit me slightly to amend his splendid idea we might have the principals in this week's fiasco attempt to square themselves with the American sporting public by fighting as did the early gladiators with bare fists and cudgels, all of course, free of any charge of admission.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman will yield further, the only thing I wonder about in this regard is whether the country and the world would ever want to see these two men in a ring together again.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman with his usual sense of penetration has something there.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NEDZI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5241) to amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate the necessity for prior approval of the Commission for a person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one carrier when such carriers are in a single integrated system of carriers lawfully operated under common control, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 392, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 5883, which was passed by the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

BARTER PROJECT BETWEEN AEC AND SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include an announcement by the Department of Agriculture and a news article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, late yesterday afternoon I received notice from the Department of Agriculture that the Department was withdrawing the barter project which involved a uranium contract between the AEC and the South African Government, surplus commodities under Public Law 480 and barter of industrial diamonds from the Congo. Several Members of Congress, including myself, and members of the press had previously raised some question about this proposed barter. As a part of the response to my inquiries, I received a letter from the Department of Agriculture marked "Administratively Confidential." One of the facets of this proposed barter that I could not understand, and still cannot understand, is why the names of the firms involved in this proposed barter should be classified as "Administratively Confidential." I am pleased that the Department of Justice has intervened and that a revision of procedures will be initiated. I hope that one of the revised procedures will be the furnishing of information to Members of Congress and to the general public. Under unanimous consent, I include the announcement from the Department of Agriculture on May 6, 1965, as a part of the Record; and also include a news article by Marshall McNeil under date of May 9, 1965:

USDA WITHDRAWS BARTER PROJECT, INITIATES PROCEDURES REVIEW

(Announcement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, May 26, 1965)

The U.S. Department of Agriculture announced today that, as a result of objections on the part of the Department of Justice, it was withdrawing the barter project set forth in announcement No. 122 of April 12, 1965, and initiating review of procedures to be followed in this type of barter in the future.

Such a review is necessary, USDA said, because the features to which the Department of Justice objects are similar to those that have been found practicable in other barter projects involving strategic materials for stockpiles that are obtainable from very limited foreign sources and frequently under legalized foreign monopoly control. The Department of Justice objections were primarily based on its concern that USDA barter acquisition procedures have undesirable exclusionary features that preclude full and free competition. The Department of Justice had not reviewed earlier projects of this nature.

The proposed barter project would have converted an existing Atomic Energy Commission contract for the cash purchase of uranium from the South African Atomic Energy Board to an arrangement whereby surplus agricultural commodities instead of dollars would have been used in order to pay for the remainder of the contract. To provide incentive for the contractors to convert the balance of the uranium contract the arrangement provided for the barter of industrial diamonds, originating in the Republic of the Congo, for surplus agricultural commodities. Since both the uranium and the diamonds are controlled by monopolies, and since the barter contractors had to be ones that would be acceptable to those foreign entities that had control of these materials, the USDA was limited in the extent to which it could provide for bidding on a truly competitive basis. USDA's requirement that contracts should be made with at least six companies was not considered adequate by the Department of Justice.

A review of the barter procedures is therefore necessary, particularly relating to provisions for competition among U.S. firms, since many of the materials for which surplus agricultural commodities might be exchanged, like diamonds and uranium, are also obtainable only from limited or monopolistic foreign sources. Competitive bidding is therefore often impractical, and, while competitive bidding is not required by law under the barter program, USDA said it would seem to be one way to meet the view of the Department of Justice. No other method has been suggested.

Secretary Orville L. Freeman plans to name a review group to consider present and past barter procedures with particular reference to methods of obtaining the maximum possible degree of competition while still carrying out the mandate of Congress and the objectives of the program. The review group will make a comprehensive study in this area, obtaining views of private firms, Members of Congress, other interested U.S. agencies such as State, Agency for International Development, Department of Defense, General Services Administration, Office of Emergency Planning, Treasury, and Justice, and Government officials responsible for the operation of the program. Pending the completion of this review no new barter arrangements involving strategic materials for stockpiles will be initiated. This will not affect barter arrangements to meet the overseas needs of the Department of Defense and the Agency for International Development.

The authority for barter in general lies in the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act as amended, and in a number of other statutory authorities and budget programs. The Congress, with the passage of Public Law 480 and subsequent amendments, clarified and provided impetus and direction for the Secretary to barter or exchange surplus agricultural commodities to the maximum extent practicable for strategic materials for stockpiling and for materials, goods, and equipment to meet requirements of Government agencies.

[From the Fort Worth Press, May 9, 1965]

FORT WORTH REQUEST UPS BARTER DEADLINE

(By Marshall McNeil)

Washington.—The Agriculture Department has extended for a second time its deadline for accepting offers to barter surplus farm products for both uranium and diamonds.

The barter is proposed for two reasons:

So the United States can acquire from the Republic of South Africa, under an old contract but without expenditure of dollars abroad, uranium valued at about $55 million; and

So the Congo can dispose of more of its industrial diamonds, thus helping its economy.

Extension of the deadline is the result, at least, in part, of a request from Representative Jim Wright, Democrat, of Texas, in behalf of Fort Worth and other Texas businessmen who hold a Congo concession in the name of Congo-Texas Co. Reportedly there are diamonds on the concession.

Wright contends that the proposed barter in its original form—not yet changed—gives a monopoly on supplying the diamonds for the barter to a Belgian concern. He feels it does our Government no good to abet what he regards as a monopoly, and doesn't help the Congo, either.

The delay would appear to open the way for Congo-Texas to make an offer of its own in the uranium-diamond barter deal. But Wright said he did not know for sure if such a proposal would be made.

He favors the barter basically because it would conserve American dollars.

Among others in the Congo-Texas Co., Wright said, are Amon Carter, Jr., Fort Worth publisher and businessman, and Bedford Wynne, another wealthy and prominent Texan.

In its simplest form, the deal could work this way:

The Government would allocate a quantity of surplus farm products to a barter dealer who would undertake to sell them abroad in places where normal U.S. markets would not be disturbed. He would use the money he received to pay South Africa for the $55 million worth of uranium, making the payment in South African currency. The uranium then would be shipped to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Having made this deal, the dealer would be eligible to get another quantity of surplus farm products, also for sale abroad, and with the money he received from this sale he would purchase diamonds from the Congo, and turn $27.5 million worth over to the U.S. supplemental stockpile.

Prospects are that several dealers, maybe as many as six, finally would be in on the barter. The deal could involve several countries.

The original contract proposed by Commodity Credit Corporation requires that the dealer proposing to take part in the barter must—

Secure authorization from the South African Atomic Energy Board that he is approved by it to participate in the conversion of the uranium contract into the barter deal; and

Get an authorization from MIBA (Societe Miniere de Bakwanga), a diamond and bort-producing company in the Congo, saying it will supply diamonds and bort originating in and legally exported from the Congo.

Thus, apparently, only MIBA diamonds, or those approved by it, could figure in the deal.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful and thank the chairman of the subcommittee for restoring the $100 million to the food stamp program. The county of Erie shares in this program and has been most helpful in aiding people who are in dire need of assistance at this present time.

I am glad that the amendment was adopted.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include testimony concerning the Fair Labor Standards Act before the General Labor Subcommittee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on May 25 the Secretary of Labor appeared before the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. He presented excellent testimony in support of the proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In view of the widespread interest in this legislation, I am including the full text of Secretary Wirtz' remarks for the benefit of my colleagues and others who may wish to read this testimony in full:

Statement of W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, Before the General Subcommittee on Labor, Committee on Education and Labor, on Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1965, May 25, 1965

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, the business before the subcommittee this morning is the consideration of H.R. 8259, introduced by Mr. Powell, H.R. 8260, introduced by Mr. Roosevelt, and H.R. 8261, introduced by Mr. Dent. These identical bills extend the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to some 4,600,000 additional workers, and change the overtime hours provision of that act in an important respect.

I appear in support of these bills, to develop in further detail President Johnson's recommendation of them to the Congress.

It is appropriate to take a moment to put today's hearing in its broader context.

Thirty-two years ago this spring, Mr. Chairman, your father, engaged in organizing his Cabinet, called upon Miss Frances Perkins to serve as his Secretary of Labor. By her report of that conversation, she demurred at first with the statement, as she later recalled it, that "If I accept the position of Secretary of Labor I shall want to do a very great deal." And then she listed her proposals:

"Immediate Federal aid to the States for direct unemployment relief, an extensive program of public works, a study and an approach to the establishment by Federal law of minimum wages, maximum hours, true unemployment and old-age insurance, abolition of child labor, and the creation of a Federal employment service."

Miss Perkins' account is that President-elect Roosevelt only smiled assuringly, told her that her plans were his own, and proceeded with the conversation on the basis that she had accepted his appointment. If she hadn't, she did.

I retell this story this morning partly as a little, inadequate payment of our respects to Miss Perkins, fourth Secretary of Labor, whose death came 10 days ago, in New York.

But it is even more that H.R. 8259, 8260, and 8261 represent a carrying on of the plans that were laid in that conversation 33 years ago.

It took 5 years for those plans to develop into the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. That was landmark legislation. It marked the winning of one of the great battles of war on poverty I.

But that was only one battle and that war was only partly won. The introduction of these bills marks another battle now in war on poverty II. For the Fair Labor Standards Act, as it now stands, leaves too many people out of this Nation's fabulous prosperity.

This hearing comes in the 51st month of the longest, uninterrupted record of peacetime economic growth in our history. Almost every economic record is being broken every month. Never have so many done so well or had so much.

These are the makings of satisfaction, of contentment and complacency. Yet what is manifest, instead, is a still stronger forward thrust—not just toward what is better by the measure of previous achievement but what is good by the higher standards of our full potential. The new prosperity for most of us is only making us more critical of ourselves because others are left out.

The pressures behind the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938 were the pressures of economic desperation. The force behind its enlargement now is the force of hard-headed idealism. In the thirties it was a matter of getting up off our backs; in the sixties it is a matter of standing straighter and taller.

I put this testimony in these broader terms purposefully. The original Fair Labor Standards Act was bold legislation. But the process of its occasional amendment, to keep it up to date with the times, has been timid and tardy. The changes proposed now mark a return to the earlier tradition of boldness. Any small approach to them will result inevitably in renewed small-gage attempts to assert special interests against the public good. Only a full appreciation of the larger obligations prosperity creates to eliminate poverty will support the full thrust of this legislation.

In urging wage protection for the disadvantaged, President Johnson pointed out in his recent economic report that—

"Even in prosperous times, some receive wages below our standards. And the poverty of one-fifth of our families traps too many of our children in lives without opportunity or aspiration."

So we face squarely the facts and dimensions of the job that remains, the inequities and the anomalies of poverty amid plenty:

That unprecedented prosperity leaves, in this country, 30 to 35 million people living below even a spare and spartan standard of economic sufficiency;

That for many of these people the problem is not unemployment, but employment with inadequate pay; so that of the 15 million children in "poverty" families, a full third—over 5 million—are in families headed by a man or woman who works the year around;

That in a typical week, 4 million people who are looking for work are unemployed, while almost 8 million others work a total of 62½ million hours overtime.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 was a commitment to improve living standards by eliminating substandard working conditions in employment subject to Federal authority over interstate commerce. That commitment, incomplete when it was made, has become less complete with the passage of time. The law has not been kept in line with the advancing economy; and some of its guarantees mean less, comparatively, than they did 27 years ago.

The remainder of my testimony will be confined to the specific terms of these bills, for the subject matter is familiar to the committee and my views are already a matter of record before it.

EXTENDED COVERAGE

The present wage and hour law (the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended) covers only 29½ million of the 60 million wage and salary workers in the United States. A large number of these 60 million are outside the possible coverage of the act. But of the total number of 47 million workers who could be brought within the coverage of the wage and hour guarantees, 17½ million are not in fact covered. (See table 1.)

There is good reason for the noncoverage of some of the groups of workers who have not been brought within the Fair Labor Standards Act protection. Some are in occupations where virtually all rates are already higher than any practicable guarantees. Others are employed in enterprises too small to make coverage practicable.

There is every reason, however, for extension of the present coverage to large groups of workers whose earnings today are disproportionately low.

There is a significant correlation between poverty earnings and exclusion from the protective provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Among family heads employed in industries generally covered by the act, only 5 to 10 percent had annual incomes under $3,000 in 1963. The proportion was 8 to 14 percent in industries where there is partial Fair Labor Standards Act coverage. But in industries where there is little or no coverage—the proportions jumped to 33 and 49 percent respectively.

Changing times and needs create opportunities for greater advances toward the ultimate of full wage and hour protection, within the reach of the commerce powers of Congress.

These three companion bills incorporate the proposal of the administration to extend the wage and hour coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to approximately 4,600,000 individuals.

The bill applies particularly to workers employed primarily in retail trade, laundries, hotels, restaurants, hospitals, taxicab companies, construction, and farm processing and logging operations.

The bill provides this additional coverage by—

Broadening the enterprise basis of coverage in section 3(s) of the act to include all enterprises (i) engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and (ii) having annual sales of at least $250,000; and

Repealing or restricting minimum wage and overtime exemptions in section 13(a).

The proposal will also—

Clarify and consolidate present exemptions for handling and processing farm commodities;

Apply the overtime pay standards of the act to employees of transit companies and gasoline service stations;

Remove inequities in the computation of overtime pay for salaried workers; and

Extend the act to employees in the Eniwetok and Kwajalein Atolls and Johnston Island.

Recommendations for amending the Fair Labor Standards Act have always been made with a double awareness—the degree of need and the feasibility of satisfying this need. There is no question that a large segment of the workers whom this bill would bring under the Fair Labor Standards Act need and would benefit from its protection.

The wages of workers not covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act generally do not rise with increases in the cost of living, and as a result they suffer a continuing decline in real earnings. These workers who are denied the modest benefits of the Fair Labor Standards Act comprise a chronically depressed class.

Thirty-one percent of the workers who would be extended minimum wage protection by the bill now receive less than $1.25 an hour. Their plight is evident when one considers that even at this wage, if a worker were employed steadily—40 hours a week for an entire year—his annual income would amount to only $2,500. Although poverty has been defined in many ways, a family income of less than $3,000 is generally regarded as falling below the line marking the poverty level. While the assurance of a wage of $1.25 an hour to workers now receiving less than that amount would still fall short of this dividing line, it would provide some measure of improvement in the unhealthful and dispiriting conditions to which they are now subjected by their intolerably low wages.

In extending the act's protection to the categories of workers dealt with in this bill, a selective approach is followed so that those needing it the most will be benefited.

For example, laundry workers have long been among the lowest paid in the country. Earnings data published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that the spread between wages in laundries and wages in low-wage manufacturing industries steadily widened between 1947 and 1960. A comparison of wages in laundries and in the fertilizer industry (which is a low-wage industry but is covered by the act) illustrates this fact. Average hourly earnings in the fertilizer industry were 15 cents higher than those in the laundry industry in 1947. By 1960, the spread between the two industries had increased to 63 cents. Today, 41 percent of the laundry workers who would be covered by this bill receive less than $1.25 an hour.

Similarly, average hourly earnings in the fertilizer industry were 28 cents higher in 1947 than the average hourly wage in year-round hotels. By 1960, this differential had increased to 63 cents. It is estimated that 36 percent of the hotel and motel workers who would be extended the act's protection under this bill now receive less than $1.25 an hour in cash wages plus tips.

The estimated number of other categories of workers who will be extended the act's protection, now receiving less than $1.25 an hour, is as follows:

	Percent
Retail trade (secs. 3(s) and 13(a)(2))	30
Agricultural processing within the area of production (sec. 13(a)(10))	64
Local transit (sec. 3(s))	10
Cotton ginning (sec. 13(a)(18))	67
Taxicabs (sec. 13(a)(12))	25
Small logging (sec. 13(a)(15))	6
Motion picture theaters (secs. 3(s) and 13(a)(2))	60
Construction (sec. 3(s))	6
Restaurants (secs. 3(s) and 13(a)(2))	29
All other industries (sec. 3(s))	28

The proposed clarification and consolidation of provisions in the act relating to the handling and processing of farm products is long past due. The exemptions covering these agricultural operations have proved over the years to be complex, overlapping, and difficult to apply. In enacting the 1961 Fair Labor Standards Act amendments, Congress directed the Secretary of Labor to "study the complicated system of exemptions now available for the handling and processing of agricultural products under the act and particularly sections 7(b), 7(c), and 13 (a)(10)." The Department made a detailed study of these exemptions, and the amendments in the attached bill reflect the information compiled in this study.

The provision extending the geographical application of the Fair Labor Standards Act to the Eniwetok and Kwajalein Atolls and Johnston Island accords the same protection to employees in these trust territories as is accorded to employees in other areas under our jurisdiction, such as the Canal Zone. The bill does provide, however, with respect to these newly covered territories, that the Secretary may issue rules and regulations allowing reasonable variations and tolerances from the act's requirements if, after hearing, he finds that economic conditions warrant such action.

As has been indicated, about one-third the 4½ million workers who would be brought under the act are now earning less than $1.25 an hour in cash wages. The proportions, however, range from 10 percent or less in construction, small logging, and local transit, to 50 percent or more in hotels, restaurants, motion picture theaters, and in agricultural processing activities.

In several of the activities in which the proportions are 50 percent or more, employees receive tips. The Fair Labor Standards Act does permit now, and will continue to allow, the counting of tips toward the minimum wage if such tips are accounted for by the employee to the employer. If a rough estimate is made of the value of tips in restaurants, the proportion of employees who would be required to receive wage increases would be 29 percent rather than 53 percent. The proportion in hotels would drop from 50 percent to 36 percent (table 2).

Studies conducted by the Wage and Hour Division on the effects of the 1961 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act indicate that the economy adjusted easily to the required increases in the minimum wage. Even in the lowest wage nonmetropolitan areas the increase in wages for workers at the low end of the wage scale was accompanied by a net increase in employment. Also, studies to measure the effects of extending the minimum wage to a group of workers not previously covered indicate that the amendments succeeded in raising the wages of workers earning less than the minimum wage, and that employment in these newly covered segments did in fact go up.

There is ample evidence that the benefits which have accrued to low-wage workers as a result of the act and its changes have far outweighed the spotty adverse effects on employment in individual establishments and individual localities. The present minimum wage of $1.25 an hour is still less than half the average hourly earnings in manufacturing, mining, and construction—the industries in which all or many workers have been covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act since 1938.

The ease with which the economy can adjust to a change in the minimum wage law depends on general business activity at the time of the change. There could be no better time than the present period of unprecedented business prosperity to broaden the base of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

This is a vital part of our war on poverty. Our concern is not alone for the jobless; the working poor live in poverty too. For far too many Americans, the conditions deplored by the 75th Congress when it enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act still remain a grim reality.

Many families living in poverty today do not need the services of welfare workers. They do not need public assistance. They do not need charity. They are quite capable of running their own affairs. What they need is a living wage for the head of the family. One of the reasons they are not getting it is that a great many of these workers are employed in industries that have not yet been covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The revision in section 7(e) of the act relating to the computation of overtime for employees (except where their work necessitates irregular hours) eliminates an inequitable situation in which the rate on which overtime pay is computed decreases as the number of hours worked in a workweek increases. Thus, the longer an employee works, the less are his earnings per hour.

The lengthening of the statute of limitations to 3 years will allow workers more time to familiarize themselves with their legal right to back wages and thus improve enforcement of the act. The short statute of limitations gives competitive advantage to violators and penalizes many workers in the collection of wages legally due. The Federal criminal statute runs for 5 years and many other statutes run for 3 years or more. The existing 2-year period under the Fair Labor Standards Act is also shorter than that allowed creditors of employees to collect money owed food and rent bills.

OVERTIME STANDARD

These bills will require the payment of double time for work in excess of 48 hours a week, with this figure being reduced 1 hour each year for 3 years so that it will eventually mean double time after 45 hours a week. This double-time requirement will apply only to employees who are now covered by the act's overtime provisions.

The purpose of this change is not to increase individual earnings. It is to reduce unemployment. This was the original purpose of the time-and-a-half provision. But that provision is lo longer an effective deterrent to excessively long hours of work. In many instances overtime work at time and a half is less costly to an employer than the hiring of additional workers. The growth of supplementary benefit costs continues to reduce the effectiveness of the time-and-one-half provision, as the premium rate for overtime is generally computed on cash wages, not on cash wages plus fringe benefit costs.

In 1963, an average of 2.8 hours of overtime were worked per week for each production worker in manufacturing industries. In 1964, the average was 3.1 hours. In each month of 1965, the average number of overtime hours worked in manufacturing has been higher than the corresponding month in 1964. In the first quarter of 1965 the seasonally adjusted average number of overtime hours was 3.7 hours a week as compared with 3 hours in 1964.

Two nationwide surveys conducted in 1964 indicate not only the extent to which overtime was worked but also the number of overtime hours actually worked by employees working overtime. The surveys covered manufacturing industries and wholesale trade.[1]

These studies along with data from secondary sources on other industries, indicate that 62½ million overtime hours—hours over 40 in a week—are being worked each week by almost 8 million employees subject to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Approximately 16.8 million of the hours are hours over 48 in a week. (See table 3.)

Flexibility is maintained in the present bill by continuing the time and one-half requirement for at least 5 hours of overtime. In addition, the bill permits regulations to be issued which would in effect waive the double-time requirement in periods of extraordinary emergency or where other compelling needs exist.

A double-time penalty will reduce overtime work and will create jobs for the unemployed. The 62½ million overtime hours worked per week in March 1964 are the equivalent of more than 1½ million full-time jobs. The 16.8 million hours over 48 in a week are the equivalent of some 400,000 full-time jobs. A double-time provision will not create that many jobs. But it will have a significant effect in terms of increased employment.

Much of the work over 48 hours per week is done on a recurring basis.

---

[1] These reports relate to a single week in March 1964, but are reasonably reliable as an indicator of overtime hours worked throughout the year in manufacturing industries—the only group for which such data are regularly available. In every year for which these data are available, the variation between the average overtime hours in March and the average for the entire year was 0.4 of an hour or less. In most years, the variation was 0.1 or 0.2 of an hour. In fact, for the 9 years for which these data are now available, the average for March is 2.4 overtime hours per employee in manufacturing and the 9-year average of the annual figures is 2.6 hours.

Many of the long hours are worked by workers at the lower end of the wage scale in jobs which the unemployed could fill with little or no training.

The Fair Labor Standards Act was a major social achievement in 1938. But its stated objective was to eliminate substandard conditions "as rapidly as possible." The proposed changes are necessary to restore the original pace.

I urge early and favorable consideration of this proposal.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated number of nonsupervisory employees covered under the Fair Labor Standards Act, as amended, and under State minimum wage laws or orders, by industry, 1964* [1]

[In thousands]

Industry	Total number of employees	Number of employees covered by Fair Labor Standards Act	Number of employees not covered or exempt from Fair Labor Standards Act	Number of employees covered by State laws only	Number of employees not covered by Fair Labor Standards Act or State laws
Total	47,200	29,593	17,667	4,937	12,730
Agriculture and fisheries	1,882		1,882	56	1,826
Mining	559	554	5	1	4
Contract construction	3,029	2,413	616	168	448
Manufacturing	15,851	15,207	644	106	538
Transportation, communications, utilities	3,664	3,474	190	34	156
Wholesale trade	3,015	2,092	923	105	818
Retail trade	7,988	2,593	5,395	2,256	3,139
Finance, insurance, real estate	2,515	1,869	646	94	552
Services (excluding domestic service)	6,253	1,391	4,862	2,117	2,745
Domestic service [2]	2,504		2,504	(2)	2,504

[1] Estimates represent employment in September 1964 except for retail trade, which relates to June 1964. Estimates are for the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Estimates for employees covered only under State minimum wage laws or orders reflect only such laws or orders enacted or revised from 1955 and through Jan. 1, 1965. All employees are included except executive, administrative, and professional employees and government workers.

[2] Coverage of domestic workers is provided by very few State laws, and the language of these laws is such that virtually all domestic workers are excluded from the coverage provisions.

Source: Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Office of Research and Legislative Analysis.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated number of nonsupervisory employees who would be brought under the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act by H.R. 8259 and the estimated number paid less than $1.25 an hour*

Industry	Employees added to minimum wage coverage by the proposed extension				
	Total number	Number paid less than $1.25			
		Based on cash wages		With an allowance for tips	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All industries	*Thousands* 4,561	*Thousands* 1,572	34	*Thousands* 1,406	31
Retail trade	1,500	456	30	456	30
Food service	100	72	72	72	72
Auto and farm equipment dealers	600	96	16	96	16
All other retail trade	800	288	36	288	36
Hotels	275	138	50	90	36
Restaurants	425	225	53	123	29
Laundries	175	72	41	72	41
Hospitals and nursing homes	890	303	34	303	34
Motion-picture theaters	75	45	60	45	60
Local transit	10	1	10	1	10
Construction	250	15	6	15	6
All other industries (3(s))	650	201	31	181	28
Agricultural processing within area of production	90	58	64	58	64
Cotton ginning	34	23	67	23	67
Small logging	87	5	6	5	6
Taxicabs	100	30	30	25	25

NOTE.—Retail, retail service, and laundry establishments with less than $250,000 in annual receipts would remain exempt.

Source: Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Office of Research and Legislative Analysis.

TABLE 3.—*Estimated number of weekly overtime hours and estimated number of overtime hours over 48 a week worked in covered industries by major industry group, March 1964*

[In millions of hours]

Industry group	Number of overtime hours	
	Total number	Number over 48 in a week
Total	62.6	16.8
Industries covered prior to 1961	59.4	16.0
Manufacturing	42.4	12.7
Wholesale trade	5.6	1.3
All other	11.4	2.0
Industries covered since 1961	3.2	.8
Retail trade	3.0	.8
All other	.2	

Source: Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Office of Research and Legislative Analysis.

GEN. THOMAS HOLCOMB

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of the House share a deep sense of loss with the passing last Monday of Gen. Thomas Holcomb, 17th Commandant of the Marine Corps.

During his more than 44 years of active service, he saw foreign duty in China, the Philippines, Cuba, and France.

As a battalion commander in France during World War I, he fought at Chateau-Thierry, Soissons, St. Mihiel, and the Meuse Argonne. He was awarded the Navy Cross, the Silver Star Medal with three oak leaf clusters, a Meritorious Service Citation, the Purple Heart, the French Cross of the Legion of Honor, and three decorations of the Croix de Guerre with Palm.

From June 1932 until January 1935, prior to his appointment to brigadier general, he served in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. He then served as Commandant of Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va., until November 1936, when he was ordered to Headquarters Marine Corps.

In December 1936, General Holcomb assumed the office of Major General Commandant. With his advancement to lieutenant general on January 20, 1942, by an act of Congress, he became the highest ranking officer in the history of the Marine Corps.

When Lieutenant General Holcomb reached normal retirement age in August 1943, the President announced he was continuing General Holcomb as Commandant of the Marine Corps in recognition of his outstanding service. Many of us here remember him as our first Commandant when we joined the corps.

With his retirement on January 1, 1944, General Holcomb was advanced to the rank of general, thus becoming the first marine ever to hold four-star rank.

During his 7 years as Commandant, General Holcomb saw the corps expand from 16,000 men to 300,000 men and women. He is considered one of the Marine Corps' great commandants.

In March 1944 General Holcomb was appointed U.S. Minister to the Union of South Africa, a position he held until June 1948. Following his resignation, he managed the family farm at Rose Croft, St. Mary's City, Md., until 1956, when he moved to Chevy Chase, Md. Following a serious illness in the spring of 1964, he returned to his native New Castle.

History has assigned a unique duty and purpose to our country—the preservation and extension of human dignity both at home and abroad. In the performance of that mission the United States has expended thousands of precious lives, often in remote and lonely corners of the earth. No one was more deeply aware of the burdens and responsibilities of that mission than was General Holcomb. His integrity, courage, and humaneness epitomized those values for which we committed the full measure of our national devotion. We shall miss him. Yet, we can be comforted by the knowledge that his leadership has assured that future generations can be free and his personal example will be an eternal standard to which they can aspire.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF PROFESSIONAL BOXING

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of all aspects of professional boxing by the House Judiciary Committee.

I believe that a full review is necessary to "save boxing from itself." The square circle has now become a stage, and boxing fights face the ignominious role of becoming exhibitions rather than contests.

I suggest that the former heavyweight champs, Jack Dempsey, Gene Tunney, Joe Louis, Rocky Marciano, publishers of ring and boxing magazines, some of the promoters and managers who have protested the operation of bigtime boxing, veteran boxing writers and some State boxing officials be brought before the committee.

I am reluctant to impose Federal controls on boxing. But it is apparent that boxing cannot, or is unwilling to exert the effort, to police itself. Let us face it—this is a big industry, and it has just perpetrated what many believe is one of the biggest frauds on the sport fan in history.

The public should be protected against unethical promotions that bill themselves as major, upstanding sports events. There is a mixed-up situation in the heavyweight ranks, with different organizations claiming to have the only bona fide world champion. We have one champ who is recognized west of the Catskills, and one who reigns on television.

I surely do not believe any thought should be given to a Patterson-Clay fight until boxing has had a thorough investigation by the Congress; and if legal action is necessary, possibly an injunction would be in order.

My resolution gives the House Judiciary Committee full power to conduct a wide-ranging probe of boxing and come up with suggested legislative remedies.

NATIONAL BOXING COMMISSION

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing and to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner.

I do not claim to be the author of the bill. It is patterned after similar bills that have been introduced in the past.

But I do know that boxing, once a national sport, has now become a national disgrace. It is time that the U.S. Government step into this situation to put a stop to what I consider to be a fraud perpetrated on the American people.

The bill calls for the appointment of a Boxing Commissioner. Frankly, I think one of two men with very little assistance and without establishing a large bureaucracy could bring order out of chaos in the boxing world. I am sure that either Jack Dempsey or Gene Tunney would be willing to serve as Boxing Commissioner, at least long enough to restore this sport to the prestige it once enjoyed. I am confident that the American people will not pay to see any more closed circuit television boxing matches, the likes of which we have watched recently. I am also confident that the art of self-defense with the use of one's hands has now reached a new low in the minds of the people because of the manner in which these so-called championship matches have been fought—if one can use the expression "fought."

I hope the appropriate committees of the Congress will take action on this matter before this once great manly sport becomes extinct.

I am introducing this bill which ordinarily would go to the Judiciary Committee, I assume. But I am going to draft one that will go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If these two bodies do not act—although I am sure they will—I am going to file a discharge petition.

The American people are asking one thing: What are you fellows in Congress going to do to protect us against such as that which happened the other night? This bill will be a good vehicle. We do not need any investigation; we need action. This bill will give us the opportunity to get that action.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. There was one winner in connection with that fight, and that was the State of Massachusetts that refused to allow them to hold it there.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. To their eternal credit. They knew what was going to happen and they put a stop to it. It is to the eternal credit of the State whence comes our distinguished Speaker, than whom no greater Speaker ever occupied that chair.

RAY HENLE AND "THREE-STAR EXTRA" DESERVE PRAISE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the last day of broadcasting for NBC's "Three-Star Extra," the "newspaper of the air."

Ray Henle, editor in chief of this distinguished news program, will continue his service to the public on various consulting assignments, and spend some time each year in Naples, Fla., as a constituent of mine. We in Florida look forward to Ray and his lovely wife Marion becoming Floridians.

The Congress and leaders in other branches of Government, along with his many listeners throughout America, will certainly miss this superb program of news coverage.

"Three-Star Extra" enjoys the reputation of having the longest continuous sponsorship in radio history. Organized by Ray Henle, it has been on the air for 18 years. Unique in format, its reporting staff has contributed to "Three-Star Extra" broadcasts exclusively, and thus has the show established an enviable record.

Ray Henle and "Three-Star Extra" have contributed greatly to the American press and the public. Among the many awards which the program has received are the Du Pont Award and five Freedoms Foundation's George Washington Medals of Honor.

I am sure other Members of Congress and Government officials will join me in wishing Ray Henle and the staff of "Three-Star Extra" every good wish for continued success.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the gentleman from Florida in paying tribute to Ray Henle and "Three-Star Extra" which is leaving NBC's broadcasting network. This has been one of the outstanding news programs in the United States. As I say, I join the gentleman in paying tribute to this outstanding program and the fine staff that has run this program for so many years.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Wisconsin in paying tribute to Ray Henle. Through his long, long years of service on "Three-Star Extra" he has epitomized integrity and straightforward factual reporting. For all his career Ray Henle has been in the forefront for the best traditions in his profession. It seems to me all of us owe a debt of gratitude to him and to his fine staff who have done so well for so long. I am sure we will miss him. We certainly wish him the best in his new endeavors.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from Florida in his commendatory remarks about Ray Henle, Ned Brooks, and others who have made this program such an outstanding success.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for taking this time to pay tribute to Ray Henle and desire wholeheartedly to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join the gentleman in what he has said about one of the great newspapermen and one of the great radio broadcasters of our time. It so happens that Ray Henle and his wife Marion and my wife Blanche and I have been very, very close personal friends for many, many years. I have gloried in his accomplishments.

Sorry as we are that he is leaving the broadcasting field, I wish for him every happiness and continued success in the future.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me and I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida and the remarks of my other colleagues who have paid tribute to Ray Henle and to "Three-Star Extra."

Mr. Speaker, everyone has mentioned the staff of "Three-Star Extra," but I want to express special appreciation to my good friend Bill Cardin who has contributed substantially and materially to the great success of "Three-Star Extra" and Ray Henle, and wish Ray and the entire staff well.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, in all my years of service in the Congress I have not had a finer, truer friend than Ray Henle. Time and again, in countless ways, he has been of assistance to me. On many occasions I have turned to him for advice, and he never hesitated to express his opinion, whether it was in accord with mine or not. And he never betrayed a confidence.

Ray has spent his life in newspaper work and in radio broadcasting. He is one of those individuals who is blessed with a natural facility for getting at the facts and a unique ability to evaluate them objectively. This accounts for his successful career as a writer and a broadcaster.

When Ray told me that he planned to retire at the end of this month and terminate his "Three-Star Extra" program, he said that he felt the time had come when he should relieve himself of the tension of meeting deadlines and be able to work more leisurely. We shall miss his broadcasts, but I am glad he has decided upon the less hectic pace he has led for so many years and begin to enjoy the many things life has to offer him. And I believe that working in a less demanding area Ray himself will contribute even more to the dissemination of knowledge and formulation of public opinion.

I join untold numbers in wishing Ray the very best in whatever he undertakes. I shall always cherish his friendship.

HORTON AMENDMENT TO TARIFF ACT OF 1930 AFFECTING BUTTON BLANKS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection?

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to limit button blanks to crude forms suitable for manufacture into buttons. I have asked unanimous consent to have the bill inserted in full at the end of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the objective of my bill is the closing of a loophole in the tariff schedules of the United States—TSUS—by which buttons of acrylic or polyester resin, fully finished except for the holes, avoid the duty on finished or unfinished buttons under tariff schedule item 745.32 and are admitted at the far lower rate of duty for button blanks under tariff schedule item 745.40.

The process of making buttons starts with the use of blanks. Imported blanks are subject to an average equivalent ad valorem duty of 36 percent. These blanks are then processed into buttons by being faced, polished, drilled, classified by thickness and inspected for imperfections. Such finished buttons, when imported are subject to an average equivalent ad valorem duty of 140 percent. However, since 1962 there has been a phenomenal increase in imports of buttons, completely finished except for the holes. As such they are admitted under the lower rate of 36 percent as blanks. The Tariff Commission has stigmatized this practice "a rate avoidance device," which is creating undue competitive hardship on domestic manufacturers. Imports of bottons without holes increased from 50,000 gross in 1962 to 1,800,000 gross in 1963 and to 4,320,000 gross in 1964. Importers of such finished blanks simply drill holes in them and thereby gain a competitive price advantage which domestic makers of such buttons cannot meet. The cost advantage is as follows: a U.S. producer processing U.S.-made blanks can make 1 gross of totally finished buttons for 20.25 cents. By using an imported blank the cost sinks to 18.41 cents. However, by using an imported and finished blank and merely drilling holes in them, the cost drops to 13.88 cents. In this latter instance the cost advantage amounts to 31.4 percent.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is intended to preserve our button manufacturing industry, which constitutes a significant sector of the economy of the 36th District of New York, which I am privileged to represent in Congress. In the early 1940's we had 125 button and button blank manufacturers in the United States. Today, we have 50. In 1964, nine companies went out of business in New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and Virginia. Employment has dropped from 10,500 to 5,500. Unless this tariff relief is granted by classifying these finished blanks as buttons, subject to the 140 ad valorem rate, our domestic button industry and its employment will disappear, leaving only hole drilling operations.

I appreciate this opportunity to emphasize my interest in ridding our tariff schedules of this avoidance device and to urge my colleagues to familiarize themselves with the hardship this legislation seeks to overcome. By supporting this interpretation, Congress will clearly show its intent that the new statute should have the effect of making buttons without holes dutiable as buttons at the 140 percent rate and not as blanks at the 36 percent rate.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 8623

A bill to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to limit button blanks to raw or crude blanks suitable for manufacture into buttons

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That headnote 2 of subpart A of part 7 of schedule 7 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 (Tariff Schedules of the United States, 28 F.R., part II, page 379, August 17, 1963) is amended to read as follows:

"2. For the purposes of this subpart—

"(a) the term 'line' in the rates of duty columns (items 745.20, 745.22, and 745.32) means the line button measure of one-fortieth of one inch.

"(b) the term 'button blanks' (item 745.40) is limited to raw or crude blanks suitable for manufacture into buttons."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, after the ninetieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

RUSK DEFENDS UNITED STATES ON STEPS IN OAS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], and me, read into the RECORD a statement on the "Dominican Crisis and the Inter-American System."

That statement included our view that "the failure to inform the OAS of U.S. intervention before it was underway was an insensitive oversight." We suggested that while OAS agreement before the landing of U.S. forces would not have been practical in view of the shortness of time, the Organization could at least have been told that the landing was going to be undertaken. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and I had personally given the full text of our statement to top State Department officials 24 hours before delivery on the floor.

This morning's New York Times carries a story by John Finney about yesterday's press conference by Secretary Rusk. Finney reports that Rusk said that the administration had begun to call OAS ambassadors to inform them of U.S. intervention immediately after the decision was made. But, Finney reports, when the official transcript of the press conference was released the words "OAS ambassadors" had been changed to read "Latin American ambassadors," many of whom do not represent their governments before the OAS.

The article goes on to describe how the Secretary had claimed that the United States had called meetings of the Inter-American Peace Committee on April 27 and the OAS Council on April 28 to discuss the Dominican situation. While both of these meetings did occur before the landing of U.S. forces, we do not believe that the United States gave any indication at either session that it was about to land troops. Furthermore, as Finney writes, despite what Secretary Rusk has said, neither meeting was called by the United States.

I can only wonder whether the administration's efforts to deny any breach of responsible diplomatic practice in the failure to notify the OAS of U.S. intervention before the fact may not compound the error.

Mr. Finney's story is reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

RUSK DEFENDS UNITED STATES ON STEPS IN ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES—HIS REPORT OF CRISIS ACTION IS AT VARIANCE WITH MINUTES

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, May 26.—Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in the face of diplomatic and political criticism, defended the administration today against charges that it had bypassed the Organization of American States in the Dominican crisis.

In making his defense, the Secretary cited a chronology of U.S. dealings with the OAS that was at variance with the official record of the inter-American organization. He also took the unusual step of amending the transcript of his news conference to correct an overstatement about the degree of U.S. cooperation with the Organization.

The administration has come under considerable diplomatic criticism for sending Marines into the Dominican Republic on the evening of April 28 without having consulted or informed the OAS. Domestic political criticism was added today to the diplomatic complaints.

Five Republican Congressmen led by Representative F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts, charged in a statement that the administration had severely jeopardized the future of collective security in the Western Hemisphere by its actions in the Dominican crisis.

One of the specific Republican complaints was that the administration, in an "insensitive oversight," had failed to inform the Organization of American States of the U.S. military intervention before it was underway.

WASHINGTON'S REBUTTAL

The administration has maintained that the situation in the Dominican Republic was deteriorating too quickly to permit consultation with the Organization. This point was made today by Mr. Rusk, who said it was "one of those situations where events themselves made it necessary that some action be taken before the formal machinery could be convoked and could act upon it on a multilateral basis."

But starting with the President's statement of April 28 announcing the dispatch of the troops, the administration has also sought to give the impression that OAS members were kept fully informed.

Today, for example, Mr. Rusk said that immediately after the White House decision in the evening of April 28 to intervene, the State Department began calling "OAS ambassadors" to inform them of the action.

In the transcript finally issued by the State Department, this was amended to "Latin American Ambassadors," after it was called to the Department's attention that many of the representatives in the Inter-American Organization had complained privately they had not been informed of the administration's action.

While seemingly minor, the distinction between Latin American Ambassadors and Organization of American States representatives has assumed troublesome proportions to the administration. Many of the Latin American countries are represented in the Inter-American Organization by someone other than their Ambassador to the United States. The administration's failure to notify the OAS representatives, apparently through lack of coordination and oversight, explains much of the criticism of the U.S. actions within the Organization.

EFFORTS TO INVOLVE OAS

Asked why the United States had not consulted or informed the Inter-American Organization before sending in troops, Mr. Rusk gave a lengthy reply. On April 27, he noted, "we did call together the Peace Committee of the OAS, for a discussion of the situation in the Dominican Republic." The following day, he said, the United States asked for a meeting of the Organization's Council "for a futher discussion."

Later that day, after the Marine landings, the United States asked for an emergency meeting of the Council, which was held April 29. In retrospect, Mr. Rusk said, "it might have looked better" if the United States had insisted upon a meeting the evening of April 28—a point also made privately by many of the Organization's diplomats.

Mr. Rusk's account of the sequence of events was at some variance with official minutes of the Organization of American States. These minutes show that the initiative to involve the Organization in the Dominican situation, both before and after the marine landings, did not come primarily from the United States.

According to the minutes, for example, the April 27 meeting of the Inter-American Peace Committee was called at the request of the Chairman, Alfredo Vazquez Carrizosa, of Colombia, and was limited largely to a report by the Dominican representative. State Department officials said, however, that the United States had privately urged the Chairman to call the meeting and that some supplementary information had been supplied by the American representatives.

Contrary to the suggestion of Mr. Rusk, the April 28 meeting of the Organization's Council was not called at the request of the United States to discuss the Dominican situation. The meeting had already been scheduled to discuss routine OAS matters, and the discussion of the Dominican situation was limited to a further report by the Dominican representative.

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, May 28, marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Armenian people from Soviet and Turkish domination. On May 28, 1918, the Armenians united their forces in an attempt to maintain a free Armenia. However, they were prevented from achieving this goal by the fortunes of war, the indifference of World War I allied powers, and their statesmen.

The nationwide commemoration of the genocide perpetrated by the Ottoman Turks against the Armenian people 50 years ago was also the subject of House debate recently.

It is important to note the vigorous support which Americans of Armenian extraction have been giving to the creation of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations. They have recognized the practical contribution which such a committee would make to exposing Soviet colonialism over Armenia and the neighboring countries under Soviet domination.

I join in saluting the brave Armenian people on this anniversary of their independence and encourage them to maintain their faith and hope in the legitimate restoration of independence and freedom to Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, Armenian-Americans have made tremendous contributions to our national political, economic, educational, and artistic successes. As loyal Americans they have maintained a very proper and steadfast interest in the restoration of freedom to the brave Armenian people still held in bondage. On this anniversary of Armenian independence, let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of Armenia and all other peoples who are still deprived of the right of self-determination.

DESPITE COMPUTERS BOMBERS PROVE WORTH

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection tc the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, time and again over the past several years our Committee on Armed Services has taken exception to Defense Secretary McNamara's overemphasis of missiles in lieu of manned bombers. We have repeatedly pointed out that to have a balanced national defense, capable of dealing effectively with any emergency—a little war, a big war, a brush war, a guerrilla war—whenever and wherever it may arise, it is essential that we have bombers in our arsenal and replacement bombers in production.

Such a program we do not have. This is not the fault of some of our professional military leaders, such as retired Air Force Chief of Staff LeMay, who have called attention to this need and deficiency in our defense planning. Nor is it entirely the fault of the Congress. Secretary McNamara has refused to follow the advice of the military professionals and abide by the wishes of the Congress.

What has been taking place in South Vietnam points up the importance of and need for bombers. In this connection I call attention to the following editorial entitled "Despite Computers, Bombers Prove Worth" which appeared in the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill., last Monday, May 24:

DESPITE COMPUTERS, BOMBERS PROVE WORTH

An unfortunate and tragic accident in South Vietnam resulted in the loss of American lives and the destruction of 40 U.S. aircraft including 10 B-57 bombers.

Ordinarily the loss of 10 aircraft from the defense arsenal would be a cause for concern, but not a cause for alarm. This is under ordinary circumstances when professional military men and Congress make the defense hardware decisions.

Today, when the computers veto Congress and the military professionals, the loss of 10 types of a particular aircraft is extremely serious.

Congress, following professional military advice, insists the manned bomber is a vital element in a balanced national defense force. It has backed its opinions with appropriations for development of new manned bombers.

The Defense Department refuses to provide the bombers.

The transistors and tubes of the electronic banks in the Defense Department insist instead that missiles are replacing the manned bomber. Their human spokesman is Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, who arbitrarily follows the robots' commands.

Isn't it strange that the computers always reflect the judgment of the Secretary of Defense?

Despite the computers' statistics, ground-to-ground missiles with the payload of a single bomber have not been used to date in the Vietnam conflict.

On the other hand, the bombers have been flying missions almost daily with proved results. At the time of their destruction the B-57's were being readied for service.

Military men know the value of manned bombers with intelligent humans at the controls to exercise judgment. As Lt. Gen. Ira C. Baker, an illustrious name in military aviation and a columnist for Copley News Service, said:

"The final irrevocable answer to bomber effectiveness came in the Pacific (during World War II), when Japan surrendered before any hostile soldier set foot on her soil."

The opinion is unanimous among the men who have studied the problem, including such professionals as Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, retired Air Force Chief of Staff; Gen. Thomas S. Power, retired Strategic Air Command Chief; Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

These are men of experience whose opinion should carry more weight in defense matters than all the computers in the Defense Department. They are aware that defense requirements are more than a consideration of money alone. Overall capability, human factors and the nature of the war also have a bearing.

The computers are not to be blamed. They do not make independent assessments, but collate the figures spoon-fed to them.

The blame for the serious national defense problem caused by the accidental loss of the 10 bombers in South Vietnam rests squarely on the Defense Department. It is urgent that Congress overrule the computers once and for all and assume its constitutional obligation to raise and support armies.

PRESIDENT NEEDS AND DESERVES SUPPORT OF ALL AMERICANS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, no nation in the history of the world has spent more of its resources in the quest for peace and no nation in the world has suffered indignities and humiliation with more compassion and understanding than has the United States.

We seek not world domination; we seek neither to conquer nor possess our neighbors nor any additional parcel of land on the face of the globe.

Today, in a sense, we are engaged in armed conflict on two sides of the earth: South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. This Nation that seeks world peace, this Nation that gives freely of its substance to raise the living standards of all human beings, this Nation that believes in the inherent rights of the individual man and individual nations, finds itself denounced because it dares to stand up for freedom and for peace.

This is not the world of 100 years ago; it is not even the world of a decade ago. Scientific advances so startling that they would have stunned the imagination only 25 years ago today are accepted matter of factly.

Remember, if you will, the period only 10 years ago when talk of placing a man on the moon and travel throughout the universe would have been considered almost lunacy. Today it is not a question of whether man will go to the moon, only when.

Advances in medicine, in technology, and all phases of science have brought the dawn of a day when we shall wipe out diseases and sickness that strike down millions. We have the technological know-how to solve the age-old problem of the world, how to feed people. Scientific application of agricultural principles and mechanization such as are practiced in the United States, would certainly lead to a day when hunger throughout the length and breadth of the globe would be banished.

Yet in spite of these advances, we see man on the brink of another war. Today the decisions are not quite so easy to make. The nuclear power of the nations of the world can literally wipe out all human existence.

It is this type of world in which Lyndon B. Johnson must lead. When we consider the record of service which he has made in the cause of world peace, it is heartrending to see a segment of the population denounce so unreasonably the course of action he has embarked upon in carrying out the commitments we have to world peace; for, my colleagues, this is the only course of action open to us, if we are ever to see a world at peace.

We seek not to dominate South Vietnam nor to subjugate its people. We seek not to impose colonialism upon the Dominican Republic. But, we do seek self-determination for the peoples of the world, and sometimes it becomes necessary for a nation that seeks only peace to use arms to attain that goal.

It was President Theodore Roosevelt who espoused a policy of walking softly but carrying a big stick. It is my considered judgment that Lyndon B. Johnson's philosophy is that of seeking every honorable means for a just and lasting peace but with a willingness to fight to protect freedom and the cause of peace when no other course is open.

As I told the people in my district on my television report last week, I support without reservation the decisions of the President in his actions to preserve world peace.

In making these statements, I am not unmindful of the toll of human life, of the sacrifice made by the more than 400 brave American young men who have given that last full measure of devotion in South Vietnam. I know full well that these sacrifices are understood better by no one than they are by President Johnson.

Each loss of life for a man who has dedicated so much of his life seeking world peace, economic progress, and freedom is a heavy burden to bear.

Sometimes there are those who must die in order that others might live. From Valley Forge to the Argonne, from Iwo Jima to Saigon, the thousands of crosses marking the graves of American servicemen bear mute testimony that others were willing to give their lives that we might live in peace and freedom.

And as much as it hurts, this is the world in which we live in the sixties.

The situation may well worsen before it gets better. I expect that it will.

The plague of communism seeks to infiltrate into every area of the world. Subversion, deceit, lies, barbaric disregard for human life and dignity are the calling card of these men who hold human life so cheaply. Their leaders seek not peace, but power. They follow a godless doctrine that has as its announced purpose, economic progress for all, but actually masks a power-mad drive to enslave in dictatorship all of mankind.

We have sought to negotiate with these power-mad despots, only to find that their solemn word was no more than a lie. In Communist Cuba today they have a continual and effective program of training subversives who seek to infiltrate all of South America, to turn that poverty-stricken area of the world into another Communist satellite.

The unstable situation in the Dominican Republic gave rise to a revolution, which had as its announced purpose free elections and democracy. In short order the trained masters of deceit, Communist agents, gained control of the fighting, and it appeared as if they would be successful in overthrowing yet another land.

Many have been saying since the Communists were allowed to take over Cuba, that the Monroe Doctrine was dead after 141 years. The determined and forceful action of Lyndon B. Johnson revived our belief in this doctrine pronounced so ably many years ago and served notice of our new and determined attitude.

For the President then to be roundly denounced and criticized by certain elements of our society is a strange paradox indeed.

The President is criticized bitterly, even by certain Members of the Congress, for the armed intervention of the United States. They cannot point, however, to a single foot of territory in another country in this hemisphere which we have annexed. How can they ignore the violence, murder, pillage, and loss of freedom which has followed every Communist takeover?

Did they not learn anything from Hungary?

The people of the United States have made many, many sacrifices and even fought a major war a half century ago to liberate Cuba from oppression by a European power. Wherever we have occupied a country to protect American lives and/or to save the people of that land from ever greater danger, the end result has always been that we have withdrawn when peaceful conditions have been achieved.

But has this been the case in Hungary? No. The hopeless fight for freedom by the Hungarian people was ruthlessly crushed. Russian tanks and troops battled freedom-loving Hungarians, who fought with bottles and bricks to have the right to self-determination, and who were crushed into submission by the Russians for their effort.

Their blood serves as a living example of the true intent of the Communist conspiracy. From this we should have learned a lesson.

President Johnson had a difficult decision to make. He knew that the Dominican Republic concerned not just that tiny island nation, but the future of all nations in the Caribbean.

Turning to the other side of the globe, the American effort in South Vietnam has been stepped up. While many of our allies, who should know the folly of appeasement, sit idly by, critical and insulting, we fight on to honor our pledges.

We have negotiated in good faith in every opportunity we have been given. The President has stated time and again, with particular emphasis on Vietnam, that he would go anywhere at anytime to discuss peace without preconditions if there were any sign of good faith on the part of the Communists. He has drawn nothing but abuse from the Reds for his offer to negotiate and for a billion dollar contribution to a peaceful development of southeast Asia. And to my sorrow, he has also drawn unjust abuse from many in this land, including national leaders, for his stand.

College students stage a huge march on Washington. The White House is picketed. The President is vilified not only by our sworn and deadly enemies, but by many of his own people, who should know better.

Have we learned nothing from history? As George Santayana once wrote:

> Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

To appease aggression is to pour gasoline on a burning fire. Did we not see appeasement and the sacrifice of thousands upon thousands to the Nazis end in World War II? Did appeasement halt their aggression?

The answer is obvious—it only made them bolder, more sure of their course, and thousands of brave American young men lie buried over the four corners of the globe for that folly.

I have read that American attacks in South Vietnam may be carried even deeper in Communist territory if Red China throws more forces into the war.

I suggest this as our course of action, for the United States has determined to stand up to this aggression as never before. We have tried every other means.

I would point out that President Johnson has proven himself to be a man of the hour. He is determined that the commitments of the United States are not hollow promises. He knows full well if the Communists win in South Vietnam, then Communists will fight similar actions in Thailand, the Philippines, in the Congo, in Venezuela—step by step. Sooner or later such Communist tactics must be met by force.

We have warned and we have pleaded. We have negotiated in good faith. We have spent billions—not for subversion, but for economic progress and freedom for impoverished lands throughout the globe.

It is idiotic to consider the Vietnamese situation civil war. It is calculated aggression, directed by Hanoi and Peiping, to take over another nation by murder and ruin, and we have determined that here they shall stop; they shall go no further.

It is a fearful decision that the President has had to make. He has far more knowledge of the dangers we face in these hours than any of us.

He has made it known that we will honor our commitments, that we will use force if necessary to prevent the establishment of another Communist regime in this hemisphere.

The latter is the 20th century version of the Monroe Doctrine, much more difficult and dangerous to fulfill than was ever visualized in the original version.

In this Nation, a number of circumstances have brought an unrest to college campuses which are a tragedy in a sense. While doubtless Communist influence, plus the unreasoning bearded beatniks and excitement-happy minority have caused a great deal of comment in the press media, it does not take into account many thousands of youngsters who realize the problems of their day.

I suggest that we have always had a minority of this type. If this were the days immediately preceding World War II, they would be pleading that we leave Hitler alone while he raped England, for what we needed to do was to negotiate. In some instances we have called this "isolation." My own term would be "idiocy."

The pattern on the college campuses is approximately the same. A minority element on the faculty has stirred a minority element of the student body to oppose our determined policy. I have been informed that, as far as can be learned, a heavy majority of the students and faculty in every place are either behind the Government or unconcerned by the issue.

In these heavy decisions which the President has had to make, I very quickly voiced my support for his course. My own acts have been criticized by some of my own people who do not understand that appeasement would only bring more aggression.

Be that as it may, I want to make my own position crystal clear. I say that this Nation must not bow to aggression, that this Nation must honor its commitments, that the time has passed when we can huff and puff about our military might while our flag is trampled in the dirt, our embassies bombed, our people murdered.

We have gone an extra mile, the extra 2 miles. In fact, we have taken the 50-mile hike in the search for peace. The only course which honorable men can take is that which is being bravely and resolutely followed by President Johnson.

A search of the records proves time and again this is a man who loves peace, not as a political gimmick, but with a deep and abiding conviction and desire for peace for all mankind. Here is a man who would gladly have his name placed in a tiny corner of the history books as one who helped to bring about lasting peace, than to have chapters written about his having led a nation to victory in a great war.

President Johnson and I may disagree on some issues, just as he disagreed with other Presidents in his long and distinguished service in the Congress. But on the course of action he follows today in meeting aggression with the only thing the Communists understand, armed might, he has whatever support I can render him.

I seek not global conflict. I have two small children myself. I want my children to grow up in a world of peace. I do not want my son, John, to have to fight and die in some foreign land anymore than the brave mothers and fathers who have given their sons in the present struggle.

In my lifetime I have seen friends and relatives march off to three conflicts, many never to return. My heart is heavy in their loss, and in the realization that others must follow.

But I know full well that the vast majority of the young men of America today will give that last full measure of devotion with the same spirit that this Nation has had since Valley Forge.

To the President, I would remind him that the greatest man of peace who ever lived, our Lord Jesus Christ, had to resort to force to throw the moneychangers out of the temple. And that he was betrayed by those who should have understood him best, and he was crucified.

No great man in history has been able to escape unreasoning and blind vilification and opposition. No matter how much we progress in so many areas, there seems that there will always be those who cannot or will not understand the lessons of history. When you appease the bully in high school, he only becomes more demanding and belligerent. When you appease the criminal, his acts of violence only become more pronounced. And when you appease naked aggression, history teaches time and again without pause that you only encourage further aggression.

The Members of this Congress, regardless of party or region, need to support the President in this difficult hour. The decisions which he must make in this hour, and in this time, are as difficult as any that Washington, Lincoln, Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, or Kennedy ever had to face.

The man and the hour have met. On the shoulders of this one man rests the future of the world. His decisions not only affect the Nation he serves today, but the course of mankind.

I believe he has chosen the right path. This conflict was inevitable. It is far better that we make our stand today than that time in the future, and it might not have been far off, when it would have been in South America, not to mention all of the other parts of the globe where this would more than likely have come about.

I do not know how history will rank Lyndon B. Johnson. We are too close on the moment to know the full consequences of that which we do. But I believe that we have seen a turning point in history.

The Communists can appreciate force. The Communists will learn that this Nation means what it says; and I say categorically that we should never make a statement, never sign a treaty, never make a commitment, that we do not intend to honor.

I am not a warmonger. To the contrary, I want peace as devoutly as any man that has the privilege to serve in this Congress. But as one who wants peace, but not at any cost, the proper course for this Nation to follow is the one which Lyndon B. Johnson has charted. It is a dangerous course, the path will not be easy, and too many lives will be snuffed out in the bloom of youth in this struggle.

But to the line of names of Nathan Hale, Alvin York, and Colin P. Kelly will be added other Americans who knew the challenge which history placed before them, and they were willing to meet that challenge.

Mr. President, I support you in your determination that the world shall someday know peace. Your detractors in this regard could learn a lesson from history, but they have had able predecessors that history disdains.

History has a special contempt for those who seek to hide their heads in the sand when the great challenges of the time require courage and sacrifice. You are meeting this challenge; your actions have been forthright in carrying out the pledges which we have made.

History will not regard you lightly.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I believe I shall not object—will the gentleman from New York tell me if this involves a change in the schedule, as just announced by the majority leader, for next week?

Mr. SCHEUER. Absolutely not, to my knowledge. The delay was caused by me personally, because of my lateness in filing a supplementary statement of views. I know of no other reason for the late filing of the majority report.

Mr. HALL. I am sure the gentleman understands that this is most unusual, after special orders have started. I merely wished to clear that up. Do I correctly understand that there will be additional views or supplementary views to the report on the Economic Opportunity Act?

Mr. SCHEUER. Yes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I only wish to identify this for the RECORD. I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ITEM VETO LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced House Joint Resolution 477 which is designed to amend the Constitution to give the President authority to veto individual items in appropriation bills. I urge my colleagues to support this measure because I firmly believe that its adoption would put an end to a lot of unnecessary spending and could mean a saving of hundreds of millions a year to the taxpayer.

As we know only too well, the present system is one of the most ridiculous practices in government. The President, in acting on appropriation bills passed by Congress, must take all or nothing—the bad with the good. This means that he must accept a lot of unnecessary "pork barrel" projects in order to approve other projects that are vital to our national development, economy, and security.

Former President Eisenhower and the late President Kennedy strongly recommended changing this reprehensible practice. They had complained that their hands had been tied and that they had been powerless to eliminate obviously unsound programs without destroying many vitally needed projects.

I introduced similar legislation in the 88th Congress in an effort to secure this constitutional amendment, and I now urge the House Judiciary Committee to hold hearings on this resolution as soon as possible, so that we can have full congressional action on it during the 89th Congress. Unless this action is forthcoming, the Congress must assume full responsibility for the continuance of the present procedure because of its failure to act heretofore on the problem.

I know that I am not the first critic of this "all or nothing" system which governs our appropriation legislation. The history of opposition dates back to the 19th century, when President Arthur roundly denounced the abuses inherent in requiring a President to accept or reject an appropriation bill in its entirety. In 1882, President Arthur explained the problem by relating:

> As citizens of one State find that money, to raise which they in common with the whole country are taxed, is to be expended for local improvements in another State, they demand similar benefits for themselves.

Well, that problem is still with us today, and I say that it is time we resolved it, once and for all.

This bargaining and bickering on appropriation bills can reach the ridiculous. As a hypothetical Congressman Tubbs said to Congressman Nubbs, "If you don't vote for digging out Catfish Creek, I'll oppose your item on flood control for the Mississippi River." And, so that the lives and property of thousands of people may be safeguarded, Catfish Creek must be dug out, and the bill goes through with all its "pork" to be put before the President. Well, this is patently wrong, and I believe the President must be given the authority to exercise some selectivity in passing on appropriation matters.

I am convinced that the item-veto bill will save the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars annually and will eliminate a lot of this ridiculous give-and-take technique of voting appropriation bills. I am sure that most of my colleagues agree with me on this matter, and I sincerely hope that I can count on their bipartisan support for this important measure.

COMMUNIST ATTACKS ON PRESIDENT JOHNSON ARE TO BE EXPECTED BECAUSE HIS POLICIES ARE PAYING OFF FOR THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the wire services are carrying a story out of Warsaw, Poland, which quotes the Polish Minister of Defense, Marshal Marian Spychalski, as follows:

> Poland's Minister of Defense, Marshal Marian Spychalski, suggested at an election rally last night that President Johnson wilfully cheated American voters with his policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.
>
> He also said U.S. military strategy was based on exploiting the Moscow-Peiping split but was actually having the reverse effect.
>
> Both Johnson and British Prime Minister Harold Wilson are helping to prove that voters in the West have no real choice, Spychalski declared in a Poznan speech quoted by the Polish press agency.
>
> "Events of the past few months prove once more that a citizen in a capitalist country has no possibility to choose the policy more or less agreeable to him," Spychalski said. "Really, what choice did the citizens of the United States make in electing Lyndon Johnson as President?"

Mr. Speaker, I do not recall ever before seeing a statement by a responsible official that is more untrue and deceptive than the statement made by the Polish Minister of Defense. Indeed, it is rather ironic that this accusation against the President of the United States should be made at an election rally at Poznan, Poland, when the whole world knows the viciousness with which the Communists in Poland crushed, in the very city of Poznan, the efforts of the Polish people to liberate themselves from Communist rule. Why, the whole world knows what a mockery the Defense Minister of Poland is making of truth when he even suggests that there is any semblance of free elections under the Communist domination of this gallant nation of Poland.

Fortunately, the Polish people see through this hypocrisy of their Communist oppressors. I am delighted to say that, to my personal knowledge, if the 35 million people of Poland, who will never be Communists, indeed had the opportunity to participate in a free election in Poland, there would not be a Marshal Marian Spychalski as Defense Minister of Poland and there would not be a Gomulka as Premier of Poland. The Polish people have a history going back 1,000 years demonstrating their respect for freedom and dignity. Many pages of history have been written about their exploits going back to the beginning of time and running up through World War II and even to today, when the Polish people, after 20 years of illegal Communist rule, are still standing up heroically against Communist oppression. Poland's Defense Minister says President Johnson cheated the American voters with his policies in Vietnam. We are not surprised that Communist leaders throughout the whole world are attacking President Johnson today. This is because for the first time in 20 years the tide is starting to turn against them and we see the hope of victory in Vietnam. Yes; we stopped the Communist conspiracy in the Dominican Republic. I am not surprised that this Communist marshal is denouncing our great President, because our great President has shown the world, that the American people, both Democrats and Republicans, stand firmly behind him. We stand firmly behind Mr. Johnson in his determination that the retreat from communism has come to an end. There is a new order in this world today, a new order of hope. The Polish Defense Minister knows that better than anyone else. Yes; the stirrings of freedom are being detected among millions of people; 180 million oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain, oppressed by the Communists in these heroic captive nations, are beginning to feel it. So we can easily understand why Marshal Spychalski would today be denouncing President Johnson. It is because he sees the handwriting on the wall and sees that the spirit of freedom is becoming infectious.

The bold and daring policies of President Johnson are finally starting to pay off all over the world. I think we can look forward to the day when under the heroic and bold leadership of President Johnson, who in my judgment will go down in history as one of the greatest leaders this world has ever seen, I think we have a right to expect and believe that the enslaved and chained people, enslaved and chained by the Communist conspiracy for more than 20 years, are going to join the family of free nations at last.

Mr. Speaker, I could not let this arrogant attack upon our President go without mention here. We are going to see a great many more similar attacks by the Communists against our President. Yes indeed, his policies are paying off. We are going to see the revival and survival of freedom. We are going to see an expansion of freedom. The whole world is waiting for that today, I believe. If we were to go into Poland today and ask the 35 million people there what they think, if they had a choice between President Johnson and this Communist puppet, Marshal Spychalski, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the overwhelming majority of the Polish people would side with President Johnson.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection?

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KREBS. I am very happy for this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his excellent and timely remarks. I also would be pleased for the RECORD to show my association with the statement made by him.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

DR. JAMES W. TURPIN AND PROJECT CONCERN

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, my distinguished colleague from California, Congressman ROBERT WILSON, and I were privileged to host a luncheon in honor of a remarkable young American, Dr. James W. Turpin, the founder of Project Concern.

I take this time today to tell Members of the House of Representatives about Dr. Turpin and Project Concern because I think it is a story worth telling and one which must inspire us all.

Project Concern is a nonprofit medical aid group without religious and political affiliations, which operates hospitals and clinics, under the direction of Dr. Turpin, in South Vietnam and Hong Kong.

More than 20 nationalities are represented on the Project Concern staff of 100 people, many of them serving on a volunteer basis.

Both Congressman WILSON and I know Jim Turpin personally, have great admiration for him and his work, and count ourselves honored to serve as members of the board of directors of Project Concern.

Dr. Turpin, 37 years old, was reared in Ashland, Ky., where his family has lived for several generations. He grew up in a tradition of service to man for as a boy he followed his grandfather, Dr. James Wesley Duke, through the hills of eastern Kentucky.

Following a period of service in the U.S. Navy, Jim Turpin enrolled at Emory University in Atlanta, Ga., where he completed his undergraduate work and continued his studies in the School of Theology. While studying theology, Jim Turpin completed the requirements for entrance to medical school, and then went on successfully to complete medical school. Following his internship and residency, he went into general practice in Coronado, Calif.

MEDICAL CLINICS IN HONG KONG

In Coronado, Jim Turpin and his wife, Martha, became active in community life. Jim served on the city council and taught a Sunday school class. This may well have been the launching pad for Project Concern, for Jim invited his adult group to "join me and let us do something about service instead of sitting here talking about it." As a result of an on-the-spot inspection of conditions, Jim and the Sunday school class members volunteered their time and services to help with a medical clinic and school at Casa de Todos in Tijuana, Mexico.

In November 1961, Project Concern was incorporated in the State of California as a nonprofit organization. It took less than a year to raise the support necessary to begin the first Project Concern medical clinics in the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong. An ever increasing circle of friends agreed to give financial support. In September 1962, Project Concern was at work in Hong Kong. Three outpatient clinics have now been established in Hong Kong. One serves the walled city of Kowloon, the second aids the squatters of Jordan Valley, while the third center floats on two junks in the center of the Yaumati typhoon shelter. These three centers have brought medical assistance and food to the masses of poor Chinese who have crowded into Hong Kong in recent years and for whom no other medical aid is available.

In 1963 I had the great privilege of visiting Dr. and Mrs. Turpin and their four children in Hong Kong and personally observed them in action in the walled city of Kowloon and rendering medical service to refugees on the floating clinic in the harbor. It was one of the most moving experiences of my life.

PROJECT CONCERN IN SOUTH VIETNAM

More recently, Dr. Turpin and Project Concern have gone into South Vietnam and have established a small hospital in the village of DaMpao, some 150 miles northeast of Saigon. Inpatients number over 50 per month and outpatients over 700 per month. In addition, a village medical officer—VMO—program has been established. This cooperative program between Project Concern and the Government of South Vietnam trains local young men and women in the fundamentals of medical assistance. Graduates return to their villages as medical officers certified by the Government. A Project Concern team, with a doctor, nurse, and laboratory technician, visits each of the villages periodically, and with the assistance of the village medical officer conducts clinic sessions with full medical services. In addition, the village medical officer, as well as the Project Concern personnel, are actively engaged in improving the living conditions of the villages in the region where they are located, seeking to prevent disease and to improve the standard of living.

DR. TURPIN ON TOUR IN THE UNITED STATES

Dr. Turpin is now in the United States on a 10-week tour on behalf of Project Concern. He must raise funds so that the work of Project Concern can be continued and, hopefully, expanded. Since Project Concern is a nonprofit organization and not connected with any religious, welfare, or governmental group, its entire support must come from interested individuals who know about the project and realize what a valuable program it is.

Here is what even small amounts of money contributed to Project Concern can do: $1 provides 7 days of treatment for removal of parasitic intestinal worms; $5 provides 21 days of treatment for severe fungus disease in a child; $10 provides 3 months of medicine and food necessary to overcome malnutrition in a child; $25 provides salary and support for a native village medical officer and basic medical care for an entire village for 1 month; $50 provides necessary daily medical treatment for tuberculosis for 1 year.

So, Mr. Speaker, even a modest contribution can mean a great deal to some individual or village in South Vietnam or Hong Kong. Anyone who wishes to learn more about this imaginative venture in bettering the lives of people in other countries can write for more information to: Project Concern, Inc., Postmaster, San Diego, Calif.

DR. TURPIN'S VISIT TO SOUTH BEND

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD several newspaper accounts of Dr. Turpin's current tour across the United States, including a report in the South Bend Tribune following his visit to my own home city of South Bend:

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, May 6, 1965]

VIET JUNGLE DOCTOR BATTLES IGNORANCE

(By Thomas Serge)

Intestinal parasites and witch doctors are two of the major medical problems in South Vietnam, Dr. James W. Turpin, a 37-year-old American physician who operates a hospital in the Vietnam jungle, said Wednesday night at St. Mary's College.

Dr. Turpin, who organized Project Concern, a nonprofit medical aid group, said that in the southeast Asian countries modern medical science often is scorned by the natives until traditional forms of sorcery have been tried and failed.

Dr. Turpin captivated an audience of 200 as he spoke in the new dining hall on the college campus. He is on a $250,000 fund drive for Project Concern, which he and his wife, Martha, founded 3½ years ago. The project is active in South Vietnam and Hong Kong. The doctor spoke at noon, Wednesday, to the South Bend Rotary Club.

His staff, which now numbers 99, originally worked among Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, but has also established a one-story 25-bed hospital in the village of DaMpao in South Vietnam, about 200 miles northeast of Saigon.

The former Navy doctor, who served an internship at Crawford Long Hospital, Atlanta, Ga., and established residency in Santa Rosa, Calif., also operates thatched-roof clinics for tribesmen in 25 surrounding villages.

TRIBESMEN TRAINED

The clinics are serviced by 35 young Koho tribesmen trained by the Turpin team, who are certified by the South Vietnam Government, to dispense first aid, medication for tuberculosis and malaria, and provide other assistances.

Dr. Turpin found deep personal pleasure in aiding starving and disease-afflicted persons when he and his wife, Martha, visited Tijuana, infamous Mexico border town, during days off from his general practice in southern California.

He said he experienced an emotional change while crossing the Mexico border one summer night almost 4 years ago, after laboring nearly 12 hours to save the lives of a young Mexican girl and her sister who were suffering from bronchial pneumonia.

That night he realized he needed these people as much as they needed him, the doctor stated.

While working with the Chinese and South Vietnamese, Dr. Turpin witnessed things he considered to be pathetic beyond imagination.

He cited the spectacle of a starving baby sucking at a mother's breast and screaming pitifully because its mother's body was so racked with malnutrition she could not give the child nourishment. And seeing thousands of children so undernourished their digestive systems were feeding on muscle fiber.

The greatest medical problem among these people other than malaria, tuberculosis, and cholera, is intestinal parasites, he said.

BOY IS AIDED

A nonmedical problem his staff must contend with is superstition in Hong Kong and Vietnam.

Dr. Turpin told of a Vietnamese woman who came to the clinic with her child who was suffering from large facial abscesses. Convinced her son was possesed by evil spirits, she brought the boy to him as a last resort after a village sorcerer's methods of cure had failed.

The witch doctor sacrificed a water buffalo and a chicken, paid for by the mother, and also dotted a piece of paper with dyes and made the boy swallow it.

The doctor lanced the abscesses and the boy showed immediate improvement. He tactfully told the woman her son had been in the spirit-separating room and she was so impressed she brought many other patients to him.

Project Concern has worked with such a variety of races that it has been called a "Little United Nations," and sometimes, "Little Hope."

Dr. Turpin left Vietnam convinced that the war is being won there and that the war is a necessary evil.

RAIDS BOOST MORALE

He said recent American air raids on North Vietnam are a tremendous morale booster for the South Vietnamese, and he noted a greater interest has been shown by people who previously cared little for their own welfare.

He warned that these persons are starving, want jobs, education and security, and will take these things from the first country to offer it, but he pointed out that they are not particularly interested in communism but are only seeking a means to these ends.

The young doctor predicted the village of Mpao would go Communist within a week if the United States were to withdraw from the war.

"The battle in Vietnam cannot be termed a civil war, there are too many other countries involved in the fight," he said.

WILL WALK FOR DAYS

The South Vietnamese are suffering horrible indignities and will walk for 2 or 3 days to reach medical clinics, according to Dr. Turpin.

In one of the colored slides a chief of a mountain tribe was depicted in underclothing—the only garments he possessed.

A man came to the clinic garbed in a woman's dress for lack of anything else to wear, Dr. Turpin said.

Presently, wells and sanitary ditches are being dug, and when screening is available dwellings are secured with it to improve existing conditions.

Turning to field activities in the colony of Hong Kong, Dr. Turpin said more than 40,000 boat people in the Yaumati typhoon shelter receive medical aid from two floating 65-foot junks equipped with modern medical facilities.

CLINIC AT CEMETERY

The boat dwellers live their lives and die afloat, and many of them are too superstitious to even go ashore for medical care.

On the mainland nearby, a clinic was established in a abandoned cemetery building given to them by the Government, Dr. Turpin said.

Project Concern has no specific religious or political affiliations. "The project wants only to bring the best American medical aid possible to those who need it the most," the doctor said.

Dr. Turpin's wife and children, Keith, 14, Payton, 12, Scott, 7, and Jan, 6, returned to California after spending the summer with him in Vietnam.

PREMEDICAL COURSE

Martha has enrolled in a premedical course since returning, he said.

Dr. Turpin was introduced by Miss Geraldine Hatt, a social studies teacher at Central High School who worked as a volunteer for Project Concern in Hong Kong in 1963.

Sister Maria Renata, C.S.C., president of St. Mary's College, and Miss Lillian Chard, Grayslake, Ill., senior class president, were hostesses. College seniors, alumni, and staff attended.

Mrs. Arthur Schenck, president of the South Bend branch of the AAUW; Mrs. Eugene Anderson, and Mrs. Ralph Emlong, cochairmen of the recent graduates committee, were in charge of arrangements.

Refreshments were served before the program.

[From the South Bend Tribune, Apr. 24, 1965]

Doctor Seeks Vietnam Fund—Wants $250,000 To Help Treat Tribesmen

SAN FRANCISCO.—An American doctor who has spent the past year treating mountain tribesmen in South Vietnam launched a nationwide drive today to raise $250,000 to help them.

"After living and working with these people, I can say that they deserve the best help we can supply," declares Dr. James W. Turpin. "They are making a genuine effort to help themselves."

Turpin, 37, has set up a 25-bed hospital in the village of DaMpao about 150 miles northeast of Saigon. He and an international staff also operate out-patient clinics for mountain tribesmen in 25 surrounding villages.

NO TROUBLE FROM REDS

"Vietcong guerrillas have given us no significant trouble," says Turpin. "And I'm sure we've treated some of them."

Turpin, who wears a brass bracelet signifying honorary membership in the Koho tribe, says morale has soared among the Vietnamese and U.S. soldier-advisers since the war against the Communist Vietcong was stepped up.

"Nobody likes to fight a war he can't win," he says.

The Turpin team has trained 35 young Koho tribesmen as village medical officers, certified by the South Vietnam Government, to dispense emergency first aid, tuberculosis and malaria medication, and other assistance to their fellow tribesmen.

"They are our most important contribution," Turpin says.

Turpin said the training toward self-sufficiency is a cooperative effort of the Government and Project Concern, an independent, nonprofit relief organization the physician and his wife, Martha, founded 3½ years ago at Coronado, Calif.

[From the Indianapolis Star, May 23, 1965]

Jungle Doctor Battles Agony, Disease in Viet

(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—Dr. James W. Turpin looks like a movie director's dream of what he really is—a jungle doctor.

And last week, thanks to Representatives JOHN BRADEMAS, Democrat, of Indiana, and BOB WILSON, Republican, of California, Dr. Turpin shared some of his extremely practical knowledge with a few Congressmen—too few, unfortunately. BRADEMAS and WILSON are directors of Dr. Turpin's mercy operation called, "Concern Inc."

The strikingly handsome young Kentucky-born physician, moved by the suffering of people in underdeveloped nations, left his practice in Coronado, Calif., to seek a new career in medicine out of the mass of agony in southeast Asia.

There, in an abandoned U.S. Special Services compound, he treats 3,500 Vietnamese a month. And he weeps over their poverty, their hunger, and their suffering.

His wife is studying medicine with the hope of joining his work. Dr. Turpin is in the United States now trying to raise $250,000 to carry forward the work of his "Concern, Inc."

The Vietnamese call him Bacsi Hakkah, the "Doctor Who Remembers (Us)," and in Hong Kong, he is known as Kai Yeh, meaning "Godfather."

He has won the devotion of the natives because he gives them help without question. He serves under the little blue-and-white banner of "Concern Inc.," which is wholly international, with compassion.

Dr. Turpin has high praise for the American Special Service Corps in Vietnam. But he is critical of the petty Americans who sit in Saigon. "Get them out in the villages," he pleads, noting that if America withdraws from Vietnam, then the Communists will take over.

In his medical compound, he has trained bright young Vietnamese to be village medical officers, outfitted them with white jackets and stethoscopes. They can dispense medicine for common ailments, refer seriously ill patients to Dr. Turpin and his associates.

Children with stomachs bloated from hunger, mothers weeping over children that nurse starvation-dried breasts, men who come with their bony nakedness covered by tattered dresses or scanty short underwear—all these affect Dr. Turpin deeply.

"To think that somehow generations of poverty have inured these people to suffering is red-white-and-blue naivete," he says. "The truth is, each generation discovers hunger, privation, and suffering anew."

The stepped-up American battle against the Communists has lifted the enthusiasm even of the formerly indifferent Vietnamese, Dr. Turpin said.

The tiny effort of Concern, Inc., is but a speck of mercy in an ocean of sorrows, but it works, and Dr. Turpin thinks it could work everywhere.

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 2, 1965]

Doctor Tells of Progress in South Vietnam—Troops' Morale Improving, He Says

(By Thomas Powers)

The contention that the United States is making no progress in South Vietnam is "absolutely false," a 36-year-old medical missionary told 600 members of the Illinois Junior Chamber of Commerce yesterday.

Dr. James W. Turpin, who has set up hospitals in South Vietnam and in Hong Kong, said that "for every atrocity, there are 1,000 acts of compassion in South Vietnam."

SEES ADDED STABILITY

Speaking in the Sherman House, he said there has been a marked increase in morale in our military forces, mainly because of the training and support being given by U.S. special forces which the doctor labeled, "the best of our manhood."

He said the South Vietnam Government has become considerably more stable, particularly since the recent reverses suffered by the Communist Vietcong forces.

He said the U.S. aid program which is costing $2 million a day can "justifiably be criticized not because of its lack of effectiveness but because so much of it is involved in noninvolvement."

He explained that Vietnamese farmers thumb their noses at trucks bearing fertilizer and farm equipment to them "because the sacks are dumped at their feet. We need to have more of those distributing the aid to move out of the large villages and move in where the really poor people are, to know emotionally and spiritually what it means to starve to death."

He told the Jaycees:

"I do not want your charity for them. Come off of your sanctimonious high horse. These people do need you. They are suffering indescribable physical privation. But you must also understand that you need them."

Dr. Turpin was a general practitioner in a suburb of San Diego until he paid a visit to a Tijuana, Mexico, slum and was appalled by what he saw. He organized Project Concern, Inc., a not-for-profit organization that provided hospitals and clinics, including two floating hospitals, for water dwellers in Hong Kong.

Turpin, a Methodist, is a graduate of the Emory University College of Theology in Atlanta.

[From the Chicago's American, May 2, 1965]

Viet Morale Up, Medic Here Says

U.S. bombing of Vietcong supply lines has brought a 100-percent increase in South Vietnamese morale, according to an American medical volunteer in that country.

Nevertheless, Dr. James W. Turpin, founder and president of Project Concern, sees a 20-year involvement of U.S. forces in South Vietnam as necessary to keep it free of Communist domination.

Declaring that the Vietnamese, like other oriental people, are "not ready for democracy yet," he said U.S. intervention will be required until they become self-sufficient. Should the United States pull out now South Vietnam would become a "Communist colony in a matter of days," he said.

ADDRESSED PRESS LUNCHEON

He made the remarks at a press luncheon in the Chicago Athletic Club given by Mrs. Harry D. Thorsen, Jr., president of the project's North Shore women's auxiliary, which is also sponsoring a special awards dinner for benefactors tomorrow evening in the Orrington Hotel, Evanston.

Named in 1963 as one of the 10 outstanding young men of the year by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, Dr. Turpin was the keynote speaker yesterday at the Jaycee's State convention in the Sherman House.

Project Concern got its start in 1962, when the physician-minister left his medical practice in Coronado, Calif., set up two medical clinics in Hong Kong with the aid of four volunteers.

RUNS FLOATING CLINIC

One, known as a "floating clinic," is housed on two Chinese junks and serves some 200,000 boat families who live on sampans in the typhoon shelters of the bay. The other is located in the walled city of Kowloon, where some 250,000 people live in a 10-block area.

The work has since been extended to South Vietnam, where the project maintains a 25-bed hospital in the hill country 150 miles north of Saigon.

Among those to be honored at tomorrow's dinner are Mr. and Mrs. W. Clement Stone, who recently gave the project $16,000 to double the $8,000 raised by the women's auxiliary.

[From the Rochester Post-Bulletin, May 8, 1965]

DEMOCRACY IN VIETNAM NOT THE ANSWER NOW

(By Thomas Furth)

Democracy is not the answer right now in Vietnam. However, some strong form of government must be established in the grief-stricken southeast Asian country.

This is the opinion of Dr. James Turpin, who will be the featured speaker tonight at the annual Minnesota Junior Chamber of Commerce State convention banquet in the Mayo Civic Auditorium Arena.

Dr. Turpin, who heads the Jaycee-sponsored Project Concern in Asia, met briefly today with three national vice presidents of the junior chamber of commerce. A former Outstanding Young Man in America in 1962, Dr. Turpin gave indications on the progress of the program.

"We need them (the Vietnamese) as much as they need us," Dr. Turpin confided. "The fulfillment of spiritual and emotional needs we receive from them helps compensate for the material welfare we provide them."

Born in Ashland, Ky., Dr. Turpin, 37, feels the strongest trump card for communism in Vietnam is dedication. "The Communist cadre will do anything to become one of them (Vietnamese)."

However, regardless how poor and sick some Vietnamese are, Dr. Turpin continued, they strive to maintain dignity. And "Project Concern," has received a good amount of support from the Jaycees in Vietnam, he added.

What Americans must sell in this region, Dr. Turpin said, is democracy and Christianity. Through Project Concern steps can be taken in that direction, he said.

Project Concern is an independent, nonprofit relief organization, in which clinics and hospitals are established overseas. Self-sufficiency is the anticipated end result of Project Concern's efforts.

Jaycees national vice presidents visiting here are G. Merritt Martin of Saline, Mich., James Skidmore of Breck Township in New Jersey, and Dr. Fred Rainey of Elizabethtown, Ky.

Skidmore, national Jaycees public relations chairman, announced that St. Paul will be host in January to the congress for the selection of the 10 outstanding young men of America.

Promoted by the Jaycees, nominees for the national honor do not have to be Jaycee members, Skidmore said. The 10 finalists are picked from approximately 20,000 solicitations across the Nation. Some past winners include J. Edgar Hoover, Walt Disney, Richard Nixon, and John F. Kennedy.

* * * * *

[From the Ashland (Ky.) Saturday Evening Independent, Apr. 24, 1965]

ASHLANDER LAUNCHES DRIVE TO AID SOUTH VIET TRIBES—DR. JAMES TURPIN SEEKS $250,000 FOR "PEOPLE WHO DESERVE BEST"

(By William C. Harrison)

SAN FRANCISCO.—An American doctor who has spent the past year treating mountain tribesmen in South Vietnam launched a nationwide drive today to raise $250,000 to help them.

"After living and working with these people, I can say that they deserve the best help we can supply," declared Dr. James W. Turpin. "They are making a genuine effort to help themselves."

Turpin, 37, has set up a 25-bed hospital in a village about 150 miles northeast of Saigon. He and an international staff also operate outpatient clinics for mountain tribesment in 25 surrounding villages.

"Vietcong guerrillas have given us no significant trouble," says Turpin. "And I'm sure we've treated some of them."

The Turpin team has trained 25 young Koho tribesmen as villege medical officers, certified by the South Vietnam Government, to dispense emergency first aid, tuberculosis and malaria medication and other assistance to their fellow tribesmen.

"They are our most important contribution," Turpin says.

The training toward self-sufficiency is a cooperative effort of the Government and Project Concern, an independent, nonprofit relief organization the physician and his wife, Martha, founded 3½ years ago at Coronado, Calif.

Turpin had conducted a general practice in Coronado for 5 years when the couple set out in 1962 to open the first Project Concern medical clinic—on a Chinese junk for the boat dwellers of Hong Kong Harbor. It has grown to three clinics treating nearly 500 patients a day in the British crown colony.

Some 20 nationalities are represented on the staff of more than 100 doctors, nurses, dentists, pharmacists, teachers and others presently working in the program. They expanded into South Vietnam last year.

Turpin said Project Concern is independent of any government, church or other affiliation, and is registered with the State Department's Agency for International Development.

A cross-country, 2-month tour will take Turpin to many major cities and his hometown of Ashland, Ky.

Mrs. Turpin and their four children, ranging in age from 6 to 14, have returned to Coronado. She has decided she wants to be a doctor, too, and is getting her premed education at Western University, San Diego.

[From the Chicago Daily News, May 1, 1965]

PROJECT CONCERN CLINICS—U.S. DOCTOR FIGHTING REDS IN VIETNAM WITH MEDICINE

(By Charles Cleveland)

A childhood dream is helping to win the war in Vietnam.

As a youngster in Ashland, Ky., Jim Turpin drove in a model T through the mountains with his grandfather-doctor and dreamed some day of becoming a medical missionary in China.

Today he is operating four clinics in Hong Kong, one in South Vietnam and still dreaming—this time about clinics to aid 1 million hill people in north Thailand.

Politics and wars, however, aren't his concern—he's a doctor treating patients, including the Vietcong Communists, but the work of his clinic has already converted at least one village from communism.

Dr. Turpin is a tall, handsome man with obvious dedication. He is in Chicago on a 2-month tour to rekindle interest in his "Project Concern," and to raise funds for his work.

He was a doctor in Coronado, Calif., successful financially but dissatisfied—"I was only doing what any other of the 1,200 doctors in San Diego could do."

Through his Sunday school class he learned of a clinic in the slums of Tijuana, Mexico, and he began devoting his off-hours to it. This, in turn, reawakened his childhood dream.

With the aid of friends he raised $10,000 and moved his wife, four children, and another couple to Hong Kong. There he set up a floating clinic to bring medical care to the thousands of refugees who live on the waters.

"I believe we have to take medical care to the people," Dr. Turpin said. "It isn't enough to set up fancy hospitals in town."

A tour of Australia, and word-of-mouth attention, brought additional volunteers. Now there are 12 doctors and 33 staff members with 16 nationalities represented and 3 additional clinics in operation that treat 500 patients a day.

A New Zealand doctor told Dr. Turpin about the central highlands of South Vietnam and he started a clinic there. Patients come from as far away as Saigon, a distance of 200 miles.

"You've got to get out your book on tropical medicine," Dr. Turpin said. "We treat everything—leprosy, TB, cholera, malaria.

"With oral medicine we cure skin fungus in a week that the sorcerers (witch doctors) tried vainly to cure for years. We even have one sorcerer on our staff now."

Are we losing the war in Vietnam?

"Absolutely not," Dr. Turpin said. "We need more military aid, I suppose, but more than anything we need those who are concerned about the people as individuals."

Dr. Turpin's own philosophy is a guideline: "I try to let the patients know I'm as happy they came to our clinic as they are to be treated."

Saturday, Dr. Turpin was honored by the Illinois Junior Chamber of Commerce at the Sherman House; Sunday night he will speak to North Shore volunteers of Project Concern at the Orrington Hotel, Evanston.

Mr. Speaker, I also insert Dr. Turpin's latest newsletter about Project Concern and an article by George A. Kellogg:

PROJECT CONCERN—A MONTHLY NEWSLETTER

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 1965.

DEAR FRIENDS: How much are you worth? Courts have awarded more than $250,000 on occasion in determining the monetary value of a human life. Sometimes we feel worth that much or more. Sometimes we feel worth nothing much at all.

In Hong Kong and South Vietnam we are encountering regularly situations where human dignity, individual worth, and personal freedom are considered as insignificant. In Hong Kong life is very cheap to many of the refugees. In Vietnam, we have had to stress to our village medical officers the importance of tender, patient and loving care for the sick individual. They are learning with amazement the extent to which we will go in time and effort to cure just one person.

I brought Nguyen Van Khanh, a 3-year-old refugee boy from North Vietnam, back with me to California recently. In San

Francisco's Children's Hospital, Dr. Victor Richards and his dedicated staff operated on this frail "blue baby." The hospital donated thousands of dollars' worth of the most modern diagnostic studies. The surgeons, nurses, blood bank and scores of others said, "Yes, this Vietnamese refugee child is worthy of the best we can offer."

It was discovered at surgery that the heart deformity was too extensive to be repaired. Our disappointment was keen, but our staffs in Vietnam and Hong Kong, as well as the 6,000 fellow refugees from communism in Tung Nghia know that we are willing to go all the way with Nguyen and with each one of them. This fact expressed believably scores of times daily is having a profound effect on the lives of those who are turning to us in ever increasing numbers.

How much are you worth? The answer may be directly proportional to the courage you have to love believably the people who desperately require your concern.

"To be loved, and to love, need courage, the courage to judge certain values as of ultimate concern—and to take the jump and stake everthing on these values."[1] The East and West are meeting today in the atmosphere of respect, understanding, and compassion. In Yaumati, the Walled City, Jordan Valley and DaMpao the tens of thousands know we are involved with them in active concern.

Yours in dedicated concern,

JIM TURPIN, M.D.

"IT'S MY SHOUT, MATES," SAYS MR. VAIR

In celebration of his birthday which he spent in Hong Kong, Mr. Howard Vair decided to foot the bill for the entire Project Concern program in Hong Kong for 1 full day. For 1 day he paid the salaries of all the doctors, nurses, lab technicians, pharmacists, drivers, clerks, boatmen, and registrars. In short, he furnished the Hong Kong payroll for April 22, 1965. For that day he paid for the drugs, the fuel that runs the personnel and baggage vans. He paid for the telephones, the electricity, the water. He paid the rent and for the medicine bottles, the bandages, the injection fluids, the cough sirups. He paid one three-hundred-and-sixty-fifth of the annual fee for the auditors who now are busy seeing that donations are properly spent and meticulously accounted for. On his birthday, Mr. Howard Vair of Detroit, Mich., known the world over as one of the foremost candy men in the United States, is "Mr. Project Concern, H.K."

Mr. Howard Vair is an American—with the American's typical sympathetic interest in his fellow man and the equally typical urge to do something practical about it, when he finds real need. And when Mr. Vair said, "It's my shout, mates," he was using the phraseology of another generous, warm-hearted people—the Australians whose expression this is.

On the Italian cruise ship *Flavia* which brought Mr. Vair to Hong Kong, he was the only American among 700 Australians and during his almost 4 weeks with them, he learned that when an Aussie decides to foot the bill, he says, "It's my shout, mates."

"I figured that it costs about $10 an hour to run the three Hong Kong clinics," said Mr. Vair after seeing the work being carried on in these charity medical facilities and asking for the annual budget figure. Ten dollars American that would be, let's see now. I got quite good at this Australian pound stuff on the *Flavia* that would be just almost exactly £4 Australian. Anyone wanting to pay for running the whole shebang for an hour, could do it for £4 Australian—or for $10 American."

Mr. Vair's check to Project Concern is for 24 hours: Two hundred and forty lovely American dollars. Thank you, Mr. Vair. And a very happy birthday. You've made it a happy day for about 500 sick people and 1,000 hungry children.

REABURNS ARE REUNITED

The apartment below decks on the *Yauh Oi* is ringing again with the shouts of little children. On the roof the swings are flying after hanging idly since the Turpins moved away. And Pung Yauh, the *Yauh Oi*'s dog, has five instead of four small fry to play with him, for the Reaburns of Collie, West Australia, have come to stay.

Mrs. Reaburn (Noela, a trained nurse) arrived with her children several weeks before her doctor husband was able to get away. Now all are reunited as Dr. Bob Reaburn joins the staff of Project Concern, bringing his medical skills, his dedication and his wonderful personality to the people served in Hong Kong by the three clinics.

This is not Dr. Reaburn's first introduction to Project Concern. In the early summer of 1964, Dr. Reaburn came as a volunteer for several weeks to find out whether or not the work was as he had envisioned it. Satisfied that it was what he wants, he returned to Collie to dispose of his very successful practice so that he could return on a permanent basis. Welcome aboard.

DR. TURPIN TOURS UNITED STATES

A brief visit with his family in Coronado, Calif., preceded a 10-week cross-country trip began with 6 days in San Francisco, including 3 days as a guest-in-residence at Stanford University. Also on the April itinerary were Seattle and Vancouver, B.C.

On the schedule for May and June:

May 1–4, 6, and 7	Chicago.
May 5	South Bend.
May 8	Rochester.
May 9–10–11	Minneapolis.
May 12–15, 17–21	New York City.
May 16	Jersey City.
May 22	Asbury Park, N.J.
May 23–24–25	Washington, D.C.
May 26–29	Atlanta.
May 29–30	Tampa.
May 31	Miami Beach.
June 1–2	Jacksonville.
June 3–4–5	Dallas.
June 6	Manhattan, Kans.
June 7	Topeka.
June 8	Lincoln-Omaha.
June 9–10	Kansas City.
June 11	Tulsa.
June 12	Wichita.
June 13	Greensburg.
June 14–16	Los Angeles.
June 17–20	San Diego.
June 22	Buffalo.
June 23–24	New York City.
June 25–28	Ashland, Ky.
June 29	Cincinnati.
June 30	Phoenix.
July 1	Oakland.
July 2–3	Coronado.

[From Hospital Topics magazine, October 1963]

PROJECT CONCERN: MODERN MEDICAL CARE FOR HONG KONG'S DESTITUTE

(The author is a retired vice president of Ethicon, Inc., and a consultant to Johnson & Johnson. When he submitted this special report after his visit to Project Concern in August, he called the project "as worthy a medical cause as I ever became acquainted with," and described its founder as "one of the finest young doctors I've ever met.")

(By George A. Kellogg)

A day with James Turpin, M.D., is something like a day with Dr. Tom Dooley and Dr. Albert Schweitzer rolled into one.

After being ordained as a Methodist minister, Dr. Turpin decided to fulfill his childhood resolve to become a physician. He obtained his M.D. degree from the Emory University School of Medicine, and practiced for 5 years in Coronado, Calif., devoting a day a week to charity medical practice in Tijuana, Mexico. Then he and his young wife decided to give their full time to rendering medical care to the Chinese poor of Hong Kong.

On their own, without the backing of any religious or other charitable organization, they organized Project Concern. Just 2 years later, they have a staff of 16 paid and voluntary doctors, nurses, and pharmacists. They operate two outpatient medical clinics—one in the old Kowloon Walled City and the other aboard a beautifully rebuilt Chinese junk, in the Yaumati typhoon shelter in Hong Kong.

Here are 8,000 junks on which live some 35,000 people. Families range from 3 to 17 persons—some living on sampans measuring from 12 to 20 feet.

The floating clinic, *Yauh Oi* (Brotherly Love), has been in the water about 7 months. An average of 150 patients come each day. Unless penniless, they are charged 50 cents Hong Kong money (8½ cents United States). "With no charge," says Dr. Turpin, "they would be apt to think the drugs of no value and not take them." Little do they realize that they frequently are given drugs with a value of $2 to $10 in U.S. money.

In the 2 clinics, Dr. Turpin and his staff treat over 4,000 patients each month. In the Walled City, a filthy, squalor-ridden area of some 10 square blocks, Project Concern has teamed with a group of British nurses and other volunteer workers to provide modern medical care.

There are many health clinics in Hong Kong, but Project Concern and Dr. Turpin reach the most destitute of this great city and prove to them that modern medical care can better their health and their lives.

The most common diseases encountered on the floating clinic are: tuberculosis—pulmonary, skin, and bone; parasitic diseases of the skin and intestinal tract; trachoma; bronchial diseases; iron deficiency anemia, due primarily to a diet consisting almost exclusively of rice and fish; opium addiction, and scabies.

One elderly Chinese gentleman, calling at the ship on his own little sampan, was examined and given drugs and vitamins galore. He did not improve. When a more thorough investigation was made some time later, the staff found that while he took his drugs, he was starving to death. Since then his little sampan has been named hospital bed No. 1—for Project Concern now feeds him.

The project is nonsectarian. The staff includes a Buddhist, a Catholic, a Jew, a Presbyterian, and representatives of other faiths. Support comes from everywhere—mostly from individuals who are amazed at its accomplishments toward good health and moral improvement among the poorest of all Chinese. Contributions are tax deductible.

Last year, Dr. Turpin was chosen as one of the 10 outstanding young men of 1962 by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce. After receiving his award in Little Rock, Ark., he went on to New York City. His lecturing on Project Concern (which, by the way, helped bring in the money that made the floating clinic possible) aroused the interest of Hazel E. Hunt, a public school principal in Jersey City, N.J., who served in his clinics during the summer on a volunteer basis, paying all her own expenses. The volunteers—from New Jersey, New York, California, Kansas, and other areas—include two college students paying their own way.

I was accompanied to the Walled City clinic and to the ship by my 11-year-old daughter, who said that day was the best day of our trip to the Orient. While we were on the ship, an officer and crew from the Navy carrier U.S.S. *Hancock*, stationed in

---

[1] Erich Fromm, "The Art of Loving," World Perspectives.

Hong Kong harbor, came aboard with a load of surplus drug and surgical supplies from the carrier's stories. Similar gifts went to a Catholic hospital and other institutions in Hong Kong.

The meeting between Dr. Turpin and Lt. D. A. Pedersen of the *Hancock* was especially moving, for the last time they had met was when Dr. Turpin delivered Lieutenant Pedersen's first child, in Coronado, Calif., 3 years ago.

Project Concern, Inc., has its U.S. headquarters at Post Office Box 536, Coronado, Calif.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT PROJECT CONCERN

Mr. Speaker, I further include at this point in the RECORD a series of questions and answers about Project Concern:

Most people know in a general way of Project Concern and the work of its founder, Dr. James W. Turpin, among the refugees from communism in Hong Kong and—more recently—among the distressed people of South Vietnam. But many questions are being asked about the details of the program, its development to date, and its aims and hopes for the future. This is an attempt to answer some of these questions.

Question. What do the words "Project Concern" mean in connection with the activities of Dr. Turpin?

Answer. The simplest answer is to say that they represent a program of activities arising from the concern that Dr. Turpin, his associates, and supporters have for those multitudes critically ill from diseases stemming from malnutrition, exposure, and other hardships, and whose offspring are being ushered into a world of uncertain survival. Dr. Turpin is concerned about these people. His project is his plan to help them.

Question. It is my understanding that Dr. Turpin's program has been underway for some time. When was Project Concern launched?

Answer. Dr. Turpin had always been interested in helping the underprivileged. During the time he practiced medicine in Coronado, Calif., he—with his wife, Martha—used to spend his day off in the children's clinic in the canyons of Tijuana, finding in work among these people an inner sense of fulfillment that made him long to devote all his time in service to the very poor.

It was the urgency of the need in Hong Kong that made him decide in the summer of 1961 to organize Project Concern. He began immediately to present his plans to friends, colleagues, and the public through correspondence, speaking engagements, radio, TV etc. in an effort to enlist interest and support. The high point of these activities was the meeting in the ballroom of the Hotel del Coronado on September 11, 1961, at which the formal announcement of the launching of Project Concern was made. This was followed by the filing of its articles of incorporation in Sacramento, Calif., on November 1, 1961.

A few weeks later Dr. Turpin was on his way to Hong Kong to make a brief survey of the refugee situation for himself. He returned to continue his fundraising at an ever-accelerating pace for some months—meanwhile still finding it necessary to carry on his medical practice.

It was on August 10, 1962, that Dr. Turpin took his wife and four children to Hong Kong to devote his life to those whose tragic need had so overwhelmed him. They sailed from Long Beach, Calif., on the SS *Arcadia* at midnight. Paul and Shirley Fleener, friends who had worked with Jim and Martha during the period of preparation, sailed with them, to become a part of the Hong Kong staff of Project Concern.

Question. How is the doctor carrying out his program in Hong Kong—specifically?

Answer. As of today, January 25, 1965, Project Concern has established three clinics in Hong Kong. The first was on the mainland of Hong Kong, in the squalid, overcrowded 10-square-block area of Kowloon, known as the Walled City.[1] Here, in a 16- by 26-foot schoolroom, Project Concern treats 125 or more patients each morning. In addition, approximately 400 children come each day to receive a glass of milk, a chewable vitamin tablet, and 2 high-protein wafers. Malnutrition is the most common disease condition in the Walled City. Evidence of the confidence Dr. Turpin has won may easily be seen in the way little ones whose parents are working at their meager jobs come to the clinic alone, some bringing still smaller ones in their arms or tied on their backs.

A second—floating—clinic is anchored in Yaumati Typhoon Shelter. It is comprised of two boats: *Yauh Oi* (Brotherly Love), launched March 9, 1963, and alongside it *Ming Ling* (Love One Another), launched November 29 the same year. Together they offer medical, minor surgical, eye, ear, nose, throat, dental, and X-ray facilities to the boat people, of whom it is estimated there are about 45,000 in this harbor.[2] The lower deck of *Yauh Oi* has been made into living quarters for the director's family.

The third clinic, the Jordan Valley, was dedicated March 9, 1964. It serves an area of squatters' shacks, of which it is estimated a total of 300,000 cling precariously to the hillsides of Hong Kong and Kowloon. Put together from any available scraps, they are the homes of the colony's very poor and shelters for many refugees. The clinic is housed in an old cemetery office building, loaned to Project Concern by the British Government. Repaired, remodeled, and painted, the old but adequate building emerged as a modern, spacious clinic, with facilities for carrying out a feeding program. In addition, there is a house for the custodian and a playground for the children.

As of January 1965, the professional staff of the 3 clinics in Hong Kong numbers 42, of whom 11 are doctors. Each day they see about 500 patients. In addition, there is a daily distribution of milk, vitamins, and proteins to about 900 children.

Question. What type of patients does Project Concern serve?

Answer. Many of them are children with tuberculosis and other diseases caused by malnutrition. Of the adults who come, many are aged. The doctor not only prescribes, but, aided by his staff, administers medicines and vitamins. Many of the conditions are the same as here in the United States: colds, constipation, ulcers, and arthritis. But hideous impetigo, leprosy, and nutritional deficiencies of serious magnitude are common.

Question. Is there any resistance on the part of these people, who suddenly find a Western doctor in their midst?

Answer. Since nearly half the people in Hong Kong are refugees, one would expect that many would be shy and somewhat fearful, and that their confidence would have to be won. But Dr. Jim Turpin found that for love and concern there were no language or cultural barriers. Today he is loved by all, and a hero to the children. Visitors tell us that when he goes ashore in his little sampan, it is thrilling to watch them waving with both hands and to hear them call out to him excitedly all along the waterlanes: "Kai yeh, Kai yeh" (godfather).

Question. Just how does Project Concern function?

Answer. Project Concern is an independent, individual, nonprofit medical relief organization, founded by Dr. Jim Turpin on the principle of love for humanity expressed in the practical terms of medical care, food, and clothing for those in need. It is incorporated under the laws of the State of California. Its national headquarters in Coronado, Calif., and chapters in various parts of the United States, Australia, and New Zealand seek to publicize the project and make its needs known through various media: the press, radio, television, slide presentations, and by a 16-millimeter movie film. The Coronado office publishes a monthly newsletter with the feature article written by Dr. Turpin from the field. Project Concern is entirely dependent upon public support. Most of it comes from those who receive the newsletter.

Question. What has been the response of people to this unique activity?

Answer. It has been generous. Starting with an initial nest egg contributed by some of the doctor's friends, which was soon augmented by additional gifts from individuals, organizations, and churches, the response continues to grow as more and more people come to see the practicality of Project Concern's concept of independent person-to-person assistance. However, as suffering and need in the world increases daily, so do Project Concern's opportunities to serve. And the urgency of an increase in funds is at present a very real problem.

Question. While the whole project seems praiseworthy, isn't it rather frustrating in view of the countless thousands who are potential patients?

Answer. This is true, particularly when the staggering needs are balanced by finances at low ebb. But we take courage when we remember the role free people have always played in the alleviation of suffering. Moreover, our confidence is further strengthened by the interest and enthusiasm developing today in many foreign countries.

Question. How did Dr. Turpin happen to start a medical work in Vietnam?

Answer. Dr. Turpin had hoped to have a clinic in South Vietnam, when in March 1964 a small hospital-clinic building was made available by the Vietnamese Government, and today in the little mountain village of Dampau—about 180 miles northeast of Saigon—medical service is being offered to tribes of Montagnards of that area. These people are some of the real casualties of the guerrilla fighting, since they have no real affiliation with either side. Natural wanderers, now living behind palisades of bamboo spikes and barbed wire, and lacking all but the barest elements of existence, they are tragic enough to move the most insensitive to compassion.

Project Concern's professional staff in Vietnam is small, consisting of Dr. Turpin as the only doctor, a laboratory technician from Vancouver, British Columbia, and two registered nurses from the United States. However, well underway—and to continue indefinitely—is a program of training qualified native young people to become medical assistants. As of January 1965 42 graduates have demonstrated they can correctly change dressings, distribute medicines, and give injections, according to written orders. Each group is in training for 3 months; the second month, in residence in the provincial hospital in Dalat, under the direction of the Vietnamese Dr. Phan. The students are sponsored by the Vietnamese Government, and upon completion of their training are recognized by the officials to qualify as village medical officers. Five of the graduates are currently assigned to the clinic. The others work in the villages as medical officers, reporting critical cases to the hospital for professional care. Dr. Turpin himself makes afternoon sick calls in the villages—by helicopter to the more remote ones.

---

[1] Through a technical error left out of the lease to Great Britain and therefore not under its jurisdiction. British attempts to rehabilitate the area have so far been unsuccessful. The Chinese authorities have objected to a new British housing scheme which would resettle much of the population of this old city; now they claim Chinese sovereignty in the area. (Cf. Illustrated London News, Feb. 2, 1963.) The present population of the Walled City is estimated at about 25,000.

[2] The boat people (estimated to total over 150,000 in Hong Kong) are a fascinating segment of the nearly 4 million people in the British Crown Colony. They form a separate community, with their own language and customs. Their strange craft fill Hong Kong waters. Many never go ashore.

In a letter of September 17, 1964, Dr. Turpin wrote: "I saw nearly 200 patients one day * * * they come in droves * * * a fascinating people. Medical and surgical situation here is intriguing. * * * I need doctors and nurses—long term, short term, whatever is possible. Please get out the word."

In another letter: "Some day we hope there may be a truly proper hospital here, a nursing school, elementary schools, playgrounds, adequate food production. Peace will come when people's elementary needs are met, their children are sent to school, they have adequate medical care, and they worship God with bodies and hearts strong and confident in themselves and in their brothers afar."

In the same mood Martha Turpin wrote from DaMpau during her recent visit: "So far I haven't seen any real play among the Montagnards—not even among the children. They are hollow-eyed and tragic, pawns in the struggle here, where people neither know nor care about the difference between freedom and communism. It's a long, long way up * * * it's going to take an immeasurable amount of generosity on the part of the fortunate ones of the world who are free * * * so much needs to be done, and done fast. Should we fail, the Communists will do it for us—they are pushing to do it."

Question. How can interested persons share in supporting Project Concern's humanitarian service?

Answer. It is very simple. Anyone wishing to help may slip a bill or a check into an envelope and send it to Project Concern, Inc. in care of Postmaster, San Diego, Calif.

PROJECT CONCERN

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the career of a remarkably young American physician, Dr. James W. Turpin of Coronado, Calif., in whose debt all of us stand.

Entirely without Government subsidy of any sort, Dr. Turpin has been operating hospitals and clinics in both South Vietnam and Hong Kong. Through his Project Concern, he has brought healing to thousands in the southeastern Asian jungles, victims of all manner of hideous disease, and whose only care came literally from witch doctors.

To these unfortunates, many of whose lives he saved, Dr. Turpin brought not only healing but a deep personal love. He was truly a mission of mercy in the great tradition of man's brotherhood with his fellows. Because they respected and trusted him, Dr. Turpin was able to serve as a kind of medical ambassador to villagers in the remotest outposts of South Vietnam, people our official diplomats never see.

To these people he taught the greatness of America by example. In this capacity he has done his country a vast amount of good.

Currently, Dr. Turpin is in this country on a fundraising campaign to support his Project Concern, which, I should add, has no religious or political affiliation. He has been honored this year as one of America's 10 outstanding young men.

Some of his views on southeast Asia I believe should be of interest to this honorable body. He reports the American air raids on North Vietnam are a tremendous morale booster for the South Vietnamese. Many of these people had previously cared little for their own welfare and had no hope for the future. Their outlook now is brighter.

He notes that these people are hungry, need jobs and education as well as security. They will take things from the first country to offer them. But they are not particularly interested in communism. They seek only a means to an end.

I submit that Project Concern and young men of Dr. Turpin's stature offer humanity everywhere a clear and obvious alternative to the evil of communism. He deserves a salute from all Americans.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Indiana for what he has done in the well of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged as a guest of the gentleman from Indiana and his cohost to be present at Dr. Turpin's demonstration, his lecture, and his very fine plea for more consideration of the care of these people around the world.

Mr. Speaker, while I know of his work and what he does, and being one of the professionals and a physician in the Congress, I was deeply impressed and only today we have had the opportunity to visit off the floor of the House with another physician who is working in another continent of the world in a similar but not identical manner but which is the essence of American know-how and of people who want to care for people regardless of race, color, creed, national origin, source or any other reason, when they are in travail and when they are ill and when they need reconstructive surgery or medicine or what we have available.

Mr. Speaker, these are the people who are empowered with the God-given decree to go among the world and help be their brother's keepers and share the knowledge and be angelical in dispensing that which they have.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] upon what he has done in bringing Dr. Turpin to us and I commend all of these gentlemen, including those who work for CARE, on Project Hope, Moral Re-Armament, Medico, to say nothing of our military forces around the world who serve in medical capacities in order that others may live and enjoy good health. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman, himself a distinguished physician and a Member of this House, for his gracious remarks. I am sure that the gentleman would not mind if in addition to the other splendid organizations which he cited we included another which is headed by the distinguished physician Dr. Peter Comanduras, known as Medico.

HUDSON RIVER—NEW CONSERVATION CHALLENGE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was privileged to present to the House the first section of a paper prepared by Mr. Irving Like for the Citizens Committee for the Hudson River. In this section, Mr. Like reviewed some of the history of the river and analyzed various official attitudes and actions for the river in past years.

In the next section, Mr. Like discusses current efforts to save the Hudson and analyzes the potential growth and development of the riverway under Federal programs such as that proposed in my Hudson Highlands national scenic riverway bill (H.R. 3012):

Hudson River—New Conservation Challenge: Part II

The Citizens' Committee for the Hudson River, a nonpartisan, nonpolitical organization of citizens of the Hudson River Valley, has been formed with the purpose of pressing for legislation which would create a national park and riverway or similar reservation to protect in perpetuity the unique scenic and historical resources of the Hudson River Valley.

This citizens' committee has undertaken to present the facts to the public regarding the Hudson River. In its first fact sheet, it stated the following: "The enormous outdoor recreation potential of the Hudson is virtually untapped. Due to neglect and pollution, natural values have been grossly under utilized and fisheries have been destroyed. The creation of a national riverway would signal the beginning of an imaginative effort to recapture these pleasures, to restore the ecology of the river and its environs and to rejuvenate its fishery and wildlife resources. It would lay the foundation for effective efforts to abate pollution and to assure clean water. It would pave the way for redevelopment of the blighted river shoreline, replacing eyesores with waterfront parks and marinas. The national riverway would link up beautifully with State and local parks, providing a continuous contiguous green belt of permanent open spaces and an efficiently administrable unit."

The citizens' committee has urged the following as the reason why legislation was necessary to protect the Hudson River Valley's natural and economic resources for the public use and benefit:

(A) To prevent:

1. The increasing and criminal abuse of the Hudson River Valley's natural resources by:

(a) Water pollution by raw sewage and industrial wastes.

(b) Air pollution from industrial parks.

(c) Destruction of fish and wildlife due to neglect and pollution.

(d) Deteriorization of shorelines and banks by junkyards, garbage dumps, debris, car graveyards, industrial waste, decaying structures, docks, and piers.

2. The private exploitation or abuse of lands, shores, and water by:

(a) Haphazard, unzoned establishment of industries, powerplants, housing developments, shopping centers, amusement parks, and piers.

(b) Unscrupulous land speculation on present large estates.

(B) To provide:

1. Planned and maintained recreational facilities—waterfront parks, marinas, fishing stations, excursion ports—with adequate access and transportation to such facilities. The rapidly growing population of metropolitan area with a projected increase of 21 million in 1980 creates an increasing demand for such facilities. (In Rockland County the projected increase by 1985 will be 350,000—a 155-percent increase from 1960). Creation of such facilities traditionally stimulates economy of nearby areas through increased tourism and its supporting activities, thus raising wages, business incomes and property values, increasing new community services, construction and local labor employment. The recently established Fire Island National Seashore will generate $60 million for Long Island.

2. Adequately planned and zoned housing and industrial areas in order to attract new industries and homeowners.

3. The renovation and revitalization of old towns and communities, and the establishment of new towns.

4. The preservation and rehabilitation of historical sites of national significance.

5. The creation of a clean water supply not only for recreational purposes but as a source of potable urban water.

The recommendations of the citizens committee are feasible and are historically strongly rooted in the national policy.

As early as January 30, 1961, the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources issued a report (Rept. No. 29, Committee Print No. 17) in which it recommended: "The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should prepare and keep up to date plans for comprehensive water development and management for all major river basins of the United States. Such plans would take into account prospective demands for all purposes served through water development giving full recognition to non-revenue-yielding purposes such as streamflow regulation, outdoor recreation, and preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and keeping in mind the ultimate need for optimum development of all water resources."

On January 31, 1962, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission submitted its report, "Outdoor Recreation for America" to the President. The report surveyed the U.S. outdoor recreation resources, measured present and likely demands upon them for the next 40 years, and recommended actions to insure their availability to all Americans of present and future generations.

The following were a few of its major conclusions:

1. Outdoor opportunities are most urgently needed near metropolitan areas, where most of the people are.

2. The problem of meeting recreation need is not one of total acres but of effective acres.

3. Water is a focal point of outdoor recreation, most people engaging in water oriented activities.

4. Outdoor recreation brings about economic benefits, enhancing community values by creating a better place to live, increasing land values, and often acting as a mainstay of the local economy. It is a basis for big business as the millions seeking the outdoors generate an estimated $20 million a year market for goods and services.

These were among its recommendations:

1. Immediate action should be taken by the Federal Government where necessary to reserve or acquire additional water and shoreline areas, particularly near centers of population.

2. Certain rivers of unusual, esthetic, and recreation value should be allowed to remain in their free-flowing state and natural setting without manmade alterations.

3. Public agencies should assure adequate access to water-based recreation opportunities by acquisition of access areas, easements, zoning of shorelines, and consideration of water access in road design and construction.

4. Where feasible, concessioners should be encouraged to provide facilities and visitor services on Federal lands under appropriate supervision. Where this is not feasible, the Federal Government should build facilities and lease them to private business for operation.

5. Recreation areas should be strongly defended against encroachments from nonconforming uses both public and private.

6. In programs and projects for pollution control, recreation should be recognized as a motivating purpose and as a necessary objective in the allocation of funds therefor.

In its conclusions and recommendations, the Commission recognized water as a key element of recreation, thus following the report of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources (S. Rept. 29, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 30, 1961).

President Kennedy also recognized the cardinal importance of water resources. In his budget message, published in the New York Times, of January 19, 1962, the President called for increased emphasis to coordinated planning based on entire river basin areas and recommended legislation to combat water pollution and to provide water based recreational opportunity.

President Kennedy's conservation message, following soon after (New York Times, Mar. 2, 1962) noted that there were 341 million visitors to Federal land and water areas recorded in 1960, and that was expected to double by 1970, and to increase fivefold by 1980. He said (almost as if referring to the Hudson): "Our Nation's progress is reflected in the history of our great river systems. The water that courses through our rivers and streams holds the key to full national development."

The President urged legislation to develop a Federal-State shoreline preservation program.

The conservation policies of President Kennedy have been carried forth by President Johnson's administration. Pursuant to the ORRRC recommendations a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has started functioning within the Department of Interior. The first great river shoreline preservation legislation became history with the enactment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway bill. A sound financial base for future acquisition of recreation opportunities was provided by the creation of the land and water conservation fund legislation.

The ORRRC report (pp. 75–80) traces and documents the economic value and benefits of outdoor recreation projects. It reports that city after city cite the experience—parks enhance the value of surrounding property. Minneapolis says that increased values in the city amounted to several times the cost of the entire park system. Essex County, N.J., found that land adjacent to parks increased in value three times as fast as other property.

Following completion of seven large reservoirs in the Arkansas White-Red River Basins in the States of Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Missouri, a comparative study was made of those counties with and those without significant reservoir shoreline. Those counties with shoreline exceeded the others in per capita income, annual wages, retail sales, bank deposits, taxes, and capital investment. Every economic sign indicates that the reservoir counties are better off.

Satisfying the demand for outdoor recreation is big business. According to ORRRC data, leisure time spending was estimated at $30 billion in 1954, and is probably as much as $40 billion today. Tourist expenditures have been estimated at about $25 billion annually. In 1957, tourists were estimated to be spending at least a billion dollars a year visting each of the States of New York, Florida, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. In 1959, $1.5 billion was spent on outdoor recreation sporting goods. An estimated $2.1 billion was spent at the retail level during 1958 for boats, engines, accessories, and other related items. Fishermen spend $3 billion annually on their sport. Direct expenditures by Government for providing outdoor recreation were over a billion dollars in 1960. Visitors to Federal and State parks, forests, and reservoirs spend over $11 billion annually. On the basis of these indicators and from general consideration of the field, consumer spending for outdoor recreation is now estimated to be about $20 billion annually. The bulk of recreation expenditures go for food, lodging, transportation, boats, and other equipment. The expenditures of recreation seekers provide a significant element in the economic life of the community. In Teton County, Wyo., which contains the Grand Teton National Park and is adjacent to Yellowstone, in 1958, tourist expenditures of $7 million produced a business of over $12 million. In 1956, some 2.5 million persons visited the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and spent about $28 million within an area extending 30 miles beyond the park boundaries. As the volume of recreation expands, it brings about additional capital investment. The desire of recreation seekers for a summer cabin or a second home near the attraction induces long-term capital investment, and provides a market for real estate, building and other materials and labor. The summer residents increase the population and bring that many more customers to local business.

In the case of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, according to data recorded over a 6-year period, tourist trade rose from 150 to 200 percent in the vicinity adjacent to the national seashore; taxable property increased in value 50 to 100 times as the park expanded the general economic activity of the region.

PROBABLE EFFECT OF SCENIC RIVERWAY ON HUDSON RIVER REGION

Based on past performances, there is every reason to believe that creation of a Hudson National Scenic Riverway would bring benefits to this region. The greatly increased number of visitors to the area would increase the demand for hotels, restaurants, motels, service stations, food stores and a multitude of other service establishments outside the proposed area. It would provide investment opportunities for local business and employment opportunities for local labor. With such development, land and building values in areas contiguous to the proposed riverway would appreciate, broadening the tax bases of local communities. Aside from tourist dollars and the income generated therefrom, there would be Federal expenditures for capital improvements, with the possibility that a substantial portion of the contracts would be awarded locally. In the construction of buildings and other facilities, local materials and supplies would be used when practicable, thus creating a strong demand for local labor. National Park Service payrolls would amount to several hundred thousand dollars yearly and additional thousands would be spent each year locally for supplies and equipment needed to operate the proposed area.

Besides the economic benefits to the region generated by increased tourist expenditures and Federal Government expenditures, the presence of a national park would provide more people with a greater knowledge of the region's superior recreation advantages. Firms engaged in research and development activities tend to feature such advantages in their attempts to recruit key scientific and professional personnel. Thus an area of national significance might provide the stimulus for future development, of a nontourist type, that would aid in the diversification and stabilization of the regional economy.

The Hudson River region meets Federal criteria as an ideal recreation opportunity qualifying for favorable Federal financial consideration as a national riverway. A national park, as experience shows, is economically feasible and will be of great benefit to the Hudson River region in particular.

The State of New York has recognized that the Hudson River is a major river basin and a prime recreational resource.

On April 1, 1965, the Hudson Highlands Committee recommended to the State council of parks the acquisition for public park and recreational purposes of 17 sites on the west side of the Hudson River from Newburgh, N.Y., south to Edgewater, N.J., and 9 sites on the east side of the Hudson from Beacon to the Bronx. The magnitude of this committee's recommendations was indicated in the news accounts which reported that the cost of such acquisition would be about $40 million.

In May of 1965, the State of New York adopted a far-reaching $1.7 billion program to purify its polluted rivers including the Hudson.

BREAKTHROUGH TO THE HUDSON

The urgency for acquiring the remaining conservation opportunities available along the Hudson is inseparable from the desperate need for redevelopment and restoration of blighted areas along the river.

A dramatic account of what awaits the visitor to the Hudson Valley is contained in an editorial appearing on May 5, 1965, in the Record, a newspaper published in Hackensack, N.J., which editorial described Senator KENNEDY's May 2, 1965, tour of the Hudson Valley, in the following words:

"In the veritable Kennedy tradition, which is lavish, Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, served up food for thought during his weekend tour of the Hudson Valley."

"Item: He talked to a Haverstraw fisherman about the havoc done by pollution to the Hudson shad run, and if broiled shad isn't one of the great universals one cannot at this time of year imagine what would be.

"Item: He walked the banks of the river and found them a hideous succession of automobile graveyards.

"Item: He examined a sample of Hudson water, filthy with suspended pollution.

"Item: He talked with members of the Citizens Committee for the Hudson River about his and Senator JAVITS', Republican, of New York, bill to establish a Hudson riverway within whose 1-mile domain on each side of the river Federal agencies would impose stringent controls on industrial and commercial land use.

"Item: He ran up the steep hill to the lighthouse over the Stony Point battlefield.

"And, finally, item: At 10:40 p.m. he fell ill—'nauseous' was the word his press officer employed—and had to beg off a speech at a $50-a-plate dinner for Representative JOHN G. DOW, Democrat, of New York. He had to go back to his hotel. The 250 diners were unhappy.

"But there's food for thought. The newspapermen he left winded in the dash up the Stony Point steeps were in shape for the dinner. The Senator wasn't. Perhaps these data are insufficient as a footing for any conclusions as to the Kennedy cult of fitness. Perhaps the evidence indicates no more than that the condition of the Hudson Valley, so much of it majestic, so much of it a desert of junk and gunk and festering slum, is enough to turn the stomach of a fastidious man.

"It is trusted he's convinced something drastic must be done. Shad would be reason enough all by itself."

A more academic, but equally dramatic description of the deterioration of the opposite side of the Hudson River is given in a report prepared by Columbia University Professors Goodman and Kouzmanoff, entitled "Breakthrough to the Hudson." The Columbia report, however, contains a hopeful note. It gives a preview of what the Hudson River area could be like if imaginatively planned and redeveloped. It is this need for redevelopment which makes the Hudson River opportunity so challenging but yet so promising.

The problem of redevelopment immediately raises the question of what level of government or combination can best undertake the goal of preservation and restoration. Mr. Laurance S. Rockefeller, on January 26, 1965, said: "I am not convinced as yet as to the best device for carrying out this goal, or whether it should be local, State, or Federal Government, or a combination of these. This is a problem which will require enlightened and imaginative study."

Congressman JOHN G. DOW, who represents the districts in which Orange and Rockland Counties are located, on the west side of the river, has also addressed himself to the problem of what type of governmental authority could best undertake the solution of the Hudson River problem. On February 9, 1965, he said:

"Of all the types of authority available for our consideration, I like the Delaware River Basin compact best. It places the authority at one stage removed from either one State or Federal, since all are represented.

"It seems to me that the States of New York and New Jersey and the Federal could be partners in a Hudson Riverway Authority."

And on March 14, 1965, Mr. Dow said:

"A vast and comprehensive reclamation program is urgently needed. A program to create a park, with spacious beaches and other necessities for recreation is a first step of a long series of steps that must follow. Such a program will enlist the thinking of planners, industrialists, historians, conservationists and politicians."

Mr. Dow then raised the specific question of who should administer such a program. He said:

"A scenic Hudson can be achieved if arrangement is made to plan in all these other directions that are needed. Authority for this, under the master legislation, will be better accepted all-around, if the several political entities which are involved formed a compact. Such was done upon the Delaware River through the Delaware River Basin Compact. There the several States involved have signed a compact with the Federal Government. The Federal authority is equal to the others, but not paramount.

"Recognition of the State of New York at least on an equal footing with Federal is desirable not only in the composition of a Hudson River authority, but even more so in the present initial stages of the whole endeavor. This is the stage for securing passage of the legislation. State of New York legislators want a State commission to protect the Hudson. The congressional bills offer a Federal authority. The Palisades Interstate Park Commission has shown that it will uphold responsibilities in this area. Perhaps the Taconic Park Commission is interested. Local communities have a stake. When all of these can be brought together in some official or unofficial concord, the problem will be solved. People like to be consulted in advance.

"We should make approaches to these several agencies. Unofficial links should be woven if official ones do not succeed. I suggest that the U.S. Department of the Interior, to which the National Park Service reports, the Department of Conservation of the State of New York, the Palisades Interstate and other Commissions, also legislators at the Federal and State levels from the Hudson shores, be brought together for discussion.

"Certainly let's proceed with hearings on the bills now offered. Out of these hearings the same consensus may emerge as we'd expect from a meeting of interested parties as I suggest. However, much may be gained from now, at once, approaching those parties that I have indicated. This would be additional to hearings on the bills. We can ask the parties for their suggestions on ways to proceed. We can ask them to join a planning group. No time need be wasted. We can begin at once."

McFADDEN DUFFY, COLUMNIST FOR THE TIMES-PICAYUNE IN NEW ORLEANS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, McFadden Duffy is a columnist for the Times-Picayune in New Orleans, which is the largest newspaper in Louisiana.

For years Mr. Duffy has kept the reading public aware and up to date on the many developments of interest to sportsmen and others who maintain an interest in the preservation of our natural resources.

In a recent column, which was one of a series of articles concerning the so-called Dodd bill—gun legislation—Mr. Duffy quotes from a statement by our colleague, Congressman T. A. THOMPSON from the Seventh District of Louisiana, in this regard.

I wish to commend this article to the attention of the membership of this body:

[From the Times Picayune, May 1965]

BASIC REASON OF FIREARM LAW SHOULD BE FOR PUBLIC SAFETY

(By M'Fadden Duffy)

Congressman T. A. THOMPSON, Seventh Congressional District, Louisiana, was the first Louisiana Member of Congress to react publicly to the threat of the proposed sweeping legislation.

"The so-called Dodd bill, which places severe restrictions on the purchase and use of firearms of all types, is currently pending before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency and will, if acted upon favorably, be referred to the Senate Commerce Committee. If passed by the Senate, it would be referred to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I wish this legislation could be referred to my subcommittee," Representative THOMPSON said. "I would do my best to kill the legislation in committee before it would even reach the floor of the House for consideration.

"In my opinion * * * our Constitution clearly establishes the right of citizens to bear arms. If citizens should be required to register every gun, regardless of the purpose for which it is used, it would provide the Government with a national inventory of privately owned firearms," THOMPSON continued.

"Not only would we have to establish, in essence, a firearm registration agency, to maintain such an inventory, but this could possibly be very dangerous. History has shown in some areas that it was partially through such registration and control of all weapons by a very small percentage of the populace that the democratic form of government was lost.

"For these reasons, and countless others, it is my intention to employ every means at my command to defeat this unrealistic and objectionable legislation. I believe that the authors of this legislation planned it as a deterrent to crime; but it can be reasonably predicted that anyone with criminal intent could, in spite of such legislation and controls, avail himself of a gun either through blackmarket maneuvers or by theft—defeating the purpose of the legislation.

"It is my opinion," he concluded, "that if effective control over certain firearms is to be had, this authority should rest within the jurisdiction of the duly constituted officals of cities, counties, and States."

The statement by Representative T. A. THOMPSON is similar to a welling up of public statements by Members of Congress, local, State, and National groups deeply interested in all aspects of firearms possession, collection, and use.

UNITED STATES DISCOVERING TRUE FRIENDS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the May 10 Houston Post wholeheartedly expresses more adequately than I my appraisal of President Johnson's policy in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic.

President Johnson's display of courage in these two disturbed portions of the world deserves the strong support of us all. This courage has been displayed in the face of so-called world opinion, as well as a dissident section of our own citizens. But by the same token, he has again solidified the strength of this Nation in a resolve such as it has not been strengthened since World War II.

President Johnson has shown that we will no longer be the patsy or the doormat for every rabble rouser who feels that he can tear the peace of this world asunder without being called to account.

I heartily recommend the reading of this editorial by my colleagues of the House, which I have the pleasure to insert at this point:

UNITED STATES DISCOVERING TRUE FRIENDS

One thing that can be said with certainty about recent events in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic is that the United States is finding out who its real friends are and who is really dedicated to defending freedom against Communist tyranny.

President Johnson, in a long series of speeches and statements, has made it crystal clear that so long as he is in the White House this country's government will not hesitate or flinch for a moment in doing whatever in his judgment has to be done, which is to say whatever the Communists make it necessary for the United States to do in order to protect its own security and interests, resist Communist aggression, defend freedom, keep its commitments and help those countries that want to be helped in defending their own independence.

He has made it just as clear that he is not going to be deterred by that nebulous and fickle thing known as world opinion, which is subject to Communist influence and manipulation, and which Communist leaders long have tried to use as a form of pressure against this country.

It is not that President Johnson is oblivious to world opinion. In fact, there probably never has been an American President who is more sensitive to what others think of his actions and policies or who has gone to greater lengths to try to win approval. But he has shown and said that he will not let disapproval keep him from doing what he believes is both right and necessary.

Moreover, he has stated very candidly that, since this country must bear the main burden for the defense of the free world whether it likes the responsibility or not, he feels that it has a right to expect understanding and support from its true friends and the beneficiaries of its policies.

He expressed this feeling very pointedly in his state of the Union message when he said: "We are prepared to live as good neighbors with all, but we cannot be indifferent to acts designed to injure our interest, or our citizens, or our establishments abroad. A community of nations requires mutual respect. We shall extend it—and we shall expect it."

There is certainly nothing unreasonable about expecting one's friends to rally to one's support when the chips are down in a crucial confrontation or test of determination between the forces of freedom and those of tyranny. If they cannot give that support, they at least can keep silent.

No one expects unanimity, and there is no such thing as infallible judgment. There is always the possibility of equally effective alternatives. But differences in viewpoint, opinion and judgment can be presented in such a way as not to give aid, comfort and help to the common enemy.

Perhaps there is no such thing as morality in international relations, but there can be loyalty.

IOWA FARM POLL INDICATES STRONG SUPPORT FOR FOOD-FOR-PEACE AND FEED GRAINS PROGRAM, OPPOSITION TO SOYBEANS ON DIVERTED ACRES

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, as we prepare to consider pending agriculture legislation, the results of a poll of agricultural producers in southeast Iowa for which I received over 1,500 returns during the past few weeks.

In answer to the question, "Do you favor the continuation and improvement of the present feed grains program?" 86 percent of the 1,519 responders answered in the affirmative. In answer to the question, "Do you favor the proposal to permit soybeans to be grown on diverted acres?" a resounding 82 percent responded in the negative. Most promising for the future of both our foreign policy and our agriculture program is the overwhelming 88 percent who favored expanding the food-for-peace program under Public Law 480. An additional 81 percent favored strengthening, rather than weakening, our worthy conservation programs. On this latter question, I received a great many thoughtful letters suggesting that the conservation program be strengthened in order to fulfill direct conservation goals, such as developing sound watershed projects. These letters were equally strong in suggesting that those portions of the program which have been used to increase agricultural production be modified. I recommend these viewpoints for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

For those who have criticized our fine feed grains program I would like to point out that the stability and strength of our agricultural economy is basic to the overall growth of our national economy. Earlier this year, a fairminded urban newspaper, the Washington Post, recognized this when it stated:

> Every dollar of agricultural products that is delivered for final demand requires about 78 cents in the products and services of nonagricultural industries. So any disruption in the agricultural sector would be transmitted immediately to all other sectors of the economy and would be magnified.

On the basis of these considerations, I urge you to support attempts to strengthen our agricultural program.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXX

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article is another in the series on "New York City in Crisis" appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

This article—as others in the series—concerns the narcotics problem and appeared in the Tribune on April 6, 1965. The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—ADDICTION: MAYOR'S MAZE OF CONFERENCES

(NOTE.—Ultimate responsibility for solving New York's narcotics problems rests in one

man—Mayor Wagner. Yet, his characteristic weapon in the battle has been words rather than action. In this, another in a series of "New York City in Crisis" articles on narcotics, Reporter Paul Weissman tells the story of what the Mayor and his administration have—and haven't—done about the blight that has made New York the criminal addiction capital of the Western World.)

(By Paul Weissman)

Dressed in a blue suit, button down shirt, blue-black rep tie and black tasseled loafers, the mayor of the city of New York walked into the New York Hilton Hotel on February 3, 1965, at 10:35 a.m. He took the escalator to the Sutton Ballroom on the second floor and began shaking hands.

"Jim, how are you?" he asked Welfare Commissioner James R. Dumpson. "I see you're smiling." Mr. Dumpson was. A 28-day strike in his department had just been settled.

In the main ballroom, the mayor nodded to Correction Commissioner Anna Kross, Judge John M. Murtaugh, and Police Commissioner Michael Murphy, who sat in the first row with his arms folded across his chest. Rev. Oberia Dempsey, organizer of a halfway house for addicts in Harlem, was waiting by the dais to shake his hand. The mayor's seat was on the dais. On his right, City Narcotics Coordinator Dr. Catherine Hess. On his left, Health Commissioner Dr. George James, and Hospital Commissioner Dr. Ray Trussell. In front of him, 200 narcotics experts and a battery of television cameras.

The ballroom was impressive and so was the brass as the mayor prepared to open the Gracie Mansion Conference on Narcotics Addiction, an event carefully designed in the mayor's office to show that his administration was coming to grips with New York's growing addiction problem and its most drastic consequence: Crime in the streets. But though it was held under the auspices of the health department, that department's officials had not been notified of the conference's existence until 10 days before. Suggestions for postponements were rejected. The need—to convince the public the city had a program—was great, it was said. Budget limitations a problem? Charge the conference to the department of public events. More time needed to arrange for distinguished foreign speakers? Get other speakers.

And so at 10:45 a.m., "Your Honor, the Mayor" was introduced by Dr. Catherine Hess.

A STRANGE SPEECH

The conference had begun. And for the next 20 minutes, Robert F. Wagner slowly read a 29-page statement printed in quarter-inch block type. It was one of the strangest speeches New York's mayor has ever delivered. At once, he described addiction as a "raging problem," then said it was not widely known, then noted that the incidence of "narcotics addiction has greatly decreased since the twenties."

The mayor said the city had initiated programs, but he looked to the conference for "directions." He said the city now had hospital facilities for addicts "that increased from 25 beds in 1959 to 300 by February 1965." The city has other programs and the mayor mentioned them all: the West Side rehabilitation program, the intake centers, the hospital detoxification programs, the experiments on withdrawing addicts from heroin by using methadone, a substitute drug.

The mayor said Dr. Hess "had provided both the leadership and the coordinated effort that are so desperately needed in this field," and asked the conference to answer specific questions dealing with the relationship between crime and addiction, the significance of teenage addiction, and whether the addict is "a criminal, a sick individual, or a sick criminal."

What the mayor was talking about was not a new problem in New York, even though he appeared to be treating it that way. Largely eliminated by cessation of sea and air travel during World War II, narcotics addiction had mushroomed to a serious problem in the city by 1950. Until July 1952, when the city initiated a $4 million program at Riverside Hospital, addicts either withdrew "cold turkey" in jail or, if they were not arrested, volunteered for admission to the Federal narcotics hospital in Lexington, Ky.

RIVERSIDE CATASTROPHE

Riverside was open only to adolescent users. There were no facilities at all for adult addicts. The facility was finally closed on May 3, 1963 and even Mayor Wagner admits "generally speaking, it was a failure." It was, in fact, a catastrophe. Addicts were permitted to come and go as they pleased. Often when they came back from outside they brought heroin. Other addicts treated at Riverside report guards abetted sales. Female patients became pregnant. The cure rate was almost nil. It has even been argued that by mixing addicts from all over the city, public officials actually contributed to increased addiction by creating a circumstance in which addicts readily became more knowledgeable. After Riverside was closed, the city transferred its staff to other city facilities.

But appeals to city hall for leadership in the fight against narcotics addiction began long before Riverside was closed. They first became intense during Mayor Wagner's second term. Ministers, teachers, and others wrote to the mayor saying they were fearful then—it was 1957—of the grip heroin had begun to take on their communities. As far as can be determined, their letters went largely unanswered.

The mayor did not respond fully until 1959, when 200 pickets from an East Harlem Protestant parish marched on city hall. Then Mr. Wagner did something. He agreed to meet with 35 representatives of Protestant churches to set up "a broad program of rehabilitation."

Nothing happened.

A year later, in a "Report to the People," Mr. Wagner viewed the narcotics problem, particularly among teenagers, as "even more critical than in previous years." That was 1960. At his 1965, Gracie Mansion Narcotics Conference, he said, the number of addicts had been increasing only during the last 2 years, 1963 and 1964.

The mayor campaigned for a third term in 1961. He formed a "task force" for the organization of medical services for addicts and promised to move quickly on broad aspects of the narcotics problem. Indeed, he made his intentions part of a strong, anticrime platform.

"These addicts are responsible for much lawlessness," he said typically a few weeks before election day, 1961. "Depraved and reckless, they must be confined to proper hospitals."

No one questioned then whether the addict was "a criminal, a sick individual, or a sick criminal." The mayor was going to get him off the streets. But the mayor did not say how he would have it done or where he planned to send addicts.

By March 12, 1962, the heat of the campaign was over and the reelected Mayor Wagner began implementing his pledge, though not quite in the way he had promised. He said now the city would come to grips with "the vexing, baffling, and tragic problem of narcotic traffic." Mr. Wagner did not now say he was going to curb lawlessness. He appointed Dr. Theodore Rosenthal, a deputy commissioner of the health department, as the city's first narcotics coordinator, and announced there would be a "wide range of new and supplementary projects."

He said neighborhood narcotics treatment centers had been developed (they hadn't: the city had only 1 day-care center with a maximum caseload of 100 and no facilities for women), established Box "N" at police headquarters for narcotics information, and announced an expanded information center and a beefed-up narcotics squad.

There was also a 1962 narcotics conference and a council of neighborhood service agencies to deal with addiction. Individually, these agencies have become the most vociferous critics of city hall's failure to implement a narcotics program. The mayor also said he would "double the number of beds" available for addicts. He did and the city now has 300. It sounded like a massive program. It wasn't. Virtually no serious provision or treatment was made for addicts after they were withdrawn from drugs and left the hospital.

Mayor Wagner kept talking.

"We will continue to regard addicts as persons afflicted with disease and not criminals," said the mayor one day in 1962 and then almost as if he had forgotten, a while later estimated, for the first time, that New York's addicts "steal about $1 billion a year to support their habit."

The mayor's seeming contradiction reflects the great debate that has developed among people concerned with addiction: Are addicts depraved and reckless criminals or are they afflicted with a disease?

PROGRAMS ON PAPER

Curiously, the debate has had relatively little to do with how addicts are to be treated, since in actual practice almost no facilities have existed. Instead of acting as a goad to the creation of either prison or hospital facilities in which the addict could be treated and—at least as important—studied, the debate actually has become a deterrent. As long as medical people cannot answer this basic question, the mayor is saying, in effect, that it is impossible to implement a program.

But as this debate has paralyzed hopes for a real program, it has also frustrated attempts of researchers and others working in the field to develop meaningful research programs that might provide an answer to the nature of addiction in New York. The result is that for all intensive purposes, the information that is now available is useless in recommending programs. For example, after 10 years of a growing narcotics problem, virtually no clinical statistics are available that would provide valid insights into possible courses for treatment.

In any case, the city's programs continued to exist only on paper, even as the mayor was saying firmly that he would like to "have New York City lead the way in this field (narcotics) as in other regards."

The mayor led the way—to a bigger and better conference. At his request, President Kennedy called a White House Conference on Narcotics. A principal speaker was Robert F. Wagner.

There were other speeches. Addiction became at once "a tangled forest" and later, with apologies to Winston Churchill who said it first about something else, "a riddle wrapped in an enigma at the center of a mystery."

By 1964, the city council began to stir. Legislation was introduced to effect narcotics control. But it was never passed.

"Screvane (Council President Paul Screvane) told us to hold off for a while," one councilman says: "He said the mayor was coming out with something big."

This promise of "something big" was fulfilled on October 27, the day the mayor delivered his annual report. He said, "the city government is working hard at this problem both in research and practice, both in treating the addicts and in pursuing and encouraging the search for the causes and cures of addiction."

In order to coordinate information and research, the mayor said, he had "agreed to call and sponsor a major conference in New York City to decide on actions that may be considered desirable." He announced that he would call a Gracie Mansion Conference on Narcotics "sometime in the month of January."

Either city officials by now had become insulated to announcements by the mayor, or City Hall simply forgot to tell the health department. No preparations were made. No speakers were invited.

Actual dates for the conference did not come in an announcement either from City Hall or the health department. They came about this way:

On December 3, Mayor Wagner went to dinner in the Grand Ballroom of the Hotel Astor. He was attending the Humanitarian Award Dinner in his honor given on behalf of the National Association for the Prevention of Addiction to Narcotics.

The mayor told the group he had directed that the views of the interested voluntary agencies and organizations "be solicited in the planning and programing" and announced the conference would be held for 3 days starting February 3. Dr. Catherine Hess, the city's narcotics coordinator, he said, would organize the conference in consultation with the interdepartmental health council.

In January, Dr. Ray Trussell, as current chairman of the council, wrote to city hall and suggested the conference be postponed so that experts might be invited from all over the world. City hall refused. Several voluntary agencies reported they were never consulted regarding planning or programing and, in fact, were made aware of the conference less than 10 days before it was scheduled to begin when they were invited as speakers. Staff members within the narcotics coordinators' office say they strongly recommended that Senator ROBERT KENNEDY and Dr. Kenneth Clark be invited to speak, but both were rejected.

So the meeting went on as scheduled.

After the mayor's keynote address, six panels, each including several speakers, were held each day in which law enforcement, society's attitude towards addicts, Federal, State, and city treatment programs, the work of voluntary agencies and similar topics were discussed.

A large majority of the speakers had heard each other before and had appeared on platforms at a dozen different seminars. Many of them complained the conference had offered little new. On the second day of the meeting the mayor invited the participants to Gracie Mansion for a cocktail party.

"Some day," one city official said, "that guy may have enough guts to play it straight. Then he'll call a conference to end all conferences and be done with wasting our time for good."

There were 200 people from all over New York at Gracie Mansion for cocktails that day. City officials, politicians, representatives of voluntary agencies and friends of the mayor chatted amiably as they munched catered cheese bits and shrimp.

An hour after the party began, the group was gathered in the west wing of Gracie Mansion. Looking straight at autographed pictures presented to him by King Baudouin of Belgium and the Prince and Princess of Monaco, the mayor said he was going to create a "working panel" to assess the work of the conference. He appointed city council president Paul Screvane, who is chairman of more committees than anyone else in New York and perhaps the universe, head of still a new committee: "The Temporary Gracie Mansion Committee on Narcotics."

A white Protestant minister, working in the narcotics field in New York for almost a decade who had expected some tangible results from the conference, reacted this way:

"I thought I'd puke," he said:

No; he did not want to make his reaction less graphic, or under the circumstances, did he think it necessary to be more specific.

QUESTIONS REPEATED

The conference then returned to the Hilton for a final day of meetings and, when it was over, Dr. Hess delivered the city's promised "action packet" on narcotics. But this did no more than restate the objectives of the conference and repeat the questions Mayor Wagner had asked the conference to answer particularly this one: Was the addict a criminal, a sick criminal, or a sick person?

Some weeks later, Mr. Screvane's small steering committee held its first meeting. A member gave this report:

"Edelstein (Julius C. C. Edelstein, the mayor's executive assistant) was there and I never expected him to be as frank as he was. He said it was an election year and the city had to come up with something big for narcotics. He said it had to be 'newsworthy.' "

Another member of the committee says Mr. Screvane already knows which programs will be announced as public pressure increases: Extension of the Daytop Lodge program, a project started by the Kings County Department of Correction for Juvenile Addicts; and further development of the use of "methadone" as a substitute drug in the ambulatory treatment of addicts and a "half-way house" program. But, he says, the city will not subsidize half-way houses until it can find a way of "approving" all of the people employed in them.

In recent weeks, there have been reports that there will be an $8 million wing addition to a city hospital to deal only with narcotics. If this wing is constructed, it will be as a result of the same factor that has guided all narcotics programs in New York in the last decade: mounting public pressure, not serious, careful, thorough research and analysis.

No real progress can be made by such a step because the city still has no real information concerning patterns of addiction, the number of addicts, the degree of their addiction, or the relationship between addiction and crime.

Some critics have gone as far as to charge that the city refuses to acknowledge that a narcotic problem in fact even exists. This is too stern a view. Existence of the problem is not the issue, doing something meaningful—and not just political—about it is.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXXI

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the fight against dope addiction in New York City and is another in the series on "New York City in Crisis" appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

This article appeared in the Tribune on April 7, 1965, and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—CITY'S DOPE-ADDICTION FIGHT: A POLICE ACTION, NOT A WAR

(By Paul Weissman, of the Herald Tribune staff)

This is the story of how the war on narcotics addiction is going in the office of the narcotics coordinator, the city agency primarily responsible for the battle against the addiction in New York.

It takes place in the command post of the agency whose work will hopefully result in a decline of the $1 billion Mayor Wagner says addicts steal every year to support their habit.

The general in charge of this office is Dr. Catherine Hess, a former obstetrician, who Mayor Wagner selected to replace Dr. Theodore Rosenthal in April 1962 as the city's narcotics coordinator. (The only official requirement for the job—a deputy health commissioner—is a medical degree.)

She is paid $20,000 a year as this city's narcotics expert and this is her view of the relationship between narcotics and crime:

"Crime is just plain increasing everywhere," she says. "It's not my addicts that are stealing. Of course, my addicts are stealing, but they're not responsible for the crime rate."

In the 3 years that Dr. Hess has held the job, narcotics in New York has become her field, one in which she is the main source of information, the principal person Mayor Wagner relies on to evalute programs. This, at least, is the view of many competent professional observers.

The headquarters for this operation is a fourth-floor office at 325 Broadway and one day not long ago, this is the way Dr. Hess described New York's addiction problem and addiction program:

"How many addicts do we really have? Close to 25,000," she said. (Other estimates range as high as 200,000. Police unofficially put the number at 100,000 addicts in New York. Dr. Hess' estimate is based on the 23,000 unduplicated names of addicts reported in the health department central registry.)

"Ninety-eight percent of our addicts are school dropouts. We detoxify 7,500 of them every year." (Though Dr. Hess did not mention it, more than half the addicts that voluntarily go to hospitals are repeaters.) "There are 800 State and city beds available to us" (300 are city beds). "Manhattan General tries to keep them 21 days, Metropolitan Hospital 6 weeks. We are going to make Metropolitan New York's addiction hospital.

A jolly woman, Dr. Hess will tilt back her chair as she answers a phone call and say: "Why sure I'm fine. I'm sittin' here in New York givin' fixes right and left."

When the call is completed, Dr. Hess, who on the day she was interviewed, wore her leather wallet tucked in her belt Gary Cooper style, began twisting the opal ring on her left pinky. She said she had to disagree with Mayor Wagner, if he said addicts commit half the crimes in New York City. "Quite frankly," she added, "I don't think narcotics addiction is increasing in New York."

BUSY PARENTS

A 49-year-old spinster, Dr. Hess blames the rise in teenage addiction on "a change in parental authority." She says, laughing as if she were still joking about "giving fixes right and left," that parents today are too busy to bother with their children. "They all say to their kids, 'here's 2 bucks. Go out and have some fun.' "

Dr. Hess does not dispute the need for research, but she says a great deal is known about addiction.

"I know what the addict's life is like," she says. "He gets up at 6 a.m. and his skin pops. Then he has to find a fence and get his orders for the day. He fools the police, and if he's a booster, he fools storekeepers. When he's successful, he gets money for his shot. Of course, it's absolutely no fun doing it yourself so you've got to find some friends.

"What people don't understand is this thrill of stealing—this thrill of beating police. I have to meet this excitement. I have to meet this with meaningful values where there were no values. I have to teach him how to dress. I have to teach him how to hold a fork. I have to teach him how to deal with all the things he's solving with a shot."

The problem is, as other medical authorities have pointed out, that there are many kinds of addicts and a hundred causes why people who are addiction-prone turn to heroin. The availability of drugs in some communities is a major factor. The use of drugs by "leaders" of teenage gangs is another. But in all cases, psychiatrists are almost universally convinced addicts are using drugs to cope with tremendous internal pressures that arise from deeply rooted psychological problems.

To come to grips with the problems of addiction, New York City has extremely limited facilities. It has 300 beds at Manhattan General and Metropolitan hospitals. Intake centers, that refer addicts to these hospitals for withdrawal from drugs, are maintained in central Harlem, Astoria, and Washington Heights. Other addicts are accepted when they are referred by recognized voluntary agencies, among them East Harlem Protestant Parish, Teen Challenge, the Salvation Army, and the Greek Pentacostal Church, all of whom maintain their own programs to combat addiction.

Because most of the research work, in practice, is conducted independently of the narcotics coordinators office, Dr. Hess occasionally does not refer to it in describing the city's program. It has led some voluntary agencies to complain that the city's approach to addiction is virtually incoherent.

Dr. Hess, in the interview, rubbed her eyes with her knuckles, leaned forward and rested her head on her elbows, and said the charge just wasn't true.

"As long as you've got addicts to go for the hospital they're off the street," she said. "That's our basic operating theory."

"Let him free for 24 hours," Dr. Hess says of the addict, "and they're nudging him. Let's try one. Let's just try one shot."

Dr. Hess agrees that halfway houses—voluntary guidance clinics must play a major role in the city's program.

"They all need funds. They all need guidelines. But we also have to see that certain standards are met before we can help them. We have to try to give them the benefit of our experience. They must have good structured programs."

What standards have to be met?

"Why they have to meet the sanitary code, the health code and the fire code," she said.

But halfway houses generally do their work in the slums. What of teenage addiction in better-income groups?

TEENAGERS

"I frankly admit I just don't know what my problem with the middle class is," says Dr. Hess. But she does know the problem with teenagers: "How do I prevent these kids," is the way she puts it, "from using everything under the sun?"

In her fight against addiction, Dr. Hess speaks on an average of once a week, sometimes more often, to any group, large or small, that requests a speaker on narcotics, from the health department. She has also commissioned a freelance writer to prepare five pamphlets for the narcotics coordinator's office. They deal with, she says, pep pills, barbituates, marihuana, narcotics, and alcoholism. But Dr. Hess has not consulted public information experts in the health department on how the booklets should be prepared, or who should do them.

Dr. Hess says she agrees with most of the medical profession that marihuana is less dangerous than heroin and its usage does not deeply trouble her.

"You take a street like 100th Street in central Harlem," she says, "practically all of them are smoking marihuana. Say 2,000 people. Only 10 percent of them become heroin addicts."

But marihuana at present is an illegal drug. Did Dr. Hess not feel the law should be enforced?

"Well," she said, "probably you and I commit all kinds of criminal acts every day. Society has become more permissive."

When halfway houses actually become part of a city program, Dr. Hess has this plan for using them:

"We can put the addict in the slot where he will do well, I intend to make this selection in a hospital setting. I might send an addict, for example, to East Harlem Protestant Parish. If he fails and goes back on drugs, quick, right away, I make a home visit and try to find the cause of failure. Then I decide which slot to try him in next."

Meanwhile, New York has no organized halfway house program, and Dr. Hess' office does no more than warn voluntary agencies when a patient they have referred to a city hospital is being released. Other addicts are referred to the West Side Rehabilitation Center at 96th Street and Broadway in Manhattan, the city's only facility for posthospital care.

But 21 days or 6 weeks after an addict enters a city hospital to withdraw from drugs, if he voluntarily remains for the full period of treatment, he is back on the streets again. The narcotics coordinators office does two things. If the patient was referred by a voluntary agency, the agency is immediately notified that he is about to be released. Those that are admitted from one of the city's four intake centers are told to report to the West Side Rehabilitation Center at 96th Street and Broadway in Manhattan. The center—the only municipal one in the city—comprises 5,000 square feet in what was once a bowling alley that burned out a few months before it was opened. The addicts who report within 24 hours are examined, processed and put on welfare roles. Periodically, urine samples are taken to test whether they have remained off drugs. This test is supposedly a condition of welfare eligibility.

Until 8 months ago, the center's technique of collecting urine samples was easily foiled by addicts who did not want to stay clean. A "black market" in "clean urine" developed in the neighborhood. The price for a sample was 50 cents. Samples are now collected under the direct observation of one of the center's staff members.

Mayor Wagner has said, not without pride, that West Side is the only rehabilitation center of its kind in the United States. It is. The only trouble is that the rehabilitation work it does is almost nil.

An addict who reports there for the first time comes from the subway at 96th Street and Broadway. On both sides of the avenue as he exits are cafeterias, which he has been told at times were two of the best places to "cop" heroin in the city. Police in the 24th precinct have recently kept the area clear of sellers, but the corner is still a gathering place for addicts and ex-addicts.

A NO. 25 SPIKE

Standing in front of the entrance to the center, street talk is invariably drug talk. Nellie, a 60-year-old addict, says she got a new No. 25 "spike" (hypodermic) for Christmas. Jack wants to talk about the great days of addiction and the times he had when "stuff" was real stuff. Other addicts talk about the Federal hospital in Lexington and doctors they know on a first-name basis.

The patient making his first trip to West Side, when he finishes lounging around in front, walks up one flight of stairs to the center itself. Directly in front of him is a wall. On his right is a commercial pool hall. On his left is a large white door that is always locked. Faced with this alternative, dozens of addicts assume the center is closed and go home. Some discover that the facilities entrance is around the stair well at the opposite end of the building.

The inside of the center might be a locker room. The entire facility is one huge room, separated into offices, examining sections, and a recreation room separated by beaverboard partitions. The first sign he sees amid the bulletin boards in the reception room says: "Ladies room. Only one person allowed in this room at a time. If you violate this rule you will be told to leave the center."

His second greeting comes from one of the two receptionists whose desks are in the waiting room. While he waits to be registered and examined, he notices a ping pong table in the recreation room. No one is playing ping pong, but he sees four or five men he may know sitting on chairs near it, looking uncomfortable, with little more to do than read a magazine.

Sherman Patrick, executive director of the center, has an office in one of the partitioned sections. He has a note on his desk from Dr. Hess, his immediate superior. It says bluntly: "I would like you to stress as many positive aspects of the program as possible."

The pay in this job is $9,800 a year, but Sherman Patrick looks at the memorandum as if it were a coffee stain on his desk. He begins to describe facilities, group therapy, and the center's limited recreation facilities and the role they play in the center's program. In theory, it all sounds very good.

"You better ask me questions," Mr. Patrick, a scholarly Negro researcher says, waving the memorandum from his superior. "You better ask me questions if we're going to talk about this program at all."

City records indicate that about 1,000 addicts report to the West Side Rehabilitation Center each year and give the impression that the figure represents the number of addicts in a rehabilitation program of some kind. Mr. Patrick said this is an inaccurate impression. The great bulk of those who report are examined, placed on welfare rolls, and told to check in regularly to deposit urine specimens. That is the extent of their rehabilitation. Only 37 male patients are in a day-care program of any kind because of the limited facilities. The center has absolutely no day-care facilities for women.

Between 40 and 45 people are employed by the city at West Side although the figure changes because it is frequently difficult to fill jobs already in the budget. A substantial portion of the $789,979 in the health department's 1964–65 budget for addictive diseases is used to pay these people.

Some others who work at West Side are on the department of hospital's pay roll. Even in such a limited facility as West Side, paperwork is such a factor that a person is employed almost full time, Mr. Patrick says, merely to account for the half-dozen people on the hospital payroll.

Though this is a center where a primary concern is recordkeeping and research work, three of the four stenographers assigned to the unit cannot even type.

For more than a year, a full-time social-worker was included in departmental budgets for the center, but no one was hired. This was typical of the limitations under which the center had to operate. The center still has no occupational or vocational therapist, though such skilled people are crucial to any rehabilitation program.

What West Side does have is a number of doctors paid to devote a specific number of man-hours to work at the center. They examine and treat patients for physical diseases, supervise limited group therapy sessions with patients in the day-care program and occasionally treat a patient on an individual basis.

Because payroll represents more than 90 percent of Dr. Hess' budget for addictive diseases, West Side is pitifully lacking in physical facilities. Its budget request, submitted to Dr. Hess on October 19, 1964, tells part of the story. In addition to requests for an occupational therapist, the center said it needed such basic materials as nine desks for staff members, a conference table, a half dozen lamps, and three filing cabinets to add to the one allotted for the entire facility. Cooking, one of the therapeutic activities Dr. Hess has prescribed for patients, also creates some problems. As the budget pointed out, the only room available for this was without windows or proper ventilation and the center had no fan.

West Side's present facilities include a ping-pong table, a television set donated by a staff member, and a magazine reading rack. It has no real recreational facilities. It has no facilities for woodworking, machine lathing, or any other machinery that could be used to provide addicts with work in which they might take pride.

But despite the center's handicaps, Mr. Patrick says there are patients who, after a year in the day-care program, are ready to be trained for a job. But there is literally no place in the city of New York for them to go.

"It's like Charley Brown and the football," Mr. Patrick says. "Here this guy has worked to keep himself clean and we've spent time and money to help him keep clean and help him get at some of his problems. He's ready to move ahead and he steps up to kick the ball. What happens? Somebody pulls it away and he falls flat on his face. Where does he go? Back on drugs."

Another problem tends to further distort the city's official picture of the addict. The average age of patients at West Side is 37, almost 20 years older than the younger addicts police believe are at the root of the crime problem. Most doctors believe that, after 35, addicts tend to "mature out" on their own, change their values, and give up drugs. The age of its patients are another factor in the meaninglessness of the West Side program.

NO PLACE TO GO

"We're supposed to be a rehabilitation center," says Mr. Patrick, "and we get people in an age group that have the least potential for rehabilitation. They're not only the oldest, but the people with the fewest skills. And even when we do succeed, there is just no place to send them."

New York's narcotics coordinator may or may not know all this. She visited the city's only rehabilitation center exactly twice last year, once for a Christmas party and once to introduce a consultant from her hometown, Philadelphia. Dr. Hess is the central official source of narcotics information in New York City, but she also has not held a single full staff conference in the last year, and many on the staff say that this has not helped morale any.

New York's narcotics addiction problem is indeed, in the mayor's words, a "tangled forest." But the tangle does not arise simply because there is no absolute cure, no single solution to narcotics addiction. Most experts agree that there are many paths to follow to a solution, many programs that could facilitate real care and possibly even cures for addicts.

But part of the trouble is that basic research the city might have done, and could still do, is totally lacking. More of the trouble is with the inability to develop meaningful programs even within facilities, like West Side, that the city is providing funds to support.

Exactly how grim the tangled forest in the city narcotics coordinator's office can be was evident not long ago.

Anxious to further the care New York was providing for addicts after they left city hospitals, on March 11, Mayor Wagner sent to the board of estimate registration No. 6606 (vol. 139) requesting $305,587 "to provide new services in an area of addictive control."

It was, of course, a program that would parallel the methods of the West Side Rehabilitation Center and this one would be in the Bronx, starting later this year. Brooklyn, the mayor said, will get its rehabilitation center, too, also modeled after West Side. If the city follows present plans, this one will be set up in 1966.

Sherman Patrick's view, based on his experience at West Side, was never communicated to Mayor Wagner.

He says what he has to say clearly enough.

"I think they should close this facility," says Sherman Patrick. "The way things are now, we're just spending a lot of money and fooling the public."

"In war," Napoleon once warned his staff, "a great disaster indicates a great culprit."

There are no culprits in New York, because this city's attack on addiction is not really a war at all.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this is National Small Business Week by proclamation of President Johnson. It is fitting at this time that we honor achievements on behalf of small business.

Small business produces one-third of our Nation's goods and services and is a principal source of employment and opportunity for our people. Our Government is the largest purchaser of goods and services in the American market, and the manner in which it exercises this function profoundly affects the destiny of the Nation.

Through the years, as a Member of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I have studied the small business programs of the military and civilian agencies.

In 1964, prime contract awards to business firms by these agencies were $35 billion, of which the Defense Department awarded $27 billion. Defense awards to small business were $4.8 billion, or 18 percent. This represents an increase in dollars and percentages for small business over the previous year in the face of a decrease in Defense Department procurements.

During the first 9 months of 1965, we again witnessed an increase in prime contract awards to small business despite a decrease in Defense spending. Procurements decreased $1.6 billion while small business awards increased $345 million. This represents an increase to 20.7 percent from 17.1 percent for the same 9-month period in 1964.

Last October, President Johnson commended the Department of Defense for its fiscal 1964 activities on behalf of small business. From present indications, the current fiscal year may be even better for small business. We are pleased to note that the Department of Defense heeded our Government procurement Subcommittee's recommendation in its report at the close of the last Congress, which stated that the Department "must continue to aggressively enforce its small business prime procurement program during 1965 to maintain or better its 1964 results in the face of expected further curtailment in defense spending in 1965."

In recognition of National Small Business Week, the Secretary of Defense has urged the military departments to join in honoring the role of small business in the U.S. defense mission. This is in line with our continuing interest in small business.

The achievements of small business will receive our attention throughout the year. We must be sure that small business continues viable and continues to make a meaningful contribution to our economy and people.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF REA

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to one of the great social and economic programs started by the Congress whose 30th anniversary was celebrated May 11 of this year.

When the Rural Electrification Administration started in 1935, the percentage of farms in Iowa with electric service was only slightly more than the national average of 10.9 percent. However, the real surge forward to lighten the work of the farm wife and to add electric power to the farmer's production capability arrived with the availability of REA loans to finance construction, on a greater scale than heretofore attempted.

Iowa was represented among the very first group of loans to be granted from work relief funds at the disposal of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It was the Central Iowa Power Co., of Des Moines; which, 3 months after receiving approval of the loan, energized the first line December 15, 1935.

After 30 years of devoted effort by hundreds of Iowa farm leaders working with the REA staff, we can proudly say our State is now 99 percent electrified. It has taken 58 REA electric borrowers, including 55 cooperatives, to reach this goal of almost 100 percent electrification. Over 150,000 rural Iowa consumers are being served over 61,000 miles of lines.

It has required a quarter of a billion dollars of investment to make this unexcelled electric service possible. all of which is being repaid with interest, ahead of schedule and without a single borrower overdue in its repayments. That is a fiscal record of which I am sure we all can be proud.

Iowa has also made use of REA's telephone program. There are 50 telephone system borrowers who have been approved for over $45 million to build modern, automatic dial telephone service benefiting 100,000 subscribers. Of this number 13,000 are receiving telephone service for the first time.

At the beginning of this year Iowa electric consumers had made a total of $106 million in payments on their Government loans. This sum included $56 million repaid in principal as due plus $18 million of principal paid ahead of contract schedule. In addition to these principal repayments, Iowans through their use of electricity had paid in interest to the U.S. Treasury a total of $32 million.

Thus the first three decades of rural electrification reveal that the foresight of the Congress in providing these programs of electric and telephone service has changed the entire living and working standards of rural America, enabled our agriculture to outproduce the world, and make possible living standards in the country that are comparable to those in our cities and suburbs.

Although we may rejoice over the success of REA we cannot lose sight of the fact that much remains to be done in this far-reaching activity. Where are the additional supplies of electric energy to come from? For every 8 to 10 years the energy requirements of rural consumers is doubling and more and more sources of cheap energy must be found or created.

In 1953 monthly consumption on Iowa REA-financed lines per consumer was 317 kilowatt-hours. By 1963 the average had risen to 679 kilowatt-hours, or more than double. So the work of REA and its need is not done because there is a continuing objective to provide adequate service under rates and conditions comparable to those available in urban communities.

Congress should not hamper this program with restrictions that are demanded by its critics who do not have the best interest of the farmer at heart. Low consumer density and low revenue per mile make the service job harder for REA borrowers than for other groups in the power business. REA borrowers in Iowa serve only 2.5 consumers per mile and average $511 in revenue per mile. This compares to 29.6 consumers and $6,105 per mile for class A and B commercial utilities.

When we consider that for every dollar of REA loans invested in these Iowa systems, consumers have invested $5 in house wiring and electric appliances and equipment, we can see what impetus has been given our economy. Nationwide surveys show that these REA-financed lines are making possible over a billion dollar market a year for new electric equipment, a flow of dollars that reaches into every industrial center of the Nation and fully justifies this program as a catalyst to the continued prosperity and growth of our gross national product.

As REA looks forward to its future help in the fields of electric and telephone services, I want to express my profound admiration for what has been accomplished and to wish the agency and its dedicated staff many more years of fruitful activity.

EXPLORER SCOUTS OF BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Irwin] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, a group of young Explorer Scouts in Bridgeport, Conn., is importing 40 troubador uniforms from Mexico. I am asking that they be relieved of paying the 42.5 percent customs duty on the apparel worth about $1,000.

The Scouts have founded a drum and bugle corps. They are studying and playing the music of Latin America. To strike a note of authenticity, they wish to wear the troubador uniform. Attempts were made to procure these in the United States. None could be found on the retail market. It would cost approximately $4,000 to have them custom made in this country. This is too high for the Troubadors.

The Troubadors Drum and Bugle Corps is a nonprofit organization, sustaining itself by the more tedious and low-profit methods of fundraising—as paper drives and cake sales.

One of the most compelling reasons for helping this group is in the nature of the city, Bridgeport, in which they live. Bridgeport, like many cities, is taking action to combat its poverty. To meet poverty's challenge, we must encourage groups as the Explorer Scouts.

In addition, that cultural diversity and interest which we are trying to promote across the country is dependent on such international contributions.

It is for this reason, that I ask for relief on this single shipment of uniforms.

NEED FOR NATIONAL BOXING COMMISSIONER

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the time is long overdue for the Federal Government to regulate the sport of boxing. The Clay-Liston fight, with its incredible blunders and mismanagement, is just another example of the need for a National Boxing Commissioner.

There is no doubt that boxing is involved in interstate commerce and that the Federal Government has the power to control this activity. It is also clear that the Federal Government has an obligation to exercise this power.

The Clay-Liston fight proved the necessity for Federal standards to protect the public from being cheated. There are other pressing considerations.

We need a National Boxing Commissioner to eliminate the influence of racketeers.

In addition, often boxers, who are not physically capable of fighting, are allowed to fight at great risk to their physical and mental well-being and in some cases even their lives.

The States have recognized the need for some form of policing of this sport. However, State boxing commissions have time and time again proven inadequate. In addition, State commissions have no power over the showing of closed-circuit television in the State. Overall coordination and supervision is clearly needed.

Today I have again introduced legislation to establish, in the Department of Justice, the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner. I sponsored similar legislation in the 87th and 88th Congresses. This legislation is the product of the dedication of one of our greatest Senators, the late Senator Estes Kefauver with whom I worked very closely on this matter. In fact, in June of 1961 I testified before the Kefauver committee on behalf of this bill. If the Congress had followed the leadership of Senator Kefauver the ludicrous performance of last Tuesday night might have been avoided.

Under this legislation the National Boxing Commissioner would have the authority to grant licenses where the issuance of licenses "is not contrary to the public interest or the interest of the lawful conduct of activities in professional boxing." The bill provides criminal penalties for those who participate directly or indirectly in professional boxing without receiving a license from the National Boxing Commissioner. The Boxing Commissioner is also authorized to establish standards for the physical examination of boxers. He would have supervisory authority over boxing contracts and other matters pertaining to the sport of boxing.

I urge the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings on this bill, and hope that it will be promptly enacted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Flynt (at the request of Mr. Stephens) for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Pucinski, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hall) were given permission to address the House, to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. QUIE, on June 1, for 60 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New York, on June 2, for 30 minutes.

Mr. REINECKE, on June 3, for 30 minutes.

Mr. CALLAWAY, on June 7, for 30 minutes.

Mr. GURNEY, on June 8, for 30 minutes.

Mr. WYDLER, on June 9, for 30 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. TENZER.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter in his remarks in the Committee of the Whole today on H.R. 5883.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KREBS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CALLAN in two instances.

Mr. STEPHENS.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mr. IRWIN.

Mr. HOWARD.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1689. An act to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502); to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 806. An act to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act to permit the listing on labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product;

H.R. 6691. An act to validate certain payments made to employees of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; and

H.R. 7031. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 28, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1169. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of savings in interest costs to the Government attainable by greater use of Treasury checking account, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati (H. Doc. No. 192); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1170. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary procurement of Hawk and Nike-Hercules missile spare components because of deficiencies in requirements computations, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 2263. A bill to provide for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the extent and means of resolving the critical shortage of qualified manpower in the field of correctional rehabilitation; without amendment (Rept. No. 381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5024. A bill to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, and the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, with respect to the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5252. A bill to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force; with amendment (Rept. No. 383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 903. A bill to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5280. A bill to provide for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 385). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8439. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROONEY of New York: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 8639. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 8283. A bill to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; without amendment (Rept. No. 428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 618. An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli; without amendment (Rept. No. 387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 856. An act for the relief of the estate of R. M. Clark; without amendment (Rept. No. 388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1473. A bill for the relief of Edward V. Amason and Emerita Cecilia Amador Amason; with amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1481. A bill for the relief of the estate of Donovan C. Moffett; with amendment (Rept. No. 390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2913. A bill for the relief of Lt. Thomas A. Farrell, U.S. Navy, and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3103. A bill for the relief of Joanne Marie Evans; with amendment (Rept. No. 392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3750. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; with amendment (Rept. No. 393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3900. A bill for the relief of Jong Wan Lee; with amendment (Rept. No. 394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4027. A bill for the relief of Capt. Ted M. Richardson, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4028. A bill for the relief of Capt. Richard A. Ingram and Capt. Arthur R. Sprott, Jr., U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4029. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John E. McRoberts and T. Sgt. Harold C. Fisher, Jr., U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4070. A bill for the relief of Dedrick A. Maanum; with amendment (Rept. No. 398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4324. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John W. Cassell, U.S. Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4719. A bill for the relief of Josephine C. Rumley, administratrix of the estate of George S. Rumley; without amendment (Rept. No. 400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5206. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Gorfain; with amendment (Rept. No.

401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5265. A bill for the relief of Gordon E. Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5471. A bill for the relief of of the widow and minor children of the Reverend Donald Aksel Olsen; without amendment (Rept. No. 403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5819. A bill for the relief of John Henry Taylor; without amendment (Rept. No. 404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRIDER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5613. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5815. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. James P. Hubbard, U.S. Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5839. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Donald R. Hurrle, U.S. Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5902. A bill for the relief of Cecil Graham; with amendment (Rept. No. 408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5911. A bill for the relief of Maj. Warren G. Ward, Capt. Paul H. Beck, and Capt. Russell K. Hansen, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6318. A bill for the relief of Lee R. Smith and Lee R. Smith III, his son; without amendment (Rept. No. 410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRIDER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6441. A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6527. A bill for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort; with amendment (Rept. No. 412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary H.R. 7090. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; with amendment (Rept. No. 413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7137. A bill for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7138. A bill for the relief of Maj. Donald B. Powers, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept No. 415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7233. A bill for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7355. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Claude E. Tabor, Jr., U.S Air Force; without amendment (Rept No. 417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7435. A bill for the relief of Col. Thomas O. Lawton, Jr., U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7682. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Christian Voss; without amendment (Rept. No. 419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7822. A bill for the relief of Marvin D. Nells; without amendment (Rept. No. 420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5830. A bill for the relief of CPO James J. Griffin, U.S. Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7439. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. David A. Staver, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7436. A bill for the relief of Maj. Victor R. Robinson, Jr., U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRIDER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7437. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Nicholas A. Stathis, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7438. A bill for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Samuel W. Smith, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7440. A bill for the relief of Col. William W. Thomas and Lt. Col. Norman R. Snyder, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 8615. A bill to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 8616. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 8617. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 8618. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 8619. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREIGG:

H.R. 8620. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters in reference to the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 8621. A bill to provide for the general welfare by assisting the States, through a program of grants-in-aid, to establish and operate special hospital facilities for the treatment and cure of narcotic addicts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8622. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for expenses paid by him for the education of any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 8623. A bill to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to limit button blanks to raw or crude blanks suitable for manufacture into buttons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 8624. A bill to amend section 116 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 8625. A bill to grant full retirement benefits to U.S. Government civil service employees after 35 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 8626. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, relating to assistance for schools in federally impacted areas, to provide that payments on account of children who live on Federal property with a parent employed there will be made at a rate equal to the State average per pupil expenditure; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 8627. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Ohio; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8628. A bill to prohibit the mutilation of currency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 8629. A bill to extend and amend the provisions of the wheat program authorized in the Agricultural Act of 1964; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 8630. A bill to reserve certain public lands for a national wild rivers system, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8631. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 8632. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 8633. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to exclude from income pension and annuity payments under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's pension under chapter 15 of that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 8634. A bill to provide premium pay under specified conditions to certain employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 8635. A bill to establish and prescribe the duties of a Federal Boxing Commission for the purpose of insuring that the channels of interstate commerce are free from false or fraudulent descriptions or depictions of professional boxing contests; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 8636. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 8637. A bill to provide that certain surplus property of the United States may be donated for park or recreational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 8638. A bill to amend section 316 of the Social Security Amendments of 1958 to extend the time within which teachers and other employees covered by the same retirement system in the State of Maine may be treated as being covered by separate retirement systems for purposes of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 8639. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.J. Res. 488. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.J. Res. 489. Joint resolution to provide for the development of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 490. Joint resolution extending recognition to the international exposition, HemisFair 1968, and authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the exposition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H.J. Res. 491. Joint resolution to require Members of Congress to file at the beginning of each regular session of each Congress a financial statement and a statement of business dealings with the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

H.J. Res. 492. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Res. 403. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation and study of all aspects of professional boxing; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 8640. A bill for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Robert J. Becker, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8641. A bill for the relief of Maj. Derrill deS. Trenholm, Jr., U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8642. A bill for the relief of Col. Eugene F. Tyree, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 8643. A bill for the relief of Grigorios Tsioros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 8644. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by a contractor of the Forest Service who were not paid for their services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 8645. A bill for the relief of Petros D. Dimitra Roumeliotis (Romas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 8646. A bill for the relief of Rifkin Textiles Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 8647. A bill for the relief of the Troubadors Drum and Bugle Corps of Bridgeport, Conn.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 8648. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ramon K. Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8649. A bill for the relief of Eugene J. Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 8650. A bill for the relief of Mother Narcisia (Gregoria Rodriguez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 8651. A bill for the relief of Kim Diana Moody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 8652. A bill for the relief of certain employees and former employees of the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Basis for Support of Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been proposed a $3.5 billion tax cut and I think it is important that we understand the basis for our support for this measure.

This proposal follows the income tax cut of 1964 of $14 billion. Following that change, consumer buying rose by $28 billion, business investment in plants and equipment rose $6.5 billion, and employment increased by 2 million and unemployment was reduced to new lows. This Nation has enjoyed the longest continued stretch of economic expansion in many years.

The most recent proposal to reduce taxes will have, we are told, similarly beneficial effects on our economy.

In addition to these predicted effects on our economy, I have received assurances that the reductions in the taxes on local and long distance telephone calls will be passed on to the consumers and I expect that the other businesses involved will also pass the reductions to the consumers.

This will mean more money in the pockets of our consumers and will provide a lift to our economy.

I support this measure on this basis, Mr. Speaker, secure in the knowledge that our people and the economy will be the beneficiaries.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the Armenians have been one of the most persecuted of all peoples in known history, and have suffered most in their historic homeland under conquering alien oppressors. They had lost their national independence more than a century before Columbus discovered America, and since then most of them have been living in dispersion. Their country was divided among their three powerful neighbors—the Turks, Persians and Russians. Under the domination of all three they suffered, yet in suffering they hoped to find their national salvation. During all that time they steadfastly clung to their national traditions and ideals: their Christian faith and their love of freedom. The more they were oppressed, the more firmly they believed that some day and somehow their day of freedom would come. That day came at the end of the First World War.

During that war most of the Armenians in the Asiatic provinces of Turkey—actually ancient Armenia—were deported and massacred. In this holocaust about 1 million Armenians lost their lives and several hundred thousands of the survivors escaped to the Caucasus, the northern part of Armenia then under Russian domination. As a result of the Russian Revolution and the collapse of czarist authority there, Armenians felt free to take their destiny into their hands and proclaim their independence. That was done on May 28, 1918. At the time the Armenians were fighting the Turks, and the population of the country consisted mostly of refugees. Under such difficult circumstance the existence of the new state was most precarious. But in the midst of insurmountable difficulties the leaders of reclaimed Armenia struggled hard, and did manage to carry on for about 2 years. Then the turn of international diplomacy played a trick upon them. The rising Turkish nationalist state and Communist Russia were determined to put an end to the Armenian state.

Late in the fall of 1920 Armenia was attacked both by the Turks and the Soviets. In a few weeks it was overrun by both. By early December independent Armenia was no more. Then the Soviets set up the Soviet Socialist Armenian Republic within the Soviet Union, and that is the only trace left of the short-lived independent Armenia. But the idea of freedom and independence lives on in Armenia, in the hearts and souls of the Armenian people, and they celebrate their Independence Day as a most memorable event in their turbulent history.

H.R. 8442: To Provide Increase in Social Security Lump-Sum Death Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1965, I introduced H.R. 8442 which provides for an increase in the maximum lump-sum death payment under social security from $255 to $312 immediately and to $368 after 1971. The present lump-sum death payment was established by Congress in 1952 and it is apparent that since that time the Consumer Price Index has risen; the cost of funerals has skyrocketed, having risen at least 30 percent; and hospital and medical costs of the last illness have risen approximately 50 percent—all without a corresponding increase in social security death benefits.

My bill, H.R. 8442, incorporates the proposals of the 1965 Advisory Council on Social Security which strongly urged a revision in the maximum lump-sum death payment. The Council specifically recommended that the amount of the payment be changed from the present maximum amount of $255 to the highest family maximum monthly benefit. In other words, under this proposal the maximum death payment would increase whenever the maximum monthly family benefits is increased. At the present time this would mean an increase of the death payment from $255 to $312 and after 1971, when the statutory ceiling for maximum monthly benefits rises, from $312 to $368.

This revision would benefit more than 600,000 families including millions of dependents who face the tragedy of the death of the family breadwinner with insufficient financial resources. While benefiting many, the cost of implementing this legislation would be minimal.

We cannot become complacent with what has gone before but rather we must recognize and deal with, each year, the problems concerning social security which were not envisioned by those who drafted the original Social Security Act. The social security program has been a successful investment for millions of Americans, and its continuing expansion and improvement can be a source of pride for Congress and for every American.

On March 26, 1965, I introduced H.R. 6843 to provide benefits to widows who remarry after age 62 but who under the present social security law forfeit benefits because of their remarriage. I stated at that time that this was but one of many inequities of our present law, inequities which should be corrected at the earliest possible moment.

The proposed increase in the lump-sum death payment is another example of an inequity which has resulted from the lapse of 13 years without an amendment to a section of the Social Security Act which applies to more than 1 million families each year.

I urge my colleagues to give this proposal careful consideration and continue the record of success in working toward an efficient, comprehensive social security system.

Thirtieth Anniversary of the REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the State of Georgia, I wish to bring the attention of the House to a most significant anniversary which occurred this month—the 30th birthday of the Rural Electrification Administration.

I deem it an honor and a privilege to make this tribute because it was from our State that two of the more outstanding events occurred which made possible the electrification of rural America and the ability to reach unserved farms which would have never been served in any other way.

Although REA is 30 years old, it was as far back as 1924 that Franklin Delano Roosevelt first began thinking about the problem of electrifying rural America. In August 1938, in a speech at Barnesville, Ga., President Roosevelt gave this account of the birth of REA:

> Fourteen years ago, a Democratic Yankee came to a neighboring county in your State in search of a pool of warm water wherein he might swim his way back to health. There was only one discordant note in that first stay of mine at Warm Springs. When the first-of-the-month bill came in for electric light for my little cottage, I found that the charge was 18 cents a kilowatt-hour—about four times what I pay at Hyde Park, N.Y. That started my long study of public utility charges for electric current and the whole subject of getting electricity into farm homes * * *. So it can be said that a little cottage at Warm Springs, Ga., was the birthplace of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Today a suitable plaque and marker at Warm Springs remind visitors that here arose the circumstances which started the search and inspired the efforts to light up rural America and bring the blessings of abundance of electric power to the farm homes of this great country of ours.

At the time President Roosevelt issued his executive order creating the Rural Electrification Administration, only 6,956 farms in Georgia had service, 2.8 percent of the farms. The national average then was 10.8 percent of the farms electrified and we in Georgia were only a fourth of the national average. In August 1935, REA approved its first loan to the Peach State, and in June of 1936 the first line was energized.

Today 69,000 miles of line are reaching 368,000 rural consumers as a result of this most significant program, one which has done more to change the lives and living conditions of rural Georgia than anything else. The investment to serve these fellow Georgians totals over $166 million and it is being handled through interest-bearing loans to 45 borrowers, of which 44 are nonprofit electric cooperatives.

What a contrast. In 1935, only 2.8 percent of our farms had electric service. Today 98.8 percent of the 92,000 farms in the State are served. And of that percent, three-fourths have received service made possible by REA loans.

But this fine record, repeated in most of the States throughout our Nation, would not have been possible but for a most significant milestone sponsored by a Georgia Congressman. I refer, of course, to Stephen Pace. It was his bill in 1944 which made a significant change in the interest rate on REA loans and the payout period. His legislation removed the shackles which prevented REA from moving ahead rapidly to electrify rural America and reach those thinly settled areas to which no one else could ever bring electric service using conventional means and methods.

The goal of area coverage received concrete support through the provisions of the Pace Act. Farms never before capable of receiving electric service now found this great modern invention capable of application and aid in increasing farm production and making us the greatest food-producing nation the world has ever seen.

The Pace Act set a uniform, firm interest rate. This made it possible for directors of the hundreds of electric systems to plan their future expansions on a sound basis, without jeopardizing the ability to repay loans on the earlier sections they had built. By extending the payout period the Pace Act provided an extra margin of credit which enabled the REA borrowers to expand and serve more consumers without endangering their ability to meet payments on what had already been borrowed and invested.

Because more money is invested in the electric power business than any other business in this country and because investment capital plays such a large role in developing additional electric service, the wise provisions of the Pace Act made possible one of the most remarkable loan repayment records in the history of finance.

By the first of this year, REA borrowers in Georgia had made a total of $78,297,355 in payments on their Government loans. These included $48 million repaid on principal as due, $6 million of principal repaid ahead of schedule, and interest payments of $24 million. No borrower was overdue in its payments.

The record is also outstanding in the other 45 States in which REA has made loans. The money invested in rural electric systems is coming back to the U.S. Treasury on schedule and even ahead of the contract payment dates.

From time to time there has been opinion voiced that the interest rate set by the Pace Act is not high enough. Yet we must consider that in my State of Georgia, the REA-financed systems, with three-fourths of all the rural load, are still averaging only 4.3 consumers per mile and annual revenue of $437 per mile.

In Georgia, as in the other States, for every $1 invested in our electric lines, the consumers have spent $5 in wiring their homes and farmsteads and getting appliances with which to use the electricity now available to them. In 1953 the average monthly consumption was 208 kilowatt-hours. By 1963 the average had risen to 450 kilowatt-hours, more than double. And it is continuing to rise and double every 8 to 10 years.

Surveys have shown that the nearly 1,000 REA electric borrowers have created a new rural market for over a billion and a quarter dollars for equipment and appliances. Here is a stimulus to the economy which could not be reached in any other way. Workers in the cities, manufacturers everywhere have greater demand for their products as a result of rural electrification. Yes, REA can be proud of the record it has made.

Address by Hon. Carlton R. Sickles at the Graduation Ceremonies of the University of Maryland's School of Social Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a speech delivered last night by my Maryland colleague, Congressman Carlton R. Sickles, at the graduation ceremonies of the University of Maryland's School of Social Work in Baltimore.

In his message, Congressman Sickles impressed upon these emerging professional social workers the importance of harmonious cooperation between public and volunteer agencies, between professional workers and the subprofessional indigenous poor who must be involved in current antipoverty and social welfare operations.

Representative Sickles' speech follows:

Social Work on the Move

(By Congressman Carlton R. Sickles)

I am delighted to be with you on this important occasion.

I commend you who have recently finished the arduous study required for a master's degree in social work, for not having been done the easy thing and decided at some point along the way that you could just as well pursue your career without full professional education.

In earning your master's degree you have equipped yourself to be a leader in the centuries-old effort to see that all of mankind have an equal chance for happiness and satisfaction.

You have earned the right to have your professional judgment respected—and acted upon. You have shown your willingness to tackle jobs that require responsible and decisive action. You have demonstrated your patriotism—for the social well-being of our Nation depends on the social well-being of her people.

Your master's degree means that you have the knowledge and the professional competence to carry out responsible missions in the congested quarters of the inner city and in the barren hollows of Appalachia. You understand and know what should be done about crowded housing, illiteracy and lack of skills, sickly bodies, and—more damaging than all the rest—bias and bigotry—aimed at people solely because they are poor, or poor and dark skinned.

The opportunities to practice your new profession stretch widely across the professional horizon.

Your skills and judgment and your prestige would be equally welcome in dozens of agencies, schools, hospitals, churches, and institutions throughout Maryland and, indeed the Nation. You are badly needed by hundreds upon hundreds of families, children, and adults who are suffering from social, health, and economic problems in every community in this land.

Wherever you go, I am confident that you will be appreciated because the demands upon your profession are greater than ever before.

The rapid growth of our national population—with the great increases in the proportion of young people and the elderly—is, in itself, a major challenge to the social welfare field. Child welfare and health agencies are bursting at the seams and waiting lists are long. Many of the children who need help most are not receiving it because we do not yet have the staffs and the programs to reach out to them and their parents.

Similarly, facilities and services for senior citizens—despite the widespread interest and activity in this field—have not been able to keep pace with the expanding population of the aged.

In our large cities, problems are further complicated by many other changes. Large numbers of relatively unskilled newcomers came to our cities in response to the need for workers during the two decades following the Second World War.

They have now found, in too many cases, that their job opportunities have disappeared with the impact of automation and the large number of unskilled applicants.

Unskilled workers in all age groups and in all parts of the country are feeling the pressure of technological change. While new opportunities are opening rapidly for the highly skilled worker, the worker with few skills has found his future darkened and his hope dimmed.

Statistically we know that nearly one-fifth of all American families, including one-fourth of all of our children, are living in poverty today. We are confronted by a critical situation whose solution will require the best efforts of all of us.

Our cities are involved in an especially difficult set of problems: the high concentrations of population; the continuing decay of the slums, which get older every year and would be decaying even if nobody lived in them; the serious lack of sufficient recreational and cultural facilities in neighborhoods where they are needed the most; and the urgent shortages of health and medical care that press most tightly on those with low incomes. The list of problems that complicate the lives of the poor could be extended almost indefinitely.

It was considerations such as these that led the President to declare unconditional war on poverty in America; to propose the antipoverty bill—the Economic Opportunity Act—which was enacted last year; and to urge a series of measures relating to education, health, welfare, air and water pollution, and urban development.

It was similar considerations that led 3 years ago to the passage of the 1962 public welfare amendments to the Social Security Act, the most far reaching attempt to improve our public welfare programs since they were initiated 30 years ago. These amendments have made possible a wide range of progressive changes in our public welfare programs. I don't need to remind this group that the potential benefits of this historic legislation are only beginning to be realized. States were given a 5-year period in which to fully establish the greatly expanded social services authorized by the 1962 amendments. It was expected also that it would take this period of time to get into full operation the staff development programs that would train the increased numbers of public welfare employees who would be needed to carry out these social services.

Along with this tremendous surge of activity in public health and welfare programs, voluntary agencies throughout the Nation are asking themselves challenging questions about their own programs: Who needs services? What kinds of services are needed? How can changing programs be formulated to meet changing needs? How is the role of the voluntary agencies changing as public programs are changed?

These questions are crucial. We are living in a period of rapid social and economic change, confronted simultaneously by untold opportunities and telling problems. We can look toward the future with great hope because we now have the economic capability to eliminate poverty. But we must look toward an immediate future filled with the complex social challenges that change inevitably brings.

One of the things I want to stress in my remarks to you this evening is the vital importance of pulling together. Call it interagency cooperation, teamwork, or whatever you want—time is too short, lives are too precious, for two agencies or two workers to dissipate their energies in an argument about which one of them will do what part of the job. You know, there is a lot of criticism of bureaucracy in the Federal Government. Some of it may be deserved, some of it may not. I daresay that all organizations—private business, military, even religious bodies—fall victim to this malady. However common it may be, may I urge you to be constantly on guard against this hindrance to effective social welfare programs.

I caution you to watch for "bureauitis" in every phase of community activity. It can paralyze the operation of a single welfare agency. It can render ineffectual the working relationship between two welfare agencies or between a welfare agency and a health agency. It can erode the mutual trust and respect that a public agency and a voluntary agency should have for each other and the saddest thing of all is that not the workers in these agencies, but the helpless people who depend on the agencies will be the full recipients of the grief that stems from this lack of cooperation.

There is an old saying that might help to clarify what I have been talking about. It goes like this: "In any endeavor requiring the efforts of several people, you can see to it that something is accomplished, or you get credit for it, but you can't do both."

There is another area that deserves as much attention as the smooth cooperation between all of the various agencies and people whose prime object is helping to alleviate the unhappy conditions that lead to and result from poverty. And this is the use of new theories and methods.

In speaking of this, I do not want to diminish in any way your respect for the classical approaches as used by social workers. Your profession has developed a valuable body of knowledge, and I heartily commend to you the full use of proven procedures. However, the very scope of our present social problems indicates that we must all be more alert and imaginative.

We are living in a period of transition, in which we recognize the insufficiency of some of our earlier methods of dealing with social ills. There is a great ferment across the country in the evaluation of existing structures—the development of research, the testing of new approaches, the use of new techniques—activities which the Federal Government is encouraging and helping to support.

The entitlement of people in need to receive adequate public assistance, medical care, social services, and other benefits which are accepted as appropriate for the use of public funds, should be the same wherever a person lives in this Nation.

This concept of equal entitlement is inherent in our democratic philosophy. But it can be fully realized only if every citizen recognizes that the problems and needs of his fellow citizens are indeed his concern, and if he acts on this concern to assure that full advantage is taken of available resources and funds, both public and private, to provide the best possible programs in this State and community.

One of the surest safeguards for democratic social welfare programs is for agencies to involve the poor themselves in planning and carrying out the programs that are intended to help improve their conditions. I refer especially to the use of what social workers call "indigenous" leaders or helpers. These people come from—in fact, are part of—the disadvantaged communities they serve. They have a close personal knowledge and understanding of the kinds of people and problems with which the organized social work effort is dealing.

You have heard of many ways in which the indigenous leaders are used—as "team mothers" in elementary school programs where classroom teachers are not needed, such as testing vision, conducting field trips, operating audiovisual equipment, and so forth. In social work settings, former juvenile offenders have been used for interviewing and research in juvenile delinquency. Public assistancce mothers whose children are of school age are used as homemakers and friendly visitors from homebound old-age assistance recipients.

As valuable as all these subprofessional services are, I believe that the most important function of an indigenous leader is to serve as a bridge between the poor and the larger community and indeed between the poor and the professional social worker. There is always the danger that professionals—and this goes for the doctor, the teacher, and the lawyer, as well as the social worker—fall into the practice of one-way communication in their effort to get their client to do what is considered good for him. By making greater use of local people from the slum neighborhoods, social workers can insure that the two-way communication they want and need will really exist. In this way, social workers and social agencies will have the latest and most accurate picture of who the poor really are, the problems they face, and what they need to solve these problems. And at the same time, the poor will be finding out that help is available, where to find it, and how to use it and they will be developing local leadership needed to enable them to cope with their problems.

In conclusion, I want to thank you for inviting me here tonight. It has been a great pleasure to share this momentous event with you.

As you go forth, keep your chin up and your sights high. There is a vitally-needed, important job for each one of you—whatever kind and combination of talents you have. Most of you will find your greatest career satisfaction in direct service to needy people. That is as it should be. Meeting human needs is the heart of your profession. But as time goes on, you will also help meet the demand for experienced people to take responsibility for supervision in social welfare agencies, for directing these agencies, and for service as planners and consultants to those who operate social welfare programs. There is plently of room at the top in this profession and I wish each and every one of you success in fulfilling your goals.

Isn't Everyone Subsidized?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the bulk of the information available to the public today on farm subsidies is deceptive in effect, if not in purpose.

Consumers and taxpayers generally are led to believe that the total annual appropriations to the Department of Agriculture are subsidies to farmers. Actually, nonfarmers participate in a larger share of this Department's expenditure than farmers themselves.

Approximately two-thirds of the Department of Agriculture's expenditures, in the 1966 budget, are for services which are of primary benefit to the general public. About one-third goes for price support and related programs in which farmers are the primary but not the only beneficiaries.

The deception may be erased by a look at 1 year's total expenditures:

[In millions of dollars]

	1964	Estimate, 1965	Estimate, 1966
Programs which clearly provide benefits to consumers, businessmen, and the general public	4,835	4,582	4,373
Other programs which are predominantly for stabilization of farm income, but which also benefit others	3,062	2,276	1,984

There seems to be a planned propensity by some Congressmen and in some areas of our business community to tie a "subsidy" tag to Government programs that seek to bring the income of farmers into a parity position with other segments of our economy. However, the word "subsidy" as a derisive expletive is seldom applied to Government policy and money aids to business and labor.

Publishers of magazines are recipients of Government subsidies through the Post Office Department. The House Appropriations Committee published figures which showed that revenues for mailing 14 national publications accounted for only 35 percent of the cost of handling these publications.

Postal deficits over a 12-year period in behalf of business almost equals the cost of farm price support programs through the Commodity Credit Corporation during more than a quarter of a century.

Take the question of food costs: Food costs have risen less since 1947–49 than most other consumer items in the cost-of-living index. For all items on the list, the increase in cost to 1964 was 33 percent. For all food, the increase was 26 percent. For rent, it was 48 percent and for medical care 72 percent.

The farmer gets none of the increase in cost for the food he produces. In fact, he receives 15 percent less for the farm food "market basket" than he did in 1947–49. The retail cost of this "market basket" has risen only 14 percent although processing and marketing costs have increased 42 percent since 1947–49.

Misleading and incomplete information, given to the American public adds unnecessary confusion to established and proved concepts; and could even place our agricultural policy in legislative jeopardy. Our foreign policy could also be affected as food is an important arm in the program. Food is survival and we should never become so well fed that we forget this principle.

Our agriculture is the Nation's largest and most vital industry. It employs 6.1 million workers. This is more workers than are in the combined employment in transportation, public utilities, the steel industry, and the automobile industry.

The assets in agriculture total more than $230 billion. This is equal to about two-thirds of the value of current assets of all corporations in the United States or about three-fifths of the market value of all corporation stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

Many are not aware of the fact that 3 out of every 10 jobs in private industry are related to agriculture.

Since here are so many myths relating to subsidies let us look at the historical records of the economy of our Nation. Do you know what the oldest economic principle written into the law of the United States is? It may come as a shock to many people—but it is the subsidy.

The second act of the First Congress in 1789 was to legislate for the new emerging Nation the enactment of a tariff law, to protect and promote the infant and frontier industrial development of America. At that time the United States was almost completely populated by farm people.

More significantly, this tariff law set up a special subsidy program to encourage the development of an American merchant fleet. The law stipulated that goods imported into the United States on American ships should have a 10-percent reduction in custom duties, and a tonnage tax also was imposed in favor of American shipping.

Since the birth of our Nation, subsidies through the years have taken many and various forms.

The Government granted 6,340,339 acres of public lands to private interests between 1827 and 1866, to encourage canal building and river improvement, in addition to rights-of-way grants. The Government made other contributions by direct appropriations, stock subscriptions, and loans to private canal companies.

Approximately 183 million acres of Federal and State lands were granted to railroads between 1850 and 1871.

The first mail subsidy was paid 125 years ago. Since then many millions of dollars have been assigned by the Federal Government to ocean and airmail subsidies, to foster the development of transportation, as was the case in the special considerations for railroads and waterways.

Many millions of dollars have been used to subsidize the building of U.S. ships on American ways. Here is one example: about $40 million in subsidy was paid on the private luxury liner *United States*. The total cost of the ship was given at $76,800,000.

Diverse as these subsidy programs are, it is unrealistic either to condemn or to praise Federal subsidies as such. Each particular program which is determined to contain an element of subsidy must be judged independently, taking into account the economic, social, and political conditions prevailing at the time.

Any broad condemnation of subsidies as such confronts these hard-core facts:

America's infant industry, without the aid of subsidy laws in the early years after the formation of this independent Nation, would have been slow to develop and the emergence of the United States as a world power could have been retarded for many years.

Without subsidy there would have been no early development of an American merchant fleet. The first accomplishments of inland transportation in this country—by canals and river improvements—would have been delayed.

Had there been no subsidy, in the form of extensive assistance to railroads in spanning the continent, the settlement and development of the West would have been retarded for many years.

The age of air travel in America, unless aided by subsidy, would have been late in arriving, and the contribution of airpower to our military preparedness would have been slowed down.

Without subsidy, no commercial seagoing ships—perhaps even now—would be built on American shores.

Subsidy has had a substantial and beneficial role in the Nation's overall industrial development.

It has been essential in stimulating vital production in wartime.

It has financed scientific development. It has been used in efforts to balance the economic positions of vast segments of our total society.

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in a special survey on subsidy and subsidylike programs of the U.S. Government reports that:

> Some contend the tariff system is a subsidy structure, since it involves Government action that enables protected industries to charge more for their goods in the American markets. Moreover, some consider that accelerated tax amortization for defense plants subsidizes the owners of these plants; that "depletion allowances" provide subsidylike benefits to the petroleum and some other industries; that Federal non-interest-bearing deposits of billions of dollars in private banks and certain services of the Federal Reserve System amount to subsidies for large private bankers; that sale of Federal surplus property at a loss is a subsidy to the purchasers, and that the postal deficit on second-class mail is a subsidy to business.
>
> Others confine their definition to direct Government payments, to the remission of charges, and to the supplying of commodities or services at less than cost or market price.
>
> There is one concept of subsidy which extends to all persons and enterprises whose economic positions are improved, or whose purposes are advanced as the result of Government action. This embraces industries whose profits would be less without protection of the tariff laws and the many other statutes that soften the full force of competition in a private enterprise economy; and this broad definition likewise encompasses all working people whose earnings are greater because of minimum wage, collective bargaining, and immigration laws.

It should be pointed out that the economic benefits accruing to industry and labor, from Government policies, are paid for, as are the costs of the farm program; by the consumer and taxpayer. Remember this: Consumers and taxpayers are one and the same.

Most of us will agree that all of our citizens feel the social and economic impact of the subsidy programs for industry, labor, and agriculture.

Again, it should be emphasized that in the overall subsidy concept this Nation's agriculture is a lesser recipient than either labor or industry. Yet, the farmer in many areas of public opinion has been cast as the chief villain of all subsidy gatherers.

Tabulation of Public Opinion Poll; Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the results of a survey of my district, Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District. Nearly 9,000 people took the time and trouble to answer. And, for the most part, they agree with me: They like the programs of the Johnson administration.

The administration's approach in Vietnam was supported by 2 to 1 over the nearest alternative.

The administration's proposal for gradual elimination of the national origins quota on immigration also was endorsed by a 2 to 1 margin.

And more than half of those expressing an opinion favored either the administration's original medicare bill or its substitute version, passed by the House, providing for hospital, doctor, and major medical expenses.

This is good showing by any standards, and it becomes more impressive when you consider the Republican leanings of the Fourth Congressional District, which, when it sent me back to Congress last fall, made me the only Democrat in the 20th century ever to win a second term in the district.

The results are as follows:

I. Vietnam: What approach do you favor for the United States in Vietnam?

1. Expand war into Communist North Vietnam and go all-out to win, 25.3 percent.
2. Military support of South Vietnam, including attacks in North Vietnam, until a satisfactory settlement can be negotiated, 50.1 percent.
3. Restrict efforts to South Vietnam and negotiate best settlement possible, 10.5 percent.
4. Withdraw troops and advisers immediately and let Vietnamese solve their own problems, 6.9 percent.
5. None of the above, 2.4 percent.

Blank, 4.3 percent.

II. Immigration: The administration has proposed gradual elimination of the national origins quota system, and replacing it with a system favoring skilled workers and relatives of people already in the United States. Do you favor:

1. The administration's proposal, 57.4 percent.
2. No limitations on immigration, 4.7 percent.
3. Present system, 21.8 percent.
4. No immigration, 5.2 percent.
5. None of the above, 5.8 percent.

Blank, 5.3 percent.

III. Transportation: The New Haven Railroad as it now stands cannot continue commuter operations much longer. Do you favor:

1. Expanded bus service instead of commuter railroad, 3.4 percent.
2. Letting private group try to provide commuter service, 17.2 percent.
3. A multistate authority with Federal and local assistance running the railroad or contracting commuter service, 62.7 percent.
4. Having the Federal Government pick up deficit and run the railroad, 9 percent.
5. None of the above, 3.5 percent.

Blank, 4.2 percent.

IV. Medical care for elderly: Which of the following approaches to medical care for those over 65 do you favor:

1. Administration proposal, financed by payroll taxes, providing hospital and nursing home care, home health care visits, and outpatient diagnostic services, 27.6 percent.
2. AMA proposal, financed by Federal-State funds and participant contributions to private insurance companies, providing voluntary comprehensive health coverage, 25.5 percent.
3. House Republican leadership proposal, financed by Federal-State funds and participant contributions to national insurance fund, providing voluntary comprehensive health coverage, 13.3 percent.
4. Combination of administration approach for basic benefits and Republican leadership plan for doctor, drug, and major medical expenses, 19 percent.

5. None of the above, 7.6 percent.
Blank, 7 percent.

V. I have listed below a number of issues of vital public concern. Please "X" the three items you feel deserve highest priority in Congress.

1. Aid to education, 11.9 percent.
2. Narcotics and crime, 14.2 percent.
3. Space research and exploration, 4.3 percent.
4. Taxes and economic growth, 9.8 percent.
5. Reexamination of foreign aid, 16.5 percent.
6. Needs of our senior citizens, 4.5 percent.
7. Reapportionment of State legislatures on population basis, 2.5 percent.
8. Regulation of mail-order purchase of firearms, 3 percent.
9. Reexamination of national defense requirements, 5.7 percent.
10. Training and employment opportunities for youth, 8.8 percent.
11. Water and air pollution control, 9.2 percent.
12. Commuter railroads, 6.1 percent.
Blank, 2.9 percent.

VI. My age is:

1. Under 25, 5.2 percent.
2. 25 to 34, 16.8 percent.
3. 35 to 44, 28.7 percent.
4. 45 to 59, 31.4 percent.
5. Over 59, 16.1 percent.
Blank, 2.1 percent.

VII. I live in:

1. Bridgeport, 14.6 percent.
2. Darien, 7.7 percent.
3. Fairfield, 4.9 percent.
4. Greenwich, 11.9 percent.
5. New Canaan, 4.9 percent.
6. Norwalk, 17 percent.
7. Stamford, 24.2 percent.
8. Weston, 1.6 percent.
9. Westport, 8 percent.
10. Wilton, 3.9 percent.
Blank, 1.6 percent.

VIII. Do you favor your Congressman asking for your views?

1. Yes, 96.6 percent.
2. No, 7 percent.
3. Undecided, 7 percent.
Blank, 2 percent.

IX. How often do you use the New Haven?

1. Regularly, 27.7 percent.
2. Occasionally, 57.1 percent.
3. Never, 12.4 percent.
Blank, 2.8 percent.

Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the May 26 meeting of the Republican policy committee, the committee voted not to endorse H.R. 7984, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, in its present form. This action was taken because the rent supplement proposal that is contained in section 101 of this bill is completely unacceptable. It is a complete departure from the ordinary American way of doing things.

Today, in the New York Times, Mr. Arthur Krock has devoted his entire article to section 101 of the housing and urban development bill. In this article he quotes at great length from the views that were filed by the minority members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. He also states:

> The rent supplement plan is merely the latest, though the most extreme, expression of the political philosophy which would create an egalitarian socioeconomy, irrespective of individual merit, with subsidies financed by the ambitious, the industrious, and the worthy. If section 101 is rejected by Congress, this will be the reason.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very thought-provoking article regarding one of the most important questions that will be presented to Congress. It is imperative that every Member of Congress and every citizen carefully study this rent supplement proposal so that the full implication of its extreme provisions will be known and understood by all prior to the time that it is presented for a vote.

I am confident that the American public and this Congress will refuse to accept this incredibly wide-open subsidy proposal once they are fully advised as to its potential evils.

In order that Mr. Krock's fine article, the views of the minority members of the House Banking and Currency Committee and the statement of the House Republican policy committee may be available to everyone, I am including them as part of these remarks.

We cannot endorse, H.R. 7984, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 in its present form.

The administration's rent supplement proposal contained in section 101 of this bill is completely unacceptable. The proposal would kill the initiative of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts. It would kill the incentive for home ownership and would make renters the wards of the Government. It is a complete departure from the ordinary American way of doing things.

From the outset of the hearings on this bill it has been apparent that section 101, rent supplements, was in deep trouble. Even those persons who normally support broader housing legislation have been unrelenting in their criticism.

The proposed program is essentially a subsidy for middle-income families including those well above median income level. It is a program without effective standards and qualifications.

We are certain that the American public will refuse to buy this incredibly wide open subsidy proposal once it is fully advised as to the potential evils of the program. This is a system of making the rent dollar of the beneficiary worth up to double or more the rent dollar of the unassisted taxpayer. It is unequal opportunity in housing by Government fiat. It is legislated discrimination against the self-sufficient citizen.

The Republican policy committee urges that section 101, the rent supplement proposal, be stricken from the bill.

The article and minority views follow:

IN THE NATION: PAYING OTHER PEOPLE'S RENT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 26.—Of all the legislation proposed by President Johnson for the attainment of what he calls the Great Society, none has raised a more basic issue of political philosophy than section 101 of the administration's housing and urban development bill. This sets forth the rent supplement plan whereby the difference between one-fourth of the income of an applicant for decent housing and its fair market rental would be made up by Government subsidies extracted from the taxpayers in general.

THE MINORITY REPORT

Although the House Committee on Banking and Currency approved the measure by a vote of 26 to 7, grounds for a much stronger opposition to section 101, when it reaches the floor, have been supplied by the minority members of the committee. After a doctrinal attack on the rent supplement plan as the way to economic integration of housing and to the socialistic state, the minority report exposes serious flaws of draftsmanship which could be exploited by the Administrator of the program to calculate supplemental rent subsidies on the test of what housing an applicant wants instead of what he actually needs.

While such a flagrant abuse of authority is improbable, the wording of the administration bill does make it possible. But among the sounder points in the minority report are these:

The [subsidy] formula kills the incentive of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts. A family with $250 a month income could live in a $100 a month apartment and pay rent of only $62.50. The disincentive to improve accommodations is readily apparent. It can live in the same $100 a month apartment with $150 a month income as it could if it increased its income to $400 a month.

To own one's own home, no matter how modest, is the goal of the typical American family. The rent supplement kills that incentive. Why strive to own a $7,500 home when for approximately the same monthly outlay for housing (under FHA home-purchase underwriting standards) it could rent a dwelling unit (which, by current estimates, will cost the Government $12,500 to $25,000 to construct)?

"We were told by the Housing Administor * * * that [this] is an experimental program. But involved is authorization [for him] to enter into 40-year contracts with approved housing owners to pay them rent subsidies in amounts not exceeding $50 million prior to July 1, 1966, which maximum would be increased by $50 million on July 1 in each of the years 1966, 1967, and 1968. * * * By fiscal year 1968, $200 million-a-year annual payment contracts would be outstanding, extending for 40 years * * * or potentially an $8 billion program that could extend to the year 2008. To us, that is a whale of an 'experimental' program."

IMPLICATIONS

"Moreover, section 101 states that a family must first pay 25 percent of its income for rent before receiving * * * Federal rent supplements. * * * The rent gougers and absentee slum landlords in urban areas would waste little time [in demanding the same percentage of their tenants.] Their justification * * *? The national standard set by the Federal Government. * * * Precedent for [such] widespread landlords' checks on tenant income * * * would be found in the proposed means test [which, according to testimony by the Housing Administrator], is to be employed in administering rent supplements. * * * The profound economic and social effects [of a private rental requirement of 25 percent of income] can be seen in administration testimony * * * that in 1960 the typical American family paid 13.6 percent of its income for rent."

UNEQUAL OPPORTUNITY

"This [the rent supplement plan] is a system of making the rent dollar of the beneficiary worth up to double or more the rent dollar of the unassisted taxpayer. It is unequal opportunity in housing by Government flat. It is legislated discrimination against the self-sufficient citizen."

To which could be added that the rent supplement plan is merely the latest, though the most extreme, expression of the political philosophy which would create an egalitarian socioeconomy, irrespective of individual merit, with subsidies financed by the ambitious, the industrious, and the worthy. If section 101 is rejected by Congress, this will be the reason.

For, though the adverse points made by the committee minority are weakened only by the exaggeration of a couple of them, the real issue is whether the Federal Union is to undergo its greatest transformation thus far into a collectivist state.

MINORITY VIEWS

THE ADMINISTRATION'S RENT SUPPLEMENT PROPOSAL

Introduction

The administration's rent supplement proposal contained in section 101 of this bill is foreign to American concepts.

The proposal kills the incentive of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts.

It kills the incentive for homeownership; it makes renters wards of the Government.

It is a system of economic integration of housing through Government subsidy.

It is the way of the socialistic state.

Killing incentive

Under section 101(d) of the bill, the Housing Administrator may subsidize a tenant's rent in an amount up to the difference between the fair market rental for the unit and one-fourth of the tenant's income.

That formula kills the incentive of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts. A family with $3,000 a year income—$250 a month—could live in a $100 a month apartment and pay rent of only $62.50 a month (one-fourth of income) with the Government providing a subsidy of $37.50 a month (difference between one-fourth of tenant's income and market rent for the unit). The disincentive of the family to improve its housing accommodations is readily apparent. Should that $250 a month family's income increase to $300 a month, its rent payment would increase to $75 a month, and the Federal subsidy would drop to $25 a month. And, of course, if the family's income increased to $400 a month, it would pay the full market rent of $100 a month as one-fourth of family income of $400 a month would equal full market rent for the unit. In other words, the family with $250 a month income has no incentive to improve its living accommodations by increasing its earnings to enable it to rent better accommodations. It can live in the same accommodations with $250 a month income as it could if it increased its income to $400 a month.

The formula also produces another type of disincentive to a family improving its living accommodations by its own efforts. That $250-a-month-income family might decide it wants to live in a $200-a-month apartment instead of the $100-a-month unit. Under the formula it could do so. And under the other proposed provisions of this section, this still would be true. The primary requirement for a qualified tenant is that he be unable to obtain standard privately owned housing at a rental no more than one-fourth of his income. As far as the proposed law is concerned, that standard housing could be standard housing suitable to the tenant's needs or suitable to his desires. The administrator could decide either way. The family would pay the same one-fourth of its income as rent or $62.50 a month and the Government would pay an increased subsidy of $137.50 a month to make up the balance of the fair market rent for the unit. Under the formula the way to better housing is increased Federal subsidy rather than increased individual effort.

When another head of a family earning $400 a month and paying $100-a-month rent—without any help from Uncle Sam—saw that his neighbor, earning far less than he, was able to move into a much better apartment with no increase in his rent payments, he suddenly would wake up to the possibility of the formula. This family, otherwise eligible for rent supplements, by free choice could be living in standard but crowded quarters. The head of the family simply does not want to allocate more than $100 a month of his income to housing. With the balance of his income he prefers to enjoy other amenities of life, such as a second car or an extra week's vacation. Rent supplement is his easy way out. He would be eligible for subsidy in a more expensive apartment. He, too, would move to the $200-a-month apartment. He would continue to pay only 100 a month of this income as rent because the Government would provide the other $100 a month necessary to cover the market rent for the unit.

This formula is a formula for killing the American incentive system of improving one's lot by one's own effort. This would be keeping up with the Joneses via Federal subsidies.

Threat to homeownership

To own one's own home, no matter how modest, is the goal of the typical American family. The rent supplement kills the incentive of a family to achieve that goal. Under FHA underwriting standards a family with $3,000-a-year income can afford to purchase a home costing 2½ times that amount or a $7,500 home. The housing cost of such a home would approximate $60 a month. But as noted in the illustration above, the $3,000-a-year family by paying $62.50 a month as rent could live in a partially federally subsidized $100-a-month rental unit. The cost of such a dwelling unit would approximate $12,500. Or, as above noted, that same family could also live in a $200-a-month rental unit and pay only $62.50 of its income a month as rent with the balance of $137.50 paid by the Government under the rent supplement formula. The cost of the $200-a-month rental unit would approximate $25,000. Why would a family strive to own a $7,500 home when for approximately the same monthly outlay for housing it could rent a $12,500 or $25,000 cost dwelling unit? Not alone would the rent supplement proposal kill incentive for homeownership, it also would be a powerful incentive for a family to discontinue homeownership and become a renter on the Federal dole. That runs counter to the American way of life.

Absurd formula

Although the subsidy formula contains no dollar amount limitations, indirectly there is a dollar limitation because of the maximum mortgage amount per unit in the FHA section 221(d)(3) program. This is the existing FHA program which would have to be utilized in financing the project. That maximum mortgage amount under existing law is $29,000 for a three or more bedroom unit, in an elevator-type building in a high cost area. This would be left unchanged in this bill for a three-bedroom unit but would be increased to $32,987.50 per unit for a four or more bedroom unit under the provisions of section 203(d) of this bill. Such a four-bedroom, two-and-a-half-bath unit would rent for approximately $315 a month. A large, qualified tenant family with only $250-a-month income could live in such a unit with the Government paying a subsidy of $252.50 a month to make up the balance of the market rent for this unit.

But even this does not measure the full amount of Federal subsidy that could be paid. Under FHA mortgage insurance programs, the mortgage limitation is satisfied if the average mortgage for the units in the project does not exceed the mortgage limitation per unit. FHA insured projects can and do have penthouses and our theoretical project would be no exception. It could have a penthouse costing $100,000 and renting for $800 a month.

The occupant could be a large family eligible for rent supplements, with its entire income derived solely from public assistance payments. Under section 101(d) of this bill the tenant's income for purposes of the formula is the "tenant's income as determined by the Administrator pursuant to procedures and regulations established by him" [emphasis supplied]. With this discretionary authority the Housing Administrator might determine that public assistance payments should not be included in tenant's income for purposes of the formula. Accordingly, this family's income would be zero. Applying the formula, one-fourth of the tenant's zone income equals zero, so the tenant would pay no rent. Under the formula the Federal rent supplement may not exceed the difference between one-fourth of the tenant's income and the fair market rental for the unit. So zero (one-fourth of the tenant's zero income) from $800 a month (the fair market rental) leaves the Government paying the full $800 a month market rent as a subsidy. The welfare family can live in the luxurious penthouse.

Fantastic? Of course the results are fantastic. Ridiculous? Of course the results are ridiculous. Absurd? Of course, the results are absurd. But they square with the rent supplement formula. It shows just how fantastic, how ridiculous, and how absurd that formula is.

Surely the Congress could devise more sensible limitations than the wideopen, socialistic subsidy formula contained in section 101 of the bill. The Housing Administrator submitted testimony to the committee (p. 255 of hearings) that under the rent supplement program:

"It should be possible to accommodate families with incomes of between $3,500 and $6,000 in larger cities and between $3,000 and $5,000 in smaller cities where costs are generally lower."

If that really is the objective of the program, then why not write those limitations into the law?

Economic integration

From a social standpoint, few would argue that one man's rental dollar should buy as much in the way of shelter as another's, within the same general area of our country. Moreover, we can support the goal of those who view with alarm the proliferation of drab Federal housing ghettos, built to accommodate a rigid and disheartening packing together of computerized equals.

But, in the disguise of calling for action against these pockets of federally sponsored sameness in our cities and towns that have low-rent public housing, the administration has recommended a program that would force—with the power of the Federal dollar—what we choose to term "across-the-board economic integration." This runs through the thinking on the rent supplement proposal, as well as the various land development programs contained within other sections of this bill.

Within broad areas of our Nation, untouched by the Federal housing dollar, we would argue with those who support an initial allocation of $8 billion for the purpose of creating a national system of unequal opportunity in housing. We oppose the view of those who would move the $2,000-a-year family in the apartment next door to the $5,000-a-year tenant, and into the $15,000-a-year neighborhood, solely through rent subsidies. Moreover, we seriously question whether the man paying $150 a month for an apartment would understand why his next door neighbor should receive equal value for half the rent. From a social standpoint, there is far more to neighborhood preference than the monthly cost of one's dwelling. In short, as the respected Housing Affairs Letter of April 16, 1965, put it: "Can this world's economic lions and economic lambs lie down en masse in the same veldt?"

Keep in mind, it has been made abundantly clear that rent supplements would be a nationwide program. On May 17, during the final stage of hearings on this bill, Congressman Del Clawson asked the Housing Administrator, "This is going to be a rather broad program, then, is it not, if we are going to move the rent supplement program in all areas involved?"

Mr. Weaver. "Yes, this will be, of course, nationwide."

Upper middle income families

Under date of April 21, 1965, the Housing Agency submitted to the subcommittee, a table showing income ceilings which would be set for individual cities in administering the rent supplement program. The setting of such income ceilings is purely discretionary with the Administrator. From this table it is readily apparent the Housing Administrator will substantially breach the national median family income ($6,249), in the case of large families. Here are the income limits the Administrator proposes to set for such families in several of the larger cities:

Philadelphia	$6,900
Toledo	8,050
Pittsburgh	7,150
Macon, Ga	6,600
Providence	6,650
San Antonio	6,450
Milwaukee	8,300
Paterson, N.J	8,100
New York City	8,900
Newark	8,750
Saginaw, Mich	7,850

Whereas the national median income for all families ($6,249) as shown by census data is total family income, the Housing Administrator is not bound by any such specific definition. Quite to the contrary, section 101(d) provides that income of the tenant shall be "the tenant's income as determined by the Administrator pursuant to procedures and regulations established by him." From total family income the Administrator could and doubtless would make one or more exclusions from total family income and thereby reduce the amount of family income that would be counted under the rent supplement proposal. Precedent for this exists in the public housing program. For instance, in New York City up to $2,400 of income earned by secondary wage earners (wife, children, etc.) in the family, can be excluded from the family's total income for purposes of determining eligibility and rent payments. Should the Administrator make a similar exclusion for the rent supplement program, the New York City family income limit of $8,900, as shown in the above table, actually could mean that the total family income was $8,900 plus $2,400 excluded income, or a total, actual income family limit of $11,300. In other words, the rent supplement proposal can reach well up into the middle-income family level.

Public housing jeopardized

It is little wonder public housing proponents are greatly disturbed by the Administration's rent supplement proposal. (See testimony of the president of the National Association of Housing & Redevelopment Officials, p. 425 of the hearings.) The rent supplement program could run the public housing program right out of business, because Federal subsidies under rent supplements can be far larger per month, per unit than is possible under public housing. Under the public housing program the Federal subsidy is limited to the amount necessary to pay principal and interest over a 40-year period on cost of the unit. There is no such subsidy limitation under the rent supplement program where the subsidy can cover not alone principal and interest costs of the unit over a 40-year period, but also practically all of the operating costs as well. Needless to say, rent supplements can also run the cooperative housing, and 221(d)(3) subsidized interest rate programs out of business.

In short, the rent supplement program has a Federal subsidy potential that no other Federal housing program can even come close to matching.

Eight-billion-dollar experiment

We were told by the Housing Administrator, as well as by other witnesses, that the Administration's rent supplements constitutes an experimental program. But involved in the proposal is the authorization for the Housing Administrator to enter into 40-year contracts with approved housing owners to pay them rent subsidies in amounts not exceeding $50 million prior to July 1, 1966, which maximum amount would be increased by $50 million on July 1 in each of the years 1966, 1967, and 1968. In other words, by fiscal year 1968, $200 million a year payment contracts could be outstanding, extending for 40 years. Potentially, that makes it an $8 billion program that could extend to the year 2008. To us, that is a whale of an experimental program.

When queried about this $8 billion potential contract cost, the Housing Administrator stated that there was "some exaggeration" in the figures. He referred to it as a $200 million contract authorization program. But turn to page 235 of the hearings. Note the table submitted by the Housing Administrator showing the estimated cost of the rent supplement program for a 100-unit project. Here we find his estimate is that the aggregate rent supplements for this 100-unit project over 40 years will amount to $944,000. That is $9,440 per unit. Since this is supposed to be a 500,000 unit program, the cost of this program alone, based on these figures, is $4.72 billion. We leave it to the reader to decide for himself which of the two cost estimates of the Administrator more accurately reflect the probable cost of the program.

Assuming appropriation and contracting of the full amounts requested ($200 million multiplied by 40 years) there can be no question that the potential cost of the program is $8 billion. With this program dressed up in a $200 million outfit, Congress is confronted with an $8 billion Trojan horse.

The means test

Additionally, we are puzzled that those who for years have objected to the means test on any and all social programs administered by Federal, State, and local governments have now reversed themselves by embracing the means test explicit in the rent supplement program.

Heretofore, means tests have been administered by various levels of government in an effort to insure that those with higher incomes and readily available assets would be ineligible for programs aimed at assisting those who couldn't afford the minimum requirements of food, shelter, and medical services. Although many charged that such tests were socially obnoxious, nevertheless they were aimed at maintaining a degree of equity for the indigent and low-income individuals and families in the total allocation of resources by the taxpaying public. In short, the means test has been restricted to indigents and those with low incomes in order equitably to carry out various social programs of public assistance.

Under the Administration's rent supplement proposal, however, we find means tests applying to those with incomes reaching far up into the moderate income levels. If such a test were condemned as socially obnoxious before, consistency requires that they be similarly treated with regard to implementation of a rent supplement program. Under this proposal, however, the means test does not have in its defense a proper allocation of public assistance funds aimed at the most needy among our citizens.

To those who doubt that such means tests will be employed by HHFA in connection with rent supplements, we direct your attention to the Housing Administrator's colloquy with Congressman Fino, found on page 263 of the hearings, with regard to a hypothetical situation involving an investigation.

"Mr. Fino. All right. How would I be in difficulty if you do not police it or investigate it, supervise it and watch me?

"Mr. Weaver. You will be in difficulty because there will be spot checks, as there always are on these activities, and if this were found, you would be in difficulty for having made a false statement. I think you would be subject to quite a bit of criminal prosecution as well as being put out of the particular project.

"Mr. Fino. My time is up.

"Mr. Weaver. And there is one other check, too, which I hate to say.

"Mr. Fino. What is that?

"Mr. Weaver. But your friends and neighbors would be very much concerned about this. They are the best investigators that you have in these projects."

Upon request, the Housing Administrator supplied for the record the estimated man-hours needed to investigate a prospective list of 100 approved applications for rent supplements. According to the Administrator, in just 77 areas of the country where there are FHA field offices, these investigations would be performed by employees of the HHFA. In all other areas, such investigations would be contracted for with employees and representatives of non-Federal organizations which could be either public or private. It was conceded by proponents in committee that Pinkerton's National Detective Agency could be such an eligible private agency.

The following comprise just a few of the tests that would be required, as submitted by the Administrator:

1. Check of incomes for 100 approved cases: Check W–2 forms presented, or if no W–2 forms telephone or send form letter to employer to determine if applicant is within the income limit for the area.

2. Check of assets on 100 approved cases: Check to see that the form and certification as to assets is complete and assets are within prescribed limit.

There can be no doubt that rent supplements would direct a means test at middle-income families, in support of a highly questionable social goal, while employing "friends and neighbors" in the very unfriendly and unneighborly role of informers.

Birth of national rental standards

Nowhere in the hearings has the administration shown evidence that it has studied the impact rent supplements would have on the prevailing patterns of rental rates. With the formula for virtually open-end subsidies, what would hold back limited-dividend and nonprofit organizations from building far more expensive multiunit apartment dwellings than those anticipated by the administration, with the consequent adverse impact on nonsubsidized rents? Indeed, under the language of section 101, the greatest rewards would derive to those organizations and tenants who build and occupy the most costly units.

Moreover, section 101 states that a family must first pay 25 percent of its income for rent before receiving any assistance from the Federal Government in the form of rent supplements. If this section were enacted, every landlord in the Nation could demand of his tenants that they pay 25 percent of their total family income for rent. Their justification for such a demand? The national standards set by the Federal Government. Anyone paying less, it could be claimed, would be paying less than he should. Such a standard rule of thumb would put enormous pressure on millions of tenants, many of whom voluntarily devote far less than 25 percent of their income for rent. The rent gougers and absentee slum landlords in urban areas would waste little time taking advantage of this.

That this could have a profound economic and social impact can be seen by the administration's testimony on page 218, where it is stated that the median gross monthly rent for families in the United States, according to the 1960 census was $71. The median national family income for that same year was $6,249. From this, the typical American family paid 13.6 percent of its income for rent—a little more than half of that proposed as the "norm" in the bill.

The precedent for widespread landlord checks on tenants' income conveniently would be found in the proposed means test to be employed in administering rent supplements. On page 262 of the hearings, the Housing Administrator states that Federal Income Tax Form W–2 would be checked in order to determine a tenants' income eligibility for rent supplements. In most cases, these forms would be surrendered to non-Government employees. Where this is impossible, "telephone or send form letter to employer to determine if applicant is within the income limit."

Can even the most cautious analyst deny the opportunities this opens to unscrupulous landlords?

WHO IS HOODWINKING WHOM?

From the outset of the hearings, it was apparent that section 101, rent supplements, was in deep trouble. Throughout the hearings, even those witnesses who normally support broader housing legislation were unrelenting in their criticism.

In a last-minute attempt to bail out the floundering rent supplement program, the committee eliminated the income floor for those eligible to receive Federal rent payments. That this change is illusory and an attempt to hoodwink Congress can be seen by the Housing Administrator's answer to a question by Senator Douglas during the Senate hearings, "Is there any reason why rent subsidies could not work for poor families, if the committee should decide to lower the income floor below $3,000?"

"Mr. Weaver. In the first place it goes back to something you said earlier and that is while we do have a volume of both limited dividend and nonprofit corporations which are ready and able to carry out the rent supplementation in the middle-income fields, it is my strong feeling that first many of these groups, certainly the limited-dividend groups are out, and many of the well-motivated nonprofit groups are really not in a position to take on all the management problems that are indigenous to this particular area of low-income management."

As if to underline this, in answer to a similar question from Senator Proxmire, "Why wouldn't they (low-income families) be the ones to get rent subsidies?" the Housing Administrator answered:

"You are not going to get the limited dividend companies building and adequately managing houses in the low-income segment."

From these candid admissions by the Housing Administrator during the Senate hearings, we leave it to the reader of this report to decide for himself the extent to which the most needy families would benefit by the committee action in eliminating the income floor from the original administration bill.

As we have pointed out, while the open-end formula in the amended bill would permit flagrant abuses within both the lower and upper income brackets, the basic socioeconomic inequities remain.

Conclusion

On page 178 of the hearings the Housing Administrator, speaking of the rent supplement program, states:

"This program has received the greatest attention among the President's housing recommendations. It is a vital part of the proposed administration bill."

In our opinion the President has been sold a bill of goods. We cannot believe that he would "buy" such an incredibly wide open subsidy proposal had he been fully advised as to the potential evils of the program. This is a system of making the rent dollar of the beneficiary worth up to double or more the rent dollar of the unassisted taxpayer. It is unequal opportunity in housing by government fiat. It is legislated discrimination against the self-sufficient citizen.

We are certain the American public will not "buy" such nonsense as is contained in this proposal.

We hope that the Congress, alerted to the pitfalls of the proposal, will reject it.

Section 101, the rent supplement proposal, should be stricken from the bill.

Paul A. Fino.
James Harvey.
W. E. Brock.
Burt L. Talcott.
Del Clawson.
Albert W. Johnson.
J. William Stanton.
Chester L. Mize.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of the Scriptures: Romans 12: 21: *Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, as we come nearer to another Memorial Day, may we see those terrible and terrific facts that war, in the final analysis, simply means the killing of men, the destruction of property, and the breaking of human hearts.

May we catch a clear vision of those moral and spiritual equivalents to build a better world which are continually challenging and demanding our very best of effort and enthusiasm, of sympathy and service.

Help us to make the public law and the peace of the world our personal concern; give us more of that spirit of love which never faileth and which we must live by and must settle our differences and disputes by in a civilized and commonsense way.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2299. An act for the relief of Robert L. Yates and others;

H.R. 3051. An act for the relief of Vermont Maple Orchards, Inc., Burlington, Vt.;

H.R. 3074. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Stevens; and

H.R. 3899. An act for the relief of C. R. Sheaffer & Sons.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3708. An act to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 800) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 45. An act for the relief of Maj. Raymond G. Clark, Jr.;

S. 69. An act for the relief of Mrs. Genevieve Olsen;

S. 97. An act for the relief of Lt. Raymond E. Berube, Jr.;

S. 134. An act for the relief of Lloyd K. Hirota;

S. 263. An act for the relief of Honorata A. Vda de Narra;

S. 572. An act for the relief of Robert L. Wolverton;

S. 919. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 1008. An act for the relief of Ottilia Bruegmann James;

S. 1068. An act for the relief of Fred E. Starr; and

S. 1267. An act for the relief of Jack C. Winn, Jr.

THE WILL TO BE FREE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an address by Senator Henry M. Jackson which he made to the alumni of the Duquesne University School of Law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the American public has heard a variety of views expressed concerning the courses of action which this Nation should follow in meeting its international responsibilities. Amidst these conflicting views and proposals it may be difficult for many citizens to formulate clear judgments regarding our policies and actions.

On the evening of May 20, 1965, the Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON, Senator from the State of Washington, delivered an address in Pittsburgh, Pa., to the alumni of the Duquesne University School of Law. Senator JACKSON's speech "The Will To Be Free," is, in my judgment, a brilliant statement of the challenges which face the United States in protecting its international security and in preserving individual liberty. In addition Senator JACKSON's speech is a truly helpful guide to individual citizens who seek a responsible perspective of recent events in such troubled areas as Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

The speech is as follows:

THE WILL TO BE FREE

(By Senator HENRY M. JACKSON)

I greatly appreciate this opportunity to be with you for this special occasion. I do not know of a more appropriate group before which to discuss matters which affect the safety of the Nation and the preservation of individual liberty.

History is a most unsentimental judge of men and nations. One society after another has been tested, found wanting, and has sunk into the oblivion of a chapter or a footnote in the textbooks. History's judgment is coldly pragmatic: Does a society have what it takes to survive the challenges thrown in its path?

As one reads history, or experiences it, one comes to understand that challenge and response are constants. Or, to put it another way, security is not a fixed condition, but a process.

As the Queen said to Alice, "Now, here, it takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that."

We have been running hard for almost a generation, first to meet and overcome the challenge of the Axis Powers and then to counter the expansionist thrusts of the Communist Powers into a world marked by swift change and electric discontents. There is no prospect whatever that we will be able to stop running, for security is not to be attained by standing still.

In recent months we have been deluged with an outpouring of protest about American foreign policy—from students, teachers, scientists, members of the clergy, Congressmen, and other concerned Americans.

Indeed, you aren't really with it these days unless you have advised the President by adding your name to a full page ad in the New York Times—or have marched a placard up and down in front of the White House.

The longer I work at the problems of national security, the more I come to share Thomas Jefferson's view that a person "is less remote from the truth who believes nothing, than he who believes what is wrong." The most expendable thing in the world ought to be a mistaken idea. Unfortunately, many people cling to them, as though they were the last roses of summer.

Let me discuss with you a few of the misleading notions about international affairs that turn up in the national debate.

One familiar view is that so-called "wars of national liberation" are purely domestic matters.

This is, of course, wrong, as ought to be apparent.

Late in 1943, upon returning from the Moscow meeting of Foreign Ministers where the Big Four had agreed to establish the United Nations, Secretary of State Hull addressed a joint session of Congress. In the course of his speech he said that as this agreement was carried into effect: "there will no longer be need for spheres of influence, for alliances, for balance of power, or any other of the special arrangements through which, in the unhappy past, the nations strove to safeguard their security or to promote their interests."

A little more than 4 years later, on March 12, 1947, President Truman spoke to a joint session of Congress, calling on Congress and the public to aid Greece and Turkey. He said: "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way. I believe that our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes. The world is not static, and the status quo is not sacred. But we cannot allow changes in the status quo in violation of the Charter of the United Nations by such methods as coercion, or by such subterfuges as political infiltration. In helping free and independent nations to maintain their freedom, the United States will be giving effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

Today Secretary Hull's statement has the ring of another era. President Truman's is as timely as this morning's newspaper.

President Truman knew, 18 years ago, that civil war is the preferred Communist technique. That is what Marx called for in 1848 in "The Communist Manifesto," for class war is civil war. It is how Lenin came to power in Russia, and Mao in China. It is how the attempt was made in Greece and Korea and elsewhere. It is how the attempt is being made today in Vietnam. In every case an armed minority seeks to subjugate society.

We should recall Khrushchev's famous speech of January 1961, in which he said: "Liberation wars will continue to exist as long as imperialism exists * * *. Such wars are not only admissible but inevitable * * *. We recognize such wars, we help and will help the peoples striving for their independence * * *. The Communists fully support such just wars and march in the front rank with the peoples waging liberation struggles."

To agree that civil war in our times is a purely domestic matter in which we should never become involved would be to call a halt to our opposition to Communist expansion. The war in Vietnam is a civil war, in the sense that Vietnamese are fighting Vietnamese, but the point to emphasize is that it is an aggressive war; it is, as President Truman said, an effort by an armed minority, the Vietcong, to subjugate an entire people.

The Russians and the Chinese may not agree about everything related to the conduct of the Vietnamese war. They have their family quarrel. But both are wholehearted supporters of so-called "wars of national liberation." And both are supporting the war in Vietnam—with resources, with diplomacy, and with propaganda.

The plain fact is that the Vietnamese war is a skirmish in the far larger contest, called the cold war, that has been going on for 20 years. We did not seek this struggle; but we cannot avoid it. And freedom must prevail in the larger contest—or everything is lost.

What we do or do not do in Vietnam, therefore, must be considered in terms of its consequences for the larger struggle. Success in Vietnam would be heady stuff for Peiping and Hanoi, with implications that are very clear to the Malaysians, the Thais, the Burmese, the Australians, and also to the British—who, unlike some Western powers, still can see beyond Western Europe. Given the calculus employed by the Communists, there is no way to deter them but to have them discover that the so-called war of national liberation is not a low-cost technique of aggression.

Another persistent illusion is that we can depend upon someone else to act in defense of our vital interests.

This is a modern version of "let George do it."

In any conflict one hopes, of course, that the interests of others will converge with one's own and lead to common action for compatible purposes. In other words, one wants and welcomes allies.

But to be backed up one has to take a lead. To get allies one must be prepared to defend one's own national interests—alone if necessary. Britain provided an inspiring example in World War II and the world stands indebted to her for that. The United States took the lead in Korea, and without that lead no U.N. coalition could have been built to defend the Republic of Korea against the Soviet-inspired attack.

Today we are taking the lead in Vietnam. Fear of China, or fear that the United States may prove to be a paper tiger, may keep some friends and allies from backing us up in word and deed. I am convinced, however, that many hope and pray for a successful resistance to the aggression in Vietnam. In time, as our determination becomes evident and as an understanding of the consequences of a Communist success sink in, additional support may be forthcoming.

Nothing succeeds like success. If in doubt ask any politician.

Some say that the problem of Vietnam should be turned over to the United Nations. It is comforting to suppose that this assignment can be subcontracted to the U.N. It cannot be.

Today, the crisis of the United Nations is evident. That organization can be one useful avenue of American foreign policy. But by misusing the organization—by loading on it a heavier burden of policy than it is able to handle—its ability to act positively in other situations is impaired. Under the banner of strengthening the United Nations, some of its supposed friends have contributed to its present plight. And the way to finally destroy the United Nations is to demand more of it than it can do—such as major military action in the defense of Vietnam.

This is not, of course, a popular view in some circles. To utter it is to expose oneself to the charge of downgrading the United Nations. But the view I am stating is not a criticism of the United Nations: it is rather a criticism of the approach to the organization taken by some of our own Government officials and by many well-intentioned but naive pressure groups.

We are doing what we can to support the basic principles and purposes of the United Nations, in Vietnam and elsewhere. A cause must have its champions and unfortunately the lot of the champion is often the kind of dirty, mean, bloody work that is going on, day after day, in Vietnam.

We can afford to "Let George do it"—only if we understand that George is us.

And only then can we expect to find allies to help carry the load.

Another misleading view—held by some who weary of our involvement in Vietnam—is that neutralism is the way out of our difficulties in southeast Asia.

Many people may be genuinely confused about this matter. I believe, however, that some of the advocates of neutralism are being less than candid, that in fact they want us to pack our bags and quit Vietnam—no matter what the consequences.

President Johnson has stated our objective "an independent South Vietnam—securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationship with others, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no other country." The problem is precisely how to achieve and assure such independence for South Vietnam.

A nation is not neutral by free world standards if it is subservient to Communist aims or a set-up for imminent takeover by local Communist stooges. This is the status of the "soft neutral" advocated by Peiping, Moscow, and Hanoi. The Premier of North Vietnam has made his aims clear: a settlement "in accordance with the program of the South Vietnam Liberation Front"—that is, the Vietcong—"without any foreign interference"—that is, as he made clear, without any interference by the United States.

As the saying goes, it is not possible to compromise with someone who is trying to cut your throat. To get the kind of hard neutrality we want for South Vietnam will take some doing. The Communists are not yet persuaded that the costs of a settlement on their terms are too high. If and when they find the venture unprofitable, they will find a way to let us know—as they did in Korea and at the end of the Berlin blockade.

Another frequent error—voiced by many people of good will—is that the conference table provides an escape from the struggle.

Like many fallacies, this one is attractive. It suggests that the risks and burdens of conflict are unnecessary. But it is a fallacy, for it rests on a mistaken idea of the nature of negotiation.

International relations are a kind of permanent negotiation. The diplomats are always at work. Even in the midst of war, diplomatic soundings never cease. The parties move from one issue to another, but they never reach the end of the list, for it is as endless as history.

In the eyes of many Americans, however, when war begins, negotiations end, and when negotiations begin, military pressure should end. It is not so with the Communists.

When American, South Korean, and other U.N. forces threw back the third Chinese spring offensive in 1951, with staggering Chinese casualties, the Communists indicated a willingness to negotiate. Thereupon, instead of keeping up the military pressure which had brought them to the conference table, the U.N. forces were ordered to halt their drive. Some officials thought that the war phase had ended and that the negotiating phase had begun. Optimists thought we might get an armistice agreement in 3 weeks; pessimists thought it might take 6. No one imagined it would take more than 100 weeks. But once American forces let up their military pressure, the Communists proceeded to drag out the negotiations, trying to win at the bargaining table far more than they had been able to win on the battlefield.

The moral of this story is that negotiation is not a substitute for pressure. On the contrary, pressure is part of the negotiating process. It is an old rule that a diplomat cannot be expected to win more at the conference table than his comrade-in-arms has won—or is clearly in a position to win—on the field of battle.

I see no reason to doubt the relevance of this principle to Vietnam. The outcome of any discussions inside the conference room will be decided by the whole series of pressures outside the conference room. All these pressures, including military moves, determine whether an international conference can be brought to a satisfactory end.

Whether Americans understand it or not, the Communists know that the war in Vietnam is part of a negotiation that has been going on for 20 years and will continue as far ahead as anyone can see.

As you may have noted, I have not discussed the Vietnam situation, or any other in detail. First things first—and the first thing is to get as broad an understanding as possible of Vietnam, and other foreign policy issues, in the perspective of an ongoing struggle that has occupied our attention and energies for many years and will occupy them for many years into the future.

Also, of course, at this stage, no diagnosis of a problem like Vietnam can be definitive. "Any man," said Macauley, "who held the same view of the French Revolution in 1789, 1804, 1814, and 1834, must either have been a divinely inspired prophet or an obstinate fool."

No unsuccessful society, I daresay, has ever consciously willed its own failure. Men face problems, they do the best they can, and time tells whether their responses were adequate.

By and large, the United States has done a good job in building its military power. The great challenge now, assuming that we maintain and continue to develop adequate military forces, is to use all elements of our power wisely to protect and advance our enlightened national interests.

And we should bear in mind that it is easier to develop strength than to use it wisely and in a manner consistent with our purposes. How one does something is important, as well as what one does.

We took the lead in the Dominican Republic to prevent a Communist takeover of the rebellion, and without that initiative no majority could have been rallied in the Organization of American States to create a special inter-American police force. But, at the outset of the Dominican crisis, we did not say some things that needed to be said and we said some things that might better have been left unsaid. As a result, although we have moved quickly to correct the mistake, we initially made an unfortunate impression of acting for a unilateral purpose—when in fact we were taking the lead on behalf of a multilateral purpose long agreed upon by the Organization of American States.

Paradoxically, as military weakness produced a paralysis of will in the thirties, today our great strength is producing a near-paralysis of will in some Americans. A recurrent note in the comment about Vietnam is fear of major conflict—perhaps even nuclear war—as though that settled the matter and ruled out our participation. Disarmament of the will precedes physical disarmament.

Yet there is no way to deter the Communists except to make aggression unprofitable—in lives, in treasure, and in the interruption of their valued programs on other fronts. This can be accomplished by the wise use of influence and power. But there is a preconditioning: we must have the will to use our influence and power and we must have steady nerves.

Clearly, the free societies have to learn to make more effective use of nonmilitary measures in preventing the deterioration of political situations. Major tools are diplomacy, trade, economic assistance, information programs, and example. It is not at all clear that this combination will be effective in future trouble spots in Africa, Asia, or Latin America. We have a great deal to learn about the use of these tools and this problem should be high on our national agenda.

Then, there are the new issues in our relations with the advanced nations of Western Europe and Japan. The independence of these nations is and will continue to be the No. 1 condition of peace. But these nations no longer need our help as they did a few years ago. Our relationship with them poses the difficult problem of making an alliance between old, proud, self-reliant, and powerful nations work. That is easier said than done, when views differ on such basic matters as dealing with the Communist bloc, or the division of Germany, or the size, organization, and balance of forces to deter Communist aggression.

The problem, as I see it, is to find the common purposes, the converging interests, on which common policies can be built for the life and death issues—and to learn to live with divergent purposes, interests, and policies on issues of less importance. Much patience, much frank consultation, much clarity on all sides about the price of going it alone, and a moratorium on hectoring and recrimination will be needed.

I know that such general remarks do not advance the ball with respect to specific issues. But perhaps we should be thinking less in terms of yards gained and more in terms of keeping a team in the field.

I would add this warning: In the kind of longrun struggle which engages us, there is the constant temptation—whenever the pressure seems to lift a little—to indulge in overoptimistic predictions. Some Government officials have shown themselves too ready to believe that the international situation is easier—when it is not. A rosy promise may quiet a few doubts today, but it will create more confusion tomorrow.

In conclusion, let me say this:

The concept of world opinion has been, I fear, much abused. Whatever it is and whatever the importance that should be attached to it, it should not deter us from getting on with the job we have to do.

We could with profit consider a predecessor in great power and far-flung responsibilities—the British in the 19th century. No one liked the British very much. For their part, they took foreign dislike in stride—and they recognized the validity of some of the criticism. But the British people were not obsessed with being liked. Nor did they waste their energy currying favor on every front.

If we are to do our duty, we cannot always win a popularity contest or a Gallup poll. I think Mark Twain summed it up correctly: "Always do right," he said. "This will gratify some people, and astonish the rest."

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 8310, the Educational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

BETTY LOU McVAY VARNUM

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 in New York City, Betty Lou McVay Varnum of Iowa was given a McCall magazine "Golden Mike" Award for her service to the community on her WOI-TV series, "Status 6."

The "Golden Mikes," awarded for the 14th consecutive year, are the most coveted awards presented exclusively to women in broadcasting.

Producer-Moderator Betty McVay, a member of the Governor's Committee on

Employment of the Handicapped, initiated and carried out a plan to help Iowa's estimated 180,000 handicapped persons. Her series, "Status 6," talked directly to the handicapped and used special visual inserts to interpret for deaf viewers.

> The program emphasized the importance of realistic appraisal of the person, not just the handicap, and provided useful advice to help them reenter society. The accomplishments of handicapped persons who had been rehabilitated were demonstrated to give added emphasis to the opportunities available to the afflicted—

Stated McCall's. The magazine said Iowa Governor Hughes commended Miss McVay saying the series had focused on one of Iowa's and the Nation's major welfare problems.

Miss McVay is featured in the May issue of McCall's magazine.

Congressman NEAL SMITH and I wish to join all of Betty McVay's friends in extending our sincere congratulations on this high honor. Her singular service is an inspiration to all of us and of tremendous assistance to those who need this kind of understanding.

AMERICAN HOUSEWIVES ALREADY PAYING THE PRICE OF SHORTSIGHTED POLICIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR REGARDING FARM LABOR

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, news reports yesterday and today reveal that American housewives are already paying the price of shortsighted policies of the Department of Labor regarding farm labor.

Supermarket prices across the country are up on many items, including vegetables and fruits.

> The main reason for the higher fruit-vegetable prices is the sharp drop in production caused by the ban on importing farm labor imposed by Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz—

The New York Herald Tribune reported.

> A survey by the Associated Press said most food stores put their price increases at about 15 percent above prices last spring—

According to this story.

Farmers in California are said to have reduced their acreage plantings this year because of the policies of the Labor Department. California crop harvests in many crops is just getting started, and will not peak out until late summer, so that the real effect will not be felt immediately. Belated recognition of the problem resulted in some relief being granted last week when additional workers were allowed to enter the State.

In Florida we have seen one of the most difficult seasons in memory, when most crops faced shortages of labor and offshore workers already certified were ordered repatriated before the harvests were completed. Fortunately relief was granted by the Attorney General.

The result of this year's labor policies unless changed will undoubtedly be felt in Florida next season. Less acreage will undoubtedly be planted because of the uncertainty of the labor supply. The housewife will face additional price increases as the supply is cut.

These increased prices are not the result of increased wages being paid farmworkers, as in Florida farmers are already paying the minimum wage, as set by the Labor Department, incentive pay, and fringe benefits required of them. The added costs are a direct result of crop losses due to an insufficient supply of labor and smaller plantings anticipated or already realized, which have a direct and immediate effect on supply and demand in the marketplace.

Not only is the housewife paying the price of this folly, but the farmer is suffering losses and the domestic farmworker faces the loss of the jobs they already have.

As one example, a large celery farm in south Florida which employs some 550 domestic workers may have to discontinue their entire operation for lack of only 44 offshore workers where their services are required in critical cutting. It has not been possible for farmers to obtain domestic workers to do this particular job. The loss of a $35,000-a-month payroll to domestic workers will result if the Department of Labor is successful in putting this farm out of business by not allowing the 44 offshore workers to enter the country to do their necessary work.

Before more losses are suffered and the consumer price for farm products increases further, the procedures in administration of Public Law 414 must be clarified and improved to permit operation of our Nation's farms with an adequate supply of required labor.

THE 1965 NORTH DAKOTA PUBLIC OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this week I am sending my annual questionnaire to the constituents of the First District of North Dakota.

Because of my desire to make the poll completely impartial, it is being sent to all postal patrons in my district instead of to my normal mailing list. This gives all the people an opportunity to voice their opinions on matters of national interest.

Last year's poll gained a fantastic response, and I will be releasing the results from the 1965 poll as soon as they begin to indicate a trend.

The questionnaire follows:

[Check your answer "Yes" or "No" in the appropriate square. No answer indicates "no opinion" or "other." I have used "his" and "hers" so both husband and wife may answer]

	His		Hers	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you favor further Federal legislation protecting the rights of individuals in voting for Federal, State, and local officials?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Do you favor repeal of sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, thus repealing the State right-to-work laws?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Do you feel the Government is spending your tax dollar wisely?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Do you favor Federal legislation to tighten control of the sale and purchase of firearms?	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Do you favor allowing the States, by a vote of the people, to establish some basis other than population in apportioning 1 body of the legislature?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. During the last 4 years, great changes emphasizing automation have been made in handling mail. Do you feel your mail service is better today?	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Do you favor raising the resale price of CCC grain thereby removing Government competition from private and cooperative grain firms and increasing prices for farmers?	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Do you feel farmers are entitled to full parity for the food that is consumed by Americans?	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Yes	No
(Questions 9 and 10, check 1 only)		
9. In Vietnam, which of the following courses of action do you favor?		
(a) Taking what U.S. military action is deemed necessary to win the war	☐	☐
(b) Negotiate best armistice possible and gradual withdrawal	☐	☐
10. Which general direction of farm policy do you prefer?		
(a) Reducing the number of farmers to 1,000,000 as has been proposed and letting prices fall to where they stabilize	☐	☐
(b) A 2-price system coupled with an all-out effort to make our food available to hungry people both at home and abroad	☐	☐
(c) Increasing support prices and limiting production sharply by mandatory controls to whatever point necessary to make this type of program succeed	☐	☐

(Name. If you sign please print)

(Address)

(Occupation)

☐ Please check here if you would like to receive our newsletter.

THE REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, at a time when this Congress and this Nation are absorbed with matters pertaining to the rights of men, we find before us a proposal to remove a right so basic as to be beyond question: the right of a man to work without being forced to join a union.

Today I received an unsolicited letter from a labor union member outside my district. The contents struck me so, and so well expressed the feelings of those who oppose the proposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, that I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

We are all familiar with the feelings and arguments of those who oppose State right-to-work laws—the union leaders. But this letter, Mr. Speaker, expresses the feelings of the rank and file union member and, better than I, ably states their case.

> MACON, GA., *May 25, 1965.*
>
> HON. HOWARD CALLAWAY,
> *Member of Congress,*
> *House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SIR: Realizing that you are not my district Representative I am requesting your help because I am not lucky enough to have a Republican Representative in my district.
>
> As you are aware there is much talk about repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. It greatly disturbs me that in our land of the so-called free our own President asks Congress to take another right away from the people. He gave as his reason: to unify labor. I know the real reason is to make good his promise to the leaders of organized labor in return for supporting him in 1964. You will please note that I said leaders and not members.
>
> Let me make myself clear that I am no outsider in this situation. I am a member of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and have been for 3 years. When I went to work for the Central of Georgia Railroad they told me that to keep my job beyond 60 days I would have to join the union because they have a closed shop agreement. Most likely, I would belong to the union anyway, but I don't like to be forced. The leadership of unions want this section repealed because they will have compulsory membership and compulsory dues everywhere. My dues average $150 per year and are used to support my organization and political parties or individuals which sometimes I am opposed. The membership has no choice of who we support. This choice is made solely by union leadership. I assure you leaders are elected to make decisions for its members but they are not elected for anything other than negotiations with employers as far as I am concerned. In this time of freedom, why do I not have a choice?
>
> This support by President Johnson is certainly in sharp contrast to the early days of labor unions. Years ago back in England it was against the law to organize and support labor unions.
>
> Please consider my thoughts and do whatever you can to stop this proposed legislation. My thoughts are shared by approximately 90 percent of my union brothers.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> P. D. DUBOSE.

DISCUSSION OF RECENT EVENTS IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, during our recent debate on foreign aid, part of the discussion included recent events in the Dominican Republic. While there was insufficient time then to give to the matter, I would like to take time now to place in the RECORD certain facts pertaining to the Dominican Republic and the course of recent events.

First, however, I am happy to note that it is reported that through the efforts of the OAS and our own officers on the scene, some degree of tranquillity has been restored to Santo Domingo. We are now busy with the job of feeding and clothing tens of thousands of people whose lives have been disrupted and who in many cases have lost breadwinners, homes, and all their possessions.

As we try to help the Dominican people pick up the threads of their shattered daily lives, we are also engaged in helping them establish a sounder political base for their country. We hope that ultimately this will lead to institutions by which they can govern themselves democratically and reduce the impulse to resort to violence for political change. In this connection, several of the highest officers of this Government have been sent to Santo Domingo, where they are working in collaboration with Ambassador Bennett. Their task is not yet finished, but our Government is confident that it will soon be successful. The Dominican people can then turn more fully to the job of securing a prosperous and constructive future for themselves. This Government should give them every assistance in achieving these goals.

The troubles started on April 24 with a rebellion against the government of Donald Reid Cabral. Middle- and junior-grade officers of the armed forces were involved, and so were several leaders of the party of ex-President Juan Bosch, who had been deposed by force in 1963.

By April 25 events had moved very rapidly. Senor Reid was forced to give up his office, and a majority of the military officers in revolt accepted the political leadership of men long associated with Juan Bosch. Senor Rafael Molina Urena who was the most immediately available successor to Bosch, was chosen to lead an interim rebel government. Military units which did not favor the rebels' action, however, continued to maintain peace in the countryside. By and large they confined the rebellion to downtown Santo Domingo.

But by far the most important event which occurred on this day—which was repeated the following day—was the emptying of military and police arsenals by those in rebellion. To a great degree this was a turning point in the crisis. The weapons in these arsenals—and they amounted to several thousands including many tommyguns and machineguns—were handed out indiscriminately to civilians in the streets of Santo Domingo. There was little or no control of these handouts. Quite naturally, Communist militants, many of them trained in Cuba and bloc countries, saw their opportunity—and they took it. They had soon acquired large stocks of arms and ammunition. With these weapons they established their own depots and in turn were able to equip their followers. We have details on these and subsequent actions of the Communists. Let me read to you extracts from confirmed reports on these activities:

> Among those active in acquiring large stocks of arms and equipping their followers in both the PSPD and APCJ were Buenaventura Johnson Pimentel, member of the central committee of the Dominican Communist Party; Juan Ducoudray Mansfield, a Communist activist and propagandist who had once worked on Havana radio broadcasts to the Dominican Republic; Jaime Duran Hernando, who was trained in Cuba; and Fidelio Despradel Roques, who had been a guerrilla fighter against the Reid government.
>
> During the course of the rebellion, the dispersal points for arms which were set up by the leaders of the three Dominican Communist movements became military strongpoints in Santo Domingo, as well as headquarters for the various parties. A building on Arzobispo Portas Avenue was one stronghold, and Diomedes Mercedes Batista, Jose Rodriguez Acosta, as well as other party leaders, were observed there, leading a paramilitary force armed with submachineguns and rifles, Molotov cocktails, and hand grenades. The Castroite movement's strong point was set up on Jose Gabriel Garcia Street near the Malecon in Ciudad Nueva, and a heavily armed force used it as a base of operations. Juan Miguel Roman Diaz, a member of the central committee of the Castroite movement, was identified as the commander of a rebel stronghold, arsenal, and prison located at the corner of Estrelleta and Arzobispo Nouel Streets. Gustava Ricart, who returned to the Dominican Republic in 1963 from Cuba bringing money to finance MPD activities, was identified as the commander of another rebel stronghold.
>
> Another APCJ post was located at No. 25 Juan de Morfa Street under Jaime Duran Hernando, Cuban-trained guerrilla warfare expert. Still another was in the hands of an armed Communist group under Fidelio Despradel Roques, also trained in Cuba in 1963, on Caracas Street between Altagracia 11 de Julio Streets. A Molotov cocktail factory was located at Calle Cambronal.

These excerpts I have just read, I repeat, are from confirmed reports.

As a result of this quick exploitation of the opening of the arsenals, the various Communist parties became an increasingly important element in the rebel force. Rebel army officers and men reportedly numbered about 1,000 at the outset of the rebellion. They were soon greatly outnumbered by the armed civilians, who were vulnerable to manipulation by the disciplined Communist leadership.

On April 26, military forces in the vicinity of the capital which had not joined the rebellion began to move against the downtown area of Santo Domingo, that is, into the heart of rebel territory. Heavy air bombings began, and the fighting became general throughout the city. Efforts of the U.S. Ambassador to obtain a ceasefire failed. Soon great numbers of American citizens, as well as nationals of other countries, were requesting that the Embassy assist in their evacuation. The Embassy itself was under strafing fire and machinegun fire throughout much of this and subsequent days.

Law and order began collapsing altogether on April 27. Evacuation operations began. The Molina government of the insurrectionist forces faded away, and Molina, along with several other political leaders who owed allegiance to

Bosch, took refuge in various embassies. It is now apparent, however, that Communist cadres among the rebel forces were made of sterner stuff. Their tight organization and effective leadership kept the rebels' hopes alive, and their resistance ultimately blunted the attacks of the loyalists' military elements. By the afternoon of April 28, the loyalist forces had lost their momentum. Armed mobs were terrorizing the city and firing on homes and other buildings, including the United States and other embassies. Governmental authority no longer existed in Santo Domingo. The rebel side had become in large part an armed mob, and the military leaders opposing the revolt from San Isidro could exercise little or no control over the city.

Colonel Benoit, the head of a provisional regime established by the loyalists, sent a message to the U.S. Embassy that Dominican authorities could no longer provide any guarantees for the safety of American citizens, that the lives of the latter were in danger, and that the presence of U.S. military forces was necessary to protect them. The chief of the Dominican police also told the U.S. Embassy that he could defend only a few key installations in the city, and could no longer cope with the situation.

The port of Haina was no longer available for evacuation of American and other foreign citizens whose lives were in danger. The evacuation route to Haina, like the Hotel Embajador and the U.S. Embassy, was under sniper fire from armed civilian groups. Further evacuation of the hundreds of Americans and other foreigners who were still assembling at the hotel, was, therefore, possible only across the open beach or by helicopter from fields near the hotel. Either operation required the protection of U.S. troops.

The U.S. Ambassador and his country team therefore recommended that U.S. marines be landed from the U.S. Navy task force lying off Santo Domingo, and that they establish a safety perimeter around the Hotel Embajador to insure the safe evacuation of additional hundreds of Americans and other foreigners. By the night of April 28, approximately 600 marines were landed and had established a safety perimeter around the hotel.

On April 29, with the first contingent of U.S. forces ashore, the rebels held the central part of the city. They also held the military, if not also the psychological initiative. They appeared to be on the point of scoring a knockout punch against the now groggy loyalist troops and police. A massive assault on the last police stronghold was begun with leaders of the smallest but most militant of the Dominican Communist parties participating. This stronghold fell the next day with considerable loss of life, and a great quantity of additional arms and ammunition were obtained by the attackers.

The U.S. Government, aware that the terrorism and violence in the streets of Santo Domingo was increasing, recognized that there was a growing danger to the lives of American citizens and other foreign nationals who wished to leave the country, as well as to those of countless innocent Dominican citizens. The Government concluded that elements of its armed forces would have to be kept in Santo Domingo, and indeed be reinforced without delay, if the chaotic conditions in the city were not to result in more intense fighting with heavy casualties.

The decision was made, therefore, to send additional troops to Santo Domingo, not only to ensure the further evacuation of American and other foreign citizens, but also to contribute to the maintenance of order for the purpose of avoiding further needless sacrifice of lives. We were already seeking action on the part of the Organization of American States—OAS—in Washington to put an end to the fighting in Santo Domingo. The objective of this Government was to preserve the situation so that, through the OAS, peace and representative government could be restored in the Dominican Republic. The United States was aware that if the Communist elements were able to obtain predominance in the rebellion, as appeared likely, and if the rebellion, so directed, were successful, any chance for restoration of democratic processes would be foreclosed. The U.S. Government therefore ordered the landing of an additional 1,100 U.S. marines west of the central part of the city, and, during the night of April 29–30, approximately 2,000 troops of the 82d Airborne Division at San Isidro, east of Santo Domingo. Reinforcements arrived on succeeding days.

Let me make clear at this point how difficult were the decisions the U.S. Government was forced to make during these trying and dangerous days. First of all, the decision to send the first contingent of marines: When the call came from our Ambassador that there was no government which could at this point assure the safety of U.S. and other foreign nationals, it was clear that we had to risk a negative reaction from some of our Latin American friends, and also that we had to take that risk without a moment's hesitation. There was no other course; either we acted immediately, or we faced the possibility that the terror reigning in the streets of Santo Domingo would engulf hundreds of innocent Americans and other foreign nationals.

Second, the decision to reinforce the early landings of U.S. troops, and subsequently to build up our forces in the Dominican Republic to sizable proportions: In these decisions, we were motivated not only by the desire to complete the job of restoring a degree of security to the international community in Santo Domingo, but also by a realization that Communist influence had suddenly—in a matter of a very few days—become highly important in the rebel movement.

I cannot say—nor do I think anyone can say—precisely how important their influence had become at the point when our troops began arriving. Certainly there were many non-Communists among the rebels, and several in the rebel high command, such as it was in the last days of April. What we did discover, however, was that Communists were supplying the most effective element of the rebellion in the streets—or to use military terms: in a tactical situation where much depended on small units, the Communists had the men, the guns, the leadership, and the discipline. Moreover, we observed the departure from the rebel camp of several important non-Communist leaders, many of them disenchanted with their comrades in arms. Finally we saw that the loyalist forces were dispirited—that the rebels would within a matter of days, or perhaps hours, have full control of the capital city. We could indeed have been faced with a city in a vacuum—a city in which the Communists could have had the most important voice in dictating terms for a new political arrangement that would have been binding on the whole country.

Under the auspices of the Papal Nuncio and with the encouragement of the OAS, a cease-fire was arranged on April 30 and established on May 1. This, as you know, did not solve the Dominican crisis, nor did the cease-fire last very long. It did, however, stop the worst of the fighting for several days.

At this point, the Communists in the rebel-held areas of Santo Domingo began to reassess their situation. If they had once felt that victory was in their grasp, they now apparently began to appreciate that the presence of large numbers of U.S. troops effectively impeded their freedom of action.

It was the consensus at meetings of Communist leaders at this time that their full-scale participation in the fighting no longer served a useful purpose, and that prominent Communists should begin withdrawing from the scene. As early as May 4, one of the three parties had instructed its members to hide the arms in their possession. Some of the Communist leaders went into hiding, among them Juan and Felix Ducoudray who had been prominent figures throughout the rebellion. Others attempted to leave Santo Domingo for towns to the north. Among these was Luis Genao Espaillat, who was later captured by antirebel forces.

Some Communists who left Santo Domingo at this time were under instructions to attempt to organize local party members and sympathizers for eventual guerrilla action in the north. False identity cards were being prepared for Communist leaders by Milvio Perez y Perez, a Communist militant who runs a photographic shop on Arzobispo Nouel Street, and who did special photographic work for the party. The stream of arms out of the rebel-held areas of the city still continues. We have a report as recently as May 21 of a truckload of arms being moved from Santo Domingo to the towns of La Vega and Bonao for concealment.

While many of the frontline Communist leaders are receding into the background—particularly those with Cuban and Soviet training—the lesser members, especially the younger ones, remain active as the backbone of the rebellion. We have reason to believe that they may have adopted the classic Communist tactic of dividing themselves into small groups or commands in the rebel-held areas, in order to avoid conspicuous meetings and gatherings. While the rebel government has few or no Communists in its makeup, the rebel territory still has many in its streets.

This seeming contradiction in the Communist position has already proved embarrassing to them. I have learned of a very interesting report concerning the activities of one Juan B. Mejia, a member of the executive committee of one of the Dominican Communist parties. Senor Majia complained bitterly to a Cuban official that Radio Havana must stop mentioning him and his party as being involved in the rebel movement; he also insisted that the Cuban radio must make no further reference to the existence of a mountain headquarters of the Communists, and that there should not be any mention of "fighting in the hills."

Admittedly there is now a very confused situation, and it will take time to establish the facts of some questions where there can now be only supposition and speculation. We do have, however, a number of indications which point, not only to differences among the Communist and non-Communist elements in the rebel camp, but to diverging opinions among the three Communist parties. This does not require too much stretching of the imagination when one faction answers to Moscow, a second is inclined toward the Chinese line, and the third and largest is a Castroite Communist front which includes many non-Communists.

Now there has been a great deal of discussion of the death the other day of Dominican Lt. Col. Rafael Fernandez Dominguez, a very able officer who was considered close to former President Bosch, and who was serving as minister of interior in the provisional rebel government. The rebel claim was that he had been shot in the back, presumably by U.S. troops, during a rebel attack on the Presidential palace.

Reports show that during such a raid, U.S. troops near the palace were in fact fired on by rebel raiders, and returned the fire. It is also a fact, however, that our intelligence reports had warned even before the raid took place that it was being planned by the militant hard-line Communist Party called the MPD. It is hard to understand, in that light, why the two rebel leaders whose bodies were found there were a leader of the Castroite group, Juan Miguel Roman Diaz, and a non-Communist follower of Juan Bosch, a Cabinet Minister presumably too busy to lead raiding parties. There is, in fact, a question in the rebel-held portion of Santo Domingo whether the two men might have been executed during the attack by the militant Communists, and their bodies left where they could conveniently be blamed on U.S. troops. All forces in the area have the same types of weapons, so that ballistic tests will not establish the facts.

Despite these complexities a clear pattern of Communist activity can be discerned over the past month. Quick exploitation of a fluid and deteriorating situation in the early days of the rebellion, the establishment of disciplined and well-trained cadres in the armed mobs terrorizing the city—and then, after the arrival of U.S. troops, the melting-away of Communist leaders, while a backbone of young militants gives strength and cohesion to the remaining rebel areas.

I believe the action that the United States took at the end of April probably saved the Dominican Republic from a Communist takeover. The exact degree of Communist control over the rebel movement at that moment can never be measured accurately, of course. But the fact remains that the risk was grave; it left this Government with no alternative but to arrest the threat.

Moreover, I believe our friends are coming to understand why we acted when we did, and what it has meant for the hemisphere. We have received generous public support for our position from many of our Latin American neighbors. We anticipate that this support will continue, and that the OAS will strengthen its important role in the hemisphere.

As concerns the specific issue of Communist involvement in the rebellion, we have also some very heartening private indications that this, too, is well understood. Latin American leaders of several countries have evidenced their concern, and so, too, have Dominicans of good faith on both sides of the battleline. Indeed, I am told that we can be confident that within the rebel area itself there are those—including some who may one day be leaders of a unified Dominican society—who are fully cognizant of the dangers that the Communists in the rebel areas still hold for their country. We can only hope that such private understanding will some day be translated into a candid and forthright recognition of the dangers through which the Dominican Republic is still passing.

It is my opinion that President Johnson and our country had to act. I believe that history will record that our President acted in the interest of the Western Hemisphere. He acted in the interest of peace and humanity. He acted fully conscious that the ideals of the American Revolution are still the guiding principles of our Nation tempered only by the ultimate responsibility of world peace.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] in making the powerful, effective, and constructive speech that he has just delivered. My distinguished friend represents his people with ability, distinction, dignity, and courage.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to the action in the Dominican Republic one of the aspects about which I have seen very little comment in the newspapers—and I do not say this critically but as a fact—is that there has been very little comment made about the masterful manner in which it was carried out.

Mr. Speaker, if the President had, only an hour before the marines and others of our troops arrived there, notified the world, with the emotional situation that existed we can see what might have reasonably and probably happened. That emotionalism would have been directed against American citizens there in particular and against the nationals of other countries in general.

We can very easily see, if we only evaluate the situation, that that action might have resulted in the killing or wounding of hundreds of Americans, as well as nationals of other countries.

So the President used excellent judgment in the manner in which he carried out his policy. I am glad to say that his action is supported by the Congress of the United States, by Members of both parties. The carrying out of the policy was executed in a most effective and humane way. We do not read of the fact that after the landing not one civilian lost his or her life. Some American soldiers in protecting the civilians of our country and other countries did lose their lives. But this is remarkable in the fact that not one civilian of either our country or the national of any other country was killed or wounded. I know they are thankful to the President and to the United States for taking the action, although they may not state it publicly, because they know their own lives were involved in this action that was taken to save the lives of human beings, thousands of whom were our own fellow citizens, and many hundreds the nationals of other countries.

I have not seen much written in the newspapers about the masterful manner in which the Commander in Chief and the American troops executed their mission in terms of saving human beings, human beings like ourselves, but they saved them, and not one civilian was killed or wounded.

This is one of the great acts of leadership that history can possibly record in this tremendous, emotional situation that existed, and once American marines landed there, not one civilian of the United States or of any other country lost their lives or was wounded. Prior to that there were hundreds of persons, unfortunately so, of the country itself, killed or wounded. I think great credit should be given to the manner, from the angle of saving human lives, in which the mission was carried out.

There is another angle. From the broad world angle there were some well-meaning people who overlooked the fact that 25 or 30 years ago a man by the name of Hitler came across the horizon of history. He wrote a book, "Mein Kampf," in which he told the world what he was going to do. But many did not believe him. He stated in this book, as Mao in Red China has stated, what he was going to do. Mao has said the same thing. Many did not believe Hitler, and now Mao because they are living in a dream world of hope.

They overlook the practical situation, the sinister intent and purposes of international or atheistic communism. They fail to consider the practical conditions that exist.

Just before World War II, and most of us have lived during this period—except the youngsters born since that time and who are now growing up—saw Hitler take over the Saar. Strong leadership at that time on the part of Britain and France might have averted that. When Hitler got away with that, we know the conniving that went on. Then Hitler took over Austria. Anyone ought to have known that that was the result of weakness in leadership. And we all know that weakness in leadership is encouragement to the dictator to go ahead. He construes that weakness in leadership as fear. So as I have said, Hitler took over Austria. Then we know what happened in the Sudetenland.

We saw the breaking and violation of solemn agreements with certain countries—and Hitler took the Sudetenland over.

We know what happened in Poland.

But then it was too late. There was nothing that could be done.

Then came World War II with all of the terrible loss of life and property. Yes; mankind had to go through that generation of pain and travail. But strong and firm leadership somewhere along the line might have averted that catastrophe. We know now that if certain things had been done, Hitler would not have done the things that he did and would not have gotten away with them.

Today we are pretty much basically in the same situation. We know that a weak and uncertain leadership 25 and 30 years ago produced a Munich and led the world and peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples of the world mistakenly to the road of appeasement. Yes; we now know the terrible suffering that was the result of World War II and the death and the wounding of millions, and the tremendous destruction of property as well. That was the inevitable result of following that road of appeasement that was taken at that time.

If we have learned anything, we ought to know now that the road of appeasement is the road that ultimately leads to war. The only thing that can avert a war is firm leadership. That is the kind of leadership that President Johnson is giving us now in these very trying times. I am proud of the fact that the great majority of the American people support our President and I am particularly proud as a Member of the House of Representatives and of the Congress of the United States and as the Speaker of this body that Members on both sides are unitedly supporting the President in his leadership—the leadership of action—with the calculated risk involved therein, as against the leadership of inaction and the calculated risk involved. Further, the President has practically united behind him all of the people of the United States and particularly, as I say, Members of both branches of the Congress.

We must also realize that history is being made at this very moment as we are meeting and talking here. Throughout the world history in one way or another is being made. The road to peace is not by following the path of uncertainty and fear. If we are to have peace in the future, there must be firm and courageous leadership that recognizes the mistakes of 25 and 30 years ago. We must firmly make the decision that we are not going to repeat those mistakes in this generation because we know now that such leadership of weakness and uncertainty is encouragement to the dictator and leads us only to the road of appeasement, and ultimately to war. If we look back and think of the days preceding World War II, we should clearly be convinced, if we have eyes to see with and minds that want to think rationally, that the road of appeasement is the road to war. Reference to happenings of 25 to 30 years ago are in order "Lest we forget."

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank our distinguished Speaker, the great Speaker of this House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], who has played such a significant role in the history of the United States that I am sure history will record him as one of the great and powerful Speakers of this body.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to commend the gentleman for the masterful way and the lucid manner in which he described the events that have taken place in the Dominican Republic. I would like to associate myself very humbly with the words of our beloved Speaker of the House.

I think, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, that everything that both gentlemen have said here today should be culminated with this statement, and I would ask my colleague if he would agree with me, that the words of the distinguished Speaker of the House concerning the kind of leadership that is necessary have been borne out by the events that the gentleman has described. But that the problem that existed throughout the Americas and the Latin American countries, of the attitude of distrust as to what was the attitude of the United States has been dissipated and I would say completely erased by the action of this leadership in withdrawing our troops, as the Organization of American States under the leadership of one who is not from the United States, but from a sister country, has come into play in the Dominican Republic.

This strong leadership, which acted at the time action was needed, is not a dictatorial leadership and every Latin American country should realize and understand this.

Judging from events, as the gentleman described them and as the Speaker has mentioned, the United States, under its present leadership, seeks no dominion and seeks no possessions. These people can sleep at peace. I hope they shall not henceforth distrust the actions of the United States and its Government, when we act to help those who are our brothers in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentleman for his meaningful words. I am happy he has made these significant points, which become a part of the Record.

HUDSON RIVER—NEW CONSERVATION CHALLENGE

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, this week I have been privileged to present to the House the first two sections of a paper by the distinguished New York conservationist and attorney, Irving Like. Mr. Like wrote this excellent report for the Citizens Committee for the Hudson River, in preparation for the hearings on my bill to establish a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway. But I feel that the document has significance for all those who are concerned with the growing problem of preserving great scenic assets and other natural resources.

In this final section of his paper, Mr. Like discusses the contribution the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway bill could make to the developing economy of the Hudson Gorge and Highlands. He also raises some novel and interesting suggestions for State and Federal cooperation which are worthy of serious consideration not only by New York on the Hudson, but for other States with similar problems as well.

The paper follows:

Hudson River: New Conservation Challenge—Part III

CONSERVATION PLUS REDEVELOPMENT

We have in the Hudson Scenic River legislation, the rare opportunity of enacting a conservation measure that is simultaneously a public works and antipoverty project of great scope, and a major river preservation and comprehensive multiple purpose water development plan. It is also a historic first eastern program of this sort, and thus a pilot inspirational example for the preservation and management of other beautiful urban rivers, in this country and abroad.

This legislation represents one of the most significant ever offered to advance the interests of the New York metropolitan region. The legislation lays the foundation for the redevelopment and restoration of the Hudson River shoreline. Thus communities within the Hudson River region can, by undertaking renewal measures incident to or in aid of a scenic riverway, qualify for Federal aid and assistance under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. For example, if a city, town, or village, desired to remove blight along its river shoreline, and to cerate instead a waterfront park, marina, or recreational facility, or any of the type of public works performed by the CCC (now the Job Corps), it could take the prescribed steps under the Opportunity Act, to obtain the moneys and help available for such projects. The scope of redevelopment and public works necessary in the Hudson Valley would insure substantial employment in the distressed construction trades for a long time, and would mark the first real hope of relieving the acute unemployment problem of Newburgh and other depressed areas of the Hudson Valley. The role of private enterprise, participating in such redevelopment effort and providing the goods and services needed for a scenic riverway, would also stimulate the economy of the region and increase employment.

The opportunity to the communities of the Hudson River Valley stemming from the creation of a Hudson Scenic Riverway is also obvious. Such a park would not only realize the enormous recreational asset values of the Hudson River, its valley and scenic highlands, which is great business, according to experts such as the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, but it would lead to construction of scenic roads and road connections to other parks, forests, and recreational and historic areas, all envisaged by the bill. Such a road building program extending over a period of years would also be a great boon to local labor and business.

Once a scenic riverway is established, the Federal interest to be benefited by pollution abatement measures and navigation improvements is increased, thus enlarging the Federal share of the cost of such works, and reducing the cost to local interests.

The proximity of a scenic river park would encourage municipalities to tie in with their own park and open space acquisitions eligible for State aid under the New York State Park and Recreation Land Acquisition Act and for Federal aid under title VII of the Housing Act of 1961, and programs qualifying for Federal grants under the recently adopted Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

It is obvious that scenic river legislation would generate public and private dollars and jobs where sorely needed in the Hudson River region, would aid the drive for clean water fit to drink and play in, and hasten the fulfillment of the river's promise as a source of wealth, abundance, pleasure and the good life, foreseen by the early explorers and colonists.

A FEDERAL-STATE JOINT VENTURE

The Hudson River region presents a challenge illustrating what the New York Times calls the new conservation. How do we conserve while at the same time accommodating necessary development. Can a significant part of our historic heritage and worthwhile landmarks be saved without sacrificing the needs of the new technology. Does economic growth necessarily mean the utter destruction of the ecological balance. How is the Federal and State interest balanced in this area.

Is the answer perhaps in some form of sophisticated governmental mechanism—a synthesis of tried and tested governmental forms, focused on the Hudson River region, and taking the form of a joint venture between Federal and State interests, expressed legally in a compact, and administratively as an authority, acting as the economic development arm of the scenic riverway, operating alongside the Federal and State conservation agencies, with all under the coordination of the Secretary of the Interior, and with other State and Federal agencies represented in order to insure the expression of the various concerns.

Only in this way can we realize the wisest handling of the Hudson River natural resource and the attainment of the multiple objectives of pollution abatement, antipoverty projects, and tourism and recreational development, open space acquisitions, redevelopment of blighted waterfront areas, and accommodation of necessary economic growth.

This is a regional approach which presupposes a creative partnership between Federal, State, and local interests. It is in keeping with New York State's development policy as enunciated in "Change, Challenge, Responsibility":

"What is here proposed is a regional focusing of interests which will build efficiently for the future and in which local responsibility will be indispensible."

A HUDSON RIVER AUTHORITY?

The ingenuity of the American political animal leaves no doubt that a viable form of intergovernmental cooperation can be achieved which will realize the common objective of saving the Hudson River and which will be based upon solid precedent and experience.

For example, the following is an outline of amendments that can be adopted to the Hudson River scenic legislation:

1. The Hudson Valley Authority to be created as part of the Hudson River scenic legislation.

2. Authority to be composed of one appointee each of:

(a) Secretary of the Interior.

(b) Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(c) Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

(d) Corps of Engineers.

(e) Governor of New York State.

(f) Chairman, Palisades Interstate Park Commission.

(g) County of Rockland.

(h) County of Orange.

(i) County of Putnam.

(j) County of Westchester.

3. Purposes of Authority—to cooperate in the undertaking of the development and rehabilitation programs authorized by the scenic river legislation.

4. Duties of Authority:

(a) To formulate a comprehensive development plan for the Hudson Riverway area compatible with the purposes of the scenic river legislation and which will coordinate as closely as possible with New York State's development policy for the Hudson River region prepared by the New York State Office of Regional Development (see "Change, Challenge, Response," published by the Office of Regional Development, 1964, p. 143).

(b) To implement insofar as possible within the scenic riverway Federal and New York State pollution abatement policy.

(c) To aid New York State and the communities within the scenic riverway to formulate programs in aid of the purposes of the scenic river legislation which will qualify the State and such communities for moneys and assistance under:

1. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

2. The Federal Housing Act of 1961 (title VII authorizes aid for open space acquisition).

3. The New York State Park and Recreation Land Acquisition Act.

4. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

5. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

6. Rivers and Harbors Act (Federal aid to navigation improvements).

7. Such other Federal and State legislation as would provide moneys and aid for programs relevant to the purposes of the scenic river legislation, with a continuing inventory of such legislation to be kept by the Authority.

(d) To formulate a comprehensive plan for water resource development and management within the scenic riverway.

(e) To undertake demonstration projects in furtherance of the purposes of the Authority, to inspire and encourage and guide State and local projects beneficial to such purposes.

(f) To make studies and engage in such programs as the Authority deems advisable in furtherance of the purposes of the Authority and the scenic riverway legislation.

(g) To cooperate with State and local governments and improvements districts, other State and Federal agencies, with educational and research institutions and foundations, in furtherance of said purposes.

(h) To encourage communities in the Hudson River region affected by the scenic riverway to adopt zoning and land use policies compatible with the purposes of the scenic riverway legislation, and to aid them in the formulating of such plans.

(i) To encourage and aid communities to undertake local programs of rehabilitation, redevelopment, and beautification of their river front and restoration of significant landmarks and vistas of value in interpreting the heritage and history of the river, its valley and highlands, and of value in providing an outdoor education for the children of the region.

5. The Authority's programs will be adopted bearing in mind the following order of priority as to their purpose:

(a) Conservation and preservation of scenic, natural, scientific, and historic values.

(b) Public outdoor recreation benefits.

(c) Such utilization of natural resources and development policies as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior is consistent with, and does not significantly impair (a) and (b) supra.

6. Financing—Federal—Percent, State—Percent with authority to receive private donations. This financing to be used only for carrying out the purposes of the Authority, and not for acquisition of lands, or interests in land, and scenic easements, the latter to be borne solely by the Secretary of the Interior.

7. The programs initiated by the Authority will be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor.

8. The Authority is to come into being after the formal establishment of the scenic riverway, and will replace the Advisory Commission.

9. The Authority members to serve overlapping terms of service, and compensation should be on a per diem basis with a ceiling.

10. Authority to hire small top flight professional staff, and enlist as many volunteers as possible dedicated to uplifting the Hudson River region. (A Peace Corps kind of spirit is essetnial to do the job and win the confidence of local interests).

11. The Authority member appointed by the Secretary of the Interior shall be the chairman.

12. The Authority shall be a public corporation.

13. Nothing in the charter of power of the Authority shall be interpreted as authorizing it to exercise any dictation over areas outside the scenic riverway, or over the functions of any community outside the riverway. Whether any community outside wishes to cooperate with the Authority or avail itself of the aid of the Authority is to be at the sole option of such community.

THE TRUST OPTION APPROACH

Assuming the State of New York were to decide to acquire lands within the scenic riverway area for park or recreation purposes, no vital State interest need be impinged by Federal scenic river legislation. An amendment could be adopted to the Hudson Scenic legislation which would give the State the right, within a reasonable time after the legislation is enacted, to acquire lands within the riverway for State park and recreational purposes. Any lands so acquired by the State could be impressed with necessary protective covenants and restrictions prohibiting incompatible uses or developments within the riverway, or could require the consent of the Secretary of the Interior before certain uses or developments are undertaken.

The State's option to acquire lands within the riverway would also extend to lands acquired previously by the Federal Government in connection with the establishment of the scenic riverway, and if the State exercised this option, it would reimburse the Federal Government for its cost of acquisition. The advantage of this arrangement would be that the lands would be placed in the public domain at today's prices in trust for the State's option. If the State did not or could not act within the specified time to purchase these lands, its option would terminate. The public interest, however, would be protected by the fact that the Federal Government could exercise its jurisdiction to acquire, preserve, and manage riverway lands under the enabling legislation. In other words, the Federal power under the scenic river legislation would be a kind of collateral security for the State's performance of its pledge to buy or condemn these sites for park and recreation purposes. The State would not be disadvantaged in any way by throwing its entire support for a scenic river bill containing this option. This is a far more prudent plan than rejection or delaying the enactment of scenic river legislation so as to give the State an opportunity to act first. If the State were unable to carry out its avowed intention of acquiring all these lands, and if the Federal legislation were junked or suspended, the public would end up the loser because the park opportunities might, in the interim, go down the drain, and more incompatible development could take place.

If the State needed Federal aid to finance the acquisition of such lands, it would be appropriate for the Federal Government to participate in the formulation of a comprehensive plan for the preservation, management and development of the park and recreation sites (Ice Age National Scientific Reserve, Public Law 88–655, 88th Cong., H.R. 1096, Oct. 13, 1964, 78 Stat. 1087, is a good example of such a joint approach between the Secretary and the State of Wisconsin). The appropriate agencies of the Federal Government should be brought in to cooperate with the State in mapping and inventorying the sites suitable for inclusion within the scenic riverway. In this way, the public will have the benefit of the combined creative thinking of the best talents on both levels of government.

In the case of the need for redevelopment, State and local interests, and private enterprise should be given a reasonable opportunity to exercise initiative to meet their responsibility of rehabilitating the Hudson River front. Here again, if they fail to act, then the Federal Government should be empowered to act.

There is ample precedent for this type of working out of the Federal-State-local responsibility in meeting a public need. The important thing is to establish in the legislation the priorities of private and governmental action, and the guarantee that such action will be taken.

It is a remarkable coincidence that the challenge of the Hudson embodies all of the subjects discussed at the White House Conference on Natural Beauty—junkyards, landscape reclamation, townscapes, water, waterfront, and water resources, urban beautification, underground utility transmission, Federal-State-local partnership, and citizen action.

The challenge of the Hudson River is the essence of the new conservation. It can be met.

As President Johnson said, in concluding his message on natural beauty:

"It is true that we have often been careless with our natural bounty. At times we have paid a heavy price for this neglect. But once our people were aroused to the danger, we have acted to preserve our resources for the enrichment of our country and the enjoyment of future generations.

"The beauty of our land is a natural resource. Its preservation is linked to the inner prosperity of the human spirit."

And as Justice Holmes said regarding the Hudson:

"A river is not just an amenity, it is a treasure."

This is our starting point.

THE U.S. OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, H.R. 8077, the bill which I have introduced as an amendment to the national security provisions of the Trade Expansion Act, is for the definite and limited purpose of meeting a specific need in one of our vital industries for a stated length of time. A great deal has been said on the floor of this House in this and prior sessions, as well as in many public meetings elsewhere, as to the vital nature of the oil and gas industry to the economy and security of this Nation. All of you know that, and it would do no good for me to repeat those statements at this time. All branches of our armed services and all of our activities use to a greater or lesser extent oil, gasoline, or petroleum products of various kinds in their operations. Our civilian economy is becoming more and more dependent on motor transport for passengers and freight and for petroleum and petroleum derivatives for power, light, and heat, as well as an extensive and growing petrochemical industry. It would add nothing for me to repeat the many statements which have been made and which are known to all of you as to the urgent necessity of maintaining an adequate domestic supply of oil and gas within the continental limits of the United States. Many instances in our recent history, our experiences during World War II, during the Korean war, and during the Suez crisis, have shown that in times of national stress and emergency this country simply cannot depend on foreign oil or the transportation facilities to bring foreign oil to our shores in order to meet its needs. We must have at all times present within the United States adequate production and adequate reserves of oil and gas and facilities for transporting oil and gas in order to meet our vital needs.

If I may summarize the matter very briefly, the position of the U.S. domestic oil business in the world oil picture has changed most radically in very recent years. As late as 1952 the United States produced 49 percent of all of the oil in the world, and had within its continental limits at that time 28 percent of all of the known oil reserves in the world. Recent discoveries of large reservoirs of oil and gas in the Middle East, in North Africa, extension of known reserves in South America, and some obvious development within the Communist block countries have radically changed that picture. Today, far from being the major oil producing source in the world, the production and reserves in the United States have become a minor part of the world oil supply, and are now estimated at 28 percent, and 10 percent respectively.

The discovery and marketing of oil from these other sources has had a radical effect on the domestic oil industry. The reserves which I have mentioned are in tremendous quantities, and are situated in proximity to many of the important markets, and the result is that Middle East oil and North African oil, as well as some from the Soviet Union and its satellites can be and is sold in the Mediterranean and European areas for less than the actual cost of production of oil in the United States. Inevitably that has meant a loss to the domestic producers of oil of foreign markets which they once had, as those areas of the world are now turning to these nearer and cheaper supplies for their needs.

The loss of foreign markets alone would have had, and has had, a depressing effect on the domestic oil industry, but in addition to that there have been certain inroads by crude oil produced in the Near and Middle East into the domestic economy of the United States. Many U.S. companies and firms have interests in these foreign oil supplies, and have refining and marketing facilities in the United States and they find it more advantageous from an economic standpoint to transport their foreign oil to the United States to be refined and marketed than to use domestic production, even their own domestic production. As a result, while the production of oil in the United States since 1952 has increased 78 percent, the imports of oil into the United States during the same period of time have increased 250 percent, so that each year a larger and larger share of the domestic U.S. market is being supplied by crude oil or products originating outside the United States. The net result of all this is to bring about a condition of depression in the domestic oil industry, and particularly in that segment of the industry whose interests are exclusively confined to domestic production, that is, the individuals and small companies who are called independent operators, and whose sole business is the production of oil, and who have no refining or marketing facilities. But it has been shown time and again that these relatively small independent operators, individuals, and companies, are the ones who have done the greatest amount of exploration, and have had the greatest success in exploration, so that future development of reserves in this country to meet future needs is dependent to a large extent on them. Thus, as a result of the discovery of large reserves abroad, and the gradual encroachment of those reserves into the domestic market, we are facing a situation in which this country is losing the benefit of the exploratory services of that group of operators which the country needs the most, to wit, the individuals and small companies who are generally referred to as independents.

Congress has taken cognizance of this matter and this problem before, and has taken some action concerning it. We have on the books the Trade Expansion Act which is designed to promote and stimulate foreign trade with other countries in every feasible way, and in 1957 there were enacted certain national security provisions to the Trade Expansion Act which in general terms gave the President the authority to restrict and limit the imports of certain commodities when he felt it necessary in order to protect and preserve the health and growth of any industry which was vital to the defense and security of this country. The Presidents who have served since that legislation was passed have exercised the authority which it gives them, and each of them has, in consultation with the members of his Cabinet who are concerned with these matters, issued and prescribed quotas limiting the import of oil and petroleum products into the United States. The industry is now operating under this quota system, and quotas are made and published semiannually, specifying the amount of production and the country from which such production originates, which may be brought into the United States, and the persons or firms who are authorized to bring it into this country.

Now, all of this is well and good, and certainly I have no objection to or criticism of the laws already enacted, but it has come to my attention from the many people in my district, as well as from other parts of the country, that there is something lacking in our present legislative program. The thing that is lacking is an assurance of a growth potential in the markets for domestic oil and petroleum products in this country. There are several bills already introduced in this session attempting to deal in various ways with that problem. I will not undertake to discuss all of these bills. Most of them are good bills, or have certain advantageous features, but as to all of them, the people who are most knowledgeable in this matter, and from whom my information comes, have found certain specific defects of unworkable provisions in the plans which they set up. The fact is that since the quota system has been inaugurated and continued for the past several years, there are certain countries who are friendly to the United States and whose continued prosperity is important to the United States, which have come to depend on the export to the United States of certain portions of their domestic production under the quotas which have already been issued to them. It would not do simply to cut out all imports, and throw the economies of certain friendly nations and particularly in the Western Hemisphere, into chaos as a result of it. Our problem is to find some means which will preserve the existing economies of these countries, yet at this time assure to the independent operators in this country a potential of growth in the future which will give them an incentive to get out and find more reserves of oil and gas with the knowledge that if they find them they will have a market for that production, or at least some of it. The demand for oil, gas, and petroleum products in this country is increasing at the rate of 3 percent each year due both to population growth and to an increased use of petroleum and its products in all aspects of life. What I propose by the bill which I have just introduced simply is to leave the oil import quota program exactly where it is for the next 5 years, and to provide that the amount of oil which shall be brought into this country during each of the next 5 years shall be the same as the amount brought in in 1964. That should take care of our foreign commitments, and provide an assurance to those free nations who have come to depend on us as a market that they will continue to have our support in this regard. At the same time, and without taking anything at all away from those nations who now sell to us, we can give assurance to the oil industry in this country, and particularly the independent operators who form such an important part of it, that for the next 5 years at least, any increase in domestic demand is to be supplied by them and them alone.

From all I know or can learn, the officials who have administered the oil import program and quota system have done an excellent job, and the introduction of this legislation is not intended as a criticism directed to any or all of them. They have had many problems and many conflicting demands and have attempted to resolve all of these to the best of their ability and have done an excellent job. There is nothing which I propose which would take away from any of the officials who participate in the quotamaking process any of the judgment and discretion which they now exercise as to the allocation of these quotas as between countries or as between firms.

Now it might be asked that in light of all this, why should we have any legislation at all, and why not leave the entire matter up to the President in consultation with the various department heads, just as it has been done in the past. My answer would be that what we are here trying to do is to provide an assurance of a domestic market for domestic production of oil, and that is the responsibility of this Congress, and not the responsibility of the Department of State or the Department of the Interior or any one department, and that we should not hide behind their backs, we should not attempt to avoid or evade our responsibility nor wash our hands of the problem. It is my sincere feeling and belief, and I hope that it is shared by the officials in the executive department who are concerned with this matter, that they need and would welcome congressional direction and control in this regard. Certainly I can see that in any future negotiations with any foreign country as to the extent of its quota or the amount of its imports, the official conducting those negotiations would be relieved of a great burden if he could simply explain to the foreign representative that his authority is limited and that under the present acts of Congress no further or future increase in quotas for the next 5 years can be obtained.

I hope this bill will have your vote and support. It is frankly intended as a compromise between the bills now pending. It seeks to avoid any radical change in the present quota system, but at the same time seeks to bring some assurance for the future to the independent operator. It is neither too liberal in delegating too much authority nor too stringent in prescribing the way in which the authority is to be exercised. It is not intended as a cure-all solution for all problems and by its terms does not purport to be permanent in its operation. Its purpose and effect is to preserve the status quo on oil imports for the next 5 years so as to give everyone concerned, the foreign producer, the executive department, and the domestic producer a breathing spell and a period of stability in this matter in the hope that during that period of time many of the problems which we now face will have solved themselves, and that the Congress sitting at that time can review this matter in the light of the experience thus gained.

REMARKS OF EMIL MAZEY, INTERNATIONAL SECRETARY-TREASURER, UAW, ON VIETNAM AND DOMINICAN REPUBLIC BEFORE UNITARIAN-UNIVERSALIST FELLOWSHIP FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE, DETROIT, MICH., MAY 15, 1965

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, recently in Detroit, Mich., nearly 1,000 concerned Americans from all walks of life, came together to hear an outstanding address by Senator WAYNE MORSE, who discussed the complex issues involved in the war in Vietnam. The meeting was held under the auspices of the Unitarian-Universalist Fellowship for Social Justice. The members of this organization are composed of a number of outstanding professional people, religious leaders, businessmen and, very significantly, working men and women.

Also on that program was a Detroiter, Mr. Emil Mazey, international secretary-treasurer of the United Automobile Workers, AFL–CIO. Mr. Mazey has distinguished himself by providing outstanding leadership in not one but three fields of endeavor: the American labor movement, the struggle for human rights, and the cause of lasting world peace. The remarks he made on that occasion are worth commending to thoughtful Americans who desire the fullest, unfettered public discussion of all aspects of our foreign policy. Hopefully, out of free discussion, we will develop acceptable alternatives to end the war in Vietnam.

To help promote that free discussion, I insert the text of Mr. Mazey's remarks at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Remarks of Emil Mazey, International Secretary-Treasurer, UAW, on Vietnam and Dominican Republic Before Unitarian-Universalist Fellowship for Social Justice, Detroit, Mich., May 15, 1965

May 8 marked the 20th anniversary of the ending of the European portion of World

War II. A great many things have happened during the past 20 years. Many new nations have come into being as a result of the ending of colonialism on the part of Great Britain, France, and Belgium. Some of the new nations of Africa and Asia won their independence only after bitter struggles with their colonial masters.

Some of the problems that currently face the people of our world today are the aftermath of struggles for independence on the part of colonial peoples. The difficulty in South Vietnam today is a typical example of what I have reference to. The people of Vietnam sought their independence from French domination and finally defeated the French in 1954. The 1954 struggle was terminated by the signing of the Geneva Conference accord, which, among other things, accepted the sound principle of self-determination and stipulated that free elections would be held in 1956 to reunite the country.

The present civil war in South Vietnam began in 1956 when President Diem, with the concurrence of the Eisenhower administration, refused to hold elections. The reasoning of Diem and the reasoning of the Eisenhower administration was that elections would result in the Communists winning control of the Government. This violation of the Geneva Conference accord is responsible for the civil war and conflict taking place in South Vietnam today.

President Lyndon Johnson inherited a war which, I am sure, he doesn't want. President Johnson has repeatedly stated that we are in Vietnam to maintain freedom, liberty, and democracy, and the right of the South Vietnamese to choose their own political path.

I disagree completely with President Johnson on this evaluation. There is no democracy in South Vietnam. There is no freedom in South Vietnam. There is no liberty in South Vietnam.

There is no representative government in South Vietnam. The people have not chosen their national leaders or their regional leaders.

There is no free trade union movement in South Vietnam.

In my opinion, the war in Vietnam is being fought to bolster and maintain an oppressive military dictatorship. The war is not being fought to extend freedom and democracy. The Government of South Vietnam does not have the confidence of the people and is totally and completely unstable. We have seen the perpetual circus in Saigon in one clique of military leaders fighting to replace another military clique for political control of Vietnam. This game of musical chairs to see who is going to control South Vietnam, apparently has the blessing and full financial support of our Government because we have endorsed and embraced each new punk dictator who has gained power.

President Johnson is very thinskinned about any criticism of his policy of South Vietnam. He has discouraged free discussion of his policies and has attempted to justify his policies on the ground that he and his advisers have information not available to the average citizen, and therefore, we must have faith in his judgment and blindly follow and endorse his policies.

Constructive criticism is equated with treason—those who oppose escalating the war are called appeasers—citizens calling for a negotiated peace have been charged with being soft on communism.

Despite the fact that we have a large military force and a large body of CIA agents in South Vietnam, every time a military coup takes place, a spokesman for our Government announced they were surprised by the overthrow of one regime by another. If our Government truly understood what was happening in Vietnam, I suggest we would not be surprised by developments there.

I believe that the President of the United States is making a serious mistake in escalating the war in South Vietnam by the attacks on North Vietnam. This policy is really the Goldwater policy and has the full support of the leadership of the Republican Party.

I suggest that President Johnson not take too much comfort in the support he is receiving from Goldwater and DIRKSEN because in 1966 and 1968, the South Vietnam war will become the major political issue and will be referred to as the Johnson war by the Republicans currently urging and egging President Johnson on to escalate the war.

I do not believe the struggle in South Vietnam can be won by negative anticommunism. It should be obvious to everyone that the South Vietnamese people have no confidence in their government because two-thirds of South Vietnam is already under the control of the Vietcong.

Frankly, the South Vietnamese have not been given anything to fight for. Fighting to maintain the status quo is not good enough. The South Vietnamese find little difference between Communist dictatorship or a military dictatorship over their country. I confess I see no difference between Communist dictatorship and a military dictatorship.

The people of South Vietnam look upon American forces as a replacement to the French forces they kicked out in 1954.

The people of South Vietnam must be given an effective alternative to communism or to a military dictatorship.

I suggest that the alternative ought to be a democratic government chosen by the people with a program of land reform and other reforms that can raise the living standards and improve the security of the people.

I know that there are no easy answers to resolve the Vietnamese problem. Among the possible answers are the following:

(1) We ought to seek the implementation of the 1954 Geneva Conference Accord. The nations that brought about the agreement in Vietnam originally ought to be called into session to seek a solution to the present problem.

(2) We ought to consider giving the United Nations an opportunity of solving the Vietnam crisis. Placing Vietnam under U.N. trusteeship for a period of time and subsequently implementing the Geneva Conference Accord of 1954, may be one way to solve this dilemma. I believe the recent statements of President Johnson to the effect that he is willing to have unconditional talks to bring about a negotiated solution to the Vietnamese problem, is good. However, I believe that the President is making a mistake in trying to bring about these negotiations through the escalation of the war.

I believe that our Government needs to reevaluate our entire foreign policy position. It should be clear to all of us that our Government cannot unilaterally act as a world police force and cannot by itself solve the many problems that the years of colonialism on the part of Great Britain, France, and Belgium created.

Our Government seems to favor military dictatorship to democracy. I am alarmed and sickened at the quickness in which President Johnson moved 30,000 marines into the Dominican Republic to bolster and maintain a military dictatorship that came into power by overthrowing the only freely elected government in the Dominican Republic in the past 30 years. Our Government gave quick recognition to the military dictatorship which replaced the democratically elected government in the Dominican Republic in 1963. In 1965, when the democratic forces attempted to overthrow the military dictatorship, our Government finds itself on the side of the military dictatorship again. Some 30 years ago, U.S. marines moved into the Dominican Republic and placed Trujillo, the military dictator, in power. We must raise our voices in protest to see that history doesn't repeat itself.

I want to commend Senator WAYNE MORSE for having the courage and the intestinal fortitude to criticize our Government on foreign policy and on other matters when he believes the Government to be wrong. I believe that the best way to support President Johnson is not to rubberstamp his every act, but to oppose him constructively when we believe that his policies are in error.

I want to commend the sponsors of this meeting because I believe the health of our democracy depends on the maintenance and exercise of free discussion and free debate.

A YOUNG MAN REMEMBERS JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, it was my distinct pleasure to attend a banquet at Le Moyne College, in Syracuse, N.Y. The main speaker was a brilliant senior from Le Moyne, Mr. Robert Griffin. The subject of his speech was "A Boy Born in Brookline, Mass., 48 Years Ago Today: John Fitzgerald Kennedy."

Unhappily, Bob Griffin could not speak of John Kennedy in the present tense, for an assassin's bullet has forever denied us the quiet Kennedy leadership. In a larger sense, however, Bob's remarks were in the present tense, since the inspiring memory of John Kennedy lives with us even today.

It is most fitting at this time that we commemorate John Kennedy's legacy, and can I think of no more apt presentation than the words of a young man whose life is inspired by that legacy:

> On the last day of January of this year, I stood with many other Young Democrats from the colleges of New York State at the grave of a great President. From that elevated vantage point, most of the significant sights of Washington can be seen. Likewise, the institutions and forces which are destined to shape the society in which we participate can now be adequately understood only in the light of—from the vantage point of—this great man's contributions to them. Therefore I feel that tonight, when we are gathered here as Democrats, with a natural concern for the future of our country and the world, it is appropriate to share a few thoughts on this President who, in such a short time, gave so much to society and, in a very real sense, to each one of us personally.
>
> They asked another President, John Adams, what he wanted written on his tombstone. He answered, "Write only 'Here lies the man who prevented war with France'."
>
> Hearing that story today, we inevitably miss the point. But surely the irony of that request could have been lost on no one who heard it or heard of it back when it was first spoken. Adams' own party, the Federalists, were determined to go to war with France, and had stirred up popular support for such a conflict. But Adams,

convinced that such a war would be disastrous for our young country, defied both his party and public opinion, and negotiated an agreement assuring peace. This accomplishment, which Adams would have us remember as his greatest achievement, was in fact the cause of his political downfall. Because of it he was not reelected, and such slander has been poured on him that his proper place in history has been appreciated only in comparatively recent times. But John Adams understood the absolute necessity of peace far better than those who vilified him, and he willingly sacrificed his career and reputation in order to save his country.

And in our own times another prophet in the wilderness has seen the necessity of peace far better than his detractors. But the peace which he was called upon to protect and to restore is a more complex matter than that sought by our second President. For Adams, the threat of war was in one crisis at one point in history. For John Kennedy, the lack of peace was the world's most pervasive reality. He saw atomic weapons poised to destroy humanity, stayed only by the ever-dimming realization of the horrors of such a war. He saw racial conflicts infect every basic principle that underlies both this Nation and any realistic hope for lasting peace. And he saw the richest Nation in the history of the world indifferent to conditions of the most abject poverty existing within its own borders. This lack of peace was not a crisis—it was an ever-deteriorating and ever-threatening condition.

And because there were no spectacular feats or accomplishments, how can we accurately estimate President Kennedy's contributions? We can easily see how and why John Adams assured peace, and what became of it. But how did John Kennedy turn the tide for peace, and in what sense does this achievement have relevance for all of us in our more complex and more difficult times?

I think the answer can best be found in an appreciation of the full meaning of peace, and this in turn can be illustrated by recalling a scene from President Kennedy's inauguration.

There, a frail, white-haired man stood on the steps of the Capitol, in the midst of the grandeur of the transfer of the world's most awesome power, and recited a poem. His poem briefly pictured the panorama of our Nation's history—and it pointedly described the process of seeking true peace.

Even the title gave what we may see as a significant definition. Most see peace as a condition of safety, secured by people and nations for themselves by strength of arms. But John Kennedy—like the old poet—knew that it is much more of a paradox than that. He knew that peace is a gift, given from man to man on a reciprocal basis in response to each man's value, a gift that can be given only when one is willing to give himself also, to meet the needs and aspirations of his neighbor, and thereby eliminate the causes of conflict, in short, a gift outright.

In the course of the poem, reference was made to a stage of discontent and incompleteness in our history. It was summed up in the words: "Something we were withholding made us weak."

And so it is whenever true peace is lacking among men. Nations refused to give themselves to the cause of mutual respect and preservation, and there resulted the threat of annihilation which still hangs over us. Individuals withheld themselves from the quest for justice, equality, and decency for all their fellow citizens, and there resulted the internal decay which plagues us to a great degree even now. We withheld commitment from those who, by virtue of our common humanity, had a very real claim upon us, and the result was that, as in the time of Jeremiah the prophet, the people shouted "Peace, peace," but there was—there could be—no peace.

It was in leading us in our first steps away from this withdrawn weakness that John Kennedy made one of his most significant contributions to our history. In an age when it was common for Americans to feel that their only responsibility was to oppose our international enemies, John Kennedy dared to call this Nation back to the greatness of its heritage. He reaffirmed the unselfish moral quality which was the unique contribution of this country to the political history of the world, and he courageously applied that quality to the disrupting problems he confronted. Pointing out that every journey begins with one step, he took the first step toward nuclear sanity by signing the atmospheric test ban. Insisting that we must live up to our obligations to all our fellow citizens, he enforced Federal court orders protecting the rights of Negro students, and sought legislation to safeguard the rights of all citizens in regard to voting and public accommodations. And, just one day before his death, he ordered his aids to draw up a bill to provide massive help for those whose circumstances did not permit them to share effectively in our society's affluence.

And, in all this, Kennedy acted not only as the master politician, but also as the great teacher that the President should be. Again and again he emphasized that we take these steps, not for narrow political or economic gain, but because they are right. He clearly saw that this self-giving, this response to others which is the basis of all true peace, is the absolute responsibility of all who would be truly human. And, in communicating this vision to his countrymen and to the world, he added a new dimension to public life, a new hope to a troubled world.

Returning to the poem, we find another concise statement, this time relating to the accomplishment of true peace; says the poet: "We found salvation in surrender." And this surrender to the value of each person by every other person is the very essence of public life as Kennedy saw it.

Last January when I was in Washington on the trip I mentioned earlier, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY spoke to our group. And in that talk he outlined and crystallized the concept of government that is another major Kennedy contribution to public life.

For the Kennedys—as for many other great statesmen of our history—the process of government is only partially the responsibility of elected officials. Each citizen has the duty to participate for the good of his fellow citizens. This idea is, of course, as old as our country or older; but it took President Kennedy to bring the concept effectively to life in our age.

This concept of government as the proper response of each citizen to his civic duties, the "surrendering," if you will, of each person to the needs and rights of others, in order to find the salvation of that peace which is true harmony in human relations—permeated all of John Kennedy's public acts and pronouncements. He used mass media more than any other President to teach and to solicit consensus. Whenever a group would petition him or his brother on the civil rights issue, the response was always the same: "What will you do to help us—how will you work with us in seeking the reforms you desire?" And, in the war on poverty, he insisted that individuals and small groups, working on specific projects in every city, town, and back road in the Nation were coequal partners with the Federal Government, for without these dedicated individuals, the Federal projects would be only a mockery.

This, then, is the answer President Kennedy brought to the chronic lack of peace in our day. He showed us that true peace is not a condition of security, but rather a rising to the challenge presented by the blunted aspirations of our fellow men. He pointed out that to be truly American—or even truly human—we must live in accord with the moral dimension which comes to us as a result of the fact that our lives are inextricably tied in with, involved with, the lives of others. And he found that government is only truly effective when each individual is concerned enough to surrender selfish interests for the common good.

This is his legacy, destined to color history for decades to come, and to offer inspiration as long as men value truth and courage. And it is only in the light of this heritage that contemporary American politics—especially the grassroots stirrings in the Democratic Party, of which our own club is an example—can be understood, for Kennedy's sharpened concept of personal responsibility in public life must sooner or later be faced, in some manner, by all.

It was Ralph Waldo Emerson who said, "There is properly no history; only biography." And indeed he was correct, for events are always what people—great and small—choose to make of them. John F. Kennedy chose to use his relatively short time on earth to better the lot of his fellow men: those who suffered because of their race, those who could not share in the material wealth that man's ingenuity had created, those who are mentally retarded, those who live under what the President called the nuclear sword of Damocles. He saw that a peace of harmony and of concern for others is the natural end—the absolute responsibility—of man.

But at his very inauguration he was careful to point out that we must not expect to see the job of peace finished and neatly put away; it is a continuing process. Our success, as individuals and as a nation, is not something we must obtain, it is something we must be. The inaugural poet summed this up in his poem's ending; he saluted the Nation "such as it would—and then, changing this in honor of the new President, said such as it will—become." If we choose to follow the lead of John F. Kennedy, if we rally faithfully to the cause of peace as he understood and explained it, we can share the assurance of the poet that our Nation will protect and extend its true greatness and that everincreasing understanding and prosperity will be the lot of mankind. This is the major contribution of John F. Kennedy—his gift outright to the world.

WAR ON POVERTY BEING WON IN SAN ANTONIO

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have fought hard and long for the programs now approved and made possible by the Johnson administration's awareness of the need and its success in working with cooperation with Congress, take considerable pride in the success that various facets of these programs have met in San Antonio, or the 20th Congressional District which I have the honor and privilege of representing.

I recall when I served in the Texas State Senate I proposed that the State and the local political subdivisions recognize a responsibility in such areas as comprehensive programs for our youth. I suggested in 1957, 1959, and 1961 the formation of what I called then a youth conservation program. I took this name from the fact that I stated repeatedly that in a State such as mine we were all aware and interested in soil conservation, but we needed a program to develop and stimulate our greatest natural resource of all: our youth.

Naturally, when I arrived in Congress in 1962, one of the first measures introduced was the bill patterned after the then U.S. Senator Hubert H. Humphrey Youth Conservation Act.

Now that these various programs, popularity known as the antipoverty program, are in effect, I want to take this opportunity to express, in behalf of my constituency, our sincere gratitude to such great national leaders as Lyndon B. Johnson and Sargent Shriver for the preeminent success the programs are having in helping those of our fellow citizens in need of an opportunity, not a handout.

Just last week the San Antonio Express and News, or. May 22, published a most impressive news story covering the first day of registration in San Antonio for the Neighborhood Youth Corps. I ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to insert into the Record at this point this report:

Job Centers Open—Youths Line Up for Summer Work

(By M. Ruiz Ibanez)

"I want to get an education more than anything in the world," Pedro Esquivel, 520 St. Augustine Street, who at 16 has just completed the sixth grade, said Friday.

Pedro, whose father, Fidel Esquivel, is unemployed, has a very good reason to feel that way.

He wasn't able to make more progress in his studies because his family would migrate periodically to other States seeking employment in the agricultural centers, but at the same time cutting short his education.

Hearing about his plight, Remigio Valdez, coordinator for the West Side Educational Opportunities Center, at San Fernando and South St. Augustine Streets, contacted him and told him about the neighborhood youth centers which will operate during the summer.

Pedro lost no time and Friday morning made his application at the center set up at Our Lady of Good Counsel Church, 1204 Castroville Road.

His application was accepted and he was overjoyed.

"This will give me an opportunity to help my parents and save enough money to stay in school during the year," he said.

Janie Sanchez, 16, of 1601 Loma Vista Street, is one of six children of Mr. and Mrs. David Sanchez, who works as a custodian for the San Antonio Independent School District.

"With no one else in our family working to help my father, I feel that getting a job in the neighborhood youth center during the summer will give me a chance to chip in a little cash to help out and at the same time save my school expenses," she said.

Angelita Gaona, 17, is one of nine children of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Gaona, 421 South St. Augustine Street.

She applied for a summer job because "school is one of the most important things in life," and she also wants to help out any way she can.

Her father is the only working member of the family.

There were also those who went back home from the registration centers with sad faces, such as Joe J. Cortez, who will be 16 June 15, but could not be accepted because eligibility to participate in the NYC requires that applicants be between 16 and 21 years of age.

"There were so many things that I had planned to do if I had been given a job in the 'neighborhood youth centers,'" said Joe gravely, and added, "I wanted to help my family and save some money to stay in school."

Joe added that "things haven't been easy, because my mother was taken to the hospital last week."

"Do you think there could be any chance that I would be given a job after my 16th birthday next June?" he asked.

There was also the case of Maria Olivia Tovares, 17, of 438 South San Ignacio Street, who graduated from Providence High School, but who wants to go to college.

She attended Providence on a scholarship that she won making excellent grades. She excelled in Spanish, and at times helped as assistant teacher of that language.

These are the typical young men and women which the NYC program was designed to assist—dropouts, potential dropouts, and youths with an ambition to continue their studies and lacking the means to do so.

Several hundred applications were filed Friday in the centers set up by the Texas Employment Commission for that purpose, and hundreds more were expected to be filed Saturday in two centers which will stay open from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. for the benefit of youngsters attending school.

Those centers will be set up under the supervision of the Texas Employment Commission at St. Alphonsus Church, 1202 South Zarzamora Street, and the Immaculate Conception Church, 314 Merida Street.

Other centers have been operating at Our Lady of Good Counsel Church, 1204 Castroville Road, St. Gabriel's Catholic Church, 747 Southwest 39th Street, St. Timothy Church, 1515 Saltillo Street, and Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, 1321 El Paso Street.

Registration will continue Monday from 8:30 a.m. to noon at the San Juan de los Lagos Church, 3231 El Paso Street, and St. Agnes Church, 802 Ruiz Street.

Brief questioning by volunteers manning the application centers determines whether the young men and women are eligible to participate in the NYC program.

If they are, they are given application blanks to fill and are assisted by other volunteers in the completion of the blanks.

An NYC data sheet will gather information considered necessary for the screening process to determine which are the ones who need the help most.

They have to state the number of persons in their household, name of the primary wage earner, whether they contribute to family support, draft classification for boys, language spoken at home, school status, if they have been out of school how long, occupation if formerly employed, referred by, and occupational goal.

TEC registration centers have been working closely with the high schools of each specific area and are getting help from teachers of the youngsters to determine their eligibility.

Locations of the 18 NYC centers:

1. Catholic Church of the Holy Family, 152 Florencia Street.
2. St. Gabriel Catholic Church, 747 Southwest 39th Street.
3. San Martin de Porres Church, 1914 Barney Street.
4. Our Lady of Good Counsel, 1204 Castroville Road.
5. St. Maria Goretti, 203 Highway 90 West.
6. St. Jude Church, 130 South St. Augustine Street.
7. Holy Cross High School, 426 North San Felipe Street.
8. Christ the King Church, 2610 Perez Street.
9. San Juan de los Lagos Church, 3231 El Paso Street.
10. St. Timothy Catholic Church, 1515 Saltillo Street.
11. St. Stephen's Church, 2127 South Zarzamora Street.
12. Immaculate Conception Church, 314 Merida Street.
13. St. Alphonsus Church, 1202 South Zarzamora Street.
14. Iglesia de la Santa Cruz, 2004 Chihuahua Street.
15. Sacred Heart of Jesus Church, 2514 West Commerce Street.
16. Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, 1321 El Paso Street.
17. St. Agnes Catholic Church, 804 Ruiz Street.
18. Immaculate Heart of Mary, 617 South Conchos Street.

LETTER FROM A YOUNG CONSTITUENT

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the Record, a touching, almost pathetic letter, which I have received from a young constituent who is a member of a migrant farm family. Those of us who have been confronted with the stark reality of the pathetic plight of these folk and who have also been bombarded by those who deny the existence of such problems especially ask your attention to the following, because I will be able to refer this young man upon his return to one of the neighborhood Job Corps opportunities:

Dear Sir: I would like to introduce myself. Well, there isn't much to say about myself, just that I'm Tony Martinez. The reason for writing this letter is because I'm looking for a job. I don't know if you'll be able to help me but I sure hope you can. At the present time we are planning on going to the State of Michigan to work on the fruit farms but only for the summer. I am planning on returning home to San Antonio before September in order to be ready for school. But I guess I'll have to come alone if I want to be ready for school and I do want to because it will be my last year. I'll be graduating from high school. It will be a great help to my family or rather to my dad if I could get an after-school job because my sister will also be graduating from high school and you can guess how expensive it can get when two, out of a family of eight, are graduating. It's true that we earn money here in Michigan but we use most of it to pay debts and what's left of it we spend on food and necessities when we get home because my dad does not have a permanent job in San Antonio and my brother had to leave his to come with us, and he doesn't know if he will get it back when returning from Michigan.

Well, sir, now you've heard my problem and I wonder if you can help me as to how to go about it. Please answer only if it isn't too much trouble. Answer to this address if it should be after the 30th of May.

Sincerely yours,

TONY MARTINEZ.

P.S.—God bless you.

MORE HOPE SHIPS ARE NEEDED

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the current crisis in the Dominican Republic demonstrates once again the explosiveness of the unrest that has historically hindered progress in Latin America.

At the same time Congress is becoming increasingly aware that more emphasis must be placed on the private sector in the field of foreign aid, especially in relation to South America.

Most assuredly a successful model of this type of foreign assistance, which also strikes at the core of unrest among our neighbors to the south, is Project Hope. Hope is a privately sponsored project which shares this country's modern medical knowledge and skills with newly developing countries. It is a prime example of a private foreign aid program which enlists and relies on the participation and contribution of the host country, thus giving the local people an important role in its success.

While it receives enough support from the Agency for International Development to defray differential costs to maintaining the hospital ship SS *Hope*, Project Hope primarily is privately financed.

But Hope—and this is the key point—Hope has shown that Americans can go into a South American country and not only help eradicate disease but establish lasting friendships. It is evidence of man's humanity to fellow man at a time in our history when the existence of compassion and faith in this world sometimes seem dim. It has been wisely observed that "men must understand one another before nations can."

Hope, at first a brave but bold experiment in international cooperation, is now a glowing success. Better understanding among the peoples of the world has been achieved on a personal level, through friendship, through knowledge and helping others to help themselves. These people-to-people contacts are helping every day to form the basis of lasting peace. It is important we recognize and study the concept which has brought this to fruition.

In Peru, for instance, the SS *Hope* was greeted in 1962 at Trujillo's port city of Salaverry by half-a-dozen anti-Americans, one gray mare and a band of bearded young pro-Castroites bearing Yankee-go-home signs.

But, Mr. Speaker, after just 1 month, the anti-American posters had disappeared and there was not a beard to be found in the city.

Not only that but these formerly bearded university students, who had been so vehemently pro-Castro, asked that Project Hope place a representative on the governing council of their university.

Finally, when 10 months later this great white ship sailed for home, 45,000 Peruvians, many barefoot, some of them traveling 400 miles, journeyed to Salaverry to say a fond, tearful goodby to their American friends aboard the *Hope*.

In Ecuador the next year it was much the same story.

Why has *Hope* been so well received when almost daily we read about anti-American orations and demonstrations in the countries of South America?

Because *Hope* is people—American people—who volunteer their time and talents away from home and income to help the poor and downtrodden. Because *Hope* has become a glowing symbol of the very best that is in the genuine American character. And because the people of developing nations, at first suspicious, finally know Americans have come in peace and mercy and as great teachers.

Yes, this sincere effort to help—without the intervention of the U.S. Government—strikes home.

By going into these countries without the umbrella of the U.S. Government and by simply doing their jobs, these "Hopies," as the SS *Hope* staffers are called, escape the criticism that they are there only to promote American interests behind some stereotyped image of the United States and its countrymen.

The bearded students of Trujillo were examples of the change of heart undergone by the peoples visited by the *Hope*. In Asia and Africa, as well, full-fledged Communists actually have helped *Hope* when they realized that to oppose it was political suicide.

The Pulitzer Prize-winning LaPrensa of Lima put it best when it editorialized:

> Gringo is no longer a synonym of Yankee capitalism, of injustice, of economic monopoly. Gringo, since May of 1962 (when the SS *Hope* docked), constitutes for the Peruvians he who saves lives and consoles their pains; who smiles and protects, while giving his time without gain, his youth, and his experience and all which he brought in his luggage.

But the answer to *Hope's* success does not lie solely in the compassion of the "Hopies." After all, these highly skilled men and women in white go to these countries for professional reasons.

They go to teach. Teaching is stressed because this enables *Hope* to have a more enduring effect on local health conditions than would attempts at any widespread treatment.

With patience and understanding, at all times working side by side with their medical counterparts, these dedicated Americans do not give—they share a knowledge and demand that their trainees participate. In this way the trainee does not feel he has been given something, but that he has accomplished something good.

While demonstrating modern medicine, whether aboard the SS *Hope* or deep in the jungles, the Hopies naturally heal and cure.

In addition, the *Hope* staffers vaccinate children who have never been inoculated; feed milk to undernourished youths and conduct nationwide nutrition programs in which mothers are taught how to prepare proper diets for their children.

In this way *Hope* attacks the miseries which are the real fruits of discontent and instability. When people have health and education they are ready to move on to economic and political progress.

Before sailing to its current port of Conakry, Guinea, the SS *Hope* had been to Indonesia and South Vietnam, in addition to Peru and Ecuador. During its first 4 years, *Hope* trained more than 2,500 physicians, surgeons, dentists, nurses, and medical technicians; treated more than 100,000 persons; conducted over 5,000 major surgeries, vaccinated more than 1 million children and distributed some 1 million pints of milk.

Hope always leaves behind a legacy wherever it visits, usually in the medical schools, where *Hope* personnel supervise the education and assist the administrators in reorganizing and upgrading their courses.

The good ship *Hope's* visit to Guinea this year marked its first trip to Africa and the third continent served by this floating medical center. Next year the vessel sails to Corinto, Nicaragua, in Central America.

But, Mr. Speaker, the SS *Hope* should not have to leave Africa. It should remain in that continent, where the highly skilled specialists of Project Hope are desperately needed. Instead, there should be a second *Hope* ship going to Central America, while the other remains in Africa, bringing its medical knowledge to other African nations, which are trying to stand on their own feet. Indeed, there should be a third *Hope* ship in Asia, where the developing nations of southeast Asia, especially, need the vital assistance of this splendid humanitarian organization.

Mr. Speaker, when Project Hope has raised from private donations the sum necessary for an SS *Hope II*, I would urge my colleagues to grant the additional AID funds necessary to maintain the vessel. And when Dr. William B. Walsh, the farsighted founder and president of Project Hope, is prepared financially to launch SS *Hope III*, I hope that my fellow Members will rally to the support of this worthwhile project and its magnificent diplomats of health and goodwill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HALL, for June

1, 1965, on account of official business in the Seventh Missouri Congressional District.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 1 hour on Tuesday next, June 1; and for 1 hour on Wednesday, June 2; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GALLAGHER, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GROSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CALLAN.
Mr. IRWIN.
Mr. VIVIAN.
Mr. MCCARTHY.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 45. An act for the relief of Maj. Raymond G. Clark, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 69. An act for the relief of Mrs. Genevieve Olsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 97. An act for the relief of Lt. Raymond E. Berube, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 134. An act for the relief of Lloyd K. Hirota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 263. An act for the relief of Honorata A. Vda de Narra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 572. An act for the relief of Robert L. Wolverton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 919. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1008. An act for the relief of Ottilia Bruegmann James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1068. An act for the relief of Fred E. Starr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1267. An act for the relief of Jack C. Winn, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 800. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 27, 1965, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 806. An act to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act to permit the listing on labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product;

H.R. 6691. An act to validate certain payments made to employees of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; and

H.R. 7031. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 1, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1171. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for period July 1964 to March 1965, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1172. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation to provide for payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the governments of Guam and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1173. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of recommendations on participation by the United States in the celebration of Alaska's 100th anniversary under the American flag, pursuant to Public Law 88-610; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1174. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of contracts negotiated for the period July 1, 1964 through December 31, 1964, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(11) and (a)(16); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 399. A bill to provide adjustments in order to make uniform the estate acquired for the Vega Dam and Reservoir, Collbran project, Colorado, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to reconvey mineral interests in certain lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 7777. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee (U.S. Air Force, retired) to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; without amendment (Rept. No. 430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 8330. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to delete the loyalty oath and criminal disclosure provisions; without amendment (Rept. No. 431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 8310. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8371. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 8653. A bill providing for the disposition of judgment funds of the Omaha Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 8654. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard vessels of foreign countries permitting trade with North Vietnam or Cuba; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 8655. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 8656. A bill to provide for the control of obnoxious aquatic plants in navigable and allied waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 8657. A bill to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make fisheries loans under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

285. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, requesting Congress to authorize hospitalization of veterans in local hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

286. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the appro-

priation of funds for the U.S. Public Health Service under the Hill-Harris Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

287. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to legislation relating to the regulation and registration of interstate firearms sales; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 8658. A bill for the relief of Maria DaGloria Ormonde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 8659. A bill for the relief of Rosolino Fontana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8660. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Troia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 8661. A bill for the relief of George Dibbini, Siroun Dibbini, Bishara Dibbini, Stella May Dibbini, and Reem Dibbini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

219. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the recording secretary general, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, relative to resolutions adopted by the 74th continental congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

220. Also, petition of John W. Oliver, Irwin, Pa., relative to declaring unconstitutional the bill S. 1592; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 28, 1965

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now adjourn until noon on Tuesday next.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1965

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 4 seconds, a.m.), the Senate adjourned, under the order of Wednesday, May 26, 1965, until Tuesday, June 1, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Nebraska School Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, as we go through the process of considering the shape of agriculture for the future as determined by the farm legislation we pass during this session, it is important that we have the results of these programs in mind.

I would therefore like to consider one aspect of the agricultural programs which is administered by the Department of Agriculture.

The school lunch program in Nebraska has been very effective and beneficial to our students. Over 111,500 children participated in fiscal year 1964 and that number increased to 125,000 in fiscal year 1965. These figures do not include children attending the 120 parochial schools which participate in the program in Nebraska.

The proposals in the administration's program for fiscal year 1966 of $138,590,000 for cash reimbursement plus $2 million for special assistance to needy schools will not permit an average reimbursement of 5 cents per lunch served which the National School Lunch Act proposes to establish.

During hearings on appropriations, the American School Food Service Association requested that the appropriation for cash reimbursement be increased to $176,880,281 with a corresponding reduction in the appropriation for commodity procurement. This would maintain the administration's total request.

The American School Food Service also requested that the special milk program appropriation be increased to provide an amount adequate for full reimbursement. This would require an increase from $100 to $108 million. At present, the available funds must be prorated for part of the year and is both a time-consuming and expensive process.

I appreciate the problems of administering this program under these handicaps and support these requests.

I think it is also in order to congratulate the Department of Education in the State of Nebraska which has been charged with the responsibility of administering this program under these handicaps.

Armenian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, today is a significant day for freedom-loving people everywhere. On May 28, 1918, the short-lived Republic of Armenia proclaimed its independence.

The Republic of Armenia's independence lasted only until 1920 when this fledgling nation became the first victim of Soviet military aggression in a pattern that has since become familiar. Armenia, that little ally of the great allies in World War I, alone in the Caucasus and out of the reach of her friendly allies, was looted, devastated, and completely overwhelmed by menacing military hordes and soon swallowed up in the Communist orbit.

In 1921, the flame of freedom flickered ever so briefly in that troubled land. Armenian patriots staged a brief uprising and were temporarily successful in winning freedom, but in a matter of months Soviet military might had crushed all resistance.

Today, Armenia is a captive nation, and about one-third the size of that once independent state. Though their freedom has been snuffed out, we here in the United States, whether of Armenian descent or just ordinary freedom-loving Americans, will never forget those brave people who are not free to celebrate their own independence in their homeland. It is therefore important that we celebrate Armenian Independence Day to show that we have not forgotten the Armenian people now living under the heavy bonds of Communist tyranny as we reaffirm the hope that they will again attain their goal and live in peace and freedom in their historic homeland.

Poems of Leon Roseman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, most of us find it all too easy to think of the inmates of our correctional institutions as troublesome riffraff whose primary needs are a strong wall and food and shelter. I wish to take the privilege today of briefly calling to the attention of my colleagues the poetic accomplishments of a 17-year-old constituent in my district, Mr. Leon Roseman, who is an inmate of a correctional institution of the State, the W. J. Maxey Boys Training School in Whitmore Lake, Mich.

The two poems reproduced below, chosen from two books of poems recently published by Leon, show clearly that there is much talent behind institutional walls, much talent to be rescued and nurtured.

The first poem, entitled "I Who Has Nothing," is from "Poems To Warm Your

Heart and Soul," dedicated by him "to my mother and father." It reads:

I WHO HAS NOTHING

I don't have anything; every day is the same.
For I have no one you see.
Not one person who cares for me.
Seems as I am a castaway just to live another
day.
I sit in my lonely room and wonder why.
What can I do? I can't cry.
For loneliness can be a dangerous thing.
So times I wish I could hang.
I will be looking for the day
When someone comes my way.

The second poem is from "Poems for Young and Old," as he says, "created and written by Leon Carlton Rose Man, dedicated with all humility to Cheryl Jacks."

LONELY AM I

There must be someone,
Somewhere for me.
Oh how I wish I could see.
For a lonely person seems like I always be.
There has to be someone somewhere for me.

My mother and father don't care.
Seems like I'll never anywhere.
For if they just love me you see.
That will be enough for me.

Lonely, lonely am I.
Just watching the days go by.
Drifting away like wood in the sea.
For lonely I will always be.

This youth author has captured the sadness that is felt by many of the thousands of young people in our land who are in institutions, often forgotten, alienated.

It is clearly evident to me, from past years of contact with correctional and penal institutions, that we must continue to increase the number of counselors and psychiatrists available to aid the boys in such institutions, if we are to have any real hope of restoring these young people to productive and contented lives.

Also, we must continue to try to enable boys such as Leon to live outside an institution in a family setting, with substitute parents, if necessary. The Ribicoff amendment to the social security bill, currently being considered in the Senate, will help in this regard by providing money to aid with emotionally disturbed children; his amendment deserves our support.

Memorial Day—A Day for the Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, next Monday, as we all know, is Memorial Day, a national holiday set aside to commemorate the many patriots and heroes in our history who have sacrificed their lives in defense of freedom and liberty.

Because it falls on a Monday, it gives us a welcome 3-day weekend, a chance to spend some extra time with our pet projects at home, or take a little trip, or just get in an extra round of golf. For most of us, it is a windfall vacation giving us a little more than the usual 1- or 2-day respite from the daily routine.

And I think perhaps as a result, we may be inclined to give too little thought to the real reason for Memorial Day, the reason we have declared it a national holiday.

We are pleased, of course, to see the ceremonies in Arlington at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. We are pleased to see the President make the pilgrimage to lay a wreath at the foot of that monument. It is a proud, sad, fleeting moment.

The bugles blow and the flags whip and flutter in the breeze and the ceremony is over.

We get quickly back to the business of living.

This is as it should be, of course; to attend to the business of living and not dwell overlong on the memories of the dead. While we feel great pride, we are also disturbed by the thought that here lies a father, a brother, a son, a comrade in arms "known but to God."

But I hope that the feeling of pride, the sad thoughts and the significance of the ceremony will linger long enough to find some meaning beyond the dead past—that they can be applied by each of us to the business of living.

Here in Washington, we live surrounded by statues and monuments to the glories of the past that have made this the greatest nation on earth. We live constantly in sight of reminders of that last full measure of devotion which so many brave souls have laid on the altar of freedom.

And for me, privileged as I am to serve here in a capacity that demands something less than that last full measure, I am never quite able to shake off the feeling of obligation, of duty, and of indebtedness to these silent, ghostly sentinels. They beseech all of us, with their stoney faces and unseeing marble eyes, to safeguard the freedom and liberty of the living which they have purchased with their lives.

I think we have a debt to these ghosts of the past. And it is a debt we can settle up only among ourselves, with each other, with the living of today and the unborn of the future. It is a debt that transcends expedience and political partisanship. It is a debt of honor which calls upon us to repay by pledging our lives to the principles of freedom and human dignity for which theirs were the price.

The process of dying in defense of those principles continues. In spite of ultimate weapons, foolproof treaties, and impregnable alliances, we will still have the Vietnams, the Dominican Republics, the Congos, and the Cubas. We still must demand the lives of a few in defense of the lives of many. Our greatest debt, perhaps, is the one owed to the heroes of the future who may one day be asked to forfeit their lives because we failed to meet our obligations now.

It is a debt which we ignore at our mortal peril.

Pollution Control Key Factor in Water Supply—Blatnik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of American County Government, the official publication of the National Association of Counties, has an excellent article in which Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, outlines his views on the progress of what is being done in the field of water pollution. Mr. BLATNIK is accorded the rightful accolade, "Mr. Water Pollution Control" by this distinguished group. During the past few months I have had the honor of serving on the Public Works Committee with Mr. BLATNIK and I can truly say that his diligent work and leadership was largely responsible for the passage of the 1965 Clean Water Act. Normally passage of such legislation would be good reason to rest a bit, but Mr. BLATNIK is already forging ahead with new ideas and plans to fulfill the Federal Government's role in the war on water pollution. Members of Congress are indebted to the National Association of Counties for publishing this article and for their leadership in preparing an excellent series of community action guides for water pollution abatement and control. The article appears as follows:

POLLUTION CONTROL KEY FACTOR IN WATER SUPPLY—BLATNIK

Three hundred and fifty million gallons a day of untreated sewage pours into Raritan Bay, producing one of the Nation's worst examples of salt water pollution and virtually ruining the once important shellfish industry there.

Industrial waste from major packinghouses in the Omaha area has so overloaded the municipal treatment plants that they cannot handle the volume, and huge volumes of such animal waste pollutes vast sections of the mid-Mississippi.

Pollution of the Merrimack River in New England has become so bad it is partly responsible for a depressed economic situation and interferes with the use of the river for almost all public purposes.

These are but three starkly dramatic instances which illustrate the crisis stage of water pollution in this country.

Responding to such situations with governmental action at both the national and the local level, the Nation is moving to alleviate the problem, however; and no man is more responsible for public activity in the water pollution field than "Mr. Water Pollution Control" himself, Congressman JOHN BLATNIK of Minnesota.

A man who grew up in the lake country of northern Minnesota, where water resources and conservation-mindedness were deeply ingrained in his consciousness, Congressman Blatnik in this exclusive interview below tells what the problem is, what is being done about it, and how he assumed national leadership with respect to it.

Question. I understand you were the author of one of the first pieces of national legislation on the subject. Is that correct?

Answer. Yes, I was sponsor in the House of Representatives of the bill to authorize the first permanent comprehensive national program for water pollution control. That act became law on July 9, 1956, Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress. It was also my privilege to sponsor in the House the legislation which made far-reaching changes in the law, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961, Public Law 87-88, which was signed by President Kennedy on July 20, 1961.

Question. Has there been a basic reorientation of direction in thinking in regards to water pollution control and abatement since that time, and if so, what?

Answer. Nine years ago pollution control was widely considered to be primarily a public health matter. Today health remains an important consideration, but more attention is being focused on the need to prevent pollution so that waters can be used for recreation, fish and wildlife propagation, agriculture, industry, esthetic enjoyment, and other purposes. Water pollution control is recognized now as part and parcel of water resources management and of the total conservation picture.

Question. What is the extent of the pollution problem specifically, and the overall water supply problem in this country in general today?

Answer. It is hard to overstate the extent of pollution in the United States today. Every major river system is polluted. Total water use in the United States doubled from 1945 to 1962—from 170.46 billion gallons a day to 342.42 billion gallons a day. By 1980 daily requirements for fresh water will reach an estimated 597 billion gallons, and by the year 2000 the demand for fresh water may reach a thousand billion gallons a day. Since engineering works are expected to increase the available fresh water supply to only 515 billion gallons a day by 1980, and to 650 billion gallons by the year 2000, we can foresee a deficit of serious proportions. Reuse of water is the effective answer, and the prevention, control, and abatement of pollution are critically necessary if water is to be fit for reuse.

Question. Is there an answer to the pollution problem in large, landlocked, relatively still bodies of water such as Lake Erie?

Answer. Lake Erie, shallowest of the Great Lakes, has taken in so much industrial, municipal, and agricultural pollution that it is described now as a dying lake. A lake, unlike a flowing stream, cannot flush itself of pollution. To stop the outpouring of pollution into the lake will take expensive measures. To restore the quality of its waters will take a gigantic, concerted, and costly effort. If we make the commitment, I think we can do the job.

The Great Lakes are the largest fresh water source on earth. The condition of Lake Erie and the southern end of Lake Michigan and situations at places on the other Great Lakes, including magnificent Lake Superior, on which my congressional district borders, makes us realize that this resource is not indestructible. The national water quality laboratory for fresh water is scheduled to be completed at Duluth, Minn., next year. The Great Lakes-Illinois River Basin project, a comprehensive program for water pollution control, has been underway for several years. Enforcement actions involving the southern end of Lake Michigan and the Michigan waters of Lake Erie are expected to result in effective remedial action. We are working with Canada through the International Joint Commission on lake pollution and low level problems. We hope that as new knowledge is developed, new courses of action will be opened for the preservation of the waters of the lakes.

Question. One of the great problems in water pollution abatement and control is that of money. What are your opinions on the possibility of the Federal Government establishing a huge revolving fund so that localities could borrow against it now, rather than perhaps be delayed in their projects because this year's funds have been exhausted?

Answer. Money is a problem. Waste treatment works are expensive, and there is competition for the taxpayer's dollar from more glamorous civic enterprises. The idea of a revolving fund on which communities could draw now is an interesting one. Variations of the revolving fund concept have been used with success to finance many activities—housing, agriculture, and power programs, for example. Governor Rockefeller has proposed, on the other hand, that the States advance the Federal share of the cost of municipal waste treatment works, and secure reimbursement later from the State's allotment under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act's construction grants program. This program expires in 2 years, and we propose to give it a thorough review before it is renewed.

Question. Do you see any other answer to the financial problem rather than the present method of gradually increasing the amount of Federal contributions and the annual appropriations for the program?

Answer. Our committee took a first step toward increased Federal participation in municipal waste treatment works construction by increasing from $100 million to $150 million the annual appropriations authorization for fiscal years 1966 and 1967. Any funds appropriated beyond the basic $100 million would be allocated to the States on a straight population basis, instead of the present population-per capita income formula, and the dollar ceilings, which we propose to double to $1.2 million for a single project, and $4.8 million for a joint project serving two or more communities, would not apply to any projects constructed with grants from the additional funds, if the State matched the Federal contribution, permitting a Federal grant up to the full 30 percent of project cost otherwise authorized by the act.

The need is so great that I look for a larger Federal construction grants program when we act to extend it beyond its June 30, 1967, expiration date. The Public Works Acceleration Act, for which implementing funds are now exhausted, the Appalachian Regional Development Act, which became law on March 9, and the public works and economic development bill, the administration measure recently introduced in both Houses, all include provisions authorizing financial assistance to certain communities on more liberal terms than those set by the basic laws authorizing Federal grant-in-aid programs. Over $100 million in APW funds gave added help to hard-pressed communities for waste treatment works construction. More States could participate in the financing of these urgently needed facilities. There are ways to get a better return on the dollars invested—development of advanced waste treatment methods, operator training, and joint use of facilities by communities.

Question. Are applicants for grant-in-aid under present law exceeding the availability of Federal funds, and if so what are the criteria for awarding grants?

Answer. Yes, the testimony of the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control before the House Appropriations Subcommittee this year told of a backlog of 1,500 applications as of December 1964, and an anticipated backlog of about the same number as of July 1965. The act specifies criteria for awarding grants. Projects must be certified by the State as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial and water pollution control needs. Public benefits, interests, and necessity are taken into consideration.

Question. Do you foresee any new problems in water pollution control other than the growing magnitude of the present situation?

Answer. A few years ago there was much talk about radioactivity as a new major pollutant. Attention shifted to detergents, then to pesticides. Scientific and industrial progress, or new technology, brings new sources of pollution. Known waste treatment methods cannot cope effectively with certain chemical wastes. Highway construction and suburban development have caused severe siltation problems in nearby streams. Ship pollution, some caused by foreign-flag vessels, has been a problem in the Great Lakes region. The situation requires nothing less than an all-out attack on pollution, from whatever source.

Question. How do you size up public sentiment on the subject? Are the people in a mood to act decisively on this problem?

Answer. There is a mounting public demand for clean water. The fight against pollution, a lonely battle of conservationists and a few others not many years ago, has widespread support today. Public water supply is the highest use of water. But people are not satisfied with just enough clean water to drink and use in their homes. They insist that bays and lakes and rivers be clean enough for swimming, fishing, boating, and water skiing. They resent the necessity to travel long distances for water-centered recreation because pollution makes nearby waters unfit for use. Farmers, commercial fishermen, shippers, industrialists, property owners, and nature lovers all have a stake in clean water. President Johnson's leadership has given tremendous impetus to the drive against pollution.

Question. What is the most important thing a local public official can do to help solve the water pollution crisis?

Answer. He can take an unequivocal stand for clean water, supporting citizens who advocate an antipollution drive, and leading public opinion where it lags. He can insist on the forceful administration of applicable laws and ordinances, and advocate strong measures if they are lacking. He can require new industry to give assurance of effective waste disposal methods, and work out realistic arrangements with existing industry to clean up pollution. He can seek financial and technical assistance from the State, and from the Federal Government. He can explore the advantages of joining with neighboring communities in constructing waste treatment works, and determine that plants are properly maintained. He can work with State officials to overcome any legal difficulties respecting the financing of new facilities and consult with them as to the method of financing which best meets the community's situation.

Question. Do you feel that local officials are aware of the full extent of the problem and that localities are doing all they can to meet the problem? If not, wherein are they lacking?

Answer. There is a vast difference in the degree of awareness and aggressiveness on the part of local officials in coping with the water pollution problem. Federal enforcement action has been necessary to prod some localities which for generations had used the river as a sewer. Other communities have been in the forefront. To the extent that they are not now doing these things, I would urge local officials to take the actions I proposed in answer to your question. Local officials today, in common with the people at large, are increasingly aware of the importance of clean water. Even narrow economic considerations demand it. A water-using industry will not locate a new plant in an area which lacks sufficient good water.

Question. As you know, NACO is carrying on an extensive water pollution abatement and control program in cooperation with the U.S. Public Health Service. What benefits do you see accruing from such a program?

Answer. The topical outline of your Public Officials' Community Action Guides and a look at the guides which you have issued thus far impress me with the fact that you have launched an important educational program. You are disseminating information of great practical value to the officials responsible for putting effective programs into being at the local level throughout the United States. I congratulate NACO on this undertaking.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this Scripture: Habakkuk 3: 18: *I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation.*

O Thou who art the Supreme Ruler of the universe whose laws and commandments are benign and beneficent, grant that we may always observe and obey the ways of Thy spirit and make them our first concern.

We humbly confess that we have failed to learn the lessons which experience and history teach us and which are necessary in the building of a better and more beautiful world and that we need the cooperation of a united people.

May we be glad and grateful that there is so much that we can do and are privileged to share with others much which will inspire them with courage and hope.

Help us then to apprehend and apply those faculties and capacities which will strengthen the bonds of brotherhood and fellowship.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 28, 1965, was read and approved.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate today and for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on the Federal Aid Highway Program be permitted to sit this afternoon and tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, with all these subcommittees and committees sitting this afternoon, I wonder if there will be anybody here to approve or disapprove the wonderful appropriation for the State Department and related agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight to file a report on the bill H.R. 6400, to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. NATHALIE ILINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1380) for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Iline.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2924) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CHARLES MAROWITZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1445) for the relief of Charles Marowitz.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

GIUSEPPE DELINA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1853) for the relief of Giuseppe Delina.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1853

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Delina shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may deem necessary to impose: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Delina shall be deemed to have been physically present in the United States since April 17, 1952."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT MARKS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1889) for the relief of Albert Marks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1889

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Albert Marks may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act: *Provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of said Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHESTER (ABRAMCZYK) HILL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1908) for the relief of Chester (Abramczyk) Hill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1908

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Chester (Abramczyk) Hill, shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert L. Hill, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of Chester (Abramczyk) Hill shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chester (Abramczyk) Hill may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert L. Hill, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further call of the bills on the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 115]

Adair
Andrews, George W.
Ashbrook
Baldwin
Berry
Blatnik
Bonner
Brown, Ohio
Cahill
Clark
Conyers
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Devine
Dickinson
Dulski
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Fisher
Fogarty
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Greigg
Hall
Halpern
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Holland
Jarman
Karth
Keogh
King, N.Y.
Landrum
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Love
McClory
McDade
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Michel
Miller
Morse
Morton
Nelsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Powell
Price
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Robison
St Germain
Scheuer
Selden
Smith, N.Y.
Stalbaum
Stephens
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Tupper
Utt
Walker, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 363 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8371, A BILL TO REDUCE EXCISE TAXES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, filed the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 404, Rept. No. 436), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 404

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8371) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8639 making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8639, with Mr. FASCELL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as has been indicated, this bill, H.R. 8639, would make appropriations in the coming fiscal year, to wit, fiscal year 1966, for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies.

Mr. Chairman, these related agencies include the American Battle Monuments Commission, the Commission on Civil Rights, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Office of Education Civil Rights Educational Activities, the Federal Maritime Commission, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, the Small Business Administration, the Subversive Activities Control Board, the Special Representatives for Trade Negotiations, the Tariff Commission, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the U.S. Information Agency.

Mr. Chairman, the amount carried in the bill is $2,085,689,900 in direct appropriations.

The bill also carries $3,898,400,000 in funds from the Highway Trust Fund for the Bureau of Public Roads.

The following table summarizes the amounts recommended in the bill in comparison with the corresponding budget estimates and the 1965 fiscal year appropriations.

Department or agency	Appropriations, 1965	Budget estimates, 1966	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1965	Budget estimates, 1966
Department of State	$384,848,000	$404,210,000	$388,202,000	+$3,354,000	−$16,008,000
Department of Justice	384,996,000	373,834,000	370,819,000	−14,177,000	−3,015,000
Department of Commerce	980,156,000	937,030,000	889,522,000	−90,634,000	−47,508,000
Bureau of Public Roads (trust fund)	(3,898,250,000)	(3,900,000,000)	(3,898,400,000)	(+150,000)	(−1,600,000)
The Judiciary	75,397,700	87,865,500	81,111,900	+5,714,200	−6,753,600
Related agencies	347,562,000	364,796,100	356,035,000	+8,473,000	−8,761,100
Total	2,172,959,700	2,167,735,600	2,085,689,900	−87,269,800	−82,045,700

Now, Mr. Chairman, insofar as the amount to which I have made reference in direct appropriations is concerned, to wit, $2,085,689,900, I should like to point out that this figure represents a decrease of $82,045,700 in the amount of the budget estimate, and is $87,269,800 below the total appropriations for all these activities in the current fiscal year.

First, I shall refer to the Department of State. The budget estimates for the Department of State total $404,210,000. The committee has included in the bill $388,202,000, which would be a reduction of $16,008,000 in the total requested for that Department, and an increase of $3,354,000 over the amounts appropriated for the current fiscal year.

Insofar as this increase of $3,354,000 is concerned, the amount recommended in the bill does not carry any funds for any additional personnel. The budget estimate contained a request for 385 additional positions. When the Secretary appeared before the committee he gave testimony with reference to this request and volunteered a reduction of 229 positions. The remaining 156 additional positions have been denied by the committee, with the result that no additional positions have been provided for. The Department and Secretary of State Rusk, with the help of this committee, have held the number of positions down to the same level as in fiscal 1961, in other words, 5 fiscal years ago. The Department and Secretary of State Rusk are indeed entitled to our commendation for this fact. The item for salaries and expenses includes additional funds to provide within-grade salary costs, wage and price increases, the opening of some necessary new posts, additional modernization of communications facilities, and improvement of the Department's security program, including the use of security-trained Seabees to supervise construction of new office buildings. This is the result of having uncovered in a newly constructed building, opened about a year ago in Warsaw, Poland, an elaborate system of listening devices which were evidently installed at the time of the construction of the building. We know that in countries behind the Iron Curtain the labor is furnished by the Communist Government of that country, whether it be Moscow or Warsaw, or wherever it is. There was no real control over such construction, and there should have been. A system has now been devised whereby Seabees, Navy trained in this sort of thing, will be on hand to supervise construction and to see that no clandestine listening devices are inserted in the framework of the building.

As to representation allowances, a favorite subject of my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], the committee has allowed exactly the same as was appropriated for this purpose in the current fiscal year. The amount carried in the bill is a decrease of $57,000 in the amount of the budget estimate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have not heard of any slippage anywhere over the world as the result of holding them down on these liquor and entertainment funds, and I commend the committee. I would like to say to the gentleman, having read some part of the hearings—not all but some part of the hearings—I do not believe that the holding down of personnel in the State Department and related agencies is attributable primarily to the officials in the State Department. I would like to say, in my opinion, the holding down on personnel is attributable to the subcommittee, the appropriations subcommittee, the gentleman from New York and his colleagues who have handled this bill through the years. I want to commend the committee in that respect.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should thank the gentleman in behalf of the subcommittee but I must be fair and say that if we did not have the cooperation of Secretary Rusk and responsible officials in the department, we could not have achieved holding the line at the same number of personnel for 5 successive fiscal years.

Mr. Chairman, also included in the bill is the amount of $24,625,000 for the acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad. In this connection the committee has denied a request for $50,000 for architectural services to rehabilitate or convert the famous Rothschild mansion in Paris at 41 Rue Faubourg, St. Honoré, which would result, if we were to go ahead with these plans, in the American Ambassador to France having a residence which would be worth approximately $5 million. For this reason the committee has once again and now for a number of times successively denied this request for such architectural services.

I might say in passing that nowhere in this bill has there been the slightest reduction in the amount of funds requested in connection with the various activities such as acquisition of buildings abroad or in the Fulbright-Smith-Mundt Act cultural exchange programs where the use of foreign currencies is required. In these circumstances every dollar's worth of these foreign currencies has been appropriated so that they may be withdrawn from the Treasury and used for these purposes.

Now we come to the contributions to the international organizations and regret to have to again say that this has been increased. The total now included in the bill is $96,953,000 to cover the various international organizations listed at pages 4 and 5 of the committee report.

The committee takes the position that our Government is a member of these international organizations including the United Nations and that we have no alternative but to pay our dues and our share of the costs as allocated by these organizations.

In the opinion of the present speaker, it is not the prerogative of this committee to say whether we shall or shall not belong to the United Nations. This is a matter for other committees of the House and of the other body.

Now I shall briefly refer to the mutual educational and cultural exchange activities. The committee has included in the bill the sum of $53 million for this item of which not less than $27 million shall be used for payments in foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States. Of this $27 million the committee requires that not less than $14.3 million be used in so-called excess currencies. The committee has also included the amount of $5.5 million which would be an increase of $200,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year for the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West located in Honolulu, Hawaii.

This might be a good point at which to explain that this bill reaching across Government as it does and with these many very important agencies of Government included therein does not represent the unanimous thinking of every member of this committee. There are amounts included in this bill which the gentleman from New York, the present Speaker, thinks are too small in amount, such as the funds for the Civil Rights Commission, for civil rights educational activities and the East-West Center, and in some instances where he thinks they are too large. This same situation, one way or the other, I am sure, applies to every one of the 10 members of the House Appropriations Committee who sat in on the markup of the bill.

The pending bill represents the best thinking which could be arrived at among all 10 members. There was, in effect, a meeting of the minds, so to speak.

Included in the bill is the amount of $100,000 to provide a statue of Abraham Lincoln to be presented to the people of Mexico and erected in Mexico City.

With respect to the Department of Justice, the committee, as usual, looked with some favor upon the requests of that Department. Once again, generally speaking, the committee has gone along with the money requests for necessary activities of that Department.

There is included in this bill the full amount requested for the Antitrust Division.

There is also included in the bill the full amount requested for alien property activities.

The full amount requested for the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been included. This recommended amount—to wit, $165,365,000—would provide for 392 additional full-year employees. We know that this additional force is necessary to the FBI because continually the Congress, year after year, gives the Bureau additional duties which must be carried out under the law. There is nothing the committee can do other than to furnish the manpower needed to carry out the laws enacted by Congress.

There is included in the bill the amount of $73,175,000 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

There is an amount of $63,560,000, in three appropriation items, for the Federal prison system.

As to the Department of Commerce, the budget estimates for that Department totaled $937,030,000. The committee has recommended, in the bill now before the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, the sum of $889,522,000, which would be a reduction of $47,508,000 in the amount of the budget estimates.

Included in this bill is the full amount requested, to wit, $1,300,000 for the Community Relations Service which was established pursuant to the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Included herein is $3 million for an outfit called the U.S. Travel Service, the same amount as provided in the current fiscal year.

Included herein are funds to start preparation for the 19th decennial census. It may be of interest to the Committee of the Whole to learn that it is expected that the 19th decennial census on a comparative basis will cost less than the 18th decennial census taken in 1960.

Moving along, in the bill you will find the amount of $33.4 million for the Patent Office, as well as $34,380,000 for the National Bureau of Standards.

There is included the amount of $106,536,000 in five separate appropriation items for the Weather Bureau.

There is included the amount of $349,811,000 in six separate appropriation items for the Maritime Administration. This would provide for the construction of 17 ships, rather than 16 as proposed by the Maritime Administrator, for the reason that we found that a half-million dollars could be saved by having a certain shipyard build 5 ships at this time rather than 4 for the American President Lines.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BETTS. With reference to the appropriation for the Weather Bureau, I noted there was an increase in the appropriation, I believe for research and development, and I believe the appropriation for equipment for weather and storm warning forecasts has been practically doubled. In view of the extreme damage caused by the tornadoes this spring in northwestern Ohio, I certainly approve this increase.

In appearances before the committee, was there any indication by the Weather Bureau officials as to the nature of the equipment they intend to add?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman from Ohio will find some detail in regard thereto in the printed hearings. I might point out that the full amount requested for hurricane, tornado, and other severe storms, to wit, $2,560,000, is included in the pending bill.

Mr. BETTS. Yes; I had noted that. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Turning to the Federal judiciary, we were presented with budget estimates in the amount of $87,865,500, including $11,249,000 from the bankruptcy referees' special account. The committee allowed a total of $81,111,900 which would be a reduction of $6,753,600 in the total amount requested for fiscal year 1966.

As to the related agencies, the committee allowed the full amount for the American Battle Monuments Commission, which is a well run and well operated bureau which maintains the cemeteries for our war dead and memorials in various parts of the world.

The committee has included the amount of $1,500,000 for the Commission on Civil Rights, which would be an increase of $220,000 over the total funds appropriated for this very important Commission in the current fiscal year.

The committee has included a total of $157,065,000 in two appropriation items for the Small Business Administration. The full amount of the budget estimate, to wit, $150 million is included for the revolving fund.

Mr. Chairman, if there are no further questions, I believe I have in summary and to some extent covered the salient features of the pending bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, over the weekend I had an opportunity to read a speech made by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Warren, who indicates in his speech that the civil caseload is at a record high. I had assumed, until I read this speech, that the additional judges that were authorized by Congress not too long ago would bring the caseload down. This was what we were told on the House floor. Instead of that, the Chief Justice, according to this speech, is now preparing to advocate an additional 42 judges. Was any testimony of this nature given to your committee to the effect that we are looking at, perhaps, another 42 Federal judges and that their caseload of unattended cases is going up instead of down?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should say to the gentleman in answer to his inquiry that there was no reference made during the course of the hearings by anyone from the judiciary, with regard to any request for additional Federal judges. I have heard of this only in the last few days. I am naive enough to think that perhaps the judiciary could get along with all those additional judges that have already been provided for in the last few years.

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to hear the gentleman say that because I have the same feeling; namely, that if they will apply themselves they can get along very well. I do note you increased the appropriation for the judiciary by some $5,700,000.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Of course I should also say to the gentleman that there has been an increase in the filing of civil cases in the Federal courts but there has also been a decrease in some types of criminal cases. We followed that through in this bill because we had to provide for the care and feeding of prisoners in the Federal penal institutions. We find that the population of these institutions has gone down.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], chairman of this subcommittee, has done his usual excellent job of explaining this bill, as he does an excellent job as chairman of this subcommittee. So there is very little that can be added to what he has said in explaining the bill item by item. I agree completely with him that there are many items in this bill that some of us thought were too high. I did not know that there were so many items in the bill that we thought were too low. But I will say for the benefit of the gentleman from New York that there are some items where we thought we should be more liberal with some of the agencies but we were able to come to an agreement on most of the items in this bill.

There are just a few things that might be pointed out in the consideration of any bill for membership to understand some of the difficulties that we have in trying to arrive at just what should be done and where we might be able to make cuts. I have a few examples here.

STUDY OF ANTARCTIC

For instance, in looking the bill over, and some of these are small items, but it is the number of small items that finally bring us up with a big bill—and one interesting item was the question of a study of Antarctica. Just what this has to do with our foreign affairs I am not completely sure. We may have some questions with some nations about Antarctica, and we spend some money there. But to have a study made of American activities in Antarctica for the last 200 years seems to me strange. As I recall, we are about 176 years old in this Nation. And it is proposed that we go down and make a study of our Antarctica relations for 200 years, not for just 176 years that we have had as a nation. This is the kind of thing that disturbs us, to understand why we make contracts for studies of this kind.

GAMBIA

Let us take another instance of things that I find hard to understand. This has to do with the emerging nations in Africa. Of course we have to have representation there. We have to have someone there to look after our interests. But there has been a question in my mind for some time whether it is necessary to have full-scale embassies, with ambassadors, and staff, as well as the USIA, when we go into some of these smaller countries in Africa. Sometimes it seems that we would have more citizens of the United States in some of these countries when we include the Peace Corps and the USIA, as well as the embassy people and the Commerce people, and the others who are now traveling abroad to foreign posts, as they have population in these countries.

Let us take one of the new emerging countries, Gambia, for instance. Mr. Chairman, I am happy that I am not studying geography these days in grade school. I used to try to memorize the countries of Africa. But when we go through these countries now, as well as the countries in Asia, I wonder if any of us have memories good enough to absorb all of what has happened.

But let us take Gambia. The total population of Gambia is 316,000. That is some 250,000 less than the population of my congressional district. This is a new nation. So we appoint an Ambassador and send him down there and I find that we are to furnish $25,000 worth of furniture to put in his house there.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman mean that the committee allowed $25,000 for furniture at that post?

Mr. BOW. They requested $24,900. That has been reduced somewhat. What they will actually use I am not sure. There will be two automobiles at this Embassy. This country is 200 miles long, not quite as long as my own congressional district from one end to the other. So they have two automobiles. I think, as I remember, that I asked whether or not they were going to have a Cadillac and I was assured that they were not, but I am not convinced that there will not be a Cadillac sent down there.

Also we are paying rent for the Ambassador's residence at $10,000 a year. The secretary down there is getting $3,000 for rent; a Foreign Service officer, $5,000 and an administrative assistant, $5,000. There are rents in this emerging country of Gambia with a population of 316,000. Principal export: peanuts. But when we begin to pay off down there it is not peanuts that they pay. It represents a pretty substantial amount when one considers what is going on.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. There will be quite a splash in Gambia when the new Ambassador arrives in that country with $25,000 worth of nice, new furniture, two automobiles and a retinue of retainers. I wonder just what our image will look like to the natives of this huge new nation with a total population of 300,000?

Mr. BOW. This is the reason why I raise the question, because I believe it is time we begin to discuss these matters.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in areas such as this we could have an Ambassador to serve several countries, or we could have ministries. I do not believe it is necessary to elevate these posts immediately to full embassies.

Mr. Chairman, the members of the committee may be interested in another country, Mauritania. The population of that country is 1 million people. Ten thousand people are located in their capital city. They requested $375,000 for their properties down there, and that includes the purchase of property, including a swimming pool and some tennis courts, in this small country.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to these people having some recreation, but it seems to me we should be a little more careful about how we are spending this money.

Mr. Chairman, this brings to mind one other thing that I should like to raise, and that is this: I am critical of the Department of State, and I believe it has got to be pursued. I would hope that the authorizing committee would join with us in pursuing the subject of excess currencies.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has mentioned the fact that excess currencies are being used to a great degree in this bill. However, it would seem to me that with the great increase—I understand they will be up to about $2 billion before long—in excess currencies in I believe some eight or nine countries, that under the contracts that this country has entered into by the Department of State, these excess currencies can only be used for particular purposes. It would seem to me that the time has come when the Department of State should begin to renegotiate some of these contracts in order to give us the opportunity of making these currencies convertible. There is still too much of an inclination now to use these excess currencies for most anything that might come along that would not be of real benefit to us. I wish we could arrange under contract to make them convertible into the various currencies of these countries where it would be possible then to use them to pay the expenses of our embassies in other countries.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, let us say that country A does business with country B, which has excess currencies. If we could make these excess currencies of country B convertible into the currency of country A and spend their currency in their country, we could then pay our expenses with the excess currency rather than spending hard dollars, if we are really interested in the gold outflow. In other words, Mr. Chairman, if we are interested in protecting the gold of this country we should be using more of these excess currencies with which to pay our expenses abroad, and I understand that can only be done if there is some provision to that effect in the contracts into which we have entered.

I would think that the State Department would be working on this. There is no evidence at all of any attempt to change these contracts to give us an opportunity at convertibility of currency.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. In a much more serious vein than I spoke in a moment ago, let me commend my distinguished friend from Ohio most highly for his suggestions. There is need for ingenuity in trying to cope with these problems, and I feel much more should be done than is now being done in this important area. Further steps should be taken within the Department to seek new solutions to old problems. I am convinced much can be accomplished with imagination and enterprise.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, I consider that the Congress and the Nation are very fortunate indeed in having as ranking minority member on this subcommittee the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, and of course, fortunate in having as chairman the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. These two outstanding Members of the House fill their respective positions on this important committee with great credit to themselves and the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. I would like to ask the gentleman a question as it relates to this overall bill, particularly with regard to the remarks he just made, and the need for reevaluation of some of these programs. I would like to ask if there is any specific reason for the consolidation of the requests for the State Department, the Justice Department, the Commerce Department, and the Judiciary into one bundle. I think I know the answer. Some of us are delighted to approve appropriations for such organizations as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, while we have some serious question as to the amounts spent by the Department of State.

Is there any reason for this combining of these Departments?

Mr. BOW. I do not think they have been consolidated to make it more palatable to vote for State Department funds. I think it is traditional that these agencies have been put together in one bill. That is true in the other body as well as this one. In the 12 years I have been on this committee it has been this way. As the gentleman knows, the Appropriations Committee is divided into a number of subcommittees, and these happen to be the ones that have been put together over a long period of many, many years, long before I came to the Congress.

Mr. DEVINE. I think that is probably one of the reasons we have so many problems in Government; that is, on the basis that is the way things have always been done. I would suggest to the gentleman, and he has my very highest respect in the position he occupies, that some consideration be given to separating the various departments in the appropriations requests so that Members of Congress can have an opportunity to express their true feelings in each area.

Mr. BOW. I will be delighted to yield time to the gentleman so that he may express his opinion on any section of the bill he wants to. As far as separation of the departments in the bill, taking each department by itself, it would be an impossible task for the Appropriations Committee to function under those circumstances. There must be some combining of various agencies, such as in the independent offices appropriation bill. There are subcommittees for others. It would seem to me to ask for a subcommittee for every appropriation item that comes up would be an impossible task.

Mr. DEVINE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. With regard to the need for an examination into foreign currencies and U.S. currencies, so that we can make use of them, I am sure the gentleman is aware of the fact that Public Law 480, section 104 (s) and (t) provides authority under which tourists and business people traveling abroad can exchange their dollars for some of these U.S.-owned local currencies. Contracts authorizing this type of exchange have been consummated with 30 recipient countries. But so far the administration has seen fit to set up the mechanics for this exchange program in only three countries, namely, Egypt, Israel, and India. I feel that in failing to set up the mechanics in these 27 other countries which have accepted this program for the tourist dollar and the business dollar exchange, we are missing a valuable opportunity to ease our balance-of-payments problem and make use of some of these soft currencies.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois. I think in those countries where it has been done, it should be made easier for the tourist to do it. As it is now, he is given a slip and must go to an embassy to make the exchange. It would seem to me there is some possibility that we could provide these currencies in this country for them before they leave or at least make it easier for them to use them. There is no incentive really now for them to go to the embassy when they can go to a bank downtown and buy something of that kind rather than go to an embassy to buy them. I should think we should extend this and make it much more convenient for the traveler today.

Mr. FINDLEY. I agree with the gentleman. I might add when the Committee on Ways and Means had under consideration the bill to reduce from $100 to $50 the duty free allowance of tourists returning to this country, I proposed that they restore the $500 duty free amount for tourists who did utilize the tourist dollar or business dollar exchange program. This would provide an incentive for them to travel and it would be a business incentive and they would make this exchange and every dollar exchanged under these programs is a full dollar gained in the solution of our gold problem. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I notice on page 44 of the bill, there is an item of $38,000 recommended for buying books for the Supreme Court. Do you suppose there is any possibility that they might get to spend about 10 percent of that for lawbooks?

Mr. BOW. I have assumed that it would be for law books. We have taken care of some of the light over there not long ago so it is easier to read and I assume what the gentleman is suggesting is that he hopes the books will be used.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I certainly do, sir.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I agree completely with what the gentleman from New York said. I do not like these assessments that are made against us in the United Nations. I think in many instances they are too high. I think many times there are assessments so that we might just as well not be in some of the branches of the organization. But we are a member of the United Nations. We are there by treaty. We are there by authorization of the Congress of the United States and, in my opinion, so long as we are a member and so long as we are bound under the treaty and operating there, it is incumbent upon the Congress to pay these assessments and to pay the bills. I know it is difficult when you see others who are not paying. But the mere fact that they are not paying does not justify in my mind the United States reneging on its responsibilities. And if we are not to do it and if anyone objects to it, then we ought to be moving toward changing our status in the United Nations.

I am disturbed about one thing that has been brought to my attention in the United Nations. That is with reference to the fact that we are not filling enough American jobs. Take UNESCO, for instance. Our quota in jobs in UNESCO is 153 jobs. In other words, there are 68 jobs out of the 153 jobs in UNESCO where American citizens are now employed. In other words, there are 68 American citizens out of the 153. It seems to me, we should fill all of our allocations with American citizens, if we are to do the job and if we are to know what is going on and if we are going to make a contribution. We ought to be filling all of our allocations that are given to this country with our own people because, if we do not fill them, there are many times when those positions are filled by people from countries that are not friendly to us and which gives them a chance for further subversion of our interests.

We contribute about 40 percent of these funds for the technical assistance programs and out in the field positions there are only 32 Americans out of 1,500 or about 2.1 percent of the jobs that are filled by American citizens while we pay 40 percent of the bill. So I suggest that this is another area where we ought to take a look.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How much of the money that we contribute to these subsidiary organizations is actually going to finance the general operation of the United Nations which has been practically halted by virtue of the fact that the various countries have not met their obligations? By indirection are we now doing what the so-called international court said other countries should do—that is, pay up? Are we financing the "deadbeat" nations through the support of these subsidiary organizations?

Mr. BOW. I am sorry, but I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I shall be glad to have that checked and I shall advise the gentleman.

Going to the Department of Justice, it is always a pleasure for me to hear and consider the testimony on the appropriations for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is a very fine agency of the Government, one as to which we have made no cuts. We know that if the money is not used and is not necessary to be used the money will be returned to the Treasury. I wish that every Government agency which came before us had the same type of testimony we get from that branch of our Government. It is dependable and always completely frank and honest. They lay the facts right out on the table before us, so that we know exactly what use is to be made of the appropriations. I compliment Mr. Hoover and his associates.

Another agency we find somewhat in the same situation is the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Justice Department. This group is one in which we have confidence that the dollars we appropriate will be properly used. I feel certain that Members of Congress recognize and appreciate the consideration given to the Congress by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I feel certain that all join me in saying that our association with them has been a very good one.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken more time than I expected to take. I have not been able to point out places where I believe cuts could be made, because it seems to me this is a good bill we bring you today.

If there are any questions which Members would like to ask either the distinguished chairman or me, so that we may try to answer, we shall be delighted to try to do so.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] as well as all the members of the subcommittee for their cooperation, assistance, and devotion to their duties as committee members.

The hearings on the bill now before you on the first of June, today, began on the second of February last.

At this point I should like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes], the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Slack], the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith], the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Flynt], and the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson], together with the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb], the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cederberg], and the distinguished ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8639, the appropriations bill before us, turns down an administration request for $82.4 million for special U.S. programs in nine "excess local currency" countries. The presentation of the $82.4 million request by the executive branch is reported in hearings, at pages 1064–1078.

As set forth on page 26 of this committee's report, the executive branch had nothing particular by way of projects in mind, but thought it would be nice if Congress gave the Bureau of the Budget the authority to use the $82.4 million. They deserved to be turned down.

But the problem that remains demands solution. On November 18–20, 1963, the House Committee on Government Operations, through the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of which the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] is chairman, held hearings into the problem of U.S.-owned foreign currency. In House Report No. 199, filed on March 22, 1965, the House Committee on Government Operations, without dissent, made certain recommendations to the executive branch for the future use of local currencies, accumulated largely under the Public Law 480 program.

A small portion of the foreign currencies generated by the United States abroad is reserved for the purpose of U.S. agencies, and hence is called "U.S. use" currencies. During fiscal 1966, nine foreign countries will have made available to us more than $1.6 billion of "excess local currencies"—over and beyond what the U.S. Treasury has determined will cover any conceivable U.S. need for the next 2 or 3 years. The makeup of these excess currencies which will be available for U.S. use follows:

[In millions of dollar equivalents]

Brazil	24
Burma	12
Guinea	8
India	662
Israel	62
Pakistan	164
Poland	494
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	132
Yugoslavia	88
Total	1,646

The recommendations made by the House Committee on Government Operations with respect to this alarming accumulation of excess foreign currencies follow:

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Both present and future arrangements with other countries governing the amount of U.S.-owned foreign currencies to be returned to the other countries for their own use, and the amount to be made available to the United States, should be carefully thought through so that—

(a) Enough is reserved to finance the legitimate needs of U.S. mission in each country instead of spending dollars; and

(b) In countries where large amounts of local currencies are generated, a larger proportion is reserved for the country's sound use to avoid further embarrassing surpluses.

2. Because the foreign aid agencies now ask Congress to appropriate dollars which are used to buy U.S.-owned foreign currencies from Treasury accounts, the agencies often are reluctant to seek the appropriations. Instead, the administration should request the direct appropriation of U.S.-owned foreign currencies to finance programs authorized by law to further the international interests of the United States.

3. The administration should prepare plans and request appropriations for necessary and constructive programs to be financed by U.S.-owned foreign currencies, particularly in those countries where the holdings are considered excess to U.S. needs. Such expenditures should advance the foreign policy of the United States without causing inflation in the country being aided and without adversely subtracting from that country's foreign exchange.

Programs and activities could be financed by foreign currencies appropriated for general U.S. mission purposes include:

Providing schools for dependent children of U.S. officers and employees overseas;

Improving language instruction for Foreign Service officers and other U.S. officials overseas;

Increasing official travel for key members of U.S. mission staffs within their regional area of service;

Leasing, renting, acquiring, and constructing adequate housing facilities and office space for U.S. mission personnel before the rising real estate values and rental costs reach a prohibitive level.

Repairing and maintaining U.S. mission buildings, equipment, vehicles, and household furnishings;

Increasing international education, cultural exchange, and leader-grant activities;

Improving personnel policy for local employees in situations where it is justified; and

Establishing training institutions to teach English as a second language.

Programs and activities which could be financed by foreign currencies appropriated for foreign aid activities include:

Stimulating small industries, marketing and distribution facilities, and similar activities;

Improving agriculture through the promotion of more efficient use of modern techniques;

Providing the type of technical assistance which will improve individuals' wage-earning capacities and directly increase standards of living; and

Developing a foundation under the direction of a binational board serving without pay to concentrate on problems of economic development and social change and much-needed studies of regional and national history.

Programs and activities which could be financed by foreign currencies appropriated to the U.S. Information Agency include:

Expanding publication of low-cost books in English;

Financing the building and staffing and stocking of municipal libraries; and

Setting up schools for training illiterate or barely literate adult and youth leaders from urban areas, villages, or local governments, and from the trades and businesses.

4. If the congressional mandate to purchase commodities in one country for foreign aid to a third country is taken literally, the executive branch would have to in all circumstances practically buy up the first country's economy—to the detriment of its foreign exchange position and its domestic economy—in order to provide foreign aid for other countries. At the opposite pole, the executive branch seems opposed to almost any third country purchases on the ground that "real wealth" is thus subtracted from an already impoverished economy.

The subcommittee recommends a sensible view which lies in between the two extremes. U.S.-owned foreign currencies should be used to buy commodities in one country for third countries when, and only when—

(a) The third country would not be buying the commodity anyway; thus, the transaction would not subtract significantly from foreign exchange; and

(b) There are unused resources of manpower and materials which can be brought into play without danger of inflation.

Mr. Chairman, the key recommendation—No. 2—is that the administration should get busy and request the direct appropriation, not in dollars, but in rupees, dinars, zlotys, and other local currencies, of whatever is needed to finance worthwhile U.S. activities, including particularly foreign aid activities of a priority somewhat lower than that necessary to meet the test for a regular dollar foreign aid appropriation.

These were good recommendations, and I am disappointed that the executive branch chose totally to ignore them. Let me suggest some worthy local currency projects which the State Department and the Bureau of the Budget could well have been presenting to the Appropriations Committee this year.

In Israel, the Weizmann Institute of Science, and Tel Aviv University, and Israeli Institute of Technology are most anxious to have an additional loan of "U.S. use" Israel pounds—there are some $32 million of them kicking around right now—to carry on scientific activities of value to the whole world. Israel has a surplus of physicians and other scientists who have immigrated from Europe. With additional funds, they could greatly expand their research activities. Moreover, these loans, if made, would be repaid by Israel in U.S. dollars, thus giving our balance of payments a much-needed boost.

The executive branch failed to present such a program.

In Yugoslavia, there is on the drafting boards a most constructive program for an American-Yugoslavian joint research and training project in regional planning. The U.S. end has been encouraged by the initiative of the Center for International Studies at Cornell University. The project, which would require in addition to private U.S. funds a very small amount of U.S.-owned Yugoslav dinars, presents a constructive opportunity to assist the Yugoslavs in developing an open Western-oriented trend in their economic planning.

The executive branch failed to present such a program.

In India, help for expanded research in mental retardation has been requested. Again, India has 2 million blind people, 60 percent of them needlessly blind, and needs help in a research laboratory project to alleviate this affliction. And a binational United States-Indian foundation for scholarly research, worked out in great detail, has been proposed.

The executive branch failed to present such a program.

In Poland, funds have been requested for a project to help some 5,000 physically and mentally retarded children now in institutions.

The executive branch failed to present such a program.

Mr. Chairman, I am not attempting to evaluate each one of these programs and say that each is worth undertaking. But surely doing something worthwhile is better than to continue to let our $1.6 billion of local currencies gather moss.

Why in the world do the State Department and the Bureau of the Budget not do what the Government Operations Committee has recommended—prepare a number of these programs on an illustrative basis, come before the Committee on Appropriations, and request an appropriation of local currency, country by country, to carry them out?

As the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney], suggested when he was asked that Congress give a blank check $82 million appropriation, without a single specific program mentioned, and was told that Congress would be told about it after the money had been spent:

> Mr. Rooney. You should come up here and tell us what you are going to do before you ever get that far. (Hearings, p. 1073.)

And again:

> Mr. Rooney. What is wrong with the present policy of presenting a request to the Congress for an appropriation for a specific purpose and presenting the facts for its consideration? What is wrong with that? (Hearings, pp. 1074–1075.)

But instead of bothering to collect their thoughts and present some specific programs, the State Department and the Bureau of the Budget contented themselves with saying, in effect, "Please give us $82 million in local currencies, but don't ask us what we are going to use it for."

I hope that the representatives of the executive branch who may observe this debate will read the report of the House Committee on Government Operations, and then come up with specific illustrative projects, and request definite sums of U.S.-owned local currencies. I know that I speak for at least some of us here in the House when I say: "We are willing to help you; we are waiting to help you; we are wanting to help you."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cederberg].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this appropriation bill. As other speakers have said, and as the chairman of our subcommittee said, there are some areas of the bill that we would like to reduce and there are some others we would probably like to increase. However, there has been a meeting of the minds of the members of the subcommittee on this bill and I think that the proposition which we have before the Committee of the Whole today is one which is worthy of your support.

In regard to the State Department, I would like to say that sometimes the State Department is an agency where it is easy for us to use them as whipping boys. In the travels that I have made in several countries around the world, I have found that the majority of the people we have representing us in our various embassies are good, sound, dedicated Americans. Of course, there are always exceptions, as there are in any organization. However, fundamentally, these men do quite a good job. When you consider that many of them move with their families to various posts around the world and then come back to the United States with their furniture and all of their belongings, you realize these dislocations with families presents difficulties. I commend the man who will make the Foreign Service his career and put up with the matter of dislocation both for himself and his family in these travels around the world. In most instances, these men do a good job in representing us as our ambassadors of good will. I think the Record should indicate that because sometimes we do not express enough appreciation to those who serve us in some of these faraway posts.

I might call to your attention, because it has not been mentioned before, this fact: I notice the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is here. A year or so ago we passed the Criminal Justice Act. At that time I think the testimony before that gentleman's committee was that the Criminal Justice Act would cost about $3.5 million a year.

If you will turn to the report you will find on page 38 that the request was for $7,040,000 to implement this program. It is under "Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel." Our subcommittee approved the amount of $3,500,000, which amount it was testified before the Committee on the Judiciary would be needed. But the request was for $7 million. I am of the opinion that this legislation within a few years is going to cost at least $15 million a year to implement. There is a great difference of opinion within the judiciary as to how this should be carried out.

I think we ought to be careful and cautious, when we authorize legislation and are told by the Government agencies how much it is going to cost. Almost invariably the cost is far in excess of what the agencies say it will be.

Here is an example of twice the initial request for the start of this particular program. And this happens time and time again.

Now, there is not very much that we on the Committee on Appropriations can do about it. We cut this item to $3.5 million. However, I am convinced that if the intent of the law is carried out under the Criminal Justice Act it is going to cost a great deal more and they will be in here with a supplemental request to take care of it. I think we should recognize this when we pass legislation of this kind because on the Appropriations Committee there is not much that we can do about it.

The gentleman from Wisconsin touched on the request of the administration for blanket authority to spend these excess currencies. Obviously we are not going to give up—no one in the Congress wants to give up this authority to the Executive to use these currencies without any plan or program whatsoever. Finally, I think all of the agencies in this bill are adequately taken care of. You cannot give as much as they want to any agency, because the sky is often the limit. Some probably could use additional funds.

I think the Civil Rights Commission is adequately funded. There is in here a quarter of a million dollars more than they had last year. I am convinced that they can do the kind of job that is necessary in this area with this appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, with that I yield back the balance of my time and urge your favorable consideration of this appropriation bill because I think it is a good bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me this time. I think if he knew what I was about to say he might not have done so, because I rise to let the House know what a tremendous experience it has been for me, my first term on this subcommittee, to serve under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney].

His grasp of the subject is absolutely amazing to me. It is very obvious that he does his homework and I think every witness who appeared before him realized that he had to be prepared, that he could not throw any curves past him. His dedication and devotion to the interests of the taxpayer have been outstanding. On the other hand, he has not wielded a meat ax. He realizes that these are important agencies that have an important function to fulfill, and must have adequate funds in order to function.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to thank him. He permitted me to ask as many questions as I wanted, but I must confess that after he was through there was not much to ask.

Also, while I am on my feet, I would like to say that the clerk of this committee, Jay Howe, has been more than courteous and helpful to me, a new member. I am sure all Members agree that he serves in the highest traditions of our public service, and that his expert knowledge and devotion to duty have served the country well.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for his highly flattering remarks. At this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins].

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have such a high regard, respect and admiration for the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee that I hesitate to ask him these questions; but I am concerned about the limitation that was placed in this bill as shown on page 23 of the report on Small Business Administration, in their use of the revolving fund.

The sum of $3,313,000 was cut from the budget for transfer and a limitation was placed on the use of this fund by the committee.

I wonder if the gentleman would comment as to why this limitation was placed on this fund and this cut was made as to a transfer of funds?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, the primary purpose in doing what the committee did with regard to the requests for the Small Business Administration was to streamline the operations in order to get them to the point where they will be far more efficient than they are at the present time. The committee has in mind the following testimony of the Honorable K. L. Hanna, Assistant Administrator of the Small Business Administration, printed beginning at page 758 of the committee hearings:

> Mr. Rooney. Are you any better informed on your requirements now than as of this time a year ago?
>
> Mr. Hanna. I believe we are. This is only a belief, however, Mr. Chairman. Referring to our statements over prior years, it has been extremely difficult to forecast what our business loan or disaster loan funds is going to be.
>
> AGENCY ERROR RESPONSIBLE FOR LACK OF FUNDS IN 1965
>
> Mr. Rooney. With all of these telephone calls to which we made reference a while ago, in every one of which the party seeking the loan stated he was directed to the Congress and this committee by the Small Business Administration, they conveyed the impression the Congress has been derelict in not providing funds for the loan program. However, the fact of the matter is that when you were here a year ago, Mr. Foley testified on March 13, 1964, at page 92 of the printed hearings as follows:
>
> "* * * As previously stated, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, for the first time in SBA's history, we are not requesting additional appropriations for the fund. In other words, on the basis of our estimates of 1964 and 1965 activities, the fund is, or rather will be, 'revolving.' That is the estimated carryover balance at June 30, 1964, and repayments, revenues, and cancellations projected for 1965 are sufficient to cover the estimated new loans to be approved and related interest and administrative expenses."
>
> Mr. Hanna. That was a true statement.
>
> Mr. Rooney. I have read Mr. Foley's testimony correctly, have I?
>
> Mr. Hanna. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. Rooney. Do you not think it would be better if the agency were to inform these loan applicants of the facts in this regard rather than have them call the Congress where the procedure is long and cumbersome, but which should be known to everybody in this agency? You know, Mr. Hanna, that an appropriation must be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, then sent up here, and so on? This request was not sent up until February 8, 1965, this request for the supplemental appropriation of $100 million.
>
> Having been sent up here, it has to go to the Subcommitee on Appropriations in the House, the House Committee on Appropriations, the House of Representatives itself, the Senate subcommittee, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Senate itself, and then very possibly, being in a supplemental bill, go to a conference between the House and the Senate.
>
> You are familiar with all of these things, are you not?
>
> Mr. Hanna. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. Rooney. Would it not be fairer to the American public and particularly the prospective borrowers, to advise them that you folks made the mistake and not the Congress?
>
> Mr. Hanna. Mr. Chairman, in the suggested letter which was sent to our field offices to advise individuals that the loans had been given favorable consideration, we reported the reason we were out of money was because of the unprecedented volume both of business and disaster loan applications.
>
> This letter did go on to say we were submitting a supplemental request and whether we would be able to approve the loan later would be contingent either upon an appropriation or additional collections.
>
> Mr. Rooney. Why bring the Congress into it at all?
>
> You received every dime of the money you requested last year insofar as the revolving fund was concerned; to wit, nothing?
>
> You at that time stated you did not need any more than nothing, so why take the time of the committee to answer telephone calls from people who think it is the fault of the Congress that they cannot get their loans? Is that a fair question?
>
> Mr. Hanna. Yes; I expect that it is.
>
> It was not intended, I must assure you, in that way. We tried to put it on the basis of the fact that because of the unprecedented——
>
> Mr. Rooney. This whole business is a mess from beginning to end. It is similar to this business of coming here and asking for no new employees and then putting 230 additional on the permanent payroll.
>
> Mr. Foley. Could I address myself to that?
>
> Mr. Rooney. Yes. I shall give you a full chance to answer that very important question.
>
> Mr. Foley. I believe that you will find that the additions to the payroll that occurred this fiscal year——
>
> Mr. Rooney. Before we get into that, let Mr. Hanna finish his statement. That is my first question when Mr. Hanna finishes.
>
> Mr. Bow. Mr. Chairman, would you yield to me?
>
> Mr. Rooney. Very well, Mr. Bow.
>
> Mr. Bow. I would like to say this: I have had a number of calls in my office in Ohio as well as letters sent back here from people who have gone to the Cleveland office. I do not know what they have been told. They did not tell me what they were told, but people write to me and say, "I have not been able to get a small business loan because there is no money there and I understand there will not be until you appropriate funds. I understand you are on the committee."
>
> I just do not know how these people found out that I am on this committee.
>
> Mr. Rooney. How did they get the telephone number here in this very committee room? We had two such calls this morning while Mr. Foley was testifying.
>
> Mr. Hanna. I have no idea.
>
> Mr. Rooney. I do not know if somebody thinks this sort of thing is smart. I think it is dumb.
>
> How would they just happen to get the number of the Capitol and the correct telephone extension?
>
> Mr. Bow. And know the members of the subcommittee.
>
> Mr. Rooney. I had only one call and it was not from New York City so I just told the fine gentleman the facts of life. I told him what a splendid Administrator Mr. Foley was and I let it go at that.
>
> Mr. Bow. That is all, Mr. Chairman.
>
> Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will answer further, did not the fact that they ran out of money cause us to pass a supplemental appropriation bill of $100 million which indicated the fact that there is a need for additional funds in the revolving fund?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. If the gentleman will kindly yield, I am sure the gentleman knows that this committee cannot give the Small Business Administration and the administration itself more money than it asks for. This is the amount that they asked for and it was included in the second supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman from New York is speaking about another item on which we have already passed a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $100 million.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That money contained in the second supplemental appropriation bill was to cure the blunders made by Mr. Foley.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. But there is a limitation of $2,313,000 which they cannot transfer and use for staffing and for personnel purposes. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman why they cut off the funds for research grants and contracts? They are empowered by law to make research contracts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the distinguished gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Could the gentleman from New York give me information as to those questions?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Let me answer the first part first.

Does the gentleman realize that in connection with the transfer from the revolving fund there is included in this bill $5,587,000 more than they have in appropriations in the current fiscal year?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. But there is a limitation on the amount that can be transferred for personnel and for staffing, and I would say to the gentleman from New York that the poverty program——

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is exactly what that amount of $5,587,000 is for, personnel and staffing, I might say to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. It has imposed more duties and more obligations and more loan authority on the SBA, in addition to the disaster loan authority.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This committee has been very much interested in seeing that the Small Business Administration is run correctly. We are doing everything in our power to streamline Mr. Foley and his operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I again yield the distinguished gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Would the gentleman address himself as to why they cut out all funds for research grants?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes. It was a year ago if I recall correctly—possibly my memory is slipping with advancing age and it could have been 2 years ago, but I am pretty sure it was a year ago—Mr. Foley had a gentleman whom he had on the payroll at $50 a day as a consultant from September 1963 to January 1964 and Mr. Foley moved this gentleman out of the $50-a-day category into a research contract of $150,000. He proposed to give him the entire amount that the agency had for all its research contracts as the wherewithal for the contract with this gentleman.

Does the gentleman want to know any more about this?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I do not know that he made a mistake but conceding he did in one instance, should you cut off all the funds for research grants just because of one contract?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Since Mr. Foley was going to give all the research money to this fellow in one contract, I do not think it is going to do any harm.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in reading various publications recently I get the impression that Geneva, Switzerland, has become an international headquarters for conferences. It seems there is no end to the conferences now being held or scheduled to be held these days in Geneva.

I wonder if my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] can tell me why all of these conferences have been moved to Geneva, Switzerland, instead of, say, the United Nations in New York, where we are already paying the bills for the upkeep of buildings, staffs, and so forth.

Has the gentleman's committee developed any information as to how many international conferences we are engaged in each year?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. May I answer the first of the distinguished gentleman's questions with a question? Has the gentleman ever been in Geneva?

Mr. GROSS. No.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman should know that Geneva is one of the loveliest cities on the face of the globe. The climate is highly unusual, the best. You have the Alps all around you, and beautiful lakes. You would feel like a new person over there in Switzerland. After all, all the people in the State Department are not fools. Why should they not pick a good spot like Geneva if they are going to sit down and work so hard?

Mr. GROSS. Is the food good in Geneva? And the champagne?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Swiss cuisine is among the finest in the world.

Mr. GROSS. I guess I have the answer as to why Switzerland has become the headquarters for international conferences.

That leads me to a question with respect to representation allowances, whether there is any money in this bill for an official wine taster? I noticed in one of the local papers recently that the State Department several months ago held a wine-tasting session in Washington for a group of new diplomats to familiarize them with what constitutes good wines. Is there any money in this bill for official wine tasters?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I assure the gentleman from Iowa that the committee has not included any money in this bill for wine tasting or wine bibbing.

Mr. GROSS. Wine what?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Bibbing.

Mr. GROSS. I never heard of that.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is when one drinks too much wine.

Mr. GROSS. I thought that individual was called a "wino."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That may be.

Mr. GROSS. I also noted in the papers not too long ago a story of how State Department employees are rotated back to this country and provided with house trailers. I do not know whether they are being provided with automobiles, but they are being provided with trailers so that they can go out over the country teaching the gospel—the gospel of the State Department I suppose—the U.N. and of foreign aid and all the rest of it. But at least they are being supplied with trailers so that they can take their families at Government expense and enjoy a nice vacation. Does the gentleman know whether there is any money in this bill for the purchase of trailers for State Department employees coming back from their arduous labors in Geneva, Switzerland?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. There is no money whatever in this bill for such a purpose. However, I do want the gentleman to understand that the Fruehauf Co. does provide trailers and returning foreign service officers do go on trips in these Fruehauf trailers without any cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that at least the trailers are without cost to the taxpayers. That may be on a par with these Cadillacs that are leased or loaned to certain Pooh-Bahs in Washington. There must be a catch to this business somewhere. I have been trying for a long time to find out how these big black vehicles get to certain officials in the Congress and in the executive branch but I have never yet found out what the catch is—how this deal works by which they get these Cadillacs and Lincoln Continentals practically for free.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well I am sure we could find out the details of such an arrangement.

Mr. GROSS. We might find out then the meaning of what one man once said—"what is good for General Motors is good for the country."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am not so much concerned with this. It is my understanding that these automobiles for officials in the Congress cost only $500 a year.

Mr. GROSS. That is my understanding too.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am not concerned about it.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to know how this comes about. I am interested. Is not the gentleman from New York interested in a $500-a-year Cadillac?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman from Iowa would be closer to General Motors than I am.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has said that the Committee held employment down in the State Department and in other departments covered in this bill. I am glad to hear that. Of course, the thing that must interest all of us is the use that is made of the employees that are on the payroll. Along that line, I regret the committee did not see fit to cut the Disarmament Agency from the $10 million that was authorized. I note in your hearings that they testified they were going to make a study of the economic impact of the closing of 95 bases of one kind or another—shipyards and other facilities in the country. It is hard for me to believe, and I so stated to Mr. Foster, Director of the Disarmament Agency, when he came before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that the Defense Department made no study of the impact of the closings upon the local economy including the Brooklyn Navy Yard. Yet in this bill they get the full $10 million for alleged disarmament. At the same time, and looking at the other side of the coin, they have practically set up a sales agency over in the Department of Defense to sell U.S. arms and munitions around the world. Congress beefed up the Disarmament Agency this year by giving it $10 million and put it on a 3-year basis for a toal of $30 million. Meanwhile we go gaily on supplying the rest of the world with arms and munitions. If that is not a fantastic contradiction—I never heard of one.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Of course, the gentleman understands that the amount carried in this bill is $2,272,000 less than the amount of the budget estimate.

Mr. GROSS. Less than what?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The amount of the budget estimate.

Mr. GROSS. That was because of the carryover, was it not?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Exactly.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I just wanted to make sure the gentleman understood.

Mr. GROSS. So they have not only been well funded, but have been overfunded.

Now, the Bureau of Intelligence Research—and this is the first time I ever heard of the Bureau of Intelligence Research—has issued a contract to the Stanford Research Institute to study the Panama Canal; that is, a new sea-level canal. Two or three years ago the Defense Department, under orders of the President, sent the Corps of Engineers down to study the prospects for a new sea-level canal. It seems to me it was only last year that Congress appropriated $17 million for additional studies of a new sea-level canal.

What in the world is the Bureau of Intelligence Research doing awarding a contract to the Stanford Research Institute for such a study?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman from New York can help me out with that. How could there be any justification for the Bureau of Intelligence Research getting into the Panama Canal situation, after $17 million was appropriated last year for that purpose, and after the Corps of Engineers studied it even before the $17 million was appropriated? For the life of me I cannot understand that kind of waste.

Then there was a study of Soviet succession, whatever that is.

There is another study, no, two of them on internal warfare political aspects. One contract or study went to a William Borton, and another went to a Fred Green. I do not know whether it is supposed to be a study of "internal warfare and political aspects" in the United States, or somewhere else in the world. I gave up.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the additional time. I yield back the remainder of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 1 minute.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] 2 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to compliment and commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and all members not only of the subcommittee but of the full committee for the fine job they have done on this very important appropriation bill.

I should like to address myself specifically to the items which apply to the Small Business Administration. Questions were raised a little while ago about that appropriation.

My words are directed as a word of caution not to the committee but to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. As already pointed out, the Administration has gotten every dollar it asked for. Unfortunately it has not asked for enough.

Most of this money is for its lending program. The Administrator did not ask for enough last year. The result was that the agency ran out of money.

The law provides, in so many words, that SBA must receive and process applications for loans of up to $350,000, yet the Administrator arbitrarily cut this back to $15,000 last year.

When the Administrator appeared before the House Small Business Committee to explain his actions, the best we could get out of him was that if he got what he asked for from the Appropriations Committee, he still might not be able to take applications for the full amount. He has again rewritten the law to please himself instead of following the intent of Congress.

I say that this is wrong. He should have gone before the Appropriations Committee and said, "We need X million dollars in order to be able to meet the congressional intent and to take and process applications for loans up to the full amount authorized by Congress."

Instead of that, the Administrator tells us he will again limit the maximum amount of loans to less than that authorized by law.

He ran out of money because of the disaster last year. He came before the Appropriations Committee and asked for supplemental appropriations and deliberately understated what he needed. He did not get enough only because he did not ask for enough. He has done the same thing again this year.

When he was before the House Small Business Committee, he represented that by letting go the small business specialists, or most of them, his department, could save $1.5 million in administration expenses this year. Year after year the Small Business Committees and the Legislative Committee of both Houses have come before the Congress and urged that what should be done is to have the small business specialists transferred from the Defense Department to the Small Business Administration.

Instead of that, the Small Business Administrator is now letting his small business specialist go and is going to rely on the Defense Department to do the job which they have never done. He justifies that on the basis of economy and of being able to do a better job. This despite the fact that the President directed that he exert every possible effort to making sure that small business gets a better break and better treatment in the various procurement agencies of the Government so that they can get a bigger and fairer share of the work which can be done by the small business firms of the country. Instead of getting more, small business will get less because of what he has now done.

At another time, I will have much more to say about the operation of this agency.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], a question. At Grand Island, Nebr., which is located in the south-central part of the State, the Committee on Appropriations in their wisdom, about 3 years ago, allowed sufficient funds to permit the Weather Bureau station there to operate 24 hours a day. Since that time, we have very badly needed some radar equipment in order to detect storms in the area. In fact, last month we had 25 separate tornadoes, according to the Weather Bureau, within a 24-hour period, all within this part of the State. One town in my district, about 60 to 70 miles away from Grand Island, Primrose, Nebr., was completely wiped out with a loss of four lives and the total damage from several tornadoes on that day approximated $4.5 million.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if there are sufficient funds in this bill to take care of the desperately needed radar equipment at the Grand Island, Nebr., weather bureau?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. I want to say to the gentleman that we were delighted to arrange a radar station in his district several years ago because of the seriousness of the problems there. I am of the opinion that there is sufficient money in this bill to take care of additional radar stations throughout the country for tornado warnings. Also the gentleman, I am sure, is interested in the agricultural weather stations which are of importance. The Weather Bureau has been well provided with funds; however, it would depend upon priorities as to where these services are placed. There is nothing in this bill which designates particular areas where they shall be placed. I am sure, with the experience that the gentleman has had in his district in Primrose, however, where they have had a most unfortunate and sad affair, it should be given top priority. I sincerely hope that the Weather Bureau will give the gentleman's area top priority and consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman. I noticed that you mentioned the agricultural weather program at North Platte, Nebr. That area is vitally interested in the establishment of such a program there in connection with the Weather Bureau. Our State experimental agricultural station in North Platte, is necessary, I understand, for the location of the station. I further understand that this agricultural weather station, if established, would give direct and immediate service to all of our TV and radio stations in the area through teletype machines with the very latest weather forecasts. That would also be of great assistance to us because we are located in the tornado belt and at this time of the year tornadoes have done very serious damage for quite a number of years. I hope the Weather Bureau can help us out on this matter.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended in my opening remarks to raise one question which has to do with the Bureau of Prisons. We have on our committee a very hard working and excellent member, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK]. Mr. SLACK makes a real contribution to our committee. In his examination of witnesses, he brought out the fact that at Leavenworth, they built a $100,000 home for the warden. This is getting pretty silly when we begin to give wardens homes costing $100,000 for construction and furnishings; $24,000 of this $100,000 was built with prison labor. I want to commend the gentleman from West Virginia for his diligence in bringing out these facts in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully call to the attention of the membership the fact that seldom has the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union been graced with an occupant of the chair more distinguished in ability and charm than it is today.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill of broad coverage. Page 1 of the committee report lists 15 major departments and agencies of Government. Yet there are many others, all of them important. The summary at the end of the report gives a complete listing of the work areas covered by the committee and its saving. In a $2 billion bill, reductions of $82 million below the fiscal year 1966 budget and $87 million below the fiscal year 1965 budget represent one of the principal savings of the year.

Even so, this committee is bound by legislative restrictions in areas where spending curbs are badly needed. I refer principally to contributions to international organizations, now totaling $97 million annually. The funds show a $9½ million increase since last year. The cost constantly is growing, but without restrictions from the authorizing committee, our hands are tied. There appears to be no inclination to hold down expenses within these organizations as long as the United States is the principal contributor.

This bill reflects small cuts in some of the civil rights programs. They are too small. More realistic reductions are in order to stop unwarranted meddling by these commissions.

Nevertheless, in most areas this is a realistic bill which reflects careful scrutiny by a thorough committee and staff. The vote which I shall cast against the bill is directed in protest against agencies and courts which I cannot in good conscience support, not against the bill itself.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the subcommittee and, as other members of the committee have already said, I, too, support the bill. There may be some items I do not think are sufficient and others that I think could be cut a little more. But it does represent a consensus.

I really did not intend to speak on this bill; however, since so much has been said about the Small Business Administration, and since I happen to be a member of the Small Business Committee as well as this appropriations subcommittee, I do want to make a few remarks directed at the previous colloquy on that item. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] indicates that they may not have enough money for loans. The bill provides $150 million for the revolving fund, to make all the loans that they may need to make in the coming year. I agree that they may need more than they requested for this purpose.

It was all that was asked, that is true. We have had a great many flood and tornado disasters that have increased the demand for loans. However, they could secure quite a lot of money, and more than they have previously, by selling some of their best paper. In order to sell this paper they have to have people on the payroll who can deal with bankers and who know how to sell this paper. For this reason and because there have been several disasters which increase Small Business Administration activities, I do feel that perhaps we have not permitted the transfer of enough money from the revolving fund to the administrative fund for salaries and expenses. There are also new situations and factors in the industry which need to be studied. Sometimes it is cheaper and sometimes one can secure more qualified studies under contracts than by placing additional people on the payroll.

Personally, I think this agency has been administered well. I think that part of the increased demand for loan money results from the fact that it has now become known in the business community that if one wants a loan, he can go to the Small Business Administration and in just a few days can secure an answer, "yes" or "no." They now provide an answer one way or the other in the office in each State rather than having to send all applications to higher offices. Heretofore for many previous years it has been well understood among lawyers, bankers, and businessmen that one might just as well not go to the Small Business Administration because by the time they would rule on the application it was too late to do any good, anyway. This situation has changed. It now has become common knowledge in the business community that they will process qualified applications promptly. I think that has resulted in greater use of the agency as a source for risk loans that banks feel do not fit into their business under their charter and available funds.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been very much concerned about the funding of the Small Business Administration. Do I understand that when they sell this paper, that money does not go into the General Treasury and then have to be reappropriated, but that it goes right back into the revolving fund?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is true. It goes into the revolving fund. They first offer the paper to the banker who participated in the loan. If he does not want it, they may sell it to someone else.

Mr. CURTIS. I did not realize that and I appreciate the information the gentleman has given me.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, one subject which is covered by this bill is a matter of great concern to me. It is the present functioning of the Passport Division of the State Department.

The record increase in the number of passports issued and renewed has imposed an unprecedented load on the Passport Division and also upon those clerks of the U.S. and State courts who have the job of processing passport applications. These applications are 235 percent of the applications 10 years ago, yet very little has been done to increase the clerks and improve the facilities which are devoted to handling these applications. In my district long delays are made necessary and the officials charged with executing applications have been compelled to make appointments far in the future instead of giving an immediate interview and making a prompt issuance, as had been their custom.

I have discussed this matter with the Passport Office and officials of this agency have informed me that they have not been allocated sufficient funds to provide additional help that is needed. I have discussed this matter with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] who is the chairman of the State Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and he maintains that adequate funds have been made available to the State Department but have not been allocated to the Passport Division.

I am not clear as to where the burden rests, but I am clear that the public is not being properly served in this case and I want to issue a warning that unless some improvement is made before next year there will be a great deal of well deserved criticism of our Passport Division's passport issuing process. The Passport Agency receives $3½ million a year to operate, while receipts from this Division amount to $5.8 million. Surely from this profitable operation, enough funds could be made available to operate this function properly. We have an obligation to the public to see that this is done.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAMIZAL SETTLEMENT

For expenses necessary to enable the United States to meet its obligations under the Convention between the United States and Mexico, signed August 29, 1963, and to carry out the American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964, $6,640,000, to remain unavailable until expended: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall not be available for expenses of operation and maintenance of works provided for in said Convention and Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY OF NEW YORK

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a clarifying amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY of New York: On page 10, line 6, after "remain" strike out "unavailable" and insert "available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

For necessary expenses for construction of the Inter-American Highway, in accordance with the provisions of section 212 of title 23 of the United States Code, to remain available until expended, $8,000,000, of which $6,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authorization granted by section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1146).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I note the Inter-American Highway is here for another $8 million. I thought we had assurances year after year and for several years that this item was out and over; that our taxpayers would not be rapped for more money for this purpose.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is quite right in what he has to say. I remember not too many years ago when I came onto the floor at that time, as a member of a separate subcommittee other than the one headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], our good friend, Mr. Preston, was chairman of the Commerce Committee. They came before us, and at that time I raised the question as to how long it was going to be that we were going to have to appropriate money. We were assured if we gave them the full amount that year it would be ended. I must confess to my colleagues on the floor of the House today when asked that question at that time I assured the House we would not be in for any more money for the Inter-American Highway. I would say to the gentleman we are back requesting this money. It is necessary to have it to complete the highway. I regret I misled the House, but it is like many other things we run into, there is nothing as permanent as a temporary agency in Washington. That is what we have in this appropriation. We have a rather permanent situation that will have to be appropriated for.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any idea how much it is going to cost to finish this highway?

Mr. BOW. I have learned my lesson. I no longer will give any idea as to how long or how much.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Or in whose lifetime.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman from New York give us any hope that this is going to be out and over any time soon?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. There is a slight ray of hope contained in the hearings, but I do not feel as though I should subscribe to it. I have been with this Inter-American Highway now for going on 20 years, and I should not say anything further.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Arms control and disarmament activities

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for arms control and disarmament activities authorized by the Act of September 26, 1961, as amended (75 Stat. 631; 77 Stat. 341), $10,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this is the agency that supplied the executive branch with the expert on Chippendale furniture, or am I thinking of some other agency of government?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This is the agency. Of course, he does the other in his extracurricular activities. He is really an expert on Chippendale furniture.

Mr. GROSS. I see. Now, with reference to the U.S. Information Agency, what in the world are they doing in Cambodia, for instance, under the circumstances that exist? We have already spent $8 million on the USIA in Cambodia or the USIS. What in the world are they doing maintaining a staff over there where the dictator of Cambodia has told us to get out and stay out of the country. Why are we still there?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, I suppose they would like to try to entice some of these Cambodians into our library and get them to read our books.

Mr. GROSS. If there is a library still there. Is there a library still there—they have not burned it out yet; have they?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have not heard lately.

Mr. GROSS. How about Indonesia? Do we still have a USIA operation over there?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am not sure at this moment.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I would be surprised if we did not, even though Sukarno has told this country repeatedly to go to hell.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will be glad to find that information for the gentleman and let him know.

Mr. GROSS. I will appreciate the gentleman's help.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. But there are places where we have been totally burned out. For instance, although Mr. Nasser and the Egyptians did $560,000 worth of property damage to our USIS center in Cairo, the USIA people are already coming along with plans to build a new and more expensive one. And we have not yet been compensated, as of this moment, so far as I know, for a nickel of the loss. They are still negotiating.

Mr. GROSS. I simply do not understand what makes the wheels go round in the minds of the people administering these programs.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. There is a great deal of this I do not understand, either, I must say to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Why should the USIS be doing anything in Cairo until Nasser has settled for our library that was destroyed?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is why we refused to allow any funds for that new construction in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I believe that one of the interesting things about the matter the gentleman is discussing is the fact that the government of Mr. Nasser had the unmitigated gall to request the use of our excess currencies there to rebuild this library which they burned down.

Mr. GROSS. The committee may have held the line on the number of employees in the Department of State and other agencies related to it, but it seems to me, in the light of some of the things disclosed here today, they need some new blood or different blood in the State Department. It seems to me that a real reorganization is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FASCELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8639) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 322, nays 60, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—322

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—60

Abbitt
Abernethy
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baring
Bennett
Bray
Buchanan
Callaway
Colmer
Derwinski
Devine
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Everett
Flynt
Fountain
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Gross
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Harris
Harsha
Henderson
Herlong
Kornegay
Latta
Lennon
Long, La.
McMillan
Martin, Ala.
Matthews
Mills
Murray
O'Neal, Ga.
Pool
Quillen
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Satterfield
Scott
Selden
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Tuck
Tuten
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Younger

NOT VOTING—51

Adair
Andrews, George W.
Ayres
Berry
Boland
Bonner
Brown, Ohio
Carey
Collier
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Dickinson
Dulski
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Fisher
Fogarty
Frelinghuysen
Hall
Halpern
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Holland
Hungate
Hutchinson
Karth
Keogh
Landrum
Lindsay
McClory
McDade
Mathias
Michel
Miller
Morton
Nelsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Powell
Resnick
Robison
St Germain
Smith, N.Y.
Taylor
Thompson, La.
Toll
Tunney
Utt
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Michel.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Robison.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. POOL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TUTEN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HARRIS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 391 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 391

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3584) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Martin]; pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 391 provides an open rule with 2 hours of debate on H.R. 3584, a bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines.

The primary purpose of H.R. 3584 is to reduce casualties in all coal mines to the maximum extent feasible through legislation. Two concurrent objectives were to attain this goal with a minimum burden upon those engaged in the coal mining industry and to augment, rather than duplicate, State efforts in this field. Consideration has been given to the safety of the men employed in coal mines and the security of their employment.

Title II of the bill, which does not apply to any mine in which no more than 14 individuals are regularly employed underground, is designed to prevent disasters arising from mine explosions, mine fire, mine inundation, and man-trip and man-hoist accidents.

Mr. Speaker, this particular piece of legislation has been kicking around the Congress for a good number of years. I myself remember that at least for the last 5 years this bill has at one time or another been pending before our committee. It is my understanding that the Committee on Education and Labor, after a great deal of study and deliberation and hearings, has arrived at a compromise bill which does meet the requirements at least of the majority, as I understand it, of the people interested in it. It is further my understanding that an amendment will be offered on the floor of the House which will meet the prime objections of most of those people who have heretofore objected to it.

Based on that, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 391 in order to permit the committee to debate the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 391, as the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] stated, provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate to be divided equally between both sides of the aisle in regard to H.R. 3584, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act.

As the gentleman stated, this bill has been kicking around the Congress for many years. It has never received favorable action and approval by the Congress of the United States. There have been some compromises and some amendments offered to this bill this year which perhaps make it slightly more palatable to the operators and owners of title I mines, who are those who are greatly concerned with this particular piece of legislation. This is sugar-coating, however, Mr. Speaker, and would still result in disastrous effects for the owners of title I mines. I would like to explain what these title I mines are. They are the small mine operators who are currently exempt from the provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. They are those mines which employ less than 15 people. Heretofore, the Federal mine inspectors have had the authority to go in and inspect these mines but they have not had any authority, if they found bad conditions in the mine, to close the mine or to require the fixing up of the things they felt were dangerous to the lives and health of the miners themselves.

During the course of the hearings 4 years ago and also 2 years ago, it was brought out in the testimony that this bill was not demanded, nor asked for, nor was there any interest in favor of the legislation from either the operators of title I mines, nor the labor involved in the title I mines. Neither was there any demand from the owners and operators of large mines, the so-called title II mines. The only segment of our economy directly interested in coal mining who want this legislation passed are the United Coal Miners. This is the United Coal Mine bill, pure and simple. You can sugar coat it all you want to with all of the amendments and compromises you want to. It is still the United Coal Miners bill. Most of the title I mines and the small operators, are not unionized. Their production is a sizable percentage of the total production of coal in the United States. It is quite easy to see why the United Coal Miners would like to see these title I mines closed down. It would, therefore, increase the production of the title II mines, most of which are organized by the United Coal Miners.

Mr. Speaker, I favor the rule under which we are going to consider this bill but I am still quite lukewarm in regard to the legislation itself.

Another point I would like to mention was brought out in our hearings.

Some of the cost of the mechanical equipment that would be required by the small operators that do not have this equipment at the present time would be as much as $40,000 to $50,000. Many of these small mines are family operated, mines operated by a few people in the same family—brothers, cousins, and so forth. These people would not have the resources or the finances with which to go out and purchase $40,000 or $50,000 worth of equipment to comply with the Federal coal mine inspector's demands. As a consequence this is going to work a severe hardship on many of our small miners in the United States.

Another point I would like to make is this. It has been estimated that 50 percent of the small mines in the State of Virginia would probably have to close if this bill becomes law. A few months ago we passed the Appalachia bill to remove poverty from that region. Unfortunately, many of these small mines with which we are concerned in this proposed legislation are in the Appalachia region. We have a billion-dollar program to alleviate poverty and yet under this bill we are going to create more unemployment and close down these mines through the enactment of this legislation.

This seems to me to be analogous to what we are trying to do here in the Congress of the United States under the Great Society as promulgated by President Johnson.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Let me suggest for the RECORD and for the information of my colleagues that I am a little unhappy that the gentleman has indicated that the cost of these improvements to save life would cost a small mineowner $40,000 or $50,000, because the committee report, based upon the evidence, says very clearly that in nearly every instance it will be minimal, and by minimal we mean a couple of hundred dollars. The most outlandish estimate given by anybody was a couple of thousand dollars, not $40,000 or $50,000. I think, therefore, the gentleman has, perhaps raised a hobgoblin that does not exist.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I beg to differ with the gentleman from California. I think if you will go through the hearings that we held 2 years ago on this legislation you will find that we had one witness from a title I mine who testified that the total cost would run probably as high as $40,000 or $50,000. I grant the gentleman that this figure was disputed by other witnesses. But the fact still remains that we did have one witness who used those figures in his testimony before the subcommittee in the 88th Congress.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I favor very much a bill to amend Public Law 552, known as the Mine Safety Act. Over the years I have received considerable information, both for and against legislation of this type.

It is a matter of record that the U.S. coal industry, in days before the enactment of effective mine safety legislation, counted its injuries in five figures and its fatalities at more than 1,500 in a single year. For the year 1959, the fatalities had dropped to 251; 274 in 1960; 256 in 1961 and 287 in 1962; 284 in 1963 and 240 in 1964—preliminary. This is indeed a mark of which the 82d Congress can be proud. It is to be hoped that the 89th Congress will give the figures a further downhill push by amending Public Law 552, to place every mine in America subject to the penalties prescribed by Public Law 552 for title II mines.

In spite of my feeling of satisfaction for having supported the original mine safety bill, I believe that 240 fatalities in 1964 constitute too many deaths in this industry.

Even though mining is now considered a hazardous occupation, we must hope and strive for the time when there will be no fatalities. Mine safety actually is a battle which must be fought constantly by all concerned—miners, operators, State and Federal mines departments and bureaus, State legislatures, and the Congress of the United States.

Every man who toils beneath the surface of the earth needs and his family is entitled to every protection from whatever source.

The principal arguments used against the passage of the original mine safety bill are well remembered. I am hearing them again today from some who oppose the pending legislation. They are stated in such terms as these:

> It is too costly. We cannot afford to do all the things the Federal law requires. We will have to shut down operations and put men out of work. Our State examinations are sufficient. Federal examination is an unnecessary duplication.

In spite of the forecast years ago that the mines would forever close if the mine safety bill became law, it is a well-established fact that the safety engineered, efficient, well-managed mines have not ceased to produce. We know that State examinations were not in themselves adequate safety guards for the miners and the producers alike. We know, too, that Federal examiners, with power to close unsafe mines, actually did bring more safety to mining operation and community in the United States. Comparative fatality and injury statistics speak effectively in this respect.

When the original mine safety legislation was enacted, it was anticipated that the fact a Federal inspector might be making an appearance at any mine, anywhere, anytime, would tend to keep State inspectors more alert to the need of facing up to their duties and do their utmost to halt violations of safety standards.

There is an awareness that perhaps there was too much laxness and neglect in the matter of State inspections in those earlier days.

These factors—but mostly the undisputed excessive and high injury and death rate in the mines—brought about the passage of the initial Federal Mine Safety Act. Who would now repeal this fine legislation? No organized effort has ever been successful to repeal the present Federal Coal Mine Safety Act.

It is right and proper that there should be Federal inspection of mines. That principle was established by law years ago. I cannot detect proper reasoning in any provision for safety measures which limits the extension of Government protection to men who accept work in mines employing more than 14 employees and withholds the same protection to employees of mines in the same neighborhood or other communities which employ 14 or fewer men.

Why should a mine on one side of the road employing 15 or more men have to be kept in a safe condition under Federal and State law while a mine on the other side which hires 14 or fewer employees completely escape the necessity of having the same Federal law enforcement with respect to its operations?

The answer to such a question is the obvious one that all miners should be entitled to equal protection against unsafe work conditions.

There is a safeguard in existing mining law against arbitrary or illegal orders which might erroneously be issued by any Federal inspector or the U.S. Bureau of Mines. This bill does not disturb the appeal section to which mine operators may resort.

There were 7,581 title I mines in this country in 1960; in 1961 there were 7,256; in 1962 there were 6,879. Title II mines numbered in 1960, 1,095; in 1961 there were 1,045 and in 1962, 1,045. Figures for 1963 and 1964 are not complete. Every mine in America is subject to inspection by the inspectors of the Federal Bureau of Mines. Yet, when Federal inspectors entered 6,879 title I mines in 1962, and found dangerous conditions existing—and they found many—they were helpless to do anything about it. They could only report the dangerous conditions and ask the coal company to correct them. Whether they were corrected or not was strictly up to the company and there was nothing an inspector could do about it, if the coal company refused to make any attempt to make the mine safe.

Amending Public Law 552, to strike from the act, section 201(b) thereof will give to the Federal Bureau of Mines the right to close down any mine in America where they find a dangerous condition to exist under the act. This gives to every coal miner the full protection of his Government regardless of whether he is employed in a title I or title II mine. That he is entitled to. His life is just as dear to him as is the life of any miner employed in a title II mine and I believe that every man who works underground is entitled to the full protection of everybody and everyone concerned with the mining of coal anywhere in the United States.

I come from a district where many coal miners once lived. I supported every mine safety bill ever presented to Congress since I have been a Member. I have been the sponsor of a mine safety bill at every opportunity and in the 89th Congress I introduced H.R. 3797.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily support committee bill 3584. I care not if a miner is working in the big mechanized mines of my home State of Pennsylvania, or in a hole in the ground in the hills of Pennsylvania and West Virginia or a dismal hollow in the States of Kentucky or Tennessee. He is entitled to a safe place to work be he a union man or a nonunion man. An employer who takes advantage of a workman's economic condition to force him to labor in an unsafe mine is not entitled to operate a mine. A live coal miner on public relief is better off than a coal miner risking life and limb every day for a substandard wage and living. No man has the right to exploit his fellow men regardless of his economic condition. Every miner should be protected from the selfish employer who takes advantage of a man's desire to provide a living for his loved ones.

I hope the 89th Congress passes this humanitarian measure by a large vote.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been before the Congress for a good many years. As far as I know, it has been pressed only by the United Mine Workers. Until now there has never been a rule to bring the bill to the floor. But there is an understanding that there will be certain amendments and there was considerable support to have the matter come before the House. So the bill was reported.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any coal mines in my district. But I was appealed to by people who came to my office from time to time when this bill was agitated who pointed out to me that they were operators of these small mines which up until today and historically have been exempt from the operation of the coal mines law if they employed not over 14 employees. They are what are known as drift mines. They are not subject to the same dangers that beset the deep shaft mines.

Mr. Speaker, I am told that under this legislation they would be put out of business. They just could not operate under this national Federal law if they took this exemption of 14 people away from these mines in operating with 3 or 4 people. They go there with a truck and dig some coal out of the ground and make a living by hauling that coal out and selling it at retail throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, it just does not seem right to put these people out of business when we are making so much noise about trying to keep employment at a high level.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN] has just recited, here we have passed a bill to spend billions of dollars in the Appalachian area where these mines are currently in operation. While we are doing that, if you pass this bill—and I was told by most of these people who came to see me it would put these mines out of business and the record will show at that time when we had a hearing before the Rules Committee, and there are probably more now—there were 35,000 people making a living and supporting their families in this depressed area out of the operation of these mines. Now, why should we put them out of business at this time when we are spending billions of dollars to put people to work in that Appalachian area? It just sounds silly to me and I hope that the Congress will not pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come when it is healthy to have a vote on this bill, but just remember that here are people who are living in an area where there is very little employment, where they are appealing to the Government to put business out there in order that they can obtain employment and earn a living for their families and, yet, we are proposing to pass a bill that is going to put 35,000 men out of a job. It just does not make sense to me.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that there was a time when I agreed basically with the statement just made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, because I originally opposed this bill and voted against it the first time that it appeared before the Committee on Rules during my service. However, it is my understanding that the committee has given this legislation a great deal of consideration and that there has been the acceptance of some amendments. It is my further understanding that there is agreement to accept a further modifying amendment which I feel would place the operators in a somewhat better position.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we might proceed to hear the committee discuss more fully this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3584) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3584, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is with much pride that I rise today in support of H.R. 3584. This bill was introduced by Representative JOHN DENT of Pennsylvania, an outstanding, effective member of my Subcommittee on Labor.

Our subcommittee conducted extensive hearings on this matter. We visited and entered coal mines in both Pennsylvania and Virginia. We considered testimony of expert witnesses representing the Federal and State Governments, coal operators, and coal workers. We discussed and marked up this bill during several executive sessions. Though primary credit for this bill must go to its sponsor, Congressman DENT, it can truly be called a committee bill.

The bill contains numerous amendments to the proposal that we originally introduced and I believe that every member of the subcommittee would concur in the opinion that it is today a better bill due to this process.

I would like to read into the RECORD at this point the concluding paragraph of the supplementary views of the minority signed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN], and the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL]. They state:

> It is our opinion that the committee bill, as amended by our proposals, represents a measure which is far better designed to achieve the primary goal of mine safety than the bill as originally introduced, and for that matter, superior in that respect to most of the measures introduced in previous years.

Shall I call it at least generous praise, which we appreciate.

Mr. Chairman, I believe each member of the subcommittee can be proud of his contribution to this bill and I am grateful to each of them. It is a good bill. It is a reasonable bill. It is an effective piece of legislation.

The purpose of the legislation is set forth in its title, coal mine safety. Our goal was to reduce casualties in coal mines to the maximum extent possible.

The bill could have been much more stringent, but the information before us was inadequate to strengthen the technical sections of the act. In section 6 of H.R. 3584 we have directed an intensive study of the mine safety provisions of section 209 of the act by the Department of the Interior. However, the importance of saving both life and limb, through the elimination of the hazards presently treated by section 209, for the duration of the study and legislative consideration of the results, made such lengthy postponement of action on this bill unwarranted.

Safety in coal mines can be achieved in many ways. Instruction in safety techniques and procedures is essential. Inspection, both as an aid to enforcement and education is vital. Enforcement powers are a proven aid to increased safety.

We have utilized each of these approaches in our attempt to reduce the unfortunate toll of human lives in coal mines. In the 5 years prior to passage of Public Law 552 there were 3,116 fatalities in all coal mines. In the most recent 5-year period there were 1,248 fatalities in all coal mines. This is a considerable reduction. But we firmly believe that a further reduction is possible through enactment of H.R. 3584. We should take this step without further costly delay.

The bill before the House would extend coverage of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to 7,000 additional mines. It would increase the authority of the Federal Bureau of Mines to abate potential disasters. It would require increased effort in the area of safety education, both through Federal and State programs. And, without delaying these achievements, it would require further intensive study of coal mine safety provisions so as to provide the opportunity for still further reduction of unnecessary casualties.

Though the bill would reduce casualties, it will accomplish this end with more equitable administrative and enforcement procedure than presently exists. The board of review will be increased to five members reflecting experience from all segments of the industry. Hearings must be held in the field upon request. Transcripts of hearings must be made available to the parties. Orders under sections 203 (c) and (d) can be annulled without appealing to the Director of the Bureau. And greater cooperation and coordination of Federal-State activities is directed.

We have had before our committee several alternative proposals presented by persons genuinely concerned with mine safety. We have adopted portions of these legislative proposals in the committee bill, H.R. 3584. We have rejected other portions for sound reasons.

The only real conflict arose with regard to nongassy drift mines employing fewer than 15 men underground. All critics of this legislation, in the final analysis, concluded that all other mines ought to be covered.

The committee weighed the arguments carefully. We concluded that nongassy drift mines were, with minor exception, subject to most of the same kind of disaster-type incidents as other mines, both large and small. The only real exception is that being drift mines, they are not subject to man-hoist disasters. The committee found that the risk of mine explosion, mine fire, mantrip, and inundation dangers militated against a special exemption for this class of mines. We concluded that all mines should be compelled to conform to the minimal safety requirements of the act. Of course, some of the provisions of section 209 will not be applicable to every mine. It is almost ridiculous to have to state the obvious fact, that where a particular provision has no application to a specific mine or condition, it will not be enforced. The language of section 209 of the act is quite specific. Where it states that a provision applies only to a gassy mine, it will be enforced only in a gassy mine. Where a provision applies to a man-hoist, it will be enforced only as to a man-hoist situation. Rock dusting will be required only where the specific conditions described in the statute exist. But where the unsafe conditions that the act seeks to abate are discovered, they must be eliminated in every type of mine for the sake of human life and limb.

Mr. Chairman, I firmly and unreservedly recommend that H.R. 3584 be supported by my colleagues and urge expeditious enactment of this bill into law.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Very briefly, if I may.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I want to compliment the gentleman and his committee for going down into the coal mines in Pennsylvania and in other States. But I would like to point out to the gentleman, you are just one generation too late. Your good mother, before they had all these safety devices and safety laws put into effect, was one of the first women that I can ever remember to go down into the mines and complain about the conditions. I come from a coal mining district in Pennsylvania and we still remember Eleanor Roosevelt and her work for the miners.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman very much. I might add that I used to have the hope some day of finding some place in America that I might visit where my mother had not been before me, but I have not yet been able to find one.

But where the unsafe conditions which the act seeks to abate are discovered, they must be eliminated in every type of mine, for the sake of human life and limb.

Let me say categorically, Mr. Chairman, the question of cost was very carefully examined by the committee. It was made very clear that minimal costs are here involved. It was stated to us very clearly that not more than $200 would be the usual amount of expenditure required and that in the most extreme cases it would not go above a figure of a couple of thousand dollars.

Mr. Chairman, when we are talking about human lives, does it not seem reasonable people should be willing to spend $200 or even up to $2,000 to do everything they can to save those human lives? I cannot believe that the Members of the House would hold up passage of a bill which would save human lives because of the minimal costs which are involved.

Mr. Chairman, on May 24, 1965, this year, an explosion occurred at the C. L.

Cline Coal Co. mine at Robbins, Scott County, Tenn. It is indicated that a dust explosion or a combination of that and some other causes resulted in the explosion. Five men were involved. The body of one had been recovered at the time I received my last report.

I wish to point out that the mine was inspected by the Federal Bureau of Mines and a report was made. I have in my hand and I will put into the Record the inspection report, which shows what could and should have been done to prevent those lives from having been lost.

But the mine inspector had no enforcement powers. He could do nothing about this.

Let me say that there is now going on a very careful investigation which will show that if certain procedures had taken place in all probability those lives would not have been lost.

In other words, let us make it very clear that all we are asking for, under the most careful procedures outlined, is a right for the Federal inspector to go in and, when he finds these dangerous conditions exist, to give him the power to see that they are actually taken into consideration by the mineowner and that the mineowner does something about it within a reasonable time, and that a further inspection will be mandatory in 90 days, so that these lives, in all probability, can be saved.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. BELL. Does the gentleman know whether the Federal mine inspector requested that the mine be closed or thought it advisable that the mine be closed?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The report indicates that all the inspector did, which is all he has the right under the law to do, was to make that information available to the mine operator..

Mr. BELL. Was the name of the gentleman who inspected the mine "Mr. Couk"?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Couk.

Mr. BELL. I talked to him, and he did not make a recommendation that the mine be closed.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Of course not. He has no right to do that.

Mr. BELL. All of them can make recommendations. He did not believe the mine was in a disastrous state or that it should be closed.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I say to the gentleman that that is a question now being decided by the investigation. The indications are to me that that is not the case.

I further state that when in previous years Federal mine inspectors have said that mines should be closed, it has been pointed out to them that they were exceeding their authority, that they have no right to make such statements, and therefore cannot and in practice do not. We want to give them that right and to give them the power of enforcement to go along with it.

Mr. BELL. I hate to belabor this point, Mr. Chairman, but the Federal coal mine inspector does have a right to recommend that a mine be closed.

Mining is a very dangerous and very hazardous business, at the least. These disasters do happen. It is terrible to think about, but they do.

I refer to one, for example, which the gentleman has not mentioned, which occurred April 23, 1963, in a title II mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BELL. If the gentleman will yield further, that is the one in which a title II mine was involved directly under the Federal Mine Safety Act. Twenty-two men were killed in the Clinchfield Coal Co. West Virginia mine. A gas explosion caused by an accumulation of gas when doors were left open in the mine, and a faulty coal-cutting machine igniting the gas. In this particular instance it was referred to time and again by the Federal Mine Inspector that this coal-cutting machine was faulty. Yet they did not do anything about it. They did not demand that the mine be closed before this exploded. I am merely pointing this out to show that mining is a very dangerous business. The fact that we put a mine safety law into effect is not necessarily at all going to prevent explosions and mine deaths nor reduce these various hazards.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Let me say to the gentleman I think he has, of course, proven our case. I will have to admit to the gentleman that we are not perfect and as a matter of fact no human being is perfect. If the mine inspector found that condition and reported it and then found it had not been corrected, the inspector involved is negligent in his duty in a title II mine, and something should have been done to him. I hope that the gentleman has taken the steps to see why something was not done to him and I will be happy to join with him in that. However, with respect to the title I mine, let us point out what the gentleman is saying is, it is true that perhaps they can technically make a request, but it is just like a policeman going up to a burglar and saying, "Now, fellow, don't do that." He has no ability nor authority to stop him. What do you think the situation would be like if that were the case?

If it is to mean anything, enforcement must go along with the ability to point out a very serious condition exists and a reasonable right to bring about abatement must then be given with the opportunity to correct it, if it is not corrected, then, of course, the mine could be closed down.

Mr. BELL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. To make these mines completely safe, all mines completely safe, we would have to have a Federal mine inspector every day in every mine throughout the United States, and you know that is impossible.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. What the gentleman is saying is that in order to prevent every crime in the United States, we have to hire innumerable numbers of policemen, which is not possible. Of course it is true, but it is a rather ridiculous argument, I think.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to my friend from Virginia.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman stated under the provisions of this bill title I and title II would be treated exactly the same. Then he brought up the case of the Tennessee mines. Under the bill which we are presently considering, would there have been anything in that bill or in this bill which would have caused that mine to be classified as a gassy mine? As I read the statute today, section 203, it says that you will make a test for methane by a permissible flame safety lamp or an air analysis showing an amount of 0.25 percent or more in any open working. In the last inspection which was made, February 5, 1965, it shows there was .0 methane in that mine itself.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The report stated that the mine is classed as nongassy.

Mr. JENNINGS. But there is nothing in this bill that would have caused that mine to be classified as a gassy mine under the provisions of that.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, but the inspection report shows this nongassy mine had things wrong in it and if they had been corrected then it might very well have prevented this accident.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman. I want to state to the gentleman from California that it was not the faulty mining machine by itself which caused the Clinchfield explosion, but it was the fact that two doors had been left open which, combined with the faulty machine, created the situation which caused the explosion. He could not close down the mine because of a faulty machine which, on its own, under proper conditions of ventilation, with the doors closed, would never have caused an explosion. An inspector cannot anticipate some miner is going to leave a door open when it is plainly marked to be closed at all periods of time during mining operations. He could not anticipate that happening at just the time when a machine gives off a spark.

To the gentleman from Virginia, I might state that if the mine inspector had the power that he will have under this bill, that mine operator down in Tennessee would have had to do the following things—and these were the recommendations made on February 5 in that mine that exploded. None of these on their own would have been sufficient reason to close the mine, but if the Federal inspector had had the power that this bill would now give him, within 30 days after the first finding of fault, he could have ordered the mine closed. But, having no power to order the mine closed, but only to recommend, he recommended as follows:

No. 1. The first violation was that the explosives were being fired with a nonpermissible blasting unit. Had he the power to recommend the explosives, he would have recommended a permissible blasting unit.

Second. Under article 5—and this is most important because it represents a cause for the entire disaster, because it has to do with the ventilation and mining gases—No. 1, the fan was in wooden housing. All fans must be kept in fireproof housing. He recommended that the fan was offset less than 15 feet. Under the mine rules the fan has to be offset at least 15 feet from the nearest side of the mine opening and he recommended that it should be 15 feet.

The air duct to the fan was made out of wood with all the leaks that come from wood. It was recommended that the air duct be made out of metal, fireproof construction as in the recommendation made on February 5.

Weekly air measurements were not taken and he recommended that they should be taken.

This is the final recommendation. The volume of air in the intake, return and the amount passing through the last open crosscut of working entries should be measured and corrected at least once a week.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, may I conclude by saying that this colloquy illustrates that things can be done. I say to my good friend from California that there was no guarantee that this would eliminate all accidents in any mine, but it would at least be a step forward, and make sure that we are taking an intelligent, constructive measure to do what we can to eliminate those areas where we know these dangers exist.

I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I arise to explain the purpose of H.R. 3584, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Amendments of 1965. It seeks to extend the legislation passed in July 1952—the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, Public Law 552. This law required compliance with specific safety standards, with penalties for failure to comply. At that time Congress exempted from coverage some 7,000 mines employing 14 men or less underground, commonly referred to as title I mines.

This is the present status of mine safety laws. We have an effective Federal Bureau of Mines. We have an effective inspection law. But the safety standards and enforcement provisions of the present Coal Mine Safety Act do not apply to the title I mines employing a total of approximately 35,000 miners, and authority to cope with violations of the act are not as effective as they might be. There is no incentive for the abatement of hazards before they are discovered in these mines. It is, furthermore, impossible to inspect often enough to take account of hazards. In order to cause the mine to comply with a reasonable standard of safety, there must be some authority in the inspector to bring about that compliance that is not forthcoming without the mandatory provisions of title II.

Last year the committee reported out a well-conceived mine safety bill which came to the floor on suspension of rules and received a majority, but not the necessary two-thirds vote. This year the committee reported out a similar bill, with amendments approved by both the majority and minority members. As a matter of fact, the supplemental report filed by the three members of the interested subcommittee states:

> It is our opinion that the committee bill, as amended by our proposals, represents a measure which is far better designed to achieve the primary goal of mine safety than the bill as originally introduced, and for that matter, superior in that respect to most measures introduced in previous years.

One can readily see that ample provision is made for the protection of the small title I operators and miners when reference is made to that section of the bill that provides that the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, now consisting of three members, be increased to five members, and the small, title I, operators and workers must each be represented as well as each of the large, title II, operators and workers. The chairman, making up the fifth member, must be a graduate engineer with experience in the coal mining industry, or shall have had at least 5 years experience as a practical mining engineer. Ample provision is made to assure his impartiality in dealing with mine safety problems. Any aggrieved party has the right to a judicial review from the decision of the board.

There is nothing in this bill that interferes with the enforcement of the mine safety provisions by those States that have such enactments. Furthermore, there is nothing that interferes with the present fine spirit of cooperation that exists between the Federal Bureau of Mines and the respective State mine safety enforcement officials.

Any opposition to this measure is based on unproved charges not basically relevant to the merits of the issue before us. Our support for this bill is based on the simple principle that human life is important no matter what the size of the mine; that those who enter such hazardous duty in this basic industry ought to be protected and experience has shown us that title I is not adequate; that costs cannot be too great when they are for human safety; that misfortune ought to be avoided when it is easily foreseeable.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], chairman of the subcommittee handling this matter.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I might add with reference to this particular mine, the one in Tennessee we are speaking of, that the jury is still out as to the real cause of the accident. They have not yet found it. They are still investigating it.

One of the points that has been brought out is that there is a gaseous condition. However, the inspector inspecting it, a few hours before, found no gas. There are many things in these mines that can cause problems and can cause disasters.

The State mining organization in most of the States in many cases is more effective than the Federal Government's organization. Title I mines have in fact, a better safety record than title II mines.

Mr. Chairman, I have opposed the extension of the Federal Coal Mining Safety Act to cover title I mines since it was advanced in the 88th Congress, 2 years ago. I do want to say parenthetically that I think that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN] understated the situation when he said that the bill has not been substantially improved. I think under the present changes the bill has been substantially improved and it is a much better bill than the one introduced a short time ago. I felt that it was unnecessary to remove the Federal exemption from title I mines. I said so then and for the same reasons I feel now that it is not necessary.

Mr. Chairman, as I have pointed out earlier, most of the States have good mine safety records for title I mines or at least as good mine safety records as the title II mines have.

Mr. Chairman, there are basically three reasons for retaining the exemptions.

First. Title I mines employing 14 or fewer men underground were never intended to be reached by this act.

Second. There is no indication that the safety record of title I mines would be improved by the removal of the exemption.

Third. There is strong evidence that an unqualified extension of the act to cover title I mines would only serve to increase the economic burden on an already marginally profitable industry.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that there are no coal mines in my district, as there are not in the district represented by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. Thus, I believe we can both look at this problem in an objective fashion and approach this legislation in this manner.

Mr. Chairman, extensive and thorough hearings were held on all aspects of mine safety and the various implications of the removal of the title I exception and, though, I would be the last to oppose an effective method of insuring mine safety, it has not been shown that the mere removal of the title I exemption would insure that result.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, first enacted in 1952, is geared to the prevention of major coal mine disasters in large mechanized mines with many workers. That purpose was clearly outlined in the 1952 House Education and Labor Committee report. It was recognized then that small mines worked by only a few men present an entirely unique safety problem. The majority of small mine accidents result from individual negligence on the part of the workers. This was pointed out by the committee in the 82d Congress and was the basis for the exemption of the so-called title I mines. It was felt then that only through State programs of education and training can the day-to-day negligence accidents be prevented.

And, Mr. Chairman, I would point out that statistics indicate a better safety record for title I mines under State regulations than federally controlled title II mines. With this in mind, I want to focus on a critical aspect of this proposal, aside from safety.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I shall yield to the gentleman after I have finished my statement.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Will the gentleman yield at this one point, because I would like to try to clear up the matter?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman for just one statement.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In the table submitted to the committee the figures do not agree with what the gentleman has just said.

In title I mines the total fatalities was 67 and the percentage rate was 1.73. Yet on the other hand in title II mines they were 142 and the percentage rate was 1.12.

Mr. BELL. May I ask the gentleman from California if those are figures from the Bureau?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. They certainly are. They are the only official figures of record.

Mr. BELL. I would like to point out right here to the gentleman from California—and I will yield no further—that the Bureau figures in testimony time and time again were questioned and questioned, and a considerable doubt was cast upon their accuracy. I would like to point this up and discuss this point at this particular time. However, it is necessary for me to point out that the Bureau has not been able to get accurate figures, or at least they have not been able to verify their accuracy. And in many cases their figures are not nearly as accurate as are the State agencies.

Mr. Chairman, title I mines form a vital economic resource in most of the poverty-stricken States of the Appalachian belt.

The economies of many small communities in that region are directly dependent upon numerous 5- and 6-man coal operations.

Testimony heard by the subcommittee indicated that a very real danger is posed for these operations in that, without specific qualifications, the blanket extension of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act may result in the closure of title I mines without reasonable cause.

The requirements of the act geared to large coal mines are administered by inspectors whose primary experience is in title II mines.

It is they who determine the existence of what is termed an "imminent danger" under the act.

Recognizing the great difference between the two classifications of mines it is easy to see that factors constituting an "imminent danger" in a title II mine would not warrant the same conclusion in a title I mine.

Unreasonably stringent and financially burdening requirements placed on the title I mines could easily jeopardize the slim margin of profit upon which most of them depend.

A few moments ago the gentleman from California stated there could be no more than $2,000 that would necessarily have been spent under the Coal Mine Safety Act to make a mine safe or to live up to the agreement set out in section 209 of the Coal Mine Safety Act. Actually, there is a requirement in there for an electric detonator which would cost, with the parts that go with it, to a small claim operator in the neighborhood of $15,000.

When this bill was first presented to the committee in this Congress it provided substantially nothing more than the repeal of the title I mine exemption.

The implications of such a dramatic policy change were obvious.

Some of us on the subcommittee urged additional hearings and subsequently effected several amendments which are now incorporated in the legislation.

Insuring representation of the title I mines in the administration of the act and encouraging continued State safety programs, these amendments to a great extent offset the objectionable results of the repeal of the title I mine exemption.

I believe that these changes, together with the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS] which I shall support, make the bill a palatable one. It is one I believe that both the small and large coal operators and miners, can live with.

I am in hopes, however, that in the Senate some further improvements can be made.

Differences between title I and title II mines—section 209 of the act changed to clarify those differences.

But under this bill the following improvements:

First. Five hundred thousand dollars was added for grants to States in support of programs of health and safety in coal mines.

Such programs, as I have stated, provide the best method of combating small-mine accidents.

Second. To secure representation of the title I mines at the Federal level, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review is reconstituted to include five members by section 3, subsection (c).

Thereby, title I mine operators, title I mineworkers, title II mine operators, and title II mineworkers will each be represented on the Board.

The fifth member who will also serve as the Chairman, will be appointed by the President and must be a graduate engineer with coal mine experience.

It was felt that a more equitable application of the act's requisites would result if the newly covered operations have a voice in the interpretation of those requisites.

Third. Provision is made in section 3 (a) for the notification of the State mine inspection agency whenever a violation of the act is determined by a Federal inspector.

At the request of the operator whose mine is allegedly in violation of the act, the State inspector will inspect the mine and report his findings to the Bureau of Mines.

The order of the Federal inspector will be immediately subject to review by the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

Again, insurance of equitable enforcement of the provisions of the act is sought through a kind of doublecheck and expeditious review procedure.

In addition, I will support an amendment from the floor by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS] who, with a firsthand knowledge of mining in his own district, has worked diligently to avoid the inherent dangers of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would close by emphasizing to those not closely aware of the implications of this legislation, that a vote against its passage is in no way a vote against mine safety.

And I would hope that a rational assessment of the bill is not lost in an emotional appeal in the name of safety.

The order of the Federal inspector would be immediately subject to review by the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

Again insurance of equitable enforcement of the provisions of the act is sought through a kind of doublecheck and expeditious review procedure.

In addition I will support the amendment from the floor, as I said earlier, of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS] who has a firsthand knowledge of mining in his own district and has worked diligently to avoid the inherent dangers in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I will close by emphasizing to those not closely aware of the implications of this legislation that a vote against its passage is in no way a vote against mine safety and I would hope a rational assessment of the bill is not lost in an emotional appeal in the name of safety.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I appreciate the gentleman's saying that he now believes the bill is palatable and both large and small mines can live with the bill because that is my own view. The gentleman spoke about an electric detonator and said that that is demanded under the bill. I would like the gentleman to point out to me where in this bill there is any such language whatsoever.

Mr. BELL. Section 209 of the code.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Of the code? But the gentleman specifically cited the statute.

Mr. BELL. Not the code—I mispoke, section 209 of the Mine Safety Act, I believe. It is in there that an electric detonator must be provided.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well, the gentleman then knows that that applies only in gassy mines and only therefore where it was absolutely necessary. The gentleman from Virginia has already pointed out that most of these mines are not gassy and, therefore, it applies to practically none of the mines now under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, in order to set the record straight, I first want to get on the side of those who are for safety and say that I introduced a bill several years ago that would do practically the same as is being done today, with the exception of the little drift mines. The bill I introduced, and the bill that I agreed to accept, would have extended the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to all slope mines, all shaft mines, and all mines that are gassy, regardless of the number of men they employed. Yet, that was not accepted.

The history of this bill goes back over several years. First, when originally passed it was demonstrated that there is a difference between the two types of mines, title I and title II mines. That difference was set at a figure of 15 men—any mine employing less than 15 men was designated as a title I mine. Those that employed more, were designated as a title II mine. It was recognized and realized that there were differences between these two mines, differences in the manner in which they mined the coal, the type of the seam, and the general conditions under which they mined.

Now, it has also been demonstrated that these title I mines have a much better safety record than we have in title II mines.

Something was said here about the incident rate. It would be very difficult for anybody to tell you the incident rate in any of these mines because of the conflicts in reporting. Time and time again the reporting both by the United Mine Workers, by the Bureau of Mines, by the State mine agencies, and the individual owners of title I and title II mines have shown different figures in the amount of coal that was mined in these mines. They have used different figures for different purposes. If you go to the pension and welfare fund, you will find one set of figures as to the number of tons of coal that have been mined in title I and title II mines. If you come to the incident and the exposure rate, you will find an entirely different set of figures. But, I think the sum total of these figures point out the fact that we do need a better reporting system on the amount of coal produced, the number of workers, and the amount of exposure in both mines, title I and title II mines.

It has also been demonstrated that the major fatalities and major accidents that we have take place within 25 feet of the face of the mine. No inspector can stop that. An inspector would have to be there at all times, one inspector with each crew of men, calling attention to the fact that this was a dangerous situation. The truth of the matter is that you cannot take the human element out of these exposures and out of these accidents. That is what causes the largest single group of accidents—the human element.

Now, this conflict in reporting of statistics has brought rise to the speculation that a group of "sweetheart" contracts have been entered into between various companies and the various worker representatives. I do not know whether that is true, but it points up the fact that there is a great difference in the reporting as to the amount of coal produced.

The bill has been improved a great deal. It has consistently been my intention, all during consideration of the bill, for the past 5 or 6 years, to try to make a bad bill better. It has been my intention to try to make the bill better, rather than to leave it in such a form that no one would want to claim title to it, and no one would be satisfied after passage.

As a result of this, I want to pay tribute to the subcommittee. First, I pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ROOSEVELT] who took the subcommittee down into the mines and saw firsthand the differences between title I and title II operations. He made explorations into these various mines. I happened to be with the gentleman at the time he went into one mine which had about a 28-inch seam. As he said, for a man 6 feet 4 inches tall, it was a little difficult to negotiate in that area.

The subcommittee did go down into the mines. They listened to representatives of all segments of the coal economy in my district. I thank them.

In addition to that I pay tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], who has on occasion acted as chairman of the subcommittee. It is his bill we were considering. After passing a bill out of the subcommittee, which I thought was particularly objectionable, he did agree to open it up for amendments, and some amendments which I suggested were accepted.

In addition, I have since talked with the chairman of the subcommittee and other members, and they have agreed to accept other clarifying amendments, which I believe will make the bill much better than even its present form.

In all my deliberations and discussions, however, I have consistently reserved the right to vote against the bill even though it has been improved over the original form.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. JENNINGS. I thank the gentleman.

I should like to discuss the two amendments briefly.

First, it has been said that these amendments were designed to "gut" the bill. Nothing could be further from the truth. I mean that sincerely, because they will not jeopardize the bill one bit.

This is actually one amendment, in two sections.

First, the bill provides there will be a stay of 6 months before certain provisions go into effect. During that 6 months' period, we would direct the Secretary of the Interior to call together all of the people who are going to be concerned with the bill—the mine safety experts from the Department of the Interior, the representatives of the appropriate State mine inspection or safety agencies, owners and operators of all classes and categories of mines including title I and title II mines, individuals or representatives of individuals employed in all classes and categories of coal mines, and such other experts as the Secretary deems advisable.

This will be a conference for the sole purpose of sitting around the table and discussing the differences between the types of mines and coming up with a consensus. This would be an endeavor to educate the people as to what is going to take place when the act goes into effect.

The second part of the amendment would merely provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall, upon enactment, immediately provide the operator of each mine subject to the amended Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, with a copy of the form used in coal mine inspections by agents of the Bureau of Mines, clearly indicating the enforcible provisions of the act.

This is very reasonable indeed. In the first place, it will add to safety. If a person takes his automobile down to an inspection station today, he knows the things they are going to inspect for safety. He knows that the brakes, the windshield wiper, the lights, and various other mechanical features of the automobile must be in perfect condition. As a result, he tries to keep those things in good condition.

This provision would merely give these people the type of inspection form that will be used when the mine is inspected. It would help them to keep the mine in a presentable and safe condition, so that when the Federal inspector and the State inspector came to inspect the mine, they would know what was to be expected of them.

In that connection, a great deal has been said about the differences between the Coal Mine Safety Act and the code itself. This is one of the areas which has caused a great deal of confusion.

Where a negotiated contract is in effect between the United Mine Workers or other representatives of labor, with the operators, they have what is known as the code. This goes beyond the Mine Safety Act itself. I see no disadvantage in that. If it promotes safety, I am for it. But, many of these sections of the code are not applicable to the title I mines. As a result they are not used for the inspection. In the Tennessee mine just referred to, page 1 of the report deals with the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, but part 2, dealing with violations and recommendations pertains to the Federal Mine Safety Code. In this amendment, we can let these little people know that they are going to be inspected for the act. And they will know that they are not going to be inspected for the code.

An important amendment that was accepted after the bill was reported out of the subcommittee was the recommendation that a $500,000 fund be included for the purpose of education. This will permit the Secretary of the Interior to go to these various States for an improved education program with the State agencies. This will reach the miners themselves and should help get some additional safety into these mines.

Let me say I do definitely think this is a much better bill than the one originally reported out. I think there is plenty of room for additional improvement. I hope that the other body can take this bill and improve on it, which will enhance safety. Especially, I hope they will address themselves to the point where they will spell out and show the differences between title I and title II mines and recognize that there is different responsibility in the case of each.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS] for his knowledge of the mining business and his ability to speak on this particular issue. I also would like to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt], for his excellent work in investigating the mines. Despite his 6 feet 4, I saw him go down in the mines in West Virginia and Virginia. I would like also to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] for his fine efforts and for his ability to work out some compromise on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation and I hope it will be approved by the House this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for logic to prevail in our application of Federal mine safety laws. Is it legal and proper, or is it fair to permit small-mine operators by design, inaction, carelessness, or for any other reason to kill and cripple men merely because they work in mines employing less than 14 men? By what stretch of the imagination can we say that it is illegal to kill or maim men in mines employing more than 14 men by passing laws to protect them and, yet, at the same time legalize killing and maiming men in small mines by denying them the same protection accorded to their more fortunate fellow miners employed in the so-called large mines?

Large disasters, killing 100 and more miners were responsible for the enactment of Public Law 552. Before the passage of the Federal mine safety bill in 1952 when Federal inspectors were given the right to close any mine where a dangerous condition existed, the coal industry killed as many as 1,500 men per year while injuries amounted to as many as 50,000 per year. Since passage of the act, deaths have fallen to a low of 240 in 1964 and there were 11,285 injuries. This is still too many but it is a far cry from the old haphazard inspections of the years prior to 1952.

Adoption of section 201(b) exempting mines employing less than 14 men was accepted reluctantly in the interest of getting a bill passed which provided Federal authority to close any mine found in a dangerous condition. It was understood at that time that those interested in saving the lives of coal miners would immediately begin to work to eliminate this obvious inequity.

At the time these small mines received this exemption the total underground tonnage they produced was perhaps insignificant but as a result of many factors these small mines now account for some 15 percent of the underground tonnage and accompanying the increased production is a disproportionate rate of fatalities amounting to approximately 30 percent of all underground deaths.

The small mines do not kill in a spectacular way and in overwhelming numbers, but the miner who dies in an accident involving only 2 workers is just as dead as one involved in a "Centralia" where 111 men died. The U.S. Bureau of Mines during its inspection of these small mines, reported time after time serious violations of safe mining practices but because of the statutory exemption the Bureau was helpless to enact compliance.

There is a continuing need for Federal legislation. Public Law 552 should be broadened and strengthened to provide protection for all coal miners from the day-to-day accidents which over the years have killed hundreds of thousands of miners.

Mine safety was not voluntarily enacted for the coal industry. It has been a savage fight, step by step, with the majority of the industry opposing every attempt to bring about safer conditions for those who toil below the earth's surface. Only in 1952 when a substantial portion of the coal industry joined the Bureau of Mines and the United Mine Workers in the fight for Federal inspection with regulatory powers was progress made in this vital field.

State inspection has improved remarkably since the passage of the Federal mine safety bill. This is due entirely to the checks and balances provided by Public Law 552. The possibility of Federal inspectors examining any mine has kept State inspectors on their toes. In some States they have been more cooperative and more efficient since Federal inspection has been available. Instead of duplication of effort which was preached by the opponents of Federal inspection service, we find a degree of mutual understanding and cooperation.

The adoption of section 201(b) exempting mines employing less than 14 men was a weird piece of legislative juggling. It was opposed by the United Mine Workers of America and the U.S. Bureau of Mines from the beginning and accepted reluctantly in the interest of getting a bill passed which provided Federal power to close any mine found in a dangerous condition. It was understood at that time that there would be an appeal to Congress to amend this Safety Act and strike from the law section 201(b) which is so obviously unfair and unjustifiable.

The Bureau of Mines' records reveal that 38 percent of the title II mines employ from 15 to 24 men underground and that 58 percent of the title II mines employ 15 to 49 men. These mines certainly cannot be considered large mines but these operators must comply with the provisions of the act which govern title II mines. In other words it is unreasonable to draw a line of demarcation between large and small mines by determining that men working in mines employing 14 men are to be exempt under the provisions of the act while men working in mines employing 15 men are to be fully protected.

It is our contention that any company regardless of size which hires men to work in a coal mine owes it to these workers and the public to keep its mine in as safe a condition as possible. Irrespective of size they should be required by Federal law to adhere to every modern safety practice that governs mines which employ 15 or more men.

We maintain that there is nothing in the Federal Mine Safety Act which would add prohibitive costs to maintain a small mine in a safe condition. The Federal mine safety law in most instances parallels the mining laws of the large coal-producing States. We deny the assertion that enforcement of the mine safety law would render it prohibitive to operate a small mine manned by 14 or less workers. Among the signatories to collective bargaining agreement are many such small mines which abide by the Federal Mine Safety Act. They are not plagued with unjustifiable costs.

Statistics show that during 1961 mines employing 14 or less men underground produced only 12 percent of the underground tonnage and yet were charged with 34 percent of the underground fatalities.

I recall only a few years ago when nine men died in an underground coal mine blast near Robbins, Tenn. In all probability those men would be alive today if the bill this House is now considering had been passed by the 85th Congress.

This was a truck mine—a family enterprise which normally employed 8 or 10 persons and produced 50 to 60 tons of coal daily. According to newspaper accounts, gas apparently collected in a pocket over the weekend when the mine's ventilating system was off. When the miners returned to work on Monday morning, a spark from an electric motor or an open-flame lamp ignited the gas. There were no survivors.

Just last week, on May 24 to be exact, another title I mine at Robbins, Tenn., blew up and five men were killed. All evidence points toward a gas and coal dust explosion of tremendous violence. Five coal miners leave 35 dependents. One miner, Laurence Griffiths, leaves a wife and 16 children, another Arthur Norris had a wife and 10 children while Russell Webb leaves a wife and 7 children. This mine employed nine men and was exempted from Federal inspection.

Mr. Chairman, it is reasonable to believe that these tragedies at Robbins, Tenn., might have been averted had these small title I mines not been exempt under section 201(b) from mandatory compliance with the Mine Safety Act. As I previously indicated section 201(b) provides that title II of the act shall not apply to any mines in which no more than 14 individuals are regularly employed underground. It is section 201(b) which I am today asking you to delete.

The purpose of the Coal Mine Safety Act was to save lives and the purpose of H.R. 3584 is to save even more lives. Some small-mine owners complain of the additional expense involved in applying title II standards to their mines; perhaps their propensity toward greater profits could be served by the endangering of human lives but this is hardly enlightened 20th-century reasoning.

In an age where much of the world is dominated by leaders who would sacrifice human freedoms, liberties, and even human life as a means to an end, there must be maintained a sanctuary where the dignity of human life is held in such high esteem that no price may be placed upon it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and the author of this bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for having done a splendid job. Long ago, out in Montana, I had quite a little experience in writing coal mine safety acts and other mining safety laws in order to promote safety in the many places where mining is practiced in the State of Montana. Always the great objection we received at the State level to this was that if we required high standards of safety under the State law, we were putting the producers and mine operators in Montana to a great disadvantage economically. They claimed they would be required to have greater expense in meeting stricter safety requirements than other places in the country. This kind of effort on the part of the Congress to pass the coal mine safety law, which is uniform for the 50 States, eliminates that objection.

I recollect just in passing and it was quite a long time ago that the now president of the United Mine Workers was then representing the United Mine Workers in our district in Montana. Tony Boyle played a very great and important part in writing what I think has been for many years a model coal mine safety bill. He also helped us write other labor safety laws in Montana.

I am glad to see that now at the national level we are making another step in the right direction and are getting the kind of regulation that we passed in Montana quite some time ago. I hope no longer will the mine owners of Montana be able to say that they will be at an economic disadvantage abiding by our State coal mine safety acts. We are going to have a uniform law at the national level so that all 50 States will have safety standards at reasonably the same level.

I support this bill and would support a higher standard. We should always promote a higher standard of safety and protecting life and limb so that these courageous people who go down into the earth to produce our coal and other products will be better protected.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I want first to point out to the committee that starting with the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], the committee will only now be presenting people who represent coal mining districts. I do not represent a coal mining district. I also want to make very clear that this bill is not the same as the metallic mine safety bill. The bill under consideration deals only with coal. Several Members asked me whether there was a distinction. There is a distinction. There is a bill under consideration that deals with safety in metallic mines. That is not this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking today in full support of H.R. 3584, the Federal mine safety bill. I have always supported Federal legislation on mine safety. I have introduced many mine safety bills since I have been a Member of Congress and shall continue to introduce them and support them until working in a coal mine has been made as safe as humanly possible.

This year I introduced H.R. 1716, which makes no changes in the law except the repeal of section 201(b), the section that allows the exemption of coal mines employing no more than 14 individuals underground. I wish that it could have been adopted by the committee and passed by this House without amendment. However, I am unhappy with the amendment outlined by the gentleman from Virginia. I am however, happy to support H.R. 3584 and think that it takes a long step in the direction of making a coal mine a safer place in which to work. I hope a good bill can be worked out in conference with the other body.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in mine safety legislation. If I had my way, I would make every coal operator in America, large or small, responsible for the lives of every man in their employ. I feel that no man or company has the right to put another human being to work underground unless willing to surround him with every bit of safety equipment, compliance with every law on the State or Federal books and under the control of competent mine foremen and supervisors.

I know that the competition in the coal industry is savage and without compassion. Every conceivable means of reducing costs is practiced, and the first place where the cost of mining is cut is in safety practices. It costs money to keep a mine free from coal dust, so it is easy to allow the coal dust to accumulate on the ribs and roadways and hope that nothing happens to set it off. It is expensive to spread rock dust in a dry, dusty coal mine, so no rock dust is purchased. Yet it is well known among mining men that rock dust will stop an explosion in its inception.

Keeping machinery operational is costly, too. It requires that electric machines be kept in a first-class condition so that a spark from an exposed wire will not set off a gas explosion. So you let the equipment run down through hasty repairs and unsafe production methods and hope gas will not accumulate in your mine.

Opponents of all efforts to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act are unanimous in declaring the cost of complying with the Mine Safety Act and the mine safety code in effect between the signatories to the contract between coal operators and the United Mine Workers of America; and that the cost of complying with the law and the code would put them out of business.

We in Congress have heard such statements time and again. In fact, we hear them every time legislation is proposed to raise the minimum wage, to extend coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act, to increase retirement benefits and provide medical and hospitalization services under the social security program, or to improve the unemployment insurance program.

Every time a bill to do any of these things comes before Congress, the same groups appear and make the same statements. Yet each time they seem more prosperous and in a sounder financial position than they were upon the occasion of their previous visits.

If the bill now under consideration is passed—and I sincerely hope that it will pass—I predict that not a single small coal mine will close down that would not, in any event, have ceased operating.

Mr. Speaker, again, I most earnestly urge this body to pass this bill without amendments in order that this Congress may not have on its conscience the death of a single coal miner because of our failure to repeal section 201(b) of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to our very beloved colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, let us make no mistake about this. I was born and raised in the hard-coal fields of Pennsylvania; and my father and my grandfather and his father worked in them, and so did I. I know a mine safety bill when I see one.

I do not know what the situation is on the golf courses in Pebble Beach in California or some other parts of the United States. But I know what mine safety is in Pennsylvania, and make no mistake about that.

As far as the soft-coal boys are concerned I have collie dogs in my district whose hindlegs scratch deeper holes than they have in many places in the soft-coal regions, in case anybody wants to know. These dogholes are no problems of mine. I do not have these dogholes. I do not think half the members of the subcommittee know what a doghole is or would know one if they saw one. Well, I do; and I think my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] does—and I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] does.

Now we have these amendments that have come up from my beloved and distinguished friend from Virginia. I remember an old expression in our family, "God protect me from my friends sometimes," if you know what I mean.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you a little story that is related by our beloved and distinguished friend from South Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RIVERS]. He tells a story about a place down in his district where he goes fishing all the time.

He goes out in this boat and he takes his old colored friend along with him who has been in the family for many years. As MENDEL catches the fish, he throws them in the bottom of the boat and this colored boy sits there with his knife in the stern sheets and he cleans the fish and puts them on a line and throws them over the side to keep freshened. On this particular day the colored boy was having trouble with one of these fish and he got it between his knees and got the knife and he says to this fish, "What is the matter with you, little fish? Why don't you lie still? All I am going to do is gut you."

Mr. Chairman, what is the matter with that? Well, I never thought I would live to see the day when we would send a bill to the other body in the hope that it would write what this body should write.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this bill as amended because there is nothing else I can do. But I do not intend to compliment anyone about it and I do not intend to pass out accolades about anyone at all. I can still read English. I was born and reared in the coalfields, as I told you. I thought even miners were entitled to equal rights under the law. I have heard a lot about civil rights around here. Apparently it does not include miners who work in many of these faulty operations, in mines employing under 14 where the operators run the mine and make an especial effort to keep it under 14 and not 15 in order to stay away from Federal protection. If you knew about this as I do then you would have a different concept of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing else I can do. I am over a barrel.

Let us pray that in the other body that for once in years we will have a proper bill of this kind for these dogholes and give equal protection to every coal mine no matter where he works, for the U.S. Government must have the right to close down any mine in the United States where a dangerous condition remains uncorrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I would be glad to yield to the author of this bill, the gentleman who has forgotten more about this subject than I will ever know, despite the length of time I have lived in the coalfields, even though he is from the soft-coal area. And, by the way, that is not coal. That is bitumite. There is only one coal, anthracite. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. DENT. If the gentleman will yield, in Pennsylvania they say the coal, like the head, has to be hard. The gentleman comes from that region. Up there you have the hard coal and sometimes hard heads but they do have soft hearts. Therefore, I am depending upon that.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. DENT. I am depending upon that part of the gentleman's nature to correct at least the impression which I got that he does not believe the bill as it is now written, before the amendment is adopted, is a good bill.

Mr. FLOOD. No, no, no; I did not mean to imply that. Certainly, I hasten to embrace this new bill. I am a cosponsor of the bill to amend the Mine Safety Act. I have co-sponsored this legislation since the 85th Congress and my bill is the same as that of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3584.

Mr. Chairman, I consider it a privilege to speak in support of H.R. 3584. My interest in coal mine safety legislation goes back a good many years. It even precedes my career in politics. My experience with the coal mining industry is long and intimate and this proposal, before you today, reflects my deep and genuine interest in the well-being of the industry and those engaged in it.

H.R. 3584 has as its primary and paramount purpose the reduction of casualties in all coal mines. Quite naturally we have sought to achieve this purpose with the minimum burden upon the coal mining industry. Additionally, taking into account the existence of varied State efforts in this field, we sought to augment, rather than duplicate, State activities.

H.R. 3584 seeks to reduce casualties in coal mines in five ways.

First. The bill would increase the authority of the Bureau of Mines to close mines that are unsafe. We do this by allowing a closing order to be issued when an operator, through an unwarrantable failure to comply with safety provisions of the act, allows the continuation of a violation of section 209 which could significantly and substantially contribute to a disaster-type incident.

Second. The bill would repeal the exemption for mines regularly employing fewer than 15 individuals underground. The Federal Coal Mine Safety Act would apply equally to any coal mine the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce.

Third. The bill authorizes and directs cooperation between the Federal Bureau of Mines and the appropriate State agencies.

Fourth. The bill provides for the enlargement and intensification of the Federal Bureau of Mines safety educational programs.

Fifth. The bill authorizes an appropriation for grants to States to implement State safety education programs in the amount of $500,000.

The proposal before you contains little that is new. With the exception of certain procedural safeguards to inhibit overzealous enforcement and to encourage the fairest administration, the general language of the bill has been before the Congress for several years. I have personally urged its passage during my entire tenure in Congress. I believe it to be sound legislation, in the public interest, and long overdue.

The increased authority to close unsafe mines was initially proposed by the Task Force on Coal Mine Safety, U.S. Department of the Interior, August 1963. This was after two major disasters had taken 59 lives. We went over the proposal of the task force meticulously and after some deliberation adopted the present language of section 3 of H.R. 3584. We are hopeful that this new procedure will reverse the recent increases in disaster-type incidents in all coal mines.

The proposal to extend coverage of the enforceable provisions of the Safety Act to all mines equally has been advocated for over 10 years. It just does not make sense to perpetuate the artificial line of demarcation established by Public Law 552. The lives of miners engaged in small operations are as precious as those engaged in the huge mechanized mines. The disaster-type incidents that occur are similar, though they are less publicized because they take fewer lives at one time. And, contrary to arguments that you may have heard, this will not impose a financial burden upon the small coal mining industry. The fears have been grossly exaggerated by propagandists and, like Hitler's big lie, are assumed to be true. They are not. The report of the committee points out the negligible costs of complying with the Coal Mine Safety Act for the overwhelming majority of small mines. But I ask, and I cannot answer my own question, How much is a human life worth? All I can say is that, if enacted, this proposal will save miners lives.

Before concluding, I would like to point out that this bill was reported from the committee without dissent. There are no minority views in the report and, in fact, the supplemental views that were filed stated:

> It became evident that a compromise between Mr. Dent's bill and the proposals offered by Mr. Jennings, of Virginia, and Mr. Bell are necessary in order to achieve sound and equitable legislation in this complex area. The bill reported by the committee takes cognizance of these differences and incorporates some of the important changes proposed by Mr. Jennings and Mr. Bell. It is our opinion that the committee bill, as amended by our proposals, represents a measure which is far better designed to achieve the primary goal of mine safety than the bill as originally introduced, and for that matter, superior in that respect to most of the measures introduced in previous years.

I urge the Congress to give early and favorable consideration to this legislation.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent], the distinguished author of the bill, to conclude the debate.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the honor and the opportunity that has come to me today. The chance to stand on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to speak on behalf of the safety of our Nation's coal miners is just that, an honor and an opportunity.

For over 10 years we have considered proposals to improve the Federal Mine Safety Act. Last year a majority of the Members of the House voted in favor of a bill almost identical to the present bill. However, the bill was before the House under a suspension of the rules and a two-thirds vote was necessary. The bill failed of passage.

This year the bill was reported out of committee without a negative vote. True, there were some compromises which allowed for this unanimity, but to those interested in the maximum of safety for those who mine coal, let me assure you, we have a good bill. The compromises, indeed, added to the attractiveness of the proposal by providing for fairer enforcement of the law and a more equitable administrative procedure. The measure was further improved by providing for Federal grants to the States to enlarge the State safety educational program, a suggestion that found unanimous and enthusiastic support.

I am proud, Mr. Chairman, that the committee was able to report out a bill that was at once effective and fair, a bill that has wide bipartisan support and minimal opposition, a reasonable bill that the Congress can justifiably take great pride in passing.

The bill has as its primary and paramount goal the reduction of casualties in all coal mines to the maximum extent feasible through legislation. From my many years of experience in the coal mining industry, I can assure the House that we attain this goal with the minimum possible burden upon those in the coal-mining industry.

Coal mining is inherently dangerous. Absolute safety could only be achieved by closing all mines in the country. But such a proposal would be as unthinkable as outlawing automobiles. Between this outlandish suggestion and no legislation at all, there exists a great scope of possibilities. Education alone was suggested by some. Education plus safety enforcement in a mine, only after it had realized a disaster, was suggested by others. And the Bureau of Mines originally proposed a severe bill that would have granted great discretionary authority to its inspectors to close mines. The committee considered these and other proposals and weighed the problem with the degree of gravity that it deserved. The safety of the men in the mines, the security of their employment, and the economic well-being of the industry were thoroughly considered and the results of this labor are before you in this bill.

Incidentally, I am gratified to report to the House, that it was the uniform conclusion of all who testified before the committee, that the very consideration of these proposals has resulted in a major enlargement and improvement of the State mine safety programs. If lives were saved as a result of such improvements we can be thankful.

Speaking of State mine safety programs, let me inform my colleagues that we gave this aspect of the problem the most thorough examination. We have made every conceivable effort to augment, rather than duplicate State activities in this field. The more inspection, the more enforcement, the more education, the greater the safety we secure. But we do not merely wish to duplicate State activity. The bill takes this into consideration and provides for the maximum cooperation and coordination of Federal and State agencies. In no way do we interfere with State programs. But when mine disasters occur with the sickening frequency that they do, we cannot simply rely upon the States solely to establish and enforce safety standards. We must supplement their programs. That is what we do here.

H.R. 3584 seeks to reduce casualties in coal mines in five ways.

First. The bill would increase the authority of the Bureau of Mines to close unsafe, inordinately hazardous mines. We do this by allowing a closing order to be issued when an operator, through an unwarrantable failure to comply with the safety provisions of the act, allows the continuation of a violation of section 209 which could significantly and substantially contribute to a disaster-type incident.

Second. The bill would repeal the present exemption for mines regularly employing fewer than 15 individuals underground. The Federal Coal Mine Safety Act would apply equally to any coal mine the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce. This would extend coverage to approximately 7,000 mines and 35,000 miners.

Third. The bill authorizes and directs cooperation between the Federal Bureau of Mines and the appropriate State agencies.

Fourth. The bill provides for the enlargement and intensification of the Federal Bureau of Mines safety educational programs.

Fifth. The bill authorizes an appropriation for grants to States to implement State safety education programs in the amount of $500,000.

A brief analysis of H.R. 3584 will help to understand more completely what it is that we are seeking to accomplish.

Section 2(a) repeals subsection 201(b) of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, thereby making the title applicable to all coal mines the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect interstate commerce.

Section 2(b) provides a 6-month period of grace for newly covered mines before the withdrawal order authority of section 3 becomes operative.

Section (c) permits continued use of black powder where expressly permitted by State statute, for 6 months in newly covered mines.

Section 3(a) amends section 203 of the act to provide that where an inspector finds that a violation of the safety requirements of section 209 not involving immediate danger "is of such a nature as could significantly and substantially contribute to the cause or effect of a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, man-trip or man-hoist accident—commonly referred to as disaster-type incidents—and such violation to be caused by an unwarrantable failure of such operator to comply with the provisions of section 209," the inspector shall include these findings in the notice which is served upon the operator which fixes a reasonable time for the abatement of such violation. Thereafter, the Bureau would be required to reinspect the mine within 90 days of the notice—in addition to any inspection required to determine whether the particular violation has been abated within the reasonable time fixed—to ascertain whether a similar violation exists. If upon the mandatory reinspection or a special investigation a similar violation is found which has been caused by the unwarrantable failure of an operator to comply with the provisions of section 209, a withdrawal order shall be issued. The discovery of similar violations upon succeeding inspections would require the issuance of a withdrawal order until an inspection occurred in which no similar violations were discovered.

Section (c) reconstitutes Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review to consist of five, instead of three, members. The term of office is extended from 3 to 5 years. The members are, respectively, to be a person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of operators of coal mines employing 14 or fewer employees underground, a person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of coal mine workers in mines employing 14 or fewer employees underground, a person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of operators of coal mines employing 15 or more employees underground, a person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of coal mine workers in mines employing 15 or more employees underground, and a neutral expert to serve as Chairman. The Board is required, upon request by an operator, to hold proceedings at the county seat of the county in which the mine is located or at any place mutually acceptable.

Section (d) requires three members to constitute a quorum, except that in any official action the members representing the viewpoints of the size of mine involved shall participate. A special panel may be assigned by the Board to conduct a hearing and submit the transcript thereof to the Board for action.

The parties shall be granted an opportunity to appear before the Board prior to any final action and may be granted an opportunity to produce additional evidence. Hearings and records shall be open to the public.

Section 5 seeks to promote more substantial coordination of Federal and State activities regarding coal mine safety, to eliminate duplication of effort and expense, and to secure effective enforcement of Federal coal mine safety provisions, by requiring the Director of the Bureau of Mines to affirmatively and diligently seek to cooperate with the appropriate agencies of the several States.

Section 5 requires the Secretary of the Interior to enlarge and intensify the safety educational programs of the Bureau of Mines and to seek the cooperation and assistance of the appropriate State agencies to the fullest extent practicable in the planning and implementation of such programs.

Five hundred thousand dollars is authorized to be appropriated for grants to the States for carrying out State coal mine health and safety programs.

Section 6 requires that the Secretary of the Interior conduct a special 1-year study into the sufficiency of existing Federal coal mine safety standards. A report to the Congress on the results of such study shall be submitted within 1 year after enactment of this bill.

As is seen from this analysis, the intent of the bill is to reduce casualties to a greater degree than is possible under existing legislation. The bill is not aimed at any particular group of coal mines. The safety record, quite frankly, is not immune from criticism in any class of coal mines. This amendment would strengthen the entire act. It would improve the safety record of all mines covered by the act.

But though this bill has six sections, all aimed at improved mine safety, one section above all others has received considerable attention. This is section 2 of H.R. 3584, which would repeal the exemption for coal mines regularly employing fewer than 15 individuals underground. This would extend the coverage of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to the so-called small or title I coal mines. The mandatory safety provisions would apply to all coal mines the products of which regularly enter interstate commerce or the operations of which substantially affect interstate commerce.

Perhaps the reason that section 2 has received such considerable attention is because a Park Avenue public relations firm has been hired by a coal operator's association to attack it. The level to which some people will stoop has been amply demonstrated by the false accusations and the malicious insinuations of intrigue, conspiracy, and plotting to get the small operators. The record, which is available to all, refutes all such charges. The accusers themselves, under questioning, back down on their charges. The bill and the committee report demonstrate beyond doubt that the goal is simple and straightforward. We want to improve the survival chances of coal miners employed in a hazardous, but not entirely uncontrollable occupation.

In July 1952, the Congress passed the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. A line of demarcation was established whereby mines employing 15 or more individuals were covered by the mandatory provisions of the Coal Safety Act and those employing fewer men were exempted.

The intent of such exemption is not clear from the legislative history. Some indicate that it was due to a necessary compromise to assure protection at least to most of the industry. Others indicate that it was due to a showing that the mines were inherently different in nature. I do not presume to know the reason, but for the record, I want to emphasize that though there are some differences in types of mines, these differences do not arise as a result of the number of men employed in them. The truth of the matter is that many of the so-called small mines are abandoned large mines, that is, fewer than 15 employees are working old, nearly worked-out mines. The hazards here are almost the same as in a large mine employing dozens of men. In fact, there are many mines employing between 15 and 50 miners which are smaller in size than the so-called title I mines.

The industry has seen many changes in recent years. One of these changes, which unfortunately results, in part, as a consequence of the exemption in the Federal act, has been the breaking up of title II mines into a number of smaller mines employing fewer than 15 miners. Frequently these are mines leased out by operators who formerly ran large operations. They find this lease method of mining to be more economical and profitable. I suggest that this is in part due to lax safety practices. But, I also suggest that the cost of safe practices has been grossly exaggerated, particularly by these coal mine lessors to create an undue fear of Federal legislation among their lessees and true small mine operators.

The proposal to extend coverage of the enforceable provisions of the Safety Act to all mines equally has been advocated for over 10 years. It just does not make sense to perpetuate the artificial line of demarcation established by Public Law 552. The lives of miners engaged in small operations are as precious as those engaged in the huge mechanized mines. The disaster-type incidents that occur are similar, though they are less publicized because they take fewer lives at one time. The committee report points out the negligible costs of complying with the Coal Mine Safety Act for the overwhelming majority of so-called small mines. But I ask, and I cannot answer my own question, How much is a miner's life worth? This proposal will save miners' lives.

It was pointed out by expert witnesses from the Department of the Interior that the safety record for title I mines is not outstanding. For the 10 years preceding 1963 there were 129 disaster-type incidents in this class of mines. The men employed in these mines and their families deserve better than this.

From my experience in this industry I know that we cannot legislate away all coal mine fatalities. But if we can eliminate the great number of deaths that are preventible, we will have done what is possible.

In the years 1948 through 1952 there were an average of 543 fatalities in the coal mines that are presently covered by the act. In the most recent 5 years the average has been 215 fatalities. This is a considerable reduction for which a great number of mines' families are grateful. However, I am not satisfied and I am sure that those who have studied the record are also unsatisfied. We can do better. The bill before you is a necessary step in this direction. Hopefully, the study which the Secretary of the Interior will be required to make will lead to further improvements. Our goal must be to eliminate every accident that is preventable by proper safety procedure. Though this bill will not reach that millenium, it will make reasonable progress toward that goal.

Before concluding, I would like to point out that this bill was reported from committee without dissent. There are no minority views in the report and, in fact, the supplemental views that were filed stated:

> It became evident that a compromise between Mr. DENT's bill and the proposals offered by Mr. JENNINGS, of Virginia, and Mr. BELL are necessary in order to achieve sound and equitable legislation in this complex area. The bill reported by the committee takes cognizance of these differences and incorporates some of the important changes proposed by Mr. JENNINGS and Mr. BELL. It is our opinion that the committee bill, as amended by our proposals, represents a measure which is far better designed to achieve the primary goal of mine safety than the bill as originally introduced, and for that matter, superior in that respect to most of the measures introduced in previous years.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend swift passage of H.R. 3584.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the honor and the opportunity to be here today on this particular occasion, and for this purpose; to stand here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives and speak in behalf of the safety of our Nation's coal miners and, as I just said, it is a great honor and an opportunity.

Having been born near a coal mine in western Pennsylvania, I can recollect from my earliest days the first disaster whistle I ever heard, and I can probably remember more vividly than any other scene in my entire life that day, that year, and that coal mine.

I remember the first casualty that came out of the mine. He was a little Italian boy with a family of seven. In those days there was no compensation, there was nothing for that widow to do but to place her children in an orphanage and then to go out into the world and fend for herself, and when I use the word "fend" I mean exactly that.

There has been a great deal of improvement in the operation of mines and in the treatment of miners. We will never reach the ultimate, and to the gentleman from California I may say that no amount of legislation will ever completely wipe out mine disasters and mine tragedies any more than any amount of traffic laws will ever wipe out all of the fatalities on the highway.

When it comes to my way of thinking, when there is a question to be resolved between the cost of making a mine safe or the protection of a miner's life, I try to resolve that in favor of the miner's life. They tell me that of the five men who were stricken down in a title I mine on the 24th of May 1955, 32 dependents have been left by these five miners. The only reason that there were not 50 or 500 is because that is all the men who were working on the shift.

I can remember the mine disaster at Monmouth, Pa., 3 miles from my home, when I was 9 years old, at which time 255 men were wiped out by the flick of a match. Certainly the title II mine safety bill has not stopped or prevented all of the mine disasters. Human weaknesses and human frailties and human forgetfulness ofttimes lead a man to do things he would not do if he were thinking. We have an absolute rule that a man cannot carry matches into the mines. There have been occasions when men have sneaked back to an off-work place and struck a match to light a cigarette that caused his own death and the death of many others. Nothing in this bill will prevent that.

Let us look at the record. It is fair that we know something about what has happened. I have heard that the figures of the Bureau of Mines are not to be relied upon, that they are not to be believed. Whom, then, are we to believe?

Are we to believe the spokesmen who comes before us and states that the mine figures of the Bureau of Mines were false and should not be believed, and when interrogated we found that his working place was in a mine on Wall Street. He represents the mine operators.

There has been a great phenomenon take place in the coal mines. That is why there has been an increase in the number of small mines. By virtue of the fact we passed a title II Mines Act which eliminated inspection of all mines of 14 men and under, a great phenomenon has taken place. Big mine operations have been closed, and we find that the owner of that mine operation leases out parcels of 25, 50, or 75 acres to go in and mine with under-14-year-old children on the payroll. They escape the responsibility of the mine safety law, but all of the coal still goes to the original mine operator. These are the types of mines that put up the fight. There was not one single mine operator appearing before the committee who represented himself as a coal mine operator with a small mine all mined with his brothers, sisters, or anybody else who might be working for his organization, either in the mines or on the surface.

Every opposition came from the type of opposition that is represented by the big organizations that have their mines in Wall Street in New York. This is the kind of mines that have now developed and are producing the great amount of coal.

Let us see what just last year's record was—in the year 1964. The reports on inspections of title I mines, completed to the last 4 months, disclosed that imminent danger was reported in 23 percent of the mines. However, less than 2 percent of the reported dangers were corrected—because there was no Federal law that would enforce the correction. Yet, in the title II mines which are now under the mining inspection law, there were 71 imminent danger reports for which closing orders were issued and corrections made.

That is the difference between this mining bill today and the kind of mining bill that has been proposed by those who have fought this legislation over the years and now by some kind of situation which I do not approve of, I find myself in the position of the man who was seated so innocently along side of his girl friend on a sofa one night and she said to him, "Wouldn't the second Thursday in June be a wonderful day to get married?" And he said, "Yes, I do not see anything wrong with it." So he was married on the second Thursday in June. That is the way I find myself with this amendment. I agreed to a certain type of amendment which would notify mine operators that a bill had passed and that they were subject to the bill, but I did not agree to the provisions of the amendment that is going to be offered. However, my chairman, the honorable gentleman from California, accepted the amendment as having been agreed to, and out of respect to his word that he has given, I will go along with the proposition and support my chairman in his position. But it does weaken the bill, and as my good friend, the gentleman from Luzerne County who is more interested in mining safety of the miner than in the amount of profit of the operators—and we have not included the mine operator—we have given him $500,000 to be devoted to the States to do the job that the mine operator ought to be doing—the job of creating safety for his miners in their mine. But we are going to pay for it. That is the $500,000 we had to pay to get support for this humane legislation.

Then let us go on a little further. In another instance, I had to give my right arm to get this bill passed to give the right of veto to the State mine inspector within 24 hours if he disagreed with the Federal mine inspector on the closing of a mine. I could go through the history of Shafton. I could go through the history of Whitney and through the history of many mines that have collapsed in my lifetime where these miners lost their lives.

I say to you today while this is a step in the right direction, it is a slow, faltering and halting step and there will be more men killed before we come back and do what we ought to do at this moment in this House in the year of our Lord, 1965.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I want to compliment the gentleman and I want to say at this point, I have not given my word to accept this amendment and I expect and would like to have as many people on the floor as we can to defeat this amendment right here in the House.

Mr. DENT. I appreciate the position of the gentleman and honor him for the statement he has made. However, there are two things a man has that he has to live by—one is his word and the other is his friend. While I have not given my word in toto on the amendment, I do not want to lose a friend.

I expect and I am fully confident of this, and I mean this in all seriousness, that the other body will see what the amendment amounts to and then will come back with the amendment I had agreed to and which I believe would do the job that ought to be done.

I am not opposed to notifying the mine operator and the mine operator knowing what he is going to have to live up to. I would be in favor of having every law that is passed that affects the lives of men to be given to them in such a way that they would understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I want to be sure I say this, because I know the hours and the toil and the sweat the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] has put into these mine safety bills since he first came to this House. If anybody knows about that, I know.

I appreciate the difficult position he finds himself in as a member of the subcommittee.

I have been in this House for many years. I have been in the same position more than once. I intend to follow his leadership, as embarrassing and difficult as it is for me, as it is for him.

So far as the fine statement he has made today is concerned, his heart is in it. The highest compliment I can pay to him is that I could not have made a better statement on this subject myself. I could not possibly say more than that.

Mr. DENT. With all due humility and truthfulness I must say that I am only a child at the knee of the expert from Luzerne County.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the wonderful job he has done and the wonderful speech he has made. If one individual from Pennsylvania knows what he is talking about with respect to mines, it is he. He fought for the miners when he was in the State senate for about 18 years. He has continued to work hard to get this mine safety bill passed since he first came to the Congress.

I will support the gentleman in the well [Mr. DENT], from Westmoreland County.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am the sponsor of H.R. 3934, a bill which provides for the amendment of Public Law 552, the Coal Mine Safety Act. I represent a district where much coal is mined. I am thoroughly familiar with the hazards of coal mining. I come from a family of coal miners and all my life I have lived with coal miners and their problems; therefore, I strongly support the pending bill.

My district was the scene of the Orien No. 2 mine explosion which killed 119 men. Not many miles away from my hometown occurred the Centralia explosion that killed 111 men. These two holocausts brought about the passage of Public Law 552, which resulted in the saving of thousands of lives in the coal-mining industry. It is a good law and I, with all the citizens of my community, was happy when it passed the Congress of the United States. Now it is being asked that Public Law 552 be amended to bring every coal mine in the United States under the jurisdiction of the act. I favor the idea. I believe that every man who hires another man to go down into a hole in the ground to work should be responsible for the conditions under which that man must work. I think if the law says that certain conditions in a mine are dangerous and unsafe, that the operator of that mine, large or small, should be forced to eliminate them. And I firmly believe that mine inspectors, the experts in the industry both Federal and State, should have the power to enforce their laws and close a mine down when they find dangerous conditions existing.

The coal-mining industry of the United States killed 240 persons during 1964, who either by necessity or choice were destined to toil in the bowels of the earth in an effort to provide the essentials in a prosperous America for their families. Many of these men were killed simply because the operators of the coal mine failed to provide a safe working place or eliminate a known dangerous condition, which has at other times claimed the life of one or more persons. Such is the fate of a coal miner in these United States.

The mining of coal is a treacherous business. Natural dangers of working below ground are ever present in the form of gas concentration which can be ignited by an arc or spark, explosive dust, falling roof, sudden inrushes of water, or the innumerable possibilities of accident potentials from moving machinery in a minimum amount of light. While it is true a measured amount of progress has been made in the field of mine safety over a period of 50 years, such has not been done voluntarily by the majority of the mining industry. Of course, there can always be found the progressive element interested in promoting safety because it is good business to do so; but, by and large, it has been easier to hope nothing will happen even though a practice or method has proven to be dangerous.

Thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money have been spent on research and experimentation to develop safe mining practices, and such efforts have not been in vain. The know-how of operating a safe mine is not a deep, dark secret, but rather the knowledge is available for all who wish to take advantage of it. It is there for the asking together with expert advice and assistance.

In addition to the governmental agencies offering a helping hand, the representative of the employees stands ready to cooperate in the search for answers to any problem which may present itself. Why is it, then, the mining industry continues to kill and maim coal miners year after year? The cry is heard, "Mining is a hazardous industry and the death toll is a consequence of that industry." While the industry was in its infancy such an explanation could be accepted, but thinking man no longer adhere to such an idiotic philosophy. Coal mining can be made a safe industry and such fact is borne out by the example established by some mines where millions of tons are produced without a lost-time accident reported. The answer, therefore, becomes relatively simple. Little or no effort is expended by those operators who continuously find the names of their companies on the fatality and injury lists.

Legislation compelling the safe operation of a coal mine appears to be the only available answer. This fact was recognized during the 82d Congress during which Public Law 552 was enacted, giving the U.S. Bureau of Mines authority to suspend the production of coal in a mine or section of mine where in the opinion of the qualified representative of the Director of the Bureau of Mines there were observed certain unsafe practices.

Yet, to this law Congress attached a condition for which no logical explanation can be given. The statute exempted from its provision mines regularly employing 14 or less persons. This magic number has, therefore, become the dividing line between what has commonly been referred to as a small or large mine. Why a mine employing 15 men should be subject to the provision of a Federal statute and mines employing 1 less should not be is devoid of answer.

Similarly, the U.S. Bureau of Mines may protect the lives of individuals of a 15-man mine under their enforcement power; whereas, those unfortunate enough to labor in a 14-man mine must defend themselves against the hazards of the industry or seek employment elsewhere, which in the majority of cases cannot be done simply because there is no other employment in the area of his domicile. That is particularly true in southern Illinois where we have approximately 20,000 unemployed.

Justification is ample to include mines employing 14 or less men underground. A review of the mining laws of the various States will reveal that each inspection department is authorized to enter and inspect all coal mines; and, if necessary, stop production in such mines until dangerous conditions are corrected. Further statistics will show that during 1960, mines employing 14 or less men underground produced in 1960, 14 percent of the coal and were charged with 30.4 percent of the underground fatalities. In 1961, title I mines—both anthracite and bituminous—produced 12 percent of the underground tonnage, and sustained 34 percent of the underground fatalities. The U.S. Bureau of Mines during its inspection of these mines reports time after time serious violations of safe mining practices; but because of the statutory exemption, the Bureau is helpless to exact compliance.

While it may be argued that many so-called major disasters—an occurrence in which 5 or more persons are killed—have not taken place in mines employing 14 or less persons, there are reports of such occurrences killing all of the persons underground. Only because less than five persons were employed was the category escaped. Persons employed in the coal mines of the United States are entitled to impartial administration of safe operating procedures. The unfortunate ones destined to toil in mines employing 14 or less persons have a right to expect they will not be ignored nor prohibited from obtaining the safety working conditions possible. This can only be accomplished by including all mines under the provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act.

I urge adoption of the pending bill. In closing I want to congratulate my good friend, the very able chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and the members of his committee for bringing out this important piece of legislation.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3584 is a sound legislative proposal which I personally support and one which I urge my colleagues to join with me in enacting into law.

The Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1965 are a dramatic step toward the further reduction of casualties in coal mines. The record of the 12 years since passage of Public Law 82–552 sustain the contention that Federal enforcement has been effective in covered coal mines. For example, in 1951, just prior to adoption of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, there were 629 fatalities in mines regularly employing more than 14 individuals underground. In 1964, there were 142 fatalities in such mines.

However, the record does indicate that this rate can be further improved for those mines already covered by the act. H.R. 3584 will achieve this further reduction of fatalities in such mines.

But while the record indicates that the so-called large mines have reduced fatalities by over 70 percent, the mines exempted from coverage have maintained the same fatality rate through this entire period. Title I mines, as the exempted mines are popularly labeled, sustained 400 fatalities in the 5 years preceding enactment of the Mine Safety Act and 386 fatalities within the last 5 years.

With the rare exception of dramatic rescues such as the one at Sheppton, Pa., in 1963, the public interest in title I mine fatalities is not aroused. There is not as large a loss of life at one time, nor is there the widespread publicity that surrounds a disaster in which dozens of men are involved. But the lives of the miners in small operations are as precious as those engaged in major coal mining operations. Certainly this assertion would not be criticized by the relatives of men working in these small mines.

My State is not noted for coal products, but my interest in the safety of our Nation's coal miners is not diminished for this reason. Concern for the well-being of the men who earn their living deep within the earth must be important to every Member of Congress. The Committee on Education and Labor demonstrated admirable attentiveness to this problem and developed an effective bill to promote safety in all mines engaged in or affecting interstate commerce.

Every segment of the coal mining industry was granted an opportunity to appear before the committee on this proposal. The differing views presented to the committee were weighed judiciously and many suggestions were incorporated into H.R. 3584. Naturally, as is always the case, some witnesses did not want the Federal Government to engage in an expanded coal mine safety program at all. Others advocated very liberal closing authority for inspectors of the Federal Bureau of Mines. Between these extremes the committee, in a bipartisan effort, achieved a moderate, yet effective piece of legislation. I believe that we can expect fatalities in coal mines to decline further if this bill is enacted into law.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join with so many of my colleagues today in support of the proposed amendments to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. As a member of the General Subcommittee on Labor I had the opportunity to examine the facts and consider the many arguments, both pro and con, which were presented to the subcommittee.

I am convinced by the record that this bill will improve safety in all coal mines in the United States. I am convinced that improved and enlarged Federal enforcement will reduce casualties in coal mines. And I can say without equivocation that the intent of the committee is to achieve the goal of mine safety with minimum burden upon the coal industry.

We considered many proposals. Some were extreme to the degree of delegating great discretionary authority to inspectors of the Bureau of Mines to close what they deemed to be unsafe mines. Others were mild to the degree of only authorizing appropriations for expanded safety education programs. Between these extremes we settled upon a moderate and justifiable bill. This proposal is before the House now. It is the fruit of extended hearings and several executive sessions of the subcommittee. It is a compromise bill. This does not imply that it is weak, but rather that it was considered with an open mind regarding constructive criticism. Several amendments were made to the bill in executive sessions. I believe that each of these amendments effectuated a fairer enforcement procedure and a bill better directed toward promoting safety without undue burdens to the industry.

The enactment of these amendments to the Coal Mine Safety Act would improve safety in all coal mines, both the so-called small mines and those already covered by the act. It would improve Federal-State coordination and cooperation. It would promote both Federal and State safety education programs. And, it would lay the groundwork for more thorough consideration of the very technical provisions of section 209 of the act by requiring that the Secretary of the Interior study the effectiveness of these provisions and report back to the Congress within 6 months.

Though I do not come from a coal-mining district, I cannot abandon this field only to such Members. The lives of thousands of human beings are at stake and the welfare of still thousands more are involved. I am not an expert in coal mine safety, but I have learned much during our hearings and consideration. I believe that we can reduce the toll of human lives in the Nation's coal mines by enacting this amendment. I urge my colleagues to join with me in taking this humane step by voting for passage of H.R. 3584, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1965.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

There are 115 Members present, a quorum.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1965".

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (b) of section 201 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 693; 30 U.S.C. 471(b)) is repealed.

(b) For a period of six months following the month during which this Act becomes effective, the amendments made by section 3 of this Act to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act shall not apply to any mine in which on the effective date of this Act no more than fourteen individuals are regularly employed underground, except that the amendments made by subsection (c) and (d) of such section shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) For a period of six months following the month during which this Act becomes effective, paragraph (5) of subsection (h) of section 209 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act shall not apply to any mine in which on the effective date of this Act (1) no more than fourteen individuals are regularly employed underground and (2) the storage, handling, or use of black powder is expressly permitted by a statute of the State in which such mine is located.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 203 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 694; 30 U.S.C. 473) is amended by adding a new subsection (d) and a new subsection (e), reading as follows, and by redesignating present subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsection (f), (g), and (h), respectively, and by amending those subsections to read as follows:

"(d) (1) If a duly authorized representative of the Bureau, upon making an inspection of a mine as authorized in section 202, finds that any provision of section 209 is being violated, and if he also finds that, while the conditions created by such violation do not cause danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident will occur in such mine immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated, such violation is of such nature as could significantly and substantially contribute to the cause or effect of a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident, and if he finds such violation to be caused by an unwarrantable failure of such operator to comply with the provisions of section 209, he shall include such finding in the notice given to the operator under subsection (b) of this section. Within ninety days of the time such notice was given to such operator, the Bureau shall cause such mine to be reinspected to determine if any similar such violation exists in such mine. Such reinspection shall be in addition to any special inspection required under section 203 or section 206. If, during any special inspection relating to such violation or during such reinspection, a representative of the Bureau finds such similar violation does exist, and if he finds such violation to be caused by an unwarrantable failure of such operator to comply with the provisions of section 209, he shall forthwith issue an order requiring the operator to cause all persons in the area affected by such violation, except those persons referred to in paragraph (3) of this subsection, to be withdrawn from, and to be debarred from entering, such area. Such finding and order shall state the provision or provisions of section 209 which have been violated and shall contain a detailed description of the conditions which such representive finds cause and constitute such violation, and a description of the area from which persons must be withdrawn and debarred. The representative of the Bureau shall promptly thereafter advise the Director in writing of his findings and his action.

"(2) If a withdrawal order with respect to any area in a mine has been issued pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, thereafter a withdrawal order shall promptly be issued by a duly authorized representative of the Bureau who finds upon any following inspection the existence in such mine of violations similar to those that resulted in the issuance of the withdrawal order under paragraph (1) of this subsection until such time as an inspection of such mine discloses no similar violations. Following an inspection of such mine which discloses no similar violations, the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall again be applicable to that mine.

"(3) No order issued under paragraphs (1) or (2) of this subsection shall require any of the following persons to be withdrawn from, or to be debarred from entering, the area described in the order: (A) Any person whose presence in such area is necessary, in the judgment of the operator of the mine, to abate the violation described in the order; (B) any public official whose official duties require him to enter such area; or (C) any legal or technical consultant or any representative of the employees of the mine, who is a certified person qualified to make mine examinations, or is accompanied by such a person, and whose presence in such area is necessary, in the judgment of the operator of the mine, for the proper investigation of the conditions described in the order.

"(e) Except as provided in subsection (g) of this section an order issued under subsection (c) or (d) of this section may be annulled, canceled, or revised by the duly authorized representative of the Bureau who issued such order or any other duly authorized representative of the Bureau.

"(f) If a duly authorized representative of the Bureau, upon making an inspection of a mine, as authorized in section 202, finds that methane has been ignited in such mine or finds methane by use of a permissible flame safety lamp or by air analysis in an amount of 0.25 per centum or more in any open workings of such mine when tested at a point not less than twelve inches from the roof, face, or rib, he shall make an order requiring the operator of such mine to comply with the provisions of section 209 of this title which pertain to gassy mines, in the operation of such mine.

"(g) (1) If an order is made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section with respect to a mine in a State in which a State plan approved under section 202(b) is in effect, and a State inspector did not participate in the inspection on which such order is based, the operator of the mine may request the agency designated in the State plan to assign a State inspector to inspect the mine. The State inspector assigned in accordance with such request shall inspect such mine promptly after the request is made.

"(2) No order shall be made pursuant to subsection (c) or (d) of this section with respect to a mine in a State in which a State plan approved under section 202(b) is in effect unless a State inspector participated in the inspection on which such order is based and concurs in such order, or an independent inspector appointed under paragraph (3) of this subsection concurs in such order. If the State inspector does not concur in such order, the operator of the mine, the duly authorized representative of the Bureau who proposes to make such order, or the State inspector may apply, within twenty-four hours after the completion of the inspection involved, for the appointment of an independent inspector under paragraph (3). Within five days after the date of his appointment, the independent inspector shall inspect the mine. The representative of the Bureau and the State inspector shall be given the opportunity to accompany the independent inspector during such inspection. If, after such inspection is completed, either the independent inspector or the State inspector concurs in the order, it shall be issued.

"(3) Within five days after the date of receipt of an application under paragraph (2) of this subsection, the chief judge of the United States district court for the district in which the mine is involved is located (or in his absence, the clerk of such court) shall appoint a graduate engineer with experience in the coal-mining industry to serve as an independent inspector under this subsection. Each independent inspector so appointed shall be compensated at the rate of $50 for each day of actual service (including each day he is traveling on official business) and shall, notwithstanding the Travel Expense Act of 1949, be fully reimbursed for traveling, subsistence, and related expenses.

"(4) An order made pursuant to subsection (a) or (c) or (d) of this section with respect to a mine in a State in which a State plan approved under section 202(b) is in effect shall not be subject to review under section 206, but shall be subject to review under section 207.

"(h) Notice of each finding and order made under this section shall promptly be given to the operator of the mine to which it pertains, by the person making such finding or order."

(b) Section 202 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 693; 30 U.S.C. 472) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(f)"; and by striking out the reference to "section 203(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203 (c) and (d)."

(2) Subsection (b)(2)(C) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(e)(1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(g)(1)".

(3) Subsection (c) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(e)(3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(g)(3)".

(c) Section 206 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 699; 30 U.S.C. 476) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(e)(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(g)(4)".

(2) Subsection (b) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(e)(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203 (g)(4)".

(3) A new subsection (c), reading as follows, is added and present subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) are redesignated as subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively, and are amended to read as follows:

"(c) Except as provided in section 203(g)(4), an operator notified of an order made pursuant to section 203(d) may apply to the Director for annulment or revision of such order. Upon receipt of such application the Director shall make a special inspection of the mine affected by such order, or cause three duly authorized representatives of the Bureau, other than the representative who made such order, to make such inspection of such mine and report thereon to him. Upon making such special inspection himself, or upon receiving the report of such inspection made by such representatives, the Director shall find whether or not there was a violation of section 209 as described in such order, at the time of the making of such order. If he finds there was no such violation he shall make an order annulling the order under review. If he finds there was such a violation he shall also find whether or not such violation was totally abated at the time of the making of such special inspection. If he finds that such violation was totally abated at such time, he shall make an order annulling the order under review. If he finds that such violation was not totally abated at such time, he shall find the extent of the area of such mine which was affected by such violation at the time such special inspection was made, and he shall then make an order, consistent with his findings, affirming or revising the order under review.

"(d) An operator notified of an order made pursuant to section 203(f) may apply, not later than twenty days after the receipt of notice of such order, to the Director for annulment of such order. Upon receipt of such application the Director shall make or cause to be made such investigation as he deems necessary. Upon concluding his investigation or upon receiving the report of such investigation made at his direction, the Director shall find whether or not methane has been ignited in such mine, or whether or not methane was found in such mine in an amount of 0.25 per centum or more in any open workings of such mine, when tested at a point not less than twelve inches from the roof, face, or rib, at the time of the making of such order. If he finds that methane has not been ignited in such mine and was not found in such mine as set out in such order, he shall make an order annulling the order under review. If he finds that methane has been ignited in such mine or was found in such mine as set out in the order under review, he shall make an order denying such application.

"(e) The Director shall cause notice of each finding and order made under this section to be given promptly to the operator of the mine to which it pertains.

"(f) Except as provided in section 203(g)(4), at any time while an order made pursuant to section 203 or this section is in effect, or any time during the pendency of a proceeding under section 207 or section 208 seeking annulment or revision of such order, the operator of the mine affected by such order many apply to the Director for annulment or revision of such order. The Director shall thereupon proceed to act upon such application in the manner provided in subsections (a), (b), (c) or (d) of this section.

"(g) In view of the urgent need for prompt decision of matters submitted to the Director under this section, all actions which the Director or his representatives are required to take under this section shall be taken as rapidly as practicable, consistent with adequate consideration of the issues involved."

(d) Section 207 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 700; as amended 74 Stat. 201; 30 U.S.C. 477) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by striking out the reference to "subsection (a), (c) or (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a), (c), (d) or (f)"; by striking out the reference to "subsection (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (f)"; and by striking out the reference to "subsection (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (d)".

(2) A new subsection (h), reading as follows, is inserted and present subsections (h), (i), and (j) are redesignated as subsections (i), (j), and (k), respectively, and are amended to read as follows:

"(h) If the proceeding is one in which an operator seeks annulment or revision of an order made pursuant to section 203(d), the Board, upon conclusion of the hearing, shall find whether or not there was a violation of section 209, as described in such order, at the time of the making of such order. If the Board finds there was no such violation, the Board shall make an order annulling the order under review. If the Board finds there was such a violation, the Board shall also find whether or not such violation was totally abated at the time of the filing of the operator's application. If the Board finds that such violation was totally abated at such time, the Board shall make an order annulling the order under review. If the Board finds that such violation was not totally abated at such time, the Board shall find the extent of the area of such mine which was affected by such violation at such time, and shall make an order, consistent with its findings, affirming or revising the order under review.

"(i) If the proceeding is one in which an operator seeks annulment of an order made pursuant to section 203(f) or 206(d), the Board, upon conclusion of the hearing, shall find whether or not methane has been ignited in such mine or was found in such mine in an amount of 0.25 per centum or more in any open workings of such mine when tested at a point not less than twelve inches from the roof, face, or rib, as set out in such order. If the Board finds that methane has not been ignited in such mine and was not found in such mine as set out in such order, the Board shall make an order annulling the order under review. If the Board finds that methane has been ignited in such mine or was found in such mine as set out in the order under review, the Board shall make an order denying such application.

"(j) Each finding and order made by the Board shall be in writing. It shall show the date on which it is made, and shall bear the the signatures of the members of the Board who concur therein. Upon making a finding and order the Board shall cause a true copy thereof to be sent by registered mail or by certified mail to all parties or their attorneys of record. The Board shall cause each such finding and order to be entered on its official record, together with any written opinion prepared by any members in support of, or dissenting from, any such finding or order.

"(k) In view of the urgent need for prompt decision of matters submitted to the Board under this section, all actions which the Board is required to take under this section shall be taken as rapidly as practicable, consistent with adequate consideration of the issues involved."

Sec. 4. Subsection (d) of section 210 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 708; 30 U.S.C. 480(d)) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(e)(3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(g)(3)".

Sec. 5. Section 212 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 709; 30 U.S.C. 482) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) For the promotion of sound and effective coordination of Federal and State activities within the field covered by this Act, to eliminate duplication of effort and expense, and to secure effective enforcement of the coal mine safety requirements established by this title, the director shall affirmatively and diligently seek to cooperate with the mine inspection or safety agencies of the several States, through formal agreement or otherwise, in the enforcement of the provisions of this title.

"(e) The Secretary of the Interior shall enlarge and intensify the educational programs of the Bureau of Mines with respect to the advancement of health and safety in coal mines, and shall, to the fullest extent practicable, seek the cooperation and assistance of the appropriate State agencies in the planning and implementation of such programs."

Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a special study to determine the sufficiency of the present safety requirements of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, with particular emphasis upon the requirements relative to roof support, ventilation, and electrical equipment. The Secretary of the Interior shall make a report to the Congress on the results of such study, together with his recommendations, within one year after the enactment of this Act.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read and open to amendment at any point, and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Beginning with line 24 on page 5, strike out everything down through line 7 on page 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(g)(1) If an order is made pursuant to subsecton (a) of this section, and a State inspector did not participate in the inspection on which such order is based, the duly authorized representative of the Bureau who issued the order shall notify the State mine inspection or safety agency immediately, but not later than twenty-four hours after the issuance of such order, that such order has been issued. Following such order the operator of the mine may immediately request the State mine inspection or safety agency to assign a State inspector to inspect the mine. The State agency shall then promptly assign a State inspector to inspect the mine affected by such order and file an inspection report with the Bureau and the State agency. The order of the duly authorized representative of the Bureau shall remain in effect, but shall immediately be subject to review as provided in this title."

Page 8, after line 13, insert the following:

"(c) Subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 205 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 697; 30 U.S.C. 475) are amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review is hereby continued as an agency of the United States, except that the Board shall consist of five members, instead of three members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"'(b) The terms of office of members of the Board shall be five years, except that—

"'(1) the terms of office of members in office on the date of enactment of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1965, shall expire on the date originally fixed for their expiration;

"'(2) the term of office of one of the members appointed to fill a vacancy resulting from the enactment of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1965, shall expire July 15, 1969, and the term of office of the member appointed to fill the other vacancy resulting therefrom shall expire July 15, 1970; and

"'(3) a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member prior to the expiration of the term for which he was appointed, shall be appointed only for the remainder of such unexpired term.

The members of the Board may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

"'(c) Each member of the Board shall be compensated at the rate of $50 for each day of actual service (including each day he is traveling on official business) and shall, notwithstanding the Travel Expense Act of 1949 be fully reimbursed for traveling, subsistence, and other related expenses. The Board, at all times, shall consist of one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of operators of coal mines employing fourteen or fewer employees underground (hereinafter referred to as "small mine operators representative"), one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of operators of coal mines employing fifteen or more employees underground (hereinafter referred to as the "large mine operators representative"), one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of coal mine workers in mines employing fourteen or fewer employees underground (hereinafter referred to as the "small mine workers representative"), one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of coal mine workers in mines employing fifteen or more employees underground (hereinafter referred to as the "large mine workers representative"), and one person who shall be chairman of the Board, who shall be a graduate engineer with experience in the coal mining industry or shall have had at least five years' experience as a practical mining engineer in the coal mining industry, and who shall not, within one year of his appointment as a member of the Board, have had a pecuniary interest in, or have been regularly employed or engaged in, the mining of coal, or have regularly represented either coal mine operators or coal mine workers, or have been an officer or employee of the Department of the Interior assigned to duty in the Bureau.

"'(d) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia. Whenever the convenience of the public or of the parties may be promoted, or delay or expense may be minimized, the Board may hold hearings or conduct other proceedings at any other place. At the request of an operator of a mine the Board shall hold hearings or conduct other proceedings at the county seat of the county in which the mine is located or at any place mutually agreed to by the chairman of the Board and the operator of the mine involved in the appeal or proceeding. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed and which shall be preserved in the custody of the secretary of the Board.'

"(d) Subsection (f) of section 205 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) Three members of the Board shall constitute a quorum, and official action can be taken only on the affirmative vote of at least three members, except that in any official action involving mines in which no more than fourteen individuals are regularly employed underground the participation of the small mine operators' representative and small mine workers' representative shall be required, and in any official action involving mines in which more than 14 individuals are regularly employed underground the participation of the large mine operators' representative and large mine workers' representative shall be required; but a special panel composed of one or more members, upon order of the Board, shall conduct any hearing provided for in section 207 of this title and submit the transcript of such hearing to the entire Board of its action thereon. Such transcript shall be made available to the parties prior to any final action of the Board. An opportunity to appear before the Board shall be afforded the parties prior to any final action and the Board may afford the parties an opportunity to submit additional evidence as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. Every official act of the Board shall be entered of record, and its hearings and records thereof shall be open to the public.'

Page 8, line 14, strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)".

Page 11, line 15, strike out "(d)" and insert "(f)".

Page 14, strike out lines 19 through 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(e)(1) The Secretary of the Interior shall enlarge and intensify the educational programs of the Bureau of Mines with respect to the advancement of health and safety in coal mines.

"(2) The Secretary of the Interior may also make grants to States to assist them in planning and implementing programs for the advancement of health and safety in coal mines. The amount granted any State for a fiscal year under this paragraph may not exceed 50 per centum of the amount expended by such State in such year for carrying out such programs and no one State may be granted an amount in a fiscal year which exceeds 15 per centum of the aggregate amount granted all States for that year. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the succeeding fiscal years for carrying out this paragraph, the sum of $500,000."

Mr. ROOSEVELT (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments may be considered en bloc, may be considered as read, and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JENNINGS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Jennings of Virginia: On page 20, after line 8, insert the following:

"Sec. 7. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall, as soon as feasible after the enactment of this Act, convene one or more conferences for the purpose of enabling those persons affected by this Act to become familiar with its provisions, particularly the enforcement provisions of section 209. The Secretary shall invite the participation in such conference or conferences of (1) mine safety experts of the Department of the Interior, (2) representatives of the appropriate State mine inspection or safety agencies, (3) owners and operators of all classes and categories of coal mines, (4) individuals or representatives of individuals employed in all classes and categories of coal mines, and (5) such other experts as he deems advisable.

"(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall, upon the enactment of this Act, immediately provide the operator of each mine subject to inspection as authorized by section 202 with a copy of the form used in coal mine inspections by agents of the Bureau of Mines, clearly indicating the enforceable provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. Such information should be in such form as would be readily comprehensible and shall include a complete description of the procedures available to an operator to seek the annulment or revision of an order of an agent of the Bureau of Mines. Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary to modify the provisions of the Act."

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, as I said previously, these are just clarifying amendments to me. I think they are indicative of the interest that has been shown in this bill. It is actually one amendment divided into two sections. In the bill itself, there is a 6 months' stay before these title I mines come under the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. This first part of the amendment provides that during this 6 months' time the Secretary of the Interior shall call together representatives from all segments of the mining industry—the experts, the owners, the operators, the workmen in both types of mine, both the title I mine, the small mine, and the title II mine, the large mine, and go over the provisions of section 209 of the Mine Safety Act.

The second section of this bill provides that a form shall be supplied to the mineowner showing exactly what he is going to be inspected for and what constitutes imminent danger. In other words, what might cause his mine to be closed down.

The reason this is so necessary is that under present-day procedures the Federal coal mine safety inspector uses the Federal Coal Mine Safety Code as well as the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. The code, as differentiated from the act, is something that is negotiated between the unions and the operators. In many, many cases they are not applicable to these title I mines. Yet when that inspector leaves the mine he posts the infractions on the outside of the mine showing exactly what was in violation of the code. These people in many cases think that the code is the act. All I am saying in the second section of this amendment is that a form will be provided with the consent of, and prior consultation with, and study by these operators, showing exactly what they are going to be inspected for, and instructing the inspectors on exactly what they are going to inspect for. To my way of thinking, this is one of the better safety provisions because it will act as a preventive measure rather than trying to find out what might be the cause after something happens. I hope that the committee will accept these amendments.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. I am very much interested in this legislation and have introduced previously H.R. 7901 which is identical to this bill. There are two clarifying questions which I would like to ask regarding this amendment if the gentleman will be kind enough to answer. First, as I understand it, this amendment will require the Secretary of the Interior to invite mineowners and operators to conferences at which this new mine safety law will be fully explained. I am interested in knowing if the effective date of this legislation is in any manner postponed until after these conferences have been held?

Mr. JENNINGS. Let me say to the gentleman that it is not my intention that the effective date provided in this bill be postponed. As I said in my original statement, there is a 6-month lapse in time.

I should hope that during this 6-month period these conferences could be called and everyone could familiarize themselves with the law, and that it could go into effect on the effective date as written in the bill.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, my point is this: Are mineowners and operators exempted from coverage of the law until they have attended one of these indoctrinating conferences? In other words, can they postpone the requirements set out in this act by failing to attend the conferences called by the Secretary of the Interior to familiarize them with the provisions of this act?

Mr. JENNINGS. I think that is covered in the last sentence where we say that "nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary to modify the provisions of the Act." And, the act speaks for itself in that instance.

Mr. BRAY. As I understand it, this amendment also requires that the Secretary of the Interior furnish each mine operator with a copy of the form used in coal inspections by agents of the Bureau of Mines. Again I ask if failure to receive such a form would be considered a defense for mineowners who do not observe the requirements established in this legislation?

Mr. JENNINGS. In that particular case I could not answer because it is the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior to furnish these people with a copy of the form that is going to be used to inspect their mines, prior to that time. Certainly I want that done. I hope it will be done. I want these people to know well in advance what they are going to be inspected for and what constitutes imminent danger.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS] has expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. With respect to the last statement of the gentleman, may I first make it very clear that the committee does intend to accept the gentleman's amendment but with the understanding that such familiarization as is provided in no way is a precondition of enforcement. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. JENNINGS. I do agree and, as a matter of fact, it is so stated in the amendment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman. Second, with respect to (b) of the amendment, it would be satisfactory, as I understand it, if the Secretary can show that he exercised due diligence in seeking to provide the information required in (b) and no other defense would be necessary.

Mr. JENNINGS. That would be my intention, certainly. The main point I want to make is that it is the responsibility of the Secretary to provide the form that these people are going to be inspected by and to show them the difference between the Mine Safety Act and the Mine Safety Code, to differentiate between imminent danger and regular day-to-day type infractions, and make certain that they understand.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is going to accept these amendments.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman has made it very clear. I would suggest the gentleman yield to the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment the gentleman and tell him that I rise in support of this amendment. I think that one of the points that he has made which is very valid is the fact that we had witness after witness testifying before our committee showing confusion as to what was the code and which was the Mine Safety Act. This clarifying amendment will be most helpful, and I am certain it will be best for all parties.

Mr. JENNINGS. I thank the gentlemen for their cooperation, and especially for their accepting the amendment.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I note that the gentleman's amendment goes even further than I first thought. You say that the Secretary shall invite the participation in such conference or conferences of mine safety experts of the Department of the Interior. That is all right. Also representatives of the appropriate State mine inspection or safety agencies. That might be all right. But this one I know cannot be complied with—owners and operators of all classes and categories of coal mines.

There are 8,700 coal mines in the title I mine category.

Mr. JENNINGS. Let me say with reference to the gentleman's observation that first I appreciate his observations pertaining to, first, the mine safety experts in the Department. There has been some question whether they were experts, but I appreciate his accepting that terminology.

Second, the representative of the appropriate State mine inspection service, or safety agents; and, third, owners and operators of all classes and categories of mines.

What I have in mind is that we will make certain the owners and operators of the title I and the title II mines; of the soft coal and the anthracite; of the drift mine and the slope mine; of the gassy mine and the shaft mine; and others are represented at these conferences.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment in its present form.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that time ran out on the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS], because I further intended to ask the gentleman if he would accept an amendment to his amendment which would insert the word "representative," of owners and operators of all classes of mines.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes, I accept the gentleman's modification to say "representatives" in the case of owners and operators of all classes.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENT TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JENNINGS

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. DENT of Pennsylvania to the amendment offered by Mr. JENNINGS of Virginia: After "(3)" insert the following: "representatives of".

Mr. DENT. Now, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am grateful to the gentleman from Virginia who accepted the word "representatives" because I believe that it makes a bad job a little better. The job that will be handed to the Federal Bureau of Mines is one that will be tremendous, one that will be almost backbreaking, because he not only has to notify the miners of a conference or a series of conferences, but also must then, after that, send out a form detailing what will be or can be inspected.

I would suggest to the gentleman from Virginia and to the gentleman from California that in order that we can get to some legislation we send to each mine operator a copy of the act because in the act it gives a clear description of the items in the mines that have to come under inspection. But to specify a certain form will be a very serious situation, because if the Bureau of Mines fails to anticipate some kind of a danger that might become imminent in a mine at a certain time, then that mine operator may easily say, "It is not on your list," even if it does cost lives.

However, I am hopeful that the Senate might look beyond that particular phase of it.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that this amendment which I just offered will at least provide some reasonable opportunity for the Bureau of Mines to enforce the act.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we can take the very case that happened recently at the mine down in Tennessee. When they went down to get the story and to try to find the mine operator, it took the sheriff of the county 5 days to find him. If we are going to take 8,700 mines and try to get every one of the operators to a conference—and if in a literal interpretation of the act it might be that unless he has been notified—and if you do not have enough sheriffs—you might never get the bill in operation.

So I want to say that if the gentleman will accept the amendment—and I am glad the gentleman himself has accepted it—and if the Senate and the House will accept it, then we have the hope that we will get started somewhere along the line.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes; I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I am delighted that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] has offered this amendment to the amendment, because without it a very careful reading of the amendment would indicate that unless an owner or operator is actually served and at the meeting, he would not be covered by the provisions of this act. I feel certain that was not the intent of the author of the original amendment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment to the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS], as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3584) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines, pursuant to House Resolution 391, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 336, nays, 42, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—336

Abbitt
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ayres
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Erlenborn
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest

Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—42

Abernethy
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bandstra
Bell
Brock
Buchanan
Callaway
Carter
Colmer
Davis, Ga.
Dorn
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Everett
Frelinghuysen
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Hagan, Ga.
Henderson
Jennings
Jonas
McEwen
McMillan
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Morris
O'Neal, Ga.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Satterfield
Scott
Selden
Smith, Va.
Stephens
Tuck
Walker, Miss.
Whitten
Williams

NOT VOTING—55

Adair
Andrews, George W.
Arends
Berry
Boggs
Boland
Bonner
Brown, Ohio
Carey
Celler
Clausen, Don H.
Collier
Cramer
Cunningham
Dickinson
Diggs
Dulski
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fisher
Friedel
Garmatz
Hall
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Hungate
Hutchinson
Karth
Keogh
Landrum
Lindsay
Long, La.
McClory
McDade
Mathias
Michel
Miller
Morton
Nelsen
Nix
Passman
Powell
Purcell
Resnick
Robison
St Germain
Smith, N.Y.
Taylor
Thomas
Toll
Tunney
Utt
Wilson, Charles H.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Passman with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Carey with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

H.R. 8662—A BILL TO ESTABLISH A SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced H.R. 8662, a bill to establish a selective immigration system. This bill is a result of a year's hearings by the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of which I am chairman.

In addition to the extensive public hearings, I have had several conferences with President Johnson and we have examined the full range of problems involved. I have advocated simultaneous repeal of the national origins quota system and the nonquota status for natives of the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere. I am advised by Government spokesmen that repeal of the nonquota status for natives of the Western Hemisphere would be inopportune at this time. Accordingly, my bill repeals immediately the national origins quota system and the Asia-Pacific triangle concept but leaves intact the privileged immigrant status of natives of the Western Hemisphere.

I have a special order for 1 hour later today at which time I will explain the major provisions of my bill.

SECRETARY FOWLER GIVES WELL-DESERVED SPANKING TO HIGH-INTEREST LOBBYISTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, our able new Secretary of the Treasury, addressed the prestigious Committee on Economic Development on May 27 in New York City. Mr. Fowler's address dealt primarily with our balance-of-payments situation, and I am happy to report that the administration takes most seriously its responsibility to end the deficit. Mr. Fowler's statement is very well reasoned, but at the same time quite understandable for the layman. It also has a determined tone which is reassuring to everyone that we are going to lick this gold problem. Of special importance is the Secretary's warning to those inflamatory voices, located around Wall Street, who scream incessantly for tighter money and higher interest rates. Mr. Fowler gave a well-deserved verbal spanking to those who believe all we have to do to solve the payments problem is increase our interest rates. He said:

> Unfortunately, such a course not only conflicts with our need to maintain our domestic expansion but also important, would not solve the problem. In view of the tremendous difference in size and efficiency between the money markets here and abroad, it is hardly realistic to expect a higher interest rate to provide the necessary reduction in long-term capital outflow. Furthermore, an interest rate increase large enough to have a significant effect in this area would almost certainly bring a recession. A recession in turn, would severely damage the climate for foreign investment in the United States and would also create a strong movement to reduce interest rates immediately.

The entire statement follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, TO THE COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, IN THE STARLIGHT BALLROOM OF THE WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, N.Y., MAY 27, 1965

For the first quarter of 1965, our balance-of-payments deficit dropped to an annual rate of slightly more than $3 billion.

That was half the rate of the final quarter of 1964.

More important, after a bad start in January, our position improved to show a surplus in March and—on the basis of preliminary figures—hopefully in April.

While it is still too early to assess the impact of President Johnson's program to reduce private capital outflows through the voluntary cooperation of the banking and business community, it appears that this program is already helping to improve our position.

Let me caution you vigorously against interpreting these results as indicating that the battle has been won. We must, at all costs, avoid undue optimism. We cannot afford any premature relaxation of our determination or our efforts.

Solving our balance-of-payments problem will be a long, hard, and difficult task, but it is a task I believe to be vital to continuing our political as well as economic leadership in today's world.

The United States has had 14 balance-of-payments deficits in the past 15 years.

During those 15 years, our deficits have totaled $35 billion. One out of every four of those dollars of deficit has been settled in gold.

The time has come to put a stop to this chronic deficit. We can eliminate it, we must eliminate it, and we will eliminate it.

The elimination of the deficit is at once the most serious and the most difficult economic task facing the United States today.

The task will not be easy. For the last 4 years, our balance of payments has engaged the best efforts of bold and imaginative men.

Many of the steps taken have been highly successful in reducing part of the deficit. But each time the deficit was held down in one place, it bulged out in another. In fact, we have been plagued by a series of deficits arising from a different mix of causes from year to year.

Putting an end to the deficit will require strong determination and firm action. A successful program to achieve equilibrium must attack the deficit on all fronts.

President Johnson launched just such a program with his February 10 message to Congress on the balance of payments. My purpose today is to tell you why that program is necessary, why it must work, and what sort of a situation we will face when it has worked.

In the early part of the 15-year period referred to, our deficits served to reduce the so-called dollar shortage. For that reason these deficits were appropriate, since dollars were needed to finance expanded world trade and nourish the redevelopment of Western Europe and Japan.

For the second part of our deficit period—1958 through 1960—our deficits reflected inadequate trade surpluses combined with rising expenditures for defense and foreign aid.

Long-term private capital outflow also rose during this period, as European recovery led to a substantial increase in U.S. private investment abroad. Finally, in 1960, the rising tide of speculation against the dollar contributed to a sharp increase in short-term capital outflow.

The first comprehensive program to reduce the payments deficit—which had averaged almost $4 billion for the 3 years 1958–60—was presented in a message to Congress in February 1961.

This program was designed to minimize the balance-of-payments impact of necessary Federal spending abroad; to reduce short-term capital outflow by restoring confidence in the dollar; and to expand our trade surplus by launching (a) a vigorous campaign of export promotion and (b) a program of special tax incentives for investment to help cut costs combined with policies, wage-price stability, both designed to increase our national competitive edge in markets at home and abroad.

Over a period of 4 years—1961–64—the efforts initiated under this program yielded results which totaled more than $3.5 billion, including increased commercial trade surpluses ($900 million); reduced oversea dollar spending for foreign aid ($400 million); economies in military spending abroad ($200 million); increased military offset sales to foreign countries by the Defense Department ($450 million); and an increase in profits and interest on past foreign investments ($1.6 billion).

But the deficit failed to narrow a corresponding amount.

The reason it did not was that just as this vigorous attack on several different areas of our deficit was gathering momentum and beginning to show increasing progress, a new problem appeared. Early in 1963, the outflow of U.S. private capital into foreign securities rose alarmingly because, in part, inadequate capital markets in the remainder of the industrialized world made recourse to our money market the easy and cheap course for all who needed capital.

This required the second program to control the deficit, which was contained in the balance-of-payments message of July 1963.

The interest equalization tax proposed in that message was immediately effective in stemming capital outflow into foreign securities. Last year, for instance, the total of such foreign borrowing was cut more than 65 percent below the rate for the first half of 1963. The program also intensified other existing programs and utilized monetary policy by combining an increased rediscount rate with measures which raised short-term interest rates substantially.

But the net result of all of these efforts achieved only a reduction in our overall deficit of $800 million—from $3.9 billion in 1960 to $3.1 billion in 1964.

Why? Because last year another new problem appeared—the marked rise in overall private capital outflow, including both short- and long-term bank credits and direct investment abroad.

It was clear that action was necessary to meet this new challenge. It was equally clear that we could no longer attack the deficit piecemeal.

To stop the flow, we had to attack the entire deficit.

That is just what President Johnson did in his balance-of-payments message last February.

In that message he strongly reaffirmed his intention to strengthen and build upon the measures already taken in both the 1961 and 1963 programs. But he also struck hard at the heart of the new problem. He called upon the business and banking community to do everything in their power to help by launching voluntary programs to reduce the net overall private capital outflows.

The result is that for the first time our entire Nation is committed to a concerted attack on the deficit. With the exception of travel and tourist spending abroad, virtually every source of private or public dollar outflow is now the target of either substantial public or private effort or both.

This program includes, in addition to the voluntary measures, legislation to remove existing tax barriers to foreign investment in the United States, an extension and broadening of the interest equalization tax, a stepped-up effort to promote foreign tourism in the United States, and a further reduction in the duty-free allowance for returning American tourists.

Some of these measures may appear to be unnecessary and trivial. They are neither. They represent our determination to make every possible effort to reduce and eliminate our deficit as quickly as we can.

I am not here to argue whether this program is right or wrong. I happen to believe that it is right. I am here to tell you that this time the program must work. The possibility of failure is too dismal to contemplate.

What is at stake in this program?

The protection of the dollar in ways fully consistent with sustaining prosperity at home, maintaining our defenses abroad when our allies are threatened, supplying private and public funds to less developed countries, avoiding renewed restriction on trade, and the achievement of a more flexible world monetary system that will permit continued free world trade and development to progress as it has since World War II.

Recent events abroad have made it plain for all to see that the international stability and standing of the dollar directly affects our national security and our capacity for effective diplomatic, political, or military action. A strong currency is essential to our success in meeting our worldwide responsibilities.

Already there are those in Europe and elsewhere who look upon the United States as a monetary paper tiger.

Already there are those who point to 15 years of chronic deficit and predict many more deficits to come.

Already there are those who point to our two previous efforts to eliminate the deficit and predict our third effort will be no more successful than the others.

Already there are those who say that we will fail, that the deficit will continue threatening the role of the dollar as a reserve currency and creating a world monetary crisis.

I say these people are wrong.

I say the program that President Johnson began on February 10 will succeed.

The simple truth is that too many dollars have been flowing out of the United States for too long. The United States is like a banker who is lending far more than he is borrowing and whose net asset position is great and growing. In one sense he is not living beyond his means. But if that banker is short of cash and current assets, which are regularly exceeded by his current liabilities, it is not prudent for him to further deplete his current assets.

The banker may wish to give even more generously to charities than before, but he will remember his primary responsibility and refrain from another big pledge. He may wish to go on a European trip until he realizes he is cash poor. He may even wish to make some long-term commitments in loans or investments that look potentially highly profitable, but he will adjust his current assets to liabilities as a first priority.

This means, whether we like it or not, we are committed to eliminating our balance-of-payments deficit.

Furthermore, it will not be enough to reach payments equilibrium for 2 or 3 quarters or even for a year and then slip back into another deficit.

Once we achieve equilibrium, we must maintain it for a substantial period. For only sustained equilibrium can wipe out the impact of our prolonged period of deficit.

Achieving and maintaining equilibrium will be a difficult task. It is not surprising that a number of wishful thinkers would like to avoid the discipline of such a course.

These wishful thinkers fall into several groups.

One group points to the fact that under our first two programs we achieved more than $3.5 billion in balance-of-payments gains—more than enough to wipe out our present deficit and leave us with a comfortable surplus. This group looks at our present problem as a very temporary one, which will soon clear up and allow our previous gains to automatically restore us to balance.

Unfortunately, this happy optimism is without foundation, and nothing could be more damaging to our efforts than unfounded optimism.

Another group believes that all we have to do to solve the payments problem is raise our interest rates.

Unfortunately, such a course not only conflicts with our need to maintain our domestic expansion but also important, would not solve the problem. In view of the tremendous difference in size and efficiency between the money markets here and abroad, it is hardly realistic to expect a higher interest rate to provide the necessary reduction in long-term capital outflow. Furthermore, an interest rate increase large enough to have a significent effect in this area would almost certainly bring a recession. A recession in turn, would severely damage the climate for foreign investment in the United States and would also create a strong movement to reduce interest rates immediately.

Still another group of wishful thinkers look to new international monetary arrangements as an escape from our present payments problem.

I must frankly admit that this attitude puzzles me. These people must be confused by the role which new international monetary arrangements will play. For instance, they certainly won't remove the necessity for the United States—as a major reserve currency country—to maintain reasonable-equilibrium in its balance of payments. And there is no doubt that whatever new monetary arrangements may be negotiated are bound to include the dollar as the major reserve currency for the free world.

The significance of improving international monetary arrangements will increase as we move closer to solving our balance of payments problem. That progress will increase interest in some of the notions of improved international monetary arrangements that we think are in the interests of the free world economy, methods of providing additional liquidity, for example, without depending upon dollar deficits.

Arriving at sustained equilibrium in our payments would allow time for other processes to occur that would make it possible to thaw out the voluntary arrangements—without fear of any further great outflow that would again create a serious deficit.

Unfortunately, there is no magical arrangement which will automatically do away with the present imbalance, or which will make possible continued large outflow without endangering the position of the dollar.

Many of these wishful thinkers embrace one or another of these various solutions to our payments problem in the hope that we will be free to return to unlimited private capital movements abroad, to intensify Government spending abroad, to abandon or slip away for our national effort to remain competitive. They would confine our activities to making some token effort to achieve equilibrium.

Unfortunately, we cannot wish away the deficit—or the potential consequences of allowing it to continue unchecked.

The only acceptable solution facing us is the one we are pursuing—to maintain our present system and to make it work by eliminating the deficit, thereby paving the way for the successful negotiation of an improved system.

There is no question that this course, through the voluntary program, requires us to restrict private new or additional business and financial activities which in normal times we would consider highly desirable.

There is no question that such new or additional business and financial investment abroad pays excellent dividends to our future balance-of-payemnts position. In fact, more than a third of the balance-of-payments gains made since 1960 under our first two balance-of-payments programs reflect increasing returns from such activities.

Such returns, however, are realized only in the long run.

But ours is a short-run problem confronting us now—this year. We cannot wait for the long run to eliminate our payments deficit. The time is too short and the risks are too great to take chances.

Our course is clear. It is a difficult one but I have every confidence that we will achieve our goal of sustained payments equilibrium.

It is not too early to consider what steps will be required to adjust to that new era of equilibrium.

First of all, there is general agreement that some modification in the international monetary system will be required. We will need some way of gradually and systematically producing the additional liquidity which will be required to finance expanding free world trade and development.

In the past, the major source for such additional liquidity has been the continuing payments of deficits of the United States. When these deficits have been brought to an end, it will be necessary that there be general agreement on an effective way of fueling the world payments system.

It is not too soon to begin high-level talks on this matter, building upon the exploratory technical discussions that have already taken place. That is why the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Callaghan, will come to Washington next month. Through the remainder of this year, there will be other discussions at all levels with representatives of other interested countries as we strive with them to reach a substantial measure of improvement in the system of international monetary cooperation.

Our view, supported by most of Western Europe, is that the best step the United States can possibly take at this time—to protect not only its own interests but also the world monetary system—is to move as strongly as possible toward equilibrium. At the same time we should continue discussions—predicated on the maintenance of the dollar as the major reserve currency of the free world—on possible steps to improve the world monetary system once our deficit has been eliminated.

Any other course would invite a crisis rather than prevent it because it would eventually—and inevitably—require the imposition of more restrictive measures, with all the problems of retaliation and damage to confidence that these measures would involve.

A second step will also be required to adjust to the new era of equilibrium, in addition to new monetary arrangements. Having reached and sustained an equilibrium in our balance of payments for a substantive period, we shall also renew our pursuit of our long-term objective of free capital markets both here and abroad. For there is no attractiveness to anyone in considering the voluntary restraint programs and the related series of interferences with these free capital markets as a permanent solution to the payments problem. No one can realistically predict when they can be abandoned, but we all agree on one thing—the sooner, the better.

There are, however, some significant factors to be noted.

For one thing, slowly but surely changes are taking place in both the depth and the quality of foreign capital markets.

Furthermore, there has been susbtantial reduction in the impact government spending overseas has had on our balance of payments. At the same time, our continuing price stability and rising productivity are contributing to increasing competitiveness of U.S. goods in foreign trade.

In addition to these important factors to the maintenance and strengthening of our trade position there is also the rising tide of earnings from U.S. private investment over the postwar period. These earnings can help to provide substantial improvement to our payments position in the years ahead.

The continuing strength of these factors in the future, and how quickly they contribute to improving our payments position, will have much to do with determining when we can remove the voluntary restraints required over the shorter term.

In conclusion I would like to remind you that the state of the dollar in today's world is far stronger than it was several years ago, and it is getting stronger every day.

Among the reasons for this are not only the measures I have cited, both short and long term, but also the deep underlying strength of the entire U.S. balance-of-payments position.

The dollar today is backed by the world's strongest economy, which is in the midst of the longest peacetime expansion in its history.

The dollar today is backed by the world's greatest gold supply, fully pledged to honor our international obligations.

The dollar today is backed by public and private claims against foreigners which exceed their claims against us by $37 billion. If you choose to consider only private assets, the United States is still in a stronger creditor position—with private claims against foreigners exceeding their claims against us by roughly $15 billion.

Finally, the United States enjoys the most favorable trade position of any major nation in the world today, with a total commercial trade surplus last year of $3.7 billion.

Clearly the U.S. dollar today is the strongest currency in the world. Our task is to maintain and increase that strength, and that is exactly what we intend to do.

Success in this task will require the imaginative marketing of more of our products and services in strongly competitive foreign markets; the continued tailoring of our Government's spending abroad to the minimum essential; the use of tax incentives and private financial market initiatives to promote foreign investment in U.S. private securities, properties and business; the fashioning of effective capital markets throughout the free world; and an ever more vigorous domestic economy in which all our human resources are fully at work.

All of this will not be easy to achieve, but with the help and cooperation of the business and financial community, and indeed of the entire nation, we can look forward with confidence to success in this vital endeavor.

BANK RESERVES PLUNGE TO MINUS $173 MILLION AS FED SQUEEZE CONTINUES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve has tightened credit yet another notch at the very moment that the administration stresses adequate credit at reasonable rates of interest. The Federal Reserve is quietly but vigorously turning the monetary screws. Net free reserves of our commercial banks in the week ended Wednesday had plunged to minus $173 million. That is right, I said minus. This is a further deficit of almost $75 billion just from the beginning of May. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, where this uncalled for action will take us. We still have great unemployment and unused industrial capacity throughout the Nation, yet the Fed is doggedly pursuing a course of action that can only end in an economic debacle. Following is an article which appeared in the May 20 issue of the New York Times, followed by titles of several feature articles from the financial press indicating that the growing credit shortage is beginning to take effect:

[From the New York Times, May 28, 1965]

Net Borrowed Reserves Climb—Indicating Tightening of Credit

(By Albert L. Kraus)

The Federal Reserve appears to have tightened credit another notch. Net borrowed reserves in the week ended Wednesday, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York reported, amounted to a daily average of $173 million, up $11 million from the week before and almost $75 million from the level at the beginning of May.

This has suggested to money market observers that the central banking system may have set a new and higher net borrowed reserve target, perhaps in the $175 to $200 million range. For some time previously, the target had been thought to be $100 million.

At any one time, some of the system's 6,236 member banks have reserves in excess of requirements, while others are forced to borrow from the central banking system.

When excess reserves are greater than borrowings, the system is said to enjoy net free reserves. When borrowings are greater than excess reserves, it is said to operate under a net borrowed reserve condition.

U.S. HOLDINGS ADVANCE

Reserves are the base upon which member banks can expand deposits and loans. Thus, a rise in net borrowings means a restriction in the capacity of member banks to make new loans and investments.

Through its open market operations, the Federal Reserve can affect the level of member bank reserves. When it buys Government securities, it adds to reserves, when it sells them, it diminishes reserves.

In the week ended Wednesday, the system added $588.5 million to its holdings of Government securities, bringing them to $38,134,472,000, a historic high. At the same time, it permitted $97.3 million of credit advanced to Government securities dealers by way of repurchase agreements to be repaid.

Despite these sizable net additions—spread among Treasury bills, notes, and bonds—the central banking system's open market operations were not big enough to bring down the net borrowed reserve position of the member banks.

In the weeks ahead, the system will have to make further substantial additions to its Government securities holdings to offset the growth of currency in circulation over the Memorial Day weekend and to accommodate the expected growth of business borrowing over mid-June quarterly tax and dividend payment dates.

Money market observers thought the system wanted to make clear, however, that recent erosion of short-term interest rates had gone far enough and that seasonal additions of funds to the money market wouldn't be permitted to drive them down further.

A factor in this decision undoubtedly has been widening of the interest rate differential between British and United States Treasury bills when hedged against currency fluctuations. In recent weeks, the advantage to Americans of investing in British bills has approached one-half percentage point.

The weekly report showed a drop of $145 million in loans to business by the 14 weekly reporting New York City member banks. At $15,133 million such loans are up $1,274 million so far this year.

Last year at the same date, they stood at $12,195 million down $581 million from the beginning of 1964. Repayments by chemical and rubber, textile and food concerns offset increase in borrowings by transportation companies, public utilities, petroleum refiners, and metal products companies.

"Industrial Output in April Increased at a Slower Pace," Wall Street Journal, May 17, 1965.

"Second Quarter Doubts Raised by Indicators," Journal of Commerce, May 17, 1965.

"Corporate Economists See No More Growth in Output During 1965," Wall Street Journal, May 18, 1965.

POSTAL AND FEDERAL PAY

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, in a clear-cut minority statement to the report of the President's Special Panel on Federal Salaries, President George Meany, of the AFL–CIO, declared:

> The report carries a positive reaffirmation of the need for full comparability between salaries of Federal employees and those paid for similar work in private industries—a concept which originated with the Randall Commission and which is now the law of the land under the Federal Pay Act of 1962. But all we have is a concept for, as the report points out, full comparability has not been achieved. In much of Government employment, in fact, we have not even approached comparability.
>
> What is even worse, the majority of the Special Panel has failed to urge immediate achievement of full comparability. In my opinion, this is a grave disservice to Government employees and to the Nation.

I agree with President Meany and today I am introducing a bill that provides for a 7-percent increase, the minimum amount necessary to reach full comparability.

Our statisticians feel a great reluctance, a great timidity, when it comes to recognizing what has happened with pay rates in industry.

The legislation already introduced provides for minute increases; in the first step in level 4 of the postal field service schedule and the first step in GS–5, the increase is for a mere $150 per year. These are the grades where we have the greatest numbers of employees. One hundred and fifty dollars provides an increase of a mere $5.76 per pay period. One dollar of this increase will go for income taxes, so the employee's take-home pay will be less than $5 increase per pay period. The hourly rate increase will be a mere 7 cents.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor, in its report of May 26 carries several interesting items on pay adjustments that the Panel should read.

The textile mills in the South report 3- to 5-percent increases in 18 months.

The McLouth Steel Corp. of Detroit granted an 11.5 cents per hour pay increase.

The United Parcel Service of New York granted a $14.80 weekly pay increase that amounts to 37 cents per hour.

Thirty thousand carpenters in Chicago received a 25-cent-per-hour increase.

I think it is about time that the Federal Government gets in step with industry, not with industry in 1961, 1962, or 1963, but with industry in 1965. For that reason, I am sponsoring legislation providing a 7-percent increase for postal and Federal employees.

DANGER FROM IMPORTATION TO CANADA OF LIVESTOCK FROM CERTAIN COUNTRIES

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the potential danger posed to this Nation's livestock industry by the suggested importation to Canada of livestock from countries known to have cattle infected with foot-and-mouth disease. This problem assumes particular importance with me, because I represent a district in which the livestock industry is highly important and because I remember vividly the ravages of the last foot-and-mouth epidemic in Canada in 1952.

At that time, bulldozers gouged huge holes in Canadian soil into which entire herds of cattle were driven and shot dead. Since my grain and livestock farm is only 18 miles from the Canadian border, I recall the mounds of earth that marked their graves. On a trip to Canada, I also remember having my own automobile sprayed with germ-killing chemicals at a checkpoint before I could return to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, because foot-and-mouth disease is so very contagious and almost universally fatal, I share the concern expressed by members of the American National Cattlemen's Association and their president, Brooks Keogh, who resides in my district, and also by the North Dakota Livestock Sanitary Board.

I would like to join both of these groups in urging our Federal officials to persuade our friends in Canada not to import cattle from a nation that has foot-and-mouth disease in its cattle herds and to ask the Department of Agriculture not to permit entry into the United States of cattle from any nation which allows imports from countries known to have infected cattle.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Record at this point the resolutions adopted at the annual convention of the American National Cattlemen's Association on January 25, 1964, and by the North Dakota Livestock Sanitary Board on May 25, 1965:

Resolution Passed by the North Dakota Sanitary Board at Their Regular Meeting on May 25, 1965

Whereas we commend our Federal regulatory officials for their work in preventing entry of foot-and-mouth and other exotic and highly contagious diseases into the United States and to North Dakota to the end that the health status of cattle in this State and the United States is the envy of the world; and whereas the Canadian Department of Agriculture has announced it will allow direct importation of live cattle from countries known to be infected with foot-and-mouth and other highly contagious diseases: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we express grave concern over the Canadian action and urge our Federal officials to protest and request the Canadian Government to rescind its action; and be it further

Resolved, That we strongly urge the U.S. Department of Agriculture not to permit entry of cattle from countries which open their borders to cattle from countries known to be infected with foot-and-month or other highly contagious diseases.

The livestock sanitary board believes that such action of other countries constitutes an inherent danger to the health of the domestic cattle of this State.

Resolution Passed at the Annual Convention of the American National Cattlemen's Association on January 25, 1964

Whereas we commend our regulatory officials for their excellent work in preventing entry of foot-and-month and other exotic and highly contagious diseases into the United States, to the end that the health status of cattle in the United States is the envy of the world; and

Whereas, the Canadian Department of Agriculture has announced it will allow direct importation of live cattle from countries known to be infected with foot-and-month and other highly contagious diseases: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we express grave concern over the Canadian action and urge our Federal officials to protest and request the Canadian Government to rescind its action; and be it further

Resolved, That we strongly urge the U.S. Department of Agriculture not to permit entry of cattle from countries which open their borders to cattle from countries known to be infected with foot-and-mouth or other highly contagious diseases.

EMIL WEITZNER—DISTINGUISHED NEW YORKER

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 25 New York lost one of its most distinguished citizens—Emil Weitzner. A highly esteemed member of the New York Bar for 47 years, he was known as "a lawyer's lawyer." In addition to his outstanding contributions to the legal profession, Emil Weitzner generously contributed his time and resources to the Emanu-El Midtown Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association, located on the lower East Side of New York. As chairman of the board and past president of the association, Mr. Weitzner's counsel and guidance to many of our city's young people will always be remembered.

A man of many talents, Emil Weitzner was a highly regarded biblicist. His book, "Humanist Meditations and Paraphrases," based on interpretations of the Old Testament, will be published shortly. He has also published several volumes of poetry and was an accomplished amateur painter.

Mr. Speaker, New York has lost a man of great intelligence and compassion. I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following obituary which appeared in the New York Times on May 27:

EMIL WEITZNER, LAWYER, 68, DIES—ESTATE SPECIALIST 47 YEARS IS STRICKEN AT MEETING

Emil Weitzner, a specialist in corporate, estate and trust law who practiced in New York for 47 years died Tuesday night at the age of 68.

Mr. Weitzner, who lived at 55 East End Avenue, was fatally stricken while attending a meeting of the board of trustees of the Emanu-El Midtown Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association at 309 East Sixth Street.

He was chairman of the board of the association and also had served as its president.

Mr. Weitzner was founder and head of the firm of Emil Weitzner, 70 Pine Street. He had formerly been a law partner with Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, and the late Judge Samuel H. Kaufman.

In addition to law, Mr. Weitzner's interests extended to poetry, music and art. He was the author of several volumes of poetry and Biblical paraphrases, including "Humanist Meditations and Paraphrases," which is scheduled for publication in the near future.

His paintings were exhibited at the annual shows of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

He was a member of the American Bar Association, Association of the Bar of the City of New York, New York County Lawyers Association, and New York State Bar Association.

Mr. Weitzner is survived by his widow, Ruth; a daughter, Judith Philips; a son, Richard E.; three sisters, Bella, Lillie and Ruth Weitzner, and five grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held at 12:45 p.m. today at the Riverside Memorial Chapel, Amsterdam Avenue and 76th Street.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF TUNISIA'S NATIONAL DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it is my duty and my pleasure to announce to the House that today is the sixth anniversary of the promulgation of the Constitution of the proud and friendly Republic of Tunisia.

To President Habib Bourguiba, who won the heart of the United States on the occasion of his visit here in 1961, to the able and popular Ambassador Driss, to all others who work in the duties of government, and to all the people of Tunisia wherever they reside and whatever is the nature of their labor, I extend for myself and my colleagues warm congratulations and sincere wishes for the future.

The bonds that unite the United States and Tunisia are strong and abiding. Our economic and technical assistance to Tunisia since 1957 has totaled over $380 million, in addition to much over $100 million in surplus agricultural products.

The American people as well as the American Government have been happy to note the wise use of our aid and the contribution it has made to the development in this modern world of a great country the history of which goes back many centuries.

Who has not heard of the city of Carthage and been moved by the glory of its rise to one of the great trade centers of the world and the tragedy of its fall at the hands of envious and fearful Rome?

Carthage was the most famed of the establishments of the Phoenician traders who took over what is now Tunisia in the 12th century B.C.

After the Roman occupation Tunisia was conquered by the Arabs in the 7th century and for many years was the center of Western Islamic culture and political power. Then came the Turk invasion in 1574, and the French protectorate in 1883. On June 1, 1959, 6 years ago today, the Constitution of Tunisia was promulgated.

The Constitution of Tunisia is much like that of the United States. Under this constitution Habib Bourguiba was elected President on November 8, 1959, and on November 8, 1964, was reelected for a second 5-year term. His son, Habib Bourguiga, Jr., a former Ambassador to the United States, is Secretary of State.

President Habib Bourguiba long has been a national hero, having been the George Washington in his country's struggle for independence.

In July of 1961 French and Tunisian forces clashed in the town of Bizerte, from which the French had not retired as from all other areas of Tunisia. Fortunately, the differences were resolved, the French military forces left Bizerte, and in 1963 French economic aid to Tunisia was resumed.

Again, Mr. Speaker, warmest congratulations and best wishes to the government and people of brave and proud Tunisia, a country of about 4 million people, 95 percent Moslem, on the northern coast of Africa between Algeria on the west and Libya on the east.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the finest time of the year, weatherwise, for an anniversary celebration in Tunisia. A rainy season extends from December to March but this is followed by an almost rainfree summer season beginning just about this time and running into September.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, June 1 marks Independence Day for Tunisia. To this nation of Africa, which regained its independence in 1956, I extend my warm congratulations.

Tunisia is a small country, about 48,000 square miles, approximately the size of Louisiana. And, as an independent nation, it is obviously quite young. But small and youthful as it is, the written history of this nation dates back more than 3,000 years. Civilization flourished in this part of northern Africa, in other words, about 16 centuries before the white man discovered and settled America and the New World. The Phoenicians established settlements in Tunisia in the 12th century B.C., and it has been occupied by the Romans, Turks, and French.

So Tunisia is a new nation with an ancient history and deep roots in the past. In some respects Tunisia bears a similarity to the Texas of 1836. In that year Texas declared its independence after having been under other flags—the French, Spanish, and Mexican. Texas, too, was a province of an ancient civilization and Indian tribes that once flourished in our State have long since vanished.

Further, the Arabs of North Africa exercised an immeasurable influence on Spain. And it was Spain, of course, which was the first country of the Old World to explore and settle the New, principally the territory of Mexico and Texas. Spanish influences, and through the Spanish the Arabic, are everywhere visible in this part of the Western Hemisphere. Texas and Tunisia are, it seems to me, both confluences of cultures, traditions and peoples, and we have many things in common.

As the Congressman from the 20th District of Texas, representing the more than 700,000 people of Bexar County and San Antonio—the home of the Alamo, the shrine of Texas independence—I again extend my warmest greeting and congratulations to the people of Tunisia on their Independence Day.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today, June 1, marks the ninth anniversary of the independence of Tunisia, and on this memorable occasion, we wish to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic of Tunisia, Habib Bourguiba; and to His Excellency, the Tunisian Ambassador to the United States, Rachid Driss.

It is appropriate that we pay our respects to a country that has, more than any other, adapted itself to the task of modernization without sacrificing the values which we consider important.

In the past, Tunisia was famous as the home of one of the most powerful states to oppose the expansion of imperial Rome: Carthage. Founded originally as a Phoenician outpost, Carthage developed into a major threat to the Empire, and despite its might and advanced culture, finally succumbed in the famous Punic Wars. When the Roman Empire finally declined, Tunisia was in the path of successive waves of invaders, first from Europe, and then from the East. It was not until A.D. 800 that the Tunisians again had their own government; the dynasty which arose then succeeded in recreating the prosperity and power of the past: it conquered Sicily and invaded parts of southern Italy while extending its dominion over much of north Africa. Later, like so many others, it was defeated and Tunisia became a part of the last of the great multinational empires of the East: the Ottoman Empire.

Finally falling under French occupation late in the 19th century, Tunisia was not to become independent again until 1956, and then only after a struggle lasting for over 35 years. The leadership of the movement for national independence was, after the early thirties, in the hands of the Neo-Destour—or, New Constitution—Party, under the man who is now President of the Republic, Habib Bourguiba.

For a man who has spent more than a decade of his life in French prisons for his open advocacy of Tunisian independence, Bourguiba is one of the outstanding political figures of our age. Throughout his life, he has never sacrificed the ideals of reason, persuasive argument, and a progressive pragmatism as a means for achieving desired goals for the much easier, and too often more effective totalitarian shortcuts. He has remained dedicated to democratic principles and humanitarian values in the face of Nazi blandishments, French intransigeance, and hostility from other Arab leaders.

The results which he and his party have achieved in Tunisia since independence speak volumes; without coercion, social unrest, and violence, Tunisia more than any other recently independent country has adapted itself to the changed circumstances and the immense challenges of the modern world. Tunisian students who study abroad return to their homeland to participate in the dynamic programs which the government has initiated in order to develop the country—an entirely different story from that associated with so many Afro-Asian countries, whose students would rather remain here than go home.

The vitality and spirit which pervades Tunisia today is infectious; other countries of Africa and Asia have looked to Tunisia and President Bourguiba's methods as an alternative to the easy reliance on autocratic means toward the achievement of extensive national economic development goals. This is a tribute by other countries which few countries have received. And, the results which have been achieved—in education particularly, in industry, in agriculture, and many other facets of national life—are impressive.

On this day, therefore, we express our great sympathy for the goals and methods which the Tunisians and President Bourguiba have chosen for themselves. Events up to the present have demonstrated their validity, and I am certain that the future continues to hold ever greater promise and fulfillment.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, June 1 marks the National Day of the Republic of Tunisia. On this important day, I want to extend my warm and sincere congratulations to the people of Tunisia and to its outstanding President, Habib Bourguiba.

Since independence in 1956, Tunisia has achieved a praiseworthy degree of economic and social progress. These significant strides forward have been achieved through the cooperation and sacrifices of Tunisians from every walk of life. It is worthwhile to mention that one-half of the 4 million population of Tunisia is under 20 years of age, and the majority of its leaders are under 40. This explains to a large degree the energy and vitality of this young Republic in its successful struggle to improve the country and its economy. Under President Bourguiba, Tunisia has achieved, without ostentation, a degree of political stability and economic progress that can be envied by any newly independent country. Concurrently, Tunisia has proved to be the voice of moderation and restraint in both Arab and African councils, though not always without criticism.

We in the United States are aware of Tunisia's efforts and are pleased to be associated with its economic development. We salute the courageous Tunisian leadership, and extend to it and to the people of Tunisia every good wish for the future.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, may I extend greetings to the nation of Tunisia on this day commemorating its independence. The aspirations and determination of the more than 3 million people of Tunisia are continuing to provide the foundation for the development of a prosperous society. As a nation who has struggled through the process of economic development, we recognize and applaud the tremendous effort being made by an independent Tunisia.

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues today in calling attention to Independence Day in the Republic of Tunisia.

Tunisia regained its independence on March 20, 1956, when an agreement was signed ending the French protectorate that had existed for 75 years.

A year later, the Tunisian Constituent Assembly voted to abolish its monarchy and to establish the Tunisian Republic.

The Assembly named Habib Bourguiba—a man who led the country's struggle for independence—as its first President. Last November, he was reelected to a second 5-year term.

The Assembly then drafted a constitution which was promulgated on June 1, 1959. Today marks the sixth anniversary of Tunisia's Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate President Bourguiba and all of the citizens of Tunisia on their Independence Day and at the same time praise the leaders of that country for their efforts to make Tunisia economically self-sufficient.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, today, the first of June, is a national holiday in Tunisia, where the people are celebrating their ninth anniversary of their independence won in 1956. It is an appropriate time to express not only our best wishes to its population and its President, Habib Bourguiba, but also our admiration for the policies which this small nation has followed since its independence.

The heirs of a proud and glorious past, the Tunisians of today are not content to let their country become a stagnant backwater while the rest of the world proceeds apace with rapid industrialization and modernization. Although the might and power of ancient Carthage was nearly obliterated by the legions of Rome, Tunisia in the past provided some of the great minds and leaders of the Empire, and, if we gage the country today by the vigor and determination of its population and leaders to once again make Tunisia a leader, their chances of success appear bright indeed.

Under the leadership of President Bourguiba, Tunisia has become a model for many of the countries of Africa and Asia of how new nations can bring the benefits of modernization, technology, and accelerated economic development to their people without falling prey to the temptation of using totalitarian methods. Tunisia's President has become the most well-known and outspoken defender of moderation, pragmatic progress, and the use of reasonable means for the achievement of his country's and his own political goals.

Tunisia is fortunate in that its leaders have created a mass party which has its roots in all the different levels of Tunisian society. Rather than create an elite group, severed from the population as a whole, the Tunisian Neo-Destour—New Constitution—Party, recently renamed the Destourian Socialist Party, decided from the start to recruit its membership from among farmers, students, labor groups, businessmen, and every other possible group in the country. In so doing, it has offered a voice in the making of policy to the whole population, and there is not that great gulf which in so many countries separates the government from its people.

In the implementation of the policies which are decided upon, once again the reasonableness which characterizes Tunisian politics is evident: persuasion and a pragmatic approach are employed. And, again characteristically, the results which are achieved are considerable. In the field of education, for example, the new school system which was inaugurated after the departure of the French has in less than a decade undertaken to educate more than twice as many pupils, and in the same period of time doubled the literacy rate from about 15 to 30 percent—a remarkable achievement.

Quite obviously, it is not possible to enumerate all of Tunisia's achievements in a short time. The record, however, speaks for itself. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to wish the Tunisians well for the future, and congratulate them on the progress which they have achieved to date. In so doing, I wish to express a hope that other countries will follow the constructive and progressive path which this small nation has chosen for itself—a most worthwhile and laudable path indeed.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today the great Republic of Tunisia celebrates its national day which is in fact a double celebration. On June 1, 1955, Mr. Habib Bourguiba, now the President of the Tunisian Republic, returned from exile to lead the victorious efforts of the Tunisian independence movement. Just 9 months later, Tunisia gained its independence. Also on June 1, 1959, the Tunisian Constitution was declared which established the basic framework of the Tunisian Government.

Tunisia has demonstrated great maturity in her relations with other countries and has been a leader in developing greater mutual cooperation among both the nations of the Mediterranean and of Africa. Tunisia has been in the forefront of the efforts of the newly independent nations to promote national self-government, economic development, and peace among all the countries of the world.

The United States of America is proud to call Tunisia its friend. I know both countries look forward to continued close and friendly relations. On this momentous and proud day in Tunisia's history, many Americans join in extending congratulations to His Excellency, the President of the Public of Tunisia, Habib Bourguiba; His Excellency, the Tunisian Ambassador to the United States, Rachid Driss; and all the citizens of this modern nation.

Lying on the Mediterranean Sea, bordered by Algeria and Libya, Tunisia has had a long and difficult history of continuous struggle for independence. From as long ago as the 12th century B.C. when the Phoenicians settled along the coastline, Tunisia has had to withstand waves of invaders: Vandals, Byzantines, Arabs, Turks, and, finally, the French in 1830. During all of this time Tunisia was able to maintain its own culture as demonstrated by the great heights reached by Tunisian civilization during the 10th century under the Hafsid dynasty.

During the 1930's, Mr. Bourguiba organized the Neo-Destour Party to fight for Tunisian independence under the slogan of "human dignity." Though the French outlawed the party and exiled Mr. Bourguiba in September 1934, independence was finally won on March 20, 1956. On July 25, 1957, Tunisia was declared a republic with Mr. Bourguiba as its first President.

Mr. Bourguiba has often explained the success of his nation's fight for independence in these words:

> Revolts are not made essentially in the name of nationalism, but in the name of an immense thirst for dignity. When those who revolt can slake this thirst in political structures minutely prepared by their leaders, then it's a success. When there are no structures, then it's chaos.

In 1958 Tunisia embarked on an energetic and comprehensive program of social and economic development. Today 65 percent of all Tunisian children are enrolled in school and by 1971 it is expected that universal primary education will have been achieved.

In less than 10 years, Tunisia has made remarkable progress in developing its agriculture, industry, and technology. The Tunisian Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Rachid Driss, has explained this phenomenon:

> The Tunisians have acquired the most important attitude for social and economic growth—confidence. We have confidence in the future. Our goal is a realization of a true democracy based on the happiness of the people.

Tunisia has a long history of contribution to world civilization. Its history as an independent republic demonstrates that its contributions to peace and economic development will continue to grow in the future. Again may I offer my warmest congratulations to the citizens of the vigorous and progressive Republic of Tunisia.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the 1st of June marks the national day of the people of Tunisia, and I think it is appropriate that on this day we pay tribute to them and their leaders.

Under the leadership of President Habib Bourguiba and the Destourian Socialist Party, Tunisia since independence has achieved very impressive economic and social progress. The most heartening part of this progress is the fact that it has been achieved under a government dedicated wholeheartedly to democratic principles and practices. Under President Bourguiba, the Destourian Socialist Party has worked diligently at obtaining the cooperation and assistance of Tunisians from all classes and occupations in the task of improving the country and its economy.

At the same time, the Tunisian Government has developed for itself an enviable record of moderation and good counsel in the international arena; it presents us with a refreshing case of a country following a responsible independent course, a useful guide for other newly emerging nations throughout the world.

We in the United States have recognized the sincere commitment of the Tunisians to an amelioration of their problems, and we have therefore seen fit to assist in a number of different ways. It is a pleasure to report that our projects in Tunisia are among the most successful in all of our programs overseas. It is, therefore, with particular pleasure that we congratulate the Tunisians on their national holiday, and extend our best wishes for the future.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, today, June 1, is the Independence Day of Tunisia.

It is proper that we honor the long fight for independence of the people of Tunisia which finally came to fruition on this day.

It is equally proper that we honor the outstanding record of internal development and responsibility in foreign relations which are characteristic of the development of Tunisia in past years. Under the able leadership of President Bourguiba, Tunisia has set an outstanding record not only in her foreign relations with African countries, but also throughout the world. In particular, Tunisia's position as an independent nation resting between Africa, the Maghrib and the West has been a source of strength for world peace.

It is appropriate that on this day we honor in the House of Representatives a valued member of the world community and its able leader.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, June 1 is a significant day in the history of the Tunisian people; for on that day in 1959 a constitution which established the Republic of Tunisia was promulgated. Today, on the sixth anniversary of that day which marked the beginning of a government for, and by, the people, of Tunisia, I would like to express my admiration for the achievements the Tunisian people have made in this short period of time.

In recent years, which have seen the emergence of many new nations, Tunisia is an outstanding example of what a free people with determination and will, led by a man of foresight, understanding, and intelligence can do. I refer of course to the distinguished President of Tunisia, Habib Bourguiba.

Indeed, the Republic of Tunisia stands as a proud symbol of the democratic system of government and as a living example that democracy can succeed in newly established nations.

The Tunisian people did not achieve their independence easily, for the French protectorate was ended in 1956 only after several years of strife and bloodshed. Following the signing of the protocol in which France recognized Tunisia's sovereignty and independence, a Tunisian Constituent Assembly was convened. This Assembly abolished the monarchy, drafted the Constitution, and named Habib Bourguiba President. The first elections under the Constitution were held November 8, 1959.

The Constitution and establishment of the Republic marked the achievement of a drive for independence which began in 1934 with the founding of the Neo-Destour—New Constitution—Party, of which Habib Bourguiba soon became president.

In October 1964 the party was renamed the Destourian Socialist Party. The second presidential and parliamentary elections under the new constitution were held in November 1964 and President Bourguiba was reelected for a second 5-year term.

Mr. Speaker, I believe President Bourguiba and the Tunisian people deserve the heartiest congratulations and best wishes of the American people on this anniversary date.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to call our colleagues' attention to the fact that on yesterday, June 1, the Republic of Tunisia celebrated its sixth independence day.

Less than 10 years ago Tunisia was a French protectorate. Today she not only proudly, and rightly so, possesses her independence, but she is making vigorous efforts both to develop her economy and to bring new stability to the shores of the Mediterranean.

Unfortunately, all too few Americans know very much about Tunisia, whose written history dates back to the 12th century B.C. Accordingly, I am including, at the close of my remarks, some background notes prepared by the Department of State.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that our colleagues will join with me in extending best independence day wishes to the courageous people of Tunisia. I know we all wish President Bourguiba and the members of his government every success in their efforts to bring greater peace and prosperity to this great country and to their neighbors:

Background Notes on Tunisia

Capital: Tunis.

Population: 3,900,000.

Tunisia regained its independence on March 20, 1956, with the signing of a protocol between Tunisia and France by which the latter recognized the sovereignty and independence of Tunisia and thereby ended the French protectorate that had been established in 1881. On July 25, 1957, the Tunisian Constituent Assembly voted to abolish the monarchy and to establish the Tunisian Republic.

The assembly named as President, Habib Bourguiba, who had led the country's struggle for independence. The same assembly drafted a constitution which was promulgated on June 1, 1959. This Constitution provides for a presidential system and is similar in a number of other respects to that of the United States. On November 8, 1959, Tunisia held its first elections under the new Constitution. President Bourguiba was unopposed and assembly candidates, backed by Bourguiba's Neo-Destour Party and affiliated labor and professional groups, had only token opposition.

THE LAND

Situated on the northern coast of Africa between Algeria on the west and Libya on the east, Tunisia has a coastline on the Mediterranean Sea extending for nearly 1,000 miles. Its area is 48,332 square miles or about the size of Louisiana.

The country is subdivided by climate into a northern area, which is wooded, fertile, and the source of most of Tunisia's agricultural production; the central area, comprising the coastal plains noted for livestock grazing and olive groves; and the southern region, which borders the Sahara Desert and lacks sufficient rainfall to support more than grazing herds and seminomadic peoples. A rainy season extends from December to March followed by an almost rainfree summer season from June to September.

THE PEOPLE

The population of Tunisia was 3,783,169 according to the results of an official Tunisian Government census of February 1956. About half the population is below the age of 21; there is an annual increase of about 80,000. Over 95 percent of the population is Moslem.

The European population has dropped since independence and constitutes about 4 percent of the total population. Largest European communities are the French (30,000) and the Italian (30,000). There is also a Maltese community of several thousand. Islam is the official religion. The official language is Arabic, but French is widely used and continues to be taught in Tunisian schools.

GOVERNMENT

The President of Tunisia appoints the ministers, who are responsible only to him. He is responsible for determining national policy, and his bills have priority before the single-chamber assembly. He may legislate by decree when the assembly is not in session. The President is elected for 5 years, renewable for two additional 5-year terms.

The Assembly, which is also elected for 5 years, meets twice a year. During its recess its interests are assured by standing committees. The Assembly's principal legislative task is to approve the budget.

The Constitution provides for an independent judiciary and a Council of State having functions similar to those of the Court of Claims and the General Accounting Office. Tunisian legal codes and court organization and procedures are based to a considerable degree on those of France.

HISTORY

Tunisia's written history dates from the arrival in the 12th century B.C. of Phoenician traders who established permanent settlements, the most famous of which was the city of Carthage. After being occupied by the Romans, Tunisia was conquered in the seventh century A.D. by the Arabs and became a major center of Western Islamic culture and political power. The Turks invaded Tunisia in 1574. A French protectorate was established over Tunisia in 1883. The outward forms of the Tunisian monarchy which had been established in 1705 continued in force, but all the power was in French hands.

Following World War I the Destour (Constitution) Party asked unsuccessfully for moderate reforms, including a legislative assembly. But the founding in 1934 of the Neo-Destour (New Constitution) Party of which Habib Bourguiba soon became President, marks the real beginning of Tunisia's drive for independence.

In March 1952, following the breakdown of negotiations with France, Tunisian guerrilla fighters (fallagha) took to the hills, and in 1954 France found herself using about 70,000 troops in an effort to restore order and security. In July 1954 France promised the Tunisians full internal autonomy. In December the fallagha were persuaded to accept a French amnesty, turning in some of their arms.

After 9 months of negotiation the Franco-Tunisian conventions on internal autonomy were signed on June 3, 1955, but from the moment the conventions were put into effect it became apparent that the Tunisians would demand their early revision and review. Events in Morocco, Algeria, and throughout the Afro-Asian world hastened this process, and Bourguiba began to press France for independence. On March 20, 1956, a protocol was drawn up in which France recognized Tunisian independence.

The March 20 protocol also specified that Tunisia and France would negotiate new "interdependence" relations, particularly in the fields of foreign affairs and defense. Considerable progress has been made on some important issues in Franco-Tunisian relations, but intense feelings over Algeria and Bizerte have slowed progress toward definitive arrangements on other matters.

France and Tunisia reached an agreement in June 1958 which provided for the evacuation of French forces, except for those at Bizerte, and for further negotiation of provisional arrangements concerning the status of Bizerte. Negotiations over the ensuing years failed to produce agreement. In July 1961, bloody clashes between French and Tunisian forces took place in the town and environs of Bizerte. A period of extreme tenseness in Tunisian-French relations followed. Direct contacts were maintained, however, and diplomatic relations were resumed in September 1962. Relations have since improved steadily. In 1963 French economic aid to Tunisia was resumed, and in October of that year the last of French military forces left Bizerte.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

Tunisia believes that it cannot formally aline itself with the West but should maintain such relations with both West and East as best serve Tunisian interests. Most Tunisians consider, however, that particular emphasis should be placed on Tunisia's relations with the West and with Tunisia's African neighbors. In addition to being a member of the United Nations and many of its specialized agencies, Tunisia is also a member of the Arab League and the Organization of African Unity.

ECONOMY

Agriculture, although handicapped by inadequate water supplies in many parts of the country, is the backbone of the Tunisian economy. The principal crops are wheat, olives, citrus fruit, grapes, truck crops, and esparto grass. Agricultural exports include grains, olive oil, wine, esparto grass, and citrus fruit.

Although no extensive mineral deposits have been found in Tunisia, there are commercially exploited deposits of phosphates, iron ore, lead, and zinc that are the source of substantial foreign exchange earnings. Extensive exploratory searches for oil have been undertaken since the recent oil discoveries in neighboring Algeria and Libya.

Tunisian foreign trade is largely oriented toward the franc zone, which since 1958 has taken about 60 percent of Tunisian exports and supplied about 60 percent of imports. The United States generally supplies less than 5 percent of Tunisia's imports and takes about 3 percent of her exports, though as a result of the U.S. aid program the proportion of imports supplied by the United States has increased somewhat in recent years. Tunisia traditionally has a substantial deficit in her trade balance.

Tunisia refused to follow France in the devaluation of December 1958 and now has its own currency, the dinar. The Tunisian and French currencies exchange on the basis of 1 Tunisian dinar for 11.75 new French francs. One dinar equals $2.38.

Tunisia faces difficult economic conditions and widespread unemployment. However, these problems are chronic rather than acute, and the last elections in November 1959 gave a resounding vote of confidence to Bourguiba and the Neo-Destour. Since the elections President Bourguiba has placed special emphasis on programs designed to provide jobs and develop Tunisia's economy.

U.S. ASSISTANCE

The United States provides economic and technical assistance to Tunisia under the mutual security program pursuant to an agreement signed on March 26, 1957. Such assistance to the end of fiscal year 1963 amounted to approximately $200 million.

The United States has also been furnishing assistance in the form of surplus agricultural commodities under title II of Public Law 480. Such assistance was first extended under an agreement signed in September 1956 providing wheat for famine relief. Since then other programs have been undertaken to provide surplus agricultural commodities for a child-feeding program, for the relief of civilian refugees from Algeria, and as a basic part of the Tunisian battle against underdevelopment through the use of the unemployed. Under these various programs the United States has contributed over $100 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities since 1959. The United States provided a $180 million long-term commitment to the Tunisian 3-year plan (1962–64). A 4-year plan (1965–68) has been prepared and is now ready for implementation. The United States has reaffirmed its willingness to continue its association in Tunisian development efforts and to provide major support on a continuing and sustained basis within the context of the 4-year plan.

New Tunisian Government: In October 1964 the Neo-Destour Party was renamed the Destourian Socialist Party. Presidential and parliamentary elections occurred on November 8, 1964. President Habib Bourguiba was reelected for a second 5-year term. The new Cabinet was announced on November 11, 1964.

Principal Government officials:

President of the Republic of Tunisia: Habib Bourguiba.[1]

Personal representative of the President: Mongi Slim (former Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs).

Secretary of State for Justice: Hedi Khefacha.[1]

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs: Habib Bourguiba, Jr.

Secretary of State for Interior: Taieb Mehiri.[1]

Secretary of State for the Plan and National Economy: Ahmed Ben Salah.[1]

Secretary of State for National Education: Mahmoud Messadi.[1]

Secretary of State for Cultural Affairs: Chedly Klibi.

Secretary of State for Youth, Sports, and Social Affairs: Mondher Benammar.

Secretary of State for Public Works and Housing: Ahmed Noureddine.[1]

Secretary of State for Public Health: Fethi Zouhir.

Secretary of State for Information and Guidance: Abdelmajid Chaker.

Director General for Postal Service, Telegraph, and Telephone: Abdallah Farhat.

Director for Radio and Television: Mohamed Mzali.

Director of President's Office: Taieb Sahbani.

Habib Bourguiba: President of the Tunisian Republic. Mr. Bourguiba was born on August 3, 1903, and is credited, more than any other individual, with being the author of Tunisian independence. Tunisians have conferred upon Mr. Bourguiba the title of "Supreme Combatant," which is perhaps the most eloquent description of his special position in Tunisian public life. He was Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs and Defense in the first Tunisian Government formed in April 1956 following independence; this government remained in power until July 25, 1957, when the Republic was proclaimed. President Bourguiba also heads the dominant political party in Tunisia, the Destourian Socialist Party. Mr. Bourguiba visited the United States most recently in May 1961.

Bahi Ladgham: A native of Tunis and Vice Prime Minister of Tunisia until July 25, 1957, Mr. Ladgham was named Secretary of State to the Presidency for Coordination and Secretary of State for National Defense in the Cabinet. He is a vigorous nationalist and one of the leaders of the Destourian Socialist Party.

Habib Bourguiba, Jr.: Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Mr. Bourguiba, Jr., is the son of the President of Tunisia. He was appointed Foreign Minister in November 1964. Born in April 1927, Mr. Bourguiba was educated in Tunis and Paris. He has served as Tunisian Ambassador to Italy (1957–58), France (1958–61), and the United States (1961–63). Before nomination to the position of Foreign Minister, he served as Secretary General to the Presidency.

Principal U.S. officials: Ambassador Francis H. Russell; Deputy Chief of Mission, Leo G. Cyr; Director, U.S. AID mission, Daly C. Lavergne; public affairs officer, William Astill.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in commemorating the sixth anniversary of the independence of Tunisa.

We are proud to call Tunisia our friend and to her President, Habib Bourguiba, our congratulations are extended for the part which he played in bringing about its independence. Under his guidance the country has achieved a praiseworthy degree of economic and technical assistance which our own country has extended to her. Her students study abroad and return to their homeland to participate in the programs initiated by her Government which are making her a dynamic and powerful influence in the Afro-Asian assembly of nations. The results which this young Republic has achieved are impressive. Her political stability can be envied by any newly independent country.

Tunisia has demonstrated great maturity in her relations with other countries and has been a leader in developing greater mutual cooperation among both the nations of the Mediterranean and of Africa. She has been in the forefront of the efforts of the newly independent nations to promote national self-government, economic development, and peace among all the countries of the world.

The courage and farsightedness of President Bourguiba in suggesting the unmentionable among Arabs—that peace should be made in the Middle East with Israel—marks him as a statesman a cut above the others in the area. He alone, not only recognized that peace would be beneficial to the entire Middle East, but was brave enough to publicly say so.

We salute the Tunisian people, and their great leader and wish them every success for future success.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the sixth anniversary of the Constitution of the Republic of Tunisia. This was a most significant reminder of the praiseworthy degree of economic and social progress which has been realized in this African nation in recent years, and is just cause for our sincere commendation.

It was just 9 years ago, in 1956, that Tunisia achieved her independence after a long struggle of several decades. A year later the Republic was established and Habib Bourguiba was named President by the Assembly. Finally on June 1, 1959, the Constitution drawn by the Assembly was promulgated.

Though this Republic is comparatively new, the area in which it lies is rich in culture and tradition. Originally the site of Carthage, a Phoenician trading center and rival of the Roman Empire, the nation's history provides a fascinating study of the determined efforts of these people to achieve a stature of independence and progress.

Under President Bourguiba the Republic of Tunisia has taken great strides toward the fulfillment of these goals. Imaginative and dynamic programs have been initiated resulting in economic growth and a greater measure of political stability. As a recipient of U.S. foreign aid, Tunisia typifies a desirable example of the proper use of our assistance by a nation which is willing to, at the same time, help itself.

In the brief period of its independence, Tunisia has made substantial progress in the areas of agriculture, education, technology, and industrial development. President Bourguiba has proven himself a true leader of his people and a remarkable political figure.

The people of the United States are pleased to be associated with the development we have seen to date, and we congratulate the leaders and people of Tunisia for their notable progress. On this important occasion we offer our very best wishes for continued success to President Habib Bourguiba, Ambassador to the United States Rachid Driss, and the people of Tunisia.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of Tunisian independence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSMAN PELLY ASKS PRESIDENT JOHNSON TO SEEK JAPAN'S COOPERATION IN U.S. SALMON DISPUTE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have wired President Johnson urging him to intervene personally and seek Japanese cooperation in support of American fishery conservation of north Pacific red salmon. I felt it essential in a last minute effort that the President appeal to Premier Satu requesting him to keep the Japanese fishing fleet away from the North Pacific Ocean area where American red salmon are congregated preparatory to their migration to our coastal waters. If the Japanese start taking these salmon with nets, which in the interest of conservation neither Canadians nor Americans can do, our fishermen in

---

[1] No change from same position in previous Cabinet.

retaliation have organized a nationwide boycott of Japanese goods and large segments of organized labor have indicated support of such a move.

Mr. Speaker, I became especially concerned last week when I learned that representatives from such organized labor groups as the ILWA, Sailors' Union, Marine Cooks and Stewards, Waitresses Union, Hotel Service Employees, Firemen and Oilers and also the Seafarers' International Union and affiliates had demonstrated in San Francisco in front of five major department stores.

I should point out that as far as I know the Japanese fleet has not yet arrived or taken fish in that portion of the ocean which would affect the red salmon runs and thereby would set off a nationwide anti-Japanese boycott.

Negotiations by our State Department have been weak and futile but that can be expected; for its press relations officer, Robert J. McCloskey, has publicly indicated that our State Department supports the Japanese legal position although our Fish and Wildlife officials have repeatedly pointed out that Japan's using small mesh nets is contrary to conservation and will result in destruction of our red salmon.

In this connection, American and Canadian fishermen have long been prohibited from using nets on the high seas, but not so the Japanese who, having depleted the Asian stocks of salmon, now threaten to do the same with ours.

Facing a loss of livelihood, our fishermen have called on organized labor in the United States to join in a nationwide boycott which could do great harm to both countries.

Meanwhile, the crisis is at hand because the period when the Bristol Bay salmon congregate before migration, is between June 1 and 20. Thus I have felt impelled to ask President Johnson to intervene in the interest of conservation of our fishery resources. Otherwise, with organized labor taking a hand, a boycott certainly could be a very serious matter.

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS BY YORAM B. SZEKELY

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1965, a young Israeli who came to this country from Tel Aviv in 1960, Mr. Yoram B. Szekely, delivered the valedictory address at Columbia College. According to press accounts he was booed at the conclusion of his speech by some of those present. Apparently what aroused the ire among some of his audience which included the 663 other members of the senior class of Columbia were his comments that recent protest demonstrations at Columbia were cases of "outright and spiteful disregard for university authority" and a "waste of intellectual resources."

The young valedictorian cited as specific examples the picketing last spring of Queen Frederika of Greece when she received an honorary degree; and the attempted boycott of university dining halls by the campus chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality; and a demonstration by 100 students who blocked the door of the college library and forced postponement of the Naval Reserve's Awards Ceremony.

Mr. Szekely, in his valedictory address, also made these points: That admission to an institution of higher learning is a privilege rather than an inherent right and that students come to a university for the purpose of obtaining an education, and should leave teaching to the teachers and administration to the administrators.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to publicly applaud this young man for reminding college and university students of some basic and fundamental facts of life that seem to have escaped a large number of those who presently comprise our student population. We hear increasingly about the so-called "new left," which is going to remake America. Perhaps if they take the time to absorb some of the lessons that can be learned while students they may come to the end of their academic careers far better equipped to deal with the complexities of contemporary problems than they will if they associate their time and energies in some of the sophomoric activities which are currently being conducted in the name of academic protest.

Mr. Speaker, I do not challenge the right of any student to dissent from the policies of our Government; nor do I disagree with the idea that it is both useful and healthy in a democracy to have a continuing dialog in important public questions. However, I do think that breaches of the peace, violations of the law, the burning of draft cards, and the issuance of inflammatory statements bordering on treason that have characterized some of these protest demonstrations are neither intelligent nor right.

Mr. Speaker, we shall scarcely be successful in furthering the concept of the rule of law in settling disputes among nations if we have no respect for the rule of law as it affects domestic problems.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Mr. Szekely's courage as exemplified in his valedictory address will inspire other students to reject the "new left" and its tactics.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT THE HERBERT H. LEHMAN MEMORIAL DINNER

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a speech by the Vice President of the United States honoring the late Herbert H. Lehman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Vice President, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, on May 20, 1965, addressed the Herbert H. Lehman memorial dinner in New York City. Not only was Governor Lehman a distinguished American statesman whose great talents covered a wide area, but, of course, he was an outstanding Member of the Congress for many years as U.S. Senator from the State of New York.

I feel there will be many who will want to read the Vice President's comments that evening—not only those who, like myself, had the privilege of knowing Governor Lehman personally, but also those who will want to be reminded of his great contributions to the progress of his country.

Vice President HUMPHREY, of course, is also to be congratulated for he has done himself great honor in his eloquence and well considered comments in tribute to a truly great American. His address follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, LEHMAN MEMORIAL DINNER, MAY 20, 1965

We are gathered here this evening to honor the memory of one of New York's—and America's—most valiant fighters in the cause of justice and freedom—Gov. Herbert H. Lehman.

Many of us in this room had the rare privilege of knowing Governor Lehman—of working with him, of struggling with him, of winning with him, and—sometimes—of losing with him.

Many of us have witnessed his indomitable courage, his determination, and his fearlessness in pushing forward the frontiers of freedom and justice—in advocating the cause of the downtrodden, the forgotten and the deprived.

And many of us have spent priceless hours—unforgettable hours—in the company of the Governor and his wonderful wife and constant companion, Edith.

But the legacy of Herbert H. Lehman is surely not just the property of those persons privileged to know him personally. His contributions to our common life will endure and be recognized by countless generations of Americans and persons around the globe.

His political philosophy was simple and uncomplicated: to use the processes of government to help people unable to help themselves.

Whether working in behalf of the Henry Street Settlement House, or participating in the life-saving work of the Joint Distribution Committee, or campaigning for Al Smith, or serving in Albany with Franklin D. Roosevelt, or becoming Governor in his own right, or saving millions of persons from the ravages of war as director of UNRRA, or again serving New York State as U.S. Senator, or engaged in reform politics of New York State, Herbert H. Lehman cared about people—and he gave of himself unstintingly in their behalf.

During his tenure in the U.S. Senate, this concern with the individual manifested itself in many ways: fighting the Internal Security Act of 1950, the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952, the Dixon-Yates power contract, and the venom of McCarthyism which had infected the Nation in the early 1950's.

And while opposing these measures with every fiber of his being, he was simultaneously fighting just as courageously for meaningful immigration reform, a sound excess profits tax, Federal aid to education, an equitable Government loyalty-security program, amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act, and, of course, full civil rights for every American.

Regardless of the issue, the time, or the place, Herbert Lehman could be found in the middle of the battle—fighting to expand individual rights and opportunities in a society which had become increasingly complex and impersonal.

The issue of civil rights always commanded a priority place on Herbert Lehman's personal political agenda. I recall so vividly his efforts in the Senate to secure consideration of voting rights and fair employment practices legislation. I remember his forthright civil rights campaign at the 1956 Democratic National Convention. And I know he would have rejoiced with us over the important civil rights victories of the past several years—and would now be grappling with the even more challenging tasks which remain unfinished.

Until this point in history, the civil rights movement has concentrated upon removing the legal barriers to full citizenship—segregated schools, hotels, restaurants, and voting discrimination. With the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965—and with its full implementation—we can say that this historic initial phase of the civil rights struggle is well on its way toward completion.

But where is the justice in a situation which permits a Negro to eat in a restaurant, but denies him the opportunity to earn enough money to pay for his dinner?

Where is the justice in removing barriers to registration and voting, but denying to Negroes and other minority groups the education necessary to become full-fledged participants in the democratic process?

And how much longer can we afford to sacrifice the earning power, the buying power, and the brain power of this substantial segment of the American people?

The Council of Economic Advisers has estimated that inequalities in educational and employment opportunities for Negroes will cost our Nation $23 billion in gross national product. I suggest that no country, however affluent and prosperous, can afford this kind of waste. And I suggest further that Americans finally must begin to take seriously this shocking waste of human and material resources.

In short, the heartening progress of the past several years in tearing down the edifice of legalized segregation and discrimination has now brought us face to face with an even greater challenge—to see whether this Nation has the capacity and the courage to bring disadvantaged Negroes and others fully into the mainstream of American political, economic, and social life.

We can, I believe, expect the civil rights movement to be concerned increasingly with problems afflicting society as a whole but which have special impact upon Negro and other minority groups—problems such as education, unemployment, urban decay, housing, disease, and automation. And we can hope that the principal civil rights organization will bring to these vital problems the same dedication, imagination, determination, and courage which has characterized their attacks on the institutions of legalized discrimination.

Indeed, the task of educating the illiterate, training the unemployed, revitalizing the ghettoes, and bringing new hope and opportunity to the forgotten is a task of historic dimension and one of immense difficulty. It will require the clear acceptance of the responsibility by public and private agencies alike, to make the civil rights of our citizens truly meaningful in terms of better education, better jobs, better medical care, and better housing.

In this context, the role of the Federal Government, in conjunction with the efforts of States and localities, will be a crucial factor in determining whether the resources of this Nation will be responsive to this new dimension of the civil rights struggle.

Under the leadership of President Johnson, this administration has demonstrated its cognizance of those massive problems and our determination to participate fully in this historic effort to secure dignity, equality, and freedom for all Americans.

In the words of the President:

"The time of justice has now come. I tell you that I believe sincerely that no force can hold it back. It is right in the eyes of man and God that it should come. And when it does, I think that day will brighten the lives of every American."

What has the Federal Government been doing to meet its responsibilities in this quest for political, economic, and social justice?

As Vice President, I have been charged by President Johnson with certain responsibilities for coordinating the activities of the Federal Government in the areas of civil rights and equal opportunity. My message to you this evening is simply this: encouraging progress is being achieved on a number of critical fronts. The resources of the Federal Government are fully committed to this battle which men like Herbert Lehman carried on so valiantly for so many years. And, I predict, we are going to win this battle.

On February 5, 1965, President Johnson established the President's Council on Equal Opportunity, a body composed of the principal governmental agencies with civil rights responsibilities, to perform the critical functions of interagency planning, coordination, and evaluation.

Since February, the Council has worked diligently to supervise and coordinate the implementation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other laws and administrative regulations relating to civil rights and equal opportunity.

Special task forces of the Council have been appointed and have begun work in important areas of civil rights policy such as employment, education, and community relations.

The Council and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights are working closely on the implementation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—the provision that made it unlawful for persons to be denied full participation on the basis of race, color, or national origin, in programs assisted by the Federal Government.

The U.S. Office of Education and the Department of Justice, acting under the mandate of title VI, are working diligently to eliminate segregation in those elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher learning that receive Federal financial assistance. The U.S. Commissioner of Education recently announced comprehensive guidelines to assist local school districts in this task—guidelines specifying that in order to continue qualifying for Federal aid the desegregation of all 12 grades must be completed by the school year commencing in the fall of 1967. The guidelines also specify that substantial progress must be made for the school year beginning next fall. In most instances this will mean the desegregation of at least four grades next September.

We must also understand that a school district cannot escape the constitutional mandate to desegregate merely by rejecting all Federal financial assistance. Those districts which do not meet the constitutional requirements will be subject to desegregation suits brought by the Department of Justice acting under authority contained in title IV of the Civil Rights Act.

In reality the choice is simply this: to continue receiving Federal aid and desegregate or to sacrifice Federal aid and desegregate anyway.

I believe the overwhelming majority of school districts will face their responsibilities squarely and get on with the business of educating children—all children—without regard to race or color.

Other major Federal departments and agencies are also requiring written pledges of nondiscrimination from all recipients of Federal funds and all participants in Federal assistance programs.

And we are determined that these pledges be more than paper promises. Appropriate procedures for systematic followup, reporting, and coordination among all departments and agencies are now being developed as part of an efficient and effective system designed to assure compliance in fact, not merely in form.

While insisting on compliance with title VI, our primary objective in this effort is to achieve law observance—not to exercise the Federal Government's powers of law enforcement.

Under title VI, we seek to eliminate discrimination in programs receiving Federal financial assistance—we do not seek the termination of Federal programs or the withholding of funds.

We are willing to walk the extra mile to achieve voluntary compliance, but we are equally determined to enforce the law, if compelled to do so.

The challenge of developing equal employment opportunities is a matter receiving high priority attention by a number of Federal agencies.

Although many white-collar, administrative, and technical jobs are being opened to Negroes for the first time, the gap separating the median income of whites from Negroes is actually widening. And the rate of unemployment among Negro workers is more than twice that prevailing for whites.

In short, the impact of job discrimination is painfully real for millions of our minority citizens—and we can postpone no longer a comprehensive national effort to achieve true equality in job opportunities for every American.

Since 1961, the President's Committee for Equal Employment Opportunity has been seeking the elimination of discrimination among employers doing business with the Government, and within the Government itself.

Despite an impressive record of accomplishment by the President's Committee, we are not satisfied—nor are we complacent. We intend to redouble our efforts until equal employment opportunity is a reality for every American—within Government and without.

On July 2, these present activities of the Federal Government relating to equal job opportunities will acquire an important new dimension with the activation of title VII of the Civil Rights Act—the section establishing national standards of nondiscrimination for employers, labor unions, and employment agencies.

Administered by a new 5-member Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, headed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., this law relies heavily upon close working agreements between the Federal Government and the States and localities with equal employment opportunity statutes currently in operation.

It must also be recognized that problems originally identified in complaints of job discrimination often turn out to be problems of education, housing, vocational training and the like. The new and dynamic Federal programs designed to expand opportunities and to better equip our citizens for useful and productive lives—such as manpower development and training, vocational education, and the broad spectrum of programs associated with the war on poverty—must be related constructively to the work of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Once again, such coordination and planning will be a major responsibility of the President's Council on Equal Opportunity and the various task forces of the Council.

As I have suggested to you this evening, we are making encouraging progress in this vital work. Much of the good news in civil rights is always submerged by black headlines telling us of bad news. But in enumerating some of the areas of progress, I do not mean to suggest that the battle is won—that victory is ours.

Some of the most difficult and frustrating days lie immediately ahead. We have mighty challenges to surmount in relation to employment, education, health care, housing and rising racial tensions in our urban areas.

But one fact is beyond dispute: our commitment to achieving full equality of opportunity is unmistakable—our bridges have been burned—we can only move forward in this noble work.

In all these activities our ultimate concern is grounded upon the same public philosophy which chartered the career of Herbert H. Lehman: Let us labor together in behalf of the less fortunate and the deprived. And as we struggle with these problems of terrifying complexity and difficulty, we will draw new courage and determination from our memories of this man who never ceased fighting in this cause—who established for each of us a shining example of dedication and self-sacrifice in the cause of human dignity and freedom.

We will always remember, with the deepest affection and profoundest admiration, our beloved friend—Gov. Herbert H. Lehman.

AGRICULTURE, FREE ENTERPRISE, AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, since I have always recognized the interdependent relationship between prosperity on the farm and prosperity in the industry and business of the country, I have a disposition to favor sound, agricultural legislation that does not penalize my district and region and impose undue burdens upon the consumers.

In the past, I have found myself, as I do today, in somewhat of a quandary when voting, because of the continued existence of huge agricultural surpluses requiring very large annual storage costs to the Government, and the deterioration, rotting, and wasting of important food and feed crops in the mass.

The best and the most outstanding experts in the Agriculture Department, and in the country, have struggled with these problems for many years, but, unfortunately, to date, they have not been able to solve them satisfactorily, and I doubt that this bill will do so much more than its predecessors.

One thing, however, that impresses me very much is that we cannot trifle with the prosperity of the Nation and the people, and we certainly do not want to take any action here that will depress agricultural prices unreasonably, and add to employment problems in the industrial and other sections of the country.

In a word, we must take the national point of view in this matter, and avoid a limited, provincial point of view. We must legislate for the country, not for just one region. We must make sure that whatever we do will be done for the interests of the country and will not result in crippling any part of the country, whether agricultural or industrial, and we must be convinced that any bill will not be harmful, but will be helpful, to our own districts and regions.

The United States is a single economic unit of many interdependent parts, and we must be very careful here not knowingly to disturb the sometime delicate economic and psychological balance between these parts.

I have carefully read Secretary Freeman's extensive, explanatory statement on this bill. In brief, he contends that this bill will strengthen the farm income, boost and strengthen rural America, further reduce present surpluses, lower Government costs, keep fair prices in the marketplace and keep a stable supply of food. If the bill can achieve these ends, Congress and the people would indeed be happy. It seems clear that we are making some progress in reducing the surpluses, lowering Government costs, maintaining prices at fairly good levels, and providing for stable supplies of food and feed.

The way the country is growing and expanding, we are rapidly reaching a point when rural and urban areas are merging and blending into each other so fast, that we can no longer in some areas clearly separate them.

This is a trend that will unquestionably continue at an accelerated rate. Some people believe that in time the United States will be one huge city, but with due respect to the proponents of that view, I believe that time may be in the distant future. Meanwhile, this body cannot ignore, but must provide for, the rural-urban mix.

The point is that we must here in this Congress take a very sharp look at the problems developing from population expansion, the explosion and accelerated pace of the movement of the population from the cities into so-called rural areas, many of which are becoming rapidly urbanized or semiurbanized.

This is a trend that is bound to continue in the future, and must not only be recognized here, but something must be done to provide for this great, unprecedented change in the national life of our country.

I have a bill pending in the House which seeks evaluation of terrain, soil, and subsurface conditions of these rural-urban areas affected by the population spread which I am convinced, would cope with some of these problems and would very materially ease them. It has good prospects and should be enacted.

I am impressed with the stability and plenty of our food supply which, aided by new fertilizers, new techniques of intensive crop cultivation and production, new equipment, continues to grow to the point where we are producing enough food for our people with considerable left over on a much smaller total acreage, and I presume this is another trend that will continue, although we must undoubtedly be prepared to cope with national disasters and national emergencies, crop failures, to make sure that we have some surpluses available to take care of every contingency requiring food, feed, and fibers.

I think that, on the whole, the Department of Agriculture is making progress toward the elimination, or at least the reduction, of surpluses to some reasonable, tolerable figure, and I think that our agricultural system is healthy, vigorous, and prosperous beyond a doubt and is producing food and feed far in excess of current needs. Is it sound to support prices to produce food and feed in excess of our needs? Of course not.

Relatively speaking, I think the prices of agriculture commodities, as commensurate with other prices, are within fairly reasonable bounds, and they must be kept that way, because we cannot allow further dangerous inflation to undermine our price structure and bring additional hardship to the consuming public which is entitled to get the benefit of lower prices in a free market.

Having in mind the evils of the inflationary spiral and the need for adequate price standards, we must make every effort we can to keep prices down, even as we realize that in a period of this kind, there is bound to be some movement upward of most prices. The aim must be to keep these increases and raises within tolerable limits, and I repeat that on the whole, this has been done fairly well as current prosperity in the Nation bears out. Labor, agriculture, management, and business—everyone—must join to the fight against inflation.

In voting on agriculture bills, I have always endeavored to take a very careful look at the provisions of the individual, pending bills and the effects the proposed legislation will have on my district, and the State and the Nation, upon the consumers and the people, upon whom it would have the sharpest impact.

I know from my experience that agriculture problems are especially difficult and challenging, and have taken that into account whenever judging the merits of any bill. It has been my practice to give the Department of Agriculture and related agencies in every administration every opportunity to try to work out some satisfactory solutions, and unless I was persuaded that pending measures were not soundly based and designed to accomplish what was claimed for them, or that they would set back, rather than advance, our goals for controlling surpluses, providing adequate food supplies and maintaining prices at reasonable levels, I have been willing to support measures which I deemed to be reasonable to cope with agriculture problems. I have also opposed measures that were in my judgment unsound or visionary and I have done so without fear or favor and regardless of political pressures.

I want to compliment the committee for the splendid manner in which they have handled this important bill, and I certainly hope that in operation it will fulfill the claims and the hopes of its sponsors and supporters, because we certainly need to promote stable food and feed supply and price conditions in this great country, and exert every effort, not only to retain, but to improve and broaden general prosperity for all regions, sections, and people throughout the country. The equitable settlement of our great social and economic problems on the basis of the principles of free enterprise, efficiency, and social justice is essential to the preservation and enrichment of our American way of life. Let us clearly realize that fact as we legislate in this great body.

CAPTIVE NATIONS MUST BE LIBERATED

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the very able and distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, my esteemed and dear friend, Congressman DANIEL FLOOD, whose work here is always outstanding, upon his excellent presentation of the case for the creation of a special, House Committee on the Captive Nations.

I want to commend and thank Congressman FLOOD, one of the great leaders of the House, for the thoroughly workmanlike, effective, brilliant job which he has done in bringing this very important, very compelling matter to the floor of the House.

As my dear and distinguished friend so well points out, such a committee, commensurate in stature and purpose with the scope, value, import and deep significance of the cause of the beleaguered captive nations, would strongly symbolize to the world the determination of the United States and the American people never to forget the captive nations and their bitter, up-hill struggle for liberation and independence.

It is my strong conviction that, as Members of the Congress, knowing full well the great importance which attaches to the campaign for the relief, liberation, and independence of all the captive nations, we have a special obligation, not only to rededicate ourselves to this great cause, but also to work untiringly, resolutely, and with unflinching determination and persistency for an end of tyranny and oppression, and a new beginning in freedom, justice, and independence for all the captive nations, who in truth love freedom just as dearly as we do.

This is not only an American cause, but a world cause. But it is all the dearer to Americans because of the deep roots of free government and democracy which at such bitter sacrifice have been planted here on sacred American soil, because of our abhorrence of tyranny in any form, and our determination to preserve our freedoms, our free way of life and all our free institutions, and because of our firm intention to help other subject, aspiring nations to share the blessings of self-determination, free government, and a way of life guarded and sheltered by ordered liberty and justice.

I think it is most essential for us to make it very clear to the Communist world that as a nation we have no intention of abandoning the millions of God-fearing, freedom-loving people behind the Iron Curtain, who are shackled by human bondage, and are living under conditions wherein their ordinary rights as free men and women are denied, and they are suppressed in their eager search for opportunity to live and work under freedom, and to provide support and sustenances for themselves and their families under institutions of their own choice.

Years ago, during and after World War II, it was understood and agreed in solemn international agreements and conventions that all nations and people would have the opportunity to exercise their choice of the kind of government and institutions under which they would live.

It was agreed by the Soviet that this would be done by plebiscites in several countries temporarily placed under Russian control, and thus that the people would have a chance to work their will upon the kind of government that they would live under. But this was a right and privilege that was never granted to them by the Communist overlords in accordance with their solemn promises, pledges, and agreements after this Nation had literally snatched them from Nazi serfdom.

Instead, since that time they have been held captive under a ruthless, Red, totalitarian system that has stripped them of their basic rights and condemned them to live under cruel dictatorship and under absolute governments conducted by brute force and ruthless disregard of political and human rights as we know them in the free world by all who realize the blessings of free individual rights.

As we know, such conditions of oppression, persecution, and domination of free human souls cannot possibly prevail in the long run. They will be challenged strongly by freedom-loving peoples, just as they are being challenged at the present time, and in my opinion that challenge should and will continue to the bitter end.

If the free world, and all peoples who believe in freedom, will only join together at this time and stand solidly together for the oppressed and the tyrannized, it is only a question of time when the great goals of universal freedom will be reached, and oppressed peoples will be unshackled from their bondage, and permitted again to live in peace and breathe the exhilerating air of personal liberty.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these are aims well worth striving for, and this Nation, if it is to live up to the promise of its great destiny must leave nothing undone, that can be done, to insure liberation and freedom for the oppressed peoples of the earth. Now is the time to act before the world is engulfed by Communist force and conspiracy and the darkness of Community tyranny settles upon a captive mankind.

I hope that this measure will prevail, and that this House will make it clear to all that we stand for freedom for all people, who want to enjoy its blessings, and that we will never give up that cause, but will agitate and fight for it until it is realized and won.

If we persist in the struggle for freedom and justice for all, we will give great courage, heart, and fresh hope and inspiration to the oppressed, and their liberation and redemption will follow as the day the night. May that day be soon. And may this House, this Nation, and the free world recognize that this is the hour for united, resolute action to free the enslaved and organize the world on the rule of law with liberty, freedom, justice, prosperity, and peace for all.

Hail and salute to our noble, gifted colleague and friend, DAN FLOOD. Let us stand with him to a man, and free the persecuted, suffering slaves of humanity, and bring brotherhood, peace, plenty, and justice to the yearning world.

SENATOR CARLSON URGES ATLANTIC UNION

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an eminent U.S. Senator and member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, has been elected to the board of directors of Federal Union, Inc., and has urged the formation of an Atlantic Federal Union. As a member of the same board of directors and longtime advocate of free-world federation, I was delighted to see the attached statement issued June 1 by our distinguished colleague:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON, REPUBLICAN, OF KANSAS, ON THE OCCASION OF HIS ELECTION TO THE BOARD OF FEDERAL UNION, INC.

Clearly there is urgent need of much stronger American leadership to unite the Atlantic community effectively and enduringly. It is no less clear that the administration is not giving this leadership. The recent session of the NATO Council in London is the latest evidence of the secondary importance it seems to attach to Atlantic affairs—and also of the increasing restiveness and dangerous disunion that results.

In his inaugural address the late President Kennedy truly said of our Atlantic allies: "United, there is little we cannot do. Divided, there is little we can do—for we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split asunder." Yet this is what we seem to often, from our actions or inaction, to be daring to do. We seem bent on proving the negative rather than the positive side of President Kennedy's statement.

Our "country is engaged in towering and troubling enterprises around this struggling globe," President Johnson said on the 20th anniversary of freedom's victory in Europe. Do we need more proof of the military, monetary, moral, and other difficulties and dangers to which division among the strongest democracies leads?

Much less perilous proof led our Founding Fathers, when only the Articles of Confederation united our 13 States, to meet in the Federal Convention of 1787. There they explored the source of their trouble, traced it to the alliance structure itself, and worked out a new structure—our Federal Constitution.

For 176 years now our Federal Union has proved the positive side of the Kennedy statement—the great things which people of democratic States can do when they are effectively and democratically united. Yet this time-tested answer to the challenge we and our Atlantic allies now face is the one which we have not yet seriously explored.

Let us all in NATO cease blaming our towering troubles on this or that ally, or on this or that leader. Let us begin to explore, as our forefathers did, whether the basic fault does not lie in the alliance structure itself, and whether we cannot build a new structure strong enough to do the job.

This view, I am happy to note, is widely shared. To speak only of my own party, witness the pledge in our 1964 platform, that "Republican leadership will move immediately to establish an international commission, comprised of individuals of high competence in NATO affairs, whether in or out of government, to explore and recommend effective new ways to strengthen alliance participation and fulfillment."

Those who share my view range all the way through, from Governor Rockefeller to Senator Goldwater. In an article in Life of January 17, 1964, Senator Goldwater called for "the structural changes necessary to enable the alliance to cope with the issues of the times."

In accepting the nomination for President he envisioned "an Atlantic civilization"—a term he was no doubt happy to see President Johnson adopt in his VE anniversary address—as "a goal more meaningful than a moon shot, a truly inspiring goal for all free men to set themselves." Earlier, on July 10, 1963, in the first Telstar TV program, former Prime Minister Eden asked General Eisenhower if he agreed that "the only future really deserving of our efforts and our idealism is some sort of Atlantic Union," and the general answered: "Well, Anthony, you have stated the final objective beautifully and eloquently."

Still earlier, on February 9, 1962, Governor Rockefeller declared: "The Federal idea, which our Founding Fathers applied in their historic act of political creation in the 18th century, can be applied in our 20th century in the larger context of the world of free nations—if we will but match our forefathers in courage and vision." Last year, on November 20, he said, still more concretely: "For far too long, we have been jerry-building the house of freedom. The first practical step would be to form a federal political structure for the North Atlantic area.

"Certain decisions must be made: First, agreement on the goal; second, agreement on a time schedule; third, agreement on the means for achieving this goal. The time has come for us and our Atlantic allies to take the leadership by appointing a preparatory convention of delegates to work out answers to these basic questions."

More than a quarter century ago the Federal Union Membership Association, under the dedicated leadership of Clarence Streit, author of "Union Now," began pioneering these ideas: That the democratic peoples around the North Atlantic do form a community, that the disasters of world war and depression they have suffered—and still face—result from faults in the structure of their relations, and that our Federal structure offers the surest, safest way for the free to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

Year in and out since early 1939, Federal Union, Inc., has been doing, by the methods of moderation and reason, very fruitful educational work in this vast field. It has thus gained widespread respect—highest among those best acquainted with it.

I am much impressed by the range of eminent leaders on its board. To name but a few examples: former Ambassadors Theodore C. Achilles and George V. Allen; former U.S. Budget Director P. F. Brundage; former Under Secretary of State W. L. Clayton; Adm. Thomas C. Kinkaid; President O. A. Knight of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union; Dr. Edward Teller, winner of the Fermi Award in nuclear physics; Dr. Harold C. Urey, winner of the Nobel Prize in chemistry; and my colleagues in Congress—Senator EUGENE C. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and Representatives PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois, and CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin. I am very pleased to join them and the other distinguished members of the Board of Federal Union, Inc., in serving so worthy a work at so opportune a time.

Obviously the goal of Federal Union involves great difficulties—but I believe they are much less towering and troubling than those which President Johnson agrees we face by our present course.

It will take time, of course, to reach this goal—and how much time do we have left? We must speed action—and we shall hasten it greatly merely by joining with our allies in a solemn declaration that our final objective is an Atlantic union. When we have reached that agreement, can we not agree on a tentative timetable for reaching the goal?

Once we Americans decided to send men to the moon, we fixed a time for achieving even that unprecedented goal—and our Atlantic goal is not unprecedented. In our own history we have the best of precedents for Federal Union of the Free. It must encourage us to lead now in this enterprise of bringing more of heaven down to earth—a truly towering enterprise, but not a troubling one.

COMMEMORATING THE 408TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1ST RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE ACT OF 1557 IN TRANSYLVANIA

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, few ideas and rights are closer to the heart of all Americans than that of freedom of conscience. Our Founding Fathers, including the great Virginians Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, championed the belief that every individual should be given the free choice of seeking truth alone and in his own manner without any coercion on the part of the state.

This belief was based not only on philosophical principles of the enlightenment period, but on the personal experience of many of the early settlers in the United States who came from the British Isles, Holland, France, and Germany to escape the religious pressures of the established state churches in those countries. It was also based in the first amendment on the belief of human dignity and upon the sanctity of the individual's relationship to God which cannot be coerced by police ordinances and punishments meted out by law.

Today we are commemorating the first act of this kind which was passed in Europe still in the midst of the ferment of reformation and counterreformation and which was later on expanded and remained basically in force in Hungary and Transylvania until the 20th century. This was the first Religious Tolerance Act of the Diet or Torda in Transylvania on June 1, 1557. Passed by a largely Luther and Calvinist Diet, signed by a Roman Catholic queen, the legislation provided for complete freedom of conscience and for a fair balance in the activities of the denominations.

Today Transylvania is under the heel of Communist oppression, as testified to by many American correspondents. Many political rights and religious freedoms are either nonexistent or abridged, and the burden of oppression falls heaviest upon the descendants of the authors of the Religious Tolerance Act of 1557, upon the 1.75 million Hungarians in Transylvania.

Without going into any detailed discussion of the political, religious, cultural, and linguistic suppression of Transylvanian Hungarians by the Communist Rumanian regime, so ably detailed by several colleagues on March 24 and by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] on April 28, I am happy to note that they and others have introduced resolutions to condemn the discriminatory practices of the Communist Rumanian Government against the Hungarian minority in Transylvania. As I understand, hearings on the matter will be held by the European Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee soon, and I hope that the committee will come to a favorable decision and report the resolution so that all of us may have a chance to vote on it.

SOME OF THE PROBLEMS CAUSING DISASTER IN CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday afternoon, June 3, 1965, I have obtained a special order to discuss some of the problems causing the catastrophic disaster plaguing the strawberry and vegetable industries in California. Acres of strawberries are rotting in the fields. Millions of dollars are being lost. Businesses are being bankrupted. Many will be unemployed. Consumer prices are increasing. Growers and processors are contemplating moves to Mexico or conversion to crops which require less hand labor, but which unfortunately are already in oversupply and subsidized in part by the Government.

This disaster is unnecessary—manmade—and will affect every person in our Nation.

In spite of wages for unskilled berry pickers ranging from $1.75 to $2.75 and more, per hour, the growers cannot obtain workers. A one-armed picker earns regularly $25 and more per day—yet all efforts to recruit workers have failed to produce adequate competent farm labor.

I plan to explain some of the causes of the disaster and to propose several immediate and long-range solutions.

If your district is affected by the farm labor shortage or the increase in consumer prices, I shall be pleased to yield reasonable portions of my allotted time for constructive comments.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the material which follows is an excerpt from the verbatim record of the executive session of the Committee on Ways and Means on the subject of excise tax reduction. This excerpt includes the direct statement of Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, and part of my interrogation of Secretary Fowler. I am inserting this portion of the transcript in the Congressional Record with the express consent of the Committee on Ways and Means.

I am also inserting in the Record a letter President Johnson addressed to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills], dated May 25, 1965, in which he states clearly that he intends to continue to exercise expenditure restraint:

[Executive session, Tuesday, May 18, 1965]

Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965

(Hearings before the House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, D.C.)

The committee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in the committee room, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Wilbur D. Mills (chairman of the committee) presiding.

The Chairman. The committee will please be in order.

We meet this morning for the purpose of considering recommendations dealing with reductions in the excise taxes. We have before us a printed document, No. 173, which contains the message to the Congress from the President and also, beginning on page 11, the bill that has been prepared by the Treasury to carry out these recommendations.

In addition we have a section-by-section analysis of the bill printed in the House Document No. 173, and we are sorry that that was not also printed in the document. It was supposed to have been. Some error occurred. It is not in the printing. We have with us this morning the Secretary of the Treasury.

I assume, Mr. Fowler, you would like to make some brief statement to the committee before we report the bill.

Statement of Hon. Henry H. Fowler, Secretary, Accompanied by Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary; Gerard Brannon, John Copeland, Office of Tax Analysis; and Laurence N. Woodworth, Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, Department of the Treasury

Secretary Fowler. Mr. Chairman, I do have a statement to make to the committee and copies of it I understand are on the way. They are being processed.

With your permission I will proceed to deliver it and as soon as copies arrive they will be distributed.

I will not repeat the recommendations that are included in the message and as one preliminary matter I would like to say that, in terms of the questions that will come from members of the committee, as you know, I have voluntarily disassociated myself from the specific recommendations or decisions as to how the excise tax reductions shall be distributed, that is, what the composition of the cut is as between various products and activities.

For that reason I am going to confine my comments today to two important aspects of this program that do not deal with the composition of the cut itself.

Insofar as questions or issues are raised concerning the composition of the cut I would appreciate it if Secretary Surrey, who is familiar with all of the planning that went into the detailed breakdown, could deal with those questions.

The Chairman. Right on that point, Mr. Secretary, I am sure that the members understand why you take this position, it is the only position you can take, frankly, as I see it, and certainly I for one recognize the validity of your position. You are not trying to duck anything.

Secretary Fowler. Not at all.

The Chairman. You feel, having been in the practice of law very recently, having participated in the Government outside of the Treasury in some thinking with respect to some of the excise tax reductions, that it is best for you to disassociate yourself from specific recommendations.

Secretary Fowler. Mr. Chairman, I went into this fairly carefully and tried to examine just what the proprieties were and I found that the best analogy to make is what happens to a lawyer if he goes on the bench.

That is the closest one I can come to, and I think there is one article in a law review that had to do with that problem some years ago which summarizes my position.

I will quote from the article itself. It says: "A second possible cause of bias is the judge's party contact. The propriety of a judge's sitting on a case involving a former client seems to depend upon whether or not the case in question was in his office prior to his going on the bench. When the judge has had prior contact with both the client and the case disqualification is universal for the obvious but seldom articulated reason that a judge would seldom have an open mind under such circumstances and to sit would invite charges of corruption."

The two aspects of the matter that I will discuss are the size of the cut itself and its timing. I will discuss these aspects of the impact that we expect them to have on the economy.

My remarks will deal simply with the excise tax reductions recommended in the President's program. The committee will want to hear from the Department of Commerce when it deals with the President's recommendation on user charges.

This sweeping reduction of selective excises is an important step in our continuing program of tax reform. We are all interested in the development of an overall tax system which is characterized by equity and simplicity and which makes a maximum contribution to economic growth.

The Revenue Acts of 1962 and 1964, together with changes liberalizing tax depreciation procedures, have carried us a long way toward such a system.

The excise tax reductions recommended by the President represent the next logical step in this direction.

Reduction of our selective excise taxes increases the equity of the system. These selective taxes are discriminatory and burdensome on producers, sellers, and consumers of the items subject to tax.

Some of these taxes, those on alcohol and tobacco, for example, are consciously discriminatory. The fact that they inhibit some choices has been part of the reason for having them throughout our history.

Gasoline and certain other taxes are in the nature of user charges, and they serve the function of transmitting to particular users part of the cost of Government services provided for them. Meeting costs is a burden, but one that has to be carried.

I believe that the Congress and the public have long felt that many of our excise taxes have no place in a permanent tax system. Thus, wherever it is appropriate to remove a particular burden on one product or another, we should strive consistent with other tax goals to provide a freely operating competitive price system, and in the President's words, "end an unfair burden on many businesses and workers who produce the commodities singled out for excise taxation."

Excise taxes, unlike income taxes, impose burdens on those whose income is below the level of their personal exemptions and deductions. The present program will lighten the burden of regressive taxation on low- and middle-income people.

The proposed reductions would simplify the tax system by greatly reducing the number of separate taxes as well as the accompanying burden on business of collecting and reporting those taxes. It will cut the Government's cost of tax collection and enforcement.

Any program of tax reduction will foster economic growth by increasing purchasing power. This program will make an extra contribution in that it will reduce the arbitrary bias against particular products and particular kinds of activity. Thereby, it will strengthen the free competitive process which is the basic source of our growth. Further, it will make a particularly valuable contribution to wage-price stability since the program itself will involve some downward price adjustments.

The President's recommendations to take affect in fiscal 1966 involve a gross revenue loss of $3.5 billion at a full year annual rate at fiscal 1966 levels of business.

But because the proposed schedule calls for putting half of these reductions into effect in July and half next January, and because of the lag in collections, the gross revenue loss in fiscal 1966 would be only $2.2 billion.

That is only $700 million more than the gross revenue loss from excise reduction that was included in the January budget.

The original proposal—in the January budget—of a total reduction of $1.75 billion on July 1, 1965, would have had a budget impact in fiscal 1966 of $1.5 billion—the gross revenue loss—because of the lag in collections.

The May 15 refund provisions respecting automobiles and air conditioners increase the budget impact of the July reduction by almost $100 million to $1.6 billion of gross revenue loss.

The budget impact of the additional January reduction will be only $600 million in gross loss. This reflects the lag in collections as well as the fact that the tax reduction will only be in effect for half of the fiscal year.

In measuring the final budget impact, however, increase in other tax collections from the increased economic activity because of the excise tax reductions should also be taken into account. This is referred to as "feedback." This feedback is estimated to be about $400 million in fiscal 1966, reducing the final revenue loss in fiscal 1966 to a net of $1.8 billion.

The effects on the general economy from any tax reduction occur only gradually. In fiscal 1967, further reductions in the automobile and telephone tax which come in the middle of the year on January 1, 1967, would raise the full year gross revenue loss to $3.6 billion, but the net budget effect of the program will only be a loss of $2 billion.

Despite the good first quarter of this year, it is quite possible that next year the growth in the private economy, without this tax reduction, will fall below the growth in our productive capacity, including the growth in our labor force. That first quarter is not likely to be repeated since it was so heavily influenced by catching up after last fall's automobile strike, and by anticipation of a possible steel strike.

Without a dynamic and vigorously growing economy, unemployment can be expected to rise. We are concerned with reducing unemployment. Our experience under the Revenue Act of 1964 showed that our economy has the capacity to increase employment under existing conditions without running into the problem of inflation.

Given the favorable impact that the excise tax reduction is likely to have on our economy, there are other considerations which make this program both prudent and appropriate.

The budget deficit for fiscal 1964 was $8.2 billion. This was a reduction from the figure of about $11 billion originally anticipated in January 1963, made possible by improved economic activity and firm expenditure control.

In January of this year the budget deficit for fiscal 1965 was estimated to be $6.3 billion. Thanks to continued expenditure control and substantial improvements in revenue collections, it was announced several weeks ago that the deficit was likely to be $5.3 billion. Now as a result of additional information, we anticipate that the deficit for fiscal 1965 will be reduced to $4.4 billion. Of this $1.9 billion reduction in the deficit below the January estimate, $500 million represents reduced expenditures, and $1.4 billion represents increased revenues.

In January we estimated that the deficit for fiscal 1966 would be $5.3 billion. We now estimate fiscal 1966 revenues will be $1.6 billion above the January estimate, and the deficit will be about $4.3 billion—slightly below the $4.4 billion now anticipated for fiscal 1965.

Beyond fiscal 1966 it would be rash to project specific budget figures. I could describe the general situation this way. Assuming continued economic growth at the long-term trend rate, administrative budget revenues should increase by about $5 billion. This potential gain will be slightly offset by the fact that the January 1966 excise tax cuts will be in operation for all of fiscal 1967 compared to only half of fiscal 1966, and some further excise tax cuts will come into effect January 1, 1967. The added revenue loss of the program in fiscal 1967 over fiscal 1966 will be about $0.6 billion. Roughly, we could put the potential revenue gain in fiscal 1967 under this program at $4.4 billion.

We certainly cannot make estimates of expenditures this early, but this potential revenue gain leaves considerable room for providing such increased expenditures as might be needed by a growing population still achieving reduction of the budgetary deficit.

Hence, the program we are urging is consistent with making steady progress toward a balanced budget. This progress depends upon maintaining the economic expansion. In the words of the President's message, "A healthy budget depends upon a healthy economy."

I believe the committee may now want to consider the program in more detail, and Assistant Secretary Surrey is ready to discuss this with you.

Excise tax program to be enacted in 1965

	July 1, 1965	Jan. 1, 1966	January 1967 to January 1969
Admissions		Repeal	
Air conditioners	Repeal		
Air freight	New tax		
Automobiles	Reduce 10 percent to 7 percent	Reduce 7 percent to 6 percent	Reduce 6 percent to 5 percent, 1967.
Automobile parts and accessories (excluding truck parts).		Repeal	
Ball point and fountain pens, etc	Repeal		
Beer	(1)	(1)	(1).
Bowling alleys and pool tables	Repeal		
Business and store machines	do		
Cabarets		Repeal	
Cameras and film, etc	Repeal		
Cigarettes	(1)		
Cigarette lighters	Repeal		
Cigarette papers and tubes			
Cigars			
Club dues		Repeal	
Coin-operated amusement devices	Repeal		
Coin-operated gaming devices			
Deeds of conveyance		Repeal	
Distilled spirits	(1)		
Electric, gas, and oil appliances	Repeal		
Electric light bulbs		Repeal	
Firearms, shells, and cartridges			
Fishing equipment			
Foreign insurance policies			
Freezers	Repeal		
Fuel:			
Commercial aviation:			
Gasoline			
Jet fuel	New tax		
General aviation:			
Gasoline	Increase		
Jet fuel	New tax		
Highway trust fund:			
Gasoline and special motor fuels			
Diesel	Increase		
Motor boats (except diesel)			
Waterways (except gasoline)	New tax		
Furs	Repeal		
Inner tubes			
Jewelry	Repeal		
Lubricating oil		Repeal	
Luggage and handbags	Repeal		
Matches	do		
Musical instruments	do		
Playing cards	do		
Phonograph records	do		
Pistols and revolvers			
Radios and phonographs	Repeal		
Refrigerators	do		
Safe deposit boxes	do		
Sporting goods (except fishing)	do		
Smoking tobacco			

See footnote at end of table.

Excise tax program to be enacted in 1965—Continued

	July 1, 1965	Jan. 1, 1966	January 1967 to January 1969
Stocks and bonds:			
Issuance		Repeal	
Transfer		do	
Sugar			
Telegraph		Repeal	
Telephone:			
General	(1)	Reduce 10 percent to 3 percent	Reduce to 2 percent, 1967. Reduce to 1 percent, 1968. Repeal, 1969.
Interior communications systems		Exempt	
Toll		Reduce	Repeal.
Television sets	Repeal		
Tires			
Toilet preparations	Repeal		
Transportation of persons by air			
Tread rubber	Increase		
Truck, sale			
Truck parts			
Truck use	Increase		
Wagering			
Wine	(1)		
Wire and equipment service		Repeal	

[1] Automatic reductions in present law to be repealed (postponed in case of telephones).

The Chairman. Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Curtis. First, Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the President's message on this subject has been put in the record.

The Chairman. No; we have it printed here.

Mr. Curtis. Yes. I have a copy here. I was going to refer to it and that is the reason I wondered about it. Maybe it ought to be in the record. I would like to ask that this be printed.

The Chairman. We will print it at the beginning of the hearing.

Mr. Curtis. Yes.

Mr. Secretary, the President says in his message that we reduced the taxes under the Revenue Act of 1964 by $14 billion. Is that a figure based upon the increased business activity?

That wasn't the figure we had.

Secretary Fowler. No; you are quite right, Congressman Curtis. That is a figure which applies the actual rate reductions which the Congress voted in the Revenue Act to the volume of business that is being done currently.

Mr. Curtis. Yes. I thought that is what it was and I thought we used the figure of around $11 billion.

Secretary Fowler. That is correct.

Mr. Curtis. The thing that surprised me about the President's message, and indeed your remarks here, is in the President's message there is no reference at all to expenditures, and in your statement on page 7 the reference is: "We certainly cannot make estimates of expenditures this early, but this potential revenue again leaves considerable room for providing such increased expenditures as might be needed by a growing population still achieving a reduction of the budgetary deficit."

From the silence of the President's message and the original reference you make here I presume that the contemplation is not to hold to the $99.7 billion expenditure level for fiscal 1966 which the President set out in his budget message this January.

Am I correct or what is it?

Secretary Fowler. I think that the best qualified source to deal with that question is the Director of the Budget, but let me give you what I can in comment on it.

Mr. Curtis. Let's clear this point up first. Surely you are consulted as Secretary of the Treasury.

Secretary Fowler. Oh, yes; and I expect to be very active in developing the 1967 budget.

Mr. Curtis. Also you have to be, I think, concerned with the expenditure levels, your Department, for 1966.

Secretary Fowler. I am very concerned with them.

Mr. Curtis. Now to go on with the Director of the Budget, yes, I would like to talk with him too, but I am trying right now to interrogate you because I am a little bit surprised that no estimates beyond the January estimate of $99.7 billion are set forth.

Secretary Fowler. Are we talking now of fiscal 1966?

Mr. Curtis. We are talking of fiscal 1966.

Secretary Fowler. Insofar as I am aware, Congressman Curtis, the estimates of expenditures for fiscal 1966 as set forth in the January budget message are valid today and I have no information that has come to me in discussions since assuming my post that would lead me to believe that those expenditure estimates will be exceeded in fiscal 1966.

Mr. Curtis. Even with this $700 million additional request for defense and the international picture being what it is? No revisions?

Secretary Fowler. Let me make a few comments on that because I think that the President's message in connection with the $700 million appropriation indicated, at least in the discussion of it, that this particular need could have been met by the Secretary of Defense with the funds that had already been requested through the exercise of his transfer power, and it is too early from what I know—and I have said this at other points publicly—to revise the defense expenditure estimate for fiscal 1966 as it appeared in the January budget.

I cannot say categorically that that defense estimate, expenditure estimate, will not be exceeded, but it is my current judgment that it is not likely to be exceeded in fiscal 1966.

Mr. Curtis. That seems very strange.

Secretary Fowler. Let me add one note to this.

Mr. Curtis. Surely.

Secretary Fowler. I think you realize that in the request for $700 million of appropriation it was felt that it would provide something of a point for an indication of support by the Congress for the course that was being followed in Vietnam and that probably these increased requirements for Vietnam, which are real and substantial, could have been met by the transfer of other moneys in the Defense budget. But it was decided that the clean and the proper way to deal with the additional expenditures for Vietnam was to ask the Congress for this particular appropriation.

I think Secretary McNamara is proceeding with his program, which you are generally familiar with—certainly it has received a good deal of attention in the Congress—for reducing Defense expenditures and that program will continue unabated. I would hope that any additional expenditures that are necessary because of the situation in Vietnam or in Santo Domingo can be made up by economies in other areas of Defense Department operations or by deferring expenditures in fiscal 1966 that otherwise might have been made had there not been these additional levies.

Mr. Curtis. Mr. Secretary, I hoped that this was a tight budget, which was the adjective used by the President. It obviously isn't because you can't just take $700 million out and shift it around this way because this $99.7 billion was based on the assumption of these very savings in the Defense Department that you are talking about.

Yes; I am quite aware of them. The Secretary chooses as his main authority the McCormack-Curtis amendment which permits the consolidation of this, so I have a personal interest in it, but this is the basis on which the $99.7 billion was put in.

The reason I stress this, Mr. Secretary, is that this became the issue over the Tax Revenue Act of 1964. The minority, the Republicans, were strongly behind the income tax cut, but we pointed out that this was bad economics in our judgment if it was not done in context with expenditure restraint, and our motion to recommit required that the expenditure levels be held to $97 billion in the first year, $98 billion the second.

The administration fought that and yet to its credit I want to say it adhered to the very thing that it had resisted being told by the Congress to do, and it was gratifying to see that the expenditure levels were held to $97 billion and then did a little better than the $98 billion for this coming fiscal year. But in the President's message and in the President's economic report to the Congress this year, the President's message in regard to this excise tax, no reference is made whatsoever to the fact that this tax cut of 1964 was in context with expenditure restraint.

This comes to the issue on this bill. In my judgment, for what it is worth, we cannot help the economy by cutting out $4 billion of excises, much as we would like to do that, if it too is not done in context of expenditure restraint.

We on our side of the aisle have been arguing for getting rid of these excises for many years. In fact we wanted to get rid of the retail excises the last go-around. I think we would have been wise to do it because they were more nuisance than anything else, but now this has been extended further.

I felt that in our package of $11 billion tax reduction we should have included some of these war excises ahead of what we have done in the income tax area, so there is no dispute between the administration and those on this side of the aisle as far as the need for the cut of excises.

It is desired and in fact—in my own comment—I think the President has presented a very well thought out package of how to cut the excises and where to do it and the timeliness, so this brings the one issue before us on expenditures.

Secretary Fowler. I don't believe it really is in issue because I believe that I share your view that this program should be accompanied by a continuance of the expenditure restraint and I believe that President Johnson feels as strongly about it and believes it as strongly as I do.

Mr. Curtis. But he says nothing about it.

Secretary Fowler. Let me say that I think acts sometimes speak a little louder than words. I know that the President as recently as May 1, I believe it was, when he announced that the budget deficit for fiscal 1965 would be an estimated $5.3 billion, emphasized the fact that $500 million of that reduction in the deficit announced at that time represented a pulldown of expenditures for fiscal 1965 from the amount that had been previously estimated. I can assure you, Congressman Curtis, from personal experience that the President exercises continuing vigilance not just in connection with the Defense Department, but in all the departments.

I think you may have seen something in the press the other day. He walked across the street and paid a visit to my Department the other day for the express purpose of congratulating the Assistant Secretary for Administration, the career man who carries the ball in our Department on management utilization techniques, to congratulate him and the Department on having achieved a reduction of about $33 million through these devices in the departmental budget of last year, so there will be no lacking on the President's part and certainly not on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury of a continued emphasis on the importance of restraining expenditures and accompanying the kind of fiscal action that is recommended here today to this committee with a positive policy of controlling expenditures.

I just cannot give you quantitative estimates on how that policy can be reflected in fiscal 1967 or fiscal 1968. I think I would be just guessing and I don't like to guess to the committee, but certainly as far as fiscal 1966 is concerned I see no reason today to think that the expenditure figures for fiscal 1966 are going to be substantially more than they are set forth in the January budget estimate.

Mr. Curtis. I hope they are going to be less.

Secretary Fowler. I do too.

Mr. Curtis. Mr. Secretary, I am very pleased to have this on the record. I hope President Johnson will say something along this line because this is the important aspect. I wish that he would in his future references to the tax cut of 1964 point out that this was in context with expenditure restraint.

This was not the Keynesian philosophy of continuing total purchasing power by not cutting back on Federal expenditures because the people are a little confused about what economic theory he was following.

Now I want to get to this point because I agree with you deeds are a great deal more important than words and I myself questioned whether the President really meant what he said in cutting back expenditures in the previous 2 fiscal years, and I have since publicly acknowledged that indeed he did, to his credit, and I will repeat that here. But here is the thing that bothers me, and I am reading now from page 45 of the tables of the budget for fiscal year 1966, table 10, balances of obligational authority, and I have had to add the figures, but at the start of the fiscal year the carryover balances of unused NOA were $87.8 billion. Then you go over to the start of 1965 and it is $89.3 and you go to 1966 and it is $96.7, and then we start with the one that is in this budget of $101.5 billion.

This is the time bomb because the President in the same message that he says, "I am only going to spend $99.7 billion in this fiscal year," and we carry over balances of $96.7 billion still he asks the Congress for $106.4 billion new obligational authority, so we are building up the unexpended or the unused authorities to spend.

Congress has no control over the expenditure level. Our control rests in whether we grant the new obligational authority, as the Secretary has pointed out in his colloquy with Mr. Schneebeli, but here we have it, Mr. Secretary.

The President has said nothing about this $99.7 billion expenditure level in his message for tax reduction of excises, but he has, in his budget message, requested $106.4 billion, and I am not adding on the request for supplemental or deficiency, for this year, of another $4 or $5 billion, but we are ending up with greater and greater authority to spend in the hands of the President and he could turn around and spend as much as $105 billion.

Secretary Fowler. Congressman Curtis, the President will have to speak for himself of course on this, but certainly you are entitled to my judgment and observations on it. They are very strongly that I don't think this President has any intention or is likely to have any intention, given the circumstances we have today, of seeing that expenditure in fiscal 1966 goes beyond the budgeted figure without one awful bit of scrambling around to avoid it.

Mr. Curtis. I am real pleased to have this statement on the record, and this is what I was seeking and I again say I hope the President will make one. The other thing that would really help would be a cutting back on these carryover balances. We had demonstrated back a few years ago what can be done when Secretary McNamara did a magnificent job, in my opinion, in cutting back on these carryover balances. He was using them up and that is one basis on which he was able to keep the Defense requests down for new obligational authority. He was using up these balances, but now we are seeing the opposite buildup and this of course bothers me.

One final line of questioning. Again it goes back to the basic economic theory. The original Keynes doctrine of balancing the budget not in a given year, but over a business cycle, I think, makes good sense. It certainly made good sense for the U.S. Federal Government where our revenues are so heavily dependent upon income tax which fluctuates, as revenue fluctuates with the business cycle. But this administration under Secretary Dillon clearly has abandoned that theory because we are in a period of economic upturn and under that theory we should be recouping and paying off some of the deficits we had during the recession.

The new theory had seemed to be that we only go to a balanced budget when we have what is called full employment.

You don't say anything at all about balanced budget in your statement. At least Secretary Dillon used to say something about it when they anticipated a balanced budget.

Now we just forget about this idea that you balance in time of full employment. I can well understand that, in spite of beefing up our economy, we still have a relatively high incidence of unemployment, but what is the administration's theory on the balanced budget? Do you ever want one?

Secretary Fowler. I certainly do.

Mr. Curtis. Do you have that as an objective?

Secretary Fowler. I certainly do, Mr. Curtis, and I would be more pleased than you could imagine to have some surpluses to use for debt retirement purposes.

Mr. Curtis. I want to see that too because I think our problems in the field of debt management are getting more and more severe. It is very clear that our debt management problems are so tied in with our monetary system that it is questionable whether we can use monetary policy in our economy.

People who will say it doesn't make any difference how big the debt is I think are ignoring this very fundamental point.

Secretary Fowler. I think it would be certainly desirable from many standpoints to achieve an economy in which we had reasonably full employment and had not only a balanced budget, but some budget surpluses.

I think those surpluses and debt retirement can be handled in such a manner that they would not be deflationary. Such debt retirement provide new sinews for the private sector for investment.

Mr. Curtis. You are right, because this is exactly where I think it would go. If with retired debt this money, then could be used and probably would be used for expanding our economy. I just wanted to get on the record that we still are talking in terms of balancing the budget even though the prepared statements of the President and your prepared statement say nothing about it.

At least in the interrogation we have something on the record.

Secretary Fowler. I did not really think I wanted to take the committee's time. I am glad you have given me the opportunity to say what I believe and think on these issues, but I didn't think it was necessary this morning to bring those out in my statement.

Mr. Curtis. That was the issue, I again say, Mr. Secretary, over the previous tax bill. There wasn't any question about the Republicans feeling very strongly that we needed tax reduction. We have been arguing about it for years and our attitude was more or less to the administration, "Well, welcome aboard."

But in my judgment for whatever it is worth, this must be done in context with expenditure restraint and that is really what I am trying to say here, and if the President would say something about this in the next day or so it would certainly help me, at any rate, really get behind this program.

However, in light of the increases in obligational authority that are being requested, which I refer to as this time bomb of building up bigger and bigger authorities to spend, in that context I think it is very important that the President say "Yes, I am going to adhere to this expenditure level of $99.7 billion and I think that we can do that in spite of the international situation because we can delay certain programs."

I was pleased, by the way, to see that he requested a stretching out of the highway program in his message rather than increasing the tax. That would have been another way.

The stretch out I think is favorable. He can stretch these programs out, but I think it would be very helpful if he would make a statement to reassure some of us that this is his intention.

Secretary Fowler. Thank you very much. I will certainly take that into account in reporting to him. I would like just to add one thing on this subject. I take some comfort, and I hope you do, that we have been reducing our deficits and moving toward a balanced budget, and yet we have been avoiding the economic downturn that would send the deficits rapidly rising.

Mr. Curtis. But, Mr. Secretary, see the point. Here we are in a business upturn and we are boasting about it, and with reason, and under the previous theories this is the time we should have had the balanced budget if we are ever going to have it. This is the time when we shouldn't be talking about just reducing the amount of the deficit, but we ought to be directing it toward possibly paying off a little of this debt.

Secretary FOWLER. I think if there is any difference at all between what you are saying and what has, in fact, happened, it is the question about the pace at which you move toward the balanced budget with presumably the full employment economy.

I just take some comfort out of the fact that, although in 1964 the original budget message for fiscal year 1964 contemplated, as you recall, $11.5 billion, we actually ended up with $8.2 billion.

In the 1965 budget the original estimate was $6.3 billion and I believe, as my statement indicates today, it looks as though we are going to get $4.4 billion, and the January budget estimate for fiscal 1966 anticipated a deficit of $5.3 billion, and I have indicated here today that, given the continued trajectory, it looks as though that can reasonably be estimated at $4.3 billion so in each one of these years we have set a kind of target that was lower than the previous year and we have bettered that target.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1965.

Hon. WILBUR MILLS,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am highly gratified at the prompt action of the House Ways and Means Committee in voting favorably on the excise tax bill today. I want to commend you and the members of your committee for this action. Seldom in our history has a congressional committee acted so swiftly on tax legislation.

I also understand that you intend to take up the proposed legislation to extend the debt limit in the Ways and Means Committee tomorrow. This promptness is also commendable. In connection with both the committee action on the excise tax reduction and the need to extend the debt limit I would like to make clear once again my strong determination to hold Federal expenditures to the lowest reasonable levels.

I believe this administration has achieved a satisfactory record in that area. In my budgets for fiscal years 1965 and 1966, the average expenditure increase has been held to $1 billion—one-third of the average annual increase for the previous 10 years. In addition, I recently announced a $500-million reduction in estimated expenditures for the current fiscal year.

The only substantial change the Ways and Means Committee made in the excise tax reduction program I recommended was in the area of the automobile tax. I had recommended that this 10-percent tax be reduced 3 percentage points on July 1, 1965, an additional point January 1, 1966, and an additional point January 1, 1967, leaving a 5-percent tax in effect.

My reasons for recommending retention of half of the automobile tax were that this would retain revenues of roughly $1 billion a year to the Government, revenues which pose no problem for the industry.

The Ways and Means Committee has voted to remove the entire automobile tax by reducing the tax an additional percentage point on January 1, 1967, and making further 2-point reductions on January 1, 1968, and January 1, 1969.

While I prefer the program I recommended, I feel that if the entire tax is to be removed, the Ways and Means Committee program represents a prudent way of doing so.

This addition to the program I recommended, together with several minor changes, will leave the budget for fiscal 1966 unchanged. The committee action will reduce revenues for fiscal 1967 by about $100 million.

Thus, the changes made by the Ways and Means Committee will leave the budget impact and fiscal stimulus of the tax reduction program I recommended basically the same for fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

Congressional approval of the excise tax reduction and the debt limit extension will reenforce my determination to hold Federal spending to a necessary minimum. The Federal budget should continue to be one which will allow us to save where we can in order to spend where we must.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

AN INTERNATIONAL ANTIDUMPING CODE

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a bill recently introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] and other Members would cause substantial changes in the present administration of the antidumping statute. On balance, these proposed changes in the U.S. antidumping program would not advance the goal of fairer and increased international trade. They will, in fact, further elaborate the already cumbersome U.S. antidumping program and make it an even greater cause of foreign complaint against U.S. antidumping practice and not adequately curb the deleterious economic practices of dumping.

As one of four congressional members of the U.S. delegation to the current GATT negotiations, I am particularly concerned with the international trade problems posed by the present administration of the U.S. antidumping program.

Thus I am at this time introducing a House resolution which expresses the sense of this body that the executive immediately begin preparatory study for an international code to harmonize the antidumping laws and administrative procedures of all nations, and that the creation of such an international antidumping code should be made a priority administration objective. In studying this code, the administration should also consider the ultimate creation of international rules of fair competition in international commerce.

THE ECONOMIC ARGUMENT

At the outset I want to make clear that I consider the concept of antidumping valid. There is a need for effective mechanisms to prevent dumping.

"Dumping" by foreign firms of goods at prices less than they charge in their own domestic markets has long been recognized as unfair and economically harmful. When dumping occurs, U.S. industries and workers can be severely damaged by foreign goods which undersell U.S. products.

Most businessmen and economists will agree that there is sound economic justification for antidumping protection for domestic industries. But there is vast confusion over what actually constitutes "sales at less than fair value." For instance, it is widely accepted that companies price differently in different markets, and that the elements that go to make up actual cost vary depending on the circumstances of sale, which include quantity discounts, difference in credit terms, advertising and other selling costs, research and development. These factors must all be considered in adjusting the producer's cost to determine fair market value. Frequently such determination becomes a matter of subjective judgment.

Equally, in determining "injury," the second criterion for finding dumping, difficult conceptual and administrative problems arise. They require, as in the determination of sales at less than fair value, considerable personal judgment by officials. One result of these numerous administrative and conceptual difficulties has been a body of antidumping decisions which set no clear, determining precedents on exactly what kinds of practices or circumstances in fact constitutes "dumping."

RECENT ADMINISTRATIVE REVISIONS HAVE FAILED

The United States has long had a protective mechanism to counter foreign dumping. The Antidumping Act of 1921 remains today our basic authority for such activity. But its administration has been difficult and for years it has been the subject of serious controversy among several elements of the U.S. economy.

The Antidumping Act of 1921 is presently administered by the Treasury under new regulations put in effect in January 1965. Previous Treasury regulations adopted in 1960, criticized for different reasons by U.S. industry, U.S. importers, and foreign exporters, were revised after lengthy Treasury hearings. Proposed new regulations were published in the Federal Register in April 1964, and the new regulations were published in final form in the Federal Register on December 5, 1965.

These new regulations are only another in a series. Antidumping procedures were extensively revised in 1955 and again in 1960. The successive changes reflect the very complex problems encountered in the administration of this act.

The new regulations represent a conscientious effort to resolve the conflicting interests of the groups and individual firms who have a stake in U.S. antidumping procedures. U.S. industry representatives nonetheless claim that the new regulations are not satisfactory. And U.S. importers express their concern that the new regulations are too restrictive and offensive to their foreign suppliers.

It is accepted that the recent revision of the administration of the Antidumping Act of 1921 was undertaken largely to quiet certain U.S. industries' claims that the antidumping law had not been properly administered. Equally, its purpose was to obviate the need for those bills, introduced last year in both House and Senate, whose effect would have been much the same as the legislation now proposed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] and others.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE EFFECTS

Certainly the U.S. effort to fairly administer the Antidumping Act is worthwhile. But I want to make clear that this statute and its changing administration has had important international effects which we cannot ignore. These effects are especially important in the context of the Kennedy round.

The lodging of a dumping claim in the United States, regardless of whether dumping is eventually found or not found, frequently hinders trade. It thus becomes a nontariff trade barrier. When a dumping claim is entered and acted on by the Treasury, and the Treasury finds a suspicion of dumping, the Customs Bureau may withhold appraisement of the imported goods in question if there is reason to believe or suspect sales at less than fair value. This means that importers cannot know for indefinite periods what duties will be assessed on their imports, and that they may have difficulty completing their sales to U.S. consumers and entering into new contracts for similar imports.

Between January 1, 1955, and December 31, 1964, Treasury acted on 321 dumping complaints. In nine cases dumping duties were assessed. Of the remaining 312 cases, 68 were terminated because the foreign supplier voluntarily adjusted his prices; in 208, Treasury found no sales at less than fair value and in 36 cases, Tariff Commission found absence of injury. Appraisement was withheld in 101 cases between 1957 and 1964, according to data supplied by Treasury. Tables showing this data are attached, and with unanimous consent will be included in the RECORD at this point:

Record year by year, Jan. 1, 1955, through Dec. 31, 1964

Year	Finding of dumping	No dumping			Total
		No price discrimination	Price revision	No injury	
1955	1	40	5	5	51
1956	0	19	1	2	22
1957	0	21	4	2	27
1958	0	20	5	2	27
1959	0	23	13	1	37
1960	1	19	7	2	29
1961	3	25	5	5	38
1962	0	9	12	2	23
1963	1	19	4	6	30
1964:					
1st 6 months	2	7	6	4	19
Last 6 months	1	6	6	5	18
Total	9	208	68	36	321

ANTIDUMPING ACT—WITHHOLDING OF APPRAISEMENT

Appraisement was withheld in the following number of cases in the calendar years indicated below:

Year 1957	3
Year 1958	9
Year 1959	15
Year 1960	24
Year 1961	10
Year 1962	11
Year 1963	16
Year 1964	13
Total	101

Antidumping claims thus represent a trade hindrance, irritating the foreign countries. They often damage U.S. importers and even consumers. In addition, the Antidumping Act has proven at best difficult and cumbersome to administer. These alone are adequate reasons for creating a better antidumping system.

There are additional, more compelling reasons for seeking a new mechanism to prevent dumping by all nations. One of these is the growth of foreign antidumping statutes which are poorly designed to eliminate dumping itself but which threaten to be used as protective barriers against foreign competition.

Foreign antidumping regulations have been generally less explicitly prescribed than our own, and on the whole seem to have a smaller restrictive effect on trade. On the other hand, these other nations, having many more other-than-tariff trade barriers than the United States point to U.S. antidumping procedures as particularly objectionable. Thus the Treaty of Rome provision that would harmonize the antidumping laws of the six members of the European Economic Community has been acted on, and a proposal has been prepared and submitted to the EEC Council. This proposal has not yet been approved, but when it is, it could be the basis for antidumping procedures ineffective in eliminating the bad practice of dumping but more restrictive to reciprocal trade than those of the United States.

Other important foreign trading nations have recently enacted dumping laws. The United Kingdom antidumping law is dated 1957, the French law 1958, the West German law 1962, the Italian law 1963. In 1963 Spain established a commission to determine sales at less than fair value. Other countries, such as Canada, Australia, and Japan have antidumping statutes which predate the signing of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1947. Still other nations, such as the Netherlands and the Benelux countries, have only administrative regulations establishing antidumping procedures. Certainly the number of antidumping cases brought before foreign governments is increasing.

There is a clear danger that national antidumping procedures can grow in stiffness and complexity, and thus in trade-restrictive effect.

In short, the channels of world trade may increasingly become encumbered by national systems of antidumping procedure, each system different from the other. Thus the next few years will be critical in shaping world antidumping practices. As tariff barriers go down nontariff protection must also be diminished, not increased. Now tariff trade barriers are a more significant threat to U.S. exporters than foreign tariffs and any threat of their further increase is ominous. All of this supports the logic from U.S. exporters standpoint of an international approach to the antidumping question.

ANTIDUMPING: AN IMPORTANT KENNEDY ROUND ISSUE

The most persuasive reason for seeking an alternative to our present antidumping program derives from its relation to the "Kennedy Round" of GATT negotiations. The GATT negotiations now in process are the first in the history of GATT to include nontariff barriers to trade. As previously pointed out, foreign nations having little else to complain about nontariff U.S. trading practices point up antidumping as negotiable in the nontariff barrier context. A tentative GATT working group on antidumping has been established.

I must make clear that U.S. antidumping law and procedure does not in any significant sense violate the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. But there is no question that the cumbersomeness of U.S. practice is a considerable irritant to world trade and there is some legitimacy in pointing to it as a nontariff barrier to trade. It could therefore be to the advantage of the United States in obtaining European concessions on restudying its dumping practices and enacting a common international antidumping program, to lead an effort to create a new means of preventing dumping. A new U.S. position on antidumping could have great bargaining value.

The present course is unsatisfactory. It will not bring us quickly to our goal of increased international trade, based upon reciprocity and a stronger international economy. Improved means to eliminate the evils of dumping must be found, and if possible it should be achieved by international agreement.

Therefore, I propose that the United States take the lead in developing an international code of harmonization of national antidumping laws. Such a code would establish uniform definitions of dumping and injury, and uniform administrative practices for entering and prosecuting dumping claims by all signatory nations. Like GATT, indeed it could well be under the auspices of GATT, it would establish standards of conduct. A nation which believes itself injured by a violation of the standard would have the right to charge the offender to cease its damaging practices or to justify them.

Some discussion of such a scheme has taken place in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD. The OECD's consultative industry group, the Business and Industry Advisory Committee—BIAC—to OECD, is preparing a possible model code of harmonization. The OECD would be a possible forum in which to prepare such an international agreement.

But I would like to look beyond even the ideal system of industrial antidumping I have proposed, to a day when international trade and commercial transactions would be carried on under broader rules of fair competition. Thus the resolution I am introducing today directs the executive to undertake actively preparatory studies and to establish as a priority objective the creation of an international agreement which would harmonize national dumping laws and procedures in a uniform code. And it also directs that study should concurrently be given to the establishment of agreed rules of international competition which could in time supplant national antidumping procedure. The text of this House resolution follows:

Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President should take such action as may be necessary for the preparation of an international agreement to harmonize the operation and administration of the antidumping laws of all the countries

That it is the sense of this House that the President should immediately initiate a study of all the antidumping laws of all the countries and the administration of such laws and take such other action as may be necessary for the preparation of an international agreement to harmonize the operation and administration of such laws. In making such study consideration should be given to the possibility of establishing international rules of fair competition for international trade to eventually supplant the various antidumping laws of the countries.

FEDERAL AID MEANS FEDERAL CONTROL

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, those who advocate more Federal aid for education typically insist, here in the Congress, that Federal aid presents no threat to our traditional system of local control over public education.

They say that local control should be retained, and will be retained despite expanded programs of Federal assistance.

The fallacy of these assurances is clearly demonstrated in the recent order of the U.S. Office of Education laying down certain requirements which local school districts must meet in order to be eligible for U.S. aid.

In a recent discussion on this subject with the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Francis Keppel, I asked him how his office could have information about each school district around the country sufficient on which to base a blanket requirement basic to the administration of local schools.

He acknowledged that he could not have that much information. "But we have to have some rules," he said.

This gives rise to a problem which I believe merits the attention of all Americans concerned with public education. We have today a clear and unmistakable trend to centralized Washington control over the decisions of local school boards. Who is to say where the trend may stop?

In this connection I call attention to the following material which appeared in the Evening Star of Washington, May 28, 1965:

AMENDMENT ON SCHOOLS URGED

(By David Lawrence)

Amendments to the Constitution are usually hard to get started and adopted nowadays, but there is one which might receive popular support instantaneously. It has to do with the rights of the States to control their own educational processes.

Although the Federal Government denies that it has any intention of dictating what is taught in the public schools or of interfering with local communities in their mapping out of school districts, it is becoming evident every day that the centralized Government in Washington is going to take over more and more of the education process by using its power over the distribution of Federal tax money.

Why, for instance, should a State from which a billion dollars in Federal taxes is collected and to which is allocated $100 million for aid to its schools suddenly be denied such aid because a Federal bureaucracy decides that the State is not complying with regulations promulgated from Washington?

The money collected in Federal taxes in a State far exceeds, of course, the allotments made to the State for education. What is being returned to the States is their own taxpayers' money. But it is being used in large part to require compliance by the States through what is being called legalized blackmail.

Congress in 1964 passed a law which condemned racial discrimination. The text of the provision follows:

"No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

Any State which uses its Federal funds to benefit schools that are predominantly Negro on the same basis as it furnishes funds to schools that are predominantly white would appear to be complying with the law as written by Congress. But the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has announced, through the U.S. Office of Education, that its own desegregation formulas must be applied. This is an extension of the words of the statute, especially since Congress did not specify that schools must be desegregated. This up to now has been handled by the courts.

Many States have not intentionally segregated their schools, but circumstances of residence and other factors have made it difficult to conform to any formula set up in Washington or demanded by pressure groups. This is true of Northern States as well as Southern States. Existing law provides for judicial review in each instance, but this today is a hazardous course to follow, because already the Supreme Court has ruled that sooner or later schools must be desegregated.

Court orders, of course, have been litigated extensively, but the Supreme Court has taken upon itself the duty of enforcing the desegregation policy. Now that the executive branch of the Government has joined in the battle and has decided to withhold funds as a method of punishment, a constitutional amendment would appear to be the only effective recourse available to protect the States from invasions of their authority to handle their own educational processes.

Certainly when the 11 States of the South pay a total of nearly $16 billion in taxes and the Federal Government decides for some arbitrary reason to withhold a portion of the funds allocated to them—especially when the reason is not at all related to the educational process itself—then the citizens of these States have a grievance. The following table lists what was collected in taxes in 1964 in those States and what they will get back in the next fiscal year for education if they comply with Federal commands:

State	U.S. taxes collected in State, 1964	U.S. funds for education, next fiscal year
Alabama	$726,000,000	$63,450,000
Arkansas	359,000,000	37,597,000
Florida	1,803,000,000	74,400,000
Georgia	1,415,000,000	75,426,000
Louisiana	928,000,000	64,553,000
Mississippi	343,000,000	48,824,000
North Carolina	2,738,000,000	93,526,000
South Carolina	490,000,000	50,550,000
Tennessee	1,042,000,000	62,170,000
Texas	4,240,000,000	163,880,000
Virginia	1,824,000,000	85,653,000
Total	15,908,000,000	820,029,000

The significance of expanding Federal control which accompanies expanding Federal aid is enhanced when we stop to realize how Federal aid is growing under the Johnson administration.

The problem is discussed in the following material which appeared also in the Evening Star of Washington on May 28, 1965:

JOHNSON AID TO STATES TO SKYROCKET

(By Richard Wilson)

It probably is fruitless to continue pointing this out, but the fantastic speedup of Federal aid to State and local governments is one of the leading characteristics of President Johnson's administration.

Each program helps the State and local governments meet their problems and increases their subservience to Washington. Before the Johnson administration introduced mass transportation aid, expanded public school aid, expanded housing programs, Federal aid to the States was running up toward $11 billion a year.

Now the scope of the aid will skyrocket and make our foreign aid program seem puny by comparison.

A new report by the Senate Government Operations Committee is a guide for States and localities whose officials may not know whom to go to in Washington. It shows that these aids have increased from $7.2 billion in the 1960 fiscal year to $10.5 billion in the 1964 fiscal year.

But we have only seen the beginning. The 92 identifiable programs now will be supplemented by more this year and probably every year of the Johnson administration, if the present trend continues.

Here is a sampling of the kind of aids that bring local officials to Washington as supplicants for Federal help—roads, transportation, school lunches, food stamps, redevelopment area assistance, National Guard center construction, grants for maritime academies, schools, a wide range of health services, education of the mentally retarded, old age assistance, medical assistance, aid to the blind and totally disabled, child welfare, aid to needy families, wildlife restoration, juvenile delinquency, refugee assistance, disaster, relief, airport planning and development, manpower training, urban planning and renewal, low-rent public housing.

Some of the new programs will make most of the old ones look small. By one estimate, local mass transportation alone may ultimately claim $20 billion in Federal assistance. It is impossible to forecast how far the antipoverty and Appalachia-type programs will go. We also have the beautification program coming along.

Later on, when the heat dies down a little, these aids, linked to State and local compliance with Federal standards, may be supplemented by outright grants of Federal money to cities and States with the loosest of strings attached.

Johnson was well-impressed by this method of sharing with States and localities the easy-to-collect Federal tax revenues until it got too much exposure in advance of his announcing it himself.

Few people have any realization of how such Federal programs can grow. Twenty years ago the so-called trust funds of the Federal Government, which are outside the regular budget but are spending programs nevertheless, attracted suspicious eyes, although the amounts involved were relatively small.

Today those trust funds expenditures paid out to the public will amount this fiscal year to nearly $33 billion, are equal to one-fourth of the total expenditures of the Government, and are three or four times the total Government expenditures in the happiest days of the New Deal. They are not even included in the "administrative budget" submitted to Congress by the President, which is the $100 billion figure so often referred to.

Congress is ambivalent on the problem. Those who complain loudest against the rapid acquisition of Federal control in States and cities are often the first to claim the aid. Even the Iowa Congressman, H. R. Gross, who has made a career of trying to block big spending by rising to object when unanimous consent is needed, publicly advocates a big Federal-local project in his district. He says this is his first transgression in 20 years in Congress.

The average Congressman, however, whether Republican or Democrat, is avidly and perpetually looking for ways the people in his district can share in the Federal aid programs.

Johnson, with the experience of 30 years in Congress, understands this very well. He clothes his Federal aid programs with restrictions on malevolent Federal interference in local affairs, but the Federal standards are usually there hidden behind the legal verbiage. His view is that we are entering a new era of benevolent State and local cooperation.

This is unquestionably true, and when the era reaches a full flowering many of the oldest concepts about State sovereignty and local responsibility will have been swept away.

THE 408TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE ACT IN TRANSYLVANIA

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in commemorating the 408th anniversary of the first religious tolerance act in Transylvania. It was the first legislation in Europe of its kind and formed a vanguard of such legislation in Europe, which, however, was implemented in most countries only after long and bloody religious wars during the next century.

By pioneering in this important field of human rights of freedom of conscience and free choice of religion, the peoples of Transylvania proved their political maturity, ethical judgment, and political devotion to the cause of individual freedom as early as 1557.

It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the peoples of Transylvania who produced an early example of religious and political toleration now find their rights denied by the Communist regime of Rumania.

These freedom-loving peoples are deprived of their religious freedom. The Greek Catholics were forcibly united with the Orthodox Church in 1948 which in turn, has also seen its rights abridged, the Roman Catholic Church has two of its three bishoprics in Transylvania vacant, and the third one is run by a bishop who is still impeded in the exercise of his ecclesiastical functions and was not allowed to attend the meetings of the Vatican Councils. Some clergymen of the Calvinist and Unitarian faiths are still imprisoned, and the seminaries for ministers and priests are either nonexistent or under strict state control.

Politically, despite the amnesty, Rumania is still a police state; there is no freedom even on the local level. Economically, the industries remain nationalized, the farms collectivized.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly apparent that the Communist regime of Rumania, like all Communist regimes, practices the denial of basic human rights. The autocratic Communist rule in Transylvania deprives the people there of their religious, ethnic, educational, and political rights.

Remembering the rich cultural contribution of the Transylvanian Hungarians and Germans and their devotion to individual and religious freedom already at a very early date today, and remembering also the freedom-loving qualities of the Transylvanian Rumanians, I conclude with the ardent hope that some day in the not too distant future these peoples may regain their political and religious freedom. I believe that one of the ways of airing their plight would be to establish a Select House Committee on Captive Nations.

NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY DEDICATION

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, 1965, community, Government, and industrial leaders, as well as Northeastern University officials, took part in the unveiling of memorial and commemorative plaques at the university's suburban campus in Burlington, Mass.

The plaques gave recognition to the efforts of civic leaders and to the financial assistance provided to make the campus possible.

Special recognition was accorded to the senatorial and congressional representatives of the area for their assistance in obtaining the former Nike site.

Dr. Asa S. Knowles, president of Northeastern University, who presided at the plaque dedication ceremonies, also praised the help provided by the Office of Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and officials of the town of Burlington and the city of Woburn.

Dr. Knowles stated that:

> This campus, located in the heart of Massachusetts' famed circumferential highway—Route 128—electronics complex, one of the greatest concentrations of electronics, space-oriented firms in the Nation, is providing convenient facilities for furthering the education of officials and employees of the electronics and other companies in the surrounding area.

The facility is 12½ miles northwest of Northeastern University's 50-acre main campus in Boston and has an enrollment of 5,000 day and evening students, many of whom are employed by the various industries of that area.

Northeastern University by its establishment of the suburban campus, which opened its doors in April 1964, has once more demonstrated the kinship which has always existed between the university and the business community, said Dr. Knowles.

That kinship has been the keynote of Northeastern's 68-year history. Founded in 1898, the university has grown steadily until today when it has a daytime enrollment of approximately 9,500 and an evening enrollment of more than 21,500.

As Northeastern's president has said:

> The university which is community focused in its service is, in turn, greatly influenced by the community. The community itself determines the kinds of programs that should be offered.
>
> Northeastern University is an urban university which has as one of its primary objectives the serving of the metropolitan community of Boston. Its programs and services reflect the demands imposed on the university by the community.

Northeastern University's suburban campus has its origins in the university's philosophy of service to the community. It came into being in response to requests by businesses and industries located on or near Route 128, which forms a half-moon perimeter around Boston.

The campus exists primarily to offer part-time programs in science, engineering, and business, particularly graduate work in these areas of study. It also provides convenient educational facilities for students studying for bachelor's degrees or for continuing education state-of-the-art courses designed to keep current industry's knowledge in these times of rapid change.

While the campus was created primarily for late afternoon and evening study for part-time students, it is also used in the daytime by some 350 freshmen as well as a large number of adult women, mainly housewives, who are resuming their education during hours while their children are at school.

"The campus is playing a vital role in assisting New England firms to keep abreast of developments in the field of aerospace in order that they may be of service to the Nation's space program and especially to the Greater Boston located NASA Space Center," President Knowles declared.

Areas of this specialized study which are offered in courses include advanced electronics circuits design, applied physical metallurgy, cryogenic instrumentation, instrumentation for the upper atmosphere, dynamics of rigid and elastic structures, data transmission, high vacuum technology, advanced optics and optical systems engineering, and other related subjects.

On the former Nike site, Northeastern University has constructed a $1 billion main building of modern design which contains 22 classrooms, a 500-seat auditorium, 2 seminar rooms, a student canteen and lounge and dining area, and faculty and administrative offices.

The former barracks on the Nike site has been converted into a modern library, to which plans are being made to add six classrooms.

Participants in the plaque dedication ceremonies included Northeastern University President Knowles; Paul W. Cronice, as my representative; Daniel J. Lynch, clerk of the criminal division of the Boston Municipal Court, representing Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL; Lawrence R. Laughlin, resident assistant for Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY; George Higginson, vice president of the New England Merchants National Bank of Boston, representing the Elizabeth A. Lufkin Trust, which granted the university funds for establishing the campus' library; Mayor Edward F. Gill, of Woburn; Burlington Selectmen John M. Kilmartin, Robert A. Vigneau, and David M. Ward, and Joseph G. Nolan, executive secretary, town of Burlington; Harold D. Hodgkinson, chairman of the executive committee, Wm. Filene's Sons Co., which granted the university funds for the campus conference room; Stacey Holmes, director of public relations of Filene's; and Donald C. DeHart, regional representative for the Office of Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Also, Irving Salsberg and Ralph L. Le Blanc, representing the architectural firm of Salsberg & Le Blanc, which designed the facilities; Julius Abrams, president of the Poley-Abrams Corp., the contractor; and the following members of the first class in women's continuing education programs: Mrs. Howard M. Fraser, chairman; Mrs. Laurence Clement, Mrs. Robert B. Hull, Mrs. Alessandro Morelli, and Mrs. Jules B. Sussman.

Among the large delegation of Northeastern University officials, in addition to Dr. Knowles, were Dr. William C. White, vice president and provost; Dr. Loring Thompson, dean of adult programs; Dean Lawrence A. Allen of University College, an evening undergraduate division of Northeastern; Dr. Arthur A. Vernon, dean of the graduate division; Prof. Edward S. Parsons, university business manager; and Prof. John S. Bailey, director of public relations.

Business and industrial leaders taking part included Christian Westphalen, manager of personnel development and training, Mitre Corp., Bedford, Mass.; and Daniel Cantor, director of employee relations, Itek Corp., Lexington, Mass.

The six plaques dedicated bear the following inscriptions:

> The first building, Northeastern University suburban campus, erected 1964; chairman of the corporation, Byron K. Elliott; president of the university, Asa S. Knowles; architect, Salsberg & Le Blanc; contractor, Poley-Abrams Corp.
>
> Northeastern University gratefully acknowledges the assistance of the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts; the Honorable EDWARD M. KENNEDY, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts; the Honorable F. BRADFORD MORSE, Representative, Fifth Congressional District; and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in making possible the site for this suburban campus, 1964.
>
> Northeastern University gratefully acknowledges the assistance of the town of Burlington and the city of Woburn in the development of this campus, 1963–65. Selectmen, town of Burlington, John M. Kilmartin, Charles L. Shea, Robert A. Vigneau, and David M. Ward; Maud S. Graham, town clerk; Joseph G. Nolan, executive secretary. City of Woburn, Edward F. Gill, mayor.
>
> The Filene Conference Room, named in recognition of a generous gift from William Filene's Sons Co., 1965.
>
> This planting is a gift from the first class in women's continuing education programs, Northeastern University, 1964–65.
>
> This library given in memory of Richard H. Lufkin by the Elizabeth A. Lufkin Trust, 1964.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

TAX CREDIT PROGRAM TO HELP MEET THE COSTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the Republican task force on education has been exploring into today's needs of American education, and it has made an early finding that there is a real need for some attention to the problem of swiftly rising costs in higher education.

The Republican task force on education has been particularly impressed with the bright prospects offered by tax credits as a possible aid to the student and his parents in meeting these higher educational costs. Wanting to hear the pros and cons concerning tax credits stated for the record, the Republican task force on education conducted a public hearing in New York City on May 24.

I am pleased to announce to my colleagues that this hearing proved to be a great success, much of this owing to the high caliber of witnesses that presented testimony to the hearing. All of the witnesses entertained a keen interest in education, with a preponderance of them being officials of, or associated with, some of our prominent institutions of higher learning. Also on hand was a parent who was concerned with the high costs of providing college education for his children; mostly we have heard from parents in the form of letters, however.

We of the Republican task force on education feel that the time is ripe to move forward with some sort of an assist for those confronted with rising costs of higher education. Inasmuch as the House Committee on Ways and Means has not conducted hearings in this regard in either the present or recent Congresses, the task force has used the May 24 hearing as a forum through which the people can express their views on this tax credit matter. I wish other hearings could be held in other sections of the country, thereby providing a comprehensive view with respect to the public attitude on tax credits as an aid in meeting the high costs of higher education.

Because this hearing brought out some extremely valuable information on the subject of tax credits, as well as other recommendations for assistance in higher educational costs, we of the House Republican task force on education have determined that the content of this May 24 hearing should be made available to all Members of the Congress through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Toward this end, six members of the task force have obtained time under special orders, planning to use this time to acquaint our colleagues with the contents of this hearing in a series of installments; hence, for today and the next 2 days of this week—as well as for the first 3 legislative days of next week—Members of the House Republican task force on education will be making their presentations.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the content of this hearing to the Members of the Congress, for it represents, I feel, a good balance of pro and con on the subject of tax credits as an aid for costs in higher education—and it is fervently hoped that this May 24 hearing will be but prologue to other congressional action to follow.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will submit for the RECORD my opening remarks at the New York hearings on May 24 of the House Republican Task Force on Education:

> It is indeed a great pleasure and high privilege to meet with you today here in New York to give consideration to a matter vital to the interests of America—the high costs of higher education.
>
> At the outset, I would like to make it clear that the object of this hearing is to provide us, as representatives of the Republican Party, with an opportunity to appraise the merits of various proposals designed to assist the student taxpayer and his parents in meeting the rapidly increasing costs of higher education. The Republican Task Force on Education is eager to make this exploration.
>
> That these costs are escalating is evidenced by the fact that tuition fees have gone up approximately 25 percent during the last 5 years. For instance, as per a representative sample of 50 well-known private colleges and universities, there is an indicated increase in tuition from $250 in 1930 to approximately $1,200 as of last year. In the so-called Ivy League schools the increase was from $375 up to $1,575. This shows that although the tuition in public institutions is materially lower than at private schools there is no promise of relief in sight,

for it is estimated that tuition will rise by another 50 percent in both private and public educational institutions over the next 10 years.

All of this raises the poignant question as to whether or not some effort should be made through Federal assistance to keep the doors of learning open to low-income qualified students. Or should these doors be permitted to slam shut in the faces of these students in the winds of high tuition costs?

In order to justify the application of Federal assistance in this area, it has to be demonstrated that higher educational programs are in the national interest—and there is cogent evidence to show that they are.

For instance, the United States, just like the rest of the nations of the world, presently is experiencing a population explosion. If the American population continues to grow at its 1962–63 rate of 1.44 percent, it will reach about 323 million by the year 2000.

This population growth could become a critical factor in American life, for as the number of citizens increases in our Nation, the imperative demand for jobs, skills, and subsistence increases. The principal problem is to keep these factors in balance.

But it must not be mistakenly assumed that the achievement of such equilibrium is an easy thing, for the highly specialized and technical character of this age in which we live demands of us an excellence in performance at high levels of skill. And a substance of these skills and talents can be acquired only in specialized areas of education, particularly the classrooms of our colleges and universities.

We must remember that the shadow of unemployment has been casting itself quite persistently in a dimension approximating 4.5 percent, and unless adjustments are made to meet the broadening skill requirements of jobs, this shadow will not diminish and might possibly lengthen.

It is estimated, for instance, that by 1970 we will have a need for a million and one-half engineers and over a half million scientists. In order to satisfy this need, we should graduate about 80,000 engineers a year during the 1960's. Unfortunately, however, present enrollment schedules reveal that we will be graduating only in the vicinity of 40,000 engineers for the present year and the next one.

Still, in a world that sees the United States joined in contests of nuclear development and space exploration with other great powers, it is upon the educated that great dependency will be placed for accomplishments in these fields. And it is disconcerting to observe that while the U.S. lags, the Soviet Union is considerably accelerating its programs of technical training, producing at least twice as many engineers each year as we are in America. In effect, we are operating on a reserve of technical talent that is not being properly replaced, and every effort should be made to correct this condition.

In a like manner, an increasing population creates demands for medical and other health services, as well as for services in the technical fields; we are going to need more doctors and dentists, and we are going to need more technicians of numerous other descriptions.

Furthermore, the political needs of a self-governing democracy require a wide variety of talents, such as teachers, social scientists, economists, diplomats, administrators, etc.—all polished by a study of the liberal arts. If we are going to continue to have a form of government and economic society within which the hopes and strivings of people can be realized and if we are to further the development of our Constitution, laws, and our social and cultural ways of life, we have a grave obligation to provide education which will give man a clear, conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, a truth in developing and questioning them, eloquence in expressing them, and a force in urging them.

But the ever-increasing costs of higher education are interfering with the satisfaction of our needs.

For instance, a Ford Foundation study of 2 years ago reveals that 69 percent of parents interviewed would like to develop plans to send their children to college in the future; however, 40 percent of these families felt that they would not be able to do so. This same study showed that fully 60 percent of American parents have no savings and the other 40 percent have only an average of $150 put away for college costs.

It is distressing to observe that about 30 percent of the top quarter of high school students never enter college, and it is determined that this failure to enter into higher education is very closely correlated with a negative economic position of the family.

If we divide the Nation's college-age youth into three approximately equal groups by level of family income, we find the following: In the lowest income third, out of every 100 youth, approximately 66 reach the senior year of high school, 56 graduate, and 10 enter college. For the middle income families, out of 100 youth, 90 reach the senior year of high school, 79 graduate, and 34 enter college. For the top third of families, 83 out of 100 reach the senior year, 78 graduate, and 55 enter college. Essentially, then, just about two-thirds of high school graduates in high-income families enter college, about one-half in the middle-income class, and less than one-fifth from the lowest income group.

All of this reveals, of course, that the greatest loss of potential talent is in both the lower- and middle-income groups.

It is a disturbing realization, also, to note that some 40 percent of those who enter college do not graduate, and only a small number continue into graduate and professional studies—and finances inadequate to meeting increasing tuition costs are charged with much of the fault in the case of those students who drop out along the scholastic way or decide against advanced professional training.

It is strikingly apparent that the educational job remaining before us is a vast one. Twenty-five to thirty years ago the cost of college education was a matter of direct concern to a relatively small fraction of the Nation's families. Today, in an age of high skill and talent requirements, more and more individuals are seeking higher education and trying to cope with the costs of higher education. Just a generation ago only one out of seven young persons entered college, while today nearly one-half of this group is avidly interested in entering, with the percentage continuing to rise.

For the next 15 years, even in the absence of student assistance, enrollment increases in college will average 340,000 each year.

In 1962 there were 4,207,000 undergraduates enrolled in American colleges and universities. The U.S. Office of Education estimates project an increase to 5,220,000 this year and 6,959,000 by 1970. The parents of most of these students will carry the financial burden of this education without scholarship assistance. And the overwhelming majority of these parents are in the middle-income group which is, in many respects, a highly neglected segment of our population in terms of special considerations received from the Federal Government.

In any discussion of Federal assistance for higher education, an assortment of plans are always brought forward for consideration. Presently there is a bevy of bills (at least 38) before the Congress providing various types of Federal assistance for higher education. Essentially, these aids resolve themselves into several different popular categories, as follows: (1) student loans; (2) student scholarships; (3) exemptions; (4) tax rebate; (5) deductions; (6) outright scholarships; (7) tax credit.

We of the Republican Party feel that there is merit to Federal assistance for higher education. We also feel that the most effective approach in this regard is through tax credit. Tax credits have long held the serious attention of the Republican Party as a probable valuable aid to the American citizen in meeting the costs of higher education. For instance, the Republican platform of 1960 stated as follows:

"Toward the goal of fullest possible educational opportunity for every American we pledge * * * consideration of means through tax laws to help offset tuition costs."

Again, the Republican Party, in its 1964 platform, set forth its views in this area:

"We shall assist the individual in surmounting urgent problems beyond his power and responsibility to control. For instance, we pledge * * * tax credits for those burdened by the expenses of college education."

Another part of the 1964 Republican platform reinforced the tax credit concept in the following words:

"In furtherance of our faith in the individual * * * we pledge continued advancement of education on all levels, through such programs as selective aid to higher education, strengthened State and local tax resources, including tax credits for college education."

And this keen interest is going forward in the Congress today. At recent date, fully 19 tax credit bills have been introduced to the House of Representatives by Republican Congressmen, while 19 Republican Senators are cosponsors to a similar tax credit measure in the Senate.

Of all these measures, H.R. 1681 is strongly supported by the Republican Party. This legislation was introduced on January 6 of this year to the House of Repreesntatives by the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, a high-ranking minority member of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

This bill provides as follows:

1. A taxpayer is allowed to take as credit against his final tax the amount of tuition and fees paid by him during the taxable year to one or more college or institution of higher education for himself or for any other individual for whom he can claim an exemption.

2. Credit for tuition and fees are allowed on the following schedule: (a) 100 percent of the first $100; (b) 30 percent of the next $400; and (c) 20 percent of the next $1,000, the maximum credit allowance under this provision would be $420.

3. A credit is provided against the final tax for an individual for the amounts representing his contributions to one or more institutions of higher education during the taxable year * * * the credit cannot exceed $100 in the case of an individual or $10,000 in the case of a corporation * * * such credit will apply only if the contribution to or for the use of an institution of higher education is deductible as a charitable contribution.

Essentially, these are the salient points of H.R. 1681, and it might be said that considerable Republican interest is centered in broadening the provisions of this legislation to provide a tax credit for those persons contributing money to educational institutions for scholarship purposes.

In addition, some interest has been evidenced in building into such a legislative provision a "depreciation scale on income." This would have the effect of reducing tax benefits as per steps upward on the income ladder; this would, of course, have the effect of directing the greatest benefits to those in the low- and middle-income ranges thereby providing the highest degree of accommodation for those who are the hardest pressed in meeting the costs of college tuition.

It is the consensus of the Republican Party that the merits of a tax credit program are outstandingly superior to other Federal aid to higher education. In effect, it would have the heaviest benefit impact and also would reach deeply and broadly into those areas where assistance is most needed; that is, the middle- and low-income groups of citizens. Further points offering strong support for a tax credit approach are as follows: (a) it would, by permitting a wide variety of selection in educational institution, preserve the valuable aspect of diversity in our higher education system; (b) it would provide the taxpayer with a free choice as relating to a college education; (c) it would direct a greater amount of benefit to low- and middle-income families.

In summary, we of the Republican Party feel that there is a dramatic need for Federal aid to higher education. Too, we resolutely feel that such assistance very precisely is in the national interest; it would relieve cost burdens presently pressing down upon the backs of many American taxpayers, and it would advance the security of our Nation by equipping it with a highly enlightened and skilled citizenry.

We live in a world that throbs with the wonders of science, art, and technology, a world that requires of us a superlative standard of higher education.

The time to act toward this achievement in education is now—for if we do not, we will have done a grave injustice both to our country and to our children's children.

We, as Republicans, firmly feel that we must not let the rich fruits of our future skills and talents waste and wither in the stale air of lethargy in the present—we pledge our unrestrained efforts toward the end of excellence at the level of higher education, and consideration for the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, the following are the remarks of Senator Dominick, my colleague from the other body, who has been in the forefront in promoting this type of legislation:

Federal Aid to Higher Education: The Case for Tax Credit

(Testimony presented by Senator Peter Dominick, of Colorado, to the May 24 meeting in New York City of the House Republican task force on education)

Mr. Chairman and members of the Republican planning and research committee's task force on education, you are to be commended on the establishment of this forward-thinking program which seeks not only answers to the problems of today in providing the best possible education for our children, but also seeks the means to continue, in the future, programs to provide better educational opportunities for every American child.

I am grateful to you for giving me the opportunity to present my thoughts which I hope will be helpful in your deliberations.

Our Nation is at a crossroads in determining its course for the future in providing a college education for our children. Tuition and fees have been increased at an accelerating rate at private and public colleges, universities, and land-grant institutions caused by the steadily rising costs of operations at all institutions of higher learning and rapidly growing enrollments. The decision we face is how best to meet and cope with this problem.

All evidence presented to us points to the inevitable conclusion that the cost of tuition, fees, books, and equipment will continue to rise. And as costs continue to rise, more and more parents will find it increasingly difficult to finance their children's education. Even now, each new increase in student costs serves to prevent a number of potential college students from attending the college of their choice, and forces some students already enrolled to drop out for purely economic reasons. The effect of this trend upon American higher education could be devastating, not only to our children but to our national interest.

Education is vital to our national interest. Our national growth is directly proportionate to the strength and excellence of our educational resources. Excellence in education has been more nearly achieved in the United States for the broad base of the population than in any other nation in the world. It is crucial that we give top priority to maintaining the strongest educational system possible and this is only possible if the youth of the Nation are provided the financial opportunity to participate in higher education. What courses of action have been advanced to assist in reaching and maintaining this goal?

Literally, there have been many hundreds of proposals offered. They have ranged from massive programs of Government-financed scholarships, grants, and loans to States and institutions of higher learning, to individual tax relief for students and their parents. All have failed to secure the necessary support because they failed to surmount one or more of the three principal objections:

1. Government domination and ultimate control of our educational system.
2. Opposition to the use of tax funds to aid church-supported schools.
3. Lack of real assistance to those in the "greatest need" dichotomy.

During the past 10 years more than 450 bills have been introduced in Congress advocating some form of tax relief for college students and their families. These have advocated three different forms of assistance under the tax laws, with the greatest number of bills advocating the relief proposed under the first category:

1. Allow as a deduction from gross income amounts paid for tuition, fees, and books by the taxpayer or his dependent.
2. Authorize an extra $600 dependent's exemption for each full-time student at an institution of higher education.
3. A tax credit for a percentage of the cost of tuition, fees, and books paid by the taxpayer for himself, his dependent, or another person.

The first two proposals have received no favorable action because they would provide the greatest benefit to the higher income taxpayer, and the least to the lower income taxpayer—none at all to the lowest income group which already owed no income tax. Of all the proposals introduced, the tax credit proposal most nearly meets and overcomes all of the principal objections, and provides the most equitable form of assistance to students while stimulating greater private efforts in support of higher education. Furthermore, to the extent that this proposal encourages private contributions to the education of others than the taxpayer's own dependents, the Government is obtaining educational dollars at substantial discounts ranging as high as 55 percent.

How does the tuition tax credit plan work? Under the bill introduced by Senator Ribicoff and myself and cosponsored by 33 other Senators, an income tax credit for college costs is provided as follows: The amount of the credit is 75 percent of the first $200; 25 percent of the next $300, and 10 percent of the next $1,000. The credit is based on the first $1,500 paid for tuition, fees, books, and supplies by or for each student at an approved institution of higher education. The maximum credit provided by our bill is $325. This credit is not the same as a deduction. Some people have confused the two terms. They are not the same. A deduction is a subtraction from gross income before computation of the amount of tax that is due. A tax credit is a subtraction from the amount of taxes the individual would otherwise pay on his taxable gross income. Because each dollar of credit reduces a person's tax by $1, the tax relief is provided uniformly without regard to the taxpayer's income bracket. On the other hand, a deduction saves a $15,000 a year man more tax dollars than it saves an $8,000 a year man, and saves a $25,000 a year man twice as much as it saves a $15,000 a year man. A tax credit would save all three men exactly the same number of dollars, as the following example shows:

For the sake of example, let us assume that Mr. A is a skilled mechanic, earning $3.50 per hour or $7,280 per annum, Mr. B is a company executive earning a salary of $15,000 per annum, and Mr. C is president of his company and earns $25,000 per annum. Each man has a son enrolled as a student at the University of Colorado. Based on figures for the year 1963, the cost of tuition, fees, and books for a resident of Colorado at this university amounted to $370.

(Assume for this example that each man is married and has two children and that deductions for each man is equivalent to the standard deduction or 10 percent of his gross income.)

Mr. A

	Tax credit	Tax deduction
Gross income	$7,280.00	$7,280.00
Exemptions, 4 at $600	2,400.00	2,400.00
Total	4,880.00	4,880.00
Standard deduction 10 percent	728.00	----------
Standard 10 percent plus tuition costs	----------	1,098.00
Taxable net income	4,152.00	3,782.00
Tax due	648.88	582.94
Less credit	193.00	0
Net tax due	455.88	582.94

Result: Tax credit reduces Mr. A's taxes $193. Tax deduction of the full tuition cost reduces his taxes only $65.94.

Mr. B

	Tax credit	Tax deduction
Gross income	$15,000.00	$15,000.00
Exemptions, 4 at $600	2,400.00	2,400.00
Total	12,600.00	12,600.00
Standard deduction, 10 percent	1,500.00	----------
Standard 10 percent plus tuition costs	----------	1,870.00
Taxable net income	11,100.00	10,730.00
Tax due	2,062.00	1,980.60
Less credit	193.00	0
Net tax due	1,869.00	1,980.60

Result: Tax credit reduces Mr. B's taxes $193. Tax deduction of the full tuition cost reduces his taxes only $81.40.

Mr. C

	Tax credit	Tax deduction
Gross income	$25,000	$25,000.00
Exemptions, 4 at $600	2,400	2,400.00
Total	22,600	22,600.00
Standard deduction, 10 percent	2,500	----------
Standard 10 percent plus tuition costs	----------	2,870.00
Taxable net income	20,100	19,730.00
Tax due	6,118	5,948.50
Less credit	193	0
Net tax due	5,925	5,948.50

Result: Tax credit reduces Mr. C's taxes $193 the same as Mr. A and Mr. B but tax deduction of tuition cost reduces his taxes $170.50. C under the deduction method receives more than twice as much benefit for the same tuition amount as B, and 2½ times as much benefit as A, who needs the assistance more.

The extra exemption concept is still more inequitable in that the lower income taxpayer would receive less than $100 in actual tax reduction ($84), while the highest income taxpayer in the above example would receive an actual reduction of more than three times that amount ($270).

While the tax credit is not a cure-all to the problem of meeting the costs of higher education, I personally believe it goes further toward providing more equitable assistance to the greatest number of people. To more clearly demonstrate its values, I think we should point out what the tax credit proposal does and does not do.

First, it does not, and indeed no tax proposal can, directly provide relief to low-income families who pay no income tax. Indirectly, however, under the bill introduced by Senator RIBICOFF and myself, there could be substantial assistance provided through the provision for allowing a tax credit to a taxpayer for payment of college expenses for a student who is not the taxpayer's own dependent. In addition, these families and their children can continue to take advantage of the scholarship, loan and grant programs, specifically designed for them, and dealt with, in many cases, both by State legislatures and by Congress. Vast numbers of scholarships available today contain a family income limitation as one of the conditions for eligibility. Most colleges and universities also give students from low-income families first priority on student employment programs.

Secondly, however, it does benefit the low-income families who do pay income taxes, and the multitude of middle-income families. Sixty-two percent of the dollar benefit would go to families with incomes between $3,000 and $10,000. Ninety-one percent of the benefit would go to families with incomes below $20,000. And, let's remember that the tax credit inures to any taxpayer who pays for the expenses of higher education. Thus, the single person who must pay tax while working himself through college will benefit as well as employed married couples where one spouse works while the other attends school.

Third, the tax credit plan is not a rich man's proposal, and anyone who so contends simply does not understand the sliding scale provisions of the bill. The sliding scale provides that the amount of credit is reduced by 1 percent of the amount by which the taxpayer's adjusted gross income exceeds $25,000. Thus, for each $5,000 of adjusted gross income above $25,000, the credit is reduced $50. The family with $5,000 annual income would get more relative benefit than the family with $30,000 annual income. The family with $60,000 annual income would get no benefit at all.

Fourth, the tax credit approach avoids many of the serious problems involved with Federal aid to education. The religious controversy and its constitutional difficulties is completely avoided. No additional Federal bureaucracy is required since we utilize the existing machinery of the Internal Revenue Service. And no Federal control is encountered. In effect, the tax credit approach, if adopted, would permit those desiring a college education, so important to the growing stature of this Nation, to use pretax earnings to accomplish their goal.

Fifth, colleges and universities in every State, both public and private, would benefit in two principal ways. They would be able to continue to assist deserving students who otherwise would be priced off the campus by the inevitable rise of tuition costs, fees and books. They would also be able to make a more selective use of available scholarship funds, and acquire new sources for additional funds to provide help to those who need it most, the students from low-income families.

Under present law, no tax deduction can be made for a designated gift for tuition, fees, books, and equipment. Tuition tax credit would allow just such designation of funds from persons other than the student or his parents. This would permit institutions, both public and private to enlist alumni and friends in the support of their most needy and deserving students, and to make more fruitful use of already available scholarship funds.

In summation, tuition tax credits will not solve all of our educational problems, but will be a significant step toward helping those who need assistance in bearing the costs of higher education. We have given grants and loans to the universities and graduate schools for buildings and equipment, we have made progress toward helping teachers, and we have created special programs to stimulate interest in secondary education. We now must recognize and act on the problem of those people who struggle to give their children the chance to improve and better their lot through higher education.

The attached chart showing the costs of tuition, fees, and books on 51 of our college campuses across the Nation graphically demonstrates the contribution which can be made through enactment of the pending Ribicoff-Dominick bill.

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, I very much appreciate your courtesy in giving me a chance to testify on the advantages to education of tax-credit systems, proposals which were endorsed by the Republican Policy Committee of the House of Representatives and a system which can be readily expanded into property tax credits for the costs of lower education and gift tax credits to sponsor additional private giving to higher educational institutions.

I congratulate you on your initiative in this field and the Republican educational task force for setting up these hearings on this very important subject.

Dollar benefit of Ribicoff tax credit amendment on tuition, fees, and books at 51 State universities and land-grant colleges

	Resident			Nonresident		
	Tuition, fees, and books	Dollar benefit of tax credit	Cost of education to person paying	Tuition, fees, and books	Dollar benefit of tax credit	Cost of education to person paying
Auburn University	$315	$179	$136	$615	$237	$378
University of Alabama	350	188	162	700	245	455
Arizona State University	320	180	140	920	267	653
Arkansas A. & M.	270	168	102	470	218	252
University of Arkansas	290	173	117	560	231	329
University of California	263–314	166–179	97–135	863–914	261–266	602–648
University of Colorado	370	193	177	994	274	720
Florida A. & M.	270	168	102	620	237	383
University of Florida	316	179	137	666	242	424
Georgia Institute of Technology	399	200	199	789	254	535
University of Georgia	350	188	162	695	245	450
University of Idaho	254	164	90	564	231	333
University of Illinois	360	190	170	710	246	464
Indiana University	390	198	192	795	255	540
Purdue University	390	198	192	940	269	671
University of Iowa	380	195	185	710	246	464
Kansas State University	334	184	150	664	241	423
University of Kentucky	310	178	132	610	236	374
Louisiana State University	260	165	95	560	231	329
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	1,790	325	1,465	1,790	325	1,465
University of Massachusetts	514	226	288	914	266	648
University of Michigan	370	193	177	990	274	716
University of Minnesota	405	201	204	870	262	608
Mississippi State University	361	190	171	761	251	510
University of Mississippi	371	193	178	770	252	518
University of Missouri	305	176	129	605	236	369
University of Nebraska	354	189	165	594	234	360
University of Nevada	351	188	163	951	270	681
University of New Hampshire	492	223	269	1,037	279	758
Rutgers (New Jersey)	596	235	361	606	245	451
Cornell University	1,790	325	1,465	1,790	325	1,465
State University of New York	515–865	227–261	288–604	515–1,085	227–284	288–801
Agricultural & Technical College of North Carolina	410	203	207	660	241	419
University of North Carolina	375	194	181	800	255	545
North Carolina State College	409	202	207	834	258	576
Ohio State University	465	216	249	960	271	689
Ohio University	540	229	311	940	269	671
Oregon State University	465	216	249	1,035	279	756
Pennsylvania State University	615	237	378	1,140	279	861
University of Rhode Island	415	204	211	915	267	648
Clemson College	546	230	316	796	255	541
South Carolina State College	380	195	185	610	236	374
University of Tennessee	315	179	136	615	237	378
University of Texas	234	159	75	534	228	306
University of Utah	390	198	192	585	234	351
University of Vermont	581	233	348	1,365	312	1,053
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	420	205	215	750	250	500
Virginia State College	430	208	222	600	235	365
University of Virginia	467	217	250	967	273	694
West Virginia University	320	190	140	850	260	590
University of Wisconsin	390	198	192	1,090	284	806

Mr. Speaker, the following is the statement of Russell I. Thackrey, executive secretary of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, who appeared in opposition to the tax credit idea and brought out suggestions of his own:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Republican Task Force on Education, my name is Russell I. Thackrey. My occupation is that of executive secretary of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, which has been my work since January 1, 1947. My comments today will be as an individual, however, except as I refer directly and specifically to positions taken by the association, which is composed of 97 universities and colleges in all States and Puerto Rico, currently enrolling more than 1.4 million students, and granting one-third of all baccalaureate and 57 percent of all doctoral degrees in this country.

It is a pleasure and privilege to meet with you today to discuss "How To Meet the Rising Costs of Higher Education." The Republican Party has a great deal to be proud of in its record in relation to higher education from its very founding. No single act of Congress has done more to make higher education widely available to people of talent regardless of economic or social status, race, creed, or national origin, than the Land-Grant College Act of 1862. Its principal author in the House was Representative Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont, its sponsor in the Senate, Senator Wade, of Ohio, and it was signed by President Abraham Lincoln, all Republicans.

On the basis of my 17½ years of experience in Washington, I can testify to the major and often decisive role which Republican Members of Congress have played in such landmark legislation as the college housing loan program, the National Defense Education Act, and the Higher Education Facilities Act, a record being extended in the current consideration of the proposed Higher Education Act of 1965. I have singled out these particular acts because all have made or will make a substantial contribution toward keeping down college costs or making it possible for individuals to meet them.

Your task force is properly concerned with the rising cost of higher education to students and parents. Every American should be concerned. We can be proud of the fact that we have made higher education more widely available to young people than any other major country. It is the source of much of the strength of our society. But we cannot be proud of the fact that, in our affluent society, we today make the student pay more of the costs of education than in any other major country of the world, and that the situation is getting worse, not better. We are in a spiral of rising student charges which generates increasing demands for help to individuals to meet those charges. This is treating the symptoms, not the disease. We need to treat the symptoms, but not in ways which nourish the disease, and above all we need to start curing the disease itself.

By that I mean that we need to take every possible action to help colleges and universities, public and private, keep down their charges to students. And in helping students meet the costs in the meantime, we need to do it in ways which will not encourage or force colleges to raise their charges. And all of our actions should be carefully considered in terms of sound public policy, of using public funds wisely and to the greatest effect, and maintaining our national policy of banning discrimination in the use of public funds because of race, color, creed, or national origin.

One of the currently popular proposals for treating the symptoms of rising college costs is the tax-credit plan for higher education expenses. It has been introduced in various forms, but for purposes of discussion I will refer to the provisions of Senate bill 12, a bipartisan measure which has several counterparts in the House. I am glad for the opportunity of these hearings because this proposal has never been the subject of full hearings before any committee of the Congress.

I have followed the evolution of the tax credit proposal for nearly 14 years. It was proposed as a means to get Federal money for colleges and universities by the device of raising tuition charges by the approximate amount of the credit. The only witness who has ever testified before a congressional committee having jurisdiction over the legislation, Dr. Roger Freeman, testified that he estimated 75 percent of the credits would be recaptured by colleges and universities in increased tuition. Dr. Freeman is a member of the steering committee of the group which has been carrying on a major campaign for the legislation.

The tax-credit proposal is unsound from the standpoint of public policy, fiscal policy, educational policy, tax policy, and our national policy of preventing discrimination in the use of public funds. Its first-year cost as estimated by the Treasury is $1 billion. Its sponsors say they intend to apply it to elementary and secondary education if successful in applying it to higher education. The initial cost of this extension has been estimated at $3 to $5 billion. If it becomes Federal policy every legislature in the land will be asked to apply it to state policy.

It is unsound public policy because the legislative arm of government should not entrust the expenditure of billions of dollars of public funds to the decision of private individuals with no assurance that the funds will be used in ways consistent with the public interest. These are public funds raised by public taxation and deducted from the amount owed the Treasury. If tax reduction is the objective let us reduce taxes. If aid to individuals in obtaining an education is the objective let us directly aid all individuals, as New York State has done. If aid to educational institutions is the purpose let us aid them directly and in above board fashion in accordance with public policy. If aid to the States in meeting their educational obligations is involved let us make funds available to the States with the specification that it be used for educational purposes.

UNSOUND FISCAL POLICY

It is unsound fiscal policy because the tax-credit plan would open a Pandora's box of Treasury raiding which it would have great difficulty in controlling. The history of every such action is that it is subsequently extended to a wide variety of groups in addition to those covered by the original purpose.

UNSOUND EDUCATIONAL POLICY

The tax-credit proposal is unsound educational policy for the following reasons:

1. It would encourage and bring pressure on colleges and universities to raise their tuition charges as a means of getting funds. The more charges are raised the greater the pressure for more tax credits.

2. It would invite Federal control of the tuition policies and—since it offers a credit for books and supplies—would require either an individual check on every student as to his actual purchase of books and supplies or a free gift whether he purchased books and supplies or not. I refer to tuition policies because some colleges now charge fees in excess of the cost of undergraduate instruction, and use the funds for graduate and professional instruction, research, or other purposes. If tax funds are available in proportion to tuition charges, the Federal Government has some responsibility to determine the basis of these charges. It has no such concern as long as private funds are involved.

3. By forcing tuition charges up, the tax credit plan would make more difficult the obtaining of a college education by students from low-income families since higher tuition charges must be paid by all students. The tax-credit plan has been called a scholarship in reverse by Dr. Richard Goode, of Brookings Institution, who recently published an extensive analysis of Federal tax policy. I am aware of proposals that direct cash grants be given those who can't take advantage of tax credits. This does not alter the fact that such students will be at the bottom end of the totem pole in the aids provided by the proposal.

4. The tax-credit plan constitutes a basic assault on the foundations of public support of education at all levels. This principle is that taxation should be for public purposes in accordance with ability to pay, and that public services should be available to all on the same basis.

UNSOUND TAX POLICY

The tax-credit plan is unsound tax policy. Its greatest dollar benefits would go to those who by any criteria are reasonably well off, with no benefits at all to those least well off. Proponents of the measure point to the fact that the benefits decline for incomes above $25,000. This is taxable income. However, an individual with $200,000 in nontaxable and $25,000 in taxable income would qualify as a $25,000 man, not a $225,000 man. An individual with $50,000 in income from capital gains would qualify for full benefits as a $25,000 man, and if his income was $100,000, he would still qualify for some benefits as a $50,000 man.

IT WOULD HELP FINANCE DISCRIMINATION IN EDUCATION

By making public funds available via the tax-credit route to institutions which wished to collect them through tuition charges, the tax-credit plan would bypass our Constitution and the Civil Rights Act with respect to use of public funds for discrimination. A segregated institution could collect up to $325 per student in public money and thumb its nose at the Civil Rights Act. If proponents of the measure wish to avoid this, I suggest they amend it to provide that no credit shall go to an individual because of fees paid an institution which discriminates.

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges has made a formal statement of position on the tax-credit plan which I here wish to place in the record, as follows:

"TAX CREDIT AND RELATED PROPOSALS

"Proposals for a direct deduction from income taxes owed the Federal Government because of tuition and required fees paid colleges and universities have attracted substantial popular support because of two widespread and contradictory assumptions: (a) that they will provide relief to hard-pressed parents, and (b) that they provide a way around the problems related to direct Federal aid to nonpublic institutions. We believe the tax-credit proposals to be unsound from the standpoint of fiscal policy, educational policy, and national policy in general. The Treasury Department has ably stated the objections from the standpoint of national fiscal policy. Proponents of this legislation have made it clear that its essential purpose is to give tax support to educational institutions proportional, to some extent at least, to the fees charged students. Since the fees would have to be raised to provide the additional income desired, the benefit would flow to the college, not the taxpayer. To the extent that fees were raised, students from low-income families would find their educational costs increased rather than decreased. Institutions with low tuition charges would be placed under pressure to increase them in order to collect Federal aid by this route. Institutions which wish to engage in discriminatory practices and still enjoy Federal support would be encouraged to do so.

"This association takes the position that, to the extent that Congress finds it in the national interest to provide either general or specific-purpose support from public funds for institutions of higher education, ways can and should be found for doing this which retain the principles of public accountability for the expenditure of public funds, which are fiscally and educationally sound, and which do not in their operation discriminate against large groups of students and institutions. The tax-credit approach does not meet these standards."

Let me now turn to affirmative, constructive, realistic ways in which Federal public funds can be used to halt the rising costs of higher education to the individual. I shall discuss first, actions which can be taken quickly on the basis of amendments to legislation already on the statute books, and longer range proposals.

I would give first priority to measures which directly keep down the cost of education to students by helping institutions keep these charges down:

1. Higher Education Facilities Act: The Higher Education Facilities Act provides Federal grants of up to one-third of the cost of academic facilities in degree-granting institutions. It was passed with strong Republican support. Colleges must raise two-thirds of the cost. This is particularly difficult for smaller and less well endowed private colleges. Many private and some public institutions either have imposed special fees or raised general tuition charges to help pay the two-thirds cost they must supply for academic facilities. Or they have taken the money out of general revenues otherwise available for operating support, which amounts to the same thing. If the Federal share were substantially increased it would help stop the rising-charge spiral. If it were doubled, to two-thirds rather than one-third of the cost of a building, the Federal cost of the increase would be about one-quarter of a billion dollars, or less than one-fourth of the first-year annual cost of the tax-credit plan.

2. Federal housing loans: The college housing loan program, initiated in 1950, has required students to pay all the cost of the money to the Federal Treasury, all administrative costs, the cost of building up a loss-reserve. It has done all this and will next year have returned a net profit to the Treasury over the life of the program of about $6 million. Meanwhile the interest rate, which started at 2.75, has been steadily rising and will go to 4 percent next July 1 unless something is done. I am glad to note that a group of minority members of the House Banking and Currency Committee, headed by Representative Widnall, Republican, of New Jersey, initiated legislation to fix the interest rate at a flat 3 percent. This will benefit thousands of students in residential colleges all over the country, by holding down the dormintory charges necessary to amortize loans. The majority of the House committee have adopted this proposal. It involves some subsidy of the program—about $3 million, not a billion. And the Federal Government is already loaning money at 2 percent on some worthy programs. Are young people less worthy?

3. Reducing matching on existing programs: A number of Federal programs, such as National Defense Education Act loans, work-study, etc., require institutional matching. One objective of matching is to give the institution a stake in the program and help assure sound use of funds. No one can quarrel with this. But many institutions have been engaged in making loans, providing student employment, etc., for a long time. The pinch comes with the Federal requirement that institutions increase (not maintain) their present efforts, to receive Federal funds. Every such increase takes money and colleges have no magic source of income. Thus to help more students many colleges must charge students more in fees so they can meet the rising cost of college charges. The colleges also customarily are made to bear the administrative costs of expanding programs. Some relief here would be helpful.

All the above are programs on the books, available to all types of institutions, involving no controversial issues.

4. Direct operating support of institutions: This is unquestionably the best and most effective way of keeping down higher education costs to students. Its proposal at the Federal level is always attended by fears of Federal control, and the issue of whether certain types of institutions can participate. Yet we have some examples. The land-grant institutions have received direct annual Federal operating support since 1890. The amount is small to be sure, a total of about $14.5 million, but it has been accompanied by no problems of Federal interference or control. Our 12 graduate schools of public health are substantially supported by Federal funds. Such a proposal is being considered in the area of medical education. I do not think we should be stymied by the difficulties, or by the fact that not all institutions may be able to participate in all Federal programs. The diversity and variety of higher education will not be preserved if all institutions are identical in their purposes or sources of support. Institutions must decide for themselves whether direct public support and conformity to public policy is appropriate to their character. But we have not exhausted the possibilities of solving the problems of extending aid directly on a reasonably broad basis. Canada, for example, gives Federal aid to the provinces on the basis of population, and the funds are then allocated to institutions by the Canadian Universities Foundation. Religious institutions may participate fully in direct aid in some Canadian provinces, not in others. In those where such aid is barred, we find there is an increasing development of nonsectarian universities with affiliated, church-related colleges. These affiliated colleges offer as many or as few courses of their own as they feel their purposes and resource call for, out of nonpublic funds. Their students then take their other course work in the university as a whole. We have some examples in this country. At the elementary-secondary level we are beginning to call it shared time.

5. Aid to students: We have on the books the National Defense Education Act loan program, the work-study program, and a wide variety of fellowship programs. The current higher education act involves an expansion of the work-study program, and an educational-grant or scholarship program which would use a combination of a cash grant, student borrowing, and work opportunity. The House committee-approved version of this bill would make it available not only to those from extremely low-income families, but also to any other student whose resources are such that he needs aid. All these programs help students meet college charges, without involving pressures to raise those charges. None of them encourage discrimination.

IN CONCLUSION

There are a good many affirmative steps which can appropriately be taken to slow down the steady rise in costs of higher education to students and parents. I have suggested several, involving both public and private action, which might be taken. I believe they offer better ways of approaching the problem than the proposal of tax credits for educational expenses. Since the latter involves an initial annual expenditure of a billion dollars in tax funds, I believe it should be subjected to the closest scrutiny, weighed in terms of both its long-range and immediate effects, and in terms of what could be accomplished by alternative uses, proper uses, of a billion dollars in public funds for education. I have, for one, worked very hard over the past 18 years toward unity in higher education in approaches to national action. Such a spirit prevails among the officers of the various national organizations located in Washington, where I work. I hope it can be strengthened. We have lots of work to do, together, to meet our most important national problem.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, toward the end of getting a well-rounded view on the tax credit device the House Republican task force on education sent out some 10,000 letters of inquiry on this subject to college presidents and others directly connected with colleges. A good quantity of replies to these letters were received in time for the May 24 hearing at New York City, and these reflected a ratio of about 7 to 2 in favor of a tax credit program for helping meet the costs of higher education—about 1 out of 10 of the replies was noncommittal.

Inasmuch as these letters represent the very interesting views of some very responsible people in the educational world, I would like to read some of them into the Congressional Record at this point and present them in the same ratio as described above, with 14 letters in favor of the tax credit idea and 4 letters in opposition to it.

Mr. Speaker, the letters in favor of the tax credit idea are as follows:

The Erie Brewing Co.,
Erie, Pa., May 20, 1965.

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Quie: I am pleased to present my views concerning the enactment of legislation authorizing tax credits as a means of helping to offset increasing costs of higher education. To begin with, I believe it is the responsibility of every family to meet its own financial requirements in the education of its youth. Historically it has been the American way. We do not want 100-percent Government-financed educational institutions, they would be nothing but carbon copies of totalitarian collegiate factories. Our children would be lost to us and become wards of the state. To avoid this, it is much wiser for us to continue as we are. To do so however, with the escalating costs of higher education is not easy. We have but two alternatives as I see it.

The first is to saddle ourselves or our children with a considerable debt to pay in the years following graduation. This, to my way of thinking is much too oppressive and in time would act as a braking force to our economy.

Secondly, the granting of tax relief would be the most sensible way to aid education. It would leave educational institutions free of governmental restraint, and leave the individual unencumbered and more able to pay the costs yearly as they occur. Also it would encourage parents to send their children to colleges by actually helping them financially where they need it in tax relief.

Hoping you are successful in pushing this very important legislation, I am,

Very truly yours,
Frederick A. Blass,
Chairman, Lay Advisory Board,
Gannon College.

The National State Bank,
Elizabeth, N.J., May 20, 1965.

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, Republican Planning and Research Committee, Task Force on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative: I appreciate your soliciting my views on the enactment of legislation authorizing tax credits as a means of helping to offset the increasing costs of higher education.

In my opinion, this is one of the soundest investments that can be made in the future of the United States.

Many of the Government supported projects for aiding higher education are encumbered by administrative costs to the point that only a portion of the benefit actually accrues to the intended recipient. Under the proposed legislation, there is a direct incentive and a direct benefit which will be 100 percent utilized.

Obviously, this will reduce Federal tax revenues, however, the administration is embarked on a deliberate program of reducing revenues by the reduction of income taxes and the cancellation of Federal excise taxes with a view of spurring the economy. All of these reductions will have the desired effect. I am reminded of the retail man who sat at my desk yesterday and gloated over the fact that a certain manufacturer's excise tax was being eliminated which would increase his margin of profit, as he had no intention of passing it along to the consumer.

In summary, I quite agree with the proposed legislation.

Very truly yours,

J. K. Boyles,
Vice President.

Wesley College,
Dover, Del., May 20, 1965.

Mr. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: This letter is in reply to your letter of May 17 concerning the enactment of legislation authorizing tax credits as a means of helping to offset the increasing costs of higher education.

I am very much in favor of this approach to lowering the costs, and I think it would go a long way in helping many of the parents who send young people to college today.

Sincerely yours,

Robert H. Parker,
President.

Mary Baldwin College,
Staunton, Va., May 20, 1965.

The Honorable Albert H. Quie,
Republican Planning and Research Committee, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: In reply to your letter, I am in favor of the tax credit approach as a means of helping parents offset the increasing costs of higher education.

Cordially yours,

Samuel R. Spencer, Jr.

Middleport, N.Y.,
May 20, 1965.

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am in favor of enacting the legislation for authorizing tax credit for the cost of higher education.

Since I am about to enter college in the fall, I know what the cost is going to be for the 4 years.

It would be an enormous help to the one paying for the education to be able to deduct some of the cost from his income tax.

I hope you will be able to get this legislation enacted.

Very truly yours,

Beverly Hill.

Law Offices,
Gillespie & Gillespie,
Tazewell, Va., May 20, 1965.

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: This is in reply to your letter of recent date requesting my views as to a solution to the problem of the rising costs of higher education.

I favor legislation authorizing a credit against Federal income taxes as a means of helping to offset the ever increasing costs of higher education. My principal reasons for favoring this means of meeting the problem are these:

1. It would often enable and at all times encourage a parent who wants to educate his own children to do so, and at the same time retain his self-respect.

2. The credit against income tax would not require a lot of applications and other redtape which would be involved in a program of Government grants and aid in scholarships or loans.

3. It would not involve the administrative costs of a Government-financed student aid program.

4. It would give temporary relief to taxpayers at a time when most needed on an equitable basis.

I sincerely hope that you will see fit to support this means of helping meet the problem.

Sincerely yours,

Carl C. Gillespie.

Gasport, N.Y.,
May 19, 1965.

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am in favor of enacting the legislation authorizing tax credits as a means of helping to offset the increasing costs of higher education.

The people who would benefit the most from this legislation are those in the middle and lower income brackets who often find it difficult to finance a higher education for their children. If this expense could be claimed as a tax credit, a greater number of people would feel they could afford to send their children to a school of higher learning. It could be an incentive to those who are undecided as to whether they could afford a higher education.

Very truly yours,

Yvonne Crandall.

The Grosse Pointe
Memorial Church,
Grosse Pointe Farms Mich.,
May 20, 1965.

Mr. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: I write to express my strong support of any legislation that will authorize tax credits for children in higher education, so that part of their tuition can be deducted.

Knowing the increasing costs of a college education, and the need for trained people for the future of our Government and economy, I urge your support of this bill.

Sincerely yours,

Bertram deH. Atwood,
Minister.

Columbia, S.C.,
May 20, 1965.

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Representative: Thank you for your information concerning the work of your task force on education regarding the "tax credit for education" plan.

As a member of the board of trustees of one of our institutions of higher learning I understand the need for constantly rising costs in education. This is necessary, but it may lead us to the time when only the rich can afford an education. When and if this happens we will be missing much of the potential leadership which could be developed from lower income groups.

My own salary may not be in the middle income bracket, but with two daughters to have in college the same years will be most difficult under the present circumstances.

As a trustee we have been given the opportunity to express our feeling on this measure and I have taken this opportunity to encourage its passage.

Thank you for the leadership your group may be able to provide.

Sincerely,

David W. Reese, Jr.,
Executive Secretary, Evangelism, Missions, and Church Extension Boards of the South Carolina Conference, the Methodist Church.

Rochester Institute of Technology,
Rochester, N.Y., May 18, 1965.

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Quie: I have your letter of May 14, and wish you to know I am a strong believer that some form of tax relief or tax credit should be given to individuals who are supporting children in higher educational institutions.

As I am sure you are well aware, higher education has a close relationship to economic growth, and, therefore, can be looked upon as an investment in the social structure. Frederick Harbison and Charles A. Myers have written a book, published by McGraw-Hill, entitled "Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth." This gives a powerful argument for continuing to plow tremendous amounts of money into higher education.

I think you and your committee are certainly on the right track.

Sincerely yours,

Mark Ellingson, *President.*

Kansas-Nebraska Natural
Gas Co., Inc.,
Hastings, Nebr., May 19, 1965.

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The question posed in your letter of inquiry dated May 17 touches on one of the basic problems of our time. To give a very comprehensive answer would require a volume and I am sure you don't want to put up with that even if I had the time and the competence to present it.

Basically I favor tax credits to taxpayers as a means of providing incentive and Government assistance for our children to receive higher education. I am a believer in the great desirability of liberal arts independent college education. Also I believe that parents should have the choice of supporting by their patronage whatever higher educational institution they may choose. Support of higher education by direct Federal subsidy would ultimately tend to impose control of the whole educational process from Washington. In these days of ever-rising expenses the independent college is at a vast disadvantage as compared to a tax-supported one, and yet to sacrifice the independence for Government subsidy is abhorrent.

The above summarizes my view on the question you are reviewing. I have the deepest convictions about them and refrain from expounding at greater length only out of consideration for your valuable time. It would be tragic to have Federal aid to education cause the loss of independence to the liberal arts colleges which have been one of the foundations of our country's rise to greatness.

Very truly yours,

Thomas Creigh, Jr.,
President.

Mississippi College,
Clinton, Miss., May 19, 1965.

Congressman Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Quie: I am delighted to know that your committee is considering tax credits for higher education. I am enthusiastically in favor of this program. I am supporting it for the following reasons:

1. Tax credits will provide aid where it is needed most. Every parent will receive assistance and encouragement in educating his children. The assistance will be greater for those parents who need financial help most.

2. Tax credits will enable students to attend the colleges of their choice. This will be a great asset to the individual student and will be a great benefit to higher education. It is particularly important to private higher education, for the higher tuition rates necessary for a private institution will be compensated for somewhat by the tax credit provisions.

3. There are some private institutions, particularly those that are operated by certain religious denominations, that will receive help under this program that would not receive assistance under any other program. The long-established principle of separation of church and state will be clearly maintained by a program of tax credits, whereas with the forms of aid now available the principle is blurred.

4. A program of tax credit is easily administered and will result in the maximum utilization of funds available. Perhaps the greatest advantage of this program is its simplicity and, at the same time, effectiveness.

Sincerely,

R. A. McLemore,
President.

Butler University,
Indianapolis, Ind., May 19, 1965.

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: Thank you for your letter of May 17, which asks whether or not I favor tax credits for higher education.

I do, indeed, favor the idea of tax credits as a means of helping higher education. In fact, I strongly favor two different kinds of tax credits: (1) tax credits to parents of college students as a means of helping to offset the increasing costs of higher education; (2) tax credits, rather than deductions, to persons making gifts to institutions of higher learning as a means of stimulating such contributions to our Nation's colleges and universities.

I am glad that there seems currently to be bipartisan support for the tax credit plan; I consider it a very effective method for rendering assistance to higher education.

Sincerely yours,

Alexander E. Jones,
President.

North Central College,
Naperville, Ill., May 20, 1965.

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: A careful review and analysis of the pros and cons of proposed tax credit legislation compels me to endorse the tuition tax credit concept without reservation.

For the reasons stated below, I believe the best interests of the United States would be served if tuition tax credit legislation were enacted:

1. Diversity in education is essential for freedom of mind and academic freedom. The freedom of choice in education of their children is preserved for parents by keeping private college tuition within reach.

2. A State monopoly in education, a probable result if tax credit is not approved, is undemocratic, uneconomical, and educationally unsound.

3. The tuition tax credit grant plan avoids problems of Government control, church-state relations, and is preferable to long-term student loans.

4. Our national survival and our national economy depends in large measure on how well we succeed in educating every child and student to his highest capacity. The tuition tax credit plan gives help where need is greatest—payment of tuition costs by parents, particularly parents of moderate income and limited savings. Every student is aided by this plan.

5. The tuition tax credit plan is in the best interests of individual taxpayers. Instead of unlimited expansion of already existing gigantic educational complexes, existing facilities of the 1,380 private colleges could be fully utilized. The tax savings in the operating costs of public institutions would alone more than offset the total cost of a tax credit program.

6. The tuition tax credit plan favors neither the big State nor the small State, the big university nor the small college, the rich man nor the poor man. It treats parents and students everywhere equally.

7. The tuition tax credit plan is simple to implement. It is workable, fair, politically feasible and free of bureaucratic controls.

8. The tuition tax credit plan will provide a great stimulus for giving to all institutions. It will broaden the base of philanthropy. Involvement of the public in fundraising will be appreciably strengthened.

The tuition tax credit concept is not devoid of pitfalls. It is a solution to a growing national problem. Its benefits will serve the national interest by helping to provide better education to more of our young men and women despite rapidly rising costs. It will strengthen diversity in education, an essential ingredient in our educational excellence.

Sincerely,

A. L. Schilling,
President.

Mr. Speaker, the four letters against the tax cut credit idea are as follows:

University of Missouri,
Columbia, May 20, 1965.

Mr. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: I have your letter of May 17 and I might say that I have sat in on a great many discussions of this problem of tax credit over the last 4 or 5 years, both with the American Council on Education and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. I think I have read everything that has been written on this, including what has appeared in the Congressional Record, and my opinion is very definitely that it would be a great harm to the prospects of education for young people from our lower income families.

I know this proposal is superficially very appealing and many of my friends in Congress who would normally be very sensitive to this aspect of the problem committed themselves to the plan before they had seen the whole picture, and it is difficult for any of us to change our minds.

I am enclosing a speech by Mr. Russell Thackrey, who is executive secretary of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, which expresses my point of view better than anything I have written or stated publicly. Judging by what I know of Missouri, we have a tremendous problem of making an education available to young people from low income groups and even some middle income groups, especially where there is more than one child. Anything that would increase costs to these young people such as the increase of tuition and fees that would result from tax credit would make it more difficult than ever to help this group.

In contrast, several things we are doing in Congress with a small fraction of cost of this could do a tremendous lot more to help out lower and middle income families with young people to educate. For instance, before one of your committees is a change in the Housing Loan Act to set a maximum on interest charge at 3 percent. This will help students all over the country in all kinds of institutions by keeping down the costs the institutions have to charge students for their housing. In our own history, on our own campuses, under our present law, we have to raise room rates every time we build a new dormitory. With a 3-percent maximum, I think we could stop that increase. The cost to the U.S. Government would be trifling compared to the cost of tax credit.

The Educational Facilities Act that you helped pass last year is another case in point. It helped all institutions and students in all categories, yet we are not able now in Missouri to take care of anything like the demand for higher education because we lack facilities, and we are using the maximum of the general revenue of the State that we can get. I see no reason why we cannot liberalize Federal aid for buildings so as to match the college contribution instead of limiting it to one-third as at present. Also there is no good reason to limiting it to science, libraries and foreign languages. This could be done by the Congress along with the other matter and the cost to the Treasury would be infinitely smaller than the tax credit plan and the benefits would be infinitely greater.

The basic reason, of course, why the tax credit plan is wrong is that it puts additional obstacles in the way of the working student who has no family help, and they are numerous, and it will prevent them and other students from low-income families ($5,000 and under) to attend college at all.

The enactment of the tax credit plan, in my judgment, would be a great tragedy.

Sincerely,

Elmer Ellis.

International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America-UAW,
May 20, 1965.

Mr. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: Thank you for your kind invitation dated May 17, 1965, to attend the hearing of the House Republican Task Force on Education scheduled for May 24 in court room 36, Foley Square, Manhattan, N.Y., to express my views about proposals for tax credits for higher education. I deeply regret that my schedule will not permit me to attend your hearing, but I do want to comply with your request to express, for the record, my position on the question of tax credits for higher education.

I am most familiar with the Senate bill 12 whose sponsor, as you know, is our good Senator Ribicoff, from Connecticut. On January 18, I wrote Senator Ribicoff expressing my opposition to the tax credit plan as outlined in Senate bill 12 and have also released for the press my opposition to this bill.

I am opposed to tax credits for higher education for the following reasons: (1) it is my considered judgment that these proposals discriminate against the poor who are in greatest need of financial assistance; (2) these proposals favor people who least need assistance, namely the upper, middle and higher income groups; (3) I agree with the statement by Senator Morse that "taxes should be levied on ability to pay, placed in the common treasury and withdrawn on the basis of public need as Congress determines * * * Support for education is one such need, but * * * I do not think it ought to be adopted on a discriminatory basis"; (4) Senate bill 12 provides for tax credits for education expenses which include, in addition to fees and tuitions, the cost of books, supplies and equipment. Administratively, this would be very difficult for the Treasury Department to police. Giving credits for books and equipment would provide the same invitation for students to turn in their books and supplies in return for engagement rings, wristwatches and other essential articles and use their roommates books or books from institutional libraries as was done under the World War II GI bills. In other words, it could lead to subterfuge for getting a Government handout; (5) tax credits for higher education would be a means of getting tax money into institutions without their being subject to the provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 regarding racial discrimination. This is opening up another form of subterfuge of getting tax money illegally; (6) a number of advocates of the tax credit scheme have publicly stated that a substantial portion of the tax credit moneys would be recaptured by institutions by tuition increases. If this were so, and I think it would be, it would be of little or no help to the taxpayer, but would be an indirect route for helping institutions of higher learning with Federal funds, but without Federal control; (7) the Senate bill 12 would provide for greater benefits to persons choosing to send their children to expensive schools than to persons sending their children to inexpensive schools. This is another form of discrimination against those in the lower income bracket.

In 1962, 72 percent of the 5.8 million families with adjusted gross income of less than $3,000 paid no Federal income taxes. Some 5.5 million of the 12.8 million families with adjusted gross incomes of less than $5,000, or 42 percent, paid no income taxes. The tax credit proposal would be of no assistance to these people. It might, in fact, be harmful in that the loss of moneys to the Federal Treasury might cut down the amount of scholarships and other aids which the Federal Government is presently providing for the lower income family;

(8) The first year cost of Senate bill 12 to the Treasury is estimated at $1 billion. This is 4 times the administration's "higher education package" as proposed for the current year and also 4 times the annual Federal contribution to the academic facilities program on an annual basis. The cost of Senate bill 12 would rise to $1.3 billion by the third year of its operation. The amount of money required by Senate bill 12 could be much better applied through other means outlined below.

In summary, I believe that tax credits for higher education expenses would be of little or no help to the lower income families who most need assistance. Such legislation would discriminate in favor of the families with better than average incomes which, in my view, is antisocial legislation.

You quite properly ask for alternative proposals if I do not favor the tax credit plan. I am convinced that public-operated community colleges must be established, where as in Connecticut they do not exist, and expanded in States where such institutions have already been established. I would suggest that much more Federal funds be made available for community and junior colleges.

There is, I understand, presently before Congress, a new series of higher education proposals, for aiding students to meet college costs. I urge your support of these worthy proposals. I refer to the:

(a) Opportunity grants of up to $800 to help needy and worthy students of college ability get through college;

(b) Expansion of the work-study program;

(c) Expansion of the Federal loan program.

I would also urge passage of the cold war GI bill of rights.

The college academic facilities grant program should be continued, but revised to provide for raising the Federal share from 33 percent for degree granting institutions to 75 percent. This would enable the private institutions to expand to accommodate a larger percentage of the burden.

I strongly urge that Federal legislation be passed which would put part of the burden of subsidizing the college housing program on the Federal Government instead of letting it subsidize the Federal Treasury as at present. Housing in public-supported institution is a greater financial burden than tuition and books. I understand that a reduction of 2 percent in the college housing loan rate would cut the carrying charge by $120 a year or $13 a month based on 9 months occupancy. This is one way of reducing room charge for thousands of students at modest cost to the Government. I favor such governmental assistance.

Pressure on tuition raises could, and I believe would, be eased by a reduction of matching provisions on ongoing programs. I urge such reductions.

Administrative machinery is already available for these alternatives. I have proposed none which would discriminate against any group in our society. All would reduce, or slow down rising college costs.

I urge that your task force think long and hard before supporting the tax credits program.

I have endeavored to suggest alternatives. I appeal for your support for these and similar kinds of legislations.

Thank you kindly for inviting me to express my views.

Sincerely yours,
MERLIN D. BISHOP,
Subregional Director.

ST. JOHN COLLEGE OF CLEVELAND,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 20, 1965.

Mr. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: I appreciate your letter of May 17, with its announcement of your inquiry into the question of tax credits as a means of helping offset the increasing costs of higher education. It is an incontrovertible fact that the numbers of college students will be greatly increasing in the coming decades. It is equally beyond question that the costs of higher education will be rapidly increasing. A third equally obvious fact is that the best interest of our Nation requires that every qualified student have the opportunity to develop his talents to their greatest potential. Any failure in this regard will deprive our Nation of a significant contribution to its economical, social, and cultural growth.

In order to meet the growing challenge in higher education, every possible resource must be used to its fullest potential. There is no other way that the task can be satisfactorily completed. The cost is great but the price of any significant failure in this regard is far greater.

It is my conviction that the tax credit plan does not begin to level up to the massive proportions of the job ahead. The critical urgency of the job of higher education requires action in a much wider dimension.

Sincerely yours,
Rt. Rev. Msgr. LAWRENCE P. CAHILL,
President.

KENDALL,
Boston, Mass., May 20, 1965.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: First, I want to congratulate you and your task force on the manner and thoroughness of your study of the ways and means of meeting the rising costs of higher education. This is already a very serious problem and one for which I see no relief in sight based on my service and experience as a trustee and treasurer of Wheaton College in Norton, Mass., and as a trustee of Brown University. Projecting the trends of recent years, I anticipate that these costs of advanced education will continue to escalate at an annual rate of 4 to 5 percent, with the result that by 1970 the total cost per student for tuition, room and board at our leading private institutions will be approaching $4,000 per two-semester terms. Clearly if we are to maintain our national preeminence in education that is essential for our survival, we need more bold and imaginative approaches to the financing of these costs than have so far been developed.

Having stated this broad endorsement of your studies, however, I cannot support the proposal to provide tax credits as a means of helping to offset these increasing costs. My criticism is the same as that of the U.S. Treasury; namely, that such a proposal would be a significant step in reducing the base of taxable income, whereas the objective should be to maintain or increase the base while reducing the ratio of taxation on personal income. The proposal is also an indiscriminate method of financial assistance even when the amount of tax relief is graduated according to various income levels. Finally, it is one more step that makes taxation an instrument of national policy rather than fulfilling its main purpose of raising revenue.

As you know, our colleges and universities are well equipped to evaluate the needs for assistance to students and their parents in financing the costs of higher education. What they lack are the resources to fill those needs. Even though great efforts are being made to raise funds by private contributions and the like to increase these resources, these efforts are almost certain to be inadequate without Federal Government support. The need is for greatly increased grants for loans, scholarship, student self-help, and the like. Thus the step taken by the House Education and Labor Committee earlier this week to double the funding of the aid to education program by providing a variety of help to institutions and students is a good step in this direction.

In this type of program of providing resources to meet the needs, I wish it were possible to provide extra incentive to those who would help themselves, perhaps along the lines of the matching grant programs of the large foundations and the growing number of corporate gift matching plans. These are sound, they stimulate incentive, and they are increasingly effective, but it is doubtful if private funds can do the job that needs to be done. Thus if the Federal Government could offer to match efforts of a college to increase scholarship and other financial aid in the same manner that it now can offer a grant toward a new science building, the college would have tremendous incentive to raise such funds from private sources and its effectiveness in doing this would be greatly enhanced.

With all best wishes for your success in developing a sound and far-reaching program.

Sincerely,
M. L. CLEMENCE.

SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION SYSTEM WITH QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE CONTROLS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I introduced a bill H.R. 8662 to establish a new selective immigration system, with qualitative and quantitative controls consistent with our domestic needs and our international commitments.

As is known, the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality has conducted extensive and searching inquiries on pending immigration legislation during the past 12 months. Testimony was taken from the Secretary of State, two Attorney Generals, the Secretary of Labor, and the U.S. Public Health Service expressing the position of the administration on the basic issues involved. Members of Congress have appeared personally or submitted statements expressing their views on the issues.

We have heard witnesses speaking in behalf of the major religious faiths, the AFL–CIO, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans Committee, the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, the Steuben Society, Ahepa, the Polish-American Congress, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, American Committee for Italian Migration, Estonian Aid Society, American Committee for Croatian Migration, the National Committee for Refugees, the Civil Liberties Union, the Order of the Sons of Italy, the Greenwich Women's Republican Club, the National Economic Council, the Liberty League, the Republican Club of 100, Inc., and many others, as may be seen from the list of such witnesses which I will include in my remarks.

It is fair to say that our subcommittee has heard every color and shade of opinion—both pro and con—on every major issue involved in this legislation.

It has been my privilege to Chair these hearings and to have the benefit of the probative questioning by the members of the subcommittee. I can state without qualification that these hearings have been completely objective and nonpartisan so far as the members of the subcommittee are concerned. We sought nothing more than the facts but all the facts with respect to every issue involved.

These hearings have established one central fact beyond any doubt; that our present method of immigrant admissions, involving several systems, is inadequate, misleading, and in need of immediate revision. We have reached a point in our national development where a selective system of immigrant admissions with qualitative and quantitative controls fixed by law cannot be avoided. The bill which I introduced today calls for such a selective immigration system.

The national origins quota system has been made the major issue in the hearings before our subcommittee. The claim has been made that the national origins quota system regulates immigration into the United States. That claim cannot be supported with facts. The official record shows that over the past 10 years quota immigration accounts for no more than one-third of our annual immigrant admissions. The remaining two-thirds are admitted as nonquota immigrants.

When the national origins quota system was enacted into law more than 40 years ago, provision was also made for nonquota status for natives of the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere. This provided two systems of immigrant admissions, one the quota system and the other the nonquota system.

The quota system fixed a ceiling on the number of immigrants we would admit each year from any country outside the Western Hemisphere, based upon a percentage of the number of people in the United States whose origin was traceable to such foreign country according to the 1920 national census. The nonquota system had no numerical limitations or restrictions of any type.

What results have these systems produced? By 1949, 25 years after these two systems were enacted into law, we find that nonquota immigration had equalled quota immigration. In the course of 15 years, between 1949 and 1964, nonquota immigration has doubled quota immigration.

What the ratio will be in 5 or 10 years hence is a matter of speculation, but I am certain that nonquota immigration will continue to increase over quota immigration unless Congress takes corrective action. This trend is inevitable because of the introduction of the nonquota concepts to the quota countries external to the Western Hemisphere. Special public legislation granting nonquota status to classes of aliens in the quota countries has made a myth of the national origins quota system.

Since enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act in 1952, there have been no less than 10 amendments to the law authorizing immigrant admissions outside the quota system. As a consequence the mathematical quota set for many countries has little relation to the number of immigrants we actually admit from those countries. Here are a few comparisons between the annual quota set by law and the annual average number of immigrants admitted over the past 10 years:

Greece: Quota is 308 per year; actually admitted, 2,666 per year.

Italy: Quota is 5,666 per year; actually admitted, 15,685 per year.

Spain: Quota is 250 per year; actually admitted, 1,264 per year.

Portugal: Quota is 438 per year; actually admitted, 2,736 per year.

Japan: Quota is 185 per year; actually admitted, 4,887 per year.

Philippines: Quota is 100 per year; actually admitted, 2,281 per year.

Korea: Quota is 100 per year; actually admitted 1,250 per year.

Indonesia: Quota is 100 per year; actually admitted 1,657 per year.

It is evident, therefore, that the national origins quota system no longer controls the number of immigrants we admit each year from countries external to the Western Hemisphere.

Another popular misunderstanding is that the annual quota ceiling set by law determines the total number of immigrants authorized for admission each year. The quota limit is 158,361 per year. Over the past 10 years we have admitted approximately 300,000 immigrants each year. Ironically, quota immigrants have averaged no more than 95,000 a year during that period.

In more recent years we have added a third system of immigrant admissions which applies only to refugees and is called the parole system. That system has two major phases, the so-called fair share refugee program and the Hong Kong refugee program.

It has been proposed that this third system of refugee admissions be expanded. Where this would lead is a matter of speculation as well as concern because testimony on this proposal has been both confusing and inconclusive. For these reasons I am advocating immediate and outright repeal of the national origins quota system together with repeal of nonquota status for natives of countries external to the Western Hemisphere and repeal of the system of paroling refugees into the United States.

To replace those systems I propose a fixed ceiling of 225,000 immigrant admissions per year from all former quota countries and for all purposes. A maximum ceiling of 20,000 a year for any one country is proposed, exempting from that country ceiling only the husbands, wives, children, fathers, and mothers of U.S. citizens.

Natives of the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere would continue in their present status, that is, no numerical limitations or restrictions are proposed on the number of immigrants we will admit from those countries.

I have advocated simultaneous repeal of both the national origins quota system and all nonquota provisions of law. I have done so because accident of country of birth is the common denominator of judgment for both the quota system and nonquota system as it applies to natives of the Western Hemisphere. It remains my belief that if we are to remove accident of country of birth as a penalty for some, we should remove it where it serves as a privilege for others.

This is necessary, in my judgment, if we are to forge a new immigration system which extends equal treatment to all the nations of the world. However, I am advised by appropriate Government spokesmen that repeal of the special nonquota status for natives of the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere is unacceptable at this time.

The selective immigration program I propose, within the total ceiling and the single country ceiling, would be governed by seven preference classes of immigrants. First preference is given, without any limit on the numbers, to spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens. The immediate members of families of U.S. citizens would not have to wait 1 day to be admitted to the United States under this provision. The numbers which will remain after the first preference is satisfied will be available to the following six classes, in the percentages indicated:

Second preference, 10 percent to members of the professions and scientists and persons with skill and talent in the visual and performing arts.

Third preference, 20 percent to spouses, children, and parents of aliens who have previously been admitted for permanent residence but who have not yet become citizens.

Fourth preference, 20 percent to married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens.

Fifth preference, 20 percent to brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens.

Sixth preference, 20 percent to persons with skills which are found by the

Secretary of Labor to be unavailable or in short supply in this country.

Seventh preference, 10 percent to refugees from Communist tyranny and oppression with a proviso that up to one-half of this number may be used by persons who have been offered a temporary refuge in this country upon a finding that they are unable or unwilling to return to their homelands because of persecution or fear thereof, and only after 2 years residence in this country.

As an additional precaution to guarantee the inviolability of family unity and to prevent harmful interpretations of law by overzealous bureaucrats, I propose that any immigrant authorized to come to the United States has an absolute right to bring his wife and children, otherwise qualified, with him.

Only after the above preferences have been satisfied will visa numbers which remain be made available on a first-come, first-served order of registration to nonpreference applicants on a worldwide basis.

Within this nonpreference class there is created a reserve, under the direct control of the President, by which he may reallocate up to one-half the available numbers to nationals of countries who may be adversely affected by the immediate termination of the national origins quota system.

For example, in Germany and the United Kingdom where the largest quota allocations are available, there has been no occasion or opportunity for desiring immigrants to register on a consular waiting list as was necessary for thousands of nationals of countries with heavily oversubscribed quotas.

Consequently, in a worldwide competition for nonpreference numbers, such nationals may be unfairly disadvantaged particularly in the years immediately following the passage of the bill.

The President's reserve would also be available to increase the number of refugees who could be admitted should a sudden, abnormal refugee situation occur, such as arose in Austria after the 1956 unsuccessful revolt of the Hungarian freedom fighters, or to take care of disaster situations such as occurred in the Azores in 1957 which necessitated special legislation to authorize admission of a number of its victims.

Other proposed revisions of the law are:

Added protection for American workers by strengthening authority of the Secretary of Labor to make determinations on the specific skills, crafts, and special occupational talents in short supply, and for which there are no able or willing workers in the United States. These added safeguards would apply to all sixth preference and all nonpreference immigrants.

Epilepsy would be removed from the mandatorily excludable classes of immigrants. Medical science has demonstrated that epilepsy is not contagious and that it is controllable by medication and medical treatment.

An "eligible orphan" is redefined by consolidating three sections of the present law which have caused confusion in determining eligibility.

The requirement that aliens from the countries behind the Iron Curtain demonstrate fear of "physical" persecution in order to stay deportation is removed.

Removal of the term "physical" recognizes that the more subtle, mental, moral, and emotional sanctions imposed upon the captive citizens by totalitarian regimes are no less a basis for our refusal to return these people to their native lands and to such oppressions.

Alien crewmen are accorded the same treatment as all other aliens under suspension of deportation proceedings, and under certain conditions adjustment of status procedure.

Any alien who entered the United States prior to December 24, 1952, who has resided here since and is of good character may be granted the status of a permanent resident. This has the effect of a limited statute of limitation against deportation.

To summarize, these would be the major outcomes of the selective immigration program I have proposed:

First. All present first, second, third, and fourth preference waiting lists would be wiped out during the first year of operations. The only exception is the fourth preference waiting list in Italy which is now in excess of 100,000 and that will take more time to satisfy.

Second. Immediate family members of U.S. citizens will not have to wait 1 day after the effective date of the bill to enter the United States.

Third. Future immigration to the United States will no longer tolerate split families because of peculiarities of the law.

Fourth. Refugees will not carry the stigma of parole as a condition of their entry and there would be only one refugee program under control of U.S. officials from start to finish.

Fifth. Professional persons and persons with skills and talents for which there is a demonstrated need in the United States will be able without delay to enter as immigrants.

Sixth. The authority given directly to the President to meet emergencies, within the available number of nonpreference immigrant visas, will make unnecessary emergency or special immigration legislation in the future.

Seventh. The number of private immigration bills before Congress should shrink to manageable proportions and should consist of only very unusual cases.

Eighth. Congress will have taken a very large step in the direction of regaining and maintaining its authority for regulating immigration into the United States.

The list of witnesses is as follows:

LIST OF WITNESSES

American Legion: Dr. Daniel J. O'Connor and Mr. Clarence Olsen.

National Association of Evangelicals: Mr. Robert A. Cook.

Order of AHEPA: Mr. Gregory Lagakos.

American Committee on Italian Migration: Hon. Juvenal Marchisio.

Doorstep Savannah, Inc.: Mrs. Rosalind Frame.

National Economic Council, Inc.: Mr. Mark M. Jones.

Nationalities Service Center of Cleveland: Mr. John Papandreas.

AFL–CIO: Mr. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn.

American Council for Nationalities Service: Miss Edith Lowenstein.

Industrial Union Division (AFL–CIO): Mr. James Carey.

Daughters of the American Revolution: Mrs. Robert V. H. Duncan.

National Jewish organizations listed in statement: Mr. Murray I. Gurfein and Mr. James P. Rice.

Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States: Mr. Francis W. Stover.

Lutheran Immigration Service: Mr. Donald E. Anderson.

Danube-Swabian Association of America, Inc.: Mr. Anton K. Rumpf.

Council for Individual Freedom: Mr. Charles A. McCarthy.

New Jersey Coalition: Mrs. Ralph D. Hacker.

Church World Service, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.: Mr. John Schauer.

Friends Committee on National Legislation: Mr. Richard Smith.

Bible Baptist Church: Rev. Cecil A. Hodges.

American Coalition of Patriotic Societies: Mr. John B. Trevor, Jr.

American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service: Bishop Edward Swanstrom.

American Committee for Croatian Migration, Inc.: Mr. Joseph V. Bosilievic, president.

Greenwich Women's Republican Club: Mrs. Alice Alesandroni, Mrs. Eleanor Gonzalez.

Order Sons of Italy in America: Mr. John Ottaviano, Jr., Mr. Joseph A. L. Errigo, Mr. Samuel A. Culotta, and Dr. Nicholas M. Petruzzelli.

National Chinese Welfare Council: Mr. Jack Wong Sing.

Liberty Lobby: Mr. W. B. Hicks, Jr.

Northern New Jersey Immigration Conference: Mrs. Arthur Hawkins.

Association of Immigration & Nationality Lawyers: Mr. Edward Dubroff.

The American Public Health Association, Inc.: Dr. Paul Harper.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom: Mrs. Selma Samole.

Japanese American Citizens League: Mr. Mike Masaoka.

Organization for Preservation of Samoan Democracy: Mr. Galumalemana Vaiinupo Alailima.

John E. McCarthy, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Dr. James Read, President, Wilmington College, Friends Committee on National Legislation.

Mr. Karl Speiss, Sr., Homeowners Federation of Arlington.

Dr. Filindo B. Masino, American Institute for Italian Culture and Philadelphia Bar Association.

Frank Weill, American Veterans Committee.

Jeanne E. Kerbs, Republican Committee of One Hundred, Inc.

Andrew Biemiller, AFL–CIO legislative director, legislation department.

Walter T. Darmopray, Esq., Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc. ·

Nicholas S. Limperis, national chairman, AHEPA immigration legislation committee, Order of AHEPA.

James H. Sheldon, United Church of Christ, Council for Christian Social Action.

George A. Maxwell, M.D.

Miss Lorna Logan, Greater Chinatown Civil Association of San Francisco.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I would be very happy to yield to my distinguished and able colleague from the great State of Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, the people of Hawaii are very much interested in this area of immigration and I have from time to time voiced that interest on behalf of the people of Hawaii to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration. I have been very much interested in the explanation of the bill which the gentleman has introduced, but there is one question which I would like to put to the gentleman in the well: What is the major difference between the gentleman's bill and the Celler bill?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Well, first, my bill calls for immediate repeal of the national origins quota system. The Celler bill stretches repeal out over a 5-year period.

Second, my bill calls for an annual ceiling of 225,000 immigrant admissions from countries external to the Western Hemisphere. The Celler bill has no ceiling set by law.

Third, my bill calls for a ceiling of 20,000 a year from any one country, exempting spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens from that country's ceiling.

The Celler bill would set an annual ceiling of 16,600 on any one country at the end of 5 years.

Also, my bill changes the order of and enlarges the number of preference classes. Immediate family members of U.S. citizens are given first preference without numerical limitation.

A new preference class is created for professional persons and persons with unusual skills and talents in the visual and performing arts. A new preference class is created for victims of Communist persecution, which repeals the practice of paroling refugees into the United States.

The present fourth preference is divided into two new preference classes.

The Celler bill perpetuates the present four preferences in the law, keeping skilled workers as first preference and allotting to that preference a 50-percent first call on all authorized visas. Under my bill direct authority is given to the President to use up to 50 percent of the visa numbers not used by the preference classes to remedy any hardships which may fall upon countries as a consequence of immediate repeal of the national origins quota system, and in order to meet refugee emergencies or natural calamities, should they occur, and the President determines action should be taken to assist some of the victims.

The Celler bill calls for a 7-member immigration board to advise the President on the use of a 30-percent reserve of the total immigrant visas authorized to remedy hardships as a consequence of the gradual repeal of the national origins quota system over a 5-year period. Also, it provides for the use of a 10-percent reserve to meet refugee emergencies and natural calamities.

Further, my bill calls for new safeguards for American workers by strengthening control of the Secretary of Labor on nonpreference immigration. That appears in section 203, subsection 8, of the bill which I introduced, H.R. 8662.

This means that the Secretary of Labor must make an affirmative finding that the jobs that nonpreference immigrants will take in the United States will not deprive any American worker of those jobs. The Celler bill provides no such safeguards for American workers.

My bill also would wipe out in the first year all waiting lists in the four preference classes of the present law. The only exception would be the fourth preference waiting list in Italy, which is in excess of 100,000. The Celler bill cannot make this claim.

Those are the major changes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman for his exhaustive explanation, and I assure the gentleman, although I am a conintroducer of the Celler bill, I will make a very careful study of the bill which the gentleman has introduced.

Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, I am happy to yield.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. What, if any, indication has the administration given as to its attitude toward the gentleman's bill?

Mr. FEIGHAN. There is no disagreement between the President and me on the principles of the bill which I have introduced.

I have had several long conferences with the President in which we examined at length the full-range problems involved in immigration.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman. I hope that we can take the fact the gentleman has introduced a bill as an indication of speedy action on this most emergent bill in order to raise the image of America throughout the world.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I agree with the gentleman. I believe this is a very sound, fair bill, the most practical bill that has been introduced, even though I am the author, and I hope and will work for speedy enactment.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman again.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I appreciate the keen interest expressed by my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, the text of my bill H.R. 8662, and a section-by-section analysis follow:

H.R. 8662

A bill to establish a selective immigration system and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter I of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1151.) be amended as follows:

"CHAPTER I—SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

"Sec. 201. Exclusive of special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27), the number of aliens who may be issued immigrant visas or who may otherwise acquire the status of an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence shall not in any fiscal year exceed 225,000 of which not more than 60,000 may be authorized in each of the first three quarters of such fiscal year.

"Sec. 202. No person shall receive any preference or priority in the issuance of an immigrant visa because of his race, sex, nationality, place of birth, or place of residence, except as specifically provided in section 101(a)(27) and in section 203: *Provided,* That the total number of immigrant visas available to citizens or nationals of any foreign state under paragraphs (2) through (8) of section 203(a) shall not exceed 20,000.

"Sec. 203. (a) Immigrant visas shall be allotted in each fiscal year as follows:

"(1) Without numerical or per centum limitation, immigrant visas shall be first made available to qualified immigrants who are the husbands, wives, children, unmarried sons or unmarried daughters of a citizen of the United States, or who are the fathers or mothers of a citizen of the United States, such citizen being over twenty-one years of age.

"(2) The first ten per centum of the number of immigrant visas not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraph (1) shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions, or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences or the arts will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States.

"(3) The next twenty per centum of the number of immigrant visas not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraph (1) shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to qualified immigrants who are the husbands, wives, unmarried sons or unmarried daughters of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent resident, or who are the fathers or mothers of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, such alien being over twenty-one years of age.

"(4) The next twenty per centum of the number of immigrant visas not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraph (1) shall be made available to qualified immigrants who are the married sons or the married daughters of citizens of the United States.

"(5) The next twenty per centum of the number of immigrant visas not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraph (1) shall be made available to qualified immigrants who are the brothers or sisters of citizens of the United States.

"(6) The next twenty per centum of the number of immigrant visas not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraph (1) shall be made available to qualified immigrants who are capable of performing specified skilled or unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States.

"(7) The next 10 per centum of the number of immigrant visas not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraph (1) shall be made available to a qualified immigrant who is or was last a national or resident of any Communist or Communist-dominated country, and is out of his usual place of abode, and who satisfies an Immigration and Naturalization Service officer at an examination in any non-Communist or non-Communist dominated country, prior to visa issuance, that he has fled from his usual place of abode, or is unable or unwilling to return to such usual place of abode, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion: *Provided,* That not more than one-half the number of immigrant visas specified in this paragraph may be made available to aliens who have been continuously physically present in the United States for a period of two years prior to application.

"(8) Any immigrant visas not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (7) shall be made available to qualified immigrants strictly in the chronological order in which such immigrants are registered on waiting lists which shall be maintained in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State. No immigrant visa shall be issued to a nonpreference immigrant under this subsection until the consular officer is in receipt of a determination made by the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Labor, that the provisions of section 212(a)(14) will not be invoked.

"(9) A spouse or child as defined in section 101(b)(1) (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) shall if not otherwise entitled to an immigrant status and the immediate issuance of a visa under paragraphs (1) through (8), be entitled to the same preference or nonpreference status, and the same order of consideration provided in subsection (b), of his accompanying spouse or parent.

"(10) During the fourth quarter of any fiscal year, immigrant visas not required for the issuance of visas to qualified immigrants specified in paragraphs (2) through (5) may, without regard to per centum limitations, be made available cumulatively, to qualified immigrants, in each of the next succeeding classes in paragraphs (3) through (6).

"(11) Not exceeding 50 per centum of the numbers allocated to nonpreference immigrants under paragraph (8), may, on the advice of the Secretary of State, be reserved by the President, without regard to the 20,000 limitation contained in section 202, for allocation to (A) otherwise qualified immigrants whose admission is determined by him to be required to avoid undue hardship, resulting from the abolition of annual quotas and nonquota classes, or to (B) otherwise qualified preference immigrants described in paragraph (7) whose admission is determined by him to be required to further the traditional policy of the United States of offering refuge to persons oppressed or persecuted or (C) otherwise qualified immigrants uprooted by natural calamity or military operations who are unable to return to their usual place of abode.

"(b) Immigrant visas issued pursuant to paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) shall be issued to eligible immigrants in the order in which a petition in behalf of each such immigrant is filed with the Attorney General as provided in section 204.

"(c) In considering applications for immigration visas under subsection (a) consideration shall be given first to applicants under paragraph (1) and consideration shall be given to other applicants in the order in which the classes of which they are members are listed in subsection (a).

"(d) Every immigrant shall be presumed to be a nonpreference immigrant until he establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer and the immigration officer that he is entitled to a preference status under paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (a), or to a special immigrant status under section 101(a)(27). In the case of any alien claiming in his application for an immigrant visa to be entitled to preference immigrant status, the consular officer shall not grant such status until he has been authorized to do so as provided in section 204.

"Sec. 204. (a) Any citizen of the United States claiming that an alien is entitled to a preference status by reason of the relationships described in paragraphs (1), (4), or (5) of subsection 203(a), or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that an alien is entitled to a preference status by reason of the relationship described in section 203(a)(3), or any person, institution, firm, organization, or governmental agency desiring to have an alien classified as a preference immigrant under section 203(a)(2), or any United States citizen, or permanent resident alien desiring and intending to employ an alien within the United States, whom he believes is entitled to a preference immigrant status under section 203(a)(6), may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification of the alien. The petition shall be in such form as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe and shall contain such information and be supported by such documentary evidence as the Attorney General may require. The petition shall be made under oath administered by any individual having authority to administer oaths, if executed in the United States, but, if executed outside the United States, administered by a consular officer.

"(b) After an investigation of the facts in each case, and after consultation with the Secretary of Labor in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor and the Attorney General with respect to petitions to accord a status under sections 203(a)(2) or 203(a)(6), the Attorney General shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in behalf of whom the petition is made is eligible for a preference status under section 203(a), approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant the preference status.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) no more than two petitions may be approved for one petitioner in behalf of a child as defined in section 101(b)(1) (E) or (F) unless necessary to prevent the separation of brothers and sisters and no petition shall be approved if the alien has previously been accorded a nonquota or preference status as the spouse of a citizen of the United States or the spouse of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, by reason of a marriage determined by the Attorney General to have been entered into for the purpose of evading the immigration laws.

"(d) The Attorney General shall forward to the Congress a report on each approved petition for immigrant status under sections 203(a)(2) or 203(a)(6) stating the basis for his approval and such facts as were by him deemed to be pertinent in establishing the beneficiary's qualifications for the preferential status. Such reports shall be submitted to the Congress on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which the Congress is in session.

"(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to entitle an immigrant in behalf of whom a petition under this section is approved, to enter the United States as a preference immigrant under section 203(a) if upon his arrival at a port of entry in the United States he is found not to be entitled to such classification.

"Sec. 205. The Attorney General may, at any time, for what he deems to be good and sufficient cause, revoke the approval of any petition approved by him under section 204. Such revocation shall be effective as of the date of approval of any such petition. In no case, however, shall such revocation have effect unless there is mailed to the petitioner's last known address a notice of the revocation and unless notice of the revocation is communicated through the Secretary of State to the beneficiary of the petition before such beneficiary commences his journey to the United States. If notice of revocation is not so given, and the beneficiary applies for admission to the United States, his admissibility shall be determined in the manner provided for by sections 235 and 236.

"Sec. 206. If an immigrant having an immigrant visa is excluded from admission or does not apply for admission to the United States before the expiration of the validity of the immigrant visa, or if an alien having an immigrant visa issued to him as a preference immigrant is found not to be a preference immigrant, an immigrant visa may be issued in lieu thereof to any other immigrant."

Sec. 2. Section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 166; 8 U.S.C. 1101) is amended as follows:

(a) Paragraph (27) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(27) The term 'special immigrant' means—

"(A) an immigrant who was born in any independent foreign country of the Western Hemisphere or in the Canal Zone, and the spouse and children of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him;

"(B) an immigrant lawfully admitted for permanent residence, who is returning from a temporary visit abroad."

(b) Paragraph (32) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(32) The term 'profession' shall include but not be limited to architects, engineers, lawyers, ordained ministers of religion, physicians, surgeons, and teachers in elementary or secondary schools, colleges, academies, or seminaries."

(c) Subparagraph (1)(F) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(F) a child, under the age of fourteen at the time a petition is filed in his behalf to accord a preference classification under section 203(a)(1), who is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of, abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from, both parents, or for whom the sole or surviving parent is incapable of providing the proper care which will be provided the child if admitted to the United States and who has in writing irrevocably released the child for emigration and adoption; who has been adopted abroad by a United States citizen and his spouse who personally saw and observed the child prior to or during the adoption proceedings; or who is coming to the United States for adoption by a United States citizen and spouse who have complied with the preadoption requirements, if any, of the child's proposed residence; provided that no natural parent or prior adoptive parent of any such child shall thereafter, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under this Act."

(d) Paragraph (6) of subsection (b) is repealed.

Sec. 3. Section 211 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181; 8 U.S.C. 1181) is amended to read as follows:

"Section 211. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) no immigrant shall be admitted into the United States unless at the time of application for admission he (1) has a valid unexpired immigrant visa or was born subsequent to the issuance of such visa of the accompanying parent and (2) presents a valid unexpired passport or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality, if such document is required under the regulations issued by the Attorney General.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(20) of this Act in such cases or in such classes of cases and under such conditions as may be by regulations prescribed, returning resident immigrants, defined in section 101(a)(27)(B), who are otherwise admissible may be readmitted to the United States by the Attorney General in his discretion without being required to obtain a passport, immigrant visa, reentry permit, or other documentation."

Sec. 4. Subsection 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182; 8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended as follows:

(a)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) aliens who are mentally retarded;".

(b) Paragraph (4) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) aliens afflicted with a mental defect, with sexual deviation, or with psychopathic personality."

(c) The last sentence of paragraph (14) is amended to read as follows: "The exclusion of aliens under this paragraph shall apply only to special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27)(A) (other than the parents, spouses or children of the United States citizens or of aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence), and to nonpreference immigrant aliens described in section 203(a)(8);".

(d) Paragraph (20) is amended by deleting the final (e) and substituting therefor the letter (a).

(e) Paragraph (21) is amended by deleting the word "quota".

(f) Paragraph (24) is amended by deleting the language within the parentheses and substituting therefor the following: "other than aliens described in section 101(a)(27)."

SEC. 5. The Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1151) is amended as follows:

(a) Section 221(a) is amended by deleting the words "the quota, if any, to which the immigrant is charged, the immigrants particular status under such quota, the particular nonquota category in which the immigrant is classified, if a nonquota immigrant," and substituting in lieu thereof the words "the preference, nonpreference, or special immigration classification to which the alien is charged."

(b) The fourth sentence of subsection 212(c) is amended by deleting the word "quota" preceding the word "number;" the word "quota" preceding the word "year;" and the word "quota" preceding the word "immigrant," and substituting in lieu thereof the word "an".

(c) Section 224 is amended to read as follows: "A consular officer may, subject to the limitations provided in section 221, issue an immigrant visa to a special immigrant as such upon satisfactory proof, under regulations prescribed under the Act, that the applicant is entitled to a special immigrant status."

(d) Subsection 243(h) is amended by deleting the word "physical."

SEC. 6. Section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U.S.C. 1254) is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Upon the cancellation of deportation in the case of any alien under this section, the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of cancellation of deportation of such alien is made, and unless the alien is entitled to a special immigrant classification under section 101(a)(27)(A), the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of nonpreference immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 203(a)(8) for the fiscal year then current."

(b) Subsection (f) is repealed.

SEC. 7. Section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 217; 8 U.S.C. 1255) is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (a) is amended by deleting the words "other than an alien crewman."

(b) Subsection (b) is amended to read:

"(b) Upon the approval of an application for adjustment made under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date the order of the Attorney General approving the application for the adjustment of status is made, and the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of the preference or nonpreference visas authorized to be issued under section 203(a) within the class to which the alien is chargeable, for the fiscal year then current."

(c) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to any alien who is of the class described in section 101(a)(27)(A)."

SEC. 8. Section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 219; 8 U.S.C. 1259) is amended by changing the words "June 28, 1940," to read "December 24, 1952," and by adding at the end thereof the following: "Upon approval of the creation of a record of lawful admission for permanent residence, unless the alien is entitled to a special immigrant classification under section 101(a)(27)(A), the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of nonpreference immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 203(a)(8) for the fiscal year then current."

SEC. 9. Section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 230; 8 U.S.C. 1351) is amended as follows:

(a) Paragraph (2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) For the issuance of each immigrant visa, $20; except that such fee shall be $10 in the case of any alien who is the beneficiary of a petition required under section 204, provided that by regulation the Secretary of State may prescribe the partial deposit or prepayment of such fee at the time of registration."

(b) Paragraph (6) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) For filing with the Attorney General of each petition under section 204, $10; and"

SEC. 10. Sections 1, 2, and 11 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 505–505); as amended by section 6 of the Act of June 28, 1962 (76 Stat. 124), is repealed.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 of the bill rewrites completely title II, chapter I (secs. 201–206) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and substitutes a selective immigration system for the present national origins quota system.

Section 201 fixes the total number of aliens from the former quota countries and areas who may acquire permanent residence immigration status in any fiscal year at 225,000—a slight increase over annual total immigration per year during the last decade. To provide for orderly administrative procedures, not more than 60,000 visas may be issued in each of the first three quarters of any fiscal year.

Section 202 expresses in statutory language a national policy that within the ceiling fixed by section 201, no preference or priority will be given to any person in acquiring permanent residence in the United States because of his or her race, sex, nationality, place of birth, or place of foreign residence.

This section also sets a maximum ceiling of 20,000 on the number of nationals of any one country who may obtain permanent residence annually, exempting from that ceiling only the husbands, wives, children, fathers, and mothers of U.S. citizens.

Section 203(a) lists the order of preference which is to be given in the allocation of the annual 225,000 immigrant visas.

First preference is given, without any limit on the numbers, to spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens.

The numbers which will remain after the first preference is satisfied will be available to the following six classes, in the percentages indicated:

Second preference, 10 percent to members of the professions and scientists and persons with skill and talent in the visual and performing arts.

Third preference, 20 percent to spouses, children, and parents of aliens who have previously been admitted for permanent residence but who have not yet become citizens.

Fourth preference, 20 percent to married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens.

Fifth preference, 20 percent to brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens.

Sixth preference, 20 percent to persons with skills which are found by the Secretary of Labor to be unavailable or in short supply in this country.

Seventh preference, 10 percent to refugees from Communist tyranny and oppression with a proviso that up to one-half of this number may be used by persons who have been offered a temporary refuge in this country upon a finding that they are unable or unwilling to return to their homelands because of persecution or fear thereof, and only after 2 years residence in this country.

Only after the above preferences have been satisfied will visa numbers which remain to be made available on a first-come, first-served order of registration to nonpreference applicants on a worldwide basis.

Within this nonpreference class there is created a reserve, under the control of the President, by which he may reallocate up to one-half the available numbers to nationals of countries who may be adversely affected by the immediate termination of the national origins quota system. For example, in Germany and the United Kingdom where the largest quota allocations are available, there has been no occasion or opportunity for desiring immigrants to register on a consular waiting list as was necessary for thousands of nationals of countries with heavily oversubscribed quotas. Consequently, in a worldwide competition for nonpreference numbers, such nationals may be unfairly disadvantaged particularly in the years immediately following the passage of the bill.

The President's reserve would also be available to increase the number of refugees who could be admitted should a sudden, abnormal refugee situation occur, such as arose in Austria after the 1956 unsuccessful revolt of the Hungarian freedom fighters, or to take care of disaster situations such as occurred in the Azores in 1957 which necessitated special legislation to authorize admission of a number of its victims.

Section 203(b) amends the present act to provide that the priority date for all preference immigrants shall be the date on which a petition to accord such a preference has been filed with the Attorney General.

Sections 203 (c) and (d) substantially reiterate provisions contained in the present act on the priority of consideration of visa applicants and the prohibition against a consul issuing a preference visa unless and until a petition has been approved. Technical changes in language caused by the elimination of the quota system are also made.

Section 204 rewrites the present sections 204 and 205 to combine a single procedure for the filing of visa petitions with the Attorney General to accord the seven preference classifications described in section 203.

This section also continues a limitation on the number of orphans who may be adopted by a single family to two. It also prohibits the approval of a petition for an alien who has been found to have married a citizen or permanent resident alien for the purpose of gaining a preference under the immigration laws.

Section 205 repeats the present section 206 of the act providing for the revocation of visa petition approvals for fraud, illegality, or change of status.

Section 206 changes present section 207 of the act to permit the reissue to another applicant under the same number, a visa not used by the initial holder of the visa.

Section 2 of the bill amends three definitions contained in the present act:

It repeals the present nonquota provisions of the act, but continues to classify as immigrants, and continues to exempt from the numerical ceiling, aliens already admitted as immigrants who are returning to the United States after a temporary absence abroad, and aliens who are natives of independent countries of the Western Hemisphere.

It repeals the definition and concept of a quota immigrant and defines the professional classes of preference immigrants to include doctors, lawyers, teachers, professors, clergymen, and engineers.

It defines in one place an "eligible orphan," the confusing definition of which exists currently in three separate sections of the law.

Section 3 of the bill essentially repeats the language of the present act which requires a visa and a passport for every arriving immigrant. It broadens the authority of the Attorney General to waive these documents for returning residents.

Section 4 of the bill makes technical changes in the language of the excluding provisions contained in section 212 of the act. The material changes are:

The words "mentally retarded" are substituted for the language "feebleminded."

"Epilepsy" is deleted as a mandatory exclusion ground.

Both of the above changes were based on the testimony of the Surgeon General's office.

Other changes are required to delete language which would become obsolete with the elimination of the quota system.

Section 5 of the bill removes the word "physical" from the language of section 243(h) of the act which permits the Attorney General to stay the deportation of an alien whom he believes would be subjected to (physical) persecution on his return to his homeland. This provision recognizes that the more subtle, mental, moral, and emotional sanctions imposed on their captive citizens by these totalitarian regimes are no less a basis for our refusal to return these people to their native lands and to such oppression. This sanction also makes other conforming changes.

Section 6 of the bill amends section 244 of the act, the suspension of deportation procedures, to make eligible for that privilege citizens of Western Hemisphere countries and aliens who entered the United States as crewmen, presently ineligible under the terms of the current act.

Section 7 of the bill amends section 245 of the act, the adjustment of status procedure, to make eligible for adjustment to permanent residence within this country, any alien in the United States (other than a native of the Western Hemisphere) who, if abroad, would be eligible for the immediate issuance of a visa. It removes the current ineligibility of crewmen for the privilege.

Section 8 of the bill amends section 249, the "registry" provisions, by advancing the date of entry of eligibles from June 28, 1940, to December 24, 1952. Under the amendment, any alien who entered the United States prior to the latter date and has resided here since, and is of good character, may be granted the status of a permanent resident. The section is, in effect, a limited statute of limitation against deportation.

All cases which result in the grant of permanent residence status by application within the United States under sections 244, 245, and 249 will also result in the deduction of 1 number in the overall ceiling of 225,000 immigrants a year.

Section 9 of the bill prescribes a uniform cost for immigrant visa issuance of $20, and authorizes the partial deposit or prepayment of such fee at the time of registration.

Section 10 of the bill repeals the Fair Share Refugee Act (secs. 1, 2, and 11 of the act of July 14, 1960), rendered unnecessary by the provisions for visa issuance to refugees under the preference classification of section 203(a)(7) of the bill.

The repeal of this provision should result in the use of the more appropriate visa-issuing procedure as the method of documenting alien refugees for admission to this country and to limit the use of the parole provisions of the act (sec. 212(d)(5)) to the purposes originally intended—the temporary reception of persons arriving in the United States without documentation and under emergent circumstances, e.g., shipwrecked crewmen, and so forth.

Mr. **FEIGHAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXPANDED PROGRAMS OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 196)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The American people want their Government to be not only strong but compassionate. They know that a society is secure only where social justice is secure for all its citizens. When there is turmoil anywhere in our own country, our instinct is to inquire if there is injustice. That instinct is sound. And these principles of compassion and justice do not stop at the water's edge. We do not have one policy for our own people and another for our friends abroad.

A vast revolution is sweeping the southern half of this globe. We do not intend that the Communists shall become the beneficiaries of this revolt against injustice and privation. We intend to lead vigorously in that struggle. We will continue to back that intention with practical and concrete help.

In southeast Asia today, we are offering our hand and our abundance to those who seek to build a brighter future. The effort to create more progressive societies cannot wait for an ideal moment. It cannot wait until peace has been finally secured. We must move ahead now.

I know of no more urgent task ahead. It requires more of us, more of other prosperous nations, and more of the people of southeast Asia.

For our part, I propose that we expand our own economic assistance to the people of South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos.

I propose we start now to make available our share of the money needed to harness the resources of the entire southeast Asia region for the benefit of all its people. This must be an international venture. That is why I have asked Mr. Eugene Black to consult with the United Nations Secretary General and the leaders of the poor and advanced nations. Our role will be vital, but we hope that all other industrialized nations, including the Soviet Union, will participate.

To support our own effort, I ask the Congress to authorize and appropriate for fiscal year 1966 an additional $89 million for the Agency for International Development for expanded programs of economic and social development in southeast Asia.

This money will serve many purposes:

First. Approximately $19 million will provide the first installment of our contribution to the accelerated development of the Mekong River Basin. This is an important part of the general program of regional development which I outlined at Johns Hopkins University on April 7. This money will enable us to meet a request for half the cost of building the Nam Ngum Dam, which the international Mekong Committee has marked "top priority" if the Mekong River is to be put to work for the people of the region. This will be the first Mekong power project to serve two countries, promising power to small industry and lights for thousands of homes in northeast Thailand and Laos. The funds will provide also for:

Powerlines across the Mekong linking Laos and Thailand.

Extensive studies of further hydroelectric, irrigation, and flood control projects on the Mekong main stream and its tributaries;

Expansion of distribution lines in Laos.

Second. Five million dollars will be used to support electrification cooperatives near three provincial towns—Long Xuyen, Dalat, and Nha Thang—in South Vietnam. Co-ops, which have been so important to the lives of our rural people, will bring the benefits of low priced electricity to more than 200,000 Vietnamese. We hope this pattern can be duplicated in towns and villages throughout the region. I will ask that we provide further support if the pattern meets the success we believe possible.

Third. Seven million dollars will help provide improved medical and surgical services, especially in the more remote areas of Vietnam, Laos and Thailand. South Vietnam is tragically short of doctors; some 200 civilian physicians must care for a population of 15 million.

In Laos the system of AID-supported village clinics and rural hospitals now reaches more than a million people. But that is not enough. We propose to extend the program in Laos, assist the Thailand Government to expand its public health services to thousands of rural villages, and to organize additional medical and surgical teams for sick and injured civilians in South Vietnam.

Better health is the first fruit of modern science. For the people of these countries it has far too long been an empty promise. I hope that when peace comes our medical assistance can be expanded and made available to the sick and wounded of the area without regard to political commitment.

Fourth. Approximately $6 million will be used to train people for the construction of roads, dams, and other small-scale village projects in Thailand and Laos. In many parts of Asia the chance of the villager for markets, education, and access to public services depends on his getting a road. A nearby water well dramatically lightens the burdens of the farmer's wife. With these tools and skills local people can build their own schools and clinics—blessings only dreamed of before.

Fifth. Approximately $45 million will be used to finance increasing imports of iron and steel, cement, chemicals and pesticides, drugs, trucks, and other essential goods necessary for a growing civilian economy. This money will allow factories not only to continue but, through investment, to expand production of both capital and consumer goods. It will provide materials for urgently needed low-cost housing. And it will maintain production incentives and avoid inflation. It is not easy for a small country, with a low income, to fight a war on its own soil and at the same time persist in the business of nation building. The additional import support which I propose will help Vietnam to persevere in this difficult task.

Sixth. An additional $7 million will supplement the present program of agricultural development and support additional Government services in all three countries, and will help in the planning of further industrial expansion in the secure areas of Vietnam.

Much of the additional assistance I request is for Vietnam. This is not a poor and unfavored land. There is water and rich soil and ample natural resources. The people are patient, hardworking, the custodians of a proud and ancient civilization. They have been oppressed not by nature but by man. The failures of man can be redeemed. That is the purpose of the aid for which I now ask additional authorization.

We are defending the right of the people of South Vietnam to decide their own destiny. Where this right is attacked by force, we have no alternative but to reply with strength. But military action is not a final solution in this area; it is only a partial means to a much larger goal. Freedom and progress will be possible in Vietnam only as the people are assured that history is on their side—that it will give them a chance to make a living in peace, to educate their children, to escape the ravages of disease and, above all, to be free of the oppressors who for so long have fed on their labors.

Our effort on behalf of the people of southeast Asia should unite, not divide, the people of that region. Our policy is not to spread conflict but to heal conflict.

I ask the Congress, as part of our continuing affirmation of America's faith in the cause of man, to respond promptly and fully to this request.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 1, 1965.*

THE FAILURE OF NEW YORK CITY TO IMPLEMENT THE JOB CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLIGAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate two young men from New York City who have become the unsung heroes of the antipoverty war.

Perhaps they deserve a parade up Fifth Avenue—ticker tape and all. They certainly deserve to be remembered in the history of the antipoverty war.

The administration of the city of New York is the second largest in the Nation. It has proclaimed its own war on poverty.

Over the last year, the city administration has set up an antipoverty operations board, hired employees, moved and moved again into new and better offices. It has spent, or seen spent, several hundred thousand dollars in antipoverty work.

The city administration has insisted it understands the vastness of poverty in New York City. More than a million residents have incomes of less than $1,600. Some 75,000 youths are out of school and out of work.

And presumably the city administration saw the importance of the Job Corps. Recruiting out of school and out of work youth, the Corps would get youths off the streets, give them work, inspiration, and skills.

And so in March, the Office of Economic Opportunity asked New York City to recommend 830 youths for the Job Corps initial enrollment.

Plenty of youths wanted to get in the Job Corps. Although New York has had no substantive publicity for the Corps, some 1,597 youths have written to the Corps from New York City. Across the Nation, some 300,000 have written in. They are applying at the rate of 15,000 every week.

Presumably, on the call of the Office of Economic Opportunity, New York's antipoverty organization shifted into high gear.

Each youth had to be interviewed. A form had to be made out, a physical taken. Eight hundred and thirty had to be selected from some 1,600 known volunteers, from some 75,000 out-of-school and out-of-work youngsters.

Presumably, the New York antipoverty organization would send forms to Washington. Waiting computers would correlate each applicant's needs with various Corps center programs, and would assign him to the appropriate center.

Presumably, this activity went on for more than 2 months. And then someone asked what had been done? Were all the youths in camps using up the quota for New York? Could not the city, with summer here, get the Office of Economic Opportunity to allocate more places for its thousands of needy youths?

But in more than 2 months—by the end of May—the New York City antipoverty organization had gotten not 830, not 300, not 200, not 100, not even 10 youths in a Job Corps camp.

The organization had gotten just two—exactly two—New York youths in Job Corps camps.

But am I being sarcastic, unfair?

True, only two got into camps. But the New York organization actually did screen 26 applicants, and sent the forms to Washington.

Yet the figures deceive. For of the 26, this efficient New York City administration filled out 7 of the simple forms incorrectly. They had to be returned.

I understand that the problem of screening applicants in New York City has run into many conflicts and difficulties.

One of these conflicts is centered on the question of who is going to give the required medical examination. The Government pays a fee for each examination.

I realize this is not really funny.

It is not even sad.

It is inexcusable—especially in a city where a million people suffer destitution, where 500,000 are on welfare, where narcotics has cut the hope from countless lives, where poverty breeds poverty and thousands of youngsters find no way out; where frustrations and desperations abound.

The Job Corps was created by Congress to reach young people between the ages of 16 and 21 who are largely unemployable because they lack education and skills. It is aimed at young people who have not completed high school and who have not found work. At the conservation camps and training centers, basic education and job training are being provided for some 2,500 youths, and by June 30, 10,000 will be enrolled.

This program is being ignored by a city government which should be painfully aware of the social dynamite.

Two weeks ago the Office of Economic Opportunity had to ask the New York State Employment Service to step into New York City and screen 200 applicants.

New York City lags behind every major city in the country. Until the New York Times reported on the situation on May 15, not a single New York City youth was actually at a Job Corps center.

Mr. Speaker, since the city antipoverty operations board is apparently incapable of doing the screening, I call upon Sargent Shriver, the Director, and the Office of Economic Opportunity to set up special emergency screening centers in New York City to process applications immediately.

Congress provided this resource almost a year ago—and we must put it to use—now, before another troubled summer—to help deprived youth break the chains of poverty.

A BILL TO BRING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUILDING AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to bring under the supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board those building and loan associations and similar institutions in the District of Columbia which are not now subject to such regulation.

At the present time, the District of Columbia statutes neither regulate these institutions directly nor do they confer upon the Home Loan Bank Board the power to regulate the 15 associations chartered by the District of Columbia. It is time that these associations be placed under the supervision of the Home Loan Bank Board.

The following is an analysis of the bill I have introduced today:

ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 5 OF THE HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933 (WITH RESPECT TO BUILDING AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)

The attached draft for a bill would add to subsection (c) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 provisions giving District of Columbia building and loan associations and similar institutions the same statutory lending and investment powers as Federal savings and loan associations, and conferring on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the same regulatory and enforcement powers that it has with respect to Federal savings and loan associations.

At present, there are 24 institutions of the savings and loan type (in addition to two associations having only branches in the District) which are operating in the District of Columbia. Of these 24 institutions, 9 are Federal savings and loan associations and 15 are District of Columbia associations. At the close of the calendar year 1964, total assets of these Federal associations amounted to $537 million and total assets of these District associations amounted to $1.4 billion.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board is the examining and supervisory authority for District of Columbia associations, as well as for all Federal savings and loan associations wherever located. However, the existing provisions of the District of Columbia statutes do not provide adequate authority for the regulation and supervision of District associations.

Thus, for example, the District of Columbia statutes neither regulate directly, nor confer on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the power to regulate, the lending practices of such associations. This is true of such vital matters as the types of real property on which loans may be made, the requirement of appraisals, the maximum percentages of value that may be loaned, and other matters customarily dealt with in the statutes of the various States and territories either by direct provision or by the conferring of regulatory authority.

Likewise, the District of Columbia statutes do not confer adequate authority over the establishment and maintenance of branches by building and loan associations in the District. It is true that the provisions embodied in subsection (c) of section 26–103 of the District of Columbia Code provide that no building association, except those engaged in and doing a building-association business on March 4, 1933, shall do a building-association business or maintain any office in the District until it has secured the consent of the Board. However, even assuming that this provision relates to the establishment of branches by such associations, it is to be noted that all building and loan associations incorporated or organized under the laws of the District of Columbia which are now operating in the District were incorporated or organized prior to that date.

At the present time all building and loan associations doing business in the District have obtained insurance of their accounts by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. While associations which apply for such insurance are required by statute to agree to certain types of regulation, the regulation to which they are thus required to agree is limited. For example, the only provision as to regulation of loans is with respect to certain loans beyond 50 miles from the association's principal office, and there is no authority to regulate the establishment or maintenance of branches.

On the other hand, the Board has express and adequate authority to regulate Federal savings and loan associations, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, under section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, subsection (a) of which authorizes the Board, under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe, to provide for the examination, operation, and regulation of such associations.

The attached draft bill would end this anomalous situation. It would give District of Columbia associations the same statutory lending and investment authority as Federal associations and would at the same time place in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the same regulatory and enforcement powers which the Board has with respect to Federal associations.

Subdivision (1) of this amendment would provide that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, with respect to all incorporated or unincorporated building and loan associations and similar institutions of the District of Columbia, or transacting or doing business or maintaining any office therein, shall have the same powers and functions as to examination, operation, and regulation as are now or hereafter vested in or exercisable by the Board with respect to Federal savings and loan associations. The reference to unincorporated associations is included because certain associations organized and in actual operation before March 4, 1909, are permitted by a specific provision of law to conduct or carry on business without being incorporated.

Subdivision (2) would extend to such building and loan associations and similar institutions the provisions of subsection (d) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 as now or hereafter in force. That subsection provides for the appointment of conservators, receivers, or supervisory representatives in charge for Federal savings and loan associations in cases of insolvency as defined therein, violation of law or regulation, unsafe or unsound operation, concealment of books, records, or assets, or refusal to submit books, papers, records, or affairs for inspection. It also provides for administrative and judicial proceedings.

The existing District law provides for taking possession of a building and loan association where it is insolvent or is knowingly violating the laws under which it is incorporated, and for the appointment of a receiver where the association discontinues operations for a specified period. However, under existing District law such matters as unsafe or unsound operation, concealment of books, records, or assets, and refusal to submit books, papers, records, or affairs for inspection are not specifically made grounds for taking possession, and it is not clear whether the existing law authorizes the taking of possession in the case of foreign associations doing business in the District.

Subdivision (3) of the proposed amendment would extend to District of Columbia associations the lending and investment provisions of subsection (c) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 and other enactments of Congress applicable to lending and investment by Federal savings and loan associations which have their home offices in the District, except provisions applicable solely to converted associations. It would provide that no provisions of statute other than those so applicable to Federal savings and loan associations shall be applicable to lending or investment by such District associations.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXXII

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns drug addiction in New York and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis."

The article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 8, 1965, and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—FREE-DRUG PLAN; ALREADY TRIED, ALREADY A FAILURE

(There is no known cure for the cancer of dope addiction, but one of the most frequently mentioned hopes is the "British system," which proponents contend would cut crime by permitting addicts to receive legalized drugs free. But the "British system," like many other proposed solutions, is more myth than fact, Paul Weissman reports as he looks into the subject in today's article as part of the continuing "New York City in Crisis" series on narcotics addiction.)

(By Paul Weissman)

The problem: drug addiction.

The solution is simple enough, some say: give addicts all the drugs they want.

Virtually every citizen concerned with addict crimes has speculated that free drugs will eliminate the more dangerous social aspects of narcotics addiction.

It is where researchers begin and disciplined people, insistent that the world in which they live be made orderly and safe now—not next week, next month or next year—end up. Their argument is this: does society not have a duty to supply a small percentage of the population with drugs to protect the majority? The great mass of the population of the city now face murder, assault and robbery by addicts who steal $1 billion a year to support their habit.

Remove the profit in heroin, the battle cry goes, and addicts will cease stealing to support their habit.

In recent years, the rallying point for free-drug advocates has been a plan called the "British system," based on the idea that Great Britain dispenses heroin, morphine and other opiates for a few cents a dose to anyone who requests narcotic drug "treatment."

A PREVIOUS EXPERIMENT

But the "British system" is not the first plan to give free drugs to addicts.

The need for a quick, permanent cure which would eliminate the social byproducts of drug addiction is nothing new in America. Immediately after World War I, the first hue and cry to "Take the profits out of addiction" began. A radical idea known as the "clinic plan" started in New York City in 1919. For the first time, addicts who registered at clinics were legally given, at low or no cost, enough heroin or other drugs to maintain themselves. As it does now, the idea seemed to make sense, and some 30 other cities followed suit.

By 1925, every one of the clinics had been closed. The cure rate was nil. Clinics found that as soon as they cut down an addict's dosage he became a ready customer for the black market.

Others learned for the first time how to "make a croaker" (feign illness) to obtain more drugs than they needed, and then sold them on the black market or persuaded friends to try a shot. Forged prescriptions became a thriving business. Worst of all, the very fact of the existence of the clinics removed the constraining idea that drug addiction was morally wrong and physically damaging. Large-scale teenage addiction appeared for the first time, and in New York the addiction rate rose sharply—and so did the crime rate, as the unregistered addicts stole to pay for their black-market supply.

World War II, with its embargo on air and sea travel cut sharply into the degree of narcotics addiction in this country. When the war ended, the Mafia rediscovered the huge profits in heroin and addiction flourished anew.

THE SECOND CALL

Ten years ago, the hue and cry to legalize drugs began again. The National Academy of Sciences among others, was unalterably opposed to the plan. It offered four basic objections:

1. It is impossible to maintain addicts on a uniform level of dosage.

2. Ambulatory treatment of addicts, as shown in the days of the "clinic plan," was impossible.

3. Clinics would facilitate introduction of new addicts.

4. Such a policy of free drugs would be contrary to international conventions and national legislation.

As for the "British system," the great shibboleth of advocates who would "take the profit out of addiction," by legalizing drugs, it is very little different from American law. Not only does England subscribe to the same international conventions controlling narcotics as the United States, its laws are not dissimilar.

The "British system," as Dr. Granville Lorimer and Dr. Henry Brill reported to Governor Rockefeller in an exhaustive 1959 study, is largely a term invented by Americans.

In 1956, Britain had 333 addicts maintained on drugs. A large percentage were people who became addicted in medical treatment, others were members of the medical profession addicted, authorities believe, because of the easy accessibility of the drugs. The figure of maintained addicts today, the British believe, is close to 800.

As the annual report on drug addiction of the British Department of Health points out: "In no case may dangerous drugs be administered except for medical or dental need where it has been similarly demonstrated that the patient while capable of leading a useful and relatively normal life when a certain minimum dose is regularly administered, becomes incapable of this when the drug is entirely discontinued."

Not a few people have pointed out that England's narcotics problem exists in a different environment than the streets of New York. The crime rate in the United States is roughly four times that of Britain and the divorce rate is 10 times higher. And yet, it is true, a few British addicts are maintained on drugs. The British Department of Health provides this example of a stabilized addict:

"Mrs. C., a housewife, is an old lady and a lifelong neurotic. Suspected of a crush-fracture in the midthoracic region after a fall she has complained of constant pain despite spinal support. With four methadone tablets, each of 5 milligrams per day, she manages her household duties. There has been no plea to increase the dose. On the other hand withdrawals have led to such a reaction that the home and family have suffered."

EXPERTS UNDETERRED

Drs. Lorimer and Brill concluded 6 years ago:

"The British system is the result of a favorable situation, not the cause of it." They said the lack of a narcotics problem in England was not the result of superior law enforcement, but the lack of a market.

Despite this, there are a few experts who still argue that a plan to "take the profit out of addiction" should be tried in the United States. They say that such a step should be on the most carefully controlled experimental level. Experts who oppose such experimentation with heroin will quote the philosopher Santayana, as they have in the past. They will say, "He who does not heed the lessons of history is condemned to repeat them."

They argue that such experimentation in the proper hands is worth another trial, recognizing the danger that it must not hold out undue hope to addicts that heroin may eventually be dispensed free and thus deter them from giving up their habit. Their rationale is that it should be tried because there may be enough Mrs. C's in America for whom drugs that are now illegal do represent the closest thing to a cure.

A major problem in the United States is that if little is known about the nature of drug addiction, even less is known about the addict. Few experts who are not politicians, will deny that addiction statistics made available either by the New York City Health Department or the Federal Bureau of Narcotics are, at best, minimal figures. These statistics represent for the most part addicts who come in contact with the law. In order to support these figures, some public officials like to believe that almost every addict is arrested at one time or another. But medical authorities have reported that there are in New York and other parts of the United States, sizable numbers of addicts with enough money to support their habit or the ability to avoid getting caught in possession of narcotic or dangerous drugs. Their habits and patterns of addiction are totally unknown to the authorities.

As Dr. Charles Winick, a leading researcher in addiction, has pointed out, "There appears to be no one kind of psychiatric diagnosis which is common to drug addicts. All kinds of people can and do become drug addicts. The psychiatric classification of the addict does not determine the progress of his addiction."

But there are certain generalizations that can be made without addicts. He is, many psychiatrists say, a person who appears to be living in defiance of convention and law, but in fact is someone in flight, someone struggling to escape reality. Like the compulsive gambler, his life at first is one of danger under control. He steals. He beats the police. He cops. He avoids jail—for a while. And the habit grows. When it becomes large enough, the danger is no longer under control. The addict becomes his need and virtually every aspect of his existence is conditioned and satisfied with one demand, one love, one fact: heroin. He has reached the world of dead souls.

THE ADDICT'S SUBCULTURE

In New York City, because of the high addiction rate, this addict's world has become an entire society in itself, a subculture, with its own mores, values, rewards, and heroes.

"I beat the fuzz," an addict will say on a street corner. "I made the scene."

But as Jeremy Larner noted in his study of teenage addiction in New York, the addict, although he is outside of and deprecatory of normal society, is acutely dependent on it. This means that the jails, hospitals, and rehabilitation centers in which he lives and moves are the crucial environmental factors on him. The conditions in these places should be such as to seek to cure him. In fact, they—and other city facilities—are of little help.

A crucial factor in the city's failures in its battle against addiction has been that it has initiated almost no valid research. Addicts are extremely difficult to examine and even more difficult to treat. Because they tend to be unusually dependent, under questioning they invariably hand up the answer any questioner wants to hear. In New York, very few researchers, psychiatrists, or social workers have taken the time or trouble to examine the addict in his natural environment: on the street. And those who have, mostly from private clinics, are rarely listened to.

Most of all, the addict desperately needs to know where he stands, must in fact know clearly what kind of treatment he can expect in the courts, from the health department, in hospitals and after. As older addicts talk endlessly of their experiences in the Federal hospital at Lexington, Ky., younger addicts hash over days at Manhattan General, Metropolitan, Napanock (a correctional institution) and Rikers Island (city jail).

The problem is that if the community itself is confused and impotent when it comes to dealing with the addict, how can the community then expect the addict to come to grips with his problem with himself and his problems with society?

This has been the problem, accentuated by lack of research, in New York City. There are some areas where research has been done, mostly in the public announcements of "cures" or dramatic progress. The danger of aiming at panaceas is that they may in fact precipitate new problems as serious as those they were intended to resolve.

Such is the situation with the Metcalf-Voelker law adopted by the State in 1963. This law permits arrested addicts, under certain circumstances to elect civil commitment in a hospital in lieu of prosecution. After a period of confinement, usually 3 or 4 months, the addict is paroled for a period not to exceed 3 years. In practice, a large proportion of addicts reject civil commitment because they prefer to take a chance on a suspended sentence or even 6 months in jail rather than face a long parole. Metcalf-Voelker, or article 9 of the State mental hygiene law, as it is legally known, has been further complicated by the seemingly arbitrary judicial selection of those who are to be eligible. And controlled State research on those who are committed has been extremely limited.

The city's research programs have similar conflicts between hopes and results. Two major projects are now being conducted with the aid of city funds. One is being done—with a Rockefeller Foundation grant meeting part of the costs—by Dr. Vincent Dole. He is attempting to discover whether addicts can be maintained on an ambulatory basis on a 20-year-old synthetic narcotic called methadone.

Before Dr. Dole began his experiments, the drug had been used for at least a decade in hospitals withdrawing addicts from heroin addiction. Methadone eased the terrible withdrawal symptoms and helped wean the addict from the more addictive drug. But some addicts complain that after leaving hospital facilities they were left with a methadone habit, then returned to heroin and found they had to kick addiction to two different drugs.

Dr. Dole's experiment is important because if it is successful, vast hospital facilities, the city hopes, might not be needed to treat addicts. The theory is that an addict would appear once a day for a shot of methadone which, hopefully, would suspend his craving for heroin.

"Our good old methadone," is the way Narcotics Coordinator Dr. Catherine Hess describes the drug. "It has no highs and it has no lows."

A GIMMICK?

One present problem is that city officials are anxious to announce that drug maintenance using methadone is a major step forward in the war on addiction, though Dr. Dole's initial experimental group involved only eight patients. The pressure to prematurely put forth maintenance on methadone as a "gimmick that worked" brought Dr. Alfred M. Freedman, chairman of the department of psychiatry at Metropolitan Hospital, to issue this caution at the Gracie Mansion Conference on Narcotics Addiction:

"There is a growing body of opinion among the informed laity in New York," he said, "that maintenance will remove the more irritating aspects of addiction, such as criminality, from the community. As professionals in this field, we owe it to the public not to make misleading and premature claims. We do not know, for example, what proportion of addicts will make methadone a drug of choice. Our own experience shows that many will abuse whatever agent is at hand—but how strong an attachment will remain to illegal drugs is still an open question."

A second experiment underwritten by the city is being conducted by Dr. Eric Simon. He is attempting to determine the effect of heroin on cell tissue as a step, perhaps, toward finding an agent that will counteract the effect of heroin.

Virtually the only major study being conducted in New York that will attempt to provide valid statistical data as guidelines for rehabilitation of criminal-addicts is now being conducted in Washington Heights, at one of the health department's intake centers. An extension of an experiment conducted by the New York State Parole Board, now partly financed with Federal funds, the present study is attempting to establish the effects of various kinds of parole in keeping addicts off drugs.

Leon Brill, who is in charge of the program, has established three separate groups of parolees. The control group is assigned to any probation officer. A second group reports to officers with special narcotics training. Still another group reports to officers who are also trained in narcotics, but carry unusually small caseloads and have closer contact with parolees. Dr. Hess describes the latter portion of the study as a reaching out kind of program.

The Federal Government is also continuing substantial research into the causes and possible cures for addiction.

Today, as last year, a decade ago and a century ago, there are no known cures. Something more is understood today of the factors that will turn an individual who is addiction-prone to actual use of drugs, and something is known of the nature of the addict himself.

But for all the vast resources of the city of New York, much of the work now being done that has become meaningful in planning programs is not conducted in municipal facilities, but voluntary agencies. Limited by pitifully small budgets and inadequate facilities for hospital aftercare, these agencies have been accepting the addict for what he is and treating him in any way they can.

The ability of the voluntary agencies to report results is severely limited. Yet Teen-Challenge, East Harlem Protestant Parish, Daytop Lodge, Henry St. Settlement House, and a dozen other organizations have made pioneer contributions not only in guiding addicts away from drugs, but contributing to understanding of the nature of the problem as it exists on the streets of New York today.

Other organizations, some highly publicized, also have real accomplishments. Synanon, the most controversial of all, has developed techniques that have been adopted by Daytop Lodge in New York and Dr. Efram Ramiez, operator of the most successful of all clinics, in Puerto Rico. But Synanon, which has no medical staff, does not often mention the contribution required for admission that preselects its patients or the fact that a number of patients remain only a short time, leave, and return to drugs.

Synanon has found popular approval among politicians and even social workers, but not with the medical profession, which argues treatment of addiction is, in fact, a medical problem. Other critics of the organization attack the extreme public relations tactics Synanon frequently goes in for in order to raise funds. The latest example is a soon-to-be-released film, "Synanon" that not only misrepresents the nature of the problem of drug addiction, but concludes in grand Hollywood fashion: Love conquers all, including heroin.

SHORT ON RECORDS

Lack of staff and lack of facilities in many organizations also hamper accurate reporting of research findings. Dr. Robert Baird, the physician who operates Haven Clinic, claims to have treated 1,000 addicts with a 35-percent success rate. He has shown no one any medical records, yet newspapers and television stations have accepted his statistics with little question. Evidence does exist that he has helped some addicts. To what extent, on what drugs, in what way? No one knows. Dr. Baird says he is doing a one-man job without time for records, but at the same time, he adds his real purpose is to "wake up the medical profession to the need of doing something about addiction."

Dr. Baird wants city, State, Federal, or voluntary funds for an $8 million addiction clinic in Harlem.

The fact is, virtually that at present and in the forseeable future, there are no cures for heroin addiction. This does not mean there is no treatment possible. New York City is already 10 years behind in planning and organizing any real program. The situation has become so critical that a program is no longer needed that will come to grips with the problems this year or next. New York needs a guiding hand capable of planning a step-by-step 10-year program that will provide a sequence of facilities that can treat addicts.

Among those things that have been learned from voluntary agencies and ex-addicts is that in every case where an addict has gone off the drugs a conversion of some kind takes place after he has withdrawn. It may be a psychiatric conversion, a conversion induced through constant group therapy or even as a result of continual contact with a strong, guiding figure. For others it has been a religious conversion. The essence of Synanon's method is to imbed the addict in an artificial power structure, remove from his home environment, where he must struggle to rise from kitchen attendant to jobs that carry higher status and more importance. Some ex-addicts are able to leave Synanon completely. Others remain in the organization as fund raisers and active proselytizers.

Doctors have speculated that the "maturing out" process, that leads addicts to quit drugs at 35 or 40 or even 50, is in itself a kind of conversion.

A SUDDEN REALIZATION

"It was a lousy life," reports one ex-addict. "A day came along when I just realized I wasn't getting anything out of the way things was. I decided to quit drugs without anyone's help. How many guys do you know can say that?"

The community is faced with the enormously expensive problem of creating not only the kind of facilities it needs, but also finding people capable of contributing to the conversion of the addict. Here are principal suggestions for achieving these goals:

Predetoxification centers are needed that will not only give the addict hope by telling him of treatment that is available, but motivating him toward a cure. This is now being done almost entirely by voluntary agencies.

Recreational therapy and, in a small way, occupational therapy, should be started in hospitals, and the city is doing some of this now. The basic problem is any addiction program is not only intensifying care and motivation at every step of the way but stretching out the program itself. Addicts, many specialists say, cannot be forced to take what may be the next proscribed step until they are ready.

Posthospital centers should not be recreations of West Side rehabilitation centers, as the city now plans, but facilities either in the city or a rural area where basic therapy can take place. An important step in this phase, as voluntary agencies have learned, is to teach the ex-addict he is capable of producing something of value: a cabinet, a group project, poetry or painting.

When the addict is ready, and only when he is ready, he should be promoted to a facility where actual work in a carefully controlled environment is done. It is a step for men "on the road," but men still too shaky to resist the temptation of drugs. Workshops, labor gangs, public works projects or farmwork might be suitable as a pretraining step before actually preparing a man for a job.

In a final stage, the addict, living on the outside, would be responsible for managing his own finances and staying on a job. He would still be able to rely on staff members for help, but not forced to report as a parolee. As the work not only of Synanon but other agencies has proved, ex-addicts can be the most useful of all personnel not only in eventually staffing such a vast program but as active combatants in the community against narcotics.

HANDLING THE COST

By beginning to plan such a program on a 10-year basis now, medical experts would have an opportunity to test the strength of each link in the chain as it is fashioned. Because of the vast expense in programs of this kind—it cost roughly $15 a day to keep a man in prison, $25 in a hospital—Federal and State budgets would have an opportunity to amortize the load.

The program would effectively remove addicts from their environment and the source of supply of drugs. Eventually, it would use the addict as an effective agent in curbing further drug addiction.

At present, the alternatives are few. Not long ago, the Rev. Norman Eddy, who has spent a decade fighting addiction in East Harlem and unsympathetic officials at city hall, offered another solution:

"All you need to do," he said, "is revitalize this city and the rest of Western civilization. Heroin is a pain killer and this is a painful world for some people to live in not only esthetically, but spiritually. It's quite possible," he said, as he pushed open the door from East Harlem Protestant Parish's center for addicts, "that heroin addiction is a sensible answer for some people."

No one who had seen him run his fingers through his white hair as he said it or heard him sigh as he stepped onto 103d Street could ever have forgotten what he said. It was a voice of despair. He did not believe anyone on earth—including New York—really cared about freeing the people in his parish from heroin addiction.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXXIII

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns possible ways of dealing with the narcotics problem.

This is the final article on drug addiction in the series on "New York City in Crisis" and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 9, 1965.

The article follows:

New York City in Crisis—Fighting the Drug Menace, What Could Be Done

(By Paul Weissman)

(The gimmicks have failed, and now the city must find effective ways of combating narcotics addiction and of rehabilitating the tens of thousands of its victims. It will not be easy, inexpensive, or quick. The beginnings of a comprehensive program can no longer be sacrificed to politically inspired but discredited methods. In this final article of the "New York City in Crisis" series on narcotics addiction, Paul Weissman presents recommendations of respected experts in the field.)

Ten years ago, New York City desperately needed a program to combat narcotics addiction. The indications were obvious. Teenage use of narcotics and other dangerous drugs was on the rise, as it is now. The city had half the addict population of the United States, warned the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. A few steps were taken, when public pressure demanded them, but virtually nothing happened.

Now, despite intensive police work, the greatest city in the world has become the criminal addiction capital of the Western World.

Courts are baffled by the narcotics addiction problem. The jails are already full. Hospital facilities for addicts are extremely limited. Except for the work of a few pioneering voluntary agencies and initial steps towards strict supervision of addicted parolees, virtually no working system exists for treating, controlling or rehabilitating the addict even after he is withdrawn from drugs.

The effect of all this is devastating: The addict population not only doesn't decrease but also multiplies at a fearful rate.

City officials are ever searching for a panacea, a "cure," a "gimmick," that will ease public pressure for a meaningful program. But there are no cures and there are no gimmicks.

According to experts in the field, the city needs a long-range, perhaps a 10-year plan for construction of facilities, workable programs and a staff able to cope successfully with the rehabilitation of addicts. Facilities must include predetoxification centers, hospital facilities, close rehabilitation centers and, eventually, a job-training and guidance program. Former addicts, as several organizations have shown, can be useful not only in these programs but in fighting new addiction.

PERSONNEL SHORTAGE

The record of the city of New York shows that it does not have the personnel capable of planning, organizing, or successfully implementing a serious antiaddiction program. Facilities cannot be staffed simply by shifting employees from one installation that has failed to another that is opening up, as was the case with the closing of Riverside Hospital and the organization of the West Side Rehabilitation Center.

If New York is to have a good program, it must be more than a political maneuver to quell the public's demands for action now, for in the past this has resulted in little more than new studies, vacant pronouncements, and "paper" programs.

Because New York represents the worst addiction problem in the United States and because authorities know that addicts gravitate to New York, the problem here is indeed a national problem. A functional program, narcotics experts say, should be drawn up on the State level in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and be implemented and administered in the State level.

Because costs for such a program would be enormous, they should be shared by the Federal, State, and city governments.

But in addition to long-range planning, there are things that can be done now. After weeks of interviews with responsible persons who have been studying the overwhelming problems for years, these recommendations have evolved:

New York City has the greatest public relations and communications experts in the world, but no educational program to fight narcotics addiction. The Health Department through the office of the city's Narcotics Coordinator, Dr. Catherine Hess, has, in effect, hardly more than a one-woman speaker's bureau: Dr. Hess herself. As a result of the failure of the health department and other city agencies, police have been forced to create their own educational program. Mayor Wagner can and should call on the Advertising Council and volunteer experts within the advertising and public relations industries to plan and organize a public education program.

More than 60 bills that relate to narcotics addiction, have been introduced in the legislature. Half of them recommend increased penalties for possession and sales. What New York police really need, however, is a minor modification of section 1533 of the State penal law so that they can arrest people who loiter for the purpose of buying drugs. The necessary change is a simple one: the law needs to be altered so that it reads, "on the street, on stairways, hallways, basements, and roofs."

Of course, other State legislation is also needed. Because of the rise in teenage addiction, illegal sales of barbiturates and amphetamines should be made a felony offense. (It is now a misdemeanor). Unlike heroin addict-sellers, merchants in pills are frequently nonusers. Sales of cough syrups that contain 1 percent codeine also need to be further restricted so that these medicines may not legally be sold to anyone under 21 without a prescription.

Most important of all, if police are to meet the public demand for action against major wholesalers and peddlers, Congress must heed recommendations of the Attorney General's office and other law enforcement agencies that would make wire tap evidence admissible in court. True, there is a legitimate civil rights issue involved, but at the same time, without wiretap evidence, crime syndicates like the Mafia are able to operate almost without fear of police.

In the history of New York jurisprudence, nothing has ever matched the spectacle of seven Mafia racketeers in a New York courtroom on November 15, 1961, when Assistant District Attorney Irving Lang said they were heroin sellers, "guilty beyond any reasonable doubt"; said they had convicted themselves in their own words, and then asked for a dismissal of the case. The evidence consisted of wiretap recordings. District Attorney Frank Hogan, Mr. Lang said, banned their admission in court until Congress specifically authorized their use.

THE COURTS

The Federal Narcotics Bureau has had sole responsibility for almost four decades for the control of narcotics. At present, fewer than 300 agents are assigned to control drug traffic into New York, and the agency says the entire Army, Navy, Marine, and Coast Guard could not stem the flow of herion. But no one has examined whether a reasonably increased force would not provide more effective control. Others have suggested the Narcotics Bureau be disbanded and law enforcement responsibility in the field be given to the FBI; combative and rehabilitation programs turned over to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Because the business of heroin is an international one, it is even more important that something be done on an international level. The State Department, through the United Nations and diplomatic channels, has reported little effort to deal with opium growing in Turkey; traffic from Lebanon, or shipments of heroin from France. Mexico appears to be another major source of drugs.

The chaos and the quality of the judiciary in New York's criminal courts is well known. For addicts brought before the bench there is often a mixture of cattle-car justice, a bored and irritated judiciary and a judiciary that has little idea of the nature of the problem. New York, rather than needing more politically appointed criminal court judges with minimal legal experience, needs a separate narcotics court, with judges trained to deal with the special problems of addiction. Such a system would permit the judiciary to deal with the addict as an individual; and, with competent medical help, to decide fairly whether the addict should be placed in a hospital, be paroled, or jailed. A narcotics court, composed of judges knowledgeable in the problems of addiction, could be permitted wide latitude in dealing with men and women brought before it.

Such a legal system might even lead to changes in arrest and arraignment procedures. Public officials, among them Mayor Wagner, have continually urged that the addict be treated as a sick person and not as a criminal. But under present procedures, until a man's case is disposed of by the courts, the treatment he receives is virtually the same as any other criminal.

The Metcalf-Voelker law, permitting certain addicts to elect civil commitment in a State hospital, instead of jail, is a step in the right direction, though in practice the law has had woeful shortcomings. Most addicts who are arrested have no clear idea of the law. Or how to take advantage of its provisions, which no one spells out for the addict. Even voluntary agencies that frequently counsel addicts cannot explain who will be accepted under the law. These agencies should receive accurate reports of the number of addicts accepted for hospitalization, why they are accepted and some idea of the success of post-hospital programs. At present, many agencies argue the system has broken down after the addict is paroled. They say close supervision is lacking because parole officers are overburdened by their caseloads.

HALFWAY HOUSES

These are the groups manning the battlelines in this city's war on addiction. They function within neighborhoods with high incidence of addiction and they need help. East Harlem Protestant parish, perhaps the most knowledgeable of all, is forced by limited funds to function in a storefront on East 103d Street. But east Harlem is only one of many agencies that need voluntary contributions and city aid. A method must be found for supporting these groups, without political strings. More important, they must be encouraged—not hindered—to pioneer new ways of dealing with addiction, even if those ways are not politically expedient.

City hall's uncertainty about the method of dealing with addiction in New York, as observers have pointed out, is a classic example of the governmental technique of inaction by continuous study. It must cease.

The Federal, State, and city government must come to grips with New York narcotics addiction problem—now.

THE NECESSITY OF AMENDING THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Friedel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives as well as a large group of distinguished Members of the Senate share my views that the Export Control Act of 1949 should be amended.

As an American, I submit, it is our duty to protect our citizens who are engaged in foreign trade. A large number of U.S. citizens are being intimidated by Arab countries just because these Americans who wish to do business with nationals of Arab countries also trade with the people of Israel, a nation friendly to the United States.

In order to stop the boycotting of our fellow citizens, I introduced H.R. 7407, a bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949, which is similar to other bills which have been sponsored by a number of Members of both Houses of Congress. In support of my bill, I submitted a statement to the Subcommittee on International Trade of the House Banking and Currency Committee. Because this is a matter of considerable importance and in order to give it greater public attention, I ask unanimous consent that this statement be inserted, at this point, in the pages of the Congressional Record.

It is as follows:

H.R. 7407—A Bill To Amend the Export Control Act of 1949

(By Representative Samuel N. Friedel, of Maryland)

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, on April 13, 1965, I introduced H.R. 7407, a bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949. I very much appreciate the opportunity of submitting this statement to the Subcommittee on International Trade in support of this measure.

The main purpose of this bill is to protect American businessman who are engaged in foreign trade and to enable them to do business without having to fear reprisals from foreign countries just because these Americans also trade with another nation. It would declare it to be the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

I submit that American businessmen are now and have been, for the past 15 years, used as a weapon of war by certain foreign nations. Our American industrialists have been and are now impeded from international trade and commerce by these nations.

American merchants have been and are being dictated to by alien governments. These foreign countries are, of course, the non-Christian Arab nations which are engaged in an economic boycott against that bulwark of democracy in the strategic Middle East—that friend of the United States—namely, the State of Israel.

It is also worthy of note that the State of Israel, after Canada, is the largest per capita consumer of the products made or found in the United States and it is, in like manner, the second best per capita customer for American services in the world.

My measure and other similar bills to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 would make it impossible for the Arab countries to assert the kind of pressure which they now exercise through their searching questionnaires and through their threats against American firms that do business with Israel or who contemplate trading with that country.

I should like to invite the attention of the subcommittee to the fact that this does not involve the confrontation of countries antagonistic to each other in economic matters. Here is a situation in which innocent American business interests are being adversely affected and threatened, not because they are nationals of Arab countries or of Israel, which, of course, they are not, but solely because as American citizens they seek legitimate international trade. The aggrieved parties are all citizens of the United States.

The latest report respecting the administration of the Export Control Act clearly states:

"A paramount objective of U.S. policy is the establishment of freer trade among the nations of the world."

If this is true, the thrust and objective of the legislation I strongly urge becomes crystal clear. It implements a fundamental American principle that we should resist any attempt by other nations to interfere in our commerce with friendly countries. It would assert the immunity of U.S. citizens from third-country interference.

This legislation will help to give Americans freedom to trade with any free nation they choose. It will counteract the boycott which has been used as a weapon of offense. Blackmail is an ugly word, but we must squarely face the fact that Arab countries are using it against our fellow American citizens.

Cases have been reported where American firms importing merchandise and products from the State of Israel have received threatening letters from the Arab Boycott Committee to the effect that any further transactions by them with business houses located in Israel would result in depriving such American concerns from all trade with Arab nations. I say this is wrong and an unwarranted interference with the rights of our fellow Americans.

All it requires to overcome the effects of Arab actions is the passage of measures which are now before this subcommittee. I earnestly advocate protection for the American businessman who makes his livelihood in foreign trade and trust that the bill I introduced and other similar measures be given favorable consideration by this subcommittee.

ADMINISTRATOR JAMES E. WEBB OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION SPEAKS ON FEDERAL PATENT POLICY

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to enclose a speech given on May 20, 1965, at Williamsburg, Va., by a distinguished former Oklahoman, Mr. James E. Webb, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The subject of the speech is patent policy of the U.S. Government, and it was given before a meeting of Aerospace Industries Association. Mr. Webb's long and distinguished Government service as well as his successful career in private industry make him eminently qualified to speak on this important topic.

Mr. Webb's speech follows:

Address by James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration

In thinking over what might be said here this evening, I was faced with two difficulties—one usual and one perhaps unusual.

The usual difficulty is that you are so well informed on all aspects of the national aeronautical and space program that any Government official would be hard pressed to tell you anything you don't already know. This, of course, leads to temptation to indulge in speculation, and while I might stir your interest with projections of manned exploration of the planets, I am not sure it would be a worthwhile contribution.

The second difficulty is the real lack of major troublesome issues between us. I believe that NASA and our partners in industry see eye to eye on the critical problems of how to get on with the Nation's aeronautical and space program.

However, there is a matter of common interest which is in flux right now. That is the matter of patent policy. I will try to bring you up to date on NASA's current views on this question.

I would also like to touch briefly on the question of NASA's interest in subcontractor selection, and to emphasize the progress we are making, in close cooperation with AIA, to improve our management processes in the complex area of program planning, mission selection, and project execution through phased project planning.

Finally, I want to suggest the value of a wide and searching review, both within and without the industry, of an important report that has recently been published by Congress—the "NASA Future Programs Task Group Report."

With respect to the patent situation, as we all know, the formulation and administration of Federal patent policy in regard to inventions made in the course of Government-sponsored research and development is by no means a simple matter.

The question of fair treatment of contractors and due respect for their property rights is complicated enough. But the questions which relate to the development of a new pattern of action to advance as well as preserve the public interest are much more difficult, particularly in an agency like NASA that must work in and advance the technologies in every area related to economic growth as well as national strength—new fields of energy use, very advanced electronics, sophisticated use of new materials, total systems engineering concepts, new ways to use the unique capabilities of highly trained men and women, and major new requirements for overall reliability.

The issue is not limited to assuring that the Government retain all the patent rights to which it is entitled. The issue is also how to stimulate inventiveness and innovation under Government research and development contracts and how to put the results to work in the stream of our national economy in ways that will yield the maximum benefits to the public and particularly to those who pay the taxes that support research and development. This is the area of predominant public interest. This is an area of NASA responsibility under the Space Act of 1958.

It is quite understandable why debate on Federal patent policy in recent years has tended to center around space programs.

Prior to issuance of the President's statement on Federal patent policy in 1963, there was a great diversity of policy and practice among the several agencies engaged in research and development in allocating rights to inventions made under Government contracts. While these differing policies could be explained partially on historical grounds, the real explanation was that each agency viewed the problem from its own vantage point and in the context of its own statutory base as well as its missions and goals.

In enacting patent provisions for NASA in 1958, Congress chose a middle ground by coupling a title-taking provision with broad waiver authority.

This middle ground approach, plus the fact that NASA's R. & D. activities involve virtually every field of science and technology, made NASA policies a focal point for discussions which took place over a number of years and culminated in a set of Government-wide patent policy guidelines issued by President Kennedy in 1963.

In formulating NASA patent policy under these Presidential Government-wide guidelines, we have consistently attempted to avoid distorting normal patterns of commercial competition; instead, we have sought to utilize these patterns to obtain the objectives sought by Congress; namely, the stimulation of inventive activity and optimum utilization of the results of this activity in the public interest.

For NASA to succeed in its missions, we urgently need the unrestrained cooperation of wide segments of industry. Some 20,000 contractors, prime and sub, are now at work in a wide variety of technologies. It has been my experience that few factors discourage a contractor's unrestrained application of his best talent to a Government contract more than a patent policy which creates uncertainty and which causes him to fear that his commercial status based on a proprietary position he has already achieved will be jeopardized.

The necessity for NASA-industry cooperation is no better demonstrated than in the context of the rapidly developing NASA technology utilization program. The input of contractors into this program, largely consisting of invention and innovation disclosures, is growing at an increasing rate. As of the end of 1964, for example, 2,661 invention disclosures from NASA contractors had been received and docketed. Of these, over 1,200, representing almost half, were received during 1964. Over 1,900 inventions and innovations which show substantial promise of commercial utility are being processed and evaluated.

These are made available for wide industrial use through technology handbooks, such as NASA SP-5002 entitled "Reliable Electrical Connections," and one just issued on micropower logic circuits (SP-5022); technology surveys, such as NASA SP-5014 on inorganic coatings; technology utilization notes such as NASA SP-5003 on "Selected Welding Techniques," and through regional dissemination centers such as the Applied Research Application Center at the University of Indiana to which NASA is furnishing about one-half its budget for a trial period of 5 years. Over 40 nonspace companies are paying the remaining one-half of the cost to obtain ready access to NASA technology.

Undoubtedly, the most controversial portion of the Government-wide patent policy established in 1963 and of NASA's operations under this policy, relates to the matter of advance waiver of commercial rights to inventions at the time of contracting. The patent provisions of the Space Act provide for a proper use of advance waiver, but up to 1963 NASA avoided allocating rights to inventions at the time of contracting largely because it was concerned that the negotiations required would unduly delay the procurement process.

Experience has shown, however, that there are a number of cases where advance waivers serve both equity and the public interest. Such waivers serve to encourage reporting of inventive activity by contractors, since an advance waiver is not effective with respect to an invention made under a contract unless the contractor submits promptly a full technical report of the invention, and the waiver is voided unless the contractor files a patent application within 8 months of reporting. Effective reporting of inventions must, of necessity, be an overriding consideration in the administration of the NASA patent provisions. No factor tends more to make unproductive the results of Government-sponsored research than failure by a contractor to follow up with timely reports to the Government regarding inventions made during the course of research. Advance waivers create a positive incentive for the contractor to prepare and submit such reports.

The Government's massive efforts in research and development, and the use of industries and universities to accomplish much of it, have resulted in increased emphasis on cooperation between industry and government, so that the latter may benefit from a contractor's investment in his technical and scientific capabilities. Advance waiver, when appropriate, is utilized to create a framework and pattern of stimulation for a cross flow of technical information and know-how between a contractor's scientists working on commercial applications and those working under a Government contract.

Under the provisions of the President's policy, which have been incorporated into NASA's new regulations, in cases where the contractor retains commercial rights to an invention, he must develop and market the invention or license others to do so within 3 years of issuance of a patent; if he does not, the Government has the right to compel royalty-free licensing of the patent. The Government has the right in all cases to require the granting of licenses, either royalty free or on reasonable terms, "to the extent that the invention is required for public use by Government regulations or as may be necessary to fulfill health needs." Under this policy, in those fields which had been principally developed by the Government, the vital question of whether the waiver of exclusive rights would possibly confer upon the contractor a preferred or dominant position is carefully considered in determining whether the public interest would be served by the waiver. Of course, when the exclusive rights are acquired by the contractor, he remains subject to the antitrust laws.

Another important portion of the NASA patent program is the licensing of NASA-owned patents and patent applications. In October of 1962 the patent licensing regulations now in effect were promulgated after extensive hearings and study. In essence, these regulations provide for royalty-free, nonexclusive licensing during the first 2 years after a patent is issued to NASA.

After the 2-year period, if the benefits of the invention have not been brought to the public, NASA will seek an exclusive licensee to exploit the invention. If, however, the invention has been commercially worked, the patent will continue to be available on a nonexclusive basis. This licensing policy differs from that of other Government agencies in that it contemplates the granting of exclusive licenses as an incentive to commercial working of Government-owned patents lying dormant with an effective procedure to implement this incentive.

Here again, the major premise in formulating the NASA licensing policy was that in granting broad licensing authority to the Administrator, Congress intended that the traditional incentives afforded by the patent system were to be utilized in making the results of NASA research activity available to benefit the entire economy—and by this I mean the incorporation of this technology in commercial products. Under the 1962 regulations, NASA has issued approximately 75 nonexclusive licenses and 2 exclusive licenses under its almost 200 patents and approximately 450 pending patent applications. Virtually all of these licenses represent instances where under the technology utilization program NASA has succeeded in stimulating industrial applications of technology resulting from NASA research activities. This further emphasizes the close interrelationship between the technology utilization program and NASA's patent program.

Now let me review for you briefly the current situation regarding new legislative proposals in the Congress on Government patent policy.

One proposal takes the form of an amendment to the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1966 which would in effect preclude NASA from following certain of the practices discussed above and the guidelines and criteria of the President's patent policy.

NASA has strongly opposed this amendment on many grounds. It is a step backwards because it amounts to a piecemeal approach to a problem which has been recognized as being government wide. Moreover, since it all but precludes NASA from ever waiving commercial rights to inventions back to NASA contractors, it would have a serious adverse effect on present efforts to find effective means through which the maximum use of new technology can be generated.

In addition to the amendment I have just been discussing, two bills of major significance regarding Federal patent policy are now pending in the Senate.

Senator McClellan, Chairman of the Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, introduced on April 23, 1965, Senate bill 1809 which provides for a Government-wide patent policy and which is founded to a great extent on the same general principles underlying the President's policy. While NASA has not completed a full analysis of the McClellan bill, it is clear that this bill incorporates the concepts that I have outlined here today, and to this extent at least NASA will undoubtedly support this bill. Senator Russell Long has also introduced a bill, Senate Bill No. 1899, which establishes a Federal Inventions Administration, and outlines a Government-wide patent policy to be administered by this new administration. Again, NASA has not completed our analysis of the Long bill, but it is encouraging that Senator Long has come to recognize the problem as one affecting the entire Government and as one which should be solved on a Government-wide basis.

Hearings on the McClellan and Long bills have been scheduled to begin June 1, and I, for one, look forward to my own and your participation in these hearings and discussions.

To keep the United States in the forefront of science and technology in the fields of aeronautic and space science, all proper incentives must be harnessed to foster the inventive capacity of this country, whether this capacity resides in universities, in government agencies, or in industry. For any patent policy to be in the public interest, it must serve to foster this capacity and to stimulate Government-industry-university cooperation in attaining our national objectives.

On the question of subcontractor selection, NASA has been criticized from time to time for doing both too much and too little.

And there has been the feeling in some quarters that if NASA took a more active role in subcontractor selection, we might be able to obtain a broader geographical distribution of our research and development work.

I hope there is no misunderstanding of NASA's position on subcontractor selection. If there is, let me clear it up.

NASA insists that the main burdens of management be placed squarely on the shoulders of the prime contractor. And this most definitely includes the prime's responsibility to select the subcontractors he thinks can best do the job. We do not intend to relieve—or appear to relieve—a prime contractor of his responsibility for getting top performance from his subcontractors.

And NASA most certainly does not have the manpower, the facilities, or the desire to operate under the so-called arsenal concept which would in effect make one of our centers the prime contractor responsible for coordinating the efforts of a group of subcontractors.

Our prime contractors have had, and will have, the responsibility of naming their subcontractors, but NASA does reserve a veto on key subcontractor designations. This is necessary, from the Government's point of view, for four main reasons: to avoid overloading a particular contractor with high priority work from various sources; to insure that adequate competition existed in the search for the subcontractor; to prevent the prime contractor from establishing, at Government expense, new sources for products and services already available from small specialty organizations; and to withhold government orders from contractors who have a poor performance record.

In certain cases, only the Government has all the background information necessary for a final decision.

So NASA does retain a right to disapprove a subcontractor selection. I am glad to say that we have very, very seldom had occasion to use this right. Nevertheless, the fact that it is there serves a number of useful purposes.

As the aerospace industry well knows, all of the major NASA programs currently underway will be concluded by the end of this decade, or soon thereafter. (This does not include the Voyager program, which is still in the program definition phase.)

In view of the long lead times involved in any significant new space project, it is essential that we start serious planning in the near future for the major programs of the next decade.

NASA has already made what I consider a very important preliminary step. The summary report of the NASA Future Programs Task Group, which was prepared in response to a request from the President, is not a formal planning document, but it is a quite complete summary of the basic capability that will be available for future projects. It does not attempt to choose among the various possibilities or to recommend priorities. It is written in nontechnical language. It is designed to provide a NASA-wide comprehensive view as a basis for wide discussion and the process of program planning and decisionmaking that is still to come.

In my letter transmitting this summary report to President Johnson, I pointed out that major decisions on space require a broad national concensus, and that during the next several years it is likely that the selection of major new space missions will be the subject of serious study and debate by many individuals and agencies in public and private walks of life. Therefore, I recomended that the future programs report be made public. The President agreed with this, and the report has now been published by both the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, and the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The report has three main sections. The first one describes the major capabilities already achieved or being achieved in aeronautics, satellite applications, unmanned exploration of space, manned operations in space, launch vehicles, and basic technology.

The second section describes how these capabilities, or modest extensions of them, could be effectively used in intermediate missions late in this decade and in the early years of the next decade.

The third section describes longer range possibilities which will require major new advances in technology.

I know you are familiar with all of these current capabilities and future possibilities, but when they are all set forth in matter-of-fact language in one publication they are very impressive and somewhat surprising. For example, in the third section under the heading "Long-Term Development," we find the following:

Under aeronautics: A section on hypersonic transports; recoverable orbital transport; and commercial vertical and short takeoff and landing aircraft.

Under satellite applications: Material on direct TV broadcasts via satellite to home receivers; global navigation aids and air and sea traffic control; and continuous global weather observation.

Under unmanned exploration of space: A discussion of probes and landers to distant planets; solar probes; and galactic probes reaching out of the solar system.

Under manned space exploration: Conventional takeoff and landing of space vehicles; large permanent space laboratories; roving lunar vehicles and lunar bases; and manned planetary exploration.

Under launch vehicles and propulsion: Boosters to put 1 million pounds in Earth orbit; recoverable boosters; nuclear engines; and electric propulsion.

Under basic technology: Isotope power supplies of 1- to 2-kilowatt capacity; guidance and control to land spacecraft within miles of a selected point on Mars; communications with a capacity of 3,000 bits per second from Mars; and so forth.

In discussing these possibilities, the Task Group stated: "We believe that these kinds of advances not only can be made, but will be made, if not by the United States then by Soviet Russia or possibly by some other nation. Further, if vigorous, intelligent, well-planned and well-managed programs are pursued, such advances can be made in an orderly progression without crash programs or excessively expensive efforts."

This report does not represent a projection of what NASA is going to recommend or what the President might request in future budgets. It does provide a basis for further analysis and for the process of discussion and debate that is now due. We in NASA hope that many gifted and farsighted leaders in the aerospace industry will use this report as a starting point for the discussion our next moves clearly call for. There have been few times in our national history when the American people have been faced with more stimulating possibilities or a more challenging agenda.

To further facilitate the space planning and decisionmaking tasks ahead, we are also working on a new management approach called phased project planning.

Under phased project planning, we envisage four separate and distinct steps in the orderly process leading to new research and development projects of major significance. These four phases are: advanced studies, project definition, preliminary design, and development and operations.

This is a new concept at NASA, and we are still in the process of thinking it through and working up a manual on it. In general, it is similar to systems program management procedures used by the Department of Defense, but in some significant details it is quite different.

We hope you will become familiar with this new approach because we expect to add no major project to our list of approved missions without the hard formative process that phased project planning requires.

This new approach, when fully implemented, provides protection to industry and Government against the major causes of cost overruns and program slippages. It will enable us to keep open as many options as possible for as long as possible and will give aerospace contractors greater assurance that a project will be carried to completion; that a fair return commensurate with risk will be possible; and that we know with some precision what we need and are prepared to pay for.

We also believe that phased project planning will enable us to make more effective use of incentive contracts in the final development and operations phase, where the heavy costs are involved.

In the preliminary design or third phase, for example, we will carry out the breadboarding and test of critical subsystems and even major systems, if necessary, prior to a total agency commitment to fund the development and operation of flight hardware.

In the past, breadboarding was a concurrent element of a development contractor's effort. The result was that problems arising at this point could, and often did, adversely affect the schedule at a time when the rate of expenditure on the project was at its highest.

In the first phase, advanced studies, much of the work will be done in NASA centers. Support from contractors, where required, would be for fixed-price, lump-sum, short-term investigations of specific subproblems within the larger framework being reviewed by our in-house scientific and technical personnel. This, of course, could involve a large number of contractors.

In the second phase, project definition, we will have several contractors working under identical fixed-price and fixed-term contracts. In the third, or preliminary design phase, we would normally expect to have two highly qualified contractor teams detailing their designs to carry out the most effective approach to the given objective. Design would not be all, however. Specifications for the needed facilities, tests, flight operations, and other support must be drawn up and validated. Management plans drawn up by the contractor and by NASA must be coordinated. And the contractor selected for the final development and operation phase must be prepared to stand by the cost and schedule estimates he prepares. In turn, NASA must work with him to identify the incentive features to be applied in the final phase.

Perhaps that is enough for tonight. You can see, I think, that in the future we expect to do things quite differently from the way we have had to do them in the past. We will both benefit, and a working group of NASA and AIA representatives has been set up to work together on the program as it develops. This working group has already held one meeting, and plans to meet monthly for as long as necessary.

Thank you for the chance to meet with you.

TAXATION OF RECEIPTS OF THE NEW HAMPSHIRE SWEEPSTAKES

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Huot] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the administration's proposal to eliminate and reduce certain excise taxes will be coming before the House.

I will support this proposal since I firmly believe the program of excise tax cuts and revisions will spur growth and move us closer to full employment.

However, there is one area I believe the administration has not considered—the taxation of the receipts of the New Hampshire Sweepstakes, a nonprofit program designed to raise funds for public education in my State.

It seems highly unfair that chapter 35 of the Internal Revenue Code applies to the New Hampshire lottery since it does not apply to wagering at parimutuel races, lotteries held in private gambling casinos, or lotteries held by many tax-exempt corporations.

Our Democratic Governor, Hon. John W. King, during the 1964 session of our legislature signed this act providing millions of dollars for our schools. We then learned that the Federal Government was to take over one-half million dollars during the first year of operation.

I do not contend that those who purchase winning receipts on our lottery should not be taxed. The State of New Hampshire recognizes that taxes on winnings are appropriate since it is added income to the winner.

However, New Hampshire should not be taxed for its system of raising money for better education. The Federal Government does not tax a State for revenue received through the sale of liquor or racing. Why then should a tax be levied against it on its sweepstakes operation? Is it the policy of the Federal Government to tax a State because it appeals to its citizen's sense of wagering?

It is quite obvious to me, Mr. Speaker, that a discriminatory practice on the part of the Federal Government is being imposed upon the State of New Hampshire. New Hampshire has chosen the sweepstakes rather than an income or sales tax, to raise money to improve its educational institutions. The levying of an excise tax on moneys received from this lottery, I believe, is improper, the same way a tax on moneys received from any other tax system would be improper.

My distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Hampshire has stated he will introduce on the floor of the Senate an amendment exempting a State-conducted sweepstakes from taxation by the Federal Government.

I am hopeful that Senator McIntyre's amendment will receive favorable consideration by the U.S. Senate so that it then can be voted on by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am in possession of a number of pamphlets published by the New Hampshire Sweepstakes Commission which explains fully the operation of our very successful lottery. If any Member of the House wishes to receive one of these pamphlets, he may do so by contacting my office.

THE MIGRANT FARMWORKER CAN HELP FIGHT THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, some people, I think, tend to get a little confused about who the enemy is in this war against poverty. In this war we are supposed to be aiming at the poor conditions which create poverty, not the poor people who are victimized by those conditions.

For example, two of the greatest problems which the migrant farmworker faces are first, he is underemployed, that is, he often cannot find work; and second, the little work that he does find brings poor wages under substandard conditions. The solution lies not in plowing the poor migrant farmworker under the ground with foreign semislaves, called braceros, who will work for even poorer wages under even more substandard conditions. That is no way to fight the war against poverty, or to eliminate open-air sweatshops. The proper thing to do, as many of us have been saying for years, is to improve employment recruitment, improve wages, and improve working conditions for farmworkers.

During the past few months farmers and growers who formerly used braceros extensively have had the opportunity to work with domestic farmworkers. The initial results have been remarkable. For they show that migrant farmworkers can be enlisted as soldiers in the war against poverty, that what is good for the migrant farmworkers is good for the farms and the economy.

Only yesterday, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz released statistics showing that the increased use of Americans for seasonal farmwork in California is having a favorable effect on both employment opportunities and welfare rolls. Secretary Wirtz said that May 15 seasonal farm employment is up 16.1 percent from a year ago and that the number of families receiving welfare in the farm areas is down sharply. Mr. Wirtz' statement followed the most recent report from the California farm labor panel in which it was unanimously decided "not to recommend the granting of any pending requests for bracero labor at this time." The report noted that whereas the total seasonal domestic labor force on May 15, 1964, was 120,000, on May 15, 1965, it rose to 139,400.

In Monterey County, where braceros have been used extensively in past years, the director of county welfare reported that only 77 families received welfare during April of this year, as compared with 313 in April 1964.

But the report, in addition to praising the cooperative efforts that have been noted in agricultural labor-management activities, was sharply critical of the strawberry industry. The panel said that existing data shows a significant increase in the use of domestic workers in practically every crop except strawberries, and went on to say:

> From the indications we conclude that the efforts of the strawberry industry to recruit domestic labor have fallen short of their full potential * * *. We recommend that an immediate, all-out effort be made to recruit both A-team and adult domestic workers and their families to harvest the strawberry crop.

The advantages to the economy of helping the domestic farmworker to help himself are numerous and cumulative. For example, in addition to the drop in unemployment and public relief expenditures as a direct result of the elimination of the bracero program and the stepped-up recruitment of domestic farmworkers, it is estimated that Mexican farmworkers earned about $36 million last year in California and spent only $6 million in that State. Obviously, if domestic farmworkers earn the same $36 million on California farms this year all of it will be spent in this country, and probably most of it in California.

In addition, according to the California Department of Agriculture market research office, California production of fruits and vegetables this year is slightly higher than at this time last year. As of the last full reporting date, May 13, there were 19,138 carlots of lettuce shipped from California as compared to 19,096 at this time last year. The figures for tomatoes, asparagus, and other crops are similar.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the Record an article from the AFL-CIO News, May 29, 1965, entitled "California Crop Shipments Belie Growers Claims of Huge Losses"; an article from the International Potter, May 1965, entitled "A Working Secretary"; and an article from the Washington Post of this morning, June 1, 1965, entitled "Wirtz Says Farm Change Is Boon." By the way, the article from the International Potter is dramatically illustrated by photographs which unfortunately cannot be reproduced in the Record. However, I would like to include two of the captions. The first caption appears below a picture of a shaky-looking wooden barracks before which two small children are standing:

> These barracks have doors on one side, windows on the other. There is no running water or sanitary facilities. The children are tomorrow's citizens or society's wards or criminals. Tenants of this housing may use TV aerial free.

The second caption appears above a windowless, painted shack in front of which a woman is standing:

> Below: This wife and her worker husband pay over $50 monthly for shanty without water or sewer, plus their electric bill.

The articles follow:

[From the AFL-CIO News, May 29, 1965]

California Crop Shipments Belie Growers' Claims of Huge Losses

Los Angeles.—Grower claims of catastrophic crop losses because of a shortage of farmworkers have been undermined substantially by Government reports which show more production this year than last.

Organized labor and church groups have been vigorously fighting attempts by the growers—mostly in California and Florida—to get a revival of the dead Mexican farm labor import program.

The Government has authorized the use of some foreign workers under regular immigration laws, but the number is less than 10 percent of those brought in last year (about 35,000 at this time in California alone).

Results, say the growers, are heavy crop losses. Union leaders, including State AFL-CIO Executive Secretary-Treasurer Thomas L. Pitts and Los Angeles AFL-CIO Secretary W. J. Bassett, maintain that there are almost no crop losses and that if growers were to raise wages and improve working conditions even more than they have been required, there would be no shortage of workers.

The Federal Government, in addition, makes the point that even if there were crop losses, they would be offset by the millions of dollars being earned by U.S. farmworkers and spent in this country.

In California alone, there are nearly 14,000 more U.S. workers on farms this year than last. The Government estimates that last year, Mexican farmworkers earned about $36 million, and spent only $6 million in this State.

As a result of new minimum wages which growers must pay if they want foreign workers, and because of the lack of low-wage imported labor, U.S. farmworkers are earning up to 50 percent more than last year.

As for crop production, L. N. Gardner, head of the Department of Agriculture's market research office here, said: "California production of fruits and vegetables this year is slightly higher overall than at this time last year, despite the bitter complaints from growers of heavy crop losses."

Prices of some crops are higher, but "in view of the increased volume generally, it is difficult to attribute the price increases to labor shortages," he said. Lettuce production is higher than last year, even though California winter lettuce from the Imperial Valley was actually held back from the market by "harvesting holidays" because growers reached agreement on quotas to try to stop lettuce from flooding the market, Gardner said.

As of the last full reporting date of May 13, there were 19,138 carlots of lettuce shipped from California compared to 19,096 at this time last year, he noted. Prices are now higher than last year for lettuce, but at the start of the year, were down to about $2 a carton compared to $5 last year. Supplies of lettuce are still heavy, Gardner said. He added that the only explanation he could give for continued high volume and high prices is that "housewives decide what they will pay" and "the vagaries of the weather."

Tomatoes are also going out in greater number this year—10,419 carlots so far compared to 10,130 last year. Some growers are blaming Mexican imports for taking away U.S. production because of lower labor costs in Mexico. But nationally, Mexico has sent the United States only 5,690 carlots of tomatoes this year compared to 5,713 carlots last year at this time.

Asparagus shipments by rail are up to 1,713 carlots compared to 1,452 last year, while prices for the growers are higher.

Strawberries also are being produced in larger quantity than last, although more are going to processors who freeze and can the berries.

Oranges are slightly behind in normal production rates, but while the fruit may stay on the trees longer, and so increase in size, Gardner said the total crop volume of navel oranges should be about the same this year as last.

Florida this year had a bumper crop which cause the price of canned orange juice to drop sharply.

Lemons are being harvested more slowly this year than last. This will mean more going to the processors, which brings a smaller return to growers than when the fruit is sold on the fresh market.

[From the International Potter, May 1965]

A Working Secretary

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz is a working Presidential Cabinet member if ever there was one. In order to learn the problems connected with migrant agricultural labor, Secretary Wirtz recently made trips to the big corporate farms of California and Florida.

He went into the fields and talked with the workers. He talked with their wives and their children. He went into the shanties which they must call home. He listened to them tell of their problems and frustrations. He looked at the almost totally inadequate sanitary facilities as human beings are forced by circumstances to live in structures which would not be used as chicken houses on many respectable farms.

The large corporate farms and farmer cooperatives have been pressuring the Labor Department to admit more foreign low-wage workers. Secretary Wirtz has been resisting these pressures in behalf of the American agricultural workers who would be deprived of even these paltry wages if foreign workers take their jobs. In addition, society would be injured as displaced U.S. workers were forced onto relief rolls.

Farmers along the U.S.-Mexican border want more Mexican braceros admitted, claiming that available U.S. workers cannot do the job. Farmers in Florida want Jamaicans admitted, claiming that there are not enough field workers available. Wirtz went to the scenes to check the facts for himself.

The pictures on this page [not printed in the Record] speak three things. They tell eloquently of the plight of these unfortunates caught on the fringes of misery. They secondly pay mute tribute to a dedicated, hard-working, industrious Secretary of Labor. Finally, they bespeak an object lesson on what often happens to workers who are gloriously free of any necessity to pay union dues.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 1, 1965]

Wirtz Says Farm Change Is Boon

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz said yesterday that the increased use of Americans for seasonal farmwork in California is having a favorable effect on both employment opportunities and welfare rolls.

In a report on the California farm situation, Wirtz said that on May 15 domestic seasonal farm employment was up 16.1 percent from a year ago and that the number of families receiving welfare aid in the farm areas was down sharply.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONSTITUTION OF TUNISIA

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Farnum] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1959, a constitution that in many respects is similar to our own, was promulgated for Tunisia, which had been among the free nations of the world since March 20, 1956.

This ancient land has much in the past to be proud of, and under President Habib Bourguiba is following a policy that promises to make its modern history also noteworthy.

Over 3,000 years ago Phoenicians had established various communities, including the famous city of Carthage, there. In the seventh century A.D., a new historic chapter opened when the area became a major center of Western Islamic culture and political power. After a later period of Turkish rule, Tunisia became a French protectorate in 1883 and a stirring for independence began to manifest itself.

This was given drive and purpose in 1934 with the founding of the Neo-Destour—New Constitution—Party, of which Mr. Bourguiba soon became president. In the struggles for freedom that followed he came to be called supreme combatant—a title as meaningful to his people as "Father of His Country" is to us.

We may be proud since that we have in several ways—through providing economic and technical assistance as well as surplus agricultural commodities—aided the new nation in its struggle to assume a proud place among the free nations of the world.

In offering our congratulations to the people of Tunisia, and to President Bourguiba on this anniversary, we should also extend our greetings to two other outstanding individuals. One, of course, is Bahi Ladgham, a famous Neo-Destour leader, and the other Mongi Slim, who before he was called home for even more important responsibilities was Ambassador to United States and that proud nation's representative in the United Nations.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to reaffirm my strongest support for the administration immigration program, which I am cosponsoring through my bill H.R. 6022.

This legislation is long overdue. Four Presidents of the United States have urged changes in our immigration and naturalization procedures. They and the greater body of American citizens have strongly demanded the elimination of the national origins system. Yet, for too long, such action has not been forthcoming from the Congress. Mr. Speaker, the idea of altering our immigration regulations so as to eliminate the national origins system has been proposed again and again. We cannot let that idea escape us once more. The time for action is now, in this year 1965, by this 89th Congress.

For all too long, America's immigration and naturalization laws have been in conflict with our national history and ideals. Before the institution of the national origins system, this country accepted new citizens on the basis of their own personal qualities, and their commitment to our democratic ideals. Yet now our present policy actually discriminates among applicants for admission into the United States on the basis of accident of birth. The national origins system thus implies that people from one country are more desirable than people from another. This is a proposition our history has rejected from its earliest years.

Oscar Handlin, perhaps the most authoritative student of American immigrant history, had said:

> Once I thought to write a history of immigrants in America. Then I discovered that the immigrants were American history.

This is a sentiment which John F. Kennedy reinforced in his memorable study, "A Nation of Immigrants."

In one way, we are all immigrants. None of us can afford to ignore the debt this country owes those people who came here to find a new life and take up new citizenship. We offered them a prize by granting citizenship. But that grant was paid back a hundredfold by their contribution to our life. We cannot allow this legacy to be blemished. Yet many throughout the world know only our present discriminatory policy. Suggestions of our rich democratic past are met with skepticism and doubt. And this skepticism is often the existence of our national origins system.

If that system is unfaithful to our past, it also corrupts our present. This country is now involved in a great struggle against the forces of discrimination and the apostles of bigotry. Our national energy and conscience are committed to that fight and its quest for equality. The past Congress dramatized that commitment when it passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Yet the same specter of discrimination, which we so firmly oppose in our domestic affairs, still appears beneath the surface of our immigration and naturalization policies. Such an inconsistency cannot be allowed to remain untouched. What may appear to some as a technicality, appears to others throughout the world as a deep injustice.

The national origins system is archaic as well as unethical. It seems clear to me that the effect of the national origins has deeply confused our immigration procedures. The system heavily favors northern Europeans who rarely fill their quota, and severely limits immigration from southern and eastern Europe, Africa, and Asia where there are lengthy waiting lists. Over 90 percent of the total immigration quota is reserved for European countries. Due to its inflexibility the McCarran-Walter Act actually governs only about one-third of total immigration to the United States. The majority of immigrants enter under private immigration legislation. Surely we can devise a program which is more in touch with present realities.

The proposed new immigration program is based on a technique of preferential admissions which seeks to attract to our country persons with ceptional skills, training, or education. It acknowledges the special continuation of that tradition, and replaces the unethical system of national origins quotas. Yet we are not concerned simply with attracting skilled foreigners to our country. A newly defined immigration policy will be humanitarian as well. We should have provisions which take into special account cases where families are needlessly separated from one another by out-of-date regulations. We will continue and fortify provisions which admit political refugees and refugees from catastrophe.

The central feature of a new immigration and naturalization program, however, must be the elimination of the national origins system. We must repair the damage done to those who have been denied entrance to this country on the basis of outdated procedure and unjust criteria. In so doing, we must, for example, be prepared to permit quota numbers not used by any country to be made available to countries where they are deeply needed. We must eliminate the highly discriminatory provisions dealing with the newly independent countries of the Western Hemisphere. We must do away with the Asia-Pacific triangle program. These proposals have been reached after the careful and deliberate consideration of experts in the executive branch. They have the earnest leadership of a President who well understands the significance of American immigrant history.

Our goal, therefore, should be a policy which is in the best traditions of our past and in the best interests of our future, a policy which is sanctioned by our democratic code of ethics, a policy which fortifies rather than compromises our foreign policy, and a policy which, above all, treats all men as human beings to be judged solely on their qualities as individuals.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF THE CLAY-LISTON FIGHT

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, last week this Nation recoiled in disgust at one of the most nauseating sports demonstrations in our history. To say that the Clay-Liston engagement was a new low for boxing is a masterpiece of understatement.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government for some time has been undertaking the responsibility of proceeding in the protection of the American consuming public. President's commissions have been created for this purpose to study and investigate consumer fraud. I would heartily recommend that Mrs. Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, undertake an investigation of the Clay-Liston fight.

It would certainly qualify as a consumer fraud from one end of the country to the other. Sports fans assembled in theaters to view a telecast of a supposed legitimate encounter between two heavyweight contenders. Millions of dollars were involved in this fight promotion. Those attending these telecasts were victimized by two pretenders who were putting on a sham performance, the net affect of which can only bring on the demise of boxing as a legitimate sport.

MOTION ADOPTED BY THE SECOND CHAMBER OF THE STATES-GENERAL OF THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS WITH REGARD TO THE EVENTS IN VIETNAM

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under date of May 20, 1965, I received a letter, with enclosure, a copy of a motion adopted by the Second Chamber of the States-General of the Kingdom of the Netherlands at The Hague, sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the President of the Second Chamber of the States-General of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Honorable F. J. F. M. van Thiel, which I herewith include in my extension of remarks:

THE HAGUE,
May 20, 1965.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND COLLEAGUE: During its meeting on May 18, 1965, the Second Chamber of the States-General has adopted a motion with regard to the events in Vietnam.

Pursuant to the wording of the penultimate paragraph of this motion, I have the honor to enclose herewith the English translation of it. I should be grateful if the document could be distributed among the Members of your House.

Yours sincerely,
F. J. F. M. VAN THIEL,
President of the Second Chamber of the States-General.

[The 1964–65 session, 8083]

EVENTS IN VIETNAM—MOTION OF ORDER INITIATED BY MR. RUYGERS ET AL.—NO. 2—MOVED ON MAY 18, 1965

The Chamber—after hearing the debates on events in Vietnam, holding the view that Peiping China's attitude is the main cause of the increased tension and that the United

States is entitled to understanding and support from her NATO partners in her ultimate political objective, viz, to check Communist China's expansionist policy in Asia—requests the Government to help, in international political consultations, to bring about (1) a truce that will put a stop to any direct or indirect aggression, thus reducing the risk of the war spreading and constituting the basis for unconditional negotiations; (2) a political settlement of the conflict—based on the Geneva Conventions of 1954—under appropriate international supervision; and (3) the active participation, after cessation of hostilities, by as many European countries as possible in the large-scale aid program for southeast Asia announced by President Johnson,

The Chamber resolves to bring this motion to the notice of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives and to the Parliaments of the European NATO partners; and passes on to the order of the day.

RESEARCH ANIMAL SLAUGHTER ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would require Federal inspection of the slaughter for food of all those animals previously used for research purposes supported in whole or in part by Federal grants.

The vast increase in scientific and medical research which has occurred in recent years has caused a corresponding increase in the Nation's population of research animals. Not only are animals used for basic research, but they are needed in large numbers to test the effectiveness and safety of drugs, insecticides, food additives, and other classes of chemical products.

Since many research animals are of types commonly used for human food, it is important that measures be taken to insure that cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, and poultry used for scientific studies do not find their way into commercial food channels without a thorough check being made of the safety of their meat for human consumption.

Some people will question whether the number of food-type animals used for research is sufficient to justify such legislation. I think the best answer would be that if the number was not sufficient, the U.S. Department of Agriculture would not have issued its regulations requiring such special inspection in federally inspected plants. The National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council has issued a survey report on the use of all types of experimental animals for medical research which indicated that the following numbers were used in a recent year: Poultry, 112,491; swine, 4,361; sheep, 3,990; horses, 695.

The report did not give any figures for cattle. It is also important to note that the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council survey covered only animal use in medical research. It is my belief that the number of this type of animal in agricultural research would be much greater.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture last year issued regulations which require the owners of food-type research animals to provide Federal meat inspectors with a complete history of the diets and treatments the animals had received. After analyzing that information, the inspectors would perform visual checks on the animals and also chemical tests if they deemed it necessary. These procedures would intercept and prevent the sale of carcasses of research animals that are unfit for human consumption.

However, these new regulations of the Department of Agriculture still leave an important loophole through which unfit research animal meat could find its way to market. The USDA regulations apply only to those slaughtering establishments which are under Federal inspection procedure. Although some States now have adopted meat inspection laws which are identical with the Federal law, meat inspection procedures in many States do not now provide for special inspection of research animals; and it is unlikely that State laws will provide such protection for many years. An owner of food-type research animals who suspects that they will not pass the new and more rigid Federal requirements is free in many cases to take those animals to processing plants under State inspection only, where no questions about their origin is likely to be asked. An ironic aspect of this situation is the fact that a great number of these research animals are supported at least in part by Federal appropriations.

The bill I am today introducing, to be known as the Research Animal Slaughter Act, will make the U.S. Department of Agriculture regulation on inspection of experimental animals more effective by extending its protection to all food-type animals supported in whole or in part by Federal grants. It requires that recipients of such grants be informed that research animals supported by those funds must be taken for slaughter to a federally inspected processing plant if their owners desire that their carcasses be sold for use as food. The bill will not create a hardship for research workers and institutions, because federally inspected slaughtering establishments are located at convenient places through the country and, as has been pointed out, constitute the majority of all meat processing plants. This legislation is a logical extension of the effectiveness of the Department of Agriculture's regulations in this area.

Most important, this legislation will provide an added assurance that consumers will not be sold meat that contains unsafe amounts of chemicals, has been subjected to the causative agent of any harmful disease, or has been treated with radiation or any other force or substance capable of affecting the animal or its biological processes in a way that would make its meat unsafe for use as food.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WILLIS (at the request of Mr. WAGGONNER), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. SMITH of New York (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business as a member of the National Commission on Food Marketing attending hearings in Omaha, Nebr.

Mr. ROOSEVELT, from Friday, June 4, through Monday, June 7, 1965, on account of attendance at ILO Conference.

Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the remainder of the week, on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, on Wednesday, June 2, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PELLY, today, for 15 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. BROCK), for 1 hour, on June 2; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. SWEENEY), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. ROONEY of New York to revise and extend his remarks make in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 8639, and to include tables.

Mr. PHILBIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROCK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TALCOTT.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SWEENEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COHELAN.

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. GRIDER.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 821. An act for the relief of the town of Kure Beach, N.C.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 821. An act for the relief of the town of Kure Beach, N.C.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 2, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1175. A letter from the Chairman, Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, transmitting the fifth annual report of Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia for period ending May 31, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 86-531; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1176. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of overprocurements resulting from ineffective supply management in Korea under the military assistance program, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1177. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of observations on program designed to evaluate effectiveness of controls over highway construction, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1178. A letter from the Chairman, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports of visa petitions approved, pursuant to provisions of section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1179. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials, opened for signature at Lake Success on November 22, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1180. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the President's determination pursuant to the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 25, 1965, the following bill was reported on May 29, 1965:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 7105. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted June 1, 1965]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1000. An act to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions; with amendment (Rept. No. 435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 404. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8371, a bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 436). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5860. A bill to amend the law relating to the final disposition of the property of the Choctaw Tribe; with amendment (Rept. No. 437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8464. A bill to provide, for the period beginning on July 1, 1965, and ending on June 30, 1966, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6400. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 8662. A bill to establish a selective immigration system and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 8663. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 8664. A bill to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials, opened for signature at Lake Success on November 22, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 8665. A bill to require Federal inspection of slaughter for human food purposes of animals used for research purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 8666. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to place the key position of foreman, mails, salary level 7, in salary level 8 of the postal field service schedule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8667. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase the rate of extra compensation of postal field service employees for each hour of night work from 10 to 15 percent of their hourly basic compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8668. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide intervals of 1 year between steps for purposes of automatic advancement by step increases for postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8669. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to correct certain inequities with respect to promotions of postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 8670. A bill to incorporate the 6th U.S. Infantry Association Auxiliary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 8671. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, in order to make permanent the authorization for certain payments under the provisions of such laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 8672. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 relating to bills and resolutions introduced in the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 8673. A bill to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 8674. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 8675. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over nonprofit cooperatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8676. A bill to establish and prescribe the duties of a Federal Boxing Commission for the purpose of insuring that the channels of interstate commerce are free from false or fraudulent descriptions or depictions of professional boxing contests; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 8677. A bill to provide assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and other personnel, and in improving capabilities, techniques, and practices in State and local law enforcement and prevention and control of crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H.R. 8678. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 8679. A bill to establish a selective immigration system and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 8680. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 8681. A bill to amend section 3 of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 8682. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 8683. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit to an individual taxpayer for tuition and fees paid to an institution of higher education, and to allow a tax credit to all taxpayers for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 8684. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the General Federation of Women's Clubs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 8685. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to provide for relocation payments to persons displaced by public building projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 8686. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to provide for relocation payments to persons displaced by public building projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 8687. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over nonprofit cooperatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALKER of Mississippi:

H.R. 8688. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to increase the maximum amount of certain home improvement loans which may be insured, to extend the permissible maturity of these loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 8689. A bill to appropriate funds to the Secretary of the Army for the acquisition of a building on Fort Jay Military Reservation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8690. A bill to amend section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8691. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8692. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, optometry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 8693. A bill to provide premium pay under specified conditions to certain employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.J. Res. 493. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 494. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. Res. 405. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President should take such action as may be necessary for the preparation of an international agreement to harmonize the operations and administration of the antidumping laws of all the countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H. Res. 406. Resolution to authorize the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

288. By Mr. RYAN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York relative to anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

289. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, urging construction of an urban male Job Corps Training Center at Camp Blanding, Fla.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

290. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to establishing a Pacific Medical Center in Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

291. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, expressing admiration and appreciation of the valor and courage of the fighting men and women of the various branches of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

292. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the apportionment of membership in the State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

293. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the retention of Federal excise taxes and to distribute the proceeds thereof to the individual States in the proportion of amounts collected from each individual State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

294. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to amending the Constitution prohibiting the denial or abridgment of rights under the laws of the United States or of any State on account of sex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

295. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the proposed discontinuance by the U.S. Department of Agriculture of its utilization research program on western rice; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 8694. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 8695. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to reopen and continue case No. 66–55; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 8696. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to reopen and continue case No. 66–55; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8697. A bill for the relief of Lorenza Lawrence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 8698. A bill for the relief of Miss Fong Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 8699. A bill for the relief of Mule Creek Oil Co., Inc., a Delaware corporation; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 8700. A bill for the relief of Francesco Cirrincione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, returning to the demands of a new week, we come with grateful hearts as we have bowed with all the Nation at the altar of hallowed memory. In the hours just past, millions have paused in quiet cities of the dead to acknowledge an unpayable debt to those who, in heroic yesterdays, paid for our freedom with their mortal lives.

We come now in the afterglow of that sacramental memorial, with the prayer, deep in our hearts, that this generation to which we belong may be saved from the supreme folly of decorating tombs and at the same time desecrating the heritage it took graves to guarantee.

As bugles are sounding, summoning the Republic to new tests and decisions in liberty's cause, solemnize our hearts with the realization that evergreens of gratitude and forget-me-nots of love for the sacrifices of the past will not suffice as weapons with which to preserve the costly heritage of which Memorial Day is a solemn reminder. In days as crucial and as dangerous as any the Republic has ever known, save us from cowardly surrender to the easy policy of "safety first," lest in the future we lose both the peace and freedom, and so fail both man and Thee.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 27, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5241. An act to amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate the necessity for prior approval of the Commission for a person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one carrier when such carriers are in a single integrated system of carriers lawfully operated under common control, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5883. An act to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 426) expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," at the 25th class reunion of the Harvard class of 1940 in Cambridge, Mass., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 800. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 821. An act for the relief of the town of Kure Beach, N.C.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5241. An act to amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate the necessity for prior approval of the Commission for a person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one carrier when such carriers are in a single integrated system of carriers lawfully operated under common control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 5883. An act to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 426) expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," at the 25th class reunion of the Harvard class of 1940 in Cambridge, Mass., was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 426

Whereas the graduates of Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, of the class of 1940, will be observing the twenty-fifth anniversary of their graduation during the days of June 13–June 17, 1965; and

Whereas the late beloved President of these United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was a member of the class of 1940 and was held by his classmates in deep bonds of respect, loyalty, and affection; and

Whereas the class book memorializing this occasion is dedicated to John Fitzgerald Kennedy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), That it is the sense of Congress that the United States Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make the film prepared by it on the late President Kennedy "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," available for viewing at a private showing to said Harvard University class of 1940, in the city of Cambridge, Massachusetts, on or about the days of June 13 to June 17, 1965.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ST. MARY COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have the honor to address the graduating class at St. Mary College, Xavier, Kans., on Sunday last. In effect, it was like coming home to Montana because so many of the sisters and the novices were from my State, and those who were not from Montana had been sent up there to teach in our schools in Butte and Anaconda, to work in our hospitals, and, in general, to do good for our people.

It was a real pleasure for me to meet so many Montanans and adopted Montanans, to recognize the daughters of many of my old friends, and to participate in the commencement exercises.

This order, within a decade of its founding, set up its first mission in the State of Montana, and the sisters traveled by boat up the Missouri River, later over the Oregon, Bozeman, and other trails. Their contributions to Montana and the West have been many. They have been most helpful and most beneficial and we look upon them with respect, admiration, and affection. They are responsible, in large part, for the close bond between Kansas and Montana and for that we are grateful.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the commencement address which I delivered at St. Mary College, Xavier, Kans., on Sunday, May 30, 1965.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, OF MONTANA, ST. MARY COLLEGE, XAVIER, KANS., SUNDAY, MAY 30, 1965

First, let me thank you, Sister Mary Janet, for the historical sketch you have just given of the connection between the development of Montana as it applies to your order and as a result of the close relationship between Kansas and Montana based on that fact. In addition to the places you mentioned, we could refer to the outstanding work performed by the sisters in my State within a decade after the founding of the order.

By boat you traveled up the Missouri and by land over the Oregon, the Bozeman and other trails. You made your imprint in the Beaverhead, the Madison, the Bitteroot, the Silver Bow and many other areas in Montana. In return we have contributed many of our daughters to this order and the work begun long before Custer's last stand in the Little Big Horn is being carried forward to this day. Your contributions have been many, varied and most deeply appreciated. It is my hope and expectation that this relationship will continue to fulfill its promise in the years ahead as it has over the past century.

Now, let me thank you for the invitation to come here today and talk with you. No man is so old or so tired that he likes to admit that he has nothing of interest to say to a group of attractive young ladies. So, while I am not sure I can do the trick, I very much appreciate the chance to try.

I am glad to be here for another reason as well. For young women along with other young men and women who have been given the blessed gift of education, will bear a special public responsibility in the future. This is true of course in all areas of national concern, but nowhere more so than in the difficult area of our relations with foreign governments. Here emotionalism easily runs wild, if it is untempered by education and contact with the day to day realities. In foreign affairs, more than elsewhere, there is a need for an up-to-date, sophisticated and restrained outlook. Without it, free government can be locked into postures made obsolete and dangerous by the shifting tides of international affairs. Without it a nation is likely to be always fighting the last war or the last diplomatic encounter over again, instead of facing directly and with fresh and penetrating thought the issues of the contemporary situation. And, finally, without an informed approach on the part of the people. the Nation may be unable, in its foreign policies, to take advantage of changes which occur continuously in the world, in order to strengthen the security of the Nation and the prospects for an enduring peace.

It is of some of these international changes of the past 15 years which I would like to speak today. These are changes which began as trickles just after you were born and are now coming into flood as you enter adulthood.

An overriding change since the Korean war has been the emergence of a kind of stalemate between Russia and the United States in terms of destructive nuclear capacity. Nuclear technology in both nations has now reached a point at which no significant military advantage is likely to be gained merely by pushing the accumulation of more destructive power. That is not to say that the Russians are not alert to possible technological breakthroughs or that we have gone to sleep. The search goes on here and it also goes on there. But a decisive altering of the basic nuclear stalemate is not in sight.

The fact is that both Russia and the United States are already in a position in which each can obliterate at least half the population of the other in a very short time. That is a sobering reality for all those with a share of the responsibility for the many decisions which, in the end, may involve an ultimate decision as to whether or not these instruments are used.

The very magnitude of the nuclear threat which hangs over the earth has had, oddly, a kind of constructive influence on world affairs. It is one of the realities which underlay the Russian withdrawal of missiles from Cuba a couple of years ago. And it was a major factor in the achievement of the nuclear test ban treaty. That treaty, in turn, was a precipitant in bringing about an improvement in the general relations—at least until recently—between the two principal nuclear powers. In that respect, the treaty was a most significant achievement in the drive for a more peaceful world. It stands as an enduring and appropriate monument to John Fitzgerald Kennedy—who would have been 48 yesterday—who refused, with great courage, to be deflected by political considerations, from his determination to achieve it.

The nuclear stalemate between Russia and the United States, then, is, indeed, one of the most significant changes of the past decade and a half. It has produced an international situation with which the principal nations have managed to live in reasonable stability for several years. In its context, the prospect of a Soviet military invasion of Western Europe which, for example, was once regarded as acute, appears to have receded. And by the same token, the military liberation of Eastern Europe which once was loudly trumpeted is no longer pressed from any responsible source as the basis of a sound policy for the Nation.

In short, the overall position of the two great nuclear powers in today's world appears to have become, increasingly, one of live and let live. This trend has emerged largely because the point has sunk home that the alternative is the opposite on such a scale as to drain either the triumph of freedom or the victory of communism of rational meaning. But the picture of a gradual easement in Soviet-United States relations is not complete unless we also take into consideration the effect of recent developments in Vietnam. These developments have not helped the trend which was inaugurated under President Eisenhower, pursued most effectively by President Kennedy, and vastly encouraged and continued by President Johnson.

The changed situation in Russian-United States relations in turn has been paralleled by changes throughout the Soviet bloc. It is obvious that the greater stability in Russian-United States relations has not set well with China but it has generally been welcomed by such eastern European nations as Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

Communism did not spring full-blown in those eastern European nations at the close of World War II. Communism was in fact grafted by Soviet power onto several countries with different traditions, even as Stalin shut down on them an iron lid or ideological uniformity. The clothes of Communist conformity, however, were uncomfortable in eastern Europe and beneath them, the individual national traditions continued to stir. In recent years, this force for diversity has begun to find fuller expression.

The growing independence in Eastern Europe has been encouraged cautiously by recent policies of the United States. This was a cardinal principle of the foreign policy of President Kennedy, who recognized its value with respect to Poland even when he was a Senator. The conclusion of trade agreements and travel arrangements with Eastern European countries which pose no threat to us, as, for example, with Poland and Yugoslavia, has tended to increase their independence from the Soviet Union and provided some inducement for other satellite countries to follow in their footsteps—and that they have been, in fact, doing.

In this atmosphere of reduced tension in Europe, a difficult and intricate problem remains as the central roadblock to further progress toward a stable peace in that region. That is the problem of a divided Germany. In East Germany, the Soviet Union has continued to maintain a harsh and rigid control over a people who dislike the Communist system intensely. For our part, policy with respect to Germany is, apparently, based on an official assessment of immediate Soviet intentions in Europe which differs considerably from that of our allies in Western Europe. It appears to me that these nations—West Germany, Britain, France, Italy, and others—see the Soviet situation in quite a different perspective—at least insofar as this perspective is reflected in policies. The Europeans, for example, carry on a trade with the Soviet Union which over recent years has run in the billions. What we have done in a most limited way in trade with Poland and Yugoslavia, they have done many, many times over with all of Eastern Europe and, of course, with the Soviet Union itself. Travel within Europe—East and West—is now very extensive and the lines of communication by sea, rail, road, and air between the two parts of the continent have expanded very markedly. In short, the Europeans generally have been acting with respect to the Soviet bloc as though peace had arrived in Europe. We have not, in policy, shared that optimism.

If there were a fusion of views as to precisely what the situation is, it is conceivable that, with it, there might also come a parallel recognition that proposals aimed at ending the armed confrontation in Germany and moving toward reunification are worth pursuing most intensely. A number of ideas have been advanced over the years which could serve as a beginning, but they have not as yet led to significant changes in policy.

The shift in Europe over the past few years is not unique. It is paralleled, for example, by significant changes which involve the underdeveloped countries. The political face of Africa has changed and over most of that continent, control is now exercised by African leaders rather than by Europeans. Many new nations have been added to the ranks of the intensely independent and underdeveloped states. But from the point of view of the nuclear powers, almost all such states are, now, of less importance as strategic prizes, to be wooed for their value as bases in the event of a total war. We ourselves have recognized this change to a considerable degree. We have, for example, abandoned a number of advanced air bases in these areas in the light of the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile and Polaris-carrying nuclear submarines. Similarly, the control of alien territory to insure access to strategic military raw materials which was once an absolutely vital consideration for all great powers may no longer carry quite so much weight.

This change in attitudes involving the underdeveloped nations applies in southeast Asia. President Johnson has said that there is no need for a forward base in that part of the world. Our fundamental power in the Pacific is air and sea power. This power, supreme throughout the Pacific, is sufficient to protect American security from any direct military threat from that part of the world for some years to come.

We also have in Vietnam, as elsewhere in southeast Asia, a shared interest with all free nations in resisting aggression. We can and will remain prepared to assist in stopping overt attempts to overrun peoples by force. But beyond this goal of preventing aggression in order to promote peace and freedom under the rule of law in the world, our direct national interests in southeast Asia are not nearly as great, for example, as those which we have with respect to Latin America.

For these reasons, as well as a basic aversion to war itself, the President has made it clear that we are willing to enter into unconditional discussions in an effort to find an honorable settlement in Vietnam and a more stable situation throughout southeast Asia. But if there is ever to be an honorable settlement, there has to be a beginning. There has to be a confrontation across the tables of peace. If such a meeting is to have any prospect of a successful outcome, there is also a parallel and simultaneous need for an interim cease fire and stand fast—both north and south. Unless the sounds of conflict are, first, stilled on all sides, the words of peace will not be heard on any side.

I am at a loss to understand how those elsewhere—in Peiping, for example—expect to be taken seriously in professing to hold paramount the interests of the people of Vietnam and a restoration of peace when, at the same time, they insist upon interpreting the President's words as meaning something other than unconditional discussion. It would be in our own best interests no less than in the best interests of the underdeveloped countries of southeast Asia were the latter able to concentrate on their own inner national needs and growth. That was clearly the President's hope when he offered to join with the Soviet Union and other nations in a common effort for the development of southeast Asia.

A common effort of this kind is clearly, too, the best way to help most of the underdeveloped nations, wherever they may be in the world, to remain free of outside domination and influence and to give indigenous institutions of freedom an opportunity to take root. Indeed, in the long run, it may be just about the only way to help them.

We are not likely to insure freedom within these nations by taking it upon ourselves either to overwhelm them with unilateral help or by turning our backs on their genuine needs for help. The one is the road to an isolated internationalism for this Nation. The other is the road to a national isolation for this Nation. And neither road is likely to lead to the safeguarding of the basic interests of this Nation. In short, the great need is for a discreet and discerning cooperation with other nations in dealing with underdeveloped nations.

This principle has relevance for the current crisis in the Dominican Republic which, after decades of a cruel dictatorship, is still a most underdeveloped nation. The President faced a critical situation—an emergency—there some weeks ago. He acted to meet it on humanitarian grounds and he met it well. And he is acting now to bring fully into play, the concept of cooperation with others in that situation. As a member of the Organization of American States, our military and diplomatic resources in the Dominican Republic are being used more and more in support of the Organization. For the problem in the island is not one of unique responsibility for the United States. It is one which must engage primarily the Dominican people and their leaders and, to the extent that it is necessary, the entire Western Hemisphere.

With the development of an inter-American military force, the heavy initial commitment of American forces on the island has already been reduced. And it is to be hoped, moreover, that this reduction will be rapidly accelerated if stability can be restored under the guidance of the OAS. I would hope, too, that the inter-American force which would remain could play two roles—that is, to support the efforts of the OAS and also to help in the reconstruction of Santo Domingo which has been seriously damaged in the struggle. It would also be desirable if other American states could develop a peace corps and send contingents to join the young men and women of this Nation who are already undertaking in the Dominican Republic many works of useful and peaceful construction.

To Americans, even to college students like you, the affairs of nations outside our borders may seem remote and unimportant at times, especially on a day like today. But I need not remind you—on Memorial Day—that events whose origins lay thousands of miles from our shores have reached into this Nation in the past and called us to sacrifice. As Americans, as inhabitants of the only world we have, I ask you to exercise the increasing responsibility which will be yours in the years ahead to see that no stone lies unturned, that no outdated myth or ancient hatred lies unexamined, and that no opportunity is neglected in the slow painstaking search for a lasting peace.

And I ask you, too, to give your prayers to the President of the United States. His is the enormous burden in these matters. His is the paramount responsibility. For him, there is no rest from the incessant pressure of the problems of the Nation. For him, there is a plethora of advice and criticism which is easily enough extended. But upon him, in the end, falls the weight of grave decision as he seeks to follow the slender path to that stable peace which is the world's great need.

For our President we give our prayers and for you, the graduating class of 1965, I express the hope, the wish, and the prayer as laid down in an old Gaelic blessing:

"May the road rise to meet you.
May the wind always be at your back.
May the sun shine warm upon your face
And the rains fall soft upon your fields.
And, until we meet again, may God hold
you in the hollow of His hand."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proposed Supplemental Appropriation, 1965, To Increase the U.S. Quota to the International Monetary Fund (S. Doc. No. 31)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1965, in the amount of $1,035 million, in order to increase the U.S. quota to the International Monetary Fund (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Report on Contracts for Experimental, Developmental, or Research Work

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report on Overobligations of Appropriations

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligations of certain appropriations within that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Approval of Loan to East River Electric Power Cooperative, Inc., Madison, S. Dak.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the East River Electric Power Cooperative, Inc., of Madison, S. Dak., in the amount of $5,919,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Prosposed Transfer of Certain Boats to U.S.S. "Alabama" Battleship Commission Mobile, Ala.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed transfer of two motor whaleboats to the U.S.S. *Alabama* Battleship Commission, Mobile, Ala.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Department of Defense Procurement From Small and Other Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other firms, for the period July 1964–March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Simplification of Admeasurement of Small Vessels

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on observations on program designed to evaluate effectiveness of controls over highway construction, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on additional overpayments of rentals for automatic data processing machines at Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md., National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary procurement of Hawk and Nike-Hercules missile spare components because of deficiencies in requirements computations, Department of the Army, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings in interest costs to the Government attainable by greater use of Treasury checking account, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on loss of revenue resulting from inadequate negotiations for communications services between Alaska and the U.S. mainland, Department of the Army, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on additional costs incurred under the dairy products price-support program by purchasing butter outside the general areas of production, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Recommendations on Participation by the United States in the Celebration of Alaska's 100th Anniversary

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, his recommendations on participation by the United States in the celebration of Alaska's 100th anniversary under the American flag (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Organic Acts of Guam and the Virgin Islands

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam, and to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Increase in Retired Pay of Certain Members of the Former Lighthouse Service

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide an increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 25

"A concurrent resolution proposing to apply to the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the apportionment by the several States of membership in the legislatures of such States

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Louisiana (the House of Representatives concurring) That the Legislature of Louisiana respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'Sec. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'Sec. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.'

"Be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"C. C. Aycock,
"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.
"Vail M. Delony,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"State of New York Resolution 27

"Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt an appropriate amendment to the Federal Constitution prohibiting the denial or abridgment of rights under the laws of the United States or of any State on account of sex

"Whereas the women of our Nation have enjoyed full civil rights since the adoption of the Nineteenth Amendments; and

"Whereas all citizens of our Nation should not only share equal civil rights but also equal legal rights; and

"Whereas there exist many statutes discriminating against women; and

"Whereas such legal differentiations, merely because of sex, lower the nation's prestige and status in the world community; and

"Whereas both political parties announced support of equal legal rights in their respective platforms; and

"Whereas such a discriminating situation is outmoded and intolerable: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to give favorable consideration to the required enabling legislation to present to the States for adoption an amendment to the U.S. Constitution providing, in substance, that 'equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex'; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York.

"In senate, May 20, 1965.

"Concurred in, without amendment.

"By order of the senate:

"GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN,
"Secretary.

"By order of the assembly:

"JOHN T. MCKENNAN, *Clerk."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 30

"To the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:

"We your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas, there is pending before Congress, the Dodd bills, known as S. 1591 and S. 1592, relating to regulation and registration of interstate firearms sales; and

"Whereas, this legislation, if enacted could: (1) Deny private citizens their constitutional property rights of selling personal valuable or rare firearms to other private citizens through interstate shipment; (2) force private citizens to sell firearms in interstate commerce only to dealers at a property value loss; and (3) infringe upon the constitutional right of private citizens to keep and bear arms: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialists respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to take great caution not to enact any legislation relating to the regulation and registration of interstate firearms sales which would tend to infringe upon the aforementioned constitutional rights of citizens of the United States; be it

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Passed the house April 27, 1965.

"ROBERT M. SCHAEFER,
"Speaker of the House.

"Passed the senate May 7, 1965.

"JOHN A. CHERBERG,
"President of the Senate.

"I hereby certify this to be a true and correct copy of House Joint Memorial 30.

S. R. HOLCOMB,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Whereas funds available for construction, renovation, and modernization of hospitals under the Hill-Harris Act depend upon congressional appropriations; and

"Whereas the amounts appropriated have been generally less than the full statutory amounts authorized; and

"Whereas grants under the Hill-Harris Act may constitute up to 48 percent of the total costs of hospital construction, renovation, and modernization but have constituted less than the maximum allocation because of insufficient congressional appropriation; and

"Whereas hospital construction, renovation, and modernization in the State of Hawaii are vital to the health, safety, and welfare of the people of Hawaii where the projected population growth requiring expanded health facilities imposes a heavy burden on State and local financial resources: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1965 (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation which will appropriate the full amount of funds authorized to the U.S. Public Health Service under the Hill-Harris Act for construction, renovation, and modernization of hospitals; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress and to the members of the Hawaii contingent in Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Whereas prior to statehood a veteran in Hawaii could be hospitalized in a hospital located in his own island community; and

"Whereas the advantages of local community hospitalization for veterans are many and significant in a State comprised of islands separated by ocean waters, including the advantages of economy, convenience, comfort, and proximity of family; and

"Whereas prior to statehood, Hawaii's hospitals assumed their full obligation to veterans and built their facilities with adequate beds to care for veterans and such facilities are now available to provide care and service for veterans: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1965 (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to consider legislation which will authorize the Veterans' Administration to contract with local hospitals in the State for hospital services to veterans when there is no U.S. Government hospital on the island on which the veteran resides; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and to the Members of the Hawaii contingent in Congress.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Finance:

"STATE OF WISCONSIN ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 81

"A joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to exempt domestic or household telephone services from the Federal excise tax

"Whereas the Federal Government charges an excise tax on domestic or household telephone services, including long-distance services; and

"Whereas such tax was established as a wartime measure, and has long ceased to serve the purpose for which originally passed; and

"Whereas such tax is grossly unfair and discriminatory in that it imposes an undue hardship upon millions of households in this country, and is discriminatory in that no other household public utility services are still so taxed; and

"Whereas there is a direct relationship between family income and household telephone development, and between farm income and farm telephone development, and the reduction in cost of service by elimination of the excise tax would promote telephone development in this State, which is below the Nation's average; and

"Whereas since in today's Great Society, telephones are a necessity, the elimination of the excise tax takes precedence over the elimination of the tax on less essential needs; and

"Whereas telephone rates are established throughout the Nation after careful consideration of all relevant facts, with objectives of the full development of the industry and provision of the maximum service to the public at the least possible cost; and

"Whereas the levying of a Federal excise tax distorts such rates, has a restrictive effect on the use of communication services, is discriminatory, adversely affects the earning potential of communication companies and thereby impairs the growth and improvement of such services; and

"Whereas it is believed that the Federal excise tax on telephone services should be modified to exempt therefrom telephone charges for domestic or household uses or for long-distance charges resulting from such uses: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to reconsider the Federal excise tax on telephone services and modify such tax to exempt therefrom telephone charges for domestic or household uses or from long-distance charges resulting from such uses; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Wisconsin Member of Congress.

"ROBERT T. HUBER,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"JAMES P. BUCKLEY,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
"PATRICK GLUY,
"President of the Senate.
"WILLIAM P. NUGENT,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

"Resolution of the general assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that membership in both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned according to population and has thus asserted Federal judicial authority over the basic structure of government in the various States; and

"Whereas this rule denies to the people of the respective States the right to establish their legislatures upon the same pattern of representation deemed advantageous for the Congress of the United States and provided by the Federal Constitution; and

"Whereas this action of the Supreme Court goes so far as to restrict the ability of the citizens of the respective States to designate the manner in which they shall be represented in their respective legislatures, thereby depriving the people of their right to determine how they shall be governed; and

"Whereas the implications of this action by the Supreme Court raised serious doubts as to the legality of the present form of the governing bodies of many subordinate units of government within the States; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized by the general assembly to propose an amendment to the Constitution; such amendment to be in the following form:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.'

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

A resolution adopted at the 31st annual convention of the Independent Bankers Association of America, at Hollywood, Fla., favoring the proposal for a blue ribbon commission to conduct a fundamental examination of the policy of the United States toward agriculture and rural America; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Resolutions adopted by the Philadelphia (Pa.) Typographical Union, the composing room chapel of the H. Wolff Book Manufacturing Co., Inc., of New York, NY., the Los Angeles (Calif.) Allied Printing Trades Council, the Boston (Mass.) Allied Printing Trades Council, and the Roanoke Typographical Union, of Roanoke, Va., all favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1781, to prohibit interstate trafficking in strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the 74th Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE ORDER OF LAFAYETTE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on May 8, 1965, the Order of Lafayette at its meeting and convention at the Shoreham Hotel adopted two important resolutions by unanimous vote. One endorses the legislation to establish a Freedom Academy and the other endorses the concept of a national defense program second to none. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that both of these resolutions, with which I wholeheartedly agree, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON FREEDOM ACADEMY

Whereas it is now clearly recognized that despite economic and military superiority during the past 20 years, close cooperation with the United Nations, the most immense foreign aid program in world history, that the United States has deteriorated as a world power, due to massive failures in the nonmilitary area of political and propaganda warfare; and

Whereas it is now becoming increasingly clear that Communist officials are highly trained and dedicated Marxists whose consistent goal is world domination of the free world by a master strategic plan, and by effective political warfare; whose most important factor is the successful training of over 20,000 student subversives each year who return to their home countries to promote Communist infiltration and subversion: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Order of Lafayette in convention assembled, May 8, 1965, That the United States immediately initiate countermeasures to confront Communist aggression, infiltration, and political takeover, by establishing a number of Freedom Academies to enable the citizens of the free world to develop the political skills necessary to preserve their freedoms; and further

Resolved, That the Order of Lafayette recommends that the House of Representatives and the Senate take affirmative action on the Freedom Academy and Freedom Commission bills as essential measures to confront and prevent Communist aggression and expansion in the cold war.

RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

Whereas the survival of freedom is the single greatest issue in the world; and

Whereas the world Communist conspiracy is an ever-increasing menace to the preservation of freedom throughout the world: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Order of Lafayette at its convention assembled May 8, 1965, That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to maintain an air and missile force second to none and a Navy far greater and more powerful than any other Navy.

RESOLUTIONS OF MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL COURT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I send to the desk a certified copy of the following resolutions passed by the General Court of Massachusetts.

I ask that these resolutions be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO RETAIN THE FEDERAL EXCISE TAXES AND TO DISTRIBUTE THE PROCEEDS THEREOF TO THE INDIVIDUAL STATES IN THE PROPORTION OF AMOUNTS COLLECTED FROM EACH INDIVIDUAL STATE

"Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson in his state of the Union message suggested that some of the Federal excise taxes be eliminated; and

"Whereas the individual State are constantly seeking new sources of revenues to meet the ever-increasing costs of State government; and

"Whereas if these Federal excise taxes were retained for at least 6 additional years and the proceeds thereof distributed to the individual States in proportion to the amounts collected from each individual State, it would be a source of great financial assistance to the States and would eliminate the necessity of the States seeking new sources of revenue: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that would continue the Federal excise tax program for 6 additional years and to permit the distribution of the proceeds thereof to the individual States in proportion of the amounts collected from each individual State; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, May 17, 1965.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

To the Committee on Public Works:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING FEDERAL GRANTS AND ASSISTANCE TO ECONOMICALLY DISTRESSED AREAS AND REGIONS

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has recently launched an attack on certain areas of poverty, undevelopment and underdevelopment by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; and

"Whereas there are pending before the Congress of the United States two bills, cosponsored by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, one providing grants for public works and development facilities and other financial assistance to alleviate unemployment in other economically distressed areas and regions (S. 1648) and one providing for the use of public works and other economic programs in a coordinated effort to aid other economically disadvantaged areas of the Nation (S. 812); and

"Whereas said bills provide for the creation of regional commissions to plan and implement economic programs, designed to foster regional productivity and growth; and

"Whereas such a regional commission for New England would be extremely effective and beneficial in coping with serious economic problems which transcend State boundaries, and which require Federal assistance founded on sound planning and directed to projects that will enhance long-term growth; and

"Whereas at a joint session of the General Court of Massachusetts on March 9, 1965, Senator KENNEDY expressed his hope that the general court would authorize participation in a New England Regional Commission which would work for regional development and cooperation, and his intention to sponsor major legislation in the U.S. Senate to provide Federal assistance for development of the New England region; and

"Whereas said legislation is vital to the New England region whose economic status more than qualifies it for the assistance provided by said legislation, because of many critical problems, the more pressing of which are caused by the closing of military installations, slack growth, deficient transportation becoming more critical each day, inadequate water pollution control, high electric power costs, a declining fishing industry, undeveloped natural resources, and unemployment: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact Senate bill 1648 and Senate bill 812, thereby providing for strong, effective regional development commissions to coordinate an attack on the varied regional problems; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts recognizes the importance of regional planning in connection with such legislation, and looks with favor upon the participation by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in a New England regional development commission; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate May 26, 1965.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. COTTON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1404. A bill to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 268).

COLD WAR VETERANS READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 269)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a favorable report on S. 9, to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period, with amendment, together with minority views of Senators Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the minority views be printed with the report of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this marks the fourth occasion upon which I have stood before this body and announced the favorable action of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on the cold war GI bill, S. 9. Each successive year that I have come here with the strong sentiments of the majority of the committee and my fellow Members of this body who are cosponsors of the bill there has been a growing tide of public support for prompt enactment of legislation which will provide equal educational opportunity for the dedicated veterans of cold war military service throughout the world. The GI educational bill is before us once again and it is more than evident that the people of America will no longer tolerate our delay or the delay of the administration in acting upon this necessary measure.

Mr. President, the time for action on the cold war GI bill is now. The American economy is crying for more highly educated citizens—citizens whose dedication to their country in time of peril has established their capacity to become intellectual and cultural assets rather than useless liabilities on the lists of the unemployed. Let us at this session indicate our willingness to extend the hand of confidence to those thousands of men and women who have served their country well and who return to the civilian community without an economic or educational foothold.

Mr. President, I am proud to submit to this great body the cold war GI bill, now sponsored by more than 40 Senators, more Senators than have ever sponsored the measure in the past.

INCREASE BED CAPACITY OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 270)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a favorable report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, which expresses the concern of Congress and declares it shall be the sense of the Congress that the authorized bed capacity limitation of 125,000 for all VA hospitals which was established by President Eisenhower in a letter to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs dated February 26, 1959, should, in view of the present need for additional bed capacity in such hospitals, be increased by the President to a limitation of 130,000. The resolution asks the President to take such action as soon as practicable and it is reported without amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

APPOINTMENT OF GENERAL McKEE AS ADMINISTRATOR OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 271)

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 1900) to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee—U.S. Air Force, retired—to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators Hartke and Pearson.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

REPORT ENTITLED "A STUDY OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 272)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I ask unanimous consent to submit a report entitled "A Study of the Federal Judicial System" pursuant to Senate Resolution 267, 88th Congress, 2d session, and ask that it be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Maryland.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of April 1965. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the Record, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal Personnel in Executive Branch, April 1965 and March 1965, and Pay, March 1965 and February 1965

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I, 2)

Information in monthly personnel reports for April 1965 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In April numbered—	In March numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In March was—	In February was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,477,653	2,466,054	+11,599	$1,498,683	$1,315,622	+$183,061
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,455,184	1,448,045	+7,139	876,390	771,530	+104,860
Department of Defense	1,022,469	1,018,009	+4,460	622,293	544,092	+78,201
Inside the United States	2,317,715	2,306,468	+11,247			
Outside the United States	159,938	159,586	+352			
Industrial employment	543,057	538,310	+4,747			
Foreign nationals	131,361	132,326	−965	24,676	23,538	+1,138

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1965, and comparison with March 1965, and pay for March 1965, and comparison with February 1965*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	April	March	Increase	Decrease	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	100,890	99,089	1,801		$58,669	$50,467	$8,202	
Commerce	32,914	32,241	673		23,566	20,868	2,698	
Health, Education, and Welfare	83,915	83,928		13	50,416	45,204	5,212	
Interior	64,066	62,522	1,544		41,588	35,940	5,648	
Justice	32,390	32,355	35		24,848	21,904	2,944	
Labor	9,078	8,962	116		6,844	5,959	885	
Post Office	596,536	593,752	2,784		328,735	286,453	42,282	
State [1] [2]	40,581	40,725		144	24,252	24,656		$404
Treasury	97,137	93,119	4,018		62,357	54,612	7,745	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	318	320		2	271	239	32	
Bureau of the Budget	483	483			535	464	71	
Council of Economic Advisers	40	41		1	47	39	8	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	73	74		1	39	42		3
National Aeronautics and Space Council	30	32		2	37	30	7	
National Council on the Arts	4	4			3	2	1	
National Security Council	39	39			42	38	4	
Office of Economic Opportunity	1,199	[3] 848	351		302	474		172
Office of Emergency Planning	374	364	10		369	320	49	
Office of Science and Technology	142	85	57		54	43	11	
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	27	28		1	32	29	3	
President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy	(4)	(4)			(4)	(4)		
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	11	11			9	9		
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	11	11			10	8	2	
President's Council on Equal Opportunity [5]	10		10					
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	25	25			27	23	4	
American Battle Monuments Commission	444	440	4		110	81	29	
Appalachian Regional Commission [6]	2		2					
Atomic Energy Commission	7,160	7,194		34	6,560	5,755	805	
Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission	1	1			(7)	(7)		
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	635	639		4	498	436	62	
Civil Aeronautics Board	823	829		6	784	[3] 683	101	
Civil Service Commission	3,731	3,731			2,621	2,312	309	
Civil War Centennial Commission	4	4			4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			5	4	1	
Commission on Civil Rights	89	91		2	67	62	5	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			3	3		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	295	296		1	224	218	6	
Farm Credit Administration	232	235		3	197	174	23	
Federal Aviation Agency	44,772	44,819		47	37,837	33,031	4,806	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			5	4	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,502	1,507		5	1,270	1,102	168	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,434	1,434			1,090	976	114	
Federal Development Planning Committee for Appalachia [8]		8		8	11	7	4	
Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska	1	1			2		2	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,251	1,248	3		1,016	875	141	
Federal Maritime Commission	238	239		1	221	198	23	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	412	415		3	441	382	59	
Federal Power Commission	1,122	1,122			964	835	129	
Federal Radiation Council	4	5		1	5	4	1	
Federal Trade Commission	1,134	1,142		8	1,017	882	135	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	190	191		1	123	120	3	
General Accounting Office	4,142	4,154		12	3,306	2,903	403	
General Services Administration	35,255	35,227	28		19,923	17,737	2,186	
Government Printing Office	7,308	7,321		13	5,040	4,070	970	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,528	13,521	7		10,117	8,802	1,315	
Indian Claims Commission	20	20			26	23	3	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,393	2,397		4	1,998	1,742	256	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,099	33,097	2		29,185	26,744	2,441	
National Capital Housing Authority	422	429		7	232	201	31	
National Capital Planning Commission	55	52	3		45	39	6	
National Capital Transportation Agency	32	31	1		34	32	2	
National Commission on Food Marketing	40	40			41	24	17	
National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress	9	19		10	5	2	3	
National Gallery of Art	313	303	10		164	139	25	
National Labor Relations Board	2,110	2,108	2		1,808	1,578	230	
National Mediation Board	135	117	18		109	124		15
National Science Foundation	1,002	1,079		77	890	723	167	
Panama Canal	15,281	15,465		184	6,071	6,090		19
President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy	1	1			1	2		1
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	58	59		1	47	41	6	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,728	1,737		9	1,205	1,052	153	
Renegotiation Board	184	185		1	195	174	21	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	158	158			115	102	13	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,391	1,386	5		1,158	1,009	149	
Selective Service System	7,383	7,353	30		2,702	2,330	372	
Small Business Administration	3,591	3,565	26		2,762	2,390	372	
Smithsonian Institution	1,875	1,819	56		1,016	928	88	
Soldiers' Home	1,109	1,095	14		412	370	42	
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26			30	28	2	
Tariff Commission	275	275			241	213	28	
Tax Court of the United States	151	149	2		153	140	13	
Tennessee Valley Authority	16,395	16,244	151		11,428	9,874	1,554	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	162	161	1		167	145	22	
U.S. Information Agency	11,609	11,649		40	6,847	6,068	779	
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	26	18	8		14	9	5	
Veterans' Administration	[9] 167,821	171,818		3,997	90,658	79,598	11,060	
Virgin Islands Corporation	312	302	10		118	113	5	
Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission	1	1			(7)	(7)		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,455,184	1,448,045	11,782	4,643	876,390	771,530	105,474	614
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			7,139				104,860	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1965, and comparison with March 1965, and pay for March 1965, and comparison with February 1965*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	April	March	Increase	Decrease	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,156	2,126	30		$2,140	$1,882	$258	
Department of the Army	[10] 361,876	360,607	1,269		215,396	188,882	26,514	
Department of the Navy	[10] 327,504	326,035	1,469		204,917	179,620	25,297	
Department of the Air Force	[10] 292,270	291,635	635		176,187	152,973	23,214	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,044	2,032	12		1,178	1,025	153	
Defense Communications Agency	958	963		5	819	695	124	
Defense Intelligence Agency	2,169	2,165	4		1,855	1,613	242	
Defense Supply Agency	[10] 32,953	31,907	1,046		19,447	17,093	2,354	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40			42	37	5	
Interdepartmental activities	9	9			6	5	1	
International military activities	55	55			50	43	7	
Armed Forces information and education activities	435	435			256	224	32	
Total, Department of Defense	1,022,469	1,018,009	4,465	5	622,293	544,092	78,201	
Net increase, Department of Defense			4,460				78,201	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [11] [12]	2,477,653	2,466,054	16,247	4,648	1,498,683	1,315,622	183,675	$674
Net increase, including Department of Defense			11,599				183,001	

---

[1] April figure includes 15,019 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 15,324 in March and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The April figure includes 3,882 of these trust fund employees and the March figure includes 4,174.

[2] April figure includes 1,228 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 1,193 in March and their pay.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

[4] No employment or pay reported since January 1965. Agency due to expire in June 1965.

[5] New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 11197 dated Feb. 5, 1965.

[6] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 89-4.

[7] Less than $500.

[8] Agency abolished pursuant to Executive Order 11200 dated Mar. 25, 1965.

[9] April figure excludes 4,081 intermittent consultants and attendings (doctors, nurses, dentists, etc.) on the Veterans' Administration rolls who were not paid during the month. The March figure has not been adjusted to exclude such persons. For further information see appendix, p. 13.

[10] In April 1,059 employees were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 680 from the Department of the Army, 89 from the Department of the Navy, and 290 from the Department of the Air Force.

[11] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

[12] Includes employment in the Job Corps by Federal agencies under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452), as follows:

Agency	April	March	Change
Agriculture Department	512	305	+207
Interior Department	546	432	+114
Total	1,058	737	+321

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1965, and comparison with March 1965*

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	99,608	97,839	1,769	
Commerce	32,305	31,634	671	
Health, Education, and Welfare	83,255	83,263		8
Interior	63,425	61,884	1,541	
Justice	32,026	31,992	34	
Labor	9,001	8,892	109	
Post Office	504,927	502,132	2,795	
State [1] [2]	11,257	11,083	174	
Treasury	96,429	92,413	4,016	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	318	320		2
Bureau of the Budget	483	483		
Council of Economic Advisers	40	41		1
Executive Mansion and Grounds	73	74		1
National Aeronautics and Space Council	30	32		2
National Council on the Arts	4	4		
National Security Council	39	39		
Office of Economic Opportunity	1,199	[3] 848	351	
Office of Emergency Planning	374	364	10	
Office of Science and Technology	142	85	57	
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	27	28		1
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	11	11		
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	11	11		
President's Council on Equal Opportunity [4]	10		10	
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	25	25		
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7		
Appalachian Regional Commission [5]	2		2	
Atomic Energy Commission	7,129	7,161		32
Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission	1	1		
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	635	639		4
Civil Aeronautics Board	823	928		6
Civil Service Commission	3,728	3,728		
Civil War Centennial Commission	4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	89	91		2
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	295	296		1
Farm Credit Administration	232	235		3
Federal Aviation Agency	43,668	43,698		30
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Independent agencies—Continued				
Federal Communications Commission	1,497	1,502		5
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,432	1,432		
Federal Development Planning Committee for Appalachia [6]		8		8
Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska	1	1		
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,251	1,248	3	
Federal Maritime Commission	229	230		1
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	412	415		3
Federal Power Commission	1,122	1,122		
Federal Radiation Council	4	5		1
Federal Trade Commission	1,134	1,142		8
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	179	180		1
General Accounting Office	4,085	4,097		12
General Services Administration	35,225	35,198	27	
Government Printing Office	7,308	7,321		13
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,319	13,312	7	
Indian Claims Commission	20	20		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,393	2,397		4
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,083	33,081	2	
National Capital Housing Authority	422	429		7
National Capital Planning Commission	55	52	3	
National Capital Transportation Agency	32	31	1	
National Commission on Food Marketing	40	40		
National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress	9	19		10
National Gallery of Art	313	303	10	
National Labor Relations Board	2,076	2,075	1	
National Mediation Board	135	117	18	
National Science Foundation	998	1,075		77
Panama Canal	156	155	1	
President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy	1	1		
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	58	59		1
Railroad Retirement Board	1,728	1,737		9
Renegotiation Board	184	185		1
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	158	158		
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,391	1,386	5	
Selective Service System	7,227	7,200	27	
Small Business Administration	3,521	3,495	26	
Smithsonian Institution	1,852	1,795	57	
Soldiers' Home	1,109	1,095	14	
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26		
Tariff Commission	275	275		
Tax Court of the United States	151	149	2	
Tennessee Valley Authority	16,392	16,241	151	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1965, and comparison with March 1965*—Continued

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued				
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	162	161	1	
U.S. Information Agency	3,467	3,642	5	
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	18	18	6	
Veterans' Administration	166,838	170,841		4,003
Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission	1	1		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,393,145	1,385,496	11,906	4,257
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			7,649	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,108	2,078	30	
Department of the Army	313,192	312,217	975	
Department of the Navy	304,018	302,924	1,094	
Department of the Air Force	266,673	266,220	453	
Department of Defense—Continued				
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,044	2,032	12	
Defense Communications Agency	906	912		6
Defense Intelligence Agency	2,169	2,165	4	
Defense Supply Agency	32,942	31,906	1,036	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40		
Interdepartmental activities	9	9		
International military activities	34	34		
Armed Forces information and education activities	435	435		
Total, Department of Defense	924,570	920,972	3,604	6
Net increase, Department of Defense			3,598	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,317,715	2,306,468	15,510	4,263
Net increase, including Department of Defense			11,247	

[1] April figure includes 3,015 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,976 in March.

[2] April figure includes 806 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 773 in March.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

[4] New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 11197 dated Feb. 5, 1965.

[5] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 89-4.

[6] Agency abolished pursuant to Executive Order 11209 dated Mar. 25, 1965.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1965, and comparison with March 1965*

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,282	1,250	32	
Commerce	609	607	2	
Health, Education, and Welfare	660	665		5
Interior	640	638	2	
Justice	364	363	1	
Labor	77	70	7	
Post Office	1,609	1,620		11
State [1] [2]	29,324	29,642		318
Treasury	708	706	2	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	437	433	4	
Atomic Energy Commission	32	33		1
Civil Service Commission	3	3		
Federal Aviation Agency	1,104	1,121		17
Federal Communications Commission	5	5		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	11	11		
General Accounting Office	57	57		
General Services Administration	30	29	1	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	209	209		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16	16		
National Labor Relations Board	34	33	1	
National Science Foundation	4	4		
Panama Canal	15,125	15,310		185
Selective Service System	156	153	3	
Small Business Administration	70	70		
Independent agencies—Continued				
Smithsonian Institution	23	24		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	3	3		
United States Information Agency	8,142	8,187		45
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	8	6	2	
Veterans' Administration	983	977	6	
Virgin Islands Corporation	312	302	10	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	62,039	62,549	73	583
Net decrease excluding Department of Defense			510	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	48	48		
Department of the Army	48,684	48,390	294	
Department of the Navy	23,486	23,111	375	
Department of the Air Force	25,597	25,415	182	
Defense Communications Agency	52	51	1	
Defense Supply Agency	11	1	10	
International military activities	21	21		
Total, Department of Defense	97,899	97,037	862	
Net increase, Department of Defense			862	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	159,938	159,856	935	583
Net increase, including Department of Defense			352	

[1] April figure includes 12,004 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 12,348 in March. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The April figure includes 3,882 of these trust fund employees and the March figure includes 4,174.

[2] April figures includes 422 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 420 in March.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1965, and comparison with March 1965*

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,621	3,629		8
Commerce	5,726	6,025		299
Interior	9,822	9,557	265	
Post Office	268	264	4	
Treasury	5,477	5,483		6
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	257	255	2	
Federal Aviation Agency	2,508	2,565		57
General Services Administration	2,223	2,172	51	
Government Printing Office	7,308	7,321		13
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,099	33,097	2	
Panama Canal	7,345	7,503		158
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	157	157		
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,252	13,062	190	
Virgin Islands Corporation	312	302	10	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	91,375	91,392	524	541
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			17	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 133,245	[2] 130,945	2,300	
Outside the United States	[1] 4,408	[2] 3,989	419	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	183,921	182,730	1,191	
Outside the United States	1,506	1,273	233	
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	125,917	125,581	336	
Outside the United States	1,157	865	292	
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,528	1,535		7
Total, Department of Defense	451,682	46,918	44,771	7
Net increase, Department of Defense			4,764	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	543,057	538,310	5,295	548
Net increase, including Department of Defense			4,747	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of April 1965 and comparison with March 1965*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	April	March	April	March	April	March	April	March
Crete	75	81					75	81
England	2,203	2,329	106	102	101	101	1,996	2,126
France	14,590	14,751	11,350	11,496	9	10	3,231	3,245
Germany	66,265	66,880	55,931	56,442	70	70	10,264	10,368
Greece	309	308			39	39	270	269
Japan	41,534	41,573	14,139	14,179	12,309	12,314	15,086	15,080
Korea	5,434	5,443	5,434	5,443				
Morocco	536	543			536	543		
Netherlands	52	52					52	52
Trinidad	363	366			363	366		
Total	131,361	132,326	86,960	87,662	13,427	13,443	30,974	31,221

APPENDIX

The Veterans' Administration has advised the committee that the number of persons in its April 1965 report reflects "activation of new employment reporting procedures" with respect to certain intermittent employment. It also advised that while its reported employment under this new procedure reflects fewer persons, no substantial reduction has been made in actual employment and that there is no reduction in the actual cost of employment.

The Veterans' Administration figure for April reflects employment exclusive of 4,081 intermittent consultants and attendings (doctors, nurses, dentists, etc.) who were not paid during April. The March employment figure has not been adjusted to exclude such persons.

The Veterans' Administration has informed the committee that further adjustments will be made in such employment figures in future months under its new reporting procedure.

The committee was advised of this situation in a letter dated May 14, 1965, from the Veterans' Administration. The letter follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1965.

The CHAIRMAN,
Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Room 329, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is a copy of our "Monthly Report of Federal Civilian Employment" for April 1965.

In April we initiated a modification of our procedures for obtaining employment counts on intermittent consultants and attendings. Previously, all such personnel on Veterans' Administration rolls were reported each month whether or not they actually worked or were paid in a particular month. Through automatic data processing methods we have found it feasible, with a very minimum additional administrative workload, to exclude from the month-end employment count intermittent consultants and attendings not paid during the report month. This is, in effect, a further refinement of our PAID system for personnel and fiscal operations from which data is generated for both internal and external reports purposes.

As a result of the initial activation of new employment reporting procedures for consultants and attendants, the line 1 count in the current SF 113-A report is substantially below that shown in our prior report—for March. A further decrease is anticipated for the May report when the new system is fully implemented.

The drop in overall VA employment figures does not reflect any substantial change in actual VA staffing or basic staffing needs; nor will it result in any actual cost reductions. This "decline" does not affect in any way the employment count of the continuing work force of full-time employees and regularly scheduled part-time employees. In summary the change in our employment figure stems merely from a refinement in employment reporting procedures for intermittently employed consultants and attendings who are carried on VA rolls primarily to augment on an "as needed basis" the regular staff in our medical program.

Sincerely,

A. H. MONK,
Associate Deputy Administrator.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of April totaling 2,477,653. This was a net increase of 11,599 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of March.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1965, which began July 1, 1964, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1964	2,492,061	10,479	
August	2,495,606	3,545	
September	2,461,376		34,230
October	2,470,330	8,954	
November	2,493,837	23,507	
December	2,485,771		8,066
January 1965	2,464,012		21,759
February	2,459,595		4,417
March	2,466,054	6,459	
April	2,477,653	11,599	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of April was 1,455,184, an increase of 7,139 as compared with the March total of 1,448,045. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in April was 1,022,469, an increase of 4,460 as compared with 1,018,009 in March.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were Treasury Department with 4,018, Post Office Department with 2,784, Agriculture Department with 1,801, and Interior Department with 1,544. The Veterans' Administration reported the largest decrease with 3,997. The increases in Treasury, Agriculture, and Interior Departments were largely seasonal, and the decrease in Veterans' Administration reflects new reporting procedures (see committee report).

In the Department of Defense the largest increases in civilian employment were reported by the Navy with 1,469, Army with 1,269, Defense Supply Agency with 1,046, and Air Force with 635.

Total employment inside the United States in April was 2,317,715, an increase of 11,247 as compared with March. Total employment outside the United States in April was 159,938, an increase of 352 as compared with March. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in April totaled 543,057, an increase of 4,747.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,477,653 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 131,361 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during April who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in March was 132,326. A breakdown of this employment for April follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Crete	75			75
England	2,203	106	101	1,996
France	14,590	11,350	9	3,231
Germany	66,265	55,931	70	10,264
Greece	309		39	270
Japan	41,534	14,139	12,309	15,086
Korea	5,434	5,434		
Morocco	536		536	
Netherlands	52			52
Trinidad	363		363	
Total	131,361	86,960	13,427	30,974

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

John M. Leddy, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Ridgway B. Knight, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Belgium;

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund;

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development;

Marshall Green, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Indonesia;

Joseph J. Jova, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Honduras; and

Mrs. Patricia Roberts Harris, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Luxembourg.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 2055. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pham Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2056. A bill for the relief of Spyridon and Ekaterini Kallimanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. McNAMARA):

S. 2057. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2058. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended;

S. 2059. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949;

S. 2060. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925;

S. 2061. A bill to authorize the establishment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of a Youth Council as an agency of the Government of the District of Columbia; and

S. 2062. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 2063. A bill for the relief of Sixto M. Pagaran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2064. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relative to the return of certain alien property interests; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 2065. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

S. 2066. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. Clark, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Javits, Mr. Morse, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 2067. A bill to amend chapter 35, relating to war orphans' educational assistance, of title 38, United States Code, so as to increase the educational assistance allowances paid under such chapter; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE ORGANIC ACTS OF GUAM AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, two bills to amend the Organic Acts of Guam and the Virgin Islands in order to provide for the payment of the legislative salaries and expenses by the governments of those two territories.

The bills are being introduced at the request of the Department of the Interior as a result of an Executive communication dated May 26, 1965. I request that the letter to the Vice President setting forth the justification for this legislation, together with the text of the bills, be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair). The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Jackson, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2065. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (e) of section 26 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 391; 48 U.S.C. 1421d(e)), is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Each member of the legislature shall be paid such compensation and shall receive such additional allowances or benefits as may be fixed under the laws of Guam. Such compensation, allowances or benefits, together with all other legislative expenses shall be appropriated by, and paid out of funds of, the government of Guam."

S. 2066. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (e) of section 6 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 499), as amended (73 Stat. 568; 48 U.S.C. 1572(e)), is further amended to read as follows:

"(e) Each member of the legislature shall be paid such compensation and shall receive such additional allowances or benefits as may be fixed under the laws of the Virgin Islands. Such compensation, allowances or benefits, together with all other legislative expenses shall be appropriated by, and paid out of funds of, the government of the Virgin Islands."

The letter presented by Mr. Jackson is as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed is the draft of a proposed bill "to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam," together with the draft of a proposed bill, intended as a companion proposal to the first, "to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands."

This Department has urged in the past, and continues to urge, the enactment of legislation intended to grant to the territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands the degree of autonomy and self-government which we believe is warranted by the demonstrated development and political maturity of these territories. The enclosed proposals are in furtherance of that policy. The proposals authorize the government of Guam and the government of the Virgin Islands to pay such legislative salaries and expenses as may be fixed by the laws of the respective territories. The federally imposed limitation on such salaries and expenses is eliminated, and the United States is relieved of its obligation to pay those salaries and certain of the expenses—an obligation which has necessitated the Federal expenditure of approximately $37,000 per year. In our judgment, the enactment of these proposals would be a useful step toward the ultimate achievement of territorial home rule, which we know is the common goal of all of those in the Federal establishment who share the obligation and responsibility for the welfare and development of these territories of the United States.

Apart from the matter of home rule and the substantial question of policy which that matter involves, we believe that a persuasive argument for the enactment of this legislation can be made premised on a recognition of the substantial local responsibilities of the territorial legislatures, and, simultaneously, of the prerogatives and privileges which they should, but do not, possess.

Under existing provisions of Federal law, specifically 48 U.S.C. 1421(e) in the case of Guam, and 48 U.S.C. 1572(e) in the case of the Virgin Islands, the basic compensation of members of the territorial legislatures is fixed by statute and provision is made for the payment of that compensation by the United States. In the case of Guam all other legislative expenses, whatever they may be, are appropriated by, and paid out of, funds of the government of Guam. In the case of the Virgin Islands, additional provision is made for per diem and travel expenses, both to be paid by the United States, and for the legislature to provide for the payment of travel expenses and per diem for its members traveling on official business outside the Virgin Islands, subject to the limitation that the latter payments shall not be in excess of those that would be allowed Federal employees similarly situated.

In each of the two territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands the Congress has provided for a legislative body independent of the executive and judicial branches with true legislative authority extending to all subjects of local application and subject only to those limitations made necessary by, and consistent with, the relationship between the territories and the United States. The exercise of this legislative authority has extended to, among a multitude of other subjects, the consideration of the territorial budgets and to the appropriation of the funds necessary for the operation of the local government. Thus, with the exception of the few Federal employees in each of the territories whose salaries are fixed by Federal law, the territorial legislatures find themselves able to fix the salaries of the officers and employees of the local governments, and to appropriate from the funds of the territories the amounts necessary to pay those salaries, but, because of the Federal law noted above, are unable to act with respect to their own salaries and expenses. Here we believe it is significant to note, without denying or attempting to minimize certain substantial Federal assistance, that neither Guam nor the Virgin Islands come before the Congress with requests for direct appropriations to support the administration of the territories except in the most extraordinary of circumstances, as, for example, the Guam Rehabilitation Act, and the appropriations requested pursuant thereto. Therefore, the expression "funds of the government of the Virgin Islands" or "funds of the government of Guam" have a significance which should not be overlooked.

When it is remembered that the members of the territorial legislatures are the popularly elected representatives of the people of the territory and are not in any way Federal officers or employees, we submit that the limitation upon the legislatures with which we are concerned is wholly unnecessary and, further, is demeaning to the extent that such limitation can and has been construed as evidencing Federal mistrust as well as the precautionary retention by the Federal Government of a substantial degree of potential leverage should the need arise in connection with the activities of the legislatures. We know that while initially the existing provisions of law may have been the product of considerable paternalism, the foregoing construction could not be more untrue today. Nevertheless, it is an allegation which we are called upon to rebut from time to time and which is of real concern to the territorial government as well as to the people of the territories and to this Department. In view of this situation, and the state of the law, the solution we suggest seems most appropriate. Considering the very substantial responsibilities of the territorial legislatures of both Guam and the Virgin Islands and what we consider to be the nature and responsible way in which those responsibilities are discharged, it seems a small thing indeed to suggest that these legislative bodies, which have been given the legislative responsibility for so much, could and should be empowered to fix their own salaries and expenses and to provide for the payment thereof, subject of course to the normal legislative procedures and the concurrence of the Governor.

The enactment of the enclosed proposals is urged by this Department upon the basis of our independent and carefully considered opinion that such enactment would be appropriate and just. At the same time, however, these proposals are urged for enactment by the Honorable Manuel F. L. Guerrero, Governor of Guam, the Honorable Ralph M. Paiewonsky, Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Legislature of Guam, the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, and the ad hoc constitutional convention which was convened in the Virgin Islands to consider the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands and to recommend, in connection therewith, changes, amendments or deletions which the convention believed to be in the best interests of the territory and necessary to the welfare and development thereof, yet consistent with the relationship which exists between the territory and the United States.

When Governor Guerrero was asked for his views concerning this proposal, he responded in a radiogram as follows: "I support such legislation on grounds that present stipend is unrealistic and that those who enact local laws should be financially supported by local government. The Governor's organic powers would be sufficient to avoid any abuse as to level of salaries set."

Governor Paiewonsky, with whom the matter frequently has been discussed, has in every instance argued the need for this legislation and urged its introduction and enactment.

The constitutional convention also turned to that section of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands which provides for the payment of compensation of the members of the legislature. While the proposed amendment is perhaps unnecessarily detailed, for which reason we have suggested the somewhat different language in the enclosed bill, it clearly evidences the wishes of the delegates to the convention. The convention's suggested amendment is as follows:

"Compensation and allowances: Each member of the legislature shall be paid such compensation as shall be fixed by enactment of the legislature and approved by the Governor; provided that such compensation after it has first been fixed shall not be changed except by legislative enactment for the next legislature. Each member of the legislature who is away from the island of his residence shall also receive a per diem, fixed by the legislature, for each day's attendance while the legislature is actually in session, in lieu of his expenses for subsistence, and shall be reimbursed for his actual travel expenses in going to and returning from each session, or period thereof. The salaries, per diem, and travel allowances of the members of the legislature shall be paid by the government of the Virgin Islands."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that this legislative proposal is in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, Jr.,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

AMENDMENT OF WAR ORPHANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Senators CLARK, FANNIN, JAVITS, MORSE, MURPHY, NELSON, NEUBERGER, PELL, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, and YARBOROUGH a bill to amend the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act. This bill will increase the monthly educational benefits that are available to the children of American servicemen who have lost their lives during past wars or those hostile actions in which U.S. forces have been involved since 1955. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for additional cosponsors for a period of 10 days.

Mr. President, the War Orphans' Act currently provides monthly educational benefits of up to $110 for the children of American soldiers who were killed, or later died from permanent injuries, as a result of the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean war, or hostile "cold war" actions. Included in this last category are such involvements as the Berlin crisis, the 1958 landing in Lebanon, Quemoy and Matsu, Cuba, the current Vietnam engagement and Dominican Republic action. Also covered are the children of American servicemen who have died from extrahazardous duty during this period.

These students, betweeen the ages of 18 and 23, receive their benefits for 18 months while attending higher educational institutions, while participating in vocational education programs or special restorative training for the disabled.

This bill is introduced in recognition of the inadequacy of the current educational benefits for war orphans. There is no doubt that there are economic hardships facing the surviving families of our servicemen. There is also no doubt that the Nation has a special responsibility to ease their plight. For these basic reasons the bill would increase the educational benefits for these children from $110 to $150 a month.

Mr. President, the average cost of higher education in public institutions today is $174 a month; in private colleges and universities it is $263 a month. This represents increases of 65 to 75 percent over 1956 when the War Orphans' Act was passed. The purpose of the War Orphans' Act was one of aiding "children in attaining the educational status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained but for the disability or death of (their) parent."

The time has come to reaffirm this purpose by raising the children's benefits in keeping with the school expenses they face.

I need not point out that both young and seasoned servicemen are losing their lives in growing numbers each day in southeast Asia. Surely, if we can afford the large sums necessary to prepare these men for the ultimate effort, we can afford the small outlays necessary to prepare their children, through education, for a full and productive life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The bill (S. 2067) to amend chapter 35, relating to war orphans' educational assistance, of title 38, United States Code, so as to increase the educational assistance allowances paid under such chapter, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REFERRAL OF FIREARMS LEGISLATION TO THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following bills, each presently pending before the Senate Commerce Committee, be referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee:

S. 14, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act;

S. 1180, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act to prohibit the importation of a firearm into the United States without a license; and

S. 1965, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

S. 14 and S. 1180 were introduced by me; S. 1965 by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The Judiciary Committee's Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, is in the process of holding hearings on S. 1592, the administration bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

It is appropriate that we take testimony on the full range of firearms legislation presently before the Senate during these hearings and I appreciate the fact that the chairmen of the two committees, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], have agreed to permit the referral of these three bills.

Hearings on firearms legislation will resume this week, on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, June 2, 3, and 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 218

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 227

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 6675, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 219)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 7717) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965 (AMENDMENTS NOS. 220 THROUGH 225)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I send to the desk six amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965—S. 1837—ask that they be printed and lie at the desk, and ask that they be printed in the RECORD at the appropriate places in my remarks.

At the appropriate time I shall discuss each of these amendments at greater length. My sole purpose in introducing them today is so that there may be an opportunity to study them before they are called up.

At a later date I shall discuss generally the U.S. economic and military assistance programs and the deficits I see in those programs which can be corrected by legislative action.

Today I shall only describe each amendment briefly.

My first amendment—No. 220—which I ask be printed at this point in my remarks, relates to the period for which authorizations would be approved for the foreign aid program. As reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, S. 1837 provides for a 2-year authorization. H.R. 7750, as passed by the other body, continues the practice of annual reviews of the program and of annual authorizations.

This amendment would continue that practice. As I shall show in later remarks, the sole purpose of this change to 2-year authorizations is to limit congressional review of the program. It can serve no other use.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 3, strike out lines 3 to 12, inclusive.

On page 3, line 13, strike out "(b) Amend section 205" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 102. Section 205 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended".

On page 3, line 14, after the comma insert "is amended".

On page 4, strike out lines 12 to 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "by striking out '1965' and '$215,000,000' and substituting '1966' and '$210,000,000', respectively."

On page 4, strike out lines 22 to 25, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) Amend subsection (c) by striking out '1965, $18,000,000' and substituting '1966, $7,000,000'."

On page 5, line 19, strike out "1968" and insert in lieu thereof "1967".

On page 8, line 19, strike out "1968" and insert in lieu thereof "1967".

On page 8, beginning with line 20, strike out through line 2 on page 9.

On page 9, line 4, strike out "Sec. 106" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 105".

On page 9, strike out lines 6 to 13, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "is amended by striking out 'and $85,000.000 in fiscal year 1965' and substituting ', $85,000,000 in fiscal year 1965, and $70,000,000 in fiscal year 1966'."

On page 9, line 16, strike out "Sec. 107" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 106".

On page 10, lines 6 and 7, strike out "each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967" and insert in lieu thereof "the fiscal year 1966".

On page 10, line 11, strike out "Sec. 108" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 107".

On page 10, strike out lines 13 to 19, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "amended by striking out '1965' and '$405,000,000' and substituting '1966' and '$350,000,000', respectively."

On page 10, line 21, strike out "SEC. 109" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 108".

On page 10, line 24, beginning with the word "each" strike out through line 2 on page 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the fiscal year 1966, not to exceed $50,000,000'."

On page 11, line 12, strike out "each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967" and insert in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1966".

On page 11, line 13, strike out ", which".

On page 11, line 14, strike out "in each such fiscal year, which sums".

On page 14, line 10, strike out "years 1966 and 1967" and insert in lieu thereof "year 1966".

On page 14, lines 12 and 13, strike out "each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967" and insert in lieu thereof "the fiscal year 1966".

On page 14, line 19, strike out "years 1966 and 1967" and insert in lieu thereof "year 1966".

On page 14, strike out lines 20 and 21.

On page 18, line 22, strike out "June 30, 1967" and insert in lieu thereof "December 31, 1966".

On page 21, line 1, beginning with the word "inserting" strike out through "1967" in line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "substituting 'for the fiscal year 1966 not to exceed $55,240,000'."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my second amendment—No. 221—which I ask to be printed at this point in my remarks, relates to the declaration contained in S. 1837, as reported, that it is the policy of the Congress that an increasing portion of assistance be distributed on a multilateral basis. This again, as I shall point out at a later time, is an attempt to diminish congressional control over the foreign aid program.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, lines 11–13, delete the following words: "United States and other free world nations place an increasing portion of their assistance programs on a multilateral basis and the."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my third amendment—No. 222—which I ask to be printed at this point in my remarks, relates to foreign economic assistance to Indonesia. This too I shall explain at greater length in the days ahead. However, anyone who has followed the press reports from Indonesia is well aware of the fact that the country has scorned our aid. If that be so, there is good reason for a congressional prohibition against any further aid to that country.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 18, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"(2) Amend subsection (j) to read as follows:

" '(j) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act, and no sales shall be made under Title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to Indonesia. No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.' "

On page 18, line 19, strike out "(2)" and substitute "(3)".

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my fourth amendment—No. 223—which I ask to be printed at this point in my remarks, relates to further economic assistance to the United Arab Republic. My amendment would ban such aid unconditionally. I have spoken often on this subject. I shall speak on it again at length when I call up my amendment. The present Foreign Assistance Act bans foreign economic assistance to nations which practice or threaten aggression against nations aided by the United States. There can be no doubt—judged by its actions against Cyprus, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Israel, and the Congo—that the United Arab Republic is acting as the aggressor in those areas. However, there does not seem to be any disposition on the part of the administration to cut off economic aid to the United Arab Republic, despite the fact that it is our aid which enables that country to continue its aggression. Therefore, my amendment would constitute an absolute bar to any further aid to the United Arab Republic.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

On page 18, after line 22, insert the following:

"(3) Add the following new subsection:

" '(n) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act, and no sales shall be made under Title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to the United Arab Republic. No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.' "

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my fifth amendment—No. 224—which I ask to be printed at this point in my remarks, relates to the authority which would be given by the bill as reported to the President to shift up to 20 percent of the amount made available for the Development Loan Fund to the International Development Association, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Finance Corporation. This again is an attempt to remove congressional control over the foreign aid program. For example, the adoption of this provision would remove the transferred funds from the restrictions of the Hickenlooper amendment governing the expropriation of U.S. owned industries. On this provision I shall also talk at length when the amendment is called up.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On pages 3 and 4, delete subsection (b).

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my sixth and final amendment relates to interest charges on development loans. My amendment—No. 225—which I ask to be printed at this point in my remarks, would change the minimum interest rates from 1 percent for the first 10 years to 2½ percent and from 2½ percent thereafter to the cost of money thereafter. I have repeatedly pointed out on the floor of the Senate that the present minimum interest rates amount to an indirect grant rather than the much publicized loans which they purportedly are. On this point I shall also speak at length when I call up my amendment.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Between lines 4 and 5 on page 4 add the following new subsection:

"(c) Amend section 201(d) which relates to interest rates, as follows:

"(1) Strike out '2½ per centum per annum' and insert in lieu thereof: 'the rate arrived at by adding one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum to the rate which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be equal to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date the application for the loan is approved and by adjusting the result so obtained to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percentum';

"(2) Strike out '1 per centum' and insert in lieu thereof: '2½ per centum.' "

So that section 201(d) would read as follows:

"Funds made available for this title shall not be loaned or reloaned at rates of interest excessive or unreasonable for the borrower and in no event shall such funds (except funds loaned under section 205 and funds which prior to the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964 were authorized or committed to be loaned upon terms which do not meet the minimum terms set forth herein) be loaned at a rate of interest arrived at by adding one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum to the rate which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be equal to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date the application for the loan is approved and by adjusting the result so obtained to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum commencing not later than ten years following the date on which the funds are initially made available under the loan, during which ten-year period the rate of interest shall not be lower than 2½ per centum per annum, nor higher than the applicable legal rate of interest of the country in which the loan is made."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 226)

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for Mr. Miller) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment, and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On page 25, line 13, insert the following: add a new subsection (6) as follows:

"(6) those additional areas in which the Secretary determines, after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture,

"(A) agriculture is the major industry,

"(B) there has been a substantial decrease (or continuing marked decrease) in the number of persons engaged in agriculture as a major source of their income or livelihood,

"(C) there is a substantial migration out of the area of such persons, and

"(D) such migration has caused or is contributing to a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment in other areas."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1877) to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch, which I introduced on May 3, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of May 13, 1965:

S. 1969. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 with respect to entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees and charges authorized thereunder: Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McGee, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morse, Mr. Mundt, and Mr. Thurmond.

Authority of May 18, 1965:

S. 1985. A bill to authorize hearings and judicial review in connection with applications for certificates to commence business by associations organized under the national banking laws, and for other purposes: Mr. Allott, Mr. Curtis, and Mr. Thurmond.

S. 1991. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program of Federal unemployment adjustment benefits, to provide for matching grants for excess benefit costs, to extend coverage, to establish Federal requirements with respect to unemployment compensation, to increase the wage base for the Federal unemployment tax, to increase the rate of the Federal unemployment tax and to provide for a Federal contribution, to establish a Federal adjustment account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, to change the annual certification date under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, to provide for a research program and for a Special Advisory Commission, and for other purposes: Mr. Case, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Clark, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. McGee, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Morse, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

Authority of May 24, 1965:

S. 2019. A bill to establish an Auto Burial and Beautification Fund in the Treasury of the United States consisting of certain tax revenues derived under section 4061(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on passenger automobiles and trailers) to finance a program for the alleviation of blight along the Nation's highways and in open spaces caused by aged or wrecked motor vehicles which have been abandoned or relegated to scrap or salvage: Mr. Clark, Mr. Gruening, Mr. McIntyre, and Mr. Nelson.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STUDENTS IN POSTSECONDARY AND HIGHER EDUCATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT NO. 194

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 19, 1965, the names of Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, and Mr. Pell were added as additional cosponsors of amendment No. 194, intended to be proposed by Mr. Morse (for himself and other Senators) to the bill (S. 600) to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education, submitted by Mr. Morse (for himself and other Senators) on May 19, 1965.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF BANK MERGER ACT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions has now held 4 days of hearings on S. 1698, my bill to amend the Bank Merger Act, and we have heard from 12 witnesses. While we have heard from the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board as our opening witness, in support of the bill, we have not heard from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. On May 27, I wrote identical letters to each of them, reading as follows:

The testimony of outside witnesses on my bank merger bill, S. 1698, has been concluded. Before we close the hearings, I am writing to say that if you desire to be heard on this bill, either Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, that privilege will be gladly afforded to you.

I have now received replies from them. I ask unanimous consent that these replies may be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. In view of these replies, there appears to be no need for further testimony, and I have scheduled an executive session of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions for tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock to consider the bill.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1965.
Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 27 stating that if I desire to be heard on the bank merger bill, S. 1698, either Tuesday or Wednesday of next week that the privilege will be afforded to me.

I have no present desire to be heard on this bill at this time but appreciate very much the opportunity you have kindly offered.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY H. FOWLER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY
ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1965.
Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Attorney General has asked me to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of May 27 according him the opportunity to appear before your committee on June 1 or 2 to testify on S. 1698.

Since the Attorney General will be unable to appear, we will submit a written report on the bill instead.

I trust this will be satisfactory.

Sincerely,
RAMSEY CLARK,
Deputy Attorney General.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE
CORPORATION,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1965.
Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: Thank you for your letter of May 27, 1965. I am very sorry that the schedule of your subcommittee and my prior commitments make it impossible for me to appear either Tuesday or Wednesday to testify respecting the bank merger bill, S. 1698.

I hope that events permit a further opportunity for me to appear before the subcommittee in the near future. I am sure that you know my personal views concerning the need for this legislation.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,
K. A. RANDALL,
Chairman.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 1, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 800) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vesssels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

CONNECTICUT DEDICATES A BUILDING TO THE LATE SENATOR BRIEN McMAHON—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO UNESCO

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 23, the University of Connecticut dedicated a building and plaque to commemorate the memory of a distinguished public servant, the late Senator Brien McMahon.

Chosen to make the dedicatory speech was Senator William Benton, now Ambassador from the United States to UNESCO in Paris. Senator Benton served as Senator McMahon's colleague from Connecticut and was chosen to make this address by the University of Connecticut because of his close association with Senator McMahon during several of his years in the Senate.

At the dedication of Brien McMahon Hall, Senator Benton detailed the foresight of Senator McMahon in fostering, as a freshman Senator, the far-reaching Atomic Energy Act, which brought our atomic armaments and peaceful development of atomic energy under civilian control. His constant watchfulness during the program's early years made possible the oustanding record of this Nation in atomic matters.

Senator Benton's address shows the care and follow-up on the diplomatic front used by Senator McMahon. He pioneered in ways to pierce the Iron Curtain with America's earliest offers of a workable program under world supervision of atomic weapons control.

It is interesting to note that after all these years, the original legislation conceived by Senator McMahon has proved to be so sound that basic amendments have not been needed to keep it modern in a changing world.

I commend this excellent address by Senator Benton to all Members of the Congress because of its historic recital of the enactment of one of this Nation's greatest legislative acts and of the further amplification of Senator McMahon's actions in the field of international diplomacy as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON AT THE CEREMONY IN MEMORY OF SENATOR BRIEN MCMAHON, UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, MAY 23, 1965

BRIEN M'MAHON—A RETROSPECT

Mr. Chairman, for some years, in a manner somewhat out of the ordinary, Brien McMahon's public career and mine touched at many points. We were colleagues in the Senate during a stirring time in the Nation's history.

I am back less than 48 hours from my present duties as U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO in Paris. Brien McMahon would have approved my decision to serve UNESCO. He saw that, ultimately, peace and justice must rest on intellectual and moral progress, not on force.

Brien McMahon charted the basic policy on nuclear weapons adopted by the Government of the United States, a policy so founded in wisdom that it remains fundamentally unchanged some 15 turbulent years later. His proposal for civilian control did not seem obvious when he made it. On a first vote, his committee stood 10 to 1 against the idea—and remember, McMahon was just a freshman Senator. But he stood by his convictions, and it turned out that his vote of one created a majority. A few ripples of public opinion began to break the surface. Suddenly a tidal wave of public support for the McMahon proposal burst over Washington. The McMahon Act became law. Senator McMahon became chairman of the Joint Committee of the Congress on Atomic Energy.

But Senator McMahon did not rest on this accomplishment. He was among the first to point out that mere supremacy in weapons-building would not solve the dangers brought about by the proliferation of mass destructive weapons. He was among the first to point out that, while retooling its military arsenal, the free world must overhaul completely its arsenal of moral weapons, its weapons for peace.

Five thousand years of recorded history, he warned his fellow Senators, have taught the lesson that armaments races end in war.

In recalling Senator McMahon's public career, I like to look upon it not only as the growth of a man but as the growth of an idea.

Trained in the law, young Brien early felt the pull of public life. While setting up his law practice he found time to take part in local politics. When the New Deal came to power, he sought and obtained from the U.S. Attorney General, Connecticut's own Homer Cummings, a minor legal post in the Department of Justice. But his time in obscurity was short. His abilities soon became apparent. Shortly he was promoted—and when he was only 31—to the high post of Assistant Attorney General. He was the youngest man ever to be so honored. He became head of the criminal division. Organized gangsterism was a national problem. McMahon soon fashioned for himself an enviable record in the successful prosecution of the gangsters.

In 1944, when you seniors in the audience were being born, he was elected to the U.S. Senate. He took his seat in January of 1945.

You know the next fateful step. In August of that same year, the bomb of Hiroshima revealed that a new and potentially horrible era had opened in human affairs. Brien McMahon might have pondered the awful implications for a while and then shied away. He might have consoled himself with the thought that in senatorial ranks, he was a novice and not a key policymaker in military or foreign affairs.

He did no such thing. He met the challenge head on. He applied his intellectual and legal talents to the problem of this unprecedented test of the workability of democratic institutions. And he never let up. This is what I meant when I said that the growth of McMahon was in a sense the growth of an idea.

As a first-termer, and in his first 2 years, the young Senator from Connecticut drafted and guided through Congress, by his resolute will, the organic act which ordained that control of the awesome power of atomic energy should rest with civilian authority and not with the military. Just as Clemenceau knew that war was too important for the generals, so Senator McMahon knew that our democratic institutions demanded civilian control of atomic energy.

For a newcomer it was an unprecedented exploit. Many students of history assume that this was his major contribution. It was not. On the contrary it was merely the first act in a continuing political drama. Ever since the formation of the first Army, and the first Navy, professional military men have resisted the introduction of new weapons. The classic illustration occurred during the first phases of World War II when the free nations went down to humiliating defeat because their military leaders, unlike the upstart Nazis, had refused to learn the lesson of the airplane and the mobile tank division.

The paradox persisted even after Hiroshima. There was strong resistance among conventional military thinkers to the building of an adequate atomic stockpile. But Brien McMahon was determined that the free world should not be caught a second or a third time. Against stubborn opposition, he set to work. He saw to it that America had the biggest stockpile; and then, in his final months, still dissatisfied, while he was wracked by the pains of a cruel disease, he sponsored and pushed to completion a major expansion of the original program.

The American stockpile of nuclear weapons has been, for the past 15 years, the shield of the United States and the shield of the entire free world against Communist aggression. Brien McMahon was the principal architect of that shield—a proud memorial for any man. It is another anomaly of history that the man who set out to be a lawyer and a public officeholder became the greatest weapons builder of all time.

With characteristic energy Brien McMahon prepared for the next step. He was persuaded that war was inevitable unless the civilized nations found a viable way to outlaw finally and forever, these monstrous weapons which he had helped to fashion. He took on the job of redesigning and retooling the moral weapons of the West. Without new methods and new direction, he saw little hope of avoiding a military collision with the Communist world. To meet the challenge, he saw that changes must be made in conventional diplomacy, and in conventional economics as well.

I believe this to be the most inspiring and the most appealing period of Brien McMahon's public life. He set out on his own journey toward the Holy Grail, to seek a formula by which the free world could turn back the tide of Communist aggression without resorting to war or risking the loss of its democratic institutions. He was never discouraged by the magnitude of the task.

He saw clearly that moral weapons held top priority in urgency even over atomic weapons. He thus sponsored his famous resolution of friendship for the Russian people, with its direct challenge to Stalin to make known its contents to the Russian people. There have been many declarations of war by Congress but this, to the best of my knowledge, was the first declaration of peace. One proof of the effectiveness of the idea was proven when Stalin obediently made its contents known to all the Russians. A moral weapon had been fired through the Iron Curtain.

When the United States later decided to go ahead with the fabrication of the dreaded hydrogen bomb, it was Brien McMahon's foresight which prevented worldwide misunderstanding of why this decision had to be made. In an inspired Senate speech, he proposed that this country expend $10 billion per year for 5 years to help the economic development of other nations, including Soviet Russia, if the Kremlin would agree to an ironclad plan for outlawing atomic weapons. By this simple gesture, he made it plain, once again, that the goal of our Nation is world peace and world progress.

Had he lived, I believe Brien McMahon, a member of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee, would have been a pioneer in establishing new forms of diplomacy, just as he was a pioneer in the establishment of atomic policy.

It is fitting that the University of Connecticut should dedicate this plaque and this building to keep Brien McMahon's memory green among the students of this great university and the citizens of our State. But it is my hope that this dedication may serve another purpose also.

In this thrilling age of missiles and computers and space flights, young men and women may gain the impression that politics is a dead art, without comparable challenge, excitement, or promise. On the contrary, there is no field in which creative thought is so urgently needed, or its exercise so rewarding. Aristotle tells us that politics is the noblest of the arts. It was Albert Einstein who pointed out that politics is more difficult than science. It is not only more difficult, but more challenging and more exciting. I call upon you young people here today to join in its pursuit so that you may gain some mastery of it.

We honor Brien McMahon today because, at a time of challenge, he had the vision, and the practical wisdom, to create new political forms to serve the Nation's needs. I trust that his accomplishments will serve as an inspiration and an example to the students of this university.

VETERANS' REOPENED INSURANCE FUND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 235, H.R. 7597.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 7597) to establish the Veterans' Reopened Insurance Fund in the Treasury and to authorize initial capital to operate insurance programs under title 38, United States Code, section 725.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 246), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

This proposal authorizes the Veterans' Administration to transfer up to $1,650,000 from the veterans special term insurance fund, for the purpose of providing administrative expenses in connection with the reopening of national service life insurance. The veterans special term insurance fund is a revolving fund into which premiums from the so-called W insurance are paid. This type of insurance was first authorized by Public Law 23, 82d Congress. The insurance is nonparticipating and any excess of receipts over claims and the requirements of reserves is paid into the Treasury. At the present time approximately $10 million in excess of the needs of this fund have accumulated. Any amounts so transferred will be repaid, with interest. The veterans reopened insurance program, authorized by Public Law 88-664, is to be self-sustaining and the Administrator must include the cost of administration in premiums and has authority to raise and lower premiums as experience may dictate. The present authorization should be sufficient to provide initial capital.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 7597) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DANIEL WALTER MILES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 250, H.R. 1867.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 1867) for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 260), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Daniel Walter Miles, of Brockton, Mass., $1,000 for property losses he sustained in the Philippine Islands during World War II involving the same matters which were the subject of an adverse determination of the Philippine War Damage Commission.

Mr. Daniel Walter Miles, of Brockton, Mass., is a former civilian internee who was interned by the Japanese for 3½ years in the Philippines during World War II. Mr. Miles arrived in the Philippines approximately 5 months prior to the outbreak of hostilities. He was sent to the Philippines as an employee of the Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. in connection with contract work of the U.S. Government. The claim with which H.R. 1867 is concerned relates to personal property losses suffered by Mr. Miles resulting from the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 1867) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

I. W. ABEL, PRESIDENT, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, today I. W. Abel will be sworn in as president of the United Steelworkers of America. This is indeed a fitting honor for one of the outstanding labor leaders in the Nation who has devoted his life to bettering the lot of American working men and women. I. W. Abel is not only a leading trade unionist, he is also a national statesman. I am indeed proud to call him my close personal friend.

He was born at Magnolia, Ohio, in 1908 and later moved to Canton, Ohio, where from his early manhood he was employed in the steel mills of that community. He was a pioneer in the industrial union movement.

As a volunteer organizer in 1936, I. W. Abel helped establish the first local union in the Timken Roller Bearing plant at Canton and served successively as financial secretary, vice president, and president. In 1942, the late great Philip

Murray, founder of the United Steelworkers of America, appointed him director of district 27, the Canton area. In that capacity he proved his great administrative ability which was recognized by his fellow steelworkers when they elected him secretary-treasurer of their union in 1952. This year they gave him their highest honor, the presidency of their union.

I. W. Abel climbed virtually every step on the traditional ladder of union promotion. Along the way he acquired an intimate understanding of union work, including organizing, grievance handling, contract negotiating, political action, community service, and human relations. He has acquired extensive bargaining knowledge at all levels of negotiations. His experience, coupled with his broad background as a millhand and widespread knowledge of the industries in which the United Steelworkers of America has jurisdiction, has prepared him well to lead America's third largest union.

The new USWA president also stresses the need to participate enthusiastically in the affairs of the labor movement generally, pointing out that the USWA must play its rightful role in promoting the basic goals and programs of the AFL–CIO and in the free trade movement of the world. He likewise has a strong interest in developing better relations between the union and the communities where steelworkers live. He believes that union members can and should assert their rightful roles in all phases of civic life, particularly in the areas of education, housing, civil rights, and welfare activities.

In my State of Ohio and throughout the Nation members of labor unions such as that headed by I. W. Abel walk with dignity and love of country. They are the envy of workers throughout the entire world. They raise their families on the "right side of the railroad tracks," to use a common expression.

Mr. President, I. W. Abel's election to the presidency of the United Steelworkers of America will benefit not only the members of his union but all American working men and women. Trade unionism today is a vital and integral part of our economy and way of life. In that sense, I. W. Abel's election will be of great benefit to the entire Nation.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSIONS TODAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Patents, Trade Marks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow, June 1 and 2, 1965.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, in the May 26 Philadelphia Inquirer, there appeared a clear and cogent dispatch on Vietnam by Jack Foisie. He reports that the conviction is growing in Saigon that even heightened pressure on Hanoi will not end the war in the south. He reports as well that the military situation within South Vietnam itself is quite serious.

This sort of reporting—straightforward, unemotional, factual—is of immense value to the public in understanding the situation that confronts the President as he strives to contribute to a reasoned peace in Vietnam. That has never been a simple question and it is, obviously, not getting any easier.

The article referred to points up clearly the grim choices which are looming in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Viet War Must Be Won in South, Experts Say

(By Jack Foisie, special to the Inquirer and Los Angeles Times)

Saigon, May 25.—The belief grows here that even all-out bombing of North Vietnam will not force the Communists to cease their war in the south.

Nor are the 45,000 American military men presently in South Vietnam going to be enough to win the war on the ground. Many thousands of combat troops will be needed, and even then the war will continue for years if it is to be kept nonnuclear.

This gloomy appraisal is common here. It may be due to the traditional impatience of the American, who, having been raised in a society where massive effort gets immediate results, cannot understand why it can't apply in Vietnam against the Communist concept of guerrilla warfare.

But the pessimism is evident not only among the Americans. Thoughtful Vietnamese and foreign military men here are coming to the same conclusion. They are convinced the war can end only when the Vietcong guerrillas are whipped in the south. So strong is the enemy hold now on many regions that it will take a protracted effort involving tens of thousands of American troops to root them out of the jungles.

To have Ho Chi Minh, the North Vietnamese leader, cry "uncle" and call off his attempt to take over the south, can never be done even by bombing Hanoi and other northern cities now inviolate under the American concept of slow escalation of air attacks.

Only the diehard airpower enthusiast believes the Communist will to resist can be broken, short of nuclear bombing. Most military men are convinced that land invasion of North Vietnam would be necessary. Even South Vietnam's leading airman, Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, advocates land invasion.

But this would put the United States in a position somewhat akin to the Russian planting of missiles in Cuba. President John F. Kennedy was willing to go to war if a hostile force remained at his doorstep. Red China's reaction certainly would be the same if Americans occupied North Vietnamese territory adjacent to China's southern border.

The bombings up north, so far restricted to the unimportant lower half, have failed appreciably to reduce infiltration of Communist-trained guerrillas. Even regular units of the North Vietnam Army now are showing up, either inside South Vietnam or just across the border in Laos. Elements of two regular North Vietnam divisions—10,000 or more men each, if at full strength—have been identified as being in the mountainous midnorthern area around Kontum.

We have bombed 27 sizable bridges and made 7 propaganda pamphlet drops in North Vietnam. The cost of these and scores of other missions conducted since the bombings began February 7 has been 43 planes lost and 25 pilots dead or captured.

But the Vietcong, losing hardly a man, have blown up as many bridges in South Vietnam in half that time. In the last 3 days they blew up four, according to the tally kept by the American military. And the foe's own propaganda efforts have been intensified to increase terrorist strikes at Government villages. There have been 200 civilian officials killed and 364 kidnaped since January 1, according to the American tally.

NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR—REMARKS OF HON. ROBERT MOSES AT REOPENING OF MEXICAN PAVILION

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks, the address delivered by Hon. Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, 1964–65, at the inauguration of the art exhibition and reopening of the Mexican pavilion, on May 25, 1965.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Robert Moses, President of the New York World's Fair, 1964–65, Corp., at the Inauguration of the Art Exhibition and Reopening of the Mexican Pavilion, Flushing Meadow, May 25, 1965

The Spaniards set a deep seal on every country on which her navigators and adventurers set foot in the days of discovery and colonialism. Language is only one of the heritages of their conquests. Mixed with native culture, extraordinary civilizations developed. In Mexico this tradition has been persistent, growing, and proliferating. Here at the fair the artifacts, arts, agriculture, and burgeoning industries of Mexico mark an entirely new civilization built upon an old and a medieval one. You have leaped from primitive to Renaissance to the most advanced and sophisticated modern. Your Briareus has reached out a hundred arms to exploit all of your resources. Democracy and the social revolution have been slow to come, but now they are here in all of their enormous implications.

On the opening of this exhibit of artistic genius we offer our profound respects to a friendly neighbor on the continent we share, whose prosperity is ours, a country which has remained aloof from world wars, and whose ways are the ways of peace. We hail the priceless opportunity you offer our people to share in your institutions and progress.

In this spirit I now present to Señora de Diaz Ordaz, the wife of your distinguished President, Gustavo de Diaz Ordaz, who has done so much to usher in a new day for Mexico, a gold Unisphere charm, and our silver medallions with the symbols of our globe and of our city, as it enters its fourth century; to Prof. Fernando Gamboa, who assembled this remarkable exhibit; and to Mr. Alfonso Corona del Rosal, Secretary of National Resources. To Mr. Octaviano Campos Salas, Secretary of Industry and Commerce, and Mr. Agustin Salvat, Minister of Tourism, I present our plaques.

I now declare the exhibit officially opened.

CHIEF OF ARMY ENGINEERS LT. GEN. WALTER K. WILSON, JR., TO RETIRE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is appropriate to devote a few moments at this time to observing the retirement from public life of a man whose career has contributed to the well-being of every American and the growth and prosperity of every 1 of our 50 States—Lt. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Jr., the U.S. Army's Chief of Engineers.

General Wilson retires from the Army on July 1 after 36 years of truly distinguished service in war and peace. In these brief remarks I propose to touch only on the last 4 years of that service, his tenure as Chief of Engineers.

We in West Virginia have ample cause to be grateful that a man like General Wilson has been in charge of the Nation's foremost water resource development agency during those years. This is a time when we have been seeking a way out of the grip of a spiral of depression; and we have found in General Wilson and his agency a major force for hope and progress. They have not simply worked in our area, but have always tried to make their work meaningful and cooperative and responsive to our needs and our own endeavors.

Under General Wilson, the modernization of the Ohio River waterway has been pushed forward with great energy. Various major reservoirs similarly have been moved forward. A number of important studies have been advanced, notably a restudy of the Guyandot River and Justice Reservoir. Recreational developments, which we expect to be a major factor in our programs for stimulating economic growth, have been given especial impetus. Last year the Corps of Engineers asked for and received from Congress a supplemental appropriation to accelerate project work in the Appalachian region; and this appropriation included provision for the expenditure of some $900,000 for recreational improvements at just two major West Virginia projects—Sutton Dam and Reservoir, and Gallipolis lock and dam—plus more than $2 million for the acceleration of work at seven or more other West Virginia projects. Finally, in response to the Appalachian Regional Development Act the Corps of Engineers under General Wilson has established a special Office of Appalachian Studies to work out programs through which the development of the water resources of the region can be fitted most effectively into overall programs for the revitalization of the regional economy.

West Virginia's experience with the Corps of Engineers is typical of that shared by all States. I am sure that every Senator here could bring forth many examples in his own State of the highly practical concern shown by the Corps of Engineers for the water problems of the American people, and General Wilson's effectiveness in translating that concern into action. One measure of this effectiveness is the fact that when General Wilson became Chief of Engineers, the Corps of Engineers' civil works construction program was about $700 million per year; whereas now it is more than $1 billion—a 40-percent increase in just 4 years—and this in a period of economy and retrenchment during which many Government programs were being cut back. This is a most impressive testimonial of the confidence felt by this whole Congress, representing as it does all the States of the Union, in the practical worth and the moral integrity of the Army's Corps of Engineers.

While carrying out these programs on the Nation's river basins, harbors, and sea coasts, the corps, under General Wilson, has also maintained its military construction program, which included the construction of a network of missile sites all over the Nation; has carried out unprecedented construction programs at Cape Kennedy and elsewhere in support of the national space program; and has played a leading role in recovery and reconstruction activities after several great natural disasters, including the Alaskan earthquake of last year and great floods this year.

One concluding observation: In commending the career of General Wilson as one of the Nation's great engineers and planners and executives, I have had at the same time to commend the corps which he has led. The fact is that the corps, under his leadership, has worthily carried forward a tradition of ability and integrity that goes back generations into the past, and is rivaled by few, if any, organization, anywhere in the world—a tradition which, I am confident, will be maintained with equal distinction under his successor, Lt. Gen. William Cassidy. I think sometimes we are inclined to overlook the tremendous value to the Nation of a tradition such as this. We tend to take the Corps of Engineers for granted, as we do our mountains and rivers and other resources; when the fact is that, far from being ordinary or commonplace, the corps is unusual among human institutions for many qualities, not the least of which is the consistency, decade by decade, of the excellence of its leadership, which has been brilliantly exemplified by Lt. Gen. Walter K. Wilson.

I convey the sentiments of the people of West Virginia, and I think also of the Senate and the Congress, when I express my gratitude to him for his career of public service to us all, and wish him every continued good fortune in his forthcoming endeavors in private life.

SAM M. LEVINE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last week brought the death of one of my State's finest citizens, Sam M. Levine, of Pine Bluff, Ark. Following his death, an editorial tribute to him was published in the Pine Bluff Commercial of May 23.

I had admiration and respect for Sam Levine, as did all who came in contact with him. I could pay him no higher accolade than to quote the concluding paragraph of the editorial:

> When men want to know the reason for America's strength at its grassroots, let them study the life of Sam M. Levine in Pine Bluff, Ark.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAM M. LEVINE

It is not easy to sum up what the name "Sam Levine" came to mean in this town and in this State, but someone ought to try it. It would be instructive and salutary for future generations to know the breed of man we were able to produce in these times.

Any summation would have to include Senator Levine's rocklike devotion to the law, his deep and active concern with education, and his willingness to rely on reason, of all things, in politics.

He was an advocate—not only at the bar but in the legislature, and in public service.

Eventually, he became so well known as an advocate that his presence alone was enough to make his neighbors weigh their words and reassert their own principles.

Born and raised in south Louisiana, he later moved to Bonham, Tex., where he encountered another young lawyer—Sam Rayburn, who went on to become the venerable Speaker of the House of Representatives in Washington. Our Mr. Sam came to Pine Bluff, in 1913 to practice law.

People soon came to know Sam Levine as a force for stability in the community. He not only had a wit of his own, they realized, but he fully appreciated a sense of humor in others.

Sam Levine's gentle eyes became piercingly sharp once you started talking about something he took seriously—the law, for example. Admitted to practice law before the U.S. Supreme Court in 1923, he was on the State board of law examiners from 1942 to 1943, and once served as president of Jefferson County's bar association.

Mr. Sam's interest in education deepened as the years passed. At his death, he was a board member of the Institute of International Education—an organization in which he played an active role for years.

A firm supporter of the liberal arts, he never welcomed the reduction of education to training.

In his three terms as a State senator, Mr. Sam proved himself an activist and a man open to constructive ideas. It was Senator Levine who sponsored the act setting up a State forestry commission and another one establishing a retirement system for State employees.

Politics gave Sam Levine scope to assert his dedication to law, to principle, and to education.

At a time when others were overcome by panic, ambition, or fear, Senator Levine advocated reason.

Arkansas had reached the point where a legislator could win popularity by promising to protect the people against public education. Those were years when a legislator could say, as one representative did on January 28, 1959: "Nothing contained in this bill should be construed to reopen the schools." And this argument, mind you, was being offered in favor of a bill.

The following day, Mr. Sam rose to tell his colleagues in the senate: "In the past, this body has laid stress on mediocrity. Let's put the emphasis on excellence and superiority."

Senator Levine continued his fight down to the wire. He took the floor on February 6, 1959, to oppose scuttling the State's public schools.

First, he attacked the bill on legal grounds, where Mr. Sam was very much at home, by saying that it violated the Arkansas Constitution and "presupposes its own constitutionality."

Senator Levine went on: "This bill," he warned, "strikes at the integrity of the public school system. It can serve no purpose except to agitate, and to detract from the wholesomeness of the public school system."

Instead of destroying public education, he urged his fellow senators to strengthen it: "At this moment, we ought to rededicate ourselves to strengthening the country and to the enlightening of youth. The alternative is to slip into an abyss of oblivion. There can be no other end."

The Associated Press noted that other senators paid little attention to the gentleman from Pine Bluff. "His colleagues," reported the AP, "all but ignored him while drinking soft drinks, munching sandwiches, reading magazines and smoking cigarettes."

That did not dismay Mr. Sam. He continued to speak softly on behalf of reason, education and the law. And no matter how virulent the opposition, he spoke out as calmly and as naturally as he walked down Main Street, his Phi Beta Kappa key dangling from his tie pin. And slowly people began to listen.

When future historians want to know why the State was able to shake off panic and fear, they will find one reason in the words of Sam Levine.

Senator Levine's language acquired a natural courtliness over the years. Like the man himself, it was restrained, direct and well mannered.

It has been some time since a candidate for political office began his campaign by reminding the voters of their duties as Senator Levine did in 1960:

"While the candidate for this extremely high office must willingly subject his qualifications to the careful consideration of voters in the course of a strenuous campaign, there is also a corresponding duty imposed on the citizens to evaluate carefully the respective claims advanced by the candidates. 'I think it well to bear in mind that, particularily where an office of this type is being sought, the need of the candidate for the office is absolutely of no concern to the voters and should be entirely disregarded. On the other hand, the needs and demands of the office are exclusively to be considered.'"

Senator Levine continued his interest in politics after leaving the legislature, speaking up for improvements that are still needed—like reapportionment. "The unequal distribution of representation is not just," he said in April of 1963. "About 40 percent of the people are running the legislature."

Mr. Sam saw the legislature plain ("Often you could set trees in the chairs and get the same results") but he suggested as well as criticized: "There's nothing more sacred than lawmaking. We should be more deliberate about our legislation—not legislate on the spur of the moment."

Sam Levine pursued even the most important things, like justice and enlightenment, with tranquillity.

He was strong and of good courage. He trained his courage not to defy, but to preserve law and reason.

When men want to know the reason for America's strength at its grassroots, let them study the life of Sam M. Levine in Pine Bluff, Ark.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S WISE POLICY IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC IS SUCCEEDING

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Friday, President Johnson delivered an important address on the occasion of his receiving an honorary degree from Baylor University, at Waco, Tex.

He devoted the address to a presentation of his administration's policy and position in the Dominican Republic. It is a position which I have vigorously supported from the beginning.

The charge that is being made at home and abroad—that our landing of marines in the Dominican Republic was a relapse into, and a resumption of, our "gunboat diplomacy" of the early days of this century—is, in my view, wholly without foundation.

As one who, as a journalist, as managing editor of the Nation from 1920 to 1923, fought against this manifestation of U.S. imperialism, I believe I am qualified to point out that our action in the Dominican Republic is in no sense a recrudescence of the discredited policies that were followed from the late eighteen nineties until President Franklin D. Roosevelt's enunciation of the good-neighbor policy. It was at President Roosevelt's first venture into Latin American affairs, at the Seventh Inter-American Conference, at Montevido, in the late fall of 1933, that a foundation was laid for a policy of nonintervention. Secretary of State Cordell Hull headed the delegation. I had been appointed as its advisor.

The interventions into Latin American countries prior to that time, the sending of our Marines into Nicaragua, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic, were motivated by American economic interests. Our occupations of these three countries were designed to safeguard the investments of American private interests. It was a policy wholly inconsistent with our national professions, and wholly at variance with Woodrow Wilson's pronouncements for self-determination of small nations, although it was in the Wilson administration that this regrettable policy was most vigorously carried out.

President Johnson's action in the Dominican Republic was motivated first by the desire to save the lives of Americans and other nationals; and, as he pointed out in his Baylor address, that was carried out without the loss of a single life among those who were evacuated. Second, his purpose was to forestall a Castro-Communist takeover and to obviate the falling behind the Iron Curtain of a second nation in the Caribbean. Third, President Johnson wanted to establish a multilateral approach to all future situations of that kind, and to enlist the Organization of American States in that worthwhile objective. It is being done. A month after the first landing of our Marines, there withdrawal has begun. It may require some time to withdraw all except those needed as a part of an inter-American peacekeeping police force but the objective has been made clear, and the process is underway.

If successful, as all of us hope it will be, it will prove to be an epoch-making event in inter-American relations. I have so stated as my view from the beginning, and I now reassert it.

Inasmuch as President Johnson, admirably summed up the whole matter, I ask unanimous consent that his speech at Baylor be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 29, 1965]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS AT BAYLOR

This is a moment that I deeply wish my parents could have lived to share. In the first place, my father would have enjoyed what you have so generously said of me and my mother would have believed it.

More than that, the honor you pay me is in a real sense honor that's due my mother. All of her life she spoke often of Baylor, a trait that I have found not uncommon among all of your alumni.

Her pride in Baylor and being the granddaughter of a president of Baylor, passed on to me early and influenced the course of my own life more constructively than I could ever describe.

So I am most grateful to you for this moment and for its meaning to me.

Woodrow Wilson once told the men of Princeton that it is not learning but the spirit of service that will give a college a place in the public annals of the Nation.

For 120 years, Baylor University has touched the lives of many generations with an unusual spirit of selfless service. That spirit expressed in the work of ministers and missionaries, of public servants and public school teachers, of devout parents and dedicated citizens has not only won for Baylor a place of esteem in this State and this Nation, it has served the betterment of the condition of man to the remote ends of this earth.

HISTORIC HOUR FOR NATION

On this occasion, we meet here today at a historic hour in the life of the American nation. In Washington, leaders of this hemisphere are meeting to work together to open a road to durable peace in the Dominican Republic.

Their efforts will have our full support, for at stake is the future not only of one of our sister republics but the principles and the values of all the American Republics.

We are members of an inter-American system in which large and small nations are partners in the defense of freedom and in the progress of economic welfare and social justice.

That partnership must be constantly strengthened. Our common aim and our combined ability must increase in crisis as well as in calm.

The tragedy of the past 4 weeks in the Dominican Republic renews our common resolution to accept common responsibility in dealing with common dangers.

In that unfortunate nation 4 weeks ago the legacy of dictatorship exploded in fury and anarchy. Hundreds of Dominicans died, leaving thousands of widows and orphans of war. Nineteen of our own American boys lost heir lives. The capital city, birthplace of the Western Hemisphere, was split asunder.

Blood and hate drowned ideals. And for days freedom itself stood on the edge of disaster.

BOLIVAR ADMONITION RECALLED

In those early terrible hours we did what we had to do, remembering Simon Bolivar's admonition that "to hesitate is destruction." As your President, I did what I had to do.

Since then, working with the Organization of American States and its distinguished Secretary General, José Mora, the forces of democracy have acted. The results are clear.

More than 6,500 men and women and children from 46 different countries have been evacuated and not a single life was lost; a cease-fire was achieved, bringing an end to the threat of wholesale bloodshed; an international zone of refuge was opened as a haven for all men of peace and a safe corridor 17 miles long was established by American men.

More than 8 million pounds of food have been distributed to the Dominican people; a well-trained, disciplined band of Communists was prevented from destroying the hopes of Dominican democracy; political avenues were opened to help the Dominican people find a Dominican solution to their problems.

Today those achievements are guaranteed—guaranteed by the troops of five nations, representing this hemisphere. They are under the command of the able Brazilian general, General [Hugo Panasco] Alvin, and for the first time in the history of the Organization of American States [it] has created and it has sent to the soil of an American nation an international peacekeeping military force.

That may be the greatest achievement of all.

The United States made its forces a part of that inter-American force and as the contributions of the Latin American nations have been incorporated into the OAS force in the last 2 days, the United States has removed 1,600 troops from the island. I am issuing orders this morning to remove an additional 1,700 men on Saturday.

I have also instructed our commanding General [Bruce] Palmer [Jr.] to discuss possible further withdrawals with General Alvin and such action will be taken when the military commanders believe it is safe and warranted by the arrival of other Latin American forces or by the continued stabilization of the military situation.

So now we ask ourselves this morning what is next.

The answer to that question rests partly with the people of the Dominican Republic, and partly with their neighbors throughout this hemisphere. Already under the distinguished leadership of Secretary General Mora the broad outlines of a reasonable settlement are beginning to emerge, outlines which meet the need and respond to the desires, first of the Dominican people themselves and then of all the people of this hemisphere.

First, the Dominican people and the people of their sister republics do not want government by extremists of either the left or the right, and that is clear. They want to be ruled neither by an old conspiracy of reaction and tyranny nor by a new conspiracy of Communist violence.

Second, they want, as we do, an end to slaughter in the streets and to brutality in the barrios.

Third, they want, as we do, food and work and quiet in the night.

Fourth, they want, as we do, a constitutional government that will represent them all and work for all their hopes.

Fifth, the Dominican people know they need the help of sympathetic neighbors in healing their wounds and negotiating their divisions. But what they want ultimately is the chance to shape their own course. Those are the hopes of the Dominican people. But they are our hopes, too, and they are shared by responsible people in every nation of this hemisphere.

STRONGER SHIELD SOUGHT

Out of the Dominican crucible the 20 American nations must now forge a stronger shield against disaster. The opportunity is here now for a new thrust forward to show the world the way to true international cooperation in the cause of peace and in the struggle to win a better life for all of us.

We believe that the new world may most wisely approach this task guided by new realities.

The first reality is that old concepts and old labels are largely obsolete.

In today's world with the enemies of freedom talking about wars of national liberation the old distinction between the civil war and international war has already lost much of its meaning.

Second is the reality that when forces of freedom move slowly, whether on political or economic or military fronts, the forces of slavery and subversion move rapidly and they move rapidly and they move decisively.

Third, we know that when a Communist group seeks to exploit misery the entire free American system is put in deadly danger. We also know that these dangers can be found today in many of our lands.

FURTHER ATTEMPTS EXPECTED

There is no trouble anywhere these evil forces will not try to turn to their advantage and we can expect more efforts at triumph by terror and conquest through chaos.

Fourth, we have learned in the Dominican Republic that we can act decisively and we can act together.

Fifth, it is clear that we need new international machinery geared to meet the fast-moving events. When hours can decide the fate of generations, the moment of decision must become the moment of action.

And just as these lessons the past 4 weeks are clear, so are the basic principles which have guided the purpose of the United States of America.

We seek no territory. We do not seek to impose our will on anyone. We intend to work for the self-determination of the peoples of the Americas within the framework of freedom.

In times past, large nations have used their power to impose their will on smaller nations. Today, we have placed our forces at the disposition of the nations of this hemisphere to assure the peoples of those nations the right to exercise their own will in freedom.

RESOLUTION CITED

And in accordance with the resolution of the eighth meeting of the ministers at Punta Del Este, Uruguay, we will join with other OAS nations in opposing a Communist takeover in this hemisphere.

And in accordance with the Charter of Punta del Este, we will join with other OAS nations in pressing for change among those who would maintain a feudal system—a feudal system that denies social justice and economic progress to the ordinary peoples of this hemisphere.

We want for the peoples of this hemisphere only what they want for themselves: Liberty, justice, dignity, a better life for all.

More than a few agitators was necessary to bring on the tragic and the cruel bloodshed in the Dominican Republic. They needed additional help and a deeper cause, and they had both.

For the roots of the trouble are found wherever the landless and the despised, the poor and the oppressed stand before the gates of opportunity seeking entry into a brighter land; they can get there only if we narrow the gap between the rich nations and the poor, and between the rich and the poor within each nation.

And this is the heart of the purpose of the United States. Here on the campus of Baylor University we will reaffirm that purpose on June 26 when almost 50 Peace Corps volunteers will begin training for service in the Dominican Republic.

These young men and women will go to the barrios of Santo Domingo and Santiago to work with and to work for the people of the Dominican Republic in attaining a new life and a new hope.

At home, with the strong cooperation of our Congress, we are waging war on poverty; we are opening new paths of learning for all of our children; we are creating new jobs for our workers; we are providing health care for our older citizens; we are eliminating injustice and inequality; we are bringing new economic life to whole regions.

These objectives we will continue to pursue with all of our strength and all of our determination.

As peace returns to the Dominican people and as a broad base is laid for a new Dominican Government responsive to the people's will, the United States will be prepared to join in full measure in the massive task of reconstruction and in the hopeful work of lasting economic progress.

For, in bold ink, our signature is on the charter of the alliance. That charter commands a peaceful, democratic social revolution across the hemisphere. It asks that unjust privilege be ended and that unfair power be curbed.

A PLEA TO OPEN GATES

It asks that we help throw open the gates of opportunity to these millions who stand there now knocking. And just as we have joined in the Dominican Republic to bring peace to a troubled world, we have joined with these forces across the hemisphere who seek to advance their own independence and their own democratic progress.

We work with and for those men and women not because we have to. We work because morality commands it and justice requires it and our own dignity as men depends upon it.

We work not because we fear the unjust wrath of our enemy but because we fear the just wrath of God.

In Santo Domingo the last month has been grim. The storm there is not yet over. But a new sense of hope is beginning. And across the angry arguments of the opposing forces, the voice of good sense is now beginning to be heard.

As the Organization of American States recommits itself to the hard efforts of peacemaking, the Government and the people of the United States proudly pledge full support to the peacemakers.

The path ahead is long. The way ahead is hard. So we must, in the words of the Prophet, "mount up on the wings of eagles, run and not grow weary."

Thank you.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, two editorials on this general subject, but dealing especially with the responsibilities and functions of the OAS. The editorials were published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 17 and the San Jose, Calif., Mercury of May 5, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, May 17, 1965]

OAS SHOULD TAKE FIRM HAND

In the Dominican crisis the Organization of American States has an excellent and unprecedented opportunity to demonstrate its capabilities as an effective instrument for peace in the Western Hemisphere.

Thus far, the OAS performance has been somewhat disappointing.

The cease-fire is not being enforced. Rival factions in the Dominican Republic continue their struggle for power by force of arms. The OAS Peace Commission is slow in exercising authority and making its presence felt in Santo Domingo.

We urge the OAS to be firm. The Organization has the power to end the Dominican chaos by negotiation and persuasion, backed up by whatever police force is necessary. Not only U.S. troops but armed units of several Latin American countries are on the scene.

It is easy to argue in theory that the United States should have kept hands off the Dominican turmoil and should have let the OAS bear the full weight of responsibility right at the outset. The fact is, however, that the OAS has not been very impressive since it was given the authority and support to take decisive action. The OAS is carrying the ball now and should show what it can do.

Most Americans assuredly share President Johnson's hope, expressed in a statement over the weekend, "that the OAS mission presently in the Dominican Republic will rapidly find a solution that will at the same time assure for the Dominican people the principles of a democratic constitution and a government of national unity able to maintain economic and political stability."

It should be noted, in fairness to the OAS and as some measure of explanation for its difficulty in taking hold of things, that the United Nations is compounding the Dominican troubles. Untimely arrival of the U.N. investigation team in Santo Domingo—headed by an Army officer from India, of all places—serves only to add to the confusion.

The U.N. ought to be encouraging international settlement of disputes by appropriate regional organizations, such as the OAS, instead of intruding undiplomatically and flexing its own muscles.

As we understand it, the Organization of American States is supposed to be in charge in the Dominican Republic. That's the way it ought to be. The OAS should be a little less timid and substantially more positive in getting a firm grip on the situation.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury, May 5, 1965]

Time To Turn Policy Into Action

The responsibility for the future of the Dominican Republic is now firmly affixed to the Organization of American States. This is as it should be.

President Johnson made this point quite clear Monday when he said American troops would be withdrawn as soon as the OAS could guarantee that a Communist government would not be set up in Santo Domingo. As the President observed:

"The moment that the Organization of American States can present a plan that will bring peace on the island and give us the opportunity to evacuate our people and give some hope of stability of government, we'll be the first to come back home. * * * We don't intend to sit here in our rocking chair with our hands folded and let the Communists set up any government in the Western Hemisphere. * * *"

Cuba is one Communist government too many in the Western Hemisphere. Had the United States acted in timely fashion in Cuba, the pervading threat of Castro communism would not now hang over the Caribbean. The least this country can do now is to insure that the policy of containment actually works.

In principle, the OAS has subscribed to that policy. Now it is time for the OAS to translate policy into action.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President at the annual convention of the Order of Lafayette held recently in Washington, the members of this widely recognized patriotic society unanimously adopted a resolution calling for the continuation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution on Un-American Activities Committee

Whereas the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives has for 30 years courageously, efficiently and effectively investigated Communist activities in all its various ramifications throughout the United States, and by its constant investigations and turning the searchlight of truth upon the aims, purposes, principles and objectives of the Communist conspiracy has succeeded in warning the American people of its menace to freedom everywhere; and

Whereas the investigation of Communist and subversive activities by the Un-American Activities Committee has, to a large degree, exposed and smashed communism in the United States before it could spread as it has in France and Italy. All Communists are potential spies, traitors, saboteurs, and enemies from within: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Order of Lafayette at its convention assembled, That adequate funds be provided annually for the investigation by the Un-American Activities Committee of communism and subversive propaganda and activities in our midst, and as long as the Communist conspiracy continues to threaten our free institutions and constitutional form of Government.

"BIG BROTHER": COMPUTERS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, "big brother" is greatly assisted by automation and the whole current scientific revolution.

One small boost that automation has given to big brotherism is the new use of computers in compiling evidence for criminal prosecutions.

Mr. Sidney E. Zion has written a most interesting piece for the New York Times, entitled "Computers on Trial."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objective, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Computers on Trial—Use in Winning Gambling Indictments Attacked as Violation of Civil Rights

(By Sidney E. Zion)

The pervasive computer swung into action this week in New York and came up with 86 alleged bookmakers.

And, as it probably expected, it also came in for some stinging criticism. Joseph P. Hoey, U.S. attorney for the eastern district of New York, disclosed on Wednesday for the first time in modern criminology computers were an integral aid in uncovering bookmaking activities. His announcement drew quick fire from some lawyers and civil libertarians, and more is likely to come as the possible implications of the practice become clearer.

The main argument of the critics is that most people today consider computers to be infallible and that therefore the mere announcement that they were used as the basis for indictments could fatally prejudice a defendant's right to a fair trial.

The New York Civil Liberties Union yesterday expressed shock and dismay at Mr. Hoey's announcement. It charged that the announcement violated the restrictions placed on pretrial publicity by Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach on April 16.

DATA ON TESTS BARRED

Among other things he restricted information regarding investigative procedures such as lie-detector tests, ballistic tests, fingerprints and laboratory tests.

The Civil Liberties Union said that the disclosure of the use of computers clearly falls within the Attorney General's proscriptions.

On this point, a legal observer pointed out yesterday that Mr. Hoey's announcement appeared to have also violated the Attorney General's rule against characterizing defendants. Mr. Hoey had singled out, by name, 4 of the 86 defendants as top-echelon bookmakers.

The Civil Liberties Union also said that significant constitutional problems would be presented if Mr. Hoey's office placed substantial reliance on the computers in obtaining the indictments.

The union said it was studying the question of whether the use of machines that make judgments can be appropriately substituted for human judgments in establishing probable cause to justify the return of indictments.

It is difficult to determine the importance computers had in the New York case.

As Mr. Hoey explained it, the computers were fed with information obtained over a 2-year period from bettors, agents, police, and other sources. This information included bookmakers' worksheets, the movements of bettors and bookmakers, geographical patterns of betting and the methods and amounts of payoffs.

Having digested all of this information, the machines then evaluated it and the indictments followed.

According to the Government's initial announcement the indictments might not have been possible without the computers. The announcement said this was because manual processing of the information would have taken so long the 3-year statute of limitations on the charges could have expired before the vital data had been obtained.

In a telephone interview on Thursday, however, Mr. Hoey said that there was sufficient human evidence before the grand jury to justify the indictments.

IMPLICATIONS DISTURBING

In any event, it is the implications of the New York case that disturb many lawyers.

"I find the whole thing revolting and nineteen eighty-fourish," said William Kunstler, a New York civil rights lawyer.

Will a computer's evaluation of a man's guilt ever be permitted into evidence at his trial?

Most lawyers questioned this week said that this evidence would not be admissible.

A few, however, had reservations, pointing out that radar evidence is generally permitted and that computer evidence is generally permitted in civil cases where business records are kept on IBM cards, for example.

The principal legal objections to its use are that a computer cannot be cross-examined, although its programmer can, and that a jury would be unduly swayed by the computer's conclusions.

The last point is the one most often stressed by lawyers. It was widely expressed on Thursday by Connecticut lawyers attending the Greenwich Bar Association's Law Day ceremonies.

"Most people today are prepared to say that the computer is right," said Jack Waltuch, a Norwalk lawyer. "It can tell you where the stars are going to be a million years from now. Do you think a jury is not going to believe that it can tell you where a bookie is in the Bronx? It's just too sacrosanct and that's what scares me."

EXPANSION OF TOURISM IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper article published in the Sunday Gazette-Mail—Charleston, W. Va.—State magazine on May 30, 1965. This article reports on the sixth annual travel clinic held at Blackwater Falls State Park in West Virginia this spring.

This annual travel clinic is always productive in boosting the morale of West Virginians—their pride and confidence in the future growth of tourism in the Mountain State. It also serves as a forum for emphasing the wonderful potential of the State as the vacationland of the East Central United States, and offers an opportunity for representatives of private enterprise and public agencies to work together in planning more and better facilities for the tourist and to tell the story of the State's vacationland to an increasing number of prospects.

I spoke at the third annual travel clinic in 1962, using the opportunity to acquaint West Virginians interested in promoting tourism with the anticipated virtues of the proposed Allegheny Parkway. I stressed the vital necessity of providing major arteries of travel as a means to bring travelers to West Virginia in more economically rewarding numbers. I pointed out the tremendous appeal of the proposed Allegheny Parkway to lovers of natural beauty, for it is designed as a scenic highway through national forests and other areas in the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Maryland.

It is my hope that my bill, S. 6, which I again introduced in this session of Congress, will receive early passage. The enactment of this measure establishing the parkway, and also authorizing connecting parkway roads and trails to permit greater utilization of adjacent national forests and resources, will provide a basis for concrete planning by those in attendance at the next travel clinic at Blackwater Falls State Park of means to care for the heavy volume of tourist business which is anticipated in future years as a result of the opening of this proposed Allegheny Parkway.

There being no objection, the newspaper article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Blackwater Travel Tonic

At Blackwater you heard a lot about white water.

Alma and Jerry Cowherd, with the help of other Hardy and Grant County residents, have for the past two Aprils mixed white water, blue skies, and red noses (from the brisk spring air) and come up with greenbacks. This magic feat was much applauded at the sixth annual travel clinic which convened April 29–30 at Blackwater Falls State Park.

A convention of travel, recreation, and publicity and promotion experts, the clinic was dedicated to the proposition that tourism in West Virginia has a future which will prove profitable, in a big way, to those who cater to the needs and whims of the anticipated tourists.

The White Water canoe races on the North Fork of the South Branch of the Potomac, examples of the sort of thing that attracts visitors to the Mountain State, were quite naturally much discussed.

As the White Water canoe races came about, in part, as a result of previous (five before this one) travel clinic discussions, it was understandable that such successful events should be viewed by veteran clinic members with paternalistic pride. The hope was that other seedling ideas, planted and nurtured at the sixth travel clinic, might later flower so successfully.

Discussions were incorporated in a format program consisting of a kickoff luncheon addressed by Mrs. Margot (it rhymes with Wells Fargo) Coley, publicity director of the Greenbrier Hotel; three sessions, devoted to the stimulation of travel in West Virginia, along with an appraisal of current travel enticements and accommodations; a Governor's banquet addressed by Gov. Hulett C. Smith; and a final address by James Gross, of Washington, D.C., executive director of the National Association of Travel Organizations.

Promoters, it may be fairly stated, are neither sociologists, historians, nor objective scientists of any stripe. They are people either selling a product or looking for a product to sell.

The product in this case was tourism in West Virginia, how it could be increased and made more profitable to the businessmen of the State. Sessions at the clinic were made up of panels of experts, some of whom complained that the State government was getting altogether too large a percentage of the tourist dollar.

Frohman Johnson, executive secretary of the Upper Monongahela Valley Association, put the matter in a nutshell. Income from the tourist industry in West Virginia, he said, was approaching $350 million a year, the bulk of which was going into the voracious coffers of the State treasury and very little going into your tax-producing, grimy little hands.

Johnson issued an impassioned appeal to private-enterprise operators "to get off your keesters and start reaping more and more of this golden harvest."

His audience did not rise as one man. The reason was that not many business people, except for dedicated ones like the Cowherds, were present. Travel and promotion experts on the panels were lecturing other travel and promotion experts on the floor, a fact which was recognized and deplored. The need for more business people at future clinics was stressed.

The clinics could use more people like Alma and Jerry Cowherd, owners for the past 23 years of a hostelry in Petersburg called the Hermitage. They do not merely talk. They act.

The White-Water canoe races are examples of Cowherd initiative. Also, Alma and Jerry are expanding the Hermitage, adding a new, 16-unit motor unit scheduled for occupancy in mid-September. They are risking $120,000 (locally financed), to demonstrate their faith in the travel future of West Virginia.

Despite its critics, State government was well represented at the clinic. Present were Parks Chief Kermit McKeever; State Road Commissioner Burl Sawyers; Paul Crabtree, of the Office of Economic Development; and Lovell Greathouse and Bob Bowers, both of the West Virginia Department of Commerce.

Governor Smith was present long enough to make a banquet speech emphasizing the positive approach. He said that every Mountaineer has an obligation to see his State first hand. Find out what West Virginia has to offer, he said, then tell others about it. "The spirit of 'we will,'" he declared, "will win hands down."

Kermit McKeever, at the first clinic session, chaired by John Scherlacher, professor of recreation at West Virginia University, spoke informally of planned park improvements and additions.

"Within the next month," said the parks chief, "we hope to advertise for bids for improvements to the Cass Scenic Railroad." Now 4 miles long, the railroad will be extended several more miles to the top of Bald Knob. Outdoor recreation opportunities in this area are virtually limitless.

Work on an entirely new park, built around major waterfalls of the Tygarts Valley near Grafton, will begin soon. Reconstruction of archeological sites—such as the one at Buffalo in Putnam County—is also planned.

E. M. Olliver, forest supervisor of the Monongahela National Forest, perhaps hit the nail on the head not only in this area, but for all of West Virginia, when he said:

"Like Kermit, we've got lots of plans. All we're doing is waiting for the money." It takes capital to get things done, and a lack of money, at the State or private level, has always been a hinderance in the Mountain State.

Olliver spoke of a 70-acre impoundment the Federal Government will build in Randolph County, and a 53-acre impoundment to be constructed near Richwood. There will also be improvements at Cranberry Glades, partially for the protection of the glades, and partly for the convenience of visitors.

The installation of boardwalks in Cranberry Glades, Olliver pointed out, depends on changing the governmental classification of the bogs. Now a natural area, for the use of students and scholars, the glades, to qualify for improvements such as might entice general tourists would have to be changed to a "scenic area."

It is probably worth mentioning that the only tourist attractions actually in the process of being built in West Virginia (not counting motels) are being financed either by Federal or State Governments. At least no others were mentioned at the travel clinic (a private attraction of merit near Harpers Ferry is actually being closed), unless you want to count the novel farm vacation arrangement of Mrs. Wilson Teets, of Moorefield. And it appears that Mrs. Teets is using, for the most part, facilities which were already in existence.

Mrs. Teets' farm vacation enterprise, as told by Mrs. Teets, was a travel-clinic highlight. She spoke softly and carried a very large travel promotion pitchfork.

Mrs. Teets has built up a brisk tourist business. Out-of-State visitors remain on her three farms for family vacations of a week or longer. Mrs. Teets has developed a small but flourishing business by stressing service, courtesy, and cleanliness with a minimum of ballyhoo—methods others might follow with profit to themselves and credit to West Virginia.

Why is Mrs. Teets in business? Probably to pay her property taxes. She owns 3,000 acres in the Moorefield area.

The second session of the clinic, titled "Wayout Promotions," promised more than it delivered, in terms of earth-shaking developments. Marlane MacLane, as inconspicuous as a fire engine at a funeral, advocated liquor by the drink to lure tourists to West Virginia, as did James Hetzer, a Huntington theatrical agent whose latest effort seems to have been an oriental girlie show from Japan.

Mary Scott, now with a Charleston advertising firm, but for many years a press agent for "Honey in the Rock," did not agree. That is, she said, "I do not think that liquor by the drink is the answer to all our problems," a statement with which the strongest partisan of John Barleycorn could scarcely disagree.

Mrs. Scott further proved her intransigence by making remarks about Marlane MacLane's false eyelashes. This was in a prepared speech, largely detailing Scott's successes in promoting "Honey in the Rock." One of the first things you learn about promotion and publicity people is that they are not shy.

This year, the clinic had intended, by and large, to dispense with speeches by panel members. Answering questions from the floor was to be the primary panel function, with general discussion to follow. But speeches there were, and many of them. Although this was not altogether bad, perhaps the resolve to curb speeches in next year's clinic program might be printed in somewhat larger type.

The 1965 clinic at Blackwater Falls State Park concluded with a dinner address by Gross. His primary message was to "See the U.S.A.," a message combined with a pep talk urging his listeners to sell travel. Said he:

"Everyone selling together blends hearts and minds and spirits, as the musicians in an orchestra harmonize musical tones, to create a mighty symphony of prosperity."

It should be pointed out that the sixth annual travel clinic, and all those preceding, would not have existed without the active support of the Monongahela Power Co., which also appears to have a strong role in another supporting organization, the Upper Monongahela Valley Association.

The support of the Monongahela Power Co. has not been merely verbal, but organizational and monetary. C. Samuel Kistler, for example, recreationist for the company, is the retiring president of the travel clinic, and Frohman Johnson, of the Upper Monongahela Valley Association, its retiring secretary-treasurer.

Although it is true that such company activity is no doubt tax-deductible, and redounds in the long run to company benefit (or hopes to), it is also true that such activity benefits the community and State. This enlightened policy is a far cry from that of the utility which considers its duty done when it mails out bills and writes nasty letters to delinquent customers.

Even if the results of the travel clinics, despite their chief sponsor, are not always electrifying, you should attend next year. That is, you should if your welfare is in any way concerned with travel and tourism.

Be there. Spark their imagination with a battery of your own shocking ideas. You'll get a charge out of it.

VIETNAM REQUIREMENTS

Mr McGEE. Mr President, writing in today's Washington Post, Edward T. Folliard calls patience and stamina our Nation's most needed requirements in connection with the pursuit of the war in South Vietnam. His reference is to patience and stamina on the part of all the American people.

Other Senators have stated, here on this floor, that Communist governments, particularly those in Hanoi and Peiping, are betting on American's well-known impatience, and believe that we shall tire of the constant demands of pursuing a faraway war. Many of us have regretted the attention given to those who already have tired of the struggle and want our Government to extricate us, for these well-publicized protestors feed the hopes of Hanoi and Peiping.

Most Americans support President Johnson, who has affirmed our intention of staying in South Vietnam and seeing the battle through. Most Americans want to show the Communists that they cannot get away with aggression against their neighbors. As a nation, I am sure, we do possess the patience and stamina that are needed for the task.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Folliard's article, entitled "Patience, Stamina—Vietnam Requirements," printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATIENCE, STAMINA—VIETNAM REQUIREMENTS

(By Edward T. Folliard)

The most important requirement for success in Vietnam, aside from fighting men, weapons, and diplomacy, may turn out to be patience and stamina in the United States. In Hanoi and Peiping, the Communists are betting that Americans are short on both of these qualities, and will not be able to match their own Oriental fortitude.

It is a fact that Americans are not noted for patience. Indeed, we have made a virtue of impatience, and this doubtless has had much to do with the Nation's greatness. Ours is a country in a hurry, as is exemplified in the slogan:

"The difficult we do immediately. The impossible takes a little longer."

This is admirable, but what happens if the war in Vietnam is a long drawn-out one? It could become the longest war in which the United States has ever engaged. It certainly will become that if Donald Johnson, national commander of the American Legion, is right. The Legion chief, who recently visited South Vietnam, said at the White House last week that he could envision the struggle going on for another 5, 6, or 7 years.

American intervention in South Vietnam began in the Eisenhower administration, but the current buildup in manpower was ordered by President Kennedy, and the first American casualties were reported late in 1961. Therefore, if the fighting should continue for another 5 years, it would set a record for American involvement with a foreign foe, exceeding in duration the Revolutionary War (1775–83).

President Johnson is eager for a settlement in Vietnam, but he has vowed to hang on there until the Reds of North Vietnam and their Vietcong allies end their aggression against South Vietnam. He says that the United States will not be defeated and will not grow tired. Moreover, the Texan believes that his successor, or successors, will, if necessary, carry on the struggle after he leaves the White House.

That still leaves unanswered the question of how the American people would behave if the conflict is prolonged. It is an important question. In writing about the Korean war in volume II of his memoirs, former President Harry S. Truman said:

"What a nation can do or must do begins with the willingness of its people to shoulder the burden."

The American people saw the Korean war through, but their patience was badly strained. There were hawks and doves then, too. But in between were millions of Americans who just weren't persuaded that this Nation's involvement was worth the cost in lives and treasure.

Sir Winston Churchill said later that this one act by Mr. Truman—his boldness and swiftness in going into Korea—entitled him to be listed among America's great Presidents. It seemed at this time, however, that the Missourian never quite succeeded in explaining to the mass of his countrymen what was at stake in Korea, and he was jeered for calling the war a police action.

President Truman had strong backing when he first sent American troops to Korea under the banner of the United Nations. But as the conflict dragged on, it became a political issue at home, and Senator Robert A. Taft and other Republicans began calling it "Truman's war."

In spite of this division, which carried over into the 1952 presidential campaign, the Communists realized after a year of fighting that the map of Korea couldn't be changed by violence. After a signal from Moscow and Peiping, negotiations for a truce began on July 10, 1951. The negotiations continued for 2 years; finally, the armistice agreement was signed at Panmunjon on July 27, 1953.

Back in the spring of 1951, President Truman had fired Gen. Douglas MacArthur as Far East commander. He disagreed with MacArthur's proposal to attack Red China and he disagreed with MacArthur's shibboleth: "There is no substitute for victory."

"The only victory we seek," said Mr. Truman, "is the victory of peace." But in saying this, he insisted that the Communists would not be allowed "to keep the fruits of their misdeeds." And so the war ended where it began.

The war in Vietnam is very much different from Korea. President Johnson's objective, however, is much the same as Mr. Truman's: to show the Communists that they can't get away with aggression against their neighbor.

Mr. Johnson has said that the United States has no desire to conquer North Vietnam and that "there is no purely military solution in sight for either side." Barring a change in policy, this would seem to leave the United States with only one course of action: to hang on until the Communists decide, as they did in Korea, that fighting is no longer profitable.

The Communist leaders of Hanoi and Peiping, as has been said, are betting that Americans don't have the staying power to go the route. A generation ago, Hitler and Mussolini were saying that the United States was decadent.

DOMINICAN HOPE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the "Inside Report" of reporters Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, which was published in the Washington Post of May 28, does much to clear the air regarding the American hope for the Dominician Republic, and to "give the lie," as they wrote, "to shrill critics who have been spreading the false rumor that President Johnson really favors right-wing military juntas and does not trust the anti-Communist left."

According to their article, the U.S. action in Santo Domingo effectively blocked the possibility of a coup by Communist elements. As it turned out, that was an easier task than the job of gluing together a progressive government with staying power.

I ask unanimous consent that the Evans-Novak article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 28, 1965]

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

DOMINICAN HOPE

SANTO DOMINGO.—Having liquidated the undeniable threat of another Cuba in the Caribbean, the United States is now liquidating the threat of a return to strong man, rightwing military rule.

The intense effort going into this work ought once and for all to give the lie to shrill critics who have been spreading the false rumor that President Johnson really favors rightwing military juntas and doesn't trust the anti-Communist left.

The intensity of the effort to rehabilitate the left-of-center leaders still holed up in the cobweb of narrow streets in the old city has not yet been fully reported. Nor, it should be added, has the collateral and perhaps more important effort to deal with that stubborn political primitive, Col. Antonio Imbert Barrera. Tony Imbert now claims (without a shred of proof) to hold the confidence of the whole country except for the revolutionary forces here.

The best place to start the story is in President Johnson's oval office in the White House one day last week. Among those present were Secretary of State Dean Rusk and his Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Thomas Mann. In a voice mixed with sadness and anger, the President said he was being blamed for using the U.S. Marines to establish and support a return to military dictatorship in the Dominican Republic. Nothing could put him in a falser light, the President said.

Almost as the President spoke, Tony Imbert's military forces were mopping up the last remaining rebel pockets north of the U.S.-patrolled corridor that separates the rebel forces in the heart of the city from Imbert's. This mopping up, far from proving that the United States was helping Colonel Imbert, was an essential event to permit McGeorge Bundy, the President's eyes and ears here for 10 days, to begin his serious talks with rebel leaders. Serious talks were impossible while the two sides sniped at each other.

But once the United States had the two sides apart, with 22,000 marines and paratroopers in the middle, the stage was set for serious bargaining. Subtly and ever so gently, Tony Imbert was warned that, if he continues to insist on his claim to be the head of the legitimate government, the United States might find itself unable to locate enough cash to pay Imbert's troops.

Not only that, but the United States might also not come through with budgetary-support funds which Imbert must have to pay the country's Government workers.

In the end, of course, it may be necessary to go much farther to force Imbert to agree on a non-Imbert government.

Along with this no-nonsense maneuver to cut Imbert down to size, the United States has now reappraised Col. Francisco Caamano Deno, with interesting results.

Instead of finding a front for the most dangerous elements in the rebel camp, as Colonel Caamano had been repeatedly characterized in the past, the United States now finds a soldier-politician who is the unquestioned rebel strong arm.

Where before the shadowy figure of Hector Aristy was regarded by the United States as Caamano's gray eminence, today Caamano is described not as a tool of Aristy or of Communist elements within the rebel camp, but as his own man—trustworthy, honorable, and fully capable of keeping any agreement he finally signs.

Thus, the conclusion is inescapable that, having eliminated the possibility of a Communist coup by swift, bold action on April 28, the United States is now promoting a progressive government. The problem is to glue one together out of the wreckage of Dominican politics.

THE HIGH COST OF HEROISM—REFLECTIONS ON MEMORIAL DAY, 1965

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, Memorial Day, 1965, has come and gone, but the reason for this solemn holiday still haunts the minds of some of us.

On this day, each year, the American people rouse themselves from other thoughts and pursuits, to honor the memory of the thousands of Americans who have given their last full measure of devotion in the defense of our freedom.

From thousands of bunting-draped speakers platforms in villages, hamlets, towns, and cities all over this land, once more came the oft-repeated words: "So, on this Memorial Day, we pause to honor those"—and so forth.

The speakers' words, the sound of muffled drums and taps—echoing over green fields filled with neat white crosses, row on row, soon fade away, and are forgotten as we turn again to the harsh realities which face the living. So, until next Memorial Day most of us will forget the real significance of the day: the fact that without the sacrifices of our honored dead, our free Nation and the world as we know it would not exist.

We also tend to forget the fact that throughout our history there have been extraordinary men—heroes—who have given that extra measure of devotion, and by their example have inspired others to rise to greater heights in defending freedom in its hours of danger.

Most conspicuous among those heroes are the comparative handful of men who are entitled to wear the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The Medal of Honor, our Nation's highest award for military valor, is given only to those who have acted with supreme courage, with total disregard of their own safety, in the face of the most hazardous conditions. It is bestowed by virtue of an act of Congress, and reflects our Nation's gratitude to those who, in moments of uncommon risk, offered in our defense everything they had including life itself.

Any man who has served in combat knows that many who qualify for decorations do not receive them, because their deeds of valor were not observed, or because there were no survivors to recount them. However, this fact should not detract from the tribute we pay those who did earn our Nation's highest award for heroism.

The Medal of Honor itself is merely a token, a gesture of recognition of "Conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty," and for sacrifices which cannot be measured or repaid in terms of worldly goods.

The harsh fact that we have not always remembered and properly honored our Nation's outstanding heroes was once again forcefully brought to my attention by an article in This Week magazine which was distributed with Sunday newspapers, all over the country, on May 30.

The article, entitled "The High Cost of Heroism," was written by Joe McCarthy, and was particularly timely, coming as it did on Memorial Day.

Mr. McCarthy traced the sad history of the shameful treatment accorded some of our Congressional Medal of Honor winners. Among others, he cited the protracted tax troubles which plagued World War I hero Sgt. Alvin York.

I believe we owe a debt of gratitude to the editors of This Week magazine and author Joe McCarthy for nudging our national conscience about the manner in which some of our Nation's greatest heroes have been ill-treated, ignored, and pushed aside.

I commend this excellent article to all Senators, and request unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HIGH COST OF HEROISM

(Our Medal of Honor recipients have a brief moment in the sun and unfortunately a long time in the shade.)

(By Joe McCarthy)

On this Memorial Day, as America honors its war dead, it might be well to consider how much honor is paid to our greatest war heroes—the gallant band of 283 surviving recipients of the Medal of Honor, the Nation's highest award for bravery "above and beyond the call of duty."

Until recently, the ceremonial recognition given regularly by the Government to the wearers of the Medal of Honor was a special red-carpet invitation to the President's inauguration. The medalists were seated in a place of prominence among the dignitaries near the President and treated as VIP's at the inaugural balls. They had to pay for the trip to Washington themselves, or hitch a ride on a military aircraft, one of the few privileges that goes with the medal. Free living quarters were available at military posts near the Capital.

"Every 4 years they made us feel pretty important," says one aging medal recipient from World War I. "We looked forward to it."

But last January, at President Johnson's inauguration, the red carpet was not rolled out. The invitation sent to Medal of Honor men included no special seats among the top-ranking guests and no tickets to the gala balls. A letter explained, regretfully, that there were no free beds for civilian medal recipients at Fort Myer or Fort McNair. By and large, those who did go to the inauguration were the few men who live near Washington.

It was said, unofficially, that the administration wanted to emphasize achievements of peace rather than the memory of wartime heroics; the medalists singled out for special recognition at the Johnson inauguration were outstanding scientists, artists, educators, and professional people decorated with the civilian Medal of Freedom.

THE PRIVILEGES OF A MEDAL HOLDER

Along with the privilege of getting free transportation on military planes, if space and flights are available, a Medal of Honor recipient rates only two special benefits not given to other veterans. He can apply for an optional Government pension of $100 a month after the age of 40, and, if his sons are qualified, they may obtain appointments to West Point, Annapolis, or the Air Force Academy without congressional recommendations.

It is widely assumed by servicemen that veterans wearing the Medal of Honor's blue and white-starred rosette in their lapels are legally entitled to receive a hand salute. But such a courtesy is not required by Army, Navy, or Air Force regulations.

As a matter of fact, the bill awarding the $100 a month pension was passed by Congress a few years ago, not as a needed financial benefit but simply because the legislators realized that the medal winners were receiving little or no recognition from the Government for their wartime heroism.

The author of the pension measure, Representative OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, himself a World War II infantry officer with the Silver Star and the Croix de Guerre, pointed out to Congress that the United States at that time was lagging far behind Britain and France in showing official gratitude to outstanding patriotic heroes. When TEAGUE introduced his pension bill, they were receiving $10 a month after the age of 65, a pension authorized before World War I.

"The $100 a month they're getting now isn't enough to live on, of course," a Government official said a few weeks ago. "It's just something to let them know we haven't forgotten them."

The Government official was asked if any further increase in benefits for Medal of Honor recipients was planned for the near future.

"There are no such plans," he said.

ROLLCALL OF FAME

Today's living 283 Honor Medalists range in age from 89-year-old Maj. Frank C. Anders, who won his medal in the Philippine insurrection of 1899, to 30-year-old Capt. Roger H. C. Donlon, decorated last December by President Johnson for bravery in Vietnam. They include such well-known names as Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, Gen. Jimmy Doolittle, cowboy movie star Audie Murphy, Marine flyer Joe Foss, who was elected Governor of South Dakota and is today commissioner of the American Football League, and Charles A. Lindbergh, who was given the medal for his solo flight across the Atlantic in 1927.

Many of the medal holders have stayed on in the armed services until retirement, or are still on active duty waiting to retire, and a large number of them are in modest paying Federal and State Government jobs. There are 27 medalists working in various cities, for example, as employees of the Veterans' Administration, Department of Veterans' Benefits, the result of an order issued by President Harry S. Truman at the end of World War II directing the VA to hire any Medal of Honor recipient who applied for a job in that Department.

A typical medalist employed by the Veterans' Administration in Newark, N.J., is Nicholas Oresko, who singlehandedly charged and demolished two enemy machinegun positions in Germany in 1945, wiping out the second emplacement with grenades and rifle fire while severely wounded.

Not so typical is Henry E. "Red" Erwin, the only enlisted airman to win the medal in the Pacific in World War II, and now assigned to the VA office in Montgomery, Ala. To make himself presentable enough to hold a job with many contacts, Erwin spent more than 2 years in a veterans' hospital after the war undergoing skin-grafting surgery on his burned and disfigured face. In a B–29 on a bombing mission over Japan a phosphorus bomb caught and ignited in the plane. To save the plane and the other men in its crew, Erwin groped for the burning bomb, picked it up, and carried it forward to the copilot's window with his hands and clothing in flames, and dropped it outside.

Most of the medalholders are members of the Medal of Honor Society, which meets every 2 years at reunions and publishes a quarterly bulletin and newsletter to keep the highly exclusive group informed of each other's doings. The current president of the society is Thomas J. Kelly, a New Yorker who worked his way through law school after winning the Medal of Honor and now serves as an Administrator in the Manhattan office of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Even among the annals of Medal of Honor citations for the past century, which crowd every page with unbelievable stories of selfless daring, the account of Kelly's award-winning exploit under fire stands out.

As a 21-year-old medical aid man, Kelly was attached to an armored infantry platoon which was caught by a surprise attack while crossing an open clearing in Germany. The platoon and Kelly ran from the plateau-like exposed ground to the protection of a downhill slope, leaving dead and wounded Americans behind them.

Going back into the clearing to bring the wounded to safety meant crawling and running under fire from the surrounding woods for a distance of 300 yards, but Kelly decided to try it. On his first trip he led out a group of seven blinded and shocked casualties who were able to walk under his guidance. Then he went back across the exposed terrain again and again, carrying and dragging more wounded soldiers. Two other GI's, who tried to help him, were both killed. Kelly made 10 trips in all, rescuing 17 fallen men from the field of sweeping machinegun fire and exploding mortar shells.

"YOU KNOW WHAT'S RIGHT"

"I thought of Sister Saint Peter, one of the nuns who taught me in parochial school," he said recently. "I could feel her gold ring tapping against my forehead, as it did when she was trying to teach me something, and I could hear her saying, 'Tom Kelly, you know what's right and what's wrong. There are wounded men out there—go and get them.' "

As president of the Medal of Honor Society, Kelly hears more about the problems of medal winners than anybody in the Pentagon or the Veterans' Administration. Many of the war heroes in his fraternity feel that they get too much recognition—of the wrong kind.

"Wearing the Medal of Honor can be harder than winning it," Kelly said. "A medalholder sometimes finds his commanding officer, or his boss in civilian life, leaning over backward, making sure he isn't treated any better than anybody else because of his medal.

"If he makes a mistake, or gets into trouble, he's likely to be given a rougher punishment than he would have gotten if he didn't have the medal. He's always carefully walking a tightrope in the glare of the spotlight."

TROUBLE MAKES HEADLINES

An automobile accident or a bankruptcy, a divorce trial or a friendly party turning into a noisy brawl, any of the misfortunes that ordinarily wouldn't be mentioned in the newspapers can make headlines if a Medal of Honor hero is involved.

"The ones you read about are the few who are having personal troubles," Kelly says, "so people think many Medal of Honor men have a terrible time trying to adjust to civilian life. Nobody writes about all the rest of us who are quietly raising families and worrying about the mortgage payments like everybody else."

The Medal of Honor heroes best known by postwar newspaper readers are indeed the ones plagued by the most troubles, such as tobacco-chewing Charles E. "Commando" Kelly, from Pittsburgh, the 36th Division's one-man army in Italy. Chuck Kelly, as he was called in his outfit, has occupied more space in newspapers since the war than during it—thanks to his prolonged struggles with unemployment, illness, and financial woes. Sgt. Alvin C. York, who died last September at the age of 76, became almost as famous in the last 20 years for his income tax litigations as he was for his World War I heroism. Sergeant York's feat of 1918 was hailed by Marshal Foch as the greatest accomplishment of any soldier in all the armies of Europe. In a 4-hour skirmish in the Argonne Forest in 1918, York and a few companions killed 25 Germans and captured the rest of an enemy machinegun battalion, 4 officers and 128 enlisted men.

A modest and unpretentious Tennessee mountaineer, York firmly refused after the war to capitalize on his Medal of Honor. Finally he was persuaded that a movie biography, starring Gary Cooper, could inspire patriotism. For the film rights to his life story, York was paid some $150,000, most of which he gave away to worthy causes and needy friends.

Then York was hit by an income tax and interest bill for $172,000. His case dragged through courts for years. The Internal Revenue authorities finally agreed to settle for $25,000, raised by public donation.

Probably the most shaky postwar readjustment attempted by any Medal of Honor recipient was the one tackled by Audie Murphy. Murphy, who won more decorations than any other soldier in World War II, received his Medal of Honor award for holding a woods attacked by the Germans almost singlehanded, personally killing or wounding 50 of the enemy. He left his cotton-growing hometown of Farmersville, Tex., after the war and went to Hollywood to become a movie star.

Now 40—he was only 20 when he won the Medal of Honor—Murphy is comfortably and solidly established in filmland and as a millionaire cowboy movie star, the only horse-riding actor still working regularly in motion pictures. He appears in four or five westerns a year, low-budget films that are shown mainly in small-town theaters.

Murphy was regarded as a "hot" prospect when he first came to Hollywood, and Murphy's friends believe that he might have become a glamour star if he had patronized the right people in Hollywood. But he kept the right people at arm's length and never regretted it.

"I have only a nodding acquaintance with Hollywood-type people," Audie once said. "I say nodding to them and they say nodding to me."

Murphy enjoys his role as a western performer. His peaceful existence in Hollywood is marred only by gossip column mentions of a Medal of Honor hero being thrown out of Sunset Strip nightclubs. It is another holder, but everyone thinks the columnists are writing about Murphy, who never goes to nightclubs.

Murphy makes a point of never identifying himself publicly with his Medal of Honor, which he has given, along with his other medals, to his two young sons. He avoids meetings of the Medal of Honor Society and turns down invitations to appear in his reserve uniform at parades. However, he went to a PTA meeting in Gardena, Calif., recently and made a speech on "What the Constitution Means to Me."

SALUTE TO GLORY

The most impressive salute ever given to Medal of Honor holders and perhaps from the looks of things, the last one, was a special reception attended by 240 wearers of the award at the White House on May 2, 1963, the largest gathering of the medalists in one place in the history of the United States. As the heroes of six wars filed past President Kennedy, shaking his hand, some in wheelchairs and others on crutches, the President's sister-in-law, Mrs. Robert F. Kennedy, made a remark which well described the emotion of the spectators:

"It is like watching a million flags march by."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, when Thomas Paine said, "There are the times that try men's souls," he was describing the pressures of life nearly 200 years ago. That great patriot might be dismayed to find, were he alive today, that the pressures and crises have multiplied; that these times are far more trying, perhaps, then the relatively placid days of the American struggle for independence.

But Tom Paine would be cheered, I believe, by the courage, the patience, the skill, and the fortitude of this Nation's Chief Magistrate, Lyndon B. Johnson.

I am thinking particularly of our President's policy in the Vietnamese conflict: wielding forcefully this country's awesome strength and destructive power, yet always holding out the hand of peace, offering to our adversaries a reasonable and workable settlement, if they will but agree to negotiate.

This, I believe, is statesmanship of a high order; and I believe that in these "times which try men's souls," we can draw strength from our President's conduct in his office.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two excellent articles, by Michael Padev which reinforce and expand upon these views. The articles were published in the Indianapolis Star of May 5 and 14.

I also commend to other Senators an excellent editorial entitled "Negotiations on Vietnam." It was published in the Washingtin Evening Star of May 18. I also request that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis Star, May 5, 1965]

Analysis of Tactics: Johnson Revolutionizes Foreign Policy

(By Michael Padev)

Washington.—President Johnson has completely revolutionized American foreign policy in the last 3 months—since the beginning of the bombing raids on Communist North Vietnam.

Southeast Asia, and now the Caribbean, are the regions where this new Johnson policy has been tried. But its repercussions are bound to be worldwide, and its effect on the future course of international developments is certain to be decisive.

What Mr. Johnson has done is to put the United States squarely "on the map" as the greatest power—fully aware of its overwhelming strength and willing, as well as able, to use that strength in defense of U.S. national interests and international peace.

In the last 20 years or so Mr. Johnson's predecessors were, in most cases, rather power shy. They were apologetic about America's enormous military strength and tremendous economic and industrial capacity.

Wherever and whenever limited American military strength had to be used—as, for example, in Greece and Turkey, in Berlin, Korea, and the Middle East—this was always under the auspices of some "international" sponsorship.

The idea was conveyed that there was something basically wrong in the use of American military strength. Yet the only wrong thing about it was the fact that the idea itself was wrong.

The use of military strength is not "wrong" by itself. It depends on who uses it, how, and for what purpose.

In this field (the use of military strength) the record of the United States is second to none. The United States is not a colonial or imperialistic power, it holds no foreign country in bondage and it never has waged wars for conquest.

Contrary to what leftwingers and "liberals" say, the world is not afraid of American military power. To the contrary—all supporters of freedom and democracy, as well as all enslaved nations—in Europe, in Asia, and everywhere else—always have welcomed and welcome now the display and the exercise of American military power. This is so because they know that American power is their friend and protector.

The quick, forceful, and determined use of American military power in southeast Asia and the Caribbean will—we can be certain—greatly increase American influence throughout the world.

All our true friends will welcome with relief and satisfaction the news that, at long last, the President of the United States is following a foreign policy worthy of the leader of the free world—a policy based on the use of adequate U.S. strength where aggressors have to be stopped and where Communist conspiracies have to be defeated.

The success of this policy can best be judged by the angry and desperate howls coming from the Communist camp. The Communists are hurt—badly—and they shriek the louder because they did not expect such a hard blow to come from the United States just now.

For many years, the Reds were accustomed to American inaction in the face of their growing provocations. But now the man in the White House shows that he can act—and how. When shot at, he shoots back right away, without even consulting the United Nations.

And as L.B.J.'s guns are the best in the world, and his aim is deadly accurate, the Reds are beginning to realize they are in the wrong game.

This soon will bring the Communist leaders to an "agonizing reappraisal" of their policy toward the United States.

The one thing that the Communists don't want—and cannot afford to have—is a real showdown (a "confrontation," as Washington diplomats would say) with the United States. They will change their policy when they see that a confrontation might be inevitable. We then shall be on the road toward a more peaceful world.

[From the Indianapolis Star, May 14, 1965]

L.B.J.'s Speech Was Effective Public Diplomacy

(By Michael Padev, Star foreign editor)

Washington.—President Johnson's speech before the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists yesterday was a very skillful and a very effective step of public diplomacy.

The President said things and proposed policies which are meant to—

1. Further deepen the rift between Moscow and Peiping.

2. Make the Hanoi Communist regime think twice before agreeing to accept any military help from Red China.

3. Strengthen the "peace party" among North Vietnam's Communist leaders.

Contrary to what liberal experts on Communist affairs predicted, the escalation of the Vietnam war has not drawn Soviet Russia and Red China together. To the contrary, it has moved them further apart.

The Red Chinese press is now full of scornful attacks on the Soviet leaders, who are accused of kowtowing to the American imperialists and of being scared to help the glorious Communist comrades in North Vietnam against the American "paper tigers."

But Red China is not helping North Vietnam either. Though the Soviet press has so far been silent on the matter, Soviet and East European Communist diplomats have been pointing out in talks with Western officials that it is the Red Chinese who seem to be scared, in spite of the bombastic war propaganda.

By stressing that Red China is the only danger to peace in Asia, President Johnson has given a diplomatic "helping hand" to the Soviet leaders in their difficult struggle against Peiping.

This is a very clever political move. The United States should do its utmost to worsen the quarrel between Soviet Russia and Red China. Disunited Communists are much less dangerous than united Communists.

It is also obvious that all is not well between Red China and the Hanoi Communist government.

The U.S. bombing offensive against Communist targets in North Vietnam has made Hanoi suffer very dearly for its "war of liberation" in South Vietnam.

Red China also supports this "war of liberation." But there are no Red Chinese casualty lists, no Red Chinese bridges are bombed, and no Red Chinese communication lines are destroyed.

As the U.S. air offensive against Hanoi continues and is extended, the North Vietnam Communist leaders cannot fail to see that their country is the only victim in a war which is supposed to be common Communist property.

The unequal share of sacrifices, hardships and privations is never a good basis for a lasting alliance between states.

Sooner or later the Hanoi Communists leaders will point out to their Chinese comrades that a peaceful settlement with the United States might prove to be the only way to save North Vietnam from destruction and devastation.

Red Chinese propaganda about the United States being a paper tiger must sound very hollow in Hanoi just now for it is the Hanoi leaders who know, from painful experience, that the paper tiger has very sharp teeth, indeed.

By offering again "unconditional discussions" for peace, coupled with an imaginative and constructive American plan for technical assistance to an international cooperative development project in southeast Asia, President Johnson has appealed directly to the "peace party" among Hanoi's Communist leaders.

There should be no doubt that such a "peace party" does exist in Hanoi. We often believe, mistakenly, that all Communists think and act alike. But this is not true, especially in times of stress, emergency or war.

We can be sure that there is, at present, a very strong group of North Vietnam Communist leaders who doubt, or who begin to doubt, the wisdom of continuing the "liberation war" in South Vietnam.

Mr. Johnson's speech was meant to strengthen the hand of exactly this group of Hanoi leaders.

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 18, 1965]

Negotiations on Vietnam

President Johnson's call for unconditional peace talks on Vietnam, combined with the idea that "there is no purely military solution in sight for either side," is being wildly misinterpreted by some people in this country and abroad.

Critics of administration policy have seized on these two phrases to bolster their hope that a sellout in Vietnam is in the making. If a negotiation can be started, they say, it will be based on our recognition of a military stalemate in Vietnam. Whether or not the Communist Vietcong is accepted as a party to the negotiation, its status as a political power will be conceded.

The United States, these people believe, will be willing to accept participation of the Vietcong as a major element of a coalition government in South Vietnam which will ultimately lead to the reunification of the country under the leadership of Hanoi.

The President, in our opinion, means no such thing. A willingness to negotiate unconditionally does not mean that we are prepared to accept any and all conditions to achieve peace in Vietnam. And to say that no purely military solution is in sight does not mean that the United States is resigned either to a Vietcong victory or an indefinite stalemate.

The President, in short, is not seeking a negotiation in order to consecrate a defeat. Much of his speech last Thursday was devoted to the task of pointing out that the struggle against the Vietcong is being waged on political, economic, and social levels which are concurrent and complementary to the military war. Nothing that he has said could be interpreted to mean that this struggle against Communist domination will not be ultimately successful.

No negotiation undertaken under the present circumstances is likely in any event to produce a final settlement of the Vietnamese problem. The United States, as the President has made clear many times, cannot accept any formula which compromises the freedom and independence of South Vietnam.

What may be negotiable are the terms for a cease-fire in the south, together with an end to infiltration of men and arms from North Vietnam and the bombing of North Vietnamese installations.

It is possible also that the groundwork could be laid for elections in South Vietnam within a reasonable time after a cease-fire. Such elections held under international supervision would determine the role of the Vietcong in any future South Vietnamese government. It would also, very probably, determine the issue of reunification according to the wishes of a majority of South Vietnamese.

It is quite understandable that a solution along these lines should satisfy neither the Communists nor those who would like to see a surrender of South Vietnam. The reaction from Hanoi and Peiping so far indicates that the Communists for their part have by no means abandoned their hopes of conquest. And they at least do not seem to be under the illusion that they can win at the bargaining table what they cannot win on the battlefield.

ADJUSTMENTS REQUIRED FOR FULL EQUALITY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, James Reston recently devoted his widely read column in the New York Times to an analysis which I commend to the attention of all Senators.

The Senate has just completed action on one of the most decisive bills of this half century—the Voting Rights Act of 1965. With the enactment of this bill, we shall see one phase of the epic struggle for full equality for Negro Americans—indeed, for all Americans—draw to a close. This legislation should, once and for all, bring success to the unflagging determination of our Negro fellow citizens to achieve full equality in the polling place. But, as Mr. Reston has astutely observed, we cannot assume that equality in the polling place will lead to immediate equality in the marketplace and in the social sphere.

We must face the fact that full social, political, and economic equality—the rightful desire of every American citizen—will become an accomplished fact only after a very long and difficult period involving major adjustments in every segment of our national life. As Mr. Reston rightly asserts, that period is about to ensue.

Therefore, I request unanimous consent that Mr. Reston's article, entitled "Washington: The Push to the Left," be printed in its entirety at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WASHINGTON: THE PUSH TO THE LEFT

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The American Negro's fight for legal equality is in its closing phase, and his push to the left will soon begin. With the passage of the voting rights bill most of the artificial legal barriers will be down, but the major barriers to economic and social equality will remain.

The battle in the courts, beginning in 1954, and the battle in the streets have been spectacularly successful, but they are also highly misleading.

Despite the progress toward desegregation of the public schools, lunch counters, hotels and other places of public accommodation, the economic segregation of the American Negro is in some ways worse than it was 11 years ago.

BETTER OFF, BUT

He is, of course, better off than he was a decade ago, but more Negroes are unemployed today than in 1954. The black slums are not narrowing but expanding. The gap between white and Negro unemployed is increasing. And more Negroes are working at unskilled jobs, highly vulnerable to displacement by automatic machinery, than ever before.

Much has happened in these past 11 years in the legal and political fields. The power of the conservative coalition in the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives and the same coalition in the Congress as a whole has been greatly reduced if not broken. The power of the local communities over the Negro has been weakened by the Federal courts and the Federal legislature.

MEANS AND ENDS

So much attention has been focused on these struggles, however, that the legal barriers have seemed to be an end in themselves rather than merely the means to an end. In fact, it has been widely asserted that the achievement of legal equality would somehow lead to economic equality, and this highly dubious assumption is what the Negro leaders are now out to destroy.

"The Negro," says Bayard Rustin, a leading tactician of the civil rights movement, writing in "Commentary," "today finds himself stymied by obstacles of far greater magnitude than the legal barriers he was attacking before: automation, urban decay, de facto school segregation. These are problems which, while conditioned by Jim Crow, do not vanish upon its demise. They are more deeply rooted in the socioeconomic order; they are the result of the total society's failure to meet not only the Negro's needs, but human needs generally."

This raises the interesting question of what the Negro will do with his vote when he gets it, and how he will react to President Johnson's domestic policies, and consensus tactics.

The President has always argued that the vote was the key to the Negro's problems in the South. Let him get the vote, Mr. Johnson has said ever since he was in the Senate, and Members of the Congress will gradually see to it that the grievances of the Negroes are removed.

The key word in this doctrine is "gradually," and it is here that the conflict is likely to arise.

Rustin defines the potential conflict between the pace of the President and the urgent demands of the Negro community clearly enough:

"We need to be calling," he says, "for public works and training, for national economic planning, for Federal aid to education, for attractive public housing—all this on a sufficiently massive scale to make a difference.

Rustin is talking about "replacing" the New York slums with public housing at a cost of $17 billion. He quotes Michael Harrington as estimating the cost of a successful war on poverty in the United States at about $100 billion.

In short, the Negro revolution in America is likely to go the way of most social and economic revolutions, which do not slow down when they achieve their preliminary goals but increase the tempo with every success.

POLITICAL ACTION

The Negro protest movement is now likely to become a much better organized political movement. Its aim will be to create a coalition with labor, liberal, intellectual, and religious leaders that will have a decisive voice not only in presidential and congressional elections but in putting through economic and social programs of a much more radical nature and in a much shorter span of time than anything the Johnson administration has thought about so far.

The conservative "Establishment" in the Congress, as the Negro leaders see it, has been defeated. The legal tools for more effective political action will soon be in their hands, and an effort will no doubt soon be made to push the President to the left from his favorite political ground in the center.

THE WORLD SITUATION AND FUTURE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to an address delivered by Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, at the 10th anniversary luncheon of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania on May 28. Governor Scranton's speech is a thoughtful analysis of the forces shaping contemporary world events and it suggests several operational premises to guide the formulation of future American foreign policy. I ask unanimous consent that Governor Scranton's address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON AT THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY LUNCHEON OF THE FOREIGN POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA., MAY 28, 1965

It is indeed fitting that, on this 10th anniversary of the founding of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, we should offer our congratulations to its director and to all those who have participated in the work of the institute over the last decade. But this day should also be the occasion to attempt to discern more clearly the forces now at work in the world, and to look ahead, to consider policies appropriate to the United States in the years which lie before us. So urged, we turn our thoughts to the changes unfolding in the world around us and to the kind of world in which we as Americans hope to live during the remaining years of the 20th century, and especially during the next decade. Only with a clear vision of the order toward which we aspire can we develop policies and strategies to meet the problems before us.

For a generation now, the United States, as the leader of the free world, has been locked in struggle with the Communists. This struggle has raged in a world swept by convulsive currents of change, the collapse of the old order, the wave of rising expectations in the lands of underprivileged peoples, the explosive growth of populations and the onrush of technology. For the last generation, two power constellations have dominated international politics: the West and the Communist bloc. The stakes of the present struggle within our world are no less than the future organization of mankind.

It is not given to men to foretell the future with any precision. Who in 1935 predicted the shape of events a generation later? Perhaps a generation hence many centers of power will replace bipolarity. In Asia, Europe, and perhaps in other regions, new powers may well contest both the United States or the Soviet Union's right to shape the world of the future. Already disputes have erupted within the Communist and the Western World. Powers presently lesser than the Soviet Union and the United States have developed aspirations to a greater role in world politics.

Nevertheless, the ability to shape the future, if it rests with any one or two powers, remains to a very considerable extent in the hands of these two nations. The side which succeeds in harnessing the revolutionary forces which now sweep across this planet will place its stamp on generations to come.

The task confronting the United States, therefore, is to design its policy and strategy so as to assure the emergence of a world community compatible with our values. The contest is essentially political, and the crucial question is how best can human society be organized to satisfy the needs and aspirations of people.

Yet the policy and strategy chosen to advance our conception of man must be related to military capabilities. The military posture possessed by both sides influences the action undertaken by each power in every important confrontation. The Soviets appear to have committed themselves in recent years to the achievement of military superiority. We as Americans received an instructive lesson in the importance of military superiority during the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962. Without the strategic preponderance available to the United States at that time, President Kennedy could hardly have turned back this direct threat to U.S. survival.

Throughout the past those who have mastered the technology of the age have held in their hands the means to forge the history of their times. Superior technology gave the European peoples the advantage over the rest of mankind as Europe emerged from the Middle Ages. Only the Europeans had the means of transportation and the weaponry necessary for the expansion of their Western civilization throughout the globe. Europe remained the power center of the international system so long as technological supremacy rested in European hands. Clearly it is the mastery of advanced technology which gives both the United States and the Soviet Union such powerful voices in world affairs today.

In recent years the notion gained respectability that there exists a "technological plateau"—that regardless of technological innovation the nuclear stalemate between the United States and the Soviet Union will remain basically unaltered. No notion could be more dangerous to the security of the United States. It runs absolutely counter to the history of science and technology, whose forward thrust has been both cumulative and accelerative at a pace almost beyond our comprehension.

Just a decade ago, before the advent of the intercontinental ballistic missile, similar thoughts were expressed. There is little evidence that the Soviets have accepted the notion of a "technological plateau." Their research in space, rocketry, and other fields goes forward at a rapid pace. Soviet efforts to develop antimissile systems and spacecraft which may have military uses continue.

Fortunately, the United States, despite the assertions of those who maintain that a technological stalemate exists between the two leading powers, is still committed to the maintenance of its existing military-technological lead over the Soviets. Yet we must reexamine our programs for long-range research in order to assure the effective utilization of our vast capabilities for technological innovation. We must take stock of the technological resources at our disposal in order to determine whether we as a nation are achieving optimum results.

We in Pennsylvania have a major role to play in this vital area. The electronic data processing age had its start at the University of Pennsylvania where the very first computer was designed. In the long run the computer revolution may well have a more dynamic impact on world affairs than even the unleashing of the atom.

We must attempt to pool the technological resources of our European allies with our own. Europe, the birthplace of the Industrial Revolution and the origin of many of the great technological breakthroughs of the 20th century, is still a leading center of scientific research. Closer collaboration in technology between the United States and its European allies could assure the West technological supremacy in many important fields for generations to come.

The relationship between the power which technology places at our disposal and the values which inform our thought has always posed one of man's most difficult philosophical problems. It is important, especially since the advent of nuclear weapons, to ask ourselves what are the appropriate objectives for which power should be used?

Obviously, basic among our objectives is to insure the survival of this country and its values. But we are not alone. The United States, in the second half of the 20th century, is the guarantor of the security of scores of nations around the globe. In particular, the United States guards the civilization of the Western World.

Basic to an answer to the question of the uses to which power should be put is an understanding of our spiritual and political heritage. Western civilization has enabled men, more than any civilization before it, to give dignity and meaning to individual lives. Respect for the sanctity of human life, the right to an inviolate personal life, and freedom of speech, of conscience, of opinion, of belief, of religion, and association are values which have been most fully developed and practiced in the modern West.

It is in the Western World that the most impressive advances have been made in political institutions, the conditions of everyday life for the masses of the people have been improved, and modern technology has advanced most rapidly. It is the civilization of the West which, through its contact with peoples in other continents, has aroused dormant civilizations and spurred their peoples to a quest for modernization.

The West, not the Communists, has revolutionized the world. It would be tragic indeed if the Communists were to capture revolutions which have their raison d'être in values transmitted from the West to the slumbering societies of the precolonial period.

The task before the United States, therefore, is to restate in terms intelligible to peoples around the world the common ideal of human progress under freedom. The United States, as leader of the free world, should offer mankind a vision more alluring than that of the Communists. The success of the American experiment, the achievements of the modern West, and the universal ideas embodied in Western civilization hold out to all men a vision of a future which the Communists cannot match.

The purpose of our power should be to establish conditions for a peaceful world in which pluralism and diversity can flourish. Only the United States and its allies, not the Communists, can offer such a promise to the rest of mankind. Such is the relationship between power and values in the nuclear age.

If the United States, in the years ahead, is to realize the kind of world in which its own values may flourish and in which there are diverse opportunities for other peoples, several operational premises must guide our thought in the day-to-day process of policy formulation.

First, we must be prepared to persist in our efforts. All too often we Americans react to each international crisis of and by itself, giving little thought to how it fits in with the longer-range problems which confront us. Having identified the major goals and having established our policy priorities, we should be prepared, if necessary, to persist in a given course of action. A policy that is worth pursuing must be pursued with tenacity if it is to contribute to the realization of the kind of world we wish to build over the next decade and in the remaining years of this century.

To shift policy suddenly and unpredictably does little to gain either the trust of our allies, the confidence of neutrals in our purposes or the respect of our adversaries. Sudden shifts in strategic doctrine and the changing military demands which we have made upon our NATO allies for a variety of purposes, from the building of conventional forces to the creation of a multilateral nuclear force, have tarnished the image of a nation sure of its goals and of the policies necessary to their attainment.

In sum, we must persevere in advancing long-range policies for the achievement of long-range goals.

Second, we must match power with goals. All too often in the past we have committed ourselves to impressive foreign policy objectives, without building the power or making available the resources necessary to assure their attainment. In an effort to achieve a political objective, conflict may sometimes ensue. Where the stakes are great, we must be prepared to commit military capabilities commensurate with the task. Similarly, if we seek to assist new nations in the formidable task of political and economic development, we must commit economic and other capabilities commensurate with the task.

Third, the United States should make a greater effort than it has in the past to relate its economic, political, and military policies to an integrated strategy designed to achieve long-range objectives. All too often we have viewed economic, political, and military policies as separate instruments of statecraft. Each of these policy categories is fraught with complexity. It is difficult enough to acquire a grasp of the wide range of problems and to develop appropriate policies in any one of these categories. Yet it is crucial to the successful operation of foreign policy that policymakers understand how to weld economic, political, and military actions into an organic whole.

Fourth, the United States should seek the maximum consensus wherever possible with its major allies, especially those in Western Europe.

The United States should begin, as a matter of priority, a search for a consensus with its allies on vital issues which affect the West as a whole. From a new spirit of cooperation new machinery for closer consultation on political, military, and economic questions with America's allies could be fashioned. We should press now for a joint examination with our allies for alternative proposals for strengthening the Atlantic Alliance.

The North Atlantic area remains the world's foremost reservoir of industrial, technological and military power. This great port city of Philadelphia along with London, Amsterdam, and Hamburg and the other great cities on the Atlantic and its adjacent seas link together the most dynamic civilization that history has ever known. This core region of Western civilization possesses the resources adequate to the building of a world in which diversity and pluralism can become the heritage of all men. It would be tragic indeed if the potential benefits of the Atlantic Alliance were to be stillborn.

Yet such a tragedy is possible. In 1969, when NATO will reach its 20th anniversary, member nations can give 1 year's notice of withdrawal. Unless some of the thorny issues which now beset the Alliance are resolved, at least some NATO countries may wish to terminate their membership.

Therefore, it is essential that the NATO countries meet to consider needed changes in the alliance before another year passes.

Finally, we must develop a clearer understanding of the linkage between foreign and domestic policy. It has been suggested, in recent months, that we should center more of our efforts upon the many pressing domestic problems confronting us. Some Americans deplore the expenditure of vast sums of money for a trip to the moon while domestic programs such as the raising of living standards for underprivileged persons and renewal or our urban areas remain uncompleted. There are other major domestic issues, such as civil rights, which rank high on the agenda. But we must establish a sensible relationship between our domestic and foreign tasks. The men who drafted the Constitution placed the goal of providing for the common defense in its very preamble. We must safeguard our Nation in order to have a Nation in which debate and action on internal problems can continue. If we do not remain powerful we may never have the opportunity to resolve domestic problems to the satisfaction of the majority of our citizens. For the foreseeable future we must simultaneously devote ourselves to the problems which press upon us from abroad, while striving to make our country a better place for every citizen. We can do both.

CONCLUSION

The tasks which lie before us are worthy of a great nation. We have at our disposal national power of unprecedented dimensions.

We face a determined opponent who has achieved spectacular gains in the last generation. In no small part, the Communists owe their success to the vision of the future which informs their actions.

But we, too, have a vision, the vision projected by the men who in 1776 met here in Philadelphia. It is a vision of freemen capable of governing themselves. The revolution so begun in this city still challenges all mankind in the second half of the 20th century. To its future success we too pledge our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.

NEGLECTED SEAPOWER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in his column in Newsweek of May 17, Raymond Moley stressed the continuing importance of seapower in various crisis points around the world. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Moley's column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGLECTED SEAPOWER

(By Raymond Moley)

The decision announced by the South Vietnamese Government to use the U.S. Navy in patrolling the coast of South Vietnam is a hopeful sign that the administration is awakening to a far more effective means of dealing with the aggression from North Vietnam and its support from Red China and the Soviet than has been used up to now.

This patrol will be within a defensive sea area. In making the announcement, the South Vietnamese Government claimed the right to inspect ships within 12 nautical miles of the coast and in some instances to act beyond those limits.

This patrol is not only very late in coming, it is far less than the Navy might do in choking off supplies to the enemy.

It has long been evident that bombing supply lines and fighting jungle war is in a sense locking the door after the horse is stolen. Action is needed to cut off supplies before they reach North Vietnam.

On April 12, Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, of Florida, listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names, nationality, and owners of ships which entered the ports of North Vietnam in the latter part of 1964. There were 153 ships which made 201 trips to those ports. They were flying the flags of our supposed friends in the free world. Those of Japan, Great Britain, and Greece were the most numerous. British ships, mostly Hong Kong based, numbered 36; Japanese, 28; Greek, 19. There were also ships under the flags of Norway, Lebanon, Italy, Panama, and West Germany. Some of the same ships were active in helping Soviet Russia in its intervention in Cuba in 1962.

EXERCISE OF RIGHT

Several groups have been urging the State Department to exert pressure on our allies to stop this trade, with little or no result so far.

Our action in the Cuban crisis points to the use of international law to block off the thousands of tons of material that reach North Vietnam by sea. While the action in the Cuban crisis was called a quarantine, it was, in reality, the exercise of a legal right vested in a country with "command" of the sea to stop and turn back vessels carrying contraband to an inimical destination. It was, moreover, an assertion that the cold war brought into action certain provisions of international law hitherto restricted to hot wars.

Rear Adm. John D. Hayes (retired), in a most significant article in the Proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute in May 1964 clearly specifies our right to stop the traffic into North Vietnam. He points out that apparently Americans do not yet see "the inconsistency in training forces for brush-fire wars and counterinsurgency while failing to resort to age-old methods of sea law to capture and condemn in prize court the arms and transporting ships which make such wars possible."

THE LAW

Under sea law, the oldest belligerent right is that of contraband. That was invoked in the Cuban crisis. But the other major belligerent right is that of commercial blockade. In the Korean war and during the Cuban crisis, Hayes says, there was a misconception that a commercial blockade means the sinking of neutral ships. "Such ships are not sunk by naval forces for performing non-neutral services; they are captured and condemned in prize courts. The actions of naval officers are thereby reviewed by civilian judges. Nothing parallels this in the laws of war on land."

If we exercised our clear rights, our Navy might well take these traders with North Vietnam into a prize court and, if advisable, both ship and cargo could be confiscated. That would soon take the profit out of this trade with the enemy.

Admiral Hayes concludes: "A new and more flexible U.S. policy is called for to meet these threats. This new doctrine should clarify the concept of freedom of the seas in a cold war. It should also announce that the United States will assume the rights of a belligerent according to sea law and will exercise those rights when necessary * * * we have pledged ourselves to world order under law. But we have failed and are failing to take advantage of the already existing sea law, which, backed by seapower, can be applied today."

DAVID E. BELL, ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, June 12, as columnist Doris Fleeson points out in an excellent offering in today's Washington Star, will mark a milepost in our foreign aid program. For, on that day, David E. Bell will establish a new record for longevity in his position as Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

For many years one of the problems with our foreign aid program was a lack of stability at the top level. Since Dave Bell took over in 1962, a great deal of improvement has been noted. Miss Fleeson makes an important point in her column when she says employees of the controversial Agency have been touched with a happy effect and will celebrate June 12 fervently. Yes, morale among our AID people is improved. So is their work. As one who made an exhaustive study of personnel administration and operations of the Agency for the Committee on Appropriations, I have been impressed with the administration of Dave Bell. His has been both a difficult and delicate job. But it has been well handled. I hope the new longevity record he is about to establish will be extended on into the future, for Dave Bell has proved himself an able administrator in a tough job. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Doris Fleeson's column, "Bell Heading for an AID Record," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BELL HEADING FOR AN AID RECORD

(By Doris Fleeson)

When President Kennedy suddenly handed the controversial foreign aid program to his brilliant budget director, David Bell, in late December 1962, it was widely classified as the most unwelcome Christmas present of the festive season.

Perhaps it was, but by June 12 Bell will pass all previous AID Administrators in length of service. His 2 years, 5 months and 22 days will exceed even the tenure of Paul Hoffman, who directed most of the expenditure of the $12 billion Marshall plan in non-Communist Europe, starting in 1948.

Hoffman's was an intoxicating privilege. It aimed to restore economic health to Western Europe, and it was brilliantly successful. Not only U.S. allies in World War II but West Germany and Italy made a dazzling recovery and the march of communism in Europe was halted.

Bell took over an aid program mainly devoted to underdeveloped nations, which are also in the midst of a Communist collision and less able to meet it with their own resources in trained men and materials. His is one of those long-term undertakings where spectacular results, much less a quick cure, cannot be expected.

Vietnam, Cuba and now the Dominican Republic have helped to make clear how the Communist threat operates in such surroundings. But the use of foreign aid to give hope of a better life to people being aided militarily to defend their freedom is still the least understood aspect of our foreign policy.

President Johnson thought it prudent this year to send the Congress a proposal for foreign aid of less than $400 million, one-third of it for military purposes, the rest economic. The congressional committees, which were hearing their first aid administrator testifying before them for 3 years running, have been on the whole kind.

The House recently approved a slightly modified version of the President's proposal without undue tumult. The Senate has one ready to go with action expected in about a week.

The Senate effort initially was clouded by indications from Foreign Relations Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT that he would not manage the bill on the floor. His objections were mainly tactical. He has long wanted military assistance separated from economic aid, but his move in committee to do this was defeated.

FULBRIGHT consistently supports foreign aid and he has been one of the leading educators on the importance of giving people economic incentives to fight for a peaceful future. Committee members now expect—and hope—that he will change his mind and take charge again.

Unlike virtually all his predecessors, Bell took on the aid chore without political pipelines into Congress. He came to it via work in the aid field in Pakistan, the Littauer School at Harvard and his success in the demanding role of Budget Director.

Members of Congress, no matter what their complaints, rarely quarrel with his careful, patient expositions of his programs. Liberals note with respect that he discusses the Communist aspect without waving the mailed fist.

The net effect he gives is that he is firmly in charge of a program he understands and approves. The happy effect on employees of the controversial agency goes without saying. They will celebrate June 12 fervently.

THE FREIGHT CAR SHORTAGE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the lack of railroad freight cars in the United States has reached a point which can no longer be tolerated. There is every indication that this year the freight-car shortage will be worse than in any year in recent peacetime history.

What was once a seasonal problem suffered in the agricultural United States has become a year-round national crisis, with no sign of improvement.

Today's Wall Street Journal contains a front-page article which clearly states the serious problem created by the lack of freight cars. Shippers around the country are shown to be suffering. Plywood mills in the Northwest are closing. Cement manufacturers, sand and gravel producers, fertilizer firms, and steel plants are struggling with the problem of an inadequate supply of freight cars. Some have switched from railroad transportation to other forms of transportation; but many shippers, particularly the shippers of agricultural products, cannot do this.

The wheat harvest will begin this week, in Texas. Shippers there report a serious shortage of cars already, even before the harvest. It can be predicted with certainty that as the harvest moves north into Oklahoma and Kansas, the lack of boxcars will reach historical proportions. When fall arrives, and other crops are harvested, the boxcar shortage will continue to take its toll. After the fall, as merchandisers try to move their inventories for Christmas sales, another group of shippers will suffer. All year round the freight-car shortage takes its toll.

While these commercial losses are serious, and should not be allowed, perhaps more serious is the threat to our national security. The Wall Street Journal article points out that the U.S. Army "recently found itself short of cars needed to ship ammunition destined for Vietnam."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 1, 1965]

Transport Pinch: Freight Car Shortage Gets Worse, Forces Some Plant Cutbacks—Sharp Pickup in Car Buying Fails To Help; Lumber and Grain Firms Are Hard Hit—Shippers Fret About the Fall

(By James R. MacDonald)

CHICAGO.—Railroads and shippers are suffering from one of the severest shortages of freight cars ever experienced at this time of year.

Shippers are demanding about 7,500 more cars daily than the railroads can provide. That's more than double the deficit of a year ago and nearly as bad as last fall when the shortage climbed to a post-Korean war record of 10,000 cars. Shippers fear the shortage will get far more critical as the year goes along, particularly this fall when harvesting is in full swing and Christmas merchandise is moving to retailers.

The car shortage already is severe enough to cause some companies to curtail operations and to boost the shipping costs of many others being forced to shift to more expensive types of transportation. The present pinch partly reflects traffic snarls resulting from floods along the Mississippi River and in the Pacific Northwest. But the shortage, in the main, is a consequence of the biggest peace time business boom in the Nation's history. The railroads simply have been unable—or in some cases unwilling—to add new cars to their fleets at a fast enough pace to meet rising demand from shippers.

WOOD MILLS SUFFER MOST

Plywood mills in the Northwest are among the hardest hit by the car drought. At least six mills have been forced to close down in recent weeks for periods ranging from 1 day to a full week because they couldn't get enough freight cars, reports Edmund Hilton, Jr., traffic manager for the American Plywood Association in Tacoma, Wash., "Countless others came so close to having to shut down that getting just one or two cars at the last minute made the difference," he adds.

But complaints are coming from a wide variety of shippers, including cement manufacturers, sand and gravel producers, fertilizer firms, and even the U.S. Army which recently found itself short of cars needed to ship ammunition destined for Vietnam.

"We've had a terrible time getting cars since the first of the year," says Robert Strange, assistant vice president of sales for Truax-Traer Coal Co. He says the company has been forced to close down two of its strip mines for 3 or 4 days a month because of the shortage.

Phillip M. Corby, traffic manager for Evans Grain Co., Salina, Kans., says one day recently he phoned five railroads in an attempt to obtain 175 boxcars to ship grain from the company's 90 elevators in Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, and Colorado. He was unable to turn up a single car.

COSTLIER PHONE BILLS

"The amount of money I'm spending on phone calls to scrounge up some cars would capitalize a small bank," laments L. J. Childs, general traffic manager for Massey-Ferguson, Ltd., Toronto farm equipment maker. Even so, he is having only limited success in solving his transport problems. He says a few days ago he asked a railroad serving one of the company's plants for 75 flatcars to ship 150 grain harvesting combines. "They told me their road didn't have that many empty flatcars on their entire system and the best they could do would be to try and get me 25 within 3 or 4 days," he declares. "This really hurts when dealers are on the phone screaming for delivery."

Some farm machinery makers, attempting to rush new equipment to their dealers as the new growing season gets underway, are switching to other forms of transportation, despite often higher costs. J. I. Case Co., Racine, Wis., normally divides its shipments about equally between rail and truck. "Lately, because of the shortage of railroad cars, we've been averaging about 75-percent truck and 25-percent rail," James Pavel, Case traffic manager, says. He notes the cost of those shipments shifted to trucks averages 10-percent higher than by rail.

Similarly, Inland Steel Co., Chicago, reports the company has experienced "a substantial increase in our costs because railroad cars haven't been available when we need them." When this happens, Inland is forced to store the steel and costs are boosted because of the extra handling.

RAILS SUFFERING, TOO

Railroads, too, have been hurt by the car shortage. Jervis Langdon, Jr., chairman of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad, says the severe shortage of freight cars was "the major factor" in the Rock Island's first quarter earnings decline. The road reported a net loss of $2,711,073 in the quarter ended March 31, compared with a profit of $753,676 a year earlier.

Robert S. Macfarlane, Northern Pacific Railway president, says thus far in 1965 his road has turned away roughly $1.5 million worth of freight "because we didn't have enough freight cars. This really hurts because of the risk that much of this business went over to competing trucklines and we may never get it back again."

The shortage will persist through the summer and grow much more severe in the fall, most railroad men and shippers predict. The peak in rail freight movement usually comes when newly harvested crops and Christmas merchandise are both in transit.

"It's already touch and go as to whether I'll be able to meet my daily car requirements," says Peter Vinsavage, traffic manager at the Herrin, Ill., washing machine plant of the Norge division of Borg-Warner Corp. "We use mostly boxcars so we compete directly with the grain industry for cars. If the shortage is bad now, it probably will be much worse at harvest."

Railroads are spending at a record level for new cars to ease the shortage but can't obtain them fast enough to solve the problem. Capital spending by railroads, mostly for new rolling stock, will reach a record $1.6 billion this year, the Association of American Railroads estimates. This would top last year's expenditures of $1,417,000,000, the previous record, and would compare with $1 billion spent in 1963.

This spending stepup, however, has not been enough to stem the long decline in the size of the U.S. rail car fleet. The railroads placed 68,043 new freight cars in service last year, nearly double the 1963 total, yet there were fewer cars at the end of 1964 than at the beginning. Specifically, the fleet at the close of last year included 1,492,000 cars, down from the 1,512,000 total of a year earlier. A high "retirement" rate on old cars too far deteriorated to be worth repairing accounts for the downtrend.

Even with this year's record capital spending, the car fleet probably will continue to shrink, railmen say. But they note that the trend toward fewer cars—while worrisome—isn't as bad as it first might appear. Many of today's new cars are much larger than earlier models. This is demonstrated by the fact that railroads last year handled 659 billion ton-miles of freight, a 60-percent increase from 1925 when the number of rail cars hit a peak of 2,357,000.

But while the newer cars themselves may be larger, they are far more specialized than ever before and can be used by fewer types of shippers. A good illustration is the rail trilevel auto rack car. While it can haul three or four times as many new cars as the old boxcar, it's pretty much limited to auto traffic. The old boxcar, however, could unload its autos and pick up a return load of grain. It's mostly these older garden variety boxcars that are being retired.

So shippers generally are critical of the fleet's decline and many railroad officials complain about it, too. The critics contend that part of the downtrend can be traced to the relatively low rental rates which railroads pay each other for the use of cars moving over their tracks. The rate structure, they say, is such that it's often cheaper to pay the rental on a car than to purchase new ones and so many lines—particularly the financially pressed ones in the East—have resorted to this tactic.

This is still the case, shippers contend, even though a new rate structure calling for rents ranging from $2.16 a day for cars valued below $1,000 to $12.88 for those worth more than $35,000 was adopted early last year. Before, the daily rental rate was $2.88 per car regardless of value. Many argue the new rate still isn't high enough to encourage new car building.

Critics are hoping that some help will come from a bill now being considered by the Senate Commerce Committee. The measure would prod railroads to return empty cars to their owners faster by providing for higher rental rates; this, it is believed, would force car-short roads to step up construction of new cars. In brief, the bill would give the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to set rental rates at a level which would both fairly compensate the owning railroad and insure an adequate national supply of cars.

But at least one shipping group isn't waiting for congressional action on the car shortage. The Southwest Oregon Shipper's Traffic Association, which has 42 lumber, plywood, and particle board mills in its membership, is threatening to boycott railroads that aren't moving to increase the car supply. "We can easily determine which roads are building cars and have our interests in mind," says O. L. Stewart, executive secretary. "For those that are not, we will simply suggest to our members that they route their traffic around those lines if possible."

Mr. Stewart estimates his group accounts for about 60,000 carloads of traffic annually, with each carload worth an average of $1,000 in freight revenues to the railroads.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM: TEACHERS PLEAD WITH A FORMER TEACHER—PART XVI

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, those to whom we in America entrust the education of our youth exercise a function second to none in importance to the future of our Republic, for the strength of our Nation is based on the character and understanding of its future citizens. Our teachers provide that. When teachers as a body take a position on matters vital to the conscience and conduct of our country, their plea deserves respectful attention.

In last Sunday's New York Times appeared an advertisement addressed by over 1,000 teachers in the New York metropolitan area to President Johnson. They urge negotiation in the Vietnam crisis and a cessation of the bombings. They express a wide and steadily growing sentiment. I ask unanimous consent that their statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO OUR PRESIDENT, A FORMER TEACHER:

We are teachers in Metropolitan New York compelled by conscience to speak out against the American involvement in Vietnam.

While we hold differing opinions about the nature and purpose of our role in Vietnam, we are anguished that the might of America is being used to destroy that tragic land; we are horrified by the slaughter of innocents, by the tragic waste of American and Vietnamese lives; we are concerned that the conflict is widening and can only lead to greater horrors and worldwide destruction.

We support your commitment to negotiate this crisis. For the sake of humanity, we implore you to stop the bombings immediately and initiate a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

Ruth Abrahams, Emil Abrams, Murray Abramsky, Clarence L. Adams, Joseph Adams, Henry Addis, Abram Adelson, Leone Adelson, Sandra Adickes, Donna Adler, Florence C. Adler, Freyda Nacque Adler, Arnold Adoff, Barbara Adolf, Claire Alexander, G. Alperin, Rhoda Altman, Matthew Altschuler, Frank Alweis, Jerome Anger, Jack Annunziata, Claire Antell, Clara Antin, E. K. Antonovsky, T. Arenson, Carlina Aretsky, Sarah Aron, Sandra Aronson, Leonard Arpel, Gertrude Asher, Dorothy Astopee, Shirley Auerbach, Frances Bader, Elaine Bakalian, Mitzi Bales, David Balfour, Roy Balfour, Robert H. Balogh, N. Bancheck, Ann Bander, Irving Barash, Sylvia Barnett, Ben Baron, Sara R. Baron, Albert Barracano, Norman Barrish, Muriel Bartel, W. R. Barton, Priscilla Bassett, Herbert Bassow, Alfred Battaglia, Bernice A. Bauer, H. C. Bauer, Ben Bauman, Zaphirah J. Bauman, George Beauchamp, Jr., Irving Bechky, Norma Becker, Paul Becker, Robert Becker, Shula Beckerman, S. Bell, Vivian Bellinson Teodarina Bello, Arnold Bellush, Anne Bender, Alice Benjamin, Carl Benjamin, Lillian Bennett.

S. Berger, Terry Berl, Douglas Berman, Norman Berman, Suzanne Berman, Leonard Bernstein, Janet Berntsen, Maurice R. Berube, Diane Betchen, Sandra Biderman, Madeline Bini, Saul Birnbaum, Leonard Blackman, Edward Blaine, Cynthia Blanchard, Efram I. Blank, Emanual Blank, Ted Bleecker, Barbara Blickstein, Samuel Block, Miriam Bloom, Murray Bloom, Dorothy Bloomfield, Gladys Blount, Ellen Blustein, Leonore Boer, W. Bogan, M. Bogursky, Tell Bookpry, B. Bortan, Joseph Botkin, Augusta Bowles, E. C. Boyce, B. L. Braunstein, Maggie Brill, Jack Brodsky, Janet Brof, Joanne B. Brooke, Albert Bronson, Myrna Bronstein, Leonore Brosius, Alice Brown, Harold Brown, Huntley Brown, Leila Brown, Louise J. Brown, Lyle Brown, Robert F. Brown, Sarah Brown, Jacqueline A. Browne, Lois Bryant, Carroll Buchanan, Walter Buchman, David Budbill, Walter Budhis, Judith Bunche, James E. Burton, Maury Buxbaum, Una Buxenbaum, Bernard Cammarata, Jim Campbell.

Shirley Caplan, Janet Carnay, Marian Carpenter, Pauline Carpenter, Thomas Carpenter, Roger Cartwright, Fred Casden, Bette Cassaro, Thelma Catalano, Al Cavicchi, William Chafe, Lionel Chagrin, Evelyn Chalis, Barbara Chamock, Sam Chapman, Hattie F. Charney, T. Charney, Neil A. Chassman, Wendy Chayette, Helen Cherne, Richard Chernick, Merton Chernoff, Elizabeth Chipura, Margaret Christenson, Fred B. Chunow, Lois T. Clapp, Marie C. Clapper, Doris Clark, Edwin Cobert, Arthur Cohen, Carl Cohen, Denore Cohen, Maxine Cohen, P. Cohen, Rachel Cohen, Rita Cohen, Rosalyn Cohen, Ruth Cohen, Sylvia Cole, Alice E. Coleman, Goldie Colodny, Lionel Comiser, Palma Conlon, Rose A. Connolly, Edna G. Cohrad, Louise Consiglio, Louis Conte, Clark Cook, Wm. D. Cook, Melissa T. Cooper, Lill Cooper, Renee Cooper, Raymond I. Coppell, E. L. Cornelius, Jan Cott, Rebecca Coven, Eleanor Cox, Mitchell Crespi, Alan Criswell, Morris S. Csgay, Juana Culhane, Ida Cummings, Norman Curtis, Pat Curtis, Anna Cutler, Evelyn Cutler.

Florane Cyrelson, Adeline E. Davis, Doris Davidson, Esther Davin, Nina Davis, S. Davis, W. A. Davis, Jr., Mary B. De Deka, Riricki De Diego, F. Delatorre, Joseph F. Demas, Rosalind Derman, Regina Dicker, Grace Ditzian, Carl Doerner, Mary A. Doin, Phyllis Dolgin, Irma Doniger, Jeanne Doran, Deborah Douglas, Lenore Downey, James F. Doyle, Mary Jane Dreyer, Ray Dubin, N. Dunetz, Charles Eckstat, Adele Edelman, Eleanor Edelstein, Mildred N. Ehrich, Sarah Einstein, Marke Eiseman, Charles Eisenberg, Edith Eisenberg, Justine Eisenberg, Selma Eisenstadt, Judith Eisenstein, Michael Elias, R. Elias, Elizabeth Eliot, Bernice Elkine, Simon Ellison, Walter Elovitch, Frieda W. Emil, N. Charles Emil, Gerald Emmet, Rebecca Epstein, Mae B. Erlichman, Muriel Etlinger, Sampson Eurogen, Shirley Evans, Ernest Fabiitti, Carolyn Fabricant, S. Farhi, Edwin Farrell, Catherine Fearon, Mary Feeley, Walter Feingersh, Lily Feinstein, Alexander Feldman, Francine Feldman, Frances Fenichel, James Fenner, Herman Ferguson, Edith Ferrara.

Beatrice Fields, Anne L. Filardo, Edgar Fink, Louis Fink, Helen R. Finkel, Laurette Finkel, Frank A. Finnel, Bennett Fisch, Sadie Fischbein, B. W. Fischer, Stanley Fisher, Edward Fishkind, David Fishman, Shirley Fishman, Mildred Flacks, Rosanne Flaum, Shirley Fleming, Deborah Flynn, Gavin Fogarty, Henry Fohr, Ellen Foreman, Leon Forer, Marion Forer, Joseph P. Forman, Ray Frankel, Jerry Freedman, Irene Freeman, Rema Freiberger, Elizabeth Freilicher, Edith Friedman, Eleanor Friedman, Is Friedman, Chet Frilmer, Leo Frisman, Carl S. Fryburg, Morton Fuhr, L. Furst, Margarita Gaines, Jaclyn Gang, Donald F. Garber, Jewel Garill, Frances Garten, Mildred K. Garvin, Clyde Gatlin, Sheila Geist, Judith Gelarie, Lia Gelb, Maxwell Gelender, Sanford Gelernter, Celia Geller, Sid Gershgoren, Ruth Gershowitz, Herman Gersten, Lloyd Gertz, J. Ghoneem, Harold Gilbert, Stephen Gilbert, Charles Gimenthal, Marjorie Gill, Beverly Gingold, Elizabeth Gineberg, Morris Glaser, Doris Glass, Rachel Glasser, Joan Godshalk.

Jeanette S. Gold, Sylvia Gold, Etta Goldbaum, F. P. Goldberg, Lucy L. Goldberg, Dan Goldfarb, B. Goldhirsch, Grace S. Goldman, S. S. Goldman, David Goldstein, Philip Goldstein, Philip Goldstein, Ruth M. Goldstein, Shirley Goldzweig, Lois Golipsky, Charles Golodner, Laura Goodman, Richard Goodman, Roger B. Goodman, Ruth Goodman, Alice Gorden, Albert F. Gordon, Bernard Gordon, Leo Gordon, Morris Gordon, Norman Gore, Pegi Goreluck, Leah Gorfein, Stanley Gotlin, Betty Gottlieb, David Gottlieb, Ed Gottlieb, Gordon Gottlieb, Leonard Gottlieb, Oscar Gottlieb, Anne Grant, Joel Green, Lesley Greenberg, Paula

Greenberg, Etta Greenfield, Miriam Greenfield, Vivian Greenfield, Arthur W. Greenstone, Janey P. Greif, Mae Greitzer, Arthur Grenberg, Robert Groff, Betty Gross, Harold Gross, M. S. Gross, Carolyn S. Grossman, Milton Grubstein, Lillian K. Grumette, Diana Guadagnino, Ruth E. Gusthader, Lawrence Gutman, Matilda Gutman, Helen Gutstein, Norma R. Hairston, Carol Hallinger, Harriet L. Halpern, Judith Halpern, Stephen M. Halpern, Dorothy I. Halprin.

Irving Halprin, Natalie Halprin, John Halvey, Adele Handlers, Aaron Hankin, Ethel Hanauer, Glinne Hanrahan, Louis Harap, Norman Harenstein, Michael Harlow, Rosalie Harmon, Helen Harris, Jay Harris, Joan H. Harris, Louise Harris, Marjorie Harris, Mary W. Harris, W. L. Harris, Delores Harrison, Priscilla Haslett, Freddie M. Haughton, Ethel B. Hauptman, Nora Hauser, Louis Hay, Joyce Haynes, Philip M. Heary, Pauline Hecker, John Helbok, Harry Helfman, Betty Heller, E. R. Heller, Paul Heller, Irene Henken, Edward L. Herbst, Emanuel Herscher, D. Hercules, B. Herman, Erna Herman, Evelyn Herzfeld, K. Herzig, Joseph Heyman, Dorothy Hibbert, Nancy Higgins, Earl C. Hill, Ruby S. Hill, Carol Hiller, Shulamith Hirsch, Frances Hochberg, Sam Hochberg, B. Hoffman, Richard Hoffman, Sarah Hoffman, Eleanor Holden, Joan Holiber, David Honig, Marlene Honsner, William Horn, Norman Horowitz, Rosalyn Horowitz, Donald Horton, Jessica Howard, Joan M. Howard, Lois Howlett.

Clara Hunt, Elizabeth Hunter, Marlene Hymel, Frank Ilchuk, Grace Cohen Ilchuk, Ellen Imberman, William Isaacs, Frieda Isenberg, Belmont Jabin, Stephen Jablonsky, Milton James, Helen Jackson, Carrie Jacobs, Claire Jacobs, J. Jacobs, Bob Jacobson, Eli Jacobson, Harriet Jacobson, Rosalie Jacobson, Roselyn Jacobson, R. Jalowski, Richard Janda, Davis Jeffrey, Wilhelmina Jenkins, Leslie Johnson, Michele Johnson, Bill Jones, Geraldine Jones, Herbert Jurist, Shulamith Justman, David Kabock, Meyer Kadko, Irwin R. Kafka, Alan Kahn, Barry Kahn, Murray Kahn, Rose Kaiser, Michael Kalin, Walter H. Kall, Joyce Kallir, Henry Kamin, Benjamin H. Kaplan, George Kapp, Miriam Kappalman, Ida Karp, Florence Kaslow, Hubert Katz, Paul Kaufman, Edith S. Kavadlo, Beverly Kelly, Phyllis Kelvin, S. A. Kempler, Walter Kendra, Jessie Keosian, E. M. Kessler, Gladys Kessler, R. Kessler, Louisa Keyes, Sylvia Kimmelman, Allan Kincher, Ronna Kinnis, Howard Kirshner, Ed Kissane, Ronnie Klemmas.

Betty Kletter, Blanche Koenigsberg, Alice Kogan, Morton Kogut, Kate Kolchin, Jules Kolodny, Robert Kolodny, Frances Korins, Sara Kornberg, Wilhelmina Kraber, Julius Kramer, P. Kramer Ruth E. Kramer, A. Krause, Elaine E. Krauss, Peter Krauss, Stan Krefetz, Ellen Kregor, Eileen Krieger, Felix Kreitmar, Flore Krigsman, Sy Krinsky, Lillian Kristol, R. Krouse, Matilda Kruger, Aaron Krumbein, Suzanne Kupfer, Bernard Kurtin, Ralph Kurwein, Davina Kurwitz, Ami Kushul, Tom Laidman, Ira Landess, Lawrence Lane, Patricia Lane, Edward Lansky, Priscilla Lapolla, Judith Lakin, June Laufer, Mark Lavis, Ed Lawrence, Ralph Lawrence, Edward Lawrence, Geraldine Laws, Ida Lebow, Saul Lechtine, Charles Lederer, Eva Lederman, Isabella Lee, Jim Lee, Milton Leff, Hadassa Legatt, Martha Lehman, Robert Lehrer, Robert Leicester, Max Leive, Marion Leonard, Irma Leibow, David Lerner, Francine Lerner, Lea Lerner, Murray Lerner, Arlene Leven.

Miriam Levenson, S. Leventhman, Claire Levine, Joan Levine, Morris Levine, Rae Levine, Ree Levine, Shirley Levine, Isabel Le Vita, B. Levy, Betty Levy, David Levy, Frieda Levy, Harriet Levy, Jane Levy, Mark Levy, David Lewin, Minnie Lewin, John L. Lewine, Carol Lewis, Claudia Lewis, Dorothy Lewis, Emanuel Lewis, Gertrude Lewis, Murray Lewis, Sylvia Lewis, T. Liao, Joan Licht, Anita Lieberman, Saul Lieberman, Malvina Liebert, Mildred Liebowitz, Arthur Linder, Nora Linn, Herbert Lipkin, Carol Lieman, Pearl Lipper, Arthur B. Lipsky, Helen Lipton, Henry Lipton, Roslyn Lipton, Adele S. Lithauer, Elsie Rae Litman, Robert Lokin, J. London, Marion London, Sylvia Louis, Sidney Lovett, Vivian Lowell, Eileen Lubin, Linda Lubow, Frances Lucas, Francis D. Lucas, Vincent D. Luciano, A. Ludwig, George Lunn, Edwin Lurzwell, Steve Lyons, Miguel A. Madrid, Morris Mailman, Rudolph Mainelli, Carl Makower, Frances M. Malden, L. Malkin.

John B. Manbeck, Florence Manda, A. Manheimer, Naomi Maning, George Manley, Arlene B. Mann, Irving Mansfield, Edith Keller Marcus, Samuel C. Marenz, Edna Mark, Nathan Marks, Alice K. Marsh, Calvin Martin, Edward Martinson, Rebecca Martz, Esther Marcus, Beth Margolis, Florence Masler, Seymour Masler, Diane Mason, J. Mass, Oscar Mass, Geraldine Massers, Jennie Mastropaolo, Marjorie A. Mathias, Thelma Matican, Anna R. Matlin, Norma Matzkin, Bernice J. May, Steven Mayer, Ben Mazen, Elnora McCarther, Eugene A. McCoy, Roxanne B. McDowell, Polly McMillan, John Meehan, Ron Mehlman, Alice Meisel, Josephine Merolla, Virginia Mells, Marjorie Meyersohn, Thomas Micklow, Alvin Migdal, Charles Miller, Kenna S. Miller, S. Millman, Carmen Miranda, Martin Mirer, Sara Mitchell, Dagoberto Molerio, Albert Montare, W. E. Moore, James Morris, Peter B. Morris, Raye Morris, Selina Morris, Sidney H. Morrison, Michael C. Moross, Sidney Moskowitz, Mary Jane Multer, Carol Muster, James Nach, Sheila Nacht.

Ethel C. Nagel, Susanne Nagel, M. Natelli, Emily Nathan, Raymond Nazer, M. H. Needleman, Lillian Nekritz, Leonora Nelson, Rose Neufield, Alice M. Newkirk, Carol Newman, Mr. and Mrs. David Newman, M. L. Newman, Renee K. Newman, Sylvia Newman, Ilene A. Nichols, Anna Nieves, Dorothy Noland, Magda North, Marianne Novak, Martin Novemsky, Jerome Novick, Nita Novick, Maxwell Numberg, T. Nunan, Gladys Nussenbaum, J. P. Olicker, Oscar Olshansky, John O'Neill, Dorothy Orland, Jeanne Ostriker, Esther Ostroff, Lynn Ostrow, N. L. Ovanin, Joseph Paladino, Fances Panitz, Gloria Paolella, Marsha Pargman, Helen Parker, Myrtle E. Parker, Barbara Patricola, Saul Pavlow, G. Pearlman, Natalie Pearlstein, Jules A. Peemoeller, Gladiola Peerman, Fill Peltz, M. Penn, Shirley Pentel, Theresa B. Perl, Joseph Perez, Edith Perlman, Joyce Perlman, Maxwell Perlman, S. Perlman, Steven Parris, Barry Pessin, Juanita Peters, Marjorie Peterson, Elsie Pickus, Sidney Pilatsky, Rudolph Pinataro, Laurence Pisner.

Paul Pitluk, Berenice Pliskin, William L. Plummer, Bess Polin, Nancy Polin, Janet Pollack, Lila Pollack, R. Pollak, Henry Pallet, Naomi Pommer, Robert Porterfield, Estelle Posner, Susan Powers, Isadore Powsner, Lucy B. Poyer, Bernice Prendergast, Nan Prener, Ann Price, Martin Price, Herminia Prieto, Burke Probitsky, Minnie Proctor, John Quinlan, Ellen Rabin, Elizabeth Rabinowitz, G. Radford, Herbert Rahinsky, Marte Ramirez, Sam Lewis Rand, Lawrence Raphael, Shelley Rapp, Doreen Rappaport, I. Rappaport, Shirley Rappaport, Ethel Ratner, Mary Rayburn, Miriam Rayburn, Arthur Razzio, Millie Rachany, Robert Redka, Stephen Reines, Bonnie Reisnar, Richard Relyea, Edward Remain, Bernard Reznick, Bertha Rhodes, Julie Rice, Sheila Rice, Sylvia Richman, E. C. Ricken, Eleanor Riklin, Jeanne Ritter, Reuben Rivlin, Rosalie Rivlin, Joseph Rizik, Bernard Roberts, Celia Robinson, Earl Robinson, Jeanne Robinson, S. Robinson, Ella Root, Michael Rosa, J. H. Rosandy.

Gertrude E. Rose, Albert Rosen, Marion Rosen, Miki Rosen, Natalie Rosen, Phyllis Rosen, Sandra Rosen, Eugene Rosenbaum, Rochelle Rosenbaum, Doris Rosenberg, Sylvia Rosenburg, William Rosenberg, Arlene Rosenblatt, D. J. Rosenblum, A. Rosenburg, Erwin Rosenfeld, Riva Rosenfield, Rose Rosenfield, Daniel Rosenstein, Emily Rosenthal, Irving Rosenwasser, Pearl Rosner, Arthur Ross, Lesley Ross, Naomi Rossabi, Martin Rosoff, Madeline Rostker, Pearl Rostov, Carol Roter, Alice Roth, Gladys Roth, Jacob Rothband, David Rothchild, Gussie Rothman, Henry L. Royston, Barbara Lee Rubin, Helen Vogatch Rubin, Morris Rubin, Richard Rubin, Anne Rubenstein, Helen Rugowin, Marianne Russo, Sean Ryder, Morris Sabbeth, Priscilla Sabbeth, F. Sabin, Betty Sacco, Sylvia Saffro, Jerry Safner, Jeane Salamy, M. Salant, Frances Saldinger, Alfred A. Salesky, Lee Saltzman, Morris Salz, Naomi Salz, Jessie Salzman, L. Salwen, Rhea Samaras, Esther A. Samson, Linda Samuels, Judith Sanderoff, David Sanders, O. Sandifer.

Susan Sandler, I. Santo, Joseph D. Sapienza, Joseph Saspro, Audrey L. Satlin, M. Schachter, Phyllis Schaefer, Beatrice Schaeffer, Virginia Schattle, Charles Scheckner, Irwin Schechter, Samuel Scherek, Florence Scherer, Toni Schiffer, Anne Schiller, Samuel Schindelheim, Lyvia Schlaefer, Berenice Schlakman, Irving Schlein, Bert Schlesing, Charlotte Schlossberg, Steven Schrader, Edith Schrank, Evelyn Schroeder, G. Schulhoe, Blanche Schulslaper, Blanche Schundelman, Roy Schunurkopf, Benedicta Schwager, Gloria Schwartz, S. Schwartz, Sol Schwartz, Sarah Schwartz, T. Schwartzbarth, Grace Schwartzman, R. Y. Scott, John Anthony Scott, Maria Scott, Luther W. Seabrook, William H. See, Julian L. Seid, Ruth Selden, Howard Seretan, Lane Serota, Barbara Sewell, David Shaine, Alex Shames, M. R. Shamroy, Sheila Shankman, Jack P. Shapira, Adele Shapiro, Ida Shapiro, Leo Shapiro, Louis Shapiro, Sidney Shapiro, Sidney Shapiro, Florence S. Shaw, Laura Shaw, Pearl Sheitz, Barbara Shepetin, Bella Sherman, Ira Sherman, C. Shimel.

Margery Shine, Flora Shore, Sylvia F. Shows, Mildred Sickles, Harvey Siegel, Edward Siegel, Marian Siegel, A. I. Sigal, Charles Sigmund, Donald M. Silber, H. Sillekens, Anita Silver, Myra Silver, Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Silverman, Myron Silverman, Abraham Singer, Barbara Singer, Gertrude Singer, J. Singer, Ann Sirotof, Linda Sklarow, Martha Skulsky, Helene S. Slater, Karen Slavin, Sarah Slotkins, Roslyn Small, Vilet Small, Bernice Smart, Alvin Smith, Betty Smith, Esther Smith, Geraldine Smith, Irene Smith, Lawrence Smith, Lucille Smith, Sylvia Smith, Jean Smolar, Helen W. H. Sniton, Mildred Snow, Sylvia Sokolow, Henry Solganik, Sidney Solomon, Jacqueline Spears, Lester Speiser, Vivian Speiser, Matthew Spetter, Madelon Spier, Blanche Solomon, Rebecca L. Soyer, Jerry Spitz, Susan Spitz, Richard Springer, J. Spoerri, Lillian Stahl, Elizabeth Starcevic, Alan L. Stein, Lilian D. Stern, Philip Stern, Frances Sternberg, Simon Stanislow, Eva Starfield, Martin Starfield, Ralph Stein.

Nancy Steinberg, Evelyn M. Stimmel, Fred Storfer, Dorothy Stoneman, Martha Stodt, Barbara Straussman, Joseph B. Strum, Kieve Stubenhaus, Norman Stuber, Isabelle Suhl, George Sundel, Nicholas Surdo, Armas Suvanto, Frieda Sverdlove, N. Talbot, Irving Talmuke, Norma Tasman, Russel Tauber, Beatrice Teitel, Lloyd Temes, Harry Tenenberg, Mildred Tenenbaum, Frances Tepper, B. Terry, Mae Terry, Carole Theil, Rachel Tholfsen, F. Thorpe, P. Tholfsen, Lary Titelman, Aaron Toder, Saul Toder, Elinor Tolbert, Aaron Traister, Susan Traub, Ruth Traub, Shirley Trapido, Abraham Tretin, Rosemarie Trimboli, A. Tucker, Kathleen Tucker, Lynette V. Tucker, Adele Tulman, Muriel Turner, Mark Ubeiman, Jo Ubogy, Elizabeth Urani, Milton Unterman, Semah Unterman, Gayle Veeder, Dora J. Vernt, Gwen Vetter, Theresa Vigo, Thomas Waber, Carol Wagner, Leo Wagner, Thomas E. Wahn, Gertrude Waldeyer, Gabriel Waldman, Ellis Wallach, Lillian Wallach, Lottie Wallach, William Walters, L. Waltznia, Violet Ward.

Carl V. Warren, Michael Warman, L. G. Watkins, Ernest Waxman, Bernice Webb, Ray Wechsle, Roberta Wedeen, Suzanne Weidberg, Hazel C. Weill, Herschel Weinstat, Irving Weinstein, Suzanne Weinsein, Henry Weinstock, Bernard Weintraub, Joshua Wiesen, Adele F. Weiss, Blanche Weiss, Malvina R. Weiss, Nancy Weiss, Norman Weil, Fromma Wellman, Marilyn Weldfeur, Margaret Werthman, Edna Wetler, Evelyn Wexler, Clementene Wheeler, Joel White, Charlene Whittaker, Harvey Widell, Polly Widerman, Hilda Wigder, Natalie Wigler, Jerome Wilkins, Ed Williams, Miriam Wills, Geraldine Wilson, R. Wirte, R. Witre, Susan Witner, Joseph Wohl, Jerry Wolf, Lois C. Wolf, Miriam Wolf, Helen Wong, Mabie S. Wood, Elaine Woodbura, Mildred Woogen, Barbara Wortman, Rosa Wrinfricki, Frances Wunder, Lionel M. Yard, Shirley Yasner, Ann Youdovin, J. Zaddin, Stanley Zelman, Allen Zelon, Stan Zibulsky, Julius Zieger, Eva Ziesk, Alex Zimmerman, Marsha Zimmerman, Frances Zippin, Helen Zirilstein, Esther Zlatchin, J. Zoffin, R. Zucker, Lester Zwicker.

For additional information, contact Teachers Committee for Peace in Vietnam, cochairmen: Sandra Adickes, Norma Becker, 520 East 12th Street, New York, N.Y., 10009.

A GOVERNMENT OF MEN

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I predicted in this Chamber a year ago that the real meat ax in the 1964 Civil Rights Act was title VI, which enables officials in Washington to determine what constitutes discrimination in any program or facility receiving Federal assistance.

I expressed the opinion then that if the 1964 bill became law it would change the kind of government the people of Virginia have known, and the kind of government that had its origin at Jamestown in 1618.

I said that under title VI every little bureaucrat could say, "This is my rule on discrimination." Supporters of the bill disagreed with me, pointing out that the President would have to approve all of the rules and regulations.

But, regardless of who makes or approves the regulations, Virginians have found out recently how far reaching title VI is in its application.

For example, the doctors and hospital officials of Virginia and adjoining Southern States were told recently by an official of the Public Health Service how completely they must integrate any hospital receiving Federal funds.

In a separate development, the Augusta County Board of Supervisors recently found it necessary to seek the advice of members of the Virginia congressional delegation in clearing up what they regard as ambiguities in some of the pledges they are being asked by State and Federal officials to sign.

One of the questions raised by the county supervisors was whether they should be required by the State to sign an agreement relating to the use of certain Federal funds for educational purposes which are expended by local school boards. The county supervisors argued that they have been asked by the State to execute an agreement concerning which they would not have full responsibility for compliance.

The county supervisors also contended the wording of the agreement was not clear as to whether it imposed personal liability for compliance on the individual signing it on behalf of the board of supervisors.

A second question raised by the Augusta County Board of Supervisors relates to the renting of office space in county facilities to various Federal agencies, such as the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

I am informed that the county entered into a compliance type of agreement covering such rented space indicating that they do not engage in discriminatory practices. But the supervisors are objecting to additional provisions being placed in the lease in regard to damages in the event of a breach of the compliance agreement.

In regard to hospitals, I have just received a copy of a paper prepared by Assistant Surgeon General Harald M. Graning, chief of the Division of Hospital and Medical Facilities, Public Health Service, in which he outlined to officials of the Carolinas-Virginias Hospital Conference what they must do under title VI of last year's law if they receive any Federal aid funds.

The Public Health official gave the following as examples of some of the questions "you may find useful in examining the facilities with which you are associated":

> Are patients admitted without consideration of any factor pertaining to race, color, or national origin?
>
> Are the same entrances, admission offices, waiting rooms and other general service facilities available to and used by Negro and other patients?
>
> Are patient room assignments made without regard to race, color, or national origin?
>
> Are patients assigned to semiprivate four-bed bedrooms and wards without regard to race, color or national origin of the other patients?
>
> Are all services and facilities available to patients without regard to race, color or national origin?
>
> Are dining spaces and cafeterias available to and used by patients, staff, trainees, and employees without discrimination?
>
> Are all clinics, emergency, and outpatient services available to and used by Negroes and other outpatients?
>
> Are professional qualifications and character the only criteria applied in granting or denying staff privileges?
>
> Do Negro physicians having staff privileges serve on a rotation basis in clinics and emergency and outpatient departments on the same basis as other physicians?
>
> Are trainees, interns, or other trainees assigned to service with patients without regard to their race, color or national origin?
>
> These are only some of the questions which should be asked. As you can readily see from this sampling, every effort should be made to comply with both the spirit and letter of the law.

Mr. President, if these are only "some of the questions" which should be asked, it is difficult to imagine any that were left out.

These recent developments indicate I was not exaggerating when I spoke last year about what would happen under title VI.

RETENTION OF SECTION 14(b) OF TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have recently received communications from two important chambers of commerce in my State. Both express support for retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. I fully agree with the views expressed by these chambers. In order that other Senators may be advised of the depth of Texas feeling on this subject, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a letter from the Athens chamber and a newsletter from the Lamar County chamber.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATHENS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Athens, Tex., May 25, 1965.

Senator JOHN TOWER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TOWER: The Board of Directors of the Athens Chamber of Commerce wishes to go on record opposing any change in section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. We object to any proposals that will either delete this section from the act or to any change that will destroy its effectiveness.

It is our feeling that this section adds materially to the freedom of choice by American working men and women. We do not believe that membership in any organization should be a requirement in getting a job just as we do not believe that membership in a chamber of commerce should be a requirement for operating a business.

We respectfully bring this to your attention and ask that you oppose any changes in this section.

Very sincerely,
LINDEN R. LEWIS,
President.

Chamber of Commerce of
Lamar County,
Paris, Tex., May 1965.

The repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act would eliminate the right-to-work law in Texas, and force any man or woman getting a job with a business in which employees are represented by a union, to join the union and pay the initiation fees and dues; or to look for work somewhere else. Under the existing law he has the choice to join or not join and his job cannot be taken from him because of his decision.

How can unions give service to members when their membership is compulsory, and there will be no need to prove that they can serve the people?

The repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act could lessen the desire of large firms to locate in Lamar County or Texas because the right-to-work law makes for better working conditions.

Repeal of section 14(b) is contrary to section 703(a) of the Civil Rights Act which states that you cannot have unlawful employment practices that discriminate against any individual with respect to terms, conditions, or privileges of employment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Irving News Texan recently published a strong and reasonable editorial advocating retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. This editorial has been called to my attention by a number of distinguished Texans, including Mr. Phillip Reid, chairman, of the board and president of the Irving Bank & Trust Co.

In order that other Senators may share the views expressed by the News Texan, I ask that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

President Is Paying Only Lipservice to Freedom if Section 14(b) Is Repealed

A great deal of lipservice is paid to freedom by the present administration. But President Johnson's recent declaration favoring the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law certainly should make voters wonder just who all this freedom is for.

Apparently, it is for those groups and organizations which make the most monetary contributions to campaign funds.

Repeal of section 14(b) would write off the books the right-to-work laws of 19 States, including Texas. But even more unjust, it would force into labor unions thousands of workers who do not desire membership. It, in essence, gives American workers the choice of either going union or not working at all.

The public has given President Johnson strong support in committing this country's Armed Forces to the preservation of freedom throughout the world. But here at home, the President evidently gives a different definition to the word freedom.

Compulsory "anything" is not a cornerstone for strength. It is a license for abuse.

Just how strongly the President feels about the abolishment of the right-to-work section in the Taft-Hartley law is really not known. He made only passing reference to it in Tuesday's labor message to Congress. However, the "Johnson treatment" of Congressmen does not always involve loud public proclamations. What the President is doing behind the scenes is much more important.

The reason behind the request for repeal, of course, is the Democratic Party's obligation to labor for support in the past national election. It is the shame that a political party must tamper with the freedom of thousands of American workers just to remain in power. But this is what is happening.

One union publication recently referred to the retention of section 14(b) as "compulsory open shop." This is like saying the compulsory right to vote or the compulsory right to bear arms or the compulsory freedom of religion. Even under the hated section, anytime a worker gets tired of nonunionism he may join a union.

Compulsory unionism relieves labor leaders of the responsibility of making their unions and the union benefits attractive. Under compulsory unionism, the worker is not guaranteed anything in return for his union dues. He is only guaranteed that there will be union dues. In short, compulsory unionism destroys the incentive of labor leaders.

Also it must be recalled that given the conditions of a closed shop, it is easier to maintain the coercive discipline on which militant unions depend in time of strikes.

Trade unions have been a dynamic force in the development of the United States. During the early days of the industrial revolution, unions did cure many inflicted labor wounds by management. But in recent years, the main function of unions has been to push the wage-price spiral further upward. Since businessmen cannot combine forces like unions, there would be nothing to stop labor leaders from accelerating the spiral, and with it, inflation, under closed shops.

The arguments against compulsory unionism are many, but one may be considered basic. And this argument is the cornerstone to our entire society. Is this to be a truly free country, or must a man under duress, need a union card to earn a living and support a family?

If President Johnson and the Democrats intend to pursue the repeal of section 14(b), then let them do it under some label other than "liberalism." It is pure and simple tyranny.

Mr. President, I have received a most important letter from the employees of the Roy Klossner Co., of San Antonio. In it they most emphatically support retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

I am in full agreement with them, and in order that other Senators may be advised of the urgency with which concerned Texans view this matter, I ask that the letter be printed at this point in the Record.

The Roy Klossner Co.,
San Antonio, Tex., May 21, 1965.

Hon. John Tower,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We urgently recommend that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act remain as it now stands.

We as employees of the Roy Klossner Co. feel that the repeal of this act would take away one of our precious liberties. Anything that you can do to help retain this law will certainly be appreciated.

Very truly yours,
The Employees of the Roy
Klossner Co.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ENTITLED "UTILIZATION OF U.S. GOVERNMENT FOREIGN CURRENCY BALANCES"

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a report from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, entitled "Utilization of U.S. Government Foreign Currency Balances."

The report is in response to an inquiry I made on March 1, 1965, as to whether, in view of the U.S. balance of payments and outflow of gold problem, it would be useful to review the treaties, contracts and arrangements under which we own and generate foreign currencies.

The inquiry was made to the Secretaries of Treasury and State, and a copy was sent to the President. The Treasury report, received under a letter dated May 27, 1965, is self-explanatory.

I ask unanimous consent to have the report and the preliminary correspondence published as part of these remarks in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the report and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1965.

Hon. Harry F. Byrd,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The enclosed report "Utilization of U.S. Government Foreign Currency Balances" supplements the material provided by the Secretary of the Treasury in his letter to you on March 12. It was prepared in cooperation with the Departments of State-AID, Defense, Agriculture, and the Bureau of the Budget.

You will note that the actions underway are not in terms of final accomplishment but rather involve continued search at all levels for further progress.

I know that you will welcome the efforts to effectively use our foreign currency balances to benefit our international payments position in ways which will not involve an adverse withdrawal of resources from countries in whose economic development we have a great interest and to which we extend foreign assistance.

I deeply appreciate your concern and value most highly your active cooperation in our efforts to further strengthen our international payments position.

Sincerely yours,
Henry H. Fowler.

Utilization of U.S. Government Foreign Currency Balances

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

How can our foreign currency balances be used to provide additional benefit to our balance of payments?

On December 31, 1964, the U.S. Government owned the equivalent of $2,937 million in foreign currencies. Of this total, $1,556 million is committed under our foreign aid program for use by the aid recipient countries for economic development and for the common defense. The balance, $1,381 million, is designated for U.S. Government use; and, of this balance, $1,239 million is in the currencies of the eight so-called excess currency countries: Burma, Guinea, India, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, United Arab Republic, and Yugoslavia. This concentration of $1,239 million of excess currencies is further accentuated by the fact that 85 percent of it is held in three of these countries—India, Pakistan, and Poland. In contrast to our expenditures in the Western European countries, which greatly exceed our supply of their currencies, it is in the eight countries listed above that our balances are in excess of the normal operating expenditures of the Government.

These foreign currency balances have accrued primarily under our food-for-peace program and have increased in total as the program has continued over the years. Sales of agricultural commodities under Public Law 480 contribute substantially to the total U.S. oversea aid effort which, in turn, is designed to strengthen the economies of recipient countries and hasten the day when they can finance their import requirements on commercial terms. Meanwhile, sales are made for payment in foreign currency to countries which cannot pay for their needed food requirements in dollars. Most of these countries are recipients of dollar assistance.

OBJECTIVES OF UTILIZATION OF LOCAL CURRENCY

The essential problem we face is one of finding means by which to utilize the foreign currencies we own so as to further save oversea expenditures in dollars, strengthen the economic position of aid recipients, harmonize usage of the currencies with other U.S. aid programs and advance our foreign policy objectives.

Basic to consideration of the problem of increased U.S. use of foreign currencies is the fact that under the food-for-peace program the United States utilizes the foreign currency proceeds by agreement with the country whose currency is involved. Against this background our reexamination shows that although some further progress is possible it will be modest even with modification of both existing U.S. legal requirements governing certain types of expenditures and our agreements with other countries. The economic position of the developing countries is not strong or rich enough to warrant their agreement to extensive use of U.S. holdings of their currencies in ways which would deprive them of foreign exchange receipts or affect stability of their economies.

The direct and immediate benefit to our balance of payments of use of foreign currencies received under food for peace and other aid programs has amounted to more than $2.5 billion over the past 10 years; such savings amounted to about $300 million in fiscal year 1964. However, recognizing the importance of increasing this balance-of-payments benefit wherever feasible, the major categories of U.S. use of its foreign currency holdings have been reexamined.

UTILIZATION FOR OFFICIAL U.S. GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

The operating expenses of all U.S. missions abroad as a matter of policy are being paid in U.S.-owned foreign currency wherever such currency is available. All exceptions to this policy are being reviewed to determine whether or not they are still justified and whether satisfactory alternative arrangements can be made. A notable exception to this policy is in the payment of quarters and other statutory allowances for military personnel which under U.S. law must be paid in dollars even though in some countries the United States has an ample supply of foreign currency.

Current U.S. Government regulations require that payment for official travel and transportation be made with excess U.S.-owned foreign currencies whenever such currencies are available for such purposes, even when only a brief stopover in an excess currency country is involved. While we have been successful in including a provision for such travel and transportation payments in many agreements, some difficulties have arisen with respect to the burden imposed on the foreign country's foreign exchange position by the subsequent conversion for U.S. airlines of these payments into U.S. dollars.

UTILIZATION FOR PROCUREMENT

U.S. procurement abroad financed with U.S. foreign currency holdings is being expanded. Government-owned furnished housing acquired with foreign currency is being increased so as to save the cost of transporting household effects of U.S. Government civilian personnel stationed abroad. Also, Department of Defense nonappropriated fund activities, including post exchange and service stores, have made substantial use of U.S.-owned foreign currencies for the purchase of goods and merchandise for resale for dollars through their outlets. Efforts are being made to identify exports of goods and services that could be purchased with U.S.-owned foreign currency at competitive prices and without creating a foreign exchange loss or inflationary pressure in the exporting country which would prejudice the achievement of other important U.S. foreign policy objectives. Such exports are being sought not only for U.S. use in third countries but also for use as U.S. financed aid to third countries. For example, allocations of U.S.-held Indian rupees for use in the AID program in Nepal totaled $41 million from 1960 through 1964.

One problem which we are seeking to resolve is that of expanding official procurement in excess currency countries with benefit to the U.S. balance of payments and without excessive cost in relation to available dollar appropriations. An AID group has recently visited several of the excess currency countries to explore the possibilities of procurement there for AID programs in third countries. As a result, plans are being made for such procurement in Israel and Pakistan, and negotiations are in process to arrange for it in several other countries.

In most of these inconvertible currency areas where we hold excess currencies, there are opportunities for some increased procurement, but only at higher cost to the agency's appropriation. Under current established policy requiring acceptance of the lowest competitive bid, awards usually go to the hard currency countries, primarily because the prices in those countries are more attractive when converted into dollars than are those in the soft currency areas.

It is anticipated that greater uses of U.S.-owned foreign currencies can be found if the Congress authorizes the use of foreign currencies without charge to appropriated funds as requested in the President's 1966 budget proposals. Under this plan it is proposed that the President be authorized to spend, for additional special activities of authorized programs, up to 5 percent of each excess foreign currency. This experimental proposal would promote for all activities increased uses of these currencies in addition to the programs which are financed from special foreign currency program appropriations, and could in particular provide an incentive toward offshore procurement with benefit to the U.S. balance of payments.

USES BY U.S. TOURISTS AND BUSINESSMEN

In future guidance to businessmen on the President's voluntary balance-of-payments program, the Commerce Department will point out the availability of certain U.S.-owned foreign currencies for use in lieu of dollars either through purchase or through Cooley loans. Sales of local currency for business purposes are being made in Israel and India, while sales to tourists are in effect in Israel, India, and the United Arab Republic. To extend the potential effectiveness of the program of sales of U.S.-owned foreign currencies in those countries where agreements to do so exist, the Secretary of the Treasury is revising the present criteria for determining which currencies are available for sale to U.S. citizens under section 104 (s) or (t) of Public Law 480 so that additional amounts will become available. Sections 104(s) and 104(t) have been included in all title I Public Law 480 agreements since section 104(t) was added to the Public Law 480 legislation last October and are being included in all new title I agreements.

UTILIZATION OF COOLEY LOAN FUNDS

AID, which is responsible for the management of Cooley funds, has established a "Businessmen's Information Center" to get information on the Cooley loan program to American business firms. It also issues periodic press releases listing the countries where Cooley funds are available.

As of February 28, some 287 loans had been made and 69 percent of the funds presently allocated for this purpose have been lent. The rate of usage of Cooley loan funds varies from region to region on the basis of U.S. investor interest. In the Latin American region 90 percent of the funds allocated for Cooley loans had been lent as of February 28.

AID is examining its policies and procedures with respect to Cooley loans to see how they can be simplified and expedited, especially as regards applications covering expenditures abroad which U.S. companies originally planned to make in dollars out of their own resources.

Moreover, in order to obtain an immediate balance-of-payments benefit from foreign currency balances held for Cooley loan purposes for which there is no prospect of early utilization, approaches are being made to the various foreign countries concerned to obtain their agreement to including Cooley balances in those covered by the "unfunding procedure" authorized by the last session of the U.S. Congress. By the unfunding procedure, foreign currency balances formerly restricted for particular uses are unrestricted and made available for expenditure without affecting in any way the programs or obligations for which the funds were originally earmarked. This unfunding will increase the amount of foreign currency available for immediate use for U.S. operating expenses and will thus reduce U.S. dollar expenditures in the nonexcess currency countries.

UTILIZATION OF OTHER COUNTRY USE FUNDS

A careful check has been made of the status of other undisbursed "country use" Public Law 480 proceeds (104(g) loan funds). This indicated that with few exceptions such balances have been committed under the terms of the agreements for agreed project purposes. These projects are the outcome of intensive bilateral planning and often have required legislative action. It would, therefore, be inappropriate and impractical to try to revise the agreements to switch these country use proceeds to U.S. use. Efforts are underway where possible to unfund those country use balances which are not expected to be disbursed in the near future.

PRESENT STATUS OF RESTRICTED U.S. USE BALANCES

All formerly restricted U.S. use foreign currency balances being held for specific purposes were unfunded as of March 31, except for $27.4 million, of which $25 million in Japanese yen was acquired under the GARIOA settlement (not related to Public Law 480) and is committed by special agreement for cultural and educational purposes in Japan. It is on deposit in American banks in Japan and in Japanese banks at 5½ percent interest, providing earnings of $1,375,000 annually, which will be used for regular U.S. operating expenses in Japan. The annual cultural program will be covered out of the principal. Unfunding U.S.-use foreign currency accounts in calendar 1964 saved our balance of payments about $105.2 million.

HIGHER U.S. USE PERCENTAGES AND CONVERSIONS

During the last year the percentage of Public Law 480 sales proceeds for "U.S. uses" has generally been increased except in the agreements with the excess currency countries and special cases such as Vietnam where other factors are involved. Over the past year there have been numerous instances of 30 to 35 percent for U.S. use, and two agreements provided for 50 percent U.S. use. The present policy is to increase this percentage within overall U.S. foreign policy objectives wherever it will benefit the U.S. balance of payments. Although there is a limit to the extent to which the terms for Public Law 480 title I sales can be hardened without jeopardizing potential sales, in some countries it has been possible to obtain agreement to the conversion of a portion of the Public Law 480 sales proceeds into other currencies. Efforts will be continued to increase the magnitude and scope of these conversions and to require the payment of interest on sales proceeds held in U.S. accounts where possible.

TITLE IV PROGRAMS

Title IV sales of surplus agricultural commodities are made for dollar repayment and are, therefore, a direct benefit to our balance of payments. It is the purpose of title IV, Public Law 480, to stimulate and increase the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for dollars and to utilize surplus agricultural commodities to assist the economic development of friendly nations. In recognition of this, most sales agreements provide that the local currency proceeds of the sale of title IV commodities within the country will be used for economic and social development programs as agreed upon by the United States and the borrowing government.

The financing of local costs is highly important in many AID programs. To the extent that title IV local currency can be used in lieu of currency generated through AID dollar expenditures in financing such programs there is a potential beneficial effect upon the U.S. balance of payments. Such additional balance-of-payments benefits are, of course, limited since AID is already employing devices which assure that virtually all of the dollars used to generate local currency are spent to finance exports from the United States. However, AID is continuously studying the more systematic treatment of title IV local currency and it is possible that as a result of this effort the beneficial effects of title IV upon the U.S. balance of payments may be enhanced.

An important additional factor with regard to title IV programs has been the recent emphasis given to larger initial payments under the program. Since the beginning of the current fiscal year 6 of the 14 government-to-government title IV agreements signed provided for larger initial payments amounting to 20 to 25 percent of the value of the agreement. This trend toward larger initial payments will continue to be emphasized under title IV programs.

CONCLUSION

Our reexamination reveals that while some further tightening up of food-for-peace terms and provision for increased U.S. utilization of foreign currencies is possible, the resulting increase in U.S. balance-of-payments benefit is likely to be modest. Determined effort has already exhausted most of the possible means of using the currencies to that end. This stems from the fact that U.S. requirements are small in most of the areas in which excess currencies are held.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The correspondence relative to the advisability, in view of the U.S. balance of payments and gold situation, of reexamining the treaties, contracts, and arrangements under which the United States owns, generates, and uses foreign currencies follows:

March 1, 1965.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the United States.

My Dear Mr. President: Please find enclosed a self-explanatory letter relative to the balance of payments and outflow of gold, which I have sent today to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury. Copies of these letters are forwarded to you for your information.

With warmest personal regards and my very best wishes.

Faithfully yours,
Harry F. Byrd.

March 1, 1965.

Hon. Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State,
and
Hon. Douglas Dillon,
Secretary of the Treasury.

My Dear Mr. Secretary: You know of my long-standing and continuing concern over our balance-of-payments deficits and the outflow of our gold.

If it has not been done, would it serve a worthwhile purpose to review all of the treaties, contracts, and arrangements under which we own and generate foreign currencies with a view to renegotiation for more constructive use under current circumstances?

It is not my intention here to be critical of earlier policies which were involved. The fact is that conditions have changed, and if it would help, renegotiation may be justified and acceptable.

You have my very best wishes.

Faithfully yours,
Harry F. Byrd.

The White House,
March 3, 1965.

Dear Senator: Thank you for sending me copies of your letters of March 1 to Secretary Rusk and Secretary Dillon suggesting that consideration be given to the advisability and usefulness of renegotiating treaties, contracts, and arrangements under which we own and generate foreign currencies as a means of lessening the balance-of-payments deficit.

I appreciate your thoughtful suggestion and assure you that it will be thoroughly explored.

Sincerely,
Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House,
March 6, 1965.

Dear Senator: This is a further answer to your good letter of March 1 about foreign currencies. I want you to know that I have personally ordered an intensive reexamination of the agreements under which we carry out the Public Law 480 programs, the source of most of the money. I am determined that we shall make the best possible use of these funds.

We have already made some progress. The agreements negotiated during the past year, mostly involving currencies not in excess supply, provide for a general increase in the share reserved for U.S. use. Further, some of the money will be available for sale to American tourists and nonprofit institutions. Since 1960 annual U.S. expenditure of local currency has risen by $100 million, to $333 million in fiscal year 1964.

As you know, however, a good part of this money consists of the currency of poor countries, desperately short of the resources they need to get their own economies growing. India and Pakistan are the most important examples. We have an important stake in their security and development. When we demand payment from them in dollars, or spend our holdings of their currency in lieu of dollars, we take away with one hand resources we give them with the other, through our assistance programs.

By selling developing countries our farm products for local currency, we provide essential support for their development efforts. They simply could not afford to buy these goods on commercial terms without stunting their growth.

Another significant part of our balances is in Polish currency. All of this is already subject to conversion and repayment in dollars on a fixed time schedule.

On the other hand, and as suggested in your letter, there may well be situations where it would be possible to improve our arrangements. I intend to find those situations and act accordingly.

In sum, we must continue both to make dollar savings and to use our agricultural abundance to advance our interests in the developing world.

During the early part of next week you will be receiving a more detailed report about the overall foreign currency situation from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury.

Sincerely,
Lyndon B. Johnson.

March 10, 1965.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the United States.

Dear Mr. President: Thank you for your response to my letter of March 1 relative to the advisability, in view of our balance-of-payments situation, of reexamining the treaties, contracts and arrangements under which the United States owns, generates and uses foreign currencies. May I commend you for the promptness of your action, and express my appreciation for it?

I know you have shared our concern over the continuing deficits in our balance of payments and withdrawal of our gold since these developments first came under examination by the Finance Committee in 1957.

This is a deep and serious problem. Turning the use of currencies in our accounts abroad into more positive effect on our balance in itself, of course, would not solve the problem. But if it is feasible it would be a needed step in the right direction which would be beneficial to both the United States and friendly nations.

Your reference to currencies generated under Public Law 480, for example, brings to mind the provision in that law for the sale of these currencies to tourists which might be made more useful to mutual advantage.

I hope the more detailed responses from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury will find merit in the suggestion. Meanwhile, I am among those who are grateful for your active interest.

You have my very best wishes.

Faithfully,
Harry F. Byrd.

RULE OF REASON SHOULD BE FOLLOWED IN CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Texas Legislature is concluding its current session with passage of a bill on congressional redistricting that should give new dimensions to the word "gerrymander." That word is not strong enough to describe what has been done to the new Texas congressional districts. It is a new example of "salami" tactics, of slicing a metropolitan area into as many pieces as possible, combined with a taffy pull, stretching a district with city suburbs at one end as far as possible toward an area having such differing occupations, geography, and trade interests as to have no similar interest with the remote dismembered county.

I have some reluctance to criticize the actions of another legislative body, for it is all too easy to find fault with the work of many weeks of hard work done under the most intense pressures. Yet the Texas Legislature has produced a congressional redistricting plan that has been greeted by few shouts of enthusiasm and a great many cries of "take it to court." The new plan will undoubtedly be taken to the Federal courts. We may validly ask whether a redistricting plan that immediately draws such a response does in fact represent a reasonable exercise of the legislature's power. The adoption of plans as unsound basically as the new Texas congressional districts is a new invitation to abdicate redistricting to the Federal courts, where citizens observe that some standard of reason and fairness applies.

I have supposed that there might be some good reasons for violating a rule of population equality in legislative districts if the purpose were to put in one district a cohesive area based on social, geographical, and historical considerations where that area fairly should be entitled to send a distinctive regional representative to the legislative body. I even see no great vice in seeking to assure the continuity of service of a distinguished legislator who has accumulated valuable seniority. But what can be said of a redistricting plan which tosses out these principles and, while achieving a superficial mathematical equality, attached metropolitan suburbs to a district stretching away for hundreds of miles? Should not one principle of redistricting be to keep metropolitan trade areas under as few districts as possible, rather than carving them into as many segments as possible?

Look at the new congressional districts in Texas: one suburb of Dallas in Dallas County has been attached to a district reaching 250 miles to the west almost to Lubbock, while another Dallas suburb also in Dallas County is attached to a district going 200 miles south to the outskirts of Houston. The northern part of Bexar County and San Antonio is made the heavy end of a strip going over 300 miles almost to New Mexico, while the southern part of San Antonio in Bexar County goes to a district going almost 200 miles to Old Mexico. In southeast Texas, two major competing port cities a hundred miles apart, Galveston and Beaumont, are put in one coastal strip district, while their respective natural trade areas are stripped away to make other districts. The Texas Legislature has carved up counties and cities and attached small pieces of counties and cities to such remote areas as to make the word "gerrymander" obsolete. This is such a governmental disaster that nothing but the word "Texaster" can describe what has been done in Texas by the Texas Legislature. One 11-county district resembles a giant fishhook in shape; shoestring districts are common, the dismemberment of cities and counties reduced to a butcher's art.

When a proposal can be analyzed on its face as a deliberate striped, or an awkward cookie-cutter pattern, or a long-reaching arm to pull in noncontiguous territory, then it is obvious that no attempt was made to protect the democratic interests of the people, nor the interests of democracy.

The interest of the people cannot be best served if an elected legislator represents varying territory having no geographical propinquity to his own residence.

If a State legislature cannot logically or fairly decide apportionment districts, a serious doubt is cast as to whether they should be trusted with this responsibility if the interests of good government are blinded by self-interest.

The Senate now has before it a meritorious bill that would make it possible for such monstrosities as this Texas plan to be tested by fair and reasonable standards in the courts. H.R. 5505, the Celler bill, in addition to other provisions, directs that congressional districts "shall at all times be composed of contiguous territory, in as compact form as practicable," and directs that the districts can vary no more than 15 percent in population from the State average. This is a highly desirable bill; I strongly urge its passage by the Senate. It would provide standards by which the irresponsible acts of the State legislature can be tested in an impartial forum. I am reluctant to admit it, but today I and a great many other Texans are thinking more and more highly of judicial review of congressional and legislative redistricting.

TUNISIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today the Republic of Tunisia is celebrating its independence day. All Americans should join in saluting this brave little country which, less than a decade ago, regained its freedom from colonial domination.

During a written history dating back to the 12th century B.C., Tunisia has been occupied and overrun many times, but she has maintained her identity as a nation.

The modern Republic of Tunisia, under the leadership of President Habib Bourguiba is now embarking on a bold 4-year plan of economic development at home, and undertaking a unique initiative in her relations with her neighbors in north Africa and the Middle East. President Bourguiba, leader of a country which is a member of the Arab League, has urged progress toward a Middle Eastern settlement under which the Arab countries and Israel could live side by side in peace.

The United States should give all possible support both to Tunisia's efforts to bring peace to the troubled Middle East, and to her programs to develop her own economy and provide jobs for her people.

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Spartanburg Herald, of Spartanburg, S.C., published in its May 26, 1965, issue a very discerning editorial analysis of the administration's opposition to the right-to-work laws. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, May 26, 1965]

REAL MOTIVE SHOWN ABOUT RIGHT TO WORK

Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, probably unwittingly, has identified the most basic motive in big labor's drive against the right-to-work law.

It is to brunt the dynamic industrial growth of the Southland.

Not much interpretation is needed to discover this meaning in Wirtz' comments to Congress.

He said that State right-to-work laws cause disruptive industrial competition among the States.

What competition is there for industry today that could be defined as disruptive?

That which attracts companies to new locations.

The South in recent years has become a vigorous competitor for the industrial prosperity which has long been the good fortune of the North.

Mr. Wirtz' view is all the more striking when you define further the meaning of his phrase.

Who is disrupted by this competition for industry?

Of course, no community likes to lose a plant and the job opportunities it provides. Spartanburg, when seeking to have a company locate in this county, surely doesn't enjoy seeing it decide to go to Greenville, much less to North Carolina or Georgia.

When a firm is going to build a new facility in one of two communities, one of the two is going to be happy and one of them disrupted, in the Secretary's word.

Presumably, the Federal Government holds no favorites among the communities which make up its Nation. Why should the Department of Labor concern itself with obstructing one town from attracting an industry which might otherwise build elsewhere?

The Nation will gain the same number of jobs, whether the plant goes in Ohio or in South Carolina. Secretary Wirtz should be as happy for South Carolina as he would be for Ohio.

But there are some people who would be considerably more disrupted than others by a management decision to come South.

These are the moguls of big labor, who have squeezed the goose unmercifully in the highly industrialized areas of the North.

They don't want to see business migrate to the South. If it remains where they have virtually complete control, they have no worry about maintaining union membership. It is nearly automatic. The man who wants to work joins the union.

The independent-minded southerner hasn't capitulated to this type of subservient membership without free choice. Many southerners do belong to unions, but they have their own personal choice in the matter.

It is this choice that President Johnson, Secretary Wirtz, and big labor want to declare undemocratic.

There are 19 States in the Union which have right-to-work laws. Which means that 31 do not have.

The 19 do not suggest it to be the right of Federal Government to impose these laws on the 31. Why do you think the 31 propose to enforce their view on the 19?

Not for the benefit of the 19, you can be sure.

THE HOUSING BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last Friday, the Washington Post published an editorial which complimented the Banking and Currency Committee of the House for its improvements on the administration's housing bill. I join in these sentiments, and say that once again the House Banking and Currency Committee has demonstrated its fine sense of workmanship and diligent devotion to the public interest.

I call particular attention to the elimination of the income floor from the administration's proposed rent subsidy plan. Under the administration's original proposal, the plan would apply only to families with incomes too high for admission into public housing. This provision thus would automatically exclude the vast majority of poor families who are in the most desperate need of such assistance.

I commend the leadership of the House Banking and Currency Committee for its removal of the income floor. It is also noteworthy that the bill reported by the House subcommittee has achieved broad bipartisan support. Only one Republican member of the subcommittee voted against the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Post editorial be reprinted at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 28, 1965]

HOPE FOR HOUSING

Solid workmanship, rather than creative brilliance, is the House Banking Committee's style. It has, characteristically, greatly strengthened the weakest aspects of the administration's housing bill. But it has simultaneously dulled one of its most interesting innovations, the new towns proposal.

Perhaps the committee may be correct in thinking that the country is not yet ready for new towns; certainly the old cities are not, for they sent their mayors to the Capitol with tears in their eyes to plead that the new towns constitute unfair competition. The committee kindly deleted that inflammatory phrase, "new town," to pacify the mayors. But it substituted Federal land mortgage insurance up to $12.5 million for a single development; mortgages for undeveloped land have never before been insurable. Since $12.5 million is nearly the cost of the land on which Reston is being built, the committee can hardly be said to have abandoned the idea of a Federal new towns policy altogether.

The bill will, no doubt, be attacked chiefly on its courageous proposal to subsidize the rents of families with low incomes. The administration had originally intended to give subsidies only to families with too much income to live in public housing, but the absurdity of that policy is obvious in a country where the volume of public housing falls fearfully short of the need. The committee has, very sensibly, proposed subsidies to the very poor as well as to their comparatively more fortunate neighbors.

A series of new departures in public housing will permit local authorities to buy or rent existing homes for families who can pay only part of their rent. Through an ingenious system of pooling mortgages, the committee expects to increase the amount of private money invested at low rates in nonprofit housing. The administration has apparently been persuaded not to give up its program of housing through low-interest mortgages, a program that is only now beginning to pick up momentum.

On balance, the bill is stronger now than when the committee took it up. It gives great promise of becoming a landmark in the development of a broad and imaginative Federal housing policy.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I had occasion to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the editor, and an editorial from the Bel Air Aegis, concerning the saving of the United Nations.

At that time I indicated that I was dismayed that so little discussion of the United Nations grave plight was taking place.

On other occasions I have risen on this floor to point out the growing concern of the American people for the fate of the United Nations. Daily editorials and letters to the editor reveal the anguish with which Americans view the creeping rigor mortis facing the United Nations.

I wish to have printed in the RECORD this very thoughtful editorial from the Baltimore Evening Sun and a letter to the editor from one of Maryland's most distinguished doctors, Palmer Futcher.

These expressions of concern for the United Nations are part of an increasing awareness on the part of the American people that we must do something affirmative to save this vital world organization.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have these two items printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun, Mar. 25, 1965]

SHORING UP THE U.N.

The United States has decided, news stories from Washington say, to contribute some $200 million to the United Nations and its various agencies this year despite the long continuing controversy over the refusal of Russia, France, and a number of other countries to pay their assessments for peacekeeping missions. It is a decision wisely taken. No doubt it will meet with some criticism but it is in keeping with the belief to which this country has been committed for 20 years. The belief is that the United Nations, despite its defects and failures, is the best hope the world has for preventing war and that support of it is very much in our own national interests. On the whole the record over the past two decades justifies the belief.

This year is a critical one for the organization that now counts 115 members, 3 times the number that brought it into being in San Francisco in 1945. The General Assembly is in recess until fall. The efforts to reach an agreement with Russia on the special assessments for the operations in the Congo and the Middle East offer small prospect of a settlement. The organization faces severe financial difficulties which, if unsolved, could seriously curtail all its activities and perhaps cause a gradual withering of such effectiveness as it has had and of such reliance as its members have upon it. The reduction of it to a feeble shadow of a collection of states at this time would not only deprive the world of a useful if imperfect instrument of international conciliation but would probably undermine other modes of cooperation. Certainly it would be extremely unwise to let it die simply for lack of money.

Earlier this month the United States reversed its position on withholding its share of the amount needed to keep the program of technical assistance in operation. Now it is once again ready to put up its full share of the regular budget and other funds. Because this is a large share—about a third of the United Nations' expenses—it is an important prop. Moreover, it expresses this country's continuing determination to try to keep the organization alive and functioning; it sets an example that should hearten other members to renew their support of it and their faith in it. At least for the time being the money can be counted as soundly invested.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Mar. 26, 1965]

PEACEKEEPING FUNCTION

SIR: In this time of world crisis, the United Nations is incapacitated in the political area, while a 33-nation committee reviews one of its most important functions, that of peacekeeping.

The United States was sufficiently aware of defects in the operation of the United Nations to spearhead the action which led to the present impasse over payments for peacekeeping activities. It is imperative that President Johnson give frequent affirmation that this action emanated from a desire to improve the peace-keeping capacity of the United Nations rather than to impair it. Yet more than a month has passed since the adjournment of the Assembly without a forceful indication from the administration that it will take leadership in support of a greater role for the United Nations in maintaining peace.

Does President Johnson now disavow the protestations by him and his presidential predecessors that the development of the United Nations is necessary to the rule of law in the world and is hence of supreme importance to the United States? Or will he reaffirm this conviction, preferably by calling for a conference of foreign ministers to review the organization and authority of the United Nations with the goal of making it a more effective instrument of world order?

PALMER H. FUTCHER.

BALTIMORE, *March 23*.

BIRTH CONTROL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on April 10, a letter to the editor, written by Dr. Edwin G. Riley, was published in the Baltimore Sun. In his letter, Dr. Riley asked this question:

> If it is considered immoral to give a woman birth-control materials and information, and thereby prevent or take a life, in one sector of our society, why is it moral to take a life, in another sector of our society, without question, simply because accepted reasons exist?

I ask other Senators to read Dr. Riley's letter and to look deeply into their own consciences, in the light of today's world population problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Riley's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Apr. 10, 1965]

MORAL RESPONSIBILITY

SIR: The moral problem of whether to give birth-control materials to unmarried women is not one of the morals of the women, but rather the moral responsibility of society toward these women and the problems created by their actions.

No one questions the desirability of the moral stricture on fornication. It would seem that after almost 2,000 years of moral preachment, far too many of our people have not seen fit to follow this precept. The problem of illegitimacy has been with us and will continue to be with us. The community spends much time, money, effort, and concern with its unfortunate results.

From much of the material that has appeared in the press it appears that not giving the control is moral and giving it is immoral. This is not the case. The choice is between two immoralities. By giving we contribute to the immorality of the mother. By not giving we forgo our moral responsibility to every child that it have the opportunity to be wanted, cared for, loved by his mother.

Certain results of immoral sexual relations are less punishable than others. No one questions the treatment of syphilis, which in almost all cases arises from irregular sexual relations. It would even be more moral to allow this, since both partners of the act could suffer the consequences. This, of course, is ridiculous. By the same token, why should just the woman suffer this other result of her immorality which is a burden on her and a worse burden on the innocent child?

There is no question that this is a matter of preventing or taking a life, which is not within the right of humans. It is done in other segments of our society without question where accepted reasons exist.

Above all the other tenets of Christianity is that of love. Allowing unwanted, unloved, neglected children to come into the world is not an act of love on the part of society and is not moral since the child is foreordained to punishment through no fault of his own. This is an Old Testament concept which is not repeated in the New. It is cruel.

The idea of birth control with the present easy methods is new. It must be remembered that at one time Christian authorities took the position that nothing should be done to save life since it interfered with the will of God. Later these authorities disapproved of easing pain in childbirth since it was the will of God that a child be brought into the world amid travail. Even today we read of certain sects that refuse blood transfusion because it is "against the will of God."

It is only by a very limited line of moral thought that withholding birth control methods can be justified. If a woman is less burdened with the products of her misdoing, even she may have an opportunity to learn a better moral level of conduct.

EDWIN G. RILEY, M.D.

DENTON, *April 5.*

DEDICATION OF STEVENS HALL, U.S. ARMY RESERVE CENTER, BELLINGHAM, WASH.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 9, at Bellingham, Wash., the new U.S. Army Reserve Center was dedicated. It was named "Stevens Hall", in honor of Gen. Isaac Ingalls Stevens, the first Governor of Washington Territory, and his only son, Brig. Gen. Hazard Stevens. The principal speaker at the ceremony was the distinguished former Secretary of the Army, Robert T. Stevens, who is a direct descendant of Governor Stevens and his son, Brig. Gen. Hazard Stevens.

The Stevens family have a long record of distinguished public service to their country—in peace and in war. Robert Stevens stands in that rich family tradition.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my remarks contained in a letter addressed to Maj. Gen. W. C. Garrison, the commanding general of the 10th U.S. Army Corps, Fort Lawton, Wash., which was read at the ceremony, and also the biographies of Governor Stevens and his son, Brig. Gen. Hazard Stevens, and the dedicatory remarks of Robert T. Stevens.

There being no objection, the letter, biographies, and remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 4, 1965.

Maj. Gen. W. C. GARRISON,
Commanding General,
Headquarters, X U.S. Army Corps,
Fort Lawton, Wash.

DEAR GENERAL GARRISON: I deeply regret that, due to a longtime commitment to participate in the dedication of the Everett port facility, it will not be possible for me to be on hand for the ceremonies in connection with the U.S. Army Reserve Center at Bellingham, Wash., on Sunday, May 9.

I do wish to take this opportunity to say how pleased I am by the decision of the commanding general of the 6th U.S. Army to name the new facility "Stevens Hall" in memory of Gov. Isaac Ingalls Stevens, the first Governor of Washington Territory, and of his son, Brig. Gen. Hazard Stevens, Medal of Honor winner during the Civil War. All of us can be proud of the great contribution this family has made to our country from the inception of the Republic. The record of the family accomplishments is one without parallel in American history. The contributions of the family are legion, both in the military field and the area of statecraft. We in the State of Washington are especially honored to have Robert T. Stevens, former Secretary of the Army, present to represent his illustrious family. Secretary Stevens is a personal friend of mine, a man I have admired and respected not only for his distinguished service to our Nation in peace and war, but for his great integrity and devotion to his country.

The Stevens name will be a continuous reminder to the men who utilize Stevens Hall of the great responsibilities of American citizenship. It is an example that I hope and trust the members of the Armed Forces who train there will endeavor to emulate at all times.

With all good wishes.
Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senator.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF ISAAC INGALLS STEVENS

Isaac Ingalls Stevens was born on March 25, 1818, in the State of Massachusetts. He was an honor graduate from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, class of 1839, receiving a commission in the Corps of Engineers. He served with distinction in the Mexican War rising to the rank of brevet major; he was credited with developing the plan that successfully breached the defenses of Mexico City during that campaign.

Following the Mexican War, President Franklin Pierce appointed Stevens to three positions simultaneously: Governor of the Territory of Washington, Chief of the Northern Pacific Railway Survey, and Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Territory. He was eminently successful in each of the three positions, including negotiations with the British on boundary disputes, arrangement of treaties with the Indians, and as the result of his popularity as Governor, was elected Delegate to Congress for Washington Territory in 1857 where he served until the outbreak of the Civil War.

Following his resignation from Congress, Governor Stevens was appointed a colonel by President Lincoln and assumed command of the 79th Highlanders of New York. By July 1862 he was promoted to major general. On September 1, 1862, General Stevens was killed in action while leading a charge against greatly superior forces under the command of Gen. Stonewall Jackson during the Second Battle of Bull Run.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF HAZARD STEVENS

Hazard Stevens was born in Newport, R.I., and entered the service at Olympia, Washington Territory. He was appointed 1st lieutenant, 79th New York Infantry, in August 1861; and was promoted to captain and assistant adjutant general on October 16, 1861. While serving in this capacity he was awarded the Medal of Honor on June 13, 1864, for gallantry in action in leading a party that assaulted and captured Fort Huger, Va., on April 19, 1863. He was promoted to major on October 13, 1864; to brevet lieutenant colonel, U.S. Volunteers, on August 1, 1864; to colonel on October 19, 1864, and to brigadier general on April 2, 1865. He was honorably mustered out of the service on September 19, 1865.

REMARKS BY ROBERT T. STEVENS, PRESIDENT OF J. P. STEVENS & CO., INC., AT DEDICATION OF STEVENS HALL, BELLINGHAM, WASH., MAY 9, 1965

Last month, at Appomattox Courthouse in Virginia, descendants of Generals Grant and Lee took part in marking the 100th anniversary of the end of the American Civil War. Not far from Appomattox, one of the men we honor here today lost his life in the Battle of Chantilly on September 1, 1862.

Here in Bellingham, nearly 103 years after his death, we dedicate this armory, Stevens Hall, in honor of Gen. Isaac I. Stevens, and his only son, Gen. Hazard Stevens.

Gen. Isaac Stevens, first cousin of mine, twice removed, was the first Governor of the Territory of Washington, a soldier, engineer and diplomat, a true pioneer of the great Northwest and a brave officer of the Union Army, who gave his life to a cause in which he stoutly believed.

During his short life of 44 years, Isaac Stevens accomplished far more than most men accomplish during twice that time. He had a brilliant record in the Mexican War of 1847. His trips overland to Puget Sound, his two appointive terms as territorial Governor, his two elections as first territorial Delegate to Congress and his efforts in this outstanding area of our young Nation, including his negotiations with the Indians, contributed an important chapter in the history and early knowledge of our Northwest Pacific frontier.

Hazard Stevens, a fine son and heroic officer of the Army, is remembered as a recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor, awarded him on June 13, 1864, for gallantry in action in leading a party that assaulted and captured Fort Huger, Va., during the devastating Civil War.

Along with you, those of us who are descendants of these gallant men take great pride in their accomplishments. Like others of uncommon valor, they are the inspiration of brave men everywhere and, personally, my own interest in military affairs, including service in both World Wars and as Secretary of the Army, stems in part from the accomplishments of these two Stevens generals, father and son. I cannot forget that your first territorial Governor stood first in his class at West Point.

Today, in farflung outposts of the world, brave Americans continue to carry forth the honor of America. Each of us is grateful that our men in uniform, supported by the vast majority of American people, under the leadership of a resolute President, are on the job in full support of freedom and an honorable peace.

Both Generals Stevens were prodigious writers and readers and, in his second year at West Point, Isaac also displayed a keen sense of devilish wit. In a letter to his cousin, Charles, he wrote: "The professor's cherries are now dead ripe and by some means or other, quantities of them disappear every night—in such things as these, you know it is wicked to call names, but this I can say that last night I ate a fine lot of them."

In his final minutes of life, Isaac Stevens was to die as he had lived—a brave man dedicated to the code of West Point—duty, honor, country. The official files reveal that. "The colorbearer being shot, Stevens seized the colors, regardless of the wounded Highlanders at his feet who exclaimed, 'For God's sake, don't you take the colors, General, they'll shoot you if you do,' and, leading his men to the charge, thus he fell in the hour of victory. His body was found after the battle; his hands closely grasped the staff, and the flag had fallen over his head and shoulders."

These early pioneers and defenders of the Nation have been honored in many places, among them Stevensville, Mont., Stevens County and elsewhere in Washington. On behalf of each General Stevens' descendants, I am certain they would, as I am, be proud of the designation of this new U.S. Army Reserve Center as Stevens Hall. I am very proud to represent the Stevens family on this memorable occasion and very proud that the name Stevens means so much in this great State of Washington.

Thank you very much.

HIGHWAY DEATHS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, more than 460 Americans died this weekend on our highways. We have become numb to statistics such as these; but I, for one, mourn the loss of each single life. We could have prevented many of these deaths.

A life lost on the highway is a life wasted. Accidents can be prevented. Lives can be saved. It is time for the people of this country to stop wringing their hands in despair, and to take positive action to implement proven programs of highway safety. We who serve in Congress must have the courage to do what is necessary in order to make our highways as safe as possible.

More than half the people who died this weekend would be alive now if Congress had done what it had the power to do. Proposed legislation now before us can reduce thousands of highway death zones, can improve automobile safety standards, and can eliminate the hazards of unsafe tires. Each of these proposals can save precious lives.

The greatest livesaver ever instituted is the interstate highway program. The death rate on these roads is less than half that on older highways. Thousands of lives have already been saved. This is a step in the right direction; but we cannot rest here. We must plan now to extend the interstate system; and the Hartke highway bill would do just this. My bill would add 19,000 miles to the presently projected 41,000-mile system. Based on current statistics, this increase will save 3,800 lives a year. The saving in property damage alone would amount to several billion dollars a year.

The past weekend, American motorists traveled some 12 billion vehicle-miles; but almost 85 percent of that travel was on old, unsafe rural roads. It was on these roads that most of the 460 lost their lives.

More lives were lost this weekend than those lost in the entire course of the war in Vietnam. We are shocked and saddened at the loss of even one pilot in southeast Asia; but a life lost on the highway is an everyday occurrence.

The tragedy is that this loss need not be. Our Nation's abundant resources can be focused on highway—safety programs. We have the power to cut the toll in half. Let us now resolve to do everything within our power to make our roads as safe as humanly possible.

THE KEPPEL GUIDELINES FOR INTEGRATING SOUTHERN SCHOOLS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., has published another excellent editorial on the subject of the Keppel guidelines for integrating southern schools under title VI of the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1964. On May 19, 1965, I had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 10997, an editorial, from the Greenville News, on the same subject.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Keppel Versus Law and Commonsense," be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, May 25, 1965]

KEPPEL VERSUS LAW AND COMMONSENSE

It may be possible that the request of nine southern Governors through their Senators and Representatives in Washington for modification or a reasonable interpretation of the Federal guidelines for desegregation to qualify for Federal aid for the public schools will bear fruit.

Commissioner Francis Keppel, of the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, however, has his bureaucratic back up and says he will not bow to political pressure.

He does not deny that his rules and regulations which under the general precedents have the effect of law, go beyond the prevailing court decrees.

But he says they are perfectly legal under titles IV and VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1963–64 which forbid racial discrimination in public facilities and permit the Attorney General to initiate suits where discrimination is charged in the public schools.

If so, and if Mr. Keppel succeeds in holding his ground, then the Civil Rights Act is worse even than we thought. The Commissioner himself is employing both political and economic pressure and refusing to listen to reason.

For, as we pointed out at some length here a few days ago, the Keppel "guidelines" go far beyond even the most extreme of the Federal court decrees. They go beyond the language of the Civil Rights Act.

The courts have forbidden the schools to discriminate against individuals on grounds of race in assigning pupils to schools and classrooms, or to discriminate in considering requests for transfer from one school to another.

The Civil Rights Act, likewise, stops at the point of forbidding discrimination. Although it may be interpreted as compelling deliberate integration, such an intention is not spelled out in the language used by Congress. That, goodness knows, goes far enough in invading property rights and personal privacy and interfering with the right of individuals to choose their associates.

The distinction here is that the Civil Rights Act and the Federal court decrees are aimed at ending discrimination by forbidding denial of certain individual rights as defined in Supreme Court decisions.

The HEW Federal aid guidelines would discriminate in the opposite direction by compelling the schools to mix the races deliberately for the sake of achieving integration (called desegregation, which is not in any dictionary). Integration is the primary objective and assistance to education is given second place.

A clear legal light is provided by the most recent court decisions on the subject. On April 7 the U.S. Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the "freedom of choice" plan of the Richmond, Va., schools whereby children are permitted to attend any school they choose anywhere in the city.

It also upheld the Hopewell, Va., plan whereby children are assigned to the schools in or nearest their residential neighborhoods.

In the Richmond case the Negro plaintiffs argued that many Negro parents prefer to have their children attend predominantly or entirely Negro schools and that this results in a continuance of segregation.

On this point the second highest court in the land for this region said:

"To that extent, they (the plaintiffs) say that, under any freedom-of-choice system, the State permits segregation if it does not deprive Negro parents of a right of choice.

"It has been held again and again, however, that the 14th amendment prohibition is not against segregation as such. The proscription is against discrimination. Everyone of every race has a right to be free of discrimination by the State by reason of his race.

"There is nothing in the Constitution which prevents his voluntary association with others of his race or which would strike down any State law which permits such association. The present suggestion that a Negro's right to be free from discrimination requires that the State deprive him of his volition is incongruous."

The Court having gone so far, it is reasonable to add that it also is incongruous to deprive whites of "freedom of choice" in the matter of schools and to compel integration of the races when one or the other or both don't want it is downright ridiculous.

The Office of Education, however, is going that far and further. While the courts have repeatedly said that choice of a racially mixed school is an individual right to be individually asserted, Mr. Keppel says the school authorities must take the initiative and completely integrate the schools in a short time, regardless of the preferences of individuals.

The integrationists are given some comfort by the partial dissent in these decisions by Judges Sobeloff and Bell. They said the plans were experimental only and added that the school officials should bear the burden of achieving integration.

In a further statement they seem to be saying that if not enough Negroes go along with those who want to integrate, they can't extricate themselves from segregation, the school officials should transfer enough to keep them company in white schools, or transfer whites to Negro schools.

There is nothing in any of the Supreme Court decisions to justify this. And, certainly, sound school administrative practice doesn't warrant it.

With respect to the assignment of children to schools geographically nearest their homes, the Court said:

"The Constitution does not require the abandonment of neighborhood schools and the transportation of pupils from one area to another solely for the purpose of mixing the races in the schools."

It is notable, too, that while the Keppel guidelines would compel integration of administration and faculty personnel, the circuit court sidestepped the issue. Instead of ruling on this aspect of the pleadings of the plaintiffs, it said that assignment of teachers could be expected in time to follow the pattern of the assignment of pupils.

This is the law as defined by the courts. Insofar as appears possible at this late date in applying the decisions and laws forbidding segregation by State or local law or administrative practices, it is plain commonsense.

The school districts of South Carolina and other States have agreed to comply with these laws and the courts are ready to step in again if they fail to do so. It is neither legal nor sensible to ask them, or the pupils and their parents, to do more.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of other Senators an editorial entitled "NCC's Tax Exemption." The editorial was published recently in the Indianapolis Star.

This editorial raises a very pertinent question about the tax-exemption status of the NCC in view of the many political stands that have been taken by the council, including the approval of a resolution recommending withdrawal of armed services from South Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NCC's TAX EXEMPTION

The leadership of the National Council of Churches should stop hiding behind the argument that the council is a religious organization in its successful efforts to avoid paying taxes.

The council professes to represent some 38 million members of more than 30 Protestant and Eastern Orthodox churches. The council enjoys tax-exempt status. But organizations not obligated to pay taxes are also not expected to lobby for pending legislation or propagandize for political causes.

Among other movements endorsed by the council have been the recognition of Red China, elimination of right-to-work laws, repeal of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, and the barring of featherbed practices in labor. It also urged Congress to strike out the loyalty oath provision of the National Defense Act. Before the 1964 Civil Rights Act passed, the council lobbied in its favor.

In December 1960 the council accepted a report which said, "The fact that (Fidel) Castro took land without paying for it, that he is hostile to American capital, does not necessarily make him a Communist." The report did not add, as it might have by sheer logic, "but it necessarily makes him a thief." One would have thought that the council's governing board would have condemned Castro in the "thou shalt not steal" basis, if on no other grounds.

The council denies being either Red-tinged or the consistent patsy for Communists. It once actually called for immunity from criticism as if it were some sacred institution created by divine will of God. On February 26, 1959, the council's governing board proclaimed that it is the right of church groups "to discuss freely and to express judgments without exposure to attacks upon motive or integrity for daring to exercise the right to do so."

No one who believes in a society of free men can deny the council's right to "discuss freely and express judgments." But no one who believes in a free society can go along with the councils belief that its motives or judgments should be immune to attack. The judgments and motives of even the President of the United States are open to question and to criticism.

The councils most recent resolution put its 38 million members on record as being for withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam. This is, of course, exactly the same stand being taken by Mao Tse-tung as well as the Daily Worker, a New York Communist newspaper.

Whether the leadership truly represents its 38 million members is up to the membership to decide. But whether the council should continue to have tax exemption while it propagandizes for changes in the Nation's laws, adding new burdens on our taxpayers, is a matter for the Internal Revenue Department to decide.

OUTSTANDING MEN IN THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the phrase "distinguished son of a distinguished father" has, perhaps, never been more aptly applied than it was in Ruth Montgomery's recent article on the Justice Department. It is a bright day, indeed, when such intelligent young men, inspired by parental public service, decide to serve their country. The Justice Department is properly proud of the fine names these young men bear, and of the excellent work for which they are well known.

I ask unanimous consent that Ruth Montgomery's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal American, May 16, 1965]

L.B.J. DEALS ACES TO JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—A good many sons have follower famous fathers into distinguished public service since the days of the Adamses, but the Justice Department could well lay claim now to some kind of a record in that category.

Starting right at the top, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, the U.S. Attorney General, is the son of an attorney general of the State of New Jersey, the late Edward L. Katzenbach. And four of his top aids similarly are sons of men who have made their marks on American history.

The four aids have something else in common—their fathers were long-time friends or colleagues of Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Deputy Attorney General Ramsey Clark turned an ice cream freezer for the neighborly Johnson as a lad, Assistant Attorney General Edwin L. Weisl, Jr.'s first recollection of the future President was sharing his bedroom with the rangy Texan at the age of five.

L.B.J. kept a friendly eye on another future Assistant Attorney General while Fred Vinson, Jr. copped eight letters in college sports.

Clark, Weisel, and Vinson were recently appointed to their posts by Johnson, who also elevated Katzenbach from Deputy Attorney General to Attorney General. The fifth member of this unusual group is Assistant Attorney General John W. Douglas, whose father, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, served with Johnson in the Senate. The younger Douglas, a star Princeton athlete, World War II Navy veteran and Rhodes scholar, was a Kennedy appointee.

The fathers of the three Johnson appointees were not only friends of L.B.J. but distinguished in the law. Ramsey's father, Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark, was Attorney General under President Truman.

The late Fred Vinson, Sr., was Secretary of the Treasury when Truman appointed him Chief Justice of the United States, Edwin L. Weisl, Sr., of New York, L.B.J.'s longtime personal lawyer and adviser, served as assistant attorney and special assistant attorney general in Chicago during the late twenties, later on the War Manpower Board, and in 1957–59 as chief counsel for the Johnson Preparedness Committee, a senatorial group which performed such an outstanding job that it started L.B.J. toward the Vice Presidency. Weisl is now Democratic national committeeman for New York.

The younger Weisl recalls his first meeting with the future President this way: "I was about 5 years old when I saw a big Texan talking politics with my father in the living room of our New York apartment, and discovered that he was planning to sleep in my bedroom.

"He has the same man then as now. He never stopped talking politics and the national interest, even after he went to bed and the lights were out. He taught me all I know about politics."

Young Weisl worked as an assistant counsel to his father on the Preparedness Committee, after graduating from Yale, taking his law degree at Columbia, and serving a 2-year stint in the Navy as a lieutenant. He then went into private law practice in New York, and as a Democratic delegate twice voted for L.B.J. for President, in 1960 and 1964.

His only child, Angela, was born the day before President Kennedy's assassination. One of L.B.J.'s first acts after he returned to Washington as the heavily burdened new President was to telephone congratulations, send flowers, and write a letter to the 2-day-old baby.

The nominations of Weisl and Vinson as assistant attorney generals await Senate confirmation, but both are starting to work under interim appointments.

Ramsey Clark, the No. 2 man at Justice, is a tall Texan like the President, but considerably more laconic. After swearing in the 37-year-old man he has known for three decades, L.B.J. asked Ramsey's 11-year-old son whether he'd had any "best days" recently. Young Tom promptly replied that this was his best one.

It was an old family joke. Once, after spending the day at the Johnson's, the youngster told the then Vice President that it was his "second best day." The best, he added solemnly, was when his grandfather let him drive an electric cart around a golf course.

The President considers that it was among the country's "best" days when the bright sons of old friends were lured into public service.

INDEPENDENCE OF TUNISIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on this day, June 1, the North African state of Tunisia celebrates its national holiday. I think it appropriate that we recognize and acknowledge the progressive and pragmatic way in which this country, under the leadership of Habib Bourguiba, is creating its own solutions to the problems which it still faces.

President Bourguiba, the man who is largely responsible for the fact that Tunisia is today an independent state, has, for over three decades, now, been concerned with the welfare of his country. In 1934, he founded the Neo-Destour—New Constitution—Party, which was the primary vehicle for bringing about Tunisia's independence from France in 1956, and for the extensive series of reforms which have been carried out in Tunisia since that date.

President Bourguiba has stated that his goal is "to raise the level of man, increase production, insure its distribution in the most equitable manner, and—in a word—build a better society."

In line with this goal, he proposed and implemented a wide ranging series of reforms and programs for the development of nearly every facet of Tunisian life. Once again, the moderation and pragmatism of the Tunisian method of achieving results is evident: Discussion, accommodation with different viewpoints, and a realistic approach which lacks the coercion and the violence so often associated with progress in other lands.

In fact, pragmatism and moderation have become so characteristic of President Bourguiba's style that they have given birth to an "ism"—Bourguibism. "Bourguibism" is a realistic approach to political problems, a progressive pragmatism, a conscientious striving to prevent a confrontation with the opposition from becoming a permanent rupture. However, it should not be thought that this entails a weak will or a willingness to sacrifice principle.

President Bourguiba's attitude toward the independence of his country during World War II is a good example. Despite the fact that he had spent many years in French jails for his activities on behalf of Tunisia, Bourguiba ignored the Nazis, who sought his cooperation in North Africa in return for promises of future independence. First, he simply could not accept the ideological premises and the methods of the Nazis; second, he felt that real independence for Tunisia could be obtained only from a free France, once again ready to discuss rationally the gains for both sides which would be the result of such independence.

Now, in 1965, we see, once again the impeccable logic behind Bourguiba's thinking: if one were to cut oneself off completely from all discussion with one's opposition, no positive results could ever be anticipated. Rather, both sides would then sit alone; their grievances against each other would fester and grow in magnitude; and imaginary insults and complaints would take on the shape of reality. Bourguiba alone, among the Arab leaders, has been willing to state publicly that Arab and Israeli differences should be discussed in hope that the outcome could or would result in a rational solution. Clearly, without discussions, without debate, without contact, a peaceful settlement would be impossible.

I believe that many of our world's developing nations would do well to follow the example of President Bourguiba. One of the most painful, and yet obvious, lessons which the past has to offer is that a lack of reasonable discussion between opposing forces has caused more misunderstanding and bloodshed than was ever necessary. Keeping open a "dialog," as Bourguiba himself terms it, presents an alternative.

I therefore take this opportunity to congratulate the Tunisians on the occasion of their national holiday. I hope that under Habib Bourguiba, the remarkable progress which Tunisia has already made will continue, and that the practices and programs of Tunisia will become models for other nations to follow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

W. J. B. DANIEL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 243, S. 304.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 304) for the relief of W. J. B. Daniel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 304

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. J. B. Daniel, of Pelahatchie, Mississippi, the sum of $1,600. The payment of such sum shall be for actual medical expenses incurred by W. J. B. Daniel as a result of injuries received by W. J. B. Daniel during World War II while serving as a civilian radar technician with the United States Army Signal Corps: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to, or received by, any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 253), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to W. J. B. Daniel, of Pelahatchie, Miss., the sum of $1,600, said amount representing actual medical expenses incurred by him as a result of injuries received during and as a result of World War II service as a civilian radar technician with the U.S. Army Signal Corps.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BENNETT obtained the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, how much time is allotted to the Senator from Utah?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the unfinished business is laid before the Senate, there will be approximately 3½ hours remaining on the bill, and 1 hour on each amendment that may be proposed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator in charge of the bill yield me 12 minutes on the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

NEW NAME—SAME OLD BOONDOGGLE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senate is about to vote on S. 1648, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Because of the time limitations, I shall not attempt to discuss specific segments of the bill or amendments suggested by the minority members of the Banking and Currency Committee on sections 2 and 4 which we considered.

This is another of those bills whose stated purpose none of us can oppose. The purpose is to reduce persistent local pockets of unemployment by using resources of the Federal Government to create local job opportunities that could not come into being without such help. How does the bill propose to do this? By continuing, under a new name, the program that has been operated for nearly 4 years now by the Area Redevelopment Administration within the Department of Commerce.

Before we face this decision and with 4 years of records to check, we should have been given a clear picture as to how well the old program has worked. But since all local projects were labeled with a political billboard, I suppose that is too much to expect. The only measure of success on which we can check is found in the claim, made in the agency's March report, that the program had created 70,000 jobs and even this does not hold up under scrutiny.

As I understand it, if we were taking all the projects that actually got underway and total up all the job estimates that appeared on the original applications for those projects, we would get this 70,000 figure. However, when the Comptroller General made a sample check on 80 of these projects, he found the jobs were overstated by some 98 percent. In other words, if that were true for all projects, there would have been only about 35,000 jobs, or half of the 70,000 estimate.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT DIFFERS

Have we any other employment figures against which to measure this accomplishment? Fortunately, we have the increase in civilian employment generated without this special Government help during those same 4 years. This figure is 3½ million jobs—100 times greater than the deflated ARA figure of 35,000.

Even 35,000 new jobs is an impressive accomplishment if they have really been created. But can we depend on this figure? Several questions remain unanswered. Are these 35,000 jobs permanent or only temporary? Are the companies supplying them operating successfully or are they still running in the red, paying out borrowed money for wages? When I have raised this question, I have been told that it is improper to give out such information about specific projects because it might damage them. This sounds to me like a significant admission that a very high proportion of all projects are in trouble—an impression that has been borne out by such specific information as I have been able to get on the outside.

There is another unanswered question which is of basic importance. In spite of all pious declarations against "pirating," how many, if any, of these jobs represent a net gain in employment, or how many of the 35,000 simply represent a transfer of activity and income from people already employed in the same industry? Of course, this goes on constantly between competitors in a free market, but these switches are not claimed as new jobs created.

UTAH EXAMPLE CITED

My doubts on this score have been confirmed, in part, by what has happened in my own State—and this experience has become for me the symbol of ARA in action. We have a coal mining area in Utah whose capacity is much greater than its market, and whose most efficient operators have not been able for years to provide full weeks of work for their miners. ARA provided funds to reopen two smaller mines that had dropped out of competition years ago. One of these apparently went through all its new Government capital without really getting into production and the account is being liquidated. I can only guess what is happening to the other one, or to other local situations where a new competitor, sponsored and subsidized by Government comes into a community to divide rather than increase the existing market whether it be for lumber, recreation, or motel rooms.

What about these jobs? Are they really new and are they permanent?

Mr. President, I realize this bill will pass. It will be adopted because all of us support its stated purpose, and promise of more jobs in smaller, less industrialized communities, and because it fits into the sociopolitical framework of the Great Society. But it will continue to fail to reach this goal because some of its basic premises are unsound.

SLIGHT DIFFERENCES ONLY

It differs only slightly from the 1961 ARA bill. Some of the conditions and standards have actually been lowered to bring in more marginal applications with less chance for ultimate success. I am reminded of the old story of the man who claimed to lose money on every sale, but made up his loss by increasing his volume. Stripped to its essentials this bill proposes to solve the problem of local unemployment in only one way—by distributing Federal money through grants and loans and do it over broader areas, on easier terms, and with interest rates directly subsidized to a level that could go below the cost of money to the Government. Discussion of the bill also produced the concept that "social" considerations will be injected into the lender-borrower relationship.

Of course, this basic "social" credit idea is not new. But in this bill it means several things to me. It is an admission that many present loans are going bad and sponsors want to have an explanation ready when it will be needed. It is a tipoff to the borrower that the administration will not be a stern collector and that part of the burden of repayment can be avoided if he can have a list of "social" benefits handy.

But there is a new twist to social values in this program. The bill is offered as a means of protecting existing social capital. That is to say that if a small community already has paved streets, water systems, libraries, and schools, not now being used to their optimum capacity due to a drop in population caused by lack of employment opportunity, the funds and forces of the Federal Government must be brought to bear to restore the population to its proper size, and thus protect its "social capital."

GUARANTEES OF GHOST TOWNS?

I wonder if anyone in ARA or any Government agency has thought that one through. Is the Great Society to be created by freezing the status quo and making every village like Henry Ford's Deerfield Village? Do we want Government guarantees against ghost towns?

Can a sound flourishing future be built on such a philosophy? Should we ignore the process that in 4 years created 100 times as many jobs as this one did? If easy money is the key to job creation, why have not the smart, successful American business executives rushed in to seize this golden opportunity? Could there possibly be other foundation stones on which to base a decision of where to locate a new enterprise? Even though the philosophy of this bill ignores them, such factors as climate, water, and power supplies, accessibility to raw materials, labor supply, and to markets—and many other factors must be considered together and given proper weight. Access to private money is seldom denied to men or companies with records of proven judgment. How do such men look at the bait this bill holds out?

Listen to an excerpt from the testimony before the Banking and Currency subcommittee of a company president who has recently faced and made a plant location decision:

> My personal business experience has provided me with a background concerning industrial plant location decisions and problems involving the relationships of these decisions to industrial development programs. At the moment, we are completing a study which will result in our building a sizable plant in Grand Island, Nebraska. Through a consulting firm, we have carefully studied the special inducements offered by the Area Redevelopment Administration and many individual localities across the country and have come to the conclusion that our decision should be based on unsubsidized economics rather than on special artificial inducements.

Mr. President, I am sure if we could check the actual performance of the program against the promise of its purpose, we would want to get much more information on its present success—or lack of it—before we extend and broaden it.

Fortunately, an expiration date has been included in the bill, and maybe by the time Congress votes on it again, I hope we will be able to have a clearer picture of its weaknesses. Because I see them clearly now, I must, as I did 4 years ago—vote "No" on this particular bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Area Redevelopment Administration Revisited—or the Quest for Truth in Spending," prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION REVISITED—OR THE QUEST FOR TRUTH IN SPENDING

(Prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee; BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, chairman, Fred B. Rhodes, Jr., staff director, May 1965)

PREFACE

President Johnson, in his March 25, 1965, economic development message, announced the functions and powers of the Area Redevelopment Administration are being transferred to a successor organization to be created by the Secretary of Commerce.

In his panegyric to the glory that was ARA, Mr. Johnson looked to the bright side of things, observing:

"Our experience with various forms of assistance under ARA and the accelerated public works program has shown us ways to improve our techniques and our tools for providing economic growth."

Perhaps. But new agencies, like young twigs, must be so bent as to grow in the paths Congress intends. The following pages are a summary of four General Accounting Office reports on ARA's management of the accelerated public works program. They provide an object lesson on how to divert a program in directions quite different from the intent of Congress when it passed the Public Works Acceleration Act. These GAO reports should be required reading for the new Economic Development Administrator and the new Secretary of Commerce.

The 1961 Area Redevelopment Act was the first of the Kennedy-Johnson pump-priming experiments, followed in 1962 by the second big one—the accelerated public works program. The Area Redevelopment Act was designed to give new direction to the economically stagnant sections of the country; accelerated public works was to provide the shoulder on which to lean until the depressed areas were moving again.

Original taxpayer investment in accelerated public works was $900 million. To handle this money, the program was turned over to the Area Redevelopment Administration, which was given authority to formulate policies and promulgate regulations.

The idea behind accelerated public works was to provide immediate, if short-term, employment in areas of the country where existed a continuing hard core—approximately 6 percent or higher—of unemployment.

ARA and its adherents maintained a drumfire of publicity requesting additional funds for both of its programs. As Congress squares away to consider fiscal 1966 appropriations, the achievements ARA publicists have claimed deserve closer scrutiny with an eye to learning lessons valuable in future handling of public works programs.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) has provided a partial review along these lines. In May, June, August, and October 1964, GAO issued a series of four unfavorable reports on ARA practices. Before summarizing the GAO reports, it might prove instructive to consider two private assessments of ARA, both issued after the first three GAO documents were made public.

In a September 11, 1964, editorial, the New York Times expressed great concern that Congress would not appropriate more funds for ARA. It admitted ARA had a problem: "It is not easy to devise workable criteria for loans and grants to revive economically depressed communities, since, by definition, if such communities could meet normal banking standards they would not need special Government help."

Opaque prose such as this in 1961 might have stopped the infant ARA in its tracks. But since that time, the ARA did not let prose of any kind, whether in law or editorial, interfere with its real mission: to spend the money. And basically, the New York Times agrees, when in effect it says Congress must prove its sincerity by giving ARA more money.

The Times cited impressive statistics. ARA, it said, had retrained 35,000 workers and helped create 110,000 new jobs. No mention of any GAO reports to the contrary.

This leads us to a second, earlier report—August 3, 1964—of a group called the National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment. (For the sake of brevity we will refer to this as the PAC report.)

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, hailed the glowing PAC report as a careful and studied evaluation when he inserted the report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 17, pages 22191–22195.

The committee proved that ARA had not promoted any pirating of industry from one area to another. How? Merely by saying the law specifically forbids this sin. The committee also noted that ARA had been criticized for loans to new enterprises in fields already overcrowded and suffering from excess capacity, but added soothingly, "ARA has made strenuous efforts to correct this and to develop a definitive policy in this regard."

And if the conclusion here is in the great tradition of committee prose—"this was a constructive development which needs continued attention"—it also is perhaps the only place in the whole report where the committee hints there is any problem which cannot be solved by larger appropriations from the old miser, Congress.

The committee was also more prudent than the Times as to the number of jobs generated by ARA: "It is estimated that when [the current projects] are in full operation, a total of some 110,000 jobs may be generated—66,500 jobs created directly, and an additional 43,500 indirectly." The committee explained that these estimates were made by "applicants [for loans, who] are expected, subject to a review by ARA, to make reasonable estimates of the number of permanent jobs that would be generated by such financial assistance."

All in all, the committee report found little wrong with ARA that more—much more—money would not correct. It mentioned no serious problems or mistakes.

This is puzzling, indeed, and raises the question as to who composed these congratulatory remarks. The ARA itself perhaps? For, as we mentioned earlier, those persistent watchdogs from the General Accounting Office had already attempted to put truth into the spending argument by issuing critical reports in May, June, and August of 1964. From the PAC report, one could not even find acknowledgment that there is such a watchdog agency as the General Accounting Office. The Times did carry brief notices of the GAO findings but the hard facts of reality did not carry over to the editorial page.

Undismayed by this lack of attention, the GAO issued thereafter another report critical of ARA in October 1964, and January 1965. It is time these reports be given careful attention.

The first four GAO findings concerned the ARA method of administering the accelerated public works program. By way of explanation, the accelerated public works program was designed to provide employment in hard core depressed areas by means of public works programs. The Community Facilities Administration (CFA) was the agency directing important parts of the program, subject at all times to control and policy decisions by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

HOW MANY JOBS HAS AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION AND ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM GENERATED?

In May 1964 GAO completed an investigation of ARA's claims on the number of man-months and man-hours of on-site and off-site employment created by the accelerated public works program.[1] PAC's report had trumpeted. "These (APW) projects are expected by their sponsors to generate an estimated 220,000 man-hours of on-site and off-site employment."

Said GAO:

"We found that the ARA reports contained significant overstatements of jobs estimated to be created by accelerated public works projects approved by the Community Facilities Administration."

"We found also that the reports contained overstatements with respect to the number of actual man-months of work created by Community Facilities Administration approved projects already under construction."[2]

A GAO investigation of 190 projects revealed the Area Redevelopment Administration overstated the man-months of work to be created by 12,261, or about 128 percent. GAO found that the Area Redevelopment Administration had estimated 55,300 man-years of work for all projects approved as of November 1, 1963. If the same margin of exaggeration held for all public works projects as for those audited, GAO projected that the Area Redevelopment Administration would have exaggerated the work created by 31,000 man-years.

Lest it be charged that GAO was indulging in mere speculation, this report revealed that on 497 separate projects under construction ARA had overstated man-months worked by 23,000, or about 83 percent. ARA had publicly reported 50,853 man-months worked, whereas GAO had discovered 27,845 actually worked. Again, based on performance, GAO projected that if the same margin of exaggeration held, ARA claims of 131,942 actual man-months worked on projects then under construction or completed were exaggerated by 60,000 man-months.

How to overestimate

The General Accounting Office found that ARA had continued to use original estimates either of applicants for funds or of the CFA with no attempt to check actual payroll records. If a project was listed as 60 percent completed, ARA reported actual on-site man-months of work to be 60 percent of the original estimate as to total man-months of work the project was supposed to generate.

"OVERESTIMATE"—MORE APPROPRIATIONS

The influence of such grossly erroneous claims is difficult to calculate, but the General Accounting Office points out at least one possibility:

"The data contained in the September 1, 1963, directory of approved APW projects was used extensively in ARA testimony before the House Public Works Committee in October 1963, to demonstrate the progress and accomplishments achieved under the Public Works Acceleration Act with respect to the creation of employment."[3]

DID THE MOST DISTRESSED AREAS GET THE MONEY?

In its friendly report PAC said: "The program was aimed to mitigate national conditions of unemployment by helping provide temporary jobs in the areas that need them most."

An article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, appearing in the Washington Post for February 10, 1965, was less complimentary to ARA, but they assert that ARA Director William Batt and his aids "stick to the old formula that good money should flow to the poorest communities."

GAO agreed the intent of the Congress was to provide jobs in areas "which suffer from persistent and chronic unemployment." But GAO reviewed ARA's performance to determine whether or not the intent of Congress was obeyed by ARA. Three investigations cover this matter.

1. In its June 1964 report GAO said:

"Our review disclosed that about $21 million in APW funds were obligated for 85 projects in areas which were no longer eligible at the time the agreement was consummated or which were due to become ineligible shortly thereafter."[4]

This report pointed out that the Department of Labor determines the eligibility of such areas and when an employment situation has so improved as to render such areas ineligible. Formal announcement of the latter action is always preceded by an early warning system which says the situation is improving. Such warnings, however, seemed merely to stimulate ARA, for the GAO reported, "the procedure whereby ARA is informed by the Department of Labor of impending termination of area eligibility appears to have been used to expedite processing of grants to applicants in such areas."[5]

---

[1] "Overstatement of Number of Jobs Created Under the Accelerated Public Works Program," report to the Congress of the United States by the Comptroller General of the United States, May 1964.

[2] Ibid., p. 1.

[3] Ibid., p. 13.

[4] "Assistance Under the Public Works Acceleration Act to Areas No Longer Burdened by Substantial Unemployment," report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States, June 1964, p. 6.

In one instance GAO found projects totaling $250,000 were cleared 1 full year after the Department of Labor notified ARA an area was no longer eligible. Thus, by such gross maladministration, projects were pushed through in ineligible areas, while other areas with genuine chronic unemployment—truly depressed areas—found their applications could not be acted on because, according to ARA, funds were no longer available.

Base conjecture, perhaps, but this would appear to have been an excellent method to get larger and larger appropriations; process the borderline cases as fast as possible, exhaust the original appropriation, and use the backlog of unfilled applications from the hard core depressed areas as justification for more money.

So it is, the friendly PAC report (that "careful and studied evaluation") could conclude, "because of its limitation in funds, time, and purpose, the accelerated public works program has succeeded only partly in meeting the public facilities needs in the eligible communities."

2. In its August 1964 report GAO found that at least $7.4 million had been approved by ARA for "projects in seemingly nondepressed areas."[6] Four States whose employment situation was such as to not make them eligible for accelerated public works assistance according to criteria laid down by Congress and applied by the Department of Labor were given grants because ARA felt there should be at least one such project in every State of the Union regardless of how it measured up to depressed conditions elsewhere. Again this meant less money for the genuinely depressed areas.

3. In its October 1964 report, GAO found that $26 million had been committed to areas after they had recovered from conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment.[7]

THE DETROIT STORY

The prize example in GAO's investigation is Detroit, Mich., where we learn:

"Through April 1, 1964, assistance of about $44,700,000 under the Public Works Acceleration Act has been approved for the Detroit labor market area, although it appears that the area had recovered from its unemployment burdens at the time of the act was passed."[8]

By September 1962 Detroit's unemployment rate dropped below 6 percent and has continued to drop ever since.

We also learn that "exclusive of the State of Michigan, the Detroit area by itself had received approval for more accelerated public works assistance than 47 of the remaining 49 States."[9]

This included projects in such "pockets of poverty" as wealthy Grosse Pointe, Mich.

For reasons of its own, the U.S. Department of Labor would not finally delete the Detroit area from the list of areas of substantial and persistent unemployment until July 1963. Apparently ARA did not get the message even then, for not until 7 months later, on February 20, 1964, did the Area Redevelopment Administration terminate the Detroit area's eligibility for Area Redevelopment Act or Accelerated Public Works assistance.

Thus, fully $23,400,000 in projects was scheduled by ARA to start in October 1963 or later, although the Labor Department had declared the Detroit area as no longer eligible in July 1963.[10]

Yet even after the Detroit area was declared ineligible, the city remained eligible under an amendment to ARA regulations dated December 31, 1963, whereby municipalities with populations in 1960 of 250,000 or over could be designated redevelopment areas based on a correlation between the unemployment rate for cities as determined by the Bureau of the Census in 1960, and the area labor market unemployment rate in 1960.[11]

Thus the money continued to flow under this gimmick. The Department of Labor advised ARA in June 1964 that the city of Detroit's unemployment rate was at an 8-year low—3.3 percent in the "area," 4.6 percent in the "city"—and questioned the advisability of continuing Detroit's eligibility. In July 1964 the Department of Labor notified ARA that Detroit's eligibility should be ended. Thereupon ARA saluted smartly, took a reading on the upcoming elections, and roared into action: it announced that if the unemployment drop continued, it would terminate the eligibility of Detroit "on about January 15, 1965."[13]

A SUMMING UP

These General Accounting Office investigation reports of June, August, and October, 1964 indicate that at the very minimum about $50 million of Accelerated Public Works funds were allowed by Area Redevelopment Administration to be expended contrary to the intent of Congress in enacting the law. According to the watchdog GAO this meant:

"Numerous areas burdened by unemployment rates of 9 percent or more in February 1964, had applications for accelerated public works projects pending in June 1964. Many of these applications had been fully processed by CFA early in calendar year 1963. Accelerated public works grants to assist these needy areas apparently cannot be made because of insufficient funds."[12]

GAO cited as another specific example Wheeling, W. Va., which has suffered "an unemployment rate of between 6 percent and over 12 percent since September 1962." Said General Accounting Office:

"On June 18, 1964, CFA records showed that seven projects totaling $3 million were pending for the Wheeling area. Some of these projects had been fully processed as early in the APW program as June 1963."[14]

West Virginia must certainly bear the dubious distinction of having been promised the most, most often, while delivered the least, most often.

One other point. The 1964–65 national debate topic for all colleges and universities was: "Resolved: That the Federal Government Should Establish a National Program of Public Works for the Unemployed." The timing of this national debate topic was especially significant in view of the enormous public works programs pushed by the Johnson administration. It is hoped that all these GAO reports were included in the recommended bibliography for college debate teams. An informed public is equally as important as an informed Congress on this leading question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in support of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 of which I am pleased to be a cosponsor.

This legislation means a great deal to sections of my State and to other areas of the country which fail to share fully in the great prosperity our country now enjoys. I believe the tools which it provides for State and local governments, development groups, and private industry are appropriate to the tasks at hand. The bill before us builds on the experience we have gained in the relatively short period of time the Federal Government has been in the business of doing something for the underdeveloped areas of our country.

I would be less than honest if I said that my support for this legislation was not predicated on the substantial benefits which the State of Arkansas has derived from its legislative forerunners—the Area Redevelopment Act and the Public Works Acceleration Act. Primarily because of the initiative of local leaders in Arkansas, my State has profited from both these programs to an exceptional degree. Twenty-one ARA projects involving $5,691,850 in public facility loans and grants and $10,507,770 in industrial loans attest to this fact. The result is well over 4,500 new jobs for Arkansas people.

But the usefulness of the ARA program in Arkansas should not be gaged solely by statistics. These payrolls and their multiplied effect on local economies have brought new hope, new enthusiasm, and even greater initiative to many communities in Arkansas. The ink was hardly dry on the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 when the first project—for the Nation as well as Arkansas—was approved. Through a combination loan and grant for an addition to the water system in Mountain Home, Ark., the Mar-Bax shirt factory was located in that community. Four years later the company employs in the neighborhood of 850 people and the city of Mountain Home has become one of the most successful communities of Arkansas. A large pharmaceutical factory has located in the community of its own initiative, without Federal assistance. Many other towns and cities in Arkansas have benefited from the ARA program and I mention Mountain Home merely because it is a classic example of the stimulating effect of proper Federal investments in local public facilities.

Most of the credit for these successes rests with the leaders in these towns and cities who have shown faith in the futures of their communities. I would like also to pay tribute to the ARA field coordinator in Arkansas, Mr. John Opitz, for the truly remarkable job he has done. Mr. Opitz has shown industry and imagination in working to build his native State and we are grateful to him for the tremendous amount he has accomplished.

---

[5] Ibid., p. 7.

[6] "Unauthorized Assistance to Seemingly Nondepressed Areas Under the Public Works Acceleration Act and the Area Redevelopment Act," report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States, August 1964, p. 3.

[7] "Accelerated Public Works Assistance Approved for Areas Under Consideration for Termination of Eligibility," report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States, October 1964, p. 5.

[8] Ibid., p. 9.

[9] Ibid., p. 9.

[10] Ibid., p. 15.

[11] Ibid., p. 13.

[12] Ibid., p. 13.

[13] Ibid., pp. 23–24.

[14] Ibid., p. 24.

Mr. President, there is no point in my reviewing in detail the provisions of this bill. This task has been admirably performed by the chairman of the Public Works Committee and the very able senior Senator from Illinois who is unquestionably the Senate's expert in this field. I think the Senate is indebted to both of them and the committees they represent for bringing to the floor a very good bill.

If our past experience in the field of economic development has taught us anything it is that there are no quick, simple, and effective solutions to the economic ills of the less developed areas of America. The bill before us largely deals with the physical aspects of economic growth—water and sewer facilities, roads, airports, industrial parks, and the like. Earlier this year the Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to more fully provide for the development of the most fundamental of economic resources—our people. The Hill-Burton program for hospital construction, the highway program, the Vocational Education Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act all contribute to the strength of our economy and each has special implications for sections which lack the revenues needed to provide the public services on which private investments depend.

By the enactment of the legislation before us the Congress can add another set of tools to the overall Federal-State-local effort to see that every able American has a skill to sell and a place to sell it.

I strongly support those provisions of this bill which generally modify and extend the ARA program. Several useful changes have been made. I am pleased that this legislation will permit the Secretary of Commerce to enlarge the Federal share of public facility grant projects to a Federal maximum of 80 percent of cost. If properly administered, as I am sure it will be, this provision will mean the difference between life and death for many small communities which did not share in the benefits of the accelerated public works and ARA programs because of their inability to come up with the local matching funds.

This bill provides a solution to one problem which inhibited the ARA program. On several Arkansas projects the companies planning a new plant or an expansion found themselves hard pressed for working capital. The ARA was precluded from making working capital loans. This new legislation will permit Federal guarantees of working capital loans to companies offering new employment in eligible areas. I strongly support this provision.

I am very pleased that title V of the bill authorizes the creation and funding of regional action planning commissions. When the Appalachian regional development bill was considered, I urged the Public Works Committee to include in it funds for further regional planning through Federal-State cooperation and particularly to provide for the creation of a development program for the Ozark mountain region of Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri. Title V of the pending bill is the fulfillment of a commitment made at that time to satisfy this appeal in separate legislation.

When the pending bill was considered by the committee this year, I was privileged to testify on the prospects for an Ozark regional commission. Testimony was also received from Dr. John Peterson, of the University of Arkansas, and representatives of the States of Oklahoma and Missouri in support of this proposal. I believe the record clearly establishes the general economic condition of this region and provides a base from which a regional action planning commission can begin its work.

The bill does not specify the regions for which commissions will be organized. Rather authority is vested in the Secretary of Commerce to designate such regions in which economic growth can be fostered by this device and which meet the general criteria set forth in section 501. I believe this is a wise course. Those of us who have worked for the creation of an Ozarks commission have not tried to say that "this county is in" or "that county is out." These decisions should be left to the Governors and the Secretary—backed up by sound economic counsel at all levels.

Mr. President, I hope that once this bill is enacted the Secretary will move promptly to develop a regional commission for the Ozarks by the initiation of discussions with the Governors of the States involved. He will find complete cooperation at the State and local levels. It is appropriate to point out that the Arkansas and Oklahoma State Legislatures have both adopted resolutions supporting this concept.

Mr. President, the Public Works and Economic Development Act holds great promise for the Ozarks region, for Arkansas and for less than prosperous areas throughout the country. In truth, this bill is designed to bolster our overall economy which in the final analysis is no stronger than its weakest links. I hope the Senate will give this legislation a substantial vote of approval.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I cannot support S. 1648, the so-called Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Under this proposed act, which we are told is patterned after the Appalachia program, the Department of Commerce would inherit and be directed to expand the ill-fated and much discredited area redevelopment and accelerated public works programs. If we have learned anything from our experience with area redevelopment and accelerated public works, we know that they simply have not worked. We have seen Government-subsidized competition drive out legitimate business, inflated claims of creating new jobs which have never materialized, political juggling with public funds, vast numbers of highly paid Government officials running about the country accomplishing little, and a general waste of your tax money and mine. Now it is proposed to regroup these two dubious programs under a different name, pattern them after the Appalachia program, which has not yet even tested its bureaucratic wings, and expand the entire pottage.

ARA and APW were just a drop in the bucket compared to this proposed program. This bill would authorize the expenditure of $2 billion over the next 5 years, just under title I alone. It also would authorize the expenditure of $265 million per year indefinitely. Thus, the program will cost about $3.5 billion over the first 5 years and after that it is anyone's guess. But even these figures do not accurately measure the entire cost of this program because the administrative expenses are not included in the bill. These expenses will be picked up by the Department of Commerce through the regular appropriation process. The Committee on Public Works in its report gives us an indication of its thinking on administration of the act on pages 18 and 19. There the committee proposes that the Department of Commerce create a new Assistant Secretary whose sole function would be to assist the Secretary in the administration of this act. The committee also said and I quote:

> The committee further is concerned that sufficient supergrades be allotted for the conduct of this program. The committee did not specifically designate the number in the bill but it would be considered inadequate if less than 20 supergrades were assigned to the administration of this program.

This sounds like an open invitation for the administrators of this program to go into competition with the poverty program to see who can hire the most highly paid administrators.

Many of the defects of this bill have already been pointed out in the process of debate. However, a few of these certainly bear repetition and emphasis. For example, there is a provision in the bill authorizing loans with a 2-percent interest subsidy. As I pointed out in the debate, it is entirely possible that, under this provision, one company could come into a depressed area and receive a subsidized interest rate and another company in competition with that company go into another depressed area and not receive a subsidy.

Section 203 establishes an economic development revolving fund to be available for loan assistance under sections 201, 202, and 403. Our past experiences with revolving funds of this nature have been quite unsatisfactory. It has always served as a good coverup as to just how much is being spent on a particular program.

Unlike the Area Redevelopment Act, this bill sets up only an annual rather than monthly review of eligible areas. But the bill does not even mention when the first such annual review shall take place. There is a suggestion made in the committee report but this is certainly not binding on anyone. Nor does the bill provide for the termination of applications after an area becomes ineligible for assistance. This is certainly a loose way to write a law for such a gigantic program.

Mr. President, many of the points that I have covered have been the subjects of reports issued by the Comptroller General over the past several years. His informative and useful report on this bill is contained in the supplemental views at the end of the committee report. And yet the majority report of the Committee on Public Works dealt at great length with refuting or attempting to discredit the Comptroller General's recommendations. As we all know, the Comptroller General, as the head of the General Accounting Office, is an arm of Congress. He is often referred to as the "watchdog of Congress." But what good can a "congressional watchdog" accomplish if we insist on muzzling him at every turn?

Mr. President, this bill is simply a rehash on a grand scale of two of the most discredited programs ever turned out by Congress. The taxpayers of this country do not need and certainly do not deserve another program enlarging the same defects in two such failures.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, we in New Mexico and in the United States have come a long way from the conditions which caused Anatole France to say that, "The law, in its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread." But we have not yet come far enough. And the American dream of real individual dignity and real equality of opportunity would be closer to complete fulfillment upon S. 1648—the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965—becoming law.

This bill is of great importance to New Mexico, where drought, depressed commodity prices, and unemployment have combined to render local communities unable to make the public improvements which are essential to the restoration of a healthy and viable economy.

S. 1648 combines the best features of the Area Redevelopment Act and the Accelerated Public Works Act which have proved their worth to New Mexico. In addition, this bill provides for regional development as outlined in legislation enacted this year for the Appalachian region.

Two constructive amendments were written into the bill before the Senate Public Works Committee acted.

One amendment will insure that five additional Indian reservations in New Mexico, as well as other smaller communities throughout the United States, will be eligible for economic aid under the act. Originally, the benefits were limited to areas of 1,500 or more population. That would have eliminated the Jemez, Jicarilla, Mescalero, Ramah, and Santo Domingo reservations in New Mexico. But, with the generous cooperation of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate Public Works Committee, I was successful in having the bill amended to lower the population figure to 1,000. This important amendment will bring these five reservations, and many other smaller communities elsewhere in the country, within the benefits of the law.

We were also successful in increasing the first year's funding from $250 million to $400 million for grants to help local governments construct essential public works.

In addition to the $400 million which will be available for public works grants, the bill provides for $170 million in loans to poverty stricken areas to assist in development of plants and facilities which will create employment.

Earlier this session, Senator Moss and I introduced an Appalachia-type bill to develop the Four Corners area of New Mexico, Utah, Arizona, and Colorado. S. 1648 replaces our bill by providing for larger scale regional development of all areas where economics and geography indicate that an interstate approach is a sound one.

The Four Corners region is ideally adaptable to the regional approach. This high plateau country, which is rich in natural beauty and natural resources, is seriously hampered by an inadequate road system.

The area is sparsely populated and lacks the assets to develop the road system so vitally needed. By opening this area through an adequate highway system, many new job opportunities would be created and the overall economy of the area would be vastly improved.

Economic growth and development of the Four Corners in northern New Mexico will do much to relieve the other economic ills of New Mexico, as well as Arizona, Colorado, and Utah. New Mexico borders on other areas in these three States which together comprise one of the largest land masses of chronic unemployment and underemployment in the United States.

Many towns and cities in New Mexico have indicated the extreme need which exists for grants for public works and development facilities.

A great need exists throughout the country and in much of New Mexico for community-type facilities ranging from water projects to youth and aged recreation centers, libraries, gas systems, and the entire range of community facilities necessary to make life more decent and dignified in the smaller communities of the areas of unemployment and underemployment.

Indian tribes in New Mexico on the Acoma, Isleta, Laguna, Jemez, Jicarilla, Mescalero, Ramah, Santo Domingo, Zuni, Santa Clara, and Navajo Reservations, no less than other disadvantaged New Mexicans, suffer from substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment.

Federal financial assistance, including grants for the development of reservation and community facilities, establishing of industries and enterprises, particularly where there are self-help features, should do much to alleviate poverty and to help the people become self-sufficient. It will, indeed, as the bill states, "enable such areas to help themselves achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies and improved local conditions."

We wholeheartedly support the view that such assistance should be preceded by and be consistent with sound, long-range economic planning and that under the provisions of this act new employment opportunities would be created by developing and expanding new and existing public works and other facilities and resources rather than by merely transferring jobs from one area of the United States to another.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

ALASKA INDIANS AND ESKIMOS WILL BE HELPED BY S. 1648, THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, we are about to vote on S. 1648, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. This bill will help us wage a more aggressive war against domestic poverty. I hope this proposed legislation will be enthusiastically endorsed by the Congress and sent to the President promptly. We need the tools provided by S. 1648.

The Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., through its executive director, William Byler, communicated with the Alaska congressional delegation for clarification of the population requirement in title IV of S. 1648. The association wanted to make certain that the benefits of S. 1648 would apply to the scattered Indian and Eskimo villages in Alaska. The Senate report on the bill specified:

> Areas of less than 1,500 population shall not be eligible for designation under this program except in the case of Indian areas, which may be considered for designation if they have a population of 1,000 or more persons.
>
> It is expected, however, that the Secretary would not consider for designation several separated or widely scattered very small Indian areas that in total would meet the 1,000 persons population requirement.

The association pointed out in its May 21, 1965, letter:

> If the 1,000 persons population requirement is applied to native villages, then clearly only a very few will qualify for designation under this program.

The bill clearly specifies that the Secretary of Labor shall designate as redevelopment areas those with substantial and persistent unemployment or those where the loss of industry for reasons of removal, curtailment, or closing shall cause unusual and abrupt rises in unemployment.

The State of Alaska, with the exception of Juneau and its immediate vicinity is designated by the Area Redevelopment Administration as a depressed area. Conditions have not arisen to change the economic picture of the State. Most Alaskan Indian and Eskimo villages are in election districts which qualify for area and district eligibility as redevelopment areas.

To clarify the situation I asked the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] to comment on the population requirement in title IV of S. 1648, area of district eligibility for redevelopment areas. Chairman McNamara concluded that the population limitation of 1,500 applies to the smallest area of eligibility which in the case of Alaska is the election district. Thus, Indian and Eskimo villages located within an election district would be qualified.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter sent to me on May 21, 1965, by the Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., my letter of May 24, 1965, to the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, and the chairman's response of May 26, 1965, be printed in the Record at this time, to dispel any doubts as to the eligibility of the Alaskan Indian and Eskimo villages.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Association on American
Indian Affairs, Inc.,
New York, N.Y., May 21, 1965.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: Knowing of your vigorous support for S. 1648 and your strong interest in the welfare of Alaska's native communities, I am writing you to seek clarification of the population requirement in title IV of the bill.

Senate Report No. 193 (p. 16) states:

"Areas of less than 1,500 population shall not be eligible for designation under this program, except in the case of Indian areas which may be considered for designation if they have a population of 1,000 or more persons. It is expected, however, that the Secretary would not consider for designation several separated or widely scattered very small Indian areas that in total would meet the 1,000 persons population requirement."

We are concerned that the benefits of this legislation be extended to the many scattered native villages. If the 1,000 persons population requirement is applied to native villages, then clearly only a very few will qualify for designation under this program.

Is it your understanding that, the above quoted language notwithstanding, scattered native villages with populations less than 1,000 persons will qualify for assistance under the terms of the legislation?

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this inquiry.

Sincerely yours,
William Byler,
Executive Director.

May 24, 1965.

Hon. Pat McNamara,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Public Works, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc. seeks clarification of the population requirement in Title IV: Area of District Eligibility for Redevelopment Areas, of S. 1648, as interpreted in Report 193, page 16, which states:

"Areas of less than 1,500 population shall not be eligible for designation under this program except in the case of Indian areas, which may be considered for designation if they have a population of 1,000 or more persons.

"It is expected, however, that the Secretary would not consider for designation several separated or widely scattered very small Indian areas that in total would meet the 1,000 persons population requirement."

The bill clearly specifies that the Secretary of Labor shall designate as redevelopment areas those with substantial and persistent unemployment or those where the loss of industry for reasons of removal, curtailment or closing shall cause unusual and abrupt rises in unemployment.

The State of Alaska, with the exception of Juneau and its immediate vicinity is designated by the Area Redevelopment Administration as a depressed area and conditions have not arisen to change the economy of the State.

Most Alaskan Indian and Eskimo villages are in election districts which qualify for area and district eligibility as redevelopment areas. I will appreciate your clarifying this matter for the members of the Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc. A copy of the letter I received from Executive Director William Byler is enclosed.

Cordially yours,
Ernest Gruening.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Public Works,
May 26, 1965.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I have your letter of May 24 requesting clarification of the population requirement in title IV of S. 1648 with specific reference to the limitation on Indian areas.

The population limitation of 1,500 applies to the smallest area of eligibility which, in the case of Alaska, would be the election districts, or a labor market area defined by the Secretary of Labor.

The exception to this is where there is an Indian area of at least 1,000 population which is not within an area designated and eligible for aid but which otherwise meets the eligibility requirements.

It should be understood that Indian areas of less than 1,000 population located within otherwise designated areas are eligible for specific aid, and may themselves be applicants for such aid.

The report language to which you refer was so stated so as to preclude from designation, Indian areas of less than 1,000 population scattered over a wide geographic area. It would be considered illogical to group such small areas, in order to come within the 1,000 limitation.

Unless the election districts to which you refer are themselves less than 1,500 in total population, those Indian and Eskimo villages located within them would be qualified.

Sincerely,
Pat McNamara,
Chairman.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state out of whose time the quorum call is to come?

Mr. McNAMARA. I ask unanimous consent that it be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 2 O'CLOCK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2 o'clock p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Accordingly, at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock p.m. today.)

At 2 o'clock p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Bass in the chair).

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. From which side will the time necessary for the quorum call be taken?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time necessary for the quorum call not be charged against any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on Wednesday last I proposed five amendments to S. 1648, all amendments having the objective of insuring the maximum involvement and participation of local government in the program provided by this legislation. It seemed to me that these amendments were in keeping with the basic principles of the program, as outlined by President Johnson in his message on area and regional economic development. In that message he stated that no economic development district would be designated unless the State and local people want it to be designated, no plan would be approved unless it has the approval of State and local authorities.

I realized that even without my amendments many of the economic development programs would be developed by "economic planning and development groups" composed of, or responsible to, the elected officials of units of general local government. I also realized that in some areas constitutional and statutory limitations would preclude local officials from undertaking these proposed activities. Furthermore, in other areas the officials may demonstrate a complete refusal or a reluctance to provide the necessary leadership. These limitations of our local governments have been adequately recognized in the committee reported bill. But I felt that we have failed to provide sufficient congressional emphasis on the positive role of local government, specifically in the development and implementation of the economic development programs themselves.

This should be done by—

First. Encouraging and giving preference to economic planning and development groups, composed of elected officials of units of general local government within whose jurisdiction such groups are authorized to plan an economic development program.

Second. Where the appropriate units of general local government are not represented on the economic planning and development group the proposed economic development program should be submitted to them for their review and comment and consideration of such comment by the economic development and planning group prior to the formal submission of the program.

This is not a requirement for the formal approval or rejection of the local governments, rather a procedure to assure their awareness and participation in a program which is designed to utilize the combined resources of an area or district. To prevent unwarranted delays, such comments must be made within 60 days, otherwise the requirement would be waived.

This additional effort appears to me not excessive. It would provide a one-time requirement for a program with long-range objectives and commitments. Any initial delays created by these amendments would be more than compensated for in the program's actual implementation.

In addition, these requirements would assist in the coordination and correlation of the economic development program with the existing programs and plans of the constituent local governments. It would be these local governments who will continue to have the responsibility of zoning, transportation planning and a host of other governmental functions which are the ingredients of a successful economic development program. Included within the resources of local government are the matching funds called for in title I of the bill.

There is another potential of this legislation which should not be overlooked and my amendments were designed greatly to aid in its realization. That is with respect to the economic development district. It is not only in the area of economic development that we can gain by having our local governments working together to solve common problems, but it is also true in such areas as health, water and air pollution, roads and highways, education, planning, and so forth. By encouraging our local governments to plan and work together in the field of economic development we can assist in providing the framework for other forms of increased cooperation. This cooperation will be slow to come, if at all, if the elected officials of the local governments are not an integral part of the leadership of any such effort.

It could be argued that the important role of local government is inherent in the program and need not be spelled out in legislative language. To me, their role is too vital for it to be assumed.

Mr. President, my concern of this situation is shared by the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, all of whom support these amendments.

In the intervening time since Wednesday of last week I have spent some time consulting with the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and with others. The Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] is one of the principal sponsors of S. 1648 and has been a leader in its development and consideration. Based on our discussions, I have modified my amendments. Therefore, I shall not call up the printed amendments at the desk but in their stead I offer four revised amendments. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be considered en bloc, that a full reading of each be dispensed with, and that I be permitted to explain each.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, the amendments will be received and considered en bloc; and, without objection, reading of the amendments will be waived.

The amendments offered by Mr. Moss are as follows:

On page 31, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

"(3) to encourage participation by appropriate local governmental authorities in such economic development districts."

On page 7, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

"(f) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations which will assure that appropriate local governmental authorities have been given a reasonable opportunity to review and comment upon proposed projects under this section."

On page 10, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"(e) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations which will assure that appropriate local governmental authorities have been given a reasonable opportunity to review and comment upon proposed projects under this section."

On page 32, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

"(f) For the purpose of this Act the term 'local government' means any city, county, town, parish, village, or other general-purpose political subdivision of a State."

On page 32, line 11, strike "(f)" and insert "(g)" before the word "There".

On page 32, line 15, strike "(g)" and insert "(h)" before the word "In".

Mr. **MOSS**. Mr. President, one of the amendments I offer I shall try to relate to the bill. The amendment would come under title I of the bill, which refers to grants for public works and development facilities. At the end of section 101 of title I the amendment would add an additional paragraph to be styled as paragraph (f), and would read as follows:

> The Secretary shall prescribe regulations which will assure that appropriate local government authorities have been given a reasonable opportunity to review and comment upon proposed projects under this section.

I would welcome at any point any comment the Senator from Maine or any other member of the committee might care to make on any of the amendments.

The second amendment would be inserted on page 10 of the bill. This is under title II, which is entitled "Other Financial Assistance. Public Works and Development Facility Loans."

On page 10, between lines 18 and 19, which is at the close of section 201, would be added a new paragraph styled paragraph (e), which would read:

> The Secretary shall prescribe regulations which will assure that appropriate local governmental authorities have been given a reasonable opportunity to review and comment upon proposed projects under this section.

It will be recognized at once that the language is similar in both amendments, one applying to title II and the other applying to title I, both having the same purpose.

Since the term "local governmental authorities" has been used in both amendments, and this term appears elsewhere in the bill, it is proposed, in the third amendment which I now offer, that on page 32, between lines 10 and 11, subsection (f) be inserted, which would read:

> For the purpose of this Act the term "local government" means any city, county, town, parish, village, or other general-purpose political subdivision of a State.

By reason of inserting paragraph (f), the remaining subparagraphs in this particular section would have to be redesignated—(f) to (g), and (g) to (h).

The fourth amendment would be inserted on page 31, between lines 17 and 18. It would be a paragraph (3) subdivision of paragraph (b), coming under the Economic Development District provision. This subparagraph (3) would read as follows:

> To encourage participation by appropriate local governmental authorities in such economic development districts.

This whole section is designed to define and designate the economic development districts which would approve the overall economic development programs.

The Secretary would be required to invite the States to draw up proposed district boundaries, to cooperate with the States in several ways, and to encourage participation by appropriate local governments in such economic development districts.

It is felt that these amendments would, by writing into the legislation these requirements for contact with and comment by local governmental units, bring the local governmental entities into the program. It is highly important that the local people be consulted and be concerned. As I have already said, many of the requirements of Government that surround the development of a program of this sort already lie with the local districts, such as zoning, roads, highways, water supply, and other items that are of great importance in planning a development district.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. **MOSS**. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. The purpose of the Senator from Utah is one in which I think most, if not all, members of the committee would concur. I should like to point out that these amendments to S. 1648 constitute a further implementation of a purpose which was stated in the committee report, page 16, as follows:

> *Local approval of development districts*
>
> Before the Secretary approves the establishment of any economic development district as provided under section 403, which in most cases will consist of several counties, municipalities, or other political jurisdictions, steps should be taken to obtain concurrence of the appropriate local governmental authorities in the counties, municipalities, or other political jurisdictions when such jurisdictions are wholly within the proposed economic development district.

The first two amendments of the Senator from Utah are to the public works section of the bill. As I understand them, they would require that an application made by a private or a public nonprofit organization or association representing any redevelopment area or part thereof, and covering a public works project under the bill, should pass through the appropriate governmental authority for review and comment.

Mr. MOSS. That is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. This is highly proper, desirable, and indeed necessary, if we are to get a development program underway which truly reflects local desires, local hopes, and local sentiment. So far as I am concerned, these two amendments, dealing with the public works section of the bill, are wholly acceptable.

The third amendment, which deals with the economic development district provision of the bill, is also one that I find acceptable. The Senator's purpose is that when an economic development district is defined, it is likely to include several units of local government, ranging from counties on down. It is the Senator's desire that representatives of the governments involved be brought into the process by which designation would be achieved, and also into the process which would develop an overall economic development program for the area.

The difficulty in dealing with this amendment is that situations vary in different parts of the country. For example, Aroostook County, Maine, which is an eligible area under the existing Redevelopment Act, is 1 county involving 93 towns, each of which is a unit of local government. This is a peculiarity, perhaps, of New England, where the town has been the foundation of local government from the beginning.

An area similar in size, involving a similar number of people, in the part of the country from which the Senator from Utah comes, may involve only two or three governmental units. So there would be the problem of fewer governmental units than exist in New England. Therefore, what the Senator from Utah and I have tried to devise is compromise language which would make it possible to work in both situations, and still insure that local units of government would be encouraged to participate in the implementation of this provision of the act.

Do I correctly understand the Senator's purpose?

Mr. MOSS. Yes. I thank the Senator from Maine for his comments. He has analyzed the amendments and has stated the purpose of offering them at this time. It was found, when we began to discuss the amendments I submitted last week, that there was such a wide variation of local governmental organization in different parts of the United States that perhaps my previous amendments were too broad. I should say that diversity is one of our strengths in this country, and we must recognize it and deal with it. We must make certain at the Federal level, when we begin to deal with local areas, that we take into account the variances that exist in our local governmental organization. But the Senator from Maine is entirely correct in saying that the objective of the amendments is to involve, in planning stages, the local authorities—the towns, the counties, and the cities—where the various activities are to be conducted, not only to be in close communication, but also to bring forth the strength of local government.

In some instances, where there are to be matching funds, it is of paramount importance that we begin, at the start, with the local authorities, who have the control of local taxing power and local funds.

As I indicated, many governmental activities are controlled by local authorities—zoning, the providing of facilities, roads, water, and so on. These governmental activities ought to be involved and recognized so that we do not create a development district or finance any kind of project that would be at cross purposes or in competition with the appropriate local governmental authority, or not recognized by it.

In my discussions with various county officials—and I was a county official before I became a U.S. Senator—I found that there was a great desire to cooperate with these types of programs. At least, those with whom I have talked welcomed the program. The predecessor of this bill has been used very widely and effectively in my State. Our towns and counties desire that the program continue. They want to contribute to the program and be a part of it.

That was another reason for writing the requirement into the legislation that the appropriate local authorities not only be advised of proposed projects, but also be consulted and asked for their comments so that they may participate in the projects from the beginning.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Utah has stated what we each have in mind.

With reference to the arguments offered, I believe that it would be useful to have printed at this point in the RECORD—and I ask unanimous consent that this may be done—two tabulations which indicate the number of local governments that could be involved in some potential groupings of counties under the bill. This indicates the problem that would be created by a multiplicity of governmental units.

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Local governments

VERMONT

County	Total (including county)	Municipalities	Townships	School districts	Special districts
Caledonia	37	6	17	2	11
Essex	17	1	13		2
Orleans	34	9	18	4	2
Total	88	16	48	6	15

NEW HAMPSHIRE

County	Total (including county)	Municipalities	Townships	School districts	Special districts
Coos	48	1	20	20	6
Carroll	52		18	17	16
Grafton	89	1	37	39	11
Total	189	2	75	76	33

OREGON

County	Total (including county)	Municipalities	Townships	School districts	Special districts
Clatsop	40	6		11	22
Tillamook	51	7		7	36
Lincoln	38	7		1	29
Cane	70	9		18	42
Benton	23	3		12	7
Linn	78	11		47	19
Polk	25	4		10	10
Marion	93	18		42	32
Yamhill	41	10		13	17
Total	450	75		161	214

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, notwithstanding that problem, we feel that the Administrator and the Secretary should use their discretion to do everything possible under the regulations to encourage the participation of appropriate local governments.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am sure that we are in agreement on that. The amendments are offered so that there would be a large involvement of appropriate local authorities from the beginning of any planning or action. In this way, there would not be misunderstandings at a later point.

At this time, I send the amendments to the desk and ask for their immediate consideration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, what effect would the amendments offered by the distinguished Senator from Utah have on bringing the establishment of these regions in line with the Appalachian region? As I understand, under the Appalachian program, we must have full cooperation with the local governmental authorities.

Is it the purpose of the amendments to place the regions that would be created under this bill in the same category as Appalachia?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I do not believe that the concept of the economic development district, which is a part of this bill, was the basic concept of the Appalachian bill.

The Appalachian program is a multi-State regional project, for which Congress approved an overall program. The economic development district proposed in S. 1648, in most instances, would involve probably a few counties, or a large number of smaller local units of government, such as towns and cities. However, it is not the regional concept, as in the Appalachia bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that. However, under the Appalachian program, an entire State, or two States, may cooperate, particularly in roadbuilding or other development projects of common interest. Certain procedures are set out to accomplish these purposes under the Appalachian program.

Are those procedures of the Appalachian program the same as those provided to carry on programs in the regional areas of the country that would be covered by this bill? As I recall, when the debate was held on the Appalachian program, many Senators desired to provide assistance for their own area. The proponents of the Appalachian bill said: "Do not offer your amendments now. Later we will provide assistance for your States under another program."

I believe that this bill is an answer to Senators who desired to participate in the Appalachian program.

How does the procedure under the Appalachia program differ from what the Senator from Utah now proposes?

Mr. MUSKIE. First of all, the Appalachian program is a multi-State program. This development district program concept is not primarily a multi-State proposal. All that S. 1648 would do with respect to the formation of regional commissions similar to those established under the Appalachian program would be to authorize the establishment of regional commissions to study the possibility of establishing programs in the multi-State regions.

In my own State of Maine, we could, if we were to meet the established criteria, form economic development districts wholly within the State of Maine. That would be true in the State of Louisiana or in the State of Utah. Those districts would involve combinations of counties and towns, rather than combinations of States.

I believe that this same approach is possible under the Appalachian program in individual States—an economic development district.

This would be wholly within one State, or a few adjacent counties in two States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could it be on a larger basis?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes, this bill would permit the establishment of a number of development districts.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the procedure in handling the money, if we were to create the development districts that we are now discussing, be the same as under the Appalachian program?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I hesitate to offer an answer that would constitute an interpretation of the Appalachian program. However, I should say that it is the intent of both programs to encourage the participation of appropriate local units of government.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, would States in the Appalachian region be able to obtain funds under the program that would be established by the bill?

Mr. MUSKIE. That is correct. The Appalachian areas would not be excluded from participation under the bill. They would be covered by the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Therefore, States which are participating in the Appalachian program would gain extra benefits to the extent of more than a billion dollars and be eligible for this program also?

Mr. MUSKIE. Those areas of Appalachia which could establish eligibility under the criteria of this bill would be eligible for the type of assistance authorized by S. 1648.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was trying to find out what the difference was between the Appalachia program and the program we are now considering, particularly in the establishments of regions that have been the subject of discussion on the Senate floor today.

Mr. MUSKIE. I notice the Senator from West Virginia is present. I would like to have him correct me if I am wrong with reference to the eligibility for inclusion in the Appalachian program, it was Congress which determined the geographic boundaries of the Appalachian region, so that no finding of eligibility for assistance can be made administratively. In contrast, under this bill, Congress would establish the criteria for eligibility. The actual designation of eligibility would be made by the Secretary under the guidelines in the bill. So not all areas included in the Appalachia program would necessarily be eligible under this program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then the statement that the bill authorizes an Appalachia program for other regions of the country really is not correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. I refer the Senator to title V of the bill. Title V, beginning on page 32 of the bill, authorizes the Secretary to designate appropriate economic development regions within the United States with the concurrence of the States. This title undertakes to create authority for the establishment in other parts of the country of development regions similar to Appalachia.

This measure would authorize regional planning programs. So to that extent the bill does carry out the Appalachia concept if other regions are qualified.

Mr. ELLENDER. And notwithstanding the fact that we are creating this authority to establish regions similar to the Appalachia region, areas within Appalachia will still be able to obtain funds under this program?

Mr. MUSKIE. This will be true also of the other regions which might be established similar to Appalachia. Those regions can, under this bill, take advantage of these benefits and at the same time begin the process of creating special regional programs for those parts of the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. But those regions will not be able to obtain funds from the Appalachia program.

Mr. MUSKIE. No; and they will not get any funds unless and until they have established an Appalachia type program for their region which has been specially authorized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose, for example, there had been established an Appalachia type regional commission in the States of Indiana and Illinois. Would those two States be able to obtain money authorized for the Appalachia region?

Mr. MUSKIE. No; they would have to come to Congress for the approval of a similar type of program for that region.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could it be done under this act, without having to come back to Congress?

Mr. MUSKIE. The process set up in title V of S. 1648 would authorize the designation of economic development regions which would have the power under the terms of the bill to research and study their programs and submit plans for their development. When such plans are developed, they must come to Congress, or the administration must submit to Congress Appalachia-type programs for the various regions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would it be necessary for us to provide additional appropriations or authorizations?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. We would be premature in providing them now, because as yet there are no plans.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. We were talking about the kind of economic development which is usually within one State. Then we come to the title V, which includes regions in more than one State. Title V is a total planning process. It has nothing to do with putting the program into action, but planning. Therefore, a State or region under title V would have to go back to Congress for appropriations before anything could be done under title V of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. So if these regions are created, they will again come back to Congress and attempt to obtain an authorization. Is that correct?

Mr. MUSKIE. It is not a question to which we can answer precisely "Yes" or "No." Direct loans for public works and supplementary grants for public works are contained in S. 1648. If a county or region should qualify for such money under this program, it would not be barred from this assistance simply because it was also included within a special regional program.

Northern New England, which conceivably could be made an Appalachian-type region, could obtain exactly the same kind of benefit as the Appalachian region would get.

Mr. ELLENDER. But there may not be any need to develop the region.

Mr. MUSKIE. The fundamental purpose of the Appalachia region bill is to develop a particular region. The public works projects covered by S. 1648 are more local in nature.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We cannot create a program of development highways, as envisioned under the Appalachia program, on a county-by-county basis. The Appalachia bill is focused upon the problem of regional transportation, recognizing that some areas are, to a degree, isolated, and it was designed to break down those barriers. In Appalachia it was thought that businesses and economic progress could not be generated adequately without a sound transportation system. With reference to the Senator's argument, I think one program complements the other, because in this instance we shall be providing public works to a degree and providing business loans for those who need to develop their areas. In the case of Appalachia, the program was primarily a development of the transport system.

I believe that is a fair analysis.

Mr. MUSKIE. Nevertheless, it may be possible, under this bill, to build a limited developmental road within the confines of a State or economic development district. The Secretary of Commerce agreed that this was a part of the concept. But when we speak of a multi-State development highway program, that would be developed as a regional program under a special authorization for that region.

There may be other projects in other regions of the country that could be more important at this time than developmental highways. We do not foreclose the development of any kind of regional project in this bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The region would have to document its case. They have to prove it; is that not true?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. What concerns me, and the reason I am asking these questions, is that under the Appalachia program we are bound to spend—as I remember—a figure of $1 billion and $60 million.

Mr. MUSKIE. That is the total authorization.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over 5 years?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is the Senator from Louisiana directing his question to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Is it $1.06 billion over a 5-year period?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The sum of $840 million is provided for the regional developmental highway system. That has to be taken out of the $1.06 billion total authorization.

Mr. ELLENDER. Notwithstanding the spending of $840 million for roads, do I correctly understand that the States in the Appalachian region could come in and get more money for roads within their own boundaries under title I?

Mr. MUSKIE. My impression is that the States within the Appalachian region and the communities within those States are eligible, under the Appalachia program, for benefits which are similar to these. If they establish eligibility under the Appalachia program, they cannot at the same time, for the same project—let me repeat that—the same project—and for the same purposes, establish eligibility and obtain the benefits which would be provided under the pending bill. In other words, they cannot have assistance from both for the same project.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, but——

Mr. MUSKIE. If the community is depressed, it cannot first go to the Appalachia Administrator and have its program underwritten by that Administrator, and then take the exact same project to the Secretary of Commerce and, under the pending bill, obtain additional grants.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can well understand that.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to respond to the Senator from Louisiana, speaking with respect to the points he has raised. I believe that there is a distinct difference between the purposes of the Appalachia program and the pending bill, at least in regard to titles I and II. I believe that the distinction, which has been alluded to by the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], is this: The Appalachia bill looks toward the basic development of regions including developmental highways, multicounty hospitals, timber management, and construction of facilities to encourage investment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Schools?

Mr. COOPER. No schools, other than vocational training, the basic kind of development of a whole region is the Appalachian approach.

The emphasis of titles I and II of the proposed legislation is to direct funds toward community development and industrial facilities which will provide long-term employment. In the Appalachia bill no funds are made available to a State or subdivision of a State or to any nonprofit organization for commercial or industrial plants.

To me, that is the distinction between the Appalachia bill and the pending bill. The money will be spent in an attempt to encourage either the location or expansion of plants—not relocation—along with the generation of local investment in commercial and industrial plants within a county or subdivision of a State or an area. That is the distinction.

I believe that the other question the Senator from Louisiana raised, concerning the building of roads under Appalachia, was whether a State could come to the Commerce Department and secure funds to build roads under the pending bill.

If a county, or three counties, in an Appalachian area should make application under the pending bill for funds to locate or build an industrial or commercial plant in that area, and if it were shown that it would be necessary to build a quarter-mile or half-mile length of road, or a road 100 yards long, as an access road to that plant, then it could secure funds under the legislation enacted, provided for in the Appalachia bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that.

Mr. COOPER. I hope I have made it clear.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator stated the items that could be eligible under Appalachia, and I said schools, I had in mind, at that point, vocational schools.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. We can spend quite a bit of money under Appalachia on vocational schools.

Mr. COOPER. For vocational schools; the Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. To go back to the question of creating regions—if, as, and when the regions are created throughout the country on a basis similar to Appalachia— they then come back to Congress for further authorization; is that not correct?

Mr. MUSKIE. They would have to obtain a special authorization from Congress for anything more than planning funds and technical assistance.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, they would have to make a case, as was done for Appalachia?

Mr. MUSKIE. Exactly.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the amount of money which may be authorized in the future for the many regional areas which may be created is somewhat indefinite; it could amount to a large sum, could it not?

Mr. MUSKIE. I cannot imagine that Congress would let it go into a large figure—at least not without full discussion and debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Appalachian region includes certain areas in West Virginia and seven or eight other States. The amount authorized is $1,060 million. Under title I of the pending bill for public works facilities and grants, $400 million a year would be authorized for 5 years, or $2 billion over that period. Then, as I understand, under title II, title III, title IV, and title V, the moneys provided are for no specific time, but would remain available indefinitely.

Mr. MUSKIE. Titles II and III have been limited, under an amendment adopted last week, to 5 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was not aware of that.

Mr. MUSKIE. The major sections of the bill are now under a 5-year limitation.

Mr. ELLENDER. So under the pending bill, the major authorizations are limited to 5 years. I shall not ask any more questions on that point, because I am glad that that was done. The expenditure of as much as $665 million, as I remember it, with an indefinite time limitation in the authorization, was, I thought, very unwise.

Mr. MUSKIE. I know. The Senator expressed that concern the other day.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. His concern had something to do with adoption of the amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason I am asking these questions is that I believe the bill as a whole to be a good bill, if properly administered. The only point I wish to go into again concerns that portion of the bill which permits a community to obtain money from several sources, for example, to build hospitals.

I do not know what the committee had in mind in permitting a community to obtain money under this legislation, while under the Hill-Burton Act as much as 80 percent of the construction cost can already be made available.

I am not clear about the necessity for a community to be able to obtain funds for up to 50 percent of the cost of a project under one law, and then, under the pending bill, be entitled to obtain 30 percent more. Why make it possible for that community to obtain 80 percent from two sources, when it could obtain 80 percent from one source?

I should like to know the reason for the committee's action. I do not yet see the necessity for tying in any Hill-Burton Act funds. The Hill-Burton Act has been operating very well, so far as I know, and I am very proud of the part that I played as a coauthor of it. This bill is making it possible for funds to be derived from two sources for one project. That question is something that I believe needs a little study. I believe that the possibility of obtaining money from any other source than the Hill-Burton Act should be reconsidered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Let me explain what I apparently failed to explain previously, and the reasons behind our action. In the first place, a public works program under the pending bill must be related to the long-range economic development prospects of a community. This is not a general supplement to any existing grant-in-aid program. Furthermore, it is limited to areas of high unemployment or low income.

To the extent that existing grant-in-aid programs may be useful in aiding the community develop those long-run economic development prospects, it can be eligible under the bill.

I am trying to find the language in the bill which is applicable.

Mr. ELLENDER. While the Senator is looking for the section of the bill he is discussing, I should like to say that in the past, Congress has been very liberal in providing funds for use by certain localities in connection with the construction of hospitals. That program has worked very well. I fear that if we permit communities to obtain funds from sources other than the Hill-Burton Act, we shall make it possible to have them get 30 or 40 percent of the money from the Hill-Burton Act, and entice them to get the rest of it from funds to be obtained under the pending bill. I believe that whatever money is provided in the pending bill, particularly under title I, should be used to the fullest extent to provide sewage facilities, good water, and things of that kind, instead of mixing it all in with hospital construction.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I do not believe the testimony that was presented to us in committee indicated any great intent to supplement hospital programs. The bill does not prohibit doing what the Senator would visualize so far as hospital construction is concerned. However, there is no indication that this would be a great part of the program. It may be that in an isolated area, where it is not possible to raise the necessary funds locally under the Hill-Burton Act, the area or community would be able to get money under the pending bill. It would be able to get some of that money, at least. However, I do not visualize any great program being developed in that connection under the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. They could get 80 percent under the Hill-Burton Act, could they not?

Mr. McNAMARA. They could get up to 80 percent only with a supplementary grant under this program. However, we do not visualize the building of a great many hospitals under the projected program. Very few would be assisted under this program.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, if I may pick up the thought which I started to develop a while ago, this is the criterion which the public works project must meet under the act: It must "tend to improve the opportunity in the area where such project is or will be located for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities."

Unless a hospital under the Hill-Burton program would tend to improve the opportunity for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial commercial plants or facilities, it would not be eligible under the pending bill.

This is true of any other public works facility with respect to which application is made. This is a more restricted criterion than that established under the Hill-Burton program, or under any other grant-in-aid program, intended to support projects useful to such an area.

In the second place, the concept of supplementary grants is already a part of the Appalachia program, which has been approved by Congress in principle.

With respect to the impact of the supplementary grant, last Thursday I inserted in the RECORD various other programs and the matching formulas. The insertion is found at page 11915 of Thursday's RECORD. Some typical public works and development facilities are as follows:

I. Public works and development facilities "directly" related to economic development

Type of project	*Existing grant-in-aid program*
Water works and water lines related to industrial and commercial development.	None.
Sanitary and storm sewers related to industrial and commercial development	Do.
Industrial parks (land development and utilities)	Do.
Police and fire stations related to industrial and commercial development.	Do.
Research centers related to industrial and commercial development.	Do.
Tourism facilities	Do.
Streets and roads related to industrial and commercial development.	50 percent from Bureau of Public Roads if on Federal aid highway system.
Waste treatment facilities relating to industrial and commercial development.	Up to 30 percent from Public Health Service.
Area vocational schools	50 percent from Office of Education.
Airports	50 to 75 percent from Federal Aviation Agency.
Watershed protection and flood prevention related to industrial or commercial development.	30 to100 percent from Soil Conservation Service.
Water works and water lines related to residential development	None.
Sanitary and storm sewers primarily related to residential development.	Do.
Streets primarily related to residential development	50 percent from Bureau of Public Roads if on Federal aid highway system.
Waste treatment facilities not related to industrial or commercial development.	Up to 30 percent from Public Health Service.
Hospitals related to community or district economic development.	33 to 66 percent from Public Health Service.

These are some of the existing grant-in-aid programs under which local public works projects can be built with Federal assistance, and some of them without Federal assistance.

The Senator has asked what the theory is. If a community or region or economic development district is deteriorating badly, either because of the loss of its essential element of economic strength, or because of technological change, the community is less able to put up matching funds under existing Federal programs than a healthy, viable community is able to do. If there is a public facility available under an existing program which would help that area get back on its feet and increase its prospects for economic growth, the committee felt that in such a situation it would be useful and justifiable for the Federal Government to supplement the existing program and bring the Federal contribution up to 80 percent. That is the theory.

I raised this question about assistance for hospitals during the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce before the Public Works Committee.

I asked whether or not hospitals would be eligible.

Secretary Connor answered:

> Secretary CONNOR. We were thinking of those only if there is a total lack of adequate hospital facilities which seriously hampers the economic needs of the community. In that case a hospital project might be eligible.
>
> A case we have financed under the ARA program, as you know, were the hospitals, the miners' hospitals in West Virginia and eastern Kentucky. They were terribly important to economic development.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator says to bring it up to 80 percent, he means cases in which a community could not raise the necessary funds to match the Government in programs other than this. Is that correct?

Mr. MUSKIE. I assume that would be one of the considerations of the Secretary in reviewing and evaluating the project.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can understand that in many areas the Government would be putting up everything except the 20 percent of the money that could be obtained locally. That is one thing we must be careful about.

Mr. MUSKIE. Under the accelerated public works program there was a gradation in the Federal contribution which depended upon the ability of the community to participate. Similar tests would be applied by the Secretary. The 80 percent is not mandatory.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. That is why I thought that if the bill were directed to programs to improve a sewage disposal system or improve water, we would be going far toward assisting communities to get back on their feet. Because of a low tax base, I can see that it is impossible for many small communities to provide sufficient funds to construct adequate water and sewage facilities. It was my hope that most of this money could be used in that connection, and that we could let the roadbuilding and hospital construction be done under existing laws.

At first that is what I thought the bill would do. I express the hope that the administrators of the program will see to it that as much money as possible is used to assist cities, towns, and villages to obtain good water supplies and sewerage systems.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator should be assured by the record of the public works program under which a majority of the projects were for either water or sewers. I would expect that comparable experience would develop under the proposed legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I had hoped that the Senator could so provide by limiting the program.

Mr. MUSKIE. We did not do so because we could not imagine all of the diversities of program that might be involved in communities. If a community needs a vocational school, for example, and it could not obtain assistance under any other program, or if it could get aid under an existing program, but could not provide the necessary matching funds, and if that were the critical additional public facility that that community needed, we did not wish to make it impossible for the Secretary of Commerce to be of assistance.

On page 46 of the hearings of the Public Works Committee, the Senator from Louisiana will find typical examples of public facility projects which the Secretary believes would be covered and supported under the proposed program. The Senator might be interested in examining that material.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to ask a few questions in relation to title II. To what extent would the Small Business Administration have under its control the distribution of funds for loans and for the purpose of making industrial and commercial guarantees for working capital?

Mr. MUSKIE. As the Senator knows, there is now a division of responsibility between the ARA and SBA in respect to that function. ARA makes the evaluation on the basis of the economic feasibility of the project and its need in the area. SBA makes the credit evaluation. That procedure could continue.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under SBA the loans must be repayable. That is, there must be reason to believe that if money is put into a certain business, the borrower will be able to repay it.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose an application is made to the Small Business Administration for a quarter-million dollars, and SBA does not believe that the industry which would be created would return enough profits to repay the loan. If a case like that were presented, would it be possible for moneys to be loaned under the proposed legislation in order to bolster a project which the SBA might think to be too risky?

Mr. MUSKIE. It is possible, because the Economic Development Administration, proposed successor agency to ARA, would be the administrative unit, EDA would be the ultimate administrator of the program. There has been some debate outside of Congress and within the committees as to whether EDA should not have total jurisdiction over all the authority in the bill. The committee felt that with the new arrangements which have been established between SBA and ARA, the present relationship could continue. In some instances, the agencies have disagreed; but I do not think that they have disagreed to a degree that should raise any alarm.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the present act, there must be a reasonable belief that the loans would be repaid.

Mr. MUSKIE. The language is "a reasonable assurance of repayment."

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The Small Business Administration could lend a certain amount of the loan applied for and be almost entirely secured for its part; but there might be serious doubt as to whether or not, under the present proposal, any further loans could be repaid. What does the Senator have to say about that point?

Mr. MUSKIE. All I can say is that the language of the bill is clear. The language of the bill contains a mandate not only to the SBA, but also to ARA. Their credit standards are different, but I cannot conceive of either agency deliberately disregarding that mandate. I suppose that there could be an honest disagreement between two individuals of equal competence as to whether or not a particular loan is a viable loan. But the policy is clear. ARA delegated the credit evaluating functions which it has under the law to SBA primarily because SBA has the manpower and the organization to do the work. But both the ARA and the proposed EDA programs are intended to be developmental programs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose the SBA would loan a business up to 50 percent of the money necessary to construct a new facility. And suppose that the business could only raise from its own sources an additional 30 percent of the total amount needed, under the pending bill, would it be possible for moneys to be used to supplement the SBA loan to that business?

In other words, it is now possible for SBA to loan a certain amount of money which might not be satisfactory to the borrower. Could the borrower then come in under the proposed legislation and borrow 20 percent more or 30 percent more, or whatever would be necessary in order that he might proceed to construct the facility for which he had applied, but for which the SBA had refused to loan all that he asked?

Mr. MUSKIE. We are talking about industrial loans?

Mr. ELLENDER. We are talking about industrial loans.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is asking whether or not SBA could supplement the ARA loans——

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. MUSKIE. Whether ARA could supplement the SBA to support a given project.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. I cannot give the Senator from Louisiana an interpretation of the law on that point; but, administratively, I cannot conceive that happening, because the EDA and the SBA together would administer this provision of the law as the agencies have administered the ARA law. In the ARA experience, I do not know of any instances of splitting individual loans.

Mr. ELLENDER. The SBA would then administer the project with its own funds?

Mr. MUSKIE. The ARA—or the EDA, as it may be called—would have direct authority over the industrial loan provisions of the bill, could continue to delegate to SBA the evaluation of the credit risk of each of the loans. The two evaluations would finally determine whether or not the loans should be made, so that when the decision was finally made by EDA under the proposed program, the decision would encompass the total financing for the project.

Mr. ELLENDER. The financing would be obtained from two sources or only one? That is the point I am trying to develop. In other words, the borrower under the SBA program may not be satisfied with the amount of money that he can obtain from SBA.

Would one agency play against the other?

Mr. MUSKIE. They could not do that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I want to be certain about that, because if an application were made, under the bill, for a small business loan, the Small Business Administration would handle it for the Commerce Department.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator means that there are some purposes for which the SBA can make loans and the ARA cannot?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. And I wish to be certain that the SBA is not placed in the position of making unsecured loans, or loans secured by another Government agency.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator understands that both SBA and ARA may be in the financial picture of the particular business, but they cannot play each other off on any particular loan authorized under the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, if the Small Business Administration were to say to a concern that was about to start a new business, "All we can lend is 60 percent of your needs, because that is all we believe you can pay back; you will have to put up the balance of 40 percent," it would not be possible, under the bill, for the SBA loan to be supplemented from funds derived from this source.

Mr. MUSKIE. I would say "No" to the Senator, based on my understanding.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not want it to appear to be the intent of Congress for the SBA to begin approving dangerous loans and thereby losing money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendments, en bloc, offered by the Senator from Utah.

The amendments, en bloc, were agreed to.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendments, en bloc, were agreed to.

Mr. MOSS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SMALL TOWNS IN AMERICA ARE ENTITLED TO THEIR FAIR SHARE OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield time to me?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it has been the historic function of the American Government to rise to meet the challenges of each age. When we were in the period of our great national westward expansion, the Government gave away free land to settlers to see to it that all sections of our vast domain were settled, and gave away vast areas of land to railroads to see that transportation was available to all sections of our country. Today the American Government is taking action to insure that these areas remain settled and productive and not be abandoned to wastage, but that they retain the prosperity which has been created there down through the years by the hard work of pioneer families and their descendants.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 will provide assistance to communities that are distressed by low income and high unemployment. This is a do-it-yourself project. Local communities will work up overall economic development plans which will detail the steps they will take to restore their economies to their former healthy conditions. Then they can receive assistance in the form of loans to attract industry and grants for badly needed public works.

The bill makes it possible for small towns to obtain the funds for water works and sewage treatment facilities. With our vast population, pure water and adequate sewage are necessary if our small towns are to be saved. Without these health safeguards hepatitis and other outbreaks or threatened outbreaks of disease doom towns and small cities to a gradual withering away. With the health and comfort safeguards of pure water and adequate sewage disposal, such towns are more nearly able to hold their own.

Towns may also receive aid for fire and police stations, tourism facilities, airports, watersheds and flood protection, and area vocational schools. In other words, this bill spells survival for hundreds of smaller cities and towns of America, which lack the capital to build these facilities alone.

Mr. President, as a coauthor of the Senate bill I strongly support the proposed legislation. It should be passed without further delay so that we can get on with the task of revitalizing our small towns and rural areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, tables 1 to 8, on pages 176, 178, 179, 182, 184, 185, 190, and 192, chapter V, of "Essays in Southern Economic Development," edited by Melvin L. Greenhut and W. Tate Whitman, and printed by the University of North Carolina Press. Chapter V is by George Macesich.

Table 4 is especially relevant. Projecting population migration in the South for the period 1970–2020, it shows that migration from rural areas will continue, although at a decreasing rate, unless action is taken to save our rural areas.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Total, urban, and rural migration: 1950–60*

	Migration (thousands of persons)			Migration rates (percent per year)		
	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural
United States	2,621	11,733	−9,112	0.16	1.07	−1.69
South	−3,247	2,607	−5,854	−.75	1.20	−2.73
Alabama	−368	166	−534	−1.16	1.07	−3.35
Arkansas	−422	17	430	−2.34	.25	−3.93
Georgia	−214	260	−474	−.58	1.40	−2.60
Kentucky	−390	67	−457	−1.30	.56	−2.58
Louisiana	−50	223	−272	−.17	1.27	−2.26
Mississippi	−434	77	−511	−1.99	1.09	−3.49
North Carolina	−328	133	−461	−.76	.84	−1.69
Oklahoma	−219	147	−365	−.96	1.13	−3.75
South Carolina	−222	21	−242	−.99	.23	−1.77
Tennessee	−273	138	−410	−.80	.83	−2.32
Texas	114	1,133	−1,019	.13	1.91	−3.88
Virginia	15	320	−306	.04	1.72	−1.74
West Virginia	−447	−94	−353	−2.31	−1.34	−2.87
Florida	1,617	1,451	166	4.30	5.52	1.49
Arizona	330	412	−83	3.30	6.30	−2.48
California	3,145	3,364	−219	2.42	3.10	−1.05
Colorado	164	279	−115	1.07	2.67	−2.41
Connecticut	234	197	37	1.04	1.12	.75
Delaware	64	53	11	1.69	2.17	.84
District of Columbia	−158	−158	(1)	−2.02	−2.02	(1)
Idaho	−40	11	−51	−.64	.39	−1.49
Illinois	124	383	−259	18	.52	−1.33
Indiana	63	139	−75	15	.53	−.45
Iowa	−228	30	−258	−.85	.22	−1.03
Kansas	−44	153	−197	−.22	1.33	−2.24
Maine	−66	−37	−29	−.70	−.77	−.63
Maryland	320	326	−6	1.18	1.70	−.08
Massachusetts	−93	−120	27	−.19	−.29	.34
Michigan	156	288	−132	.22	.57	−.67
Minnesota	−97	189	−285	−.30	1.01	−2.16
Missouri	−130	120	−250	−.32	.45	−1.09
Montana	−25	30	−55	−.40	1.01	−1.65
Nebraska	−117	40	−158	−.86	.59	−2.34
Nevada	86	84	2	3.97	6.04	.28
New Hampshire	13	12	1	.22	.35	.05
New Jersey	577	614	−37	1.06	1.29	−.55
New Mexico	52	160	−108	.65	3.41	−3.25
New York	210	152	58	.13	.11	.25
North Dakota	−105	22	−127	−1.68	1.14	−2.94
Ohio	409	560	−152	0.46	0.89	−0.61
Oregon	16	146	−130	.10	1.53	−1.90
Pennsylvania	−475	−235	−240	−.44	−.30	−.76
Rhode Island	−26	−5	−22	−.32	−.06	−1.80
South Dakota	−94	7	−101	−1.41	.28	−2.38
Utah	10	83	−72	.13	1.50	−3.14
Vermont	−38	−6	−32	−.99	−.45	−1.31
Washington	88	186	−98	.34	1.08	−1.09
Wisconsin	−53	186	−239	−.14	.83	−1.66
Wyoming	−20	11	−31	−.64	.69	−2.16

[1] The District of Columbia has no rural population.

TABLE 2.—*Southern rural migration by race, 1950–60*

	Migration (thousands of persons)		Migration rates (percent per year)	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
South	−3,955	−1,899	−2.40	−4.09
Alabama	−315	−219	−2.82	−4.60
Arkansas	−326	−124	−3.63	−5.01
Georgia	−241	−233	−1.86	−4.44
Kentucky	−428	−29	−2.52	−4.12
Louisiana	−115	−157	−1.47	−3.76
Mississippi	−203	−307	−2.63	−4.46
North Carolina	−254	−206	−1.26	−2.92
Oklahoma	−326	−39	−3.70	−4.23
South Carolina	−42	−201	−.52	−3.53
Tennessee	−344	−67	−2.16	−3.75
Texas	−848	−171	−3.70	−5.15
Virginia	−194	−112	−1.42	−2.84
West Virginia	−318	−34	−2.72	−6.02
Florida	210	−44	2.32	−2.09

TABLE 3.—*Urban net migration by race, 1950–60*

	Migration (thousands of persons)		Migration rates (percent per year)	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
United States	9,745	1,988	0.96	1.67
South	2,602	5	1.54	.03
Alabama	189	−23	1.80	−.46
Arkansas	29	−11	.53	−.71
Georgia	255	5	1.99	.08
Kentucky	76	−9	.71	−.64
Louisiana	181	42	1.50	.77
Mississippi	82	−5	1.84	−.18
North Carolina	147	−14	1.26	−.35
Oklahoma	133	14	1.13	1.16
South Carolina	49	−29	.80	−1.12
Tennessee	145	−8	1.14	−.20
Texas	1,077	56	2.08	.75
Virginia	317	4	2.14	.10
West Virginia	−78	−16	−1.19	−3.50
Florida	1,285	166	6.11	3.16
Arizona	397	15	6.39	4.56
California	2,984	380	2.98	4.58
Colorado	266	13	2.63	3.94
Connecticut	157	40	.93	5.31
Delaware	48	5	2.27	1.47
District of Columbia	−224	66	−5.26	1.90
Idaho	10	1	.37	2.83
Illinois	147	236	.22	2.85
Indiana	94	45	.39	2.12
Iowa	22	8	.16	3.86
Kansas	149	4	1.39	.49
Maine	−39	1	−.80	6.30
Maryland	282	45	1.78	1.34
Massachusetts	−146	26	−.36	2.82
Michigan	173	115	.38	2.07
Minnesota	181	7	.99	3.19
Missouri	80	40	.34	1.30
Montana	29	1	.98	3.80
Nebraska	35	5	.53	2.03
Nevada	76	8	5.83	9.29
New Hampshire	11	1	.32	8.52
New Jersey	483	131	1.10	3.51
New Mexico	155	5	3.42	3.10
New York	−173	325	−.14	2.78
North Dakota	22	0	1.13	1.26
Ohio	128	132	.75	2.16
Oregon	139	7	1.49	3.25
Pennsylvania	−329	94	−.47	1.33
Rhode Island	−7	3	−.11	1.65
South Dakota	6	1	.25	2.21
Utah	82	1	1.51	.66
Vermont	−7	0	−.45	2.34
Washington	168	18	1.01	3.18
Wisconsin	146	39	.67	7.72
Wyoming	11	0	.71	−.14

TABLE 4.—*Population and migration projections for the South: 1970–2020*

Year	Population			Migration	
	Thousands of persons	Percent increase	Percent of total	Thousands of persons	Percent rate
Rural:					
1960	20,522	−0.89	44.9	−5,878	−2.98
1970	18,946	−.80	37.1	−5,181	−2.63
1980	17,655	−.71	30.6	−4,619	−2.53
1990	16,609	−.61	25.2	−4,150	−2.42
2000	15,773	−.52	20.9	−3,758	−2.32
2010	15,119	−.42	17.3	−3,431	−2.22
2020	14,626	−.33	14.4	−3,157	−2.12
Urban:					
1960	25,188	3.07	55.1	2,632	.88
1970	32,145	2.43	62.9	2,334	.82
1980	40,081	2.20	69.4	2,105	.59
1990	49,225	2.05	74.8	1,913	.43
2000	59,849	1.94	79.1	1,753	.32
2010	72,272	1.88	82.7	1,620	.25
2020	86,874	1.83	85.6	1,509	.19
Total:					
1960	45,711	1.10	100.0	−3,247	−.67
1970	51,091	1.11	100.0	−2,847	−.59
1980	57,736	1.22	100.0	−2,514	−.46
1990	65,835	1.31	100.0	−2,237	−.36
2000	75,622	1.39	100.0	−2,005	−.28
2010	87,391	1.45	100.0	−1,811	−.22
2020	101,500	1.50	100.0	−1,648	−.17

TABLE 5.—*Nonagricultural employment: 1950 and 1962* [1]

	Employment (thousands)				Percent per year growth: 1950–62	
	United States		South			
	1950	1962	1950	1962	United States	South
Total	44,942.3	55,123.6	9,098.4	11,753.3	1.70	2.13
Mining and oil	902.6	649.4	432.1	341.0	−2.74	−1.97
Manufacturing	15,248.2	16,783.7	2,608.1	3,250.4	.80	1.86
Construction	2,343.6	2,817.3	536.3	692.8	1.53	2.13
Transportation, communication, and public utilities	4,041.5	3,879.9	854.0	843.2	−.34	−.11
Trade	9,412.6	11,502.4	1,990.8	2,502.4	1.67	1.91
Finance, insurance, and real estate	1,843.7	2,793.4	292.2	518.4	3.46	4.78
Services and miscellaneous	5,115.6	7,724.4	1,004.4	1,469.8	3.43	3.17
Governments	6,034.5	8,973.1	1,380.5	2,126.3	3.31	3.60

[1] Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Employment and Earnings Statistics for States and Areas: 1939–62," Bulletin No. 1370 (1963).

TABLE 6.—*Nonagricultural employment growth rates and differentials, 1950–62*

[Average percents per year]

	Growth rate	Differential	Weight part	Rate part
South	2.13	0.43	−0.05	0.48
Alabama	2.03	.33	−.06	.39
Arkansas	2.36	.66	.11	.55
Georgia	2.56	.86	.05	.81
Kentucky	1.54	−.16	−.26	.10
Louisiana	1.85	.15	−.01	.16
Mississippi	2.58	.88	.20	.68
North Carolina	2.49	.79	−.05	.84
Oklahoma	1.94	.24	.00	.24
South Carolina	2.29	.59	−.05	.64
Tennessee	1.99	.29	.07	.22
Texas	2.65	.95	.00	.95
Virginia	2.45	.75	.05	.70
West Virginia	−1.35	−3.05	−.86	−2.19
Florida	5.62	3.92	.33	3.59
Arizona	6.75	5.05	.15	4.90
California	4.04	2.34	.21	2.13
Colorado	3.56	1.86	.19	1.67
Connecticut	1.78	.08	−.09	.17
Delaware	2.07	.37	−.13	.50
District of Columbia	1.08	−.62	1.01	−1.63
Idaho	1.77	.07	.07	.00
Illinois	1.00	−.70	−.06	−.64
Indiana	1.15	−.55	−.21	−.34
Iowa	.95	−.75	.16	−.91
Kansas	1.72	.02	.02	.00
Maine	.83	−.87	−.01	−.86
Maryland	2.34	−.64	.05	.59
Massachusetts	.86	−.84	.05	−.89
Michigan	.63	−1.07	−.19	−.88
Minnesota	1.68	−.02	.08	−.10
Missouri	1.12	−.58	.06	−.64
Montana	1.10	−.60	.02	−.62
Nebraska	1.73	.03	.30	−.27
Nevada	6.94	5.24	.29	4.95
New Hampshire	1.64	−.06	−.04	−.02
New Jersey	1.90	.20	−.10	.30
New Mexico	3.89	2.19	.22	1.97
New York	.98	−.72	.12	−.84
North Dakota	1.30	−.40	.40	−.80
Ohio	.95	−.75	−.13	−.62
Oregon	1.50	−.20	.05	−.25
Pennsylvania	.10	−1.60	−.26	−1.34
Rhode Island	−.09	−1.79	−.09	−1.70
South Dakota	1.99	.29	.41	−.12
Utah	3.44	1.74	.12	1.62
Vermont	1.00	−.70	.02	−.72
Washington	1.83	.13	.22	−.09
Wisconsin	1.40	−.30	−.08	−.22
Wyoming	1.50	−.20	−.25	.05

Source: See table 5.

TABLE 7.—*National image deviations: 1950 and 1962*[1] *(percent of total nonagricultural employment)*

	1950	1962		1950	1962
South	6.5	4.9	Iowa	10.3	6.3
			Kansas	14.3	11.7
Alabama	5.2	5.1	Maine	10.2	8.7
Arkansas	9.8	4.6	Maryland	3.7	4.3
Georgia	3.5	3.9	Massachusetts	7.9	7.4
Kentucky	11.8	6.6	Michigan	15.4	10.0
Louisiana	11.9	13.8	Minnesota	8.9	6.2
Mississippi	10.0	6.4	Missouri	6.7	4.1
North Carolina	11.2	12.1	Montana	23.2	18.6
Oklahoma	20.4	16.7	Nebraska	19.3	13.6
South Carolina	12.2	13.0	Nevada	30.0	29.8
Tennessee	3.4	3.7	New Hampshire	13.6	13.3
Texas	15.7	11.8	New Jersey	11.7	8.7
Virginia	7.0	5.6	New Mexico	28.2	24.3
West Virginia	22.7	11.9	New York	5.2	5.6
			North Dakota	29.7	25.8
Florida	20.5	15.0	Ohio	10.2	8.7
Arizona	24.0	15.7	Oregon	5.2	5.8
California	11.3	4.6	Pennsylvania	9.6	7.9
Colorado	16.7	13.5	Rhode Island	15.6	9.8
Connecticut	16.4	14.4	South Dakota	25.0	22.3
Delaware	12.3	7.3	Utah	19.1	13.9
District of Columbia	38.6	36.6	Vermont	7.0	4.9
Idaho	18.3	13.8	Washington	9.5	5.4
Illinois	5.2	4.9	Wisconsin	8.6	7.2
Indiana	11.7	10.6	Wyoming	29.1	25.4

[1] Source: See table 5.

TABLE 8.—*Per capita personal income levels, 1950 and 1962*

	Personal income (dollars per capita)		Increase	
	1950	1962	Dollars	Percent per year
United States	1,491	2,366	875	3.85
Alabama	867	1,567	700	4.93
Arkansas	805	1,504	699	5.21
Georgia	1,016	1,759	743	4.57
Kentucky	958	1,712	754	4.84
Louisiana	1,089	1,705	616	3.74
Mississippi	729	1,285	556	4.72
North Carolina	1,009	1,732	723	4.50
Oklahoma	1,133	1,905	772	4.33
South Carolina	881	1,545	664	4.68
Tennessee	995	1,702	707	4.47
Texas	1,340	2,013	673	3.39
Virginia	1,222	2,018	796	4.18
West Virginia	1,095	1,810	715	4.19

Source: Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COOPER OF KENTUCKY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 7, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "$400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$325,000,000."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the time to be taken from the time of the Senator?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, my amendment is not difficult to understand. It would reduce the amount authorized under section 1 from $400 million to $325 million—a reduction of $75 million.

The President of the United States, in submitting his message and request to the Congress that this bill be enacted, asked only an annual authorization of $250 million. The Secretary of Commerce testified at length before our committee. His testimony was comprehensive and indicated a fine knowledge of the background and purposes of the bill. The Secretary stated that $250 million would be an adequate sum for this section, and he supported his testimony with careful data.

It may be asked then, if $250 million was the sum requested by the President and by the Secretary of Commerce, why I do not move to reduce the $400 million by $150 million? I shall be frank to say that I believe that there is a greater possibility that the Senate will consider favorably a reduction of $75 million than a reduction of $150 million. I say that from my experience in the Senate and my judgment of the programs under consideration. There are other substantive reasons, which I shall now discuss.

In past years I have supported and now support the various bills which are now comprehended in this bill. As I said in presenting the provisions of the bill on the floor of the Senate, it is an extension of three programs—the ARA, the Appalachian Regional Development Act, and the accelerated public works program of 1962 and 1963, all of which I strongly supported. I was one of the five cosponsors of the original ARA bill, first recommended by President Eisenhower and later enacted under the leadership of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in the Senate. I also cosponsored with other Senators the Appalachian Act, particularly with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and I comanaged with him the bill on the floor of the Senate.

I speak as one who has supported the legislation upon which the pending bill is based. Nevertheless, I believe the record will indicate that the sum proposed by my amendment, $325 million annually, a reduction of $75 million in the bill, will be fully adequate. Neither the President of the United States nor the Secretary of Commerce asked for $400 million. Having worked on these bills in past years on the Committee on Public Works, I know that there are differences between the pending bill and the earlier emergency bills, which I believe, support my argument.

This section of the bill differs from the old accelerated public works program in that it is not directed toward providing emergency employment for a 2-year period, as was the old bill. The bill will be effective for 5 years, and its criteria emphasizes the development of commercial or industrial enterprises which will provide long-term permanent employment in our communities.

The Secretary of Commerce said, in his testimony before our committee, that these criteria would be stricter than the criteria used under the old Accelerated Public Works Act. The new criteria must be developed for both the area, and the specific project within the area. It would be wise for the Senate to watch the operation of this new bill for a year to see if the new regulations meet the needs, before voting for the full amount over and above the requests estimated by the administration.

The increase of $150 million over the request of the President is not included in the budget. It would be added to the deficit which is now expected to exceed $4 billion. That has some significance. The President has also now requested that the national debt limit be raised to $329 billion, and the House has approved only $328 billion. We must take these facts into account and make some reductions as we go along, so that worthwhile programs can be maintained and paid for, and so the criteria that are applied will enable people all over the Nation to benefit.

The reduction encompassed by my amendment is from $400 to $325 million annually. I ask that the Senate agree to this reduction. I ask this as one who has been a cosponsor and a supporter—both in the committee and on the floor of the Senate—of the worthy bills to assist depressed areas and unemployed people. I am the only Republican who originally joined in sponsoring and introducing this bill in this Congress. Since the committee work on the bill, Senator FONG has given his sponsorship, and I believe that more than half of the Republican Senators will vote for the bill; but it is necessary that we do not authorize more than is actually needed.

I believe that this is a sensible amendment. I notice my friend, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], looking at me. I know that he will say, "We are giving the same kind of assistance to foreign countries." In answer I say I want to give this assistance to our own people and communities. I shall vote to reduce the foreign aid bill by the amount needed to do so.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would tell us, and accurately so, of the value of these projects. I agree with him.

I support the bill, but I believe that it is sensible for us to adhere as closely as possible to the request of the President, so that the money will be spent wisely.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I gather that the Senator's amendment has no relation whatever to any other title of the bill than public works.

Mr. COOPER. In no way at all.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the Senator a question about title II, while he is on his feet? I am deeply concerned about the section's continuing to provide loans for machinery and equipment.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. I know that was brought out in the hearings.

Mr. JAVITS. We in the great industrial States are concerned about the pirating of business; that is, the attraction to business which comes from liberal offers which can be an inducement to establish new plants in other States.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is directing attention to title II.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. We discussed this question quite thoroughly. As I remember, the old ARA did not permit loans for machinery except in cases of demonstrated need. It was argued by the Secretary that, unless the loan section included provision for machinery, certain projects might never come into operation. A second point discussed was that loans should not exceed the life of the machinery.

The committee unanimously accepted the policy previously adopted by ARA in this regard.

Has the Senator any particular thought as to the value or lack of it?

Mr. JAVITS. We had a colloquy the other day and have the implementation in the RECORD enjoining the Secretary to condemn and beware of pirating practices, and the section of the bill referred to was implemented; but I was interested in the substantive part relating to machinery and equipment. When I was on the Banking and Currency Committee I protested it. I sought to excise it from the bill. I think it is a rather dangerous point and requires great scrupulousness in its administration. I wanted the Senate to have some concept of the way in which the committee looked at it. I gather that the committee assumed that it would be used sparingly.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. I believe we had assurances from the Secretary that applications for funds for this purpose would be considered carefully, particularly in regard to the terms of these loans.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as may be required, which will not be long.

The Senator's amendment goes to title I. Now we are getting into a discussion of title II.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. McNAMARA. I wish to comment now on the amendment of the Senator to reduce the amount from $400 million to $325 million.

We believe that any reduction in the amount of money proposed to be authorized for public works grants in this bill would be a serious mistake. The Public Works Committee has looked long and hard at this subject, and believes that the $400 million authorization is the very minimum needed to accomplish the desired result.

Our examination indicated that there is a backlog of at least $250 million in projects that could not, because of exhaustion of funds, be financed under the APW program, but would meet the criteria of this bill. We expect that a similar total of new applications will be made in the next fiscal year. About $100 million in projects that are received next year should be processed to the point of approval during the coming year. That gives us a total of at least $350 million in viable projects.

In addition, the committee felt that there should be available an additional $50 million in reserve to help finance projects that may come in from areas hit suddenly by economic disaster because of plant closedowns, the removal of military establishments, or other causes.

The Senator from Kentucky discussed the testimony given by the Secretary of Commerce and the grants requested by the administration. His remarks were perfectly in order. However, there was a great deal of other testimony given before the committee that justifies the amount of $400 million, which the committee recommended in the bill.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who, I believe, has some thoughts on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the chairman of the Public Works Committee in giving me an opportunity to join in the refutation of the remarks on the amendment offered by our beloved colleague from Kentucky, who would cut the amount of the annual grant under the bill from $400 to $325 million, the so-called public works feature of the legislation coming before us now.

It is important for me to say this at the outset, because the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has indicated, at least by indirection, that the White House would be displeased if the Senate should vote $400 million, rather than $325 million that the Senator would like to have in the bill.

The White House will not veto this legislation if $400 million is included in title I over the period of 5 years for such a worthy purpose.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] has indicated the amount of accelerated public works projects which are now, in a sense, on the shelf, ready to be proceeded with, approval for which has been given and local financing having been arranged. I think the Senator has given a very conservative figure.

I like the presentation the Senator has made, but frankly, I desire to have incorporated in the RECORD the table which is found on page 44 of the hearings. I ask unanimous consent that the table, entitled, "Pending APW grant-in-aid applications in presently eligible redevelopment areas by States," be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Pending APW grant-in-aid applications in presently eligible redevelopment areas by State

State	Number of projects	Amount requested
Total	2,518	$467 858
Alabama	43	11,531
Alaska	27	8,467
Arizona	22	3,948
Arkansas	64	10,373
California	28	7,356
Colorado	14	1,408
Connecticut	6	1,777
Delaware	1	134
Florida	5	624
Georgia	73	13,894
Hawaii	2	99
Idaho	3	180
Illinois	93	17,324
Indiana	19	4,091
Iowa	7	499
Kansas	11	1,917
Kentucky	98	27,076
Louisiana	56	14,921
Maine	14	709
Maryland	12	2,844
Massachusetts	27	5,417
Michigan	102	16,565
Minnesota	76	14,833
Mississippi	64	8,690
Missouri	32	3,420
Montana	21	6,452
Nebraska	28	1,806
Nevada	----------	----------
New Hampshire	8	2,359
New Jersey	108	29,618
New Mexico	53	6,691
New York	62	16,805
North Carolina	21	5,667
North Dakota	4	553
Ohio	68	12,341
Oklahoma	54	7,329
Oregon	34	4,413
Pennsylvania	416	88,009
Rhode Island	13	7,298
South Carolina	35	4,795
South Dakota	40	3,680
Tennessee	68	15,103
Texas	62	15,314
Utah	27	2,927
Vermont	1	30
Virginia	18	3,031
Washington	22	3,337
West Virginia	116	22,153
Wisconsin	83	6,807
Wyoming	6	293
Guam	----------	----------
Puerto Rico	251	22,950
Virgin Islands	----------	----------

Mr. RANDOLPH. I wish to comment on the amount. It is not $250 million. It is $467,858,000. We realize that there is an attrition, and the chairman of the committee has set forth his views on this matter. But when we find that in the State of Kentucky there are applications pending for more than $27 million, we realize that those applications are valid applications. These are projects in Kentucky now that are ready to go, not a year from now, not 2 years from now, and not 3 years from now. They are ready to go now. They are necessary projects. They would strengthen the economy of the area. They would provide employment. They would build an economic base on which the community could develop business, industry, and its entire economy in the years ahead, as well as provide necessary employment.

With respect to the State of Michigan, so ably represented by the Senator who manages the bill, Michigan now has 102 projects ready to move, in the amount of $16,565,000.

Mr. President, I wish the Senate to realize that the $400 million in Federal grants under title I of the pending bill is not a figure arrived at out of thin air.

My beloved friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] himself set $325 million as a figure. We believe that in the figure of $400 million we are being conservative.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] who is now in the Chamber believes that it should be $1 billion a year.

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Alaska has introduced legislation looking toward that objective.

There are many Senators who, I believe, are of the conviction that $400 million is a conservative figure, that it is not a high figure—and I am one of those Senators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD under title 1, the report which was filed with S. 1648 which covers this provision of the pending legislation.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

TITLE I—PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

The purpose of this title is to increase the amount of Federal funds being expended both for general improvement of the physical structure of an area and for specific improvements related to projected economic development. The committee believes that one of the greatest handicaps of a community, area, or region can suffer when economically disadvantaged is the inability of its physical plant and public services to support existing industry, let alone new development.

"Indirect" as used in the language of this title in section 101, as well as in section 201 of title II, is meant to include those facilities which commercial and industrial development depend upon, but which are not necessarily related to a specific business enterprise.

For example, if a community has an inadequate sewage treatment plant it can hardly hope to induce industrial development which would further overload its disposal plant, thus creating a health and welfare problem.

This type of investment cannot adequately be measured in terms of jobs created. The purpose in this case is not the immediate employment gain, although that will be an additional benefit. The purpose is first to create public facilities that make a community attractive for economic growth, capable of supporting additional population, and of making the most of its natural and human resources.

The grants are not limited to traditional public works but are meant to include physical properties which will have a bearing on industrial and commerical development.

Examples of projects

Examples of projects which should be eligible for grants under section 101 (as well as loans under sec. 201) on the basis of being directly related to economic development are waterworks and waterlines, sanitary and storm sewers, industrial parks, police and fire stations, research centers, tourism facilities, industrial streets and roads, waste treatment facilities, area vocational schools, airports, and watershed protection and flood prevention. This list is not meant to be exhaustive nor to imply that grants applied for under these examples need be related to a specific industrial or commercial project. They are not limited to serving one new customer although that could be a possibility. Prospects for industrial and commercial development will more likely follow after these projects are undertaken.

Examples of facilities which if indirectly related to economic development could be eligible for grants under section 101 (and loans under sec. 201) are streets primarily related to residential development, water and sewage facilities related to residential development, hospitals, vocational education facilities, community centers, and in some circumstances libraries and similar buildings.

Use of funds

The committee wishes to emphasize that the funds provided under this title for grants-in-aid are not to be merely substituted for funds available under existing programs. It would be contrary to the intent of this act if other Federal agencies cut back the amount of funds which would have gone to designated areas if these additional funds were not available. The General Accounting Office ought to be concerned that the intent of Congress in this respect is carefully followed. The funds here are to be considered additional to those which a designated area might obtain under other programs.

This is a major reason for providing supplementary grants in this bill in addition to the direct grants available. It is an important feature in this program over and above previous programs, that supplementary grants may be made for projects receiving basic grants under this bill, as well as under other programs. Thus the Secretary can make grants up to 80 percent of the cost of a direct grant project in areas of greatest need. These supplementary grants are expected to be used for projects in designated areas without regard to any limitation of other laws, except that in no case will the Federal share be greater than 80 percent. Where supplementary grants are made to direct Federal projects, such projects must have been previously authorized. Direct Federal projects which can be useful include, but are not limited to, watershed and flood prevention, water storage, and land improvement.

The committee particularly notes the grants can cover the cost of related equipment and machinery in development facility projects as well as in industrial and commercial projects.

The funds authorized under this title should be used for projects in eligible areas even if those areas are in established development regions, but they should not be used only for projects with regionwide impact. The same is true for development districts within regions. Projects of value to one county, community, or a group of counties should not be denied because of regional assistance being given under another program.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there is every reason for the Senate to endorse the provisions of title I of the pending bill. I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be decisively defeated by the Senate, that the pending bill will be agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives, that it will go to the President of the United States, and he will sign it into law.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am in full accord with the statement the Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Public Works Committee has just made, which has been so well amplified by the Senator from West Virginia who has never ceased to work for this kind of legislation which will put the unemployed to work, and give the economy a substantial boost.

Whenever the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] rises on the floor, his words are entitled to the most respectful and sympathetic consideration. We all love and admire him. This happens to be one of the rare occasions when I find myself in disagreement with him. I must oppose his amendment to cut the annual public works appropriation in this bill from $400 to $325 million. As it is, the amount provided is far from sufficient. I find it particularly distressing that he, who has been the only Republican, according to his own statement, to endorse this measure, should spoil that beautiful and unique record by now moving a reduction in the amount to be authorized, which reduction is not quite so slight, because the reduction of the $75 million he proposes will be an annual reduction and will therefore go on through the years.

This is one of the most important pieces of legislation from the standpoint of the national economy that we could have. I have been fighting for the reenactment of public works legislation ever since I came to the Senate. It has demonstrated its value. It means that people will be put to work on useful projects, that the economy will be stimulated, not merely at the site of the project where it goes into operation but at the factory where the materials are produced and on the arteries of transportation in between. In Alaska particularly, this will be important, because it will affect so many of the depressed areas which need help, and all but one of Alaska's areas are depressed areas. This legislation will diminish the depression and the unemployment.

I hope that the amendment will fail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Alaska has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the biggest mistakes Congress made in recent years, in my opinion, is that it did not refresh and refinance the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962.

Under that act, speaking only for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, a great many projects were built costing many millions of dollars. This money was spent—and spent wisely—for essential public works. The increase in employment which was generated by that money is really startling. As soon as the accelerated public works bill ran out of money, we had a recurrence of unemployment in many of the areas of chronic and persistent unemployment in my State.

I believe that Republicans and Democrats alike in Pennsylvania will testify today to the great economic benefit which was brought to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by the passage and administration of the Accelerated Public Works Act.

I was very much disappointed when, in this year's budget, there was not, to my way of thinking, adequate refinancing and refurbishing of the accelerated public works principle.

The Senator from Michigan, the Senator from West Virginia, a number of other Senators and I were of the view that we should at least reduce the program to the same amount as before; namely, $1 billion plus.

I was vastly disappointed when that was not done. I testified before the subcommittee of which the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] was chairman, and with my enthusiastic support it increased the amount of the authorization for public works from $250 million to $400 million. I believe that that increase was modest. I had hoped that the amount authorized would be substantially more, but he and I realize the practical, pragmatic situation under which we are operating, and it seemed unwise to go further than we had. We were also acutely aware of the fact that all of the State of West Virginia is in Appalachia, as well as much of the State of Kentucky. It seems to me incredible that Senators coming from States where the benefits of the war against poverty are so badly needed, where the Appalachia program is making some dent in the war against poverty, where the major part of the public works program in Appalachia is for highways, would not join unanimously in supporting the increase in the appropriation for public works in this particular bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky, but the Senator must do so on his own time.

Mr. COOPER. That is satisfactory.

Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. I joined the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia in supporting and sponsoring these related programs, the area redevelopment program, the accelerated public works program, the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Appalachia development bill; but I have submitted this amendment for two reasons. One is that it would cut back the authorization to one-half of the increase which was made over the President's recommendation of $250 million. Second, I am aware of what Congress, and the Senate in particular, has done in passing the great bills which have helped my State; namely, the accelerated public works program, the Area Redevelopment Act, and the Appalachia Development Act.

I believe that we cannot overdo it. We just cannot expect that the country will continue to provide ever larger amounts before full needs and uses are shown and proved. I believe that we must keep these programs within some kind of reasonable limit—and the most reasonable limit wherever possible. I have proposed a very reasonable limit; namely, one-half the increase made by the committee beyond the request submitted by the President.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Kentucky is one of the ablest members of this body. I respect him in every way. I honor his integrity and ability. In this particular case, however, I believe that he is dead wrong.

This is not an extravagant and unnecessary increase in a vitally needed program. The provision as it now appears in the bill falls far short of the requirements for assistance in a number of States, which come under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 10 seconds to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph].

Mr. RANDOLPH. In the State of Pennsylvania, there are 416 projects at a cost of $88 million which are now eligible and ready to move. The able Senator from Pennsylvania knows that this is the situation in all States in the Union. I congratulate him on his vigorous espousal of this moderate increase in the pending bill.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his helpful interest.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO VOTE ON COOPER AMENDMENT AT 4:45 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield me one-half minute?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Cooper amendment take place at 4:45 o'clock p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How is the time to be allotted for further debate on the amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Whichever ways Senators wish to use it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Kentucky has stated that he has supported all these programs. He has been so preeminent in that support that I did not wish to add my own voice at the point when he was speaking, although it is a fact that I have, on this side of the aisle, also supported these programs, both in committee, when I was a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and on the floor of the Senate.

I am known, and proud to be known, as a liberal, anxious to have my State, which pays the most taxes of all the States, support the well-being of the country, notwithstanding the fact that it is often said, in answer to my votes that New York pays $3 for every dollar that it gets back. As long as I am a Member of the Senate that will never be a factor in determining my vote.

However, I appreciate and am ready to support conservation where conservation is appropriate in terms of these projects. When the President of the United States requests $250 million, and the amount is raised by the committee to $400 million, I expect eventually to hear facts stated that will support the increase.

The Senator from Kentucky, a strong supporter of the bill, proposes to cut the increase by 50 percent, on the theory that it is necessary to have a good reason to raise the figure by $150 million, and that in the absence of such a good reason the least that can be done is to cut the increase by one-half. If one is to be a liberal, he must be a hardheaded liberal. Therefore, I am glad to support the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, when the Senator from New York speaks of facts as an essential element in deciding the issue which has been raised by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, I would say that both the Senator from Kentucky and the other members of the committee felt that they had a sound factual basis for their conclusions.

Secretary Connor, when he testified before the committee, advised us that more than $700 million worth of APW applications were pending when that program ran out. The Secretary has screened the applications, and has reduced the amount to a possible $450 million, or a little more than that which might be eligible for assistance under the pending bill, if it is enacted.

The $250 million figure obviously falls short of that figure. We recognize that the $250 million called for in S. 1648 would be an annual figure, running for the life of the authorization, and that the $450 million figure is also an annual figure running for the life of the authorization.

I believe that in addition to the points which have been made, it should be pointed out that the $450 million in APW applications will have a running start on whatever figure Congress approves for this bill. If it is the $250 million figure, the projects which can be justified on the basis of needs developed since the APW program terminated will have to fall behind and run behind the projects that are pending in the APW file. It has seemed to us that this would militate against the many areas of the country which have developed needs since that program terminated, and would militate against smaller communities and smaller towns which are not in a position to develop projects as rapidly as more sophisticated planning departments are able to do in the larger communities.

For that reason, in addition to the others that have been advanced by the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from West Virginia, we felt we were justified in increasing the figure to $400 million.

Mr. COOPER. To respond to that argument, I should like to ask that the analysis of the APW backlog, submitted to the Committee on Public Works by Secretary Connor, shown at page 45 of the hearings, be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE APW BACKLOG

From areas eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act on April 15, 1965—excluding the "labor surplus areas" eligible only under the Public Works Acceleration Act—the Community Facilities Administration of HHFA and the Public Health Service of DHEW had on hand 2,518 applications requesting $468 million in APW grants.

However, these figures have only very limited significance as a measure of the potential demand for grants under section 101 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act for the following reasons:

(1) The principal purpose of the APW program was to create jobs, and projects had only to fulfill an essential public need, not necessarily related to economic development. Under the new act, each project must tend to improve either directly or indirectly the opportunity for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities, or assist otherwise in the creation of additional long-term employment opportunities, or primarily benefit the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families or otherwise substantially further the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965.

(2) While apparently eligible under the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act, many of the pending APW applications clearly do not meet the requirements of the new act. For instance, the total includes 368 grant requests for courthouses, townhalls, and the like, amounting to $61 million, and 51 grant requests for hospitals and other health facilities amounting to $29 million, most of which do not meet the new requirements.

(3) Many of the pending APW applications date back to 1962 and 1963, and we do not know how many of these projects have been built in the meantime.

(4) Among the 624 grant requests for water and sewer facilities and other utilities amounting to $129 million, there appears to be a preponderance of projects which may not meet the test of contributing to economic development, and the same appears to be true of the 573 grant requests for streets and roads, amounting to $92 million.

Conservatively estimated, no more than one-third of the APW "backlog," or about $150 million in grant requests, will be eligible under the new act.

On the other hand, the flow of new applications under the Public Works Acceleration Act was drastically reduced in the spring of 1963, when both CFA and DHEW announced that APW funds were already oversubscribed. A large influx of new applications which would be eligible under the new act may, therefore, be anticipated as soon as the new law is passed.

Mr. COOPER. This analysis was prepared by the Secretary of Commerce. It states:

> Conservatively estimated, no more than one-third of the APW "backlog," or about $150 million in grant requests, will be eligible under the new act.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the words are "conservatively estimated." Whatever figure is used to settle down that $450 million figure will be an estimate. His guess may be better than mine, and his guess may be more conservative than mine. Whatever the size of the backlog, it gives a running start for communities which have applications on file, and militates against communities which do not have applications on file, even though their need might be greater.

I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

MINNESOTA AND THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to speak in support of S. 1648, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. I welcome the opportunity because this legislation represents a sound approach to the problems of labor surplus and economic decline in many areas of the Nation. It extends and improves the important features of the area redevelopment program, the accelerated public works program, and the Appalachian redevelopment experience. It proposes to deal with underdevelopment by a concerted regional and areawide attack, grouping distressed areas together to form economically viable development districts.

Those of us who have worked closely with the ARA and the accelerated public works in the past will recognize in the new bill many substantive and technical improvements which will make these programs more effective and more suited to the task of mobilizing our economic resources.

The greatest promise of America has always been the unqualified assurance of equal opportunity for all people regardless of their background or circumstances. We have made it a fundamental principle that every American be afforded the chance to build a full life for himself and his family. Today in America there are a wide range of programs and projects to guarantee that no one is denied this chance because of race, because of a lack of education, or because of the poverty of his birth.

But today opportunity is closed to many of our fellow Americans because of the economic decline of the area in which they live. In such distressed areas, which spread throughout the country, young people leave school early to help their families and thus rob themselves of the skills and knowledge needed for a full and rich life. The same young people leave the area entirely, stripping it of the youth and vigor necessary to fight its economic problems. These circumstances lead to blocked progress and further decline.

We simply cannot afford to waste our human and natural resources. Loss of economic power stunts national growth and inhibits our position as the leading nation in the world community.

Most of all, we cannot sit contentedly by and allow millions of Americans to be foreclosed from the fulfillment of hope that the rest of us share. This would deny the American promise I spoke of earlier—the unqualified assurance of equal opportunity for all.

I am most happy that the bill specifically provides for relief and assistance to those living in substandard and poverty conditions on Indian reservations in the United States. This bill recognizes that the great majority of these areas are among the most critical in the United States in terms of labor surplus, economic distress, and poverty.

As former attorney general of Minnesota and one who has long been interested in Indian affairs as well as the problem of economic development in economically distressed areas, I myself was shocked by a recent review of the economic conditions of our own Indians.

In the State of Minnesota there are entire communities, not just isolated families, living on Indian reservations in poverty and in destitution. The median family income of the Indians on Leech Lake, White Earth, and Nett Lake Reservations is under $1,000 a year, which, as I understand it, Mr. President, is less than one-third of the minimum which our Government has ascribed as the poverty line and poverty level.

The unemployment rate on Leech Lake ranges from 40 to 80 percent depending upon the time of the year. At Nett Lake the average rate is 69 percent, at White Earth 60 percent, at Red Lake 47 percent.

Ninety percent of the Indians at Leech Lake live in substandard housing, and 70 to 100 percent of the children drop out of the public schools in the area before graduating from the 12th grade.

I do not believe there is any other area in the country or any other people in the country that could mark a higher rate of dropout than that.

This is, I think, a pathetic circumstance of incalculable proportions in the midst of the richest nation in the world. I would like to see an attempt in Minnesota to harness experienced, retired managerial talent, making them available for an extended period of time to work with those on Indian reservations and train them in management and development skills.

I think our businessmen would find such a project exciting, if we could say to them, "You are now retired at the age of 65. You are in good health. Why do you not help us put together an industry that will provide employment, diversification, and give these people a chance to get started?"

The bill does make it abundantly clear that technical and management assistance will be made available to local development areas. Many of these areas lack the technical skills and know-how to attack their problems in an efficient and practical fashion. The technical assistance the Secretary is authorized to provide to redevelopment areas includes project planning and feasibility studies, management and operational assistance, and studies evaluating the needs of and developing potentialities for economic growth of such areas. This section will provide local areas with assistance in developing their staff, their action programs, and liaison with Federal and other agencies that will be needed to further their progress under this act. It will assist them in understanding what the economic potential of their area is. It will help them pinpoint methods by which they might harness the economic resources they possess.

In this connection, the bill will allow the Secretary to provide such technical and managerial assistance through experienced retired managerial talent. It seems to me a terrible waste to have hundreds of top executive personnel, who have spent their whole lives in the unique and rewarding experience of entrepreneurial ventures, who have behind them skills and talents to assemble capital, to development of management systems, to train and assemble what is necessary to make an enterprise work not being fully used by our society.

I might add at that point that many leading executives in Minnesota who have reached retirement age have come to me and said, "Now, what do I do? I am in good health. I should like to help in some fashion. Is there some area in which I can contribute my talents and time?"

I believe that one of the most exciting features of the Economic Development Act of 1965 is the provision to use those talents where they are most needed.

In addition, I was most happy to see included in the bill language to insure that eligible areas will not lose designation or have their eligibility removed in cases where economic growth may be short term or where the growth is primarily the result of increased temporary employment. In many areas, an influx of construction labor, with a corresponding rise of employment, will cause a rise in unemployment statistics which is purely temporary and passing. Once the construction workers leave, affected areas would have to wait 3 years for renewed eligibility, and many of the good effects of the Federal programs would be lost in the intervening period. This amendment would allow a sufficient period of time during which it could be demonstrated with some assurance that the expansive effects in certain areas were not merely temporary.

I see this amendment as one of the keys to the success of the program in the State of Minnesota and in many other regions across the Nation.

I had specifically in mind the problem with which we are confronted in northeastern Minnesota, in the heart of Minnesota's traditional Iron Range. There we are experiencing the beginning of a taconite development which stretches across that range. Approximately five persons will be engaged in construction labor for every one person who is finally employed in the taconite mines once the industry is in full operation. There will be several thousand construction laborers and workers in related construction work on the range during the next few years, and that fact would probably make St. Louis County and Itasca County technically ineligible under the ARA. But once the plants were in full operation, I believe the statistics would reflect that those counties would once again be eligible.

What the amendment, incorporated in the bill, would provide is that those counties might continue to be eligible during that period, recognizing the temporary nature of the employment.

Many Senators must share in the praise for the drafting and work on this good bill. As a member of the Banking and Currency Subcommittee which considered titles II and IV of this legislation, I think that my chairman, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] and the other members of the subcommittee, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] are to be commended and congratulated on the fine result of their work. I also thank the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] for his excellent work in preparing this bill in the Public Works Committee. I was most happy to have had the opportunity to play a role in drafting this legislation.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has 2 minutes remaining on the amendment. Does he yield 3 minutes on the bill also?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. I yield the necessary time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I wish to urge my colleagues to support the bill before the Senate, S. 1648, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The citizens of Portsmouth, N.H., and the Maine-New Hampshire seacoast area, as well as the citizens of other communities which are about to be hit by the loss of major sources of employment, will all share my appreciation for the action of the Senate Committee on Public Works in retaining, and indeed, strengthening, the language of my bill, S. 400, which would have amended the Area Redevelopment Act.

I would like to express my own sincere thanks to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], and my neighbor from Maine [Mr. Muskie], for their assistance and contributions toward the best possible legislation for the problems facing Portsmouth.

What section 401(a)(4) does is to provide the full assistance of the Federal Government earmarked for redevelopment areas for communities such as Portsmouth which are threatened with severe unemployment because of the planned, future loss of a major source of employment. In the case of Portsmouth and the seacoast area, such a threat has been posed by the statements of the Department of Defense that the workload at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard will undergo a severe drop by 1968.

The testimony before the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency clearly brought out the seacoast region's need for this type of assistance.

Mr. President, again I urge my colleagues to support the pending bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 minutes?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] to my statement, which will be brief. At the end of it I expect to ask a question.

First, I shall support the bill. I believe that we should have good, strong, permanent legislation in the field of public works. We might call it made-work, or whatever we will. The program is necessary particularly in view of the fact that a great many areas are so depleted financially and their resources are so thin that they cannot modernize, if we might use that term, fast enough to get into the running and thereby support a viable economy at the present time. With a little lift they could get over that barrier.

As the Senator from Michigan knows, title IV establishes the basic standards for designation of redevelopment areas under the pending bill. The two primary criteria are that an area first, must have an unemployment rate in excess of the national average; or second, have a family median income not in excess of 40 percent of the national family median income. I am aware that these criteria were drawn purposefully to be more restrictive than the standards which were established by the Area Redevelopment Act and the Accelerated Public Works Act. In addition they are concerned with economic factors rather than labor surplus standards.

Although I agree that the standards under this bill should be more restrictive than those of previous acts, I question the particular standards set up in title IV.

Under the operation of the bill, 20 counties in my State would not be able to qualify. Some of those counties have a relatively thin economic status and standing.

As will be recalled, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 adopted the standard that a family whose annual income was less than $3,000 should be classified as a poverty stricken family. Nationwide, 21.4 percent of all families had an income of less than $3,000. The average for the State of Mississippi, however, was 51.1 percent of all families, and every county in the State exceeded the national average of 21.4 percent. Therefore, all of the 20 counties excluded under this bill exceed the national average for families with less than $3,000. For example, in Prentiss County 62.1 percent of all families have less than $3,000 income; in all of the 20 counties except one, the percent of families having less than $3,000 exceeds 30 percent. So it is clear that 19 of these 20 counties far exceed the national average for poverty standards as adopted last year when Congress passed the antipoverty bill. In view of these facts I believe it would be well to consider modifying the standards.

I shall not offer an amendment, because this is a complicated subject to deal with, and needs the benefit of the consideration of Senators who are members of the committee and of their experts. I hope that as the bill progresses through Congress, those handling it on the part of the Senate will consider the additional facts that the debate has brought out, to see if some standard could be adopted which would protect the

bill and its sound provisions, and at the same time make it possible for some of the counties which are situated as I have described to be included.

If we amend title IV, for example, to make counties eligible if their family income did not exceed 50 percent of the national family median or 53 percent, which equals the $3,000 standard of the poverty bill, 7 of these 20 counties in Mississippi which are now excluded would be eligible. These counties are Union, Prentiss, Tishomingo, Scott, Itawamba, Wayne, and Alcorn. I believe these are counties of great need and should not be excluded from participation in the benefits of this program. With only a small variation in the formula, I believe those counties could qualify for participation in the program.

I should like to ask the Senator from Maine what his interest would be in a certain situation. I do not ask him to give a binding promise at this stage of the debate.

Mr. MUSKIE. It is conceivable that a policy could develop in the direction which the Senator from Mississippi has suggested. The 40-percent-of-national-median-income test was written into the bill because the criteria in the Area Redevelopment Act were unsatisfactory with respect to rural areas—that is, areas as to which no labor statistics and unemployment figures were available. The Area Redevelopment Administration developed some ad hoc standards, which were regularized by its regulations. They were useful and helpful in spreading the benefits of programs into areas such as the Senator from Mississippi describes. Out of this experience was developed the criterion of 40 percent of national median income.

As experience develops under the proposed act, I would not be at all surprised if the agency and the committees of Congress found that, in all justice, this standard should be broadened so as to cover the areas with which the Senator from Mississippi is concerned.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Maine for his fine sentiment along that line. The situation I have described could exist because of the lack of more accurate statistics as to the percentage of persons who are actually employed.

I hope that as the bill progresses through Congress, the Senator from Maine will be friendly to the idea that the criterion should be changed and the formula modified to the extent of perhaps being more accurate, so as to include countries that are near the borderline of the formula.

Mr. MUSKIE. We shall certainly take a good look at the situation to see if the formula should be modified. I thank the Senator for his support and for his eloquent expression of the philosophy of the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Maine. I appreciate the excellent work that he and other Senators are doing in this field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table of the counties of Mississippi that are excluded, their population, and the percentage of families having less than $3,000 annual income.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Counties excluded	Population	Percentage of families with less than $3,000 annual income
Alcorn	25,282	54.0
Tishomingo	13,889	61.0
Prentiss	17,949	62.1
Union	18,904	60.3
Lee	40,589	43.8
Itawamba	15,080	55.9
Monroe	33,953	50.0
Lowndes	46,639	42.8
Lauderdale	67,119	39.7
Scott	21,187	61.4
Rankin	34,322	40.4
Hinds	187,045	30.9
Adams	38,730	39.8
Wayne	16,258	54.4
Lamar	13,675	47.6
Forest	52,722	37.0
Pearl River	22,411	44.3
Stone	7,013	49.1
Harrison	119,489	42.1
Jackson	55,522	23.6
Total	846,778	

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a number of questions have been asked concerning the operations of the three programs. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table entitled "Comparison of Industrial Commercial Loan Programs," which consists of a comparison of provisions of the bill in nine categories.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of industrial and commercial loan programs

Item	ARA	EDA	SBA, 7(a) loans
1. Limits on individual loan amount	None	None	$350,000.
2. Limits on Federal participation	65 percent	65 percent	100 percent direct loans; 90 percent guarantees or participation.
3. Limits on term	25 years	25 years	10 years.
4. Rate of interest	Established with Treasury at 4 percent.	Cost to Treasury plus at Secretary's option, amounts to cover other costs. Estimate 1966, 4⅛ percent.	Same as ARA in ARA areas; otherwise maximum 5½ percent.
5. Security required	Reasonable assurance of repayment. Can go to 2d position.	Reasonable assurance of repayment. Can go to 2d position.	"Of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure repayment." Stricter collateral requirements than ARA.
6. Working capital loans	None	Guarantee up to 90 percent of outstanding balance.	No restriction.
7. Funds available	Not to exceed $200,000,000 in loans outstanding.	Annual appropriation for all loans and guarantees $170,000,000 annually.	Not to exceed $1,325,000,000 outstanding, including Poverty Act and disaster loans. Approximately $250,000,000 unused authority will remain as of June 30, 1965.
8. Restrictions	1. Applicants approved by instrumentality of State, or subdivision thereof concerned with problems of economic development. 2. Provide more than temporary alleviation of unemployment. 3. Not available for relocation. 4. Financing must not be otherwise available.		Also required to make guaranteed loans first if possible.
9. Additional loan authority	Public facility loans	Public facility loans	(a) Disaster loans, 3 percent, 20 years, no limit. (b) Poverty program. $25,000, interest provision same as Economic Development Act. 15 years, "reasonable assurance of repayment." (c) Investment company 50 percent or $4,000,000, whichever less. (d) State and local development company for reloaning to small business. 25-year term (secs. 501 and 502). (e) Small business investment company purchase of debentures on matching basis up to $200,000.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I support S. 1648, which is a very far-reaching bill and perhaps one of the most significant pieces of proposed legislation to come before Congress thus far. It involves economic development; but more, it puts the approving stamp of Congress on planning. This is important. Planning at the regional level; planning at the multicounty level; and planning at the local level. As in the case of the Appalachia legislation, it looks to sound programs of public improvements geared to stimulating permanent industrial growth and permanent employment.

S. 1648 recognizes that there are areas other than Appalachia which have not shared in the general level of our prosperity and seriously need resource development through Federal assistance. This is the philosophy that was shared by many of us at the time of the debate on the Appalachia bill. As Senators will remember, it was because such a piece of legislation was promised by the administration to cover national needs that we held off in expanding the Appalachia program to include our other needy areas. S. 1648 seeks to fulfill the promise and to expand the policy of regional rehabilitation.

I wish to compliment the Senators and other Members of Congress who have worked diligently and persistently to develop the concept of regional development for other areas of our Nation, and who have worked hard on the particular bill before us. My particular gratitude goes to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] who have done an outstanding job in guiding this legislation in committee and on the floor.

S. 1648 is an excellent bill. It provides for the establishment of regional commissions to study the needs of our less developed areas, and come up with broad economic recommendations and programs which can be applied above and beyond existing Federal assistance.

It combines the better features of the area redevelopment and accelerated public works programs, placing primary emphasis on public improvements that will foster and expand industry.

It recognizes the importance of the role that the healthier communities must play in assisting the less fortunate areas. The opportunity is provided for multicounty economic development districts which could bring together eligible and noneligible areas under special regional and subregional plans for growth. This type of economic, multicounty planning is already underway in my State. The planning and technical assistance money provided in the bill will give these larger areas a good opportunity to work out coordinated programs.

The key to this new legislation is coordination; among the communities; among the States; and between the States and the Federal Government. The goal of the legislation is to apply the assistance to those areas and projects where it will do the most good for the long haul. This is a public works bill with a plan; it signifies an excellent approach for the future. I sincerely urge its passage.

Last March, I made a special address to the Massachusetts Legislature citing the crucial need for a coordinated regional development program for New England, and for a regional commission to implement this program. The response which I received to this suggestion at that time was particularly encouraging. Today I am extremely gratified to announce that the Massachusetts House and Senate have adopted a joint resolution fully supporting S. 1648 and the concept of a New England regional commission.

The joint resolution emphasizes that the economic status of New England more than qualifies the region for assistance provided under S. 1648, and it supports the principal that regional planning will be effective and beneficial in coping with our economic problems.

Mr. President, I think this expression of approval from the Massachusetts Legislature is a splendid example of the way many sections of the country feel about this economic development bill, and I would hope that other States in New England, and in other areas, would follow the lead of Massachusetts in offering State legislative support for this important legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Massachusetts joint resolution be placed at this point in the Record.

The formal presentation of this resolution was made in the Record earlier today.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing Federal grants and assistance to economically distressed areas and regions

Whereas the Congress of the United States has recently launched an attack on certain areas of poverty, undevelopment, and underdevelopment by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; and

Whereas there are pending before the Congress of the United States two bills, cosponsored by Senator Edward M. Kennedy, one providing grants for public works and development facilities and other financial assistance to alleviate unemployment in other economically distressed areas and regions (S. 1648) and one providing for the use of public works and other economic programs in a coordinated effort to aid other economically disadvantaged areas of the Nation (S. 812); and

Whereas said bills provide for the creation of regional commissions to plan and implement economic programs, designed to foster regional productivity, and growth; and

Whereas such a regional commission for New England would be extremely effective and beneficial in coping with serious economic problems which transcend State boundaries, and which require Federal assistance founded on sound planning and directed to projects that will enhance long-term growth; and

Whereas at a joint session of the General Court of Massachusetts on March 9, 1965, Senator Kennedy expressed his hope that the general court authorize participation in a New England Regional Commission which would work for regional development and cooperation, and his intention to sponsor major legislation in the U.S. Senate to provide Federal assistance for development of the New England region; and

Whereas said legislation is vital to the New England region whose economic status more than qualifies it for the assistance provided by said legislation, because of many critical problems, the more pressing of which are caused by the closing of military installations, slack growth, deficient transportation becoming more critical each day, inadequate water pollution control, high electric power costs, a declining fishing industry, undeveloped natural resources, and unemployment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact Senate bill 1648 and Senate bill 812, thereby providing for strong, effective regional development commissions to coordinate an attack on the varied regional problems; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts recognizes the importance of regional planning in connection with such legislation, and looks with favor upon the participation by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in a New England regional development commission; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, at the hearings before the Public Works Committee, members of the New England senatorial delegation and representatives from industry, labor, and the Governors of our various States made a comprehensive presentation in support of S. 1648 and S. 812. There was bipartisan support, and it was strong support.

Mr. President, this regional approach to solving economic problems was very much a part of President Kennedy's thinking. As a Senator, he devoted his first speeches on this floor to outlining New England problems, and calling for a multistate approach to solving them. He sought the united efforts of the entire New England congressional delegation. He supported the idea of New England Governors' conferences, he backed the New England Council, representing businessmen, all with the conviction that the way to get New England moving forward again was to plan, and coordinate, and organize, and work hard. Above all, he believed that New England's development would be best obtained by regional planning and sound Federal-State programs.

S. 1648, then, in large part, reflects the President's hope for the future.

Mr. President, I think it would be very helpful if excerpts of certain statements and materials were placed in the Record which would provide a picture of our New England situation, and the strong support this bill has received in our New England area. I ask unanimous consent that these be printed following my remarks.

Thank you very much.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement Delivered by Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, in Support of the Public Works and Economic Development Bill (S. 1648) and the Need for Such Legislation in the New England Regional Area, Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to appear before the committee this morning and express my support for the administration's economic development bill. As the chairman well knows, many of us were seriously concerned during the Appalachia debate that other areas of the country, also lagging in economic growth, should have the opportunity to develop regional programs similar to Appalachia. In fact, we were prepared to introduce our own region amendments to the Appalachian legislation, but held off on this after assurances from the administration that we would be covered in a forthcoming national development bill.

This we now have before us in S. 1648. One of its most important provisions concerns the creation of regional commissions to plan and implement long-range economic programs. For some time, I have urged that the establishment of such a commission for New England would be extremely effective and beneficial. The administration has wisely chosen to extend the Appalachia approach of regional programing to other problem areas. In my opinion, this is one of the most significant new steps in economic development legislation to come forward in many years.

I would suggest that the committee seriously consider integrating the language of S. 812 into the administration bill. S. 812, of which I am a cosponsor, was introduced by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], whose knowledge and experience in this field is of the highest caliber. I feel that this language would provide more effective guidelines and greater flexibility in the selection of regional commissions; a stronger incentive for such commissions to come to the administration and to Congress with a development program as soon as possible; and a more specific description of the membership of the regional commissions and of the power of the Federal member in approving commission plans.

In addition to providing for regional development commissions, S. 1648 provides for continuation of the better features of area redevelopment and accelerated public works assistance, on a more flexible basis with greater emphasis on planning for permanent industrial development rather than the mere creation of temporary employment. This assistance would be available as soon as money is appropriated, and for the most part, would not have to wait for long-range programs to be developed by the commission. Continuing ARA and APW type of funding to assist existing redevelopment areas is of crucial importance. My only major concern here is that the annual money authorized for public works and development facility grants is too modest and thus should be increased substantially in order to develop a truly meaningful growth program.

S. 1648 has two other features which I like very much and which I feel will be helpful in implementing long-range growth programs. One involves the recognition of economic development centers which although not distressed, would still be eligible for development assistance if the projects would contribute to the alleviation of high unemployment and low income in surrounding areas. The other concerns the creation of multicounty economic development districts which would bring together eligible and noneligible areas under a kind of subregional development plan and program.

This type of coordinated area attack on unemployment could be extremely effective in the Lowell-Lawrence-Haverhill area of Massachusetts, and in the Fall River-New Bedford-Providence area.

Of particular importance to my State, and to New England, is the new provision for Federal assistance to those areas or military installation closings, or other economic emergencies.

Throughout the bill, there is the basic philosophy that Federal assistance shall be concentrated in accord with sound planning, and directed to projects which will enhance long-term growth. With this kind of assistance, and with the additional funding which I hope will come from a New England regional program developed by its commission, we have substantial reason to be encouraged and hopeful.

New England's present economic status more than qualifies it for the assistance provided in the pending legislation.

It is a six-State area, with economic and cultural ties, separated from surrounding regions by its geographical location and its topography. There is probably no more precise version of an economic region existing in the United States today than New England. We have traditionally shared markets, employment, transportation, financial investment, education and other resources. In size, the region covers only 2.2 percent of the country's area, yet it has almost 6 percent of U.S. population, and much of this is concentrated in its three smallest States. Because it is a small but distinct area, its problems transcend local and State boundaries, and it is constantly in search of regional solutions.

Recognizing this, our New England Governors recently proposed a six-State regional planning compact to deal with major New England problems. This cooperative effort on the part of our Governors, will be enhanced and strengthened by the creation of a New England Regional Commission adding the Federal Government as a partner to our regional efforts to solve problems and stimulate economic growth.

Details on New England's present economic condition will be set forth in exhibits and analyses which have been prepared by the Library of Congress, the Department of Commerce, State agencies, the New England Council and others. These materials will be submitted for the record during our presentation. From this economic information, I should like to make some important general observations.

New England is a region which is increasingly lagging behind the Nation's level of growth. Unlike Appalachia, we were once prosperous and productive, with a high level of employment in manufacturing and agriculture. As the Nation expanded, our mills moved elsewhere, our farming declined, and there was not sufficient diversification of industry to take up the slack.

As a result, New England's increase in personal income is below the national average. Except for Massachusetts and Connecticut, its per capita personal income is considerably less than the national figure. Serious pockets of poverty are prevalent in its northern rural areas and in older industrial centers of southern New England. Unfortunately, aggregate statistics cannot tell the true story, because the metropolitan Boston area and southern areas of Connecticut with heavy populations are doing rather well, while many other parts of New England are falling far behind.

The most important single source of personal income in New England has been manufacturing. It has provided a base for the trade and the service industries. It has developed a splendid force of skilled and semiskilled industrial workers. However, during the past 15 years, industrial employment in New England has fallen off by over 250,000. Most of this decline has come from losses of textile, shoe, furniture, jewelry, and other traditional industries which were concentrated in relatively few urban centers. For many, the impact has been catastrophic with substantial unemployment continuing for many years despite efforts to bring in new industry. Almost half of New England's labor markets are in this category.

Other factors contribute to New England's economic distress. The region ranks close to the last in new buildings for trade and industry. Many of the old edifices which housed the production of a great industrial era now stand dilapidated and in some instances, unusable. New industry is not attracted to old environments. Existing industry lacks the incentive for expansion when cities and towns cannot provide modern public improvements. Much private housing, schools, and municipal buildings are of ancient vintage. All of these factors discourage new industry from moving into our labor depressed centers.

We need a major redevelopment effort through Federal assistance to provide the opportunity for more and diversified industrial activity, and the development of our human and material resources.

However, apart from its economic distress, New England has a number of immediate problems which need to be solved through regional cooperation and planning.

We have a crisis in transportation. Our major railroads are in or near bankruptcy and need complete rehabilitation. We are at this moment faced with the discontinuance of all intercity passenger service, and the possibility of substantial abandonment of freight service which could ruin forever industrial development in hundreds of potential growth centers in New England. Our only major airline is fighting for its life in the courts. It needs permanent status as a trunkline carrier, major financing for new equipment; and better airports with electronic guidance equipment. Air service from New England to eastern cities is suffering under this situation. Efficient air service is a necessary part of economic improvement.

High-speed expressways are needed to open up the resources of northern New England. The Port of Boston is not being adequately utilized. Many urban centers need new and larger warehousing and handling facilities for integration of truck, rail, and air freight services.

All these things call for a regional program of coordination and assistance to develop a fast, efficient transportation network between New England centers, and to markets outside the New England region. Industry cannot grow without efficient transportation.

New England has an abundance of water—for human consumption, for industry, for power. Yet water is one of its major problems. Sewage and industrial wastes make much of this resource unusable and a peril to recreation, fishing, and industrial development.

Water collection and distribution systems are inadequate. Many urban areas increasing their demands for clean water will be faced with serious shortages. Again, we need a regional program, substantially financed, for both pollution control, and water distribution and conservation.

New England is the highest cost electric power area in the Nation. Its consumers and industries pay almost 30 percent more than the national average. While other regions of the Nation have benefited from billions of dollars of Federal funds, for hydropower complexes, no major facility of this nature has been constructed in New England. Nor do we have any substantial program for buying power from other regions. Instead we rely on small and scattered power systems which must import various fuels from long distances at increased expense. This is another example of the need for a regional plan to coordinate our existing capacity, and to prepare major projects to meet the demand that lies ahead. Cheap and abundant electric power is fundamental to any regional economic development program.

New England has natural resources which have not been adequately utilized. Perhaps it has been our preoccupation with manufacturing that has diverted our attention away from this. We have more of our land area covered by forests than does any other region in the United States. This area is a natural for extensive recreational and housing development for middle and lower income families. At the same time, through modern methods of forestry and transportation, commercial use of this resource can be expanded. Since the early settling of New England, commercial enterprise has looked to the coastal areas and to the sea for profit.

For many reasons, our fishing industry has been allowed to decline, when in fact it should have moved to keep pace with other regions of the United States and foreign countries. This decline has contributed substantially to unemployment in Massachusetts, and other States. The Continental Shelf and coastal regions abound in fish, shellfish, minerals, and other resources. Science has provided us with the technology and know-how to modernize our fishing fleet and its marketing methods, and to begin industrial development of our offshore resources. We need now the program and the initiative to move ahead. This, too, is a regional responsibility.

Other problems concern our human resources. New England's severe unemployment situation in areas which had long been dependent on a single industry points up the need for an accelerated program of vocational education and manpower retraining. This is particularly necessary where the industry we are attracting have job opportunities primarily in the skilled categories. Our special need here is for regionally located vocational schools, training institutes, and community colleges, closely integrated with local industrial development programs. New England can benefit greatly from a computerized assessment of its job opportunities leading to regional and subregional placement programs.

Boston is one of the world's most prominent medical centers, yet the rest of New England suffers substantially from the lack of modern hospitals, medical schools, and nursing care facilities. This creates a special problem because our region has one of the highest percentages of citizens over 65, which will need increasing care in advancing years. Many of these older people are in the low-income category. We will have to develop a network of regional medical complexes, combining the latest in psychiatric, medical and surgical care, and providing special inexpensive diagnostic services. Our State universities must be encouraged to develop medical schools and training centers at these complexes. Extensive centers for aging, nursing care facilities, should be constructed in each of our population centers.

A substantial financial investment is needed with respect to our human resources. A community which cooperates with industry, trains and places its workers, provides top medical care, and looks out for the aging, is a community which is bound to grow. It is attractive to industry, and to the professions which will give it leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken the time to explain some of New England's problems in order to place in perspective the importance of regional planning contemplated by S. 1648, and the great need for substantial Federal assistance to stimulate economic activity in our area.

In many ways we are different from Appalachia. We once had economic success, but now we are slipping behind the Nation, unable to offset fast enough the severe employment losses and industrial shifts dealt us over the past 20 years. Appalachia never got started, but now it is on its way. We still have the economic potentials—in human skills, in resources, in consumer strength, in industrial sites, but we need a new effort to put these potentials to work in a different kind of economy.

Both Appalachia and New England, like the areas of the upper Great Lakes, the Ozarks, and others can benefit from the special assistance and guidance that will come from a Federal-State regional planning program. S. 1648 will begin the task. It is for New England to take the lead from there. We will take that lead, and we will succeed.

U.S. Department of Commerce,
Area Redevelopment Administration,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1965.

Hon. Edward M. Kennedy,
U.S. Senate, Old Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kennedy: Attached, as requested, are materials relating to the New England economy.

Salient points about the region's economy are:

1. Personal income in the New England States has been rising, but more slowly than the United States.

2. Only Connecticut and Massachusetts, among the several States, show significant associations between personal income and gross national product. The pull of overall national growth through stimulation of aggregate demand is likely still to leave behind and to aggravate the economic problems of New England.

3. The trend of employment, as revealed by industrial patterns in the period 1950–60, shows movement away from land use (agriculture), labor intensive production (textiles), and outmoded forms of manufacture and transportation. As demand shifts, as the service sector grows, and as automation and technological change takes place—these being concentrated in the metropolitan areas—the intraregional disparity in growth widens.

4. Economic activity is primarily concentrated in the Boston metropolitan area and in the Connecticut SMSA's. Aggregate indicators, therefore, understate the slow growth and development in the region as a whole.

To lessen intraregional disparities and to promote the growth of New England as a whole, the slowly growing areas need to be more closely integrated with and draw economic sustenance from growing areas.

Sincerely yours,

Robert T. Miki.

Changes in New England Employment, 1950–60—Indicators of Trends in the Region's Economy

The material in the following four pages show that:

1. The decrease in employment in each State is usually concentrated in one to three industries making up approximately 50 to 75 percent of the total. On the other hand, the increase in each State is distributed more evenly, with smaller percentage for each.

2. Most of the major decreases and increases center around corresponding movements away from land use (agriculture), labor intensive production (textiles), and outmoded forms of manufacture and transportation (railroads) and toward technological and automated industry.

Changes in New England Employment, 1950–60; Indicators of Trends in the Region's Economy

DECREASES IN EMPLOYMENT

1. Of the three industries that represented over 80 percent of the decreases in employment in New England as a whole, all are represented in each State, and at least one is a major cause of the decrease (in relation to its percentage share and the number of industries in the total).

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
Textiles	55.0	54.9	30.7	53.1	35.1	76.5	18.7
Agriculture	18.1	17.0	33.4	8.7	34.6	2.8	48.2
Railroad and railroad express	8.9	6.8	6.2	10.3	11.0	2.9	8.6
Total	82.0	78.7	70.3	72.1	80.7	82.2	75.5

2. One other industry was represented in the decrease in every State, but the industry share was usually less.

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
Forestry and fisheries	2.3	1.1	5.9	1.7	0.3	3.8	1.3

3. Five industries were represented in the decrease in all but one State each:

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
Lumber and wood products	3.9	----------	10.6	1.6	2.8	0.3	9.8
Other transportation	2.5	1.1	.9	3.6	.2	3.6	----------
Food and dairy products	1.0	----------	1.5	3.6	.9	2.9	.5
Hotel and other personal service	2.6	1.9	.9	4.9	3.3	2.6	----------
Entertainment and recreation	.7	----------	1.3	1.3	.8	.2	.7
Total	10.7	3.0	15.2	15.0	8.0	9.6	11.0

4. Total percentage share accounted for by the nine industries listed above:

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
9 industries' share	95.0	82.8	91.4	88.8	89.0	95.6	87.8

Changes in New England Employment, 1950–60; Indicators of Trends in the Region's Economy

INCREASES IN EMPLOYMENT

1. The increase in total employment was distributed more evenly over several industries and not all of them represented a major share of the increase in each State.

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
Medical, educational, and other professions	23.7	20.2	17.8	27.1	18.8	19.4	27.8
Industry not reported	18.7	14.2	8.8	23.6	15.0	21.6	8.3
Electrical and other machinery	12.0	9.0	----------	15.4	21.5	5.1	12.0
Transportation equipment manufacturing	8.9	20.6	6.6	2.9	4.0	4.0	----------
Armed Forces	7.4	2.6	21.1	5.9	10.6	14.0	3.1
Total	70.7	66.6	54.3	74.9	69.9	64.1	51.2

2. Five industries were represented in the increase in every State, but did not account for as large a share of the employment increase:

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
Food and kindred products manufacturing	2.9	2.3	3.7	3.0	2.2	3.6	2.7
Printing and publishing	2.7	3.0	2.1	2.6	2.3	2.3	3.3
Chemicals and allied products	.5	1.1	.4	.1	.1	.8	.4
Other retail trade	2.8	6.0	6.4	.4	4.8	---	10.5
Publications administration	3.2	2.8	5.7	2.3	3.0	5.4	2.0
Total	12.1	15.2	18.3	8.4	12.3	12.1	18.9

3. Six industries were represented in the increase in all but one State each:

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
Apparel, other fabric	0.9	---	1.6	1.8	0.6	3.8	0.8
Trucking service and warehousing	.7	0.6	---	.7	1.0	.6	1.4
Communications	.8	1.1	.7	.8	.4	---	.2
Miscellaneous manufacturing	4.6	---	11.5	5.1	5.0	6.9	10.9
Total	7.0	1.7	12.8	8.4	7.0	11.3	13.3

4. Total percentage share accounted for by the industries listed above:

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
14 industries' share	89.8	73.5	85.4	91.7	79.2	87.5	82.4

THE NEW ENGLAND ECONOMY FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF AN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The objective of New England, as a region, and of its component States includes the economic development of underdeveloped resources and the promotion of more vigorous development in growing areas, and the incorporation of lagging areas into growing sectors.

New England is growing, but less rapidly than the Nation as a whole. Over the long run, as a consequence, its share in total personal income has shrunk from 6.72 percent in 1948 to 6.44 percent in 1963. Concomitantly, nonagricultural employment has fallen from 6.94 percent of the total in 1957 to 6.70 percent in 1964; manufacturing employment from 8.66 percent (1957) to 8.25 percent (1964). As a region, New England has been losing economic resources to other, more rapidly growing regions.

1. Rhode Island, Maine, and Massachusetts shares in total personal income have fallen, while New Hampshire, Vermont, and Connecticut shares remain virtually constant.

2. The individual States have shared proportionately in the decline in manufacturing employment. In 1964, the percentages of New England manufacturing were:

Connecticut	30
Maine	7
Massachusetts	46
New Hampshire	6
Rhode Island	8
Vermont	2

There have been wide sectional variations within the region, for individual States experience different patterns and rates of growth depending on their industrial composition and the growth rate of a region within a particular industry—its regional share. In general, New England's employment gain (1950–60) in general industry, finance, insurance, real estate, transportation equipment manufacturing, and government has been offset by losses in agriculture, textiles, railroads, railroad express service, and retail food and dairy products stores.

1. Connecticut, employment losses in agriculture, textiles, and miscellaneous manufacturing have been offset by long run gains in machinery manufacturing, general retail, and finance, insurance, real estate.

2. New Hampshire's employment losses in agriculture, textiles, lumber, furniture, wood products, and railroads and railroad express services were matched by gains in machinery manufacturing and government, leaving a positive total employment effect.

3. In the other New England States, however, losses in the several sectors (agriculture, textiles, railroads and railroad express services, and retail food and dairy products) have outweighed employment gains in manufacturing and other sectors.

The pattern, then, is one of slow employment gains, punctuated by employment rates greater than the national average in Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island and pockets of high unemployment in the several States, as shown. If the unemployment rate in Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island were brought down at least to the U.S. average, the gap between potential and actual output would be narrowed and personal income should rise. Similarly, an increase in employment in Connecticut, Vermont, and New Hampshire, would raise the growth rate in output and income.

The pockets of continuous high unemployment are especially significant for these areas are not being pulled up by growing areas via spillover benefits. A program of public works and development facilities is particularly well suited to assist in facilitating and accelerating the growth process by providing a capital structure for the creation of external economies in localities where such economies are presently poorly developed, and the fostering of the location of several enterprises in the same area.

PRESENTATION OF NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS BEFORE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, APRIL 27, 1965

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. PHILLIP W. HOFF, GOVERNOR, STATE OF VERMONT

Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct pleasure and honor to act as liaison of my fellow New England Governors before you during your deliberations on Senate bill 1648.

New England, by the dint of the magnificent efforts of our forebears and the Yankee ingenuity of our inhabitants, has managed to share in the prosperity of our American free enterprise system. New England as a region badly needs the assistance of the current bill in order to maintain its proper share of the Nation's bounty.

To this point, I invite the attention of the body to that work with which you and your companion New England Senators are familiar, the 1961 Federal Reserve Bank of Boston Report: "New England at work in the Space Age." As so well stated by the author, "Obviously the New England economic machine simply cannot work—and equally obviously, it does."

Disadvantages

Among the disadvantages New England labors under are its general lack of industrial raw materials, and its disadvantageous location. I have presumed, Mr. Chairman, to attach some core statistics (exhibit A) which to me contain some important facts which help highlight the need and desirability of Senate bill 1648. Review of these facts show:

(1) Our declining share of population and density of population; our slow rate of change from agriculture to other income sources; our failure to automate.

(2) Our eggs-in-basket dependence on manufacturing; our decline in size of manufacturing work force; our low wage status.

(3) The substantial handicaps imposed on New England's manufacturers, e.g., lack of raw materials; high costs of fuel and power (to which I shall turn in a later section of my statement); our longer haul to market and our crucial transportation problems.

(4) Our curiously structured work force, with proportionately higher older workers and female workers than is found elsewhere in the Nation.

Added to our disadvantages, Mr. Chairman, are those economic scars, infrequent we are pleased to say, which are identified in the pending bill as distressed areas. And, further, those areas of pitifully low incomes. It is indeed encouraging to note that in legislation now being implemented, in the 3½-year history of the Area Redevelopment Administration, significant strides have been taken. I am sure that this committee is well aware of the well-documented report on this matter issued in February 1965 by the U.S. Department of Commerce Secretary, John T. Connor, and Area Redevelopment Administrator. William L. Batt, Jr.

I have attached hereto interim and informal statistics as to New England's participation in this worthy program (exhibit B). May I note, Mr. Chairman, that it was the wise and judicious action of the Senate which caused the so-called Proxmire amendment to be added so that our rural areas incapable of showing technical compliance with the distressed area concept might also share in the "operation bootstrap" improvements made available to our low-income areas by the original ARA bills.

I strongly urge that the pending bill might well be subjected to minor amendment to permit continuation of eligible areas designated under the Proxmire amendment. We realize the annual review section of the pending bill might be interpreted to divest States, such as Vermont and New Hampshire, of designations under the original ARA bill. We in Vermont have had the benefit of the Proxmire amendment by gubernatorial designation of a three-county area. This has brought needed municipal improvements and new industrial hope.

New flexibility

The pending bill enjoys much needed new flexibility. We note, with appreciation, that grants and loans for municipal projects may now be given to improve job opportunities on a long-range basis, as well as the proven validity of the providing of jobs concurrent with the construction of the projects. The previous job justification criteria, proven somewhat unsatisfactory, has been eliminated. Also the area designations are more flexible in that in addition to the pocket-poverty distressed areas, now areas contiguous may share in the designation—provided the multiarea unit is a recognized economic region.

The new bill also provides guarantees for working capital to industries being aided. We feel this will enhance participation by private banking sources—in Vermont our recent amendments to our Industrial Building Authority Act were passed on this premise.

In 1963 I had the pleasure of appearing before the House Committee on Banking and Currency in respect to the ARA bill. At that time, I requested that technical planning money be made available without matching funds from the State or community. I note with appreciation that the $15 million technical assistance program in the present bill does not require matching funds.

Action remedies

In addition to the badly needed changes which this new bill includes, this bill provides what we in New England believe to be the key to the future. I refer to the regional action planning commissions we find in title V.

The six New England States comprise one region in the opinion of its inhabitants and in the opinion of the Nation.

As was well said in an editorial in the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press, on Tuesday, March 30, 1965: "the eastern megalopolis now stretching from Concord, N.H., south beyond Washington, D.C. * * * In 1975, New England * * * in effect if not in fact * * * will be one large State. Programs of regional cooperation which are just in the discussion stage now, will wipe away the stifling boundaries of traditional competition."

Over the years, valiant efforts have been made to meet the regional needs of New England. We are all well aware of the significant contributions to our economy and unity made by such groups as the New England Council, our labor groups, and various regional committees and commissions.

With partnership between the Federal Government and our State governments made feasible by the Regional Action Planning Commission, we could begin to find action remedies for many of our problems.

Transportation

The transportation situation is but one of a number of major interstate-Federal problems that are in evidence. Our air system needs both planning and action. And, this Senate is well aware of the staggering multi-State impact of the proposed closing of rail services on the New Haven Railway. You are also well aware of the fact that with temporary economics in sight, some of our Federal agencies are curtailing use of rail services, such as now occurring to railway mail operations in New England. This, despite the fact that New England is so distant from the population center of the Nation—which continues moving westward—and New England urgently needs a major improvement in surface bulk and passenger transportation.

Power

New England urgently needs massive improvements in electric systems. Our regional consumers pay as much as 20 percent more for electricity than the national average. Our industrial consumers pay 66 percent more than the national average. Our commercial enterprises pay 17 percent more than the national average (exhibit C).

Again, the partnership among the New England States needs the addition of the Federal partner.

Planning

As indicated above, the New England States have realized the urgent needs for regional action. I am proud to have led the introduction of a New England planning compact before the New England Governors. This compact has been approved by each of the New England Governors and is currently pending passage in the several States (exhibit D).

I hasten to assure this body that the New England planning compact is by no means an instrument competitive with the Regional Action Planning Commission, as viewed in title V of this bill.

Viewed in one light, the planning compact could serve a long-range purpose plan project for New England. Viewed in another, the planning compact could serve as one of the arms of the New England Regional Action Planning Commission.

The Appalachia solution, to us, seems long overdue and most reasonable. The problems of New England are not the problems of the Pacific coast. The enactment of legislation designed to meet New England needs is a real necessity. The joint Federal-State effort is long overude.

While we in New England appreciate the significant contribution of ARA and APW, we foresee the Regional Action Planning Commission as the most significant device for improving the well-being of our citizens. A plan without a purpose is piffle. A plan without consideration of regional impact is equally worthless, and overall action without proper planning and proper recognition of the needs of our respective regions is reckless.

I have attempted, Mr. Chairman, to accurately reflect the combined views of the New England Governors. Factors of time did not permit submission of the text of these remarks to my fellow Governors. However, although we New England Governors may have differences of opinion as to the priority of needs, I am confident that I reflect our combined views when I urgently recommend passage of this significant legislation.

EXHIBIT A

NEW ENGLAND HANDICAPS

Basically—disadvantageous location; general lack of natural resources.

Specifically—1. Declining share in most of the Nation's economic activities and vital statistics.

(a) Population, 1950–60.[1]

	Percent	Density
New England	+12.8	166.5
Middle Atlantic	+19.3	300.1
Great Lakes	+19.2	148.0
Pacific	+40.2	23.6
United States	+18.5	50.5
Vermont	+3.2	42.0

(b) Employment changes—nonagricultural employment—1950–1960.[1]

	Percent
New England	+11.1
Middle Atlantic	+ 9.2
Far West	+43.9
United States	+18.2

(c) Overall relatively lower output per employee (failure to automate).[2]

Gross product originating per employee—1960 dollars

	1947	1957
New England	$5,400	$6,606
Middle Atlantic	5,640	7,414
Great Lakes	5,582	7,535
Far West	6,523	8,274
United States	5,350	7,164
Vermont	4,357	5,681

2. Eggs-in-one-basket dependence on manufacturing for its livelihood.[3]

In terms of concentration on manufacturing—New England ranks No. 1:

	Percent
New England current income from manufacturing	38
Middle Atlantic current income from manufacturing	34
Far West current income from manufacturing	27
U.S. current income from manufacturing	28
Nonagricultural employment in manufacturing:	
New England	39
Middle Atlantic	35
Far West	27

3. Decline both relative and absolute in manufacturing work force.[3]

Percent change

	1950–60	1947–62
New England	−2.2	−6.0
United States	+9.1	+7.8
Middle Atlantic	−.7	−6.4
Far West	+56.8	+70.1

4. Wage rates—differentials, hourly wages, manufacturing: [3]

New England, $2.09 (a low-wage area).

Middle Atlantic, $2.32, +11 percent over New England.

Far West, $2.62, +25.4 percent over New England.

5. Handicaps imposed on New England manufacturers: [3]

a. Basic lack of industrial raw materials.

b. Higher than average costs of fuel and electric power.

c. Transportation costs higher because of greater haul to market.

d. Distance from Nation's population center and from rapidly expanding consumer markets.

6. The general antiquity of its overall manufacturing equipment and to its lower than average investment rate in new capital equipment.[3]

MISCELLANEOUS

1. Low agricultural employment and income—1960: [3]

New England, 3.4 percent of labor force—1.1 percent of total personal income.

United States, 10.0 percent of labor force—3.7 percent of total personal income.

Percent change—agricultural employment, 1950–62: [4]

New England	−42.5
United States	−32.5

2. Transfer payments (social security and old-age benefits) large part of New England personal income: [3]

New England, 10.8 percent of population—65+.

---

[1] Department of Commerce—Bureau of the Census.

[2] National Planning Association.

[3] Federal Reserve Bank of Boston—Annual Report, 1961.

[4] U.S. Department of Labor—Manpower Administration.

United States, 9.2 percent of population—65+.

Vermont, 11.2 percent of population—65+.

About 8 percent of New England personal income from transfer payments.

3. New England has older work force.

Structure of labor force—percent distribution, 1960

Age groups	14–24	25–34	35–44	45–64	65 and over
New England	16.52	19.48	23.40	35.47	5.13
United States	17.16	21.04	23.59	33.69	4.52
Vermont	17.51	18.74	21.60	36.11	6.04

LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYMENT CLAIMANTS FOR COMPENSATION [5]

New England, 40 percent of claimants were over 55 years of age.

United States, 25 percent of claimants were over 55 years of age.

New England, 25 percent of claimants were 65+.

United States, 11 percent of claimants were 65+.

4. New England has a larger female work force.[3]

New England, 40 out of 100 women are in the labor force (34.59 percent).

Labor force participation rates—female, 1960

	All ages	45–64	65+
New England	29.4	51.1	11.5
Middle Atlantic	28.0	45.8	10.8
Great Lakes	25.5	44.0	10.4
Far West	26.9	47.0	10.2
United States	26.0	44.4	10.2
Vermont	25.3	48.8	12.5

United States, 36 out of 100 women are in the labor force (32.09 percent).

New England: Women accounted for more than half of the long-term unemployment claimants for compensation.[5]

United States: Women accounted for only two-fifths of the long-term unemployment claimants for compensation.[5]

---

[3] See footnote 3 on page 12175.

[5] Federal Reserve Bank of Boston—New England Business Review, March 1963.

EXHIBIT B

ARA activity in 6 New England States as of Mar. 31, 1965

	Financial assistance			Technical assistance		Training			APW assistance (Jan. 1, 1965)		
	Number of projects	ARA investment	Employment potential	Number of projects	ARA investment	Number of projects	ARA investment	Trainees	Number of projects	Investment	Man-month employment
Connecticut	6	$5,693,000	1,510	5	$73,480	15	$519,357	1,212	54	$6,367,000	6,511
Maine	20	13,156,428	4,185	12	213,967	28	268,925	754	55	4,593,000	7,212
Massachusetts	15	3,257,683	1,095	10	463,631	29	777,646	738	102	20,857,000	21,306
New Hampshire	4	991,730	220	2	102,535				23	2,116,000	2,497
Rhode Island	4	1,485,784	565	5	190,590	17	955,687	1,225	43	12,398,000	16,554
Vermont	2	119,075	110	1	400	3	44,718	70	11	1,317,000	1,609
Total	51	24,703,700	7,685	35	1,044,603	92	2,566,333	3,908	288	47,648,000	55,689

New England—ARA totals:

Number of projects approved	178
ARA investment	$28,143,636
Employment potential (direct)	7,685
Employment potential (direct and indirect)	12,680
Number of trainees	3,908

New England—APW totals:

Number of projects approved	288
APW investment	$47,648,000
Man-months of employment	55,689

EXHIBIT C

POWER

New England's electric consumers pay the highest electric rates in the continental United States.

Residential consumers pay as much as 20.2 percent more for electricity than the average for the Nation.

Highest bills in the continental United States for 250 kilowatt-hours are paid by residential consumers of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, in that order.

As of January 1, 1963, Connecticut residential consumers' bills were 10.8 percent above the national average for 250 kilowatt-hours.

RESIDENTIAL

[Percent paid above the national average]

Residential consumers:

Maine [1]	20.2
Massachusetts	18.9
New Hampshire	19.8
Rhode Island	16.6
Vermont	2.4

(Vermont's low figure is due to St. Lawrence and Niagara power.)

[1] Source: "Typical Electric Bills, 1963," a Federal Power Commission publication (cities 2,500 and more).

INDUSTRIAL

[Percent paid above the national average]

Industrial consumers:

Maine [1]	12.4
Connecticut	45.7
Massachusetts	57.1
New Hampshire	41.9
Rhode Island	61.9
Vermont	44.8

[1] Source: Federal Power Commission publication, "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, Privately Owned, 1962."

COMMERCIAL

In 1962 New England commercial enterprises paid 17.2 percent more than the national average for power.

A combination of long winter nights, high heating requirements, and high rates * * * results in the commercial consumers paying from 11.3 to 45.4 percent more in their electric bill than the national average.

[Percent paid above the national average]

Commercial consumers:

Maine [1]	42
Connecticut	17.2
Massachusetts	31.5
New Hampshire	45.4
Rhode Island	43.7
Vermont	11.3

[1] Source: Federal Power Commission publication, "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, Privately Owned, 1962."

Power purchased by manufacturing industries—1962

	Kilowatt-hours purchased	Total cost	Average cost per kilowatt-hour	Percent above or below U.S. average
	Billion	*Million*	*Cents*	
Total, United States	313.7	$2,827.1	0.9013	
New England	12.0	180.0	1.4961	+66
West North Central	12.2	151.8	1.2468	+38
Middle Atlantic	47.7	545.3	1.1431	+27
East North Central	81.0	808.8	.9990	+11
South Atlantic	35.4	327.3	.9250	+3
West South Central	20.8	175.9	.8442	−6
Pacific	38.9	277.0	.7121	−21
Mountain	8.5	60.4	.7080	−21
East South Central	57.2	298.5	.5222	−42

Source: 1963 Census of Manufactures, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Commerce Department.

EXHIBIT D

STATUS REPORT—LEGISLATIVE ACTION ON THE NEW ENGLAND INTERSTATE PLANNING COMPACT BY STATE, APRIL 23, 1965

Connecticut

Compact legislation has been submitted in both the senate and the house. The house committee on State development has approved the compact and no opposition was voiced at the hearing held by the senate committee on Federal and intergovernmental relations.

Maine

After a hearing at which there was no opposition the joint committee on State government reportedly has a very favorable reaction to the compact.

Massachusetts

Governor Volpe strongly supported the compact when he introduced the legislation at a meeting of the joint assembly on April 5, 1965. The compact was unopposed at a recent hearing held by the joint committee on State administration.

New Hampshire

The compact, which has the strong support of Governor King, is presently in the house rules committee.

Rhode Island

The necessary legislation has been submitted by Governor Chafee's office, in addition to the introduction of a supplemental appropriation request to cover the State's share for the operation of the interstate planning commission.

Vermont

The compact, considered to be one of Vermont's most important pieces of legislation by Governor Hoff, has recently passed the senate with extremely strong support. The legislation is now in the hands of the house conservation and development committee which held its first discussion on the measure on April 22. The house committee's initial reaction appeared quite favorable.

NEW ENGLAND INTERSTATE PLANNING COMPACT

ARTICLE I

Findings

New England is by virtue of geographic location and other characteristics a great population, cultural, economic, and resource area which, with more intense use of physical, social, and economic resources, increasingly requires coordinated planning as a basic ingredient of effective and orderly growth of the region. To this end, it is the intent of this compact to establish and provide for the operation of an interstate planning agency for New England.

ARTICLE II

Purpose

It is the purpose of this compact to provide, in the New England region, improved facilities and procedures for the coordination of the policies, programs, and activities of interstate significance in the New England region in the field of physical, social, and economic resources, and to study, investigate, and plan appropriate governmental activities with respect to the conservation, development, and use of the same; to provide means by which interstate conflicts may be resolved; and to provide procedures for interstate coordination of the interests of all public and private agencies, persons and entities in the fields covered by this compact, and to provide an organization for cooperation in such coordination.

ARTICLE III

Creation of commission

There is hereby created the New England Interstate Planning Commission hereinafter called the commission.

ARTICLE IV

Membership

The commission shall consist of one member from each party State to be appointed and to serve, in accordance with and subject to the laws of the State which he represents.

ARTICLE V

Functions

To carry out the purpose of the contract it shall be the responsibility of the commission to prepare studies and plans, and to recommend procedures for implementing coordination of the policies and programs and activities of interstate significance in the field of physical, social, and economic conservation and development in the New England region which may include the following:

(1) Collection and interpretation of basic data.

(2) Investigation, planning, and programing (including scheduling) of projects of interstate or regional significance.

(3) Planning and scheduling of governmental services and programs which would be of assistance to the orderly growth and prosperity of the region, and to the well-being of its population.

(4) Encouraging of the referral of plans or proposals for projects and programs of interstate or regional significance to the commission.

(5) Studying and recommending means for the most effective utilization of such Federal assistance as may be available on a regional basis or as may have an interstate or regional impact.

(6) Assisting the party States, or any of them, in cooperative planning undertakings with the Federal Government or any agencies thereof.

To avoid duplication of effort and in the interests of economy, the commission shall make use of existing studies, surveys, plans, data, and other materials in the possession of the governmental agencies of the party States and their respective subdivisions or in the possession of other interstate agencies. Each such agency, within available appropriation and if not expressly prevented or limited by law, is hereby authorized to make such materials available to the commission and to otherwise assist it in the performance of its functions. At the request of the commission each such agency is further authorized to provide the commission with information regarding plans and programs affecting the New England region so that the commission may have available to it current information with respect thereto.

The commission shall use qualified public and private agencies to make investigations and conduct research, but if it is unable to secure the undertaking of such investigations or original research by a qualified public or private agency, it shall have the power to make its own investigations and conduct its own research. The commission may make contracts with any public or private agencies or private persons or entities for the undertaking of such investigations or original research within its purview.

The officers and personnel of agencies of the party States, and of any other government or agency whatever, or private citizens, or representatives of private organizations, may serve at the request of the commission upon such advisory committees as the commission may determine to create; and such officers and personnel of any such government or agency, may serve upon such committee without forfeiture of office or employment and with no loss or diminution in the status, rights and privileges which they otherwise enjoy.

ARTICLE VI

Cooperation with the Federal Government and other governmental entities

Each party State is hereby authorized to participate in cooperative or joint planning undertakings with the Federal Government, any appropriate agency or agencies thereof, or with any interstate agency or agencies. Such participation shall be at the instance of the Governor or in such other manner as State law may provide or authorize. The commission shall facilitate the work of State representatives in any joint interstate or cooperative Federal-State undertaking authorized by this article, and each such State shall keep the commission advised of its activities in respect of such undertakings, to the extent that they have interstate or regional significance.

ARTICLE VII

Voting

No action of the commission shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which a majority of the commission members are present and a majority of the total number of votes on the commission are cast in favor thereof: provided that any action not binding by reason of failure to meet this requirement may be ratified within 30 days by the concurrence in writing of a majority of the commission members.

ARTICLE VIII

Finances

A. The commission shall submit to the Governor or designated officer of each party State a budget including a statement of all funds expected to be available to the commission and their sources and, a request for an appropriation to cover that State's share of expenditures for such period as may be required by the laws of that jurisdiction for presentation to the legislature thereof.

B. With due regard for such moneys and other assistance as may be made available to it, the commission shall be provided with such funds by each of the several States participating therein to provide the means of establishing and maintaining facilities, a staff of personnel, and such activities as may be necessary to fulfill the powers and duties imposed upon and entrusted to the commission.

With due allowance for moneys otherwise available, each budget of the commission shall be the responsibility of the party States, to be apportioned among them as follows: 50 percent on an equal basis; 30 percent on the basis of population; 20 percent on the basis of area, either within incorporated places or places having units of local government, such population to be determined in accordance with the last official U.S. census of population.

C. The commission shall not pledge the credit of any jurisdiction. The commission may meet any of its obligations in whole or in part with funds available to it under article IX(E) of this compact, provided that the commission takes specific action setting aside such funds prior to the incurring of any obligation to be met in whole or in part in such manner.

D. The members of the commission shall be paid by the commission their actual expenses incurred and incidental to the performance of their duties, subject to the approval of the commission.

E. The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements of the commission shall be subject to the audit and accounting procedures established under its bylaws. However, all receipts and disbursements of funds handled by the commission shall be audited by a qualified public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

F. The accounts of the commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by such agency, representative, or representatives of the jurisdictions which appropriate funds to the commission.

ARTICLE IX

Administration and management

A. The commission may sue and be sued and shall have a seal.

B. The commission shall elect annually, from among its members, a chairman, vice chairman, and treasurer. The commission shall appoint an executive director who shall also act as secretary, and together with the treasurer, shall be bonded in such amounts as the commission may require.

C. The commission shall appoint and remove or discharge such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions irrespective of any civil service laws which might otherwise apply. The commission shall establish and maintain, independently by contract or agreement, or in conjunction with any one or more of the party States, suitable retirement programs for its employees. Employees of the commission shall be eligible for social security coverage in respect to old-age and survivors insurance provided that the commission takes such steps as may be necessary pursuant to Federal law to participate in such program of insurance as a governmental agency or unit. The commission may establish and maintain or participate in such additional programs of employee benefits as may be appropriate to afford employees of the commission terms and conditions of employment similar to those enjoyed by employees of the party States generally.

D. The commission may borrow, accept, or contract for the services of personnel from any State or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, from any intergovernmental agency, or from any institution, person, firm, or corporation.

E. The Commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions under this compact, any and all appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services, conditional or otherwise, from any State or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or intergovernmental agency, or any institution, person, firm, or corporation, and may receive, utilize, and dispose of the same.

F. The Commission may establish and maintain such facilities as may be necessary for the transacting of its business. The Commission may acquire, hold, and convey real and personal property and any interest therein.

G. The Commission may adopt, amend, and rescind bylaws, rules, and regulations for the conduct of its business.

H. The Commission shall make and transmit annually, to the legislature and Governor of each party State, a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding year, and embodying such recommendations as may have been adopted by the Commission. The Commission may issue such additional reports as it may deem desirable.

ARTICLE X

Other compacts and activities

Nothing in this compact shall be construed to impair, or otherwise affect the jurisdiction of any interstate agency in which any party State participates nor to abridge, impair, or otherwise affect the provisions of any compact to which any one or more of the party States may be a party, nor to supersede, diminish, or otherwise affect any obligation assumed under any such compact; nor shall anything in this compact be construed to discourage additional interstate compacts among some or all of the party States or the establishment of intergovernmental agencies in subareas of the region. Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit the jurisdiction or activities of any participating government, agency, or officer thereof, or any private person or agency.

ARTICLE XI

Enactment

This compact shall become effective when entered into and enacted into law by any three of the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. Thereafter it shall become effective with respect to any other aforementioned State upon its enacting this compact into law.

ARTICLE XII

Withdrawal

This compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon each party State until renounced by it. Renunciation of this compact must be preceded by sending 3 years' notice in writing of intention to withdraw from the compact to the Governor each of the other States party hereto.

ARTICLE XIII

Construction and severability

The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence, or provision of this compact is declared to be unconstitutional or the applicability thereof, to any State, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof, to any other State, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. It is the legislative intent that the provisions of this compact be reasonably and liberally construed.

PRESENTATION OF NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL BEFORE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, APRIL 27, 1965

STATEMENT OF EDWIN W. WEBBER, DIRECTOR OF INTERSTATE RELATIONS AND NATURAL RESOURCES, NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to appear before this committee on behalf of the New England Council, a private nonprofit organization with offices in Boston, Mass. The council is composed of 2,200 members drawn from business, labor, education, and government within New England, and is devoted to the development of a sound and dynamic region through full utilization of all its human, natural, and material resources.

It is an organization that seeks to represent all of the economic interests of the region. The council is vitally interested in S. 1648, the proposed Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the emphasis the act gives to regionalism as a device by which joint Federal-State efforts may be undertaken toward effective treatment and solution of economic problems.

Regionalism has always been a meaningful concept to New England. It has been made much more so in recent years, due to the region's realization that total development of the region's potential is achievable only through creation of a balanced and viable economic system.

More specifically, this achievement is possible only through regional cooperation.

New England is a small region, composed of six small States. These States share a close-knit identity, and a similarity of outlook and economic interest. There are, of course, differences among the various States, some of which are economic, such as levels of income and economic resources. But in general it may be said that their size and compactness qualify them eminently for regional planning and for regionally based programs of economic development.

These six States recognize this feature as an integral part of their collective future, and have been actively seeking regional solutions to a number of common problems, including regional economic development and planning.

While our States have enjoyed some success in moving toward achievement of these regional goals, much remains to be done. We have many needs, and I would like to enumerate a few of our more basic requirements of today.

First, we need an economic system by which the benefits of economic growth created within those areas now enjoying high levels of economic activity can be spread to include those areas in New England that have lagged behind, often as a result of structural changes in the economy.

The gradual reorganization of the region's economy from manufacturing to nonmanufacturing activities has resulted in shifts in the location of our economic growth centers. This process of change, in turn, has reinforced a trend of population movement from outlying towns and villages to our expanding metropolitan areas.

The result has been that the areas most distant from these metropolitan centers have experienced chronically high rates of unemployment, as well as deterioration of their public facilities.

The stresses and strains of making up for lost tax bases have created severe burdens on the remaining economic elements of the community, now required to support facilities such as schools, water and street systems, recreation facilities, and downtown rehabilitation programs.

The problems of the expanding metropolitan area and the decline of the small community suggests the need for new solutions. The idea of organizing for development in terms of growth centers, multicounty development districts, as well as the traditional distressed redevelopment areas, seems to hold creative answers to hard problems.

It must become possible to develop, through more adequate transportation systems and better technical services, a more meaningful and complementary economic relationship between economically weaker communities and the growth centers. Such a development would go far in applying effective treatment to one of our region's basic needs.

Second, we need mechanisms by which all levels of government can work closely together in devising the coordinated system necessary for the effective, deliberate, and orderly development of the region.

Governmental efforts must be coordinated as well with private development efforts. To this end, S. 1648 would provide authority to create a series of joint Federal-State regional development commissions. This undertaking is unique in that decisionmaking would be shared by the participating States.

In New England much exists upon which to build an even stronger regional economic program. Numerous Federal, State, local, and private development efforts are underway or are being proposed.

The need for more effective coordination is clear. Before the present Congress there are other legislative proposals which have regional implications.

For example, there is the proposed Water Resource Planning Act, S. 21, H.R. 1111, which could lead to establishment of a New England Regional River Basin Commission. This agency would be charged with the responsibility for preparing comprehensive plans for the development of the region's river basins, and for related land resources.

By comparing this program with the aims of the regional commission envisioned by S. 1648, it is possible to see two activities, seeking the same basic ends, but quite possibly utilizing conflicting and competing techniques. You cannot talk about regional economic development on the one hand, and regional water resource planning and development on the other, without running the risk of repeating yourself.

There has been a growing recognition within New England of the need to avoid this type of confusion, and our New England States on their own initiative have moved on this problem by seeking creation of a New England Regional Planning Commission.

The purposes of this interstate body are to provide a mechanism by which the various statewide planning and development efforts may be coordinated, and by which a comprehensive regional plan may be developed.

This proposed interstate group is but the most recent and dramatic example of regional cooperation in New England in a number of important areas. It is our belief that already existing and proposed interstate cooperative efforts can be an extremely valuable asset in mounting the type of effective regional development program proposed by S. 1648.

Against this background of general need, namely, creation of a balanced viable economic system and coordination of governmental efforts, it is possible to single out some of New England's specific requirements. For the sake of simplicity, they may be categorized as functional and geographical.

A. Functional

1. Passenger transportation, both intercity and commuter service.
2. Urban development, particularly along the circumference of our metropolitan areas, and redevelopment of the downtown sections in our older industrial towns.
3. Comprehensive multipurpose river basin development.
4. Water and air pollution control planning.
5. A regional program to alleviate poverty.
6. A regional program for retraining and placement of workers.
7. A regional program for technological development with particular emphasis on rendering technical assistance to industries and local governments in the outlying areas.
8. A regional program for health services.
9. A coordinated regional program for outdoor recreation planning and development.
10. Optimum regional development of all power resources.
11. Development of adequate port and air facilities.

B. Geographic

We have urgent need for action programs in certain subregional areas in New England which are geographic in their context, including the following:

1. Redevelopment of the Fall River-New Bedford-Providence area which comprises major portions of Rhode Island and southeastern Massachusetts.
2. Development of northern Maine.
3. Development of northern Vermont.
4. Development of the Berkshire area, including Pittsfield and North Adams, Mass.
5. Development of the fringe areas of Boston's metropolitan area which reaches northward toward Maine and New Hampshire.

It should be stressed that this list is selective rather than exhaustive and is primarily intended to show the dimension and form of developmental needs for our region. A more complete picture is needed, and can only be obtained by systematic study of the problem.

However, if even this small list of problems is examined in terms of regional growth trends, as projected to 1976, a picture of even greater urgency for action emerges.

According to recent studies completed by the National Planning Association, the population of New England will be approximately 14 million by 1976, an increase of approximately 3 million over the present.

As a consequence, New England will have an increase in its labor force of approximately 1¼ million people by 1976. Approximately 700,000 to 800,000 new and better paying jobs are going to be required in New England if the increased population is to be accommodated.

Furthermore, urbanization will continue to spread, and 78 percent of the population increase will occur within these urban areas. Today's major centers of population will continue to radiate outward, forming an integral part of what is referred to as the "megalopolis" of the Northeastern United States.

More urbanization means more need for recreational opportunities, but it is equally obvious that open space for such needs will be in less supply. This increased population will require newer and expanded methods of air and water pollution control, waste disposal, improved passenger transportation, and numerous other public services.

It is no less significant that there will be an increase of approximately a quarter of a million people 65 years of age and older that will have to be accommodated, and that additional health facilities will have to be constructed.

Even more dramatic in its impact is the projected increase in number of our young people. It is predicted that we will have approximately 1 million more children 14 years of age or younger coming along within the next 10 years. We will need teachers and schools in sufficient number and quality for them.

These problems are not limited to any single region. Much of our frustration in not finding quick and easy solutions to our economic difficulties has been our failure to recognize completely the regional dimensions of the task.

We believe that the willingness to experiment with new approaches to economic distress on a regional basis represents a promising step toward balanced economic growth.

We would like to thank you for this opportunity to appear before the committee to comment on certain aspects of this significant legislation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the capable Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the State of Massachusetts is incorporated certainly within an area that could well provide a proving ground for these programs, including the program of public works and development facilities.

At present, 116 projects in West Virginia amounting to $22 million, are eligible for moving forward and employing people in the construction of needed facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am most appreciative, as I am sure other Senators are, of the support given the pending proposal by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia. The Senator is one without peer in understanding the concept of regional development. He has devoted his great energy and conviction to this bill and to the regional approach. The people of my State—and the people of New England—very much appreciate his understanding and support.

We recognize that New England must come up with a program and the kind of study that will demonstrate the need for this special and far-reaching assistance.

I am convinced that we have the facts to justify our program and receive the support of Congress. All we ask is that there be thorough consideration of the needs of our less developed areas.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for the contribution which he has made over the course of the past several months to the development of the regional concept upon which the important title V of the bill is based.

The Senator and I have worked closely. I know that he has worked closely with Senators from other areas of the country which could conceivably take advantage of that title, the development of the regional concept, the administration support for it, and the effort needed to bring the legislation to the floor.

It has been a privilege and a stimulating experience for me to work with the Senator. I congratulate him and take this opportunity to make his contribution clear on the record.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Kentucky has offered an amendment that would reduce the authorization of $400 million, provided for in title I, to $325 million.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. That is the pending amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that if the amount were cut to $325 million, it would still be $75 million more than the administration requested?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. The administration asked for an authorization of $250 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill, instead of providing $250 million, would make $400 million available in the form of grants.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that there are other acts now on the books that have a relationship to the objective of this bill, which is, supposedly, to help areas in which unemployment exists. Those acts are the Appalachian Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Manpower Retraining Act. The pending bill, if enacted into law, would be the fourth program to cover the same field of activity.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. The acts which the Senator has enumerated are related. However, they have different specific purposes.

We discussed on the floor today the Appalachian program. That program goes more to the basic structure of the area—such as roads, multicounty hospitals, timber and land management, vocational training, and local public facilities.

The Economic Opportunity Act has as its chief purpose, educational and job opportunities. The Manpower Retrainnig Act would train individuals in the development of skills. I know these programs well, and I have worked in support of them.

The pending bill would appropriate money for grants or loans to encourage the establishment of commercial or industrial enterprises which would have long-term opportunities. The bill has a specific objective and differs from the other acts. However, it is true that they are all related in that they try to improve educational and employment opportunities for the people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, there is very little duplication between the programs. They are all carefully separated. For example, the ARA program, which is current and has been in existence for 4 years, included a manpower retraining program which we eliminated from this program.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I did not offer my amendment because a number of bills contain similar proposals. I merely ask that the amount be reduced because the administration asked for only $250 million and $325 million is all that has been shown to be adequately usable; after this program has been in operation, there may be further use shown to be required. This would be a new program in the sense that its purpose is long time employment opportunities, rather than emergency employment opportunities, and the money is to be more carefully spent.

The pending bill, if enacted into law, would develop new and specific criteria which, I assume, will take some time for the Secretary to apply and use to determine what additional use of money may be needed.

I believe that it is reasonable to say that the Government cannot successfully spend more than $325 million on this program, based on the information and testimony given the committees. That is my judgment. I have worked on these bills and know something about them. I know something of their practical application.

With respect to the emergency public works program, we had to work quickly and approve applications to put people to work. That was the objective of the bill. However, this is a different kind of bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, were there any new developments in the economy that occurred between the time the administration requested that $250 million be appropriated and the time the committee recommended that $400 million be appropriated?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. I believe that there was a small change in the unemployment rate after the bill was introduced. Second, there is a proposed cut in excise taxes, which is designed to stimulate the economy and to provide additional work as demand increases.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If there were developments, they were developments that would militate against the raising of the request, and support a reduction of $250 million.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The real developments between the time the administration sent the bill to Congress and the time the committee acted on it were during the hearings on the bill. There were long hearings and, on the basis of the committee hearings, some members were convinced after hearing the evidence that there should be provided $500 million a year for a 5-year period for public works; but we were able to prevail upon those members, after listening to the hearings, that we could make a better case, and a good case, for $400 million. I have already made the case in the RECORD, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What the Senator has said refers to no new developments for the program. That which the committee had, the administration had when it asked for $250 million a year. I do not think it can be refuted that the economy is stronger on this day than it was on the day the President recommended $250 million.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

On the point just mentioned, I say to the Senator from Ohio that the bill was conceived in a period of unparalleled national prosperity. We needed no direct evidence that the country was prosperous. But we felt, and still feel after all the hearings on the bill that, in spite of general national prosperity, there are pockets of depressed areas, areas that are not enjoying prosperity, areas of high unemployment. The situation of such areas has not improved since the bill was reported from the committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the administration knew about those areas.

I will ask another question. What will Congress really do when we get into a depression? What is it going to do when, in a period of great abundance, we are talking about spending that which revenues do not justify?

Mr. MUSKIE. We are trying to build into the economic structure machinery and safeguards that will avoid the heartrending depressions that destroy a country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have heard that statement before. It touches the heart and makes one sympathetic, but it is not related to reality.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have listened to the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, as well as those of other Senators.

I say to the Senator from Ohio that there are now pending in the State of Ohio 68 projects, amounting to $12,500,000. We do not look upon those projects in any way as boondoggling, but as investments. When sewage treatment plants are built in a local community, it is something that strengthens the economy in that community of Ohio. The Public Works Committee in the past reported a bill in an amount far in excess of what has been reported in this case for accelerated public works. It was not enacted, but the committee had done that prior to last year. There are bills containing larger amounts than that contained in this bill. It was my intention that the amount of $250 million be increased to $500 million. I offered an amendment to that effect, which is at the table, and which has been signed by 25 other Senators. We have lowered the amount to $400 million, as reported in the bill before us, in an attempt to compromise.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have half a minute to reply?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield half a minute to the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from West Virginia pointed out that there were 68 applicants.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Sixty-eight projects.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Sixty-eight projects. The more money that is made available, the greater the number of applicants. There were no applicants before this bill came into existence. If the amount were raised to $650 million, there would be 130 applicants.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not know if the Senator was against the accelerated public works program, but I point out that his State and the people of Ohio were greatly benefited by it. I have referred to pending projects, requiring $12½ million.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] for the excellent job the Public Works Committee has done in bringing this bill to the floor so quickly. It will provide a great deal of assistance to communities throughout the country which are economically underdeveloped and distressed.

My own State of Maryland is now benefiting from the Appalachia bill. But Appalachia is not the only depressed and underdeveloped area in Maryland. We have in the Chesapeake Bay area, both on the Eastern Shore and in southern Maryland, serious economic hardship.

In fact, Mr. President, Maryland shares with its sister States of Delaware and Virginia a depressed economy in the entire Chesapeake Bay area. The bay is our greatest natural resource in Maryland, but it has been misused and abused for many years. We now have serious problems of pollution, obnoxious aquatic plants, of drastically reduced shellfish and shellfish production. Many of our bay fishermen find their catches dwindling every year. Our oyster catch last year was one-tenth of what it was in 1890.

Title V of the bill provides for the creation of regional planning commissions to deal with the problems of depressed areas that occur in two or more States. I note that on page 17 of the committee report, the committee states that this title was developed to meet the needs of such depressed areas as the upper Great Plains, the Ozarks, and the upper Great Lakes, and perhaps New England.

I would like to propound this question to the distinguished Senator from Michigan: Whether this list is exclusive or whether it might be possible for other regions in the country to qualify for assistance under the title?

Mr. McNAMARA. I assure the Senator from Maryland that this is not an exclusive list, but is intended to be merely a list of examples of areas. It does not preclude such areas as the Senator has in mind.

Mr. TYDINGS. Am I correct, then, in assuming that if the Chesapeake Bay area, including parts of Maryland, Virginia, and possibly Delaware, could qualify under the standards set forth in section 501 of the bill, it would be possible to establish a Chesapeake Bay Regional Development Commission under title V?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am pleased to have that assurance from the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan. As the record will show, there are a number of counties located in this area that have already been designated as depressed areas under the Area Redevelopment Act. In my own State of Maryland, Somerset and Dorchester Counties on the Eastern Shore, and Calvert County in southern Maryland, have already been so designated. In Delaware, Kent and Sussex Counties have been designated depressed areas under the Proxmire amendment to the Area Redevelopment Act. Finally, in Virginia the northern neck counties of Westmoreland, Lancaster, Richmond, and Northumberland have been designated as depressed areas.

It would be my hope and expectation that the States of the Chesapeake Bay would be able to utilize the provisions of this act to begin to solve some of the problems of economic depression in the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator mentioned title 5. I am sure the Senator recognizes that this title provides only for planning money. That is what the Senator has referred to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong support of S. 1648, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, with amendments as proposed by the Senate Public Works Committee. This legislation is of historical significance in its dramatic approach to the problems of economically distressed areas, and I am pleased to have joined as a cosponsor of the measure.

This bill serves as a recognition on the part of the Federal Government that the vast majority of these areas cannot, within their own resources, initially provide the basic community needs which industry looks for and has a right to expect when seeking new plant locations for business expansion. The bill provides an inducement to industry, not only to accelerate its expansion programs, but also to locate in areas where new employment opportunities will have the greatest economic impact.

The experimental Area Redevelopment Act program has already demonstrated the value of Federal assistance to those areas of high unemployment and low family income. It has given new hope to the people in these areas and provided a stimulus for uniting in a cooperative effort toward a common goal—achieving economic stability.

The preparation of the overall economic development program under ARA was a large undertaking. For many areas of my State of West Virginia, it constituted the first organized effort at long-range planning and practical, coordinated determination on the direction to be taken in promoting economic growth.

But the development of a program was only the first step up the long trail toward economic recovery and only a few communities have been successful, thus far, in attracting a new industry. One of the greatest deterrents has been the inadequacy of basic community services, such as water and sewage facilities. Because of the intense competition for new industry throughout the United States, plant locaters will not even look at a proposed site where basic community services do not already exist, or cannot be readily expanded to satisfy their requirements.

A further deterrent in many areas of greatest economic need was the ARA statutory requirement that 10 percent of the project cost be provided by local or State funds as equity capital or as a loan repayable only after the Federal loan had been repaid in full. In some instances, intensive effort by the local development organization failed to raise the amount of money needed and the industrial prospect located in some other area. In other instances, the community was forced to turn away a second industrial prospect because its funds were tied up for such a long period as a result of participation in an earlier project.

The people of West Virginia recognized that ARA could provide them with an opportunity never before envisioned to help them on the road to economic recovery and they worked tirelessly and diligently to avail themselves of this opportunity. Not all their efforts were successful, but they have made a start. They have been stimulated into activity and are ready to intensify this activity under the new legislation. ARA has approved 16 industrial and commercial loans; 17 public facility loans and grants; 30 technical assistance projects; and 49 training programs in West Virginia, as of the first quarter of this year. It has invested $42,111,000 in these 112 projects which will create 4,835 direct jobs.

The accelerated public works program provided an additional source of assistance for obtaining needed public facilities. And 303 projects were approved in West Virginia with a total cost of $79,674,000, of which $42,543,000 was provided by APW. These projects will provide an estimated 52,125 man-months of labor.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 not only combines the best features of both ARA and APW but it also follows the concept of the Appalachia Regional Development Act by encouraging regional development planning. It has my full and wholehearted support.

I wish to compliment my colleague from West Virginia, the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, for his effective and constructive work on this measure in the Public Works Committee. I pledge my full efforts toward securing the necessary funding to implement this authorization bill as such time as it may be before the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member.

It is my sincere belief that the planning and assistance envisioned under S. 1648 offer the sorely needed further opportunity for distressed areas to move toward long-range economic development and to consolidate past gains made under the previous Federal programs.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased that the Senate is moving surely toward final approval this afternoon of the vastly important Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

I have long supported legislation to provide the tools, the training, the advice, and the planning necessary to realize the full economic potential of every area of our Nation.

I have been a sponsor of bills to establish an effective framework for Federal State, and local planning to achieve the necessary environment and facilities for establishment of improved, stable, and diversified local economies and enhanced living conditions.

My sponsorship and vote for the Appalachia bill and my sponsorship of the predecessor bill to S. 1648 illustrate my continuing interest in this approach to local, State, and regional economic problems.

The signing into law of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 will represent a milestone of effective Federal Government cooperation with State and local governments and private industry to bring all areas of the American economy up to their potential, to eliminate poverty, and to provide full employment.

This bill addresses itself to the nationwide problem of underemployment of people, machinery, and resources. In short, it addresses itself to waste.

These problems of waste of human and industrial potential are common to many areas of our Nation.

They are of concern to all.

They prevent all our people from fulfilling and sharing in our national wealth and prosperity.

They rob us all by retarding our full national economic potential.

These problems are a particular and unique concern to New England, the cradle of industrial America, and to my own State of Connecticut.

The traditional technology and industry which New England nurtured for the new America a century and a half ago have been, in too many cases, outpaced by technological advance, displaced by lower costs elsewhere, or replaced by new forms of industry employing fewer persons.

The textile, shoe, and fishing industries and the decline of railroad transportation are cases in point.

As a result, New England's employment has declined, its new investment in plant has been retarded, and the personal income levels have lagged behind the national growth rates.

I am gratified to be able to report that industrial development and personal income in my own State of Connecticut have set a faster pace than most other areas of New England and by and large compare favorably with the national average.

But we in Connecticut have never rested on our oars in pursuing full utilization of our State's human and industrial potential.

We cannot afford to do so now.

This act will provide the people of my State, the people of New England, and the people of all the United States the planning and the financing to bring every area of the Nation up to its full economic promise.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 will help put an end to waste of national resources—human, industrial, and natural.

By doing so, the act will provide all our people a richer and fuller participation in our national life.

I hope that the New England States will work together and with the Federal Government, so that the people who live in these six States can benefit from this new program.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, as a coauthor of S. 1648 and as one who is concerned with the development of an effective area assistance act, I want to congratulate the Public Works Committee on the pending bill.

I believe that the approach that has been fashioned in this act for aiding areas of lagging economic growth will prove much more effective than the old Area Redevelopment Act. I am especially pleased that the criteria for qualification of areas of below average development have been modified to include measures other than unemployment alone.

My own State of South Dakota is an agricultural State. Decline in farm numbers and farm employment in the State has been barely offset by an increase in tourism and development of minor industries. For the most part, industrial development has passed us by at this point in our history.

In spite of lagging economic growth, we do not have excessive unemployment. We train our young people, and they migrate to other States in search of employment. Our outmigration of persons seeking employment was slightly greater than the total number of new entrants into the labor force in the State in the 1950–60 decade. We have been transferring our employment problems—along with a sizable investment in training and education of young people—to other areas. To the extent that the South Dakota economy, and the whole Upper Great Plains economy, can be developed, we will lessen the problems of other States and cities.

I am strongly of the opinion that the measure now pending will be of real assistance to the Upper Great Plains, to my State, and to the sound economic growth of the Nation as a whole.

The Public Works Committee has reported a splendid bill, and I urge that it be enacted.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that it be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], I ask for the yeas and nays on his amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The hour of 4:45 p.m. having arrived, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The result was announced, yeas 31, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 100 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dominick
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Holland
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—53

Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Jackson
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson
Curtis
Eastland
Ervin
Gore
Hruska
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
Magnuson
McGee
Miller
Neuberger
Ribicoff
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers

So Mr. Cooper's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce that if the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] were present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1648) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 5 o'clock p.m., having arrived, the vote on the passage of the pending bill is in order. The bill having been read the third time, and the yeas and nays having been ordered on the passage of the bill, the question is, Shall it pass? The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold by vote.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee].

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller].

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson].

If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay" and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

The pairs of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] have been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 12, as follows:

[No. 101 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—12

Allott
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Dominick
Hickenlooper
Holland
Jordan, Idaho
Mundt
Robertson
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—17

Curtis
Eastland
Ervin
Gore
Hruska
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Magnuson
McGee
Miller
Neuberger
Ribicoff
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Young, N. Dak.

So the bill (S. 1648) was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MUSKIE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce that if the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] were present and voting, he would vote "yea."

PASSAGE OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, passage by the Senate today of the Public Works and Economic Development Act is most gratifying. I voted for this bill because it offers the communities of New York as well as of the whole country an opportunity to participate in the economic well-being of the Nation. Under this bill, communities and counties can band together in economic development districts to improve employment and encourage the expansion of industry. Cities and towns will be able to build needed public facilities such as waterlines, police and fire stations, research centers and industrial facilities.

I am particularly pleased that the Senate accepted the committee amendment providing that counties eligible for assistance under ARA on or after April 1, 1965, will also qualify for funds under the new act. Hamilton County, which was just designated as a redevelopment area, would be eligible under the new program. Cayuga and Cattaraugus Counties, which are losing their designation, would also still be eligible for assistance under the new program.

Another committee amendment which the Senate accepted authorized $400 million rather than the original $250 million for the community development phase of the program. This larger sum will provide the needed funds for this important work.

It is now up to the communities of New York and the Nation, to use this assistance for the benefit of all our less fortunate citizens.

NEED FOR NEW DEPRESSED AREAS BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the bill which the Senate has just passed provides for new and streamlined redevelopment for distressed areas. In addition to providing more effective help to areas with high unemployment, it will also help communities hard hit by defense installations shutdowns and plant closures.

The bill embraces most of the recommendations made last year by the subcommittee of which I am chairman, the Subcommittee on Unemployment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It includes provisions for making Federal economic aid available to nondistressed communities faced by imminent closure of a defense installation. Many such communities, such as the Greater Harrisburg area in my own State, are not presently eligible for such assistance. With this assistance now available, a full kit of planning, technical, and financial aid will be available to help Greater Harrisburg adjust to the impact of the closure of the Olmsted Air Force Base when and if it comes.

The bill includes another of our subcommittee recommendations by permitting groups of counties or even groups of States to band together, pool their resources and launch a broad-scale attack on their economic problems. Experience has demonstrated how difficult it is for each separate county—hobbled by little money and little manpower—to rebuild its economy.

Congress has already passed another of our recommendations by consolidating the old area redevelopment retraining programs with the Manpower Development and Training Act, thus cutting redtape to a minimum.

Finally, the bill is in closer accord with our subcommittee findings on the need for public works assistance in distressed areas than the original administration request. It has increased the authorization for public works grants from $250 to $400 million. This is much closer to the $470 million backlog of already approved but unfunded projects filed by distressed communities under the old Accelerated Public Works program.

In Pennsylvania alone, we have an $88 million backlog of approved community public works in distressed communities awaiting funds. This includes $12 million for hospitals, $10 million for water lines, $30 million for sewers and sewage treatment facilities, and $17 million for streets and roads.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 175, H.R. 7717.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 7717) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences with amendments on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "$5,183,844,850" and insert "$5,196,826,350"; in line 3, after the word "astronomy", to to strike out "$4,537,121,000" and insert "$4,533,350,000"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "Apollo", to strike out "$2,967,385,000" and insert "$2,973,385,000"; in line 3, after the word "astronomy", to strike out "$160,500,000" and insert "$165,900,000"; in line 12, after the word "development", to strike out "$60,600,000" and insert "$63,600,000"; in line 14, after the word "procurement", to strike out "$179,500,000" and insert "$178,700,000"; in line 20 after the word "systems", to strike out "$33,000,000" and insert "$27,000,000"; in line 24, after the word "propulsion", to strike out "$51,200,000" and insert "$36,200,000"; on page 3, line 2, after the word "acquisition", to strike out "$242,321,000" and insert "$246,200,000"; in line 5, after the word "utilization", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$4,750,000"; in line 8, after the word "acquisitions", to strike out "$60,675,000" and insert "$67,376,350"; after line 10, to insert:

(2) Electronics Research Center, Cambridge, Massachusetts, $10,000,000;

At the beginning of line 13, to strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)"; at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)"; in line 16, after the word "Florida", to strike out "$7,854,400" and insert "$8,195,000"; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "(4)" and insert "(5)"; at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(5)" and insert "(6)"; at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "(6)" and insert "(7)"; in line 22, after the word "Texas", to strike out "$3,953,300" and insert "$4,180,000"; at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "(7)" and insert "(8)"; in line 24, after the word "Alabama", to strike out "$4,291,100" and insert "$2,309,450"; on page 4, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "(8)" and insert "(9)"; in line 2, after the word "Louisiana", to strike out "$269,500" and insert "$284,750"; at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(9)" and insert "(10)"; in line 4, to strike out "$1,905,600" and insert "$1,910,450"; at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "(10)" and insert "(11)"; at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "(11)" and insert "(12)"; in the same line, after the word "locations", to strike out "$19,871,400" and insert "$20,182,700"; at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "(12)" and insert "(13)"; in line 10, after the word "for", to strike out "$7,215,700" and insert "$5,000,000"; in line 11, after the word "operations", to strike out "$586,048,850" and insert "$596,100,000"; on page 5, line 15, after the numeral "(2)", to strike out "contracts may be entered into under the 'Administrative operations' appropriation for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the fiscal year following that for which the appropriation is made" and insert "maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the 'Administrative operations' appropriation for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year"; on page 6, line 22, after the numeral "(10)", to strike out "and"; in the same line, after the numeral "(11)", to insert a comma and "and (12)"; on page 7, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "$53,459,300" and insert "$62,376,350"; and on page 9, line 12, after "Sec. 5.", to strike out "It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds on a geographical basis whenever feasible and use such other measures as may be practicable toward this end" and insert "It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible".

SEVENTEENTH INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS CONGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on September 20, 1963, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. Fulbright], together with the then Senator Humphrey and Senators Clark, Dirksen, Ervin, Hickenlooper, Jordan of North Carolina, Keating, Kuchel, Saltonstall, Scott, and myself, introduced a resolution (S.J. Res. 120) extending an official welcome to the book and music publishers from some 40 countries throughout the world who would attend the 17th Congress of the International Publishers Association in Washington, D.C., from May 30 to June 5, 1965. This resolution was passed by the Senate on February 7, 1964, passed by the House of Representatives on April 6, 1964, and enacted into law on April 17, 1964.

This week, the 17th International Publishers Congress is meeting in Washington, D.C., under the sponsorship of the American Book Publishers' Council, Inc., and Music Publishers Association, Inc., in what will hopefully be a fruitful exchange of ideas and the basis for warm and lasting relationships. The meeting marks the first time in its 70-year history that the International Publishers Association will have conducted its meeting in the United States. It is attended by approximately 800 publishers from the United States and abroad. I believe I speak for the sponsors of that measure and many other of my colleagues in extending a warm welcome to the publishers from abroad. I take particular pride in expressing these words of welcome in view of the fact that the State of New York, which I have the honor of representing, is considered by many to be the publishing center of the world and has contributed greatly to the development of publishing.

MAY 1—LAW DAY, U.S.A.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the lawyers of America have undertaken a public service in sponsoring May 1 as Law Day, U.S.A. In a recent issue of the Los Angeles, Calif., Bar Bulletin, the distinguished president of the Los Angeles County Bar Association, Mr. Edward S. Shattuck, wrote an excellent article describing what May Day, U.S.A., means to every American, under the Constitution, and contrasted it with what May Day means to communism, on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

I commend the article to the reading of all Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 1—LAW DAY, U.S.A.

(By Edward S. Shattuck)

May 1 is Law Day, U.S.A. What will it mean to the American people in this year 1965? What will be its impact upon citizens of other nations around the world? Can and should the lawyers of the United States lead a determined effort to make this year's Law Day purposeful and effective both at home and abroad? These are questions I have asked myself over and over again and, with your indulgence, I would now like you to share my thoughts and conclusions.

May 1 has long been a day set aside by Communist nations for bringing forth their armed might and parading it before the world. It has been a day when Communist dictators have wantonly indulged themselves and their people in excessive abuses to our country, falsely proclaiming us to be imperialists and aggressors.

In this posture of May 1, the American Bar Association suggested that we offset this bawdy demonstration of the Communist world by declaring through the President of the United States that May 1 each year should be set aside as Law Day, U.S.A. Throughout the land we should utilize it to give recognition and thanks for our government of the people, by the people, and for the people—a government of law and not of men—a government by our duly elected representatives, not a government imposed upon us by self-appointed dictators. In this manner—so we reasoned—we would call attention of peoples all over the world to the contrast between citizens living in our Nation under the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing the individual rights of every person, and the citizens living under Communist regimes where individual rights depend upon the whims of the dictators of the moment.

Will May 1, 1965, utilized for this purpose in the United States, ring true in the minds and hearts of our own people? Will it create the worldwide image of contrast between our people and people in Communist nations—the objective of Law Day, U.S.A.? I have concluded that the answer depends upon what action is taken by the lawyers of America—the very ones who conceived of Law Day, U.S.A. in the first place.

On March 16, 1965, the President of the United States, addressing a joint session of Congress, stated the issue we must face on Law Day in these eloquent and simple words:

"This was the first Nation in the history of the world to be founded with a purpose. The great phrases of that purpose are still found in every American heart, North and South: 'All men are created equal'—'Government by consent of the governed'—'Give me liberty or give me death.' Those are not just clever words or empty theories. In their name American have fought and died for two centuries and today are risking their lives.

"Those words are a promise to every citizen that he shall share in the dignity of man. This dignity cannot be found in a man's possessions or his power or his position. It rests on his right to be treated as a man equal in opportunity to all others. It says that he shall share in freedom, choose his leaders, educate his children, provide for his family according to his ability and merits as a human being.

"To apply any other test—to deny a man his hopes because of his color or race, his religion or the place of his birth—is not only to do injustice, it is to deny America and to dishonor the dead who gave their lives for freedom."

The President was addressing himself primarily to the fact that we have not carried out the clear mandate of the 15th amendment to our own Constitution because we, in some instances, have denied American citizens the right to vote in the selection of their leaders. The challenge of his speech went much deeper. It said what should be and, in most cases, is in the mind and heart of every American citizen. The time for universal justice for every person in our Nation is now. The time to end forever bigotry, intolerance, and discrimination in America is now.

Universal justice, the end to bigotry, intolerance, and discrimination, which must come unless we are to sound like hypocrites before world opinion, cannot be accomplished by laws alone. Laws will help, as they always do when a few people resist the unalienable rights of others. The real challenge, however, is to arouse our conscience and to implant a determination in the heart and mind of every American that in his day-to-day life and in every way within his power he shall seek justice for every American and do no act which may be rooted in bigotry or intolerance or that could result in discrimination.

If Law Day, U.S.A. in 1965 is to ring true to our own people at home and to the people abroad, we as lawyers must use our inherent ability to speak and write by reiterating publicly in speeches and privately in correspondence our belief in the great purpose of our country. We must let the people know that our learned profession believes deeply that all men are created equal, are entitled to equal opportunity and must always stand equal before the bar of justice. We must be willing and anxious, at every opportunity, to defend the rights of Americans, all Americans, to vote, to the equal protection of law, to petition the Government, to peaceably assemble, to pray in private or in public, and to exercise fully every other right preserved by the U.S. Constitution. We must have the courage to insist on these rights being recognized and at the same time, to insist that we and those we seek to help, who are demonstrating, do so in a lawful manner.

Cannot the members of the bar be effective in this fight for freedom for all? In these turbulent days in which we live, cannot lawyers put their full strength back of the wheel which is now in motion? I am sure we can and we must if Law Day, U.S.A. in 1965 is going to be impressive either at home or abroad.

So, what can we do? As individual lawyers we can write letters all over the country. At the time of the American Revolution, and again when the great moral issue of slavery confronted our Nation, and during this century, when we were called upon to defend liberty throughout the world, lawyers exchanged letters with each other and wrote profusely to their laymen friends espousing the cause of freedom. If everyone of our 6,000 members wrote 10 such letters before May 1, 1965, and asked every person to whom he wrote to do the same, the Los Angeles County Bar Association alone would reach 600,000 people. Will you do it?

Will you also seize on every opportunity to speak out? Lawyers are eloquent. Speak out among your neighbors, at social gatherings and in public addresses. Give the leadership to public opinion. Our knowledge of history and law is respected by our neighbors, friends and the public. We have a unique influence because of our education and our professional standing.

Finally, I have proposed to the board of trustees—I hope that by the time this reaches print the Board will have approved—that the Los Angeles County Bar Association ask every major bar association in America to join us in this "lawyers' crusade for freedom."

A fire has been kindled by the President. Can we make Law Day, U.S.A. in 1965 purposeful and effective so the flame will heighten and the fire will spread? I know we can and I believe we will.

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES OF THE KANIKSU NATIONAL FOREST, IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 435.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 435) to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire by exchange, purchase, or otherwise, the real property described in section 3 of this Act. Upon such acquisition the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest are extended to include such real property.

SEC. 2. In the acquisition of the real property described in section 3, the Secretary of Agriculture shall be guided by the following policies:

(1) He should make every reasonable effort to acquire the property by negotiated purchase.

(2) The property should be appraised at its fair market value by the Secretary of Agriculture before the initiation of negotiations, and the owner or his designated representative should be given an opportunity to accompany the appraiser during an inspection of the property.

SEC. 3. The real property authorized to be acquired under authority of this Act is more particularly described as follows:

Township 63 north, range 4 west, Boise meridian:

Section 18, southeast quarter southeast quarter; section 19, northeast quarter northeast quarter, lot 3 (southeast quarter northeast quarter); section 20, southwest quarter northwest quarter; section 33, lot 1 (northeast quarter northwest quarter), lot 2 (southeast quarter northwest quarter), lot 3 (northeast quarter southeast quarter), lot 6 (southeast quarter southwest quarter), west half southwest quarter northeast quarter, west half northwest quarter southeast quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Township 63 north, range 5 west, Boise meridian:

Section 24, northeast quarter northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter northeast quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter, lot 2 (northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter), lot 3 (northeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter).

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on my own behalf and on behalf of my colleague from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

URGENT NEED FOR ECONOMIC POLICY: STATISTICS ON JOB VACANCIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a question that has concerned many economists and businessmen is the failure of the Federal Government to provide statistics on job vacancies. Unemployment statistics are vital ingredients of many Federal policies. But unemployment figures should be balanced with accurate, reliable, authoritative figures from the Federal Government to show what jobs are available for the unemployed.

The National Industrial Conference Board has taken up this issue recently and has made an interesting interim report. The conference board points out that, until quite recently, practically no information on this subject was available for the United States, while in most developed countries of the world it is available.

The conference board reports on an intensive study of Monroe County, N.Y., which includes the Rochester area. The board chose this area because it desired to ascertain what the job vacancy rate was in a county with a tight labor market. They found that the job vacancy rate was about 3 percent of employment. Unemployment was about 2.7 percent. Therefore, by their definition of vacancy rate, vacancies exceeded unemployment in Monroe County during the period of investigation they chose.

However, they point out that vacancies included some jobs that would not be available for several months. So they made another comparison, which they felt would be valid for some purposes, for what may be called the immediate job vacancy rate. Here they found that unemployment was 2.7 percent, while the immediate job vacancy rate was 1.9 percent. This makes an interesting comparison. I think both statistics are useful for analysis.

Furthermore, they compared the unemployment rate and the vacancy rate with respect to unfilled job openings as shown in the files of the U.S. Employment Service, which many people believe might serve as a good measure of job vacancies.

Their comprehensive investigation disclosed that unfilled jobs listed in the U.S. Employment Service covered only one-eighth of the vacancies, following their comprehensive survey of the entire county.

I should like to read the concluding sentence of their report, because I believe it is highly appropriate:

> Our experience with these surveys has led us to the tentative conclusion that the collection of job vacancy statistics is a feasible operation when the information is obtained by interview and the groundwork in the community has been carefully prepared. Employers were cooperative in almost all cases and readily understood the concepts and definitions. A preliminary analysis of the results indicates that they are reasonable and consistent with other information. Our final judgment, however, must wait upon the results of the two additional sample surveys in Monroe County, one in May, and the other in August 1965.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this brief article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Conference Board Record, May 1965]

CAN YOU MEASURE JOB VACANCIES?

(NOTE.—Unfilled job openings totaled nearly 8,000 in Monroe County, N.Y., in mid-February. A sample survey conducted by the conference board revealed large numbers of vacancies in professional occupations and in semiskilled jobs. Employers required at least a high school diploma for most jobs but were willing to accept persons with no related experience in more than half of the cases studied. Vacancies were found in all industries surveyed; they were most common in durable manufacturing and education. The survey, which covered 401 employers, will be repeated twice this year.)

Many questions have been posed in recent years about the number and characteristics of unfilled job vacancies in the United States. The great interest in this subject has been evidenced by articles in business and trade journals, statements of businessmen and public officials, and in congressional hearings. Until quite recently, however, practically no information was available on this subject for the United States. This is in contrast with most other developed nations, where data on unfilled vacancies are collected and published regularly.

About 1 year ago, the conference board undertook a study of the feasibility of collecting job vacancy statistics. The study is to continue for 18 months and is financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation. The area chosen for field work is Monroe County, N.Y., which was coextensive, until this year, with the Rochester standard metropolitan statistical area and the Rochester labor market area. Among the reasons for selecting the Rochester area is the low unemployment rate that has characterized the area for several years. That is, it has been considered either a "tight" labor market or one in balance. This in turn suggests the existence of a significant number of unfilled job openings. Our plans call for three surveys during 1965. This is a progress report based on the first of these surveys.

A series of probing interviews conducted during the fall of 1964 provided the basis for our first sample survey, conducted last February. Information on job vacancies and employment was obtained from 401 employers in the area. Almost all employers were contacted by personal visit and the information transcribed on the spot. The survey covered all branches of industry except agriculture and private households. A job vacancy was defined in our survey as an unfilled job opening, present or anticipated, for which the employer was actively recruiting an employee, on February 12, from outside his organization. Openings which the employer expected to fill by transfer or promotion of persons already working in the organization were excluded. Job vacancies include full time, part time, permanent, and temporary openings. "Actively recruiting" includes requests to employment agencies, public and private, newspaper, advertising, interviewing walk-in applicants, etc. Workers on layoff were not included.

There were nearly 8,000 job vacancies in Monroe County on February 12. About 5,000 of these, or 62 percent, were for immediate starting; the balance were for jobs to start at later dates, ranging through January 1966. There was a large concentration of jobs (over 1,000), with starting dates in September; these were almost entirely connected with education and they reflect the beginning of the new school year.

Starting date	Number of job vacancies	Percent distribution of job vacancies
Immediately (Feb. 12)	4,989	62.4
Later in February	328	4.1
March	306	3.8
April	[1] 479	6.0
May	[1] 569	7.1
June	125	1.6
July	126	1.6
August	[1] 1	0
September	1,066	13.3
January 1966	[1] 2	0
Total	7,991	100.0

[1] Statistically unreliable.

Corresponding to the finding of 8,000 job vacancies is a total employment figure of 260,000. As shown in table 1, 33 large employers, each with total employment of 1,000 or more, accounted for 39 percent of total vacancies. Very small employers, each with total employment below 10 persons, accounted for another 16 percent.

The "vacancy rate," defined as the number of job vacancies divided by vacancies plus total employment, is a measure analogous to the unemployment rate. The vacancy rate relates vacancies to total labor demand (persons currently employed plus additional persons sought), while the unemployment rate relates the unemployed to total labor supply (employed plus those seeking work). In Monroe County, we estimate the vacancy rate at 3 percent in February. This figure permits a rough comparison to an unemployment rate of 2.7 percent in the area (without seasonal adjustment for the midweek of February), as estimated by the Division of Employment of the New York State Department of Labor.[1]

---

[1] "Rochester Labor Market Newsletter," March 1965. The unemployment rate estimate includes agricultural and household workers; the industrial coverage is, therefore, somewhat different from that of the NICB survey. The comparable unemployment rate for the United States for February is 5.7 percent (without seasonal adjustment).

TABLE 1.—*Employment size—Job vacancies, number of employers, and total employment by employment size*

Employment size	Number of employers interviewed	Estimated: Number of employers	Estimated: Employment (E)	Estimated: Number of vacancies (V)	Standard error of number of vacancies	Vacancy rate (V as percent of E+V)	Percent distribution of total number of vacancies
0 to 9	108	9,526	29,874	1,270	315.00	4.08	15.9
10 to 19	41	1,092	14,536	380	103.00	2.54	4.8
20 to 49	51	710	19,892	722	107.00	3.50	9.0
50 to 99	38	237	16,338	672	71.70	3.95	8.4
100 to 249	47	156	22,416	579	44.20	2.52	7.2
250 to 999	83	87	43,705	1,254	6.48	2.79	15.7
1,000 to 2,499	20	20	30,237	599	0	1.94	7.5
2,500 and over	13	13	81,637	2,515	0	2.99	31.5
Total, Monroe County	401	11,841	258,635	7,991	358.00	3.00	100.0

TABLE 2.—*Industry group—Job vacancies, number of employers, and total employment by industry group*

Industry group	Number of employers interviewed	Estimated: Number of employers	Estimated: Employment (E)	Estimated: Number o. vacancies (V)	Standard error of number of vacancies	Vacancy rate (V as percent of E+V)	Percent distribution of number of vacancies
Durable manufacturing	66	460	94,644	2,537	83.60	2.61	31.7
Machinery (except electrical)	15	107	10,803	407	50.70	3.63	5.1
Photographic, optical, and instruments	17	173	52,874	1,585	20.60	2.91	19.8
Other durable goods	34	180	30,967	545	62.20	1.73	6.8
Nondurable manufacturing	48	623	25,458	408	10.40	1.58	5.1
Food products	19	253	8,048	63	3.46	.78	.8
Printing and publishing	10	220	5,225	28	0	.53	.4
Other nondurable goods	19	150	12,185	317	9.80	2.54	4.0
Construction	28	1,347	11,536	966	183.00	7.73	12.1
Building construction	11	507	5,044	408	95.40	7.48	5.1
Other	17	840	6,492	558	156.00	7.91	7.0
Public utilities and transportation	15	405	10,027	[1] 408	201.00	3.91	5.1
Trade, retail and wholesale	103	3,678	43,317	1,010	143.00	2.27	12.6
Retail:							
General merchandise	12	283	9,333	97	6.48	1.03	1.2
Food	10	269	4,910	47	6.00	.95	.6
Auto dealers and service stations	14	535	4,838	359	102.00	6.91	4.5
Retail, eating and drinking places	17	814	5,434	196	61.80	3.48	2.5
Other	50	1,777	18,802	311	77.50	1.63	3.9
Finance, insurance, and real estate	21	720	9,202	266	50.10	2.81	3.3
Services	104	4,388	51,399	2,066	156.00	3.86	25.8
Personal	12	515	4,009	130	33.60	3.14	1.7
Medical and health	22	1,718	10,650	328	7.75	2.99	4.1
Education (public and private)	27	161	20,412	1,319	42.80	6.07	16.5
Other	43	1,994	16,328	[1] 289	145.00	1.74	3.6
Government	16	220	13,052	330	15.70	2.47	4.1
Total, Monroe County	401	11,841	258,635	7,991	358.00	3.00	100.0

Industry group	Total employment: Number	Total employment: Percent distribution	Total vacancies: Number	Total vacancies: Percent distribution	"Immediate" vacancies: Number	"Immediate" vacancies: Percent distribution
Durable manufacturing	94,644	36.6	2,537	31.7	2,168	43.5
Construction	11,536	4.5	[1] 966	12.1	[2] 302	6.1
Trade	43,317	16.7	1,010	12.6	882	17.7
Education	20,412	7.9	1,319	16.5	135	2.7
All other	88,726	34.3	2,159	27.0	1,502	30.1
Total, Monroe County	258,635	100.0	7,991	100.0	4,989	100.0

[1] Statistically unreliable owing to large relative size of standard error.
[2] Statistically unreliable.

It should be noted, however, that an unemployed person is defined, in official statistics, as a person immediately available for work. Our definition of job vacancies, on the other hand, includes positions for later starting dates. Another comparison, more valid for some purposes, can be made between the unemployment rate and what might be called the immediate job vacancy rate. The latter would relate job vacancies for immediate starting to the sum of total employment plus "immediate vacancies." This computation yields an immediate vacancy rate of 1.9 percent.

The (total) vacancy rate was highest for the group of smallest employers, but fluctuated erratically between other size classes; employers of 2,500 or more persons had an overall vacancy rate of 3 percent, the same as for all firms combined.

A measure of the reliability of the sample estimates is provided by the standard errors shown in each table. The standard error indicates, approximately, the range within which the (usually unknown) true value will be, with a given probability. For example, the total number of vacancies, estimated at 7,991, has a standard error of 358 (table 1). This means technically that about 68 percent of all estimates of total vacancies, which could be made from samples of 400 firms drawn like the NICB sample, would fall within 358 of the true value. Also, about 95 percent of all sample values would be within 716, or two standard errors, of the true value; and about 99 percent would be within 1,074, or three standard errors. Thus we can judge the reliability, or accuracy, of a sample estimate by comparing it to its standard error. When the standard error is small relative to the sample estimate (as with the estimate for total vacancies), the estimate may be taken to be reasonably reliable. When the standard error is large relative to the same estimate (see "personal services" in table 2), not much confidence in the numerical value of the estimate is warranted.

On the survey date, more than one-third of total employment (excluding agriculture and private households) was in durable manufacturing (table 2). This reflects the importance of the photographic, optical, and instrument industries, for which the Rochester area is well known. It is not surprising, therefore, to find 32 percent of total vacancies in durable manufacturing and 20 percent in the photographic, optical, and instruments industries. Another large concentration of vacancies was in services, educational services in particular. As noted above, however, many jobs in educational services were to begin in September and were thus of a rather different nature than those in manufacturing (table 3).

The vacancy rate varied considerably between industries (table 2). The rate was very high in construction, auto dealers and service stations, and education. In construction and education, this reflects seasonal variation to a large extent. The vacancy rate was quite low in food-products manufacturing; this reflected the seasonal low of this industry in Monroe County.

Occupation group	Total vacancies		Percent of vacancies open to—		
	Number	Percent distribution	Males	Females	Either sex
Professional workers	2,127	26.6	15.7	8.4	75.9
Semiprofessional workers	331	4.1	63.7	1.8	34.4
Managers and officials	186	2.3	71.5	3.2	25.3
Clerical workers	752	9.4	18.0	62.2	19.8
Sales workers	402	5.0	63.4	9.0	27.6
Service workers	563	7.0	36.2	31.6	32.1
Skilled workers	1,393	17.4	88.8	4.6	6.6
Semiskilled workers	1,730	21.6	79.4	15.6	5.0
Unskilled workers	507	6.3	84.8	12.2	3.0
Total	7,991	100.0	53.9	15.9	30.2

TABLE 3.—*Industry and starting date—Job vacancies by industry group and starting date*

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF JOB VACANCIES

Industry group	Starting date										Total	Standard error of total number of vacancies
	Immediately	Later in February 1965	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	January 1966		
Durable manufacturing	2,168	98	191	32	16	13	13	1	3	2	2,537	83.6
Nondurable manufacturing	385	19	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	408	10.4
Construction	302	0	0	112	552	0	0	0	0	0	[1] 966	183.0
Public utilities and transportation	91	5	0	284	0	28	0	0	0	0	[2] 408	201.0
Trade, retail and wholesale	882	71	17	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,010	143.0
Finance, insurance, and real estate	180	12	73	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	266	50.1
Services, other than education	598	123	19	0	0	1	0	0	6	0	747	150.0
Education, public and private	135	0	6	9	0	0	112	0	1,057	0	1,319	42.8
Government	248	0	0	1	0	80	1	0	0	0	330	15.7
Total, Monroe County	4,989	328	306	[1 2] 479	[1] 569	125	126	[1] 1	1,066	[1] 2	7,991	358.0
Standard error of total	246	48.4	41.2	208	136	0	0	0	42.8	0	358	---

HORIZONTAL PERCENT DISTRIBUTION

Industry group	Immediately	Later in February 1965	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	January 1966	Total	Standard error of total number of vacancies
Durable manufacturing	85.5	3.9	7.5	1.3	0.6	0.5	0.5	0	0.1	0.1	100.0	---
Nondurable manufacturing	94.4	4.7	0	.2	0	.7	0	0	0	0	100.0	---
Construction	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	(1)	---
Public utilities and transportation	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	(2)	---
Trade, retail and wholesale	87.3	7.0	1.7	4.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	---
Finance, insurance, and real estate	67.7	4.5	27.4	0	.4	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	---
Services, other than education	80.1	16.5	2.5	0	0	.1	0	0	.8	0	100.0	---
Education, public and private	10.2	0	.5	.7	0	0	.5	0	80.1	0	100.0	---
Government	75.2	0	0	.3	0	24.2	.3	0	0	0	100.0	---
Total	62.4	4.1	3.8	6.0	7.1	1.6	1.6	0	13.3	0	100.0	---

VERTICAL PERCENT DISTRIBUTION

Industry group	Immediately	Later in February 1965	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	January 1966	Total	Standard error of total number of vacancies
Durable manufacturing	43.5	29.9	62.4	---	---	10.4	10.3	---	0.3	---	31.7	---
Nondurable manufacturing	7.7	5.8	0	---	---	2.4	0	---	0	---	5.1	---
Construction	6.1	0	0	---	---	0	0	---	0	---	12.1	---
Public utilities and transportation	1.8	1.5	0	---	---	22.4	0	---	0	---	5.1	---
Trade, retail and wholesale	17.7	21.6	5.6	---	---	0	0	---	0	---	12.6	---
Finance, insurance, and real estate	3.6	3.7	23.9	---	---	0	0	---	0	---	3.3	---
Services, other than education	12.0	37.5	6.2	---	---	.8	0	---	.6	---	9.3	---
Education, public and private	2.7	0	2.0	---	---	0	88.9	---	99.2	---	16.5	---
Government	5.0	0	0	---	---	64.0	.8	---	0	---	4.1	---
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	(1 2)	(1)	100.0	100.0	(1)	100.0	(1)	100.0	---

[1] Distribution statistically unreliable owing to small number of reported vacancies.

[2] Statistically unreliable owing to large relative size of standard error.

TABLE 4.—*Occupation and sex—Job vacancies by occupation group and sex*

Occupation group	Estimated number of vacancies open to—				Standard error of total number of vacancies	Percent distribution of total number of vacancies
	Males	Females	Either sex	Total		
Professional workers	333	179	1,615	2,127	44.40	26.6
Chemists	16	1	40	57	2.45	.7
College faculty	15	0	105	120	13.40	1.5
Engineers	216	0	211	427	12.00	5.3
Electrical	109	0	34	143	11.50	1.8
Mechanical	56	0	98	154	3.46	1.9
Musicians and music teachers	0	0	30	30	7.75	.4
Social and welfare workers	3	9	111	123	5.48	1.5
Primary and kindergarten teachers	2	87	409	498	36.20	6.2
Secondary teachers and principals	4	13	307	324	15.50	4.1

TABLE 4.—*Occupation and sex—Job vacancies by occupation group and sex*—Continued

Occupation group	Estimated number of vacancies open to—				Standard error of total number of vacancies	Percent distribution of total number of vacancies
	Males	Females	Either sex	Total		
Semiprofessional workers	211	6	114	331	13.20	4.1
Draftsmen	72	0	16	88	6.00	1.1
Laboratory technicians	61	6	63	130	2.45	1.6
Managers and officials	133	6	47	186	34.60	2.3
Clerical workers	135	468	149	752	77.10	9.4
Clerks:						
General office	8	85	37	130	14.50	1.6
File	1	16	2	19	2.45	.2
General industry	12	24	1	37	11.50	.5
Operators, office machines	9	31	4	44	5.48	.6
Clerk, shipping and receiving	15	2	1	18	2.45	.2
Stenographers and typists	4	72	30	106	17.00	1.3
Stock clerks	25	2	1	28	2.45	.4
Sales workers	255	36	111	402	77.70	5.0
Salesmen:						
Insurance	6	3	90	99	21.40	1.2
To consumers	6	9	0	15	4.24	.2
Service workers	204	178	181	563	71.10	7.0
Maids and housemen	10	1	0	11	2.45	.1
Waiters and waitresses	0	94	1	95	20.30	1.2
Kitchen workers	43	5	1	49	15.90	.6
Practical nurses and midwives	12	17	63	92	13.90	1.2
Skilled workers	1,237	64	92	1,393	180.00	17.4
Machinists	109	0	4	113	21.60	1.4
Tool and die makers	75	0	36	111	24.30	1.4
Electricians	59	0	0	59	9.49	.7
Masons	204	0	0	204	59.90	2.5
Carpenters	124	0	0	124	36.30	1.6
Chauffeurs and drivers	7	0	17	24	5.48	.3
Mechanics [1]	70	0	1	71	4.24	.9
Foremen, manufacturing	7	3	0	10	2.45	.1
Semiskilled workers	1,373	270	87	1,730	262.00	21.6
Textile fabricators [1]	7	127	61	195	3.46	2.4
Laundry workers	10	45	19	74	18.30	.9
Warehouse workers	14	0	0	14	2.45	.2
Machinists' apprentices	91	0	0	91	14.90	1.1
Unskilled workers	430	62	15	507	84.40	6.3
Laundry workers	3	9	2	14	4.24	.2
Public service workers	20	0	4	24	7.75	.3
Laborers:						
Packing and filling	4	11	6	21	5.48	.3
Transportation equipment	60	0	0	60	17.30	.8
Warehouse	101	0	0	101	24.10	1.3
Total, Monroe County	4,311	1,269	2,411	7,991	358.00	100.0
Standard error of total	341.00	82.60	73.20	358.00	------------	------------

[1] Not elsewhere classified.

TABLE 5.—*Occupation and education—Job vacancies by occupation group and minimum education requirement*

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF JOB VACANCIES

Occupation group	Years of schooling required									Total	Standard error of total number of vacancies
	0	1 to 7	8	9 to 11	12	13 to 15	16	17 to 19	20		
Professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers	0	11	0	7	250	439	1,625	130	182	2,644	57.9
Clerical and sales workers	0	29	32	108	852	72	61	0	0	1,154	109.0
Service workers	35	175	102	80	94	71	6	0	0	563	71.1
Skilled workers	14	238	466	131	490	51	3	0	0	1,393	180.0
Semiskilled workers	195	70	140	669	655	1	0	0	0	1,730	262.0
Unskilled workers	93	104	150	84	76	0	0	0	0	507	84.4
Total, Monroe County	337	627	890	1,079	2,417	634	1,695	130	182	7.991	358.0
Standard error of total	35.6	97.4	181.0	221.0	174.0	38.3	64.7	13.6	0	358.0	------------

HORIZONTAL PERCENT DISTRIBUTION

Occupation group	Years of schooling required									Total	Median years of schooling
	0	1 to 7	8	9 to 11	12	13 to 15	16	17 to 19	20		
Professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers	0	0.4	0	0.3	9.5	16.6	61.5	4.9	6.9	100.0	16
Clerical and sales workers	0	2.5	2.8	9.4	73.8	6.2	5.3	0	0	100.0	12
Service workers	6.2	31.1	18.1	14.2	16.7	12.6	1.1	0	0	100.0	8
Skilled workers	1.0	17.1	33.5	9.4	35.2	3.7	.2	0	0	100.0	8
Semiskilled workers	11.3	4.0	8.1	38.7	37.8	.1	0	0	0	100.0	10
Unskilled workers	18.3	20.5	29.6	16.6	15.0	0	0	0	0	100.0	8
Total	4.2	7.8	11.1	13.5	30.2	7.9	21.2	1.6	2.3	100.0	12

TABLE 5—*Occupation and education—Job vacancies by occupation group and minimum education requirement*—Continued

VERTICAL PERCENT DISTRIBUTION

Occupation group	Years of schooling required									Total	Median years of schooling
	0	1 to 7	8	9 to 11	12	13 to 15	16	17 to 19	20		
Professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers	0	1.8	0	0.6	10.3	69.2	95.9	100.0	100.0	33.1	----------
Clerical and sales workers	0	4.6	3.6	10.0	35.3	11.4	3.6	0	0	14.4	----------
Service workers	10.4	27.9	11.5	7.4	3.9	11.2	.4	0	0	7.0	----------
Skilled workers	4.2	38.0	52.4	12.1	20.3	8.0	.2	0	0	17.4	----------
Semiskilled workers	57.9	11.2	15.7	62.0	27.1	.2	0	0	0	21.6	----------
Unskilled workers	27.6	16.6	16.9	7.8	3.1	0	0	0	0	6.3	----------
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	----------

Professional occupations were most in demand, in the Rochester area, followed closely by semiskilled and skilled occupations. The professional occupations reflect a large demand for teachers and engineers (table 4). The vacancies for semiskilled and skilled workers, on the other hand, were divided among a large number of specific occupations. In table 4, only those occupations are shown for which the number of vacancies was reasonably large relative to the corresponding standard error; the sum of the vacancies in specific occupations does not add to the group totals therefore.

More than one-half of total vacancies were open only to men, 16 percent only to women, and the balance, 30 percent, to either. The proportion of vacancies for men was highest in the manual occupations, skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled workers, as one might expect. Equally without surprise is the finding that job openings for women were relatively most important in clerical occupations. Jobs open to either sex were most commonly found in the professional occupations, reflecting vacancies for teachers and several other specific occupations (table 4).

The occupation title is often inadequate in describing a job or job opening. This is true for the jobseeker, for example, who wishes to compare his qualifications to employers' requirements. In order to provide a reasonably complete description of available vacancies, we obtained the sex, education, and experience requirements for each vacancy. The minimum acceptable number of school years and the minimum acceptable period of related experiences were requested from employers in an attempt to obtain realistic measures.

A large number of job vacancies were available to persons who had not graduated from high school (table 5). One-fourth of all vacancies, on the other hand, required at least 4 years of college. Jobs for those without high school diplomas were concentrated in the manual occupations—service workers and the three skill groups. Jobs requiring some college training were concentrated in the professional, semiprofessional, and managerial group.

Years of schooling required	Total vacancies	
	Number	Percent distribution
Fewer than 12	2,933	36.6
12	2,417	30.2
13 to 15	634	7.9
16 or more	2,007	25.1
Total	7,991	100.0

Another way of considering the relation between occupation and education requirements is the percent of vacancies in an occupation group that requires high school graduation, college graduation, etc. This reveals that most of the vacancies (73 percent) in the professional, semiprofessional, and managerial group require college graduation; all but 15 percent of the vacancies in the clerical and sales group require high school graduation; a large proportion (60 percent or more) of the vacancies in the service and other manual occupations are open to persons who have not completed high school.

Fifty-eight percent of the job vacancies in Rochester required no related experience of prospective workers (table 6). Most vacancies for skilled workers (90 percent) required experience; one-half required 4 or more years of related experience. The semiskilled occupations and the clerical and sales occupations frequently had experience requirements ranging from 1 month up to 2 years or more. In all occupation groups other than skilled workers, however, less than 50 percent required any related experience. It seems clear, therefore, that employers with unfilled job vacancies in the Rochester area have more stringent requirements with respect to formal schooling than to practical experience.

Formal schooling and practical experience are substitute qualifications, to some extent. The employers we interviewed frequently expressed this view, both informally and by stating alternative job requirements. For example, one job called for either (a) 12 years of schooling and 3 years of experience, or (b) 14 years of schooling and no experience.[2] Additional evidence for this statement is presented in the following summary (derived from table 7). Here we see that vacancies with low education requirements tend to have above-average experience requirements while vacancies with low experience requirements tend to have above-average education requirements.

Related experience required	Years of schooling required				
	Fewer than 12	12	13 to 15	16 or more	Total
	Percent of vacancies with stated experience requirement				
None	28.6	28.9	9.3	33.2	100.0
1 to 11 months	60.6	29.0	9.1	1.2	100.0
1 or 2 years	41.0	38.7	7.9	12.4	100.0
3 years or more	49.9	26.7	3.4	20.0	100.0
Total	36.7	30.2	7.9	25.1	100.0
	Percent of vacancies with stated schooling requirement				
None	44.9	55.1	67.2	76.2	57.6
1 to 11 months	10.0	5.8	6.9	.3	6.0
1 or 2 years	19.9	22.8	17.8	8.8	17.8
3 years or more	25.2	16.4	8.0	14.7	18.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Many persons have suggested that the unfilled job openings in the files of the offices of the U.S. Employment Service might serve as good measures of total job vacancies. In order to investigate this possibility, we requested that the New York State Division of Employment provide us with the number of unfilled job openings in Monroe County on February 12, 1965. The data which were kindly made available to us are shown below. It is interesting to note that while the NICB survey estimated a total number of vacancies almost five times the number in the State file,[3] the percent distributions by occupation group do not differ greatly. The State file has a relatively large percentage of openings for service workers and clerical and sales workers, while the NICB survey has relatively more openings for professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers and for manual workers. The greatest differences are in the service group (more important in the State file) and in the semiskilled group (more important in the NICB survey).

Percent of vacancies in stated occupation group

Occupation group	Years of schooling required				
	Fewer than 12	12	13 to 15	16 or more	Total
Professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers	0.7	9.5	16.6	73.3	100.0
Clerical and sales workers	14.7	73.8	6.2	5.3	100.0
Service workers	69.6	16.7	12.6	1.1	100.0
Skilled workers	61.0	35.2	3.7	.2	100.0
Semiskilled workers	62.1	37.8	.1	0	100.0
Unskilled workers	85.0	15.0	0	0	100.0
Total	36.0	30.2	7.9	25.1	100.0

Occupation group	New York State Employment Service, job openings		NICB survey, estimated vacancies	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers	447	27.8	2,644	33.1
Clerical and sales workers	314	19.5	1,154	14.4
Service workers	379	23.5	563	7.0
Skilled workers	248	15.4	1,393	17.4
Semiskilled workers	145	9.0	1,730	21.6
Unskilled workers	74	4.6	507	6.3
Total	1,607	100.0	7,991	100.0

---

[2] In each case where two or more alternatives were given for schooling and experience, we used the alternative with the lower schooling requirement in preparing our tables. This tends to reinforce the statement made above that education requirements are more stringent than experience requirements in the Rochester area.

[3] The total for the State may be slightly understated, since job orders do not always specify the exact number of workers sought. In such cases, only one opening is included in the State tabulation. There were only three such cases.

TABLE 6.—*Occupation and experience*

JOB VACANCIES BY OCCUPATION GROUP AND MINIMUM EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENT

Occupation group	Minimum period of related experience												Total	Standard error of total number of vacancies
	Less than 1 year				1 year	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 years	6 years	7 to 9 years	10 years or more		
	None	1 to 3 months	4 to 6 months	7 to 11 months										
	Estimated number of job vacancies													
Professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers	1,837	8.0	2.0	1.0	158.0	215	109.0	115.0	119.0	17	36	27	2,644	57.9
Clerical and sales workers	696	21.0	83.0	25.0	134.0	117	30.0	13.0	32.0	1	2	0	1,154	109.0
Service workers	437	0	12.0	12.0	19.0	74	1.0	7.0	0.0	1	0	0	563	71.1
Skilled workers	133	4.0	13.0	48.0	166.0	141	144.0	383.0	133.0	191	35	2	1,393	180.0
Semiskilled workers	1,003	104.0	140.0	3.0	43.0	352	70.0	8.0	7.0	0	0	0	1,730	262.0
Unskilled workers	497	2.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	507	84.4
Total, Monroe County	4,603	139.0	251.0	92.0	523.0	900	354.0	526.0	291.0	[1] 210	[2] 73	[2] 29	7,991	358.0
Standard error of total	209	42.5	34.4	26.2	55.4	222	64.1	58.4	31.5	141	0	6	358	----------
	Horizontal percent distribution													
Professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers	69.5	0.3	0.1	0	6.0	8.1	4.1	4.3	4.5	0.6	1.4	1.0	100.0	----------
Clerical and sales workers	60.3	1.8	7.2	2.2	11.6	10.1	2.6	1.1	2.8	.1	.2	0	100.0	----------
Service workers	77.6	0	2.1	2.1	3.4	13.1	.2	1.2	0	.2	0	0	100 0	----------
Skilled workers	9.5	.3	.9	3.4	11.9	10.1	10.3	27.5	9.5	13.7	2.5	.1	100.0	----------
Semiskilled workers	58.0	6.0	8.1	.2	2.5	20.3	4.0	.5	.4	0	0	0	100.0	----------
Unskilled workers	98.0	.4	.2	.6	.6	.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	----------
Total	57.6	1.7	3.1	1.2	6.5	11.3	4.4	6.6	3.6	2.6	.9	.4	100.0	----------
	Vertical percent distribution													
Professional, semiprofessional and managerial workers	39.9	5.8	0.8	1.1	30.2	23.9	30.8	21.9	40.9	----------	----------	----------	33.1	----------
Clerical and sales workers	15.1	15.1	33.1	27.2	25.6	13.0	8.5	2.5	11.0	----------	----------	----------	14.4	----------
Service workers	9.5	0	4.8	13.0	3.6	8.2	0.3	1.3	0	----------	----------	----------	7.0	----------
Skilled workers	2.9	2.9	5.2	52.2	31.7	15.7	40.7	72.8	45.7	----------	----------	----------	17.4	----------
Semiskilled workers	21.8	74.8	55.8	3.3	8.2	39.1	19.8	1.5	2.4	----------	----------	----------	21.6	----------
Unskilled workers	10.8	1.4	.4	3.3	.6	.1	0	0	0	----------	----------	----------	6.3	----------
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	(1)	(2)	(2)	100.0	----------

[1] Statistically unreliable owing to large relative size of standard error.

[2] Distribution statistically unreliable owing to small number of reported vacancies.

TABLE 7.—*Education and Experience*

JOB VACANCIES BY MINIMUM EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS

	Years of schooling required									Total	Standard error of total number of job vacancies
	0	1 to 7	8	9 to 11	12	13 to 15	16	17 to 19	20		
	Estimated number of job vacancies										
Minimum period of related experience:											
Less than 1 year: None	212.0	311.0	276	518	1,331	426.0	1,355.0	66.0	108	4,603	209.0
1 to 3 months	17.0	0.0	24	39	52	4.0	3.0	0	0	139	42.5
4 to 6 months	95.0	8.0	28	27	51	40.0	2.0	0	0	251	34.4
7 to 11 months	0	0	2	52	37	0	1.0	0	0	92	26.2
1 year	0	79.0	24	29	273	62.0	22.0	1.0	33	523	55.4
2 years	3.0	65.0	46	338	277	51.0	101.0	18.0	1	900	222.0
3 years	0	96.0	73	12	78	13.0	67.0	10.0	5	354	64.1
4 years	0	0	271	22	152	5.0	46.0	16.0	14	526	58.4
5 years	0	66.0	4	23	92	28.0	64.0	9.0	5	291	31.5
6 years	0	2.0	142	11	41	0	12.0	2.0	0	[1] 210	141.0
7 to 9 years	10.0	0	0	8	23	2.0	16.0	6.0	8	[2] 73	0
10 years or more	0	0	0	0	10	3.0	6.0	2.0	8	[2] 29	6.0
Total, Monroe County	337.0	627.0	890	1,079	2,417	634.0	1,695.0	130.0	182	7,991	358.0
Standard error of total	35.6	97.4	181	221	174	38.3	64.7	13.6	0	358	----------

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 7.—*Education and Experience*—Continued

JOB VACANCIES BY MINIMUM EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS

	Years of schooling required									Total	Standard error of total number of job vacancies
	0	1 to 7	8	9 to 11	12	13 to 15	16	17 to 19	20		
	Horizontal percent distribution										
Minimum period of related experience:											
Less than 1 year: None	4.6	6.8	6.0	11.3	28.9	9.3	29.4	1.4	2.3	100.0	----------
1 to 3 months	12.2	0	17.3	28.1	37.4	2.9	2.2	0	0	100.0	----------
4 to 6 months	37.8	3.2	11.2	10.8	20.3	15.9	.8	0	0	100.0	----------
7 to 11 months	0	0	2.2	56.5	40.2	0	1.1	0	0	100.0	----------
1 year	0	15.1	4.6	5.5	52.2	11.9	4.2	.2	6.3	100.0	----------
2 years	.3	7.2	5.1	37.6	30.8	5.7	11.2	2.0	.1	100.0	----------
3 years	0	27.1	20.6	3.4	22.0	3.7	18.9	2.8	1.4	100.0	----------
4 years	0	0	51.5	4.2	28.9	1.0	8.7	3.0	2.7	100.0	----------
5 years	0	22.7	1.4	7.9	31.6	9.6	22.0	3.1	1.7	100.0	----------
6 years	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	(1)	----------
7 to 9 years	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	(2)	----------
10 years or more	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	(2)	----------
Total	4.2	7.8	11.1	13.5	30.2	7.9	21.2	1.6	2.3	100.0	----------
	Vertical percent distribution										
Minium period of related experience:											
Less than 1 year: None	62.9	49.6	31.0	48.0	55.1	67.2	79.9	50.8	59.3	57.6	----------
1 to 3 months	5.0	0	2.7	3.6	2.2	.6	.2	0	0	1.7	----------
4 to 6 months	28.2	1.3	3.1	2.5	2.1	6.3	.1	0	0	3.1	----------
7 to 11 months	0	0	.2	4.8	1.5	0	.1	0	0	1.2	----------
1 year	0	12.6	2.7	2.7	11.3	9.8	1.3	.8	18.1	6.5	----------
2 years	.9	10.4	5.2	31.3	11.5	8.0	6.0	13.8	.5	11.3	----------
3 years	0	15.3	8.2	1.1	3.2	2.1	4.0	7.7	2.7	4.4	----------
4 years	0	0	30.4	2.0	6.3	.8	2.7	12.3	7.7	6.6	----------
5 years	0	10.5	.4	2.1	3.8	4.4	3.8	6.9	2.7	3.6	----------
6 years	0	.3	16.0	1.0	1.7	0	.7	1.5	0	2.6	----------
7 to 9 years	3.0	0	0	.7	1.0	.3	.9	4.6	4.4	.9	----------
10 years or more	0	0	0	0	.4	.5	.4	1.5	4.4	.4	----------
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	----------

[1] Statistically unreliable owing to large relative size of standard error.

[2] Distribution statistically unreliable owing to small number of reported vacancies.

NOTE.—(1) Data in all tables relate to Monroe County, N.Y. and to Feb. 12, 1965.
(2) Components do not necessarily add to totals owing to rounding.
(3) Unless otherwise stated, the source for all tables is the NICB survey. (See text.)
(4) All standard errors are rounded to 3 significant digits.

The sample for the NICB February survey was designed to obtain reliable information from employers of all sizes and in all major industry groups. Nine different size groups (in terms of employment) were used in the sample design. In addition, 10 different industry divisions were separately sampled. All employers with 250 or more employees were included in the sample. Of 416 employers chosen, 10 were found to be out of business on the survey date, 3 were seasonally closed, 3 refused to provide information, and 1, a very small employer, could not be contacted by an interviewer. Substitutions were made for two of the refusals, in medium-sized firms. Of those employers available to respond, 99 percent did so. Of those responding, 48 percent reported one or more job vacancies.

The interviews were carried out by six members of the staff of the conference board and eight employees of Bernardine Slade Market Research, Inc. Prior to the February survey a number of extensive exploratory interviews were conducted with Rochester employers. A pretest of 45 small- and medium-sized employers was conducted in January. Also, a conference board employee conducted a postenumeration quality check after the February survey of 14 employers previously interviewed.

Our experience with these surveys has led us to the tentative conclusion that the collection of job vacancy statistics is a feasible operation when the information is obtained by interview and the groundwork in the community has been carefully prepared. Employers were cooperative in almost all cases and readily understood the concepts and definitions. A preliminary analysis of the results indicates that they are reasonable and consistent with other information. Our final judgment, however, must wait upon the results of the two additional sample surveys in Monroe County, one in May and the other in August 1965.

JOHN G. MYERS,
Senior Economist, Special Projects,
Office of the Chief Economist.

AMERICAN PUBLIC PATIENCE BIG REQUIREMENT FOR SUCCESS IN VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Edward T. Folliard, a columnist for the Washington Post, has written a thoughtful and wise article on the great importance of patience and stamina on the part of the American public with regard to Vietnam. He says, in part:

> The most important requirement for success in Vietnam, aside from fighting men, weapons, and diplomacy, may turn out to be patience and stamina in the United States. In Hanoi and Peiping, the Communists are betting that Americans are short on both of these qualities, and will not be able to match their own Oriental fortitude.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATIENCE, STAMINA: VIETNAM REQUIREMENTS

(By Edward T. Folliard)

The most important requirement for success in Vietnam, aside from fighting men, weapons and diplomacy, may turn out to be patience and stamina in the United States. In Hanoi and Peiping, the Communists are betting that Americans are short on both of these qualities, and will not be able to match their own Oriental fortitude.

It is a fact that Americans are not noted for patience. Indeed, we have made a virtue of impatience, and this doubtless has had much to do with the Nation's greatness. Ours is a country in a hurry, as is exemplified in the slogan:

"The difficult we do immediately. The impossible takes a little longer."

This is admirable, but what happens if the war in Vietnam is a long drawn out one? It could become the longest war in which the United States has ever engaged. It certainly will become that if Donald Johnson, national commander of the American Legion, is right. The Legion chief, who recently visited South Vietnam, said at the White House last week that he could envision the struggle going on for another 5, 6 or 7 years.

American intervention in South Vietnam began in the Eisenhower administration, but the current buildup in manpower was ordered by President Kennedy, and the first American casualties were reported late in 1961. Therefore, if the fighting should continue for another 5 years, it would set a record for American involvement with a foreign foe, exceeding in duration the Revolutionary War (1775–83).

President Johnson is eager for a settlement in Vietnam, but he has vowed to hang on there until the Reds of North Vietnam and their Vietcong allies end their aggression against South Vietnam. He says that the United States will "not be defeated" and will "not grow tired." Moreover, the Texan believes that his successor, or successors, will if necessary carry on the struggle after he leaves the White House.

That still leaves unanswered the question of how the American people would behave if the conflict is prolonged. It is an important question. In writing about the Korean war in volume II of his memoirs, former President Harry S. Truman said:

"What a nation can do or must do begins with the willingness of its people to shoulder the burden."

The American people saw the Korean war through, but their patience was badly strained. There were hawks and doves then, too. But in between were millions of Americans who just weren't persuaded that this Nation's involvement was worth the cost in lives and treasure.

Sir Winston Churchill said later that this one act by Mr. Truman—his boldness and swiftness in going into Korea—entitled him to be listed among America's great Presidents. It seemed at this time, however, that the Missourian never quite succeeded in explaining to the mass of his countrymen what was at stake in Korea, and he was jeered for calling the war "a police action."

President Truman had strong backing when he first sent American troops to Korea under the banner of the United Nations. But as the conflict dragged on, it became a political issue at home, and Senator Robert A. Taft and other Republicans began calling it "Truman's war."

In spite of this division, which carried over into the 1952 presidential campaign, the Communists realized after a year of fighting that the map of Korea couldn't be changed by violence. After a signal from Moscow and Peiping, negotiations for a truce began on July 10, 1951. The negotiations continued for 2 years; finally, the armistice agreement was signed at Panmunjon on July 27, 1953.

Back in the spring of 1951, President Truman had fired Gen. Douglas MacArthur as Far East commander. He disagreed with MacArthur's proposal to attack Red China and he disagreed with MacArthur's shibboleth: "There is no substitute for victory."

"The only victory we seek," said Mr. Truman, "is the victory of peace." But in saying this, he insisted that the Communists would not be allowed "to keep the fruits of their misdeeds." And so the war ended where it began.

The war in Vietnam is very much different from Korea. President Johnson's objective, however, is much the same as Mr. Truman's: to show the Communists that they can't get away with aggression against their neighbor.

Mr. Johnson has said that the United States has no desire to conquer North Vietnam and that "there is no purely military solution in sight for either side." Barring a change in policy, this would seem to leave the United States with only one course of action: to hang on until the Communists decide, as they did in Korea, that fighting is no longer profitable.

The Communist leaders of Hanoi and Peiping, as has been said, are betting that Americans don't have the staying power to go the route. A generation ago, Hitler and Mussolini were saying that the United States was "decadent."

L.B.J. IN SANTO DOMINGO NOT TOO LITTLE OR TOO LATE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the Chicago Sun-Times of May 30, Eric Sevareid discussed the Santo Domingo situation. He said, in part:

> I cannot understand the cry that we put in far too many men. An airport, several miles of corridor, and a safety factor with a long perimeter require thousands of soldiers who require other thousands to support and supply them. Nor can I understand the complaint that the President acted with too much haste. Over many years I have been adjusted to the complaint of "too late with too little." I find it hard to make a quick switch to the complaint of "too soon with too much."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOMINGO REDS NEVER A MYTH

(By Eric Sevareid)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.—The tide of second guessing about the American intervention in Santo Domingo—as to its justification, its size, its methods and its aims—had reached oceanic proportions by the time this writer managed to get to the first European city established in the New World. Here in what Columbus called "the land of God," had come the first teachers and preachers, yet here remains, after five centuries, one of the political hellholes of the hemisphere, its soiled streets once again thronged with armed men from abroad.

The scenes of bitter sorrow in Santo Domingo have been well described; there are other things, perhaps, worth putting down at this late date. I thought I had rarely seen such brave work by combat reporters, rarely such emotional involvement on the part of some of them, rarely such a wealth of unconfirmable reports and rumors, rarely such a disasterous lack of contact between reporters and American officials who were not only physically remote but for a long time silenced by Presidential orders. And rarely have I read such certain conclusions in American press editorials about a phenomenon in which so much was uncertain and inconclusive.

For me it is impossible to believe that the Communist threat was a myth, impossible to believe that a democratic and stable government could have been formed by the impassioned leaders of thousands of armed and impassioned people, a vast number of them youngsters. It is hard for me to believe that we could not have prevented the tragic fighting in the northern part of the city, easy to believe that we did prevent an even more awful bloodletting in the congested downtown region.

I cannot understand the cry that we put in far too many men. An airport, several miles of corridor and a safety factor with a long perimeter require thousands of soldiers who require other thousands to support and supply them. Nor can I understand the complaint that the President acted with too much haste. Over many years I have been adjusted to the complaint of "too late with too little." I find it hard to make a quick switch to the complaint of "too soon with too much." I fail to understand the editorialist who points out with disdain that after all, there were only a few handfuls of Communists present. In a very real sense their lack of numbers is their strength. It was because they were few that former President Juan Bosch had not bothered to deal severely with them. It was because they were few that they could do much of their work undetected. It was because they were few that foreign opinionmakers could make the Americans seem ridiculous and give us a propaganda defeat. As former Ambassador John Bartlow Martin reminds us, Communists do not make revolutions, they take them over.

And their small number in various other Latin American countries lies near the heart of the profound dilemma that confronts the United States for the future. Revolts are brewing in other nations to the south. In all these revolts Communist elements will be present. Are we to put down every uprising because a Communist threat is present? Obviously we cannot, even though some of these uprisings probably will produce Communist governments.

But nothing in this realm of human action is inevitable; the game is not lost as long as we act on the assumption that it can be won. There are Latin societies strong enough to handle the Communists. Others will be galvanized into counteraction by Communist victories or near victories close by their borders.

Meantime, the nonsense arguments should stop. To say that the United States has kept the Dominican Republic from enjoying a free, stable democratic government is nonsense; we have given them another chance to find their feet on the long, hard road to democracy. To say that the real fear in Latin America is of American gunboat diplomacy is nonsense; every literate Latin American knows that American interventions have always been temporary while communism is permanent.

It is nonsense to indulge any longer the self-conscious idea that Latin America's troubles are the fault of the United States. Some are; most are the fault of Latin America. Its ways of life are superior to ours in more than a few respects, but not in respect to the art of government. In the last century and a half there have been in all of Latin America approximately 3,700 coups, rebellions, and civil wars.

INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the May 28, 1965, issue of the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., entitled "Justice Action on Baker Overdue."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE ACTION ON BAKER OVERDUE

Well over a year ago, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, had urged continued Senate investigation of Robert G. Baker, former secretary to the Senate Democrats. He wanted the Senate to be free of criticism that "someone high in the Government" was being protected.

Senator WILLIAMS also noted then that it was time for the Department of Justice to begin criminal prosecution in the Baker case.

Earlier in 1964 the head of the Justice Department's criminal division had said his office was conducting an important investigation into Baker's affairs "to ascertain the possibility of false statements, conflict of interest, bribery, fraud against the Government and conspiracy."

Then late last year it was revealed that a Federal grand jury in the national capital had started an investigation of conflict of interest and other charges against Baker.

The onetime protege of Lyndon B. Johnson had refused, under 5th amendment protections, to testify and to provide requested information before the Senate Rules Committee. His refusal was legally proper because of the possibility of court action against him.

The whole series of revelations—still far from complete—came after a civil suit had been filed against Baker in September of

1963, a suit charging that he had used political influence in the award of contracts in defense plants for a vending machine firm. Since then there have been out of court negotiations for settlement of this case.

It is no wonder now that Senator WILLIAMS is concerned over a pending summary report from the Senate Rules Committee. From unofficial leaks, he has come to the belief that a desperate effort is being made to discredit him while the committee's majority Democrats and the Johnson administration are trying "to save Baker from legal prosecution at all costs."

There is no question that the Department of Justice Criminal Division has had plenty of time to probe the Baker case for possible violations of Federal laws governing the conduct of Federal employees.

Baker is reputed to have built up a fortune of about $2 million before he was forced to resign his $19,000-a-year job for the Senate Democrats—a job to which he was appointed originally in 1955 shortly after Mr. Johnson became majority leader of the Senate.

Senator WILLIAMS has displayed great courage in demanding a complete Senate investigation of the Baker case—which now seems impossible.

Senator WILLIAMS has displayed even greater courage in demanding Justice Department action—which now is long overdue.

Diversionary smears against the Republican Senator from Delaware are no substitute for honest prosecution of the Baker case, and impartial enforcement of the law if there has been substantial evidence of law violation.

Obviously, the next move is up to the Department of Justice.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7717) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is with a certain degree of reluctance that I take the floor to express my doubts and uncertainties about the pending measure which would authorize total expenditures for the following year of $5,196 million for space exploration.

As I look through the specific purposes for which the authorization would seem to be directed, it is apparent that the overwhelming proportion of the authorization would be for the purpose of landing a man on the moon within the next decade and returning that man or men to the earth. The Apollo project, which is quite explicitly for this purpose, would authorize $2,978 million. The Gemini program, which will kick off on Thursday, would authorize $242 million. There are various other authorizations contained in the bill, the precise effect and purpose of which are not easy to determine. However, they seem to be very closely connected with the proposal to land men on the moon and return them to the earth.

This authorization of $596 million for administrative purposes seems to be largely devoted to this purpose. I believe that it is probably safe to estimate, therefore, that at least $4 billion of the $5 billion would be devoted to the purpose of landing a man or men on the moon in the next decade.

I know of course that this bill will be passed. I know that, to the degree that public opinion is awakened, it supports this measure. Nevertheless, I do feel that it is my duty to express my doubts.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to study the need to put a man on the moon. However, I have had an opportunity to study the bill.

The bill would authorize the giving away of private patents in the amount of $4,533,350,000 on research. The giving away of that much money for new research could uncover something that might be worth many times that much money. We never know what will be found in the course of research. Frequently, something is discovered that is worth more than that which we tried to discover in the first instance.

While I may have some doubts with regard to whether we should put a man on the moon and spend this much money for it, I have no doubt that we have no justification whatever for giving away private patents on research, particularly in the willy-nilly fashion in which the Administrator of National Aeronautics and Space Administration has proposed doing. He would propose to sign contracts to give away contract rights before he knows what he is giving away.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I expect to support the Senator from Louisiana on this issue, as I have done in the past.

It is perfectly true that research may very well have byproducts. However, the subject matter of the research makes a great deal of difference.

I believe that the incidental results to be derived from trying to put a man on the moon would be less than if we were to spend a fraction of the $5 billion on fundamental research in astronomy or in the ultimate nature of energy.

I shall support the Senator from Louisiana. However, I do not believe that we would be justified in spending $5.2 billion primarily in putting a man on the moon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In the course of doing that, there may, and probably will, be contracts to develop something like a fuel cell. A fuel cell is a new type of generating power which could make the use of oil and gas obsolete.

As I understand, with a fuel cell, a person could manufacture all the power he wanted with the use of water and air. If that development were to be successful, it might well be that it would make all the modern automobiles and airplanes, as we know them, totally obsolete. Such a development would be an entirely new means of providing power. It could be a basic patent that might control the transportation and fuel industries of the United States and foreign nations.

If any such fantastic development should be discovered with public funds, it would seem to me that that development should be freely available to all people so that they might all benefit from its development, rather than have someone charge 40 times the cost of a product. This happened recently when an individual engaged in health research came forth with a patent on a little device which had to do with rendering assistance to mentally retarded children.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana. I am not arguing against research in the field of outer space. From the information I have been able to collect, the same results could, however, be obtained by the expenditure of a fraction of the amount called for in this bill.

As I have said, I have consulted with a number of scientists about the worthwhileness of putting a man on the moon. I am informed that, as they see it, there is no military value in putting a man on the moon; that if the purpose is to hit some spot on the earth, that spot could be hit just as well from another spot on earth as by going up into the heavens and being in a position to rocket bomb a particular area. In other words, it is not necessary, for military purposes, to put a man on the moon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am reminded of the story of the dog that kept chasing automobiles when a highway was built through a certain town. Every time a car came through, the old dog would jump up and chase the car. One of the oldtimers of the town said, "I wonder what he is going to do if the old mutt ever catches one of those cars."

I suggest, if we succeed in getting a man on the moon, what are we going to do when he gets there?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Exactly. Scientists say also that there can be no scientific value to be gained by getting a man on the moon. There would be value in getting unmanned instruments on the moon which would send back a sampling of the geological construction of the moon.

We have already obtained valuable information by photographing the moon at various distances and from different angles, but there apparently is no scientific value connected with this program of landing a man on the moon and then returning him.

The real argument that is advanced for placing a man on the moon is that the Russians want to get a man on the moon, so we must get there ahead of them, or not very far behind them. In other words, it is a question of prestige.

I never thought we should spend a great deal of money in keeping up with the Joneses when it will not be of any value either to the Joneses or to us to do what they aim to do. It will not help us to put a man on the moon. It will not help the Russians to put a man on the moon. But if the Russians are going to do it, it is said, we should do it and not be left behind. Why should we race to get to a place where neither of us gains by arriving there?

If the Russians, therefore, were to carry on experiments by cutting off a part of a man's leg to see if it could be grafted to the rest of the man's leg, it might be said that we should also cut men's limbs off to see if they could be grafted back on again. These were experiments performed by surgeons in Nazi Germany.

What is the use in competing with other countries in experiments that have no importance either to military security or to human improvement and where the benefits are highly conjectural and doubtful?

Five billion, two hundred million dollars is an enormous sum of money, of which probably $4 billion can be earmarked as being connected with the attempt to put a man on the moon. The technical difficulties are tremendous. The surface of the moon changes from extreme heat to extreme cold. There is probably an absence of oxygen on the moon. These are very difficult problems to solve, but we spend enormous amounts of money to solve difficult problems which have no value should we solve them.

Think of what could be done with the $4 to $5 billion each year. This is an annual appropriation. It is now 1965. We aim to get a man on the moon by 1970. That means an expenditure of at least $20 to $25 billion in the next 5 years. Think of what that amount of money would do in the field of public health, what it would do in the field of education, what it would do in the war on poverty. We could make of this country a very much better Nation with the expenditure of those funds.

I think it is a pity to have us largely waste these resources when they could be turned to better account. If the money were left in the pockets of the people, they could use it to build extra rooms in their houses, for example, to send their children to college, to take a vacation with their families, to develop a garden, to contribute to their church, and for a myriad of worthwhile purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Or it could be used to relieve the shortage of housing in colleges.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; it could be used to eliminate such shortages; to give education to the needy; and to improve health. We could do all those things to make this a better Nation.

I wish to express my thoughts and uncertainties on this point. I remember that when I first heard of this proposal some 4 years ago I expressed doubts, and was immediately reminded that the same doubts had been expressed when $50,000 was expended in the 1840's to help S. B. Morse start work on the telegraph. It was said that much good had come from that. So it is said that $5 billion a year spent to put a man on the moon might turn out to be good, also.

Mr. President, there is a big difference between $50,000 and $5 billion a year.

Somehow I think the American people have been so influenced by space, so mesmerized by the great accomplishments of science in sending capsules into orbit, and with the romance of the whole procedure—and, of course, I admit it is romantic—that I believe it is time to question the fundamental assumptions upon which this enormously costly venture is based. So as a humble American citizen and as only one of a hundred Senators, I want to show my concern. When the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow morning carries my remarks, I want to indicate that there is at least one American who doubts whether the flame is worth the candle.

THE PRESIDENT'S FORTHRIGHT ACTIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD recent expressions of editorial opinion in support of the President's forthright action in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. These expressions were published in the San Diego, Calif., Union and the Rapid City, S. Dak., Journal.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Diego (Calif) Union, May 4, 1965]

ULTIMATUM TO COMMUNISM: REDS MUST QUIT HEMISPHERE

The United States now has assumed policing duties that idealists had hopefully placed with the United Nations.

The U.N. Security Council can talk and argue but with both the free world and the Communist world having a veto over each other's decisions, nothing much can come out of it.

And the more representative General Assembly has been paralyzed by refusals to pay special assessments for policing actions.

With the necessary assumption of an enlarged responsibility against various forms of aggression, in South Vietnam as well as in the Dominican Republic, has come at last the frank reacknowledgement that communism is an international conspiracy directed against all of the free world and that it advances in proportion to our reluctance to face up to that fact.

President Johnson decided the time had come to act first and talk later. Mr. Johnson told the Nation that:

"The American nations cannot, must not, and will not permit establishment of another Communist government in this hemisphere."

It could not have been made more simple or more direct.

The beginnings of the revolt in the Dominican Republic are as yet not fully explained but it was all to clear that the Communists had moved into a chaotic situation and that a second Cuba was in the making.

By the time the United Nations had talked this one out, the Western Hemisphere would have witnessed a second takeover by the international Communist conspiracy.

The "germ" of Cuba had not been isolated, as claimed, and the seizure of the Dominican Republic would have marked another vital step in the closing off of the Windward Passage that connects us by the sea with Latin America.

This administration seems to have rid itself of an inherited burden that also paralyzed our own reaction to the enemy's avowed threat to bury us.

Too many of us had begun to half accept the propaganda that atheistic communism is merely another economic system. We were told that it is not an international conspiracy but arises spontaneously in individual countries as a result of social conditions, and that the hostility between us and the Soviet Union is due mostly to mutual misunderstandings and suspicions.

But Mr. Johnson called communism an international conspiracy and that is that.

He most certainly will be accused of oversimplifying world situations. To him, things are either good or bad. Barry Goldwater suffered under a similar attack. He too saw the enemy as an enemy.

The United States will have to go on defending itself in all of the world forums, including the United Nations. The United Nations is the proper place, and we must do it with pride and vigor. Mean and false charges will be leveled against us, and particularly from some countries which maintain their independence only because of our power.

This country is strengthened by its long record in the cause of freedom for all peoples and independence for all nations.

We should have no apologies to offer for guaranteeing the freedom of the Dominican people.

[From the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal, May 2, 1965]

FIGHT IN ALL DIRECTIONS

President Johnson and many Americans had hoped for a peaceful world.

The news proves that this Nation is embroiled or involved any direction the citizen cares to look.

The situation is global. However, the complications for the Dominican Republic get us as close to home as any island in the Caribbean could be.

Castro still runs his island. And Castro has been named several times as the instigator of revolutions or attempts to overthrow governments throughout all the Latin American nations. His funds and weapons come from Communist nations which can supply money and munitions. There are only two such—Red China and the Soviet Union.

The poor Chinese doesn't care much about conditions of the poor Dominicans. He doesn't know. The richer Russians should be reminded that this Nation, the United States of America, has been helping wherever possible to improve living conditions in the neighboring nations.

Marines moved into Santo Domingo to protect lives of Americans there.

President Johnson asked: "Why must this Nation hazard its ease, its interest, and its power for the sake of a people so far away?" He referred then to the conflict in southeast Asia. He answered his own question by saying: "We fight because we must if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. And only in such a world will our own freedom finally be secure."

The United States and each of its citizens is committed as a leader in world affairs.

The Dominican people don't feel so strongly about their government that so many Dominicans should get killed. The record proves Communists prefer to agitate and furnish some money and some guns. But they have no responsibility for the economy, education, or welfare of the people. Cuba is the prime example. Living was good under the previous dictator.

> If and when the United States must use troops and weapons anywhere on the globe, then full support of those who believe in freedom is necessary. There can be dispute on strategy but there is little doubt as to the enemy. Communists do this to us.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I approve emphatically of the expressions of support which these editors express, except for the statement of the Rapid City Journal, that conditions under the previous dictator of Cuba were praiseworthy.

The tragedy which has befallen the Cuban people under Castro does not, unfortunately, mean that the plight of the common people of Cuba was ideal before Castro came to power.

GIVEAWAY OF PRIVATE PATENT RIGHTS BY NASA

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have pending at the desk an amendment to H.R. 7717, seeking to prevent the giveaway of private patent rights on research done by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. When the authorization act for NASA first became law, there was a difference between House and Senate over the measures which passed with regard to patent rights. The provision of one body asserted that there would be no private patents on Government research under NASA. The provision of the other body asserted that it was silent on the subject, which presumably would permit private patents to exist in Government research.

In conference, the conferees agreed to language which would provide that the Administrator of NASA should have the power to waive patent rights when he determined it to be in the national interest.

Subsequently, representatives of NASA came before the various committees of Congress and asked that they be permitted to change their authorization so that they could waive private patent rights without having to have a finding that it was in the national interest. They argued that some large concerns, many of which had been found guilty of antitrust violations in one respect or another, might not be interested in doing research for the government unless they could obtain private patents on government research.

We studied their recommendation, and so far as committee experience was concerned, I assured them that any proposed legislation that would involve a waiver of patent rights without knowing what was being waived would be resisted to the utmost by those of us who felt that this was public research and that the public, having paid for it, was entitled to its full benefits.

So we turned them down.

Nevertheless, they proceeded to undertake a policy of merely waiving patent rights in advance, without knowing what they were waiving.

This was done on the theory that monopoly was good for the public, and that the public should tolerate a monopoly which would charge them higher prices and impose upon them all the evils associated with the inefficiency of monopolistic power, including the right to withhold from the public the public's rights over private patents.

The Administrator of NASA, Mr. Webb, proceeded to issue an order that he was going to commence waiving in advance the patent rights on Government research without knowing what he was waiving patent rights on.

Mr. President, when one waives rights to the fruits of research at the time of contracting, he does not know what he is waiving. It may be that a small research contract might turn up something of great value. It may be that something will be discovered in research completely different from what one sets out to find in the first instance.

For example, sulfanilamide was a real breakthrough in antibiotics which came about in Germany in the effort to find a better dye. Someone was looking for a better dye for clothes and brought about, instead, the greatest breakthrough of the century in the field of medicine.

Therefore, a similar amount of effort, such as was invested in finding a better dye for cotton materials, could well result in a discovery that might be worth billions of dollars.

But here comes Administrator Webb, finding that it is in the national interest to waive the fruits of research without even knowing what will be waived.

That situation should be stopped. It is against the law. The only way on earth one could conclude such an attitude to be in the national interest—to waive the fruits of research without even knowing what one would be waiving—would be on the theory that monopoly must necessarily be good for the public. The experience of most Americans has been to the contrary.

There are some who try to contend that if the Government were to waive patent rights to a private concern, the private concern would put a product on the market more quickly. All experience has been to the contrary.

Experience has shown that when a new product is developed, it will be marketed more quickly if all competitors are free to put a similar product on the market more quickly. The more competition there is, the more rapidly each competitor will try to get his product on the market first, so that he will get a head start and gain prior acceptance for his product. That is the experience in the field of commerce.

In addition, by permitting competition in the field, lower prices can be obtained. An example of that came to light the other day. A doctor working with public funds in the field of mental retardation for small children, who had no interest in patents one way or the other, was persuaded that he should apply for a patent on a little kit which he had developed for testing children for a certain disease which could lead to mental retardation.

The cost of manufacturing the kit was approximately $6, which included the profit.

Miles Laboratories succeeded in getting an exclusive license from this doctor, and wanted to charge $262 for the kit, compared to the cost of $6 at which the kit was being manufactured in Louisiana and Massachusetts by the hospitals there. Compared to the cost at which the doctor had been able to produce the kit, Miles Laboratories was still charging an extravagant price for such a product and was still trying to get it, even though the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare moved in and asserted its rights under provisions which protect the Government's rights to research.

I am glad to state that this kind of highway robbery is no longer continuing. However, we have had innumerable examples down through the years of how holders of private patents charge as much as 100 times the cost of production of a product over a long period of time. They contend that the price they charge depends upon the maximum profit that could be made, having no relationship whatever to the interests of the American people, or the people of any other nation, insofar as they have a complete patent monopoly on their product.

Mr. President, I am not quarreling with the right of a person to own a patent. I am not even arguing his ability to deny the public the benefits of something he discovered, because he might have discovered it first. That is not the issue. It is his right, even though he found the idea 5 minutes sooner than someone else, and had a patent properly prepared, to deny the public its benefits for 17 years, even though someone else had been working on the same idea and discovered the idea 5 minutes later. That is the penalty, I believe, for urging and encouraging the American people to spend their money and devote their efforts to developing new products and new commodities. I am not quarreling with that. It is an accepted fact of life, and I do not question it at this point.

But it is also an accepted business practice that whoever pays for the research is entitled to the patent rights involved. If the people of the United States pay for the research, the contractor gets a contract for it and hires the men and women who, in turn, do the research. Those who do the research do not get the patent rights, just as those who do research for the Federal Government do not get the private patent rights. The patent rights should go to those who pay for them. If we did business the way a businessman would do it, that is, if we operated the government the way a businessman would operate his private business, we would insist that 192 million people in this country, having paid their taxes to make the research possible, should have the benefits, instead of one person who might be a government favorite and obtained the contract without bidding for it—as oftentimes has been the case with an individual who has been found guilty of criminal violations of the law. The General Electric Co. was found guilty of violating the law and defrauding the Government over a period of 10 long years, and taking from the Government untold millions of dollars, and then sending one executive to court to plead guilty or nolle contendere with the sentencing judge stating that the whole corporation is just as guilty. Such corporations and such people have enough influence even to obtain tax relief, so that they can pay the treble damages that they are required to pay. Such concerns are Government favorites to the extent that they can get such contracts.

Then they want private patent rights on many billions of dollars. That is not right. It can be no more justified than it could be justified to give the public domain to someone who had been permitted to go on it and wander around on it, and give it to him at a guaranteed profit, plus expenses.

What I propose in the amendment is, first, that we prevent the waiver of property rights on U.S. inventions made under NASA contracts until the inventions are made, so that we will know to what we are waiving the patent rights.

In other words, there would be no pig-in-the-poke advance waivers. Such a procedure was never intended by law anyway.

Second, the amendment would require compliance by the Administrator of NASA, along with the other executive agencies, with section 207 of the Federal Property Act. In other words, the Administrator of NASA would be required to submit a proposed waiver to the Attorney General of the United States, for advice as to antitrust implications. If one of these inventions, developed with the $4½ billion, should be something like a fuel cell, which would give the holder of a private patent a monopoly on the whole transportation industry, or would displace automobiles as we know them today, or airplane engines as we know them today, or over the entire world transportation industry, as we know it, with resulting fantastic antitrust implications, the Administrator of NASA should have the advice of the man who is responsible for protecting the taxpayers with regard to antitrust implications, namely, the Attorney General of the United States.

This is required with regard to Federal agencies generally, and should be with respect to the proposed giveaway by NASA. There is no requirement that the administration follow the advice of the Attorney General, but at least he should know what the advice is. We have a right to complain about it if the giveaway occurs.

In addition, the amendment would require that the Administrator, before giving a waiver, should find that the equity justifies the waiver. It should be found that the person obtaining the waiver of patent rights would have done more than merely spend Federal money on a guaranteed profit basis plus expenses. He would have had to put some of his own money into it, either before or after the contract, and he would have had to make a contribution over and beyond the Federal money he has received in order to justify the waiver.

The amendment would also provide that the waiver would promote the use of the invention in the interest of the United States. This relates to the specious argument of those who contend that waivers are justified because a monopoly would place a product more rapidly on the market than would be the case if competition prevailed. The argument is unsound. In any event, there should not be a waiver of private patent rights under a Government research contract when the result of the waiver is to deny the public for possibly 17 years the benefit of that for which it paid. If these people are to argue that they can make better use of Government research and Government patents than by making them available to the public, it is only fair to insist that they not withhold discoveries from the public and then play "dog in the manger" as a result of having obtained private patents on the research efforts of the people of the United States and paid for by the public.

That is the least we can ask. It would still be possible to have a waiver on private patents on Government research, but at least we would get the camel's nose from under the flap of the tent of giving away something without knowing what we were giving away. We would have some advice as to what the antitrust implications would be, and we would insist that there be some equity to justify it, and we would insist that the invention subject to the waiver be not denied the public as a result of the waiver.

That is the minimum that could be requested. I would like to see a great deal more done. In the future I shall try to do more on this subject. However, now, in trying to stop gross abuses in this field, I am hopeful that the Senate will support my amendment to prevent the giving away of private patents on the $4½ billion Government research program.

In line with the argument made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], with respect to putting a man on the moon, which is a somewhat dubious program at the best, and a somewhat questionable program, it would probably mean spending $25 billion between now and 1976, and it is entirely possible that this $25 billion could be of fantastic value to the people of this country, in the domestic economy alone. It is for us to decide whether the $25 billion are to be used for the benefit of the 190 million people of this country or for the benefit of the Government favorites who obtain contracts without price competition, sometimes as the result of great influence, and sometimes even as the result of munificent campaign contributions.

Should such persons be permitted to take unto themselves the overwhelming advantage for everything they can squeeze from the fruits of research, paid for by 190 million people, to the tune of $25 billion? In my judgment the answer is "No." The public, having paid for the research, is entitled to the full benefit of it.

My amendment does not guarantee it, but it is a substantial step in that direction.

I hope Senators will read the RECORD tomorrow and alert themselves to my argument. I shall undertake to respond to the arguments that have been made by others and that will be made.

For example, it will be contended that some corporations might not want to do research for the Government unless they could have private patents on the research.

General Electric has always been the bell cow in making that argument. General Electric had about 15,000 patents that barred people from going into competition with it. In World War II General Electric was the big hog in suggesting that it did not want to do any research for the Government, at a time when men were sacrificing their lives, unless they were given the right they had been given previously to make fantastic wartime profits.

General Electric sent people before our committee to suggest that it was not interested in doing research if it could not have private patents. We found that they were practically breaking down the door to get NASA to give them research contracts, even though they could not get private patents. It will be found that this same corporation is doing research for the Atomic Energy Commission—I believe I am correct about this—even though that agency is not permitted to give them private patents on the research that is being done for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Oh, no, Mr. President. Those people do not wish to let anyone else get some of the Government money to do research. They want to get all of it. And they—that is, the largest ones—will take it upon whatever terms may be necessary in order to get the research money. Having obtained it, they wish to take every conceivable advantage they can of it. If they cannot get enough advantage as a result of the monopolies achieved at public expense, they will steal it— and they have been caught stealing it by conspiracies lasting over a period of 10 years. They proceed to surrender some dispensable vice president, and he takes the fall for it, as though he were responsible for all of it. No one but the president, the chairman of the board, and the other executives theoretically can do anything about such a plan of conspiracy between themselves and their competitors. That practice has gone on over a long period of time.

Now they say that they are the great guardians of the public interest. They would not be interested in doing research unless they could be assured of every conceivable hammerhold and advantage over the public once they find or develop something. When we call their hand, we find what we suspected. They were not telling the truth. It was a big falsehood. And yet they are up in front, the first in line at the pie counter, once there are some goodies to be passed on to someone who may have signed on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis.

Mr. President, I shall debate the amendment further tomorrow. I hope Senators will review my remarks in the RECORD.

EXPANSION OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 196)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and will be appropriately referred.

The President's message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The American people want their Government to be not only strong but compassionate. They know that a society is secure only where social justice is secure for all its citizens. When there is turmoil anywhere in our own country, our instinct is to inquire if there is injustice. That instinct is sound. And these principles of compassion and justice do not stop at the water's edge. We do not have one policy for our own people and another for our friends abroad.

A vast revolution is sweeping the southern half of this globe. We do not intend that the Communists shall become the beneficiaries of this revolt against injustice and privation. We intend to lead vigorously in that struggle. We will continue to back that intention with practical and concrete help.

In southeast Asia today, we are offering our hand and our abundance to those who seek to build a brighter future. The effort to create more progressive societies cannot wait for an ideal moment. It cannot wait until peace has been finally secured. We must move ahead now.

I know of no more urgent task ahead. It requires more of us, more of other prosperous nations, and more of the people of southeast Asia.

For our part, I propose that we expand our own economic assistance to the people of South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos.

I propose we start now to make available our share of the money needed to harness the resources of the entire southeast Asia region for the benefit of all its people. This must be an international venture. That is why I have asked Mr. Eugene Black to consult with the United Nations Secretary General and the leaders of the poor and advanced nations. Our role will be vital, but we hope that all other industrialized nations, including the Soviet Union, will participate.

To support our own effort, I ask the Congress to authorize and appropriate for fiscal year 1966 an additional $89 million for the Agency for International Development for expanded programs of economic and social development in southeast Asia.

This money will serve many purposes:

1. Approximately $19 million will prosupport electrification cooperatives near three provincial towns—Long Xuyen, Dalat, and Nha Thang—in South Vietnam. Co-ops, which have been so important to the lives of our rural people, will bring the benefits of low-priced electricity to more than 200,000 Vietnamese. We hope this pattern can be duplicated in towns and villages throughout the region. I will ask that we provide further support if the pattern meets the success we believe possible.

2. Five million dollars will be used to provide the first installment of our contribution to the accelerated development of the Mekong River Basin. This is an important part of the general program of regional development which I outlined at Johns Hopkins University on April 7. This money will enable us to meet a request for half the cost of building the Nam Ngum Dam, which the international Mekong Committee has marked "top priority" if the Mekong River is to be put to work for the people of the region. This will be the first Mekong power project to serve two countries, promising power to small industry and lights for thousands of homes in northeast Thailand and Laos. The funds will provide also for:

Powerlines across the Mekong linking Laos and Thailand;

Extensive studies of further hydroelectric, irrigation, and flood control projects on the Mekong main stream and its tributaries;

Expansion of distribution lines in Laos.

3. Seven million dollars will help provide improved medical and surgical services, especially in the more remote areas of Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand. South Vietnam is tragically short of doctors; same 200 civilian physicians must care for a population of 15 million. In Laos the system of AID-supported village clinics and rural hospitals now reaches more than a million people. But that is not enough. We propose to extend the program in Laos, assist the Thailand Government to expand its public health services to thousands of rural villages, and to organize additional medical and surgical teams for sick and injured civilians in South Vietnam.

Better health is the first fruit of modern science. For the people of these countries it has far too long been an empty promise. I hope that when peace comes our medical assistance can be expanded and made available to the sick and wounded of the area without regard to political commitment.

4. Approximately $6 million will be used to train people for the construction of roads, dams, and other small-scale village projects in Thailand and Laos. In many parts of Asia the chance of the villager for markets, education, and access to public services depends on his getting a road. A nearby water well dramatically lightens the burdens of the farmer's wife. With these tools and skills local people can build their own schools and clinics—blessings only dreamed of before.

5. Approximately $45 million will be used to finance increasing imports of iron and steel, cement, chemicals and pesticides, drugs, trucks, and other essential goods necessary for a growing civilian economy. This money will allow factories not only to continue but, through investment, to expand production of both capital and consumer goods. It will provide materials for urgently needed low-cost housing. And it will maintain production incentives and avoid inflation. It is not easy for a small country, with a low income, to fight a war on its own soil and at the same time persist in the business of nation building. The additional import support which I propose will help Vietnam to persevere in this difficult task.

6. An additional $7 million will supplement the present program of agricultural development and support additional government services in all three countries, and will help in the planning of further industrial expansion in the secure areas of Vietnam.

Much of the additional assistance I request is for Vietnam. This is not a poor and unfavored land. There is water and rich soil and ample natural resources. The people are patient, hardworking, the custodians of a proud and ancient civilization. They have been oppressed not by nature but by man. The failures of man can be redeemed. That is the purpose of the aid for which I now ask additional authorization.

We are defending the right of the people of South Vietnam to decide their own destiny. Where this right is attacked by force, we have no alternative but to reply with strength. But military action is not a final solution in this area; it is only a partial means to a much larger goal. Freedom and progress will be possible in Vietnam only as the people are assured that history is on their side—that it will give them a chance to make a living in peace, to educate their children, to escape the ravages of disease and, above all, to be free of the oppressors who for so long have fed on their labors.

Our effort on behalf of the people of southeast Asia should unite, not divide, the people of that region. Our policy is not to spread conflict but to heal conflict.

I ask the Congress, as part of our continuing affirmation of America's faith in the cause of man, to respond promptly and fully to this request.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 1, 1965.*

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 2, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 1, 1965:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the line of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Thomas D. Davies
Fillmore B. Gilkeson
John R. Wadleigh
Burton H. Shupper
Frederick E. Janney
Robert B. Erly
Valdemar G. Lambert
Frank C. Jones
Ben B. Pickett
Leslie J. O'Brien, Jr.
George C. Bullard
William N. Leonard
Walter L. Small, Jr.
Lucien B. McDonald
Leroy V. Swanson
Frank W. Vannoy
Thomas J. Rudden, Jr.
Charles D. Nace
Paul A. Holmberg
Lloyd R. Vasey
Ernest W. Dobie, Jr.
Dick H. Guinn
Maurice F. Weisner
Roy M. Isaman
Frederick H. Michaelis
Roy G. Anderson
William E. Lemos
Gerald E. Miller
Isaac C. Kidd, Jr.
Donald M. Showers
James F. Calvert
Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tennessee's New Technical Information Centers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, technical information forms the foundation for any successful business today. But sometimes industry has been too far away from the source of information to acquire it quickly.

Recently, however, came the announcement that Tennessee was meeting this problem with new technical information centers to be located at the public libraries in Memphis, Nashville, Chattanooga, and Knoxville. In effect, TIC will form a network of special university and metropolitan libraries, tied together as though their combined holdings were a single library.

At each center, a qualified librarian will handle requests relayed from other libraries or received directly from an industrial customer. Requests will arrive by rapid communications, and a thorough search will be made for the desired material from special reference volumes, extensive periodical holdings, and expanded subject interest collections at hand. If answers are unavailable on this level, the doors of every library in the State will swing open to the TIC librarian. If the answer is not in the State, TIC will find it elsewhere.

The service is administered by the Tennessee State Library and Archives Commission and financed with State and Federal funds.

Mrs. Margaret J. Barr, of Memphis, State chairman of National Library Week, told me about this new program. Since Tennessee is the only State to have this type of program in operation, I thought it might be of interest to my colleagues.

Congressman Cohelan's Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe our colleagues will share my interest in the results of the questionnaire poll which I mailed to 130,000 of my constituents in late March. The results represent a return of 10 percent:

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Health care: The House Committee on Ways and Means is meeting in executive sessions on the long-discussed program of insured hospital and nursing home care, financed through Social Security, for all Americans 65 and over:			
(a) Should Congress enact this program?	60.1	31.1	8.8
(b) Should a voluntary insurance plan be added to cover doctors' fees and prescribed drugs?	54.4	21.4	24.2
2. Elementary-secondary education: The House Education and Labor Committee has approved a program of Federal assistance to elementary and secondary schools with the major emphasis directed at helping communities where large numbers of children come from families earning less than $2,000 a year. Do you favor this program?	71.3	21.8	6.9
3. Higher education: President Johnson has recommended an expanded program of loans and grants to institutions of higher education. This includes construction of college classrooms, libraries and laboratories, and scholarships for able but needy high school graduates. Would you support this program?	70.3	21.7	8.0
4. Voting rights: The U.S. Civil Rights Commission has reported that many minority group members are still being denied the right to register and vote:			
(a) Do you feel existing law is sufficient to protect voting rights?	27.9	57.1	15.0
(b) Do you feel stronger enforcement of existing law is possible?	62.6	17.0	20.4
(c) Do you feel Congress should enact stronger voting guarantees, including the use of Federal voting registrars?	64.8	24.5	10.7
5 .Cities: In a special message to Congress, President Johnson pointed out many of the serious problems confronting our urban areas and he proposed several measures to improve and rehabilitate our cities:			
(a) Would you favor a program of rent supplements to families with incomes above the poverty level yet with incomes too low to afford privately built housing?	27.8	53.3	18.9
(b) Would you favor establishing a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs to coordinate all Federal programs in this field?	45.8	37.2	17.0
6. Immigration: The House and Senate Judiciary Committees are considering legislation to amend our present immigration law which assigns national quotas based on the 1920 population makeup of the United States. It would eliminate this "national origins system" over a 5-year period and give priority to those with exceptional skills or education, and to spouses and children of U.S. citizens. Should Congress approve this legislation?	71.5	16.7	11.8
7. Presidential disability: The Senate has passed and the House will soon consider a constitutional amendment which would enable the President to nominate and the Congress to elect a Vice President whenever there is a vacancy in that office. It also provides a formal procedure for determining Presidential disability. Would you favor this amendment?	84.3	7.3	8.4
8. Reapportionment: Several bills are pending before the House and Senate which would allow one chamber of a State legislature to be apportioned on "factors other than population." This would overturn the Supreme Court's "1 man, 1 vote" decision of 1964. Would you favor these bills?	44.9	32.9	22.2
9. Firearms: Testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee in 1963 indicated that no effective controls exist over the interstate shipment of firearms:			
(a) Would you favor a law which would prevent the mailing or delivery of firearms to persons under 18 years of age?	86.3	7.7	6.0
(b) Would you favor a law which would require a person to obtain a police permit before buying a gun?	69.5	22.9	7.6
10. Migrant farm labor: Several different bills have been introduced in the field of farm labor:			
(a) Would you favor extending the national minimum wage of $1.25 per hour to agricultural workers?	74.6	14.1	11.3
(b) Would you favor resuming Public Law 78, the importation of Mexican farmworkers (braceros), which was ended by Congress in 1964?	45.2	37.9	16.9
11. Manpower: The House Committee on Education and Labor is considering legislation to continue and expand the Manpower Development and Training Act established by Congress in 1962. Should this measure be approved?	56.5	13.6	29.9
12. Water pollution: The Senate has passed and the House Public Works Committee is holding hearings on a water pollution control bill. This measure provides matching Federal-State grants to help with pollution from sewage and storm systems, and authorizes Federal standards of quality for interstate waters. Would you support this legislation?	85.7	5.5	8.8
13. Redwoods: The Deaprtment of the Interior is preparing legislation providing assistance to California in rounding out and preserving existing redwood State parks, and also Federal acquisition of additional outstanding redwood forests for a major national park. Do you favor this proposal?	87.8	6.8	5.4
14. Foreign aid: President Johnson has asked Congress to continue the foreign aid program. His request was for the smallest amount of money since the program began in 1948:			
(a) Should Congress continue this program of military and economic development assistance?	46.1	31.3	22.6
(b) Should the economic and military sections be considered separately, as recommended by Senator Fulbright?	72.4	10.6	17.0

Thank you for your assistance. The results of this questionnaire will be tabulated and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as well as distributed to our local newspapers.

I would also like to call your attention to a 5-minute television program which I present every Monday during the 10 a.m. and 10 p.m. news programs over station KTVU, channel 2, Oakland. This program gives me an opportunity to discuss briefly some of the current issues before Congress, and I will welcome your comments.

JEFFERY COHELAN,
Member of Congress.

Legislation To Aid Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a package of bills to aid postal employees, supplementing an initial group of bills I introduced earlier this year.

My four bills, all of which amend title 39, United States Code, are aimed at, first, raising mail foremen to level 8 of the postal field service schedule; second, raising the nightwork extra compensation rate from 10 to 15 percent of their hourly base rate; third, correcting certain inequities with respect to promotions of postal field service employees; fourth, providing intervals of 1 year between steps for purposes of automatic advancement by step increases for postal field services employees.

These bills represent a step in the direction of much-needed improvement in benefits for postal supervisors. I hope that this Congress will take the opportunity to put its stamp of approval on the hard work of our Nation's supervisory postal employees.

University of Iowa Symphony Band to Tour Russia, Eastern Europe in 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to commend the University of Iowa Symphony Band on its selection by the U.S. Department of State to represent the United States on a concert tour of Russia and other eastern European countries. We can be proud to have this outstanding group represent our Nation and serve as our cultural ambassadors during the spring of 1966 tour. I am sure these 100 young people look forward to this chance, not only to demonstrate the high quality of their musical accomplishment, but to gain an understanding of the youth of the other countries they visit.

The band will leave Iowa City between February 14 and February 21, and will return to the United States during the first part of May. The director of the band, Mr. Frederick C. Ebbs, has announced that the group will arrive in Moscow on March 21 after playing in several eastern European countries, and will complete the Moscow concerts on April 27. In all, the Iowans will play in 10 or more Russian cities.

President Howard R. Bowen, of the University of Iowa, has made the following comment on the significance of the tour:

> The entire university is honored at the selection of our symphonic band as cultural emissaries to Russia and Eastern Europe, and the many thousands of Iowans who have heard these fine young musicians perform will know that the Department of State could not have made a better choice. Their trip should be a wonderful educational experience, one from which we shall all benefit.

Arrangements for the tour have been made by Charles M. Ellison, director of the office of cultural presentations in the U.S. Department of State. Those making the tour will be enrolled as University of Iowa students for the second semester, paying tuition and receiving academic credit in music, but all of their other expenses will be paid by the Department of State, with the exception of lodging, meals, and transportation in Russia, which will be provided by the Russian Government. An interpreter to travel with the band while they are in Russia will also be provided by the Russian Government. In setting up the Russian part of the tour, Mr. Ellison has worked with representatives of the Ministry of Culture in the Soviet Union.

I am in complete agreement with Mr. Ellison's statement that cultural exchanges with other countries are proving very valuable in promoting international understanding, as the performing arts permit us to skirt economic, poltical and language barriers and communicate directly with the people of other countries. An intensive program of activities outside the regular concert schedule has been designed to give the members of the University of Iowa Symphonic Band the unique opportunity to gain an understanding of the youth of the countries they visit and to have a new insight into the lives they lead and the problems which they face.

Commemorating Anniversary of Religious Tolerance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, people from Transylvania commemorate all over the world the passing of the first religious tolerance act in 1557 by their Diet at Torda which is significant because it precedes by long decades all other similar legislation in Europe. It was the small principality of Transylvania, a part of the Hungarian kingdom which had to become independent in 1542 to escape Turkish occupation that led the old nations of Europe to recognize the futility of religious coercion and to strike a blow for religious freedom and a free conscience to the individual.

We, in the United States, cherishing religious freedom which finds its expression in our tradition, as well as in our Constitution—first amendment—have a special interest and acknowledgment to make to the creators of legislation of religious freedom in Europe at a time when Bloody Mary ruled England and state Lutheran churches were introduced in most German principalities while heretics were burned in Italy and Spain.

Paying homage to the wisdom of the Transylvanian people which faced with the danger of foreign invasion and murderous soldateska realized that national unity must prevail and that such unity cannot be achieved without religious tolerance and freedom, we cannot help but remember the present fate of the peoples of Transylvania.

Our hearts feel sad in seeing them still living under Communist domination, be they Rumanians who were in 1557 only a minority, Hungarians, the state nation in 1557 together with the German Saxons who also survive in Transylvania.

Yet we must also recognize that the Hungarian minority is not only persecuted on ideological grounds, but also on account of ethnic antagonism. Of course, the sympathy demonstrations of students of Hungarian origin in Transylvania during the glorious, but unsuccessful, Hungarian fight for freedom also helped to influence the Communist masters to distrust this proud people. On March 24, 1965, I explained some of the sorry consequences for the Hungarian minority in Transylvania. I also introduced a resolution calling for a condemnation of the discriminatory measures of the Rumanian Communist Government against its Hungarian minority, together with eight other colleagues. I understand that the European subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee is planning hearings on them in mid-June to which I already submitted my written testimony. I trust that the committee will report out the resolution so that the entire House may have an opportunity to vote on this issue of minority persecution both on ideological and ethnic grounds.

Past National Commanders Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most exclusive and interesting organization's in our country is the Past National Commanders Organization. Referred to by its members as Panco, its membership eligibility includes past national commanders of seven different national American veteran organizations.

These are the American Legion, AMVETS, Catholic Veterans of the U.S.A., Disabled American Veterans, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Military Order of the Purple Heart, and Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

In the future, other organizations may be approved by Panco members present at any regular semiannual meeting.

As a past national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, it is my privilege to be a member of Panco, an affiliation I value most highly.

During a recent luncheon with my predecessor as commander in chief of the VFW, Cooper T. Holt—presently the assistant adjutant general of the VFW and the executive director of its Washington office, located near the Capitol—conveyed to me some interesting facts about Panco, which was organized some 3 years ago, under his chairmanship, for the purpose, briefly, to create and foster a patriotic and educational forum to study the great issues of our time and country and to speak out on subjects of mutual interest.

Panco now has 65 members in good standing, with 20 other past national commanders being eligible to become members, upon payment of the annual fee of $10, mailed either to its secretary-treasurer, Mr. Sam Shaikewitz, past national commander of the Jewish War

Veterans and presently a general insurance agent at 722 Chestnut Street, St. Louis, Mo.; to its president, Mr. Erle Cocke, Jr., past national commander of the American Legion and presently connected with the Peruvian Airlines, at 5108 Balton Road NW., Washington, D.C.; or to its vice president, Dr. Winston E. Burdine, past national commander of AMVETS, who is both a psychiatrist and a lawyer, at 849 Peachtree Street NE., Atlanta, Ga.

At its last meeting, in the assembly hall of the American Legion's headquarters building, on Wednesday, April 28, 1965, Panco was presented with its certificate of membership in the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, by the chairman of its Disabled Veterans Committee, Mr. Clarence Bird, on behalf of the chairman of the President's Committee, Mr. Harold Russell, together with a very nice letter welcoming Panco into its membership, together with some 600 other prominent individuals and national organizations. As a past national commander of AMVETS, three times, Mr. Russell is a Panco member. His immediate predecessor as chairman of the President's Committee, Gen. Melvin J. Maas, had so served for precisely 10 years up to the date of his death on April 13, 1964. General Maas had served as a national commander of the DAV, and also of several other smaller veteran organizations, and had also served in the U.S. Marine Corps during World Wars I and II and during the Korean war, as well as a Congressman from Minnesota for some 18 years. Incidentally, the senior surviving past national commander of the DAV, Millard W. Rice, the sponsor of Panco's membership of the President's Committee, has served on its executive committee since its inception in 1957 and has long been chairman of its awards committee.

Several Panco members and eligibles—all of whom had received White House invitations—attended the meetings of the President's Committee during the 2 days following the Panco meeting. Many more are expected to be attending future annual spring meetings of the President's Committee, with an increasing number participating in the activities of the Governors committees of their respective States. One of the semiannual meetings of Panco has been scheduled to meet each spring just preceding or following the annual meeting of the President's Committee. Panco's last prior meeting had been held during the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of President Lyndon B. Johnson, with all Panco members having been invited to participate in same.

During the last Panco meeting, its president, Mr. Erle Cocke, Jr., reported that Panco's 1963 and 1964 resolutions had been exposed to the President's special assistants and that several of the specific recommendations therein have been reflected in various White House messages to the U.S. Congress and to the American people, thus indicating that Panco has already made valuable contributions to our beloved country.

All Panco members and eligibles have played significant roles in our changing, expanding American society. In addition to having served as elected leaders of their respective national veteran organizations, for one or more terms, they have served their fellow Americans in many different capacities, including U.S. Representatives, State Governors, city mayors, members of State legislatures, governmental officials, judges, lawyers, doctors, business executives, contractors, lobbyists, national legislative directors, national service directors, executive directors, national service officers, radio commentators, and so forth, as well as having served in the U.S. Army, Air Force, Navy, or Marine Corps as generals, colonels, captains, sergeants, corporals, and privates.

Vietnam: A Chronology of Communist Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in looking over the many letters I have received from concerned constituents, it becomes increasingly apparent to me that our people have the right to be fully informed on what is happening in southeast Asia and on the full implications to the peace and security of not just Vietnam, but to all free nations throughout the world.

The chronology that follows, based on information provided by the U.S. State Department and the U.S. Library of Congress, shows the birth and development of the Communist Party in southeast Asia as far back as 35 years ago, providing the foundation for the ultimate takeover of that section of the world from the French.

The lesson of history in this part of the world clearly shows, first of all, that U.S. policy has been firm and consistent. We pledged military aid to Cambodia, Vietnam, and Laos as far back as 1950. It was only when our military aid was not adequate or when we agreed to negotiate that totalitarian communism enslaved more peoples in that area. First North Vietnam was negotiated away and then Laos and Cambodia were neutralized to become transportation routes and havens for Communist forces striking into South Vietnam. If we negotiate South Vietnam away, we will surrender Thailand and find ourselves defending Communist strikes at Malaysia, the Philippines, and Australia.

The negotiations at Geneva in 1954, after the sad annihilation of the French at Dienbienphu, gave the Communists the framework from which to build. When Vietnam was partitioned, thousands of carefully selected party members were ordered to remain in place in the south and keep their secret apparatus intact to help promote Hanoi, the capital of North Vietnam, in the conquest.

The original calculation was that Vietnam would fall under the control of Hanoi without resort to force, and Communist cadres were ordered to penetrate official and nonofficial agencies, to propagandize and sow confusion and generally aggravate war-torn conditions and weaken South Vietnam's Government and social fabric. When this did not work, and South Vietnam conversely achieved a period of steady progress and growing prosperity, outdistancing that in the north, the leadership in Hanoi resorted to open aggression and violence.

By 1958 the use of terror by the Vietcong increased appreciably, to win back prestige and support from the people that political and propaganda appeals had failed to produce, and to create confusion and insecurity in South Vietnam.

As the chronology shows, by the end of 1961, the situation was so grave in South Vietnam that its government asked the United States for increased military assistance, and that request was met.

The Vietcong, however, tightened their organization and adopted new tactics, with increasing emphasis on terrorism, sabotage and armed attacks by small groups. Armor and antiaircraft were introduced, and guerrillas were supplied with heavier weapons. The internal struggles within South Vietnam provided the Vietcong with yet another advantage.

In 1964, 436 South Vietnamese hamlet chiefs and other government officials were killed outright by the Vietcong and 1,131 were kidnapped, destroying the local governmental leadership capability and setting the stage to promote the Communist concept of collectivized conformity under dictatorial leadership.

Though it has been apparent for years that the regime in Hanoi was conducting a campaign of conquest against South Vietnam, the government in Saigon and the United States both hoped that the danger could be met within South Vietnam itself. The leaders in Hanoi, however, responded with greater violence, apparently interpreting restraint as lack of will.

We were then left with a threefold choice:

We could do nothing, thereby permitting the growth of communism and the aggressive forces to surround us, as evidenced by the advance of Castroism in the Western Hemisphere.

We could resort to negotiations, as we did in Geneva, providing the foundation for peaceful Communist takeover, as evidenced in North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, East Germany, and other Iron Curtain countries, North Korea, and some emerging African nations.

Or, we could stand firm with advice, counsel, and the required military capability and effort to a nation desiring to remain free but yet incapable of developing its own counterforces.

It is naive to think that the Communist line of peaceful coexistence is designed to enhance the concept of freedom as we know and understand it. Anyone familiar with the history of the Communist movement will understand its "sacred historical task" to destroy capitalism—and freedom—by any means available. The Communist objective of surrounding and isolating capitalist countries—with the primary target, the United States—has already achieved devastating strides. It becomes increasingly mandatory that we recognize these international political facts of life and move toward the development of an economic and technological offensive that would promote peace and freedom.

In my judgment, a summit meeting of the free nations of southeast Asia to facilitate political actions is overdue. I have long advocated organization of a civil-political-military complex in each of these countries to resolve problems in their own environments—principally, to combat the insidious encroachment of subversive communism.

Further, I have long advocated the creation of a Freedom Academy designed to train people participating in this offensive in the specific workings of communism, in counterinsurgency techniques, and, generally, in expanding the nonmilitary capabilities of this great Nation and of all nations free and desiring to remain free.

Chronology of Communist Growth in Southeast Asia

In the year 1883: French protectorate established over Tonkin (North Vietnam) and Annam (Central Vietnam).

In the year 1930: Formation of a Communist Party in Indochina, then under protectorate of France.

In the year 1941: Vietnamese Communists form Vietnam Independence League (known as Vietminh).

March 1945: Japanese take over direct administration from the French in World War II.

August 1945: Japan surrenders to allied forces and Vietnamese Communists immediately establish Provisional Democratic Republic of Vietnam in Tonkin under Ho Chi Minh (who still leads Communist Party in North Vietnam).

September 1945: French, British and Indian military forces arrive in Saigon.

October 1945: French begin military and civil operations to reestablish French control over Vietnam, paving the way for continuing skirmishes and negotiations with the Communists over the next 9 years.

In the year 1949: Chinese Communist troops reach the northern border of Vietnam.

January 1950: Vietnamese Communist regime recognized by Communist China and U.S.S.R.

December 1950: United States signs mutual defense assistance agreement with France, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos for indirect U.S. military aid to Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

In the year 1951: United States signs agreement with Vietnam for direct economic assistance.

May 1954: French fortress at Dien Bien Phu surrenders to Vietnamese Communist armed forces.

July 1954: Geneva Conference on Indochina surrenders half of Vietnam to the Communists, partitioning Vietnam along the 17th parallel into Communist North Vietnam and free South Vietnam. Signed by Russia, Communist China, Cambodia, France, Laos, and Vietnamese Communists (Vietminh); United States, and Vietnam do not sign. United States declares it shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections, supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly.

Flow of almost 1 million refugees from North to South Vietnam begins.

January 1955: United States promises direct assistance to Vietnam for support of the Vietnamese armed forces.

February 1955: SEATO (Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty), covering Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, comes into force.

April 1955: Northerners are prevented from migrating to South Vietnam by North Vietnam Communists. Saigon Government appeals to United Nations.

July 1955: Communists initiate first overt propaganda move in South Vietnam by distributing literature signed by North Vietnam's "National United Front."

September 1955: Cambodia leaves French Union; declares itself an independent sovereign state.

February 1956: Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia visits Peiping, China, and renounces SEATO protection.

May 1956: Communist China signs a 2-year economic and technical aid agreement with Cambodia. Soviet Union establishes diplomatic relations with Cambodia.

August 1956: Agreement reached between Prince Souvanna Phouma (neutral) and Pathet Lao leader Prince Souphanouvong (Communist) for establishment of a coalition government in Laos.

In the year 1957: U.S. Military Assistance and Advisory Group (USMAAG) and U.S. Information Service (USIS) installations in Saigon bombed; U.S. personnel injured.

January 1958: Large Communist guerrilla band attacks plantation north of Saigon, reflecting steady increase in Communist armed activity in South Vietnam since mid-1957.

July 1958: Cambodia recognizes Communist China, after verbal attacks on South Vietnam alleging that South Vietnamese have violated Cambodia border.

June 1959: Pathet Lao (Communist forces) in Laos resume attacks in northern provinces of that country.

July 1959: Communist guerrillas attack Vietnamese military base at Bien Hoa, killing and wounding several USMAAG personnel.

July 1959: North Vietnamese Communist regime states "we are building socialism in Vietnam, but we are building it in only one part of the country, while in the other part we still have to direct and bring to a close the middle-class democratic and anti-imperialist revolution."

January 1960: Large Communist guerrilla band attacks Vietnamese army installation at Tay Ninh, indicating growing size and aggressiveness of Communist guerrilla-subversive apparatus and intiating present crisis.

Communist newspaper in North Vietnam states "the North has become a large rear echelon of our army" and "the North is the revolutionary base for the whole country."

May 1960: South Vietnam requests increase in number of USMAAG.

September 1960: Resolution adopted by North Vietnamese Congress declares that an immediate task of the "revolutionary struggle of our compatriots in the south" is to overthrow President Diem's government.

June–October 1960: Communist guerrilla activities in South Vietnam increase; series of attacks by large Communist guerrilla force in the Kontun-Pleiku area.

South Vietnam states these attacks are staged from bases in the "north" through Laos in preparation for further actions in Vietnam and that events in Laos had facilitated Communist movements in Vietnam.

October 1960: President Eisenhower states that United States will continue to assist Vietnam "so long as our strength can be useful."

November 1960: South Vietnam says Communist attacks are well prepared, conducted by regular forces trained in North Vietnam and employed weapons made in North Vietnam and other Communist countries.

January 1961: Radio Hanoi states that the "sacred historical task" of the NFLSV (National Front for Liberation of South Vietnam) is to overthrow the United States-Diem clique and to liberate the south.

March 1961: Communists announce guerrilla offensive against South Vietnam will be started to prevent holding of April 9 elections.

March 1961: Pathet Lao renews aggression in Laos to gain control of the country.

May 1961: After months of civil war in Laos involving the attempted Communist takeover, the International Control Commission of the United Nations reports a cease-fire in Laos and a 14-nation conference on Laos in Geneva. A "neutral" Laos is established through negotiations.

September 1961: Stepped up Communist guerrilla attacks; Communist forces seize capital of Phuoc Thanh province, only 60 miles from Saigon.

October 1961: President Diem declares state of national emergency; declares "it is no longer a guerrilla war waged by an enemy who attacks us with regular units fully and heavily equipped and who seeks a strategic decision in southeast Asia in conformity with the orders of the Communist international."

December 1961: U.S. State Department issues "white paper," documenting North Vietnam's direction and support of the Communist guerrilla-subversive war against the Republic of Vietnam through the infiltration of espionage agents, military personnel, weapons and supplies.

May 1962: Communist forces in Laos gain control of large territories.

June 1962: Canadian and Indian members of the International Control Commission find North Vietnam guilty of subversive and covert aggression against South Vietnam.

December 1962: Large cache of Chinese-made weapons and ammunition discovered by South Vietnamese patrol in the central highlands.

September 1963: Cambodia receives from Soviet Union three Mig-17 jet fighters and other military equipment.

September 1963: President Kennedy says "to reduce U.S. aid to South Vietnam might bring about a collapse similar to that of the Chiang Kai-shek government in China after World War II."

December 1963: Report by U.S. military spokesmen on stepped up guerrilla attacks on hamlets, outposts, and patrols in November; enough weapons captured by the Vietcong to arm five 300-man battalions.

January 1964: A Vietnamese Army group seized in the delta area of Vietnam some 300,000 rounds of small arms ammunition, weapons like mortars, recoilless ammunition marked "Made in China." Hanoi primarily responsible for their infiltration into South Vietnam.

January 1964: McNamara—"The survival of an independent government in South Vietnam is so important to the security of southeast Asia and to the free world that I can conceive of no alternative other than to take all necessary measures within our capability to prevent a Communist victory."

February 1964: Vietcong launches offensive in Tay Ninh Province and the Mekong Delta in South Vietnam. In ensuing fighting, hundreds of Government troops reported dead.

April 1964: Rusk—"Aggression against South Vietnam was organized and is directed, supported, and supplied by the North Vietnamese Communist regime in Hanoi." These attacks are "supported by the Communist regime in Peiping" and "supported at least verbally by Moscow."

May 1964: Johnson—"The Vietcong guerrillas, under orders from their Communist masters in the north, have intensified terrorist actions against the peaceful people of South Vietnam. This increased terrorism requires increased response."

May 1964: Stevenson at U.N. Security Council—"Leaders and armed forces of North Vietnam, supported by Communist China, have abused the right of Cambodia to live in peace by using Cambodian territory as a passageway, a source of supply, and a sanctuary from counterattack."

May 1964: Explosion in Saigon Harbor sinks U.S. aircraft transport ship.

August 1964: Destroyer *C. Turner Joy* and destroyer *Maddox* are attacked in Tonkin Bay off the coast of North Vietnam by North Vietnamese PT boats. Johnson orders U.S. air action against gunboats and supporting facilities in North Vietnam. United States sends reinforcements to Tonkin Bay area.

August 1964: Supporting the President's action, Congress approves southeast Asia resolution (to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia) (House vote: 416–0; Senate: 88–2).

October 1964: Sihanouk of Cambodia, at Communist China's 15th anniversary celebration, says China will grant Cambodia military and economic assistance. United States charges Cambodian troops crossed South Vietnam border and seized a U.S. officer. United States charges Cambodians fired on U.S. helicopter in South Vietnam searching for missing U.S. officer.

November 1964: Russia delivers new arms shipment to Cambodia to replace American equipment.

December 1964: Terrorist bombing in Saigon Embassy kills 2 Americans and wounds 52 Americans and 13 Vietnamese.

February 1965: Fierce Vietcong attack on military compound at Pleiku. Eight GI's killed and 108 wounded. United States says attack ordered and directed from North Vietnamese capital of Hanoi; Vietcong terrorists blow up building housing American enlisted men in Quinhon. Heavy casualties; 49 U.S. Navy carrier planes blast Communist troop staging base in North Vietnam in retaliation for raid at Pleiku; and more than 100 U.S. and South Vietnamese fighter planes strike at military installations in North Vietnam, marking the start of the major U.S. attacks on North Vietnam.

Workers for Apple Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in my district, the apple industry, which conducts extensive operations in that area, is facing the prospect of inadequate labor supply to complete apple picking and the harvesting of that delicious fruit. Obviously, unless a sufficient qualified labor supply is found, the apple industry will be facing hardship conditions and the prospect of staggering losses.

Since the lack of adequate, efficient labor could well cause the crop to spoil in the orchards, or as the result of improper handling, many large and small growers are becoming concerned, and these are obviously conditions that compel immediate and appropriate attention by the Department of Labor.

So far as the apple industry is concerned, on previous occasions in previous years, while there has been some stress and strain in securing adequate, experienced workers, the Government has cooperated, and at length, a generally adequate labor supply was realized.

I take this opportunity to urge that the Department of Labor give renewed and most vigorous attention to these serious problems affecting my district, where they are giving rise to increased concern that apples may be wasted and great losses sustained because of a failing supply of capable, experienced apple pickers.

I think that almost everyone will agree that to allow valuable foodstuffs and standard crops like apples to rot in the fields, because of lack of qualified labor, would be unthinkable and would bring tremendous losses to the industry concerned, and would be a great personal misfortune to many honest, industrious, hard-working, patriotic farmers and business people who are doing their best, under difficult and ofttimes adverse conditions, to harvest their crops and put them in the market with the legitimate hope of some reasonable profit.

To allow waste and heavy losses to afflict this industry would truly be a serious blow to the free enterprise system which applegrowers represent. It would also be responsible for considerable unemployment and dire economic waste hardly imaginable in these modern times when man-produced spoilage of valuable crops would be a grievous offense against good moral principles as well as sound, prudent economic policy.

I cannot urge the distinguished Secretary of Labor and his staff too strongly to give high priority and attention and study to these vexing labor problems of a great American industry and hope the Government will take prompt, effective action to assure the apple industry that it will be assisted in every way possible to secure all necessary, qualified workers to pick its crop.

The Secretary has been most considerate and helpful in this matter up to this time and I believe he is anxious to assist the apple industry and hope he will evolve and effectuate an effective program real soon.

Lincoln Statue for Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to offer my congratulations to the Members of the House of Representatives on today's overwhelming approval of the appropriation bill which included necessary funds to operate the State Department during the coming fiscal year 1966.

A relatively modest part of the State Department's $388 million appropriation, $100,000, has been set aside to cover the expenses of presenting a statue of Abraham Lincoln to the people of Mexico in commemoration of their nation's independence.

As one of the coauthors of last year's Public Law 88–399, which authorized this presentation, I am highly pleased at the favorable action taken by the House today because it brings closer to a successful conclusion our more than 5 years' effort to secure enactment of this worthwhile legislation.

In addition, I am confident the nearly 4 million U.S. citizens of Mexican descent are especially honored by such a fitting gesture of recognition and token of esteem for the great contributions to the cause of freedom and liberty made by our neighboring Republic of Mexico.

This gesture is an important step in promoting closer relations with Mexico as a symbol of America's deep commitment to the principles of the Alliance for Progress, and the continuing economic development of our sister nations of the Western Hemisphere.

As an expression of mutual friendship and good will toward the people of Mexico, a statue of Lincoln would seem to be particularly significant and appropriate, not only in view of the 100th anniversary of this world-revered statesman's death this year, but also because the memory of Lincoln is cherished by the Mexican people for his sympathetic concern for them during the period when Mexico was struggling to regain its independence from European domination.

Moreover, the common purposes and developing unity of interest between the historic contemporaries, Benito Juarez, father of modern Mexico, who fought against a foreign invader, and Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, who fought to preserve the Union, testify to the close spiritual identification of our two nations through the years.

Like all our relations with our Mexican friends, the Lincoln statute presentation will not be something we do because we have to. It will be something we do because we want to, as an act of good will between friendly neighbors in a world too often racked by hostility and conflict.

Much of the credit for our current friendly relations with Mexico should go to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt as a continuing legacy of the good neighbor policy he initiated during the difficult years of the 1930's.

In more recent years, we can look to the dynamic inspiration and youthful vigor of our late beloved President John F. Kennedy in promoting the imaginative goals of the Alliance for Progress and in starting the highly successful people-to-people, self-help program that is known as the world famous Peace Corps.

In addition, President Kennedy was responsible for starting the statesmanlike negotiations with Mexico which led to joint ratification under the then President Lyndon Johnson of the historic Chamizal Treaty in December 1963, finally setting a thorny, century-old dispute caused by shifting of the channel of the Rio Grande along the Mexico-Texas border.

Finally, President Johnson has had a series of very cordial and mutually satisfactory meetings with both former Mexican President Lopez Mateos and the current President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz.

Their vigorous bilateral efforts have been able to work out an agreeable compromise settlement of the long-standing problem of excess salinity in the Colorado River water that flows into Mexico.

All these recent developments constitute added evidence of the strong bonds of mutual respect and affection existing between the citizens of our two neighboring republics.

And for these reasons, I again thank my colleagues in the House for their support of this appropriation bill, for I know that the presentation of the Lincoln statue to the people of Mexico will further strengthen the cause of hemispheric solidarity at a time in history when unity and mutual understanding are essential to the peace and freedom of the world.

Memorial Day, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 30, and Monday, May 31, I had the privilege of participating in Memorial Day exercises at a number of outstanding service organization ceremonies. I want to congratulate the post commanders of the following organizations for their magnificent tribute to our fallen war dead:

The American Legion of Richmond County, Ed Ringle, commander.

Veterans of Foreign Wars, Richmond County, Arthur Vomero, commander.

Henry & Stanley Cichon Post No. 1578, the American Legion, Chester Wydrinski, commander.

Anderson Lagno Post No. 5090, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Peter Chaston, commander.

Cespino-Russo Post No. 1544, the American Legion, John Gerbino, commander.

Patrick J. Dalessio Post No. 1310, the American Legion, Andrew Fallucca, commander.

Post Office Department Post No. 930, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Kings County, Murray L. Linker, commander.

Marine Corps League, Staten Island Detachment, Arthur Foley, commander.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my Memorial Day message:

MEMORIAL DAY, 1965

Ladies and gentlemen, it is customary and, of course, fitting, on Memorial Day to pay tribute to those who have given their lives to hold the torch of freedom high above the waves of tyranny that from time to time threaten to engulf the world. Once, almost 50 years ago, we were joyously convinced that we had rolled back the waves of tyranny for all time with the surrender of Imperial Germany on November 11, 1918. We counted the cost—53,402 killed in action and 204,002 wounded—and found a measure of solace in the thought that their sacrifice had made the world safe for democracy.

Perhaps we were naive; we were young and inexperienced in the wiles of global politics, unfamiliar with international rivalries and hostilities, and unaware of the hunger for power and dominance that can consume some men and nations. So it was that we drifted back into preoccupation with our own affairs, little realizing that another wave of tyranny was gathering in Nazi Germany to deluge Europe in blood and terror. The cost of stemming this evil tide was 291,557 dead and 670,846 wounded. In paying it, we came painfully of age, aware for the first time that tyranny is never really conquered; it is only subdued.

It came as no real surprise, then, to most of us to find that we had crushed one form of tyranny—Naziism—only to preserve another—communism—which, because its perverted ideology is international rather than narrowly national, is a far greater menace to the free world. The echoes of the guns had hardly died away when our erstwhile ally, if hostile and suspicious Russia could properly be called that, became an active enemy in everything short of actual war. The Kremlin's successive attempts to bully us out of Berlin left no doubt in anyone's mind that we faced an implacable foe, patiently dedicated to our destruction. Aware of our peril, we reacted with the vigor that we, as a people, have always displayed in emergencies.

But again, preoccupation, this time with the Russian threat, cost us dearly. With our attention riveted on Europe, we paid scant heed to the few who warned that communism was infecting Asia, that another wave of tyranny was gathering at our back while we built a defensive dike to contain the wave to our front. On a summer's dawn in 1950 this wave surged out of North Korea—a Communist enclave in an ancient nation ironically known as "the land of the morning calm"—and caught us woefully unprepared. The price we paid to repel and eventually contain this onslaught was 33,629 dead and 103,284 wounded.

So, in a few years short of half a century, we have paid 378,588 in dead and 978,132 wounded—keep in mind that I have counted only combat casualties—to keep the torch of freedom aloft.

It would be gratifying on this Memorial Day to say that these gallant men had made the world safe for democracy. Sadly, this is not the case. Democracy is threatened as never before. There is hardly a section of the globe where Communist intrigue and subversion doesn't smoulder, awaiting only a favorable wind to burst into flaming revolt. Need we look farther than the Dominican Republic to be reminded of this grim fact? No, the deaths and wounds of our young men in three world wars have not made the world safe for democracy, but their sacrifices have made us realize, at last, that constant vigilance, and vigilance everywhere, is the price of liberty.

Today we are engaged in another struggle with the Communist foe, this time in remote South Vietnam, a land that only a few years ago was totally unknown to most Americans. Already in this "dirty little war," as someone has so aptly called it, 385 Americans have died and 2,176 have been wounded. But unlike those who gave their lives and blood for the cause of freedom in three previous wars, the men who are fighting and dying in South Vietnam are largely unsung, and, shockingly, even reviled.

The vast majority of us, of course, honor these men and their cause even though some—and I am not one of them—might doubt the wisdom of the policy that sent them to South Vietnam. But not all of us, not all of us.

Two weeks ago, a jeering, unruly mob swarmed into the streets carrying crude placards proclaiming "Yankee killers go home" and "Stop the war in South Vietnam." And where was this? In Peiping? In Moscow? In East Berlin? No. It was right here in New York City, on the occasion of President Johnson's visit, and those degrading our troops and embarrassing the President were Americans. Not long ago the President was shrilly denounced as, and I quote, "The most dangerous man in the world." And who denounced him? Castro? Kosygin? Mao Tse-tung? No. It was a college professor, an American college professor. Just recently, a policeman assigned to help keep a noisy delegation of demonstrators under control at a Manhattan parade overheard one of them say, as the flag passed by, "There goes that rag again." And who said it? A U.S.-hating foreigner? No. It was an American.

These incidents were the work of what is becoming known as the new far left, a loudly dissident group that has sprung into rebellious, contentious life on many American college campuses in the past year. They are a minority, and a tiny one, but the attention they attract is far out of proportion to their numbers. Though ostensibly pacifist, they voice no objections to the shedding of American blood.

These are the students, most at least are students—though their demonstrations inevitably attract a certain percentage of beatnik drifters—who staged a liedown—to coin a phrase—at the recent Armed Forces Day parade here, the students who have brazenly disrupted ROTC ceremonies at more than one—Columbia and Cornell—college, the students who, in some cases, have attempted to persuade other students to resist the draft, the students who, according to one outraged undergraduate who wrote a New York newspaper, have even advocated taking up collections on campus for the Vietcong, the students who can find nothing right with their country's policy and nothing wrong with the policies of their country's enemies, the students who apply the epithet "Yankee killers" to the men who are giving their lives daily in South Vietnam to protect the right of free speech for everyone—even those who degrade them.

The logical question, then, is: Are these militant dissidents Communists? Probably not. My own view is that they are mainly naive, totally ignorant of the basic realities of the worldwide Communist conspiracy, and quite likely unaware of the damage they do their country and, ultimately, themselves. But there is no doubt at all that the Communist Party, U.S.A., exploits their irresponsible and often outrageous words and deeds. Let me repeat to you what FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover had to say recently in hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

Said Mr. Hoover, and I quote: "Regarding our youth, the Communist Party, U.S.A., has made clear its purpose and interests. The language jargon utilized is directed toward a single aim—the inculcation in young minds of a perverted theological faith in the ideals and objectives of a Communist society.

"The increased number of public appearances by leaders of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in the last few years, whether it be in the form of press conferences, on radio programs, or on college campuses, is utilized in an effort to project the image that the party is a legitimate political party; to gain increased acceptance and respectability for the party; to generate an atmosphere of good will and understanding; and to spread Communist propaganda.

"Since students constitute a primary Communist target group, party leaders in their public appearances continue to concentrate on college and university campuses throughout the country. Over the past 3 school years, party spokesmen have averaged 50 campus appearances each year. Their audiences ranged in size from an intimate 13 to a huge 4,000. The latter number heard Dorothy Healey, a member of the party's national committee, when she spoke in the stadium of the California State College at Los Angeles on May 20, 1964. Audiences from 500 to 800 were common."

Those are Mr. Hoover's words. It is hardly necessary to add that he knows what he is talking about.

There may be some among you who feel that I have exaggerated the importance and the impact of this noisy minority. I don't think I have. Let me remind you that, back in 1933, some 300 youthfully cynical and militantly pacifist students and England's ancient Oxford University signed what became known as the Oxford pledge, in which they vowed never to fight for King and country. The incident was publicized over the world, and nowhere was it read with greater interest than in Berlin, where Adolf Hitler was even then plotting Britain's downfall.

To Hitler, knowing as he did that Oxford was the training ground for England's leaders, the pledge was taken as certain evidence of Britain's weakness and decadence. It was, of course, nothing of the sort. It was simply a harebrained idea, and the signers, almost to a man, flocked to the colors when Germany leaped at England's throat. But the damage had been done. Today, Hitler's misreading of the Oxford pledge is considered a factor in his decision to challenge Britain and the democratic world, a decision that plunged the world into the most terrible conflict it has ever known.

We have a similar situation—or problem, to be precise—with the far left on our college campuses. We know that the vast majority of Americans back the President's resolute stand in South Vietnam. There is honest, responsible disagreement with his policy, certainly, and that is as it should be in a democracy. But total, irresponsible condemnation is something else again. It can be misread in Moscow and Peiping, and likely is, as an indication of a growing disenchantment in this country of our Vietnam stand.

Obviously, this misinterpretation of our national determination bolsters the Communists in their delusion that, ultimately, we will tire of the struggle in South Vietnam and withdraw our forces, thus leaving all of southeast Asia to fall like a ripe plum into their hands. The plotters in Moscow and Peiping read only the unruly demonstrations against this country's policy; they have no like means of gaging the massive but chiefly silent support our policy actually has.

What can we do to counter this dangerously misleading minority, whose irresponsible words and deeds are feeding Communist propaganda mills the world over? We cannot silence them; the right of free speech cannot be made selective; it must be extended even to those who flagrantly abuse it. But we can fight them with truth.

First, let us look to our children, particularly those of college age. Are they aware of the true nature of the Communist conspiracy? Do they know that it is remorseless in its aim to destroy all freedoms, including the academic freedom they now enjoy? Or are they being subverted by the Communist line currently being pushed on American campuses? Find out what they think and correct them if they are being mislead. Remember what Mr. Hoover said: the Communists aim at youth; and also remember a quotation attributed to Nikolai Lenin, prophet of world communism: "Give me a child of 8 years and it will be a Bolshevist forever."

Second, speak out. Arouse an active interest in behalf of our country's policy in your veterans, civic, and fraternal organizations. Get on the record in support of President Johnson's resolute stand in South Vietnam and see that the record is brought to public attention. Demand to know how your political leaders stand—and stand up and be counted yourself. If you do this, the Communist leadership will get the message, and the message is that America will stand firm, determined as always to fight for the cause of freedom everywhere.

And in doing so, you will be paying tribute in deeds—not just words—to those gallant men who have in the past and are now holding the torch of freedom high above the waves of tyranny. Thank you.

Address by Senator Muskie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 22, 1965, the Nebraska Democratic Party held its annual Jefferson-Jackson Day banquet in the State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebr. In every respect this gathering was a success. The highlight of the evening was an inspiring speech by the banquet speaker, Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of the State of Maine. Senator MUSKIE gave to those in attendance his clear-cut answer to the question, "What is the Great Society?—What Does it Mean?" I believe his speech is so important and relevant to our day that I would like to commend it to my colleagues in Congress, and therefore include it with my remarks in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE AT LINCOLN, NEBR., MAY 22, 1965

Governor and Mrs. Morrison, Lieutenant Governor and Mrs. Sorensen, Congressman and Mrs. Callan, and Cornhuskers, this is my first visit to Nebraska, and I am delighted to be here. I like what I have seen, and I like what I have heard in the few hours I have been here.

Although this is my first visit, Nebraska was not unknown to me before I came. I had heard that Nebraska has a football team. And I knew about Willie Greenlaw, of Portland, Maine, who used to play on that team. The fiction of Willa Cather had made Nebraska a vivid land for people in the remotest corners of our country.

William Jennings Bryan and George Norris are beacons of dedication, courage, and leadership to all Americans. And your new leaders are adding distinction to Nebraska's name.

Governor Morrison, impressive to me because he is an effective Governor in dealing with the difficult problems which I know Governors face, is achieving a nationwide reputation—in part because of what he is doing for Nebraska, a story you know better than I—but, even more important, because of what he is, because of the things for which he stands, and because of the qualities of leadership he brings to American public life.

We would be proud to have him in the U.S. Senate.

Lt. Gov. Phil Sorensen is the envy of those of us who are past the half-century mark because he is already running fast at an age when we had not yet reached the starting line. He is clearly a young man of ability and talent who knows how to get things done and who will go far.

Congressman CLAIR CALLAN is a distinguished freshman Congressman who is already making an impact and getting results in Washington for Nebraska and Nebraska farmers. That isn't easy for a freshman to do. I know, because my freshman years are not too far behind me.

He takes his place beside the majority leader of the Senate, a distinguished Senate committee chairman, a former Attorney General of the United States, a powerful House committee chairman, in saving veterans hospitals which had been scheduled to close in their States. I am going to make an appointment with him next week to learn how he does it. I am impressed, as I know you are, by these leaders and their high promise for Nebraska and our country.

It is my task tonight to speak to you of victory of the Democratic Party, of the Great Society, and of what they mean to America. It is customary to do so, on an occasion such as this, with some fire and brimstone directed at the opposition. I will disappoint those who expect that touch. I have been courting Republicans so long that I find it difficult to speak harshly of them. More importantly, there is constructive work to be done.

What is the Great Society? What does it mean?

It was the dream of Jefferson and those others who wrote and signed the Declaration of Independence in the exciting and perilous days of 1775.

It was the goal of the Constitution makers of 1787.

It is what Americans have worked and struggled and fought for ever since.

It is nothing more and nothing less than the belief that our country will achieve fulfillment in the fulfillment of each of her citizens.

In 1810, Jefferson phrased it this way: "The freedom and happiness of man are the sole objects of all legitimate government."

Washington's victory at Yorktown did not achieve these objects, but rather the freedom to pursue them. His victory did not win for his countrymen a system of government, but rather the freedom to choose one. And their first choice was a bad one. Having fought a war to escape the abuses of the King's government, they were afraid to create an effective one of their own.

The results were predictably bad, and almost disastrous for the cause of freedom. The world saw emerging on this continent, not a single, united country, but 13 small and quarrelsome ones—erecting trade barriers against each other—creating competing and worthless currencies—ignoring national problems and national responsibilities at home and abroad.

Doubts arose on both sides of the Atlantic as to whether freemen could govern themselves. The veterans of Washington's armies begged him to make himself king.

When the forefathers gathered at Philadelphia in 1787, they had one overriding responsibility: to find a way for freemen to consider their common problems, to form common judgments, and to make effective common decisions.

Some 30 years later, Jefferson, in the evening of his life, writing to a friend in England said: "We have demonstrated on this continent that a government so modeled as to rest continually upon the will of the whole society is a practicable government."

That has been the test and the measure of our national policies even since—to find practicable ways to meet the problems and to overcome the obstacles on the road to the fulfillment of man. It is the test and the measure of the Great Society and the man who leads us toward it—Lyndon Johnson.

And our system has worked. It has enabled us to preserve freedom and, at the same time, to deal effectively with our common problems.

Consider where we began and where we are. Three million people clustered in 13 weak colonies, huddled on the Atlantic seaboard, have become 190 million people, spanning the continent, who are the most powerful influence and force for good on the face of the globe.

To travel that distance we have moved successfully through a great Civil War which threatened to destroy us; we have filled and developed the vast open spaces of the West; we have met and mastered the industrial revolution in a way which is the supreme example of the world, friend and foe alike; we have absorbed millions upon millions of immigrants from overseas, who spoke with a variety of tongues, and so many of whom had no tradition in the practices of freedom; and we have dominated the victories and the aftermath of two World Wars.

There are those who say that we achieved the form and the purpose of our society in 1789. That was only the beginning of the long journey toward our goal. We must press on. We have been committed to our goal from the beginning of the Republic. But we have learned that the achievement of that goal has become more difficult, more complex, more frustrating—yes, almost more impossible—with every passing day.

We all know the problems. Here at home—

The growing pressures of population and what they are doing—to our cities, to our highways, to our schools, to the air we breathe, to our water, and to our people.

The incredible impact of science and technology—which lengthen life, shorten distances, and produce new and marvelous and even useless physical things almost faster than we can use them constructively.

The accelerating obsolescence and waste of these physical things—but, even more importantly, of yesterday's ideas and answers to the accompanying problems of living together and working together.

The greed and the dishonesty, the crime and the corruption, the prejudice and the discrimination which threaten the deterioration and breakdown of decency and order, and of the civilizing qualities which prompt men to love and respect and help each other.

Around the world—

The prospects for the ultimate triumph of decency and the fulfillment of the nobler instincts of man are no less discouraging.

The drive and determination of peoples for better lives, above the level of ignorance and poverty and disease, are caught up and frustrated by ignoble men, ruthless systems of government, ancient prejudices and hatreds.

These problems and these obstacles—here at home and in our world—are the day-to-day work of our country. Are they more than we can manage? That depends upon how much we are willing to try.

At the very outset of my political life, I expressed some doubt, to an old friend, about the wisdom of my decision to subject myself to the burdens and the sacrifices, the slings and arrows, of a political career. The wise old man—an ardent and lifelong Republican, I might add—said to me: "Muskie, as long as you are in this world, you should be a part of it."

His own life was the best definition of what he meant. He did not have a political career, but, in every way, he was very much a part of his community and his State.

To a noteworthy and unusual degree, he seems to have cast his actions and thoughts, in his law practice and in his business affairs, in the context of his concept of the larger public interest.

He believed that man can improve—both his purposes and his ability to achieve them.

He believed in the essential desire of man to do so and, in so doing, to advance the welfare of his fellow man.

He believed that, in order to do so, each of us must apply our intelligence, our creative force, our will, and our courage to the task.

He believed that each of us can be sustained by faith in each other, notwithstanding the human weaknesses and the shortcomings which accumulate so much evidence to undermine that faith.

These were not the innocent beliefs of a child, but the hardened convictions of a warmhearted, tough-minded old man who, for more than 90 years, lived constantly as a part of this world.

Unfortunately, there are many who do not share my old friend's attitude toward democratic government. There are the doubters—the cynical citizens and the cynical leaders—who generate apathy to public wrongs and resistance to change.

In many ways, they are the most dangerous enemies of the public interest. For wherever there is cynicism, there is distrust. Wherever there is distrust, there is fear, and wherever there is fear, faith in each other is endangered.

There are the cynical leaders. We all know them. Some of them entered public service as cynics, looking to public office as a means to wealth and power: and betrayal of the public trust is their daily practice.

Some of them have become cynics because of the wrongs they have suffered and the injustices they have seen committed. In them the light of public life has burned out. And there are the cynical citizens who, for good reasons or none, distrust politics and political leaders. They are like the soap manufacturer who advertised that his soap was so strong it could "wash the reputation of a politician clean."

They discourage public participation in the political process.

They encourage the destruction of confidence in law and in the men who make and administer the laws.

In extreme cases, we find them in open defiance of our institutions and of the rights of free people under our Constitution.

These cynics, citizens and leaders alike, are not justified—by our national experience or by the story of man. But their numbers and their influence are growing.

My father came to this country at the turn of the century. He spent long hours telling me of what he left behind and what he found here.

I cannot understand how anyone who knows our national experience, who has studied the American story, who fully realizes the obstacles we have overcome, can but believe deeply that we have found the best way ever conceived for men to live and work together in order, justice, and peace.

Jefferson and his colleagues created the Great Society. My father came to it. I was born in it. You and I, as members of the only political party founded by men who also helped establish our system, understand the duty and the responsibility imposed upon each of us in that society. And we have a clear vision of the future and its promise when we finally achieve the fulfillment of man.

SENATE

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, infinite in mercy, love, and power: We come with the consciousness that apart from Thee, all is vanity; that all other cisterns are empty and broken; and that in Thee, alone, is the fountain of life.

From the fret and fever of the vexed world's problems, from all thought of the praise or blame of men, from discordant noises and confused conceptions which beat upon our senses, at noontide we would follow the beaten path to the quietness of Thy presence.

Guide us to make every personal and national blessing a transparent window in the temple of service, so that Thy spirit can shine through it in glory for human good.

Grant that our hearts may be shrines of prayer, our homes nurseries of virtue, our personalities centers of contagious good will, and our Nation an inspiring bulwark for the oppressed and a flaming beacon of hope whose beams will battle the darkness in all the world.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 1, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1853. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Delina;

H.R. 1889. An act for the relief of Albert Marks;

H.R. 1908. An act for the relief of Chester (Abramczyk) Hill;

H.R. 3584. An act to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; and

H.R. 8639. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 435. An act to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1867. An act for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles;

H.R. 2299. An act for the relief of Robert L. Yates and others;

H.R. 3051. An act for the relief of Vermont Maple Orchards, Inc., Burlington, Vt.;

H.R. 3074. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Stevens;

H.R. 3899. An act for the relief of C. R. Sheaffer & Sons; and

H.R. 7597. An act to establish the veterans reopened insurance fund in the Treasury and to authorize initial capital to operate insurance program under title 38, United States Code, section 725.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1853. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Delina;

H.R. 1889. An act for the relief of Albert Marks; and

H.R. 1908. An act for the relief of Chester (Abramczyk) Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3584. An act to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 8639. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Leddy, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 5 years.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Senate returns to legislative session, I wish to say that the list of nominees presented today, whose nominations the Senate has confirmed, is an extremely capable list.

I should like to say a special word for Marshall Green, who is to be our new Ambassador to the Republic of Indonesia. Mr. Green is an extremely capable Foreign Service officer. He knows the Far East quite well. He is not only competent, but has a wide-ranging view of the area, based in part, at least, on his position as consul general at Hong Kong for several years. Mr. Green, who is a distinguished public servant, is going to a most difficult assignment. We wish him well in the years ahead.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 255, H.R. 6755.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6755) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments, on page 2, in the table after line 2, in the first line, to insert:

Alabama-Coosa__March 2, 1945__$38,000,000

In the second line of the table, in the amount for the "Arkansas River", to strike out "$115,000,000" and insert "$290,000,000"; in the third line of the table, in the amount for the "Brazos River", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$14,000,000"; in the fourth line of the table, in the amount for "Central and Southern Florida", to strike out "$11,000,000" and insert "$30,000,000"; in the fifth line of the table, in the amount for the "Columbia River", to strike out "$73,000,000" and insert "$223,000,000"; after the fifth line of the table, to strike out:

Los Angeles-San Gabriel__ August 18, 1941__ $10,000,000

In the line following the amendment just above stated, to insert:

Lower Mississippi__May 15, 1928__$53,000,000

In the seventh line of the table, in the amount for the "Missouri River", to strike out "$24,000,000" and insert "$116,000,000"; in the eighth line of the table, in the amount for the "Ohio River", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$89,000,000"; in the ninth line of the table, in the amount for the "Ouachita River", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$11,000,000"; in the tenth line of the table, in the amount for the "Upper Mississippi River", to strike out "$14,000,000" and insert "$27,000,000"; in the eleventh line of the table, in the amount for the "West Branch Susquehanna River", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$17,000,000"; in line 4, after the word "this", to strike out "Act" and insert "section"; in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$263,000,000" and insert "$908,000,000"; after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. In addition to previous authorizations, the completion of the Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway, New York, project, approved in the River and Harbor Act of August 30, 1935, as amended, is hereby authorized at an estimated cost of $5,000,000.

And, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. In addition to previous authorizations, the completion of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Los Angeles River Basin, approved by the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented, is hereby authorized at an estimated cost of $31,000,000.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, this bill was passed by the House on May 12, 1965. It provides for increases in monetary authorizations for 13 river basin plans which are under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers. The increased authorizations are necessary in order to cover appropriations for the construction of various river and harbor, flood control, and multiple-purpose projects within the plans.

In the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938, Congress approved multiproject development plans for many of the Nation's river basins, in the interest of flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power development, and other allied water purposes. Congressional approval embraced in each case the entire plan; but because of the magnitude of the undertakings and the length of time anticipated for their realization, Congress limited the authorization of funds to the amounts expected to be required for only the ensuing several years.

In later acts, Congress approved plans for additional river basins, and also increased the monetary authorizations for the basins previously authorized, to the extent needed to provide for further appropriations. It has been customary to include such increased basin authorizations, where needed, in omnibus river and harbor and flood control bills.

Presently, there are 21 river basin plans that are subject to monetary limitations—ranging from the Connecticut River Basin, in New England, to the Los Angeles River Basin, in California.

In passing House bill 6755, the House expressed grave concern regarding the present status of work on certain of these river basin plans. It indicated that if this measure were not enacted into law as rapidly as possible, it would be necessary to curtail the awarding of contracts, with the consequence that delays would be experienced in completing the various projects.

At the present rate of appropriations, 10 basin plans, out of the total of 21, will not have sufficient authorization to cover appropriations during the fiscal year 1966. The total deficit will amount to $263 million. This is the amount provided in the House version of the bill.

We certainly have no intention or desire to delay any of the projects contained in these previously approved basin plans. We have been aware of the need for increasing the available monetary authorizations for a number of these plans, in order to provide for anticipated appropriations. However, it has been the policy of the Committee on Public Works to include such increases in an omnibus rivers and harbors bill; and, toward this end, the committee has been holding extensive public hearings on such a bill, including the need for increases in monetary authorizations. I note that this is the first consideration of a major rivers and harbors bill since 1962.

The Senate Committee on Public Works initiated public hearings on the omnibus rivers and harbors bill in March of this year. Hearings were continued in April and in May, and will be concluded with a week's testimony in June.

Testimony concerning basin monetary authorizations has been received from the Chief of Engineers and other representatives of the Corps of Engineers, in connection with the consideration of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. The committee has been informed that the Chief of Engineers desires the approval of at least 2 years of monetary authorization, or the amount necessary to provide for appropriations through the fiscal year 1967.

The committee will continue its consideration of a general omnibus authorization measure, in the expectation that such proposed legislation will reach the Senate floor this month. It is my understanding that the House will act upon such a bill when it is received.

However, since the House has acted on basin authorizations only, and is concerned about the element of time, this bill can be acted upon at this time and can be followed shortly by the general omnibus authorization bill.

The committee feels that sufficient monetary authorizations should be made available to the Corps of Engineers to provide for appropriations for a period of 2 years. Therefore, the committee has seen fit to amend the House version of the bill, in order to increase the amounts contained therein sufficiently to adequately cover the estimated appropriations through the fiscal year 1967. We do not believe there is any emergency which requires a 1-year increase.

The committee has recommended increases for 13 basin plans, totaling $944 million. This includes increases for the Alabama-Coosa, Arkansas, Brazos, central and southern Florida, Columbia, lower Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Ouachita, upper Mississippi, and West Branch Susquehanna River Basins.

In addition, there is included in the bill language authorizing the completion of the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, N.Y., and the Los Angeles River Basin projects. It was considered desirable to do this, since both projects require only small amounts of monetary authorization after the fiscal year 1967. The language included will insure the completion of these projects on schedule, subject, of course, to the appropriation of funds.

While I feel that legislation providing for increases in monetary authorization appropriately belongs in the general omnibus bill, since House bill 6755 has been passed by the House, it would facilitate matters to have action taken on this bill at this time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the Report No. 266, explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 6755, as amended, is to authorize an increase in the monetary authorizations for certain comprehensive river basin plans previously approved by the Congress.

AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Public Works of the Senate has considered H.R. 6755 as passed by the House. It is of the opinion that an omnibus authorization bill including necessary increases in monetary authorization should be enacted early in 1965. Toward this objective, the committee has been holding extensive public hearings. Testimony has been received from the Corps of Engineers, Members of Congress, local interests, and others. The committee initiated hearings early in March with the hope of reporting a bill early in fiscal year 1966. This is still the objective.

However, since H.R. 6755 has been enacted by the House as a vehicle for basin authorizations only, the committee is of the opinion that this legislation should be acted upon at this time to be followed shortly by the general omnibus authorization bill.

The committee feels that sufficient monetary authorizations should be made available to the Corps of Engineers to provide for appropriations for a period of 2 years. Additional authorization will be considered in the omnibus authorization bill for navigation and flood control which is currently underway. Therefore, the committee recommends amendments to the House bill that would increase the basin authorizations to an amount to adequately cover estimated appropriations through fiscal year 1967, or for a period of 2 years.

In the case of the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, N.Y., and the Los Angeles River Basin projects, the committee has included language in the bill authorizing the completion of these projects. It was considered desirable to do this since both projects require only small amounts of monetary authorization after fiscal year 1967. The language inserted by the committee will insure the completion of these projects on schedule, subject, of course, to the appropriation of funds.

GENERAL STATEMENT

In the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938, Congress approved plans for the development of many of the river basins throughout the Nation in the interest of flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power development, and other allied water purposes. Congressional approval embraced in each case the entire plan, but because of the magnitude of the undertakings and the length of time anticipated for their realization, Congress limited authorization of funds to the amounts expected to be required for only the ensuing several years. In later acts, Congress approved plans for additional river basins and also increased the monetary authorizations for those basins previously authorized to the extent needed to provide for further appropriations. It has been customary to include such increased basin authorizations, where needed, in omnibus river and harbor and flood control bills.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be considered and agreed to, en bloc.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 6755) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, speaking as a Californian, the proposed legislation will constitute authorization for a continuance toward completion of the vitally necessary Los Angeles County flood control district works, so ably undertaken by the Army Corps of Engineers in conjunction with the people in that vast metropolitan area. I wish to express my gratitude to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] and to all other members of that committee, Democratic and Republican, who have so expeditiously brought the subject to the floor of the Senate. The measure contains authorizing legislation that is vitally necessary to various parts of the country.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2068. A bill to provide injunctive relief from activities which dilute the distinctive quality of a trademark or trade name or which otherwise constitute unfair commercial activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 2069. A bill to broaden the vessel exchange provisions of section 510(i) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to extend such provisions for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bartlett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 2070. A bill to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of South Dakota at Rapid City; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGovern when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 2071. A bill to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency:

S. 2072. A bill to authorize a contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross; and

S. 2073. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2074. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways in order to require the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for projects on the Federal-aid highway systems for the purpose of protecting fish and wildlife and recreation resources; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2075. A bill for the relief of Abraham A. Osipovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2076. A bill for the relief of Kil Ja Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2077. A bill for the relief of Dr. Anthony N. Manoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

CONGRATULATIONS TO MISS HELEN KELLER ON HER 85TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. Kuchel) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 110) to congratulate Miss Helen Keller on her 85th birthday, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Hill, which appears under a separate heading.)

CIVIL REDRESS TO PERSONS DAMAGED BY UNFAIR COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES IN OR AFFECTING COMMERCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide civil redress to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce. Recommended by the Committee on Trademarks and Unfair Competition of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the bill is designed to create a uniform body of Federal law on unfair competition, enforcible in the Federal courts, in cases where interstate commerce is affected.

The bill has been previously introduced both by myself and by Congressman Lindsay in the House. In the 88th Congress, hearings were held on the bill by the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Testimony in support of the bill was provided by the chairman of the section of patent, trademark and copyright law of the American Bar Association expressing the approval of the American Bar Association.

The bill has received additional attention by the Committee on Trademarks and Unfair Competition of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, and slight modifications suggested by it have been incorporated. A parallel measure has also been introduced in the House by Congressman Lindsay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2068) to provide injunctive relief from activities which dilute the distinctive quality of a trademark or trade name or which otherwise constitute unfair commercial activities introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTEND VESSEL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to broaden the vessel exchange provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and to extend the program for an additional 5 years.

This 5-year program was initiated on July 5, 1960. The purpose of the program was to provide a means by which the unsubsidized operators in the domestic and foreign trade of the United States could exchange war-built vessels being used by the operators for larger and more efficient Government-owned vessels in the reserve fleet with the operators paying the difference in value to the United States.

The program has been a success. Fifty-two vessels have been involved in exchange agreements during the past 5 years. Use has been made of surplus vessels in the reserve fleet and thereby reduced reserve fleet maintenance costs. The Government has benefited also in increased Treasury receipts of over $3 million from ship sales. The U.S. active merchant fleet, particularly the tramp fleet, has been improved. American shipyards have undertaken $100 million in repair work from the program. I therefore, believe, that the program should be continued.

I also believe the act should be expanded to permit vessel operators on the Great Lakes, who have vessels built before 1939, to benefit from the vessel exchange program and to permit surplus tanker vessels in the reserve fleet to be exchanged, but only if the vessel will not be employed as a tanker and restricted to the domestic trade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2069) to broaden the vessel exchange provisions of section 510(i) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to extend such provisions for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Bartlett, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

A BILL PROVIDING FOR THE DISTRICT COURT IN WESTERN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the U.S. District Court for the District of South Dakota to hold court for its western division in Deadwood and Rapid City.

Currently, the western division of the court holds regular sessions under section 122 of title 28, United States Code, in

Deadwood. The General Services Administration has recently announced the completion of a survey indicating the need for a Federal building in Rapid City. In formulating plans to authorize this structure, I believe that the GSA should examine every possible Federal need. Presently, there is no authority for the court to meet in Rapid City, and, with the introduction of this bill, attention can be directed to programing space in this proposed structure which would be appropriate to accommodate this important judicial function.

Though the court itself has the authority to arrange for terms of the Federal court, it can only do so within the framework of sites designated by the Congress and the existence of adequate judicial facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2070) to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of South Dakota at Rapid City, introduced by Mr. McGovern, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BASIC AUTHORITY FOR THE U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record at this point, together with the letter and explanation of draft legislation from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, dated May 21, 1965, in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2071) to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2071

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Director of the United States Information Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "Director" and the "Agency", respectively) may—

(a) employ, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, aliens abroad for services in the United States relating to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available (such aliens to be investigated for such employment in accordance with procedures established by the Director and the Attorney General). Such persons may be admitted to the United States, if otherwise qualified, as nonimmigrants under section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)) for such time and under such conditions and procedures as may be established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General;

(b) pay travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for service in the United States and their dependents to and from the United States;

(c) incur expenses for entertainment within the United States within such amounts as may be provided for in appropriation Acts;

(d) obtain insurance on official motor vehicles operated by the Agency in foreign countries; and pay the expenses incident thereto;

(e) pay claims to any persons, in amounts not to exceed $15,000 each in the manner authorized in section 2734, as amended, of Title 10, of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries, as though the Director were the Secretary of a military department and as though officers and employees of the Agency were commissioned officers and members of the Armed Forces;

(f) advance funds within the meaning of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

(g) employ aliens by contract for services abroad;

(h) provide ice and drinking water abroad;

(i) pay excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad;

(j) pay the actual expense of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons, not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in Agency activities;

(k) rent or lease, for periods of less than ten years, offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for persons engaged in Agency activities abroad;

(l) maintain, improve, and repair properties used for information activities in foreign countries;

(m) furnish fuel, water, and utilities for Government owned or leased property abroad;

(n) pay travel expenses of employees attending official international conferences, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 835–842), but at rates not in excess of comparable allowances approved for such conferences by the Secretary of State.

Sec. 2. Appropriated funds made available to the Agency for any fiscal year for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the continental United States, including travel of dependents and transportation of personal effects, household goods, or automobiles of such personnel shall be available for all such expenses in connection with travel or transportation which begins in that fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not be completed until the following fiscal year.

Sec. 3. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), any contract for the use of international radio stations and facilities may provide, with the approval of the Director, that the United States will indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be thereafter appropriated for the purpose against either or both of the following but only to the extent that they may arise out of the direct performance of the contract and to the extent not compensated by insurance or otherwise:

(1) Claims (including reasonable expenses of litigation or settlement) by third persons for death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property, from a risk that the contract defines as unusually hazardous.

(2) Loss of or damage to property of the contractor from a risk that the contract defines as unusually hazardous.

(b) A contract, made under subsection (a), that provides for indemnification must also provide for—

(1) notice to the United States of any claim or suit against the contractor for the death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property; and

(2) control of or assistance in the defense by the United States, at its election, of that suit or claim.

(c) No payment may be made under subsection (a) unless the Director certifies that the amount is just and reasonable.

(d) Each contractor which is a party to an indemnification agreement under subsection (a) shall have and maintain financial protection of such type and in such amounts as the Director shall require to cover liability to third persons and loss of or damage to property.

Sec. 4. Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purposes of this Act, and such appropriations and appropriations for acquisition and construction of radio facilities may be made without fiscal year limitation.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. Fulbright are as follows:

U.S. Information Agency,
Washington, May 21, 1965.

Hon. Hubert Humphrey,
Vice President of the United States.

Dear Mr. Vice President: I have the honor to transmit to the Senate for its consideration a draft of a proposed bill "to provide certain basic authority for the United States Information Agency", and an explanation thereof. The draft bill has also been submitted to the House of Representatives. Except for the deletion of a section which would have authorized indefinite Foreign Service Reserve officer appointments, and the substitution of "Director" for "Secretary of State" in section 1(a), the proposed draft legislation is identical to S. 2213 as passed by the Senate in the last session of the Congress. The authority for indefinite Reserve Officer appointments was deleted from this draft bill since such authority has been proposed as an amendment to the Foreign Service Act. The second change from S. 2213 noted above is merely a technical change to confirm to provisions currently proposed for the Agency Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1966.

The proposed bill is, in effect, a "point of order bill" to provide basic authority to support items traditionally included in annual Agency appropriations. In general, the proposals are identical with the language regularly included in such appropriation acts and do not constitute any new authority.

Several provisions of the proposed legislation, however, do result in changes in the Agency's statutory authority. These provisions are:

1. Section 1(e) authorizing payment of meritorious claims against the Agency arising abroad not in excess of $15,000, and
2. Section 1(k) authorizing the Agency to lease property abroad for periods of less than 10 years and permitting lease of living quarters for persons engaged in Agency activities abroad who are not employees of the Agency.

Enactment of the above proposals would conform the Agency's basic authority to its annual appropriation language and would provide additional authority to meet administrative requirements.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

CARL T. ROWAN,
Director.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

BACKGROUND

Annual appropriation acts of the Agency have, each year since 1953, included items which were not authorized in substantive legislation and which were, in effect, general legislation for the ensuing fiscal year. Both the Standing Rules of the Senate and the Rules of the House of Representatives make such substantive legislation in an appropriation act subject to a point of order (rule XVI-2 of the Standing Rules of the Senate and rule XXI-2 of the Rules of the House of Representatives).

Therefore, the proposed legislation is, for the most part, a codification in basic legislation of administrative authorities which have regularly been made available in annual appropriation acts. In general, the proposals are identical with the language regularly included in such appropriation acts and do not constitute any new authority.

Several provisions of the proposed legislation, however, do result in changes in the Agency's statutory authority. These provisions, discussed more fully below, are:

1. Section 1(e) which authorizes payment of meritorious claims against the Agency arising abroad not in excess of $15,000; and
2. Section 1(k) which authorizes Agency leases abroad for periods not in excess of 10 years and the leasing of living quarters for persons engaged in Agency activities abroad who are not employees of the Agency.

In addition to the above legislative changes, the Agency anticipates that future appropriation acts will not include the following language which heretofore has appeared in such acts:

"Radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, narration, scriptwriting, translation, and engineering services, by contract or otherwise; maintenance, improvement, and repair of properties used for information activities in foreign countries."

This language recites in specific terms certain broad authorities which are included in the more comprehensive provisions of the Agency's basic statutes such as the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and other provisions of law available to it. We believe that the deletion of the above quoted language will in no way result in a diminution of Agency legal authority and that all activities heretofore carried on under the quoted provision can be carried on under the more general provisions of the Agency's basic statutes.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1(a): This subsection, described below, is similar to that included in Agency appropriation acts since the establishment of the Agency in 1953 and does not constitute any enlargement of existing Agency authority.

The language authorizes the Agency to employ aliens abroad for service as a narrator or translator. For example, it may not be possible to find in the United States announcers who have the proper accent or who are familiar with the up-to-date idiom of certain exotic languages or dialects. In such instances the Agency can recruit and employ qualified narrators and translators directly from abroad.

No new authority.

Section 1(b): This subsection is complementary to subsection 1(a) and simply authorizes the Agency to pay travel expenses of alien narrators and translators and their dependents employed abroad to and from the United States and their country of residence.

No new authority.

Section 1(c): Agency appropriation acts have regularly included authority similar to that proposed in subsection 1(c) for entertainment within the United States. Under the proposed language, expenditures for entertainment are authorized only when and to the extent specifically provided in an appropriation act.

No new authority.

Section 1(d): This subsection authorizes the Agency to secure liability insurance on official vehicles operated abroad. It is common practice for Embassy vehicles, both State Department and USIA, to carry liability insurance. In many foreign countries such insurance coverage is mandatory under local law.

The Comptroller General has ruled consistently that appropriated funds may not be expended, in the absence of statutory authority, to purchase insurance to cover the Government's possible tort liability (19 C.G. 798).

No new authority.

Section 1(e): This subsection differs from tort claims settlement authority regularly included in Agency appropriation acts in that the proposed language authorizes settlement of meritorious claims.

It is an integral part of the Agency's function to promote and maintain friendly relations with peoples abroad. It is essential in such regard to be able to make prompt settlement of meritorious oversea claims, when the damage, injury, etc., is caused by activities of the Agency. Our past authority—in appropriation acts—has been limited to "payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries"; the cited section contains the administrative settlement authority of the domestic Tort Claims Act. Because of the inappropriate nature of the cited law, and because its application imposes on the Agency the unrealistic and virtually impossible requirement of claims settlement "in accordance with the laws of the place where the act or omission occurred," the proposed language would relate the Agency's foreign claims authority to the Military Foreign Claims Act (10 U.S.C. 2734) which was specifically drafted for use by the armed services in connection with noncombatant operations in foreign countries—its language begins, "To promote and maintain friendly relations through the prompt settlement of meritorious claims * * *." Also, the proposed authority would authorize the settlement of claims up to $15,000 as in the Military Claims Act.

Section 1(f): This subsection, which is similar to authority regularly contained in Agency appropriation acts, permits advance of funds to grantees, contractors, and others engaged in activities which further the basic purposes of the Agency program. Specific authority for advance payments is required under the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) which reads in part:

"No advance of public money shall be made in any case unless authorized by the appropriation concerned or other law."

No new authority.

Section 1(g): This subsection, which is similar to authority regularly contained in Agency appropriation acts, permits the Agency to contract wth aliens abroad. The nature of the Agency's program involving such varied activities as exhibits, lectures, periodical distribution, etc., requires the use of local contractual services.

Specific statutory authority is necessary for employment of personal services by contract as a result of numerous decisions of the Comptroller General (25 C.G. 579; 26 C.G. 468) to the effect that all employment of personal services must be by appointment in accordance with civil service and classification laws or the Foreign Service Act of 1946 in the absence of statutory authority for employment by contract.

No new authority.

Section 1(h): The Comptroller General has ruled (3 C.G. 828), that in the absence of specific statutory authority, appropriated funds cannot be used to purchase ice or drinking water. Agency appropriation acts have regularly contained such authority.

No new authority.

Section 1(i): The Comptroller General has held (19 C.G. 625), that in the absence of specific statutory authority therefor, appropriated funds are not available for payment of excise taxes on checks drawn on U.S. Government deposits in foreign banks. Agency appropriation acts have regularly included such authority.

No new authority.

Section 1(j): Statutory authority exists for the transportation of remains of employees from abroad to the United States. The remains of persons serving abroad under grant or contract in Agency activities are not covered by existing statutory authority.

The proposed subsection is similar to authority regularly included in Agency appropriation acts to permit the transportation to the United States of remains of persons engaged in Agency activities abroad who are not U.S. Government employees.

No new authority.

Sections (k), (l), and (m): These subsections are similar to authority regularly included in agency appropriation acts for rental and maintenance of office and residential quarters. At present, however, the language of the appropriation act authorizes leases for a maximum of 5 years and does not specifically authorize leases of living quarters for persons engaged in agency programs abroad who are not Government employees.

The proposed subsection (k) would enlarge agency leasing authority for a maximum period of 10 years and would authorize the rental and maintenance of living quarters not only for Government employees as presently, but also for grantees and agency contractor personnel engaged in agency activities abroad.

It is believed that 10-year leases may result in lower rents for the longer period. Oftentimes landlords are interested in a fixed return over the longest period of time. Also, authority for 10-year leases places the agency in the same position as the Department of States and AID who have such authority enabling the three agencies to standardize their leasing practices thus reducing the possibility of costly competition between them.

Subsection (k) would also authorize the agency to provide housing for grantees and agency contractor personnel engaged in agency activities abroad. In Africa, for example, housing is available only on payment of several years' rent in advance, and in many cases only on extensive renovation of quarters. Employees of agency contractors engaged in the English teaching program in central Africa have been unable to secure, or could not afford to rent, living quarters directly. The proposed legislation would authorize the agency to lease and maintain quarters on behalf of such persons engaged in agency activities when circumstances require. In such cases no quarters allowance will be paid to individuals who are provided with Government quarters.

No new authority in section (l) and (m).

Section (n): This subsection is similar to authority included in recurring agency appropriation acts. Under this authority, agency personnel attending international conferences abroad can be paid travel expenses and per diem at the rates established by the Secretary of State for the particular conference without regard to the standardized Government travel regulations.

No new authority.

Section 2: This section, which is repetitive of technical language in recurring Agency appropriation acts, permits the Agency to charge the appropriation for the fiscal year in which travel begins for all expenses of such travel even though not concluded until sometime in the succeeding fiscal year.

No new authority.

Section 3: This section contains authority more restrictive than that included each year in Agency appropriation acts and is similar to authority now possessed by the military departments (10 U.S.C. 2354). It permits the Agency to agree, in contracts for the use of international radio stations and facilities, to indemnify owners and operators of such radio stations and facilities against unusually hazardous risks involved in broadcasting operations. Under the proposed section, the unusually hazardous risks to be indemnified must be defined by the terms of the contract and the Director of the Agency must certify that any payments in indemnification are just and reasonable.

At the present time, the Agency has only one contract in effect with an indemnification clause. No claims have been made or paid pursuant to the indemnification provision carried in prior Agency appropriation acts.

No new authority.

Section 4: This section is a technical provision which authorizes Agency appropriations for the specified purposes to be available until expended when the language of an appropriation specifically so provides.

Estimate of increased annual cost

The increased annual cost of the proposed legislation is estimated at $5,000 resulting from anticipated payments of meritorious claims under section 1(e). No increased costs are expected to result from the enactment of any other sections of the proposed bill.

CONTRIBUTION BY THE UNITED STATES TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize a contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State, dated May 21, 1965, in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2072) to authorize a contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2072

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an annual sum of $75,000 as a contribution on the part of the United States toward the expenses incurred by the International Committee of the Red Cross.

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, May 21, 1965.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is submitted herewith a proposed bill which would authorize the Government of the United States to make an annual contribution to the International Committee of the Red Cross to assist in defraying the expenses of that organization.

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) is the founder organization of the Red Cross movement and recognized under the Geneva Conventions to which the United States is a party. In fulfillment of its commitments under the conventions the ICRC has performed impartial humanitarian activities for the relief and protection of victims of war and detainees in trouble spots all over the world. It is best known for its services in seeking out and transmitting information concerning the whereabouts and welfare of prisoners of war and those detained in internal civil conflicts. In recent years the ICRC has performed traditional Red Cross services in the conflicts in Indochina and Korea, in the civil war in Hungary, in the Suez conflict, in Algeria, Cyprus, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Cuba, Tunisia, the Congo, Laos, Nepal, Vietnam, and Berlin.

Sixty-eight governments have contributed varied amounts to the ICRC administrative expenditures and the reserves for emergencies over the past 10 or 12 years. The total annual income from these contributions has averaged $750,000. Calls for ICRC interventions have become more numerous and costs of operations have increased. When special expenditures for relief, food, and medical services and supplies have been required they have been met initially as emergencies out of the income from government contributions. On many occasions, however, operations have been of such a delicate nature that no public appeal for support of the particular operation has been possible. On other occasions directly interested governments have contributed to support the particular operation. Seldom, however, have the specific operations developed complete reimbursement for the expenditures incurred. The United States has not heretofore made a contribution to the administrative and supporting budget of the ICRC. The American Red Cross has made an annual nominal contribution of $25,000.

In recent months the ICRC has carried forward activities of special interest to the United States, such as medical services and supplies and relief for hospitals in the Congo, the establishment of a special Red Cross mission in Laos concerned particularly with prisoners, including Americans in the hands of Pathet Lao and especially difficult services to Tibetan refugees in Nepal, of which 5,000 have been in desperate need of relief and resettlement assistance. No other international public or private agency for refugees has been admitted to Nepal. The ICRC also acted in Cuba until 1960. Since then efforts to assist prisoners and detainees have not proven successful, although they are still being pursued.

In the light of the foregoing services of interest to governments working to reduce tensions and sufferings throughout the world and in consideration of the contributions of 68 other governments, it is recommended that the United States share in support of these activities by making an annual contribution of $75,000 to the ICRC, beginning with fiscal year 1966. Such a contribution would be appropriate in amount in relation to other government contributions and would give evidence of U.S. support of ICRC activities which have become of increasing interest to the United States. It is hoped that the Congress will give favorable consideration to this report during the present session.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that from the standpoint of the administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

TO AMEND THE FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT, 1926

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter and background paper from the Secretary of State, dated May 24, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and background paper will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2073) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2073

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 4 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 295); is amended to read as follows:

"In addition to amounts authorized before the date of enactment of this amendment, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State—

"(1) for acquisition by purchase or construction (including acquisition of leaseholds) of sites and buildings in foreign countries under this Act, and for major alterations of buildings acquired under this Act, the following sums—

"(A) for use in Africa, not to exceed $6,525,000, of which not to exceed $3,260,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1967;

"(B) for use in the American Republics, not to exceed $9,410,000, of which not to exceed $4,520,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1967;

"(C) for use in Europe, not to exceed $4,335,000, of which not to exceed $1,860,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1967;

"(D) for use in the Far East, not to exceed $5,340,000, of which not to exceed $2,260,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1967;

"(E) for use in the Near East, not to exceed $8,790,000, of which not to exceed $4,325,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1967;

"(F) for facilities for the United States Information Agency, not to exceed $865,000, of which not to exceed $680,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1967;

"(G) for facilities for agricultural and defense attaché housing, not to exceed $800,000, of which not to exceed $400,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1967;

"(2) such sums as may be necessary to carry out the other purposes of this Act.

Sums appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall remain available until expended. To the maximum extent feasible, expenditures under this Act shall be made out of foreign currencies owned by or owed to the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926 (22 U.S.C. 292), is amended by designating the initial paragraph as (a), and adding the following paragraph:

"(b) Payments made for rent or otherwise by the United States from funds other than appropriations made under authority of this Act may be credited toward the acquisition of property under this Act without regard to limitations of amounts specified hereunder."

SEC. 3. Section 9 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926 (22 U.S.C. 300), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary of State is authorized—

"(1) to sell, exchange, lease or license, any property or property interest acquired under this Act, or under other authority, for use of diplomatic and consular establishments in foreign countries,

"(2) to receive payment in whatever form, or in kind, he determines to be in the interest of the United States for damage to or destruction of property acquired for use of diplomatic and consular establishments abroad, and the contents of such buildings, and

"(3) to accept on behalf of the United States gifts of property or services of any kind made by will or otherwise for the purposes of this Act.

"(b) Proceeds derived from dispositions, payments, or gifts under subsection (a) shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, be applied toward acquisition, construction or other purposes authorized by this Act or held in the Foreign Service Buildings Fund, as in the judgment of the Secretary may best serve the Government's interest: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary shall report all such transactions annually to the Congress with the budget estimates of the Department of State."

The letter and background paper presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, May 24, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
The President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Department of State encloses, and recommends for your consideration, proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926 (22 U.S.C. 292–300), to permit continuation of the program for the acquisition, maintenance and operation of real property required abroad by diplomatic, consular and other activities of the United States operating in foreign countries.

Under current legislation enacted August 12, 1963 (Public Law 88–94), appropriations of $49.8 million were authorized and $24.6 additional was provided for program operating expenses for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 by legislation enacted August 10, 1964 (Public Law 88–414). The amount of $18,125,000 was appropriated under this authority for each of the fiscal years 1964 and 1965. The amount requested to be appropriated for fiscal year 1966 is $20 million which, if provided, will reduce the remaining amount presently authorized to $18,174,000. However, this balance is limited by the application of statutory provisions to $13,509,000 for operating expenses, leaving available only $4,665,000 for acquisition and construction.

Thus far the Department of State has acquired office buildings, residences and staff housing having a value far in excess of their cost of approximately $200 million. The Department is now requesting $36,065,000 to meet its most urgent worldwide needs for facilities for fiscal years 1967 and 1968. In addition, the proposed bill would grant permanent authorization for the operating expenses of the foreign buildings operations.

Under regulations of the U.S. Treasury, the Foreign Service buildings program is required to use foreign currency holdings of the United States before acquiring foreign currency from any other source. Treasury regulations, together with the Department's longstanding policy of using U.S. foreign currency holdings whenever feasible, insure maximum use of these currencies. Therefore, rather than a specific monetary limitation, only a general statutory requirement has been included in the proposed legislation, identical with previous authority appearing in Public Law 88–94, approved August 12, 1963.

In addition, a number of substantive provisions are proposed which will clarify and augment present authority.

The Department of State has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to this proposal from the standpoint of the administration's program.

A letter similar in content is being sent to the Speaker of the House.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

(Enclosures: (1) Draft bill, (2) background paper.)

BACKGROUND PAPER: PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO REVISE FBO AUTHORITY TO ALLOW APPLICATION OF PREPAID RENTS TOWARD PURCHASE AND TO RETAIN PROCEEDS FROM VARIOUS SOURCES

The proposed legislation is basically a bill to authorize further appropriations to carry out the purposes of the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended. To this end, it specifically authorizes appropriations of $36,065,000 (divided into limitations by geographic area) for acquisition by purchase or construction and for major alterations of buildings during fiscal years 1967 and 1968. It would also establish permanent authorization for appropriations for the operating expenses of the foreign buildings operations. These recurring expenses cover minor improvements of properties, maintenance and repair of buildings, building operating expenses, furnishings expenses, leasehold expenses, project supervision and administration costs. Annual appropriations are currently about $12 million for these purposes. Precedence for this continuous authority has been established for most of the other activities carried out by the Department of State.

It is proposed to amend section 1 of the act by designating the present paragraph as (a) and adding a second paragraph (b) to allow acquisition of property by exercise of options to purchase contained in short-term leases, applying to the purchase price all or part of the prepaid rents without reimbursement to the appropriation funding the rent payments.

The Department has negotiated a number of short-term leases which include options to purchase at a fixed price. In many instances provision is included for all or a portion of paid rents to be applied toward the purchase price at the time the option is exercised.

The Deprtment believes that the inclusion of options to purchase in leases, when possible, is clearly in the best interests of the Government since they protect the Government's investment in rents that would otherwise be lost and also serve as a protection against inflation of prices or rents.

When rents are applied to the purchase, the landlord receives less profit than he would if an outright purchase is subsequently negotiated at a later date under usual purchase procedures. The crediting of paid rent under a lease does not result in higher investment costs for the property than outright purchase and it does protect the Government from an expensive acquisition of properties which may later prove to be unsatisfactory after occupancy.

Since there is no commitment to purchase involved in the procedure, the landlord has merely rented his property at the going local rate if the option to purchase is not exercised. In many instances under local finance procedures, the landlord may have amortized the value of the property from the rent payments over the period of the lease in any event and is satisfied on a nominal additional profit.

GAO has questioned this practice on the grounds that ultimate purchase is contemplated and that when the purchase price is credited with rent paid under short-term leases, funds from appropriations other than FBO are being indirectly applied toward the purchase of real property.

Although the General Accounting Office has not instructed the Department to refrain from exercising options to purchase, its views are clear. In order to avoid controversy and insure continuation of this essential FBO procedure, the Department deems it appropriate to seek definitive legislative authority in this matter. The proposed bill will accomplish this objective.

Section 9 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act (22 U.S.C. 300) provides authority for the sale of real property acquired under the terms of the act and the use of such proceeds for the purchase, construction, furnishing and preservation of other properties. All such proceeds of sales are reported annually to the Congress.

The proposed legislation would replace the present section 9 and enlarge the authorities granted by it.

The proposed bill would allow disposal of property interests by other means than sale, where such other means are more in the interests of the Government. Disposal could be by sale, exchange, lease (for instance, in cases where sales values are abnormally low at a time a building becomes surplus to needs) or license (perhaps to a Government-supported program or commercially in cases where our requirements for the property are too uncertain to allow a lease for a specified time.) The Department needs flexible disposal authority in order to obtain the best possible commercial terms for its surplus properties.

The disposal authority would be extended to properties now not clearly enough covered by the present language—for example, properties acquired for diplomatic or consular purposes prior to enactment of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, properties donated to the Department for diplomatic and consular purposes (under section 1021 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.S.C. 809)) and properties acquired by FBO through disposition by other agencies as surplus.

The bill would allow payments (in cash or kind) for damages caused to Government-owned property overseas to be received by the Secretary under authority of the Foreign Service Buildings Act. Subparagraph (a) (2), in conjunction with subparagraph (b), would allow use of such funds to replace or repair damaged properties. At present, it appears that in absence of this authority such payments must be deposited in the miscellaneous receipts account at Treasury. If these compensatory payments are not made immediately available to the Department for repairs and replacement, extensive damages, such as have occurred in recent months, can result in considerable disruption of the building program.

At present, gifts of real property or of furniture, furnishings and equipment for Government-owned properties are accepted by the Department under authority of section 1021 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 809). The provisions of that section allow acceptance of gifts of real property and of furnishings but require quite different handling of these properties from the routine operation and administration of buildings acquired under the Foreign Service Buildings Act. This hampers the administration of such gift properties by the Department's Foreign Buildings Operations since they cannot be treated as all other properties are. There is no clear authority to use funds appropriated under the Foreign Service Buildings Act for operation or improvement costs. The uncertainties involved have caused considerable problems in acceptance of gifts and have discouraged some potential donors. Subparagraph (a)(3) would bring gift properties made for purposes covered by the Foreign Service Buildings Act under the terms of the act and both encourage gifts and simplify their administration.

Paragraph (b) of the proposed revised section would allow proceeds from dispositions of all properties covered by the act, from payments for damages, and from gifts to be applied toward the purposes of the act. It retains the requirement of the present section that all such proceeds be reported annually to the Congress.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 228

Mr. MILLER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 229

Mr. MILLER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 7750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HART, and Mr. NELSON be listed as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1483) to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes, at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) authorizing the use of the good offices of the United Nations on behalf of the enslaved Baltic States, my name be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 2, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 435) to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 10 minutes.

EMBEZZLERS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last year it was discovered in the Defense Department that certain employees had embezzled or diverted to their own use certain funds of that agency. When this was discovered the Internal Auditing Division of the Department examined the case, and it was subsequently forwarded to the Department of Justice for further examination. This ultimately resulted in the indictment of three employees.

This was the story as it was released to the press, and on the surface it had every appearance of having been efficiently handled. Further examination, however, develops a rather strange set of arrangements that were followed whereby it was made possible for two of the employees, rather than being fired, to be placed in a position where they could claim immediate retirement benefits far beyond what they would have been eligible to receive had they been routinely separated.

Actually two of the men, assuming they will reach the age of 77, the normal life span, together will collect additional retirement benefits of around $120,000 over and above what they would have received under normal circumstances.

I shall review the record and let it speak for itself.

JOHN A. WYLIE

October 31, 1963: A routine audit by personnel of the Office of the Comptroller of the Department of Defense revealed irregularities in the handling of certain miscellaneous funds in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Mr. John A. Wylie was then the head of the Budget and Finance Branch of the Office of the Secretary of Defense—at grade GS-16, $17,500 per year—and he was responsible for the management of these funds.

In lieu of suspension pending the investigation Mr. Wylie took annual leave. Later his status was converted to sick leave.

January 7, 1964: Mr. Wylie was served with a notice of intention to remove him from his position.

January 16, 1964: A report of the preliminary investigation with respect to Mr. Wylie was forwarded by the Department of Defense to the Attorney General, and an investigation of this matter by the Federal Bureau of Investigation was continued.

Mr. Wylie was not suspended. Instead, on February 4, 1964, he applied for disability retirement.

April 7, 1964: The Civil Service Commission granted him total disability retirement to become effective June 12, 1964, the next day after his pay under annual and sick leave stopped.

Accordingly, Mr. Wylie, at the age of 57, on June 12, 1964, was granted immediate retirement benefits under total disability of $516 per month.

What were the special advantages of Mr. Wylie's being granted total disability retirement in lieu of having been fired or routinely separated when the embezzlement was first discovered?

The Retirement Division of the Civil Service Commission advises that had Mr. Wylie merely resigned on June 12, 1964, he would not have been eligible for an annuity until his 62d birthday—January 9, 1969—and then his annuity would have been $453 per month. Instead, his annuity under total disability was boosted to $516 per month, and it started immediately, or nearly 5 years earlier on June 12, 1964.

By getting his annuity started in 1964 instead of having to wait until 1969, Mr. Wylie will gain two advantages: First, he will collect his retirement benefits for an additional 4½ years, and second, he will be collecting $516 per month—total disability rate—instead of $453 per month—normal retirement rates. Assuming Mr. Wylie has the normal life span of 77 years, this will mean that in 19½ years he will collect retirement benefits totalling $120,744. On the other hand, had it been a routine separation he would have had to wait until he was 62 for retirement benefits—as all other employees do. Then assuming the same life span, he would have collected $453 per month for 15 years—age 62 to 77—or a total of $81,540. Thus we have a situation now where Mr. Wylie will collect an additional $39,204 as a result of being carried on the payroll after the embezzlement was discovered until he could be classified as disabled.

On December 16, 1964, Mr. John A. Wylie and two other employees were indicted for the misuse of Defense funds estimated at about $66,000.

But Mr. Wylie will continue to draw his retirement check regardless of the outcome of the trial.

I may add that since the preparation of this statement, Mr. Wylie has been convicted.

JAMES ROBERT LOFTIS

Mr. Loftis was the second employee to get kid-gloves treatment after being suspected of embezzlement.

At the time of the audit of the Office of the Comptroller of the Department of Defense on October 31, 1963, which revealed possible irregularities in the handling of certain funds in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. John A. Wylie was serving as the head of the Budget and Finance Branch. This was the office in charge of these funds, and the Budget and Finance Branch was a component of the office of Mr. J. Robert Loftis, the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

Let us follow the extraordinary procedure which was followed in order to boost Mr. Loftis' retirement benefits after his part in this embezzlement was suspected. This time they shuffled the duties of his office, changed a few titles, and then presumably abolished his old job, thus making it possible for Mr. Loftis to retire on the basis of reduction in force.

Beginning on January 13, 1964—6 days after Mr. Wylie had been notified of his pending separation—all functions of the Budget and Finance Branch were transferred to the Comptroller of the Department of Defense. This was just 3 days before the case was referred to the FBI.

January 31, 1964: All remaining functions of the Administrative Assistant—Mr. Loftis—were transferred to the Assistant Secretary, Manpower.

February 3, 1964: The position of Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Defense was abolished, and on the same date Mr. Loftis was given notice of separation due to reduction in force pursuant to the abolishment of the position he had been holding.

March 27, 1964: Mr. Loftis was officially separated and elected optional retirement as a result of reduction-in-force separation. This sounded so much better than being fired under suspicion of embezzlement.

The next day, March 28, 1964, Mr. Loftis elected optional retirement as a result of reduction-in-force separation and was granted an immediate annuity of $735 per month on the basis of his involuntary separation by the abolishment of his position or reduction in force.

Had these special arrangements not been made whereby Mr. Loftis could have qualified for an involuntary separation he would not have been eligible for retirement until March 10, 1974, at which time he would have reached the age of 62. Then he would have received $795 per month.

However, Mr. Loftis is now receiving an annuity of $735 per month which began March 28, 1964. As a result of qualifying for retirement benefits under an arranged reduction-in-force procedure Mr. Loftis will, for the remainder of his life, now receive an annuity of $735 per month or $8,820 per year. Mr. Loftis upon his retirement was 52 years of age and, assuming a normal lifespan of 77 years, this means that he will for the next 25 years collect $8,820 per year, or a grand total of $220,500.

Had he not been dismissed under this reduction-in-force arrangement but merely separated he would not have been eligible for retirement until 1974, when he would reach the age of 62. Then he would have been eligible for retirement benefits of $795 per month. Still assuming the same 77-year normal age, this would have meant that he would have received $9,540 annual retirement—$795 per month—for 15 years or a total of $143,100 instead of the $220,500 which he will now get.

Thus we find that as a result of this special arrangement, all of which took place after the embezzlement was discovered, Mr. Loftis will be able to collect an additional $77,400—assuming the normal span of life.

The Great Society has been boasting that it will eliminate poverty, and based on these two examples who can say that they have not started?

On December 16, 1964, Mr. James Robert Loftis, Mr. Wylie, and one other employee, were indicted in the Federal court for participation in the embezzlement of about $66,000 in Government funds.

Here we find two men who in October 1963 were in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, suspected of embezzlement of Government funds, a suspicion which in January 1964 developed to the point where one of the men was notified of his suspension. Both men were carried on the payroll until one could qualify for total disability retirement benefits and the job of the second man could be abolished in order that he could qualify for immediate retirement benefits as a victim of reduction in force. The result was that these two men, both of whom are now under Federal indictment for misappropriation of approximately $66,000 in Government funds, will draw approximately $120,000 in additional retirement benefits from the U.S. Government.

The question may be asked, What happened to Mr. William H. Godel, the third man indicted for this embezzlement?

Apparently Mr. Godel did not have any friends in court. He was fired. Instead of applying for retirement he asked for refund of the retirement deductions which had been taken from his salary, totaling $13,199.40. This was denied pending resolution of his possible indebtedness to the United States.

It is hard to understand why this was allowed to happen; particularly is this difficult to understand when we consider that during the same interval in which all of this was taking place in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Air Force Academy, a division of the same Defense Department, was expelling some students for cheating in school and severely disciplining, if not expelling, other students not because they had cheated but because they knew of boys who were cheating and had not told on them.

How can the Defense Department justify this dual standard of ethics? Surely we cannot expect our youth to have higher moral standards than the adults.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my letter as addressed to the Secretary of Defense under date of August 10, 1964, along with a copy of the reply thereto of August 31, 1964, as signed by Mr. David E. McGiffert, assistant to the Secretary.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1964.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received a report alleging that certain discrepancies exist in the expenditures of some of some of the funds in the Budget and Finance Branch of the Department of Defense.

Allegedly, Mr. J. R. Loftis, Administrative Assistant to the Secretary, was suspended; a Mr. Val Hogue was transferred to another department; and a Mr. John A. Wylie, head of the Budget and Finance Branch, were involved.

In this connection, I would appreciate a report on the following:

1. The accuracy of such charges.
2. The names, positions, and salaries of each individual connected with the irregularities.
3. The date these irregularities took place, along with a complete description of what they involved, as well as the dollar amount involved.
4. The method in which these funds were misappropriated; that is, does it involve embezzlement or improper expenditures for the benefit of the individuals?
5. Were any of the above-named individuals suspended? If so, the date of their suspension and the circumstances as described in official records indicating the reason for their suspension.
6. If any of these individuals have been separated and are on retirement, were their retirement benefits in any way affected or increased as a result of the method in which they were separated; that is, by the abolishment of jobs to provide early retirement, etc.?

With this report I would appreciate any additional details indicating the extent to which any other individuals may have been involved, either as participants in the irregularities or in covering up.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1964.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Secretary McNamara has requested that I reply to your letter of August 10, 1964, with respect to the expenditure of funds under the control of the Budget and Finance Branch of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The following is a brief summary of the circumstances to which you refer.

On October 31, 1963, a routine audit by personnel of the Office of the Comptroller of the Department of Defense revealed the possible irregularities in the handling of certain miscellaneous funds in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Mr. John A. Wylie, then the head of the Budget and

Finance Branch of the Office of the Secretary of Defense (at grade GS-16, $17,500 per annum) was responsible for management of these funds.

Pending investigation, Mr. Wylie exercised his right to take annual leave in lieu of suspension in accordance with applicable civil service regulations. His status was later converted to sick leave upon certification of a physician. The Secretary of Defense instructed the General Counsel of the Department of Defense to undertake a preliminary investigation. The Department of Justice was advised that a preliminary investigation was being conducted.

The Office of the General Counsel continued its investigation, and on January 7, 1964, Mr. Wylie was served with a notice of intention to remove him from his position. Mr. Wylie applied to the Civil Service Commission for disability retirement and on April 7, 1964, the Civil Service Commission granted him disability retirement, in accordance with applicable regulations.

On January 16, 1964, a report of the preliminary investigation with respect to Mr. Wylie was forwarded by the Department of Defense to the Attorney General and an investigation of this matter by the Federal Bureau of Investigation is now continuing.

The Budget and Finance Branch was a component of the Office of the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (GS 18, $20,000 per annum). The Administrative Assistant was Mr. J. Robert Loftis. On January 13, 1964, all functions of the Budget and Finance Branch were transferred to the Comptroller of the Department of Defense. On January 31, all remaining functions of the Administrative Assistant were transferred to the Assistant Secretary (Manpower). The position of Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Defense was abolished, and on February 3, 1964, notice of separation due to reduction in force pursuant to abolishment of position was served on Mr. Loftis. Mr. Loftis was separated on March 27, 1964, and elected optional retirement under applicable civil service regulations.

Continuing investigation of collateral aspects of the Wylie matter by the Office of the General Counsel raised questions with respect to expenditures of funds by Mr. William H. Godel, at that time the Deputy Director for Management, Advance Research Projects Agency (GS-18, $20,000 per annum). Results of a preliminary investigation were forwarded to the Department of Justice on April 30, 1964, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation assumed jurisdiction of the matter on May 7, 1964.

Upon the basis of information developed through continued investigation, Mr. Godel was served with a notice of suspension and removal on July 16, 1964, and was immediately relieved of all duty. Procedures under the notice of intention to remove were pursued in accordance with the applicable civil service regulations, and Mr. Godel was removed from his position on August 24, 1964.

At the present time the Federal Bureau of Investigation is continuing an intensive investigation into these matters.

Mr. Wylie and Mr. Loftis are currently in a retired status. Their respective retirements were requested by them and granted by the Civil Service Commission in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. If you desire, the Civil Service Commission can provide you precise details with respect to the retirement status of each of these individuals.

With respect to further details in this matter the Department of Defense must defer to the Department of Justice. As you are, of course, aware, the provisions of title 5, United States Code, section 311(a), embody the so-called Williams amendment, which was passed under your sponsorship. This provision of law vests in the Department of Justice responsibility for the investigation of any possible violation of title 18 of the United States Code involving Government officers and employees.

Mr. Val Hogue is an employee of the Office of Civil Defense of the Department of the Army. He formerly was employed in the Office of the Administrative Secretary which was not part of the Office of the Administrative Assistant. There is no evidence that Mr. Hogue was in any way involved in the matters now under investigation.

I trust that the foregoing information will serve the purpose of your inquiry.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. MCGIFFERT,
Assistant to the Secretary (Legislative Affairs).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two letters, one dated March 9, 1965, and the second dated March 11, 1965, both from the U.S. Civil Service Commission, signed by Mr. Andrew E. Ruddock, Director of the Bureau of Retirement and Insurance of the Civil Service Commission, which outline the retirement benefits which these two men are receiving and the benefits which they would have received had theirs been a routine separation.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
BUREAU OF RETIREMENT AND INSURANCE,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1965.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: The following information from retirement records in the custody of this Bureau is furnished for your official use as a Member of Congress and in response to your letter of March 1, 1965.

Photocopies of employment records are enclosed for Mr. James Robert Loftis, Mr. John A. Wylie, and Mr. William H. Godel.

Mr. Loftis has been awarded an annuity of $735 per month beginning March 28, 1964, with annuity of $435 per month potentially payable to a surviving widow. His annuity is based on 30 years, 0 months, and 23 days of service, and on involuntary separation March 27, 1964, caused by abolishment of his position. If he had not been separated, he would have become eligible for optional retirement when he attained age 55 on March 10, 1967.

Mr. Wylie has been awarded an annuity of $516 per month beginning June 12, 1964, with annuity of $272 per month potentially payable to a surviving widow. His annuity reflects a finding of total disability as that term is defined in the Retirement Act, and is based on 20 years, 6 months, and 0 days of service. If he had not been separated, he would have become eligible for optional retirement when he attained age 62 on January 9, 1969.

Mr. Godel has not received any retirement benefits. He has filed an application for refund of his retirement deductions, which total $13,199.40, but payment has been denied pending resolution of the question of possible indebtedness to the United States.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW E. RUDDOCK,
Director.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
BUREAU OF RETIREMENT AND INSURANCE,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1965.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is the information you requested on March 10 concerning civil service retirement benefits for John A. Wylie and J. Robert Loftis.

Assuming Mr. Wylie had not been found disabled but had been separated voluntarily on June 12, 1964, he would be eligible for a deferred annuity benefit commencing on his 62d birthday (January 9, 1969). His annuity rate under this provision of law would be $453 a month, with annuity of $263 a month potentially payable to a surviving widow.

Assuming Mr. Loftis had been separated voluntarily on March 27, 1964, he would be eligible for a deferred annuity benefit commencing on his 62d birthday (March 10, 1974). The annuity rate payable to him on this basis would be $795 a month, with annuity of $472 a month potentially payable to a surviving widow.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW E. RUDDOCK,
Director.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the question is asked: What will happen to the retirement benefits of these men should they be convicted? The answer is: Nothing will happen. They will continue to receive their checks even if convicted. This administration has seen to that. As I pointed out earlier, two of the men have been convicted, and the third is awaiting trial.

In 1954 the Congress had passed a law, the purpose of which was to cancel the retirement benefits of any public official who was convicted of embezzling Government funds or selling his influence by accepting bribes in connection with decisions he was making in the official conduct of his office. This same law also canceled the retirement benefits of those public officials who, when questioned by a congressional committee in connection with their actions or decisions as public officials, elected to take the fifth amendment.

In all such instances these individuals would have received a refund of all their contributions to the retirement fund plus accumulated interest, but no more.

However, this administration felt more kindly toward those men who used their public office to enrich their own personal fortunes. Apparently the Jeffersonian philosophy that a public office is a public trust is not the slogan of the Great Society.

On September 12, 1961, the Senate passed H.R. 6141, a bill sponsored by this administration. The purpose of this bill was to repeal the 1954 act and thereby make it possible for public officials to take the fifth amendment, embezzle Government funds, or accept bribes in connection with their official duties and still be eligible for full retirement benefits at the taxpayers' expense.

All three of these men were indicted, and since the preparation of this statement the recent trial of two, Mr. Wylie and Mr. Godel, has resulted in their convictions. The trial of Mr. Loftis, the third man, is to be scheduled at a later and undetermined date.

Contrast the manner in which the administration dealt with Mr. Wylie and Mr. Loftis to the treatment the administration gave Mr. Otto Otepka. Mr. Otepka, once the State Department's top security evaluator, was fired from his job a couple of years ago for something called "institutional disloyalty to his superiors." All that he did was to give information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which was investigating security malpractices in the Department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles, one entitled "Two Found Guilty of Conspiracy To Embezzle," written by Jerry Kline, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 22, 1965, and one entitled "Otepka Case Too Hot To Handle," written by Holmes Alexander, which appeared on May 26, 1965.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 22, 1965]

TWO FOUND GUILTY OF CONSPIRACY TO EMBEZZLE—JURY OUT 25 HOURS WEIGHING FATE OF EX-PENTAGON AIDS

(By Jerry Kline)

Two former high-ranking Defense Department officials were convicted in Alexandria Federal District Court last night on charges of conspiring to embezzle Government funds. The jury deliberated more than 25 hours.

William H. Godel, 43, a GS–18 who lives in the 200 block of Waterway Drive, Falls Church, also was found guilty by a jury of making a false statement indicating he had spent $10,000 in 1961 for a secret research project in Vietnam. He was found not guilty on two embezzlement charges involving a total of $5,600.

John A. Wylie, 58, of the 8000 block of Barron Street, Silver Spring, also was convicted on three counts of embezzling a total of $13,401 in 1962 and 1963 and one count of making a false claim in 1963 regarding the expenditure of $5,839. The jury found him not guilty of making a false claim for a $10,000 appropriation.

Wylie, who was a GS–16 and the head of the Defense Department's budget and finance branch, was accused by the Justice Department of using his position to appoint military disbursing officers from whom he would draw Government funds to be converted to his personal use.

RELEASED ON PERSONAL BONDS

Godel, who was deputy director for management in the Defense Department's Advanced Research Project Agency, was accused of participating in the conspiracy from May 1961, to November 1963.

Judge Oren R. Lewis released the defendants on personal bonds pending sentencing after probation reports are submitted, probably in 3 to 5 weeks.

Godel faces a possible maximum sentence of 10 years' imprisonment and a $20,000 fine. Wylie could be imprisoned for 40 years and fined $50,000.

The jury of nine men and three women returned the verdict at 9:55 p.m. after deliberating for more than 25 hours over a 3-day period.

The trial, which began May 10, went to the jury Wednesday. Fifty-seven witnesses testified and more than 160 documents were submitted during the trial, Alexandria's longest in at least 5 years.

INDICTED IN DECEMBER

Godel, married and the father of five daughters, and Wylie, who has a son and daughter, were indicted last December. Also named as a codefendant, but not a coconspirator, was James Robert Loftis, Jr., 53, former administrative assistant to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

Loftis, a GS–18, is to be tried on five embezzlement counts at an undetermined date.

Godel and Wylie also were charged with a number of additional related offenses, some of them pending and others dismissed during the trial.

The embezzlement conspiracy was uncovered, Justice Department officials said, during an audit of accounts of class A agents, disbursing officers who provide funds for unusual classified projects. A total of $57,400 could not properly be accounted for, a Justice official said.

On October 31, 1963, the same day as the audit, Wylie took annual leave "in lieu of suspension," a Pentagon spokesman said.

On January 7, 1964, Wylie was served with a notice of intention to remove him from his position but, after a medical examination by the Civil Service Commission, he was granted a disability retirement.

Medical testimony in the trial indcated Wylie suffered from hypertension, depressive psychosis, severe anxiety, and other illnesses.

The conviction will not affect his retirement pay. Under the provisions of the Hiss Act, as amended in 1961, a person convicted of embezzlement cannot be denied his retirement annuity. Wylie held his $17,500 a year job since April 1, 1951.

Godel, a marine veteran and a graduate of Georgetown University, joined the Defense Department in 1952 and was a special representative to southeast Asia in 1960 and 1961. He received the National Civil Service League Award in 1962.

Fired from his $20,000 a year position last August 24, he has appealed the removal.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 26, 1965]

OTEPKA CASE TOO HOT TO HANDLE

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Having failed to move the chair up to the piano in the Otto Otepka case, the State Department is now straining to move the piano over to the chair—and to strike up a couple of new tunes.

Otto Otepka, once the State Department's top security evaluator, was fired from his job a couple of years ago for something called institutional disloyalty to his superiors. He gave information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee which was investigating security malpractices in the Department.

Since then Otepka has been trying to get a hearing to appeal his dismissal. Since then the Department has been finding one bogus excuse after another to dodge the showdown. The most recent date set for the hearing is next September 15, and here is what is happening behind the scenes:

A massive reorganization bill (H.R. 6277), introduced by Representative WAYNE HAYS, would dump Otepka and many others out of civil service into a Foreign Service officers reserve. The bill, sold as an economy measure to the administration but suspiciously regarded by several members of the Foreign Relations Committee, would have the side effect of taking away Otepka's appeal rights. It would permit the State Department to use a process called "selection out" to get rid of Otepka forever.

This is the piano-moving process—a law to oust an individual. The tune to be played would be legislative marching orders for Otepka.

Meanwhile, amid the music, the word is whispered that Otepka will get one more chance to go quietly. William Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration (the Department's organizational man) has been desperately huddling in off-record meetings. The best information is that Otepka will be offered an obscure post, in this country or overseas, if only he won't insist upon laying the facts surrounding his dismissal, on the line. The facts, already established, are that State Department officials have lied against him, that six or eight of the key witnesses requested by Otepka have been transferred to the boondocks, that literally hundreds of security reports (embarrassing to top officials) have been swept under departmental rugs.

Secretary Rusk may not know—but it's a fact—that Otepka has a huge tome of written material for which a publisher has offered him a contract. He could readily take his revenge at a profit. But Otto Otepka, one of the finest career men in Washington, would work as a ditchdigger before he would dance to a degrading tune.

His unwillingness to do the walk-away waltz suggests an alternative melody on the administration's piano. When Secretary Rusk does his expected departure from Foggy Bottom (probably during the congressional recess) a new Secretary might very well be glad to have Otepka's services and could reinstate the security checker without prejudice.

But as matters stand today, one Edward Dragon—a mild man who does not at all resemble his name—has been designated to hear the Otepka case in September. Mr. Dragon, 37, took his law degree at Georgetown University and practiced briefly. He became an "advance man" for the Kennedy campaign of 1960. Thereafter he got Federal appointments with the Office of Emergency Planning and more recently with AID under the State Department.

Ed Dragon, with whom I have talked, could be expected to conduct a fair hearing for Otepka, despite being a political appointee. But he may never get the chance.

To the lilt of one tune, Otepka may be legislated out of existence by the Hays bill. To the jingle of another, he may be reinstated by a new Secretary who, needing confirmation by the Senate, will decide to right all these many wrongs. One way or another, it's been quite a hoedown for Otto.

PRESIDENT'S NEWS CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in a press conference at the White House yesterday afternoon, before the eyes of the Nation and the world, President Johnson gave a detailed account of the events that led to the decision to send U.S. Armed Forces to the Dominican Republic on April 28. The President underscored the purpose of this decision which was to protect the lives of Americans and other foreign nationals pinned down by the hail of bullets which emanated from both sides of the revolution. Bullets once fired respect no national differences, no accidents of birth. They kill the involved and the uninvolved alike, in the same final way. And the thousands of foreign civilians living in the Dominican Republic, up to and until they were evacuated aboard American ships and planes, who were innocent of involvement in the national struggle in the Dominican Republic were in grave danger.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the President's frank and highly informative press conference be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1965]

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PRESIDENT'S NEWS CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

OPENING STATEMENT

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

The situation in the Domician Republic continues to be serious. That is why we welcome the additional efforts which are being made in the OAS today to enlarge and to strengthen the effort to find a peaceful settlement.

We continue to give our full support to Secretary General [José A.] Mora in his outstanding service under existing OAS resolutions.

But we share his judgment that a very strong and sustained effort is going to continue to be needed.

Meanwhile, I've been advised today by Gen. [Hugo Penasco] Alvin, the Commander in Chief of the inter-American force, and by Lieutenant General [Bruce] Palmer, the Deputy Commander of the inter-American force, that conditions in the Dominican Republic will now permit the further withdrawal of the U.S. military personnel from the inter-American force.

This recommendation has the concurrence of Secretary General Mora and Ambassador [W. Tapley] Bennett.

I am therefore accordingly ordering the immediate withdrawal of one battalion landing team of U.S. marines plus headquarters and supporting personnel. This will total approximately 2,000 people.

U.N. ANNIVERSARY

Now to another subject. This month of June marks a very historic anniversary in the affairs of man. Twenty years ago, while war still raged in the world the nations of Europe assembled at San Francisco to sign the charter of hope that brought into being the United Nations. [The White House said the President meant "the nations of earth."]

Men were mindful that in these times humankind must choose between cooperation or catastrophe. At San Francisco there was brought into being a great instrumentality for international cooperation and we can believe today that the cooperation engendered by the United Nations has helped to avert catastrophe in this century.

So today we have to work not on the things that divide us but instead on the things that unite nations in the bonds of common interest.

On June 24 and 25 and 26 of this year the General Assembly of the United Nations will meet for a commemorative session in San Francisco. It is my hope and plan at this time to be in San Francisco and to address the delegates at that time during the meetings of the sessions there.

AID TO SOUTHEAST ASIA

This afternoon I am sending to the Congress a very special message requesting an additional appropriation to help in the peaceful economic and social development of southeast Asia. This is another forward step toward carrying out my April proposal for a massive effort to improve the life of man in that conflict-torn corner of the world.

The American people, I think, want their own Government to be not only strong but compassionate. They know that a society is secure only when there is full social justice for all of its people.

And these principles of compassion and justice never stop at the water's edge. So we do not intend that the enemies of freedom shall become the inheritors of man's worldwide revolt against injustice and misery.

Therefore we expect to lead in that struggle—not to conquer or to subdue, but to give each people the chance to build its own nation in its own way.

My personal representative, Mr. Eugene Black, has already begun extensive and hopeful discussions with interested parties around the world. Thus the groundwork has already been laid for a long-range development plan for all of southeast Asia, led by Asians, to improve the life of Asians.

In South Vietnam today, brave and enduring people are carrying on a determined resistance against those who would destroy their independence. They will win this fight, and the United States of America is going to help them win it.

But there is another, and a much more profound, struggle going on in that country, and that is the struggle to create the conditions of hope and progress which are really the only lasting guarantees of peace and stability.

The 16 million people of South Vietnam survive on average incomes of $100 per year. More than 60 percent of the people have never learned to read or write. When disease strikes, medical care is often impossible to find.

As I had remarked the other day here, there is only 1 doctor for every 29,000 people, compared with 1 for every 740 in the United States. They have 200 doctors, whereas they need 5,000.

This poverty and this neglect take their inevitable toll in human life. The life expectancy there is only 35 years. That's just about half of what it is in our country.

Now, we think that these are the common enemies of man in South Vietnam. They were there before the aggressor struck. They, of course, will be there when aggression is completely gone. These enemies, too, we are committed to defeat.

Today's request will be used to help develop the vast water and power resources of the Mekong Basin. They will be used to bring electricity to small towns in the provinces. We have had REA (Rural Electrification Administration) teams, as you know, there working for several weeks making these surveys and planning to build several REA systems.

We will build clinics and provide doctors for disease-ridden rural areas. We will help South Vietnam import materials for their homes and their factories. And, in addition, the members of the American Medical Association have already agreed with us to try to recruit surgeons and specialists—approximately 50 of them. We are particularly very much in need of plastic surgeons to go to Vietnam to help the wounds of war and to heal them, as well as to help with the ravages of unchecked disease.

Now this is just a part of the beginning. This appropriation today calls for only $89 million. But in the future I will call upon our people to make further sacrifices, because this is a good program, and the starts that we are making today are good starts.

This is the only way that I know in which we can really win not only the military battle against aggression but the wider war for the freedom and for progress of all men.

And now I'll be glad to take any questions you may have.

QUESTIONS

1. Hemisphere aggression

Question. Mr. President, in your speech at Baylor on Friday, you spoke of new international machinery being needed to counteract any future aggression or subversion in this hemisphere. Could you spell out in any further detail just what your concept of this is militarily or diplomatically?

Answer. Yes. I think that we are very delighted for the first time in history we have presently on the military side an inter-American force that is functioning and functioning effectively under leadership of General Alvin in the Dominican Republic. A good many of the nations of this hemisphere are supplying forces to that inter-American force and others will be making contributions, we hope, in the next few days.

On the political side, we are now considering in the Organization of American States certain solutions for the Dominican Republic which could very well serve as an indication of what has come in similar situations down the road.

We have had very enlightened and very positive leadership under Mr. Mora, the Secretary General of the Dominican Republic [Mr. Johnson evidently meant to say Organization of American States], and we hope not only can they supply forces to help provide a military answer to the necessities in that field but that they can evolve a formula that will provide judicious determinations in connection with political judgments that may be needed to make in the future.

2. Role on Government

Question. Mr. President, could you spell out for us, the efforts and role which the United States has been playing in seeking a compromise government in the Dominican Republic and what you think the chances for success are?

Answer. Yes, I'd be very glad to. We found it necessary in order to stop the wholesale killing of hundreds, and even thousands of Dominicans to intervene in the Dominican Republic.

Since that time we have counseled at great length and sought the assistance of the OAS in connection with contributing the military forces that would bring about a cease-fire and preserve the peace.

At the same time, we have urged the OAS to establish machinery to help find a political solution, and awaiting the establishment of that machinery which is what we're really considering in the OAS today; we have sent some of the best people in this Government to maintain contacts with a broad base of leadership in the Dominican Republic in the hope that there would in due time evolve a broadly based government that would meet with the approval of the Dominican people.

I've had Mr. [Cyrus R.] Vance, Mr. [McGeorge] Bundy, Mr. [Thomas C.] Mann, and Mr. [Harry] Vaughan and others maintain liaison with various leaders of the various groups there. That those conferences have been taking place from day to day and we have been keeping the OAS and their representatives fully informed.

We're hopeful that in due time they will reach conclusions as to how they think it can be best handled and that we will be able to contribute our part and cooperate with them. As you know, they are discussing the matter over the weekend—today—and we hope that a decision will be in the offing and in the immediate future.

We have no desire to insist on our particular brand of military solution or political solution. We think it's an inter-American matter and we want to cooperate fully with them.

Prior to our intervention we considered and discussed the gravity of the situation there with 14 Latin American nations, beginning on Saturday when the revolution took place up through Wednesday when we sent the marines in.

During that same period we met with the peace committee of the OAS on Tuesday and we met with the OAS council on Wednesday, and it's been our desire all along to contribute all we could to a cease-fire, to the eventual evolution of a stable government that would be broadly based and to make our appropriate contribution to the necessary reconstruction of that country.

We feel that when the OAS reaches its decision that that decision will be communicated to the people of the Dominican Republic. We hope that they will be able to find agreement between the inter-American body and the folks there that will ultimately lead to an expression of opinion by the people of the Dominican Republic and ultimately lead to a broadly based government that will include none of the extremists.

3. Wagner race

Question. Mr. President, do you think Mayor Wagner, in view of his indecision to run again——

Answer. What?

Question. Do you feel Mayor Wagner should run again?

Answer. I think that this is a matter not for the President to determine.

4. *Attacks on Mora*

Question. Mr. President, do you think that the attacks which have been made on OAS Secretary General Mora in the Dominican Republic may have undermined his usefulness as a peace negotiator?

Answer. No, I don't think so. I think it may have had that objective in mind—that may have been its purpose. But you know the old story: When a man gets in the role of a mediator, both sides usually hit at him. But we think, as I said in my opening statement, that the Secretary General has performed a very useful role and a very intelligent one, a very objective one, and we have every confidence in his efforts.

We have regretted to see the attacks that have come upon him, as we have regretted to see the attacks come upon us. But we much prefer the attacks to what could have happened except for our action and except for his action.

5. *Teach-ins*

Question. Mr. President, this morning sir, you said we welcome and ask for new ideas in foreign policy from universities and journals and public platforms across the land. Two questions, sir: Does this mean you approve of the university teach-in technique, and what is your view of dissenting comment on Vietnam and other foreign problems?

Answer. I'll answer the latter question first. I think that this administration profits from the suggestions and recommendations of leaders in other branches of government, from men who occupy public platforms, and general discussion. I think that that is a strength of the American system instead of a weakness.

I am hopeful that every person will always exercise the free speech that the Constitution guarantees him, and I would prefer, of course, that it be constructive and it be responsible, and I think generally that has been true. I am glad that I live in a nation where, in the midst of conflict, when men are dying to preserve our freedom, that our citizens still do not fear to exercise it. And I can assure you that they do exercise it.

6. *Fighting in Vietnam*

Question. Mr. President, there's been a flareup of the fighting in Vietnam. Could you give us an estimate of the situation there, the military situation?

Answer. We have anticipated that we would have some actions of this type at this season of the year. We had a rather serious engagement in the last few hours—the most immediate past. The South Vietnamese have lost, according to the reports we have, dozens, even hundreds, of people. We do not know exactly the extent of the Vietcong losses, although we believe them to be substantial.

We do not announce those, perhaps unfortunately, along with the announcement of our own losses. We know how many we lose, but we don't know how many they lose until we get out there and count them. So their losses never really catch up with the original story of our losses. Suffice to say I think it's been serious. We are concerned about it. It's occupying our attention.

As you know, General [Maxwell] Taylor plans to be here in the next few days, and he will probably have more definite information at that time, not just about the details of this particular engagement.

7. *Dominican Reds*

Question. Mr. President, sir, last month when you spoke to the Nation on the Dominican Republic, you indicated that the threat of Communist control of the rebel movement was very serious. More recently we have included the rebel leaders in these talks for a coalition. Do you feel that the Communist threat in the Dominican Republic is now over?

Answer. Oh, no. No.

Question. Mr. President?

Answer. If you want me to elaborate on that a little bit, I will say the threat was greater before 21,000 Americans arrived there. It always is. The Communists did not, in our judgment, originate this revolution, but they joined it, and they participated in it, and they were active in it and, in a good many places, they were in charge of it, and we think that following the action that this Nation took, it had—it served a very good purpose, and some of the men who had originally participated in the revolution and had to take asylum returned, and more moderate forces took leadership, and the Communist elements have not been so active, although their presence is still noted hour by hour, and their effectiveness is still observed. From day to day, we see their handiwork in the Dominican Republic and elsewhere throughout the world, particularly in the propaganda field.

8. *Inter-American force*

Question. Do you foresee that an inter-American peace force which may be set up permanently would be used only to suppress Communist-directed revolutionary movements in Latin America or would it also be used to thwart revolutions by military juntas which were attempting to destroy an elected government, and I'd also like to ask that in view of the precedent which may be created by such a force would you look with favor upon the creation of similar regional forces in such areas as Africa and the Arab world?

Answer. I would not want to anticipate what action the OAS was going to take.

9. *Reapportionment*

Question. Today the Supreme Court handed down several decisions in reapportionment cases in line with its doctrine of one man, one vote. However, as you know, there are several proposals already introduced in Congress for constitutional amendments which would nullify this doctrine in part. Could you tell us what your administration's position is on this legislation?

Answer. The President does not take action in connection with constitutional amendments. I have reviewed some of the proposals that have been made. I am generally sympathetic with the reapportionment that's taking place throughout the country in compliance with the Supreme Court's decision. I would not want to get into detailed discussion of the individual programs about which the President will not act one way or the other because a constitutional amendment doesn't require White House action. It's a matter for the representatives of the people to decide. In submitting it, the Congress takes that action and the people themselves have an opportunity to judge it.

When the Congress does get down to debating the question and considering it, I will, of course, spend some time on it, become thoroughly conversant with it but I wouldn't want to predict at this time just what measure would emerge in the form of an amendment or what action Congress or the people might take on it.

10. *Space shot*

Question. Mr. President, the astronaut flight on Thursday is going to have more maneuvering than was originally announced. Was this increase done on your suggestion or urging, sir?

Answer. No.

11. *Vietnam invasion*

Question. If the situation in Vietnam in which you have promised the United States to help that country achieve victory becomes such that American combat troops are used in the combat there, could you give that order, sir, in the event that there was invasion from the north?

Answer. I don't see that I could do you any good, the country any good or myself any good by discussing future operational plans. I know of no real reason why we ought to photograph them or decide them until we're confronted with that possibility.

12. *Fears in U.N.*

Question. Mr. President, in connection with your statement on the United Nations, the Secretary General of the U.N. has expressed the apprehension that the OAS action in the Dominican Republic might establish, I think what he called an embarrassing precedent that the Arab League might act in its region and the African States might act in theirs. I was wondering whether you share those apprehensions about the U.N.?

Answer. I do not.

13. *Johnson doctrine*

Question. Mr. President, some persons claim that you have enunciated a new Johnson doctrine under which American troops would be used to prevent the establishment of a Communist government anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. In sending American troops to Santo Domingo and explaining your actions afterward, did you have any such purpose in mind?

Answer. No, and I'm afraid that the people that have branded the Johnson doctrine are unfamiliar with the fact that the nations of this hemisphere have repeatedly made it clear that the principles of communism are incompatible with the principles of the inter-American system, just as President Kennedy made it abundantly clear. And that is the basis of our attitude on the matter as I explained in my television appearance.

That does not mean, of course, that this Government is opposed to change. The greatest purpose of the Alliance for Progress which we're working on so hard and making such substantial contributions to is to encourage economic and social change. We believe that will benefit all the people of this hemisphere. And we are doing our best to provide the encouragement for those changes.

But I think it's a well-known and well-advertised doctrine of the hemisphere that the principles of communism are incompatible with the principles of our inter-American system. President Kennedy enunciated that on several occasions. The OAS has enunciated that, and I merely repeated it, and I'm sorry I got some folks excited by it.

14. *Bosch return*

Question. Mr. President, I'd like to ask you two questions about the Dominican rebellion. One, dealing with its origin, and one dealing with the possible future. Do you think that it would have been helpful if Juan Bosch had returned and might, would he, do you think he might have exercised a restraining influence on some of the left-wing extremists or Communists who were in there; and, secondly——

Answer. That's dealing with persons. I don't want to get any personalities involved. Go ahead.

Question. On the second one regarding the future, do you think it would be useful if the Dominicans were to follow the example of the Founding Fathers in this country and hold a Constitutional Convention themselves to talk out some of their differences before they try to set up a new government?

Answer. We have taken several steps in the order of priority that we felt was required. Many months ago we became aware of the increasing tensions there and the difficulties that would likely confront us.

On the Sunday before we went in there on Wednesday, we asked the Ambassador who had already come to Washington at our calling to leave his family's home and come here to meet with us. Ambassador Bennett met with us on Monday. We rushed him back to the Dominican Republic and set in motion certain steps. First, was to attempt to obtain a cease-fire. Second, was to take the precautionary steps necessary to protect approximately 5,000 Americans, as well as thousands of other nationals, if that should be required.

We moved our ships up there on Sunday. The Ambassador arrived there on Monday. He talked to various leaders and we did all we could to bring about a cease-fire in cooperation with the papal nuncio and others who were active on the scene.

On Wednesday at noon it became apparent that danger was lurking around the corner and the Ambassador gave us a warning in a cable about 1 o'clock.

We had met on Monday, and we had met on Tuesday, and we had met on Wednesday, and we had had many conversations on Sunday that we did not issue any handouts on.

During that period I think from the time we were notified on Saturday until we intervened on Wednesday we spent a good part of both day and night giving our attention to this matter, from moving the ships up to making the final decision.

I had 237 individual conversations during that period and about 35 meetings with various people. Finally, on Wednesday afternoon we got another warning that we should have a contingent plan ready immediately and a little before 6 o'clock we got a plea from the—a unanimous plea—from the entire country team made up of the Ambassador and the aid director and the CIA and the USIA and the Army and Navy and Air Force, to land troops immediately to save American lives.

Now, of course, we knew of the forces at work in the Dominican Republic. We were not unaware that there were Communists that were active in this effort. But 99 percent of our reason for going in there was to try to provide protection for these American lives and the lives of other nationals.

We asked our Ambassador to summon all of our people immediately to the Embajador Hotel, put them in one central group, and in the presence of Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara, and Secretary Ball, and Mr. Bundy, and Mr. Morriers of my staff, we consulted with the Latin American desk—Mr. Vaughan and his experts and Mr. Vance and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

UNANIMOUS DECISION

And in the neighborhood of 6 o'clock Wednesday evening we made the decision—and it was a unanimous decision about which there was no difference of opinion either at the Dominican Republic level of the country team or the Cabinet level here to send in the troops. We did not want to announce that they were on their way until they had landed for obvious security reasons.

But when I made the decision, I pointed out to the Secretary of State that we've been consulting since the weekend with some 14 Latin American nations and we'd had a meeting of the peace council—or the Peace Committee of the OAS and we'd had a meeting of the council of the OAS. And I thought it was very important that we notify all the Latin American ambassadors forthwith.

So the decision was to notify the Congress and ask them to come down so we could review with them the developments; and notify the ambassadors and ask for an immediate session of the OAS and to notify the troops because the lives of our citizens were in danger and men were running up and down the corridors of the Ambassador Hotel with tommyguns shooting out windows, and through the roof, and through the closets, and our citizens were under the beds and in the closets in trying to dodge this gunfire and our Ambassador, as he was talking to us, was under the desk. We didn't think we had much time to consult in any great detail more than we had talked about up to that time.

But we did make the announcement about 8 o'clock and immediately I asked the OAS for an urgent meeting the next morning.

Since that time we've had two purposes in mind: One is for them to take action that would give us a military presence and provide a military solution so that we could quit killing people. I think that the Armed Forces are entitled to one of the greatest tributes ever paid that group in war or peace for the marvelous operation they conducted.

They moved in there and landed within an hour from the time the Commander in Chief made the decision: they surrounded the hotel and protected the lives of 1,000 American citizens and many hundreds of other nationals. They did not lose one civilian. They opened a route of 7 miles to the port and they evacuated 5,600 people, and those people came from 46 different countries.

The next step that we thought should be followed was to be—to provide food and clothing and sustenance for those people, so we sent an economic team of 32 people, headed by Mr. Solomon, who was sworn in today as Assistant Under Secretary of State in charge of economic matters, and we started feeding the three and a half million people of the Dominican Republic. We have provided food and other necessities—medicine—since that time to those people without regard to which side they were on. In addition, we have treated more than 15,000 with our medical facilities.

So, having gone in and secured the place, having evacuated 5,600 people—and now the commercial planes are running and they can come out on their own steam—having obtained a cease-fire, having provided the economic aid, having sent our best people to talk to all groups and all factions and leadership to try to find a government that would appeal to all the Dominican people, we now think that there are two essential things left to be done.

One is to find a broadly based government under the leadership of the OAS that will be acceptable and approved by the Dominican people.

And second, to engage in the comprehensive task of reconstruction of that nation, and trying to make it possible for three and a half million to gain—have an economic comeback.

Question. Thank you, Mr. President.

COFFEE HOUSE THEATER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the June issue of Reader's Digest there appeared a heartwarming article about 2 nuns and 14 girls from Clarke College in Iowa, who took their lively college variety show to GI audiences in France, Germany, and Italy. The show, called "Coffee House Theater," was a smash hit everywhere it went, and the participants are still receiving letters of appreciation from the GI's they entertained.

The trip is described in an excerpt from a speech given by Sister Mary Xavier, the director of the group and a professor in Clarke's drama department. Her eloquent description of the experiences of her troupe make it easy to see why the tour was so successful.

Mr. President, I think many people will want to read of this trip, and I ask unanimous consent that the article I referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"GI'S AND THE GIRLS FROM DUBUQUE"—THE HEARTWARMING ACCOUNT OF WHAT HAPPENED WHEN 14 YOUNG AMERICAN GIRLS REMINDED THOUSANDS OF GI'S OF HOME

(NOTE.—For 7 weeks last August and September, 2 nuns and 14 girls from Clarke College, Dubuque, Iowa, brought their lively college show, Coffee House Theater, to GI audiences in France, Germany and Italy. The GI's, spotting the nuns, thought that they were in for a hymn-singing session, but soon were pleasantly surprised. Of the show, the Armed Forces newspaper, The Stars and Stripes, reported: "Coffee House Theater served a delightful cup of folk singing, modern dance, jazz, blackouts and improvisations that delighted even the most hard-bitten GI. The show is fast-moving, tuneful and professional." Added the "Army Chronicle": "Two nuns playing like Bob Hope and 14 pretty American girls are socko in Coffee House Theater."

(Director of the show was Sister Mary Xavier, B.V.M.; technical director was Sister Mary Jeremy, B.V.M. Both nuns are professors in Clarke's drama department and members of the Roman Catholic teaching order of the Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary. To the GI's abroad, they became known fondly as "the girls in black."

(In this speech, given to various organizations in Dubuque, Sister Mary Xavier tells of her moving experiences with the young GI's.)

How can I tell you what it was like to be a nun in the Army? I am reminded of the Army officer on the Military Air Transport Service plane on which our troupe flew to Europe, who asked me, "Ma'am, what general is your brother?" He was amazed to find that Sister Mary Jeremy and I were members of the military on a USO show—the first Sisters ever to be on such a mission.

Clarke College was one of seven universities and colleges chosen last year to have their shows tour the European Command under the auspices of the American Educational Theater Association and the United Service Organizations. Coffee House Theater was presented 75 times; we traveled more than 13,000 miles, primarily in southern Germany.

Our audiences were never as large at the beginning of the show as they were at the end. When the program began, the men sprawled in their chairs with limp spines and an attitude of "You gotta show me." After the first set of blackouts and the laughter that always followed, they were sitting upright having a marvelous time. The crowd increased as the soldiers came in from a nearby game or poolroom. Often a lad—obviously an advance scout—would go to the window and whistle; then 10 or 15 of his buddies would come in. Soon every seat was taken; then men sat on radiators, on the floor, stood on tables. One night they slid down a banister and sat 12 deep on it, because there was no other space. As one of the men described it: "In 5 minutes we were the happiest bunch of soldiers this side of Paris."

Many people have asked, "What was the most memorable part of the tour?" I can truthfully answer: the American soldier. We hear much about the lads overseas who get into trouble; we know too little about the average boy who is not sure why he is so far from home. His life has been interrupted for 2 or 3 years; he hates the interruption, the Army, and his sergeant; he is willing to die if there's war; but, when there isn't, he can't wait to get back to the things he is used to. He plays war with live ammunition and lives in a pup tent in all kinds of weather for a month at a time with only one change of clothing and a pint of water a day for drinking, shaving and washing. Yet none of these things bother him nearly so much as the fact that there are no American girls around to talk or dance with.

Frequently the girls would offer to have a dance after the show or on their night off. You can imagine what it was like—300 men and 14 girls. Each dance was ladies' choice, and, by common agreement, no girl danced more than 2 minutes with the same boy. You would hear remarks like, "Hey, Mac, perfume!" or, "Real American nylons!"

One night during the show I noticed one soldier in particular. He would look at a girl, shut his eyes, then repeat the process for all the other girls. Asked what he was doing, he said, "Memorizing the faces so I can dream about them tonight."

For the final number of the show, the girls wore long white gloves and floor-length formals. Their appearance in this attire never failed to bring a tremendous ovation from the boys, not the shouting wolf-whistle response, but a kind of awe. Frequently I heard boys saying softly to no one in particular, "God, they're beautiful!" Many nights soldiers would thank me for having the girls look so lovely.

Before we left the United States, we were warned that a GI audience can be rude, crude and even obscene. Yet we found that when we expected the best from these men, when we assumed that they were gentlemen, they responded accordingly. As the Army said of our tour: there were no incidents.

At one post we had been warned of an impending race riot. More than the usual number of MP's were on duty this night. The performance was about half over when a noisy crowd of men came in, and our escort officer said, "Here comes trouble." But Sister Mary Jeremy greeted them in her own smiling way and said, "Come right in. We're so glad you came. You can sit in the first row, where we'll put up more chairs." The men sat down like little boys in third grade, and before long they were laughing and having a good time along with the other GI's.

Everyone in our company had a job to do each night before the performance. While the girls were putting up the portable sets, I would sit in the back of the hall and write the daily report which we sent home. But never once did I finish the report before the show. The boys are lonely and desperately need someone to listen to them. After a few minutes a GI would come up and say, "Please, ma'am * * * sir * * * sister (they never did know quite what to call us), could I talk to you?" It soon became a company joke, and the girls would say, "Sister's hearing confessions again."

Some of the stories the men had to tell were funny; others would twist your heart. One lad said, "Ma'am, what do you think of mixed marriages?" I asked, "What do you have in mind?" He told me that he was a Baptist, but his girl was a Lutheran. I said, "Well, it's the same God, isn't it?" He went off happy.

Another boy who came up to talk to me had spent that day learning how to use a bayonet and was deeply upset. "You know, ma'am, the sergeant kept telling us, 'You put it in and then you turn it. You put it in and then you turn it.' Today it was only sandbags, but what if it were a man? I never could do it. I couldn't kill anybody." We talked a long time about the necessity of protecting the country during a war.

One of the nicest occasions we had was at Illesheim, a missile site high in the mountains of Bavaria. We were invited to dinner in the messhall. The men had gone to great effort to entertain us; they used bed sheets for tablecloths, put wild flowers in aluminum foil as centerpieces. They made place cards, provided two escorts dressed in "civvies" for every girl and then served us on trays. Never have I seen such large portions. My host kept saying, "Don't you like it, ma'am? Is everything all right, ma'am?" I finally had to confess I just couldn't eat quite as much as the ordinary soldier.

After dinner one of the men came over to my table and said, "Ma'am, this is only half of us. The others are on 24-hour duty up the mountain at the missile site, but they sure would like to see the girls, too." I told him if he could get transportation, I would get the girls. "The bus is outside, ma'am, just in case you'd say yes."

So off we went up the mountain. Because missile sites are "classified" we had to be locked in and out. With only 10 minutes' notice that we were coming, all the men had put on fresh fatigues and polished their shoes. We did parts of our show for them in a chart room.

When it was time to go, no one could find the key to the gate. The boys said that they guessed that we would just have to stay there. Finally I said, "You find that key, or I'll phone General Lawrie." "Yes, sir, ma'am" was the reply. So we got back on our Army bus and went down the hill. We were a little late for the next performance, but no one cared, because the rest of the company had seen the girls.

The hospital shows were touching and rewarding. These boys, some badly hurt, never seemed to feel sorry for themselves. In one ward two boys, each with a broken arm, combined efforts and clapped together with their good hands. Another soldier, who had lost his arm at the shoulder in a jeep accident, regretted his loss because he could not applaud the girls after they did the show in his room just for him.

Many kind letters—from GI's, chaplains, service-club and Red Cross directors, and from mothers of boys in the service—have come to the college as a result of our tour. One GI wrote: "After spending months away from the ones we love, we often ask ourselves if it's worth it; do the people in the United States really care? I cannot think of a better way of showing appreciation than by what Clarke's ambassadors gave us. Thank you from the thousands who sat in your coffee house. Hurry back."

Would we go back again? Just ask us.

CLARKE COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was my honor and privilege to participate in the commencement exercises held at Clarke College, Dubuque, Iowa, on May 29. It gave me the opportunity to meet new friends and to renew old friendships. More important, it recalled for Mrs. Mansfield the years she spent in high school and college at Mount St. Joseph's as Clarke College was then called. These were happy years, fondly remembered years, and, added to the recollections, Clarke College awarded to her the honorary degree of doctor of laws. For me, it was a most happy and auspicious occasion and it constituted literally a thrill in a lifetime.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert at this point in my remarks a copy of the commencement address which I gave on that occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN'S JOURNEY, U.S.A.

(Commencement address by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, Clarke College, Dubuque, Iowa, May 29, 1965)

Before I begin my remarks to you, I should like to pay tribute to the one person who, more than any other, is responsible for my being here today. I refer to Maureen Hayes Mansfield—who spent 7 happy years at Clarke, who has so many friends here and who is responsible for my being referred to, on occasion, as the third Senator from Iowa.

It is not too difficult for a man in public life to gain recognition, provided he is lucky enough to share his private life with an exceptional wife. All too often, the women who stand with public figures go unnoticed and unsung. But I know and I am delighted to acknowledge that if I had not had Maureen Mansfield by my side through the years, these years of public life would not have been possible. If I had not drawn strength from her patience, if I had not found courage in her understanding—if I had not had access to her wisdom, I would not be with you today. You would not have had occasion to invite me, for the simple reason that I would not have had anything very much to say to you.

So, for making it possible for me to be here, for her enormous assistance to me in a life of public service which has brought me much personal fulfillment, I should like to add to the public honor which you have bestowed on Maureen Mansfield, a public expression of my deep affection and gratitude to her.

Ladies of the graduating class of 1965, distinguished members of the faculty, parents, relatives, and friends, I am grateful for the privilege of sharing in this graduation ceremony.

It is a pleasure to return to Clarke College. The campus does not look exactly the same to me as on my visit here 8 years ago. I detect the presence of buildings which were not around then and I note that the college has expanded its facilities and curriculum.

There is, however, a striking similarity between the graduating class I addressed in 1957 and the graduating class of 1965. The product of the earlier class was—and the product of today's class is—a fine and alert looking group of graduates.

To you graduates, your diploma is the capstone of your college career. It is for you, at once, the beginning and the continuance—the commencement—of what might be called "Women's Journey in the United States."

That journey began with the very beginnings of the Nation. And through the years it has been marked by change. In the earliest days, it was slow and scarcely a perceptible change. But in what historians eventually will record as a relatively brief period of time, three factors have been instrumental in creating startling change in the role of women in our society. These factors are expanded educational opportunity, expanded economic opportunity, and expanded political opportunity.

Almost from the beginning, an elementary school education has been available to both boys and girls in this country. But the door to a secondary school education for a girl opened more slowly. Nevertheless, by the end of the 19th century, twice as many girls as boys were being awarded high school diplomas because, for work reasons, males constituted a higher percentage of school dropouts.

At the higher education level a real distinction between educational opportunity for males and for females has existed until very recent times. It was almost 200 years after Harvard University was founded to provide higher education for men that Oberlin College in 1833 broke ranks to provide instruction at the advanced level to what was referred to as "the misguided and neglected sex." In spite of this breakthrough, it was a long time before the concept of free choice for women in educational pursuits received any general acceptance. Even 50 years ago, for example, it would have been pointless for a girl to prepare for a career in politics or international affairs.

As soon as women were given a fair crack at educational opportunities, they proved that they did, indeed, possess brainpower equal to that of men. Nowadays, women earn one-third of all B.A.'s, one-third of all M.A.'s and one-tenth of all Ph. D.'s. Virtually no profession is closed to a woman who is capable and trained. What is of the essence, of course, is this Nation's general and growing recognition that an equitable educational opportunity should be available to all, regardless of the individual's color or sex or the station in life in which he or she was born.

And as with educational changes, expanded economic opportunity has also brought a significant transition in the role of women in our society. In the relationship of women to work outside the home, statistics reveal that in the span of 60 years—from 1900 to 1960—the number of American women earning paychecks increased almost fivefold. Today, more than half of the women who are working are married, and one in every three workers in the United States is a woman.

It is clear that some women must work to support themselves and dependents. And some women work to supplement family income. But increasing numbers of married women are working because they find they can successfully blend the responsibilities of family life with those of a part- or a full-time job. After her children are grown up many a married woman has virtually a second adult lifetime which may be dedicated to self-development, the use of talents and skills, and service to family and to community, in its broadest sense.

A third factor to bear in mind as instrumental in the changing nature of woman's journey in the United States is expanded political opportunity. Remember, woman's universal right to vote dates back only to 1920—when the 19th amendment to the Constitution was finally approved. As you know, Congress now has before it a bill which seeks to secure this fundamental right irrespective of color. It is a good time to note that just a few decades ago about half the entire population did not have this right just because they were women. That is a measure of the distance we have come in a relatively short time.

I will note parenthetically that in the field of political rights, a great change in the status of women has occurred not only in this Nation but throughout the world. Of the 119 nations that currently are members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, 106 countries give women full and equal political rights to vote and hold office; 6 countries grant women partial rights; and in only 7 countries are women accorded no political rights.

The forces that have revolutionized the role of women in our society are forces that are simmering or stirring beneath or above the surface in the developing nations of the world. In all change there is potential for good or evil. The crux of the matter is the direction change takes. In the explosive and complicated world of which we are a part, there is ideological confrontation between the Communist world and the free nations over the direction change is to take in those newer nations engaged in a search for identity. We cannot afford to ignore nor to neglect the winds of change. It behooves us—in fact it is essential for us as a nation—to help to shape change in a fashion so as to create those conditions under which all peoples can live and prosper in peace. The women of this Nation should be willing to contribute in that undertaking and their contribution should be welcomed.

One area in the United States where a change in the role of women has been particularly significant is in the field of politics. Today—only 45 years following ratification of the suffrage amendment—women occupy political offices at all levels of government. They serve as mayors and on town and city boards. They are members of State legislatures and occupy State elective and appointive posts.

Women are also active in political party councils. As you have doubtless noticed on television, women are much in evidence at political conventions where they act as delegates, speakers, contributors to party platforms, and, last, but not least, occasionally as a vice-presidential or presidential candidate. As a Democrat, I do not wish to be in the position of advising the Republican Party but it is no secret that I favored Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH as that party's candidate for the Presidency in the last election. The Republicans did not heed my advice and you know what happened last November.

My State of Montana sent the first woman to the U.S. Congress in 1917. Since then, the role of women has continued to expand in national politics. Over 60 women have been Members of the House of Representatives, and 10 currently serve in that body. Ten women have been Members of the Senate. Currently, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, a Republican from Maine and MAURINE NEUBERGER, a Democrat from Oregon, make a great contribution to the Senate and the Nation.

They do so because they are intelligent, wise and immensely skilled Senators and equally because they are charming and gracious women.

The scope of politics is broad. It covers a wide range of activities—from doorbell ringing or "getting out the vote" on election day to waging a political campaign or serving in public office. How effectively small tasks are performed often can mark the difference between a victory and a defeat for a candidate.

Anything men can do in politics, women can do, and in many instances, better. Through participation in politics, you graduates can make your voices heard and your views felt in our democratic system of government. Politics offers you a way of helping to promote good candidates for office, to keep good officials in office, and to insure good government across the board. Politics offers you a way of translating into political action your own ideas and thoughts. Politics offers you a means of influencing public attitudes, governmental policies, and world events. I trust you will accept those offers and make them at least a part of your contract with life.

Women's journey in the field of international affairs, like that of politics, is of rather brief duration. The first American woman to become a Foreign Service officer was appointed in 1922 and assigned to Bern, Switzerland, as third secretary of legation. Today over 250 women serve as Foreign Service officers and close to 75 as Foreign Service Reserve officers. Women comprise 6.6 percent of the total Foreign Service officer complement. This is a small but significant proportion when it is considered that most of a Foreign Service employee's career is spent in assignments overseas. It is a career difficult for a woman to combine with the responsibilities of marriage, and most women, at least at the last count, are still interested in getting married.

Franklin Roosevelt was the first President to nominate a woman to a high diplomatic post. During his first administration, he appointed as Minister to Denmark Ruth Bryan Owen. Our first woman diplomat to attain the rank of ambassador was appointed by President Truman, and the first woman ambassador chosen from career ranks was nominated by President Eisenhower. At the present time there are two women Ambassadors, Margaret J. Tibbetts, a career Foreign Service officer serving in Norway, and Catherine White, Ambassador to Denmark. I anticipate Senate approval soon of President Johnson's recent nomination of another outstanding lady, Mrs. Patricia Roberts Harris, to be Ambassador to Luxembourg. Mrs. Harris, a lawyer, would become our first Negro woman to serve in an ambassadorial post.

Our natural inclination is to associate foreign affairs primarily with the Department of State and Foreign Service. Yet many women also work in other agencies of government which have important responsibilities in the field of foreign affairs—the U.S. Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Peace Corps.

Some of you graduates may be considering the Peace Corps. It is a wonderful opportunity to serve your fellow man and to enrich your own experience. Women volunteers from Iowa have been dispatched to such faraway places at Turkey, Brazil, the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, Nigeria, and Ethiopia. They have been teachers of music, English, general science, mathematics, or physical education. They have been nurses or home economists or social, community development, or agricultural extension workers.

I might allude at this point to the Peace Corps' domestic counterpart known as Volunteers in Service to America, or VISTA, in short. That program is attracting its share of qualified young women volunteering to join in trying to put an end to poverty in the United States.

No résumé of women's accomplishments in the field of international affairs is complete without mention of women who have served this country with distinction in various United Nations posts. Eleanor Roosevelt was the first chairman of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. Mrs. Roosevelt's place in history will be measured not only by her tangible achievements and distinctions such as that one, but by the intangible contributions she made through her outpouring to others of sincerity, warmth, conviction, and understanding.

Two other women have ably represented this Nation on the U.N. Human Rights Commission—Mary Pillsbury Lord and Marietta Tree, whose appointment by President Johnson carried with it ambassadorial rank.

I have called attention to some of the noteworthy attainments of women in the field of international affairs. But I do not want to leave you with the impression that you graduates cannot make a significant foreign policy contribution unless you are a Peace Corps volunteer, an expert on foreign aid, or an Ambassador. In every community there is a genuine need for citizens who take an interest in and acquire comprehension of foreign policy problems. It is fallacious to assume that foreign policy problems are too complex for anyone but the expert to grasp. It is wrong for any individual in this 20th century to assume that his concerns end at the county, State, or National boundary line.

What are some of the ways in which you increase understanding of the world in which we live and enhance other people's understanding of us? You can keep yourself informed on international affairs. You can become an active participant in one or more of any number of volunteer or professional organizations that study specific foreign policy issues or engage in other activities related to foreign affairs; you can communicate to your elected representatives any ideas you have; you can take foreign visitors sightseeing or invite them to visit your homes.

Most important, you can make intelligent use of the unparalleled sources of information which are available in this Nation, particularly the press. Newspapers, large and small, those printed in the metropolitan centers of our country and those that abound in smaller cities, have done an outstanding job of supplying the facts and informed opinion on national and international developments. They have helped to keep government on its toes. They have served to bring to the public an independent picture of our national policies at home and abroad.

And while I am on this subject, I want to say a word of praise for the American men and women who report the news. They do an excellent job even if I may sometimes suffer personally at their hands. The reporter's job is to turn the light on, regardless of the inadequacies in government which may be exposed. Management of news by government can never be squared with our continuing and growing need for a fully informed and alert public. It can never be squared, in other words, with the needs of a democratic society.

And in no aspect of this Nation's public affairs is a press contribution more essential than in foreign policy. The function of the newspapers is to point up the facts as they see them—the strengths and weaknesses, the consistencies and inconsistencies, the reasons for and reasons against our policies and our posture.

We will never safeguard this nation by deprecating, in the name of national policy or of a superior governmental wisdom, the free press which is one of the principal institutions by which freedom is maintained. Government officials are almost always inclined to think—and understandably—that they know better than the press what is transpiring in the world or any segment of it and what to do about it. But time and again events have indicated that on many occasions they do not. In this connection, I think, for example, of the work of American correspondents in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic which has been outstanding in every respect. One sometimes has the impression that the accuracy of the press reporting and some of the press analyses in both places may very well have been greater in many instances than the great flow of information which has come to Washington through official channels.

I want to say, too, that over the years as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, in secret or public sessions, the flow of information from the executive branch to the Senate on the international situation is more copious but many times no more revealing or lucid than that which has been carried in the great newspapers of the Nation.

In short, I want to stress to you the indispensable service which the press of the Nation performs in our society. It must continue to reflect the truth as it sees the truth, directly, with its own eyes, and not as it is reflected in the retina of official positions. The two may be and often are identical. That is fortuitous when it is the case. But when it is not, there must be no forced convergence in the name of a national unity. For that kind of unity can never be more than skindeep. It is not a source of strength. Rather, it is a source of a dangerous and delusive weakness.

The basic work of the press leads to the asking of the incisive questions which in a democracy need to be asked by the people and answered by their government. And so, as in the cast of the situation in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, the press provides the impetus and stimulus for a searching and continuing public debate which is likely to go on and should go on until there is a satisfactory resolution of critical national questions.

Speaking of the press, the other day I read a magazine description of the composite American woman. She was portrayed as "good-looking, youthful, energetic, capable, independent, restless, confused, frustrated, spoiled—lucky." I shall reserve comment on that characterization on the grounds that were I to do otherwise, I might incriminate myself. But I think you graduates and I would both agree that you have been lucky in having the opportunity to attend this institution of higher learning where the pursuit of excellence is emphasized and the quest for truth is encouraged.

Moreover, I think you are lucky to be living in the 20th century of unfolding opportunity, unprecedented demands, and unparalleled hope. Of you women, much will be asked. You will be expected to possess capacity for change, clarity of thought, and courage of conviction. You will be expected to work hard. You will be expected to have purpose and to be willing to commit yourself to service in useful articulation of the needs of your family, your community, your country, and the world.

Your church, family, friends, community, and schools have influenced your development into what you are. What you become and what you do in the future is your challenge in the years ahead. What you become and what you do can make a difference in shaping the face of the future world. Responsibility for our Nation's survival in freedom and for the future of all mankind is a responsibility all Americans share.

I should like to leave you with my hope for your part of the women's journey in the United States which you start today, a hope expressed in an old Gaelic blessing:

"May the road rise to meet you.
May the wind always be at your back.
May the sun shine warm upon your face
And the rains fall soft upon your fields.
And, until we meet again, may God hold
you in the hollow of His hand."

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF NATIONAL CATHEDRAL SCHOOL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday the President delivered a commencement address at the National Cathedral School. It was an address from the heart because it was given to a graduating class which included his charming and lovely daughter, Miss Luci Baines Johnson. The stress of the speech was on the vital importance of public debate on national and international issues. The President called this fundamental practice "one of the great strengths of American democracy."

No society in the history of mankind has placed such great emphasis on the need for public discussion in the process of making national policy. No society, no government, no leadership in any country at any time has shown a more active, continuing and abiding concern, has paid more attention, or more closely heeded the opinions of its citizens on issues of great importance.

It is against this background—this essential background—that, as the representative of all the people, the President makes his decisions. That great burden, in the end, is his alone to carry. President Truman put it well when he placed a small sign on his desk which said, succinctly, "the buck stops here." The President must act as he sees fit, with the advice of the Congress and his staff and the great body of public opinion as it is refined, distilled, and expressed in a free discussion and an independent press but always, finally, on what he perceives as in the best interests of this Nation and its people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this warm and wise commencement speech at National Cathedral School be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, NATIONAL CATHEDRAL SCHOOL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 1, 1965

Presiding Bishop Hines, Mr. Clayton, Dean Sayre, members of the faculty, members of the 1965 graduating class and their parents, families, ladies, and gentlemen, the Office of President presents many challenges, but I am sure that every father that is here this morning will understand sympathetically that few challenges could compare with the exacting demands of speaking before the graduating class of your own daughter.

I have been reminded repeatedly before this morning that in talking here I really have a family reputation to uphold. I only hope that it is not principally a reputation for talking.

For you members of the class of 1965, I know this is a very proud and happy and rewarding day for you. Speaking for myself, as a parent, I find this moment both sad and glad. I shall miss the small comfort of knowing that no matter how much homework I might bring to the White House every night Luci still would have brought more than me.

But at the same time I am glad and I am eternally grateful that by the time that she reached her junior year at NCS Luci had learned to spell her name correctly, with an "i" instead of a "y."

Most of you here this morning will go from here to serve your country in many ways. So this morning I want to ask your assistance in a very special way. This particular occasion will be broadcast and reported to millions of people—some in other lands. Now, this is not a tribute to me or to you, but it is a tribute to the importance of our beloved country. So this morning I would like to discuss with you and the Nation a matter which concerns me and about which I have given much thought.

As is true for many national issues, we have had much discussion here of late about the various aspects of American foreign policy. I have disagreed with some of the views that have been expressed. I know that the large majority of Americans support our country's efforts everywhere to stop aggression.

But I also know that such discussion is one of the great strengths of American democracy. How rare is the land and extraordinary the people who freely allow and really encourage, as I have on many occasions, the citizens of our Nation to discuss and to debate their Nation's policies in time of danger.

So, let no citizen that is secure in his own liberty ever forget how precious it is and how brave we must be if we are to keep it, how many generations of men have perished in order to guard its light, and how many scattered throughout the world are dying still to protect it.

Our soldiers are falling in Vietnam. Twenty have died and one hundred have been wounded on guard in the Dominican Republic so that men may always rise with perfect safety to criticize and to try to influence the leadership of their Government.

Nor should we forget that the purpose of liberty is not merely to allow error but to discover truth, not only to restrict the powers of the Government but to enrich the judgment of the Nation. So, by testing ideas in the forum of the Nation we discover their strength as well as their wisdom.

As the Bible says: "Where no counsel is, the people fall: But in the multitude of counselors there is safety."

Therefore, we welcome and we ask for new ideas from serious and concerned men and women, from universities and journals and public platforms all across this land. We are constantly searching for views and proposals which might strengthen and unite and help our Government.

Of course, there can be no decision with which we all agree. But all will be heard. And let no one ever think for a moment that national debate means national division.

For even among those who do not support our Government policies, the very process of discussion rests on a broad and deeply set foundation of shared belief, principle, faith, and experience.

There are, first of all, the assumptions of American democracy. Thus, most of those who disagree are really trying to influence the democratic process and not rip it and tear it apart. They are really seeking to exercise their own freedom and not deny it to others. They try to affect the decisions of the Nation, not flaunt or ignore them.

Secondly, even among those who quarrel with particular acts, most believe, as I believe, in the principles which have shaped American world policy for more than a generation.

We seek neither conquest nor domination. We seek to work toward a goal where every country can run its own affairs, can shape its own progress, can build its own institutions according to that country's own desires and needs.

And to do all that can be done to find enduring peace at the same time, while we are resisting aggression by any who wish to subdue others and gobble them up and really try to destroy us.

We seek to reserve our special friendship for those governments that are dedicated to social justice and progress for all of the people—and all the people, not just a privileged few.

It is these principles which I am trying so hard, as best I can, for your government to support in every continent of the world today because I think these are also the beliefs of the American people. Therefore, we need never shrink from debate because debate can only strengthen our determination and our ability to follow this course.

In a democracy, the people have to want to do what must be done. And that particularly includes students like you.

I have visited many campuses and I have talked to many students, and I can tell you that this generation of young Americans is a generation of which I am deeply proud. And, I think, you are very lucky to be joining them.

This is not the lost generation or the silent generation or the indifferent generation. This is the concerned and the committed generation. And I, for one, believe that adult America should be proud and should be thankful that young America—youthful America—is so concerned for their country, so committed and dedicated to a genuine understanding of all of America's problems and they are uncowed in their determination to be a part of the answers that we are seeking and that we need.

This world that we live in is a restless world. It is a world filled with revolution and even violence, and we must never make the sad mistake of thinking that this is only the work of our enemies.

Of course, our enemies are at work like ants, constantly united and dedicated and determined. But they thrive on the desperate struggle by the poor of the world to try to create a more hopeful life.

Our life in America is good. Our land is rich. Our comforts are many. But more than 2 billion of the 3 billion people in the world have an income of less than $20 per month. Half of the world's children today have no school to go to at all and have never darkened a schoolroom. Two hundred million people in the world today have no safe water to drink any day of their lives. More than half the population of Asia and Africa and Latin America, by our standards, have no homes at all in which to live.

This is the world that you live in and, whether you know it or not, it is a world with slums and shacks; it is a world without lights or water in the homes; it is a world without food on the shelves or health in the bodies; a world with too few teachers and too few doctors. In Vietnam, they have 200 doctors and if they had the same ratio of doctors that we have in this country they would not have 200, they'd have 5,000.

So, this is a world where hope is too rare and help is too scarce. Wherever and whenever men struggle to escape this misery no nation ought to be neutral—whatever be the continent or the creed or the color of those who reach upward striving and yearning for a better life.

Were there no cold war and no communism at all, this planet would still be wracked and seething with man's heroic battle to secure justice for himself.

For myself, I do not propose that this powerful Nation which I lead shall stand alone or shall stand apart from this most decisive struggle of our times. Concerned as I am with the future of freedom for America, concerned as I am with the world that my daughters shall know, I would commit the American Nation to face up to its obligation to be with the world's people on their march toward the life that all God's children should know on this earth.

This is not a political commitment, nor even an economic commitment that we alone must make. This is a moral commitment that we have made and that we must keep in all that we do.

Look around this great cathedral. Every day men and women come here to fulfill their spiritual and their moral needs. Every day they come here to seek the blessings and the strength and the guidance of God.

But as people we shall never satisfy the command of God, or the responsibilities of country, simply by coming to the houses of worship.

When the time of judgment comes, it will be no excuse to say that they were far away, or their language was strange, or their color was different, or I did not know their names.

It will be asked of you, and it will be asked of me: What did you do—you, the children of abundance—what did you do to help those who were hungry, and those who were sick, and those who were fatherless, and those who were homeless?

What did you do? You were conceived in hope, and you have been raised in opportunity, and your parents have made great sacrifices so that you could be in this place of honor today. But what did you do to brighten the promise of those who, from the moment of birth, the moment they discovered the world, could see only the darkness of fear and insecurity and poverty?

I propose that when the day of answering comes, the American Nation and the American people shall be able to answer that we kept the trust of our abundance, that we kept the faith of our moral beliefs, because we were good and faithful servants of the ideals which we promulgated and for which we said that we stood.

You must give the hours of your life, and the fruits of your learning, and the courage of your spirit, and the substance of your home to those in need in every continent of the earth. You must, in the words of the Bible, "Let your light so shine before men that they may seek your good works."

Then only will you have earned what you have so abundantly received, as is in evidence here this morning.

Then only will you have really met your duty to your God and your country and your family, but most of all to yourself.

To do all of these things you must prepare yourself. You have been doing that in this school.

Whether you go on to college or not you will continue your education for the rest of your life. For to stop learning at any age, is to relapse into ignorance.

And one of the greatest satisfactions that come to me in my hours of sunshine and sorrow, and nights of trouble, is the knowledge that my daughter, who is a part of you, has decided to spend her life healing the sick and ministering to the needs of the needy.

You are going to learn many things in the years to come, but I hope that you will remember that education's greatest gift is not just particular knowledge. Education's greatest gift is a spacious and a skeptical mind. It is the willingness to accept fresh ideas, even if they challenge the most cherished assumptions.

And here, I think, I can pay a very special tribute to Miss Lee and to the faculty of this great institution. Whatever else that may be said about them, they do develop and instill, at least from my personal observation, a reasonable amount of independence and independent thinking among their graduates.

So, it is this ability to seek the right, to seek the right while never forgetting that you could be wrong, and that you may be wrong. But if you are to be among those who lead and who act then even this is not enough.

It is not hard to act when you know that you are right. I find it far more difficult to act when I just believe that I am right, but sometimes knowing that I could be wrong. Yet that is the burden that responsibility imposes on thought, and that is the price that leadership exacts of freemen and freethinkers.

A great statesman once said that he would rather be right than President. Well, I must try to be both. I must try, as best I can, with whatever the good Lord gave me and with whatever help God chooses to give me now, to seek the right course, not just for myself but for you, to whom I have a special responsibility, and to the Nation, who relies on me.

And as President of your country I must act, in this 20th century, often swiftly, always decisively, according to judgment.

So, we will proceed with the course that we are on, glad of the overwhelming support of the American people, always open to criticism and the flow of ideas, but proceeding as we believe that we must, following the path that we believe is right, however the transient winds of opinion may blow.

This is what I believe the American people expect of their President.

This is what they shall receive from me.

But, I guess, this is enough of grave and weighty matters. Recently I gave a speech, and when I came back to the White House that night my wife and my two daughters were sitting on the bed talking and reading, and I asked Lady Bird what she thought about what I had said that evening—as I will ask her at home this morning. She said, "Darling, you were wonderful, except you did miss several good opportunities to sit down."

Well, I will take that opportunity now. This is a shining spring day. You are all young and beautiful, and this is a wonderful moment for me. And, I think, it is very nice of you sparkling, scintillating, fresh, intelligent young ladies to let a much older and rather solemn man come here and talk to you about his problems. I hope you know how it lifts my heart to just look at you, and to understand and to believe and to know that a little of what I will do today, and tomorrow, and the years ahead, may perhaps possibly enrich your lives and insure peace for you and your families.

Thank you so much.

CONGRESS SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN DEBATE BETWEEN ADMINISTRATION AND FEDERAL RESERVE ON U.S. ECONOMIC POLICIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the very important speech—which has tremendous implications in the financial markets of New York and the world—that William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, delivered yesterday before the Columbia University alumni.

In this speech the Chairman saw disquieting similarities between our present prosperity and the boom of the twenties, which was followed by a "bust" in the thirties, which shocked the United States and the world to its very foundations. Whenever a high public official in such a distinguished and important position as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board makes this kind of talk, we had better stop and take notice.

We all know that this speech involves the surface indication of the tremendous conflict going on in the administration between the views of Mr. Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, and the views allegedly being expressed by the administration—the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, and Dr. Ackley, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

In my judgment, there is no real parallel between the situation which occurred in the twenties and that of the sixties. Chairman Martin agrees that there are some important differences between the present and the 1920's. Though there may be danger—and there always is—of some great world cataclysmic disaster of an economic character, I do not believe that we can reach this conclusion by any template based upon our experience of the twenties. The situation in our Nation is completely different. At that time in our history there was a $80 billion economy. We now have a $600 billion economy. The Dow-Jones stock exchange average was roughly 365 in 1929. That average is now 908. As Chairman Martin observed, the potentialities of monetary and fiscal policies are better understood today than they were 35 years ago. The great depression was largely due to the absence of prompt antirecession measures. Today many of the tools necessary tc avoid a depression are available. In addition, the per capita wealth is broadly distributed among the people of the United States. Sixty percent of the people have a reasonable well being, economically speaking, as against roughly 12 percent in 1929.

When all of these things are taken into consideration, including the fact that we then had enormous unemployment—which does not even compare with our endemic unemployment now—we have a far different situation.

However, what is very important is that, for essential purposes, the world is still tied to the same monetary mechanisms, and there is the same concern about gold and its price as there was 35 years ago.

These matters may seem subtle. They may seem very complex to the people of the United States. However, they are as lethal as a war would be in terms of what they can do to the economy of the United States and to the fortunes of every American.

I believe that it is high time that we took an entirely new position with regard to the monetary position of gold. It is my judgment that the dollar is a great deal more valuable than gold as a medium of exchange. This is because of the productive powers of the United States. The dollar, rather than gold, represents the thing to which the world should adhere.

The world monetary system is built upon confidence. It is built upon confidence in pieces of paper. Those pieces of paper have nothing but faith and credit behind them. If we were to destroy that faith and credit, we would have a major economic disaster. Therefore, we must take this problem seriously.

I believe that the proper forum for the debate over the correct U.S. economic policies at this time which has now broken out almost in the open is the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, of which I have the honor to be the ranking Republican. Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS has the honor to be senior Republican on the House side. We have today written to Chairman PATMAN of the Jcint Economic Committee and urged that immediate hearings be held by the committee on the fundamental and critical issues raised by Mr. Martin, so that this controversy may be fully aired and the people of the United States and of the world may find out what it is all about.

I hope Congress shall have an opportunity to participate in this debate. I have no reason to believe we shall not be given the opportunity to have the entire issue discussed in the public forum, as I have described it. Representative CURTIS and I hope Chairman PATMAN will see very clearly, in the highest interest of this country and in terms of the world position we occupy, and in terms of the prosperity, that it is necessary to deal with these issues in the public forum. In our view, the Joint Economic Committee is the proper forum to make an objective analysis of these issues.

If anyone doubts the importance of this subject, let me point out that all he has to do is to consider what Chairman Martin's speech did to the stock market yesterday. It drove down prices by 1 percent in the total value of stocks listed.

There will be repercussions in the markets of the world, because the critical importance of the monetary mechanism with which we are dealing is well understood and that it must be approached from a totally new base, rather than to have the same fears as a result of what happened in the 1920's. The great increase in production, distribution of wealth, and a wider condition of well-being among all the peoples of the world, have established a new plateau against economic insecurity and against the earth-shaking experiences we had in the 1930's.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts from Mr. Martin's speech which appeared in the New York Times of June 2, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1965]

EXCERPTS FROM RESERVE CHIEF'S SPEECH

Some eminent observers have recently compared the present with the period preceding the breakdown of the interwar economy, and have warned us of the threats of another great depression. We should take these warnings seriously enough to inquire into their merits and to try to profit in the future from the lessons of the past.

And indeed, we find disquieting similarities between our present prosperity and the fabulous twenties.

Then, as now, there had been virtually uninterrupted progress for 7 years.

Then, as now, prosperity had been concentrated in the fully developed countries, and within most of these countries in the industrialized sectors of the economy.

Then, as now, there was a large increase in private domestic debts; in fact, the expansion in consumer debt arising out of both residential mortgages and installment purchases has recently been much faster than in the twenties.

MONEY SUPPLY GROWING

Then, as now, the supply of money and bank credit and the turnover of demand deposits had been continuously growing; and while in the late twenties this growth had occurred with little overall change in gold reserves, this time monetary expansion has been superimposed upon a dwindling gold reserve.

Then, as now, the Federal Reserve had been accused of lack of flexibility in its monetary policy.

Then, as now, the world had recovered from a wartime disruption of international trade and finance.

Then, as now, international indebtedness had risen as fast as domestic debt; recently, in fact, American bank credits to foreigners and foreign holdings of short-term dollar assets have increased faster than in the closing years of the earlier period.

Then, as now, the payments position of the main reserve center—Britain then and the United States now—was uneasy, to say the least; but again, our recent cumulative payments deficits have far exceeded Britain's deficits of the late twenties.

Then, as now, some countries had large and persistent payments surpluses and used their net receipts to increase their short-term reserves rather than to invest in foreign countries.

Then, as now, the most important surplus country, France, had just decided to convert its official holdings of foreign exchange into gold, regardless of the effects of its actions on international liquidity.

DOUBTS ABOUT EXCHANGE

Then, as now, there were serious doubts about the appropriate levels of some existing exchange rate relationship, leading periodically to speculative movements of volatile short-term funds.

And most importantly, then as now, many Government officials, scholars and businessmen were convinced that a new economic era had opened, an era in which business fluctuations had become a thing of the past, in which poverty was about to be abolished, and in which perennial economic progress and expansion were assured.

If some of these likenesses seem menacing, we may take comfort in important differences between the present and the interwar situation.

The distribution of our national income now shows less disparity than in the earlier period.

The increase in stock market credit now has been much smaller.

Instead of a gradual decline in wholesale prices and stability in consumer prices, there has now been stability in wholesale prices though consumer prices have been creeping up.

The worst defects in the structure of commercial and investment banking and of business seem to have been corrected—although we are time and again reminded of our failure to eliminate all abuses.

EXPENDITURES ASSURED

The potentialities of monetary and fiscal policies are, we hope, better understood—although the rise in Government expenditures even in times of advancing prosperity threatens to make it difficult to be still more expansionary should a serious decline in private business activity require it.

In spite of the rise in the international flow of public and private credit and investment, business abroad appears in general to be less dependent upon American funds. The recent restraint on the outflow of U.S. capital has had little effect on business activity abroad, in contrast to the paralyzing effect of the cessation of U.S. capital outflows in the late twenties.

While the cold war makes for sources of friction absent in the twenties, we are no longer suffering from the cancer of reparations and war debts.

We have learned the lessons taught by the failure of trade and exchange restrictions, and of beggar-my-neighbor policies in general, although the temptation to backslide is ever present.

We have become aware of our responsibility for helping those less developed countries that seem willing and able to develop their economies—although the poor countries still are not becoming rich as fast as the rich countries are becoming richer.

The International Monetary Fund has proved to be a valuable aid to a better working of the international payments system.

DANGER REDUCED

A network of international, regional, and bilateral institutions and arrangements has reduced the danger of lack of international financial communication.

And, finally, the experience of the twenties has strengthened the resolution of all responsible leaders, businessmen and statesmen alike, never again to permit a repetition of the disasters of the great depression.

But while the spirit is willing, the flesh, in the form of concrete policies, has remained weak. With the best intentions, some experts seem resolved to ignore the lessons of the past.

In 1931 and 1933, an increase in the price of gold was recommended in order to raise commodity prices. Today, a gold price increase is recommended as a means to provide the monetary support for world price stability.

In 1931 and 1933, an increase in the price of gold was recommended in order to combat deflation; today it is recommended in effect as a means to combat inflation. In 1931 and 1933, an increase in the price of gold was recommended as a desperate cure for national ills regardless of its disintegrating effect on world commerce; today it is recommended as a means to improve integration of international trade and finance. Can there be worse confusion?

GOLD SITUATION

True, most advocates of an increase in the price of gold today would prefer action by some international agency or conference to unilateral action of individual countries. But no international agency or conference could prevent gold hoarders from getting windfall profits; could prevent those who hold a devalued currency from suffering corresponding losses; could prevent central banks from feeling defrauded if they had trusted in the repeated declarations of the President of the United States and of the spokesmen of U.S. monetary authorities and kept their reserves in dollars rather than in gold.

But most importantly, no international agency or conference could prevent a sudden large increase in the gold price from having inflationary consequences for those countries that hoarded gold, and deflationary consequences for those that did not.

If then we doubt the wisdom of the three most fashionable recent proposals—to increase the dollar price of gold, to return to pure gold-standard principles, or to delegate monetary policy to an international agency—what should be our position?

In my judgment, it is less fruitful to look for institutional changes or for a semiautomatic mechanism that would guarantee perennial prosperity than to draw from interwar experience some simple lessons that could save us from repeating our worst mistakes.

First, most observers agree that to a large extent the disaster of 1929-33 was a consequence of maladjustments born of the boom of the twenties. Hence, we must continuously be on the alert to prevent a recurrence of maladjustments—even at the risk of being falsely accused of failing to realize the benefits of unbounded expansion.

Second, most observers agree that the severity of the great depression was largely due to the absence of prompt antirecession measures. In part, the necessary tools for this were not then available nor were their potentialities fully understood. Today it is easy to understand where observers went wrong 35 years ago.

But it is less easy to avoid a repetition of the same mistake; we always prefer to believe what we want to be true rather than what we should know to be true.

Third, and most importantly, most observers agree that the severity of the great depression was due largely to the lack of understanding of the international implications of national events and policies. Even today, we are more apt to judge and condemn the worldwide implications of nationalistic actions taken by others than to apply the same criteria to our own decisions.

NEED FOR COMMERCE

Recognition of the close ties among the individual economies of the free world leads to recognition of the need to maintain freedom of international commerce. This means not only that we must avoid the direct controls of trade and exchange that were characteristic of the time of the great depression.

It means also that we must avoid any impairment of the value and status of the dollar, which today acts—just as sterling did until its devaluation in 1931—as a universal means of international payment between central banks as well as among individual merchants, bankers, and investors.

If the dollar is to continue to play its role in international commerce, world confidence in its stability must be fully maintained; the world must be convinced that we are resolved to eliminate the long-persistent deficit in our balance of international payments.

The measures taken in accordance with the President's program of February 10, 1965, have so far been highly successful. But some of these measures are of a temporary character, and these include the efforts of the financial community to restrain voluntarily the expansion of credit to foreigners. We should not permit the initial success of these efforts to blind us against the need of permanent cure.

BURDEN ON POLICY

Some observers believe that our responsibility for maintaining the international function of the dollar puts an intolerably heavy burden on our monetary policy; that this responsibility prevents us from taking monetary measures which might be considered appropriate for solving domestic problems.

I happen to disagree with that view. I believe that the interests of our national economy are in harmony with those of the international community. A stable dollar is indeed the keystone of international trade and finance; but it is also, in my judgment, the keystone of economic growth and prosperity at home.

Yet even if I were wrong in this judgment, and if indeed an occasion arose when we could preserve the international role of the dollar only at the expense of modifying our favored domestic policies—even then we would need to pay attention to the international repercussions of our actions.

We must consider these international effects not because of devotion to the ideal of human brotherhood, not because we value the well-being of our neighbors more than our own. We must do so because any harm that would come to international commerce and hence to the rest of the world as a result of the displacement of the dollar would fall back on our own heads. In the present stage of economic development we could not preserve our own prosperity if the rest of the world were caught in the web of depression.

UNITED STATES-GERMAN RELATIONS—VISIT OF CHANCELLOR ERHARD

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to what I consider to be a historic visit, of Chancellor Erhard of the Federal Republic of Germany. I had the honor to go to New York for a dinner last night attended by Chancellor Erhard, Foreign Minister Schroeder, and other distinguished guests.

In an hour of great strain for the Atlantic Alliance, with President de Gaulle withdrawing France's cooperation in crucial phases of even its defense activity, United States-German relations assume an importance even greater than before.

For, we can never forget World Wars I and II and the cost to us in blood and treasure required to defeat first German militarism and then German ultranationalism.

Since the end of World War II, the whole thrust of U.S. foreign policy has been to bring about the integration of the German Federal Republic into a united Europe and to endeavor to extend the benefits of Pan-Europeanism to the whole German people through the effort to achieve the reunification of East and West Germany by peaceful means and under conditions of freedom.

In an important way, the gage of the likely German cooperation with these objectives has been the extent to which the part of Germany which remains able to speak for itself—the Federal Republic of Germany—has sought as a moral obligation to atone for the terrible crime of genocide inflicted upon the Jewish people by Hitler's Nazi regime. Therefore, upon the occasion of the visit here of the German Chancellor, Ludwig Erhard, to confer with our President, a summing up of these events becomes most pertinent.

All freedom-loving peoples hailed with great satisfaction the extension by the German Bundestag of the statute of limitations for war crimes, making it possible to continue to prosecute Nazi criminals whenever and wherever they may be found. Similarly, free peoples everywhere are hailing with great satisfaction the very recent action of the Bundestag under its President Eugen Gerstenmaier, in setting aside an additional $300 million for a hardship fund to compensate 180,000 Jews and others persecuted by the Nazis, who lived until October 1953, in the eastern bloc nations occupied by Nazi Germany in World War II. Though this fell short of what had been asked for by concerned Jewish organizations—which had sought to integrate these victims into the basic indemnification law applying to those persecuted in Germany itself—it certainly will help, and is at least a partial recognition of the justified demands of those who were also Nazi victims. It is most gratifying that members of the two major political parties in the German Federal Republic—the CDU under Chancellor Erhard and the SPD under Fritz Erler—supported this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent to have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. But the most significant of all the developments of this character was the decision taken by Chancellor Erhard in the name of the German people to recognize the State of Israel and exchange diplomatic representatives with it. Notwithstanding that Israel is recognized by 94 nations and is maintaining diplomatic relations with 84, this action caused 10 Arab States to break off diplomatic relations with the German Federal Republic in pursuance of their blind intransigence against the very existence of Israel. The important thing here is that the Chancellor reports that the German people have nonetheless regarded their action in recognizing Israel with well-nigh universal satisfaction and approval and have not been dismayed or had any second thoughts about it. This has occurred despite the adverse reaction of certain Arab States—with the marked exception of Tunisia, Libya and Morocco—which refused to be stampeded, and maintained, to their credit, their diplomatic relations with the German Federal Republic—or any loss or danger of loss of foreign trade which might result.

The significance of these events, which are of historic importance to people of the United States, is their clear implication that it is the purpose of the almost 50 million people of West Germany to remain firmly within the orbit of the Atlantic community and to do their full share for the security and prosperity of that community and its efforts to secure peace and the accelerated economic development of the rest of the world. So long as the German people remain constant in this position, then no matter what diversions or nettling objections President de Gaulle allows to dissuade him from cooperation with the Atlantic community, this community will remain viable, effective and essentially true to its purposes and objectives until that great day when France will again undertake her proper role of cooperation and leadership.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the new Rayburn House Office Building is in all probability the most stupendous architectural monstrosity of our time. Architecturally, it is a national disaster. It has been termed a Mussolini-type structure.

It is ugly. It is wasteful. It is quite possibly the worst building costing the most money in the history of the construction of public buildings anywhere in the world.

This building is probably the most expensive edifice ever constructed by man. It took more than 7 years to build, costing at least $22 million more to complete than originally estimated, largely as a result of expensive miscalculations. Changes ordered during construction were more than 300 percent beyond the Government average. The building itself is a functional monstrosity. Although it was built to provide additional office space for Members of the House of Representatives, only 15 percent of the gross floor space is used for congressional offices. In other words, only about one-seventh of the building is in office space. More than 40 percent is for parking space.

Mr. President, the official blameable and responsible for this fiasco is the Architect of the Capitol, J. George Stewart, who is, in fact, not an architect. However, presumably it is his responsibility to choose architects for construction projects on Capitol Hill. If the Rayburn Building is any indication of his taste, then it is high time that the Capitol had a new architect who would select his own staff, including a new assistant architect.

What are J. George Stewart's qualifications for the position in which he has supervised the spending of more than $200 million of taxpayers' money? The answer is, no qualifications. He served in the House of Representatives from 1935 to 1937. This certainly does not qualify him as an architect. He attended the University of Delaware, class of 1911, and received his bachelor of science degree in civil engineering in 1958, 47 years later. In other words, as an alumnus, he was honored nearly half a century after he attended classes. He served as a member of the staff of the Senate District of Columbia Committee from 1947 to 1951. Immediately prior to his appointment in 1954 by President Eisenhower as Architect of the Capitol, he was head of the Speaker's Bureau of the Republican National Committee. Apparently he was an effective worker for the Republican National Committee. His appointment by President Eisenhower was a political appointment.

None of this experience—absolutely none—qualifies him for the important post which he has held for the past 11 years.

Mr. President, the Architect of the Capitol is appointed by the President of the United States and serves at the pleasure of the President. The position pays $27,000 a year. Until recently, it was a little-known post and had been regarded as a haven for a deserving politician such as this ex-Congressman appeared to be to President Eisenhower.

However, the recent construction fiasco on Capitol Hill has pointed up the importance of this position and the clear need for a qualified appointee.

I fervently hope that the President will appoint an exceptionally able and experienced architect to perform the vital public services of this post.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, there is much legislation pending for new construction projects on Capitol Hill. That great American, Patrick Henry, once said:

> I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know no way of judging of the future but by the past.

I personally shall not vote for such legislation unless it contains the provision that all planning, architecture, and construction work be supervised by the General Services Administration, or in any event is taken completely out of the hands of the present Architect of the Capitol.

Regarding most buildings, there is room for a difference of opinion as to appearance and usefulness. However, I cannot recall any public building concerning which adverse opinion of experts and the public alike has been so unanimous as that regarding the Rayburn Office Building. As one result, citizens question the ability of their Representatives to supervise properly the spending of taxpayers' dollars. I am assuming that any actions taken by J. George Stewart during his term of office have not been intentionally wasteful. However, his good intentions are not enough when such huge sums of money are involved. Benjamin Franklin once said:

> Experience keeps a dear school, but fools will learn in no other.

J. George Stewart should be replaced as soon as possible. He should not have been appointed in the first place.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I desire to commend my colleague for the vigorous expressions he has made concerning the inordinate and unexplainably large cost of the Rayburn Building. No explanation has, thus far, been given to the people of the country, giving adequate reason for the great disparity between the estimated cost and the final cost which has been placed upon the shoulders of the taxpayers.

Many new buildings are being contemplated for construction soon, one of them being the Madison Memorial.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. At that point let me say to my colleague that the Madison Memorial Building is estimated to cost the taxpayers $72,500,000. It is a much-needed building, as an addition to the Library of Congress.

I have conducted hearings as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Public Works Committee, and certainly appreciate the comments of my colleague. I know, as he does, that J. George Stewart should not have supervision over the construction of that building.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with my colleague's conclusion. The Madison Memorial Building is one of the new buildings being contemplated. It will entail a huge cost. We certainly cannot have the people of the Nation left in doubt as to the efficiency of our architectural work and the spending of so much of the taxpayers' money in the construction of Federal buildings.

Mr. President, it is rather shocking to frequently hear and read of misconduct in government. About 3 weeks ago, I saw a gridiron show, and one of the skits dealt with fraud, deception, and graft in government.

The theme was, "Everyone is doing it, why not I?"

We have read about conditions in several States and in the Federal Government, and the impact those conditions are making upon the people of the Nation is not good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, something must be done about it, and I am glad to observe that my colleague, who is in direct touch with the situation through the committee on which he serves, has asserted himself so vigorously with regard to the problem.

It is shocking to read of the extravagant cost of the Rayburn Building. I am certain that the mail of other Senators is similar to mine with so many people writing in to ask why the Rayburn Building has cost so much. I know that I cannot give a satisfactory explanation and that I therefore am left embarrassed.

If we wish lawful conduct, if we wish people to have respect for government, if we wish obedience to law, it is essential that we in Congress set the example for such conduct. Silence on this matter is not good, and that is why I wish to repeat my commendation of the good work of my colleague in this matter.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank my distinguished colleague for his generous remarks.

ITALIAN REPUBLIC DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, today, June 2, 1965, marks the 19th anniversary of the founding of the modern Italian Republic. This gives us an excellent opportunity to pay a well-deserved tribute to the people of Italy, who can take great pride in the progress of their nation since the end of World War II, and to the people of Italian ancestry all over the world. Throughout history, the accomplishments of the Italians in such fields as art, music, religion, literature, cuisine and fashion, have been particularly noteworthy. Here in the United States where many persons of Italian descent now make their homes, substantial contributions to the enrichment of our way of life have been made by this segment of our population.

It is really the people of the modern Italian Republic whom we are honoring today. Many of World War II's severest battles were waged on Italian soil, and the aftermath of the war found the country in ruins, physically, economically and politically. The spirit of the people had been almost completely demoralized by their Fascist leaders. But the strong desire of the Italian people to establish a democratic state could not be turned aside and on June 2, 1946, the country voted to abolish its monarchy and to replace it with a republic.

Italy's growth in the postwar recovery period has been outstanding. She has put to good use assistance made available to her through UNRRA, the Marshall plan, and other U.S. military and foreign assistance programs. Her economy has been stabilized and industrial and agricultural production have increased significantly. Unemployment has dropped and much has been done to erase the conditions of poverty and disease which plagued the land and her people after the war. The most important ingredients in the success of this recovery program have been the ingenuity, resourcefulness, and vitality of the people.

Democratic political institutions have replaced the totalitarian machinery of the Mussolini government, and although the unsettled political climate after the war and Italy's strategic location made her particularly vulnerable to Communist advances, she has chosen to aline herself firmly with the free world community of nations. She is an important member of NATO, the United Nations, and the European Common Market and has been a forceful leader in the efforts to unify Europe.

Our country particularly has benefited from Italians who have migrated to our shores and contributed their talents and energies to the prosperity of our Nation. We are glad there is a large Italian community in Massachusetts. Our present Governor, John A. Volpe, is an Italo-American. We are all proud of his leadership and of others of Italian ancestry who have assumed positions of responsibility in our Commonwealth.

On this 19th anniversary of the Republic, I join other Americans and friends of Italy everywhere in congratulating this nation on her fine record of achievement. We all wish her continued success in the future.

CLEANUP OF POTOMAC RIVER DEBRIS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 23, many Washington area residents donated their Sunday afternoon to cleaning up the Potomac River.

In a spectacular display of citizen interest, men, women, and children set out in powerboats, amphibious cars, canoes, cars, buses, and on foot to pick up litter on, in, and beside the Potomac.

The District Commissioners proclaimed it "Potomac Pickup Day" and that is precisely what it was. By late afternoon, canoes were returning to the Army Corps of Engineers control boat *Choptank* with cargoes of sticks, beer cans, and old rubber automobile tires.

In their thoroughness, the volunteers did not neglect the river bottom. Skin divers from the Atlantic Council of Skin Divers probed the depths. They came up with a park bench, the tailgate to an unfortunate trailer, and a bulldozer blade.

Already, plans are underway for the second annual Potomac Pickup Day sponsored by the Citizens Committee for a Clean Potomac.

The huge pile of debris that the cleanup volunteers collected, however, represents only a small portion of the debris that exists and continues to plague the Potomac.

The Corps of Army Engineers are currently preparing a proposal for two drift collectors to work on the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers on a full-time basis. These craft will go a long way toward easing the problems of debris on the river. I am sure that the corps will take heed of the demonstrated citizen interest for a clean Potomac and expedite their planning of the debris catchers.

Naturally, cleaning up debris and litter must be more than a once-a-year event. I hope that many groups, such as scouts and conservationists, will plan their own pickup days along the banks of the Potomac.

RESOLUTION IN TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RUSSELL OF GEORGIA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce has adopted a resolution commending the senior Senator from Georgia for the outstanding service he renders to his State.

The junior chamber of commerce also extended its sincere wishes for the continued improvement of Senator RUSSELL's health, in which I know all the Members of this body join.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE GEORGIA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL serves well the people of this State, giving of himself and his great wisdom freely and unselfishly; and

Whereas the said Senator Richard B. Russell has many times proven his friendship and loyalty to the Georgia Jaycees through the many courtesies extended by him to our organization; and

Whereas we have noted with concern that it has been necessary for the said Senator Richard B. Russell to be away from the U.S. Senate because of health condition, but are greatly encouraged by the reports of improvement in health; and

Whereas it is fitting that the Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce extend to the Honorable Senator Richard B. Russell our sincere wishes for continued improvement in health; and our appreciation for all courtesies heretofore extended by him to the Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved and spread upon the minutes of the 1965 State convention, Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce duly assembled, That we do extend our best wishes and our sincere appreciation for all courtesies heretofore shown the Georgia Jaycees by the said Richard B. Russell;

And further, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all areas of news media in publication of our appreciation, and the high regard, and great esteem held by the membership of the Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce for Senator Richard B. Russell.

BIG BROTHER: POLICE EAVESDROPPING

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Minneapolis Star, in April, ran an editorial entitled "Why Let Police Eavesdrop?"

This interesting editorial was only recently brought to my attention.

Basically, the editorial points out that the police, like all Americans, are subject to the strictures of our Constitution.

I ask unanimous consent to have this thoughtful editorial printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star, Apr. 22, 1965]

Why Let Police Eavesdrop?

The goal behind the revised bill in the Minnesota Senate to outlaw electronic eavesdropping is an urgent one. The availability and temptations of tiny listening devices are no joke, and the public requires protection from their hidden ears.

Not so clear, however, is why the police should be largely exempt from the prohibitions. The bill takes note of the inherent dangers by requiring them to follow a procedure similar to that in securing a search warrant and by putting a 10-day, renewal limit on their eavesdropping authority.

But there is much doubt that eavesdropping fits into the constitutional provision for searches and seizures. Seizures with a warrant, for example, are limited to the fruits of a crime, the instrumentalities used in the commission of a crime and contraband that it is unlawful to possess. Evidence gained by listening devices meets none of these tests, and their prime purpose is to secure unconstitutional, self-incriminating statements.

Even if that were not the case, there is no way to restrict the police to conversations concerning a particular crime. They would, in fact, be given legal access to all that was said by any person within range of the listening device, even if for only 10 days. This destroys part of the protection the bill is designed to gain.

It is no answer to say that police already engage in "illegal" eavesdropping and would reform their habits if a legal procedure were available. On the contrary, there is just as much chance that they would continue illegal snooping where court permission was doubtful or rejected.

While police do need means to detect crime they do not need and should not be encouraged to use unconstitutional methods. Far better would be a complete ban on listening devices.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS IN HAWAII

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the State Legislature of Hawaii has adopted a concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to continue present levels of support for soil and water conservation districts.

This resolution is in protest to the proposal by the Bureau of the Budget to require farmers to contribute up to 50 percent of the costs of soil conservation districts services now provided by the Federal Government.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this concurrent resolution by the State Legisalture of Hawaii printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State Legislature of Hawaii Concurrent Resolution

Whereas soil and water conservation districts in the State of Hawaii play an integral role in the protection and effective utilization of the natural resources of the State, and especially the development of productive small farms and flood control projects; and

Whereas the Budget Bureau of the U.S. Government has proposed that Federal funds for soil and water conservation districts be reduced, and that farmers be required to contribute up to 50 percent of the costs of soil conservation district services now provided by the Federal Government; and

Whereas the proposal that farmers make substantial contributions to the costs of the program will adversely affect conservation work in the State, and the burden on small farmers or persons now beginning to develop agricultural land will prevent their participation in soil and water conservation districts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1965 (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is memorialized to continue present levels of Federal support for soil and water conservation districts; and be it further

Resolved That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; and to the members of the Hawaii's congressional delegation.

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, last month the country observed National Maritime Day. Port cities of the United States joined in a salute to the American merchant marine. I hope this observance will be celebrated annually, for it can serve two important purposes—to honor the past and to look to the future.

National Maritime Day is the proper moment to commemorate the patriotic service rendered by the merchant marine in peace and in war. I do not think it necessary to remind anyone of the courageous crews which sailed the high seas during World War II.

Yes, Mr. President, our merchant marine has a proud past, but what of its future?

I wonder if the current plight of the merchant fleet and related industries would be permitted to continue if it were fully known throughout the Nation.

This is where National Maritime Day can serve a second purpose. It can be a time to call public attention to the pressing need of the fourth arm of our national defense.

George H. Hearn, Federal Maritime Commissioner, did just that in a thoughtful Maritime Day address at San Diego.

Commissioner Hearn outlined the risks our Nation would face if our merchant fleet, shipyards and terminals were allowed to deteriorate further. He pointed out that while the U.S. fleet was declining, the fleets of the world, including that of the Soviet Union, had almost doubled in the past 14 years. The Soviet Union expects a merchant marine of 20 million deadweight tons by 1980.

The Commissioner said our merchant marine could be revived by expanding trade and fuller use of American vessels carrying American goods.

He suggested a slogan, "Ship via American flag."

I support his objective and applaud his slogan.

By following that slogan America can take a big step to insure that it will have a merchant marine with a future worthy of its proud past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Commissioner Hearn delivered May 21 at San Diego be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Commissioner George H. Hearn at the Unified Port of San Diego, Calif., on May 21, 1965

"International commerce and the ships which make it possible have contributed immeasurably to America's greatness. The sea and ships are in integral part of this country's past, present, and future." (President Lyndon B. Johnson, March 24, 1965.)

It is both a pleasure and an honor to appear before you today and to join with you in saluting our American merchant marine, and exhorting America to return to the merchant marine some measure of the support which it has given to us. The merchant marine has always been available to the Nation and in our darkest hours it has been a boon to our national security. In halcyon times, however, our merchant marine has always been treated as a stepchild. Astute observers have many times pointed out that we have taken it for granted, neglected it, and, in time of peril, have wondered why it has not been standing in the same readiness, as it had been left when it had last assisted in our deliverence from danger.

At the outset, I should like to point out the obvious: a healthy privately owned, efficient merchant fleet is, simultaneously an integral adjunct to our national Defense Establishment and an essential instrument of our international commercial preeminence. In defining our merchant marine, I do not restrict myself to vessels per se. I refer to shipyards, terminals and the men who make these entities dynamic.

Now before I address myself to the dual nature of our maritime community, I want to comment on my observations here at San Diego. In existence for only a few short years your port, I am pleased to acknowledge, has already been presented with the presidential E-award for excellence in providing truly outstanding port facilities. This is an uncommon accomplishment, especially for such a recently organized port. Cargo handled here has increased 67 percent in one recent fiscal year. Your port has attracted, in 1 year, the services of 400 vessels in our foreign trades. Also, the operation of your colossal bulk handling facility with its 2,000-ton-per-hour capacity, the splendid dock and warehouse space you have strategically provided, and the natural advantage of a climate that affords full-time efficient working of vessels all represent telling omens of a bright future for San Diego. The launching, tomorrow, of American President Line's handsome addition to its fleet, the SS *President Monroe*, at the yards of the National Steel & Shipbuilding Co., also augurs well for San Diego as a shipping center. I commend all of you who have expressed your confidence in America's seafaring future by investing hard cash in these tangible tools of commerce. At this point in history we must strive to insure that all of our maritime assets, ports as well as vessels, management as well as labor, will maintain that degree of excellence epitomized by your own Presidential citation. Personally, I think that the entire national maritime community could advisedly emulate your efforts here in San Diego.

The dual nature of our merchant marine, of course, is found in its singular adaptability to both defense and commerce. No other element of our economic fabric has traditionally so readily adapted itself to military necessities as has our merchant marine. The maritime community, vessel operators, shipbuilders, terminal operators, freight forwarders, and the men necessary for their success, possess unique skills which lend themselves, at the same time, to our national defense structure as well as to our economic goals.

It is particularly significant that Maritime Day falls during World Trade Week. We can honor our merchant marine for its traditional heroic service to the cause of freedom, and call the attention of the Nation to its expertise in furthering our own economic escalation. But during our annual salute let us not err:.We are concerned on both counts. Our national security, during this entire century, has been endangered, and our hitherto unquestioned leadership in world trade is challenged throughout the world, particularly in Europe and in the Far East.

First, let us dwell upon the national defense role of the merchant marine. We all are aware of the historic role played by the merchant fleet in the First World War, in World War II, and during the Korean conflict. Our merchant men wrote colorful pages in our proud heritage. During World War II alone, we suffered the loss of some 5,600 seamen and over 700 merchant vessels. In the event the Nation needs reassurance of the reliability of a privately owned fleet for defense purposes, just last fall, the largest peacetime amphibious operation ever undertaken in Atlantic waters, Operation Steel Pike, held off the coast of Spain and involving more than 55,000 men, employed 10 privately owned and operated merchantmen successfully. In fact, Admiral McCain, the admiral commanding the tremendous undertaking, testified before a congressional committee that an amphibious operation, without the participation of privately owned vessels, could not be successfully accomplished. This testimony raises immediately the question whether as a Nation, we can afford to permit those unique skills found in our maritime callings to atrophy. If there are still any doubts as to the essentiality of maintaining privately owned, strong merchant fleet, they should be dispelled when we consider our role as the peacekeepers of the free world. I am sure that never in history has a single nation has thrust upon it this enormous obligation of world stewardship. Nevertheless, we are, at one time, the bulwark of liberty throughout the free world and the benefactor of developing nations. Our international peacekeeping commitments are, indeed, staggering. The obligations we have had cast upon us in this respect would play havoc with the economy of any other nation or any combination of nations. At this very moment our commitments have culminated in our intimate involvement in both Vietnam and the Dominican Republican. With obvious distress but unflinching courage, our President has acted forthrightly in these areas. So far, our merchant marine has not been engaged here, but without professing any military expertise in the matter, and cognizant of the exceptional leadership of the Department of Defense, I believe we should all realize that our wondrous airlift power has its limitations and that at some point our merchant marine may be called upon to support sustained peacekeeping missions and to assume its traditional role in our lifeline of communications. At no time should we be caught short; caught holding inefficient, obsolete tonnage.

Aware of our farflung commitments I want to remind you that while the world fleet is increasing in number, ours is decreasing; and while world fleet deadweight is increasing, ours is decreasing—and at an alarming ratio: world deadweight has increased almost 100 percent since 1951 while ours has decreased by about 5 percent. These unhappy figures do not speak well for the future of our merchant marine. Consider too, if you will, the fact that the Soviet Union has doubled its merchant fleet between 1952 and 1964, and that by 1980 it expects to utilize a fleet of 20 million deadweight tons. I trust that our merchant marine will achieve that degree of size and efficiency which will take its rightful place among the fleets of the world. President Johnson, within the past year created a task force to examine carefully, our national transportation system, including the merchant marine. That study is now underway and just a few days ago Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor expressed the view that the present decline in American shipping is adverse to our national interests.

Second, I want to say something about our merchant marine in regard to world trade. President Johnson has proclaimed that it is essential that we continue to expand our export trade. Make no mistake, gentlemen; in our commercial posture we must either trade or fade. And the Federal Maritime Commission has a role to play in this commercial struggle. The touchstone of the Shipping Act, passed in 1916, is fairness. The act requires among other things, that shippers and consignees be protected against unjust discriminations and unreasonable prejudices by carriers and other persons subject to our jurisdiction, notably terminal operators and freight forwarders. Strange as it may sound, prior to 1961, in our foreign trades, no inbound tariffs were filed with the Federal Maritime Board, by carriers, and outbound tariffs had to be filed only 30 days after the vessel had sailed. Through the erudite stewardship of Senator MAGNUSON and Representative BONNER the Shipping Act was up-dated to reflect the realities of the mid-20th century. Since the 1961 amendment to the Shipping Act, American exporters can learn in advance their exact shipping costs and, importantly, the costs that their competitors must bear. Further, since 1961, a carrier in our foreign trades, is required to abide by his tariff rates, and to deviate therefrom, is now unlawful. These provisions, administered by the Commission, represent a substantial benefit to American importers and exporters in their ever-increasing foreign trade struggle.

Nevertheless, if we are to place our goods in foreign markets at competitive prices, particularly in this day of escalating costs, we must give effect to the admonition of Lord Kelvin: "Think of a better way." It is mandatory that we burn the fat out of our costs of doing business, and do so all across the board. It has been said that waste in our own maritime undertakings is all too common. Economy, in the ensuing years, must be the rule. We are high-cost operators, no doubt, because our standard of living so dictates. But that same high standard requires increased efficiency, especially since we are faced with increasing world competition.

Finally, I would like to address myself to our industry and to the posture of our seafaring men. Ship building and ship operating are very expensive undertakings in our country. Each of these endeavors, however, is extremely important to our national wellbeing. When our ship builders and our ship operators compete with their much less costly counterparts in foreign lands in my opinion they are competing with much less valuable ships and services, whose nations have more limited goals. Our own builders and operators are second to none in the world. They are entitled to fair rates on their investments. No one in this country can carp with the comparatively meager dividends associated with ship building and ship operating investments, vis-a-vis other commercial ventures. Each of these endeavors requires enormous capital investment. Each suffers more acutely from economic turmoil than do most domestic commercial undertakings. A vessel, for example with an economic life of about 20 years engaging in world trade subjects itself, in addition to economic fluctuations, to international political problems including trade and flag restrictions, the hazards of the elements and acts of God.

American terminal operations also are more expensive than their foreign counterparts. American terminals are constantly being brought up to date at considerable expense and the cost of operating terminals is also higher in this country than in others. But here in America where our standard of living is the envy of the world we must expect that these terminal operations will be substantially more costly than they are in less affluent ports around the globe.

American seamen, likewise, represent a national investment which we can ill afford to lose. All too often we hear how grandly they are compensated. All too often, however, their compensation is compared to that of their foreign counterparts—not to that of the white collar or blue collar workers in our own country. You and I know that American seamen possess special skills. We all know of the rigors of their lives and we are all aware, I hope, of the economic opportunities which are ever increasing shoreside. I, for one, on this Maritime Day, wish to salute those American seamen who are willing to serve our Nation by foregoing, for long periods on end, the fruits of our American high standard of living here at home. I wonder how many of us would trade places with them. They enjoy the company of their families only sporadically, they are on call 24 hours per day, and they are often imperiled by the elements. Let me assure you, that it is no longer fashionable to stroll on many of the port streets in other lands. American seamen in foreign lands are exposed to health dangers that are unknown to us here at home, and orderly police protection in many lands does not approach that which we enjoy here.

In conclusion I compliment this port and the men who had the foresight to build it and the men whose expertise makes it operate. I want you all to do your utmost to think of a better way, a more competitive way, a less expensive way, to get your jobs done. And finally, as an American citizen I call on all American businessmen to follow the precepts of the Trade Expansion Act, and to sell American. Also in view of the dual nature of our merchant marine I exhort you to ship via American flag, so that our own economy will continue to grow, so that we may be able to continue to assist friendly nations, and, more importantly, so that we might attain the Great Society which is within our reach.

I thank you.

THE FREIGHTCAR SHORTAGE—RESOLUTION OF THE NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a resolution adopted recently by the Nebraska unicameral legislature. The resolution is in support of efforts by Congress to help ease the freightcar shortage, which every year plagues the Nation's great Farm Belt States.

One of the reasons—but by no means the entire reason—for the annual shortage is the fact that railroads in other sections of the country find it cheaper to pay the user chargers levied for the use of cars owned by other roads than to acquire and maintain their own freightcar fleets. The bills which I sponsored and cosponsored, S. 179 and S. 1098, will go to the heart of this aspect of the problem. They would authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to take into account adequate compensation, as a factor in determining the level of user charges. This would provide an added incentive for the nonowning railroads to acquire and maintain cars in sufficient numbers to meet both commercial and national defense needs.

This freightcar problem was the subject of a series of hearings in the field during the past spring, one of the hearings being at Omaha, Nebr., on April 22. I participated in that hearing, through the courtesy of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. The testimony presented that day was overwhelmingly in support of this legislative effort. The Nebraska unicameral legislature's resolution also supports this effort.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 47, LEGISLATURE OF NEBRASKA

Whereas inasmuch as the present boxcar shortage has been with us for several years and that it appears to be getting worse instead of better, and inasmuch as it is having a depressing effect on grain markets and thereby on farm income in that export markets are being threatened, if not lost, because we are unable to move grain into export positions fast enough to satisfy shipping movements and thus grain may be more readily bought from other nations; and

Whereas the available boxcar supply is totally inadequate; and

Whereas often months elapse before grain can be moved for which orders for export have been received; and

Whereas the shortage of cars has a serious depressing effect on the grain trade, and consequently on our agricultural economy; and

Whereas middle western railroads are building cars but that these cars find their way to eastern and southern United States area railroads and are retained there because it is cheaper, under existing levels of per diem rates, to rent a car than it is to own one: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 75th session assembled:

1. That Congress be requested to enact legislation which will authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to set the per diem rates at a point that there will be an incentive to all railroads to construct or to purchase rolling stock rather than to rent them from other railroads.

2. That printed copies of this resolution be sent by the clerk of the legislature to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member of Congress from Nebraska, to the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives and to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

PHILIP C. SORENSEN,
President of the Legislature.

Attest:

HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial recently published in the Nebraska State Journal, of Lincoln, Nebr., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORNHUSKER GLEANINGS—THAT BOXCAR SHORTAGE

In this age of transportation miracles, it has become almost as simple to send a man to the moon as to ship a boxcar of grain out of the Midwest.

And if something is not done soon to relieve the chronic shortage of freight cars in Nebraska and surrounding States, the Great Society will become only a joke as far as this area is concerned.

Time was when a temporary shortage of boxcars occurred at harvest time. This could at least be understood, if not condoned. But now the dearth of boxcars has become a yearround proposition. The reports of shipping problems related to a special Senate subcommittee in Omaha by Nebraska grain interests are incredible in a day of supposedly modern transportation.

One Lincoln grain interest reported that the railroads have not been able to supply 50 percent of its boxcar needs over the last 3 years. A Hastings firm said that one-third of an export shipment remains to be shipped 7 months after the order was received.

The reason for this exasperating situation is an old story by now. Midwestern railroads dispatch their grain-laden cars to coastal points via other lines which then keep the cars at a ridiculously low rental of less than $3 a day, rather than provide their own cars. Since this area has a much greater volume of outgoing grain than of incoming goods, it becomes virtually impossible to get the cars back.

The whole arrangement is tragic testimony of the archaic and inefficient state of railroad management today. The inability of the industry itself to cope with the problem raises grave questions of its competence to survive in the increasingly competitive transportation field.

But because the railroads have lacked either the will or the ability to solve this intraindustry problem, the Federal Government has become the last resort for midwestern farmers and shippers if they are to be spared a permanent crippling of their economy.

Legislation aimed at rectifying the situation is pending before Congress. It is aimed at such steps as a mandatory increase in boxcar rental rates which would encourage the return flow of new boxcars as a means of accelerating construction.

These measures demand not only support but the most vigorous promotion by midwestern political interests of both parties. It would seem to be time, too, for President Johnson and his administration to take an interest in this problem that is so vital to the vast heartland of the Nation.

Few issues are of more pressing concern to the Midwest today than the largely unnecessary and senseless shortage of boxcars.

THE BANK MERGER ACT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, Business Week, for May 29, 1965, in an editorial entitled "Defining the Law on Bank Mergers," sets forth clearly the problems facing the banking world, and endorses Senator ROBERTSON's bill, S. 1698. It would perhaps be appropriate to point out that, while the editorial takes the position that the Justice Department is opposing the bill, the Committee on Banking and Currency has not yet received a report from the Justice Department, so we have no official notice of this. The editorial's conclusion deserves emphasis:

> There is no matter in which the country has a greater stake than the health and strength of its banking system. The conflict and confusion of the past few years—especially when it produces a decision as dangerous and absurd as the ruling in the Manufacturers Hanover case—is intolerable. It must be brought to an end promptly, and the clean-cut way to resolve it is through the Robertson bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFINING THE LAW ON BANK MERGERS

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON and his Banking and Currency Committee last week began hearings on a short but vital piece of proposed legislation. The bill (S. 1698) flatly and explicitly gives the final authority to approve or disapprove bank mergers to the three Federal banking supervisory agencies—the Comptroller of the Currency for national banks, the Federal Reserve Board for other member banks, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for insured nonmembers.

This is precisely what everyone thought Congress had provided when it passed the Bank Merger Act of 1960. The Supreme Court, however, has put its own interpretation on the 1960 act. Two years ago, it upheld a suit by the Justice Department to stop a merger of two Philadelphia banks that had been cleared by the Comptroller of the Currency. In 1964, it ordered the breakup of two small banks in Lexington, Ky., that already had merged.

Following the Supreme Court's lead, the Federal district court in New York last March ruled that the merger of the Hanover Bank with the Manufacturers Trust, three and a half years earlier, had been illegal.

All this makes no sense. If we have learned anything from the long and often unhappy history of banking in this country it is that a bank cannot be run on the same basis as the corner grocery store. Banks are the custodians of other people's money. The soundness of bank credit is absolutely crucial to the health of the whole economy. Banking is and must be a regulated industry, in somewhat the same way that public utilities are a regulated industry. And this fact must be taken into account in framing a policy to cover bank mergers.

U.S. antitrust policy is based on the idea that the best way to protect the public is to promote aggressive competition among a large number of companies in the same industry. In fact, recent court interpretations of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act have tended to make the effect on competition the sole criterion in determining whether or not a merger is legal.

To apply this yardstick blindly to the Nation's banking system would be to invite disaster. Within limits, competition is desirable in banking, but it cannot be the overriding consideration. As many State laws explicitly recognize, the most important thing of all is to protect the safety of the banking system and the soundness of its practices. Where unrestrained competition produces weak banks and dangerous policies, then competition is against the true public interest.

As a matter of fact, anyone who knows New York banking will testify that the Manufacturers Hanover merger increased competition markedly in the Nation's biggest financial center. By putting together two banks with complementary characteristics—one with many small accounts, the other with a blue-ribbon list of customers—the merger produced the third largest bank in the city. Manufacturers Hanover promptly became a hot competitor for the two biggest New York banks, Chase Manhattan, and First National City.

If the U.S. banking system is to grow in step with the rest of the economy, there will have to be other mergers. Banking cannot remain static while the rest of business grows in the scale of its financial demands and the diversity of its operations. To meet the requirements of the future, banking will have to change, and in many cases this will involve combining smaller units into new institutions with larger pools of capital and managerial talent.

THE FINAL WORD

The Bank Merger Act of 1960 recognized this fact. It empowered the Federal regulatory agencies to approve mergers that they considered to be in the public interest, after weighing both banking considerations and competitive factors.

As the courts have interpreted the law, however, the final word on a merger does not lie with the regulatory agencies now, but with the Justice Department.

Senator ROBERTSON'S bill, as he phrases it, "will reinstate the original purpose and intent of Congress when it passed the Bank Merger Act." It would make the authority of the regulatory agencies in merger cases absolute, and it would forbid the Justice Department to upset a merger that had been properly approved.

As a safeguard, each agency would be required to consult the other two before giving final approval. In addition, the Justice Department would have to be consulted on the competitive aspects of the merger. In making the final decision, the regulatory agency would consider the question of competition, but that would not be the only thing that it could consider.

Perhaps understandably, the Justice Department is opposing the Robertson bill. But this is not a place where doctrinaire thinking can be allowed to prevail. There is no matter in which the country has a greater stake than the health and strength of its banking system. The conflict and confusion of the past few years—especially when it produces a decision as dangerous and absurd as the ruling in the Manufacturers Hanover case—is intolerable. It must be brought to an end promptly, and the clean-cut way to resolve it is through the Robertson bill.

THE NEBRASKA REA YOUTH TOUR

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, for the past several years, the Nebraska Rural Electric Association has sponsored a youth tour to Washington. The group is made up of boys and girls who are the winners of essay contests sponsored by their individual Nebraska rural power systems, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

It is a privilege to include five of these winning essays in my remarks. The first, by Pam Geu, is entitled "The Value of Rural Electrification in the Home and Community." Pam is 15 years of age, and is a sophomore at Sidney High School, in Sidney, Nebr. She is sponsored by the Wheatbelt Public Power District.

The second essay is by Carey Ann Frey, and is entitled "The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community." Carey, age 16, is a sophomore at Sunflower High School, in Mitchell, Nebr., and is sponsored by the Roosevelt Public Power District.

Essay No. 3 is written by Vicki Epley, and bears the title "Why I Enjoy Electricity." Vicki is sponsored by the Loup Valleys Rural Public Power District, and is a 17-year-old junior, living at Ord, Nebr., and attending Arcadia High School.

The fourth essay bears the title "What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community," and is written by Marilyn Stevens. This contestant is sponsored by the Cornhusker Public Power District; and she is 15 years old, and is a sophomore at Fullerton Public High School.

The fifth essay is written by an 18-year-old senior living in Broken Bow, Nebr., and attending Sargent High School. George Young is sponsored by the Custer Public Power District; and the title of his essay is 'The Value of Rural Electrification."

I ask unanimous consent that all five of the essays be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMATION

My name: Pam Geu.

Age: 15.

Grade: Sophomore.

School: Sidney High School.

Name of father: Earl Geu, Sidney, Nebr.

Contestant sponsored by the Wheatbelt Public Power District, Sidney, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN THE HOME AND COMMUNITY

Thunder clashes. Lightning flashes. Wind whips, and the rain pours. A powerline snaps, and suddenly the farm plunges into an inefficient and helpless unit.

Farms of today have come to depend on electricity and its advantages so heavily that without it they are incapable of functioning.

Before 1935 only 1 out of every 10 farms was ever affected in the manner described above, as electricity in 9 of these homes was unheard of. Yes, 9 out of 10 rural farms were without the conveniences electricity brings. They operated under the same conditions we experience with a power failure, all the time.

Imagine what it would be like without electric heat, pressure water systems, automatic washing machines and dishwashers, electric clothes dryers and lights. Think of the innumerable disadvantages the rural family had to put up with. Instead of taking only a few hours to wash clothes, housewives spent the day heating water and then washing, as hot-water heaters were only available to city dwellers at that time.

In 1935, however, a revolutionary change, aiding rural America, struck the Nation. It was in this year that President Roosevelt established the Rural Electrification Administration, a nonprofit and cooperative association. Farms and other rural communities began receiving conveniences, which several years earlier had been only a dream. What had caused this facelifting? Electricity.

With the electricity brought by REA came a chance for rural people to live in the modern world which was growing up around them. No longer did a family have to live in a city to receive the benefits of modern conveniences. Thanks to REA the farm home became as modern as any city residence.

Looking at the farm of today, we find that instead of being a remote, outdated unit, it has become a mechanized plant. Feed grinders operated by electricity grind the grain needed for feeding; cooling devices and automatic watering make poultry-raising easier; and pump irrigation systems make possible increased production.

By these examples we can see that electricity increases output, while at the same time decreases the labor and time required. By increasing the efficiency of the farm the whole community benefits. New plants are opened to handle production in the area; for instance, the safflower plant at Sidney.

The development of any small industry, such as the Egging Cab Co. or the Stramit plant, certainly boosts the economy of a community. With an increased economy, the community develops by growing and becoming more prosperous.

Today 95 out of 100 farms are receiving the benefits which once were impossible. Comparing a farm of today with one of 30 years ago, it would seem the miraculous had taken place. The miraculous did take place in the form of an agency called the Rural Electrification Administration, with its most important asset—electricity. Electricity for home, farm, community, and even Minuteman missiles, which are located in our immediate area.

INFORMATION

My name: Carey Ann Frey.

Age: 16.

Grade: Sophomore.

School: Sunflower High School.

Name of father: Robert Frey, Rural Route No. 2, Mitchell, Nebr.

Contestant sponsored by the Roosevelt Public Power District, Mitchell, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

My great-granddaddy used to climb out of bed before dawn and trudge out to the barn to milk his dairy herd by the light of a lantern. Next he would feed the rest of the stock and examine the sky for possible signs of ominous weather, then head for the house for breakfast. Meanwhile grandma would have the big, black cookstove stoked up with corncobs and a chunk of wood as a prerequisite for the preparation of the morning meal. Before breakfast was well on the way, granny had probably made several trips down to the cellar for butter, eggs, and cream. After breakfast the day's work really began with the pumping of water to heat for washing dishes and clothes, the cleaning of the lamps and all of the irksome chores that meant the good old days.

Today's farmer is quite a contrast to the farmer of granddaddy's day. The countless laborsaving and timesaving devices have nearly obliterated these irksome chores from a farmer's workday. How can one value this source of power that is available to all and has come to mean so much?

Value is a fine-sounding word that Mr. Webster defines as meaning usefulness, importance, or to estimate the worth. After careful consideration I have decided that to estimate the value of rural electrification would be an impossibility for the latest computer, and even this amazing machine would require electricity to supply an answer.

The farmer's transition from kerosene lamps to incandescent light bulbs did not occur with just the development of electricity in towns and cities. Thousands of miles of powerlines had to be strung, and innumerable plants for the production of electricity were constructed before the dream of rural electrification became a reality. The turning on of the little light bulb was the dawn of a new life for rural America, and that small globe of glass became the symbol of electricity. Farm families just wanted electric lights like the folks in town, never dreaming of what this unlimited supply of power would mean in the future. Those miles and miles of poles and wire that crisscross our country have entered our homes, schools, and farms, and brought light and power to all. The result is better everything for rural America—our health, education, economy, living conditions, working conditions—the list is endless.

The good old days are gone and we should give thanks every time we flip a switch that the dim, dark past has been brightened by the glow of that little glass bulb and all it stands for. Value is to estimate the worth. Is there anyone, or anything, anywhere that can estimate the value of electrification to rural America?

INFORMATION

My name: Vicki Epley.
Age: 17.
Grade: Junior.
School: Arcadia High School.
Name of father: Elden Epley, Rural Route No. 2, Ord, Nebr.

Contestant sponsored by the Loup Valleys Rural Public Power District, Ord, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

WHY I ENJOY ELECTRICITY

Quite simply, REA means "more of the better things of life." My enjoyment isn't dimmed by kerosene light at dusk. I have time for reading, sewing new school clothes, or watching television.

We have more help with the housework. Electric cookery is sanitary, safe, and swift. We set the automatic timer on the hour we want the oven to begin functioning while we are at church or at school. We have a complete oven dinner ready when we get home. Our refrigerator runs "purrfectly"; ironing no longer takes the starch out of people.

Dad has more conveniences, using electricity in his shop, doing home repairs, and enjoying yard light safety. His electric motors are under perfect control requiring no special care in starting or in operation.

Our whole family is always in "hot water," showering, shaving, dishwashing, clothes washing, thanks to electricity and a dependable hot water heater.

We never had it so good.

When I look around and see how electricity has citified our countryside, I am very grateful for the way rural electrification has lightened our workload and our view. Now we have more time for community affairs, church activities, and pleasant visits with friends, because we have powerful machines working for us, while we work making our community a more pleasant, sociable place.

Electricity brought us television, which has widened our horizons worldwide, exposed us to many new ideas, and in increasing our knowledge has erased the "country bumpkin" name forever. When I visit my sister in New York State, I find her life not significantly different than my own in terms of electrical convenience, and receiving information through electrical communications.

If every farmer individually would have had to pay for all the poles, wire, and labor involved in bringing electricity to his home, the cost would have seemed prohibitive. But the cooperative association made it easier for us to get our power supply. Now that we have it we would never do without, no matter what the cost.

The power generated at one place can be distributed efficiently to a large number of places. Because of the simplicity of its generation and reconversion, it is better suited than other forms of energy. It has almost unlimited flexibility, which permits transmission over long distances, unlimited subdivision, and ease of control.

Electrical energy has given us chemical compounds for industrial purposes, such as silicon and carbides, which were previously either entirely unknown or mere curiosities.

Another nice thing about rural electrification is the rates. A new lower rate became effective this year. We can purchase floodlight power for a candlelight fee.

When we are looking for farm living with ease, we appreciate the "E's" of electricity: efficiency, economy, excellent living.

You can't "hold a candle to" the number of ways electricity has helped our living.

INFORMATION

My name: Marilyn Stevens.
Age: 15.
Grade: Sophomore.
School: Fullerton Public High School.
Name of father: Burton Stevens, Fullerton, Nebr.

Contestant sponsored by the Cornhusker Public Power District, Columbus, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

In 1943, the Cornhusker Public Power District was organized. Between that time and 1951, most of the families living in the rural areas of Nance, Boone, Platte, and Colfax Counties obtained electric power for their homes for the first time. Rural electrification made sweeping changes in many phases of the lives of these families.

Perhaps the most important changes rural electrification brought to my community were in the field of better health practices. Botulism and other forms of food poisoning which were once dreaded killers are almost unheard of since electric refrigerators and freezers have been used to keep foods fresh and electric ranges have been used to cook them thoroughly.

In the days when canning and drying were about the only ways to preserve foods, it was difficult for the farm wife to prepare interesting, well-balanced meals. Now, a wide variety of fruits, vegetables, meats, and dairy products may be had at any time of the year through better electric storage appliances.

The advent of rural electrification brought modern conveniences to farm homes. Electricity provides heat in the winter and air conditioning in the summer easily and efficiently. Water pumps and hot water heaters mean instant hot water for bathing and washing. Electric dishwashers, clothes washers and dryers, mixers, vacuum cleaners, frying pans, coffee pots, toasters, and other appliances allow the housewife to have more leisure time to spend with her family.

In the early days of Nebraska, the farmers were known as an uneducated, uninformed class. Now, however, rural youths are offered a wide curriculum at country schools modernized by electric laboratory equipment for science and home economics departments. Television and radio help farm families to be well-informed, active citizens by serving as news media.

The livestock owners and farmers in my community have discovered many ways to increase the profits in their businesses. Electricity provides heat for small animals in the first crucial hours of their lives. The problem of cattle getting into growing crops is no longer present when farmers use electric fences. Electric milking machines and electrically cooled bulk milk tanks make it possible for dairy farmers to milk more cows and store the milk for longer periods. Costly machinery repair bills are eliminated by electric welders and battery chargers. Do-it-yourself carpenters find electric powersaws and power drills to be valuable assets.

Rural electrification brought benefits to the community as a whole as well as to the individual farm family. Since farmers are making more money through improved farming practices and are buying more electric appliances, there is a greater demand for the businessman's goods. Since the businessman is then taking in more money, he can stock up on higher quality goods for his customers to buy. New jobs are created and the general economy of the community is greatly improved.

To sum it all up, what rural electrification means to me and my community is this: better health, better education, better farming practices, and better economy—short, "better living, electrically."

INFORMATION

My name: George Young.
Age: 18.
Grade: Senior.
School: Sargent High School.
Name of Father: Dale H. Young, Rural Route No. 3, Box 70, Broken Bow, Nebr.

Contestant sponsored by the Custer Public Power District, Broken Bow, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

When Senators George Norris, of Nebraska, and Sam Rayburn, of Texas, sponsored the Rural Electrification Act in 1935, do you think they realized how this act would revolutionize rural living? It is doubtful that they could realize just how much the Rural Electrification Act would change life in rural communities. Nothing in the history of man has made such an impact on rural people and rural communities as the addition of electrification.

The wide usage of electricity on farms today is an amazing thing. Little more than 20 years ago, when electricity came to the country, many farmers used less than the kilowatts allowed in a minimum charge, but today there is hardly a farm or ranch user who has not gone far beyond this minimum.

Even though REA serves anyone, no matter how impractical or costly they are to serve, it has managed to keep electricity prices down so that electricity is the lowest priced helper on the farm. This helper is ready to work anywhere and anytime at the same low price.

Farmers and ranchers have taken advantage of the fact that electricity can do many jobs cheaper and faster than man can. On many farms a flip of a switch can quickly grind feed or feed cattle while the farmer can be busy doing some other job, probably with the help of electricity. Electricity can do many jobs at once while man can only do one job at a time. Perhaps we should call electricity the farmers' most ambitious, hard working, cheapest, uncomplaining helper in the world.

With the help of electricity a farmer completes his work faster. The time he has saved can then be spent enjoying some type of entertainment made possible by electricity, as radio, television, or reading with electric lights.

In summer electricity comes to the aid of many farmers to insure that he will have a crop to harvest in the fall, even if very little rain falls. Irrigation with electricity gives every farmer an opportunity to be sure of a crop—rain or no rain.

The farmer isn't the only one to benefit from electricity. What would the farmer's wife do without electricity? Think of the long hours saved by the use of dishwashers, automatic washers, clothes driers, and vacuum cleaners to name only a few things that are brought by electricity to help the homemaker.

Rural electrification helps many other people beside farmers. Think of all the electric appliances and machinery that farmers buy. This is a boost to the whole Nation's economy.

Rural electrification has also attracted industry into farm communities. With this industry comes more employment and a higher standard of living for the community.

The value of rural electrification is very great. It has revolutionized rural life. It eases the burden of farm families. It gives rural families a safer, healthier, and more enjoyable and prosperous life.

BISHOP SWANSTROM SPEAKS ON THE CHALLENGE OF WORLD HUNGER

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the world's leading figures in the battle against hunger is the Most Reverend Edward E. Swanstrom, director of the Catholic Relief Services. During 1961 and 1962, when I served as Director of President John F. Kennedy's food-for peace program, it was my privilege to work closely with Bishop Swanstrom. I know of no one who has traveled more widely or viewed more closely the problems of human hunger around the globe than has he.

He understands well the moral and political challenge to the United States which grows out of the stark fact that half the people of the world are suffering from hunger. In referring to the hunger pangs of the peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East, Bishop Swanstrom warns:

> If a peaceful revolution in these areas is impossible, a violent revolution is inevitable.

Mr. President, Bishop Swanstrom has provided an unusually wise and moving statement on the challenge of world hunger. His statement was made on April 30, in a sermon at the dedication of the Academy of Food Marketing, of St. Joseph's College. I ask unanimous consent that his superb sermon be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that it may be studied by the Members of Congress and by other readers of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERMON BY HIS EXCELLENCY EDWARD E. SWANSTROM, TITULAR BISHOP OF ARBA, ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

During the closing days of the third session of the Ecumenical Council in Rome last November, the bishops of the whole world focused their attention on a problem which some months before our Holy Father, Pope Paul VI had referred to as the No. 1 problem of our age. I refer, of course, to the problem of world hunger, as a result of which more than half of the population of our earth lives in the shadow of starvation. Bishop after bishop, at the council, pointed to the fact that in this critical period in the world's history the church must continue to take a leading part in the battle which must be waged against this poverty and destitution if we are to attain the peace for which all of us strive and pray.

I imagine—and I say this, not in a spirit of boastfulness, but merely as a statement of fact—that few people have had the privilege of visting as many areas of the modern world as I have had. As the director of the American bishops' foreign relief program, I have visited most of the countries of Europe, the Middle East, Africa, Asia, and the Far East and Latin America.

For us in America, the world still presents a face of some calm and orderliness. Our lives have not been caught up in the incessant upheavals that have afflicted so many human beings whose fate it was to be thrust over frontiers as refugees, or to be part of the postcolonial areas battling their way into freedom and struggling for some semblance of stability.

Even though there are some very threatening clouds on the horizon, life in America is in sharp contrast to all the unrest, the homelessness, the hunger, and the anguish that I have witnessed all over the world in the past several years.

I suppose we all remember with poignant clarity the Gospel stories of need and suffering that were taught to us in our earliest years. The story of Lazarus has always retained a special poignancy for me. As I have traveled about the world—to its misery-scourged corners—I have seen Lazarus in my mind's eye over and over again.

I saw him most obviously in a leprous beggar dragged in a cart on a begging journey around the streets of Calcutta, a city whose streets teem with millions of people, many of them refugees. I saw him, too, in the refugee who had escaped from the mainland of China in 1961, and who had been caught up and deposited in the Fan Ling Transit Camp. I went up to this camp, and saw thousands of unfortunates who had risked their lives to escape, but were allowed to sit at the gates of the free world for a few days, then were herded into trucks, to be returned to China. There was no inn for them in the towns and cities of our western civilization.

In the giant slums which have mushroomed around Latin America's proudest cities—Rio de Janeiro, Santiago, Lima, Bogotá—I have seen countless men waiting at the gate of the world for an opportunity to take part in productive life, but waiting in vain.

The Lazarus of the Gospel sat at the gate, longing for "the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table."

But the rich man, "who used to clothe himself in purple and fine linen, and who feasted every day in fine fashion," turned away from Lazarus, and gave him no aid. Poor Lazarus died, and went from the gate, where "the dogs licked his sores," to the peace of Abraham's bosom in heaven. When the rich man died, he went to—well, somewhere else—and he cried for Lazarus to come down and put a drop of water on his tongue in his place of torment.

But as the Gospel tells us, "a great gulf" had been placed between them. The gulf that the rich man had chosen to maintain between him and the poor while on earth was continued for all eternity. It gives us pause to realize that no other sin is imputed to the rich man, merely that he did not perform the works of mercy in his power. He did not feed the hungry.

The great gulf that exists between the hungry and the well fed, between the rich and the poor nations, is one that is dangerous, not only in the temporal order, but quite clearly in the eternal order. Even here at home in our blessed America, we must be on our guard. It is very easy, in our so-called affluent society, to forget what the face of misery is—to forget the terrible degradation of many of our Negro brothers, of migrant workers, of untrained workers in our great cities, and of those in poverty belts such as Appalachia.

If we are our brother's keeper, we must bear witness to this fact. It is not as simple, any more, as leaving our home and finding a Lazarus at our gate. Just as Vatican Council II is concerned with updating every aspect of the church's mission, to make the Gospel of Christ relevant to 20th century life, we must update our expression of concern for our brother in the world in which we find ourselves. I frequently say that I doubt that most Americans actually realize how bad the situation really is in most of the quarters of the globe.

It is a fact that on three continents, in dozens of countries, hundreds of millions of people struggle to exist on incomes of little more than a dollar a week.

In the 112 or more nations in our world, only 6 of them have an average income of as much as $80 a month: Sweden and Switzerland, Australia, and New Zealand, Canada and the United States. Those are the only six countries. Here in the United States we ought to get down on our knees every night and thank the good Lord for our blessings—that our average income is more than $200 a month, when more than two-thirds of the people of the world have less than $8 a month.

These people have less to spend, each day, on food and on shelter and on clothing, on medicine and on all of their other needs, than the average American spends at his corner drugstore for a package of cigarettes. They live in rundown country shacks of tarpaper; they live in city slums. They live without heat, water, or sanitation of any kind. They have no doctors nor hospitals to go to. In many places, their children have no schools to attend.

During the past few years, the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences has been conducting surveys and studies which confirm certain facts which are only too evident to those who work among these people.

The life expectancy of most of the people in the so-called underdeveloped areas is between 35 and 40 years of age. In some places it is even lower. More tragic than anything else is the effect of this malnutrition and hunger on new-born children.

In a conference on the prevention of malnutrition in the preschool child, which was held in Washington as recently as December of last year, it was scientifically demonstrated that while infant mortality rates in underdeveloped countries may be only 10 or 15 times as great as those in technologically advanced areas, the mortality rate in the 1 to 4 age group may be 50 to 60 times greater. In many areas up to 50 percent of the children fail to survive to school age.

These preschool children are victims of the most unsanitary conditions and fall heir to every type of disease. Even if they do survive, their physical condition and mental abilities have been so seriously impaired that it is practically impossible for them to achieve a normal life. It is for this reason that now we are giving priority to the feeding of the preschool child, in our food programs throughout the world.

The conditions I have described are not new. Poverty, hunger, and disease are afflictions as old as man himself. But in our time and in this age, there has been a change. The change is not so much in the realities of life, but in the hopes and expectations for the future. If a peaceful revolution is these areas is impossible, a violent revolution is inevitable.

This knowledge has helped create the worldwide boom, of vast portent, which we know as the revolution of rising expectations. The meaning of this revolution is very simple: It means that people in the rest of the world want for themselves the same things that you and I want for our loved ones, for our friends, and for our children, and that most of us have already.

They intend to have their families live a decent life, and that they have a job that gives them survival and dignity. They intend to have their children taught to read and write, they intend to have the hungry fed and the sick treated. They intend to take their place in the great movement of modern society, to take their share in the benefits of that society.

The developing world would soon become a cauldron of violence, hatred, and revolution, without some assistance. How would you feel if you were a member of a family whose total income was less than $80 a year? Yet a majority of the people of the world, as I have said, have incomes of less than $80 a year.

Under such conditions, communism—with its false and easy promises of a magic formula—might well be able to transform these popular desires into an instrument of revolution. That is why every American who is concerned about the future of his country must also be concerned about the future of Africa, Asia, and our old friends in Latin America.

I am sure that it will be of interest to you to know that some 20 American voluntary foreign relief agencies, like the one that I am privileged to head, have been attempting to make at least a little dent in this tragic situation. The largest of these agencies, with one exception, are associated with one or another of the churches in this country. They are the Church World Services of the National Council of Churches, the Lutheran World Relief of that great body, the Joint Distribution Committee of the Jewish group, and our own Catholic Relief Services. The one exception that I refer to is the CARE organization. All of us receive our basic support from our constituents; but, during the past decade particularly, we have been working in close partnership with the American Government.

It may surprise some of you to learn that we are now distributing, each year, close to 2 million tons of America's abundance of food which our Government purchases from the farmers with your tax dollar, and gives to us, for free distribution to the poor and the needy. These goods had a value of about $200 million; and our Government also pays the ocean freight on these commodities. In all, they represent an investment on your part of about $250 million. I doubt that any money is better spent, inasmuch as it enables us to supply some food to about 60 million people in the most sorely tried areas of the world.

To this food, all of us add huge stores of clothing and medicine; so we are helping to supply the basic necessities of life to the most needy of God's children; and it is done on a people-to-people basis, through volunteers drawn from the populations of the countries we serve; and it is done without regard to race, creed, or color. Our sole criterion is the need of the individual or the family.

Everyone realizes that the critical social and economic problems that plague the peoples of the underdeveloped nations cannot be solved through the mere distribution of food, clothing, medicines, or other direct relief, as significant and vitally important though these things may be. Therefore, all of these voluntary agencies, like my own, in recent years have been placing great emphasis upon self-help projects designed to improve the educational level, the health level, and, most important, the general standard of living of the masses in underdeveloped countries. Our projects include the development of cooperatives, agricultural training, the provision of seeds and agricultural equipment, and training in small industries. Of course these things require a great deal of financing; but the people of the country have been most generous in supporting our efforts in this regard.

It is a record such as this that makes me feel that the good people of the United States are maintaining some contact with the Lazarus whose needs have been made known to us. It does offer some living proof that we are extending our concept of neighbor, that we are beginning to see the people of the earth as a single human family, the family of man, and that we have a real understanding of our brother's needs.

It would be nice to point out, by way of conclusion, that we have really begun to solve some of the staggering problems I have outlined for you that cry for solution. With our world population increasing by 50 million persons each year, with no indication that the average per capita income in the developing countries is increasing year after year, with one-half of humanity either sorely undernourished or on the verge of starvation, at least a billion persons who are illiterate, and one-quarter of a billion of the world's children with no opportunity to attend school, the world picture is certainly not a very bright one.

Some men, like the Swedish economist Gunnar Myrdal, even go so far as to say that unless we in the United States and others produce all the food which an advanced agricultural technology permits, "the burgeoning populations of underdeveloped countries face starvation of hundreds of millions of people." I have heard of another expert who even goes so far as to say that despite all that we do, there will be a world famine of appalling extent in the next 10 or 15 years.

Yet, with it all, there is no reason for us to be pessimistic, much less to despair. Probably for the first time in the history of civilization the whole world has awakened to the problem that confronts us. Vast international organizations, like the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the world food program, the churches, and various bodies of our own Government, have assembled the facts, so that the true picture is now quite clear; and they have been mobilizing all their resources, to center the attention of the peoples of the world on the need for the most scientific and far-reaching approach to its solution. The progress being made here at St. Joseph's as evidenced by the blessing of this new building of your Academy of Food Marketing, this afternoon, is one more indication of the vital importance being attached to adequate and advanced programs in nutrition and food technology, which are so essential if we are to make permanent contributions to the economy and health of the developing countries.

Even though one may be optimistic about the final outcome, the picture I have drawn for you is a rather grim one. Yet, I have done it with a purpose. It does show you the challenging opportunity that is yours in our modern-day world. To one without faith, the problems of our modern-day world would be overwhelming; but for those powered by faith, hope, and charity, each of them can be a challenging opportunity to apply the love and truth of Christ to a world that will perish without them.

WINNING ESSAYS IN NEBRASKA RURAL ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION CONTEST—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, my colleague, Senator HRUSKA, is en route to Omaha, Nebr., where he is to preside over hearings of the National Commission on Food Marketing. He has asked me to place in the RECORD, for him, a statement by him and the essays of four of the winners of the Nebraska Rural Electric Association's annual essay contest.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement and the essays be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA

Next week, the winners of the Nebraska Rural Electric Association essay contest will be visiting Washington as their award for writing outstanding essays on "What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community."

For the past few years, I have had the privilege of placing some of the winning entries in the RECORD, and of bringing them to the attention of all Senators. Once again, the essays are of excellent quality; indeed, they seem to improve each year. These youngsters have graphically and succinctly portrayed the benefits of rural electrification in their communities.

It is my pleasure to place in the RECORD the essays written by the following:

Cal Lacy, 17, a junior at Hyannis High School; the son of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Lacy, of Hyannis, Nebr. Sponsor: Panhandle Rural Electric Membership Association, Alliance, Nebr.

Marcia Martens, 17, a junior at Ogallala Senior High School; the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert Martens, of Ogallala, Nebr. Sponsor: The Midwest Electric Corp., Grant, Nebr.

Mary Ann Watkins, 17, a junior at Venango High School; the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Jay Watkins, of Venango, Nebr. Sponsor: The Midwest Electric Corp., Grant, Nebr.

Darrell Petska, 16, a junior at Ord High School; the son of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Petska, of North Loup, Nebr. Sponsor: Loup Valley's Rural Public Power District, Ord, Nebr.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

(By Cal Lacy)

I recently returned home after a stay at one of my grandfather's places. It has no electricity, running water, or other modern luxuries. It was the same place that I was raised until our family left when I was about 4 or 5 years old. Grampa never did improve the place because he never lived there; he lives in Mullen and my uncle lives up the valley on his own place and looks over the whole ranch.

I don't claim to be any authority of REA, but I know how much better it is to live on a place with electric power than one without. For instance, 14 head of milk cows is a herd when you have to milk them by hand. Rawhide! When our family lived on a small farm by Broken Bow, we had a milking machine and the chores went faster and a lot easier. Grampa didn't have a milking machine.

After I came in from milking, I filled a water basin off the windmill and I put the pan on the wood stove to heat. Grampa didn't have an electric water heater. Then when the water was right, I washed up and had breakfast. The only company I had was a transistor radio, no "Today" show this morning. After breakfast I washed the tins and went to check calves.

The week went on and at night, all I had to keep me occupied was that transistor radio and a heap of paperbacks. I was glad when I got home so I could watch television. After my stay at the homestead I really appreciated good-ol-take-it-for-granted electricity. I couldn't flick on a kerosene lamp, or yard light, or push the burner button on a wood stove, to cook my food. In fact, a person really gets to understand why electricity is so important on a farm or ranch. Electricity isn't a luxury, it is a necessity. With the assets that a rancher owns, it is his electric power, next to his cattle, that is his biggest and most taken for granted, until he doesn't have it.

When electricity is cut off for a while, a person sweats until the lights come back on again. Anymore, rural electric power is applied to so many uses, it is difficult to describe its even vaster potential in future uses. The REA has come a long way since those early days in the thirties, when the REA started, and the REA is still growing because it is forever meeting the growing demands put upon it. It does my heart good to see powerlines crossing the sandhills, because it means that wherever you go you know that the REA will service you.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Marcia Martens)

Rural electrification has done much to revolutionize the life of the farmer. It not only makes his life more comfortable, but also helps increase farm production, promote safety, and on the whole, raise his standard of living.

Aladdin had his magic "genie" in a lamp; we have our magic "genie" in an electric outlet. Our "genie" is electricity. We flip a switch and our "genie" lights our homes, cooks our meals, and milks the cows. The uses of electricity on the farm are unlimited.

No doubt Grandma often dreamed of a magic "genie" to help with the housework as she, on her hands and knees, scrubbed and waxed the floors. Now electric sweepers whisk up dirt; electric waxers and polishers keep the floors in top condition in a matter of minutes with a minimum of labor. And many times as she sat straining her eyes by the light of the coal oil or gasoline lamps, Grandma wished for a better way to lengthen the working day.

Grandma spent many hours slaving over her dear old cookstove to provide wholesome meals for her family. And, of course, the cobs and wood had to be carried into the house. It was my job to keep the cob basket full when I was younger, and as I was not fond of performing this task, I can truly sympathize with Grandma. New electric ranges have done away with all this drudgery, providing clean, flameless heat with the turn of a dial. Electric heating and air conditioning systems keep our homes at a constant temperature the year around.

Washday no longer calls for the washboard. Electric automatic washers and dryers eliminate the lifting, scrubbing and carrying of water that made Grandma's washday a backbreaking chore.

Grandpa did not have a magic "genie" to help him, either. He carried a kerosene or gasoline lantern to provide light while he did his chores. Electric milking machines were unheard of, and old "Bessie" had to be milked by hand. There were no electric drills, saws or welders to help him in the shop.

Because Grandpa had no way of outsmarting the weather, he often had to stand in the blazing sun and watch his crops wither and die from lack of moisture. Today, with the aid of electricity, irrigation pumps supply us with fresh, lifesaving water than can turn a desert into a lush, green oasis.

Electricity brings entertainment into our homes through radio, television, stereo and hi-fi. Television makes it possible for us to tour far and distant lands from our own living rooms. We can see history being made as we view the flights of our country's astronauts, or listen to the President speak to the Nation.

Electricity has made all this possible. We, as consumers of electricity, truly owe our thanks to Thomas Edison for his discovery of electricity and to men like the late Senator George W. Norris for his efforts in bringing electricity to rural America.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Mary Ann Watkins)

I am 17. I am of the REA generation. I have always been privileged to enjoy the blessings of rural electricity. I do not know what it means to "live in darkness"; my memories of home will always be one of bright, comfortable living, made possible by REA.

"Before we had REA," is an expression I have often heard, and it almost seems that the lives of the people in rural communities have been divided into two areas—before and after REA. The good old days before electricity seem to be strictly for reminiscing, and I have never heard anyone express a desire to relive those days.

The rural people in our area are alert and aggressive. When the power of REA surged into their farms, they put it to work quickly and efficiently. It pumps their water; it lightens the burden of the everyday farm chores, and the tools in their well-equipped shops enable them to repair and maintain their equipment. By letting the light help perform some of the 400 tasks that were formerly done manually or with animals, I know that the farmers in western Nebraska do their share in helping America lead the world in food production.

A city visitor in our home was amazed that the farm homes in our area were furnished and equipped as well as hers in Chicago. She was genuinely surprised at the many activities in our community in which the farm women participate, and to find that rural living is so pleasant and easy. She had never realized the REA has made it possible for the average farm wife to accomplish 10 times as much in 1 day as her ancestors did and still have the time and energy to enjoy the good things of life with her family and friends. Our friend left us with a feeling of thankfulness that REA has made the standard of rural living equal to that of urban areas.

I asked my parents which luxuries they have enjoyed most from REA. They could not decide—the pleasure of light and power when it is needed, or the miracle of having an abundant water supply. Ample water for the livestock, for every need in our home, water for a spacious lawn and garden, and just for a cool, fresh drink on a hot day is a dream come true. My mother has never forgotten when her family depended on the wind for the water supply nor the work it took to help carry enough water for a family of 10.

I have never had to carry water, study by a kerosene lamp, cook on a coal-burning stove, or want for the convenience of city living. I am lucky; I belong to the REA generation.

WHY I ENJOY ELECTRICITY

(By Darrell Petska)

Electricity, that marvelous flow of electrons, has initiated many remarkable advancements since being harnessed by mankind. Everything on this earth has profited from this powerful "giant"; therefore, there is endless dependence upon our friend, electricity.

Although all forms of civilization have benefited from electricity, agriculture has gained the most. Electricity makes farming more attractive to young people—and to their parents. It provides much more efficiency, much less hard work, plus the conveniences and comforts of modern living in the country.

Should I say, "I enjoy electricity," I would be making an understatement, but I do enjoy electricity. My main reason for enjoying electricity is broad in nature.

Since I live on a farm, I know the joys and discomforts of farm living. Electricity has provided an abundance of joys and a minimum of discomforts for me. This, then, is my reason for enjoying electricity. I am thankful, for it has made more of my farm tasks easier and quicker. I enjoy electric power, for I know that even my grandfather did not have this tremendous power ready to work for him.

Forty years ago, my grandfather rose before dawn and hurriedly kindled the fire in the old wood range. He then prepared and ate his breakfast by lamplight.

The daily task of carrying water into the house from the windmill was followed by milking the cows—by hand, of course.

While grandfather toiled in the fields, grandmother "slaved" in the hot, stuffy kitchen as she prepared dinner for her hungry family.

In the evening, to prepare for some infrequent "socializing" in the village the next day, grandfather made that familiar trek out to the windmill for more water. Later, he whipped out his straightedge razor, which always managed to take some skin along with the whiskers. Yes, grandfather had it hard in those days before electricity made its appearance.

Today, I rise before dawn to an electrically heated home. I flip the light switch and then prepare breakfast by making toast in our electric toaster and by frying some bacon and eggs on our electric skillet. After breakfast, I milk the cows, aided by an electric milker. The milk is then cooled electrically. While I am doing my chores, my mother works effortlessly in her cool, all-electric kitchen.

In the evening, while getting ready to go to town, I whip out my electric shaver and enjoy a comfortable, "nick-free" shave. At the turn of a faucet, I have an abundant supply of hot water furnished by our electric water heater and water system.

Thus, electricity has made my farm living much easier and more comfortable.

Should I ever begin to take electric power for granted, I must stop and think to myself, "What would I do without this faithful servant?"

Electricity, I enjoy your helpful hand. Keep it always extended.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, President Johnson's request of Congress yesterday for $89 million—the first installment on a vast American-supported regional development plan for southeast Asia—initiates a program which gives rise to serious doubts.

The basic assumption, as expressed by the President, is that a sufficient quantity of American dollars is both necessary and adequate to effect economic viability and, subsequently, political stability.

I question this assumption.

I would like to point out, consequently, that a decade of foreign aid to the underdeveloped nations of the world is typified best by a singular lack of success. In Western Europe, under the Marshall plan, American aid was employed to rebuild an economy. The basic structure of the economy existed. The potential for renovation and expansion—in terms of physical plant, technology, and administrative know-how—existed. Capital was lacking. And capital was basically all that the Marshall plan provided.

In the underdeveloped areas of the world, however, we, unfortunately, must work with more troublesome circumstances. Capital is but one of the necessary ingredients to economic development which is lacking. A competent labor force, modern methods of accounting, technical know-how, and managerial and entrepreneurial ability are generally conspicuous by their absence. Thus, American capital constitutes only one of the necessary ingredients which the economies of these countries must obtain if they are to achieve significant growth and maturity.

Yet, in southeast Asia, as the President has proposed, we witness a repetition of a policy which has borne little fruit in the past. We witness, furthermore, the application of this policy under circumstances of political chaos.

If, under the best of political circumstances, American aid to underdeveloped countries resulted in little, what success then can we expect from a massive dose of dollars extended to an area which is characterized by political chaos?

Mr. President, $1 billion in aid constitutes a massive quantity in relation to the economies of the countries in question. As a percentage of their annual production, $1 billion represents a significant portion indeed. In the name of efficiency and effective application, consequently, how valid is it to assume that Laos, Thailand, and South Vietnam can adequately use or absorb the amount of aid proposed?

What evidence is there that the technical know-how, the administrative ability, the entrepreneurial ingenuity, exist in these countries to adequately execute the expensive projects envisaged?

Above all, Mr. President, what evidence is there that the execution of such projects shall be blessed by sufficient political stability in the midst of a raging war

The American people are willing to make the military sacrifices in terms of lives and materiel which are necessary to meet the Communist challenge in southeast Asia. They would be no less willing to continue economic aid if there existed a logical and feasible hope for success. Our foreign aid program—already scarred with many failures—would, it seems, be destined for another setback.

And, if the real intent of the President's proposal were economic progress, Mr. President, the opposition to this proposal would not be as extensive as it is. But we cannot help wondering if this proposal is not, in effect, an effort to buy peace under the guise of economic assistance. For I would inquire whether this program would have been instituted if Communist aggression were not present in southeast Asia.

The truth that much of our foreign aid has taught us is that we cannot buy friends.

We should also know that we cannot buy peace.

THE SHIPPING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WHEAT FARMERS SHOULD BE ENDED

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Export Control Act of 1949, extended and amended by the 87th Congress, terminates June 30 of this year and I understand that hearings will be held soon on its extension.

I hope that when the measure is taken up the Banking and Currency Committee will give consideration to language which would prevent the issuance of unnecessary and discriminatory restrictions on shipments of agricultural commodities.

Despite our 900-million-bushel carryover of wheat, we are today unable to compete for sales to Russia, which is in the market for wheat, because of a regulation issued under the act requiring that 50 percent of any sales to the Soviet Union be carried in American ships. The shipping charges put our wheat out of competition with Canada, Australia, and other wheat-exporting nations. The withdrawal of this regulation will not mean any loss of jobs for seamen. They are getting no work carrying U.S. wheat because there are no sales.

As matters now stand, however, the American farmer is losing the opportunity to make sales of wheat and be able to increase his production. The Nation loses an opportunity to improve its balance-of-payments position.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Brookings, S. Dak., Register of May 26 in regard to the situation, indicative of the view of the situation in wheat-producing areas.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE RESTRICTIONS UNFAIR TO OUR WHEATGROWERS?

Are Great Plains wheatgrowers the victims of "unfair and unrealistic restrictions" which deny them a big cash market for their grain?

Andrew Brakke, of Presho, chairman of Great Plains Wheat, Inc., said a clause in the export licenses has forced the grain trade to ship at least half of any wheat they sell to Russia or East European countries in U.S.-flag vessels. The sales would be for gold or hard currency.

"This cargo-preference restriction is one of the cruelest regulations which has ever been forced upon U.S. wheat producers," Brakke declared. "It is rank discrimination against a single minority in our American economy—the wheat farmer—and applies to no other commodity."

Brakke said an export license was recently issued to a producer of industrial equipment for the sale of $15 million in machinery to Rumania. About 85 percent of the sale was to be carried on long-range credit terms, he said.

"There was no hue and cry that this industrial equipment be shipped to Rumania in U.S. vessels," he said. "Yet, when the U.S. wheat farmer proposes to sell his product abroad for good hard cash on the barrel, he is confronted with the spectre of the cargo-preference clause and other tangles of redtape."

He said U.S. wheat producers can offer foreign buyers competitive prices at dockside, but that buyers refuse to pay the higher freight rates demanded by U.S. maritime interests.

"The U.S.-flag ship requirement does not benefit anyone, including the maritime people," Brakke said, "because the restriction freezes them completely out of the market, along with our wheat producers."

He suggested a new policy should be devised which would give U.S. shipping the volume it needs without hindering commercial sales of wheat.

Great Plains Wheat, Inc., is a market promotion organization supported by some 300,000 wheat farmers in South Dakota, North Dakota, Kansas, and Colorado.

We hope changes will be made.

COLORADO STATE COLLEGE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it was in April 1889, that the then Governor of the State of Colorado signed into law a bill calling for the establishment of a State Normal School at Greeley, Colo. In October of the same year, the State Normal School of Colorado started classes, with a principal, four instructors, and 96 students.

Today, as it prepares to celebrate its 75th anniversary, Colorado State College—by which name the original State Normal School is now known—has a campus of 317 acres, a faculty staff of 283, and carries on instruction for over 5,000 students. Also it is recognized, along with Stanford, Peabody, Columbia, and Iowa, as one of the five top teachers colleges in the United States, and is rated as the top teachers college in the Rocky Mountain area.

I extend congratulation to Colorado State College; to its new president, Dr. Darrell Holmes, and his faculty; and to the people of Greeley, Colo., who have contributed so much to the growth and success of this outstanding educational facility. The achievement of Colorado State College is one in which all Colorado takes great pride; and I join all the citizens of my State in wishing for this fine college many more years of growth and accomplishment.

In this regard, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial which was published on May 28 in the Greeley Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greeley Daily Tribune and the Greeley Republican, May 28, 1965]

CSC CAN REJOICE WITH CONFIDENCE

"The purpose of the (Normal School) will be the instruction in the science and arts of teaching, with the aid of a suitable practice department, and in such branches of knowledge as shall qualify teachers for their profession." (From a bill signed in April 1889 by Gov. Job A. Cooper, for the establishment of a State normal school at Greeley.)

This weekend, as the State Normal School, now Colorado State College, observes its 75th anniversary with 3 days of festivities, it can feel assured that the job which it was intended to do has been competently performed.

If all those who had a part in the founding of the college could look at it today, they perhaps would be somewhat amazed at the great strides Colorado State College has made in fulfilling its purpose and extending itself beyond the basic normal-school function of teacher preparation.

Today, the graduates of Colorado State College have a major part in shaping the minds of young people in Colorado, and are performing a similar role in other States from coast to coast. The farflung positions of the graduates is evidence that Colorado State College is doing a job not only in quantity but also in quality.

Still further evidence can be found of the esteem gained by Colorado State College in its 75-year history. Among this evidence are the ratings that place Colorado State College among the top five teachers colleges in the United States, along with Stanford, Peabody, Columbia, and Iowa. Also included are the judgments of the university and college presidents of the Rocky Mountain States, who rate Colorado State College as the top teachers college in the area. Even more evidence can be added by noting that former students hold 60 percent of the teaching positions in Colorado and that graduates hold presidential posts at 17 colleges.

Colorado State College has not been content, however, with merely carrying out its role of teacher training. Throughout its history it has sought other ways to make it more useful to education and hence to its State and Nation.

Early in its history, the college began efforts to upgrade the standards for teachers and their status. During the greatest war in its history, World War II, Colorado State College operated a clerical school which trained more than 4,000 men for the Air Force. In the wake of the war, the college continued its service to the Nation through its Air Force Reserve Officers Training Corps program and its selection by the Federal Government to establish an institute of education and research in east Pakistan to develop faculty for teachers colleges in that country.

Other things which have made Colorado State College of greater service are its full graduate program. Its expansion in the liberal arts, its department of special education to train teachers for the mentally and physically handicapped and its educational planning service, which provides assistance to school districts.

In 75 years Colorado State College has developed not only an outstanding reputation in its field of service but a campus that covers 317 acres, including an 80-acre mountain campus, and contains more than 80 buildings. The 283-member faculty carries on instruction for over 5,000 students in 8 academic divisions: arts; education; health, physical education, and recreation; humanities; music; nursing; science and social science.

All this is a far cry from the State Normal School, which started classes October 6, 1890, with a principal, 4 instructors and 96 students meeting in churches and other buildings until the first building on campus—Cranford Hall—could be completed.

Colorado State College has grown over the years along with the steadily increasing enrollments in higher education and growing demands for teachers. But certainly neither of these factors would have been any advantage to Colorado State College without presidents and faculty members highly qualified for and dedicated to their missions in education. Colorado State College has become an outstanding institution because they devoted themselves to making a better college, preparing qualified teachers and adapting the college to meet the educational needs of the times.

"In some histories," Ford Cleere, director of the Colorado State College news service, writes, "Thomas Gray is listed as the first president, but current historic interpretation is to classify him as the principal of the normal school." The person "usually accorded the honor" of being the first president, he adds, is Dr. Zachariah X. Snyder. Dr. Snyder was followed by Dr. John G. Crabbe, Dr. George Willard Frasier, and Dr. William R. Ross.

This weekend as part of the 75th anniversary celebration, the inauguration will be held for the 5th president—Dr. Darrell Holmes, who came here with strong credentials from San Diego State College, where he served as an executive dean. In the short time that he has been here, the community has quickly learned that the board of trustees of State colleges chose a man with the background and experience and the enthusiasm and vision to lead Colorado State College to a place of even greater prominence in the latter part of its first century.

The success of the past and the hope for the future make this weekend's diamond jubilee celebration a truly gala affair.

J. EDGAR HOOVER'S 41ST ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, Monday, May 10, 1965, marked the 41st anniversary of one of the outstanding Americans of our time, J. Edgar Hoover, as the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Two weeks later, on May 24, this body passed Senate bill 313, which provides that any future successor who might be named by the President to succeed Mr. Hoover shall be confirmed by the Senate.

I am proud to have supported this measure, and I urge that every effort be exerted to assure its early and final passage by Congress—not only because I believe it to be in the best interests of the safety and well-being of our people, but also because I look upon it as a tribute to a man who has, in my opinion, contributed as much as any other living man in this area of our concern. The entire 41-year span of Mr. Hoover's service as Director of the FBI has been marked with personal achievements. Foremost, perhaps, among these achievements was the herculean task Mr. Hoover performed when he reorganized what had become an almost ineffectual group of political hangers-on into what is now recognized as the greatest investigative organization in the world. It was primarily through this effective and decisive action by Mr. Hoover and the sheer force of his personal integrity that the FBI reached the pinnacle of respect it occupies today.

Whoever may be the President who is called upon to appoint a successor for such a man as J. Edgar Hoover, who has become a legend in his own time, both he and his appointee deserve, and will need, the support that Senate confirmation will provide.

BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the 27th of May marked the birthday anniversary of one of our most distinguished colleagues, Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON. On this occasion, I join his many friends and admirers in offering to this distinguished gentleman, my sincere respects and congratulations.

As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I have been proud to have the opportunity to work with this most able chairman. Although we do not see eye to eye on every question, Senator ROBERTSON's frank and vigorous expression of his views and his unfailing courtesy have won the respect and affection of all the committee members. I salute him on his birthday, and wish him many, many more.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE ITALIAN NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, June 2 is a significant day in the history of the Italian Republic—the anniversary of the Italian national holiday.

On June 2, 1946, the people of Italy, in a national referendum, voted to replace their monarchy with a republican form of government. One year later, Italy adopted her constitution, thus linking her ever closer to the democracies of the world.

Since that time, Italy has been going through a second renaissance. The industry of the Italian people has been producing an economic upsurge that parallels her reaffirmation of democratic institutions.

We, her friends in the United States, join in commemorating this landmark occasion, and extend to Italy and to the Italian people our warmest hopes for continued success in their advancement.

ARAB BOYCOTT BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in our country there is a rising tide of concern for the economic warfare which the Arab States are continuing to wage against Israel.

The Arab boycott of firms doing business with Israel is a form of discrimination which is inconsistent with the fundamental principles to which the United States has always adhered, and it tramples on the rights of Israel to conduct free and unimpeded trade with other nations.

With 30 other Senators, I have submitted to the Export Control Act an amendment which would protect American businessmen from coercion by the Arab boycott office. Hearings on this measure will be held next week, and I am confident that ultimately it will win the approval of the Senate.

A resolution adopted in April by the Conference of Illinois-Indiana Region of Hadassah and a recent editorial in the New York Herald Tribune deal in a clear and forthright manner with these matters.

Therefore, I ask that both the resolution and the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZIONIST AFFAIRS—ARAB BOYCOTT

Resolution adopted at conference of Illinois-Indiana Region of Hadassah, Lafayette, Ind., April 1965

Whereas it is a fundamental American principle that there shall be no distinction among citizens of the United States in their conduct of lawful trade, travel and other activities abroad, and

Whereas the Arab boycott, an instrument of the economic war against the State of Israel, organized by the League of Arab States, makes demands of American industrial trade and commercial organizations that they comply with Arab restrictions against trade with Israel as the price of doing business with Arab countries, and thus violates the above-stated American principle,

The Illinois-Indiana Region of Hadassah, in conference assembled, records its support of the amendment to the Export Control Act of 1949, proposed by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, as a constructive effort to give American businessmen who reject such methods and conditions the full support of the U.S. Government. The amendment contains the statement that "it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices, or boycott, fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States." Hadassah wholeheartedly endorses the view of Senator WILLIAMS that this action is called for, not only for the sake of Israel's free and unhampered economic development, but because "the American flag must not be lowered in surrender to piracy, whether by cutlass or questionnaire."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, May 17, 1965]

THE ARAB BOYCOTT: UNNEUTRAL NEUTRALITY

The Arab countries, declaring themselves to be in a state of war, have the right to conduct economic warfare against Israel, and the latter, if it chooses, may reply in kind. The United States, which seeks to maintain friendly relations with both, has the right to remain neutral. The Washington administration professes to be doing so. But it isn't. It is permitting the Arab States to conduct their economic warfare on American soil by allowing their diplomatic, consular, and business agents in this country to engage in their boycott and blacklist activities.

There is nothing, of course, to stop them from such activities on their own soil, or on that of their Communist friends or of others who may be motivated purely by profit. But that is no reason why Washington should make their task easier and, by doing so, become their unwitting accomplice. Its failure to uphold strict rules of neutrality has exposed American chambers of commerce and other trade associations to pressure by Arab States to handle their blacklisting papers and questionnaires for them.

To the extent that they are doing so, this raises the startling question whether such chambers and associations should be required to register as agents for foreign countries—and not just any countries but ones which are in a state of war. And the question is even more startling if applied to the U.S. Department of Commerce. The Herald Tribune series on this issue has pointed out that the department allowed its journal to advertise the discriminatory trade offer of an Arab State.

The proposal by a group of Congressmen to legislate against the conduct of Arab economic warfare on American soil makes sense. It would not end the warfare. That will take years and will come only after the Arabs themselves recognize that their best interests will be served by coming to terms with Israel. But it might help reduce it, and correct our presently unneutral position.

NEWSPAPER ENDORSES OHIO RIVER PARKWAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, for years a number of us in southern Indiana have dreamed of building a scenic parkway along the Ohio River. The wooded hills rising at the river's edge offer unparalleled vistas of green grandeur. Legends are legion, from the times of the earliest Indian canoes, through the steamboat era, to the modern-day river barge. The river has been a source of inspiration for generations; and, with a parkway, thousands can enjoy access to this heritage.

This April, I introduced in the Senate a bill which, in the months ahead, it is hoped, will bring this dream into reality.

Evansville has long shared an interest in this parkway; and support for the project was recently voiced by the Evansville Courier. I call the attention of all Senators to the Courier's valuable comments, and ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Courier, May 17, 1965]

OHIO RIVER PARKWAY WORTH CONSIDERATION

Anyone who has driven a modern superhighway for hours on end can appreciate the relief that comes from a few dozen miles of normal traffic and normal speeds. He can also testify that, at the pace necessary to keep up with traffic on the futuristic highways, there's little chance to see the countryside, much less to comment on it to others in the car. In many stretches it's positively illegal to stop and look at the scenery.

The desire for a change of pace or for a leisurely family drive is part of the reason for an Ohio River parkway. Such a route would parallel Interstate 64, allowing the traveler to leave the superhighway for as many miles as he chose. It also would provide better transportation for communities without a good, through east-west highway.

The prospect of a road that would take advantage of the forest and river vistas of southern Indiana is not as visionary as it might sound. President Johnson says he will recommend a system of new parkways and scenic drives when the Recreation Advisory Council finishes a current study of scenic driving facilities. The study is scheduled for completion this summer.

Last year, the advisory group asked the Department of Commerce to analyze detailed data from the States on existing scenic drives and possible routes for new highways. Undoubtedly development of a parkway system would take some of the pressure off the new interstate highways, and off the drivers who would rather look at sweeping hillside than at a high-riding speedometer.

For those who have traveled the area, the Ohio River route needs no additional recommendation. The others should include some of it in their travel plans. Even under present road conditions, it's a rewarding experience.

This treasury of natural beauty can be opened for many more Americans if a parkway becomes a reality. The cost per mile, incidentally, is far less than the cost of an interstate route. By its very nature, a scenic highway tends to follow natural contours, thus simplifying construction.

State and Federal officials would render a real service to the public by giving the route early consideration.

EXCISE-TAX EXEMPTION FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE SWEEPSTAKES—PART III

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, when House bill 8371, to reduce excise taxes, reaches the Senate floor, it is my hope that it will have been amended in committee so as to provide equitable treatment for the New Hampshire sweepstakes, which is currently raising money for the public-school system of the State of New Hampshire.

It has been somewhat of a surprise to me that Congress, which in the Federal wagering tax law provided specific statutory exemptions for parimutuel racing and gambling casinos, all of which are run for private profit, would not be sympathetic to the consideration of similar consideration for State-operated sweepstakes which have as their sole purpose the raising of funds for the school systems of a sovereign State. I hope the Senate will see the logic of my position, during the debate over House bill 8371, when it reaches us.

There has been some question as to whether the State of New Hampshire would be bound to use the extra funds which would be available if the Federal wagering tax were lifted for educational purposes. This question was anticipated by the State of New Hampshire, which enacted, on July 1, 1963, a law designed to put the issue to rest. This law, chapter 200 of the New Hampshire Laws of 1963, specifies that prizes and awards shall be fixed "in such a manner as will yield the largest net revenue for the benefit of public education, bearing in mind the expenses to be incurred, and all other factors which tend to influence net revenue."

There should be no doubt that the New Hampshire sweepstakes are being run strictly as a fundraising device for educational purposes. Lotteries, of course, have been widely used in the past for purposes of public fundraising. This afternoon, I wish to discuss some of the background of lotteries used to provide public funds in America. I do this, of course, not as an advocate of new lotteries, but, rather, to illustrate the historical background of the New Hampshire sweepstakes. Much of this information is to be found in a book entitled, "Fortune's Merry Wheel, the Lottery in America," written by John Samuel Ezell, and published in 1960 by the Harvard University Press.

The first American lottery was held in England in the spring and summer of the year 1612. According to Mr. Ezell, by the winter of 1611 the Virginia Co. of London was experiencing considerable difficulty in supporting its settlement at Jamestown. The new royal charter of March 12, 1612, authorized the Virginia Co. to conduct lotteries, the funds to be used in the Virginia colony.

The Virginia lottery was apparently a success. It was the only dependable source of revenue for the colony. Sir Edwin Sandys, a member of the Virginia Co., relied upon the lottery for some £8,000, out of his 1621 fiscal year budget of £17,800.

In reading through the pages of colonial history, I have been struck by the number of colleges which received funds from lotteries. These lotteries for educational purposes, direct ancestors of the New Hampshire Sweepstakes, were held to raise funds for Dartmouth, Harvard, Yale, the University of Pennsylvania,

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Brown, Princeton, and Columbia, among others.

My own college, Dartmouth, was no laggard in the use of lotteries for fundraising purposes. On November 25, 1772, the Reverend Dr. Eleazer Wheelock petitioned the New Hampshire Legislature to be allowed to raise £5,000 for a "large house" at 3-year-old Dartmouth College. In a special message, the Governor urged that the college be helped; and the assembly approached the new Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Earl of Dartmouth, for aid. Dr. Wheelock's request for permission to hold a lottery was ultimately turned down; but the idea of using a lottery to raise funds for Dartmouth persisted.

In 1784, Dr. Wheelock's personal appeal for funds for Dartmouth was granted; and the college was allowed up to 3 years to raise, by means of a lottery, not more than £3,000 for a new building of 48 rooms.

Later, in 1787, the trustees of Dartmouth College were granted permission to conduct a lottery to obtain country produce, to raise up to £1,800. This lottery was not a success; and the final drawing of tickets created a small scandal, inasmuch as the drawing took place on the desk of the college chapel.

Dartmouth continued to use the lottery as a fundraising device. Perhaps the most noteworthy Dartmouth lottery was the one authorized by the New Hampshire Legislature on December 31, 1795. New Hampshire law barred the sale of out-of-State lottery tickets; but under an arrangement made with Massachusetts, Harvard lottery tickets would be sold in New Hampshire while Dartmouth lottery tickets were sold in the Bay State. Some 800 tickets were sold in Boston, alone; and the net proceeds to the college amounted to about $4,000. Statewide attention was drawn to a man in southern New Hampshire who tore down the lottery advertisements, asserting that—

> It was an infamous thing, that they pretended that the college was in debt, but really the money would be put in their pockets * * *.

Later investigation revealed that the man was a disgruntled undergraduate engaged in smearing tactics.

The point of this discussion is not to advocate the wide-open use of lotteries for private colleges, or to point out the desperate financial straits of 18th-century Dartmouth. Rather, by this discussion, I would point out that there is a longstanding American tradition regarding the use of lotteries for educational purposes.

Mr. President, it seems quite clear to me that the New Hampshire Sweepstakes, a lottery conducted by a State for the express purpose of raising funds for educational purposes, should be entitled to at least the same favorable tax treatment which Congress has granted to parimutuel races and to private gambling casinos. I hope House bill 8371 will be amended in this respect by the Senate.

PROBLEMS OF THE STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a survey made by the First National City Bank of New York ranks the percentage return on net worth for 41 industries. In 1955, the steel industry was 14th; in 1958, the industry moved to 27th. In 1962, steel was 41st—in last place—on percentage return. By 1963, the industry had moved into 38th position. I call attention to this survey, with regard to an editorial by radio station WLTH, of Gary, Ind., in which the editors pointed out the problems of the steel industry when faced with increased importations of steel.

The editors cited figures on the decline of this vital industry; and the survey substantiates the claim. WLTH called attention to Senate bill 1634, which would require labeling on steel containers sold in the United States, in order to determine their origin, as a remedy to the situation. The editorial and the survey add credit to the need for swift enactment of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WLTH Editorial

While the stock market soars—while American industry, generally, is doing better than believed possible, the steel industry, lifeblood of northwest Indiana, plods along.

Let us hasten to add that the industry is progressive when it comes to the development of new techniques and new products. It is in the forefront in the benefits and opportunities it offers to employees.

But, alas, it suffers in the pocketbook.

After a 5-year lag in the demand for steel—the demand was up last year. Production was up and the return on the sales dollar was up—slightly.

But the steel industry still lagged behind most other industries in return on investment. In 1963, the industry had a return on net worth of 7.2 percent, while the return was 11.5 percent for all industry.

Since 1958, the return for all manufacturing has never been below 10 percent while the return for the steel industry has never been above 8.4 percent.

What are the reasons? Iron Age magazine cites four main factors; but the main one is competition—from other materials such as glass, plastic and aluminum, and competition from foreign producers of steel.

After World War II, when the steel mills of Japan and Europe were pretty well bombed out, the U.S. steel industry stood out like a beacon in a fog.

But since then a great deal of rebuilding has been accomplished. And as the foreign producers rebuilt, they put in the finest in new equipment—better than much of the equipment then in use in the United States of America.

In the meantime, nations which had never been steel producers got into the act—many with financial help from the United States of America and from the United Nations. As a result, the United States imported 6,711,000 tons of steel during 1964 from 43 countries. More than a third of it comes from Japan, and another fifth from Belgium. We even imported steel from such out-of-the-way places as Iceland, Taiwan, Malta, Bermuda, and even a single ton from Pakistan.

The upshot of all these foreign imports is the exportation of jobs from northwest Indiana to all kinds of farflung places.

When you buy a steel product—you have no way of knowing whether it was made in this country.

This brings us to the subject of a new bill presented in the U.S. Senate by Vance Hartke, of Indiana. One of the widest uses for steel is in containers, cans—for meat, vegetables, soft drinks, etc.

The Hartke bill would make it mandatory that steel containers made from foreign steel, be labeled with the name of the country from which the steel came.

Failure of a manufacturer to comply with the regulation could result in a fine of up to $5,000 and imprisonment up to 1 year.

The purpose, of course, is to discourage the use of foreign steel in the manufacture of containers, and it might prove a deterrent. But even if it didn't slow down the use of the foreign steel, it would at least, make us all aware of the growing problem which the steel industry has faced—almost alone.

We trust and pray that there will never be another war, any larger that is, than the brush fire war—but if there should be—it behooves the United States of America to have a strong steel industry.

FINE WORK OF THE BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as all other Senators do, I receive every day numerous complaints and protests against legislation or actions of the Federal Government. Therefore, I was particularly delighted the other day, when a letter from Richard Kobler, of the Thomas A. Edison Laboratory, in West Orange, N.J., came to my desk.

Mr. Kobler had taken time to write me a three-page letter in which he told me of the very fine cooperation he and his firm had received from the Bureau of International Commerce of the Commerce Department. He pointed out that, due to the Bureau's exemplary efforts on his behalf, he had developed a substantial volume of business in Great Britain—business which he had not anticipated, and which he attributed in great part to the activities of the Bureau of International Commerce. As Mr. Kobler quite correctly pointed out, the activities of the Bureau of International Commerce have not only assisted his firm, but, in doing so, have made a good contribution to the correction of our balance-of-payments problem.

In his letter, he spoke most highly of Mr. Clausen, export operations officer in Washington; Mr. Aronowitz, of the New York office; and, particularly, of Mr. Donald S. Kilby, director of the London Trade Center. To these gentlemen, I offer my thanks for the help they have given to an American businessman.

I know that all Senators will be interested in Mr. Kobler's thoughtful letter, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Thomas A. Edison Laboratory,
West Orange, N.J., May 27, 1965.

Hon. Harrison Williams,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: If I were to guess what the mail of a U.S. Senator looks like, I would probably assume that it must bear some resemblance, at least in part, to some of the mail an executive in American industry receives, namely complaints about performance and petitions for the expediting of actions. It is my sincere hope that this letter, if my above assumptions are true, will constitute a pleasant exception because, while not solicited by anyone, it deals with an outstanding performance of one of our Government agencies.

In his constant search for two facts and improvements, a citizen of a great democracy, such as ours, is obliged to analyze and criticize; what is, however, frequently overlooked, is his equally important obligation to point up fine performance in order to encourage not only continuation but possibly even expansion of such successful activities.

In this spirit, Senator Williams, I would like to draw your attention to the Bureau of International Commerce of the U.S. Department of Commerce, and in particular to the U.S. Trade Center in London, England.

Over the past 5 years, our laboratory developed what is now known as the Edison Responsive Environment Learning System (ERE), a highly sophisticated multisensual device with which children as little as 2½ years of age can teach themselves the skills of reading and writing without any adult interference; retarded, mentally ill, and even schizophrenic and autistic children have benefited from this interplay to such an extent that a number of them have been saved from lifelong institutionalization and some of them even returned to school. For your kind perusal I am enclosing an operational manual and a pamphlet produced by our marketing affiliate, the Responsive Environments Corp. in New York City.

Mr. Kurt Swinton, the English associate and director of the Responsive Environments Corp., initiated the thought to exhibit ERE overseas and to have it make its debut at the audiovisual show held by the U.S. Trade Center in London from May 11 to May 21, 1965 at their exhibit hall (57 St. James Street, London S.W. 1).

In spite of the enormous expenses involved in such an enterprise—the air shipment of some 1,500 pounds of equipment, round-trip transportation, and several weeks of stay in England of myself and two of my engineers—we decided with "tongue in cheek" to embark upon this adventure.

To a great extent our decision to participate in this show at all was influenced by the alertness and efficiency of the Government personnel involved, particularly of Mr. Clausen, export operations officer in Washington, Mr. Aronowitz, of the New York office and, above all, of Mr. Donald S. Kilby, director of the London Trade Center. They not only relieved us from much of the terrible paperwork which usually would be involved in the back and forth shipment of such equipment but they took care of customs clearance both here and in England, of expediting transportation, etc.

Our real surprise, however, came after we arrived in London. Mr. Kilby and his staff had prepared a very attractive exhibition center, dramatized the exhibit of our instrument particularly within an excellent exhibition area and, most importantly, did such an outstanding job in public relations that our instrument received a reception which exceeded even our own expectations. In collaboration with Mr. Swinton, Mr. Kilby and his staff attracted all major newspapers and magazines, both major television and radio networks, released fine announcements and invitations to many hundreds of important personalities in government as well as in behavioral and psychiatric research, with the result that several hundred of the most important people in England viewed, operated, and discussed with us in most enthusiastic terms our instrument.

Messages to our staff were promptly relayed by the central switchboard, public address and telephone booth system: room for conferences was supplied; all this enabled us to conduct serious business and we had a feeling that our British friends enjoyed visiting and revisiting with us.

On the basis of the success of this show, we and our marketing affiliates seriously contemplate to set up an overseas company in London, charged with the distribution of the ERE-Instrument for the total European territory. Our British friends assure us that quite a few instruments will be sold almost immediately and that the success of these instruments in turn will stimulate further considerable business. Since each of these instruments sell here in the United States for $30,000, such export could be quite interesting not only for us as a company but also as far as its contribution to a favorable trade balance is concerned.

In concluding I would like to say to you, Senator Williams, that this type of corporation between government and business should not only be continued but jointly expanded. The inertia some sectors of American business have to start an overseas operation can be counteracted by this kind of stimulus and cooperation. The mere fact that representatives of American industry can enter into a place overseas, completely familiar with local business habits, is in itself highly desirable. The showing of industrial products under these most favorable conditions can not help but stimulate business and the desire of American industry to increase their efforts in international trade.

It is my sincere hope that you shall find occasion to point out some of these facts when the time comes for Congress to review the activities of this branch of our Government. I myself have several ideas which may further promote our international trade. Should you so desire, I shall be most pleased to discuss same with you.

Very cordially yours,

Richard Kobler,
Manager.

TELONIC INDUSTRIES RECEIVES E-AWARD

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on May 20, 1965, Telonic Industries, Inc., of Beech Grove, Ind., received the President's award for excellence in the field of export increases. The company is to be commended for this outstanding record in a time when the administration, Congress, and the public are vitally concerned with the trade and payments gap. Telonic Industries, Inc., is certain to increase this commendable record during 1965; and I feel certain that all Senators join me in wishing this company an even more successful year. I ask unanimous consent that material describing its operation be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Telonic Industries, Inc., Receives President's E-Award

Telonic Industries, Inc., of Beech Grove, Ind., on May 20, 1965, received the President's E-Award for excellence in exporting. The award was presented to C. R. Wainwright, Telonic president, by Anthony J. Buchar, Director of the Chicago field office, U.S. Department of Commerce, at a 4 o'clock ceremony and open house on the plant grounds of Telonic Industries.

The citation for the award says that Telonic "has substantially increased export sales of its electronic equipment through initiative in redesign to meet foreign requirements, thereby effecting a breakthrough in a market where competitive conditions are difficult."

In a market where 6 percent represents a normal export figure, Telonic Industries, Inc., is currently exporting more than one-quarter of its total business. This unusually high ratio is attributable to intensified marketing and adaptation of product design to the oversea market.

As an example of product design, prior to 1959 Telonic Industries was marketing a sweep generator in the United States for laboratory and production line adjustment, alinement and insepction of the RF channels and of sections of television receivers and of other VHF circuits. In 1959 Telonic's president toured Western Europe and realized the potential market there. Telonic made its SV–6 available to the European market. To order the instrument for use in Italy the customer would order the model SV–6F (the "F" denoting foreign), specifying Italian standards.

Then realizing that the European market could continue to grow and the resulting paperwork could lead to errors in transmitting orders to the production department, Telonic designed a revolutionary new model. All the extra optional features of the SV–6 were incorporated into the new instrument and each model number represented standard frequencies for a particular country. An Italian order then need only specify an SV–8.

Having worked through an export representative for 10 years, Telonic decided the interests of European customers would be better served by dealing direct. Since this major change the following has been accomplished.

1. Catalogs furnished to the French and Spanish markets in their own tongues, and presently under preparation is a German catalog. A short form catalog in the local languages will soon be available throughout Europe.

2. Direct shipments from Indianapolis wherever practical. Also, some equipment is inventoried with the representative, making off-the-shelf delivery possible.

3. Increased commissions to European representatives, thus furnishing additional incentive. With this increased financial assistance, representatives have improved their technical and financial capabilities, resulting in increased sales effectiveness.

4. Sales training visits by key engineering and sales people have stimulated European representatives to add cooperative advertising and trade show displays to the company promotional program. Representatives have shown equipment in England, Holland, Germany, and France.

All printing plates used for U.S. advertising are available to European representatives for use in their country's publications.

Representatives in Europe are provided demonstrators of most commonly purchased items. These are sent on consignment. All shipments are made by air, furnishing 24-hour delivery in most cases. A price differential due to duties, etc., exists, however it has been overcome through production of a quality product, state-of-the-art engineering, and modified product design to meet the exact market requirements.

It is organizations like this, that are responsible for our exports increasing from $19.6 billion in 1960 to over $26.5 billion in 1964, an increase of over $6 billion or more than 27 percent. For every additional billion dollars in export sales there are created 134,000 jobs for American workmen, which means that a total of 3.5 million Americans are employed today due to the exports during 1964 being over $25 billion.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

GREETINGS OF SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY TO ADATH ISRAEL CENTER, OF DOVER, N.J.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the many functions I enjoy as a U.S. Senator is participation in the numerous community and State functions to which I am graciously invited. It is always a matter of great regret when I find myself unable to participate in such a function—in this case, the recent dedication ceremonies of the new Dover Jewish Center, Adath Israel, in Dover, N.J. Again, I extend to the Jewish people in Dover my heartiest congratulations for this external evidence on their growth and progress.

I ask unanimous consent that my brief greetings to them on that important day be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY

Even before Moses, the synagogue was the embodiment of Judaism, and the prophet Jeremiah referred to it as "Beth Am," the House of the Prophet. Your synagogue has served the cultural and religious needs of your people and has been an inspiration and hope for the future for Jewish residents in your community.

May the Almighty grant you and your congregants many years of life and good health, so that together you may continue to cultivate your faith, your work for Israel, and a nobler society for the entire human family.

Shalom.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POLICY ON VIETNAM

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, my attention has recently been called to two different positive approaches to President Johnson's policy on Vietnam.

The first is a Memorial Day sermon by Rev. William D. Goble, minister of the First Baptist Church, of Manchester, N.H. Reverend Goble made a number of very sound points in his sermon; and I feel that he came straight to the point when he said:

> One of the central lessons which 20th century history teaches us is that aggressors must be stopped soon and not allowed to gobble one country after another.

Mr. President, his sermon was a fine one, and I feel that it deserves the wider reading which will be brought about by publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the sermon be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS AMERICA DOING IN VIETNAM AND IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC?

(Luke 10: 25–37: A sermon preached in the First Baptist Church of Manchester, N.H., by Rev. William D. Goble, minister, May 30, 1965)

About 450 young American men have lost their lives in the undeclared war in Vietnam, which has been going on actually since 1954. This is about the same number of Americans who lost their lives in the Spanish-American War of 1898. About 19 American men have lost their lives in the recent conflict in the Dominican Republic. On this Memorial Day, 1965, we want to remember and honor these men who "gave the last full measure of their devotion for their country." One of our own church members, Mark Tracy, is a marine and is fighting in the Dominican Republic. I understand that on the day his company landed in that country, one of his buddies with whom he had gone through training was shot with a machinegun and his body lay in the street for some time because the marines were pinned down by the gunfire. Peter Coogins, a member of our neighboring church, St. Paul's Methodist Church, was shot down in Vietnam where he was serving with the Air Force. He survived, was decorated, and is now, I believe, back home. Thus, the wars in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic become very personal to those who have friends, sons, husbands who are involved.

Now, some people believe that America ought not to be involved in those wars at all. Recently on a number of college campuses, students and faculty members have had "teach-ins" which have largely ended up with a strong condemnation of our country's involvement in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic. Some Congressmen such as Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, have been equally critical of U.S. involvement in those countries. I recently was sent a summary of their statements entitled, "The Conscience of the Senate on the Vietnam War." Some clergymen of all faiths have also protested these military actions. About a month ago I received an urgent request to sign a petition to protest the Vietnam war. Over 2,600 clergymen signed it and the New York Times carried a full-page statement by these clergymen. I did not sign it. And even more recently, clergymen, including myself, were asked to go to Washington to demonstrate against our military action in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic. Many did go, but I did not.

Now, although most of us may disagree with these sentiments, and I for one certainly do disagree, we must at the same time respect for the most part this protest. I personally know some of the clergy who have been protesting. One of their main reasons is a hatred for war and violence, a pacifist philosophy. Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, one of the national leaders of the protest movements, is an American Baptist pastor with whom I worked in Syracuse while I was in the university. He has always been a most highly respected pacifist. And we need the pacifist testimony, to be reminded constantly that war is morally wrong, and an admission of human failure to find right solutions. Some of the Congressmen who have been protesting, such as Senator FRANK CHURCH, honestly feel that America is overextended in the world, that we cannot be everywhere at the same time. We can respect their point of view also, even though we may disagree with it. Of course, a few of the protesters are "beatniks," unwashed youth who don't like any authority. A few may even be Communist agents.

Many clergy, including myself, feel that although war, any war, is unfortunate, yet sometimes, under some conditions, it is necessary for the United States to wage war, just as under some circumstances it is necessary for a policeman to use violence to restrain a criminal. I feel that the Vietnam and the Dominican Republic conflicts are two wars in which the United States must be involved. When I was in Washington last February, I had the opportunity to be briefed by the State Department on the Vietnam war, and I have read many pamphlets on the subject, and I am convinced that the United States is doing the right thing. May I amplify my belief by suggesting several points.

First of all, there is no doubt at all that communism is bent on world conquest, one way or another. Russia may favor nonviolent means to world conquest, while Red China may favor violent conflict, but the ultimate goal is the same: world conquest. "We will bury you" they boast. Communism has already succeeded in conquering East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and other East European countries, and in conquering North Korea, and North Vietnam. Communism is out to conquer the rest of the world, including England, France, and America, and in every country they have agents at work and are trying every means to subvert these countries. This is what the Communists are trying to do in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic, and they have been at it for many years. In 1954, we promised South Vietnam that we would help her defend herself against Communist aggression. We have made similar promises to Thailand, to the Philippines, to Cambodia, to Japan, and to any other Asian country that needs, and wants, our help. We are in Vietnam to help South Vietnam combat communism, to keep free. And it is clear that we will assist the other nations also to keep free.

And we are in the Dominican Republic for the same reason. The Castro-type Communists tried to subvert the Juan Bosch rebel forces and take them over. A special committee of the Organization of American States recently made this absolutely clear. This country could not allow another Communist Cuba to be established within the Western Hemisphere. We are there also, incidentally, to protect the lives of many American citizens.

This U.S. action is, of course, partly in our own self-interest. We know that if we do not take a strong stand in Asia and Europe against communism, communism will be encouraged to think us weak, and eventually we would be faced with a Communist invasion of our own shores. One of the central lessons which 20th century history teaches us is that aggressors must be stopped soon and not allowed to gobble one country after another.

The strong stand we are taking in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic is not really a new stand for us at all. In 1914, and again in 1941 the United States came out of isolation to stop German world conquest. And in the postwar years the United States has kept Greece from going Communist; it fought a bitter war in Korea to contain communism; it has poured at least $100 billion in foreign aid to help restore Europe and Asia and prevent communism from using postwar poverty and chaos as a springboard for action. The action which we have taken has halted violent communism in Europe; we now must apply the same technique in Asia and in South America.

As President Johnson said in his talk at the University of Johns Hopkins (April 7, 1965) "we want nothing for ourselves, only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way." We are not bound on any kind of imperialism; we do not seek a Pax Americana. We are spending our billions and risking our lives because we believe in freedom, both for ourselves and for others who want it.

Nor do we seek, either, destruction of communism as such, or Russia and Red China. Our American stand is not part of a holy crusade to conquer communism or any nation. If we tried that, not only would that be unchristian, but also it would result in atomic world war. We seek only to stop communism from going any further in its world conquest. We say in the word of the Bible, "Hitherto thou shalt come, but no further." Of course, we hope, and we ultimately believe, that in time communism will change, that it will in time respect the rights of other nations and compete with us only in economic and ideological terms. But in the meantime, it must be contained by force.

Second, even as we take this firm stand in Asia and in South America, we must always be ready for "unconditional negotiation," to use President Johnson's words. When the Communists have had enough, let us be willing to sit down with them and negotiate. Even Communists will keep an agreement if it is to their national interest to do so. We know that military force really accomplished only a negative result: it permits negotiation.

And third, we must continue to be concerned about the economic and political and social welfare of Asia and South America, as we have been concerned about these in Europe. After all, communism is an idea which feeds on poverty and chaos. The idea cannot be beaten only on the battlefield, but must be conquered in the minds and hungry stomachs of people. The Alliance for Progress is doing this, and so is the Peace Corps. And our missionaries have been doing this for years. The President has urged a giant Mekong Valley project, which would help bring prosperity to Asia.

We usually think of the parable of the Good Samaritan as concerned only with individual responsibility to help others. Might it not also be a challenge for a really Christian nation to demonstrate a concern for whole peoples, to help them recover from the ravages of a robber, and also to put the robber in jail? We cannot sit idly by and let the world be devastated by communism. Our help is needed and we are offering it now in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

The National Council of Churches (February 1965) urges our country to try to bring peace and to help all peoples achieve freedom and prosperity. We agree.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, the Christian Science Monitor published an editorial entitled "Program for Vietnam." The editorial presents another favorable appraisal of the administration's Vietnam policy. The editorial ends as follows:

> It is encouraging to note that, while American determination in southeast Asia has not flagged, there is official realization that warfare alone cannot possibly solve Vietnam's problems.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 15, 1965]

PROGRAM FOR VIETNAM

President Johnson's address to the editorial cartoonists has provided further valuable insight into Washington's readings on the Vietnamese war.

More starkly and forcefully than ever before, Washington has let it be known that it looks upon that war as part of a Chinese effort to eliminate American power and influence in southeast Asia as a means to the domination of all Asia. Not only did the President reiterate his determination to forestall the Chinese but he also sought to separate Hanoi and Peiping by stressing that peace talks would be to Hanoi's advantage and that a peaceful North Vietnam could expect American economic aid.

Particularly interesting—if this Washington reading is right—was the statement that the Communists are coming to realize that there is no possibility of forcing an American withdrawal. But equally significant was the admission that "there is no purely military solution in sight for either side." These two circumstances make all the more logical and necessary early efforts to find an acceptable basis for peace negotiations.

But it is clear that Washington will insist that such talks do not further Chinese imperialism toward the rest of Asia. And there is ample reason to believe that both Moscow and Hanoi (to say nothing of the rest of non-Chinese Asia itself) at least secretly see eye to eye with America on this.

One can expect particularly bitter reaction from Peiping to President Johnson's clear effort to drive a wedge between North Vietnam and Communist China. There can be few more effective ways to do this than by convincing Hanoi that China, as the President stated, "desires the war to continue whatever the cost to their allies." Faced with an American determination not to withdraw from Vietnam so long as the war continues, Hanoi might well ask itself how long it should bear an increasing sacrifice from which China hopes to extract advantage.

Designed to lend substance to his offer of aid to a peaceful North Vietnam was the President's optimistic report that rapid progress had been made in drafting the "massive, cooperative development effort for southeast Asia" mentioned in his April 7 address. We are particularly happy to note that it is the United Nations which is setting up the new mechanism for this effort. This has many practical and psychological advantages.

It is encouraging to note that, while American determination in southeast Asia has not flagged, there is official realization that warfare alone cannot possibly solve Vietnam's problems.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the problems of American resistance to Communist aggression will be with us for a long time to come. It is really encouraging that in these trying days, Americans are giving their support and understanding to President Johnson.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

NASA AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7717) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

SENATE RESOLUTION COMMENDING HELEN KELLER ON HER 85TH BIRTHDAY ON JUNE 27

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield briefly to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 110, submitted on behalf of myself and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 110

Whereas Miss Helen Keller will celebrate her 85th birthday on June 27, 1965; and

Whereas this remarkable woman, through her triumph over the blindness and deafness which struck her in infancy, has been a symbol of faith and courage and a challenging inspiration to all mankind; and

Whereas she has tirelessly devoted herself to the improvement of conditions for the physically handicapped throughout the world; and

Whereas as counselor to the American Foundation for the Blind, she has guided programs to advance the economic, cultural and social opportunities of blind and deaf-blind persons throughout the United States; and

Whereas through the Helen Keller World Crusade for the Blind, administered by the American Foundation for Overseas Blind, she has inspired programs for the education and rehabilitation of blind persons around the globe; and

Whereas Congress and the Chief Executive have expressed deep concern in improvement of conditions among the physically handicapped, and have initiated constantly expanding programs to this worthwhile end: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, in recognition of the vast contributions made by Miss Helen Keller to the well-being of all humanity, the Senate hereby extends its greeting and best wishes to Miss Keller on the occasion of her 85th birthday, which will occur on June 27, 1965; and be it further

Resolved, That all citizens of the United States are invited to participate in this recognition of Miss Helen Keller by making her 85th birthday the occasion for reaffirmation of their determination to assist in the improvement and expansion of facilities and programs for the relief, education and rehabilitation of all handicapped persons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the preamble is agreed to.

NASA AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7717) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the bill be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as amended be treated as original text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, we have before us today H.R. 7717, which as amended by the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, authorizes appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations for fiscal year 1966. I am happy to report that, as in all previous years, the members of your committee have agreed without objection to report this measure to the Senate.

This is NASA's eighth annual budget, the third in a row to remain at about the $5.2 billion level, and the second consecutive time that NASA's budget request was less than the request of the previous year.

NASA's increased managerial competence in recent years is gratifying to your committee, and is reflected in the low percentage of the cut made from NASA's request.

NASA asked the Congress for $5,260 million. The House Committee on Science and Astronautics recommended an authorization of $5,183,844,850, a reduction of 1½ percent. The authorization act passed the House May 6 by the overwhelming vote of 389 to 11 without any further amendments.

Your committee recommends an authorization of $5,196,826,350, of which $4,533,350,000 is for research and development, $67,376,350 is for construction of facilities, and $596,100,000 is for administrative expenses. This recommendation is $63,173,650 less than NASA requested, and $12,981,500 more than the House approved.

The level of the 1966 NASA budget is accounted for by the fact that it is designed to preserve the momentum of the broad-based existing program formulated by President Kennedy and the Congress in 1961, rather than to provide funds for newly approved programs.

There is, in fact, only one major new project approved by the executive branch during the year for which NASA is requesting authorization from the Congress: Voyager, which will send unmanned spacecraft to Mars by 1971. Voyager's principal objective is to gather information about the Martian environment—particularly whether or not life exists on that planet.

The national space program is designed to give this Nation preeminence in space, so that whatever any man can do there, freemen can do; and so that man can learn to use the vastness surrounding this planet for his benefit and that of his children and of generations yet unborn.

To accomplish this we must push back the frontiers of knowledge and pursue a course that requires us to learn new things and to develop new operational and management techniques—knowledge that will be necessary for whatever we eventually try to do in space.

Our major space effort is the Apollo program, whose objective is to place a man on the Moon and return him safely to Earth by 1970.

Mr. President, we are well on our way to fulfilling this goal. The Gemini program, which is now underway, is a necessary preliminary to a lunar landing. Already we have had the first successful Gemini mission of Major Grissom and Lieutenant Commander Young. Tomorrow the fourth Gemini spacecraft will be launched and is scheduled to circle the earth 62 times in 4 days. This will more than double the amount of manned space flight time the United States now has to its credit. Fiscal year 1966 will be the peak year for Gemini flights; launches are scheduled to take place every 3 months during this period. With the completion of the Gemini program we will have gained the operational experience we need for extended manned space flight, particularly with respect to crew performance and the effects of space flight on the astronauts' physical condition. In addition, we will have perfected the vital techniques of rendezvous and docking.

The Apollo program serves as a focus for our entire space effort and so in a sense we are sending men to the moon to preserve the role of space leadership for the United States. What we are striving for is preeminence, excellence, and leadership. To do this we must develop the technical capability required, build the equipment, and develop the operational techniques needed to master this new environment, not to conquer or control it in an aggressive or belligerent manner, but so no one else can deny us the use of the space environment for peaceful purposes. That is why we have established the goal of going to the moon in this decade.

One day in 1969 or 1970 three brave men will leave for the Moon. About 2½ days after leaving the surface of the Earth two of these men will land on the surface of the Moon while the third will wait in a lunar orbit. A day or so later the two will leave the surface of the Moon, rendezvous with their colleague and all three return to Earth. We hope they will be first, but more importantly they will be Americans—they will be American trained, leave from an American facility in American equipment made by American know-how and America will have demonstrated its mastery of the space environment. As long as there is history men will remember when it was done and who did it.

The Apollo program is approaching the critical period of ground and flight testing that will prove out the design and development of the Apollo hardware. Since Apollo is both the focus of our entire space effort and the most costly program in the budget, your committee spent a great deal of time examining this program and found it sound and ably managed.

The national space program consists of more than Gemini and Apollo—the manned space flight efforts.

The 1966 NASA budget provides funds for the continued development of such promising projects as weather satellites; solar, astronomical, and geophysical observatories; and unmanned flights to the Moon and the near planets.

The budget provides funds for advanced research in the fields of aeronautics, nuclear and chemical propulsion, and auxiliary power systems.

NASA's interest in directly bringing the benefits of the space age to our universities and business communities is reflected in its sustaining university and technology utilization programs.

Finally, the budget provides funds for facilities in which to carry out NASA's work, and for salaries and the other administrative expenses involved in employing nearly 34,000 men and women to carry out the program.

The construction of facilities authorization has gone down from $716,060,000 in fiscal year 1964, to $262,880,500 in fiscal year 1965, to the $67,376,350 recommended by your committee for fiscal year 1966.

NASA started 7 years ago with a few small facilities inherited from the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and later picked up some facilities from the Defense Department. For the most part, however, NASA has had to construct its own space age facilities. That task is nearly done, and is reflected in the reduced construction of facilities budget.

The act also includes four minor legislative changes. One of them expresses the sense of the Congress that the national interest would benefit from wider distribution of Government research and development funds. Your committee amended the House language so that it cannot be implied that the Congress favors overturning long-established procurement regulations, or that Congress no longer wants NASA to obtain maximum value for the taxpayers' dollars in awarding contracts.

It has been my privilege to be a member of this committee since it was created and, while we have worked diligently in the past on similar bills, I cannot remember a time when a NASA authorization bill has received the scrutiny that we have given it this year.

As a preliminary, the committee held hearings on space launch vehicles on January 26 and 27. Witnesses from both NASA and DOD were heard. The committee was anxious to learn about the development of these vehicles by these agencies and particularly about the cooperation and coordination between them.

The committee began its hearings on the authorization bill on March 8 and held 10 days of open hearings, 1 day of classified hearings, and 2 days of executive session before reporting this bill. These hearings are printed in three parts, and a copy of each, along with the report, is on each Senator's desk.

In part 1 of its hearings, the committee reviewed the Nation's space programs, looking particularly hard at the management of those programs. In the second part of its hearings, the committee reviewed in detail NASA's budget request. Part 3 of the hearings contains material discussing NASA's post-Apollo plans.

Mr. President, your committee is generally satisfied with NASA's management of its current projects. We examined criticism that NASA was spending too much on certain programs—such as Apollo—and not enough on others—such as advanced aeronautical research—and concluded that NASA's budget provided a well-balanced program within the scope of what must be limited funds.

The NASA undertakings for which some critics believe too little is being spent are being carried out in some form by other agencies as well. For example, advanced aeronautical research is being done by the Defense Department and Federal Aviation Agency among others, and research in space nuclear auxiliary power—SNAP—is being performed by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Space projects require years of leadtime to build the launch vehicles and spacecraft, to train the men, and to develop the telemetric instruments needed. If we are to avoid an embarrassing and costly pause in our efforts to understand space and learn to operate spacecraft in that environment, then decisions regarding post-Apollo space activities must be made soon, and NASA should give Congress all of the facts relating to alternatives being considered. We feel this is especially necessary for future manned space flight projects.

We, therefore, urge NASA to present a well-balanced post-Apollo program to the Congress at an early date, and in any event not later than the 1967 budget.

Any criticism, however, does not, Mr. President detract from the soundness of NASA's 1966 budget, as unanimously reported out to this body by your committee.

Mr. President, your committee is proud of the fine job NASA has done in preparing this budget, and recommends to the Senate that it approve H.R. 7717 as amended.

In addition to report No. 188, your committee has prepared a detailed summary of its actions in regard to H.R. 7717. I ask unanimous consent that the summary appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The total amount of money requested for NASA for fiscal year 1966 is $5,196,826,350. This amount is divided into three main categories: Research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For research and development the request is $4,533,350,000 which is divided into five main areas: Manned space flight, space science and applications, advanced research and technology, tracking and data acquisition, and technology utilization.

Manned space flight

For manned space flight the request is $3,225,485,000. The major programs are the Gemini, Apollo, and advanced missions.

Gemini, $242,100,000

Gemini is our two-manned space flight program whose objectives are to develop a capability to conduct specific experiments in support of Apolla and Department of Defense programs, and for scientific investigations. Gemini will develop capabilities for flights up to 2-weeks duration, rendezvous and docking procedures, spacecraft maneuvering, extra-vehicular activity, and controlled reentry.

The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Apollo, $2,973,385,000

Apollo, the Nation's most ambitious space program, is designed to land astronauts on the Moon and return by the end of this decade. More important, however, is the larger goal of developing a broad national capability for manned space exploration and to achieve a position of leadership for the United States. The Apollo program is an extensive one which requires the development of new boosters and engines, more sophisticated and reliable spacecraft, a highly complex lunar landing craft, and advanced reentry systems. In addition, there is under construction a vast network of ground-based facilities, including manufacturing plants, test stands, launch facilities and tracking stations. At its apex then, the Apollo program will provide for this Nation an extensive capability to undertake a variety of future alternatives for space exploration and exploitation.

The House reduced the request for Apollo by $30 million in an across-the-board cut. The committee recognized that the Apollo program is entering the critical period of ground and flight testing to prove out the design and development of the Apollo hardware. Consequently, your committee believed that, with respect to this portion of the program, NASA should have adequate funds to fully support the test program and also be equipped to undertake remedial action promptly if such is indicated by test results. For this reason, your committee restored the $30 million House reduction. However, it was noted that a total of $58 million was included in the combined Apollo and advanced missions program requests for studies of future manned missions. In view of the level of planning effort and the substantial funds authorized for such study work in prior years, it appeared that the fiscal year 1966 request was excessive and therefore your committee reduced the funds for Apollo extension systems from $48 million to $24 million, a reduction of 50 percent.

Advanced Mission Studies, $10 Million

This program provides funds to allow NASA to study possible advanced manned space systems which might be needed in the future.

The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Space sciences and applications

For space sciences and applications the request is $773,015,000. The major programs are physics and astronomy, lunar and planetary exploration, sustaining university program, launch vehicle development, launch vehicle procurement, bioscience, meteorological satellites, communication satellites, and applications technology satellites.

Physics and Astronomy, $165,900,000

This program is designed to gain knowledge about the space environment of the earth, with particular emphasis on the effect of solar activities. Research is conducted in the upper atmosphere, the ionsphere, and space with a variety of vehicles including balloons, airplanes, and sounding rockets, as well as satellites and space probes. Major projects in this program are the solar observatories, astronomical observatories, geophysical observatories and the Explorer series.

The House reduced this item by $6.2 million, the amount identified with the fifth orbiting astronomical observatory, since this observatory is not scheduled until 1969. Your committee concurs.

In addition, the House believed the $5.4 million associated with the seventh orbiting geophysical observatory should be deleted because the launch schedule appeared overly ambitious.

Your committee believes that the more that is known about the space environment between the earth and the moon, the less will be the risks involved for the Apollo astronauts who will soon be traversing this region. Consequently, this $5.4 million was restored.

Lunar and Planetary Exploration, $213,115,000

These programs are designed for unmanned exploration of the moon, space beyond the moon, and the planets. The objective of the lunar program is to obtain data on the structure and topography of the lunar surface, including the physical, chemical, geodetic, and gravitational properties. The three projects in the lunar program are the Ranger (now completed), the Surveyor, which will soft land on the moon, and the lunar orbiter, which will orbit the moon taking pictures. The planetary programs have so far concentrated on the two nearest planets, Venus and Mars. The successful Mariner II flight to Venus returned an enormous amount of new information about that planet. The Mariner IV, launched last November, is expected to rendezvous with Mars in July of this year and will complete that program.

The next planetary project is the Voyager which is being initiated this year and with an initial operational flight to Mars in 1971.

Also included in this category are the Pioneer missions which are designed to obtain other important data on the interplanetary media. Other studies are being made for possible future flights closer to the Sun and farther away than Mars.

NASA requested $4 million for a lunar roving vehicle to be utilized in the later Surveyor flights. The House reduced this amount by $1.5 million, recommending that the remaining $2.5 million be used to study the feasibility of the concept in greater detail, together with a reconsideration of the need. Your committee concurs.

The House also reduced $1 million for initiation of block II lunar orbiters, stating that they were not convinced of the need. Your committee concurs.

The Voyager is a new program, the ultimate cost of which will probably exceed $1 billion. Consequently, your committee has strongly urged NASA to submit this project as a separate line item in succeeding budget requests.

Bioscience, $31,500,000

This program is designed to gain information regarding life processes outside the earth's environment. It will provide a better basic understanding of these processes, as well as develop information essential to long-duration manned space flight. Much of the research is ground-based, but also included is the biosatellite program. The biosatellite will be a recoverable capsule designed to orbit for periods of from 3 to 30 days. It will investigate effects of the space environment on lower forms of life, plants, small animals, and primates.

The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Meteorological Satellites, $42,700,000

This program is designed to develop satellites which will take sophisticated measurements of the earth's meteorological phenomena. The highly successful Tiros project is nearing the end of its development period and is due to become a totally operational

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

system under the U.S. Weather Bureau at the beginning of 1966. NASA will continue to do advanced meteorological satellite research with the Nimbus program. In addition, NASA conducts a substantial meteorological sounding rocket program designed to obtain information in the areas from 20 to 60 miles above the earth's surface.

The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Communication Satellites, $2,800,000

This program is designed to assure the development of the technology of communications satellites and satellite systems which may be required in the future. NASA's efforts in this area have been sharply reduced in recent years as a result of the establishment of the Communications Satellite Corp. Also included in this area is NASA's preliminary research into the possibility of the development of a navigational satellite system, although no firm program has yet been approved.

The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Under the communications satellite program there are included $400,000 in funds for "navigation satellite system" feasibility studies.

The idea of a navigation satellite goes back for almost a hundred years, and indeed, the Navy now has an operational system of such satellites although many of the details are classified. From testimony received by the committee it appears that a nonmilitary navigation satellite system could fulfill the growing need for commercial navigational aids as well as for air and sea traffic control, rescue missions, and so forth. There currently exists a Joint Navigation Satellite Committee, chaired by NASA with five other agencies participating: Interior, Treasury, Defense, Commerce, and FAA. This Joint Committee is investigating the feasibility of such a system and is preparing a report due to be completed during the second half of calendar year 1965. In testimony submitted for the record, however, NASA made the following statement: "The Joint Navigation Satellite Committee is not considering national policy nor who might be responsible for establishing or controlling an operational system. The Committee's report will be furnished to the agency heads represented on the Joint Navigation Satellite Committee for any implementation of effort by the respective agencies * * *. The mandate for the establishment of policy * * * is very broad among the charters of the various Government agencies."

Your committee respectfully submits that national policy concerning a global system is not likely to be established by sending a report to six agency heads and waiting for "implementation of effort by the respective agencies."

It is therefore requested that 30 days after the submission of the Joint Navigation Satellite Committee's report to the agency heads, but not later than January 30, 1966, NASA report to the Congress on whether any steps are being taken to establish a uniform national policy toward a global navigation satellite system.

Your committee believes that a navigation satellite system might well become another useful application of space technology whereby the public interest would be served and that establishment of national policy will be necessary if such a system is to be developed.

Applications Technology Satellites, $28,700,000

This program is designed to improve the technology of satellite operation for possible use in a number of advanced applications systems. There is need both in the Department of Defense and NASA for improved spacecraft technology in the areas of stabilization, orientation, and stationkeeping in orbits up to synchronous altitudes. Much effort will be made here to develop gravity gradient stabilization controls, electrical subsystems, spacecraft antennas, and to study the basic nature of wave propagation, particularly in the high frequency bands.

The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Launch Vehicle Development, $63,600,000

The purpose of this program is to develop launch vehicles in order to insure that they will be available to meet mission requirements. Currently only the Centaur vehicle is being developed under this category. The Scout and Delta, previously developed in this fashion, are now procured under the next category as completely developed vehicles.

During its launch vehicle hearings in January of this year the committee determined that both DOD and NASA believed that the launch vehicles currently operational or under development, would adequately support the national requirements now envisioned through 1975. Your committee believes that NASA, in complete cooperation with DOD, should maintain a supporting research and technology program on launch vehicle requirements and developments to provide a solid base for continuing a high level of launch vehicle competence. The House, as a result of its review, felt that this activity was more properly in the province of the Office of Advanced Research and Technology, and, that some overlap existed between this program and the sustaining engineering and maintenance portion of the launch vehicle procurement program. Accordingly, the House assessed a $3 million reduction.

During committee hearings it was determined that NASA paid in fiscal year 1964 over $170 million to the DOD for DOD-developed launch vehicles and associated launch services. NASA officials have stated that among existing military and NASA launch vehicles, continuing studies are being undertaken to strengthen and improve the composition and capability of the vehicles. It is not infrequent to find one stage of a launch vehicle NASA developed and another compatible stage a development of the military. Studies concerning the compatibility of vehicles and modification requirements are a necessary effort toward the long-term goal of standardizing our launch vehicle family. Your committee, therefore, restored this reduction.

Launch Vehicle Procurement, $178,700,000

All launch vehicles which are purchased for use for unmanned space missions are included in this heading. Vehicles currently being procured are Scout, Delta, Thor-Agena, Atlas-Agena, and Atlas-Centaur.

In fiscal year 1966, NASA established launch vehicle procurement as a separate program rather than including vehicle funds in the associated scientific program request. This change was made to coincide with launch vehicle procurement practice and to facilitate combining procurement quantities of launch vehicles. In its review of this program, your committee noted that $10.8 million was included under Centaur to initiate Atlas vehicle procurement for Surveyor flights beyond No. 10 to effect procurement economies through placement of the largest possible order for Atlas vehicles at one time. While the committee agrees with the principle of reducing costs, it does not believe vehicle procurement should precede that of the spacecraft, now funded, through No. 10 only, particularly since the committee has some reservations about the need for all 17 Surveyor flights. Therefore, your committee recommends a reduction of $10.8 million in the Centaur account.

The House made an across-the-board reduction of $5 million in NASA's total request of $194.5 million for "launch vehicle procurement." This reduction was made because the House believed that the requested amount was based upon overly ambitious launch schedules, thereby overstating current funding requirements for launch vehicles and, in addition, noted that unobligated funds remained in this account. Your committee concurs in this $5 million reduction.

The House also reduced by $10 million a $19.4 million request for sustaining engineering and maintenance contained in the Centaur procurement request on the basis that NASA, because of a $59.6 million request for Centaur development, still considers this vehicle in development. Your committee concurs that such a large request for sustaining engineering and maintenance is not appropriate until a vehicle is fully operational. However, on May 6, 1965, the Cochairmen of the Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board—the Associate Administrator, NASA, and the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, DOD—concurred that modifications to the standard Atlas launch vehicle leading to the SLV–3X configuration are consistent with the proper objectives of the national launch vehicle program. This action, on which NASA and DOD are about to proceed, involves an uprating of the Atlas standard launch vehicle (SLV–3) to provide additional booster capability. Aside from the fact that this added capability will be available for all Atlas launch vehicle combinations, NASA believes this has particular merit in providing a better margin on booster capability for the Surveyor mission. The cost of these modifications is estimated at $15 million, and therefore your committee recommends a restoration of the $10 million House cut to compensate in part for this work.

Therefore, a total reduction of $15.8 million is recommended in the launch vehicle procurement program.

Sustaining University Programs, $46 Million

This program is designed to strengthen university participation in aeronautical and space sciences, as well as to help support NASA's research activities. Funds are provided in three main areas, to increase the future supply of scientists and engineers by providing graduate fellowships, to help build specialized laboratories where urgently needed, and to provide research grants to universities in support of NASA's programs.

The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Advanced research and technology

For advanced research and technology the request is $283,900,000. This research will provide the necessary technological foundation for future space projects. Major programs are basic research, space vehicle systems, electronic systems, human factor systems, nuclear-electric systems, nuclear rockets, chemical propulsion, solar and chemical power, and aeronautics.

Space Vehicle Systems Program, $35,000,000

The objective of this program is to identify and solve critical problems associated with space vehicle systems. These are problems related to launch and ascent through the atmosphere, flight through space, entry into the atmosphere of earth or other planets, and landing. For example, during launch and ascent there are such problems as ground-wind loads, mechanical vibration, intense acoustic noise, wind gradient aloft, propellant sloshing, and so forth. Flight through space involves problems of high-energy radiations, meteorites, high vacuum, temperature extremes, zero gravity, and so forth. Return into the atmosphere is characterized by problems associated with high-speed reentry, intense heating, and so forth. Research must be carried out in aerothermodynamics, structures, and many associated disciplines in order to solve these problems.

The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Electronic Systems Program, $34,400,000

Electrical systems of one kind or another make up a substantial portion of all launch vehicles and spacecraft. Much is yet to be learned about the operation of these systems, particularly in the space environment. This research is necessary in order to assure the availability of reliable and efficient electrical components for future aeronautical space flight missions. Research is conducted on the problems of guidance, control, communications, tracking, instrumentation, and data processing systems.

The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Human Factor Systems Program, $14,900,000

Space is a hostile environment for man. NASA's research on human factors is designed to define man's reaction to this environment, to find out how best to protect him and provide the necessary technology to develop equipment for this purpose, and to discover how best to use man's unique capabilities in a man-machine system. The answers to these questions will help to determine the limits of man's usefulness in space in relation to the weight and cost considerations of the equipment to keep him there. Research is being conducted in electronics, physics, engineering, psychology, biology, and nearly every field of medicine.

The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Basic Research Program, $22 Million

The purpose of this program is to learn more about the nature of physical and mathematical sciences. Such knowledge is necessary for the development of current and future aircraft and spacecraft. Research is conducted on the nature of materials, electrophysics, superconductivity, fluid physics, magnetohydrodynamics, plasma flows, mathematics, and so forth.

The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Nuclear-Electric Systems Program, $27 Million

All space systems must have power for the operation of equipment. NASA, in conjunction with the Atomic Energy Commission, is developing a series of nuclear-electric systems that will be quite useful in supplying power for this purpose. Also, an advanced ion or electrical propulsion system would require a large amount of power which could only be obtained from a large nuclear-electric source. Large systems might also be useful in the operation of a lunar base or a large space station at some future date.

The President in the budget for fiscal year 1966 did not include funds for the NASA effort on the SNAP–8 nuclear power system and said that this project would be terminated. Consequently no authorization for a NASA effort on this project was requested. Testimony before the committee indicates that the decision to terminate the NASA portion of this program was made for administrative budgetary reasons only. The AEC, however, would continue development of the nuclear reactor for the SNAP–8 systems during fiscal year 1966 at a request level of $9.5 million.

Subsequent questioning of the Administrator of NASA about the specifics of termination activity resulted in the presentation of a termination plan designed to realize the maximum technical return from development activity to date. Authority of $2.15 million to support the SNAP–8 project to a logical technical termination point was reprogramed within the fiscal year 1965 nuclear electric systems program account and the committee has been notified that money to fund the termination plan will be transferred into the SNAP–8 account from the fiscal year 1965 tracking and data acquisition program account.

It is clear from testimony that the SNAP–8 represents the only current development program, as well as the only reasonably available potential source, for supporting the large electrical power requirements—35-kilowatt range—for extended space missions. Further, this cancellation occurs after NASA has had approximately $60.7 million approved for the development of SNAP–8, and AEC about $46.2 million—a total of $106.9 million, most of which has been obligated.

The House recommended that the project be continued and authorized $6 million for the SNAP–8 above the budget request for nuclear-electric systems. In addition, it recommended that an additional $2 million of the approved amount for nuclear-electric systems also be allocated to SNAP–8. Your committee does not concur in these recommendations.

For your committee, this was a most difficult decision to make. However, the committee appreciates that the application for the SNAP–8 system is probably in the post-1970 time frame and, therefore, the termination does not immediately restrict a capability urgently needed at this time. Further, your committee does recognize that budgetary circumstances may necessitate choices in the overall national interest; however, it regrets that we have to take calculated risk on the availability of this system to be ready when needed. Therefore, your committee urges that the Administration restudy its decision to terminate this program and not hesitate to reinstate this program at the earliest opportunity if it is found that auxiliary power systems of at least 35 kilowatts will probably be required before 1975. If at any time a decision is made that the SNAP–8 system might be needed to support the Nation's space program to help achieve our objective of becoming preeminent in space, your committee is prepared to consider any request for additional authority for the SNAP–8 project which the President would want to make of the Congress of the United States.

Nuclear Rockets Program, $58 Million

Virtually all space scientists agree that future space travel will require the use of nuclear rockets because of their much more efficient utilization of fuel. Consequently, NASA, in conjunction with the AEC, is exerting a substantial effort to develop a solid core nuclear rocket system so that it will be available when needed. In general, the AEC is responsible for development of the nuclear core while NASA is responsible for the engine, pumps, piping, and other hardware that would constitute a system.

NASA is also spending a small amount on advanced concepts, such as the gaseous core nuclear engine which theoretically offers substantially greater efficiencies than even the solid core system.

The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Solar and Chemical Power Program, $14,200,000

At present most of the power needed to operate on-board equipment for the spacecraft is supplied by batteries or solar cells or a combination of the two. In spite of the high efficiencies of nuclear systems, and because of cost, weight, size, and other considerations, it is anticipated that chemical and solar power systems will continue to see wide use. In this area NASA is continuing with its research in developing better batteries and fuel cells as well as better solar thermionic and solar dynamic systems. In addition, this program includes supporting research on conditioning, distribution, and control of electrical power throughout the spacecraft and in improving the reliability and efficiency of related equipment such as power converters, inverters, regulators, and protective devices.

The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Chemical Propulsion Program, $36,200,000

Despite the promise of nuclear propulsion, there will continue to be a widespread need for chemical propulsion systems. To this end NASA is continuing with high energy liquid and solid propellant research. Also involved are the design, fabrication and test of model systems using these fuels in order to meet anticipated requirements for later development of operational engines.

Two of the projects in this program were not approved by the President for continuation in fiscal year 1966: the M–1 engine and the 260-inch large solid motor. The House approved continuation of both programs, $15 million additional for the M–1 and $6.2 million additional for the 260-inch solid.

In the case of the M–1, the termination was made for administrative budgetary reasons, and subsequent questioning of NASA personnel by your committee resulted in the presentation of a termination plan designed to continue the current effort to a cutoff point which would accrue the maximum technical return on the investment to date. This termination plan in lieu of an outright cancellation necessitated reprograming by NASA of $3 million from the fiscal year 1965 M–1 construction of facilities account to the M–1 R. & D. account.

This engine represents the only very high thrust (1,500,000 pounds) upper stage engine under development at this time; however, it is recognized that the applications requirement for such an engine would occur in the post-1970 era and most likely in the 1975–80 time frame. Therefore, although this termination does not deprive the Nation of the ability to support a currently identified upper stage mission requirement, the committee regrets the cancellation of development activity which might well play a significant role in our national space capability in future years. Accordingly, the committee, although it does not concur in the House recommendation, urges the Administration to reassess the need for an engine with this capability and if found necessary, particularly in connection with post-Apollo plans, to reinstate this program at the earliest opportunity.

The committee is prepared to consider any request for additional authority for the M–1 engine project which the President would want to make of the Congress of the United States.

The case of the 260-inch large solid motor project is somewhat more complicated. In June 1963, a large solid propellant rocket motor feasibility demonstration program was initiated by NASA and the Air Force. It included both 260-inch diameter and 156-inch diameter solid propellant motors. In November 1963, the Department of Defense requested that NASA fund the 260-inch solid motor project in fiscal year 1965 and thereafter with the DOD continuing to fund the 156-inch motor. Consequently, for fiscal year 1965 NASA assumed the funding for the 260-inch solid motor project and for that project requested $13 million which was authorized by the Congress.

The 260-inch solid motor project is an advanced research and development project whose objective is to demonstrate that large solid propellant boosters delivering 3 to 6 million pounds of thrust can be built at low cost, on a predictable schedule and with high reliability.

Testimony before the committee is that boosters of this size would be useful—even necessary—for post-Apollo manned flight programs and that studies show that if these large solid motors can be successfully developed the cost of future space vehicles can be substantially reduced.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

However, no fiscal year 1966 authorization was requested for the NASA large solid motor project as the President, in his fiscal year 1966 budget, scheduled the project for termination.

The Administrator of NASA testified that the only reason that the President did not provide funds for the 260-inch solid motor project was for budgetary reasons in that there was a stringency of funds for the NASA fiscal year 1966 budget and NASA does not now have an established requirement for launch vehicles with the capability of the 260-inch solid motor. This was done notwithstanding the fact that the opening sentence in NASA's justification for their chemical propulsion program states, "Propulsion represents one of the greatest limitations in capability for exploring space."

The 260-inch solid motor project is now in phase I, which will culminate in firing two half-length 260-inch solid motors by two contractors, Thiokol in Brunswick, Ga., and Aerojet in Miami, Fla. Under the NASA termination plan for this project this demonstration will be completed at about the end of December 1965 or by early February 1966.

At the completion of the phase I portion of the 260-inch development program this year, the Government will have expended $56.5 million for this program. In addition, the contractors have spent substantial amounts for facilities especially tailored to the requirements of this large solid rocket motor.

While the 260-inch solid motor project has run into technical problems in the motor case and nozzle fabrication which have stretched out the program by 6 months and increased its estimated cost to completion to $56.5 million, or $14.5 million over the initial negotiated target cost, NASA officials have testified that no insurmountable technical obstacles have appeared and that thus far the program has proceeded along the planned course.

Your committee has always strongly supported NASA propulsion research and development. In particular, in the field of chemical propulsion it has supported the concurrent development of the large solid propulsion motor with the large liquid engines and stages.

The committee, recognizing this need supported the large solid motor program last year and said in its report on the NASA authorization for fiscal year 1965: "It would be unfortunate if phase I resulted in an outstanding success, a decision was made to go into phase II and then the agency found that there was not adequate funding to accomplish an orderly transition."

The committee believes now that it would be unfortunate if phase I resulted in an outstanding success and the administration was in a position where it was unable to go into phase II because adequate authority was not available.

Your committee, therefore, decided in the case of the 260-inch solid motor project to recommend approval of the $6.2 million added by the House committee and approved by the House of Representatives.

However, your committee, in recommending to the Senate that it approve this $6.2 million authorization also recommends against the inclusion of that amount in the fiscal year 1966 NASA appropriation. The committee recommends inclusion of the $6.2 million in the authorization bill simply to have the authorization available for consideration in a supplemental appropriation in the event that the President and NASA shall conclude, after the completion of phase I, that they wish to move ahead into phase II with this project.

Aeronautics Program, $42,200,000

The amount requested for aeronautical research under research and development only is $42,200,000. As has been frequently pointed out, the first "A" in NASA stands for aeronautics and, indeed, it is in the area of aeronautical research that NASA has its historical roots and reputation for competence. In spite of the rapid growth of its space programs, NASA has not ignored its aeronautical responsibilities. In fact, the effort here has increased steadily in the last 7 years to a level which is the highest in the entire 50-year history of the agency, is twice as great as in the first year of the space age, and it is four times greater than at the peak of World War II. This level of effort is somewhat difficult to identify correctly because it includes not only the $42,200,000 for R. & D. requested in this item, but also an estimate of the salaries of the 1,600 NASA personnel engaged in aeronautical research and basic and applied research listed under other programs which is applicable to aeronautics. In total the estimate comes to about $108 million for fiscal year 1966.

The main objective of this research is to improve the efficiency, utility, and safety of aircraft. The scope of this research includes considerable effort in the continuation of research with the highly successful X-15, as well as research on supersonic transports, vertical and slow takeoff-and-landing craft, and hypersonic ramjets.

Also, research continues on air breathing propulsion, aircraft aerodynamics, loads and structures, and operating problems including noise suppression.

The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Tracking and data acquisition

For tracking and data acquisition the request is $246,200,000. Every vehicle launched must be properly guided into its planned flightpath and communications with it must be maintained so that its position is known and the information it has collected is transmitted back to the earth.

Operations, $129,300,000

The nature of space flight makes it necessary to maintain a large number of ground stations and ships all over the world. These stations are connected into a vast ground communications network that is daily producing more than 40 miles of magnetic tape of scientific data. Included here are the manned space flight network, satellite network, deep space network, instrumentation systems for sounding rockets communications, and data processing.

Equipment, $102,400,000

New equipment such as receivers, transmitters, antennas, radars, and so forth, is needed for each of the networks and categories listed immediately above.

Supporting Research and Technology, $14,500,000

This is research and development of new equipment and methods designed to improve the tracking and data acquisition operations.

The committee noted that in fiscal year 1966 the tracking and data acquisition equipment budget request reflects a significant decline from fiscal year 1965 indicating the progress in fulfilling the overall network requirements. The committee also noted that the network operations budget is increasing as tracking and data installations are completed and enter checkout and operational status. In view of this status, the committee believes NASA should have adequate funding for network operations in the coming year and therefore, recommends full restoration of the House reduction of $3,879,000.

Technology utilization

For technology utilization the request is $4,750,000. The main purpose of this program is to provide for the widest practical dissemination to industry of information concerning NASA activities. The NASA program offers U.S. industry unique opportunities to improve existing industrial techniques and to develop new products and methods. This program assists in identifying quickly these many opportunities and insures their expeditious dissemination to industry, and the public. Technology utilization also includes projects to study and evaluate those factors which will improve our understanding of the implications of the space program.

The House approved the full $5 million budget request for this item. Your committee believes, however, that this program can be continued at the same level of operation as in fiscal year 1965, $4,750,000, and, therefore, recommends a reduction of $250,000.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

The construction of facilities needed for the Apollo program is nearing completion. Two years ago (fiscal year 1964), the construction of facilities request was $800 million, last year the request was down to $281 million, and the current request is only $74.7 million. So it is obvious that most of the large facilities needed for the manned lunar landing program have already been funded. In fact, the current request is less than for any year since the NACA became the NASA (fiscal year 1959).

The amount for construction of facilities approved by the House was $60,675,000 and your committee recommends a total of $67,376,350.

Ames Research Center

For this research center, located 35 miles southeast of San Francisco, Calif., NASA requested $2,749,000 for a systems engineering facility. The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Electronic research center

For this research center, to be located in Boston, Mass., NASA requested $10 million for a space guidance laboratory, an optical communications laboratory, a microwave radiation laboratory, and center support facilities. The House deleted these facilities on the grounds that because of delays in obtaining the building site that these funds would not be needed in fiscal year 1966. During the authorization hearings of your committee, NASA witnesses were questioned extensively on this very point; that is, the schedule for land acquisition and beginning of construction.

Although NASA acknowledges there are procedural steps to be accomplished before the site will become available, NASA has an agreement with the city of Cambridge for delivery of a 29.3-acre site in the Kendall Square section and to date NASA has no evidence that it will not be fulfilled. Therefore, the site could be available in mid-fiscal year 1966, and it should be possible to advertise for construction of the facilities during the latter part of the fiscal year. Conversely, if these funds were not authorized this year, initiation of these facilities would have to await fiscal year 1967 authorization action thereby restricting the NASA freedom to program the construction of this Center in an orderly manner. Therefore, your committee recommends the approval of the full $10 million requested.

Goddard Space Flight Center

For this research center, located in Greenbelt, Md., NASA requested $2,400,000 for a space science data center and utility installations. The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

John F. Kennedy Space Center

For this Center, located at Cape Kennedy, Fla., NASA requested $8,595,000 for an RF systems test facility, flight crew training building extension, extension to the medical facility, utility installations, and launch complex No. 17 alterations. This Center is one of the centers which operates under the direction of NASA's Office of Manned Space Flight. Of the total request for construction of facilities, $25,025,000 was identified for manned space flight. The House committee believes that this was an excessive request and reduced the amount by $2,825,000. Prorating this reduction among the various centers, Kennedy Center received a reduction of $740,600. Your committee believes that this reduction was somewhat severe and accordingly recommends an overall reduction of $400,000 without specific allocation of the reduction to individual items. Consequently, your committee recommends $8,195,000 for construction of facilities at the John F. Kennedy Space Center.

Langley Research Center

For this research center, located at Hampton, Va., NASA requested $8,250,000 for a flight control research facility, life support technology laboratory, increase research capabilities of mach 6 and mach 8.5 tunnels, and a magazine and test area for high-energy propellants. The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Lewis Research Center

For this research center, located in Cleveland, Ohio, NASA requested $867,000 for a building addition for data processing and a space power research laboratory. The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Manned Spacecraft Center

For this center, located at Houston, Tex., NASA requested $4,400,000 for modifications to the environmental laboratory and for center support facilities. For reasons mentioned above in connection with the Kennedy Center, the House reduced this request by $446,700. Your committee believed this amount to be excessive and instead, recommends a nominal reduction of $220,000. Consequently, the committee recommends $4,180,000 for construction of facilities at the Manned Spacecraft Center.

Marshall Space Flight Center

For this center, located in Huntsville, Ala., NASA requested $4,776,000 for a nondestructive testing laboratory, additions to materials laboratory, test engineering building extension, extension to high-pressure gas systems, and LOX storage facilities for west test area. The House made a pro rata reduction of $484,900 for reasons described above in connection with the Kennedy Space Center. Your committee studied these requests in great detail, keeping in mind the availability of similar facilities at other NASA centers.

In view of the extensive test facilities previously funded and now under construction at the Mississippi test facility, and since testing is the sole justification for that facility, your committee believes, on the basis of the facts presented, there is insufficient justification for the extensions to high-pressure air and helium gas systems and for the LOX storage facilities. Further, the committee was not convinced of the basic need. Therefore, your committee recommends that these two requests be denied.

Your committee believes the three remaining facilities requested enhance the basic capability of this center and, therefore, are recommended. In recommending the three facilities, the committee believes it should also restore a part of the House reduction tnd a net reduction of $121,550 out of the $2,431,000 NASA requested for these three facilities.

Therefore, your committee recommends a total of $2,309,450 for construction of facilities at the Marshall Space Flight Center, a reduction of $2,446,550 in the NASA request.

Michoud plant

For this plant, located near New Orleans, La., NASA requested $300,000 for improvements to the storm drainage system. The House reduced this request by $30,500. Your committee believes that half of this reduction should be restored for a total recommendation of $284,750.

Mississippi test facility

For this facility, located in southwest Mississippi, NASA requested $2,121,000 for an addition to S–II stage checkout facility, general support facilities, including a locomotive shop, a liquid hydrogen storage tank and associated equipment. The House reduced this request by $215,400 for reasons described in connection with the Kennedy Space Center above.

After careful study, your committee recommends the deletion of a proposed locomotive shop and associated facilities and equipment at the Mississippi test facility because it believes that the establishment of a maintenance and repair capability by NASA for one locomotive is not warranted. As a secondary consideration, your committee was not persuaded as to the need for shelter for this equipment based upon observed railroad practice for similar equipment. A reduction of $110,000 is therefore recommended.

The remaining facilities requested for this installation are considered to be necessary additions and, therefore, are recommended subject to a nominal reduction of $110,550 which includes approximately a 50-percent restoration of the House reduction. Consequently, the committee recommends $1,910,450 for construction of facilities at the Mississippi test facility.

Wallops station

For this station, located on Virginia's eastern shore, NASA requested $1,048,000 for a launch control building and an assembly shop. The House approved this item as requested by NASA and your committee concurs.

Various locations

For this item NASA requested $21,694 for nine construction projects at various locations as follows: Facilities for F–1 engine at Canoga Park, Santa Susana, and Edwards, Calif.; facilities for J–2 engine at Canoga Park and Santa Susana, Calif.; facilities for S–II stage at Seal Beach and Santa Susana, Calif.; a deep space antenna facility near Madrid, Spain; a deep space antenna facility at Canberra, Australia; support facilities at Fairbanks, Alaska; a ground station at Antigua, West Indies; community support facilities at Antigua, West Indies; and, a ground station on the Grand Canary Island.

The House cut $622,600 from the NASA request for additional facilities for the F–1 and J–2 engines and the S–II stage as part of a general reduction of approximately 10 percent assessed against all manned space flight facilities. Your committee believes that the facilities for both the F–1 and J–2 engine programs have merit to support engine improvement developments and changed requirements which may emanate from the extensive engine test program now being undertaken by NASA. Your committee also believes the fabrication and test program for the S–II stage warrants support of the NASA request for additional facilities. Therefore, these three items are recommended with a $311,300 reduction, or a 50-percent restoration of the House reduction. The resulting reduction is not applied to any of the NASA project estimates to permit flexibility in construction operations.

The House, in its action, also reduced the NASA request for an Apollo network ground station at Antigua, West Indies, by $200,000, the amount allocated to purchase of land, because there is a reasonable possibility of obtaining a cost-free site. If this does not materialize, the House stated it would be amenable to a reprograming request to support a purchase action. Your committee ascertained that there were two possibilities for cost-free land—the British Government and the U.S. Air Force—and believes that these should be exhausted before undertaking purchase action. Therefore, your committee recommends that the House reduction be sustained.

In support of the Antigua Apollo network ground station, NASA proposed $3,090,000 to augment U.S. Air Force base facilities to house permanent and temporary duty station operating personnel. The House cut this request by $1 million on the basis that more practical facilities should be provided and that economies could be effected. Your committee appreciates the need for facilities, however, it concurs fully with the House that more economical and appropriate facilities can be arranged; therefore, a total of $2,090,000 is recommended for this item. Consequently, your committee recommends $20,182,700 for construction of facilities for various locations.

Facility planning and design

For this item NASA requested $7.5 million. The funds requested under this item are required for advanced facility planning and design on projects for which construction funds may be requested in subsequent budgets.

Your committee recognizes the advantages of and, in fact, has frequently stressed the need for adequate planning. However, it is felt that advance facility planning resources have a relationship to the number and magnitude of proposed programs and to the current status of presently approved programs as well as to the facility capability acquired from prior years funding. In view of these considerations your committee recommends $5 million for facility planning and design for fiscal year 1966, a reduction of $2.5 million from the NASA request.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

NASA's current request of $609,400,000 for administrative operations is considerably less than that of last year primarily due to large nonrecurring purchases of electronic data processing equipment in fiscal year 1965. Over one-half of the funds requested for the category of administrative operations involves salaries and expenses of NASA personnel. In addition, funds are required for institutional support at NASA centers. This support includes utilities, rent, supplies, minor repairs, printing, transportation, support contracts, and so forth.

Your committee, as stated in its report on last year's authorization, reviewed during fiscal year 1965 NASA's overall administrative operation with particular emphasis on ascertaining what economies can be realized in this area. NASA proposes, with the exception of an increase for the newly opened Electronics Research Center, the same overall position level as for fiscal year 1965. Your committee, however, noted that the NASA program has attained a high degree of maturity with a lesser on-board strength, and, therefore, it has reservations about the need for the full proposed complement, and recommends that NASA continue to conduct organizational and functional analyses and intensive manpower utilization studies to ascertain the effectiveness of its workforce and carefully assess its personnel needs for its operations.

Moreover, an analysis of the hearing testimony concerning institutional support indicates that reductions in administrative operations can be illusory. For example, certain costs for supporting contractors have been carried in the category of research and development when in fact these supporting costs properly belonged under funding for administrative operations. Although NASA's total budget may not be affected one way or another because the support contract is improperly characterized, your committee recommends that NASA in presenting its budget should reflect the actual amounts

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

allocated for each of the three budget categories if the budget is to be meaningful at all. This is particularly relevant in view of NASA's increased use of service contracts. NASA now contemplates 19,000 support contractor personnel for a cost figure of $329 million for fiscal year 1966. These support contracts are divided so that of this $329 million, $85 million will be funded from administrative operations and the remaining $244 million from research and development.

While recognizing the fine line that sometimes exists between service contracts which support research and development and others which support administrative operations, your committee believes this is an area that requires continuing attention if NASA's three basic budget categories are to have significance to the committee.

The House approved $586,048,850 for administrative operations; $23,351,150 less than requested. NASA told your committee that this reduction will severely handicap NASA in the efficient conduct of its fiscal year 1966 operations.

Your committee desires to provide NASA the utmost flexibility in managing all phases of its operations, however, it does evidence some concern in the two areas discussed above and accordingly, recommends a total of $596,100,000, a reduction of $13,300,000 from the NASA request, but $10,051,150 more than approved by the House.

Your committee intends to continue to perform reviews of NASA administrative operations during fiscal 1966, which reviews will include policies with respect to the allocation of its budget reduction.

LEGISLATIVE CHANGES

There are four legislative changes considered by your committee in connection with NASA's authorization bill for fiscal year 1966:

(1) NASA requested a new provision in subsection 1(e) that would permit NASA during fiscal year 1966 to make contracts under the "administrative operations" appropriation for procurement and maintenance and other services on which performance could be rendered until June 30, 1967.

Under present provisions of law, support service contracts entered into during any fiscal year must terminate at the end of such fiscal year, as authority to fund them from the administrative operations account ceases at the end of such fiscal year for which the funds are authorized and appropriated.

The language suggested by the Administration would permit NASA to spend funds from the administrative operations account for support services contracts for the full year following June 30, 1966. The House agreed to the Administration's language. NASA officials, during the Senate hearings, however, said that limiting such authority to a 12-month period would overcome their problem. Your committee therefore recommends that the bill be amended so that NASA will have authority to make such contracts at any time during the fiscal year for a 12-month period. NASA could then stagger its contracts for support services throughout the fiscal year and avoid the administrative burden of having to negotiate such a large number of contracts at one time. The language would read as follows:

"(e) When so specified in an appropriation act, (1) * * * and (2) maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the 'administrative operations' appropriation for periods not in excess of 12 months beginning at any time during the fiscal year."

If this authority is granted, NASA, for example, would be able to enter into a contract in November 1965 and fund such contract from the fiscal year 1966 administrative operations account until November 1966.

(2) NASA requested a new provision, subsection 1(h), to overcome a technical accounting procedure which at the present time prevents NASA from apportioning costs between the accounts. For instance, if NASA should decide to fund a facility out of the construction of facilities account, they are prevented from reimbursing the construction of facilities account from the research and development account even though it is later determined that research and development should share part of the burden of the cost of such facilities.

The House agreed to the language request of NASA and your committee recommends concurrence in this action.

(3) Section 3 of the authorization bill requested authority for NASA to transfer funds to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation from the "Research and development" appropriation and also to reprogram funds within the construction of facilities account. NASA was allowed this flexibility in prior years, by giving them authority to transfer up to 2 percent of the R. & D. funds to the C of F appropriation which together with authority to reprogram $30 million of the funds in the construction of facilities account could be used for construction if the Administrator determines such action to be necessary. Because of the sharp decline in construction of facilities in the last 2 years, a continuation of the reprograming authority at this level would result in an amount far in excess of the total amount for construction of facilities. Consequently, the House approved language amending NASA's reprograming authority in section 3 of the bill by reducing (1) the 2 percent to one-half of 1 percent; and (2) the $30 million that can be reprogramed within the construction of facilities account to $10 million. Your committee recommends that the Senate agree with this House amendment.

(4) The House, in acting on NASA's fiscal year 1966 authorization, added a new section in which language was included indicating that it was the sense of the Congress that in the national interest consideration be given to geographical distribution of research funds whenever feasible and that NASA should explore ways and means of distributing its R. & D. funds on a geographical basis whenever feasible and use such other measures as may be practicable toward this end. Your committee considered carefully the new language approved by the House and recommended that it be adopted in an amended form.

Your committee appreciates the fact that there is a substantial concentration of research and development in essentially a few geographical areas and that the economy of other areas would benefit by as wide a distribution of Government money as possible. Your committee, however, in no way wishes to imply that the present governmental procurement philosophy derived as a result of years of experience spent in establishing regulations insuring that the Government receives the greatest return for each dollar spent will be materially altered by an overriding consideration being given to a geographical distribution of Government funds. Your committee, therefore, has amended the House language so that no such interpretation will be made as a result of the inclusion of such language in the bill.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of our committee has summarized the main provisions of S. 927. As ranking minority member of the committee I have some additional observations to make.

This bill marks a turning point in our civilian space program. For the first time since the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Senate is asked to approve an authorization for a lesser amount than was appropriated the previous year.

We need only look at the drastic reduction in NASA capital improvements to understand what is happening. Two years ago over 10 times as much was authorized for facility construction as is being requested this year.

The ground facilities necessary to support the moon landing in this decade are near completion. We have developed an industrial complex employing over one-third million space-oriented people. We have created a Federal space agency employing 34,000 people. We will have authorized $20 billion during these past 5 years alone. We are already committed as a Nation to go to the moon.

We are making commendable progress, but where are we really going? Where are the plans; the programs beyond the lunar landing? If there are any plans—any programs—we are not informed of what they are.

The situation we are now reaching reminds me of that old military saw of "hurry up and wait."

For several years now I have asked the same question: "What are our plans in space after the moon landing?" What are we to do with this multibillion-dollar space investment? We have been told that going to the moon is not the end of our space program, but where are the plans beyond the moon landing? Persistent questioning of NASA finally elicited the material found in part 3 of the hearings before the Senate. That material is not a plan of action, it is a list of alternatives. In my judgment the time for a decision is overdue. Already this year we have seen the administration cut out three vital programs that will be needed in the 1970's. These three programs were terminated after an investment of hundreds of millions of dollars. The House reinstated these programs. Now I am sympathetic to the need for the M-1, the SNAP-8 and the large solid program, but I believe that until the administration requests their reinstatement Congress should not initiate these programs.

As stated in our report, our committee is ready at any time to listen to the administration should they express a desire to move ahead with these programs. Until they say to the committee in effect that they have changed their minds and they do want the programs, it is not for us to say, "Here is the money; you must reinstate these programs."

Congress has on other occasions tried to force the executive branch to act by approving programs not requested, but to little avail. Until the administration decides we are going somewhere other than to the moon, these programs are unnecessary anyway. Perhaps the administration has facts not known to us as to why these programs were canceled, but our testimony is that these programs were cut for budgetary reasons alone.

This year we have one project designed to operate in the period after 1970. That is the Voyager spacecraft, which would have the primary objective of obtaining information about the planet Mars. This one project could ultimately cost over $1 billion.

My concern is not whether we should learn more about Mars, but rather that a comprehensive plan be presented by the administration of what their plan of action is to be in space with a list of priorities. This piecemeal vacillating philosophy as an alternative for a real comprehensive plan of action is not only shortsighted, but is penny wise and pound foolish. It is false economy.

Congress and the American people have a right to know if landing a man on the moon is the end of our venture into space. If it is not the end, why cannot the administration be candid and above board and tell us where we are going?

I believe that we have an extremely competent organization in NASA. It is truly remarkable what they have accomplished in space in such a short period of time. But more than technical capability is now required. The brightest technical minds in NASA cannot contribute much if no one can tell them where we are going and what we need to accomplish.

I might say, Mr. President, that 2 years before Sputnik we were engrossed in Congress with a discussion concerning the building of a Federal Interstate Highway System. This system, which involved 41,000 miles of roads and ultimately will cost nearly $50 billion, was the biggest peacetime public works program ever initiated by our Government up to that time. I recall the intense interest Congress expressed in seeking to ascertain the overall master plan as to the proposed location of these new highways. I do not expect NASA can be that precise in presenting their plans for future programs in space. I do expect, however, that if we are in space to stay, then it is past time to tell us what we will be doing there after going to the moon.

While I am concerned about NASA's inability to tell us where they are going beyond this decade, their plans and programs for the 1960's are convincing. This bill reflects those programs.

The administrative procedures at NASA were the subject of extensive questions by your committee. We recognize that any organization with 34,000 employees acquired in the span of a few years has growing pains. Now that NASA's level of employment is remaining nearly constant, initial organizational problems should be resolved.

The NASA administrative organization is spread throughout the United States in a dozen major centers monitoring billions of dollars in research and development contracts. The contractor personnel required just to supply the support for these NASA facilities will jump to 19,000 this year, or one support contractor for every two NASA employees. This is an area that requires constant attention. NASA is operating under a manpower ceiling and although NASA testified it had an adequate number of employees to do its job, the number of support contractor personnel to help NASA personnel do their job increases substantially each year. In view of the general policy of the U.S. Government that services necessary in connection with governmental activities are for performance by regular employees of the Government and subject to Government supervision, we learned from NASA that it never uses service contracts for what might be called "flesh peddling"—that is, just to obtain additional personnel.

NASA's stated policy in the use of contractor personnel is encouraging, having in mind the recent criticism leveled at other governmental agencies in their misuse of support contractors.

In summary I would say that our committee is following NASA's programs and administrative operations with greater diligence now than at any time since NASA was established. I believe even a cursory perusal of our three volumes of hearings will show that while we are impressed with NASA's accomplishments, we are not blind to the areas where improvements can be made.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the chairman for his comprehension of the many facets of this bill. His broad knowledge has been the source of invaluable contributions to our hearings and to the reporting of this bill. I would also like to commend all the members of the staff for their impartial and conscientious assistance during the hearings and in the reporting of this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine for her statement. There is no more diligent member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences than the Senator from Maine. She was present throughout the hearings, and day by day made great contributions to the hearings. I am proud to be associated with so distinguished a member of the committee, and the ranking minority member of it.

Mrs. SMITH. I deeply appreciate the words of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am happy to join the distinguished Senator from Maine in commending the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences on the excellent work of the committee as shown by the hearings on the bill. The Senator from New Mexico is known as one of the ablest men in the Senate, as well as in government. He is sharp and shrewd, with a superlative analytical mind. I always hesitate to disagree with him because of his great ability.

The NASA budget is not only one of the largest presented to Congress; it is also one of the most complex. For this reason, I am proposing no amendments to the bill which the Senate is now considering. However, in the Committee on Appropriations, where this authorization will be considered, I shall closely examine NASA's requests. Then there will be an opportunity to go into details.

The House has reduced NASA's proposed budget by some $76 million. The Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences would increase the House-passed figure by about $13 million, but that amount would remain under the budget request by some $63 million. These reductions are small—1 percent, or a little more than 1 percent of the total request, which is more than $5¼ billion.

For most programs, the Senate committee has restored a part of the House reductions. For a few programs, the committee has accepted or further reduced authorizations already reduced by the House.

One program which the House deleted—the $10 million Electronics Research Center of Cambridge—has been completely restored by the Senate committee. I oppose this restoration. I wonder whether this is not another case in which an agency has committed itself to a program—in this case, by contracting to purchase land—and afterward comes to Congress for the money.

There is another, more general, policy of NASA which troubles me as a Senator from the Midwest. In the House debate, it was pointed out that approximately 80 percent of the NASA budget is spent in the coastal States, in the well-known "space crescent" extending from Florida around through Texas.

The House bill declares that it is the sense of Congress that NASA should "explore ways and means" of spending research and development funds "on a geographical basis whenever feasible." The House provision does not appear to be mandatory so far as actual spending is concerned. Yet the Senate committee would make this innocuous but laudatory provision more innocuous and less laudatory.

I refer to page 9 of the bill and shall read the language that the House provided. The Senate, strangely, it seems to me, changed that language. The House language reads:

> It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds on a geographical basis whenever feasible and use such other measures as may be practicable toward this end.

The Senate amendment started with the same language, but when it reached the action part, so far as the Space Administration is concerned, it dropped off completely. I shall quote the language. The House language at that point reads:

> The National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds on a geographical basis whenever feasible——

And so forth. The Senate version reads at that point:

> And that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

In other words, the Senate language deletes the geographical reference entirely. I cannot see that what the Senate has added really means anything. After all, if it is not proposed to ask the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to give consideration to geographical concentration, in this distinct imbalance, what does this section do? The concentration of activities in the "space crescent," it seems to me, makes the language of section 5 as the Senate has amended it useless, a mere pious declaration.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences what comfort a Senator from the Midwest can get from the change in the House language, which provided that whenever practicable and feasible, consideration should be given to geographical considerations by NASA, while the Senate amendment deletes this specific reference to NASA's action.

Mr. ANDERSON. The committee struggled quite a little with this section. We dropped the last few words of the House amendment, "and use such other measures as may be practicable toward this end," because they seemed to imply that the Space Administration could use other methods than the ordinary allocation of money. They might have said to groups, "We will give you money if you do not do anything."

But in section 5, of which a midwestern Senator participated in the drafting, we said that:

> It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds.

That is the exact language of the House proposal—"a geographical distribution of Federal research funds." The committee thought that that was probably enough; that they looked to NASA for ways and means to try to get this done, without saying specifically that other means should be used, because it might refer to something we did not know about.

The question arose from a discussion concerning the location of electronic centers. I feel certain that the language in the bill suggests as strongly as could be done that the research should be spread across the Nation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted to hear that statement by the Senator from New Mexico. That legislative history will help a great deal. But the way the language reads in the bill, with the deletion by the Senate of the words "geographical basis," so that the language is left that NASA "should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds wherever feasible," the implication is that NASA does not have to be concerned with geographical distribution; that it can distribute, perhaps, upon some other criteria, like the size of business.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, the language two or three lines above that refers to geographical distribution.

It is the intent of the committee to see that the handling of these funds for research by the NASA organization should involve attention to geographical distribution. There is no question about that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe that that is very helpful. Although I still reaffirm my faith and regard for the distinguished chairman, I go on record now as against the last amendment, as well as the amendment which would provide for an additional $10 million for the Cambridge installation.

Mr. ANDERSON. The amendments have been agreed to en bloc. However, I am very happy that the Senator has stated his position. We believe that the NASA organization thoroughly understands the point that the Senator from Wisconsin has made.

The same point was made time after time by members of the committee. The point was made by a new member of the committee, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] who was quite expressive as to what he thought of the situation. I believe that the NASA organization has been very well advised as to the feelings of many Senators.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the chairman of the committee.

I point out that research, mostly university research is at least three-fourths, or perhaps 80 percent, of the NASA program. The program relies heavily on our university facilities. There is no part of the country which is stronger in university facilities than the Middle West. More Ph. D.'s are graduated from the University of Wisconsin than from any other university in the country. In the Midwest we have a greater concentration of Ph. D. graduates than does any other section of the country. However, we employ fewer Ph. D. graduates in the Midwest than any other section does.

This is one of the many indications that the university facilities of the Midwest are not being utilized by the Federal Government as they should be. I recognize that when we start a program in a certain area, it is easier to stay within that area.

It seems to me that, not only to give the Midwest a fair and equitable break, but also to use all of the great educational facilities throughout the country, the NASA organization should go into the Midwest, it should consider the returns which would be realized by making a wider investment of research efforts. I believe that if they were to do that, the very great contribution which the University of Wisconsin and many other universities would make in the fields of mathematics and physics, among others, in which we are extremely strong as well as in the other fields, would persuade the NASA organization that it could gain a great deal by giving greater consideration to such a move in the future than they have in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair). The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I support the NASA authorization bill, as recommended by the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.

The key word in the 1966 NASA budget, Mr. President, is "continuation"—continuation of a sound, well-planned, well-executed program that will make us preeminent in space.

The budget we are considering today will carry us well past the halfway mark in our program to land a man on the lunar surface and return him safely to earth. Four years ago last week, President Kennedy asked Congress to authorize an expanded space program that he and we hoped would accomplish that objective by 1970. He warned us that such a program would be costly, but that if we adopted it, we must see it through.

We adopted such a program, Mr. President, and we owe it to the country to see it through. This body has repeatedly reaffirmed the national commitment to outer space, including the effort to land a man on the moon in this decade.

It is our duty, Mr. President, to see to it that a well-balanced space program that will fulfill national goals is being carried out as efficiently as possible. I think the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] deserves the thanks of this body for the work the space committee has performed in reviewing the program.

As a member of that committee, I am convinced that NASA is going along at the right rate of speed. The 1966 NASA budget is no fly-by-night affair, Mr. President. It is built solidly on the foundation laid by seven predecessors. It is the result of yearlong study and pruning. It is designed to best combine speed and efficiency.

NASA has presented evidence to show that the program it is carrying out is a comprehensive, well-balanced effort to obtain the most knowledge of outer space for each dollar spent.

These have been 4 impressive years for our country in outer space, Mr. President. Our manned space program is the most dramatic, and the Gemini program has been dominating the space news this week.

However, our broad national program includes bringing the entire globe together in a single, reliable, all-weather communications network. It includes predicting the weather 5 days in advance over every square inch of this planet. It includes orbiting satellites to measure physical properties of the earth, sun, and space. It includes advanced research in medicine, metallurgy, and engine propulsion—research that will aid human knowledge in every field.

The benefits of the space program's work with schools, laboratories, and business firms are being felt in every State of the Union. I am proud to say that Ohio is contributing to this increase in knowledge in the space age, most notably through work done in NASA's Lewis Research Center.

The work being done as part of the space program is vital to our Nation's future, Mr. President, because that future is going to be lived in what men are already calling the age of space. Our ability to be a space faring nation will affect our prestige, our national security, our modern industrial base, our education and scientific facilities, and our ability to play the leading role among the nations of the earth.

The NASA budget will finance most of the work done in this program. NASA, though a comparatively new agency, has proved to my satisfaction that it can carry out our space program with speed, competence, and efficiency. I have found its personnel to be able, its facilities to be well constructed, and its programs to be imaginative, probing, and geared to the acquisition of space age competence.

I trust NASA to do the job, Mr. President. Their budget request is sound and reasonable, and I join in urging this body to approve it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, to go a step further with the question raised by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], it is true that fears have been expressed that NASA is creating an imbalance in our economy by concentrating its contracts and facilities in a few States. Suggestions have been made that the Congress devise some formula to require NASA to more widely distribute its projects on a geographical basis.

NASA is deeply concerned with the problem; it wants the people of every State to be knowledgeable supporters of the space effort, and it realizes that such support is more readily forthcoming if the Congress and the people believe that NASA is being as fair as it can.

NASA has instituted a series of regional meetings to acquaint business firms and institutions in every State with possible opportunities arising out of the national space program.

But the desire for widespread distribution is limited by other, more important considerations. After all, Mister President, the cardinal principle to be observed by any agency of our Government in its procurement policy is this: Contracts must follow competence.

As Administrator Webb has pointed out, NASA's basic and required procurement policy is to insure widespread dissemination of information on contract requirements so that there is open competition for these contracts.

But NASA must then grant these contracts, not on the basis of geographic distribution, but on the basis of who can best and most economically do the job on the basis of past performance records and bids. To do otherwise would be to violate both the law and commonsense, and to lay NASA open to severe criticism and to the kind of pressures that could be disastrous to our space effort.

Our aerospace industries, for example, were developed in certain geographical areas, primarily on the west coast, but also in New York, Missouri, and Texas. For this reason, most of NASA's prime contracts for large space hardware have gone to those areas because the competence exists there. You can imagine the effect on our space program if the Congress ever attempted to impose a distribution formula on such contracts. Fortunately, the Congress has never tried to do this, and never should.

If every region of the Nation had an equal aerospace capacity, the problem of distribution of industrial contracts would not arise. NASA believes, however, that there is an equal distribution of other kinds of potential capabilities in this Nation that can be used to help the national space program. One of NASA's most promising efforts to create such a nationwide capacity is its sustaining university program.

NASA's purpose in this program is to "do what we can to increase the total competence of the United States, but at the same time we must consider our own NASA responsibility and get work done where there is competence to do it."

NASA "did not consciously go about distributing the support for this program geographically," but instead said that "we will look for competence where it is and support it where it is, on the assumption that competence is distributed pretty uniformly around the country in our universities."

Mr. President, this assumption has proven correct. NASA now has a sustaining university training, research, or facilities program in every State of the Union.

Most widespread is the training program, in which promising undergraduates are given grants to study for doctor of philosophy degrees in space-related subjects. NASA currently is supporting 3,132 students in training. Every State is represented by at least three students; and while California with 207 students, and Texas with 178, are among the leaders, so are New York with 305, Illinois with 156, Ohio with 133, and North Carolina with 94. There has been a similar distribution in the research and facilities grants.

So it can be seen, Mr. President, that where the opportunity arises, NASA has been willing to encourage every part of this Nation to take part in the space effort. NASA is doing all it can to help create space competence in every corner of the United States.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DODD. I am very grateful to the Senator from New Mexico, chairman of the committee. I ask the Senator from New Mexico if he can assure the Senate that under the authorization for Saturn 1–B Centaur design studies and our research authorizations, it is the committee's view that NASA should begin now to do the required engineering and design work on the various possibilities of thrust augmentation of all vehicle stages.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I assure the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, who is a valued member of the committee, that that is the intent of the committee.

Mr. DODD. I am glad to hear the Senator give that assurance. My concern is that we make certain our space program has needed launch power and takes advantage of the Nation's boosters, such as large solids and other developments. Frankly, I think this must be done if we are to get full value from the Saturn 1–B Centaur hardware. Also, if this work is done now, NASA will be in a position to better define missions requiring added booster power as the committee has so often suggested.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record the first portions of an article by George Alexander in the May 17 issue of Aviation Week and Space Technology. The article is entitled "Use of Centaur as Saturn 1–B Upper Stage To Give NASA Significant Payload Increase." This article clearly shows what is possible in the uprating of Saturn 1–B Centaur hardware.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Use of Centaur as Saturn 1–B Upper Stage To Give NASA Significant Payload Increase

(By George Alexander)

Cocoa Beach, Fla.—Addition of the General Dynamics/Convair Centaur upper stage to the present two-stage Saturn 1–B launch vehicle will give National Aeronautics and Space Administration a booster with a payload capability significantly greater than the current weight estimate for the Mars/Voyager spacecraft.

The booster also will have a more than adequate growth potential to accommodate later, heavier, and more sophisticated Voyager versions.

The Saturn 1–B Centaur will be able to put 9,000 pounds on a Mars trajectory. NASA plans a weight of 7,000 to 8,000 pounds for the initial Voyagers. Later versions are to weigh as much as 11,000 pounds, and NASA launch vehicle specialists are certain that the three-stage vehicle can be upgraded to fly that weight.

Although not currently included in any firm plans for earth- or lunar-orbital operations, the Saturn 1–B Centaur can inject 35,000 pounds into a low-inclination, 200-nautical-mile earth orbit, compared with 30,000 pounds lifted to that altitude by the two-stage Saturn 1–B. For lunar missions, the Saturn 1–B Centaur can lift about 14,000 pounds—an intermediate capability between the 2,500 pounds capacity of the Atlas-Centaur and the 95,000 pounds of the Saturn 5.

The Saturn 1–B Centaur program is beginning to take form. NASA has given George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., overall managerial responsibility for the three-stage launch vehicle. The Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, will continue as Centaur manager and will deliver the stage to Marshall for integration into the overall vehicle in much the same way that USAF provides the Martin Co. Titan booster to NASA for the Gemini program.

NASA has requested only $5 million for the Saturn 1–B Centaur in the 1966 budget, mostly for preliminary design of the three-stage vehicle such as determining bending moments on the combined vehicle during flight, structural design of the 260-inch diameter shroud which will surround the Centaur stage and Voyager payload and development of guidance equations, and telemetry requirements.

Currently, NASA is considering an initial order of six Saturn 1–B Centaurs—two for research and development flight tests and four for operational Voyager missions. Some observers believe the first two flight articles will carry some scientific payload on a piggyback basis.

In the three up-coming Mars launch opportunities—1969, 1971, and 1973—only the last two are certain to use the Saturn I–B–Centaur as the launch vehicle. The 1969 window probably will be handled by an Atlas-Centaur, boosting a light engineering model of the Voyager (Aviation Week and Space Technology, Feb. 15, p. 45). This could change, however, if the Agency decides to fund both the Voyager and the Saturn 1–B Centaur heavily in fiscal 1967.

There is optimism in some NASA quarters that the new three-stage vehicle could be developed quite rapidly and provide Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Voyager program manager, with a heavier weight-envelope for the first spacecraft than could an Atlas-Centaur. Most observers consider it unlikely, however, that NASA will rush development of the spacecraft just to utilize the 1969 window.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

As the third stage of the Saturn 1–B, the Centaur will be encased in a 260-inch diameter, two-piece, clamshell-type shroud. The 57.1-foot-long shroud, fabricated of solid and honeycomb aluminum, will surround both the Centaur and the Voyager. Around the Centaur, the shroud will be a 29-foot-long cylinder; around the spacecraft, it will be a 28-foot-long frustum and cone.

Marshall studied an unshrouded version of the Centaur atop a Saturn 1–B, but decided against it, principally because there would have been aerodynamic problems with the large angle between the 120-inch-diameter base of the Centaur and the 260-inch-diameter forward skirt of the S–4B second stage—a none-too-clean aerodynamic configuration. Also, the thickness of the Centaur airframe would have had to be increased to accommodate both static and dynamic loads imposed by the Voyager.

This latter problem alone would have amounted to nearly a total redesign of the Centaur. To avoid this, the agency decided to use a load-bearing, jettisonable shroud. As a secondary bonus, the 260-inch-diameter of the shroud also provides a larger volume for payload designers than could be obtained by an unshrouded 120-inch-diameter Centaur.

At about the middle of the shroud, where it tapers from a cylinder to a frustum, NASA plans to hang six, three-legged snubbing and tensioning brackets on the inside of the structure. Spaced 60° apart, these brackets will take out both static and dynamic loads imposed on the Centaur, as well as preventing lateral movement of the forward end of the stage during boost flight. Base of Centaur will be mounted in S–4B's interstage adapter.

During second stage operation, when the shroud is jettisoned, the pressurized Centaur airframe will transmit the loads of the Voyager into the S–4B interstage adapter. By the time this occurs, the vehicle will be at an altitude where the hammerhead configuration of the Voyager/Centaur combination will be unaffected by the atmosphere.

On a typical flight, the shroud would be split longitudinally by a linear shaped charge at an altitude of about 350,000 feet and separated by two cold-gas spheres, each with an effective thrust of 765 pounds. The two halves of the shroud will fold back and down, like petals, and fall clear of the vehicle in 3.5 seconds.

NASA plans to separate the Centaur and its Voyager space craft from the spent S–4B by imparting a retrograde impulse to the latter. Four 3,500-pound solid motors on the S–4B's forward skirt will be fired after a linear shaped charge in the interstage adapter has broken the bond between second and third stages. The thrust of the motors will drive the S–4B back and away from the Centaur.

In adding the Centaur to the Saturn 1–B, NASA has stipulated that changes be kept to a minimum. The only modifications now authorized are those which are necessary to adapt the Convair stage to the present two-stage vehicle. For example, NASA directed Convair to retain the four glass-fiber insulation panels which the Centaur now carries around its liquid hydrogen tank. Despite the fact that the 260-inch-diameter shroud would protect the Centaur from aerodynamic heating during boost flight, NASA felt that there were three reasons to retain the jettisonable panels throughout a mission:

Panels would have to be jettisoned during S–4B second stage operations, at an altitude where there is still some atmospheric drag to pull them off the stage. Because of the large difference in the diameters of the Centaur and the S–4B (120-inch versus 260-inch), NASA feared that the panels might not clear the second stage in jettisoning, but instead would strike the latter and possibly rupture its airframe.

Large quantities of helium required to purge the 0.1-inch wide annular space between the glass fiber panels and the Centaur's hydrogen tank. Since the panels are not to be jettisoned, the quantity of purge helium can be reduced from a normal value of 150 pound-hour to 30 to 60 pound-hour. Some cryopumping of air or water vapor in the annular space may result, but NASA feels that this will reduce the insulation value of the panels only slightly.

Maximum payload capability of the Centaur is not required in present plans. Jettisoning the panels would provide another 1,300 pounds of payload, but NASA does not now feel that Voyager needs this additional margin.

Both the two-stage Saturn I–B and the Centaur have good growth potential. The eight Rocketdyne H–1 engines which now power the S–1B booster are rated at 200,000 pounds each; this could be increased to 225,000-pound thrust with not too much developmental difficulty. The single Rocketdyne J–2 engine which drives the S–4B stage is now rated at 205,000 pounds thrust, this could be increased to 215,000 to 230,000 pounds. Or, NASA could substitute the J–2T—a toroidal combustion chamber version of the J–2, operating at about 3,000 pounds per square inch (nearly three times greater than the chamber pressure of the current J–2 design) and a thrust of 315,000 pounds in place of the J–2. Coupled with a lengthened S–4B airframe to provide another 120,000 pounds of propellants, the uprated H–1's in the first stage and the J–2T in the second stage could boost the Saturn I–B's earth-orbital capability from its present 37,000-pound limit to about 50,000 pounds.

Adding a Centaur to the Saturn 1–B just described would increase the vehicle's escape capability to almost 19,000 pounds. By thrust augmenting the first stage with four first-stage Minuteman ICBM motors, the capability increases to about 21,000 pounds; adding four 120-inch-diameter solid motors used by the Titan 3–C raises the figure to approximately 30,000 pounds.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his contributions to the work of the committee.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 102 Leg.]

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Cannon
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Holland
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
McNamara
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hill, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Miller, Mr. Morse, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Scott, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Tower, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Williams of Delaware entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

AMENDMENTS NO. 219

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call up my amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceed to state the amendments identified as No. 219.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be waived and that they may be printed in the Record at this point. I believe I can explain the amendment quite easily and to the better satisfaction of Senators than would be the case if the amendments were read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments, ordered to be printed in the Record, are as follows:

On page 9, after line 24, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 6. The first sentence of section 305(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2457(f)) is amended to read as follows: 'Under such regulations in conformity with this subsection and with section 207 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 488), as the Administrator shall prescribe, he may waive all or any part of the rights of the United States under this section with respect to any invention which has been made in the performance of any work required by any contract of the Administration if the Administrator determines that such waiver (1) is justified upon equitable considerations by the contribution made or to be made, without financial assistance from the United States, by the applicant to the making or development of such invention, and (2) will promote substantially the use of such invention in the interest of the United States.' "

On page 10, line 1, strike out "SEC. 6", and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 7".

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I shall explain what the amendments would do.

In the first place, the amendments would prevent the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, under the $4.5 billion research and development authorization in the bill, from granting a private patent on research under the bill when he does not even know on what he is granting a waiver. In other words, when a person signs a contract for research, he does not know what will be discovered. For example, a person in Germany was doing research in the field of dyes for use on cloth. He came up with a substance which would be potentially useful as a dye, but it was discovered that it would be better as a medicine. That is how sulfanilamide was discovered. It was perhaps the greatest breakthrough in the field of drugs that had occurred in more than a hundred years. That person was looking for a better dye, and he discovered something that was of fantastic value for health.

The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was given authority to waive patent rights if he finds it to be in the national interest to do so.

What has he done under that provision? First he came to us and asked for authority to waive patent rights without any impediment whatever. We turned him down. Having been turned down, he said he was going to do it anyway. He is now proceeding to grant to contractors a waiver of patent rights without knowing what the patent would be and without knowing whether it would be of great value or of slight value. In other words, it is a complete pig-in-the-poke procedure or waiver, giving away patent rights without knowing what he was giving.

For him to do that is clearly against the law. How would he know whether it was in the national interest to waive certain patent rights, if he did not know what the patent would be and what it pertained to or what value it had, or if there were potential antitrust aspects connected with it?

My amendment would forbid such pig-in-the-poke waivers, which are clearly contrary to the law, even though the Administrator has now construed the law to give him the right to waive patent rights without knowing on what he is waiving patent rights.

In addition, the amendment would require compliance with the Federal Property Act when it is contemplated to give away Government property. What that will mean, so far as the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is concerned, is that if the Administrator desired to give away private patent rights on $4.5 billion of Government authorized research under the bill, he would have to submit such a proposal to the Attorney General and let the Attorney General tell him what the antitrust aspects of the proposal are, and perhaps what the value of the rights might be from the point of view of the Attorney General.

That is the law. The law in question relates to patents; in fact, it specifically mentions patents.

As it is now, the Administrator construes his authority to be such that he does not even have to consult the antitrust division or consider the antitrust aspects of the question.

Senators will find that in relation to policy questions that have arisen, the question of whether or not the action would create a monopoly that might be detrimental to the best interests of the people of the United States has not been considered. When patent rights are involved, in the absence of an express exemption, the Attorney General should be consulted in order to get his judgment on the antitrust aspects of the question.

My amendment would require one more thing. If the administration is going to waive patent rights under a contract, where the contractor has a cost-plus, guaranteed-profit contract, or a cost-plus, fixed-fee contract, with no danger of losing any money, on a basis which would require him to justify the waiver, there must be some equity on the part of the contractor. He must have made a contribution himself. He must be able to show that he did more than spend Federal money on a guaranteed-profit basis in order to justify that waiver. The Administrator would have to find that the waiver would promote the interests of the United States. In other words, he would have to find—and we would have no power to challenge him on this—that, for example, as he would allege, the invention would be put into public use. He would not be able to go along and authorize the waiver if he had reason to believe that the inventor was merely going to sit on the invention produced with public money and deny the public the benefit of the invention. He would have to find that the use of the invention would be promoted, rather than, by waiving the Government's rights, permitting a contractor to be a "dog in the manger" and deny the public, for 17 long years, the benefit of an invention achieved with public funds.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I ask the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana what would happen if the Administrator should determine to issue a waiver, and other branches of the Government thought the waiver was not in the public interest. Is there any provision in the amendment for a review by the Attorney General, or would the Attorney General be given the power to recapture the right to the invention if the waiver had been issued improvidently?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The amendment would not require that the Attorney General should have the power to protect the public interest in that respect, but it would place the burden on the Administrator at least to consult with the Attorney General so that he would have some idea of what he would be giving away.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Where is the language in the proposed amendment which would require the Administrator to consult with the Attorney General or with anyone else?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The amendment makes reference to title 40, section 488, of the United States Code. By reference, the Administrator would be required to consult the Attorney General and obtain the advice of the Attorney General. The Administrator would not have to follow that advice, but at least that would put the Attorney General in a position to be consulted on the question. It would put some of us in the position to complain about it in the event a patent were issued, for example, on a fuel cell which might give the holder of the patent complete monopoly rights over the whole future transportation industry of America.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Under the proposed amendment of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, would the decision of the Administrator be final and irrevocable? Would there be any right in any officer of the Government to recapture those rights for the people if the Administrator's waiver had not been a wise one?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No; such language is not in the amendment. I would hope that the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration would write into his waivers some language which would protect the Government. But the amendment would not require it. The amendment would be only a step in the right direction. It is an effort to say, "You will not give these things away without the Government's knowing what you are giving away."

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Would the distinguished Senator from Louisiana consider accepting an amendment to his amendment which would give the Attorney General the right of recapture if the give-away were an improvident wastage of the people's rights? The people of our country, under the bill, would spend how much?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Four billion five hundred million dollars.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Is it $4.5 or $5 billion?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Four billion five hundred million dollars for research.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Four billion five hundred million dollars a year. It seems to me, with such a vast sum of money involved, that to give one man, a temporary Administrator, the power to give away the rights of all the taxpayers in all of that property would be an utter failure to protect the public interest. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana would do some good, since it would at least require determination by the Administrator before the rights could be given away. Under existing law, as

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I understand it, contractors have automatically secured those rights; they have taken all of them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They do not have the right, they have admitted it, but now they claim the law gives the right to them, and they are doing it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. They seize the right; they have taken it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. While I admit that the amendment should go further, I would say to the Senator from Texas that it will be difficult to have the amendment in its present form agreed to. Consider how much better a position we will be in protecting the public if we have the amendment on the statute books than if we do not have it.

At least we would not have the pig-in-the-poke giveaways that are now going on. In addition, the Administrator would at least be required to consult with someone who had the public interest at heart and who would have the Attorney General's advice prior to giving the rights away.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I do not desire to slow down our race to the moon, but I see no reason for giving away the $5 billion in research that the people are spending every year in the program to reach the moon. Why should not the benefits of that research be reserved for the people who are paying for it? Those who engage in contracts under the program are making their profits out of it. They are being paid for the research that they are doing. Why should the benefits of that research be given exclusively to them by waiver of the Government's right to the patents? It is utterly unconscionable.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I agree with the Senator. If we should be successful and prevail with the amendment, I would have no objection whatever to the Senator from Texas offering an additional amendment to the bill in order to try to stop the giveaway of patent rights in other situations that would not be covered by my amendment. At least under the amendment the Administrator would be required to find that there is some equity to justify the giveaway. He would have to determine that the contractor had done more than spend the Government's money and was making a fortune by doing so. He would have to find that a waiver would actually bring about use of the invention, rather than merely bringing about a monopolistic condition to the detriment of those who had paid to bring about the invention.

The Senator has indicated by his statement that the race to the moon may not do much good for the average citizen. It may make him poorer, but I fail to see how it would make him richer. If we were to win the race to the moon, the achievement might give the average citizen some pride and satisfaction to know that the Americans had reached their objective. But if the American citizen is going to receive some economic benefit from the $4.5 billion poured into research on the program, it will have to come as a result of gaining the benefit of the knowledge and the information that we develop in spending the $4.5 billion.

We cannot tell what might be developed. A contractor might develop a fuel cell, which would not be particularly helpful to Louisiana because we produce oil, but it would greatly reduce costs and increase efficiency of power. He might develop a device that would operate an engine on water and air. One might fill the device at his home water hydrant and he would not have to go by a filling station to buy fuel. That is a project which is being worked on in one of the Government departments.

A contractor might develop new uses of materials. All kinds of fantastic things could be developed under the NASA contracts.

I am told that the amount of knowledge we have is doubling every 9 years. The Government is paying for 70 percent of that. The results will not benefit the taxpayer. He would not be particularly benefited if a man should reach the moon, but it might benefit him to have free use of the billions of dollars worth of information which is being developed.

By 1970, almost $25 billion will be spent under the research program of NASA alone. Do we desire the 192 million people of our country to have the benefit of that $25 billion of research, or do we wish those benefits to be locked up for a few special interests, a few large private companies which have filed for private patent rights on it? I know what the Congress is being importuned to do by the various associations of industrialists, the electronic firms, the chemical manufacturers and every big manufacturer in this country. The Government is being importuned to give away private patent rights on everything that the Government does in the field of research.

I submit that there is no more outrageous thing that can be done to the public interest. Many of these people have much influence. I, like others, have importuned some of them for campaign contributions for my party and for myself. Much as I felt fortunate about my success—and in some of those campaigns I had the help of these firms as I campaigned in the Democratic interest—nevertheless, we owe it to the people, now and then, to save one or two votes for them. This is one such instance. This is one way we can vote to give the people the benefit of $15 billion of Government research instead of an unjustified profit to private concerns.

If any Senator should suspect that he might lose his campaign contributors by voting with me today, I might assure him that I have been able to obtain contributions from some of those people, even though they knew I voted for the public interest as I see it on such issues as this.

Another instance of public interest is that of the high interest rates, which are costing the general public another $25 billion a year, compared with what the interest rates were under Franklin Roosevelt and Truman. We have an opportunity to stand up and do something for the people of the country.

I say to my Democratic colleagues that if this amendment prevails, it will prevail with 95 percent of the votes for it being Democratic votes. We should be proud to do this under Democratic support.

Sometimes big business representatives are told that various special interest schemes can best be accomplished under Democratic administrations. It is said that Republicans cannot get away with much special interest favoritism, because Democrats would fight it, and the Republican Party is suspect because of prior administrations like that of Grant and Harding.

But we Democrats can trade on the dubious assumption that we are the protector of the public interest only so long if we permit things like these patent giveaways. If the people find us out, it will be because we have tried to go along with the vested interests on such matters as this. We should stand up and vote for the people, and see to it that if they pay for the research, they will get the benefit of it.

Only last night, I was speaking with an executive of one of the great corporations of the country. He told about a certain invention that had to do with better cloth. The invention was developed with the company's money. The company was generous to the inventor. It gave him half a million dollars. The company made a hundred million dollars on the patent; it will make more. The company felt that it would be fair to give the inventor a little extra, so it gave him another $250,000. That is what the company thought was fair to pay the inventor for doing the work for the company in the company's laboratories. He had a contract, and the company got the invention. But it was a good deal both ways. I do not complain about it for a minute.

What I complain about is that if the company had had a Government contract, the people of the country would have been taxed, as they are being taxed $15 billion now, to pay for that kind of research. Yet the man who did the inventing in the case I have just spoken of ended by receiving three-quarters of a million dollars. The company would receive not only a guarantee of 7 percent for everything that they spent, even if they find nothing, but, in addition, it would get more than a million dollars from the patent rights at the expense of the public and the right even to deny the use of the patent to the public for 17 years, if it so desired. It is that type of thing that I would hope to prevent.

The amendment would not prevent the giveaway of private patents, but it provides that there shall be some kind of equity to justify it, even though I am sure the Administrator, knowing the man, will do his best to weigh the equities, so far as he can in favor of the companies. The amendment requires that he know what he is giving away when he does so.

I say to Senators, even those who favor the giveaway of Government research on private patents to the extent of $15 billion, that if they must give it away, think how much more satisfaction there is to know that something very valuable was given to the Government favorite, compared with giving it away and not knowing it had great potential value.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that since the new NASA patent waiver regulations went into effect on October 1, 1964, the total number of prime contracts and subcontracts entered into between that date and March 31, 1965, which could have been considered for possible waiver of rights, was 4,480.

There were 48 requests for waiver at the time of contracting which were made during this period.

Seven requests for waiver at the time of contracting were granted by NASA.

The number of requests denied was 37; the number of requests withdrawn was 2; the number of requests pending is 2.

During the period between October 1, 1964, and March 31, 1965, the NASA Inventions and Contributions Board also received some 47 additional waiver requests, 29 of which related to specifically identified inventions and 18 of which related to the contract rather than specific inventions. They were being considered for possible waiver after contract execution in accordance with NASA regulations.

As I have said, these figures hardly show cause for alarm. Of 47 additional waiver requests, 29 related to specifically identified inventions, and 17 related to the contract rather than specific inventions. However, out of 4,480 contracts, only 7 requests for waiver were granted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Massachusetts is speaking about advance waivers, not the many waivers granted after the invention was made. He said there were seven advance waivers granted, without knowing what the Government was waiving patent rights on. All seven were in violation of the law. The law may have been violated in more instances than that if they had not had someone like the junior Senator from Louisiana inquiring what rights were being waived. Once contractors get their way clear through Congress, there will be many more than seven waivers. It is against the law to do what has been done. One of those seven advance waivers were given to a corporation which controlled 85 percent of the market already. That is a true monopolistic situation.

If we had had the advice of the Attorney General on those waivers, I am sure he would have said, "That company already has a monopolistic situation. They will pretty well control the market, the way things are now." I doubt whether we ought to give them any stronger hammer lock on the public than they already have.

Consider a company like General Electric. That company already has about 15,000 patents with which to protect itself from competition. It wants still more, at public expense.

Those people tried to tell us that they did not think they would be interested in doing Government research unless they could be assured that they would have a patent monopoly on all the research they did. So they were turned down. What did they do? They broke the door down to "hog up" the contracts, even though they could not get advance waivers on patent rights. In other words, by their own action they proved that they had not been telling the truth.

General Electric sells a great amount of electrical equipment to the Government. For 10 years, it had one of its executives sitting in a room with executives of its competitors, all of them agreeing to rig the prices and charge the Government much more money than it should have been charged. When they were caught, they pleaded nolo contendere, which is like pleading guilty. They asked the judge to accept that plea, and one of their vice presidents was sent to the penitentiary, on the presumption that he was responsible for what happened. They threw themselves on the mercy of the court. Then they came to Washington and persuaded the Internal Revenue Service to let them deduct from their income taxes the treble damages assessed for damages to their commercial customers. Considering what the people had been defrauded of for 10 long years, Uncle Sam wound up by picking up 75 percent of the treble damages paid out by the electrical companies for overcharging the public. Those interests have so much influence that they do not need patents at public expense. When they are turned down, they will all be here grabbing for contracts.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for some questions?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield for a question.

Mr. JAVITS. I am much interested by the language in the amendment, on page 2, lines 6 and 7, "without financial assistance from the United States." Does that mean exactly what it says: that if the assistance from the United States is an infinitesimal part of the research work which results in an invention, nonetheless the patent is in the public domain?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not at all.

Mr. JAVITS. Has the Senator any qualification of that language?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. All that the amendment provides is that whoever is applying for the waiver must have done something besides merely spending Government money. He must have invested some of his own money in doing some of the research or development. He must have done something other than merely spending Government money. He must have spent some of his own money or done something to put some equity on his side.

Mr. JAVITS. Whatever the words are, what the Senator has in mind is that the project must be one in which he has spent money, and not one in which there was exclusively Government money. According to the language, looking at it as a lawyer, it would seem to me that it would work exactly the other way. If the Government had put up anything, the contractor could not ask for the waiver. The amendment reads, "Without financial assistance from the United States." I am merely trying to get at the purpose and intent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have had legislative counsel draft this amendment. The legislative counsel who drew the amendment has had considerable legislative experience. He is a former Justice Department attorney. This is what we intended.

I say to the Senator from New York that, as a good lawyer himself, he is hard to satisfy on a contract. A while back, I thought we had arrived at language that was clear. It was clear to me. It was clear to the Department of Justice. However, the Senator insisted on rewriting it. If the language were changed, but still retained the same meaning that I intend, I would have no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe that this question is important, and that we could clarify it if the occasion were to require.

I have a question of substance to put to the Senator. I believe the Senator knows of my sympathy for the general social position for which he stands, so I am not speaking adversely. The Senator has been arguing with great eloquence about the arrogation of patent rights, in a manner of personal aggrandizement, by companies which have been contracting with the Government.

The Senator has been arguing that this proposal is in the interest of the people, and that the patents should be in the public domain. We are all practical men. We know that a patent is worth nothing unless it is exploited, developed, refined, and technologically worked out so that it is workable. Every patent requires that.

Will the Senator address himself to this question: If we were to adopt the basic policy which the Senator has advocated here so eloquently and for so long, would we be depriving the people of the United States, when we put all the patents in the public domain, of the expertise, the investment, the intelligence, the ingenuity, and the work which goes into making patents mean something in terms of cheaper and better products for the people of the country? By eliminating the private interest, would we not lose something because of the lack of care in developing the patent since it would then be in the public domain?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The argument that monopoly would develop a product more rapidly than competition has been made by the monopolists. It is the most specious, ill-founded, ridiculous, and difficult-to-document argument that I ever ran across.

I made a speech on that subject on May 4, 1965. The speech appears at page 9343 of the RECORD. I have challenged others to show us a single case in history when a good product would not have been put on the market except by virtue of someone having monopoly rights. They have yet to produce the first case. I believe that they produced some kind of debatable case in which a product of dubious value might or might not have been put on the market. However, it took them about 3 years to cite even a debatable example of something which may or may not have been put on the market if they had had a monopoly on that product.

I made my speech on this subject on May 4 of this year and placed in the Record, case after case in which the Government has developed new inventions and new materials. Aerosol is an example. Aerosol is a product that causes the spray to come out of the can, or the shaving cream to come out of the can when the button on top of the can is pressed. Hundreds of people grabbed the idea and developed it once it was available.

We cannot find a case in which something good has ever been developed with Government money that people have not utilized it and put it on the market. Quite to the contrary, we find that time after time when there was a monopoly, the product was kept off the market.

The fluorescent lighting is an example. The fluorescent light was available for a good many years before we ever saw the first fluorescent light tube. That was because the electric companies thought they might make more money by using the old-fashioned light blubs which burned out more quickly and gave less light.

The telephone company had a monopoly. It delayed for years using dials for dial telephones.

I could cite numerous examples in which monopolists have kept something from public use. Not one example has been cited to show that monopoly had put something on the market which would not otherwise have been so placed.

My speech on this subject starts on page 9343 of the Record on May 4, 1965, and continues for several pages thereafter. In that speech, I cited case after case and example after example in which hundreds of competitors have developed products with their own money and made the products available. I challenged monopoly to cite a single case in which something would not have been on the market if it were not developed by monopoly.

The record is replete with examples of products being denied to the people year after year where monopoly existed.

The record of the GAO indicates that many of the best discoveries, in direct violation of the terms of the Government contract, have been withheld from the Government itself for as much as 4 long years after discovery before being made available to those working on parallel research.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I like what the Senator says. There is a great deal to it. I believe that the rights of the people can be adequately protected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Please understand that the amendment would permit the Administrator to be favorable to business. In my judgment, the Administrator is now doing things that are against the law. Such things are being done in favor of business. The amendment would permit the Administrator to determine that waiver would provide the best use of the product.

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question in my mind that there are many cases in which a waiver would be granted if it was decided that it would be equitable.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In line with the argument of the Senator, if my amendment were agreed to, it would insure that when the Administrator gives a waiver, the waiver may be revoked. Suppose a person has a new engine that would benefit the entire public. If he did not pursue the invention, the Administrator could revoke the waiver. If he were doing nothing, the Administrator would revoke the waiver and let someone else develop it, if the product were not to be used.

Mr. JAVITS. What we are really discussing is a method by which a fundamental purpose can be achieved. In the case of most waivers, I believe that there would probably have to be compulsory licensing in order to preserve the very thing which we are trying to protect: The development and exploitation of patents. It is for that reason that I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The Senator will find at the top of page 2 the following words:

> He may waive all or any part of the rights of the United States under this section with respect to any invention—

Does the author of the amendment construe that language to mean that the Administrator could carry on a policy of compulsory licensing as a condition of waiver, as well as recapture rights, although the rights of the United States, if narrowly construed, might merely mean the right of the United States as a government to use the invention? Although those words are very limited in the text, I do not believe that the Senator has any such limitation in mind as to the conditions of waiver which would have to be met.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No; quite to the contrary. In any event, I would like to see the administration protect the right of the United States to use an invention for its own public interest. The standard contract in that respect provides that the United States may have royalty-free license to use the invention, but that it may not use it to provide general services to the public.

I do not particularly like the provision that the United States can use the license only for Government purposes; but corporations have in the past been able to prevail on NASA and the Defense Department to put such a provision in the contracts.

Mr. JAVITS. My question was broader. Can there now be written into the waiver, under the language of the amendment—although the language of the amendment is narrow—compulsory licensing, to avoid losing the patent rights, or even to recapture them, if the waiver is not exploited or used?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should think so. I would hope, if the waiver inventions were not used, that would be done. In some instances, it would be much better if the person who did the research could charge someone else a royalty to use it, rather than prevent him from developing a competing product. For example, RCA had control of a color television patent. RCA rather than the Columbia Broadcasting System was selected by FCC to bring out color television. But the Government ruled in effect that RCA must issue licenses; and Motorola, and other companies were licensed. It is desirable to do that. I would hope it would be done in this case. Also, if there were to be a waiver, I would hope that there would be considered a waiver of less than 17 years' duration, so that the product would be made available for others to produce in 7 or 9 years, rather than 17 years.

Mr. JAVITS. I know the Senator knows I am trying to be of help, and knows that I feel something must be done.

Does the Senator feel it would be more in the general public interest if there were a generic Federal policy? The Patents Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], is holding hearings on that question at this time. That question is also before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with respect to medical research. The minority members of that committee are drafting an alternative to the so-called Long amendment, tailored very much along the lines of the subject which the Senator is now discussing.

The Senator from Louisiana is the deputy leader on his side of the aisle, and for that reason he has a little more responsibility than do other Senators. I wonder whether the Senator would comment on the question whether it would be best in the public interest to develop a policy and a provision which would apply across the board for all Government agencies as a result of consideration and evaluation by the McClellan subcommittee and by other committees. I do not preclude the Senator's purpose. But I believe the Senator ought to give us his view on that point.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That argument has been suggested for a good many years, and it has been suggested this year.

There was an amendment, back in 1947, offered by the late Senator Kilgore and Senator Aiken, who is still with us, to amend the National Science Foundation Act and prevent private patents being obtained under it.

At that time the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] made the same argument, namely, that we ought to have one bill that applied uniformally to the patent policy of the Government. The argument was made eloquently then. The Senator from Massachusetts is still making that argument. He made it no less than 3 months ago. He said we ought to have one patent policy bill.

Think what a situation we would have been in if we had waited from 1947 to 1965, a period of 18 years, to have a uniform patent policy. Some of our boys who are now fighting in the Armed Forces were not born at that time.

I tried to make this policy uniform. I went to the White House when President Kennedy was President, and I said:

> This is an outrage. Something ought to be done about it. Mr. President, you can stop it with one stroke of the pen. You can issue an Executive order to protect the public interest.

He said:

> I will think about it.

Then Dr. Jerome Wiesner came to me and talked to me about it.

Incidentally, if a Senator wants to be sure his recommendations are received favorably at the White House, if he happens to represent a corporation—which no Senator does now, but if that should be the case at some time—the one way to have his recommendations adopted would be to have a White House adviser who was sympathetic to his view.

In this case Dr. Wiesner came to me and talked to me about it. He said the executive branch wanted to get together on a policy.

So a Presidential patent policy committee was established. Mr. President, there are about 11 agencies which are by law prohibited from giving away patent rights. Some of them are so much against giving away patent rights that if someone should suggest it he would run the danger of being punched in the nose by one of them. There are those who become outraged if one even talks about it. On the other hand, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration wants to give away some patents when it can do it. The Defense Department and other agencies want to give away everything they can.

So there was adopted what was called a President's patent policy. Anybody could read it and do anything he wanted under it.

If a certain Government official wanted to give away some patent rights, he could find something in that policy which would allow him to give them away. If someone else did not want to give them away, he could find something in that policy which would prevent him from giving them away.

I regret to say that I agreed to that policy at that time because I was able to get one small sentence in it. I said that if it had something to do with health, that patent should not be given away. Yet bless Pat, even that is being given away in some cases. So if one wants to find a way to give a patent right away, he can find justification somewhere in that policy for giving away a patent. If one has not been successful in justifying giving away a patent, one of the lawyers who might have collected a big fee as a result of being successful in having a patent right given away will say, "You should have hired us, and we would have obtained it for you."

I regret that I had anything to do with that policy. I started by going to the White House to protect the public interest. It was one of the few times I went there to speak for the general interest at large rather than to speak for the cotton growers or rice farmers or for tidelands or something else that affected my State or a group of my constituents in particular. Senators should do that from time to time, rather than represent their farmers, business interests, or labor people in particular. I tried to represent the public interest. The result was a document that ranks with the foolish. It shows that there is truth in the saying that the road to hell can be paved with good intentions.

That is what happens when we try to get one bill to cover all agencies. They are not going to agree on it. About the best thing we can do is to try to cover them one by one.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question? I am grateful for the time the Senator has given me and for the manner in which he has answered the questions.

The Long amendment has been virtually the same in text in a number of bills. Now we have a revised Long amendment on this bill and still another version on the health research bill.

Will the Senator tell us what has induced him to tailor these amendments apparently differently from the standard Long amendment?

Has he revised his view as to what should be done, or what is the fundamental rationale for revising the Long amendment now, as contrasted with the Long amendment which went into other bills?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The rationale is that I am trying to curb an agency which has been giving these things away. I am trying to stop, within the spirit of the original authorization act, something that has been going on.

It is easier when and simpler when we start a new program. When the original authorization for NASA was passed, if I had been able to look into a crystal ball and see that the Administrator was going to interpret that language "in the public interest" to mean what he interpreted it to mean, I would have fought tooth and nail against any conference report that might have so provided.

Mr. ANDERSON. The original language put in the space bill by the Senate was strong language. It went to conference and was very much changed there. The language we got back was different from that which the Senate tried to pass.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be happy to settle for the language the Senate passed in the first instance, if I thought I could get it.

We want to know what they are going to be giving away, before they give it away. There must be some equity in favor of the recipient. Also the antitrust aspect must be considered.

Does the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] desire to have me to yield to him at this time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I repeat what I said previously to the Senator. It seems to me he is rather exaggerating the idea of the Government giving things away.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in this field, I believe it is impossible to exaggerate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well. I merely say that since the NASA revised patent waiver regulations became effective on October 1, 1964, which were upon President Kennedy's statement on Government patent policy, and endorsed by President Johnson, there have been 4,480 NASA contracts where waiver at the time of contracting could have been considered, yet, only 7 waivers were granted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is talking about waivers before the fact. He is not talking about waivers after they develop. When they develop, the Government is still giving them away. Everything that is valuable is being waived, and after the fact. I am talking about waivers before the fact. My amendment would prohibit the seven cases to which the Senator referred. Those 7 cases should be prevented before the situation grows to 707 cases.

With regard to hundreds of patents, with waivers after the discovery, my amendment would prohibit such waivers unless they are proved to be justified.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I share the concern of the Senator from New York as to the language in the amendment. I appreciate the Senator's tolerance when he said that possibly the language might be modified. However, I am concerned about the expression in lines 6 and 7 on page 2, "without financial assistance from the United States."

Granted that the legislative history made here makes it appear that this is not——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to strike that language and insert in lieu thereof the following: "contract on their own account."

Does that satisfy the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MILLER. Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that I am about to suggest the language "with his own resources," but I believe that the Senator's language is just as clear.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to strike that language and insert in lieu thereof the following, "with its own resources" or did the Senator say "with his own resources"?

Mr. MILLER. I believe it would be more grammatical to say "with its own resources."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator very much.

I should like to ask him one further question, in order to make a little more legislative history. The Senator refers in his amendment to "equitable considerations," which is a rather broad concept. For example, if a contractor put up $1 million and the Federal Government put up, say, $100,000, might that mean that one-tenth of the value of the rights under an invention might be repaid by the Federal Government and nine-tenths might be waived to the contractor; is that the kind of "equitable considerations" which the Senator has in mind?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If he wished to do so, he could waive 100 percent. If he wished to do so, he perhaps could waive 10 percent if that is what the Senator had in mind. It would be easy enough to conclude that he should waive it all, because the Government put up only $100,000. At least there would be some equity to be considered. It is, therefore, as wide open as all outdoors. That is the kind of consideration that could be taken into account by waiver.

Mr. MILLER. I believe that it is well for us to give some indication of what we have in mind when we use the term "equitable considerations," because the

Administrator might well like to have some guidelines. As I pointed out to the Senator from Louisiana when we discussed the Long amendment to the Water Pollution Control Act about 3 months ago, some of us had in mind, at the time of the hearings before the Hoover Commission last year, that it might be a fairer approach to have an allocable portion of the patent rights or invention rights based upon the relative financial contribution as between the United States and the contractor. I am not saying that this is the only approach to it, but I believe that this could be an approach which the Administrator might follow, and I would like to find out if this could be done.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say frankly to the Senator that, in my judgment, it would be best for the amendment to stand on its own on the NASA authorization. If we extend it, I frankly believe that we should conduct business the way a private concern does, generally speaking. A private concern is paid to do the research, and, therefore, those who pay for the research get the patent rights. If the Government paid for the research, it would be for the benefit of 192 million people who should receive the benefits of the research. I believe it would be better to sign a contract under which the Government pays for the cost of the research and gets what it paid for rather than the various fuzzy arrangements.

The argument will be made on the basis of "equitable considerations," that the concern has already spent a large amount of money in research in this field, and that it has already spent its own money, which justifies an equitable waiver.

Mr. MILLER. At least the equitable waiver is justified in part.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; but I would hope that the Government, in negotiating contracts, would do it in the way it is doing now, and would pay the entire cost from the time it signed the contract. Of course, some kind of partnership arrangement might be worth considering when the concern pays a part, and the Government pays part, splitting the royalties, and permitting anyone to be licensed to produce the product. That is possible under the amendment with regard to health and matters of that sort. It would be better to wait and debate these points on their own merits, because other questions are involved.

Mr. MILLER. I am glad that the Senator brought out one of these features; namely, that a company might have done much basic research. This is adapted to the particular project which perhaps is financed entirely by the Federal Government. Nevertheless, "equitable considerations" would indicate that some of the rights, at least, should be waived. But I understand that that is not what the Senator had in mind. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

One further question. The Senator uses the word "invention" in line 2 on page 2 of his amendment. Does he imply patent rights there also?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; everything.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I did not intend to speak on this amendment to the NASA authorization bill. However, as the ranking Republican on our committee, I believe I have a duty to speak.

This amendment to the patent section of the basic act creating NASA may be a good amendment, or it may be a bad one. I do not know. I do know that the entire subject of patents is most involved and very complicated. I know that no hearings have been held by our committee on the subject of patents. I know that the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], is currently holding hearings on several bills which would establish a uniform Government patent policy.

Whatever merit this amendment may or may not have, until hearings have been held and made available for evaluation, either by our committee or some other committee, I shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mrs. SMITH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I commend the distinguished Senator from Maine for the attitude she takes. We are dealing with an area which is entitled to full consideration.

The Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences is responsible for the bill which has been brought to the floor of the Senate.

As the distinguished lady has stated, we have not held any hearings.

It seems to me that our first objective is to have the finest and best and most advanced space program that we can possibly have. We have made great progress with respect to space under the present patent law. Certainly we should not change it hastily on the floor of the Senate. Even though the subject has been discussed for years, it has not been pursued in committee for years. After all, we are dealing with a complex subject. When a company has a Government contract, it is difficult to determine how much of the new ideas that came out of its research had their origin years and years before in investments and expenditures totally unrelated to Government activity.

As a matter of principle, I do not favor a system under which the Government would have a monopoly on patents, because, if that were to happen, the Government of the United States would have a monopoly upon advance and upon progress and growth. Our historic patent system has given reward or the hope of reward to the individual who has thought and dreamed and developed or, in our more sophisticated age, has through laboratory research developed new ideas. It is very important that we continue with the progress, and that any change should be made upon the recommendations of a majority of the members of a committee, and not based on discussions on the floor of the Senate.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank my distinguished colleague, a valuable member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate is considering a major bill, the annual authorization of funds for our National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This bill authorizes the expenditure of $5.2 billion during the fiscal year 1966, which will begin July 1.

No one will dispute the fact that this is a considerable amount of money.

As recently as 1959, when I first came to the Senate, only the small amount of $339 million was allocated to the agency, 0.5 percent of the budget.

In fiscal 1966, 4.9 percent of the budget is set aside for the research and development work of NASA.

But despite the fact that a bill of this magnitude will have a substantial effect on the economy in general, and the space and related industries in particular, we will be asked today to add to the authorization of funds a patent policy amendment which would have far-reaching and, I fear, adverse effects on our space program.

This amendment has been offered by the distinguished majority whip, Senator Long of Louisiana and it is with regret that I part company with him on this issue.

And I do so because I do not believe that the floor of the Senate in a vote on an amendment, is the proper place to decide whether or not a substantive change in the patent policy of a Government agency should be made.

I agree with the Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith] and other Senators who have said that this is no way to change the patent policy of any agency of Government.

This argument is, I know, made quite often by the proponents of a bill.

How many times have each of us heard something to the effect: "No, no, this amendment has not been studied by the committee. It should be a separate bill, heard as such and then reported to the Senate. I promise the Senator that I will take it up soon, if the Senator will introduce his proposal as a bill, and so forth, and so forth."

And sometimes, perhaps even often, this is a legitimate argument against an amendment, as is the case with respect to the patent amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The NASA bill does not contain any amendment in either the House or the Senate versions to the agency's patent authority, which is spelled out in the Space Act of 1958.

The Senate Space Committee, on which I serve, did not hold hearings on the patent question.

Admittedly, the Senator did propose a broad patent amendment to our committee more inclusive than the one he has offered on the floor. And the committee did discuss to some extent the Long amendment, but we did not vote on it or hold hearings.

No action, one way or the other, was agreed upon. There were, in my opinion, two good reasons for this.

One, hearings on governmentwide patent policies were to come up soon. In fact, these hearings before Senator John McClellan's Patents Subcommittee started yesterday on three bills, one of them introduced by Senator Long, intended to establish by statute a patent policy which would apply to all departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I believe it was on May 17 that we gave notice in the Congressional Record that hearings would start. We held hearings yesterday. We heard six witnesses yesterday and six this morning. We were scheduled to hear eight witnesses this afternoon. We may not be able to hear that many today. However, we are proceeding with diligence to try to develop a record on which the Senate will be able to act.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Arkansas for that accurate information. That is the point I wished to make. A committee is in the midst of holding hearings. Yet the Senator from Louisiana offers his amendment at this time. I hope he will reconsider his action and withdraw the amendment and give the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] and our committee an opportunity to hear all views on this very important subject.

Two, to resume my original statement, NASA's patent policies, developed in a number of stages since 1958, seem to have worked well. Certainly well enough so that I do not think NASA should be singled out as the only department or agency to have a new patent policy imposed on it at this time.

It is with some trepidation that anyone of us in the Senate speaks on the complex subject of patent policies.

Few of us have had the opportunity to acquire an adequate knowledge and understanding of the details of patent procedures and practices, either of NASA or of any other Federal agency.

So I feel that it is imperative that this complex and important subject undergo hearings and expert comment before the Senate does anything at all.

It is primarily for this reason that I strongly urge rejection of the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I certainly do not pretend to be a patent expert but, since this matter came up, I have felt an obligation to probe into it as deeply as time would allow.

I think that all of us, both opponents and proponents of the Long amendments, agree that the innovations and inventions that stem from federally financed research and development should be effectively utilized for the benefit of the economy as a whole.

NASA has an obligation to preserve America's role not only as a leader in aeronautical and space science and technology but also in the application of this science and technology to the conduct of regular, peaceful activities.

On the basis of my study, I would say that NASA has actively pursued a patent program the purpose of which is to foster the utilization of the technology emanating from its research programs by the private, commercial sector of our economy.

So NASA, with me, Senator Long and most other Senators, feels that the taxpayer should get the benefit of the new technology that flows from the space program.

But there is disagreement as to how NASA can best achieve an effective technology utilization.

Or to be more specific, what policy for handling rights to inventions will best contribute to this objective.

The Senator from Louisiana contends, in the amendments he has offered to other bills in previous years and in the general patent policy bill he has introduced, that since the taxpayers of this country pay the bill for Government research and development, the rights to any resulting inventions should become the exclusive property of the United States.

It is tempting, in such a complex field, to settle for a clear and simple position such as this.

But I personally do not think the answer is that easy.

Perhaps if I briefly discuss some of the research and development work conducted by NASA I can best explain what I mean by this.

This is a $5 billion program at the forefront of science and technology. Unlike the relatively narrow fields of technology involved in other programs, including the field of nuclear energy where the development costs were borne entirely by the Government from the very start, the fields of technology related to NASA's research and development activities are of tremendous breadth. They embrace the whole spectrum of science and technology.

In carrying out its mission, NASA conducts active research programs in such unrelated fields as rockets and engines and microelectronics; in lubricants and paints and in lightweight computers and tape recorders.

NASA conducts research in lens design, medical electronics, nutrition, biology, batteries and power supply design, valves, pumps, storage tanks for cryogenic fluids, plasmaphysics, motor design, nuclear research, fiberglass technology and solar cells, in addition to the uniquely space-related fields of satellite systems design and launch vehicle systems.

A substantial portion of NASA's research and development, representing approximately 50 precent of NASA's research and development budget, is conducted in the field of electronics.

We cannot, and should not, therefore, lightly pass on this subject. The NASA authorization bill is not one that is analogous to the other bills to which the Senate has aded Senator Long's patent amendment.

The Water Resources Act and the Saline Water Act, for example, involve much smaller sums of money each year and, more importantly, are programs which have less of a potential for commercial application than do the NASA programs.

Mr. President, I cannot subscribe to an action here on the floor of the Senate that would result in amending the patent provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act in the absence of complete hearings.

I note with interest that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana introduced the other day a bill, S. 1899, which like the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, to which I have referred earlier—S. 1809—would establish national policy cn a governmentwide basis. That is a constructive action to take, and I am glad that the Senator introduced the bill. I wish, therefore, that he would put his efforts behind the bill before the committee over which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] presides, which committee is now holding hearings. Everyone will then have a good opportunity to understand this very complicated question as well as the philosophy of the bill.

The philosophy of these bills is quite different, just as the philosophy of Senator Long's amendment and NASA's policies differ.

I do not think this is the time to choose between patent philosophies or to attempt to create what might be claimed as further precedent one way or the other on this question. There must first occur the most careful study, with full hearings, at which all the varying viewpoints can be aired. The issues must be studied on a governmentwide, not a piecemeal, basis. And this is being done now by Senator McClellan's subcommittee.

I therefore feel, Mr. President, that the proper action to take today, without prejudice to any point of view is to refrain from amending in piecemeal fashion the basic NASA Act insofar as it relates to the handling of patents.

I have no desire to discourage further discussion in this issue. If, however, it is the intention of the Senator from Louisiana to obtain a vote of his amendment, I wish to advise the chair now of my desire to move later at an appropriate time to table the amendment.

Even though the main point of my argument against Senator Long's amendment is a procedural, rather than a substantive one, I do feel that I should discuss NASA's patent policies for a minute or two.

This is because I personally think that NASA has followed a sound and consistent patent policy, fully in keeping with the law, with President Kennedy's Executive order on patent policy, and with the present administration's patent policy.

In 1958, a special subcommittee worked out a patent provision as part of NASA's basic act.

The distinguished Speaker of the House, John McCormack, who served as chairman of this subcommittee, has this to say in interpreting the patent provision, which was changed from a provision originally approved by the House:

> The original patent provision was too closely patterned after the stringent requirements in the Atomic Energy Act which are

not fully applicable to the space field. The substitute provision agreed to by the conferees protects both the interest of the Government and affords enough flexibility to the Space Administrator to let him meet needs for preserving the incentives of the individuals and companies whose efforts it is public policy to encourage.

Subsequent to President Kennedy's Statement of Government Patent Policy, issued on October 10, 1963, NASA modified its regulations for the granting of waivers, and these guidelines have been reaffirmed by President Johnson.

Indeed, yesterday morning two administration witnesses testified in support of a Government patent policy substantially like NASA's during the Patent Subcommittee hearings held by Senator McCLELLAN.

Both Dr. Donald F. Hornig, Director of the Office of Science and Technology, and James E. Webb, Administrator of NASA, made lengthy statements, generally favorable to Senator McCLELLAN's rather than Senator LONG's bill.

On the basis of this recent administration testimony and the record made by NASA in the area of patent policy, I would venture the opinion that it would be contrary to the administration's wishes that we adopt even the modified version of Senator LONG's amendment that is now the pending business.

And what is NASA's record with respect to the waiving of the Government's patent rights?

Last week I asked the Administrator to give me a statistical summary of the NASA waiver policy as actually carried out both under its regulations issued in 1959 and under the revised regulations adopted in the fall of 1964, implementing President Kennedy's patent guidelines for Government-wide use.

Under the old regulations, there were 2,338 inventions reported as of March 31, 1965.

Only 128 waivers were granted by the Administrator of NASA, and 6 of these have subsequently been voided.

Under the revised NASA regulations, which have only been in effect since the fall of 1964, out of an estimated number of 4,480 eligible prime and subcontracts, advance waivers at the time of contracting have been sought in only 48 cases, 7 of which have been granted. Some 18 petitions for advance waiver were pending before the NASA Inventions and Contributions Board as of March 31, and some 48 petitions relating to specifically identified inventions. The Board has not yet acted on these petitions.

As far as I can tell, this is a good record, one that shows that NASA has done its best to protect the public interest.

And for this reason, I would not want to see NASA singled out as the agency which will have its patent policy revised while other agencies, some perhaps less responsive to the public interest, are permitted to continue with their own patent policies.

I wish to repeat what I said earlier. I shall make a motion to table the amendment after all Senators have had a full and fair opportunity to discuss it. I desire the Senator from Louisiana to know that, in making the motion, I shall do so with great friendship and respect for him. I am sorry that we are on different sides on this particular vote.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO PATENT PROVISIONS OF SPACE ACT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I endorse the statement of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut opposing the effort to amend the NASA organic act relating to patents.

There is a danger, I think, of becoming so preoccupied with a particular aspect of a problem that we fail to grasp the full import of what is involved.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his emphatic insistence, over the years, that the benefits flowing from Government research and development programs be made available to the taxpayer who foots the bill. With this it would be difficult to disagree.

The able and experienced Administrator of NASA, the Honorable James Webb, agrees with this objective, but believes his agency has the most effective program in Government for identifying technology which might have commercial application, and disseminating information regarding this technology to people who might be interested.

The handling of patents is obviously a key aspect of the problem of how best to move the full benefit of this new technology into the mainstream of our economy.

I also commend my able friend from Louisiana for his concern over the possibility that, through the acquisition of title to patents covering inventions made under federally financed programs, companies, particularly large companies, will be able to stake out a dominant position in the field, and through monopoly rights, charge exorbitant prices for the resulting product.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would appreciate it if the able Senator would permit me to finish my statement. Then I shall be glad to yield.

I would draw to the attention of Senators the fact that the President's patent policy deals specifically with this problem. The criteria contained in the President's memorandum for determining whether the principal rights to inventions should rest with the Government, or the contractor specifically require retention of these rights by the Government in situations where to do otherwise might confer on the contractors a preferred or dominant position. The NASA patent regulations are equally clear on this point.

It is said that a major defect in the President's patent policy, which is reflected in the new NASA patent regulations, is that the matter of rights to inventions may, under some circumstances, be settled at the time of contracting, and before any inventions are actually made.

The question to be answered is:

"How can NASA, or any other agency, effectively guard against conferring on a company a dominant or preferred position if it settles the question of who gets the principal rights to inventions before they are specifically identified?"

Mr. President, I believe an effort to deny NASA the opportunity to make such a decision at the time of contracting, in the face of the stringent rules and safeguards contained in both the Presidential guidelines and the NASA regulations, is a basic assault on the Presidential guidelines themselves, and therefore should be defeated.

Before a contracting officer can grant an advance waiver, he must officially make a positive finding on six counts. The six are:

First. It is not a principal purpose of the contract to create, develop, or improve products, processes, or methods which are intended for commercial use by the general public at home or abroad, or which will be required for such use by governmental regulations.

Second. It is not a principal purpose of the contract to explore into fields which directly concern the public health or public welfare.

Third. The contract is not in a field of science or technology in which there has been little significant experience outside of work funded by the Government, or where the Government has been the principal developer of the field, with respect to which the acquisition of exclusive rights at the time of contracting might confer on the contractor a preferred or dominant position.

Fourth. The contract is not for services of the contractor for the operation of a Government-owned research or production facility, or coordinating and directing the work of others.

Fifth. The purpose of the contract is to build upon existing knowedge or technology to develop information, products, processes, or methods for use by the Government.

Sixth. The work called for by the contract is in a field of technology in which the contractor has acquired technical competence—demonstrated by factors such as know-how, experience, and patent position—directly related to an area in which the contractor has an established nongovernmental commercial position.

Experience to date has shown that it is possible to determine with adequate accuracy the characteristics of the inventions which may arise so as to make an intelligent advance judgment regarding the disposition of rights. To protect the Government's interest where unforeseen developments occur, however, the follow-up requirements in both the Presidential guidelines and NASA's patent regulations protect against abuses.

For example, when rights to inventions are waived at the time of contracting, NASA makes these rights subject to a number of conditions and reservations. The waiver is effective only as to inventions reported by the contractor to NASA. The information regarding these inventions is then made freely available by NASA through a variety of dissemination techniques. The Government reserves to itself an irrevocable nonexclusive royalty-free license to practice the invention throughout the world on behalf of the United States, or any State or municipal government, or any foreign government pursuant to treaty.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should first like to finish my statement; then I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

NASA further provides that a contractor who has been granted an advance waiver must reply to yearly inquiries regarding the commercial use being made of the invention. In the event that a contractor cannot, after 3 years, demonstrate that he has worked the invention and made it reasonably accessible to the public, NASA can require that it be made available for licensing, either royalty-free, or on terms that are reasonable in the circumstances.

In all cases, NASA reserves the right to require the contractor to grant licenses either royalty free, or on reasonable terms where to do so would satisfy Government regulations for public use of the invention, or as necessary to fulfill health needs, or for other public purposes that may be stipulated in the contract.

Based on the above facts, Mr. President, it is hard for me to agree with those who say that these procedures overlook the public interest, or fail to include adequate protections against abuse.

It is my conviction that preoccupation with but one aspect of this matter has tended to obscure a critical problem in getting the benefits of new technology into the mainstream of the economy for the benefit of citizens and taxpayers. This problem is that contractors in the past have lacked motivation to take the time and trouble to adequately record inventive activity, and to report promptly to the Government the inventions and innovations made under the Government-financed program. It is in such circumstances that the taxpayer really gets short changed.

Nothing is more stultifying to inventive activity than for the Government to adopt a rigid rule that the Government gobbles up and lets lie dormant all the patent rights to inventions stemming from federally financed research and development.

In support of this position I would quote briefly from the letter of Dr. Donald F. Hornig, the President's Science Adviser, to our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; dated April 22, 1965. In opposing an earlier proposed amendment to the NASA authorization bill, Dr. Hornig stated:

> The proposed amendment fails to recognize the importance of providing incentives to the contractor to identify patentable inventions. I am not referring to intentional withholding of patentable ideas from the Government. Rather, the discovery that a patentable invention has come up in the course of research and development work takes alertness and positive effort. Without patent incentives it is unlikely that the contractor's organization would devote sufficient attention to looking for patentable ideas. It would not be motivated to identify inventions which, in many cases, are incidental rather than central to the goals of the Government-supported work.

I submit that this amendment would, in the long run, foster the suppression of inventive activity and, by so doing, deny to the taxpayer and to the economy the benefits which, under the flexible but carefully safeguarded procedures set forth in the President's patent policy, will increasingly flow from Government research and development programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement on patent policy issued by President Kennedy, and reaffirmed by President Johnson, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement on patent policy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM AND STATEMENT ON GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY

[GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY]

Memorandum for the heads of executive departments and agencies

Over the years, through Executive and legislative actions, a variety of practices has developed within the Executive Branch affecting the disposition of rights to inventions made under contracts with outside organizations. It is not feasible to have complete uniformity of practice throughout the Government in view of the differing missions and statutory responsibilities of the several departments and agencies engaged in research and development. Nevertheless, there is need for greater consistency in agency practices in order to further the governmental and public interests in promoting the utilization of federally financed inventions and to avoid difficulties caused by different approaches by the agencies when dealing with the same class of organizations in comparable patent situations.

From the extensive and fruitful national discussions of Government patent practices, significant common ground has come into view. First, a single presumption of ownership does not provide a satisfactory basis for Government-wide policy on the allocation of rights to inventions. Another common ground of understanding is that the Government has a responsibility to foster the fullest exploitation of the inventions for the public benefit.

Attached for your guidance is a statement of Government patent policy, which I have approved, identifying common objectives and criteria and setting forth the minimum rights that Government agencies should acquire with regard to inventions made under their grants and contracts. This statement of policy seeks to protect the public interest by encouraging the Government to acquire the principal rights to inventions in situations where the nature of the work to be undertaken or the Government's past investment in the field of work favors full public access to resulting inventions. On the other hand, the policy recognizes that the public interest might also be served by according exclusive commercial rights to the contractor in situations where the contractor has an established nongovernmental commercial position and where there is greater likelihood that the invention would be worked and put into civilian use than would be the case if the invention were made more freely available.

Wherever the contractor retains more than a nonexclusive license, the policy would guard against failure to practice the invention by requiring that the contractor take effective steps within 3 years after the patent issues to bring the invention to the point of practical application or to make it available for licensing on reasonable terms. The Government would also have the right to insist on the granting of a license to others to the extent that the invention is required for public use by governmental regulations or to fulfill a health need, irrespective of the purpose of the contract.

The attached statement of policy will be reviewed after a reasonable period of trial in the light of the facts and experience accumulated. Accordingly, there should be continuing efforts to monitor, record, and evaluate the practices of the agencies pursuant to the policy guidelines.

This memorandum and the statement of policy shall be published in the Federal Register.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

STATEMENT OF GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY

BASIC CONSIDERATIONS

A. The Government expends large sums for the conduct of research and development which results in a considerable number of inventions and discoveries.

B. The inventions in scientific and technological fields resulting from work performed under Government contracts constitute a valuable national resource.

C. The use and practice of these inventions and discoveries should stimulate inventors, meet the needs of the Government, recognize the equities of the contractor, and serve the public interest.

D. The public interest in a dynamic and efficient economy requires that efforts be made to encourage the expeditious development and civilian use of these inventions. Both the need for incentives to draw forth private initiatives to this end, and the need to promote healthy competition in industry must be weighed in the disposition of patent rights under Government contracts. Where exclusive rights are acquired by the contractor, he remains subject to the provisions of the antitrust laws.

E. The public interest is also served by sharing the benefits of Government-financed research and development with foreign countries to a degree consistent with our international programs and with the objectives of U.S. foreign policy.

F. There is growing importance attaching to the acquisition of foreign patent rights in furtherance of the interests of U.S. industry and the Government.

G. The prudent administration of Government research and development calls for a Government-wide policy on the disposition of inventions made under Government contracts reflecting common principles and objectives, to the extent consistent with the missions of the respective agencies. The policy must recognize the need for flexibility to acommodate special situations.

POLICY

SECTION 1. The following basic policy is established for all Government agencies with respect to inventions or discoveries made in the course of or under any contract of any Government agency, subject to specific statutes governing the disposition of patent rights of certain Government agencies.

(a) Where?

1. A principal purpose of the contract is to create, develop, or improve products, processes, or methods which are intended for commercial use (or which are otherwise intended to be made available for use) by the general public at home or abroad, or which will be required for such use by governmental regulations; or

2. A principal purpose of the contract is for exploration into fields which directly concern the public health or public welfare; or

3. The contract is in a field of science or technology in which there has been little significant experience outside of work funded by the Government, or where the Government has been the principal developer of the field, and the acquisition of exclusive rights at the time of contracting might confer on the contractor a preferred or dominant position; or

4. The services of the contractor are:

(i) For the operation of a Government-owned research or production facility; or

(ii) For coordinating and directing the work of others,

the Government shall normally acquire or reserve the right to acquire the principal or exclusive rights throughout the world in and to any inventions made in the course of or under the contract. In exceptional circumstances the contractor may acquire greater rights than a nonexclusive license at the time of contracting, where the head of the department or agency certifies that such action will best serve the public interest. Greater rights may also be acquired by the contractor after the invention has been identified, where the invention when made in the course of or under the contract is not a primary object of the contract, provided the acquisition of such greater rights is consistent with the intent of this section 1(a) and is a necessary incentive to call forth private risk capital and expense to bring the invention to the point of practical application.

(b) In other situations, where the purpose of the contract is to build upon existing knowledge or technology to develop information, products, processes, or methods for use by the Government, and the work called for by the contract is in a field of technology in which the contractor has acquired technical competence (demonstrated by factors such as know-how, experience, and patent position) directly related to an area in which the contractor has an established nongovernmental commercial position, the contractor shall normally acquire the principal or exclusive rights throughout the world in and to any resulting inventions, subject to the Government acquiring at least an irrevocable nonexclusive royalty free license throughout the world for governmental purposes.

(c) Where the commercial interests of the contractor are not sufficiently established to be covered by the criteria specified in section 1(b), above, the determination of rights shall be made by the agency after the invention has been identified, in a manner deemed most likely to serve the public interest as expressed in this policy statement, taking particularly into account the intentions of the contractor to bring the invention to the point of commercial application and the guidelines of section 1(a) hereof, *provided*, That the agency may prescribe by regulation special situations where the public interest in the availability of the inventions would best be served by permitting the contractor to acquire at the time of contracting greater rights than a nonexclusive license. In any case the Government shall acquire at least a nonexclusive royalty free license throughout the world for governmental purposes.

(d) In the situation specified in sections 1(b) and 1(c), when two or more potential contractors are judged to have presented proposals of equivalent merit, willingness to grant the Government principal or exclusive rights in resulting inventions will be an additional factor in the evaluation of the proposals.

(e) Where the principal or exclusive (except as against the Government) rights in an invention remain in the contractor, he should agree to provide written reports at reasonable intervals, when requested by the Government, on the commercial use that is being made or is intended to be made of inventions made under Government contracts.

(f) Where the principal or exclusive (except as against the Government) rights in an invention remain in the contractor, unless the contractor, his licensee, or his assignee has taken effective steps within 3 years after a patent issues on the invention to bring the invention to the point of practical application or has made the invention available for licensing royalty free or on terms that are reasonable in the circumstances, or can show cause why he should retain the principal or exclusive rights for a further period of time, the Government shall have the right to require the granting of a license to an applicant on a nonexclusive royalty free basis.

(g) Where the principal or exclusive (except as against the Government) rights to an invention are acquired by the contractor, the Government shall have the right to require the granting of a license to an applicant royalty free or on terms that are reasonable in the circumstances to the extent that the invention is required for public use by governmental regulations or as may be necessary to fulfill health needs, or for other public purposes stipulated in the contract.

(h) Where the government may acquire the principal rights and does not elect to secure a patent in a foreign country, the contractor may file and retian the principal or exclusive foreign rights subject to retention by the Government of at least a royalty free license for governmental purposes and on behalf of any foreign Government pursuant to any existing or future treaty or agreement with the United States.

Sec. 2. Government-owned patents shall be made available and the technological advances covered thereby brought into being in the shortest time possible through dedication or licensing and shall be listed in official Government publications or otherwise.

Sec. 3. The Federal Council for Science and Technology in consultation with the Department of Justice shall prepare at least annually a report concerning the effectiveness of this policy, including recommendations for revision or modification as necessary in light of the practices and determinations of the agencies in the disposition of patent rights under their contracts. A patent advisory panel is to be established under the Federal Council for Science and Technology to:

(a) Develop by mutual consultation and coordination with the agencies common guidelines for the implementation of this policy consistent with existing statutes, and to provide overall guidance as to disposition of inventions and patents in which the Government has any right or interest; and

(b) Encourage the acquisition of data by Government agencies on the disposition of patent rights to inventions resulting from federally financed research and development and on the use and practice of such inventions, to serve as basis for policy review and development; and

(c) Make recommendations for advancing the use and exploitation of Government-owned domestic and foreign plants.

Sec. 4. Definitions: As used in this policy statement, the stated terms in singular and plural are defined as follows for the purposes hereof:

(a) "Government agency" includes any executive department, independent commission, board, office, agency, administration, authority, or other Government establishment of the executive branch of the Government of the United States of America.

(b) "Invention" or "invention or discovery" includes any art, machine, manufacture, design, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, or any variety of plant, which is or may be patentable under the patent laws of the United States of America or any foreign country.

(c) "Contractor" means any individual, partnership, public or private corporation, association, institution, or other entity which is a party to the contract.

(d) "Contract" means any actual or proposed contract, agreement, grant, or other arrangement, or subcontract entered into with or for the benefit of the Government where a purpose of the contract is the conduct of experimental, developmental, or research work.

(e) "Made" when used in relation to any invention or discovery means the conception or first actual reduction to practice of such invention in the course of or under the contract.

(f) "Governmental purpose" means the right of the Government of the United States (including any agency thereof, State, or domestic municipal government) to practice and have practiced (made or have made, used or have used, sold or have sold) throughout the world by or on behalf of the Government of the United States.

(g) "To the point of practical application" means to manufacture in the case of a composition or product, to practice in the case of a process, or to operate in the case of a machine and under such conditions as to establish that the invention is being worked and that its benefits are reasonably accessible to the public.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have also a recent speech of the Administrator of NASA, Mr. James E. Webb, which sets forth the considerations that led NASA to follow the Presidential guidelines in the exercise of the waiver authority given the NASA Administrator.

This statement of Mr. Webb sets forth in proper perspective the role of patent policy as a major element in stimulating inventive activity under Government R. & D. contracts, in securing prompt and full reporting of this inventive activity, and then in getting this new technology out into the economy. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Webb's statement be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration

In thinking over what might be said here this evening, I was faced with two difficulties—one usual and one perhaps unusual.

The usual difficulty is that you are so well informed on all aspects of the national aeronautical and space program that any Government official would be hard pressed to tell you anything you don't already know. This, of course, leads to temptation to indulge in speculation, and while I might stir your interest with projections of manned exploration of the planets, I am not sure it would be a worthwhile contribution.

The second difficulty is the real lack of major troublesome issues between us. I believe that NASA and our partners in industry see eye to eye on the critical problems of how to get on with the Nation's aeronautical and space program.

However, there is a matter of common interest which is in flux right now. That is the matter of patent policy. I will try to bring you up to date on NASA's current views on this question.

I would also like to touch briefly on the question of NASA's interest in subcontractor selection, and to emphasize the progress we are making in close cooperation with AIA, to improve our management processes in the complex area of program planning, mission selection, and project execution through phased project planning.

Finally, I want to suggest the value of a wide and searching review, both within and without the industry, of an important report that has recently been published by Congress—the NASA future programs task group report.

With respect to the patent situation, as we all know, the formulation and administration of Federal patent policy in regard to inventions made in the course of Government-sponsored research and development is by no means a simple matter.

The question of fair treatment of contractors and due respect for their property rights is complicated enough. But the questions which relate to the development of a new pattern of action to advance as well as preserve the public interest are much more difficult, particularly in an agency like NASA that must work in and advance the technologies in every area related to economic growth as well as national strength—new fields of energy use, very advanced electronics, sophisticated use of new materials, total systems engineering concepts, new ways to use the unique capabilities of highly trained men and women, and major new requirements for overall reliability.

The issue is not limited to assuring that the Government retain all the patent rights to which it is entitled. The issue is also how to stimulate inventiveness and innovation under Government R. & D. contracts and how to put the results to work in the stream of our national economy in ways that will yield the maximum benefits to the public and particularly to those who pay the taxes that support R. & D. This is the area of predominant public interest. This is an area of NASA responsibility under the Space Act of 1958.

It is quite understandable why debate on Federal patent policy in recent years has tended to center around space programs.

Prior to issuance of the President's statement on Federal patent policy in 1963, there was a great diversity of policy and practice among the several agencies engaged in research and development in allocating rights to inventions made under Government contracts. While these differing policies could be explained partially on historical grounds, the real explanation was that each agency viewed the problem from its own vantage point and in the context of its own statutory base as well as its missions and goals.

In enacting patent provisions for NASA in 1958, Congress chose a middle ground by coupling a title-taking provision with broad waiver authority.

This middle-ground approach, plus the fact that NASA's R. & D. activities involve virtually every field of science and technology, made NASA policies a focal point for discussions which took place over a number of years and culminated in a set of Government-wide patent policy guidelines issued by President Kennedy in 1963.

In formulating NASA patent policy under these Presidential government-wide guidelines, we have consistently attempted to avoid distorting normal patterns of commercial competition; instead, we have sought to utilize these patterns to obtain the objectives sought by Congress—namely, the stimulation of inventive activity and optimum utilization of the results of this activity in the public interest.

For NASA to succeed in its missions, we urgently need the unrestrained cooperation of wide segments of industry. Some 20,000 contractors, prime and sub, are now at work in a wide variety of technologies. It has been my experience that few factors discourage a contractor's unrestrained application of his best talent to a Government contract more than a patent policy which creates uncertainty and which causes him to fear that his commercial status based on a proprietary position he has already achieved will be jeopardized.

The necessity for NASA-industry cooperation is no better demonstrated than in the context of the rapidly developing NASA technology utilization program. The input of contractors into this program, largely consisting of invention and innovation disclosures, is growing at an increasing rate. As of the end of 1964, for example, 2,661 invention disclosures from NASA contractors had been received and docketed. Of these, over 1,200, representing almost half, were received during 1964. Over 1,900 inventions and innovations which show substantial promise of commercial utility are being processed and evaluated. These are made available for wide industrial use through technology handbooks, such as NASA SP-5002 entitled "Reliable Electrical Connections," and one just issued on micropower logic circuits (SP-5022); technology surveys, such as NASA SP-5014 on inorganic coatings; technology utilization notes such as NASA SP-5003 on "Selected Welding Techniques," and through regional dissemination centers such as the Applied Research Application Center at the University of Indiana to which NASA is furnishing about one-half its budget for a trial period of 5 years. Over 40 nonspace companies are paying the remaining one-half of the cost to obtain ready access to NASA tehcnology.

Undoubtedly, the most controversial portion of the Government-wide patent policy established in 1963 and of NASA's operations under this policy, relates to the matter of advance waiver of commercial rights to inventions at the time of contracting. The patent provisions of the Space Act provide for the proper use of advance waiver, but up to 1963 NASA avoided allocating rights to inventions at the time of contracting largely because it was concerned that the negotiations required would unduly delay the procurement process.

Experience has shown, however, that there are a number of cases where advance waivers serve both equity and the public interest. Such waivers serve to encourage reporting of inventive activity by contractors, since an advance waiver is not effective with respect to an invention made under a contract unless the contractor submits promptly a full technical report of the invention, and the waiver is voided unless the contractor files a patent application within 8 months of reporting. Effective reporting of inventions must, of necessity, be an overriding consideration in the administration of the NASA patent provisions. No factor tends more to make unproductive the results of Government-sponsored research than failure by a contractor to follow up with timely reports to the Government regarding inventions made during the course of research. Advance waivers create a positive incentive for the contractor to prepare and submit such reports.

The Government's massive efforts in research and development, and the use of industries and universities to accomplish much of it, have resulted in increased emphasis on cooperation between industry and Government, so that the latter may benefit from a contractor's investment in his technical and scientific capabilities. Advance waiver, when appropriate, is utilized to create a framework and pattern of stimulation for a cross-flow of technical information and know-how between a contractor's scientists working on commercial applications and those working under a Government contract.

Under the provisions of the President's policy, which have been incorporated into NASA's new regulations, in cases where the contractor retains commercial rights to an invention, he must develop and market the invention or license others to do so within 3 years of issuance of a patent; if he does not, the Government has the right to compel royalty-free licensing of the patent. The Government has the right in al cases to require the granting of licenses, either royalty free or on reasonable terms, "to the extent that the invention is required for public use by Government regulations or as may be necessary to fulfill health needs." Under this policy, in those fields which had been principally developed by the Government, the vital question of whether the waiver of exclusive rights would possibly confer upon the contractor a preferred or dominant position is carefully considered in determining whether the public interest would be served by the waiver. Of course, when the exclusive rights are acquired by the contractor, he remains subject to the antitrust laws.

Another important portion of the NASA patent program is the licensing of NASA-owned patents and patent applications. In October of 1962 the patent licensing regulations now in effect were promulgated after extensive hearings and study. In essence, these regulations provide for royalty-free, nonexclusive licensing during the first 2 years after a patent is issued to NASA. After the 2-year period, if the benefits of the invention have not been brought to the public, NASA will seek an exclusive licensee to exploit the invention. If, however, the invention has been commercially worked, the patent will continue to be available on a nonexclusive basis. This licensing policy differs from that of other Government agencies in that it contemplates the granting of exclusive licenses as an incentive to commercial working of Government-owned patents lying dormant with an effective procedure to implement this incentive.

Here again, the major premise in formulating the NASA licensing policy was that in granting broad licensing authority to the Administrator, Congress intended that the traditional incentives afforded by the patent system were to be utilized in making the results of NASA research activity available to benefit the entire economy—and by this I mean the incorporation of this technology in commercial products. Under the 1962 regulations, NASA has issued approximately 75 nonexclusive licenses and 2 exclusive licenses under its almost 200 patents and approximately 450 pending patent applications. Virtually all of these licenses represent instances where, under the technology utilization program, NASA has succeeded in stimulating industrial applications of technology resulting from NASA research activities. This further emphasizes the close interrelationship between the technology utilization program and NASA's patent program.

Now let me review for you briefly the current situation regarding new legislative proposals in the Congress on Government patent policy.

One proposal takes the form of an amendment to the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1966, which would, in effect, preclude NASA from following certain of the practices discussed above and the guidelines and criteria of the President's patent policy.

NASA has strongly opposed this amendment on many grounds. It is a step backward because it amounts to a piecemeal approach to a problem which has been recognized as being Government wide. Moreover, since it all but precludes NASA from ever waiving commercial rights to inventions back to NASA contractors, it would have a serious adverse effect on present efforts to find effective means through which the maximum use of new technology can be generated.

In addition to the amendment I have just been discussing, two bills of major significance regarding Federal patent policy are now pending in the Senate.

Senator McCLELLAN, chairman of the Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, introduced on April 23, 1965, Senate bill 1809 which provides for a Government-wide patent policy and which is founded to a great extent on the same general principles underlying the President's policy. While NASA has not completed a full analysis of the McClellan bill, it is clear that this bill incorporates the concepts that I have outlined here today, and to this extent at least NASA will undoubtedly support this bill. Senator

RUSSELL LONG has also introduced a bill, Senate bill 1899, which establishes a Federal Inventions Administration, and outlines a Government-wide patent policy to be administered by this new Administration. Again, NASA has not completed our analysis of the Long bill, but it is encouraging that Senator LONG has come to recognize the problem as one affecting the entire Government and as one which should be solved on a Government-wide basis.

Hearings on the McClellan and Long bills have been scheduled to begin June 1, and I, for one, look forward to my own and your participation in these hearings and discussions.

To keep the United States in the forefront of science and technology in the fields of aeronautic and space science, all proper incentives must be harnessed to foster the inventive capacity of this country, whether this capacity resides in universities, in Government agences, or in industry. For any patent policy to be in the public interest, it must serve to foster this capacity and to stimulate Government-industry-university cooperation in attaining our national objectives.

On the question of subcontractor selection, NASA has been criticized from time to time for doing both too much and too little. And there has been the feeling in some quarters that if NASA took a more active role in subcontractor selection, we might be able to obtain a broader geographical distribution of our R. & D. work.

I hope there is no misunderstanding of NASA's position on subcontractor selection. If there is, let me clear it up.

NASA insists that the main burdens of management be placed squarely on the shoulders of the prime contractor. And this most definitely includes the prime's responsibility to select the subcontractors he thinks can best do the job. We do not intend to relieve—or appear to relieve—a prime contractor of his responsibility for getting top performance from his subcontractors.

And NASA most certainly does not have the manpower, the facilities, or the desire to operate under the so-called arsenal concept which would in effect make one of our centers the prime contractor responsible for coordinating the efforts of a group of subcontractors.

Our prime contractors have had, and will have, the responsibility of naming their subcontractors, but NASA does reserve a veto on key subcontractor designations. This is necessary, from the Government's point of view, for four main reasons: to avoid overloading a particular contractor with high priority work from various sources; to insure that adequate competition existed in the search for the subcontractor; to prevent the prime contractor from establishing, at Government expense, new sources for products and services already available from small specialty organizations; and to withhold Government orders from contractors who have a poor performance record.

In certain cases, only the Government has all the background information necessary for a final decision.

So NASA does retain a right to disapprove a subcontractor selection. I am glad to say that we have very, very seldom had occasion to use this right. Nevertheless, the fact that it is there serves a number of useful purposes.

As the aerospace industry well knows, all of the major NASA programs currently underway will be concluded by the end of this decade, or soon thereafter. (This does not include the Voyager program, which is still in the program definition phase.)

In view of the long leadtimes involved in any significant new space project, it is essential that we start serious planning in the near future for the major programs of the next decade.

NASA has already made what I consider a very important preliminary step. The summary report of the NASA future programs task group, which was prepared in response to a request from the President, is not a formal planning document, but it is a quite complete summary of the basic capability that will be available for future projects. It does not attempt to choose among the various possibilities or to recommend priorities. It is written in nontechnical language. It is designed to provide a NASA-wide comprehensive view as a basis for wide discussion and the process of program planning and decisionmaking that is still to come.

In my letter transmitting this summary report to President Johnson, I pointed out that major decisions on space require a broad national concensus, and that during the next several years it is likely that the selection of major new space missions will be the subject of serious study and debate by many individuals and agencies in public and private walks of life. Therefore, I recommended that the future programs report be made public. The President agreed with this, and the report has now been published by both the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, and the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The report has three main sections. The first one describes the major capabilities already achieved or being achieved in aeronautics, satellite applications, unmanned exploration of space, manned operations in space, launch vehicles, and basic technology.

The second section describes how these capabilities, or modest extentions of them, could be effectively used in intermediate missions late in this decade and in the early years of the next decade.

The third section describes longer range possibilities which will require major new advances in technology.

I know you are familiar with all of these current capabilities and future possibilities, but when they are all set forth in matter-of-fact language in one publication they are very impressive and somewhat surprising. For example, in the third section under the heading "Long-term development," we find:

Under aeronautics: A section on hypersonic transports; recoverable orbital transport; and commercial vertical and short takeoff and landing aircraft.

Under satellite applications: Material on direct TV broadcasts via satellite to home receivers; global navigation aids and air and sea traffic control; and continuous global weather observation.

Under unmanned exploration of space: A discussion of probes and landers to distant planets; solar probes; and galactic probes reaching out of the solar system.

Under manned space exploration: Conventional takeoff and landing of space vehicles; large permanent space laboratories; roving lunar vehicles and lunar bases; and manned planetary exploration.

Under launch vehicles and propulsion: Boosters to put 1 million pounds in earth orbit; recoverable boosters; nuclear engines; and electric propulsion.

Under basic technology: Isotope power supplies of 1 to 2 kilowatt capacity; guidance and control to land spacecraft within miles of a selected point on Mars; communications with a capacity of 3,000 bits per second from Mars; and so forth.

In discussing these possibilities, the task group stated: "We believe that these kinds of advances not only can be made, but will be made, if not by the United States then by Soviet Russia or possibly by some other nation. Further, if vigorous, intelligent, well-planned and well-managed programs are pursued, such advances can be made in an orderly progression without crash programs or excessively expensive efforts."

This report does not represent a projection of what NASA is going to recommend or what the President might request in future budgets. It does provide a basis for further analysis and for the process of discussion and debate that is now due. We in NASA hope that many gifted and farsighted leaders in the aerospace industry will use this report as a starting point for the discussion our next moves clearly call for. There have been few times in our national history when the American people have been faced with more stimulating possibilities or a more challenging agendum.

To further facilitate the space planning and decisionmaking tasks ahead, we are also working on a new management approach called phased project planning.

Under phased project planning, we envisage four separate and distinct steps in the orderly process leading to new R. & D. projects of major significance. These four phases are: Advanced studies; project definition; preliminary design; and development and operations.

This is a new concept at NASA, and we are still in the process of thinking it through and working up a manual on it. In general, it is similar to systems program management procedures used by the Department of Defense, but in some significant details it is quite different.

We hope you will become familiar with this new approach because we expect to add no major project to our list of approved missions without the hard formative process that phased project planning requires.

This new approach, when fully implemented, provides protection to industry and Government against the major causes of cost overruns and program slippages. It will enable us to keep open as many options as possible for as long as possible and will give aerospace contractors greater assurance that a project will be carried to completion; that a fair return commensurate with risk will be possible; and that we know with some precision what we need and are prepared to pay for.

We also believe that phased project planning will enable us to make more effective use of incentive contracts in the final development and operations phase, where the heavy costs are involved.

In the preliminary design or third phase, for example, we will carry out the breadboarding and test of critical subsystems and even major systems, if necessary, prior to a total Agency commitment to fund the development and operation of flight hardware.

In the past, breadboarding was a concurrent element of a development contractor's effort. The result was that problems arising at this point could, and often did, adversely affect the schedule at a time when the rate of expenditure on the project was at its highest.

In the first phase, advanced studies, much of the work will be done in NASA centers. Support from contractors, where required, would be for fixed-price, lump-sum, short-term investigations of specific subproblems within the larger framework being reviewed by our in-house scientific and technical personnel. This, of course, could involve a large number of contractors.

In the second phase, project definition, we will have several contractors working under identical fixed-price and fixed-term contracts. In the third, or preliminary design phase, we would normally expect to have two highly qualified contractor teams detailing their designs to carry out the most effective approach to the given objective. Design would not be all, however. Specifications for the needed facilities, tests, flight operations, and other support must be drawn up and validated. Management plans drawn up by the contractor and by NASA must be coordinated. And the contractor selected for the final development and operation phase must be prepared to stand by the cost and schedule estimates he prepares. In turn, NASA must work with him to identify the incentive features to be applied in the final phase.

Perhaps that is enough for tonight. You can see, I think, that in the future we expect to do things quite differently from the way we have had to do them in the past. We will both benefit, and a working group of NASA and AIA representatives has been set up to work together on the program as it develops. This working group has already held one meeting, and plans to meet monthly for as long as necessary.

Thank you for the chance to meet with you.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it would seem a serious matter to attach to a bill to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for a single fiscal year, requirements relating to patents which would require NASA to take a divergent line from the policies in the patent field administered by the Department of Defense.

On that particular point, based upon my experience in private business and in the executive branch, I believe that if this amendment were adopted, but not included as policy in the Defense Establishment, it would react seriously against the progress of the entire space program.

In the beginning, there was much concern that NASA's more stringent patent regulations would make it more difficult to obtain the best scientists and engineers in American industry in competition with our military services. Fortunately, however, NASA has been able to administer the provisions of its law so as to prevent this and, at the same time, protect the necessary rights of the Government in inventions and patents. It will be a serious matter to take a step backward and create difficulties for NASA and for industry by requiring NASA contracts to be handled even more rigidly than present policies provide; and which have proved successful.

I am of the firm view, Mr. President, that this question should not be dealt with by an amendment on the Senate floor without benefit of hearings. The Space Committee wisely omitted patent amendments from the NASA authorization bill before us. Hearings began yesterday before the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] is chairman, on the whole matter of Government-wide patent legislation. I believe that is the proper forum for discussion of Government patent policy and that any piecemeal effort to amend the NASA authorization bill would be inappropriate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to have printed in the Record at this point the statement made yesterday at those hearings by Mr. James E. Webb, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Before the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to present the views of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on the important subject of Government patent policy and to respond to your request for NASA's comments with regard to the several bills presently before this committee dealing with this subject.

The formulation and administration of Federal patent policy in regard to inventions made in the course of Government-sponsored research and development is not a simple matter. The question of fair treatment of contractors and due respect for their property rights is one factor. But many other factors must be taken into consideration, including the full protection of the Government's rights and interests. Some of these factors must also relate to the development of carefully worked out new patterns of action which include the application of recent experience in efforts to advance as well as preserve the public interest. The requirements for success in creating significant new patterns under which the currently required large-scale organized efforts in science and technology can advance, as well as preserve the public interest, are much more difficult in the programs conducted by NASA than in previous more limited efforts. To succeed in the development and use of today's potential in aeronautical and space systems means that we must work in and advance the technologies in every area related to economic growth as well as national strength—new fields of energy use, very advanced electronics, sophisticated use of new materials, total systems engineering concepts, new ways to use the unique capabilities of highly trained men and women, and major new requirements for overall reliability.

The issue certainly includes assuring that the Government retain all the patent rights to which it is entitled, but it cannot be limited to that one factor alone. The issue is also how to stimulate inventiveness and innovation, how to spread our most pressing problems over the largest number of able minds, how to expand the Nation's resources in science, technology, engineering, and production, and how to put the results to work to the fullest possible extent in the mainstream of our national economy in ways that will yield the maximum benefits. This is a major area of predominant public interest. This is also an area of NASA responsibility under the Space Act of 1958.

As you know, ever since the enactment of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, which contained provisions dealing specifically with property rights in inventions, NASA has been among those at the center of the controversy regarding Government patent policy. This is understandable. Prior to the issuance of the President's statement on Federal patent policy in 1963, there was a great diversity of policy and practice among the several agencies engaged in research and development in allocating rights to inventions made under Government contracts. While these differing policies could be explained partially on historical grounds, in large part they resulted from each agency viewing the problem from its own vantage point, and in the context of its own statutory base as well as its missions and goals.

In enacting patent provisions for NASA in 1958, Congress chose a middle ground by coupling a title-taking provision with broad waiver authority and vested wide administration discretion in the Administrator, charging him with the following heavy responsibilities:

"BASIC NASA AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE OBJECTIVES

"I. The scientific measurement and understanding of the space environment.

"II. The development of a broad-based national capability for manned and unmanned operations in space and close cooperation with the Department of Defense and other agencies having current or potential needs related to such capabilities.

"III. The development of the practical uses of space.

"IV. Continued advancement in all areas of aeronautics in order to maintain world leadership in this field.

"V. An adequate level of research and development to support other Government agencies with needs or interests in aeronautics and space.

"VI. The bringing together of Government, industry, and university capabilities into an effective national system for meeting the needs of space exploration and use.

"VII. The maintenance of a technological base in aeronautics and space adequate to meet all nonmilitary needs.

"VIII. The strengthening and efficient utilization of the Nation's aeronautical and space-related resources in science, engineering, and technology.

"IX. The maximum utilization of the scientific and technical results of the space effort for nonspace purposes.

"X. The use of space for furthering international cooperation and understanding and for the good of all mankind."

In 1958, when those responsibilities were placed on a new agency yet to be formed, the successful flight of Sputnik I had burned into our national consciousness the fact that man had taken his first step toward the exploration of a completely new environment by means of a completely new technology—that of the utilization of an engine which could deliver its power in a vacuum—the rocket engine. We had become keenly aware that in the U.S.S.R., which accomplished this first step, new horizons were opened and there was a surge of national pride and accomplishment. We were aware that a new initiative and drive had been created that changed the posture of the Soviet society, widened its horizon, and vastly enhanced its international image and capacity for leadership.

We were also aware that in the free world the immediate effects were quite the opposite.

Down through the course of history, the mastery of a new environment, or of a major new technology, or of the combination of the two as we now see in space, has had profound effects on the future of nations, on their relative strength and security, on their relations with one another, and on their internal economic, social, and political affairs as well as on the concepts of reality held by their people. The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, including its provisions for the handling of proprietary rights and its requirement for the creation of national capabilities to retrieve our lost position of leadership, took into account the fact that when a nation masters a new environment and a new technology, history shows that it inevitably achieves an increase in power and position and that there also inevitably follows an adjustment in relationships among nations by negotiation, by cooperation, or by conflict. The 1958 act also took account of the historical knowledge that in such a situation important changes within national societies come about from actions taken to compete in the new environment and to develop and use the new technology. It was clearly seen that in the space age the interplay of new knowledge, new thought, increased resources and changed social relationships would inevitably require the United States to develop new and more effective patterns in the relationships between universities, industry and the Government in the areas specifically related to science and technology. The patent and many other provisions of the act reflect this wise view of the requirements of the future.

The middle ground approach adopted with respect to the policy of the new agency, NASA, has been an important factor in permitting the development of all of the factors which have brought together a strong and vigorous aeronautical and space effort by those in the Nation best capable of making this effort—in universities, in industry, and in Government laboratories. As a result of the work of these past 6 years, we already have a broad base of scientific and technical knowledge about many of the basic factors of space and are entering a period of rapidly expanding launch capability which we will use to achieve a far broader scientific and technical base and to gain wide experience in manned space flight. Our nine successful Saturn I test launches point to the operational use of the much greater boost power of the Saturn I-B by 1966 and to the use of the giant Saturn V booster by 1967.

In the critical area of determining man's capabilities in space, Gemini operations with two-man crews, supported by a worldwide net of stations and recovery forces, have already begun. Apollo operations with three-man crews will begin in 1967 and will significantly extend the Gemini experience so that by the time we undertake the first manned landing on the moon, the Gemini and Apollo programs will have provided thousands of man-hours of flight time.

In science, the measurements and knowledge acquired over the next few years will become increasingly valuable as they are used and refined. More sophisticated questions will be asked by scientists and more sophisticated spacecraft such as the Orbital Astronomical Observatory and the Surveyor, together with manned spacecraft, will be used to search for answers.

In communications and meteorology, the imminent operational use of satellite systems will answer many questions as to the current value of these systems and further research will answer many questions as to their potential for the future.

These activities will uncover new uses for space, force the solution of many emerging technical problems, and reveal others not now identified. This has been the way of all new areas of scientific and technical development, and it will certainly be true in space. The creation of the effective relationships which have produced this increased national power rests on the proper combination, or merging, or articulation of a number of elements which, working together, have produced this forward thrust and, at the same time, have operated to protect the public interest with respect to the new inventions and new technologies arising in this rapid developmental period. The fact that NASA's research and development activities involve virtually evey field of science and technology have made NASA policies a focal point for discussions which took place over a number of years and culminated in a set of Government-wide patent policy guidelines issued by President Kennedy in 1963.

In the fall of 1964, NASA revised and republished its patent regulations, including the standards which would govern the use of the Administrator's broad waiver authority. These 1964 revised regulations were based on the criteria and guidelines contained in the President's patent policy statement. This action was taken in accordance with the authority provided by the patent provisions of the Space Act, and was an appropriate and responsible action to take to meet agency responsibilities under policies established by the President.

Undoubtedly, the most controversial portion of the Government-wide patent policy established by President Kennedy in 1963 and of NASA's operations under this policy relates to the matter of advance waiver, or the granting at the time of contracting of commercial rights to the contractor. Up to 1963, in all but a few cases NASA avoided settling the disposition of domestic commercial rights to inventions at the time of contracting because speed was necessary in getting its program underway and because it was concerned that the negotiations required would unduly delay the procurement process. Exceptions to this were made in the case of advanced waiver of foreign rights and the waiver back to the contractor of a royalty free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license.

Experience has shown, however, that there are a number of situations where advance waivers serve both equity and the public interest. Such waivers serve to encourage reporting of inventive activity by contractors, since under our regulations an advance waiver is not effective with respect to an invention made under a contract unless the contractor submits promptly a full technical report of the invention. Also, the waiver is voided unless the contractor files a patent application within 8 months of reporting.

NASA's success depends on rapid advances in technology and a full utilization without delay of each new advance made by any of its 20,000 prime- and sub-contractors. Therefore, effective reporting of inventions must be at all times an overriding consideration in the administration of its patent provisions. No factor can undermine our efficiency more than a system with inadequate incentives and penalties which operate on contractors to insure timely reports regarding inventions made during the course of research. Advance waivers are, when properly used, part of the NASA system to create positive incentives as well as penalties for contractors to make sure that their employees prepare and submit such report. This requires more effort on the part of contractors than is often realized and, in some cases, requires a priority on the time of the very scientists and engineers who are most needed to push on with the project work. It is easy, in industry as in Government, to do the main project work and put off the documentation and reporting of innovations. The reality of the present situation is met better in the NASA system than in any other that we have been able to examine. Still, we must gain even further experience and make further improvements. This we are doing and the knowledge and feedback will be used to make refinements.

The Government's massive efforts in research and development, and the use of the skills and competence of industry and universities to accomplish much of it, have resulted in increased emphasis on cooperation between industry and Government, so that Government programs may benefit from the investment a contractor has made or is prepared to make in the buildup of his technical and scientific capabilities. Advance waiver, when appropriate, is also utilized to create a framework and pattern of stimulation for a crossflow of technical information and know-how between a contractor's scientists working on commercial applications and those working under a Government contract.

In view of the very broad base of NASA's research and development contracts, requiring advances in all fields of science and technology, a rigid compartmentation of Government contract work is highly undesirable. Cross-fertilization and a full use of previous commercial developments, particularly those which contribute to reliability, is of great value to the Government.

Under the provisions of the President's policy, which have been incorporated into NASA's new regulations, contractors are encouraged to put inventions made under Government contracts to work in nongovernmental fields without delay. In cases where a contractor retains commercial rights to an invention, he must develop and market the invention or license others to do so within 3 years of issuance of a patent. If he does not, the Government has the right to compel royalty free licensing of the patent. The Government has the right in all cases to require the granting of licenses, either royalty free or on reasonable terms, "to the extent that the invention is required for public use by Government regulations or as may be necessary to fulfill health needs." Under this policy, in those fields which had been principally developed by the Government, the vital question of whether the waiver of exclusive rights would possibly confer upon the contractor a preferred or dominant position is carefully considered in determining whether the public interest would be served by the waiver. Of course, when the exclusive rights are acquired by the contractor, he remains subject to the antitrust laws.

Another important portion of the NASA patent program is the encouragement it gives to early use of Government-owned inventions.

In October of 1962, the patent licensing regulations now in effect were promulgated after extensive hearings and study. In essense, these regulations provide for broad royalty free, nonexclusive licensing during the first 2 years after a patent is issued to NASA. After the 2-year period, if the benefits of the invention have not been brought to the public, NASA will grant an exclusive license to exploit the invention. If, however, the invention has been commercially worked, the patent will continue to be available on a nonexclusive basis. This licensing policy differs from that of other Government agencies in that in cases where utilization will thus be made possible, the granting of exclusive licenses will be used as an incentive to commercial working of dormant Government-owned patents with an effective procedure to implement this incentive and, at the same time, protect the Government's rights.

The major premise in formulating the NASA licensing policy was that in granting broad licensing authority to the Administrator, Congress intended that the traditional incentives afforded by the patent system were to be utilized in making the results of NASA research activity available to benefit the entire economy, including use in commercial products. Under the 1962 regulations, NASA has issued approximately 75 nonexclusive licenses and 2 exclusive licenses under its almost 200 patents and approximately 450 pending patent applications. Virtually all of these licenses represent instances where under NASA's technology utilization program, industrial applications have been uncovered. In NASA's work with both universities and industry to advance science and technology, there is a close interrelationship between the technology utilization program and the patent program.

For NASA to succeed in its missions, we urgently need the unrestrained cooperation of wide segments of industry. Some 20,000 contractors, prime and sub, are now at work in a variety of technologies. It has been my experience that few factors discourage a contractor's unrestrained application of his best talent to a Government contract more than a patent policy which creates uncertainty and which causes him to fear that his commercial status based on a proprietary position he has already achieved will be jeopardized.

The necessity for NASA-industry cooperation is no better demonstrated than in the context of the rapidly developing NASA technology utilization program. The input of contractors into this program, largely consisting of invention and innovation disclosures, is growing at an increasing rate. As of the end of 1964, for example, 2,661 invention disclosures from NASA contractors had been received and docketed. Of these, over 1,200, representing almost half, were received during 1964. Over 1,900 inventions and innovations which show substantial promise of commercial utility are being processed and evaluated.

This new technology is made available for wide industrial use in a variety of ways: through the publication of technology handbooks, such as NASA SP-5002 entitled "Reliable Electrical Connections," and one just issued on micropower logic circuits (SP-5022); through technology surveys, such as NASA SP-5014 on inorganic coatings; through technology utilization notes such as NASA SP-5003 on "Selected Welding Techniques," and through regional dissemination centers such as the Applied Research Application Center at the University of Indiana to which NASA is furnishing about one-half of its budget for a trial period of 5 years. Over 40 nonspace companies are paying the remaining one-half of the cost to obtain ready access to NASA technology. And the consumers of the products of these companies are the main beneficiaries.

NASA tech briefs, which were first published beginning January 1, 1964, are now being published at a rate of eight each week. Over 320 tech briefs have been published and widely disseminated. Almost 10,000 copies of the NASA STAR publication—the Scientific and Technical Aerospace Reports abstract journal—are distributed to over 4,000 subscribers. The increasing volume of new technology emanating from the space effort is underscored by the fact that the number of publications documented by NASA, which now totals 100,000 unclassified, unrestricted documents, is expected to double within the next 18 months.

Fundamental to NASA's approach to the patent policy question and to technology utilization is our belief that active effort must be expended, and meaningful incentives provided, if the byproducts of the space effort are to flow through entrepreneurs willing to risk investment capital to the general public. A corollary of this is that the rate of this flow is directly dependent upon the effectiveness of these efforts and of these incentives.

The President's patent policy emphasizes this latter point. As a basic consideration, the policy recognizes that: "The public interest in a dynamic and efficient economy requires that efforts be made to encourage the expeditious development and civilian use of these inventions. Both the need for incentives to draw forth private initiatives to this end, and the need to promote healthy competition in industry must be weighed in the disposition of patent rights under Government contracts."

If NASA's experience has served to establish one principle, it is the overriding principle reflected in the President's policy that "a single presumption of ownership does not provide a satisfactory basis for Government-wide policy on the allocation of rights to inventions." NASA's experience further establishes a premise underlying the President's policy that the "Government has a responsibility to foster the fullest exploitation of the inventions for the public benefit."

Mr. Chairman, I have gone into NASA's experience in some detail to bring out the point made at the outset of my remarks that the issue posed here is not simply one of assuring that the Government secure all property rights to inventions coming out of federally financed research. The issue is more complex and fundamental. It involves how to get the most out of such research and development by stimulating inventive activity, by assuring prompt and effective reporting of technology, and then by developing effective techniques for the dissemination of this technology and for stimulating its use in the economy in a competitive environment. As a new Government agency operating in the forefront of science and technology, we have been very active in examining and trying out new ways and means to bring these results about. A restrictive patent policy that focuses attention on only a narrow aspect of the much broader question of technology utilization would be a step backward and would impair our efforts and the efforts of our industry and university partners to bring about really significant achievements in the stimulation and use of technology to enhance the vitality and strength of this country.

None of us should doubt that new technology is at the very cutting edge of our economic growth and of our military strength and international image. Therefore, the matter before this subcommittee is one of major national significance, and we offer you, Mr. Chairman, all the help we can give you in formulating a forward-looking Government patent policy that takes into consideration the dynamic impact of technology in this space age in which we live.

I would like to turn now, Mr. Chairman, to the bills presently before the committee and to comment generally on them in light of NASA's experience under its own special statutory provisions and under the Presidential guidelines.

We welcome the formulation of legislative policy in this field so long as it is approached on a Government-wide, not a piecemeal basis. Therefore, we are happy to note that all three bills dealing with Government patent policy are Government-wide in scope.

It is our position that the President's patent guidelines would constitute an excellent basis for Government-wide legislation. This being the case, we believe S. 1809 to be closest to the kind of legislation we would support. NASA has submitted to the chairman of the full committee its detailed comments on each of the bills. I will leave it to Mr. Sohier, General Counsel of NASA, to deal more specifically with our views on each of these bills as well as to expand on the patent policies and practices of NASA during almost 7 years of experience under the patent provisions of the Space Act.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and the other members of the subcommittee for this opportunity to state the views of NASA on the important question of Government patent policy. It is my firm belief that to keep the United States in the forefront of science and technology all proper incentives must be harnessed to foster the inventive capacity of this country, whether this capacity resides in universities, in Government agencies, or in industry. For any patent policy to be in the public interest, it must serve to foster this capacity and to stimulate Government-industry-university cooperation in attaining our national objectives.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to amplify three points which the Senator has made. First, he read the six conditions in the regulations of the NASA Patent Waiver Regulations dated August 27, 1964. I wish to emphasize that the six conditions which he mentioned must be satisfied before waiver can take place at the time the contract is entered into.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is important to note that those six conditions must be fulfilled by the contractor before any agreement to waive can come into existence.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator know of any contractor with NASA who has been found to have made excessive profits?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Not that I know of.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I understand correctly that determination of rights at the time of contracting is important because of the advantage that will be gained by the Government from having the contractor submit reports under the contract as time goes on? Is this not to be preferred to that which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] has recommended, that the agreement can be made only under limited conditions after the contract has been entered into?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The advantage of having rights determined at the time of contracting is that it stimulates the contractor and we know, then, whether conditions have been fulfilled. Otherwise, we would not get anywhere.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, when I asked the question a few moments ago, the Senator was discussing certain powers that were seemingly reserved by NASA, powers which might come as the result of research.

What is the source of that power reserved to NASA? Does that power derive from statute or regulations adopted by NASA or Presidential guidelines?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The power is derived from section 305 of the Space Act. I should be glad to read that section into the Record at this point.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I suggest that it is important that the Record be clarified, because earlier in the discussion the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] made inquiry concerning the existence of certain provisions that might invest NASA with the right to recapture. I should like to have that section read into the Record.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Ohio. His suggestion is most constructive. Section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act of 1958, as amended, reads as follows:

> Sec. 305. (a) Whenever any invention is made in the performance of any work under any contract of the Administration, and the Administrator determines that—
>
> (1) the person who made the invention was employed or assigned to perform research, development, or exploration work and the invention is related to the work he was employed or assigned to perform, or that it was within the scope of his employment duties, whether or not it was made during working hours, or with a contribution by

the Government of the use of Government facilities, equipment, materials, allocated funds, information proprietary to the Government, or services of Government employees during working hours; or

(2) the person who made the invention was not employed or assigned to perform research, development, or exploration work, but the invention is nevertheless related to the contract, or to the work or duties he was employed or assigned to perform, and was made during working hours, or with a contribution from the Government of the sort referred to in clause (1),

such invention shall be the exclusive property of the United States, and if such invention is patentable a patent therefor shall be issued to the United States upon application made by the Administrator, unless the Administrator waives all or any part of the rights of the United States to such invention in conformity with the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

It is my understanding that the Senator is of the opinion that we now have laws that protect the Government, but that even if we did not have them, the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Louisiana ought not to be agreed to as a part of this appropriation bill, but that we ought to await the results that would come from a study now being made by a committee chaired by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan].

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct. I do not believe that this is the right way to handle the matter. I believe the Government is protected.

The Administrator of NASA is an able and honorable man. Many years ago, when I first knew Mr. Webb, he was Director of the Bureau of the Budget. At that time I was Secretary of the Air Force. Mr. Webb is well known in his home State of North Carolina, throughout this city, and throughout the country as one of the most honorable and intelligent public servants we have had in many a day.

He has built the space agency from the ground up. It has been doing a good job. We hope in 2 days to have another magnificent achievement, so as to keep us in the forefront of space.

Inasmuch as most NASA contractors are contractors who also work for the Department of Defense, and inasmuch as it is so difficult to build a new agency, I hope we do not cripple the interest of large and small contractors doing work for NASA. I believe this amendment would do just that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I believe that in the past I indicated my deep desire to protect the public against the exploitation of patent rights on inventions discovered while research was being done for the Government primarily at Government expense. My views have not changed.

I commend the junior Senator from Louisiana for his interest in this matter. However, there does appear to be a new element here today, and that is that a study is being made to determine what is the best method of protecting the public. On the basis of the study now in progress, I subscribe to the views just expressed by the Senator from Missouri, that we ought not to attach this amendment to the bill until the study is completed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio. Let me assure my friend, the majority whip, that no one in the Senate has more respect for his opinion than I, on this and all other subjects.

He is a dedicated and able public servant. What the Senator from Louisiana has done in this field has already been of great service to the taxpayers of the United States. It happens that in this particular case I do not agree with him entirely. But I understand the sincerity of his position, as I know he does mine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it shall be my purpose to speak very briefly. I do not know that this is the place—if my position is correct, this is not the time, at least—to go extensively into the merits of the pending amendment.

We operate under a committee system. As the bills are introduced, they are referred to committees having appropriate jurisdiction. The bills are processed there, or no action is taken.

In this instance, there is pending before the Committee on the Judiciary and before the Patent Subcommittee thereof, of which I am chairman, three bills which deal with the very issue that is now before the Senate. Those measures also deal with other aspects of patent administration on the part of the Government. One of the bills I mention was introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall]. Another was introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], who is sponsoring this amendment. Another bill was introduced by myself.

These bills have been introduced at different times. The committee is also considering another bill, which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams]. However, that bill deals with another aspect of the problem, and not with an aspect which I would regard as being put at issue by this amendment.

On May 17, I believe, without any contemplation of the situation developing as it has developed here today in the Senate and without being inspired to set a date for hearings by reason of this bill being acted upon and a contemplated amendment to the bill such as the one now pending, we scheduled hearings for yesterday.

I placed the usual and proper notice in the Congressional Record. We opened hearings yesterday. During the day, we heard six witnesses. We proceeded this morning and heard six more witnesses.

We have scheduled for this afternoon eight more witnesses, including the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who, I understood, wanted to appear, and wanted to appear last on the schedule. It has been arranged accordingly.

In addition to those witnesses and those who are scheduled for this afternoon, it had been our purpose to hear from the Department of Defense, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Justice, and also the General Accounting Office.

It is our purpose to develop the record, to get as much information as possible with respect to the bill of the Senator from Louisiana, the bill of the Senator from Massachusetts, and the bill which I have introduced, as will instruct and enlighten the Senate as to what is involved, that will give the Senate the facts, and enable it to make an enlightened judgment.

I do not agree with the idea that everyone who may disagree with the amendment wants to give the Government away, or give away the Government's property, or that we are acting adversely to the Government's interest and the welfare of the people in order to satisfy some lobbyist or special interest. I do not ascribe such motives as the Senator from Louisiana does to those who have a different opinion. I do not ascribe such motives to any other Senator in this Chamber. A Senator may well vote for the amendment, believing his position to be right. This is a complex field.

Up to now, I do not know, and I cannot say without reservation, that I shall in the end favor my own bill. My purpose, and the purpose of my committee, is to serve the Senate in trying to develop essential facts in appropriate hearings. I hope the committee is making progress in that direction, and I believe it is. That is what we are trying to do.

I do not believe we can legislate well and wisely, in a field as complex and difficult as this is, simply by offering amendments on the floor of the Senate and having the author of it saying, "I mean this," and having another Senator say the language means something else, and then undertake to modify the amendment on the floor. That clearly demonstrates that this subject needs study and needs the best evidence that we can secure to guide us in this field.

I cannot agree that President Kennedy did a foolish thing by issuing his directive. It may not be perfect in the judgment and wisdom of the Senate. Some Senators may want to change that policy. But I see no reason to ascribe to the President of the United States motives which have been mentioned or implied here. The President heard 20 agencies of government, called them in for counsel, and all save one agreed to the directive. As I understand, the President was following the best counsel he could get. I now learn also that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] was consulted or was in counsel with the President. The heads of these agencies are not persons trying to give away the Government's property.

There is another issue or another factor here. The question is not all black on one side or all white on the other. The purpose in the patent field, and in this area where the Government is making contracts with corporations in the country having technical know-how to do research, is not to serve just one side. The people, the companies, to whom the Government goes to get the research done, have put time and investment in their facilities and in the technical skills they have employed, and they have some rights, too.

The public has rights that may transcend either the rights of the contractor or the agency of Government involved. If an invention is made, from which the public can get some benefit, are those patents going to be lodged in the archives of the Patent Office? I do not think that is the best way to get that information disseminated and to get the invention developed for use. Yes, some will go there, but I am talking about how best to serve the public and how the public can best get its benefits out of those inventions.

I do not know that anybody is going to be richer as the Senator from Louisiana says by reason of the space effort to go to the moon. I have no desire to go. I will yield whatever prerogative I may have to go there to somebody else. I do not know that anybody is richer by reason of the fact that we have the atomic bomb. But I do know this: My country is safer today because we have the atomic bomb. I do not know that anybody is richer because we have a great armada of fighting planes, but I do know my country is safer because we have them.

I do not know that we or anybody else will be richer by our putting a man on the moon, but I feel more secure and I feel the country is more secure if we do it, although I do not know, and nobody knows, what discoveries will be made by our going there. I certainly do not want to be indifferent about it, and do nothing about it, and let Russia—the Communist world—find out and perhaps have some great advantage over us. We cannot afford not to pursue this project.

That does not mean that, if we pursue it, we must give everything away. Again I do not believe anybody wants to do that. I believe every Member of the Senate wants to find the best answer and enact a law which is as applicable and in the wisdom of the Senate best suited for the general welfare, and let that law govern. We feel that we should review the question and get all the advice and counsel and all the technical information that we can, and bring it to the Senate.

If a bill is reported to the Senate which does not meet the judgment and approval of the Senator from Louisiana, or any other Senator, there will be an opportunity to amend the bill on the floor. The Senate can then exercise its will. But the way attempted here this afternoon is a poor way to do it. If we are to do it this way, we may just as well abandon, in many instances, the committee system.

The amendment was not heard before the committee that processed the bill to which it is offered. I do not know why it was not presented to that committee. I am not advised. There may have been good reason. But here on the floor of the Senate, 10 minutes after the debate began on it, good reason was shown for the Senate to reject it without further study. The amendment had to be amended on the floor by its sponsor. I am not sure now what it means. I doubt if the Senator from Louisiana knows. We should have counsel and advice on it, and not hastily or arbitrarily and without due deliberation, simply adopt this amendment because we do not like some alleged practice that we think may be going on in a particular agency. We have the committee hearings pending. I expect to hear any witness of standing or stature who indicates he wants to be heard. I have no intention of prolonging the hearings.

I have got all the work I can do, anyhow. I have had to arrange my schedule in order to be able to hold the present hearings—I felt there was need for them. I was interested in this matter—and justifiably so. We are proceeding with all possible diligence. I see some members of the committee in the Chamber who have been working with me on this problem and they will verify that we have merely been trying to get at the cold facts. I have certainly sought to do that and to seek out all possible objections and to ask questions of what will happen; that is, cannot this happen or cannot that happen under these provisions. I wish to get at the facts. I am interested only in obtaining a bill—a law—which will be just and right and fair and will serve the best interests of the people of this country.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is my privilege to serve under the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] on the patent subcommittee. I fully subscribe to the suggestions he is making in the Chamber today. I have supported amendments of this character before. Perhaps in the hearing which the Senator from Arkansas will be directing, I can support this amendment. I am sensitive to the possibility that technology and development are impeded by certain patent practices, and I would hope that all Senators would be in a position to make a final judgment, once the record has been developed.

I know the Senator from Arkansas well enough to know that if artificial restraints are imposed on the committee's actions, he will be intolerant of them. I also know that the Senate will be presented with a record on which all the facts will be accurately expressed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I do not believe that I need to say more unless other Senators have questions to ask. I can assure the Senate there is no purpose on our part to delay. However, I cannot tell Senators the bill will be reported and be in the Chamber next week or the next week or even 1 week after the hearings are concluded. I do know that every member of the committee must study the problem, because it is involved and requires study and deliberation. I, therefore, shall not promise that the record will be read next week or the next week after that but I do expect the committee to make a report and I do expect to make it at this session of Congress so that the Senate will have an opportunity to act upon it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not believe that there is any necessity for long discussion on this matter on my part, other than to express my hope that the Senate will reject, by way of postponement, or by whatever method it considers to be proper, the pending amendment.

I agree with the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who is the ranking member on the Republican side on the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, that this may be a good amendment, or it may not be a good amendment. I do not know. However, along with many other Senators, I have had some experience in attempting to fabricate a patent approach to some of the highly specialized agencies. I refer to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has twice wrestled for a long time with the question of patents.

When the Atomic Energy Committee began to build the law around atomic energy, we realized the unusual and complex nature of that activity and that it required, very often, a different partnership between private enterprise and governmental operation. We realized that patent difficulties would arise. At that time, there was no real mechanism to deal with patent rights, either for the Government, for the private individual, or for the developer or discoverer of an invention.

We went through lengthy hearings. I believe that at one time the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], was chairman of that committee, in connection with many of the hearings, and could probably give the Senate a more accurate statement as to the time spent.

We spent many weeks on this patent problem, trying to apply the patent approach to the specialized operation of Government. We heard representatives from the Patent Bar of the United States, representatives of Government in the various agencies, representatives of the Department of Justice, and representatives of industry who develop many patents in this country. There was a comprehensive hearing.

Later, we developed some statutory law. As I recall, later we found that there were certain deficiencies and inequities in the law as we had developed it; and we went through another series of activities in connection with searching for methods of equitable approach which would protect the Government and protect the discoverer of the invention. I assure the Senate that it is a highly complex operation, in a highly complex field. It is not so simple as saying that someone who invents something shall have a 17-year lease on it exclusively, or that he shall have no lease at all. It is a question of the complexity of background research and the necessity for applying that research when the Government induces a private individual to come into Government service.

He may make a new invention based upon something that he previously developed. The subject has many ramifications, more than one can possibly imagine. Not every day, but almost every day, new variants come to light. It is a complex problem.

The Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences has held hearings on this problem. This is a situation in which the patent law will have to be tailored, at least in part, to fit the particular and peculiar necessities of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and its programs. But it must contain certain fundamental principles as well.

I know of the zeal and interest of the Senator from Louisiana in this subject. He has been zealous in protecting the Government's rights in many fields. I believe that all Senators wish to protect the Government's rights, but I believe that all of us wish also to protect the rights of the private individual.

There is no more reason for the Government to be authorized to seize the inventive genius of an individual than there is for the Government to seize his farm or his house without reasonable and adequate compensation.

All I am saying—and probably I could have said it all in one sentence—is that I believe this is a vital and important part of the American system of enterprise, stimulus, and encouragement in the patent system, the system of inventions, and encouragement of the individual generally, or a business. New inventions are designed to seek to better the old situation. I believe the subject is so important and so vital a part of the free economy of this country, and the stimulus of that economy, that we had better let the committees look into the subject carefully and meticulously. I know, from the two long experiences we had with the Atomic Energy Committee and the Atomic Energy Commission and their problems, that the committees will approach the study in the interest of the Government of the United States, and also in the interest of the private enterprise system of invention and the reasonable protection of inventions, as well as in the interest of inventors and the interest of the public.

I believe that I shall vote for a motion to table the amendment when it comes up. I understand that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is about to make such a motion.

I would be inclined to vote for it in preference to voting against the Senator's amendment. I am not so sure that I would be against the Senator's amendment if there were adequate committee investigation and consideration. I am not against the protection of the Federal Government or the protection of the public. I merely say that we do not have adequate information in connection with this highly complex and technical field to legislate on it on the floor of the Senate in a field that is, to say the least, mysterious and in an early state of development. I believe that the committees ought to have an opportunity to study this subject.

The Senator from Arkansas has pointed out that he is working zealously in the field now. I am sure other committees will be in the field. I am quite sure that the Space Committee will wish to look at any recommendations that are made to see whether they are tailored to fit the necessities of the space agency. I am sure that other committees will wish to think about it, too.

I believe we shall wish to have all the advice we can get from committees, because that can affect in a great measure the willingness or the zeal with which many institutions and people will serve the Space Agency.

If they believe their rights are equitably protected as against the Government, it will open the field to greater cooperation, than if we close the door inadvertently by adopting an amendment which does not take into account sufficient background and history and examination by the technicians in the various fields.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be postponed by way of a tabling motion, which I do not believe will necessarily be a vote against the amendment, but a vote to postpone it. As I said a moment ago, I might even be in favor of the amendment, but I wish to have a firm basis upon which to act as a result of adequate hearings and as a result of all the technical and governmental advice that we can get in regard to this most comprehensive and most complex subject.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have heard with the greatest interest the statement of the Senator from Iowa. I believe he states the case very well. However, I do think it needs one corollary, which bears upon what the Senator from Louisiana has argued so eloquently, and that is that if we are to do something about this subject, which is of such great importance, it cannot be done based on the criterion of 1947 to 1965. If we table the amendment, the Senator from Louisiana ought to be assured that he has already rendered an enormous service, because he is making us face this problem. We will face it. That should be made clear.

Second, I believe we have an obligation to act upon this matter, and to act upon it at this session of Congress. I mean this year.

I shall do my utmost, as one member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to bring into the committee, in connection with the medical research bill, which is being held up expressly for this purpose, an alternative which we suggest. I hope that we may have from Senator McClellan's subcommittee a report before we are required to act on any other bill. In that way we should be able to incorporate, in our own committee, what is recommended as a generic policy.

I wish to make a pledge today—and this is due as a matter of elementary justice to the Senator from Louisiana—that we shall act on this matter and use every effort that we can to bring us to that action, including an amendment to the bill which is within the compass of my own committee, to see that the matter is brought to a resolution this year before we go home, so that the policy of the United States can be made clear.

It has been brought out in questions and answers on the floor that we are faced with the problem of clarifying some fuzzy language, because this matter has been acted upon in an ad hoc way. I have already pointed out that the well-intentioned amendment of the Senator from Louisiana contains language which might preclude a waiver even if almost no U.S. funds at all were used. Obviously the Senator from Louisiana does not mean that.

Also, when we look at the stock language of the Long amendment that was adopted, for example, the Appalachian Regional Development Act and other acts, we find the language:

> Nothing contained in this subsection shall deprive anyone of any background patent relating to any such activity without his consent.

The phrase is "background patent." There is a wide area for argument as to what that phrase means.

There is the added point that a patented invention, in order really to benefit the public, must not only be in the public domain, but must be used, exploited, developed, refined, and made available to the public, and open to competition. I think that is fine, but that does not mean the brains and ingenuity which has brought such an invention into being should be deprived of reward. All the facts can be reconciled. I believe that we have by our own discussions today clearly indicated something of the consensus on the floor of the Senate.

I pledge myself as one Senator to do my utmost to contribute to the final resolution of this problem this year at this session of Congress.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without prejudicing my rights, I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Reserving the right to object, will the Senator yield first to me so that I may make another unanimous-consent request on another subject?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the rollcall, the time for debate on the amendment shall be confined to 30 minutes, to be equally divided, and to be controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] and by the Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may the yeas and nays be ordered first?

Mr. ANDERSON. A motion to table may be made. I would not know where the yeas and nays would fall in that case.

Mr. MORSE. I am always willing to accept a gentleman's understanding. We have sometimes been caught with a unanimous-consent agreement limiting time, by finding it impossible to obtain a yea-and-nay vote. I wonder if the Senator from New Mexico will pledge his help to obtain a yea-and-nay vote. If he does so, I shall not object.

Mr. ANDERSON. I so pledge myself.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator may put us in a difficult position, and I call it to his attention, because I believe it is most important. Let us consider the situation. The 30 minutes for debate have expired, a motion to table is made, and the tabling motion does not carry.

Then there would be no opportunity to say anything about the amendment. The vote would come automatically on adopting or rejecting the amendment.

I put that problem to the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the Senator is in error. He can always offer an amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Let us ascertain what the situation is. Let me ask the Chair this question: If the time is limited on the amendment and the time expires, is an amendment to the amendment in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment would be in order, but no further debate would be in order.

Mr. JAVITS. I suggest to the Senator from New Mexico, for whom I have the greatest affection, that his proposed unanimous-consent request be revised to provide that debate on the amendment shall end at the end of 30 minutes, as he suggests, except that if an amendment to the amendment is offered 5 minutes of debate may be allowed in favor and 5 minutes against an amendment that may be offered to the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to make a suggestion. I have looked for the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], who said that he intended to make a motion to table the amendment. All he would have to do would be to enter his motion with the understanding that there would be 30 minutes of debate on it. Then the Senate would be clear parliamentarywise. I do not see the Senator.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the situation is sufficiently clear.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, a motion to table is not a debatable motion, and unanimous consent would be required to take further action. I am willing to agree to 15 minutes of debate on each side. I would be willing to agree that the amendment should remain subject to amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. With 5 minutes of debate on each side?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Any amount of time that any Senator desires. Let us agree to that point subsequently. We will see if the amendment is agreed to. If it is agreed to, the Senator can still offer his amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Chair restate the request that is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has asked unanimous consent that debate on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana shall close in 30 minutes, the time on one side to be controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and on the other by the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Is the Senator from New Mexico confining his request to the proposed motion to table?

Mr. ANDERSON. If the motion to table carries, the Senate will not be concerned about any amendment thereafter. If the motion fails, I shall submit a request that 15 minutes to a side be granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in the manner in which the request was stated, it was not specifically stated that the time would be equally divided. Is that point a part of the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sorry. I should have included in the request the further request that the time be equally divided between the proponent of the amendment, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Chair restate the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is to limit debate on the amendment to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to each side, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, inasmuch as I rose to support the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] in his position, and inasmuch as he is not in the Chamber at the present time, I shall be glad to move to table the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement is to limit debate on the amendment to 30 minutes. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I withdraw the suggestion.

The PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe it was agreed that I could suggest the absence of a quorum, at the conclusion of which the unanimous-consent agreement would go into effect. I believe it would now be in order to suggest the absence of a quorum.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 103 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Under the agreement, the Senator from Louisiana has 15 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, much has been said about the desirability of a uniform Federal patent policy. The U.S. Government had a uniform Federal patent policy from the beginning of the Nation until 1942. Under George Washington, the U.S. Government let a contract to Eli Whitney to manufacture interchangeable parts for firearms, and from that day until 1942 there was a uniform Federal policy of the fruits of public research being freely available to the public. It was exactly the kind of policy I have been speaking for, although it was much stronger than the one I am advocating here today. It was not a policy to enable somebody to raid the Government of something the Government had paid for. That was our uniform patent policy for 150 years.

In 1942, we began to get flexibility. How did that happen? We were at war. Some of the big companies, headed by General Electric, which repeatedly has been found guilty, and some of whose executives have been sent to jail for violating the antitrust laws, said they were not interested in doing research for the Government unless they could do so on a guaranteed-profit basis and they could keep the patents exclusively for 17 years, making the people of the Nation pay through the nose for the benefit of what the people had had free for 150 years. It was a "shakedown."

Our boys were fighting and dying for the country; yet those pirates were telling the Government, "We want to keep private rights on Government research; otherwise, we are not interested in doing the research." That was a bluff. They would never have let their competitors do the research.

However the Government, when Roosevelt was called on to win the war, said, "Perhaps we had better go along with them." They agreed to let them have patents on private research starting back in 1942. From that day forward things became extremely complicated. Why was that? The Bible says:

> You cannot serve God and mammon. You will love the one and hate the other, or you hate the one and love the other.

How complicated the situation becomes when one tries to serve two masters and work things out so that both masters will be satisfied. He will wind up either loving the one and hating the other, or hating the one and loving the other.

In 1942 we began to get flexibility. How has it worked out? Under the Manhattan project and then under the Atomic Energy Commission, we developed the atomic bomb.

In that field the Government could not give away private patents.

In the Manhattan project, and under the Atomic Energy Commission, we went at least 5 years ahead of the whole world in research.

Then we created NASA. The Senate wanted to pattern this agency after the Atomic Energy Commission. The House left the measure wide open. We received the compromise, through the conferees, that the Administrator may waive patent rights if he finds it to be in the national interest. The Administrator proceeded to find it to be in the national interest to waive patents even without knowing what the invention would be.

We had studies made by the General Accounting Office. We found that the contractors, Lockheed, and Thompson Ramo Woolridge, two of the biggest contractors, hoped, under the Air Force contracts, to obtain a private patent on Government research. They were holding out on their findings, developed with Government money, for as long as 4 years.

A distinguished American once told me that he urged the president of Lockheed Corp. to tell his competitors what he knew about solid fuels. The president of Lockheed said he was not about to do it, stating:

> Others know a lot more than I know in other fields. They are not about to tell me, and I am not about to tell them.

How could we hope to be first when the information necessary to put us first was being kept from one another by a dozen or more contractors?

We are 5 years behind the Russians in space. That was once the testimony of our experts. We may have caught up to some extent. However, we were 5 years behind when the second sputnik went up. Under the old shakedown, we were falling behind by trying to benefit those who would squeeze the blood out of this country for their own selfish advantage.

What am I trying to do? I am attempting to make a small step toward getting the horse back into the stable where it belongs.

The issue that I am debating is as old as government. It is a question of whether this Government is going to serve the many or the few.

This is the issue that divided Jefferson and Hamilton. This is the issue that separated Andrew Jackson from the Bank of the United States. This is the issue that made Theodore Roosevelt quit the Republican Party and run on his own when he had a fight with the monopolists of his day. This is the issue that Woodrow Wilson had to face when he put the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Act on the books. It is the same old fight.

Are we in government for the many? Are we for the benefit of 192 million people? Are we to set up a deal and parcel out billions of dollars of Government money in a way which satisfies the few so that they can rake in billions in profits on Government contracts at the expense of the public for many long years?

Are we going to vote to try to protect the interest of the people of this country? It has been said that the NASA policy is well advised. I just want Senators to hear the testimony of an attorney for NASA. This testimony was given before my subcommittee. Some Senators believe that I just came in suddenly with this. This testimony was given before me in 1959.

The lawyer for NASA stated:

> Contractors have requested that we include in our contract provisions certain assurances that inventions in certain classes will be waived if such inventions are made.
>
> We have taken the position that that type of contract provision would be inconsistent with the apparent purpose of section 305. It appears to us that we should not grant waivers in advance of the making of the invention because of the great difficulty, if not impossibility, of determining with any degree of assurance that the interests of the United States would be served by waiver before the precise nature of the invention is known. So we have not included in our contracts any such provisions, and we have informed contractors that this matter is not open to negotiation.

That was said by the lawyer for NASA. He advocated the patent giveaway policy that NASA is now following. He said that it would be against the law to do it without a change of law. But they are doing it, even though they have sent a man down to ask for a change in the law. They are doing it though they said that it would be against the law.

Mr. President, we have made out very well when Government has done its own research. We did our own research in agriculture. We are so far ahead of the Russians that they cannot catch up with us even with our help.

The Tennessee Valley Authority did research. They are ahead in the area in which they performed research.

We are preeminent in atomic research where patents are retained by Government.

All that we can do here is to make it possible for the people of this Nation to more nearly enjoy the benefit of their research. This is only a small step in that direction.

It has been suggested that I took this proposal off the top of my head. I have been conducting hearings on the subject for as long as any Senator here. I have conducted as many hearings on the subject as has any other Senator.

I fought this battle as long as anyone has. I have testified repeatedly before the committee of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I regret that the committee did not report something. I have been on the floor and repeatedly urged amendments along this line with success. Senators have voted with me time and time again. Senators have voted with me to protect the public interest. This would not be the first time that this has happened. Senators have voted with me twice this year already. We have had ample precedent. We have been going step by step in an effort to protect the public interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, Senators have gone along with me on matters involving pollution, water resources, and health. However, they find it difficult to do so when we talk about NASA. That is because we have touched the sensitive nerve of the military complex. That is what President Eisenhower warned against in his farewell address. It is a threat to the whole structure of our Government. When that combination finds themselves crowded, they come in and say, "It may be all right when applied to someone else, but this is different. You are talking about big business." That is the big difference, in my mind.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Louisiana knows, I have stood with him for many years in the Senate on the patent fight.

The Senator will recall that in 1954 when the atomic energy bill was before the Senate, I started a filibuster which lasted for 13 days and 6 nights.

Our efforts were to protect the interest of the American people with respect to patents in the atomic energy bill. The Senator from Louisiana stood with me shoulder to shoulder in that fight. We had an amendment which sought to protect patent rights under the atomic energy program. It provided for something quite different from what we would have in NASA if we were not to agree to this amendment.

There has been much talk about what the amendment of the Senator would do. It has been said that this is complex and confusing. I see no complexity or confusion in it. The Senator has set out on a mimeographed sheet the three objectives of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MORSE. The mimeographed sheet states that the amendment would: First, prevent waiver of the property rights of the United States in inventions made under NASA contracts until the inventions are made.

What is wrong with that? The Senator puts it very well. It is a question as to whether we are going into this patent field to protect the public interest, or give license to a few to exploit the public interest.

I continue to read from the statement:

> (2) Require compliance by the Administrator, along with other executive agencies, with requirements of section 207 of the Federal Property Act; i.e., submission of proposed waiver to Attorney General for advice as to antitrust implications.

What is wrong with that?

Continuing:

> (3) Require the Administrator, before making waiver, to find that:
>
> (a) Equity justifies the waiver—

It does not say there must be waiver, but it requires proof that waiver would be justified; so this test must be met.

Continuing:

> (b) The waiver will promote the use of the invention in the interests of the United States.

What is wrong with that?

The Senator points out what happened in 1952 when, to their discredit, I am sorry to say, some corporations would not share their secrets, although they were necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. The war effort was handicapped because we did not have cooperation from certain corporations. That spells the difference between serving the public interest and giving to someone—I care not what label one attaches to it—a license to exploit the patent.

I hope the Senator's amendment will be agreed to.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall be brief. This is not a question of working under two masters; it is a matter of NASA working under one master, and that is the Government. It is working under regulations propounded in August 1964, put into effect October 1, 1964, under guidelines established by President Kennedy and endorsed and continued by President Johnson. Those regulations apply among other things to contracts at the time they are entered into. They establish six explicit conditions which must be met before waiver can take place. They are:

(1) It is not a principal purpose of the contract to create, develop, or improve products, processes, or methods which are intended for commercial use (or which are otherwise intended to be made available for use) by the general public at home or abroad, or which will be required for such use by governmental regulations.

(2) It is not a principal purpose of the contract to explore into fields which directly concern the public health or public welfare.

(3) The contract is not in a field of science or technology in which there has been little significant experience outside of work funded by the Government, or where the Government has been the principal developer of the field, with respect to which the acquisition of exclusive rights at the time of contracting might confer on the contractor a preferred or dominant position.

(4) The contract is not for services of the contractor for (i) the operation of a Government-owned research or production facility or (ii) coordinating and directing the work of others.

(5) The purpose of the contract is to build upon existing knowledge or technology to develop information, products, processes, or methods for use by the Government.

(6) The work called for by the contract is in a field of technology in which the contractor has acquired technical competence (demonstrated by factors such as know-how, experience, and patent position) directly related to an area in which the contractor has an established nongovernmental commercial position.

These are the six specific conditions that are set forth as conditions to granting waiver at the time of contracting. They exist under regulations and guidelines endorsed by President Johnson.

When a contractor enters into a contract with NASA he has to make reports from time to time to NASA authorities. This reporting is encouraged by waiver at the time of contracting. This is a beneficial requirement, much better than the Senator from Louisiana states. He ignores this benefit when he expresses that there can be no right of patent obtained until the contract has been performed.

So far as I know, there have been no abuses by a contractor under these NASA regulations.

From October 1, 1964 to March 31, 1965, contracts and subcontracts which could have been considered for possible waiver numbered 4,480. Out of that number, the number of requests for waiver during that period was 48. NASA granted waivers in only 7 of the 48 requests out of the total number of 4,480 contracts. This is certainly not an abuse of NASA patent waiver authority.

As the Senator from Arkansas stated so well, the entire matter of Government patent policy is now being considered by his subcommittee. It is holding hearings at this moment. This question relates to the merits of a Government policy that will affect not only NASA, the Department of Defense, but other agencies as well. There are 20 agencies that enter into research and development contracts. We want them regulated in some consistent manner and have those regulations made clear.

I hope that either the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will be defeated or that, if a motion to lay on the table is made, the motion will be adopted. This should be done so that the matter can be carefully studied.

Patent law and policy are extremely complex. As one who helped draw these NASA provisions, I know how difficult it is.

I hope, therefore, that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record remarks which I wish to make at greater length on the proposed amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I am opposed to the adoption of this amendment to the NASA authorization bill. Its effect would be to change substantially the patent provision of the National Aeronautics and Space Act and the present patent waiver regulations thereunder.

This amendment not only ignores the lessons and experience gained by NASA in the negotiation of its research and development contracts since creation of the Agency in 1958, it contradicts the provisions of the President's statement on Government patent policy promulgated by the late President Kennedy in October 1963, and endorsed by President Johnson. This amendment is unnecessary in the light of existing law governing NASA disposition of patent rights; furthermore, I believe its adoption would be detrimental to the best interests of the United States under its space program.

A primary purpose of NASA, as defined in the act, is to insure "preservation of the role of the United States as a leader in aeronautical and space science and technology." A principal means for achievement of this objective is through the research and development programs conducted by NASA. These are sophisticated programs. They require the creation and production of advanced and refined methods and products by the best qualified sources obtainable.

Years of experience in the negotiation of research and development contracts have enabled NASA to develop a proper approach for settling the legitimate rights of all parties to these contracts. It has sought, I believe, to achieve the best results for the space program and to perform equity towards the parties to these contracts.

The experience of NASA has shown that the goals of the space program are best achieved by offering the greatest incentives to make significant technological advances. To do this, patent regulations were devised to apply equitable and reasonable standards for determining whether the Government or the contractor, under a contract, had been the principal developer in a particular field of technology and whether waiver of proprietary rights in favor of the contractor would be an effective incentive to work the invention at the earliest practicable date. This approach has served to achieve results for the space program; it has recognized the rights of the parties to a research and development contract; and it has served the public interest by fostering early commercial development of the invention, where possible, for the benefit of the consumer. This has also been the approach of the President's statement on Government Patent Policy. Yet, this amendment would ignore this approach.

By changing the present language of section 305(f), which authorizes the Administrator to waive the commercial rights to inventions "made or which may be made" in any "actual or proposed contract," the proposed amendment would deny to NASA the right to settle the question of property rights in inventions at the time of contracting. This in turn would prevent NASA from implementing the President's patent policy, and place NASA out of step with all of the other agencies in the Government on the question of allocation of rights to inventions. The theory upon which advance waivers would be prohibited is, according to Senator Long's statement on the Senate floor last night, that an advance waiver is buying a pig in a poke. The President's patent policy faced squarely this problem. Under the NASA regulations which implement the President's policy, six different, but explicit findings must be made before an advance waiver can be obtained. These findings rule out the kinds of examples that Senator Long has been citing on the Senate floor from any possibility of advance waiver or, for that matter, waiver even after the invention is identified.

Advance waivers are protected by a number of specific requirements in the NASA regulations. Such a waiver has no application until a specific invention is reported to the Government under a contract. If that invention relates to public health or is required for public use by Government regulation, the Government can compel the company to license the invention royalty-free or on reasonable terms. If practical application of the invention cannot be demonstrated after 3 years, the Government can compel the contractor to license others royalty-free or on reasonable terms. In any event, the antitrust laws continue to apply. There has not been cited a single instance of a NASA waiver leading to a position of dominance by the company involved either under the old or the new NASA regulations.

The difficulty with a narrow view of advance waivers is that it ignores the other elements of the problem which are just as important—how to stimulate inventive activity, how to get contractors to effectively document this inventive activity and to report these inventions to the Government, and then finally how to disseminate information regarding these inventions and to foster the investment of the funds necessary to develop the inventions to some marketable form. The examples cited by Senator Long on May 4, 17, and on June 1, are examples of inventions which arose primarily out of Government programs having as their purpose the development of items for commercial use. Unlike such departments as

Agriculture and HEW, NASA and DOD seldom, if ever, contract for the development of an item to be used by the public. The inventions made under NASA contracts are related to R. & D. projects to carry out the NASA mission. To orient them to a commercial use normally involves a considerable expenditure of money, estimated to be from 10 to 100 times the cost of the original invention.

Under the amendment being proposed today, before the Administrator of NASA can waive even after an invention is identified, under the criteria of the proposed amendment, he must determine that such waiver "is justified upon equitable consideration of the contributions made or to be made, without financial assistance from the United States, by the applicants to the making or developing" of the invention. While such a test may be relevant, and may even go to the question of whether the United States is entitled to any rights in the invention, the criteria of the President's policy which NASA follows are much more objective and far more meaningful in terms of protecting the public interest. The mere fact that a contractor may have contributed substantially to the making or development of an invention should not by itself be determinative of the public interest; for example, such contribution may have occurred in the performance of research and development related directly to public health where the public interest would still require the acquisition of title to resulting inventions by the Government. On the other hand, when a corporation puts together an expert and highly trained research organization and the Government uses this organization, the contractor has already made a substantial contribution to the making of the invention notwithstanding the relative monetary contributions at the time the invention was made.

My opposition to this amendment is based not only on its merits. I oppose it for the manner in which it is offered.

Proper disposition of patent rights under Government research and development contracts is an extremely important and complex subject. It requires careful and detailed analysis by the appropriate committee of the Senate before we should be asked to form a judgment as to whether a particular approach may be the correct method. This, however, has not been the case with respect to the amendment before us. It was never considered in committee; yet, we are expected to consider immediately its merits and demerits, as well as its presumed effect. I consider this to be premature and unwise.

There is another compelling reason why this is not the proper time for introduction and consideration of this amendment. At this moment, the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Senate Judiciary Committee is considering the very subject of patent rights disposition under Government research and development contracts. Prudence would dictate that we await the conclusion of these hearings and obtain the benefit of the analysis to be made by this subcommittee. This is to me the proper and reasonable approach.

We are asked here to ignore the deliberations of an appropriate Senate committee; we are asked to ignore the lessons gained by NASA under its patent provision and waiver regulations; we are asked to ignore the President's statement on Government patent policy in spite of the extensive study and analysis which led to its promulgation and before we have had a chance to see how it works. Frankly, I cannot do this.

For these reasons, I oppose this amendment.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I yield such time to the distinguished minority leader as he may require.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I hope a motion to table the Long amendment will be made. In the absence of any other Senator's making such a motion, I shall make it.

I shall do so for a number of reasons. In the first instance, notwithstanding the fact that I may have previously supported the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, with a clear conscience, I now wish to reject his amendment. I believe I can assign a reason why Senators may have previously voted for the amendment.

If memory does not fail me, his amendment came at the shank end of the day, just about the time we were ready to conclude consideration of the bill to which it was offered. Rather than go into a lengthened session, the idea was to let the amendment go in the bill, with the idea that it probably would be taken out in conference. That is as good a reason as any. That is probably why I supported the amendment before.

But the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] has advanced the best reason for tabling the amendment. He is Chairman of the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary which is considering this question. Once upon a time I served on that subcommittee. I know something about the complexity of patents, but the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has become an expert, and, in addition, he has developed a reasonably expert stand.

He stated on the floor this afternoon that this subject is under consideration by his subcommittee. The Long amendment has not been considered by the McClellan subcommittee. In view of the complexities and implications that are involved, either we should tell the McClellan subcommittee that it is useless, and worthless, and that we do not need it any longer, or we should let it function as it should function, because the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction of this subject under the rules of the Senate, and that responsibility has been delegated to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan]. He is entitled to an opportunity to examine every implication that is involved before the Senate takes precipitate action in this field.

Mr. President, I assign one more reason: There is only one creative instrument under God's canopy, and that instrument is lodged in the human skull. I can think of no other creative force in all the universe. Show me any great work of man, whether it be the Pyramid of Cheops, the Empire State Building, the Taj Mahal, or Hoover Dam—I do not care what it is called—but it had to come out of a human brain.

There are two things I wish to see fully protected. The first is the atmosphere in which the brain of man operates—and it can operate best in the moral climate of freedom; and, second, that brain operates best when there is some incentive. When we close the door to human incentive, I do not know what we can expect. We can lavish all the dollars from the Federal Treasury on an idea, and it will not amount to a single hoot unless we have a catalyst which will convert that idea into practicality. That instrumentality is lodged in the human skull.

Mr. President, I would be the last to thwart it, to dampen it down, or to diminish it, by putting something on the statute books which may be sumptuary and done in haste.

The pending amendment has not been considered by Senator McClellan's committee. Are we going to be so foolish this afternoon, in the face of an emotional argument, as to turn down the Patent Committee and adopt that amendment? That is the reason I hope the motion to table will be sustained—and it should be sustained.

The world will not fall, the United States will not quake, the Treasury will not be despoiled, the country will not be robbed blind, until John McClellan can come back to the Senate with a bill which has had careful and reasoned consideration in his committee—a committee which has been assigned to the responsibility of developing and dealing with matters in the whole patent field.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this debate any longer. The Senate might be doing me a favor, and every member of my committee a favor, by adopting the pending amendment and then discharging the committee, if that is the way the Senate wishes to operate. All Senators serve on committees and know the problems and the hard work some hearings involve.

The pending amendment has not been considered by the committee which reported the bill, to which the pending amendment is sought to be attached. The amendment has not been considered by the committee having jurisdiction of patent laws and which is now engaged in the performance of its duties with respect to pending patent bills.

We have said something about the subject of patent rights being complex. After the pending amendment reached the Senate, in the space of only 10 minutes after debate opened, it had to be modified by its author. This is not a simple problem to deal with. It is a very complex one. It is not so simple as situations in history many years ago to which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] referred.

Mr. President, I will not be a party to reflecting on Presidents who have had just as worthy motives in the patent field as anyone in this Senate. The statement that President Franklin D. Roosevelt in effect gave away Government rights and that President Kennedy also gave them away to special interests, and that now President Johnson, by his actions, is giving them away to special interests, does not impress me.

We have a job to do in the Senate, a job, as has been pointed out by the distinguished minority leader, to get the most information we can, the best counsel we can, and to exercise the best wisdom we possess in trying to resolve this problem. If we are to solve these problems in the fashion here attempted, by coming to the floor of the Senate with unconsidered amendments, with language which may have any kind of meaning, then, in my opinion, that is the wrong way to proceed. Read what the author himself says in his statement he intends to do and then consider what the language in the amendment really does. There is not a Senator in the Chamber this afternoon who is sure in his own mind just what the language in the amendment means or just what it does.

The amendment needs study. If we are to adopt it immediately, in spite of the language it now contains, and depart from tradition from the normal practices of this great body, then that is the choice of the Senate, but I do not agree with such procedure.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, all through the statute books of this country—relating to Agriculture, Interior, Atomic Energy, NASA itself, there are provisions which relate to patent policy in those particular departments of Government. Almost all of them, with the exception of NASA itself, declare that private patents shall not be given away when made as a result of Government research.

None of those came out of the Judiciary Committee. It is all right with me for the Judiciary Committee to report a bill, but I have been offering amendments on the Senate floor which have been voted on in research bill after research bill—and on NASA—which I am satisfied have been worked on without going through the Committee on the Judiciary. It is all right with me for the Judiciary Committee to make them, but I am advocating an amendment similar to one which the Senate advocated when it authorized NASA to begin with.

This is a very big issue on which the Senate will have to vote on time and again in the future until we have succeeded in protecting the public interest.

Mrs. SMITH. Are there any other Senators who wish time to speak? If not, Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mrs. SMITH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on previous occasions when this subject has been under discussion, I have joined the Senator from Louisiana in support of his amendments. Today, I have already commended him for the fight he has been making, but the facts as presented to the Senate establish a completely different picture. Although I have only one purpose, and that is to protect the public right, I cannot go along with the argument that we should, in this slipshod way, proceed with disposition of the issue.

Mr. President, I join the Senator from Arkansas in his comments. President Franklin D. Roosevelt has been condemned as having given away the public's rights. President Kennedy, by implication, has likewise been condemned. President Johnson has also been condemned.

I cannot subscribe to that kind of argument.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I intend to vote for Senator Dodd's motion to table the long amendment to the pending NASA authorization bill. In doing so, I want to make clear that I am neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the merits of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana. In my judgment, what is at issue is the procedure that should be followed in evolving a change in the Government-wide patent policy adopted in 1963. That policy was adopted after 18 months of study, and had the support and agreement of some 20 Government agencies.

This week, Senator McClellan's subcommittee is conducting hearings on the whole question of the Government-wide patent policy. This affords us a unique opportunity for reflection and study. By contrast, the amendment which the Senator from Connecticut seeks to table was made available for study only this morning, so far as I know, and is at least the third version to be mentioned within the last week.

We all know that the amount of Federal money involved here is enormous, and that the question of how best to develop space technology is of the utmost significance to our national security.

In view of the fact that we do have a chance to have this matter considered in the context of a full hearing, with a full opportunity for study of the statements of all interested parties, I do not think we should move ahead without awaiting the results of such hearings.

We should all be aware that tabling the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will not result in any endangering of the national security. NASA has been operating under the Government-wide patent policy, and that policy is basically oriented to Government retention of title to patents. It allows for exceptions in certain cases, to be sure; but these are limited by carefully defined standards. It may be that it would be desirable to have a policy which would be different in the degree of Government retention of title; but it should be clear that all we are talking about is a difference of degree.

The popular press has characterized the issue as being a dispute between those who want private industry to make a financial killing with Government money, and those who want complete Government retention of title to inventions discovered as a result of Government-financed research. That is not the issue at all. Instead, what is involved is an extremely complicated dispute between two groups, both of which are basically oriented toward Government ownership of inventions, but which differ on the question of how much flexibility should be left for waiving Government ownership and allowing contractors with the Government to retain title to their inventions.

This matter is so delicate and so complicated that it should be resolved only after full and ample hearing. That is why I support Senator Dodd's motion.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I move to lay the pending amendment on the table.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut to lay the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] on the table. The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay", and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 26, as follows:

[No. 104 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Aiken
Allott
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Fannin
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
McClellan
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—26

Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Burdick
Church
Clark
Douglas
Ellender
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Long, La.
Mansfield
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Nelson
Neuberger
Proxmire
Talmadge
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—15

Byrd, Va.
Eastland
Ervin
Gore
Hruska
Inouye
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
Muskie
Randolph
Ribicoff
Simpson
Smathers
Sparkman

So Mr. Dodd's motion to lay Mr. Long's amendments on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 4, as follows:

[No. 105 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Ellender
Fannin
Fong
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—4

Douglas
Fulbright
Morse
Robertson

NOT VOTING—17

Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Case
Eastland
Ervin
Gore
Hruska
Inouye
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
Muskie
Randolph
Ribicoff
Simpson
Smathers
Sparkman

So the bill (H.R. 7717) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. Anderson, Mr. Symington, Mr. Stennis, Mrs. Smith, and Mr. Jordan of Idaho conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement for the record in explanation of the vote which I cast in opposition to the bill. I voted against it for 2 reasons: First, I could not vote for a bill in which the Congress gives away the people's interest—the dollars that they spend on the NASA program—by authorizing special selfish interests in this country to exploit the American taxpayer. I believe that is exactly what we have done by not giving the American taxpayer the protection to patent rights in any research project that is financed out of the taxpayers' money. I heard not a single argument this afternoon which in my judgment would justify my vote for a license to private interests in this country to exploit the public interest.

I took exactly that position in 1954 when an attempt was made on the floor of the Senate to obtain unanimous consent to pass the atomic energy giveaway bill the very afternoon that it was brought to the floor of the Senate—a bill some 110 pages long. As the Record will show, I said I did not believe that 10 Members of the Senate knew what was in the bill.

Not very many persons knew that a patent sleeper clause was in that bill, for in that atomic energy giveaway bill of 1954 the proposal was to turn over to the private utilities of the country, the atomic energy program for nothing, although the American taxpayers had spent more than $14 billion in the development of the atomic energy program during the war. Part of the program included the right to exploit the public with respect to any patents that were developed.

The patent issue in the NASA bill was not complicated; it was an issue as to whether the Senate wanted to go on record in protecting the public interest, or whether it wanted to give the private companies that are to do the research, completely financed by the taxpayers of the country, the bonanza that the bill gives to them. I could not possibly vote for that kind of giveway of the taxpayers' interests.

In the second place, I could not vote for the bill because, in my judgment, the program involves the expenditure of such a huge sum of money that it will result in a great deal of waste. I do not feel that there is any need for the type of crash program that is involved in the NASA project. I am not persuaded by the so-called prestige argument.

There are many other things on the domestic front that are vital to the welfare of the people of the country, for which millions of dollars could be better spent.

For example, I think of the education crisis; I think of the juvenile delinquency crisis; I think of the water pollution problem; I think of the need to protect the natural resources of the country; I think of what needs to be done, by the spending of many millions of dollars, to develop the security interests of our own people on this planet; I think of a social security system that does not begin to pay the monthly benefits to the elderly of the country that can possibly keep them in health and decency. Yet when some of us have proposed for many years, as has the senior Senator from Oregon, to increase the social security benefits, so that the aged of the country can live out their lives in decency, we are told that we cannot afford it. What hypocrisy. The fact is that we are running out on our obligations as legislators to protect the public interest.

We would do more for our national prestige by applying the money to these social sores than by applying it to the extravagance of space travel.

But we can find hundreds of millions of dollars to pour into a NASA program. That is a program that can both wait and be processed under a go-slow policy, not under the crash program that is contemplated by the President and his administration. I say to my President: "I think you could better spend that money in developing and protecting human values on this planet, rather than spend millions of dollars at such a rapid rate in connection with the NASA program."

In broad outlines, those are my two main reasons for voting against what I think is a shockingly wasteful program, wasteful in view of the greater domestic needs of the people of the country, who have a right to look to Congress to do something about them first. That is why I voted as I did; and I am proud of my vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Oregon has already expressed the reasons why I also voted against the bill. Last year I tried as hard as I could to cut the amount back. This year I did not make that effort because of the futility of attempting to do so. But I voted against the bill for the reasons the Senator from Oregon has given.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to be associated with the views of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to express my complete agreement with the views expressed by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Arkansas. I voted for the bill, but I intend, and I hope that other Senators will join me—indeed, I hope other Senators will take the leadership—to propose an amendment to the appropriation bill to provide for an across-the-board cut, in order that the arguments which the Senator from Oregon has just made can be made at greater length. In my opinion, he is 100 percent correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Oregon so far as they pertain to the protection of the people's right in this research. I personally think the greatest value to be derived from the expenditure of this money is the research that is being done. We are providing $4,500 million for research and development. This does not pertain merely to our getting a man to the moon; the program has great value from the standpoint of research in and of itself. We have almost $3,500 million in one program.

I do not object to the program; I voted for it. My objection is to giving away the fruits of the research. I think that is enough to cause anyone to pause and be shocked. Why should the Government be asked to give to the contractors all the fruits of the research, when the contractors are paid for the work that is done.

I ask the Senator from Oregon this question: Do not the people who obtain the research contracts get their pay regardless of whether they find or develop anything?

Mr. MORSE. Of course.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Are they not guaranteed against loss?

Mr. MORSE. Of course.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. They receive a highly remunerative profit when they engage in research, regardless of whether they are successful.

Mr. MORSE. Of course. There is talk about the fruits of the research coming out of their skull. It is also an educational process for which the American taxpayers are paying. Scientists are being trained to be better scientists, month by month, at the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the Senator from Oregon for his fight. I joined with him and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] in the effort to prevent the shocking giveaway of $4,500 million. The American people have an interest in that $4,500 million. The research should continue. I voted for the bill to have the research continue, but I still think it is shocking to give the fruits of the research away.

FEDERAL TAX CREDIT AS AN AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently I had the honor to speak in New York City before the Republican Planning and Research Committee's Task Force on Education. I spoke on the subject of the case for tax credit as an aid to higher education. I presented some facts on Federal aid to higher education through tax credit by way of the income tax that I think would be of interest to other Senators, since the Senate will be considering this subject later in the year. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks and a table on this subject be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement and table were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal Aid to Higher Education—The Case for Tax Credit

Mr. Chairman and members of the Republican planning and research committee's task force on education, you are to be commended on the establishment of this forward thinking program which seeks not only answers to the problems of today in providing the best possible education for our children, but also seeks the means to continue, in the future, programs to provide better educational opportunities for every American child.

I am grateful to you for giving me the opportunity to present my thoughts which I hope will be helpful in your deliberations.

Our Nation is at a crossroads in determining its course for the future in providing a college education for our children. Tuition and fees have been increased at an accelerating rate at private and public colleges, universities, and land-grant institutions caused by the steadily rising costs of operations at all institutions of higher learning and rapidly growing enrollments. The decision we face is how best to meet and cope with this problem.

All evidence presented to us points to the inevitable conclusion that the cost of tuition, fees, books and equipment will continue to rise. And as costs continue to rise, more and more parents will find it increasingly difficult to finance their children's education. Even now, each new increase in student costs serves to prevent a number of potential college students from attending the college of their choice, and forces some students already enrolled to drop out for purely economic reasons. The effect of this trend upon American higher education could be devastating, not only to our children but to our national interest.

Education is vital to our national interest. Our national growth is directly proportionate to the strength and excellence of our educational resources. Excellence in education has been more nearly achieved in the United States for the broad base of the population than in any other nation in the world. It is crucial that we give top priority to maintaining the strongest educational system possible and this is only possible if the youth of the Nation are provided the financial opportunity to participate in higher education. What courses of action have been advanced to assist in reaching and maintaining this goal?

Literally, there have been many hundreds of proposals offered. They have ranged from massive programs of Government-financed scholarships, grants, and loans to States and institutions of higher learning, to individual tax relief for students and their parents. All have failed to secure the necessary support because they failed to surmount one or more of the three principal objections:

1. Government domination and ultimate control of our educational system.
2. Opposition to the use of tax funds to aid church-supported schools.
3. Lack of real assistance to those in the greatest-need dichotomy.

During the past 10 years more than 450 bills have been introduced in Congress advocating some form of tax relief for college students and their families. These have advocated three different forms of assistance under the tax laws, with the greatest number of bills advocating the relief proposed under the first category:

1. Allow as a deduction from gross income amounts paid for tuition, fees, and books by the taxpayer or his dependent.
2. Authorize an extra $600 dependent's exemption for each full-time student at an institution of higher education.

3. A tax credit for a percentage of the cost of tuition, fees, and books paid by the taxpayer for himself, his dependents, or another person.

The first two proposals have received no favorable action because they would provide the greatest benefit to the higher income taxpayer, and the least to the lower income taxpayer—none at all to the lowest income group which already owed no income tax. Of all the proposals introduced, the tax credit proposal most nearly meets and overcomes all of the principal objections, and provides the most equitable form of assistance to students while stimulating greater private efforts in support of higher education. Furthermore, to the extent that this proposal encourages a private contribution to the education of others than the taxpayer's own dependents, the Government is obtaining educational dollars at substantial discounts ranging as high as 55 percent.

How does the tuition tax credit plan work? Under the bill introduced by Senator RIBICOFF and myself and cosponsored by 33 other Senators, an income tax credit for college costs is provided as follows: The amount of the credit is 75 percent of the first $200; 25 percent of the next $300; and 10 percent of the next $1,000. The credit is based on the first $1,500 paid for tuition, fees, books and supplies by or for each student at an approved institution of higher education. The maximum credit provided by our bill is $325. This credit is not the same as a deduction. Some people have confused the two terms.

They are not the same. A deduction is a subtraction from gross income before computation of the amount of tax that is due. A tax credit is a subtraction from the amount of taxes the individual would otherwise pay on his taxable gross income. Because each dollar of credit reduces a person's tax by one dollar, the tax relief is provided uniformly without regard to the taxpayer's income bracket. On the other hand, a deduction saves a $15,000 a year man more tax dollars than it saves an $8,000 a year man, and saves a $25,000 a year man twice as much as it saves a $15,000 a year man. A tax credit would save all three men exactly the same number of dollars, as the following example shows:

For the sake of example, let us assume that Mr. A is a skilled mechanic, earning $3.50 per hour or $7,280 per annum, Mr. B is a company executive earning a salary of $15,000 per annum and Mr. C is president of his company and earns $25,000 per annum. Each man has a son enrolled as a student at the University of Colorado. Based on figures for the year 1963, the cost of tuition, fees and books for a resident of Colorado at this University amounted to $370.

(Assume for this example that each man is married and has two children and that deductions for each man is equivalent to the standard deduction or 10 percent of his gross income.)

Mr. A

	Tax credit	Tax deduction
Gross income	$7,280.00	$7,280.00
Exemptions, 4 at $600	2,400.00	2,400.00
Total	4,880.00	4,880.00
Standard deduction, 10 percent	728.00	
Standard 10 percent plus tuition costs		1,098.00
Taxable net income	4,152.00	3,782.00
Tax due	648.88	582.94
Less credit	193.00	0
Net tax due	455.88	582.94

Result: Tax credit reduces Mr. A's taxes $193. Tax deduction of the full tuition cost reduces his taxes only $65.94.

Mr. B

	Tax credit	Tax deduction
Gross income	$15,000	$15,000.00
Exemptions, 4 at $600	2,400	2,400.00
Total	12,600	12,600.00
Standard deduction, 10 percent	1,500	
Standard 10 percent plus tuition costs		1,870.00
Taxable net income	11,100	10,730.00
Tax due	2,062	1,980.60
Less credit	193	0
Net tax due	1,869	1,980.60

Result: Tax credit reduces Mr. B's taxes $193. Tax deduction of the full tuition cost reduces his taxes only $81.40.

Mr. C

	Tax credit	Tax deduction
Gross income	$25,000	$25,000.00
Exemptions, 4 at $600	2,400	2,400.00
Total	22,600	22,600.00
Standard deduction, 10 percent	2,500	
Standard 10 percent plus tuition costs		2,870.00
Taxable net income	20,100	19,730.00
Tax due	6,118	5,948.50
Less credit	193	0
Net tax due	5,925	5,948.50

Result: Tax credit reduces Mr. C's taxes $193 the same as Mr. A and Mr. B but tax deduction of tuition cost reduces his taxes $170.50. C under the deduction method receives more than twice as much benefit for the same tuition amount as B, and 2½ times as much benefit as A who needs the assistance more.

The extra exemption concept is still more inequitable in that the lower income taxpayer would receive less than $100 in actual tax reduction ($84), while the highest income taxpayer in the above example would receive an actual reduction of more than three times that amount ($270).

While the tax credit is not a cure-all to the problem of meeting the costs of higher education, I personally believe it goes further toward providing more equitable assistance to the greatest number of people. To more clearly demonstrate its values, I think we should point out what the tax credit proposal does and does not do.

First, it does not, and indeed no tax proposal can, directly provide relief to low-income families who pay no income tax. Indirectly, however, under the bill introduced by Senator RIBICOFF and myself, there could be substantial assistance provided through the provision for allowing a tax credit to a taxpayer for payment of college expenses for a student who is not the taxpayer's own dependent. In addition, these families and their children can continue to take advantage of the scholarship, loan and grant programs, specifically designed for them, and dealt with, in many cases, both by State legislatures and by Congress. Vast numbers of scholarships available today contain a family income limitation as one of the conditions for eligibility. Most colleges and universities also give students from low-income families first priority on student employment programs.

Secondly, however, it does benefit the low-income families who do pay income taxes, and the multitude of middle-income families. Sixty-two percent of the dollar benefit would go to families with incomes between $3,000 and $10,000. Ninety-one percent of the benefit would go to families with incomes below $20,000. And, let's remember that the tax credit inures to any taxpayer who pays for the expenses of higher education. Thus, the single person who must pay tax while working himself through college will benefit as well as employed married couples where one spouse works while the other attends school.

Third, the tax credit plan is not a rich man's proposal, and anyone who so contends simply does not understand the sliding scale provisions of the bill. The sliding scale provides that the amount of credit is reduced by 1 percent of the amount by which the taxpayer's adjusted gross income exceeds $25,000. Thus, for each $5,000 of adjusted gross income above $25,000, the credit is reduced $50. The family with $5,000 annual income would get more relative benefit than the family with $30,000 annual income. The family with $60,000 annual income would get no benefit at all.

Fourth, the tax credit approach avoids many of the serious problems involved with Federal aid to education. The religious controversy and its constitutional difficulties is completely avoided. No additional Federal bureaucracy is required since we utilize the existing machinery of the Internal Revenue Service. And no Federal control is encountered. In effect, the tax credit approach, if adopted, would permit those desiring a college education, so important to the growing stature of this Nation, to use pretax earnings to accomplish their goal.

Fifth, colleges and universities in every State, both public and private, would benefit in two principal ways. They would be able to continue to assist deserving students who otherwise would be priced off the campus by the inevitable rise of tuition costs, fees, and books. They would also be able to make a more selective use of available scholarship funds, and acquire new sources for additional funds to provide help to those who need it most, the students from low-income families.

Under present law, no tax deduction can be made for a designated gift for tuition, fees, books, and equipment. Tuition tax credit would allow just such designation of funds from persons other than the student or his parents. This would permit institutions, both public and private to enlist alumni and friends in the support of their most needy and deserving students, and to make more fruitful use of already available scholarship funds.

In summation, tuition tax credits will not solve all of our educational problems, but will be a significant step toward helping those who need assistance in bearing the costs of higher education. We have given grants and loans to the universities and graduate schools for buildings and equipment, we have made progress toward helping teachers, and we have created special programs to stimulate interest in secondary education. We now must recognize and act on the problem of those people who struggle to give their children the chance to improve and better their lot through higher education.

The attached chart showing the costs of tuition, fees, and books on 51 of our college campuses across the Nation graphically demonstrates the contribution which can be made through enactment of the pending Ribicoff-Dominick bill.

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, I very much appreciate your courtesy in giving me a chance to testify on the advantages to education of tax-credit systems, proposals which were endorsed by the Republican policy committee of the House of Representatives and a system which can be readily expanded into property tax credits for the costs of lower education and gift tax credits to sponsor additional private giving to higher educational institutions.

I congratulate you on your initiative in this field and the Republican educational task force for setting up these hearings on this very important subject.

Dollar benefit of Ribicoff tax credit amendment on tuition, fees, and books at 51 State universities and land-grant colleges

	Resident			Nonresident		
	Tuition, fees, books	Dollar benefit of tax credit	Cost of education to person paying	Tuition, fees, books	Dollar benefit of tax credit	Cost of education to person paying
Auburn University	$315	$179	$136	$615	$237	$378
University of Alabama	350	188	162	700	245	455
Arizona State University	320	180	140	920	267	653
Arkansas A. & M	270	168	102	470	218	252
University of Arkansas	290	173	117	560	231	329
University of California	$263–314	$166–179	$97–135	$863–914	$261–266	$602–648
University of Colorado	370	193	177	994	274	720
Florida A. & M	270	168	102	620	237	383
University of Florida	316	179	137	666	242	424
Georgia Institute of Technology	399	200	199	789	254	535
University of Georgia	350	188	162	695	245	450
University of Idaho	254	164	90	564	231	333
University of Illinois	360	190	170	710	246	464
Indiana University	390	198	192	795	255	540
Purdue University	390	198	192	940	269	671
University of Iowa	380	195	185	710	246	464
Kansas State University	334	184	150	664	241	423
University of Kentucky	310	178	132	610	236	374
Louisiana State University	260	165	95	560	231	329
MIT	1,790	325	1,465	1,790	325	1,465
University of Massachusetts	514	226	288	914	266	648
University of Michigan	370	193	177	990	274	716
University of Minnesota	405	201	204	870	262	608
Mississippi State University	361	190	171	761	251	510
University of Mississippi	371	193	178	770	252	518
University of Missouri	305	176	129	605	236	369
University of Nebraska	354	189	165	594	234	360
University of Nevada	351	188	163	951	270	681
University of New Hampshire	$492	$223	$269	$1,037	$279	$758
Rutgers (New Jersey)	596	235	361	696	245	451
Cornell University	1,790	325	1,465	1,790	325	1,465
State University of New York	$515–865	$227–261	$288–604	$515–1,085	$227–284	$288–801
North Carolina A.G. & T.	410	203	207	660	241	419
University of North Carolina	375	194	181	800	255	545
North Carolina State College	409	202	207	834	258	576
Ohio State University	465	216	249	960	271	689
Ohio University	540	229	311	940	269	671
Oregon State University	465	216	249	1,035	279	756
Pennsylvania State University	615	237	378	1,140	279	861
University of Rhode Island	415	204	211	915	267	648
Clemson College	546	230	316	796	255	541
South Carolina State College	380	195	185	610	236	374
University of Tennessee	315	179	136	615	237	378
University of Texas	234	159	75	534	228	306
University of Utah	390	198	192	585	234	351
University of Vermont	581	233	348	1,365	312	1,053
VPI	420	205	215	750	250	500
Virginia State College	430	208	222	600	235	365
University of Virginia	467	217	250	967	273	694
West Virginia University	320	180	140	850	260	590
University of Wisconsin	390	198	192	1,090	284	806

LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE FOR REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana the schedule of the Senate for the remainder of the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Peace Corps bill will be brought up, as will the daylight saving time bill and the veterans' bed capacity bill. The foreign aid bill will be laid before the Senate on Friday. I am sure that all Senators will be fully protected.

Mr. MORSE. I shall make a statement, and the Senator from Montana may comment to the extent he wishes to do so. The Senator from Montana, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], and the Senator from Oregon have had a personal conversation on the subject, but I desire to have the majority leader know that I am scheduled to be absent on Friday and Saturday of this week. However, if I could not have an understanding that there would be no votes on Friday or Saturday on the foreign aid bill, or unanimous-consent agreements of any kind that would in any way jeopardize the right of the senior Senator from Oregon to insist upon full debate without any limitation whatsoever, I should like to know that now, because I would then cancel my engagements.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Oregon has already received that assurance. His rights will be fully protected.

Mr. MORSE. I know that the Senator from Montana feels that way about the situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Oregon has my word.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] came to me and said that he was concerned and thought I ought to make a statement for the Record.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, would that mean that no other amendment offered by Senators could be considered?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. They would be considered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is concerned about his right to offer amendments and speak at length on them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my absence I could not insure that no other amendments would be offered.

AMENDMENT TO PEACE CORPS ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of S. 2054.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2054) to further amend the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 2, line 4, delete the period and insert the following: "; and by adding at the end of section 4(a) the following sentence: " 'The Director shall hold no other Federal office of equivalent rank'."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to provide that the Director of the Peace Corps, Sargent Shriver, shall not be, at one and the same time, Director of the Peace Corps and Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, administering the antipoverty program.

First and foremost, let me say that Sargent Shriver is an excellent public servant. The entire effort which I have made is to do my best to see that he is not torn in two. Mr. Shriver states that it is not his decision that he serve in both these critically important posts. It is the decision of the President of the United States. Mr. Shriver so informed me.

I see no other alternative than to have Congress declare its intention on this subject. One of the jobs is bound to suffer.

The one statement that I want to be clear on the record is that I am hopeful that the amendment may be accepted by the Senator in charge of the bill. I want to state my feelings about Mr. Shriver. As a public servant, he is one of the best. That is the very reason why he should be given every chance to do the new job that he has accepted without being torn apart in an attempt to perform the old job at the same time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter. The situation is rather unusual. It was discussed to some extent in the committee. I should be glad to take this question to conference and see what can be done about it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator. I am ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I want to make sure that I am on record as being opposed to the Javits amendment. I feel very strongly that Mr. Shriver's dual responsibility for the Peace Corps and the poverty program is a matter that should be left up to Mr. Shriver and President Johnson. Congress should not interfere.

I want to make sure that this Senator is recorded as being opposed to the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this bill would authorize $115 million for the Peace Corps program in the next fiscal year and will make a number of substantive changes in the Peace Corps Act, most of them minor in nature. The authorization is the same amount as the Congress approved last year.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-six will be the fifth full year of Peace Corps operations. The 4 years of operations to date have proven the wisdom of Congress' decision in 1961 to authorize this unique experiment. I am sure that the program has been surprisingly successful to many original skeptics and a disappointment to its most optimistic supporters. It has not proved to be a Government-financed, foreign-based social science laboratory for wide-eyed, impractical idealists or a panacea for the economic and social evils of the world. But it has provided a means through which dedicated, unselfish citizens of this Nation can share their skills with their less fortunate world neighbors and help to create conditions which make democracy more likely, and totalitarianism a little less likely to succeed. The Peace Corps program is a good example of the Nation's highest ideals being carried out in a pragmatic manner. The Committee on Foreign Relations believes that the record to date warrants continuation of the program at the level requested in the President's revised budget request.

Approval of the $115 million authorization provided in this bill will finance a modest but steady increase in the program. By August 31, the end of the current program year, there will be a total of 13,710 Peace Corps volunteers and trainees in service. The authorization in this bill will permit an increase in volunteer strength to 15,110 by August 31, 1966. Peace Corps volunteers are serving in 45 countries today, scattered all over the globe. Fifty percent of the volunteers are engaged in education, 27 percent in community action programs, 11 percent in health, and 8 percent in agriculture. The committee report contains a country-by-country listing of where volunteers are serving and a description, by regions, of the type of work they are doing.

The committee has been impressed with the fact that Peace Corps officials have refused to sacrifice quality for quantity and that the standards for volunteers remain high. The principal reason for the reduction in the initial budget requested by $10,200,000 is because the Peace Corps is not obtaining sufficient numbers of volunteers with the qualities desired to justify the program level planned originally. It is rather rare for an agency to be honest enough with the Congress to pull in its horns in this manner.

The average annual cost per volunteer has been going down each year and is expected to be $7,927 in fiscal 1966. Progress is being made in improving the administrative aspects of the program. In this fiscal year administrative expenses will be 22.2 percent of the total budget. They will be reduced to 21 percent in the next fiscal year. And the ratio of paid staff to volunteers is improving—from 1 to 12 in the current year to 1 to 13 in the next. Although overhead expenses are being reduced in relation to the actual costs of operations, the committee has suggested other areas in which further improvements might be made. The committee has, for example, limited to $500,000 the amount available for research in the next fiscal year. It has not been convinced that the Peace Corps research program is justified at the planned level.

The major change which this bill would make in the Peace Corps Act would permit the appointment of the Washington-based Peace Corps staff under Foreign Service Act authorities. In the committee's report on the original act of 1961, it said that "the success of the Peace Corps will depend largely on the type of employees it has and the type of volunteers who will be sent abroad." Time has proven the wisdom of this comment. And it has also shown the need for additional flexibility in management of the Washington staff, flexibility which is not available under the civil service system of appointments.

The Peace Corps Act now provides for appointment of the foreign-based staff of the Peace Corps under Foreign Service Act authorities. Employees receive appointments in either the Foreign Service Reserve or Staff, depending on the nature of their duties. Peace Corps officials have convinced the committee that a unified system which would be applicable to both the foreign and the domestic staff would aid in carrying out the unique functions of the agency. A single personnel system based on Foreign Service Act authorities would enable the Peace Corps to bring in new talent and new ideas to the staff in the same manner as it now has a constant turnover of volunteers.

Under the provisions of the bill approved by the committee, the appointments of all employees, except those GS–8 and below, will be limited to a total of 5 years service in the Foreign Service Reserve or Staff. The Peace Corps plans to make appointments of 2½ years as a general rule and will, in exceptional cases, extend the appointment for up to a total of 5 years. Three hundred and twenty of the seven hundred employees in the headquarters staff have some type of career status and they will receive unlimited staff appointments. Eighty-eight persons hold positions above GS–8 and will be affected by the 5-year limitation.

Employees will not receive any additional benefits under this new authority. Personnel will continue to pay into the regular civil service retirement fund and will receive only the standard benefits accorded all civil service employees. Although personnel will be appointed under Foreign Service authorities, they will not in any way be a part of the Foreign Service system or share in any of the fringe benefits accorded those under that system. This authority will enable the Peace Corps to have its own personnel system tailored to meet the peculiar needs of that organization. Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations believe that this authority will enable the Peace Corps to better carry out the role assigned to it by the Congress and recommend approval of the proposal.

The bill makes several minor changes in the Peace Corps Act which are discussed in detail in the report. I will mention several of the more significant ones only briefly. The positions of two associate directors, now filled administratively, will be subject to appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate. The growing importance of these positions justifies making them Presidential appointments. This will not involve a net increase in the number of associate directors or an increase in salary.

Another provision would permit dental services to be provided to persons who have agreed to enter Peace Corps training but have not actually commenced training. This will prevent disrupting the training of volunteers who need minor dental work. They will now be able to get the dental work accomplished before entering the training phase. The bill would also permit physical examinations to be given returned volunteers up to 6 months after their release from service. Due to the lack of medical facilities in some locations, it is impossible to give the volunteer an examination before his return to the United States.

The bill will authorize an increase in the number of volunteer secretaries and clercal personnel from 100 to 200. The Congress authorized this category of volunteers in 1963 and the program has proven so successful that the committee has approved this increase. Secretarial and clerical volunteers will be used in lieu of regular salaried personnel, resulting in considerable savings in personnel costs.

Another provision would allow for health care to be provided for infants of married volunteers. Some 30 children have been born abroad to married volunteers and the committee believes that when the Peace Corps determines that the continued service of a married volunteer who becomes a parent is in the national interest, the Government should assume the responsibility for the infant's medical needs.

The Peace Corps Act now provides for the Peace Corps to transfer gifts of property to organizations abroad with which the Peace Corps volunteers are working, and the committee has approved a provision which would allow the Corps to transfer gifts of money also. The Peace Corps officials have explained that this authority will facilitate people-to-people programs, such as where a local Parent-Teacher Association or other group wishes to make a gift to a school in a foreign country and designates the Peace Corps to select the project and transmit the funds. By acting as the conduit for the funds, the Peace Corps will be in a position to see that they are used properly.

As a final item, the per diem rate for consultants is being increased from $75 to $100 to bring it in line with the maximum paid by other Government agencies. This does not mean that all consultants will be paid at a rate of $100 a day. The average daily rate budgeted for consultation for the next fiscal year is only $50. It will pay the maximum rate only when bringing in outstanding authorities for consultation.

In its report on the original bill, the committee described the Peace Corps as a "new venture for the American people." After 4 years it is still a new venture. When it is no longer faced with the necessity of breaking new ground each day and begins to take on bureaucratic fat, it will have lost sight of its basic objective. No one can say how long the Peace Corps will be with us or how large it will grow. That is for the Congress to decide on the basis of the Peace Corps' record in the next and succeeding fiscal years.

In the judgment of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Peace Corps has become a proven instrument for helping others to help themselves, while giving Americans an opportunity to demonstrate to those in other lands the best qualities of our society. The record to date has been good and the Congress should have no reason to regret its decision of 4 years ago.

I urge the Senate to approve the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2054) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of that Act, is amended by striking out "1965" and substituting "1966", and by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "of which not to exceed $500,000 shall be available for carrying out research".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4(a) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which provides for the appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, is amended by striking out "and a Deputy Director of the Peace Corps" immediately after "a Director of the Peace Corps" and substituting therefor ", a Deputy Director of the Peace Corps and two Associate Directors of the Peace Corps"; and by adding at the end of section 4(a) the following sentence: "The Director shall hold no other Federal office of equivalent rank."

(b) Section 16 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the appointment of persons serving under prior law, is amended by adding immediately after the end thereof a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) Any person serving as Associate Director of the Peace Corps for Program Development and Operations or Associate Director of the Peace Corps for Peace Corps Volunteers on the date this subsection becomes law may serve as one of the two Associate Directors of the Peace Corps for whose appointment provision is made in section 4 (a) of this Act until the end of the first session of the Eighty-ninth Congress, or until the President shall commission him or his successor as such an Associate Director of the Peace Corps, or until his nomination as such an Associate Director is rejected by the Senate, whichever sooner occurs."

(c) Section 303(e) of the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964, which provides for the application of level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by section 302 of that Act to certain offices and positions, is amended by striking out paragraphs (71) and (72) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraph (71):

"(71) Associate Directors of the Peace Corps (2)."

SEC. 3. Section 5 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to Peace Corps volunteers, is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (e):

(1) In the first sentence, strike out "and such health examinations and immunization preparatory to their service," and substitute therefor "applicants for enrollment who have accepted an invitation to begin a period of training under section 8(a) of the Act shall receive such health examinations, immunization, and dental care preparatory to their service, and former volunteers shall receive such health examinations within six months after termination of their service,".

(2) In the second sentence, strike out ", examinations, and immunization" and strike out "for volunteers".

(b) In the first proviso of subsection (g), strike out "one" and substitute therefor "two" and strike out "in the aggregate".

(c) In subsection (h), immediately after "(5 U.S.C. 73b–5)," insert "the Act of December 23, 1944, chapter 716, section 1, as amended (31 U.S.C. 492a),".

SEC. 4. In section 6(3) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the provision of health care to the spouses and minor children of volunteer leaders, immediately after "accompanying them" insert ", and a married volunteer's child if born during the volunteer's service,".

SEC. 5. Section 7 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to Peace Corps employees, is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out subsections (a) and (b).

(b) Redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (a) and in the subsection as redesignated:

(1) In the introductory phrase:

(A) Insert "(1)" immediately before "For the purpose of".

(B) Strike out "—" immediately after "may".

(2) In paragraph (1), strike out "(1)".

(3) In paragraph (2):

(A) Strike out the first sentence thereof and substitute therefor "The President may utilize such authority contained in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, relating to Foreign Service Reserve officers, Foreign Service Staff officers and employees, alien clerks and employees, and other United States Government officers and employees apart from Foreign Service officers as he deems necessary to carry out functions under this Act: *Provided, however,* That all Foreign Service Reserve or Staff appointments or assignments shall be limited or temporary and not exceed five years in duration unless the appointee or assignee held a career or career-conditional appointment at grade eight or below of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.), under former section 7(a) of this Act immediately prior to the effective date of the repeal of that section: *Provided further,* That a person who serves as a Foreign Service Reserve or Staff officer or employee under this paragraph may not be reappointed or reassigned under this paragraph until the expiration of a period of time equal to his preceding tour of duty."

(B) Strike out in the second sentence thereof "the Foreign Service Act of 1946" and insert in lieu thereof "that Act".

(C) In the first proviso in the second sentence thereof strike out "of" immediately after "the period of the appointment" and insert in lieu thereof "or".

(D) Insert immediately after "may prescribe" in the second proviso thereof ": *Provided further,* That under such regulations as the President may prescribe persons who are to perform duties of a more routine nature than are generally performed by Foreign Service Staff officers and employees of class 10 may be appointed to an unenumerated class of Foreign Service Staff officers and employees ranking below class 10 and be paid basic compensation at rates lower than those of class 10."

(4) In paragraph (3):

(A) Strike out "specify" and insert in lieu thereof: "The President may specify what additional compensation authorized by section 207 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 118h), and".

(B) Strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(a)".

(C) Strike out "that Act" and insert in lieu thereof "those Acts".

(c) Redesignate subsection (d) as subsection (b) and in that subsection as redesignated:

(1) Immediately after "or assigned" insert "for the purpose of performing functions under this Act outside the United States".

(2) Strike out "subsection (c)(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "subsection (a)(2)".

(d) Redesignate subsection (e) as subsection (c) and in the second sentence of that subsection as redesignated strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(a)".

SEC. 6. (a) Section 5 of this Act shall not become effective until the first day of the fourth pay period which begins after the date this Act becomes law.

(b) Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, each person employed under authorities repealed by section 5(a) of this Act immediately prior to the effective date of that section shall effective on that date be appointed a Foreign Service Reserve officer or Foreign Service Staff officer or employee under the authority of section 7(a)(2) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, and appointed or assigned to an appropriate class thereof: *Provided, however,* That no person who holds a career or career conditional appointment immediately prior to the effective date of that section shall, without his consent, be so appointed until three years after the effective date of that section. Each officer or employee so appointed shall receive basic compensation at the rate of his class determined to be appropriate by the President, except that the rate of basic compensation received by any officer or employee immediately prior to the effective date of his Foreign Service Reserve or Staff appointment shall not be reduced by the provisions of this section.

SEC. 7. In section 10(a)(3) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to acceptance, employment, and transfer of gifts, immediately after "and transfer such" insert "money or".

SEC. 8. In section 13(a) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the employment of experts and consultants, strike out "$75" and substitute therefor "$100".

SEC. 9. In the second sentence of section 15(c) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to training of employees, strike out "Such training shall not be considered employment or holding of office under section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U.S.C. 62), and any" and substitute therefor "Any".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 267), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 2054 is to authorize an appropriation of $115 million for Peace Corps activities in fiscal year 1966 and make a number of substantive changes in the Peace Corps Act.

II. PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill would authorize an appropriation of $115 million, which is the full amount of the amended budget request. The initial budget request was for $125,200,000 but this was reduced in a message from the President dated April 22, 1965 (H. Doc. 150).

In addition to the authorization of appropriations, the bill contains the following provisions:

1. Authorization for appointment by the President, with confirmation by the Senate, of two Associate Directors of the Peace Corps, positions which are now filled administratively. It would not change the salary level for the positions.
2. It would authorize the Peace Corps to provide dental services to applicants prior to their entering training and for health examinations to be given volunteers up to 6 months after the end of their service.
3. It would increase from 100 to 200 the number of secretarial and clerical volunteers who may work on the staff of Peace Corps representatives abroad. The 1963 act authorized this category of volunteer work on a trial basis.
4. It would authorize U.S. disbursing officers to treat Peace Corps volunteers as other U.S. personnel for cashing of checks or the conduct of foreign exchange transactions.
5. Health care of infants born to married volunteers would be authorized.
6. It would authorize use of Foreign Service Act authority for appointment of the U.S.-based Peace Corps staff, thus creating a unified personnel system for the foreign and domestic staff. Foreign-based staff personnel now receive their appointments under Foreign Service Act authority and the headquarters personnel are appointed under civil service authority.
7. Provision would be made to insure that Peace Corps employees are not automatically eligible for the additional compensation generally paid other U.S. employees serving in Puerto Rico or similar places.
8. The Peace Corps would be authorized to transfer gifts of money to an organization abroad with which Peace Corps volunteers are working as a means of facilitating people-to-people programs. The existing act limits transfers of this nature to property only.
9. Authorization would be made for the Peace Corps to pay consultants $100 per diem instead of $75, the maximum under the existing act. This would place the Peace Corps on the same basis as AID, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and other Government agencies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I apologize to the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. I thank the Senators for their courtesy.

REAPPORTIONMENT—THE ROTTEN-BOROUGH AMENDMENTS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is with some trepidation that I rise for my first major speech. As a boy, I walked these Halls and stood on this floor with my late, adoptive father, Senator Millard Tydings. I have been conscious since childhood of the great opportunities, and responsibilities, of a U.S. Senator. There is no greater legislative body in the world.

On this occasion, Mr. President, I wish to address myself to what I believe to be the most important constitutional issue confronting the Nation today. I refer to the proposed amendments to our Constitution which would permit one house of a State legislature to be apportioned on the basis of "factors other than population." I have called these the "rotten borough amendments" for they permit our State legislatures to be as malapportioned as the famous boroughs of 19th century England that were represented in Parliament notwithstanding the fact that they had no population and were, in one case, under the sea.

I. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ARE ILL ADVISED

Mr. President, I am convinced that these amendments are ill advised. As I have listened to the testimony before the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I have become persuaded that these amendments would weaken, not strengthen, our Federal system; that they would debase our democratic form of government; that they would hinder us in dealing with the increasingly complex problems of our age.

OUR REVOLUTION WAS FOUGHT FOR FAIR REPRESENTATION

Mr. President, I intend to show that Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, and the author of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, all supported the principle of representation on the basis of population.

Yes, our Founding Fathers, if they were alive today, would be fighting the adoption of a rotten borough constitutional amendment. These amendments are foreign to the principles for which our forebears fought and died in the Revolutionary War and alien to the basic considerations on which our Federal Constitution was drafted.

The fundamental issue in our war for independence from Great Britain in 1776 was that the citizens of our Thirteen Original Colonies were denied representation in the British Parliament. They were deprived of the fundamental right of equal representation. George III felt our Colonies only had poor, ignorant colonial bumpkins.

Too long the proponents of self-perpetuating malapportionment in our legislatures have attempted to cloak their arguments with the protective garb of tradition and historical precedent.

A fair examination of the facts shows that for the first 100 years of our Federal Republic our legislatures were, almost without exception, fairly apportioned, substantially on the basis of population. It was only in the last quarter of the 19th century, with the movement of the American people from the farm to the urban areas, that the legislatures began to resort to all manner of devices to perpetuate minority control and to establish or perpetuate the rotten borough system.

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS

My objections to the proposed amendments go beyond our historical commitment to fair apportionment. I also believe that the rotten borough amendments are contrary to our concept of representative, democratic government; that they are legally deficient, without standards or guidelines and without adequate provisions to insure that a malapportionment scheme was truly desired by the people of the State. Finally, and most important, I am persuaded that, as a practical matter, they would permit a small minority in many States to maintain a stranglehold on State government and frustrate the aspirations of the majority of citizens of the State. This frustration of majority will has led underrepresented groups to seek solutions to essentially local and State problems from the Federal Government, and thus has contributed to an undesirable weakening of State responsibility in our Federal system.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland has chosen an extremely important subject for his maiden speech. When he says that this is the most important constitutional issue confronting the Nation today, that is no exaggeration. I agree. I have had an opportunity to read his speech. In his exposition of his position he very eloquently states why this issue is so important.

Is it not true that when one House has been based on elements other than population, the State governments have been unable to act, unable primarily, to act on urban affairs as well as many other problems, because they have different constituencies and because there is a built-in conflict, assuring the State that their legislature will clash, conflict, disagree, and frequently be unable to act?

Mr. TYDINGS. The truth of the Senator's statement is clearly borne out by the Michigan Legislature, where, year after year, a Michigan State Senate, representing a minority of the people, has blocked bill after bill to provide such measures as polio shots for needy children, unemployment insurance and other liberal legislation aimed at relieving urban problems. The urban and suburban areas have been blocked time and time again by a Senate that has been malapportioned. This is true in legislature after legislature.

I shall introduce into the RECORD a table of the legislatures, indicating the percentages of persons who elect members of one house. In cases in which a minority has controlled one house, legislative relief for suburban and urban areas has been denied. This has forced the people to seek relief from the Federal Government in matters which would have been best handled at the State and local level.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not also true that, even without that division in the houses of the legislature there is a check and balance system in every State, the State's Governor being the executive, the legislature having legislative power, and the judiciary having the judicial power, which is the classical check and balance system?

Mr. TYDINGS. Absolutely.

Mr. PROXMIRE. For example, in the State of Wisconsin we have had one-man, one-vote representation in both houses since the State came into the Union in 1848. Our check and balance system has worked well. The rural areas have had their day in court. They have had their representation. Minorities of all kinds have been given every consideration under our State bill of rights. Does the Senator see that a further division is necessary from the standpoint of protecting the rights of any minority?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. A balance of power exists in the three branches of government, as the Senator has so eloquently illustrated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. One further question. I ask the Senator if it is not true that questions that deal with urban problems that have been crowding the Congress of the United States this year as never before, and will continue to crowd us more in future years—such as housing problems, clean air, and clean water, mass transportation, and many other questions—would be handled more expeditiously and in a more satisfactory way on a local or State level if the States had a one-man, one-vote representation in both houses of their State legislatures, so they would not be divided against themselves as they are now and as they would be under the Dirksen amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. Absolutely. As the distinguished Senator has pointed out, the present weakness of State governments in our Federal structure arises because of our malapportioned legislatures. This is one of the key factors that has motivated us strongly in opposition to the proposed amendments. These amendments would perpetuate the very system which chips away day by day at our Federal system. Those who wave the flag of States rights the longest and the highest are the very ones defeating their own purposes by striving to perpetuate malapportioned State legislatures. Such legislatures really break down State government and State responsibility.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. As the chairman of the subcommittee which has spent a considerable amount of time hearing this important legislative issue, I compliment the Senator from Maryland for the diligent efforts he has devoted to the work of the committee. He has been one of our most regular attenders. He has made significant contributions time after time to the discussions of the committee. I have not yet uncovered a more elaborate, detailed presentation of the argument than that which is presented in the Senator's maiden speech.

As the Senator knows, this is a very complicated problem. It is one in which there are definitely at least two very strong points of view. The Senator from Maryland makes an extremely eloquent and able presentation in supporting one of those points of view.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I have tried to play the "devil's advocate" and remain openminded. I trust that we can glean from both these points of view the best of the arguments. The Senator has presented the best of the arguments supporting his point of view. I compliment him for the effort which he has devoted in compiling his statement, which is comprehensive to the "*n*th" degree. This kind of contribution is what it takes ultimately to solve even the most controversial of problems.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Indiana, and say to him that as chairman of the subcommittee, he has been fair and able at all times. His questions have been penetrating and most helpful to all members. I am sure that his courtesy to all witnesses has been appreciated by all who appeared before us.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

The Nation is well aware of the decisions of the Supreme Court requiring the apportionment of State legislatures substantially on the basis of population. In the landmark case of Baker against Carr, the Supreme Court held that Federal courts had jurisdiction to hear and determine cases which challenged the apportionment of State legislatures. The Court did not say in the Baker case what a fair apportionment plan would be, but remanded to the district court to take testimony and fashion a remedy.

Two years later, in Reynolds against Sims, the Court held that both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned substantially on the basis of population. In the related case of Lucas against Colorado General Assembly, the Court held that the basic right of equal representation cannot be taken away even though a majority of the voters of a State indicates its desire in a popular referendum to have a malapportioned legislature.

PUBLIC OPINION SUPPORTS REAPPORTIONMENT

The American public has not been disappointed by the Supreme Court's decisions. Quite the contrary. Dr. George Gallup, the noted pollster, reported in August 1964 that 60 percent of the American people support the Supreme Court's decision.

THE PENDING AMENDMENTS

We are all aware, however, that the howls of State legislators have reached the Halls of Congress. Congress debated bills to delay further reapportionment last year, but took no action. As a result, the foes of fair representation are back on our doorsteps, and in our midst, urging now a constitutional amendment to undo the decisions of the Supreme Court in Reynolds against Sims and Lucas against Colorado. With numerous reapportionment cases now pending in the courts, the enemies of fair apportionment see these amendments as a last ditch effort to perpetuate the rotten-borough system in our State legislatures.

The Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, of which I am a member, has been holding hearings on four proposed amendments to the Constitution on the subject of reapportionment. The first, and by far the most important of these proposed amendments was introduced by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and 36 other Senators. The proposed amendment, known as Senate Joint Resolution 2, reads as follows:

> The right and power to determine the composition of the legislature of a State and the apportionment of the membership thereof shall remain in the people of that State. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit the people from apportioning one house of a bicameral legislature upon the basis of factors other than population, or from giving reasonable weight to factors other than population in apportioning a unicameral legislature, if, in either case, such apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has introduced Senate Joint Resolution 44 which has the same basic purpose as the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. It does not, however, contain the first sentence of the Dirksen amendment, which has been widely interpreted as preventing judicial review of action taken under cover of the amendment. Moreover, Senate Joint Resolution 44 appears to permit periodic review by the voters of a malapportionment plan. The senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has introduced two resolutions, Senate Joint Resolution 37 and Senate Joint Resolution 38, but presumably endorses the latter. Senate Joint Resolution 38 has the same general purpose as Senate Joint Resolution 2, but would permit judicial review and require periodic review by the voters.

PETITIONS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Also pending before the Congress are the applications of some 23 State legislatures for the Congress to convene a constitutional convention in accordance with article V of the Constitution for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution essentially the same as proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2. Also, two additional State legislatures previously have passed applications for a convention to propose an amendment removing the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court over reapportionment. On the other hand, five State legislatures have declined to request a convention but have asked Congress to propose, in the normal manner, an amendment similar to Senate Joint Resolution 2. Meanwhile 11 or 12 other State legislatures have defeated resolutions requesting a convention or asking the Congress to interfere in State legislative apportionment.

The petitions for a constitutional convention are the result of a campaign by the Farm Bureau Federation, the Assembly of States of the Council of State Governments and the Southern Governors' Conference. The effort is being made under the heretofore unused amending process in article V which states:

> The Congress * * * on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments.

The consequences of petitions under this provision arose repeatedly in the questioning of witnesses before our committee. It is clear from expert opinion that the mere adoption of such applications by two-thirds of the several States could not force the Congress to convene a constitutional convention.

In any event, the testimony of persons appearing before our subcommittee, proponents as well as opponents of the rotten borough system, has uniformly been that the calling of such a constitutional convention would open a Pandora's box and could well develop into a national calamity.

Before turning to the amendments themselves, it may be worthwhile to state briefly just what is at stake.

PROGRESS IN REAPPORTIONMENT

In 1962, when the Supreme Court first held that legislative apportionment raised a constitutional question cognizable in Federal courts, there were incredible population disparities in the apportionment of State legislatures. The votes of some rural Vermont citizens were worth 987 times the vote of their urban neighbors. In California, the Los Angeles State senator represented 6 million persons while one of his colleagues represented only 14,000.

In 1962, less than 20 percent of the population could elect a majority of the State senate of eight States. In Nevada, only 8 percent of the people could control the senate. While there has been substantial progress since 1962, our legislatures are still a long way from fair apportionment.

The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has compiled a table from articles in the New York Times of December 1964, which shows the present population imbalance in State legislative districts.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

II. HISTORICAL OBJECTIONS TO MALAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I believe that the rotten-borough amendments strike at the heart of democratic government. The very word "democracy," translated directly from the Greek, means "the rule of the people." The Athenians practiced direct democracy in its purest form. Every adult male citizen was entitled to attend public meetings at which governmental decisions were made. In that forum each man had one vote.

EARLY ROOTS OF FAIR REPRESENTATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The concept of political equality had early roots in the United States. The colonists brought with them as their intellectual luggage, religious concepts and political ideas that were conducive to the development of fairly apportioned legislative institutions. The Protestant ethic stressed the individual worth of each man and his personal relationship to God. The political strife that caused our forefathers to abandon their homes for an unknown wilderness, left them with a deep and abiding distrust of monarchy, feudalism, and the English rotten borough parliamentary system. Here in the New World, they established a society in which the artificial advantages of birth and position were abolished and each man was able to achieve according to his own ability.

In this atmosphere, fair representation flourished. As early as 1635, the Massachusetts colonists established the Massachusetts General Court, a legislative assembly in which population was the significant basis of representation.

ROTTEN BOROUGHS IN ENGLAND

Simultaneous with the establishment of representative institutions in this country, there was developing a constitutional crisis over the rotten borough system in England.

As early as 1690, the great political theorist John Locke scathingly denounced the rotten boroughs:

> To what gross absurdities the following of custom * * * may lead. * * * when we see the bare name of a town of which there remains not so much as a ruins, where scarce so much as a sheepcoate or more inhabitants than a shepherd is to be found, sends as many representatives to the grand assembly of lawmakers as a whole county numerous in people and powerful in riches.

Locke's words were not immediately heeded in England, and the situation steadily deteriorated. At the time he wrote these words, four-fifths of the population of England was engaged in agriculture. Within 100 years, the industrial revolution produced a dramatic shift in population to the north, where coal and waterpower were available.

By 1821, the 12 coastal counties of southern England contained less than one-third of the population, but returned more than half the representatives. Populous boroughs such as Leeds and Manchester had no representation at all, while Old Sarum, with no inhabitants and Boroughbridge with 86, sent two members each to the House of Commons.

The rotten boroughs were undemocratic in more ways than one. There was no uniform electoral law, so that in some boroughs representatives were named by the town corporation or a few owners of real property. Many boroughs were entirely dominated by influential persons called "borough mongers." By 1820, it was estimated that less than 500 individuals, most of them members of the House of Lords, really designated a majority of the House of Commons. This power in the hands of a few people invited corruption, nepotism, bribery, and abuses of all kinds.

England did not manage to throw off the yoke of the rotten borough until 1832, when riots in the streets and the real threat of insurrection and revolution persuaded the King to threaten to pack the House of Lords unless it approved the Reform Act.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I have been listening with great interest to the first part of the Senator's extremely able speech, which I have had an opportunity to read. I congratulate him on the research which has gone into it.

I also congratulate him on his courage to stand up and be counted in opposition to what I believe both he and I have called the "rotten borough" amendments to set aside the wise decisions of the Supreme Court which establishes the constitutional principle of "one-man, one-vote." This is the term I used last year when this same issue was before the Senate.

In the course of studying some of the disabilities of the Congress over the years, I had occasion to look with some depth at the problem which the Senator from Maryland is now discussing, namely, the fight over the reform bill in England in the early 1830's. The parallels the Senator is pointing out are striking, indeed.

It is interesting to note how Lord Russell was able to bring a reluctant House of Commons and a recalcitrant House of Lords in behind the reform bill which, in my judgment, unquestionably saved England for democracy and freedom.

I am most interested in the discussion of the Senator from Maryland on this subject, and also in the whole framework of his speech. I believe it will make a significant contribution to the debate which I feel will have to be had on the floor of the Senate later in this session, when we face the Dirksen amendment or something like it. The Senator from Maryland will remember that before he came to the Senate we beat down the Dirksen amendment, last fall, and I hope we will be able to do so again.

I commend my friend for his courage in standing up for what he thinks is right.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Maryland. He is making a very fine and significant contribution by very carefully discussing the subject of reapportionment. I have had the opportunity to observe the Senator from Maryland in his studious attendance on the work of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee. His talk today illustrates how well he studies his subjects.

Last summer we had a rather extensive discussion of this issue on the Senate floor. That discussion, I believe, served to clarify the impact of the Supreme Court ruling and illuminated the need for reapportionment in many States.

New Mexico is one of those States. The legislature of my State completed its session earlier this year and, to the regret of many, it failed to face up to the need for reapportionment of the senate as it on a previous occasion courageously met its responsibilities and equitably reapportioned the house of representatives. The gross underrepresentation in the State senate of a large segment of the population of New Mexico—which I pointed to last September—still persists. No issue is solved until it is solved right. My hope and the hope of many persons in New Mexico was that the legislature would have faced up to the most important governmental issue confronting it. That would have been far better than having the issue resolved by the courts because of legislative default. In New Mexico today, Bernalillo County in which Albuquerque is located has more people than the combined population of the 21 smallest counties.

In the senate with only 32 members, this means that these 21 smallest counties, if they were united, not only could pass what legislation they desired in the senate but would have about a two-thirds majority to override a Governor's veto. Put another way, the citizen in Harding County, which has 1,800 people, now has in the State senate more than 150 times the voting strength of a citizen in Bernalillo County, which has 300,000 people.

I cannot believe that the people of New Mexico feel that is a just situation. That is an extreme case but not by very much because the same condition applies, relatively speaking, to the other sparsely populated counties in New Mexico.

As I warned last September, time alone is not going to improve the situation. By 1970, it is expected that Bernalillo County will then have more population than the 23 smallest counties if the present rate of growth continues. If the State senate is not fairly reapportioned, the injustices of the present system will be perpetuated and compounded. The handwriting is on the wall; only a blind man would not see it. I would hope that the Senate of the United States would not take any action that would impede the course of democracy in the States.

I hope that the Senator from Maryland in his battle does not battle rotten boroughs alone but also battles situations that exist in the States like mine, in which some areas are not properly represented in the State legislature.

I also hope the Senator from Maryland will keep up his good work and his studious habits in the long years that he will have in the Senate of the United States. If he does, I shall be very grateful to him.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his penetrating observation. His comments about the situation in the State of New Mexico point out the problem that we face; namely, the problem of malapportioned State legislatures. It is a problem similar to the one we have in Maryland. It is "right on the button," and I believe that his remarks have made a great contribution to this debate. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. People in my State have written to me to complain about the Central Government in Washington being built up and having too much power and growing too big. They also complain that there is not enough local government.

One of the problems is that people turn to Washington because they do not obtain relief from State and local governments. If a State has a legislature in which a county with 300,000 population, as many people as live in 21 other counties, has the same representation as a county that has only 1,800 people, naturally the people in the populous county will feel that they are not adequately represented in the State legislature. Therefore they turn to Washington, where they would not otherwise turn if they had proper representation in their State and local governments. That is one further reason why I am interested in what the Senator from Maryland is saying.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from New Mexico has clearly pointed out the most compelling argument against the rotten borough amendment. Rather than assisting in establishing a strong, responsible State government, a malapportioned State legislature leads to a centralized government in Washington.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend the Senator from Maryland for the thorough and compelling way in which he has explained his position on the question of reapportionment. This is a question which will receive a great deal of attention, and the discussion and debate on it will be quite extended once a joint resolution is reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

I have listened to the Senator with great interest. I have gone through his speech. To me, it is one of the best speeches that I have seen, so far as research is concerned.

I compliment and commend the Senator for leading off in this particular battle, and explaining his point of view in such a cogent and well understood manner. He is to be commended for his leadership in this particular situation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank my distinguished majority leader for his very kind remarks.

FOUNDING FATHERS FAVORED FAIR REPRESENTATION

The founders of our Republic were keenly aware of the rotten borough system and uniformly condemned it. Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and many other Founding Fathers were avid students and great admirers of John Locke. His teachings and the English experience with rotten boroughs were directly relevant to them.

Benjamin Franklin came to the Continental Congress on July 21, 1775, with his "Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union." These Articles would have allotted delegates to each of the States strictly according to the voting population.

Thomas Jefferson, in 1783, in his draft of a constitution for Virginia, outlined his thinking on direct representation in the State legislatures. He wrote:

> The number of delegates which each county may send should be in proportion to the number of its qualified electors; and the whole number of delegates of the State shall be so proportioned to the whole number of qualified electors in that they shall never exceed 300 nor be fewer than 100.

Jefferson continued:

> If any county be reduced in its qualified electors below the number authorized to send one delegate, let it be annexed to some adjoining county.

Jefferson proposed that these principles of fair apportionment apply to both houses of the Virginia Legislature.

Some years later, Jefferson criticized the Maine constitution on the ground that one house was apportioned on the basis of factors other than population.

Said Jefferson:

> [It is a] grave error to allow each town regardless of size one seat in the legislature * * * equal representation is so fundamental a principle in a true republic that no prejudice can justify its violation because the prejudices themselves cannot be justified.

Alexander Hamilton, in the Federalist Papers, criticized the Articles of Confederation because they were not based on equal representation. Hamilton stated:

> Its operation contradicts that fundamental maxim of republican government, which requires that the sense of the majority should prevail.

James Madison argued for the Virginia plan at the Constitutional Convention in these words:

> If a fair representation of the people be not secured, the injustice of the government will shake to its foundations.

While Madison ultimately agreed to the compromise which created the U.S. Senate, he was truly apprehensive. He stated:

> If power is not immediately derived from the people, in proportion to their numbers, we may make a paper confederacy, but that will be all.

Daniel Dulany, the noted Maryland pamphleteer during the Revolution criticized the theory of virtual representation in these strong terms:

> Fantastical and frivolous nonsense [and] the most contemptible idea that ever entered the head of a man. It does not deserve serious refutation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I think this is a very important element to stress. The Senator from Maryland has pointed out that Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison—and I am sure he could have gone on and named many others——

Mr. TYDINGS. I could have gone on.

Mr. PROXMIRE. All of our leading Founding Fathers—and I stress "all"—felt this way. Many people feel that somehow or other our Founding Fathers favored a different system of representation than one based on one-man, one-vote. I believe the Senator from Maryland has put that ghost to rest completely, namely, that they were virtually unanimous on this subject. The only exceptions in the Constitutional Convention were those few representatives from small States, but they did not argue at any time that the principle of one-man, one-vote should not be recognized in State legislatures.

As the Senator will no doubt point out—I believe I anticipate him—the formation of the Federal Constitution, with the U.S. Senate based on territorial representation, was the result of a coalescence of virtually sovereign countries. They had their own armies, their own taxing systems, and they were making an alliance, of a sort similar, in part, to the League of Nations or the United Nations. Any analogy to State governments is, to be blunt, ridiculous.

So far as State governments were concerned, there was no difference of opinion on the part of our Founding Fathers, whom we look up to as men of superb education and great philosophical bent and ability. I say to the Senator from Maryland what so many Senators have already said to him. The hour is late, and I must depart, but I wish him to know that, speaking as one who took a vigorous part in the debate last year against the Dirksen amendment, I am delighted that the Senator from Maryland has taken such a forthright leading part in this debate at this time.

He is a member of the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee. His attendance at hearings to listen to the proponents and opponents of the Dirksen amendment has been far above and beyond the call of duty.

He has made a great contribution to the cause of those of us who feel that the Dirksen amendment is a serious threat to our constitutional system of representation.

It is most important that the Senator has chosen the subject upon which he is speaking for his maiden speech. It is a very comprehensive, detailed, and beautifully researched speech. As I said previously, the fact that he has led off this debate and has documented his case so extremely well will be of invaluable help. If we are successful, if we do prevail, I am sure that much of the credit must go to the distinguished Senator from Maryland, who has taken the leadership with this great speech.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the very distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin for his very kind remarks. He, together with the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], led the fight here last year. Their leadership in the present fight is inspiring. I am looking forward to battling shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Wisconsin in this cause. As the Senator realizes, the issue which we are discussing is the most important domestic issue confronting the Congress this year. Adoption of the rotten borough amendment would be a tragedy for those who believe in the Federal system—for those who believe in State responsibility and strong State government. I sincerely appreciate the comments of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I, too, wish to echo the sentiments expressed by my colleagues in commending the Senator from Maryland on his truly outstanding documentation of what I consider to be one of the most important questions which will come before the Senate this year—or any other year. I have had an opportunity to review the Senator's presentation in detail. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I wish to say that the Senator from Maryland has performed yeoman service in providing members of that committee, as well as Members of the Senate, with a reasoned approach to the questions surrounding the reapportionment issue. He has considered the history, the philosophy, the importance of protecting minority and majority rights, and all the other far-reaching implications of this important matter. And, Mr. President, he has done this well. I, therefore, wish to be identified in commending the Senator from Maryland on his scholarly analysis, on his thoughtfulness, and on the perceptiveness that he has employed in discussing this subject before the Senate. He speaks for many Members of the U.S. Senate.

In the days ahead I believe all of us who share the Senator's opinion on this important question will look to him for increasing guidance and to represent us in this important struggle. Again, I wish personally to commend the Senator, and to express the appreciation of the people of Massachusetts for the contribution which he has made.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts. I know that with his counsel, assistance and advice the fight against the rotten borough amendments will be far less arduous. I have had an opportunity to observe the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, who bears such a cherished name in this Nation. I have been privileged to watch his work in the Judiciary Committee. I was happy to be one of those who worked with him in his recent efforts to build a stronger voting rights bill, which we accomplished. His work was an inspiration to all of us. I know that his leadership and his help in the very important fight ahead could very well mean the difference between success and failure. I am highly appreciative of the fact that the Senator would take the time to be present and to comment on my speech.

THE ALLEGED FEDERAL ANALOGY

The proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 2 point to the fact that whatever the views of our Founding Fathers, the fact is that they established a union in which representation in the Senate was apportioned equally to each State, regardless of population. They point out that Nevada, with a population of some 450,000 has 2 Senators, the same as New York with a population of more than 17 million.

Those favoring Senate Joint Resolution 2 argue that there is "a Federal analogy" between the States and the United States on the one hand and counties and State governments on the other. I believe a study of the proceedings of our Constitutional Convention clearly shows that such an analogy is inaccurate and deceptive.

The fact of the matter is, that the composition of the U.S. Senate represented the "great compromise" of the Convention which drafted our Constitution. The initial discussion at the Convention was based entirely on the Virginia plan which would have apportioned seats in both the House and the Senate substantially on the basis of population.

The great compromise, permitting equal representation of States in the U.S. Senate, was adopted by the framers of our Constitution only after the open threat of Delaware, and the veiled threats of New Jersey and several other of the small States to withdraw from the Convention and make alliance with a foreign power if they were not given equal representation at least in the Senate.

The reasons for the great compromise were summarized by Elbridge Gerry, one of the delegates to the Convention.

Said Gerry:

> We were, however, in a peculiar situation. We were neither the same nation nor different nations. We ought not, therefore, to pursue the one or the other of these ideas too closely. If no compromise should take place, what will be the consequence? A secession would take place, for some gentlemen seem decided on it: two different plans will be proposed, and the result no man could foresee. If we do not come to some agreement among ourselves some foreign sword will probably do the work for us.

This explanation of the great compromise demonstrates, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] so well stated in his testimony before our subcommittee, that there is no valid Federal analogy. The Senator said:

> The States created the United States. In doing so they reserved much authority and power to themselves. And the representation of the States in the Senate of the United States can in fact be justified on the Federal principle. This principle of federalism is a vital ingredient of American liberty. But it would be ridiculous to apply it to counties or towns. Nobody pretends that counties or cities within a State have such a residual of power. They are creatures of the State, administrative units that can be abolished or created by the State legislature. They exist to provide an orderly framework for the administration of laws and the provisions of services. If and when they prove too cumbersome or ineffective they can be, and often are, replaced by units of government more realistically attuned to the needs of the people.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] has ably demonstrated that the Federal analogy is a false analogy.

The only fair analogy between the 13 States and the United States would be if the countries of Europe today were to get together in a constitutional convention and agree to unite in one United States of Europe and have a bicameral legislature with an upper house in which each country would be represented equally, and a lower house, established according to population. But to say that a county has the same relationship to a State as a State has to a federation of sovereign states is completely misleading. A State can draw and redraw county boundary lines any time it wishes to do so.

BOTH HOUSES OF THE LEGISLATURES OF THE THIRTEEN ORIGINAL STATES WERE FAIRLY APPORTIONED

The founders of our Republic did not apply the Federal analogy to the composition of State legislatures. In almost every case, both Houses of the legislatures of our Thirteen Original States were apportioned on the basis of population or substantially on the basis of population. This point is so important, Mr. President, to an understanding of the reapportionment problem that I think it is worth dwelling on for just a moment.

The highly respected Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which the Congress established during President Eisenhower's administration, has studied the apportionment of our colonial and early State legislatures in depth. The Commission found that Pennsylvania had the distinction of being the first Colony to adopt population as the basis for legislative representation. The Pennsylvania constitution of 1776 provided for a unicameral legislature in which seats were apportioned on the basis of population. The revised Pennsylvania constitution of 1790 established a bicameral legislature in which population was the sole basis for representation in both houses.

Following the lead of Pennsylvania, New York and South Carolina adopted population as the basis for representation in both houses of their legislatures and Georgia adopted it as the basis for apportionment in its unicameral legislature.

While colonial Massachusetts and New Hampshire departed somewhat from strict population as the basis for representation for one house of their bicameral legislatures, they did not depart very far. In Massachusetts, for example, each town was entitled to a representative but towns of more than 150 persons were given additional representation in accordance with population.

The Middle Atlantic States, including my own State of Maryland, accorded representation on the basis of political subdivisions. The Advisory Commission points out:

> If the 1790 population figures of these five States (Delaware, New Jersey, Maryland, North Carolina, and Virginia) are considered it appears that representation based upon a county did not differ greatly from the distribution of the State's population.

In other words at that time when the Colonies determined the boundary lines of their counties, they did so to provide substantially equal population in each county.

NORTHWEST ORDINANCE

While the Founding Fathers recognized population as the primary basis for apportionment in both houses of the legislature of the Original Thirteen States they extended that rule, even more strictly, to the States subsequently to be admitted to the Union.

The Northwest Ordinance adopted by the Continental Congress under the Articles of Confederation in 1787 provided:

> The inhabitants of said territory shall be always entitled to the benefits of the writ of habeas corpus; of trial by jury; of a proportionate representation of the people in the legislature, and of judicial proceedings according to the course of the common law.

The Continental Congress thus treated equal representation as a fundamental right, of the same importance as the great writ or jury trial.

NEW STATES FROM 1740 TO 1889

The principle of fair representation did not die with the founding of the Union or the passage of the Northwest Ordinance. All but 2 of the 20 States which joined the Union between the ratification of the Constitution and the Civil War considered population to be the sole basis for legislative representation in both houses of their State legislatures. Prof. Robert B. McKay, associate dean of New York University Law School, and a noted authority on reapportionment, has reported that between 1790, when Vermont was admitted to the Union, and 1899 when Montana was admitted nearly 100 years later, every State entered the Union with a constitution providing for representation based principally on population in both houses of the legislature.

On the basis of its study, the Advisory Commission concluded:

> Population as the sole basis of representation in both houses of State legislatures is not a new revolutionary doctrine. To the contrary, in the earlier days of our Republic, it tended to be the rule with other bases constituting the exception. At one time or another, 36 of our 50 States had provided in their constitutions that population would be the primary basis for representation of both houses in the legislature. Twenty-seven of these States provided that it should be the sole basis. This has been an extremely uncomfortable fact for those who contend that the very foundations of the Republic were swept away by the Supreme Court decisions of 1964.

I, therefore, conclude, Mr. President, that the Supreme Court was entirely correct when, in Reynolds against Sims, it characterized reliance on the Federal analogy argument as an "after-the-fact rationalization."

DEVELOPMENT OF MALAPPORTIONMENT

Since the legislatures of the Original Thirteen States and the States admitted to the Union prior to the Civil War were based primarily on population in both houses of the legislature, why do we have a reapportionment problem today? The answer lies in the history of the latter half of the 19th century.

The Civil War accelerated the rate at which we were becoming an industrialized society. As factories were built and men were needed to tend the machines, more and more of our grandfathers left their farms and villages to come to the cities. As the cities grew and the agricultural areas declined in population, the State legislatures became increasingly malapportioned.

Rural legislators responded to this shift of population to urban areas in two ways: In many States, including such populous States as California, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, the apportionment formulas were revised to preserve legislative control in the rural areas. These formulas were then locked into the State constitutions. With continuing population shifts, the number of legislators who would be adversely affected by a return to apportionment based on population continued to increase. Change thus became a virtual impossibility.

Where amendment of the constitutional formula was not practicable, a number of State legislatures simply ignored the State constitutional provisions for periodic reapportionment. Tennessee, from whence came Baker against Carr, and Alabama, the source of Reynolds against Sims, were such States. And the Legislature of Maryland, my own State, repeatedly ignored popular referendums calling for a constitutional convention for fear it might lead to reapportionment.

We can summarize the history of American legislative apportionment with three simple statements: First, historically, both houses of nearly all of our State legislatures were apportioned substantially on the basis of population; second, the shift of population from rural to urban areas created malapportionment; third, this system of unequal representation was deliberately perpetrated by rural legislators who resisted the loss of their seats and power.

II. PHILOSOPHIC OBJECTIONS TO MALAPPORTIONMENT

My second set of reasons for opposing the proposed amendments to the Constitution is that these amendments are inconsistent with the concept of representative, democratic government.

MALAPPORTIONMENT FRUSTRATES MAJORITY RULE

Three hundred years ago, John Locke argued that the legitimacy of any government rests ultimately upon the consent of the governed. This basic principle distinguishes our free and open society from totalitarian dictatorships. In a representative democracy the consent of the governed is expressed through the election of representatives. Unless some people are more worthy of representation than others, it must follow that each citizen should have an equal voice in electing his representatives.

Since 1776, our Nation has rejected the notion that some people are more worthy of representation than others. A fundamental axiom of our political faith is that all men are created equal. To give some people a greater voice in the selection of their representatives is to make them more equal.

We recall, with a smile, the wonderful satire of Communist ideology by the noted essayist, George Orwell. In his book "Animal Farm," the barnyard was communized and leadership devolved upon the pigs. The pigs soon acquired the best food, the best accommodations in the barn and freedom from work. This pseudo-egalitarian barnyard society was built upon the slogan "All Animals Are Equal—But Some Animals Are More Equal Than Others."

I submit that our malapportioned legislatures rest upon the same perversion of democratic theory. The fact is that some people in our society are more equal because they have greater representation in our legislatures. Like the leaders of "Animal Farm," they use their inequality and privileges to secure for themselves better roads, lower taxes, and the other privileges and perquisites of power.

It is for these reasons that I believe that the Supreme Court was correct in stating in Reynolds against Sims:

> Legislators represent people, not trees or acres. Legislators are elected by voters, not farms or cities or economic interests.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2 THREATENS MINORITY RIGHTS

The proponents of the rotten borough amendments argue that the proposed amendments embody the principle of consent of the governed, for under the language of that resolution no legislature could be malapportioned unless the apportionment scheme were approved by the people of the State in a popular referendum. I suggest that this is also at variance with our democratic traditions. Equally important as the concept of majority rule is the principle of minority rights. Our Bill of Rights—our first 10 amendments—catalogs a host of rights which under our Constitution, no majority, however large, can take away from the minority.

This point was ably made by American University professor, Royce Hanson, in his testimony before the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee. Professor Hanson pointed out:

> We could, by constitutional amendment, only dissimilar in scope from the present proposed amendment, have the Constitution read: "Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit a State from doing anything it pleases so long as its actions shall be approved in a referendum by the people of such State." Few, I think would applaud such an amendment. The reason is that we consider some personal rights beyond the reach of any majority at any time.

I believe that the right of fair representation is a fundamental right, just as fundamental as the right of free speech or trial by jury. It should not be abridged by majority vote.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. First, I wish to commend the Senator from Maryland for his remarks today. This is a vitally important matter. Too little attention has been paid to it by the press and the general public in the period of the last few months. The junior Senator from Maryland has performed a distinct public service by bringing the subject to the attention of the Senate in the way he has. His speech should be read not only by all Senators, but also by people across the United States.

The effect of these amendments would be important not only for the present generation of Americans, but for many generations hereafter, so the Senator is making a major contribution by his speech today. I am sorry that he must deliver it at this late hour, because I know there was great interest in it. However, I hope all Senators will read the speech and understand the implications of the amendments, not only for us but for our children and our children's children, as well.

I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland some questions. Is it not correct and, indeed, most ironic, considering the efforts we are making in the Congress to protect minorities, that these amendments would divest many minority groups throughout the United States of their right to vote and take part in public affairs?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is absolutely correct. He points out one of the tragic consequences of the adoption of these amendments. As former Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall pointed out in testimony before our committee, it would permit the people of a State to dilute and diminish the franchise of minority groups—particularly Negro minorities. There would be a great many opportunities to disenfranchise persons who are not white. In a sense, there could be continued double discrimination. Not only are some of our Negro citizens denied the right to vote or discouraged from voting, but if they live in cities, and most of them do, their vote when cast is often worth less than that of a rural voter. The Senator's point is extremely well made. It is very pertinent.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Is it not also correct to say that although the proponents of the amendments say they are designed to help those who live in rural areas—those who in the past have had a considerable role in their State legislatures—the amendments could, if agreed to, result in the urban residents and other groups getting together to disenfranchise those who live in rural areas, not only for a few years, but for many decades to come?

Mr. TYDINGS. Absolutely. The door would be opened. If the majority could select the group to be favored, an urban majority could decide to disenfranchise a rural area. To say that a majority of persons of a State have the right to select a pet group and say that their vote shall be worth 10, 15, 20, or 30 times as much as any other group would open up the door to many problems.

It is ironic, but the amendment sponsored by the Farm Bureau Federation could inure to the disadvantage of the particular group they represent.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Will there not also be a problem not only as to what minority groups might be disenfranchised but also as to what minority groups will be singled out for protection? Is it to be those who have blond hair in a particular State; those who have blue eyes; those who live in communities having a population under 5,000; those who live in communities having a population of 50,000 or more? Will it be to help Negroes, Catholics, Jews, or Protestants? What group would be selected under such an amendment, if it were agreed to, to be the minority group that would be protected in a particular, special way? Will that not be a great problem?

Mr. TYDINGS. Absolutely. This is a great danger.

The distinguished Senator from New York has a wide background. He ably presented the case of Gray against Sanders before the Supreme Court. Obviously he has done his homework and knows the subject of reapportionment backward and forward.

There are no guidelines, no standards in the Dirksen amendment. The amendment refers vaguely to "factors other than population." A mischievous legislature—and there have been many of them—could enact all sorts of schemes to deprive groups of representation or to give pet groups over representation. Particularly in the South, it would be easy to set up educational standards or a standard of property ownership, or another kind of standard, to disenfranchise effectively the Negro voters. That could easily be done. The Senator's point is well made.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I have read the statement of the Senator from Maryland. He has made his points eloquently. I wanted to stress some of them and to say also that the Senator from Maryland is performing a highly useful public service.

During the last few months, not much public attention has been drawn to this subject. Hearings were held before the subcommittee of which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] is chairman. A number of witnesses were heard. However, those hearings received little attention.

I look back to 1962 and 1963, when certain other constitutional amendments were being proposed and considered across the United States, in connection with the felt need to overrule certain decisions by the Supreme Court. Again, these proposed amendments gained support throughout the United States until the spotlight of public attention was thrown on them. When their weaknesses were exposed, they were dropped or defeated. But for a while those amendments had great momentum. Then the Chief Justice of the United States spoke out on them. Anthony Lewis, of the New York Times, wrote about them. Many speeches were given and many letters were written to explain the proposed amendments and their implications. After all that occurred, those who advocated such amendments were unable to proceed further with them.

The junior Senator from Maryland today is performing the same kind of function and the same kind of public service by focusing attention on these amendments, so that everyone may consider them.

I hope that the comments of the Senator from Maryland will not only be read by all Senators and Representatives, but also by people across the country so that if one of the proposed amendments is agreed to, it will be seriously considered and everyone will understand its implication and what it might lead to, and what would be the result throughout the United States if it were ratified.

In my judgment we made a major step forward, and a real revolution took place in 1961, 1962, and 1963 in the arguments before the Supreme Court on these questions and in the decisions of the Supreme Court.

I believe that if one of the proposed amendments were to be adopted, it would be a step backward. I believe that the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who has led this fight, is owed a great debt by all of us.

I am glad to be here to commend the Senator; and I thank him on behalf of the people of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for his kind words. I believe that he has pointed out that the purpose of the address is to alert Members of Congress, Senators, and, indeed, the people of the United States, to the tragic consequences of adoption of these rotten borough amendments.

These are the first constitutional amendments which would limit the franchise since the founding of our Republic. This would be the first real step backward in human rights and the democratic concept of our Government.

I hope the Senate will think long and hard before agreeing to the inclusion of such an amendment in the Federal Constitution.

THE WIDENED FRANCHISE

The principle of fair representation is deeply imbedded in the political history of this country. The entire course of our constitutional development from the Declaration of Independence to the Voting Rights Act of 1965, is a history of widening the franchise.

We have adopted five amendments to our Constitution which expand the franchise: the 15th amendment guarantees all citizens of the United States the right to vote regardless of race or color; the 17th amendment provides for the direct election of U.S. Senators; the 19th amendment extends the franchise to women. The 23rd amendment allows residents of the District of Columbia to vote for President; and the 24th amendment outlaws the poll tax in Federal elections.

This session, we have been deeply concerned with implementing the 14th and 15th amendments to insure that Negroes in every part of the Union can exercise the right of suffrage. What a mockery it would be, Mr. President, if the same Congress which adopts the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were to approve and forward to the States an amendment to the Constitution, which reestablishes the rotten borough and deprives those of our citizens, black and white, who live in the suburbs and cities of their right to equal representation in our legislatures.

III. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ARE TECHNICALLY DEFECTIVE

My third set of principal objections to the rotten borough amendments lies in the language of the amendments themselves. The four amendments pending before our subcommittee vary somewhat in their language. For the sake of simplicity, I will deal here only with Senator DIRKSEN's Senate Joint Resolution 2. It is the resolution that appears to command the most support and is also the one that raises the most serious legal and policy problems.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

The first sentence of Senate Joint Resolution 2 is deceptively simple. It reads: "The right and power to determine the composition of the legislature of a State and the apportionment of the membership thereof shall remain in the people of that State."

There lurks in this simple language a fundamental constitutional problem. If the right and power to apportion a State legislature remains "in the people" what role, if any, can the courts play in enforcing the guarantee of the equal protection clause?

In his testimony before our subcommittee, Senator DIRKSEN expressly disclaimed any intention to remove the power of Federal courts to review State apportionment plans. If that is his intention, however, one can only wonder what the purpose of the first sentence of this amendment might be. I, for one, am very concerned that notwithstanding Senator DIRKSEN's disclaimer, the sentence might be read by the courts as precluding judicial review. If this is the case, there would be no effective way to insure that the State legislatures live up to the requirements of Senate Joint Resolution 2. We would, in short, be back where we were before Baker against Carr, with no effective remedy for malapportionment, however gross, and with no way to test whether the referendum procedures specified in the amendment had been met.

FACTORS OTHER THAN POPULATION NOT DEFINED

Even if the first sentence of Senate Joint Resolution 2 were eliminated, the balance of the proposed text would be objectionable. The second sentence begins: "Nothing in the Constitution shall prohibit the people from apportioning one house of a bicameral legislature on the basis of factors other than population." I have sat, Mr. President, through many days of testimony by proponents of this amendment and have yet to find out what these "factors" are.

I am convinced that to allow one house of a bicameral legislature to be apportioned on the basis of factors other than population without any definition, limitation or enumeration of what those factors may be would be an invitation to caprice, to prejudice, and to chaos.

RACE AS A FACTOR

My principal fear is that the legislatures of some of our States might overtly or covertly embody the race factor into their apportionment plan. I find nothing in Senate Joint Resolution 2 to prevent a State from apportioning representation in its senate among the white voters of the State or giving unequal representation to areas where white persons are in the majority. While such action is today prohibited by the 14th and 15th amendments, I am deeply concerned that the adoption of a rotten borough amendment could be construed by the courts as an implied repeal of the 14th and 15th amendments with respect to apportionment. As the junior Senator from New York, ROBERT KENNEDY, has pointed out, the only purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 2 is to carve out an exception to the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment as determined by the Supreme Court in the reapportionment cases.

Even if race were not explicity or obviously used to disenfranchise Negroes, what is there in Senate Joint Resolution 2 to prevent a State from apportioning membership in its senate on the basis of education, or ownership of property? Mr. Burke Marshall, former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division, has demonstrated that either of these factors would in many of our States effectively disenfranchise Negroes and other economically and socially disadvantaged groups. He testified:

> If property qualifications are used, for example, only three out of eight nonwhite households owned their own homes in 1960, as compared to five out of eight white householders. These are national figures, the disparity would be much greater for the Southern States. In terms of education, in 1960 the median school years completed for whites was 10.9, while the comparable figure for nonwhites was 8.2 years; 6.7 percent of the whites in the country have had less than 5 years of elementary school, but this was true in 1960 of 23 percent of the nonwhites. Similar disparities can be found in any educational standard that is chosen. And they can be multiplied in terms of any economic, social, or even regional interests, not related to population, which might be used as a test of representation.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I submit that reapportionment is a civil rights issue. Mr. Clarence Mitchell of the NAACP told our committee that a great deal of the support for the rotten borough amendments comes from those who oppose political equality for Negroes. It would be ironic, indeed tragic, if the same Congress which takes long overdue action to enfranchise the Negro, were also to authorize the effective disenfranchisement, through unfair apportionment, of millions of Negroes and other minority groups.

The possibility of racially motivated malapportionment exists in fact and not in fancy. The Civil Rights Commission has found in its 1961 voting study that there is a close relationship between malapportionment and racial discrimination. Prof. V. O. Key, a noted authority on southern politics, has observed that "by the overrepresentation of rural counties in State legislatures the whites of the black belts gain an extremely disproportionate strength in State lawmaking." In Louisiana, for example, the Civil Rights Commission found in 1960 that certain rural parishes in northern Louisiana had, on a straight population basis, six or seven times as much representation as selected urban parishes. In these rural parishes few if any Negroes voted, while in the urban areas the nonwhite voting registration was quite high. As a result, racial discrimination in voting magnified the malapportionment and the whites in rural areas were effectively overrepresented by a factor of 12 or 14 to 1. This malapportionment serves to intensify the racial crisis in the South, for, as Professor Key has observed, these overrepresented black belt areas are "in general the most conservative and irreconcilable on the Negro issue."

OTHER INVIDIOUS FACTORS

While race is the most obvious and most invidious "factor other than population" that might be employed in apportioning a State legislature, there are in many States other factors, such as religion, national origin, and wealth, which could be employed to disenfranchise an unpopular minority. When one looks at what Justice Clark called the "topsy-turvical" apportionment plans of many of our States one has little confidence that the nonpopulation factors that might be employed would be reasonable, or fair.

Nor is the problem of disenfranchising minority groups through malapportionment limited to the South. In the New York Constitutional Convention of 1894 a rural delegate argued for malapportionment in the following terms:

> I say without fear of contradiction that the average citizen in the rural district is superior in intelligence, superior in morality, superior in self-government, to the average citizen in the great cities * * * [W]e * * * have no Emma Goldbergs and no Herr Mosts.

Another delegate to the same convention declared: "The people in our big cities are unfit for citizenship." More recently, a former president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards stated:

> Today the greatest threat to democratic institutions, to the republican form of government, and ultimately to freedom itself, lies in our big cities. They are populated for the most part with the mass man, devoid of intelligence, and devoid of civic responsibility.

THE URBAN BACKLASH

There is also inherent in Senate Joint Resolution 2 the possibility that the majority's power to apportion on the basis of factors other than population may be turned against a rural minority. I am convinced from the hearings that proponents of this measure support it because they hope and expect that in some States an urban-suburban majority will be prevailed upon to give more than equal representation to rural interests. But it is also possible for a coalition of urban voters to assign to themselves more than equal representation.

Once an urban-suburban majority takes control of a legislature under a rotten borough amendment it, too, could reapportion upon "factors other than population." An urban-suburban majority would thus have power to accord rural interests less representation than that to which they would be entitled on a strict population basis.

Dean Erwin N. Griswold of Harvard Law School has written in opposition to a reapportionment amendment on the ground that the longrun consequences of malapportionment cannot be foreseen. Dean Griswold said:

> As the country grows and as there are population shifts, as once rural areas become urban, and as some urban areas have fewer people because their populations move to the country, we might end up with a wholly unexpected pattern of political control.

In short, by accident or by design those who now favor the rotten borough could find that they ultimately receive less, not more, than equal representation.

WHICH PET MINORITY?

Another point which concerns me about the use of the phrase "factors other than population," is that it gives the voters of a State carte blanche to choose which pet minority they will favor. Some of the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 2 have suggested a need for apportionment on the basis of factors other than population in order to protect the interests of farmers, mining concerns, or lumbering enterprises. But when we look closely at a State we invariably find there are a multitude of interests.

My own State of Maryland, for example, runs the gamut from the maritime, fishing, and poultry interests on the Eastern Shore to urban-suburban constituencies in the Baltimore and Washington areas to mining, lumbering, and dairy farming interests in the western part of the State.

On what basis is anyone to say that in the apportionment of the Maryland Legislature the oystering interest should be given greater than equal representation? How can we determine that oysters are more important than coal or cows—or people? Should oystermen have greater representation than university professors? Should Catholics have greater representation than Jews?

Today, 15 rural counties of Maryland, containing less than 15 percent of the State's population, can elect a majority of our senate. This apportionment has been defended on the ground that the rural counties must have such control for protection of their minority interests. But Negroes are a slightly larger minority in Maryland. They make up almost 17 percent of our State's population. If minorities require control of the legislature to protect their interests, Negroes should be just as entitled as our rural counties to elect a majority in one house of the Maryland legislature. This is, of course, absurd, but no more so than the philosophy behind the rotten borough amendments.

I submit that there is no fair way for the majority to decide which minority shall be favored. There is no rational basis for singling out an interest or group for special consideration. To attempt to do so is to invite appeals to prejudice, self-interest, and the lowest form of political chicanery.

I submit that the capacity of a legislature to balance the diverse interest of a great State rests with its ability to reflect those interests in proportion to their actual occurrence within the State. That occurrence can only be measured fairly and impartially by the number of people who are engaged or concerned with that particular enterprise or interest.

ABSENCE OF LIMITS ON MALAPPORTIONMENT

Even if one could identify the special interest groups to which one wanted to accord special privileges and power, I believe Senate Joint Resolution 2 is defective in that it does not contain any limitation upon the extent to which nonpopulation factors may be employed.

We should recognize that the Supreme Court has not called in its decisions for mathematically precise legislative districts. In the Reynolds opinion, the Court was careful to point out that there was room for flexibility in drawing legislative districts; that factors other than population—including political subdivisions—could be considered if they were "incident to the effectuation of a rational State policy."

This brings us to the nub of the evil of Senate Joint Resolution 2. The proponents of the rotten borough system want to be able to apportion one house of a State legislature on a widely discriminatory basis. They want to be able to ignore population entirely, and perpetuate apportionment schemes which accord some voters 5, 10, 100 times the political power of other citizens.

This is the critical question on which every Senator, every Congressman, and every citizen must search his conscience: Is there to be any limitation on the ability of a State wholly to disregard population in one house of a bicameral legislature? I believe our history, our democratic heritage and our good, commonsense require a strongly affirmative reply.

APPROVAL BY REFERENDUM

By far the most troublesome language in Senate Joint Resolution 2 is the requirement that a legislative body may not be malapportioned if "such apportionment plan has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with the law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting."

I previously explained why I feel that it is contrary to our historical traditions and to democratic theory to submit so fundamental an issue as fair representation to majority vote. But even if I were to concede, for the moment, that this were an acceptable course, it seems to me the proposal is fraught with practical difficulties and unsuspecting boobytraps.

The first practical problem is how an apportionment scheme would come before the voters. Some States do not provide for referendums. It is uncertain whether in these States any apportionment scheme would be submitted to the voters.

In those States which do have provisions for referendums, the referendum machinery is generally controlled by the legislature. Only 13 States provide opportunity for voters to initiate constitutional amendments, while 7 others provide opportunity to initiate statutory changes. In the remaining 30 States the content of any reapportionment plan to be submitted to the voters would be exclusively controlled by the legislature. This means that the malapportioned house of a State legislature would control the content of any apportionment plan to be submitted to the people. Can we realistically expect the people to be given a fair, effective choice?

The historical record shows that we cannot. In 1962, for example, the Colorado legislature put to the voters two apportionment plans. The so-called Federal plan gave less than equal representation to the city of Denver, but provided for single member districts. The so-called population plan apportioned representatives equally, but would have required all of Denver's delegates to run at large. A majority of the citizens of Colorado including the residents of Denver, voted for the Federal plan, but the Supreme Court found that "neither of the proposed plans was, in all probability, wholly acceptable to the voters in the populous counties." Other examples of malapportionment can be found in a paper entitled "Majority Rule, the Initiative and Reapportionment" by Prof. Robert McKay. I ask unanimous consent that this paper be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the simple fact is that the way a question is asked will often determine the answer which is received. If voters were asked, "Do you want your vote to have equal weight with every other person's vote?" we might well receive a different reply than if the voters were asked, "Do you wish to protect the interests of rural citizens by according them extra seats in the legislature?" One great defect in Senate Joint Resolution 2 is that in the 30 States which lack initiative, the power to frame the referendum question rests exclusively with the rotten-borough legislators whose own seats are at stake.

We are all aware, Mr. President, of the shortcomings of any referendum campaign. A referendum may often be the means by which those who can afford the mammoth costs of television and newspaper propaganda can mislead the voters. Issues are generally couched in highly technical, legal language which is difficult, if not impossible, for many voters to penetrate. Clarence Mitchell of the NAACP pointed out in his testimony that mass advertising can so twist a proposal that the voters—in a form of Orwellian double think—actually vote in favor of a proposition they disapprove.

There is a very real possibility that an unsuspecting public, weary of successive referendums and misled by a skillful mass communication campaign, could be induced to accept a legislative apportionment plan which is less than fair and which, if the choice were really free and uncoerced, they would reject.

Finally, Mr. President, the experience in most States is that far fewer votes are generally cast on referendum propositions than for candidates for office. Senate Joint Resolution 2 specifies that a malapportionment plan can be validly approved by a "majority of those voting on that issue." This could well be less than a majority of those who voted for candidates in the election, and certainly less than a majority of the adult citizens. A dedicated minority could thus disenfranchise an apathetic or unaware majority.

The Association of the Bar of the City of New York has summarized the problems well:

> Voter approval may indicate not satisfaction with the apportionment proposed, but simply that it is regarded as an improvement over the existing apportionment.

Even in those States which provide for initiative, the advocates of fair representation would face great obstacles. An initiative is generally proposed by petition. In some States there must be signatures from every county, including the overrepresented counties. The cost of initiative often becomes prohibitive. In recent years an initiative effort in Ohio cost in excess of $100,000, just to get the proposition on the ballot.

PERIODIC REVIEW

Another major difficulty with the referendum provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 2 is that any proposal, once approved by the voters, could become frozen and uncorrectable. Let us assume, for example, that in my own State of Maryland the voters were to approve in a popular referendum a reapportionment plan that was reasonable in the light of today's population distribution. Ten or twenty years from now that apportionment may very well be unreasonable. The proposed amendment provides no machinery whereby the apportionment plan could be periodically resubmitted for voter approval.

IV. PRACTICAL OBJECTIONS

I would like now, Mr. President, to turn to what I shall term the "practical objections" to the rotten borough amendments.

TREND TO FEDERAL PROGRAMS

We are all aware that an ever-increasing number of problems that were once the exclusive responsibilities of our States have become the subject of congressional legislation and extensive Federal programs. In the single session that I have been here we have passed legislation to control water pollution, to extend massive Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, and to regulate State voting procedures. It is all but certain that before we adjourn we will enact legislation dealing with the problems of health care for the aged, mass transit, housing, air pollution, and even with such traditionally local matters as law enforcement.

One need not search far to find the reasons for the increasing tempo of Federal activity in areas once reserved to the States. In 1955 the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations reported to President Eisenhower that—

> If States do not give cities their rightful allocation of seats in the legislature, the tendency will be toward direct Federal-municipal dealings. * * * Paradoxically enough, the interests of urban areas are often more effectively represented in the National Legislature than in their own State legislatures.

The simple but regrettable fact is that our State governments with few exceptions have failed to meet their responsibilities.

The inadequacy of State government is all too vividly illustrated in my own State. During the 70-day session of the legislature just concluded, Maryland lawmakers once again failed to come to grips with basic problems confronting our State. The Maryland Senate—where 15 percent of the people control 52 percent of the seats—could not agree to apportion on the basis of population even one house of the legislature. It could not take action on legislation to control the distribution of guns, or to provide for fair housing, or equal access to public accommodations, or an educational TV network.

During the final hours of the legislature, while the clock was running out, the senate engaged in a spirited debate on the location of a garbage incinerator for the city of Annapolis. Truly the Maryland Senate fiddled while the people of Maryland burned. Is it any wonder that the people of Maryland and so many other States look to Washington for constructive and progressive legislation?

Much has been written about the cause of defects in our State governments. We all know that most State legislative sessions are too short; that our State legislators and many State executives are woefully underpaid; that our State legislators lack adequate staff or technical assistance to fulfill their responsibilities; that outmoded constitutions shackle effective State action. But these shortcomings are merely symptoms and not the cause of the basic infirmity.

The fundamental illness, the overriding malady, of our State governments lies in their malapportionment. If we can cut away the cancer of the rotten borough system, State legislatures can overhaul their governmental machinery and procedures and rewrite outmoded constitutions.

Once these reforms are achieved our States can reassume their historic role in providing effective government for their people. When these reforms are accomplished State governments can at last address themselves to the problems of our great metropolitan areas. Our States will not be revitalized overnight, but when State governments begin to grapple effectively with the problems of all their citizens, the need for Federal involvement in such matters as mass transit, law enforcement, air pollution, education, and health care will be substantially reduced.

LIBERAL PROGRAMS BLOCKED

With States rights go, of course, State responsibilities. Yet, few if any States have responsibly come to grips with the problems which beset our increasingly urban society.

There may, of course, be valid reasons not to enact any particular piece of legislation. But there is no excuse for State legislatures time and time again to frustrate the will of the majority of the people of the State.

Let me give some examples. Last March the Missouri House of Representatives defeated a bill to provide a $1 an hour minimum wage in the State of Missouri by a vote of 83 against to 68 for. The 83 "no" votes came from legislators that represented a combined population of 1.3 million people. The 68 affirmative votes came from legislators representing 2.6 million people. Thus the representatives of two out of every three people in the State supported legislation that was defeated 5 to 4.

In his testimony last year before the House Judiciary Committee, August Scholle, president of the Michigan State AFL–CIO documented the "evils of minority control of a legislative body" in his State. He cited example after example of how the rural dominated Michigan Senate blocked progressive legislation despite the fact that senators representing a majority of the people voted for the measures. Some examples are:

First. A bill to provide free polio shots for needy children was blocked by senators representing 2.8 million people despite the fact that senators representing 3.2 million people voted for it.

Second. A bill to provide for an unemployment insurance increase of $3 was killed by senators for 2.4 million people despite support for the bill by senators representing 3.5 million people.

Third. The addition of several hundred badly needed mental health beds was blocked by senators for 2.8 million people despite support for them by senators for 3.1 million people.

During this period the Michigan lower house was apportioned substantially on the basis of population. These important measures were blocked by the malapportioned senate. As Senator DOUGLAS has so forcefully stated:

> The record could not be more clear: Any failure to apportion both houses of a State legislature substantially on the basis of population is certain to deny the majority fair consideration of their problems. As the Michigan experience so well demonstrates, it takes only one unrepresentative house to block legislation desired by a majority of the people.

NO PARTISAN ADVANTAGE

The Nation should understand, Mr. President, that a plea for fair representation is not a partisan plea. There is no evidence that a fairly apportioned State legislature would favor the Democratic Party. Indeed, there is every reason to believe that Republicans would exert a greater influence in many State governments. The reason for this is that the most underrepresented areas in most States are not the cities but the suburbs, and the suburbs have a tendency to vote Republican.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First I congratulate the Senator from Maryland on what I believe is the best maiden speech delivered by any Senator in the 17 years I have served in this body. It is a magnificent discussion, sound historically, cogent, logical, infused with his characteristic idealism. It indicates what an extraordinarily bright future the junior Senator from Maryland has in the public life of this Nation and in the deliberations of this body.

I congratulate him. Those of us who have been trying to defend this same principle in the past take grateful encouragement from the aid and leadership which he is giving to the general cause.

It is particularly appropriate that the Senator should take the floor on this matter almost immediately following the passage by the Senate of the Voting Rights Act. For the Senator is now defending the unalienable right of American citizens to have an equal and meaningful vote, just as he labored for the act to protect the right to register and cast a vote. Unfortunately, there are those who claim to support the right to vote but who would pass the rotten borough amendments which will drastically reduce the meaningfulness of a person's vote.

In this connection a very interesting letter appeared in the New York Times the other day from the Governor of Vermont, in which he pointed out that the poll tax in Vermont is more than is commonly believed; it ranges from $3.50 to more than $18, and it disqualifies as many as 10,000 voters in local elections, and therefore leads to a lack of representation.

Governor Hoff points out in his letter—and this is extremely important—that the Vermont State Senate, where representation is based upon population, has, on four separate occasions, tried to eliminate this abridgment of the right to vote, but on each occasion the lower chamber—which is the malapportioned branch of the Vermont Legislature—killed the bill.

He points out that the lower house in Vermont—where 12 percent of the population controls the majority of the seats—has, four separate times, defeated the proposal of the State senate to eliminate the poll tax.

This is a clear indication of the fact that, no matter how fairly representative one house may be, if the other house is malapportioned it can exercise a veto power and prevent needed reforms.

In my own State of Illinois, it is the senate which is malapportioned. Twenty-nine percent of the population, according to the census of 1960, elects a majority of the members of the State senate.

I hold in my hand an article from the Chicago Daily News, page 10, for May 1, 1965, reporting the likely outcome of legislation still pending. It shows that reapportionment is being held up by the senate; that open occupancy legislation is being held up by the senate after the house had passed and sent two bills to it; that a bill providing the city of Chicago with authority to raise sufficient money to conduct its affairs is being held up and in all probability will be defeated by the senate; that a minimum wage bill is being held up in the senate; and that a new revenue article, to replace our archaic revenue article adopted in 1870, is certain to be blocked by the senate.

The article also predicts that the senate will permit certain important revenue bills to go through, but only increases in taxes—gasoline, cigarette, and utility—which are certain to be passed on to the consumer and which, of course, are regressive. The house is forced to agree to these taxes or there would be no revenue.

Each session we face the same difficulty. The house, which is more fairly apportioned, will send to the senate needed legislation on labor, welfare, and city home rule matters, but the malapportioned senate, in effect, vetoes them.

Thus, the experience in my own State as well as the experience of the State of Maryland which the able Senator has discussed, bears out the contention that it is necessary not merely to have fair apportionment for one house, but for both houses. As the Senator is pointing out, it is important that people understand this practical effect of the rotten borough amendments.

Let me thank the Senator from Maryland for the great ability and energy which he has shown in this matter, and to congratulate him once more on his extremely fine presentation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the very distinguished senior Senator from Illinois for his generous and kind remarks.

The leadership of the Senator from Illinois in this fight last year received the approbation of citizens across the Nation. I certainly observed and wished him well at that time. I am very happy that I am now in the Senate to assist him, as well as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and other Senators, to continue the fight to eliminate this very unfortunate situation.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. President, I am convinced that from every point of view the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 2, or any of its substitutes or alternatives, would have disastrous consequences on the quality of government. It would be the first time in the history of our Republic that we have acted to restrict rather than expand the franchise. It would lead us backwards in our ability to deal effectively with the problems of the 20th century.

These amendments confront us with a change in the supreme law of the land, a change which will have fundamental effects on the American system of government. We should not seriously consider, much less adopt, such a far-reaching change unless we faced a constitutional crisis which called for drastic action. I believe we have no such emergency.

Indeed, all the available evidence suggests that until the Federal courts finally intervened the gross malapportionment of our State legislatures was creating a constitutional crisis of grave proportions. Our States were simply failing to meet their responsibilities. The adoption of the rotten borough amendments would turn back the clock, and perpetuate all of the difficulties in Federal-State relations that have plagued us for over 50 years.

My plea, Mr. President, is to give the Supreme Court's decisions a chance to take effect. The decision in Reynolds against Sims is not yet 1 year old. We do not know all of its consequences. Let us not amend the Constitution in panic. If, in the future, we find a need for greater flexibility in the composition of our State legislatures we can then take careful and deliberate action to deal with the problem.

To amend the Constitution in haste is to amend it unwisely. Let it not be said that this Congress proposed to the States an ill-considered amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

EXHIBIT 1

Table prepared by Senator Douglas from an article in the New York Times in December 1964 to show population imbalance in State legislative districts—The smallest percentage of the people which may elect a majority of each house of State legislatures, as of Mar. 1, 1965

[1960 census data]

State	Upper house	Lower house
New England:		
Connecticut	(1)	(1)
Maine	47	40
Massachusetts	45	45
New Hampshire	(2)	(2)
Rhode Island	18	47
Vermont	47	12
Middle Atlantic:		
Delaware	52	[3] 45
New Jersey	19	51
New York	(4)	(4)
Pennsylvania	43	43
Border States:		
Kentucky	45	47
Maryland	14.2	35
Missouri	48	20
Oklahoma	49	49
West Virginia	44	45
The South:		
Alabama	28	43
Arkansas	14	33
Florida	15	30
Georgia	49	22
Louisiana	33	33
Mississippi	37	41
North Carolina	47	26
South Carolina	23	46
Tennessee	45	40
Texas	30	39
Virginia	(5)	(5)
Middle West:		
Illinois	29	(6)
Indiana	42	48
Iowa	37	[7] 45
Kansas	50	19
Michigan	50+	50+
Minnesota	39	35
Nebraska	44	(8)
North Dakota	32	42
Ohio	45	29
South Dakota	41	39
Wisconsin	48	45
Mountain States:		
Arizona	13	46
Colorado	50+	50+
Idaho	17	44
Montana	16	37
Nevada	36	8
New Mexico	14	42
Utah	25	38
Wyoming	24	47
Pacific States:		
Alaska	42	47
California	11	45
Hawaii	18	38
Oregon	48	48
Washington	36	38

[1] January 1965 reapportionment on population basis.

[2] Late 1964 reapportionment on population basis.

[3] Figures in dispute and may be much lower.

[4] Percentages for the new apportionment plan not known.

[5] Virginia was 41 percent in both houses, but presumably reapportionment adopted in December has increased the percentages.

[6] At large.

[7] A temporary plan in effect now has percentages of 39 in the senate and 44 in the house.

[8] Unicameral.

EXHIBIT 2

MAJORITY RULE, THE INITIATIVE, AND REAPPORTIONMENT

(By Robert B. McKay, associate dean, New York University School of Law)

Some critics of the Supreme Court decisions in the 1964 reapportionment cases have expressed substantial agreement with the equal population principle as a general principle, but would permit deviation from representation in proportion to population upon a showing that the majority of the voters in a State had approved the use of nonpopulation factors in the apportionment formula.

Mr. Justice Stewart, for example, dissenting in the Colorado case, would have permitted the malapportionment in the State senate because the Colorado voters had approved the challenged plan by an initiative vote in 1962. Accordingly, he thought there was no "frustration of effective majority control," which was for him the key to decision under the equal protection of the laws clause which he thought otherwise applicable. He put it this way: "Thus the majority [of Colorado voters] has consciously chosen to protect the minority's interests, and under the liberal initiative provisions of the Colorado constitution, it retains the power to reverse its decision to do so. Therefore, there can be no question of frustration of the basic principle of majority rule." *Lucas* v. *Colorado General Assembly,* 377 U.S. 713, 759 (1964).

The same premise is shared by several of the principal resolutions before Congress proposing amendment to the constitution to allow apportionment in one house of a bicameral State legislature on the basis of nonpopulation factors so long as "such apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue."

The Supreme Court, however, rejected all temporizing solutions and insisted on population as the nearly exclusive factor in both houses. In so doing the Court addressed its argument directly to the majority of the voting public who were, after all, the beneficiaries of the ruling. Nevertheless, the argument that use of the initiative protects against "frustration of the basic principle of majority rule" sounds so plausible that it deserves more careful analysis.

Reminder is scarcely necessary that malapportioned legislatures have been notably reluctant to propose changes in apportionment to transfer power to areas of growing population at the expense of sitting legislators. As a result of this and other voter complaints that legislatures have often failed to satisfy the popular will, State government experts have sometimes believed that the system would be improved if voters could be given some more direct means of bringing about constitutional amendment.

The initiative was devised to permit direct voter action to overcome legislative inertia or disregard of popular will; and for a time it seemed likely that an initiative provision would be incorporated in most State constitutions. However, that initial enthusiasm was tempered by discovery of the difficulties encountered in practical operation; now only 13 States provide for voter initiation of constitutional amendments,[1] while 7 others provide the initiative for statutory change.[2] Even in those States, however, experience with the initiative has been disappointing, particularly in connection with attempts to secure apportionment. It has not proved a very helpful means of preventing frustration of effective majority rule. Before telling that story, however, it may be useful to note how the initiative usually operates.

An amendment proposed by initiative must ordinarily be proposed by its sponsors in an initiative petition signed by a prescribed percentage of the qualified voters of the State, ranging in 12 States from 3 to 15 percent, while North Dakota requires 20,000 signatures. The signature requirement has a further restrictive bite in some States; Ohio, for example, requires that in at least half of the State's 88 counties 5 percent of the voters must sign the petition. Thus, an attempt to change Ohio's lower house by initiative would require signatures from a number of overrepresented counties which would lose representation as a result of any reapportionment in satisfaction of the equal-population principle. Where, then, is the effective majority rule?

Moreover, it has been estimated that the cost in Ohio of attempting to get an initiative proposal on the ballot is prohibitive for any individual citizen, and indeed for all but the wealthiest groups as well. In recent initiative efforts in Ohio the cost has been considerably in excess of $100,000, without considering the substantially larger outlay that would be required for the campaign itself.

The difficulties involved in securing a place on the ballot are only part of the problem. Even if an initiated proposal gains a place on the ballot, it is often not easy to interpret the significance of the vote. As the Supreme Court noted in seeking to determine the significance of the Colorado vote on amendments Nos. 7 and 8 in 1962, "neither of the proposed plans was, in all probability, wholly acceptable to the voters in the populous counties." *Lucas* v. *Colorado General Assembly,* 377 U.S. 713, 732 (1964).

For these reasons the initiative has been little used as a means of achieving reapportionment. There appear to be only five States—Arkansas, California, Colorado, Michigan, and Oregon—in which a change in the apportionment formula has been effected by constitutional initiative, and one, Washington, in which reapportionment was accomplished by statutory initiative. Because each instance (plus Nebraska where the theoretical availability of the initiative has been discussed by a Federal court) is instructive, the experience in those States is briefly summarized below.

Arkansas: Reapportionment was achieved by constitutional initiative in Arkansas in 1936 after nearly half a century of legislative failure to act. The amendment provided for decennial reapportionment by a board of apportionment and vested in the State supreme court the power to review action of the board. The old basis for representation was retained and brought up to date—population for the senate and 1 representative for each of the 75 counties, with 25 additional seats allocated on a population basis. In 1956 the Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation sponsored a successful initiative measure which froze permanently the senate districts laid out by State supreme court order in 1952, taking away from the apportionment board any jurisdiction over senate districts. Even if due credit be given the operation of the initiative to overcome a long period of legislative inaction, the 1956 decision seems by any standard unfortunate in its permanent establishment of legislative districts regardless of population shifts certain to occur in later years. Undoubtedly, the change was presented to the voters as no more than a ratification of the existing formula without calling to their attention the way in which it would operate to magnify the inequalities over the years.

California: The original California constitution of 1849 provided for representation in both houses of the legislature in accordance with population. For at least three decades northern California, with more than nine-tenths of the State's population, held firm control of the legislature. Even after the balance began to shift south, population continued dominant in the constitutional formula until about 1930. Reapportionments were made in 1883, 1891, and 1902 to reflect the gradual shift of population to the south.. But conflicts between north and south developed in the early years of the 20th century, and it became necessary for the Los Angeles interests to join with rural interests in order to secure for Los Angeles the representation to which it was entitled.

---

[1] Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Oregon.

[2] Alaska, Idaho, Maine, Montana, South Dakota, Utah, and Washington.

As southern California continued to gain population, that alliance broke down. "By 1920 rural groups were determined to control at least one house of the legislature, while the decline of San Francisco tended to encourage an alliance with other northern groups to prevent southern California majorities in both houses"—"Report of California Study Commission on State Apportionment," 6 (1962).

The respective interests turned to the initiative and placed two measures on the ballot in 1926. The proposal to continue a population base and to establish a reapportionment commission was defeated by a margin of about 3 to 2, while the so-called (but somewhat misnamed) Federal plan, initiated by the California Farm Bureau Federation and supported by other farm groups and by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, was approved about 5 to 4. Since that time Los Angeles County, with more than a third of the population, has had only 1 of 40 senators, the same as the least populous senatorial district, with a 1960 population of 14,294, for a ratio of almost 500 to 1. It is hard to believe that this result promotes "effective majority rule," engineered as it was by a combination of interest groups normally antagonistic to one another, united only in their desire to prevent effective representation of a great urban center. Subsequent events bear out the same pattern. In 1948, 1960, and 1962 initiative measures were qualified for the ballot for the purpose of providing a greater measure of representation in the State senate for the populous counties, although never on a strict population basis. Each was defeated, again largely as a result of the unwillingness of this oddly alined majority to relinquish even in part its selfishly aggrandized power. If the right to vote is an individual right entitled to individual protection, surely the majority should not be allowed thus cavalierly to foreclose effective representation.

Colorado: The initiative for reapportionment purposes was first used in Colorado in 1932 to accomplish a redistricting where the general assembly had failed to perform its duty under the State constitution.

In 1962 the Colorado electorate adopted proposed amendment No. 7 by more than 3 to 2 and defeated proposed amendment No. 8 by more than 2 to 1. The rejected amendment prescribed an apportionment plan pursuant to which seats in both houses of the Colorado Legislature would have been apportioned substantially in accordance with population, while amendment No. 7 provided for apportionment of the house on the basis of population, but essentially maintained the existing apportionment in the senate, which was based on a combination of population and other factors.

To understand the voters' choice it is necessary to examine the immediately preceding apportionment situation and some of the side effects of amendments 7 and 8 apparently unrelated to the population question. The apportionment formula adopted in 1953, which was in effect prior to the 1962 amendment, provided for the election at large of senators and representatives chosen from counties entitled to more than one senator or representative. Thus, for example, the city and county of Denver had 8 senate seats and 17 house seats, while Pueblo County had 2 senators and four representatives. Voters in the more populous counties, particularly members of minority groups (racial, religious, ethnic, or political) commonly felt disadvantaged by the elections at large within their counties. Accordingly, when amendment No. 7 proposed that all seats in both houses should be chosen on a single-member basis, while No. 8 proposed continuance of the objectionable elections at large in the populous counties, it is not surprising that in the minds of many the disadvantages of elections at large outweighed the advantages of enlarged representation. As the Supreme Court observed, "the choice presented to the Colorado electorate, in voting on these two proposed constitutional amendments, was hardly * * * clear cut. * * * Thus, neither of the proposed plans was, in all probability, wholly acceptable to the voters in the populous counties, and the assumption of the court below that the Colorado voters made a definitive choice between two contrasting alternatives and indicated that 'minority process in the senate is what they want' does not appear to be factually justifiable" *Lucas* v. *Colorado General Assembly,* 377 U.S. 713, 732 (1964).

Even if the facts were otherwise, the bare fact of the adoption of a particular apportionment by popular vote should not be regarded as justification for denying protection to the individual right of franchise. In the American constitutional system some matters are submitted to majority rule, while others, usually including matters within the reach of the equal protection prohibition against invidious discrimination, are not subject to majority limitation. "No plebiscite can legalize an unjust discrimination." *Hall* v. *St. Helena Parish School Board,* 197 F. Supp. 649, 659 (E.D. La.), affirmed, 368 U.S. 515 (1962).

Michigan: Until 1952 the Michigan constitution had required representation substantially in accordance with population in both houses, but the requirement had been sadly neglected for many years; and in 1930 the voters rejected an amendment that would have given the secretary of state the duty of reapportionment in accordance with the State constitution if the legislature failed to act promptly after each U.S. decennial census.

In 1952 the Michigan voters approved the so-called balanced legislature plan, which provided for apportionment of representatives in accordance with population, increased senatorial districts from 32 to 34, and froze those 34 districts into the constitution without provision for reapportionment. This reflected the increased tensions between Wayne County, where the proposal was disapproved almost 2 to 1, and the rest of the State where it carried by substantial margains. At the same election in 1952 the voters rejected about 3 to 2 a proposal to guarantee apportionment on a population basis, with mandatory provisions for decennial adjustment. The petition for this proposal had been initiated by the Michigan Committee for Representative Government, supported largely by the CIO. Due to the attitude of Democrats in the upper peninsula, the Democratic Party was divided, and the "balanced legislature" proposal, supported energetically by the Michigan Farm Bureau and Republicans generally, was approved. As in the case of California in 1926 various interest groups in the State joined in what would have been a strange alliance for any purpose except that of putting populous Wayne County at a disadvantage in the State legislature. But that objective at least was effectively accomplished.

Nebraska: Although the initiative has never been used to accomplish reapportionment in Nebraska, the initiative provisions in that State merit comment because their very existence was urged by the defendants in a challenge to existing apportionment as a sufficient protection against malapportionment. In rejecting the argument the Federal district court explained the procedures for use of the initiative, which it said, was not "an adeqaute remedy" to correct existing malapportionment. The proponent of an initiative proposal in Nebraska is required first to clear his petitions with the secretary of state. Then he must secure the signatures of 10 percent of the electors of the State if he is proposing a constitutional amendment, or of 7 percent, if he proposes enactment of a law. Moreover, the signatures must be distribtued to include 5 percent of the electors of each of two-fifths of the 93 counties of the State. The court continued with examples:

"The Nebraska State Bar Association with its over 2,000 members failed recently to secure sufficient signatures to place on the ballot an amendment relating to the judiciary. The court of its own knowledge knows that in 1957 an attempt was made to place on the ballot a proposal to elect rather than appoint the State commissioner of education. Petitions with 58,548 signatures were presented; 56,793 were required; 4,884 were struck by the secretary of state following examination. This reduced the number of qualified signatures below the number required to put the proposal on the ballot.

"To say that such a remedy is adequate for one ordinary voter, and we are here concerned with the rights of an individual voter, for concededly one voter could maintain this action, is being impractical. In addition, the expense of putting an initiated proposal on the ballot in Nebraska is prohibitive for the ordinary voter." *Nebraska League of Municipalities* v. *Marsh,* 209 F. Supp. 189, 192-93 (D. Nebr. 1962).

Oregon: By initiative in 1952 the Oregon constitution was amended to provide enforcement for the appointment provisions after nearly half a century of legislative inaction. The basis of representation, primarily population in both houses, was retained from the original constitution of 1857, and a temporary reapportionment was approved to begin in 1954. The amendment provided for decennial redistricting by the legislature beginning in 1961, subject to direct review in the State supreme court upon the petition of any qualified voter. If the legislature should fail to act by July 1 of the year of the legislative session following the Federal census, the secretary of state was directed to prepare a plan to be filed with the Governor by August 1 of the same year, which would then become law. This is the one example of an initiated change in apportionment formula which satisfied both the equal-population principle and a broadly based combination of interest groups. The initiative campaign was supported by Young Democrats, Young Republicans, the League of Women Voters, and even by agriculture and labor organizations.

Washington: The State legislature did not reapportion either house on its own after 1901, in defiance of State constitutional requirements. Despite the burdensome State procedures for the initiative, necessitating the signatures of 8 percent of the registered voters, the statutory initiative was employed in 1930 and 1956 to overcome the legislative failure to act. Although the measure was approved, the 1956 act illustrates another defect in the statutory initiative as a reapportionment device; for in 1957 the legislature sharply restricted the population base of the initiated measure, and the State supreme court upheld its power to do so (*State ex rel. O'Connell* v. *Meyers,* Wash. 2d 454, 319 P. 2d 828 (1957)).

In 1962 initiative No. 211 sought to redraw the State legislative districts according to 1960 population figures (as required by the State constitution). But it was defeated by the voters, perhaps because they now sensed the futility of their action where the legislature had proved willing to upset a similar vote only 5 years earlier. When the Federal district court was asked to decline jurisdiction of a suit challenging the malapportioned State legislature, the court's answer was, in its words, "concise and direct":

"We have no way of knowing whether the measure was defeated because a majority did not desire reapportionment or whether they didn't approve of the proposed method or whether they didn't understand it (there were numerous other complicated matters on the ballot) or whether the opponents were better organized than the proponents. It makes no difference. The inalienable constitutional right of equal protection cannot be made to depend upon the will of the majority," *Thigpen* v. *Meyers*, 211 F. Supp. 826, 832 (W.D. Wash. 1962).

Experience with State initiative provisions suggests a further cautionary word about the proposed constitutional amendments now under consideration. The Dirksen proposal, for example, would permit use of nonpopulation factors in one house of a bicameral legislature if "such apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue." Experience with the initiative suggests practical difficulties with that proposal in that it would allow a plan submitted to the people, if once approved, to be binding not only in the short run but as well for the indefinite future. With a transient population such as that in the United States and increasing concentration in limited geographical areas, it seems wrong to impose upon the next generation the apportionment decisions of any earlier period. If there is no popular initiative the legislature cannot be forced to present a new proposal to the voters. If there is an initiative, for the reasons already stated, it is likely not to prove a safe vehicle to prevent "frustration of effective majority control."

(At this point Mr. Douglas took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLARK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, William S. White, the well-known syndicated columnist, pays his respects to me in a column published this morning, entitled "Clark's Filibuster: Senate Liberals Called Hypocrites." I should like to pay my respects to Mr. White. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this column may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 2, 1965]

Clark's Filibuster: Senate Liberals Called Hypocrites

(By William S. White)

The gravest domestic issue before Congress, an issue so profound as to dwarf even civil rights, is approaching a showdown in a dense cloud of hypocrisy from the knee-jerk liberals that is quite remarkable for its double talk and double standard.

The professional liberals, led by Senator Joseph Clark, of Pennsylvania, intend to resort to the very weapon they have so endlessly denounced, the filibuster. By this means they are determined to prevent an obvious majority of the Senate even from attempting to save something of a reasonable power balance between the urban and rural and smalltown interests of the country.

The background is this: The Supreme Court has held that the seats in not merely one but both branches of the State legislatures must be allocated hereafter on the basis solely of population figures—and must be even if the people of a State voted otherwise. Historically, most of the districts in the upper legislative houses of the States have, like the U.S. Senate, been apportioned on factors other than mere head counts. The historic purpose has been to give some protection to minority geographic interests. Precisely this is still done in the U.S. Senate, where the smallest State has the same voting power as the largest.

In a word, what is at stake is much of the whole concept of a government of checks and balances, which is the single most distinguishing aspect of the American system.

Strike down this wise weighted balance—which assumes that momentary majorities are not necessarily always right all at once as though their ideas sprang from the forehead of God—and what is left? A Gallup poll democracy, which can completely overrun all the wishes and needs of the less populated areas.

This is instant government, as in instant coffee. It also involves a rejection by the Supreme Court of nearly two centuries of law and custom.

Against this extraordinary ukase by the Court—a ukase which evoked powerful dissent from its fairest members—Senator Everett Dirksen of Illinois had proposed that Congress submit to the States, for their adoption or rejection, a simple constitutional amendment. It would say that the people themselves could decide, notwithstanding the new law made by an unelected Supreme Court, to maintain in their upper houses a weighted allocation of seats—and of power.

Dirksen happens to be the Republican leader of the Senate. But here he acts in a far larger role; and he has many companions, in both parties. He acts in defense of an ancient, and partial, restraint on overwhelming majorities which requires them to prove a case before making it law.

But Clark and his associates—all urban-based and all constant shouters for democratic procedures—are maneuvering to use that nasty thing, the filibuster, to stop the Dirksen bill from being voted on at all by the Senate. For if voted on, they fear, they would lose.

Clark in particular has made a career of attacking not only the filibuster—that is when it is used by southerners, conservatives, or other automatically bad types—but also what he calls the Senate Establishment. In plainer language, the establishment is those Senators of special capacity, of special talent and thus, inevitably, of special influence.

Tirelessly, he has protested a dreadful state of affairs in which a minority can tie up the Senate and so, as the saying goes—and goes and goes—"deny the majority will."

Now, however, the shoe is on the other foot. And with that shoe Clark and company are kicking at the majority will without the least embarrassment. They want the big city people who elect them to have not just that three-fourths of all the real national power they already have, but every last useful ounce of it. The filibuster is a perfectly legitimate weapon. It is, however, arresting to see it appealed to by men who have spent so many years so bitterly condemning its use by others.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall not attempt to emulate Mr. White's ponderous, purple prose. Nor do I take offense at his method of attacking those with whom he disagrees by the use of such epithets as "Hypocrites, knee-jerk liberals, double talk and double standards."

Mr. White, whose views of our American form of government are somewhat colored by his admiration for southern society at the time of the first battle of Bull Run, has long been waging a losing battle against that democratic and compassionate way of life which has been supported by every American President since Calvin Coolidge, and which, in recent years, has also been supported by the Congress of the United States. Now, having lost his fight against civil rights and white supremacy, he turns his attention to reapportionment, a subject on which he has obviously not done his homework.

These are some of the factual errors in Mr. White's column of this morning:

First. Historically, from the beginning of the Republic, seats in State legislatures were not, as Mr. White says, apportioned on factors other than population. They were apportioned on a one-man, one-vote basis. It was the movement of the people to the cities and the suburbs and the failure of the State legislatures to reapportion as required by most State constitutions which caused the imbalance which the Supreme Court has now held to be unconstitutional.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in Reynolds against Sims, laid the ghost of the so-called Federal analogy raised by Mr. White. It has no bearing on the problem of the fair reapportionment of State legislatures.

Second. Thus, to pretend that malapportionment was due "to a historic purpose to give some protection to minority geographic interests" is plainly untrue. It was and is due to the failure of State legislatures to do their legal duty, as required by their own State constitutions.

Third. What is at stake is not "the old concept of a government of checks and balances" as Mr. White contends, but whether a notoriously un-American system of rotten boroughs shall be permitted to continue in violation not only of law as laid down by the Supreme Court, but also of the sound and historic democratic custom of majority rule.

Fourth. Mr. White refers to the Supreme Court decision requiring fair reapportionment on the basis of one man, one vote as "an extraordinary ukase by the Court—a ukase which evoked powerful dissent from its fairest members." Yet, the decision in Reynolds against Sims, the case to which Mr. White must refer, was approved by eight of the nine members of that Court.

Only the conservative justice, John Marshall Harlan, an able man, dissented.

The opinion of the Court by our great Chief Justice Earl Warren is as calm and cultured a statement of sound legal doctrine as was his historic opinion in Brown against the Board of Education, striking down segregation in the public schools—a decision which incidentally also drew the fire of the irascible Mr. White.

Fifth. Nor will reapportionment aid "the big city people," as Mr. White erroneously suggests. Every competent student of the effect of the one-man, one-vote principle knows that reapportionment will shift political power from the inhabitants of the rural areas of the country, now vastly overrepresented, to the suburbs, now vastly underrepresented. Big city representation will scarcely be affected at all.

Sixth. If Mr. White were candid with his readers, he would explain that he is not interested in people, but only in geography, and in an outmoded, obsolete, and essentially sterile concept of our political philosophy.

As the defender of the status quo antebellum—and the "bellum" I refer to is the Civil War—Mr. White is put in the faintly ridiculous position of supporting votes for birds, bears, bees, and flowers while denying the equal protection of the laws to American citizens, in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

Now a word as to the filibuster, an absurdity which lingers on in the Senate with the happy acquiescence of Mr. White, long after it should have been buried 10 fathoms deep.

I have taken an active part for years in trying to persuade my colleagues to eliminate the filibuster and substitute majority rule after reasonable debate.

In this effort I have been happy to serve under the leadership of the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], whom I see on the floor. This procedure of majority rule after reasonable debate is followed in the House of Representatives and the legislatures of all 50 States.

I shall continue these efforts as long as I am a Member of this body, but I play the game in the Senate in accordance with the rules in effect at the time the whistle blows, and I do not intend to let Mr. White or any other defender of an age that is past deter me from using every parliamentary procedure sanctioned by the rules of the Senate to obtain a just result of the important problems of reapportionment.

Mr. White has placed himself in the untenable position of contending that the filibuster is a perfectly legitimate weapon when used to sustain the dwindling power of a small group of men whose political philosophy has been repudiated time after time in recent years by the American people, through their elected Representatives in the Congress; but his view is that the filibuster should never be used by those who have some understanding of the problems of the 2d half of the 20th century.

In other words, Mr. White believes that what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander.

I have no apologies to make for what I have said here this afternoon. I leave it to Mr. White's well-advertised sense of decency whether he in good conscience can say the same.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 3, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 2, 1965:

U.S. ATTORNEY

John H. Reddy, of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 15, 1965.

U.S. MARSHAL

Ellis Maylett, of Utah, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Utah for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 24, 1965.

Cato Ellis, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 15, 1965.

Fred F. Hoh, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 8, 1965.

R. Ben Hosler, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 24, 1965.

Anton T. Skoro, of Idaho, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Idaho for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 8, 1965.

Wesley H. Petrie, of Hawaii, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Hawaii for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 15, 1965.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. Ellis E. Wilhoyt, Jr., Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U.S.C. 661), vice Brig. Gen. Arthur H. Frye, Jr., Corps of Engineers, retired.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Marcus J. Wallace, Jr.
Clayton D. Morrison
William H. Tydings

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Alfred T. Wilcox
John T. Keating
Hugh A. Dayton
Edward L. Weilbacher
Roger R. Roznoski
Richard R. Bock
Alfred W. Harrell
James L. Van Horn
John N. Malsom, Jr.
William A. Swansburg
Thomas V. Fielding, Sr.
Donald P. Billings
Charles W. Judge
Robert D. Weddell
Donald J. Strathern
Jack W. Wroton
Dennis R. Kay
Milford G. Gillam, Jr.
David A. Meadows
David C. Newton
Richard G. Gobble
Robert C. Wright
Harold D. Willis

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–4 subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Baldasari, Nilo J.
Bowman, Glenn P.
Boyce, John H., Jr.
Campbell, William H.
Canfield, Glenn R.
Carryl, James J.
Daniels, William J.
Dignon, Donald H.
Donovan, Peter B.
Doss, Edward H.
Faini, Orlando R.
Gay, William C.
Goldberg, Sol
Gripp, John J.
Hamilton, Frank P., Jr.
Hutchison, Frank
Long, Robert G.
Martz, Donald B.
McGroarty, Edward J.
Molloy, Stephen J.
Mitchell, Hammett
Mitchell, Leonard T.
Murphy, Edward L., Jr.
Murray, Leo J.
Neyer, Arthur E.
Powell, Norman R.
Reustle, Charles H.
Swanson, Joseph L.
Wheeler, Eugene D.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–3 subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Aldrich, Marvin M.
Allen, Raymond S.
Allerdings, Robert D.
Anderson, James C., Jr.
Baker, Oscar M.
Baney, Richard L.
Bishop, John F.
Boesenhofer, Karl, Jr.
Booth, Thomas G.
Bostick, Daniel C.
Boucher, Leonard R.
Briody, John H.
Budacki, Frank J.
Bull, Charles H.
Butler, Kelly, Jr.
Cady, Howard P.
Carr, Robert G.
Casey, Henry F., Jr.
Chandler, Neil B.
Chastain, Edward C.
Clark, Lloyd E.
Coke, Carroll E.
Davenport, William K.
Dolan, John
Dowdey, Jesse C., Jr.
Duncan, Burrell E.
Durland, Ray M.
Edwards, Charles R.
Ellis, John W., Jr.
Enzminger, Kenneth A.
Epoch, Paul
Esenwein, Robert G.
Ferguson, John R.
Fickett, Lawrence E.
Foster, Russell L.
Ganey, Walter F.
Gerbis, Daniel
Giles, Guy M.
Glaab, George W.
Haldeman, Leonard D.
Hamlin, William R.
Hanna, Adrian L.
Hathcock, Milton T.
Hedrich, Charles L.
Henderson, Ronald E.
Hendricks, Thomas B.
Hill, Francis E.
Hogle, Walter D.
Holdridge, Oscar A.
Hyatt, Gerald C.
Isebrands, Arthur B.
Jacobs, Meredith D.
Jensen, Dana C.
Johnson, Roland L.
Jones, John D.
Jones, William W.
Kemske, William M.
Ketterer, Frank R.
Koehler, Merle H.
Kremsner, Carl J.
Kunold, Gerald J.
Lamb, Gerald M.
Largent, Gilbert M.
Layel, Coy L., Jr.
Lee, Willard
Lindholm, Garth F.
Lovett, Owen, Jr.
Luther, Bert S.
Martinez, Roy B.
Mathews, Donald B.
McFarland, Archie P.
McGowen, George F.
McKnight, William N.
McMurrain, Robert L.
Mealor, Leonard D.
Melvin, Van
Meyer, Harry W.
Mitchell, Harold J.
Murphy, William J.
Myers, Paul R., Jr.
Myers, Wayne E.
Neely, Benjamin C.
Neil, Richard C.
Nelson, Warren H.
Oates, Bob, Jr.
Olmsted, Andrew R.
Olmsted, Stanley H.
Orr, Charles P.
Parris, Eddie R.
Perkins, Daniel J.
Peters, Randolph
Pettigrew, Melvin N.
Pierce, Burton M.
Player, Charles E.
Proctor, Marlow
Quicker, Joseph M.
Rathke, John E.
Reber, Forrest C.
Roberts, Alvin E.
Robinson, Paul
Roche, Patrick J.
Salamon, William
Scales, John W., Jr.
Schmidt, Christopher G., Jr.
Shaffer, Charles T.
Shew, Henry C.
Smith, Charles S.
Smith, George D.
Smith, Henry A.
Smith, James E.
Soler, Carlos R.
Specht, Kenneth W.
Stanton, Robert E.
Steadman, Joseph D.
Stiles, Roger L.
Stowers, Bernard L.
Stuart, Edward W.
Tarkington, Dewey A.
Teal, Roy A.
Terry, James
Thomas, Robert C.
Thornton, Terrence E.
Torres, Edward G.
Turetz, Richard
Turner, Jack D.
Ventresca, Arthur
Walker, Willie A.
Wilkes, Roy W.
Wyatt, Robert N.
Yarbrough, Lawrence B.
Youngdahl, Robert J.
Zulick, Paul

Lt. (junior grade) Philip A. Goins, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the Civil Engineer Corps subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Chief warrant officer, W–4

Hixson, James T.
Schiavone, Anthony J.

Chief warrant officer, W–3

Arnett, William C.
Bacha, Michael.
Bailey, Howard L.
Bates, Arthur H.
Bodge, George R.
Brockman, Edward B.
Burns, John C.
Cochrane, James E.
Cote, Roland F.
Durren, Richard L.
Dyer, William J.
Early, George, Jr.
Fortney, Doyle W.
Friel, Joseph A., Jr.
Gonzalez, Ernest G.
Hanson, Francis G.
Hillhouse, William C.
Hohe, Joseph D.
Huffman, James W.
Hughes, John C.
Hutchins, Elmer S., Jr.
Jaggard, Joseph F.
Johnson, Charles J.
Jones, Daniel G.
Jones, Willard E.
Kellner, Edward J.
King, Alfred E.
Kinnie, Phillip B., Jr.
Kitch, Dale
Kliem, Arnold W.
Kraft, James R.
Kulik, Charles A.
Landon, Stewart N.
Leduc, Donald E.
Mann, Arthur M., Jr.
McKinley, Robert N.
Munger, Robert H.
Nadal, Jaime B.

Newton, Killraine, Jr.
Nicholas, Robert H.
Parrish, Solomon A.
Parrish, Wiley B.
Patton, Kuemen B.
Pendleton, Edmund P., Jr.
Powell, Morrison, Jr.
Preston, William J.
Ross, Ralph
Saffell, Charles R.
Scarlett, Bernard
Schardein, Edgar A.
Schneider, James M.
Schuman, Daniel D.
Shultz, Robert C.
Sluss, Charles S.
Terry, Donald L.
Thornley, Robert, Jr.
Vanarstdalen, John P.
Wagner, Charles P., Jr.
Waller, James R.
Westfall, Harvey J.
Whitcomb, Winfield J.
Witte, Ernest R.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abbey, James R.
Abbott, Ernest L., Jr.
Abel, Warren R.
Abercrombie, Michael G.
Adams, Alton L.
Adams, William V., Jr.
Afdahl, Darwin F.
Agamaite, James N.
Albright, Lee H.
Albright, Robert E.
Alexander, James W.
Allee, Donald W.
Althouse, Paul M.
Althouse, Thomas S.
Amb, Dennes L.
Ames, Harry L.
Andersen, Kenneth E.
Anderson, Alan A.
Anderson, Chase D.
Anderson, David J.
Anderson, Philip C.
Anderssen, Arthur H.
Andrews, Michael K.
Archer, David B.
Archer, Edward C.
Argo, John T., Jr.
Argus, Ballard L.
Armstrong, Donald
Arnest, Charles S.
Arnold, Bruce B.
Arnold, David P.
Arnold, Larry J.
Arnold, William K., Jr.
Arthur, John R.
Ash, Robert F.
Ashman, Kenneth E.
Atkinson, Richard N.
Auborn, James J.
Austin, William M.
Ayres, Frank H.
Bacchus, William I.
Bachman, John H., Jr.
Backus, Lee F.
Badger, Fredrick H.
Baehr, John G., Jr.
Bagby, James L., Jr.
Baird, Don W.
Baker, John L.
Baker, John S.
Baker, Ronald C.
Baker, Steven M.
Baldwin, John M., III
Baldwin, Richard C.
Ballard, Robert C.
Balut, Stephen J.
Banford, Alfred J., Jr.
Bansak, Stephen A., Jr.
Barker, Edward P.
Barker, Walter G., Jr.
Barnes, James H.
Barnes, William L.
Barrow, Alston M.
Bartlett, Michael R.
Barton, Robert J.
Baser, Van D.
Basile, John A.
Bass, William M., Jr.
Bateman, Walter E.
Bates, Robert C.
Battin, Harry B.
Batts, Charles J.
Bauer, Maurice D.
Bayer, Charles J.
Bayless, Thomas H.
Beakschi, Peter F. M.
Bealle, William E.
Beamer, William E.
Beard, Errol D.
Beasley, Fenn C.
Beedle, Ralph E.
Beers, Ronald C.
Begley, Jerry N.
Behm, Dennis D.
Bekkedahl, Douglas L.
Belanger, Raymond L.
Bell, Merlin G.
Belton, David C.
Benepe, John W.
Bennett, Robert F.
Bennetts, James H., Jr.
Benton, William C., III
Benzing, Joseph C.
Berg, David A.
Berg, John S.
Berkey, Thomas J.
Berliner, Harold I.
Berry, Michael L.
Bewick, James S.
Bierig, Frederick A.
Biggs, John A.
Billings, Bryce G.
Billue, Sidney K.
Bingham, John H. L.
Bird, Walter R.
Bishop, Bruce B.
Bishop, Richard K.
Bissonnette, Laurence A.
Bivins, Howard V.
Blacksher, James U.
Blair, James N.
Blake, William D.
Blakeley, William R.
Blank, Gilbert C.
Blegstad, Gary C.
Blesch, Jerry M.
Blouch, John W.
Boggess, Randolph C.
Bolton, John N.
Boman, Kirk S.
Bond, William C.
Bonds, John B.
Boone, George J.
Boorda, Jermy M.
Borsic, James P.
Boss, Ronald A.
Bostwick, Stephen H.
Bourland, David L.
Bourque, Eugene B.
Bove, Roger G.
Bowers, Charles H.
Bowers, Fred F.
Boyd, John T.
Bradbury, Robert B.
Bradt, Leonard D., Jr.
Brandon, Herman T.
Brandt, Dale E.
Branish, Ronald L.
Brems, Richard A.
Brennan, William J.
Brett, James R.
Brewer, Harold L.
Brickett, John F.
Brink, James A.
Brinkman, Charles B.
Brock, Lynn S.
Brockett, William A., Jr.
Brockway, David M., Jr.
Brodehl, Richard B.
Bronson, Marshall W.
Brook, Harvey J.
Brooks, Edward J.
Brooks, Lynn A.
Brown, Charles M., Jr.
Brown, David C.
Brown, Edward D., Jr.
Brown, George E., Jr.
Brown, Jay S.
Brown, Joseph R.
Brown, Noel W.
Broz, Joseph P.
Bruins, Berend D.
Brunelle, William T.
Bryner, John E.
Buche, John A.
Buchholz, Brian R.
Bulharowski, John F.
Bunger, Robert H.
Burdick, Gary R.
Burges, Rufus T., Jr.
Burke, Bruce
Burke, Charles R.
Burke, Gary L.
Burkhart, Paul T., Jr.
Burkons, Hugh A.
Burr, Thomas S.
Burritt, James G.
Burrow, James B., Jr.
Burrows, John S. III
Bushore, Arthur W.
Butler, Dennis E.
Butler, Edward A.
Butler, John H.
Byers, John A.
Byrne, Robert M.
Cahill, Allen L.
Caldwell, Benjamin E.
Callahan, Paul L.
Calligan, Christopher C.
Calvert, Robert E.
Camp, Don L.
Camp, Peter W.
Camp, Richard A.
Campbell, Charles E.
Campbell, Edward L.
Canady, Paul A.
Canham, Lester F., Jr.
Capie, Donald J.
Carlson, Douglas L.
Carlson, John A.
Carlson, Paul E.
Carpenter, Allan R.
Carrico, James E.
Carroll, Terrence O.
Carter, Gordon H.
Carter, Owen T.
Carter, Robert L.
Carter, William M.
Cashin, Joseph W., Jr.
Cerrone, George J., Jr.
Chace, Alden B., Jr.
Chadwick, Stephen K.
Challender, Jack L.
Chamberlin, Dennis R.
Chambers, Robert H.
Champion, Robert H.
Chapman, John R.
Chapman, Robert D.
Chappell, Richard L.
Charles, David M.
Chasteen, Robert W.
Chauncey, Gregory A.
Chesbrough, Geoffrey L.
Chesley, Howard S.
Chesson, Ralph R., Jr.
Chinnes, Bennie A.
Christen, Samuel E.
Christensen, George A.
Christensen, Edward L.
Christianson, Daniel T.
Church, James A.
Cisler, Thomas M.
Clancy, Robert S.
Clarey, Stephen S.
Clark, Colin M.
Clark, Daniel W.
Clark, David G.
Clark, Jerry A.
Clark, Vady R.
Clarke, Carl W.
Clarke, Edward J.
Clarke, Wayne C.
Claypool, Allan J.
Cleary, Francis P.
Cleater, John F.
Clemenger, John W.
Clement, "A" Michel
Clemetsen, Norman J.
Clemmer, Everett D.
Clendenin, James E.
Cliff, William R.
Clifford, Robert M.
Clugston, Joe E.
Cochran, John R., Jr.
Cohen, Steven R.
Cole, Charles E.
Cole, Steven C.
Coleman, Robert H.
Coleman, William E.
Collins, Charles D.
Collins, Edward G.
Collins, Edward E.
Collins, Johnny W., Jr.
Colucci, Anthony R.
Colwell, Charles R.
Comfort, Richard L.
Commins, William J.
Condon, Daniel J., III
Connor, John C.
Conrey, Thomas R.
Conte, John C.
Conway, Frank M., III
Cook, Larry E.
Coon, David W.
Coopersmith, James M.
Copley, David R.
Corbin, Floyd E.
Corcoran, Joseph F.
Cornell, Thomas R.
Cornforth, Clarence M.
Costello, Charles F., Jr.
Cota, Phillip C.
Cotton, Douglas L.
Coupe, Jay, Jr.
Covey, Robert W.
Covington, William E., III
Cowan, Charles B.
Cowart, John M.
Cox, Gary L.
Cox, John H.
Cox, Virgil G.
Craddock, John R.
Craggs, John R.
Crawford, David C.
Crawford, Harry E.
Creecy, Carson H., Jr.
Creighton, Charles B.
Crellin, Ronald E.
Creps, Stephen G.
Croll, Larry R.
Crombie, Kenneth M.
Crooks, Stephen C.
Cross, William D.
Crossman, Walter A.
Crouch, John M., Jr.
Crowhurst, Henry D.
Crowley, Edward J.
Crumly, Jerry M.
Crump, Edward W.
Curran, Daniel A.
Curtis, Lynn H.
Curtis, Richard A.
Cybul, Harvey J.
Dahl, Dennis K.
Dale, Frederic M.
Daleo, Paula
Dalton, Gerald H.
Daniels, James E.
Davis, Alton T.
Davis, Dock H.
Davis, Edward A.
Davis, George B.
Davis, James D.
Davis, Jay N.
Davis, Martin D.
Davis, Richard G.
Davis, Richard C.
Dawson, William D.
Dean, David M., Jr.
Debus, Peter J.
Decker, Stephen S.
Declerco, Keith L.
Degavre, Robert C. O.
Delesie, James C.
Delgado, Josue J.
Delp, Alan F.
Delury, Michael E.
Dempewolf, Donald G.
Demshar, Carl W.
Dennis, Michael R.
Dennis, William E.
Denson, Stephen L.
Deputy, Robert W.
Dereemer, William S.
Desmond, Dennis J., Jr.
Detinger, Mark
Devoe, George M., Jr.
Dias, Gerald F.
Dickson, Frank C., II
Dickson, Robert E.
Diedenhofen, John W., Jr.
Diedrich, Gerald B.
Diehl, Robert W. J.
Dietrich, William V.
Diget, Donald L.
Dillard, Odell G.
Dimotta, Emil C., Jr.
Dinunzio, Henry V., Jr.
Ditchey, Robert L.
Ditmore, George W., II
Dodd, James L.
Dodson, Durrett B.
Dollard, John A.
Dommers, Richard W.
Donahue, James J.
Donahue, James W.
Donaldson, William J.
Donovan, William F.
Dorman, Craig E.
Doty, Wells B.
Dougherty, Robert J.
Dowling, Edgar J., Jr.
Doyle, Joseph L.
Doyle, Thomas F., Jr.
Dreifke, Hilmer W.
Dressel, Robert H.
Droste, James B.
Dubs, Theodore B.
Duckforth, Stephen M.
Duffy, Denis C., Jr.
Dugan, John J., Jr.
Dukat, Frank
Dukes, Gary R.
Duncan, Duane S., Jr.
Dunlap, Calvin R., III.
Dunn, Joseph E.
Dunstan, Richard A.
Dunton, Lewis W., III.
Dupee, David V.
Durbin, Larry A.
Durham, Dan W.
Eastman, Peter R.
Eastwood, Thomas I., III.
Eaton, Gareth R.
Edleson, Stuart K., Jr.
Edmonson, Norman V., Jr.
Efird, William A.
Egg, William C.
Eldred, William A.
Eller, John C.
Ellern, James B.
Elliot, Bruce
Elliott, Ronnie R.
Ellis, John M., III.
Ellis, John R.
Emanuel, Richard C.
Emerson, Norman P.
Engelking, James F.
English, David C.
Eppinger, John P.
Epstein, Joseph L.
Ericson, Jon K.
Estell, William A., Jr.
Etter, Charles E.
Evans, Robert B.
Everett, Robert F.
Eversole, Delmar
Ewert, Lawrence E.
Ewing, Donald R.
Fachinger, Joseph A.
Fagan, Cornelius J.
Fairbanks, Richard M., III
Fant, Robert S., Jr.
Farber, Martin J.
Fard, Jackie R.
Farrell, Edward R.
Farrell, Gerard D.
Farris, Ronald M.
Feeney, Harry J., III
Felton, Robert W.
Fentress, Clydus M.
Ferguson, Donald R.
Ferguson, Jerry E.
Ferrell, John L.
Ferriter, Nicholas M.
Fields, David D.
Fink, Carl M.
Fischer, Ernest C.
Fish, Donald E.
Fisher, Adam, Jr.
Fisher, Arthur W., III
Fisher, Marty R.
Fitch, Sanford
Fitrell, Stuart J.
Fitzgerald, George M.
Fitzgerald, John A.
Fitzgerald, Richard N.
Fleming, Myron T., Jr.
Fletcher, Robert A.
Fletcher, William D., III
Flintoft, Richard A.
Flock, Carl B.
Flynn, Richard P.
Flynn, William K.
Folsom, John H.
Fontenot, Nolan J.
Foody, Richard R.
Forgione, Ralph
Forrest, Paul J.
Fort, John H.
Forte, Frederick F.
Forys, Michael G.
Fossum, Erling P.
Foster, John W.
Foster, Michael L.
Fournie, Thomas A.
Fowler, Thomas A.
Fowlkes, Paul D.
Foyle, Robert C.
Francis, Stephen T.
Francis, Wayne H.
Frank, Allen J.
Franke, Donald K.
Frederick, Ronald E.
Freeman, James W., Jr.
French, Thomas P., Jr.
Frewing, John L.
Frick, Dean E.
Frick, Frederick M.
Fritz, Jerome C.
Frizzell, George E.
Froehlich, Edward W., Jr.
Fryer, Charles W.
Fuller, George C.

Fuller, James D.
Fuller, John P.
Fullerton, John D.
Fulton, Stephen H.
Fulton, William J.
Fulton, William L., II
Funk, Ronald C.
Futch, George W.
Gaffney, Frank J.
Gaines, William A.
Galanti, Paul E.
Galbraith, Joseph L.
Gallaher, Dale M.
Gamboa, Jose C.
Ganley, Richard E.
Gann, James W., Jr.
Gantz, Bruce T.
Garlick, Richard E.
Garmon, Gerald S.
Garns, Keith M.
Garoutte, Lawrence H.
Garrett, Jerry D.
Garrison, Carl D.
Garrison, Stephen A.
Gass, Alan R.
Gaukroger, James G.
Gaul, James H.
Gaulden, James C., Jr.
Gauvin, William A.
Gay, George R.
Gaynor, Cornelius W.
Gee, George N.
Gentry, Donald G.
Gerdts, Richard J.
Gerhardt, Charles L.
Ghirardi, Lawrence F.
Giles, Robert E.
Gill, Gary E.
Gingras, Peter S.
Ginieczki, Richard F.
Gladding, George S.
Glasier, Peter K.
Glenn, Walter L., Jr.
Glover, Jimmy N.
Glover, William F. H.
Gluck, John M.
Godek, Leonard S.
Goebel, David M.
Goebel, Louis E.
Goettel, Bruce D.
Gold, Bennett A.
Goldman, Dan E., Jr.
Goldsborough, Martin W.
Golwas, Peter G., Jr.
Gomez, Francis A.
Gonzalez, Charles F., III
Good, Hoyt R.
Goodman, Grayson A.
Goodness, Louis
Goodrich, James M.
Goodwin, James H.
Googins, Bruce R.
Gordon, Donald P.
Gordon, Gray B.
Gordon, Richard S.
Goudy, Ronald C.
Gower, Roger E.
Graf, Karl R.
Grafton, Patrick S.
Graham, Edward M.
Graham, Homer H., Jr.
Graham, John E., Jr.
Graham, Walter H.
Granneman, Gary A.
Grant, Louis R., II
Gray, Myron P.
Gray, Victor S., Jr.
Green, Norman R., Jr.
Greene, Patrick E.
Greenman, Robert P.
Gregory, Carl W.
Griffin, Charles M.
Griffin, Charles D., Jr.
Griffin, Harold C., Jr.
Griffiths, David J.
Grigg, Lewis W.
Griggs, Stanley D.
Grinstead, Darrel J.
Grondahl, Clayton M.
Grzymala, Thomas C.
Guehring, Paul N.
Gunlock, Thomas R.
Gutteron, William L.
Guyon, Robert J.
Gwadz, Robert W.
Habermann, Richard C.
Haddick, John R.
Hall, James B.
Hamilton, Jack E.
Hamilton, Ross M.
Hamly, Frederick N.
Hammer, John L., III
Handberry, John E.
Hanlein, Jon K.
Hanley, John J., Jr.
Hanley, Michael D.
Hansen, Laurence R.
Hanson, Michael K.
Hanzel, Joseph A., Jr.
Harbour, George A., III
Hardekopf, Robert A.
Hardy, James C. C.
Hardy, Richard E.
Hargrett, Gregor J.
Harkin, Thomas R.
Harlow, James H. V.
Harms, Raymond J.
Harris, Leigh
Harris, Robert H.
Hart, Larry M.
Hart, Patrick V.
Hartleroad, Bobby L.
Hartman, Charles W., II
Hartman, Michael A.
Hartman, Robert C.
Harvey, Paul R.
Harvey, William C.
Haskins, John B.
Haskins, Toner C., Jr.
Hastings, Richard W.
Hatfield, Philip N.
Hatheway, Arthur L.
Haugen, Ronald G.
Havey, Brian J.
Hayes, Edward D.
Hayes, Gilbert F.
Hayes, Richard J.
Hays, George E., Jr.
Heck, David W.
Heffernan, Thomas J.
Heinzelman, David B.
Helbig, Raymond A.
Helweg, Arthur W.
Henderson, Willie B., Jr.
Henderson, Phillip C.
Hendrick, William S.
Hendricks, John N.
Henley, Richardson L., Jr.
Henry, Eugene S.
Henry, Russell J.
Herbert, Thomas L.
Herbert, William G.
Hering, Frederic S.
Herman, Paul G.
Hermann, Kermyn J.
Herriott, Jack A.
Hertzfeldt, Daniel R.
Hess, Norman B.
Hewett, Harvey J., Jr.
Hewitt, John F.
Hewlett, Harold E.
Hiatt, Dennis R.
Hickam, Aubrey W., Jr.
Hickox, Oscar J., Jr.
Hicks, Gerald F.
Hicks, Robert L.
Hicks, William L.
Hiebert, Eldon A.
Hill, William G.
Hinchman, Michael H.
Hinkle, John C.
Hitchborn, James B.
Hitchcock, Thomas K.
Hoag, Stephen E.
Hobson, Kenneth C.
Hoffman, David W.
Hoffman, William G.
Hoffman, William S.
Hogg, George W.
Hollister, William C.
Holt, Philip N.
Holt, Robert B.
Homer, James J.
Horner, Donald W.
Horst, Carl H.
Horton, Charles O.
Horton, Jerry D.
Horvath, Frank J.
Howe, Henry F.
Howell, Robert L.
Huchthausen, Peter A.
Hughes, Faust F., Jr.
Hughes, Frank W.
Hughes, James
Hughes, Kirk A.
Hughes, Michael B.
Hughes, William A.
Huling, John M., Jr.
Hunt, Paul Delton, Jr.
Hunt, Paul Dean
Hunter, John R.
Huntington, Solomon P.
Hurd, Michael F.
Hurley, Robert F., Jr.
Hurst, Cecil R., Jr.
Hurst, Edwin K., II
Hurst, Paul D.
Hutchinson, David V.
Huth, Donald W.
Hyde, Albert R.
Hyland, John J., III
Hymel, Philip J.
Ingram, Alan F.
Ingram, Charles R.
Ingram, Isom I.
Ingram, William H., Jr.
Inskeep, George W.
Irwin, Thomas C.
Ise, William H.
Ison, William B., Jr
Jackle, Rudolph E.
Jackson, James B.
Jackson, Jon H.
Jamieson, Jerry G.
Jankowsky, Alexandre
Jeffers, Paul R.
Jeffords, Douglass C.
Jenkins, Jon M.
Jenkins, Tim M.
Jenks, Jack N.
Jerger, Allan D.
Jetton, James R., Jr.
Jiannas, John S. E.
John, Joseph R.
Johnson, Bradley
Johnson, David K.
Johnson, Edwin R.
Johnson, John P. A.
Johnson, John L.
Johnson, Kenneth H.
Johnson, Philip H.
Johnson, Robert O.
Johnson, Terry L.
Johnston, James R.
Johnston, Thomas F.
Johnston, Wayne G.
Johnstone, Robert M., Jr.
Jones, David F.
Jones, James L.
Jones, Richard A.
Jones, Robert E.
Jones, Thomas L.
Jones, William D.
Jordan, George L.
Jordan, James F.
Jordan, William M.
Judge, Charles V., II
Jurden, Wilbur L., Jr.
Kalleres, Michael P.
Kallus, Ernest R.
Kammerdeiner, Roger N.
Kane, Charles R.
Kane, Michael L.
Kasberg, Walter B.
Kasdorf, Clifford P.
Kay, Norman B.
Keeling, Robert A.
Keenan, Thomas D.
Kees, John C.
Kehl, Stephen L.
Kehrli, Lynn C.
Keim, Edward F.
Keiski, Laurie P.
Keithley, Charles L., Jr.
Keleher, John A.
Keller, Douglas G.
Kelley, Richard A.
Kelly, John P.
Kemp, Roger W., Jr.
Kendrigan, James R.
Kennedy, John C.
Kennedy, John R.
Kennedy, Robert S.
Kennelly, Robert J., Jr.
Kenny, John J., Jr.
Kerachsky, Harvey S.
Kerwin, Robert F.
Kesel, Philip G.
Kester, Patrick J.
Ketner, Barry R.
Kidd, George N.
Kiess, Dean W.
Kihlstrand, Dennis E.
Kile, Thomas J.
Kilgore, Michael W.
Kimball, Darrell H.
Kime, Steve F.
Kindley, William R.
King, Donald M.
King, John B.
Kinger, Joseph M.
Kinnard, James L.
Kinsley, Dudley J.
Kirkland, Herbert D., III
Kirvan, William H., Jr.
Kisiel, Roger W.
Kislack, Arthur
Kissick, Ralph L.
Klinger, Robert L.
Kleyn, Frederick G., III
Klintworth, Philip G.
Klippert, Richard H., Jr.
Klukas, Herbert A.
Knapp, William H.
Knight, Windall R.
Knochel, Charles A.
Knotts, Stanley R., Jr.
Knubel, John A., Jr.
Kobar, Michael L.
Koch, James P.
Koch, Robert W.
Koeber, Charles J.
Koenig, Rodney C.
Kohankie, Robert W., II
Koss, Russell S.
Kotchka, Jerry A.
Kramer, Lawrence J.
Kramer, Robert L.
Kraus, Richard J.
Kreutzmann, Kenneth P.
Krommenhoek, Jeffrey M.
Krueger, Dan W.
Kruger, Richard W.
Kunsky, David A.
Kuntz, Robert P.
Kushins, Allan M.
Labatt, Walter B.
Labyak, Peter S.
Lagrandeur, Larry B.
Laine, Lawrence L.
Laity, Walter W.
Lally, Robert F., Jr.
Lamb, John P.
Lamoureaux, Frederick H.
Lamasters, Edward R.
Landeck, Albert W.
Laplante, John B.
Larisch, Erich W., Jr.
Larocque, David F.
Larsen, Jerome E.
Lasiter, Elvie D.
Lastaiti, Ronald S.
Latham, Peter R.
Lattimer, George W.
Laws, Richard L.
Lawson, Urbie A.
Leatherman, John B., Jr.
Lecroy, Floyd G.
Lee, Charles R.
Lee, Joe R.
Lee, Richard C.
Lee, Richard N.
Legrande, Lawrence C.
Lemons, Doyle R.
Lencses, David B.
Leone, Anthony D.
Letourneau, Charles E.
Lepak, Ronald R.
Letteney, Lawrence K.
Levangie, James C.
Leventis, Alexander A.
Levings, William H., III
Lewis, Ernest L.
Lewis, Frederick L.
Lewis, Oscar Y., Jr.
Lewis, Robert P.
Lewis, Robert J.
Lewis, Stanley T.
Lewis, Thomas A.
Lhuillier, Robert L.
Liacopoulos, Vanpeter
Lieb, Edward J.
Lieblein, William H.
Life, Richard A.
Light, Henry D.
Lindsay, James H., Jr.
Lingley, Gordon, S.
Lison, Stephen A.
Little, Edwards S.
Livingston, William C.
Locher, Oliver G.
Lockhart, Theodore C.
Lockwood, Stuart M.
Lodge, Charles D.
Lodge, Raymond F.
Lojko, Boley A.
Lombardo, Stephen W.
Longfellow, Dennis R.
Lorentzen, Gary C.
Lorenzen, Mylan W.
Lorino, William J.
Losoya, Rodolfo
Lotz, Robert
Lucas, James D., Jr.
Lucey, John F.
Luker, Richard A.
Lundquist, Dallas E.
Lundquist, Donald G.
Lynch, Charles W.
Lynch, Floyce M.
Lynch, James R.
Lynch, Michael G.
Lytle Vincent A.
MacDonald, William R
MacGregor, John A.
MacIsaac, Peter C.
Mackinnon, Ranald R.
Maddox, George N.
Madison, Russell L.
Madison, Theodore J.
Magretta, William R.
Magruder, Peyton M., Jr.
Mahannah, Stephen L.
Maheu, John C.
Majeski, Robert A.
Malave, Pedro M.
Maley, Michael D.
Mallen, Frank H.
Malott, James S.
Maness, Anthony R.
Manker, Myron W.
Mann, Edward B., Jr.
Manno, Samuel F.
Mansell, Philip L.
Mansfield, Richard H.
Mantei, Thomas J.
March, Randall A.
Margosian, Paul M.
Marik, Rudolph F.
Marrical, Anthony R.
Marsden, Leo J.
Marsh, Alan G.
Marshall, Frank G., III
Marshall, James A.
Martin, Charles B.
Martin, Edward F., III
Martin, Michael J.
Martin, Walter P.
Martineau, Richard G.
Marvin, Robert C.
Mason, Henry B.
Massanari, Gerald J.
Massey, Scott S., Jr.
Masterson, Roy C.
Mathiowetz, Donald R.
Matthews, Dean E.
Matthews, John G.
Maurer, John H., Jr.
Maxey, Fred, Jr.
Maxson, Robert J.
Mayer, Luke F., Jr.
Mayfield, David M.
McArthur, Ronald E.
McBride, Michael A.
McCammon, Peter L.
McCarthy, John J., Jr.
McCarthy, Robert M.
McCasland, James S.
McCormick, James T.
McCormick, John V.
McCormick, William M.
McCray, Donald
McCray, Ronald E.
McCrosky, Dan S.
McCullough, Donald C.
McCullough, William L.
McDaniel, Vernon D.
McDonald, James A.
McDonald, Thomas A.
McDougal, Rodney L.
McElroy, James H., Jr.
McGann, Thomas P., Jr.
McGill, Bruce K.
McGlone, Hugh F., Jr.
McGrath, John M.
McGuire, Thomas P.
McHugh, Richard G.
McIsaac, William E., Jr.
McKean, Scott H.
McKechnie, Thomas W.
McKenna, John F.
McLean, Robert
McNeill, Corbi A., Jr.
McNeill, Donald R.
McPhail, Eugene B.
McQuarrie, Robert K.
McRae, David A.
McWhinney, Robert T., Jr.
McWhite, Peter B.
Mead, Robert M.
Meakim, John T.
Mears, Edward I.
Meckler, Jacob M.
Medaglia, Cornelius P.
Meenen, Fred M.
Melendy, David R.
Mendicino, John S.
Mengden, Joseph D.
Mercer, Thomas A.
Merchant, Steven L.
Meredith, Kenneth A.
Meredith, William C., III
Merkey, Russell K.

Merkle, James A.
Merrill, Lawrence H.
Meskel, Thomas J.
Messer, James S.
Messikomer, Edwin E.
Mettler, James H.
Meyer, Frank D.
Meyer, Frederick C., Jr.
Meyer, Victor A.
Michels, Bruce E.
Mikolajczyk, Ronald J.
Milkowski, Gerald C.
Millard, John W.
Miller, Roy E.
Miller, Timothy L.
Miller, William C.
Mills, Robert C.
Minard, Duane E., III
Mitchell, Charles R.
Mitchell, Robert L.
Modlin, Frank W.
Moessner, Paul C.
Moffatt, Robert B.
Monaghan, Brian D.
Monash, Richard F.
Monell, Joel C.
Monroe, Harry, III
Moore, Robert H.
Moore, Warwick B.
Morawey, Michael R.
More, Alan R.
Morefield, Martha R.C.
Morgan, Donald H.
Morgan, James P.
Moritz, Carl A., Jr.
Moritz, Charles J.
Morler, Edward E.
Moroney, Joseph M.
Morrison, Michael F.
Morrison, Vance H.
Morse, William R.
Mosser, Joel E.
Motteler, Terry R.
Mountjoy, J. L.
Muehlhauser, Joel W.
Mullen, Graham C.
Mullins, David L.
Munger, Jerry W.
Munkasy, Warren C.
Murphy, Jerome T.
Murphy, Thomas F.
Murray, Thomas E.
Murray, William L.
Mustin, Thomas M.
Myers, Collin K.
Myers, Fraser R.
Nair, Sterling E., Jr.
Nakayama, Homer S.
Nardone, Carl F.
Nash, Michael A.
Natter, John T.
Neal, John S.
Nee, David M.
Nelson, Denton J. C.
Nelson, Geoffrey A.
Nelson, Leonard M.
Nelson, Peter J.
Nerup, Robert K.
Neuman, Dennis E.
Newcomb, William L.
Newell, Michael T.
Newkirk, Roger S.
Newton, Frank H., III
Newton, Roy I.
Nichols, Charles L.
Nichols, Richard E., Jr.
Nickerson, Guy D.
Nicklas, Charles
Niederstadt, Robert G.
Njus, Ingmar J.
Nolan, Michael K.
Norman Warren A., Jr.
North, Wayne K.
Norton, Charles K., Jr.
Norton, Jack T., Jr.
Novak, Edward M.
Novelline, Joseph A., Jr.
Nowell, Herbert T.
Nutt, Stephen D.
Nystrom, Stephen C.
Oakes, Charles W.
Oates, Anthony B.
Obermeyer, Boyd D.
O'Brien, Joseph R.
O'Brien, Martin J.
O'Brien, William G.
O'Connell, Douglas A.
O'Connell, Gerald D.
O'Connell, Robert L.
O'Connor, Kip
O'Connor, Michael B., Jr.
O'Connor, Thomas F., II
O'Dell, Peter G.
O'Donnell, Francis X.
O'Donnell, William H.
Oertel, "E" James
Okeson, James C.
Oliver, Raymond A.
Olsen, George D.
Olsen, Glenn R.
Olsen, James R.
Olson, Donald W.
Olson, Harvey D.
Olson, Jerrold E.
Olson, Phillip R.
Opeka, John F.
Orr, John D.
Orriss, David A.
Osborn, Geoffrey H.
Osterman, Richard J.
Otto, Loren H.
Overstreet, John W., Jr.
Owen, Robert H.
Owen, Thomas J.
Owens, William A.
Oxman, David C.
Packman, Robert I.
Palma, Richard J.
Palmer, James M.
Palmer, Robert E.
Pancoast, Patrick A.
Panian, John M.
Paquin, James E.
Parker, William C., Jr.
Parker, William L.
Parrett, David P.
Parsons, William D.
Partin, Benjamin R.
Partrick, Robert E.
Pastore, Michael J.
Patten, Michael J.
Payne, Edwin F.
Payne, John A.
Pearce, James W.
Pearson, Dale Q.
Pedretti, Donald F.
Pelton, Frank E., III
Pennington, Richard A.
Penny, Douglas C.
Perez, Manuel J., Jr.
Perkins, Ernest D., II
Perry, Philip W.
Peters, Joseph P.
Peterson, David A., Jr.
Peterson, Dennis W.
Peterson, Gary G.
Peterson, Julius E.
Peterson, Myron J.
Peterson, Ralph D.
Pfingstag, William C.
Pfister, William C.
Phayre, Martin G.
Phillips, George B., Jr.
Phillips, Jerry A.
Phillips, John B.
Phillips, Joseph L.
Phoebus, Charles R.
Pickett, Larry J.
Pierce, Sidney R.
Pierson, Michael A.
Pitz, Paul B.
Pitzer, Ronald T.
Plath, Richard N.
Pless, Michael T.
Plotz, Steven C.
Plourde, Jean E.
Poe, John R.
Pontius, Duane H.
Pooser, James E.
Popp, Arvel J.
Porter, Philip E.
Pozzi, Robert J.
Pratt, Thomas R.
Predtechenskis, Victor
Preston, William G.
Procopio, Joseph G.
Pryzby, Stanley J.
Puariea, Donald H.
Puchtler, Wolfgang H. G.
Purdy, Alan M.
Queen, Robert A.
Raggett, Michael M.
Rainer, Michael A.
Ramsdell, James V., Jr.
Ramsey, Roger C.
Rapp, Michael D.
Rappe, Gerald C.
Rathjen, Arthur D.
Rau, Morton D.
Rawlings , David C.
Rawls, Hugh M., Jr.
Reber, Peter M.
Reed, Gary A.
Regan, John T.
Reiche, John C.
Reiling, Victor G., Jr.
Reilly, Edward L.
Reilly, John R.
Reilly, Thomas M.
Reistetter, Emery A.
Reynolds, Franklin E.
Rhea, Kennedy J.
Rhodes, Donald W.
Rhodes, James M., Jr.
Rich, Harry E.
Rich, James E.
Rich, Thomas F.
Richarde, Henry M., Jr.
Richardson, Earnest W.
Riddell, Richard A.
Ridgely, Philip J.
Riemenschneider, Bert R.
Riess, Joseph R., Jr.
Rifer, Vernon L.
Rising, Lynn M.
Ristow, John D.
Ritt, Dayton W.
Ritter, John E.
Roach, John A.
Robb, Jeffrey D.
Robbins, David L.
Robertson, George W.
Robson, John E.
Rogas, Edward, Jr.
Roman, Gordon G.
Ronka, Paul A.
Rood, Charles F.
Roode, Peter G.
Roper, James E.
Rosenbach, Bernard L.
Rosenbach, Bernard H.
Roski, Jeffrey H.
Ross, James A.
Rosser, Theodore N., Jr.
Rossi, Joseph L.
Rosson, Vernon L.
Rotsch, Herman D.
Routh, Eugene C.
Rowson, Joseph P.
Roy, Bill
Royalty, Kenneth M.
Rue, Thomas A.
Ruff, John C.
Ruffin, James T.
Ruland, William J.
Ruliffson, James H.
Rumsey, Peter A.
Rupprecht, Robert P.
Russell, Peter F.
Rutherford, Paul F.
Ryland, Robert B.
Sadler, John W.
Sagerian, Ara
Salyards, Gregory M.
Samuelson, Roland W.
Sand, James C.
Santi, Ralph L.
Sapp, Neil C.
Sargeant, Harry, Jr.
Saunders, Phillip G.
Saxon, Ross E.
Saxton, Harry J.
Scanlon, Jerome B.
Schaag, Frank L.
Schaefer, Lyle H.
Schatz, Arthur D.
Schaus, Richard H.
Schenck, William H.
Scherwitzki, Wilhelm G.
Schetter, Harry W.
Schiffer, John R., Jr.
Schiffman, Marvin C.
Schiller, Frederick C.
Schilling, Gerald W.
Schlecht, Vernon E.
Schlegel, James D., II
Schmeling Leslie L.
Schmidt, Charles T.
Schmidt, Clemens E.
Schmitz, Marion C.
Schneider, Charles R.
Schrade, Richard D. C.
Schrader, John Y., Jr.
Schreiber, Jerry B.
Schroeder, Arthur F., Jr.
Schroller, Kermit W., Jr.
Schropp, John W.
Schubert, Carl E.
Schuller, David D.
Schunk, Stephanie R. J.
Schwalbert, James G.
Schwartz, Henry W.
Schwartz, William T.
Schweizer, George W.
Scopa, Robert J.
Scott, Joseph W.
Searcy, Millard J., Jr.
Seelig, Martin A.
Seiberling, Ronald K.
Senn, Laurence E.
Settlemyer, Charles T., III
Severin, Lawrence R.
Shafer, Jerry P.
Shafer, Jimmie F.
Sharp, Clay L., Jr.
Shaw, Joseph W., Jr.
Sheafer, Edward D., Jr.
Sheffield, George A., Jr.
Sheldon, William G.
Shelton, Gene B.
Sherman, James L.
Shields, Donald K.
Short, Jerome H.
Short, Travis E.
Shriver, James A.
Shuman, Arnold B.
Sieglaff, Peter M.
Siemer, John R.
Silver, Dwight E.
Simmons, Richard L.
Simpson, Stephen T.
Singer, Don A.
Singer, Edward A., Jr.
Siren, William H.
Sisk, Raymond M., Jr.
Sloan, Deward V., Jr.
Sloat, James W., Jr.
Smart, Ronald E.
Smith, Arthur W., Jr.
Smith, Bradford D.
Smith, Dan H.
Smith, David L.
Smith, Franklin J., III
Smith, Fred W.
Smith, Leighton W., Jr.
Smith, Michael O.
Smith, Roger W.
Smith, William R. H.
Snow, Franklin D.
Synder, Christian R.
Snyder, George A.
Sobierski, Jan M.
Sofman, Peter D.
Soluri, Elroy A.
Sontheimer, Robert M.
Sortwell, Fred N.
Spaans, David N.
Spane, Robert J.
Spofford, Barry A.
Sprague, Herbert O.
Sprague, William E.
Springer, Charles H. T.
Standish, John A.
Stanford, Harold M.
Steckman, David L.
Steele, Billie O.
Steele, Daniel L.
Steele, Thomas A., III
Steinkruger, Frederick J.
Stender, Charles F.
Stender, Richard H.
Stender, Russell M.
Stephens, David A.
Stephenson, William W., II
Stere, David H.
Sterner, George R.
Sternfels, Urvan R.
Stevens, Harry J., III
Stevens, John B.
Stevens, Paul L.
Stevens, Philip C.
Stewart, Jake W., Jr.
Stewart, John C.
Stiehr, Peter E.
Stilwell, William C.
Stivers, Robert L.
St. John, James B., Jr.
Stolgitis, William C.
Stoltman, Richard H.
Stone, Arthur W.
Stone, Thomas E.
Stonelake, Henry T.
Stoorza, Edwin L., Jr.
Story, William F.
Stotsenburg, John C.
Stouder, Nial E.
Strand, Richard C.
Stratton, Craig A.
Strickland, James D., Jr.
Stringer, Thomas C., Jr.
Stubbe, Robert P.
Stubbs, William O., Jr.
Sturvist, Gerald H.
Sullivan, James T., Jr.
Sullivan, Michael E.
Sund, Jeffrey O.
Sundberg, Andrew P.
Sushka, Peter W., Jr.
Sutton, Paul D., Jr.
Sweat, Arthur J.
Swenson, Lennart A.
Switzer, Charles M., Jr.
Sykes, Dustin C.
Syphers, Grant E., Jr.
Szekely, Richard A., Jr.
Tabb, Hugh A.
Taft, George
Takeuchi, Robert S.
Tamny, Michael A.
Tansey, Philip M.
Tanski, William J.
Taylor, Carroll E.
Taylor, William L.
Tease, Henry V., Jr.
Teeple, William W.
Teller, John P.
Thau, August B.
Thaxton, David R.
Theis, John H., Jr.
Thelen, Antoni A.
Theriot, Simon, Jr.
Thomas, Edward C., Jr.
Thomas, Frank H., Jr.
Thomas, Peter W.
Thomassy, Louis E., Jr.
Thompson, Allan W.
Thompson, Duval G.
Thompson, James J.
Thompson, Merville R.
Thompson, Paul D.
Thompson, Wayne E.
Thornton, Jack C., Jr.
Tidball, Robert N.
Tiernan, Michael C.
Tierney, Sean E.
Tillotson, Charles R.
Tilton, James R.
Tinder, William P.
Tipton, John E.
Tobolski, Donald M.
Todd, Terrence S.
Tolbert, Clarence O.
Toler, Roger H.
Tolmie, Richard A.
Tomlin, Joseph M.
Tompkins, Paul S.
Tomsho, Michael E.
Toone, John P.
Torbit, Jerry B.
Toreson, Arthur H., Jr.
Tortora, Carmine
Towers, Edwin L.
Townsend, James T.
Townsend, Okey, Jr.
Travis, David T.
Trax, Lindsay J.
Tripp, Richard W., Jr.
Trisel, Terry E.
Trotman, George, Jr.
Truhlar, Joseph J.
Tucker, Albert L.
Tune, Cecil, L., Jr.
Turner, Charles E.
Turner, Frank B.
Turner, James S.
Turner, Stephen A.
Tyner, Jimmie C.
Uber, Thomas E.
Underwood, Walter J.
Urice, Ronel M.
Urquhart, Andrew W.
Usborne, Roger W.
Valentine, Gordon E.
VanAllman, Alfred C.
VanBrackle, Vernon L., Jr.
VanSaun, Arthur
Vaughan, Herschel M., Jr.
Vaughan, Trotter
Vaught, Russell S.
Veirs, James W., Jr.
Veith, Dennis A.
Verd, George H.
Verdell, William S.
Verhasselt, Robert R.
Vernallis, Samuel L.
Vick, John E.
Viera, James J.
Vincent, William L.
Vinson, Clyde R.
Vogel, Raymond W., III
Volk, John S., II
Vollmar, Frederick J., Jr.
Vopelak, Richard J.
Vorachek, Mary A.
Vreeland, Roy A.
Wachter, Bruce G.
Wagner, Frank
Wagner, George P.
Wagner, George F. A.
Wagner, Walter L.
Wahler, Fred R.
Walker, Benny H.
Walker, James E.

Walker, Michael R.
Wallace, Roy N.
Wallin, Steven R.
Walman, Michael L.
Walsh, Bernard
Walton, Harold A.
Ward, Jerry N.
Warren, William E., Jr.
Warthin, Jonathin C.
Waterman, George R.
Watkins, Donald E.
Watson, Randolph G.
Watt, John T.
Weatherly, Larry M.
Weaver, James E., Jr.
Webster, William J.
Weegar, Carl A.
Wehner, Joseph L.
Weigant, John A.
Weiner, Stephen E.
Weis, Edward W.
Weisenburger, Thomas W.
Weiske, James W.
Weiss, Daniel C.
Welham, Walter F., Jr.
Wells, Jan P.
Wells, Norman L.
Werlock, James P.
Wertin, John E., III
Wesner, Ross C.
West, David C.
West, Michael E.
Westbrook, Richard E.
Westerman, Thomas F.
Wheaton, David J.
Wheeler, Kenneth B.
Wheeler, Sidney E.
Whitaker, Roger B.
White, Arthur E.
White, John D., II
White, Joseph A., Jr.
White, Robin J.
White, Thayer D.
Whitehurst, Byron P.
Whitney, Richard K.
Whitt, Eugene N.
Wickman, Raymond H.
Wiggins, Robert H.
Wildman, James H.
Wilhoit, James M.
Williams, Charles L.
Williams, David L.
Williams, David D.
Williams, Gary O.
Williams, Lowell K.
Williams, Russell T., Jr.
Williams, Thomas D.
Williamson, Thomas F.
Williamson, William S.
Willmott, James J.
Willoz, Clifford P., Jr.
Wilson, Harold D.
Winder, Jon W.
Winkler, Joseph J.
Winslow, Frederic D.
Winter, Ward L.
Wise, James L.
Wisehart, Kenneth M.
Wisely, Hugh D.
Wolf, Richard J.
Wolfe, John T.
Woller, Robert H.
Wood, Forrest K.
Wood, John G.
Woodbury, Laurence O.
Woodfin, Ronald L.
Woodka, Thomas K.
Woodruff, Peter B.
Woodruff, William H.
Woods, Donald L.
Woods, James S., III
Woods, James R., Jr.
Woodward, Benjamin W., III
Woodworth, George P., Jr.
Wright, Will R.
Wunderly, William L., Jr.
Wurts, Edward V., III
Yandell, Lawrence A.
Yandrofski, Ronald M.
Yanovsky, Allen J.
Yates, Joseph W., III
Yeatts, Thomas R.
Yerkes, Alan C.
Yohanan, Robert R.
Yonkers, David P.
Young, Robert A.
Yufer, Kenneth L.
Zaccagnino, Anthony J.
Zachman, William H.
Zagayko, Andrew R.
Zaretki, John P.
Zimmerman, Raymond P., Jr.
Zimmermann, Harold K.
Zink, Roy A.
Zuhr, Raymond A.
Balink, Linda J.
Barrett, Barbara A.
Beckley, Mary A.
Bingman, Bette K.
Blake, Sally A.
Burgess, Barbara E.
Cheston, Barbara J.
Clark, Georgia
Curry, Viola D.
Graichen, Dimity L.
Hahn, Janice L.
Harman, Elizabeth L.
Honeycutt, Betty S.
Kadenacy, Katherine M.
Kaldunski, Alice M.
Lakin, Alice I.
Martin, Noreene A.
Martin, Priscilla R.
Matheson, Carol A.
Naughton, Mary D.
Nyce, Barbara R.
Peterson, Sandra L.
Terry, Agnes S.
Tiller, Trudith D.

SUPPLY CORPS

Abernethy, James R., Jr.
Alwine, Paul R., Jr.
Baker, Joseph R.
Bartholomew, Frank L., III
Beasley, Ronald D.
Beer, Robert O., Jr.
Bennett, Paul G.
Bentson, Gordon J.
Bestor, Robert H., Jr.
Birindelli, James B.
Blankenfeld, Richard K.
Boehmler, Erwin W., Jr.
Bondi, Peter A.
Braswell, Carmen B.
Braver, Stephen H.
Bromen, Roger R.
Brown, Bernard E.
Brown, Jack M.
Burk, William E.
Burnham, John K.
Cantrall, Edward L.
Carre, Darwin B., Jr.
Carroll, John P.
Chapman, Richard B.
Cleary, Richard T., III
Coburn, John M.
Cooper, William K.
Collins, William A.
Corbert, James T.
Costello, John N.
Cox, Thomas P.
Cronin, John L., Jr.
Dailey, John C., Jr.
Dannenbring, David G.
Danner, Glenn R.
Davee, Francis W.
Delasfuentes, Jose, Jr.
Denvir, Quin A.
Dominy, John F.
Fay, Todd L.
Fellows, Fred Y., III
Fields, Billy J.
Fleming, James A., Jr.
Foley, Richard L.
Frantz, Harold W.
Fulghum, Robert E.
Gallion, Robert Z.
Garmus, David P.
Garrison, Thomas M.
Gee, Charles D.
Gent, Raymond D.
Green, Harold C., Jr.
Greer, George W., III
Hale, Ronald A.
Hamm, Michael R.
Hanscom, Frank E.
Harrington, Phillip H.
Helmuth, Robert A.
Hodapp, Charles A.
Hunt, George A.
Johnson, Stephen G.
Johnson, Thomas L.
Johnson, William W.
Kasriel, Jerome D.
Keating, Jeremiah A.
Keller, Leonard, Jr.
King, William D.
Kittredge, Thomas M.
Koch, Karl W.
Kosch, Charles A.
Kostin, Edward B.
Krehely, Donald E.
Kyllo, Roger A.
Lamb, Donald L.
Lehmann, Charles
Lillico, Keith R.
Martin, Hoke P.
Mather, Gregory A.
McCanne, William G., III
McCraw, Thomas, K.
McDonough, Thomas J., Jr.
McGavran Francis J.
McKeever, George F.
McKinley, Keith A.
McSwain, Franklin L.
Meneely, Frank T.
Meyer, James R.
Mitchell, Carl M.
Mix, Victor E.
Monroe, James L. D.
Morris, John D., III
Mortimer, James R.
Moum, Jerry D.
Murray, Brian J.
Mustaine, Myron P., Jr.
Nagel, John W.
Nelson, Wayne J.
Niesar, Gerald V.
O'Connor, Joseph A.
Pace, John E.
Parker, James F.
Parks, Leonard C.
Perrill, Fredrick E.
Peterson, Dale J.
Phillips, James D.
Plester, Fay M.
Pinskey, Howard S.
Popik, Michael J.
Prager, Gerald D.
Pressley, Joseph L.
Price, Clifford R.
Quigley, Patrick J.
Quinn, John T.
Quinn, Kenneth J.
Rasmussen, Paul D.
Redick, John A.
Reed, William A.
Renfro, Jack D.
Richards, Gary T.
Rittenhouse, Ferness L.
Roche, Douglas R.
Rosebery, Alan C.
Rowan, Alan J.
Rueckert, Jon
Russell, Frank A.
Saito, George N.
Sapera, Leonard J.
Schwartz, James M.
Sickafoose, Keith E.
Sikes, James E.
Sloan, James B.
Smith, Olen B., Jr.
Soletti, Lawrence A.
Starnes, Bobby F.
Steen, George S., Jr.
Steiner, Richard A.
Sullivan, Michael J., III
Suter, David F.
Szalapski, Jeffery P.
Taube, Arden R.
Tiger, James D.
Tomcheck, John K.
Treanor, Richard C.
Tully, Albert P., Jr.
Ullius, David J.
Vanness, Robert L.
Voyles, Clyde W.
Wagoner, John D.
Waite, Richard, IV
Wallace, James J.
Wallace, William W.
Watkins, Robert S.
Webb, Evans W.
Welch, Kenneth T.
Welch, Richard A.
Wilson, Michael G.
Witt, Terry J.
Worsena, Richard F.
Young, Robert R.
Zumbro, Sherrod B.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Argus, Wilbert L., Jr.
Bender, Carl H., Jr.
Berget, Kaspar G., Jr.
Black, Wilson M.
Blackwell, Larry G.
Bordas, Peter S.
Brandon, Robert L.
Bratzler, John H.
Carter, Stuart L.
Chapla, Paul A.
Cloar, James A.
Cofer, Rufus H., Jr.
Coffey, Fred S.
Crain, Harold S., Jr.
Day, Norman W.
Drennon, Patrick W.
Ekstrand, William N.
Endebrock, Robert N.
Fowler, George, III
Gardner, Thomas N.
George, Emory J.
Griffith, Verne E., Jr.
Heine, William A., III
Houck, Carl P.
Lehder, Wilfred E., Jr.
MacKenzie, Kenneth B.
Martinelli, Salvatore A.
McCahill, Dennis F.
Monney, Neil T.
Rabke, Walter E.
Stokes, Stephan R.
Smith, Sherrill E.
Sturmer, Donald C.
Thrasher, Stephen M., Jr.
Towle, Nathaniel A.
Wells, Donald R.
Williams, John K.
Woodford, Donald L.
Yoder, Dan S.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Baird, John R.
Beckner, William M.
Brown, Gary D.
Brown, Wayne A.
Carnahan, Clarence L.
Chatelier, Paul R.
Coan, Richard M.
Cusick, Richard A.
Delaughter, John D.
Duncan, Alexander R.
Ferguson, John C.
Gogel, Casper J.
Hill, Thomas A.
Kinsella, Lawrence T.
McGuire, James S.
Parrish, William C.
Peck, John A.
Peterson, Warren R.
Rhodes, Durward L.
Saye, Clarence B.
Skelly, Robert S., Jr.
Stayton, Richard A.
Theisen, Charles J., Jr.
Tucker, John R., Jr.

NURSE CORPS

Ancelard, Madeline M.
Dickson, Barbara A.
Maloney, Anne C.

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line or Staff Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Philip T. Blake
John C. Self

James W. Forester, Jr. (Navy enlisted scientific education program) to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Philip B. Alexander (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Gene T. Izuno
Clarence G. Strom

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald W. Ernst
Edward R. Gorman

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William L. Anderson, Jr.
Jon G. Beidler
John W. Buckner
Howard A. Buell
Robert L. Gibbs
William A. J. MacLeod
Lawrence E. Nelson
Thomas H. Pinkstaff
Harold W. Schmidt, II
Robert W. Slate

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald G. Blanchard
Anthony W. Branon, Jr.
Carl E. Branyan
James E. Dice
John P. Grisham
Morris L. Hicks
Patrick Ho
Jon T. McAnear
Massoud G. Mowad
Bobby M. Sharp
Cameron M. Smith

James G. Franklin, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent captain in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following named (Army Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointments to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard Gnazzo.
John C. Livingston.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 2, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

John M. Leddy, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ridgway B. Knight, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belguim.

Marshall Green, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Indonesia.

Joseph J. Jova, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Honduras.

Mrs. Patrica Roberts Harris, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 5 years.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years.

◆

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words of Scripture:

Ezekiel 11:16: *Thus saith the Lord God, Although I have scattered them among the countries, yet will I be to them as a little sanctuary in the countries where they shall come.*

O Thou who art everywhere, grant that this Chamber may be made blessed and holy by a sense of Thy divine presence shielding and sheltering our faith from the hardness of the secular spirit.

We are often tempted to allow our spiritual life to be smitten and wither under the blight of unreality and insincerity and there seems to be within us so little of radiant light and power.

Here may we feel that in rendering public service we are engaged in the Father's business and that we must also fill the days with honest labor and live to do Thy will ere the night cometh when no man can work.

Help us to keep the light of Thy divine Spirit aglow in these dark times and may nothing ever eclipse or extinguish it when difficult problems need to be solved.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1867. An act for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles; and

H.R. 7597. An act to establish the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund in the Treasury and to authorize initial capital to operate insurance programs under title 38, United States Code, section 725.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 304. An act for the relief of W. J. B. Daniel; and

S. 1648. An act to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 435. An act to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Thursday to file a privileged report on the legislative branch appropriation bill, 1966.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS AND POWER

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit while the House is in session during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 118]

Andrews, George W.
Blatnik
Bonner
Brown, Ohio
Chamberlain
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clevenger
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Cunningham
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Fisher
Fogarty
Goodell
Griffin
Hansen, Iowa
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Holland
Kornegay
Landrum
Lindsay
Mackay
Mathias
Michel
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Powell
Price
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
St Germain
Taylor
Toll
Utt
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 391 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations have until midnight, Friday, June 4, 1965, to file a report entitled "Government Operations in Space."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1965

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 404 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 404

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8371) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 404 provides for consideration of H.R. 8371, to reduce excise taxes, under a closed rule, waiving points of order, with 4 hours of general debate.

This bill calls for the long-awaited repeal of excise taxes which, in large part, were imposed as emergency measures at the time of the Korean war, or World War II, or the depression of the 1930's. It removes a large number of the taxes outright and most of them within the next 3 years.

Last year when there was a partial reduction of excise taxes, the committee expressed the intention of looking into the entire field of excise taxes. H.R. 8371 is the result of long, hard work by the committee and constitutes a major revision of the Federal excise tax system.

It is expected that for the most part, the excise tax reduction will result in increased general consumer spending in response to price reductions made on the products now taxed, and follows closely the recommendations of the President in his message of May 17.

By way of explanation I might add that the waiver is simply to comply with the Ramseyer rule and also the closed rule since it opens up the general excise tax limited to the items that are included in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule, and urge its adoption.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the able gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] has made a very excellent statement on the rule, the time, the purpose, the waiver of points of order, and the reasons. I agree with each and every statement he has made in that regard, and will not repeat those conditions here at this time.

May I simply add, Mr. Speaker, that this goes over a period of years up until January 1, 1969. The first will start on July 1, 1965 and will be about $1¾ billion for the first year, $1.7 billion for the second year, then for the next 3 years up until 1969 an additional approximately $1.4 billion. That makes a total reduction of between $4.8 billion and $4.9 billion over these several years.

If you will refer to the report, starting on page 3, you will find all of the various items that have been listed and what will happen to them in future years to come. As to the retailers' excise taxes there is a 10-percent repeal on July 1, 1965, manufacturers' excise taxes are repealed with certain exceptions. The items listed thereunder, 4 to 13, repealed in 1965, with the exception of item No. 6, which is on January 1, 1966. That has to do with light bulbs.

On passenger automobiles, that is reduced to 7 percent effective on July 1, 1965, then to 6 percent on January 1, 1966, and on down until eventually repealed in January 1969.

The same applies on communications. Over a period of time the tax on communications is repealed.

The report will show that certain of these taxes will not be repealed. What will happen is that they are on a permanent basis, such as alcohol and cigarettes.

This is a great day for many Members of the House who in years past have introduced bills repealing certain of these excise taxes. I personally offered bills in three sessions to eliminate the taxes on telephones. I had the opportunity of testifying before the Committee on Ways and Means last year, and I am happy indeed to see this is one of the taxes that has been reduced. I know other Members are also in this particular situation.

I commend the Committee on Ways and Means, and the distinguished chairman, for bringing this matter before the House at this time. I remember last year when the other body in connection with the extension bill added three or four eliminations on furs, jewelry, and the like, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means asked that we do not do it by piecemeal; that we give the committee a chance to hold hearings. He said he would hold hearings and report a bill if the committee desired. That bill is on the floor today. So in that regard I commend the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the members of that committee, for bringing the bill here today.

I do hope as this bill progresses that the various States, most of which seem to need additional revenue, will not come to the conclusion that inasmuch as people have been paying these many taxes over the years that they are used to paying them and so now we will just take these taxes and add them to the State taxes. If so, some of the effect of what we are doing today will be seriously jeopardized.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add just a few words of caution on the basis that I personally do not think we can have our cake and eat it. That old saying has gone on for many, many years. I am heartily in accord with this bill. By the same token I would hope the administration and our leaders would give consideration to not starting so many new programs and not extending so many existing programs. Otherwise we are not going to have the same economy and the same good employment situation that we have now. We cannot cut taxes by $4.8 billion, and increase spending, and raise the debt and still remain financially stable.

As an example, the Appalachia program. Now that is a new program. It will cost a lot of money. The poverty program has started. Personally, I do not think we can create employment and bring ourselves up by our own bootstraps. My information is that the poverty program will probably be calling for additional, an increased amount of money of $1 or $2 billion. There is tremendous military spending throughout the world. With all of the programs we have now, by cutting taxes we may not be able to maintain our economy and our employment and keep the financial responsibility of the United States in as good a condition as possible. If we are to continue to protect the world and keep the world in as good a condition as possible, I hope we will not continue to add so many, many spending programs. Otherwise the result of this tax cut may be ineffective.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I personally do not think we can have our cake and eat it. I hope we can keep spending relatively within the budget. In turn, as to this particular bill, I am in support of it and urge the adoption of the rule.

May I say to the gentleman from New York, I do have one request for a couple of minutes time, but other than that, that is all the requests I have and, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I now yield at this time 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee heard the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, on this bill. Today we are called upon to vote on it.

I do not like to see this bill pass without someone expressing, to a feeble extent, some of the misgivings I know many of us feel about the headlong speed this House is making on important measures of vital interest to the country as a whole, acting upon them so rapidly that neither the Members of the House nor the country realize exactly what we are doing.

Everybody likes to see a reduction in taxes. Anyone who expresses any degree of disturbance about it does not calculate to increase his popularity either in the House or in the country.

But I should like to express some feelings about whether these things we are doing are for the good of the country or whether we are doing things now which ultimately may bring great disaster upon the country.

I remember that a couple of years ago we enacted a law to drastically cut taxes. Everybody realizes that taxes in this country have reached the point of confiscation. But we cannot do away with our tax structure. We must have it. We must have the money.

At the same time we are doing this we are entering upon new programs of great potential cost to the taxpayers. We are doing it so rapidly that even Members of Congress cannot digest and understand the legislation. Certainly there is no opportunity for any reaction from the country as to the views of the people about these bills we pass so rapidly.

I am only submitting a word of caution, in our rapid race down the road to the Great Society and the abolition of poverty—that some day somebody in this generation or a future generation will have to pay the bill. How are we to do it if we increase expenses and reduce revenues?

That is what we are doing now.

The reduction is for approximately $5 billion, though the President and the Bureau of the Budget recommended something like a $2 billion reduction.

Yesterday the Rules Committee granted a rule for the consideration of this bill, and it is being considered today, to reduce revenues by $5 billion. Tomorrow, if you please, the Rules Committee will do as we did with respect to the last reduction. We will report a rule to consider a bill to raise the debt limit so that we can borrow the money to reduce the taxes. If that is not an absurd way to run a railroad I never heard of such a thing. Yet we are doing it. We did it before. We are doing it again. We are borrowing money to reduce taxes and still we are increasing the potential programs of great expenditures in the future, with no prospect of having the revenues to meet the expenditures as they come along.

I realize that it is unpopular to look at the basic facts on this thing. Everybody wants taxes reduced. These were wartime taxes; that is, they were put on in time of war as they should have been. At the end of the war they should have been repealed long years ago, and they would have been if this Congress had been as frugal as I think it should be with the taxpayers' money. You cannot keep on running a welfare state at this rate. The chickens are going to come home to roost some day.

Yesterday I mentioned in the Rules Committee that probably the best barometer we have as to what is happening back home in the country is the stock market on Wall Street. I mentioned that over the past 10 days we had had flurries in Wall Street that seemed to signify a recurrence of bad times. While I was talking about that, the stock market opened in New York yesterday and they had one of the worst recessions in the market that has happened in recent times. Now those things mean something. I think the best financier we have in Government is, in my opinion, William McChesney Martin. He reminded the country, in a speech he made yesterday, which you will find in the financial pages of the Washington Post, that the same symptoms are present today as occurred in 1928 preceding the great depression of the 1930's.

Now, I have spoken the voice of doom and nobody is going to like it, but I think somebody ought to put it on record as to just what we are heading for.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1965

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 8371, to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8371 with Mr. ROOSEVELT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] will be recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] will be recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 8371, provides for reductions and elimination of a number of excise taxes which are listed in the committee report on pages 3, 4, and 5, and leaves those excise taxes which are set forth on pages 38 and 39 of the report in existence. The bill also eliminates the termination date with respect to certain of the Korean excise taxes, that Members who have been in the previous Congress and in earlier Congresses will recall we were in the habit of extending on an annual basis from 1955, I believe, up to this time.

The tables I have referred to are as follows:

Tax	Existing rate	Committee action and effective date	Estimated annual revenue loss when fully effective (millions)
A. Retailers' excise taxes:			
1. Jewelry	10% of retail price	Repeal, July 1, 1965	$220
2. Furs	10% of retail price	Repeal, July 1, 1965	30
3. Toilet preparations	10% of retail price	Repeal, July 1, 1965	210
4. Luggage, handbags, etc	10% of retail price	Repeal, July 1, 1965	90
B. Manufacturers' excise taxes:			
1. Passenger automobiles	10% of mfr. price	Reduce to 7%, July 1, 1965 [1,2]; reduce to 6%, Jan. 1, 1966 [2]; reduce to 4%, Jan. 1, 1967 [2]; reduce to 2%, Jan. 1, 1968 [2]; repeal, Jan. 1, 1969.	1,900
2. Automobile parts and accessories (except truck parts)	8% of mfr. price	Extend 8% rate to Jan. 1, 1966, and then repeal, Jan. 1, 1966.[2,3,4]	230
3. Lubricating and cutting oil:			
(a) Cutting oil	3¢ per gal	Repeal, Jan. 1, 1966 [2]	28
(b) Lubricating oil	6¢ per gal	Refund tax for oil not used in highway motor vehicles, beginning Jan. 1, 1966.[4]	
4. Refrigerators, freezers, and air-conditioning units:			
(a) Refrigerators and freezers	5% of mfr. price	Repeal, July 1, 1965 [2]	41
(b) Self-contained air-conditioning units	10% of mfr. price	Repeal, July 1, 1965 [1,2]	34
5. Electric, gas, and oil appliances	5% of mfr. price	Repeal, July 1, 1965 [2]	85
6. Electric light bulbs	10% of mfr. price	Repeal, Jan. 1, 1966 [2]	45
7. Radio and television sets, phonographs, records, etc	10% of mfr. price	Repeal, July 1, 1965 [2]	255
8. Musical instruments	10% of mfr. price	Repeal, July 1, 1965 [2]	27
9. Sporting goods, except fishing equipment	10% of mfr. price	Repeal, July 1, 1965	25
10. Photographic equipment:			
(a) Cameras, lenses, film	10% of mfr. price	Repeal, July 1, 1965 [2]	40
(b) Projectors	5% of mfr. price	Repeal, July 1, 1965 [2]	
11. Business machines	10% of mfr. price	Repeal, July 1, 1965 [2]	75
12. Pens, mechanical pencils, and lighters:			
(a) Pens and pencils	10% of mfr. price	Repeal, July 1, 1965	11
(b) Lighters	10¢ each, not to exceed 10% of mfr. price	Repeal, July 1, 1965	
13. Matches:			
(a) Plain	2¢ per 1,000, not to exceed 10% of mfr. price.	Repeal, July 1, 1965	4
(b) Fancy	5½¢ per 1,000	Repeal, July 1, 1965	

See footnotes **at end of table.**

Tax	Existing rate	Committee action and effective date	Estimated annual revenue loss when fully effective (millions)
C. Facilities and services:			
1. Admissions and cabarets:			
(a) General admissions	1¢ for each 10¢ in excess of $1	Repeal, noon, Dec. 31, 1965	$55
(b) Race tracks	1¢ for each 5¢ of full price	Repeal, noon, Dec. 31, 1965	
(c) Cabarets	10% of bill	Repeal, noon, Dec. 31, 1965	47
2. Club dues	20% of annual dues, if in excess of $10	Repeal, Jan. 1, 1966	85
3. Communications:			
(a) Local and toll telephone service and teletypewriter service	10% of amount billed	Reduce to 3%, Jan. 1, 1966;[3] Reduce to 2%, Jan. 1, 1967; Reduce to 1%, Jan. 1, 1968; Repeal, Jan. 1, 1969.	913
(b) Private communications services	10% of amount billed	Repeal, Jan. 1, 1966	130
(c) Telegraph service	10% of amount billed	Repeal, Jan. 1, 1966	17
(d) Wire and equipment service	8% of amount billed	Repeal, Jan. 1, 1966	15
4. Transportation of persons by air	5% of amount paid	Extend rate on permanent basis	(5)
5. Safe deposit boxes	10% of amount paid	Repeal, July 1, 1965	7
D. Miscellaneous taxes:			
1. Documentary stamp taxes:			
(a) Bond and stock issues		Repeal, Jan. 1, 1966	195
(i) Stock, except mutual funds	10¢ per $100 of value.		
(ii) Mutual fund shares	4¢ per $100 of value.		
(iii) Bonds	11¢ per $100 of value.		
(b) Bond and stock transfers		Repeal, Jan. 1, 1966	
(i) Stock	4¢ per $100 of value but no more than 8¢ per share or less than 4¢ per sale.		
(ii) Bonds	5¢ per $100 of value.		
(c) Conveyances	55¢ per $100 of value	Repeal, Jan. 1, 1966	
2. Playing cards	13¢ per pack	Repeal, July 1, 1965	11
3. Coin-operated amusement devices (not including gaming devices)	$10 per year	Repeal, July 1, 1965	6
4. Bowling alleys, billiard and pool tables	$20 per year	Repeal, July 1, 1965	7
E. Alcohol and tobacco taxes:			
1. Alcoholic beverages:			
(a) Distilled spirits	$10.50 per proof-gal	Extend present rate on permanent basis.	(5)
(b) Beer	$9 per barrel	Extend present rate on permanent basis.	(5)
(c) Wines	Various rates	Extend present rates on permanent basis.	(5)
2. Tobacco:			
(a) Cigarettes	8¢ per pack	Extend present rate on permanent basis.	(5)

---

[1] Provision is made for refunds to consumers who purchased item after May 14, 1965, and before July 1, 1965.

[2] Provision is made for floor stock refunds.

[3] The existing rate is extended from June 30, 1965, through Dec. 31, 1965. In the case of the telephone taxes only the tax on general (local) telephone service was scheduled to expire and is extended to Dec. 31, 1965.

[4] Remaining revenues allocated to highway trust fund.

[5] The bill forestalls rate reductions which would otherwise occur under present law on July 1, 1965. In the case of transportation of persons by air, the revenue loss which is prevented is $140,000,000; in the case of distilled spirits, it is $203,000,000; in the case of beer, it is $104,000,000; in the case of wines, it is $12,000,000; and in the case of cigarettes, it is $262,000,000.

TABLE 13.—*Excise taxes remaining after all reductions made by H.R. 8371 become effective*

	Rate	Estimated revenue (millions) [1]
Retailers' excise taxes: Diesel fuel and special motor fuels.	4¢ per gal	$195
Manufacturers' excise taxes:		
Trucks, buses, trailers	10% of mfrs. price	410
Truck parts and accessories	8% of mfrs. price	20
Tires, etc.:		
Highway type	10¢ per lb	450
Other	5¢ per lb	
Inner tubes	10¢ per lb	
Tread rubber	5¢ per lb	
Gasoline	4¢ per gal	2,800
Lubricating oil (highway use)	6¢ per gal	50
Fishing equipment	10% of mfrs. price	8
Pistols and revolvers	10% o. mfrs. price	2
Other firearms, shells and cartridges.	11% of mfrs. price	19
Miscellaneous excise taxes:		
Transportation of persons by air	5% of amount paid	140
Stamp tax: foreign insurance policies.	4¢ or 1¢ per dollar of premium	5
Wagering:		
Wagers	10% of amount of wager	7
Occupation of accepting wagers.	$50 per year	
Coin-operated gaming devices	$250 per device per year	18
Use tax on certain highway vehicles.	$3 per 1,000 lbs. per year	108
Sugar	0.53¢ per lb	105
Import tax on oleomargarine	15¢ per lb	(2)
Regulatory taxes:		
Narcotic drugs:		
Opium, opiates	$1 per ounce	1
Opium for smoking	$300 per lb	
Occupational	$1 to $24 per year	
Marihuana:		
Transfers	$1 or $100 per ounce	
Occupational	$1 to $24 per year	
Regulatory taxes—Continued		
White phosphorus matches	2¢ per hundred	(2)
Adulterated butter	10¢ or 15¢ per lb	
Process butter	¼¢ per lb	
Occupational taxes: adulterated or process butter.	$48 to $600 per year	
Filled cheese	1¢ or 8¢ per lb	
Occupational taxes: filled cheese	$12 to $400 per year	
Cotton futures	2¢ per lb	
Bank circulation tax (other than national banks).	1/12 of 1%; 1/6 of 1%; 10%	
Alcohol taxes:		
Distilled spirits	$10.50 per proof gal	$2,750
Beer	$9 per barrel	940
Wine	Various rates	118
Rectification tax	30¢ per proof gal	25
Occupational taxes:		
Rectifiers	$110 or $220 per year	22
Brewers	$55 or $110 per year	
Manufacturers of stills	$55 per year plus $22 per still	
Wholesale dealers	$123 or $225 per year	
Retail dealers	$24 or $54 per year	
Other	$25 to $100 per year	
Tobacco taxes:		
Cigarettes	$4 per 1,000	2,150
Cigars	$2.50 to $20 per 1,000	70
Manufactured tobacco (chewing, smoking and snuff).	10¢ per lb	18
Cigarette paper or tubes	½¢ or 1¢ per 50	2
Machineguns, etc.:		
Transfers	$5 or $200 per firearm	(2)
Occupational	$10 to $500 per year	
Total		[3] 10,433

---

[1] The estimated revenue shown is for a full year of liability based upon expected yields in the fiscal year 1966. This is not the full yield expected from all excise taxes in 1966 because it does not include the expected yield of those taxes scheduled for elimination by the fiscal year 1969.

[2] Less than $500,000.

[3] This total can be reconciled with excise tax collections of $15,356,000,000 shown in table 1 by subtracting total effect of reductions under H.R. 8371 of $4,838,000,000 plus $85,000,000 representing undistributed depository receipts and unapplied collections which were included in the total shown in table 1.

This bill, as is indicated in the committee report, represents a comprehensive overhaul of our Federal excise tax structure. When this bill becomes fully effective—which does not occur until 1969—we will, for the first time, have gotten some logic into the Federal excise tax structure, and for the first time, we will be able to say that the excise taxes which still remain in effect are there for a logical reason.

All of the excise taxes remaining will be there for one of three reasons.

First. There are those that will represent user charges. These are taxes, such as those which are dedicated to the highway trust fund, where the users of a particular governmental service in part, at least, pay for the cost of these services by paying excise taxes which, to a substantial degree, measure their use of the service provided. This is the so-called benefit principle of taxation, and in my view it is desirable that some of our excises be levied on this basis, because it means that the person using the service is also the one helping pay for it as well. In my estimation, this leads to responsibility in spending, clearly a policy which should be encouraged to the extent possible. Another user charge, in addition to those dedicated to the highway trust fund, is the excise tax imposed on the sale of fishing equipment. Funds, equal to the collections from this tax, are used for conservation purposes primarily in stocking lakes and streams with fish. Still another tax which in effect is a user charge is the tax on the transportation of persons by air. Here the air traveler is making a small contribution toward the airport program of the Federal Government.

A second category of taxes which will still remain are the regulatory taxes, such as those on marihuana, opium, wagering, white phosphorous matches, adulterated butter, firearms, and machineguns.

The third category of taxes which will still remain is the so-called sumptuary taxes; namely, those on alcohol and tobacco products. It is recognized that the taxes in these cases may limit consumption to some extent, but, for one reason or another, this is generally viewed as desirable from the standpoint of public policy.

The full list of taxes which will still remain after this bill becomes fully effective are shown on pages 38 and 39 of the committee report. I believe that you will find all of these taxes fall within the categories that I have referred to. In total, they will still bring approximately $10.4 billion a year in revenues to the Federal Government.

The excise taxes which this bill repeals were initially levied as emergency revenue-raising measures at the time of the Korean war, World War II, or at the time of the depression of the 1930's. As a result, they represent a hodgepodge of taxes, not developed on any systematic basis.

Some industries are taxed, and others are not. Some consumer products are taxed and others are not. It has been very difficult for me in the past to justify these taxes on any ground other than the fact that they raised needed revenue. In one case a product will be taxed while in the case of a closely competing product, no tax is levied. This is true, for example, in the case of sterling silverware and fine crystal. Although these products serve quite different purposes, they usually are thought of as being closely competing products because they frequently represent alternative gift choices. In the case of the silver, a tax is imposed, while crystal can be purchased tax free. This same type of comparison can be repeated time and again in the case of almost every one of the selective excise taxes which this bill repeals.

It sometimes is suggested that the present selective excise taxes are justified on the grounds that they are imposed on the sale of luxuries as contrasted to necessities. But in our society today it has become almost impossible to distinguish between luxuries and necessities. The basis for saying one product is a luxury and another a necessity has almost vanished from our society. Today, for the most part, we can distinguish between luxuries and necessities primarily on the basis of how expensive a model is that is purchased rather than the type of product. Certainly, with today's standards the average family in America considers stoves, refrigerators, and other appliances to be necessities. Much the same can be said for a radio or television set, although some perhaps would not now so view the more expensive color television sets. The day may come, however, in the near future too, when these also are viewed as a necessity.

I point this out to you simply to show that there is little, if any, basis for taxing one product under a selective excise tax system and not another. As I indicated before, I believe we will have logical reason for continuing to impose taxes in the case of those products still remaining subject to tax after this bill becomes fully effective. I do not believe that we have a logical reason, however, for continuing to tax the various selected products from which this bill either removes the tax immediately or over a period of years. For that reason I consider the enactment of this bill to be another major step toward the revision of our Federal tax structure. It removes the miscellany of selective excise taxes which cannot be justified, retaining only those for which there are logical reasons for imposition of a tax at the Federal level.

This bill provides for a tax reduction when fully effective of $4.8 or $4.9 billion. The reason for this difference is that it depends upon whether one is looking at the administrative budget or the consolidated cash budget, taking into account the different trust funds. The $4.9 billion is the effect on the administrative budget. However, somewhat less than $100 million in revenue of this represents a diversion from the general fund to the highway trust fund. This is because your committee has transferred the lubricating oil tax—after removing from it nonhighway use—together with the tax on truck parts to the highway trust fund.

Your committee's bill, in acting on these various excise taxes, has for the most part followed quite closely the recommendation of the President. He proposes a reduction of approximately $1.75 billion to take effect on July 1 of this year. He also proposed another reduction of approximately $1.7 billion to take effect on January 1 next. The bill which your committee has reported with respect to these reductions is almost exactly the same as that proposed by the President.

The reductions selected for this July 1 are primarily those where it was believed that there would be an adverse effect on consumer purchases if their repeal were to be much beyond the consideration and enactment of the bill. These include the four retail taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags. The July 1 reduction also includes the repeal of almost all of the manufacturers' excise taxes except those on passenger cars, auto parts, and electric light bulbs.

The passenger car tax is reduced by your committee's action by 3 percentage points this July 1. The revenue loss of repealing the entire tax at this time, however, would have been too great. This tax alone brings in about $1.9 billion. They would also be an adverse impact on the used car market. However, this tax is repealed entirely over a period of years. The reductions after this June reduction, however, are scheduled over a period of years so that any one reduction will be sufficiently small that it will be unlikely to adversely affect consumer purchases. Thus, the reduction for next January is to be 1 percentage point, and on subsequent Januarys is to be 2 percentage points a year until the tax is entirely removed in January 1969.

The administration recommended the repeal of only 5 of the 10 percentage points of tax on passenger cars.

Mr. Chairman, the committee thought it would be left in an untenable position, difficult to explain, if it eliminated all of the selective excise taxes except the one selective excise tax on automobiles. Therefore, the committee staged the reduction of the last 5 percentage points of the automobile tax over the same period of time involved in the staging of the elimination of the tax on local and toll telephone service so that the tax will be entirely eliminated by January 1, 1969, on the sale of automobiles as well as on local and toll telephone services.

The auto parts tax, except for the tax on truck parts to which I previously referred, is removed entirely on January 1, 1966. It seemed unlikely that the delay of the repeal of this tax until that time would adversely affect purchases. The truck part tax was retained both because of the needs of the highway trust fund and also because it was recognized that there would be problems if no tax were imposed on truck parts and accessories and a 10-percent tax were retained on trucks. Were we to permit such a situation to exist, we would undoubtedly have problems with the parts and accessories for new trucks being sold separately from the trucks themselves.

The only other manufacturers' excise tax, the repeal of which is postponed until next January, is the tax on electric light bulbs. It was felt that this could be done without adversely affecting consumer purchases. Certainly, the purchases of light bulbs are not going to be postponed to any appreciable degree awaiting the repeal of this 10-percent manufacturers' excise tax.

The other manufacturers' excise taxes which are repealed on July 1 include those on refrigerators, freezers, and air-conditioning units, electric, gas, and oil appliances, radio and television sets, phonographs and records, sporting goods—apart from fishing equipment—photographic equipment, business machines, pens and pencils, and lighters and matches. The tax on firearms and ammunition which is allocated to conservation and wildlife purposes is retained.

Most of the other excise taxes which are repealed are included in the category to be repealed next January 1. This includes the taxes on admissions and cabarets, with the exception that in these cases, in order to avoid the confusion which would occur if these taxes went off on New Year's Eve, they are taken off as of noon of the last day of the old year—December 31, 1965.

Other taxes which are repealed as of January 1 are the taxes on club dues, telegraph service, wire and equipment service, and the documentary stamp taxes on security issues and transfers, as well as real estate conveyances.

The tax on local and toll telephone service and teletypewriter service is reduced next January 1 from 10 percent to 3 percent, but for revenue reasons it was not possible to entirely repeal these taxes at that time. For that reason, it has been necessary to schedule the elimination of the last 3 percentage points of these taxes on January 1, over the years 1967, 1968, and 1969 at 1 percentage point a year.

The remaining category of excise taxes repealed are those on safe deposit boxes, playing cards, and the occupational taxes on coin-operated amusement devices—but not gambling devices—and on bowling alleys and billiard and pool tables. These taxes are included in the category repealed on July 1 of this year.

This bill also extends the alcohol and tobacco taxes at their present rates on a permanent basis. This will make it unnecessary for us to pass each year an excise tax extension bill for the alcohol and tobacco taxes. This is also true of the tax on the transportation of persons by air which, in effect, is a user charge paying a small part of the cost of our aviation program. Should it be desirable to reduce the tax on these items at some future date, it will, of course, always be possible to reconsider the present tax rates.

As I indicated previously, this bill calls for a reduction of about $3.4 billion in fiscal year 1966. However, $1.75 billion of this is effective in July and the remaining $1.7 billion is to be effective next January. The delay in this second grouping of reductions is desirable not only because it preserves revenue in the 6-month interval in which the taxes remain on, but also because it will aid in offsetting the temporary economic impact of the increased payroll taxes which go into effect next January 1.

There is, in addition to the $3.4 billion reduction initiated in fiscal year 1966, a reduction of $1.4 billion spread over the years 1967, 1968, and 1969. This latter reduction represents entirely the scheduled reduction of two taxes: The tax on passenger cars to which I previously referred and also the tax on local and toll telephone service. The passenger car tax goes off 2 percentage points a year over the years 1967 through 1969 and the telephone taxes go off 1 percentage point a year over the same period of time.

The full description of these excise taxes which are repealed are shown in the committee report, in summary fashion, on pages 3 through 5, which I previously have included in my remarks.

Someone may say it may well be good, it may well be desirable to eliminate these excise taxes but how do we justify doing it when we are not making these reductions out of an existing surplus of revenue? Mr. Chairman, when the budget was submitted to the Congress in January, it is my recollection that for the fiscal year 1966 it estimated receipts at $94.4 billion, that it estimated expenditures at $99.7 billion.

Since the January estimates were prepared, it develops that the administration revenue estimates were low by about $1,600 million.

It has been said we are reducing excise taxes, however, to the extent of $4.8 billion. That is true over a period of years. But let us look at the effect on the fiscal year 1966 first. The budget that was submitted in January took into account on the revenue side the $1.75 billion reduction in excise taxes that is contained in this bill to go into effect on July 1. This was estimated to effect the fiscal year 1966 to the extent of $1.5 billion. The budget last January did not take into account the $1.7 billion of reductions to go into effect on January 1, 1966. But the enactment of reductions in that amount on January 1, 1966, affects the receipts of fiscal year 1966, only to the extent of $600 million. Since we now expect a gain in revenues of $1.6 billion as compared to the estimates made this last January, after reducing that gain by the $600 million additional excises affecting fiscal year 1966, we still have a revenue increase of $1 billion over the January estimate. That still leaves receipts at $95.4 billion with a rate of expenditure of $99.7 billion. We are thus coming out with a deficit of $4.3 billion compared to $5.3 billion deficit for 1966 in the budget estimates sent to us in January of this year.

If we did not act on this bill, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to say we would have $2.1 billion or $2.2 billion additional of revenue in this fiscal year 1966, which is the amount of the reduction under the bill. I do not know what effect economically this reduction has upon the economy, although the Treasury feedback estimate is about $400 million in the fiscal year 1966 and $1.49 billion in the fiscal year 1967.

But I have yet to discuss the matter with an economist qualified in the field who does not tell me that we get just as much economic impetus out of $2 billion of excise tax reduction as we do out of general income tax reduction. I have not yet made up my mind that we do. So, as I say, I do not know how much economic buildup you get from a reduction in these excise taxes. Neither do I know the exact amount of drag you have on the economy by retaining them. But I do not think we can say with certainty that the retention of these excise taxes would improve our receipts for the whole of the fiscal year—to the extent that we estimate that there will be a loss.

I believe there will be an improvement in receipts, however. This improvement in revenues is evidence of the salutary effect of the reduction made in the Revenue Act of 1964 upon the economy, and is the kind of effect which this excise tax reduction also can be expected to have in the coming year. As I am sure you know, we have already had rising business conditions over a period of 52 months, the longest peacetime expansionary period on record. This excise tax reduction bill, in addition to making sense out of our excise tax structure, will also aid in sustaining ths general improvement of business conditions over a much longer period of time.

This improvement in revenues with the tax reductions we have made in recent years has occurred at the same time we have been restraining expenditures. This is a policy which I am glad to say the President has indicated he is continuing. The president's letter to this effect is set forth on pages 10 and 11 of the committee report.

We have all recognized that in an excise tax reduction bill it is necessary to watch very closely the effect of such a reduction on consumer purchases during the interval between the time of the announcement of the proposed elimination of the various excise taxes and the effective date of these reductions.

It was because of these problems that I asked the administration to withhold the announcement of its proposals with respect to excise tax reduction until the time remaining before the proposed effective date would be the minimal period consistent with providing Congress an adequate time to consider and take appropriate actions on the proposed excise tax reductions.

As a result, the President sent his message to Congress on May 17 and all of the excise tax reductions, where it was believed that there might be problems of buyer resistence, take effect on July 1. This is less than a month and a half and could hardly be a shorter period of time and still give Congress sufficient time to consider the reductions.

We also have provided floor stock refunds in almost all cases with respect to the inventories of retailers and wholesale dealers which they have on hand on the end of business on June 30. As a result, there should be no reluctance on their part to maintain normal stocks of the taxed items during this transition period.

As to the effect on consumer purchases, it was recognized that in some cases there may be deferrals of these purchases during this period. It is important to emphasize, however, that in most cases these will be merely deferrals in sales and not lost sales. Thus in some cases sales probably will be somewhat lower in May and June than would otherwise be expected. However, this should be made up for by higher sales in July and August. In fact, probably the increased interest in these taxed products, plus the price reductions which occur because of the tax repeals, will stimulate sales for this entire period to such an extent as to bring total sales above that which could otherwise be expected.

As a general rule, however, your committee did not provide for consumer refunds effective back to the date of announcement of the President's proposals. Your committee considered this undesirable because of the tremendous compliance burden which this represents for manufacturers and distributors.

It is not possible to provide for purchases during this transitional period in any way except through refunds, because the law requires the collection of the tax until the bill has been acted on by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President. Moreover, it is essential, if refunds are to be provided, to provide them through the manufacturers of the product. Only in this way is it possible to verify the fact that the sales were made, and whether the sales occurred before or after the reduction date. Unfortunately, however, this presents a very large compliance problem both for the retail and wholesale dealers on one hand and the manufacturers on the other. This would mean—if we were to provide generally for consumer refunds—millions of refund claims which would have to be processed from the consumers through the retailers, back to the wholesalers, and from them back to the manufacturers. Finally, this would have to be also processed from the manufacturers back to the Government.

Actually, the tax reduction is sufficiently small in the case of many of the manufacturers' taxes so that any real knowledge on the part of the consumer about the size of the reduction would hardly affect his purchases.

There also would be considerable confusion on the part of the consumers as to exactly how large their refund should be. Most of them are not acquainted with the manufacturers' price and would expect their 10-percent or 5-percent refund to be that percent of the retail price. The retailers would have great difficulties in explaining the difference, and might well find some dissatisfied customers on their hands if they provide refunds of anything less than the tax multiplied by the retail price.

However, in two cases, the President recommended consumer refunds and your committee's bill goes along with him in this respect. One such refund is provided for air-conditioning units because a very large proportion of their sales for the entire year occurs during May and June. Something like 40 percent of their total sales are in this period. If these sales are delayed, they may possibly be delayed for a season and not just a month.

Similarly, the President recommended a consumer refund for the tax on passenger automobiles. This was done because of the large size of the average tax in this case and the fear that the delay in auto sales might have an adverse effect on the economy as a whole.

While I recognize that there are problems in the case of other products subject to excise tax which are being repealed, your committee concluded that the problems that they have are not of the same magnitude as exists in the case of the air conditioners and passenger cars. As a result, no other consumer refunds are provided.

I should note in passing that in practically all of these other cases the major sales period occurs around Christmas time rather than in the spring with the result that a deferral in their sales will not have a permanent effect.

The procedure the Treasury Department has indicated is to be used in the case of consumer refunds for automobiles and air conditioners is as follows:

Retroactive Provisions for Automobiles and Air Conditioners

The retroactive refund provisions, which have been provided for autoombiles and air conditioners, would operate much in the same manner as a floor stock refund; that is, the refunds would be channeled through the manufacturer or importer who would then file a consolidated claim with the Internal Revenue Service. Basically, the process would work as follows:

1. All consumers purchasing automobiles and air conditioners beginning on Saturday, May 15, and ending on the day before the excise tax cut or repeal takes effect (presumably July 1, 1965), would be eligible for a refund.

2. At the time the consumer purchases the article, the dealer could inform him that, if the excise tax reduction is enacted as scheduled, he will be refunded the amount of the cut in the manufacturer's excise tax which has been paid on the article. In the case of automobiles, the tax reduction would amount to 3 percent of the manufacturer's sale price and in the case of air conditioners, it would amount to 10 percent of the manufacturer's sale price. (In this regard, some retailers are promising a refund to consumers of more than the tax reduction. While this is permissible, it should be noted that the refund from the Internal Revenue Service will be limited to the amount of the tax reduction.)

3. After the enactment of the excise tax cut, the dealer would notify the manufacturer (or importer) of the specific automobiles or air conditioners which were sold during the retroactive period and which are eligible for a refund. In the case of automobiles, the dealer would, in most cases, notify the manufacturer directly since he most likely purchased his inventory directly from the manufacturer. On the other hand, in the case of air conditioners the notification would most likely be channeled through the distributor from whom the retailer purchased his air conditioners. In both cases, however, this notification could be made at the same time the dealer forwards his request for his floor stock refund. As in the case of a request for a floor stock refund, the dealer's notification to the manufacturer as to people qualifying for consumer refunds would have to reach the manufacturer by January 1, 1966. This cutoff is provided in order to give the manufacturer time to process the claims, make reimbursements, and file his overall claim with the Internal Revenue Service, which all must be done by February 10, 1966. These dates allow approximately 3 months more time than was provided for the floor stock refunds in 1954.

4. After receiving the information from all his dealers, the automobile or air conditioner manufacturer or importer would consolidate it and file an overall claim with the Internal Revenue Service for the tax reduction on the items involved. This must be done by February 10, 1966. As part of such claim the manufacturer would be required to submit evidence that the consumers have actually been reimbursed in at least the amount of the tax reduction on the automobile or air conditioner. This reimbursement can either be made directly by the manufacturer to the consumer (as apparently the automobile manufacturers intend to do) or can be made through the dealer who originally sold the article. The amount of the reimbursement to the consumer must be in at least the amount of the tax reduction on the automobile or air conditioner. Thus, if the manufacturer desires for the dealer to make the refund, he will have to notify the dealer as to the amount of tax involved on each article since the dealer will most likely not have access to the manufacturer's price from which to compute the tax.

5. Upon filing his claim and substantiating the fact of reimbursement, the manufacturer or importer will receive the amount of his refund from the Internal Revenue Service. This refund will be limited to the tax reduction on the articles involved.

MANNER OF REIMBURSEMENT

As indicated above, either the manufacturer or the dealer could reimburse the consumer. If the dealer is to do it, he could make the refund out of his own funds and then wait for reimbursement from the manufacturer, or he could first file his request with the manufacturer and wait to reimburse the consumer until he has received funds from the manufacturer. If the first route is to be followed, the dealer would have to obtain the necessary information as to the amount of the tax involved from the manufacturer.

In any event, the refund would have to be in the form of a separate payment to the consumer (which may be larger than the tax reduction) in order for the manufacturer to qualify for a refund from the Internal Revenue Service. In other words, a dealer could not effect the refund by merely reducing the price originally charged the consumer. This would be prohibited because it would be impossible to tell whether the price reduction really reflects the tax reduction or is merely a cut in price which the consumer would have received anyway. The refund to the consumer must be by check or cash; a credit to a balance due would not suffice.

The Internal Revenue Service, on May 28, 1965, issued a technical information release (No. 730) which indicates the type of evidence which the manufacturer must have in his records to substantiate his claim. A copy is attached.

Mr. Chairman, following is a technical information release issued by the Internal Revenue Service this last Friday on the types of records which will be required with respect to the consumer refunds:

Technical Information Release

The U.S. Internal Revenue Service said today that it has received numerous requests from the public as to the type of records which will be required to be maintained in order to qualify for the refunds provided in the retroactive repeal of certain excise taxes by H.R. 8371. The bill now before Congress provides, under certain circumstances, for refunds of excise taxes paid by manufacturers on articles purchased by consumers after May 14 and before July 1, 1965.

While the bill is not yet law, the Service wishes to advise the public on the type of records it will consider adequate to substantiate refunds as provided in the bill. The Service realizes that changes may occur in the bill prior to its enactment, but that there is a need for immediate guidance as to recordkeeping. In the event the bill is amended the Service will announce as soon as possible any new or changed rules which may be appropriate.

H.R. 8371, a bill to reduce Federal excise taxes, was introduced by Congressman WILBUR MILLS on May 24, 1965. The bill embodies the President's recommendations for reduction and repeal of certain excise taxes. Under the bill, the present 10-percent manufacturers excise tax on self-contained air-conditioning units would be repealed effective July 1, 1965. In the case of passenger automobiles and trailers suitable for use with such automobiles, the manufacturers excise tax would be reduced from 10 to 7 percent, effective July 1, 1965.

The bill would also authorize refunds of excise taxes paid by the manufacturers (including importers) of self-contained air-conditioning units on those units purchased by consumers after May 14, 1965, and before July 1, 1965. In addition, in the case of passenger automobiles and trailers suitable for use with passenger automobiles purchased by consumers after May 14, 1965, and before July 1, 1965, H.R. 8371 would authorize a refund of the 3-percent proposed reduction in the excise tax paid by the manufacturer on the vehicle. However, in both situations in order for the manufacturer to qualify for the refund, the amount of the total reduction must be reimbursed to the consumer.

The Revenue Service emphasized that the excise tax on both automobiles and air conditioners is based on the price at which the manufacturer sells the item, not the retail price. Thus, if the manufacturer's selling price (for tax purposes) of an air conditioner is $125 and the article is eventually sold to the consumer for $175, the amount of the tax, and therefore, the maximum amount for which a refund may be claimed by the manufacturer, is 10 percent of $125.

The Revenue Service indicated that the reimbursement to the consumer must be in the form of a separate payment either in cash or by check, and cannot merely be in the form of a reduction in the price for which the article is sold. No other form of reimbursement, such as a credit on the consumer's account, will be acceptable. This requirement does not preclude payment to a consumer in an amount larger than the excise tax to effect a greater price reduction. However, the amount of the refund to the manufacturer will be limited to the amount of the tax.

Payment to the consumer may be made either directly by the manufacturer or through some other person, such as the dealer from whom the consumer purchased the article. The Revenue Service will then make a refund to the manufacturer on the basis of his claim for refund.

Many questions have been raised as to what evidence the manufacturer will be required to have in his records to substantiate the fact that the article for which a refund is claimed was purchased by a consumer and that he has been reimbursed. The Revenue Service said it will require the following evidence:

1. The name and address of the consumer;
2. The name and address of the dealer or other person from whom the consumer purchased the article;
3. The invoice (sales slip) number and date of purchase of the article by the consumer;
4. The serial number (identification number) of the article purchased;
5. The date and amount of the reimbursement to the consumer. If such reimbursement was made by a person other than the manufacturer, the manufacturer must maintain in his files a statement signed by the consumer that reimbursement has been made to him.

In addition, the person (whether the manufacturer, distributor, dealer, or other person) who made the reimbursement to the consumer must have in his possession either the cancelled check or a receipt signed by the consumer.

If the reimbursement was made through a person other than the manufacturer, similar evidence should be maintained by such other person.

Further information as to the procedures for filing the claim for refund, as well as the procedures applicable to floor stock refunds will be forthcoming at a later date.

To summarize, I have no hesitancy in recommending to the House that these particular excise taxes that are involved in this legislation be eliminated even though the fiscal year in which most of them will come off still looks to us as though it will be a deficit year. For I view these taxes primarily as being undesirable sources of Federal revenue—discriminatory in effect, creating administrative problems and difficulties in compliance. The net effect of the action we recommend is to bring about improved equity in our tax laws. I believe that over the long run this will do much to bring back to us from the remaining sources of revenue the amount of revenue we forego through the elimination of these excise taxes.

Thus I would urge the House to agree to the bill, H.R. 8371, when we have a record vote on it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I heard the gentleman say, at the close of his remarks—and I was rather surprised to hear it—that he felt there would not be any reduction in the amount of revenue because of, evidently, stimulated business or a pickup somewhere else.

Mr. MILLS. No. The gentleman misunderstood me. I said that there would be a reduction in revenues of $2.1 billion or $2.2 billion as a result of this, in the fiscal year 1966.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I understood that.

Mr. MILLS. I believe I may have confused the gentleman by saying that in the long run he will regain much of the revenue. But on the basis of the estimates today, we estimate that is the reduction for the fiscal year 1966.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I should like to ask the gentleman where he would propose to pick up the revenue which is going to be lost.

Mr. MILLS. I am not proposing anything in the legislation to pick up revenues lost through the excise tax reduction.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does the gentleman not believe that we must take that into consideration? If we lose revenue from one source we should look to regaining it someplace else.

Mr. MILLS. I should be glad to call a meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means, to let the gentleman come before us and tell us where to pick it up.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not have an answer to that.

Mr. MILLS. I do not have an answer, either, in this bill for that.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is why I am against this bill. I believe we need all of the revenues we have.

Mr. MILLS. I believe the gentleman would be making a mistake to vote against the bill, but that is the gentleman's right.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MIZE. The gentleman called attention to page 38 of the report, as to excise taxes remaining after all reductions made by the bill become effective. I note the item of tires, tread rubber, et cetera. Does this mean that tractor tires and tires on farm implements still are to be taxed?

Mr. MILLS. The tires are taxed. Nonhighway-type tires are taxed at 5 cents a pound rather than the 10 cents per pound rate of tax on highway-type vehicles. The proceeds of the tax on both types of tires go into the highway trust fund.

That is not in this bill, however. None of that is the subject matter of this bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief.

This bill is an example of the fact that not every bill which is reported by the Committee on Ways and Means comes to the floor on a controversial basis. Certainly this bill can be classed as legislation on which there is general agreement.

I believe that this general agreement springs from the very nature of the taxes we here propose to repeal.

Our whole excise system grew out of emergencies and grew up like Topsy. All of these taxes are onerous, are inequitable, and are discriminatory. Their only justification can be as a source of revenue during a time of real emergency.

Many of us have believed that some of these taxes which were especially discriminatory, especially inequitable, and especially onerous should have been repealed before this, even though our revenue needs were great. I refer to the retail excises. It will be recalled that I attempted last year to have these taxes repealed.

I should say at the beginning that I do not believe there is any question that we have today certain revenue needs which are not being met. We will have a deficit this year. We will have another deficit next year. But the nature of these taxes, it seems to me, is such that in spite of the deficits we should consider the repeal of these taxes.

Many of these taxes were enacted in the 1930's. Others were enacted in 1940 and 1941 in order to meet the problems brought about by World War II. Others were enacted as a result of the Korean war in 1951.

With the enactment of this bill, we wipe off the books all of these various selection excise taxes and we leave only those excise taxes for which a specific justification can be made for their continuation. For instance, there are those that go into special funds. The tax on fishing equipment, reels and rods, and the tax on firearms, which are used for conservation purposes. The tax on gasoline, trucks, tires, and so forth, which go into the interstate highway trust fund for the building of highways. There are the regulatory taxes, such as those on machineguns and narcotics and some of the various other taxes, each of which has some special reason for its continuation.

Then in addition to that, we have the sumptuary taxes to which the chairman referred; namely, those on alcohol and tobacco.

If you look on page 38 of the report, you will find listed the taxes that remain in effect. I think rather than worry about what taxes are repealed, it is easier to look at what taxes will remain, because we do a complete job of getting rid of the taxes imposed on a selective basis and which can only be justified in a time of extreme emergency and extreme revenue needs. I wholeheartedly support the elimination of these taxes.

While we do have revenue needs, I think it is advisable that we do as the committee has recommended; namely, repeal all of these excises rather than try to be selective to which ones we would reduce or phase out and eliminate. We have done the full job except for those limited areas that I have referred to and which are set forth on page 38 of the report. As far as all the rest are concerned we envision that by 1969 they will be swept off the books.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned that we do have revenue needs and we are not proposing this reduction at a time when we have a surplus of revenues that can be used for that purpose. This bill, to some degree, will have an impact on our budgetary situation. As far as fiscal 1966 is concerned, it will amount to approximately $2 billion. In fiscal 1967, there will be a further impact. In fiscal 1968, there will be an additional amount. In fiscal 1969, there will be an additional amount also. But as far as the immediate impact is concerned, the estimate is that the reduction in revenue for fiscal 1966 will amount to about $2 billion. I think, frankly, that there is room to quarrel with whether or not that is an accurate figure because it does not take into consideration, as I understand it, the administrative costs of collecting these taxes, and if there is any group of taxes that involves administrative headaches from the standpoint of the Internal Revenue Service and the taxpayers, it is these excise taxes. I do not believe the savings in administrative cost is reflected in this $2 billion figure.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is eminently correct, as usual. This bill does not take into account any reduction in administrative costs. In addition, I think it is well to call the attention of the House to the fact that the figure of $2.2 billion, representing the effect of this bill in the fiscal year 1966, does not take into consideration any so-called feedback whatsoever. Any economic effect of the bill is not considered in this estimate.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is right. Nor does it take into consideration, for instance, Mr. Chairman, the compliance cost to the manufacturers in the case of the manufacturer's excise taxes, which are an expense and are reflected in their income tax liability. Nor does the estimate take into account as far as retail taxes are concerned, the bookkeeping and other burdens imposed upon our retail establishments. So that, again, when they are relieved of that burden, they are relieved of an expense which is today, of course, deductible in figuring their income taxes.

So I say, if I would quarrel with anything, I would quarrel with the assumption that the figures indicate a $2 billion loss in revenue. I do not believe that is an accurate figure if you take into consideration the administrative burden on the Government and the administrative burden on the taxpayers, such as the retailers and the manufacturers. But still, in spite of those facts, I should issue a word of caution, because we are in a deficit picture and there are indications of our spending going up. I would caution, as I did back in 1963 at the time we considered the income tax reduction bill which passed this Congress in September of 1963, that you cannot talk about taxes in a vacuum. You must look at what your spending picture is and what your deficit picture is. And I would recall a little history. I opposed the tax reduction bill in September of 1963—why? Because as I said, there was no indication of a proper restraint on spending. What we were doing at that time, with the deficit constantly rising, was contemplating tremendous increases in expenditures for the following years.

We will recall, for instance, that it was estimated at that time that the expenditures for fiscal 1965 would be $102 billion. At that time we were operating at a level of approximately $97 billion and contemplating $97.7 billion of expenditures for the fiscal year 1964.

I said at that time that we could justify a reduction in taxes only if we held the line on spending. I told the House at that time that we should limit expenditures for 1965 to $98 billion, and if we could work toward that goal we could justify tax reduction.

We were ridiculed, those of us who suggested that that was possible. We were told that we could not possibly live with a $98 billion expenditure ceiling in 1965. But it was done. Our expenditures for the fiscal year 1965 will not come up to the $98 billion that I said was the ceiling we should impose on ourselves. And I want to give every credit to the Congress, to the Committee on Appropriations, and to the President for holding the line on spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I caution that restraint on expenditures must continue, and that if we take the lid off spending, we would not be justified in passing this tax reduction bill today no matter how onerous these taxes may be. We must have the assurance that even in fiscal 1966 our expenditures will remain under $100 billion. Under those circumstances, although I would have to say, Mr. Chairman, conditions still are not as desirable as I would like—I would like to see us holding a firmer rein than the $2 billion increase in expenditures contemplated for this coming year—yet I believe the fact that there is being manifested at least some restraint and because these taxes are so onerous and so inequitable, we are justified in supporting this bill as it comes from the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the favorable support of the membership in behalf of this bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS].

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the administration, the President, and the chairman of this committee for bringing this bill to the floor of the House today. I feel that it has long been needed.

Mr. Chairman, I was amazed over the weekend while discussing this bill with a man of my acquaintance to hear him say that he considered it the most bearish action that had been taken by this administration and that he was personally convinced that the administration saw trouble and therefore proposed the reduction of the excise taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that there has probably never been a time when a single Congress has met that there has not been considered in one bill or another the question of the reduction of excise taxes. This is not a new proposal. It has been proposed in many Congresses.

Mr. Chairman, the reason for this bill is to stimulate further the economy before trouble arises.

Now, there are some who on the other hand would say that this is not a bearish action, but that this action will cause inflation. I believe that should be answered also.

If an excise tax is cut and if the cut is passed on to the consumer, we will reduce the cost-of-living index. So, far from being inflationary, it is in truth deflationary.

If the cut is passed on—and it is inconceivable that the people who receive these cuts would actually increase the price of their article above the price of the article now with the tax added—therefore, I do not feel that there will be inflation as a result of this proposed cut.

In addition to that there is nothing to indicate that even if consumption is stimulated America's productive capacity is straining at its seams. We can meet the problem of production.

Mr. Chairman, of all of the taxes proposed to be cut as suggested here in this bill, in my judgment the one which will have the best effect upon the economy is the proposed automobile excise tax cut. Perhaps some of us are unaware that the price of an automobile is the only price which by Federal statute must be published. Therefore, the purchasers will receive the full reduction because they will be able to check the price of the automobile with the price which they have paid in previous years.

In addition to this, Mr. Chairman, of all the items sold in America, this item requires the most component parts and has the best effect upon the total economy of the Nation.

So I particularly appreciate the fact that this tax has been removed. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means pointed out this is the only tax removal which the committee included beyond the President's recommendation. Personally, I would have supported the full 10-percent reduction at one time. I think it would have been stimulating to the economy. In addition to that, I feel we would get used cars off the road, perhaps, and everyone would enjoy the effect. However, you must remember there are people who own a great many used cars, and there would have been a 10-percent reduction on those cars also. The Ways and Means Committee is not in business to put other people out of business. It is perhaps as well that the tax has been removed in stages.

May I say also I am particularly opposed to earmarking any part of the auto excise tax. Any tax that is earmarked, in my experience, has never been removed. If a bureau cannot spend it for the reasons it is earmarked, it will think of some other reason. Therefore, I am opposed to earmarking any part of the tax on a car because the sale of cars has more effect on our total economy than any other item sold. The difference between the fourth quarter of last year when you had a partial auto strike, and the first quarter of this year, was $14 billion in the gross national product annually. The difference can be accounted for largely by the increased manufacture of cars. Therefore, I think it would be most unwise to earmark any part of the auto excise tax.

It is time, therefore, for the benefit of all, that these excise taxes be removed, and that we have a bargain day in America.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to advise the House that there are some extensive printed public hearings on this issue of excise tax reform. These hearings were held last year, of course, but they were, I thought, very good hearings, and laid the base for the action that the committee is taking here today in recommending the removal of $5 billion of a $15 billion area of revenue.

I am critical of the fact that the committee did not hold public hearings at the time we actually moved forward on this particular bill. I am disturbed, I might say, and I have expressed it on many occasions at the tendency of committees to hold executive-session-type hearings on matters that have no basis for confidentiality. Certainly there are areas where for security reasons or other special reasons, we might have to conduct hearings behind closed doors. I think probably I am more concerned about the lack of concern of my colleagues here in the House and the lack of concern of the news media and of the people in this method of conducting public business.

During these hearings behind closed doors, which I regret to say are not published and are not available for the House in its consideration of this matter. The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler, testified and a number of us interrogated him. I particularly did so and I did ask permission of the Committee on Ways and Means, the chairman, to at least excerpt this portion of the hearings which were recorded and place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have done so and that appears in this morning's RECORD, the June 1 RECORD, on page 12071, and the interrogation is on page 12073.

The gist of this interrogation has to do with expenditures. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] has pointed out the necessity when we are dealing in reducing taxes or increasing taxes to relate this to the other side of the ledger—What are our expenditures—What is this situation in regard to balanced budgets?

I wrote supplemental views on the Excise Tax Act of 1965 which can be found in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means.

For some time—a few days—it was was a question of whether those were to be minority views opposing an excise tax cut—opposing a cut which I have been arguing for much longer, I might say, than those in the administration who advocate it and those on the Ways and Means Committee on the majority side of the aisle—arguing for it because in my judgment this was an uneconomic tax which was a real burden on the economy. In fact, the hearings that I referred to which were held last year by the Committee on Ways and Means where we called before us some of the great students and scholars in this area substantiate this point of view. Yet, these views that I am referring to would have been minority views urging that the Congress not vote for this—at least the House not vote for this particular excise tax cut—depending on what the administration had to say about expenditures.

To me, it is shocking that the President of the United States in sending the message to the Congress that we cut $4 billion, of revenues which was his recommendation in this excise tax area, nowhere said anything about expenditures or expenditure restraint or about a balanced budget. When the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the committee just a few days ago in his prepared statement he said nothing about expenditure restraint or about balanced budgets. I am happy to state that in this interrogation which you will find in the RECORD, the Secretary of the Treasury did reiterate a determination to hold the expenditure levels as given to this Congress this January in the budget message to $99.7 billion for fiscal year 1966. He reiterated the belief of his administration in the goal of a balanced budget.

I said I would feel a lot better and could vote for this bill if there were some indication on the part of the President that he was going to continue a policy of expenditure restraint. I am happy to state that the Secretary of the Treasury thought the President would make such a statement. He said certainly the President's record, his deeds, spoke more loudly than words.

I myself must concur that the President has done a good job in the expenditure restraint area. I had felt, actually, he would be unable to do it when we discussed this same issue in relation to the 1964 income tax report. Still, it was important that he actually state this.

The President did send a letter to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee dated May 25, 1965, which I also put in the RECORD, in which the President reiterated twice this basic goal of exercising expenditure restraint.

I want to read my supplemental views. I want them in the RECORD. Then I will develop them further.

It is important to consider the economic theory on which a reduction of excise taxes at a time when the Federal budget is still not in balance and the economy is in a period of cyclical upturn.

The President in his message to the Congress on cutting excise tax revenues stated:

> I know that the Congress and the country will join me in recognizing our good fortune in being able to declare a new fiscal dividend of nearly $4 billion in excise tax cuts out of the bounty of a prosperous and growing economy—a dividend that will help keep it prosperous and growing.

I think it is necessary to contest this presumption. The Nation has no earnings out of which a "dividend" may be declared, as evidenced by the President's simultaneous request that the debt ceiling be raised from $324 to $329 billion.

The justification for repealing the selected retail and manufacturers' excise taxes and the excise taxes on transportation and communication lies in the economic inequities and impediments to economic growth inherent in these kinds of Federal selected excise taxes. Furthermore as Republicans have been consistently pointing out that many of these taxes were imposed during wartime to deliberately limit the amount of economic activity in certain areas and as a matter of governmental good faith these taxes should have been the first to be removed ahead of or concomitantly with income tax rate reduction, when the time had arrived when tax reduction could be considered.

In other words, the removal of these selected excise taxes is the removal of impediments to economic growth. It is not as the administration is wont to put it, particularly as it did in discussing the Federal income tax rate reductions to provide a stimulus to economic growth. This is not just a quarrel over figures of speech. After the removal of an impediment, a rock from the shoe, as it were, euphoria continues. After applying a stimulus, a shot in the arm, as it were, euphoria declines as time goes on.

It must be emphasized that the 1964 Federal income tax rate cuts law removed serious impediments to economic growth, but it could only have been successful if new sizable impediments were not created concomitantly with the removal of the old impediments. The Federal income tax cuts were accompanied with expenditure restraint, as the gentleman from Wisconsin pointed out—and he was the leader in this—so that greater impediments to economic growth hopefully were not created in the difficult field of debt management, not the least of which are inflation and deficiency balances in our international payments. It must be remembered that the Republican motion to recommit the 1964 income tax bill required that the bill be immediately reported back with an amendment which required the President to proclaim that expenditure levels were not to exceed $97 billion for fiscal year 1964 and $98 billion for fiscal year 1965.

Although the administration resisted being so told, it received the message, and to its great credit did hold expenditures to these levels; indeed, it is keeping the level for this fiscal year below the $98 billion mark.

So the issue on cutting $4 to $5 billion out of the $15 billion revenues the Federal Government receives from selected excise taxes relates to the administration holding expenditure levels to at least the increased figure of $99.7 billion for fiscal 1966 it gave the Congress in the budget message this January.

That is what the Secretary has promised us in these remarks that he made before the Committee on Ways and Means. Now this is very important.

The administration spokesmen have stated that in spite of the international situation and in spite of the recent request which was granted for $700 million new obligational authority to the Department of Defense for activities in South Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic, it is adhering to the $99.7 billion expenditure level. The President in a special letter to the Ways and Means Committee has reaffirmed his intention to continue to exercise expenditure restraints.

Just as I felt that $97 and $98 billion were still too high expenditure levels in a period of economic upturn, so I feel that $99.7 billion is still too high for fiscal 1966. However, this is now not a dispute over a matter of economic theory, but of judgment based upon an adherence to an agreed upon theory.

The Keynesian economist, or the neo-Keynesian views are not prevailing and the administration is resisting them. It is now a matter of judgment based upon an adherence to an agreed-upon theory.

The administration in spite of some spokesmen among its multifold membership is positively supporting the theory that tax cutting under present economic conditions can only be beneficial if accompanied with expenditure restraint. Expenditure restraint is never easy and it remains particularly difficult when the administration exercising this restraint at the same time is urging the Congress to enact increasing amounts of new obligational authority to spend for the future, specifically in the amount of $106.4 billion for fiscal 1966 and obviously in increasing amounts in the ensuing fiscal years if the programs the administration is initiating are to be fully carried out.

Furthermore, the administration has reiterated its determination to achieve the goal of a balanced budget and that balanced budgets are not economic myths adhered to only by out-of-date Puritans. The deficits have been decreasing and a balanced budget is within our sights by fiscal 1967 if expenditure restraint is exercised.

While the administration is to be commended for exercising expenditure restraint in the past 2 fiscal years, and hopefully in the next fiscal year beginning July 1, it must be noted that the carryover unspent authorizations enacted in prior years increased from $87.8 billion at start of 1964 to $89.3 billion at the end of 1964, to $96.7 at the end of 1965, to $101.5 billion at the end of 1966.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Missouri 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. This is the "time bomb" which the President can explode at any time, over which the Congress has lost effective control.

I think it is important that the administration implement its policy of expenditure restraint by cutting down on its previously granted authorities to spend before seeking new authorities or better still to send up a few rescission bills to the Congress to cut back on this huge carryover authority of $101.5 billion it otherwise will have on July 1, 1966.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman on his supplementary statement and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the longtime Republican position in favor of reduction of Federal excise taxes, a position that I support in general.

And I want to commend the work of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] on this important subject. He has successfully cited the need for discipline and order in management of the Federal budget.

The concept of restraint in Government spending has proven itself time and time again as essential to the success of fiscal and monetary policies in times of economic expansion.

The minority membership of the Joint Economic Committee has highlighted this fact in House Report No. 175, the 1965 Joint Economic Report.

It refers to the 1964 tax cut and the Republican position that along with the cut, Government expenditures should be held to a limit of $97 billion in 1964 and $98 billion in 1965.

Advocates of high Government spending as a means of economic stimulation protested the Republican concept at that time. Nevertheless, the Republican position was adopted in practice, and has been vindicated since then in the general public and Government satisfaction over events since the tax cut was enacted.

As the Joint Economic Committee minority states:

> If the tax cut had been accompanied by large increases in Federal spending on the order of the previous 3 years, it is likely that the Nation would have experienced a serious inflationary overheating of the economy.

Now we face a comparable situation. The promise of a budget balance in fiscal 1967 seems empty. Even in fiscal 1966 there is cause for concern in view of the fact that if the various White House proposals are enacted into law Federal cash payments to the public in fiscal 1966 will be $6 billion, or 5 percent higher than in the current fiscal year.

Other indicators show that the present concern is not a depressed economy, but an overstimulation. The distinguished Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., just yesterday in New York spoke of the need for world confidence in a stable dollar.

As every American housewife knows today, food prices have gone up considerably in the past 3-week period.

So I vigorously support the same concept which has proven itself in times of economic well-being: a tax cut must be accompanied by policies of restraint in Government spending. Otherwise the result could be spiraling inflation and a premature economic downturn.

Specifically, two objectives should be sought in management of the budget. First, domestic spending should be curtailed. Second, the budget should be balanced as a sign that this country is capable of keeping its economic house in order.

But there is no sign that domestic spending is even being held to constant levels. On the contrary, domestic spending is growing greater and there is every indication that spending levels will continue to increase. The budget deficits, instead of being reduced, appear to be increasing.

Tomorrow we will be asked to raise the legal limit on the national debt from $324 to $329 billion. And this comes only 1 day behind today's legislative proposal to reduce excise taxes by almost $5 billion. I cannot reconcile these two actions from the standpoint of fiscal responsibility.

We desperately need a comprehensive tax reform, not a series of expedient taxation changes implemented under political pressures of various kinds and supported by short-term, artificial devices.

The 1964 tax cut was a political action which was economically sensible only because the Republican recommendation for spending restraint was somewhat heeded in practice.

But today there does not apear to be a reasonable possibility that spending restraint will accompany a new tax cut. New spending obligations in the amount of $106.4 billion for fiscal 1966 are in the works.

Therefore it is my conviction that a brake on spending must accompany a reduction in taxes. These old wartime excise taxes should be reduced and I will vote for their reduction, but I shall continue my fight to cut Federal spending in every reasonable way. This Congress must exercise restraint in spending. The President must exercise restraint in his requests for spending. And the people must exercise restraint in their demands for Government handouts. Without this restraint, our action today in passing this bill will be a tragic mistake.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, now I come to a point which I think is one of the most interesting points that can be made. Here I have advanced this economic theory. The administration by its actions and statement is adhering to this economic theory. And yet the news media throughout this country will continue to report an entirely different economic theory, the theory of deficit financing, that increased expenditures are what keep our economy moving. And the economists, many of them throughout the country, will reiterate this position and try to create the impression, as they have, that the tax cut is not in context with expenditure restraint.

The President helped to create this kind of a situation in his economic message to the Congress this year when he boasted about the economic effect of the 1964 tax cut. He could well boast about its effect, but this was done in context of expenditure reform and nowhere in the economic message does he point this out.

In fact, the President's Council of Economic Advisers are among the greatest offenders in talking as if this were not in context of expenditure restraint.

It will be interesting to find if anyone in this House of Representatives—and there are many on the Democratic side of the aisle who do not adhere to the economic theory that I have advanced here and the administration has followed; they actually go along the line of the neo-Keynesian philosophy and argue there should be increased expenditures—it will be interesting to see if any of them come down into the well of the House—and there are those who are on the Joint Economic Committee—to defend this theory that is not being followed. I daresay they will not, and the RECORD tomorrow probably will not even show any insertions justifying such a position.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to the speech that William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System gave yesterday before the commencement day luncheon of the Alumni Federation of Columbia University. The distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. SMITH], referred to this in his remarks on the rule. This needs to be read, and under authority previously granted in the House to insert extraneous matter I am going to insert this in the RECORD at the end of my statement. Mr. Martin is pointing out the dangers that lie in overheating our economy.

I am not sure—and I want to emphasize this—I am not sure that even holding to a $99.7 billion expenditure level we can justify a cut of $4 billion from our revenues in this fiscal year. It will be less than $4 billion; the full effect is not $4 billion, but approximately $2 billion in this oncoming fiscal year.

We are in a dangerous situation. Our international balance of payments has not improved. All we have been doing is applying palliatives, putting off the evil day. I am hopeful that the administration will read this speech.

I also want to advise the House that Senator JAVITS, the ranking minority member on the Joint Economic Committee, along with myself, have sent a letter to Chairman PATMAN of the Joint Economic Committee urging that immediate hearings be held on this subject of Mr. Martin's speech; call him before us, call the Government people before us, call outside people before us, to get to the bottom of this serious matter. In this letter we pointed out that we had sent a similar letter 2 or 3 years ago, at the time that the Kennedy administration was talking about the need of a quickie tax cut in order to stimulate the economy.

We said that certainly before such a thing was moved, the Joint Economic Committee ought to hold hearings, call before us the administration spokesmen and sponsors of this idea and listen to experts who held a different point of view so that we knew what we were doing.

And, Mr. Chairman, to the credit of the Democrat leadership of that committee, we did hold such hearings and I submit that was the reason there was the end of any pushing for this quickie tax cut and we got back onto a sounder fiscal basis.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge, in light of the past experience the Joint Economic Committee hold hearings on the subject of the remarks of Mr. Martin, chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and give especial consideration to this matter Mr. Martin has pointed up that we are overheating this economy to the point where we may experience exactly what we experienced in the thirties.

Mr. Chairman, certainly all of us on all sides of the aisle are interested in the handling of our fiscal affairs to see that this does not occur.

Mr. Martin's speech follows:

DOES MONETARY HISTORY REPEAT ITSELF?

(Address of William McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, before the Commencement Day luncheon on the Alumni Federation of Columbia University, New York City, June 1, 1965)

When economic prospects are at their brightest, the dangers of complacency and recklessness are greatest. As our prosperity proceeds on its record-breaking path, it behooves every one of us to scan the horizon of our national and international economy for danger signals so as to be ready for any storm.

Some eminent observers have recently compared the present with the period preceding the breakdown of the interwar economy, and have warned us of the threats of another great depression. We should take these warnings seriously enough to inquire into their merits and to try to profit in the future from the lessons of the past.

And indeed, we find disquieting similarities between our present prosperity and the fabulous twenties.

Then, as now, there had been virtually uninterrupted progress for 7 years. And if we disregard some relatively short though severe fluctuations, expansion had been underway for more than a generation—the two longest stretches of that kind since the advent of the industrial age; and each period had been distorted in its passage by an inflationary war and postwar boom.

Then, as now, prosperity had been concentrated in the fully developed countries, and within most of these countries, in the industrialized sectors of the economy.

Then, as now, there was a large increase in private domestic debt; in fact, the expansion in consumer debt arising out of both residential mortgages and installment purchases has recently been much faster than in the twenties.

Then, as now, the supply of money and bank credit and the turnover of demand deposits had been continuously growing; and while in the late twenties this growth had occurred with little overall change in gold reserves, this time monetary expansion has been superimposed upon a dwindling gold reserve.

Then, as now, the Federal Reserve had been accused of lack of flexibility in its monetary policy: of insufficient ease in times of economic weakness and of insufficient firmness in times of economic strength.

Then, as now, the world had recovered from the wartime disruption of international trade and finance, and convertibility of the major world currencies at fixed par values had been restored for a number of years.

Then, as now, international indebtedness had risen as fast as domestic debt; recently, in fact, American bank credits to foreigners and foreign holdings of short-term dollar assets have increased faster than in the closing years of the earlier period.

Then, as now, the payments position of the main reserve center—Britain then and the United States now—was uneasy, to say the least; but again, our recent cumulative payments deficits have far exceeded Britain's deficits of the late twenties.

Then, as now, some countries had large and persistent payments surpluses and used their net receipts to increase their short-term reserves rather than to invest in foreign countries.

Then, as now, the most important surplus country, France, had just decided to convert its official holdings of foreign exchange into gold, regardless of the effects of its actions on international liquidity.

Then, as now, there were serious doubts about the appropriate levels of some existing exchange rate relationships, leading periodically to speculative movements of volatile short-term funds.

And most importantly, then as now, many Government officials, scholars, and businessmen were convinced that a new economic era had opened, an era in which business fluctuations had become a thing of the past, in which poverty was about to be abolished, and in which perennial economic progress and expansion were assured.

If some of these likenesses seem menacing, we may take comfort in important differences between the present and the interwar situation.

The distribution of our national income now shows less disparity than in the earlier period; in particular, personal incomes, and especially wages and salaries, have kept pace with corporate profits, and this has reduced the danger of investment expanding in excess of consumption needs.

Perhaps related to that better balance, the increase in stock market credit now has been much smaller.

Instead of a gradual decline in wholesale prices and stability in consumer prices, there has now been stability in wholesale prices though consumer prices have been creeping up.

The worst defects in the structure of commercial and investment banking and of business seem to have been corrected—although we are time and again reminded of our failure to eliminate all abuses.

The potentialities of monetary and fiscal policies are, we hope, better understood—although the rise in Government expenditures even in times of advancing prosperity threatens to make it difficult to be still more expansionary should a serious decline in private business activity require it.

In spite of the rise in the international flow of public and private credit and investment, business abroad appears in general to be less dependent upon American funds. The recent restraint on the outflow of U.S. capital has had little effect on business activity abroad, in contrast to the paralyzing effect of the cessation of U.S. capital outflows in the late twenties.

While the cold war makes for sources of friction absent in the twenties, we are no longer suffering from the cancer of reparations and war debts.

We have learned the lessons taught by the failure of trade and exchange restrictions, and of beggar-my-neighbor policies in general, although the temptation to backslide is ever present.

We have become aware of our responsibility for helping those less developed countries that seem willing and able to develop their economies—although the poor countries still are not becoming rich as fast as the rich countries are becoming richer.

The International Monetary Fund has proved to be a valuable aid to a better working of the international payments system.

A network of international, regional, and bilateral institutions and arrangements has reduced the danger of lack of international financial communication.

And finally, the experience of the twenties has strengthened the resolution of all responsible leaders, businessmen and statesmen alike, never again to permit a repetition of the disasters of the great depression.

But while the spirit is willing, the flesh, in the form of concrete policies, has remained weak. With the best intentions, some experts seem resolved to ignore the lessons of the past.

Economic and political scientists still argue about the factors that converted a stock-exchange crash into the worst depression in our history. But on one point they are agreed: the disastrous impact of the destruction of the international payments system that followed the British decision to devalue sterling in September 1931. At that time, sterling was the kingpin of the world payments system, exactly as the dollar is today. While changes in the par values of other peripheral currencies affected mainly or solely the devaluing countries themselves, the fate of sterling shook the entire world.

This is not wisdom of hindsight. Only a few weeks before the fateful decision was taken, the most eminent economist of the day stated that "for a country in the special circumstances of Great Britain the disadvantages (of devaluation) would greatly outweigh the advantages" and he concurred with his colleagues in rejecting the idea. His name was John Maynard Keynes.

And soon afterward another great British economist, Lionel Robbins, declared that "no really impartial observer of world events can do other than regard the abandonment of the gold standard by Great Britain as a catastrophe of the first order of magnitude." This was long before the final consequences of that step had become apparent—the political weakening of the West which followed its economic breakdown and which contributed to the success of the Nazi revolution in Germany, and thus eventually to the outbreak of the Second World War and to the emergence of communism as an imminent threat to world order.

As if neither Keynes, the founder of the anticlassical school of economics, nor Robbins, the leader of the neoclassical school, ever had spoken, some Keynesian and neoclassicist economists—fortunately with little support at home but with encouragement from a few foreign observers—are urging us to follow the British example of 1931 and to act once more in a way that would destroy a payments system based on the fixed gold value of the world's leading currency. In doing so, they not only show that they have not learned from monetary history; they also impute to our generation even less wisdom than was shown in the interwar period.

The British Government in 1931, and the U.S. administration in 1933, can rightly be accused of underestimating the adverse international effects of the devaluation of the pound and the dollar. But at least they had some plausible domestic grounds for their actions. They were confronted with a degree of unemployment that has hardly ever been experienced either before or after. They were confronted with disastrously falling prices, which made all fixed-interest obligations an intolerable burden on domestic and international commerce. They were confronted with a decline in international liquidity, which seemed to make recovery impossible.

Neither Keynes nor Robbins have denied that, from a purely domestic point of view, there was some sense in devaluation. In the United States of 1933, one worker out of four was unemployed; industrial production was little more than half of normal; farm prices had fallen to less than half of their 1929 level; exports and imports stood at one-third of their 1929 value; capital issues had practically ceased. In such a situation, any remedy, however questionable, seemed better than inaction.

In the Britain of 1931, things were not quite as bleak as in the United States of 1933; but fundamentally, the economic problems were similar. Ever since 1925, the British economy had failed to grow, and by 1931, one out of five workers had become unemployed, exports—far more important for the British economy than for our own—had declined by nearly one-half, and most observers believed that overvaluation of the British pound was largely responsible for all these ills. Can anybody in good faith find any similarity between our position of today and our position of 1933, or even the British position of 1931?

In 1931 and 1933, an increase in the price of gold was recommended in order to raise commodity prices. Today, a gold price increase is recommended as a means to provide the monetary support for world price stability. In 1931 and 1933, an increase in the price of gold was recommended in order to combat deflation; today it is recommended in effect as a means to combat inflation. In 1931 and 1933, an increase in the price of gold was recommended as a desperate cure for national ills regardless of its disintegrating effect on world commerce; today it is recommended as a means to improve integration of international trade and finance. Can there be worse confusion?

True, most advocates of an increase in the price of gold today would prefer action by some international agency or conference to unilateral action of individual countries. But no international agency or conference could prevent gold hoarders from getting windfall profits; could prevent those who hold a devalued currency from suffering corresponding losses; could prevent central banks from feeling defrauded if they had trusted in the repeated declarations of the President of the United States and of the spokesmen of U.S. monetary authorities and kept their reserves in dollars rather than in gold. To this day, the French, Belgian, and Netherlands central banks have not forgotten that the 1931 devaluation of sterling wiped out their capital; and much of the antagonism of those countries against the use of the dollar as an international reserve asset should be traced to the experience of 1931 rather than to anti-American feelings or mere adherence to outdated monetary theories.

But most importantly, no international agency or conference could prevent a sudden large increase in the gold price from having inflationary consequences for those countries that hoarded gold, and deflationary consequences for those that did not. And the gold holding countries are precisely those whose economies are least in need of an inflationary stimulus since they are most prosperous—not prosperous because they are holding gold, but holding gold because they are prosperous; in contrast, those that do not hold gold are most in need of further expansion. Hence the inflationary and deflationary effects of an increase in the price of gold would be most inequitably and most uneconomically distributed among nations.

If we were to accept another sort of advice given by some experts, we might repeat not the mistakes of 1931–33 but those of earlier years. We are told that a repetition of the disaster of the great depression could be averted only, or at least best, by returning to the principles of the so-called classical gold standard. Not only should all settlements in international transactions between central banks be made in gold; but also the domestic monetary policy of central banks should be oriented exclusively to the payments balance, which means to changes in gold reserves. Whenever gold flows out, monetary policy should be tightened; whenever it flows in, it should be eased.

This is not the place to discuss whether this pure form of gold standard theory has ever been translated into practice. I doubt that any central bank has ever completely neglected domestic considerations in its monetary policy. And conversely, we do not need to adhere to an idealized version of the gold standard in order to agree that considerations of international payments balance need to play a large role in monetary policy decisions. But even strict adherence to gold standard principles would not guarantee international payments equilibrium. As a great American economist, John H. Williams, put it in 1937:

"For capital movements, the gold standard is not a reliable corrective mechanism. * * * With capital the most volatile item in the balance of payments, it is apt to dominate and to nullify any corrective effects which might otherwise result from the gold standard process of adjustment. * * * It is surely not a coincidence that most booms and depressions, in the 19th century as well as in the 20th, had international capital movements as one of their most prominent features."

Even countries that advocate a return to gold standard practices do not practice what they preach. Gold reserves of some continental European countries have been rising strongly and continuously for many years, and according to the rules, these countries should follow a clearly expansionary policy. But in order to offset inflationary pressures, they have done exactly the opposite—and who is there to blame a country that wishes to assure domestic financial stability even at the expense of endangering equilibrium in international payments?

But obviously, if we permit one country to violate the rules of the gold standard in order to avert domestic inflation, we must also permit another country to violate those rules in order to avert domestic deflation and unemployment. In other words, we must agree that a country may be justified in avoiding or at least modifying a tightening of monetary policy even though its gold reserves are declining, if otherwise it were to risk precipitating or magnifying a business recession.

True, this deviation from gold-standard rules could be carried too far. Domestic developments might be taken as a pretext to avoid an unpopular monetary move, although the payments situation would seem to demand it and although the action would be unlikely to be damaging to the domestic economy. But the possibility of abuse and error is inherent in all human decision, and just as no sane observer would ascribe infallibility to the decisions of central bankers, neither should he ascribe infallibility to a set of rules. Few experts today would want to argue that it was right for the German Reichsbank in 1931, in the middle of the greatest depression that ever hit Germany, to follow the gold standard rules by raising its discount rate to 7 percent merely in order to stem an outflow of gold; or that it was right for our own Federal Reserve to take similar restrictive action, for the same reason, in the fall of 1931.

And just as the success of monetary policy cannot be guaranteed by an abdication of discretion in favor of preconceived gold standard rules, it cannot be guaranteed by following the advice of those who would shift the focus of policy from national agencies to an international institution. Surely, international cooperation should be encouraged and improved whenever possible. And the functions of the International Monetary Fund might well be enlarged so as to reinforce its ability to act as an international lender of last resort and as an arbiter of international good behavior.

But no institutional change can exclude the possibility of conflicts between national and international interests in specific circumstances. Moreover, there is no reason to believe that such conflicts would necessarily be resolved more wisely, more speedily, and with less rancor and dissent if they were fought out in the governing body of some supranational bank of issue rather than by discussion and negotiation among national authorities.

It is true that such discussion and negotiation may prove fruitless and that inconsistent decisions may be taken on the national level. But similarly, lack of consensus within a supranational agency may result in a paralysis of its functions, and the effects of such paralysis could well be worse than those of inconsistent national actions.

If then we doubt the wisdom of the three most fashionable recent proposals—to increase the dollar price of gold, to return to pure gold standard principles, or to delegate monetary policy to an international agency—what should be our position? And what is the outlook for solving present and future difficulties in international monetary relations, and thus for avoiding a repetition of the disasters of 1929–33?

In my judgment, it is less fruitful to look for institutional changes or for a semiautomatic mechanism that would guarantee perennial prosperity than to draw from interwar experience some simple lessons that could save us from repeating our worst mistakes.

First, most observers agree that to a large extent the disaster of 1929–33 was a consequence of maladjustments born of the boom of the twenties. Hence, we must continuously be on the alert to prevent a recurrence of maladjustments—even at the risk of being falsely accused of failing to realize the benefits of unbounded expansion. Actually, those of us who warn against speculative and inflationary dangers should return the charge: our common goals of maximum production, employment, and purchasing power can be realized only if we are willing and able to prevent orderly expansion from turning into disorderly boom.

Second, most observers agree that the severity of the great depression was largely due to the absence of prompt antirecession measures. In part, the necessary tools for this were not then available nor were their potentialities fully understood. Today it is easy to understand where observers went wrong 35 years ago. But it is less easy to avoid a repetition of the same mistake; we always prefer to believe what we want to be true rather than what we should know to be true. Here again, we need most of all eternal vigilance. But we must also be ready to admit errors in past judgments and forecasts, and have the courage to express dissenting, even though unpopular views, and to advocate necessary remedies.

Third, and most importantly, most observers agree that the severity of the great depression was due largely to the lack of understanding of the international implications of national events and policies. Even today, we are more apt to judge and condemn the worldwide implications of nationalistic actions taken by others than to apply the same criteria to our own decisions.

Recognition of the close ties among the individual economies of the free world leads to recognition of the need to maintain freedom of international commerce. This means not only that we must avoid the direct controls of trade and exchange that were characteristic of the time of the great depression. It means also that we must avoid any impairment of the value and status of the dollar, which today acts—just as sterling did until its devaluation in 1931—as a universal means of international payment between central banks as well as among individual merchants, bankers, and investors.

If the dollar is to continue to play its role in international commerce, world confidence in its stability must be fully maintained; the world must be convinced that we are resolved to eliminate the long-persistent deficit in our balance of international payments. The measures taken in accordance with the President's program of February 10, 1965, have so far been highly successful. But some of these measures are of a temporary character, and these include the efforts of the financial community to restrain voluntarily the expansion of credit to foreigners. We should not permit the initial success of these efforts to blind us against the need of permanent cure.

Some observers believe that our responsibility for maintaining the international function of the dollar puts an intolerably heavy burden on our monetary policy; that this responsibility prevents us from taking monetary measures which might be considered appropriate for solving domestic problems. I happen to disagree with that view. I believe that the interests of our national economy are in harmony with those of the international community. A stable dollar is indeed the keystone of international trade and finance; but it is also, in my judgment, the keystone of economic growth and prosperity at home.

Yet even if I were wrong in this judgment, and if indeed an occasion arose when we could preserve the international role of the dollar only at the expense of modifying our favored domestic policies—even then we would need to pay attention to the international repercussions of our actions. We must consider these international effects not because of devotion to the ideal of human brotherhood, not because we value the well-being of our neighbors more than our own. We must do so because any harm that would come to international commerce and hence to the rest of the world as a result of the displacement of the dollar would fall back on our own heads. In the present stage of economic development we could not preserve our own prosperity if the rest of the world were caught in the web of depression. Recognition of this interdependence gave rise to the Marshall plan—in my judgment the greatest achievements of our postwar economic policy.

It should not have taken the great depression to bring these simple truths home to us. Today, as we approach the goal of the Great Society—to make each of our citizens a self-reliant and productive member of a healthy and progressive economic system—we can disregard these truths even less than we could a generation ago. By heeding them instead, we will have a good chance to avoid another such disaster. If monetary history were to repeat itself, it would be nobody's fault but our own.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement and associate myself with his remarks.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I would like particularly to make a little record on the fact here today as far as the transition period is concerned and the effective date of the reduction of some of these so-called emergency or excise taxes upon different types of items are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I think of this action as a deceleration or as a de-escalation of this imposed Korean tax structure.

Mr. Chairman, I have read the report and I am referring particularly to page 13, IV, "The Reasons for Limiting the Types of Consumer Refunds Permitted Under the Bill."

Is it not true that the retroactivity, as I believe the committee refers to it, is unfair in certain areas, to the extent that because of the Department of the Treasury's action and the President's message which came down on May 17, it has in fact delayed orders because some people actually canceled some orders in certain areas, because where they had been accustomed to looking for a discount price of maybe 1 to 3 percent for prompt payment of the bills as ordered, now by simply delaying delivery until after July 1 or next January, as the case may be, they can easily receive a 10-percent discount, especially on big business machines such as calculators, computers, and so forth. This can have a drastic effect upon the employees and the manufacturers thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is certainly correct in stating this and I want to compliment the gentleman for calling this matter particularly to the committee's attention and say that we did consider it and we were all concerned about it. I know the chairman of the committee was concerned about it as well as the various dates affecting other products.

I, myself, thought the better judgment would be to have been a little more liberal in predating it, not to just include automobiles and air conditioners, but possibly television sets and business machines to which the gentleman has referred.

I must say that there was some reason that the Treasury Department gave for distinguishing these. They pointed out that there has to be a cutoff point somewhere. But I believe the gentleman is right in pointing this up and all I can say is that it is a difficult area at best and at least they will get them off by July 1.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I realize it is difficult and I appreciate the fact that we are making a refund proviso, because the retroactivity is seasonal certainly and certainly I submit that a portable typewriter as a gift to a blushing young graduate from high school is just as seasonal as an electric door chime for Christmas, both being electrically impelled.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, under the able leadership of our chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, our Ways and Means Committee today reports legislation which could well become the most significant consumer benefit bill to pass the 89th Congress. While the committee's deliberations were completed with dispatch, our chairman patiently resolved every issue. Every point of view was explored. I am sure that the House will concur in the sound judgment of the committee.

This bill, to reduce Federal excise taxes by nearly $4 billion, was proposed by our President to help business and buyer alike. Our Committee on Ways and Means has substantially reported the bill in the form suggested by the President.

Before the vote is taken, I wish to underscore the intent of the administration and the Congress, that this bill—this consumer benefit bill—actually does make it easier for a person to buy.

In his message, President Johnson said:

> To insure that the excise tax reductions make the maximum contribution to continued price stability and balanced prosperity, I call on American business to translate lower excise taxes promptly into lower retail prices for consumers.
>
> Business will share fully in the benefits of excise tax cuts through the larger sales volume they will generate. Rising volume will boost profits and create more jobs.

Underlying this excise tax reduction bill, H.R. 8371, were extensive hearings held by our committee from July 21 to August 3 of last year.

I should like to place into the legislative history of this bill a few highlights from the 1964 hearings on excise taxes, to illustrate assurances by manufacturer and merchant associations to pass along savings to consumers.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the story does in fact reach the public that if consumer prices do not go down, the fault will lie entirely within the business area.

The only loss of revenue will be on the part of the Federal Treasury. The manufacturer, the jobber, the retail merchant all will receive their prices. The price schedules for goods usually are set up with excises making a direct and nonpyramiding effect on goods sold; presence or absence of excise collections alone will not affect profit margins.

On July 24, 1964, Mr. Joseph T. Meek, president of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, told the committee:

> I do not like what I have seen these levies do to the small specialty store over the past two decades.
>
> Government cannot make a good retailer. But it can do a lot to kill him. These excises help in the death.
>
> That retailer needs less sales resistance. He must have more volume. He needs the excitement, the action which a 10 percent price reduction would give him.

On behalf of the Business Equipment Manufacturers Association, Mr. Stanley Laing, chairman of the group's excise tax committee, made this point in his statement:

> By far [the excise tax] the worst feature is that it constitutes a direct charge on the cost of doing business and to that degree tends to discourage capital investment in equipment designed specifically to improve the productivity and efficiency of American business. The tax is passed on and pyramided through all layers of distribution as an added cost to virtually all products and services in the country.

Mr. Laing saw business equipment excises as an added factor in the overhead of running any business.

On July 22, 1964, Mr. Nathaniel Goldfinger, director of research of the AFL–CIO, reiterated the labor body's traditional opposition to the excise tax structure:

> Our opposition is based on our confirmed view that these taxes impose a proportionately higher share of the burden on low and moderate income families than on wealthy families. In that sense, we have the firm view that these taxes are regressive and inequitable.
>
> In addition, such taxes restrain the demands for goods and services and * * * such taxes are a damping effect upon the general level of activity in our economy.

Mrs. Pauline B. Dunckel, executive secretary of the Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, told the committee on July 29, 1964:

> A tax on essential household appliances is, in effect, a tax on food and good health. Both Federal and State governments have avoided taxing food and drugs, yet a Federal excise tax on a range or a refrigerator is, in effect, a tax on food. An excise tax on a water heater or a clothes dryer is, in effect, a tax on good health and sanitation.

On the same day, Mr. Joseph F. Miller, managing director of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, said in a prepared statement:

> The elimination of the excise tax on electrical household appliances would—
>
> 1. Contribute to the growth of the appliance industry, including manufacturers, distributors, dealers, homebuilders, service organizations, and contractors; and
>
> 2. Contribute to the growth of the economy and increased employment.

In his testimony July 29, 1964, Mr. John C. Wallace, appearing for the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association's gas water heater division, told the committee:

> Economic conditions in the industry are such as to make repeal of the tax on water heaters a must. * * * Certainly an industry which is handicapped with this volume of market loss described in detail in testimony should not also be burdened with an excise tax on the products which it sells.

After delivering his prepared statement that same day, Mr. Richard Burke, on behalf of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association's domestic gas range division, was questioned:

> Mrs. GRIFFITHS. If this tax is removed, can you assure this committee that savings will be passed on to the consumer?
>
> Mr. BURKE. Yes, I can. Our industry is excessively competitive, and it is inconceivable to me that it would be possible to do otherwise than to pass this savings on to the consumer, Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. Chairman, two major categories of discretionary consumer goods remain, air conditioners and automobiles.

On air conditioning, the committee heard testimony July 29, 1964, from Mr. U. V. Muscio, on behalf of the room air conditioner section, National Electrical Manufacturers Association, saying in part:

> Air conditioning is completely accepted everywhere as being essential to efficiency, health, and well-being of human beings. A major contributing factor to the unsatisfactory financial condition of the industry is not only the 10-percent tax itself, but the fact that the much higher rate of tax on self-contained air conditioners is discriminatory as compared with all the other household appliances taxed under the same subchapter (at 5-percent rate), each of which competes for the consumer dollar.

Mr. Chairman, the largest single excise that we are reducing and eventually eliminating will be that on new automobiles. A healthy auto industry means a healthy economy. We are accustomed to 8-million-car years now, and we do not want to interfere with the trend.

One business in every six in the country is automotive; $1 in every $5 is spent for automotive products or services; one worker in seven is employed in the automotive and highway transport industries. In the last instance, that means 11.6 million persons. Eight families in ten own cars.

In last year's excise tax hearings, the automobile manufacturers individually and through their association went on record in favor of excise reductions and elimination.

Mr. Richard E. Cross, chairman of the Taxation Committee, Automobile Manufacturers' Association, testified:

> With the intense competitive pressures existing in the retail automobile market today, the elimination of the excise tax on new passenger cars should be reflected in lower prices to the consumer.

Note that Mr. Cross uses the word "should," since it is at the local dealer's showroom that the consumer pays his money or signs his note.

Thus it seems that at this point a car customers' advocate is needed. And in last year's hearings, there appeared one—Mr. Ed Kossman, chairman of the Governmental Relations Committee, National Automobile Dealers Association. He said:

> I also speak in the interest of our customers. The elimination of the excise tax on automobiles will permit the great majority of those families to meet an acute need for better and more convenient transportation.

This is so because the repeal of the automobile excise tax would result in substantial reductions—

Substantial reductions, Mr. Speaker—in the new-car price structure and this, in turn, would lead to downward adjustments in used car prices. Such reductions would permit many one-car families to become two-car families and two-car families to acquire that often needed third car.

Subsequent to his testimony, Mr. Cross, the Automobile Manufacturers' Association spokesman, assured the committee that his company, American Motors, and the others would pass along the excise reductions to the dealers.

One of the most significant questions was asked of Mr. Cross by the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS]:

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. What do you estimate the increased demand for automobiles would be if you had this reduction?

Mr. CROSS. Our economists have made many studies. We have treated this in the brief a little bit. We have advanced the rule of thumb that a percentage decrease in price will be reflected by anywhere from ½ to 1½ percent of volume. For example, if you made a $30 reduction, you might get a 1-percent increase in the number of cars you are selling.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a listing of the current automobile prices of the industry's Big Three—Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler. These lists are worked out with as much accuracy as can be attained in tables where the dollar amounts are rounded off. American Motors was also asked for its price and excise tax information, but the information was not received in time for this presentation.

The tables given here show the factory retail price, the excise levies at 10 percent and 7 percent of dealer cost, the various totals, and the saving to the consumer on each car and model shown—if the dealer passes the saving on to the car buyer.

Because of the very great importance to the economy of the automotive industry, the Congress should keep watch on the results of the excise tax cuts. If the intention of the administration and the Congress are not honored by tangibly lower costs of new automobiles, the Congress should consider immediately reinstituting the levies.

If private business does not see fit to pass the savings to the customer, the Federal Government could collect the excise and make direct rebates to the customers—thus bypassing the manufacturer and dealer.

Mr. Chairman, the price and excise tables follow; they might well be used as a guide to prospective new-car purchasers:

New-car purchaser's guide—Office of Congressman CHARLES A. VANIK

Car make and model	Net factory retail price (no excise)	Excise tax (May 1965) (10 percent of manufacturer's price to dealer)	Factory retail plus tax (current rate)	Excise at 7 percent (July 1, 1965)	Retail plus new excise	Price reduction (if passed on)	Current excise as percent of factory price (retail)	Proposed excise as percent of factory price (retail)
Ford Falcon:								
Standard 2-door 6-cylinder	$1,846	$154	$2,000	$108	$1,854	$46	8.35	5.85
Standard 4-door 6-cylinder	1,903	159	2,062	111	2,014	48	8.35	5.85
Futura 2-door 6-cylinder	1,959	163	2,122	114	2,073	49	8.32	5.84
Futura 4-door 6-cylinder	2,005	167	2,172	115	2,120	52	8.32	5.84
Futura 2-door hardtop 6-cylinder	2,036	170	2,206	119	2,155	51	8.32	5.84
Futura convertible 6-cylinder	2,269	189	2,458	132	2,401	57	8.32	5.84
Station wagons:								
2-door Standard 6-cylinder	2,136	179	2,315	125	2,261	54	8.40	5.88
4-door Standard 6-cylinder	2,165	182	2,347	127	2,292	55	8.40	5.88
4-door Futura 6-cylinder	2,298	188	2,486	132	2,430	56	8.40	5.88
4-door Squire 6-cylinder	2,442	203	2,645	142	2,584	61	8.40	5.88
Station buses:								
Station Bus (6-cylinder only)	2,148	169	2,317	119	2,267	50	7.84	5.49
Club Wagon (6-cylinder only)	2,286	180	2,466	126	2,412	54	7.87	5.51
Deluxe Club Wagon (6-cylinder only)	2,472	195	2,667	137	2,609	58	7.88	5.52
Standard 2-door 8-cylinder	1,998	165	2,153	115	2,113	50	8.35	5.85
Standard 4-door 8-cylinder	2,045	170	2,215	119	2,164	51	8.35	5.85
Futura 2-door 8-cylinder	2,101	174	2,275	123	2,224	51	8.32	5.84
Futura 4-door 8-cylinder	2,147	178	2,325	125	2,272	53	8.32	5.84
Futura 2-door hardtop 8-cylinder	2,178	181	2,359	127	2,305	54	8.32	5.84
Futura convertible 8-cylinder	2,411	200	2,611	140	2,551	60	8.32	5.84
Station wagons:								
2-door Standard 8-cylinder	2,278	190	2,468	133	2,411	57	8.40	5.88
4-door Standard 8-cylinder	2,307	193	2,500	135	2,442	58	8.40	5.88
4-door Futura 8-cylinder	2,398	199	2,597	140	2,538	59	8.40	5.88
4-door Squire 8-cylinder	2,542	214	2,756	150	2,692	64	8.40	5.88
Ford (6-cylinder):								
Custom 2-door sedan	2,148	173	2,321	121	2,269	52	8.05	5.63
Custom 4-door sedan	2,198	177	2,375	124	2,322	53	8.05	5.64
Custom 500 2-door sedan	2,242	182	2,424	127	2,369	55	8.11	5.66
Custom 500 4-door sedan	2,292	186	2,478	130	2,422	56	8.11	5.67
Galaxie 500 4-door sedan	2,442	196	2,638	137	2,579	59	8.02	5.61
Galaxie 500 2-door hardtop	2,448	196	2,644	137	2,585	59	8.03	5.60
Galaxie 500 4-door hardtop	2,528	199	2,727	139	2,667	60	7.87	5.49
Galaxie 500 convertible	2,694	209	2,903	146	2,840	63	7.75	5.41
4-door Ranch Wagon	2,524	199	2,723	139	2,663	60	7.88	5.50
4-door Country Sedan	2,610	205	2,815	144	2,754	61	7.85	5.51
4-door Country Squire	2,841	228	3,069	160	3,001	68	8.02	5.63
Ford (8-cylinder):								
Custom 2-door sedan	2,249	182	2,431	127	2,376	55	8.09	5.64
Custom 4-door sedan	2,299	185	2,484	130	2,429	55	8.04	5.65
Custom 500 2-door sedan	2,343	189	2,532	132	2,475	57	8.06	5.63
Custom 500 4-door sedan	2,393	194	2,587	136	2,529	58	8.10	5.68
Galaxie 500 4-door sedan	2,543	204	2,747	143	2,686	61	8.02	5.62
Galaxie 500 2-door hardtop	2,549	204	2,753	143	2,692	61	8.03	5.62
Galaxie 500 4-door hardtop	2,629	210	2,839	147	2,776	63	8.06	5.59
Galaxie 500 convertible	2,795	223	3,018	156	2,951	67	7.97	5.58
Galaxie 500-LTD 2-door hardtop	2,957	236	3,193	165	3,122	71	7.98	5.57
Galaxie 500-LTD 4-door hardtop	3,037	244	3,281	171	3,208	73	8.03	5.63
Galaxie 500-XL 2-door hardtop	2,957	236	3,193	165	3,122	71	7.98	5.57
Galaxie 500-XL convertible	3,203	257	3,460	180	3,383	77	8.02	5.62
4-door Ranch Wagon	2,625	207	2,832	145	2,770	62	7.88	5.52
4-door Country Sedan	2,711	213	2,924	149	2,860	64	7.85	5.49
4-door Country Squire	2,942	234	3,176	164	3,106	70	7.95	5.57
Ford Thunderbird (8-cylinder only):								
2-door hardtop	4,103	333	4,436	233	4,336	100	8.11	5.67
Landau	4,199	340	4,539	238	4,437	102	8.09	5.66
Convertible	4,537	366	4,903	256	4,793	110	8.06	5.64
Ford Mustang (6-cylinder):								
2-door hardtop	2,178	174	2,352	122	2,300	52	7.98	5.60
2-door hardtop (fastback)	2,379	190	2,569	133	2,512	57	7.98	5.59
Convertible	2,402	192	2,594	134	2,536	58	7.98	5.57
Ford Mustang (8-cylinder):								
2-door hardtop	2,278	182	2,460	127	2,405	55	7.98	5.57
2-door hardtop (fastback)	2,479	198	2,677	139	2,618	59	7.98	5.60
Convertible	2,502	200	2,702	140	2,642	60	7.99	5.59
Lincoln Continental:								
4-door sedan	5,766	485	6,251	340	6,106	145	8.41	5.89
4-door convertible	6,367	536	6,903	375	6,742	161	8.41	5.88

New-car purchaser's guide—Office of Congressman CHARLES A. VANIK—Continued

Car make and model	Net factory retail price (no excise)	Excise tax (May 1965) (10 percent of manufacturer's price to dealer)	Factory retail plus tax (current rate)	Excise at 7 percent (July 1, 1965)	Retail plus new excise	Price reduction (if passed on)	Current excise as percent of factory price (retail)	Proposed excise as percent of factory price (retail)
Mercury:								
Monterey:								
2-door sedan	$2,519	$216	$2,735	$151	$2,670	$65	8.57	5.99
4-door sedan	2,586	221	2,807	155	2,741	66	8.56	5.99
4-door sedan (Breezeway)	2,647	227	2,874	159	2,806	68	8.56	6.00
2-door hardtop	2,645	226	2,871	158	2,803	68	8.56	5.97
4-door hardtop	2,716	232	2,948	162	2,878	70	8.57	5.96
Convertible	2,951	253	3,204	177	3,128	76	8.57	5.99
Montclair:								
4-door sedan (Breezeway)	2,864	245	3,109	172	3,036	73	8.55	6.00
2-door hardtop	2,862	245	3,107	172	3,034	73	8.56	6.00
4-door hardtop	2,932	251	3,183	176	3,108	75	8.55	5.99
Park Lane:								
4-door sedan (Breezeway)	3,080	263	3,343	184	3,264	79	8.53	5.97
2-door hardtop	3,078	263	3,341	184	3,262	79	8.53	5.97
4-door hardtop	3,148	269	3,417	188	3,336	81	8.54	5.97
Convertible	3,294	281	3,575	197	3,491	84	8.54	5.98
Station wagons:								
Commuter	2,955	253	3,208	177	3,132	76	8.56	5.98
Colony Park	3,140	268	3,408	188	3,328	80	8.53	5.98
Comet (6-cylinder):								
202:								
2-door sedan	1,972	178	2,150	125	2,097	53	9.04	6.33
4-door sedan	2,023	183	2,206	128	2,151	55	9.04	6.32
404:								
2-door sedan	2,053	186	2,239	130	2,183	56	9.04	6.33
4-door sedan	2,104	190	2,294	133	2,237	57	9.03	6.32
Caliente:								
4-door sedan	2,180	197	2,377	138	2,318	59	9.03	6.33
2-door hardtop	2,200	198	2,398	139	2,339	59	9.02	6.31
Convertible	2,444	220	2,664	154	2,598	66	9.02	6.30
Station wagons:								
202 4-door	2,285	206	2,491	144	2,429	62	9.01	6.30
404 4-door	2,366	213	2,579	149	2,515	64	9.00	6.29
Villager 4-door	2,536	228	2,764	160	2,696	68	8.99	6.30
Comet (8-cylinder):								
202:								
2-door sedan	2,072	187	2,259	131	2,203	56	9.04	6.32
4-door sedan	2,123	192	2,315	134	2,257	58	9.04	6.31
404:								
2-door sedan	2,153	194	2,347	136	2,289	58	9.03	6.31
4-door sedan	2,204	199	2,403	139	2,343	60	9.02	6.30
Cyclone 2-door hardtop	2,460	222	2,682	155	2,615	67	9.02	6.30
Caliente:								
4-door sedan	2,280	206	2,486	144	2,424	62	9.03	6.31
2-door hardtop	2,300	226	2,526	158	2,458	68	9.82	6.86
Convertible	2,544	250	2,794	175	2,719	75	9.82	6.87
Station wagons:								
202 4-door	2,385	215	2,600	150	2,535	65	9.01	6.28
404 4-door	2,466	222	2,688	155	2,621	67	9.00	6.28
Villager 4-door	2,636	237	2,873	166	2,802	71	8.99	6.29
Plymouth:								
Belvedere I (6-cylinder):								
2-door sedan	2,045	166	2,211	116	2,161	50	8.10	5.67
4-door sedan	2,081	169	2,250	118	2,199	51	8.10	5.67
4-door wagon, 2-seat	2,356	191	2,547	134	2,490	57	8.10	5.67
Belvedere II (6-cylinder):								
2-door hardtop	2,186	177	2,363	124	2,310	53	8.10	5.67
4-door sedan	2,162	175	2,337	123	2,285	52	8.10	5.67
Convertible	2,389	194	2,583	135	2,523	59	8.10	5.67
4-door wagon:								
2-seat	2,437	197	2,634	138	2,575	59	8.10	5.67
3-seat	2,528	205	2,733	143	2,671	62	8.10	5.67
Belvedere I (8-cylinder):								
2-door sedan	2,134	173	2,307	121	2,255	52	8.10	5.67
4-door sedan	2,170	176	2,346	123	2,293	53	8.10	5.67
4-door wagon. 2-seat	2,445	198	2,643	139	2,584	59	8.10	5.67
Belvedere II (8-cylinder):								
2-door hardtop	2,275	184	2,459	129	2,404	55	8.10	5.67
4-door sedan	2,251	182	2,433	128	2,379	54	8.10	5.67
Convertible	2,478	201	2,679	141	2,619	60	8.10	5.67
4-door wagon:								
2-seat	2,526	205	2,731	143	2,669	62	8.10	5.67
3-seat	2,617	212	2,829	148	2,765	64	8.10	5.67
Satellite (8-cylinder only):								
2-door hardtop	2,437	197	2,634	138	2,575	59	8.10	5.67
Convertible	2,641	214	2,855	150	2,791	64	8.10	5.67
Fury I (6-cylinder):								
2-door sedan	2,178	168	2,346	117	2,295	51	7.70	5.39
4-door sedan	2,228	172	2,400	120	2,348	52	7.70	5.39
4-door wagon, 2-seat	2,550	196	2,746	137	2,687	59	7.70	5.39
Fury II (6-cylinder):								
2-door sedan	2,273	175	2,448	123	2,396	52	7.70	5.39
4-door sedan	2,323	179	2,502	125	2,448	54	7.70	5.39
Fury III (6-cylinder):								
2-door hardtop	2,471	190	2,671	133	2,604	57	7.70	5.39
4-door sedan	2,465	190	2,655	133	2,598	57	7.70	5.39
Fury I (8-cylinder):								
2-door sedan	2,278	175	2,453	123	2,401	52	7.70	5.39
4-door sedan	2,328	179	2,507	125	2,453	54	7.70	5.39
4-door wagon, 2-seat	2,650	204	2,854	143	2,793	61	7.70	5.39
Fury II (8-cylinder):								
2-door sedan	2,373	183	2,556	128	2,501	55	7.70	5.39
4-door sedan	2,423	187	2,610	131	2,554	56	7.70	5.39
4-door wagon:								
2-seat	2,710	209	2,919	146	2,856	63	7.70	5.30
3-seat	2,806	216	3,022	151	2,957	65	7.70	5.30
Fury III (8-cylinder):								
2-door hardtop	2,571	198	2,769	139	2,710	59	7.70	5.39
4-door sedan	2,565	198	2,763	138	2,703	60	7.70	5.39
4-door hardtop	2,631	203	2,834	142	2,773	61	7.70	5.39
Convertible	2,803	216	3,019	151	2,954	65	7.70	5.39
4-door wagon:								
2-seat	2,842	219	3,061	153	2,995	66	7.70	5.30
3-seat	2,938	226	3,164	158	3,096	68	7.70	5.39

New-car purchaser's guide—Office of Congressman CHARLES A. VANIK*—Continued

Car make and model	Net factory retail price (no excise)	Excise tax (May 1965) (10 percent of manufacturer's price to dealer)	Factory retail plus tax (current rate)	Excise at 7 percent (July 1, 1965)	Retail plus new excise	Price reduction (if passed on)	Current excise as percent of factory price (retail)	Proposed excise as percent of factory price (retail)
Plymouth—Continued								
Sport Fury (8-cylinder only):								
2-door hardtop	$2,721	$210	$2,931	$147	$2,868	$63	7.70	5.39
Convertible	2,953	227	3,180	159	3,112	68	7.70	5.39
Valiant V-100 (6-cylinder):								
2-door sedan	1,844	149	1,993	105	1,949	44	8.10	5.67
4-door sedan	1,910	155	2,065	108	2,018	47	8.10	5.67
4-door wagon, 2-seat	2,175	176	2,351	123	2,298	53	8.10	5.67
Valiant V-200 (6-cylinder):								
2-door sedan	1,958	159	2,117	111	2,069	48	8.10	5.67
4-door sedan	2,021	164	2,185	115	2,136	49	8.10	5.67
Convertible	2,246	182	2,428	127	2,373	55	8.10	5.67
4-door wagon, 2-seat	2,282	185	2,467	129	2,411	56	8.10	5.67
Signet (6-cylinder):								
2-door hardtop	2,156	175	2,331	122	2,278	53	8.10	5.67
Convertible	2,482	201	2,683	141	2,623	60	8.10	5.67
Barracuda (6-cylinder): 2-door sports hardtop	2,292	186	2,478	130	2,422	56	8.10	5.67
Valiant V-100 (8-cylinder):								
2-door sedan	1,965	159	2,124	111	2,076	48	8.10	5.67
4-door sedan	2,031	165	2,196	115	2,146	50	8.10	5.67
4-door wagon, 2-seat	2,296	186	2,482	130	2,426	56	8.10	5.67
Valiant V-200 (8-cylinder):								
2-door sedan	2,079	168	2,247	118	2,197	50	8.10	5.67
4-door sedan	2,142	174	2,316	121	2,263	53	8.10	5.67
Convertible	2,367	192	2,559	134	2,501	58	8.10	5.67
4-door wagon, 2-seat	2,403	195	2,598	136	2,539	59	8.10	5.67
Signet (8-cylinder):								
2-door hardtop	2,277	184	2,461	129	2,406	55	8.10	5.67
Convertible	2,482	201	2,683	141	2,423	60	8.10	5.67
Barracuda (8-cylinder): 2-door sports hardtop	2,369	192	2,561	134	2,503	58	8.10	5.67
Dodge:								
Dart (6-cylinder):								
2-door sedan	1,909	155	2,064	108	2,017	47	8.10	5.67
4-door sedan	1,969	159	2,128	112	2,081	47	8.10	5.67
4-door wagon, 2 seat	2,218	180	2,398	126	2,344	54	8.10	5.67
270 (6-cylinder):								
2-door sedan	2,007	163	2,170	114	2,121	49	8.10	5.67
2-door hardtop	2,095	170	2,265	119	2,214	51	8.10	5.67
4-door sedan	2,070	168	2,238	117	2,187	51	8.10	5.67
Convertible	2,286	185	2,471	130	3,416	55	8.10	5.67
4-door wagon, 2-seat	2,310	187	2,497	131	2,441	56	8.10	5.67
GT (6-cylinder):								
2-door hardtop	2,215	179	2,394	126	2,341	53	8.10	5.67
Convertible	2,423	196	2,619	138	2,561	58	8.10	5.67
Dart (8-cylinder):								
2-door sedan	2,030	164	2,194	115	2,145	49	8.10	5.67
4-door sedan	2,090	169	2,259	119	2,209	50	8.10	5.67
4-door wagon, 2-seat	2,339	189	2,528	133	2,462	66	8.10	5.67
270 (8-cylinder):								
2-door sedan	2,128	172	2,300	121	2,249	51	8.10	5.67
2-door hardtop	2,216	179	2,395	126	2,342	53	8.10	5.67
4-door sedan	2,191	177	2,368	124	2,315	53	8.10	5.67
Convertible	2,407	195	2,602	136	2,543	59	8.10	5.67
4-door wagon, 2-seat	2,431	197	2,628	138	2,569	59	8.10	5.67
GT (8-cylinder):								
2-door hardtop	2,336	189	2,525	132	2,468	57	8.10	5.67
Convertible	2,544	206	2,750	144	2,688	62	8.10	5.67
Coronet Hemi-Charger (competition car)	4,326	350	4,676	245	4,431	105	8.10	5.67
Coronet Six:								
2-door sedan	2,023	164	2,187	115	2,138	49	8.10	5.67
4-door sedan	2,059	168	2,227	117	2,176	51	8.10	5.67
Coronet Deluxe Six:								
2-door sedan	2,060	167	2,227	117	2,177	50	8.10	5.67
4-door sedan	2,096	170	2,266	119	2,215	51	8.10	5.67
4-door wagon, 2-seat	2,371	192	2,563	134	2,505	58	8.10	5.67
Polara:								
2-door hardtop	2,582	199	2,781	139	2,721	60	7.70	5.39
4-door sedan	2,553	197	2,750	138	2,691	59	7.70	5.39
4-door hardtop	2,653	204	2,857	143	2,796	61	7.70	5.39
Convertible	2,855	220	3,075	154	3,009	66	7.70	5.39
4-door sedan 318	2,482	191	2,673	134	2,616	57	7.70	5.39
4-door wagon:								
2-seat	2,876	221	3,097	155	3,031	66	7.70	5.39
3-seat	2,974	229	3,203	160	3,134	69	7.70	5.39
Custom 880:								
2-door hardtop	2,813	217	3,030	152	2,965	65	7.70	5.39
4-door sedan	2,743	211	2,954	148	2,891	63	7.70	5.39
4-door hardtop	2,873	221	3,094	155	3,028	66	7.70	5.39
Convertible	3,045	234	3,279	164	3,209	70	7.70	5.39
4-door wagon:								
2-seat	3,126	241	3,367	168	3,294	73	7.70	5.39
3-seat	3,224	248	3,472	174	3,398	74	7.70	5.39
Monaco 2-door hardtop	3,064	236	3,300	165	3,229	71	7.70	5.39
Chrysler:								
Newport:								
2-door hardtop	2,806	216	3,022	157	2,957	65	7.70	5.39
4-door sedan	2,749	212	2,961	148	2,879	64	7.70	5.39
4-door town sedan	2,874	221	3,095	155	3,029	66	7.70	5.39
4 door hardtop	2,880	222	3,102	155	3,035	67	7.70	5.39
Convertible	3,152	243	3,395	170	3,322	73	7.70	5.39
4-door wagon:								
2-seat	3,226	248	3,474	174	3,400	74	7.70	5.39
3-seat	3,326	256	3,582	179	3,505	77	7.70	5.39
300:								
2-door hardtop	3,244	250	3,494	175	3,419	75	7.70	5.39
4-door hardtop	3,316	255	3,571	179	3,497	74	7.70	5.39
Convertible	3,579	276	3,855	193	3,772	83	7.70	5.39
300-L:								
2-door hardtop	3,804	293	4,097	205	4,009	88	7.70	5.39
Convertible	4,237	326	4,563	228	4,465	98	7.70	5.39
New Yorker:								
2-door hardtop	3,802	293	4,095	205	4,007	88	7.70	5.39
4-door town sedan	3,749	289	4,038	202	3,951	87	7.70	5.39
4-door hardtop	3,874	298	4,172	209	4,083	89	7.70	5.39

New-car purchaser's guide—Office of Congressman CHARLES A. VANIK—Continued

Car make and model	Net factory retail price (no excise)	Excise tax (May 1965) (10 percent of manufacturer's price to dealer)	Factory retail plus tax (current rate)	Excise at 7 percent (July 1, 1965)	Retail plus new excise	Price reduction (if passed on)	Current excise as percent of factory price (retail)	Proposed excise as percent of factory price (retail)
Chrysler—Continued								
New Yorker—Continued								
4-door wagon:								
2-seat	$4,422	$340	$4,702	$238	$4,660	$102	7.70	5.39
3-seat	4,522	348	4,870	244	4,766	104	7.70	5.39
Imperial Crown:								
Coupe	5,446	414	5,860	290	5,736	124	7.60	5.32
4-door hardtop	5,299	403	5,702	282	5,581	121	7.60	5.32
Convertible	5,692	433	6,125	303	5,995	130	7.60	5.32
Imperial Le Baron: 4-door hardtop	6,057	460	6,517	322	6,379	138	7.60	5.32
Chevrolet:								
Corvair 500:								
2-door hardtop	1,882	154	2,036	108	1,990	46	8.19	5.73
4-door hardtop	1,952	160	2,112	112	2,064	48	8.19	5.73
Corvair Monza:								
2-door hardtop	2,143	174	2,317	122	2,265	52	8.13	5.69
4-door hardtop	2,212	180	2,392	126	2,338	54	8.13	5.69
Corvair Corsa:								
2-door hardtop	2,302	187	2,489	131	2,433	56	8.13	5.69
Convertible	2,437	198	2,635	139	2,576	59	8.13	5.69
Greenbrier sports wagon	2,437	198	2,635	139	2,576	59	8.08	5.66
Chevy II 100 Six:								
2-door	1,894	153	2,047	107	2,001	46	8.08	5.66
4-door	1,929	156	2,085	109	2,038	47	8.08	5.66
Wagon	2,207	176	2,383	123	2,330	53	8.10	5.67
Chevy II Nova Six:								
4-door	2,047	166	2,213	116	2,163	50	8.10	5.67
2-door hardtop	2,072	168	2,240	118	2,190	50	8.10	5.67
Wagon	2,294	186	2,480	130	2,424	56	8.10	5.67
Chevy II Nova Super Sport: 2-door hardtop (6-cylinder)	2,222	181	2,403	127	2,349	54	8.10	5.67
Chevy II 100 V-8:								
2-door	1,994	161	2,155	113	2,107	48	8.10	5.67
4-door	2,029	164	2,193	115	2,144	59	8.10	5.67
Wagon	2,307	184	2,491	129	2,436	55	8.10	5.67
Chevy II Nova V-8:								
4-door	2,147	174	2,321	122	2,269	52	8.10	5.67
2-door hardtop	2,172	168	2,340	118	2,290	50	8.10	5.67
Wagon	2,394	194	2,588	136	2,530	58	8.10	5.67
Chevy II Nova Super Sport 2-door hardtop (V-8)	2,322	189	2,511	132	2,454	57	8.31	5.82
Chevelle 300 Six:								
2-door	1,963	163	2,126	114	2,077	49	8.31	5.82
4-door	1,997	166	2,163	116	2,113	50	8.31	5.82
Wagon	2,237	186	2,423	130	2,367	56	8.32	5.82
Chevelle 300 DeLuxe Six:								
2-door	2,032	169	2,201	118	2,150	51	8.32	5.82
4-door	2,067	172	2,239	120	2,187	52	8.32	5.82
4-door wagon	2,342	195	2,537	137	2,479	58	8.32	5.82
Chevelle Malibu Six:								
4-door	2,142	178	2,320	125	2,267	53	8.32	5.82
2-door hardtop	2,167	180	2,347	126	2,293	54	8.32	5.82
Convertible	2,362	196	2,558	137	2,499	59	8.32	5.82
4-door wagon	2,416	201	2,617	141	2,557	60	8.32	5.82
Chevelle Malibu Super Sport Six:								
2-door hardtop	2,316	193	2,509	135	2,451	58	8.32	5.82
Convertible	2,511	219	2,730	153	2,664	66	8.32	5.82
Chevelle 300 V-8:								
2-door	2,063	171	2,264	120	2,183	51	8.32	5.82
4-door	2,097	174	2,271	122	2,219	52	8.32	5.82
Wagon	2,337	194	2,531	136	2,473	58	8.32	5.82
Chevelle 300 Deluxe V-8:								
2-door	2,132	177	2,309	124	2,256	53	8.32	5.82
4-door	2,167	180	2,347	126	2,293	54	8.32	5.82
4-door wagon	2,442	203	2,645	142	2,584	61	8.32	5.82
Chevelle Malibu V-8:								
4-door	2,242	186	2,428	130	2,372	56	8.32	5.82
2-door hardtop	2,267	188	2,455	132	2,399	56	8.32	5.82
Convertible	2,462	204	2,666	143	2,605	61	8.32	5.82
4-door wagon	2,516	209	2,725	146	2,662	63	8.32	5.82
Super Sport: 2-door hardtop	2,416	201	2,617	141	2,557	60	8.32	5.82
Convertible	2,611	227	2,838	159	2,770	68	8.32	5.82
Biscayne Six:								
2-door	2,162	171	2,333	132	2,294	39	7.91	5.54
4-door	2,212	175	2,387	123	2,335	52	7.91	5.54
4-door wagon	2,534	200	2,734	140	2,674	60	7.91	5.54
Biscayne V-8:								
2-door	2,262	179	2,441	125	2,387	54	7.91	5.54
4-door	2,312	183	2,495	128	2,440	55	7.91	5.54
4-door wagon	2,634	208	2,842	146	2,780	62	7.91	5.54
Bel Air Six:								
2-door	2,239	176	2,415	123	2,362	53	7.88	5.52
4-door	2,307	182	2,489	127	2,434	55	7.88	5.52
Wagon:								
2-seat	2,595	203	2,798	142	2,737	61	7.84	5.48
3-seat	2,690	211	2,901	148	2,838	63	7.84	5.48
Bel Air V-8:								
2-door	2,339	184	2,523	129	2,468	55	7.88	5.52
4-door	2,407	190	2,597	133	2,540	57	7.88	5.52
Wagon:								
2-seat	2,695	211	2,906	148	2,843	63	7.84	5.48
3-seat	2,790	219	3,009	173	2,963	46	7.84	5.48
Impala Six:								
4-door	2,450	192	2,642	134	2,584	58	7.84	5.48
2-door hardtop	2,455	193	2,648	135	2,590	58	7.84	5.48
4-door hardtop	2,514	198	2,712	139	2,653	57	7.84	5.48
Convertible	2,701	212	2,913	148	2,849	74	7.84	5.48
Wagon:								
2-seat	2,726	214	2,940	150	2,876	64	7.84	5.48
3-seat	2,822	221	3,043	155	2,977	66	7.84	5.48
Impala V-8:								
4-door	2,550	200	2,750	140	2,960	60	7.84	5.48
2-door hardtop	2,555	201	2,706	141	2,696	60	7.84	5.48
4-door hardtop	2,614	206	2,820	144	2,758	62	7.84	5.48
Convertible	2,801	220	3,021	154	2,955	66	7.84	5.48
Wagon:								
2-seat	2,826	222	3,048	155	2,981	67	7.84	5.48
3-seat	2,922	229	3,151	160	3,082	69	7.84	5.48

New-car purchaser's guide—Office of Congressman C*harles* A. V*anik*—Continued

Car make and model	Net factory retail price (no excise)	Excise tax (May 1965) (10 percent of manufacturer's price to dealer)	Factory retail plus tax (current rate)	Excise at 7 percent (July 1, 1965)	Retail plus new excise	Price reduction (if passed on)	Current excise as percent of factory price (retail)	Proposed excise as percent of factory price (retail)
Chevrolet—Continued								
Impala Super Sport Six:								
2-door hardtop	$2,605	$204	$2,809	$143	$2,748	$61	7.84	5.48
Convertible	2,851	223	3,074	156	3,007	67	7.84	5.48
Impala Super Sport V-8:								
2-door hardtop	2,705	212	2,917	148	2,853	74	7.84	5.48
Convertible	2,951	231	3,182	162	3,112	69	7.84	5.48
Corvette Sting Ray (V-8):								
Hardtop	3,986	305	4,291	214	4,200	91	7.65	5.36
Convertible	3,786	290	4,076	203	3,989	87	7.65	5.36
Pontiac:								
Tempest Six:								
2-door	2,059	171	2,230	120	2.179	51	8.30	5.81
4-door	2,108	175	2.283	123	2,231	52	8.30	5.81
4-door wagon	2,378	197	2,575	138	2,516	59	8.30	5.81
Tempest V-8:								
2-door	2,159	179	2,338	125	2,284	54	8.30	5.81
4-door	2,208	183	2,391	128	2,336	55	8.30	5.81
4-door wagon	2,478	205	2,683	144	2,622	61	8.30	5.81
Tempest Custom Six:								
2-door	2,138	178	2,316	125	2,263	53	8.31	5.82
4-door	2,188	182	2,370	127	2,315	55	8.31	5.82
2-door hardtop	2,198	183	2,381	128	2,326	55	8.31	5.82
Convertible	2,411	200	2,611	140	2,551	60	8.31	5.82
Wagon	2,457	204	2,661	143	2,600	61	8.31	5.82
Tempest Custom V-8:								
2-door	2,238	186	2,424	130	2,368	56	8.31	5.82
4-door	2,288	190	2,478	133	2,421	57	8.31	5.82
2-door hardtop	2,298	191	2,489	134	2,432	57	8.31	5.82
Convertible	2,511	208	2,719	146	2,657	62	8.31	5.82
Wagon	2,557	212	2,769	148	2,705	64	8.31	5.82
LeMans Six:								
2-door	2,273	188	2,416	132	2,405	56	8.27	5.79
4-door	2,328	193	2,521	135	2,463	58	8.27	5.79
2-door hardtop	2,333	193	2,526	135	2,468	58	8.27	5.79
Convertible	2,555	212	2,767	148	2,703	64	8.27	5.79
LeMans V-8:								
2-door	2,373	196	2,569	137	2,510	59	8.27	5.79
4-door	2,428	201	2,629	141	2,569	60	8.27	5.79
2-door hardtop	2,433	193	2,526	135	2,568	58	8.27	5.79
Convertible	2,655	220	2,875	154	2,809	66	8.27	5.79
Catalina:								
2-door (V-8 only)	2,507	197	2,704	138	2,645	59	7.83	5.48
4-door	2,673	210	2,883	147	2,820	63	7.83	5.48
2-door hardtop	2,631	207	2,838	145	2,776	62	7.83	5.48
4-door hardtop	2,703	212	2,915	148	2,851	64	7.83	5.48
Convertible	2,935	231	3,166	162	3,097	69	7.83	5.48
4-door wagon, 2-seat	2,941	231	3,172	162	3,103	69	7.83	5.48
Wagon, 3-seat	3,042	237	3,279	166	3,208	71	7.83	5.48
Star chief:								
4-door	2,853	223	3,076	156	3,009	67	7.81	5.47
4-door hardtop	2,976	232	3,208	162	3,138	70	7.81	5.47
Bonneville:								
2-door hardtop	3,087	240	3,327	168	3,255	72	7.79	5.45
4-door hardtop	3,157	246	3,403	172	3,329	74	7.79	5.45
Convertible	3,306	258	3,564	181	3,487	77	7.79	5.45
4-door wagon	3,342	260	3,602	182	3,524	89	7.79	5.45
Grand Prix: 2-door hardtop	3,218	250	3,468	175	3,393	75	7.76	5.44
Oldsmobile:								
F-85:								
2-door V-6	2,136	178	2,314	125	2,261	53	8.32	5.82
4-door V-6	2,186	182	2,368	127	2,313	55	8.32	5.82
Wagon V-6	2,455	204	2,659	143	2,598	61	8.32	5.82
F-85 Deluxe V-6:								
2-door	2,317	191	2,508	134	2,451	57	8.26	5.78
4-door	2,286	189	2,475	149	2,435	40	8.26	5.78
Wagon	2,554	213	2,767	149	2,703	64	8.26	5.78
Cutlass V-8:								
2-door	2,412	201	2,613	141	2,553	60	8.26	5.78
2-door hardtop	2,542	212	2,754	148	2,690	64	8.26	5.78
Convertible	2,726	227	2,953	159	2,885	68	8.26	5.78
Vista Cruiser:								
2-seat wagon	2,687	220	2,907	154	2,841	66	8.17	5.72
3-seat wagon	2,812	230	3,042	161	2,973	69	8.17	5.72
Custom Vista Cruiser:								
2-seat wagon	2,881	235	3,116	165	3,046	70	8.17	5.72
3-seat wagon	2,995	235	3,230	165	3,160	70	8.17	5.72
Jetstar 88:								
4-door	2,698	210	2,908	147	2,845	63	7.78	5.45
2-door hardtop	2,751	214	2,965	150	2,901	64	7.78	5.45
4-door hardtop	2,823	219	3,042	153	2,976	66	7.75	5.43
Convertible	3.069	238	3,107	167	3,263	71	7.75	5.43
Dynamic 88:								
4-door	2,763	215	2,978	151	3,064	64	7.74	5.42
2-door hardtop	2,815	220	3,035	154	2,969	66	7.74	5.42
4-door hardtop	2,889	224	3,113	157	3,046	67	7.74	5.42
Convertible	3,135	243	3,378	170	3,305	73	7.74	5.42
Delta 88:								
4-door	2,903	225	3,328	158	3,261	67	7.73	5.41
2-door hardtop	2,992	231	3,223	162	3,154	69	7.73	5.41
4-door hardtop	3,063	237	3,300	166	3,229	71	7.73	5.41
Jetstar I 2-door hardtop	3,316	256	3,572	179	3,495	77	7.73	5.41
98:								
4-door	3,688	283	3,971	198	3,886	85	7.67	5.37
2-door hardtop	3,870	297	4,167	208	4,078	89	7.67	5.37
4-door hardtop	3,941	302	4,243	211	4,152	91	7,67	5.37
Convertible	4,145	318	4,463	223	4,368	95	7.67	5.37
Starfire:								
2-door hardtop	3,864	254	4,118	178	4,042	76	7.67	5.37
Convertible	4,410	338	4,748	237	4,647	101	7.67	5.37
Cadillac:								
Calais:								
2-door hardtop	4,664	345	5,009	242	5,251	103	7.39	5.17
4-door hardtop	4,839	358	5,197	251	5,304	107	7.39	5.17
4-door sedan	4,839	358	5,197	251	5,304	107	7.39	5.17

New-car purchaser's guide—Office of Congressman CHARLES *A.* VANIK—Continued

Car make and model	Net factory retail price (no excise)	Excise tax (May 1965) (10 percent of manufacturer's price to dealer)	Factory retail plus tax (current rate)	Excise at 7 percent (July 1, 1965)	Retail plus new excise	Price reduction (if passed on)	Current excise as percent of factory price (retail)	Proposed excise as percent of factory price (retail)
Cadillac—Continued								
De Ville:								
2-door hardtop	$4,990	$370	$5,369	$259	$5,258	$111	7.40	5.18
4-door hardtop	5,229	387	5,616	271	5,500	116	7.40	5.18
4-door sedan	5,229	387	5,616	271	5,500	116	7.40	5.18
Convertible	5,203	386	5,589	271	5,474	115	7.34	5.14
60 Special	5,989	440	5,429	308	5,297	132	7.34	5.14
El Dorado	6,231	457	6,688	320	6,551	137	7.34	5.14
75:								
Sedan	9,036	660	9,696	462	9,498	198	7.30	5.11
Limousine	9,236	674	9,910	472	9,708	202	7.30	5.11
Buick:								
Special V-6:								
2-door	2,136	177	2,313	124	2,260	53	8.28	5.79
4-door	2,186	181	2,367	127	2,313	54	8.28	5.79
Convertible	2,378	197	2,575	138	2,516	59	8.28	5.79
4-door wagon	2,454	204	2,658	143	2,597	61	8.28	5.79
Special Deluxe V-6:								
4-door	2,271	189	2,460	132	2,403	57	8.28	5.79
4-door wagon	2,546	211	2,757	148	2,694	63	8.28	5.79
Skylark V-6:								
2-door	2,316	191	2,507	134	2,450	57	8.24	5.77
4-door	2,438	201	2,639	141	2,579	60	8.24	5.77
2-door hardtop	2,448	202	2,650	141	2,589	61	8.24	5.77
Convertible	2,590	214	2,804	150	2,740	64	8.28	5.77
Special V-8:								
2-door	2,201	183	2,284	128	2,229	55	8.28	5.79
4-door	2,251	187	2,438	131	2,382	56	8.28	5.79
Convertible	2,443	203	2,646	141	2,584	62	8.28	5.79
4-door wagon	2,519	210	2,729	148	2,667	62	8.28	5.79
Special Deluxe V-8:								
4-door	2,336	195	2,531	138	2,474	57	8.28	5.79
4-door wagon	2,611	217	2,828	152	2,763	65	8.28	5.79
Skylark V-8:								
2-door	2,381	197	2,578	138	2,519	59	8.24	5.77
4-door	2,503	207	2,710	145	2,648	62	8.24	5.77
2-door hardtop	2,513	208	2,721	145	2,658	63	8.24	5.77
Convertible	2,655	220	2,875	154	2,809	66	8.24	5.77
Sportwagon:								
2-seat	2,736	223	2,959	156	2,892	67	8.15	5.70
3-seat	2,860	233	3,093	163	3,023	70	8.15	5.70
Sportwagon Custom:								
2-seat	2,894	236	3,130	165	3,059	71	8.15	5.70
3-seat	3,010	245	3,255	172	3,182	73	8.15	5.70
Le Sabre:								
4-door	2,707	211	2,918	148	2,855	63	7.79	5.46
2-door hardtop	2,783	217	3,000	152	2,935	65	7.79	5.46
4-door hardtop	2,839	221	3,060	154	2,993	67	7.79	5.46
Le Sabre Custom:								
4-door	2,778	216	2,994	152	2,930	64	7.79	5.46
2-door hardtop	2,848	222	3,070	155	3,003	67	7.79	5.46
4-door hardtop	2,909	227	3,136	159	3,068	68	7.79	5.46
Convertible	3,057	238	3,295	167	3,224	71	7.79	5.46
Wildcat:								
4-door	2,922	230	3,152	161	3,083	69	7.87	5.51
2-door hardtop	3,018	238	3,256	167	3,185	71	7.87	5.51
4-door hardtop	3,074	242	3,216	169	3,143	73	7.87	5.51
Wildcat Deluxe:								
4-door	3,017	238	3,255	167	3,184	71	7.87	5.51
2-door hardtop	3,068	242	3,310	169	3,237	73	7.87	5.51
4-door hardtop	3,131	246	3,376	172	3,302	74	7.87	5.51
Convertible	3,219	253	3,472	177	3,396	76	7.87	5.51
Wildcat Custom:								
2-door hardtop	3,277	259	3,536	181	3,458	78	7.87	5.51
4-door hardtop	3,334	262	3,596	183	3,517	79	7.87	5.51
Convertible	3,427	270	3,697	189	3,616	81	7.87	5.51
Electra 225:								
4-door	3,754	287	4,041	201	3,955	86	7.65	5.35
2-door hardtop	3,764	288	4,052	200	3,964	88	7.65	5.35
4-door hardtop	3,879	297	4,176	208	4,087	89	7.65	5.35
Electra 225 Custom:								
4-door	3,924	300	4,224	210	4,134	90	7.65	5.35
2-door hardtop	3,934	301	4,235	210	4,144	91	7.65	5.35
4-door hardtop	4,049	310	4,359	217	4,266	93	7.65	5.35
Convertible	4,097	313	4,409	219	4,315	94	7.65	5.35
Riviera 2-door hardtop	4,066	312	4,378	219	4,285	93	7.67	5.37

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, in 1962 and 1964 Congress passed Revenue Acts which have contributed significantly to our effort to formulate an equitable and workable overall tax system.

The 1964 Revenue Act in particular has had tremendous impact on our economy. By reducing our income taxes this year by $14 billion, it stimulated vast increases in consumer buying, business investment, and helped to create new jobs throughout our economy.

The bill we are considering today, H.R. 8371, represents the next logical step in the development of the kind of tax system we are striving for.

H.R. 8371 calls for repeal of most of our selective excise taxes and the gradual phasing out of several others.

The total reduction will amount to about $4.8 billion—$3.5 billion of which will go into effect in two stages, on July 1, 1965, and January 1, 1966.

Many of these taxes originated during wartime and thus their continuation is no longer necessary to our economy.

The tax cuts and revisions proposed by this bill will move us closer to full employment by stimulating consumer and business purchasing power. They will also simplify the administration of the tax law and result in a more just and equitable distribution of the tax burden.

At present the existing selective excises are discriminatory in several ways.

They are regressive in their impact. Those who spend more of their income on consumer goods—generally in the lower income brackets—pay the largest portion of these taxes.

Producers of the taxed products also bear an unfair burden. Sales are reduced by the higher costs and consequently jobs and incomes in those industries are correspondingly reduced.

Moreover, many of the selective excises are on items used in business, thus imposing arbitrary tax burdens on those firms which depend on taxed items for their operations.

In the long run, these costs are, of course, generally passed on to the consumer.

Several of the excises to be repealed, especially the retail excises, are extremely costly taxes to collect and are burdensome from a compliance standpoint.

Many of us have felt for a long time that many of our excise taxes do not belong in a permanent tax system. President Johnson agrees, and has asked that we "end an unfair burden on many businesses and workers who produce the commodities singled out for excise taxation."

We have seen that tax reduction stimulates the economy by increasing purchasing power. The bill before you would go beyond this major objective by simultaneously eliminating the inequitable bias against particular products and activities.

I strongly support H.R. 8371 and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Betts].

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, this measure providing for elimination of excise taxes is, in the main, long overdue and I intend to vote for it. It will have the beneficial effect of relieving the small businessman from the burden of complex bookkeeping as a tax collector, and it will remove a nuisance in many areas which the customer has had to accept for many years. But these welcome benefits must be accompanied by positive action on the part of the Federal Government to match the loss in revenue by a reduction in expenditures.

Since the Ways and Means Committee began consideration of this proposal, various warnings have been noted about the possible effects of the bill's passage which indicate that the American people are serious about the need for caution in dealing with the accompanying reduction in revenue. Only last Sunday the New York Times editorially commented on the subject. In a letter to Chairman Mills, the head of the American Farm Bureau said:

> In view of the present high level of economic activity, the prospective 1966 deficit is clearly inflationary. We do not consider it prudent to make a substantial cut in Federal revenues under such circumstances without accompanying action to reduce the prospective deficit.

In the income tax reduction proposal of 1963–64 the Democratic administration and speeches by its supporters stressed the fact that a reduction would speed up the economy, thereby increasing revenue, and this in turn would lead to a balanced budget and payments on the national debt. I have not heard any such encouraging statements in connection with this bill.

However, in a publicized letter to Chairman Mills on May 25, 1965, the President promised a "strong determination to hold Federal expenditures to the lowest reasonable level." And, he further said:

> The Federal budget should continue to be one which will allow us to save where we can in order to spend where we must.

But, "reasonable levels" as well as saving "where we can" and spending "where we must" are relative terms and are subject to differing opinions as to what they mean in dollars. I think we would all have been happier if the President had flatly promised to reduce spending and balance the budget.

Second, I trust that a tax reduction will not be a signal for price increases. To me this would be breaking faith with the American people. They have been long suffering with excise taxes and the consumer deserves the benefit of the repeal to the fullest.

It was reassuring to note in the Washington Star of last Saturday—May 29, 1965—that Sears, Roebuck and other companies have definitely promised to pass these tax savings on to the consumer. I hope that all merchants will follow this example.

At this time it is to be hoped that there will be no rush to increase wages. Reduced taxes, a Federal deficit, and higher wages are three horses of inflation that could start a stampede and spell trouble for the economy. Support of this bill must be accompanied by a recognition of our solemn duty to hold the line on these three fronts—Government spending, prices, and wages.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Collier].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before the House today is indeed belated but, as the saying goes, what is worth having is worth waiting for. For the several years that I have been a Member of Congress, and I know that this applies to many of my colleagues here today, I have offered legislation dealing with the removal of wartime and other miscellaneous excise taxes included in this bill.

A year ago the Republicans proposed the repeal of several of the excise taxes paid by consumers in a recommittal motion on the excise tax extension bill. For some reason or other, there was almost party line opposition to taking the action which we are now wisely taking today.

I am particularly pleased that we are moving to systematically phase out the tax on telephone service. Interestingly enough, polls show that this has been the most unpopular tax on services required by the general public. Eighty-five percent of the people in my own district reflected this sentiment in the questionnaire which I distributed several weeks ago.

It is my firm belief that the greater percentage of the tax moneys saved by the average American under this legislation will move into the economic mainstream of the country, particularly as it applies to the everyday consumer goods where the savings will be on over-the-counter sales and will be more significant to the lower income families than others.

At the same time it seems to me that reducing Federal revenues by $4.8 billion, as this act will do, emphasizes the need for prudence in the spending habits of this Congress in particular and the Federal Government in general. Only if such restraint is applied will the effects of this legislation be meaningful.

For the purpose of the legislative history of this bill, I should like to point out that while I wholeheartedly favor it, I believe that the committee has erred in not making the repeal and reductions on certain household goods and business machines retroactive to the May 14 date as is applied, for example, to air conditioners. As a result, I believe June may be a slow month from the standpoint of sales for many retail stores in the appliance business unless the other body moves toward making these changes. And even if they do, the impact of the announced effective dates will still be felt, though not as heavily as it otherwise would.

In the area of the removal of taxes upon lubricating oils as it applies to use in the automotive field, I believe that the intent of the committee should be clarified to the extent that we specifically state that any remaining taxes levied upon lubricating oils continue to exempt the re-refined products. It might even be well to recommend that the other body clarify this point in their version of this legislation by stating that re-refiners of lubricating oils are not, for the purpose of this act, to be defined as producers or manufacturers.

In general, however, I think that the committee, under the usual competent and able leadership of the gentleman from Arkansas, has written an excellent bill and legislation which will certainly be among the most significant of this session of Congress.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reaffirm my position in favor of the long-awaited excise tax reductions provided by the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965.

Last year, I supported the Republican proposal to recommit the excise tax bill which would have repealed retailers excise taxes on jewelry, toilet articles, luggage, handbags, and furs. These taxes are severely burdensome for the small retailer, discriminate against those consumers who must buy the taxable items, and do not produce revenue commensurate with high compliance and administrative costs; therefore, it was my opinion, these taxes should have been reduced at that time. The recommittal motion, however, was defeated on a party line vote and the administrations bill extended the 10-percent retailers tax on these selected items another year .

Early in this session, Republicans went on record in favor of immediate action to reduce luxury taxes, and many Republicans sponsored pertinent legislation. Such luxury taxes include, in addition to excise taxes on jewelry, luggage, furs, and toilet preparations, telephone service tax, and manufacturers taxes on household appliances and automobiles. Largely enacted as emergency wartime measures to provide additional revenue and to make resources available for the wartime effort these taxes have outlived their initial purpose and remain as selective and burdensome taxes.

I have received many letters from small retailers, jewelers, who ask for relief from the retailers tax. Many constituents opposed to the 10-percent tax on local telephone service have written. While they are aware this tax was imposed to take the pressure off the communication system during wartime, many find it difficult to justify the delayed repeal of the tax on telephone service, the only service tax on utilities.

Small retailers must contend with problems of collecting retailers taxes and of filling out more Government forms to report them. Too, it is not always easy to determine the taxable items from the nontaxable items. For example, shampoo for tinting is taxable; shampoo for cleansing is not. Cold cream, aftershave lotion, and rouge, are taxable, but shaving cream, bobby pins, and powder puffs are not. And yet, the retailer is liable to the Government for the retailers tax on taxable items sold.

Often taxable products are in close competition with nontaxable products. When one product is subject to a tax of 10 percent while competing products are exempt, discrimination against the manufacturers and retailers of taxable products is serious. Examples of closely competing products, some of which are taxable, while others are not, best illustrate this discrimination allowed under present tax law: fur coats, air conditioners, automobiles, and electric dishwashers are taxable; woolen and imitation fur coats, industrial fans, house trailers, and electric washing machines are nontaxable. Manufacturers and retailers of such taxable items must contend with consumer preference for nontaxable items.

Selective excise taxes also discriminate against the consumer and place disproportionate tax burdens on those consumers who purchase taxable items. The retailers taxes are directed primarily against women who are major purchasers and users of items subject to retailers taxes—toilet articles, handbags, jewelry, and furs. It can be argued the manufacturers tax on automobiles is a tax on a particular kind of transportation which for many is a necessity. The telephone service tax discriminates against those businessmen who must use the service extensively for business purposes.

Also significant is the relatively heavy burden these excise taxes place on the lower-income groups. The excise taxes the lower and middle-income groups must pay for telephone service; household appliances, such as refrigerators, water heaters, now necessary for modern, healthful living; and automobiles, absorb a larger proportion of their incomes the lower their incomes are. In addition, in the rural areas it costs more to provide telephone service than in urban areas, and yet incomes tend to be lower. Such taxes on items and services of necessity which place disproportionate burdens on consumers, would be eliminated as rapidly as possible.

As I understand it, the bill now before the House would eliminate either outright or on a scheduled basis all those selective excise taxes which do not fall into the category of, first, users' taxes, that is, those who use a certain government service or benefit from it help pay the cost of the service through taxes; or second, regulatory taxes, such as those on marihuana, opium, and gambling; or third, sumptuary taxes, such as those on alcohol and tobacco.

Thus, H.R. 8371, includes repeal of the excise tax on jewelry, luggage, toilet preparations, furs, household appliances—refrigerators, freezers—electric, gas, and oil appliances, radio and television sets, sporting goods, photographic equipment, business machines, and musical instruments. It provides for gradual repeal of excise tax on telephone services and passenger automobiles by 1969.

If enacted, this bill, H.R. 8371, would effect long-overdue adjustments in the existing excise tax structure. It would largely correct the disproportionate excise tax burdens placed on certain consumers, retailers, and manufacturers and would substantially improve the fairness of the Federal excise tax structure. Such inequities and discrimination can simply no longer be justified and should be eliminated without delay. Therefore, I heartily urge passage of H.R. 8371, Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, there is no question that reductions of excise taxes as recommended in H.R. 8371 are long overdue. The American consumer and the merchant are entitled to relief from these levies, many of which were emergency tax measures enacted during World War II or the Korean war.

A year ago I supported Republican efforts to bring about gradual reduction or elimination of many of these excise taxes. In this Congress I have joined in introducing legislation to repeal many of the excise taxes. I am gratified to note that many of my proposals including gradual repeal of the tax on communications services and repeal of retailers' excise taxes on jewelry, toilet preparations, furs, luggage, handbangs, and so forth, are included in this bill.

We have a responsibility to continue to work to relieve the tax burdens upon the American citizen. But tax reduction must be accompanied by spending restraints. The Federal Government can not go on indefinitely spending more money than it takes in. The Congress and the administration have a joint responsibility to keep Federal spending within the $99.7 billion requested for fiscal 1966, or these reductions in taxes may set off spiraling inflation, further decreasing the value of the dollar and putting in peril the future of those citizens who depend on pensions and fixed income to survive.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support passage of this bill. But as we debate the merits of tax relief through elimination of certain excise taxes, another bill calling for another in a long line of increases in the Federal debt ceiling is waiting for House consideration this week.

It is absolutely imperative that immediate restraints be placed upon domestic spending by the administration. Every effort must be made to achieve a balanced budget by 1967 at the very latest. Unless these objectives can be achieved in the near future, the benefits of the tax reduction we vote today will be lost in economic chaos.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support H.R. 8371, which will reduce excise taxes—many of them wartime taxes which should have been eliminated years ago. Many small businessmen who have operated their businesses by day and served as bookkeepers and tax collectors for Uncle Sam by night will be able to breathe a sigh of relief if this bill becomes law.

But let us not kid ourselves—if we are to cut taxes by nearly $4 billion, we must do one of three things—add it to the debt, find new sources of revenue to make up the losses, or reduce spending. If we are to add it to the debt, then we charge it to future generations. If we seek new sources of revenue or increase others—then we rob Peter to pay Paul. I hope that the administration and the Congress will take the honest approach and reduce Federal spending.

The administration still has available around $100 billion in unspent authorizations provided by past Congresses. This year, an additional $106 billion of new obligational authorities have been requested—a grand total of approximately $206 billion. Next week we will be asked to raise the debt limit to $329 billion—and there is no doubt in my mind that this body will do just that. Is it not about time for us to stop, look, and ponder? Our entire spending program must be revised downward. The President's spending budget for last year has been too high. The proposed spending budget of $99.7 billion for fiscal 1966 is still too high. Let us cut taxes, but let us be realistic at the same time. Let us cut spending accordingly. It sounds good to tell the American people that by cutting taxes, people will have more to spend, and the tax loss will be recouped by the Government through the resulting increase in economic activity. But the facts show that the increased activity does not make up for the tax losses.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the end of certain Federal excise taxes is now near at hand.

These taxes have been a source of much concern to me for many years. We passed most of them in wartime to curtail the sale of luxury items and to make employment easier in the war industries. After the war was over, we found ourselves unable to get rid of them because the need for revenue was so great. That people should continue under these burdens was inequitable and unjust.

I am happy that their end is near. There may have been some excuse for them in wartime; they served an understandable purpose. There has been no good excuse for them since and should have been repealed years ago.

Unfortunately, for those of us in New England, excise taxes that were bad for the Nation were doubly bad for us. Most of the items subject to this pernicious tax were made in New England, and the burden fell with special weight upon our industries.

Jewelry, silverware, and plated ware are made in great quantities in my district. Forty-six percent of all the employees in this industry in the Nation live in Massachusetts, and 39 percent of all the employees making costume jewelry and miscellaneous notions. More than 32 percent of the American watchmakers live in our State. These industries and these workers have been special victims of Federal excise taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I have been working for many years to free them from this unfair burden, but without success. The cry has always been that the Federal Government could not spare the revenue, yet we seemed to find ways and means to relieve other industries of burdens.

But I am happy that the time has now come to do justice. Many of these industries in Massachusetts are located in areas of persistent unemployment. This tax relief should be a boon to those areas. It means more business and more jobs.

We are hopeful that this tax relief will expand the sales and the production of the many items now manufactured by our New England craftsmen, and that this expansion of output will be good for our cities and towns, good for our workers, good for a better profit in these manufacturing concerns, and eventually good for the Federal Government itself, which will tax this additional profit and this additional income to employees.

I share the hope of everyone who has worked for the passage of this measure—that it will be good for the economy of the country.

The bill is long overdue, and I support its speedy passage.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express gratitude to Chairman WILBUR MILLS for his leadership and for the farsighted action of the members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House in favorably reporting H.R. 8371—Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965—which we are now considering. We must remember the Revenue Act of 1962 contributed to the economic health of our Nation.

The Revenue Act of 1964—the largest tax reduction in U.S. history, in my humble opinion—made a substantial contribution to the more than $14 billion increase in our gross national product during the first 3 months of 1965.

This effective legislation enabled the American people to substantially increase their purchasing power which, in turn, created new employment for our continually expanding population by private industry.

The measure that we are now considering this afternoon will enable private industry, including the small businessman, to expand production and increase sales by the simple process of providing a substantial increase in purchasing power.

This measure will do more than any other single proposed domestic legislative measure—to keep America moving forward.

These total tax reductions as recommended will, when fully effective in 1969, amount to a savings of $4.8 billion annually.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I strongly feel that the citizens of America are extremely grateful to Chairman MILLS and the members of his committee for their further outstanding contribution to our future, and I strongly urge the Members of the House to pass this bill as reported by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am confused about the tax reduction policies of the administration. We have before us this bill to eliminate some excise taxes, including some that are hardly regressive against low-income people. I have in mind, of course, the elimination of the 10-percent excise tax on furs and fur coats and things like that. That tax certainly does not present a problem to low-income people.

I share the President's concern to eliminate taxes that are actually regressive in character.

But at the very same time that we are considering a bill eliminating a 10-percent excise tax on a luxury item like furs, in the Committee on Agriculture we are considering a bill which would raise to 100-percent value the excise tax on processors of wheat for bread.

If we translate that 100-percent excise tax on wheat for bread into its effect on the retail price of bread the increase comes to 8 percent. And the same legislation before the Committee on Agriculture proposes an excise tax on rice, which is a popular item among low-income people. Witnesses estimate this will increase the retail price of rice for low-income people in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and areas of New York where the item is very popular, by 50 percent at the retail level.

So I cannot reconcile the administration proposal to impose a regressive tax on wheat and rice, which hits the poor people, with the bill now before us which would eliminate a luxury tax, like the 10-percent excise tax on furs.

Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to yield to anybody who could shed some light on why this inconsistency exists.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I wish someone had risen to answer the question of the gentleman from Illinois. I cannot do so. But by reason of the gentleman's knowledge of matters in the field of agriculture I should like to ask whether or not it is true that on July 1 of this year the existing bread tax is going to be increased by order of the Secretary of Agriculture?

I am advised by a constituent of mine, knowledgeable in this field, that the tax on wheat, as he puts it, is being raised July 1 from 70 to 75 cents per bushel on every bushel ground for domestic human consumption; is that correct?

Mr. FINDLEY. That is correct. And the bill now before our committee would raise this figure to $1.25 per bushel for each succeeding year, which is approximately the market value of wheat today. So it is a 100-percent excise tax on wheat for bread.

To me, that is a poverty program in reverse.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. RONCALIO].

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. However, I would like to speak a word of caution, because it has been my experience in these matters that upon the repeal of a tax such as this several years ago which many of my colleagues will remember, only a relatively few entrepreneurs passed the supposed tax reduction on to the consumer.

Here, the purpose of the tax repeal is to pass the savings on to the consumer, and thus reduce the living cost index. This will result only if this tax cut is not camouflaged or carried on as some type of price increase.

Mr. Chairman, the continuing vigorous economy requires prudent taxation that provides adequate revenue without lowering the vital incentives for profit.

When it can be demonstrated that a tax or series of taxes, such as the excise taxes we are discussing today, have outlived their usefulness, then it is in the best interests of this vigorous economy to reduce them.

This reduction can be accomplished in a gradual program that eliminates the possibility of severe disruptions that follow abrupt change.

On February 23, I introduced a bill calling for repeal of the excise tax on communication services, a tax imposed during the depression as an emergency revenue producer. This tax, raised during World War II, has remained in effect, even though it was originally termed temporary.

President Johnson's May 17 message calling for graduated cuts of almost $4 billion in existing levies, will eliminate this communications tax and other wartime excise taxes in a well-advised move to spur our economic growth and approach full employment.

This bill will pour more dollars into our economy, giving consumers the means to purchase more goods and services than ever before. The resulting upsurge in business will provide greater employment opportunities, contributing to the gross national product.

I am happy to announce my support for this prudent measure. I am also proud to be a Member of this House of Representatives at this time. I now witness twice in my short term here, the great legislative generalship of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of this bill, just as proud as I was of the medicare bill, and am proud of these great steps forward in what I perceive to be good government. This bill is fair to all; to those persons who buy furs and jewels and to those persons who buy bread as well. It will benefit every segment of our economy.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation which is before the House today, representing a comprehensive overhaul of our Federal excise tax structure is sound and should be enacted. I am strongly in support of the provisions of this bill, and it is my hope that after it passes the House today, it will be speedily considered by the other body so that these long-needed revisions can go into effect as soon as scheduled.

The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, has already explained broadly the reasoning behind the bill and the overall provisions which it contains. I will not undertake to repeat what he has said.

However, there is one category of taxes which this bill repeals to which I wish to address myself briefly. The bill repeals the four categories of so-called retail excises. This is one of the most laudable parts of this legislation because these retail excises are regressive, they constitute a nuisance not only for the taxpayer but for the businessman in many instances, they are difficult to administer in the vast majority of cases, and they affect an extremely large number of taxpayers. I am advised there are over 300,000 businesses paying these taxes. There are many thousands out of this total located in the city of Chicago and in my own congressional district.

Where the taxable items are small in value and the number of unit sales per day is large, as is true of toilet preparations and costume jewelry, the possibility of clerical mistakes in the recording of tax for individual sales can be relatively high, and the nuisance of having to keep up with and mark thousands of items with the relatively small amount of tax, ranging from less than 1 cent up to 5 cents or so, makes this type of tax an unreasonable and regressive one.

Another possible source of error and confusion is the determination of which items are taxable. I recall one particular case drawn to my attention from my own district which involved an attempt by the Internal Revenue Service to impose the jewelry tax on 5 and 10 cent trinkets sold in plastic capsules to children in vending machines on legs about 1 foot high suitable only for children to pull the lever. The tax on a 5-cent item, of course, runs to about 5 mills. This shows the preposterous problems which are presented to taxpayers and to businessmen in trying to apply a tax of this nature.

Moreover, jewelry stores often carry nontaxable glassware and bric-a-brac. Taxable and nontaxable items must be identified to achieve correct recording of the tax due. In cases of this kind, the fact that a tax exists on a given piece of silverware, for example, but does not exist on a given piece of glassware may influence the taxpayer to purchase the nontaxable item when in fact he would prefer to purchase the other item. This, therefore, creates problems not only for the businessman but for the taxpayer.

Another type of problem is that which is confronted by furriers. Fur coats are taxable; cloth coats of a more expensive variety are nontaxable. All kinds of problems are encountered in trying to determine at what point a cloth coat with fur collar or cuffs is taxable or nontaxable. Furriers also have to make a cost breakdown in some repair work because part of the work can be taxable and part tax free. If the repair job includes the making of a sleeve, cuff, collar or lapel, the cost of this part of the work is taxable because it is considered the production of an "article" made of fur. Replacement of a worn patch, however, is not considered to be taxable. This has led to problems and considerable difficulty both for the Internal Revenue Service and certainly for the businessmen and the taxpayers.

I could continue in this area with a long list of incredibly difficult problems in administration and appliance which have evolved over the years that these taxes have been in existence.

I am confident that repeal of the retailers excises will particularly benefit and be appreciated by our friends of the fairer sex who have long maintained that taxation of handbags and cosmetics is a special burden on basic items of dress and personal appearance. In addition, consumer expenditure studies show that expenditures for toilet preparations are regressive because those consumers at the lower end of the income scale spend a higher proportion of their income on these products than those with above-average incomes.

Mr. Chairman, I have made special mention of the importance of repealing the consumer excise taxes, but I do not wish to underestimate the importance of other provisions of the bill which will repeal excise taxes on a long list of the selected, regressive excises. The tax on refrigerators, on air conditioners, on automobiles, on television and radio sets, and so forth, is a tax which bears unduly heavily on the lower income groups.

I strongly support the provisions of this sound and beneficial legislation. It is another step in the revision of our tax structure. It is commendable and deserves the support of all Members.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a great amount of pleasure that I rise today in support of H.R. 8371, a bill to reduce the burdensome wartime excise taxes in the total amount of $4,800 million over the next 4 years. As my good friend and very able chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], pointed out in his report, this excise tax reduction represents a comprehensive overhaul of our Federal excise tax structure. The present excise taxes, for the most part, were initially levied as emergency taxes; yet the American people were left with these burdensome taxes for too many years.

As a former automobile dealer, I know of the tremendous economic impact the reduction of excise taxes on automobiles will have in stimulating the economy. The reduction of taxes on many other consumer items, such as refrigerators, electric, gas, and oil appliances, radio and television sets, jewelry, furs, toilet articles, luggage, handbags, and other items will be a great relief to the citizens of this country and again, I repeat, will have a tremendous economic impact on the purchasing power of the American buying public.

Mr. Chairman, I have received hundreds of leters from constituents who are vitally concerned about these taxes and I know they will sing the praises of the House Committee on Ways and Means, the Congress, the present administration, and the President for this bold move. The economic shackles are now being lifted to a great degree from the American consumer. I want to personally thank the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and every member of his great Committee on Ways and Means for bringing out this great bill.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the measure overwhelmingly. I hope it will reach the President's desk by the end of this month so that the July date of repeal can become effective.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for an ultimate repeal of approximately $4.8 billion in Federal excise taxes. Most of these taxes are repealed entirely effective July 1, 1965, and January 1, 1966. However, repeal of the tax on local telephone service and on automobiles is spread over a longer period in order to minimize the impact on the industry and on the Federal revenues. If this bill is enacted, the remaining Federal excise taxes will consist of the so-called "sumptuary" taxes applicable to alcoholic beverages and tobacco products, the taxes which are levied on account of special services or facilities supplied by the Government—that is the so-called user taxes—and the taxes which are purely regulatory in nature on gambling devices, certain firearms, and the like.

Admittedly, this is a far-reaching bill. On the other hand, if the Federal Government is to raise revenues in the form of a tax on the production or sale of goods, the system which this bill will repeal was poorly designed for that purpose. It was a hodgepodge of discriminatory taxes which grew out of three wars and a great depression.

Many of these excise taxes were first resorted to in 1917 and were designed not only to raise revenue for the First World War, but to reduce "extravagance." Following that war, many of the excise taxes were repealed. New taxes were enacted in 1932 when revenues from income taxes fell off due to the depression of the 1930's. Even then, the excises were regarded "as a temporary measure to last only during the present emergency."

Before the depression excises could be repealed, we were faced with the Second World War. Rates were raised and new excises were enacted, not only to raise revenue, but to discourage certain activities which did not contribute to the war effort.

Again, these taxes were regarded as "purely temporary" for the duration of the emergency. Although so regarded, it was not until March 31, 1954, before any substantial reduction was made in the wartime excise taxes. Most rates were reduced by about one-half in 1954, leaving an excise tax structure with rates ranging from 5 to 20 percent, some at retail and others at the manufacture level, applying to selective products and services. This selectivity in itself created a discriminatory tax system.

The Republicans have long favored reform or elimination of our excise tax structure. Many of these taxes are regressive and discriminatory, producing undesirable economic effects, and imposing severe administrative burdens not justified by the revenue yield.

Taxes based on consumption are regressive, since moderate and low income families must spend a greater proportion of their income on consumption than more affluent families. Items subject to tax are consumed by all families, and include such basic essentials as pens, light bulbs, matches, handbags, toilet preparations, musical instruments, phonographs, radio, and television sets.

Taxes imposed on the manufacturers sales price are further increased through percentage markups in the distribution channels before reaching the consumer.

Excise taxes can disrupt the productive forces of a free enterprise economy by exerting an influence on resource allocation, job creation, and consumer preference unrelated to the underlying economic and social facts.

Excise taxes retarded the technological growth so vital to our national economic health.

Another objection to these taxes, Mr. Chairman, is the interrelated problem of discrimination and compliance.

A tax applies to aftershave lotion, but not to shaving cream—unless the shaving cream is advertised as having a soothing effect. No tax is imposed on shampoos in general, but a shampoo designed to "tint as it washes" will be taxed. The individual buying a furniture type high fidelity set will be buying a taxed product, but the individual buying an expensive set of components pays no tax. Taxes are applied to some business machines and not others, and the distinctions often make little economic sense. The difficulty of distinguishing between taxable and nontaxable items is compounded by rapidly changing products and swift technological advances. After the relevant distinctions have been made, sales records relating to a variety of products—products often involving a small purchase price and large volume sales—must be maintained. The net economic loss may exceed the tax revenue realized in many cases.

If we take up these taxes by item and by category, I think that the Members of this body will say to themselves that the action we are taking today is long overdue. Frankly, I think we will find it difficult to explain why we waited so long to repeal the bulk of these taxes.

The first category of taxes which we are repealing, and certainly the most onerous, are the retailers excise taxes. These taxes produce about $500 million in revenue, collected by adding 10 percent to the sales price of a myriad of articles sold by the local druggist, clothier, jeweler, and other merchants.

This tax was directed—inadvertently I am sure—against the very products which are most frequently purchased for and by our ladies. The toilet preparations which the ladies use. Their handbags. The articles of adornment—and I do not mean the Tiffany bracelet, but any costume jewelry, pin, brooch, or clip which may be sold over the counter of the neighborhood variety store.

The retailers excise taxes were strictly an emergency measure, adopted in 1941 in order to discourage the use of the so-called "luxuries." Not only are these taxes directed particularly against the women, since there are no other comparable Federal sales taxes, the taxes likewise discriminate against the items being taxed at the retail level. The Republicans have long recognized that these taxes were a "nuisance" and should be repealed at the earliest possible date. In fact, it was a Republican Congress in 1954 that reduced these taxes from the wartime rate of 20 percent to the existing rate of 10 percent.

In the last Congress, when we had up the extension of the expiring wartime excise tax rates, the Republicans proposed the repeal of the retailers excise taxes in our motion to recommit. Our motion to recommit sounded the death knell for these taxes. That motion lost by a mere 12 votes. I am sure that it became evident at that time that the retailers excise taxes would not survive another excise tax extension bill. It is for that reason particularly that I am most happy to be able to support this bill. It recognizes and reaffirms all that we said about the retailers excise taxes a year ago.

In addition, the bill would repeal most of the manufacturers excise taxes, except for the so-called "sumptuary" or "regulatory" taxes. Again, it is difficult to find justification for selecting the specific items which are made subject to a manufacturers excise tax, to the exclusion of others.

For example, let us consider the tax on "business machines." This tax applies to a wide variety of items which are specifically enumerated in the statute. It applies to the pencil sharpener, the postage meter, not only the business typewriter but the portable typewriter which is used as a graduation gift, to the adding machine, and to most of the items which were found in the business office at the time that the tax was enacted. However, because the computer was unknown at that time, the tax on business machines does not apply to the computer or data processing equipment which has revolutionized business practices. In this case, we were taxing multitudinous small items while the costliest business machine of all remained untaxed. Unless we were prepared to tax progress—the data-processing system—it made no sense to tax business machines. I certainly would not recommend that we levy any tax in this field.

Other manufacturers excise taxes were levied on domestic appliances such as the refrigerator, the stove, and washing machine used by the housewife. At one time, it may have been justified as a part of the war effort, to discourage the use of the materials and manpower which went into the production of these items. That day has long passed. I see no reason for taxing the housewife's kitchen.

Other manufacturers excise taxes fell in the "nuisance" category. A tax was levied on electric light bulbs, fountain and ballpoint pens, mechanical pencils and lighters. Taken together, the taxes did not produce over $60 million. When we are dealing with Federal revenues of the magnitude of $100 billion annually, selective excise taxes which produce a few millions of revenue cannot be justified on any basis other than as a regulatory measure.

Of all the manufacturers excise taxes, the tax on passenger cars produces the largest revenue. This tax will produce almost $2 billion in revenue. While it is a significant part of our revenue system, this does not mean that it is a good tax.

An automobile today is just as much a necessity for the working man as the shoes on his feet or the clothes on his back. The American today relies most heavily on his automobile for transportation to and from his job, and in many cases for the actual earning of his livelihood. If we are to repeal any of the Federal excise taxes, it is essential that we repeal that tax which falls as a burden on our means of transportation. We are a mobile society. We should encourage the production of automobiles and not penalize their production by a selective excise tax.

The automotive industry along with the housing industry constitute the two major industries in our Nation. Repeal of the tax on the American automobile may result in a temporary loss of revenue, but the impetus which will be given to this great industry should offset that revenue loss within a relatively short period of time.

It will be noted that the tax on automobiles is repealed in stages. There were some who urged that the tax should be repealed immediately, or at least that the period should be shortened. The Ways and Means Committee considered this question very carefully. We had the benefit of the views of the automotive dealer organizations. There were several members of the committee who were associated with the automotive industry. It was agreed that the repeal of this tax must be spread over a period of years, not only because of the loss of Federal revenue, which would otherwise result, but because of the impact that the tax would have on the automobile dealer.

We have a great automotive industry because we have a great automotive dealer organization. The sale of a new automobile generally entails the acceptance of a trade-in, a practice unique to this industry. Any tax reduction which would seriously affect the value or marketability of the used car taken in trade would necessarily disrupt the market. I believe that the committee has worked out a formula which will avoid that result.

Finally, I would like to mention briefly the miscellaneous excise taxes which apply to services, as distinguished from manufactured items. The tax on telephone and telegraph services produces about $1 billion in Federal revenues. We are repealing this tax in stages. Along with our transportation system, both public and private, our communications system is a major segment of the American economy.

It is easy to raise revenue through a tax on telephone service. Everyone uses the telephone, whether it be the teenage daughter or the business executive. That does not mean that it is a good tax. The telephone is just as much a tool of business as the cash register, adding machine, or computer. When we levy a tax on the business phone, we levy a tax on the cost of doing business. The tax becomes a business expense, deductible against Federal income taxes. When we repeal the tax on this telephone service, there is an immediate recoupment through additional income taxes. A major part of the revenue loss will be recouped from a tax on the profits of the business rather than a tax on the cost of doing business. I think that this is highly desirable.

As applied to the personal telephone, the tax on telephone service singles out this one item in the family budget for taxation while leaving untaxed electricity and gas service, and any and all other services required by the householder. It is highly discriminatory in this regard. In our society today, the telephone is just as essential as electricity or gas. By no stretch of the imagination is it a luxury. It is an essential part of our society, from the telephone booths, which are conveniently located throughout our cities and along our major highways, to the phone in the kitchen that keeps the housewife in contact with her family.

I certainly agree that the repeal of this tax must be staged so as to spread out the full impact on our Federal revenues over a period of years. We simply cannot afford to wipe out this tax overnight. Its repeal is nonetheless justified.

The other miscellaneous taxes are insignificant in amount. We tax safe deposit boxes to raise $8 million in revenues annually. We tax admissions to sporting events, and other amusements. The total taxes from all these sources do not exceed $50 million annually. We tax bowling alleys and pool tables for about $5 million annually. We tax club dues and initiation fees. There is no justification for taxing these activities as a regulatory measure, or to discourage the particular service or amusement. None of these taxes significantly contributes to the Federal revenues. If we are ever to simplify our tax structure, we must be prepared to repeal taxes such as these.

In the final analysis, therefore, although the scope of this bill may come as a surprise to many, careful consideration will inevitably lead to the conclusion that this is a step in the right direction. The Ways and Means Committee unanimously reached that conclusion. I personally am convinced that the repeal of these taxes is the most far-reaching step in tax reform which the Congress has been called upon to enact in many years. If the Congress would be willing to tackle with equal vigor Government expenditures, we will have done a great service to the American people.

Even though the reduction of excise taxes will come as a welcome relief to the American people, it likewise imposes some questions as well as some problems.

One of the questions which has been asked a number of times is whether the excise tax savings will be passed on to the consumers. In some cases the consumers may not feel the immediate effect of this tax reduction, but in the long run it will obviously mean less increase in costs being passed on to the consumers. In the final analysis it is bound to result in less cost to the consumers.

Another question is whether or not local and State governments will increase their sales taxes to make up for the savings in Federal excise taxes. This may happen in many States and communities, because over the period of years the Federal Government has not left the State and local governments many sources for additional revenue. Second, if the State and local governments increase their taxes as the result of this excise tax cut they may be in a position to assume more of the responsibilities which they have been passing on to the Federal Government and therefore ultimately reduce the cost of operating the Federal Government.

As I stated before, this reduction in excise taxes will cause some problems. We can lightly compare this situation somewhat to that of an aching tooth. While it is desirable that the tooth be extracted, modern dentistry requires medication to ease the pain of the extraction. The committee is therefore concerned about the shock to the economy and to some businesses as the result of the reduction of excise taxes. It was for this reason that the committee made the first 3-percent reduction in excise tax on automobiles retroactive to May 15 in order that there would not be a "buyers' strike" prior to this bill becoming law. The committee also approved a gradual reduction of the balance of the automobile excise taxes of 1 percent on January 1, 1966, 2 percent on January 1, 1967, 2 percent on January 1, 1968, and 2 percent on January 1, 1969, because any decrease in excess of 2 percent at any one time might likewise cause a "buyers' strike."

The committee took the same action on retroactivity for air-conditioning equipment because a buyers' strike for that product might cause the manufacturer or industry to lose the sale entirely for the calendar year, since it is not likely a consumer would purchase an air conditioning unit after July 1, but would wait until the following year. The same problem was taken into consideration when we provided for a refund of excise taxes on all inventory and floor stock on hand as of July 1, 1965, on which the manufacturers excise tax had been paid before the effective date but the item had not yet been sold.

The committee hopes that there will be a minimum of injury and shock to any business as a result of this legislation. Subsequent to the committee action, however, I learned of one area of economic hardship which is being caused by this legislation. I believe that the committee would not have wanted this to happen nor would it have been permitted to happen if the committee had been advised of it in time.

The area to which I refer is a limited area on which there will be no loss of revenue to the Federal Government if this matter is corrected. I am referring to the excise tax on the initiation fees for new members on new clubs not in operation as of this date but which will be in operation prior to January 1, 1966.

There has not been too much discussion or too much controversy over the reduction of excise taxes on dues and initiation fees on clubs which is scheduled to be reduced on January 1, 1966. These excise taxes are 20 percent at this time, higher than excise taxes on any other items. The various clubs throughout the Nation are not asking for an earlier date for the elimination of this tax. On the contrary they are most grateful and appreciative of having their problems recognized by the committee, and since they have waited this long for some relief it will not hurt them to wait until January 1, 1966. But I am referring to the new clubs or businesses that will open after the enactment of this bill and before January 1, and not the clubs which are in existence at this time.

I know of only one club, and it may be that there is only one in the entire Nation that falls in this category. But, regardless of whether there is 1 or 10 or

20 we do not want to cause unnecessary injury to them if it can be avoided. The club I know of is planning to open in September and has been counting on the initiation fees of its new members for the necessary funds to finance the opening. Public knowledge by the prospective members of the reduction in excise taxes on initiation fees as of January 1, 1966, has virtually eliminated any new applications for membership to this facility at this time. Obviously the prospective new members would prefer to wait until January 1, in order to save 20 percent, since they would only have use of the new club facilities for approximately 3 months anyway.

There is a different situation insofar as the existing clubs are concerned. Their members are paying dues now and therefore are paying excise taxes now. The initiation fees for new members in the existing clubs are a minor source of revenue for them, and in any event in most instances initiation fees for new members can be withheld until January 1, without necessarily doing violence to the financial stability of an existing club.

For the new club, however, the loss of initiation fees means a complete elimination of all revenue until January 1, 1966, because obviously these would have to come from the new members before the facility can be operated. In other words, what we have here in the case of new clubs is a "buyers' strike" on the part of prospective new members—the same situation we attempted to avoid in the case of automobiles and air conditioners by making the reduction retroactive to May 15 and gradual thereafter.

The Federal Government will get little or no revenue from the initiation fees in the new clubs, because there will be little or no initiation fees to tax.

I am therefore proposing an amendment to eliminate this injury to the new clubs by making the effective date of July 1 for the elimination of the 20-percent excise tax on the initiation fees for new members of all clubs not in operation as of July 1. The July 1 effective date is the same as the effective date for the elimination of excise taxes on all retail items and most of the manufacturers excise taxes. The excise tax on dues for existing and new clubs and the initiation fees on existing clubs will expire on January 1 as now provided for in the bill.

I repeat for emphasis, the adoption of this amendment would not result in any significant loss of revenue to the Federal Government, but may in the long run result in increased revenue due to the fact that it would permit a prospective new business to open up as planned originally.

Unfortunately, I learned of this problem too late for the Committee on Ways and Means to take action while considering this legislation in the committee. I am confident that they would have favorably approved it if it had been called to their attention. Another problem is the fact that we are considering this legislation today under a closed rule which prevents amendment being offered from the floor. While the rule does permit consideration of committee amendments, the committee has not had the opportunity to consider this amendment and therefore it would not be fair or proper for it to be offered today as a committee amendment. In the meantime, however, I have talked this problem over with the chairman of our committee and he was most sympathetic to the problem and indicated to me that he would be most willing to help me to get the amendment approved by the other body.

It is my understanding that he will join with me in recommending to the Senate that they adopt this amendment and that we would accept the Senate amendment in the House. We have therefore asked the staff to prepare the appropriate language that would accomplish this purpose and relieve the new clubs of the injury.

I am hopeful and I believe that this amendment will be adopted. I am making this statement on the floor of the House today in order that the House of Representatives may be advised of this oversight and what is being recommended to the Senate with the assurance that our recommendation will be accepted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE].

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. I am especially happy to see that the excise taxes on appliances, hot-water heaters, documentary stamps, communications services and automobiles are to be removed.

I would urge the distinguished chairman and the members of the Ways and Means Committee, when they later consider the user excise taxes for the highway revolving fund, to eliminate excise taxes on tires and tubes for farm tractors, farm implements, and earth-moving equipment.

These farm implements and tractors do not use highways, primarily, and I do not believe they should be expected to contribute to the highway revolving fund by way of excise taxes.

It is difficult to justify and to explain to our farm friends how we can eliminate taxes on furs, luggage and so forth, and yet expect them to continue paying excise taxes on tires and tubes for farm implements, tractors, and trucks.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I am particularly grateful that the committee has taken steps to eliminate the tax on telephone calls. It is my hope that the telephone companies will not absorb this reduction by seeking rate increases from local and State commissions.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD].

Mr. TODD. Mr. Chairman, with the repeal of the excise taxes upon automobiles in four gradual stages, I believe we have an unusual opportunity to take steps which will assist in making our cars and our highways safer. One of the objections to imposing safety standards on our cars is that the standards would raise the price of the cars. Now that objection has been overcome, since the reduction in excise tax will be much greater than the cost of installing the desired safety features.

Accordingly, I have introduced today a bill to extend the new Federal safety standards for Government automobiles to all cars, the standards to take effect on January 1, 1967, at which time the excise tax on cars will be reduced a further 2 percent. On the basis of the bill we have passed today, the tax will have been reduced by 8 percent of the value of the car by that date, providing more than enough to cover any foreseeable added costs.

The bill is substantially the same as that introduced by Senator NELSON.

It would apply to all cars manufactured for, sold, or shipped in interstate commerce.

It would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe standards for passenger safety devices to be required in all such cars. These standard would be consistent "to the extent deemed desirable" with the GSA standards for federally owned cars. The bill also suggests that, in setting the standards, the Secretary consult private auto companies and any other organizations which he feels might be helpful.

The bill would impose a $1,000 fine for the violation of the safety requirements.

Evidence and statistics in support of these bills follow:

During 1964, 48,000 Americans lost their lives on the highways, 50 times as many as were killed in airplane crashes, and about twice the total number of fatalities in the Korean war. At the present rate a 2-year auto fatality total, 96,000, will surpass World War II's average annual casualty rate of 81,080.

In the critical age group of 5 to 29, the automobile is the No. 1 killer.

During 1964, 4.8 million Americans were injured in traffic accidents. Auto experts now estimate that the average American, during his or her lifetime, has no better than a 50–50 chance of escaping injury in an auto accident. This statistic from the January 1965 issue of American Trial Lawyers.

A study made by the University of Michigan estimates that, if cars were built so that protection could be provided for the head alone, at least one of five who are now dying on the highways could be saved.

Another study made by the University of Michigan revealed that, of the 48,000 who died in auto crashes last year, 38 percent were thrown from their cars. While it is impossible to make any concrete estimations on the basis of this figure alone, it is safe to say that seat belts and shoulder harnesses would be major factors in reducing highway fatalities.

The same study revealed that of the 48,000 who died last year in auto accidents, 18 percent were killed by the steering column, the built-in bayonet of all cars. The GSA standard for steering columns would require that a steering column not be displaced more than 8 inches rearward on collision with a barrier at 30 miles per hour.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Chamberlain.]

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, for the past several years when the legislation to extend excise taxes has been before the House, I have had the problem of trying to find something new to say about the need to repeal the tax on automobiles. This year the situation is altogether different. All of the arguments for tax revision have been made and most have been accepted. The bill we have before us certainly takes a giant stride to bring greater equity to our tax structure and I take this time to express my gratitude and to commend all of those who have contributed to this great achievement.

While I fully support the bill before us, I would like to make a few remarks with particular reference to the elimination of the discriminatory tax on automobiles. The very first bill I introduced after I came to Congress back in 1957 was to repeal this tax and as many of my colleagues are quite well aware, this proposition has had my continuing attention over the years.

It was a tremendous source of encouragement to have the President's recent recommendations to Congress, and I was even more gratified by the prompt action of the House Ways and Means Committee. I want to take this occasion to commend the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and all of the members of his committee for their prompt consideration of the President's recommendations; and I want particularly to salute my colleague, the gentlelady from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths], for the aggressive leadership she has provided in making certain that the need for the automotive excise tax reform received the attention it has long deserved. This bill clearly bears her own distinguishing mark and without her able and determined effort, I am satisfied that we would only be doing half the job today.

The arguments over the years for repeal of the unjust auto excise tax are well known to you. The tax was designed to make automobiles more expensive, to keep people from buying them, to reduce production and employment in the automobile industry. Repeal will not only correct an inequity but generate increased activities in automobile-related industries. It is well that we remember that one business in every six is directly dependent on the manufacture, distribution, service and use of motor vehicles. The benefits in an increase in auto production will most certainly spread to all businesses and workers throughout our whole economy.

Many have expressed their concern about the impact of this legislation on the revenues needed by the Treasury to carry on the functions of our Government. I, too, share this concern, but may I say that this need in itself, although great, cannot justify the continued imposition of discriminatory taxes throughout the country. If added revenues are needed to carry on the functions of Government, and they may well be, I say that there are certainly more equitable and more practical ways of raising them than continuing the many obsolete, oppressive, and discriminatory excise taxes that have grown like Topsy over the years.

Because of its significance, I would like to make special note of the retroactive features of this bill. Although it has been just over 2 weeks since the President sent his excise tax recommendations to the Congress, I have already heard from many dealers who have advised me that in this limited period since the proposal has received wide publicity, it has created confusion in the public mind. For this reason, I think it is well that the committee and the House have acted with such dispatch and it is my hope that the other body will also give the matter expeditious consideration and remove any doubts about the intentions of the Congress with respect to the retroactive feature of this and other tax reductions.

While I am indeed pleased that we are taking the initial steps to bring about the complete elimination of the tax by January 1969, going further than the President asked, I am disappointed that the measure has come before us under a closed rule. Frankly, I would have preferred that the auto excise tax be completely removed as of January 1, as was provided in the bill I introduced this session, and I would have liked to have been permitted to offer such an amendment. As the Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress directs its attention to reform, I believe that some thought should be given to the practice of bringing so many bills before the House under closed rules. Over the years I have felt that such action has not always been in the best interests of representative government. It is difficult for me to accept the theory that this House of Representatives is not capable of working its will and should not be permitted to do so. True, it would take a bit longer to consider some proposals but, in my judgment, in the end the legislation would reflect more accurately the collective opinion of the representatives of the people.

Before concluding, let me again commend the chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee for bringing this bill to the House. While I regret it does not go a bit further, it is certainly an acceptable compromise. As I have said before, I am satisfied that the recommended reduction of this tax is sound and will provide a surging force to sustain the continued growth of our expanding economy. It is my hope that this legislation will receive prompt action by the Congress and that it will soon be presented to the President for his approval.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the statements that have been made today and I have heard a good many warnings to manufacturers, distributors, and retailers not to increase the prices of products presently covered by these excise taxes. However, I have yet to hear anyone in any way allude to the fact that the hoped for savings to consumers from the repeal and reduction of these excise taxes can be very quickly absorbed by price increases that have been necessitated by wage increases. I have heard no one serve any kind of a notice upon those who may be negotiating for wage increases subsequent to the enactment of this bill. I join with those who at this time agree with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that with a reduction of taxes, we can elect only one road to travel and that is the road to reduced Federal expenditures. I trust that the distinguished chairman, and the members of the committee will join with some of us in the future to cut expenditures to fit the reduced revenues to the Government from the repeal or reduction of these taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this bill and for the reason that since becoming a Member of Congress some 17 years ago I have been committed to repeal of the war levied excises. I intend to keep that commitment. This is the tax action that should have been taken last year instead of the more than $11 billion cut in Federal income taxes.

I reiterate what I have said on many, many other occasions in this Chamber that unless fiscal sanity is returned to the operation of the Government—unless the budget is balanced and orderly payments made on the staggering Federal debt—the Nation will inevitably face bankruptcy. Not even the Federal Government can go on endlessly borrowing or printing billions of dollars to prop up this Nation's economy and that of countless foreign countries.

The recent nosedive of the stock market in the face of President Johnson's rosy picture of national prosperity is a danger signal that only the blind will let go unheeded.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, after listening to all these speeches here today I think I will find myself in probably the smallest minority with which I have ever been associated. I am not opposed, of course, to reduction of excise taxes, but I do intend to vote against this bill. I probably have a different reason than many Members have, but I feel that before we bring about a reduction in revenue that is going to be financed by going further into debt, as will be evidenced when we pass the bill to increase the debt ceiling, we should first find some way to recover the revenue that is going to be lost.

Of course, these taxes should have been repealed years ago, after the war was over. But during the years we have become adjusted to having this revenue and it was about as painless a method of extracting it from the public as we could have. Of course, I am not going to try to defend the repeal of the tax on furs and jewelry and other luxuries like those. I do not agree with my friend from

Michigan, for instance, that there is going to be any increased sale of new automobiles because of the repeal of this tax. I do not think this tax has had any effect whatsoever on the purchase of new automobiles. But I do know this: I am not an economist but I have observed things that have happened over a long period of years. I am just telling you this right now, and I think you will agree with me, that every time we have had an increase in the national debt we have had increased inflation, and I think we are going to continue to have that.

As the gentleman from Iowa said, recalling remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of this committee, for whom I have the highest regard—in fact, there is no Member of this House in whom I have more confidence than I have in the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]—at the same time, unless we do cut down some of these expenditures and cut down on this national debt we are going to continue to have increased inflation. If we cannot have a balanced budget, and reduce the national debt in prosperous times such as we have had, we can never do it.

I think the poor people today are going to suffer more from the reduction or elimination of these excise taxes than any other group of people. In the first place, few of them will receive any direct benefits from the reduction or elimination, but they will suffer from the effects of inflation. As soon as this automobile excise tax is reduced and eventually eliminated, what is going to happen? The value of every used car in the country is going to be less than it was the day before. That is the effect it is going to have. In other words, the value of the investment of the man who owns the second-hand car is going to be less.

I have told this story before to demonstrate what inflation does to the people who are near retirement, the people who have retired, Government workers and others, who have looked forward to retirement. Every Member gets letters from people saying, "My social security is not large enough to accomplish the things we were told it would accomplish at the time it was started back in 1936." It does not do it because the inflation since 1936 has wiped out all of those benefits. The effects of inflation keep one step ahead of the constantly rising cost of living.

I want to say this and say it as clearly as I know how. I do not think you are going to get the stimulation in the economy through the money that will be put back into circulation which will be saved by this reduction of the excise tax. It is not going to work that way. Within the next year or 2 years you are going to have more inflation. I am going to vote against extending the debt ceiling. I have voted against it on several other occasions, always for the same reason, expressing my opposition to increasing the debt during prosperous times when we should be balancing the budget.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, I told the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means:

> If you will put this debt ceiling on the basis of some permanent ceiling to which we can tie, I can support it. Put it as high as you want to, but let us at least be honest with ourselves.

The temporary ceiling of $285 billion is so unrealistic it is tragic.

Mr. Chairman, we are not being honest with the people of our Nation today in passing this tax reduction, for this reason: A lot of people are going to interpret this action today to the effect that here we have reduced taxes to the extent of $4.8 billion. They will say, "Boy, are we not well off? We can afford a tax reduction of $4.8 billion." Tax reductions may sound good but there will be a day of reckoning for "chickens do come home to roost."

Mr. Chairman, we are not well off at all. We are going to be worse off, because this action is going to bring about more inflation. Mr. Chairman, the poorer the man is, the more he is going to pay under this line of reasoning. It has been my observation that welfare rolls increase in direct ratio with the increase in inflation.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill which is before us today, if enacted, will accomplish three important purposes.

It will contribute to the economic well-being of the Nation.

It will improve the fairness of our tax system.

It will simplify the administration of the tax law.

There has been general belief for a long time that something should be done to reduce the plethora of excise taxes remaining from World War II or Korean war days.

We have about 75 categories of such taxes on the books today and the resulting complexity requires more than random repeal of a few taxes.

It requires what is proposed in the bill before us—thorough revision based on a comprehensive study of them all.

Elimination of outmoded excise taxes will provide us with a tax system which rests on logical categories of taxes. Basically, all remaining excises will fall under three groups:

First. Those which are so-called user charges;

Second. Those which are regulatory in nature; and,

Third. Those which are sumptuary such as alcohol or tobacco.

Basically the bill calls for the elimination of all other excise taxes, referred to in the bill as selective excises.

At the present time selective excise taxes represent burdens on the consumers and producers which in most cases are discriminatory. Imposed for the most part in times of national emergency, they have remained and become the source of undeserved discrimination.

Because consumers of these products have to pay a premium over the market price these taxes reduce sales, thereby reducing incomes and jobs in industries producing these goods.

In addition, these taxes in many instances have a greater impact on persons in lower income brackets than those with higher incomes.

Those who have to spend a larger portion of their income for consumption have a larger portion of their income absorbed by these taxes.

The burden is particularly hard on those who are starting families and who find it necessary to make large investments in applicances and other taxed commodities.

Because of the regressive and discriminatory nature of these taxes, I am convinced that their repeal and revision will prove to be a boon to our economy.

Mr. Chairman, before concluding, I should point out there were certain technical amendments which were not considered in connection with this bill but which we will later consider in connection with the hearings on the highway thrust fund. I strongly support H.R. 8371 and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that at long last we are considering a comprehensive bill to reduce or eliminate many excise taxes. I have been fighting for years for a realistic approach to these unnecessary and restrictive taxes, and it is gratifying that both the legislative and executive branches of the Government have seen fit to agree.

It also is gratifying to note that most of the proposals contained in this bill reported by the able gentlemen on the Committee on Ways and Means are proposals also contained in my own bill. The section repealing the retailers' excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage, handbags, et cetera, has been retained intact. My suggestions for reducing and eliminating the excises on automobiles and parts have been accepted with only minor change. And my suggestions of long standing relative to eliminating taxes on telephone and other communications services were adopted in principle. It also is good to see that at least some attention was paid to the solvency of the highway trust fund, through continuation of user taxes, so that the interstate highway program will proceed without difficulty. I even note that excises that were not eliminated or reduced, such as those on alcoholic beverages and tobacco, have been included in the permanent part of the law. This certainly is in line with recommendations that I and others from my side of the aisle, have made in the past, that excise taxes should not remain on a year-to-year basis, but should either be made permanent or allowed to expire.

Mr. Chairman, what more could a minority Member ask?

These reductions in unfair excise taxes are long overdue, and can provide a real benefit to individuals and the general economy. However, there is one big danger that could wipe out these benefits. Federal spending must now be held in check by this Congress or these reductions in taxes may set off a perilous round of inflation, further decreasing the value of the dollar and putting in peril the futures of our people who depend on pensions and fixed incomes. The truth of this is noted by the fact that later this week we will be called upon to consider the matter of increasing the national debt limit. I will have further comments on the subject at that time.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, the excise tax reduction legislation before the House today is a needed stimulant to the continued economic growth of our Nation.

As one who believes that the fiscal integrity of the United States ranks second only to the national defense, I am pleased to speak for this legislation. It has been difficult for me to understand how the country could continue to have a planned annual deficit of $5 billion, and a national debt of $317 billion, and at the same time cut personal income taxes by $11 billion and excise taxes by $4.8 billion. But I have been convinced of this fiscal strategy after hearing the testimony on these tax reductions from leading economists from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, from the AFL–CIO, and from other business and economic leadership.

I am also convinced that these tax reductions are necessary because of the Ways and Means Committee report, which says:

> The excise tax reduction provided in your committee's bill does not postpone but, rather, promotes continued progress toward a balanced budget at high levels of employment and output.

The committee report also points out that the reduction will continue the economic upswing, which has lasted over 51 months.

I am also convinced that this is a good bill because the President has promised to hold down spending. He wrote the esteemed chairman of the committee:

> I would like to make clear once again my strong determination to hold Federal expenditures to the lowest reasonable levels.

I applaud this statement, and as one Congressman I plan to do my part in holding down Government spending.

One section of the bill before the House today is of particular interest to me. That is the section dealing with the repeal of the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services. These taxes were placed on telephone service and teletypewriter exchange service during the war and were used to discourage the nonessential use of such services. Now the telephone is a basic instrument of communication, essential for business and emergency use. Early in the session I introduced H.R. 6416 to repeal these taxes, and I am pleased that the committee has recommended the repeal of these taxes.

I have received many letters from taxpayers in Florida stressing the need for this excise tax reduction, and for the Record would like to include a resolution from the city of Jacksonville dealing with the communications services tax and a resolution from the Jacksonville Automobile Dealers Association, dealing with the automobile tax:

Resolution by City of Jacksonville, Fla.

Whereas a Federal excise tax was imposed on the users of local and long-distance telephone communication services during World War II to produce additional revenues during a time of national emergency, and as a war measure to discourage the nonessential use of such services; and

Whereas the nature of this tax was intended to be temporary and repealed at the end of the national emergency; and

Whereas this tax has continued for more than 20 years after the emergency for which it was imposed; and

Whereas the telephone is the only common household utility so taxed and continuation would be a gross discrimination against telephone users; and

Whereas under no circumstances can the telephone be considered a luxury service because conditions of daily life have now caused the use of telephone service to be a necessity in the transaction of urgent business and the obtaining of emergency medical, police, fire protection, and similar services; and

Whereas the repeal of this unjust and discriminatory tax has been demanded constantly and insistently by telephone users; and

Whereas the Federal excise tax impairs the growth and improvement of telephone services, restricts the use of telephone services, and discriminate against users of telephone services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Commission of the City of Jacksonville, Fla., That it strongly urges the Congress of the United States to repeal the Federal excise tax on communication services; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Florida congressional delegation, to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and to the Federal Communications Commission.

Attest:

J. M. Ingram,
Secretary, City Commission.

Resolution on Elimination of Federal Excise Tax on Passenger Cars

Whereas the Jacksonville Automobile Dealers Association is comprised of 22 franchised new car dealers representing domestic and imported makes of vehicles; and

Whereas President Johnson has called for the repeal or reduction of Federal excise taxes in the amount of $1.75 billion, effective July 1, 1965, designed to "increase purchasing power and stimulate further growth in the economy"; and

Whereas a Federal manufacturers excise tax of 10 percent is presently levied on all new automobiles manufactured for sale in the United States; and

Whereas this tax was imposed as a temporary measure to help finance the war effort in World War II and the Korean conflict and to discourage purchase of automobiles; and

Whereas the avowed purposes for the continuation of the passenger car excise tax no longer exist and the elimination of the tax would contribute to sustained economic growth in conformance with current national goals; and

Whereas despite the fact that the passenger car is a necessity, not a luxury, for most individuals, the present tax rate on automobiles is twice the rate on most nonluxury consumer durables such as refrigerators, freezers, clothes dryers, dishwashers and other household electric, gas, and oil appliances whose rate of tax was reduced in 1954 from 10 to 5 percent; and luxury items, such as fur coats and jewelry, have been reduced 50 percent since the Korean war, and some luxury items, such as watercraft, are not taxed at all; and

Whereas the tax on passenger cars, which average about $225 per car is a special hardship on lower income groups since it is imposed on car purchasers and owners without regard to their income thus constituting a consumption tax with regressive effects, particularly on these lower income groups; and

Whereas the Federal new car excise tax has impeded sales of new and used passenger cars and repeal of the excise will lower the price of some 20 million new and used cars now purchased annually stimulating additional car demand and contributing more than any other single excise tax action to stronger, sustained economic activity; and

Whereas the repeal of the tax on automobiles will amount to a reduction in taxes of $1.8 billion per year, releasing consumer purchasing power that will stimulate the national economy and, through respending effects, will add ultimately about $5 billion annually to the gross national product; and

Whereas the repeal of the automobile excise will reduce used and new car prices, consequently lowering the cost of living, relieving the industry and the consumer of a burden that has offset the record of automobile price stability and product value increases, and discontinuing a form of taxation that makes the purchase of cars more expensive than it need or should be; and

Whereas Federal excise tax revenues from the sale of passenger cars in 1963 in the State of Florida amounted to $54,130,000, constituting a heavy tax burden on the citizens of this State which should be eliminated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Jacksonville Automobile Dealers Association in convention assembled this 9th day of April 1965, urges the immediate elimination by the U.S. Congress of the Federal manufacturers excise tax of 10 percent on passenger cars as being in the best interests of the citizens of this State, and of the national economy; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, requesting and urging support for the elimination of this tax, be forwarded to each U.S. Senator and Representative from the State of Florida.

S. Marshall Catlin,
President.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8371.

A short time ago, an economist friend of mine said that if this country really wanted to accelerate consumer spending we should forget about repealing excise taxes on luxury items and institute a major tax cut in the lower income brackets thus putting more money into the pockets of those with a greater propensity to consume. I feel that this opinion fails to consider the realities of the present-day prosperity which this country enjoys.

As a nation becomes more prosperous, the line between luxuries and necessities becomes blurred. Thus, where the purchase of an automobile was once a luxury available to a few, today the demands of our mobile society create a need for automobiles in a majority of our people. Where once housewives would contentedly wash their clothes by hand and cook over an open fire, they now would be appalled to be told that a washing machine or stove was a luxury item. Certainly no one can seriously contend that telephone service is now a luxury. To me the real factor is that as more and more Americans become able to acquire the items upon which excise taxes are imposed, there grows a need within our less affluent citizens to acquire similar items. To keep these people from making these purchases by a system of arbitrary excise taxes, is to deny their needs to assume a dignified place in our "affluent society."

I would like to add a regional note at this point. My home State of New Hampshire is the second most industrialized State in the Union. A large proportion of the industry is concentrated in the retail trades. The repeal of excise taxes would have a substantial impact on our State's economy as more and more people make the purchases they have put off pending the repeal of excise taxes.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the measure before us. Action is long overdue on the elimination of what were stated to be only temporary excise taxes enacted by the Congress during a period of national emergency, but which have threatened to become permanent because of a reluctance to eliminate a source of revenue used to pay for the burgeoning cost of operating a constantly expanding Federal Government.

Maybe it is coincidence, but I cannot help but think that the fact that we are acting on this tax cut measure now, just 1 day before we are scheduled to pass judgment on a proposal to raise the national debt limit to $328 billion is significant and should not go unnoticed. We are asked to give still another increase in our spending and debt limit. Try as I may, I cannot fully accept, let alone praise that alleged sophisticated economic theory which tells us not to be upset by a continuing policy of deficit spending.

These remarks should not be considered as an indication that I am not enthusiastic for the excise tax cut under consideration. The contrary is true and in a moment I will state my reasoning in support of the plan. Rather, I wish to indicate my deep concern for what appears to be a way of life for Uncle Sam—spend, spend, spend without concern for the source from which the money to finance the expenditures is to come, if indeed it is coming at all.

Let us accompany this major tax cut with a resolve that we will make every effort to restrain ourselves with regard to higher spending. Just as there are essentials in every program that is approved, there are excesses; let us be determined to eliminate these excesses.

I would be remiss in my obligation to the Nation and the people I represent if I did not pause for a moment to get on record this aspect of the issue before us.

The excise tax cuts that we are considering should pass by an overwhelming vote. I would be greatly surprised if this did not happen in view of the fact that the plan was first proposed by Republicans and is now being embraced by a Democrat administration. I am pleased that there is now agreement on the desirability of such action because I feel that it will provide a shot in the arm for our economy. The tax cut we passed in the last Congress had a stimulating effect on the economy, this should serve as a booster shot by placing more money in the hands of consumers enabling them to purchase additional goods and services. And, of course, it follows that an increased demand for the products of men and machines will result in the creation of more jobs to keep pace with the needs of an expanding population.

Of major importance in this undertaking is, as the President put it, the need for American business to "translate lower excise taxes promptly into lower retail prices for the consumers." Spokesmen for industry in my district have assured me that the savings will be passed on to their customers. I certainly hope that this action will be the rule and not the exception.

In reviewing this bill, I am especially pleased with that portion concerned with the eventual elimination of the excise tax on telephone service. Perhaps this, more than any of the other cuts proposed, will most directly affect Americans in all economic levels.

The telephone, as the popular advertisement stated, is "ubiquitous." Four out of five Americans have telephones in their homes and the percentage is on the increase. Of special significance, as I view it, is the fact that 86 percent of the households in the United States with telephone service have annual incomes under $10,000. In short, the telephone is not a luxury, but a necessity and the greatest beneficiaries from the cut in excise taxes will be those in the low- and middle-income brackets.

Telephone companies report that the average Federal excise tax paid in 1964 by communications customers was $18.51. If, after the full cut is in effect, each one of these nearly 50 million customers takes his average $18.51 saving and spends it for products that he might otherwise not be able to purchase, it is easy to see what a beneficial effect this will have on the economy.

On a measure such as this, which has my enthusiastic support, it would not be difficult to speak on at great length and to cite further facts and figures to give added weight to my position.

If the lines of opposition were clearly drawn and there was any possibility that the bill was in serious trouble, I would not hesitate to take such action. However, I do not feel this to be necessary because I am confident that there is widespread recognition of the merits of the proposal. I only hope that there is equal widespread recognition of the need for Federal restraint in future expenditures.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8371 to reduce excise taxes.

The President, on May 17, 1965, sent to this body his excise tax message calling for a sweeping reduction and elimination of many excise taxes. He referred to the Revenue Act of 1964, which I supported, and which reduced the income taxes of the American people by $14 billion. That action had a profound impact on our economy. It increased consumer buying by $28 billion. It increased business investment in plant and equipment by $6½ billion. And it helped create 2 million new jobs.

The bill before us today is an equally important step in assuring the health and growth of our economy. It will spur growth and move us closer to full employment by removing an unnecessary drag on consumer and business purchasing power. It will lower prices to the consumer; lessen the tax burden on low-income families; and raise business profits by expanding sales.

However, if these excise tax reductions are to have their maximum effect—if they are to contribute to price stability and balanced prosperity, American business must immediately translate lower excise taxes into lower retail prices for customers. For only then will this important measure secure the benefits the President foresaw when he sent the message to Congress.

I have confidence that American business will respond—and will act promptly to pass excise tax reductions on to the American consumer.

Mr. Chairman, the President's message set forth a realistic program toward an imaginative and far-reaching goal. And much credit must be given to the Committee on Ways and Means, its great chairman, and its members, who acted both expeditiously and wisely upon the Presidential proposals.

Particularly important, I think, is that provision which, by making the effective date July 1, 1965, avoids any deferral of purchases.

Today, we have the good fortune of being able to declare a new fiscal dividend of nearly $4 billion in excise tax cuts out of the bounty of our prosperous and growing economy—a dividend that will keep it prosperous and growing. I am proud of this bill—proud of our President who proposed it, proud of the Ways and Means Committee which acted upon it, and proud to support it.

I urge its passage.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8371, the excise tax reduction bill of 1965.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the Republicans have long favored the gradual reduction or elimination of excise taxes. In this regard, the retail excise taxes should have been eliminated as we suggested last year. This would have set the stage for a gradual elimination of these onerous taxes which would not have had the possible ramifications of an all-out reduction at this time. Moreover, I believe that this tax cut must be coupled with certain fiscal reforms and spending restraints. Unless this is done, this tax cut may lead to a spiraling inflation and a consequent premature economic downturn.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to this legislation, I would like to call attention to the fact that at its May 26 meeting, the Republican policy committee took a position in support of H.R. 8371. However, the committee also recommended that in conjunction with this tax cut there should be an immediate implementation of appropriate expenditure reforms and spending restraints. The statement that I issued as chairman of the Republican policy committee with respect to H.R. 8371 follows:

> While we favor the recommended reduction of excise taxes, we feel it is our duty as the minority to remind the majority of the dangers of cutting taxes unless certain precautionary steps are taken. Although tax cutting has proven to be effective within certain limits to bolster a sagging economy, it is entirely possible that a tax cut at this

time, unless it is coupled with monetary reforms, could lead to a spiraling inflation and a consequent premature economic downturn. Certainly, when tax cutting of this magnitude is undertaken in a period of prosperity, there is little left in the way of emergency measures, in the event of an economic downturn.

Republicans have long favored the gradual reduction or elimination of excise taxes and we still do. In this regard, the retail excise taxes should have been eliminated as we suggested last year. This would have set the stage for a gradual elimination of these onerous taxes which would not have had the possible ramifications of an all-out reduction.

Without question, tax reduction can remove the impediments to economic growth. The tax reduction of 1964 has had that effect on the economy. However, the 1964 tax cut was successful only because it was accompanied by a holddown on Federal expenditures that Republicans insisted upon and that the administration initially said was impossible.

It is absolutely imperative that the following measures be implemented along with the reduction in excise taxes.

1. The excise tax reduction must be coupled with expenditure restraint. The $99.7 billion budget must be maintained and if possible reduced.

2. Every effort must be made to continue the Republican-sponsored movement in the direction of a balanced budget so that this goal can be achieved by 1967.

3. In view of pressing defense needs, immediate and dramatic restraint in domestic spending must be exercised. Unfortunately, to date, the administration has not indicated by its actions that it recognizes this basic requirement.

It is only in the context of prompt and appropriate expenditure reform and spending restraint that the Republican Policy Committee supports the excise tax reduction. It is with the greatest sense of urgency that we recommend the immediate implementation of the suggested fiscal measures so that the excise tax cut will trigger the hoped-for benefits rather than the start of a disastrous economic decline.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the excise tax reduction bill. It is my firm belief that we must make a concerted effort to revise and streamline our present tax structure. One of the important moves toward this goal is the present bill before this august body.

We have before us an opportunity to eliminate a tax that was implemented with specific objectives in mind. These objectives have been attained; the utility of these taxes are thus obviated.

One of the paramount motives for initiating these excise taxes was to reduce consumer demand in wartime. The retention of these taxes thus assumes the proportions of a major anachronism in light of our rapidly striding consumer economy.

This country has seen the enormous economic growth which has in part been engendered by a sagacious tax cut in 1964. We have learned that the economy of our country can increase in size when stifling taxes are reduced, but what is of equal importance must not be forgotten—when our economy increases, so do tax returns.

The elimination of the excise tax will be the removal of a regressive tax imposed on low-income families; an increase in business profits, through elimination of costly tax compilations, and by increasing sales; a reduction of Government costs for the collection of taxes; and the liberation of many enterprises that have been unfairly burdened by this tax.

This country is in the midst of an economic boom—we have experienced more than 51 months of unbroken peacetime expansion. A wise tax policy can help continue this unprecedented achievement.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my support for the excise tax reduction bill of 1965.

Many letters have come to me from my district, and, in fact, from the entire State of Nebraska, urging passage of this long-overdue tax reduction legislation.

I have favored repeal of the so-called temporary wartime excise taxes ever since I came to the Congress 9 years ago, because first of all I believe they are discriminatory, applying only to a small category of so-called luxury items. Still, I find it difficult to perceive how a woman's handbag can be classified as a luxury. I am sure the womenfolk would agree with me that this item more aptly should be classified as a necessity.

In addition to this, these excise taxes have outlived their original purpose and they are out of tune with the times. They were originated during an emergency period when very appropriately they could be termed luxuries; however, that particular emergency period is past and so is the justification for that luxury classification. Today, these excise taxes are revenue items, and in the current vogue of tax reduction they are subject either to reduction or elimination.

The fact of the matter is that I have supported an attempt on the part of the Republican Party in the last Congress to reduce some of these excise taxes and to eliminate others—a Democrat administration, however, vigorously opposed these tax cutbacks; hence, that proposed tax reduction legislation did not pass.

The way I feel about it, this legislation is too limited, and I would prefer to go further and, for instance, eliminate the excise tax on telephones right now. The telephone is, in my opinion, not a luxury but a very necessary instrument in this modern world depending so very much on rapid and efficient communication.

Telephone communication is a vital ingredient in industrial function, and industry is an important contributor to the economic health of our country. In addition, it contributes in an important manner to the various social activities conducted in our society, as can be attested to by any member of a woman's club or any man making a quick search for a golf partner—and over and above this, it is an absolute necessity to many of our senior citizens and to those confined to sickbeds.

With respect to an elimination of the telephone tax, I cannot think of any tax reduction that would be any more appreciated. Here, indeed is a tax reduction that would receive monthly appreciation, every time that one had to draw out his checkbook and pay his telephone bill.

I would like to recommend that any reduction or elimination of excise taxes be accompanied by a corresponding reduction in Government expenditures. In the absence of such a cutback in Government spending, any reduction in Government revenues would result in deficit financing by the Federal Government. And because Government debt is the seed for inflation, there would be an invitation for higher prices which would, in turn, defeat any gain to the taxpayer through excise tax reduction.

In short, then, I recommend that the Congress act to cut out some of the spending on unnecessary projects, for otherwise the supposed benefits from any downward adjustment in excise taxes will be more a myth than a fact.

In concluding, I would like to say that the proposed repeal or phaseout of these various excise taxes in this session of Congress has the very strong approval of the citizens of my congressional district and of my State of Nebraska—this legislation, then, has my unqualified support.

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate having this opportunity to express my interest in this legislation. It is my serious hope that this bill is favorably acted upon by the House of Representatives.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the recommended reduction of excise taxes, having proposed such cuts for some time. My support must be qualified, however, to the extent that such cuts are accompanied with cuts in spending and responsible fiscal policies.

Experience has shown that tax cuts without fiscal restraints can lead to spiraling inflation. Should this happen, the desired benefit to be gained by reducing the excise taxes will be negated.

It is thus essential that the excise tax reduction be coupled with spending restraint and that every effort in the direction of a balanced budget be made.

I am hopeful that in cutting these excise taxes the administration and the Congress will show a sense of responsibility as it relates to reducing future spending. On the basis that spending will be reduced, I support the reduction of these excise taxes.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to rise in support of this bill to affect repeal of excise taxes which will certainly most effectively stimulate the national economy.

President Johnson's earlier repeal of income and corporate taxes has proven to be such a worthwhile experiment that I am sure that its results had a profound effect upon the thinking of the Members on the Committee on Ways and Means when it entertained excise tax repeal legislation.

The day has gone when America considers excise taxes on jewelry, handbags, cosmetics, and other such items as being luxuries. Certainly they more appropriately are classified as essentials and should be regarded as such for purposes of tax.

I am particularly pleased to note that the bill contains repeal of telegraph and telephone excise taxes. The real merit of this bill seems to be in the fact that the benefits flow directly to the consumer and the consuming public would realize immediate benefit when this bill is enacted into law.

I would commend the administration and its economic advisers, as well as the membership of the House Committee on Ways and Means under its distinguished and able chairman, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, for reporting out to the House this landmark piece of progressive legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support this tax reform measure.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my wholehearted support of the bill before us, which provides across-the-board abolition or reduction of so many unwarranted excise taxes. I have introduced many bills in the past to remove burdensome excise taxes, and I am deeply gratified to see that this long-overdue action is finally being taken.

I think all Americans—manufacturers, retailers, and consumers alike—will rejoice at the repeal of these anachronistic taxes. I know, too, that the women will be particularly pleased to see an end to the taxes on cosmetics. It is about time we gave the girls a break: their beauty should be encouraged and promoted, not taxed. In addition, excise taxes are supposedly predicated on the assumption that the items taxed are luxuries. It is simply inconsistent with the stress we place on beauty to view cosmetics as luxuries. I am certain that all the women in America can testify to the necessity and importance of cosmetics. From the evening facial to the morning lipstick, from the powder puff to the eyebrow pencil, who among us can say that these are not essentials of the American woman's daily life?

The direct effect of the legislation will be the spurring of consumer purchases on products ranging from pens to refrigerators. I feel quite certain any losses to the Treasury which might result from the repeal of the excise taxes will be more than compensated by the increased revenues which will inure from the substantial rise in profits which naturally accompanies increased sales. We witnessed this phenomenon recently in connection with the reduction of income taxes, where, as a matter of fact, the revenue was well over a billion dollars more than our most optimistic economists had predicted. I am sure that the repeal of these taxes will benefit not only the American people, and business community, but the American economy as well.

Many families which just could not afford cameras, or freezers, or phonographs, will now find these articles within their reach. In addition, I am sure this summer will be a good deal more pleasant for those who will now be able to buy that long-coveted air conditioner And the increased competition which follows from the enhanced incentive to purchase these products, may well further reduce the sales prices and make the products available to more and more Americans.

I believe this is a very healthy stimulant to our economy, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this truly worthwhile and long-overdue modernization of our tax structure.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, my own vote on the pending bill to eliminate or reduce excise taxes by $5 billion calls for one of the most difficult decisions I have been required to make as a Member of Congress.

My best political interests dictate that I support the cut. But I have consulted my conscience and have determined in my own judgment that my political interests and the national interest do not coincide. That being the case, I can only decide in favor of the national interest.

There are many features of the bill that I could support as sound economics, but on the whole I believe the measure goes too far, too fast. Today it is proposed that we eliminate $5 billion annually in tax revenues. Tomorrow we will be asked to increase the debt limit another $5 billion to a total of $329 billion. At the present time, the interest on our national debt is $10 billion each year; over 10 percent of our annual budget.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that the administration has asked and will be given a blank check to press our military operations in Vietnam. The excise taxes were mostly passed to pay for our military expenses. We are still faced with the necessity for such expenses.

I know that I am one small voice, but I must raise it now and take the consequences.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I wish at this time to make a few brief comments in support of the excise tax reduction bill as reported by the House Ways and Means Committee.

I commend the members of this committee for their prompt action on this bill which will reduce Federal excise tax revenues by some $4.8 billion annually when all features of it become fully effective. This amount is relatively insignificant when it is compared with total Federal tax revenues from all sources of $112.3 billion which our Government received during the fiscal year 1964.

I firmly believe that our economy is now well able to support these additional tax cuts. Already we have seen the effect which the tax reduction bill enacted in 1964 has had upon our entire economy. During this current fiscal year 1965 the Treasury Department has already collected $1.5 billion more in taxes than was predicted earlier. The primary reason for this, many believe, is the strong upsurge which our economy has made since the tax cut became effective in 1964.

Many of these excise taxes were originally imposed during World War II as a temporary expedient to bring in additional revenues to meet the heavy requirements for waging an all-out war. However, with the cessation of hostilities, rather than being promptly eliminated, these excise taxes have remained on our statute books to impose an unfair burden upon business as well as consumer.

I am particularly gratified that this bill will at last give some measure of relief from the excise tax on telephone service. Certainly all of us will readily agree that the use of the telephone is indispensable in the operation of any business as well as being highly essential in any home. Since these taxes are passed on to the consumer, they only increase the businessman's operating costs and those of the private individual.

Now that a thorough study has been made of the whole range of Federal excise taxes, we must delay no longer in acting favorably upon this bill.

Approval of this measure will accomplish the following objectives:

It will give relief to the manufacturer and retailer of these taxed commodities as well as to the American consumer. The competitive advantage now enjoyed by firms producing and selling untaxed goods and services will at last be eliminated. Manufacturers and retailers will further be relieved of the nuisance and added expense entailed in acting as tax collector for the Federal Government. Low-income families, particularly, who bear the brunt of these regressive taxes, will benefit from their reduction or repeal.

These tax savings passed along to the consumer will place additional purchasing power into his hands to provide himself and his family with more of the essentials and comforts of life.

Increased demand for consumer goods and services will serve to stimulate greater productivity and employment.

Higher incomes and profits will also be realized which will provide the Government with additional income tax revenues, which, in time, will offset the initial loss which will accompany repeal or reduction of these taxes.

Thus business, the consumer, the Government, and indeed, our entire economy will stand to benefit from enactment of this excise tax reduction bill.

For these compelling reasons, I urge all my colleagues to join with me in support of this measure.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. The Committee on Ways and Means has done an admirable job in handling this question, and Chairman MILLS has distinguished himself by the way in which the entire delicate problem of excise taxation was treated under his leadership.

This legislation will do much to reinforce the already expansive economy. As one who has long advocated the reduction and repeal of the excise tax on telephone service, I am pleased to see this action taken by the committee, and urge approval by the Congress. The telephone tax is estimated to cost 1964 telephone users in Florida an average of $20.42 each. As a sponsor of this repeal, introducing H.R. 6635, I earnestly applaud this assistance and relief offered to the telephone subscribers, users, and the administrative costs of American business.

Similar relief to the business community may be seen in the committee's approval of excise tax repeals on luggage and handbags, jewelry, fur sales, and cosmetics and other related items. As a sponsor of legislation to repeal these taxes I join wholeheartedly in the committee's efforts. Not only will these reductions assist consumers, but will ease the bookkeeping requirements imposed on retailers as well.

The committee's action in approving reductions and repeal of excise taxes on passenger automobiles will also do much for the Nation's economy in view of the large portion of the American work force employed by that industry, and the significant part the industry plays in related segments of the economy as well. As a sponsor of H.R. 8075, which would repeal that tax, I urge enactment of this provision as well.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support H.R. 8371, and commend the committee for its efforts in this field of taxation.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as one who has consistently advocated the elimination of the so-called wartime emergency exise taxes over the past several years, I am very glad to rise in support of this measure, H.R. 8371, and urge its overwhelming passage.

The problem of what to do about these Federal excise taxes has challenged the conscience of the Congress and continued to penalize our people and our businesses ever since the end of World War II.

Surely the time has now come to settle the matter forthrightly and realistically.

The existing current situation projects hardships, contradicts the term "luxury" in this modern world and it is economically unjustifiable.

Is there anyone who truly feels that cosmetics, furs, luggage, automobiles, television sets, long-distance telephone calls, washing machines, refrigerators, air conditioners, club dues, babies' things, electrical appliances, and a host of other articles should still be classified as luxuries in this nuclear age?

According to the testimony and the evidence of economic authorities that has been revealed here this afternoon the repeal of these excise taxes would eliminate substantial elements of drag and discrimination in our fiscal system and inject an increased purchasing power factor of significant influence into our economy which must be encouraged to expand, especially during this period of unemployment adjustment to the challenging impact of automation.

The further facts of this problem are that most of these excise taxes have a greater adverse effect on people in the low-income brackets as compared with those in the higher brackets because low-income families inevitably have to spend a higher proportion of their income for consumption products.

The present system further tends to impose heavier tax burdens on new families that must spend a substantial part of savings and income on purchases of appliances and other taxed commodities.

Unquestionably a great many of these taxes have been an unjustifiable burden on and harassment of the traditional conduct of business within our American free enterprise system; this harassment and these burdens should be ended, now, not only for increased business efficiency but for the general economic good.

Despite the fears expressed by some I believe that an objective analysis of the expert testimony presented to the House Ways and Means Committee, in connection with this subject, and the provisions of this bill will indicate clearly that this measure will promote, rather than restrain, continuing progress toward a balanced budget at high levels of employment and production. This is obviously the case because the excise tax reductions should certainly sustain the current upswing in economic activity that has already lasted longer than any other period of uninterrupted peacetime economic expansion. Further than this the testimony given by the Treasury Secretary before the Ways and Means Committee reveals that as a result of expenditure control and substantial increases in revenue collections, estimates of the Federal budget deficit in the fiscal years 1965 and 1966 have been substantially reduced below the figures estimated in the President's budget message released in January. Additionally, we have the President's public pledge he will exercise every resource of his office "to hold Federal expenditures to the lowest reasonable levels."

Mr. Chairman, when these excise taxes were originally enacted the Congress went on record with a promise to remove these "temporary" and "luxury" impositions as soon as the "emergency" no longer existed to any vital extent.

May I remind my colleagues here that we have consistently and abundantly fulfilled all of our pledges to our foreign allies and friends and we are still engaged in doing so. Here is our opportunity to keep faith with our own people and our own businesses who have suffered too long from too much taxation. I hope we will overwhelmingly seize this opportunity without further delay.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to vote for repeal of this series of regressive, objectionable wartime and depression-born excise taxes. I also welcome this opportunity to congratulate the President, his economic advisers, and the majority leadership in the Congress for the aptitude they have shown in following—at long last—the advice that we Republicans have offered. Republicans have been advocating repeal of these excise taxes for years. It seems that in this field, as in some others, including foreign policy, we have conferred, even in our defeat, the gift of foresight upon the majority party. The country will be better off for it. It would be better off yet if the majority party were to extend this new-found trait of following Republican wisdom in other major areas of national policy.

These excises, which I twice voted to repeal in the last Congress, were enacted during times of crisis specifically to retard certain kinds of economic activity, as well as to produce revenue. Some date back to the depression years, some to World War II, and some to the time of the conflict in Korea. Their repeal should have been the first order of business once conditions permitted. It should have come even before the lowering of the income-tax rates. Nevertheless, this bill is better late than never. It should be pointed out, however, that repeal is less a matter of spurring the economy than of removing unjustified obstacles upon the economy. Repeal is not, as the President put it in his excise message to Congress "a new fiscal dividend." As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] so ably pointed out in his supplemental views on the bill, the country has no earnings or surplus out of which to pay any dividends.

The fact is, we are in debt and the President has asked that the debt limit be raised from $324 to $329 billion. American taxpayers are presently forced to pay more than $11 billion a year for interest on the hundreds of billions we have already borrowed.

Thus, while I am happy to support the repeal of these excise taxes, for which I have so often called, it is essential for the Government to tighten its belt, to restrain itself in the creation of costly new programs of doubtful worth, and to control these budget deficits. If we cannot bring the budget into balance during times of high prosperity such as these, how can we hope to deal with the critical demands of less happy times that may lie in the future? We are the bulwark of the free world and our economic health is vital. I urge the administration and my colleagues to keep this basic fact uppermost in all their considerations of new programs and new commitments.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I have been advocating a comprehensive overhaul of our present inconsistent, and often discriminatory, schedule of excise taxes ever since I first came to Congress in 1959. It gives me a great deal of pleasure, therefore, to rise in support of this far-reaching bill today.

Our present system of excise taxes has been, for the most part, a creature of depression and war. It has developed either as a means to restrain civilian demand in wartime or as an emergency revenue-raiser.

The result has been that excise taxes have not evolved along any systematic lines. They are frequently discriminatory in their application, either to the taxed industries or to purchasers of the taxed products.

As a matter of fact, the committee, in its report, has quite correctly pointed out that many excise taxes are regressive in their impact, absorbing a larger share of the limited funds of low-income families than of those with higher incomes. They also weigh more heavily on newly formed families which must commonly invest heavily in purchases of appliances and other taxed commodities.

It should also be noted, Mr. Chairman, that this reduction will not in any way delay or deter our continuing and steady rate of economic growth. We are now in our 51st month of uninterrupted economic advance. This bill represents a sound and profitable investment in that continued growth and should be approved overwhelmingly today.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the excise tax cut bill because these cuts, taken by themselves, will be beneficial to the Nation's economy. Excise taxes are frequently inequitable, are costly and inefficient to collect at the consumer level, and unfairly discriminate against a particular industry.

While both the administration and the Congress are considering major tax relief programs, consideration should also be given to a supplementary group of alternative fiscal devices through which the Federal Government could place dollars promptly in the hands of consumers—alternatives which would achieve greater equity and a greater fiscal stimulating effect on the economy, than the proferred package.

For example, it might well be appropriate to review the current tax system which levies an estimated $300 million in taxes annually from persons who are characterized by one Federal agency as living in poverty, and who are then plunged into further penury by the Federal tax collector who reduces their $3,000 annual income by several hundred dollars per annum. This appears to be profoundly inequitable and totally inconsistent with our war against poverty.

It should be noted that, considered purely as a fiscal matter, a combined Federal welfare and tax reform program which would place more dollars into the hands of individuals and families in the poverty brackets, through reduction or elimination of income or social security taxes, and increased welfare payments for single mothers with dependent children, and aged retirees, would have a measurably greater impact on the economy, than the program of excise tax reductions now being contemplated by Congress, appropriate as they undoubtedly are on grounds of equity, and ease and cost of administration.

A dollar saved by the average taxpayer is applied 93 percent to the spending stream, and about 7 percent to personal savings. Undoubtedly the beneficiaries of tax savings from the contemplated excise tax reductions enjoy a higher than average annual income. Therefore, a higher percentage of the dollars saved from reducing or eliminating excise taxes on furs, jewelry, country club dues, leather luggage goods, automobiles, and the like, will be applied to savings, and a lesser percentage will be spent by consumers for goods and services. It is self-evident that an additional dollar placed in the hand of a single mother with children, or an aging person in the poverty brackets would be spent in its entirety on goods and services and would therefore reverberate throughout the economy.

If this bill did not come before the House under a closed rule, I would offer an amendment, the effect of which would be to eliminate the $300 million in income taxes levied on persons or families at or below the poverty line.

The poor will receive little relief from this bill. If we can save $4 billion for the middle income and affluent members of society, we can afford to save $300 million for the poor, thus generating that much desperately needed effective purchasing power and economic capability as a long-delayed first basic step to uplift the status of 35 million Americans living in poverty.

Since I cannot offer this amendment, I hope that the Members of the other body will give serious consideration to this proposal.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of H.R. 8371, the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965. This bill represents a comprehensive overhaul of our Federal excise tax structure. Most of the present excise taxes were initially levied as emergency revenue raising measures at the time of the Korean war, World War II, or during the depression of the 1930's.

These taxes are often discriminatory in their application to the taxed industries or to purchasers of the taxed products because they were not developed on any systematic basis, but were levied with some haste as emergency measures. Over the years since I came to Congress in 1953 I have received thousands of appeals from constituents urging that these so-called "nuisance" taxes be repealed on luggage and handbags, toilet preparations, jewelry, telephone and telegraph, electrical appliances, sporting goods, cameras and film, musical instruments, television sets, automobiles and accessories, general admissions, and a host of other items.

This legislation provides for at least an orderly beginning in cutting these nuisance taxes, and in some instances provides for outright repeal. These taxes tend to reduce sales and therefore reduce incomes and jobs in the industries which produce the taxed goods. For example, the A. G. Spalding & Bros., Inc., one of the largest and well known sporting goods manufacturers in the country, is located at Williamansett, Mass., in my district and is a large employer. Mr. E. L. Parker, the president of A. G. Spalding & Bros., Inc., wired me advising that:

> In view of the uncertainty regarding removal of excise tax on certain sporting goods items, buyers all over the United States have stopped placing orders and are refusing to take goods.

He points out that "business is booming in the country and all of us want it to continue." I am sure that my colleagues join with me in sharing Mr. Parker's sentiments, and that is one good reason for passing this bill today.

Mr. Chairman, last year 107,303 telephone customers in my Second Congressional District paid $1.8 million in excise taxes. I am pleased that this bill will provide for a 7-percent cut in local and long distance telephone service on January 1, 1966, and that the remaining 3 percent of the excise tax will be reduced gradually to 2 percent on January 1, 1967, to 1 percent on January 1, 1968, and entirely eliminated on January 1, 1969.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of the pending bill, H.R. 8371, to reduce and repeal a host of Federal excise taxes.

No legislative subject has had my greater attention in this 89th Congress than the one now before us. I have been vitally interested in winning enactment for the termination or reduction of the levies imposed by our national Government on the sale or manufacture of many goods and services that are obvious necessities in today's life.

I have sponsored my own legislation in this area, as well. In fact, on the opening day of this session, I introduced a bill to do away with the nuisance excises on handbags, cosmetics, jewelry, and furs. Subsequently, I offered bills to end excise taxes on photographic products, admissions, telephone service, new cars, club dues, and various other items.

Each time I have introduced a proposal to remove an excise tax, I have taken the time to point out my reasons.

From every point of view, excise taxes have no place in American life in 1965. They were levied as reveue raisers and spending discouragers during periods of national emergency. Yet in the fashion of so many acts that have but a temporary intention, these excise taxes have stayed with us.

Throughout this extended period of excise taxation, the producer and purchaser of the taxed goods and services have been subjected to economic discrimination.

In examining excise taxes, we find a situation seriously apart from our general tax philosophy. Where income taxes are graduated or progressive and based on ability to pay, excise taxes are regressive. They are applied uniformly and as a consequence fall most heavily on those least able to bear the burden.

When initially levied as emergency measures, excise taxes were imposed on items not considered essential. Today, even that argument has vanished. To the lady, her handbag is just as essential as the pockets in a man's trousers. We do not tax trouser pockets. Why tax handbags? Either in business or the home, can one question that the telephone is anything other than a necessary communications link? Why, then, tax telephone service as a luxury? Similarly, with the myriad other items taxed at point of purchase or production, the luxury quality just is not there. These are essential items forced to compete at a disadvantage with other items, also essential, which are not taxed.

Equity for all Americans in taxation as in every other realm is the concern of Congress. Passage of this bill to repeal and reduce excise taxes will make plain our commitment to that purpose.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8371, which proposes to remove and modify Federal excise taxes presently imposed on a variety of consumer items. The argument which is most heard for the removal of these taxes is that they are a burden on the economy of the Nation—that they impede the so-called prosperity which all our citizens should enjoy.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that the main reason I am supporting this bill is because these taxes have become an unfair burden on those who can least afford to pay them and the reason for their being originally imposed has long since passed.

The present structure of excise taxes has developed over many years but most of them are the result of grave crises to our country. World War I, the great depression, World War II, and the Korean war are the key causes for this increase in tax revenue. At the time of their imposition, all of us accepted their need. We knew that they imposed a greater burden but the emergency of the situations caused us to accept them without question. They were brought about by special conditions. Because of the importance of those situations we did not question their validity nor did we question the impact they had on individuals of varying income. Now, however, we have legitimate cause to argue the need for their continuance.

I realize that a reduction in taxes is necessary for us to continue the unprecedented period of prosperity which the country has enjoyed for the past 4 years. I realize that such a reduction is expected to produce multiple benefits; new jobs for workers, lower prices to consumers, higher profits to business, and a reduction in the cost of tax collection and enforcement. But I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the principal reason I am so strongly supporting this bill today is that it will give a break to the consumer and a shot in the arm to much of the industry in my congressional district.

Rhode Island is a leading producer of jewelry and silverware and an important segment of the national market in the production of pens and pencilware, luggage and machine parts. It is interesting to note that back in 1954 when, I am proud to say, I fought for tax relief for Rhode Island industry and helped secure a cut from 20 to 10 percent in the retail tax on jewelry, sales increased the following year by almost 50 percent. I am sure that should we be equally effective today the reductions in retail taxes would result in similar increases in volume in the affected industries with resulting benefits to all our Rhode Island people. And this means jobs, Mr. Chairman, and jobs with their resulting income are what is necessary to provide the purchasing power so important to a continuance of our upward economic spiral.

The complete elimination of the retail tax on furs, on jewelry, on luggage and handbags and on toilet preparations and cosmetics will certainly be welcome. Jewelry and luggage are industries which have an obvious importance to Rhode Island. Perhaps less known is the effect which the elimination of the toilet preparations and cosmetics retail tax will have. For each of the past 10 years, when Congress adjourns, Mr. Chairman, going back to 1955, it has been my policy to tour my congressional district and to send out my congressional staff to talk with people in every community, village, and hamlet in my district. The purpose of this has been to determine what the thoughts and feelings of my constituents were on the issues facing the Congress.

One of the things that has made a very great impression on me is the recurring reports from most of the drugstores in my area indicating the unfair burden on them of the recordkeeping requirements caused by regulations connected with the excise tax on toilet articles and cosmetics. The detailed information asked for and the voluminous reports required took many hours to prepare. I know that the elimination of the tax on cosmetics and toilet preparations will not only be a multiple blessing to the woman purchaser who incidentally has long considered them as not a luxury but a necessity, but will also be a multiple blessing to the pharmacist or beauty preparation salesman if only because he will be spared the necessity of completing the many reporting forms required under present rule.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is a good example of what can be done by a regional group which avoids partisan advantage and works solely for the community good. The New England congressional delegation has done just this by subordinating any individual political advantage in order to do a real job in our area. I am confident of the bipartisan support of every Member from New England on this bill today and I hope that such cooperative effort continues in the months to come when we have similar beneficial legislation before us. There is no question in my mind but that such cooperation will bring about a more prosperous and vibrant New England.

Mr. Chairman, while the bill before us deals only with retail and manufacturers taxes as recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, the total message from the President mentioned something further on which I feel I should comment. It called for an increased imposition, rather than elimination, of taxes on tires and truck transportation through a suggested users tax. This I contend is unfair.

I have been in the Congress for the past 25 years and in each of these years it has been my impression that the truckers and the trucking industry has at least paid its share toward the general support of Government. To me, it appears that the Federal Government is singling out the trucking industry to bear an added burden. We are certainly protective of the airlines, with their tax supported terminals, and proposed action seems to intend to do something for the railroads. I am very much pleased that the House Ways and Means Committee has decided to wait until a future time to act on this Presidential recommendation. I know that the truckers and the trucking association are not trying to avoid their fair share of the tax burden. What they want is to be given the same consideration as all other transportation groups with the same tax burdens and benefits. This I contend is only fair and is a premise with which I can heartily concur.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the excise tax reduction bill. I have the utmost confidence in the integrity, patriotism, and ability of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MILLS. He and his great committee did not mislead this Congress or the American people when they reported the income tax reduction last year. The economy has moved forward. There is more tax revenue for the Treasury as a result of improved business.

Mr. Chairman, this excise tax reduction will have the same effect. Our economy will continue to improve. The reduction of excise taxes will help to create more jobs and opportunities by simply placing in the hands of our people more revenue for expansion and progress.

Mr. Chairman, should the House today remove this excise tax we will be keeping faith with the people. The taxpayers of this country have long been led to believe that the emergency wartime tax would be removed. They have been assured again and again by responsible men in Government and the Congress that it would be removed. Such things as automobiles, long-distance telephone calls, appliances, and conveyances are absolutely essential to the welfare and livelihood of our people.

Those of us who really oppose the ever-growing and increasingly more powerful centralization of the Federal Government should support this bill. This bill will have the effect of keeping money out of the hands of bureaucrats. Rather than having this revenue tied up in Washington, it will stay at home where it belongs. Our people will have more revenue, not only to balance the family budget, but to assist local government and aid in the construction of new schools, hospitals, and libraries. This additional revenue will help communities to expand municipal projects such as cleaning up pollution in order to provide for pure water and fresh air.

Mr. Chairman, this is a States rights bill. This bill will return indirectly to the States approximately $4.8 billion over a period of less than 4 years. As long as the taxpayers revenue is used to support a bloated Federal bureaucracy, States rights and individual liberty will be jeopardized.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to pass this excise tax reduction bill by an overwhelming majority. By doing this we will keep faith with the American people.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the constructive efforts of the chairman and members of the House Ways and Means Committee in formulating this excise tax reduction measure. This bill will, in my estimation, stimulate the American economy by ridding our tax system of burdensome excises which have endured since World War II, long after the basic reason for their original passage had gone.

I especially applaud the action of the committee in providing for the removal of the 10-percent tax on mechanical pencils, fountain pens, and ball point pens by July 1, 1965. The city of Fort Madison, Iowa, is the home of hundreds of skilled workmen who have contributed a great deal to the economy of southeast Iowa in their work for the Sheaffer Pen Co. The removal of this excise tax is especially important to the economy of southeast Iowa and should provide impetus for the growth and expansion of this fine industry with its skilled and talented craftsmen. The products of this industry have not only achieved notable distinction in our Nation's economy, but have become the basis of an exceedingly important export trade.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I have long felt that proponents of the Federal excise tax ought to be called woman taxers because these onery taxes seem aimed almost exclusively at women. The women are accustomed to being irritated every time they go shopping for toilet articles for themselves and families and for cosmetics. These include baby oils and powders and anything in the way of creams or ointments advertised to improve one's appearance. Such items have long since passed out of the luxury classification so far as American women are concerned yet they have had to pay this so-called luxury tax with every such purchase. I do not blame them one bit for being irritated. In a less stable society such a thing could bring down a government.

I strongly support H.R. 8371 and the administration's efforts to end these taxes. In fact, in previous years I have introduced bills to repeal them. They should have been done away with a long time ago but we cannot turn back the clock. If H.R. 8371 is enacted the wartime nuisance excise taxes will be ended. I favor passing it as soon as possible and I am in favor of the proposed retroactive features which will permit refunds to those who have paid the tax recently.

These taxes were originally applied during the war not only to raise revenue but also, and some say more importantly, to discourage the purchase of autos, gasoline, admissions to entertainment, furs, leather goods, telephone service, air travel, jewelry, tobacco, liquor, the toilet articles and cosmetics I mentioned and other items. Now, with the passage of this bill, the consumer will realize a savings of $2 on a $20 telephone bill, $10 on a $100 leather suitcase, $60 on a $600 fur coat, 5 cents on a 50-cent jar of face cream, and so forth.

Aside from being a nuisance to both purchaser and merchant, these taxes have been a positive drag on our economy. They have certainly discouraged buyers in notable instances.

Mr. Chairman, I think the removal of these taxes will actually increase revenue. Lower sales prices of goods in the marketplace customarily result in greater sales volume, higher profit and more tax revenue.

In addition, less tax collection effort will be required by the retail merchant who is overburdened with the present necessity of computing the tax and the accurate selection of the taxable items through the use of Government directives, the labeling and collecting, the bookkeeping and accounting. With these unproductive duties removed the merchant will have more time for sales producing, revenue producing activities. In my opinion it is wrong anyway to make a merchant be a tax collector without pay. It is involuntary servitude.

I want to reiterate my support for H.R. 8371. It seems to be a good bill from every point of view.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. **MILLS**. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on this bill at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN**. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MILLS**. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Under the rule the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. **MILLS**. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no amendments.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROOSEVELT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8371) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 404, he reported the bill back to the House.

The **SPEAKER**. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. **MILLS**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The question was taken; and there were—yeas 401, nays 6, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—401

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Culver
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—6

Baldwin
Griffin
Joelson
Jones, Mo.
Marsh
Smith, Va.

NOT VOTING—26

Andrews, George W.
Bonner
Bow
Brown, Ohio
Colmer
Craley
Cramer
Cunningham
Evans, Colo.
Fisher
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Holland
Keogh
Kirwan
Kornegay
Lindsay
Mathias
Michel
Passman
Powell
Resnick
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Utt
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. George W. Andrews.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Craley.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Holland.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION TO APPOINT GEN. WILLIAM F. McKEE TO OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules (on behalf of Mr. DELANEY) reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 407, Rept. No. 440), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 407

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7777) to authorize the President to appoint General William F. McKee (United States Air Force, retired) to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 408, Rept. No. 441), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 408

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8439) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader whether the gentleman can give us some additional information as to the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the gentleman from Illinois, we have finished the program for today. Tomorrow we will proceed, as scheduled, with the bill authorizing the extension of the Reorganization Act.

We are adding to the program for tomorrow H.R. 7777, a bill to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, which has been reported out under a rule with 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further I will advise the Members of the House that if we finish these 2 bills on tomorrow it will be our plan to adjourn over until Monday next.

Mr. ARENDS. The question of the debt limit will go over until next week?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the bill dealing with the debt limit will go over until next week.

Mr. ARENDS. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma have anything in mind as to what might be the tentative program for next week, or is it too early to give the Members of the House any information on that?

Mr. ALBERT. We have scheduled for consideration next week an appropriation bill. We will have suspensions, as well as the Consent Calendar on Monday. Beyond that, I prefer not to make any statement.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit on tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MILITARY PAY RAISE BILL

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in deference to the President of the United States, I today have introduced legislation recommended by the President which would provide a pay increase for military personnel.

As the Members of the House know and understand, I am bitterly disappointed in the recommendations of the Presidential Panel regarding military pay. In my judgment, and I am happy to add, one shared by many Members of Congress, the recommendations of the President's Panel are completely inadequate. Therefore, it is my intention to initiate committee hearings on both the recommendations of the President's Panel, which I have introduced here today, and the legislation which had previously been introduced by myself and many other Members of the House, providing a more realistic increase in military pay. These hearings will begin on Monday, June 7, at 10 a.m., and I hope that at that time, we will have the privilege of having as our first witness the Chairman of the Presidential Panel on Federal Salaries, the Honorable Marion Folsom.

I have prepared a detailed and somewhat lengthy statement which is responsive to some of the criticisms expressed by the Presidential Panel concerning the pay recommendations previously submitted by many Members of Congress. I include in the RECORD at this point the text of this complete statement:

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the military pay bill recommended by the President providing an increase in the compensation provided our men and women in the uniformed services.

I do so only to provide a legislative vehicle upon which the Congress can work its will.

As you know, I and 33 other members of the House Armed Services Committee previously introduced a proposal which, if enacted, would provide a more realistic and equitable increase in military compensation.

The changes in military compensation recommended by the President in his message to Congress on May 12, 1965, reflect, without apparent change, the recommendations of a Special Presidential Panel on Federal Salaries presented to the President on April 15, 1965.

Although the Presidential Panel included recommended changes in compensation in Federal civilian salaries as well as increases in compensation of all uniformed personnel, I will confine my remarks to those portions of the recommendations relating to changes in compensation for uniformed services personnel.

The increases recommended by the President's Special Panel on Federal Salaries would ostensibly provide an average upward adjustment of 4.8 percent in compensation to all uniformed services personnel, except enlisted personnel with under 2 years of service. Enlisted personnel with less than 2 years of service would receive a 2.7-percent increase in basic pay.

The estimated annual cost of the compensation increase for uniformed personnel on active duty would be $402,837,000. This recommendation contrasts sharply with that made by myself and many other Members of Congress in which we recommend an average 10.7-percent increase in military compensation for personnel on active duty, at an estimated annual cost of approximately $892,474,000.

The President's Special Panel made a pathetic effort to discredit the military pay recommendation made by Members of Congress by referring to it in a manner which clearly suggests that the figures used to support the 10.7 percent increase in military compensation had no basis in fact and were clearly erroneous.

Now let me give you the facts, and I will do so by responding to each of the individual criticisms levied by the President's Panel concerning the proposal endorsed by 34 members of the Armed Services Committee.

1. PANEL CRITICISM

The Panel states that "A summary analysis of the bill printed by the House Armed Services Committee states that since 1952 increases in military pay to those with over 2 years of service total 36.6 percent, whereas pay increases during the same period for classified civil servants averaged 46.3 percent. The panel is unable to determine the basis for these figures. Data supplied by the Department of Defense indicate that the increase over this period for classified civil servants averaged 52.7 percent, and 57.1 percent for officers with greater than 2 years of service, and 34.1 percent for enlisted personnel with more than 2 years of service."

1. THE FACTS

The figures and statistics used by the Committee on Armed Services are those provided the Congress by the Department of Defense. These figures appear in Senate Report No. 1191 on S. 3001, dated July 9, 1964. Table No. 6, contained in that document, indicates that military personnel were given an average percentage increase of 33.9 percent during the period 1952 to 1964, with officers receiving an increase of 42.1 and all enlisted personnel receiving an increase of 30.3 percent. A refinement of these figures for officers and enlisted personnel based on years of service supports the data used by the Committee on Armed Services.

Similarly, the statistics relating to pay increases provided classified civil service personnel during the period appear in table No. 7 of the cited congressional report. This table indicates that the percentage increase provided classified civil servants was in fact 46.3 percent.

In view of the fact that these figures were supplied to the Congress by the Department of Defense and appear in a published congressional report, it is difficult to comprehend why the special panel could not identify these figures if any conscientious effort was made in this regard.

2. PANEL CRITICISM

The President's Special Panel on Federal Salaries stated:

"In further support of the proposal, the House Committee's staff analysis of H.R. 5725 maintains that the military departments are unable to attract and retain 'high quality' personnel. No supporting data are provided."

The panel continues by supplying data which presumably is intended to indicate that there is in fact no problem in retention of experienced military personnel. It further stated categorically that—

"Congressional action in 1962, 1963, and 1964 placed military compensation at a level, in relation to civilian pay levels, sufficient to attract and retain adequate numbers and quality of personnel in the Armed Forces."

2. THE FACTS

This statement is ridiculous on its face. Only a few days ago, the Secretary of the Navy, in a Navy-wide message, pleaded with enlisted personnel to extend their enlistment so that the Navy could retain adequate numbers of experienced personnel to cope with the current world situations. This condition in the Navy, as well as in other military departments, is not a recent development. It is a condition which has grown progressively worse and has provided the individual service Secretaries with serious problems as is evident by the following statement made by the Secretary of the Navy when he appeared before the Committee on Armed Services in March of this year, when he said—

"Our declining performance in recruiting and retention of enlisted personnel is indicative of serious trouble."

At the same time, he stated—

"The most important problem which confronts me today as Secretary of the Navy involves procurement of personnel and the retention of skilled, experienced military personnel as careerists in the naval service."

The Secretary of the Air Force recently made this statement concerning retention of qualified personnel to the Committee on Armed Services—

"Unfortunately these skilled and experienced people have to spend too much of their time in on-the-job training of new airmen, only to lose the young airmen to industry at about the time they are beginning to be productive.

"The problem of retention is not confined exclusively to airmen, but also affects our younger officers. Obviously, there are many factors that bear on retention rates. Among these, as in any profession, is that of compensation."

Can anyone doubt that there exists a serious retention problem of skilled and "high quality" personnel in the military departments when Congress is provided this type of testimony from civilian secretaries. We all know that this testimony can and will be corroborated a thousand times over by our military leaders, if they are allowed to speak out.

In view of these facts, I am truly bewildered by the pontification of the President's Special Panel on this subject of retention of military personnel. This is particularly true when the only military member on the Panel, Gen. Omar Bradley, registered the strongest possible dissent with the Panel's recommendation on military pay. General Bradley, who is eminently qualified to speak on the subject of military pay, made his observations concerning the Panel's failure to act properly on military pay in a formal statement which appears in House Document No. 170 of the current session of the Congress. In view of the pertinency of General Bradley's observations, I consider it essential that my statement today include the complete text of General Bradley's opinion on this matter.

The statement follows:

"STATEMENT OF GENERAL OF THE ARMY OMAR N. BRADLEY, A MEMBER OF THE PAY PANEL APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT ON JANUARY 28, 1965

"I concur with the report of the Panel except for one point. The report implies that full comparability for the uniformed services was reached in the Military Pay Act of 1963 and that the pay is now sufficient to attract and retain qualified personnel.

"I am not convinced that this is true.

"(I want to point out that my pay would not be affected by any increase. All recent service pay legislation for active or retired officers has specifically excluded generals of the army and admirals of the fleet.)

"Unlimited liability is inherent in the mandate from the people of the United States charging each person in uniform to stand ready to defend this Nation, when necessary, at the risk of his life. This charge exists for no other walk of life, profession, or calling.

"Military professionalism requires long training, rigid discipline, a high degree of versatility, and unflagging dedication. The need of the military services is more than a matter of numbers; it is the preservation and encouragement of excellence. For this reason, I am concerned that past failures to keep service pay abreast of civilian wage and salary increases are reflected in the quality of personnel in the armed services. Service pay scales should be adequate not only to attract but also to retain the quality and quantity of personnel required, and to motivate members of all ranks to strive for higher responsibilities throughout their careers. Few military personnel enter the profession of arms in search of financial gain. Yet the standard of living the military is expected by the American people to maintain, coupled with the increased educational requirements caused by the complexity of the modern military machine, causes today's military professionals to be increasingly aware of the necessity for providing adequate estates for their families. The head of any military family must now evaluate his military pay in relationship to the demands for education of his children in an increasingly competitive society where his Federal civilian counterparts have a continuing advantage. The head of a military household finds he lacks the financial resources to afford his growing children opportunity to attain a level of education similar to his own. It should be also pointed out that the military man knows no normal 40-hour week. Indeed, the military profession is a 24-hour-a-day calling, without the benefit of overtime pay compensation.

"Comparison of military pay scales with civilian pay scales is extremely difficult, since there are significant differences between military specialties, particularly in the combat elements of the Armed Forces, and civilian occupations. The unique demands of military service and the total responsibilities of military command have no counterparts in civilian life. Nevertheless, in line with President Johnson's statement that he wants our uniformed citizens to be first-class citizens in every respect and their wives and children to know only first-class lives, it is appropriate that a determination of reasonable comparability be made.

"Complete comparability of the military profession to any other calling is not possible because of the unlimited liability in defense of the Nation which I have mentioned. Nevertheless, an attempt at comparison is useful for two reasons. First, the members of the Armed Forces of a democracy are true members of its society and should take their appropriate place in its structure. Second, qualified individuals look upon the military profession as one of several possible career pursuits and assess its advantages and penalties accordingly. If a life in the services falls short in this comparison, then the law of supply and demand will operate to reduce the quality of our fighting men.

"Comparison must be made not at a single point in time, but must consider total lifetime accrual of benefits and penalties. It is when this long view is taken that the lack of compensation to military personnel is most obvious. Equity dictates that an individual who has chosen the military profession should, as he successfully advances through its hierarchy, take on the same stature in society as his running mate in other callings—equal energy, equal devotion, equal intellect, equal responsibility should bring equal compensation. But even if this requirement for equality were met—and it certainly is not when private soldiers earn less than the national minimum wage scale—even so the principle of comparability would requires more compensation to military members to recompense them for the erosion of their estates caused by the three aspects of military life that severely discount present earnings. These three negative factors are: The ponderous inertia and inflexibility of military compensation caused by the requirement that it be established in law; the career-long transient status of the military and their families; and the short full-earning period caused by early mandatory retirement. Most men in civilian pursuits draw substantial salaries for many years after reaching responsible positions in their professions. Military men have very short periods to serve after reaching responsible positions and attaining salaries approaching those of business executives.

The first of these penalties denies to the soldier the flexible compensation advantages and retention incentives of his civilian counterpart—the Christmas bonus, the cash award for suggestions, the profit-sharing plan, the stock options for the employee, the quick adaptation to a change in cost of living.

"Frequent movement between military posts in the United States and remote locations overseas denies to both officer and soldier the opportunity to establish a permanent home, to build a permanent equity of material goods or of local reputation or to root his family in a social structure of confidence and security.

"The prospect of forced retirement before an estate can be established—particularly before children can be educated—is the most serious of the imponderable penalties that face the career military man. Beginning a second career above the age of 50 is extremely difficult—particularly in view of the severe limitations placed by law upon a retired person's activities. This contrasts with other Government servants who have a lifetime career until age 70.

"In any discussion of pay, we have in mind total compensation—including fringe benefits and retired pay. Many years ago the uniformed services had more fringe benefits and a better retirement system than most of their counterparts. Now all workers have social security benefits, and most industries have fine retirement plans. Most workers have annual leave, and only work days count (whereas in the uniformed services every calendar day counts); sick leave; a Christmas bonus which in many cases includes up to a month's extra salary; profit-sharing plans; company stores which in some cases rival post exchanges; health plans including hospitalization; and life insurance plans.

"Usually when discussing any increase in service pay, the chance of such increase is tempered by mentioning how much such increase will add to later costs of the retired list. I don't recall hearing any such statements when considering increases for civil service employees—or when giving an increase to someone in industry.

"In any study of comparability, all fringe and retirement benefits must be included in the pay of the industrial or civil service worker, as well as of the man in the uniformed service.

"One may argue that job security partially offsets a lesser pay. I doubt that job security for a serviceman is any greater than that of a civil service worker, or of an industrial worker who is protected by his union, and the rules of the National Labor Relations Board. In contrast a career officer cannot take advantage of the right to go from one company to another one which would give him a better job.

"On page 17 of the Panel report certain percentages are quoted, indicating improvements in qualifications of officers and enlisted men. The report states that many factors affect the ability to attract and retain quality personnel, but a hurried reading might lead one to jump to the conclusion that adequate pay was the primary factor. In fact, these improvements each had a very definite cause other than pay. For example, the Army raised its mental standards for acceptance in 1960; the total of high school graduating classes in 1963 was some 37 percent greater than in 1956; in 1956 we still had many officer callups from World War II and the Korean war, who have now been replaced largely by recent college graduates. (Most services have raised the educational requirements for new officers.)

"I am not as concerned about the number of officers we can attract as I am about our ability to attract and retain enough outstanding ones—men such as Marshall, MacArthur, Eisenhower, Halsey, Nimitz, Rickover, etc. Statistics comparing the salaries offered by industry to members of the university and college graduating classes with those offered to second lieutenants and ensigns would show a big difference.

"Taking all these things into consideration indicates that real comparability demands some form of additional compensation for the man who chooses the military life. Raising his earning-period income considerably is one clear method to do so. It is not the only way—elaborate scholarship plans, liberalized home-loan schemes, less rigid employment rules following retirement—these and many other such suggestions would help. But they would be ponderous to enact into law and selective in their applicability. Substantial increase in current pay at this time appears to be the simplest, most effective, and in the long run, cheapest solution if the services are to retain the hard-core professionals which the Nation so desperately needs.

"I recommend that such increases be granted at an early date.

"OMAR N. BRADLEY."

How can the President's Panel continue to support its present military pay recommendations and yet at the same time remain completely silent on the overwhelming arguments against such a recommendation as outlined in General Bradley's eloquent dissent?

3. PANEL CRITICISM

The Presidential Panel's report charges that the Committee on Armed Services, for practical purposes, deliberately frustrated the efforts of the Panel to evaluate the detailed data on which the committee's proposal for a military pay increase was based. The statement of the Panel is as follows:

"The Panel's attempts to obtain additional information from the House Armed Services Committee have been unsuccessful. On March 5, 1965, Mr. Folsom, chairman of the Panel, wrote to Chairman RIVERS of the House Armed Services Committee and asked for materials developed by the staff, particularly the analysis supporting linkages between military and civilian pay, and the evaluation of relative military and civilian fringe benefits. In a letter dated March 8, 1965, the chairman indicated that the information was not in such form that it could be sent to the Panel but said he would be happy to meet with Mr. Folsom. Attempts by Mr. Folsom to arrange such a meeting have been unsuccessful."

3. THE FACTS

The fact is that on March 5, 1965, Mr. Folsom asked me to supply him with:

"1. The analysis supporting the linkages between military and civilian pay printed in the pay tables contained in Analysis of Proposed Military Pay Act of 1965; and

"2. The detailed evaluation of relative military and civilian supplemental (fringe) benefits."

I advised him on March 8 as follows:

"I appreciate very much your letter of March 5, 1965, in which you requested detailed information concerning the proposed pay increases recommended by an overwhelming majority of the members of the Committee on Armed Services for members of the Armed Forces as reflected in H.R. 5725.

"Although the materials utilized by the Committee on Armed Services for members in H.R. 5725 were all carefully collected, reviewed, and evaluated by both me and my staff, they are, except for the analysis enclosed herewith, not presently available in a form which would lend itself to your purpose. Therefore, I must reluctantly and respectfully decline to submit this information.

"On the other hand, I sincerely appreciate your desire to acquaint yourself with the factors which prompted my recent introduction of this urgently required military pay increase. Therefore, I would be most happy to discuss this matter with you personally in my office at your convenience.

"I will look forward to an early reply from you on this vital subject."

Subsequently, with no preliminary notice to me, or any effort to arrange an appointment, Mr. Folsom did come to my office unexpectedly on March 29 to visit me. Unfortunately, I was not in the office at that time and therefore did not have an opportunity to discuss this matter with him. Had I known he had planned to visit my office, I would have been there.

In view of these circumstances, on April 15, 1965, I addressed the following letter to Mr. Folsom:

"DEAR MR. FOLSOM: I am sorry that we were unable to get together on March 29 when you were in Washington.

"By the time you receive this letter, it is possible that the Special Panel on Federal Salaries report may have been issued and, of course, I am most anxious to read your recommendations. Whether or not the report is issued, I would enjoy chatting with you the next time you are in Washington."

These facts speak for themselves.

The Panel concluded its superficial analysis of the Committee on Armed Services pay proposal by making the following additional points:

4A. PANEL CRITICISM

The Panel states:

"* * * that no justification is offered for the 10.7-percent increase since no evidence is presented to establish a satisfactory 'comparability linkage'."

4A. THE FACTS

The Committee on Armed Services has never claimed to have developed its new pay scales on the basis of a direct "comparability linkage" with other Federal statutory pay systems.

What I, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, said in the press release referred to in the Panel report was:

"My bill attempts to link uniformed services pay levels to those provided Federal civilian employees."

In attempting to develop the proposed new rates of basic pay, consideration was given by the committee staff to the feasibility and desirability of "linking" military pay rates directly to those of the other Federal statutory pay systems. This approach, however, was, upon intensive study, found to be unsatisfactory and therefore was not utilized. However, as will be developed in our forthcoming committee hearings on military pay, the new proposed pay scales, notwithstanding the various differences which exist between civilian and military "employment," do have a positive relationship. It would be wholly impractical to attempt to establish uniformed services pay scales without regard to existing pay levels for other employees and executives of the Federal Government. Consequently, in developing the proposed basic pay scales, certain "limiting" benchmarks have been used; and it is believed that the proposed new rates of basic pay recommended by the committee do in fact bear demonstrable, and equitable relationships to the compensation of other groups of Federal employees.

4B. PANEL CRITICISM

The President's Special Panel says that: "Although the principal purpose of the bill is stated to remedy the services' inability to attract and retain high-quality personnel, the largest increases are proposed for those serving obligated service, and the smallest percentage increases apply to the grades at which the career commitment is normally made."

4B. THE FACTS

The fact is that the pay recommendations of the President's Special Panel in respect to active duty personnel reduced the total cost of the Armed Services Committee's proposal by $489,637,000.

Approximately $401,500,000, or more than 82 percent, of this amount is "saved" by the President's Panel by reducing the proposed pay increase for enlisted personnel.

It is interesting to note that of this "saving" of more than $401 million recommended by the President's Panel, more than $290 million is realized at the expense of enlisted personnel in pay grades E–3 through E–6—the most critical rates in all of the military departments.

Statistics available to the Department of Defense indicate a steady decline since 1960 in the percentage distribution of "career" personnel in the military forces.

In 1960 approximately 48 percent of all enlisted personnel had 4 or more years of active service. Today, this figure has dropped to 43 percent. It is therefore evident that this decline in "career" enlisted personnel must inevitably affect adversely the experience level and capabilities of our forces.

The military departments, particularly the Army and Navy, have a substantially less experienced force overall than they desire. For example, the Army and Navy believe that to attain the proper experience balance in their force, they will require an increase in their career ratios of approximately 8 to 10 percent.

Attainment of these objectives will, in my opinion, be absolutely impossible without a significant increase in the pay provided career enlisted personnel. This is particularly true since the "career ratio" of the military will decline further with the transfer of significant numbers of World War II enlisted personnel from active duty to a retirement status.

The enlisted personnel who the military services and I are talking about are, for the most part, found in pay grades E–3 to E–6.

This is the group of enlisted personnel against which the Panel would levy approximately 60 percent of the cut it recommended in the overall pay increases urged by the Committee on Armed Services.

Yet, the Panel states that our proposal places the proposed increases at "the wrong points." It is incredible that such a preposterous statement could be made by the President's Panel if it had given even the most cursory study to the needs of the military pay structure.

4C. PANEL CRITICISM

The President's Special Panel further states—

"The Committee proposal purports to take precise account of military fringe benefits. In fact, the only adjustment made to reflect the differences in supplementary benefits available to military and civilian employees is the exclusion of 6½ percent of basic pay, to take into account the noncontributory retirement system. The adjustment is erroneous. Liabilities for the military retirement system now accrue at a rate of 24.4 percent of basic pay."

4C. THE FACTS

Again, this statement by the President's Panel is completely inaccurate. The adjustments made to reflect the differences in supplementary benefits available to military and Federal civilian employees not only considered the noncontributory aspects of the military retirement system but also considered the special tax advantages inherent in certain elements of the military compensation structure. This is clearly reflected in table B of the material provided by the House Committee on Armed Services to the President's Panel on Federal Salaries.

Can it be that the Panel never bothered to look at the background material provided by the House Committee on Armed Services, or is this statement merely reflective of the inadequacy of the study made by the President's Special Panel?

Furthermore, the adjustment made by the Committee on Armed Services in imputing a retirement contribution of 6½ percent for military personnel was made to equate in its comparative analysis the actual contribution made for retirement by Federal civilian personnel. Neither the Committee on Armed Services, nor anyone else, would claim that this 6½ percent represents the total cost of military retirement, but the same situation applies in respect to the civil service retirement system which, as every Member of Congress knows, presently has an actuarial deficiency of more than $37 billion. Perhaps the members of the President's Panel were not aware of these facts—or preferred to ignore them.

4D. PANEL CRITICISM

The President's Special Panel further stated—

"The Congress, by its actions in 1962, 1963, and 1964, when it enacted legislation which, in total, raised military compensation for those with over 2 years of service by an average of 18.4 percent, placed military compensation at a level, in relation to civilian pay levels, sufficient to attract and retain sufficient numbers and quality of personnel. We see no need to change this relationship before the next major structural review."

4D. THE FACTS

This last statement by the President's Special Panel is so completely absurd that it does not merit any further comment. Have the members of the Panel deliberately ignored the events of the past few months which, in themselves, clearly indicate the existence of a military personnel problem?

You may think that I have been somewhat bitter in my comments in respect to the recommendations made by the President's Special Panel on Federal Salaries. The truth is that I feel considerably greater annoyance than these few words can convey. However, this matter will be more thoroughly aired when the Committee on Armed Services begins hearings on the military pay recommendations.

I will be pleased if we can then be given the privilege of having the members of this illustrious Panel explain the reasoning by which they arrived at their recommended increases in military pay.

To the everlasting credit of George Meany and Gen. Omar Bradley, it should be noted that they dissented from the Panel's military pay recommendation.

Now what has the Panel actually done?

As I read its report it states that it has based its recommended pay increase on a Bureau of Labor Statistics survey which indicates that salary levels in private enterprise increased about 3 percent during the year ending in March 1964.

Consequently the Panel has recommended a general increase of 3 percent across the board in Federal salaries so as to restore to Federal salary levels, both civilian and military, the relative position they had held in 1963 when compared to salary levels in private enterprise.

It is interesting to note that although the Panel reportedly recommends a 4.8-percent average increase in military "compensation," my inspection of the proposed legislation indicates that the actual increase will be confined to only one element of military compensation—that is, basic pay. The Panel's proposal makes no change in either quarters allowances or subsistence allowances, both of which, along with basic pay, constitute the principal elements of military "compensation."

Therefore, the average increase for all personnel with over 2 years of service amounts to 5 percent of basic pay, while the actual increase for personnel with under 2 years of service will be 2.7 percent of basic pay.

In any event, the 4.8-percent figure referred to by the Panel eludes me. My calculations further indicate that the actual proposed increase in military "compensation" as provided in the Panel's proposed bill, figures out to approximately 3.6 percent for personnel with over 2 years of service, as contrasted to the 3 percent provided civilian employees of the Federal Government.

Is it possible that the members of the Panel actually believed that they were recommending a 4.8-percent average increase in "compensation" for military personnel with over 2 years of service and did not realize that the actual increase in military "compensation" (basic pay plus quarters plus subsistence allowances) contained in their proposal amounts to only 3.6 percent?

The Panel made no real effort whatsoever to address itself to the fact that since 1952 military levels of compensation have consistently lagged behind the wage adjustments paid other workers in the economy—so that today military wage levels are more than 10 percent behind the levels of compensation presently provided other Federal employees.

The Panel brushes aside this fact of life with the statement that data supplied by the Department of Defense indicates that during the period 1952 to 1964 wage increases for classified civil servants averaged 52.7 percent while similar increases in wages for officers with over 2 years of service amounted to 57.1 percent.

This "alleged" increase in wages for military officers is, in my opinion, completely erroneous, and I challenge its accuracy.

Furthermore, the Panel concedes that since 1952 wage increases for enlisted military personnel with over 2 years of service was only 34.1 percent. Yet, it makes no effort to explain its failure to correct this obvious shortfall in the military pay structure.

As I have previously mentioned, the Panel's recommendations as compared to the bill proposed by the members of the Armed Services Committee reflects an overall reduction in the amount of the proposed military pay increase for members on active duty of approximately $490 million.

Regrettably, the bulk of this "saving" was realized at the expense of enlisted personnel, who absorbed more than 82 percent, or $401 million of this reduction.

Now, let us briefly examine the impact of this "reduction" on a group of military personnel who, even under the data professed to be used by the Panel, have, since 1952, fallen far behind their civilian contemporaries in compensation increases:

Proposed increases in monthly pay

Rank or grade	Service	Panel	House committee
E–1 (recruit)	Under 4 months	$2.10	$9.90
E–2 (private)	Under 2 years	2.40	11.70
E–3 (private 1st class).	do	2.63	18.53
E–4 (corporal)	Over 4 years	10.50	18.30
E–5 (sergeant)	Over 10 years	13.50	33.60
E–6 (staff sergeant)	Over 14 years	16.20	39.90
E–7 (1st sergeant)	Over 18 years	18.90	57.90

A review of the above table reflects the fact that the increases recommended by the Armed Services Committee are by no means extravagant, whereas the increases recommended by the President's Panel are disgracefully inadequate.

It requires very little imagination to comprehend the reaction of our fighting men in South Vietnam, Santo Domingo, and in a hundred other potential trouble spots in the world, to the paltry wage increase now recommended by the President's Panel.

I can think of no more effective and sure way of destroying the morale of our military forces than by telling them they don't deserve a decent wage increase. It appears that the Panel has recommended as small a pay increase as they believe they could possibly recommend. I will not be a party to such an effort. I believe a wage adjustment must be equitable. The recommended increase by the Panel completely disregards, in my opinion, the obvious equitable considerations that must apply.

The Department of Defense will undoubtedly flood the Congress and the press with statistics of one kind or another designed to establish the fact that military men are adequately paid.

I'll not repeat that old expression about figures and the people who manipulate them—all I will say is that the present pay of military personnel is simply inadequate.

This is the only possible conclusion we can reach when we recognize:

That the numbers of personnel obtaining hardship discharges because of financial and related reasons is steadily increasing each year;

That during calendar year 1964 approximately one-third of all enlisted personnel in the continental United States in pay grades E-4 to E-6 were "moonlighting" to increase their incomes;

That almost 2 percent of all enlisted men in grades E-2 to E-9 in the continental United States were actually receiving some form of public assistance;

That a substantial number of enlisted men in pay grades E-4 and below, receive military incomes which, according to generally accepted standards, places them in a poverty category.

That enlisted entrants into military service will, even under the pay increase recommended by the President's Panel, be in a relatively worse position financially than inductees in 1940;

That despite every conceivable administrative effort, the military departments are unable to properly man many operational billets in our Armed Forces.

Why did the Panel ignore these facts?

What was the function of the Panel? Was it, as some might suggest, merely created to rubberstamp a pay action already decided upon by the Pentagon?

I prefer not to reach that conclusion since I think too highly of the distinguished gentlemen who formed the Panel.

Now let me briefly refer to other recommendations of the Panel.

The Panel recommended that Reserve and National Guard personnel be excluded from the proposed increase in basic pay.

Historically, those in a drill-pay status have been entitled to the current basic pay authorized by law.

Congress in 1963 and 1964 acted affirmatively to insist that this traditional concept be maintained and accordingly, despite the opposition of the Department of Defense, included Reserve personnel in previous pay adjustments.

The Panel has provided no justification whatsoever for excluding this category of personnel from receiving increases in basic pay and therefore I wish to assure you that these reservists will be included in any pay adjustment reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

Now, let me also briefly refer to the Panel's recommendation for the permanent establishment of a "Federal Salary Review Commission." One of the principal purposes of the Commission would be to recommend to the President periodic changes in levels of Federal pay, with the President in turn implementing these recommendations with the force of law unless specifically repudiated by the Congress within 60 days.

Again, we are confronted with the executive branch telling the Congress that it no longer has the capability of acting wisely, prudently, and expeditiously with regard to changes in the Federal pay structure. In my opinion, this recommendation constitutes a vote of "no confidence" in the Legislature of the United States.

If this reasoning is carried to a logical conclusion, the Congress could very well go out of business and permit the executive branch to not only administer our Government but also legislate its laws.

I for one will not be a party to such an abdication of our constitutional congressional responsibilities.

I didn't come to Congress to merely exercise a negative vote—my constituents, and I am sure yours as well, have sent me here to speak positively for them—and I intend to do just that.

In closing, I call your attention to article I, section 8, of the Constitution which gives Congress the exclusive authority and responsibility "to raise and support" our Armed Forces. Perhaps the Panel was not aware of this provision in the Constitution—but I am—and you are—and I am confident we will observe it.

UNCLEAN CLOUD OF POISON ON THE LAND

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, like many Congressmen who seek to represent their constituents effectively, I am often up at dawn to get a plane from my district to Washington. But the clean air and bright sky that once consoled people who had to get out of bed this early is almost a memory in most industrial centers of the United States.

The morning air is acrid with the discharge from factory chimneys and the smog the morning mist and automobile pollution combine to form. Instead of a morning freshness there is an unclean cloud of poison on the land.

This year gasoline-powered vehicles will discharge more than 92 million tons of deadly carbon monoxide into the air Americans breathe.

These and other chemical poisons discharged into the air by automobiles, trucks, buses, and factory chimneys are linked closely with deaths from lung cancer, hypertensive heart disease, cardiovascular disease, pneumonia, and chronic bronchitis. The second killer of children in the country today is cancer, and I do not doubt that there is a connection between the poison in the air they breathe and the tragic deaths of our children from the silent creeping killer.

The economic cost to the Nation of air pollution exceeds $12 billion annually according to competent estimates.

In this statistic is a suggestion that effective control of air pollution could be financed from the savings that would be realized.

It is for these reasons that I bring to your attention a recent proposal by President Walter Reuther, of the United Automobile Workers, suggesting that part of the savings realized from the reduction of excise taxes on automobiles be put into the installation of devices on automobiles which will help eliminate the poisoning of our air and our people from this source. He also, in the interests of reducing the traffic death toll, suggests certain other safety measures.

Mr. Reuther's letter to the presidents of the automobile companies follows; the proposal and the arguments for it merit your attention:

UAW Offers To Aid Automakers in Excise Cut Drive, if Savings Are Given Consumers Through Antismog, Safety Devices Plus Price Slashes

The UAW has proposed a joint union-auto industry campaign to work for the elimination or reduction of excise taxes on cars provided the savings are passed on to consumers through a combination of antismog and other safety devices built into the vehicles plus direct price cuts.

The offer was make by UAW President Walter P. Reuther, on behalf of the union's international executive board, to the presidents of General Motors Corp., Ford Motor Co., Chrysler Corp., and American Motors Corp.

Text of Mr. Reuther's letter follows:

"Your corporation and the other automobile producers have repeatedly sought elimination of the excise tax on passenger cars. The industry has now launched a major campaign directed toward that end. Informal requests have been made to the UAW to support that campaign.

"Such requests are perfectly reasonable and we have given them careful consideration. While the relationship between your corporation and our union centers around collective bargaining, both of us have a common interest in the welfare of the industry as a whole. Elimination of the excise tax would undoubtedly advance the welfare of the industry in terms of expanded markets and increased production and employment—provided, of course, that the excise tax savings are passed on to consumers.

"Along with—and, in fact, as part of—our common interest in the welfare of the industry, there goes a joint responsibility to the public that buys or is affected by the products manufactured in your plants by our members.

"Increasingly, that public is becoming concerned about the health and safety effects of automobiles.

"Legislation is now pending in Congress to require new cars to be equipped with devices to consume and render harmless those chemicals now present in exhaust fumes which help to blanket our cities with smog, increase the risks of cancer and poison the air with carbon monoxide. Such legislation is already on the books in California and will be made applicable, by regulation, to cars produced in the 1966 model year and thereafter.

"At the same time, responsible authorities have concluded, after careful study, that much can be done that is not now being done to reduce accident and fatality rates by modification of car designs and specifications. The General Services Administration has found it necessary to propose certain minimum standards for passenger safety devices (plus smog suppression devices) to be met by all cars purchased for use by the Federal Government.

"There is no question but that conformance to GSA standards would promote safety and minimize accidents and injury to motor car users and to the public. In view of the growing concern with car safety and the increased pollution of the air in our large urban centers, commonsense and public responsibility would suggest that smog control devices and the other GSA standards be applied not only to cars bought by the Government but also to cars sold to the general public.

"The industry is morally obligated to design its products, to the maximum extent feasible, so as to minimize both pollution of the atmosphere and hazards to life and limb. Voluntary leadership on the part of the automotive industry in meeting this obligation will serve the public and such voluntary action will give the industry a far stronger claim on public support for elimination of the excise tax. Voluntary action to minimize car-produced smog and to maximize safety would also avoid the necessity for Government intervention through legislation that the industry might find onerous.

"I am therefore writing you and the heads of the other passenger-car-producing companies, at the direction of the UAW International Executive Board, to propose joint action by the industry and the UAW directed both toward advancing our common interest in elimination of the excise tax and toward meeting our joint responsibility to minimize adverse effects of cars upon health and safety. These dual objectives would be pursued jointly by the industry and the UAW on the basis of agreement on the following points:

"1. The UAW will cooperate with the industry to create a joint committee to petition Congress and to mobilize maximum public support for elimination, or at least substantial reduction, of the excise tax on passenger cars.

"2. The industry will commit itself to pass on to the general public and to consumers the full benefits of excise tax elimination or reduction through a combination of improved health and safety features to be built into the cars (in conformity with GSA standards), plus direct price reduction.

"3. The industry will agree that, if the tax should be reduced but not eliminated completely, or if total elimination is approached by stages through successive reductions of the tax; the priorities in the use of the tax savings will be as follows:

"(a) First, to incorporate in all new cars, starting with the 1966 models, smog-suppression devices of the kind required to meet the standards under the California law.

"(b) Second, to incorporate in all new cars, no later than the time sufficient excise tax savings become available to meet their costs, the remaining safety standards proposed by the General Services Administration for cars bought for Federal Government use.

"(c) All remaining excise tax savings will be passed on to car buyers in the form of price reductions.

"4. To assure fulfillment of its commitments, the industry will agree to support legislative provisions which would make excise tax reduction or elimination applicable only to those vehicles which incorporate the smog-suppression devices and the other GSA safety requirements (the latter at least to the extent that could be paid for by the amount of tax savings available at the time) and which fully reflect in their list prices any part of the excise tax reduction not offset by the cost of such devices and requirements.

"We believe that the possibilities of excise tax relief being enacted in this session of Congress would be greatly enhanced through joint industry-UAW action based upon agreement to the above points. Such agreement would enlist the widest possible public support for excise tax elimination for it would promise substantial benefits not only to car buyers but also to the general public. The public as a whole would enjoy the benefits of cleaner air and improved safety on the Nation's streets and highways. Car buyers would benefit from both safer cars and price reductions.

"There can no longer be any dispute over the need for smog-suppression devices on cars. The substantial contribution made by motorcar exhaust fumes to air pollution is now widely recognized, and a program to end it is urgent and long overdue. Your company and the other major producers have already developed antismog devices capable of reducing the harmful effects of exhaust fumes and we understand that the overwhelming majority of 1966-model cars will be engineered to accept such devices. However, they are to be installed only on cars sold in California, where they will be required by State law, and on cars sold to the U.S. Government, where they will be required under the ruling of the General Services Administration.

"While the Los Angeles area has a particularly bad smog problem, due in large measure to car exhaust fumes (and this led California to pass the first State law requiring an exhaust control device), similar problems exist in nearly all U.S. cities. Surgeon General Luther Terry reported to the Second National Conference on Air Pollution in 1962:

"'Approximately 90 percent of the urban population live in localities with air pollution problems—a total of about 6,000 communities.'

"In an interview published in U.S. News & World Report of September 16, 1963, the Surgeon General said that 'there is not a large city in the United States that does not have an air pollution problem,' and that, if motor vehicles could be stopped from emitting fumes that create smog, 'it would certainly solve a very significant part' of the smog problem.

"Vernon G. Mackenzie, Chief of the Division of Air Pollution in the Public Health Services appearing before the Muskie Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution on June 24, 1964, to discuss the creation of photochemical smog by motor vehicles, quoted the 1963 Yearbook of Agriculture:

"'Los Angeles no longer has, if it ever had, a monopoly on photochemical smog. The characteristic symptoms on plants have been found in almost every metropolitan area of the country * * * the entire coastal area from roughly Washintgon, D.C., to Boston has come to rival southern California for extent, severity, and economic loss to agriculture because of photochemical smog.'

"Mr. Mackenzie concluded:

"'Mr. Chairman, I believe that this brief discussion clearly demonstrates that photochemical smog deriving from motor vehicles is not confined to the Los Angeles area, but must be considered an important aspect of the national air pollution problem.'

"Similarly, there can be no dispute on the need to make cars safer to operate. An estimated 48,000 Americans died and 1.6 million were injured in car accidents last year and for the third year in a row the rate of deaths per vehicle mile increased, confirming the reversal of a long-term downward trend.

"While we fully recognize that the condition of the vehicle is not the major cause of most accidents, there are safety devices which could undoubtedly help motorists to avoid accidents, and others which could cut down the risk of death or injury when accidents occur. Much research into such devices has been done. The GSA standards were developed in consultation with the automotive industry, technical societies, trade associations, the medical profession, and Government agencies. The GSA lists 17 such devices including an exhaust emission control system which meets the California State standard, which it proposes should be required, where applicable, as equipment on all cars purchased by the Federal Government. Many of them are already standard or optional equipment on some models. The list includes the following:

"Standard anchorages for seat belt assemblies, including shoulder belts, to insure that the seat belts function properly.

"Padded dash panel and sun visors.

"Recessed instruments, control knobs, etc., on instrument panels.

"Impact-absorbing steering wheel and steering column to prevent impalement of the driver in head-on crashes.

"Safety door latches and hinges to prevent doors flying open in accidents.

"Safety anchorage of car seats.

"A control that permits all four turn signals to be flashed simultaneously as a hazard warning.

"Safety glass in all windows.

"Dual brake system which will insure that if one brake fails the others will continue to function.

"Standard bumper heights.

"Standardized gear shift for automatic transmissions.

"Multispeed, electrically operated windshield wiper with washer attachment.

"Design of instrument panel and windshield wiper surfaces to minimize glare in the driver's eyes.

"Safety tires and rims.

"Backup lights.

"Outside rearview mirror.

"The GSA safety standards are but a beginning and there is growing recognition of the need for the automotive industry to give greater consideration to the engineering and designing of the cars with respect to safety factors.

"The added cost of meeting the GSA standards on cars sold to the public would represent only a portion of the present excise tax on passenger cars. The tax averages approximately $225 per car, while the cost of meeting the GSA standards—including the smog-suppression devices—is estimated to be less than $100. Thus, there would be ample room, after meeting those standards, to make meaningful cuts in car prices.

"It would be necessary, of course, to insure that such price reductions would be made and that they would be continued in subsequent model years. Since auto industry representatives have publicly committed themselves to pass any excise tax saving on to car buyers, I am sure there would be no difficulty in finding means to assure that this course would be followed.

"Such a step would add substantially to auto production and employment. It has been estimated that a 1-percent cut in retail car prices will stimulate a 1.2-percent increase in new car sales. On this basis, every reduction of 1 percent in average retail car prices resulting from reduction of the excise tax could boost domestic sales of U.S.-made cars by about 90,000 units, and create possibly 7,000 new production worker jobs in the auto industry, plus additional jobs in the industries supplying it and those engaged in selling and servicing cars. These newly employed workers would immedately become customers for all the other goods and services which workers and their families need.

"For those who would have bought a new car in any case, elimination or substantial reduction in the excise tax would free the amount of their tax saving for other purchases, thus helping to stimulate the general economy further.

"As you know, we have long favored the elimination of the excise tax on passenger cars because it is highly regressive. Cars are no longer luxuries. They have become necessities to most workers and their families. Elimination or reduction of the tax would enable many more families to afford a new car, resulting in increased demand and production and thereby creating thousands of additional jobs in the auto industry and in the firms which supply it. Needless to say, such expansion of the market would also be reflected in higher profits for your corporation and the others engaged in producing passenger cars.

"The excise tax on passenger cars is essentially a wartime tax. It was increased from 3½ to 7 percent in 1941, and further increased to 10 percent in 1951, during the Korean war, for the express purpose of discouraging purchases of new cars because they used up precious steel, rubber, and other strategic defense materials. Such restraints are necessary in wartime, but their continuation in peacetime for purely revenue purposes cannot be defended on either economic or social grounds. Similar taxes, imposed at a much lower level on motor vehicles and associated products during World War I, were repealed in 1926 and 1928.

"Repeated efforts made by the industry in recent years to obtain repeal of the excise have been unsuccessful. There is danger of a similar failure this year unless the campaign for repeal can enlist the wide public support that our proposal would assure.

"If the repeal effort should fail this year, there would remain, nevertheless, the probability that legislation will be adopted during this session of Congress to require the installation of antismog devices on all cars and a strong possibility that, within the very near future, safety standards similar to those proposed by GSA will be required by law on cars sold to the general public.

"In that case, the likelihood is that car prices will be raised rather than reduced with the consequence that markets will narrow, and production, employment, and profits will be decreased.

"In the light of these facts, we urge the representatives of the automotive industry to give favorable consideration to this constructive and responsible proposal that would serve the best interests of the public, the consumer, the industry, and the workers.

"Since hearings are already being held on legislation to require the installation of antismog devices, and since Congress will soon begin consideration of excise tax cuts, time is of the essence. A favorable decision by the automotive industry will enable the industry and the UAW to launch the joint campaign we propose with a minimum of delay and a maximum of effectiveness.

"We would therefore appreciate an early reply.

"Very truly yours,
"WALTER P. REUTHER,
"*President, International Union, UAW.*"

TELEPHONE EXCISE TAX SHOULD BE REPEALED NOW

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I submit, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal the excise tax on telephone service.

My bill proposes to eliminate the injustice inherent in a law which taxes a necessity of life. Communicating, Mr. Speaker, is as essential to human survival as is breathing, and the telephone is to human communications in America what air is to breathing: an absolute necessity. Fifty years ago perhaps the telephone could be considered as a diamond studded luxury, an expensive conversation piece which only the rich could afford and the possession of which could be justifiably taxed. But today over 47 million American households have telephone service. That is 84 percent of the total, Mr. Speaker, dramatic testimony indeed that Mr. Bell's invention is now an indispensable thread in the complex fabric of modern American life. Consider the chaotic results if that thread were removed. Consider the consequences for American commerce, American Government and the American people of all of America's telephones suddenly dissolved. Consider how vital the telephone is to a corner grocer, to a captain of industry, to a housewife and, yes, even to a Member of Congress. Consider these points, Mr. Speaker, and it is easy to see why Americans regard their telephones as absolutely indispensable to their daily lives.

Now, is it just to tax a commodity so necessary to our lives as is the telephone? I say that it is not. Is it just to tax a man for communicating word of approaching danger to others? I say that it is not. Is it right to tax a man for reporting a fire to the authorities which otherwise might have cost thousands or millions of dollars in property damage or possibly a single priceless life? I say that it is not right or for calling a doctor when one is needed? Or for calling the police when they are needed? I say that it is not right to tax men for these things.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, to tax a necessity of life is usually to place a heavier burden on those who are least able to afford it—the lower income groups. Examination shows this to be especially true in the case of the telephone excise tax. Bureau of Census figures for 1960 show that 20 percent of the households which had telephones in that year, or approximately 7.8 million households, had incomes of less than $3,000 per year. Additionally, the incomes of 53 percent of households with telephone service or approximately 21 million households, were less than $6,000 per year. Furthermore, in comparison with other such levies, this tax takes a particularly regressive form, forcing those who can least afford it to pay a bigger percentage of their incomes. Estimates by the Tax Foundation, based on Bureau of Labor Statistics and Department of Commerce data, are that households earning under $1,000 per year pay 0.67 percent of their income to the telephone tax; households earning between $1,000 and $2,000 per year, 0.43 percent; between $2,000 and $3,000 per year, 0.33 percent; and so on down to 0.15 percent for those earning over $15,000 per year—clear evidence Mr. Speaker, that our lowest income groups are hit hardest by this unjust levy.

In addition, we find that the consumer is charged doubly by the telephone tax: First, when he pays taxes for using his own private phone; and, second, when he pays higher prices on the goods and services he buys from businesses who pass to him the cost of their telephone taxes. In 1962, for example, according to the U.S. Treasury, 47 percent of the total telephone excise tax, or about $418 million, resulted from business calls. Unfortunately for the lower income consumer, the largest share of this figure was paid by the food and apparel industries, and the prices of these basic necessities, of course, reflected the telephone taxes paid by their manufacturers, distributors, and retailers.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, my bill proposes to eliminate the inequities stemming from the inefficient allocation of some of our economic resources which in turn results from the imposition of this tax. Maintenance of this tax artificially stunts what would otherwise be the natural growth of our economy. This tax prevents many of the 12 million households who would otherwise be able to afford it from having their own telephone service. They are thus deprived of an item regarded by most Americans as a necessity of life. Moreover, the tax prevents households and businesses which already have it from utilizing their telephone service to its fullest extent. Thus, Mr. Speaker, demand is artificially stunted, and the telephone industry is unable to expand its facilities to provide services which the public should be enjoying but cannot afford. Inability to expand in turn forces the unemployment rate unnaturally higher than it should be. Removal of the tax, on the other hand, will bring increased telephone services within the reach of the public. The increased demand which will naturally result therefrom will mean an expansion of business by the telephone industry; and that means the creation of thousands of new jobs. The income from these newly created jobs will mean increased purchasing power for the public which, when added to the increased purchasing power created by removal of the tax itself, will be a powerful factor in assuring the continued growth and development of our economy.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the American people truly have much to gain by the enactment of my bill which will repeal this burdensome tax—justice for all and especially for our lower income groups, increased communications facilities and service and, finally, a further guarantee for the continued growth and good health of our economy.

I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that I am delighted that the President has also recognized the necessity of relieving the American people of this burdensome tax. His recent message to this body reflects a wise assessment of the forces motivating our economy and the vital role played by tax policy in channeling those forces upward. I congratulate the President on the wisdom of his overall proposals for excise tax reduction. Gratifying to me as those proposals are, however, I do not believe that they go far enough, fast enough with regard to the telephone excise tax. The President would eliminate this tax over a period of more than 3½ years. I firmly believe that the American people are entitled to speedier repeal of this irksome levy. Therefore, my bill would eliminate the entire tax now.

FAIRPLAY FOR OLDER RETIREES

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to benefit civil service retirees and their survivors, because I feel it is important to equalize our former career government worker's benefits with present-day costs.

My bill will amend the retirement act by making the Consumer Price Index subject to review every 3 months and thereby accelerate annuity increases and eliminate the present 15-month lag.

None of us will disagree that inflation is the greatest enemy of the retired employees of the Federal Government and their dependents and survivors who are trying to live on meager retirement annuities. The Congress made an effort 2 years ago to bridge part of the gap between annuity dollars and the cost of living but the 5-percent adjustment effective January 1, 1963, was not enough to make ends meet.

We have thousands of people who retired many years ago when their salaries were low and there was a less liberal retirement formula than now. They paid for their annuities with 100-cent dollars but they are receiving 30-cent dollars.

I do not feel that we can continue to raise our own salaries, the salaries of our present Federal workers, of our military, of social security beneficiaries, and continue to pass up these people who, through no fault of their own, find themselves doomed by inflation.

There are about 700,000 Federal retirees of which 280,000 are annuitants and survivors whose benefits began prior to 1956.

A person who retired 10 or 12 years ago receives from 30 to 50 percent less than one who has retired recently from the same kind of a position. In 1962 the Congress enacted into legislation a pledge to increase annuities to match increases in the cost of living whenever there has accrued an increase in the cost of living 3 percent or more. This was a giant step forward in maintaining the purchasing power of annuity dollars. But, at the same time, in what purported to be an increase to match previous increases in the cost of living, they received only 5 percent to cover cost of living increases which had totaled 14 percent since the last general annuity increase in 1955.

In 1962, the 5 percent increase was meant to cover increases in the cost of living only since 1958 because there was an annuity adjustment bill approved in 1958. However, the fact is that the 1958 annuity adjustment bill was planned and approved as a means of giving to persons retired before the 1958 act, the equivalent of a portion of the benefits otherwise denied to them but available to future retirees. The 1958 annuity adjustment was not a general increase because it was specifically denied to persons retired on or after October 1, 1956. This is a most significant point since the cost of living made terrific advances in the period from 1955 to 1958.

If we want to attract and retain high caliber career Federal employees we must offer them an equitable and adequate guarantee that retirement benefits will keep pace with increasing living costs.

For those persons who retired before 1956 I understand that the average monthly benefit is $179 a month, or less than $2,150 a year, which amounts to about $45 a week.

We must keep in mind that advancing age brings with it unusual medical and related expenses.

I am aware that many Federal retirees have benefits in excess of $179 monthly average and, also, that some receive additional retirement incomes from social security, Veterans' Administration, etc. This is no doubt true, but from the best information available to me a greater number by far have annuities below the average.

Another section of my bill would preserve any benefit for the surviving spouse and give the children all percentage increases that have been allowed during their mother's tenure of receiving cost of living increases.

For the sake of guaranteeing the continued service of high caliber Federal employees I hope that the Congress will give favorable consideration to the passage of this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on May 20 I was temporarily and unavoidably called away from the House Chamber, and therefore it was not possible for me to vote on rollcall No. 104. Had it been possible for me to cast my vote, I would have voted "no"; that is, I would have voted against recommital. The purpose of the recommital motion was to amend the bill by striking out all of section 106. This section authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into a cooperative agreement for the construction and operation of a large seed blanket reactor. I agree with the Joint Committee that this plan is sound and fully worth the $91½ million which the Federal Government will be authorized to expend for this reactor. I would, therefore, have voted against a recommital designed to delete this from the bill. Happily, the motion to recommit did not prevail and I was pleased to vote "yea" on final passage of the full authorization of appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission.

PROGRESS REPORT ON THE KENNEDY ROUND TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform my colleagues now present that I will take the floor this afternoon under special order to report to the House of Representatives on my recent trip to Geneva to participate in the current international trade negotiations taking place under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT.

As many of you will recall, one of the great and constructive congressional innovations of the Trade Expansion Act—comparable in fact to the creation of the office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations—was the inclusion of authority to appoint four congressional delegates for trade negotiations.

My colleague the gentleman from California, Congressman CECIL KING, and I serve as the representatives of this House on the congressional delegation. Senators JOHN WILLIAMS, of Delaware, and HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, serve as representatives of the other body, with Senators FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, and ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, as their alternates.

The role of the congressional delegate is to participate fully in a policymaking capacity as accredited members of the official U.S. delegation for trade negotiations.

I think a public review of the so-called Kennedy round is timely and highly necessary. Three years after the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act and 1 year after the formal opening of the sixth GATT round in May 1964, the concrete accomplishments of the Kennedy round are very few. We must critically and realistically appraise our progress, and I will attempt to do so this afternoon. I will welcome the comments of my colleagues, other students of this interesting and complex subject, and of the news media.

THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has come to Chicago and gone. Before it arrived its legislative purposes in holding the hearings were very much in doubt. Now that it has departed, such purposes are still in doubt. Certainly, the committee gained no additional information that it did not possess previously.

One of Chicago's able reporters who covered the hearings was Mike Royko, of the Chicago Daily News. His impressions as contained in that newspaper on May 28, 1965, are as follows:

THE RED MENACE: A NONCONFORMIST NONCONFRONTATION

(By Mike Royko)

All the best people in wild-eyed circles were at 1212 North Lake Shore Drive yesterday for the last of the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings.

It was the biggest event of its kind since the violent ward patients got at the silverware.

The American Nazi Party, great admirers of the House committee, marched (rather badly) on the sidewalk and shouted advice: "Gas them, gas them."

Nearby, a group of fat ladies, possibly troubled by dreams of lustful Red Chinese hiding under their beds, walked in a circle and announced in shrill tones that the would rather be dead than Red. They were joined by a lanky man who waived a sign recommending that "unjust assassinations" be abolished.

Another group of procommittee youths chanted "Nothing to hide, nothing to fear." They recommended an all-out battle against the Red menace. None, however, was in uniform.

Meanwhile, a horde of long-haired young men and fat-legged young women hurled themselves at policemen. Their purpose was (1) to indicate that they wanted their freedom now and (2) to show that they were against the committee's investigation. Someone squirted paint on them.

The policemen, who had no freedom to give them, instead wrestled the youths and hauled them to paddy wagons waiting at the curb, a rare sight for the 1200 block of North Lake Shore Drive.

Others sought their freedom by throwing themselves to the pavement and entwining their limbs, making it difficult to lift 1 without lifting 20 others. A few kicked at the policemen while shouting "police brutality."

Amidst the turmoil, one youth sat cross-legged on the sidewalk. He appeared calm, despite a crack in the top of his head that had appeared during the melee.

An eager radio reporter rushed over and put a microphone under the youth's nose. This might have helped a nosebleed but it did little for his scalp. "Freedom, I want freedom," the youth yelled at the microphone. An ambulance came and he got stitches instead.

A deputy U.S. marshal was overcome by the excitement and suddenly delivered a roundhouse blow to the chest of one demonstrator. The blow did not knock the youth down because he was already lying on the pavement. The marshal strutted away, telling onlookers that he felt better, having relieved his tensions.

Inside the building, the five Congressmen were busy battling the Red menace by collecting fifth amendments. A heated debate was in progress between a witness' lawyer and the committee chairman.

"As a southern gentleman," shouted a lawyer for the witness, "the chairman of this committee should retract his statement that my cocounsel is weird."

"Ah did not say that your cocounsel was weird," said the chairman. "Ah said that her understanding of this committee's rules was weird."

"There is nothing weird about my cocounsel," persisted the lawyer. "She is a member of the bar and you should retract that statement about her being weird."

"Her understanding is weird," countered the chairman.

The weird debate went on for a few minutes until it was interrupted when several anticommittee spectators leaped to their feet and burst into song. They sang a patriotic song but marshals carried them out anyway.

"That is a planned demonstration," cried the chairman. "They always do that."

A delegation of John Birch members applauded the chairman's perception.

The hearing continued, with the committee gathering more fifth amendments from people who refused to testify against themselves in public. It didn't appear to make any difference, since the FBI and the committee members already knew the answers to most of the questions.

The big moment arrived late in the afternoon. A Chicago heart research scientist and his assistant finally were called. They had been the chief targets of the committee all this week. To nobody's surprise, they announced that they were not answering any questions. They got up and walked out, on the advice of their lawyer.

This angered a chubby Congressman from Texas. He pointed at the big clock on the wall and said:

"Let the record show, Mr. Chairman, that the witness walked out of this committee room at (he stared at the clock for several seconds)—6:17."

The room was hushed. The chairman of the committee also stared at the clock. It was a dramatic moment.

The chairman turned and looked at the chubby Congressman from Texas and said: "P.M."

"Yes," he answered. "P.M."

And so ended the hearings.

You can bet Mao had a sleepless night.

REMARKS OF DR. GRAYSON KIRK, PRESIDENT OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, AT END OF COLUMBIA'S 211TH YEAR

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to take particular note of the outstanding remarks made yesterday by Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, at the ceremonies marking the end of Columbia's 211th academic year.

The essence of Dr. Kirk's remarks, which were quoted in the New York Times, was a warning that irresponsible actions and statements by university students and members of the faculty could reflect adversely on the independence and integrity of the university.

Dr. Kirk said:

> A professor should think twice before he makes a ringing public declaration of his views on a controversial subject if it is far removed from his own area of scholarly competence or expertise.

Dr. Kirk then addressed himself to the students and said:

> He may argue heatedly with his comrades the long night through, but he may not in good conscience attempt to interfere forcibly either with their free expression of differing views or with the activities that derive therefrom.

His remarks were prompted by a renewal of student demonstrations that day at the Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps awards ceremony and commissioning exercises. These exercises had been scheduled on May 7 but student demonstrations had forced the postponement until yesterday.

Dr. Kirk's admonition to the students was that they have an obligation "to yield to the view of others that respect he demands for his own. The right to interfere with the rights of others is no part of academic freedom."

I hope that other university and college leaders will follow the outspoken example of Dr. Kirk in reminding not only the faculty and students but all Americans that our hard-won American freedoms include personal responsibility as well as respect for our institutions.

BILL WOULD TERMINATE SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE OF PALATINE POLICE FORCE

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker I am today introducing a bill which, if enacted, will resolve a situation by permitting the State of Illinois to terminate the social security coverage of the members of the police department of the village of Palatine, Ill. I have been requested by the village of Palatine to submit this bill because of the present double-coverage burden which the police department is carrying. Because of the growth of the village, the police department has been required, by State law, to assume coverage under the police pension fund although, also by law, the police department, as a part of the entire village-employee complex, had previously assumed coverage under the Social Security Act.

The situation has been described as follows by the village attorney:

> Because of unsual timing, the double coverage of the Palatine Police Department is considered a unique position in the State of Illinois. Neither the corporate authorities, nor the policemen, themselves, desire this double coverage. There appears to be no way to escape the operation of the State-required police pension fund contributions and coverage. Because of Palatine's present population, the application of the police pension statute is mandatory. Municipalities with a police pension setup are not required to assume social security coverage.

Mr. Speaker, if the village had attained its population growth before social security coverage was first extended to the village, the problem would not have arisen. It happened in reverse order, however, and the Palatine police force now finds itself overwhelmed by two plans, neither of which will permit it to withdraw. I would hope that the Congress will look favorably upon this request for relief.

GOOD LUCK, LIEUTENANT GILLIGAN

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, like many loyal policemen throughout our Nation, Lt. Thomas R. Gilligan, of the New York City police force, has decided that the time has come to use all legal means to counteract the smear group which attacks policemen, imputes their motives, and makes them the strawmen in a big lie campaign. You will probably recall that last summer, during a period of racial tension in Harlem, Lieutenant Gilligan fatally shot a Negro youth. It was determined by investigation that this was an unfortunate but proper action on his part.

Lieutenant Gilligan was the center of a smear and hate campaign which saw agitators use every means to fan antipolice protests. Signs appeared in Harlem: "Wanted for Murder—Gilligan the Cop."

The New York Daily News has carried an article indicating that Lieutenant Gilligan has filed a $5 million suit naming two national civil rights leaders, Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., and James Farmer as well as local leaders such as Jessie Gray and William Epton, long known for their radical activities. One cannot help but wish Lieutenant Gilligan the best of luck. It would be a great day for America if the Grays and the Eptons in particular would get their wings clipped for their slanderous activity.

The news story is as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News, May 27, 1965]

GILLIGAN FILES $5 MILLION SUITS

Police Lt. Thomas R. Gilligan, whose fatal shooting of a teenage Negro boy touched off last summer's Harlem riots, filed two Supreme Court libel suits yesterday for more than $5 million against the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., James Farmer, and other civil rights leaders and organizations.

Gilligan's lawyer, Roy M. Cohn, also disclosed that he planned to bring a third suit against NBC in connection with two broadcasts last July on which King and Farmer appeared. Gilligan has announced his intention to sue in April.

In his $1.5 million action against the Congress of Racial Equality and Farmer, its national director, Gilligan charged that the integrationist leader falsely accused him last July of then being in a mental institution for treatment. He also accused Farmer of urging his arrest on a murder charge in the slaying of 15-year-old James Powell.

In a $3.75 million suit against King, Farmer, rent-strike leader Jessie Gray, William Epton and others, Gilligan contended that the defendants were responsible for printing and distributing a handbill with his picture which said he was "wanted for murder."

CLEARED OF BLAME

CORE, the Progressive Labor Movement and the Harlem Defense Council were named in the larger suit. Gilligan said they had "conspired and maliciously and willfully participated in a plan to defame his good name and reputation."

A 17-year police veteran with numerous departmental citations, Gilligan was exonerated of criminal liability in the shooting of Powell by a grand jury and the police review board. He claimed that the youth had threatened him with a knife.

FREE ENTERPRISE HAS TO BE FOUGHT FOR IN THIS COUNTRY DESPITE ITS SUCCESS

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Henry R. Luce, entitled "Free Enterprise Has To Be Fought for in This Country Despite Its Success," is most interesting at this time in our history:

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The idea of Fortune began to take shape just before the Wall Street crash of October 1929, which might have discouraged many publishers from going ahead with a magazine of this kind. Yet as events turned out, Fortune's dedication to reporting the philosophy of American business and its tangible assets—its steel mills, its drilling rigs, its agriculture, and the day-to-day work of its entrepreneurs and managers—fulfilled a real journalistic need in the depression thirties, and thereafter. In this article, Henry R. Luce, who staked out Fortune's original claim and who has at every point influenced its development, sums up the extraordinary accomplishment of U.S. enterprise, and reflects on the nature of the institutions that have carried the Nation thus far and will carry it further.)

(By Henry R. Luce)

A few years ago we were all speaking of the miracle of Germany—of the fact that within a decade Germany had risen from a mass of dead rubble to a great prosperity and that it had done so mainly because of free enterprise. The chief worker of this miracle (under the aegis of Adenauer) was Prof. Ludwig Erhard. I met this corpulent, blue-eyed professor a few months after war's end. We walked for an hour or two through the streets of Munich, which were piled high with rubble and empty of traffic. The professor kept saying over and over again, "Free enterprise * * * Free enterprise—Marktwirtschaft * * * that is the only way." To me, he sounded pixilated; it seemed impossible to have such unqualified faith in free enterprise in the midst of all that silent ruin. Erhard is one of the very few men in history who had a faith, who got the chance to put that faith into practice, and who saw it work.

In that winter of 1945–46, when I was walking with Erhard, everyone—almost literally everyone, including American foreign correspondents—assumed that the countries of Europe would be ruled, after the war, by Popular Front (Socialist-Communist) governments. They did not foresee the rise of the Christian Democratic parties, which were to be one of the factors in swinging Western Europe toward free enterprise. Another factor was the Marshall plan, which under the persuasive genius of Paul Hoffman planted the seeds not only of productivity but also of free enterprise.

So, in a decade, came the miracle of Germany. And then came the miracle of Italy and then the miracle of France and the miracle of Europe generally, and then—way off yonder—the astonishing miracle of Japan. And then we gave up talking about miracles and settled down to taking all these amazing achievements almost for granted.

Yet all the while, of course, the greatest miracle of them all was the miracle of the American business-enterprise system, which had been the inspiration and the source of all the rest.

The American economy has now reached an extraordinary point, one rarely, if ever, reached by any large human construct. The American economy has arrived at the point where it meets all, or very nearly all, the demands put upon it. It meets the demands both of capitalism and of socialism. It meets the demands of businessmen that it should provide ample opportunity for production for profit—and it also meets the demands of the welfare of all the people.

To this last statement there will be instant objections. But consider. In his famous book, "The Affluent Society," our former colleague on Fortune, John Kenneth Galbraith, argued that we are spending our affluence on all the wrong things—on tail fins (that was back in the fifties) instead of on education or medicare. He may have been right; he may still be right. But note that Mr. Galbraith was not arguing that the American economy was incapable of meeting social demands; he was simply saying that the demands made on the economy (fins) were not the demands he himself would make. As for me, I would be happier if the $6 billion we now spend on agricultural subsidies were to be spent on more inspiring projects.

Since Mr. Galbraith's book, two things have happened: the economy has grown bigger, faster; and the criticisms of American life have become deeper and more widespread. This was shown in the 1964 presidential campaign, when there was a minimum of bread-and-butter issues. Both sides stressed intangibles: Mr. Goldwater stressed individual freedom and morality; Mr. Johnson, not satisfied with having all the bread and butter on his side, stressed utopian hopes.

To whatever degree President Johnson's utopianism is taken seriously—and I think it ought to be taken seriously—it is not entirely impractical and it serves a purpose. It fills, or seeks to fill, an aching void. That void is in the heart, mind, or soul of Americans—the feeling that, with all our wealth and power, we are deficient in those moral and ideal purposes which give life its zest and savor.

This void is also felt by the followers of Goldwater; it is even more painfully felt by liberal Democrats. Thus, speaking as a liberal Democrat, Charles Frankel, professor of philosophy at Columbia, opens his book on "The Democratic Prospect" with a chapter entitled "The Politics of Malaise." In that chapter Professor Frankel says: "At a moment in [our history]—when almost all the most liberal programs of the preceding generation have been realized, malaise and a sense of helplessness and drift have become the badges of the liberal mind." The rest of the book is devoted to showing liberal Democrats how much there is still to do. The significant thing is that, in setting forth a liberal agenda, Professor Frankel starts with the premise of malaise and says little about the inadequacies of the American economy as such. This is a very different approach from old-fashioned liberal attacks on capitalism.

But, after all, is there not still poverty? Yes—and some might add that it took President Johnson's political genius to discern it. Putting behind us all such uncompassionate thoughts, we can see that poverty in America today is not primarily a defect in the economy, not even in the distributive aspect of the economy. Poverty in America today is primarily the result of social, including educational, disabilities. The problem is now being attacked on these terms. And the solutions require more than money from the public treasuries. But insofar as money is required, the economy can afford it. That is my point. The American economy can and does supply both guns and butter—both in excess. It can and does supply both TV wasteland and academic excellence.

Obviously, the economy cannot supply every absurdity (like farm subsidies or solid-gold putters) that anyone could possibly think of, and the present malaise or aimlessness will not last forever. We will grow out of it or we will be shocked out of it either by new goals or by new misfortunes and most probably by both. My fundamental assertion has to do with the instant moment: the American economy has reached the extraordinary point where it can and does meet all the demands that can reasonably be made upon it.

Now, how did all this come about? My observations, in glancing back over 35 years, will be directed mainly to that question. First of all, of course, we have to note the proliferating miracles of science and technology. But, as can be seen by the drab example of Russia, science and technology work no economic miracles by themselves. We have then to note, second, and in my view most important, the American political system. However much erosion there may have been of the pristine principles of the Constitution, the system established by our Founding Fathers still puts an effective check on statism. It leaves nearly all economic acivity (including most government expenditures) to nongovernment or "private" enterprise.

In recent years commentators (many of whom are innocent of any knowledge of commerce or industry) and even some businessmen have allowed themselves to use a formulation that comes out of faraway India: they speak of the "public sector" and the "private sector" of the economy. These phrases may correctly describe the situation in India, where poverty flourishes under a lot of state ownership and state planning. But this Indian English makes no sense in America. Our economy is at heart capitalistic: special dividends or taxes are taken from business-created wealth to pay for all sorts of nonprofit enterprises (many of them "private") such as art museums, symphonies, universities, churches. They also go to pay such tax-supported activities as universal education and social security. There is no "public sector" in our economy, or hardly any; what we have is profitmaking business from which taxes and other contributions are drawn to pay for nonprofitmaking, though salutary, activities.

Granted, then, the basic importance of modern technology and granted the even more basic blessings of our form of government, we must also emphasize the extraordinary contribution of a type of economic system that perfectly "fits" and complements our form of government. The wonder of the enterprise, or market, economy is that it disperses economic power and decision while at the same time coordinating human effort in the interest of what the public wants. Now in one sense this kind of economy is nothing new, and businessmen, in producing for profit and hence for use, are not so different from their whiskered confreres of yesterday. Yet in other respects there have been vast changes in how businessmen act and in what we expect from them. I would cite at the start the proposition on which Fortune was founded—that all business is vested with a public interest. And since it is, like no other capitalistic business anywhere, ever, American business in the 20th century has been open to inspection. It is not only open to inspection by all manner of Government agencies including the Antitrust Division and the Securities and Exchange Commission. It is also open to the inspection of journalists, and in this Fortune has played a leading role.

I elaborated all this once in a speech to young businessmen, when I said: "It is, I suppose, almost impossible for the younger men here to realize how radical was this proposition of inspection when I was your age. To be sure, at the beginning of this century there was a great deal of public law. Teddy Roosevelt had made the antitrust law a real force and—imagine—he had even gone so far as to instigate a Pure Food and Drug Act. And grocers were required to have scales that didn't cheat—thus putting a limit on the age-old law of caveat emptor. But still, with all of that, the bankers in Wall Street and LaSalle Street and the heads of great corporations sincerely thought of themselves as individuals going about their private business, with essentially no more accountability to the public than the corner grocer or sodapop vendor.

"Journalistically, this meant that no leading banker or businessman considered that the inquiring reporter had any right to knock on his door—unless he came to write a puff story. The idea that the journalist should inquire after the facts was not only outrageous to the businessman, it was inconceivable. And anyway, who cared about the facts of business? And then came the great depression, and suddenly everybody cared—in a bewildered, confused, bitter, hysterical way. The heavens had fallen. Business was the villain. Well, you know the rest of the story—how the New Deal brought in many great reforms but no prosperity; and how the war came with its tremendous upsurge of productivity; and then these amazing postwar years.

"And not least of the wonders is how universally it is now accepted that all business is vested with a public interest. That proposition is of course 'fundamental' to socialism. The fallacy of socialism, however, is that it leaps to a false conclusion from a sound premise: since all business is vested with a public interest, the Government should own and operate business. This Socialist fallacy may lead to tyranny of the Communist variety or some other, and, it certainly leads to inefficiency and poverty. It is the genius of America that it has worked out an economic system by which the public interest is continually represented, while the public enjoys the blessing of liberty and the fruits of competitive and skillful management and initiative. In most of the rest of the world you will not find anything like this."

THE PARADOX OF SUCCESS

I come now to the second of my observations—to the paradox that free enterprise, or, as I prefer to call it, business enterprise, has to be fought for in this country, despite its success. Fought for against whom? Who is against it? Presumably people who call themselves liberal Democrats and organizations like the ADA, recently rescued from obscurity by Goldwater-Miller.

The Republican Party, through all these years, has stood for business enterprise. Is, then, the majority Democratic Party against it? By reason of its stream of welfare legislation it might seem to stand under that accusation. And yet I cannot think of a single Democrat in Congress or in any other high office who would not feel cruelly maligned if you said he was against business enterprise.

In my New York apartment in 1960, when Joseph Patrick Kennedy and I were waiting to hear his son's speech accepting the Democratic nomination for the presidency, I said to Joe that of course Jack would have to be left of center on domestic affairs but * * *

Joe cut in with all the colorful explosion of language at his command. He said: "Blank, blank, how can you imagine that any son of mine would be any blank blank liberal?"

I calmed him down by explaining that, in the nature of American politics, the Democratic candidate couldn't possibly be elected without being a tiny bit left of center, and that we wouldn't hold that against him, provided he performed well on other counts.

In fact, President Kennedy did not feel himself to be against business enterprise. He wanted "to get this country moving" and that to him meant getting business moving forward. He probably regretted the storm that blew up about steel prices. In any case, he always seemed, to me at least, to be both a little baffled and a little hurt by any hostility that business felt toward him.

And now, of course, we have a President who, unlike Kennedy, got a lot of businessmen to vote for him and who has spoken more ardently in praise of business than any other President since Calvin Coolidge. You recall President Johnson's heartfelt burst of enthusiasm when he expressed his pride in a system where "the employer, hoping to make a little profit, the laborer hoping to justify his wages, can get together and make a better mousetrap."

Perhaps we have come to the end of a long era and business enterprise will no longer have to fight for its existence against creeping socialism and all that. Perhaps. But I do not think so. Why? Partly because the business-enterprise system tends to be a disruptive as well as a creative process, overturning older and more static ways of economic organization: it is no fun to have the worth of one's effort measured in the marketplace. Again, a political democracy will always find it easier to dream up new "programs" for redistributing wealth already created than to strengthen the incentives that produce wealth. Finally, it is no easy task to define and to fight for the proper functions, and the proper limits, of government power in our economic affairs. The enterprise economy needs strong government in the realm of external defense, of internal security, and of monetary policy, to mention a few. It is all too easy to confuse these needed powers with attempts of government officials to run the whole show—to dictate specific prices and wages and other matters. In this whole business the price of freedom is indeed eternal vigilance.

FAILURE OF THE NEW DEAL

The nearest Fortune ever came to intimate involvement with high politics was in the Willkie campaign of 1940. Hundreds of people felt that they were uniquely responsible for Wendell Willkie's nomination in that dramatic convention in Philadelphia. The fact is that two men were mostly responsible—first, Willkie himself, a lawyer for big business who had a powerful personality and powerful gift of speech; and second, Russell Davenport, then managing editor of Fortune, a passionate idealist who saw the intimate connection between freedom for business and all human freedom. Willkie and Davenport worked out an impressive case against the New Deal, showing how the New Deal had miserably failed to produce prosperity, how prosperity arising from business activity was not incompatible with social welfare, and why social welfare without business prosperity is a sickness both of body and spirit. If the Hitler blitz had not come that year, I believe Willkie would have been elected.

When Davenport first met Willkie—it was only in 1939—he was well prepared for the role he was to play, because in his years as managing editor his major preoccupation had been "Business and Government." He recognized that in this technological age government would have to do a lot more than it had previously done, but also that government must keep one end in view—namely, the stimulation, not the stagnation, of business enterprise.

The war came. President Roosevelt said he was no longer "Dr. New Deal." What a giveaway that was. Roosevelt had always behaved as if the American economy was something that had to be treated as a perpetual invalid. Happily for the economy, President Roosevelt now declared himself in effect to be "Dr. Win the War." In the process of winning the war, America found its economic muscles again. And after the war, contrary to liberal theoreticians, there was no massive unemployment. America had returned to its native trend line of advancing business enterprise prosperity.

Yet the fight for the principles of enterprise had to continue, and in 1948 Fortune reorganized its editorial charter accordingly, taking on a "mission," namely, "to assist in the successful development of the American enterprise system." We recognized that, besides reporting the business game, we needed to give heed to defining the "rules of the game." And we did this in the very year when it looked to most observers as if a Republican, Thomas Dewey, would be elected.

With Dewey's defeat we found more than plenty to do in enterprise's defense. For President Truman, when elected, kept sending to Congress demands for such massive expenditures that they would have exhausted the resources of Al Capp's Shmoo. Why did this solid little man from Missouri act this way? Partly because no doubt he knew darn well Congress wouldn't agree to his demands. In any case, Harry Truman had the best of both political worlds. He could ask for everything for the common man and yet count on Republicans and conservative Democrats to keep the country solvent and the climate fairly safe for business enterprise.

It is notable that when Eisenhower came in he did so on a series of issues summarized in the Republican slogan, "Communism, Korea, and Corruption," and not as the champion of free enterprise as such, though he himself understood the contribution of the system full well. Perhaps this serves to point up the fact that in a political democracy it will always be necessary for independent voices of opinion to stand up for the market economy, whoever controls the Government. Be that as it may, the Republican party in its present hour of unhappiness may at least take this consolation: that insofar as it stood for free enterprise during these 35 years, it shares at least equal credit with its quasi-socialist opposition for bringing America to its present pitch of material welfare.

Like many others whose views are apt to be more right than left of center, I would give full credit to much of our social legislation. Much of it has been right and proper, not only for the primary purpose of serving the ends of justice and compassion, but to broaden the base for the ever expanding potential of a free economy. But I cannot refrain from expressing a vain wish: I would wish that the time might come when those who style themselves liberal Democrats would have the plain fair-mindedness to acknowledge the indispensable contribution of business enterprise to the kind of country that they want.

FIRST WAS THE ANTHILL

My third line of observation concerns the growth of that notable contemporary phenomenon, the organization. Of course, there have always been organizations, ever since men began to band together. And there was the anthill before that, and the word might even be applied to the gravitational music of the spheres or indeed to the whole universe. But never before the 20th century have organizations been so many, so big, so various, so efficient, so heavily relied upon for the world's work, and, above all, never before have thinking men been so conscious of the phenomenon of organization.

In 1938, Chester Barnard, president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co., published his book, "The Functions of the Executive." This book was given to me by Charles L. Stillman, then as now the chief financial officer of Time, Inc. In the early days of the magazine Stillman also served as a part-time editor, helping us to achieve a touch of economic sophistication. Mr. Barnard's book made a great impression on me. It was, I was told and correctly, the first book in the history of human thought to deal with organization in terms of philosophical-analytical theory. A marvelous example of how the world's thinkers can ignore major phenomena of life right under their noses—and on their breakfast tables.

Organization has everything to do with modern economic development—whether by socialist or capitalist means. It also has everything to do with the present and future governments of the world. Thus modern tyrannies, Communist or Nazi, are more terrible than tyrannies of the past because of their ability to make organization effective—thereby preventing revolts against them. An absolute monarch like Louis XIV was incapable of exercising anything like the power of, say, the U.S. Treasury, let alone of Stalin or Hitler.

Awareness of organization has, of course, been growing rapidly for a century or more. But there is a world of difference between both the fact of and the feeling about Morgan's United States Steel or John D. Rockefeller's Standard Oil and the fact and the feeling about these same companies today. The same could be said for many another company—Sears, Roebuck, for example—and in addition we have a whole new form of organization in NASA and the moon shot.

It was Fortune's William H. Whyte, Jr., who made the organization man a household word—and the organization wife, too. His was a fine achievement in sociological reporting. In it he related the phenomenon of the business organization to questions of human personality and values. The kind of people who are eager to hear the worst about American society assumed that Mr. Whyte was predicting the destruction of individualism by the organization—by, that is, the business organization. Weirdly enough, these antibusiness people never worry about the organizational dangers of socialism to the individual. After Whyte's book came out there was a lot of ululation about the dangers of conformity. It amused one to note that for several years one of the noisiest examples of conformity was the preachment, in commencement speeches and elsewhere, against conformity.

Whyte was not a doomsayer. True, he was uneasy about corporate life, which seemed to stifle creativity and individualism. He was uneasy about the subtle pressures in the office and at home that called for smooth performance rather than daring creation. But he did not urge the organization man to leave his secure environment. Rather he urged him to fight the organization when necessary and he was optimistic that the battle could be successful. "Fight the organization," he wrote. "But not destructively." He added, "I write with the optimistic premise that individualism is as possible in our times as in others. I speak of individualism within organizational life."

To me several things seem quite clear about the organization as it has developed in our time—especially in the United States, and particularly in U.S. business.

The organization increases, rather than diminishes, opportunities for the individual—not necessarily for all individuals but for the many millions who are tolerably well suited to organization life. The individual in an organization has facilities that he could not possibly have otherwise.

Organizations, meaning large and very large organizations, are obviously essential to do the work of today's world. Manhattan project is a milestone in human history—not only because it produced the bomb, but because it showed so dramatically that only an organization of that size can get that kind of work done. The current equivalent is NASA—and the organizational equivalents of the future will be mining in the oceans and capturing the energy of the sun.

THE RULES ARE FAIR

The growth of thought about the problems of organization has made the business corporation more humane. It is generally recognized that corporations are highly conscious of their public responsibilities. It is perhaps not so well understood that internal management today is characterized by a keen sense of concern for justice and fairness, and also for the informal virtues of human kindness. Walter Guzzardi's recent Fortune study of the "young executive" finds that, while the fellow is by no means a sentimentalist, and harbors no old-school-tie feelings of loyalty to the corporation, the young executive does credit the modern corporation with being a place where the rules of the game are fair and where ability and talent will be noted and rewarded.

Equally important, the growth of the modern corporation has gone hand in hand with increasing knowledge and sophistication about business methods and problems. The businessman today not only emphasizes efficiency in production but also has a far more competent grasp than formerly of changing markets and the problems of distribution. In addition, he has come to see that what his corporation does in the matter of investment may have a very real effect on the economy taken as a whole. We have yet to conquer the business cycle, but it is fair to say that the businessman today goes about his work with larger knowledge of the total economy than in the days when he kept his profit-and-loss statement in his hat and occasionally took a look at the latest figure on carloadings. We of Fortune have tried to increase this understanding, specifically through Business Roundup, which, starting as a history of events in the past month, today seeks to look forward into the future, and indeed indulges in the hazardous task of 18-month forecasts.

All of which is not to say that the organization, and particularly the large business organization, does not present dangers to the desirable development of man. It carries with it a full complement of the faults of humanity. And some of these faults—such as, broadly, "materialism"—it may tend to aggravate. But the organization is the outstanding new means by which we can achieve whatever we may mean by a Great Society. And within the organization there seem to be possibilities of tempering man's inhumanity to man.

One of the points Chester Barnard made most strikingly was that, in any organization, there is a formal organization and an informal one—and that the informal may be more important than the formal. The formal organization is represented by the organization chart and by all the rules and formal commands given within the organization. But, as everyone knows, what often counts most is not the meeting of the executive committee—but what is said at coffee breaks or at the 19th hole. It is there, quite as much as in the board room, that reputations are made and policies initiated—and wild ideas or dreams materialized.

It is to be hoped that many people in years to come may lead highly individual lives—contemplative or creative. What I have been trying to stress is that organization is the means by which most of the social work of man will be done, that we should appreciate its enormous possibilities and strive to make organization correspond more and more to whatever may be best in human affairs and working relationships.

HONG KONG IS DIFFERENT

Finally, I should like to make a few simple points about a vast subject—the importance of the United States to the economies of the whole world.

Six years ago when I stopped off at Bangkok, I was surprised to find that during the previous week Bangkok had overnight abolished all rickshaws and pedicabs. The wide streets of that city would henceforth be filled only with motor traffic. This is just a dramatic example of how all the cities of the world more and more resemble each other. Great diversities of culture still happily remain: The personalities of Hong Kong and Rome and Chicago are unmistakably different. But they remain different only within an increasingly universal pattern of machines and commerce. The motorcar takes over the widened streets. Tall buildings rise above the temples. The hurrying crowds are dressed mostly "Western style"; Madam Butterfly vanishes. The shops are full of much the same merchandise and Coca-Cola is everywhere. Pepsi-Cola, too.

This is sometimes called Americanization. But it is not essentially that; it involves essentially the rapid spread of modern technology, more or less available to all, and, equally important, the spread of modern methods of commerce and finance. This tide of modernization is remaking the social structures of Europe and Japan and wherever else it reaches. It creates a consumer economy and a much bigger middle class. The "Americanization of Europe" is often deplored, especially by the aristocratic right and the would-be leaders of the proletarian left. But whether it is good or bad, it is not being done mostly by Americans; it is being done mainly by Europeans—and Japanese and the businessmen and engineers of other lands.

Nevertheless, the United States has a very special responsibility with regard to this worldwide panorama of economic progress.

The first responsibility is elementary, though often lost sight of. It is to protect freedom—to protect specifically Europe and Japan and other places in the world where the institutions of freedom exist or are being developed. Economic progress depends upon freedom (surely the evidence on that point is now conclusive), but it also depends upon a large measure of peace and order. The miracle of Germany, the miracle of Japan, and all the other miracles could not have occurred except under the reliable umbrella of the Military Establishment of the United States. And without the continued guarantee of that umbrella, all the economic miracles (and social securities) will vanish.

The United States has many other responsibilities toward the growing world economy. One of them, for example, is to take the lead in developing adequate monetary policies. The responsibility that I should like to cite as being the most important (next only to the protection of existing freedom) is the responsibility to advance, to promote, and to encourage the formation of constitutional governments in all those parts of the non-Communist world where constitutional governments either do not exist at all or exist only in a very dubious manner. On this point there is much disagreement and confusion of tongues. It is argued, rightly enough, that many nations are not "ready" for truly democratic governments. To this it may be replied that governments may be reliably constitutional without an excess of direct democracy.

It is also argued, again with reason, that nations differ so widely in their characteristics that it is foolish to expect them to become, politically, like us. This is the argument that, in my view, needs more careful analysis. It is my belief that, if the matter of cultural differences is more carefully examined, it will be found that there are principles of freedom and order that are universal in their human and psychological and even in their institutional truth. Anyway, the truth of "liberty under law" is the truth we know, and live by, and so we should never tire, with all our busyness of business and politics, in showing forth by word and deed the truth we live by. Let every nation make its own adaptations but let us never cease to make plain that what most concerns us as Americans is human freedom and the institutions that guard and promote it.

Fortune's John Davenport has just written a most valuable book entitled "The U.S. Economy." His last chapter is "Of the American Mission." I am happy to conclude my reflections by quoting his concluding paragraph.

"What is that mission after all? To maintain a sheltering shield of military power against the further encroachment of tyranny, and to rollback and neutralize those who have said they will bury us; * * * to project outward the rule of law and liberty under the law which has been both our inheritance and our pride; to shape not only a more prosperous America but an America that, in the phrase of John F. Kennedy, 'will not be afraid of grace and beauty'; to use the promise of the machine, not just for the conquest of poverty, but for the pursuit of excellence and distinction. Great tasks require great builders, and the mission of America is to build no less than to defend. Yet, in the clamorous and busy world of tomorrow, let us hope too that there will be time for reflection in those silent and indeed lonely hours when the spirit reasserts its influence and reanimates the human endeavor. America is not a purpose but purposes, not an ideal but ideals, not a crowd but men and women. It will be in the heart and mind of each one that the future of the Republic will be shaped, its premises vindicated, and its promises fulfilled."

ACCELERATING COSTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE, chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Education, took the floor to familiarize Members of the House of Representatives with the active interest of the House Republican Task Force on Education in the problem of accelerating costs in higher education. It was pointed out that the task force entertained a particular interest in tax credits as an aid in helping student taxpayers and their parents meet the increasing costs of education at the university and college levels.

Special attention was directed to the hearing conducted on May 24 in New York City by the Republican Task Force on Education, and it was pointed out that this hearing was directed, as per the words of Chairman QUIE:

> Toward the end of sampling attitudes with respect to tax credits and receiving recommendations on other types of assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Task Force on Education feels that the hearing on May 24 was a supreme success, for it brought together a group of highly competent witnesses who presented varying views on tax credits and who offered other recommendations for meeting the high costs of higher education.

Because I am a Member of the House Republican Task Force on Education, I want to continue the effort initiated yesterday to acquaint the Members of the Congress with the content of the May 24 hearing. In this respect, I would like to say that although Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY of Vermont was not able to be on hand for the hearing, he submitted a very illuminating statement to the proceedings.

Senator PROUTY, of Vermont has been a champion of the tax credit approach in helping to meet the costs of higher education—he has introduced legislation of his own in this respect, and he has cosponsored similar legislation. He is consummately dedicated to the proposition of providing an opportunity of higher education for deserving and competent students who are unable to accommodate the pertinent costs. He believes, as he said in his statement for the hearing, that:

> The investment we make now in these young men and women will be repaid many times over as they contribute to the improvement of our society in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point to insert Senator PROUTY's statement into the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF U.S. SENATOR WINSTON L. PROUTY, REPUBLICAN, OF VERMONT, BEFORE THE TASK FORCE ON EDUCATION OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE, UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF HON. ALBERT H. QUIE, OF MINNESOTA, MAY 24, 1965, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. Chairman, as ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, it gives me great pleasure to submit this statement at the hearings of your task force on ways of meeting the rising costs of higher education.

I deeply regret that the current debate on voting rights legislation in the Senate prevents my appearance in person at this public hearing. I wish to commend the distinguished minority leader of the House of Representatives, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan; the distinguished chairman of the House Republican Conference, the Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin, and yourself, Mr. Chairman, for the very genuine and constructive concern that Republican Members of the House, under your leadership, have shown in working for sound programs to improve higher education in the United States and make its benefits available to an increasing number of our young men and women.

I am today introducing in the U.S. Senate a bill to provide tax credits to persons now burdened with the rising expenses of higher education.

The idea of tax credits as an aid to education is not new. In the past decade over 400 bills have been introduced in the Congress. In the 88th Congress alone 19 bills were introduced in the Senate and over 100 in the House. I have joined a number of Senators of both parties in sponsoring S. 12, introduced in January by Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Kennedy.

The Republican platform of 1964 specifically calls for a tax credit plan to aid those who must bear the cost of putting a student through college. The Republican education omnibus bill in the House of Representatives, introduced by Congressman WILLIAM AYRES, of Ohio, contains a college tax credit section (title III of H.R. 6349).

After a decade of growing support for tax credits for college expenses, the time has come—in fact the time is well overdue—for the Congress to act.

Let us take a look at the hard realities of today.

1. More and more young Americans are going to college. According to the U.S. Office

of Education, the fall enrollment in institutions of higher education in 1960 was 3.583 million. Last fall that number had risen to 4.774 million—an increase of 1,195,000 in only 5 years. This represents an average annual increase of 6.5 percent. In 1970 it is estimated that 6.959 million young Americans will be in college, representing an average annual increase over the next 5 years of 9.4 percent.

2. The percentage of all young people going on to college is also rising. In 1960, 375 of every 1,000 young people aged 18 through 21 were enrolled in institutions of higher education. In 1963 this number had risen to 404 of every 1,000.

3. The costs of attending college are rising sharply. According to the U.S. Office of Education, the cost of tuition and required fees for public colleges in the school year 1960–61 was about $179. This fall the estimated cost will have risen to about $241, an increase of 35 percent in 5 years. In private colleges over the same period, tuition and fee expenses have risen from $676 to about $874—an increase of 29 percent.

4. Many of our most promising young men and women cannot afford to go on to college. U.S. Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel has said that "each year more than 100,000 high school graduates with high aptitudes and interest in college fail to continue their education because of financial inability." Note that these are not just young men and women who barely make it through high school and have little interest in college. These are the prime prospects—those with demonstrated aptitude for college work and a high interest in going on to school.

5. An alarming number of young people entering college will drop out before graduation because of inability to pay the bills. Dr. Rexford G. Moon, Jr., director of the college scholarship service of the college entrance examination board, has estimated that around 40 percent of entering freshmen will be forced to drop out due to lack of funds.

6. There are many ways for our society to meet the pressing needs of higher education. Commissioner Keppel told the Senate Education Subcommittee that "The best way to think about this problem of financial aid at the college level is in terms of a combination of ways of going about it. No single method would seem to me to be suitable to every student."

The private sector of our economy has put forth magnificent efforts to make it possible for qualified young men and women to get through college. This aid has come from philanthropists, foundations, charitable organizations, business firms, banks, savings and loan institutions, and other sources. In addition, a growing number of government programs, at the State, local and national levels, recognize the importance to the Nation of higher education. It should be our goal to design Government programs so that they effectively and efficiently complement these private programs in helping our institutions of higher education, our college students, and those who must help the student meet his college expenses.

In February 1964, Senator RIBICOFF offered his college tax credit bill as an amendment to the tax cut bill then under debate. Unhappily, the amendment was defeated by a close 45-to-48 vote. Eighty-four percent of the Republican Senators voting on the Ribicoff amendment voted in favor of it, while 31 percent of the Democratic Senators did so.

On June 6 of this year Senator RIBICOFF introduced his amendment as Senate bill S. 12. Thirty-three Senators joined the Senator from Connecticut as cosponsors. I am happy to say that I am one of them.

The provisions of the Ribicoff bill are simple. It would provide tax credit on the first $1,500 expended on tuition, fees, books, and supplies for a student at an institution of higher education. Unlike a tax deduction or exemption, the tax credit is subtracted from the amount of tax due; thus each dollar of tax credit is a dollar actually saved by the taxpayer, regardless of his gross income.

The amount of credit in the Ribicoff bill is computed according to a sliding scale. For the first $200 of expenses the credit would be 75 percent; for the next $300 it would be 25 percent; and for the next $1,000 it would be 10 percent. Thus a taxpayer with allowable college expenses of $1,500 could receive a maximum credit of $325. Room and board expenses are not included.

The credit would be available to any taxpayer who pays the tuition and fees covered in the bill—parents, students, or any other person who pays for a student's higher education.

There is a limitation on credit under the Ribicoff bill which would gradually reduce benefits so that high-income parents, who are more able to provide for the education of their children, would not be unduly benefited at the expense of the ordinary taxpayer. The credit is reduced by an amount equal to 1 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income in excess of $25,000. Thus a taxpayer whose adjusted gross income is $41,250 would be entitled to claim no more than half the maximum credit of $325, and a taxpayer with an income of $57,500 would receive no benefit at all.

I believe that the tax credit plan typified by S. 12 is a sound, responsible plan to promote higher education in America. There is, however, room for improvement in some of its provisions. To that end I am today introducing a similar measure which I believe will help to overcome the objections of some of those who have opposed the Ribicoff bill.

One objection brought against the Ribicoff bill holds that it would disproportionately aid students attending the more expensive private colleges. and thus discriminate against students at the public and land-grant universities, which generally charge lower tuition.

Few would argue that taxpayers should be entitled to claim equal tax deductions for medical expenses, when one taxpayer may have had none, and another many thousands of dollars' worth. Naturally, the one with the greater expenses should be allowed to deduct more on an absolute, if not on a percentage basis. So it is with educational expenses. The argument is not that students attending high-tuition colleges should get no more in credits than students attending low-tuition schools, but that the high-tuition students should not get so much more.

To counter this objection I have designed a compromise sliding scale for benefits which would help students paying low tuitions somewhat more than would Senator RIBICOFF's version.

In my bill a taxpayer could claim a credit of 100 percent of the first $200 of college expenses; 10 percent of the next $300, and 5 percent of the next $1,000. This adds up to a maximum credit of $280 for a student paying $1,500 in expenses.

Simply put, students paying up to $600 in tuition, fees, books, supplies, and equipment would gain substantially from my bill as opposed to the Ribicoff bill, while students paying more than $600 would gain somewhat more under S. 12.

To make a more exact comparison between my bill and S. 12, consider the taxpayer paying the college expenses at a public institution in 1962–63. The median figure for tuition and fees, for a public college in that year was $170, plus an estimated $90 for books, supplies, etc. Under the Ribicoff bill the taxpayer would have claimed a credit of $165. Under my bill, he could have claimed $206.

In the same year the taxpayer paying the median expenses at a private college paid out $690 in tuition and $90 in books and supplies. Under the Ribicoff bill he could have claimed $253; under my bill he could have claimed only sightly less—$244.

Thus my bill, more so than S. 12, will tend to equalize the assistance for students now attending our public and land-grant colleges and universities. For example, using figures inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator RIBICOFF, a student attending the University of California would gain about $209 under my bill, compared to $172 in S. 12. A student at the University of Connecticut would gain $205 under my bill, compared to $163 under S. 12. A student at Cornell or MIT, however, would gain $280 under my bill and $325 under S. 12. The important thing is, however, that the amended scale offered in my bill may be enough, coupled with other improvements, to win the support of the few additional Senators whose votes will guarantee the early passage of tax credit legislation—legislation which will aid all parents and students, whether the students attend private or public colleges.

Another objection raised to the Ribicoff bill was that it afforded no benefit to the individual whose income was so low, or who had so many deductions and exemptions, that he owed less tax than the credit to which he would be entitled, or perhaps no tax at all. I have attempted to ease this objection in my bill by permitting an individual whose computed credit exceeds his tax-liability to claim up to $100 of the difference as an overpayment of tax.

This is, in effect, an absolute tax credit. Take the example of a family with a son in college whose tuition, fees, books, etc., amount to $600 a year. Suppose the family is large, its income modest, and its tax liability to the Federal Government only $100.

Under the Ribicoff bill the computed tax credit would be $235, but since the head of the family owed only $100 in taxes, he could claim only $100 of the computed credit. He would thus not pay any tax at all, but he would not get the maximum aid to which he would otherwise be entitled if his tax liability were $235 or more.

Under my bill this taxpayer would also be entitled to a $235 tax credit, but he would be allowed to claim $200. One hundred dollars would offset his tax liability, and the remaining $100 would be refunded to him by the Treasury, just as an overpayment of withholding tax is now refundable when it exceeds the tax due.

This absolute credit provision absolutely guarantees that every low- and middle-income taxpayer, regardless of his income, deductions, and exemptions, will get at least $100 in cash or credit toward the expenses of higher education borne by him for himself or any other person whose expenses he pays, provided only that he actually expends that amount or more.

The third difference between the Ribicoff and Prouty bills lies in the reduction of credit feature. This feature was introduced to placate those critics who saw the Ribicoff bill as a windfall for high income taxpayers at the expense of those of middle and low income. In S. 12 the maximum amount of credit the taxpayer may claim is reduced by 1 percent of the excess of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income over $25,000. In my bill the point at which the credit begins to diminsh is an adjusted gross income of $10,000, and the rate of decrease is 2 percent instead of 1 percent.

Where under the Ribicoff bill benefits to taxpayers would not decrease to zero until the taxpayer's income rose to $57,500, under my bill a taxpayer with an income of $24,000 would not benefit. It seems to me that those who earn $25,000, $30,000, $40,000, and $50,000 a year should be able to put their children through college without this extra assistance.

For taxable year 1961 only 1.3 percent of taxable returns showed incomes above $25,000, so somewhat over 95 percent of the Nation's taxpayers could still benefit under my bill. For these few families who would be excluded there is some consolation in the fact that their children are far more likely to receive scholarship assistance than are children from low-income families. If the Government is to help equalize the educational opportunities for the millions of America's young men and women who come from lower and middle-income families, the Government program must be designed to help where the need is greatest. This my bill attempts to do.

The bill sponsored by Senator RIBICOFF is a sound and much-needed measure which has my support. I have introduced my alternative college tax credit bill in an effort to go part way in meeting some of the objections that have been made to S. 12, in the hope that a broad consensus can be reached that will permit speedy enactment of the whole program.

On June 6, 1963, one of the most eminent Democratic Senators rose in advocacy of a very similar college tax credit measure. He told the Senate:

"The pressing need for vastly increased financial resources to support higher education in this country cannot be ignored. This legislation would provide this urgently needed assistance at a time of maximum need. It would represent a capital investment in the minds and talents of our youth and the future of our society. Let us, then, meet this challenge with honesty and courage before this time of great need has passed and millions of American youth have been denied their educational birthright."

These are the words of HUBERT HUMPHREY, now the Vice President of the United States. They were wise then; they are wise now. May the Congress heed them promptly.

Before closing I should also like to mention a bill I have introduced (S. 1486) entitled the College Student Tax Relief Act of 1965. Joining with me in sponsoring this bill are 26 Republican Senators, but as yet no Democratic members have seen fit to add their names.

S. 1486 is aimed at a specific problem—that of the college student who must work his own way through school without any tax relief at all. The bill would permit a working college student—but not his parents or any other person—to deduct up to $1,500 actually paid by him for college tuition, fees, books, equipment, and supplies when computing his Federal income tax. This bill would provide appropirate and timely aid to those students who are struggling through school primarily on their own earnings.

Last February when the tax cut bill was before the Senate, I offered this tax deduction measure as an amendment, minutes after the Ribicoff amendment was rejected on a 45 to 48 vote. I am sorry to report that it failed of passage by a 47 to 47 tie vote, notwithstanding the fact that every Republican Senator on the floor cast his vote in the affirmative. It is my hope that Senators will have the opportunity again this year to consider one or both of these measures, and that the few additional votes can be found to secure their passage.

The good people of my Green Mountain State of Vermont have for over a century revered the name of U.S. Senator Justin Morrill. He was the author of the famous Morrill Act, that established the great land-grant colleges and universities of our Nation.

When Justin was a lad in the little village of Strafford, he yearned to go on to Dartmouth College in nearby Hanover, N.H. At 15 he was ready; but his father gently told him that he did not have the money to send all his sons to college, and thus, he could not discriminate in favor of Justin, the eldest.

Young Justin Morrill was heartbroken, but he determined to make the best of it. He got a job with the village storekeeper, rose in the ranks of commerce, and was eventually chosen to represent Vermont in the House and then the Senate.

Through the long years Justin Morrill carried with him a dream and a faith—a dream of full educational opportunity for the children of even the most humble families, and a faith that he could persuade his colleagues in the Congress, deeply concerned over the gathering clouds of civil war, to take the action to make that dream a reality.

Millions of young Americans have since benefited from the determination of Vermont's Justin Morrill, whose land-grant college bill was signed into law by President Lincoln on July 2, 1862. When the gate of educational opportunity was closed in his face by the poverty of his family, Justin Morrill made up his mind that it should not be so for those who came after him. His fixity of purpose was rare, and it earned him just renown. But how many young men and women today, possessed perhaps of great talents but somewhat less determination than Justin Morrill, will fail to rise to the heights of achievement of which they are capable? Might it be otherwise if they had the chance to get into and through college, a chance that young Justin never had? The investment we make now in these young men and women will be repaid many times over as they contribute to the improvement of our society in the future. Let us, as Republicans, as Democrats, as Americans, remove the last roadblocks without further delay.

Comparison of college tax credit proposals

Coverage	Prouty, 89th Cong.	Ribicoff, S. 12, 89th Cong.	Humphrey, S. 1677, 88th Cong.	Goldwater-Curtis, S. 2269, H.R. 8981, 88th Cong.
Expenses incurred for	Taxpayer and any other individual.	Taxpayer and any other individual.	Taxpayer, spouse, or dependent	Taxpayer, spouse, or dependent.
Maximum amount of credit per student.	100 percent of 1st $200; 10 percent of next $300; 5 percent of next $1,000; maximum, $280.	75 percent of 1st $200; 25 percent of next $300; 10 percent of next $1,000; maximum, $325.	75 percent of 1st $100; 40 percent of next $400; 30 percent of next $500; 20 percent of next $500; maximum, $485.	$100 percent of 1st $100; 30 percent of next $400; 20 percent of next $1,000; maximum, $420.
Reduction of credit for higher income taxpayers.	2 percent of adjusted gross income over $10,000; no benefits for taxpayers with over $24,000 income.	1 percent of adjusted gross income over $25,000; no benefits for taxpayers with over $57,500 income.	None.	None.
Excess credit over tax liability for low-income taxpayers.	Excess credit over liability treated as overpayment, to a maximum of $100.	None	do	Do.

Mr. Speaker, another champion in the Senate for tax credits as an aid to the increasing costs of education was former Senator Kenneth B. Keating of New York. And Senator Keating—although he could not be present at the May 24 hearing in New York City—wanted his sense of presence evidenced for that hearing.

That Senator Keating evidenced a vivid interest in tax credits as an aid to higher educational costs is manifested by the many times he took the Senate floor to laud this proposal. For instance, on January 29, 1964, he took the floor of the Senate to make the following statement:

> Mr. President, we have taken steps in this 88th Congress to allocate Federal funds for construction of buildings in colleges, for loans to medical students and medical schools, and for improving vocational education. We have continued and expanded both the National Defense Education Act and the impacted areas program.
>
> There is another way we can help, though, and that is by affording direct relief to the parents and students struggling to meet the high cost of a college education. I have long advocated tax relief for this group and have been offering bills on this subject for at least 3 years. Their expenditures are actually investments in our Nation's future, and they should be helped and encouraged by the U.S. Government.

Another point of interest is that on February 4, 1964, an amendment was offered in the U.S. Senate to the Revenue Act of 1964, an amendment providing a tax credit for higher education. In the few minutes remaining before a vote was taken on that measure, Senator Keating rose on the Senate floor and states as follows:

> By now, everyone has had a chance to familiarize himself with the technicalities of our plan—the sliding scale tax credit, the ceiling to prevent windfalls to wealthier taxpayers, the inclusion of fees, books and supplies as well as tuition, and the availability of this credit to anyone who actually pays the bills—so I will not take valuable time, to repeat the details. It is sufficient to state that those of us who have, for years, supported some kind of tax relief for those making this kind of investment in America's future, have agreed that the measure should be enacted now.

And, Mr. Speaker, as it turned out the measure came remarkably close to being enacted, unfortunately losing out only by 3 votes, 48 nays to 45 yeas.

As it sums up, then, Senator Keating has introduced tax credit legislation to the Congress, and he has cosponsored similar legislation—in addition, he has, as evidenced above, taken the floor of the Senate to press for action on a tax credit program to help in meeting the costs of higher education.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is eminently clear that Senator Keating has been a dedicated sponsor of tax-credit-for-higher-education legislation.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CURTIS

Mr. Speaker, as there have been champions of tax-credit-for-higher-education legislation in the Senate, so have there been similar champions here on the House side.

One of the foremost advocates of this type of legislation has been Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri. Mr. CURTIS is a high-ranking minority member of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Congressman CURTIS has introduced numerous bills with respect to tax credits to the House of Representatives, to the current and to previous Congresses.

And interestingly enough, as Congressman CURTIS has introduced his tax credit bills to provide an assist for education, each measure serves as an improvement on the bill introduced before it. Presently Mr. CURTIS has H.R. 1681 before the House of Representatives, this legislation being in a highly refined state and designed to provide the greatest assistance in the areas of the greatest need.

Mr. Speaker, the statement submitted by Congressman CURTIS to the May 24 hearing presents a graphic account of his tax credit legislation; hence, at this point I submit that statement to the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS B. CURTIS

Representative CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the real pinch in the cost of education is at the parent level because parents bear both the basic cost as parents and the supplemental cost as taxpayers. To ease this cost burden somewhat and to aid and encourage education at the post-secondary school level, I introduced a bill, H.R. 3393, earlier this year, which is similar to the measures I have introduced in prior Congresses. As I mentioned in my remarks at the time I introduced H.R. 3393, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 2, page 1849, I chose the mechanism of a sliding scale credit against tax as a means whereby the desirable goal of aiding education would be attained without encountering the major objections to other forms of aid to education.

Today I am introducing a bill which is a refinement of my previous bill. One refinement in the legislation that I am proposing is that a person is entitled to use this credit against tax only when the student is a candidate for a degree, or is taking courses required for the attainment of educational, professional, or vocational objectives. Another refinement offered in this bill is one which allows the taxpayer to take a credit against tax as well as a deduction, if he is entitled to the deduction as a trade or business expense. I feel that with these two added provisions, plus the revision of the technical language, the objectives of my first bill can be more readily attained.

A second section of the bill that I am introducing gives a credit against tax for contributions made to nonprofit institutions of higher learning by either individuals or corporations. There is an upper limit, $100 for an individual and $10,000 for a corporation, to the amount of this credit in any one year. The taxpayer, under this section, is permitted to take a deduction for charitable contributions, as well as the credit provided.

I feel that by adding this section to the bill, a stimulus is provided for increasing contributions to our colleges and universities, which are characteristically in extreme financial straits and having great difficulty in expanding facilities, increasing faculty salaries, and sponsoring more research. This provision, I believe, will alleviate to a considerable extent the plight of those colleges and universities which do not have large endowment funds, or other similar means by which the costs of education are absorbed.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 39—tuition and fees paid to institutions of higher education.

(a) Taxpayer is allowed to take as credit against his final tax the amount of tuition and fees paid by him during the taxable year to one or more college or institution of higher education for himself or for any other individual for whom he can claim an exemption.

(b) (1) Credit for tuition and fees shall be allowed on the following schedule: (a) 100 percent of the first $100; (b) 30 percent of the next $400; (c) 20 percent of the next $1,000.

For example, a parent pays $1,350 in tuition and fees to a college on behalf of his son. Thus the parent would be entitled to a credit of $390 as follows: (a) 100 percent of first $100, $100; (b) 30 percent of next $400, $120; (c) 20 percent of next $850, $170; total, $390.

The maximum credit allowance under this provision would be $420.

(b) (2) Where more than one taxpayer pays the tuition and fees the credit allowance shall be prorated among the taxpayers.

For example, a parent pays $500 and his son pays $1,000 in tuition and fees to a college. The credit allowance would be $420, of which the parent would be entitled to one-third or $140, and the son would be entitled to two-thirds or $280.

NOTE.—the application of this subsection would be very limited inasmuch as each taxpayer must be able to claim an exemption for the individual for whom tuition and fees are paid. In the case cited above, the parent could continue to claim his son as an exemption even though the son is himself a taxpayer provided that the parent contributes more than one-half of his son's support while the son is a student.

(c) (1) defines "tuition" and "fees" as those required for enrollment or attendance or required for courses of instruction at an institution of higher education. It excludes amounts paid for meals, lodgings and other personal, living and family expenses. If the tuition and fees include an amount for meals, lodging, etc., not separately stated, the portion of the amount attributable to meals, lodging, etc., shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(c) (2) defines "institution of higher education" as one which: (1) normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum; (2) normally has a regularly organized student body in attendance where the educational activities are carried on (thereby excluding correspondence schools); (3) offer education at a level above 12th grade; and (4) gifts made to it constitute charitable contributions within the meaning of the code.

(d) (1) If an individual receives a scholarship or fellowship grant (which are not included in gross income) or receives an education and training allowance under the Korean GI bill or War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act, the amount of such grant or allowance is deducted from the amount paid for tuition and fees in determining the credit allowance. Thus, if the amount paid for tuition and fees is $1,500 and the individual receives a grant or allowance of $800, then the credit allowance is based on $700, and not $1,500.

(d) (2) In the case of an individual who is a candidate for a college degree, credit allowance will be given only for tuition and fees paid for courses for which credit is allowed for a college degree. In the case of an individual not a candidate for a degree, credit allowance will be given for tuition and fees paid for courses required for the attainment of an educational, professional, or vocational objective.

For example, a Foreign Service officer, transferred to a new post, may take a limited course of instruction in the language, culture, and history of the country to which he has been assigned, or a lawyer may wish to enroll in several graduate law courses to upgrade and enlarge his legal skills. Under both examples, it is intended that credit for tuition and fees paid would be allowed.

On the other hand, a certified public accountant who enrolls in a course in Shakespeare merely for his own enlightenment and entertainment would not be entitled to a credit for tuition and fees paid, since the course in Shakespeare would not be part of an educational, professional, or vocational objective.

(d) (3) Provides that the credit allowance cannot exceed the amount of tax owed by the taxpayer. If the credit allowance is $420 and the amount the taxpayer owes is $400, then the credit allowance is reduced to $400. Simply a technical amendment to prevent a claim by the taxpayer that the Government owes him $20 or the amount in excess of his tax.

(e) If a taxpayer is entitled to a deduction under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses) for tuition and fees paid, he may continue to claim the deduction and the credit allowance as well. However, the deduction and the credit together cannot exceed the amount actually paid for tuition and fees.

For example, a taxpayer in the 30-percent bracket pays $150 in tuition and fees. He reduces his tax by $45 (30 percent of $150) by way of the deduction and is entitled to $115 as a credit. Since the total amount of the credit and the deduction is $160, the credit is thereby reduced to $105.

(f) Secretary of the Treasury is given authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this provision.

Section 40—Contributions to institutions of higher education.

(a) Provides a credit against his final tax for an individual for the amount of his contributions to one or more institutions of higher education during the tax year.

(b) The credit cannot exceed $100 in the case of an individual or $10,000 in the case of a corporation.

(c) Such credit will apply only if the contribution to or for the use of an institution of higher education is deductible as a charitable contribution. Where the contribution is made not to a college or university but to an agency, foundation, or institution, such contribution may be used only by the agency for the same purposes that a college or university may use its funds.

(d) Definition of "institution of higher education" same as section 39(c) (2).

(e) Same as section 39(d) (3).

(f) Permits taxpayer to continue to take a deduction for charitable contributions as well as the credit provided by this section. In no event shall the deduction and the credit together exceed the actual amount of the contribution. Similar to the example set forth in section 39(e) (2).

(g) Secretary of the Treasury authorized to issue regulations to carry out provisions of this bill.

(h) Technical amendment—renumbering of code sections.

Section 2. Provisions shall apply to taxable years ending after the enactment of this act. If this bill becomes law in September 1963, a taxpayer may take advantage of the credits provided herein in filing his income tax return for the taxable year 1963.

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a tax credit for certain tuition and fees paid by individuals to institutions of higher education and to allow a tax credit for certain contributions made by individuals or corporations to institutions of higher education

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by renumbering section 39 as 41, and by inserting after section 38 the following new sections:

"SEC. 39. TUITION AND FEES PAID TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, an amount (determined under subsection (b)) of the tuition and fees paid by him during the taxable year to one or more institutions of higher education in providing an education above the twelfth grade for himself or for any other individual with respect to whom he is entitled for such year to an exemption under section 151.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) AMOUNT PER INDIVIDUAL.—The credit under subsection (a) for tuition and fees paid in providing an education above the twelfth grade for any individual during the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) 100 percent of so much of such tuition and fees as does not exceed $100,

"(B) 30 percent of so much of such tuition and fees as exceeds $100 but does not exceed $500, and

"(C) 20 percent of so much of such tuition and fees as exceeds $500 but does not exceed $1,500.

"(2) PROBATION OF CREDIT WHERE MORE THAN ONE TAXPAYER PAYS TUITION OR FEES.—If tuition or fees for any individual are paid to one or more institutions of higher education by more than one taxpayer during the taxable year, the credit allowable to each such taxpayer under subsection (a) shall be the same portion of the credit determined under paragraph (1) which the amount of the tuition and fees for such individual paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year is of the total amount of tuition and fees for such individual paid by all taxpayers during the taxable year.

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) TUITION AND FEES.—The term 'tuition and fees' means only—

"(A) tuition and fees required for the enrollment or attendance of a student at a level above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education, and

"(B) fees required for courses of instruction above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education.

Such terms does not include any amount paid, directly or indirectly, for meals, lodging, or similar personal, living, or family expense. In the event an amount paid for tuition or fees includes an amount for meals, lodging, or similar expenses which is not separately stated, the portion of such amount which is attributable to meals, lodging, or similar expenses shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' means only a duly accredited educational institution—

"(A) which normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly organized body of students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are carried on,

"(B) which regularly offers education at a level above the twelfth grade, and

"(C) contributions to or for the use of which constitute charitable contributions within the meaning of section 170(c).

"(d) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS AND VETERANS' BENEFITS.—The amounts otherwise taken into account under subsection (a) as tuition and fees paid for any individual during pay period shall be reduced (before the application of subsection (b)) by any amounts received by such individual during such period as—

"(A) a scholarship or fellowship grant (within meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which under section 117 is not includible in gross income, and

"(B) education and training allowance under chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code or educational assistance allowance under chapter 35 of such title.

"(2) NONCREDIT AND RECREATIONAL, ETC., COURSES.—Amounts paid as tuition or fees for any individual shall be taken into account under subsection (a)—

"(A) in the case of an individual who is a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such tuition or fees are attributable to courses of instruction for which credit is allowed toward a baccalaureate or higher degree, and

"(B) in the case of an individual who is not a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such tuition or fees are attributable to courses of instruction necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"(3) APPLICATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—"The credit allowed by subsection (a) to the taxpayer shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed on the taxpayer for the taxable year by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under this subpart (other than under this section and section 31).

"(e) CORRELATION WITH SECTION 162.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Deduction shall not be denied under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses), for tuition and fees otherwise allowable as a deduction under such section, by reason of the fact that such tuition and fees are taken into account in determining the credit allowable under subsection (a).

"(2) REDUCTION OF CREDIT.—If the amount allowable (but for this paragraph) for any taxable year as a credit under subsection (a) for tuition and fees paid by the taxpayer in providing an education above the twelfth grade for himself, when added to the amount by which the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year is less by reason of the allowance of a deduction under section 162 for such tuition and fees, exceeds the amount of such tuition and fees, then the amount allowable as a credit under subsection (a) shall be reduced by an amount equal to such excess.

"(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"SEC. 40. CONTRIBUTIONS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount (subject to the limitations of subsection (b)) equal to the amount of contributions by the taxpayer, payment of which is made within the taxable year, to or for the use of one or more institutions of higher education.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) INDIVIDUALS, ETC.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, the credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed $100.

"(2) CORPORATIONS.—In the case of a corporation, the credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed $10,000.

"(c) CONTRIBUTIONS TO WHICH APPLICABLE.—Subsection (a) shall apply to a contribution to or for the use of an institution of higher education only if—

"(1) such contribution is a charitable contribution within the meaning of section 170(c), and

"(2) if such contribution is made for the use of an institution of higher education but is not paid to such institution and is not made available to it by the recipient only for the same purposes for which such institution of higher education may expend its funds.

"(d) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning assigned to it by section 39(c)(2).

"(e) APPLICATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) to the taxpayer shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed on the taxpayer for the taxable year by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under this subpart (other than under this section and section 31).

"(f) CORRELATION WITH SECTION 170—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Deductions shall not be denied under section 170 (relating to charitable, etc., contributions and gifts), for contributions to institutions of higher education otherwise allowable as a deduction under such section, by reason of the fact that such contributions are taken into account in determining the credit allowable under subsection (a).

"(2) REDUCTION OF CREDIT.—If the amount allowable (but for this paragraph) for any taxable year as a credit under subsection (a) for contributions to institutions of higher education, when added to the amount by which the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year is less by reason of the allowance of a deduction under section 170 for such contributions, exceeds the amount of such contributions, then the amount allowable as a credit under subsection (a) shall be reduced by an amount equal to such excess.

"(g) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(h) The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Section 39. Tuition and fees paid to institutions of higher education.

"Section 40. Contributions to institutions of higher education.

"Section 41. Overpayments of tax."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, the House Republican task force on education has, as Chairman QUIE of the task force revealed yesterday, effected a broad circulation of inquiries on the matter of tax credits with educators and persons interested in higher education.

The replies to these inquiries have been in a ratio of 7 to 2 in favor of tax credits as an approach to assisting the student taxpayer and his parents in meeting the increasing costs of higher education. And because these letters represent some interesting viewpoints on this highly interesting proposition of tax credits, I would, at this point, like to introduce to the RECORD nine of these responses, 7 for and 2 against:

SEFTON ASSOCIATES INC.,
Grand Rapids, Mich., May 20, 1965.

The Honorable ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress,
First District of Minnesota.

CONGRESSMAN QUIE: Thank you for your letter of May 17 and the opportunity to express my thoughts on tax credits for higher education.

This approach would permit maximum flexibility for parents in determining the college or university the student should attend. It would also reward those private schools which maintain attractive standards and would minimize the competitive advantages currently enjoyed by State supported schools. The net effect should be an eventual saving for the taxpayers through greater efficiency and effectiveness on the part of all institutions of higher education.

The same impartial principle could well be applied to elementary and high schools, of course. With the same salutary effects.

The total educational process is of vital importance to our country. The use of tax credits at all levels would encourage perpetuation of private and parochial grade and high schools which often operate at considerably less cost-per-student than public schools in the same community, yet maintain equal or higher standards.

Our economy is based and built on competition. Competition for tax credited students between public and private schools at any level is both logical and desirable in a free enterprise system.

Sincerely,

G. William Sefton.

Lafayette College,
Easton, Pa., May 21, 1965.

The Honorable Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: In response to your letter of May 17 I am glad to say that I am in favor of legislation which might allow tax credits for the costs of higher education.

Tax credit for selected causes does occur. Certainly the costs of higher education justify consideration of the possibility of lightening the burden for those who can undertake such costs only at personal sacrifice. The society in which we live is after all a prime beneficiary of the investment made by individuals in higher education.

Also, under present condition, one has to take into account the importance tax credits might have in helping to keep alive and further institutions of higher education supported primarily by private funds. I believe that tax credits may significantly help to maintain the variety and the healthful competition which have characterized American higher education.

Sincerely yours,

K. Roald Bergethon.

The Baldwin State Bank,
Baldwin City, Kans., May 20, 1965.

Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: In reference to your letter of May 17, as I have indicated my thinking on a previous report I am very much in favor of the proposed tax credit as a means of helping to offset the increasing costs of higher education.

I was very much in favor of the credit on the graduating basis which will also help offset the cost of tuition in the nontax supported schools.

I am much in favor of the tax credit for higher education but would like to express my feeling about the Government, on the Federal level entering into aids to education in school systems through the first 12 grades. I feel that this latter should be left up to the local and State organizations.

Yours very truly,

Donald O. Nutt,
Executive Vice President.

Roosevelt University,
Chicago, Ill., May 20, 1965.

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives.

Dear Congressman Quie: In my opinion, the tax credit approach to financing the college education of children would be a definite aid to the private college and university as well as benefiting the parent.

There are, of course, many alternative ways of providing funds to help parents put their children through college. In addition, of course, the youngster can be asked to assume some form of long-term debt.

I favor the tax credit approach because it permits the parent the privilege of choosing either a State supported institution or a private institution.

This in turn will mean that taxpayers in general will not have to pay the millions of dollars needed to build or expand State universities and colleges while underutilizing private college facilities.

There are numerous other benefits I'm sure—but this short note gives one aspect of the benefits of the tax credit approach.

Sincerely yours,

Edward S. Gordon,
Associate Dean.

Ohio Wesleyan University,
Delaware, Ohio, May 20, 1965.

The Honorable Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Quie: In response to your letter of May 17, I would like to state that I do favor a concept of tax credits for higher education.

Although I may not be familiar with all of the implications, I do feel that this assistance would give a substantial relief to parents who are forced to pay the currently high costs of higher education and that it would encourage contributions from others to support the higher education.

It seems to me that this might be an effective way to give Federal support to education without invoking the dangers of control or imperiling the basic concept of the separation of church and state.

Sincerely yours,

Elden T. Smith,
President.

Mount Aloysius Junior College,
Cresson, Pa., May 20, 1965.

Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: Thank you for your notice pertaining to the proposed legislation concerning aid to offset the increasing cost of higher education via the tax credit approach.

I am indeed in favor of such an arrangement and hope that it will become available soon. Such legislation is highly appropriate in this area which lies in a low economic stratum.

With every good wish for the success of the work there, I am

Very sincerely yours,

Sister Mary de Sales, R.S.M.

Kenyon College,
Gambier, Ohio, May 20, 1965.

The Honorable Albert H. Quie,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: Yes, you may certainly list me as a long-time supporter favoring tax credits for the expense of attending colleges. I shall not attempt to "brief" the case here; but I am convinced first, that tax credits represent the most effective equalization of support as between publicly supported institutions and private colleges; second, that each and every so called "private" institution serves the public no less vitally than a "public" institution; and last, that we have a vital and compelling need to preserve a balance between both private and public universities and colleges. Toward this end, I see no more fundamental approach than that of tax credit.

I wish that I could attend the hearing on May 24; but the short notice prevents this.

Sincerely,

F. Edward Lund.

New York, N.Y., *May 21, 1965.*

Mr. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: Absence from the city has prevented me from making a more prompt reply to your inquiry of May 17 asking for my views on possible legislation authorizing tax credits for higher education. I trust that this reply will reach you in time to be of some use in your prospective hearings on May 24.

May I first attest to my interest in the promotion of higher education. I am a trustee and a member of the finance committee of a small independent college, and a member of advisory councils to three major universities. I am a former college teacher. For the last 25 years, I have also been an avid recruiter of the products of our colleges—first for Federal Government service, and later for business. I am, therefore, extremely interested that the products of our colleges and universities shall be of high quality and that no one who has a capacity and interest to become a highly qualified college graduate should be denied the opportunity by reason of his economic circumstances.

At the same time, I do entertain very great reservations about such proposals as have come to my attention for adding a tax credit to our income tax laws. There may be many variations, but the one with which I am most familiar is the so-called Ribicoff tax credit bill. I am opposed to the principles embodied in that bill for three principal reasons:

1. It would be unwise tax policy to enact any such credit.
2. In the proposed form it would be unfair and unacceptable in any event since it in effect would steepen the tax progression through diminution (even complete elimination) of the credit because of income size.
3. It would give little relief to those unable financially to provide college training.

Very truly yours,

Leroy D. Stinebower.

The Ohio State University,
Columbus, Ohio, May 19, 1965.

The Honorable Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Quie: In responding to your letter of May 17, 1965, let me say that almost all of us in higher education would agree with your conviction that individuals ought to be able to obtain advanced education without excessive financial sacrifice. Additionally, I believe you would get strong consensus in support of your position to the effect that such a goal should be attained without in any way weakening our excellent system of higher education. Suggested ways to accomplish this end have been introduced from time to time in testimony provided by representatives of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Briefly stated, my own personal point of view can be summarized about as follows: I believe there is considerable public misunderstanding of the tax credit approach. With anything more than a cursory study of the tax credit plan one sees rather easily, I think, that this bill will provide almost no help for those who need it most. Let me illustrate:

A taxi driver who is attempting desperately to provide his four children with educational advantages that he was never able to enjoy would find no relief in this measure. Simple arithmetic reveals that with his large family he pays little or no Federal taxes and, therefore, cannot benefit from a tax credit. On the other hand a family with an income of $35,000 annually could receive up to about $225 in tax credit, but such a family is in that group that needs the least help.

There is an equally dangerous but more subtle aspect of the tax credit proposal. Proponents of the bill, as I understand it, have inferred that institutions also will benefit through opportunities to raise tuitions. If this action does occur, and it no doubt will if the bill is passed, the tax credit plan would fail not only to aid students from low-income families, it would actually add to their burdens in seeking higher education. If my conclusion is correct, then the enactment of a tax credit plan would not be in harmony with the goal you set forth in your letter of May 17, 1965.

For your benefit I am attaching a brochure that has been prepared by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. From my personal point of view this brochure sets forth in succinct language what I believe to be the essence of the tax credit route.

Finally, I doubt seriously if an investment of $1 3/10 billion annually in aid to higher education can produce the best results through a tax credit approach.

I have every confidence that our Congress, in its deliberations as to the best methods to assist higher education, will find a way to broaden opportunities for able young people to go to college, rather than merely settling on a plan that will provide subsidy to those already fortunate enough to attend college without such assistance.

I appreciate very much receiving your letter of May 17 and, while my views that have been set forth above may not square with the kinds of information you are seeking, I know you would want me to express my personal convictions, my professional commitments, and my honest opinion on a matter as critical as this one is.

Very sincerely yours,
NOVICE G. FAWCETT,
President, the Ohio State University.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to commend the gentleman from New York on the good work he is doing on the Republican task force on education. I am very pleased that you would take the time from your duties to serve on this subcommittee. I have seen not only the tremendous interest but the insight you have on educational problems. It has been a great help to us to have you working on these problems in the field of education and working toward a solution in an effort to meet the problems that confront us throughout the country. Not only those of us on the Republican side, but all of the Members of Congress and the country at large can be happy that the gentleman from New York is working with us in this effort to try to solve these problems.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, although I cannot say that I agree with all the philosophical implications of the statement which the gentleman from New York has made, nevertheless I do want to say a word of welcome to him as he completes his maiden speech to the House.

The gentleman and I were classmates at Dartmouth as members of the class of 1933 and we have maintained a friendship over the years since our graduation. We also had one other experience in common. We both at different times for a goodly span of years held the post of secretary of our college class.

I therefore welcome him as an old friend and hope that he will find happiness and satisfaction in his service in the House of Representatives.

SOME ANSWERS TO SECOND-GUESSERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of June 1 carried a column by Eric Sevareid which comes as a fresh breeze of reality and truth at a time when there is much confusion, misunderstanding, and lack of clear thinking with regard to President Johnson's policy in the crisis of the Dominican Republic.

The title of that column is "Some Answers to Second-Guessers." Mr. Sevareid points out that second guessing on any issue is one thing, but having the responsibility to act in a crisis is still another thing. I commend a reading of this column to those who believe it is time that we discard self-conscious ideas about what others think of the United States and concentrate on ideas and actions required to preserve democratic government. By leave obtained, I include the column on "Some Answers to Second-Guessers":

SOME ANSWERS TO SECOND-GUESSERS

(By Eric Sevareid)

SANTO DOMINGO.—The tide of second guessing about the American intervention in Santo Domingo—as to its justification, its size, its methods and its aims—had reached oceanic proportions by the time this writer managed to get to the first European city established in the New World. Here in what Columbus called "the land of God," had come the first teachers and preachers, yet here remains, after five centuries, one of the political hellholes of the hemisphere, its soiled streets once again thronged with armed men from abroad.

The scenes of bitter sorrow in Santo Domingo have been well described; there are other things, perhaps, worth putting down at this late date. I thought I had rarely seen such brave work by combat reporters, rarely such emotional involvement on the part of some of them, rarely such a wealth of unconfirmable reports and rumors, rarely such a disastrous lack of contact between reports and American officials who were not only physically remote but for a long time silenced by Presidential orders. And rarely have I read such certain conclusions in American press editorials about a phenomenon in which so much was uncertain and inconclusive.

For me it is impossible to believe that the Communist threat was a myth, impossible to believe that a democratic and stable Government could have been formed by the impassioned leaders of thousands of armed and impassioned people, a vast number of them youngsters. It is hard for me to believe that we could not have prevented the tragic fighting in the northern part of the city, easy to believe that we did prevent an even more awful bloodletting in the congested downtown region.

I cannot understand the cry that we put in far too many men. An airport, several miles of corridor and a safety sector with a long perimeter require thousands of soldiers who require other thousands to support and supply them. Nor can I understand the complaint that the President acted with too much haste.

Over many years I have been adjusted to the complaint of too late with too little. I find it hard to make a quick switch to the complaint of too soon with too much. I fail to understand the editorialist who points out with disdain that after all, there were only a few handfuls of Communists present.

In a very real sense their lack of numbers is their strength. It was because they were few that President Bosch had not bothered to deal severely with them. It was because they were few that they could do much of their work undetected. It was because they were few that they could act with rapidity when the explosion came. It was because they were few that foreign opinion makers could make the Americans seem ridiculous and give us a propaganda defeat. As John Bartlow Martin reminds us, Communists do not make revolutions, they take them over.

Partly because of this—their small numbers—American troops could not invade the heart of the city, or allow anyone else to invade it.

You cannot risk causing many deaths in order to capture a few individuals and expect, ever, to justify such an action to anybody, certainly not to the American people. So, at this writing at least, the Dominican Communists remain, finding safety as they first found strength, in their numbers—their small numbers.

And their small number in various other Latin American countries lies near the heart of the profound dilemma that confronts the United States for the future. Revolts are brewing in other nations to the south. In all these revolts Communist elements will be present. Are we to put down every uprising because a Communist threat is present? Obviously we cannot, even though some of these uprisings probably will produce Communist governments. This is why Castro laughs in his beard. He believes the political metamorphosis of Latin America is not manageable on our terms.

But nothing in this realm of human action is inevitable; the game is not lost as long as we act on the assumption that it can be won. There are Latin societies strong enough to handle the Communists on their own. Others will be galvanized into counteraction by Communist victories or near victories close by their borders.

Meantime the nonsense arguments should stop. To say that the United States has kept the Dominican Republic from enjoying a free, stable democratic government is nonsense; we have given them another chance to find their feet on the long, hard road to democracy. To say that the real fear in Latin America is of American gunboat diplomacy is nonsense; every literate Latin American knows that American interventions have always been temporary while communism is permanent.

It is nonsense to indulge any longer the self-conscious idea that Latin America's troubles are the fault of the United States. Some are; most are the fault of Latin America. Its ways of life are superior to ours in more than a few respects, but not in respect to the art of government. In the last century and a half there have been in all of Latin America approximately 3,700 coups, rebellions, and civil wars.

HELP AMERICA BY HELPING AMERICANS GET A BETTER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it has been for me a real privilege to serve as a member of the House Republican task force on education.

I have long been interested in education, and year after year, I have studied various plans and programs that have been presented to the Congress, so that more and more I have come to the conclusion that if we really want a Great Society and to banish crime and poverty, there is really only one long-range solution to cure these domestic problems of our time, and that is education.

However, it has seemed that most legislation proposed has been directed toward improved facilities and the needs of education itself, and less or too little toward helping worthy students and parents so an education is possible. By this I mean that outside of loans and grants to students, it has seemed to me that too little consideration has been given, in the face of ever-increasing tuition and fees of institutions of higher learning, to the individual who should go to college. Certainly, it is in the national interest to assist the student taxpayers and their parents in meeting these increasing costs so that working students and their parents are able to afford the education.

Speaking of increasing costs, Mr. Speaker, in my own State of Washington, for example, it is conceded by educational organizations that—thanks to a new Governor—our State legislature earlier this year provided what was considered to be reasonably adequate appropriations for public education, including a provision for needed increases in teachers' salaries. However, the board of regents of the University of Washington, in the face of greatly expanded need, has been forced to raise yearly tuition from $300 to $345 and it is expected that Washington State University will follow suit. This is the same pattern of other similar institutions, and I understand that a sampling of 50 well-known private colleges and universities, due to ever-escalating costs, indicates an average increase in tuition from $250 per year in 1930 to $1,200 a year as of 1964.

Furthermore, as Representative ALBERT QUIE, chairman of the House Republican task force, recently pointed out, it is estimated that tuition will rise by another 50 percent in both private and public educational institutions over the next 10 years.

In this connection, certainly Congress has an obligation, in the interest of the general welfare, to keep the doors of learning open and available to qualified students of low-income families.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard many friends and older persons of my generation say that they worked their way through college, and they do not see why young people today cannot do the same. Well, of course, many students are able to work their way through college today, but what we forget is that when many of us were of college age, income tax rates were lower and tax exemptions and deductions were much larger than they are today. I refer to the period before World War II. The fact is that approximately 30 percent of the top quarter of high school students today do not enter college, and it has been determined that this failure to go on to institutions of higher education is closely related to economic problems of the family.

In the days when technical training was not so important, when there was less need of engineers, of doctors and dentists and technicians, and so forth, a college education was of concern to only a small percentage of the Nation's families. Today, on the other hand, in this jet-space-nuclear age, not only is an educational background a necessity to an individual in order to qualify for most jobs, but the country's needs for greater skills and talents have increased to the point where enrollment in colleges must be made more accessible. Meanwhile, let us not forget that it is the parents of most students who must carry the financial burden of the student.

At one time in the past, there was a natural reluctance in providing assistance to taxpaying families on account of the cost of education; it could have amounted in many cases to helping some wealthy people who might not need a tax credit. But times have changed. No longer is it a situation where the wealthy go to Ivy League universities while ordinary folks send their children to State and public supported and once more-or-less free institutions, where low-income families could afford it. Actually, very few families today have the means to send their children to college, as shown by a Ford Foundation study of 2 years ago. This study showed that 60 percent of American parents have no savings and the other 40 percent have an average of only $150 put away for college costs.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican task force on education has gathered much in the way of statistics and valuable material of one kind or another as to programs and proposals looking toward meeting the educational needs of America. Opinions differ, but as for myself, after studying this subject, I have concluded that legislation to provide tax credits for a portion of a student's costs of higher education is highly desirable, and likewise, I would favor allowing a tax credit to corporations for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education, to encourage gifts for educational institutions.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am today joining many of my colleagues of the House who have sponsored various measures to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow an income tax credit both for costs of tuition and likewise for educational contributions.

Right now, Congress is considering repealing excise taxes to make it easier for the citizen to buy things, including luxuries and entertainment—and I am for such tax relief. However, I think the national interest would be equally or even better served if Congress lightened the burden and made it easier for a citizen to buy an education.

I am hopeful that my party—the Republican Party—even though at the moment, in this House, its influence is not so great, can persuade the Democratic leadership in Congress that tax relief to college students and parents should be given priority by Congress.

Let us help America by helping Americans get a better education.

PROGRESS REPORT ON CURRENT GATT TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently returned from the sixth round of trade negotiations taking place under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—at Geneva. I attended these negotiations, and I make this report to you today, in exercise of my responsibility as a congressional member of the U.S. delegation for trade negotiations.

The role of congressional delegate, which I share with my colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman CECIL KING, and with Senators JOHN WILLIAMS and TALMADGE and their alternates, Senators CARLSON and RIBICOFF, holds a special obligation and responsibility to the Congress and the Nation. Appointed under the authority of section 243 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, our duty is to participate fully in a policymaking capacity as accredited members of the official U.S. delegation to the trade negotiations throughout the duration of the Trade Expansion Act. Appointment of congressional delegates was one of the major procedural reforms of the Trade Act, ranking with the establishment of the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

I might begin with the comment that the Kennedy round faces an uncertain future. Begun in a spirit of high optimism, it was intended to bring an unprecedented cut in tariff and nontariff barriers to world trade in both agricultural and industrial products. But progress has been very slow, even tortuous. Three years after the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act and 1 year after the formal opening of the sixth round on May 4, 1964, the meaningful achievements of the Kennedy round are few.

Yet there are now signs that, given judicious and tough bargaining, U.S. negotiators can bring a successful conclusion to the present round.

I would like to report my findings and thoughts on several important aspects of the negotiations, then to express my views on the direction of the U.S. program to increase and free up international trade, and on future intermediate trade goals which may be appropriate for the United States.

AGRICULTURE

From the beginning of the current trade negotiations agriculture has had a key role. The United States has insisted that acceptable access for U.S. agricultural products in European markets must accompany reduction of tariffs on industrial products.

Our specific goals are now very general. At the start of the current trade negotiation effort the United States had hoped to achieve a 50-percent reduction in barriers to agricultural trade, concurrent with our effort to achieve 50-percent reduction in barriers to trade in industrial products.

Clearly this early goal has been abandoned. But even so, after a long period of great pessimism, I believe there is now ground for hope that we can achieve modest freeing of agricultural trade.

Until very recently progress in agriculture negotiations has consistently been delayed by the European Economic Community's inability to agree on a common agriculture policy, especially in grains. In part EEC difficulty in reaching agreement reflects very deep internal conflicts among the six EEC member nations—conflicts which, we have well learned, are strongly reflected in the current GATT negotiations. And in part EEC resistance to lowering barriers to imports results from the desire to use trade barriers to create cohesiveness among the members of the EEC "club."

A TABLING SCHEDULE FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

But on Monday, May 17, the EEC after months of delay submitted its grains offers to examination by the participants in the GATT Cereals Group. Grains tabling constitutes only the opening move in the agriculture negotiations—it allows GATT participants to take the initial step in the actual bargaining on grains. Nonetheless it is of immense significance. It gives us reason to hope that the EEC will meet the September 16 deadline for tabling offers on all remaining agricultural items.

With regard to these remaining agricultural items, discussions were begun in Geneva on May 3 in order to identify the relevant elements of support or protection which could enter into the negotiation beginning September 16 and to exploring the views of the participating countries regarding the type and content of offers required to achieve the objectives of the Kennedy round.

The schedule of these exploratory discussions during the next several months follows:

May 10–13, Committee on Agriculture, rice and cereal preparations.

May 14, Committee on Agriculture, beverages.

May 17–21, Group on Dairy Products.

May 24–28, Group on Meat.

May 31 to June 4, Committee on Agriculture, live animals, meat, and eggs.

June 8–9, Committee on Agriculture, tobacco.

June 10–11, Committee on Agriculture, sugar.

June 14–18, Committee on Agriculture, fats and oils.

June 21–25, Committee on Agriculture, vegetables and fruits.

June 28–29, Committee on Agriculture, live trees and plants, bulbs, and so forth.

June 30 to July 2, Committee on Agriculture, miscellaneous preparations and residues.

July 5–9, Committee on Agriculture, other products.

The beginning of actual negotiations on agriculture items is important because of the U.S. insistence that agricultural and industrial negotiations proceed together—that without agricultural concessions there can be no industrial concessions. A number of participating countries, including many less developed countries, can only participate fully in the negotiations when the agricultural negotiations are finally in process. And the United States has had to consider carefully how far to allow industrial negotiations to proceed ahead of progress in agricultural negotiations. These considerations have slowed the progress of the overall negotiations.

Unfortunately tabling dates and schedules do not themselves result in successful negotiations. The EEC grains offers are very general in nature—the detailed examination of all participants' grains offers will begin on June 10. Only then can we begin to see what the negotiations may bring.

In the grains and other commodity negotiations the EEC may well attempt to negotiate on the basis of a principle it has previously proposed—the so-called "montant de soutien"—roughly, "margin of support". The "montant de soutien" proposal would, essentially, freeze the amount of the difference between the domestic support price—or "reference" price—and the minimum import price. This would amount only to an EEC guarantee that the import price—against which foreigners have to compete—would move up—or down—only when the domestic support price fluctuated. It would not provide for a freeing of trade by reduction of present import price levels. Thus the "montant de soutien" concept has been rejected by the United States and most other major negotiating countries.

In the disagreement over the "montant de soutien" and in face of inability to agree on any generalized bargaining terms, or "ground rules," agricultural bargaining will go forward on a "pragmatic" basis. That is, discussions and negotiations will take place commodity by commodity. In the commodity negotiations and notably in the impending grains discussions the "montant de soutien" will almost surely again raise its ugly head.

I will not predict whether we can substantially achieve our goal of acceptable conditions of access to world markets for agricultural products in furtherance of a significant development and expansion of world trade in such products. It is a worthwhile goal and we must continue to fight for it, but certainly any hope for a 50-percent cut in the various types of protection of agriculture is now unrealistic. I can only say that I hope by linking industrial bargaining to agricultural bargaining we can achieve a significant freeing of trade in both. For the only real incentive for the EEC to lower agriculture trade barriers is substantial industrial and reciprocal nontariff barrier concessions from the United States. The EEC has little interest in agricultural concessions from the United States.

Mr. Eric Wyndham-White, the Director of GATT and a man whose abilities I respect very highly, said during his recent visit to the United States that:

> The final settlement of international trade and agricultural policy is a long-term objective, that while results in terms of maintaining trade channels and trade opportunities in the immediate future must be achieved in the Kennedy round, the evolution of an acceptable viable international agricultural and food policy is something which will have to be worked out very patiently over the years. We musn't expect that one can solve all these very deep-seated problems in one go-around, in a single negotiation.

I think this statement which has been widely misquoted provides good perspective for current negotiating efforts in agricultural products. We earnestly hope that the Kennedy round will ease, or free, access to European agricultural markets. But to solve the much larger problems of the coordination of national agricultural policies—in the context of the vastly increasing world demand for food—will require years.

Furthermore, it is in the agriculture sector that other than tariff trade barriers have always been prominent. The mere decision to attempt to grapple with the various subsidy, state trading, license and quota, and embargo programs in agriculture is a great step forward.

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS

Last November 16 the major nations participating in the Kennedy round tabled their exceptions lists—lists of industrial products that they will exclude from tariff cuts. The U.S. exceptions list was the result of several years' inquiry. Businessmen with whom I have talked have indicated their views have been given full consideration by the Trade Information Committee, the section of the Office of the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations charged with obtaining such information, and another great innovation in the Trade Expansion Act of 1963. Throughout, the United States attempted to limit to the greatest possible extent the size of its exceptions list. Its good faith in doing so may indeed have resulted in a bargaining disadvantage. However, by insisting upon a full justification of the large exception list of the EEC the bargaining equilibrium may be reestablished.

EXCEPTIONS LISTS—AN INNOVATION

I would like to point out that the "exceptions list" is a phenomenon peculiar to the Kennedy round, and one of its most helpful innovations. In previous trade negotiations participants made selective offers. It was possible then for a participant to exclude from negotiation any item in its tariff schedule it might choose. For the United States, this negotiating procedure partly resulted in permanently withholding many items from negotiation. There have been no cuts on at least 400 items in the U.S. schedules. And it is estimated that fully 900, out of a total of about 6,000, items in the U.S. tariff schedules have duties of at least 30 percent, compared to a very few similarities in the EEC schedules—though median U.S. and EEC tariff levels are fairly comparable. To put this in full context it should be pointed out that 40 percent of U.S. imports are duty free, according to statistics compiled in 1961.

THE DISPARITY ISSUE

The existence of a number of relatively high U.S. rates provided the grounds on which the EEC introduced, in 1963, the concept of "disparities." An issue of great complexity, never resolved, it bears on two very important current problems—the size of the EEC exceptions list and the ECC's real intentions in the negotiations. The point is that a 50-percent cut on a high-tariff rate, 50 to 25 percent, for example, is not an equitable concession to a 50-percent cut on a low-tariff rate, 12 to 6 percent, for example. Actually an allowed claim for disparity adjustment would not affect the United States as much as it would third countries, and the United States has resisted the EEC move for disparity consideration primarily on behalf of third countries. This is so because on many of the high-tariff rates of the United States which might be subject to disparity consideration there is little trading or prospect of trading, but on possible EEC disparity items there is considerable prospects of trading, particularly on the part of "the Outer Seven."

In May 1963 the EEC proposed that on certain items on which the U.S. tariff was by a certain amount higher than the EEC tariff on a corresponding item, a rule of "disparity" could be invoked. In general terms, when a "disparity" was claimed, the tariff cut on that particular item would be calculated in a special way. The disparities concept, if applied, would seriously inhibit the 50-percent across-the-board-cut ideal.

Throughout the yearlong debate on the disparities issue the United States maintained the EEC's arguments in favor of the disparities concept lacked substance. The disparities rule, if applied broadly enough, would significantly reduce the number of items on which the EEC would be required to make reciprocal tariff reductions. It would also introduce into the industrial negotiations a number of very complex issues. Perhaps the most important of these is the effect of the proposed EEC disparity rule on "third" countries. The Swiss Federal Councillor last May in Geneva described the third country problem rather movingly:

> Is there indeed any economic sense, or any commonsense, in a regulation whose consistent application would mean that because of arithmetic differences between the tariff rates of two participants, vital exports of "innocent" third countries to the country claiming the disparity should not profit by the full tariff reduction? How do you explain, economically speaking, the invocation of disparities when the low-tariff country imports very little or nothing at all from the high-tariff country responsible for the disparity?

The United States has been strongly supported in its effort to define and restrict the application of the proposed disparities rule by the other major negotiating countries, namely the seven European free trade area countries, Japan, and Canada. This solid opposition front may have induced the EEC to allow the disparities issue to lapse—in any event, it has been little discussed since May 1964.

Meanwhile, the major participants have tabled their exceptions list. The EEC's exceptions list is discouragingly large. It applies, for example, to fully 80 percent of the exports of Norway. This means that if the EEC list is left unchanged, Norway could get no cuts from the EEC on fully 80 percent of Norway's exports.

The EEC list includes not only items that will be completely excluded from negotiation, but items that will be both partially and conditionally excluded. Thus a major difficulty in evaluating the real impact of the EEC list in trade and bargaining terms is not knowing the exact extent to which an item will be "partially" exempted, and the exact conditions on which the EEC will negotiate its "conditional" exemptions.

The United States hopes to try to bring the EEC to reduce its exceptions list by the greatest extent possible. But if we successfully pressure the EEC to substantially reduce its list it is conceivable that the EEC, in order to protect certain categories of products, may once again claim that a disparities rule be applied.

And let me point out that a policy basis exists for reopening the disparities question. The GATT ministerial resolution of May 1963, which established policy guidelines for the round, stated that:

> In those cases where there are significant disparities in tariff levels, the tariff reductions will be based upon special rules of general and automatic application.

Everything possible must be done to avoid one again entering the debate on disparities. U.S. negotiators were unable to reach agreement with the EEC after a year of constant discussion. I do not doubt that months of technical discussions would be required to find an acceptable solution. If the EEC were to introduce disparities at a critical and late point in the negotiations, the success of the round could be severely jeopardized. And were this to occur, the EEC would in fact demonstrate finally its intention that this great trade expansion effort should not realize its full potential.

I do not mean that the United States should discontinue its effort to reduce the size of the EEC exceptions list simply for fear that the EEC will retaliate by again introducing disparities. Rather, the United States must be prepared to meet the disparities argument with very firm, very carefully substantiated opposition that will convince the EEC to retreat or to restrict sharply its disparities proposal.

In preparing its case to support its concept of the "special rules of general and automatic application" to apply to cases of disparity, the United States should insist that all disparities be "significant," and that a disparities claim not rest on a mere arithmetical difference between United States and foreign duties. U.S. negotiators should insist on several minimal criteria to determine "significance." Disparities should not be "significant" when the foreign country imposes quantitative restrictions on the total volume of imports; when the country with the higher tariff manufactures the commodity; when the country with the higher duty imports a large volume of the commodity. Further, disparities should be limited to the smallest possible number of items, and should apply only to items on the tariff schedules of the United States, United Kingdom, and EEC. Most important, the United States should require the EEC to prove each of its disparities claims case by case according to whatever "special rules" of application might finally be evolved.

The case is well made that the EEC is aware that it will have to give way to the demands for tariff reduction of other traditional trade partners, such as Austria, and that these reductions will be extended to the United States as required by GATT rules. Seen in this light, EEC violations of the original ground rules of the negotiations by the disparities proposition and their excessive and ill-defined exceptions list are intended to exact from the United States the maximum possible access to U.S. markets for each of its own concessions.

I want to add, for the sake of perspective, that the size of the EEC exceptions list and the lingering problem of disparities have in my opinion somewhat obscured public recognition of the actual achievement represented by the tabling of the exceptions lists. The offers tabled on the 50-percent cut basis are the largest, most significant ever made in trade negotiations at Geneva. Nonetheless much tedious bargaining will be required to successfully achieve substantial cuts across the board.

NONTARIFF TRADE BARRIERS

Trade practices of governments other than tariffs, whose effect is to restrict international trade, have become widely recognized as important hindrances to trade. These nontariff trade barriers have for the first time been included in GATT negotiations during the current round.

In July 1964 GATT working groups were set up to study six areas: customs valuation, including the American selling price and wine-gallon systems, and the assessment of U.S. duties on the f.o.b. as opposed to c.i.f. basis; regulations on imports, government buying practices; quantitative restrictions, including coal quotas; internal taxation, including road and taxes and "border" taxes; and antidumping measures.

These working groups have been inactive. The group on antidumping has not been constituted and the others have not met since last July. Yet the U.S. bargaining strategy, emphasizing the necessity for duality of negotiation on agricultural and industrial products, officially treats nontariff barriers as coequal with agricultural and industrial negotiations.

Ideally, when concrete bargaining begins in earnest on a wide range of industrial and agricultural items, we should also be prepared to turn the problems in the nontariff barriers area to our best advantage. I doubt that we will be prepared to do so by the time concrete bargaining begins, hopefully next fall and winter. I hope that we can be.

Whether the United States has the authority to negotiate some of its nontariff barriers in the GATT context and under the authority of the Kennedy round which have been particularly pointed up by other countries, has been seriously questioned. Europeans, among them GATT Secretariat officials, maintain that all nontariff trade barriers must be open to discussion and negotiation. Yet American selling price and antidumping laws were enacted long before the existence of GATT, and therefore are not subject to GATT regulations.

AMERICAN SELLING PRICE

The American selling price—ASP—method of customs evaluation has received great attention in the nontariff barriers context. Europeans particularly have emphasized an alleged trade restrictive effect of ASP.

The economic validity of ASP as a protective device is in my judgment questionable. The main criticism directed against it is that it is uncertain and difficult to determine. I think it would be a wise course to compute the equivalent foreign market sale price and set the tariff rate to equal the amount of actual duty paid based upon ASP. However, this would require congressional action and is not within the powers of the Kennedy round negotiators.

However, the American selling price system applies only to about 4 percent of U.S. imports of foreign chemical products. Its actual effect is therefore rather small and it seems to be fundamentally a talking point on the part of countries which have a variety of nontariff barriers which are presently in violation of the GATT and therefore subject to consideration in the present negotiations on reducing tariff rates. The possibility of trading ASP for a large reciprocal advantage from European negotiators is nevertheless highly tempting. And the United States can be criticized for allowing ASP—essentially a matter beyond the purview both of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the Trade Expansion Act of 1962—to assume such an important place in the negotiations. It is an issue blown far out of proportion to its true size.

ANTIDUMPING: NEED FOR AN INTERNATIONAL SOLUTION

Several other of the limited U.S. nontariff trade barriers which other countries are seeking to point up deserve brief comment. Antidumping in particular periodically becomes an important subject, one which should be resolved as soon as possible. There has been a recent trend among European and other important trading nations to enact antidumping statutes. As tariff barriers go down antidumping measures may be resorted to by other countries to protect selected domestic industries from international competition. An international agreement defining some of the key concepts of antidumping, such as "injury," and specifying permissible methods to combat harmful dumping, is timely and necessary. I have recently remarked on this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 1, 1965, page 12075.

The United States is an offender in this field because of what are described as its frequent and lengthy antidumping claims procedures. The United States could gain much by leading in reaching an understanding with other major trading nations which might liberalize all antidumping procedures, including the United States and would effectively prevent dumping, which is universally recognized as being economically undesirable. This would prevent national antidumping procedures from becoming really substantial world trade barriers.

Certainly the answer to what has become an international problem does not lie in further elaboration of restrictive U.S. procedures by legislation whose effect almost surely will be to make our already strict procedures more burdensome still.

GOVERNMENT BUYING REGULATIONS

Government buying procedures is another nontariff trade barrier which has recently brought attention. Europeans have long objected that well-publicized U.S. Government buying regulations are a hindrance to trade. U.S. representatives have countered that European regulations are stricter than those of the United States, but because they are largely administrative regulations and thus are not publicized, their nature and actual impact cannot accurately be determined.

A recent study presented to this body by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] has shown that many important foreign trading countries have stricter buying policies than our own. This knowledge has caused Mr. SAYLOR and others to advocate that the U.S. Government respond not by using this evidence to induce our trade partners to liberalize their buying practices, as one might expect. Rather they wish to use this new evidence to justify more restrictive U.S. practices.

I think we should shun the temptation to tighten U.S. buying practices. To the greatest extent feasible we should encourage not discourage the U.S. Government procurement personnel to buy from the cheapest quality suppliers—and thus to get the most for the dollar of expenditure.

On balance the United States has not been swift enough to turn the GATT discussions in the nontariff barrier field to its advantage. Extended research on the problem of European border, or "frontier," taxes on U.S. exports is needed, but there can be no doubt that these practices are very substantial trade barriers and that in this matter European nations are vulnerable. Our new knowledge of European government buying practices should strengthen U.S. efforts to liberalize them. We should take a fresh position on the question of antidumping. In short, the United States should take more vigorous initiatives to remove foreign nontariff trade barriers which are so much more extensive and greater than ours instead of being defensively pressed to remove those barriers we ourselves maintain.

THE "SECTOR APPROACH" TO NEGOTIATIONS

Recently Mr. Eric Wyndham-White, Director General of GATT, suggested an approach to negotiations in five of the most sensitive industrial sectors: steel, aluminum, textiles, paper, and chemicals. The EEC exceptions list contains many items in these five categories. Many of them frequently in the past have been protected by all trading countries from tariffcutting negotiations. Mr. Wyndham-White's proposal is to begin multilateral discussion in these areas as a tactical approach to ironing out the differences among countries on a multilateral, rather than bilateral, basis.

Some reportorial comment has, however, presented these sector discussions, into which the United States is now preparing to enter, as a prelude to multilateral negotiations to arrange markets. And certain industry groups have expressed fears that this negotiating approach could result in harmful market arrangements. I am convinced that in proposing the sector approach Mr. Wyndham-White had no such intention. Nonetheless there is ground for such suspicion. Not the least is President Johnson's statement on "Expanding World Trade" of October 29, 1964, "we are seeking to work out arrangements among the woolen textile-producing nations," in context with the International Textile Arrangement which was worked out just 2 years ago.

We must realistically assess the domestic and international pressures that could result in a multilateral agreement to arrange markets, not only in textiles.

The long-term cotton textile arrangement regulates foreign cotton textile access to U.S. markets. It has caused foreign producers to shift production into fabrics made of wool or other natural fibers or manmade fibers, and blends of these fibers, which are competitive with U.S. products. The resulting increased foreign competition has caused U.S. wool textile producers to ask for an international market arrangement which would limit imports of foreign wool products.

U.S. manmade fiber producers argue that an international market arrangement for wool products would result in a similar diversion of foreign production into manmade fiber products, and greater foreign competition for the U.S. manmade and blended fabrics market. They cite the efforts of the Japanese Government to divert its cotton textile production to make fabrics of other fibers.

In addition there is evidence that the long-term cotton textile arrangement has not functioned satisfactorily. Its purpose was to promote an orderly expansion of trade through restraining the impact of new cotton textile production on new markets. In effect this intended expansion has not taken place. In addition, the cotton arrangement is itself very difficult, and I might say costly, to administer.

THE DANGER OF AN INTERNATIONAL ALL-FIBER TEXTILE ARRANGEMENT

We find that the entire U.S. textile industry—both natural and man made—has united to pressure the U.S. Government to enter an all-inclusive textile arrangement.

How ironic it would be were the sector approach—designed to facilitate trade barrier reductions—to result in market arrangements, especially in the context of the Kennedy round.

I suggest that, in the preparation for the coming review of the long-term cotton textile arrangement next fall, U.S. policymakers carefully review the actual effects of the arrangement, and reassess its desirability.

I suggest this for the several reasons I have mentioned, and also because of the impact on less developed countries of adjustments in the international market for cotton textiles. Cotton textile manufacture is a classic means of entry into the industrialization process. Large-scale manufacture of textiles was a foundation stone of both English and American industrial growth. By preventing less developed countries' textile products from competing freely in developed nations' markets we are cutting off a valuable source of hard currency they need to finance economic development.

I hope I can make clear that my interest in avoiding a multitextile market arrangement is not simply to achieve quicker progress toward expanded trade. To those who represent textile producing regions in particular and to all who would erect barriers to fair international trade, I want to make clear my concern—thoroughly substantiated by economic theory—that market arrangements of any kind which result in more than fair compensation for true economic differentials not the proper subject of competition, and so result in the protection of a U.S. product from competition, ultimately result in the least beneficial allocation of U.S. resources. The protection of an industry from fair competition represents a kind of tax on all efficient producers and on consumers. Protection from fair competition allows inefficient producers to use scarce resources, thereby raising costs of these same resources to efficient producers.

INADEQUATE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE?

In instances when industry reorientation as a result of foreign competition is required, adequate adjustment assistance measures should be fully used.

Have the adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act been adequate? Recently we have read and heard public statements that these provisions have "failed." This comment has been occasioned by the consideration of new adjustment assistance provisions incorporated in the bill to implement the Canada-United States Automotive Products Agreement, H.R. 6960.

Critics have based their opinion on the Tariff Commission's rejection of all 19 cases of adjustment assistance claims brought to it.

In my view the claims brought to the Tariff Commission have been inadequate to meet the requirement that the claimed injury be in major part caused by imports of competitive products. The adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act were intended to be the safety valve on an engine—the 50-percent tariff reductions authorized by the Trade Expansion Act—which has not yet built up a head of steam. To claim now that these adjustment assistance provisions are inadequate or that the Tariff Commission has somehow failed in applying them, is premature and unfounded.

THE KENNEDY ROUND AND THE U.N. CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

One of the most encouraging developments in the current GATT negotiations is the new GATT chapter on trade and development. Adopted on February 8, 1965, the new chapter is a significant development in the commercial policy field. It gives a contractual and legal basis for new, important commitments to less developed countries—LDC's—to help them meet their economic development requirements through trade.

The new GATT approach to developing countries has resulted in a GATT timetable for the tabling of LDC offers, and for negotiations with developed countries. Thus I hope that developing countries will receive effective consideration on the basis of their ability to trade and compete in the world economy.

According to the schedule for LDC participation adopted by GATT, LDC's were to notify GATT of their intention to table offers on August 1, 1965. By April 15, Ceylon, India, China, and Jamaica so notified GATT . Four other less developed countries, Nicaragua, Rhodesia, Peru, and the United Arab Republic, notified GATT that they would table offers on October 16 because of "predominant interest in exports of agricultural products." The October 16 date will give these countries time to examine and prepare offers on the basis of the developed country lists to be submitted on September 16. Argentina, Brazil, Indonesia, Malta, Pakistan, Togo, and Uruguay were uncertain about which date they would choose. Israel and Portugal have indicated that they would also like to be extended LDC treatment, but these cases have not yet been determined.

A résumé of the schedule for LDC participation follows:

May 1: (a) Linear negotiating countries plus Canada will submit information, with supporting reasons, on their exceptions of LDC export interest. These will be distributed by the GATT Secretariat to LDC's which have notified their intention to participate.

(b) Trade Negotiations Committee Chairman Mr. Wyndham-White gives summary of linear exceptions lists to LDC's intending to participate.

(c) Participating countries suggest to LDC's offers that LDC's might submit, distributed to LDC's by GATT Secretariat.

June 15 to July 1: Examination by LDC's who notified on April 15 of lists of items excepted by linear countries.

August 1: Participating LDC's—except those tabling offers on October 16—and including Israel and Yugoslavia, will table offers.

September 16: Developed countries tabling offers on agricultural products other than grains.

October 16: LDC's which notified of their predominant interest in agriculture table offers.

LDC's which did not adhere to the above timetable would not be prevented from tabling offers after October 16. Those LDC's having tabled a statement of their proposed contributions will then take part in trade negotiations and will receive the complete exceptions lists of the linear countries.

The relationship of this new GATT program for LDC's to the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development—UNCTAD—is tremendously important. If less developed countries can be brought into the world trading system under GATT rules, special, preferential and perhaps trade-restrictive arrangements urged by UNCTAD can be avoided and replaced by constructive devices whose effect will ultimately be to promote world trade.

The effort to convince less developed countries to participate in the Kennedy round must continue. They must be helped to realize that real solutions to their trade problems do not lie in the essentially political forum provided by UNCTAD. I would like to commend the very valuable work of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference in attempting to convince Mexico of the advantages of GATT participation. Were Mexico to join GATT, I am certain that many South and Central American nations would follow.

But I emphasize that, as in the agricultural, industrial, and nontariff barrier negotiations, the rules under which less developed countries will participate in the round have yet to be elaborated. As in so many areas of the present negotiations we are exploring new depths, yet unfathomed. In our explorations, we should keep in mind that we have an opportunity to prevent the division of the world into economic spheres of influence. We should allow freest possible access to world markets for LDC products of all kinds, perhaps through preferences by developed countries as a whole to less developed countries as a whole. Trade in preference to aid should be basic U.S. policy.

EAST-WEST TRADE AND GATT

The Kennedy round involves another serious issue—the inclusion of Communist countries. Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia have indicated their interest in entering the present tariff negotiations. Poland, a member of GATT, tabled its offers on April 11. The desire to participate in the Kennedy round demonstrates the tendency of some Communist nations to enter international undertakings which require no ideological realinement or commitment, but instead considerations of national interest and advantage.

It will be interesting if the Kennedy round further involves Communist nations in predominantly free world economic groupings—intent on opening their horizons because cooperation with free world nations is to their best advantage.

Special negotiating rules will have to be developed for each of these three countries to participate. Yugoslavia's economy is semicompetitive; Poland's and Czechoslovakia's are dominated by state enterprises. In these latter cases the concept of a tariff cut is questionable. These factors will require special procedures in the GATT context.

In addition, these three countries each have different and in some cases special relationships with GATT. Czechoslovakia is a full contracting party, Poland participates under special arrangement, and Yugoslavia has acceded provisionally to GATT.

Czechoslovakia presents a special problem for the United States. Because section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act prevents the United States from extending most-favored-nation treatment to Communist countries other than Poland and Yugoslavia, the United States must ignore Czechoslovakia, which otherwise fully participates in the round.

NO QUICK END IN SIGHT

I have attempted to present in some detail some of the elements that have made the Kennedy round at once one of the most frustrating and yet most promising international negotiations the United States has entered.

I think it is fair to say that after a long and very dim period the negotiations as a whole can now move slowly ahead—in agricultural and industrial products and in nontariff barriers—to resolve issues such as the "montant de soutien" and disparities. And as these discussions proceed the participants will be able to work out terms of participation for the less developed countries, and for those other nations, like Australia and New Zealand, whose specially structured economies entitle them to unique terms of participation in the negotiations.

The variables of this tremendously complex negotiation will take many, many months of discussion to blend together and resolve. It is not too soon to think of renewing the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

THE TERMINAL DATE—JUNE 30, 1967

The authority given the President to negotiate tariff reductions by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 will terminate on June 30, 1967.

Clearly much progress must be made in the next 2 years in order to achieve the purposes of the Trade Expansion Act. Given the slow progress to date, ways to speed the negotiations must be forthcoming or the Trade Expansion Act will have to be renewed.

Any early efforts to extend the Trade Expansion Act's authority might simply relax pressure on the EEC to make the internal adjustments necessary to allow it to bargain down barriers to foreign trade.

I think it essential to use every available means of achieving a successful conclusion before the deadline, and I am assured from my personal observation that able U.S. negotiators both in Geneva and Washington will do so.

WHAT FUTURE TRADE POLICY?

My concern with the slow progress of the Kennedy round and with the many complex issues yet to be resolved, leads me to consider new approaches to trade expansion. In doing so I would ask you to consider with me this question:

WHAT ARE U.S. WORLD TRADE GOALS?

The U.S. objective since the start of the reciprocal trade program in the 1930's has been to achieve fairer trade. Seldom have I heard an official spokesman proclaim the goal of fair trade. But fair trade is a goal now dictated by the logic of our past and present trade expansion efforts. Even if the Kennedy round completely fulfills its highest objectives we must ask, "What next?" I believe we must make the complete removal of all tariff and other-than-tariff barriers to international trade unjustified by proper economic differentials our primary national trade objective.

As the strongest Nation in the world, we must lead the way toward creating a world economy which will fully include less developed countries and slow the centripetal forces set in motion by regional trading arrangements.

If in the Kennedy round the EEC shows that it is unable to make substantial tariff cuts on both agricultural and industrial products we must seek alternatives to traditional ways of bringing fairer and expanded trade.

THE NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL STUDY

These broad questions of international trade policy must be examined thoroughly with full participation by Congress. Too often a proposal to drastically change public policy has been developed without the participation of this body. Then, in a tremendous push, measures have been introduced and passed, sometimes in badly mangled form. Congress must make itself a part of the creative proposals and new thinking at every stage in order that intelligent congressional examination be assured during the legislative process.

Thus I have advocated an annual congressional review of U.S. trade policies. The Joint Economic Committee now examines the annual report of the Presiden and his Council of Economic Advisers and issues its own statements on this report, and its views on the state of the economy and on economic policy. This yearly confrontation procedure, while not perfect, has resulted in immeasurably greater public and congressional knowledge and debate about U.S. economic policies.

AN ANNUAL REVIEW OF TRADE POLICY

I propose the same procedure be applied to U.S. trade programs and policies. Section 402 of the Trade Expansion Act requires the President to submit to Congress an annual report on trade. This report could appropriately be examined by the Ways and Means Committee of the House. Alternatively, the Joint Economic Committee would be entirely competent to examine it. I will urge that this proposal be seriously considered.

A COMMITMENT TO AN OPEN WORLD

I have long felt that the Trade Expansion Act and the great labors expended on the current trade negotiations, in spite of their lack of obvious result, have served an essential purpose. The U.S. trade expansion effort in the last 3 years has been a major instrument to prod, cajole, urge the members of European Economic Community to resolve many of their internal differences, and most important, to look outward to the world. I have often considered, in examining pessimistic reports of our progress at Geneva, that in this respect the Kennedy round is fulfilling its most essential mission.

But I nonetheless recognize the effect on relations between states of a trading world encumbered by barriers and restrictions. These conditions have been the stuff out of which wars have sprung. We must continue our efforts to smooth world trade relations, just as we are attempting to smooth world financial relations. Thus we must continue our march toward a fairer trading world.

In trade and payments, in international economic and political cooperation efforts of every sort we have shouldered responsibilities of huge size. In no sense are we incapable of bearing these burdens, for they are, when wisely governed, within our power to sustain.

We find ourselves now at a crossroad in international commercial policy which may well mark the end of the postwar phase of the world trade efforts begun in the 1930's. By bold innovation and by perseverance—always aware that the national interest requires international cooperation—we can realize new achievements in world economic cooperation and development.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his full and informative report on the progress being made in the Kennedy Round tariff and trade negotiations over in Geneva. The gentleman's remarks about the importance of acceptable access for U.S. agricultural products in European markets are, of course, particularly interesting to me. We in the great plains area of the Nation are always glad to be able to make the bounty of our vast high-protein grain production available to hungry consumers everywhere in the world, especially when those consumers are able to benefit themselves by paying low prices for our high quality grain as against high prices for grain of less suitable quality.

The point I would like to emphasize today, as I did in my Additional Views in the 1965 Report of the Joint Economic Committee, is the importance for all concerned of making sure that acceptable access for U.S. agricultural products means competitive access rather than so-called guaranteed access. The development of so-called guarantees of quantitative access would be a step in the opposite direction from freeing up world trade: it would introduce new rigidities into the free flow of foodstuffs over the face of the globe. On the other hand, an arrangement providing for reasonably fair competitive success would benefit European consumers, would give American agriculture a fighting chance at the market, would be less likely to cause international political problems in the future, and would have a less severe effect on our balance-of-payments problems.

I join with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] in saluting our negotiators at Geneva for their outstanding work, and urge them to press for competitive access negotiations for our agricultural products to European market.

THE 19TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on June 2 of this year the people of Italy observe the 19th anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic. It gives me particular pleasure to send them my best wishes on this occasion. For many years now I have taken a very special interest in Italy. This is partly because Italy is of the country of origin of my forebears and of the forebears of millions of other Americans. Our concern for developments in Italy and our affection for the people of that land are only natural. But my interest, and, I am sure, the interest of all my fellow citizens, has still broader foundations.

It is impossible to be concerned with the preservation of Western civilization without becoming aware of the extent to which that civilization has been shaped by the contributions of the people of ancient Rome, the people of the Italian city-states, and the people of modern Italy. It is impossible to follow the progress of Europe toward ever greater unity without coming to realize that Italian leaders have been in the forefront of that vital movement. It is impossible to reflect upon the significance and the achievements of the Atlantic Alliance without becoming aware of the consistently positive role that Italy has played in this vital coalition. It is impossible to turn one's attention to the problems of poverty, disease, and ignorance in a world of ever-rising expectations without being encouraged by the remarkable transformation that is taking place in southern Italy. It is impossible to contemplate the problems of preserving a democratic society and democratic institutions in an age of violence and revolution without being led to admire the achievements of postwar Italy in these respects.

Mr. Speaker, every nation can boast of illustrious statesmen and immortal artists. And because America is a land at once of one people and of many people, we pay homage to the heroes and innovators of many countries scattered throughout the world. Today, however, I would like to single out for mention some of the many Italians who have shaped the world in which we live, who have captured our imagination, who have left their imprint on our lives and on our consciousness.

Let us begin with our schoolchildren. They early learn about the age of discovery and about the adventures of those hardy souls who first came to the shores of America. They cannot help but learn about Italy and the intrepid Italian navigators and explorers. Marco Polo, they find, was one of the first to venture far to the East and establish the trading routes by which the peoples of the Western World increased their contacts with the lands and peoples of the Eastern World. They are introduced to Christopher Columbus and the arduous voyage of the *Nina*, the *Pinta* and the *Santa Maria*. They learn that Giovanni da Verrazano was the first to sail along the North American coast. They learn that an Italian explorer—Amerigo Vespucci—gave his name to America.

Later, if they study Latin, they become acquainted with those illustrious forebears of the Italians—the Romans. The works of Virgil, Caesar, and Cicero become familiar to them. They learn about the glories of the Roman empire; they come to understand that Roman law and the institutions of the Roman Republic have left a deep imprint on modern political systems. They cannot study world history without learning about the Renaissance. They cannot learn about the Renaissance without becoming acquainted with one of the most glorious periods of Italian history. The names of Dante and Petrarch, of Giotto and Fra Angelico, of Michelangelo and Leonardo da Vinci, of Tintoretto, and Titian become engraved on their memories.

And when they turn to modern history and science, here also they make their acquaintance with Italians who have left their mark. At the very beginning of modern science stands the towering figure of Galileo. Two hundred years ago, the experiments of Luigi Galvani and of Alessandro Volta paved the way to the modern production of electricity. Behind two major marvels of the 20th century—radio and the harnessing of nuclear energy—stand the achievements of two Italians—Guglielmo Marconi and Enrico Fermi.

And in the telling of the history of the 19th century, how can the exploits of Garibaldi, the impassioned writings of Mazzini, and the outstanding contributions of the statesman Cavour fail to make an impression on young minds. All three were influenced by the American Revolution. All three strove to bring unity and democracy to Italy. Garibaldi is perhaps an especially appealing figure. For he made history in the New World as well as in Italy. Following an abortive liberal revolution in Italy, he fled to South America and led the wars of independence in Uruguay. He then returned to Rome to help defend the short-lived Roman Republic. In 1860, his expedition to Sicily helped to bring about the unification of Italy.

When we turn to music, we find that music would be a greatly impoverished homage to the achievements of Italian composers. The repertoire of chamber music would be greatly impoverished without the works of Corelli and Vivaldi and their contemporaries. And whoever thinks of opera must inevitably think of Italy and of Monteverdi, Rossini, Donizetti, Bellini, Verdi, and Puccini. Today, Milan's La Scala is the center of the opera world. And from a career of directing opera in Italy came one of America's most distinguished conductors—Arturo Toscanni.

Educated men everywhere will single out Dante's "Commedia" as one of the immortal works of world literature. But today we might also remember that Carlo Collodi's "Pinocchio" has enchanted children in many lands, and that the literature of our century would have been the poorer without the contributions of Pirandello and Ignazio Silone, of Carlo Levi and Tomasi di Lampedusa and Quasimodo.

Mr. Speaker, there are three men of postwar Italy who I believe have already secured prominent places in the history of our times. It is impossible for me to believe that democratic institutions would have been so securely founded in postwar Italy without the guiding hand and inspiring leadership of Alcide de Gasperi. But the contributions of this statesman were not limited to his native land. He also helped to found the Europe of the Six we know today. For he, like so many other Italians, believed that the road to European unity was the only road away from the struggles and strife of the past. Perhaps less well known but equally to be admired is Prof. Luigi Einaudi. It was Einaudi who as Governor of the Bank of Italy and Budget Minister under de Casperi was in large measure responsible for the financial policies that paved the way to Italy's remarkable economic accomplishments in postwar years. It was only natural that a grateful nation should name him the first President of the Italian Republic in 1948, in which office he was to serve with so much distinction. And lastly, I come to a figure who was loved and revered not only in Italy but throughout the world, a man of great courage and humility, a man of strong faith, a man who was deeply devoted to improving the lot of the poor and sick and to furthering the cause of world peace. I am speaking, of course, of Pope John XXIII, whose words and actions captured the hearts of millions and left a deep imprint on his church.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at the great sweep of Italian history, we may single out the achievements of the Roman Republic and the Roman Empire, the achievements of the Italian Renaissance, and the achievements of the Risorgimento as marking the high points of that history. I am convinced, however, that we will soon wish to add another notable period of achievement to those I have named. That period opens with the founding of the Republic of Italy on

June 2, 1946. In only slightly less than 20 years, Italy has been transformed. This transformation has not been the work of just a few. It has been the work of millions of Italians determined to build a modern democracy and a modern economy. On this, the 19th anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic, I would like to express my admiration for their achievements as well as my admiration for their illustrious forebears and contemporaries.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today the people of Italy celebrate the 19th anniversary of the founding of their Republic. Today, they can look back on almost 20 years of unbroken progress and accomplishment. Today, they can look forward to a future filled with promise.

If one can judge from the past, they will make this day an occasion for rededicating themselves to the achievement of the goals that they set for themselves in 1946. In 1946, these goals seemed far distant, for the ugly scars of war and fascism were everywhere apparent. Today, these goals seem within reach. The scars are gone. Political institutions have shown remarkable stability while being subjected to severe pressures. A modern industrial economy has taken firm root. The benefits of economic and social progress are being shared with the less privileged south. Foreign trade is flourishing as Italian goods displaying the traditional artistry and skill of the Italians reach markets in all corners of the world. Firm ties have been established with the nations of Western Europe and the nations of the Atlantic world. Responsible Italian statesmen give their constant thought and attention to the further consolidation of these ties.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to express my admiration for the Italian people, to offer them my congratulations for their achievements since 1946, and to express my firm conviction that in the future their record will outshine even the glorious record of the past 19 years.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, to those of us in democratic nations, the significance of free elections is paramount. We understand their imperativeness and the degree of their impact upon a people. When the people of Italy held their first postwar free elections 19 years ago—following years of terror under a totalitarian regime—they elected to become a republic and to embark on a long and proud road back to freedom and liberty.

In less than two decades the people of Italy have effected an amazing and remarkable recovery. They have established a stable constitutional democracy, while simultaneously increasing industrialization and full national development. Besides advancing at home, Italy has participated in the forging of new alliances with both other European nations and the United States in order that the holocaust of World War II never be repeated. She is aware of the meaning and importance of cooperation and of the need of mutual action in today's tense world. We would be hard pressed to find another people as diligently committed to the cause of world progress as the Italians.

There are few countries in the world with as rich a heritage as Italy owns. For centuries, she was the font of art, music, and culture for much of the Eastern Hemisphere. Today the land of the Renaissance is beginning a new renaissance of her own—a rebirth of spirit, of progress, and of dedication to the future. We take pride in saluting Italy on her 19th year of independence.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, 19 years ago today, the Italian people, suffering from the ravaging effects of World War II, and threatened by a large, well-organized Communist Party, voted to establish a Republic, whose guiding principles were and are consistent with the ideologies of the other western democracies. It is a measure of the determination and vitality of the Italian people that they sought to found solid democratic institutions at home as well as participate in the movement toward a strong, democratic, and united Europe.

Such a task was not easy. Existing conditions in Italy after the war could have resulted in chaos and economic collapse. But the courage and ingenuity of the valiant Italian people did not waver, and in the relatively short period of 20 years Italy has become a full partner in the activities of the free world.

Italy's life since World War II has been a dynamic one. She has continually expanded her industrial development, and one of Europe's leading industrial areas is located in northern Italy. Dogged efforts and ingenuity are bringing about important changes in the once underdeveloped regions of southern Italy. Unemployment, one of Italy's most severe problems in past years, is gradually being reduced to manageable proportions. Moreover, I think we can safely say that Italy's remarkable progress is only one indication of the spirit and determination of these freedom-loving people.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of my colleagues join with me in sending greetings and warm wishes to the Italian people on the occasion of the 19th anniversary of the founding of their fine Republic.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, 19 years ago on June 2, 1946, the Italians held their first elections following World War II. On that day they chose to become a Republic; on that day they took their first formal step following an unhappy period in their history toward becoming the proud, prosperous, and stable nation that we know today. When we look at the record of the Italian Republic we cannot help but be filled with admiration. Within the short period of 19 years, a progressive constitution has been promulgated, democratic institutions have taken firm root, unemployment has been reduced to minimum levels, a modern industry second to none has been established, and the underdeveloped South has been brought within reaching distance of prosperity.

But Italians have not limited their sights to challenges within their own borders. They have identified themselves with the fate of Western Europe and the fate of the Atlantic world. They have joined with other European nations in the building of a strong and united Europe. They have joined with the United States in an alliance aimed at preserving that civilization to which they have contributed in such large measure. And in recent years, they have turned their sights in still another direction. Even with pressing economic problems at home, they have undertaken a foreign aid program in the underdeveloped nations of the world.

There are special bonds of affection between Americans and the people of Italy. More than 5 million Americans proudly claim Italy as their land of origin. American soldiers fought along with Italian soldiers to protect the independence of Italy during World War I and to help restore freedom to Italy during World War II. Although the so-called Italian miracle must be attributed chiefly to the hard work and the determination of the Italian people, Americans are proud that Marshall plan aid played a part in spurring the development of the Italian economy. Today, more than one-half of the foreign firms investing in the south of Italy are American firms. Thus Americans continue to play a role in the transformation of the Italian economy.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans visit Italy each year. There they can observe the spectacular achievements of Italy since World War II. There they can also contemplate the civilization of ancient Rome and the glories of the Italian Renaissance. They become vividly aware of the fact that Italians have played a large part in the shaping of the culture that Americans have inherited. They carry home with them the lasting impression that Italians are genuinely delighted to receive visitors from other lands and that they spare no efforts to make them feel welcome.

Recently, the President of the United States had the honor of receiving a visit from Premier Moro and Foreign Minister Fanfani. The visit was widely described as uneventful, there being no great issues to thrash out and no wide divergences of viewpoint. The significance of the visit lies in this very absence of controversy. Italians and Americans found that the ties between their two nations were as firm as ever. They found that they were preoccupied by similar domestic problems—notably that of eliminating pockets of poverty in their two nations. They found that they agreed substantially on the need to strengthen the Atlantic Alliance and to stand firm in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to extend my best wishes to the people of Italy as they observe the 19th anniversary of the founding of their Republic. It is my hope that in years to come, relations between our two nations will continue to be marked by the affection and mutual respect and confidence that have marked these relations in the past.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, today is an appropriate occasion to pay tribute to the people of Italy for their amazing accomplishments since the end of World War II and for their steadfast devotion to the cause of European unity and of Atlantic solidarity. Nineteen years ago, on

June 2, 1946, the Italians held their first elections following World War II and rejected an unhappy past to set out on a new course. The tasks at hand were enormous. Fascism and war had brought large-scale destruction to the country. Large portions of the population suffered from severe shortages of food and clothing. There was almost a complete absence of consumer goods. The currency was weak. A large and well-organized Communist Party posed an ominous threat to newly established democratic institutions.

These conditions could have led to despair and chaos. That they did not is a measure of the spirit, the vitality, and the determination of the Italian people. In the relatively short period of 20 years, prewar industries not only have been rebuilt, but also expanded and modernized. Northern Italy has become one of the leading industrial centers of Europe. Persistent efforts are transforming the once underdeveloped region of southern Italy. New sources of energy have been exploited to compensate for Italy's lack of raw materials. Unemployment has been reduced to manageable levels. Measures to protect the currency have proved effective. Foreign trade has soared while the foundations for maintaining a favorable balance of payments have been laid. The Communist Party, while still uncomfortably large, has been effectively excluded from power. Democratic institutions have taken firm root. Italian leaders have consistently promoted the movement toward European unity. They have made the Atlantic alliance a cornerstone of their foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there can be no dissenting voice when I express my esteem for the Italian people and my admiration for their achievements. I am sure that my fellow Americans would wish to join with me in sending them greetings on the occasion of the 19th anniversary of the founding of their Republic.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today is observed by the Italian people as the anniversary of their Republic, for June 2 is the anniversary of a 1946 referendum in which the people of Italy voted for a republic rather than a monarchy.

The strides of the Italian Republic since that date have been great. From the Trentino to Calabria, from Sicily to the Alps, Italy is humming with progress and alive with pride in her achievements. The Republic has proven itself, and proven the decision made on that remote postwar June day. Italy has carved out a viable political and economic place in the new Europe and the New World.

The Republic has not proved itself without pain. Democracy has not always been the easy way when predicated on the shifting sands of coalition government. Nor is the economic picture of Italy wholly rosy. There is still grinding poverty in the Italian south, just as in our American South. But just as I have faith in America's future, I have faith in Italy's. Our two great Republics, united in friendship—past, present, and future—have only begun to realize their place in the sun.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most exciting countries to watch in the world today is Italy. Only a few short months ago the prophets of doom were at work. They were saying that the Italian miracle had come to an end, that governmental instability was growing, that the Communist Party was securing new bases of power, that the inclusion of Socialists in the government would lead to a weakening of Italy's alliance ties, and that some Italians were interested in following in the footsteps of De Gaulle. They were also saying that development efforts were flagging, that industry was overextended, that unemployment was sure to grow by leaps and bounds, and that balance of payments difficulties could only worsen.

True, in the last few years, Italy has experienced inflation followed by recession and there have been moments when it has been difficult to form a government. But if we look at Italy today, we can readily conclude that the prophets have been confounded. The Communist Party leadership is divided and it has been losing its traditional hold in many localities. Vigorous measures to combat first inflation and then recession have brought encouraging results. A favorable balance of payments has been restored and shows every sign of lasting. Italy has a new President, a Premier, and a Foreign Minister who are firmly committed to the causes of Western European integration and Atlantic unity and who are working hard to combat the disruptive influence of De Gaulle. Industry is beginning to hum again after the briefest of pauses. Unemployment is giving ground. New and ambitious plans have been drawn up to continue and expand development efforts in the south.

Indeed, nothing shows better the continuing determination of the Italian people to adhere to the goals they set for themselves 20 years ago than their concern with conditions in the south of their country—the so-called Mezzogiorno. In the past 15 years, more than a million acres of underutilized land have been redistributed in this region. Land reclamation has proceeded space. Irrigation systems have been developed. Roads, bridges, and dams have been constructed. Electricity has been brought to rural communities. State industry, private industry, and foreign industry have been encouraged to establish plants in the region. New technical schools and education and training programs have begun to provide skilled labor for new industries.

There are still great disparities between north and south, but these are being rapidly overcome. In the last 10 years alone, per capita income in the south has doubled. Currently, the Italian Government is preparing a bill to extend the life of the Cassa per il Mezzogiorno—the fund that finances development in the south—for another 15 years. In the next 5 years alone, the amount that will be spent in the south will be double the amount spent in the last 5 years. Intensive efforts will be made to increase tourist facilities, to encourage agriculture in irrigated zones, and to spur the further development of industry in the industrial triangle of Bari, Brindisi, and Taranto.

In short, Mr. Speaker, if we look at Italy today, we can only conclude that the political institutions of the country are well-founded and that the economy is basically strong. The vitality of the people is as evident as ever. Their confidence in the future of their country is undiminished. On the occasion of the 19th anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic, it is a pleasure to send greetings to a people who are profoundly devoted to democratic institutions, to economic and social progress and to the cause of Western unity.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks in the body of the Record following the special order by by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] on the subject of the Italian Republic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXXIV

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the war on poverty in the Puerto Rican community in New York.

The article is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 10, 1965.

The article follows:

New York City in Crisis—Puerto Rican Panacea: New Study

(By Alfonso Narvaez)

New York City's war on poverty in the Puerto Rican community appeared yesterday to be ready to take another faltering step forward.

Mayor Wagner is expected to announce within a week that the city's antipoverty operations board has earmarked $13,300 for a 2-month study of slum conditions in the Puerto Rican community and for the formulation of plans to combat them.

The only trouble is that the city has already spent approximately $79,000 for a similar study and plan.

Recipients of the $13,300 will be the Puerto Rican community development project, a 65-man citywide board of community leaders.

Last month the board was split with internal dissension and 22 members resigned. Most of those who resigned were members of the Puerto Rican Forum, a nonprofit leadership development organization, which had conceived the idea for the citywide board as part of a $12.5 million effort to combat the effects of poverty in the Puerto Rican community.

The board was to be part of an 11-pronged attack on poverty, plans for which were submitted to the city in October 1964. The plans were the outgrowth of a 3-month study by the Puerto Rican Forum for which the city spent $49,000. This was followed by a $10,000 a month grant by the city for a holding operation while the city took 3 months to make up its mind on the proposals.

Finally last month Mayor Wagner announced that 3 of the 11 proposals would be supported by the city and he asked the Federal Government for $437,000 to implement them. The city would then add an additional $48,000 for the three projects.

Dr. Francisco Trilla, chairman of the forum, although disappointed that the city chose only three of the proposals, said that he had been told by the antipoverty board that the city would not fund any more community-wide programs, such as Har-You-ACT or Mobilization for Youth.

Meanwhile, the community development project board reorganized itself, elected the Reverend Reuben Dario Colon as president, and asked the city for funds.

The proposed 2-month, $13,300 study was the city's answer. The group was told to come back before the end of the fiscal year—May 31—with a program that would be funded by the city.

The proposed program would deal with community-action-type activities and would be designed to stimulate a commitment from local grassroots groups to take an active part in the war on poverty.

It is expected that the program resulting from the 2-month study will be a reshaping of some of the eight proposals originally submitted in the forum document, but which were not accepted by the city.

The man slated to head the study is Manuel Diaz, director of Community Activities for Mobilization for Youth, who took an active part in formulating the original forum document. He is negotiating a leave of absence from MFY and hopes to begin the study within a week or two—as soon as the mayor makes the announcement and the money is appropriated.

Mr. Diaz said that most of the money earmarked for the study would be spent for consultants and further research into community problems.

"I know that many of the proposals in the original document were not approved by the city," he said, "but at this point they have asked for a viable program. I hope to put the proposals into a form acceptable to them. The six or seven separate programs that they finally accept will strengthen the total organizational fabric of the community and will have a big effect on the Puerto Rican community."

The forum's chairman, Dr. Trilla, said that the various aspects of the proposal originally submitted by them would help the Puerto Rican community.

"I thought they were good when we submitted them to the city," he said, "But they didn't want a total effort. I hope the new project board can put them into a form acceptable by the city and that they get the program underway."

Meanwhile, the city has made no announcement of the proposed study. A spokesman at the antipoverty board said that the study would be made but that no details of the expenditure would be made available until an announcement is made by the mayor. He said that this would come within a week or two.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXXV

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

This article concerns the loss of factory jobs in New York and appeared in the Tribune on April 11, 1965.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PLIGHT OF CITY FACTORIES: WHY ARE THEY MOVING OUT?

(By Barrett McGurn)

"I have been reading your articles on New York City in crisis.

"The writer would like to know where the factories are moving as we would like to move along with them."

This is from a letter the Herald Tribune received after turning the spotlight on one of the roots of New York's troubles: the loss in only 6 years of 81,000 factory jobs—the very kind of employment most needed by the least privileged, least prepared and potentially most disorderly and burdensome parts of the city's population.

The articles intended, of course, to point up the difficulty and suggest possible solutions, not to aggravate the problem. But this is the way Manuel Hochberg, of the Regal Metal Products Corp., of 848 Stanley Avenue, Brooklyn, reacted. He makes parts for automobiles, electrical equipment and a wide range of hardware. He wrote:

"The only thing a business can look forward to in New York City is additional taxes every year, put on by the city.

"We hired three people off relief one day. The longest one worked 8 hours. The other two quit before the day was over. We also hired three boys on the school employment program, where they go to school half day and can work in the afternoon in order to get a high school diploma. The longest one worked 2 weeks."

"IMPOSSIBLE"

Thousands of local industrial development corporations in New Jersey, on Long Island, throughout the rest of the Middle Atlantic States, and across the country (notably in the South) would like to get in touch with Mr. Hochberg, but most of his clients are within a 400- to 500-mile radius from New York City, so his general area still attracts him.

The Manuel Hochbergs of New York City are legion. To find an answer for them, 14 of the city's foremost businessmen (presidents or board chairmen of the New York Telephone Co., the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, the Chase Manhattan Bank, R. H. Macy & Co., the Ford Foundation, the New York Chamber of Commerce and others) are now conversing behind closed doors trying to determine how the city's commercial leadership can persuade Manuel Hochberg and others like him that New York is still the best place.

TIMID STEPS

Something can be done, and the city's department of commerce and industrial development, in a small way, has begun to meet at least a few of the demands of men like Manuel Hochberg. The city's first timid steps may suggest a road for the committee of 14 to follow. Here is an example of the things the commerce and industrial development department, headed by ex-businessman Louis Boido, formerly of Gimbels, so far has accomplished:

The case of the East 91st Street laundries found the efforts of one city department, the New York Housing Authority, colliding with those of another, Mr. Broido's industrial development section.

The Housing Authority decided to expand the Stanley Isaacs low-cost housing development, which occupies two blocks north of 93d Street, between First Avenue and Franklin D. Roosevelt Drive.

Men like Larry Semega, at 413 East 92d Street, protested. Mr. Semega is co-partner in a garage which pays $835 a month in taxes and rent.

"Answer me this," he challenged. "What sense does it make to take away a business like mine which pays all this and replace it with subsidized housing?"

In another case in Flushing, Queens, Mr. Broido managed to angel another save-the-work operation.

In that case, the Eutectic Welding Corp. asked to buy up a small section of city roadway in order to reach a siding of the Long Island Railroad. The gist of its story was:

"We can add 150 employees if you say 'Yes.' If you say 'No' we must pull out. Nassau County, across the line, has invited us and we'll go. That will wipe out, as far as New York City is concerned, our present 350 jobs."

Neighbors, as is often their wont, told Eutectic it could clear out. They said their children enjoyed playing ball in the street in question and, anyway, fire engines needed it in case of trouble. Borough President Mario J. Cariello weighed it all and sided with the neighbors. Commissioner Broido examined the site and found "four other ways fire engines can get there." Eutectic has the green light and is staying.

Commissioner Broido hopes the committee of 14 will join forces with him.

SPUDS SOAR INTO STRATOSPHERE

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the current meteoric rise in the price of potatoes is a national scandal. These prices, zooming upward, rival the rockets that are currently being released from the launching pads at Cape Kennedy.

Certainly there is no rational reason why the customary methods of distribution cannot be adjusted to provide this food staple at a normal and reasonable price.

This price rise with its injury to the pocketbook of the average consumer certainly comes at an inappropriate time, since the Committee on Agriculture is currently considering the authorization bill for farm legislation.

I deprecate this squeeze of the consumer and have called upon the Secretary of Agriculture for an explanation of this increase in the cost of potatoes and I can assure him and this House that my sentiments are shared by many of the Members and by millions of consumers throughout the country.

NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD'S 100TH MEETING

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on May 27, 1965, the National Science Board of the National Science Foundation convened its 100th meeting since the establishment of the Foundation by the act of May 10, 1950. I want to take note of this occasion and to pay a few words of sincere tribute to the outstanding contributions which the National Science Foundation and the members of the National Science Board have made to the furtherance of basic research activities and education in all the major fields of science. These contributions have had an important part in enabling the United States to maintain and strengthen the leading position which it assumed as the result of the successful utilization of scientific talent during World War II.

The widespread desire to establish a peacetime organization whose responsibility would be the advancement of American science led, after several years of intensive discussion, to the 1950 legislation, cited above, which set up the National Science Foundation. Broadly stated, mission of the Foundation is "to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense." The principal ways in which the Foundation discharges this mission include: First, the support of basic research in the physical sciences, engineering, mathematical, biological, medical, and social sciences; and second, the support of education in the sciences. The latter task is accomplished through a variety of programs, including the awarding of fellowships and traineeships to deserving students, the improvement of scientific instruction and curriculums at all levels, and the funding of specialized facilities and national research centers in order to meet the contemporary sophisticated equipment needs of scholars. The recently established science development program aids selected potentially first-rate institutions to develop their capabilities and thus increase and geographically distribute the number of centers of excellence.

The enabling act of the Foundation also directs it to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries; to maintain a register and provide a central clearinghouse of information concerning all scientific and technical personnel in the United States, and to develop studies related to planning of science policy. This is indeed an impressive list of duties.

Lest there be misunderstanding, I must point out that the Foundation is only 1 of more than 40 Federal departments and agencies with responsibilities in the field of science. However, the research and development programs of these other departments and agencies are oriented to some extent to their explicit missions, such as military security, agriculture, aviation, medicine, meteorology, et cetera, whereas that of the Foundation is uniquely directed to sponsoring scientific activity without regard for immediate application, and to fostering development of the total research resources of the Nation.

In the short space of 15 years the Foundation has grown from an agency with an initial appropriation of a quarter of a million of dollars, with less than a dozen employees, to an organization whose latest budget was $530 million for fiscal year 1966, and with an estimated total of 1,000 permanent positions.

The National Science Board has had an important role in the formulation, execution, and review of Foundation activities from the beginning. It is composed of 24 members who are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for 6-year terms. Many members have served for more than one term. To be eligible for appointment, a person must be eminent in the fields of the basic sciences, medical science, engineering, agriculture, education or public affairs, and this established record of distinguished service is the sole basis of selection of members. The Board meets several times a year, usually for about 2½ days for each meeting. Considering that the members all have other important responsibilities, the time devoted to these meetings represents a substantial contribution of effort. Members receive only a nominal fee for each day of meeting plus expenses.

As the policymaking body of the Foundation, the Board occupies a position of vital importance. During the recent hearings before the House Appropriations subcommittees on the fiscal year 1966 budget, Board Chairman Eric Walker commented briefly on the Foundation's mission and on the role of the Board. After reviewing the broad mandate of the Foundation, he outlined the part it had played not only in developing a variety of programs aimed at promoting scientific activity throughout the Nation, but also in the larger and perhaps more important role in attempting to coordinate these activities so as to achieve a balance among them that would be in the national interest.

Dr. Walker said that the Foundation has tried to watch over the development of all aspects of scientific endeavor and within the limits of its responsibilities to channel Government support for these activities in such a way as to provide for the health and well-being of the scientific community, while at the same time promoting the broad economic and social development of the Nation. Summarizing, he said, "Thus, in carrying out its responsibilities, the Foundation must not only make decisions that involve the merits of individual proposals, but must evaluate requests for its support in terms of broad goals and policies." And in direct reference to the Board, he stated, "It is in the development of these broad guidelines for the Foundation's effort that the Board has been able to contribute most effectively to the operation of the Foundation."

The future role of the Foundation may well be even more significant. This was discussed by a majority of the special 15-man panel of the National Academy of Sciences in a recent report, "Basic Research and National Goals," prepared at the request of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Two major conclusions emerged from the study:

> The first is that Government should recognize that, on the whole, science in the United States today enjoys preeminence, and that what is done in the future should be based on expanding and improving the present situation. * * * The second essential point * * * is the belief, stated either explicitly or implicitly, that the role of the National Science Foundation during the next decade should become much greater than it has in the past, especially in the physical sciences. * * * Two courses for providing increased support to the physical sciences are open, and probably both should be followed. The first, recommended by several panelists, is that mission-oriented agencies, at times such as this when budgets are rather stationary, should devote a larger fraction of their budgets to basic research. * * * The second course, which by no means excluded the first, is to make the National Science Foundation a much larger agency than it now is—so large that it can eventually become the "balance wheel" or even the main "umbrella" for the support of basic research—especially in the physical sciences—that is too remote to merit support from the mission-oriented agencies.

During the coming months, the role of the Foundation and of the Board will come under intensive scrutiny during the forthcoming hearings on the Foundation which have been announced by the Subcommittee on Science Research and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. Whether a decision will be made to vastly increase the scope of the Foundation or whether the steady growth will be the pattern of operation, the role of the National Science Board will continue to be one of continuing significance both to the scientific community, and to the national interest. I am proud to salute the National Science Foundation and the National Science Board in recognition of their remarkable accomplishments and dedicated service.

A BILL TO ASSURE DEFENDANTS IN FEDERAL CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS OF THE RIGHT TO TRIAL BY JURY

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BANDSTRA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to assure defendants in Federal land condemnation cases of the right to trial by jury, if they so demand, on the issue of just compensation for their property.

At present, defendants in such cases do not enjoy this right. It is denied, as a right uniformly protected in all Federal land condemnation cases, by rule 71A(h) of the Rules of Civil Procedure for the U.S. district courts. This rule, adopted in 1951 by the Supreme Court, provides that a U.S. district court judge may, at his discretion, assign a land condemnation case to a three-member commission, even if the defendant desires a jury trial. The specific part of rule 71A(h) to which my bill would apply reads as follows:

> Any party may have a trial by jury of the issue of just compensation by filing a demand therefor within the time allowed for answer or within such further time as the court may fix, unless the court in its discretion orders that, because of the character, location, or quantity of the property to be condemned, or for other reasons in the interest of justice, the issue of just compensation shall be determined by a commission of three persons appointed by it (28 U.S.C. appendix).

I feel strongly that this rule should be modified so as to remove the discretionary power of U.S. district court judges to assign land condemnation cases to commissions, regardless of the defendant's desire for a jury trial. If the defendant wants the value of his land determined by a jury, he should not be overruled by the court and sent instead before a court-appointed commission. The Federal Government, by condemning the defendant's land, has already exercised a certain amount of discretionary power. Such power should not be extended into the courtroom and used to deny the defendant's request for a jury trial.

Of course, the Federal Government has the authority, under statutes based on the power of eminent domain, to condemn private land for public use. This is a necessary power, perhaps more essential in our complex society of today than ever before. Without it, the Government could not build highways, construct dams, and proceed with the many other public works projects so necessary for the development of urban and rural areas. The Federal Government's power to condemn land when the public interest requires it should not in any way be weakened, nor would it be by the bill I am introducing today.

The purpose of this bill is simply to insure that the rights of property owners are given the maximum possible protection in Federal condemnation proceedings. The Federal Government is increasing its use of the power of eminent domain, and that is all the more reason for making sure that those affected by it are treated with the utmost fairness. This is important from the practical standpoint, inasmuch as the good will of property owners whose land is condemned is a necessary factor in the prompt completion of a public works project. In some cases, property owners may want the value of their land determined by a jury. Such a request is surely not unreasonable, considering that trial by jury is one of the basic traditions of our legal system. Since the property owner is losing his land through no fault of his own, and since the U.S. district court is obliged to see that he receives just compensation for the condemned land, he should at least enjoy the right to trial by jury. As a general rule, a jury trial should not be denied in condemnation cases unless there is a legitimate and well-proven reason why justice would better be served through the use of another type of tribunal.

In two instances, the Congress has by law established special tribunals for Federal land condemnation proceedings. One instance is the Tennessee Valley Authority, where the initial determination of value is made by three commissioners, appointed by the U.S. district court, from a locality other than the one in which the condemned land lies. Either party may appeal the commission's award to the district court, in which case the appeal is heard by three district judges, unless the parties stipulate a lesser number. Since the TVA, as a regional agency, was faced with the task of acquiring a large amount of land within a relatively small area, the Congress provided for the somewhat unique procedure of a three-judge court reviewing de novo the initial award of the commission. This procedure was established in an effort to assure uniform condemnation awards under the unusual conditions in which the TVA must operate, where disproportionate awards among neighboring landowners would create harmful animosity. The other instance of a special tribunal, created by the Congress for condemnation proceedings, is the one employed in the District of Columbia. Under this system, the Federal court is required in all cases to order the selection of a jury of five, whose members must have the regular qualifications of jurors and, in addition, must be freeholders of the District and not in the service of either the District or the United States.

Both these special tribunals were created by statute to deal with land condemnation cases under circumstances not normally encountered in other parts of the Nation. The evidence is that these tribunals have operated fairly, and they would not be affected by the bill I am introducing today. The Supreme Court, in promulgating rule 71A(h), took note of the statutory authority under which these tribunals operate and specifically excluded them from the general provisions of the rule. There is, however, no specific statutory authority for the use of three-member commissions in Federal condemnation cases arising under normal circumstances.

Nonetheless, these commissions were established by the Supreme Court under rule 71A(h), which has a long, involved and somewhat controversial history. In 1934, the Congress enacted a law empowering the Supreme Court to promulgate general rules of civil procedure for the U.S. district courts. Four years later, the Supreme Court, acting under the authority of this law, adopted the Federal Rules for Civil Procedure. But a rule governing condemnation proceedings was not included in 1938, as there was no general demand for it. However, this sentiment changed during World War II, when the large number of Federal projects instituted at that time revealed the need for a uniform condemnation procedure among U.S. district courts.

Therefore, in May 1948, the Advisory Committee on Rules for Civil Procedure, after some 4 years of study, submitted to the Supreme Court a proposed rule for Federal condemnation proceedings. Rule 71A(h), as recommended in 1948, provided that except where a special tribunal for condemnation cases had been established by the Congress:

> Any party may have a trial by jury of the issue of just compensation by filling a demand therefor within the time allowed for answer or within such further time as the court may fix.

Under the proposed rule, U.S. district court judges were given no power, discretionary or otherwise, to assign condemnation cases to a commission. The Advisory Committee noted that the question had been raised as to whether a commission might be used, but concluded:

> Since in the bulk of States a landowner is entitled eventually to a jury trial, since the jury is a traditional tribunal for the determination of questions of value, and since experience with juries has proved satisfactory to both government and landowner, the right to trial by jury is adopted as the general rule.

The Supreme Court did not, however, adopt rule 71A(h) as originally proposed. In December 1948, the Court held two conferences on the proposed condemnation rule, but decided to return the draft to the Advisory Committee "for further consideration." The Advisory Committee submitted a revised draft in March 1951, this time including, as part of rule 71A(h), the provision for discretionary use of court-appointed commissions. The committee, in its report to the Supreme Court, explained that the change was in large part the result of views expressed by Judge John Paul of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Virginia, who was favorably impressed with his experience in trying condemnation cases under the Tennessee Valley Authority commission system. Judge Paul argued, the Advisory Committee noted, that if the TVA system were to be retained, as provided by the rule proposed in 1948, then commissions should likewise be used for condemnation proceedings in other large Federal projects. With this in mind, the Advisory Committee redrafted the rule so as to give Federal judges the discretionary power to employ the commission system. Referring to the new provision, the Advisory Committee stated in its report:

> The rule as now drafted seems to meet Judge Paul's objections. In large projects like the TVA the court may decide to use a commission. In a great number of cases involving only sites for buildings or other small areas, where use of a jury is appropriate, a jury may be chosen.

The language of the redrafted rule, however, did not precisely reflect the intent of the Advisory Committee. For rule 71A(h), as revised in 1951, made no distinction between "large projects," where the Court might use a commission, and the "great number of cases" involving smaller projects, where a jury trial would be appropriate. Nor, apparently, did the Advisory Committee give any consideration to the possibility that the particular circumstances of the TVA might not apply, as a general rule, to other large Federal projects elsewhere in the Nation.

In any case, the Advisory Committee's proposal of March 1951, was adopted by the Supreme Court as part of the Rules for Civil Procedure. It became effective on August 1, 1951, after the Chief Justice had notified the Congress 90 days earlier, as required by law, that the Supreme Court had promulgated the new rule.

Before it became effective, rule 71A(h) met with strong objections in the Congress. The Senate Committee on the Judiciary reported out a resolution on July 9, 1951, to modify the rule so as to conform to the original Advisory Committee proposal of 1948, thereby eliminating the provision allowing the use of court-appointed commissions. This modification was necessary, the Senate Judiciary Committee said, to protect the right to trial by jury. The committee's report stated:

> The committee takes note of the fact that in approximately 41 States in the United States the right to trial by jury exists in condemnation proceedings. Under existing practice the State law governing condemnation proceedings is followed in the Federal courts. Accordingly, if subsection (h) were adopted in its entirety the basic right to trial by jury existing in all but seven of our States would be abrogated (S. Rept. 502, 82d Cong., 1st sess., p. 2).

The resolution, as recommended by the Judiciary Committee, passed the Senate on July 11. However, the House Committee on the Judiciary amended the Senate resolution so as to postpone the effective date of the condemnation rule, as promulgated by the Supreme Court, until April 1, 1952. The committee explained, in its report of July 19, 1951, that the issue of jury trials and the discretionary use of commissions "is of such an importance that it should be studied further." The amended resolution passed the House on July 25. But the Senate and the House could not resolve their differences, with the result that both resolutions died. Thus rule 71A(h) went into effect without modification, or without receiving further study by the Congress.

The Congress, I think, should take action this session to modify rule 71A(h). This rule, it seems to me, is open to valid criticism from at least four standpoints.

First, and of most importance, it restricts the defendant's opportunity for trial by jury without good cause. The jury, as the Advisory Committee on Rules for Civil Procedure noted in its report of May 1948, is "a traditional tribunal for the determination of questions of value." In some cases, such as those involving complex corporate transactions, it may be necessary to refer the issue to a special tribunal. But the evidence presented in land condemnation cases is not beyond the comprehension of the average juror. If a jury has the competence to hear medical evidence in physical injury suits, or to weigh the testimony in a murder case when a man's life may be at stake, it surely is an adequate tribunal for determining the value of a tract of land. Furthermore, trial by jury is fundamental to our legal tradition. The jury system may contain imperfections, as do all human institutions; but it has stood the test of time. If, under unusual circumstances, justice is better served by a specially constituted tribunal, then of course such a tribunal should be employed. But the success of the TVA commissions, limited to but one region of the Nation, is hardly adequate grounds for giving Federal judges the discretionary power to deny jury trials in condemnation proceedings throughout all of the United States.

Second, it seems apparent that the Supreme Court, in promulgating rule 71A(h), exceeded its statutory authority. The law of 1934, giving the court the power to adopt Rules of Civil Procedure, states:

> The Supreme Court shall have the power to prescribe, by general rules, the forms of process, writs, pleadings and motions, and the practice and procedure of the district courts of the United States in civil actions.
>
> Such rules shall not abridge, enlarge or modify any substantive right and shall preserve the right of trial by jury as at common law and as declared by the seventh amendment to the Constitution (28 U.S.C. 2072).

Trial by jury is a "substantive right," not a procedural matter. And, as the Senate Judiciary Committee pointed out in its 1951 report, the right to trial by jury in Federal condemnation proceedings existed in the vast majority of the States prior to the adoption of rule 71A (h). This stemmed from the fact that the general conformity statute, which was superseded by rule 71A(h), provided that Federal condemnation proceedings should be governed by the prevailing State law. The Advisory Committee on Rules for Civil Procedure, in formulating the original proposed rule in 1948, took note of this situation and stated in its report:

> Since the general conformity statute is superseded by rule 71A * * * and since it was believed that the rule to be substituted should likewise give a right to jury trial, subdivision (h) establishes that method as the general one for determining the issue of just compensation.

Nevertheless, rule 71A(h), as finally promulgated by the Supreme Court, does not preserve the right of trial by jury in any of the States, despite the statutory injunction that the Rules for Civil Procedure shall not "abridge" any substantive right.

Third, rule 71A(h), promulgated to achieve uniform procedure, itself violates the principle of uniformity. At the outset, it provides for a dual system of trial: by jury or by commission, as the judge in his discretion may decide. Worse yet, because of the vague wording of the rule, the Federal courts have not acted with uniformity in setting apart those cases to be tried by jury from those assigned to commissions. The Advisory Committee on Rules for Civil Procedure, in its report of March 1951, drew the distinction between large and small projects, suggesting commissions for cases arising under the former and juries for cases involving the latter. A year later, after the adoption of the rule, the Advisory Committee informed the Supreme Court by letter that it interpreted rule 71A(h) "as prescribing trial by jury as the usual and customary procedure" to be followed, if demanded, in condemnation proceedings. This interpretation was adopted by the Judicial Conference of the United States held in March 1952, but it did not substantially affect later court decisions. The Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, in a case decided in 1952, held that only "extraordinary circumstances" warranted the use of a commission. However, in 1955, the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled otherwise, stating that Federal judges were vested with a "broad discretion" in choosing between a commission or a jury. A study of court decisions on rule 71A(h), published in 1963, concludes:

> The trend of the cases is away from a strict construction of what constitutes "extraordinary" circumstances and commissioners have been appointed under a wide variety of circumstances. A majority of jurisdictions favor the view that the rule vests in the trial judges a broad discretion to appoint commissioners and the appellate courts have been extremely reluctant to overturn the lower courts exceptional election to refer the issue of just compensation to commissioners, even where the validity of the reference was of doubtful propriety. (Nealy, "Some Historical and Legal Aspects of Rule 71A(h) in Federal Condemnation Proceedings," 23 Federal Bar Journal 45, p. 59.)

Had trial by jury been prescribed as the "usual and customary procedure" in the rule itself, rather than in an interpretation of the rule, at least some guidance would have been available for a judge's discretion. But this measure of uniformity is lacking, and, as a result, the discretionary power to deny trial by jury has been expanded beyond the original intent of the rule.

Fourth, and finally, a commission appointed under rule 71A(h) may not function as a proper legal tribunal if it is not adequately supervised by the court. The Supreme Court made this point in a decision of February 24, 1964. Justice Douglas, who delivered the opinion, warned:

> There is danger that commissioners, unlike juries, may use their own expertise and not act as a deliberative body applying constitutional standards. A jury, until it retires, sits under the direct supervision of the judge, who rules on the admissibility of evidence, who sees that witnesses are properly qualified as experts, and who polices the entire hearing, keeping it within bounds. * * * The judge who uses commissioners, however, establishes a tribunal that may become freewheeling, taking the law from itself, unless subject to close supervision. (*U.S* v. *Merz*, 376 U.S. 192, 197).

There is, of course, no way of knowing how often commissions have operated as freewheeling tribunals. But if the danger exists, as the Supreme Court said it does, then it is a very serious risk. For it would be grossly unjust if a defendant, seeking only fair payment for his land, were sent by the discretionary power of a judge before a commission governed by discretionary procedure.

The Supreme Court, in the 1964 decision, did not deal with any questions concerning the right to jury trial notwithstanding rule 71A(h), and I do not think it advisable to await the possibility that the Court will declare its own rule unconstitutional. If rule 71A(h) is to be modified, action by the Congress appears necessary. The right to a jury trial on demand of the defendant, as provided in the bill I am introducing, is the least that can be done to insure that the rule does not work any future injustice on property owners. I therefore hope that the Congress will give careful consideration to this legislation.

PRINCIPALITY OF TRANSYLVANIA

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Addabbo] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, 408 years ago in the Principality of Transylvania, a part of the Hungarian Kingdom that had to become independent to escape Turkish domination a few years before 1557, the Diet enacted a statute on June 1, which said as follows:

> Each person may hold whatever religious faith he wishes, with old or new rites, while we at the same time leave it to their judgment to do as they please in the matter of their faith, just so long, however, as they bring no harm to bear on anyone at all, lest the followers of a new religion be a source of irritation of the old profession of faith or become in any way injurious to its followers.

This act signed into law by a Catholic, Queen Isabella, is a predecessor of that article of our Constitution which establishes the freedom of conscience, the first amendment. It is also a too early forerunner of the present ecumenical spirit in the Catholic and Protestant churches which is, in turn, a result in part of militant atheism under the guise of communism trying to take over countries and continents of the globe.

When we remember the wisdom of these Transylvanians who knew from personal experience what slavery meant by the Turkish raids, we must, however, remember the present plight of the peoples of Transylvania suffering under the yoke of dictatorial communism, and particularly that of the Transylvanian Hungarians who were the spiritus rector of the 1557 Act of Tolerance. On March 24, 1965, I joined with my colleagues in deploring the discriminatory practices of the Rumanian Communist government against them and on the next day I also introduced a resolution together with several other Members to condemn these discriminatory practices. I am happy to know that the European Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is planning hearings on the resolutions by mid-June, and I trust that the resolution will finally come to the House floor before adjournment.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mr. Craley (at the request of Mr. Friedel), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Wright (at the request of Mr. White, of Texas), for the balance of the week, on account of death in the immediate family.

Mr. Aspinall, for Thursday, June 3, 1965, after 5 p.m. until June 7, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. Mathias (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for the week of June 1, 1965, on account of illness.

Mr. Hansen of Iowa (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Hechler, for 15 minutes, on tomorrow, June 3, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Brock), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rodino, today, for 15 minutes; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Patman, on June 3, for 60 minutes; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Olsen, of Montana, on June 3, for 30 minutes; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Roosevelt and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Curtis asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Vanik during general debate on H.R. 8371 and to include a table which sets forth the dollars and percentage reduction in automobile prices to be expected as a result of the excise tax reduction bill.

Mr. Fino and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Brock) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Bray.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Henderson) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Albert.

Mr. Whitener.

Mr. Helstoski in two instances.

Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Casey.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 304. An act for the relief of W. J. B. Daniel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1648. An act to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1867. An act for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles;

H.R. 2299. An act for the relief of Robert L. Yates and others;

H.R. 3051. An act for the relief of Vermont Maple Orchards, Inc., Burlington, Vt.;

H.R. 3074. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Stevens;

H.R. 3899. An act for the relief of C. R. Sheaffer & Sons; and

H.R. 7597. An act to establish the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund in the Treasury and to authorize initial capital to operate insurance programs under title 38, United States Code, section 725.

SENATE-ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 435. An act to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1867. An act for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles;

H.R. 2299. An act for the relief of Robert L. Yates and others;

H.R. 3051. An act for the relief of Vermont Maple Orchards, Inc., Burlington, Vt.;

H.R. 3074. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Stevens;

H.R. 3899. An act for the relief of C. R. Sheaffer & Sons; and

H.R. 7597. An act to establish the Veterans Reopened Insurance Fund in the Treasury and to authorize initial capital to operate insurance programs under title 38, United States Code, section 725.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 3, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1181. A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Department of State, Agency for International Development, transmitting a supplemental report to executive communication No. 651 of March 1, 1965, relative to unnecessary dollar grants to a foreign country under the foreign assistance program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1182. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter requesting Congress to approve legislation implementing the Florence Agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1183. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting reports of the number of officers on duty with headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on March 31, 1965, pursuant to section 3031(c) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1184. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 71st quarterly export control report covering the first quarter 1965, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1185. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of overpayments of per diem travel allowances, U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1186. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1187. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain persons, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87–885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1188. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in certain cases, pursuant to provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1189. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to furnish vehicles and other necessary equipment to rural carriers for the delivery of mail in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 407. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7777, a bill to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee (U.S. Air Force, retired) to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; without amendment (Rept. No. 440). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 408. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8439, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; without amendments (Rept. No. 441). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 8701. A bill to provide for landscaping and scenic enhancement of Federal-aid highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 8702. A bill to provide for the control of junkyards along certain Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 8703. A bill to provide for the control of outdoor advertising along certain Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BANDSTRA:

H.R. 8704. A bill to provide for jury trials upon demand by defendants in condemnation proceedings in U.S. district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 8705. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 8706. A bill to repeal the tax on general telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 8707. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 8708. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 8709. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other reasons; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 8710. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 8711. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 8712. A bill to provide that chief judges of circuits and chief judges of district courts shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 65; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 8713. A bill to provide for payment of special pay for duty subject to hostile fire to members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in Vietnam and the waters adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (by request):

H.R. 8714. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 8715. A bill to authorize a contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 8716. A bill to amend the act of Congress approved August 7, 1935 (Public Law 253), as amended, concerning U.S. contributions to the International Council of Scientific Unions and certain associated unions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8717. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 8718. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code with respect to military retired or retainer pay and to deductions therefrom for the provision of survivor annuities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 8719. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to salvage value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 8720. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 8721. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the Government of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 8722. A bill to permit the State of Illinois to terminate the social security coverage, under its agreement entered into under section 218 of the Social Security Act, of the members of the police department of the village of Palatine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 8723. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from gasoline-powered or diesel-powered vehicles, to establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 8724. A bill to prescribe certain safety features for all motor vehicles manufactured for, sold, or shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 8725. A bill to modernize congressional control and review over the budgetary process for the purpose of achieving efficiency and economy in the Federal Government, to provide that the Director and the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to establish a Joint Subcommittee on the Federal Budget and Fiscal Policy in the Joint Economic Committee, and to strengthen the functions of the General Accounting Office; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.J. Res. 495. Joint resolution establishing the Commission on Art and Antiquities of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 409. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 8726. A bill for the relief of Miu-Ling Chung Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 8727. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Howard H. Adelberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 8728. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria do Vau Machado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 8729. A bill for the relief of Onofrio Alaimo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8730. A bill for the relief of Assunta Cacciuottolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8731. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8732. A bill for the relief of Ercument Mergen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8733. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Storta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8734. A bill for the relief of Dr. Takashi Wakamori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 8735. A bill for the relief of Dr. Incarangal Alzona Naval; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 8736. A bill for the relief of Gertrud E. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 8737. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tong H. Chang, and his wife, Whaja Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 8738. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio Francisco Frexes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 8739. A bill for the relief of Luigi Avallone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 8740. A bill for the relief of Fumihiro Morikawa, Masamitsu Kaneko, Toru Oka, Masakatsu Kawano, Shogo Fukuda, Atsushi Saito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 8741. A bill for the relief of Maureen Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 8742. A bill for the relief of Basliel Michael Babana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Federal Government and Rhode Island Partners in Crime and Vice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the unhappy collaboration of the Federal Government and the State of Rhode Island in promoting the physical and financial wellbeing of the underworld.

I refer to the 17th century morality of the Federal and Rhode Island officialdoms who refuse to decontaminate illegal gambling by controlling it and making gambling revenues work public good rather than mob mischief. It is common knowledge that gambling profits finance every loathsome form of crime and vice known to man. This will be true so long as gambling is both illegal and widespread. The paragons of public virtue who merely sweep gambling under a social carpet of illegality rather than attempt to deal with it constructively are limited partners in every vice they help perpetuate.

Rhode Island, Mr. Speaker, is a hotbed of gambling that would be harmless if it were Government-regulated. But as it is, the Rhode Islander's fun money is the syndicate's gun money. Nor is Rhode Island gambling a smalltime operation. Rhode Island is a small State, but it has more illegal bounce to the ounce than States many times its size.

Last year, the parimutuel betting in Rhode Island came to $106 million. The real loot, however, turns on illegal gambling. Testimony before the McClellan committee pegged national off-track gambling at $50 billion annually. Other testimony indicated that off-track betting accounts for only some 42 percent of illegal gambling. This would put yearly illegal gambling in the United States at $120 billion or thereabouts. On a population basis, Rhode Island would have about $600 million of this total. The crime rings get to keep about 10 percent of this money as profit.

By keeping gambling illegal, the unholy partnership of the Federal and State Governments makes all this possible. So long as gambling is illegal, it will work against, and not for, the people. The governments that team up to keep gambling under the rug and out of the sunlight are fullfledged partners in the dirt that ensues.

I ask the Members of Congress to look at the relationship between crime and gambling, and to ignore the bleats of the wounded lobbyists of the syndicate-bluenose alliance who hate the truth. We need a national lottery in America to make the ineradicable gambling instinct work for the national good and not the national detriment.

Houston All-City Symphony Invited to Beyreuth Music Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in its renowned history, the Beyreuth Wagnerian Festival in Germany has invited an American high school orchestra to perform at its festivities.

We, in Houston, are extremely proud that the honor goes to our own Houston All-City Symphony Orchestra, composed of 105 talented junior and senior high school musicians.

Sponsored by the music department of the Houston public schools, the All-City Orchestra has appeared on television, recorded albums, and plays for outstanding civic occasions in our city and State. This invitation is an honor they richly deserve, and is but one more in a growing list of such distinctions. They were selected as the most outstanding in the Nation by the National School Orchestra Association, and they have performed for the National Mid-West Band and Orchestra Clinic in Chicago.

In this day, when we read and hear so much about our "lost generation" of teenagers, the beatniks and the delinquents, it is indeed gratifying that such a fine group of boys and girls as this can go abroad to show the world the true caliber of the youth of our Nation. They will make great ambassadors to the world's finest music festival. They will be a credit to our Nation, our great city, and to their distinguished director, Harry Lantz, who has worked so hard and patiently to develop them into the artists they are.

At the moment, the youngsters and the many civic-minded citizens of our area are engaged in raising the $65,000 needed to defray the expenses of this magnificent trip. I certainly intend to do all I can to help them in this worthwhile endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to share the news of this great honor to a fine group of youngsters, for I know my colleagues share my own pride that such a distinguished student orchestra will represent the United States. We all have every reason to be proud of them.

Layne R. Beaty, Former Resident of Ardmore, Okla., Receives Superior Service Award for Improving and Expanding the Broadcasting of Agricultural and Consumer Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to advise my colleagues that Mr. Layne R. Beaty, Chief of the Radio and Television Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, recently was presented with the Superior Service Award by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, for having improved and expanded the broadcasting of agricultural and consumer information.

All Oklahomans are proud of Mr. Beaty. He was born in Caddo, Okla., which is in my congressional district; graduated from high school in Ardmore, Okla., also in my congressional district; and received his college education at Southeastern State Teachers College in Durant, Okla., still in my congressional district.

Layne Beaty has done a magnificent job with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Secretary Freeman cited him "for his achievement of more efficient radio-television service and a wider use of department programs through his work with broadcast media." Under his leadership, weekly radio tape distribution from the Department of Agriculture increased from 374 stations to 630 stations. He established the highly successful weekly half-hour program, "Across the Fence."

I salute Layne Beaty for this recognition of his fine contributions to our country. I also congratulate his fine parents, Mr. and Mrs. E. Carl Beaty of Ardmore, Okla.

Anniversary of the First Religious Tolerance Legislation in Transylvania of June 1, 1557

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the most important date in Transylvanian history is June 1, 1557, for on that date the Diet of Torda in Transylvania passed the first religious tolerance edict.

June 1, 1965, marks the 408th anniversary of the act of 1557 which provided for freedom of conscience and for the free exercise of religion, the first of its kind in Europe which was torn by religious warfare between the Catholics and Protestants, and often between the various Protestant denominations themselves.

This religious tolerance edict speaks of the great wisdom and courage of the Transylvanian people in that they could so early realize that true religion comes from the heart and from the love of God and mankind.

Today, when Transylvania is under Communist domination and when its Hungarian and Saxon minorities are especially oppressed, it is well that we pause to commemorate this historic event.

The history of Transylvania is replete with examples of tolerance toward mankind. The act of 1557 was followed, in 1571, by the final act which provided that "the word of God shall be preached freely everywhere; no one shall be harmed for any creed, neither preachers nor listeners." The tenor of the acts sound almost like the spirit of our own Constitution and the first amendment, and expresses the highest ideals for which our forebears often fled from Europe: individual and religious freedom.

The people of Transylvania can point with pride to some of their ancestors who provided the statesmanship and culture of that country. Transylvania gave Poland one of its greatest kings, Stephen Batory; Queen Isabella who signed the 1557 Act of Tolerance into law was the daughter of a Polish king and her son, John Sigismund, was the first Prince of Transylvania.

The famous mathematician, Eugene Bolyai, the founder of non-Euclidan geometry, and the great Hungarian prince and freedom fighter Francis Rakoczi, the ally of Louis XIV and the great explorer of Tibet, Alexander Korosi-Csoma are examples of Transylvanian citizens who became known throughout Europe and the world. Another is the famous Prime Minister of Hungary, Count Paul Teleki, who committed suicide rather than break his word and attack Yugoslavia in 1941 in league with Adolf Hitler.

What is the present fate of Transylvania? After World War II it was given to Rumania, between 1940 and 1944 it was divided between Hungary and Rumania and, at present, is again a part of Communist Rumania. Its Hungarian population is still numerous despite decades of Rumanianization, reaching about 1.75 million in population. Communist oppression constitutes a heavy burden on Rumanians, Hungarians, and the German Saxons alike in Transylvania. The middle classes were economically and often physically destroyed. The Hungarian minority is regarded as suspect ever since student demonstrations, which often also involved Rumanian students as well, in Transyvlania; showed that the Hungarians sympathized with their brethren across the frontiers who were writing a glorious, but unsuccessful, chapter of their history with their fight for freedom from communism and the Soviet Union in 1956.

Mr. Speaker, the future destiny of this minority group is far from being bright. In 1957, there were still 1,116 schools which taught the Hungarian language. Now there is no independent Hungarian language school left in all Rumania, only integrated schools with a Hungarian branch in which an increasing number of courses are taught in the Rumanian language.

Between 1952 and 1961 there was at least a semblance of local autonomy in the form of the Magyar autonomous province in eastern Transylvania, though it never did comprise more than 28 percent of Transylvania's Magyar population. In 1961 even this was changed by assigning several purely Hungarian districts to the adjoining Rumanian province and by adding Rumanian districts to the autonomous region.

This served as a pretext for decreasing the number of Hungarians in the local councils to less than one-third of the total membership, although the Hungarians were still making up 63 percent of the population of the area.

Hungarian professionals who still must overcome heavy odds in obtaining their diplomas in courses of higher education are assigned by the state into Rumanian areas in Transylvania or to other Rumanian regions outside Transylvania.

By virtue of the 1963–64 amnesty, political prisoners were released from prison confinement, although many clergymen and political figures still remain in custody. Moreover, as a result of street brawls and unrest, large groups of Hungarians were arrested last summer on the charge of agitating against the treatment of the Hungarian minority by the regime; or on disorderly conduct charges when they tried to defend themselves from bodily attacks by the Rumanians who were incensed by the fact that the Hungarians dared to use their own language in public places. The November 19, 1964, issue of the Reporter carried a story by George Bailey who stated that the Hungarian salespeople in a store in the capital of the autonomous region refused to talk to him in Hungarian lest they should be summarily dismissed from their jobs.

Religious freedom is also sharply curtailed or totally absent. Several people who have relatives in Transylvania have told me that they have received letters which state that "going to church is still a sin against the Government." Two Catholic bishoprics are vacant and in the third the bishop is still not free to freely exercise his ecclesiastical rites, nor was he permitted to attend the meetings of the Vatican Council.

Industrialization is also used to artificially promote Rumanization of compact Hungarian areas. At Marosvasarhely—Tirgu Mures—at the powerplant at Erdoszentgyorgy in the autonomous region and many other places where new plants and factories were established, the Government uses imported Rumanian labor and technicians instead of local Hungarian labor which is, in turn, encouraged to migrate into the Rumanian areas around Brasov or to the capital city of Bucharest.

Many other instances of discrimination could be cited, including the three officially admitted death sentences in 1957, the hundreds of arrests between 1957 and 1961. According to affidavits of local residents who were part of the 3,000 persons living in one village in the autonomous area between 1954 and 1963, not less than 17 Unitarian ministers were imprisoned and 54 people sentenced to long prison terms because of alleged infractions of the law.

Under the circumstances, I am happy to note that several of my colleagues have already raised the Transylvanian question in this House during the latter part of March and have introduced resolutions condemning the discriminatory practices of the Rumanian Government. It is my understanding that the European Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has scheduled hearings for mid-June on this subject. I hope that our Government will do its utmost during the economic and cultural negotiations with Rumania to ease the situation of the people of Transylvania, especially that of the oppressed Hungarian minority.

John Shissler Retires From Lakewood, Ohio, Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, after 43 years my good friend, John Shissler, is retiring as president and editor of the Lakewood Post, serving the residents of the Lakewood, Ohio, area in the 23d District which I represent.

The Post will continue its contribution to the community under the very capable supervision of John's longtime copublisher, David R. Hawley, and Harry Volk and Milton L. Friendlander, owners and publishers of the Heights Sun Newspapers, who have purchased his stock interest in the newspaper.

John Shissler began his newspaper career as a reporter with the Cleveland Plain Dealer while attending Western Reserve University. He was graduated in 1921 and a year later took over editorship of the Post, launching a career in journalism which has played an important part in the impressive growth of the city of Lakewood.

John is a quiet, unassuming man who probably would deprecate the praise his friends in greater Cleveland are voicing as they review the many years he has dedicated to the interests of the west side.

It is good to know he plans to spend much of his time traveling, adding to the store of Travel Vignettes which he wrote for the Post over the years. I am pleased to report that he plans to publish them in book form.

John Shissler's many loyal readers will miss him. I personally regret the loss of his wise and valuable counsel and the thoughtful editorials he wrote which kept a finger on the pulse of his community. John has been a wonderful friend to me over the years. He has my affectionate regard and good wishes for the future.

I wish too to express my confidence in his successors. As John said of them in his farewell statement in the Post, Harry Volk and Milt Friedlander are newspapermen "uniquely fitted by demonstrated competence, successful experience and earned respect to aid in carrying forward the traditions which have so long characterized" the paper.

New Jersey Homing Pigeon Fanciers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring to the attention of my colleagues the good works being accomplished in New Jersey by a group of sportsmen who previously came to their country's aid during time of war.

I am speaking of the more than 500 members of nine racing pigeon clubs who live in my district and the entire northern New Jersey area who have been giving aid to Cerebral Palsy Centers in Bergen and Passaic Counties during the past 6 years.

These men spend much of their free time, Mr. Speaker, engaged in a very fascinating hobby, the breeding, training and racing of long-distance homing pigeons.

It was not so very long ago that these same individuals came to their country's aid, not only by donating birds that were used during both World Wars by our Armed Forces as message carriers, but also by serving themselves with the Army Signal Corps, Air Force, and Navy, training message carriers and developing the use of pigeon communications.

In each of the two World Wars the Armed Forces of the United States drew upon the lofts of civilian fanciers for more than 50,000 valuable, highly tested racing pigeons, which served as breeding stock to produce the message carriers used in combat. A very high portion of this number came from my State, which is a leading center of the racing pigeon sport.

Descendants of these civilian pigeons established a remarkable record during wartime in the percentage of messages delivered. It was rare indeed when the pigeon-borne message failed to go through. If one, two or three were shot down—often the case—there was another to take its place.

Many of the fanciers from my district were in the combat areas, setting up the message centers and instructing troops in the use of pigeons.

There are legendary stories to tell about the pigeon heroes of our armed forces. Thousands of soldiers and airmen were saved by these feathered messengers in all theaters of operations in both wars. Many men today owe their lives to the valor of these birds.

A number of the feathered warriors turned in such outstanding feats that they were decorated for heroism and extraordinary performance. To them have been awarded the Dickin Medal, the counterpart of the Congressional Medal awarded to the human members of our Armed Forces.

From these civilian pigeons came the fabled "Cher Ami," who as a blood-smeared ball of feathers, one of his wings shot through, one leg gone, he carried the message dangling from its ligaments which saved the famous Lost Battalion of the Argonne. There also were "Big Tom," "President Wilson," "Mocker," "Blackie Halligan," the priceless "GI Joe," who saved the lives of 1,000 British infantrymen, "Wickie," "Paddy," "Ruhr Express," "Burma Queen" and others who survived and surpassed shellfire and weather to carry vital messages to their soldier-trainers.

Today, although refinements in electronics apparently have made pigeon message carriers obsolete in warfare, New Jersey fanciers still say they are ready to help if needed. Indeed, a number of them are now using their birds for message carriers during drills held by civil defense units. All of them are continuing as sportsmen to develop better techniques of conditioning and training pigeons and are flying them with remarkable speeds for distances up to 500 and 600 miles.

But they also are showing the same spirit and willingness to help their community in my district as they did during the war—this time in a far different direction.

Annually, the outstanding members of the Bergen County, Passaic, Paterson, North Jersey, Westside, North Haledon, Little Falls, Lyndhurst, and Garfield Homing Pigeon Clubs give young pigeons bred from their best birds to the Bergen and Passaic Counties Pigeon Fliers Cerebral Palsy Fund.

Others are donated to the fund by fanciers from many parts of the United States. On several occasions, European fanciers, impressed by the effort on behalf of children, have shipped birds to the sale.

The annual auction of these young racing pigeons, each with a pedigree as impressive as a thoroughbred, draws fancier from many States to compete in the bidding. Prices range as high as $100 per pair—and all of this money is donated annually to the Bergen and Passaic Counties Cerebral Palsy Centers.

The most recent auction was held several weeks ago and Arthur Kachadrian, treasurer, informs me that the homing pigeon fanciers donated $2,700 to the cerebral palsy centers this year, a record high.

This amount, added to previous donations, makes a total of more than $15,000 contributed by these civic-minded sportsmen for the aid of stricken children. Their efforts have provided much help through needed therapy and hope through the promise of research.

This effort, and the time-consuming job done by the men in charge of the fund, is worthy of accolades, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud to have such sportsmen living in my district and home State.

Case for Repeal of 14(b)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this Congress I introduced H.R. 1151 to amend section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act to prohibit the States from passing so-called right-to-work laws. And all during this first session of this Congress I, like all of my colleagues, have been asked for my views on the question of repeal of section 14(b). Both repeal of section 14(b) and amendment of section 14(b) are proposed for the same reason—to restore free choice to labor and management alike when faced with the question of union security.

I am happy to insert in the RECORD the text of an article I wrote for Drive, in which I present my reasons for supporting repeal or amendment of section 14(b):

THE CASE FOR REPEAL OF 14(b)

(By Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT)

Congress over the past 30 or more years has adopted the policy that free collective bargaining is to be favored and encouraged. What laws it has passed affecting collective bargaining have primarily been for the purpose of establishing ground rules for its conduct. As such they have been essentially procedural in nature. There has been a reluctance by Congress to interfere with the substantive terms of what is actually agreed to by the parties. Even in the procedural area Congress has acted with restraint. Only if it felt that legislation was required to increase the utility and effectiveness of collective bargaining did it take action.

It is my belief that the 89th Congress must act to assure the vitality of the collective bargaining process. And it can best afford such protection by repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. By so doing it will strike down the so-called right to work acts which 20 States have enacted, and will restore to labor and management in these States the right to fully agree upon mutually aceptable terms of employment.

FAVORS COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

I firmly believe that union membership as a basis of continued employment should be neither required nor forbidden by law, but that the decision should be left to agreement by management and labor through the process of collective bargaining.

The effect of section 14(b) is to forbid an employer and a union to agree that union membership shall be a condition of employment.

It is not my intention, either now or when this matter comes to the Congress, to argue only that the union shop benefits both labor and management through the stability it brings to labor relations, the orderly and uniform contract administration it secures, the more effective voice it gives to employers or the assurances of greater union democracy it provides.

Nor shall I stress only the strict codes of democratic conduct which the Government by law has imposed on unions. No other voluntary organization must meet such requirements of secret ballot elections, frequently held, freedom to criticize elected officials without reprisal, and democratic procedures for setting policy and making decisions.

MUST REPRESENT ALL

Nor shall I emphasize solely that the union shop operates only where a majority of the workers have decided in its favor and where the employer has agreed with the union to a union security contract. Under Federal law, the union which is selected by a majority of the workers must represent all the workers in the factory or shop in collective bargaining relations with the employer. The union has no choice. Even if it wanted to, it could not refuse to represent any individual worker or group of workers. It must represent them all.

What I do urge as the most basic argument for repeal of section 14(b) is that, consistent with the clearly stated congressional policy mentioned above, unions and employers should be free to negotiate union security provisions if they wish to do so. And, they should be free to exclude such provisions if they cannot agree on them. What I want, and what repeal of section 14 (b) would assure is freedom for American unions and American employers—freedom to agree or disagree on union security, without interference from State government.

I am equally convinced that section 14(b) and the right-to-work laws it fosters result in an out-and-out contradiction on the one hand, and repudiation on the other, of that congressional policy which I urgently commend as being most compatible with our American traditions of free democratic action.

The American Patent System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Congressman RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, of Indiana, is leading the fight for corrective legislation to curb foreign drug pirates who are injuring American industry and labor.

Congressman ROUDEBUSH's efforts started in the 87th Congress, and have since gained wide nonpartisan support among Members who have become aware of the situation in some industries.

Fifteen Members of the House have followed Congressman ROUDEBUSH's lead and cosponsored legislation in the House, and Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey has introduced similar legislation in the Senate.

As the leadoff witness of Senator WILLIAMS' bill held Wednesday, June 2, before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Congressman ROUDEBUSH explained the problem in detail.

Under unanimous consent, I request his Senate testimony be reprinted in its entirety for the information of all Members of Congress.

Congressman ROUDEBUSH's testimony follows:

> The American patent system is as old as this Nation of ours, and I am here today to add my support to Senate bill 1047, introduced last February 8 by the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., distinguished U.S. Senator from New Jersey.
>
> Senator WILLIAMS' bill is designed to protect the American patent system, American industry, and the American worker.
>
> I am the father of this legislation, so to speak, and have introduced bills identical to Senator WILLIAMS' bill, in not only this Congress, but in the 87th and 88th Congresses.
>
> My current bill in the House—H.R. 150—was introduced last January 4, on the first day of the 89th Congress.
>
> Since January 29, 1962, I have made 11 speeches on the floor of the House of Representatives, citing the advantages of the American patent system and the necessity for protecting and preserving this system.
>
> After working during three Congresses to enlist support for this most needed legislation, we were greatly encouraged and very proud and pleased when Senator WILLIAMS offered the bill in the Senate.
>
> Quite deservedly, this legislation enjoys wide bipartisan support because of its unique need in the field of patent law.
>
> There are a total of 16 bills in the House similar to Senator WILLIAMS' bill. Besides my own bill, similar legislation has been offered by Congressman BRAY of Indiana, Congressman HALL of Missouri, Congressman RODINO of New Jersey, Congressman ADAIR of Indiana, Congressman O'KONSKI of Wisconsin, Congressman CAREY of New York, Congressman HARVEY of Indiana, Congressman CARTER of Kentucky, Congressman DONOHUE of Massachusetts, Congressman DOW of New York, Congressman ST. ONGE of Connecticut, Congressman McDADE of Pennsylvania, Congressman POOL of Texas, Congressman NELSEN of Minnesota, and Congressman TENZER of New York.
>
> This bill is picking up more support all the time, and both American industry and organized labor have indicated interest in its passage.
>
> The bill would prohibit the Federal Government of the United States from purchasing foreign-made articles which have been manufactured from processes protected by American patents, where the patent and invention knowledge has not been obtained legally, or properly licensed.
>
> The proposed legislation, however, contains an emergency provision that would permit the Secretary of Defense to purchase these foreign items if he deemed it necessary to the national security of the United States.
>
> Need for this legislation has arisen from the purchasing methods of the Defense Department, Veterans' Administration, and other agencies, which have been making oversea purchases, chiefly of drug and pharmaceutical items, from concerns which obtained the formula for such products from American inventions by illegal methods.
>
> These foreign manufacturers, using American patents, have been able to undersell their American competitors because the foreign concerns have had no scientific research expense.
>
> As you know, great expense of American industry is involved in the research and development of new products which have enabled our Nation to reach its present pinnacle of success and achievement.
>
> But, when foreign competitors can obtain these secret American processes without benefit of lawful transaction and then reproduce American products at exceedingly low costs, both American industry and American jobs are endangered.
>
> The latest figures made available to me reveal that for the current fiscal year, total Government purchases of drug items are about $80 million.
>
> Of this amount, an estimated $2 to $3 million involve offshore purchases of items manufactured with American patents not legally obtained.
>
> This is a tremendous blow, not only to the American drug industry, but, in terms of jobs, an estimated $10 million has been lost in employment over the past 5 years.
>
> Four hundred jobs have been lost in the drug industry, and another 100 jobs lost in related fields during this 5-year period.
>
> Loss of business to foreign markets involving illegal patent acquisition is costing an estimated 100 to 150 new jobs in the drug industry each year.
>
> American industry and American labor are not afraid of fair competition. But, when American capital is forced to compete with foreign manufacturers who have gained their advantage illegaly, Congress should act.
>
> At present, the Federal Government, through its Defense Department and Veterans' Administration agencies, encourages circumvention of American patent and research rights by purchasing items from these oversea sources.
>
> American economic growth depends today more upon technological advances than upon any other single factor. And new technologies in turn depend on advance in sciene.
>
> Advance in science depends, of course, on American research and development.
>
> The Federal Government should be doing everything possible to encourage this research and development in American industry, instead of discouraging and retarding it by rewarding oversea patent parasites.
>
> Research and development by American industry will create more new products and new jobs. This progress must not be impeded by shortsighted Federal agencies.
>
> Instead, the Federal Government must lead the bandwagon to encourage and promote this continuing research.
>
> Tens of millions of American workers can trace their jobs directly to inventions; almost no jobs can be found that are completely free from the effects of patents issued in the past century.
>
> Now 175 years old, the American patent system has issued 3,250,000 patents, outlining the greatest technological revolution the world has known and detailing everything from mousetraps to the $126 million Mercury space capsule.
>
> Today the Patent Office receives more than 1,000 applications weekly.
>
> Ours is a system of free and competitive enterprise, and in such a system, if it is to be preserved, business and industry must take the initiative in research. Government can and should help when and where it can, and as frequently as it can, but without usurp-

ing prerogatives that belong in the private sector or undermining the basic incentives of our free enterprise system. One of the best means we have to help the private sector is in strengthening our patent system, for the patent system is at the very core of our technical effort and is a powerful stimulus to industrial growth.

Senator WILLIAMS' bill will help strengthen the American patent system, and I respectfully urge your support. It is no accident that the strongest patent system in the world is located in the strongest nation in the world.

Thank you.

Memorial Day Address of the Honorable James Kee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and beloved colleague, the Honorable JAMES KEE, of West Virginia, was invited to deliver the Memorial Day address at the Veterans Memorial in Bethesda, Md., on Monday, May 31, 1965. The program was sponsored by representatives of veterans and other patriotic organizations of Montgomery County, Md.

Congressman KEE prepared a most eloquent speech but due to the death of his aunt, Mrs. C. T. Smith, of Bluefield, W. Va., the Congressman could not deliver his address in person. Congressman KEE's superb and timely address was read at the memorial services by his able administrative assistant, Frank Gus Tsutras.

Congressman KEE's address was truly magnificent and I commend this classic oration to the attention of the entire Congress and the people of the United States:

Mr. Master of Ceremonies, reverend clergy, members of the Veterans Memorial Day Committee, representatives of participating organizations—ladies and gentlemen, it is with a humble heart that I join with you on this sacred day.

Memorial Day has a special significance for each of us because this day of reverence for our military dead—including both men and women—had its humble origin in the hearts of the American people.

It is proper that we assemble here at your Veterans Memorial.

The story has been told many times before but in the retelling it never loses the freshness of its simple grandeur.

About a century ago the most dreadful war in the annals of our country was coming to a close.

It was a civil war, a war between the States, a war of neighbor against neighbor, of family against family, of brother against brother.

When the hostilities finally ceased—in both North and South—grief-stricken mothers and fathers set aside this day to place wreaths and flowers on the final resting place of their loved ones who had paid the supreme sacrifice.

It was a spontaneous gesture.

In the beginning the day was known as Decoration Day. Flowers were chosen by the mourners as the appropriate symbol to express eternal devotion to the gallant young men who had gone before.

Later, this day was enshrined in the calendar of our sacred holidays and officially proclaimed as Memorial Day.

But even today, a century after, there are millions of Americans who prefer to call this historic day by its homely name of Decoration Day.

Since the dawn of recorded history, men have sought to find appropriate words and ceremonies to express our love and gratitude for the heroic dead who died in war.

Down through the centuries, the story of the small band of Spartans of Ancient Greece who held the pass at Thermopylae has become a treasured legend.

According to tradition, a simple marker was set up to recall their deeds—a marker inscribed with a few words which the noted English author—John Ruskin—described as "the noblest group of words ever uttered by man." Let me quote those words to you:

"Go tell the Spartans, thou that passeth by, that here, obedient to their laws, we lie."

Suppose we adapt those inspiring words to this occasion. We are the passers-by. Upon us, there lies the holy duty to tell this generation of Americans—and the next generation of Americans, that our military dead rest content because they died in the defense of our liberties. In a thousand hallowed cemeteries across this broad land, there lie buried untold numbers of young Americans whose names will never be known to us, who fought to save their country with the same gallantry which made immortal the Spartan youth who died at Thermopylae.

This is the true meaning of Memorial Day. This is the reason why the memory of our military dead must never be erased from the tablets of our memory. This is the reason why Memorial Day has now been set aside to honor the dead of all wars in which our country participated.

There is another lesson of deep meaning to be gleaned from the story of the Civil War. In the third year of that conflict, there was fought at nearby Gettysburg, the greatest battle, and the most costly in terms of human sacrifice, ever fought on the American continent. We are inclined to think of the soldiers of the past as mature men and seasoned veterans. But the official records reveal that the average age of the Union soldiers who fought at Gettysburg was 19 years and a few months. The average of the Confederate soldiers who fought there was slightly less. So the issue of Gettysburg was contested, not by mature men grown old and hardened by war but, by youngsters and, if you will, by competing hosts of teenagers.

This has been true in practically every war. Young men must do the fighting. This is the ultimate meaning and the deep mystery of war. The greatest sacrifice is demanded of those who have the most to lose.

The young men who died on a hundred American battlefields like Gettysburg, passed on just when the golden promise of life was at its zenith. Like the young people of today they looked forward to a happy life, to the joys of courtship and to the deep satisfaction of founding a home and rearing children of their own. But duty called them to a sterner fate and they responded. They gave up the golden future because there were some values which they valued more than life.

We glory in the gallantry of the Union soldiers who died at Gettysburg. But the wounds of war have long since healed and I believe—like Abraham Lincoln—that we must cherish the memory of the young Confederate soldiers who died so bravely for the lost cause. What happened at Gettysburg is now enshrined as a sacred part of our American heritage. In our charity, and compassion, let us rest content that divine providence and not us will pass final judgment on the merits of the boys who won and the boys who lost.

I am pleased to see so many of our younger generation participating in this ceremony—to pay reverent tribute to the men and women who died on land and sea to preserve America. There is a message of inspiration to be garnered from this annual day of recollection. This gathering has a dual purpose: to express our gratitude to the heroes of the past and to rekindle the flame of our own patriotism. I am happy that you young people are privileged to live in the fairest land on the face of the earth: and I ardently trust that every one of you will go away conscious of the truth that every liberty you possess was earned in the blood of America's martyred dead. You are the most valued asset of America—the time is rapidly coming when the responsibility of the leadership of our Nation will be in your hands.

The men and women of my own generation have their lesson to learn from this observance. As in ancient Sparta—we are the passers-by—we are the ones who must never weary in telling the next generation about the enduring value of our precious American heritage.

The United States became a Nation in a mighty protest against tyranny. It has been truly said that the soldiers and sailors of the Revolution did something more than win liberty for their own countrymen—they lit the torch of freedom all over this globe. They taught the race of mankind that no matter how hard or how long the struggle, freemen will always prevail over tyranny.

This Nation is now nearing the end of the second century of its existence as a free nation. But the struggle against tyranny still goes on. The United States fought in two World Wars to halt the spread of despotism that threatened to engulf Europe and ultimately ourselves.

Hardly more than a decade ago this Nation fought a war in far-off Korea to contain the onward sweep of the most hateful tyranny that ever cursed this earth—the conspiracy of international communism. Today the soldiers and sailors, the marines, and airmen of the United States are battling against a new encroachment of Communist tyranny—this time in faroff Vietnam. The cast of participants has changed, but the issue remains the same. The issue is freedom against tyranny.

In every time of crisis there are timid souls who believe that the easiest way is to yield. Just now there is a vigorous and clamorous minority telling the youth of America that in Vietnam we are fighting a war in which we have no business—fighting a war which we cannot hope to win. They seek to intimidate the American public by warning of what Communist China will do or what Communist Russia will do if we persist.

For the sake of our young people who may be misled by this clamor, suppose we set the record straight. This Nation gave a solemn pledge to stand by its loyal allies in South Vietnam and a resolute President of the United States with the backing of the Congress has decreed that we shall honor that pledge.

Are we in danger of defeat in Vietnam?

Suppose we turn once again, for light and guidance, to our own Revolutionary War. The story of Valley Forge is engraved on the heart of every American boy and girl. George Washington was there with an army of young country boys who knew very little about the science of organized warfare. He had an army short of guns and muskets and short of ammunition. An army without decent food or shelter, to fight the rigors of a terrible winter. Against this rabble in arms there was arrayed the world's strongest military power. Close by in Philadelphia was a well-supplied army supported by a navy of unrivaled might.

The critics in those far-off days said that George Washington couldn't possibly win against such tremendous odds. But the critics were wrong—because they failed to count the spiritual weapons in General Washington's Army. They overlooked the fact that free men were fighting against tyranny.

I sometimes feel glad that today's timid souls were not at Valley Forge. Not that their gloomy pessimism would have discouraged George Washington. But in times of stress—the general had a hasty temper—and he might have lost patience with those who preached that he and his hungry lads should forsake the cause of freedom because they were outgunned and outmanned.

Let me give this word of assurance to the younger generation. We shall not be deterred from doing what is right in Vietnam by Communist threats or Communist bullying. We are not outgunned—and we are not outmanned—and we are going to prevail. The United States is going to accomplish what it set out to accomplish—to help preserve the liberty of a brave people. Just that and nothing more.

On this Memorial Day, let us relearn the grandest lesson that history has to teach—the lesson—that until the last trumpet sounds—your country will not give ground to the evil power of tyranny. This much we owe to the brave men—and women—who died that our country might live.

We will not fail our obligation.

Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6400, the so-called voting rights bill, will soon be on the floor for consideration by the House of Representatives.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary I have joined with my colleagues, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. John Dowdy, and the gentleman from South Carolina, Hon. Robert T. Ashmore, in preparing and filing minority views. I ask unanimous consent that this statement of our views be made a part of the Record.

Minority Views of Basil L. Whitener, John Dowdy, and Robert T. Ashmore, Members of the House of Representatives, on H.R. 6400

H.R. 6400 is a legislative proposal of questionable constitutionality but unquestioned harshness. It has been characterized by its author as "strong medicine."

As legislators under a sworn duty to support and defend the Constitution of the United States we are compelled to register our strong disagreement with the majority of our colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary. This compulsion results from our firm conviction that the majority of the committee would lead the Nation down a path of destriuction of basic principles which have made our Nation the envy of the people throughout the world.

We recognize and applaud the provisions of the Constitution of the United States which guarantees to all qualified citizens the right to vote. We do not condone discriminatory practices of any type which would deprive a qualified American of this right. Our opposition to H.R. 6400 is strong, but it is not one whit stronger than our desire to see that the right of qualified persons to vote is protected within the framework of time-honored constitutional principles.

Thoughtful people in areas of the Nation other than those made the target of this iniquitous legislation have sounded a warning to the Congress. On March 22, 1965, the Wall Street Journal discussed the legislation in an editorial entitled "An Immoral Law." This editorial so clearly registers our views that we quote its full text at this point:

"AN IMMORAL LAW

"When President Johnson last Monday asked Congress for a new law to safeguard the voting rights of Negro citizens he rested his case on the Constitution and on a basic principle of morality.

"What he has now proposed that the Congress do is enact a law which would violate that Constitution he asks us not to flout and, more, which is itself immoral.

"If you think not so, consider:

"The administration's bill offers a formula—a complicated one, which we will come to in a moment—to prohibit certain States from using any test of a citizen's ability to read and write our language as a qualification for voting.

"The argument for doing this is the 15th amendment to the Constitution which provides, clearly enough, that neither the Federal Government nor any State shall deprive a citizen of his vote "on account of" his race or color.

"But the proposed bill does not stop with providing means against the violation of the 15th amendment. It does not aim at insuring that any such State literacy test shall be fairly drawn and impartially administered so that it may not be used as an excuse to deprive anyone of his vote "on account of" his race.

"The effect—and indeed the purpose—would be to abolish such tests entirely in the affected States. And that flies squarely in the face of this selfsame Constitution which the President professes to uphold.

"The very first article of that Constitution authorizes the individual States to decide the qualifications of voters in both Federal and State elections, subject only to the proviso that whoever is deemed qualified to vote for "the most numerous branch of the State legislature" is automatically qualified to vote in Federal elections.

"Making this a State function was no casual decision. It was reaffirmed in identical language in the 17th amendment—adopted, incidentally, more than 40 years after the 15th amendment—which provided that all such qualifications should be impartially applied among all citizens.

"This principle in the Constitution has been repeatedly upheld and affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court, not merely in dusty antiquity but as recently as 1959 by judges presently sitting upon that bench.

"Now we are well aware that there are a good many people, and perhaps the President is included, who oppose any literacy requirement. They say that a man's illiteracy is irrelevant to the question of having his judgment counted in public affairs. No man can quarrel with the right of such people to argue their case and, if persuasive, to alter the Constitution so as to prohibit them.

"But the requirement that voters be able to read and write is by no means restricted to those Southern States now the object of this special legislation. Many others—including New York State—require that qualification, as the Constitution entitle them to do.

"If it is immoral, as the President says, to deprive a qualified citizen of his right to vote 'under color of a literacy test,' is it moral to violate one part of the Constitution under the color of upholding another which is in nowise in conflict?

"Nor does the question end there, for what this bill propose to do is to set up a double standard. Some States would be permitted to keep their literacy requirement; others would not.

"The formula prescribed is that of a ratio between the number of persons of voting age within a State and the number of voters in an election. If 50 percent or more of the voting age inhabitants do vote, then the State is absolved. The Federal authorities will keep out, and the State may set its own qualifications for voters, including literacy tests; otherwise, no.

"This formula has been carefully devised so that in practice it is expected to apply only to six States—Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia. In these States the Federal authorities would not only have the right to supervise voter registration but to abolish the voter qualifications they don't like.

"A few moments' reflection on this formula will suggest such weird paradoxes, and the possibility of such strange discriminations, as to stagger the mind.

"A minor one is that a strict application of the formula would probably make it applicable to Alaska. However, a way has been devised to exempt it, which as much as anything suggests that the intent is not to write a general rule of law but to subject certain States to special laws.

"Not so minor, but certainly weird, is the provision that a person once registered as a voter by the Federal authorities will be stricken from the list if he fails to vote 'at least once during 3 consecutive years while listed.' In short, you have to vote or you can't.

"Of more consequence is the fact that if we have this law a citizen, white or Negro, can be entitled to a vote in Alabama no matter how illiterate he is or, for that matter, even if he is a moron. But if the same citizen, white or Negro, lives in New York State he will not be entitled to vote.

"This would create a truly ingenious paradox. The illiterate citizen, Negro or otherwise, would find himself with more 'rights' in Alabama and her five outcast sister States than in the great State of New York. More, the educational level of the voting citizens of Alabama, the low level of which is part of the general complaint against it by civil rights leaders, would be further reduced. And this by Federal sanction.

"Unfortunately, the irony is not funny. Beneath the paradox lies a serious question. Is it moral that our national laws should apply one rule to one State and another to another, requiring that the people of one State abolish qualifications for voters while the people of another State may uphold their standards?

"Nor is that the end of the consequences of that weird formula. Recall that it permits the Federal Government to put all this machinery in motion, the takeover of the whole voting procedure by Federal authorities, only when the voting percentage of a

State falls below 50 percent of the voting-age population. If there was ever a device open to what President Johnson calls manipulation, this is it.

"So long as a State contrives that one-half of its adults vote, it is free of the formula. This will not be overlooked by ingenious men who can contrive many things when justice is measured by percentages.

"And this brings us to what we think is the fundamental immorality of this proposed law, unintentioned though it may be by those who drew it.

"Any citizen, white or Negro, has the right to be treated by the law like all other citizens. If he has to meet qualifications to vote—age or any other—they must be only the qualifications asked of all. If he qualifies like any other he has the right to vote and to deny him that right is to deny him what is inalienably his.

"It makes no difference whether 99 percent of his neighbors vote or whether only 20 percent do. It makes no difference whether he has voted in the last three elections, or in none at all before he presents himself at the polls. His right is to vote or not to vote as he pleases.

"That is the whole of the moral issue. And the whole duty of government, insofar as it touches this matter, is to see that all equally can exercise this right.

"The constitutional duty of the Federal Government is to see that this right is not abridged—anywhere, populous States or sparse States, Northern States or Southern States where many go to the polls or where few take the trouble to. The means of assuring this, everywhere, is what any Federal voting law ought to do, and all it ought to do.

"To play with complicated formulas, to measure justice by percentages, and to aim punitive laws at some States, not only violates both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution but buries the real moral question in sophistry."

Many outstanding legal scholars have expressed views in accord with the foregoing comment of the Wall Street Journal. One of those was the distinguished attorney general of the Commonwealth of Virginia who testified before Subcommittee No. 5 of our committee that the bill was "among the most dangerous pieces of legislation ever offered in the Congress of the United States. I make this statement advisedly, for I earnestly believe it goes further than any step yet attempted to erode the basic concepts of constitutional government in which the individual States are acknowledged to be sovereign. The legislation is not only patently unconstitutional, but it is shockingly discriminatory."

H.R. 6400 discriminates in an arbitrary and unjustifiable manner against States which are free of any racial discrimination in the conduct of elections by the use of the phony formula set forth in section 4(b) of the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. This formula makes the bill applicable to States and political subdivisions in which less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age were registered on November 1, 1964, or less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964. It further infringes upon the constitutional power of the States to require nondiscriminatory qualifications of voters.

The effort to establish by a simple mathematical stratagem a conclusive finding of fact that discrimination has occurred is without precedent in the legislative history of our country. If this strategem is accepted as a sound basis for legislating it is difficult to envision all of the disastrous consequences which may ensue in our Republic.

If by a strong medicine legislative action the Congress undertakes to strike down nondiscriminatory voter qualifications which have been, or may hereafter be, prescribed by the several States, such action will be inconsistent with decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

In *Lassiter* v. *Northampton County Board of Elections* (360 U.S. 45 (1959)), the Supreme Court said:

"The States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the right of suffrage may be exercised * * *. So while the right of suffrage is established and guaranteed by the Constitution * * * it is subject to the imposition of State standards which are not discriminatory and which do not contravene any restriction that Congress, acting pursuant to its constitutional powers, has imposed * * *. While section 2 of the 14th amendment, which provides for apportionment of Representatives among the States according to their respective numbers counting the whole number of persons in each State (except Indians not taxed) speaks of 'the right to vote,' the right protected 'refers to the right to vote as established by the laws and constitution of the State.'"

On March 8, 1965, in *Carrington* v. *Rush*, —— U.S. ——, the Court again stated:

"There can be no doubt either of the historic function of the States to establish, on a nondiscriminatory basis, and in accordance with the Constitution, other qualifications for the exercise of the franchise. Indeed, 'the States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the right of suffrage may be exercised * * *. In other words, the privilege to vote in a State is within the jurisdiction of the State itself, to be exercised as the State may direct, and upon such terms as to it may seem proper, provided, of course, no discrimination is made between individuals in violation of the Federal Constitution.'"

It will readily be seen that the U.S. Supreme Court has consistently held that the several States are vested by our Constitution with the power to determine conditions governing the exercise of the right of suffrage and that the only limitation upon the States is that there must be an absence of discrimination in their electoral process. The proponents of the instant legislation now ask the Congress of the United States to disregard these fixed constitutional principles.

Section 10 of the committee amendment would prohibit a requirement by the States that a person "pay a poll tax or any other tax" as a prerequisite to participating in local elections. The majority of the committee contends that such requirements are in some way discriminatory as to certain voters on the basis of their race or color. This, to us, is an absurd conclusion even though we do recognize that such taxpaying requirements may constitute a hindrance to voting by certain individuals.

We cannot see, however, that the requirement of the payment of a poll tax or other tax as a prerequisite to voting in a State or local election can be equated with discrimination on the basis of race or color. In our judgment the race or color of an individual has no relationship whatever to his payment or nonpayment of poll taxes. There is no evidence before the committee that any political subdivision has ever barred any individual of any race or color from freely paying such taxes as are imposed by local government authority.

We further point out that in the 88th Congress it was the judgment of the Congress that in order to strike down the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections a constitutional amendment was necessary. It seems strange to us that some of the advocates of that constitutional amendment who agreed with us at that time now feel that the poll tax payment requirement for voting in local and State elections can be stricken down by statute.

It is our view that if a constitutional amendment was required in that instance the same requirement faces the Congress if it would strike down the poll tax requirement for local voting.

Section 3(c) presents another unconscionable legislative proposal. As far as we know it is unprecedented for Congress to suggest that the Attorney General of the United States should have veto power over State legislation. This would be accomplished under the terms of the bill by providing that the Attorney General would have 60 days within which to object to State legislation which provided a qualification, prerequisite, standard practice, or procedure, with reference to voting which was different from that in force and effect at the time a proceeding had been instituted by the Attorney General against a State or political subdivision in a voting rights case.

We unhesitatingly condemn this proposal. We affirm our strong conviction that no nonjudicial Federal official should be given the arbitrary power to nullify legislative action by the duly elected representatives of the people in any State or political subdivision.

Another unpalatable provision of the committee bill is contained in section 5. This would require that a State or political subdivision would have no tribunal to which it could resort other than the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. The Federal courts in all other districts other than the District of Columbia would be barred to any State or political subdivision falling within the "50-percent formula" which sought to have a legal determination as to the validity of its electoral procedures.

This requirement places an undue hardship upon the local governments involved and constitutes an expression of lack of congressional confidence in the willingness and ability of Federal courts outside the District of Columbia to sit in judgment in cases of this type. We are astounded that such a proposal would be advanced by the Attorney General of the United States and ratified by the great Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill in its entirety is an example of gross discrimination against a few of the sovereign States of the Union. It was deliberately designed to have unequal application as between the several States. That alone is sufficient to condemn it.

During the course of the debate in the House of Representatives it is contemplated that there will be an opportunity to offer amendments which will eliminate some of the provisions of the committee bill. There will be amendments offered which will seek to add new matter to the legislation. It is our fervent hope that this bad package of legislative proposals can be substantially amended in a way that would eliminate at least some of its bad features.

It will be our role to seek to improve the legislation. If this effort should fail we would urge that our colleagues assist us in providing the proper antidote to this constitutionally poisonous "strong medicine" The proper antidote is a defeat of the measure and an adherence to constitutional principles.

BASIL L. WHITENER.
JOHN DOWDY.
ROBERT T. ASHMORE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. Father B. Thomas Zeisig, St. Raphael's Church, Bay Village, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Dear God, bless today this Congress which labors and toils for the good of the Nation it serves.

Give to them moral and spiritual vision to build a better world. This vision or aid from you is most necessary in the trying times in which we live.

The world today demands so much, our efforts are being taxed at every turn, and yet our goals are ever increasing. Goals never dreamed about in the days of our fathers, but today a reality.

Help them to gain wisdom in all their endeavors, and to have the peace of the world as their own personal concern.

Today being a day of distinction for our country with the safe launching of Gemini—a day that our country will remember into the time of history—the event now taking place should launch this the 89th Congress into prayer.

Dear God, safety to those who operate and direct this space venture—to those who direct from these hallowed Halls let all of us give first the credit and knowledge due to Almighty God for this in His creation.

In our ventures let it be our prayer that we, being directors or operators never forget the wisdom, knowledge, and omnipresence of the Almighty. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 27, 1965:

H.R. 2998. An act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to continue the authorization for appropriations.

H.J. Res. 436. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed; and

On June 2, 1965:

H.R. 1870. An act for the relief of Edward G. Morhauser;

H.R. 2354. An act for the relief of William L. Chatelain, U.S. Navy, retired;

H.R. 3995. An act to transfer certain functions of the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6497. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States; and

H.R. 8122. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6755. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7717. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. STENNIS, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2054. An act to further amend the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SILVER COINAGE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 199)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

From the early days of our independence the United States has used a system of coinage fully equal in quantity and in quality to all the tasks imposed upon it by the Nation's commerce.

We are today using one of the few existing silver coinages in the world. Our coins in fact, are little changed from those first established by the Mint Act of 1792. For 173 years, we have maintained a system of abundant coins that with the exception of pennies and nickels is nearly pure silver.

The long tradition of our silver coinage is one of the many marks of the extraordinary stability of our political and economic system.

Continuity, however, is not the only characteristic of a great nation's coinage. We should not hesitate to change our coinage to meet the new and growing needs. I am, therefore, proposing certain changes in our coinage system—changes dictated by need—which will help Americans to carry out their daily transactions in the most efficient way possible.

There has been for some years a worldwide shortage of silver. The United States is not exempt from that shortage—and we will not be exempt as it worsens. Silver is becoming too scarce for continued large-scale use in coins. To maintain unchanged our high silver coinage in the face of this stark reality would only invite a chronic and growing scarcity of coins.

We expect to use more than 300 million troy ounces—over 10,000 tons—of silver for our coinage this year. That is far more than total new production of silver expected in the entire free world this year. Although we have a large stock of silver on hand we cannot continue indefinitely to make coins of a high silver content—in the required quantity—in the face of such an imbalance in the production of silver and the demand for it.

We must take steps to maintain an adequate supply of coins, or face chaos in the myriad transactions of our daily life—from using pay telephones to parking in a metered zone to providing our children with money for lunch at school.

The legislation I am sending to the Congress with this message will insure a stable and dignified coinage, fully adequate in quantity and in its specially designed technical characteristics to the needs of our 20th-century life. It can be maintained indefinitely, however much the demand for coin may grow.

Much as we all would prefer to retain the silver coins now in use, there is no practical alternative to a new coinage based on materials in adequate supply.

THE NEW COINAGE

I propose no change in either the penny or the nickel.

The new dime and the quarter—while remaining the same size and design as the present dime and quarter—will be composite coins. They will have faces of the same copper-nickel alloy used in our present 5-cent piece, bonded to a core of pure copper. The new dime and quarter will, therefore, outwardly resemble the nickel, except in size and design, but with the further distinction that their copper core will give them a copper edge.

This type of coin was selected because, alone among practical alternatives, it can be used together with our existing silver coins in the millions of coin-operated devices that Americans now depend upon heavily for many kinds of food and other goods.

THE HALF DOLLAR

Our new half dollar will be nearly indistinguishable in appearance from the present half dollar.

It will continue to be made of silver and copper, but the silver content will be reduced from 90 percent to 40 percent. It will be faced with an alloy of 80 percent silver and 20 percent copper, bonded to a core of 21 percent silver and 79 percent copper. The new half dollar will continue to be minted with the image of President Kennedy. Its size will be unchanged.

THE SILVER DOLLAR

No change in this famous old coin, or plans for additional production, are proposed at this time. It is possible that implementation of the new coinage legislation that I am proposing, greatly reducing the requirement for silver in our subsidiary coinage, will actually make feasible the minting of additional silver dollars in the future. Certainly, without this change in the silver content of the subsidiary coinage, further minting of the silver dollar would be forever foreclosed.

It is our intention that the new coinage circulate side by side with our existing coinage. We plan to continue the minting of our current silver coins while the new coinage is brought into quantity production.

The new coins will be placed in circulation some time in 1966.

In terms of the present pattern of coin usage, adoption of the new coinage will permit a saving of some 90 percent of the silver we are now putting into coins annually.

I want to make it absolutely clear that these changes in our coinage will have no effect on the purchasing power of our coins. The new ones will be exchanged at full face value for the paper currency of the United States. They will be accepted by the Treasury and by the Federal Reserve Banks for any of the financial obligations of the United States. The legislation I am proposing expressly recognizes the new coins as legal tender.

It is of primary importance, of course, that our new coins be specifically designed to serve our modern, technological society. In the early days of the Republic, silver coins served well because the value of a coin could only be measured by the value of the precious metal contained in it. For many decades now the value of a particular coin has depended not on the value of the metal in it, but on the face value of the coin. Today's coinage must primarily be utilitarian. The new coinage will meet this requirement fully, while dispensing with the idea that it contain precious metal.

It is, above all, practical. It has been specifically designed to function, without causing delays or disruptions of service, in coin-operated merchandising machines.

Furthermore, it is composed of materials low enough in value and readily enough available to insure that we can have as many coins as we need.

The legislation I am proposing also contains these additional recommendations:

OTHER AUTHORITY REQUESTED

First. As a useful precautionary measure, I request standby authority to institute controls over the melting and export of coins to assist the protection of our existing and our new silver coinage.

Second. I request authority to purchase domestically mined silver at not less than $1.25 per ounce.

Third. I am asking for authority to reactivate minting operations temporarily at the San Francisco Assay Office.

Fourth. As a safeguard for assured availability of the new coinage, I am asking for new contracting authority for the procurement of materials and facilities related to it.

Fifth. I propose the establishment of a Joint Commission on the Coinage, composed of certain Members of the Congress, the public, and the executive branch of the Government, to report to me later the progress made in the installation of the new coinage and to review any new technological developments and to suggest any further modifications which may be needed.

WHY THE SILVER CONTENT OF THE COINAGE MUST BE REDUCED AT THIS SESSION

These recommendations for revision of our silver coinage rest upon extensive study of the silver situation, and of alternatives to our present coinage, by both governmental and private specialists. The Treasury Department's comprehensive report, known as the Treasury Staff Silver and Coinage Study, is being released today as background to my recommendations. Its principal finding was that the supply of silver in the free world has become progressively incompatible with the maintenance of silver in all our subsidiary coins.

On the average, in the 5 years from 1949 through 1953, new silver production in the free world amounted to about 175 million troy ounces per year, while consumption amounted to more than 235 million ounces. There was an average deficit in those 5 postwar years of more than 60 million ounces of silver per year.

In the latest completed 5 years, 1960 through 1964, free world consumption of silver has averaged 410 million ounces annually, but new production has averaged a little less than 210 million ounces a year. The result has been an average annual deficit of about 200 million ounces. That is three times the average annual deficit in the 5 years from 1949 through 1953.

If no silver at all had been used for coinage there would have been a deficit in new production in free world silver during the last 5 years averaging over 40 million troy ounces, or some 1,370 tons, a year.

The gap between the production of silver and silver consumption is continuing to increase. In 1964 the silver production deficit swelled to over 300 million ounces—half again the 1963 figure. And in 1964, the use of silver in coinage and the use of silver for the arts and industry of the free world were each—taken separately—greater than new production.

There is no dependable or likely prospect that new, economically workable sources of silver may be found that could appreciably narrow the gap between silver supply and demand. The optimistic outlook is for an increase in production of about 20 percent over the next 4 years. This would be of little help. Further, because silver is produced chiefly as a byproduct of the mining of copper, lead, and zinc, even a very large increase in the price of silver would not stimulate silver production sufficiently to change the outlook.

Short of controls that are undesirable in a peacetime free society, there is no way to diminish the bounding growth of private demand for silver for use in jewelry, silverware, photographic film, and industrial processes. The one part of the demand for silver that can be reduced is governmental demand for use in coinage.

Most free world countries no longer use silver in their coins. A few—as we now propose—continue to make limited use of it. It is true that U.S. coinage does not currently depend upon new silver production, because for many years we have supplied silver for our coinage out of large Treasury stocks, which still amount to 1 billion troy ounces.

But—and this is the crux of the matter—at the present pace, this stock cannot last even as much as 3 years. We would them be shorn of our ability to maintain the coinage and, if there were no alternative to our present silver coinage, the Nation would be faced with a chronic coin shortage. That is why definitive action is necessary at this session of the Congress.

PROTECTION OF THE COINAGE

It is necessary for the U.S. Government to have large stocks of silver in addition to the quantity needed for coinage.

We need these stocks because our silver coins in circulation must be protected from hoarding or destruction. Protection of the silver coinage will continue to be a necessity since we plan for it to continue to circulate alongside the new coins. Our silver coins are protected by the fact that the Government stands ready to sell silver bullion from its stocks at $1.29 a troy ounce. This keeps the price of silver, as a commodity, from rising above the face value of our coins. This, in turn, makes hoarding or melting of the silver coinage unprofitable.

It is an additional protection for the existing coinage that I am requesting standby authority to institute controls over the melting, treating or export of U.S. coins.

It may be asked why we seek standby control authority since we retain a large stock of silver with which to protect our silver coins through operations in the silver market.

The answer is clear. Given the magnitudes by which demand for silver is outrunning new production, we must consider the possibility, however unlikely, that the silver stock we possess could itself require the support and protection that would be afforded by authority to forbid melting and export of our coins.

We believe our present stocks of silver to be adequate, once the large present drains from coinage are greatly reduced, to meet any foreseeable requirements for an indefinite period. However, prompt action on a new coinage will help us protect the silver coinage by freeing our silver reserves for redemption of silver certificates at $1.29 per ounce. Thus, we can assure that no incentive will be created for hoarding our present coins in anticipation of a higher price for their silver content.

There is the opposite, although in all likelihood short run, possibility that a fall in the price of silver might result from the enactment of this legislation largely removing silver from our subsidiary coin. It is for the purpose of protecting silver producers from a precipitate drop in the price of silver resulting from the action of the Government that I am requesting authority for the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase any newly mined domestic silver offered to him, at the price of $1.25 per troy ounce.

THE SAN FRANCISCO ASSAY OFFICE

Coinage operations at the San Francisco Mint were ended in 1955. Legislation converting the mint to the San Francisco Assay Office was passed in 1962. As part of our efforts to overcome the coin shortage of the past year, coin blanks have been cut and annealed at the San Francisco Assay Office. Present law forbids full minting there. However, we will temporarily need the facilities of this plant to move into large quantity production of the new coinage and to continue production of existing coins until enough new small money is made to make certain we have adequate supplies. Consequently, I am asking for authority to reactivate minting operations at San Francisco on a temporary basis.

A new, fully modern mint is to be built in Philadelphia. However, it cannot be completed and in operation before late 1967. It is our expectation that when the new Philadelphia Mint's capacity is added to that of the Denver Mint, our coinage requirements can be met efficiently and economically. Consequently, no more than temporary authority to mint coins in San Francisco is recommended in the draft legislation I am sending to you.

WHY COMPOSITE COINS ARE RECOMMENDED

We have no choice but to eliminate silver, for the most part, from our subsidiary coinage. The question was: What would be the best alternative? After very thorough consideration of all aspects of this highly complex problem, we have settled upon the two types of composite, or clad, coins I have already described. These are 10-cent and 25-cent pieces with cupronickel alloy faces bonded to a solid copper core, and a new half dollar with outer and inner layers of differing silver-copper alloys.

This type of coin was found to be necessary if the new coinage is to be compatible with the existing silver coinage in all the 12 million coin-operated devices in use in the United States.

The convenience of using coins in automatic merchandising and service devices is a fact that, like the coins in our pockets and in our store tills, we take for granted. But if our coinage were suddenly to be such that it would not work in coin-operated devices, the public would be subjected to very great inconvenience and serious losses would occur to business with harmful effects upon employment.

The automatic merchandising industry is a large and growing part of our national economy. Last year, $3½ billion worth of consumer items were sold through 3½ million of these machines. On more than 30 billion separate occasions a consumer made a purchase by putting a coin in a machine. In growing numbers, factories, hospitals, and other places now depend upon automatic vending for the service of goods. A million and a half people now rely upon coin-controlled vending for at least one meal a day. The use of coin-operated devices is expanding rapidly, not only in merchandise vending, but also in a number of other services.

Six million of our coin-operated devices, including nearly all vending machines, have selectors set to reject coins or imitations of coins that do not have the electrical properties of our existing silver money. Highly selective rejectors are a necessity in these machines if they are to be a low-cost source of food and other goods and services. Otherwise, fraudulent use would soon make them costly.

The sensors in these machines are set to accept or reject coins on the basis of the electrical properties of our traditional coins, which have a high proportion of silver. To be compatible in operation with our existing coinage, therefore, our new coins must duplicate the electric properties of a coin that is 90-percent silver. No single acceptable metal or alloy does so. The composite coins, made of layers of differing metals and alloys, that I am asking the Congress to approve, are coins made to order to duplicate the electrical properties of coins with a high silver content. They are the only practical alternatives we have discovered to our present coinage.

Selectors exist that can handle coins with the widely varying electrical properties of, say, nearly pure silver and nearly pure nickel. But that is not enough. When the selectors are set to accept coins with greatly differing electrical properties, the selectivity of the mechanism declines and they will accept wrong coins and imitations. Unless the coins in use have very similar electrical properties, the coin-operated machines become subject to a high degree of fraudulent use. This would be costly to all concerned.

The future may bring selectors of a different kind able to accept coins of widely varying electrical properties while at the same time rejecting imitations and wrong coins. They are not available now. When and if they become available, our new coinage will work in them. On the other hand, if we now chose an incompatible coinage, there would be delays and interruptions lasting a year to 3 years in the services of these machines. This would impose heavy inconveniences upon the public and would cause business and employment losses in a large and growing industry.

In view of these considerations of public interest, we have concluded that our new coinage must without fail be able to carry out the technical merchandising functions of a modern coinage, working alongside our existing silver coinage. The new coins that I am recommending to you do this, and do it well, because they were specifically designed for the task.

The new half dollar was designed with the strong desire in mind of many Americans to retain some silver in our everyday coinage. We believe that by eliminating silver from use in the dime and the quarter, we will have enough silver to carry out market operations in protection of our existing silver coinage—and to make a half dollar of 40 percent silver content. It is clear and unmistakable that we would not have enough silver to extend this to the dime and quarter: they are heavily used, indispensable coins that we must have at all times in large quantity. We are convinced that we can include a 40-percent silver half dollar in the new coinage, but we cannot safely go beyond that. As a precaution, we intend to concentrate at first on getting out large quantities of the new quarter and dime before we embark upon quantity production of the new half dollar.

THE JOINT COMMISSION ON THE COINAGE

We believe the recommendations being made for a new coinage are sound and durable and in the best public interest. However, the installation of a new coinage is a matter so intimately affecting the life of every citizen, and so delicately related to the Nation's commerce, that it is impossible to be certain in advance that all problems have been foreseen, even by such a long and arduous process of research as has gone into the selection of the proposed new coins.

Consequently, I am including among my recommendations the proposal for a Joint Commission on the Coinage. It will be composed of the four officers of the executive branch most directly concerned with matters affected by the coinage—the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Director of the Budget Bureau, and the Director of the Mint; of four members representing the public interest, to be appointed by the President; of the chairmen and ranking members of the Banking and Currency Committees of the House and the Senate; of one Member each from the two Houses of the Congress, to be appointed by the Vice President and the Speaker of the House. The Commission will be appointed soon after the new coinage is issued. It will study such matters as new technological developments, the supply of various metals, and the future of the silver dollar. It will report as to the time and circumstances in which the Government should cease to maintain the price of silver. It will be directed to advise the President, the Congress, and the Secretary of the Treasury on the results of its studies.

THE COINAGE—CURRENT AND PROSPECTIVE

I am pleased to report to the Congress substantial progress toward overcoming the coin shortage the Nation has been experiencing. Greatly increased minting has eliminated the shortage of pennies and of nickels. We are still somewhat on the short side of the demand for dimes and quarters, but this deficit is rapidly being overtaken. A severe shortage of the half dollar continues, due to the popularity of the new 50-cent pieces bearing the image of President Kennedy.

I want to emphasize that we will continue to make the existing coins while the new ones come into full production, and that we contemplate side-by-side circulation of the old and new coins for the indefinite future. There is no reason for hoarding the silver coinage we now use, because there is no reason for it to disappear.

We are gearing up for maximum production of the new coins as soon as they are authorized by the Congress. Supply of the materials for them is assured. Both copper and nickel are economical and available in North America. Their usage in coins will not add enough to overall employment of these metals to create supply or price problems.

In the first year after new coins are authorized, we expect to make 3½ billion pieces of the new subsidiary coins. That is a billion and a half more pieces than will be made of the corresponding silver coins in the current fiscal year.

In the second year after authorization of the new coinage, we expect to be able to double the first year's output of the new coins, reaching a production total of 7 billion pieces.

We expect in this way to avoid any new coin shortage in the transition to production of the new coins, and within a period of less than 3 years to reach a point at which we could if necessary meet total coinage needs out of production of the new coins.

I am satisfied that, taking into account all of the various factors involved in this complex problem, the recommendations that I am making to you are sound and right. Your early and favorable action upon the proposed legislation will make it possible to produce and issue to the public a coinage that will be acceptable, provide the maximum convenience, and serve all the purposes—financial and technical—of modern commerce. In considering this problem the needs of the economy and the convenience of the public have been placed ahead of all other considerations. They are the factors that have resulted in my recommendations to the Congress. I urge their approval at the earliest possible date.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *June 3, 1965.*

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 120]

Andrews, George W.
Ayres
Bandstra
Blatnik
Bonner
Bow
Brown, Ohio
Casey
Chamberlain
Cramer
Cunningham
Dent
Diggs
Duncan, Oreg.
Evans, Colo.
Fisher
Fogarty
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gilligan
Halleck
Halpern
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Holland
Karth
Keogh
Laird
Lindsay
Mathias
Michel
Miller
Minshall
Morris
Murray
Passman
Powell
Price
Purcell
Resnick
Roberts
St Germain
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Willis
Wright
Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER AMENDING THE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 326, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4623) further amending the Reorganization Act of 1949. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson] and pending that such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, while there is considerable controversy, as I understand, over the bill which will be made in order by this resolution, I know of no opposition to the resolution and, therefore, reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that were the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] here today, and incidentally he also serves as ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Government Operations, I am sure this is one bill on which he would have exercised his prerogative to make his views known particularly when we undertake to consider the rule.

Because of my service with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] on this committee in years past, I know that probably there is no single act of Congress with which he has been associated of which he is more proud than this, considering the fact that he is thought of by many—and I believe rightfully so—as the legislative godfather of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

The older Members of this body will recall that the gentleman from Ohio served with distinction on the Hoover Commission on the reorganization of the executive branch.

I take this time to call to the attention of Members of the House that it is much to our regret, because of illness, that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] is not in our midst today. I further take this opportunity to assure the Members of the House that those of us who have undertaken to check with his office from day to day understand he is recovering, that he is feeling much better, and that he expects to be back with us sometime next week.

I also express what I am sure is the unanimous sentiment on both sides of the aisle—we join in wishing him a complete and speedy recovery. We sorely miss his wise counsel and legislative leadership. On occasions beyond number, he has exhibited his great capacity to winnow the kernel of legislative truth from the chaff of irrelevant and irresponsible proposals upon which this body is ofttimes called to act. His service in the Congress down through the years has been in the highest traditions of this body, and we hope and trust that his services to our beloved country will continue to be available for many years to come.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman is entirely correct in expressing the sentiments of all Members of the House in wishing our friend from Ohio [Mr. Brown] a quick recovery and a quick return. I am certain that everybody on this side, as well as on the other side, joins in that sentiment.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take much additional time under the rule. I believe the gentleman from Missouri has correctly stated the situation.

Let me say only that the point at issue today will not be whether the Reorganization Act of 1949 should be extended. There are very few acts of Congress which have met with more general approbation than this particular act.

The point at issue will be found in the views of the minority, as very well set forth in those views which are a part of Report No. 184. The minority views suggest that an amendment to this act ought to be adopted, to provide for a 2-year extension rather than a permanent extension of the act. That is the only real point at issue today, as I understand it.

Perhaps because I have had the opportunity of serving under the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson], and the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], in years past, I do feel obliged to say that I agree with the Members of the minority who have said it would be wise for us to preserve the right we have as a Congress to periodically, every 2 years, consider the question of the extension of the act.

Members will recall that in 1949 President Truman asked for permanent reorganization authority. The Congress at that time did not see fit to give him permanent authority, but passed the act for 4 years. Since that time the act has been renewed, on the average, about every 2 years.

I believe that during the times when the extension of the act has come up, the House has undertaken to review the act. On two occasions I can recall we made important amendments to the Reorganization Act.

I believe it would be poor policy indeed at this time for the Congress to give up the right which it now has under the Reorganization Act of 1949 to periodically consider the question of its extension.

I hope that during the general debate, when this issue will be presented, and, as I understand it, when the amendment is offered under the 5-minute rule, to provide for a 2-year extension rather than a permanent extension of the act, Members of this body on both sides of the aisle will consider the importance of adopting that amendment and then going on to approve the extension of the Reorganization Act.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks, let me merely reiterate this point: I do not think on the grounds of this consuming and inordinate amount of time on the part of Congress that we ought to give up the right we have heretofore had in considering the extension of this act on a periodic basis. I have studied the hearings reported this year and find they took a portion of 1 day, March 3, 1965. Under the rule we will spend about an hour of time in considering this matter today. It all seems to me a relatively small expenditure of time on our part, and it will be well worth the effort we ought to make today to retain our prerogative in considering the further extension of this act.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

POLITICAL SHAKEDOWNS IN THE REA

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the May 28 issue of the Washington Star contained a front page story by Walter Pincus indicating that the political arm twisters are at work again trying to pressure Federal employees into buying $100 tickets to the 1965 Democratic congressional dinner on June 24 at the National Armory. I include this article at this point in my remarks, along with a Washington Star editorial of June 1 commenting on these disclosures:

U.S. Workers Targets Again

(By Walter Pincus)

Machinery to solicit political contributions from Federal employees again has been set in motion by Democratic Party officials given the job of selling $100 tickets to the 1965 Democratic congressional dinner on June 24 at the National Armory.

The aim this year, through mailings and personal contact, apparently is to get those employees who contributed last year during the presidential campaign to contribute again.

As part of their program, the Democrats again appear to be planning to push ticket sales within Federal departments and agencies—a practice that previously has stirred up criticism from within the Civil Service.

This year, however, it's the "salesmen" selected to do the pushing who appear disturbed.

"You have a choice—break the Justice Department's law or Maguire's law," one political appointee said Wednesday. He had just been made part of his agency's team to push sales of $100 tickets to the dinner to a list of his colleagues.

The "Justice Department's law" is a section of the Federal code which makes it illegal for one Federal employee to "directly or indirectly" solicit, receive "or * * * in any manner (be) concerned in soliciting or receiving, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for any political purpose whatever * * *" from another Federal employee. The penalties: a fine of not more than $5,000 or a sentence of not more than 3 years in jail or both.

"Maguire's law" refers to Democratic Party treasurer Richard Maguire, the man credited with setting up the machinery for systematic solicitation within Federal agencies.

The "in-house" salesmen, for the most part, are the agency's political appointees whose futures depend in large part on the good will of party officials.

In the past, the Federal law has pretty much been winked at. This year, however, the Justice Department is weighing a Federal Bureau of Investigation report to determine whether several officials of the Rural Electrification Administration violated Federal law in their promotion last year, of $100 tickets to the Democratic fund-raising gala.

The Civil Service Commission, after a preliminary inquiry into the matter last fall, determined the facts were such to warrant study for prosecution.

Despite the Justice Department inquiry, Democratic Party aids have begun to distribute lists of last year's contributors to Federal agencies to aid in selling this year's dinner tickets.

Officials at both the State and Commerce Departments reportedly not only have received such lists, but have discussed promotion of ticket sales with selected top staff members.

At the State Department, a meeting reportedly took place within the past week and the list of last year's contributors was broken down among a group of eight political appointee "salesmen." Their job was to keep to the "strictly political" jobholders, but to encourage them to again contribute to the party.

Reports that a similar meeting took place at Commerce could not be confirmed.

At one point in the State meeting, a suggestion that solicitation letters be sent to ambassadors overseas was vetoed.

Complementing the direct solicitation effort is a mailing to lists of contributors over the signature of Party Chairman John M. Bailey inviting the recipient to the dinner and enclosing a pledge card.

The card contains a code number that permits the dinner committee to identify a Government employee's agency and so seat him with his coworkers.

MILDER THAN 1964 EFFORT

This year's in-house solicitation appears to be much milder in its approach than was the effort made last year to sell gala tickets.

At that time, top agency officials scheduled cocktail parties to precede the event and agency "salesmen" went down their assigned lists asking fellow workers if they were coming to the party.

From the party, buses took those present to the gala where they all sat together—usually with the front row of their section filled with the highest ranking agency officials from the Secretary down.

How much actual "pressure" is involved in ticket sales? Some civil servants considered the very fact they received an invitation at home implied "pressure."

One agency salesman said the belief that President Johnson was the kind of politician who watched officeholder contributor lists was a form of "pressure."

NEW ELEMENT NOW

Adds a Democratic National Committee spokesman: "The biggest pressure came from repeated news stories that employees were being threatened as to what would happen if they didn't come through."

This year there appears to be a new element of resentment among the "salesmen." They have a fear that should someone report them—as happened in the REA case—no one, particularly party officials, could come to their defense.

Party officials who hand out contributor lists in no way violate the law. Only the Federal employee who approaches a colleague faces trouble.

Maguire's Law

Well, the time for another of the Democrats' $100-a-plate fundraising dinners is once more drawing near. And once more the party hierarchy in Government offices all over town is revving up the machinery to put the arm on Federal employees for contributions—in clear violation of Federal law.

Thus far, as the Star's Walter Pincus noted the other day, the main complaints are coming from employees recruited to push the congressional dinner ticket sales. Their concern is understandable. For the Federal code is quite specific in making it a crime for any Federal employee "directly or indirectly" to solicit funds from another Federal employee "for any political purpose whatever." And while this is not a new provision, most of the ticket pushers are fully aware that the Justice Department is examining an FBI report on complaints which arose in connection with a similar party gala last year.

The trouble is, as one anonymous political appointee put it, that he and many of his colleagues are placed in a position of breaking either "the Justice Department's law or Maguire's law"—the latter referring to the solicitation plans reportedly set up by Richard Maguire, the Democratic treasurer.

There is no question, of course, about what action is called for here. "Maguire's law" ought to be repealed, fast, and no congressional action is required to do it. Legislation may well be desirable to encourage wider financial support of political candidates and their parties, possibly through tax credits or tax deductions. But in the meantime Federal employees should be protected against the pressures to give which are inevitably present under the sort of solicitation program which is now getting underway.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to publicly commend Mr. Pincus and his newspaper for bringing these shocking political shakedowns into the open, and exposing them to public view. I believe it is a great public service.

As Members of this body know, similar complaints of illegal political fundraising solicitations by Federal officials were brought to me many months ago by Federal workers in the Rural Electrification Administration of the Department of Agriculture because I once served as REA Administrator.

After much badgering, the Civil Service Commission agreed to look into the charges and documentation which had been provided to me, and the very first Civil Service Commission investigation of its kind was begun. Finally, on October 8, 1964, I was advised that the Commission had found four REA officials to be "involved." Three of the officials are in excepted positions and one is in the classified service.

In the October 8 letter, the Commission's General Counsel also advised me that the results of the investigation were being turned over to the Justice Department for determination of possible criminal violations. I include the text of this October 8 letter at this point in my remarks:

U.S. Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C., October 8, 1964.
Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Nelsen: This is in response to your letter of September 22, 1964, concerning the investigation of alleged Hatch Act violations in the Rural Electrification Administration and your telephone calls of September 28 and October 1. As I told you on the phone, I was somewhat handicapped in my endeavor to obtain the information you wanted because of the hospitalization of Mr. Meloy, who was personally supervising the conduct of the investigation.

As you know, we conducted an investigation of the alleged Hatch Act violations in the Rural Electrification Administration. There are four individuals involved. One is in the competitive service and subject to our jurisdiction; the other three are in excepted positions and subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. In an effort to coordinate action we have notified the Secretary of Agriculture of our investigation. We have not been advised as to what they plan to do.

In addition, we have furnished the Department of Justice with a copy of our investigation. That Department has jurisdiction to determine whether to prosecute for violation of the criminal laws. It has been our practice in this kind of a situation to defer administrative action until the criminal aspects of the case have been fully explored.

I am not in a position at this time to express an opinion as to a violation of the Hatch Act by the employee who is subject to our jurisdiction. Under the procedure we follow such a decision is made initially only after a letter of charges has been served and the employee's answer has been considered.

Sincerely yours,
John J. McCarthy,
Assistant General Counsel.

Mr. Speaker, in January of this year I inquired of the then Acting Attorney General as to the progress of the Justice Department consideration of the civil service findings. Mr. Katzenbach replied to my letter of January 12 on February 4 stating that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had been requested to investigate the facts in the case. This exchange of correspondence is included at this point in my remarks as a further documentation of the chronological development of this investigation:

January 12, 1965.
Hon. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach,
Acting Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Katzenbach: Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter which I received from the Assistant General Counsel of the U.S. Civil Service Commission under date of October 8, 1964, reporting on their investigation of alleged Hatch Act violations in the Rural Electrification Administration.

You will note that three individuals involved in this investigation are in excepted positions and subject to possible prosecution for violation of the Corrupt Practices Act.

You will note further that a copy of the Civil Service Commission investigation was furnished the Department of Justice.

As this point, I would be interested in knowing if your Department has determined whether to prosecute for violation of criminal laws and whether any report has been made to the Civil Service Commission of your consideration.

I am fully cognizant of the necessity for protection of the rights of individuals involved in such procedures, and at this point I am not asking that I be provided with a detailed report which would divulge the identity of the Federal employees involved. In the interest of protecting and fostering the merit system in Federal employment, however, I do feel that cases such as these should have prompt and expeditious consideration.

Thank you for your kind cooperation.

Sincerely yours,
Ancher Nelsen,
Member of Congress.

February 4, 1965.
Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Nelsen: This will reply to your letter of January 12, 1965, with which you enclosed a copy of a letter to you from the Assistant General Counsel of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, referring to an investigation of alleged violations of the Hatch Act in the Rural Electrification Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

We have requested the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate the facts in this matter following which a determination will be made whether any violations of Federal criminal statutes relating to the solicitation of political contributions by Federal employees have occurred which would warrant prosecution. You are undoubtedly aware that in addition to possible criminal violations there are also involved possible administrative penalties, the imposition of which is within the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission and the employing agency.

Sincerely,
Nicholas deB. Katzenbach,
Acting Attorney General.

After a time lapse of almost 2 more months, I again contacted the Justice Department for a report. At the same time I addressed a letter to Chairman Macy, of the Civil Service Commission. My deep concern over the apparent lack of expeditious resolution of this case was expressed to both Attorney General Katzenbach and Chairman Macy. Acting Assistant Attorney General John Doar responded to my letter of March 26 on April 5, stating in part:

> I have received the results of the FBI investigation into this matter. This report is being carefully reviewed by this Division and it is expected that this review will be completed in the near future.

I include my letters of March 26 and the Justice Department reply of April 5 at this point in my remarks:

March 26, 1965.
Hon. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Attorney General: This is with further reference to my letter of January 12 and your reply dated February 4, 1965, concerning the investigation of alleged violations of the Hatch Act and Corrupt Practices Act in the Rural Electrification Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

In your letter of February 4, you informed me that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had been requested to investigate facts in this case preliminary to a determination as to whether criminal violations had occurred which would warrant prosecution. It is evident that no such determination has yet been made, since no action has been taken by the Civil Service Commission within its responsibility of an administrative nature concerning violations of the Hatch Act in the classified service. It has been my understanding, and I am so informed, that it is Commission policy to defer its action in a case pending resolution of criminal aspects by the Department of Justice.

I am concerned that any possible delay in the handling of this case by the Department of Justice would be the cause of any default in the expeditious consideration of a matter so important to the preservation of the integrity of our Federal Civil Service.

I would hope that I would have your report on this matter in the very near future.

Sincerely yours,
Ancher Nelsen.

April 5, 1965.
Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Nelsen: In your letter of March 26, 1965, to the Attorney General you expressed concern over possible delay by the Department of Justice in handling the investigation of alleged violations of the Hatch Act and Corrupt Practices Act in the Rural Electrification Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

I have received the results of the FBI investigation into this matter. This report is being carefully reviewed by this Division and it is expected that this review will be completed in the near future.

I will keep you advised of any developments in this matter.

Sincerely,
John Doar,
Acting Assistant Attorney General,
Civil Rights Division.

March 26, 1965.
Hon. John W. Macy,
Chairman, Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Enclosed is a copy of my letter to Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach concerning the current Justice Department consideration of alleged violations of the Hatch Act and Corrupt Practices Act in the Rural Electrification Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

I first made public reference to this situation back in 1961, and finally in 1964 was challenged by your Commission to provide documented evidence of my charges. This

I did, and a Commission investigation was instituted in June of last year. The results of this investigation were reported to me by the Commission's General Counsel by letter dated October 8, 1964.

Mr. Meloy reported that four individuals were found to be involved, one of whom was in the classified service and three of whom were in the excepted service. His letter goes on to state that final action by the Commission under its jurisdiction in the case would not be taken until all criminal aspects of the case had been determined by the Department of Justice.

More than 2 months have now elapsed since the Attorney General's advising me that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had been requested to look into the case. It is now going on 6 months since your General Counsel's advising me that the results of the Commission investigation had been referred to the Justice Department. It is now over 4 years since my having revealed this situation in a public statement.

The primary duty and responsibility of the Civil Service Commission being to maintain and protect the independence of our Federal merit system, I feel it incumbent upon me to impress you and your Commission of my concern over the lack of dispatch in the handling of this case. It would be my understanding that you would be in constant contact with the Justice Department in the interest of expediting the fair and just determination of this entire matter and that you are keenly aware of the significance of this case to the merit system employees throughout the Federal Government.

Sincerely yours,

Ancher Nelson,
Member of Congress.

We are now in the first of June, and this is where the matter continues to lie 9 long months after the Civil Service Commission report showing involvement in possible violations of the Hatch Act and the Corrupt Practices Act. These investigations by the Justice Department and Civil Service Commission have turned into a long stall.

The Washington Star article shows clearly that failure to take corrective action has served as an open invitation to the money-hungry politicians in Federal jobs to go right ahead with their harassment and pressures on employees in the service of their Government.

Obviously, the best way to deter such activities is to take proper action against those who have already been found to have been engaging in political fundraising among civil service employees. I would hope the effect of these latest disclosures will be to awaken officials in the Civil Service Commission and the Justice Department to their responsibilities to protect our Federal workers from further shakedowns and arm twisting.

FURTHER AMENDING THE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4623) further amending the Reorganization Act of 1949.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4623, with Mr. Sisk in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Erlenborn] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4623 was introduced at the request of President Johnson and, as reported by the Committee on Government Operations, would give permanent authority to the President to submit reorganization plans to the Congress.

Let me underscore that heretofore, except when the authority was granted for a 4-year period, we have granted this authority every 2 years for the past 32 years.

President Johnson considers this an essential tool for the reorganization of Government departments and agencies. Under the power which expired on June 1, President Johnson has submitted five reorganization plans in this current year, indicating that he intends to use this legislation to achieve efficiency and economy in the vast Federal establishment of Government.

Reorganization authority has been given to every President from Herbert Hoover to Lyndon B. Johnson. The present Reorganization Act was enacted in 1949. Under its terms the President may submit reorganization plans to Congress which will go into effect after 60 days unless either the House or the Senate vetoes the plan by simple majority vote.

Since 1949, this authority has been extended for intervals of 2 years with the exception that I mentioned of 4 years which was in the period of 1949 to 1953. In his message of February 3, 1965, to the Congress submitting the draft bill, President Johnson said:

> With only a few lapses since 1932, the authority generally similar to that conferred by the present Reorganization Act has been available to the Presidents then in office. The usefulness of the authority to transmit reorganization plans to the Congress and the continuing need for such authority to carry out fully the purposes of the Reorganization Act have been clearly demonstrated. The time has now come, therefore, to eliminate any expiration date with respect to that authority; the authority should be made commensurate with the responsibility of the President under the same statute.

There was general agreement in the committee on the extension of the present law. The only difference of opinion was on the length of the extension. In my judgment, the case was well made for permanent extension. Among other things, the Executive has been handicapped in times past in his effort to make reorganizations due to the failure of the Congress to promptly enact the necessary extensions, thereby causing periods when the law did lapse and his authority would not be available. We are in one of those periods now. For the last 2 days, since June 1, we have been in that period when there is no authority at this time for the President to send up plans. At other times that lapse occurred for a matter of several months. I might say, however, that this fault did not lie with the House inasmuch as we have always been diligent about the timely extension of the Reorganization Act and if there be any blame on the House it can only extend to the 2 days just past, because this is the only time the House has not acted before the expiration date.

It should be noted that in 1957 the Act lapsed from June 1 to September 4. In 1959 the act lapsed on June 1 and Congress did not reinstate the authority until April 7 of 1961, nearly 2 years later. In 1963, the act lapsed on June 1 and was not reinstated until July 2, 1964, more than a year later.

We have been informed by officials of the Bureau of the Budget that this continual uncertainty has had a severe effect on reorganization planning and has limited the advantages provided by the legislation.

I might say—and I hope my Republican friends are listening—that President Hoover endorsed permanent reorganization authority for the President, when he served as Chairman of the Commission that bears his name. Both the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] and I were privileged to serve on that Commission under President Hoover and I can attest to the great ability of this past President of the United States; how earnestly he worked; he put in more hours on that Commission, I think, than any of the members including your present speaker. He recommended permanent reorganization power for the President because he realized that there would always be housekeeping improvements to be made in our very sprawling agencies of the Federal Government.

This is an authority that has been used for many years. It has proven its merits. Why the Congress should have to come in every 2 years and go through this ritual seems somewhat fruitless in my mind. If it were an untried piece of legislation, it would be different. However, we are talking about something that has proven its worth over the span of 3 decades.

So, Mr. Chairman, our committee reported out the bill giving permanent authority to the President. However, since our committee reported the bill, the other body has acted to extend the law for a period of 3½ years, until December 31, 1968, which coincides with the present President's term of office.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is different from the permanent extension requested by the President and passed by the House Committee on Government Operations. Furthermore, as I have already stated, the present authority expired on June 1, just 2 days ago. In order, then, to prevent a further postponement of final action and in order to get the authority back on the books as quickly as possible, it seems reasonable to agree to the 3½-year extension approved by the other body.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the majority members of the committee recede at this time from their position of giving permanent authority and accept the action of the other body which will, in effect, extend the period from 2 years to 3½ years, making it conterminous with the present President's term.

Mr. Chairman, an amendment to that effect will be offered at the proper time by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS]. As has been said by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], there is no argument about the extension of this act. All of us know that it is worthwhile. The argument, if there was an argument which existed at all, would be as to whether it should be extended for 2 years or made permanent.

Mr. Chairman, the majority of the Committee on Government Operations has accepted the 3-year 7-month extension of the other body, believing that this represents a reasonable compromise.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my friends on the Republican side of the aisle will recognize this.

There was a time, in 1949 to 1953, when we had a 4-year term and we had no trouble during that time. Therefore, I would anticipate no trouble during the 3½-year period of time.

Mr. Chairman, may I remind my colleagues that there are ample safeguards contained in the 1949 act and the prerogatives of the Congress are fully protected.

When a President submits a reorganization plan to the Congress, it is immediately referred to the Committee on Government Operations of both the House and the Senate for their study and consideration. Any Member of the House or Senate may file a disapproval resolution which is likewise referred to the Committee on Government Operations of either body. The committee will then hold hearings on the resolution, and it must do that within the span of 10 days. Thereafter, the plan is usually reported by resolution to the floor with a recommendation one way or the other.

If the committee does not report the resolution back within 10 days, the Member who filed the resolution of disapproval or any Member of the House who is opposed to the reorganization plan may move to discharge the committee from its consideration of the legislation. This motion only has to carry by a majority vote of those present and voting.

A motion reported by a committee or discharged by a committee may be called up by a Member at any time thereafter within the 60-day period.

Mr. Chairman, a reorganization plan is a privileged resolution I will call to the attention of the Members of the House. If the disapproval resolution is passed by a simple majority of either House, the reorganization plan cannot go into effect.

So I say that there are ample safeguards, that there is no delegation of authority to the President to legislate. There is authority delegated to him to send up a draft of legislation in the form of a reorganization plan.

But the legislative bodies control what they are doing with that plan. They can reject it or they can accept it by a simple majority vote of either House.

It is true that reorganization plans reverse the usual legislative procedure. But the Congress is well protected under the law and neither dilatory action by committees nor requirements for a constitutional majority can now prevent adverse congressional action on a plan.

The Committee on Government Operations has always carefully scrutinized the details and effect of all plans submitted by the President. The committee has, in the past, recommended to the House that plans be rejected because they were defective in the terms in which they were drawn or would not achieve the objectives of the Reorganization Act. As noted in our report on this bill, the committee has, in many instances, requested the opinions of the committees of the House where the departments or agencies concerned fell within their legislative jurisdiction but, of course, always reserving the right to make our own final judgment on a plan. On at least one occasion we rejected a plan, rewrote it as legislation, and recommended its passage by the Congress.

The Reorganization Act has worked well. It has proved its value in the results of eliminating duplication and improving methods of Government operation that have been established under reorganization plans. I urge that the basic Reorganization Act be extended.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me state that the question before us is not a question of partisan, political nature. The real question before us is the basic question of the separation of powers; the constitutional creation of a government composed of three equal and coordinate branches of government.

The history of the reorganization legislation and the Presidential requests for plans for reorganization, I think, are interesting in the context of this debate. The reorganization procedure goes back to approximately 1932. I might state that the original plan or the original enactment of reorganization powers in the executive did have the feature of granting this power on a permanent basis, so that there is some legislative precedent for the bill now before us for a permanent granting of this power to the President. However, it is also interesting to note that the Congress did not wait long to remedy what it considered to be the mistake of granting this on a permanent basis. Within 7 months, after the original reorganization plans were granted they took away the feature of permanency and made the limitation 2 years.

From time to time subsequent to the original enactment reorganization powers were granted, but always on a basis of having the short termination date, usually a period of 2 years. During the war years these powers were extended on an emergency basis without limitation, the only limitation being that the powers would lapse 6 months after the termination of hostilities.

The act that we are now amending is the Reorganization Act of 1949, which is the result of the activities of the Hoover Commission. At the time it was enacted, the period of time that the powers existed was specified to be 4 years.

Since that time the Congress has extended these powers at 2-year intervals and, as has been mentioned before, on one or two occasions there have been lapse periods of time when these powers were not in force.

It is also interesting to note when I mention this is not a partisan political question, but really a question between the legislative and the executive branch of Government, that three Presidents have requested that this power remain permanent; first, President Truman in 1949, then President Eisenhower in 1953, and now President Johnson in 1965.

In addition, former President Hoover recommended that these powers be made permanent. However, the Congress has been jealous of its legislative prerogative and as yet has not seen fit to grant these powers on a permanent basis.

Let us also understand that the Reorganization Act does grant legislative authority to the Executive and there have been some fine constitutional questions raised as to the power of the Congress to do so. Let me state that in my opinion, this is, and there is no question but what it is, a grant of legislative powers to the Executive. However, there can be such a grant without it being an unconstitutional grant, and I believe the reorganization powers that have been granted to the President is a constitutional grant of the legislative powers because the act itself sets the guidelines under which the President can act.

This question has not per se been decided by the Supreme Court though some related cases have been.

In effect, we are, under the reorganization procedure, reversing the legislative process. The President is given the power to promulgate legislation. The President in doing so prepares a plan of reorganization within the limits of the law, that is the Reorganization Act, and submits this to the Congress. Under this procedure, the Congress is given the ordinary executive power of veto because this is the only power that we can exercise in the reorganization procedure.

Once the Executive has filed the reorganization plan, Congress has the power of veto for a 60-day calendar period which it can exercise or not as it sees fit. We do not have the other ordinary legislative powers, the power to amend and so forth.

Some have asked, since the power to veto has been made more liberal as the years have gone by, why is it not now possible to extend the reorganization powers on a permanent basis? I think we should recall that over the years the veto process has been changed considerably. At one time to override a presidential reorganization plan required a constitutional majority of both Houses acting together in concert. Later it was made within the power of one House acting with a constitutional majority to veto a reorganization plan and most recently, and under the present law, either House of Congress, acting alone with a simple majority of those voting, can override or veto a reorganization plan.

But I point out to you that these substantive changes in the law have been tied to extensions of the power. If this power was made permanent in the President, it would then be very easy for the President to veto bills that contained such substantive changes. So that the periodic extension of the powers of this act gives the opportunity then to tie in one legislative enactment substantive changes that Congress deems necessary together with the extension, thereby giving the President a choice either of vetoing the bill and destroying his power, because the extension had not been signed into law, or of signing the bill into law which gives the extension power and also because Congress changes any substantive portion of the act that Congress may from time to time deem necessary.

It is not only that question that concerns us, the question of the method of overriding the plan or vetoing the plan. There are other substantive changes that have been necessary from time to time and the most recent and outstanding was the amendment that was adopted just last year by the Congress.

You may recall that President Kennedy submitted a plan for reorganization which incorporated the creation of a new executive department. This was the Department of Urban Affairs. At that time Congress balked and said it was never the intention of the Congress to grant to the Executive power either to abolish or create new departments. The power of the President under the Reorganization Act lapsed as a result of this dispute.

Congress in its wisdom last year, in extending the plan, also amended the Reorganization Act to specifically prohibit the creation or abolition of departments.

I believe it has been shown that the periodic extension gives to Congress power to make substantive changes in the act which are necessary.

Another objection to extending the act for a long period of time is the fact that within the act itself are specified rules which apply to the procedure for overriding or disapproving plans.

It is historically true that we adopt our rules on a 2-year basis. We do not adopt permanent rules in the House. Every 2 years the new Congress has an opportunity to reexamine the rules and to change the rules.

In effect, if we should extend this act without limitation, or extend it beyond the 2-year period, we would be adopting rules for a period beyond this Congress and binding future Congresses.

I believe it goes without saying that over the years there has been constant interaction among the three coordinate branches of Government—the judicial, executive, and legislative. At one time one was predominant and at another time another was predominant. I am sorry to say that at the present period in history I doubt if any political scientist or historian would say that the legislative branch of Government was predominant. Certainly the executive, since the early 1930's, has become stronger and stronger and has become a more predominant branch of our Government. In more recent years our Supreme Court and the judicial branch of Government has become stronger and stronger and in some instances, in my opinion, has entered into the legislative field.

The question before us really involves the power of the Congress, our power as an equal coordinate branch of the Government. We, the Congress, should be jealous of our constitutional prerogatives. We should guard with every effort we can put forth the rights we have as legislators.

I have no objection, nor does anyone of whom I know on the minority side, to the extension of this act. We feel that under the circumstances it has been a constitutional delegation to the President. But we do feel there should be periodic reexaminations of the use of this power of reorganization.

I understand, from the gentleman from California, that an amendment will be offered at the close of the debate in the Committee of the Whole to extend the act, rather than permanently, for a period of 3½ years.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Does the gentleman not believe that this is a reasonable compromise between those who feel that 2 years should be the time limit and those who believe the act should be extended on a permanent basis?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I do not, for two reasons.

First is the fact that it would bind a future Congress, if we made the extension more than 2 years. Second, I believe a fatal error in picking this particular time—I believe it is really 3 years and 7 months—is that it would make the act expire on December 31, 1968. I believe that using this particular period of time, which the other body has and which the gentleman proposes in his amendment, would almost guarantee that the power would lapse, because it would lapse at a period of time when Congress would not be in session. The next session would begin in January of 1969. Therefore, the power would lapse, and it would take some period of months for Congress to extend the power.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the gentleman will yield further, I will say it is customary to extend acts some time before the expiration dates. There would be nothing to prevent our committee, which is a diligent committee, from extending the time prior to the expiration of the act.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I would say to the gentleman I understand from a reading of the hearings in the other body the purpose of the extension for this period of time was to make it coextensive with the term of the President, so when a new President came into office the new President could reexamine this power. I submit to the gentleman if the extension occurs in 1963, before the expiration of this time, the Congress will not know who the new President is. So this argument is no longer valid.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ERLENBORN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I want to commend and congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for this very fine presentation and analysis of this rather complex question. I certainly concur in much of what he has said. I quite agree with him that while the proposed 3½-year extension is a considerable improvement over a permanent extension, the 2-year extension, which he was discussing and which was discussed in great detail in the minority views, is certainly preferable. Again let me acknowledge the very thoughtful contribution which has been made by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to amplify on what the one gentleman from Illinois said about the other gentleman from Illinois. The previous speaker in the well [Mr. ERLENBORN] just made his first presentation in the House of Representatives as a new Member handling a rather technical question and problem, and in the almost unique situation for a freshman House Member, directing the debate on the Republican side as ranking committee Member I think he did a splendid job, and all of us should be proud of his performance as a new Member of the House.

Mr. Chairman, the issue here really is very simple and clear cut. It is, should the Congress make permanent the Presidential power under the Reorganization Act. I might add that at least that is the position at the moment, although, of course, it will be amended shortly, as the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has pointed out.

Now, then, what is this power we are talking about, anyway? Well, of course, it is that the President may formulate and transmit plans for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government which will go into effect unless the Congress vetoes the plan within 60 days. However, of course, the issue we are talking about here is not that at all, because we are all agreed that this is a good idea. What we are talking about is the power here of the President to legislate, because here in this Reorganization Act the President has a very unique power, that is, to legislate, which we, the Congress, have transferred to him and surrendered to him, if you will. The President has had this power under one form of legislation or another since 1932. Many plans have come down to the House and many have been approved. Some have been rejected. But now we ought to ask ourselves for a moment, is there any reason to make the power permanent or, for that matter, to extend it beyond the usual time of the 2-year period we have been operating under for most of the period of the power since 1932.

I would like to point out to the House that there were only factors in the administration's presentation. First of all, there was a letter which the President sent to the Speaker of the House. Next there was one short hearing conducted before the committee. Actually, there was only one witness. I find nothing in the letter and nothing in the hearing that presents any valid reason whatsoever or, for that matter, any argument at all to show that it is necessary to make the power permanent or, for that matter, now to extend it beyond the custom we have been following of 2 years. As a matter of fact, in the hearings the witness was asked by one of the members:

> In your opinion, Mr. Seidman, have these gaps inhibited your ability to function in this area?

He replied:

> I think not my ability, but I think it has inhibited the President.

And then Mr. BROWN said: "Where did a President fail to function at that time?"

There was a short answer to that; and then:

> What did a President want to do that he could not do, or didn't do?

And then the expert Government witness said this:

> It is difficult for me to cite the specific examples, but I know there were ones.

Obviously, he did not know, and I would say and submit that since he was a Government expert witness and could find no examples that there really were no valid reasons. I would like to make the point that both the ranking minority Member here has made, as well as the chairman on the Democratic side handling the bill, that this is not a partisan issue. There is no administration issue or program at stake. It is not a Republican or a Democratic position.

It really is not an issue of States' rights as opposed to big Government. The real issue is that of the Congress of the United States, the House and the Senate, the real function and integrity of the Congress. We of the minority say that we should delegate our legislative function only temporarily. Our position is, of course, only for 2 years. I would submit that the Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, could well support this position if they wanted to.

It has been said again and again, and I certainly think it is true, and I think everyone on this floor would admit it, that the Presidency is the most powerful public office in the world today. The President has Executive order powers, and thousands of them have been promulgated since the beginning of the Republic. I think a good case could be made that there has been a lot of legislation here. Over in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, we are engaged in the one place in a very heavy war and in the other place in a skirmish. The President of the United States actually has handled this almost entirely on his own. The Congress has not declared the war. And I do not quarrel with this, I do not quarrel with the President here. I think the President and the administration are doing an excellent job in these situations. I simply cite this as an example of the powers which the President has in this country. I would say that he really does not need any more power.

You know, when we were children we had a little poem that I sometimes use:

> Little drops of water,
> And little grains of sand,
> Make the mighty ocean,
> And build a mighty land.

I think it epitomizes very well our issue here. Since the founding of the Republic, certainly there has been a good deal of power transferred from the Congress to the President. More and more has the office become more powerful. That is the issue here today. I do not think we should transmit any more power at our expense.

The Republican, or minority, position is simply this. We say that the President ought to come back to the Congress every 2 years and remove this unique legislative power that we have delegated under this act. This will not in any way impede the President's mission. As a matter of fact, it will not impede the carrying out of his mission, whatever program he wants. It will not tie his hands. But I think it will serve to remind the President that the power that he has under this Reorganization Act is our power, that of the Congress of the United States, that we have transferred to him temporarily.

I would like to close these brief remarks by reading from the President's letter. If you will bear with me, I think this is fairly important. When the President sent up this bill to Congress, he had this to say in his letter. Speaking of his authority, he said:

> From this authority will come benefits for the people whose Government this is.
>
> The people expect and deserve a Government that is lean and fit, and—

And he goes on to explain it otherwise. Also he said:

> Reorganization can mean a streamlined leadership, ready to do more in less time for the best interests of all the people.

I think the President had a good point to make when he talked about the people.

And, as a matter of fact, when we vote on this issue and when we vote for the Republican amendment or support the amendment that has been outlined on the other side of the aisle, I believe that what we should be concerned with, Mr. Chairman, are the people of the United States—because it is the people under the Constitution of this Government that delegated the lawmaking power, the legislative power, to this House of Representatives, to the other body and to the Congress of the United States and now in the Reorganization Act we have transferred and delegated and surrendered a part of this precious power to the President. I would say the least we could do here is to surrender this power for a limited period of time. Further, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the least we can do is have the President come back to the people through us, the Congress, and ask that the power be renewed from time to time.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I say that the people have a right to expect that this be done and certainly following the custom which we have followed for years and years of an extension of 2 years, makes all kinds of sense, and I would hope that enough Members on the Democratic side would support our Republican amendment to pass it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise as chairman of the Republican policy committee to report to this body the position of the policy committee on H.R. 4623.

The Reorganization Act of 1949 has demonstrated its effectiveness in promoting economy and efficiency in the executive branch of the Government. The act, therefore, should be extended.

H.R. 4623, the further amending of the Reorganization Act of 1949, however, is presently written in such a way as to threaten the prerogative of the Congress to review this legislation on a regular basis by making the extension of the act permanent.

The act itself constitutes a reversal of the constitutional procedure whereby the Congress enacts legislation which becomes law upon approval of the Executive. Under the Reorganization Act of 1949 the Executive is authorized to propose reorganization legislation subject only to a limited right of veto by the Congress.

The fact that this reversal of constitutional procedures provides for a more effective means of executive branch reorganization justifies the departure from normal procedure. To strip future Congresses of the right of legislative review of reorganization matters is, however, both unnecessary to the purposes of the act and unwise.

The entire legislative history of the act proves the wisdom of regular congressional review. The act has been amended a number of times since its original enactment. Future Congresses should continue to have the right to make such amendments when, in their view, they are needed.

We support the minority members of the Committee on Government Operations in their effort to amend the present legislation to provide for biennial review.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 205), as amended, is hereby further amended by repealing subsection (b) thereof and by deleting the subsection designation "(a)".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REUSS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Reuss: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That subsection (b) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 205; 5 U.S.C. 133z–3), as last amended by the Act of July 2, 1964 (78 Stat. 240), is hereby further amended by striking out 'June 1, 1965' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1968'."

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, the authority granted by the 1949 Reorganization Act ought to be made permanent. This is the judgment of President Johnson. The permanency feature was also the judgment of the late President Herbert Hoover and the Hoover Commission. It was the judgment of President Truman and the judgment of President Eisenhower.

However, Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with this situation today. By a unanimous vote of the majority members of the Committee on Government Operations, this bill has been brought to the floor with the permanent reorganization power given to the President. By what I believe is a unanimous position of the minority members, the proposal was made that while the extension of the reorganization power is in the public interest, it ought to be extended for only 2 years. We are now faced with the following reality:

Unhappily, the existing reorganization power of the President expired on June 1, just 2 days ago. Since the Committee on Government Operations of the House reported out H.R. 4623 back in March of this year, the Senate has passed the bill, S. 1135, now on the Speaker's desk to extend the authority for 3½ years, until the end of December 1968. This will be the end of the first term of office of President Johnson.

Mr. Chairman, in order to avoid prolonging the period under which we are now suffering, where no authority to submit plans will be available to the President, and hence his ability to reorganize for purposes of economy and efficiency is seriously handicapped, I hope that this amendment will be adopted, and that we may then take from the Speaker's desk the identical Senate-passed bill and thus be in a position to send the combined Senate-House bill to the White House for signature.

I am well aware of the fact that a 3½-year extension does not cure all of the problems caused by the 2-year extension, but it is vastly preferable to the 2-year extension.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As manager of this bill, may I say that I have consulted with the other members of the committee, the majority members of the committee, and they are in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman. I see my worthy friend on his feet seeking recognition, so all I will say is that the majority side is in favor of the amendment as a reasonable compromise.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman, and hope that the amendment will be adopted.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ERLENBORN

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I offer as a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Erlenborn as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Reuss: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That subsection (b) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 133z–3) is amended by striking out 'June 1, 1965' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 1, 1967'."

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, the question now is going to be squarely presented to the Committee as to whether we want to extend this power for a 2-year period or for a 3½-year period. It was mentioned that the other body has chosen the 3½ years, and somewhat reluctantly the majority in the House is willing to go along.

I think there are some obvious defects in going along with the 3½-year period. First of all, I pointed out in my presentation before this means we are going to extend the rules of the House beyond the current Congress, that these rules will be applicable to the next Congress, somewhat contrary to our usual procedure.

Secondly, and I think more important, to understand why the 3½ years was adopted by the other body, you will have to read the text of the hearings that were conducted by the Government Operations Committee of the other body. It is also interesting to note that one of the most vocal opponents to the permanent extension in the Committee on Government Operations of the other body was the chairman of that committee, who was the sponsor of the bill at the request of the President. After these hearings were conducted the sponsor of the bill, chairman of the committee, found he could not go along with the President's request as he originally had done by introducing the bill, but he, together with others, devised a plan of extending this for 3 years and 7 months.

The purpose, as I explained it, is that it does coincide with the term of our present President. He could have requested this for another 4 years, but this coincides with the term of the next President so that we could consider this power in the light of the knowledge who our next President would be in each 4-year period.

I think they made some miscalculations. Since the Congress in 1968 no doubt will adjourn prior to the November elections and will not be again in session until January 3 of 1969, the extension of this power cannot be accomplished in 1968 prior to adjournment with the knowledge of the fact who the next President is going to be. And the same thing will be true for an extension of 4 years. So that the purpose of the gentleman in the other body of choosing this period of time, I think has been thwarted by their choosing of this period of time of 3 years and 7 months.

I think it makes much more sense for us to extend this for 2 years as my substitute amendment would do and then we could extend it for another 2 years, and that would bring us to June 1 of 1969 and at that time the new President would have been chosen and he would have been in office a few months, and this Congress would be in a better position to assess the necessity or the worthwhileness of extending the reorganization power to the new President.

So I think this expiration date of June 1 that we have, and extending in 2-year periods, would better accomplish the purpose of the gentleman of the other body who chose this awkward period of 3 years and 7 months. Therefore, I urge the adoption of my substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substituted amendment.

I oppose the substitute amendment offered by the distinguished minority member [Mr. Erlenborn], for one important reason.

The reorganization plan procedure, even if made permanent, is a very shy bird and a very frail reed. That is so because reorganizations can only be attempted under it in about 4 or 5 months of the average year. It will not work in the first month or two of congressional organization. It takes a 60-day waiting period, and no administration is likely to want to send up a reorganization plan toward the end of the session for the simple reason that 60 days is not likely to elapse before adjournment.

For this reason there have been serious gaps in our reorganization procedure. In recent years, in 1959 and 1960 and again in 1963, reorganization was impossible because Congress had neglected to renew the authority. Indeed, it is true today and for the first 2 days in June that there is on the books no reorganization authority. So President Johnson, President Eisenhower, President Truman, and President Hoover knew what they were talking about when they asked that this authority be made permanent. The 3½-year, end-of-the-presidential-term proposal, of the other body is not as good as making it permanent, but it is vastly better than cutting it back to 2 years, as the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Illinois would do.

So in conclusion, let me urge my Republican friends to join us in voting down the 2-year amendment for two good reasons. First, from the standpoint of party solidarity, I would hope that you would give the late President Hoover unstinted backing in his feeling that a 2-year limitation is unwise and unjust.

Secondly, as reasonable men, we Democrats have come here with a bill for permanent power. You Republicans have come here with a 2-year proposal. We now offer 3½ years. We ask you to go up by a year and one-half and we are willing to come down from infinity—from eternity—to 3½ years. As is said in the Bible, if my adversary will go with me a mile, I will go with him twain. We Democrats have come a long way from infinity. I hope Republicans, as reasonable men, will join us in voting down the 2-year substitute.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of this committee, I have heard the arguments of the gentleman from Wisconsin frequently raised in opposition to the 2-year extension and in favor of a 3-year extension—or a permanent extension—as was proposed by the majority party. I have heard the argument raised that this power has lapsed from time to time. The gentleman from Wisconsin just raised this point and indicated this was unfortunate, and that this unnecessarily restricted the Executive's opportunity to put forward reorganization plans. Yet, the years he cited, of course, were years when the Democratic Party was in the majority as they are in the majority now. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin would have to agree there was no reason in the world for this power to have lapsed this year. The Government Operations Committee considered this early in the year and it was considered in sufficient time to come out prior to the lapsing of this power this year.

It seems to me that the problem of lapsing could be easily overcome if the leadership wanted to have it overcome, if they wanted to schedule the extension for floor action, if they were seriously concerned about the disadvantage to the executive branch which the gentleman claims as a result of a lapse in the authority.

I am also aware that this power may have lapsed at times when the Republican Party was in control of the Congress.

To my knowledge, none of the lapses actually restricted the Executive from offering a reorganization plan.

I would add that the arguments the gentleman from Wisconsin has made in opposition to the 2-year extension could be applied with as much effectiveness and eloquence against a 3½-year extension which he now supports.

I certainly urge the Members of the House to support the proposal for a 2-year extension. I believe it would be a reasonable extension. It is similar to what we have done in the past.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

I want to set the record straight on a couple of matters.

In the first place, there was testimony before the Committee on Government Operations that past lapses had in fact inhibited the reorganization process.

In the second place, it is true that those lapses did occur. It is only the rule of comity between this House and the other body which keeps me from saying now which body was responsible for those regrettable lapses.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. REINECKE. Is it not also true that if this power lapses as of December 31, 1968, we could not possibly reinstitute the procedure until new committees of Congress had been formed and the committees could go to work, which would almost guarantee 1-month delay.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the gentleman. This, of course, is a possibility. Let me emphasize that I support the extension of this reorganization authority. This procedure has worked well. I favor the 2-year extension. I oppose the permanent extension. If the 2-year extension fails it is my intention to support the 3½-year extension, not as the best solution, but as a considerable improvement over the proposed permanent extension.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Erlenborn amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

I should like to set the Record straight, in terms of the observation made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] that there were reasons given in the testimony that the lapses inhibited the actions of a President. I thought I had made it clear in the well in my previous argument, that there was no such evidence at all.

The only evidence possibly shading on this point occurred when the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Seidman, had completed his testimony. He gave nothing in this testimony to show this. He was asked a question by Mr. Brown:

> What did a President want to do that he could not do, or didn't do?

That referred to when there had been lapses. Mr. Seidman said:

> It is difficult for me to cite the specific examples.

He did not know any. There was no evidence, actually.

It seems to me the issue is down to the fact that the majority obviously has discarded the argument that the power in the President ought to be made permanent. They recognize and adhere to the minority position that the power should be extended for a temporary time only.

We have operated under this Reorganization Act or one similar to it since 1932, some three decades. All during this time, except for one period of 4 years, as I understand it, we have always done so under 2-year extensions. Since we have operated so well and the thing has worked so well, as everybody has agreed, both Democrats and Republicans, why not continue to operate the program under 2-year extensions which have worked so well.

It seems to me that is the nub of the argument, instead of pulling some 3½-year rabbit out of a hat, which does not tie to anything or make any sense, really, at all.

I hope that the gentleman from Wisconsin might support our reasonable argument for a 2-year extension.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the substitute amendment is appropriate, and in support thereof I wish to make two points to the Committee. First, I have reasonable doubt that the Reorganization Act of 1949 should be extended on any basis. I believe there is considerable evidence that it is an erroneous delegation of the legislative power. I thought that an additional point was beautifully made by the ranking minority member handling this bill; namely that, once this power is extended interminably, the President will then have the veto power on further limitations that the Congress might send up. Third, I think we cannot agree to an outright appeal of the time limitation. I think it is a constitutional delegation of duty to us. Above all, much has been said here with eloquent pleas about the "twain," vis-a-vis the art of compromise by the gentleman from Wisconsin. "Twain" out in our part of the country—Missouri—means something else. It was a pseudonym for Samuel Clemens, the writer of "Huckleberry Finn," "Tom Sawyer," and other books. It really means 2 feet deep in measuring water in channels. However, we have to decide from whence we proceed when we make a compromise. We do not compromise with all of the walnuts in one boys basket, and then start dividing them. Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to say is compromise is not involved when we have already reversed the process of veto, between the legislative and the executive branches of the Government.

The second main point I wish to make in addressing this Committee of the Whole, is that according to Senate Joint Resolution 2, which was passed by this body, there is now a Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress. It is composed of 12 Members of this body and 12 Members of the other body. This is a completely bipartisan committee. If the weight of the evidence heard to this date has any substance whatsoever, it is that this question of reorganization should be strongly reconsidered. In fact, the restoration of legislative prerogative is being strongly considered by the committee now. I submit that this is no time to make this permanent or bind a successive Congress, namely, the 90th Congress; while the organization of the Congress, including its relations with other bodies and branches of Government, are being seriously undertaken. Therefore, I would strongly urge the Members to support the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Erlenborn].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Erlenborn) there were—ayes 40, noes 75.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Sisk, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4623) to eliminate the expiration date for the authority of the President to submit reorganization plans to the Congress, pursuant to House Resolution 326, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. This question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Erlenborn moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4623 to the Committee on Government Operations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1135) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before December 31, 1968, a similar bill to the one just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1135

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 205; 5 U.S.C. 133z–3), as last amended by the Act of July 2, 1964 (78 Stat. 240), is hereby further amended by striking out "June 1, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1968".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H.R. 4623) were laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 407 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 407

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7777) to authorize the President to appoint General William F. McKee (United States Air Force, retired) to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith], and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 407 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 7777, a bill to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee, U.S. Air Force, retired, to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

H.R. 7777 would authorize the President, acting by and with the advice of the Senate, to appoint General McKee to the office without affecting his status as a retired officer of the Air Force, subject to the provisions of the Dual Compensation Act.

The bill provides that General McKee, in the performance of his duties as Administrator of the FAA shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition—military or otherwise—other than would be operative with respect to him if he were not a retired Regular Air Force officer.

The intent of Congress is expressed that the authority granted by enactment of this legislation is not to be construed as approval by the Congress of continuing appointments of military men to the office of Administrator of the FAA in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 407.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden], House Resolution 407, if adopted, would provide for an open rule of 2 hours of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 7777, having to do with the appointment of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the history of this agency is rather interesting and, if I may, I might review it for a moment or two.

Mr. Speaker, going back to the days of the late President Roosevelt there were suggested certain reorganizations having to do with aviation, and continued on subsequently, and when we had a fine airplane, the C–47 which turned out to be the workhorse throughout the world, we had various agencies controlling the airlines at that time, the military, civilian, and otherwise. There were a number of accidents by the military- and civilian-operated planes. As a result the Congress in its wisdom decided that it would set up a separate agency and take these operations away from the Department of Commerce. As a result the Federal Aviation Agency was created back in about 1958. As I understand it, Congress at that time had some concern as to whether or not this agency might be controlled by the military.

So it wrote into this particular act a restriction that a person from the military could not be the head of the particular Agency. At that time General Quesada was the individual who was to be selected as the head of the Agency, a very distinguished, a very qualified individual. He could not receive his retirement after some 35 years in the service, and at the same time receive a salary as Administrator of FAA. He was a man of some means, and gave up his retirement, or resigned from it, and became a very distinguished head of the FAA. As I understand it, after he resigned as head of the FAA we restored his retirement status to him.

Mr. Halaby came in, and he is going to resign. We have General McKee, whom I understand from both the minority and majority reports, is a very capable individual. He is an Air Force general with some 35 years of service, and he apparently is not in the position to waive his retirement pay.

The opposition takes the position on the basis this would set a precedent; possibly the law itself should be changed if we are going to make this exception, and permit an individual to receive his retirement at the same time he handles this particular job. Those are the arguments for and against.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am personally concerned, there are many retired generals in various capacities with private corporations, receiving large salaries, who are back here lobbying for legislation. If General McKee has earned his retirement, I think he is entitled to receive it. If he is as qualified as everybody states he is, and wants this position, I think he is entitled to receive the salary of that position.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot find any printed hearings on this bill.

Is it customary for the Rules Committee to report bills on which there are no extended hearings?

Mr. SMITH of California. So far as hearings are concerned, I do not believe the Rules Committee has any custom on that. We have the report before us, and the bill, and that is what we rely upon.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7777) to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee (U.S. Air Force, retired) to the Office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7777, with Mr. ZABLOCKI in the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

It merely authorizes the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee, U.S. Air Force, retired, to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

I think it might be helpful to first review a little of the history of the Federal Aviation Act and then bring you up to date and thereby provide you with the information which makes this exception necessary.

The Civil Aeronautics Authority was established by the Congress in 1938. Prior to that time we had only a minimal program with reference to aviation. There was some partial authority which was granted under the old Air Commerce Act. But this new and fabulous mode of transportation became a reality, and the need for further regulation became a necessity. That is recognized by most everyone in all phases of the industry. So the Congress in the 1938 program established a five-man board, and an administrator to head the program, and called it the Civil Aeronautics Authority. But the program hardly got started when in 1940 President Roosevelt by a reorganization act established out of it or converted it to the Civil Aeronautics Board. That is what we have today, and we call it the CAB. At the same time the Air Safety Board was abolished. The administrative end of it was transferred to the Department of Commerce and it became the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Then the development of this mode of transportation really got underway. We saw what happened during World War II. The gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] mentioned the old C-47 which became the workhorse and which was the real airplane at that time, and what a great achievement we accomplished in this country by its development and use.

Then during the war you know there were various planes that were developed to meet the requirements of our national defense. Many of those were put into commercial operation following the war. Of course, we had the old C-47, or DC-3, which was followed by the DC-4 with a four-engine operation.

From there on we began to develop other types of planes, until finally we hit the stage where the fast jets were coming into operation. Then commercial aviation really began to progress. As I said to the Rules Committee the other day, if the remainder of industry in this Nation could keep up with transportation in progress and development, as well as communications, this would be the greatest achievement toward a great society of which we could possibly conceive, because these two phases of our way of life have really provided this Nation with the most fabulous development that the mind of man can possibly conceive, in my judgment.

With these new innovations and new developments problems usually develop, and problems did develop. We had fast planes and then we had faster planes. Then we got to talking about planes faster than sound, jet planes traveling through the air so fast that the old control methods simply would not accommodate them. This brought on safety problems. Dangerous situations developed throughout the country. It was quite obvious that the air traffic control facilities we had during the 1950's simply would not accommodate this new development.

Out of all of this came a recognized fact, that we must do something about it. So President Eisenhower set up a special committee—a White House "Blue Stocking Committee," if I may call it so—to make a study, to investigate and go into the problem to see what we could do about it.

This committee was headed by a retired general of the Air Force, General Quesada. A great many Members know General Quesada. He was an outstanding Air Force general. He had an outstanding military record. I believe he was a West Point graduate prior to going into the Air Force. He had a long military career of I believe 30 years or more. He performed fine and recognized service for his country.

General Quesada had retired. He was retired as a lieutenant general.

General Quesada was given the responsibility of heading up this committee, called the Airways Modernization Board appointed by former President Eisenhower. This group did an excellent job in making a study of the program and what was needed to meet the developments we were experiencing. Out of that came a rewriting of the old Civil Aeronautics Act as to the administration and partly as to the Civil Aeronautics Board. This became known as the Federal Aviation Act.

The act applicable to the Civil Aeronautics Board itself was amended only slightly in 1958, but the other phases, the administration, were completely rewritten and modernized and brought up to date.

I give this background to explain that at the time we had this man assisting us. Who was the witness who testified for the bill, and who was helping to put it together? General Quesada. General Quesada did an excellent job. He was to be the first Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, the new agency coming into being.

As a retired general of the military, General Quesada was to take over—which he did—to operate that agency from the time the bill was passed in 1958 until he was replaced in 1961.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes indeed.

Mr. SPRINGER. The chairman does not want to leave the House with the impression that the crucial issue involved here is whether or not he was a civilian. I am sure you do not want to leave the House with the impression that General Quesada was a general at the time.

Mr. HARRIS. I will give the whole story so that the Members can have the benefit of it.

We had to bring together two systems of navigation control. The military, the Air Force, had developed a system of air control of its own. The commercial aviation industry and private flying had its own air navigation system. There were two separate programs going in their own directions. When these fast planes began to come into existence, then the two systems began to clash. It was obvious that the two systems could not continue to operate without endangering the lives of the people of the country. Consequently this new concept was to bring both into one controlled operation. It was decided under this proposed program, which was submitted downtown at the White House by the then President, to bring them under one control. However, we had to take some 14,000 to 15,000 military personnel out of the military and bring them into this agency, the Federal Aviation Agency. We had to merge them with some 12,000 to 14,000 civilian personnel of the existing aviation agency, which made a total number of 26,000 to 27,000 employees, both military and civilian, that had to be brought together and merged together as one unit and one operation under a civilian head. That was the Federal Aviation Agency.

So we brought all of these military personnel over from the Air Force and the Army. We had some in the Army, too. We brought them over and put them under the new Federal Aviation Agency. The question arose, Would bringing all of these thousands of military personnel over into a civilian agency raise problems? We had General Quesada, a retired military man, promoting the program. We had the question arise, Should we put a restriction on or should we give consideration and attention to being sure that this remained a civilian agency? It was generally considered that it should be a civilian agency and should be maintained as a civilian agency and therefore should be operated and administered as such. General Quesada, in meeting that problem said:

> What I am going to be—

And it is in fact what happened—

> I am going to be named the first Administrator of the program. But in order to meet this I will tell you what I will do. I will just give up my retirement and resign.

And that is what he did. As such he technically met the provisions of the act that the head of the Federal Aviation Agency must be a civilian.

I might say that it did not mean too much to General Quesada because financially he was in a position to do so. I do not say he was a wealthy man, but he had no problems getting along so far as finances were concerned. That was 1958, in the latter part of the year. Within 1 year this Congress, with my support and that of the majority of the committee, reestablished his retirement status. We provided for it in a bill signed by the President of the United States on September 16, 1959.

We are not going to change a man's thinking, change a man's background and training just because he says, "I am going to give up my retirement" in order to serve in a position of this kind.

That is the brief history of it. General Elwood Quesada did do a magnificent job, in my judgment. He made a fine Administrator. There was no problem about control by the military. He did a good job and I upheld him as far as I could and I applauded him for the job that he did.

After he left another great Administrator was appointed who is now serving, Najeeb Halaby, who had some military background during the war. Later, he was an outstanding test pilot. He had had a lot of experience in the administrative field in the aviation industry with some of the largest companies in the United States. He has done a very good job in these 4 years, in my judgment, handling a very tough assignment.

Early this year he advised the President—it was in April of this year—that he wished to be relieved of this responsibility. It is my understanding that the President attempted to prevail upon him to stay. He told the President that he came here to stay 4 years, that he had long range plans and would like to proceed with those plans. The President accepted his statement and said that as soon as he could get somebody, he would be glad to do what had to be done. The President wanted to get someone who was an outstanding administrator, a man who had had experience in administering a program comparable to this program. At the same time he wanted a man who was knowledgeable in the fields of science and technology. He wanted somebody who knew something about the programs that we have underway, because one of the biggest problems in this country is the development of the supersonic plane. We are in competition on that plane with the British and the French. If they beat us to it, they will get the aviation business and the aviation industry in this country will be hurt. We have to recognize this.

The President had this in mind. The President was advised that there was a man, General McKee, who had 35 years of military service and was in a retired status. Today, he is Assistant Administrator for Management and Development, a prominent position, in NASA, serving in that great agency in connection with the development of some of these programs. The President decided that here is a man who would fill the bill; he would do the job. So he announced the appointment of General McKee. From this arose the question of the provision in the Federal Aviation Act stating that the head of the Agency must be a civilian.

Let me go back to what happened in the consideration of this problem when General Quesada was helping us rewrite the bill.

We said then that since General Quesada is going to be the first man to head the Agency and he has a military background, the next man, the Deputy Administrator would not be anyone with a military background. In other words, he must be a true civilian. We either must have the Administrator or the Deputy Administrator a true civilian. So, we provided the very first exception when the act was passed by this Congress. We set the precedent. We provided—and we wanted it and still want it as a civilian agency—that if the Administrator is to be a man with a military background and record, the Deputy Administrator must be a true civilian.

So, Mr. Chairman, what did the President do?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the President said, in carrying out that concept and philosophy, "Then I will name Dave Thomas as the Deputy." Dave Thomas is a true civilian and one of the finest, most knowledgeable people in the United States in this business. He is the man who is going to serve as Deputy Administrator

So, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, we have a situation here that fits the bill. The President has asked for it. He has his responsibility. I, for one, believe that under the circumstances this is a reasonable request.

Mr. Chairman, in the report which is now before the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, at page 5 thereof, the members will see that the President's letter is included and I invite the attention of the members to page 5 of the report.

Mr. Chairman, there are some who are trying to make something out of this, some who say that it violates the spirit of the act. However, I have tried to give to the membership the history and the background in order to show how we started.

Mr. Chairman, this in no way in my judgment transgresses the spirit of the act any more than it did when we started.

Now, Mr. Chairman, General McKee is not a man of means. All he has in this world is his retirement which he has earned over the span of 35 years for himself and his family. He is in no position to just throw it away, resign his commission, and give it up. He told us that very frankly and candidly when he appeared before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there is some substance to this request and I ask my colleagues of this House to join me in giving our President the man he has selected whom he feels will do a good job and one who did perform a great job as Administrator of the Air Force itself when General LeMay placed him in charge for a period of several years at the time General LeMay was Chief of Staff.

Mr. Chairman, General McKee is a man who made a great record as the Administrator of the Air Force and who also has served in other administrative positions over civilian as well as military personnel during his career.

Mr. Chairman, I believe General McKee meets the criteria prescribed for this position. I believe it would be in keeping with the spirit of the act with this agency set up as it is. In my judgment it is going to continue to be a civilian agency. I, for one, am going to see that it is a civilian agency so long as I am here in the Congress.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I hope in these few minutes, without showing any derogation to the good chairman—who is a good chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]—to see if I can cut through this maze of what has been said and what is contained in the report in an effort to see if I can tell the members of the Committee in simple terms what this is all about.

This is what the law says now, today. This is the law:

> At the time of his nomination he shall be a civilian.

When we passed the act in 1958 I do not believe there was a section of the Federal Aviation Act as passed over which we spent more hours, had more disputes arise as to the wording of this particular section, with insistence, may I say, that the Administrator be a civilian. And may I say this did not come from my side, or the Eisenhower administration. In fact, I can confess there were more over on that side who were insisting this language be included in the bill than there were on my side. In fact, I believe it was almost unanimous on the Democratic side that this wording be included in the bill that "he be a civilian."

One of the reasons was when General Quesada came before the committee to testify, it was indicated he was going to be the Administrator of this agency, and the fact is he said "I expect to be nominated." This is all the more reason why the same men sitting here today insisted that this wording be put in the bill.

Let us see about General Quesada. General Quesada did not voluntarily say to the United States, "I will resign my commission." If you want to know what happened, the President sent his emissary down to our committee to find out whether he could appoint General Quesada without making him a civilian. The President got a very definite answer that we would not change this law for General Quesada.

It was then that the President of the United States and Quesada yielded. Quesada said, "I will resign my commission to be Administrator." I think I am speaking the truth as to how this act was originally passed and why those words were put in the bill. From each side of the aisle insistence came that General Quesada resign his commission.

But that is not the problem that is involved here. It is the fact that he should be a civilian and ought to be a civilian. We decided that in 1958, and it is just as true in 1965 that he ought to be a civilian. So far the law has not been violated.

What is the nature of H.R. 7777? Mr. Chairman, this is a personal bill; it is nothing less than that. Directly involved here is changing the law for General McKee during the time he serves as Administrator of FAA. That is what this bill is about. It is a personal bill for General McKee—no more, no less.

May I come, now, to the question of why he should be a civilian: When the Federal Aviation Act was passed the Air Force had a considerable area of the sky which they sort of ruled as their own route. They did not file flight plans, they flew all over the sky. You had accidents with civilian planes crashing with Air Force planes. It was only by the formation of the Aviation Act that we could get the Defense Department to surrender enough of its power to make up the Federal Aviation Agency, combining what they did with the Civil Aeronautics Authority, which at that time did have charge of the safety of the skies as far as civilian aircraft were concerned.

We were afraid in 1958 of exactly what happened with General Quesada, and what is happening in this administration with General McKee. It has happened. There is no way in which we can prevent the President of the United States from nominating General McKee if he is a civilian any more than this Congress could prevent the nomination and I suppose final confirmation of General Quesada for General McKee reasons.

May I ask, is General McKee the only person in this country who can be found to do this job? Is he the only man who can administer the Federal Aviation Agency with grace, with dignity, and with confidence? I do not believe any of us believe that. But I think the issue here is whether or not you are going to violate the law or change the law in the way that this bill does, to allow a member of the armed services who is now in retirement and who could not be appointed under this act to be appointed. That is the simple issue with which we are faced.

Now let me say this. I have a high respect for General McKee. There is no issue about that. I am sure we had the same high respect for General Quesada in 1958. I would say General Quesada and General McKee are both men eminent in their field and both highly qualified and both greatly respected. That is not the issue. The issue is whether or not we are going to have a civilian administer this Agency.

My distinguished friend, the chairman of the committee, has said he does not think this violates the spirit of the act. Gentlemen, I do not know whether it violates the spirit of the act. But it violates the act—period. It is that simple and that is all there is to it.

Let us go over here to a part of this and I guess the committee felt so ashamed—at least I felt rather sad about it. This amendment was put in:

> It is hereby expressed as the sense of Congress that after General McKee leaves the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, no additional appointments of military men to that office shall be approved.

Why did we not do that back when General Quesada was up for appointment? Because at that time we believed firmly that the man who had to administer this agency ought to be a civilian. I believe that just as firmly as I did when General Quesada was there and I believe it today. Gentleman, this is the issue as I see it. It is as simple as that. It is up to you to determine whether or not you are going to change this law in order for a military man to serve in a position where the law says that at the time of his nomination he shall be a civilian. Gentlemen, it is that simple.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 8 minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I think it is extremely unfortunate that we are proceeding with a bill of this importance without the printed hearings. It is impossible to refer to a number of things that were referred to in the hearings which I would like to refer to and which if I mentioned them would probably be questioned and it might be said that it did not happen. I think it is unwise for the Congress to take up a bill of this size and of this importance without printed hearings.

As I mentioned when we were considering the rule, it does not seem to be in the best interests to do that.

You may think that we have all civilians in this Aviation Agency. I think it is well for us to know just who we do have in this Agency. I would like to give you some figures of just how many military men are already in this Agency. In the Ready Reserves there are 1,250. In the Active Standby Reserves there are 628. In the inactive standby there are 4,364. In other words, in the Agency including the enlisted men and noncommissioned officers and so forth there are 6,292. Of retired military men who are retired and on pension, there are 1,812 in the Agency.

So it is rapidly becoming a military organization.

Let me give some more figures. As of the present time there are 94 retired and active Regular officers who enjoy executive assignment in the FAA. General Grant is the incumbent Deputy Administrator. His permanent grade is a major general. The Federal Air Surgeon is Maj. Gen. M. S. White. The Associate General Counsel is Brig. Gen. Martin Menter, whose permanent rank is colonel. There are 15 colonels, 31 lieutenant colonels, and 20 majors drawing Air Force or Army retirement while working with this Agency. So we have already created pretty much a military organization.

In the hearings there was mentioned a number of times—and when we tried to find out the real motive for this appointment, we were referred a number of times to the fact that the President had a military purpose, but we were never able to get what the purpose was.

I believe all of us know of the Executive orders that were prepared during the Kennedy administration for preparedness. They were famous Executive orders.

I should like to read the Executive order in respect to the Aviation Agency. It is Executive Order No. 11003.

> By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, including authority invested in me by Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1958, it is hereby ordered as follows:
>
> Section 1. Scope: The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency (herein referred to as the Administrator), shall prepare national emergency plans and develop preparedness programs covering the emergency management of the Nation's civil airports, civil aviation operating facilities, civil aviation services, and civil aircraft other than air carrier aircraft. These plans and programs shall be designed to develop a state of readiness in these areas in respect to all conditions of national emergency including attack upon the United States.

If the military purpose of the President is with respect to the idea that he plans to issue some of these Executive orders—which can be issued, because we are still operating under the emergency clause of the Korean affair—the Executive orders can be issued at any time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I am glad to yield to the chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to call to the attention of the gentleman—I am sure he has not overlooked the fact, since I endeavored to explain it briefly in my statement a while ago—that the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 provides in section 302(c) for military participation. That is set up in the act. The purpose of the act was to serve military as well as civilian requirements. If the gentleman will read subsections (c) (1), (2), (3), he will find this is carrying out what the gentleman just said.

Mr. YOUNGER. I am perfectly aware of that. That was brought out a number of times in the hearings. That is why I am sorry the answers we had in the hearings are not available to the Members. I believe it is regrettable that our committee brings to this body a bill without the printed hearings available.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. YOUNGER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HARRIS. As the gentleman knows, there were only a few witnesses. First was Mr. John Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Mr. Hartramft, head of the AOPA and a fellow by the name of Mr. David Scott, who is head of the National Pilots Association, appeared. General McKee appeared in executive session. Those were the only witnesses, and the gentleman has the benefit of all their statements.

Mr. YOUNGER. I have the benefit of them, but none of the Members of the House have the benefit of those hearings. In other words, following your argument, no committee would print the hearings before they bring a bill to the floor of the House, because the committee already heard them. It is a rather fallacious argument to present to this House.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman thinks so, I have a transcript here which I will be glad to present to him.

Mr. YOUNGER. I do not want it.

Mr. HARRIS. Or I will present it to any other Member who might want to see it.

Mr. YOUNGER. I know. It is a very fine gesture and a good gesture. If you are of the opinion that we should bring bills to this House without printed hearings, then that is your opinion. However, I oppose that kind of procedure. I think the rules of the House state and the usually followed procedure is that committee hearings are printed. This thing of ramming bill after bill through the House here without following the usual procedure is something we ought to object to here in the legislative halls. I think there is too much of this thing going on already. I think if the President has in mind issuing any of these orders, which he may have, then the appointment of General McKee would be perfectly in order, but I believe that the House ought to have that information, and he ought to say to the House, "Yes, I intend to use him exactly to prepare this Federal Aviation Agency for military purposes." We ought to know that.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. Is it not true that our chairman—and I think you will agree with me he is a very fine chairman—acted under the specific direction of the committee? When it reported this bill he was instructed to proceed to take it to the Committee on Rules to obtain a rule to bring the bill before the House. At no time during the hearings of the Committee on Rules was any objection lodged against the granting of a rule, or statement made that it should be held in abeyance until such time as the committee hearings were printed. I am not disagreeing with the gentleman as to the need for having committee hearings and printing them but merely stating that to place the responsibility on the chairman and to charge that he has acted wrongly is totally in error.

Mr. YOUNGER. I did not do so.

Mr. MOSS. It is a shared responsibility, if there is any fixing of responsibility.

Mr. YOUNGER. Just a minute. You did not quote the entire resolution which brought this bill out. Will you quote the rest of it?

Mr. MOSS. I do not have the resolution before me, but I know that the instruction to the chairman was the usual instruction to take the usual steps.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is right.

Mr. MOSS. I do not recall any specific mention in any of these instructions on any occasion requiring that the chairman first see that the hearings were printed.

Mr. YOUNGER. I have been here for the same length of time as you have; that is, 13½ years, and all except two of them serving on this committee. I have seen the same resolution to bring out a bill and to proceed in the usual manner, but on all occasions we have had reports of the hearings printed.

Mr. MOSS. We have had reports, but I do not think the gentleman will contend that we have in each and every instance had printed hearings, because a little careful research might cause him to correct his statement. I do not believe he wants to leave that impression.

Mr. YOUNGER. Will the gentleman agree that we should not have printed hearings when we have a bill of this import?

Mr. MOSS. No. I agree we should have printed hearings, but let us take a little of the responsibility for it ourselves. You and I and the rest of the committee, too. If we feel they are so necessary, then let us direct the chairman, at the time we report the legislation, to see that the hearings are first printed.

Mr. YOUNGER. Do not blame me. I did not vote to bring this bill out. I voted against the bill. You are the one who voted to bring it out.

Mr. MOSS. I did, without apology, but I do not recall the gentleman's request for printed hearings.

Mr. YOUNGER. I am sorry, then. If hereafter that is the way the committee wants to function, that is all right. We will say each time that the hearings shall be published and printed before the bill goes to the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. Will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes. I am glad to yield to the chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. Would the gentleman vote for this bill if he had the hearings printed?

Mr. YOUNGER. No; I did not vote to bring the bill out. I am opposed to the bill. I am talking about a principle here, whether we want to hoodwink the Members of this body and not let them know what happened in the hearings. If we do that, then I say that this body is going to be nothing but a rubber-stamp for the executive department and I, for one, will not follow that kind of procedure.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer some of the questions that have been raised by my colleagues and try to throw some light on this subject. In 1958, when General Quesada was appointed, we had a former general in the White House and there were other generals in the Government. I happened to be a member of the committee at the time as was the gentleman who is chairman of the committee and who is handling this bill today. There were some fears in America that perhaps we were trying to "generalize" everything in the country. There was a provision written into the law that has been mentioned. We do not have a general in the White House today, or a former general.

Strange as it may seem, this gentleman that we are talking about did not apply for this job. He was not an applicant for the job. He was called by the President of the United States to the White House. He did not know why he was called until he was told. When he came there, the President asked him to take this job. Why did the President ask him to take this job? Because, in his opinion, he is the best qualified man in America today to do the job, in these trying times. I say to the Members of the House, representing all segments of America, do you want the second best man? The President said he was the best. And the men who advised the President—and I am not referring to one individual, because he had a committee—advised him that he was the best. Do you want the second best?

He did not apply for the job. The President picked him out after a lot of screening as the best man who could serve America today in this job.

It is rather significant that the vote in the committee was 23 to 8 to report out this bill. Anyone who has listened to the arguments against this bill should keep this in mind, that the vote was 23 to 8 by those who heard all of the testimony.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the Chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. Is this not the only question here? If General McKee would resign his commission, relinquish his retired status, then he would serve without any objection on the part of anybody? Is that not true?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. Therefore, the only question is this. This is the same man, the same mind, the same background, the same experience, and he could serve without any objection on anybody's part if he would merely resign his commission as a retired military officer.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Consequently, does it not add up to this, that he would be required to take a substantial reduction in his income, which he has earned through 35 years, if that were to be done?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is true.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the simple issue, is it not?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is the only issue. If he resigned his commission, nobody here would contest his appointment. I would like to make this further statement. If he resigned his commission that would not change his basic qualities, or his basic character. He has paid into this retirement fund as you and I have paid into our retirement fund. Do you think the Congress ought to say to either one of us, if we were offered an appointment, "If you give up your retirement, you may have the appointment?" This retirement protects his family. He testified before our committee that in educating his children it took most of his wealth.

Now, he is paying on his house. He has to pay on that but yet he would have to take a reduction in pay if he accepted this position.

Mr. Chairman, he is serving this country now.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the present pay of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, or of the Director thereof?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Thirty thousand dollars a year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, what is the retirement income of this gentleman?

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman from West Virginia will yield further, General McKees' retirement income is $14,808. Let us straighten this out. Under the Dual Compensation Act he is receiving as an Assistant Administrator for Management under NASA $24,500, plus his earned retirement of $14,808, which amounts to a total of $39,308. If he serves as Administrator of FAA he would receive $30,000 as Administrator and his participation in the retirement program would only be $8,404. Consequently, he would receive $38,404. Therefore, he would take an actual reduction as compared with what he is today receiving. The reduction would be $904 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just state for the information of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], who just inquired about the salary involved here, that he and I both voted against and fought against this dual compensation bill.

Mr. Chairman, General McKee is receiving full retirement, and under that bill if he served with NASA, he could receive full retirement. However, under this bill, if he is appointed as Director of the Federal Aviation Agency, he will go back to the extent of $2,000 as the chairman of the committee stated, and then half of the rest of it.

But, Mr. Chairman, for the protection of his family, if something happens to him while he is serving in this capacity, they would be left out in the cold. I do not think that would be fair.

Mr. Chairman, the President has stated that General McKee has a vast wealth of knowledge in this field and that we should make use of it. This was done after the Civil Service searched for a qualified man and after that Commission came up with General McKee as the best qualified man for the place.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe we want to take second best. That is the entire basis of my argument.

Mr. Chairman, the bill as written says:

> It is hereby expressed as the intent of the Congress that the authority granted by this Act is not to be construed as approval by the Congress of continuing appointments of military men to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency in the future.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that that language serves notice that this does not establish a precedent. As I previously stated, General Quesada was an exception. In 1959 they came back and passed Public Law 86–177 and gave to General Quesada his full retirement in 1959.

Mr. Chairman, we did that for General Quesada. Here we have a man who can serve and is serving our country and whom the President feels is the best qualified man to serve in this position, and I believe we ought to pass on this bill affirmatively and let it go on to the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, as I previously stated this bill came out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by a vote of 23 to 8.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush].

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7777.

Mr. Chairman, there are many good reasons why this bill should be defeated.

Not the least of these reasons is that passage of H.R. 7777 would put a military man in control of an agency which Congress has specifically reserved for a civilian appointment.

There are many qualified and highly trained civilians available for the position as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

H.R. 7777 clearly circumvents the intent of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which states explicitly in section 301(b) that the Administrator shall be a civilian at the time of his nomination.

General McKee cannot be construed as a civilian in any sense of the word, so far as this appointment is concerned.

He is a retired general, and this bill would further enable General McKee to retain his military status and priviliges including a portion of his retirement pay.

It would seem to me that a man who has been a four-star Air Force General without a pilot's rating, while retaining military status and privileges, including partial retirement pay, is not a civilian.

To substantiate my belief that General McKee is not a civilian insofar as this appointment is concerned, is the fact that this legislation excludes this appointment from the provisions of section 301(b) of the Federal Aviation Act, a tacit admission that the sponsors of this appointment consider General McKee a military man rather than a civilian.

Why did Congress specify in 1958 that a civilian be appointed as Administrator of the FAA, and why should Congress not allow this circumvention of the law at this time?

This type of post, as most cabinet appointments, have traditionally been given to civilians. This is in line with the principles of our government where the military and civilian controls and responsibilities have been kept separate.

Those of us interested in civilian aviation seriously question the propriety of placing a retired general in this high administrative post.

There are many serious conflicts and problems arising continuously between civilian aviation and military, and I firmly believe that in the post of Administrator of FAA, we should have a civilian rather than a retired general.

Inasmuch as the law prohibits a professional military man from holding the post of Administrator of the FAA, and due to the tremendous importance of civilian aviation in this country, I respectfully urge the House to reject H.R. 7777.

My opposition to H.R. 7777 has nothing whatsoever to do with the qualifications or abilities of General McKee.

As stated in the minority views on this bill, if the principle involved were unimportant and we felt that an exception to the law would work no harm, General McKee is undoubtedly the man for whom the exception could be made.

On the contrary, however, I feel that the precedent set by such an exception to the present law would do great damage and we must therefore oppose the passage of H.R. 7777.

The restriction against military appointments to this civilian agency, was made for good reason. I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 7777.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes tc the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Devine].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, none of us who signed the minority views in connection with the appointment of General McKee raised any question whatsoever as to his qualifications to fill the position of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. The fact is I think all of us feel that he is fully qualified, even though he does not know how to fly an airplane. It is not necessary and it is not one of the qualifications set forth under the terms of the act.

Mr. Chairman, there is much emotion involved here and a lot of things have been said in order to get away from the true issues involved. We know he will make $38,500 under the circumstances. But the issue involved is just one thing: Under the terms of the Federal Aviation Act, which is presently the law of the land, it states in mandatory language that the Administrator shall—and I emphasize the word "shall"—be a civilian.

General McKee does not enjoy that status. The mere fact that you remove him from the military retirement provisions and things of that nature still does not change the Federal Aviation Act. It seemed to many of us in the minority that the way to attack this problem is to amend the Federal Aviation Act, if that is what you wish to do, rather than amending it by indirection in connection with H.R. 7777.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Perhaps I misunderstood the gentleman, but if he were to resign his retired status then he would meet the provisions the gentleman referred to?

Mr. DEVINE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of reluctance that I feel constrained to oppose enactment of this private bill for General McKee to waive the provisions of existing law in order to permit him to serve as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency because, indeed, I recognize General McKee is a very competent, capable, fine administrator. He is the only nonflying four-star Air Force general. He must have something on the ball.

In this day and time when we have seen Supreme Court Justices appointed who do not have judicial experience; when we saw an Attorney General appointed who had never practiced law a day in his life; when we have a Secretary of Agriculture who has never farmed; an Architect of the Capitol who is not an architect, I suppose that a Federal Aviation Administrator who is not a pilot must be eminently qualified for the position. We have in this Agency a man by the name of Gordon Bain, a very capable expert on the subject of supersonics and who heads up the SST program in the Agency. One of the reasons given by advocates of this bill is that General McKee is quite knowledgeable in the supersonic field, and is needed to promote that development. I am sure that is a valid argument for bringing the general into the Agency, but does that necessarily justify changing the law so he can serve as Administrator of the whole Agency? Surely, he could make the same contribution to the SST development as an Assistant or Deputy Administrator.

Mr. Chairman, others who have preceded me in this debate have paid high tribute to the exceptional competence of General McKee as an administrative officer. On the basis of what I know about him, and the testimony given to our committee, I would put a full stamp of approval on their remarks. Certainly I do not question his ability to do an excellent job as Administrator of this far-flung Agency, and it is not on that ground that I feel compelled to oppose this legislation. My opposition is based purely and simply on the principle at issue: is this to continue to be a Government of laws and not of men? Are we to find men to fit the laws, or are we to make our laws to fit the man?

When Chairman Harris and his committee colleagues wrote the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, they wrote into the law that one of the qualifications to be possessed by the Administrator was that "at the time of his appointment he shall be a civilian." As if that language might not be sufficiently clear as to insure his being a civilian, and in order to nail it down, they emphasized the point by writing into the statement accompanying the conference report that the Administrator shall be a civilian "in the strictest sense of the word."

Now, Mr. Chairman, who is asking us to waive that restriction; none other than the very people who insisted that it be put into the law in the first place.

In asking us to waive this requirement, they are saying in effect that they really did not mean what they wrote into the original act. If you do not believe that, take a look at the majority report on this bill. Turn to page 3 and you will find this amazing statement:

> We are satisfied that a future prohibition against military men * * * is undesirable.

Are they saying that they were wrong in writing this stipulation into the organic law? Are they dissatisfied with the act as it stands? If that be true, it seems to me they should be trying to amend the act itself, instead of trying to get around its provisions by passing this type of bill.

I offered an amendment in committee that would do that very thing, change the act, to take out this limitation and permit appointment of military men subject to the confirmation of the Senate. It did not get enough votes to count. I hope I am going to be able to offer it again here on the floor of the House, and I hope Members of this House will look at it just a little bit more seriously and will deal just a little bit more openly with the American people than we did in committee. While I do not advocate military men as heads of this agency, if the President is going to continue to send appointments of military men and ask the Congress to waive the requirements of law in each instance, then we might as well face the issue squarely, remove the stipulation, and leave it wide open for the President.

I have heard the chairman make the point that if General McKee were to resign his ties with the military, he would become qualified. Of course, he would. That was the very purpose of putting this protective requirement into the act in the first place, because so long as a man continues to have ties with the military, he has obligations to the military.

Now, as far as I am concerned, the dual compensation issue which has been raised is purely a side issue. I am not interested in that. As far as I am concerned, General McKee has put in 35 long, hard years of service in order to earn his retirement, and he is entitled to get it. That does not concern me at all with regard to this bill.

But, Mr. Chairman, we searched in vain for the special qualifications that General McKee possesses which would justify the extraordinary procedure of waiving the requirements of law in order to permit his appointment. Not one witness came up with anything specific. They dealt in generalities. They pointed out that he is an expert in the field of supersonics and his skills are needed because we are going to have to develop supersonic transports within the next few years. Conceding his special skills in that area, why not take him into the aviation agency and assign him to work exclusively on supersonics?

Mr. Chairman, let me read to you from the Senate minority report on the companion bill to H.R. 7777:

> At this moment, 94 retired and active Regular officers enjoy executive assignments in the Federal Aviation Agency.
>
> General Grant is the incumbent Deputy Administrator.

Let me pause just a minute to state that the name of General Grant brings to mind the observation that one of General McKee's very special qualifications is the fact that he comes from the good old Confederate State of Virginia. But after all, he is still a military man, and the law says a military man cannot be appointed to this position. Why, even if the beloved, revered, competent, able Gen. Robert E. Lee were a candidate for this position I would still have to vote against his nomination, so long as the law disqualifies military men for the place.

I read further:

> The Federal Air Surgeon is Maj. Gen. M. S. White. The Associate General Counsel is Brig. Gen. Martin Menter (whose permanent rank is colonel). There are 15 colonels, 31 lieutenant colonels, and 20 majors drawing Air Force or Army retirement while working in this Agency. There are three Navy captains, nine Navy commanders, one Marine colonel, and two Marine lieutenant colonels in the same category. Yet, this is a civilian agency in whose very creation Congress wrote exceptional safeguards against domination by active and/or retired military officers.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the bill should be defeated. However, if it is the wish of the Congress that General McKee be made qualified to serve as administrator, we should have the courage to change the basic law so as to remove the military disqualification.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams], who has served so long as the ranking member of his party on the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aviation and who is the outstanding expert in this Congress as of now. He stood for principle in 1958 when this act was written. He has not changed his principles in 1965.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. I am up against two conflicting principles here. As a civilian pilot, I do not believe that the agency should be headed by a military man. But if I support the amendment, I am up against another principle, that I believe we are setting a very poor precedent if we in reality amend the law in this way.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman refer to the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. ICHORD. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. If the gentleman from Missouri has the impression that I endorse the amendment, I do not. I would not vote for it nor support it.

I believe the law was good in 1958 when it was passed. I believe it is good law today. I did not mean to leave the impression that I support the gentleman's amendment.

I did say the gentleman stood by the position that the administrator ought to be a civilian in 1958. It is my understanding, from what the gentleman said to the committee, that he is still in favor of a civilian to head up the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me say to the gentleman that I do not advocate the removal of this requirement that the Administrator be a civilian. What I do advocate is sticking to it, but if we are not going to stick to it, then I suggest we should be honest with the American people and take it out of the law.

I quite agree with the gentleman. As a matter of principle I am opposed to it, also. Since it appears we are going to make a practice of waiving the law whenever the President desires to appoint a military man, it seems to me that the requirement in the law is not worth the paper on which it is written, anyway.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I voted in 1958 for the language requiring a civilian Administrator for this agency, and I voted in conformity with the sense of the report—a civilian in the strictest sense of the word.

Immediately the President sent the nomination of a man who had just resigned his commission to the other body for confirmation as the Administrator of that agency. I did not thereby achieve my objective, and I can see no substantive difference between the man who can afford to resign his commission and qualify, knowing full well that we will give it back to him less than a year later, and the one who forthrightly comes before us, as General McKee did, and says:

> I cannot afford to give up the protection that my commission gives to my family after 35 years of military service.

I think there is a distinction without much difference. I think that there is a lot of noise being made here in protest that looks at the form and not at the substance of the argument. I am not enthused about joining in setting aside this provision of law, but my President has told me and his principal adviser, a man long in career service, has told me that this is an eminently qualified individual. Using the rights of the Congress, we have the full opportunity to examine into the qualifications and determine whether or not a waiver should be granted. I have heard nothing in debate to convince me that it should not be granted. As a matter of fact, in 1958 we were somewhat ambiguous when we drafted the language of this statute, because we first said that the Administrator should be a civilian at the time of his appointment, but we went on to say, in talking about the Deputy Administrator, that:

> Nothing in this act or other law shall preclude appointment to the position of Deputy Administrator of an officer on active duty with the armed services, except that if the Administrator is a former regular officer of any one of the armed services, the Deputy Administrator shall not be an officer on active duty with one of the armed services.

Now, clearly we were being ambiguous. Clearly we were being inconsistent. We said he must be a civilian in the strictest sense of the word, but if he was not—if he was not—then his Deputy had better be one. So we did not intend what we said when we required that he be a civilian.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I will be very happy to yield to my chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not also true at the very time we wrote the act, when we said, "he shall be a civilian" and used the language referred to by our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], a moment ago, that we had the military officer sitting in front of us saying that he was going to be the first Administrator of the act; and it was knowing that he was going to be the first Administrator which caused the committee to write this language that the gentleman referred to, recognizing the fact that we were going to have a military man to head up the agency?

Mr. MOSS. That is precisely correct. I do not think there was a doubt in the mind of a single member of the committee but that President Eisenhower would submit in nomination the name of General Quesada as the first Administrator. Notwithstanding that fact, we acted and, as I say, ambiguously, to see that if it happened, then the deputy had to be a civilian. So there was not this great clarity and this finely delineated principle that has been referred to here in the discussion this afternoon. Really, the question is are we going to permit one man to serve because he could afford to resign his commission for about 9 months and then deny the same privilege to another man when both are well qualified, and I think equally qualified. I will grant that one of them is not a pilot, but then I am not a lawyer, and yet I do not come here to this well with any feeling of inadequacy as a legislator.

I do not think you have to fly a plane to administer a program.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am happy to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. MILLER. I just want to say that General McKee had hardly taken off his uniform before he was appointed Deputy Administrator for Administration of NASA, one of the highest ranks in that agency. Here is a man who has had a wealth of experience in the field of administration. His work in the Air Force was known because he was a fine administrator. I think we are going between tweedle dee and tweedle dum if we sacrifice a man of proven ability just because of some technicality.

Mr. MOSS. In serving with NASA, as he does at this time, and as he may legally continue to do on into the future, General McKee will make more money, draw more in total sum from the Government than he would by accepting the position of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. As a matter of fact, there is nothing persuasive in this argument that he is going to draw retirement because if he had accumulated 35 years of service in civilian industry and been on retirement, we would not ask him to put it aside and make that sacrifice in order to take on responsibilities with the Government. We are going to pay the Administrator's office the same, regardless of who occupies it. That is all that is going to be charged to the budget of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say that in this case, I hope the bill prevails, but that the Federal Aviation Agency, if it does, will be the gainer and NASA will be the loser.

Mr. MOSS. In context with history as it is evolving since we drafted the act in 1958, I think we would be far more consistent to approve this legislation than we would be to reject it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we should consider what is said in the letter to the chairman of the committee:

> General McKee possesses the qualities essential for a top policymaker in the administration. In addition, his experience in the past year in examining, analyzing, and evaluating the program of the Space Agency in advanced science and technology will certainly be of considerable benefit in his discharging the duties of the FAA Administrator.

We must also keep in mind that for 9 years General McKee had command and management responsibilities in the Air Materiel Command and directed the work of more than 150,000 civilian employees engaged in aviation occupations and professions, in this country and abroad.

We also know that in this particular position one of experience and one possessed of the broadest qualifications is necessary in connection not only in the field of outer space from a civilian angle but from a military angle. And I say this as former chairman of the select committee some years ago from which came the bill establishing NASA; that we must never lose sight of the importance of outer space, not only from a civilian angle but particularly from a military angle.

General McKee certainly possesses all the qualifications from a civilian angle. He has retained the civilian state of mind during the years that he served in the Armed Forces. He certainly possesses profound qualifications from the military angle.

It seems to me that no matter who is President, whether he is elected as a Republican or a Democrat, if he thought that some particular person was especially qualified to fill a particular position, the Congress of the United States ought to accept the President's judgment and cooperate with him.

Mr. MOSS. I agree with the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7777 which would permit the appointment of a retired Air Force general officer to the post of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

The Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is most explicit on this question. Section 301(b) provides:

> At the time of his nomination (the Administrator) shall be a civilian.

An exception was made for the first Administrator, General Quesada. Even in that case, however, the nominee had been out of active service for 7 years and was willing to sever all ties, with the military.

Now, on the question of the third nominee for this position, we are asked to make another exception. However, in this case, General McKee will be permitted to retain his military status while serving as Administrator.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress wisely put this limitation in the act of 1958. It did not want this vital Agency, which must regulate all of civil aviation, to be headed by a military man. It provided that the Deputy Administrator may be military. He can advise the Administrator on the military aspects of any problems.

In my review of the testimony on this bill, I have failed to turn up one exceptional reason why the Congress should again waive the requirement it imposed in 1958. General McKee is an outstanding military officer and certainly has a distinguished record of 35 years with the Air Force. He is now doing a very important job for NASA. I do not feel, however, that it has been demonstrated that he is the only man qualified for the FAA post.

I urge my colleagues to hold to the limitation that was put into the law in 1958 and to reject H.R. 7777.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the very fine job done by outgoing Federal Aviation Administrator Najeeb Halaby deserves praise from everyone concerned with the Nation's airlines.

Recognition of Administrator Halaby's distinguished record is seen in the recent award given him at the Aviation/Space news conference held in Albuquerque, N. Mex. Upon receipt of the Monsanto Aviation Safety Award, Halaby offered some of his thoughts, drawn from close-hand experience, on air safety.

But even though air safety has become a mark in Administrator Halaby's fine record, he also is deserving of recognition for his policy of forethought in anticipating the future growth of aviation in America. Airport planning, for example, has kept pace with the needs of growing towns and cities across the Nation.

Efficiency in the administration of FAA regulations ranks among Najeeb Halaby's accomplishments also.

And I can say as a Member of Congress that under Najeeb Halaby the Federal Aviation Agency's service to the Nation and cooperation with the Congress has been maintained at a high level.

Other Members I am sure, along with his colleagues in Government and many friends in industry, join me in wishing him well in future endeavors.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the law specifically states that at the time of his appointment, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency "shall be a civilian." This bill, H.R. 7777, would enable an exception to be made so that the President may appoint Gen. William F. McKee of the U.S. Air Force, retired, to the Administrator's post.

Although I do not know him personally, every report I have concerning General McKee is highly favorable. That he is a distinguished officer, however, is beside the point. The policy of civilian control was clearly established for excellent reasons when the FAA was brought into existence by the Congress. That principle would be violated by this legislation. This bill would establish a clear precedent for the future. In the face of this fact, I cannot understand why the President is presenting Congress with the name of a career military officer.

Problems concerning the use of airspace are growing in complexity. Great interests are at stake, commercial and private as well as military. The reasons for insuring the civilian control of the FAA are, if anything, greater today than they were in 1958 when the FAA was created.

So, for reasons that have nothing to do with the personality of the outstanding officer who has been designated, I oppose this bill. There is absolutely no overriding or compelling reason for either the President or the Congress to overturn carefully established policy in this arbitrary manner.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard for Gen. William F. McKee and know of no finer military officer in our country today. I know that he is possessed of all of the abilities requisite to doing a splendid job as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. My vote against H.R. 7777 should not in any way be construed as an expression of any lack of confidence in the general.

Mr. Chairman, my vote against this legislation is based upon the firm conviction that the Congress acted wisely when it provided that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency should be a civilian. Had General McKee resigned his military commission as General Quesada did when he was made Administrator of the FAA, I would heartily approve his accepting the position as Administrator. I do not believe, though, that it is proper for this gentleman to receive the pay to which he is entitled as a retired officer of the Regular Air Force and at the same time receive the compensation as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

It is for these reasons that I reluctantly voted against the legislation.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, in listening carefully to the thoughtful debate of the Members of the House of Representatives on this proposed exception to the original action of Congress which provides that the office of head of the Federal Aviation Agency shall be filled by a civilian, I have not heard a single criticism of the purposes and the provisions of the original enactment. I feel that the decision of the Congress in this original enactment was sound. I, therefore, stand in opposition to the proposed exception to this well-designed congressional act and its purposes.

I want to make clear that this in no way reflects a criticism on my part of the career and services of General McKee, but it does reflect my conviction that in all of the numbers of people in the population of the United States, it is my belief that the President could have found someone qualified for Administrator within the intent of the original act of Congress.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7777

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 301(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1341(b)), or any other provision of law, the President, acting by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint General William F. McKee (United States Air Force, retired) to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. General McKee's appointment to, acceptance of, and service in that office shall in no way affect any status, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the United States Air Force or any component thereof, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided,* That so long as he holds the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, he shall receive the compensation of that office at the rate specified in the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 (title III of the Act of August 14, 1964, Public Law 88–426) and shall retain the rank and grade which he now holds as an officer on the retired list of the Regular Air Force, and shall in addition continue to receive the retired pay to which he is entitled by law, subject to the provisions of the Dual Compensation Act (the Act of August 19, 1964, Public Law 88–448).

SEC. 2. In the performance of his duties as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, General McKee shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were not an officer on the retired list of the Regular Air Force.

SEC. 3. It is hereby expressed as the intent of the Congress that the authority granted by this Act is not to be construed as approval by the Congress of continuing appointments of military men to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency in the future.

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WILLIAMS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the form of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS: On page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the second sentence of section 301(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'shall be a civilian and'."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment obviously is to remove the requirements contained in the Federal Aviation Act to the effect that the Administrator of this Agency be a civilian. This is the only way we can meet this issue head on. It is being frank with the American people and the aviation community.

Mr. Chairman, I do not advocate the appointment of military men to this position; nonetheless, since it is obvious it is going to be done anyway, I feel that we should be straightforward and honest with the American people. It is with that in mind that I offer this amendment as a substitute for the bill.

Mr. Chairman, if this is to be a government of laws and not a government of men, let us keep it a government of laws. My substitute amendment is the only way we can cope with this problem within that principle.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Surely.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that what the gentleman's amendment would do, if adopted, would be to remove the provision under the present law that says—speaking of the Administrator—"he shall be a civilian and"?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is exactly right.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will yield further, that is all the gentleman's amendment does?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. Of course, that accomplishes the purpose of your bill, because if this language were adopted, General McKee would be immediately eligible for the appointment, notwithstanding the fact that he is a professional miliary man. This would be consistent with the language which I read a moment ago from the majority report which says:

> We are satisfied that a future prohibition against appointments of military men is undesirable.

Mr. Chairman, this is in conformity with that principle as expressed by the majority of the committee and I feel quite frankly that this should be done rather than to permit the law to be flouted to accommodate specific individuals.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it would be in the best interest of the Nation to remove this provision. I do not believe it could be done without creating a lot of adverse feelings in the minds of some segments of the aviation community.

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier, there appeared before the committee at the time of the hearings the president of the Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association who did not oppose providing this exception. He told the committee that at the time he appeared and he did not oppose providing the exception, but he did ask that we include this language, which we did, in the report.

> It is hereby expressed as the intent of the Congress that the authority granted by this act is not to be construed as approval by the Congress of continuing appointments of military men to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency in the future.

I do not feel that this exception under the circumstances that were brought to us is in any way contrary to the precedent that has been set, and to the history of this act.

Let me again remind you that when this new Agency was set up and established we brought together a merging of some 15,000 military people with some 14,000 civilian people in the Civil Aviation Administration, which together became the Federal Aviation Agency. We brought together these two categories of employees to operate this huge, important, responsible Agency, which in my judgment has done an excellent job during these last several years.

For the last 7 years we have had the Federal Aviation Agency as we have it now. We did attack this problem at that time. It is true, as the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] mentioned a moment ago, that we went beyond the provision that the Administrator at the time of his nomination shall be a civilian, and we provided then—I want to reemphasize and read this to you, so far as the Deputy Administrator is concerned:

> Nothing in this act or other law shall preclude appointment to the position of Deputy Administrator of an officer on active duty with the armed services—

We provided that, recognizing the fusion of these two groups. We did not stop there. We went further, and I would emphasize this as a matter of policy—I think it is just as honest as you can present it—

> except that if the Administrator—

Recognizing there was going to be an Administrator who was an officer—

> if the Administrator is a former regular officer of any one of the armed services, the Deputy Administrator shall not be an officer on active duty with one of the armed services, or a retired regular officer, or a former regular officer of one of the armed services.

It has been referred to by my colleague that the military was being established in it. The very next section in the act, 302(c) provides for military participation. I will not take the time to read it, but (c) provides that in the interest of national defense we shall use these military men in the operation of this Agency.

The act itself provided for this kind of administration and, in my judgment, we have seen during these 7 years an agency operate with military personnel in the background who have had the experience and who have come over to the Agency as civilian employees and who do an excellent job.

We have tried since then to provide a fusion of the retirement for this particular group where they would get the benefit of the previous military experience. But we could not bring it together without interfering with the regular established military retirement pay. So they are now in the category so far as their retirement status is concerned, part military and part civilian. Let us not upset this balance here. I believe we have a good principle going and a good agency operating. Let us keep it that way.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was disturbed a little while ago to hear the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] say that when Congress enacted the law now sought to be amended that the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce knew that a military man would be appointed to the office. I am surprised that all Members of the House were not made acquainted with this fact.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOSS. The daily papers both in the morning and evening editions were full of the information at the time, and I know the gentleman pursues them diligently.

Mr. GROSS. That may be. I pursue the work of all committees as diligently as I can. And that takes us right back to the lack of printed hearings on this bill. I have served on several committees in Congress and I never heard a motion made in any of those committees, when a bill was reported to the floor of the House, that the hearings be printed. That has been done automatically on any committee on which I have served. Perhaps I have not served on the right committees—I do not know.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. I would not want the House to get the impression that we are not having the hearings printed. It was only a few days ago when Mr. Macy and the other three witnesses referred to appeared. The hearings are in process of being printed. It was a very short hearing. Only a statement from Mr. Macy and Mr. Hartranft, Jr.—a very short statement. Mr. Scott and General McKee himself who made an informal visit to the committee. It lasted about an hour. There is no question about the hearings being printed. They are being printed.

Mr. GROSS. The fact remains that the hearings are not available. Now, I wonder what we would be doing in setting up the head of an agency with a $38,404 a year paycheck. As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has said, he would be the third highest paid man in the Government. What will be the reaction of the rest of the officials of Government if Congress approves putting a man in an administrative agency at $38,404 per year—what amounts to a salary greater than any other individual in Government with the exceptions only of the President and Vice President. Just what kind of situation are you creating today if you do this—if you pay this appointee more than Cabinet officers and others? I would point out in passing, for whatever it may be worth, that when General Eisenhower retired as President it was made plain by the Congress that he could take one retirement or the other but not both. He could take either the retirement provided for a former President of the United States or he could take his military retirement, but not both.

I join with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Springer] in asking this question—in a nation with 190 million population, is this retired general the only man who can administer the Federal Aviation Agency? Is this what you are saying here today?

And what are you saying, if you change this law, to the civil servant of this Government who goes back to work after having retired? That individual, the retired class act employee on going back to work for the Government, must sacrifice his retirement.

Let us be fair. If you are going to open the door for the purpose of permitting dual compensation for this retired general, then you should permit dual compensation for every class act employee who retires and then goes back to work for the Federal Government.

Let us be fair. Let us be honest with all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman wanted to know about the qualifications of General McKee. I readily concede the general's administrative qualifications, as I am sure the gentleman from Iowa does.

Mr. GROSS. I do not question his administrative qualifications.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course. Does it not seem rather peculiar to the gentleman that out of the hundreds of flying generals there are in the Air Force, the President should have picked the only nonflying, four-star general in the Air Force to head the flying agency for the country?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I would say that does seem strange, indeed.

Mr. Chairman, this is special privilege legislation. It is an outright violation of a principle established by Congress. It is wrong and it ought to be defeated.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

The gentleman from Iowa makes a great "to do" about the fact that there would be a payment of a salary set by law for the Director of the Federal Aviation Agency plus a portion of the retirement to which he is entitled as a retired officer of the military services of the United States.

The retirement pay for an officer returning to work for the Government is set by law. This Congress, not the President, laid down the policy that a military officer could go to work for the Government in a civilian capacity and draw a portion of his retirement pay while serving on full salary for the Government. It is not a case of any confusion with the situation of the former President of the United States, who was given the opportunity to elect which retirement he would accept.

At the present time, as I pointed out in my remarks earlier in the debate, the general now draws a salary as an adviser to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and his retirement, which is greater than he would draw under the provisions of the legislation proposed here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNGER

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Younger: On page 2, line 21, after section 3, strike out the balance of section 3 and insert, "It is hereby expressed as the intent of the Congress that the authority granted by this Act is not to be construed as approval by the Congress of continuing appointments of military men to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency in the future. It is hereby expressed as the sense of the Congress that after General McKee leaves the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency no additional appointments of military men to that office shall be approved."

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, if we had the printed hearings to which reference has been made, to refer to, we would find that a great deal was said about a resolution which was passed for the appointment of General of the Army George C. Marshall to the office of Secretary of Defense, a very similar case.

I may say that this bill was drawn very carefully, and drawn almost verbatim to the bill which was passed on behalf of General Marshall, until the final clause. Then it is all changed.

By the vote just now the Members of the Committee have said that they want to continue the act which provides we must have a civilian as administrator. If Members will read section 3 of the bill before the Committee, they will find there is not any prohibition.

What is left out of the bill is the clause which was in the Marshall bill. It is in the committee report but not in the bill. It was in the Marshall bill. This is what it says:

> It is hereby expressed as the sense of Congress that after General Marshall leaves the office of Secretary of Defense, no additional appointments of military men to that office shall be approved.

That is in the committee report. It was signed by the majority of the committee. It is the belief of the committee. You have now expressed your will that that is the sense of Congress that we should not have military men in that office. All I am adding to this bill is that one clause:

> It is hereby expressed as the sense of the Congress that after General McKee leaves the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, no additional appointments of military men to that office shall be approved.

I think if we mean what we say, then we ought to express it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WILLIAMS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Williams offers the following amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Younger: On page 2, line 21, strike out all of section 3 through line 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "Except when the President elects to nominate a military man, it is hereby expressed as the intent of the Congress that the authority granted by this Act is not to be construed as approval by the Congress of continuing appointments of military men to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency in the future."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I confess that this substitute amendment is offered somewhat facetiously. The amendment is offered simply to point up what we are doing today. We march uphill by saying we will not permit the President to appoint a military man, and then we promptly march downhill and say, "Yes, except that whenever the President wants a military man, we will accommodate him with special legislation."

As I say, I offer this amendment purely facetiously and simply for the purpose of pointing up the devious manner in which we are circumventing the law.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that in whatever I have said here today it can be construed that I was trying to speak in the public interest. I did not believe in 1958, when General Eisenhower sent or wanted to send down to this committee a change in the law, that it should be changed. I did not believe it should be changed for General Quesada, and we did not change it. I have never tried to introduce politics into debate, and I hope I am not today, but I will say in respect to those men in 1958 who stood firmest for no change in the law, that they came from my distinguished colleagues on this side of the aisle. Most of them did. Not all of them but most of them came from this side of the aisle. In fact, out of all those who sit in the subcommittee and in the committee I do not recollect a single member on this side of the aisle who would have voted to waive this law at the time that General Quesada was mentioned as the first Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in the gentleman's statement that this should not be considered a political matter. I certainly would not imply—and if I have I did not intend to—at any time during this debate that the gentleman from Illinois or anyone else was approaching this from the standpoint of politics. I will say to the gentleman that in 1958 there was no request for anything; we were just told, as the gentleman has mentioned, by General Quesada that he would resign his retired commission. Then everybody was satisfied that that would meet not only the letter but the spirit of the law. Of course, the gentleman knows what resulted.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is slightly different from that of the chairman. I do not intend to contradict him. The facts may have been as he has suggested. But it was my impression that General Eisenhower did send an emissary down here; at least, he came to see me and he talked to two or three Members on that side of the aisle. When he asked if we would change the law for General Quesada, I think the President of the United States got a very firm answer in 1958 that we would not change the law for General Quesada and that if he wanted to serve in that capacity he was going to have to serve in a civilian capacity.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further comment?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman supported the bill just 1 year later restoring General Quesada's commission, did he not?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is an entirely different matter and if the matter came up, after General McKee had resigned his commission and served as a civilian, I am not going to say now that I would do that, although I supported it for General Quesada. But I did it after he had served in the capacity of a civilian. That is exactly the issue today. I do not believe we ought to have a law over which this committee has spent weeks of time and decided to keep the President of the United States from appointing a man who was either a member of the Armed Forces or who was in a retired capacity, and change it at will. That is the issue with which we are faced today.

I hope this will not be based upon any political loyalty, but that it will be based upon principle. I believe we are right and I believe the American people are entitled to no less than that.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7777) to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee (U.S. Air Force, retired) to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, pursuant to House Resolution 407, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 228, nays 137, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—228

Abbitt
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callan
Callaway
Carey
Cederberg
Chelf
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corman
Craley
Culver
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
de la Garza
Delaney
Denton
Dingell
Dole
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Dulski
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Krebs
Landrum
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Moeller
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Pool
Price
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roush
Roybal
Satterfield
St. Onge
Scheuer
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Wolff
Zablocki

NAYS—137

Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Baldwin
Baring
Battin
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Cahill
Carter
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Findley
Fino
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hanna
Harsha
Hicks
Hutchinson
Ichord
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Kastenmeier
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
MacGregor
Mackie
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Monagan
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Ottinger
Pelly
Pike
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Saylor
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stalbaum
Stanton
Stephens
Talcott
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Tuck
Utt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Weltner
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NOT VOTING—68

Andrews, George W.
Annunzio
Arends
Bandstra
Bates
Bell
Bonner
Bow
Brown, Ohio
Cameron
Casey
Celler
Chamberlain
Clevenger
Cramer
Cunningham
Dawson
Dent
Diggs
Donohue
Duncan, Oreg.
Evans, Colo.
Fisher
Fogarty
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gilligan
Halleck
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Herlong
Holland
Keogh
Kluczynski
Laird
Lindsay
Long, La.
McEwen
McMillan
McVicker
Mathias
Michel
Minshall
Morris
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Passman
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Ronan
Rostenkowski
St Germain
Shriver
Sikes
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Watts
Whalley
Willis
Wright
Yates
Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina for, with Mr. Yates against.

Mr. Casey for, with Mr. Passman against.

Mr. Duncan for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. McEwen against.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mr. Chamberlain against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Cramer against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Whalley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Young with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Bates.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Evans of Colorado.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Bandstra.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Fuqua.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Morris.
Mr. Murray with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Willis with Mr. George W. Andrews.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Roberts.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. McVicker.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Gilligan.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. RONCALIO, and Mr. TUPPER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. RALPH HARVEY, was recorded. The gentleman from Indiana is in the hospital and there must be some error.

The SPEAKER. His name will be taken off the rollcall.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] as to the program for the balance of this week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished Republican leader yield to me at this point?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman I would advise that we have completed the legislative program for this week. It will be my purpose to ask unanimous consent to go over after announcing the program for next week.

Mr. Speaker, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar Day.

There are nine suspensions as follows:

H.R. 8147: Exemption from duty for returning residents.

H.R. 5842: Amending the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961.

H.R. 1771: 5-day week for postmasters.

H.R. 2263: Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965.

H.R. 3157: Spouses' annuities under Railroad Retirement Act of 1937.

H.R. 7042: Use of additives in confectionery.

H.R. 7954: Implementing the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, London—1960.

H.R. 5280: Balance of payments voluntary agreements.

S. 1796: Assistance for disaster victims.

Mr. Speaker, these bills may not necessarily be called in the order in which they have been announced.

For Tuesday there is scheduled the 1966 Legislative Appropriation Act and,

H.R. 7105, extension of the Export Control Act.

Wednesday and the balance of the week the program is as follows:

H.R. 8464: To provide a temporary increase in the public debt ceiling for the period July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966.

H.R. 8439: Authorizing certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7847: SBA authority to lend to SBIC's and State and local development companies.

H.R. 5306: Interest rates on foreign official time deposits.

Mr. Speaker, of course, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any additional program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES, AND FOR ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7717) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLER, TEAGUE of Texas, KARTH, HECHLER, MARTIN of Massachusetts, and FULTON of Pennsylvania.

SUCCESSFUL MANEUVER OUTSIDE GEMINI CAPSULE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to announce to the House that astronaut Major White left the capsule and was out of it for about 10 minutes. I believe the time has not been verified as yet. However, he has returned to the capsule that is orbiting the earth. It has been closed and repressurized and they are continuing on their flight.

Mr. Speaker, I have every confidence and I am sure the hopes of all of us go with the astronauts for the next 3 days.

Mr. Speaker, if we can recover this one as successfully as we recovered the last one, it will represent one of the great milestones in the history of the conquest of space.

THE CLERK AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND THE SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ANY ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PATMAN INTRODUCES ADMINISTRATION COINAGE BILL—TO RECEIVE PROMPT CONSIDERATION BY BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President, a few moments ago, transmitted to the Congress a message on our coinage. Immediate solution of our coinage and silver problem is of the utmost importance and of particularly keen interest to all Americans. For these considerations, I feel it is not only appropriate, but absolutely necessary, that legislation be immediately introduced to accomplish the recommendations of the administration. Therefore, today I am introducing this legislation, and I assure every Member of the House that it will receive immediate consideration by your Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am chairman, and which has jurisdiction over this proposal.

For the convenience of the Members, the text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis prepared by the Treasury Department follows:

H.R. 8746

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "The Coinage Act of 1965."

TITLE I

Section 1. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to cause to be minted and issued the following coins:

(1) A half dollar or fifty-cent piece which shall be composed of an alloy of 800 parts of silver and 200 parts of copper per each one thousand parts by weight clad on a core of a silver-copper alloy of such fineness that the composition of each coin shall be 400 parts of silver and 600 parts of copper out of each 1,000 parts by weight.

(2) A quarter dollar or twenty-five-cent piece and a dime or ten-cent piece each of which shall be composed of an alloy of 75 percent of copper and 25 percent of nickel clad on a core of pure copper.

(b) The cladding alloy used for the outside layers of such coins shall comprise not less than thirty per centum of the weight of each coin. Such coins shall be of the same diameter, respectively, as the coins of the United States of corresponding denominations current at the time of enactment of this Act.

(c) The weight of the half dollar provided for herein shall be 11.50 grams, of the quarter dollar 5.67 grams and of the dime 2.268 grams.

Sec. 2. Subject to the requirements of section 1, the methods of manufacture of the coins therein provided, the wastage allowances, and the allowable deviations in the metallic percentages and weights, shall be as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury. Such coins shall be subject to the laws pertaining to the designs and inscriptions on coins of the United States.

Sec. 3. All coins minted pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be legal tender for all debts, public and private, public charges, taxes, duties and dues.

Sec. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be deemed to prohibit the continued minting of coins of the United States authorized by law at the time of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 5. Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury such action is necessary to protect the coinage of the United States, he is authorized under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe to prohibit the exportation, melting or treating of coins of the United States.

Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell on such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, at not less than the monetary value thereof, any silver of the United States in excess of that required to be held as reserves against silver certificates.

Sec. 7. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase at the price of $1.25 per fine troy ounce silver mined after the date of enactment of this Act from natural deposits in the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof and tendered to a United States mint or assay office within one year after the month in which the ore from which it is derived was mined. The bullion fund provided by section 3526 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 335), may be used for such purchases.

Sec. 8. In order to expedite acquisition of essential equipment, patents, patent rights, technical knowledge and assistance metallic strip and other materials necessary to assure the prompt and continued availability of materials required to produce an adequate supply of the coins provided for herein, the Secretary of the Treasury, during such period as he may deem necessary, is authorized, without regard to the provisions of section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 340), or any other law, to enter into contracts upon such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate and in the public interest, for the acquisition or transportation of such equipment, patents, patent rights, technical knowledge and assistance, metallic strip, or other materials.

Sec. 9. (a) The Act of September 3, 1964, Public Law 88–580, is amended to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding section 3517 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 324), all coins minted from the date of enactment of this Act shall be inscribed with the year of the coinage or issuance unless in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury such inscription is likely to contribute to a shortage of coins, in which case the particular coins involved may be inscribed with the last preceding year whose date has been inscribed on coins of the same denominations."

(b) Section 3550 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 366) is repealed.

Sec. 10. The first sentence of section 3558 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 283), is amended to read as follows:

"The business of the United States assay office in San Francisco shall be in all respects similar to that of the assay office of New York except that until such time as the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the mints of the United States are adequate for the production of ample supplies of coins, its facilities may be used for the production of any coins of the United States authorized by law."

Sec. 11. Section 4 of the Act of August 20, 1963 (31 U.S.C. 294) is amended by striking of "$30,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$45,000,000."

Sec. 12. Section 3 of the Act of December 18, 1942 (31 U.S.C. 317c) is amended by striking out "minor" each place it appears in such section. Section 9 of the Act of March 14, 1900 (31 U.S.C. 320) is hereby repealed.

Sec. 13. Section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 340), is amended (1) by striking out "this Act," in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "law,"; (2) by striking out "minor" each place it appears in such section; and (3) by striking out "$3,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$30,000,000."

Sec. 14. Section 485 of the Act of June 25, 1948 (18 U.S.C. 485) is amended by striking out "the gold or silver coins" and inserting in lieu thereof "gold, silver, silver-clad, or cupronickel-clad coins."

Sec. 15. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 16. Whoever knowingly violates any of the provisions of section 5 hereof or of any order, rule, regulation or license issued pursuant thereto shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. In addition, there shall be forfeited to the United States any coins exported, melted, or treated in violation of this Act or any order, rule, regulation or license issued hereunder, or any metal resulting from such melting or treating of coins. Such coins or metal may be seized and condemned by like proceedings as those provided by law for the forfeiture, seizure or condemnation of property imported into the United States contrary to law.

TITLE II

Section 1. The President is hereby authorized to establish a Joint Commission on the Coinage to be composed of the Secretary of the Treasury as Chairman; the Secretary of Commerce; the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; the Director of the Mint; the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee; the chairman and ranking minority member of the House Banking and Currency Committee; one Member of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker; one Member of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and four public members to be appointed by the President, none of whom shall be associated or identified with or representative of any industry, group, business or association directly interested as such in the composition, characteristics, or production of the coinage of the United States.

Sec. 2. No public official or Member of Congress serving as a member of the Joint Commission shall continue to serve as such after he has ceased to hold the office by virtue of which he became a member of the Joint Commission. Any vacancy on the Joint Commission shall be filled by the choosing of a successor member in the same manner as his predecessor.

Sec. 3. The Joint Commission shall study the progress made in the implementation of the coinage program established by this Act, and shall review from time to time such matters as the needs of the economy for coins, the standards for the coinage, technological developments in metallurgy and coin-selector devices, the availability of various metals, renewed minting of the silver dollar, the time when and circumstances under which the United States should cease to maintain the price of silver, and other considerations relevant to the maintenance of an adequate and stable coinage system. It shall, from time to time, give its advice and recommendations with respect to these matters to the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Congress.

Sec. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated to remain available until expended, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

TITLE I

Section 1 authorizes the minting and issuance of a new series of coins in denominations of 10, 25, and 50 cents which will be manufactured from composite metals containing three layers. In the case of the 50-cent piece, the outside or cladding layers would be composed of an alloy of 80 percent silver and 20 percent copper and the core of a silver-copper alloy of such fineness that the overall composition of each coin would be 40 percent silver and 60 percent copper. The 10- and 25-cent coins would consist of cupronickel (75 percent copper, 25 percent nickel) clad on a core of pure copper. Section 1 also prescribes the proportionate amounts of core and cladding alloys in the coins, the weight of each coin and that such coins are to be of the same diameter as the current coins of the United States of corresponding denominations.

Section 2 authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to determine the methods of manufacture of the new coins, the wastage allowances, and the allowable deviations in the metallic percentages and weights. It provides also that such coins shall be subject to existing laws pertaining to the designs and inscriptions on U.S. coins.

Section 3 provides that the coins shall be legal tender. While existing statutes governing legal tender are broad enough to cover the new coins, an express provision in the new bill is deemed desirable to eliminate any possible doubt.

Section 4 provides continuing authority for the coinage of coins authorized by provisions of existing law. This will enable the continued production of present coinage to the extent necessary to assure the production of ample supplies of coins during the period of transition to the new coinage.

Section 5 gives standby authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to prohibit the exportation melting or treating of U.S. coins when necessary to protect the coinage.

Section 6 provides for sales by the Treasury of silver in excess of that required to be held against silver certificates at prices not less than the monetary value. This will clarify the authority of the Treasury to make sales of such excess silver under appropriate conditions.

Section 7 authorizes the purchase of newly mined domestic silver by the Treasury at the price of $1.25 per fine troy ounce. This will protect silver producing industries against any precipitate drop in the price of their product which might result from the change in U.S. coinage alloy. Silver purchased under this provision can be used in coinage at values not less than $1.29+ per fine troy ounce. Section 7 also authorizes the use of the bullion fund for the purchase of silver.

Section 8 authorizes the Secretary, for as long as he deems it necessary, to procure, on terms deemed appropriate and in the public interest, any materials, technical knowledge and assistance, equipment, patents, transportation services, etc., necessary to assure prompt and continued availability of materials required for the new coinage without regard to any laws requiring advertising and competitive bidding or imposing other restrictions on the negotiation of contracts for the purchase of property by the Government.

Section 9 directs that coins minted after enactment of this act shall bear the year of the coinage or issuance unless the Secretary of the Treasury determines that this is likely to contribute to a coin shortage. In this event, the particular coins involved may be inscribed with the last preceding year whose date appeared on coins of these denominations. This section would also repeal an obsolete provision of law requiring that the obverse working dies at each mint be destroyed at the end of each year.

Section 10 authorizes use of the San Francisco Assay Office for coinage on a temporary basis until such time as the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the facilities at the mints are adequate for the production of ample supplies of coins. It is anticipated that during the period of transition to the new coinage the mints' production load will be particularly heavy and additional facilities will be needed. Use of the San Francisco Assay Office is the most expeditious way of providing these. Section 10 also authorizes permanent use of the San Francisco Assay Office for refining gold and silver bullion. This will also contribute to the efficiency of operations at the mints and assay offices.

Section 11 increases the maximum amount authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the new mint at Philadelphia from $30 million to $45 million. Additional funds will be necessary to provide equipment and facilities for the new coinage.

Section 12 will authorize and provide financing for the melting of any worn and uncurrent U.S. coins, including the new cupronickel-clad and silver-clad coins, received in the Treasury and the sale or recoinage of the resulting metals. The section also repeals an act which requires recoinage of all worn and uncurrent subsidiary silver coins received in the Treasury.

Section 13 authorizes use of the minor-coinage metal fund and the minor-coinage profit fund (to be renamed the coinage-metal fund and the coinage-profit fund) for the purchase of metals for the coins provided for in the act and for certain expenses incurred in such coinage; namely, the wastage and cost of distribution of the coins. It also raises the amount available in the coinage-metal fund from $3 million to $30 million. This increase in amount is necessary because after enactment of the bill this fund will be used for the purchase of metals used in coinage of all denominations whereas at the present time it is used only for metals for 1- and 5-cent coins.

Section 14 amends one of the counterfeiting laws so as to make it applicable to the new cupronickel and silver-clad coins on the same terms and conditions as it is now applicable to the subsidiary silver coins. It is not necessary to amend any of the other counterfeiting laws since these will be applicable by their terms to the new coins.

Section 15 is a general provision authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue regulations that may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

Section 16 provides penalties for violations of any regulations issued under section 5 of the act, prohibiting the export, melting, or treating of U.S. coins. The penalties would be forfeiture and imprisonment up to 5 years or a fine up to $10,000, or both.

TITLE II

Section 1 provides for the establishment of a Joint Commission on the Coinage, composed of four executive officials, six Members of Congress, and four public members to be appointed by the President. The public members shall not be representatives of any group having a direct interest in coinage.

Section 2 provides that the executive and congressional members shall cease to serve on the Joint Commission after leaving their public office, and provides for the filling of vacancies on the Commission.

Section 3 provides that the Joint Commission shall study the progress made in the implementation of the coinage program established by the act. It shall review and give its advice and recommendations from time to time to the Congress, President, and the Secretary of the Treasury on such matters as the needs of the economy for coins, the standards for the coinage, technological development in metallurgy, the availability of various metals, renewed minting of the silver dollar, the time when and circumstances under which the United States should cease to maintain the price of silver, and other considerations relevant to the maintenance of an adequate and stable coinage system.

Section 4 authorizes the appropriation of such amounts as may be necessary for the expense of the Joint Commission.

J. K. WADLEY A GREAT HUMANITARIAN AND PHILANTHROPIST

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday evening, May 26, 1965, in Dallas, Tex., a great humanitarian and philanthropist, Mr. J. K. Wadley of Texarkana, was accorded recognition by the Leukemia Society. Known as the De Villiers Award, this distinction came to Mr. Wadley for a lifetime of good works. At 88 years of age this great gentleman is the prototype of the American success story, enriched by strong currents of deep-felt compassion and generous concern for others. The Texarkana Gazette has performed a public service by reporting the inspiring story of Mr. Wadley's life, set forth below, together with an editorial from the same newspaper:

LEUKEMIA SOCIETY'S HIGHEST AWARD WON BY J. K. WADLEY—PRESENTATION WEDNESDAY NIGHT

J. K. Wadley, Texarkana philanthropist who with his late wife made possible the establishment of Dallas famed Wadley Research Institute and Blood Bank, will receive the highest national award of the Leukemia Society, Inc., at a testimonial dinner in Dallas on Wednesday, May 26.

Mr. Wadley is one of five nationally prominent people singled out this year for the society's new De Villiers Award for humanitarian service in the crusade against leukemia. Others are Former Astronaut John Glenn, Industrialist Pierre S. duPont, Nassau County, N.Y., District Attorney William Cahn, and Baltimore Comptroller Hyman Pressman.

The award will be presented to the 88-year-old businessman-lumberman-humanitarian at a dinner at 7 p.m. in the Sheraton Dallas Hotel. It will be presented by Dr. Joseph M. Hill, director of Wadley Research Institute and Blood Bank and a member of the medical advisory committee of the Leukemia Society, Inc.

Also present at the award dinner will be Martin I. Hassner, national director of the society; Mrs. Edie Martin, regional director; Debs Hensley of Dallas, national LSI board member; trustees of Wadley and the society's Greater Dallas chapter, supporters of Wadley and the Leukemia Society, and others who have helped the two organizations in the fight against leukemia, and members of Mr. Wadley's family.

The De Villiers Award is named for Mrs. Antionette de Villiers of New York City, who established the De Villiers Foundation out of which grew the Leukemia Society, Inc. Other presentations of the award, instituted this year, are being made during May and June.

Mr. Wadley joined his wife, who died earlier this year, in making the original gift to establish Wadley Research Institute and Blood Bank in 1951. The gift was presented in memory of the couple's only grandson, Keener Bob Moseley, who had died of leukemia several years prior to that.

Through the years, Mr. and Mrs. Wadley have given a total of more than one and a quarter million dollars to the Dallas institute, which has grown to encompass the Southwest's largest leukemia patient service, an internationally known scientific research institute, the South's major regional blood bank, and a postgraduate teaching institute, affiliated with Baylor University, that has granted more Ph. D. degrees than any other school in north Texas.

Mr. Wadley, and his wife, Susie L. Wadley, before her death, have maintained a consistent interest in the institute and its efforts against leukemia, the cancer of blood.

In addition to their philanthropies on behalf of Wadley and the leukemia crusade, Mr. and Mrs. Wadley also made possible a 200-bed, $3½ million Wadley Hospital in Texarkana and have contributed generously to the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Baylor University in Waco, the First Baptist Church in Texarkana, and many other community, civic, and religious organizations.

Born April 1, 1877, in Arkadelphia, Ark., and educated in public schools in Arkansas, Texas and Louisiana and at the University of Georgetown (now Southwestern) in Georgetown, Mr. Wadley has been successful in the lumber, oil and gas, and mining businessses.

He began his business career at the age of 17 with the William Buchanan interests, which operated large sawmilils, manufacturing plans, and other companies in the Southwest, and the Louisiana and Arkansas Railroad. He began as a telegraph operator and office assistant for the railroad and, by age 20, had risen to become auditor and assistant treasurer for the Buchanan companies.

At 24 Mr. Wadley went into business for himself, organizing the Porter-Wadley Lumber Co. at Cotton Valley, La., in 1904. Later he organized the Alexandria Lumber Co. and Long Pine Lumber Co. at Alexandria.

In 1919 he began extensive operations in the oil and gas development in northwest Louisiana and conducted extensive wildcat operations in oil-producing States from Alabama to Utah. He entered the gold mining field in California, Arizona, and Nevada in 1932.

Mr. Wadley has had extensive holdings in various hotels, formerly owning the Washington-Youree Hotel in Shreveport as well as substantial interest in the Hilton Hotels chain.

He has been a director of the Texarkana National Bank for more than 30 years and is a former director of the Commercial National Bank of Shreveport.

Mr. Wadley joined the First Baptist Church of Texarkana, Tex., in 1901, and has been a deacon there since 1910. He was Sunday school superintendent for 15 years.

For many years Mr. and Mrs. Wadley provided financial help to many young boys and girls, enabling them to receive educations at various denominational schools, seminaries, and medical schools.

An active golfer, he is formerly president of the Arkansas and Texas Golf Associations, and former director of the U.S. Seniors Golf Association, and the Western Seniors Golf Association.

He holds an honorary doctor of laws degree from Baylor University.

In 1958 Mr. Wadley received the C. E. Palmer Achievement Award for outstanding contribution to the development of civic, social and cultural, and religious life in Texarkana.

He and Susie Lee Crowell were married on September 25, 1901. Their two daughters are Mrs. Elloine Wadley Moseley of Dallas, and Mrs. Emily Wadley DeWare of Santa Barbara and Palm Springs. A granddaughter, Mrs. William Lee Sinclair, lives in Texarkana.

Richly Deserved Recognition

Wednesday night was a great night for Texarkana in Dallas. The citizens of that great city assembled 500 strong to pay tribute to our beloved J. K. Wadley for the work he has done in the search for a cure for the dread disease, leukemia.

His establishment of the J. K. and Susie L. Wadley Research Institute and Blood Bank in Dallas was the basis for his having received the deVilliers Award, which is national recognition of his contribution to the fight against leukemia.

Although a cure for this disease (cancer of the blood) has not been achieved, great progress has been made and the lives of many victims have been lengthened considerably by the knowledge that has been gained through research at the Wadley Institute. Two children stricken with leukemia early in life have now passed their 10th birthdays and on Mr. Wadley's 88th birthday, they sent him a huge birthday card in which they not only sent greetings to him but thanked him for making their 10th birthdays possible.

Many profound statements were made at the testimonial dinner for Mr. Wadley but none was more touching than that by Dr. Eduardo Uribe Guerola of Mexico City who said that it was Mr. Wadley's great love for humanity that prompted him to do all of the things he has done to relieve suffering and to find a cure for a fatal disease.

There were many Texarkanians at the testimonial dinner in Dallas, which in itself was a great tribute to Mr. Wadley. It was Christ Himself who made the profound and somewhat rueful statement that "a prophet is not without honor save in his own country."

We are glad to observe day by day how much Texarkana appreciates the work of Mr. Wadley and his late beloved wife, and we know that our people will learn to appreciate them even more as the years go by and more and more of their objectives are realized.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TREASURY ON NEW COINAGE

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the message that has just been received from the President of the United States has to do with the recommendations of the Treasury Department with respect to the new coinage that we will be asked to consider in the next few days.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House that under the Constitution of the United States the coinage of money and the regulation of the value thereof is the direct responsibility of the Congress. I would also like to bring to the attention of the House that the Treasury Department has had this under consideration for 2 years.

And, Mr. Speaker, after the appointment of our new Secretary of the Treasury on April 1, it has taken him 2 months to come to a decision on the silver situation.

Mr. Speaker, with this recent history it would seem to me that it would be improper if the Congress of the United States were persuaded to pass this legislation within a 2- or 3-day period, which may be requested by the executive branch of the Government.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Members of this body to pay particular attention to what will be said here this afternoon with respect to this message and any comments that I may have.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have any Members who are interested to take part in that special order.

NO ROOM AT THE TOP FOR DISUNITY IN FISCAL POLICY

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 1, Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin, in an address before the Columbia University alumni, directed attention to "the disquieting similarities between our present prosperity and the fabulous twenties."

The voice was that of William McChesney Martin, but the words were the warmed-over utterances of former Treasury Secretary George Humphrey who promised a recession which would "curl our hair." Apparently the two gentlemen are still in intimate counsel.

Mr. Martin failed to tell us whether he was stating official policy of this Government, official policy of the Federal Reserve System, or his personal brand of "open market" opinion.

Mr. Martin certainly understood the effect of his statement and must accept full responsibility for confidence irreparably destroyed. His is the power to make good his prophecy.

Perhaps the administration will now recognize that there is no room at the top for disunity in fiscal policy. The place for dissident points of view is outside of the Government. Mr. Martin makes a first-rate case for Mr. Patman's bill—but it may be already too late.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE BILLIE FARNUM

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, every senior Congressman is always happy to see freshman Congressmen do well and I am sure that pleasure is doubled when the Congressman who does well is one from your own State. It is a pleasure for me to draw the attention of the House to an editorial written by Harold Fitzgerald, owner and publisher of the Pontiac Press, concerning the work of Billie Farnum, the freshman Congressman from Michigan's new 19th District:

New Congressman

This general area can rejoice over the promising early start of our newest Congressman in Washington, Billie Farnum. His baptismal weeks have been fruitful.

District of Columbia newcomers are inevitably thumbed to the sidelines and bluntly advised to be seen and not heard. Our newest Representative hasn't committed the indiscretion of flying in the face of congressional precedent, but in the early business of being seen he has created a very favorable image. Farnum is quietly on the job to a much greater extent than the traditional beginners although he has never transgressed by challenging historical procedures.

He already graces the Appropriations Committee which is a major achievement for a yearling. This highly coveted spot customarily comes after meeting preliminary tests. Washington newspapermen say that the Michigander has handled himself very creditably and that this district can be proud of his first months of quiet but effective service.

There are monumental problems at hand and more lie ahead. The Press is happy to report on the early showing of this fledgling statesman.

INDUSTRY SHOULD SHARE PART OF RESPONSIBILITY IN CLEANING UP AIR AND WATER POLLUTION AND WASTE TREATMENT PROBLEMS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, only a few weeks ago the House passed the 1964 Clean Water Act without a dissenting vote. This bill provides more help to communities faced with serious problems of water pollution. It was my privilege to be a member of the Public Works Committee which listened to the many witnesses testifying on this bill. It was apparent that this bill—while a big step forward—is only part of the solution to this problem.

While it is evident that various municipalities and States are faced with a huge task in cleaning up air and water pollution and waste treatment problems, I believe that industry must share part of the responsibility. In Erie County alone, more than 1 million tons of air contaminants is ejected yearly. Industry accounts for 85 percent of this type of pollution. The same story is true for water pollution—here the main culprits are the municipalities.

I believe that various industries in my district are cognizant of these problems and are now making attempts to correct this situation. But I am afraid this is not enough action to really stem the tide of air and water pollution.

In keeping with my strong interest in attacking these problems, I am introducing today a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage industry to install more air and water pollution abatement equipment. My bill would provide amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months.

Such an inducement would help enlist all industries on the Niagara frontier in the war on air and water contamination. The 1965 Clean Water Act provides municipalities and the States with incentives to get into the fight. My bill would provide incentives for industry to install new equipment to join in this fight on air and water pollution.

I realize that it is easy to point an accusing finger at the industries whose manufacturing processes add to the air and water pollution, but many persons do not realize the huge costs of installing and maintaining such abatement equipment. As one who came straight from industry into Congress, I do. These same industries provide thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in payrolls to the Niagara frontier. I believe it is only fair that if the various governments are going to require higher standards of enforcement, it is only right that we make installation of such abatement equipment possible by providing fast tax writeoffs.

I believe that cooperation is necessary by industry and the communities in the war on air and water pollution. For this reason I am happy to introduce this bill as part of a continuing program to fight these problems. The time has come for faster action and more community awareness of these problems.

THE BATTLESHIP "MASSACHUSETTS"

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the battleship *Massachusetts* is about to come home.

I rise at this time, Mr. Speaker, to bring my colleagues up to date on our efforts to enshrine the battleship *Massachusetts* as a permanent memorial to American heroism and to berth it at Fall River, Mass.

The Speaker and I, in cooperation with Senators Leverett Saltonstall and Edward M. Kennedy, called a meeting at the Capitol on Tuesday of this week so that top officials of the Navy Department and leaders of the Massachusetts Memorial Committee, Inc., could sit down together and arrive at final decisions regarding this historic vessel.

I am pleased to report that the Navy's wishes in regard to safe berthing of the vessel have been met, and plans have been made to begin towing the ship from Norfolk, Va., on or about Tuesday, June 8. The voyage is expected to take about 4 days. A contract is to be signed tomorrow.

I wish to pay my tribute now, Mr. Speaker, to the community leaders of Massachusetts who have worked hard for several years to bring about this result, and particularly to the community leaders of Fall River, who now head this committee and whose plans have been crowned with success.

Joseph Feitelberg, of Fall River, has provided responsible leadership, and he has been loyally assisted by William Torpey, of the State pier in Fall River; George Pelletier, the chairman of the Fall River Port Authority; Theodore Thomte, Martin Adler, and many others.

They have bold plans for the future of this vessel. It includes a park, a parking area, and a marina along the Fall River waterfront, use of the vessel for meetings of such organizations as the Boy Scouts and the military reserve units. They expect that a refurbished ship will be a major tourist attraction, badly needed in the Fall River-New Bedford section of our State.

They expect that the wise management of this ship will have a major impact upon the economy of greater Fall River, that it will be a special boon to restaurants and motels. This city, with its textile mills fleeing to other sections of the country, has long needed the economic "lift" that this project may give it.

Everyone in Massachusetts, and particularly in the Fall River area, is aware that the arrival of this ship is no cureall for our problems. In many ways, it is only the beginning of more work for this committee that has already worked so hard. But it does show the kind of community spirit, the kind of long-range planning, the kind of concern for a new and more beautiful waterfront and city, that can improve things greatly for Fall River and Massachusetts.

I wish to pay my tribute to all the men and women—and yes, the schoolchildren who have contributed their coins—who have labored so hard to make this retired vessel a worthy memorial. I congratulate them on their success to date. I wish them well for the future.

ALLEVIATING THE CHRONIC SHORTAGE OF RAILROAD CARS

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to help alleviate the chronic shortage of railroad freight cars. This shortage has become a national problem for shippers and is particularly crippling to industries of the Pacific Northwest, such as plywood mills. Basically this problem is this: Due to the rental rate structure it has become less expensive for certain railroad companies, especially those with an inadequate supply of cars, to rent cars from other railroads rather than purchase new ones. This leaves the other companies with too few cars to meet freight demands.

It is not only shippers who are hurt by this shortage of cars. Railroads themselves are finding that they must turn away business because of inadequate facilities by which to transport freight.

The bill I am introducing is a companion measure to one introduced by Senator Warren G. Magnuson that is now before the Senate Commerce Committee of which he is chairman. It will raise rental rates on freight cars, thereby encouraging railroads to return empty cars to their owners faster and at the same time giving an incentive for the purchase of new cars by railroads with a short supply.

An excellent appraisal of this critical situation, clearly explaining the nature and the implications of this freight car shortage, was published in the June 1 edition of the Wall Street Journal. I insert this very comprehensive survey of the freight car shortage in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 1, 1965]

TRANSPORT PINCH: FREIGHT CAR SHORTAGE GETS WORSE, FORCES SOME PLANT CUTBACKS—SHARP PICKUP IN CAR BUYING FAILS TO HELP; LUMBER AND GRAIN FIRMS ARE HARD HIT—SHIPPERS FRET ABOUT THE FALL

(By James R. Macdonald)

CHICAGO.—Railroads and shippers are suffering from one of the severest shortages of freight cars ever experienced at this time of year.

Shippers are demanding about 7,500 more cars daily than the railroads can provide. That's more than double the deficit of a year ago and nearly as bad as last fall when the shortage climbed to a post-Korean war record of 10,000 cars. Shippers fear the shortage will get far more critical as the year goes along, particularly this fall when harvesting is in full swing and Christmas merchandise is moving to retailers.

The car shortage already is severe enough to cause some companies to curtail operations and to boost the shipping costs of many others being forced to shift to more expensive types of transportation. The present pinch partly reflects traffic snarls resulting from floods along the Mississippi River and in the Pacific Northwest. But the shortage, in the main, is a consequence of the biggest peacetime business boom in the Nation's history. The railroads simply have been unable—or in some cases unwilling—to add new cars to their fleets at a fast enough pace to meet rising demand from shippers.

WOOD MILLS SUFFER MOST

Plywood mills in the Northwest are among the hardest hit by the car drought. At least six mills have been forced to close down in recent weeks for periods ranging from 1 day to a full week because they couldn't get enough freight cars, reports Edmund Hilton, Jr., traffic manager for the American Plywood Association in Tacoma, Wash. "Countless others came so close to having to shut down that getting just one or two cars at the last minute made the difference," he adds.

But complaints are coming from a wide variety of shippers, including cement manufacturers, sand and gravel producers, fertilizer firms, and even the U.S. Army which recently found itself short of cars needed to ship ammunition destined for Vietnam.

"We've had a terrible time getting cars since the first of the year," says Robert Strange, assistant vice president of sales for Truax-Traer Coal Co. He says the company has been forced to close down two of its strip mines for 3 or 4 days a month because of the shortage.

Philip M. Corby, traffic manager for Evans Grain Co., Salina, Kans., says one day recently he phoned five railroads in an attempt to obtain 175 boxcars to ship grain from the company's 90 elevators in Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, and Colorado. He was unable to turn up a single car.

COSTLIER PHONE BILLS

"The amount of money I'm spending on phone calls to scrounge up some cars would capitalize a small bank," laments L. J. Childs, general traffic manager for Massey-Ferguson, Ltd., Toronto farm equipment maker. Even so, he is having only limited success in solving his transport problems. He says a few days ago he asked a railroad serving 1 of the company's plants for 75 flatcars to ship 150 grain harvesting combines. "They told me their road didn't have that many empty flatcars on their entire system and the best they could do would be to try to get me 25 within 3 or 4 days," he declares. "This really hurts when dealers are on the phone screaming for delivery."

Some farm machinery makers, attempting to rush new equipment to their dealers as the new growing season gets underway, are switching to other forms of transportation, despite often higher costs. J. I. Case Co., Racine, Wis., normally divides its shipments about equally between rail and truck. "Lately, because of the shortage of railroad cars, we've been averaging about 75 percent truck and 25 percent rail," James Pavel, Case traffic manager, says. He notes the cost of those shipments shifted to trucks averages 10 percent higher than by rail.

Similarly, Inland Steel Co., Chicago, reports the company has experienced "a substantial increase in our costs because railroad cars haven't been available when we need them." When this happens, Inland is forced to store the steel and costs are boosted because of the extra handling.

RAILS SUFFERING, TOO

Railroads, too, have been hurt by the car shortage, Jervis Langdon, Jr., chairman of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad, says the severe shortage of freight cars was "the major factor" in the Rock Island's first quarter earnings decline. The road reported a net loss of $2,711,073 in the quarter ended March 31, compared with a profit of $753,676 a year earlier.

Robert S. Macfarlane, Northern Pacific Railway president, says thus far in 1965 his road has turned away roughly $1.5 million worth of freight "because we didn't have enough freight cars. This really hurts because of the risk that much of this business went over to competing trucklines and we may never get it back again."

The shortage will persist through the summer and grow much more severe in the fall, most railroadmen and shippers predict. The peak in rail freight movement usually comes when newly harvested crops and Christmas merchandise are both in transit.

"It's already touch and go as to whether I'll be able to meet my daily car requirements," says Peter Vinsavage, traffic manager at the Herrin, Ill., washing machine plant of the Norge division of Borg-Warner Corp. "We use mostly boxcars so we compete directly with the grain industry for cars. If the shortage is bad now, it probably will be much worse at harvest."

Railroads are spending at a record level for new cars to ease the shortage but can't obtain them fast enough to solve the problem. Capital spending by railroads, mostly for new rolling stock, will reach a record $1.6 billion this year, the Association of American Railroads estimates. This would top last year's expenditures of $1,417,000,000, the previous record, and would compare with $1 billion spent in 1963.

This spending step-up, however, has not been enough to stem the long decline in the size of the U.S. rail car fleet. The railroads placed 68,043 new freight cars in service last year, nearly double the 1963 total, yet there were fewer cars at the end of 1964 than at the beginning. Specifically, the fleet at the close of last year included 1,492,000 cars, down from the 1,512,000 total of a year earlier. A high "retirement" rate on old cars too far deteriorated to be worth repairing accounts for the downtrend.

Even with this year's record capital spending, the car fleet probably will continue to shrink, railmen say. But they note that the trend toward fewer cars—while worrisome—isn't as bad as it first might appear. Many of today's new cars are much larger than earlier models. This is demonstrated by the fact that railroads last year handled 659 billion ton-miles of freight, a 60-percent increase from 1925, when the number of rail cars hit a peak of 2,357,000.

But while the newer cars themselves may be larger, they are far more specialized than ever before and can be used by fewer types of shippers. A good illustration is the rail tri-level auto rack car. While it can haul three or four times as many new cars as the old boxcar, it's pretty much limited to auto traffic. The old boxcar, however, could unload its autos and pick up a return load of grain. It's mostly these older garden-variety of boxcars that are being retired.

So shippers generally are critical of the fleet's decline and many railroad officials complain about it, too. The critics contend that part of the downtrend can be traced to the relatively low rental rates which railroads pay each other for the use of cars moving over their tracks. The rate structure, they say, is such that it's often cheaper to pay the rental on a car than to purchase new ones and so many lines—particularly the financially pressed ones in the East—have resorted to this tactic.

This is still the case, shippers contend, even though a new rate structure calling for rents ranging from $2.16 a day for cars valued below $1,000 to $12.88 for those worth more than $35,000 was adopted early last year. Before, the daily rental rate was $2.88 per car regardless of value. Many argue the new rate still isn't high enough to encourage new-car building.

Critics are hoping that some help will come from a bill now being considered by the Senate Commerce Committee. The measure would prod railroads to return empty cars to their owners faster by providing for higher rental rates; this, it is believed, would force car-short roads to step up construction of new cars. In brief, the bill would give the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to set rental rates at a level which would both fairly compensate the owning railroad and insure an adequate national supply of cars.

But at least one shipping group isn't waiting for congressional action on the car shortage. The Southwest Oregon Shippers' Traffic Assn., which has 42 lumber, plywood, and particle board mills in its membership, is threatening to boycott railroads that aren't moving to increase the car supply. "We can easily determine which roads are building cars and have our interests in mind," says O. L. Stewart, executive secretary. "For those that are not, we will simply suggest to our members that they route their traffic around those lines if possible."

Mr. Stewart estimates his group accounts for about 60,000 carloads of traffic annually, with each carload worth an average of $1,000 in freight revenue to the railroads.

PRIVATE IMMIGRATION BILLS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the heavy schedule of hearings by the full Judiciary Committee, together with hearings by Subcommittee No. 1 on pending immigration legislation, has reduced the time normally available for consideration of private bills introduced by Members. The subcommittee appreciates the patience of the Members under these circumstances and I wish to announce that henceforth Wednesday of each week will be devoted exclusively to the consideration of private bills. If circumstances permit, additional days will be set aside for the consideration of these bills.

THEIR REWARD IS POVERTY

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, will soon consider a military pay increase and I take the floor this day to bring attention to a problem which rapidly approaches a crisis nature. The men and women who choose to dedicate a good portion of their lives so that this Nation may remain mighty are the victims of one of the most brutal inequities of our time. To say that military personnel are underpaid is perhaps as great an understatement as saying Cassius Clay is sometimes a bit opinionated.

In this day of megatons and satellites it seems a bit strange we would be willing to place our national security on the line merely because we fail to adequately reward our service people. You might say I overemphasize the magnitude of this problem. If you believe that, I intend to convey to you certain facts that serve to stress the need for a long overdue reappraisal of our pay policies.

Fact No. 1: Since 1952 military pay has increased 36 percent. Civil service pay increased 46 percent in the same period. Production workers enjoy 53 percent more today than in 1952. Professional and technical workers bring home 56 percent more. In addition to these discrepancies so-called "fringe benefits" have more than quadrupled for civilian and civil service personnel since 1946. Therefore service-connected fringes are less desirable than ever before. The archaic argument of these services fringes has lost its validity.

Fact No. 2: The reenlistment rates in all the services are decreasing at an alarming rate. The Army regular enlistment rate has dropped from approximately 53 percent in 1962 to 50 percent in 1964. That represents a loss of the most highly skilled men in the Armed Forces. The Navy slid from 50 percent in 1962 to 38 percent in 1964. The Marines dropped from 42 to 30 percent and the Air Force fell from 71 to 58 percent. Every single man who is represented in these figures is highly trained and experienced.

Inductee reenlistment rates are shockingly small. In 1962 the Army retained 20.1 percent of those they drafted. Last year this figure plummeted to an alltime low, 3.6 percent. When you realize that it takes about $5,500 per man or more to train these people, a 96.4-percent loss is akin to the burning of millions of dollars. You ask why we are losing this many trained men? We shall see.

Fact No. 3: I, as a Member of this body and as a citizen of the United States, relate this fact to you with great shame. A recent survey indicates that over 5,000 Air Force men are on relief. That is not all—55,000 more of the same group are eligible for these payments but do not accept them. Had enough? Try to swallow this one—169,000 have an annual income below the level set by the Government as poverty status. That is just the Air Force. Approximately one-half million service people, almost one of every four are, by our own standards, living in poverty. Is this the reward for service to country, a life of poverty? Under these conditions it does not surprise me that a young man would be reluctant to seek a military career.

Fact No. 4: Under the present circumstances the military cannot exercise selectivity in selection of career personnel. This more than anything is cause for alarm. The armed services are forced to accept inferior personnel because they have no choice. Pardon me, they do have a choice, that being, an inferior man or no man at all. To illustrate this point I direct you to the score required on the AFOQT test given men desirous of entering the Air Force ROTC program. In 1957 a man had to score 63 to qualify. Today he need only score 52. When you consider we will spend tens of thousands of dollars to train this man, this easing of requirements points to eventual mediocrity in our services. We must attract the best men possible if we are to remain strong.

In light of the above, I must work to increase the 4.8-percent increase proposed by the administration. Besides being too small it provides the least amount of raise for those who need it most. Budgetary considerations are paramount when reviewing most legislation, however, when the question is our national defense, security, and survival must be given the highest priority. We spend over $50 billion a year keeping this Nation secure. I think an additional billion is not a high price to pay for an insurance policy which covers our annual defense investment. In any event a military pay raise should have the highest priority of any of our spending requirements. Raising the military pay is not at all the same as buying tanks, missiles, and rockets. We would realize a great return on this investment. We are losing over a half a billion dollars annually already due to falling reenlistment rates. Some of that would certainly be saved if by raising these pay rates more qualified men could afford to stay in the service.

The time has come when this body must decide in which direction we are to move. Either we create a pay policy which provides incentive and allows selectivity or we take our chances with our present policy which is resulting in creeping mediocrity among service personnel. The stakes could not be higher. I am confident this 89th Congress will face up to this situation and enact legislation which will enable our servicemen to live in reasonable comfort and security without undue economic hardship and loss of dignity. We must act soon or opportunity to correct these inequities will suddenly slip away.

CHANGES IN THE METALLIC CONTENT OF SOME U.S. COINS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the report of the results of the Treasury's study of the country's silver situation, and the recommendations for changes in the metallic content of some U.S. coins has now been presented to the Congress. The report has been long and eagerly awaited, because its findings and recommendations should put the Congress into position to deal fully with the coin shortage which the country has been encountering.

The Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, has long concerned itself with the coin-shortage problems. We have held public hearings and have issued two reports on coin shortages.

Since our studies began last year, the former drastic penny shortage has been completely eradicated, and the nickel shortage has been relieved to the point where it, too, is well on the way to extinction.

Elimination of shortages of dimes, quarters, halves, and silver dollars has been greatly complicated by the fact that the Treasury's supply of silver has rapidly been shrinking. Important decisions on the questions of how best to relieve the shortages in those coins have been frustrated by the silver shortage. It is for that reason that the Treasury has had the entire silver situation under study for a long time, and has tested numerous alloys as possible substitutes for the present silver content of our subsidiary coins.

We realized that the problem of finding alloy substitutes which could be produced rapidly in huge quantities and yet economically was a massive undertaking. On the other hand the businesses and the people of the country were entitled to have adequate supplies of coins with which to conduct their affairs. We, therefore, urged the Treasury to move ahead as rapidly as possible in making their studies and in making their recommendations to the Congress.

Now that the report has been issued I trust that it will receive the immediate consideration of and action by the committees of the Congress which are authorized to deal with coinage and appropriations matters.

THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, Congress will soon be voting on a measure of vital importance to the citizens of more than 1,000 economically depressed areas in our country—the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965—H.R. 6991.

This bill, not unlike a famous headache remedy, is a combination of proven ingredients—including the successful Accelerated Public Works Act, the major provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, and the regional development approach of the Appalachia Development Act applied to other areas.

The key elements of this legislation are unquestionably effective tools for building economic viability.

The Area Redevelopment Act is the first, successful step in the economic development concept. Since the act was passed in 1961, ARA has created 115,000 new jobs, helped to retrain 41,000 jobless workers and approved financial assistance for 550 projects totaling $268 million.

Ohio has successfully shared in the ARA program. Our State has received ARA loans and grants totaling $1.7 million, and occupational training projects totaling $868,000. Purchases of equipment directly related to ARA projects in other States have brought to Ohio $7.7 million in new business.

In addition, the accelerated public works program, administered by ARA, has invested $27.1 million in Ohio's future industrial growth by building access roads, new sewage disposal plants, new water systems and other facilities necessary to attract industry.

Our local experiences with ARA have been duplicated in scores of communities throughout the country. The conclusion is inescapable: ARA has made a promising start toward the revitalization of distressed economies. We have learned that such a program can make a big difference in helping communities to help themselves.

For example, in Greenfield, Ohio, ARA has provided funds for the Collins Packing Co. to expand its facilities through the purchase of land, buildings, and equipment. This plant is now employing 85 full-time employees.

In Junction City, Ohio, ARA loaned $86,000 to a local clay manufacturing plant to purchase and rehabilitate a similar facility in town that had ceased operations and was closed. This plant is now fully operational and well on the way toward providing some 90 full-time jobs.

In Aurora, Ohio, ARA provided $167,000 to build new waterlines to the town's industrial park. The new water will be used by two new industries, and possibly a third, with a total potential of 195 new jobs.

In Cleveland, ARA has provided $727,000 for a 3-year project of the Cleveland Small Business Opportunity & Development Corp. to help stimulate and create employment opportunities in that city through the establishment of new small businesses.

These are only a few highlights of ARA's accomplishments in Ohio. At the conclusion of my remarks, I will seek permission to enter into the Record a more detailed statistical summary of ARA projects in my State. I believe this summary will demonstrate the kinds of programs that ARA has initiated to bring meaningful economic progress during the past 4 years.

H.R. 6991 is the logical successor to this pioneering program. This bill recognizes that economic development takes place at many different levels and requires help at all of them. There is the local economic development center; there is the redevelopment area—which is usually a county or a city of 250,000 or more; there is the multicounty economic development district; and, finally, the multistate action planning region.

The new program provides considerably more by way of grants for facilities which support economic development than did the ARA program. A total of $250 million annually is authorized for grants, in contrast to the $75 million for grants over a 4-year period under ARA.

The new program will also be easier to administer since many administrative criteria have been simplified. And, most important, it will be possible to concentrate help in areas of the greatest need. I believe it is vital that we move ahead with H.R. 6991 to meet the problems involving wasted human and natural resources.

The majority of Americans who live in comfort and security cannot fully comprehend the frustrations and despair of many of our less fortunate citizens who are trapped in a vicious cycle of poverty. The world of the poor is literally a world apart from the bustling towns and commercial centers of America. But it is a very real world, nevertheless. And its presence is felt by us all.

Poverty means fewer customers for American manufacturers and businessmen.

Poverty means larger tax payments by prosperous areas to help pay for costly welfare programs, and to make up for smaller tax receipts from the distressed regions.

Poverty means that our national economic growth is being held back by our inability to use the full potential of our national resources.

President Johnson has recognized the impact of poverty on our national growth and welfare. But the President has also emphasized the moral nature of the struggle in drafting this new and expanded program. "It has a call," he said, "upon the moral conscience of every American citizen. * * * These conditions of our depressed areas can and must be righted. In this generation they will be righted."

These courageous words are the philosophic roots of H.R. 6991, a bill that brings to our economically depressed communities the tools for a brighter tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record a summary of ARA activities in the State of Ohio:

[From the U.S. Department of Commerce, Area Redevelopment Administration]

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY FOR THE STATE OF OHIO, AS OF APRIL 30, 1965

(By Congressman Robert E. Sweeney)

Counties and cities eligible for ARA assistance: Adams, Belmont, Brown, Carroll, Clermont, Gallia, Guernsey, Highland, Hocking, Jackson, Lawrence, Meigs, Morgan, Noble, Perry, Pike, Ross, Scioto, Washington, city of Cleveland and city of Toledo.

Financial assistance projects approved

	ARA amount	Employment potential
Jefferson Development Corp. (industrial-commercial loan)	$211,000	66
Arcadia Rest Home, Inc. (industrial-commercial loan)	128,000	25
Cincinnati Box & Partition Co. (industrial-commercial loan)	138,000	17
Summit Acres (industrial-commercial loan)	94,000	14
Fabricators, Inc. (industrial-commercial loan)	57,000	23
Village of Aurora (public facility loan and grant)	160,000	195
Collins Packing Co. (industrial-commercial loan)	213,000	85
Mecto, Inc. (industrial-commercial loan)	70,000	26
Greenfield Printing & Publishing Co. (industrial-commercial loan)	99,000	6
Junction City Clay Co. (industrial-commercial loan)	86,000	90
Health Services, Inc. (industrial-commercial loan)	141,000	20
Adalet Manufacturing Co. (industrial-commercial loan)	437,900	17
Total, 12 projects	1,834,900	584
Pending: None.		

Technical assistance projects approved	*ARA Amount*
University of Ohio: New products and industries survey for southeast Ohio	$80,000
Jack Drilling Co.: Test drill and equipment for rock salt wells	125,000
University of Ohio: Establish regional development institute	116,000
Corplan Associates: Economic development program to minimize impact of Army depot closure	36,000
City of Ashtabula:	
Study to develop recreational marina	12,000
Pilot study to develop growth opportunities	37,000
City of Conneaut: Financial and technical feasibility of lake front improvement	32,000
Candeub, Cabot & Associates: Demonstration program to identify industrial sites	24,000
City of Cleveland: Job opportunity and building and land survey	72,000
Stanley Engineering Co.: Feasibility study of establishing commercial docking facility in Scioto County	26,000
University of Toledo: Feasibility of establishing a farmers wholesale and retail market	3,000
City of Toledo: Study of needs and financial operating experience of proposed convention exhibition hall	22,500
City of Cleveland: Small Business Opportunity and Development Corp.: Create, maintain, and stimulate employment opportunity in Greater Cleveland area (establishment of new small businesses)	242,429
Total, 13 projects	827,920
Pending: Total, 4 projects	400,700

Occupational training projects approved

	ARA amount	Trainees
Lumber grader	$16,775	15
Home attendant (adult)	3,262	20
Nurse aid	3,752	20
Clerk-stenographer	14,937	20
Nurse aid	3,472	20
Machine tool operator	45,099	48
Do	27,832	24
Stenographer	37,828	40
Spray painter	15,951	25
Auto service station mechanic	15,951	25
Clerk, general office	43,768	50
Clerk-typist	54,679	75
Do	32,872	50
Burrer, hand	16,443	25
Maintenance man, building	23,115	25
Bench assembler (machine and electrical products)	13,987	25
Custodial worker-maintenance Janitor I	23,190	25
Clerk-typist	17,662	25
Flame cutter operator	16,491	25
Combination welder	19,978	20
Nurse aid (medical service geriatrics)	56,100	160
Short order cook	17,183	25
Electrical appliance repairman	22,385	25
Cashier-grocery checker	11,899	25
Electronic mechanic	58,780	60
Do	47,213	60
Nurse aid	4,130	20
Do	4,194	20
Do	7,982	40
Nurse aid (medical service)	4,489	24
Home attendant	2,803	15
Bookkeeper II	13,187	14
Clerk-stenographer	22,787	25
Nurse aid	4,052	25
Do	3,919	25
Do	3,805	25
Salesperson (general)	13,467	25
Nurse aid	7,610	50
Do	2,942	16
Extruder operator (plastic material)	3,484	10
Home attendant (adult care)	2,183	12
Auto transmission repairman	50,020	40
Ignition and carburetor mechanic	21,274	20
Hospital orderly	3,179	16
Auto service station attendant mechanic	29,052	36
Welder, combination	32,071	32
Clerk-typist	37,000	40
Diesel mechanic, entry	18,558	16
Bookkeeping machine operator	32,187	18
Clerk-stenographer	37,956	40
Total, 50 projects	1,022,935	1,561

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES FOR THE STATE OF OHIO

1. Approved financial assistance projects

On December 21, 1962, ARA approved a section 6 loan for $128,050 to the Arcadia Rest Home to purchase an existing motel, enlarge it and convert it into a 60-bed nursing home. This project, while not fully operational, is now well on the way toward providing adequate nursing home facilities in the area and will ultimately create 25 new jobs.

On June 25, 1963, we approved a section 7 loan and a section 8 grant totaling $167,000 for the village of Aurora for waterlines to their industrial park. This will affect two new industries and negotiations are now underway for a third new plant with a total potential of approximately 195 new jobs.

On March 6, 1963, ARA approved a section 6 loan to Cincinnati Box & Partition Co., Williamsburg, Ohio, for $137,845 to purchase land, building, and equipment to produce paper boxes for packaging purposes. There had been some difficulty after approval in closing loan because of site location, but this plant is now being developed and has a potential employment of 30.

On March 19, 1962, ARA approved a section 6 loan to Collins Packing Co., Greenfield, Ohio, for $212,700 to expand its hog-dressing facilities through the purchase of land, buildings, and equipment. This plant is now employing 85 full-time employees. Further employment is provided through the purchase of hogs from nearby farms in the area. The company is now planning further expansion through the SBA 502 program.

On April 15, 1963, we approved a section 6 loan in the amount of $88,400 for equipment to Fabricators, Inc., to expand facilities for machinery component manufacturing. This plant is now fully operational and employing 24 full-time people. They are currently exploring possibilities of a further expansion.

On June 13, 1963, ARA approved a section 6 loan to Greenfield Printing Co., Greenfield, Ohio, for a new building to expand printing facilities. This plant is now fully operational and employs 14 full-time employees.

On June 30, 1964, we approved a section 6 loan to Health Services, Inc., Marietta, Ohio, to construct and equip a nursing home. Some problems developed in closing the loan but are now being worked out. This project will employ 16 full-time employees.

On August 29, 1963, we approved a section 6 loan to Junction City Clay, Junction City, Ohio, for $86,000 to purchase and rehabilitate an existing clay manufacturing plant which had ceased operations and was closed. This plant is now fully operational and while it experienced some initial operating difficulties, it is now well on the way toward providing about 90 full-time jobs.

On June 22, 1964, ARA approved a section 6 loan in the amount of $141,000 to the Jefferson Development Corp. (a local group) to build a new building for lease to the NuTone Co. to manufacture wooden kitchen cabinets. This plant was formally dedicated in October 1964 and has a potential employment of 66 new jobs.

On April 16, 1963, we approved a section 6 loan to Mecto, Inc., Greenfield, Ohio, to establish a new plant manufacturing mechanics handtools. This plant is now fully operational with a potential employment of 26 new jobs.

On June 25, 1963, we approved a section 6 loan to Summit Acres, Inc., Caldwell, Ohio, to establish a 33-bed nursing home at an ARA cost of $96,200. This project has not gotten off the ground as yet. It seems doubtful whether the applicant is ready or willing to accept the authorization.

2. Pending technical assistance projects

Drainage and flood control study in Guernsey and Noble Counties	$30,000
Study of economic development for city of Martins Ferry, Belmont County	16,000
Southeast Ohio designated counties, development program for Ohio Valley	350,000
Industrial survey, Brown County, Ohio	4,700
Total, 4 projects	400,700

TRIBUTE TO J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this Congress and this Nation is duty bound to pay tribute to a man who, for 41 years of dedicated service, has headed the Federal Bureau of Investigation; tribute to a man who has stood steadfast against the cries of pressure groups who would subvert the purpose of the organization he has led to an eminence that places it in a category alone. He has labored with infinite pains to make this organization at once incorruptible and notably successful in the discharge of its duties.

I hail J. Edgar Hoover—who amid the trials and tribulations of our people, amid clouds and shadows that surround us, against restless voices that say the end justifies the means, has refused to bow to clamor and stands now a shining beacon, a rock, a fortress of democracy.

At a time when many men in office, many courts of justice, many legislative assemblies have been willing to twist and distort the high purpose of their own and of his Department, this man has stood firm. Fortunately for all Americans, the attacks that have sought to move him from duty have been as pebbles against a suit of armor. For this man is clothed in the armor of democracy and he has vowed that the Federal Bureau of Investigation will never become a tool of tyranny. Declining to be accuser, prosecutor, judge or jury, J. Edgar Hoover has kept clearly before this Nation the function of his great Department. Thank God.

In this day, when small men cry for vengeance by whatever means, we have among us this "tall man, sun crowned, who lives above the fog"—an example of high courage and impregnable honor to the whole Nation.

UNIFORM PROCEDURES LEGISLATION NEEDED TO ESTABLISH A POLICY FOR THE ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to establish a Federal policy of uniform procedures for the acquisition of real property by the various agencies and branches of the U.S. Government. This bill also provides for the relocation payments for persons displaced by activities under any such programs.

During the past few years there has been a growing number of complaints concerning the fairness of the land acquisition procedures followed by local agencies acquiring land in the course of public improvement programs carried on with the aid of Federal funds. There has been particular concern over the lack of uniformity in these land acquisition procedures. It should be the responsibility of Congress to assure that programs receiving substantial Federal support are carried out in such a manner as to minimize the hardships which often result from the acquisition of land by eminent domain in the course of federally assisted programs.

This bill provides that the agency or applicant make every reasonable effort to acquire the real property by negotiated purchase with appraisal of the property to take place before the initiation of negotiations and the owner having an opportunity to accompany the appraiser during his inspection of the property.

Other provisions of this bill include the right of the owner to keep possession of his property until he is paid the agreed purchase price arrived at by negotiation or not less than 75 percent of the most recent and reasonable price if the amount of it is in dispute. No construction may be scheduled if a person is lawfully occupying the property without at least 90 days written notice to the person of the date on which the construction is scheduled to begin. Also, the Government is required to acquire the entire property if the intended acquisition of the part of the property would leave the owner with an uneconomic remnant.

A final provision in the bill sums up the reasoning for its introduction: the Government shall take into account human considerations, including the economic and social effects of the proposed public improvement on owners and tenants of real property in the area when determining the boundaries of a proposed public improvement.

TESTIMONY OPPOSING REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the House Education and Labor Committee in opposition to H.R. 77, the proposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. In my testimony I urged that the rights of men and States take precedence over the demands of labor leaders, and that section 14(b) be retained to guarantee these rights. The testimony is as follows:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE HOWARD H. CALLAWAY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, THIRD DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, JUNE 3, 1965

Mr. Chairman, at a time when this Congress and this Government are absorbed with matters pertaining to the rights of men, we find before this committee a bill, H.R. 77, to remove a right so basic as to be beyond question: the right of a man to work without being forced to join a union.

Last week this committee heard intensive testimony supporting the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. I have studied the statements of those who testified to find their justification for the repeal of a right so basic to States and individuals. I submit that though this testimony was ably presented, it does not justify the passage of this bill.

According to numerous statements, supporters of section 14(b) are purported to have no interest in the workingman, but hope to weaken organized labor and thereby lower American working conditions. I find this ridiculous assumption to be widespread, Mr. Chairman, the assumption that those favoring repeal are prolabor, and those opposing it antilabor. Nothing could be further from the truth. Repeal of 14(b) guarantees the power of the labor leaders, and shows very little, if any, interest in the rights of the workingman. Retention of 14(b) guarantees the rights of the workingman, and is therefore in the truest sense prolabor. Surely if the aim were to weaken labor and exploit workers, then statistics would show the effect of such a policy in the right-to-work States. But they do not. To the contrary, the right-to-work States are consistently low on the unemployment rate list, and have shown a marked percentage increase over non-right-to-work States in jobs, workers, and earnings.

Let me quote figures from my own State of Georgia, a right-to-work State. These figures are taken from records of the U.S. Government for periods generally covering the last 10 years. Georgia has enjoyed a 3-percent increase in production workers, while production workers in non-right-to-work States have decreased 14 percent. Our per capita personal income is up 49.6 percent as opposed to 35.4 percent in non-right-to-work States. Our hourly earnings by manufacturing workers have increased 45.2 percent and in non-right-to-work States, 41.5 percent. Georgia's average weekly earnings for production workers are up 55.7 percent, compared to non-right-to-work States, 42.8 percent. This economic growth has occurred in spite of the fact that our population increase was 2 percentage points lower than that of the non-right-to-work States. Surely these figures show that Georgia's labor force is not suffering under our right-to-work law, but rather that it is prospering.

You have heard testimony from a union leader saying that "most employees voluntarily pay union dues and fees because they know they cannot have the benefits of union representation without contributing to defrayal of the expense. And history has conclusively demonstrated that the vast majority willingly pays." This is as it should be.

Unions, like anyone else, should be required to sell themselves to their members through good service and high purpose, and as long as they do, men and women will proudly want to join.

But a contradiction appeared in further testimony claiming that, "In right-to-work States, unions at present cannot allocate sufficient attention to these problems (labor-management problems) because they must constantly endeavor to convince the minority of employees in a bargaining unit that they should join the union and give it financial support." This to me is like a businessman saying that he could do a much better job at manufacturing his product if he just didn't have to take time out to convince people to buy it.

Mr. Chairman, when will union leaders realize that competition is the basis of American success and that a good union is its own best salesman. When will they understand the real meaning of their own words, that "when not bothered, pressured, or influenced, the overwhelming majority of working men and women will join a union voluntarily."

The testimony from supporters of this bill is full of contradictions. They say on one hand that businesses want union shops and are banned from having them in 19 States. On the other hand they say that the same businesses are being lured to the same States by right-to-work laws.

Union leaders on the one hand complain of free riders who get the benefit of union services without paying dues and on the other hand deny the right of free riders to bargain for themselves. It is obvious that the union leaders want to have their cake and eat it too.

But all of these arguments, Mr. Chairman, pale and become unimportant when we turn to the one overriding consideration in this issue: the proponents' utter and cold disregard for the inalienable rights of men and States.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the crux of the matter; we cannot cover it with a smoke screen of lesser arguments; and we cannot close our ears to it, no matter how we tire of hearing men preach this cause. We cannot overstate the right of a man to work without joining a union and the right of a State to choose whether or not it wants compulsory unionism. These matters are basic, and the fact that they should be at issue here is a travesty of America's purpose.

Secretary Wirtz testified that, "what is involved is only the effect which any group decision has on the position of a member who disagrees with it." I submit that infinitely more is involved when a man is forced by national law to make payments against his will and accept policies with which he disagrees in order to earn a living.

What has happened to this administration's alleged concern for minorities? Has this Government and this Congress lost so much sense of perspective that with one hand it will pass legislation to protect the rights of one minority and then repeal the rights of another? Is it right for a majority to force a man to take money from his wife and children to support policies with which he disagrees and charities in which he has no interest.

Has no one reminded us that Samuel Gompers, the father of organized labor, once said that, "There may be here and there a worker who for certain reasons unexplainable to us does not join a union of labor. This is his right, no matter how morally wrong he may be. It is his legal right and no one can or dare question his exercise of that legal right."

How foolish, and how dangerous it is in a country built by and for free individuals to tamper with the very rights on which it was founded.

That this is a matter of individual liberty was brought home to me by an unsolicited letter from Mr. P. D. DuBose, a member of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen in my State of Georgia. As a railroad worker he is not protected by section 14(b) and has been forced to join the union and pay its dues of $150 per year. Mr. DuBose is not antiunion, in fact he states that he would probably join the union anyway, but he does object to being forced to join. And he does object to being forced to spend his own money to support causes not of his own choosing.

Mr. Chairman, there are millions of responsible workers like Mr. DuBose in this country. I ask you to hear their plea. Do not take away from the people of the several States their right to give to others the freedom Mr. DuBose seeks.

PROJECT HOPE

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Erie, Pa., Times-News points out that in addition to bringing modern medical science to developing nations, Project Hope is also demonstrating humanitarianism at its best.

In the article, Rev. Robert D. Goodill points out:

> Like Peter's bark taking Christ to the crowds that needed His ministry ashore, HOPE with its chaplains and its medical staff, its solace for the body and the soul, carries anew the compassionate and triumphant Saviour.

And Reverend Goodill adds:

To the millions imprisoned in Communist lands or blinded by Communist lies, the work of HOPE is the noblest and certainly the most effective aid given by America.

Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to read the full article by Reverend Goodill and therefore include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

HOPE TO THE WORLD

(Rev. Robert D. Goodill is the chaplain for the 1965 Erie County Medical Assistants Association Committee for Hope Benefit and will participate in the program at the Project Hope ball and breakfast scheduled for October 23. Father Goodill is the pastor of St. Luke's RC Church and is a commander in the Chaplain Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve.)

(By Rev. Robert D. Goodill)

On a bleak, chill day when the roar of cannons echoed faintly in the January skies, I stood on the deck of the U.S.S. *Consolation*, in Inchon to bless the Navy medical teams—helicopter pilots, corpsmen, doctors and nurses whose dedicated skill cared for the wounded marines flown aboard from the Korean lines.

Only last week, I thrilled again listening to Dr. Harold A. McLaren, Jr., at the dedication of the personnel whose skills and services are now at work aboard the same ship, now the U.S.S. *Hope*, caring for the sick, the halt and the blind in America's most shining example of aid to the world's needy.

HOPE (Health Opportunity for People Everywhere) is a voluntary nonprofit organization founded by Dr. William B. Walsh, a heart specialist, on suggestion of President Eisenhower. How, on a person to person basis, to open the heart and skills of America to the suffering, the hopeless, the wretched—the least of His brethren. The answer was a ship that would be hospital, medical school, dispensary, and source of life sustaining food—a ship that could go anywhere and be a self-contained city of faith and hope and true charity.

For the project the U.S. Navy loaned the ship. It was refurbished and rechristened *Hope*. Dr. Walsh planned the project and recruited the staff—doctors, surgeons, dentists, nurses, technicians, aides. Supplies and equipment were donated by manufacturers, drug companies, suppliers, and outfitters of all sorts including Erie's own American Sterilizer.

Rotating medical teams volunteered for service aboard from 2 to 6 months without pay. In four voyages, averaging 10 months each, *Hope* has been staffed by more than 2,500 skilled and dedicated specialists. Over 5,000 major operations were performed, over 1 million vaccinated for polio, whooping cough, tetanus and diphtheria and more than 1 million quarts of milk given to children who never tasted milk before.

Splendid as even a momentary gesture, the work of HOPE is more than a momentary alleviation of the wretchedness of the poor. In Saigon, Trujillo (Peru), Cuenca (Ecuador), and presently at Conakry (Guinea), teams of HOPE go ashore to work in or set up local hospitals, training local personnel in modern medical techniques. Other local personnel already possessing some medical skill are brought back aboard the *Hope* to work there in this 250-bed hospital with its brilliant and dedicated staff so that they might learn the latest discoveries and uses of diagnostic, clinical, and surgical advancements.

To John questioning from Herod's prison, "Are you the one who is to come, or are we yet waiting for some other? Christ replied, "Go and tell John what your own ears and eyes have witnessed; how the blind see, how the lame walk * * * the deaf hear * * * and the poor have the gospel preached to them." To the millions imprisoned in Communist lands or blinded by Communist lies the work of HOPE is the noblest and certainly the most effective aid given by America.

Like Peter's bark taking Christ to the crowds that needed His ministry ashore, HOPE with its chaplains and its medical staff, its solace for the body and the soul, carries anew the compassionate and triumphant Saviour. Truly the hands of Christ, truly the work of America, truly the opportunity for each of us to contribute his part to give hope to the world.

EXCISE TAX BILL

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately and unavoidably I was absent from the House yesterday when the vote was taken on the excise tax bill. I had counted on the debate utilizing the full 4 hours accorded it in the rule, and if this had been the case I would have returned to the House in time to have cast my vote in person for the measure instead of being paired for the bill.

I was absent from Washington the earlier part of yesterday because of a commitment made several months ago to attend and participate, along with Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN and Gov. Dan K. Moore, in ceremonies dedicating the Burlington Industries Center in Alamance County, in my congressional district, in honor of the late and beloved J. Spencer Love, the founder of this large textile complex.

Although I had arranged to fly back to Washington immediately after the conclusion of the ceremonies, I arrived in the House Chamber too late to cast my vote for the excise tax bill. I have been an enthusiastic supporter of the administration proposal to repeal these taxes and had earlier introduced a bill myself for the repeal of the communications tax. I am delighted that the bill met with such slight opposition in the House and that it passed by such a fine margin.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present I would have voted for the bill.

NATION NEEDS NEW MINT IN ILLINOIS

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the message from the President received today regarding the need for revising the metallic content of coins does not adequately consider the acute coin shortage which continues to affect large areas of our country.

The recommendations to reduce the silver content in half dollars and to eliminate silver in dimes and quarters recognize the obvious fact that supplies of silver are limited. In essence, the message is presented as a step toward averting what otherwise might prove to be an even greater crisis in the supply of coins.

However, the message makes no reference to the necessity of establishing a third U.S. mint. The suggestion for a temporary reactivation of the San Francisco Mint is but a further stopgap in a continuing problem which the Congress and the administration must meet. The need for large quantities of coins in the great Midwest area of the country was demonstrated at hearings held last year by the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs of the House Committee on Government Operations. Most of the testimony relative to the coin shortage emanated from the Midwest area, including statements from bankers, retailers, and others having peculiar knowledge of the coin shortage and the novel methods which have been developed by banking and retail institutions for securing the coins needed for daily consumer use.

Legislation is pending before the House Public Works Committee—including H.R. 39 which I introduced and H.R. 865 which was introduced by my colleague, Congressman ROMAN PUCINSKI, as well as other bills—recommending the establishment of a new mint in Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly recommend that, in dealing with the subject of our coinage, full consideration be given to the advantages—indeed, the genuine need—for establishing an additional mint to supply the coinage requirements of the great Middle West.

DEDICATION OF MEMORIAL MONUMENT TO THE GOLD STAR MOTHERS, SOUTHBRIDGE, MASS., MAY 30, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day of this year I was privileged to address a gathering at Southbridge, Mass., on the occasion of the dedication of a memorial monument to the Gold Star Mothers.

Following are the remarks which I made on that occasion:

It is with a sense of great honor, deep satisfaction and glowing pride that I join the very distinguished group that is gathered here today on this most impressive occasion when we dedicate this striking monument to the Gold Star Mothers.

For the ceremony in which we are engaged today concerns the greatest, most hallowed of American traditions, both local and national.

Moreover, our purpose is not confined to one subject or ideal alone, for the honor of the occasion is not limited to any class or creed or group or faction.

Indeed, on this cherished Memorial Day, when with true spiritual devotion, we prayerfully honor our illustrious dead, we lift our voices in praise of everyone concerned in the great and awful grief attending the mass destruction of warfare, and we pause with reverent thoughts and hearts overflowing with gratitude to pay our special tribute to these wonderful, gallant women—the Gold Star Mothers—who have given so bravely of themselves for God and country, and for everything America means to us.

Their sacrifices must stand alone as a symbol of unselfish national devotion, of patriotic spirit unsurpassed, for they have given of their own flesh and blood, first to establish this great Government, then to save this Union, and then to uphold, protect, and defend the security, the liberties, and the freedom of this Nation.

Today, Memorial Day, 1965, has perhaps a little different, an added significance to us who are gathered here.

Originally, the observance of this hallowed day centered on the heroes of our great and dreadful Civil War.

In time, following the First World War, its meaning was changed that it might bestow the blessings and the gratitude of the Nation on the fighting men of all our wars and our own dear ones who have gone to their heavenly reward.

And to thousands of good Americans, including some assembled here today, there is a very special, personal, deep-rooted, soul-stirring meaning to this day and this occasion, in that it represents to these sterling Americans, the Gold Star Mothers, the greatest loss they have ever known, or ever could be expected to know.

It is to these heroic women—our Gold Star Mothers—those who have carried the heaviest burdens and deepest sorrows of war, that the heart and soul of this community and the Nation is solemnly and gratefully, and with special depth and feeling, so sincerely extended today.

There are no words of mine that could adequately praise or describe these stalwart women, no phrase of the poet, no couplet of the bard, no song of the minstrel, no acclaim, no feeble human word that could possibly give these honored courageous women their due in terms of their bitter sacrifice, their sufferings, their grief, and their contributions to our country.

The courage of these mothers of Massachusetts fighting men reflects the basic character of the rich heritage of America, the firmness, valor, and ruggedness of the Yankee, the loyalty, devotion, and self-sacrificing spirit of the Franco-Americas, so many of whom are represented here today, and the invincible, unflagging purpose of people drawn from every race and creed, from almost every national origin, and every profession of faith that goes to make up the human foundations of this great country which we love and to which we are unalterably pledged.

This occasion is also fully in keeping with the glorious local traditions of this community, which abounds in tales of heroic conduct and superlatively loyal citizenship on the part of men and women alike.

There has never been a time in history, never a time of crisis in the affairs of this Nation, never an occasion when liberty was challenged, our security was assailed, that the patriotic men and women of Southbridge did not step forward, undaunted and unafraid, to exhibit a fierce sense of responsibility in all their undertakings, and a moral fiber which has stood this community and this Nation so well over the years, in every endeavor, both civil and military, and in all the wide ramifications of human life in our great free country.

It is this kind of contribution, the kind represented here today, the proud, loyal, unrestrained devotion to duty and responsibility—this love of home and family tradition, this willingness to sacrifice all for the cause of liberty and justice—that has rendered the fighting sons of this beautiful town, our great district and State, among the very bravest of any in the Nation.

And we must never forget that it is the courage of our mothers, of mothers throughout the years, of mothers such as those assembled here today, of the mothers to whom this fine memorial is established, that has provided the basis for all that we are, all that we have been, and all that we shall ever be in the future looming before us.

In the light of these immortal contributions of the mothers and the sons and the people of America who have made this great Nation what it is, who have stood fearlessly to meet every crisis, to face every challenge, to gain every victory, let us courageously face the great problems that are before us today.

Let us follow the example and precepts of these gallant mothers, and their brave sons, who have saved America, who have kept and preserved it to be the great bastion of promise and freedom that it is today.

With calmness and faith, with confidence in our strength and our will to preserve our security, to defend our liberties and, in time, to banish tyranny, oppression, and violence from the world, and to follow the rule of law and to live in understanding, brotherhood, and peace with all nations, let us take inspiration and example today from these incomparable women.

As we proudly dedicate this memorial to the Gold Star Mothers of Southbridge, upon which I congratulate all of you, let us hope, let us pray and let us strive that their spirit, and the spirit of their cherished sons, who without thought of self, gave their young lives for God and country, may continue to serve as a beacon light to guide all of us, who would defend with our lives the precious birthright of American freedom, and the noble principles of liberty and justice which always must be the indispensable foundations of our free way of life.

Our great Government must always gratefully and generously acknowledge the debt we all owe to the Gold Star Mothers and their heroic sons.

May this monument long preserve their blessed memory, and may the good Lord always keep them close to Him.

Let me thank you warmly for the great honor and privilege of being with you, and let me thank Mr. Albert J. Langevin, commander, Franco-American War Veterans, Post No. 29, and the chairman of the Gold Star Mothers Committee, and his esteemed officers, comrades, and members, and my dear friend, Mr. Archie Champagne, for their kindness in inviting me and, above all, for conceiving, planning, and constructing, this outstanding monument and for arranging and conducting this most inspiring dedicatory program.

CONSTRUCTION BY JEFFERSON MILLS OF A NEW MILL IN JEFFERSON, GA.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, on May 20 I had the privilege of participating in a most pleasant and significant event in the State capitol in Atlanta, Ga. Governor Sanders announced the plans for the construction by Jefferson Mills of a new mill to be called the Southworth division in Jefferson, Ga., which is in my congressional district.

This announcement is significant for several reasons which I believe merit bringing to the attention of this body. First, this is tangible and concrete evidence of the wisdom of the administration and the Congress of the United States in enacting one-price cotton legislation last year. Those of us who supported this legislation contended that it would revitalize and stimulate the textile industry into a new era of expansion and growth, providing new jobs and new income and new sources of revenue for the economies where such establishments would be located.

Second, this ceremony demonstrates the necessity for the Congress to extend the present one-price cotton law which has contributed so materially to the rebirth of a new era in the history of cotton and the textile industry in our Nation.

Third, this ceremony demonstrated the faith and wisdom of a distinguished textile family in my congressional district—fath in the future; faith in the Congress of the United States in perpetuating one-price cotton which has contributed so much to the competitive economic opportunity which was denied the domestic textile industry under the system of two-price cotton. It demonstrated wisdom and foresight on the part of the owners of the Jefferson Mills of Jefferson, Ga., because they have committed themselves to the expenditure of millions of dollars in the erection of a new plant which will incorporate push-button yarn manufacturing and weaving—a totally new concept in the textile manufacture of cloth. This mill will be the first of its kind in the world. The new process represents a new breakthrough in textile manufacturing and it reduces the number of processes required for the manufacture of cloth from the conventional 17 to only 6. The new plant will employ an additional staff of highly trained technicians, working three shifts around the clock and it will represent approximately a 25-percent increase of the total capacity of Jefferson Mills.

Morris Bryan, president of Jefferson Mills, a graduate of Georgia Tech, and a distinguished member of the board of regents of the university system of Georgia, has designated this new operation the "southworth system" in memory of his brother, a former official of Jefferson Mills, who recently met an untimely death. Governor Sanders stated at the time of the announcement, which was attended by many industrial, financial, and business leaders of the State of Georgia, that the "southworth system" can become a potent factor in the world marketplace and help solve the U.S. balance-of-payments problem.

It was my privilege to be permitted to congratulate the Bryan family at these ceremonies and to thank them for giving tangible evidence of the confidence which they have placed not only in the future of the textile industry, but of the city of Jefferson, Ga., and the integrity of the Congress and the administration in continuing to provide an atmosphere of competitive opportunity, in order to meet the challenges overseas as well as at home.

This, Mr. Speaker, is not the only new textile installation which has been initiated since the enactment of one-price cotton legislation last year and with the assurance that one-price cotton will be continued, I have every confidence that the textile industry of this Nation will continue to expand and fulfill its vital role in the economic and military life of our Nation.

HUMANE TREATMENT OF LABORATORY ANIMALS—CLEVELAND BILL WINS BACKING OF NEW HAMPSHIRE FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, at the annual convention of the New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs on May 12, this distinguished organization voted to endorse H.R. 5647, my bill to provide for humane treatment of laboratory animals. Also endorsed was S. 1071 by Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, the companion bill in the other body.

Thus, growing support for this legislation is recorded by an ever-increasing number of thoughtful and responsible citizens. As I pointed out when I introduced my bill—page 3980 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 2—this legislation follows the guidelines enacted into law in Great Britain in 1876 and which have been in force ever since. The bill in no way would impede the course of legitimate medical research dependent on the use of experimental animals. It would set and enforce needed Federal standards to help insure humane treatment of these animals and to limit their use to bona fide research. It would go far toward eliminating unnecessary duplication of experiments.

There is a pressing need for this legislation, which should be the concern of every civilized country. The backing of the New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs is welcome and important. It is timely recognition of this moral issue. I hope similar action will be taken by similar groups in every State and that action may be taken at this session of Congress. I take this opportunity of extending my thanks and appreciation to the Federation of Women's Clubs of New Hampshire.

I also want to thank those clubs which have written me individually to endorse the bill. These are the Presidents Club of the Keene district, composed of present and past presidents of 16 women's clubs in Keene; the Keene Woman's Club; and the Effingham Woman's Club.

CLEVELAND PROPOSES RAILROAD RETIREMENT BE PUT ON SAME BASIS AS SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would place taxes and benefits under the railroad retirement system on the same basis as those under social security.

Unlike social security, which is withheld on the basis of an employee's salary for the whole year, railroad retirement withholding is split into monthly periods. Often this means that railroad employees do not get the full benefit credits to which they would be entitled if their retirement taxes were withheld on an annual basis. If a railroad employee is out of work in some months because of illness or any other personal reason, he loses his credits for that period even though his total earnings for the year are greater than the maximum needed for full benefits. If the railroad retirement system were placed on an annual, rather than on a monthly basis, covered employees would be able to receive their full benefits and, of course, make their full contributions.

This measure would correct a situation that presently works to the disadvantage of many railroad employees and is unfair. I hope it will be possible to hold public hearings on the bill during the current session of Congress.

STATEMENT BEFORE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1965, it was my privilege to testify before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress to present my thoughts on organization of the Congress. Under unanimous consent I include my statement in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE DONALD RUMSFELD, 13TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, ILLINOIS

Chairman MONRONEY, Chairman MADDEN, members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, I am grateful for this opportunity to discuss some thoughts on the important subject of the organization of the Congress. As one of the sponsors of a resolution (H. Con. Res. 169) to create this joint committee, I am naturally enthusiastic about your work and look forward to studying your recommendations in detail.

First, let me acknowledge the difficulty of your assignment. I have great respect for the Congress of the United States. I recognize, however, as you do, that almost 20 years have elapsed since the last substantial improvements in the organization of the Congress by the LaFollette-Monroney Reorganization Act of 1946, and that many changes have taken place in our Nation and the world. Because of these continuing changes, there is obviously a need for the Congress to be alert to ways to sharpen its procedures and to improve the quality of its service to the country as it strives to conduct the public's business efficiently and effectively.

Certainly the legislative solutions drafted by the Congress must be the very best solutions possible if our Nation is to meet the challenges of the coming decades. As a people, we can settle for no less than the very best solutions. Further, for the Congress to succeed in its work, there must be a high level of public respect for Congress and government. If the Congress is to be able to perform its constitutional responsibilities effectively, it must have the cooperation, the assistance, and indeed the confidence of the people of this Nation.

To undertake this task of historical significance, the Congress has selected to serve on this joint committee, individuals of stature, experience, and ability. I congratulate you all for the honor and responsibility which have been given you and wish you well. Your success, the imagination that is shown by this committee in its recommendations, will in a major way determine the future success of the Congress as an instrument of government.

I have no illusions about my appearance here today. As a relatively junior Member of the House, having had but brief experience as a student of government, as a congressional staff member, and more recently as a Member of Congress, I am aware that there may be many valid arguments—unseen by me—against the suggestions I will make. My remarks include some specific suggestions as well as an expression of support for some recommendations which I am told may have been made by others.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

1. I believe that the policy of encouraging or assisting Members of Congress in the announcement of Federal grants, contracts, or projects in their States or districts should be terminated. If, in fact, a Member of Congress has successfully achieved Federal support for a legitimate problem in his State or district, this fact will surely become known. However, to encourage or assist Members in making initial announcements of Federal grants, projects, and particularly

Federal contracts, leaves at least a shadow of question as to whether or not the contract or project was awarded solely, as it should have been, on factors such as cost, performance, and national interest. I would think that a procurement officer or Corps of Engineers' official, for example, who based his decisions on need, cost, performance, would not be pleased to see Members' announcements of these contracts or projects leaving the impression that they may have influenced his decision.

2. I recommend that consideration be given to relieving Members of Congress of responsibilities involving postmasterships and rural letter carriers, U.S. Service Academy appointments, and private immigration and claim matters.

3. I have been interested in the discussion of the possibility of a 4-year term for Members of the House. To test public sentiment on this question, I included a question in my 1965 questionnaire to residents of the 13th District of Illinois. The response was as follows:

> Do you favor the proposed change in length of term from 2 to 4 years for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives? Yes, 61.7 percent; no, 34.4 percent; no answer, 3.9 percent.

This, of course, is a complicated question. I will not discuss it in detail other than to simply offer a possible alternative which may not have been suggested thus far. Admittedly, it may have many disadvantages. The suggestion is that Members of the House be phased into a 6-year election schedule, as are Members of the Senate, whereby they would, on a staggered basis, run for a 4-year term, then a 2-year term, then a 4-year term, etc. This would mean that during every 6-year period, each Member would seek reelection twice, and each Member would, over a span of years, run in both presidential election years and in nonpresidential election years. I recognize the value of the 2-year term and the desirability of keeping the House responsive to the people of the country. However, at the same time, I recognize the desirability of reducing that portion of a Member's time which is devoted to reelection activities so that Members are permitted to spend a greater portion of their time on the important matters before Congress.

4. I recommend that the Congress adopt rules prohibiting congressional trips inside or outside the continental limits of the United States by "lameduck" Members.

5. I urge that the House and the Senate establish a regular 4- to 6-week recess each summer. For many years the possibility of a summer recess for the House of Representatives has been discussed. With the increasing complexity of the problems facing the Nation in recent years, it has become apparent that the sessions will inevitably run well into the fall, just as they have in 1962—to October 13; in 1963—to December 30; and in 1964—to October 3. A summer recess of a minimum of 4 weeks, scheduled annually, would be in the best interests of the Congress and the country. Some of the advantages would include: An opportunity—indeed, almost the only opportunity—for Members who are parents to be with their children at a time when the children are not in school. (Family life is not, I would hope, entirely a thing of the past); health of Members; and needed time scheduled in advance for Members to visit their districts, as was envisioned by the drafters of our Constitution.

CONGRESSIONAL STAFFING

1. Minority staffing: I urge consideration of the need for minority members of committees to have adequate staff assistance. As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics I have joined with other members of the committee in pointing out, in additional views appended to committee reports on the NASA authorization bills for 1963, 1964, and 1965, the urgent need for staff members responsible to the minority members of the committee, including both professional and clerical help. We have stressed in each of these reports, the need for staff members to be available to minority members of the committee if the House is to be benefited by well-balanced research, conclusions, and recommendations. The present staff is overburdened to the extent that it is difficult for them to be of assistance to minority members. It is my recommendation that at least one minority staff member be assigned full time for each subcommittee. The Congress, the committees of Congress, and the majority and minority members have an obligation to the people of this country. They fail in that obligation when, because of inadequate committee staff, they are unable to properly discharge their duties. I believe that it would be best if committee staff members were allocated in the same proportion as the party membership on a given committee. I will say also that I will work equally hard for this reform at that point when my party, the Republican Party, is in the majority.

2. Committee staffing: In the additional views on the NASA authorization bills for 1963, 1964, and 1965, minority members of the committee have expressed concern over the total number of staff personnel available to the Committee on Science and Astronautics. In our opinion, it is impossible for the 12 professional and technical staff members to adequately handle the workload associated with the committee's broad responsibilities in the field of science. This committee has one of the largest budgets in Government to authorize and oversee, and one of the smallest committee staffs in Congress to assist in this process. With the present staff, despite their individual competence, we believe the committee cannot fully perform its responsibilities—to review the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's budget and to assist in evaluating, on a continuing basis, these programs. This situation constitutes a weakness in the system of checks and balances. Here is an instance where the legislative branch of Government, because of inadequate staff, is unable to keep watch on a $5 billion executive agency. Anyone who has served on this committee and participated in the markup of the NASA authorization bill knows that, while the desire is there and the intentions good, there are instances when many members must inevitably conclude on a given item that they just don't know with assurance whether or not it is reasonable. The Congress should not continue to fail to exercise its constitutional prerogatives and responsibilities, and run the risk of wasting taxpayers' dollars by failing to insist that sufficient staff be selected to assure reasonable supervision of this budget and efficient handling of the many other responsibilities of the committee.

3. Because of my desire to see a better public understanding of the Congress, I have instituted in my Washington office a summer intern program for college students. After 2 years of encouraging results with this program, I recommend that consideration be given to finding ways to encourage Members of Congress to utilize the services of summer interns. In addition, colleges and universities increasingly are developing programs whereby students may gain credits toward graduation for work experience. Possibly colleges and universities would be encouraged to include congressional staff experience in their work-study programs for college credits, if such a program were encouraged by the Congress to permit students spending semesters or quarters on congressional staffs during the school year. There is no question in my mind but that those individuals who gain this very valuable experience take with them in their succeeding years, regardless of their future occupations, a better awareness and understanding and, indeed, respect for the Congress, in addition to the contribution they make while working. Action in this area could be a most constructive and imaginative recommendation of this committee.

4. The Nation's Capital is naturally and properly a great attraction for visitors. Washington, D.C., is the Capital for every citizen of this country. The Federal Government is their government. The employees of the Federal Government, including policemen, elevator operators, and others, are the employees of these citizens. There is no excuse for lack of courtesy and hospitality by Federal employees to individuals visiting the Nation's Capital. In view of the fact that there is a surplus of good people available, I would recommend that some procedure be established whereby prompt suspension or dismissal of discourteous Hill employees could be achieved. Perhaps a review board could be set up that would be firm about discipline in matters of discourtesy. The people of this country should be able to enjoy coming to their Capital and should not be subjected to harassment. Capitol Hill should set the tone.

5. I urge that the confusing base pay, gross pay "monkeyshines" be terminated in favor of a gross annual pay scale for staff members which is easily understood by all.

6. I favor a revision of the congressional page program to permit college students—freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors—to serve as pages in addition to high school students.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

1. I urge that consideration be given to restricting the activity of the first day of the first session of each new Congress to the swearing-in ceremonies and that this be followed by a 2-day recess, so that Members of both parties would have an opportunity to consider any purposed rule changes, possible challenges to the seating of Members, and other matters which may be of immediate importance. The pace is rapid during the first few hours of the Congress, not only for new Members who must find it bewildering, but also for more senior Members who wish to participate in the decisions to be made which they will then have to live with during the succeeding 2 years.

2. I recommend a study to improve the format and content of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Possibly rules should be adopted to reduce the insertion of extraneous material in the body of the RECORD. In addition, it might be valuable to insert in the RECORD clarifying statements, possibly in bold type, and drafted by the Parliamentarian or an appropriate officer of the House, to indicate in layman's terms what is taking place. Such revisions might substantially improve readership, as well as speed up the process of scanning the RECORD. At the minimum, it would seem that a bold-type statement by the Parliamentarian to immediately precede votes and briefly describe what was being voted on, would be valuable. I am aware that the Digest summaries do this to some extent. This might help standardize reporting of the various record votes which take place, whether by the press or other organizations. Certainly it would not prevent any individual or organization from using other words or editorializing further. However, it might encourage more accurate reporting and discussion of these important issues. If there were an official description of the vote, it could be used by the Members in rebuttal to questions stemming from differing descriptions of what a vote was, such as one from a Cope memo of April 19 describing the motion to recommit, by Representative JOHN BYRNES of Wisconsin, on the medicare bill as a vote for "wrecking the bill." Also, I believe that Members, staffs, and other users of the RECORD would be

saved considerable time if the pages of the RECORD were perforated to facilitate tearing pages out. I understand that this can be done as part of the normal printing process at no extra cost once the equipment is installed.

3. I urge revision of procedures and rules to facilitate the ease of achieving a record vote on major bills. Possibly a record vote should be required on all appropriation bills. In the past few weeks, the House passed by voice votes the appropriation bills for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare totaling $7.9 billion and for independent offices totaling $14.1 billion. The public's business should be conducted in public, and certainly the people of this country have the right to know how their Representatives are representing them. Possibly, part of this problem could be solved by reducing to 10 or so, the number of Members now required to stand to gain a record vote on a given bill. For example, I can recall the House during the 88th Congress passing by a voice vote the resolution requiring arbitration in the settlement of the railroad labor dispute, because there were only a handful of Members on their feet seeking a record vote. This was an important piece of legislation. The public should have been permitted to know how their Representatives voted. In addition, I urge consideration of the possibility of permitting votes on titles of bills, such as might have been desirable on the recently passed medicare bill which had three major bills within one. Conceivably, this would enable Members to record their positions with greater preciseness and reduce the danger of honest misunderstanding or of irresponsible campaign attacks. This country has a serious problem with communications. Anything we can do to better clarify what is in the minds of the people charged with the responsibility of conducting government will, I believe, raise the level of the dialog and discussion on government.

4. I urge that the minority party be given equal time to debate conference reports as a matter of right, rather than at the discretion of the majority. This has been abused on occasion by the majority, possibly regardless of which party was in the majority. The issues being resolved by these conference reports are not infrequently of major importance to the country. Constructive discussion demands that consideration and opportunity for debate be given to both sides of the issue. This suggestion has been proposed by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and is contained in my bill, House Resolution 156—89th Congress. Also, in view of the importance of the reports of conference committees, it would seem to me only proper to protect the rights of the minority of the conferees and permit them an opportunity to attach dissenting views to the conference reports.

5. I urge that either a germaneness rule be adopted in the Senate or that the House rules be revised to prohibit consideration of measures containing nongermane amendments which have been added to House bills in conference committees. The most recent example of this, I can recall, involved the bill providing supplemental agricultural appropriations, to which the Senate added an amendment to bar the use of funds appropriated to the Veterans' Administration to close or reduce services of any veterans' hospital or facility. Earlier this year, I introduced House Resolution 185 to correct this situation and for other purposes.

6. I am hopeful that the committee will consider some plan providing for annual public disclosure of the financial affairs and business connections of candidates for Congress, Members of Congress, and staff members receiving in excess of possibly $10,000 annually, and the possibility of an Ethics Review Committee for the conduct of Members and their staffs, or a Joint Committee on Ethics. I have introduced a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 260, for this purpose. Public confidence in Congress requires high moral and ethical standards by elected Representatives. House Resolution 773, which I introduced during the 88th Congress and which would enable the House Administration Committee to investigate financial, business, and campaign fund activities of Members and their employees, might be a step in the right direction. Also, I will be interested in your recommendations on possible revision of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

7. I believe that it might be advisable to install additional microphones at appropriate locations on the floor of the House, possibly two more on each side of the Chamber, and urge that consideration be given to installing one additional committee table on each side. This, in my opinion, would make the floor a more usable work area for the Members.

8. Also, I wish to express my interest in proposals to: Relieve Congress of some of the burden of legislating for the District of Columbia; abolish or enforce the House rule concerning "qualifying to vote"; permit Members to cosponsor bills, rather than introduce identical bills to reduce printing costs; permit a reasonable (possibly $25) income tax credit for individuals who contribute to political campaigns; and to admit former Presidents and Vice Presidents as Members at Large of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, without voting privileges.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

1. As a member of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Government Information, I am particularly sensitive to the problem of Government secrecy. I urge that consideration be given to recommendations that legislative hearings, and, particularly, appropriations hearings, be held in open sessions except when executive sessions are necessary, such as when national security is involved. In view of the Public Records bill being considered by the Subcommittee on Government Information, which will require, if passed, greater public disclosure by the executive branch, it would seem appropriate that the Congress at the same time establish enforcible rules to minimize the number of executive sessions of committees and, in addition, to bring about greater public disclosure of the activities of the Congress generally.

2. Possibly one way to encourage better committee and subcommittee attendance would be to make available to the public attendance records of the Members of Congress in committee sessions. At the minimum, I urge that the names of all committee members be printed in every committee report that comes to the floor in connection with a pending piece of legislation, and that the report specifically indicate how each Member voted on reporting the bill. Also, I believe the compelling arguments against the use of proxies in voting on the floor of the House of Representatives are applicable, also, to committee action, and urge a prohibition on the use of proxies in committee votes.

3. I urge that consideration be given to finding ways to bring about a better utilization of the talents of all 435 Members of the House of Representatives. Positions of leadership—in a party, on committee, or in subcommittee—are extremely time-consuming. The results of these leadership activities are of great significance to the country. A rule which provided that a Member could not serve as chairman or ranking member on more than one committee, joint committee, or subcommittee would bring about a better distribution in workload and conceivably would result in more constructive and better balanced work by the Congress. Certainly, there is a sufficient number of able men in the House of Representatives that could assume responsibility and authority.

4. I favor exploration of some method of modifying the seniority system. I recognize that this is more a matter of party preference and tradition than of the rules of the House. However, I feel that the committee would be providing a service if it would look into the subject. A variety of approaches have been discussed. One proposal involved rotating annually the chairmanship and ranking member position between the two top members of each party, in each Congress. Thus, the senior Member on each side would fill the top position (chairman or ranking member) during the first session, and the second senior member would fill the top party position during the second session. A second proposal would be that the chairman and ranking members be elected by secret ballot in party caucus from among the top three Members on their side in seniority. Admittedly, this could be done without action by your committee. However, some action in this area by your committee to revise the rules to encourage greater diversity of viewpoint in leadership positions would result, I believe, in a broader debate and discussion of the many possible solutions to any given problem.

5. I endorse the proposal offered some years ago by Representatives ROBERT GRIFFIN, of Michigan, and THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri, both members of this committee, to the effect that when both the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government are controlled by the same political party, the Committees on Government Operations in the House and Senate should be under the control of the minority party. Such a revision would be a healthy innovation for the Congress and the country by assuring vigorous probing, challenging and questioning of the conduct of Government. To avoid political irresponsibility, which some Members fear, it might be best to have an equal number of members of the committee from each party, except that the chairman would be of the minority party, thereby giving the minority party a one-vote advantage.

6. I am hopeful that your committee will make recommendations with respect to revising and consolidating the number of committees and subcommittees. In this connection, it would seem to be desirable for House and Senate committees to have similar jurisdiction and titles whenever possible. For example, unnecessary confusion frequently results from the fact that the House Space Committee is called the Committee on Science and Astronautics, whereas, in the Senate, it is called the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. Also, I see merit in the recommendations for greater use of joint committees as a timesaver for representatives of the executive branch, as well as to improve congressional control over such areas as the appropriations process as in the suggestion for a Joint Legislative Budget Committee.

7. Further, I urge that each House develop uniform committee rules with adequate means to insure compliance. Suggestions concerning consolidation of committees as well as questions of committee compliance with the rules of the House have been raised in recent years with respect to various congressional committees, and, particularly, the House Committee on Un-American Activities. For some time this committee has been a subject of criticism. Critics have charged that the committee is unconstitutional (by investigating ideas and beliefs, instead of acts), denies witnesses due process, and has not served a legislative purpose commensurate with its cost. Since criticism of this committee generally takes the form of challenges to its jurisdiction, its status as a legislative committee, or its interpretations of the rights of witnesses, these charges should be met head on by the Congress. Cer-

tainly, a study by this joint committee to consider these and other charges against this or other legislative committees could do much to clear the air.

The proper legislative work of the Congress is of great importance to the country and should proceed in an atmosphere conducive to the accomplishment of Congress constitutional responsibilities. The protection of the rights of witnesses before congressional committees is of sufficient importance that charges such as those leveled against the House Committee on Un-American Activities as recently as last week in Chicago, by attorneys as well as in the press, should not go unanswered. If charges against a congressional committee are valid, the Congress should take steps to avoid recurrence. If invalid, such charges should be exposed as false in the interest of maintaining public confidence in the Congress. In addition, I hope that consideration will be given to the proposals of Representative THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri, which are embodied in bills I have sponsored (H.R. 4422 and H.R. 4276) relating to contempt citations in cases of witnesses before congressional committees and providing declaratory judgment procedures in cases involving refusal of witnesses to testify or produce papers before congressional committees.

I recognize the jurisdiction of the Rules and House Administration Committees in these areas. However, I raise the question as to whether it might be valuable for each House to have a review committee to consider such charges or citations—a committee composed of Members not sitting on the particular committee which may be the subject of an attack or which may have requested issuance of a contempt citation.

Let me emphasize that I specifically am not passing judgment on the propriety of the activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any other committee of Congress, past or present. I do suggest that consideration be given to the questions I have raised.

CONGRESS AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. Chairman, in the mid-1800's Alexis deTocqueville said:

"We have seen that the Federal Constitution entrusts the permanent direction of the external interests of the Nation to the President and the Senate, which tends in some degree to detach the general foreign policy of the Union from the direct control of the people. It cannot therefore be asserted with truth that the foreign affairs of the state are conducted by the democracy."

This quotation and events of recent years raise the question as to whether the balance in our system of government would be more perfect if the Congress as a whole, and particularly the House of Representatives, had a larger legislative role in the area of foreign policy. Areas for possible consideration in this connection include:

1. The proposal to amend the Constitution to give the House of Representatives, along with the Senate, authority to ratify treaties. This problem was brought to mind with the recent consideration of the International Coffee Agreement which came about as a result of the treaty which had never been considered by the House of Representatives, and yet House action was required to enact the implementing legislation to fulfill U.S. treaty obligations.

2. The proposal to strengthen the role of Congress in the field of national security and foreign policy by the creation of a permanent Joint Committee for National Security with authority to make findings and recommendations to the appropriate legislative committees.

Finally, I am of the opinion that it might be appropriate at this point in history for a study of the nature of the constitutional authority granted the Congress with respect to foreign and military affairs. For example, at the time the Constitution was drafted, the meaning of the word "war" was reasonably well understood. The U.S. position, with respect to World Wars I and II, was clear. However, more recently, and particularly in Korea, Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic, the United States has pursued military actions which, by any reasonable definition, constitute warfare. These actions were at the direction of the President and without any official declaration of war by Congress.

Our Constitution created separate branches of the Federal Government and attempted to establish checks and balances between these branches. Undoubtedly, the Congress was given the power to declare war for a reason. Today the United States is engaged in an undeclared war in Vietnam. This, I believe, raises a number of questions:

Does the concept of declaring of war need updating?

What was the original constitutional intent?

Should Congress hold additional hearings on such matters, or merely let the "teach-ins" serve as a platform for debate on foreign policy?

If hearings should be held, which committees should be involved?

What is Congress proper role today in these areas of foreign policy and undeclared war, in view of the advent of nuclear weaponry and the modern technology of warfare and the need for centralized control and decisionmaking?

Is the normal authorization and appropriation process sufficient and/or is it being utilized adequately, to fill the desirable congressional role in this area?

Is Congress effectively exercising its power of appropriation to involve sufficiently the Representative branch of the Federal Government in the basic issues underlying our foreign commitments—and a declaration of war is only one point on the spectrum in this regard?

Is the congressional check on Executive action in the increasingly important area of intelligence, counterinsurgency, and covert military operations adequate?

With the improbability of wars on the scale of 19th and early 20th century conflicts and the increasing likelihood of so-called cold war wars, and the resulting use of programs of counterinsurgency, do we need to define the various war situations that we are likely to face and evaluate the desirable congressional role—which might vary considerably—in each?

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the world is constantly changing. Even meanings of words are continuously changing. I do not pretend to know the answers to the questions I have raised. Nor do I make any specific observations or recommendations with respect to current U.S. foreign policy. Rather, I am raising these questions in the sincere hope that your committee will consider, and hopefully shed some light on this question of Congress and its role in the foreign and military activities of the Federal Government—a matter I believe to be of great significance to the Nation and our system of government.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my remarks. Let me thank you and the members of this committee for giving me this opportunity to make these comments concerning the Congress, an arm of Government for which I have such deep respect.

Certainly, the future of the Congress and to a major extent the success of our Government rest in your hands and in the ability of the Members of this Congress to come to grips aggressively and creatively with the problems of our time: The people of the country will be grateful to you and the Congress for making this effort on behalf of our system of Government.

Congress must be able to do more than merely nod "yes" or "no" to presidential proposals—whether out of apelike obedience or uninformed obstinacy. For our system to bring forth the best solutions to the increasingly complex national and international problems, Members of Congress must have the assistance to gather and the time to study information on the important issues, relatively free of nonlegislative details, as well as the desire, imagination, and courage to enact constructive programs for the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I will be pleased to discuss these comments further if members of the committee have questions.

THE UNTIDY SOCIETY—COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY BY ITS PRESIDENT, DR. PAUL MILLER

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Paul Miller, president of West Virginia University, is one of the Nation's outstanding educators. His address to members of the graduating class at West Virginia University this last Memorial Day contains a message for all of us who, whether we like it or not, belong to "The Untidy Society."

In his address, Dr. Miller departed from the usual form of commencement speeches, to spell out what he meant by "The Untidy Society." Unfortunately, I could not be present for this commencement activity at my alma mater, but William D. Evans, veteran editor of the Fairmont, W. Va., Times, who did attend, said there was a capacity audience. Editor Evans described the audience reaction in this way:

> Yet from the very beginning his [Mr. Miller's] address gripped the audience, and at its close there was a spontaneous ovation.

I believe you can see why this address would grip an audience and why West Virginia University is so fortunate to have such an outstanding man as Dr. Miller as its president.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks this outstanding address by this outstanding educator:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY BY PAUL AUSBORN MILLER, PRESIDENT

My remarks as the president of the university to the graduates are captioned "the Untidy Society." They help me join an illustrious company of people who struggle to capture the meaning and grandeur of American life at this moment in its history. The struggle has become a national vogue. Our President sets forth a vision of the Great Society. Professor Galbraith shared with us his now classic "the Affluent Society." Economist Robert Thobald speaks gloomingly of "the Cybernated Society." Michael Harrington stirred us anew to rediscover American poverty with "the Invisible Society." Most commencement speeches this year would collapse without reference to "the Industrial Society," and in our churches we are sometimes uneasily alerted to the possibility of "the Post-Christian Society."

Within this company I propose to take a place. My gift is "the Untidy Society." Its only claim as a slogan is that it is more precise. You can see "the Untidy Society." You can't really see the others. You have to guess at their meaning, but not mine. To repeat, I give you "the Untidy Society."

It is a society with a penchant for piling up beer cans in public parks. Its streams serve both excretion and consumption. Its people tolerate the intake of strontium 90, acid fumes, and smoke. It doesn't seem to mind the gleaming dead bellies of fish in its rivers and lakes. It will do no more than grumble over dirty sidewalks. It knows how to chew up land for a fast buck and how to spew out tracts of monotonous houses, dumps, and sliced-off hill tops. As I say, you can see "the Untidy Society." Sometimes, too, you can smell it.

You can fly over it at more than the speed of sound, yet inch your way for hours to get to your place of work. It is a society in which vandals will knock every window from your house within a week after you vacate it. It has ways of getting people to buy things they don't need, and the items are carefully planned to wear out. It needs junkyards in handy places, and markets to promote the widespread sale of imitations. Years ago it chopped up its frontier because it was only passing through. Today it despoils the countryside and turns cities into urban jungles because it won't take the time to love them. As you can see, "the Untidy Society" isn't very abstract.

Its people eat and drink too much and exercise too little. Its amphitheaters outdo those of ancient Rome and Greece as tens of thousands of unfit oldsters sit down to watch increasingly soft youngsters win for them. It will park its automobiles in flower beds rather than walk a city block. To give kicks to an unloved boy, you can be silently stabbed—in a subway, on an open corner, in the heart of a university campus. "The Untidy Society" stages great spectacles about the corruption in public and private life yet produces few great moral advances. It can turn dark-skinned people away at the church door, or use a courtroom to attack civility among men. It can make a ghetto out of the heart of the city and then desert it for suburbia. And if you are its first inhabitants or if your pigment is scarcely average, it can take you a hundred years, to become a citizen. In short, "the Untidy Society" won't pamper you.

Thus, I give you my not-so-verbal creation. It is no sudden wave of bitterness or cynicism which washes over me, but I am indignant. I want you to become the same way: over what we are doing to a beautiful country; over the scars on the face of this precious State. And, especially, I don't want the untidy society to turn into "the Ugly Society."

Now to the question about why such untidyness persists. Fundamentally, we are a very clean people. More than others, we chastise our young over lapses in personal hygiene. Though with an eye to impressing the family next door, we design bathrooms of Babylonian splendor. A giant and still-growing industry traffics in mouthwashes, deodorants, and bubble baths. As individuals we seem truly antiseptic.

We ought to know enough to be tidy. Our society abounds in knowledge—literally mountains of it. We produce knowledge for the second and third time because we don't know that it was produced the first time. We once worried about remembering facts, but now the problem is to remember the publications in which they are found. No, though we speak of knowledge as an industry, not knowing enough isn't at the bottom of our problem.

Since the take at the box office may impress the untidy society, perhaps there is not enough money. This seems doubtful, indeed. A national project of less than a billion dollars gets little publicity. Without blinking we can build a road that ends nowhere. Important as they are, we are rather relaxed about that proposition of the budget which is required to get a man on the moon, or to build dams around the world. The gross national product seems to require two houses for everyone. We will go on the cuff for an Adriatic vacation, for a private airplane or motorboat, for a new tuxedo in junior high, a sports car with wire wheels in senior high. No, too little money isn't the answer.

Perhaps the problem is too big for us. The population count is ahead of estimates. We are engulfed by tons of industrial waste, sludge, detergents, and tissue paper. Maybe it's a matter of hard choice: if you want good jobs and high comfort, it may be asking too much to live in a garden. Yet, because we wanted to do it, we transformed American agriculture. With every passing hour, we add new miracles to the treatment of disease We make machines which do arithmetic better and remember it longer than people. No, the problem of untidyness isn't too big; it is just too unimportant.

Right there is where we begin to get to the cause of the untidy society. Hypnotized by rapid change, we tend to get bored with one thing for very long. Ours is therefore a time of halfway problems and halfway solutions. Also, we lose interest in how the system works. And since it works well only if the people understand it, we collide with one obstacle after another. Here, I believe, we may apprehend the untidy society.

One obstacle comes from the difference between problems and solutions. The problems are general, unspecialized, linked together, interdependent. The solutions are specific, unrelated, and detached. For example, the problem of air pollution involves simultaneously California, New York City, and Detroit; chemistry, profit taking, and effective lobbying; traffic jams, unused technology, apathy, arrogance, and pulmonary emphysema. The solutions are dispersed in special agencies which perform specific tasks, that is, without concern for wholeness. This rift in the nature of problems and solutions is the cause of civic anguish in America.

A second obstacle involves our versatility with hardware and our neglect of institutions. We multiply gadgets faster than we can use them. The imbalance has caused us many problems, but we have been able to buy ourselves out of them. We have assumed that anything could be bought, but this assumption is by now clearly wrong. Not even a billion dollars and more in a national poverty program will transform poor communities unless poor schools based on pastoral memories, courts, and police officers based on frontier standards, and cities now strangulated by antique jurisdictions are transformed to serve modern needs of the urban, corporate community.

A third obstacle is the tragic falling star of State and local government. This demise occurs at a time when the Nation's progress depends upon elaborate cooperation between them and the Federal Government. Tax revenues of the Federal Government exceed the need for them. The opposite is true of State and municipal governments. Today the demand for State and municipal services is great and growing, but the attitude toward new taxes is ususally cold. Meanwhile 6 billion of additional revenues more than the year before flow into the Federal Treasury without earmarked use. Despite nearly a hundred major State universities, and many State colleges and institutes, Washington knows far better than the States how to use brains. The real "brain-drain" is not from Europe to America but from the States and cities to the Federal Government.

The fourth obstacle lies with our preference for listening with greater attention to the claims of private interests than to those of public interests. None of us would deny the importance of outspoken private positions with reference to the country's development. May they continue. Yet, from Hollywood to Madison Avenue, by every conceivable medium of influence, the individual is asked to think, to buy, and to act in some prescribed way. The individual—except through the occasional ballot box—isn't always able to talk back, to do a bit of prescribing on his own. It grows difficult to mount a genuine public offensive. If you don't like the smell of your nearby river, what do you do about it? The answer is not uncommonly enveloped in mystery.

There are no easy answers to "the Untidy Society," nor to any other kind of society, name it what you will. But my remarks this morning were selected and now shared with you because it is important for the graduates of 1965 to sense that just now our country is turning from its historic interest in standard of living to one of manner of living. The graduates will depart at a time when a new indignation is stirring the hearts of the American people. May each of you give them the leadership of reason and passionate concern. Last week a White House Conference on Natural Beauty was held for the first time. Both at home and abroad, new and enlarged efforts are underway with the basic rights of citizens, with poverty, wilderness areas, and urban renewal. May you help keep them from being mere flirtations with programs. Due to the vision and persistence of our State leaders, West Virginia continues to brush up its remarkable beauty. West Virginians today are more committed to children—to new educational opportunity, "Headstart," and mental health clinics. And people are everywhere listening to the young adults who sometimes faultily but nevertheless resolutely expose how an older generation failed to practice what it preached. The sit-ins, freedom marches, teach-ins, the Peace Corps, all are indicative of a growing commitment to social change.

Yet, "the Untidy Society" will make it difficult for you to be a participant. It will try to make you a spectator. It will have you parrot scraps of information without any grand design. It can influence even whole universities. How else may one explain magnificent campuses surrounded by extremism, the worst slums in the Nation, and haphazardly planned communities. Perhaps you may better appreciate now why I am so determined to enlarge the public obligation of this university. Whether as graduates, faculties, or whole universities, we may learn from Whitehead when he said: "A merely informed man is the most useless bore on God's earth."

Someday you will agree that it makes little difference whether your diploma reads engineering, law, English, or medical technology. The true difference will deal with the flash of understanding you may have in the future about how unchained to history the revolution of the inevitability of changes has become; and the difference, too, of whether you will meet this understanding, hopefully out of some residue gained at West Virginia University, with a personal style for knowing what makes a good man or woman, what goes into a good community, into good government, into good music and art, into good human relationships.

I hope you will realize that slogans about whole societies always are too imprecise and stereotyped. And so it is with "the Untidy Society." Instead of labels for the entire society, let us together express and understand the need for continual social renewal and innovation, for public awareness of community, for hope and enlightened change, for style of living.

Listen now to John Gardner, who himself has struggled to capture the meaning of our society:

"The renewal of societies can go forward only if someone cares. * * * Apathetic men accomplish nothing. Men who believe in nothing change nothing for the better. They renew nothing and heal no one, least of all themselves.

We proceed now with the awarding of degrees. May it be remembered as an act in our lives which prepared us for choosing the excellent from the merely unusual, the eternal from the merely traditional.

GOODBY TO GUNS

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to stampede Congress into enacting tight restrictions on the sales of guns, some proponents seek to minimize the importance of old-fashioned artillery warfare in the age of nuclear capability. This sophistry persists despite the hand-to-hand fighting raging in Vietnam and the recent experience in the Dominican Republic where only the accurate marksmanship of our fighting men prevented snipers and guerrillas from taking a far greater toll of American lives.

Men and boys trained in the use of firearms have formed the nucleus of this country's defenders from the days of our early settlers. Sharpshooting pioneers picked off and drove off enemies in the forests as civilization moved west, and ambitious European powers finally surrendered their designs to territory in this sprawling land when it became evident that no aggressor could match our determined and talented militia.

Training that came from shooting squirrels and bears and birds made the difference when this young Nation's hopes were dimmed as the British moved toward New Orleans as 1814 slipped into history. Andrew Jackson assembled a strange assortment of volunteers of every description, but among them were mountaineers from Tennessee and Kentucky who knew how to use rifles. When Britain's most experienced soldiers marched into battle, those mountain boys cut them down "like wheat before the mower," according to historian Glenn Tucker. In 5 awful minutes 795 officers and men were struck down by the deadly fire.

In World Wars I and II, military officials responsible for shaping volunteers into capable and methodical foot soldiers found vital assistance in those with experience in the use of guns. By now big guns and bombers were taking their place in modern warfare, but in no way was the role of the infantryman diminished. What lies ahead for the world is an uncertainty of awesome proportion, but even the most tyrannical despots in Moscow and Peiping may recognize that a nuclear attack would bring total destruction to both sides.

This morning I testified in the Committee on the Judiciary against a bill which I consider unnecessarily restrictive of gun sales. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that objectivity has been driven akilter by the unfortunate and unforgettable assassination of President Kennedy. Too many persons are losing sight of the fact that our beloved President was killed by a Communist who never should have been readmitted to this country. Instead of placing the whole blame for this dastardly crime on guns, Congress could do well to check on whether it is still possible for a terrorist of the type of Oswald to enter the United States and be free to roam and to kill.

With permission of my colleagues, I should like to insert in the Record the following editorial from the Record-Outlook of McDonald, Pa., of May 13, 1965:

GOODBY TO GUNS?

Because big cities like New York cannot cope with their crime problems the Johnson administration is busy trying to remove all guns from the Great Society.

There is not a single reason why a drug addict, a known criminal, or a young punk should own a gun. But that is no reason why a farm boy shouldn't be allowed to potshoot a woodchuck on his own farm without having to get a permit from the Secretary of the Treasury.

Connecticut's Senator Thomas J. Dodd has introduced S. 1592 in the Senate as a perfect example of how rural America under reapportionment will suffer for the sins of cities. Under S. 1592, the Secretary would have the power to impose registration of all firearms. The history of registration all over the world has been confiscation and the end of recreational shooting.

The big cities have a crime problem alright. But that is no reason to penalize more than 20 million law-abiding citizens who hunt and shoot for fun. Hunters pour $1.5 billion a year into the national economy, much of it in rural areas.

If the city people would spend more time on outdoor recreation, their crime rate would drop. J. J. Jones, the jailer of Knox County, Tenn., found that out of 10,000 inmates less than 2 percent had owned a fishing or hunting license. Judge William G. Long, of Seattle juvenile court, who heard 45,000 cases over a 20-year period, says that not one of the boys or girls that came before him had a wholesome outdoor hobby.

There are nearly 20,000 Federal, State, county, and city firearms laws already on the books. If they are properly enforced, the Secretary does not need the power to disarm sportsmen. But if the people do not complain to their Senators and Representatives, their right to own and use firearms will be taken away.

LABOR PRESS RILES BEN

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Akron Beacon-Journal is one of the very outstanding newspapers in my State and while this city is in the district of my good friend and colleague, Bill Ayres, there is a considerable following for this paper in my district, too. The editor of the Beacon-Journal is Ben Maidenburg who wrote a cogent analysis of some of the slanted labor periodicals which extol the virtues of socialism-liberalism and attack conservatism-free enterprise with the persistent staccato of an airhammer. In fact, Ben just plain got riled after reading one of them but then I will leave it to his own words. Their weekly organs of opinion are a classic example of the "big lie" technique.

He makes a very telling point. Labor periodicals because of their bias are not in the same class as the free, professional press. Every newspaper editorializes to some extent but the responsible press distinguishes between fact and opinion. The labor press tends to write news columns like they are appealing to a sixth grade dropout and usually offend the sensibilities of most intelligent workingmen. The AFL–CIO News and Views which is published weekly in Columbus, Ohio, is a good example of this. Its weekly columns smear Senator Lausche, Bill Ayres, demean all Republicans and conservatives and present a viewpoint which is so narrow that it can be called little more than yellow sheet journalism.

Thanks, Ben, for your fine article in the May 30, 1965, Akron Beacon-Journal which is a responsible analysis of irresponsible news reporting. The article is as follows:

[From the Akron Beacon-Journal, May 30, 1965]

LABOR PRESS RILES BEN—WITH MYTHS AND FABLES

(By Ben Maidenburg)

Recently one of the national news magazines devoted some comment to the "growing up" of the labor press—meaning the periodicals published by individual unions for their members.

It is true that, barring a few, the union publications have improved beyond words, technically. Typographically they are far more attractive. They publish medical advice and legal advice columns, and so forth.

But aside from a scant few they still indulge themselves in reporting that is so far out, and so slanted that it makes the leaning tower of Pisa the straightest building in the world.

I don't expect these labor newspapers to cheer the boss man. After all, eliminate the hostility factor and there'd be a frittering away of union membership.

Even where there is a relatively good contract, when there can be a fine relationship between the union and management, the labor press keeps picking at the boss. The wise union leader knows the score.

All this being a fact of life, I still don't dig the union editors printing goop that must make the membership rather ill in the stomach.

I rather think that $99\frac{44}{100}$ percent of the union members are quite intelligent, well read, and up on their economics today.

And constantly peddling them pap like "The boss is always wrong," etc., can only have the effect of the members slowly but surely discounting all the news comment.

I get a lot of union papers and read them rather carefully. I might interpose here that the United Rubber Workers weekly, edited by George Scriven, is one of the better publications.

The other day there came to me a copy of the Machinist which is published in behalf of the members of the International Association of Machinists (IAM).

It is a good looking, and technically well put together weekly. But the content. There's hardly a week that something in the Machinist doesn't cause me to hold my nose.

For example, some boasting that went on in a recent issue: Under the heading "Union at Work" is the story of some goings-on at Sellersville, Pa. I'll quote the Machinist word for word and ask you whether the union should have boasted of this, or been ashamed:

"Union auto mechanics at Sellersville, Pa., have found a way to boost the union's radio program 'World of Labor.' They are tuning car radios to WNPV, the nearby Landsdale station broadcasting the labor program.

"John Gallagher, president of IAM Lodge 1092, reports that auto mechanics have been asked to preset that station on all car radios they install or service. The lodge has also enlisted the aid of area radio repairmen and service station operators.

"The idea of enlisting the cooperation of the auto mechanics to build the listening audience for the IAM broadcasts originated with IAM Vice President P. L. (Roy) Siemiller, of Chicago. He is asking cooperation from auto mechanics' lodges in every city where the 'Voice of Labor' can be heard."

What I'd like to ask Mr. Gallagher is this:

Would it be OK with him if the National Association of Manufacturers got the repair lads to fix the car radios so that the listener would have to search for the "Voice of Labor"?

I'd like to ask: What consarned business of his is it to monkey with anyone's car radio?

In this same issue of the Machinist there is a wad of propaganda in favor of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This is the section of the Federal labor laws which permits States to pass laws barring the enforced union shop. The Taft-Hartley Act already bars the closed shop.

The closed shop forces union membership on the employee immediately when he goes to work. The union shop causes the worker to join the union within, say, 30 or 60 or 90 days after taking the job.

Section 14(b) is better known as the right-to-work law. This title is pure nonsense. For 14(b) neither gives one the right to work nor deprives him of it.

They tried to pass a right-to-work law in Ohio some years ago. The Beacon-Journal opposed the law, and the voters bashed the brains out of the effort.

Right now, 19 States have RTW laws. Most of these States are in the Southland, where unions, historically, have never been allowed much oxygen. There has been more hogwash spilled in the name of right to work than anything in the recent history of the United States.

The Machinist proclaims that RTW laws hold back union organizing and bargaining.

Certainly the RTW laws don't make it easier for the union. But look at it another way. No union has a God-given right to existence, any more than a manufacturer is fully protected against going broke.

If the majority of workers want a union, that certainly is their privilege. But if an employee doesn't want to join, he, too, has some rights. Workers in a RTW State still can have a union if they want it.

But the "force" being removed, it makes the job of organizing more difficult for the union.

So in a nub it is up to the union to sell its wares, just as it is up to the employer to sell his tin cans.

The IAM's the Machinist publishes some "myths" about RTW and also some "facts." An example:

"Myth: RTW laws protect civil rights and widen the job opportunities of Negroes and other minorities."

"Fact: The high-sounding labor law provides no civil rights, no employment rights or any other right. In all 50 States the boss does the hiring. Most of the RTW States are in the South. Did RTW help? Actually, RTW helps block union contracts which provide job security, seniority, and other protection for all workers. The most active supporters of these (RTW) laws are the most violent opponents of equal rights and equal opportunity."

Such unabashed drivel. Of course, RTW provides no civil rights. But there it ends.

Is it true that the boss does all the hiring? In some cases, yes. In many cases, no.

Some industries have union hiring halls. There are other devices which amount to about the same thing. In these, if you want a carpenter or bricklayer you call the union and it sends out the men. So the business about the boss hiring all the employees is rather at odds with all the facts.

Civil rights? What a laugh.

If repeal of RTW would make jobs for Negroes and other minorities, then how come so many Negro organizations are constantly picketing building sites?

Answer. Because the Negroes have not been able to get into so many unions. Minus the union card, there is no job.

There is no question but that unions provide security for the individual. But security for the man or woman is the only reason for any union's existence.

Now, when the International Association of Machinists argues that with RTW eliminated there will be more jobs for minorities, I'd like to have a couple of statistics: How many members are there in the IAM and how many are Negroes?

And I point the finger not only at the IAM, but ever so many unions—unions which fight off apprenticeship programs that could make jobs not only for Negroes but whites as well.

You'd be surprised how many unions claim the right to provide the workmen, but who, because of dilatory apprenticeship programs, just do not do it.

And why? Simple. It builds in overtime.

And now we come to the charge that most active enemies of the repeal of RTW are also enemies of civil rights. More garbage.

Some employers fall into that category, for sure. The largest majority of employers would rather work with a union that is strong; with a union that can control individuals who fire up wildcat strikes; with a union that can act according to law and with a union not beset with internal political problems that hinder efforts of the union officers to carry out their duties.

In the same issue the Machinist tries to draw wages parallels between the 19 RTW States, and the others.

In 1964, says the IAM paper, the national average income was $2,550. In the RTW States, the average was $2,093. (Interesting enough was that Nevada, a RTW State, ranked third highest in the Nation with $3,248.)

The Machinist points the low-average-wage finger at Mississippi, Arkansas, South Carolina, Alabama, Georgia, Utah, and South Dakota as sorry examples of RTW States.

What the paper ignores blithely is that these States are primarily agricultural and that it would take an earthquake to change them.

You want a second sample of "labor news"?

Take the May 1965, issue of the Teamster. It discusses the taxidriver election in Chicago at long length and flays an opposition union unmercifully.

But the Teamster in no spot mentions that the real key to the Chicago affair was one Joey Glimco, onetime head of the taxi union, and a gentleman with quite a record.

Did the Teamster expect that, not having mentioned Brother Glimco, the members would mentally sweep the name under the carpet?

Another sample: In the current issue of News and Views, the voice of the Ohio AFL–CIO, the editor talks of the proposed fair housing bill before the Ohio Legislature.

Some Republicans on the Senate Rules Committee have been in favor of a lesser version of fair housing than others want.

News and Views says the new Republican State chairman, John Andrews, was addressing a Negro political organization in Columbus (quoting News and Views) "as if the audience wasn't aware of what his party was up to a few yards down the street at the State House." This made reference to the opposition within the Senate Rules Committee.

In other words, if four or five members of the Republican Party were against something, it was the Republican Party which was against it, according to this union newspaper.

I wonder how News and Views would react if we paraphrased the article and said, "While Lyndon B. Johnson was urging the civil rights law in his address, he wasn't aware of what his Democratic Party was up to down the street." Referring, of course, to a hardly imaginary situation where a group of hard-shell southern Democrats in Congress were opposing the civil rights law.

In other words, if a Republican does it, it is the Republican Party. If a Democrat does it, it is only the one Democrat.

Well let's have a smile.

At a party at her home the daughter of a pillar of society was singing the plaintive "Carry Me Back to Old Virginee." An elderly man, one of the guests, bowed his head and wept.

The hostess was quite touched. She put her hand on his shoulder and asked, gently, "Pardon me, sir, are you a Virginian?"

"No, madam," he replied, "I'm a musician."

PHONY, FILTHY DEMONSTRATORS BELONG IN JAIL

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, last week I was privileged to sit as a member of the special subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities which conducted hearings in Chicago. As usual the protesters were present and poured out their venom against HCUA. In one sense, it was almost amusing to observe the picket lines since, judging from their statements and jeers, so few of the demonstrators appeared to really have any knowledge of the issues involved. They were just against. Men like Gil Green, once head of the Communist Party in Illinois, and Frank Wilkinson, head of the national anti-HCUA group were there fanning the flames.

One of Chicago's news reporters, Jack Mabley, observed firsthand the machinations of these pickets and wrote a collum entitled "Phony, Filthy Demonstrators Belong in Jail." Mr. Mabley is not exactly a booster of HCUA, but he could not stomach the beatniks. I include this column at this point in the RECORD along with an article from the Chicago Tribune:

[From the Chicago's American, May 27, 1965]

PHONY, FILTHY DEMONSTRATORS BELONG IN JAIL

(By Jack Mabley)

I respectfully suggest that the judge who hears the cases of the beatnik pickets who spit at law and order stop babying these bums and throw them in jail.

Chicago is infested with a gang of filthy, immature, arrogant, troublemaking professional pickets, male and female, who are doing grave damage to liberal causes.

Presently they have latched onto the demonstrations against the House Un-American Activities Committee. If they're loose this summer they'll be demonstrating against segregated housing and against the Chicago school system.

The most immediate benefit to the community would be giving these people a good scrubbing at the county jail.

Maybe physical filth has nothing to do with abolishing the HUAC, but it does affect public relations, and from the way these pickets ham it up for the TV cameras, I assume public relations is part of their program.

This is not intended to condemn all who are arrested. But there are a few who turn up repeatedly in court. They are contemptuous of law and order. They are treated with kid gloves by the judges, who give them a wrist tap and send them out to their next cop kicking.

There are proper ways to petition one's grievances and express one's dissent. Placing oneself above the law—saying your moral law supersedes the laws of the land—is not proper. It sabotages law and order. Those individuals who repeatedly practice it should be severely penalized.

This has never been more apparent than during the demonstrations at the hearings of the HUAC.

There was one man marching in the picket line whom very few realized was present.

He is Gil Green, a Communist. Green once was head of the party in Illinois. I have a certain admiration for Green, as much as I disagree with his political beliefs. He never has weaseled. He stands up for what he believes.

He had more justification for being in the picket line than anyone else. Green served 5½ years in Federal prison because of his political beliefs. The Federal action was in violent conflict with my conception of the principles on which this Nation was founded.

Along with the bums and beatniks in the picketing were many clergymen. It's hard to tell the priests from the ministers because the ministers put on their clerical collars for these demonstrations.

There were many decent, law-respecting students from Chicago colleges and from Wisconsin and Michigan. There were teachers and professors, businessmen, housewives.

Orderly picketing is a traditional American way of demonstrating dissent. So is passing out handbills. Many signed petitions. Dr. Jeremiah Stamler of the board of health demonstrated respect for due process by bringing suit in Federal court seeking to stop the hearings.

But the decent and proper, and bathed, protesters all were smeared by the contemptible action of the beatniks who fancy themselves so right and so just that they are above the law.

They are cheap exhibitionists. Knowingly or unknowingly, they are doing the handiwork of the Communist conspiracy, which seeks to destroy the strength of America. This strength is built on proper function of the law and of the courts.

These troublemakers belong in jail, and it's time a Chicago judge had the guts to put them there.

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 28, 1965]

Thirty-nine Arrested at House Hearing: Protesters Throw Cops to Ground in Attack

(By Thomas Powers)

Thirty-nine persons were arrested by city police and Federal marshals yesterday in clashes inside and outside the hearing room of the House Committee on Un-American Activities at 1212 Lake Shore Drive.

Demonstrators against the committee were thwarted in an attempt to intercept a police car carting five of their fellows off to jail, and others failed in an attempt to break through police lines into the hearing room.

SPLASHED WITH PAINT

A score of demonstrators knocked sawhorse barricades aside, knocked police to the ground, and were wrestled down themselves in the assault on the front entrance of the old U.S. Court of Appeals Building where the committee was winding up 3 days of hearings.

A plastic bag filled with red paint was tossed into the air and landed among the pickets, spattering many of them, as well as policemen and a few newspaper reporters and cameramen.

Fifteen or twenty of the pickets carried signs supporting the committee with such statements as "Nothing to hide, nothing to fear" and "Better brave than slave."

BEGIN TO SING

The anticommittee demonstrators got rolling when four women spectators in the hearing room stood and began singing while the committee was trying to question a witness. Deputy U.S. marshals dragged them to the back door of the building on Stone Street.

Fifty demonstrators ran to the intersection of Division and Stone Streets, apparently expecting the police wagon with the prisoners to head south to the Chicago Avenue station. Instead, the police went north on a circuitous route, thwarting the pickets, who apparently intended to stop the police car and throw themselves under the vehicle.

GO THROUGH UNDERPASS

Meanwhile, a score of other demonstrators, mostly members of the Congress on Racial Equality and the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, who had been meeting on the lakeside shore of Lake Shore drive, came through an underpass to the front of the building.

As the red paint burst among the demonstrators they charged the police lines. Some policemen were bowled over. The barricades were knocked down. One demonstrator got as far as the entrance when a policeman wrestled him to the ground.

Eleven of those arrested were taken to the U.S. marshal's office in the Federal building. They are:

Jonathan Birnbaum, 19, of 1005 East 60th Street, a student; Julanne Tyler, 18, of 1634 East 53d Street, who also was arrested Wednesday; Lenora Davis, 16, of 5718 Kimbark Avenue, a student; Daniel Stern, 31, of 5455 Blackstone Avenue; Garfield Harris, 21, of 6141 Greenwood Avenue, a student; Robert Brown, 24, of 1369 East 50th Street, a laborer; Beth Skinner, 16, of 1355 East 55th Place, a student; Barbara Fischer, 14, of 1316 Madison Park, and her sister, Katherine, 15, both students; Barbara Miller, 17, of 675 East Oakwood Boulevard, a student; and Beth Jaffe, 20, of 756 East Oakwood Boulevard.

TAKEN TO LOCKUP

Taken to the women's lockup in police headquarters at 1121 South State Street were Barbara Switzer, 20, of 2057 Sheffield Avenue; Katherine DeLacy, 22 of 6101 Ellis Avenue; Shiela Hite, 18, of 1355 East 55th Place, who also was arrested yesterday, an unidentified 17-year-old girl and an unidentified 16-year-old girl.

Taken to the East Chicago Avenue station lockup were Michael N. Anderson, 19, of 501 East 37th Place; Patrick S. Hunter, 19, of 3124 Prairie Avenue; Stephen D. Starkweather, 20 of 1531 Wellington Avenue; Frank M. Martin, 29, of 1369 East 50th Street; Eric D. Joseph, 21, of 5528 Greenwood Avenue; John P. Slocum, 18, of 5514 University Avenue; David Vigoda, 18, of 1005 East 60th Street; Thomas Gregier, 22, of 114 Crest Street, Bartlett; Derik S. Faeger, 21, of 627 Rohdale Circle, Lombard; John Montonegro, 16, of 5429 Winthrop Avenue; Joel D. Silvers, 60, of 5605 Drexel Boulevard; Robert W. Hickler, 20, of 5514 University Avenue; Sol Golden, 23, of 5429 Ridgewood Court; Robert S. Scheir, 21, of 5470 Cornell Avenue; John W. Dovard, 20, of 1628 North Linder Avenue; James Morris III, 18, of 5137 Ingleside Avenue; Robert H. Sherwood, 22, of 1531 Wellington Avenue; Earl W. Silbar, 23, of 5478½ Woodlawn Avenue; Terrence Ford, 20, of 2216 Cleveland Street; Jay P. Greenberg, 23, of 4933 Ellis Avenue; Lowen Belman, 23, of 1442 Sedgwick Street; Erick T. Chester, 22, of Royal Oak, Mich.; and Kenneth L. Burg, 23, of 5537 Hyde Park Boulevard.

Federal authorities said those taken to the marshal's lockup would be charged with interfering with the proceedings of a governmental body, a felony. Adults taken to city lockups were to be charged with disorderly conduct.

MOUNTAIN HOME

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my good fortune to have among the many assets in my district the second largest Veterans' Administration center in the United States—Mountain Home.

Sunday, May 30, 1965, Dr. Joseph H. McNinch, a great American, a man who has spent his life in the service of our country, delivered the Memorial Day address to a vast throng of Memorial Day visitors in Memorial Park at the center.

Dr. McNinch served the Armed Forces well and during his service received many awards, including the Distinguished Service Medal, Bronze Star, and Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster. He retired from the Medical Corps, U.S. Army, with the rank of major general in 1962 to become director of research, American Hospital Association, and in June 1963 accepted the appointment of Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration.

His address was timely and was received with great interest by all and I would like to share his stirring message with my colleagues and all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Dr. McNinch was introduced by Col. Lee B. Harr, who is doing an outstanding job as center director. I feel that Mountain Home is one of the best operated VA facilities in the United States and Colonel Harr, his staff, and all of the personnel there are to be commended for the fine work they are doing.

Memorial Day Speech at the Mountain Home VA Center by Dr. Joseph H. McNinch

Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to speak to you on this solemn occasion—when all the Nation joins together on Memorial Day to honor our heroic dead.

Today, I am going to begin my talk by reading a list of names—American names like Keokuk, Fort Scott, and Salisbury—and foreign names, like Belleau Wood, Meuse-Argonne, and Mexico City.

Listen to this list—

Mobile and Sitka, Barrancas and Baltimore, New Bern, Woodlawn, and Long Island.

Carthage, Golden Gate, Henri-Chapelle.

Florence, Italy and Florence, S.C.

Beaufort, Brittany, Bellicourt, Brest, and Balls Bluff.

Seven Pines, Luxembourg, Manila, Kemmel, Montfaucon, Montsec, Mound City.

Little Rock, Rock Island, Cold Harbor, and Fort Bliss.

What is this list—with its names, some harsh, some smooth like pebbles rolling on the bed of a trout stream?

And why am I reading a list of place names to you—today—of all days—on Memorial Day?

Well, let me add three more names to that list and you will see why: Arlington, Gettysburg, Flanders Field.

Yes, my friends, these are the names of national cemeteries here in America—and our military cemeteries and memorials on foreign soil. As the late President Kennedy once said, "No nation in the history of the world has buried its soldiers farther from its native soil than we Americans—or buried them closer to the towns in which they grew up."

Some of these cemeteries are like the Flanders Field in McCrae's poem: "the poppies blow, neath the crosses row on row * * * For as far as the eye can see, there are none but the stark, white muteness of crosses, broken here and there with a fallen Star of David."

Other cemeteries have a more varied pattern—there are the crosses, or white markers hundreds and hundreds, and a central monument, or perhaps many monuments, all trying to say something monumental and memorable about the monumental and memorable deeds of those who rest beneath that sod, those who made that most monumental and memorable of sacrifices.

In speaking of cemeteries, I am reminded that 4 years ago today I had the honor to give a Memorial Day address at a cemetery which I have not listed, St. Mihiel in France. On that day, the thing that impressed me most was the manner in which the French citizens of that tiny rural community joined with us in paying honor to the American dead of World War I. These were not officials of a great government, but the farmers, small shopowners, and village officials who lived in and near St. Mihiel, whose homes were defended long ago by the American heroes buried in that cemetery. One sensed that they still remembered—and appreciated—that America had come to the defense of their liberty.

Today, I want to talk to you about two other monuments to their sacrifice—the significant monuments, the unmarked monuments, the monuments that we really celebrate on this Memorial Day.

The first monument to the nearly 1 million men who gave their lives in the 8 wars—from the Revolution to the Korean conflict—in which our Nation has been engaged is found in the central, simple fact that there is a United States of America. Perhaps that is putting it a little too strongly, perhaps if our veterans had not fought and died for America we might still exist as a small, weak country, hemmed in by powerful enemies. But the United States as we know it today—the mightiest nation on earth—that United States would not exist.

The other monument is as old as the breakup of the colonial empire of Spain, as new as the newest country in Africa. For if American fighting men had not won liberty for themselves and protected it for others many of the new nations, many of the oldest, would still live under colonial domination. Our success in maintaining liberty here at home, our ability to extend and protect it abroad, has meant that the wave of liberty has been the wave of the future since 1776.

The material existence of these United States—the spiritual existence of the ideas of freedom and liberty—these are the two monuments erected over the graves of our veterans—whether they lie in their village churchyard, in one of the many national cemeteries, or in an unknown, unmarked grave in one of a thousand battlefields.

But these two majestic monuments pertain not only to the one million American war dead, they pertain not only to the millions who felt in their bodies the cold steel of war, they also pertain with equal force to 22 million living veterans. For all veterans, living and dead, share the glory of the very existence of our country and the fact that liberty and freedom rather than philosophies based on greed and hate, are capable of moving men to great deeds, of filling men with hope.

On Memorial Day the Nation takes time to salute the men and women—living and dead—responsible for these two great monuments. Fortunately, the great majority of the 31½ million who fought in our wars, the vast majority are alive today. Thus, the Nation is in a fortunate position of being able to show its gratitude, in a concrete way, to living American veterans. And, of course, the Nation has responded generously through symbolic occasions such as this Memorial Day and through providing needed benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration and various State and local programs.

Let me tell you about some of these benefits.

Now I am a physician, and although I am familiar with the many nonmedical benefits provided to veterans by a grateful nation, I am on more solid ground when I talk about medical subjects.

During the past week, we in VA central office defended our fiscal year 1966 budget submission in the Senate. As you know, we are living in an age of great medical progress. This progress is reflected in that budget. It will support these new medical benefits for America's veterans.

The activation of three new modern hospitals: Washington, D.C., Charleston, S.C., and Atlanta, Ga.

The care of veterans in the first 2,000 VA-operated nursing care beds.

Eight million dollars to pay for care of veterans in public and private nursing homes.

Four more outpatient activities for veterans with nervous and emotional problems.

Provision of free drugs to veterans receiving aid and attendance funds.

Establishment of more general medical and surgical units in our mental hospitals.

The establishment of 13 centers where heart surgery will be available for veterans with valvular heart disease. As a result of research in physiology, surgery, the chemistry of plastics, and hemodynamics, it is possible in many patients to replace the wornout human valve with a plastic valve which works efficiently and adds years of useful, happy life.

Establishment of special units in 26 hospitals for treatment of veterans with chronic lung diseases.

Action to establish a second blind rehabilitation center in San Francisco.

Operate the first 11 or 12 centers of a final number of 43, where patients with chronic kidney disease can be treated with an artificial kidney.

Thus, I can report to you that our Government not only recognizes its responsibility to honor its heroic dead, but also recognizes its obligation to bring to the living veteran the benefits of the miracles of modern medicine. We in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, with the resources made available by a generous Congress, shall continue to dedicate ourselves to participate in the discovery of those miracles and to incorporate them into the medical care provided to the American veteran.

Mr. Speaker, the complete program of the service at the VA Center, Mountain Home, held at 3 p.m. Sunday, May 30, was as follows:

MEMORIAL DAY—VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CENTER, MOUNTAIN HOME, JOHNSON CITY, TENN.

Sunday, May 30, is Memorial Day—a day set aside by the Congress of the United States for commemoration of our soldier and sailor dead.

At 3 p.m. that day, the public is cordially invited to join with the members, patients and employees of the Center in paying tribute to our departed comrades.

Dr. Joseph H. McNinch, Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, will be our speaker and guest of honor.

Congressman JAMES H. QUILLEN will represent the ex-servicemen and their families in placing the wreath on the replica of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

The colors will be massed by the service organizations; the Boy Scouts of the Sequoyah Council will decorate the 4,100 graves of our soldier and sailor dead; the Johnson City High School Band and the East Tennessee State University and the Johnson City Community Choirs will bring the message of music.

On Memorial Day we pause to reflect on the memory of our soldier and sailor dead and to rekindle in our hearts those ideals they so gallantly strove to attain. Let us not fail our departed comrades. The obligation is ours to assure that the honored dead shall not have died in vain.

LEE B. HARR,
Center Director.

PROGRAM

Massing of the colors by color guards of service organizations.

"America, the Beautiful," Johnson City High School Band, directed by Prof. W. F. Weddle.

Invocation: Chaplain Roscoe B. Garris.

Variants on "A Mighty Fortress," by Darst; East Tennessee State University Choral Union and Johnson City Community Choirs directed by Dr. Virgil C. Self; Mrs. D. G. Stout, organist; Miss Joan Marler, pianist; Brass Ensemble from ETSU.

Recognition of Gold Star Mothers, distinguished visitors, and introduction of speaker, Lee B. Harr, center director.

Address: Dr. Joseph H. McNinch, Chief Medical Director, Veterans' Administration.

"The Lord Is My Shepherd," by Schubert. East Tennessee State University Choral Union and Johnson City Community Choirs.

Decoration of replica of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, by the Hon. JAMES H. QUILLEN, Congressman, First District of Tennessee.

Salute to the dead.

"Taps."

Benediction: Chaplain Harry T. Wright, with choral response.

"Crossing the Bar," by Barnby, East Tennessee State University Choral Union and Johnson City Community Choirs.

MEMORIAL DAY

Memorial Day is a day devoted to those who have fallen in battle but it's more—it's a day of hope rather than regret—a day to look forward rather than backward.

Memorial Day is the only day in the year when our entire Nation mourns its dead.

Memorial Day is a day of dedication and of memories.

Memorial Day is a day set aside by Congress to allow all of us to search our hearts to make certain that we are really keeping faith with those who gave life itself that we might enjoy the freedom, happiness, and all the spiritual and material blessings we have in such abundance.

Memorial Day is the most beautiful and sacred of our patriotic holidays.

Memorial Day is a day set aside each year that we might pause and again pledge in the words of Abraham Lincoln: "That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

WAR IN BOLIVIA

Mr. **BROCK**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. **GROVER**. Mr. Speaker, a fortnight ago I proposed to the House that it pass a resolution urging the creation of a joint military defense command for the defense of this hemisphere against the expected series of Communist inspired, supported, and activated revolutions, insurrections, and/or invasions.

If unilateral action to implement the Monroe Doctrine, the Johnson-Mann doctrine or whatever protectionist policy—is objectionable to our revolution-prone and defenseless neighbors, then let us band together.

Above all, let no man in this House—or in our country—close his eyes to the obvious, the apparent, the real, and present danger to our Nation's security, which has been the studied objective of the Communists for over a decade—our so-called soft under belly—Latin and South America.

The alarming and dangerous state of affairs, is indicated by this short editorial by Stanley Ross, publisher of the Huntington, N.Y., Times on May 28, 1965.

Mr. Ross, with a wealth of knowledge of hemispheric affairs, states:

WAR IN BOLIVIA

It seems incredible the U.S. Government, with hundreds of CIA agents in every nook and cranny of Latin America, has not yet tumbled onto the fact that the current revolution in Bolivia is Communist China's first attempt to take over a nation in this hemisphere.

We say incredible, because the U.S. State Department has been periodically advised for the past 15 years by experts in the matter, including the present publisher of this newspaper, that Red China has been preparing the terrain in poverty-wracked Bolivia. The Barrientos government may manage to survive the present crises, despite the death and ruin which is spreading like a stain over the face of that unhappy nation. But it will have been dangerously weakened.

We have praised President Johnson's courageous actions in the Dominican crises, and we know he is prepared to do anything necessary to save this hemisphere from international communism. But we shudder to suspect the reasons he is kept uninformed about the recurrent crises in hemispheric affairs until it is almost too late to do anything about them.

STANLEY ROSS,
Publisher.

RACIAL INEQUALITY IN EMPLOYMENT: THE PATTERNS OF DISCRIMINATION

Mr. **BROCK**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. Speaker, racial discrimination as practiced, especially by labor unions, against Negro, Puerto Rican, and other Americans, I have discussed previously in RECORD items—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 2, pages 1569–1572. In continuing to keep the dialog moving on this subject, Herbert Hill, the labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, has written an article which was printed in "The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science"—Philadelphia, volume 357, January 1965, pages 30–47—entitled "Racial Inequality in Employment: The Patterns of Discrimination" which is pertinent now as many people around the country are and should be working on this problem. Under unanimous consent, I insert a summary of that article in the RECORD at this point:

SUMMARY OF "RACIAL INEQUALITY IN EMPLOYMENT: THE PATTERN OF DISCRIMINATION"

(By Herbert Hill)

THE UNEMPLOYMENT CRISIS

The Negro community today is undergoing a serious unemployment crisis. In industrial centers throughout the country more than 50 percent of all the unskilled Negro workers have been unemployed for substantial periods since 1958. Moreover, the Negro worker can look forward only to the prospect of increasing long term unemployment. This is the result of generations of enforced overconcentration of Negroes in the unskilled and menial job classifications. Jobs in these classifications are disappearing at the rate of 35,000 a week or nearly 2 million a year. The holders of these dead-end jobs are a disproportionate number of Negroes and hence the termination of such jobs due to automation and technical innovation creates a corresponding disproportionate displacement of Negro workers.

THE NEGRO IN THE SOUTH

Even though an increase in industrial development has been taking place in the South since the end of World War II there has been little benefit to the Negro worker. The existence of a rigid and systematic pattern of employment discrimination prohibits the Negro from enjoying the fruits of the South's rapid industrial growth. In many industries the percentage of Negroes in the labor force has actually declined in the past 50 years. In 1908 the textile industry in South Carolina employed 9 percent Negroes. This declined to 4.7 percent by 1960.

In other major industries such as automobile manufacturing pulp and paper industries the tobacco industry and the railroads, the gains of the Negro laborer have been extremely limited. The major contributing factor of the problem for Negro workers in southern industry is the operation of separate racial seniority lines in collective bargaining agreements entered into by management and labor unions. Negroes are primarily hired to fill such job classifications as "common laborer" or "yardworker." These are the segregated all-Negro labor departments established by labor-management contracts. The unfortunate result of these segregated departments is that Negroes are denied seniority, promotion rights, and admissions to training programs in the desirable job catagories. Some perpetrators of this segregated system are: the United Papermakers' & Paper Workers Union, the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers' Union, the Tobacco Workers' International, and the International Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen. All of these unions are affiliated with the AFL–CIO.

STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

Another serious obstacle confronting Negro workers is the discriminatory practices of the State employment services. Often job orders are racially designated, and job referrals are made on the basis of race. Under such a system contractors cannot possibly conform with the President's Executive order banning employment discrimination. In addition, the Federal Government itself must bear much of the responsibility as it provides the operating costs of all the State employment services.

Even in the North the operation of State employment services represents a serious obstacle to Negro workers. The State employment services receive funds and awards from the Federal Government based primarily on the number of gross placements made per year. Thus the services are inclined to submit to discriminatory and arbitrary job requirements in referring workers for jobs and in selecting them for job training. A related problem is the usual tacit assumption made by local employment service personnel that there are "white" jobs and "colored" jobs, and the reluctance of these personnel to innovate changes.

In addition the Federal Government fails to alleviate this problem under the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act. Investigations by the NAACP indicate that most programs under this act merely serve to perpetuate the traditional concentration of Negroes in menial and unskilled jobs. There is overt racial discrimination in many training programs while in others it exists under the guise of selecting applicants on the basis of the statutory requirement that there shall be "reasonable expectation of employment." The net effect is to extend and deepen the job gap between the white and Negro workers.

APPRENTICESHIP AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING AND THE ROLE OF LABOR UNIONS

For many occupations the only way that a worker can be recognized as qualified is to successfully complete apprenticeship training programs. In most apprenticeship training programs the role of the labor unions are decisive as the union usually decides who is admitted into training programs and therefore who is admitted to union membership. Unfortunately most unions carefully exclude Negroes from their programs. In fact this tradition of race discrimination has been deeply institutionalized to the point that such apprenticeship arrangements have the appearance of a medieval guild. Examples of craft unions employing such practices are: Plumbers Union, Sheetmetal Workers Union, Electrical Workers' Union, and the Structural Iron Workers' Union.

OTHER RACIAL PRACTICES OF ORGANIZED LABOR

In addition to outright exclusion of Negroes from membership, separate seniority lines in collective bargaining agreements, and refusal to admit qualified Negroes into apprenticeship training, many unions engage in discriminatory practices by maintaining segregated locals within their jurisdictions. These are filled with nonwhites and are known as Jim Crow auxiliaries. Members of these auxiliaries are denied admission into the unions skilled craft locals. The International Ladies Garment Workers' Union has been accused of such practices by the New York State Commission on Human Rights. Also such charges have been leveled against the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters, and the Seafarers International Union.

THE NEED FOR A FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES LAW

The need for a Federal law is acute. There must be a new approach toward the initiation of affirmative action based upon the overall pattern of employment discrimination. The operation of State and municipal commissions have proven unequal to the task. Specifically the ineffectiveness of State and local commissions is due to limited staff and funds, political difficulties, and the fact that they operate mainly as a complaint-gathering body.

In addition the NAACP has concluded that recourse to the national AFL–CIO and its affiliated internationals is also futile as they are either unwilling or unable to act decisively.

The solution sought for by the NAACP involves the development of a new body of labor law. It is hoped that this development follows the position taken by the NLRB in its historic 1964 decision involving the AFL–CIO International Longshoreman's Association in Brownsville, Tex. In that decision the NLRB ruled that racial discrimination by a labor union is an unfair labor practice and that unions may lose their certification as the collective bargaining agent as a result of such practice. This principle, which rules that racial discrimination by a union in its employment practices is a violation of the duty of fair representation under section 9(a) of the NLRA, will have far-reaching consequences if sustained by the Federal courts.

This new standard of legal responsibility for trade unions to represent all workers fairly has importance to all aspects of American life. Without this new standard the civil rights gains of the past 20 years are in danger of being destroyed by the growing crisis of unemployment and underemployment of Negroes. This will have far-reaching consequences for the entire country.

A BILL TO MODERNIZE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OVER THE BUDGETARY PROCESS

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, I am sponsoring a bill to achieve economy in Government by revitalizing the congressional function of reviewing and overseeing the decisions made, and the criteria used, by the executive branch in the preparation of the Federal budget. This bill will allow congressional committees to acquire a greater amount of information and achieve more coordination in reviewing budget requests by supplying all standing committees with General Accounting Office—GAO—reports relating to all areas within their jurisdiction, and also by making available to these congressional committees the comments and requests made by the Federal agencies to the Budget Bureau. It will allow greater congressional control by requiring that the Budget Director and the Deputy Director be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate. Continued congressional awareness of the work and activities of the Bureau of the Budget will be achieved by the provision which requires submission of a detailed report by the Bureau to the Congress. Finally, more coordination between the branches of Congress will be secured by the proposed amendment to the act which created the Joint Economic Committee establishing a permanent subcommittee on the Federal budget and fiscal policy.

All of these reforms are crucial and long overdue. Congress has long since lost its historical function of initiating budgetary policy. It is now in grave danger of being stripped of its supervisory or watchdog role, the loss of which would place the entire budgetary policy in the hands of the executive branch and further sever the ability of the American people to determine where and how their tax money will be spent.

Today Congress has unfortunately all but abrogated its role of overseer. The budget is currently presented to the Congress with a tacit hands off command. In the interest of the American people, Congress ought to be able to review the procedure and decisions made by the Bureau of the Budget and the administration. Instead it is now hampered in this endeavor by lack of cooperation between the authorizing and appropriating bodies. Congressional Appropriation Subcommittees, in general, hear only the witnesses supplied by the administration after the decision has been made, while they also ought to hear the requests, objections to requests, and reasons discussed during the Budget Bureau's decisionmaking process.

This bill is a realistic approach to restoring to the Congress its constitutional position of safeguarding the financial interests of the American people and returning economy to Government.

In this context, I would also call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent booklet written by Dr. John S. Saloma entitled "The Responsible Use of Power: A Critical Analysis of the Congressional Budget Process." Under unanimous consent, I include at this point the "Recommendations for Reforming the Congressional Budgetary System," from that excellent booklet so as to further elucidate the points that need to be made concerning this matter:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REFORMING THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGETARY SYSTEM

The conclusions that emerge from this study are not comprehensive in the sense of providing answers for all the issues raised in the course of the paper. They are not developed as full legislative proposals. But they are advanced as suggestions, for consideration, of practicable means of better equipping the Congress for responsible use of its proper powers in certain important areas of budget control and fiscal policy formulation.

1. CONGRESS SHOULD ESTABLISH A JOINT COMMITTEE ON FISCAL POLICY [1]

Profiting from the experience and criticisms of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget and the proposed Joint Committee on the Budget (McCLELLAN), the new committee should meet the following specifications. It should be streamlined in membership with representation from the four fiscal committees.[2] (Total membership, including representatives from any additional committees, should not exceed 20.) Members need not be the most senior members of their respective committees but should be selected on the basis of experience and interest. They should be men who are "listened to" on their committees—men who have already mastered the art of congressional influence.[3] The strengths and weaknesses of another major congressional experiment—the Joint Economic Committee—can be traced in large part to this factor.

The Joint Committee should not be required to submit a formal legislative budget for congressional enactment. At most it should develop budgetary guidelines to assist the fiscal committees (guidelines that probably would be kept confidential). Primarily, it should provide a forum for continuing congressional consideration of the budget, changing economic and political assumptions on which the budget is based, and the status of authorizations, appropriations, and revenue measures. Its functions should be advisory and informational and should probably include responsibility for several of the proposals listed below. It should be adequately staffed to carry out the functions assigned to it. The temptation must be avoided of giving the committee unrealistic objectives that invite disappointment.

The utilities of a Joint Committee on Fiscal Policy—apart from specific functions it might handle—are several. It would provide a far more effective channel for communication than now exists informally between the Houses and the fiscal committees. This is not an insignificant gain if one considers how infrequently members of various committees testify before other committees on questions concerning the budget. The committee would also provide a means for

---

[1] A similar but less flexible instrument is Arthur Smithies' proposal for a Joint Budget Policy Committee. The leadership of both political parties would be "strongly represented." The new committee also retains the concurrent resolution of the 1946 act but at a later stage in the process, and the concept of the omnibus appropriations bill. Op. cit., pp. 192–97. The Committee for Economic Development has recommended a Joint Budget Policy Conference (without the concurrent resolution provision) whose major functions would be "study of current fiscal policy and consideration of the long-run effects of the budget." Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, "Control of Federal Government Expenditures: A Statement on National Policy" (New York: CED, 1955), pp. 15–16.

[2] Other committees that might be included (perhaps on a nonvoting or ex officio basis) are Government Operations, Banking and Currency, and Joint Economic.

[3] See Congressman MILLER's description of congressional power, Baker ed., op. cit., pp. 104–106. "* * * the Congressman who consults privately with shrewdness, who has just come from a closed meeting with somebody with information to impart, who works quietly underground, will wind up in the donjon with the prize. He will, in the course of time, exert influence. He will be asked for his opinion. In a profession which makes much of handing out advice, it is being asked for it that is the greatest jewel."

Congress to express its sentiments on broad fiscal policy where it now speaks with several voices or frequently not at all. Again the Joint Economic Committee provides an example. Its reports and staff studies command attention within the executive and the academic community in general, while to a lesser extent educating the membership of Congress to broader economic issues. The JEC has made possible a meaningful dialog between the President and Congress on the state of the Nation's economy. Finally a joint committee would provide the best basis for developing information on the budget for use by the full membership of Congress. The chances of its staff being monopolized by one or two of the fiscal committees is less than would be the case with an increase of regular committee staff or a joint appropriations staff. A joint committee could give Congress a continuing picture of the budget that it now lacks.

The example of the JEC may invite the further comparison and criticism, that such an "advisory" committee has little if any immediate impact on the legislative process. The committee has been reluctant to press its views on economic policy before the legislative committees responsible for economic policy decisions. The McClellan committee, however, would be enjoined to receive information from and to make reports and recommendations to the legislative committees. Similar provisions could be incorporated under a Joint Committee on Fiscal Policy.

A Joint Committee on Fiscal Policy could be established in one of three ways: (1) as a new joint committee, perhaps via amendment of section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act (the McClellan approach), (2) by expanding the membership and functions of the Joint Economics Committee,[4] or (3) in two steps, by establishing a Joint Appropriations Committee with staff and then merging it with the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

2. CONGRESS SHOULD EXERT MORE CONTROL AT THE AUTHORIZATION STAGE OF THE BUDGETARY PROCESS

Congress must give more consideration to the time dimension of expenditure. Instead of viewing the budget as largely inflexible due to prior commitments, Congress should focus its attention on the new authorizations and those long-term or "open" authorizations that may be subject to revision. The trend toward annual and multiyear authorizations has meant greater congressional control in the latter case but new authorizations remain a problem (especially when one recognizes that annual authorization may be a deliberate effort on the part of the legislative committee to increase appropriations).[5] Some additional external constraint is required.

In 1956, Congress enacted into law a requirement that cost information be included in all agency reports to congressional committees on proposed legislation. In theory, as one congressional study states, "each report on a pending or proposed bill contains the probable cost or savings attributable to the legislative proposal over each year of the first 5 years of operation." Also included are the estimated maximum additional man-years of employment and expenditures for personal services.[6] In fact, this provision has not been adequate. Cost information submitted by the agencies has been uneven and congressional committee staff have often been unable to give the data a searching review. When one adds to this the tendency of agencies and sympathetic committees to underestimate costs in the budget game—a common strategy—this approach to the control of authorizations appears to have limited effectiveness.

Accordingly several Members of Congress have introduced resolutions that would require every report from a committee (other than Appropriations) to include estimated appropriation or fund requirements for new programs for each of the first 5 fiscal years they are to be in effect. A comparison of committee estimates with corresponding recommendations from the executive branch would also be required.[7] Another resolution would require the inclusion of similar cost estimates in the executive budget as submitted.[8]

Congress should act to insure it has as adequate cost data as can be reasonably expected on requests for new program authorizations. Its legislative committees should be adequately staffed to collect and evaluate such data from the agencies. Staff personnel from a Joint Committee on Fiscal Policy or the GAO could be made available on request to the committees to assist them in setting up procedures for cost analysis and projection. To insure compliance, the Rules Committee could legitimately refuse to consider or grant rules for bills that were not accompanied by full cost information.

This reform would permit more intelligent congressional action at one of the critical points of control in the congressional budget process.

3. THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES SHOULD PROVIDE FOR A MORE INTEGRATED REVIEW OF THE BUDGET

Reform at the authorization level is not enough. The aggregate of individually meritorious programs is still bound to add up to too much. Further screening is provided by the individual subcommittees of appropriations but the full committee exerts minimal control.[9] The legislative budget and omnibus appropriations bill both suggest techniques that could be adopted on a regular basis at the full committee level.

At the beginning of the session the Appropriations Committee, with the consultation of the Joint Committee on Fiscal Policy, should define a set of flexible budgetary guidelines, a modest effort toward a legislative budget. The Appropriations Committees should each set up a coordinating subcommittee, composed of the chairmen of the various subcommittees, which would recommend appropriations ceilings to the subcommittees. In the experience with the consolidated appropriations bill, this "steering committee" did not have the power to amend subcommittee bills but it could refer them back to the subcommittee with recommendations. The executive budget process functions with a similar set of preliminary estimates, and if the appropriations target figures are treated as flexible and kept confidential within the steering committee the process should be feasible. The Appropriations Committees have experimented with procedures like this before. They should now establish them on a regular basis.

Reinstitution of the consolidated appropriations bill—a logical step in this process—should be approached cautiously, perhaps not until staff and budget information services for the membership are improved.

4. THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES SHOULD INCREASE THEIR STAFFS TO DEVELOP ADEQUATE INFORMATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS DECISIONS

Effective congressional control at the appropriations stage ultimately will depend upon the thoroughness of the work the Appropriations Committees and their staffs do. The committees are free to develop several alternative staff sources; regular professional committee staff, investigatory staff, joint appropriations staff, the GAO, etc. They are free to set the rules governing the use of staff personnel. Staff resources external to the committee's control can serve useful functions (see recommendation 7), but they cannot, barring revolutionary shifts of power in the appropriations process, replace the budget review and analysis that occurs at the Appropriations Subcommittee level.

Ideally appropriations staff members should meet several qualifications. They should meet high professional standards and receive commensurate salaries. They should develop a thorough acquaintance with the agency budgets to which they are assigned. Frequent rotation of regular committee staff or excessive reliance on temporary investigative staff are accordingly not desirable. By virtue of their position in the legislative branch they will have to depend to a considerable degree on information developed by the agencies and Budget Bureau. They cannot approximate the access or accumulated firsthand knowledge of the Bureau's budget examiners. But they should be in a position to troubleshoot or spot-check agency estimates.[10] We have already noted the quasi-advocate role that the Bureau may assume. Add to this the fact of a political executive directing the formulation of the budget and an appreciation of the size and complexity of modern bureaucracy and the case for an independent staff responsible to the appropriations committees is clear.

Two specific reforms are suggested. First, the number of regular professional staff employees should be increased. The 1946 recommendation of four staff members per subcommittee (to be reassigned according to workload) is a reasonable start. The minority should have at least one staff member responsible to it on each subcommittee. The bulk of the committee staff personnel should serve members on request, without regard to party affiliation or seniority. The natural tendency for subcommittee chairmen and ranking minority members to receive a disproportionate amount of staff service available to the subcommittee can be partially corrected by a moderate increase in staff, but may better be approached through the adoption of committee rules spelling out staffing procedures.[11]

Second, the current restrictions on the use of the special investigative staff members greatly reduce their utility to the committee membership and should be relaxed to permit closer association with staff personnel. Subcommittees should be able to redefine the terms of reference and objectives of investigations as they unfold. Such subcommittee guidance of special investigations should increase the effectiveness of investigative staff work. Furthermore, investigative staff personnel should be free to brief the subcommittees on findings, answer members' questions, and sit in on agency hearings on request of the subcommittees.

---

[4] An alternative suggested by the CED, op. cit., p. 16.

[5] This was probably the intent of annual authorization for the NASA budget. Frye and Saloma, op. cit., pp. 17–21. See also Green and Rosenthal, op. cit., ch. v, "Authorizing Techniques and Decision-Making," esp. pp. 170–171. The extension of annual authorization to the Coast Guard in the current session is the most recent example.

[6] "Financial Management in the Federal Government," op. cit., p. 137. Previously the Bureau of the Budget had compiled such information informally.

[7] H. Res. 185, 88th Cong., 1st sess. (Judge HOWARD SMITH).

[8] H.J. Res. 294, 88th Cong., 1st sess. (Judge HOWARD SMITH). Another technique for relating individual budget decisions to the overall state of Federal finances is suggested by Weidenbaum, op. cit., pp. 72–77.

[9] Fenno, op. cit., p. 315.

[10] The long tenure of appropriations staff, like that of many members of the appropriations committees, affords them a knowledge through experience that their younger Budget Bureau counterparts may not yet have.

[11] Some members interviewed felt that more attention should be given to using appropriations staff outside of congressional sessions.

The assumption is made in both these recommendations that potential gains in committee effectiveness far outweigh the traditional fears of increased staffing. The further assumption is made that increased staffing is necessary if the appropriations function is to be exercised responsibly. The burden of calculation the committee faces is a persuasive argument for more effective staffing arrangements, not a justification for time-saving techniques such as meat-ax cuts and the incremental approach to budgeting.

5. THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES SHOULD MAKE MORE EFFECTIVE USE OF THE EXPENDITURE ANALYSIS AND REVIEW ACCOMPLISHED BY THE COMMITTEES ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND THE GAO

The appropriations committees can effect better integration at another level—expenditure review. The House Appropriations Committee has made increasing use of GAO audits and investigations in recent years. However, the communication between its members and staff employees and their counterparts on Government operations, the committees immediately responsible for expenditure review, is limited.[12]

As financial control has focused more on improvements in management and organization and less on specific items of expenditure—a trend reflected in the changing orientation of the GAO—the appropriations committees should tap the experience and knowledge of both the GAO and the Committees on Government Operations. Witnesses should be invited to testify before appropriations subcommittees on a regular basis. There is some sentiment for a more formal coordination of the appropriations and review functions but this might lead to an unnecessary proliferation of committees.[13] Alternatively the suggested Joint Committee on Fiscal Policy might through its reports and recommendations reinforce the position of the GAO and Government Operations, especially with reference to the authorizing committees.

6. CONGRESS SHOULD PROVIDE MEANS FOR BETTER INFORMED PARTISAN DEBATE ON THE BUDGET

On the assumption that the budget will continue to be a subject for partisan debate, Congress should facilitate intelligent, informed discussion between the parties. This can be accomplished through a better distribution of budgetary information to the general membership. More specifically it means providing the minority spokesmen—the minority members of the fiscal committees—with adequate professional staff facilities. House Appropriations affords a particular problem. Each ranking minority member on the subcommittees receives an allowance for clerk hire sufficient to hire a secretary or junior staff member but insufficient to retain a senior professional staff assistant.[14] The minority staff employees are not permitted to sit in appropriations hearings and as a result frequently become absorbed into the members' office staffs. The House Republican appropriations (Bow) task force had to recruit additional voluntary assistance from the minority staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee and from outside the Congress during the 88th Congress.[15]

The Bow task force operated with its own set of confidential appropriation targets in a parallel fashion to the steering committee included in recommendation 3. Although it is too early to predict the permanence of the minority appropriations task force, this might well be a development that will contribute to integrated congressional consideration of the budget.[16]

7. CONGRESS SHOULD DEVELOP A BUDGET INFORMATION SERVICE AS ONE OF THE FUNCTIONS OF A JOINT COMMITTEE ON FISCAL POLICY

Congress does not have a current, authoritative picture of the budget as it passes through the congressional budget cycle. It initially receives the President's budget which is later updated in the midyear review. Agency presentations are available in appropriations hearings. Committee reports and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD provide further information. But at a given stage in the session it is extremely difficult to determine what Congress has done to that date with the executive budget. What is the status of the various appropriation bills? What changes have Ways and Means and Senate Finance made in the revenue provisions requested by the President? What have the findings of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation been in regard to the revenue estimates? This kind of information would be purely factual with respect to relevant congressional actions and findings. It would not require a large investigative staff. In view of this it is surprising that Congress has not already moved to set up a clearinghouse service on the budget. As a general rule Congress should not needlessly duplicate the informational services provided by the executive (the Budget Bureau has made numerous revisions in the budget document and explanatory materials that accompany it to make them more intelligible and serviceable to the Congress).[17] But, in this instance, the information is clearly internal to Congress and should be a congressional staff responsibility.

The utility of cost information at the authorization stage (recommendation 2) would similarly be increased if it were integrated into periodically revised congressional reports on the status of the budget. Congress should have at all times as complete a picture as possible of the budget and of the effects its actions are likely to have. These are modest reforms that are essential to any significant increase in congressional control of the budget.

All of these information services are provided under the proposed McClellan joint committee. They are logically assignable to a Joint Committee on Fiscal Policy. There are two additional information services that might be considered in a package of reforms. First, objective interpretative analyses of the budget, perhaps broken down to correspond with the appropriation bills, perhaps on selected aspects of the budget, might be prepared for the use of individual members. These analyses could sharpen the major policy decisions implicit or explicit in the President's budget. They could be cross referenced to other budgetary documents, committee hearings, GAO investigations, for the member who wants to dig deeper. They would be, in effect, condensations of committee hearings, tailored to the use of the member. Ideally, committee reports should serve this function, but the general stance of the House Appropriations Committee—the presentation of a united front to the House without minority reports—would appear to bar this alternative. For similar reasons an expansion of the professional staff of the committee to develop analyses for the use of the membership might prove disappointing. A joint committee staff, supplemented by the GAO, may be the only feasible alternative. One qualification should be noted. The type of analyses suggested here should not be construed to be a substitute for the budget review and analysis performed by the House Appropriations Committee. It would be a supplementary service provided for the general membership. The intent would be to provide a means of raising the general level of understanding and debate. Nothing will replace hard work and application in arriving at the detailed component decisions that go into making the budget. As a rule, the individual member will still have to defer to his colleagues on the committee who have had the time and have taken the effort to do their homework.

A second suggested reform pertaining to the availability of information to the Congress would be applicable to the form of the budget document itself, a proper concern of the Bureau of the Budget rather than a congressional staff office. The budget document serves as the basis for decisionmaking by the Congress.[18] It is now the only common point of reference for the fiscal committees and subcommittees of Congress. A recent study of the Federal budget document by the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee concluded that the budget in its present form was "outmoded." Extensive revisions in format and content were suggested to facilitate the analysis of Federal policies. The subcommittee report noted that "* * * the essence of budget decisionmaking is a comparison between alternative policies. If the information on each of these alternative policies is to be found in diverse and relatively obscure sources, the budgetary comparisons are much more difficult." [19]

To resolve "the dilemma of budgetary reform" (i.e., the simultaneous demand for greater simplicity and more detail), the subcommittee made several recommendations, one of which bears directly on the utility of budgetary information. The budget, it suggested, should be presented on a program basis but with a program classification so based on an overall index system that appropriations requests could still be made on an agency basis by the functions performed. Cross indexing on a functional program basis would enable all users of the budget, not the least Congress, to determine the types of activities in which the Federal Government is engaged and the dollar significance of these activities. The subcommittee cited the example of the appropriations for education in 1961 which were postponed when it was discovered that "educational activities were carried on by such a host of agencies, offices, divisions, bureaus, and other bodies that no one in the Government really knew what the total figures were or what the educational end result or accomplishment had been."[20] Information on this basis, the report concluded, is "not only relevant for congressional decisionmaking but is also equally relevant for the agency decisionmaking that presumably underlies proposals to the Congress."[21]

---

[12] See Clapp, op. cit., p. 219. Also Kofmehl, op. cit., ch. x, "Interstaff Relations," esp. p., 147.

[13] Arthur Smithies suggests a formal expenditure review process by Appropriations and Government Operations jointly in addition to the annual appropriations review. Op. cit., pp. 178–183. Wilmerding proposes a Joint Committee on Public Accounts. See his testimony, hearings: "Organization and Operation of Congress," op. cit., pp. 495–504.

[14] Supra, p. 46, note 21.

[15] In the case of Senate appropriations, a minority staff works closely with ranking minority members in preparing for pre-markup conferences between the subcommittee chairmen and the respective ranking minority members.

[16] The case can be made that increased debate between the parties would contribute to more strife and "irresponsible" party actions at the expense of Appropriations Committee unity and continuity of policy. The assumption of this recommendation, however, is that there are legitimate roles for party in the legislative process which can be improved without disrupting the congressional system.

[17] See testimony of Charles L. Schultze, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget, Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, Joint Economic Committee, hearings: "The Federal Budget as an Economic Document," 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, esp. pp. 149–158.

[18] Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, Joint Economic Committee, report: "The Federal Budget as an Economic Document," 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, p. 2. See also comments by Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, hearings: "The Federal Budget as an Economic Document," op. cit., p. 194.

[19] Report: "The Federal Budget as an Economic Document," op. cit., p. 15.

The major objection that has been raised against functional cross indexing is the problem of definition. Is the school-lunch program, for instance, to be included under education, agriculture (surplus disposal), or welfare activities? The budget cannot easily be resolved into clear-cut functional components. The Budget Bureau has been approaching this problem gradually. "Special analyses" on important aspects of Federal activity—research and development, grants-in-aid to State and local governments, expenditures for statistical programs, etc.—have been added to the budget. The Bureau is also studying the development of an integrated classification code for the budget, and the possibilities for increasing the use of automatic data-processing equipment.[22] Ultimately it may be possible to develop a full series of special analyses from the current mass of budget data. These analyses would be nonadditive but they could provide useful practical perspectives on a Governmentwide basis. In the congressional budget process, they would afford a broader view of governmental spending than is currently available to the highly specialized appropriations subcommittees.[23]

Additional changes in the budget document have been proposed which are not discussed at length here. Several deal with the methods of budgetary accounting. One proposal would convert the budget from its current basis of new obligational authority (NOA, i.e., the sum of new authorizations to incur obligations—place orders, award contracts, receive services, etc.) to an accrued expenditure basis.[24] Congressional control, now limited to the control of NOA, could then be extended to actual expenditure ceilings for a given year. "Expenditure control" goes beyond the provision of information on an expenditure basis. It would impose a new discipline on agency programing, and reduce the flexibility or discretionary range in the timing of expenditures.[25] While Congress could enforce this type of expenditure control, more modest informational reforms in the budget document should probably be attempted first. The Bureau of the Budget should be encourage to develop improvements already underway and to continue discussions with the Joint Economic and the major fiscal committees on further changes in the format of the budget document.

8. CONGRESS SHOULD IMPROVE THE SCHEDULING OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS

The delay of appropriation bills well beyond the beginning of the fiscal year has become a chronic problem that merits congressional attention. We have already noted the trend toward annual authorization as a major factor. Assuming that this trend is not reversed. Congress will soon have to give consideration to changes in its schedule or subject the executive agencies to severe planning difficulties.

As a first step, Congress should accept the year-round session with scheduled recesses as normal. It is inconsistent to aim for a July 1 adjournment and press at the same time for a meaningful legislative budget with adequate review at the authorization stage.[26] On the basis of a year-round session, the congressional leadership should then project a schedule for authorization and appropriation bills. The current pattern might be regularized with major authorization bills (NASA, foreign aid, etc.) to be completed by the first of September; appropriation bills between then and adjournment. This would in effect shift the fiscal year back 6 months to coincide with the calendar year, while adding 6 months to the period of budget formulation and congressional review.

An alternative and preferable course would be, again on the basis of a full-year session, to advance the authorization phase from the beginning of the session to the previous September for programs requiring annual authorization. Most authorizations could then be completed by April or May; appropriations, by July 1. In either case the executive budget process will have to make adjustments to accommodate the expanded congressional activity. A 6-month span for the congressional budget process, confined at one end by the budget submission, at the other by the new fiscal year, is no longer a realistic assumption.

A postscript on expectations

The strategy of reform suggested above is essentially a low-cost strategy in that it does not present an immediate challenge to the basic elements of the congressional power structure. We have assumed that a high-cost strategy has little likelihood of success without an unforeseeable change in the climate of congressional opinion. It does not follow, however, that the gains that could be realized from the suggested reforms would be inconsequential.

Essentially, what we have done has been to take the basic power structure of Congress as given and to seek to rationalize it. In a system characterized by dispersed centers of power rather than hierarchy and command, we have emphasized steps to facilitate interunit bargaining, negotiation, and compromise. The recommendations for a Joint Committee on Fiscal Policy and a Budget Information Service attempt to institutionalize communication and information functions that are not being met by the current budgetary system.

The reforms that have been presented assume that a need for rationalization at this level exists, and is perceived by a growing number of Members of Congress. If this assessment is correct we can expect marginal, yet cumulative, gains in our objectives of economy, oversight, overall policy review, and budgetary control. A serious congressional effort to rationalize its procedures, in itself, should also realize the gains of increased public prestige and a greater sense of congressional efficacy.

The reforms suggested here develop a common theme. Congress should exercise its constitutional powers responsibly by accepting the full implications of a national role. This means equipping Congress and its committees with the means for informed judgment and intelligent action.

Congress alone bears the responsibility for the failure to develop the reforms of 1921 and 1946. Further improvements in the Federal budget process now await its approval. As Congress begins a new period of introspection, it would do well to consider its disappointing experience with fiscal reform and the still unrealized potential for effective congressional action.

POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS IN NEGOTIATING CONTRACTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 11 contained the final installment of my compilation of the policies and practices of foreign governments in negotiating contracts for public works. The series has since been reprinted, and I shall make copies available to my colleagues.

The study explains in detail why it is next to impossible for Amercan producers and suppliers to share in markets financed by foreign governments regardless of the price and quality of our materials. The universal attitude, outside of this country, is to buy from home industry and labor whenever and wherever possible.

I find no fault in this buy-at-home philosophy, and it is my contention that the U.S. Government must adopt a similar policy in deference to the industries and workers who pay the taxes that finance our public works projects.

My office staff is in the process of accumulating records that will indicate the extent to which U.S. Treasury funds are being expended for foreign products that compete with the products of your State and mine. It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that American industry has almost as difficult a time getting contracts from the American Government as it does from foreign governments.

---

[20] Ibid., p. 7.

[21] Ibid., p. 14.

[22] Hearings: "The Federal Budget as an Economic Document," op. cit., p. 156.

[23] Several members and staff interviewed expressed the view that the executive was unlikely to implement an effective cross-indexing system for congressional use for fear "it would open a Pandora's box." The executive by implication would prefer to keep the appropriations subcommittees within their narrow fields.

[24] For a discussion of progress toward annual accrued expenditure limitations—a recommendation of the second Hoover Commission—and the objections raised by the House Appropriations Committee, especially in regard to the device of "contract authority," see "Financial Management in the Federal Government," op. cit., pp. 56–60, 98–110.

[25] See Congressman CURTIS' discussion of "expenditure control." Hearings: "The Federal Budget as an Economic Document," op. cit., pp. 194–203. For a full definition of the various budget concepts see Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, Joint Economic Committee, joint committee print: "The Federal Budget as an Economic Budget," 87th Cong., 2d sess., 1962, pt. II, "Budget Concepts."

[26] An alternative to an extended session would be a shift to a full committee workweek (as opposed to the current Tuesday-Thursday mode of operation).

Because of the large number of public power projects underwritten by our taxpayers, large sums are appropriated by Congress for the purchase of turbines, generators, and transmission facilities. Western Pennsylvania is a leading manufacturer of both steel and electrical equipment, so our people understand how much our economy benefits when Government contracts for these materials are negotiated with American producers. According to estimates of both Westinghouse and General Electric, an order for a 500,000 kilowatt turbogenerator would provide jobs for 600 to 700 workers for a full year. Yet while foreign equipment keeps rolling into the United States and while our Government must underwrite work projects to take care of our unemployed, there is no place for manufacturers to go with their wares so far as other governments are concerned. Below is an excerpt from a speech made last year at Union College in Schenectady, N.Y., by Gerald L. Phillippe, chairman of the board, General Electric Co.:

> If you hear glowing reports about an American firm's great increase in oversea sales, better check the figures closely before jumping to conclusions. For example, find out how much of the business is financed by U.S. foreign aid money, or by loans from the Export-Import Bank. Then ask yourself whether this business constitutes a permanent basis for ongoing foreign business.
>
> Or take the turbine business. This great growing Common Market and the rest of Europe aren't going to provide us much of any market in turbines even if all tariffs were abolished tomorrow. Why not? Aren't the world's best turbines made right here in Schenectady? Sure they are. But the power suppliers of most European countries, almost entirely government-owned, will buy only from electrical manufacturers in their own countries. American manufacturers, General Electric included, are effectively foreclosed from sales to European countries by these nationalistic purchasing practices. I do not mean we have to bid extra low—I mean there is, in effect, no point in our bidding at all. Meanwhile, some of our European competitors, in effect, are encouraged by their own governments to compete in U.S. markets, while within their own borders their domestic markets are held secure.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's support of a buy-American stipulation in the Navy shipbuilding program should serve as a guideline in all Government purchasing contracts. This provision prohibiting expenditure of funds in foreign shipyards for major components of the hull and superstructure of naval vessels is akin to my amendment to the Urban Transportation Act of 1964 and should be included in all legislation appropriating funds for public works projects.

ORDERLY MARKETING ACT OF 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Robison] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join in sponsoring the Orderly Marketing Act of 1965, which is designed to give some protection to American industries injured or threatened with injury by a continuing flood of low-cost imports.

This bill represents a new approach to the hardships experienced by a number of our important domestic industries who seemingly cannot obtain any relief under existing legislation. While the act would apply to all industries which are faced with constantly increasing imports of high-labor-content products from countries with low labor costs, its preparation has been pioneered by the footwear industry which is experiencing increasingly higher levels of import penetration.

Through what was known as the orderly marketing amendment to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, we attempted to develop voluntary quotas as an answer to this problem. However, many administrative difficulties have been encountered and meaningful relief where needed has not been forthcoming under that approach. By contrast, the concept of the bill I am introducing today will bring a better balance to our trade policy by enabling us to meet unfair competition through international agreements or, if necessary, through unilateral—but still flexible—quotas, which at the same time will continue to properly allow foreign competitors to share in the growth of our economy. It is, then, a reasonable solution to a most difficult problem, and I hope it will receive early consideration by the appropriate committees of this Congress.

NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION—UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S POSITION

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of concern has been expressed that emphasis on the sciences in recent years has created an imbalance in our educational system. I want to call the House Members' attention to a statement I received from President Clark Kerr, of the University of California, indicating the university's support of the proposed Humanities Foundation.

Supporting the recommendations of the Commission on Humanities, President Kerr highlights the need for a reorientation of our education policies to insure equal opportunity for scholars in the humanities.

The above-mentioned follows:

University of California's Position With Regard to the Proposed National Humanities Foundation

The case for Federal support for the humanities and the arts is eloquently stated in the report of the Commission, and those arguments need not be repeated here. It is well, however, to emphasize one of the central points of the Commission's case for Federal support of the humanities and the arts: "the Nation's need for balanced education."

For a long time many of us who are deeply interested in the development of the humanistic and artistic studies have been concerned with an imbalance resulting from emphasis on the natural sciences. This imbalance is partly the result of action taken by the Federal Government. Beginning in 1950, when the National Science Foundation was established, and scientific research and development were given massive financial support by Congress, science in this country began an unparalleled advance. The disparity between the sciences and the humanities subsequently greatly increased. In 1960 the President's Science Advisory Committee recognized the growing imbalance between science and humanities and the need to redress the balance. The Committee pointed out that "even in the interests of science itself it is essential to give full value and support to the other great branches of man's artistic, literary, and scholarly activity. The advancement of science must not be accomplished by the impoverishment of anything else."

Thus, scientist and humanist alike are agreed that we need to give people interested in the humanities and the arts a new opportunity and incentive, the equivalent chance to engage in creative and productive research as is now available in the sciences. In many areas of the humanities and the arts we have superb scholars who lack the funds for travel, library materials, and free time for creative accomplishment, whereas in the sciences the Federal Government has made large sums of money available to scientists for such activities.

The creation of a National Humanities Foundation would encourage students of the humanities and the arts in a way which would benefit a much wider group of people than the specific grants and scholarships would reach, and go a long way toward recapturing public prestige for humanistic and artistic studies.

For these reasons, the University of California hopes that the Congress will see fit to take this progressive step of establishment of a national foundation designed to enrich the whole area of the humanities, and thereby take the first measure to correct the imbalance in our education system.

There is tremendous need for library support in the humanities and arts at the national level if our efforts to support humanistic and artistic studies are to be effective. Scholarly associations which reported to the Commission on the Humanities urged that a National Humanities Foundation should provide financial assistance in the construction of libraries and in the building up of collections in school, college, and public libraries. We strongly endorse this recommendation.

At this time I would also like to take this opportunity to comment briefly on certain specific aspects in some of the bills to support the humanities before your committee: The restrictions of grants to citizens, and the loyalty oath provision.

One of the major factors in the continuous development of humanistic interests in this country has been the continual participation of foreign scholars and artists in American artistic and scholarly activities. Some of the most prominent figures in American arts and letters are not American citizens, but many do become citizens after years of living in the United States. It seems to us that support should be given on the basis of ability and the contributions which such foreign scholars and artists make to humanistic development in this country.

On the subject of the loyalty oath provision we see little or no justification for inclusion of such a provision in legislation adopted to further humanistic and artistic studies. Indeed we are pleased to note that many of the bills do not contain such a provision.

CLARK KERR.

TASK FORCE ON PLATFORM IMPLEMENTATION

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the Republican conference our colleague, the Honorable James Battin, reported in behalf of his task force on platform implementation. Congressman Battin has done an outstanding job in summarizing the record of our party in the House in promoting the principles and specific programs so convincingly expressed in our 1964 Republican platform. I commend Congressman Battin for his effective work and the leadership he has demonstrated not only as chairman of this important task force, but also as a skilled, dedicated, and knowledgeable member of the executive committee that prepared the original draft of our platform in the 1964 convention. I place the Battin task force report in the Record at this point:

GOP OBJECTIVES IN THE 89TH CONGRESS—A REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON PLATFORM IMPLEMENTATION TO THE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(James F. Battin, of Montana, chairman, Charles Chamberlain, of Michigan, Glenn Cunningham, of Nebraska, Paul Findley, of Illinois, Carleton King, of New York, Glenard Lipscomb, of California, and Vernon Thomson, of Wisconsin.)

The Republican task force on platform implementation has worked with and now surveys the activities of the Republican Members of the House of Representatives both in carrying out the specific pledges of the 1964 platform and in discharging their general obligation to write a constructive record in the 89th Congress.

It finds that these related obligations have so far been discharged in an exemplary manner. In spite of the handicaps of being outnumbered, of being denied needed staff assistance in some committees, of being gagged in debate, Republicans in the House of Representatives have taken a constructive position. They have given unstinting support to the administration in those matters of foreign and domestic policy in which the administration position has been sound. They have put forward their own positive proposals in fields in which the administration has offered unsound solutions to problems or has had no solutions to offer.

FOREIGN POLICY

Republicans have placed the welfare of the nation above partisan advantage.

It might be argued that the President sought partisan political gain when he said in a speech on August 29:

"I have had advice to load our planes with bombs and to drop them on certain areas that I think would enlarge the war and escalate the war, and result in our committing a good many American boys to fighting a war that I think ought to be fought by the boys of Asia to help protect their own land. And for that reason, I haven't chosen to enlarge the war."

The Republican position has consistently been "* * * we will make clear to any hostile nation that the United States will increase the costs and risks of aggression to make them outweigh hopes for gain * * *. We will move decisively to assure victory in South Vietnam * * * we must make it clear that, when conflict is forced with America, it will end only in victory for freedom * * *."

Republicans do not thereby give blanket approval to all that the administration is doing or has done in foreign affairs. In view of the critical situation in Vietnam, they have not considered the past few months as the propitious time to stress points of disagreement with the administration in foreign policy.

Republicans also spelled out clear objectives for a Latin American policy aimed at salvaging what we could from the vacillation and indecision of the Bay of Pigs fiasco in saying: "* * * we will vigorously press our OAS partners to join the United States in restoring a free and independent government in Cuba, stopping the spread of Sino-Soviet subversion, forcing the withdrawal of the foreign military presence now in Latin America, and preventing future intrusions."

Criticism of the President's action in both Vietnam and the Dominican Republic has come principally from members of his own party.

INITIATIVES IN FOREIGN POLICY

In foreign policy House Republicans have not been just a cheering section for the administration. They have on some occasions proposed action which the administration subsequently adopted.

For example, on April 30, the House Republican leadership proposed the creation of an inter-American police force to restore peace and order in the Dominican Republic. On May 3, the administration offered this proposal to the Organization of American States.

The appropriation of an additional $700 million for defense as a means of emphasizing national unity and national resolve in the face of Communist aggression on two continents was suggested by minority floor leader Gerald R. Ford. The administration subsequently requested the increased appropriation. It was granted with the unanimous support of Republican Members of both House and Senate.

On the other hand, an initial Republican success—the prohibition of the use of agricultural funds for aid to Nasser voted by the House on January 26—was reversed under severe administration pressure on February 8.

PLATFORM IMPLEMENTATION

The Republican platform of 1964 contained 50 pledges which call for implementation by legislative action. Legislation has been introduced in the 89th Congress to carry out all but five of these pledges. The bills which have been introduced run the gamut of matters of legislative concern. In their totality they comprise a comprehensive, broad-gaged, and constructive legislative program.

EMPHASIS OF REPUBLICAN LEGISLATION

On the basis of numbers, the emphasis of Republican-sponsored legislation has been on expanding and liberalizing the social security system. Two-hundred and fifty-six bills having this effect have been introduced by Republican House Members. They deal with such things as reduction of the age requirements for beneficiaries, increasing the age for eligibility of children, expansion to groups not presently covered, and increasing the amount of earnings permissible without sacrifice of social security benefits. All this carries out the platform pledge of "* * * a strong, fiscally sound system of social security with improved benefits to our people" and "revision of the social security laws to allow higher earnings, without loss of benefits, by our elderly people."

In second place come excise tax reduction and repeal, provided for in 61 bills introduced by Republican Members of the House of Representatives. This carries out the platform pledge of "* * * removal of those wartime Federal excise taxes, favored by the Democratic administration, on pens, pencils, jewelry, cosmetics, luggage, handbags, wallets, and toiletries."

Next comes voting rights legislation, sponsored by 59 Republicans. This carries out the platform pledge of improvements of civil rights statutes adequate to changing needs of our times and such additional administrative or legislative actions as may be required to end the denial, for whatever reason, of the right to vote.

Other than promising enforcement of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Democratic platform made no pledges on future civil rights action and more specifically the Democratic platform was silent on voting rights.

Fifty-four House Republican bills have been introduced providing medical care for the aged beyond the scope of the Kerr-Mills bill, which was limited to the medically indigent. Twenty House Republicans introduced bills to expand and improve Federal-State medical care programs. This carries out the platform pledge of "* * * full coverage of all medical and hospital costs for the needy elderly people, financed by general revenues through broader implementation of Federal-State plans, rather than the compulsory Democratic scheme covering only a small percentage of such costs for everyone regardless of need" and "* * * assistance to help senior citizens meet the costs of medical and hospital insurance."

Forty-six House Republicans have proposed a constitutional amendment to permit the States to consider factors in addition to population in the apportionment of seats in one house of their State legislatures. This carries out the platform pledge of "* * * support of a constitutional amendment, as well as legislation, enabling States having bicameral legislatures to apportion one house on bases of their choosing, including factors other than population."

More than 20 House Republicans have proposed legislation to establish an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President to deal with urban area problems. This carries out the platform pledge of "* * * an especially determined effort to help strengthen the ability of State and local governments to meet the broad range of needs facing the Nation's urban and suburban communities."

More than 20 have proposed bills to solve the problems of farmers producing feed grains and wheat. This carries out the platform pledge of "* * * repeal of the administration's wheat certificate 'bread tax' on consumers, so burdensome to low-income families and overwhelmingly rejected by farmers" and "* * * to provide our farmers, who have contributed so much to the strength of our Nation, with the maximum opportunity to exercise their own management decisions on their own farms, while resisting all efforts to impose upon them further Federal controls."

In addition a significant number of Republicans have proposed legislation on the following subjects:

Providing tax credits against the cost of higher education.

Permitting deferment of the payment of the 1964 income tax for taxpayers who were the victims of underwithholding.

Raising the pay of members of the Armed Forces.

Establishing a National Humanities Foundation.

Improving and strengthening retirement and survivors' benefits under the civil service system.

Making an assault on the President or the Vice President a Federal crime.

Providing an adequate supply of lead and zinc.

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the independence ofthe Baltic States.

Granting home rule to the District of Columbia.

Constitutional amendment on equal rights for men and women.

Constitutional amendment relative to prayer in public schools and other places.

REPUBLICAN ALTERNATIVES

When Republicans have been unable to accept the administration's proposal for dealing with an admitted problem requiring the attention of the Federal Government, they have offered an alternative solution.

For three major pieces of legislation already passed by the House, they have had alternatives ready. In place of the administration's medicare bill—compulsory in coverage, financed through increased social security taxes, restricted to limited hospital care—Republicans sought to substitute the Byrnes bill (H.R. 4351), providing a voluntary system, financed through general revenues, and covering all medical costs.

For the administration's education bill—dispensing Federal funds more lavishly to rich areas than poor, imprecise in its scope, and raising the danger of control by a Federal bureaucracy—Republicans sought to substitute a system of tax credits for those who support schools, coupled with selective Federal assistance for the "head start" education of small children.

For the administration's Appalachia program, Republicans sought to substitute a program for all areas of the Nation needing Federal economic assistance.

For legislation that has not yet reached the floor—notably in voting rights, urban area problems, and housing—Republican substitutes were developed, all of which are more effective than the proposals sent to the Hill by the administration.

The offering of alternatives has not been an empty exercise. In at least two instances Republican alternatives, coupled with Republican criticism of administration proposals, promise to bring about important modifications of administration measures. The medicare bill which passed the House incorporates important features of bills offered by Republicans. It is safe to predict that the voting rights bill which is finally enacted will be a far cry from that originally presented by the White House. It, too, will bear a Republican imprint in some of its provisions.

THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION IN CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CONABLE] may extend their remarks and include extraneous matter at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of taking this time today is to discuss with Members of the House the serious situation that exists in my district concerning farm labor, and particularly that in connection with the strawberry crop.

I have several pictures with me. Of course, they cannot be included in the RECORD, but I will leave them here on the table in the well of the House for Members who may wish to view them.

Izaak Walton said one time—when he got his mind off fishing:

> Doubtless God could have made a better berry. But doubtless God never did.

Of course, this has reference to the strawberry. I also have some color pictures that were taken in my district during the week of May 10. These are accurate representations of the condition of the strawberry crops in my district, and I invite any Member to view them. If they do not make you sick, they will sadden you.

My district is plagued with a manmade disaster. Millions of dollars of crops are rotting in the fields and thousands of American skilled workers will not enjoy their usual employment this year or in future years. Many small family farmers and some large corporate farms are only one step away from bankruptcy. The prices of fruit and vegetables, to the consumer, have necessarily increased. But most significantly, valuable and nutritious food is being extravagantly wasted. The crops are actually turning to garbage in the fields. The effects will spread to every district in the United States.

I would like to give you a brief history of the situation in my area.

California produces 43 percent of the fresh fruits and vegetables of the Nation. My district, the 12th District of California, has some 600,000 acres, less than 1 percent of the irrigated land in the State of California, but on this land we produce more than 25 percent of the Nation's strawberries and more than 30 percent of the Nation's head lettuce, celery, and broccoli and about 95 percent of the Nation's artichokes; 70 percent of our produce is shipped out of the State, mostly to markets in the Eastern States.

Also in my district we have the largest beet sugar manufacturing plant in the world.

To give you an example of the extent and productivity of raising lettuce in my district, we have shipped more than 1 million carloads of lettuce—1 million carloads of head lettuce alone. This would fill a train more than eight times the distance across the United States in length. Transportation costs are high because of the long distances and extra care and refrigeration required. Our seasons conflict with the highest employment seasons of other industries such as the building trades, tourist industries and backyard gardens throughout the entire United States, as well as other farmers raising the same and different crops elsewhere.

We have the best working and living conditions in the country. We have a favorable climate and weather. It seldom rains in the summer. There are no mosquitos or bugs. We have the best housing. There is no segregation in the fields, in the churches or in the schools. We have been leaders in automation and in trying to provide the most mechanized and automated industry that we can.

We have the highest wages paid anywhere in the United States. I think I can safely say that there is no one working in the fields today in our area who can earn any higher wage anyplace in the country doing any other kind of work.

So I can speak with some pride concerning our district. We not only have high-quality produce, but we have taken a genuine interest in the welfare of the workers, paying them high wages and providing high-grade housing and good working conditions. We have the most favorable labor laws of any State in the Union. We want to improve them. We can and should do better. I want to help to do better in every way. But this traumatic and wrenching change from 100,000 braceros to none is a difficult if not impossible situation to cope with. I think we need more understanding and more sensitivity in meeting this problem and that is why I want to talk today. We want to hire domestics. We want to hire them first always. We want them to earn high wages and enjoy their work and their life in our area. This is one of the reasons why I favored the bracero bill. I thought it was very sound and ingeniously devised to protect first the local worker at all times and also to provide a safeguard against crop losses. It is one of the best foreign aid programs ever devised. It had an automatic provision for phasing out when we were able to obtain enough local workers. There was strict governmental supervision. The Congress, as we know, terminated this law. But we still have Public Law 414 which can be used to help in the chaotic situation we are facing now in our area because we still need labor and need it desperately. We need temporary, supplemental labor, particularly at peak harvesttimes. Not only do we need adequate labor but we need competent labor. We need reliable labor. Unfortunately, these crops require enormous amounts of hand labor, sometimes called "stoop" labor. For lettuce thinning and strawberry picking and for fragile, delicate, perishable crops, we do employ domestic workers. In fact, we use them all year round.

But we cannot control the weather. We cannot control the time of maturity of the crops. When perishable crops mature, they must be picked within hours, or they will spoil. When strawberries are overripe, they cannot be sold, but still must be picked to save the plant. Also, it should be known that we do not encourage the migrant system. This nomadic life is one of the most cruel which could be imposed upon anyone, particularly upon children. Next to communism and war the migrant life is worst. It is almost impossible for them to obtain an adequate education. Their school life is not only disrupted, but also they disrupt the schools in the areas through which they must roam. They have no roots. They have no stability. Their housing is expensive for them because of short-term rentals and large families. Yet no one could provide adequate family housing to be used only 2 or 3 months of the year. Not even the largess of Federal Government can finance that kind of housing.

I believe that these are good arguments for the bracero program.

I have never said that U.S. citizens will not do the work. I have merely said that there are not enough of them at the right times and in the right places. It has been said now, as an excuse for not giving us the opportunity to import the necessary workers we need at the time we need them, that if we would pay enough we would get the workers. The workers have received increased wages in my area, but there are limits. There are limits to productivity. There are limits to skills. There are limits to what a man can earn.

"Stoop" labor on farms is one of the most unskilled types of work. We cannot pay to low-skilled workers more than is paid to high-skilled workers. There must be some consideration given to the farmer's costs. There must be some consideration given to the competition with other skills and with other workers in other places in the country who are producing the same crops and doing the same work.

In our district at the present time a strawberry picker—an average strawberry picker—can earn $2 or $3 per hour, and have steady work. There is a one-armed strawberry picker working in my district today who is earning $23 a day. He is not experienced, but he is willing. Certainly a person not so handicapped should be able to earn as much.

The skill is low, so of course the people cannot earn as much as people with higher skills can earn, but they do earn more than they can earn anyplace else in the United States at this time doing any other work.

It seems to me that farmworkers should be able to help make a profit for their employers.

We have tried to increase the wages and to improve the working conditions, as well as the housing conditions, for the people who are employed, but still we have not been able to attract enough labor to our district during peak harvest times.

The Department of Labor has suggested that we should recruit more extensively. We have tried every suggestion which has been made by anyone. We have used students. We have used "weekenders." We have used housewives. We have used delinquents. We have used prisoners and Indians and football teams and scout troops and church groups. We have recruited in every State in the Union.

Most are farm-labor-demand States so workers do not want to come all the way to California for only a few months' work.

We have tried automation. We are working hard at mechanization. We have probably done as much on mechanization and automation of crops as any other area. We are even experimenting now with a lettuce picker. The only way one can tell whether the lettuce is right is to plump it. We are trying to develop a machine for this.

We developed the sugarbeet wheel in our district. We use crop duster airplanes for fertilizers and insecticide application which supplants hundreds of workers. We have enormous cultivators. We use overhead sprinklers. We have assembly lines in packing sheds which are equal to the assembly lines of many automotive plants.

We are doing our best to develop the machines to do the tough jobs.

There is a sad problem with respect to mechanization. The low-skilled worker who needs the job the most, the one in whom we should be the most interested, is the first worker to be automated out of work. When a low-skilled farmworker is automated out of a job, he has no place to go. When a factory worker is automated out of a job he may be able to get work on the farm, but the farmworker who is automated out has no place to go except on welfare.

There are many other ways to get workers, and there are many workers who have been imported into the United States under Public Law 414, the law we are hoping can be utilized to import workers to work in the fields.

There were something like 411 sheepherders who were permitted to come into this country last year. There were many agricultural workers from the British West Indies, 810 Japanese, 124 Filipinos, 14,000 Canadian lumberjacks, 7,558 entertainers and dancers, 7,168 musicians and professors—just to name a few.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. First I would like to commend the gentleman on a very splendid presentation.

To the list that the gentleman has just given us of foreigners admitted under Public Law 414, I think should be added several thousand, who since the first of the year have been admitted to this country as waiters and busboys for service right here in the city of Washington, D.C. Obviously, this is done on the theory that scores of thousands and hundreds of thousands of unemployed on the east coast are not capable of being waiters or busboys. The Secretary of Labor has seen fit to let Swiss, Germans, and Latin Americans come in here in order to do hotel work, but not for the harvesting of crops.

Mr. TALCOTT. The gentleman is certainly correct, and one of the most knowledgeable on this subject. I am informed that these waiters come into the country as permanent citizens. I did some inquiring about this and about whether or not it would depress working conditions in Washington, D.C. If you go to any hotel here in the city, few of the waiters or restaurant workers have been here more than 3 or 4 months. However, the Department of Labor has a ruling that if they enter the United States in groups of more than 25 at one time, they have to get a certification that they will not depress the labor market here. So they come in in groups of 24 at a time.

There are many other people who come in the same way. We are recruiting nurses from other countries. We are aggressively recruiting for hotel and restaurant workers in advertisements in the Swiss papers. Airline hostesses are also recruited to come here to work. Not only does this mean that the Department of Labor and Immigration officials are saying the unemployed people in the city of Washington and the city of New York cannot have those jobs, but it means they cannot even be trained for them. This seems to be paradoxical to me, but there are many paradoxes about the farm labor situation.

For instance, in my district they say that we should not permit the importation of cheap foreign workers. The same people who oppose the importation of cheap foreign workers, as they call them, advocate the importation of cheap foreign products, such as strawberries. They are quite willing to have produce and products imported from Mexico. This means that not only will the labor of cheap foreign workers be imported but also cheap foreign fertilizer, cheap foreign seed, water, land, capital, and many other cheap foreign things. We hear no complaints about importing foreign strawberries into this country—only complaints about importing foreign workers to harvest the strawberries grown here.

This points up another problem that we are having in our district. Because we cannot obtain the labor to harvest crops, many other industries are considering moving to Mexico. Previously there has been some objection to going to Mexico for fear that the machinery and the improvements would be expropriated by the Mexican Government, but they now have assurances that this will not occur. These people can move into Mexico and will be able to export to the United States the produce grown in the cheaper areas. We will then be buying this product and paying gold and dollars for them, thereby worsening our imbalance of international payments situation.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DYAL].

Mr. DYAL. Because of your comments on the possibility of this movement into Mexico, I wish to join my colleagues in commenting on the labor shortage problems in California. I have received considerable correspondence on this subject. A recent letter from the Liberty Groves Operating Corp., which is composed of 58 members representing 800 acres of citrus, expresses concern that the small grower is being forgotten in this serious field labor problem. The 58 members are members of the San Gabriel Valley Labor Association which organization does recruiting, housing, and feeding of workers. They have struggled through the lemon harvest which is not yet completed and still somewhat behind schedule; and with the opening of activities in the northern part of the State and the traditional migration north, their picking force of 30 men has now dropped to 13. The Valencia orange harvest season is just beginning and these growers are finding it impossible to build an adequate force to handle this new activity. Along with the efforts of the San Gabriel Valley Labor Association to recruit workers, these members do considerable recruiting of domestic workers on their own. They also work with an industrywide organization called Farmers Harvest Association which is experiencing a shortage of workers.

Federal compliance officers have classified their camp facilities as good and restaurant facilities and food, excellent. Wages this year, since the adoption of the recommended industrywide policy, have averaged better than $1.75 per hour, which is considerably above the criteria of $1.40 per hour minimum guarantee.

Aside from the citrus harvest in my district, I have been informed that at least 25 percent of the vineyards will be abandoned next year unless adequate labor is available to harvest next fall's crop.

I would say to the gentleman that I have not supported a return to the bracero progrom, but I do concur that Public Law 414 does furnish the means to handle this problem.

I agree that there must be an early solution to the labor shortage existing in California if we are to protect our growers' investments.

I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that even Mr. Wirtz recognizes that there is a need for supplemental labor in California. Yet he has laid down a condition, or placed himself in a position so that to get that labor a grower must offer $1.40 an hour, plus housing, plus transportation. One dollar and forty cents an hour is more than the national minimum wage for industry. When you add these other fringe requirements, it amounts to considerable.

I have just talked to a grower, James House, in the Imperial Valley, who is a relatively small farmer, who has just visited in Mexico. He says that down there the Mexicans are working from dawn to dusk for $1 a day, picking tomatoes and doing other things with tomatoes, in the tomato harvest. There are huge canneries being built down there. Already the Mexican fresh tomato is dominating the fresh tomato market, at least in the western part of the United States. They sell for a high price when American tomatoes are not moving. But when Americans start moving their tomatoes, they immediately drop their price. In other words, they are trying to capture the whole market.

Also I would like to comment on Mr. Wirtz' oft-quoted statement that the Congress, in effect, imposed this policy on him. We failed to pass a 1-year extension of Public Law 78, here in the House, by only a very few votes. I am certain that most of the Members here who voted against Public Law 78, either a 1-year or a 2-year extension, realize that Public Law 414 was on the books and could be used as a vehicle of equal treatment for California along with other areas that have used Public Law 414.

We have relied on Public Law 78. But since at the time we only extended Public Law 78 for 1 year and Public Law 414 was on the books, the fact that we sought to extend it for a year did not mean that we disapproved of the program.

This program in its development was a terminal one, extended from time to time, so this was not an expression of policy on the part of the Congress, such as Mr. Wirtz says he relies on in his action in denying labor to California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me further?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to what the gentleman from California [Mr. Hagen] had to say in respect to the minimum wage. I do not know any farmer in California who objects to paying $1.40. As a matter of fact, they are paying $1.75. And, as has been indicated by the gentleman from California [Mr. Talcott], they are paying $2 and $3 an hour for workers who produce. What they object to is paying $1.40 to somebody who only produces 25 cents or 40 cents in effort. I am sure that Mr. Hagen meant exactly that. We do not find fault, or our farmers do not find fault, with the figure $1.40 for persons who actually earn it.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN of California. The problem the farmer has is really that the labor he gets is the bottom of the labor market. It is labor that the gentleman from California [Mr. Talcott] has indicated cannot find jobs in industry by and large. But there are corps of workers who prefer agricultural work.

As a consequence, Mr. Speaker, the farmer is not in a position of General Motors of being selective from the standpoint of an accomplished work force. The only way he can handle this problem is through a piece rate production process where the worker is paid according to his productivity. Farmers generally are willing to do that and have been doing it in California. But when you average it and say flatly that every worker, regardless of his productivity, will receive $1.40 an hour, you create problems of loss and bankruptcy for the farmers.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, as further testimony to the extreme shortage of labor and to the fact that the people of California are attempting to do something about this problem, I am in receipt of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles specifically asking for 4,000 men who are presently under the supervision of the director of the bureau of public assistance, to be assigned from the public assistance rolls to assist the farmers with their problems in the fields in an effort to save millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the resolution to which I have referred at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Edmondson). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution referred to follows:

Resolution by Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles

On motion of Supervisor Hahn, unanimously carried, the board hereby adopts the following resolution; and hereby reaffirms the board policy set forth in board order No. 191 of September 29, 1964, copy of which is hereto attached:

"Whereas there exists in California a serious shortage of manpower to harvest the crops; and

"Whereas the agricultural industry is one of the major industries in the entire State of California, and every citizen of California is dependent upon agricultural production; and

"Whereas there exists at the present time approximately 12,000 men in all of the 58 counties of California who are between the ages of 21 and 35 and receiving public assistance funds under the aid to families with dependent children unemployed fathers program; and

"Whereas most of these men are able-bodied, willing to work, and need jobs, while at the same time there is a tremendous shortage of manpower in the fields: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles does hereby instruct the director of the bureau of public assistance to offer forthwith to the farmers of California this available manpower in Los Angeles County—more than 4,000 men to harvest the crops—and state as a policy that, if there are decent working conditions and prevailing wages are paid as determined by the State and Federal Government, a recipient of welfare who is offered work and refuses will be cut off the relief rolls, subject to all legal requirements; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the board to the other 57 counties of California and to the Governor of California, director of social welfare, and other interested parties."

I, Gordon T. Nesvig, clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, and ex officio clerk of the governing body of all other special assessment and taxing districts for which said board so acts, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of the original minutes of board order No. 160, adopted on May 11, 1965, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, and ex officio the governing body of all other special assessment and taxing districts for which said board so acts.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the county of Los Angeles this 12th day of May 1965.

GORDON T. NESVIG,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, and Ex Officio Clerk of the Governing Body of All Other Special Assessment and Taxing Districts for Which Said Board So Acts.

On motion of supervisor Hahn, unanimously carried, it is ordered that, as a policy of the board, the following standards be and they are hereby adopted for implementation by the bureau of public assistance in securing training and giving opportunity for work in farm areas under President Johnson's anitpoverty program:

1. That suitable and proper conditions of employment be provided which will include adequate sanitary facilities (these sanitary facilities should be inspected and meet standards set by the county health officer).

2. That the minimum wage for employees shall be at least $1.25 per hour. (The minimum wage for county employees, including laundry workers, is $1.72 per hour.)

3. That, if at all possible, the work shall provide steady employment with an assurance of minimum reasonable work period.

4. That adequate transportation to farm and ranch areas with reasonable departure and arrival times be regulated by the bureau of public assistance.

5. That the director of the bureau of public assistance exercise judgment in carrying out this policy so that recipients of public assistance shall not be required to work under unusual circumstances, such as illness or other difficult conditions in their family.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his taking this time and making such a splendid address on the subject of the need for labor in the gentleman's congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include an article which appeared in the Washington Post under date of April 18, 1965, the title of which is "Braceros Miss That California Dinero," by George Natanson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The article follows:

BRACEROS MISS THAT CALIFORNIA DINERO

(By George Natanson)

MEXICO CITY.—Ciudadela Plaza is in the heart of Mexico City. It has well-kept lawns and flowers; its fountain and trees give promise of a moment's rest to the passerby.

But Ciudadela is different from the other lovely plazas for which Mexico City is famous. On any day of the week hundreds of men sit disconsolately on the park benches. Others slumber on the grass or stroll through the plaza. Still others stand quietly discussing their problems.

The men are not idlers or tramps. Nor are they city men. Most of them are Mexican campesinos, country people who are described as representative of Mexico's finest workers.

These men were formerly braceros, remnants of that huge army of more than half a million farmworkers who were previously contracted to work in the United States every year to help harvest crops of fruit, vegetables, and cotton.

Since the so-called bracero program was begun more than a decade ago, Ciudadela Plaza has been the site of the central hiring hall for braceros, serving much of the country.

The Mexican Government has announced repeatedly that the United States will not renew the program which was allowed to lapse last December 31, and has continually urged these men to return to their homes in the country to await further developments.

But the campesinos don't comprehend the strange set of circumstances which prevents them from working in the United States, so they come daily to Ciudadela Plaza in the hope that they can once again return to the other side to work.

Antonio Hinojosa is one. His wife and seven children are waiting for him in the southern Mexican state of Oaxaca. "But I can't go home because there is no work there. And there is no work in Mexico City. I simply must wait until I get a job on the other side and can send money home," he said.

Meanwhile, Hinojosa barely manages to survive by performing odd jobs at night and hurrying to the plaza in the morning to wait for news. He catnaps on the grass through the day.

Until December, Hinojosa worked during seasonal periods at stoop labor in the United States. During the 3 or 4 months he was on the other side he earned what for Mexican labor is considered top wages. On the average, Hinojosa and his fellow braceros received from $45 to $60 and $65 weekly. More than half of this was sent home.

Mexico is in no position to comment officially. This country has not enjoyed watching some of its finest workers being forced to cross the border to earn a living. However, officials admit privately that the bracero program, when in full swing, took a considerable load off Mexico's chronic unemployment problem.

Exact figures are not available, but it is estimated that of Mexico's 18 million campesinos, some 7 million are unemployed.

The campesino, and agriculture in general, are one of Mexico's most delicate problems which, if not eased soon, threaten to turn into an explosive issue disrupting Mexico's long period of political stability.

Mexico's president of 4 months, Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, is taking determined strides to help the campesino, but the Ciudadela Plaza is a constant reminder that much yet needs to be done.

Those who crowded around during my visit to Ciudadela Plaza cannot understand why U.S. Labor Secretary Wirtz said that as long as there are Americans unemployed, foreign workers cannot come in.

The Mexican braceros don't even know Wirtz' name, nor are they interested in the arguments set forth by U.S. labor unions who are backing Wirtz.

"We hear that crops in the United States are going to ruin because they are not picked. We have heard that women are being employed to do a man's work. Even that the machines have failed and that Americans won't work in the fields," said one.

"Why, then, can't we go back to work?" they chorused.

The attitude assumed by the Mexican fieldworker is not one of anger, nor does he know anti-U.S. sentiments. He feels friendly toward the United States.

Few if any criticisms were heard in Mexico over the bracero program, even from extreme leftwingers. There have never been cries of "more wages" for the "exploited" Mexican worker—despite the deplorable living conditions of many of the workers who lived in dilapidated shacks with a single water faucet for four and five families and had inadequate medical and school facilities.

It is recognized that the Mexican campesino earned far more during a single season working in the United States than if he worked here 2 or 3 years steadily.

Farsighted Mexican opinion molders are urging the government to make good use of the returned bracero who has learned much while working in the United States.

There are positive results of the bracero program in this country. Many workers have taken the money they earned and gone into business for themselves. Others have bought their own plots of land, working and applying the many agricultural techniques they learned on the other side.

In addition, Mexico as a nation has benefited. More than $30 million yearly was returned by the bracero, which not only served to stimulate the economy but has helped that segment of the population which needs it most.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, Public Law 78 was approved by this Congress in 1951 and this labor was brought in from Mexico, into as many as 21 States, for many years. My State of Arkansas used a considerable number of the braceros for the harvesting of strawberries, and cotton, largely.

Mr. Speaker, at this particular time the situation has changed considerably. When we did not extend Public Law 78 a year ago it expired on December 31, 1964, certain things happened:

In the first place, these Mexican people did not get to do that farmwork that they had been performing in this country. They need it badly today as this article here by Mr. Natanson will depict.

Another thing was this: It was said that if we were to pay these people enough for their labor we would have ample domestic labor with which to do this stoop type of work.

Now, the gentleman from California has stated that he pays well in his district for workers to harvest vegetable crops but cannot recruit enough domestic labor to do the required work when they are needed. In Arkansas we have gone to mechanization very fast and as a result we displaced our own domestic laborers who had been accustomed to fieldwork on these farms of picking cotton, chopping cotton and the like.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California for his very splendid speech and I would like to join with him in his efforts to alleviate this critical situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman would state whether or not there will be as many acres another year, in 1966, in his district devoted to the growing of strawberries as there have been in the year 1965?

Mr. TALCOTT. It is difficult for me to predict now. I know that many crops are being turned under because they cannot get the pickers. The strawberry people tell me they intend to look into the possibilities of going into Mexico next year. I think there will be less acres of strawberries in our district next year. This is very serious, because strawberries provide a lot of employment. It takes two or three persons an acre to harvest the strawberry crop. A single person can harvest many acres of other crops. There are many other workers in allied industries who are affected, people who work in refrigeration plants, people who work in packaging and shipping, and other people who are going to be short of work.

Mr. GATHINGS. The same situation exists in your State as to tomatoes. Your State has produced more than 50 percent of the canned tomatoes in America. You are going to affect people not only who grow tomatoes but the lack of an adequate labor supply for the farmer is going to adversely affect people who process the tomatoes, the people who print the labels, the canners, and other people including the transportation facilities and the consuming public.

Mr. TALCOTT. The planting of tomatoes, incidentally, is down 23 percent from last year. This is a tremendous drop.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. We should not overlook the problem of related employees in the citrus industry in packinghouse employment, which is down at least 25 percent in southern California. This means 25 percent of domestic Americans are not employed in the packinghouses, and there will be at least that many less. It will affect the trucking employees who are engaged in trucking citrus from the fields to the packinghouses and from the packinghouses to the railroad station, or to the port. So much more than farm labor is involved. It is the whole matter of related industries, including many, many fine workers who do not have jobs because these crops are not being harvested.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this particular point out. One thing that puzzles me is this: You produce relatively the same kind of crops in California that they do in Florida. How come Florida is not having this problem? How come they are able to import all kinds of cheap labor from the British West Indies to get their crops harvested while you cannot do it in California? Is there some favoritism? It looks to me as if there is. I wish the gentleman would touch upon that point.

Mr. TALCOTT. I am not suggesting that there is any favoritism. We do have many different crops, although there are crops that are similar. The problem in California, particularly in my district, is that we have an enormous increase of production during the summer time and domestic labor is inadequate. The British West Indies, of course, is closer to the United States. There is a pattern of using British West Indian labor in Florida.

Mr. O'KONSKI. But Mexico is closer to California than the British West Indies is from Florida.

Mr. TALCOTT. We have been cut off from using the Mexican nationals. I am glad that the people in Florida are able to obtain this labor.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. It is a fact, I believe, that Florida, too, has had very serious harvest problems.

But I think it is also a fact that the Secretary of Labor has been more generous in allowing supplemental farm labor in the form of British West Indians to be admitted or to be kept here under section 414 of the immigration law in the case of Florida than he has in the case of California. I think the facts speak for themselves. The peak harvest season in Florida is all over. It came off much earlier than California. They had their big problem some months ago and are probably still having it. We are not yet in our peak season in California. It is true that we harvest some crops all year in California. Lemons are picked all year. We have winter crops of lettuce, particularly down in the Imperial Valley that are just now coming into our peak season. I would certainly hope the Secretary of Labor would not want to find himself in the position of being accused of the fact of discriminating against California in the weeks and months to come in comparison with what he did for Florida. He did grant some relief to Florida and a little relief to California but not nearly enough.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I have been watching this thing a little bit because, frankly, I have been worried about the vote I made on this proposition. But very frankly, it appears to me there is very distinct favoritism that they seem to have. As a matter of fact, I believe I read in one of the exposure columns in a newspaper where one certain Senator, for a certain maneuver that he made, got special consideration for the State of Florida.

It seems to me, if we are going to keep out cheap labor, so-called, that it ought to apply to the whole country and not let Florida get by with it when they do not let California get by with it. I think it is more important that we import Mexicans from Mexico, our next-door neighbor, than some of the other help that we are importing to Florida. I am going to take another hard, cold look at this matter if it ever comes up again.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Would the gentleman be good enough to yield once again?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I am delighted to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin make the statement that he just made. I think the Record also should show on this same general subject that the Secretary of Labor has fixed what really is a minimum wage—no matter what he calls it—of $1.40 in California and a much lower rate in other States including Florida. To me, again, it is just a matter of discrimination.

Mr. TALCOTT. I think that the discrimination that we feel the most is where we are required to pay $1.40 an hour and there are many other growers in other States who are permitted to pay a good deal less. This is very serious discrimination, especially against California, where the shipping costs and the transportation distances are so great.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am very worried about the situation because very frankly I have thought of it ever since I made my vote on that proposition. I sort of think I made the wrong vote on that. Labor is very definitely interested in this. I have listened to the other side of the story on the importation of braceros. If they are against it, let us apply it all over the country. I just do not want it to apply to the State of California and to let the State of Florida go scot free with special favoritism. I do not go for that sort of thing whether labor is for it or against it. I have become convinced that there is something rotten in Denmark somewhere and for that reason if the bill is brought up again, I am going to give it a hard, cold look and see that this thing is straightened out.

Mr. TALCOTT. I appreciate the willingness of the gentleman to reconsider his view after learning the facts. One of the problems that I think many of my colleagues are going to have to face up to is the situation of the growers of apples and other produce in the Northwest and in the Northeast, and many other places, and pickle producers in the North Central States. Many growers who felt that they did not need any help last year opposed the bracero program and now are finding that California is recruiting very heavily and taking many of their usual workers from them. Now they are beginning to feel the pinch because workers much prefer to work in California where the weather is comfortable and conditions are good and they get $2 to $3 an hour.

Already San Benito County which adjoins Monterey County is complaining of the growers of Monterey County for pirating away workers from them. If the farmers from Monterey County can pirate workers from their adjoining counties, certainly they are going to pirate from other States throughout the whole United States. This will present a very serious problem to growers of all kinds of produce throughout the United States. It has been said that the lack of adequate labor is only hurting the big corporate growers. This is not true. I will read a telegram which tells about one situation:

> Field inspection Friday, May 28, by University of California extension service shows on one 487-acre farm 3,530,750 pounds of fruit rotten, overmatured, and in need of immediate picking. Market value for freezer recovery, $600,227.50. California Farm Labor Panel ridicules our recruiting efforts. Here are the facts as of June 1. Gate hired, 5,176. Farm labor office referrals, 975; out of county and out of State recruits, including Sioux Indians, 945. Total hired as of June 1, 7,096 domestics. Balance on hand today picking, irrigating, loading, etc., 726. Over Memorial Day weekend using radio and TV announcements for pickers we averaged 866 workers each day. These workers plus our supplemental imported help averaged 40,513 crates each day. We should still be picking over 65,000 crates each day. This means even if we had 800 additional people picking each day of the week we would still continue to lose more fruit.

This is typical throughout my district, for both the large and the small growers.

With reference to a small grower, who has only a 12.3-acre ranch, the total fruit ready for harvest today, already unsalable due to failure to harvest, is 23,000 pounds. That is more than 10 tons of fruit that this small farmer is going to lose.

Another farm, of only 487 acres, will have a total loss of over 564,000 pounds due to overmaturity. This is over 280 tons of strawberries that this one grower will lose. That is $25,000 per day, and the loss is escalating.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. I hesitate to interrupt the gentleman again.

Mr. TALCOTT. That is perfectly all right.

Mr. GATHINGS. I should like to ask the gentleman what is the effect of these losses on the consumer of fresh vegetables and fruits in this country? Could the gentleman give us that information for the Record?

Mr. TALCOTT. I have some information here which I intend to put in the Record. Consumer prices are going up. Your wife and my wife can tell us, simply by going to the store and trying to buy strawberries in the markets of Washington, or anyplace in the country, that retail prices are going up.

Mr. GATHINGS. Does the gentleman have a comparison of the price of strawberries today as against a year ago or 2 years ago?

Mr. TALCOTT. In the city of New York, according to the Bureau of Consumers' Service and Research, the general price for strawberries for the week ending May 28, 1964, was 39 cents a pint. This year, for the same week, it is 45 cents a pint—up considerably.

Mr. GATHINGS. Could the gentleman give some information on lettuce? Has there been an increase in the price of lettuce?

Mr. TALCOTT. There has been a tremendous increase in the price of lettuce. For the week ending May 28, 1964, the price of lettuce in New York, for a head, was 23 cents. This year, for the same week, it was 39 cents. That is an increase of almost 100 percent.

I should say that this is not entirely due to a lack of sufficient harvest labor. The price of lettuce varies a good deal because of many factors, not merely the lack of labor or incompetent labor.

The increase in the price of strawberries, I contend, is entirely due to the lack of labor, or the lack of competent labor. Not only are the crops spoiled in the fields, but the crops which are picked are inferior crops in quality, because of bad mix. Some berries in the same carton are overripe and some are underripe, and this mixture commands a lesser price in the marketplace.

Mr. GATHINGS. Could the gentleman give the House any information with respect to the price of lemons, as compared to a year ago?

Mr. TALCOTT. Lemons have increased in price from 25 cents a pound to 29 cents a pound, for the same week, in New York.

There has been an increase for almost every fruit and fresh vegetable, because of the increase in the cost of labor. I will include at this point in my remarks the table from which the prices quoted above were obtained, and other price indexes and market reports.

Selected retail price comparison[1]

Commodity	Unit	Most general price for week ending	
		May 28, 1964	May 27. 1965
		Cents	*Cents*
Asparagus	Pound	25	29
Broccoli	do	24	26
Cabbage, white	do	12	19
Carrots	Package	15	17½
Celery	Stalk	23	25
Lettuce, iceberg	Head	23	39
Onions, yellow	Pound	10	14½
Potatoes, white	5 pounds	45	59
Tomatoes	Pound	33	39
Do	Carton	23	29
Lemons	Pound	25	29
Strawberries	Pint	39	45

[1] Source: Department of Markets, City of New York Bureau of Consumers' Service and Research.

The wholesale price index for fresh and dried fruits and vegetables was 117.6 in April 1965 (1957–59=100). In April 1964 it stood at 105.9 and averaged 103.2 in 1964.

Wholesale prices of fresh fruits and vegetables at Chicago, as reported by the Department of Agriculture's Fruit and Vegetable Division show sharp increases over 1964 levels. Some examples in the Chicago market are as follows:

Commodity	Prices	
	May 26, 1964	May 25, 1965
California strawberries (pint)	$0.28	$0.44
California broccoli (½ crates, 14 bunches)	2.85	3.25
California cauliflower (cartons, film wrapped)	3.35	4.15
Florida celery, Pascal type (2 to 4 dozen)	3.60	4.15
Lettuce, iceberg, California (carton)	3.00	6.85

A recent AP story discussing the price increases for meat, potatoes and fresh vegetables had this to say:

"Many in the produce markets blame the Government's decision to end the 'bracero program' under which Mexican workers were brought into California to help harvest lettuce, tomatoes, asparagus, strawberries and other crops that have to be picked by hand. Acreage is down, as well as harvests, produce dealers say."

Official Market News Service Reports of the Department of Agriculture are more frequently referring to labor shortages in their comments about specified commodities. An example follows:

With regard to California lemons: "Picking continues fairly heavy but still behind last season."

California strawberries: "Some growers are having difficulty keeping up with fields and getting fruit picked uniformly."

California carrots: "Movement (in Imperial Valley) at peak but labor shortage restricting some harvest."

Florida celery: "Harvest curtailed some account labor trouble."

California dry onions: "Some field labor shortage" in the Imperial Valley, "Severe labor shortage" at Blythe.

The Secretary of Labor has said that the consumer, the housewife, would be willing to pay the increase in cost. Of course, if the farmers could recover the increased costs, the farmers would be more than happy to pay the workers higher wages. Nothing would please the farmer more than to be able to pay his workers higher wages. The problem is that there is very little relationship between the price of fresh fruits and vegetables in the eastern markets and the cost of producing them.

Over Memorial Day weekend in my district we had many housewives and students come out to pick strawberries partly out of a patriotic duty or desire to help the beleaguered farmer, and the farmers had to pay those pickers more for picking than the crop commanded on the market.

There was simply a loss just in the picking. This is because of incompetent, inexperienced, and unreliable labor. It takes some skill and experience to be able to pick satisfactorily. People who want to come out only on weekends and only part time are usually not able to do a satisfactory job, and the farmers should not be required to use them.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TALCOTT. I am going to include for the Record some other selected retail price comparisons. The problem is that the full impact of the price increases has not yet occurred. It will be a few weeks before we really find out how expensive these strawberries are. Because we have so many mature berries and overripe berries we had to use air transportation to get the berries to the markets in time This has caused an increase in the price. In order to get the berries accepted at the packing sheds and the freezing plants, farmers had to regrade and resort them. This was all because of incompetent labor. All of these factors relating to labor are increasing the cost of strawberries throughout the United States. Costs are increasing as time goes on.

In spite of the troubles we are having recruiting labor and strawberry pickers in our district, another phase of the Federal Government, the community action program, under the Economic Opportunity Act, right at this time in Graham County, N.C., is hiring an extension agent to advise farmers on strawberry raising. Under title III, about 15 loans have been made to farmers to help establish them in strawberry raising. Under the law, they can get $2,500. The Federal Government is giving $2,500 to get people into the strawberry business when people in my district are unable to get labor.

In addition to that, 12 people have formed a marketing cooperative and are applying for a loan of $200,000 to harvest their first crop next spring. It seems to me that the right hand of the Federal Government does not know what the left hand is doing. Here we have strawberries spoiling in the fields, farmers losing millions of dollars, and we are trying to get other people into this industry in another area of the country.

We have also heard it said that the increased price would be easily and gladly passed on to the consumer, but that is simply not true. The housewife will buy the foreign imports at a cheaper price first.

There are many other things I would like to convey to the Members of the House. I have several proposals I hope to introduce in order to try to avoid the crop losses and to provide work for the migrant workers and to make living conditions and working conditions more attractive for the domestic workers. These are not easy. In the meantime, before some of these new projects can be developed, I think we need a lot more understanding from the Department of Labor. The panel appointed by the Secretary of Labor to investigate this problem in my district said that there were less people on welfare this year because of the withdrawal of the bracero. That is simply not true. The reason why there are less people on welfare in my district this year than last year is because the weather which has been the best for 10 years and crops matured much earlier. The people not only in the administration in California but in the Federal Government have gone to great extents in order to try to camouflage the problem. The Department of Employment in the State of California has actually padded the figures to show a larger number of domestic workers available for farmwork than are actually available. The Governor's office recently took out of context a statement by the welfare director of Monterey County, which indicated that less families were on welfare this year because of recruiting activities, which is not true.

There is a statement that there are some 400,000 California people who are unemployed and that these unemployed people should be able to do the work in the fields. In many instances I would agree with this, but the figure of 400,000 unemployed in California is simply not a fair statement in relation to farmwork. I shall include at this point in my remarks two newspaper reports which are accurate statements of the situation of the unemployed in California. They show that conditions are not nearly as bad as the unemployment-mongers would like to have them appear.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, May 30, 1965]

REPORT—MANY JOBS, MANY IDLE

(By Ray Christiansen)

Although 437,000 California residents were reported unemployed last month, the State was unable to fill an order for 10,000 seasonal farmworkers.

"About 5,000 strawberry pickers are needed in the south and central coastal areas," the State reported. "Around 3,100 jobs are available in lemons and oranges. About 1,500 workers are wanted to thin and hoe lettuce, and 1,300 are needed to cut asparagus."

The State could have issued a somewhat similar report for many other occupations, reporting shortages of qualified janitors, metalworkers, waiters, office employees, cooks, nurses, chemists, technicians and on and on through a long list.

OUT OF DATE

With 437,000 persons walking the streets, looking for work, why couldn't these jobs be filled?

Because there weren't 437,000 persons "walking the streets, looking for work."

"Walking the streets, looking for work" went out with the great depression.

But millions of Americans still think unemployment simply isn't what it used to be.

Some of those 437,000 persons wouldn't take work under any circumstances.

JUST LOAFING

Some are just plain loafing between jobs.

Thousands are receiving unemployment insurance payments as a form of subsidy for making themselves available for seasonal work.

Some of those 437,000 can't hold a steady job in the city, and won't go into the country. (The farmers don't want them, either.)

Many are teenagers looking only for part-time work after school hours.

Many are white-collar workers over 55 who couldn't take hard physical work in the fields.

Others are married women with working husbands—seeking work to help support unemployed teenagers.

Phyllis Gillette of the State department of employment asked:

"Who is to say that a man, having lost a $750-a-month job should take any $450-a-month job that is offered him?

"Who is in a position to criticize an unemployed clerk for refusing to work in the fields?"

EXPERTS EXPLAIN

Three San Francisco experts on labor statistics, Max Kossoris, Don Mayall, and Edward N. Smith, presented facts and figures to permit a better understanding of unemployment figures and the nature of the labor market.

From charts and tables, it is seen at once that unemployment rates are not the same for all segments of the work force.

The U.S. average last month was 4.9 percent. But rates ranged from 2.5 percent for married men to 30 percent for teenaged Negro girls.

The 2.5 percent figure is of special significance; one could say there is "full employment" among the Nation's "prime breadwinners."

In World War II, U.S. employment never dropped below 1.2 percent—which is, perhaps, the irreducible minimum in a democracy.

High employment among married men is of special importance to the economy because they support three out of every four persons in the country—themselves, their wives, and their children.

An unemployment rate of 2.5 percent in such an important segment makes it easier to understand why both city and farm employers complain that they can't find the workers they want although there are reports of millions unemployed.

Farmers won't find many workers among teenage Negro girls, who have an unemployment rate of more than 30 percent, and they won't find many among city-bred workers of middle age.

Of the 3,552,000 Americans listed as unemployed last month, 933,000 were 14-to-19 years old, of whom 348,000 were seeking only part-time work after school and on weekends. One-sixth of the unemployed of all ages—a total of 597,000 persons—wanted only part-time work.

More than 315,000 of the unemployed last month were women over 45 and more than 330,000 were men over 55—a total of 645,000 unlikely prospects for hard field labor.

About one-fifth of the unemployed were white-collar workers, and almost one-half blue-collar workers, most of them with industrial skills and experience.

INEXPERIENCED

About one-sixth of the unemployed had no work experience. Most of these are members of the postwar baby crop which is just reaching the labor market now.

Only 2.9 percent of the 3,552,000 were farmworkers and only 9.7 percent were common laborers.

Don Mayall of the State department of employment commented:

"In general, people with skills have little trouble finding jobs these days. There are shortages of skilled workers in many categories.

DISPLACED WORKERS

"But to say that there is full employment among workers with skills that employers want is to ignore the problem: that there are growing numbers of unskilled workers being displaced, and there are declining job opportunities for young workers entering the job market."

Kossoris, regional director of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, added:

"While the Bureau lists as unemployed some persons who won't accept work, and others who are seeking only part-time work, it doesn't count those persons who are too discouraged to look for work any longer; they have left the labor market and are not counted as unemployed."

Kossoris noted that the pace of economic growth is sufficient to offset loss of jobs due to increasing productivity but not large enough to absorb all of the unemployed.

The worst unemployment problem involves the influx of teenagers. They came into the labor market at the rate of 750,000 a year in the 1950's, at the rate of 1,500,000 last year, and will be seeking jobs at the rate of 2.5 to 3 million a year after 1970.

Most San Francisco employers interviewed on employment opportunities said they had difficulty finding "qualified help"—the same complaint heard frequently from California farmers.

A spokesman for Pacific Telephone Co. said the phone company never has enough telephone operators, although it had more job applicants than jobs. Some persons, it was explained, cannot speak well enough to fill these positions.

DON'T WANT JOBS

James Meredith, personnel manager of American Building Maintenance Co., remarked:

"If we can find capable and experienced men among 10 percent of our applicants, we'd be doing great.

"Many seem to be going through the motions of seeking work with no intention of obtaining a job. Most applicants for work don't ask what the wage rate is."

An officer of a mortgage banking firm said no less than one-third of applicants for clerical work "don't want to work."

"They're just making their job hunting a matter of record for unemployment insurance," he said.

Another employer with a large business machine firm said "a surprisingly large number of youths have been in trouble with the law and cannot be bonded."

Another firm reported that it can find enough graduate engineers, but it cannot find enough men who are good enough to yield a profit on their work.

A lack of education and training is the crux of the problem.

When we know more about the skill requirements of industry," said Kossoris, "we will be in a better position to develop the necessary training programs."

[From the Wall Street Journal]

POOR STATISTICS AND WORSE ECONOMICS

As a voice in the statistical wilderness that has long questioned the validity of the Federal unemployment estimates, we naturally welcome Samuel Lubell's call for a new and sharper definition of the jobless.

Mr. Lubell, the diligent and perceptive political pollster, has spent many recent weeks interviewing hundreds of people out of work in 21 cities around the Nation. His overriding conclusion is that the national unemployment rate as proclaimed by Washington is in several ways misleading and in need of considerable revision.

It is not only that the figure distorts the actual condition. What is worse is that it has come to be regarded as the single most important barometer of the Nation's economic climate. It can be, and is, used as the basis for vast new public spending programs, however irrelevant or wasteful they may be. Another way of putting it, in our somewhat jaundiced view, is that it has become a convenient tool for politicians eager to tap the Treasury.

Yet this sacrosanct statistic, as Mr. Lubell observes, does not provide an accurate estimate of how serious is the need for more jobs. For one thing, the Government does not even attempt to measure the job vacancies that exist along with unemployment. Nor does the announced national rate yield, in the interviewer's words, "a sensitive picture of the shifts taking place in the quality of the unemployed and of the changing nature of their problems."

Moreover, the figure does not tell how much, or how little, hardship there is among the jobless. To us this is a particularly important point. Surely a humanitarian Nation should be more concerned with the actual cases of hardship than with statistical veneration. Beyond that, we reject the proletarian doctrine, implicit in governmental attitudes, that everyone should work regardless of need. If some people can make a decent life without working, we would say that is their privilege and pleasure.

Part of the trouble with the official unemployment rate stems from the sampling methods used, a survey of 35,000 households in which the main question is, "Have you been looking for work?"; if the answer is yes, the individual is counted as unemployed. As sampling techniques go, 35,000 households might be considered adequate, though obviously capable of producing only a broad national guess. The loose questioning is another matter.

One of its results, Mr. Lubell writes, is that "the identical label 'unemployed' is applied to such an astonishing variety of situations that it has been robbed of much of its real meaning. A coal miner who has lost his job for good is given the same statistical weight as an auto worker who is guaranteed 70 percent of his pay even when laid off for model changes."

The sweeping definition of "unemployed" also leads to abundant abuse: People who are on jobless relief but won't look for work, people who won't take jobs at pay lower than they had been making, people who don't need to work at all but receive compensation. One young man interviewed at an extension university admitted that he was a full-time student and shouldn't be getting unemployment checks.

To give the Labor Department its due, it does put out certain breakdowns of unemployment by groups. Unfortunately the more significant of these figures are usually granted scant attention by the public, the politicians, and apparently Labor Department officials themselves, since they are among those who constantly contend that the aggregate level of unemployment is intolerable.

Almost certainly, it seems to us, the most revealing estimate, in terms both of degree of hardship and of economic significance, is not the national rate, currently given as 4.9 percent of the labor force, but the jobless rate for married men. These, after all, are generally speaking the people who do need to work and who comprise the bulk of the labor force. By any standard they are far more deserving of concern than the jobless teenagers about whom there is so much weeping.

That rate for married men is presently put at 2.5 percent. If it is anywhere near a correct approximation, it represents not a state of intolerable unemployment but for all practical purposes full employment. In a huge, complex and mobile economy, with a considerable amount of seasonal employment, it would be difficult if not impossible to attain a much lower rate of unemployment.

The deficiencies of the jobless tabulations suggest their own remedies. One private group, the National Industrial Conference Board, has just shown, in a local survey, the way to correcting part of the problem—the compilation of job-vacancy figures. It is by no means unlikely that a national survey would indicate more job opportunities than qualified jobseekers.

But what is needed most of all is public realization that the lot of the genuinely unemployed is being employed for questionable political purposes. In such a climate, it is at least encouraging when attempts are made to expose an arrangement which builds, on a foundation of faulty evaluation, a pyramid of bad economic policy.

There is one problem that I think the Federal Government should look into, a situation which does not permit an industrial worker drawing unemployment benefits—and approximately one-half of the unemployed do—may not engage in farmwork and leave such farmwork and again qualify for unemployment compensation prior to having another industrial job.

This is one of the reasons we do not attract the unemployed who are drawing unemployment benefits, to the farms. I have a proposal which is somewhat like the bracero program that I would like to introduce, putting the responsibility in the Department of Agriculture rather than in the Department of Labor. One of the problems here is that the Department of Labor is simply not oriented to agriculture, especially our kind of agriculture. It is oriented to the big city factory type work. The responsibility for certification of farmworkers should be with the States who know the situation rather than with the Federal Government which in our case is 2,500 miles away and not oriented to our problem.

One of the reasons migrant workers have so much difficulty is the matter of housing. We try to provide the best housing possible, particularly for single workers. Providing housing for families is a great deal more difficult and expensive. But I am proposing a mobile housing subsidy for farm migrant workers. This will require more study before I have it perfected in form.

I am going to recommend that we have a minimum wage of $1.50 for farmworkers throughout the United States. I think we should prohibit the importation of foreign products from countries which pay less than 50 percent of our labor wage.

I think there should be some indemnity to the growers who have suffered these tremendous losses. This is a manmade disaster, just as serious as the disasters because of the floods in California.

I think we should change our unemployment regulations to permit farmwork by the industrially unemployed without changing their employment status and eligibility.

Mr. Speaker, I prefer not to take any more time now. I ask unanimous consent to include certain extraneous matter in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to congratulate the gentleman for a thorough and cogent statement. I think it was an excellent statement and will be of benefit to the Members of the House. I know of no Member of the House who has been more diligent in working on this particular problem than the gentleman in the well and I congratulate him.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from California for bringing to the attention of the Members of the House the disastrous situation which has occurred in his State as a result of the exclusion of adequate bracero farm labor.

Certainly I join my good friend on behalf of the agricultural areas of my State of Washington in deploring the conditions that have been allowed to occur in spite of the pleas so many of us have made to try to prevent exactly what has occurred.

It is true that we of the State of Washington have not used bracero labor for a number of years. But I can assure my colleagues that we are feeling the pinch. The reason is that we of the State of Washington depend on domestic migratory labor which regularly follows the crop harvest across many parts of the Nation. These are experienced farmhands who like to come to the State of Washington to participate in the asparagus harvest, the soft fruit harvest and the apple harvest. But now that these workers are needed in the southern areas of the country to fill in the void created by the shortage of bracero labor, the domestic workers are not coming to the State of Washington any more. The effect of the Secretary of Labor's action—or lack of action—is definite and of severe impact in my State in upsetting established patterns of migratory labor.

As an example, an acute shortage of labor to harvest asparagus has already developed and it has been necessary to request the warden of the State penitentiary to release convicts to do the work formerly done by experienced domestic farmhands. Asparagus is the first crop needing migratory labor to be harvested in the State of Washington since the bracero program has ended. As other crops mature similar problems are expected.

I might also point out at this point that the State of Washington suffered abnormally low temperatures at critical periods this year resulting in freeze damage to a number of tree fruit crops. The crop loss is expected to be substantial. It is imperative that the good quality fruit remaining be harvested by skilled hands and with dispatch. I am wondering how many migratory laborers will come to the State of Washington when they know they will be needed where they are now and when they know that the tree fruit crop harvest in my State will be smaller than usual.

Farm labor wages in the State of Washington are high, compared with some States. But I doubt this inducement will be sufficient to attract labor we need in view of the insurmountable obstacles precipitated through Government fiat.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] on the fine presentation he has made. He has pointed out that this manmade disaster has already struck in the 12th District of California. Mr. Speaker, we have a similar disaster impending in the 10th Congressional District of Michigan.

The State of Michigan is the Nation's largest producer of cucumbers for pickles. Harvesting of these cucumbers requires stoop labor. The future of this industry hangs in the balance. The U.S. Department of Labor is playing a game of teeter-totter with the Michigan farmer. The Labor Department is telling the farmer it will make known the volume of migratory labor available in our State when it learns how many acres of farmland are placed under contract with the pickle companies. The farmer naturally will not sign a contract with a pickle company until he knows for certain that he is going to have access to an adequate supply of labor to harvest his crop. The farmer should not be expected to take this gamble.

Mr. Speaker, where is the voice of the Secretary of Agriculture in this crisis? The Secretary of Agriculture is the spokesman for the American farmer in the President's Cabinet. I have seen no indication of his concern about Michigan's pickle industry in this serious matter. Not only is this an income crop for the farmer but it means thousands of jobs in our pickle processing plants.

Any one familiar with the harvesting of this crop knows it is no job for an amateur. For the novice it means many a backache.

Yet the Secretary of Labor intends to make guinea pigs of Michigan cucumber growers and gamble on the harvest by telling the farmers that Washington will send him high school and college athletes to harvest his cucumbers. If the Secretary of Labor wants to use Michigan pickle fields for a laboratory he should experiment in a small area first. Then if the plan is successful, growers will have confidence enough to accept it statewide next year.

It is one thing to make one or two shoestring catches in a baseball game or to crouch over a football during four quarters of a game but it is another to bend over pickle vines for 8 hours a day in the hot sun.

The Mount Pleasant, Mich., Daily Times-News, one of the fine daily papers in my district has been running a series of articles by its staff writer, David Lyon, on the plight of local pickle growers in Michigan.

One of its series entitled "Uncertainty Plagues Pickle Crop" reads as follows:

[From the Mount Pleasant (Mich.) Daily Times-News, May 25, 1965]

UNCERTAINTY PLAGUES PICKLE CROP

(By David Lyon)

It is not as easy to grow pickles for a profit as it used to be.

Hampered by several years of uncertainty regarding the availability of harvest labor, the pickle industry in Isabella County and the rest of Michigan is on the wane.

A few short years ago farmers were planting up to 1,600 acres of pickles in Isabella County alone. Last year it was estimated at 350 to 400 acres, and this year it will be less than half of that, according to three local persons familiar with the situation.

They are Isabella County extension director Louie Webb, pickle company representative, Mrs. Donald Decker, and grower Ron Ervin.

Central Michigan is the heart of the pickle-producing area in one of the chief pickle-growing States. The leading counties are Montcalm, Saginaw, Gratiot and Bay. Last year Michigan harvested 22,800 acres of pickle cucumbers but this year growers indicate they will plant only 16,000 acres.

Lawmakers and labor officials in Washington are primarily responsible for the decline of the Michigan pickle industry. Congress last year refused to renew a law that permitted unrestricted importing of harvest workers from Mexico.

Before Federal labor officials will allow the workers to come into this country, they must be shown that a definite need exists for these Mexican nationals, called braceros. Labor officials also have to be shown that growers and canners of fruits and vegetables requiring hand-harvesting have made genuine attempts to recruit domestic labor, and that enough domestic labor can't be found.

Last year it took 12,800 braceros (and 3,500 other field workers) to harvest the Michigan pickle crop. A five-man farm and labor panel has told Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz a need exists for only 5,000 braceros in the State this summer, because more domestic workers are willing to labor in the fields.

Wirtz is expected to rule shortly whether to grant the request for the 5,000 braceros. But as of now many growers have no assurance they will be able to harvest the pickles they plant. So they aren't planting. The planting season has begun already and lasts only until June 10.

"I'd like to put in some pickles, but I can't take the risk." Ervin says. Ervin has a farm a short distance northwest of town, and he planted pickles annually for several years.

Ervin and other pickle growers earlier in the year signed contracts with a pickle cannery to grow so many acres. The contracts are the pickle companies' devices to assure that farmers will have a market for their pickles and will not produce a surplus.

"I got a very attractive contract this year," Ervin said. "But I wrote in a clause that it would be void if there weren't any Mexican nationals (braceros) available to harvest."

"Pickle company representatives have tried to assure growers they will get help by harvest time," Webb said. "But many farmers apparently are not convinced."

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, though the peak of the harvest season for fruits and vegetables in western New York is still some time away, there is great concern in our area of the country that adequate numbers of workers will not be available to harvest the crops. Fruit growers, particularly, have been expressing these fears to me since early this year and I have been advising the Secretary of Labor of their position. We have in the 37th Congressional District highly productive apple and cherry orchards and truck farms. If adequate numbers of competent workers are not available at the critical time, the losses to both the farmers and the consumers will be highly damaging.

The country has already witnessed abnormal increases in the prices of fruits and vegetables this year, contributing to a record high for the Consumer Price Index last month. The housewife and the consumer have a great stake in this issue, along with our fruit and vegetable farmers. However, in view of the administration's position on this matter and its recent proposal for a bread tax, I wonder whether higher food prices are a deliberate objective of administration policy.

I have mentioned that the concern is over adequate numbers of competent workers. Competency and dependability are key considerations here. In declining to authorize the temporary movement into the country of foreign farmworkers, the Secretary of Labor has maintained in letters to me that adequate numbers of domestic workers are available, if only our farmers will recruit them and offer satisfactory wages and working conditions.

Our farmers point out in disagreement that if adequate numbers of skilled domestic workers were available, they would have been employed in previous years. But, as one farmer wrote to me:

> Too many people have the mistaken idea that all of farm labor is unskilled. This is no more true today in agriculture than it is in other industries. We are absolutely dependent upon highly skilled, experienced apple pickers to harvest our crop.

Another letter reads as follows:

> Had willing and able domestics been available in past years, the Employment Service would not have certified any State for foreign workers. Had the Employment Service known of any reasonable supply or source, the growers would have been sent to get them. In spite of the textbooks on economics, higher wages do not attract seasonal farmworkers nor do higher wages keep them on the job.

Mr. Speaker, all of us want to expand the job opportunities for American workers; our farmers are no exception to this. At the same time, none of us believes it is necessary to cripple the efforts of our foodgrowers to achieve this. Congress has created the authority to permit foreign workers to come into our country to help harvest our abundance of fruits and vegetables, as needed. The Secretary of Labor is empowered to exercise this authority, and we ask no more of him than that this authority be used in a sound and reasonable manner to guarantee the efficient harvest of our agriculture products. This can be done in the best interests of the farmer, the workers, the consumers, indeed, of all segments of the Nation.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from California in discussing a subject which is of vital importance to all congressional districts. The lack of adequate farm labor affects not only vegetable and fruit producing rural areas, but also the mass consuming public all over our country. The housewives of America are suffering from the most staggering grocery price increases in recent history. Why? Because in this era of abundance, the supply of produce is not sufficient to meet the demands of our families. This shortage is not the result of natural disasters or inefficient farming methods. Instead, the cause is a manmade disaster created by the Labor Department.

The particular type of agriculture involved here presents peculiar problems. The vegetable and fruit farms of our country have not benefited as others from the vast improvements in farm technology during the past 50 years. As yet, no one has developed the miraculous, laborsaving machines applicable to the produce farms which have so benefited our grain farms. One reason for this is the nonuniform ripening characteristic of these products. Manual labor, utilizing the individual judgment so far only available from human beings, must be used. I am certain that the Secretary is well aware of this aspect of the problem. He has, in good faith, determined that, with our depressing unemployment rate, enough domestic workers can be found for this job. If this were true, I would join with him wholeheartedly in his efforts.

However, the crops are now rotting in the fields and the grocery prices are skyrocketing. Many of the domestic workers refuse to subject themselves to the backbreaking work involved in produce and fruit farming. The laboring conditions and oppressive heat are not compatible with our automation-oriented labor force. This does not excuse the deplorable working conditions found on a few of our farms. But these conditions should be, and in part have been, corrected by long-range legislation and self-regulating measures by the growers. The question now is one of practicality.

The higher prices now found in our grocery stores are a drag on our overall economy. Money spent on higher-priced food essentials cannot be spent for refrigerators, automobiles, or television sets. We have learned in the past that bargains provided consumers by farmers are largely responsible for the great expansion of our nonfarm economy.

In addition to this, produce- and fruit-affiliated industries are, quite logically, moving their facilities to the labor source, Mexico. We cannot afford to lose these concerns. And yet, we cannot expect them to suffer the consequences of ill-advised government policies.

I join my colleagues in asking that the Secretary of Labor immediately reverse his impractical and devastating decision and allow for the extension of the bracero labor supply.

REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 days, Members of the House Republican task force on education have taken the floor to acquaint their colleagues with the proceedings relating to a hearing conducted by the task force at New York City on May 24—I was privileged to be present at that hearing. That hearing pertained to the proposition of tax credits as an aid in meeting the elevating costs of higher education, and I rise to provide further information on that superbly successful hearing.

Before proceeding toward that, however, I would like to remind the Members of the House of Representatives that while an interest in tax credits is a paramount concern at present of the House Republican task force on education, this is not by any means the sole interest of the task force.

The House Republican task force on education is interested in making an appraisal of the total needs of education in America today, of making a finding of solutions for these needs, and of determining what parts the various levels of Government shall play in satisfying these needs.

Such a broad-scoped view will, of course, reach into many areas of education, including, for instance, that vast desert of learning existing between the high school and college levels.

The simple truth of the matter is that the students who are not college material exceed in number those who are equipped to go forward with advanced educational training. These below-college-level students are ideally suited for the technical and trade schools, but somehow there seems to be a lack of coordination between the high schools and the trade schools, with both a substantial number of students and society suffering in the process.

Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that a lack of training in this area of trades and technical skills contributes in a substantial measure to the severity of our unemployment problem. Still, when I have inquired of educators as to the absence of such training, I am advised that there is a great number of institutions which provide this type of training in the trades and technical skills.

Maybe there is a substantial number of such trade schools, but there is a multitude of students who never see the inside of these institutions, for otherwise they would not be walking the streets both unskilled and unemployed.

It could be, Mr. Speaker, that the costs of education at this trade-school level are rising at a level comparable to that of higher educational institutions. If so, some attention must be given in this area, and whether the answer is tax credits or whatever, some search for a solution is very much in order.

I would like to say at this point, however, that the House Republican task force on education discovered at the outset of its studies into educational matters that a keen concern is being evidenced by student taxpayers and their parents with respect to the increasing costs of education. And through a preliminary examination into this matter, the task force became measurably impressed with the prospects of tax credits for coping with this particular problem.

Toward the end of testing public attitudes on tax credits and with a view to sounding out various other recommendations for helping the taxpayer to meet the escalating costs of education, the House Republican task force on education conducted a public hearing in New York City on May 24. Highly competent witnesses provided the task force with a broad assortment of views on tax credits—mostly favorable—and they also recommended to the task force's attention several other solutions for meeting the costs of higher education.

Among those of such competent witnesses who testified at the May 24 hearing was Dr. Oliver C. Carmichael, Jr. Dr. Carmichael has, for man years, been a leading light in educational circles, having been a dean of students at Vanderbilt University from 1952 to 1955 and president of Converse College from 1956 to 1960. Presently Dr. Carmichael is serving as chairman of the Committee on Higher Education in North Central Indiana, and as president of the Citizens National Committee for Higher Education, Inc.

Dr. Carmichael is a devoted advocate of a tax credit program as an aid in meeting the increasing costs of higher education, and in his testimony supporting this approach he uses as an example S. 12, as introduced by Senator RIBICOFF, of Connecticut.

Had Dr. Carmichael known about legislation planned by Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY, of Vermont, in this regard, he might well have used Senator PROUTY's bill as an example, for as Senator PROUTY expressed through a statement at the hearing:

> I believe that the tax credit plan typified by S. 12 is a sound, responsible plan to promote higher education in America. There is, however, room for improvement in some of its provisions. To that end I am today introducing a similar measure which I believe will help to overcome the objections of some of those who have opposed the Ribicoff bill.
>
> One objection brought against the Ribicoff bill holds that it would disproportionately aid students attending the more expensive private colleges, and thus discriminate against students at the public and land-grant universities, which generally charge lower tuition.
>
> To counter this objection, I have designed a compromise sliding scale for benefits which would help students paying low tuitions somewhat more than would Senator RIBICOFF's versions.
>
> In my bill a taxpayer could claim a credit of 100 percent of the first $200 of college

expenses; 10 percent of the next $300, and 5 percent of the next thousand dollars. This adds up to a maximum credit of $280 for a student paying $1,500 in expenses. Simply put, students paying up to $600 in tuition, fees, books, supplies and equipment would gain substantially from my bill as opposed to the Ribicoff bill, while students paying more than $600 would gain somewhat more under S. 12.

Another objection raised to the Ribicoff bill was that it afforded no benefit to the individual whose income was so low, or who had so many deductions and exemptions, that he owed less tax than the credit to which he would be entitled, or perhaps no tax at all. I have attempted to ease this objection in my bill by permitting an individual whose computed credit exceeds his tax liability to claim up to $100 of the difference as an overpayment of tax.

The third difference between the Ribicoff and Prouty bills lies in the reduction of credit feature. In S. 12, the maximum amount of credit the taxpayer may claim is reduced by 1 percent of the excess of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income over $25,000. In my bill, the point at which the credit begins to diminish is an adjusted gross income of $10,000, and the rate of decrease is 2 percent instead of 1 percent.

Where under the Ribicoff bill, benefits to taxpayers would not decrease to zero until the taxpayer's income rose to $57,500, under my bill a taxpayer with an income of $24,000 would not benefit. It seems to me that those who earn $25,000, $30,000, $40,000, and $50,000 a year should be able to put their children through college without this extra assistance.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Oliver C. Carmichael documented a convincing argument in favor of a tax credit approach for helping to meet the increasing costs of higher education, and his testimony will make a very valuable contribution to any study concerned with the merits of tax credits as an aid in meeting higher educational costs. I shall introduce Dr. Carmichael's testimony, presented at the May 24 hearing, in the RECORD at this point:

A PLAN FOR EASING THE FINANCIAL BURDEN OF PARENTS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS AND PROVIDING NEW SOURCES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SCHOLARSHIPS

(By Oliver C. Carmichael, Jr.)

(NOTE.—Oliver C. Carmichael, Jr., received his A.B. degree from Vanderbilt University, M.A. degree from Columbia University, LL.B. degree from Duke University, and his Ph. D. in public law and government from Columbia University. He served as dean of students at Vanderbilt University from 1952 to 1955; as the executive director of the Vanderbilt University Development Foundation from 1955 to 1956; and as president of Converse College from 1956 to 1960. He is a trustee of Converse College, St. Mary's College, the University of Notre Dame, and Vanderbilt University. He is now chairman of the board, Associates Investment Co. and its subsidiaries, the Capitol Life Insurance Co. of Denver, Emmco Insurance Co., and First Bank & Trust Co. of South Bend, Ind. Mr. Carmichael is presently serving as chairman of the Committee on Higher Education in North Central Indiana, and as president of the Citizens National Committee for Higher Education, Inc.)

Any discussion of tax credit legislation must be based upon knowledge of the concept. Lack of understanding has prompted many people to reject it initially.

A clear distinction must be made between tax credit and tax deduction. A tax credit is a subtraction from the taxes an individual would otherwise pay. One dollar of credit reduces the person's tax by $1, without regard to the taxpayer's bracket. A deduction or exemption saves a $15,000-a-year man more tax dollars than a $5,000-a-year man. A credit saves both taxpayers the same. Regardless of the individual's tax bracket, a $200 tax credit would reduce the Federal income tax by that amount. For example, if the tax owed was $500, the taxpayer would pay the Government $300.

For the purpose of this discussion, the Ribicoff bill will be used as an example. As S. 12, it has 34 bipartisan cosponsors in the 89th Congress and has been introduced in the House by Representative HERLONG, of Florida, a member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Under the Ribicoff bill, the credit is based on the first $1,500 paid for tuition, fees, books, and supplies per student at an institution of higher education.

The amount of credit is 75 percent of the first $200, 25 percent of the next $300, and 10 percent of the next $1,000. The maximum credit allowable is $325.

The amount of credit is reduced by 1 percent of the amount by which the taxpayer's adjusted gross income exceeds $25,000. The taxpayer with $60,000 income would receive no benefit at all.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

Certain assumptions are basic to the belief by an increasing number of college presidents, administrators, faculty members, trustees, parents, and concerned citizens that tuition tax credit must be adopted.

First, it is in the national interest to preserve and strengthen the diversity which has been the bedrock of excellence of American higher education. The diversity is manifold. At its core is the basic diversity between institutions which are privately controlled and those which are publicly controlled.

There is diversity among private institutions between those which are church-related and those which are nondenominational. Among public institutions, diversity reflects their educational history and philosophies, as well as the individual needs of the States and communities which support them.

Further, there is great diversity in size, in admissions policies, in academic goals and teaching methods, and in the means and methods of financial support.

The diversity has been essential to the unique accomplishments of American mass higher education.

Second, the costs of providing quality higher education to a rapidly increasing number of students have been mounting dramatically. There is no known way of curtailing this cost spiral without making education suffer.

Finally, a major portion of the burden of these costs has been placed upon those who are financing students' higher education, through steadily increasing tuition and fee charges at both public and private colleges and universities. Tuitions and fees have been going up in recent years, and at an accelerating rate—especially for out-of-State students attending public colleges and universities.

The increases have not been based on what the traffic will bear, but upon the increased expenses of providing education to more students with no sacrifice in quality.

Costs of tuition, fees, books, and supplies will continue to rise almost universally. All evidence points to this conclusion; none contradicts it.

It is becoming increasingly difficult for parents to finance their children's college education. Each tuition and fee increase excludes certain students from attending the college or university of their choice.

As selectivity is destroyed, the structure of diversity is weakened, and education and the national interest suffer.

Tuition tax credit will relieve some of the pressure on middle-income taxpayers financing students' higher education and help create a source of funds for designated scholarship for sons and daughters of nontax-paying parents. It will thereby strengthen choice and shore up the diversity of our system of higher learning.

How will the tax credit plan aid the individual student and his parents?

How will it help create funds for designated scholarships?

Tuition tax credit will lower, by the amount of the credit, the annual cost of college attendance at any institution of higher learning.

For example, Northwestern University's 1963 tuition and fees of $1,500 would earn the maximum statutory credit of $325, or a reduction in cost of 21.7 percent to $1,175. Any additional costs would provide no further credit.

The University of California's 1963 cost for tuition, fees, books, and supplies[1] would earn a tax credit of $618—62.2 percent of the annual cost—reducing the cost to $102.

An out-of-State student at the University of California faced a 1963 expense of $870, which would bring a $262 tax credit, representing 30.1 percent of the cost and reducing the actual cost to $608.[2]

Real and substantial relief would therefore accrue to the person—parent, student, or friend—financing the college education. Furthermore, the relief would help to preserve freedom of choice in selection of an institution of higher learning.

Many people have income too low to necessitate the payment of Federal income tax. Tuition tax credit would not help them directly. But few, of course, are financing anyone's higher education. And the fact that a measure helps some people does not justify the inference that it hurts others.

In fact, students of limited means may be aided immeasurably because millions of dollars of scholarship aid could be both generated and liberated to help them.

The tuition tax credit will permit designation of payments for tuition, fees, books, and supplies. For example, under the Ribicoff bill, any individual could pay $200 for a non-tax-paying student and receive a credit of $150. The sacrifice of $50 could mean the difference between college or no college education for many students.

The colleges and universities could use tuition tax credit as a mighty instrument for the promotion of philanthropy by creating direct involvement on behalf of the most needy students.

Furthermore, scholarship-holding students from middle-income families could reduce their scholarships for at least some portion for which they receive tax credits, thus freeing institutions' funds for designation to other worthy students needing financial assistance.

	Percent reduction
University of Denver: $1,050—$280 credit	26.7
University of Colorado: $370—$193 credit	52.2
Out of State: $994—$274 credit	27.6
University of Notre Dame: $1,390—$314 credit	22.6
Purdue University: $390—$190 credit	50.8
Out of State: $940—$269 credit	28.6
Yale University: $1,640—$325 credit	19.8
University of Connecticut: $250—$163 credit	65.2
Out of State: $650—$240 credit	36.9

---

[1] Based on the U.S. Office of Education estimate of average annual cost of $90 for books and supplies.

[2] Additional examples of the tax credit amount and percent of reduction of tuition, etc. (1963 tuition, fees, etc., plus the $90 cost for books, supplies.)

How will the tax credit plan aid the public and private colleges?

Tuition tax credit will permit both public and private institutions to continue to provide service to students who otherwise will be priced off the campus by the inevitable rise of tuition and fees. It will enable the colleges and universities to create more scholarships, thus broadening their services.

Both qualitatively and quantitatively, the institutions will be assisted in meeting their obligations to their students and the Nation.

The percentage of relief would be greater for those financing the education of students at State and land-grant institutions. The dollar amount of relief would be higher at private colleges and universities.

In terms of channeling national income into higher education, proportionately more dollars will flow to the parents of students at State universities and land-grant colleges. Most private colleges and universities charge more than $500; therefore, only a 10-percent tax credit will accrue for each increase in charges. On the other hand, a 25-percent tax credit will be permitted for each increase at public institutions, until the total charges reach $500.

Do you believe that the initiation of the tax credit plan will result in a reduction of other Federal aid to colleges and universities?

Tuition tax credit does not imply any causal relationship with extant Federal programs, nor does it suggest that its proponents either endorse or oppose other forms of aid, Federal or otherwise.

However, less or possibly no Federal scholarship and loan funds will be necessary, i.e., because of the relief provided parents from the increasing burden of tuition and fees; and secondly, because new sources of funds for scholarships will be made possible. More dollars at less cost will go to the recipients; i.e., under the tuition tax credit plan the full amount of dollars will be channeled directly to the parent or students without any Government overhead.

Tuition tax credit promises to be an efficient, equitable means of meeting a significant portion of this challenge for both our public and private institutions.

Tuition tax credit is not a panacea. It is a solution to a growing national problem.

Do you believe that the initiation of the tax credit plan will result in another rise in tuition at both private and public colleges and universities?

Tuitions will go up: there is ample evidence that this will be true whether tuition tax credit becomes law or not.

But responsible institutions base their tuition and fee charges on their financial needs, with particular emphasis on annual operating costs, such as faculty salaries. The vast majority of colleges do not increase charges capriciously in light of ability to pay. Most raise costs reluctantly, because in so doing they tend to drive away deserving students who cannot afford to meet skyrocketing expenses.

Little can be done to hold the line on operating costs in the face of increased enrollments, justifiable increases in faculty salaries, and the continued prospect of a shrinking dollar. But tuition tax credits will, in large measure, permit institutions to continue to provide quality education to more students who need and deserve it.

To increase tuition and fees for independent colleges and universities and out-of-State students of public institutions would benefit their parents only by $10 for each $100 increase and none beyond the $1,500 tuition cost—this is hardly an incentive to raise tuition and fees.

Which group of our citizens do you feel will be able to make the most use of the points of the tax credit plan?

This plan is directed to ease the burden of the middle-income group and to create a source of scholarships for students of non-tax-paying parents.

Sixty-two percent of the direct benefit will go to 62 percent of the population, those with incomes between $3,000 and $10,000. Ninety-one percent of the direct benefit will go to families with incomes below $20,000 a year.

An undetermined number of students will benefit from the scholarship funds because this will be dependent upon the success of the colleges and universities in procuring tuition and fee payments for students of non-tax-paying parents. But millions of dollars should become available.

It has been argued that there is a basic inequity in the tuition tax credit concept, because it does not benefit all or that it does not help them equally. These arguments are not sound.

Within the area of higher education, Congress has shown that it considers the national interest more important than imbalance between disciplines or institutions.

A Brookings Institute study found that "the direct effects of the Federal programs have been profound and beneficial in the sciences, noticeably more imbalanced in the social sciences, and negligible in the humanities."

Imbalance. But considered to be in the national interest.

An Office of Education bulletin of 1963 shows that of all Federal research grants made to institutions of higher learning, 68 percent went to 25 universities, 82 percent to 50 universities, and 94 percent to 100 universities.

Thus, 94 percent of the dollars for research went to five percent of America's institutions of higher learning. Evidence indicates that a similar situation exists even today.

Imbalance. But considered to be in the national interest.

To stimulate the national economy, the 88th Congress passed a tax reduction. This reduction did not look to individual need; it embraced every bracket. And yet consensus deemed that this was wise.

Congress enacted tax credit legislation for capital investment. A company purchasing a $100,000 piece of equipment will receive more tax credit than one purchasing a $10,000 item—hardly equal benefits to both companies. Service companies which make few purchases of capital equipment receive little benefit and yet it was in the national interest to enact this type of legislation. President Johnson recently announced a policy concerning added depreciation allowances—providing approximately $700 million for industry. These new administrative regulations are of little benefit to businesses that do not have depreciable assets. And yet this action was determined to be in the national interest.

If tax legislation must benefit everyone equally, the medical deduction would be eliminated because it cannot be used by non-taxpayers. The $600 individual income tax exemption, plus $600 for each dependent, would be eliminated as discriminatory against welfare recipients and married couples with no children.

In brief, the national interest concerns us all—and yet the benefits of a particular measure may not embrace all. That tuition tax credit promises to benefit as many as it does is a strong argument in its favor.

What do you think are the chances for passage of the tax credit bill?

Chances for passage are good. Congressional support of tuition tax credit has been consistent and enthusiastic and is gaining momentum. Last year the bill had bipartisan support and was cosponsored by 14 Senators. It was narrowly defeated 48–45. It should be noted that due to external pressures three cosponsors of last year's bill voted against it—thereby bringing about its defeat.

This year the Ribicoff bill has 34 cosponsors—Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives—in the present Congress.

In addition to support in the Senate, evidence indicates that many Congressmen are rallying to the support of the legislation. The bill now has been introduced by Congressman A. SIDNEY HERLONG, a member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Should the tax credit bill fail to pass in Congress, what other measures could be attempted to solve the basic problems attacked by the tax credit bill?

Although the tuition tax credit concept merits the highest priority—the gift tax credit concept should be given serious consideration. It will provide a great stimulus for giving to all institutions. It will broaden the base of philanthropy to include potentially every taxpayer in the United States. It will offer the institutions a new and dramatic vehicle for involvement of the public in their fundraising efforts.

Total philanthropy to higher education in 1962–63 was $500 million. A tax credit, for example, of $40 for a $50 gift could double this figure. If 20 million taxpayers gave $50 each to the institutions of higher learning, each individual gift would cost the donor $10. One billion dollars would be channeled into education—with a reduction of $800 million for the Federal Treasury—and without the expense of governmental overhead and control.

One other program to reduce tuitions and fees would be direct Federal subsidy for operating expenses. Such a solution, however, is fraught with many dangers. Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president of Purdue University—Indiana's land-grant university—made a recent statement about tax support of independent colleges and secondary schools. (Culver Alumnus, winter issue, 1965). He said, "If direct tax support from local, State, or national sources is provided to private, independent schools, they no longer can call themselves private and independent. When public money is spent for educational purposes, the institutions receiving such support money must necessarily serve public needs."

In addition to direct tax support for nonpublic institutions destroying their independence—State universities and land-grant colleges would lose a large degree of it. If they were to receive tax support from "national sources," they would be required to serve "public needs" as determined by the Federal Government—at least to such extent as they receive financial assistance.

Dr. Hovde continued: "The chief support of private institutions should and must come from private sources or the institutions can no longer remain truly private, electing to serve their educational constituencies in special ways."

Passage of gift tax credit legislation would enable all colleges and universities—public and private—to receive financial support from millions of additional private sources—thus making it possible for them to continue to serve their educational constituencies in special ways.

Dr. Hovde concluded: "I have no objection to the use of public money for the educational support of individuals through scholarships, fellowships, GI bill, student loans, etc.—in these programs the individual is free to pursue his education wherever he wishes, in public or private institutions. The only thing that matters is that the individual so aided becomes a more productive citizen and contributor to the society which was willing to help him."

Tax credit for tuition and fees will accomplish these same objectives, including creation of scholarships, etc., and without governmental overhead. Each individual will be even more free to pursue his education wherever he wishes—in public or private institutions. This is one of the most impelling reasons for the passage of this type legislation.

REFERENCE TO THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. Speaker, as there are many voices raised in favor of tax credits as an aid in meeting the costs of higher education, so are there some voices that speak out against this concept.

The Association for Higher Education is one such organization that opposes the tax credit approach, and this association is a part of the National Education Association of the United States. Under date of June 1, 1965, the following letter expressing opposition to the tax credit proposal was directed to Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE, chairman of the House Republican task force on education:

JUNE 1, 1965.

GENTLEMEN: The excutive committee is the official policymaking body of the Association for Higher Education and is elected by its membership. At the executive committee's recent meeting, in March 1965, after an extended debate, the committee took action opposing the tax-credit program. Primarily the committee took this action in the conviction that the tax-credit approach does not appear likely to achieve what the association considers a major objective: making possible the opportunity for college attendance by those who for financial reasons would otherwise not be able to do so.

Sincerely yours,

G. KERRY SMITH,

Executive Secretary, National Education Association of the United States, Association for Higher Education.

Mr. Speaker, others of the House Republican task force on education who have appeared before me have introduced to the RECORD copies of letters received by the task force on the subject of tax credits.

These letters run into a ratio of about 7 to 2 in favor of tax credits. And because they present some highly interesting observations on the matter of tax credits, I would like, at this point, to introduce some copies of these letters to the RECORD in the ratio mentioned above.

First, I would like to present those letters in favor of tax credits:

MASON & LEE, INC.,
INVESTMENT SECURITIES,
Lynchburg, Va., May 21, 1965.

REPUBLICAN PLANNING AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE,
Task Force on Education,
Washington, D.C.
(Attention: Mr. ALBERT H. QUIE, chairman.)

GENTLEMEN: I feel, as has been suggested, that the plan for giving tax credit to people who are sending children to college, is very wise. Also, I think, in addition to this, it would be well for the Government to establish scholarship or loan funds for our youths that should further their education not only through college but on further to the universities.

So many well-rounded children that would be very beneficial to the country if they were sufficiently educated do not get the opportunity to go to college because, in lots of cases, their parents do not know where to turn. We have counselors in our high schools but they don't seem to know enough about the availability of funds for this purpose. If some plan like this could be developed, all the high schools should be informed so they could pick the students that need such aid and counsel with them where it can be obtained. In that way we could strengthen the knowledge of our future generation and not lose a lot of good talent to lesser things.

I wish you every success in your undertaking and trust that through your efforts we can make our country wiser and much stronger.

Yours sincerely,

WALTER G. MASON.

PRESIDENT'S CLUB,
Winston-Salem, N.C., May 21, 1695.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of May 17 reached me yesterday afternoon, and I am in hopes this reply will reach you prior to your hearing in New York.

I am very definitely in favor of the tax credits as a means of helping to offset the increasing cost of higher education. In my opinion, it would be very unwise for the Federal Government to centralize our educational system, since I think the administration by the States has been very satisfactory.

History proves that the closer the relationship in education the better the results, and I do not feel that the Federal Government in Washington can familiarize itself with the varying problems of the 50 States. Furthermore, I feel that a control of the cost of education can best be met through tax credits—which means that the responsibility is still placed on the individual parent. If our economy is to be preserved, the individual must feel the direct responsibility for his own needs and should not be more and more dependent on the illusion of something for himself from the Federal Treasury.

Having served as a trustee for two old and well-established colleges, I know the problem of cost; but I also know the results of efforts to improve the quality of education. These results have been accomplished by direct and unselfish interest on the part of administration and faculty and could not have been attained by mandates from a central government.

Sincerely,

CHAS. N. SIEWERS.

THE CRESCENT CO.,
Nashville, Tenn., May 20, 1965.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am especially pleased that hearings are to be held on the subject of proposed tax relief for those paying tuition on their youngsters.

Starting this September, I will be paying tuition on four of our own children and one cousin whose father has a serious health problem. I am very fortunate in having a good cash income, but I can tell you that this is a difficult load to carry from current fully taxable income where you don't have real wealth to fall back on to help through this sort of a period. It seems to me that the taxpayer should be given an alternate in this regard of deducting total tuition and other costs, except the student's miscellaneous spending, from income before computing the tax, or a specific dollar reduction of tax liability. This would allow the higher income, large family individuals, like myself, to have some relief through a reduction in taxable income, and would allow much greater relief to the parents who have smaller incomes.

In our highly competitive economic society nothing is more important than educating our young people, and even though I have been able to assist several youngsters in obtaining a college education, it becomes increasingly difficult without some tax relief. It seems to me that there just isn't any more important item facing the Congress than this one.

Very truly yours,

D. R. BUTTREY.

THE EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE
SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N.Y., May 21, 1695.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman,
House Republican Task Force on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Unfortunately I will be in Chicago on May 24, the date of your hearings on the rising costs of higher education. It would be a pleasure to express my views at greater length.

In capsule form, there seems no more apt solution to meeting such enormous costs (to the average family) than by a tax-credit system. There is adrift an attitude that such a system would destroy or at the least, denature our current system of higher education.

Frankly, I cannot see that. From a financial standpoint, countless millions of dollars would become available for education that would not be in circulation in that area otherwise. More importantly, from a frame-of-mind view, education would not appear so distant and out of reach for millions of our good people.

Opposition to the tax-credit system seems vague and incomprehensible. I speak both as a trustee of a college and as the father of five children, four of whom have received college educations—and one yet to go. All I can see in tax credits is greater advantages for the children, better plants and facilities, higher salaries for faculties, more of our people with the wherewithal to face the worldwide competition of the future.

If we are to be both "Athens and Sparta," give us the tools.

Yours most respectfully,

CHARLES R. CORCORAN,
Vice President.

HAMPDEN-SYDNEY COLLEGE,
Hampden-Sydney, Va., May 21, 1965.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: Your request for comment on means to assist middle income bracket parents in meeting the cost of education is appreciated. It is my conviction that the tax credit program best promotes this end by making an immediately recognizable benefit to the parent and by doing this in a way which minimizes the cost of distribution of such benefit (i.e., no governmental channel needed for assignment; hence total benefit available for parents). If the tax credit be permitted for anyone who pays for the education of a student, help will be made available to lower income bracket parents through the philanthropy of private citizens.

One recognizes that the tax-credit program cannot solve all the problems. However, used in conjunction with other Federal programs, it can become the most efficient and effective pattern for meeting some of the problems. No new governmental machinery must be put into operation to make it effective, consequently, 100 percent of its cost to our Nation (i.e., in loss of revenue) will be applied to the need it seeks to meet.

Sincerely,

TAYLOR REVELEY.

ALVERNIA COLLEGE,
Reading, Pa., May 19, 1965.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: I endorse wholeheartedly the tax credit approach to alleviate the heavy burden imposed upon prospective and current students in pursuit of higher education. Any measures that would lighten the burden or facilitate access to higher education for qualified students is commendable and worthy of support.

I believe the plan which operates in the States of New York and New Jersey; namely, a plan to help finance scholarships for worthy students to a school of their choice, is an excellent means of helping to offset the increasing costs of higher education.

I hope that all States would adopt this plan.

Sincerely yours,

Sister M. Zygmunta,
President.

Richmond, Va., *May 19, 1965.*

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: Replying to your letter of May 17, I am entirely in favor of tax credits to help offset part of the mounting cost of higher education.

Support from Federal and State Governments is now making it impossible for independent and church related colleges to compete with State institutions. Tax credits would tremendously help in relieving to some extent a long-standing and unfair situation.

As a trustee for more than 30 years of an independent college, I am convinced that relief must come from some source or we shall fail to serve our State and Nation when college graduates are most imperative.

Personally, I have talked with the parents of several young people who said their childern would be denied a college education because our board of trustees was compelled to add $400 to the cost of tuition and fees for the 1965–66 session.

Congratulations to you and your committee for seeking a remedy for a threatening crisis.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Tate, D.D.

Now, I shall introduce two letters opposing the tax credit feature into the Record:

University of Delaware,
Newark, Del., May 18, 1965.

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Quie: I am, along with the presidents of most State and land-grant universities, on record as being opposed to tax credits as a means of offsetting the increasing costs of higher learning.

In addition to the fact that such a program would not aid institutions of higher education but would help only a special group of parents, I am opposed to any such proposals on the basis of fiscal responsibility. Such a bill would, in effect, allocate revenues by tax credit without any control or accountability on the part of the Congress. The private colleges would raise their fees still further and parents would, I fear, seize the opportunity to send their youth to more prestigious and more expensive institutions. Hence, the total cost of higher education would be inflated.

I certainly cannot be for such a measure.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Perkins.

Rochester, N.Y.,
May 24, 1965.

Mr. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: Providing tax assistance to parents and prospective students to enable them to have their education subsidized, in my opinion, is unconstitutional. It merely takes tax dollars from others to give to another segment of the population. So far as I can tell, there is nothing in the Constitution that would permit the Government to subsidize education in any branch.

I suggest that if there are those who must rely upon the Government for enough means to educate their children, that they apply to the poverty administration. Let that division give them the money.

Sincerely yours,

Karl N. Smith.

EARLY RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I asked for time on the floor today in order to call attention to the legislation now pending before the new Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The subcommittee is headed by our capable colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels] whose efforts on behalf of the Federal worker and his job security are well known to us all.

According to the Legislative Calendar of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of April 29, 1965, there are some 200 retirement bills now pending before the committee. These bills propose a number of important improvements in the Civil Service Retirement Act, 5 U.S.C. 2256, and deal with a host of problems involving everything from increasing annuity payments to the improvement of the retirement financing system. About a dozen of the bills call for retirement, with full annuity after 30 years of service and some of these specify retirement at age 55 with 30 years of service. My bill, H.R. 3055, in my opinion, is one of the more forward looking of all of these so-called early retirement bills. It would permit the older worker to retire at age 55 with 30 years of service or after age 55, when any combination of completed years of service and age totaled 85.

FLEXIBILITY

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Civil Service retirement system, even as it exists today, is a good system. It has a built-in flexibility which is far superior to many of the retirement plans of private corporations and companies. And, this is as it should be because, in my opinion, the Federal Government as an employer should lead the way in all matters relating to employer-employee relationships, whether it is salaries, working conditions, on-the-job training or discrimination because of race, color, creed, or national origin. And, if the Federal Government leads in these matters, private industry will soon follow.

To quote from a splendid article on retirement plans which appeared in the May 1965 issue of Fortune:

> Many who have wrestled with these problems are coming to believe that the best approach is neither early retirement as it is now being promoted, nor compulsory retirement at 65. Instead, it would be a highly flexible system that could take account of older workers' differing abilities and preferences for work or leisure. What many are suggesting, in effect, is that corporations adopt pension systems similar to the highly flexible one that covers Federal employees. This permits a person to retire as early as 55—

With penalty, I might add—

> but also allows him to stay on until 70.

Well, we appreciate these kind words about our Federal civilian retirement system, but I for one do not believe that it is nearly flexible enough, certainly not, if we compare it with the retirement system for the armed services. Many servicemen, as we all know, retire in their forties with good pensions after only 20 years of service. Some of them begin second careers after retiring from the military and thus can bring their experience and skills to the labor market. Moreover, in my opinion, it is wrong to penalize civilian workers in the 55–59 age group who wish to retire after 30 years' service. To continue this penalty upon the older worker is to ignore completely the facts of life as they relate to today's labor market and the place of the older worker in it. The Social Security Administration partially recognized these changing conditions when it dropped the retirement age for males from 65 to 62.

A NEW LOOK

The fact is that the Federal retirement system has fallen behind private industry in retirement and pension plans. Look at the United Auto Workers 1964 agreement with the Big Three calling for larger pensions for early retirees. Similar new approaches to earlier retirement are under consideration by the United Steel Workers, the Teamsters, the National Maritime Union, and the Machinists Union, according to the Fortune article. As for the Federal workers, a spokesman for the National Association of Letter Carriers stated to the Senate Subcommittee on Retirement:

> One of the most important inducements to enter the Federal service should be the retirement program; and certainly a liberalization of the present law would attract more employees and at an earlier age.

Thus, a considerable amount of support has been built up behind the early retirement bills now before our committee and most seem to favor some liberalization of the present 60–30 optional retirement formula. The 55–30 formula appears to have widespread support among employee organizations, but in the past, the Civil Service Commission has opposed this solution. I understand that all of these retirement proposals are now being given special review by a Cabinet committee appointed by the President, and according to the press, a report will be forthcoming on December 1, 1965, too late for any action by Congress this year.

THE LURE

Personnel administrators and pension plan experts tell us that the surest way to get older workers to retire is to make retirement attractive to them. This is the philosophy behind the UAW-Big Three agreement mentioned earlier and behind the 55–30 bills now before our committee. In other words, the worker in the 55 to 65 age bracket is offered an attractive retirement package, with generally adequate annuities, designed to lure him out of the labor market, thus opening up a job opportunity for a younger men who may well be brought in at a much lower salary. According to an estimate made for the Post Office Department, these savings could amount to $1,000 annually for each retired employee. Needless to say, in physically active occupations, requiring full use of brain and limb, the younger man could be expected to improve productivity and at less payroll cost.

Take, for instance, the case of the postal workers as described by a spokesman for the National Association of Letter Carriers:

> In the Post Office Department, the pressures of increased mail volume, continuing increased productivity and the transition to mechanization and automation cause the senior employee to be more vulnerable to ailments such as heart disease, back problems, and mental fatigue.

But, under the Civil Service Retirement Act, a Federal employee must be "totally disabled" before his application for disability retirement can be approved. And, since only "basket cases" are eligible for disability retirement, there are many Federal workers today who are physically unable to perform their duties for an entire shift. Some of these must resort to use of sick leave or without pay status for those hours when they are unable to work. For the most part, agencies are understanding about these and other handicapped workers, and they should be.

ANY COMBINATION OF 85

Now, from what I have said, it will be apparent that although a 55–30 bill will improve the present retirement plan, I believe that my bill, H.R. 3055, offers a better solution to the problem. A colleague of mine called it "a compassionate bill" and it is, because it would permit an employee in the 55 to 61 age group, who for one personal reason or another does not want to continue working, to retire gracefully if he so desires. Moreover, this is a better bill for the Federal Government than the 55–30 bills. Under the 55–30 bills, in many cases, the youngest and most active man on a staff could retire at age 55, leaving on the job the older workers who do not have the necessary 30 years' service. My bill would help to lure the older workers over 55 years of age into retirement because of the annual reduction in the years of service required. A worker at age 61 could retire on full annuity after completing 24 years' service, rather than 30 years, as now required or as required in the 55–30 bills.

And, most important of all, this bill would help to open up the career service "at the top" where now most of the top positions in the classified service are held by employees in the 55 to 65 age bracket. A common complaint of Federal employees concerns the lack of opportunity for advancement in the Federal service, and anyone who has examined the classified grade structure knows that there is now extreme pyramiding at the top. I say let us make it possible for these older workers in the higher grades, many of whom came into the service in the New Deal era, and are dedicated public servants, to move out and give the younger men and women in the service a chance to move up.

It is extremely difficult to estimate the added cost of these early retirement proposals because no one knows for sure how many Federal workers would take advantage of these more liberal arrangements. In 1963, the Civil Service Commission estimated that the enactment of a 55–30 bill, on a normal cost-plus-interest basis, would cost $67 million per year. My bill undoubtedly would cost more, but how much more would depend largely upon the "personal reasons" of the older worker for deciding to retire. In any case, it is cheap because offsetting these increased costs to the Government would be the savings of $1,000 per retiree per year mentioned above, plus the savings accruing from substantially increased productivity. This increase would result not only from the younger workers moving up to the vacated posts, but also from new young workers entering the Federal service for the first time. An attractive and viable retirement plan, as proposed in H.R. 3055, will induce more qualified workers into the Federal civilian service and at an earlier age than any other single measure Congress could enact.

In closing, let me repeat what I said earlier that the Federal Government as an employer should lead and not follow in all matters relating to employer-employee relationships. So, let the Federal Government open its doors to some of the millions of young workers now entering the labor market for the first time. One sure way of doing this is by liberalizing our Federal retirement system. And, if the State and local governments and large segments of private industry were to follow the Federal Government's leadership, we would be well on our way toward resolving the major economic problem of our time, the lack of job opportunities for our young people. All will agree, I am sure, that in spite of the great advances we have made in social legislation, something is wrong in our society today when healthy young people cannot find jobs because older workers cannot afford to vacate them.

REQUEST OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT TO REMOVE SILVER FROM U.S. QUARTERS AND DIMES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Congress today has received a long-awaited request which the Treasury Department has been formulating for 2 years. Congress is being asked to exercise its constitutional authority to regulate the Nation's coinage system by stripping our dimes and quarters of their silver content. Congress is being asked to shortchange the American public by authorizing instead the minting of cupronickel faced copper-cored dimes and quarters that have the dull ring and greasy lusterless look of bus tokens. Congress is being asked to cast aside 173 years of tradition—to sell out the intrinsic value of our coins—for a mess of copper pottage.

Congress is being asked to remove silver from our dimes and quarters because the Treasury Department is erringly convinced that soon there will be a critical shortage of the precious white metal.

I will take a moment to outline the silver coinage situation in light of the 10 years of study I have devoted to the subject.

The deterioration of our coinage system began more than a decade ago, when free world supplies of silver slipped below consumption. The situation has been ignored by Congress and the administration until recent years.

Attention to the problem was slightly evident during the debate over the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act in 1963. Last year, Americans more sharply focused on the status of our coins during the ridiculous rush on the Treasury for silver dollars. Congress nearly took enough interest to pass legislation requiring a thorough study of the problem. This murmur of interest resulted in the Treasury initiating an examination of the needed revisions in the coinage laws. And although the results of this study were to be reported to Congress on February 1 of this year, the report has arrived today—4 months late.

Fearing long ago that our Treasury officials would be overpersuaded by the proponents of nonsilver coins, I explored the silver-coinage matter as thoroughly as possible, and have concluded that it is not only possible, but absolutely necessary that we reduce the silver content of our subsidiary coins.

I followed by introducing a bill in early February that would reduce the amount of silver in our coins to as low as one-third of the present number of grains. Since that time, and while the Treasury Department has been overconvinced of the silver shortage, I have been convinced new silver discovery and recovery methods will give us adequate supplies to maintain 40 percent silver in our coins.

Reduction in the silver content of our coins would have a twofold benefit. The most obvious, of course, would be the released pressure on the demand side of silver. More important, however, is that under my bill, the value of silver would be raised to a realistic level. By raising the monetary value, more than two-thirds of the silver backing silver certificates would be freed for coinage and for sales to domestic users. My bill allows these sales to be made at a price not less than $1.29 per ounce, so that the domestic market will stay below the melting point of our existing coins.

This is a short, and I believe, a realistic appraisal of the silver situation and what Congress would provide through enactment of my bill, H.R. 4184, and the companion bills introduced both in the House and Senate.

Let us compare H.R. 4184 with the legislation recommended by the administration. The legislation we are asked to enact at the earliest possible date would strike all silver from our dimes and quarters. H.R. 4184 would allow a reduction to as low as approximately 30 percent silver in these coins. The silver-eliminated coin is unattractive and immediately distinguishable from the present coins. The coin authorized by H.R. 4184 is practically indistinguishable from our present coin and would maintain the honor and prestige of this country because it has intrinsic value.

It is asserted that the token coinage proposed by the administration will circulate side by side with our present coins. I do not think so. Federal edict will not convince American citizens that the coins are of equal value to their present coins. Federal edict will not prevent the mass hoarding of our present coins at the time we will need them the most. The only possible way for a changed coinage to exist side by side with the present coinage is by confidence in the new coins. The coins authorized by H.R. 4184 are such, but those which we are asked to authorize in the bill sent to us today certainly are not.

Although the proposed bill would make the silverless dimes and quarters legal tender, they will not, in the minds of the American people, have the same value as a silver content coin. The fact that our present currency can be reduced to coins of intrinsic value gives the American citizen confidence in that currency. If the currency can be reduced only to an odd-looking and odd-feeling composition of copper and nickel, I think John Q. Public will feel he is exchanging nothing for nothing.

If I were convinced that we could dispense with the idea that our money should have intrinsic value or be converted to something of intrinsic value, I would myself sponsor legislation such as suggested to us by the message rather than urge passage of H.R. 4184. Such are not the facts of life, however, and I am sure that the Congress will not want to contribute to confusion in the marketplace by the lack of adequate coins, which would follow enactment of the proposal.

We are asked to offer standby authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to prohibit the export, melting, or treating of U.S. coins. Earlier this year I spoke on the floor of the House about possible control measures we must enact in order to protect our existing coins.

I think further control measures are required, specifically the end-use certificate and a prohibition against the pledging of coins for commercial loans.

The proposal which we were sent today does not seek a change in the silver content of the dollar. I think this is its greatest mistake. H.R. 4184 more realistically makes a change in the silver dollar and thereby in the monetary value of silver. I say more realistically, because the problem of supply-demand differential is created by this ceiling price. As author of H.R. 4184, I fully realized the need for maintaining that selling price through the transition period. It authorizes the sales of free silver to legitimate domestic users at that price. This device is better because we do not again have to go through the legislation process in order to eliminate that selling price.

The proposed bill would set a floor price of $1.25 per ounce for silver which would be necessary if the other parts of this proposed legislation were enacted. If, however, H.R. 4184 were enacted, there would be no need for this provision, because the law of supply and demand would be allowed free operation.

The proposed bill provides no strategic reserve. H.R. 4184 would automatically establish a silver reserve in excess of 300 million ounces.

I have no quarrel with the request that the new coins bear the date of the year in which they are minted, nor with the recommended authorization of revitalizing the San Francisco Mint. Although every Member of Congress would like to see a mint established in his district, I realize that the need for speedy action is best served by utilization of the old facility.

The proposed Joint Commission on Coinage is a good idea, one which should have been established years ago. I certainly recognize the need for such a commission if the proposed legislation were enacted. If H.R. 4184 were enacted, I do not think it would be necessary because adequate authority is placed in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury to make the necessary changes in accordance with our coinage needs and materials supplied.

It is evident there was a great deal of vacillation within the executive branch between a recommendation for a reduced silver content coin and one for a silverless coin. As I stated earlier, I think that the figures supplied to us by the Treasurer's staff study are not accurate reflections of supply and demand. Although the figures for consumption would indicate that we use a great deal more silver than we produce, I think that we must distinguish between actual use and purchases for speculative purposes. Without a doubt, a great deal of the silver reflected in the consumption figures supplied to us by the Treasury represent hoarded silver coin and silver bullion. The figures supplied for production are reasonably accurate but the projection of future mine activity is unreasonably pessimistic.

Rather than make a hasty decision on the administration bill, I propose that first we have the benefit of reviewing accurate figures on the consumption and production of silver. Interior Committee hearings to provide these statistics are scheduled next week. We have recognized for some time that the silver situation is critical. We have waited 4 months for the Treasury solution. Surely, we should now wait until all the facts are available.

When realistic silver production and consumption figures are available and when the public has been fully informed of the Treasury proposal, then I would point out article I, section 8 of the Constitution, which is clear:

> The Congress shall have the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

In using this power, I suggest that we modify the administration proposal to allow minting of quarters and dimes with 40 percent silver content. With this legislative safeguard, and if the American public reacts unfavorably toward the cupro-nickel substitute—as I believe they will—the way would be open to continue the minting of silver coins.

CLOSING THE "DEFENSE EDUCATION GAP" IN OUR SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to direct the attention of this body to the "defense education gap" which currently exists in our American schools.

This gap has been created in large part by the effect of the National Defense Education Act, legislation passed by Congress in 1958 to meet the challenge of the space age in our national security and defense.

As the original declaration of purpose which accompanied this law pointed out, the programs of the National Defense Education Act were designed to correct existing imbalances in American education which had led to an insufficient proportion of the population being educated in science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other skills.

It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that the National Defense Education Act, while increasing the quality and quantity of school programs related to national security, has created a new imbalance, one which has brought about inferior defense-related education for large numbers of American boys and girls.

To determine how this has occurred, one need only study title III of the act, the section which deals most directly with education at the elementary and secondary levels. This title authorizes matching Federal grants to public educational agencies for the purchase of laboratory and other special equipment to be used in the teaching of science, mathematics, history, civics, geography, modern foreign language, English, or reading in public elementary and secondary schools.

Nonpublic schools were specifically excluded from participation in this program. Instead, a section was included which allowed the Commissioner of Education to make loans to private nonprofit schools to allow them to buy laboratory equipment. These loans are repayable in 10 years and carry an interest rate which currently is about 4 percent.

Since the bill was enacted in 1958, public schools have benefited measurably from title III of the National Defense Education Act. From fiscal years 1959 through 1964, $290 million in Federal funds were expended for laboratory and other special equipment to public schools.

This assistance has aided those schools in increasing the quality and quantity of their courses which relate to national defense needs.

For example, in 1958 there were 46 language laboratories; today there are almost 7,000. Some 280,000 public school projects have been approved for acquisition or remodeling of equipment and materials for instruction in covered subjects.

While $290 million was being granted to public schools, loans to nonprofit, nonpublic schools totaled only $3.6 million. Loan funds, allotted to States on the basis of numbers of private school students, are rarely used up, I have been informed by officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The reason is obvious: loans must be paid back, and most private and parochial schools are in no position to undertake such financial obligations. Many of these schools exist just beyond the point of economic survival. For them a National Defense Education Act loan, no matter how desirable, is out of the question.

The result of the National Defense Education Act, therefore, has been to widen the gap between the public and nonpublic schools in the matter of providing an education geared to modern defense needs. It is a classic example of the rich getting richer and the poor, poorer.

Today some 6,900,000 American children attending nonpublic schools—14 percent of the total school population—are receiving inadequate training in subjects directly related to the security and survival of our Nation.

This situation cannot be allowed to continue. Unless a remedy is found, the purpose for which the National Defense Education Act was legislated never will be completely achieved.

No one can pretend that the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of our young men and women—specifically prescribed in the act's policy declaration—is being accomplished when 14 percent of our schoolchildren have little opportunity to obtain needed laboratory and other special equipment.

Certainly existing imbalances in education programs are not being corrected as the nonpublic schools fall further and further behind the public schools in providing education in defense-related subjects.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the National Defense Education Act must be amended to give adequate, effective assistance to those American children who choose to attend a nonprofit, nonpublic school.

This can be done without major alteration of the existing law and without danger that the constitutional guarantees of separation of church and state will be abridged.

Indeed, in amending the National Defense Education Act, we have as a guide and precedent a bill enacted into law during this very session of Congress: the Elementary-Secondary Education Act.

Under title II of that act direct grants of Federal funds can be made to purchase textbooks and library aids for use in nonpublic schools so long as the ownership of the materials lies with a public education agency. Only the use of these materials is given to the children in private and parochial schools.

This formula easily could be applied to the laboratory and other special equipment provided under title III of the National Defense Education Act.

By amending the National Defense Education Act, it would be possible to give nonpublic schools the same assistance now being received by public schools, while leaving the ownership of the equipment involved in public hands.

Who owns the equipment is immaterial. It is the use of this equipment which is so important to the educational welfare of the 6,900,000 children in nonpublic schools.

In order to perfect and strengthen the National Defense Education Act to this purpose, I have today introduced a bill into Congress which would apply the principle embodied in title II of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act to title III of the National Defense Education Act.

In order to insure equitable treatment for all schoolchildren, the bill contains several other provisions:

First, in those States in which no State agency is authorized by law to provide laboratory or other special equipment for the use of children and teachers in nonprofit, nonpublic schools, the Commissioner of Education would be authorized to provide the equipment for use on an equitable basis. This provision also follows the precedent of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act.

Second, those schools which previously had obtained laboratory or other equipment with National Defense Education Act loans would have the option of turning over ownership of the items to a public school agency, while retaining their use. Upon doing so, the loan obligation would be canceled and 50 percent of the principal and 100 percent of the interest already paid on the loan would be returned to the school.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that only by amending the National Defense Education Act in this way can the purposes of that historic legislation be achieved. It is my hope that congressional action can be taken quickly to remedy present shortcomings in the act and provide equitable assistance under the National Defense Education Act to all school children and teachers.

Until such time as this is accomplished, the defense education gap will continue to widen—to the detriment of almost 7 million schoolchildren and our national security interests.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include a copy of the bill to amend the National Defense Act of 1958.

H.R. 8774

A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to make equipment purchased under title III thereof available to all children attending public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 303(a)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended (1) by striking out "public" after "or reading in", (2) by inserting "public" after "of local", and (3) by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: "in public schools".

(b) Section 303(a) of such Act is amended by renumbering paragraph (5) thereof as paragraph (6), and by inserting immediately after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) provides assurance that such laboratory and other special equipment will be provided on an equitable basis for the use of children and teachers in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in the State which comply with the compulsory attendance laws of the State or are otherwise recognized by it through some procedure customarily used in the State;".

SEC. 2. Section 304 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) In any State which has a State plan approved under section 303(b) and in which no State agency is authorized by law to provide laboratory or other special equipment for the use of children and teachers in any one or more public or private nonprofit elementary or secondary schools in such State, the Commissioner shall arrange for the provision on an equitable basis of such laboratory and other special equipment for such use."

SEC. 3. Section 305 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"PUBLIC CONTROL OF LABORATORY AND OTHER EQUIPMENT WHICH MAY BE MADE AVAILABLE

"SEC. 5. (a) Title to laboratory and other special equipment furnished pursuant to this title, and control and administration of their use, shall vest only in a public agency.

"(b) The laboratory and other special equipment made available pursuant to this title for the use of children and teachers in any school in any State shall be limited to those which have been approved by an appropriate State or local educational agency for use, or are used in, a public elementary or secondary school of that State.

"(c) If a school agrees to transfer the laboratory and other special equipment acquired with loans made under this section as in effect immediately prior to the enactment of this subsection to a State or local educational agency for use as provided in paragraph (5) of section 303(a) and in subsection (c) of section 304, the Director shall—

"(1) cancel the obligations of such school to pay interest on such loans and make a grant to such school equal to the amount it has theretofore paid as interest on such loans, and

"(2) make a grant to such school equal to the amount paid on account of the principal of such loans in excess of one-half of the original principal amount thereof, and shall cancel its obligation to make further payments on account of the principal of such loans when the amount paid thereon equals one-half the original principal amount thereof."

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE COINAGE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am sorry I cannot agree with my colleague from Idaho in this vital issue, though I do agree with him on certain aspects of the President's report.

I feel that every June bride in this country should rise in indignation over this report, because certainly if this report is carried into fulfillment, into law, the price of silver will double, triple or quadruple, and the price of silverware and other houseware items which contain silver will rise accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before this great body today disappointed and disgruntled. I have wrestled with the problems that have confronted our coinage system for virtually as many years as I have been privileged to serve in the House. I have watched patiently and hopefully as the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Mint have proposed stopgap measure after stopgap measure to bridge the gulf that existed between our supply of coins and the demands made upon that supply across the country, but their best efforts have only proved futile. We have always come up with too little too late.

I have watched with trepidation a supply of silver being sucked away from the Treasury Department at an alarming rate and a rate that is ever increasing.

I have argued and I have spoken, on the floor of this body, in the committee room of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee and in every forum that was made available to me that we must meet the problems of a need for coins and a need for silver head on; we cannot dodge, we cannot hedge, we cannot turn aside and hope for the best. But, all of my words seem to have fallen on deaf ears.

Today, we received a message from the President on his proposed changes for our coinage system. I can only say with regret that we have not read or heard a plan for the future.

We have only procrastination where we had hoped for promise.

We have only seen once again a President who has spread himself too thin in an attempt to keep everybody happy.

He has eliminated some of the silver usage for coins.

He has continued to use some silver in the half dollar.

He has proposed a metal content for dimes and quarters that will keep them in circulation.

But, he has maintained a silver content in the half dollar that will push it into the hoarded collections of the silver coin speculators to join more than 480 million silver dollars and more than 250 million Kennedy half dollars. So long as there is a silver-content coin minted, we will be minting a coin that will not be circulated.

I cannot and I will not join the ranks of those who will be satisfied with another in the long line of stopgap measures.

I will not say with abandon, "Well, we tried."

I will urge each of you to listen to what I have to say and hope that you will agree with me. The facts are on the table. We have reached the point where we cannot continue to use silver in our circulated subsidiary coins and still be in a position to answer the call that goes out daily from our industrial and defense manufacturers for silver. The President said in his message and I quote:

> Silver is becoming too scarce for continued large scale use in coins.

I would say, silver is too scarce today to use in any one of our subsidiary coins, on any scale.

Silver as proposed has been eliminated from the dime and the quarter. But it is continued in reduced quantity in the half dollar. Why? There is not one good reason that can be given in defense of such a proposal. But a reasonable and persuasive argument can be made against just such a proposal.

There will be approximately 40 percent silver in the proposed new half dollar where before there had been 90 percent. If that new half dollar were to be minted at the rate that 50-cent pieces were minted in 1964—which, incidentally, was insufficient to meet the demand for that coin—we would consume approximately 30 million ounces of silver a year. It is certainly not the more than 300 million ounces of silver that will be used for coinage this year, but it is substantially equal to the total annual silver production in the United States.

How can a problem be resolved when we are effectively drawing off the means that would be used to meet the problem?

Those 30 million ounces of silver are precious and I do not mean their metallic characteristics. The industrial requirements for silver today are in excess of the total free world production and that includes the 30 to 36 million ounces of silver produced domestically.

Every ounce of the silver now in the Treasury, that is used to mint coins, reduces our ability to maintain a stable price for silver in the world market.

Every ounce of silver that is used for coins decreases the silver that is required by law to be available for the redemption of silver certificates.

And, every ounce of silver that is used for coins will find its way into the hands of those who are accumulating silver-content coins waiting for the day that another decision on the silver situation will have to be made—a decision that will come too late to forestall their being able to cash in their coins, not as a medium of exchange but for their silver content.

Today we have the opportunity to propose a change in our subsidiary coins that will meet the challenge before us. Tomorrow the problems will be more complex and the solutions less accessible.

We must have an across-the-board elimination of silver from the subsidiary coins. We cannot take two steps forward and one step backward. That pinch of silver that it is proposed to use in the new half-dollar could well be the pinch that spells the difference between the continued production of film, for the family photo album, for X-rays, for industrial and defense photography. It could be the silver that would go into a battery for a submarine, a radar installation, or a missile.

I would not sacrifice any one of these uses to placate the demands of the western miner to keep the mint on his consumer list or a traditionalist who demands a retention of intrinsic value in his coins. We have seen the worth of intrinsic value in the dime and quarter. The worth of these coins is the goods and services they can buy for their holder. It is not the value of the metal that goes into the coin. And, what is good for the dime and the quarter is good for the half-dollar. And it is good for those people who depend on silver for their very existence.

Are we to see the reduction in the price of jewelry that 401 of us voted for just yesterday be eaten up by an increased price in the silver that goes into the making of that jewelry?

We must step back, gain a proper perspective, and look closely at the President's proposal. The strength or weakness of any stand that is taken is proved, not by ramrodding your point of view, but by careful and deliberate examination and discourse. The hearings on this change in the coinage system should not get underway before we have all had the opportunity to further evaluate every proposal. These coins will not be minted until sometime in 1966.

This is the first major change in our coinage system in 173 years. That change should be well studied and must be farsighted. If we are to call our efforts successful, they must be capable of enjoying such long-lived validity.

The time is now. The means are ours. I hope you will join me.

FACTFINDING MISSION TO NATO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, here is the text of a significant resolution adopted yesterday by the Republican conference of the House of Representatives:

> Whereas misunderstanding between friends threatens to break up the free world's most essential institution, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.
>
> The growing rift between two historic allies—the United States and France—appears to be the major reason for the grave difficulties in which NATO finds itself and the most formidable obstacle to rebuilding and strengthening this vital alliance.
>
> The decline of NATO is so sharp it endangers free world security. This crisis deepens unnoticed because it has none of the violence and drama of trouble spots like Vietnam which monopolize governmental and public attention: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That in recognition of this grave and unmet danger, the House Republican conference hereby endorses and sponsors a mission drawn from its task force on NATO and the Atlantic Community. The mission will make a factfinding trip to NATO headquarters in Paris as soon as scheduling permits.
>
> Through this, the conference hopes to—
>
> 1. Alert the American people to the deepening crisis in NATO and contribute to a better understanding of its gravity.
> 2. Learn firsthand the basis and depth of Franco-American disagreement as viewed by the French.
> 3. Aid our Government in moving swiftly and wisely to meet these problems.

Mr. Speaker, in announcing the Republican factfinding mission to the press, our distinguished minority leader, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan, had this to say:

> Gentlemen, we asked you here today to announce what I consider to be one of the major undertakings of House Republicans this year. Under sponsorship of the House Republican conference, we are sending a factfinding mission on NATO to Paris, France, in an effort to get at the root of the troubles currently afflicting both NATO and Franco-American relations. The mission will

> depart New York by plane on Friday, June 11, and will remain in France for at least a week or as long as necessary to collect the facts they need. They will talk to prominent French officials, including their opposite numbers in the French National Assembly. The factfinding mission will be headed by Representative Paul Findley, of Illinois, chairman of the House Republican Committee on NATO and the Atlantic Community. He will be accompanied by three other members of that committee, Representatives E. Ross Adair, of Indiana, Hastings Keith, of Massachusetts, and James D. Martin, of Alabama. The details of the mission I will leave to Mr. Findley.
>
> As you know, I was a member of the Republican Committee on NATO until I became minority leader and its understakings are close to me personally. Republicans have been consistently outspoken about the need for NATO unity and for improved relations between this country and our historic ally, France. We sincerely believe that this factfinding mission can make a contribution toward achievement of these goals.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the conference [Mr. Laird] made this summary of the conference resolution:

> The House Republican conference at a meeting this morning adopted a resolution to sponsor a visit to Paris, France, of a factfinding mission drawn from the House Republican Committee on NATO and the Atlantic Community, headed by the committee chairman, Representative Paul Findley, of Illinois.
>
> As the resolution states, the purpose of this mission will be "to alert the American people to the deepening crisis in NATO and contribute to a better understanding of its gravity; to learn firsthand the basis and depth of Franco-American disagreement as viewed by the French and to aid our Government in moving swiftly and wisely to meet these problems."
>
> The mission is wholly consistent with the Republican Party platform of 1964 which stated: "Republicans regard NATO as indispensable for the prevention of war and the protection of freedom."
>
> The cost of this mission will be borne by the conference. No public funds are involved.
>
> The conference is deeply concerned with the drifting apart of France and the United States and the resulting difficulties in which NATO finds itself. We believe this is a threat to free-world security.
>
> When the mission is complete, it will report in full to the conference. And I look forward with optimism toward the mission's success.

Mr. Speaker, a grave danger to free-world security is rising sharply.

Misunderstanding, doubt, and distrust are driving friends apart and threaten to split asunder the free world's most essential institution—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The danger goes unnoticed and unmet, partly because it has none of the violence and dramatic personal hazards which are commonplace in Communist-inspired trouble spots and partly because it arises in an unexpected place—entirely within our circle of allies.

The crises in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic dominate the headlines and monopolize official attention, while this unspectacular but ominous development undercuts our basic defenses.

Most obvious of the forces splitting NATO are the conflicting policies and actions of the United States and France. These two nations are essential to the North Atlantic community and to the cause of freedom for whose protection NATO was formed. They are the world's oldest pioneer republics.

France was the first ally of our Thirteen Original States, and French aid was crucial in our war for independence. In turn, our Revolution inspired the French Revolution which established the first republic among the great powers of Europe.

Today these historic allies and sister republics find themselves sharply at odds. This lack of accord has accelerated a sharp decline in the vitality and influence of the organization that holds the greatest hope for freedom, peace, and economic progress.

This week's NATO defense ministers' meeting in Paris produced a glimmer of hope. U.S. Defense Secretary McNamara proposed joint NATO development and procurement of weapons. This is the kind of action our Republican NATO committee has long advocated. We must give substance to this excellent suggestion.

Unfortunately most recent NATO meetings have dealt with nothing of importance. Tiptoeing around problems has been a habit. For example, the NATO foreign ministers' meeting less than a month ago in London ducked every major issue as being too fraught with controversy.

With 1969—NATO's important 20-year milestone—just around the corner, predictions that the organization will soon be completely dead are heard with disturbing frequency.

This chasm between friends must be closed, so that the decline in NATO can be reversed before it becomes a fall.

NATO's fall or even the withdrawal from NATO of a single nation like France would constitute a military and political setback of major magnitude for us and for our other allies. It would reduce sharply the effectiveness of free world arms.

NATO's decline comes at a time when the need for free-world unification is greater than ever before. Military, monetary, nuclear, and trade problems that affect the vital interests of the entire Atlantic community mount rather than recede. To meet them NATO must be made stronger. Instead it grows weaker and verges on collapse.

Europeans may wonder if the United States is preparing a 1919-style withdrawal. Do we still place a high premium on close working arrangements with NATO?

President de Gaulle is widely portrayed in the United States as the sole and malevolent cause of all American difficulties in Europe. On the other hand, some Europeans accuse the United States of seeking to dominate all Europe.

The French Government has described U.S. proposals for an Atlantic nuclear force or for a multilateral nuclear force as disguised efforts to formalize U.S. mastery of NATO's nuclear arm and Washington's control of life-and-death decisions of NATO.

In part these disagreements stem from honest misunderstandings, in part from natural tensions between two great and proud nations.

Whatever their origins, the importance of these problems to free-world security is so great that thoughtful and concerned Americans can no longer ignore them in the hope that they will simply go away.

Clearly, the lack of Franco-American accord forms the major obstacle to getting on with the job of rebuilding NATO, and making it strong enough to solve the many urgent common problems which confront the Atlantic community.

Republicans in the U.S. House of Representatives 2 years ago established a special task force in recognition of the need to strengthen NATO.

On recommendation of the task force, the Republican Party platform last year called for an international commission to explore and recommend effective new ways to strengthen NATO. The commission has not been established. The exploration of new ways to strengthen NATO has not begun.

The need remains. It demands full bipartisan spirit and action.

In that spirit the Republican conference of the House of Representatives is sending a study mission—drawn from its task force on NATO and the Atlantic Community—on a factfinding trip to NATO headquarters and to France. No Government funds will be used. This mission is unprecedented just as the NATO problem is unprecedented. Lincoln's words of a century ago are appropriate today:

> The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew.

The mission is seeking answers to many questions, of which two may be cited as typical:

First. If NATO in its present form is unacceptable, what modifications might be made that would be workable and provide adequately for free-world security?

Second. What modifications in U.S. policy regarding NATO are desired by France?

Scheduled events will include interviews with officials at NATO headquarters as well as with our legislative counterparts in the French National Assembly.

It will be a factfinding, not a faultfinding mission—and will remain there until its members are convinced they understand the attitude of French and other officials toward NATO and our role in the Alliance.

Through this, we hope to alert the American people to the deepening crisis in NATO, contribute to a better understanding of its gravity, learn firsthand the nature of Franco-American disagreement as viewed by the French and aid our Government in moving swiftly and wisely to meet these problems.

We realize that President Johnson has worldwide burdens that are staggering, complex, and varied.

We undertake this mission in a sincere effort to render constructive assistance, and do so at this date because we are convinced the decline of NATO is a problem so menacing that it has overriding urgency.

Wise action must take proper account of conflicting viewpoints freely expressed in a cordial environment. Mutual understanding of the facts underlying the current discord is today's greatest need.

COMMEMORATION OF THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE ACT IN TRANSYLVANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant rights any people can have, is the right to worship in the church of their own choice. Transylvanians all over the world commemorate on June 1 the anniversary of the first religious freedom legislation in the world, passed by their Diet at Torda on June 1, 1557. The act passed by a mostly Protestant Diet and signed into law by a Roman Catholic Queen Mother established religious freedom for all prevailing religions.

Freedom of conscience was thus established in Transylvania long before the peace of Westphalia and 18th century enlightenment had finally extended these rights to other Europeans. Even today, religious freedom is not a universally accorded right. In the countries under Communist domination religious persecution and the abridgement of the freedom of conscience are still the order of the day.

It is therefore indeed a sign of political and religious maturity that the peoples of Translyvania denounced bias and bigotry at such an early date. And the 1557 legislation was just the beginning. By 1571 a comprehensive legislation was enacted which survived in Transylvania, and then in Hungary, until 1948.

The Hungarian and Saxon peoples of Transylvania together with the Rumanians who, at that time, amounted to 25 percent of the population, now live under Communist Rumanian rule. On March 24, 1965, I had the opportunity to speak on the floor on the plight of these peoples and to introduce a resolution—H.R. 291—calling upon the House to condemn the discriminatory practices of the Rumanian Government against its Hungarian minority. I understand that the end of June, hearings will be held by the European Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee and I trust that the Foreign Affairs Committee will decide to present the resolution favorably for a vote by the entire House.

Today I wish to congratulate the peoples of Transylvania at their anniversary and express the hope that oppression will cease and the true spirit of cooperation and tolerance will again become hallmarks of Transylvanian life.

Finally, I hope that the U.S. Government will do everything in its power to call the attention of the Rumanian Government to existing abuses in Transylvania during its economic and cultural exchange conversations with the Bucharest Government and will seek immediate relief for the Hungarian minority in Transylvania.

RESULT ON 1964 PUBLIC OPINION POLL OF 17TH DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have recently concluded polling the 17th Congressional District of Ohio regarding important issues which are before the Congress. This marks the fifth year that I have used this method of sharing with my constituents the decisions which their Congressman must make. While the responsibility for my vote is mine alone, I have found this to be a very useful means of securing the thinking of the electorate.

There were 22,474 who participated in this poll, over 1,250 of whom were high school students. More than 5,000 of those who returned their questionnaires included letters or statements regarding issues and every conceivable legislative matter. These, even more than the results of the opinion poll, are helpful in serving as a sounding board of public opinion back home. Questionnaires were sent to a cross section of Republican, Democratic, and independent voters in every precinct in my district. I think the results are very indicative of their thinking.

Most of the answers would indicate that constituents tend to cross party lines on the issues. There is a definite concern for big government, runaway Federal spending, and our foreign policy.

The results of the poll are as follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Not sure
1. Do you favor the termination of the military draft?	30.0	52.6	17.4
2. Do you favor a GI bill to provide education for those who have completed military service since the Korean war?	49.7	38.7	11.6
3. Do you favor revision of present immigration laws to allow increased immigration to the United States?	9.9	81.1	9.0
4. Do you favor a constitutional amendment which would permit States to apportion one chamber of their legislature on factors other than population?	63.6	34.3	2.1
5. Would you favor establishing a special labor court to settle disputes which pose a threat to the national security?	61.3	23.2	15.5
6. Do you favor removal of sec. 14b of the Taft-Hartley law which grants States the option of enacting right to work laws?	18.8	67.8	13.4
7. Do you favor a Federal law which would reduce the normal workweek from 40 to 35 hours with no loss of pay?	19.5	74.4	6.1
8. Do you favor a Federal law which would increase overtime pay for hours of work from time and one-half to double time?	18.9	76.6	4.5
9. Should Federal antitrust laws apply to labor organizations as well as industry?	80.5	6.9	12.6
10. To meet the current gold crisis, do you favor the administration's request to reduce or repeal the gold reserve requirement?	11.3	63.0	25.7
11. Do you favor legislation which would prohibit the use of wiretapping devices by police and governmental agencies?	31.0	55.0	14.0
12. Do you favor Government action to curb the use of cigarettes?	31.9	58.6	9.5
13. Do you favor additional deficit spending to achieve nonessential goals of the Great Society?	4.6	84.3	11.1
14. Should Communist China be admitted to the United Nations?	10.0	76.5	13.5
15. Should the United States use its first veto if necessary to block Communist China from admission to the United Nations?	74.2	11.7	14.1
16. Do you favor setting aside a small percentage of budget receipts each year to systematically reduce the national debt?	89.0	4.1	6.9
17. Do you believe that a constitutional amendment should be approved which would permit prayer on an optional and nonsectarian basis in public schools?	85.0	9.1	5.9
18. In the current situation in southeast Asia, which course of action do you prefer? (Check one.)			
(a) U.S. withdrawal from South Vietnam	25.0		
(b) Continued support of South Vietnam including the use of troops for training and combat	14.6		
(c) Stepped up military action against North Vietnam including air and sea attacks	48.2		
Not sure	12.2		
19. If the Chinese Communists should change from guerrilla tactics to a massive attack by troops similar to their Korean action, what course of action would you prefer? (Check one.)			
(a) Responsive U.S. action commensurate to the attack by the Chinese Communists	33.6		
(b) U.S. withdrawal from South Vietnam	14.9		
(c) Nonnuclear massive retaliation against not only the North Vietnamese but also the China mainland	36.9		
Not sure	14.6		
20. If Indonesia attacks Malaysia, what should the United States do? (Check one.)			
(a) Assist the British who are pledged to defend Malaysia but refuse to commit American troops to such a fight	31.5		
(b) Assist the British with supplies and troops	20.5		
(c) Do not get involved	36.4		
Not sure	11.6		
21. With regard to medical care for the elderly, what Federal action do you favor? (Check one.)			
(a) Increasing social security taxes to finance certain hospital and nursing home costs for those over 65 along the lines of the King-Anderson bill	10.9		
(b) A tax credit or Federal financing for those without tax obligation to enable individuals to purchase guaranteed renewable private insurance to provide both medical and hospital care for those over 65	15.9		
(c) Hospitalization plan financed separately from social security which would provide coverage for major medical expense but not cover small medical bills	22.3		
(d) I do not believe in Federal participation in this field	44.5		
Not sure	6.4		

CONGRESSMAN CLARK MacGREGOR SPEAKS BEFORE THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS ANNUAL MEETING

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, Congressman Clark MacGregor of Minnesota, speaking before the U.S. Conference of Mayors annual meeting in St. Louis this week, came to grips with the necessary relationship between local officials and the Federal Government.

Congressman MacGregor, through his work as the Republican conference chairman of the task force on urban and suburban affairs, has developed a detailed and incisive knowledge of metropolitan problems.

His emphasis on the need for overall coordination of all Federal programs affecting urban and suburban communities, for service centers on metropolitan problems at the regional level, for improved congressional mechanisms for coping with metropolitan needs and for a creative State-Federal revenue-sharing program deserve the attention of us all. I ask unanimous consent to include his remarks in the Congressional Record following my remarks.

Congress Looks at the Cities

(By Congressman Clark MacGregor)

(Address delivered to the delegates, U.S. Conference of Mayors annual meeting, St. Louis, Mo., Monday, May 31, 1965)

There is a growing number of Congressmen who recognize the challenges of our fast-expanding metropolitan areas. Because of this I am hopeful that our efforts on the House Republican task force on urban-suburban affairs will help bridge the gap which too often exists between those who govern these metropolitan centers and the Congress of the United States.

You do not need an elementary course in urban affairs. You deal with the problems. You are the workshop. You already are aware that approximately 125 million Americans and nearly 80 percent of our productive capacity are now located within our 212 metropolitan areas. You already know that within 25 years, these urban areas will increase by another 100 million people. I can spare the statistics. You need no further proof that there are multiplying problems of core city deterioration and unhealthy suburban growth.

With this phenomenal growth, the problems of urban life—education, employment, housing, transportation, crime, air and water pollution, discrimination, open spaces, planning, and all the rest—have become increasingly complex.

There is no escaping the fact that the role of the Federal Government has assumed increased importance in metropolitan affairs. Competition for industry between the States and a wide variety of other factors have presented State and local governments with an increasingly difficult job in raising the revenues they need to meet their problems—problems which are increasing in magnitude and which frequently cross local and even State boundaries.

Despite all this, is there a mayor here who would say that the States and localities do not have the primary responsibility for meeting these problems? The American system has made the responsibility yours. Who can deal better with the problems than those who know them best?

Each of us at all levels of government needs to help provide you with the muscle it takes to get the job done. And it is not merely bigness, or just money, or only slogans which are going to do. You know that, too.

I am going to propose here a number of steps which I believe can and should be taken: I don't mean to suggest that this is the policy of the Republicans in the House of Representatives. But it does represent the thinking of many of us. I come from a metropolitan area. My congressional district has added more than 100,000 people since 1960. It will have increased by over 100,000 more persons by the 1970 census. My background is the city.

First of all, Americans need, and need badly, an office of community development in the Executive Office of the President. Nearly 30 Republican Members of the House have introduced legislation to accomplish that purpose. For even if we were to get a Cabinet department of urban development tomorrow, the need for an effective office in the White House to coordinate the proliferating activities of the Federal Government, as they affect urban and suburban areas, would be no less desirable.

Here is why. By ignoring some 80 other Federal programs concerned with metropolitan problems and by simply elevating the Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet rank, a Department of Housing and Urban Development cannot hope to achieve coordination, efficiency, or economy. Urban problems cut across departmental lines, and as urban life grows increasingly complex, more and more of the problems can be expected to cut across these lines. The necessary coordination can be achieved without any increase in Federal control, and without any significant increase in the burgeoning Federal bureaucracy, by an Office of Community Development in the White House.

A bit later, I would like to return for a closer look at this proposal.

Secondly, as we attempt to improve the capacity of the executive branch of the Federal Government to give more effective help in the solution of metropolitan problems, we would be well advised to give thought to improving the way Congress itself functions in this area. Today, for example, an agreement between States on resolving problems of water and air pollution would be passed upon, not by the congressional committees which deal with health problems or with urban matters, but by the Judiciary Committees of both Houses. I am hopeful that the present commission which is studying the problems of congressional organization will provide some answers to the problem of congressional jurisdiction of metropolitan area affairs.

Third, consideration should be given by the Federal Government to the development of metropolitan service agencies in the field. To offer a single agency with which mayors could deal would avoid duplication, would review on a more comprehensive basis than is possible today the applications of local government for Federal assistance, and, in general, could afford all of you the opportunity to discuss your needs with a single repository of information on Federal programs. Too often a project application approved by a field agency of the Federal Government is now rejected, on the same set of facts, by the Washington central office.

Why should Federal regional offices be spread over the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Public Health Service, representatives of the Bureau of Public Roads, the Federal Aviation Agency, and countless other agencies, each dealing in a fragmented fashion with bits and pieces of urban problems. We should consider a union of Federal agencies at the field level. Since Federal regional offices are, by and large, not decisionmaking agencies, we should at the minimum help simplify the service potential to the communities and States by bringing their functions under a single roof, subjecting local plans to a comprehensive and unfragmented review.

Fourth, renewed consideration should be given to the program sparked initially by Republican Governors for the sharing of Federal tax revenues with State and local governments. This program was given consideration by the administration of President Eisenhower—and reportedly since then—and was recently revived by Dr. Walter Heller. We welcome the bipartisanship. We are pleased that the chief economic adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson has joined Republican Governors who have, over a period of years, proposed the reallocation of revenue resources so that communities and States would be better prepared to meet their responsibilities.

This proposal needs further public discussion. A more equitable sharing of tax revenues, with no strings attached, can have a profound impact on the future of our cities.

I would now like to take that second look I promised at the proposed Department of Housing and Urban Development. To understand why a mere change in the status of HHFA would not do the job, let's look at the relationships of some Federal programs today. Take the Federal Bureau of Roads, under the Commerce Department, and the HHFA, for example. Under the proposed department, activities of the Bureau of Public Roads would not be included. Highway planners, as you all know, find their concern is often exclusively with traffic needs. On the other hand, local housing agencies have as their objective the avoidance of new slums and the replacement of existing ones. Clash for space, as each seeks to accomplish its own task, is often inevitable. The Federal Government, through two separate agencies—the Bureau of Public Roads and the HHFA (proposed to change to department status)—provides funds for each, in cooperation with the States and localities.

But these objectives can and do clash. And, in some urban places in America, that clash can raise havoc which the dream of a beautiful America. Rather than elevating HHFA to Cabinet level, we need a referee. A White House office, such as we propose, would be an appropriate umpire.

The proposed Johnson administration bill creates neither a Cabinet-level department to coordinate the Federal programs geared to the needs of the urban communities nor a Cabinet-level department to administer the principal programs of the Federal Government which provide assistance for housing. Less than one-third of the Federal Government's housing activities would be encompassed in the new department.

I have already mentioned that the Bureau of Public Roads is not included. It will stay in the Department of Commerce.

Water pollution and sewage disposal programs will stay in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Vocational education funds, social security activities, welfare activities, disposal of surplus Federal properties to schools and hospitals and other municipal entities, Hill-Burton funds, activities designed to promote public health, all will remain right where they are now. And the more than 40 separate programs of financial aid for urban development involve some 13 departments and agencies.

We cannot divide responsibility and expect sound decisions for the most efficient use of the taxpayers' dollars in meeting overall community needs.

This is precisely why I favor the establishment of an Office of Community Development in the White House. Your efforts to overcome the problems of air and water pollution, crime, education, public health, and others deserve equitable assistance, and we are determined to provide that assistance. This Republican proposal, if adopted, would not discourage local and State initiative or direct the development of appropriate solutions, but would provide State and local officials with a coordinating point of reference for all Federal programs. This coordination can be achieved with efficiency and economy.

If we establish an Office of Community Development; if the Congress will improve its handling of metropolitan affairs, if the executive branch will develop metropolitan service agencies in the field, and if steps can be taken to share Federal tax revenues with State and local governments—if these four proposals can be adopted, we will have taken the first steps toward strengthening our metropolitan centers and improving the relations between these centers and the Federal Government, both executive and legislative.

But the very first step is to build and strengthen the liaison between the city officials and the Members of Congress. This is the primary reason for the creation of the House Republican Task Force on Urban-Suburban Affairs. Too often we find that the Congress tells the cities what they need without first asking a true cross section of city leaders. This method of operation must not be allowed to continue. The cities must tell the Congress what Federal programs the cities properly need and want before the Congress takes action.

The challenge of our great metropolitan growth is a challenge for every American. It is a challenge which must be met with boldness and determination to recognize a problem and to get at the heart of that problem. But the first responsibility is with the local and State governments. It must be with those who know the problems best. The Congress hopes to work more closely with you in helping to meet that responsibility.

HON. PETER W. RODINO

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Howard] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the distinguished dean of the New Jersey congressional delegation, the Honorable Peter W. Rodino, was awarded the highest decoration given by the Republic of Italy to a foreigner.

It was most fitting that this decoration, the Order of Merit, Rank of Grand Knight, Republic of Italy, was presented to this great man on the 19th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Italy. This award was presented by Ambassador Sergio Fenoaltea at the Italian Embassy here in Washington.

Mr. Rodino also was previously tendered the honor as knight commander of the Order of Merit, Republic of Italy, as well as the Star of Solidarity.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rodino is a man who has given of himself for the good of everyone. During World War II he was one of the first enlisted men to be commissioned overseas. He was discharged from the Army as a captain with a distinguished war record in 1946. In 1948 Mr. Rodino spearheaded a drive against communism in the April 1948 elections in Italy.

Included among Mr. Rodino's many awards and decorations, I would like to note that he holds knighthood in the Sovereign Military Order of Malta, that he was also knighted by former King Umberto of Italy. His American decorations include the Bronze Star Medal by the U.S. Army and the 1964 Bill of Rights Award for distinguished public service in the field of government.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there can be no dissenting voice when I express my esteem for my good friend and congressional dean for his many fine achievements.

Certainly yesterday was an appropriate occasion to pay tribute to the people of Italy for their amazing accomplishments since the end of World War II and for their steadfast devotion to the cause of European unity and Atlantic solidarity. Yesterday was the 19th anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic.

It is the great goals which men like Peter Rodino have attained which prompted New Jersey's Governor, Richard J. Hughes, to declare June 2, 1965, as Republic of Italy Day in New Jersey.

I would like to include the Governor's proclamation at this point in the Record:

Proclamation

Whereas June 2, 1965, is the 19th anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic; and

Whereas in less than 20 years the people of Italy have worked to build a modern democracy and modern economy; and

Whereas Italy has been in the forefront of the progress of Europe; and

Whereas Italy has played a vital role in the Atlantic alliance; and

Whereas worldwide attention to the problems of poverty, disease, and ignorance have been encouraged by the transformation that has taken place in southern Italy; and

Whereas postwar Italy has recorded great achievements in preserving democratic society and institutions during an age of violence and revolution; and

Whereas Italy continues to make vital contributions to world civilization;

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Hughes, Governor of the State of New Jersey, do hereby proclaim June 2, 1965, as Republic of Italy Day in New Jersey and urge all citizens to participate in this important observance.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of New Jersey, this 1st day of June in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-five, and in the Independence of the United States the one hundred and eighty-ninth.

Richard J. Hughes,
Governor.

By the Governor:

Robert M. Falcey,
Acting Secretary of State.

NASSER AND SUKARNO

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Record will show that before leaving the city last week I was granted a leave of absence for Wednesday May 26 and Thursday May 27 on account of official business in our congressional district, including the dedication of a post office and an appearance as speaker at a college commencement.

H.R. 8370, the agricultural appropriations bill was considered on Wednesday and my office contacted the pair clerk and requested that I be paired in support of this appropriation bill because of the fact that seven of the eight counties which I represent are agricultural counties. Apparently there was some confusion or misunderstanding, because instead of receiving a pair in favor of the bill on final passage, I was paired only on the motion to recommit and was shown paired as being against such motion.

When I checked the Congressional Record, I was astonished to find I had been paired as being against a motion to recommit, which provided that none of this appropriation should be used to finance any export of any commodity to either the United Arab Republic or Indonesia under title I of Public Law 480.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present I would have supported this motion to recommit. I understand there were some arguments presented to the effect that had this motion to recommit been adopted, the Department of Agriculture would not be bound but could go ahead with gifts under title II and sales under title IV. Others complained that this motion would amount to only a slap on the wrist.

Mr. Speaker, whether effective or not this motion would have the beneficial effect of serving notice to Mr. Nasser and Mr. Sukarno and their ilk that we resent the insults which these persons—please observe I did not say gentlemen—have directed to us within the past several months. No matter how we varnish this thing or attempt to cover it over by veneer, Public Law 480 is still a form of foreign aid. Regardless of the description it is a gift just as much as though we walked over to them with some hard American dollars and delivered these dollars to the two who have seen fit to insult us in language that anyone in America can understand if such language were used on the street or in ordinary conversation.

It is true in January, I voted against a similar restriction because the President had been inaugurated only a few days before and I felt that the administration should be given an opportunity to act on its own to cut off these programs. I am glad to find out that at the present time there is no program under Public Law 480 for Indonesia and there have been no development loans over the past 2 years. As to the United Arab Republic, I find there is a 3-year contract under Public Law 480 under which the President has the authority to commit the funds, but has withheld them. Such withholding should justify the action of those who last January expressed their confidence that the President would act firmly against Nasser.

The present motion to recommit would not tie the President's hands because we have only recently passed a foreign aid authorization.

Mr. Speaker, one of our popular columnists recently suggested that President Gamal Abdul Nasser wants to improve relations with the United States and wants to try to amend past relations. He points out that Nasser does not wish the whole weight of aid to come from the East.

Well, that may be true, but the fact remains that this motion to recommit included not only Nasser or the United Arab Republic, but also includes Indonesia and Sukarno. Remember the President is empowered to continue aid to Egypt if he finds it is in the national interest. There are some timely questions we might ask. Is it in our national interest for Nasser to pressure Libya to eliminate our American bases there? Is it in the national interest for Nasser to provide the Congolese rebels with weapons? Is the presence of 40,000 Egyptian troops in the Yemen in our national interest? Is Nasser's undermining of our prestige and interfering with our relations with Ethiopia, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, and Sudan in our national interest? And is the proposal of Egypt to send an ambassador to North Vietnam in our national interest?

The time has come for us to take a new inventory of those who are our real friends and those who turn our generosity and good will into poisoned arrows to be hatefully aimed back at us. We simply cannot continue to lend aid and comfort to our enemies.

Now let us take a quick look at the latest word about President Sukarno of Indonesia. Just a very short while ago, there was a big jamboree in Djakarta. Billboards depicted Uncle Sam stomping the American Negro. There was a big torchlight parade which ended in an effigy burning of Uncle Sam. All over the entire scene, which was the occasion of the 45th anniversary of Partai Komunis Indonesia, Asia's oldest Communist Party, there were huge 40-foot hammer and sickle emblems woven from straw and bamboo. Sukarno made it plain that he was delighted that United States-Indonesian relations were at their lowest ebb. I say to my colleagues, let us accommodate Mr. Sukarno. Let us make it known we are not happy that he has sanctioned and condoned billboards of large dimensions on the streets of Djakarta printed in the English language directed at the United States with the words, "Go to hell with your aid."

I do not want to be associated with any effort to give further aid to President Sukarno and I want the Record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted for the motion to recommit which provided no part of the appropriations could be used to finance export of agricultural commodities to Egypt or Indonesia.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN FEDERAL TAXES ALREADY ASSESSED UPON TRUCKERS ALARMS THE TRUCKING INDUSTRY

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, looking forward to the future of transportation in America, it is not in the public interest for our Government to thwart its growth. Transportation has played a vital role in our Nation from its earliest days. Today, the movement of goods and people is more than a $100-billion-a-year industry and a very large part of our gross national product. Transportation affects the lives of all of our people—whether it is by air, land, or water.

The proposed increase in Federal taxes already assessed upon truckers has alarmed the trucking industry. It is a burden which truckowners feel they should not be asked to assume based on the facts included in a letter sent to me by Mr. William A. Bresnahan, managing director of the American Trucking Associations, Inc.

I wish to submit this letter for inclusion in the Record, along with an article from Business Week:

American Trucking Associations, Inc.,
Washington, D.C., *May 27, 1965.*
The Honorable Thaddeus J. Dulski,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Dulski: This is a desperate appeal, in behalf of truckowners of all kinds throughout the United States, for simple justice.

You recently received a White House message calling for substantial reduction of excise taxes. The trucking business was singularly excluded from the beneficiaries.

Instead, a part of that message called for very substantial increases in the already heavy and burdensome Federal taxes assessed against truck transportation.

Truck operators everywhere are left no choice but to oppose these increases with every ounce of their strength, and if you will be good enough to carefully read and weigh this necessarily lengthy letter you may agree that the proposed tax increases are neither justified nor necessary.

We are convinced that the harassed President was not given all of the facts, and it is our purpose here to lay before you some of the facts which apparently have been overlooked and which must be considered if justice is to be done.

Let's start with the simple truth that owners of motor vehicles pay all of the general Federal taxes paid by anyone else, and thus unquestionably pay their share toward the general support of Government. Since 1917, however, motor vehicle owners (including truckowners) have been required to make additional and special contributions toward the general support of Government, in the form of excise taxes on equipment, fuel, parts, and accessories, etc.—special levies of a type which were not assessed against any other form of transportation.

In the period 1917 through 1956 these special levies, paid only by motor vehicle owners, brought into the Federal treasury a total of $25,407,472,000. During that same period, it is true, the Federal Government spent money for the Federal-aid highway program—a total of $9.195 billion. The difference of more than $16 billion is the measure of the magnitude of the injustice motor vehicle owners, including truckowners, were forced to suffer in that 40-year period. During most of that period motor vehicle owners, including truckowners, cried out for justice but Congress after Congress was plagued by tough fiscal problems and could offer only sympathy.

Then came 1956, when Congress determined that the national welfare and the national defense demanded a significant increase in the Federal Government's roadbuilding activity. It was decided to substantially increase Federal contributions toward construction of regular A–B–C roads and, in addition, to build a 41,000-mile, $27 billion National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

Here, at long last, was an opportunity for justice. The special motor vehicle taxes already being levied in 1956 were adequate to do the entire job if only Congress would now decide to spend for roads all of the special motor vehicle taxes then being collected. But that Congress, plagued like its predecessors with fiscal problems, could not see its way clear to render full justice. It went part way and designated an increased portion of the special motor vehicle taxes for the new highway trust fund, but supplemented this with substantial increases in motor vehicle taxes, especially on trucks. Highway users, including truckowners, supported the program largely on the theory that half an equity was better than no equity at all.

As laid out by the Highway Act of 1956, the new road systems were designed to serve generations yet unborn, but to be built and paid for entirely by special levies on motor vehicle owners, especially truckowners, in a 16-year period. Thus, from the very beginning, it has been a pay-before-you-go program. This, too, was acceptable, in exchange for partial equity—after 40 years of gross inequity. So it was all settled by the Highway Act of 1956, we thought.

Five years after the program got underway—in 1961—those responsible for carrying out the program came back to Congress with the staggering news that instead of costing $27 billion the new interstate and defense network of 41,000 miles was going to cost $41 billion, a slight miscalculation of $14 billion. A distressed Congress again increased motor vehicle taxes, especially on trucks.

Earlier this year, these same people who are responsible for overseeing the program came back to Congress again, to report that the price of the 41,000-mile Interstate and Defense System had gone up again, this time to $46.8 billion, or an additional $5.8 billion. This sickening news was accompanied by widespread rumors of another whopping tax increase—this time with truckowners singled out for a backbreaking load.

On the 90–10 matching basis, the Federal share of this so-called deficit is about $5 billion. However, a separate report subsequently sent to Congress by the Treasury Department, showed that revenues from the present tax levels would exceed expectations by $1,937 million, thus reducing the "deficit" to $3,063 million.

The present tax program is scheduled to expire in October 1972. By extending the expiration date about 9 months, enough money can be collected to take care of this deficit. This is the course which has been urged and still is urged by the trucking industry. We see nothing sacred about a date fixed in 1956 when everyone though the interstate and defense system would cost $27 billion. The truck operators of America are in a tough competitive field; they are asking no tax relief at a time when virtually everyone else is getting tax relief; they ask only that a few extra months be allowed to pay for a program which, from a cost standpoint, clearly has gotten completely out of hand. Nor are we alone in this position. All the other highway users and automotive interests which are a part of the National Highway Users Conference have taken the same stand.

The White House message actually accepts this position, in part, by recommending that you extend the date for reduction of the present trust fund taxes from September 30, 1972, to February 28, 1973—a period of 5 months. The proposed increase in truck taxes, according to the message, is designed to bring in about $200 million a year in new money so that some States which are running ahead of schedule will not have to slow down. On the other hand, there are other States which are way behind schedule and probably will not finish on time anyway.

In any event, in seeking to justify the singling out of the trucking industry to bear a new injustice on top of all the old injustices, the message relies entirely upon one part of a two-part study made on the orders of Congress by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads. Since this can be a key point, we plead for your earnest consideration of the following facts:

When Congress enacted the Highway Act of 1956, it included a section instructing the Bureau of Public Roads to make a study of the fair distribution of the Federal road tax burden among the different beneficiaries.

One part of this instruction called for distinguishing between the direct beneficiaries, i.e., the owners of motor vehicles, and the benefits accruing to the public generally. On this point, the Bureau long ago found that at least 8 percent of the cost was assignable to the public generally, not even considering the obvious national defense implications of the roads, and, therefore, that at least 8 percent of the money should come from the general fund. However, until now at least, this finding has been ignored completely and every dime of the money has been assessed against motor vehicle owners, as such.

Another part of the instruction called for a determination of the proper distribution of the burden as between different classes of vehicles using the roads, using two different methods:

1. The differential benefit method, which assigns tax responsibility on the practical basis of the relative benefits derived from the roads by different classes of vehicles, and

2. The incremental or differential cost method, which is based on a theoretical determination of the added cost of highway construction to accommodate vehicles of different sizes and weights.

At the time of the aforementioned deficit crisis of 1961, Congress called upon the Bureau of Public Roads for the results of its study. At that time, the Bureau reported that it had not yet put all the finishing touches on the study, but that it had tentative results, and that the final results probably would not vary significantly from the tentative findings.

The tentative findings submitted by the Bureau in 1961 showed that the actual tax payments by the trucks exceeded their responsibility under the differential benefit method, and fell short of their responsibility under the differential cost method. Congress found and stated that the fair and reasonable thing to do was to fix the truck taxes at a level in between the results of the two different studies. As a result, the trucks took a substantial tax increase in 1961.

The Bureau was correct in its 1961 statement that the final results would not vary significantly from the tentative results then submitted. In fact, the final results are substantially the same as those upon which Congress based the 1961 tax adjustment. It is very curious, though, that it took 4 more years to put the finishing touches on the report and submit it to Congress. For the final report was not submitted until this years, curiously timed to coincide with the new deficit in the trust fund.

The recent White House message completely ignored the half of the Bureau's study under the differential benefit method—the one which found that trucks were paying taxes substantially in excess of the benefits derived.

Instead, the message relied entirely upon the theoretical differential cost method, whereby the trucks were found to be underpaying. This would appear unjust on its face. It is particularly unjust when you consider the highly questionable nature of the Bureau's differential cost study. The theory here is to determine how much large commercial vehicles add to the cost of road construction, and this obviously requires a practical determination of what kind of basic roads would be built if the large commercial vehicles did not exist.

If the Bureau had approached this on a practical and realistic basis, and started with a basic road that would be required by national defense, public service vehicles, and medium farm vehicles—or even if it had started with the kind of road it builds where trucks are excluded, such as the Washington and Laurel section of the Washington-Baltimore Parkway—it would have found necessarily that current tax payments by large commercial vehicles far exceed their added cost responsibility.

But the Bureau did not take this practical and realistic approach. Instead, it began with an absolutely theoretical basic road, a road that would not be built even if there were no large commercial vehicles, a road and a type of bridge that would not even carry fire engines, or military vehicles, or even the roadbuilding equipment used by the highway departments themselves to build roads. In fact, the Bureau started with a fictitious road which would be far inferior to the roads which are designed and built for "passenger cars only," and which would be soon destroyed by the ravages of weather alone, without any traffic of any kind.

On this basis alone, this dubious basis, the message signed by the President, would inflict heavy and ruinous new taxes on the truckowners of America. The benefit portion of the study has been ignored. We simply refuse to believe that the President was presented with all of these facts.

Now, we can only appeal to you to consider all of the facts, and to give them careful consideration, and to see that true justice and equity prevail. The truckowners of this country are not stepchildren. They are hard-working citizens, making a vital contribution to the economy and welfare of the United States, and providing employment for more workers than any other industry. For too long they have been abused and maligned and it's about time they were given a fair shake. We ask you, please, to help see that they get it. They are in your hands.

Very truly yours,

W. A. BRESNAHAN.

[From Business Week, Mar. 27, 1965]

MORE FOR THE ROADS

TWO WAYS TO PAY A $3 BILLION BILL

To meet the added costs of Federal-aid highways, there are two rival proposals:

The incremental cost method would assess charges according to weight. The heavier a vehicle, the more it would pay because of the heavier construction it requires.

The differential benefit method would relate charges to the benefits vehicles derive from the new highways.

Average cost per vehicle would be:

Type of vehicle	Present payment into highway trust fund	Incremental cost method	Differential benefit method
Automobile	$30	$31	$36
2-axle pickup truck (6,000 pounds)	40	24	25
2-axle van truck (18,000 pounds)	80	61	42
3-axle tractor-semitrailer gasoline (45,000 pounds)	466	462	344
4-axle tractor-semitrailer gasoline (55,000 pounds)	676	771	543
4-axle tractor-semitrailer diesel (55,000 pounds)	897	1,189	910
5-axle tractor-semitrailer diesel (66,000 pounds)	923	1,369	782

Data: Bureau of Public Roads.

The Bureau of Public Roads pumped more fuel into an already flaming controversy this week by submitting to Congress a 450-page report purporting to show which classes of motor vehicles aren't carrying their full share of the cost of the Federal aid highway program.

The cost allocation study is particularly important this year. It will be used by the administration and Congress to help determine who will pay an extra $3.1 billion in user taxes between now and 1972 to complete the interstate highway system on schedule.

The Bureau already has told Congress it will cost $46.8 billion to complete the interstate system, $5.8 billion more than the last estimate in 1961. The Federal share, to come out of the highway trust fund, is $5 billion. But the Treasury estimates that this increase in costs will be offset partially by an anticipated increase of $1.9 billion in user-tax revenues.

TRUCK TARGET

Though the administration has yet to submit recommendations on how to raise the additional $3.1 billion, expectations are that the heaviest burden will fall on operators of heavy trucks. Truckers started fighting such a possibility long ago.

The Bureau draws no conclusions and makes no recommendations in its cost allocation report, but submits figures to speak for themselves. However, included in the report is a new differential benefit method of cost allocation along with the traditional incremental cost method, giving truckers fresh ammunition for their fight.

Under incremental cost method, each element of highway design affected by the number, size, or weight of the vehicles in the traffic stream is broken down into a series of increments. The cost of providing for each of these increments is charged only to those vehicles whose size and weight require them.

But the newer differential benefit method assigns dollar values to four kinds of benefits to vehicle operators:

Reductions in operating costs.

Savings in time made possible by new and improved roads.

Reductions in accident costs.

Reductions in the strain and discomfort of driving.

Such benefits from the interstate highway system are estimated at $6 billion in 1964 and are expected to reach $20 billion annually by 1970.

DIFFERENT FINDINGS

Both cost allocation methods came up with startling different figures, particularly in the area of heavy, tractor-semitrailer, four- and five-axle trucks. The incremental cost method shows that these vehicles fall far short of bearing their share of the financial burden; the differential method comes up with a much different picture.

Congress got a taste of the forthcoming battle at hearings this week conducted by the House Roads Subcommittee. As might be expected each class of highway user clasped firmly whichever set of figures suited its purpose to prove conclusively that additional taxes should be levied on other types of users to cover the $3.1 billion deficit.

The subcommittee is studying the need for additional Federal aid authorizations to complete the interstate system on schedule. The real fight is yet to come—when the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee begins work on the problem of user taxes.

THE CHOICE

Officials of the Bureau of Public Roads and the Commerce Department consider the traditional incremental cost method the better of the two cost allocation systems. Administration recommendations later this spring likely will concentrate on higher user taxes on heavy trucks.

However, the Bureau's report does tend to show that the $3.1 billion deficit probably cannot be made up solely by an increase in user taxes on heavy trucks, chiefly because their numbers are relatively few when compared with the millions of automobiles using the highways.

This certainly will support arguments of some Congressmen who want to make up at least part of the deficit by a simple extension of user taxes—due to expire on October 1, 1972—or a diversion of some share of the 10-percent auto excise tax into the highway trust fund.

HIGHER TAXES

The administration has not spelled out its proposals, but has said it will recommend increasing highway user taxes by $247 million a year. Retiring Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon says none of the added tax burden will fall on motorists. So the speculation is that the administration will recommend tax increases on such items as diesel fuel and retread rubber and a special truck levy.

In addition, the administration has let it be known that it would favor an extension of current or amended user taxes for a short period, perhaps 6 months, to help make up the deficit. If taxes are increased by the suggested $247 million per year, a simple 6-month extension would more than cover the $3.1 billion deficit.

The trucking industry generally favors the extension plan, and Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the House Ways and Means Committee, is known to be giving it serious consideration. For that matter, so is Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, second-ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee.

REVENUES

Under existing law, the bureau estimates user tax payments into the trust fund in 1964 at more than $3.3 billion. This is made up of approximately $2 billion from autos, $38.8 million from buses, $668.5 million from single-unit trucks, $593.3 million from combination trucks, and $12 million from publicly owned vehicles.

With these user taxes rising each year, it probably would take only a 9-month extension of the October 1, 1972, deadline to make up the $3.1 billion deficit.

All classes of vehicles do pay more taxes than those that go into the trust fund. The bulk of this comes from the 10-percent excise tax on new autos ($1.6 billion a year) and tne 8-percent tax on parts and accessories ($233.6 million per year).

There is sentiment in Congress for diversion of at least a part of these taxes into the trust fund to make up the deficit. However, the auto industry already is fighting any such plan that would lock it into future highway programs. The industry instead wants these taxes eliminated.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXXVI

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the establishment of an addiction rehabilitation center in New York.

It is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 12, 1965.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—REHABILITATION FOR 1,000: NEW DRUG ADDICT CENTER ON STATEN ISLAND

(By James W. Sullivan, of the Herald Tribune staff)

The city plans to establish another "halfway house" on Staten Island for rehabilitation of narcotics addicts, it was learned yesterday.

The new rehabilitation center will be located on 10 acres on Staten Island's south shore formerly occupied by the Marist Fathers Novitiate in Princess Bay. It will be called Daytop Village.

Eventually, it will provide rehabilitation for 1,000 narcotics addicts of both sexes. City officials hope it will be in operation next month, receiving voluntary admissions and referrals from courts and probation and parole authorities.

The new center will be closely related to Daytop Lodge, a treatment center for young addicts which aroused controversy on Staten Island when it was established 18 months ago in Tottenville.

However, the new facility is in a more remote location and officials believe it will not stir so much controversy.

Daytop Village, a much larger establishment than Daytop Lodge, will be operated by a nine-member board of directors headed by Rev. William B. O'Brien, a Roman Catholic priest who has fought narcotics and similar problems with an organization in the Bronx. It also will have a 25-member professional advisory council.

Dr. Daniel Casriel, New York City psychiatrist, will be medical-psychiatric superintendent, and Dave Deitch, 31, former addict who has been resident director of Daytop Lodge, will be director of Daytop Village.

Techniques at the new center are expected to follow those of both Daytop Lodge and Synanon, the west coast organization which has adapted the methods of Alcoholics Anonymous to the treatment of narcotics addiction.

Addicts are expected to spend about a year in full-time rehabilitation before they begin to take outside jobs, returning to Daytop Village to sleep.

The city will finance the operation through the mental health board. First year's cost is expected to be $300,000, with the cost per addict about $4 or $5 a day. The cost of maintaining addicts in prison is about $20 a day. Mental hospital costs are about double that.

Population of the village is expected to grow to about 2,000 during the first year of operation.

Daytop Lodge is operated by the probation department of the second judicial district of the State supreme court.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXXVII

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns medical care in New York City and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 13, 1965.

The article is part of the series on New York City in Crisis and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—TOO-SILENT HELMSMAN FOR NEW YORK BLUE CROSS

(The feverish increase in Blue Cross rates has disturbed all of New York. Last Saturday, a Governor's committee headed by Marion Folsom probed the patient and found many ills. In this continuing series, the Herald Tribune examines the problem of Blue Cross against the background of the committee's report and independent evidence.)

(By Earl Ubell, science editor)

Blue Cross is a ship with hidden helmsmen. Yet it must steer between the Scylla of bankruptcy and the Charybdis of premium rates so high that it prices itself beyond the reach of its 7.5 million subscribers.

One of the silent steersmen is the doctor. Although he controls 60 percent of Blue Cross charges, he has no responsibility for them. He has few controls, except his own sense of ethics and the occasional pressure of his peers.

It is the doctor who decides when a patient goes to a hospital, where he goes, how long he stays, what procedures, tests, and drugs he gets. All these items add to hospital costs which in turn drive the ship of Blue Cross as if before a hurricane. Blue Cross premiums depend strictly on hospital costs.

Thus, the doctor is involved in one of the great determinants of the cost of insurance. Experts call it, technically, utilization; the number of days of hospitalization in a population. Obviously, if utilization is low, the cost to the insurance company will be low and premium rates will also go down.

In the United States, utilization varies from more than 2,000 days per year for each 1,000 persons, down to 400 days for special groups. Of the 12 largest Blue Cross plans in the Nation, New York has one of the lowest rates, of about 1,000 patient-days per year.

The question is: Can utilization be decreased still further in New York? As the Folsom committee pointed out, about 17 percent of the patients in hospitals have no need to be there. This adds about 17 percent to the premium.

That is where the doctor and the modern practice of medicine come in. The doctor controls the hospitalization of the patient, and if it is more convenient for a doctor or patient, or both, to put the patient in the hospital, the physician will more likely do so than not.

GROUP PRACTICE

In medical plans where the doctors work in groups, the rate of hospitalization of patients can be 20 to 50 percent less than with patients treated by doctors working solo. This is true of the Kaiser Medical Foundation in California, of the Health Insurance Plan in New York, and of Group Health, of Washington.

However, group practice may not be the whole secret. A study made among District 65, Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, shows that hospitalization in that group is about equal to that of HIP in New York. The reason may be that the union monitors very closely the hospitalization and the doctors paid for out of union funds.

In the Kaiser plan, which is a hospital-centered plan, many of the procedures that would be done in hospitals in New York are done at the health centers. Furthermore, since in the Kaiser plan it has been made in the doctors' interest to keep hospitalization low, he does so.

In New York, the doctor also decides when the patient leaves the hospital, and he often keeps the patient in the hospital longer than necessary, frequently under pressure from the patient who has inadequate arrangements at home for taking care of himself. Thus, there is a big increase in discharges from hospitals on the 21st day when the full-care Blue Cross benefits run out.

Since the average stay in a New York hospital is about 8 or 9 days, the decision by a doctor to keep a patient in an extra day or two could add 12 to 20 percent to the cost of insurance. It is not the gross abuse of hospitalization that sends costs up, but borderline decisions.

In New Jersey, Blue Cross has put all its experience with length of stay on computers, and derived averages for different diagnoses. Starting May 1, a doctor will have to certify longer stays than the average, or Blue Cross will not pay.

In New York, Blue Cross goes over records to see if hospitalization was necessary. When Blue Cross turns down a payment, the wrath of the patient is usually directed against Blue Cross, rather than against the doctor who put him in the hospital, or against the hospital who accepted him.

Doctors also decide where the patient goes for care. Many patients do not need the services of a general hospital. They could be cared for in a nursing home, at home, or in the doctor's office. But it is a fact of medical practice that the patient goes where the insurance is.

Since Blue Cross and most private insurances do not cover nursing home, doctor's office, or home care, the patient puts the doctor under great pressure to admit him to a general hospital where everything will be paid for.

Sometimes a simple social problem is involved. A child of working parents has pneumonia. If one of the parents stays home to care for the child, working pay will be lost in addition to the cost of drugs and other procedures. It is pretty hard for a doctor in private practice to refuse to hospitalize a child when the parents have Blue Cross coverage.

If Blue Cross plays any role in the decision to hospitalize, it is in the slowness with which it has developed insurance arrangements to cover nursing home, office, and home care. The new Federal insurance program for the aged passed by the House of Representatives last week makes such provisions. That should set the pace for Blue Cross plans throughout the country, including New York.

In addition to understandable pressures on the doctor, there are many physicians who admit patients to the hospitals for their own convenience. It is easier to see six patients in one hospital than to visit these at home, or in scattered nursing homes. In one study made of unnecessary hospitalizations, it turned out that general practitioners abused the privilege more often than specialists. It also turns out that there are some surgeons who admit patients for unnecessary surgery. Blue Shield, the companion plan to Blue Cross, which pays physicians, keeps a check on those doctors whose incomes suddenly go up. This will pick up the chronic abusers of hospitalization, but not the borderline cases.

Doctors frequently admit patients to hospitals on Fridays, and the patient stays in the hospital for a "lost weekend" during which little or nothing is done because labs are shut down and services curtailed. The doctor does it to save the bed, but it can add 20 percent to the average hospital bill.

Blue Cross recognizes the role the doctors play in determining Blue Cross premiums, J. Douglas Colman, president of New York's Associated Hospital Service, says:

> "For the most part these [medical] professional judgments are rendered outside of any organizational structure which fixes accountability for the economic consequences of such judgments."

LEANDER H. PEREZ

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the United States has had more than its share of political bosses, demagogs, and cynics. Fortunately, they are fading fast from the political scene. Yet there is one remaining who epitomizes all the evils that this breed of leader has stood for. Worse, many of his utterances go unchallenged, and these utterances are magnified by the national press and the nationwide television that we enjoy for so many useful purposes today.

This man's control over the citizens and the interests of one small area need to be fully exposed if his kind of leadership is to be wiped clean from our country forever.

And that is my purpose today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with some reluctance to undertake this task. This man is not from my State. I realize that I will be charged with interfering in activities which do not concern me.

But I reject these arguments ahead of time. This man has made himself a national figure with his vile statements. And the citizens of America need to be alerted to men such as this one. If they are not, they may one day find themselves without freedom, as this man's people are.

This man, in bringing ridicule and disdain to democracy has done a disservice to all American citizens, and not just those fine people in his own area.

The despot of whom I speak is Leander H. Perez, officially the president of the Plaquemines Parish Commission Council, but actually the dictator of that parish, the No. 1 enemy of the Negro in the United States and foe of the Roman Catholic Church.

His vile attacks on his own church earned him excommunication from that highly respected body.

I have heard this man's snarling cynicism for the dignity of man for several years—but it is only recently that I have come to know intimately what Louisiana and its people are really like.

I find none of this antisocial feeling among my distinguished colleagues in the Congress from Louisiana. I find none of it in my visits to Louisiana and my meeting with the leaders of the State, including the fine Governor, John J. McKeithen.

In them I find the very opposite of men like Leander Perez.

Who, then, is this man, Leander Perez?

I asked myself that question and I began to look for the answers. The Library of Congress, just across the street, proved to be a storehouse of information about this man. And my distinguished colleague from Louisiana, Mr. T. A. THOMPSON, provided me with a timely account of his opinions of Perez.

Here is the Associated Press account of his statement:

> Louisiana Representative T. A. THOMPSON, Friday termed Plaquemines Parish political leader, Leander Perez, a self-appointed dictator whose emotional tirades are damaging the State's national image.
>
> The Seventh District Congressman from Ville Platte said in a strongly worded statement that Perez "has been repudiated by the greatest patriots and Americans of our time."
>
> THOMPSON's statement was in answer to one May 6 by Perez calling five members of the State's congressional delegation renegades who should be purged at the polls next year.
>
> Perez singled out THOMPSON, Senator RUSSELL LONG, and Representatives HALE BOGGS, JAMES H. MORRISON, and EDWIN E. WILLIS.
>
> Perez, Louisiana's most outspoken segregationist, "has seen fit to criticize and abuse anyone who disagrees with anything he believes will serve his own purposes," THOMPSON said. "And certainly his purposes can easily be evaluated for what they are by a review of his actions in the past."
>
> THOMPSON said Perez not only has fought "against duly elected representatives of Louisiana but he has been instrumental in stopping a tidelands settlement which could have been had by the people of Louisiana a long time ago."
>
> The Congressman did not elaborate on this point.
>
> "If anyone would care to check the record and evaluate the fortune he [Perez] has amassed over the years," the THOMPSON statement continued, "it would be clearly evident that his efforts for the most part have been in his own behalf, rather than in behalf of the people he claims to serve.
>
> "I am convinced that Leander Perez feels that he is so well insulated by the vast personal fortune he has acquired that he can become a self appointed dictator over the thoughts of people."
>
> THOMPSON said Perez in calling for the purge of elected officials has insulted the people who elected those officials.
>
> "Inasmuch as he mentioned my name as one of those officials deserving his attack," THOMPSON said, "I must indicate publicly that I not only resent this insult to my people, but I personally resent it, and I want to state that Leander Perez may seek me out wherever and whenever he so desires.
>
> "I will be available to protect and defend the interest of my people, myself and the whole United States against his emotional tirades."
>
> At one time Perez "assumed such powers upon himself that he even put up a roadblock in defiance of orders from the Governor of Louisiana to make available to the public the records of Plaquemines Parish," the THOMPSON statement added.
>
> THOMPSON noted that Perez recently appeared on nationwide television to show "the

> dungeons and pits he has established for the express purpose of imprisoning people who might dare to enter his domain."
>
> The reference was to Perez' threat to imprison in old Fort St. Philip beside the Mississippi River any civil rights worker who appeared in Plaquemines Parish.

Mr. Thompson has not been alone in condemning Perez. Perez has been called stupid, nuts, arrogant, and a dictator to whom defiance is a way of life. His Plaquemines Parish, which he rules with a harsh hand has been called the "last unconstitutional monarchy in the United States, the Western Hemisphere's only autonomous oil sheikdom" over which Perez has a tighter dynasty than Mr. Khrushchev had. It has been said that "by comparison with him, Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama seems an angel of reason and moderation and ex-Gov. Ross W. Barnett of Mississippi a towering intellect."

What has earned Perez these terms? His own utterances have. And the files of the Library of Congress are filled with Perez opinions reflecting his disregard for his fellow man, his own church, and the lawful authority of our Nation.

Consider the following subjects and the Perez comments:

Of Negroes, Perez said:

> There are only two kinds; the bad ones are niggers and the good ones are darkies.

In calling upon school parents to boycott integrated schools, he shouted:

> Are you going to wait until these Congolese rape your daughters? Are you going to let these burr-heads into your schools? Do something about it now.

In questioning before the Senate Judiciary Committee on the voting rights bill, Perez was asked why only 3.3 percent of the Negroes in Plaquemines Parish were registered to vote. The following exchange took place:

> Mr. Perez. Well, I can only tell you that we are fortified, it is not an opinion with us. It is a fact borne out by the record. It is because of lack of interest, lack of any effort to register, and certainly we are not to be condemned for that.
>
> That was found by a solemn decision after a trial in the Federal court in New Orleans, and affirmed by the fifth circuit court.
>
> Senator Scott. Mr. Perez, I recall you also said something about lack of character. Do you want to develop that?
>
> Mr. Perez. Did I say lack of character?
>
> Senator Scott. You said for reasons of not having character.
>
> Mr. Perez. Well, if you want to go into that, sir——
>
> Senator Scott. Yes, I do.
>
> Mr. Perez. I could expound on that question; yes, sir.
>
> Senator Scott. Would you expound on it?
>
> Mr. Perez. Yes, sir; and I think that is why the moral qualification is left out of this Senate bill 1564. It is a matter of general knowledge, the immoral conduct of our Negroes, yes, sir, the large numbers of illegitimate children, yes, sir.
>
> Senator Scott. You feel that because of the lack of moral character that this has something to do with the either failure or inability of Negroes to register?
>
> Mr. Perez. No, I do not say so. I think it is just a low type of citizenship. They do not have the ambition, they do not have the urge, they do not know enough about government, they do not care. They are being well treated. They are being well taken care of. I know in my area they have the finest schools that could be found anywhere. They have accredited schools. We have less than 1-percent unemployment in my parish but we are condemned just the same by you people here who do not know anything about it. You are willing to take statistics and fabricated statistics that do not show the true facts.
>
> As I say, we are near the 50-percent line, but still the aliens of the age are included in the statistics. There is no difference made as to them.
>
> Senator Scott. Mr. Perez, you said a low type of citizenship. You are arbitrarily assuming that the Negro is a low type of citizen?
>
> Mr. Perez. I would say——
>
> Senator Scott. While a white man such as yourself is a different type of citizen?
>
> Mr. Perez. I would say that, the rank and file; yes, sir. There is no doubt among people who know them.

Perez has also been outspoken against the President of the United States. After a momentary victory in his fight to keep President Johnson off the ballot in Louisiana in 1964, Perez remarked:

> It will force Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson to come to Louisiana and tell the voters what he's doing to them—and then the voters will give him a kick in the pants.

This year he used the following language in answering his own question "Now where will this Lyndon Johnson-Hubert Humphrey administration voting rights bill leave this State and the other Southern States?"

> We know that during the years of the first reconstruction when the Federal Government forced "manhood suffrage" and total Negro voting on the Southern Black Belt, what crude and brutal methods were used to attempt to destroy our white civilization. A noted historian wrote how the Negroes who knew nothing of the affairs of government were put into power over their old masters, assisted by two classes of whites, the northern predator—the carpetbagger—who stalked the stricken South like a jackal to filch for himself something of the wreckage, and his partner the renegade and apostate southerner—the renegade without honor, pride, or patriotism—a political unnamed, who deserted his own people in their hour of peril to become a scavenger, hovering like a vulture above the ruins of Negro rule. Today that scavenger is with us again—elevated to high office in Washington by our people whom he now would betray for political favors from the national administration whose sole purpose is to be the highest bidder, for the Communist dominated minority bloc votes in the largest Northern and Eastern States.

The FBI has also been a target. When that agency investigated voting in Plaquemines Parish, Perez said:

> Whoever gave the FBI their orders can go to hell. We resent the intrusion of the secret police, called the FBI, and Gestapo methods to harass our people about their registration.

He has charged that there were Communists in the U.S. attorney's office, but as usual, offered no supporting evidence.

Of his own archbishop, the late Joseph Francis Rummel, who integrated Catholic schools and excommunicated Perez for his public denunciation, Perez said:

> I say to the archbishop and I've said it before, I think he's earned the punishment of hell for selling out on his people.
>
> The men who led our Catholic Church and who had our respect before have lost the right to all decency and respect of their fellow men. That is how low a person will stoop when he gets caught. When he has sold his soul, he has no decency left.

Perez said the archbishop was telling a bareface lie when he announced segregation was morally wrong.

> We are caught up in the spider web of international intrigue * * * with our church leaders taking directions from Communists.

Perez said.

Perez accused the church of integrating its schools because it got a $3 million bribe—grant—to build an apartment building for the aged.

Perez has the same cynical regard for his own people, his own supporters, too. When asked if he had inspired an advertisement urging defiance of the FBI, he replied:

> It was my idea. Who the hell else has any ideas in Plaquemines?

Asked if there was any question about who would be president of the newly formed parish government in Plaquemines, he replied:

> Well, why should there be? After all, it was my brain child. I'd say the work of the parish—the financial setup has made it all possible—is all the result of my work and special legislation which I wrote over the years. What is the objection to Perez being the lee-dah?

He once told the president of the National Lead Co. who was seeking a new plant site: "Sir, you are wasting your time. I don't want you down here."

As for parish growth, he comments: "We could have 100,000 people in this parish but we don't want 'em."

What is life like in Perez' Plaquemines Parish? It isn't very American-like, if you happen to disagree with Leander Perez.

When U.S. Armed Forces commanders were urged to seek equal treatment for Negro servicemen, Perez' government put the parish bars off limits.

To retaliate against a rebellious public official, the Plaquemines governing body abolished the ward the public official represented.

The librarian of the parish resigned because Perez had forbidden him to order books on the United Nations, Franklin D. Roosevelt, "or any book showing a liberal viewpoint." The librarian said when he resigned in 1963 that Perez had not permitted Negroes to check out books since 1960.

When a rival Governor appointed a political foe sheriff, Perez refused to yield the office to the appointee. He mobilized all the able-bodied men of Plaquemines and set up a flaming roadblock of gasoline-soaked oyster shells to turn the appointee back. The Governor sent the militia to install the appointee and Perez fled across the Mississippi River.

Lawyers fighting Perez often find themselves in peculiar circumstances. One described his experience at a hearing in which he was contesting an election.

He tells it this way:

> On this specific occasion in question, I recall that the matter was tried in the parish courthouse at Pointe a la Hache, La., in Plaquemines, and to the best of my recollec-

> tion, I believe there was 11 members of the committee. This committee hears the issues and the matters brought before it as to the question of whether a person is properly qualified, and so forth, and so on, and at the time of the hearing, when we walked into courts, there was only two members of the committee present, Mr. Perez and somebody else, and Mr. Perez had, I believe, nine proxies. We went forward with the hearing, which lasted, oh, I would say, 3 days. I'm not certain about the time. The counsel that was appointed to represent our opposition was advised by Mr. Perez to sit down, that he wasn't doing too well, that he, Mr. Perez, would take over. So a very peculiar legal situation arose at several stages during the hearings which Mr. Perez was the parish committee; he also was the counsel for the other side and then he was a witness at the same time.

Voting rights are a sham for Negroes in Plaquemines Parish, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights found when it investigated registration in 1961.

Only after Negroes filed suit in Federal court was a permanent office for registration located in Plaquemines. Then, after Negroes traveled long distances, they found they were required to wait in line for hours, while white persons were waited on as soon as they arrived.

The Civil Rights Commission found that prospective registrants were required to interpret the Constitution in writing by answering at least 2 questions supposedly selected at random from a group of 25 question cards. The questions were judged by comparing them with answers previously drawn by Leander Perez.

Reported the Commission:

> But the Commission's findings cast serious doubt on the fairness of her (the registrar's) administration. Her office records show that only 47 Negroes are registered—less than 1 percent of the Negro population over 21, as compared to 95 percent of the white population and only 7 of these Negroes had been registered since the installation of the constitutional test card system. The constitutional clauses on the cards received by Negroes were much more difficult than those received by white persons. And the manner in which certain cards turned up, or failed to turn up, suggests the whole system was rigged.

The investigation showed that 2 of the 25 test cards, Nos. 2 and 8, were administered to 86 percent of the registered voters in the sample, all of them whites. None of the seven Negroes registered at the time with the card system had used those two cards.

Perez perhaps reached his zenith and human dignity its lowest ebb when the Catholic church integrated its Plaquemines school.

One of the Negro parents who was going to send his child to that school found himself before his employer the next day. He was told:

> I don't know what you did, but Judge Perez told me to—I have to get rid of you, or he'll get rid of me, and I have to stick with the people with the money.

At subsequent meetings, Perez described parochial school desegregation as the payoff of a conspiracy and bribe involving Communists, the Jews, the President and the Catholic hierarchy.

Here is what Perez said at one of those meetings:

> But $3 million grants to the hierarchy in New Orleans supposedly to build an apartment house for old folks. Well, now that Mr. Catholic President Kennedy has set the example of paying off $3 million to the Catholic hierarchy here, what's he going to do when the pressure is put on him by the Protestant Christian leaders such as this Bishop Oxnam a fellow traveler in Atlanta? That takes us back just 1,962 years ago, when a Judas took 30 pieces of silver, but the price has gone up, my friends. Three million is the first installment. But regardless of the price there's no such thing as "the price is right" on the heads of our fine little girls and boys. Out of 34 parochial schools, if you will check, you'll see that 16 of them had only one or two burr heads. There were four others that had three or four little pickaninnies. There's just barely 124 integrated schools, but that only the foot-in-the-door policy, because they will pour into those schools in the proportion that the white people lose their nerve and lose their courage and abandon their children to a life of immorality and indecency with these filthy little Negroes who don't know what legitimacy means in the first place. Can you imagine the future of America with all the white children driven out of our public schools, in the end, and that's what is going to happen gradually. What is the future of our country? Why are the Communists conspiring to deprive our white youth of educational opportunities? Does Mr. Kennedy see that, or does he give a damn? Did President Eisenhower see it surrounded by his Zionist advisors, Max Rabinowitz? Goldfine and Company? Did Harry Truman see it? No. I don't suppose Franklin Roosevelt gave a darn, either. I was nauseated, sick in the stomach, when I saw the performance by the mayor and the chief of police and the first chief in New Orleans, saying, "We're ready. We're going to use the force of the police against these good people when they come out to protest against parochial school properties being stolen and taken away from them and their children dispossessed." But you're not going to get that kind of reception here, my friends, in Plaquemines Parish—here.

The day before school opened the parish priest went to get gas for the schoolbuses and found they did not have any brakes. The master cylinders on both buses had been drained of all the brake fluid.

That night the Negro parents started getting calls—at 3 o'clock in the morning. The callers said that if one parent sent his child to school, they would "burn us out and every other nigger in Boothsville."

A white parent who continued to send his child to the school was visited at 2:30 a.m. by representatives of his company. He tells what happened:

> They explained to me why they were there, and that they had had a call from top brass of my company—asking them to talk with me and see if I wouldn't step out of this school situation, that the pressure had been put on the company, with a threat of closing the company down if I didn't get out of this school situation, and closing down of the company would have put roughly 500 men out of work. Well, there's only one man in the parish with that kind of power. No one else has anywhere near the power to do that.
>
> There's only one man it could have been and that's Leander Perez.

The parish priest announced that school would be discontinued "because of numerous threats of physical violence and fear of insufficient police protection."

And the priest described the terror struck in his parishioners:

> A priest almost senses that they're even afraid to talk to us any more, or wave to us, because something might happen if they get too friendly with a priest. Even in going to church at hours other than regular church services, some people are afraid to come to church to make a visit, or holy hour, because something might happen.

One night, after the initial crisis, a nun at the school took a phone message: "If you take those Negroes into our new white school, it will be blown to pieces with you in it."

That night an explosion rocked the school knocking walls apart and charring the ceiling.

In his comment after the blast, Perez said:

> I do not decry the activities of our people in resisting and in objecting in any way they can to the unlawful un-Christian, unmoral actions of the hierarchy, or of their local priest to deprive them of their property, to deprive their children of the private Christian education which they had planned and for which they paid.

So there you have some of Perez' utterances and some examples of life in Plaquemines. How did he get so powerful? Fortune magazine tells how in its March 1958 issue repeated herewith.

At this point I would like to have this article inserted in the RECORD along with an account of Perez' appearance before the Senate Judiciary Committee, the two-part series on Perez by Collier's magazine and the account of the CBS Reports program entitled "The Priest and the Politician":

OIL, BRIMSTONE, AND "JUDGE" PEREZ

(By Richard Austin Smith)

(The oil companies handle him like a demijohn of nitroglycerin. And no wonder. He holds the power to blow any business enterprise in his rich bailiwick sky high. He is the boss of Plaquemines Parish, La.)

"As the chief executive of this State," rumbled Louisiana's Earl Long in the summer of 1956, "I thought I had a right to look at income taxes. * * * I found several astounding revelations. I found that a certain district attorney in a certain parish had gone, I think, from $24,000, $25,000, or $26,000 to $200,000. * * * I'm informed that the levee boards in Plaquemines Parish, and some companies that a certain man (is) interested in, are receiving royalties from the Freeport Sulphur Co. I'm informed that that's not necessarily a voluntary contribution. * * * If you want to do well, you've got to stay with the king. I had a man the other day to tell me—(he's) a multimillionaire—that he swore he would not give an overriding royalty, I think of one-sixteenth. He stood out and stood out and finally his partners come to him and said, 'Listen, we've got great investments. Everybody else in that part of the country has done it. Go ahead and do it and let's recover something on our investment.' "

Whom the Governor meant by "the king" and what "staying" with him entailed were no mystery to U.S. corporations doing business in Plaquemines Parish, the deep delta county that squeezes the Mississippi on its final thrust to the Gulf. Its district attorney is Leander Perez. The corporations dealing with him include not only Freeport Sulphur, but Shell, Texas, Humble, Tidewater, Gulf, and California; they all have had firsthand experience in the most fantastic land-lease situation, not to say the most authoritarian political duchy, in the United States.

Plaquemines Parish is Louisiana's richest mineral county ($184 million worth of oil produced in 1957, $40 million in sulfur). For almost 35 years it has been under the dictatorship of one man, Leander Perez; either you do business with Perez, or you don't do much business in Plaquemines Parish. The mechanism works in this wise: years ago Perez-controlled levee boards leased thousands of acres of land either to Perez-controlled land companies, or to his nominees, who in turn assigned the leases to the Perez land companies. Mineral companies have found that it's prudent to sublet from one of the land companies, from which Perez derives a sizable part of his income. In Plaquemines Parish, boundary lines are a series of unknowns, both legal and geographical. The decisive influence in levee-board land disputes: Leander Perez.

It's no wonder that individual oilmen are most careful of what they say about the dictator of Plaquemines Parish. The major petroleum companies themselves habitually handle him like a demijohn of nitroglycerin—and for good reason. If they want to lay a pipeline or put up a terminal in Plaquemines, Perez has the power to block them. If their leaseholds are being challenged, as consistently a hazard of life in Plaquemines as the cottonmouth moccasin, then Perez may be behind it—and what they can save of their holdings lies substantially in his hands. Consider, for example, the recent $135 million land dispute between Freeport Sulphur and John Mecom on the one side, and Humble, Shell, Texas, Gulf, plus Leander Perez on the other.

In 1951, John Mecom, Houston's immensely successful independent oilman made a deal with Ernest Cockrell, Jr., to take a mineral lease on some Plaquemines Parish land. The Cockrell acreage dated back to 1927, when Ernest, Sr., bought it, and covered part of the Lake Washington field. Lake Washington is now the biggest field in the parish, with a whopping reserve of 315 million barrels; 273 wells dot its 5,460 acres and in 1957 produced 10,228,000 barrels of crude. The deal itself was for Mecom to drill two deep wells to validate the Cockrell holdings, Cockrell and others to get a royalty of 17⅔ percent on the production. Freeport Sulphur was brought in when Mecom needed more cash, took a half interest with him, splitting the cost.

But as soon as there was production, Perez joined the party. (In essence, what he said was: You're drilling on my land; a representative from the opposing side remembers retorting: "'All right, where is your land?' Everywhere we drilled, that was his land.") Humble Oil and other sublessees (Gulf, Texas, Shell) thought they had a valid claim on a portion of the same land from Perez via one of his land companies. (In 1938, before State mineral board approval was required, a Perez land company had got a fabulously generous blanket lease on all the uncommitted acreage that one of Perez' parish levee boards could scrape together. Only a token amount of money—$1,500—was paid to the levee board, while the land company itself was now in a position to get an override on any future subleases, such as Humble and others, were now asserting they held.) Perez conducted the early discussions, taking the lead for Humble and associates, who demanded that Freeport-Mecom move its claim northwestward, and the conferences were reported as pleasant until an outrageous demand by Perez caused Freeport-Mecom to break them off. Then Perez, who had appeared on the scene as mysteriously as one of the islands that float up out of the Mississippi, vanished again below the surface. Freeport and Mecom kept on drilling, soon had a lot of production on the section they would have forfeited had Humble-Perez been able to make their claims stand up. But the more successful they were, the more insistent Humble and partners became that their lease from the Perez land company was valid on the 400-odd acres involved. Freeport and Mecom finally capitulated. The settlement of 1955, involving some 90 million barrels of reserves, was a compromise. The results for Humble, Shell, Texas, Gulf: half the production from the disputed area; for Perez: his land company got an override on this half, as the sublessor. Freeport-Mecom lost half the mineral acreage they thought they owned, instead of 100 percent of the production, wound up with half.

This incident throws a bright light on the man many Louisianians regard as the most powerful figure in the State. A burly, 66-year-old with a rampant pompadour, Leander Perez is the individualist who devised the filibuster stratagem that saved "Kingfish" Huey Long from being run out of office in 1929; who took over national leadership of the States' Rights Democratic Party in 1948; who openly refers to Huey's brother Earl, Louisiana's present Governor, as "that maniac in Baton Rouge"; who was the instigator of Louisiana's claim to a fatter slice of the tidelands (the "Perez Line" of 1954); who has all but closed his parish to further industrialization and recently shouted at the astonished president of National Lead in search of a plant site: "Sir, you are wasting your time. I don't want you down here. Now, with the Freeport [Sulphur] crowd, we've got to know them and like having them around, but we don't want any more." His prime interest? Not money, but sheer power. He has cultivated power since first becoming district judge back in 1919, perfected it in almost 35 years as district attorney and manipulator of the parish's great fur and mineral wealth until Plaquemines is today, as one Louisianian wryly described it, the last unconstitutional monarchy in the United States.

THE LOOK OF A SWAMPLAND CAESAR

That Perez has managed to rule his unconstitutional monarchy so absolutely and for so many years is no accident. Rather it is an almost classic instance of the way a bold, brilliant, and ruthless tactician can beat off all challengers once he thoroughly identifies himself with his domain. Physically, Plaquemines is a low, waterlogged parish, chopped into silty islands at its southern end where the Mississippi rolls through seven passes into the gulf. Most of it is trembling prairie, a great rolling green plain full of alligator runs and the three-cornered grass so relished by muskrats. The swamp buggies of seismographic crews crosshatch its lonely marshlands, hunting the oil on which a good part of the parish seems to float like a green scum. Oysters abound along its intricate waterways, neither too salty nor too fresh, and on the ribbons of firm ground back of the levees grow some of the finest oranges in the world. The 30,000-odd people who live in Plaquemines and in neighboring St. Bernard (the two parishes together make up the 25th judicial district) have adjusted to the mosquito and Leander Perez, but little else. A basic Creole stock plus "Cajuns" and "Tockos," of Acadian French and Dalmatian Slavic lineage (with a leavening of the Irish who built the levees back in the 19th century), they have all the virtues and all the shortcomings of an insular people: self-sufficiency, pride, intolerance, lawlessness, and blind adherence to tribal codes. Some of these characteristics Perez himself possesses, having been born and bred in Plaquemines, in a poor family of 13 children; others he has studiously acquired until he is now a sort of composite of many of the prevailing attitudes in the parish.

"Mine is the life story," Perez declares today, "of a man who's done more, I believe, than any other man in this country in a restricted area, in building up a community." "Perez, in his own mind" echoed a onetime sulfur executive, "is the greatest citizen since George Washington, maybe even better: He didn't chop down any cherry tree." Even so, nobody can help but admire the material evidence of what Perez has done in a third of a century as the self-appointed "parish business manager." His stewardship has resulted in almost $9 million worth of new schools ($2,700,000 for new Negro schools of "equal excellence"); an average of $25,000 distributed annually in college scholarships; 10,000 farm acres under drainage; two main highways; three water purification and distribution plants to reduce the age-old dependence on rainwater; a free ferry across the Mississippi; free waterways, canals, and locks instead of the heavy tolls fishermen had to pay for a round trip through a canal; free boat haulage at two parish yards; a flock of new fire departments; and with all this, the lowest countywide tax rate in the State. Perez, his pleasant wife "Momma Perez" and four grown children themselves live in a style that has nothing to do with his district attorney's salary of some $7,000 a year. "The Judge," as he is called by almost everyone, has two houses in Plaquemines, one on New Orleans' "millionaires' row" (deeded to a married daughter), large herds of prize cattle, and drives about the parish in an air-conditioned car with, from time to time, a revolver nestled in its glove compartment. At his disposal as a private yacht is the 73-foot parish "patrol boat" *Manta*, where many a sulfur or oil executive chomping the judge's succulent corn or sipping his bourbon on a cruise down the Mississippi, has learned the not so palatable facts of life in Plaquemines.

THE COMMON BOND OF PREJUDICE

The people of Plaquemines are uncompromising segregationists; so is Perez. He decries integration as a Communist plot to destroy the country and finds gratifying expression for his white-supremacy dogmas in the citizens council. During the war his skin-deep sociology vented itself in opposition to California's uprooted Nisei working on the parish's verdant truck farms. He recalls with relish what he said to U.S. Government officials: "I know these Japs can't farm in court, and that's where they're going to be for a long time. I'll demand a jury trial, and my closing argument will be, 'No matter in what kennel you may buy the highest pedigreed dog, he's still an * * *, and no matter where a yellow Jap is born, he's still a yellow * * *.'"

More recently Perez has broken up Plaquemines homes by enforcement of Louisiana's heartless miscegenation law, ever pressing for the extradition of those people who have sought sanctuary in other States. For some citizens of the parish, long accepted as white, but perhaps with Negro blood far back in their family tree, there is the terror that he may someday uncover this forgotten heritage; then they will have to move out of their white neighborhoods, while their children withdraw from white schools and relinquish their white playmates, for in local parlance they've "got a spot," or they've been "dipped." "There's only two kinds of Negroes," he is fond of saying, "bad ones are niggers and good ones are darkies. If He didn't intend him to be inferior, why did God make the black man?" And on one occasion, as the self-appointed interpreter of divine logic (his desk carries a tract entitled: "God, the Original Segregationist"), Catholic Perez entered a parish church and compelled a nun to segregate a group of schoolchildren.

A LITTLE MATTER OF LATITUDE

The people of Plaquemines like to bend the law to suit their convenience. Their ancestors trafficked with Jean Laffitte, the celebrated 19th century pirate, and bought the slaves taken on his forays in the gulf; they were enthusiastic rumrunners during prohibition, concealing their liquor under layers of shrimp or oysters as a regular thing (for deluxe shipment, they pressed a funeral cortege into service); they were equally resourceful as smugglers of contraband Chinese—though, if capture were imminent, not above murder or jettisoning their cargo overside in sealed barrels. A deep deltan would shoot a man for poaching on his oysterbeds, meanwhile poaching, gun in hand, his pirogue hidden away in the grasses, on some fur company's muskrat marsh. Indeed, their rather one-sided conception of what was "fittin'," plus an equally deep-rooted distaste for doubledealing, nearly cost Perez his own hide in the trappers war of 1926.

The trappers war, which embraced both Plaquemines and St. Bernard Parishes, reveals the judge in an early instance of the dual role he was to make so profitable with the coming of oil and sulfur. Perez first appeared on the scene in benevolent guise ("my first interest was to help the trappers") as the organizer, and attorney, of the St. Bernard Trappers' Association, a group with exclusive trapping rights to thousands of acres. Subsequently the association's rights on 100,000 acres were sold to a buyer acting as trustee for unnamed persons—who promptly tripled the trapping fees. Perez' refusal to identify the purchasers (he was subsequently charged with being their attorney) suggested that they might be the judge himself. Denouncing the sale, the president of the association filed suit to have it rescinded.

"SHOOT TO KILL"

Legally, the battle ebbed and flowed with first one side then the other pressing the legal advantages won in each new court decision. The trappers swarmed over the area when a decision favored nullification of the sale; when an appeal favored the mysterious purchasers, they tore down trap markers, and posted guards. As for Perez, the "benevolent" dictator began acting just like any other dictator when crossed. He hurried down to Texas to recruit more tractable trappers. Hard-bitten Texans were brought in to patrol the contested lands. The local trappers moved on Perez in Plaquemines, bent on shooting him. He heard of their coming, got his family into a rowboat and escaped across the Mississippi. Orders had previously gone out to the Perez gunmen and deputies regarding any trappers found on the disputed lands: shoot to kill. Now the climax of the "war" approached: in a single fight one deputy was killed and five others wounded; the trappers had three casualties. This kind of statistic was bound to give pause even to the Judge. Very soon thereafter, the trappers bought the battleground and the war was over. It was one of the few lickings Perez ever took.

PERILS OF A PRIVATE CITIZEN

More recently, the residents of the tiny Plaquemines settlement of Ostrica were treated to the spectacle of what happens when a single citizen collides with the "law" and a big company in Perez' parish. A storekeeper, tired of having his roadside front steps knocked off by Gulf trucks, finally flagged one down and told the driver he couldn't go through. This brought Plaquemines deputy sheriffs on the run. They declared the truck was going through nevertheless; the storekeeper rashly told them to go to hell. But passage of the truck didn't end the affair; nor did the man's retreat into his store. The "law" was apparently out for blood. The chief deputy had a submachine gun; one of the other deputies, interestingly enough, was Gulf's superintendent of transportation, who was handed a revolver at the scene. The storekeeper's pregnant wife subsequently swore she heard Gulf's superintendent-deputy sheriff say: "Best thing is to get him out, then to shoot him." The storekeeper stayed put. His wife suffered a miscarriage, collected $10,500 in damages from Gulf in 1952.

Of course, oil companies themselves can get into trouble in Plaquemines over a misinterpretation of what "the law" actually is. One of Perez' chief officials rents boats to the oil companies. A corporation that rejects this service does so at its inconvenience. As one outfit discovered, fuel tanks of its company-owned craft had a way of getting clogged up with sugar during the night, while during the day fishing boats blocked passage through the canals leading to the rigs.

Perez' overt bending of the law has been no less colorful. Leander-the-lawyer is a deep student of the Constitution; indeed a labor attorney who once heard him argue a case before the Louisiana Supreme Court described him as the "most brilliant constitutional lawyer in the State." But when a workman declared he was within the law in picketing, a Plaquemines deputy sheriff shouted that he was the law in the parish Constitutionalist Perez accosted two union officials in the New Orleans Federal Court itself, where they sought protection of the guarantees of peaceful picketing and assembly, pointed them out to his sheriff and simply said: "If you catch them down there [in Plaquemines] any more, put them in jail."

THE "ROTTEN BOROUGHS"

Politically, Perez' contortions with the law have earned his parishes of Plaquemines and St. Bernard the statewide epithet of "the rotten boroughs." Declared the district's judge in 1940, after Perez had moved for his impeachment: "The control that [Perez] presently has in Plaquemines Parish being complete in every detail, in that no act is performed by any of the officers of that parish unless he is first consulted; his holding of undated resignations of each and everyone of these officials, members of these public boards, etc., constitutes them his absolute slaves." Though this statement can be accepted as a generalization, the fact is the judge doesn't need to ride close herd on everyone every minute. His power is too manifest to require it; moreover, it isn't any more necessary for a political boss to instruct his experienced lieutenants on the way things should be done than it is for a corporate boss. The objective in either instance is success and the means is always there to put heavy penalties on failure. Only token votes are obtained by Perez' opposition, and through the years there have been repeated charges about "the muskrats voting down there." But the notorious Plaquemines count was still apparent as late as 1950, and upon FBI evidence, five Plaquemines election commissioners were convicted of vote fraud. Their attorney asked for leniency on grounds that none of the defendants had criminal records. The Federal judge did suspend sentence but observed wryly: "When you're on the right side down there, you're not likely to have a criminal record." "Some of these Plaquemines folks," Perez explained recently, blowing the incident away in a puff of mellow cigar smoke, "don't have any way of getting to the polls, so they used to ask their friends to cast their votes for them. That's all that happened."

A STATE OF OPEN REBELLION

Perez himself got tangled up in the law most spectacularly when his parish took on the State of Louisiana in the "little war" of 1943–44. The Plaquemines sheriff had died in office, which put the appointment of a successor in the eager hands of reform Gov. Sam Jones. Jones jumped at the opportunity of establishing a bridgehead in Perezland; but the judge was just as aware as the Governor of what might happen with a Jones man in the sheriff's office. The sheriff is a powerful personage in Louisiana, much like the old-time sheriffs of England, and charged with such sensitive responsibilities as collecting taxes. The pulling and hauling over this key post finally reached the Louisiana Supreme Court, which ruled in favor of the appointee. Entreaties to accept the Jones appointee went out from Baton Rouge; legalistic catcalls came back from Plaquemines. The State guard held drills in New Orleans. Perez organized a Plaquemines Parish patrol of gun-waving citizens. The Governor proclaimed that a state of "open rebellion" existed in Plaquemines and a battalion of State guardsmen moved down the peninsula to establish martial law at the parish seat of Pointe a la Hache. "General" Perez drew his revolver and marshaled his own forces but, prudently, the first and only "blow" was delivered by Leander the lawyer, as the State guard column drew up to the first roadblock, three Perez deputies attempted to serve a local court order forbidding the invasion. They got nowhere, and within a few hours the last of the barricades had been cleared away, the Jones appointee was established in the courthouse, the parish patrol had metamorphosed into a group of guileless citizens lolling on their front porches, and Leander, his pistol holstered, had long since crossed to the other side of the river on the parish's ferryboat. Though the war was over, legal barrages continued. But only a few months later the Jones sheriff was swept out by the electorate and the man on the white horse was back in the saddle again.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF POWER

Nominally, Perez is just the district attorney, one of whose duties is to act as legal adviser to the police jury, an elective body that functions as a county board. But Perez took his own handpicked slate of police jurors into office with him when first elected D.A. back in the twenties, and has been picking them ever since. All the key instrumentalities of power in Plaquemines—the tax assessor, the school board, the sheriff, the police jurors, the district judge,[1] and so on—are Perez men, "selected" at caucuses of the party faithful. Democracy in action? "Not democracy," growled Perez recently. "I hate that word. Joseph Stalin had the best democracy in the world, and next to him, Franklin Roosevelt."

But even though the police jury gave Perez their "100 percent cooperation" from 1924 on ("we sort of get together before the meetings where there's any issue that might cause dissension. We talk it over and work it out, and then sit down and vote unanimously"), it had very little money to do anything with. Politics without money is like a car without gasoline, but in 1932 Perez had a brilliant scheme for getting some: from the levee boards.

The levee boards, something of an anachronism in that the U.S. Army Engineers had taken over most levee work, had been deeded thousands of acres of land by the State to finance any construction they undertook. This assignment of land meant little to anybody prior to 1928, but that year oil was discovered in Plaquemines. Now not only were the levee boards in a position to make a mint on petroleum leases (while the police jury still went begging), but they were run by appointees of the Governor, anathema to a home-ruler like Perez. The Judge trotted up to Baton Rouge and introduced just a little old "local bill" in the legislature. The legislators weren't quite hep to Perez at that stage of the game, so they put it through without much thought. What the judge got was a constitutional amendment which permitted a police jury to assume the bonded indebtedness, and consequently the assets, of the levee districts within the parish; in short, Perez' police jury now had a stake in mineral lands potentially worth many millions of dollars.

---

[1] District Judge Bruce Nunez' enthusiasms for Perez are implicit in the statement of a veteran New Orleans lawyer: "It took me 3 years to get a suit through Plaquemines court; Perez got one through in 10 days."

THE THIRD FORCE

Such political and economic power in the hands of a man like Leander Perez are formidable enough in themselves, but when the two are allied with a third force—the vagaries of geography in the Deep Delta country—they can become well-nigh invincible. The police jury (through its economic power over the levee boards) had financial control of thousands of acres of lands ceded by the State, the State reserving the water bottoms. But what was land and what was water bottom? A survey made in the fall, for example, when the Mississippi was low, would turn up a lot more land than one made during the spring floods. Moreover, it seems that an early surveyor in laying out one of the township lines established it 3 miles too far north. Subsequent surveyors repeated the error. Thus the Payne plats of 1912, on which the Buras Levee Board was to base a land sale, fitted two townships of 6 square miles each into the space of a township and a half; 72 standard sections were shown where there was room for only 54. All section boundary lines and dimensions, in consequence, were unreal.

Perez noticed this error and after discovery of oil in the area, had a suit brought for the Buras Levee Board against the owners of the lands; he claimed certain sections and, repudiating the Payne plats, sought to have the court hold that the board was not bound by the plats. His basis of the board's claim was a replotting of the two townships, which would confirm its title to additional lands.

SOME EXOTIC GEOGRAPHY

When the Perez suit reached the Louisiana Supreme Court (1933), a majority of the justices took a look at his claim and dryly observed that "sections 11, 12, and 13 (in the rich oil and sulfur area of Lake Grande Ecaille) have been, figuratively speaking, pulled down south more than a mile from where the Payne map locates them, and incidentally pulled out of the water and onto land and placed on the exact spot where oil was discovered * * *. (If the levee board) is to be decreed the owner of the oil dome, the location of sections 11, 12, and 13 on the ground must be changed, and that is what it is trying to do." The court decided that the levee board did not own the oil dome, and in broad language declared that the board had sold all the land it could. Perez pressed on, however, and in a subsequent suit won a less damaging interpretation of the Supreme Court's decision; the circuit court of appeals found that title to sections 11, 12, 13 of the particular township "as it is actually located is settled, but no other land is covered by the decree."

Complete confusion now set in. It took a crystal ball to tell where sections 11, 12, and 13 really were, despite the Supreme Court ruling. Freeport Sulphur was in a particularly vulnerable spot with a $3,500,000 operation set down in an area where a lease contest might deprive them of the right to mine. The oil companies—Humble, Gulf, Shell—were just as exposed. "We were all floating around (in 1938), and still are," recollected one oilman. "The only way we could handle it was to pool our leases and work out compromise agreements." To compound the uneasiness and confusion, some newly formed land companies had begun to appear: Delta Development and Louisiana Coastal. These companies got their leases either directly from the local levee boards or by assignment from others who had, then re-leased the land in return for an overriding royalty. It soon became obvious in Plaquemines Parish that the leases with the most powerful backing were to be had from Delta Development or Louisiana Coastal. The reason: Perez himself organized Delta "for the purpose of taking up some leases," had had another attorney organize Louisiana Coastal for him. And Delta Development, incidentally, was the Perez company that figured in the $135-million *Freeport-Mecom* v. *Humble* land dispute described earlier. Concerning Delta, a Gulf executive recently commented: "Every oil company in the business holds leases from Delta Development. They (Perez and Delta) are pretty well synonymous; they're linked up together."

THE SQUEEZE ON FREEPORT

The first real test of Perez' perfected power combination—politics, economics, and geography—occurred in 1936. The victim: Freeport Sulphur. Freeport got into Perez' bad graces by starting to bring in people from outside the parish. That was bad enough in the judge's eyes, for he will tolerate no dilution of his electorate; what made it worse was that the company began laying off a bunch of Plaquemines people in the process. Perez, already in Baton Rouge on other legislation, slipped a "wolf bill" into the works: strictly a shakedown, it proposed raising sulfur severance taxes from 60 cents to $2 per long ton. Freeport's President Langbourne Williams came down to Baton Rouge on the double, was reassured by Gov. Richard Leche that even if the legislature passed the tax, he'd veto it. "Well," snorted a Freeport executive recently, "I don't think Williams' train had even got as far as Atlanta before Leche signed that bill."

The fat was now in the fire so far as Freeport was concerned. No tax relief could be got short of 2 years, when the legislature would meet again. The company chopped back their Louisiana production almost a fourth and boosted that in Texas by over a third, but it was clearly a losing game. At the time, Plaquemines supplied over half their total output, contained the second-biggest sulfur mine in the world. Moreover, the sulfur people were harassed by two suits, one by private parties, the other by Perez acting for the Buras Levee Board. Involved in both were the collection of back royalties, the establishment of a basis for payment of future royalties, and, most important, the security of Freeport's lease on Fractional Section One, the sulfur source for their biggest plant. By 1938, with the legislature preparing to meet, Freeport was ready to say "uncle." It made friendly overtures to the judge, who soon showed himself to be as effective an ally as an antagonist.

First, he took the lead in working out a compromise settlement of the royalty suits against Freeport, about which more later. Then, he concluded a "gentlemen's agreement" between Freeport and Plaquemines to keep the overall property tax rate below 20 mills (Perez recalls it was 35 at the time), and got a commitment that the company would employ a certain percentage of Plaquemines people (currently the payroll is 75 to 80 percent from the parish). Next he had a constitutional amendment put through the legislature establishing the sulfur severance tax at $1.03. Friend Leche who had obligingly signed the 233 percent tax increase in 1936 just as obligingly threw his weight behind the 48 percent tax reduction.

Naturally, the tax element of Perez' 1938 maneuvers has been the subject of much oratory and speculation ever since. So much so in fact that the compromising of the royalty suits against Freeport has not received the scrutiny it deserves. On advice from its statutory counsel (Perez), the board accepted the offer of Freeport (plus other interested parties: Humble, Gulf, Shell, and Ernest Cockrell, Jr.) to settle the claims of the board and two other parties by Freeport's paying 25 cents per long ton on sulfur produced prior to 1938 and 35 cents per long ton thereafter. The board further accepted his recommendations of how this particular melon was to be divided:

(1) The Buras Levee Board did not get the 50 cents a ton specified in its contract. It got 32 percent of that amount for production prior to 1938, 40 percent for total land production in the future.

(2) Robert J. Lobrano and one Herbert Waguespack, the other individual litigants, got a slightly better deal on the pre-1938 royalties (36 percent of their claim) and a substantially better settlement (60 percent of their claim) on future royalties. Between themselves, the Lobrano-Waguespack split was just about equal for pre-1938 royalties, on future payments it could run as much as 5 to 1 in Lobrano's favor. (The main reason: while the two shared royalty rights on Fractional Section One, Lobrano also had mineral rights on some 9,000-odd acres of potential sulfur lands.)

Who was Robert J. Lobrano? A onetime chief deputy clerk of court in Plaquemines, but more important, as the judge explained this past December, he was "one of our boys." He might better be described as Perez' boy, the nominee who had been trading in levee-board mineral leases since the twenties. Back in 1928, the Buras Levee Board upon the advice of Perez, awarded him mineral rights on the 9,000-odd acres that figured in the royalty settlement just described; his yearly rental: $500, some 6 cents an acre. Eight years later, as an officer of Delta Development, Lobrano was to witness the 1936 lease whereby Delta got oil, gas, and mineral rights on a tract of land (estimated at 10,000 to 30,000 acres) from the Grand Prairie Levee Board for no more than 3 cents an acre (even then the going price in the coastal parishes, according to expert opinion, was $1 to $3 an acre). Now, after the sulfur settlement, Lobrano turned around and assigned to Louisiana Coastal, one of the other land companies Perez had had organized, $32,263 of his $43,017 cash settlement and all but 3¼ cents of his future royalties, i.e., 7¼ cents on the first 5 million long tons, 8¾ on the next 5 million, 9¼ cents on the balance. In consideration of this assignment he was paid 500 shares of Louisiana Coastal. But who was Louisiana Coastal? Lobrano, Coastal's president from 1939 to 1941, said it was Judge Perez. Accountant Robert J. Chauvin, onetime secretary of Coastal, now its president, forged the link even more securely. He would not let anyone see the books, unless he'd first talked to Perez; the minute book was in Perez' possession, he said, and all dividends on the stock were turned over to the judge. Not long after the sulfur settlement, according to the New Orleans Item, Perez was confiding to friends that he'd become a millionaire.

AN ARTICLE OF FAITH

One crucial question, of course, is whether the Buras Levee Board knew of Perez' interest in the Lobrano settlement. He himself has murmured he believed they did know it. It seems a curious point to be in doubt about, but perhaps it wouldn't have made any difference if the board had known the full facts. Its president told the Item, long an informed critic of Perez' activities, that he and other members of the levee board had always followed the judge's advice unquestioningly and in good faith.

In this context it is interesting to note that there seems to be a distinct correlation between the profits of the companies the judge created—Delta Development and Louisiana Coastal—and the prosperity of Perez himself. Latest figures (1956) show that $2,450,000 in oil, gas, and sulfur royalties was paid to the Plaquemines Parish police jury by Gulf, $894,000; Tidewater, $650,000; Humble, $513,000; Freeport, $218,000; the California Co., $173,000. These payments to the parish, of course, are the basis for figuring the earnings of Delta and Coastal; the two companies by now have got their hands on much of the mineral land the Plaquemines levee boards can lease, and now release such land to the majors in return for overriding royalties.

The vigilantly guarded figures of Delta and those of Leander Perez for the 5-year period 1946–50 lend much credence to the presumption that one of the judge's mechanisms for getting money out of the companies has been through the receipt of large legal fees. This stratagem would obviate the embarrassment of his being a stockholder, which might become a matter of record, and it would also eliminate double taxation on dividends. The biggest item in Leander's income is business profits; his business is that of a lawyer.

Delta Development, on the other hand, lists deductions as its biggest item of expense, and the biggest element of the deductions is for contract payments. These accounted for over a third of Delta's gross income, 1946–50. In 1947, Delta's contract payments represented money paid to Leander Perez. It is reasonable to suppose that Delta's payments on contracts for the other 4 years also went to the judge; the amounts of Delta's payments on contracts for those years reveal the same correlation with Perez' business profits as in 1947.

Just as provocative is the judge's income from rents and royalties. Almost the whole of this in each of the 5 years is made up of royalties from oil rights. Now Perez' normally torrential conversation has a way of drying up like a desert river at the first mention of personal finances. He will do nothing more than admit to owning 8,000 acres of land for about 20 years. "I've leased it and don't have a well on it." Whence then the royalties from oil rights? The question is unanswered.

THE PRICE OF RETRIBUTION

One thing that argues for Perez' continued prosperity is the fact that the oil companies cannot afford to do anything that would destroy the situation he has so painstakingly created. Years of playing footsie with him have given them a huge financial stake in his survival, however mixed their feelings might be in the matter.

Politically, the judge's future is much less secure—not that he is likely to be defeated for district attorney anytime soon, or lose his grip on his Plaquemines machine, but simply because he is running against time and the times. For some little while now he must have been conscious of how he has had to prop up his prestige through support of tidelands, States rights, white supremacy. The tidelands play has currently been taken away from him by Louisiana Attorney General Jack Gremillion, and the States' Rights Party is an empty anachronism. The only thing left for the judge to make general capital of is "white supremacy." Moreover, the industrialization that he has so feared in Plaquemines is taking place in neighboring St. Bernard Parish. New people have come in (the population has doubled since 1940), independent people with no ties or obligations to the judge. Yet if he is to keep getting elected district attorney of the 25th district, he must get 30 percent of St. Bernard's votes to round out his Plaquemines majority.

A BLOW FROM BATON ROUGE?

A political fight is now raging, with the bulk of the St. Bernard Police Jury arrayed against Perez, and the sheriff oscillating between the two groups. There's reason to believe that in the 1960 elections the newcomers in St. Bernard may tip the scales against Perez' State senator (though Perez himself will doubtless win the district attorneyship). And from Baton Rouge itself, where a hostile Governor sits, may come the severest setback of all. There is considerable pressure to abolish the levee boards and consolidate all their holdings in a single State agency. Perez' diversion of levee-board revenues to his police jury would thus end at a stroke and with it a large measure of his political power. How much of this will come about, of course, depends on timing and the temper of "the new element" in the parishes. One reason the judge has been able to get away with so much so long is because a lot of other people have been getting away with it, too. "He's just like a big ol' tomcat," mused a State representative who had himself been clawed, "lettin' the mice play around, get into mischief. When he's ready, he gets 'em." In the next few years or so, after the thing's been done, it may surprise everybody how few "mice" it took to make mincemeat of a "cat," himself somewhat paw-weary from a generation of mischief.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 1, 1965]

THE SEGREGATIONISTS' SEGREGATIONIST

(By Mary McCrory)

Leander H. Perez, of Plaquemines Parish, La., is the segregationists' segregationist.

He does not mess around.

He is a short, stocky man with gray hair and a kind of lion's face, with a permanent frown and all the lines going downward. He chain smokes cigars in an ivory holder, bellows at Senators, and is an unblushing white supremacist.

Two southern members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which heard him as a witness on the voting rights bill, Chairman JAMES EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, and Senator SAM ERVIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, called the boss of Plaquemines "Judge."

The other members, who seemed slightly stunned at his nonstop invective, did not call him anything until mid-afternoon when Senate Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, abruptly had enough.

Perez gave the committee a taste of old-fashioned southern demagoguery. By comparison with him, Gov. George C. Wallace, of Alabama, seems an angel of reason and moderation, and ex-Gov. Ross W. Barnett, of Mississippi, a towering intellect.

The patriarch of Plaquemines came to the stand accompanied by the director of public safety. He slapped folders around, flicked pages of long statements, offered exhibits right and left, damned the voting rights bill as "a Thaddeus Stevens bill," said it "goes right down the line for the Communist conspiracy," said it would enfranchise morons, aliens, and perverts, and is "the vilest discrimination against the South."

After one such diatribe, Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, said, "I didn't think anyone could add to what Robert Welch has said about the John Birch Society, but I think you have."

Perez seemed to be pleased with this tribute to his testimony.

He was happy too, to provoke an explosion from the normally long-suffering minority leader. DIRKSEN burst out when Perez offered to debate anyone on the proposition that "There is a Communist plan behind this thinking."

"That is about as stupid a statement as has ever been uttered in this room," said the minority leader, who happens to be one of the authors of the voting rights bill, "and it is a reflection on Senators here."

DIRKSEN asked him about a Louisiana parish where out of 4,500 Negroes only 86 were registered."

"I have the answer to that," said Perez. "Here's a committee of Congress who doesn't know the local situation and doesn't understand Negroes, their thinking and their mentality and their lack of interest in voting."

The registration figures "prove nothing with regard to the character of the people involved," said Perez. "They don't try to register."

Perez admitted, "We don't go around beating the bushes to get the Negroes registered."

Then he added triumphantly, "You have to pay them off. You've got to bribe their preachers who control their votes. They come to the candidates and demand money. And for this you are going to condemn us. You don't know the facts."

Finally spoke the racist of Plaquemines Parish. "They are of immoral character. They are a low type of citizenship. They are being well treated. They are being well taken care of. They have good schools. And we are being condemned here by your people who don't know anything about it."

Nothing the protesting Senators said could reach or shame him. Perez thinks Negroes are an inferior, immoral people who have no voting rights in his part of the world and deserve none.

He probably did in his way as much for civil rights as other old-school segregationists like Bull Connor in Birmingham and Sheriff Jim Clark in Selma had done in theirs.

[From Collier's magazine, Dec. 17, 1949]

LEANDER H. PEREZ: KINGFISH OF THE DIXIECRATS

(By Lester Velie)

Salvador Chiappetta, native son of the Louisiana delta country south of New Orleans—free, white, and over 21—has two obsessions. He wants to eat and he wants to vote. About these twin urges, Citizen Chiappetta, father of two boys killed in the war, is quite stubborn. In order to eat, you must have a job, and to vote, you must register. Doing either, for Chiappetta, presents bizarre difficulties.

Six times during the last 8 months he climbed into his ancient jalopy and rattled off to the parish (county) courthouse 25 miles away to register for his fall's voting. The six round trips totaled 300 miles. But for all this mileage, Citizen Chiappetta, as this is written, was still unregistered. To him, mysteriously, the registrar is never in. Neither is the registrar's deputy. In fact, somehow, for Chiappetta, no registrar's office exists, although the State law says plainly that there should be one at the parish seat.

A persistent man, Chiappetta wrapped his huge farmer's fist about a pen and took to the mails. He sent a registered letter to the parish registrar asking when he could register to vote. No reply. Only a receipt for the letter. He got himself a lawyer and wrote the local political boss, who is also district attorney and therefore the guardian of Citizen Chiappetta's civil rights. Still no answer.

Chiappetta tried the U.S. district attorney at New Orleans, the State attorney general at Baton Rouge. Finally, he wrote the President of the United States. The President, through an Assistant Attorney General, said it was a State's affair. The State attorney general, through an assistant, said it was a local affair. After 8 months of arduous penmanship, Citizen Chiappetta was as unregistered as the day he was born.

Oddly, few of Chiappetta's deep delta neighbors suffer his galling frustration. To many, registration is just a lark. They don't even have to seek out the registrar. In neighborly friendliness he comes to them. Or while driving along in his car, the registrar will stop, alight, take the registration books from the back seat and register lucky passing citizens then and there. Knowing this, Chiappetta regards himself as a political "untouchable."

Even worse, he is an economic outcast. He can't get a job on the highways or the river levees. He can't even get a job in local private employ. Recently, hired as a watchman on a school construction job, he was fired before he could report for work. Word had come down, mysteriously, from above. Even Chiappetta's 17-year-old son, Eugene, can't get summer vacation work cutting grass on the levees like other kids.

Eating and voting are habits to which a man gets strongly attached. How did Citizen Chiappetta get himself into the fix which makes it difficult for him to do either? He says it happened when he got on the wrong side politically. "Fatally," he says, "he opposed and offended the local leader, Leander H. Perez."

The Russians have a name for Chiappetta's offense: "Political deviation." Yet, in an American setting, the consequences did seem drastic.

"But what do you expect?" Chiappetta asks simply. "This is Plaquemines Parish. This is the sort of thing that happens to us who disagree. And there aren't many of us left—who dare."

Plaquemines, situated south of New Orleans, is one of Louisiana's most famous parishes. For one thing, Plaquemines embraces the mouth of the Mississippi. A stubby, 125-mile-long thumb of lushly green, creamy delta earth, Plaquemines pokes out into the Gulf of Mexico, spurting out the Mississippi as from the nozzle of a hose. For another thing, Plaquemines contains fabulous riches of oil, sulfur and natural gas, much of it on public lands. But most important for Plaquemines' fame: it is the bailiwick of Leander H. Perez.

A formidable man, Perez once saved Huey Long from almost certain impeachment. He is one of the few holdovers of the Long era who survived to flourish politically. And in a State which measures its public men against the lengthening legend of the departed Kingfish, Perez is regarded by many as smarter than Huey, and today the most redoubtable man in Louisiana. Perez, for instance, is credited with masterminding Huey's younger brother, Earl, into the Governor's mansion and with naming most of Earl's running mates. Although no member, Perez hasn't missed a Louisiana legislative session for more than 25 years, and is credited with engineering the amendment of many laws affecting local government in the State—including the law under which Citizen Chiappetta finds it so difficult to register.

"A mighty hunter before the Lord," as Bible-wise Louisianians might put it, Perez' voice reaches from the deep delta country even to Washington. A powerhouse in his own State and region, Perez is emerging as an important national figure. He leads the fight for State control of the vast oil riches beneath the tidewaters off their shores. And he is the national leader of the States' Rights Dixiecrats.

Perez is formidable in both roles. As the States' champion in the oil fight, Perez, a brilliant lawyer, went back to colonial times to dig up (and confound Federal attorneys with) a treaty between the English Crown and the original States to support his argument that the States, not the Federal Government, have title to the oil lands.

As the champion of the Dixiecrats, he says he fights for a constitutional amendment to "protect the States against further infringement of their liberties." Says Perez: "The closer you keep government to the people, the more democracy you have."

When a man raises such a hue and cry about "local democracy," and becomes its national advocate, it is interesting to see how local democracy works in his own neighborhood.

In Plaquemines Parish and its neighbor St. Bernard, "Jeffersonian" Democrat Perez has been district attorney and political boss for a longer time than many of his neighbors can remember—25 years. Perez has ruled so long and to such effect that he is often compared to Huey Long. Perez, it turns out, is an ardent admirers of Huey's ("He's the most constructive Governor we ever had") and has created in his own bailiwick a miniature regime reminiscent of Huey's Louisiana, public works and all. New Orleans papers have called him Potentate Perez and his two parishes "the rotten boroughs."

The authentic voice of the Old (and passing) South of Ole Gene Talmadge and That Man Bilbo, Perez—a man of much greater stature and finesse—is one of the South's biggest kingfishes. And you can use any yardstick; political muscle, or legal brains or great wealth.

The crime commission never did get a look at the companies' books and even lost its life in the attempt. For Perez, an inexorable foe, sharpened his legal hatchet for the commission and didn't let up until the State supreme court declared the body unconstitutional on a budgetary technicality. Even the records of the commission's probe of Perez' affairs are no longer available to public scrutiny. So ruled the current attorney general, Bolivar Kemp, a Perez protégé.

But it is known that Perez' personal fortune began to grow when oil and sulfur were discovered on lands owned or controlled by public boards for which Perez, as district attorney, is also officer ex officio and legal adviser.

Plaquemines yields roughly 10 percent more oil than any other Louisiana parish, producing some 18 million barrels yearly, worth about $40 million. It embraces the second largest sulfur dome (of its type) in the world, which yields another $20 million of mineral wealth annually. Most of these riches gush from public lands. Once owned by the Federal and State governments, they were turned over to the local levee and school boards as nest eggs with which to finance levee repair work and education. And from these lands, administered locally, came fortunes for a select few, among them the area's political boss, Leander H. Perez.

COMPLETE SECRECY IS IMPOSSIBLE

A fortune, if carved from public lands, can't be shrouded in complete darkness. There are flickers of light: recorded proceedings of the levee boards and school boards which dispensed wealth-yielding leases. There are notarized contracts. The investigator who digs these out and pieces the involved jigsaw together is rewarded with a series of fascinating tableaux:

In one tableau, we have Leander H. Perez, as legal adviser, say for the Buras levee board, seated on one side of the table. As such, Perez represents and guards the public interest. In this capacity he prepares and approves the legality of leases on lands destined to yield millions in oil and create fortunes in overriding royalties and bonuses for the lucky leaseholders. On the other side of the table are friends who obtain the leases for nominal considerations, sometimes as little as $100 and seldom more than $500 per year rental.

The tableau changes. Now we have Perez sitting on the same side of the table as his friends who have taken the valuable leases. Presto. Perez, who is a guardian of the public interest, is now lawyer for the private interest. As such, he prepares the contracts for the leaseholders in their dealings with major oil companies to whom they assign their leases.

Does Perez, the public's legal adviser, come in conflict with Perez, the private lawyer? Louisiana's attorney general thought so in 1940. When he sought to get the books of the companies for which Perez was lawyer, Perez told him:

"Go to hell."

Where were some of the key levee board leases consummated?

Right in the New Orleans law office of Leander H. Perez, whose private and public chores were so intimately intermingled that his own office telephone and that of one levee board were listed (in 1939 and 1940) under the same number. Vouchers show that the levee board paid bills for that number.

One fortunate friend who obtained oil-land leases which later brought him independent wealth was Robert J. Lobrano, former deputy clerk of the district court (serving Plaquemines and Saint Bernard) where Perez was judge from 1919 to 1924.

Friend Lobrano's name pops up in interesting deals, and popping with him, in the background, is the name of Perez.

Once, for instance, in the early scramble for prospectively valuable oil lands, Lobrano bought some tracts which were foreclosed for unpaid taxes. Nothing remarkable about that. But tax sales must be advertised in the regular editions of the official newspapers to give owners and others a chance to bid. In a sworn and notarized affidavit, the former editor of the official paper, the Plaquemines Gazette, said the advertisement (of the land purchased by Lobrano) never appeared in the regular edition. Instead, he explained, the owner of the paper, Perez, ordered him to have 100 special copies printed, to insert the tax ad therein, and to turn 6 of these copies over to the sheriff to show the sale was advertised as required by law.

Royalty rights on some of the public lands leased by Lobrano from the levee boards were assigned to companies for which Perez is the lawyer. The contracts were drawn in Perez' office, notarized by A. Sidney Cain, Jr., then and now an associate lawyer with Perez, and witnessed by Antia Conrad, Perez' secretary and by Rudolph McBride, Perez' assistant district attorney at Plaquemines.

Perez says he does not own the companies which obtained leases and royalty rights on Plaquemines oil and sulfur lands. But his relations with some of these companies are intimate—and lucrative.

FRIENDS IN INFLUENTIAL POSITIONS

The officers are old friends and sometimes associates from Perez' own law office. Perez' law associate, Cain, is vice president of Louisiana Coastal Lands Co., holder of valuable oil-land leases. An officer of Delta Development Co. is Harold Sicard, of Thomas J. Moran Sons, printers, for whom Perez opened up the State's substantial printing business and later served as lawyer.

Perez' mother-in-law, Mrs. Henry Chalin, and another kinswoman by marriage, Mrs. A. B. Pursglove, were the incorporators of a lesser company which obtained trapping rights on public lands. In a series of involved transactions in which a Perez assistant district attorney played a part, some of these rights were vested in the Delta Development Co.

Asked about mineral- and trapping-land leases obtained by intimate from boards he dominates, Perez replied:

"What reason would I have to object that my friends should have leases?"

Tax records and minutes of company meetings reveal that such loyalty was appreciated.

So valued, for instance, were the services of Lawyer Leander Perez that the Delta Development Co. in 1937 authorized the purchase of health, accident, and life insurance for its attorneys and officers.

And in 1938, according to Louisiana tax records, the company paid out $89,000 (more than half of its income after deductions for depletions) in legal fees. In 1939 the company paid out $76,400 in legal fees. Perez' income that year was $218,000—and the oil rush was still young.

The 1939 State income tax statement of Delta Development Co., notarized by an office associate of Perez, cast further light on Delta's affairs:

The two listed officers, R. J. Lobrano and R. J. Chauvin, each owned only a fraction of 1 percent of the stock.

The outlay in attorney fees was the chief cost of running Delta Development and overshadowed all other expense items. The attorney fees of $76,400 came to $1,460 weekly. The company's general expense as well as rent and telephone totaled $789, or less than $16 weekly.

In New Orleans this writer did not have to seek out Perez.

"This is Judge Leander H. Perez," he boomed into the telephone after I had begun to study the setup of Plaquemines and St. Bernard Parishes.

Face to face soon after, Perez declared cheerfully:

"I hear you've come to get Perez. Well, there ain't nothing to get on Perez.

"I want to show you some of the constructive work we're doing in Plaquemines," Perez said. "We've got the best government out there in the United States." Then he added, "In the whole world."

We got into one of Perez' cars. In the back seat was Mrs. Perez, a pleasant, matronly woman to whom Perez is obviously devoted and who is at his side so constantly that friends laughingly call her his bodyguard.

Turning south from New Orleans we skirted Jefferson Parish, the feudal barony of a Perez ally, Sheriff Frank Clancy (they are frequently together on State issues and candidates), who rules his roost with such an iron hand that he's known as "King Clancy." Soon we were in deep delta country. St. Bernard Parish, which—for redhot politics and protected commercial gambling—was described to me, along with Jefferson and Plaquemines Parishes, as "one of the hellholes of Louisiana."

THE "SLOTS" OPERATE FREELY

We drew into a gasoline station where three slot machines beckoned unashamedly for business. In the deep delta parishes the "one-armed bandits" are everywhere—in fruit markets, barbershops, in movie lobbies even in shops near schools. Since commercial gambling is barred both by the State constitution and by State statute, I told District Attorney Perez, a State official, about the "slots" at the gas station in his St. Bernard Parish.

We rolled south along the Mississippi River into Plaquemines Parish.

With the pride almost of personal ownership, Perez expanded.

"See that park?" (Braithwaite Park at the entrance to the parish.) Perez pointed. "I gave that to the parish—3,200 feet of frontage."

"See that drainage?" He motioned farther down the road. "I put that in."

"See that church?" Perez pointed to a small chapel under construction. Already built was the facade with three doors.

"One is for white folks," Perez explained. "Another is for dark-skinned Negroes, and the third for light-skinned ones."

"You know, they like it that way," he said. "Yet people ridiculed Bilbo for fighting the hybridization of the race."

The old church had rested on a mound, and the pastor wanted the new edifice on a hillock too.

"Who do you suppose got that mound moved?" Perez asked. "I'm friendly with the U.S. Engineers," he explained, "and I worked out a deal."

It was obvious from what he had done and from the way people treated him that Perez was—on his home grounds—the patroon, the grand seigneur, the master, and sometimes, as he himself told it, the generalissimo. Once, in 1943, when Gov. Sam Jones sought to install his appointed sheriff in Perez' bailiwick, Perez formed a home guard and rallied the countryside to resist the move. When the State militia arrived, scattering Perez' roadblocks and homegrown army, the embattled leader retreated to the river. There he boarded his "navy"—the free Plaquemines Parish ferry that plies the Mississippi. In midstream, Perez breathed defiance against the assembled might of the sovereign State of Louisiana. Under cover of darkness he slipped home, leaving the enemy in possession of the field. This was only a temporary setback, as will be shown later.

Seeing Plaquemines with Perez reveals one of the reasons for his power.

A down-at-the-heel rural parish with a modest budget of $40,000 as recently as the early thirties, Plaquemines today revels in a near-million-dollar budget that is the envy of the whole State. It hums with public construction reminiscent of WPA days. The parish provides free ferry service for all, across the Mississippi. It repairs boats free for fishermen on its own boatways, gives out $20,000 of college scholarships yearly, and owns a luxurious vessel to patrol the shrimp beds and to entertain, in style, visitors to the parish.

A miniature welfare state (a phrase repugnant to Perez) Plaquemines even has a 4-year plan of public works. And like a welfare state it is one of the biggest employers in the area (if part-time jobs are counted).

All this—and lower taxes too. The taxes, halved since 1932, will go still lower this year. How does Perez do it?

He does it with oil wells and sulfur. Perez is literally at the throttle of a well-lubricated civic and political machine.

RICHES FOR PARISH BOARDS

As owners of oil lands, the levee boards and school board in Plaquemines collect one-eighth royalty on oil produced on such lands. This comes to about $1 million yearly and is funneled to the parish governing body, known as the police jury, which handles the boards' money affairs. (The mineral wealth in Plaquemines is so lavish that the parish is rich, and the companies which took leases from it—and for which Perez is lawyer—aren't doing so badly either. These lease-holding companies get their cut from the big oil producers to whom they've assigned their leases. The big producers, of course, have little interest in and no connection at all with local politics. They are strictly in the oil business.)

Besides the royalties it gets, the Plaquemines governing body is the further lucky recipient of another $200,000 yearly—its share by State law of the severance taxes paid by the oil producers to the State.

The good works that can be lubricated with this sort of money are manifest in Plaquemines.

"This will be the most modern consolidated school anywhere, both high and elementary," Perez said proudly as we watched construction work on a handsome and impressive brick structure.

"We'll have an auditorium and a gymnasium. Costs $800,000, including architects' fees. There's nothing even in New Orleans to compare with this," he said.

The school superintendent is Patrick Olinde, an earnest young man who is married to a niece of Perez. (Other Perez kinfolk on the public payroll include nephew, Frank Giordano, the registrar who isn't there to the wrong people, and A. M. Walker, a Perez brother-in-law, who is parish purchasing agent.) Olinde disclosed that 3 new consolidated schools will rise in Plaquemines over the next 2 years to care for 1,500 children. There will be two new schools for Negroes.

In Plaquemines the triple color line goes to school as well as to church. "We have two Negro schools across the river," Perez related. "Because the light-skinned ones won't mix with the dark ones."

But oil-rich Plaquemines can afford even this. On its new schools it will spend $3 million—a tidy sum for a rural southern county of 12,000 souls. In fact, a big-league expenditure anywhere.

At Pointe a la Hache, the parish seat, there was further evidence of the county's bounty.

"You'll see the only parish-owned, free ferry anywhere," Perez said. "There's nothing like it in the whole country.

"Hold the ferry, Rudy," Perez instructed his assistant district attorney, Rudolph McBride, a shy young man in a bow tie. Perez showed me the renovating job being done on the courthouse and rummaged among court records, while the ferry—with its pedestrians and motorists—waited for 15 minutes beyond its starting time until the leader was ready to board it.

We boarded the trim, all-steel ferry and started across the brown, smooth expanse of the Mississippi. A prominent sign on deck read: "Free Ferry—Plaquemines Parish—Police Jury."

"Cost $90,000," said Perez. The cost of running the ferry, $45,000 yearly, is more than Plaquemines spent on its total budget in the thirties. Perez displayed the shipshape restrooms. He called down into the engineroom and, raising his voice above the clatter, made it a point to address the engineer by his first name and inquire after his family.

"We cross thousands of pedestrians daily as well as cars," Perez said. The ferry has a reputation for being on time. But once it stalled. That was when political rival Sam Jones tried to hold a rally across the river. Mysteriously, the ferry suspended, stranding the Jones adherents.

Well-heeled Plaquemines owns still another vessel, a $75,000, 70-foot luxury yacht with a teakwood deck and mahogany superstructure. Perez picked it up at a bargain.

Commissioned to patrol fishing out of season (thus duplicating State patrol work, conservation officials observed), the boat is manned by a skipper and a cook and is used, as Perez says, "to entertain people we think can benefit the parish." The spanking white vessel, known as the *Manta,* has thus been the scene of many happy yachting parties, all calculated to make friends for Plaquemines.

"Last week," Perez said, "I took out a party of men interested in locating new industry. We've also entertained the U.S. Engineers." As hosts, it is necessary of course that parish officials, and sometimes members of Perez' family, take part in the yachting party chores.

Perez beams down on the parish folk with still other free services.

For fishermen he built three boatways which repair their boats free.

Plaquemines is also the only parish in Louisiana that puts up dollar for dollar with the State to build paved roads. As a result we rolled through miles of beehive roadbuilding activity which will soon permit delta motorists (like Lincoln's Father of Waters) to "go unvexed to the sea."

Louisianians like to compare Leander H. Perez with Huey P. Long.

Huey used to boast: "I took Louisiana out of the mud; I gave the kids schoolbooks." Perez likes to point to the schools and roads he's building. Huey openly reveled in the role of dictator, calling himself the Kingfish and boasting of his powers. Leander H. Perez is more modest.

"They tell you Perez is a boss, Perez is a dictator," he complains. "The truth is, Perez is just a darn workhorse."

RESPECTS LAW—AS A WEAPON

Huey's methods were brutally direct. "I can buy legislators like sacks of potatoes," he yelled. He treated the organic law as a scrap of paper. Perez, a man of finesse, is usually to be found behind the scenes rather than in front of them. He respects the law and uses it as a weapon to outwit his opponents.

"I can hold my own with any damned lawyer there is," says Perez.

This is so well recognized in Louisiana that for years legislators have come to Perez for help in framing State laws, and he is acknowledged to be the father of much legislation affecting local government. The recognized master of legislative maneuver, there is a joke in Baton Rouge about the way Perez, as lobbyist for his bailiwick, guides legislation into the hopper.

"Gentlemen, I have a little bill (so the story goes). It only amends the constitution in six places."

Although Perez' job is that of district attorney, the mountain of clippings about him in the New Orleans papers seldom touches on his role as prosecutor. They tell of almost endless political squabbles in the courts; of efforts to impeach Perez (unsuccessful); of his efforts to impeach opponents (successful); of charges of fraud in elections; of fights of rival candidates to get on the ballot—and of Perez' fights to keep them off—through the local court, through the State supreme court. Most of these legal fights Perez wins. One judge said:

"Perez stands on the law, and he is always prepared."

One lesson of Huey's, Perez, his admirer, never forgot. In Huey's Louisiana there was no Lebensraum for enemies. He kept an "s.o.b. book," a terrible little volume into which went the names of offenders: men marked for oblivion as soon as Huey could conveniently get around to them. Perez, who keeps his grudges in his head, is considered by some to be just as implacable as Huey Long.

"Of all the people in the country the one I'd like least to have as an enemy is Perez," one observer said of him.

Salvador Chiappetta, whom we met at the beginning of this story, would agree. Once a highway maintenance foreman, he grumbled to neighbors that Perez was using State highway commission labor to build himself a private road and fishpond on his plantation, Promised Land, a charge Perez denies. Chiappetta has had trouble voting or working ever since.

"People are afraid even to talk to me," says Chiappetta.

Bigger men can feel Perez' wrath too. Because Sam Jones sent the State militia into his bailiwick, Perez wouldn't rest until he found a suitable candidate and built a formidable slate which defeated Jones when Jones sought reelection.

"It was an obsession with me," Perez explains.

A creative man, as well as an observant one, Perez has fashioned from the tools at hand—the local boards, party machinery and customs—his own pattern of political control.

Perez' pattern, like all works of genius, is classically simple.

As district attorney, Perez is the lawyer for the parish police jury (as Louisianians call the county governing board).

The resolutions which settle the parish business are written by Perez, often in his private law offices in New Orleans, and offered to the police jurors for adoption.

"Except in some small instances," Perez couldn't recall for this writer one debate in the police jury.

"There's hardly ever a dissenting note," Perez said. "We work together 100 percent."

But such cooperation from the key police jury was only a start for Perez. There were other boards in the parish. Some of these, like the oil-landowning levee board, are named by the Governor. Soon after he took power, Perez realized that a hostile Governor could fill the boards with local foes.

Perez didn't leave the levee board's cooperation to chance. His next move was a master stroke. He went to Baton Rogue and pushed through a constitutional amendment. Approved by the folks back home, the bill let the police jury take over the debts—and the revenues—of all the public bodies in the parish.

VAST POWER FOR POLICE JURY

Overnight Perez' police jury took over the purse strings—and control—of everything in the bailiwick, including the strategic levee boards which administer lands now producing many millions in oil yearly.

Now, Perez had the cooperation of all the public bodies round about.

When the State dictator, Huey Long, sought to centralize all the levee boards into one State agency under his fist, he found that Perez had been too quick for him. Huey never got Plaquemines.

When oil was discovered and royalties began to flow to the levee boards and school boards and on up to the police jury, Perez had money and political jobs to dispense.

Perez minimizes the number of persons who hold public jobs in Plaquemines. But critics, pointing to this year's $800,000 budget, say it's a rare family in the parish that hasn't at least one member on a public payroll—even if it's only part-time work.

The opportunities for public employ are varied. The parish needs boatwrights for its own boatways; supervisors of front levees (facing the river) and supervisors of back levees (facing the gulf); it needs engineers for its ferryboat and farmhands for its experimental farm; it needs mechanics and oil gagers and drainage foremen and a skipper for its patrol yacht and a cook for its galley; it needs foremen and hands for "clearing and maintenance of streams and canals." And it needs many other workers.

Over all these jobs Perez is the boss.

"I have a hand in everything," he says.

And he has, including private jobs. It has long been known that industries moving into the deep delta have to listen to "suggestions" from the parish administration.

"Even the oil-drilling corporations sometimes have to clear with the parish on the matter of employment," one politically wise deep-delta resident told me. Recently, he related, a driller, on orders from the parish, was forced to fire a group of workers from the "outside," so as to make room for Plaquemines men.

[From the Colliers magazine, Dec. 24, 1949]

"Democracy" in the Deep Delta—Concluding Kingfish of the Dixiecrats

(By Lester Velie)

(Boss Perez, who once saved Huey Long from impeachment, runs things in the deep delta. A new national figure, he is No. 1 Dixiecrat and champion of the States in the tidelands oil fight.)

Folks downriver from New Orleans know that the undisputed political overlord of the deep delta country is Leander H. Perez. A master of "Louisiana politics," Perez knows every trick of the trade; how to make it tough for your opponents to get on the ballot, how to run friendly caucuses, how to win a 97 percent majority for your candidate.

To get on the ballot when you're not Perez-picked you must be on guard against the minutest technicality or wage a long fight through the Louisiana courts—against the State's most resourceful lawyer.

Adolph E. "Jake" Woolverton, a restaurant man, learned this when he tried to get on the ballot in 1947 to run for the State legislature against Perez' man.

First, Jake asked the local Democratic executive committee to let him have qualification (candidates') forms to fill out. Some forms came in the mail. Jake didn't know where they came from, because the envelope was unmarked. And he never found out. But Jake's lawyer took one look at the forms and said, "Don't touch."

"They're phonies," said the lawyer. "Fill them out, and you're a dead duck. You'll be disqualified for giving inadequate information."

Jake's lawyer was Sam "Monk" Zelden, who once starred at halfback for Loyola University of the South (New Orleans). Ex-halfback Monk called for an end play around Perez' parish Democratic executive committee. He went directly to the secretary of state to get authentic candidates' forms.

But when these forms were filled out and went up to the Democratic executive committee for checking, lawyer Monk Zelden and candidate Jake Woolverton were thrown for a loss.

"We proceed according to the law, and we see that whoever qualifies does so properly and according to the law," Perez says.

And so, with legal punctilio, Perez and his committee disqualified Jake on a technicality and 24 other "oppositionists" as well.

But the New Orleans Times-Picayune held its nose.

" 'Plaquemines smell' again," the paper observed wryly.

The technicality on which Jake and other Perez foes were barred was that they had failed to post the proper qualifying fee.

"I couldn't find out what it was," Jake complained through his lawyer. None of the Perez candidates had that trouble.

To get on the ballot, Jake's lawyer had to buck his way through the district court—with lawyer Perez resisting stoutly. When ex-halfback Zelden broke through in the lower court, Perez took up a 1-yard stand in the State supreme court. But finally Perez had to give way. The decision came down: Jake Woolverton could run for the State legislature. (Another Perez opponent, however, was ruled off the ballot.)

Candidate Woolverton's fight to get on the ballot was old stuff in Perez' bailiwick. Court records are sprinkled with similar cases.

Technicalities which can be serious enough to throw a citizen off the ballot can sometimes disappear as if by magic—when Perez is willing.

"Once we threw out 12 of Jimmy Noe's (James A. Noe ran for Governor in 1940) local candidates," Perez related to this writer. "As our committee ruled their qualifications were not in order, Noe's lawyer (he was a decent young chap) said, 'Can't you let us have a couple of them?' "

All technical difficulties for "a couple of them" melted.

"I said I had no objection," Perez related amiably.

Of candidates' troubles in Plaquemines the Times-Picayune said (in 1947):

"Political dictatorship in Plaquemines has stained the parish and State records with far too many smelly incidents and unsavory chapters. * * * The political annals and court records of the parish are so smeared with performances like these (disqualification of candidates) that 'Palquemines politics' has become a byword the State over."

Unruffled, last year Perez achieved the ultimate in rousting candidates from ballots. He engineered the Dixiecrat move to keep President Truman off the ballot in Louisiana. In Democratic Louisiana there was no way for Democrats to vote for Democratic Candidate Truman (except by complicated write-in) until Gov. Earl Long asked the State legislature to solve the problem. President Truman went on the ballot, but not under the Democratic emblem. Triumphantly, Perez cast Louisiana's 10 electoral votes for Dixiecrat Candidate Strom Thurmond.

Perez is district attorney and political boss of two Louisiana delta parishes. From this relatively modest home base he has achieved what is reputedly one of the big fortunes in the South and is emerging as a significant national figure.

A brilliant lawyer, he leads a resourceful fight for State control of the oil riches in the tidelands off the States' shores. For years a Louisiana kingmaker (he is credited with masterminding Earl Long into the Governor's mansion), Perez has projected himself on the national political stage too. He is the national leader and voice of the States' Rights Dixiecrats, a movement of extreme rightwing southerners. In this role, Perez is the sonorous and scrappy champion of "constitutional government and local self-rule."

"We [the Dixiecrats] are awakening the people of every State to the menace to their right of self-government by the encroachment of the National Government," says Perez.

Local self-rule—deep-delta style—can be viewed close up on Perez' own home grounds: Plaquemines and St. Bernard Parishes.

Perez described proudly how candidates for office are designated in his parish.

"Let me tell you about the real democracy we have here," he said.

He related that as head of the parish administration he issues a call for a parishwide caucus.

"We write to about 200 people in the parish to come and bring their friends, and we publish a notice in the paper," said Perez. "Sometimes about 800 people come. Then we break them up into smaller meetings, and ward by ward they designate the candidates for office.

"Can you find anything more democratic?" asked Perez. "That word 'democratic' has been so much abused."

Here, critics agree with Perez.

They charge that only friends of "the parish administration" get the written invitations to the caucus. Opponents, uninvited, stay away. The caucus, presided over by Perez, is a model of harmonious agreement.

Has the caucus ever backed an anti-Perez maverick?

"They (the folks at the caucus) know who's knocking the parish administration," Perez said.

Perez revealed the unanimity of feeling that prevails in his area.

"There aren't even half a dozen (in the parish) who knock the administration," he said. "We could easily have them with us if we gave them political favors."

The extraordinary political harmony under Perez is reflected in the election returns.

The Perez-backed candidate for Governor in 1936, Richard W. Leche, who later went to prison for using the mails to defraud, got over 97 percent of the votes in Plaquemines. In a third of the precincts, the anti-Perez-Leche candidate polled not even one vote.

In the 1938 congressional elections, Plaquemines—voting on Perez-supported constitutional amendments—was better than 99.44 percent pure Perez. Of 5,364 ballots, only 3 could be found against the measures. In St. Bernard Parish, the showing was even better. Official records reveal: none against.

This sort of success is astounding in a democracy. Even Hitler didn't do better in his "elections."

It is so astounding that sometimes Perez' foes don't believe it.

When Judge Robert Kennon ran against RUSSELL LONG for the Senate last year, he got only 121 votes out of more than 3,100 cast in St. Bernard Parish. Since the whole statewide race was decided in RUSSELL LONG's favor by a close margin, Judge Kennon was understandably perturbed.

"They're phony and baloney," he stormed of the voting returns from St. Bernard.

"Why, I've got more than 121 personal friends in the parish who told me they voted for me," he agonized.

Even more agonized was the candidate who ran against Huey Long for nomination of Senator in the 1930 primary. In that race the political partisans of St. Bernard Parish achieved a classic in election arithmetic. They counted more votes for Huey than there were persons registered. From 2,194 registered, investigators found, Long received 3,979 votes. There were even some votes left over for Huey's opponent, 9 to be exact. (Perez was district attorney of Plaquemines and St. Bernard at the time. He also was political leader of Plaquemines and an ally of Dr. L. A. Meraux, leader of St. Bernard.)

Perez stands by his boys' election arithmetic and doesn't hold with recounts.

LOSER DEMANDS A RECOUNT

Last year when Candiate Henry G. McCall lost out for the State court of appeals by a hairbreadth—272 votes out of some 150,000 cast in 7 parishes—he charged fraud in Plaquemines and St. Barnard (among others) and demanded a recount.

Over my habeas corpus, was Perez' reaction. Quick to gird on his legal sword when outsiders seek to pry into Plaquemines and St. Bernard affairs, Perez leaped into the fray as lawyer for the successful candidate. Thoroughly familiar with the election law, Perez convinced the district judge that he (the judge) had no jurisdiction in the suit brought by the unsuccessful candidate. There was no recount.

But how does the election machinery operate? In 1943 when Perez' foes showed up at the parish courthouse to take a hand in the election arrangements, they found the courthouse dark. The meeting had been shifted 30 miles up the river. Only Perez' friends showed up.

Bring suit?

"By the time the court gets around to it, the election's been held," one delta native told this writer.

Election Day in the delta has its own customs.

"Some families don't even go down to the polls," one native told me. "Their friends at the voting place know how they feel about things and take care of it for them." (The ballot is voted by marking with X's.)

But others may spend a whole day trying to vote.

In the bayou country, sparsely settled by oyster fishermen and fur trappers, the "voting booth" may be located back among the bays and lakes, hard for the "oppositionists" to reach. Oppositionists tell tales of starting out in the morning to go to the polling place. If they go by boat they may find that canals leading directly to the voting are blocked to them. Forced to make a round-about journey, they arrive to find the polls have just closed for the day.

Even to native Louisiana writers like Harnett T. Kane, the deep delta is a never-never land of "problem parishes."

But Perez, district attorney and political boss, is satisfied that honest elections are assured.

"We have a standing offer of $1,000 reward for information leading to the buying of votes in Plaquemines," he says.

"I always take the offensive," says Leander H. Perez. "The defensive ain't worth a damn."

The seventh of a delta planter's 13 children, Perez, launched his offensive on the world at the age of 24. Fresh out of law school, he challenged the triumvirate of bosses who had ruled the deep delta with an iron fist since the revolt against the carpetbaggers in 1892.

Into the sparsely populated bayou country where thugs often cracked oppositionists' skulls, young Perez carried his offensive.

"Believe it or not, I'm a reformer at heart," he says.

So by boat and by foot, from the crown of a river levee or from in front of a crossroads store, the youthful reformer blasted political bossism. The trimvirate—he charged—stifled all opposition, refused to recognize citizens' rights, controlled the elections which seldom registered less than 90-percent majorities for the machine.

For his crusading pains, young Perez came out with a handful of votes. But he won a reputation as a daring young "good government" man. This paid off 3 years later when reform Gov. John M. Parker named young Perez to fill an unexpired term in the local district court.

But Perez needed another offensive to hoist himself up on the bench. With his cousin John R. Perez, who had helped him get the appointment—John Perez was a leader in Parker's reform administration—Leander started for the courthouse to get himself sworn in. But when he got there, the courthouse was bare. His machine rivals, disregarding the Governor's appointment, had already sworn in a rival jurist named by the chief justice of the State supreme court. Louisiana politics can be full of surprises.

Undaunted, Perez had himself sworn in on the courthouse lawn. Then he unlimbered his lawbooks and launched his first major legal assault. Before the supreme court he argued a point of law: If an elective office is vacated with a year still to run, the Governor can appoint a successor. The supreme court agreed with young Perez.

He ascended the bench. Now, Perez had a grand jury behind him in his battle with the entrenched political machine. With grand jury action as a threat, next year when Perez ran for reelection the voting was honest—for the first time since 1892, observers noted. Perez, elected, was on his way.

A district court in a country parish is usually a quiet place where ordinary legal business drones its routine way. Under young Judge Perez it became a turbulent arena. First, Perez cleaned out the protected commercial gambling run by his political foes in St. Bernard Parish. Then he caused the registrar of voters (another political enemy) to be haled before him. The charge: refusal to register oppositionist voters. Next, Judge Perez himself was haled before a court—the Louisiana State Supreme Court.

His political enemies sought to impeach the young judge. They gave this version of how Perez ran his court:

He acted as investigator, prosecutor, and judge—all in one—it was charged. He was accused of keeping a pearl-handled revolver beside him on the bench, of lobbying in Baton Rouge, of favoring his friends from the bench, of punishing his enemies. There were 23 charges in all.

"He tried to put us in jail because we're against him politically," said one accuser. "If this isn't highhanded dictatorship, then I don't know what is. Perez is a dangerous man to have on the bench."

"Political plot," cried Perez. He accused his enemies of lying and, in detail, told of political graft.

The State supreme court prepared to try a district judge on ouster charges for the first time in 50 years and for the second time in Louisiana history. The justices built themselves a witness stand in the high tribunal and settled down to hear the dozens of witnesses expected from the delta country.

It was a legal free for all.

For 3 weeks witnesses scrubbed Plaquemines' political linen before the State's highest court. Even as a defendant Perez took the offensive. He peppered his accusers with so many charges that soon they were defending themselves as busily as he was.

Then, with the impeachment trial in full swing, with charges and countercharges flying thick and fast, dramatically and suddenly the trial was over.

The prosecution had moved to dismiss. No explanation.

An explanation Perez gave this writer was that his enemies could not support the charges. Asked if his accusers had not been charged with possible irregularities, Perez said this was true but that the incident was not used to influence discontinuance of the case. Perez' foes learned, during the impeachment fracas, that they had, in Perez, a man to reckon with.

The reckoning came the same year. Perez crushed the triumvirate of political bosses who had ruled the delta for a quarter century. He turned his back to the bench, was elected district attorney and carried with him into office his own slate of candidates for judge and police jury. So successful was Perez that he even swept into office as district judge a candidate who was then a fugitive from justice. Perez was master of Plaquemines.

A half dozen years later all Louisiana too knew that it had in Perez a man to reckon with. For, so much did Perez learn from his own impeachment ordeal that in 1930 he saved Gov. Huey Long's political life.

Perez met Long after "Kingfish I" ran unsuccessfully for Governor in 1924. Both were reformers, fighting the Old Ring (Regular Democratic machine). "Kingfish I" had a shrewd eye for ability, and between Long and Perez it was mutual respect at first sight. Perez tied the delta's political fortunes to the tail of the "Kingfish."

Elected Governor in 1928, Long was in difficulty soon after. When it looked as if impeachment might put "Kingfish I" on ice, Perez hopped a train to Baton Rouge.

Perez found Huey Long in his rooms at the Heidelberg Hotel in bed, face downward, his eyes red as from weeping.

"I hardly recognized the poor fellow," Perez relates. "He was haggard, and he hadn't had a wink of sleep for nights."

Perez lost no time in idle commiseration.

An offensive was indicated. Perez reached for his trusty weapon of offense, the law. From the small library of lawbooks adjoining the prostrate Huey's bedroom, Perez took down one covering removal from office and impeachment proceedings. From the legal tome, Perez drew the germ of an idea that was to save Long.

At Huey's bedside, Perez expounded the impeachment law.

"My views seemed to reassure him," says Perez.

From the posture of despair, face down, on his stomach, "Kingfish I" flipped over on his back and was soon lost in refreshing sleep, his first in days.

Under Louisiana law, the house of representatives (of the legislature) draws up the articles of impeachment, and the senate tries them. Perez now plunged into the bedlam that raged in Baton Rouge as the lower house debated the evidence on which to draw the impeachment articles.

Daily, Perez held a pep rally with Long's contingent in the lower house and sent them forth to raise legal technicalities with which to slow down the impeachment debate. Perez had a plan. The debate was being waged during a special session which, under the law, ends on a date set by the Governor when he calls the special session. If the impeachment trial could be prolonged beyond the Governor's announced closing date, Long would be saved.

"The legislature would stop being a lawmaking body and become just a crowd of men," Perez explained.

On the day set by Long's foes for the impeachment vote (in the house) Perez and the Long contingent were ready.

"As the impeachment resolution was read," Perez relates, "our 30 legislators all jumped up at once. They shouted and booed and raised hell. They took the opposition by surprise and caused them to withdraw the resolution and redraft it." (Lawyer Perez' contention was that Long could be tried on only one charge at a time, not the lumped charges made by his foes.)

Then when the impeachment was voted and Long awaited trial before the Senate, Perez prepared the coup de grace.

Long's ouster on charges of "misusing State moneys," "gross misconduct in public places," "habitually carrying concealed weapons," "coercion" and others seemed certain. The lower house, close to the people and reflecting public opinion, had voted impeachment. The required two-thirds majority in the senate seemed ready to go along.

"Huey's a dying duck. Too bad," was the street talk.

But again, Perez was on the offensive. He organized the famous "round robin" of 15 senators. Banded together, these lawmakers announced that they would not vote for impeachment regardless of the evidence. Since a two-thirds majority was needed to impeach the round robineers' 15 nays doomed it in advance.

On what grounds did they take this stand?

The special session of the legislature had expired, they argued. It was no longer a lawmaking body, just a crowd of men.

The legislature gave up and went home.

The 15 round robineers went on, some to become judges, others to get lucrative legal fees and, for their constituents, windfall public work. Long went on to launch the wild Louisiana hayride which ended in death for him and prison terms for some of his chief, boodling henchmen. Perez, now a proved legal strategist of high rank, went on to become the biggest political powerhouse behind the Louisiana scenes.

During the next 10 years he consolidated his political mastery of the deep delta and built a fortune reputedly in the millions.

TWO NAMES FOR THE SAME WAR

Then, during the war, Perez took Louisianians' eyes away from Europe and the Pacific with a vest-pocket war of his own. New Orleans newspapers called it a "Perez Putsch." Gov. Sam Jones called it insurrection and rebellion. Perez called it resistance to gestapo methods.

Louisiana's little war started in 1943 when Gov. Sam Jones appointed and sought to install a sheriff to replace one who had died in Plaquemines.

Jones was the Governor who only a few years before had sought to pry into Plaquemines' (and Perez') affairs with an investigation into the leasing of rich oil lands belonging to public boards in the parish. Leases on public lands had been granted to individuals and companies for which District Attorney Perez had become the lawyer. The Governor wanted to look at the leaseholding companies' books. Perez blocked him.

Now the reform Governor was butting into Plaquemines again. If he succeeded in installing his sheriff, Plaquemines would have its first anti-Perez official in Perez' political regime. Perez said the Governor was out of bounds legally and insisted that his man, the local coroner, was the legal successor.

Perez' sheriff and deputies locked themselves in behind barricaded doors in the courthouse and posted armed guards outside. As a further precaution, Perez went before the Plaquemines district judge—sitting in the same courthouse—and obtained an order barring the Governor's man from taking office. (The judge was suspended temporarily several months later by the State supreme court as an "interested party.")

Up to the supreme court the Governor's sheriff took his case. Meanwhile the Governor, with the National Guard away to war, ordered the newly formed State Guard to limber up with a few drills. On the alert in the delta, Perez started drilling, too. If the Governor could have an army, so could he. His parish police jury (governing body) proclaimed a "Plaquemines Parish Emergency Patrol," empowered to "bear arms concealed or openly."

Perez rallied every able-bodied man, and specifically the local American Legion post, to resist invasion.

Down came the State supreme court opinion.

"There is no doubt that the Governor had the authority to appoint Blaize (Walter J. Blaize, the anti-Perez man) to the office of sheriff," said the highest tribunal.

But Perez would not climb down from the barricades. Technically, the supreme court's opinion was not binding, he argued. The court had rendered no decree. Besides, the Governor's man did not bring the proper suit to test squarely who had the right to the job, said Perez.

From Camp Pontchartrain in New Orleans a convey of a dozen trucks, bearing a few hundred State guardsmen in battle dress, moved on Plaquemines. At its head was a brigadier general. An armored scout car prowled in front. Tractors rumbled along behind to clear the enemy's roadblocks and fortifications.

At the entrance to Plaquemines, the State troops "made contact" with parish forces: three armed sheriff's deputies who had stood behind a parish stop sign and halted all traffic. The deputies were disarmed and hustled into a staff car. One vainly tried to serve the guard officers with a court writ restraining the military.

Midway to the parish courthouse, the State guard found the road blocked. In front of the Perez home on the Promised Land Plantation, trucks had been driven into the ditches on either side of the road. A third was stalled between them on the highway. For some time, everyone who traveled the highway had to detour into Perez's backyard and pass inspection by armed guards posted there. Stopping there the day before, reporters found a dozen guards in the Perez home. The yard and the highway swarmed with armed men. Mrs. Perez, unperturbed, was serving up a roast-chicken dinner.

Now, as the guardsmen deployed in front of the barrier and an armored car headed straight for it, armed defenders behind it were seen to flee. A tractor cleared the road, and the war went on.

Down the road a piece the State guard ran into a barricade of fire. The Plaquemines forces had dumped several truckloads of oyster shells (used in road surfacing) across the road, soaked the pile with gasoline and set it afire. Guardsmen got out of their trucks and shoveled this barrier aside.

As the military convoy rolled into the parish seat, Pointe a la Hache, some 75 men with Perez at their head evacuated their courthouse citadel. Perez had called for a mass meeting of citizens. But with the military on the way, the deltans thought it wiser to stay home. Perez' Plaquemines Parish Patrol retreated to the free parish ferry and backed away into midstream. Plaquemines fell without a shot.

But the parish was not entirely undefended. Encamping in Plaquemines, the guardsmen sent an emergency call to New Orleans.

"Rush mosquito lotion," they pleaded.

With the Governors' sheriff installed under martial law, the nonshooting war in Plaquemines was over. But the war of words had only begun. Both sides filed charges against each other of "conspiracy to murder." Busily, lawyer Perez fired away in the courts, and at one time had 15 suits going at the same time; against the Governor, against the militia, against the sheriff, against the State attorney general. The Governor's sheriff, installed in office, appealed to the supreme court to stop some of Perez' suits.

siding with Perez, the supreme court said, "No."

And in the end, Perez again had the last word.

A judge from outside Plaquemines, sitting in the Plaquemines courthouse while troops patrolled outside, ruled that Perez' man—not the Governor's—was the legal sheriff after all. (The Governor had appointed his man legally all right, ruled the judge, but the sheriff had neglected to qualify properly.) Besides, the same judge ruled later, the State militia had no business in Plaquemines in the first place. The civil power was superior to the military. The judge ordered the troops out. By that time 4 months of martial law had elapsed, and only a handful of State guardsmen remained in the parish. Next month, Governor Jones ended martial law altogether. In the election soon after, Perez' man was elected and took undisputed office. The Governor's man wasn't even paid for the hectic time he spent in office.

Perez never forgave Governor Jones.

When the war was over (the country's war, not Perez') he looked for a man with whom to beat Jones and found him in Earl Long, younger brother of Huey. Perez named most of the candidates on Long's slate (to strengthen it) and, behind the scenes, guided Long's campaign.

"I stuck close to Earl so he wouldn't make mistakes," says Perez.

President Truman is another man Perez can't forgive.

"I'm a Democrat," says Perez. "But I don't go along with the radicals who have taken over the National Government."

Radical to Perez, in President Truman's administration, is the Federal fight for the riches of oil in the tidelands off the States' shores. Radical, also, to Perez is proposed civil liberties legislation.

DELVING INTO COLONIAL LORE

Against the Government, on the tidelands oil issue, Perez has turned out to be a brilliant and lucidly plausible antagonist. With a scholar's love for the law, he rummaged through Washington bookshops for contemporary works on colonial history. He reread Benjamin Franklin's autobiography and pored over the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention. His object: to find out who had original title to the tidelands.

Perez' devoted scholarship was rewarded. He discovered a 1782 treaty between the British crown and the original States (then banded in the Congress of Confederation). The treaty acknowledged the States as free, independent and sovereign, and relinquished to them (as such sovereign States) the crown's territorial and proprietary rights. Perez argues from this that the U.S. Government never had title to the tidelands, and such underwater lands have always belonged and still belong to the States.

Against the administration's fight for civil liberties legislation Perez (as the head of the Dixiecrats and their voice) has been less plausible.

Before a Senate committee, Perez argued that enforcement of civil liberties legislation would require "a Federal gestapo" that would soon transform America into a totalitarian state. To clinch his argument he cited provisions from the Soviet Union's Constitution which call for "equality of rights" to all citizens of the U.S.S.R.

"I want to file these articles (from the Soviet Constitution) in the record," Perez told Senate committeemen.

Here, the committee chairman, J. Howard McGrath (then Senator, now U.S. Attorney General) observed:

"We will file that right beside a paragraph from our own Constitution guaranteeing these rights."

As head of the Dixiecrats, Perez says he is fighting to keep the Federal Government out of State and local affairs and to preserve local self-rule.

Most Americans would agree with Perez that local self-rule is the foundation of our democracy. But under the kind of self-rule that exists in the parishes bossed by Perez, citizens of the delta have had to appeal to the Federal Government to safeguard their rights.

One delta citizen, still trying to register after months of fruitless effort, appealed to the Federal district attorney and even to the President of the United States. Other delta citizens, protesting elections which gave the local machine over 90 percent majorities, year after year, have called for—and at least once obtained—Federal investigators to watch the balloting.

Perhaps Perez' kind of rule is asking for what Perez hates most: Federal intervention.

"CBS REPORTS": "THE PRIEST AND THE POLITICIAN," WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1963

(Reporter: Dan Rather. Coproducers: William Peters and David Buksbaum. Executive producer: Fred W. Friendly.)

(All copyright and right of copyright in this transcript and in the program are owned by CBS. This transcript may not be copied or reproduced in any way (other than for purposes of reference, discussion, and review) without the written permission of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc. When using material contained herein with such permission, please credit "CBS Reports.")

(DAN RATHER. Buras, La., 1 year ago—the church, the graveyard, the street, and the school have been photographed so often they begin to resemble a stage set for the third act of a classic tragedy. For 15 days, until the last student dropped out, this newly, desegregated parochial school was in a state of virtual siege. Television flashed the scene to the Nation last fall. The central characters in the drama could almost be the leading players in an allegory on the ancient contest between good and evil. The pastor, a Franciscan priest, Father Chris Schneider.)

Father SCHNEIDER. Parents want to send their children and simply were afraid of economic reprisals and damage to property, and also threats of physical violence.

(Mr. RATHER. A year ago, newspapers throughout America front-paged a four-column picture of the protestors. Prominent in the picture was the rural political boss, credited with making sure the school had no students. Leander Henry Perez.)

Mr. PEREZ. I'm not bragging, sir, but I said we are not surrendering our schools to anybody and that means anyone. I say the archbishop and I've said it before, I think he's earned the punishment of hell for selling out on his people.

(Mr. RATHER. Father Schneider's last student dropped out of this school almost exactly 1 year ago today, and for 349 days, these open doors of an empty schoolhouse symbolized the duel between the spiritual power of religion and the politics of race. Then, 3 weeks ago, one of the sisters at the school received a phone call.)

Sister BERNADETTE. When I answered the phone, it was a woman's voice. She asked when school would begin and in what school we would be teaching. Before she hung up, she said, "If you take those Negroes into our new white school, it will be blown to pieces with you in it."

(Mr. RATHER. That same night, a blast rocked the school.)

(ANNOUNCER. Now, here is Dan Rather, chief of CBS news, southern bureau, New Orleans.)

(Mr. RATHER. Good evening. In the intensive coverage of the 9-year racial crisis in the South, two elements of the overall story have gone almost unreported. One is the role of the church, where, indeed, it has chosen to play any role. The other is the anatomy of the rural political leader and the sources of his sometimes crucial power. In Plaquemines Parish, La., these two forces have met head on. There, in the absence of Negro organization, where the courts and the Federal Government have yet to act, the church—in this instance, the Roman Catholic Church—has taken a determined stand. Father Chris Schneider is the priest on the scene, armed with whatever spiritual power his small pulpit and the backing of his church give him. Facing him in a duel of wills is Leander Perez, perhaps the most powerful, old-style political boss remaining in the United States, a southern segregationist, whose grip on his people is all but absolute. In the short-term look at this story, seen through day-to-day flashes of violence, it might appear that Judge Perez is winning. This report is a long-range appraisal of the struggle, as our camera watched it over the past 18 months. To understand the duel between the priest and the politician, one must first understand the politician—and the rural Louisiana parish—or county—that bred him.)

Mr. PEREZ. Some of my friends call me "the shack bully." Do you know what a "shack bully" is?

MAN. No, I don't.

Mr. PEREZ. Well, a "shack bully" is a foreman out in the timber areas, you know, and they have these log cutting camps, and he's the guy who is the head man who has to get the work out of these fellows. A pretty difficult job, you see. So I have to work harder than they do sometimes to get the work out of them—so they call me the shack bully.

(Mr. RATHER. Plaquemines Parish lies on both sides of the milewide Mississippi on rich, marshy soil that has, over the centuries, washed down the 2,350 miles of twisting river to push its delta even farther into the Gulf of Mexico. In the years when Leander Perez was growing up, 1 of 13 children of a sugar and rice planter, the flat prairie, the swamps and bayous of Plaquemines Parish were the source of its chief industry—the trapping of muskrats. Today, all that is changed. Oil, discovered in 1928, has altered both the parish and Perez, and neither have been the same since. The parish, today, with its oil, sulfur, and natural gas; its oysters and shrimp, is one of the richest counties in the Nation. As the money began to roll in, Leander Perez, through shrewd manipulation in the State legislature, managed to siphon off a good deal of it for the parish.)

Mr. PEREZ. Back in 1930, when oil was first produced in Plaquemines, I saw the potential, and I had special legislation and constitutional amendments passed, which authorized not only our parish, but any other parish in the State, which might take advantage of the provisions of law, to assume the outstanding bonded and other indebtedness of local districts, and then succeed to the revenues and resources. We have two levied districts situated wholly within the parish, and those two districts owned quite a bit of land, and it developed that those lands were productive. As a result, the parish has secured a great deal of revenues.

(Mr. RATHER. To his credit, Perez used much of this revenue to reclaim thousands of acres of swampland, to build roads, a tunnel, schools, hospitals, public libraries, water purification and sewage disposal plants, levees to hold back the river, and two free ferries to cross it—all at no cost to the taxpayers.)

Mr. PEREZ. We could be tax free, but I don't think it's a good policy. I think that everybody should pay some tax and be conscious of the fact that they owe an obligation to government.

(Mr. RATHER. Each of these improvements, of course, put hundreds of parish citizens on the public payroll, thus adding to the long list of voters indebted to Leander Perez.)

Mr. ANSARDI. Of course, there is only one Judge Perez. Let's don't kid ourself. There is only one Judge Perez, and as I said, that man was a gift from God to us.

Mr. Farac. I think the judge is one of the finest men that I ever worked for and ever knew.

Mrs. Edna la France. The judge, I think—practically all of the people in Plaquemines consider him a prince.

Sheriff Chester Woonton. I definitely think that he could be considered as one of the natural resources of the parish.

(Mr. Rather. There are, of course, dissenters—mostly from outside Plaquemines Parish.)

Victor Bussie. To me, Judge Perez is a very egotistical sort of character. He's arrogant, generally, self-righteous, but I think most of the time completely wrong. He's anti-Negro. He's antilabor, antiarchbishop, anti-Supreme Court, anti-Federal Government, anti-State government, anti almost anything except when Judge Perez believes in. He's very pro-Judge Perez.

Sam Monk Zelden. Everybody in that parish better play ball with Leander Perez, one way or another. They'd better, because there's too many ways that he can make it very obnoxious. It is my personal opinion that Mr. Perez, over a period of years, has established a tighter dynasty and has a better setup than Mr. Khrushchev has.

(Mr. Rather. The grip of that dynasty was demonstrated in 1952 when Perez delivered his overwhelmingly Democratic parish almost solidly to the Republicans.)

Mr. Perez. When we supported Eisenhower in his first election, our parish of Plaquemines gave to Eisenhower the largest percentage of votes of any parish, county, or municipality of the whole country. We gave Eisenhower a 98-percent vote.

(Mr. Rather. But, judge, how do you do it? Khrushchev doesn't get a 98-percent vote in his bailiwick?)

Mr. Perez. Well, we did it. If you had heard speeches made by Adlai Stevenson, especially the speech he made in the Mormon Tabernacle, and when we get the message to our people about those matters, and we convince them, they go along with us.

(Mr. Rather. Once a district judge, the highest elective office Leander Perez has ever held is district attorney of Plaquemines and St. Bernard Parishes—combined population 54,731. Yet, for years, he dominated the Louisiana State Legislature. He is supposed to have written much of its constitution, was a political colleague of Huey Long. He still likes to pose beneath Long's statue.)

Mr. Perez. I represented him, by the way, in his impeachment proceedings and helped save him from impeachment, and I know the tactics used by some of his opponents in that situation. I didn't approve of everything that Huey did politically. I did support him, and as a result, incurred the enmity of certain people here in New Orleans, you know, some of the theoretical do-gooders and some of the newspapers as well.

(Mr. Rather. Though he has never been elected to it, Judge Perez has been faithful in his attendance at sessions of the Louisiana Legislature. The New Orleans Item once called him its third house.)

Mr. Perez. I've devoted more time to the legislature than any nonmember of the legislature over the years. I have not missed a regular session of the legislature in the last 50 years—that's quite a record, but as a result, I have had a lot of beneficial legislation—constitutional amendments which I sponsored that were adopted for the general good of the public, and the particular advantage of our parish.

Well, hello, how are you feeling, kid?

First Man. Judge, fine. You working with those people now? I thought you were a friend of mine, Judge.

Mr. Perez. Hey, Chester, how do you do?

Second Man. How do you do?

Mr. Perez. Hi, August. By the way, can you get out of here our legislative program? I want to check it with Udell. There's some confusion about that one bill that I asked you not to take up with the committee at the time. The joint services.

Third Man. 401?

Mr. Perez. I don't know, but it's joint services stated there.

Fourth Man. Hello, Judge, how do you do?

Fifth Man. Want to get behind Judge Chassez here?

Mr. Perez. Oh, a hundred percent; oh, we're going all out for him. Sure.

Sixth Man. I got those two bills out of committee yesterday.

Mr. Perez. Which?

Sixth Man. The piggy-back——

Mr. Perez. Oh, did you get the letter—emergency?

Sixth Man. Oh, yeah. The clerk already read——

Mr. Perez. Fine. Now, then, is there a provision in the bill declaring any emergency legislation? I don't recall that.

Sixth Man. No, sir.

Mr. Perez. Well, then, we can put it in by floor amendment possibly.

Sixth Man. I imagine so.

(Mr. Rather. Here, the judge and house majority leader, Pappy Trish, of Ascension Parish, discuss a pet piece of legislation.)

Mr. Perez. I don't know how in the hell they let Jackson's office write the bill instead of the one we were working on. Why didn't they introduce the one Jackson's office wrote? We don't know anything about it.

Pappy Trish. I'll get together with them.

Mr. Perez. But what we want to do is the one that we worked on. And I want to have—I had our bonded attorney in the other day to check on the last provision. You know, we checked on it. We're going to have a good bill, not a half-baked, half-hearted thing like Jackson's working on.

(Mr. Rather. And the judge is thanked for one of his many good deeds.)

Mr. Perez. Now, let's see—this says——

Man. I just want to shake your hand and thank you. I found out you took care of the——

Mr. Perez. Well, you put me in the hot seat, didn't you? You said, "Sit at the head of the table." How did you find out?

Man. I'm the one planned that party for this gang.

Mr. Perez. Well, I'm glad I was able to help you out there.

Man. And here I go invite you to talk——

Mr. Perez. Well, I enjoyed it.

Man. Thank you, Judge.

Mr. Perez. All right. Yes.

(Mr. Rather. Rejecting the findings of modern anthropologists, the judge quotes his own favorite.)

Mr. Perez. I know there's—one of the old Encyclopaedia Britannica had an article on that by a British scientist, who says that the Negro child will develop until he gets to be about 11 years of age, and then because of the thickness on his cranium and the limited size of the brain area, he stops expanding. He goes so far and no further.

Man. That's pretty good—this friend of mine who wrote that.

Mr. Perez. Yes.

Man. I'm glad you enjoyed it, Judge.

Mr. Perez. So long.

Politics, of course, is a science of fooling the people and getting by. I can work through certain of the leaders and men who are effective in the legislature. I hardly ever lobby any member of the legislature in support of any bill, and I just sell the bill on their merits. I just hate politics, and I say that politics is the curse of the country. I believe in government. I believe in the public business, but I despise politics, because politics will bring about the destruction of our country. Politicians will reach out for any influences to get them votes for their own self-aggrandizement, regardless of the public welfare.

(Mr. Rather. To Judge Perez, there is no such thing as a "loyal opposition" in Plaquemines Parish.)

Mr. Perez. Oh, there's a little group that are always—we call them soreheads. There's a little group who are disappointed because they've tried to get on the political payroll and we wouldn't hire them as deadheads. There's just a half dozen or so of those and they can always stir up a little opposition, you know.

(Mr. Rather. Opposition candidates often have problems even qualifying to run for office in Plaquemines Parish. A New Orleans lawyer, Sam Monk Zelden, fought one such case.)

Mr. Zelden. On this specific occasion in question, I recall that the matter was tried in the parish courthouse at Pointe a la Hache, La., in Plaquemines, and to the best of my recollection, I believe, there was 11 members of the committee. This committee hears the issues and the matters brought before it as to the question of whether a person is properly qualified, and so forth, and so on, and at the time of the hearing, when we walked into court, there was only two members of the committee present, Mr. Perez and somebody else, and Mr. Perez had, I believe, nine proxies. We went forward with the hearing which lasted, oh, I would say 3 days. I'm not certain about the time. The counsel that was appointed to represent our opposition was advised by Mr. Perez to sit down, that he wasn't doing too well, that he, Mr. Perez, would take over. So a very peculiar legal situation arose at several stages during the hearings which Mr. Perez was the parish committee; he also was the counsel for the other side, and then he was a witness at the same time.

(Mr. Rather. Judge Perez defends such practices.)

Mr. Perez. I have always followed a policy of never helping my political opponents, or political enemies, and if they didn't come right under the law, I would take advantage of the law. I've always done that. So they made it difficult on themselves by not qualifying properly and we took advantage of their errors.

(Mr. Rather. He calls himself the shack bully. This is his "shack." The amount and the sources of Judge Perez' personal wealth are obscure.)

Mr. Perez. Well, I've learned the philosophy of living. Now see, I live on a dollar and a half a day, and I can make that any time, so I'm not worried about money.

Mr. Rather. A dollar and a half a day wouldn't take care of your cigars, would it?

Mr. Perez. Well, you see, I smoke a given number of cigars, usually as many as are given to me.

(Mr. Rather. Two years ago, an ad appeared in local papers when FBI agents were investigating alleged discrimination against Negro voters. Citizens were advised: "Answer no questions. Tell them they are not welcome.")

Mr. Perez. Yes, we'll put an advertisement in the newspaper. We'll put it on the radio as well. When you say, "FBI," it's like the Gestapo in certain parts of Europe among the people. They are very feared of secret police and that is developing more and more in this country. Of course, we advised our people that their registration and their right to vote was none of the business of any FBI or any other Federal agent and that's correct.

(Mr. Rather. In 1956, Archbishop Joseph F. Rummel, in a pastoral letter, declared that segregation was sinful. Later, he announced that the parochial schools of the New Orleans archdiocese would be desegregated. The final order came in 1962. Leander Perez, himself a Catholic, reacted with public attacks on the archbishop and his order.)

Mr. Perez. The men who led our Catholic church and who had our respect before have lost the right to all decency and respect of their fellow men. That is how low a person will stoop when he gets caught; when he has sold his soul, he has no decency left.

(Mr. Rather. On April 16, 1962, Archbishop Rummel excommunicated Leander Perez for "provoking the devoted people of this venerable archdiocese to disobedience and rebellion." The Right Reverend Monsignor Charles J. Plauche explains.)

Rt. Rev. Msgr. C. J. Plauche. Excommunication is the most serious penalty which the Catholic Church ever invokes. In effect, it means expulsion from the communion of the faithful. It means that the one who is excommunicated does not participate in the prayers, or the blessings of the church, and is not admitted to the sacraments of the church.

Mr. Perez. You must remember that the darkest pages in the history of government was when certain parts of Europe were governed by bishops. You might remember that Joan of Arc was convicted of heresy and burned at the stake at the order of this bishop. And later on, years following, she was canonized as a saint. Those bishops made a horrible mistake, didn't they? I don't believe I have been excommunicated. I think it's a monumental fraud and a bluff to try to intimidate other people.

(Mr. Rather. Leander Perez, the politician; absolute political boss of Plaquemines Parish. His confrontation with the priest, immediately after this message.

(Commercial.)

(Announcer. "CBS Reports": "The Priest and the Politician." Here, again, is Dan Rather.)

(Mr. Rather. Plaquemines Parish is equally divided between Catholics and Protestants. Twenty-nine percent of the people are Negroes. Last month, stories datelined Plaquemines, La., reported Negro demonstrations and mass arrests. The city of Plaquemines lies 100 miles north of Perez, and Plaquemines Parish, where no such demonstrations have occurred. In Plaquemines Parish, there is no NAACP, no urban league. There is no Medgar Evers, no Martin Luther King. And so the role of opposition to Leander Perez, so long uncast, fell at last to a Franciscan priest, Father Chris Schneider.)

Father Schneider. Fourteen years ago, the school No. 1, the present school No. 1 for mulattoes was opened. This was the first Catholic school on the delta. There was no public school for the mulattoes as such. They could not attend the white school and would not themselves go to the colored school, and, therefore, to give them some kind of education, we opened up our Catholic school for them. And then, 8 years ago, we built the present new school, and that was known as school No. 2 for the whites up until the directive to open our doors to all Catholic children.

(Mr. Rather. Quick to respond to that directive were a successful Negro contractor and his wife, who registered two of their children in the school, Mr. and Mrs. Marcus Prout.)

Marcus Prout. Well, I first heard of it—that they were going to integrate parochial school, and well, we decided we'd send our kids to try to get them a Catholic education, and that's the reason I send my kids to school—not trying to get above myself, or anything else. I was just—just wanted a better education for my children. That's all. As I came up—I didn't have any school. During the time when I was raised, we had 3 months' school and we'd go to school just a half a day, and then many days we didn't have any out of them 3 months.

Mrs. Prout. We thought it was better for them to go to Catholic school, and that they learned more at Catholic school, and by me not having no education when we were going to school, I thought I would just try to get my children some kind of education, because I wasn't able to send them to no boarding school to get no Catholic education.

(Mr. Rather. Even before the school opened, word leaked out that Marcus Prout had entered two of his children.)

Marcus Prout. The man that I was working along with called me up, or I called him, and he said, "What you doing today?" I said, "I ain't doing anything." So he said, "Come up, I want to talk with you." So I went where he was working. He was working in his yard. Had a bunch of mens. Well, the man didn't tell me anything in front of the other mens, so he called me to the side and we sat down. He said, "Marcus," he says, "I don't know what you did, but," he says, "Judge Perez told me to—I have to get rid of you, or he'll get rid of me." He says, "And, Marcus, I have to stick with the people with the money." And when he told me that, well, I knew then there was no way out for me, that my work was just done with—in the parish.

Father Schneider. The Monday night before school opened, there was a mass meeting held at the Buras auditorium, and that Monday, they had men on the highway giving this leaflet to all the automobiles who passed, so that they would be sure to know about the meeting. Also, as they usually do, they'd have this flyer in the paper. They put it in the paper so that every home would have it.

(Mr. Rather. At that, and other meetings, Leander Perez described parochial school desegregation as the payoff of a conspiracy and bribe involving Communists, the Jews, the President, and the Catholic hierarchy.)

Mr. Perez. But $3 million grant to the hierarchy in New Orleans supposedly to build an apartment house for old folks. Well, now that Mr. Catholic President Kennedy has set the example of paying off $3 million to the Catholic hierarchy here what's he going to do when the pressure is put on him by the Protestant Christian leaders such as this Bishop Oxnam a fellow traveler in Atlanta? That takes us back just 1,962 years ago, when a Judas took 30 pieces of silver, but the price has gone up, my friends. Three million is the first installment. But regardless of the price there's no such thing as "the price is right" on the heads of our fine little girls and boys. Out of 34 parochial schools, if you will check, you'll see that 16 of them had only 1 or 2 burr heads. There were four others that had three or four little pickaninnies. There's just barely a hundred in the 24 integrated schools, but that's only the foot-in-the-door policy, because they will pour into those schools in the proportion that the white people lose their nerve and lose their courage and abandon their children to a life of immorality and indecency with these filthy little Negroes who don't know what legitimacy means in the first place. Can you imagine the future of America with all the white children being driven out of our public schools, in the end, and that's what is going to happen gradually. What is the future of our country? Why are the Communists conspiring to deprive our white youth of educational opportunities? Does Mr. Kennedy see that, or does he give a damn? Did President Eisenhower see it surrounded by his Zionist advisers, Max Rabinowitz? Goldfine and company? Did Harry Truman see it? No. I don't suppose Franklin Roosevelt gave a darn, either. I was nauseated, sick in the stomach, when I saw the performance by the mayor and the chief of police and the fire chief in New Orleans, saying, "We're ready. We're going to use the force of the police against these good people when they come out to protest against their parochial school properties being stolen and taken away from them and their children dispossessed." But you're not going to get that kind of reception here, my friends, in Plaquemines Parish—here.

(Mr. Rather. The day before school opened, Father Schneider went out to gas up the school buses.)

Father Schneider. So I went out to the churchyard, where we keep the buses during the summer months and took the old bus first, and started out the driveway, and it didn't take long to find out that I had no brakes on that bus. Both of the buses had been gone over during the summer, and the new bus, just two or three weeks before, had made a rather lengthy trip. I believe it was to Covington. I took that one next to gas it up and the same thing happened. I had no brakes on that bus either.

Harold Mitchell, (bus driver). We found that the master cylinders on both school buses was drained of all the brake fluid.

(Mr. Rather. That night the Prouts received a phone call.)

Mrs. Prout. They called before day that morning. They called around 3 o'clock that morning—they started calling, and the first call they said that they heard that we were sending our children to the integrated school, and that if we would send our children, they was "going to burn us out and every other nigger in Boothsville." That's the way they said it.

Mr. Prout. They had took everything I had there, so there ain't nothing much more could happen, so I just sent them to school anyway then.

(Mr. Rather. At the school, the first act of an outdoor drama was about to begin. Folding chairs were unloaded and arranged in neat rows. Umbrellas were set up to shield the audience from a blistering sun that would soon heat the humid gulf air to 100°. Ice water and paper cups were also provided by the management—the county government of Plaquemines Parish, headed by its president, Leander Perez. An air of carnival pervaded the scene long before the children assembled at the church.

Father Schneider. We could see from our rectory and as we went over to church, that there was already a large crowd gathered over in front of school No. 2. No doubt to see if there would be any colored children go in the school. Actually five showed up. Father Adrian, one of the assistants, had the mass that morning, and I helped with the children to see that they went into church orderly, and so forth. Whenever we bring the children from mass, we walk through the cemetery, and over to the school. So as we went through the cemetery, we prayed the rosary so that we would be busy ourselves, and if anybody said anything, we wouldn't answer—as there were many people gathered out in front of the school. We crossed the highway, and there were people all around, but no one blocked our entrances to the school, and we went into the school, and then the children went to their respective classes. The sisters gave out the textbooks and paper and pencil, and so forth, and we noticed that the crowd kept getting larger and larger, so we decided then to have a half day of school. We dismissed the children, put them on the school bus to go down to Venice at 12 noon. When we left the school someone said, "You haven't seen the end of this." Mr. Perez was also in front of our school for a speech to the people.

Mr. Perez. Our people in Plaquemines Parish have stood the test of ravaging hurricanes. This is the worst, because this would strike at the very foundation of your homes, the protection of your children, and your right to raise your children as good, moral, American citizens.

(Mr. Rather. That night, Marcus Prout received a phone call from Sheriff Chester Woonton.)

Mr. Prout. So Mr. Woonton got on the line, he said to me, he says, "Marcus," he says. "I've been a friend to you and a friend to the family." He says, "This is not an order. This is just only a request. Take the children out of school till I can get this thing under control, because it's out of hand and something dreadful might happen." So I called Mr. Haidel in New Orleans and I asked him about a job, so he told me, he said, "Come on up" he says, "and we'll see what we can do." So the morning I left to come up to go to work, I took my family with me.

Mr. PEREZ. But I can tell you that the five Negroes that they got to sign up at the parochial school in Buras all summer didn't want to go to that school, and some of our friends simply went to them and said, "Did you ask to go to that school? Is that what you wanted to do? Put your children in that white school? You know that you didn't put up any money to help build that school—isn't that right?" "Yes, that's right." And they took them out.

(Mr. RATHER. The next day, crowds were at the school again. No Negro children appeared. With the closing of school that day, the hours of terror began. A mechanic for a large company in the parish, Harold Mitchell, kept two of his children in the school.)

HAROLD MITCHELL. At 2 in the morning, I received a call from a representative of my company wanting to talk to me at the office, and I told him at present time, that I couldn't leave my home, and if they wanted to talk with me, that he'd have to come to my house and—which they did about 2:30 in the morning, they came to my house and they explained to me why they were there, and that they had had a call from top brass of my company that—asking them to talk with me and see if I wouldn't step out of this school situation, that the pressure had been put on the company, with a threat of closing the company down if I didn't get out of this school situation, and closing down of the company would have put roughly 500 men out of work. Well, there's only one man in the parish with that kind of power. No one else has anywhere near the power to do that. There's only one man it could have been and that's Leander Perez.

(Mr. RATHER. Told he had been blamed for such threats, Judge Perez had an answer.)

Mr. PEREZ. Well, you know damn well that isn't true, and if they received threats, that might be expected in the ordinary course of human events, because people resented them sending their children to the school that was integrated against the general wishes of the public and those who had supported and paid for the parochial school, but I doubt if there was any serious threats made.

Mr. MITCHELL. I decided the best thing that I could do would be to leave the parish and to get my family out of the parish for their safety, which I did the same night.

Father SCHNEIDER. This one family, with children in our school, reported to me that the sisters and priests would be tarred and feathered the next morning. The next morning when I went over to school, the front walk all the way up to the school doors was littered with feathers as if someone had cut apart several mattresses. Both Father Malachi and myself stood right in the middle of the feathers, and I called the press over on the church grounds and asked to see their credentials, and then I made the statement that "There will be no school today because of numerous threats of physical violence and fear of insufficient police protection."

(Mr. RATHER. Parish police maintained that such fears were groundless—that sufficient protection existed around the school at all times. The Labor Day weekend of 1962 followed, providing 3 days of calm. Then, it all began again. This time, some of the people in the crowd wanted to talk.)

FIRST WOMAN. Well, I have a little girl that went to Catholic school for 4 years, and this year since they're integrating it, I put her in a public school, and I'm like everybody else over here, I hate to see that happen, because I don't want my children to go with the Negroes.

SECOND WOMAN. I have about 20 colored people working for me on my boats, and not one of them has a child in this school, and they told me that they did not want to go to school—they were just forced into it, and the priest here will go all out for the colored people. He carries those colored people to and from school. Their school, they pay $3 a month for their children to school and we pay $5. They pay $1 for registration and we pay $2. Now, why? I don't know. I was coming from Venice one day and there was a colored man standing on the road and a white woman walking. The priest passed that white woman up and he stopped and picked up that colored man. Everywhere you see these priests—they have colored people in their cars—in their cars with them.

(Mr. RATHER. Leander Perez was there again.)

Mr. PEREZ. We, your parish officials, are not only backing you up—we're right out in front with you.

(Mr. RATHER. But Leander Perez was not backing up these women—mothers with children in the school.)

THIRD WOMAN. I'm concerned about my child's education, not who she's in school with, but what she is there for. That's what I believe in, and I think if we are a Catholic, we should stand up and act like one and live like one. That's what I think.

FOURTH WOMAN. My children don't think anything at all of it. They know what's right. I have taught them. Since they were born I've tried to teach them right from wrong and they know what's right, and my little teenaged daughter told me just yesterday, "Mama, can't those children—those people see they're doing wrong?"

THIRD WOMAN. I know of many mothers at home crying their hearts out because their children aren't here, because they are afraid to send them, because of losing their jobs.

DAVID BUSKBAUM. Where does your courage come from?

THIRD WOMAN. My Catholic faith. That's where my courage comes from, and I know I'm right, and I'm going to continue to do what I think is right.

Father SCHNEIDER. The families with children in the school tried to ask other families who they knew had registered, to please send their children, feeling that if enough sent their children that we could keep our school open, and they could send their children, and in union there is strength. That's the way they felt. But every time a few more would come, the next day it would drop again. So as a result, after 2 weeks of that, and the number going down to about six or seven, the parents themselves saw that it was useless, and no one showed up after that. Since that time, we have opened up school each day of the school year to show that our school was open to all Catholic children even though no children came. I have asked myself why did this happen? What could I have done, or what should I have done to avoid a situation which is unpleasant for all? It's unfair to call it a boycott on the part of Catholic parents. The only reason the parents did not send their children, or continue to send them, was because of fear. We would open the school doors and stay there for 30 minutes to an hour. As soon as we would leave, someone would close the doors. One morning, the doors were chained shut and padlocked so that our janitor had to cut the chain with a hacksaw in order to get in our own school.

(Mr. RATHER. As the time neared for the reopening of the parochial school in Buras this fall, we asked Father Schneider about the atmosphere in the parish.

Father SCHNEIDER. I think that the people are certainly uneasy in our parish down there right now. You almost—a priest almost senses that they're even afraid to talk to us any more, or to wave to us, because something might happen if they get too friendly with a priest. Even in going to church at hours other than regular church services, some people are afraid to come to church to make a visit, or a holy hour, because something might happen. That's the way they put it.

(ANNOUNCER. Something did happen—the story of the violence of recent weeks and the bombing of the school, after this message.)

(Commercial.)

(ANNOUNCER. CBS reports: "The Priest and the Politician." Here, again is CBS News Correspondent Dan Rather.)

(Mr. RATHER. On Monday afternoon August 26, 3 weeks ago, Sister Ann Bernadette received a telephone call.)

Sister ANN BERNADETTE. When I answered the phone, it was a woman's voice. She asked when school would begin and in what school we would be teaching. Before she hung up, she said, "If you take those Negroes into our new white school, it will be blown to pieces with you in it."

(Mr. RATHER. That night, a man, or men, climbed a willow tree to the roof of the schoolhouse carrying three 5-gallon cans of gasoline. A fuse was made from 40 feet of string. Most of the gasoline was poured down this vent to a heater in the classroom below. More gasoline was poured along the line of the string. And, finally, just before midnight, the fuse was lit. After the explosion, Father Schneider told us about the damage.)

Father SCHNEIDER. We found the room still full of smoke and it was apparent that a pretty good deal of damage had been done. The both walls were blown out—the one on the upper side more severely than the one on the low side of the building. The ceiling of the room was completely charred, and the blocks—top blocks of the wall leading to the adjoining classroom were blown out.

(Mr. RATHER. The day after the explosion, Archbishop John P. Cody, of the New Orleans archdiocese, expressed his indignation.)

Archbishop JOHN P. CODY. To protect the lives of our sisters, priests, and the children of Our Lady of Good Harbor parish, I can do nothing else but order the immediate closing of Our Lady of Good Harbor Parochial School No. 2, which was scheduled to reopen on September the 3d. I do this with the greatest reluctance. I sincerely trust that the destruction of property, in this instance, will bring the people of Buras together to oppose the hateful influences that have long hampered the work of Holy Mother Church in this area.

Mr. RATHER. Judge, you acknowledge you are the genuine leader of these people in this parish. Let's suppose that the people who were responsible for, say, the explosion at the school turned out to be influenced by you and what you have said about the school. How would you feel about that?

Mr. PEREZ. Now, look, you are not going to pin any responsibility, directly, or indirectly, upon me, for any overt act which is improper. I do not decry the activities of our people in resisting and in objecting in any way they can to the unlawful, un-Christian, unmoral actions of the hierarchy, or of their local priest to deprive them of their property, to deprive their children of the private Christian education which they had planned and for which they paid.

Mr. RATHER. You don't condone violence such as the explosion, do you?

Mr. PEREZ. Now, let me say—You're not going to have me to say that I am against violence if it is a matter of self-defense. I am not going to surrender and I don't want to see our people surrender to the Communist conspiracy. Violence, in certain cases, is absolutely justified under the law, and I will not say that I'm against violence as a matter of self-defense. I, personally, would use violence as a matter of self-defense.

Mr. Rather. If the parochial school in Buras is reopened on an integrated basis, would you recommend that the people do the same as they did before?

Mr. Perez. I don't have to recommend. I know that the people will resist it. Oh, we'll resist it to the utmost with whatever may be necessary to prevent the archbishop from stealing their school and turning it over to the Negroes.

Mr. Rather. Now, judge, this is going to be a long question, and it may be our last. You now have as your enemies, your opponents, at least the last four Presidents of the United States—President Kennedy, President Eisenhower, President Truman, President Roosevelt, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Earl Warren; other Justices of the Supreme Court; the late Pope John; Cardinal Cushing of Boston, a man that some people consider in the forefront of the fight against communism; the last two Attorneys General; a number of Governors of this State of Louisiana. You also have as your enemies, your sworn opponents, such institutions as the U.S. Government; parts, at least, of the Roman Catholic Church; the National Council of Churches; the Departments of Justice, Interior; to some extent, the Department of Defense; the U.S. Navy; United Nations—this is a formidable list. Many of these people and many of these institutions are considered among the most popular, the most respected of our time and our era. Now, where does all of this end? Can you win?

Mr. Perez. Well, if that question is correct, then I must be completely annihilated and liquidated. I don't concede it, however.

Mr. Rather. Well, isn't the tide of history running against you?

Mr. Perez. I cannot subscribe to the principle of surrender and the brainwash technique of saying. "It's bound to happen, so what? Let's lie down and die. Let them kick our teeth out. Let the American people forget that they are men. Let them forget our proud tradition of standing up for America. It's bound to happen, so what? Let it happen." And then let the American people be reduced to the condition of degraded slaves to a foreign ideology. I can't subscribe to that and I don't believe I'm as loathsome as your question would imply. I'm not alone.

Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Perez, I understand, through the years, has had a lot of power, but I think about all the power he's got left now is to stand in front of one little parochial school and shake his fist and declare that it won't be opened.

(Mr. Rather. We asked Father Schneider if the school would ever be reopened.)

Father Schneider. Definitely, this school will be reopened. It's just a matter of when we will reopen.

(Mr. Rather. The power of the Federal Government is not involved here; nor are States rights. Simply put, the issue is whether the clergymen charged with the leadership of Our Lady of Good Harbor School will be permitted to run their school as they see fit. In the running conflict between segregationists and integrationists there are sharp differences and room for opposing points of view, but the struggle between Judge Perez and his kind, and Father Schneider and his kind, is something more than that. "A contest between good and evil," we called it at the start of this report, and neither side is likely to deny it. Each denounces the other as evil. Each sees himself on God's side. The political power and glory of Leander Perez has been challenged by a different kind of power and glory, and the final outcome is likely to be felt far beyond the bayous of Plaquemines Parish.)

Father Schneider. God wanted this for some reason, and I think it's apparent that this is a blessing in disguise for our parish, that even though right now it's hard or difficult, and we are suffering and would like to have it otherwise, yet, good people are becoming better people because of this. I believe that when a better day dawns materially, and there's no longer the atmosphere that we have to work in at present, when that is no longer around, people will say thanks to God for giving them this chance to show their true color in the sense of being loyal to their faith and to Holy Mother of the church, and for being a part of the crucifixion themselves in adding to our Lord's suffering for those who are not yet actually saved.

(Mr. Rather. The explosion at Our Lady of Good Harbor School was not the first to rock the South. Nor is it even the most recent. Here, in Birmingham, Ala., where we are taping an epilog to this report, this Negro church was bombed 3 days ago. Four children were killed. Nor is there even any assurance that this will be the last in the long series of acts of terror that has plagued the South over the past 9 years. The real question is not, Who threw the dynamite that killed four childlren here, or Who pulled the trigger of the gun that killed Medgar Evers, or Who lit the gasoline-soaked fuse that blasted the parochial school in Plaquemines Parish? The real question is, Who put the fire of hate in the men who performed those acts of destruction and death? A final footnote: Archbishop John P. Cody, of New Orleans, announced today that Our Lady of Good Harbor School will reopen for all Catholic children the week of October 14. Children's mass will be held at 8 a.m., classes at 8:30. Schoolbuses will be available for all registered children. The story of "The Priest and the Politician" goes on.)

(Announcer. A word about the next "CBS Reports" in a moment. "CBS Reports": "The Priest and the Politican," was filmed and edited by the staff of "CBS Reports" under the supervision and control of CBS news.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Purcell (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. Jacobs, for June 7 to June 10, on account of Indiana 11th District business within district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. White of Idaho, for 60 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Zablocki, for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Conte, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Findley, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Brock) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Halpern, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Ashbrook, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Poage and to include a speech by the President of the United States.

Mr. Wolff and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Tenzer.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Brock) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Pelly.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Dyal) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Jones of Alabama.

Mr. Pickle.

Mr. Rogers of Florida.

Mr. Annunzio.

Mr. Rosenthal.

Mr. Diggs.

Mr. White of Idaho.

Mr. Kirwan.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2054. An act to further amend the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 7, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1190. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the request for appropriations for the mutual defense and development programs, for the fiscal year 1966 (H. Doc. No. 197); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers.

1191. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting a report on proposed increase in International Bank for Reconstruction and Development assistance to private enterprise through the International Finance Corporation and associated matters (H. Doc. No. 198); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered printed.

1192. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 402 of the National Housing Act and section 14 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1193. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report of plans for works of improvement which have been prepared under the provisions of section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, as follows: Crooked Creek, Ala.; Haney Creek, Ark.; Upper Crooked Creek, Ark.; Muddy Fork of Silver Creek, Ind.; Cub Creek, Nebr.; Assunpink Creek, N.J.; St. Thomas Lodema, N. Dak.; and Buffalo Creek, Ohio; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1194. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of substantial savings available through change in method of obtaining space and utilities for small post offices, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1195. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of duplicate payments to Westclox Division of General Time Corp., for artillery fuses destroyed in testing, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1196. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel cost for applicants invited by a department to visit it for purposes connected with employment; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1197. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of S. Sgt. Robert E. Martin, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1198. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report of plans for works of improvement which have been prepared under the provisions of section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, as follows: Lower Little Tallapoosa River, Ga.; Uncle Tom Creek, Okla.; Wilson Spring Creek, Tenn.; Attoyac Bayou, Tex.; Castleman Creek, Tex.; Donahoe Creek, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STEED: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 8775. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 8743. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 8744. A bill to expand and improve existing law and to provide for the establishment of regulations for the purpose of controlling pollution from vessels and certain other sources in the Great Lakes and other navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 8745. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 8746. A bill to provide for the coinage of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 8747. A bill to correct certain inequities with respect to the granting of survivor annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8748. A bill to amend Public Law 409, 74th Congress, to authorize the appropriations necessary to carry out authorized improvements in the project for the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 8749. A bill to provide for a voluntary wheat certificate program, under which the price of all wheat would be supported at not less than $2 per bushel; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 8750. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use appropriated funds for the payment of medical care of temporary and seasonal employees and employees located in isolated areas who become disabled because of injury or illness not attributable to official work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 8751. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, optometry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 8752. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.R. 8753. A bill to authorize the President to maintain reserve inventories feeds, and fibers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 8754. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to provide that benefits and payments thereunder shall be computed on the basis of annual rather than monthly compensation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 8755. A bill to modernize congressional control and review over the budgetary process for the purpose of achieving efficiency and economy in the Federal Government, to provide that the Director and the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to establish a Joint Subcommittee on the Federal Budget and Fiscal Policy in the Joint Economic Committee, to strengthen the functions of the General Accounting Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 8756. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the memory of the late President of the United States, Herbert Clark Hoover; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8757. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the memory of the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8758. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8759. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 8760. A bill to amend the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1961 (33 U.S.C. 1001-1015), to implement the provisions of the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 8761. A bill to provide an increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8762. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 8763. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common carrier property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 8764. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8765. A bill to provide for the control of junkyards along certain Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 8766. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8767. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit the use of social security records to aid in locating runaway parents who are failing to comply with court orders for the support of their children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 8768. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 8769. A bill to establish a Federal policy of uniform procedures for the acquisition of real property in the course of development programs carried out or assisted by the United States, and to provide relocation payments for persons displaced by activities under any of such programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 8770. A bill to provide an increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8771. A bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 8772. A bill to promote the replacement and expansion of the U.S. nonsubsidized merchant and fishing fleets; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 8773. A bill arranging for orderly marketing of certain imported articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 8774. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to make equipment purchased under title III thereof available to all children attending public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 8775. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8776. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 8777. A bill to amend section 204 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 8778. A bill to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to certain processed yarns of manmade fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 8779. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.J. Res. 496. Joint resolution extending for 1 year the existing authority for the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.J. Res. 497. Joint resolution to provide for a study of needed Federal-aid highway programs for 10 years following the termination of the present interstate and defense highway program by requiring the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive investigation and study of highway traffic and needs forecast for the year 1992, and the changes determined necessary in the Federal-aid highway systems as a result thereof, and to report to Congress the results of such study and his recommendations for a 10-year highway program commencing July 1, 1971; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 498. Joint resolution relating to U.S. diplomatic relations with the Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Con. Res. 428. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of "History of the House of Representatives," and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H. Res. 410. Resolution creating in the House of Representatives a Committee on Grievances to study complaints concerning the conduct of Members of the House of Representatives and to make investigations and appropriate recommendations thereon; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. Res. 411. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949, and related acts; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

296. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to eliminating virtually all excise taxes; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 8780. A bill for the relief of Angela Vendetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 8781. A bill for the relief of Hyoun Chul Chai and wife, Chung Nem Oh-Chai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 8782. A bill for the relief of Eva Craig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8783. A bill for the relief of Donald W. Mitchell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 8784. A bill for the relief of Maria Schinaraki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 8785. A bill for the relief of Francisco Coelho Ferreira da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 8786. A bill for the relief of Maria Lukacs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 8787. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs Jorge Tzavaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 8788. A bill for the relief of Gyongyi Erzsebet Szakasits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 8789. A bill for the relief of Theodosios N. Kogionis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 8790. A bill for the relief of Yue Hei-Chi (Edward Yu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 8791. A bill for the relief of Lerlyn and Thomas Bonaparte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8792. A bill for the relief of Filipo Rappa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8793. A bill for the relief of Eugene J. Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 8794. A bill for the relief of Yung Jae Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 8795. A bill for the relief of Miss I-Pang Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 8796. A bill for the relief of Kathryn Choi Ast; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 8797. A bill for the relief of Ivana Jancar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

221. The SPEAKER presented a petition of American Association of Airport Executives, Wilmington, Del., relative to airline management policies; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, the sky and the earth showeth Thy handiwork. Thou hast taught us to love beauty in form and color—in the glory of the garden, in the tint of the tiniest flower, in the glint of a bird's wing, and in the leafy loveliness of trees that lift their arms to pray. O God of growing things, who doth walk in gardens: Coming through the arbor gate of the holiness of beauty, may we be partakers of the beauty of holiness.

Open our inner eyes, that with all our seeing, we may not miss the beauty and strength of the spiritual world, more real even than the dust beneath our feet or the feathered songsters that wing their trackless way above our heads.

In spite of suspicions, animosities, disappointments, and misunderstandings which plague the councils of men, gird our hearts to seek righteous peace and to pursue it, that the sadly sundered family of mankind may at last be bound by golden cords of universal fellowship around the feet of one God.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 2, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 27, 1965, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 702) to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Quinaielt Tribe of Indians.

THE COINAGE ACT OF 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 199)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on coinage. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and appropriately referred.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

From the early days of our independence the United States has used a system of coinage fully equal in quantity and in quality to all the tasks imposed upon it by the Nation's commerce.

We are today using one of the few existing silver coinages in the world. Our coins, in fact, are little changed from those first established by the Mint Act of 1792. For 173 years, we have maintained a system of abundant coins that with the exception of pennies and nickels is nearly pure silver.

The long tradition of our silver coinage is one of the many marks of the extraordinary stability of our political and economic system.

Continuity, however, is not the only characteristic of a great nation's coinage. We should not hesitate to change our coinage to meet new and growing needs. I am, therefore, proposing certain changes in our coinage system—changes dictated by need—which will help Americans to carry out their daily transactions in the most efficient way possible.

There has been for some years a worldwide shortage of silver. The United States is not exempt from that shortage—and we will not be exempt as it worsens. Silver is becoming too scarce for continued large-scale use in coins. To maintain unchanged our high silver coinage in the face of this stark reality would only invite a chronic and growing scarcity of coins.

We expect to use more than 300 million troy ounces—over 10,000 tons—of silver for our coinage this year. That is far more than total new production of silver expected in the entire free world this year. Although we have a large stock of silver on hand we cannot continue indefinitely to make coins of a high silver content—in the required quantity—in the face of such an imbalance in the production of silver and the demand for it.

We must take steps to maintain an adequate supply of coins, or face chaos in the myriad transactions of our daily life—from using pay telephones to parking in a metered zone to providing our children with money for lunch at school.

The legislation I am sending to the Congress with this message will insure a stable and dignified coinage, fully adequate in quantity and in its specially designed technical characteristics to the needs of our 20th century life. It can be maintained indefinitely, however much the demand for coin may grow.

Much as we all would prefer to retain the silver coins now in use, there is no practical alternative to a new coinage based on materials in adequate supply.

THE NEW COINAGE

I propose no change in either the penny or the nickel.

The new dime and the quarter—while remaining the same size and design as the present dime and quarter—will be composite coins. They will have faces of the same copper-nickel alloy used in our present 5 cent piece, bonded to a core of pure copper. The new dime and quarter will, therefore, outwardly resemble the nickel, except in size and design, but with the further distinction that their copper core will give them a copper edge.

This type of coin was selected because, alone among practical alternatives, it can be used together with our existing silver coins in the millions of coin-operated devices that Americans now depend upon heavily for many kinds of food and other goods.

THE HALF DOLLAR

Our new half dollar will be nearly indistinguishable in appearance from the present half dollar.

It will continue to be made of silver and copper, but the silver content will be reduced from 90 percent to 40 percent. It will be faced with an alloy of 80 percent silver and 20 percent copper, bonded to a core of 21 percent silver and 79 percent copper. The new half dollar will continue to be minted with the image of President Kennedy. Its size will be unchanged.

THE SILVER DOLLAR

No change in this famous old coin, or plans for additional production, are proposed at this time. It is possible that implementation of the new coinage legislation that I am proposing, greatly reducing the requirement for silver in our subsidiary coinage, will actually make feasible the minting of additional silver dollars in the future. Certainly, without this change in the silver content of the subsidiary coinage, further minting of the silver dollar would be forever foreclosed.

It is our intention that the new coinage circulate side by side with our existing coinage. We plan to continue the minting of our current silver coins while the new coinage is brought into quantity production.

The new coins will be placed in circulation sometime in 1966.

In terms of the present pattern of coin usage, adoption of the new coinage will permit a saving of some 90 percent of the silver we are now putting into coins annually.

I want to make it absolutely clear that these changes in our coinage will have no effect on the purchasing power of our coins. The new ones will be exchanged at full face value for the paper currency of the United States. They will be accepted by the Treasury and by the Federal Reserve banks for any of the financial obligations of the United States. The legislation I am proposing expressly recognizes the new coins as legal tender.

It is of primary importance, of course, that our new coins be specifically designed to serve our modern, technological society. In the early days of the Republic, silver coins served well because the value of a coin could only be measured by the value of the precious metal contained in it. For many decades now the value of a particular coin has depended not on the value of the metal in it, but on the face value of the coin. Today's coinage must primarily be utilitarian. The new coinage will meet this requirement fully, while dispensing with the idea that it contain precious metal.

It is, above all, practical. It has been specifically designed to function, without causing delays or disruptions of service, in coin-operated merchandising machines.

Furthermore, it is composed of materials low enough in value and readily enough available to insure that we can have as many coins as we need.

The legislation I am proposing also contains these additional recommendations:

OTHER AUTHORITY REQUESTED

First. As a useful precautionary measure, I request standby authority to institute controls over the melting and export of coins to assist the protection of our existing and our new silver coinage.

Second. I request authority to purchase domestically mined silver at not less than $1.25 per ounce.

Third. I am asking for authority to reactivate minting operations temporarily at the San Francisco Assay Office.

Fourth. As a safeguard for assured availability of the new coinage, I am asking for new contracting authority for the procurement of materials and facilities related to it.

Fifth. I propose the establishment of a Joint Commission on the Coinage, composed of certain Members of the Congress, the public, and the executive branch of the Government, to report to me later the progress made in the installation of the new coinage and to review any new technological developments and to suggest any further modifications which may be needed.

WHY THE SILVER CONTENT OF THE COINAGE MUST BE REDUCED AT THIS SESSION

These recommendations for revision of our silver coinage rest upon extensive study of the silver situation, and of alternatives to our present coinage, by both governmental and private specialists. The Treasury Department's comprehensive report, known as the Treasury staff silver and coinage study, is being released today as background to my recommendations. Its principal finding was that the supply of silver in the free world has become progressively incompatible with the maintenance of silver in all our subsidiary coins.

On the average, in the 5 years from 1949 through 1953, new silver production in the free world amounted to about 175 million troy ounces per year, while consumption amounted to more than 235 million ounces. There was an average deficit in those 5 postwar years of more than 60 million ounces of silver per year.

In the latest completed 5 years, 1960 through 1964, free world consumption of silver has average 410 million ounces annually, but new production has averaged a little less than 210 million ounces a year. The result has been an average annual deficit of about 200 million ounces. That is three times the average annual deficit in the 5 years from 1949 through 1953.

If no silver at all had been used for coinage there would have been a deficit in new production in free world silver during the last 5 years averaging over 40 million troy ounces, or some 1,370 tons, a year.

The gap between the production of silver and silver consumption is continuing to increase. In 1964 the silver production deficit swelled to over 300 million ounces—half again the 1963 figure. And in 1964, the use of silver in coinage, and the use of silver for the arts and industry of the free world were each—taken separately—greater than new production.

There is no dependable or likely prospect that new, economically workable sources of silver may be found that could appreciably narrow the gap between silver supply and demand. The optimistic outlook is for an increase in production of about 20 percent over the next 4 years. This would be of little help. Further, because silver is produced chiefly as a byproduct of the mining of copper, lead, and zinc, even a very large increase in the price of silver would not stimulate silver production sufficiently to change the outlook.

Short of controls that are undesirable in a peacetime free society, there is no way to diminish the bounding growth of private demand for silver for use in jewelry, silverware, photographic film, and industrial processes. The one part of the demand for silver that can be reduced is governmental demand for use in coinage.

Most free world countries no longer use silver in their coins. A few—as we now propose—continue to make limited use of it. It is true that U.S. coinage does not currently depend upon new silver production, because for many years we have supplied silver for our coinage out of large Treasury stocks, which still amount to 1 billion troy ounces.

But—and this is the crux of the matter—at the present pace, this stock cannot last even as much as 3 years. We would then be shorn of our ability to maintain the coinage, and, if there were no alternative to our present silver coinage, the Nation would be faced with a chronic coin shortage. That is why definitive action is necessary at this session of the Congress.

PROTECTION OF THE COINAGE

It is necessary for the U.S. Government to have large stocks of silver in addition to the quantity needed for coinage.

We need these stocks because our silver coins in circulation must be protected from hoarding or destruction. Protection of the silver coinage will continue to be a necessity since we plan for it to continue to circulate alongside the new coins. Our silver coins are protected by the fact that the Government stands ready to sell silver bullion from its stocks at $1.29 a troy ounce. This keeps the price of silver, as a commodity, from rising above the face value of our coins. This, in turn, makes hoarding or melting of the silver coinage unprofitable.

It is an additional protection for the existing coinage that I am requesting standby authority to institute controls over the melting, treating, or export of U.S. coins.

It may be asked why we seek standby control authority since we retain a large stock of silver with which to protect our silver coins through operations in the silver market.

The answer is clear. Given the magnitudes by which demand for silver is outrunning new production, we must consider the possibility, however unlikely, that the silver stock we possess could itself require the support and protection that would be afforded by authority to forbid melting and export of our coins.

We believe our present stocks of silver to be adequate, once the large present drains from coinage are greatly reduced, to meet any foreseeable requirements for an indefinite period. However, prompt action on a new coinage will help us protect the silver coinage by freeing our silver reserves for redemption of silver certificates at $1.29 per ounce. Thus, we can assure that no incentive will be created for hoarding our present coins in anticipation of a higher price for their silver content.

There is the opposite, although in all likelihood shortrun, possibility that a fall in the price of silver might result from the enactment of this legislation largely removing silver from our subsidiary coin. It is for the purpose of protecting silver producers from a precipitate drop in the price of silver resulting from the action of the Government that I am requesting authority for the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase any newly mined domestic silver offered to him, at the price of $1.25 per troy ounce.

THE SAN FRANCISCO ASSAY OFFICE

Coinage operations at the San Francisco Mint were ended in 1955. Legislation converting the mint to the San Francisco Assay Office was passed in 1962. As part of our efforts to overcome the coin shortage of the past year, coin blanks have been cut and annealed at the San Francisco Assay Office. Present law forbids full minting there. However, we will temporarily need the facilities of this plant to move into large quantity production of the new coinage and to continue production of existing coins until enough new small money is made to make certain we have adequate supplies. Consequently, I am asking for authority to reactivate minting operations at San Francisco on a temporary basis.

A new, fully modern mint is to be built in Philadelphia. However, it cannot be completed and in operation before late 1967. It is our expectation that when the new Philadelphia Mint's capacity is added to that of the Denver Mint, our coinage requirements can be met efficiently and economically. Consequently, no more than temporary authority to mint coins in San Francisco is recommended in the draft legislation I am sending to you.

WHY COMPOSITE COINS ARE RECOMMENDED

We have no choice but to eliminate silver, for the most part, from our subsidiary coinage. The question was: What would be the best alternative? After very thorough consideration of all aspects of this highly complex problem, we have settled upon the two types of composite, or clad, coins I have already described. These are 10-cent and 25-cent pieces with cupronickel alloy faces bonded to a solid copper core, and a new half dollar with outer and inner layers of differing silver-copper alloys.

This type of coin was found to be necessary if the new coinage is to be compatible with the existing silver coinage in all the 12 million coin-operated devices in use in the United States.

The convenience of using coins in automatic merchandising and service devices is a fact that, like the coins in our pockets and in our store tills, we take for granted. But if our coinage were suddenly to be such that it would not work in coin-operated devices, the public would be subjected to very great inconvenience and serious losses would occur to business with harmful effects upon employment.

The automatic merchandising industry is a large and growing part of our national economy. Last year, $3½ billion worth of consumer items were sold through 3½ million of these machines. On more than 30 billion separate occasions a consumer made a purchase by putting a coin in a machine. In growing numbers, factories, hospitals, and other places now depend upon automatic vending for the service of goods. A million and a half people now rely upon coin controlled vending for at least one meal a day. The use of coin-operated devices is expanding rapidly, not only in merchandise vending, but also in a number of other services.

Six million of our coin-operated devices, including nearly all vending machines, have selectors set to reject coins or imitations of coins that do not have the electrical properties of our existing silver money. Highly selective rejectors are a necessity in these machines if they are to be a low-cost source of food and other goods and services. Otherwise, fraudulent use would soon make them costly.

The sensors in these machines are set to accept or reject coins on the basis of the electrical properties of our traditional coins, which have a high proportion of silver. To be compatible in operation with our existing coinage, therefore, our new coins must duplicate the electric properties of a coin that is 90 percent silver. No single acceptable metal or alloy does so. The composite coins, made of layers of differing metals and alloys, that I am asking the Congress to approve, are coins made to order to duplicate the electrical properties of coins with a high silver content. They are the only practical alternatives we have discovered to our present coinage.

Selectors exist that can handle coins with the widely varying electrical properties of, say, nearly pure silver and nearly pure nickel. But that is not enough. When the selectors are set to accept coins with greatly differing electrical properties, the selectivity of the mechanism declines and they will accept wrong coins and imitations. Unless the coins in use have very similar electrical properties, the coin-operated machines become subject to a high degree of fraudulent use. This would be costly to all concerned.

The future may bring selectors of a different kind able to accept coins of widely varying electrical properties while at the same time rejecting imitations and wrong coins. They are not available now. When and if they become available, our new coinage will work in them. On the other hand, if we now chose an incompatible coinage, there would be delays and interruptions lasting a year to 3 years in the services of these machines.

This would impose heavy inconveniences upon the public and would cause business and employment losses in a large and growing industry.

In view of these considerations of public interest, we have concluded that our new coinage must without fail be able to carry out the technical merchandising functions of a modern coinage, working alongside our existing silver coinage. The new coins that I am recommending to you do this, and do it well, because they were specifically designed for the task.

The new half dollar was designed with the strong desire in mind of many Americans to retain some silver in our everyday coinage. We believe that by eliminating silver from use in the dime and the quarter, we will have enough silver to carry out market operations in protection of our existing silver coinage—and to make a half dollar of 40 percent silver content. It is clear and unmistakable that we would not have enough silver to extend this to the dime and quarter: they are heavily used, indispensable coins that we must have at all times in large quantity. We are convinced that we can include a 40-percent silver half dollar in the new coinage, but we cannot safely go beyond that. As a precaution, we intend to concentrate at first on getting out large quantities of the new quarter and dime before we embark upon quantity production of the new half dollar.

THE JOINT COMMISSION ON THE COINAGE

We believe the recommendations being made for a new coinage are sound and durable and in the best public interest. However, the installation of a new coinage is a matter so intimately affecting the life of every citizen, and so delicately related to the Nation's commerce, that it is impossible to be certain in advance that all problems have been foreseen, even by such a long and arduous process of research as has gone into the selection of the proposed new coins.

Consequently, I am including among my recommendations the proposal for a Joint Commission on the Coinage. It will be composed of the four officers of the executive branch most directly concerned with matters affected by the coinage—the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Director of the Budget Bureau, and the Director of the Mint; of four members representing the public interest, to be appointed by the President; of the chairmen and ranking members of the Banking and Currency Committees of the House and the Senate; of one Member each from the two Houses of the Congress, to be appointed by the Vice President and the Speaker of the House. The Commission will be appointed soon after the new coinage is issued. It will study such matters as new technological developments, the supply of various metals, and the future of the silver dollar. It will report as to the time and circumstances in which the Government should cease to maintain the price of silver. It will be directed to advise the President, the Congress, and the Secretary of the Treasury on the results of its studies.

THE COINAGE—CURRENT AND PROSPECTIVE

I am pleased to report to the Congress substantial progress toward overcoming the coin shortage the Nation has been experiencing. Greatly increased minting has eliminated the shortage of pennies and of nickels. We are still somewhat on the short side of the demand for dimes and quarters, but this deficit is rapidly being overtaken. A severe shortage of the half dollar continues, due to the popularity of the new 50-cent pieces bearing the image of President Kennedy.

I want to emphasize that we will continue to make the existing coins while the new ones come into full production, and that we contemplate side-by-side circulation of the old and new coins for the indefinite future. There is no reason for hoarding the silver coinage we now use, because there is no reason for it to disappear.

We are gearing up for maximum production of the new coins as soon as they are authorized by the Congress. Supply of the materials for them is assured. Both copper and nickel are economical and available in North America. Their usage in coins will not add enough to overall employment of these metals to create supply or price problems.

In the first year after new coins are authorized, we expect to make 3½ billion pieces of the new subsidiary coins. That is a billion and a half more pieces than will be made of the corresponding silver coins in the current fiscal year.

In the second year after authorization of the new coinage, we expect to be able to double the first year's output of the new coins, reaching a production total of 7 billion pieces.

We expect in this way to avoid any new coin shortage in the transition to production of the new coins, and within a period of less than 3 years to reach a point at which we could if necessary meet total coinage needs out of production of the new coins.

I am satisfied that, taking into account all of the various factors involved in this complex problem, the recommendations that I am making to you are sound and right. Your early and favorable action upon the proposed legislation will make it possible to produce and issue to the public a coinage that will be acceptable, provide the maximum convenience, and serve all the purposes—financial and technical—of modern commerce. In considering this problem the needs of the economy and the convenience of the public have been placed ahead of all other considerations. They are the factors that have resulted in my recommendations to the Congress. I urge their approval at the earliest possible date.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 3, 1965.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1135) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before December 31, 1968.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 8371) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 8371) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency and the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff, as of March 31, 1965 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the first quarter of 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 402 OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT AND SECTION 14 OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 402 of the National Housing Act and section 14 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF LEGAL AID AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Trustees, Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the period June 1, 1964 to May 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

THE EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL MATERIALS IMPORTATION ACT OF 1965

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials, opened for signature at Lake Success on November 22, 1950, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

SPECIAL REPORT ON PROPOSED INCREASE IN INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE TO PRIVATE ENTERPRISE THROUGH THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting, pursuant to law, a special report on proposed increase in International Bank for Reconstruction and Development assistance to private enterprise through the International Finance Corporation, and associated matters (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON DOLLAR GRANTS TO IRAN UNDER FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on dollar grants to Iran under the foreign assistance program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overpayments of per diem travel allowances, U.S. Information Agency, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overprocurements resulting from ineffective supply management in Korea under the military assistance program, Department of Defense, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PETITIONS OF CERTAIN ALIENS, GRANTING FIRST PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATION

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning visa petitions which the Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that Association, dated March 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FURNISHING OF CERTAIN VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT TO RURAL MAIL CARRIERS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to furnish vehicles and other necessary equipment to rural carriers for the delivery of mail in certain cases (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 8

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to study methods to eliminate the electoral college as the means of electing the President and Vice President of the United States and to provide a more just and equitable electoral system

Whereas the Constitution of the United States now provides for an election of the President and Vice President of the United States on a statewide basis, each State having as many electoral votes as it has Senators and Representatives in Congress with the entire amount of electoral votes going to the candidate winning a plurality of the popular vote in the State; and

Whereas the electoral college has become outmoded and unjust since it allows the possibility of a presidential candidate becoming President even though he received a minority of the popular vote and in any event this system does not provide an accurate expression of voter preference and is a distortion of the popular vote; and

Whereas the electoral college system has given disproportionate power to large, urban States over smaller, rural States; and

Whereas the present system allows each State to select its own method for choosing delegates to the electoral college, and thereby permits States to appoint unpledged electors; and

Whereas if no candidate obtains a majority of the electoral college vote the decision for the selection of President is made by the House of Representatives, each State having one vote, which presents the possibility of an unnecessary delay in the inauguration of the President which could prove disastrous in these critical times; and

Whereas the tendency today, which is fostered by the electoral college system, is to limit presidential candidates to men from States having large electoral votes; and

Whereas there is much public opinion in favor of the abolition of the electoral college: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorializes Congress to initiate a study concerning the electoral college and to determine more desirable alternatives as a means of electing the President and Vice President of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That authenticated copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the members of the Wisconsin delegation to the Congress of the United States.

PATRICK GLUY,
President of the Senate.
WILLIAM P. NUGENT,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
ROBERT T. HUBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JAMES P. BUCKLEY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

H. Con. Res. 426. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," at the 25th class reunion of the Harvard class of 1940 in Cambridge, Mass.

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 1516. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 273).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment:

S. 1004. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 274).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 7060. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 275).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

Lawson B. Knott, Jr., of Virginia, to be Administrator of General Services.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2078. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States by regulating petroleum imports; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOWER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2079. A bill to expand the market for cotton, to assist in the orderly marketing of cotton, to strengthen the cotton industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) (by request):

S. 2080. A bill to provide for the coinage of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 2081. A bill to amend section 402 of the National Housing Act and section 14 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2082. A bill to provide time off duty for Government employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2083. A bill to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

S. 2084. A bill to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. RANDOLPH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (by request):

S. 2085. A bill to provide for premium pay under specified conditions to certain employees in the Postal Field Service; and

S. 2086. A bill to provide severance pay to certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2087. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order that acreage on the farm not planted to wheat or feed grains in 1965 because of flood, drought, or other natural disaster shall be deemed to have been planted for certain purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REGULATION OF OIL IMPORTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, President Eisenhower established the mandatory oil import program on March 10, 1959.

This program came into being following a determination by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization under the provisions of the so-called national security amendment contained in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1959. The Director of OCDM on February 27, 1959, "advised the President that imports of crude oil and its products and derivatives were threatening to impair the national security."

Accordingly, the President, acting under authority delegated to him by the Congress, placed a limitation on the amount of petroleum which could be imported into the United States.

In taking this action, the President declared that the basis for the mandatory oil import program is "the certified requirements of our national security which makes it necessary that we preserve to the greatest extent possible a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry in the United States."

Mr. President, the standards for measuring the health and vigor of the domestic industry were established after long and thorough study by our Government.

In 1957, a Special Cabinet Committee concluded in its report that, in order to assure the necessary oil to meet essential domestic consumption and emergency needs, it is imperative that this Nation follow a policy which will encourage continuation of free enterprise, exploration and development of new oil reserves at a rate in line with the demands of a growing economy. This Committee pointed out that the timelag between exploration and actual production requires that we search today for the oil to meet the demands of tomorrow.

The report declared that to follow any other course would invite disaster, that we need to find sufficient oil each year to provide for industrial expansion, consumer demands, and most important of all to have available adequate oil reserves to meet any type of national emergency.

These basic objectives remain the same today as when the program was adopted.

This program has been operating now for over 6 years; and although it has served a useful purpose, and has no doubt prevented complete chaos in the petroleum producing industry, it has not accomplished its announced goal of insuring a stable, healthy oil producing industry within the United States. During the 6-year period the program has been in operation, we have witnessed a continual decline in exploratory activity, employment in the industry, additions to the Nation's petroleum reserves, and a crude oil price erosion, all of which add up to a severely depressed economic picture. No one seriously contends that all of the woes of the petroleum producing industry can be placed on the doorstep of excessive imports, but likewise no one can deny that a lion's share of the problem is attributable to too much foreign oil.

Mr. President, when we look to see what has happened in this vital national security industry during the past 10 years, it should be enough to shock the Government into action to reverse these declining and adverse trends:

First. Today, geophysical and core drilling crews, the real sign of things to come, the forerunner of exploratory drilling are almost 50 percent below what they were in 1956.

Second. In 1964 exploratory wells drilled were 29 percent below the number drilled in 1956.

Third. Oil drilling rotary rigs in 1964 were 43 percent below the number of active rigs in 1956.

Fourth. Employment in the production of oil and gas is down 16 percent, or about 55,000 employees since 1957.

Fifth. The price received for a barrel of crude today is 20 cents a barrel below that received in 1957, while the cost of drilling and equipping a well is up about 10 percent over 1957.

Sixth. The cost of labor since 1956 has risen 26 percent.

Is it any wonder then, Mr. President, that this Nation has produced for use more crude oil during 4 of the past 8 years than it has found.

In a recent study by the Department of the Interior entitled "An Appraisal of the Petroleum Industry of the United States," it was stated:

> What has been done since 1956 to find new supplies of oil, whether through new discoveries or through increasing recovery rates of old deposits, has not been enough to provide a sound basis for future growth.

Historically, the domestic petroleum producing industry has discovered far more oil each year than the Nation has consumed.

Today, we are finding more oil per well drilled than we did in past years. The trouble is we are not drilling enough wells. Why are we not? The answer is that the cost-price squeeze the industry finds itself in, due in large part to cheap foreign oil, is killing off the small independent oil producer who historically has found 80 to 85 percent of the oil discovered in the United States.

During the past 5 or 6 years, the independent producer has been leaving the oil business by the hundreds. He is giving up the ghost.

How do we reverse these alarming trends now prevalent in this vital industry? Mainly, they can be reversed and started in the right direction by creating an economic climate in the industry that will encourage oil producers to risk their money in this most hazardous of all businesses.

One way to breathe new life into this faltering industry is to make meaningful reductions in the ever-growing tide of foreign imports.

Mr. President, a substantial cut in oil imports would do two things: It would help restore health and confidence to the domestic oil producing industry and it would also go a long way toward aiding this Nation's serious balance-of-payments deficit.

In a recent report prepared by the Independent Petroleum Association of America—IPAA—I note that for the last 7 consecutive years the adverse balance in our international accounts has ranged between $3 billion and $4 billion. During this same interval, according to IPAA:

> The oil trade deficit has exceeded $1 billion each year and this does not include the tanker transportation costs paid to foreigners to haul the oil, nor does it include U.S. military purchases of oil abroad. If these payments are added, the average annual trade deficit due to oil alone becomes $1.5 billion for the last 7 years. Therefore, it is apparent that the adverse balance of trade in petroleum is a major item in the overall payments imbalance.

Mr. President, on top of this, U.S. military purchases of light petroleum products—excluding residual or bunker oil—exceed 200,000 barrels per day and annual expenditures for these foreign supplies aggregate $250 million. The purchase of light petroleum products from foreign sources have grown from less than 15 percent to 36 percent of total Department of Defense light product purchases during the last 10 years. The U.S. military imports about 35,000 barrels daily of these foreign purchases—mainly jet fuel—into the United States for consumption at air bases within this country despite the fact that such refined products are readily available from domestic refineries which have operated at only 80 to 85 percent of capacity for several years.

I find it hard to watch a vital industry being wrecked by excessive imports of oil and excessive and unwarranted military purchases of foreign oil. The Defense Department particularly should be aware of the need for a healthy going oil industry—yet the growth in its oversea purchases of oil runs counter to this Nation's longstanding policy of limiting imports of oil in the interest of national security and the economic welfare of this Nation.

Mr. President, I do not know what the complete answer may be, but I have studied a bill introduced on the House side by Congressman OMAR BURLESON, H.R. 2177; and I believe this proposal, if enacted into law, would go a long way toward meeting the problems of the domestic petroleum producing industry. Accordingly, I am today introducing in the Senate a companion bill to H.R. 2177 and urge the Senate to give favorable consideration to its enactment.

Briefly, the bill would reduce the level of oil imports now running at the rate of 2.2 million barrels per day by 375,000 barrels per day. This would reduce the outflow of dollars by about 375 million annually.

It would limit the Department of Defense purchase of light petroleum products from foreign sources to 15 percent of its total requirements for these products. This would reduce total outflow of dollars by about $125 million annually.

The bill would also direct the administrators of the oil import program to take all possible steps to encourage shipments of oil into the Far Western States which now produce less than they use, from the eastern portion of the Nation which now has a large shut-in oil producing capacity.

Mr. President, I sincerely believe that enactment of this legislation is essential to the health and welfare of the domestic petroleum industry and to the security of this Nation. I earnestly recommend that the Senate take favorable action on the bill as soon as possible, and I ask that the bill lie at the desk for 1 week for the convenience of possible cosponsors, and that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk for 1 week and will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bill (S. 2078) to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States by regulating petroleum imports, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the national security provision (19 U.S.C.A. 1862) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 be amended by adding the following new subsections:
>
> "(e) Imports of petroleum into districts I–IV shall not exceed 10 per centum of production of crude petroleum and natural gas liquids in those districts during the same period of the preceding calendar year.
>
> "(f) It is the policy of the Congress that in implementing this section, every effort shall be made to encourage increased production of crude petroleum within district V and increased shipments of petroleum from districts I–IV into district V so as to prevent to the fullest extent possible district V and the Nation from becoming increasingly dependent upon foreign supplies of petroleum. In order to further this policy, after the date of the enactment of this Act, any increase in imports into district V over actual imports in calendar year 1964 shall be accompanied by a commensurate decrease in imports into districts I–IV.
>
> "(g) Imports of finished and unfinished derivatives of crude petroleum, excluding residual fuel oil for use as fuel, and imports of natural gas liquids are prohibited.
>
> "(h) As used in this Act:
>
> "(1) 'Imports' shall include shipments of petroleum, except shipments of residual fuel oil, (A) from Puerto Rico into the United States, (B) from foreign sources into the United States by the Department of Defense, (C) from foreign sources into a foreign-trade zone located within the United States, and (D) from foreign sources into the United States entered in bond and later withdrawn for commercial use in vessels and aircraft.
>
> "(2) 'Districts I–IV' means the District of Columbia and all the States of the United States except those States within district V.
>
> "(3) 'District V' means the States of Arizona, Nevada, California, Oregon, Washington, Alaska, and Hawaii.
>
> "(i) Purchases by the Department of Defense of petroleum products, excluding residual fuel oil, from foreign sources, shall be limited to 15 per centum of the total purchases of such products and, for the purposes of this Act, such purchases shall be deemed to be imports into the United States."

MARKETING OF COTTON

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the the 1964 emergency cotton law was developed as a stopgap measure. This act, which expires with the 1965 crop, instituted direct subsidy payments to mills to make cotton competitive with synthetics, and a system of direct payments to growers who agree to reduce cotton acreage. Growers with 15 acres or less, get payment without cutting acreage. The latter obviously has had little effect on output as attested by the big 1964 crop.

The cost of this plan is far too great. Thus, the matter of how to make cotton competitive still looms as the heart of the problem. Furthermore, the use of Government payments as a substitute for market prices is destructive of the market system.

This proposed program has been thoughtfully tailored to overcome not only the shortcomings of the present law, but to provide a sound solution to the cotton price problem at greatly reduced cost to the Federal Treasury.

The grower is offered three alternatives. He may plant his allotment; he may release his allotment for reapportionment and maintain it as many have done in recent years; or he may release the allotment permanently in exchange for three annual rental payments.

Under the latter alternative, the grower would agree to release his allotment permanently and devote the land to conservation uses for a period of 3 years. For this he would receive annual payments at a per acre rate equal to 8 cents per pound times his normal cotton yield.

The allotment acreage released under this provision would be available after the contracts expire for reallocation. The provisions of present law relating to release and reapportionment would remain in effect. But present provisions for the domestic allotment plan and export acreage would be discontinued.

The price support and subsidy provisions of the proposal are calculated to make cotton competitive. This would be accomplished by graduated annual stepdowns of 1 cent in price supports and 2 cents in mill payments over a 3-year period.

Price supports would be set at 29 cents for 1965, 28 cents for 1966, and 27 cents for 1967. In 1968, and thereafter, the support would be set at 90 percent of the average price received by farmers in the immediately preceding 3 years and would move up and down with the changes in this average.

It is anticipated that under this program the average market price received by farmers would be above the support level beginning in 1965.

The formula for establishing support prices is completely automatic, leaving nothing to discretionary action. At the end of each year the prices received for that year would be substituted in the formula and the new 3-year average would be computed.

Coupled with this change in price support systems is a protection against the possibility that market prices might be beaten down by CCC stocks. The price at which these stocks could be sold would be increased from 105 percent of the support price, plus charges, to 115 percent plus charges.

The mill payment part of the plan to make cotton competitive would reduce the present 6½-cent subsidy payment by 2 cents in each of the next 2 years and terminate the payment with 1967.

The net result of the proposed changes in mill payments and price supports is that each group—textile mills and cotton producers—would be contributing roughly 1 cent per pound per year for a period of 3 years, starting with the 1965 crop.

This proposed cotton program is designed to set market strengthening forces into motion at once and lead to substantial market expansion over the next few years. This, coupled with the reduction in output to be expected from the allotment reduction plan, means that within the near future the national allotment might safely be increased from the present level.

It will encourage cotton production in the more efficient producing areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2079) to expand the market for cotton, to assist in the orderly marketing of cotton, to strengthen the cotton industry, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SILVER IN COINAGE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have today introduced the administration silver bill, with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] as cosponsor, by request.

In order to explain the various provisions of the bill, and the President's program, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a summary of the program, a section-by-section analysis, and a copy of the bill, together with a press release I issued this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, summary, section-by-section analysis, and press release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2080) to provide for the coinage of the United States, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BENNETT), by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "The Coinage Act of 1965".

TITLE I

SECTION 1. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to cause to be minted and issued the following coins:

(1) A half dollar or 50-cent piece which shall be composed of an alloy of eight hundred parts of silver and two hundred parts of copper per each one thousand parts by weight clad on a core of a silver-copper alloy of such fineness that the composition of each coin shall be four hundred parts of silver and six hundred parts of copper out of each one thousand parts by weight.

(2) A quarter dollar or 25-cent piece and a dime or 10-cent piece each of which shall be composed of an alloy of 75 per centum of copper and 25 per centum of nickel clad on a core of pure copper.

(b) The cladding alloy used for the outside layers of such coins shall comprise not less than 30 per centum of the weight of each coin. Such coins shall be of the same diameter, respectively, as the coins of the United States of corresponding denominations current at the time of enactment of this Act.

(c) The weight of the half dollar provided for herein shall be 11.50 grams, of the quarter dollar 5.67 grams and of the dime 2.268 grams.

SEC. 2. Subject to the requirements of section 1, the methods of manufacture of the coins therein provided, the wastage allowances, and the allowable deviations in the metallic percentages and weights, shall be as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury. Such coins shall be subject to the laws pertaining to the designs and inscriptions on coins of the United States.

SEC. 3. All coins minted pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be legal tender for all debts, public and private, public charges, taxes, duties, and dues.

SEC. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be deemed to prohibit the continued minting of coins of the United States authorized by law at the time of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury such action is necessary to protect the coinage of the United States, he is authorized under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe to prohibit the exportation, melting, or treating of coins of the United States.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell on such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, at not less than the monetary value thereof, any silver of the United States in excess of that required to be held as reserves against silver certificates.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase at the price of $1.25 per fine troy ounce silver mined after the date of enactment of this Act from natural deposits in the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof and tendered to a United States mint or assay office within one year after the month in which the ore from which it is derived was mined. The bullion fund provided by section 3526 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 335), may be used for such purchases.

SEC. 8. In order to expedite acquisition of essential equipment, patents, patent rights, technical knowledge and assistance, metallic strip and other materials necessary to assure the prompt and continued availability of materials required to produce an adequate supply of the coins provided for herein, the Secretary of the Treasury, during such period as he may deem necessary, is authorized, without regard to the provisions of section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 340), or any other law, to enter into contracts upon such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate and in the public interest, for the acquisition or transportation of such equipment, patents, patent rights, technical knowledge and assistance, metallic strip, or other materials.

SEC. 9. (a) The Act of September 3, 1964, Public Law 88–580, is amended to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding section 3517 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 324), all coins minted from the date of enactment of this Act shall be inscribed with the year of the coinage or issuance unless in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury such inscription is likely to contribute to a shortage of coins, in which case the particular coins involved may be inscribed with the last preceding year whose date has been inscribed on coins of the same denominations."

(b) Section 3550 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 366) is repealed.

SEC. 10. The first sentence of section 3558 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 283), is amended to read as follows:

"The business of the United States assay office in San Francisco shall be in all respects similar to that of the assay office of New York except that until such time as the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the mints of the United States are adequate for the production of ample supplies of coins, its facilities may be used for the production of any coins of the United States authorized by law."

SEC. 11. Section 4 of the Act of August 20, 1963 (31 U.S.C. 294) is amended by striking out "$30,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$45,000,000."

SEC. 12. Section 3 of the Act of December 18, 1942 (31 U.S.C. 317c) is amended by striking out "minor" each place it appears in such section. Section 9 of the Act of March 14, 1900 (31 U.S.C. 320) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 13. Section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 340), is amended (1) by striking out "this Act," in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "law,"; (2) by striking out "minor" each place it appears in such section; and (3) by striking out "$3,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$30,000,000."

SEC. 14. Section 485 of the Act of June 25, 1948 (18 U.S.C. 485) is amended by striking out "the gold or silver coins" and inserting in lieu thereof "gold, silver, silver-clad, or cupronickel-clad coins."

SEC. 15. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 16. Whoever knowingly violates any of the provisions of section 5 hereof or of any order, rule, regulation or license issued pursuant thereto shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. In addition, there shall be forfeited to the United States any coins exported, melted, or treated in violation of this Act or any order, rule, regulation or license issued hereunder, or any metal resulting from such melting or treating of coins. Such coins or metal may be seized and condemned by like proceedings as those provided by law for the forfeiture, seizure or condemnation of property imported into the United States contrary to law.

TITLE II

SECTION 1. The President is hereby authorized to establish a Joint Commission on the Coinage to be composed of the Secretary of the Treasury as Chairman; the Secretary of Commerce; the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; the Director of the Mint; the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee; the chairman and ranking minority member of the House Banking and Currency Committee; one Member of the Houes of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker; one Member of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and four public members to be appointed by the President, none of whom shall be associated or identified with or representative of any industry, group, business, or association directly interested as such in the composition, characteristics, or production of the coinage of the United States.

SEC. 2. No public official or Member of Congress serving as a member of the Joint Commission shall continue to serve as such after he has ceased to hold the office by virtue of which he became a member of the Joint Commission. Any vacancy on the Joint Commission shall be filled by the choosing of a successor member in the same manner as his predecessor.

SEC. 3. The Joint Commission shall study the progress made in the implementation of the coinage program established by this Act, and shall review from time to time such matters as the needs of the economy for coins, the standards for the coinage, technological developments in metallurgy and coin-selector devices, the availability of various metals, renewed minting of the silver dollar, the time when and circumstances under which the United States should cease to maintain the price of silver, and other considerations relevant to the maintenance of an adequate and stable coinage system. It shall, from time to time, give its advice and recommendations with respect to these matters to the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Congress.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated to remain available until expended, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

The summary, section-by-section analysis, and press release presented by Mr. ROBERTSON are as follows:

SUMMARY: A PROGRAM FOR A NEW AND MODERNIZED U.S. COINAGE

This summary of the President's coinage program, the Treasury staff study of silver and coinage, and the study of alloys suitable for use as U.S. coinage are made available as background to the President's coinage program.

One underlying determination had to be made as the basic and fundamental decision affecting the U.S. coinage. This was: Will there be enough silver available to justify continued large-scale use of silver in U.S. coins?

The Treasury staff study of silver and coinage came to the unequivocal conclusion that there is not. (See point 1 of the digest of the study, and parts III and V of the study, and the table at the end of this summary.)

There was no choice whether the United States should turn away from its traditional high silver content coinage at this time. It had to do so because to attempt to retain it in the face of a growing imbalance between silver supply and demand could only result in a severe and chronic national coin shortage in the not distant future.

There was a choice in only one matter: What substitute should be used for the existing 90-percent-silver coinage?

The silver and coinage study provides a set of criteria for a modern coinage (see part II of the digest and of the study). The new coins the President is recommending to Congress meet this criteria:

They will provide uninterrupted service as a medium of exchange. They can be made without further major changes for a long period ahead. They are made of materials for which there is assured access. They can be minted without undue difficulty and at moderate cost. They can be used—across the counter and in all of the 12 million coin operated devices in use in the United States—side by side with the existing silver coins. These factors were determining in the selection of the new dime and a new quarter despite the fact that they have a distinctively different appearance from their traditional silver counterparts.

The silver supply-and-demand situation is summarized in a table at the back of this document. It should be noted that: In 1964, free world consumption of silver exceeded new production by a massive 335 million troy ounces—11,557 tons (see the last figure in the table). Even if no silver had been used anywhere in the free world for coinage, there would have been a silver deficit, on the average, from 1957 through 1961, and growing deficits in 1962, 1963, and 1964 (compare the first and the sixth columns of the table).

Coinage demand for silver has been growing fastest, and U.S. use of silver in coinage accounts for nearly all of this increase (see the second, third, and fourth columns).

The entire use of silver by the United States in coins, and in part the use of silver in the arts and industry in this country, are supplied from the Treasury's silver stock, acquired mainly in the 1930's. This stock now stands at approximately 1 billion ounces.

Thus, unless the United States acts now to ease its dependence upon silver in the coinage, the Treasury's large stock of silver would be gone in 2 to 3 years.

Consequently, a new, largely nonsilver subsidiary coinage is proposed now, while the U.S. silver stock is large enough to insure an orderly transition to the new coinage, without danger of a coin shortage, and without major upsets to the silver market.

Of the six coins in use in the United States, the new coinage program leaves three unchanged. These are the penny, the nickel, and the silver dollar.

With respect to the silver dollar:

1. The silver dollar remains unchanged as the coin it has been since 1837, a coin weighing 412½ grains overall, 90 percent of its weight silver.

2. There are no plans at present for new production of the silver dollar.

The new dime and new quarter: They will be the same size and have the same design as the present dime and quarter. But they are composite coins. They are faced with cupronickel, the alloy of 75-percent copper and 25-percent nickel now used in the 5-cent piece. The cupronickel facing is bonded to a core of pure copper. The copper core gives these coins their distinctive feature: a copper edge.

This type of coin was selected because it alone, among practical alternatives, can be used without interruption of service in all coin-operated devices in use in the United States, including the 6 million coin machines that have sensors set to reject anything other than the present 90-percent silver coinage.

This is a public convenience factor that was given great weight in making selections for the new coinage, in view of the following. In 1964 the public bought some $3½ billion worth of goods and services, in more than 30 billion transactions, through merchandise-vending machines. The 1965 figures will be bigger, because this method of merchandising is expanding rapidly in the United States. The public has come to depend upon automatic merchandising for the provision of food and other small consumer items, at all times and in a growing number of places.

The new half dollar: This too will be a composite coin. But it will be almost indistinguishable from the present half dollar. It will be the silver standard bearer of the new coinage, faced with an alloy of 80 percent silver and 20-percent copper, bonded to a core of approximately 21-percent silver and 79-percent copper, giving an overall 40-percent-silver content. It will continue to be minted with the image of the late President Kennedy.

The coinage program includes as a central feature the continued circulation of the existing silver coinage.

Retention of the existing silver coinage in use for an indefinite period ahead means that:

Both the old and the new coins must be accepted by the 6 million coin-operated devices in operation in the United States that use sensors set to reject coins other than the present silver money. They do this by rejecting any coin, or slug, that does not have the electrical properties of a coin with a 90-percent silver content. To be compatible in technical use, therefore, the new coins had to duplicate the electrical properties of the present silver coins. The proposed composite coins were engineered to do this. They do so precisely and consistently.

If an incompatible new coinage had been chosen, the sensors in coin machines could have been changed to accommodate them, at a cost estimated at approximately $100 million. This cost did not enter into decisions as to the new coinage, since every industry must from time to time spend to keep in step with changes around it. The following factors were influential:

1. Changing the rejector devices in vending machines would impose upon the public service delays of 1 to 3 years.

2. Changing the rejector devices to accommodate a new coinage with electrical properties different from those of the existing silver coinage creates, rather than solves, a problem. This is so because setting rejectors to accept coins of variant electrical properties in effect desensitizes them, exposing them to extensive slugging. This would raise the cost of goods sold through coin operated vendors, as the losses through fraudulent use would be passed along to users in the form of higher prices for the goods and services sold through the machines.

The composite coins avoid all these problems.

Continued circulation of silver coins also means that the silver coinage must be protected from hoarding and destruction. This requires that the silver in them must not be permitted to become more valuable—as silver—than the face value of the coin.

This will be prevented by continued action by the Treasury to hold the price of silver at not more than $1.29 and a fraction cents a troy ounce. At this price it is uneconomic to melt existing U.S. silver coins for their silver content.

The silver coinage will be protected in this way by the fact that the Treasury stands ready to supply silver from its stock at the $1.29+ price. It is expected that the transition can be made to the new coinage, the existing coinage can be protected, and the Treasury will still have a large supply of silver stock on hand at the end of 3 years.

Introduction of the new coinage into circulation will start next year, if legislation authorizing it receives prompt congressional approval.

Meanwhile, the mint will continue making the existing silver coinage.

The new coins will have the same purchasing power as present silver coins. They will be legal tender, exchangeable at full face value for all the financial instruments of the United States.

Use of the new coinage will permit an ultimate saving, in terms of the present pattern of coin usage, of 90 percent or more of the silver we now put into coins.

Estimated free world silver consumption and production, 1949–64

[In millions of fine troy ounces]

Calendar year	Use					New production	Deficit
	Industry and the arts	Coinage demand			Total consumption		
		United States	Foreign free world	Total			
1949–53 averages	153	36	48	85	238	174	64
1953–57 averages	190	37	36	74	264	191	73
1957–61 averages	216	47	51	98	314	200	114
1962	248	77	50	128	375	207	169
1963	252	112	56	167	419	214	205
1964	286	203	62	265	550	216	335

NOTE.—A troy ounce equals 480 grains, an avoirdupois pound equals 7,000 grains, a 2,000-pound ton equals 14,000,000 grains, hence, 1,000,000,000 troy ounces (480,000,000,000 grains) equal 34,285 tons.

Source: Treasury Silver Study, pt. III, table 1, figures rounded.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

TITLE I

Section 1 authorizes the minting and issuance of a new series of coins in denominations of 10, 25, and 50 cents which will be manufactured from composite metals containing three layers. In the case of the 50-cent piece, the outside or cladding layers would be composed of an alloy of 80 percent silver and 20 percent copper and the core of a silver-copper alloy of such fineness that the overall composition of each coin would be 40 percent silver and 60 percent copper. The 10- and 25-cent coins would consist of cupronickel (75 percent copper, 25 percent nickel) clad on a core of pure copper. Section 1 also prescribes the proportionate amounts of core and cladding alloys in the coins, the weight of each coin and that such coins are to be of the same diameter as the current coins of the United States of corresponding denominations.

Section 2 authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to determine the methods of manufacture of the new coins, the wastage allowances, and the allowable deviations in the metallic percentages and weights. It provides also that such coins shall be subject to existing laws pertaining to the designs and inscriptions on U.S. coins.

Section 3 provides that the coins shall be legal tender. While existing statutes governing legal tender are broad enough to cover the new coins, an express provision in the new bill is deemed desirable to eliminate any possible doubt.

Section 4 provides continuing authority for the coinage of coins authorized by provisions of existing law. This will enable the continued production of present coinage to the extent necessary to assure the production of ample supplies of coins during the period of transition to the new coinage.

Section 5 gives standby authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to prohibit the exportation, melting or treating of U.S. coins when necessary to protect the coinage.

Section 6 provides for sales by the Treasury of silver in excess of that required to be held against silver certificates at prices not less than the monetary value. This will clarify the authority of the Treasury to make sales of such excess silver under appropriate conditions.

Section 7 authorizes the purchase of newly mined domestic silver by the Treasury at the price of $1.25 per fine troy ounce. This will protect silver producing industries against any precipitate drop in the price of their product which might result from the change in U.S. coinage alloy. Silver purchased under this provision can be used in coinage at values not less than $1.29+ per fine troy ounce. Section 7 also authorizes the use of the bullion fund for the purchase of silver.

Section 8 authorizes the Secretary, for as long as he deems it necessary, to procure, on terms deemed appropriate and in the public interest, any materials, technical knowledge and assistance, equipment, patents, transportation services, etc., necessary to assure prompt and continued availability of materials required for the new coinage without regard to any laws requiring advertising and competitive bidding or imposing other restrictions on the negotiation of contracts for the purchase of property by the Government.

Section 9 directs that coins minted after enactment of this act shall bear the year of the coinage or issuance unless the Secretary of the Treasury determines that this is likely to contribute to a coin shortage. In this event, the particular coins involved may be inscribed wih the last preceding year whose date appeared on coins of these denominations. This section would also repeal an obsolete provision of law requiring that the obverse working dies at each mint be destroyed at the end of each year.

Section 10 authorizes use of the San Francisco Assay Office for coinage on a temporary basis until such time as the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the facilities at the mints are adequate for the production of ample supplies of coins. It is anticipated that during the period of transition to the new coinage the mints production load will be particularly heavy and additional facilities will be needed. Use of the San Francisco Assay Office is the most expeditious way of providing these. Section 10 also authorizes permanent use of the San Francisco Assay Office for refining gold and silver bullion. This will also contribute to the efficiency of operations at the mints and assay offices.

Section 11 increases the maximum amount authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the new mint at Philadelphia from $30 million to $45 million. Additional funds will be necessary to provide equipment and facilities for the new coinage.

Section 12 will authorize and provide financing for the melting of any worn and uncurrent U.S. coins, including the new cupronickel-clad and silver-clad coins, received in the Treasury and the sale or recoinage of the resulting metals. The section also repeals an act which requires recoinage of all worn and uncurrent subsidiary silver coins received in the Treasury.

Section 13 authorizes use of the minor-coinage metal fund and the minor-coinage profit fund (to be renamed the coinage-metal fund and the coinage-profit fund) for the purchase of metals for the coins provided for in the act and for certain expenses incurred in such coinage; namely, the wastage and cost of distribution of the coins. It also raises the amount available in the coinage-metal fund from $3 million to $30 million. This increase in amount is necessary because after enactment of the bill this fund will be used for the purchase of metals used in coinage of all denominations whereas at the present time it is used only for metals for 1- and 5-cent coins.

Section 14 amends one of the counterfeiting laws so as to make it applicable to the new cupronickel and silver-clad coins on the same terms and conditions as it is now applicable to the subsidiary silver coins. It is not necessary to amend any of the other counterfeiting laws since these will be applicable by their terms to the new coins.

Section 15 is a general provision authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue regulations that may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

Section 16 provides penalties for violations of any regulations issued under section 5 of the act, prohibiting the export, melting or treating of U.S. coins. The penalties would be forfeiture and imprisonment up to 5 years or a fine up to $10,000, or both.

TITLE II

Section 1 provides for the establishment of a Joint Commission on the Coinage, composed of four executive officials, six Members of Congress, and four public members to be appointed by the President. The public members shall not be representatives of any group having a direct interest in coinage.

Section 2 provides that the executive and congressional members shall cease to serve on the Joint Commission after leaving their public offices, and provides for the filling of vacancies on the Commission.

Section 3 provides that the Joint Commission shall study the progress made in the implementation of the coinage program established by the act. It shall review and give its advice and recommendations from time to time to the Congress, President, and the Secretary of the Treasury on such matters as the needs of the economy for coins, the standards for the coinage, technological development in metallurgy, the availability of various metals, renewed minting of the silver dollar, the time when and circumstances under which the United States should cease to maintain the price of silver, and other considerations relevant to the maintenance of an adequate and stable coinage system.

Section 4 authorizes the appropriation of such amounts as may be necessary for the expense of the Joint Commission.

COMMENT BY CHAIRMAN ROBERTSON OF THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ON SILVER COINAGE MESSAGE

Needless to say, the decision reached by the President with respect to the metal to be used in future coins will not be entirely satisfactory to anyone. After months of study and conferences with the three primary interested groups, namely, the silversmiths and other silver users, who wanted no silver used in future coins; coin collectors, speculators and purists, who wanted no change whatever in silver coins, and the owners and operators of coin vending machines, who wanted to make sure their machines would continue to operate, the Treasury has recommended and the President has approved a plan designed to protect the future price of silver to a reasonable extent, and to produce coins that can be used in machines. It is also designed to conserve for a substantial period our diminishing stockpile of silver, which at the current rate of use would be consumed in 3 more years.

While the new proposal does not affect the 90 percent of silver now used in silver dollars, no more silver dollars will be minted until a commission appointed to recommend a permanent coinage program has submitted a report.

The present content of the half dollar is substantially less than 50 cents worth of silver. That content will be cut in half, which means there will be no demand for new 50-cent pieces, except for currency. Before coin collectors and speculators started buying Kennedy half dollars there was no great demand for coins of that denomination.

All silver will be eliminated from quarters and dimes. They will be nearly as heavy as present coins and, through a special process of laminating nickel on copper, they can be used in all vending machines.

The metal content of nickels and pennies, which contain no silver, will not be changed, and until the current shortage of small coins has been relieved, the year 1964 will continue to be stamped on all coins.

As chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee I shall, by request, introduce the administration proposal, with the ranking Republican member of the committee, Senator Bennett, of Utah, as cosponsor. I will arrange for hearings on it next week.

Action should be prompt in both the Senate and House, and I anticipate it can be, because this compromise measure is temporary legislation to protect a rapidly diminishing silver supply until permanent legislation can be formulated and enacted.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 402 OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT AND SECTION 14 OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board has recommended legislation to increase the borrowing authority of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and to authorize the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to require institutions insured by it to make deposits in the Corporation up to 1 percent of total savings.

I have introduced the bill by request, and I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Horne's letter and an analysis of the bill together with a copy of the proposed bill inserted in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2081) to amend section 402 of the National Housing Act and section 14 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Robertson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of section 14 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act is hereby amended by striking out "$3,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,000,000,000".

(b) The first sentence of subsection (i) of section 402 of the National Housing Act is hereby amended by striking out "$750,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,000,000,000".

Sec. 2. Section 404 of the National Housing Act is hereby amended by adding thereto at the end thereof the following:

"(h) (1) Each insured institution shall make such deposits in the Corporation as may from time to time be required by call of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Any such call shall be calculated by applying a specified percentage, which shall be the same for all insured institutions, to the total amount of all withdrawable or repurchasable shares, investment certificates, and deposits in each insured institution. No such call shall be made unless said Board determines that the total amount of such call, plus the outstanding deposits previously made pursuant to such calls, does not exceed 1 per centum of the total amount of all withdrawable or repurchasable shares, investment certificates, and deposits in all insured institutions. For the purposes of this subsection the total amounts aforesaid shall be determined or estimated by the Board or in such manner as it may prescribe.

"(2) The Corporation, in accordance with such regulations as it may prescribe, shall credit as of the close of each calendar year, to each deposit outstanding at such close, a return on the outstanding balances, as determined by the Corporation, of such deposit during such calendar year, at a rate equal to the average annual rate of return, as determined by the Corporation, to the Corporation during the year ending at the close of November 30 of such calendar year, on the investments held by the Corporation in obligations of, or guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"(3) The Corporation in its discretion may at any time repay all such deposits, or repay pro rata a portion of each of such deposits, in such manner and under such procedure as the Corporation may by regulation or otherwise prescribe. Any procedure for such pro rata repayment may provide for total repayment of any deposit if total repayment of any and all deposits of equal or smaller amount is likewise provided for.

"(4) The provisions of subsection (f) of this section and of the last sentence of subsection (e) of this section shall be applicable to and with respect to deposits under this subsection, and for the purposes of this subsection the references in said subsection (f) and said last sentence to the prepayments and the pro rata shares therein mentioned shall be deemed instead to be references respectively to the deposits under this subsection and the pro rata shares of the holders thereof, and the reference in said subsection (f) to that subsection (except the last such reference) and to subsection (d) of this section shall be deemed instead to be references to this subsection."

The letter and analysis presented by Mr. Robertson are as follows:

Federal Home Loan Bank Board,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1965.

The President of the Senate.

Sir: The Federal Home Loan Bank Board hereby transmits, and recommends for enactment, a draft for a bill to amend section 402 of the National Housing Act and section 14 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and for other purposes. The provisions of the draft are summarized and discussed in the analysis which is also transmitted herewith.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that the enactment of the proposed legislation would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

John E. Horne.

Analysis of Draft Dated May 17, 1965, for a Bill To Amend Section 402 of the National Housing Act and Section 14 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and for Other Purposes

The first section, unnumbered, of the above draft bill would liberalize the limitations on the funds which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation are authorized by statute to borrow from the Treasury for insurance purposes. The existing limit for the FDIC, fixed in 1947, is $3 billion, and the existing limit for the FSLIC, fixed in 1950, is $750 million.

This section would raise the $3 billion limit to $4 billion and the $750 million limit to $2 billion, representing in each case approximately 2.16 percent of the estimated insurance liability of the particular Corporation. That percentage figure is based on estimates of total deposits in FDIC-insured banks of approximately $337 billion at November 18, 1964, of which it is estimated that 54.5 percent, or approximately $184 billion, was insured, and on estimates of the total savings in FSLIC-insured institutions of approximately $97.8 billion at December 31, 1964, of which it is estimated that 94.5 percent, or approximately $92 billion, was insured.

It is felt that, as in the past, it will probably not be necessary to make use of this statutory authority, but it is believed that the proposed increase would be helpful as reassurance to the public as well as by providing more adequate ceilings in the event that, contrary to present anticipations, such resort should later prove to be advisable.

Section 2 would provide additional financial resources for the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation by authorizing the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to require insured institutions to make deposits in the Corporation. Such deposits would be limited to 1 percent of total savings in insured institutions, as set forth in the draft bill.

The Corporation would be required to credit to each deposit, at the end of each calendar year, a return on the outstanding balances of the deposit during the year, as determined by the Corporation. This return would be at a rate equal to the average annual rate of return during the year ending on the preceding November 30 on the Corporation's investments in obligations of or guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. The Corporation could at any time repay all deposits or a pro rata portion of each, and could provide for the total repayment of any deposit if the total repayment of all deposits of equal or smaller amount was also provided for.

As is stated above, neither Corporation has ever called on the Treasury for any borrowing, and neither expects to do so. In carrying out this approach of self-reliance, section 2 would authorize the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to obtain additional liquid resources from the insured institutions themselves, if and when the need might arise. In this way the authority of that Corporation to borrow from the Treasury could be kept in its proper position as a source of ultimate resort.

June 2, 1965.

COMPENSATORY TIME OFF TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OBSERVING RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill, for appropriate reference, to authorize heads of departments in the executive branch of the Federal Government the power to grant, under regulations prescribed by the President, to employees under their jurisdictions, to the extent compatible with the requirements of public business and performance of essential services, time off from duty to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2082) to provide time off duty for Government employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this bill is a companion measure to legislation introduced in the House of Representatives by Representatives John V. Lindsay and Jonathan B. Bingham, both of New York.

Instead of taking time off without pay, as is now the case, the affected employees would be allowed to make up such time by arrangement with the department or agency concerned. For example, a Seventh Day Adventist or other sabbatarian employed by the Post Office Department would work on Sunday instead of Saturday. An Orthodox Jew, could exchange work on Christmas Day, for example, for time off on Yom Kippur. There would be no cost to the Government.

The bill would give the department considerable discretion in making these arrangements. It would provide authority for time off for religious obligations to an extent compatible with the exigencies of public business and the performance of essential services. Thus the Government administrators have authority to permit time off to their employees to comply with religious obligation if they find it appropriate in the public interest.

This is a measure that will ease the minds of many considering Federal employment who may have heretofore felt that observance of their religious practices has been a barrier to Government employment. It will also provide uniform procedures for Federal service throughout the Nation. It is a measure which merits favorable consideration. Federal agencies may wish to consider this proposal on their own for appropriate administrative action.

STIMULATION OF INDUSTRIAL AND ECONOMIC GROWTH THROUGH APPLICATION OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a program designed to stimulate the industrial and economic growth of States and regions in the United States through the application of science and technology.

My bill differs in several important respects from a similar measure (S. 949) introduced earlier as an administration bill.

My bill would enable the Federal Government to make grants to States in support of programs to make better commercial use of the latest findings of scientific and technological research and development. These programs, planned and carried out locally, would place their findings in the hands of local business and industry. Emphasis in the technical services program to be established by my bill would be on local leadership, local initiative, local resources, and local participation.

Educational institutions would play a major role in partnership with Government and industry. Technical services would be offered through qualified educational and other institutions in the State. Typical programs would include: Technical information services, analysis of industries important to a particular region, a technical referral service, workshops or seminars in advanced technology suitable for local industry.

A State wishing to participate in the program to be established by my bill would designate an agency—that is, a State government department, a State university or land-grant college—to administer and coordinate the State's technical services program.

The designated agency would prepare a 5-year plan, outlining the technological and economic situation in the State, the major regional and industrial problems, and the means to be used in assisting in their solution.

The designated agency would also prepare an annual technical services program, covering the objectives for the first year, the budget, and the responsibilities assigned to each qualified institution participating in the program. Up to $25,000 per year for each of the first 3 years may be paid to the designated agency to assist in preparing the first 5-year plan and the initial annual programs.

An advisory council would be established by the designated agency to evaluate and report on the 5-year plan and the annual technical services program.

The 5-year plan and the annual program would be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce. Federal matching funds would be made available to the designated agency to support eligible programs. The maximum annual Federal payment will be limited by a formula to be established by the Secretary, taking into consideration three criteria: First, population; second, level of industrial and economic development and productive efficiency; and third, technical resources. Supplementary matching grants may also be made to support programs which the Secretary determines have special merit.

These provisions are designed to assure nationwide diffusion of the program's benefits and the use of funds only in support of adequately developed programs which will in fact advance the purposes of the act.

New plans are required at 5-year intervals. Annual technical services programs must be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce each year in order to qualify for annual matching funds. In administering the program and approving plans, the Secretary would consult with other agencies of the Federal Government as appropriate. Each designated agency is required to submit an annual report on the program it administers to the Secretary of Commerce who, in turn, is required to report annually to the President and Congress.

My bill authorizes the appropriation of $105 million in Federal matching grants for the first 5 years of the program, commencing with fiscal year 1966. This would give the Congress an opportunity to reevaluate the program's effectiveness in 5 years, rather than granting an open-ended authorization such as is provided in the administration's bill.

All funds made available to States for technical services, with a few exceptions designated by the Secretary of Commerce, would be matched at least equally by non-Federal funds.

My bill also differs from the administration bill in that it provides that a State may designate an existing State agency such as its department of commerce to administer the program, without its Governor having to explain his reasons for not selecting a university to the Secretary of Commerce here in Washington. It would further permit a Governor's council on science and technology, such as we have in my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to act as the advisory council charged with evaluating technical services program proposals submitted by the administering agency.

Mr. President, the program proposed in my bill may seem modest in comparison with some that we have been considering in the 89th Congress. But I believe that it can make a significant and beneficial contribution to the economic and industrial growth of the several States and regions in this Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2083) to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise, introduced by Mr. Scott, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

TIME-AND-A-HALF OVERTIME PAY FOR ALL POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, by request of the administration, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide time-and-a-half overtime pay for all employees of the postal field service.

In recent hearings before the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office of the Committee on Appropriations, the Postmaster General explained the serious problems which have arisen in regard to work schedules and overtime, caused by the tremendous volume of mail which the Post Office Department handles and the financial limitations under which it operates. Postal employees all over the United States are working long hours to deliver the mail. Examples of work schedules have been brought to my attention demonstrating that many employees work 80 or 90 hours a week. There are about 57,000 temporary employees who are being used in an effort to fill the gap caused by the lack of permanent employees. The problem is one of the most important faced by the Department today. I know that the Postmaster General is making every effort to find solutions. I also know that the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of both Houses of Congress are studying appropriate measures.

Premium pay is certainly one of the solutions to be considered. At the present time, only regular career employees are paid for overtime. Substitute employees—who may also have career status—and temporary employees are not paid overtime compensation. They work side by side with regular employees but they are paid straight time. As I remarked during our Appropriation Committee's hearings, if such a situation existed in private industry, the Government would persecute the employer for violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. The Government must live up to the obligation it requires of private enterprise. This bill would help fulfill that obligation. It would give the Postmaster General the necessary authority and discretion to establish reasonable work schedules and provide premium pay when any employee is required to work more than 40 hours in a workweek. I am confident that it will go far to improve working conditions in the postal service and to life the morale and spirits of those employees who are not now compensated for working long hours at a hard job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2085) to provide for premium pay under specified conditions to certain employees in the postal field service, introduced by Mr. Monroney, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SEVERANCE PAY FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, by request of the administration, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish severance pay for Federal employees who are involuntarily separated from their position in the Federal Government through no fault of their own.

This bill would authorize severance pay when an employee is separated because his job is abolished or—and this has particular significance now for those working at military bases subject to be closed by the Department of Defense—when their installation is terminated or relocated.

The bill would authorize up to 1 year's salary payment for employees having many years of service. It is intended to bridge the gap between employment and reemployment. Many employees, particularly those 40 years of age or older, find it extremely difficult to adjust when their job is abolished. For junior employees who are terminated, it will provide 1 week's pay for each year up to 10 years, and 2 weeks' pay for each year in excess of 10 years. Employees 40 years old or older would receive an additional 10 percent of the total severance pay for each year their age exceeds 40. In no case will the severance pay exceed 1 year's salary, based on the salary received at the time of termination.

Severance pay has been characteristic of private enterprise in this country for many years. The Federal Government has no program of financial assistance to compensate employees who are separated through no fault of their own. The time has come for the Government to act—and act effectively—to help these employees readjust.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2086) to provide severance pay to certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Monroney, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 230

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he submitted the above amendment, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of Senator Magnuson be added as a cosponsor of S. 1991, the bill I introduced to improve the unemployment compensation program, at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of May 19, 1965:

S. 1993. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce: Mr. Burdick, Mr. Inouye, and Mr. Moss.

Authority of May 25, 1965:

S. 2025. A bill to provide for a voluntary wheat certificate program, under which the price of all wheat would be supported at not less than $2 per bushel: Mr. Cooper.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SILVER COINAGE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing on Wednesday, June 9, 1965, on the bill, S. 2080, to provide for the coinage of the United States. The hearing will be held at 10 a.m. in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

In view of the urgency of the matter and in accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, members of the public who wish to testify will be required to file written statements with the committee by 5 p.m., Tuesday, June 8, and to limit their oral presentations to brief summaries of their positions, not to exceed 10 minutes.

It is the committee's hope that we can hear within 1 day representatives of all segments of industry and the public interested in the matter. In lieu of personal appearance interested parties may submit statements to the committee for the information of its members and the Senate.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with this bill are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-3921.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Address by Representative Henry B. Gonzalez, delivered at commencement exercises at St. Mary's University, in San Antonio, Tex., on May 30, 1965.

ASSISTANCE FOR AREAS SUFFERING MAJOR DISASTER

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on April 30, 30 Senators filed a bill (S. 1861) to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster. The sponsors of this bill included, besides myself, both the majority and minority leaders of the Senate. The bill was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

No action has been taken to hold hearings or to report this bill to the full Senate for passage.

The bill was designed by its 30 sponsors to more adequately meet the needs of the thousands of people who have suffered millions of dollars in damage, not to mention personal hardship to themselves and their families, from the tornadoes and floods which ravaged many of our States this year. Unfortunately the Disaster Relief Act of 1950 does not adequately meet these needs.

Our bill, for example, would empower the Secretary of Agriculture to refinance a borrower's indebtedness, at interest rates as low as 3 percent and for a term as long as 40 years, under programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration; and a suspension of the payment of principal and interest charges would be permitted for a period of up to 5 years where necessary to avoid severe financial hardships. It would empower the Secretary of Agriculture to refinance a borrower's indebtedness for a term as long as 40 years under programs administered by the Rural Electrification Administration; and a suspension of the payment of principal and interest charges would be permitted for a period of up to 5 years where necessary to avoid severe financial hardship. Similar authority would be granted to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in the case of programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in the case of programs administered by the Veterans' Administration; and to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration in the case of programs administered by that Agency.

Matching grants on a 75 Federal, 25 State basis would be authorized to enable States to refinance outstanding home mortgage obligations which are not insured or guaranteed by any Federal agency, with interest rates as low as 3 percent and for a term as long as 40 years and with a suspension of the payment of principal and interest for a period of up to 5 years.

One of the major provisions of the bill would authorize the President to provide housing accommodations for any individual or family whose home was destroyed or damaged to such an extent as to be uninhabitable as the result of a major disaster where such action is necessary to avoid severe hardship and the owner or tenant cannot otherwise provide suitable housing for himself and his family. These people could occupy such housing for such period as necessary to enable them to find other decent housing which is within their ability to finance and at a rental which is within their ability to pay. Rentals could be adjusted or eliminated for a period of up to 12 months.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for another 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the Chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. In addition the bill would provide assistance to unincorporated communities, to local educational agencies where schools have been destroyed or seriously damaged, and to private owners of homes and businesses who have incurred emergency expenditures for the purpose of preventing damage from floods where the local government was unable to or failed to provide protection.

This legislation is urgently needed. But the only action taken by the Senate thus far has been passage of a bill by the senior Senator from Wisconsin permitting the Small Business Administration to suspend the payment of principal and interest on its loans for a period of up to 5 years, and to extend the period of a loan to 30 years. I might point out that the senior Senator from Wisconsin is also one of the sponsors of S. 1861.

There are reports being circulated that action on this bill is awaiting a green light from the Budget Bureau and the White House. It would seem that the people affected by these disasters have waited too long already.

In yesterday's Washington Evening Star one finds an article reporting that, only the day before, the President announced that he is requesting the Congress for an extra $89 million in foreign aid for South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos to relieve the poverty and neglect of the people in those areas. And, of course, everyone knows that the President and his administration is spending hundreds of millions of dollars under the so-called antipoverty program for economically deprived people in this country.

The inaction by the White House on our disaster relief bill is difficult to comprehend in light of these programs. Does not the White House care about the hardship and deprivation caused by the terrible disasters in our own country by tornadoes and floods? Thousands of American citizens, through no fault of their own, are without decent housing, without businesses, and without hope for recovery from the hardship which these disasters have brought to them—unless this legislation is given the green light by the White House and passed by the Congress.

I would say to President Johnson: These good people are waiting for you to act. Please do not make them wait any longer.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Evening Star to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRA $89 MILLION ASKED BY JOHNSON FOR ASIA AID—$50 MILLION SOUGHT TO HELP VIETNAM DEFEAT POVERTY AND NEGLECT AND REDS

(By Garnett D. Horner, Star staff writer)

President Johnson, promising that the United States will help South Vietnam defeat the "common enemies" of poverty and neglect as well as Communist aggressors, has asked Congress for an extra $89 million to expand economic and social aid to southeast Asia.

The President announced his request during a televised press conference in the White House East Room late yesterday and followed it up with what he called a very special message to Congress.

He also announced that he plans to address a special session of the United Nations General Assembly, meeting in San Francisco on June 24–46, to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the U.N. Charter signing.

The $89 million in additional economic aid funds the President asked Congress to appropriate for the 1966 fiscal year starting July 1 would go to South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos—more than $50 million of it to South Vietnam.

INTEND TO LEAD

Reminding Congress that "a vast revolution is sweeping the southern half of this globe," the President said:

"We do not intend that the Communists shall become the beneficiaries of this revolt against injustice and privation. We intend to lead vigorously in that struggle."

In South Vietnam, he said at his press conference, brave people are resisting those who would destroy their independence.

"They will win this fight," he said, "and the United States of America is going to help them win it."

But, he said, there is a much more profound struggle going on in South Vietnam, where the life expectancy is only 35 years as poverty and neglect "take their inevitable toll in human life."

"We think that these are the common enemies of man in South Vietnam," he added. They were there before the aggressor struck. They of course will be there when aggression is completely gone.

"These enemies, too, we are committed to help defeat."

MEDICAL AID PLANS

As part of the medical aid phase of the program, the President said members of the American Medical Association have agreed to try to recruit approximately 50 surgeons and specialists.

"We are particularly very much in need of plastic surgeons," he said, "to go to Vietnam to help (heal) the wounds of war, as well as (specialists) to help with the ravages of unchecked disease."

His message to Congress allotted $7 million of the $89 million requested to help provide improved medical and surgical services, especially in the more remote areas of Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

He said he hopes that "when peace comes, our medical assistance can be expanded and made available to the sick and wounded of the area without regard to political commitment."

The biggest single chunk of the extra aid fund—$45 million—would be allotted to finance increasing imports of iron, steel, chemicals, pesticides, drugs, trucks, and other essential goods necessary for a growing civilian economy in South Vietnam, the President said. He explained that this would provide materials for urgently needed low-cost housing as well as to expand factory production.

Another $5 million would be used to support electrification cooperatives near three provincial towns in South Vietnam, bringing the benefits of low-cost electricity to more than 200,000 Vietnamese.

MEKONG PROJECT

Approximately $19 million would be earmarked as the first installment of the U.S. contribution to accelerated development of the Mekong River Basin project. It would take care of half the cost of building the Nam Ngum Dam, providing power to small industry and lights for thousands of homes in northeast Thailand and Laos.

About $6 million would be used to train people in building roads, dams, and other village projects in Thailand and Laos.

The remaining $7 million, the President said, would supplement the present program of agricultural development and support additional Government services in all three countries.

He described the proposed $89 million appropriation as just the beginning of the U.S. part in helping to harness the resources of all southeast Asia for the benefit of all its people.

"Our role will be vital," he said, "but we hope that all other industrialized nations, including the Soviet Union, will participate."

U.S. leadership in such a program, he declared, "is the only way that I know in which we can really win, not only the military battle against aggression, but the wider war for the freedom and for progress of all man."

The President refused to say whether he would order U.S. troops into combat in South Vietnam in the event of an invasion from Communist North Vietnam. Rebuking his press conference questioner, he said, "I don't see that I can do you any good, the country any good, or myself any good, by suggesting future operational plans."

He also appeared to be taking a slam at some critics of his Vietnam policy when he said, "I am glad that I live in a nation where in the midst of conflict, when men are dying to preserve our freedom that our citizens still do not fear to exercise it—and I can assure you that they do exercise it."

He said he hopes that every American will always exercise the right of free speech guaranteed by the Constitution. But he added, "I would prefer, of course, that it be constructive and that it be responsible."

He said said he believed that public discussion of foreign policy generally has been responsible, and that his administration "profits from the suggestions and recommendations from leaders in other branches of government, from men who occupy public platforms, from general discussion."

Asking about the current flareup of fighting in Vietnam, he said such an outbreak had been anticipated at this season. He said there had been a "serious engagement" in the last few hours, with heavy losses by the South Vietnamese.

Addressing the U.N. General Assembly in San Francisco late this month, the President said the United Nations founding meetings there 20 years ago created "a great instrumentality for international cooperation" which has "helped to avert catastrophe in this century."

ESTABLISHMENT OF A PEACE BY INVESTMENT CORPORATION

AMENDMENT NO. 230

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk for printing under the rule, and appropriate reference, an amendment to the foreign aid authorization bill, S. 1837.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the amendment is offered for the purpose of incorporating a plan for the establishment of the Peace by Investment Corporation, very much like Comsat, in the foreign aid field. It follows legislation which I have introduced in the 87th and 88th Congresses, and which was introduced this year as S. 1992, with the sponsorship of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott].

The so-called Peace by Investment Corporation which would be created under this amendment would enable millions of small investors in the United States to participate in the growth of effective private enterprise in developing nations receiving U.S. aid. It is designed to expand by $2.5 billion the flow of U.S. private investment to developing countries. Initial and temporary funds for the Peace by Investment Corporation tataling $50 million would be subscribed to by the U.S. Government through the Treasury Department. The Corporation would also be authorized to borrow a total of $300 million from the Treasury during the first 6 years of its operation, while it was an agency of the United States. These initial subscriptions and borrowings would be retired with funds obtained from millions of small investors—as was done in the case of Comsat—through the sale of stock at a price of $5 per share. Upon retirement of the basic portion of the original investment in the project by the Treasury, the Corporation would go through an orderly transition from an agency of the United States to private operation and management.

In the 4 years since the idea was first promulgated, this proposal has been analyzed by the executive branch, by business and other groups, and in my view, the measure in its present form meets all objections raised against it successfully.

I believe that this amendment would provide new initiative in the foreign aid field, which is so hungry for new ideas, and for new approaches to do the things which international economic institutions and private enterprise have not been able to do. This proposal, heavily premised upon private enterprise, could fill this void, at least in part.

Mr. President, I hope very much that the amendment will receive the serious and considered attention of all Senators.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an analysis of the amendment.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Section-by-Section Analysis Presented by Mr. Javits

Section 1 sets forth the purposes of the bill which are to establish and expand people-to-people relationships in the economic field; to encourage an expanded flow of private capital investment from the United States into economically sound enterprises in underdeveloped areas of the world in the interest of world peace through mutual economic progress; to enlarge the number of private investors participating in this flow of capital so as to forge more direct links among the people of the world, and for other purposes.

Section 2 defines the basic functions of the Corporation which are (1) to serve as an equity investment agency which would make available funds of a private capital nature, to assist in the financing of economic development projects; (2) to act as an investment trust; (3) to establish an insurance system designed to protect all or part of the outstanding oversea investments of the Corporation against loss arising from any cause, including but not limited to political or military events; and (4) to establish a second insurance system to protect against loss for specific causes, not including mismanagement, all or part of the outstanding investments of private investors other than the Corporation in any oversea undertaking eligible for financial assistance by the Corporation.

Section 3 establishes basic criteria for the investment program of the Corporation. As a necessary condition for making such investments the Corporation would have to find that such project met sound economic criteria. The Corporation would also be required to obtain the views of the country in which the affected enterprise would be located. A further criterion of assistance would be that loan financing or equity assistance would not take the place of funds which would otherwise flow readily for the same purpose. Findings would also be necessary that the investment program in general was consistent with the policy of the United States to maintain maximum employment, production, and purchasing power within the domestic economy; that the program in general was consistent with the promotion of a satisfactory balance-of-payments position for the United States; and that the program in general was in accord with the general international economic and political policies of the United States.

Section 4 sets forth the means to provide basic financing of the Corporation. Subsection (a) states that to provide initial and temporary capital funds for its operations, the Corporation would be authorized to issue class A stock of 50 shares of par value of $1 million per share totaling $50 million. This class A stock would be subscribed to by the U.S. Government through the Secretary of the Treasury.

Subsection (b) authorizes the Corporation to offer for public sale 500 million shares of class B stock at par value of $5 a share provided that not more than 250 million shares of this class B stock in the aggregate, nor more than 75 million shares in any one year shall be sold so long as the Corporation remains an agency of the United States.

Subsection (c) authorizes the Corporation to issue from time to time, by purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, its notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations provided that the issue of such obligation shall not exceed $60 million in any one year nor shall the aggregate amount of such obligations outstanding at any one time exceed $300 million, nor shall any such obligations be issued more than 6 years from the date of the first issue, nor shall any such obligations be issued except so long as the Corporation remains an agency of the United States. Such obligations would be interest bearing and would have varied maturities not in excess of 20 years, with provision for retirement before maturity.

Subsection (d) provides that one-fifth of the proceeds of the sale of the class B stock be earmarked in a special fund for the retirement of the class A stock which would have to be retired in full within 6 years or less from the date of original issue of class B stock.

Subsection (e) states that except as otherwise provided in section 4 of this bill, all funds available to the Corporation pursuant to this section, and its earnings from its operations, shall be available for its general purposes under the act.

Section 5 describes the form of initial management of the Corporation.

Subsection (a) provides that the Corporation shall be an independent agency of the United States, until the conditions set forth in section 6 of the act are fully met.

Subsection (b) states that the management of the Corporation during its existence as an agency of the United States would consist of a Board of Directors of 15 members consisting of a President, and Executive Vice President appointed by the President of the United States, and five members appointed from private life by the President of the United States, all with the advice and consent of the Senate; four members appointed by the President of the United States from various U.S. agencies concerned with international economic developments; and the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Labor, serving ex officio.

Subsections (c) through (i) provide for the election of a Chairman, designation of an Executive Committee, the compensation of the Board, the President of the Corporation, and the Executive Vice President and authorized the President of the United States to appoint an Advisory Committee to the Board.

Section 6 establishes a method of transfer of the Corporation to private ownership and management. "When the class A stock of the Corporation has been retired in full within the period 6 years or less provided in section 4(d) of this act, the Board shall transmit to the President of the United States, for submission to the Congress, recommendations for such legislation as may be necessary to provide for the orderly transition of the Corporation from an agency of the United States to a corporation under private ownership and management, including (1) appropriate provision for transfer to the owners of the outstanding class B stock of the Corporation, the assets and liabilities of the Corporation, (2) appropriate provision for vesting in such owners of class B stock the exclusive voting power of the Corporation originally vested in the owners of class A stock, with each owner of class B stock being thereupon entitled to one vote per share, and (3) such additional provisions as may be necessary to protect any outstanding investments in the Corporation by the United States: *Provided*, That the President, in connection with such submission to the Congress, shall also provide recommendations as to whether a sufficient portion of the obligations purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 4(c) of this act have been retired to justify the transfer of the Corporation from public to private ownership and management.

"(b) In connection with such transfer, a complete and final accounting shall be made by the Corporation and the Government, at which time the Government shall receive reasonable compensation for all Government services rendered the Corporation."

Section 7 establishes general corporate powers and duties for the Corporation.

Section 8 sets up penal provisions.

Section 9 calls for periodic reports to the Congress.

Section 10 authorizies the Corporation to make certain studies.

Section 11 provides that this act may be cited as the Peace by Investment Corporation Act of 1965.

GREEK-TURKISH ECONOMIC COOPERATION PLANNED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a new international effort to encourage economic cooperation between Greece and Turkey.

While there is great public attention focused on Greek-Turkish tensions over Cyprus we must not lose sight of the all-important area where Greece and Turkey could cooperate most effectively and profitably with what could be a most healthy effect on the political climate of the whole region. The recent agreement of the Greek and Turkish Foreign Ministers at the May meeting of the NATO Foreign Ministers' Conference in London, to seek a peaceful solution to their differences over Cyprus has added an important impetus to this effort.

With the support of the delegates of Turkey and Greece to the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, of which I was then Chairman, the effort to encourage closer economic cooperation between the two countries got underway during the spring of 1964. It was dictated by the fact that both these countries were the less developed countries among the 15 NATO nations and that NATO countries should also help their own.

On May 24, 1965, the effort moved into high gear with the organization of a nongovernmental International Advisory Commission on Greek-Turkish Economic Cooperation, at a breakfast meeting held at the Ritz Hotel in Paris. The meeting was attended by 62 representatives of Turkish, Greek, United States, and European business, banks and foundations, as well as observers from international organizations and members of the Special Committee on Economic Development in Less Developed NATO Countries, of which I am Chairman, which was established in November 1964 to oversee this project on behalf of the 15-nation NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. I had the honor to chair the breakfast, assisted by the two Vice Chairmen of the Special Committee; Alexander Spanorrigas, member of the Greek Parliament and presently Deputy Minister of Commerce of Greece, and Kasim Gulek, prominent member of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey.

The purpose of the meeting was to explain the nature of the effort to the business community of NATO countries and to seek their support in implementing it. The reaction to the project was enthusiastic which shows every promise of proceeding along the same lines which made the ADELA Investment Company such a great success for Latin America. At the conclusion of the breakfast meeting an Executive Committee of the International Advisory Commission was established to act on behalf of the Commission between meetings.

A brief history of the project is as follows: In the spring of 1964 the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference agreed that an effort under its sponsorship to bring about economic cooperation between Greece and Turkey could make a significant contribution to development and peace in the southeastern European anchor of NATO. Consequently, the Committee requested that an extended study be made of specific areas where cooperative ventures between the two countries would be feasible and practical. With the support of the Louis G. Cowan Foundation and the Atlantic Institute in Paris, an American and a European scholar undertook a brief study of the feasibility of such a study under present circumstances.

These initial studies, which were completed in September 1964, concluded that cooperation between the two countries was feasible—despite tensions caused by Cyprus—in such fields as the development of the Evros—Maritsa—River Valley—which constitutes the borderline between the two countries in Thrace—tourism; the joint marketing of fruits and vegetables in northern Europe; and fishing, particularly involving conservation problems, the improvement of fishing methods. Other fields may include cultural and educational cooperation.

I visited Greece and Turkey last November and held extensive conversations with political, business, and academic leaders there. I was assured of their close cooperation. The reaction of leaders of such international organizations as the OECD and NATO has also been most favorable. I reported this to the plenary session of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in Paris during the week of November 16, 1964 which approved the project and created a special committee to implement it. I was elected chairman. Alexander Spanorrigas, of Greece, and Kasim Gulek, of Turkey, are Vice Chairmen. T. E. Westerterp of the Netherlands is rapporteur.

On March 26, 1965, the Ford Foundation approved a $150,000 grant to finance a major part of the cost of the studies which are now required; $12,000 in contributions have been also received from major American corporations with deep interest in the economic development of Greece and Turkey. Additional funds are being sought from European foundations and business.

It is our objective that within a period of not more than 2 years this effort will have resulted in several projects being put into effect by the two governments concerned or by the two governments concerned jointly with the private sectors—manufacturers, bankers, farmers, hoteliers of Greece, Turkey, and other NATO countries. If necessary, recommendations will also be developed to create new institutional mechanisms to implement one or more aspects of this effort. Experience in bistate cooperation in the United States, such as that between New York and New Jersey in the Port of New York Authority may very well be applicable in working out cooperative ventures in the development of the Maritsa—Evros—River's potential for irrigation, land reclamation and electric power.

For the further information of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that a paper submitted by me to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference last November describing the background of the Greek-Turkish project; a press release issued in Paris on May 24 concerning the organization meeting of the International Advisory Commission; a list of members of the Executive Committee of the International Advisory Commission; a list of the members of the Special Committee on Economic Development in Less Developed NATO Countries of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference; and certain newspaper reports concerning the project may be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATUS OF GREEK-TURKISH PROJECT

(Submitted by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS)

At the April 4, 1964, meeting of the Working Party, it was agreed that as its primary task the Working Party should encourage closer economic cooperation between developing countries of NATO, particularly between Greece and Turkey. Tourism was mentioned as one significant area for cooperation. I was requested to seek the support of U.S. foundations for a careful and extended inquiry of the feasibility of Greek-Turkish economic cooperation leading toward the establishment at a yet undetermined date of a Greek-Turkish Binational Commission. At the May 16, 1964, meeting of the Economic Committee, the Working Party program was approved and the effort to seek assistance from U.S. foundations was endorsed.

During the summer, I sent Mr. Peter Cusick, a consultant, to Europe to meet with key officials of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference and to acquaint them with the program of the Working Party, particularly with the effort to develop closer economic cooperation between Greece and Turkey. Mr. Cusick had conversations with the President of the Conference, Dr. George Kliesing, in Bonn, with the next President of the Conference, M. H. Moreau de Melen, in Liège, with the Rapporteur of the Economic Committee, Hon. Anthony Kershaw, in London, and with the Executive Secretary of the Conference, Mr. Otto van H. Labberton, in Paris. The key officials welcomed this effort and urged that it be pursued vigorously.

Preliminary to submitting formal application for funds necessary to undertake a major study, some evidence of the feasibility of Greek-Turkish cooperation had to be demonstrated. Such a preliminary step was also needed to provide an initial indication of areas where a beginning toward such cooperation may be possible.

With the assistance of the Louis G. Gowan Foundation, New York City, and the Atlantic Institute, Paris, two independently conducted studies were prepared during the early part of September. One study was prepared in New York by Dr. Harry Psomiades of Columbia University in New York. The other study, under the sponsorship of the Atlantic Institute in Paris, was undertaken by Torsten Gardlund, a European scholar. The latter based his findings on conversations with high-ranking government officials and businessmen during a 2-week visit to Athens, Ankara, and Istanbul.

The conclusions of the two studies, although independently reached, are remarkably similar. They both suggest several fields where cooperation between the two countries appear to be possible.

Their conclusions can be summarized as follows:

1. The joint development of tourism would be of substantial and practical benefit to both countries. Greece annually attracts over 700,000 tourists, earning it an annual income of over $80 million. Turkey receives about 200,000 tourists per year contributing close to $10 million to its annual foreign exchange earnings. The success of two other Mediterranean countries, Spain and Italy, give a clear indication of the potential benefits of tourism. In 1963, Spain earned close to $700 million from 8.8 million tourists, while Italy earned over $900 million from 8.3 million tourists.

Two geographic areas are suggested for further development: Thrace and the Greek Islands and the Turkish coast.

While Thrace is not endowed with major tourist attractions, it is the sole land route connecting Belgrade and Athens with Istanbul. Work continues on the Balkan Highway connecting Belgrade with Istanbul via Thessaloniki. Three bridges span the Maritsa, one at Edirne, and a railway bridge at Pythion. In 1950 the two countries agreed to share in the construction of a highway bridge between Paplos in Greece and Ipsala in Turkey (southern Thrace). The bridge was completed in 1960. What is needed in the area are improvements in the road network, tourist rest stops and aid stations. Since a greater number of tourists from Western Europe will be motoring to Greece and Turkey, planning should take into consideration the fact that motorists prefer to take the Belgrade-Thessaloniki-Istantbul route as one-half of their round trip and the Istanbul-Edirne-Sophia-Belgrade route as the other half of their round trip. Both routes pass through Greece.

For Greece, it will mean bringing some of the tourist trade to eastern Macedonia and Thrace which heretofore have been neglected. Tourists spots in the area of the famous Mosque of Mimar Sinan in Edirne—the Selimieh, the beaches of Thrace including the beautiful islands of Thrace and Samothrace, and archeological sites in eastern Macedonia.

The benefits of this cooperation are obvious for Turkey. Many of the cities of classical antiquity are on Turkey's Aegean coast: Ephesus, Troy, Pergamum, Halicarnasus, etc. Immediate benefits would accrue to Turkey if ferry services were established between the Greek-Aegean islands—Rhodes, Samos, Chios and Lesbos—and Western Anatolia. Rhodes and the Turkish coast should be given top priority because of the very large number of tourists who visit Rhodes. The added attraction of visiting areas on the Turkish mainland would serve as a further incentive to expand the tourist trade in Samos, Chios and Lesbos. A new ferry service should run from Piraeus-Rhodes-Marmaris or Fethiye. From Fethiye one can drive to Antalya and continue along Turkey's Mediterranean coast to Syria and Lebanon. A ferry service should also be opened at Antalya or Anamur to Cyprus and from Cyprus to Israel and the Arab world.

Ferry service has started between Piraeus and Izmir. But contact between the Greek islands and the Turkish mainland barely exists.

The raising of the curtain between the Greek islands and the Turkish coast would also make it easy for Greeks and Turks to visit each other's country and perhaps encourage local trade.

Joint efforts should include publicity campaigns, package tours and Aegean cruises, the ownership or leasing of ferry services, the provision of high quality tourist facilities and services, the creation of a regional hotel school and scholarships for students of hotel management.

2. The further development of the Maritsa (Evros) River Valley is suggested as another area with great potential for closer cooperation between Greece and Turkey. The Greek frontier with Turkey in Western Thrace is about 124 miles long, of which about 117 miles is the Maritsa River frontier. The key to the future development of the Maritsa Valley is increased livestock, and agricultural production—wheat, maize, cotton and fruit. About 250,000 Greeks and 350,000 Turks make their living from the soil of the basin area of the river. To improve the economic conditions of the inhabitants, measures such as new irrigation works, land reclamation projects and electrification will be necessary.

A beginning in this direction has already been made. After negotiations between Greece and Turkey in the early 1950's an agreement was reached in 1955 to establish joint flood control works for the river and also a jointly constructed bridge across it. This project represented phase 2 of the three-phase project recommended by a large American construction company for the U.S. economic aid program in 1951–52. The flood control works and the bridge were completed in 1960–61.

The two uncompleted phases of the project one involving improved land management and agricultural practice, the other the irrigation of 28,500 hectares of land, could serve as the basis of a new effort to significantly improve conditions in the area and to establish a sound and lasting basis for cooperation between the two countries.

3. The establishment of joint sea patrols would substantially reduce friction between the two countries over the violation of fishing waters and smuggling. Such patrols could be established to police fishing in areas where Greek and Turkish territorial waters meet or between the Greek Aegean islands and the Turkish coast. Fishermen suspected of poaching in the exclusive waters of their neighbor's country could be tried by special courts, with perhaps a representative from the fisherman's country. The joint patrol and its courts could also apprehend and try smugglers who historically have passed to and from the Greek islands and the southwest coast of Anatolia. The joint patrol could perhaps also render assistance to ships in distress and to earthquake victims. The Greek islands and the Turkish coast are in an earthquake belt.

4. In the field of agriculture two areas are singled out for closer cooperation between the two countries: (a) joint efforts in marketing agricultural products, and (b) the joint development of the fishing industry.

It is recognized that cooperation in the two areas are complicated by such factors as the competitiveness of the two countries' agricultural output and past controversy over territorial waters and fishing rights. Nevertheless, common action in the field ought to be pursued vigorously.

(a) Fruits and vegetables ripen earlier in Greece and Turkey than in western and central Europe. Both countries must improve the packaging of these crops. The major field of cooperation, however, would be in joint advertising campaigns in western and central Europe, and more important, in the joint handling and quick transportation of these crops to consumer areas. It is believed that fruits and vegetables grown in the Izmir area would arrive in better condition and would enjoy cheaper transportation costs if they were shipped from Izmir to Thessaloniki in Greece and then by rail to central and northern Europe. A joint investment in refrigerated railway cars and ships would benefit both nations.

(b) The major problem in the fishing area which requires Greek-Turkish cooperation is conservation, improvement of fishing methods and policing of fishing activity. Fish stocks like other natural resources are in need of rational management and follow certain biological principles. Policing of fishing activity is also necessary. Greek fishermen have, on several occasions, fished in Turkish waters, especially between the Greek and Aegean islands and the Turkish mainland. In recent months Turkey has announced the extension of her territorial waters from a 6- to a 12-mile limit. The problem of territorial waters and fishing rights can become a serious source of controversy. One need only refer to the controversy arising from the 1958 decision of Iceland to extend her territorial waters and exclusive fishing rights from the 4- to the 12-mile limit.

5. Cooperation in the allocation of resources and in the distribution of electricity are two other areas which could be explored over the long term. For example, Greece could serve Turkey's shipping and shipbuilding needs, and Turkey could help fill Greece's requirements for meat products, cereal, lumber, metal goods, and electric power. The feasibility of connecting the national grids of Turkey and Greece in Thrace and the extension of the Turkish national grids to include electric service for the Greek Aegean islands along the Anatolian coast should also be looked into. The possibility may exist to supply cheap electricity to Cyprus from the Turkish mainland which is believed to have excellent potential for hydroelectric power. In the spring of 1960, the Greek Public Power Corporation (PPC), completed the linking of the national grids of Greece and Yugoslavia. It is understood that the Greeks were also thinking at the time of linking their national grid with that of Turkey in Thrace.

Both studies rule out industry as a field for promotion through the Working Party on the ground that there is already an awareness of the need for industrial cooperation and that an adequate institutional framework appears to exist for this purpose.

In my judgement the two studies offer substantial proof that, despite current tensions between the two countries over Cyprus, there exist today areas of common economic interest—some of which are outlined above, which could be developed and encouraged through a soundly conceived and well-financed binational commission or commissions for the lasting benefit of the two countries and of the NATO Alliance. The history of Greek-Turkish relations during the past 30 years supports the belief that economic cooperation between the two countries is entirely possible.

In the pre-Cyprus days there existed a growing economic cooperation between the two countries taking the form of special neighborly agreements as well as a certain unity of outlook and policy in the field of international economic relations.

The two countries had mutually abolished visa requirements, and citizens of one country living in the other enjoyed special privileges as to work permits, establishment of enterprises, transfer of capital, etc., an agreement which in practice meant that about 10,000 Greek citizens were permitted to live in Istanbul in a privileged position. There was also an agreement on trade and payments between the two countries dating from 1953.

During the postwar period the two countries, both of which were given ample financial support from the United States, usually acted in fairly close cooperation at the various economic conferences. Both countries had also signed an association agreement with the European Economic Community—Greece in July 1961 and Turkey in September 1963.

For Greece the customs alinement with the Community starts immediately on the coming into force of the association agreement and will be attained during a transitional period of 12 years. For Turkey the transitional period for the customs alinement is also 12 years, but will start only after a preparatory period of 5 years. Although with a certain time differential, there is an identity in the overall economic perspectives of the two countries—both envisage their economic future in a European context, where modern production techniques from the West will be brought to a peripheral region with abundant labor supply and fairly rich climatic and raw material resources.

The exchange of goods and services between Greece and Turkey is exceedingly small: current trade between the two countries is less than 2 percent of their respective exports. In the perspective of continued industrialization of the two countries, there should nevertheless be scope for a certain coordination in the allocation of new industries in order to attain larger markets. In point of fact, a week before the Cyprus crisis, a Turkish delegation (consisting of the two leading industrialists, Koc and Eczacibasi, one of the directors of Tyrkie Ts Bankasi and the director of the Union of Chambers of Commerce and Industry of Turkey) visited Greece for the purpose of establishing contacts for industrial coordination.

During the year of the Cyprus crisis the situation as to economic cooperation between Greece and Turkey has quite naturally undergone a profound change. Turkey canceled all the special agreements—including those on visas, trade and payments, and privileges for the Greek citizens of Istanbul. Continued tension over Cyprus would necessarily orientate the economic interests in both countries toward peripheral regions, outward instead of mutually directed.

On the other hand, if a constructive and satisfactory solution of the Cyprus question can be found before the previous tendencies toward economic cooperation have lost all impetus, it becomes more meaningful to look for new areas of cooperation between the two countries. Although Dr. Gardlund's conversations in Athens, Istanbul, and Ankara with some leading representatives in the political and economic fields during the first 2 weeks of September 1964 have made him acutely aware of the dangers, there was on the other hand a hopeful sign in the fact that no one he talked to looked upon a discussion of future economic cooperation as wildly unpractical even at the present time.

On the basis of the foregoing considerations, I have submitted to the Ford Foundation in November 1964 a request for funds for a major study in depth of areas of potential economic cooperation between Greece and Turkey with the principal objective of developing specific projects to be put into effect by a future Greek-Turkish Binational Commission.

I am also quite hopeful that in view of the evidence presented in the two studies and the support expressed by key officials of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, by the former Secretary General of NATO, Mr. Dirk U. Stikker and by key government officials of several NATO governments, including the United States, the funds necessary for the study will be forthcoming in the foreseeable future.

GREEK-TURKISH ECONOMIC COOPERATION PLANNED

The project to encourage closer economic cooperation between Greece and Turkey moved into high gear today with the organization of the International Advisory Commission on Greek-Turkish Cooperation at a breakfast meeting held at the Ritz Hotel, Paris, attended by over 50 representatives of Turkish, Greek, European and U.S. business, banks, and research foundations in the presence of members of the Special Committee on Developing NATO Countries organized for this purpose at the 10th Annual NATO Parliamentarians' Conference held in Paris November last. The Chairman of the Special Committee, Senator Jacob K. Javits, of New York, chaired the breakfast session, assisted by the two Vice Chairmen, Alexander Spanorrigas, Deputy Minister of Commerce, Greece; and Kasim Gulek, member of the Grand National Assembly, Turkey. The Advisory Commission appointed an Executive Committee through which it will function between meetings.

The breakfast organization meeting of the Commission was followed by a meeting of the Special Committee held at the NATO Headquarters at which the work of the organization of the Commission was approved, and the Chairman, Senator Javits, was directed to proceed to obtain the services of Executive Directors for the purpose of carrying on the day-to-day functions of the project, to contract for the necessary research studies, and to maintain close liaison with the Governments of Greece and Turkey and the governments of the other NATO countries concerned, the business groups represented on the Advisory Commission, and the European and international organizations interested in this project.

The Ford Foundation of the United States, which has been responsible for the principal financing of the research to be done on the project, was represented at the organization meeting of the Advisory Commission by Amory Bradford, formerly vice president and general manager, New York Times. Senator Javits was also assisted by Seymour Rubin, former U.S. representative on the Development Assistance Committee. It is expected that a head office will be established shortly in Paris and that officers of the Advisory Commission and the Executive Committee will be announced as well as the Executive Directors.

Since the summer of 1964, the groundwork has been laid for extended study of specific areas where Greece and Turkey can cooperate economically to their mutual benefit. These have included the joint development of (1) the Maritsa (Evros) River Valley; (2) tourism; (3) marketing of fruits and vegetables in northern Europe; and (4) fisheries.

Senator Javits visited Greece and Turkey last November, met with Greek and Turkish leaders in business and government, and was assured of their close cooperation; meetings since that time have confirmed these assurances. The project also has enjoyed the support of the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Manlio Brosio, and the Secretary General of the Organization for Economic Cooperation Development, Thorkil Kristensen, and has had the sympathetic backing of a number of the NATO governments.

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION

Greece: Karol Arliotis, Banque Foncière Evangelos Devletoglou, Bank of Greece; Jean Karras, Greek Shippers.

Turkey: Nejat Eczacibasi, president of the Eczacibasi Ilac Fabrikasi, Istanbul; Tewfik Ercan, businessman, Istanbul; Huseyin Gülek, businessman, Istanbul.

Canada: (To be named.)

France: (To be named.)

Germany: (To be named.)

Italy: Dr. Piero Giustiniani, Montecatini.

Netherlands: Dr. P. Schoenmaker, director, van Doorne's Automobiel Fabriek, NV.

United Kingdom: G. J. R. Colville, director of Hill-Samuel Co.

United States: George F. James, senior vice president, Socony Mobil Oil Co.; Adm. John M. Will, chairman of the board, American Export-Isbrandtsen Lines.

NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON DEVELOPING NATO COUNTRIES—1965

Belgium: Senator J. van Buggenhout.

Canada: Herbert Gray.

Denmark: Niels Matthiasen.

France: Senator Y. Coudé du Foresto.

Germany: Dr. K. Birrenbach; Professor F. Burgbacher.

Greece: Alexander Spanorrigas.

Iceland: M. A. Mathiesen.

Italy: G. de Meo.

Luxembourg: Romain Fandel.

Netherlands: T. E. Westerterp.

Portugal: Ulisses Côrtes.

Turkey: Kasim Gülek.

United Kingdom: Anthony Kershaw.

United States: Senator Jacob K. Javits.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 25, 1965]

GRECO-TURK ECONOMIC ACCORD EYED

Paris, May 24.—Western businessmen today stepped in where politicians have failed and unveiled an ambitious project for economic cooperation between Greece and Turkey.

The businessmen hope the plan will open the way to improved political relations between the two countries.

The initiative was taken at a meeting here of more than 50 leading representatives of the banking and business communities of the United States, Europe, Turkey, and Greece.

The conference was sponsored by a special NATO parliamentarians committee set up last November with Senator Jacob Javits, Republican, of New York, as chairman.

THOROUGH STUDY

Senator Javits said his committee already had done the groundwork for a thorough study of specific projects, including the joint development of the Maritsa (Evros) River Valley, tourism, fisheries, and the marketing of fruits and vegetables in northern Europe.

The work now will be taken over by the International Advisory Commission on Greek-Turkish Cooperation, a private organization formed today by the businessmen.

The commission will have a 17-man executive committee which will be based in Paris and which is expected to hold its first meeting within 3 months.

At a press conference, Senator Javits stressed that the plans were nonpolitical. But he said they were based on the assumption that "in about 2 years from now, when preparatory work will be over, the Cyprus question will have been solved."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 25, 1965]

GREECE AND TURKEY

Paris.—Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York, participated in the creation of the International Advisory Commission on Greek-Turkish Cooperation, which is aimed at bringing closer economic cooperation between the two countries. The Commission was set up at a meeting of more than 50 Greek, Turkish, European, and American businessmen, which followed an initiative by Javits in 1964 to find areas in which the two countries, which are bitterly divided over Cyprus, could cooperate economically.

[From the London Daily Telegraph, May 25, 1965]

Greek-Turkish Cooperation Group Formed

Paris, Monday.—Closer economic cooperation between Greece and Turkey took a major step forward today with the creation of the International Advisory Commission on Greek-Turkish Cooperation.

The Commission was set up by a meeting of more than 50 representatives of Turkish, Greek, European, and U.S. businesses and banks.

Senator Jacob Javits, United States, said in Paris after the meeting that the groundwork had been already laid for a thorough study of specific projects. These included tourism, the marketing of fruits and vegetables in northern Europe, and fisheries.—Reuter.

PROPOSAL FOR TAX CREDITS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION EXPENSES GROWS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, students, parents, college teachers, and college administrators from all parts of the country are showing increasing concern for the rising costs of higher education. This concern has led to new interest and numerous expressions of support for my bill, S. 12, that provides income tax credits for higher education expenses.

I ask unanimous consent that a petition signed by members of the administration, faculty, and students of Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N.J., and resolutions of the University of Houston Student Association Senate, Houston, Tex., be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the petition and resolution were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Student Council,
Rutgers College,
New Brunswick, N.J., May 1, 1965.

Senator Abraham Ribicoff,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Ribicoff: The Rutgers University Student Council is very concerned with the financial problems of higher education.

We currently support the Committee on Undergraduate Education (CUE), an intercollegiate team working for a broad-based State tax for higher education in New Jersey.

On the Federal level, student council endorses by acclamation your tax credit for higher education bill.

Enclosed are petitions in favor of your bill, including one sheet signed by student council members.

Sincerely,

Henry N. Wallace,
Corresponding Secretary.

Petition and Names

We the undersigned students, faculty, and administrators of Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J., support Senator Abraham Ribicoff's aid-to-education bill that would grant tax credit of 75 percent of the first $200, 25 percent of the next $300, and 10 percent of the next $1,000 spent on tuition, fees, books, and supplies for a student at an institution of higher education.

Rutgers Student Council members:

Henry N. Wallace, Stuart B. Finfter, Robert L. Bluestow, B. D. Sadman, Eddie Dauber, president; Tom Kennedy, vice president; Steve Klein, James Mann, David Mason, Andrew R. Jacobs, Raymond I. Kinner, Jim Bunting, Barry Jay Sagotsky, Gary Baker, Thomas G. Getzmain, Gary L. Falkin, Leo P. Ribuko, and also signed by 200 other students.

Rutgers University Student Council.

University of Houston Student Association
Senate Bill No. 20

(Sponsors: Jerrold Pesz and Bill Walker)

A bill to support legislation introduced in the U.S. Senate by Senator Abraham Ribicoff, Democrat, of Connecticut, and cosponsored by Senator John Tower, Republican, of Texas, providing for income tax credit for expenses of college students at institutions of higher education

Whereas Senate bill No. 12, introduced in the U.S. Senate by Senator Abraham Ribicoff, Democrat, of Connecticut, and cosponsored by Senator John Tower, Republican, of Texas, provides for an income tax credit on $1,500 of tuition, fees, books, and supplies for a student at an institution of higher education; and

Whereas the Student Association of the University of Houston has been asked to support Senator Ribicoff's bill; and

Whereas this bill would be an effective aid to higher education and would be of benefit to many students and their families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the University of Houston Student Association:

Article I

That the University of Houston Student Association, which represents the students of this university, firmly supports this measure and urges the approval of this bill by the Congress of the United States of America.

Article II

That this bill, with supporting material, be sent to the Representatives and Senators from Texas, and to the President and Vice President of the United States, urging passage of this bill.

Passed by the student senate:

Richard Gaghagen,
President, Student Association.
W. A. Yardley,
Dean of Students.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION COVERAGE FOR AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I would like to express my support for and urge the prompt passage of S. 1991, the Unemployment Security Amendments Act of 1965.

This bill would for the first time provide unemployment compensation coverage for our Nation's farmworkers. It also brings about long needed improvements in the area of Federal-State unemployment benefits.

As chairman of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee I have studied the problems of our migratory farmworkers and have found that their employment periods, through no fault of their own, cover less than half of the year.

Agricultural workers at the present time are eligible for unemployment compensation benefits only in Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Yet, because of the uncertainty of their occupation, these are the people who most need unemployment compensation coverage.

The bill, S. 1991, would extend unemployment compensation coverage to all agricultural employees performing farm labor for employers who used more than 300 man-days of hired farm labor in any one of the four preceding calendar quarters. In effect, unemployment compensation benefits would be extended to farm enterprises using approximately four or five full-time employees during a calendar quarter. This test would cover approximately 78,000 farms and provide a coverage for over 750,000 farm employees. At the present time, these farm employees are not eligible for any form of Federal-State unemployment compensation.

The proposed minimum Federal standards in this bill on the number of weeks of employment which States may require for eligibility for unemployment compensation, and the extension of the duration of unemployment benefits, will also aid the American farmworker.

Farm jobs provide the average migratory farmworker with only 110 days of work during the year. Therefore, almost all State eligibility employment requirements would bar many farmworkers from unemployment compensation benefits. Under the bill, S. 1991, States would be prohibited from requiring more than 20 weeks of employment in a base period for a worker to qualify for unemployment benefits. In addition, States would be required to extend the payment of unemployment benefits for at least a 26-week period of time.

The proposed changes in our unemployment compensation laws are long overdue. Our agricultural workers have too long been excluded from unemployment benefits granted to the rest of our Nation's citizens. I, therefore, again urge the prompt passage of this much needed legislation.

L.B.J. AND SHRIVER, NOT CONGRESS, SHOULD DECIDE SHRIVER'S JOBS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the Javits amendment, barring Sargent Shriver from holding both his Peace Corps and poverty jobs at the same time was adopted by a voice vote over my objection. The Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] successfully amended the Peace Corps bill when the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who was managing the bill, surprisingly accepted the amendment.

The action occurred suddenly and without warning. Less than a half dozen Senators were on the floor. I am sure that the overwhelming majority of the membership of the Senate had no knowledge of this serious rebuff to the President—and Mr. Shriver—was going to take place.

After the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] made a brief presentation of his amendment, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee said in about 20 seconds that he would take the amendment to conference and the amendment was gaveled through.

There was no quorum call to alert Senators to this significant decision. In my judgment if this amendment had been subject to debate it would have been rejected overwhelmingly by the Senate. I hope and pray that when this amendment is considered in conference, Senate conferees on the Peace Corps bill will quickly recede. If ever an amendment could be said not to have been given full and thoughtful Senate consideration, it was this one.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee did not consider the amendment to have sufficient merit to include it in the bill. Not more than three Senators actually voted favorably on the amendment on the floor.

Mr. President, in my judgment, Sargent Shriver is as fine an administrator as this Government has. He ranks along with Secretary of Defense McNamara and a very few others as the best of President Johnson's excellent team of administrators.

The entire argument of the Senator from New York against Mr. Shriver is that good as he may be, two jobs of this degree of responsibility is one too many.

Now, Mr. President, just consider this situation from President Johnson's standpoint. Here is a President who has not two jobs of heavy responsibility but a list of jobs as long as your arm, each of which imposes far heavier obligation than the combined burden of the two jobs Sargent Shriver holds.

President Johnson is responsible for the execution of all of the myriad of Federal laws, and we know how seriously he takes this overall administrative responsibility. The President is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and does any Senator contend that the President is not on top of the full strategy and, indeed, much of the tactics involved in this immense duty?

President Johnson must maintain a steady day-to-day relationship with the American press and public. His speeches, his press conferences, his briefings of business, labor, and other leaders, all constitute the most vital kind of democratic leadership. The President must do this job with high excellence or he is a failure.

As we in Congress know so well, the President is the legislative leader. He takes the initiative. He exercises the veto. He involves himself in all the significant legislation that confronts this Congress. He involves himself personally—and we know he does.

The President—most important of all—has the heavy job of working constructively for peace with more than a hundred foreign countries. This job imposes subtle, complex burdens on the President. The quality of his decision cannot only decide peace or war, it can literally decide whether freedom or communism prevails in great sections of the world.

The President is the chief budget officer of this Government. He must submit a hundred-billion-dollar spending program to the Congress. He works on this project for many months every year. And all Senators who are aware of what's going on in this Government know that Lyndon Johnson studies, questions, analyzes every line of that document and modifies quite a few lines.

Mr. President, if this were not the morning hour, I could go on for several hours listing the immense number of jobs of great responsibility which President Johnson handles.

Now, of course, he can and does delegate much of his work to topflight assistants as every good executive must, but what is more important, he deeply involves himself in every great decision of his administration and gives the decision the benefit of his unique experience and judgment.

Here is a President who not only has this immense burden, but who does his job so superlatively well that at least two out of three Americans—including a majority of Republicans have expressed their approval of his performance and, during much of his tenure, three-quarters of the people of America have approved of the job he is doing.

Even more convincing than the polls is the fact that President Johnson's performance was endorsed in the last election by the greatest majority any President has ever received.

So the President is doing many different jobs, and he is doing them well and, many would say, brilliantly.

Does it not seem logical that the President should be free to select for two jobs one of his most brilliant subordinates, a man who has won international acclaim for the finest practical expression of America's idealism in the Peace Corps?

How easy it would have been for the Peace Corps to have fallen flat on its idealistic face with wild-eyed young messiahs rushing all over the world telling people how to run their own business. How swift and sure would have been the congressional and public condemnation of a program that does not directly help any Americans and costs over a hundred million dollars.

But the quality of Sargent Shriver's administration has been so high that the Peace Corps has become the shining success of both the Kennedy and the Johnson administrations. No program has done more to advance understanding, well-being, health, and human skill—all the ingredients of peaceful progress—throughout the world than the Peace Corps. And Americans—conservatives as well as liberals—enthusiastically applaud it.

Now under these circumstances, Mr. President, why not assign Sargent Shriver to the directorship of the Domestic Peace Corps, the poverty program?

The poverty program obviously needs the very qualities of excellence of personnel, deep personal commitment, the patience and perseverance and sheer love of underprivileged people which Shriver instilled so successfully into the Peace Corps.

Now how about the poverty program? Certainly it is controversial. It is new—radically new. It is costly, and it is going to cost a great deal more. No people in a large country have ever before taken on the tough, discouraging, aggravating job of eliminating poverty as we have under President Johnson.

He chose the best man in America for this particular job. The man and the program have suffered their share of brickbats, and the brickbats may get heavier and more frequent in the future. But the problem will not be solved by taking an administrator of proven excellence off the job. In any task as new and difficult as the poverty program, we can expect failures as well as successes. In the tough art of government, the most reliable tool we can work with is trial and error. In a new program designed to solve a problem that has never been solved, there will be many errors on which we must build. But I think President Johnson has done exactly right in assigning Sargent Shriver to the poverty program and keeping him also doing his great job with the Peace Corps. He has chosen the best man for both jobs.

One more word, Mr. President. The question is not whether or not there are enough hours in the day for Shriver to do two jobs. The question is whether Mr. Shriver can delegate sufficient authority in the two agencies so that each of them can operate efficiently and so that each can have the surpassing benefit of Mr. Shriver's great talents as an administrator. If the President can do many jobs well—with the help of able assistants and with sensible delegation—why cannot Sargent Shriver do two jobs well with the same kind of delegation?

Let us not be mousetrapped. Critics of the poverty program would love to get that program out from under Sargent Shriver's administration. Consider how much more vulnerable this highly controversial program would be without "Mr. Integrity" running it.

I know the distinguished Senator from New York admires Mr. Shriver as one having exceptional ability and being highly skilled in the administration of the antipoverty program. I know he has respect for him. But the consequence of forcing the President to remove Sargent Shriver from the program would be catastrophic.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, let us not be mousetrapped. I am not asking the President to take Sargent Shriver out of the antipoverty program; that is where I want him. I am asking him to take Mr. Shriver out of the Peace Corps program, because the very evangelism and excitement that Sargent Shriver gave to the Peace Corps programs may now begin to be missing. I am not alone in saying that; others are saying it. I placed in the RECORD on April 20, 1965, a column written by Roscoe Drummond, in which he said the Peace Corps is slipping.

I want that evangelism that Mr. Shriver had and I think there are other people in the country who are available to continue it—perhaps even one of his assistants in the Peace Corps.

Let us get on with the job. Let us keep Mr. Shriver in the antipoverty program, to be the watchdog and the figure that I believe he is, and that I said yesterday I felt he is. That is point No. 1.

Second. Why cannot the President of the United States cover all these jobs?

If he is going to cover them, let him cover them by assigning one person to each high position. I am sure there must be several assistants in each organization, all of them persons like Mr. Shriver, handling individual departments, who can do the job in depth in the departments. Then the President can, in fulfilling his constitutional duties, cover the field.

It is widely discussed that the greatest "whiz" in the administration is Secretary McNamara. Many people say of him that the ambit of his responsibilities is wide enough to cover him not only as Secretary of Defense, but also as something of a Secretary of State. If the Senator from Wisconsin thinks that Secretary McNamara, who has great power, is a good man, who works 18 or 19 hours a day, why not make him Secretary of State—notwithstanding that we have an outstanding Secretary of State—as well as Secretary of Defense? Why is it necessary to pay salaries to all the individual Cabinet members? Let one man handle all the positions, and the Government can save much more money in salaries.

That seems like a ridiculous suggestion, but that is what is involved here. It is anomalous and most unusual that the President should keep as the head of two such great agencies of the Government a single individual, especially so since that individual is a very good man, and especially so since everyone knows that one of the great threats of political infiltration in the disbursement of enormous sums of money, of dishonesty, and everything else that goes with it, is possible in the antipoverty program. It is traditional that the very people who need help the most are those who are the most often exploited.

Hence, my whole purpose—and I am obliged to the Senator from Wisconsin for enabling me to disclose my purpose—is to have Sargent Shriver concentrate his great ability on the poverty program, and the poverty program alone. I feel it would be a great disservice to the country to have him supervise two agencies, just as I feel it would be a great disservice to the country to try to have him stretch his supervision to two such vast programs, one of which is, in my judgment beginning to suffer now.

I have exactly the same high regard as the Senator from Wisconsin does for Mr. Shriver, for his ability, for his integrity, and for his efforts. He does not have to defend Mr. Shriver; I will defend him. Mr. Shriver is an outstanding public servant. It is because he is such an outstanding public servant that it is up to people like me, who see something wrong going on, to do something about it.

There was nothing sudden about what happened yesterday. It may seem to the Senator from Wisconsin to have been sudden.

I refer my colleague to the fact that I raised the question when there was a hearing on the nomination of Mr. Shriver to be Director of the antipoverty program, on September 9, 1964. When the confirmation of Mr. Shriver came up on the floor, I made the point that he should not hold both jobs. I could not oppose him, because he is such a good man. However, I reiterated the fact that it is wrong for a man to hold two such jobs, and that I would continue to protest until something was done about it.

I did continue to protest, in committee as well as on the floor. On April 26, 1965, on page 8427 of the Congressional Record, I protested. On May 18, 1965, in a hearing on the Higher Education Act before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I protested again.

The Peace Corps bill was called up very suddenly late yesterday. I had no particular notice of it, any more than did the Senator from Wisconsin. I should have been very glad to have engaged in a comprehensive debate and called every Senator to the Chamber. However, as frequently happens, Senators had been sent home and told that there would be no votes. When the matter was called up, I had no choice but to act with respect to it, as I had convictions upon the matter. The Senator from Wisconsin was certainly here and heard everything that went on.

I made it very clear, and am making it very clear now, that we are dealing with an outstanding public servant. It is we, in the performance of our legislative responsibility, who should deal with the question of what should be done with his time, in view of the fact that the President apparently—although he may change his mind—has done very little about this matter, but has permitted it to slide along.

Mr. Shriver does not give any indication that he has sought to hold the two jobs. I have asked him time and time again for his opinion. He has stoutly refused—and I can understand that—to give an opinion. He said:

> The President has given me the two jobs. There is nothing for me to do but to do the best I can. I have worked very hard.

I know that he has worked very hard. He said:

> I will do my utmost to do justice to the two jobs.

Therefore, in order to resolve the Gordian knot, I offered my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask that I may be permitted to continue for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New York is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as the Senator has said, the amendment is contained in the bill. The bill will go to conference. The House will have an opportunity to reconsider it. The bill will come back to us with a conference report. There will be plenty of time and opportunity to reconsider the matter, in addition to the time and opportunity which have already been afforded.

I have great regard for the judgment of the Senator from Wisconsin. I have read his statement. The Senator was very gracious. He gave me notice that he would make his statement promptly at noon. I believe that I have answered the point that the Senator makes in his statement—at least, to my own satisfaction. I feel secure in the action which I initiated yesterday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point relevant excerpts from the transcript of the hearings before Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on September 9, 1964, on the nomination of Mr. Shriver to be Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, excerpts from the transcript of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on May 18, 1965, on the Higher Education Act of 1965, a letter which I wrote to Mr. Shriver on March 4, 1965, and Mr. Shriver's reply dated March 15, 1965.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Senator Javits. Mr. Shriver, do you consider the job of being head of the Peace Corps a part-time job?
>
> Mr. Shriver. I do not think that my record, in performing that job would lead anybody to that conclusion, Senator.
>
> Senator Javits. Well, you say in performing that job. Are you the head of the poverty program now?
>
> Mr. Shriver. No; I am not the head of the poverty program, and I shall not be the head of the poverty program until I am confirmed by the Senate.
>
> Senator Javits. Then I do not quite get the point. You say in performing that job. What job are you talking about?
>
> Mr. Shriver. You asked me if I considered the job of directing the Peace Corps a part-time job. My reply was that my record on that job would not leave anybody with the impression that it is a part-time job.
>
> Senator Javits. I misspoke myself. Do you consider being the head of the poverty program a part-time job?
>
> Mr. Shriver. I see. No; I do not consider the head of the poverty program as being a part-time job.
>
> Senator Javits. In that case, how do you square it with keeping the Peace Corps job and being head of the poverty program, or are you going to give one up?
>
> Mr. Shriver. It is not my privilege or my intention to either give up one or retain both. That is a matter within the discretion and the judgment of the President of the United States.
>
> Senator Javits. What do you think? You are here for confirmation. You are the man seeking confirmation. You have, for my money, the best sponsor in the Senate, our beloved colleague, Paul Douglas. Do you seek our confirmation on the ground that if the President will let you, you will keep both jobs? You are not resigning them, are you?
>
> Mr. Shriver. I am here not to parade my credentials and I am very honored to have with me the senior Senator from Illinois. I am here only to respond to the extent that I can to questions on the jobs and the duties which are given to me. If the President of the United States considers it possible and desirable for me to handle both of these jobs, I certainly will give them both the maximum of my ability. That is not to say that either one of them is a part-time job.
>
> Senator Javits. Do you think therefore, that if I, as a Senator, thought poverty and Peace Corps were both full-time jobs, I should vote against you? Not that you are a bad man—I think you are a very good man—but that you are a very good man for one full-time job and not two full-time jobs.
>
> Mr. Shriver. This is a matter of definition. I can remember in the old days, Christy Mathewson used to pitch every other day.

He had a very fine record. In one season, he won over 40 games. Some of the other pitchers used to pitch every 4 days and those were full-time jobs but Mathewson just happened to be a very fine pitcher.

Senator Douglas. May I interrupt to say the people from the East sometimes underestimate the energy and ability of the Middle West.

Senator Javits. I would say to my friend from the Middle West that westerners often underestimate the good sense of easterners.

May I ask you, Mr. Shriver, now, whether you believe that you can keep both these jobs and do equal justice to both of them, notwithstanding that you, yourself, say they are both full-time jobs?

Mr. Shriver. As I said a minute ago, Senator, all I can say is this, That I will give them both the maximum of my ability and time. It is a decision of the President of the United States to determine whether or not I am able to do both adequately in his judgment.

Senator Javits. But you are going to keep them. In your judgment, you can do both adequately. You are not just a martinet, obeying the orders of the President; you are making up your mind that you can do this job well, is that not true?

Mr. Shriver. No, I am not a martinet, thank you, or I hope not, anyway, or a puppet. But I am anxious to do what I can in response to the President of the United States, as I think nearly all citizens in these United States are anxious to do. Therefore, I am going to do what he asks me to do to the extent of my capacity and ability.

Senator Javits. Do you believe you can carry both jobs?

Mr. Shriver. I think that is a question the President of the United States will be able to decide, and I will be able to decide, also, on my record.

Senator Javits. You have no question about it as you come to us for confirmation? As far as you are concerned, you do not know whether you can or cannot.

Mr. Shriver. That is not the question.

Senator Javits. That is my question.

Mr. Shriver. I understand. I am just trying to say the question, however, is whether the President considers it advisable and possible for me to do both jobs. Certainly, as long as I have both, which may be a short time, may be a long time—that is his judgment—I will do the best I can. I am not seeking and I have never sought either job.

Senator Javits. Well, you are going to be a high official of this Government. Do you wish us to believe that you have no opinion about this matter whether you can handle both jobs? You are taking both jobs without an opinion that you can handle it?

Mr. Shriver. Well, there is on the record the fact that during the planning period for the poverty program, I have had responsibility for the planning of the program. It also might as well go on the record that during this period, I have also been running a foundation, the Kennedy Foundation, which is an important responsibility.

I am also very lucky in the fact that at the Peace Corps, we have an extraordinarily able staff of people who now have the substantial experience with the Peace Corps. As a matter of fact, we have five Associate Directors at the Peace Corps and for the last 3 months, all five of those jobs have been filled simultaneously for the first time since we started the Peace Corps. They are filled by men who have had substantial experience with the Peace Corps. So that the operation of the Peace Corps is no longer quite the same as it was in the first days, when we had to find and train a whole new cadre of people to run an entirely new program. That program, the Peace Corps, I have said on a couple of occasions, is working embarrassingly well at a time when I am also devoting some effort to the antipoverty program.

The Peace Corps is in fine shape and the men who are connected with it are doing excellent work, so I think if it ever were possible for this to work effectively, now is the time.

Senator Javits. Am I to assume from what you now say that you do believe you can do both jobs, notwithstanding that they are both full-time jobs?

Mr. Shriver. As I say, I do not feel that I should advance my opinion about whether I can or cannot do something. There is a person responsible for the executive branch of the U.S. Government, the President of the United States. His opinion is what is important here, not mine. All I am trying to do is to do the best I can in response to his recommendations.

Senator Javits. Now, we have a responsibility, too, to confirm you here in the Senate; if we do not confirm you, you do not get the job. I as a Senator sitting on the committee considering your qualifications am asking you directly, do you believe you can handle both jobs? It is not an answer to tell me the President believes it. I am asking you whether you believe it. Do you or do you not?

Mr. Shriver. All I can say is so far, I have.

Senator Javits. And you will not tell me whether you believe you can or not.

Mr. Shriver. I am not going to take that position, Senator Javits, despite that fact that you feel, evidently, that I should make a categorical statement on it, for several reasons: first of all, it is not my decision. Second, I have run both of these jobs so far with a reasonable amount of success. Third, nobody can predict exactly what will happen in the future. It may be that 2 days from now, the President may relieve me of one of these jobs. He may relieve me 2 months from now. That is his decision to make. I certainly do not want to prejudice his opinion or his freedom of discretion or choice by making any statements here which presume anything.

Senator Javits. You do not want to advise us as to whether you pledge yourself in your own judgment to be able to handle both jobs, bearing in mind that though you have been active in the legislative end of this thing, you still have not run the poverty job. You now would run it if you were directing it. There are lots of things you have to do, which you know even better than I.

Mr. Shriver. I pledge myself to do the best of which I am capable, and I think on the record, the Senate, you included, would have reasonable cause to believe that I will do that.

Senator Javits. And you are not giving us the benefit of your conviction that you can do both jobs?

Mr. Shriver. No, sir; I am not giving you the benefit of my convictions; I am giving you the benefit of the President's convictions, which I think are a lot more important.

Senator Javits. With all respect, Mr. Shriver, I think we ought to have your convictions that you can handle both jobs. We are confirming you, not the President. He has recommended you. We have the power to confirm or deny the recommendation. I think we have a right to know whether or not you think this is a job you can do. You are not giving us a direct answer. In my opinion, that is unsatisfactory.

* * * * *

Senator Javits. Is there any implication in your holding both jobs that the poverty program is only a temporary program?

Mr. Shriver. Well, I held the Peace Corps job under the same statutory provisions for 3½ years now. It depends on what you mean by "temporary," I suppose.

Senator Javits. I was not speaking about the statutory provisions. I ask if there is any implication in the fact that you are taking two full-time jobs that the latter job, to wit, the poverty job, is just a temporary one?

Mr. Shriver. I have not heard any such implication drawn by anybody. I see no reason why that implication is inevitable, no.

Senator Javits. How much time are you giving yourself to decide whether, as an honest man, you can hold both jobs?

Mr. Shriver. Well, as I say, I think that is a decision for the President to make. I feel that I can be honest in saying to you that I am going to give both jobs the maximum. Some people work 8 hours on a job and some people work longer. Usually I work longer.

Senator Javits. I think I do, too.

Mr. Shriver. I know you do. I know everybody here does, but I am talking about people who manage things rather than legislators.

Senator Javits. Do you think we have to wait until one of the jobs breaks down before deciding you cannot handle both, or are you going to let us know if you decide?

Mr. Shriver. As I say, there is somebody whose responsibility that is. That is the President of the United States. His job is to manage the executive branch, and if he sees either an individual breaking down or a job breaking down, it is his responsibility to replace the individual or modify the job and I have absolute confidence in him as the Chief Executive to take such action as is needed.

Senator Javits. You have such confidence that you will not even tell us? You are going to wait?

Mr. Shriver. The thing about this President and the previous one, they do not have to wait for somebody to tell them. They seem to find things out pretty rapidly themselves.

Senator Javits. The workers in the executive branch of every President attribute to them supernatural powers which they did not have before they became President.

Mr. Shriver. I have had the highest opinion of the ability of both President Kennedy and President Johnson in this respect.

Senator Javits. I do not believe that this President or his beloved and revered predecessor or President Eisenhower, or any of our Presidents, suddenly develop supernatural powers. I respectfully submit, Mr. Shriver, that this part of the whole proceeding disturbs me greatly. It has from the beginning. I believe that it is your duty and I state this unilaterally, even though you do not apparently agree with me, to inform the Senate which has confirmed you, as it undoubtedly will, and the President, as an honest public servant, if you find what seems to me very likely to be the case, that it is almost impossible to do justice to two enormous, full-time jobs like this, and with all respect for your great talents, and you have them. You have been very widely and much applauded and deservedly, in our country—I am the first to say that. I just think that to do justice to these two monumental efforts, really bring them to the point of development and expansion they deserve, is any man's full-time job for every conceivable waking hour, including Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. With that, sir, I bid you farewell.

Mr. Shriver. Thank you, sir. I might say the President does not have to find these things out unilaterally, by himself. After a person becomes President, they have something called the Bureau of the Budget which looks around to see what is going on, and they also have a very capable staff in the White House which observes things pretty well. So the President has information from persons in the executive branch and elsewhere which are not open to other individuals even though there are those like Presidents Kennedy and Johnson—before they become President. So there are ways for them to find out how things are going, without having to do it unilaterally.

Senator JAVITS. It is my opinion that you have a responsibility to let us know how you feel about whether you can handle both jobs. That does not diminish my respect and friendship for you, which continues just as it did before, except that I really seriously question the advisability of this plan.

Mr. SHRIVER. Let me say this, sir, if I may make this one comment, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MCNAMARA. Go right ahead.

Mr. SHRIVER. Obviously, when I am working for President Johnson, if I am confirmed to this job, I will be giving him my best judgment about how the work is going and whether I need more assistance or whether he ought to give somebody else the job. There is no question about that. I will advise him as my boss, progress or lack of progress. I just feel that it is his decision, no matter what I tell him, as to whether he wants me to continue or not continue. That is the decision I do not want to prejudice by making any statement here. Obviously, I will give him my best judgment as to whether I should or somebody else should take on both of these jobs.

Senator JAVITS. I think that is better.

Senator MCNAMARA. Senator RANDOLPH, do you have any questions or comments?

Senator RANDOLPH. Senator DOUGLAS, Mr. Shriver, my opinion, for what it is worth, in reference to the matter of holding two directorships, the Peace Corps and the economic opportunity program, is that President Johnson will not ask you to hold both positions. That is my personal feeling. Since it has been a matter of comment and colloquy here today, I would like to have the record indicate my feeling in this regard. I believe that you have the capacity to hold two positions, perhaps even more than two positions, but it is my opinion and my belief and my hope that it will not be necessary for the Chief Executive to divide and decrease your leadership in the programs of the Peace Corps and economic opportunity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a biography can never adequately convey to me the depth and breadth of a man's ability to do a particular job in the public service. But I would want the record to indicate insofar as this Senator is concerned I shall vote affirmatively on the pending nomination when the committee goes into executive session to consider Sargeant Shriver for the position for which he appears. I would want the record to indicate further that in my approximately 20 years of service in the House and in the Senate, I have known few men in the Federal Government who had more conviction, more courage, and more compassion than the man who sits before us today. I am not attempting now to add up the pluses or subtract the minuses or in any way to divide a man's affirmative and negative qualities. I am just saying that on the overall opinion which I express today, I am very happy in the privilege of supporting the pending nomination.

Senator MCNAMARA. Senator METCALF, do you have any questions or comments?

Senator METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to make any comments. I am delighted that my good friend, the Senator from New York, has brought out the fact that there is nothing that will interfere with the service of Mr. Yarmolinsky. He is a dedicated and devoted public servant, and I feel he has unique attributes to carry out this antipoverty program. I hope that his talents will be used in the program.

I want to compliment you on your responses to Senator JAVITS. I feel that it is not your duty to tell us whether you can handle both jobs; it is our duty to make up our minds, and it is the President's duty to make up his mind. I feel that the superb organizational and administrative job that you have done in the Peace Corps indicates that you can do a similar job in our antipoverty program. President Johnson has a job that is far beyond any of the problems that any of us can envisage in either the Peace Corps, the antipoverty program, or any other department. Likewise Secretary McNamara and Secretary Rusk. If they can do their jobs, I know with your background and your record of superb performance, you can do both jobs and will do them well.

I shall vote for your nomination.

Senator MCNAMARA. Thank you, Senator. There was some question as to why I skipped Senator PROUTY. I think I should point out for this record that the Senator whom I called on has to leave very shortly. He must preside at the convening of the Senate at 12 o'clock. So for that reason, we apparently skipped Senator PROUTY.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will he be called upon to open the Senate with prayer also, today? He has doubled in the Senate. He has held two jobs, in effect.

Senator METCALF. Yes; I had to hold two jobs at one time.

Senator MCNAMARA. Senator PROUTY?

Senator PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the minority, I am accustomed to being passed over on occasion. I certainly understand the situation here and am very glad to have you recognize Senator METCALF.

Mr. Shriver, your past achievements leave no doubt in my mind concerning your ability to administer the Economic Opportunity Act in a very effective manner, and I intend to vote for your confirmation. As you know, I did have some reservations concerning certain facets of the program, although I did vote for it on final passage. Some of those reservations were taken care of through amendments in the Senate and the House. I certainly hope as strongly as anyone could hope that this program will succeed and do what it is intended to.

However, I do share Senator JAVITS' reservations as to one man's ability, regardless of his competence to administer both of these two vitally important programs. I hope that you will give serious consideration to your ability to do that and will make your position known to the President. We want both of these programs, and I am sure you do. But it seems to me an almost herculean task to ask of any one man, regardless of his ability, that he assume responsibility for both programs.

MAY 18 HEARING

Senator JAVITS. * * * I have just one other item, Mr. Shriver. One, I still have enormous admiration for you as an administrator. Two, I still believe you shouldn't hold the two jobs you do. And three, I wish you would think very seriously, because I intend to do it, unless you show me a good reason to the contrary, I think you should think very seriously about whether or not you should just stick to the poverty job and ask the President to turn the other one over to somebody else.

Mr. Chairman, I feel when this poverty bill is before the committee I shall raise by amendment this question of the administration having the one job. But if Mr. Shriver feels very strongly about it, he has always felt that he leaves it to the President and if the President wants him to wear two hats, he feels very strongly about it, I certainly am open to persuasion if there is a good reason but I must say every time I see a piece in the paper about the fact that the Peace Corps is or may be lagging, I just wonder why you take a good man like this one, serving his Government with extraordinary ability and patriotism, and split him in two.

Mr. SHRIVER. I would like to say on that, if I may, Senator JAVITS, as you know, I wrote you a letter on that subject——

Senator JAVITS. March 15.

Mr. SHRIVER. In which I tried to put down my position as clearly as I could.

Senator JAVITS. Would you like me to put that in the record?

Mr. SHRIVER. No. That is fine. I am very happy. I just want to say, however, for the record I hope it is clear to this committee as it is I assume to everybody else, since this question has been asked of me a number of times, that I didn't ask for either of these jobs and I didn't insist on keeping either one or both, and I have on numerous occasions proposed other people to do one or both of them and I take the position very simply that I work in the executive branch and we have a Chief Executive of the U.S. Government and I feel that it is his responsibility, I mean, it is obvious that it is his responsibility to make sure that in his judgment programs are being executed satisfactorily to him.

Now, with respect to the Peace Corps, the spate of articles that came out, I also wrote you about them and also I wrote, took the opportunity to write to the author of them to indicate that there really isn't any substance to those allegations. I mentioned here earlier, Senator MORSE, that when the Peace Corps got started many people thought it was a phenomenal thing that 14,000 or 15,000 people would volunteer to serve in the Peace Corps which they did in the first year, and I can remember quite vividly obviously since I was in them, I can remember the cartoons showing me being inundated with a flood of applications and that was on the basis of the 14,000 or 15,000 applications.

In the first place, as I said earlier in the testimony, VISTA has gotten more applications in 7 months than the Peace Corps got in its first year. And the Peace Corps this year will have about 46,000 applications which is whatever that is, 4 times, 3 times what we got when everybody said we were being inundated with applications.

In addition to that, the quality of the Peace Corps applications has gone up rather than down and out of the total number who apply today, more of them are readily usable by the Peace Corps than was true in the first group and that stands to reason I suppose because as people get to know more about the requirements of the Peace Corps, those who are not eligible don't even bother to fill out an application.

The result is that this year right now, at this minute, we have somewhere in the neighborhood of 2,000 to 3,000 more people who have applied and who are eligible for Peace Corps service than we had last year at this time. And last year we had something like a 20-percent increase over the previous year.

Now, the number of applicants and the quality of the applicants and quality of the volunteers has steadily gone upward. Now, this is not attested to simply by me but by the people who run the selection division. There have been four people run it, so it is not just one fellow's idea. One was a man named Nicholas Hobbs, president right now of the American Psychological Association, he was succeeded by a man named Lowell Kelly, head of the Department of Psychology at Michigan and had been previously president of the American Psychological Association, third was a man named Dr. Edward Henry, in charge of all the industrial psychology of Standard Oil of New Jersey, who was in charge of employing and selecting people for Standard Esso all over the world.

And the present man is Dr. Abraham Carp who assisted in selecting astronauts for the Air Force.

These people are among the most distinguished men in America in the job of selecting people for service, whether it is astronauts or Peace Corps volunteers.

Senator JAVITS. Would you yield, Mr. Shriver?

Mr. SHRIVER. I just want to——

Senator JAVITS. It is 11:18.

Mr. SHRIVER. I just want to make——

Senator JAVITS. You are now on your own time.

Mr. SHRIVER. Fine. If I could have a minute, I would like to say all of these men would be happy to come here and testify. They testified in writing that the quality of the Peace Corps volunteers is as good today as it has ever been and some of them think including the current man that it is better.

Therefore I am not advancing my theory about whether the quality is good or the numbers are adequate. I am resting on what they say and they operate in a completely professional environment in our place, not subject to pressures from financial sources or political sources to get people in or out of the Peace Corps. The selection has been completely scientific, if you will. At least it has been professional. And I think that the people now coming in the Peace Corps this summer will put 6,200 youngsters and older people, too, into training.

That is the largest entering class I think of any university in America. It is just like opening up a college with 6,000 freshmen. They will all go to school this summer in preparation for service abroad. That is the largest that it has ever been.

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Shriver, you have shot a fine arrow but it has missed the target and for this reason. Again it is so hard to separate this from you. You are a fine man and I like you no end and I think you are an outstanding public servant and if that helps you get elected Governor of something, that is too bad.

Mr. SHRIVER. Did you say "or something" or "of something"? Did you say that was too bad?

Senator JAVITS. I didn't finish my thought. Why I say you missed the target—you see in those days, Mr. Shriver, when you were going around and making the most of the tremendous morale factor which is the Peace Corps in this Nation to our young people, you were doing the job that I would visualize as optimum for the head of the Peace Corps. There is no substitute for that. And that kind of evangelism, which I think is tremendously useful to the country, you have no business to do now. You just couldn't take the time away from this tremendously important poverty job you have got and I just think that we are straining the resources of one able man beyond what the Nation ought to ask of him and that it does deprive the Nation to some extent of a quality which you gave the Peace Corps which only a director can give it and which I think is extremely useful to the Nation over, above, and apart from the technical operation of the recruitment of the good people itself. That is really the main point I make.

Mr. SHRIVER. I only mentioned the other because simultaneously with your criticism you put into the RECORD articles by newspaper people who made these allegations which I am putting on the record to be untrue.

Senator JAVITS. That is right.

MARCH 4, 1965.

Hon. SARGENT SHRIVER, Jr.,
Director, Peace Corps,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SARGE: As you know, I have in the past expressed some concern over your holding two important full-time positions in this administration, as Director of the Peace Corps and as Director, Office of Economic Opportunity.

Inasmuch as you have now had several months experience in these two important positions, I would greatly appreciate word from you on how this is working out. Have you been able to give effective and satisfactory direction to each of them, comparable with what you gave the Peace Corps before you took on both jobs?

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS.

PEACE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1965.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Thank you for your letter which I receive on March 8 concerning my responsibilities as Director of the Peace Corps and as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

My response to your question can be brief: It is my obligation to continue to do my best at both tasks as the President has requested.

Obviously, I am not spending the same amount of time at either job as I did with the Peace Corps when that agency was my sole responsibility in its early days. Perhaps this is not a valid comparison, however. We have an experienced, tough-minded Peace Corps staff at work at home and abroad. Our programs are established and successful. As well, we have gained much knowledge from the Peace Corps efforts which has helped in our organization and initial implementation of program in the war on poverty. This is a special advantage which continues.

Moreover, the staff at OEO is extraordinarily competent, experienced and hardworking. It's encouraging that so many outstanding men and women have rallied to this cause. They bear most of the burdens and certainly deserve the largest part of the credit for our success.

You have asked me also whether I "have been able to give effective and satisfactory direction" to both programs. I am not the one to judge. That's the President's job. He is the Chief Executive. All of us in the executive branch do our best to help him bear the immense burdens of his office in the ways he asks us to serve. That's all I'm doing. But in doing it I'm encouraged and rewarded by the extraordinary popularity of both the Peace Corps and the Office of Economic Opportunity with the people. It was not always so, especially in the early days of these agencies. But, now even public opinion polls and a recent survey of economists made by the Chase Manhattan Bank reveal widespread support for and satisfaction with our efforts.

I do not ask, however, to be continued in either of these positions personally satisfying though they both are. I shall continue only to perform to the best of my ability in the responsibilities asked of me by the President as long as he requests me to do so, and my continued good health and other responsibilities permit.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, once again, I state that I have great regard for the Senator from New York. I appreciate his sincerity in this matter. I am sure that the Senator means it when he states that he has such respect for Sargent Shriver.

But now the Senator from New York changes his tune. No longer would he tell President Johnson to put Shriver in either job—not both. Now he says—yank Shriver off the Peace Corps job or we kill the Peace Corps.

I wonder how many Senate votes the Senator from New York would get for a proposal to force President Johnson to fire Shriver from the Peace Corps job where Shriver has done a job internationally recognized as magnificent.

The Senator from New York has carried on a campaign on this issue for some time. He has done so in committee and on the floor. Until yesterday's sudden, semisecret blitz, the Senator has never had success with this issue. He has agreed that yesterday's action was sudden and that other Senators were not on the floor. He has agreed that there was not a quorum call. There was no notice. The amendment went through in about 20 seconds. There was no real opportunity to debate or oppose the amendment. There was very sudden action.

For the record, and for the consideration of the members of the conference committee, I believe that they should fully realize that no opportunity was afforded to Senators to debate the amendment before a decision was made on it.

The Senator from New York contends that we shall have an opportunity to act when the conference report comes back to us in disagreement. But we all know that conference reports on bills of this kind afford no real opportunity to delete an amendment. We vote for or against the Peace Corps and the amendment. As one inseparable entity. There is very little likelihood that we would kill the Peace Corps. Therefore, if the conferees agree, the Senate has no further recourse.

The discussion and debate between the Senator from New York and myself, it seems to me, should underline the unwisdom of having Congress decide who should head what department. This is a matter that should be decided by the President so long as we have any faith and confidence in him. I have great faith and confidence in President Johnson. When the President makes mistakes in recommending legislation, I believe that we have a right and a duty to oppose such recommendations. Of course he makes mistakes, as all Presidents have. However, it seems to me that we should give the President complete jurisdiction over determining who is to head his agencies as long as we have faith and confidence in his ability to do the job, and as long as his appointees qualify as loyal American citizens, have no conflict of interest, possess integrity, and have the competence to qualify them to do the job adequately. Sargent Shriver measures up in spades for all those qualifications.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I express complete agreement with what the Senator from Wisconsin has just stated. I was shocked to find that, on a voice vote, with no notice afforded, the Senate took this action yesterday and proclaimed that Mr. Shriver should not be allowed to handle both these positions, both of which he is, in my opinion, handling most capably.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New York is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was under no compulsion to accept my amendment. I made it very clear in a campaign which extended back for 6 months that I would seek to right this situation by Senate action at the earliest possible moment.

The Senator from Arkansas stated, and the RECORD will show, that the matter had been discussed. He knew that there was considerable sentiment in his own committee with respect to the two-job operation. The situation had been discussed in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I do not believe that the proposal was sprung on anyone suddenly. I believe that it is something that we have all been thinking about and concerned about. The situation is quite unusual. Apparently nothing could be done about the situation except to handle it in the manner in which it was handled yesterday. I am convinced that our action was right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it ought to be made abundantly clear that Senators knew the Peace Corps bill was to be called up. I checked with the majority leader at noon. I announced to our policy committee what the order of business was to be, and that it would include the Peace Corps bill. Therefore, our good friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, should not have been so shocked that the bill was called up.

It is a Senator's responsibility to know what is going on. The majority leader is on the floor nearly all the time. If any Senator wishes to know what is going to happen, all he has to do is to check and find out what is scheduled on the agenda.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Was notice given to all Senators that the Javits amendment pertaining to Sargent Shriver was to be offered to the Peace Corps bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There does not have to be any notice.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I did not say that. I asked if any notice was given.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there was notice. I told the majority leader before I called the amendment up that I had the amendment. The majority leader had the complete choice as to whether to bring the measure up. He saw fit to bring it up and said that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] would accept the amendment. There was ample notice in accordance with the finest tradition of the Senate. I have never done anything else, and I hope that I never shall.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course, the Senator from New York gave notice to the leadership. He is a very honorable and meticulous man. However, no notice was afforded to other Senators. The leader knew about it and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations knew about it. They acted properly. However, about 95 of the 100 Senators had no idea that the Shriver-get-out-of-the-Peace-Corps measure was coming up.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has admitted that he was shocked. I have discussed the matter with other Senators, whose reactions vary from being surprised to being stunned. The New York Times reporter, in an article, expressed his surprise.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There should have been no surprise. Every Senator is on notice that a measure can be called up. Any number of Senators on this side came to me and asked, "What is next? Will there be any rollcall votes today?" I told them that the Peace Corps bill would be taken up, and that the Senator from New York had an amendment to offer to it.

The Senator from Wisconsin could have found out. He is not tongue-tied. He could have asked the majority leader.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No notice was given to the Senate as a whole and both the Senator from New York and the Senator from Illinois know it.

Mr. JAVITS. I gave notice that I would do it. I believe the only surprise the Senator had was that it was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

UNIFORM TIME LEGISLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 257, S. 1404.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencement and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 2, after line 19, to strike out:

(c) For any violation of the provisions of this section the Interstate Commerce Commission or its duly authorized agent may apply to the district court of the United States in which such violation occurs for the enforcement of this section; and such court shall have jurisdiction to enforce obedience thereto by writ of injunction or by other process, mandatory or otherwise, restraining against further violations of this section and enjoining obedience thereto.

And, on page 3, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Act of March 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 451; 15 U.S.C. 262), whenever any State or political subdivision thereof or the District of Columbia adopts daylight saving time consistent with the provisions of section 3 hereof, in all statutes, orders, rules, and regulations relating to the time of performance of any act by any officer or department of the United States, whether in the legislative, executive, or judicial branches of the Government, or relating to the time within which any rights shall accrue or determine, or within which any act shall or shall not be performed by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. It shall be understood and intended that such time during such period shall be said daylight saving time, and such time shall be the exclusive time within such State or political subdivision for the transaction of all public business by any department, agency, or court of the United States, or by any officer, agent, employee, or representative of any such department, agency, or court.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 4. The second sentence of section 2 of the Act of March 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 451; 15 U.S.C. 262), is amended by striking out "be the United States standard time of the zone" and insert in lieu thereof a comma and "insofar as practicable, be the prevailing established time (including daylight saving time where established) of the area".

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Uniform Time Act of 1965."

SEC. 2. It is the policy of the United States to promote the adoption and observance of uniform time within the standard time zones prescribed by the Act entitled "An Act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 450), and the Act entitled "An Act to transfer the Panhandle and Plains section of Texas and Oklahoma to the United States standard central time zone," approved March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1446). To this end the Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized and directed to foster and promote widespread and uniform adoption and observance of the same standards of time within and throughout each standard time zone as prescribed by such Acts.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever any State or political subdivision thereof or the District of Columbia adopts daylight saving time, such time shall commence at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in April and shall end at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in October and shall advance the standard time otherwise applicable by one hour.

(b) It is hereby declared that it is the express intent of Congress by this section to supersede any and all laws of the States or political subdivisions thereof insofar as they may now or hereafter provide for advances in time or changeover dates different from those specified herein.

SEC. 4. The second sentence of section 2 of the Act of March 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 451; 15 U.S.C. 262), is amended by striking out "be the United States standard time of the zone" and insert in lieu thereof a comma and "insofar as practicable, be the prevailing established time (including daylight saving time where established) of the area".

SEC. 5. (a) The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States" approved March 19, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 450; 15 U.S.C. 261), is amended to read as follows:

"That for the purpose of establishing the standard time of the United States, the territory of the United States shall be divided into eight zones in the manner provided in this section. The standard time of the first zone shall be based on the mean solar time of the sixtieth degree of longitude west from Greenwich; that of the second zone on the seventy-fifth degree of longitude; that of the third zone on the ninetieth degree; that of the fourth zone on the one hundred and fifth degree; that of the fifth zone on the one hundred and twentieth degree; that of the sixth zone on the one hundred and thirty-fifth degree; that of the seventh zone on the one hundred and fiftieth degree; and that of the eighth zone on the one hundred and sixty-fifth degree. The limits of each zone shall be defined by an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, having regard for the convenience of commerce and the existing junction points and division points of common carriers engaged in commerce between the several States and with foreign nations, and such order may be modified from time to time."

(b) Section 4 of such Act (40 Stat. 451; 15 U.S.C. 263) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The standard time of the first zone shall be known and designated as 'Atlantic standard time'; that of the second zone shall be known and designated as 'Eastern standard time'; that of the third zone shall be known and designated as 'Central standard time'; that of the fourth zone shall be known and designated as 'Mountain standard time'; that of the fifth zone shall be known and designated as 'Pacific standard time'; that of the sixth zone shall be known and designated as 'Yukon standard time'; that of the seventh zone shall be known and designated as 'Alaska-Hawaii standard time'; and that of the eighth zone shall be known and designated as 'Bering standard time.' "

SEC. 6. The Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1000–1011) shall apply to all proceedings under this Act, the Act entitled "An Act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, as amended, and the Act entitled "An Act to transfer the Panhandle and Plains section of Texas and Oklahoma to the United States standard central time zone," approved March 4, 1921.

SEC. 7. This Act shall take effect January 1, 1966.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are agreed to en bloc.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. An explanation from the report will be placed in the RECORD, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] will make a statement on the bill. In short, it provides that daylight saving will be put into effect at the same time and go out of effect at the same time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the report on the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the extract (Rept. No. 268) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to establish uniform dates for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in the States and local jurisdictions where it is observed. It is designed to eliminate a major part of the costly, wasteful confusion which results from current conflicts in the Nation's time standards.

As reported, the bill, S. 1404, would—

1. Require any State or political subdivision that adopts daylight saving time to begin the observance of such time at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in April and end it at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in October.

2. Express the intent of Congress to supersede State laws or local ordinances which provide for different dates for the observance of daylight time than those set forth in the bill. However, the bill still leaves the States or their political subdivisions free to decide for themselves whether or not to observe daylight saving time.

3. Provide that daylight saving time shall advance the standard time by 1 hour, thus preventing so-called double daylight time.

4. Express the understanding that legal time for Federal purposes shall, insofar as practicable, be prevailing local time, including daylight saving time where established. Present law refers only to standard time.

5. Include relatively technical provisions creating new standard time zones, mainly for Alaska and Hawaii, making the Administrative Procedure Act applicable to proceedings of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the Time Act, and directing the ICC to foster and promote the adoption and observance of uniform time standards.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] is absent on official business as a member of the Food Marketing Commission. He is a cosponsor of the bill, S. 1404, and presided at the public hearings which the Senate Commerce Committee conducted on the measure. Were he able to be here, he would have joined me in presenting the bill to the Senate and explaining its provisions.

Mr. President, for more than 2 decades—ever since the end of World War II—millions of Americans have been plagued twice each year with the problems and confusions arising from the switch from standard time to daylight saving time and back again.

The problem is twofold. About half our citizens observe daylight time during the summer months—while the other half remains on standard time the year around. And, as if this were not confusing enough, the problem is compounded by the fact that those who observe daylight saving time start and stop on a bewildering multitude of dates.

The result is not only a matter of widespread confusion and inconvenience; it imposes a costly and wasteful burden on many American industries and businesses, especially those in the transportation and communications field. Testimony presented to the Senate Commerce Committee indicated that just to revise and republish the schedules and timetables of the buses, planes, and trains costs millions of dollars each year. For instance, witnesses before our committee from the buslines estimated the added costs at $1 million a year, while the extra expenses for the railroad industry were estimated at $2 million. Neither the airlines nor the radio and TV people attempted to calculate the extra costs they must bear because of time confusion, but obviously it is substantial. No one knows, of course, the dollar cost of the missed appointments and wasted time of millions of individuals. Clearly, the problem is important enough to merit action by the Congress.

Obviously, the problem could be solved by banning the use of daylight saving time and putting everyone on standard time the whole year, or, with equal effectiveness, the problem could be ended by enforcing nationwide daylight saving time. Neither of these solutions is sound or realistic. Nearly 100 million Americans, 58 percent of our population, now observe daylight saving time, while 42 percent of the country remains on standard time all year. Nationwide uniformity could only be achieved by forcing daylight time on millions who have never indicated any desire for it, or by denying it to millions who have approved it by overwhelming votes in many cases.

Rather than seek any such drastic solution, the bill which Senator MCGEE and I introduced and which is now before the Senate, seeks to provide uniformity only with respect to the dates for beginning and ending the observance of daylight saving time by those areas which observe it.

Under the bill those States or political subdivisions which adopt daylight saving time would be required to begin its observance at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in April and end it at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in October.

Actually, more than 90 percent of those who use daylight saving time already use these starting and stopping dates, and they will not be affected in any way by its passage. Nor, of course, will those who observe standard time all year be affected in any way by enactment of this legislation.

While its effect on the public generally will be minor, the bill will, nevertheless, eliminate the single most troublesome area of confusion in our present timekeeping system. As things stand today, 15 States began their observance of daylight saving time on the last Sunday in April. But in parts of 16 other States, daylight time started on some 11 different dates throughout the month of May and into early June. When fall comes, the switchback will come on a score of different dates ranging from August through October. Not even the 15 States starting together will end together. The bill will end this kind of clock madness.

It would achieve this desirable and I believe, essential measure of uniformity with a minimum of fuss and feathers. Because the measure affects decisions to be made almost exclusively by States or their political subdivisions, I do not believe any enforcement provisions will be needed. The simple statement that Congress intends by this act to fix the changeover dates for all of those who choose to observe daylight saving time should be more than sufficient to end the current confusion in dates.

The bill would also make some relative technical, but long overdue changes, in the Standard Time Act of 1918, bringing it more in step with the needs of the 1960's. These changes include provisions which would: create new standard time zones for Alaska and Hawaii to bring within the scope of the law the time zones they now use; direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to foster and promote the adoption and observance of more uniform time standards throughout the country, and make the Administrative Procedure Act applicable to proceedings under the Standard Time Act.

Except for the wartime daylight saving time, Congress has not since 1918 attempted to do anything about our system. Millions of Americans have paid the price in extra expense and in inconvenience and confusion because we have not acted. Today we can pass a simple, yet effective measure to bring a real measure of uniformity and consistency to our clocks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

SILVER PROBLEM—SMALL COINS SYSTEM

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, for a number of years we have realized that it was going to be necessary to make a complete change in our U.S. subsidiary coinage system. Today President Johnson has sent to Congress a message outlining his views about some changes to be made, and a bill to implement those proposals will be introduced by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. I am very happy to be a cosponor of this administration proposal.

Mr. President, for a number of years we have been in an intolerable situation. Time has just about run out on us. Free world production of silver falls so far below the consumption even for industry and the arts, let alone for use in coinage, that the deficit has been made up by withdrawals from the U.S. Treasury supply of silver which was acquired for coinage.

On the basis of current supplies and demand it is obvious that if we had continued as at present for 2 years, we would have been completely out of silver.

The President's proposal is a very ingenious solution for the short-range problem of providing a new coinage system. We can set in motion, as fast as machinery can turn out the coins, a system which is completely compatible with our present system, including the use of coins in vending machines. At the same time the bill provides for the appointment of a special Coinage Commission made up of representatives from the Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses, the Secretary of Commerce, Director of the Mint, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Treasury, and four public members. This Commission will have time to face the long-range problems, which have to do with the ultimate desirability of our present all-silver coins, or practically all silver, and the policy with respect to long-time withdrawals of silver from the Treasury to be used by the arts and industry.

This will take time. It may take 2 or 3 years to set up adequate standards for the coins. In the meantime the two coinage systems can operate side by side. We still have this deficit problem. In 1964 the free world consumed about 286 million ounces of silver in industry and the arts. The free world produced 215 million ounces in the same year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. I ask unanimous consent to have another 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. This represents a deficit of 71 million ounces, which could be made up by withdrawals from the Treasury. Coinage demands during the year totaled 264 million ounces, of which over 200 million ounces were used in U.S. subsidiary coins. This amounts to an overall deficit in free world supply of about 335 million ounces. It is obvious that this deficit could not be made up with Treasury silver indefinitely in the future because the Treasury supply would soon be depleted.

The President's proposal is very practical. It proposes to make no change in the silver content of the dollar. The dollar is not in general circulation. The present ceiling of $1.29 an ounce for silver would remain. The bill would also establish a floor price of $1.25 an ounce, which means a narrow range, and could prevent the price from falling or rising too much, as long as the Treasury had silver to meet the needs of the processors.

The other silver-bearing coins—namely, the dime, quarter, and 50-cent piece—will be made by a process called cladding. There will be a core of lower value, and it will be covered, like a sandwich, on both sides by a face of higher value metal. In the new 50-cent piece, the core will be 21 percent silver and 79 percent copper. A face of about 80 percent silver clad to this core will result in a coin with a content of about 40 percent silver. The dime core will have no silver in it. The core will be of pure copper and the facing will be a combination of copper and nickel alloy as is presently used in our 5-cent pieces.

One of the real problems we have had to face has been the question of vending machines. There are over 83 million vending machine transactions each day for the vending of merchandise, to say nothing about telephone and other such uses. Coins must be available to operate these devices. They are not operated by weight or size alone, but employ a magnetic field to test conductivity. A coin with little or no magnetic properties is not accepted sufficiently while one which is highly magnetic is also rejected. The new coins will have the same electric conductivity as the old ones. So the new coins will operate in vending machines without any change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. I ask unanimous consent to have one additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. I shall not take the time to explain the full effect of the proposal, but I believe this is a reasonable solution for both processors and producers. It is also proposed to develop, through the Joint Commission on Coinage, a long-range solution of the problems. In the meantime the coinage systems will be protected because the price of silver is controlled, and it will not tempt persons to melt down coins that they have in their pockets.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Utah in applauding the administration for recognizing the fact that we do have a very serious shortage of silver in this country. The fact is, we have been importing silver in order to meet the needs of American producers. I speak now of the producers of manufactured goods including electronic devices where silver is absolutely essential.

My interest in this problem, of course, stems from my concern for the jobs of my constituents. Silver is necessary in much of our industry. We in Rhode Island are in the silverware production field and have been conscious of the problem.

I would hope that now that the message has been sent to Congress, the appropriate committees will expedite legislation because unless we do so, we will face a serious shortage, especially of the 10-cent piece and the quarter, which are now being made out of silver but which henceforth, if the legislation is enacted into law, will be made of a substitute metal.

My only regret is that the silver content of the half-dollar piece will be reduced only from 90 percent to 40 percent.

I believe that 40 percent silver is too high. The silver content of the half-dollar piece should be reduced even further and I understand that it will be. It will take 15 million ounces of silver to manufacture the half-dollar pieces when we get into production. I do not see why the use of silver to this extent was absolutely necessary.

I have no objection to the silver dollar being manufactured out of silver for the simple reason that the silver certificates have to be redeemed and that will not affect the price of silver too much.

But, I repeat, it is regrettable what will happen to the half dollar. I realize the administration had certain practical problems to face. There are quite a number of representatives of the various States interested in using silver for coinage and that might have been one of the reasons why the silver content of the half-dollar piece will be reduced only from 90 percent to 40 percent, although I thought it could go down to approximately 20 percent. But in any event I feel that the administration has met the problem head on, that it has come to grips with it and I would hope that Congress will, as I said before, get busy on the legislation and pass it before we get ourselves involved in the serious problem of the shortage of quarters and 10-cent pieces which are apt to be hoarded when it is realized that new pieces will be coming out.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION WITH KOREA AND AUSTRIA

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senate that pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy proposed amendments to agreements for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy presently in existence with the Government of the Republic of Korea and the Government of the Republic of Austria. The proposed amendments were received by the Joint Committee on May 27 and 28, respectively. Section 123c of the act requires that proposed amendments lie before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for a period of 30 days while Congress is in session before becoming effective.

In keeping with the Joint Committee's general practice of informing Congress of the pendency of matters of this type, I ask unanimous consent, as vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, the text of the proposed amendments and supporting correspondence.

Among the supporting correspondence is a letter dated May 7, 1965, from President Johnson to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, approving the execution of the proposed amendments to the agreements with Korea and Austria as well as a proposed amendment to the agreement with Turkey. Other materials pertaining to the amendment to the Turkish bilateral were printed in the RECORD on May 13, 1965, and for that reason are not published herewith.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1965.
THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise and extend for 10 years to February 2, 1976, the agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea which was signed on February 3, 1956, as amended by the agreement signed at Washington on March 14, 1958.

The present agreement with Korea now contains a provision in article II that the Commission will lease uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} to Korea for fueling defined research reactors. While there is no immediate intent to change Commission policy of leasing fuel for research reactors, it is believed that, in view of the proposed 10-year extension of the agreement, flexibility to lease or sell this material should be provided. Accordingly, article I of the proposed amendment would substitute the word "transfer" for the word "lease" in article II A and D of the agreement and article II of the proposed amendment would substitute the word "transferred" for the word "leased" in article VI C of the agreement.

In addition, article I of the proposed amendment modifies article II of the agreement to make provision for the reprocessing at the discretion of the Commission of source or special nuclear material received from the United States to be performed in other than Commission facilities and adds to article II of the agreement provisions with respect to rights in special nuclear material produced as a result of the irradiation processes. These same provisions are contained in agreements for cooperation with other countries.

In keeping with U.S. policy that it is timely for us to arrive at an explicit understanding with those countries with which we have agreements as to the transfer of safeguards to the International Atomic Energy Agency, provision has been made in article III of the proposed amendment that the agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. The transfer of this responsibility to the Agency would be effected without further modification of the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement to be negotiated between the Government of the United States, the Government of the Republic of Korea, and the Agency.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the proposed amendment will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,
GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., May 7, 1965.
Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me certain proposed amendments to existing agreements and has recommended that I approve each such proposed amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The amendments so submitted are listed below:

"Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy."

"Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Austria Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy."

"Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy."

Pursuant to the provisions of 123b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) Approve each of the proposed amendments listed above, and determine that the performance of each of these agreements as amended will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America;

(b) Authorize the execution of each of the proposed amendments on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1965.
Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR CHET: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

(a) An executed "Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy";

(b) A copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the Amendment; and

(c) A copy of a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the Amendment and authorizing its execution.

The amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, modifies and extends for 10 years to February 2, 1976, the Agreement for Cooperation with the Republic of Korea which was signed on February 3, 1956, as amended by the agreement signed at Washington on March 14, 1958.

Under articles I and II of the amendment, the word "lease" as it appears in article II A and D of the agreement is changed to the word "transfer", and in article VI C of the agreement the word "leased" is changed to the word "transferred" in order to permit either the lease or sale of enriched uranium for fueling defined research reactors. There is no immediate intent on the part of the Commission to change its policy of leasing fuel for research reactors. This change, however, will permit the Commission flexibility to lease or sell such fuel should unforeseen circumstances require a change in that policy during the 10-year extension of the agreement.

Article I of the amendment modifies article II of the agreement to make provision for the reprocessing of source or special nuclear material received from the United States to be performed in other than Commission facilities and adds to article II of the agreement provisions with respect to rights in special nuclear material produced as a result of the irradiation processes. These same provisions are contained in agreements for cooperation with other countries.

Article III of the amendment provides for the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of Korea promptly to request the International Atomic Energy Agency to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the agreement. The transfer of this responsibility to the Agency would be accomplished without further modification of the agreement by means of a trilateral agreement to be negotiated between the Government of the United States of America, the Government of the Republic of Korea, and the Agency.

The amendment will enter into force when the two Governments have exchanged written notifications that their respective statutory and constitutional requirements have been fulfilled.

Cordially,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed at Washington on February 3, 1956 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation"), as amended by the Agreement signed at Washington on March 14, 1958,

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article II of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended as follows:

(a) Substitute the word "transfer" for the word "lease" wherever said word appears in paragraphs A and D.

(b) Paragraph C is deleted in its entirety and the following substituted therefor:

"C. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States of America requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel shall not be altered after its removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing."

(c) The following new paragraphs E and F are added to Article II:

"E. Special nuclear material produced in any part of fuel leased hereunder as a result of irradiation processes shall be for the account of the Government of the Republic of Korea and, after reprocessing as provided in paragraph C of this Article, shall be returned to the Government of the Republic of Korea, at which time title to such material shall be transferred to that Government, unless the Government of the United States of America shall exercise the option, which is hereby granted, to retain, with appropriate credit to the Government of the Republic of Korea, any such special nuclear material which is in excess of the needs of Korea for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

"F. With respect to any special nuclear material not subject to the option referred to in paragraph E of this Article and produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States of America which is in excess of the needs of Korea for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States of America for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or group of nations in the event the option to purchase is not exercised."

ARTICLE II

Article VI, paragraph C of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by deleting the word "leased" and substituting in lieu thereof the word "transferred".

ARTICLE III

The following new Article is added directly after Article VII of the Agreement for Cooperation:

"ARTICLE VII (A)

"A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea, recognizing the desirability of making use of the facilities and services of the International Atomic Energy Agency, agree that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this Agreement for Cooperation. It is contemplated that the necessary arrangements will be effected without modification of this Agreement, through an Agreement to be negotiated between the Parties and the Agency which may include provisions for suspension of the safeguard rights accorded the Commission by Article VI of this Agreement during the time and to the extent that the Agency's safeguards apply to such materials and facilities.

"B. In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on the terms of the trilateral arrangement envisaged in paragraph A of this Article, either Party may by notification terminate this Agreement. In the event of termination by either Party, the Government of the Republic of Korea shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to this Agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of the Republic of Korea for such returned material at the current United States Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically."

ARTICLE IV

The first sentence of Article VIII of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by deleting the date "February 2, 1966" and substituting in lieu thereof the date "February 2, 1976".

ARTICLE V

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation, as hereby amended.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this ——— day of 1965.

For the Government of the United States of America:

CHARLES W. THOMAS,
Officer-in-Charge, Atomic Energy Affairs, Office of International Scientific Affairs.

EARLE W. COOK,
Foreign Affairs Officer, Division of International Affairs, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of the Republic of Korea:

SUK HEUN YUN,
Minister,
Embassy of Korea.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Austria Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise the agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of Austria which was signed on July 22, 1959, and which entered into force for a period of 10 years on January 25, 1960.

First, the present agreement with Austria contains a provision in article IV that the Commission will, upon request and in its discretion, make special nuclear material available as uranium enriched up to 90 percent in the isotope U^{235} for use in research and materials testing reactors each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 8 kilograms of contained U^{235} in uranium. The Government of Austria has requested that the agreement be amended so as to permit material enriched to more than 90 percent to be transferred to Austria for uses which have heretofore qualified under the agreement for material enriched up to 90 percent. Such an amendment would be in accordance with our current policy with respect to the transfer of highly enriched uranium. Accordingly, article I of the proposed amendment would revise article IV of the agreement to provide that the Commission, upon request and in its discretion, may make available material enriched to more than 20 percent in the isotope U^{235} for use in research or materials testing reactors and reactor experiments each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 8 kilograms of contained U^{235} in uranium. Second, Austria desires to have the opportunity to gain a limited experience in converting and fabricating enriched uranium received from the United States for use in research reactors located in third countries with whom we have agreements. Article I of the amendment, therefore, would add a new provision to article IV of the agreement which would permit transfer of special nuclear material for performance in the Republic of Austria of conversion or fabrication services, or both, and subsequent transfer to another nation or group of nations with which the Government of the United States of America has an agreement for cooperation within the scope of which such subsequent transfer falls. You will recall that a number of our other agreements have been modified to accord countries similar opportunities.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Austria. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the amendment will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

———— ————,
Chairman.

Enclosure: Amendment to the agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Austria.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1965.
Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR CHET: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

(a) An executed "amendment to the agreement for coperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Austria;"

(b) A copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and

(c) A copy of the letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amendment and authorizing its execution.

The amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise the agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Austria which was signed at Washington on July 22, 1959.

The Government of Austria has requested an amendment to the agreement which would permit uranium enriched to more than 90 percent in the isotope U^{235} to be transferred to Austria for those uses which now qualify under the agreement for material enriched up to 90 percent. Accordingly, article I of the amendment provides that the Commission will, upon request and at its discretion, transfer material enriched to more than 20 percent in the isotope U^{235} for use in research and materials testing reactors and reactor experiments each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 8 kilograms U^{235} contained in uranium.

In addition, provision has been made in article I of the amendment which would permit the transfer of special nuclear material for performance in Austria of conversion or fabrication services, or both, and subsequent transfer to another nation or group of nations with which the United States has an agreement for cooperation within the scope of which the subsequent transfer would fall. This provision, which was requested by Austria, is in accordance with established Commission policy and is the same as that used in other of our agreements for cooperation.

The amendment will enter into force on the day on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of this amendment.

Cordially,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

Attachments: (1) Amendment to agreement for cooperation with the Government of the Republic of Austria (3); (2) letter from the Commission to the President (3); (3) letter from the President to the Commission (3).

AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF AUSTRIA

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Austria,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Austria, signed at Washington on July 22, 1959 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation"),

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended as follows:

(a) Paragraph C is deleted in its entirety and the following substituted therefor:

"C. The Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make available all or a portion of the enriched uranium supplied hereunder as material enriched to more than twenty percent (20%) in the isotope U^{235} for use in research or materials testing reactors and reactor experiments each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed eight (8) kilograms of isotope U^{235} contained in such uranium."

(b) The following paragraph I is added to Article IV of the Agreement:

"I. In addition to transfers for the purposes provided under Article V and paragraphs A and C of this Article, the Commission may transfer to the Government of the Republic of Austria under such terms and conditions as may be agreed by the Parties, and within the limit of the amounts authorized in paragraph A of this Article, special nuclear material for the performance in the Republic of Austria of conversion or fabrication services, or both, and subsequent transfer to a nation or group of nations with which the Government of the United States of America has an Agreement for Cooperation within the scope of which such subsequent transfer falls. It is understood that the net amount concept described in paragraph A of this Article is also applicable to such transfers for conversion or fabrication services."

ARTICLE II

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation as hereby amended.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this ——— day of ——— 1965.

For the Government of the United States of America:

CHARLES W. THOMAS,
Officer-in-Charge, Atomic Energy Affairs, Office of International Scientific Affairs.
EARLE W. COOK,
Foreign Affairs Officer, Division of International Affairs, Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of the Republic of Austria:

WILFRIED PLATZER,
Ambassador,
Embassy of Austria.

APRIL 15, 1965.

"LAWBOOKS U.S.A.: AN INSTRUMENT OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION"

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on prior occasions I have brought to the attention of this body a truly imaginative and constructive effort known prosaically as "Lawbooks U.S.A.", an endeavor to strengthen the foundations of struggling nations by affording the benefits of experience and progress in the field of legal affairs and jurisprudence.

Through this program, our Nation's barristers and jurists have given meaning, for countless numbers around the globe, to the phrase graven above the entrance to the Supreme Court of the United States—"equal justice under law." The benefits from the endeavor are immeasurable, but certainly are of tremendous significance in bringing equity and consideration to peoples of many lands.

The contributions of this effort, a project of the American Bar Association and the Federal Bar Association, are summarized in an article which was published recently in Case and Comment, under the byline of the dedicated attorney who has been a driving force behind the activity, Scott Hodes. I believe his account of the progress made would be inspiring to many; therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

In this connection, I am happy to salute the publishers of this magazine—the Lawyers Cooperative Publishing Co. and the Bancroft-Whitney Co.—for their steadfast support of, and deep interest in, this practical project in the realm of international good will.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAWBOOKS U.S.A.: AN INSTRUMENT OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION

(By Scott Hodes)

"Eighteen times this year, American libraries have been stoned, sacked or put to the torch—in Latin America, in Africa, in Asia and in the Middle East. Four of the book burnings occurred in a recent 12-day period: two in Indonesia, one in Egypt, one in Sudan. In the same 12 days, November 26 to December 7, U.S. Embassies were stoned in Russia, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, and anti-American demonstrations broke out in four African states." This situation was reported recently in U.S. News & World Report and is merely a sampling of the mounting tensions in our troubled world.

Yet, how many Americans have ever stopped to reflect on the real cause of these international incidents? It would appear that these tensions have developed out of misunderstandings, and often deep-seated mistrust, between members of the world community. Although misunderstanding and mistrust may be due in part to conflicting theories of government and individual freedoms, probably the most compelling interpretation is that people in various parts of this world have not learned, or even made an honest effort, to communicate with one another. Communication is the unique instrument which will help break down the walls of prejudice and bring the peoples of the world to a better understanding of how to live in peace and harmony.

Regrettably, citizens in some of our more sophisticated and cultural societies have not grasped the true significance of this void in communication at a time when many of the newborn countries are struggling for a cause. On the other hand, the Communist nations have noted this gap and have made a dedicated effort to furnish literature and political guidance to newly emerging nations. We have discovered that as Communist ideology is exported and takes root, our efforts to develop strong economic and social ties with foreign neighbors are frustrated and often misunderstood. Thus, Americans must strive to communicate with peoples abroad so that they will gain an opportunity to learn about our culture, our system of government, and our credo of individual freedom through due process, trial by jury, and presumption of innocence.

International Cooperation Year: Recognizing the value of communication between peoples of the world, President Lyndon Johnson has proclaimed 1965 as International Cooperation Year. He has urged the citizens of our great democracy to consider the importance of world understanding in the quest for peace and has challenged various segments of our society to implement this ambitious undertaking.

Probably the most important instrument in the maintenance of the American way of life is our cherished system of government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." Obviously, the legal profession is in a unique position to communicate the story of this system to the world. The Lawbooks U.S.A. program is that medium which will permit the organized bar in this country to answer the challenge of our President in 1965.

Lawbooks U.S.A.: Lawbooks U.S.A. is a joint project of the World Peace Through Law and Younger Lawyers Committees of the ABA, and the Federal Bar Association in conjunction with the U.S. Information Agency to send oversea packets of eight preselected paperback books on the nature of our legal system. Technical treatises are omitted from the selection so that foreign recipients can readily understand and evaluate our system. Works by our greatest legal minds, including Learned Hand and Benjamin Cardozo, are included in this worthwhile packet.

Response to the lawbooks program has been widespread and enthusiastic. Justice Tom C. Clark, a lawbook trustee, has stated that "I am enthusiastic over the prospects of establishing better relations with lawyers and opinion makers in the emerging nations through this program and thus stemming the tide of communism." Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, of California, has authored an extended article on the merits of Lawbooks U.S.A. in the December 1964, issue of the American Bar Association Journal. Another advocate of the program is Vice President Hubert Humphrey, who remarked that "Lawbooks U.S.A. is an impressive and significant step in developing educational opportunities in the emerging nations." Speaking for the profession, ABA President Lewis F. Powell, Jr., has said that "this plan is further evidence of the interest of the organized bar in cooperating with the lawyers of other nations, and especially in taking appropriate steps to extend knowledge and understanding of the rule of law."

Members of the legal profession are urged to donate funds to send packets abroad. For each $8 contributed, a packet is shipped overseas with the donor's name enclosed, and the recipient is encouraged to communicate directly with the American donor on a "lawyer to lawyer" basis. Gifts in any amount are welcome, and where less than $8 is contributed, several donations are aggregated to purchase a single packet.

The individual American donor may indicate a particular country within which he prefers his packet distributed, but final selection of recipients is made by the USIS. Occasionally, visiting government officials may assist USIS and Peace Corps volunteers in the actual distribution of the packets. To date, some 1,000 packets have been shipped abroad to fill the communication vacuum. Yet, packets are in tragic supply and urgent messages from USIS posts call for additional sets to help break the Communist grasp on the communication and the educational media.

Join Lawbooks U.S.A.: Lawbooks contributions have been received from lawyer and law student alike from all parts of the country. Each contributor automatically becomes a member of Lawbooks U.S.A. National Committee and receives periodic reports on the progress of the program. Many distinguished attorneys and statesmen are members and earnestly communicate with foreign counterparts in an effort to spread the cultural, economic, and social philosophy of our country. These American lawyers are trying to stem the tide of communism and oppression through international cooperation and understanding. Won't you join this noble undertaking by sending a packet of lawbooks today?

"GO AND FIND THE WIND"—ADDRESS BY THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, a speech entitled "Go and Find the Wind," recently delivered by Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson, reminds me of the old nautical maxim, "sailing by an ash breeze." The expression stems from the days when a becalmed sailing vessel was towed by sailors, in the ship's longboat, pulling on white-ash oars. In the address, presented at the Washington, D.C., Propeller Club dinner, on May 20, Administrator Johnson drew attention to the fact that the American merchant marine is rapidly coming out of its doldrums.

Mr. President, at a time when grave concern is being expressed over the future of our merchant marine, I find it particularly reassuring that the Maritime Administration is aggressively seeking the wind—for, indeed, it is "all ahead"—in terms of such developments as surface-effect ships, the possibility of nuclear power for merchant vessels, and the mother-ship concept of carrying barges, instead of small containers. These are exciting possibilities; and, with this vision, our merchant marine may well see a quantum jump into the future.

For the interest of all those concerned with maritime developments, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Johnson's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"GO AND FIND THE WIND"

(Remarks by Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson, at the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of Washington, D.C., dinner, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., May 20, 1965)

"The power over nature which science is giving our generation permits us to look forward with hope and toward the solution of many age-old problems, if we apply results of scientific advance well and wisely."—President Lyndon B. Johnson, transmitting to Congress the annual report of the National Science Foundation, February 15, 1965.

This is a very special occasion for me. Last year on Maritime Day I had been in office only a few months. A year has passed since then, and I have learned from you much about this industry and its history.

More important, this year marks the 15th anniversary of the Maritime Administration.

In one form or another, this agency has been in existence since 1916. But the reorganization of 1950 marks a significant turning point in our history. For the first time the difference between the agency's subsidy and promotion activities on the one hand, and its regulatory functions on the other, was given institutional recognition. Now the two functions are vested in two separate agencies. The Maritime Administration has bent its undivided efforts to building and expanded merchant marine capable of an ever greater contribution to our national security and economic prosperity.

The American merchant marine has a long and proud history. Like almost any institution that has been in existence since the beginnings of our country, our Nation's merchant fleet has had its ups and downs.

It is useful for those who are concerned with the health of this industry to pause periodically, and take stock of where we are, where we have come from, and where we are going. For the cyclical nature of our maritime history is not the inevitable consequence of some natural law—it stems from courage and competitiveness on the one hand, and misunderstanding and misfortune on the other. There is much for us to learn in the history of maritime affairs in the United States, and occasions such as this are proper times for us to take account of old learning.

The merchant navy of early America prospered. We were a nation heavily dependent upon imports of finished products from England, and the West Indies furnished a second leg of the famous triangular trade. Early in the history of this industry its affairs became deeply enmeshed with those of the government. In 1817 the Congress provided that only ships constructed in American yards could sail in our domestic trade. But the relationship was not one merely of governmental favor. During the Revolutionary War the merchant marine had staffed our navy with fine officers, among them John Paul Jones, and during the War of 1812, 517 merchant ships were commissioned as privateers, taking nearly 1,300 prizes during the course of the war.

This magnificent effort was more than matched in commercial maritime operations. In the 1820's, for example, over 90 percent of trade was carried in American bottoms. As for competitive ship construction, the United States was an exporter of ships during this period. America had abundant resources of wood, and her shipwrights were fine craftsmen. A 500-ton ship, which cost $45,000 in Great Britain, could be purchased for $10,000 less here.

This exciting period of growth was climaxed by the short period of American maritime hegemony achieved through our great clippers. You are all familiar with this period; it constituted the last "golden era" of the American merchant marine.

After the Civil War and into the 1870's the American merchant fleet sunk to comparitive unimportance on the seas. While this change was occasioned in part by the drop in demand after the California gold rush, and the loss of ships during the Civil War, the principal reasons go deeper. Both the industry and the government failed to foresee the significance of steel construction and steam propulsion. We lagged substantially behind the British in the production of steam powerplants and in the construction of large, efficient iron works. Our government, unlike the British, was unwilling to underwrite the large expenditures required to develop the industry.

The consequences were immediate. In 1870 our iron ships cost one-third more than those of the British. Shipping and shipbuilding lolled through the doldrums together. In this period was born a school of thought which is with us yet today—that an adequate merchant marine must be maintained regardless of the cost. President Grant sent a message to Congress in which he said, "A nation of the vast and ever-increasing resources of the United States * * * must one day possess its full share of the commerce of the seas, no matter what the cost."

Congress did nothing in response, and the health of this important industry did not begin to improve until the late 1890's when the American steel industry became more advanced. The Spanish-American War, and a general renewed interest in maritime affairs during the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt, added to our maritime resurgence.

Shortly thereafter, of course, the merchant marine entered what we might call its "modern" history alternating between gigantic wartime expansion at great expense and great neglect. This period stretched from 1900 through the end of the 1940's.

There are lessons to be drawn from this short review. Very important, of course, is the necessity of maintaining a merchant marine adequate to meet our emergency needs, both military and economic.

Equally important, however, is the fact that both the golden era of American merchant power, and the resurgence at the end of the 19th century, were due to technical advances. Our early shipbuilding techniques were excellent; the clipper pioneered a wholly new concept of transportation economies; the men who owned and sailed our ships were constantly searching—and finding—new and better ways of doing things. The end of shipping prosperity and competitiveness was closely tied to the expiration of this spirit and a feeling that steam and steel were merely strange toys.

Finally, we ought to take note of the fact that the British prospered in the age of steam because of the aid of the British Government. But the aid was not designed to perpetuate sailing vessels. It did not undertake merely to subsidize conventional ships and conventional shipyards. No, the government underwrote a wholly new method of transatlantic transport—and assumed thereby a commanding lead.

There are parallels we can draw between this period and that of the last 15 years. These years have also been important because America has faced the problem of building and maintaining a merchant marine without the spur of wartime building. Moreover, while the military need for merchant shipping continues, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the nature of those needs is changing radically. The consequent reemphasis of the importance of the economics of merchant shipping in the Government and the economy generally has led some to revert to the refrain sounded by President Grant: cost is no object.

How have we done?

We have done extremely well in meeting military and economic emergencies, largely through the medium of the national defense reserve fleets.

When the Korean crisis erupted, almost 600 ships were reactivated during the first 18 months of the war. The cost of placing these ships in operation was about $160 million—instead of a sum approximately 25 times as much which would have been required to build the ships anew.

The next emergency was economic, and created by the closing of the Suez Canal in 1956. Because the length of the haul was so substantially increased for so many ships, shipping rates rose sharply and it became increasingly difficult to obtain shipping service. About 220 ships were withdrawn from the reserve fleets during this period, and were used largely to carry Government-sponsored cargo.

But the book may not be closed. There are many serious questions to be asked about our ability to meet similar needs in the future. Of the 1,600 ships in the reserve fleet, about 970 are receiving preservation treatment. Many of these are the slower type of victory ships. By 1970 all but a few of those ships remaining will be 25 years of age. Many of them have seen less than 10 years of active use, and have been receiving expert preservation techniques. Nevertheless, some deterioration is inevitable. Moreover, as the speed of our naval and merchant ships increase, the slower World War II vessels increasingly become a liability in the event of real military need.

How are we to satisfy these needs for the future? Shipbuilding capability alone in time of emergencies is not the answer, for the logistical requirements of limited war are such that the real need comes in the first few months, and the critical time will have passed before new keels are laid.

These facts pose difficult questions, which must be answered very soon. For we cannot for much longer meet our emergencies with the aid of the remains of the World War II fleet. One possibility, of course, is to retire some of our ships much earlier and place them in the reserve fleet while still in good condition. Such a suggestion has widespread implications, including fiscal ones, but it would give us considerably more flexibility and avoid much of our problem with block obsolescence.

In terms of renewal of the fleet, this 15 years has seen the only major nonwartime building program in this century. Thirty-five mariners were constructed between 1951 and 1955. One hundred and twenty-eight more ships have been delivered or are presently under construction. There are now 11 of the new, automated ships at sea. Every one of the 150 ships remaining to be replaced will be mechanized, and many with a higher degree of sophistication than those ships already delivered.

Of our existing, post 1952 ships, about 100 are to be part of the retrofit program, which will bring mechanizaton to existing ships.

But we may ask the same kind of questions about this achievement of which we are all rightfully proud, as we have about our ability to meet emergencies.

Are we being shortsighted? Is a new age of steel and steam just around the corner? Are we prepared for it?

I have discussed these issues before, and some members of the industry have responded to the challenge.

Achievements and questions abound in maritime research and development. We have constructed and successfully operated the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, the NS *Savannah*. The ship has now visited 14 foreign countries; it is a shinning example of American technological progress, viewed by more than 560,000 foreign visitors—and 826,000 Americans. This has been a very significant achievement, but we must be careful to keep it in perspective. Does nuclear power represent a qualitative increase in the merchant marine, or is it merely a way station on the road to even more significant improvements? Should we concentrate on developing marine nuclear power for surface displacement vessels, or ought it to be reserved for submarines and other situations where its natural advantages are overwhelming?

During the past year questions like these have been receiving increasing attention from the maritime industry and from the Government. We have moved forward in many areas, both to increase the economy and efficiency of our existing ships, and to explore the possibilities of entirely new ship systems.

Management improvements have also been demonstrated. United States Lines and American Export-Isbrandtsen have merged their passenger-solicitation activities in order to reduce the overhead of this expensive undertaking. Moore-McCormack and the National Maritime Union have agreed to reduce the manning levels on the passenger ships *Argentina* and *Brasil* in order to reduce the heavy losses which had been incurred in operating those ships.

Similarly, the Government has been moving forward to improve the efficiency of its own operations in the maritime area. An agreement may be reached by which American Export-Isbrandtsen, which has operated the *Savannah* for the Government as an ambassador of good will, will use her as part of an ordinary commercial service—the first nuclear powered ship to be so used. That change could save the American taxpayer a great deal in reduced operating costs to the Government.

In the area of mechanization, 11 semiautomated ships have been delivered, and all future replacement ships will have at least the present level of automation. A completely automated boiler system has been tested on a Great Lakes ship, the *William Mather*, and the results in man-hours saved has been very impressive.

For existing ships, plans are firming up for introducing increased mechanization on ships which came off the ways before the newer, automated ships. This program will make more competitive 100 ships which otherwise could operate only at a severe disadvantage in the world market.

We have also recently completed a study on maneuvering propulsion devices, which may increase markedly the ease with which a ship can be berthed.

There has been a thoroughgoing review of current maritime policies, which is still in progress. In addition to Government review of this subject, the Committee of American Steamship Lines, the Seafarer's International Union, and the National Maritime Union have all produced careful discussions of important aspects of maritime policy. The President's Maritime Advisory Committee is playing an important role in the formulation of new policies.

The Maritime Administration is turning a searching eye inward as well, in accordance with President Johnson's emphasis upon economy and efficiency in agency management. We have carefully reviewed the goals and performance of over 90 programs and projects. We have created new management reporting systems. We have inaugurated a college recruitment program that will add 40 of America's ablest college graduates to our staff during this coming summer. We have undertaken management training programs for maritime employees of all grades and ages. We are giving increasing attention to maritime labor through a staff of labor advisers. We are very much a part of the computer revolution. We are phasing out unneeded programs and facilities, saving the taxpayers close to $1 million this past year alone. We have simplified and eliminated reports required from the maritime industry and within the agency. And we have stepped up our activities in support of our statutory obligation to promote the maritime industry: publications, cargo promotion activities, the new Maritime Exhibit Hall in the GAO building, and indeed, this very Merchant Marine Week.

Most impressive, of course, is the scope of this past year's developments in new ship systems.

In reviewing them, I cannot help but think of a story I was told about the early days of the American merchant marine. Two brothers named Griswold ran a very aggressive and successful shipping company. One cold, winter day one of their captains expressed some reluctance to sail, claiming that there was no wind. One of the Griswold brothers replied to him with a phrase that became commonplace in the lexicon of the sailing men of their day: "Go and find the wind—the wind is all ahead."

It is this spirit, embodying a rejection of the passivity of the man who views his future as dependent upon the way things are, that led our merchant marine to greatness in the 19th century. It is this same spirit—a refusal to accept the idea that we have evolved to the summit of our capabilities—that is today leading the American merchant marine over a new threshold of achievement.

Containerization, which has never really been exploited in international trade, is attracting the attention of a number of companies. The Maritime Administration expects to have a special project team from the Harvard Business School devoting full time to this subject during the summer.

The Lykes Brothers, Co. has come forward with a proposal of genuine vision, involving a mother ship carrying barges instead of smaller containers; when the ship arrives in port the barges are floated off and a new set, previously loaded, is floated on. Thus the expensive part of the ship—the hull and powerplant—is not required to stand idle during the unloading process, and the return on the vessel's high capital cost is greatly increased.

There are other proposals of similar vision, including a number for the construction of very advanced dry bulk carriers. Many of these ideas are not entirely new. But the magnificent thing is that for the first time in many years the Maritime Administration is confronted with a variety of concrete proposals to actually build and operate these vessels in commercial service.

The men who have developed and adopted these ideas have gone in search of the wind—and they have found it.

Just barely one step further in the future is the surface-effect ships, about which I have spoken many times before. Our preliminary economic feasibility studies will soon be completed. They seem to provide basis for considerable optimism. Many other agencies and groups are developing an increasing interest in this advanced mode of transport. Only recently Navy magazine contained an editorial speaking highly of the opportunity presented by surface-effect ships for a "quantum jump in the speed of large, oceangoing vessels." And a number of major aircraft companies are becoming increasingly deeply involved.

So, I close today on a note of considerable encouragement.

The current state of the American merchant marine is increasingly healthy.

Its future is increasingly bright.

We have gone to "find the wind."

SMALL BUSINESSMAN OF YEAR

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, as you know, Alaska has its own version of the gold flow problem. In our case, the flow is trade with the lower 48 States.

Alaskans want and expect to reverse the direction of that flow. That spirit is reflected in the success of Dominic Donatello, of Anchorage.

Mr. Donatello, the son of an Italian immigrant, has expanded part-time production of chlorine bleach into a business which exports products to Seattle and Japan in addition to supplying Alaska with soap merchandise.

With the help of loans from the Small Business Administration, his plant has grown from a one-man operation in the cellar of his home to a 50,000-square-foot plant employing 7 persons.

By adopting modern techniques, he has used a local resource, animal fat, to build a business which is competitive in world markets.

I am happy to report that Mr. Donatello's feat, achieved in a high-cost area, has not gone unrecognized. Last week President Johnson presented him with the Small Businessman of the Year Award.

I want to add my congratulations to those of the President.

I also want to congratulate the Small Business Administration for its wisdom in supporting Mr. Donatello's plans. The success of his firm, the Don Chemical Co., the fact that it now exports products to foreign nations as well as to other States, once again demonstrates the validity of cooperation between the public and private sector in a free enterprise system.

The next chapter in Mr. Donatello's story will involve pelletized cattle feed made from surplus meat meal. This will reduce the cost of importing cattle feed, which in turn will cut the price of milk in Alaska.

Yes, Mr. President, Alaskans are intent on paying their own way and then some. Mr. Donatello reflects that spirit.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD MEXICO—RESOLUTION OF MISSION, TEX., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Mission, Tex., Chamber of Commerce has recently adopted a most important resolution asking that Mexico be treated as the good neighbor she is, and be exempted from any tightening of import duty restrictions.

I fully agree with the position of the Mission Chamber, and I ask that its resolution be printed in the Record, for the information of other Senators.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution —

Whereas at the regular monthly meeting of the Board of Directors of the Mission Chamber of Commerce duly held on May 18, 1965 it was brought to the attention of said board by the legislative committee that there is present legislation in the form of H.R. 7368 which seeks to reduce the duty free allowance for merchandise brought into this country from any and all foreign countries; and

Whereas it was discussed that certainly in the opinion of the Mission Chamber of Commerce Board there presently exists a severe balance-of-payments problem which must be resolved in order to insure the further sound economic basis of our Government, but that said problem would not be resolved but rather made more severe by applying the effect of this legislation to the country of Mexico, our neighbor to the south, for the reason that there is presently a favorable balance existing in our country by virtue of the flow into the United States from Mexico through purchases made by citizens of Mexico; and

Whereas to include rather than exclude the country of Mexico from this proposed legislation would not only create a more severe balance-of payments problem but also strain relationships with Mexico in all border communities; and

Whereas by motion duly made and carried the Mission Chamber of Commerce Board, with all members in attendance, resolved that the resolution be spread upon the minutes of said chamber in opposition to the inclusion of the country of Mexico under H.R. 7368 but rather that this board unanimously urge the leaders of this country to exclude Mexico from the effect of said H.R. 7368: It is, therefore, unanimously

Resolved by the Board of Directors of the Mission Chamber of Commerce, That said chamber of commerce herewith opposes present H.R. 7368 for the reason that said legislation includes the country of Mexico, our neighbor to the south, which inclusion, as previously set out, does not only fail to assist, but is highly detrimental to the balance-of-payments problem sought to be resolved and solved by this legislation and it further resolved that true copies of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, Hon. Ralph Yarborough, senior Senator from the State of Texas, Hon. John Tower, junior Senator from the State of Texas, and Eligio de la Garza, U.S. Representative of the 15th Congressional District of Texas.

Witness our hands this 27th day of May, 1965.

Carl C. Waltz,
President,
Mission Chamber of Commerce.

Attest:

George E. Williams,
Board Secretary.

GAMBLING IS ILLEGAL IN ILLINOIS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last week a Representative from New York criticized the Federal Government and Illinois for not legalizing gambling. His remarks are contained in the May 26, 1965, issue of the Congressional Record, on page 11863. Usually, I do not take exception to opinions expressed by other Members of Congress; but, in this case, he went on to make some unfortunate statements about the motives of my State, as well as those of the Federal Government.

Gambling remains illegal in Illinois, so that it may be the preserve of mobs who thus finance the many criminal ventures.

Mr. President, I do not assume to represent a utopia, but I do represent what I know to be one of the best States in the Union. I am proud that Illinois has not legalized gambling; and I am proud of her efforts to bring to justice those—from whatever State they may originate—who come to Illinois and take illegal advantage of the prosperity of her citizens. I had intended to let the matter drop where it lay, namely, in the Congressional Record. However, I see that these charges have made front page copy in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; and I feel that a word of truth is now in order, on behalf of Illinois and the Federal Government.

Illinois stands ready to cooperate with any nearby State or with the Federal Government to take positive action against organized crime. While we realize that we are not perfect, we are making a hard and a sincere effort to remove criminal elements from operating in our Nation. State prosecutions against members of organized crime in Illinois are well underway, and I look forward to the successful eradication of the underworld from within our borders. Rather than criticize Illinois and the United States for not legalizing gambling, I believe we should praise them for their resistance to that pastime, which history has proven time and time again to bring unbearable burdens on the persons and the families who can least afford them. Legalized gambling has been attempted in the past, with nefarious results, to say the least, as Representative Roy H. McVicker, so aptly pointed out in the May 28, 1965, issue of the daily Congressional Record, on page A2743.

I dislike to call attention to such an unfortunate and misguided attack upon my State and upon the Federal Government; but, in view of the publicity given these attacks, I felt that they must be answered.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON COINAGE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to express my great satisfaction with the message from the President regarding changes in our coinage system. The reforms which he recommends, involving the use of new materials in the manufacture of our coins, should be speedily enacted by Congress.

I realize fully that many persons throughout our country have strong traditional attachments to the use of silver in coins. But, as the President has made so clear, the use of silver per se is no longer essential to the maintenance of the value of our coins; and, in fact, the heavy consumption of silver in coins now is resulting in severe economic hardships for industrial users of silver throughout the country.

Nowhere else is this so apparent as it is in my home State of Rhode Island, where we have a heavy concentration of silver users in the jewelry and silversmith fields. The Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, Inc., which has its headquarters in Providence, has estimated that there is an overall shortage of silver, amounting to 75 million ounces, for industrial uses throughout the free world.

President Johnson's assurance that the new coinage program will result in a saving of 90 percent of the silver now used in coins is, therefore, good news, indeed, for silver users everywhere, and is a cause for special satisfaction in areas such as Rhode Island, where there is such a high concentration of industrial users.

There are, however, some words of caution and reservation which must be stated at this time. One is that the silver users would hope that, over the long run, silver might be altogether removed from our coinage, and that even the modified silver content of silver half-dollars might be eliminated. Only in this way could silver users be assured a completely free market for silver, in which they could be assured the lowest possible price that might result from new changes in the supply and the demand of silver.

Second, we in the industrial States must express the hope that the new demand for different materials used in the new coinage program will not result in further disruption of the metals market. In particular, I refer to copper which will play such a big role in the manufacture of new dimes and quarters, but which itself has been in short supply for the wire mills and the fabricating plants in my home State. Only recently, we have fought hard to obtain a modest, and not wholly satisfactory, release of copper from the national stockpile. It is my earnest hope that the administration now will fully assess the consequences of the new demand for copper in coins, and will take any steps which might be necessary to assure that the supply of copper for industrial users will not be disrupted.

Notwithstanding these reservations, I want to express my complete support of the President's proposal, and urge that it be enacted promptly.

A SALUTE TO A DISTINGUISHED JOURNALIST

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, no man has made a more important contribution to enlightened journalism in my State than has Bill Johnston, for the last 16 years, managing editor of the Lewiston, Idaho, Morning Tribune. Unfortunately, Bill Johnston is leaving Idaho, to accept the post of publisher of student publications at the University of Washington, in Seattle. Notable among the distinguished tributes that have been paid in recent weeks to Bill Johnston is a well-written profile by Sam Day, which was published in the May 20 edition of the Idaho Observer.

I ask unanimous consent that this article entitled "Bill Johnston of the Lewiston Tribune—The Voice of Idaho Liberalism," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bill Johnston of the Lewiston Tribune—The Voice of Idaho Liberalism

(By Sam Day)

"Year by year as I travel about the West," the late great historian and author Bernard DeVoto wrote a decade ago, "I am forced to think of the Western press at large as timid, conforming, crowd-minded, and resolved to upset no apple carts lest business suffer and the West get a black eye.

"And both as a westerner and a historian well acquainted with the western past, I am saddened and more than a little alarmed.

"Which is why I want to salute the Lewiston Morning Tribune. I am sorry to say that I did not become aware until 4 or 5 years ago that a first-rate, intelligent, and liberal newspaper was being published in the very backyard of the Inland Empire's spokesman and review of western reaction.

"Clippings would come in regarding some cause or controversy I was interested in and I would find it justly reported and frankly and forcibly discussed in the Tribune. In an area where journalism is on the whole sloppy it is professionally expert. In an area where editorial opinion is usually unexpressed and when expressed is usually respectful to the man-eating shark and gravely concerned about the political radicalism of Chester A. Arthur it is forthright and outspoken.

"It is not afraid to support unpopular ideas which it respects or to insist on discussing freely and fairly those which it does not support. It is the kind of paper that used to be common in the West but by now has become very rare * * *."

It wasn't the first time, nor the last, that praise from high quarters has been heaped on the Lewiston Morning Tribune, a pint-sized newspaper in a small town far from the Nation's mainstream. The vigor and forthrightness which caught the fancy of DeVoto have been winning friends (and making enemies) for the Tribune since its establishment in 1892 by a couple of young brothers from Texas, Albert and Eugene Alford.

But for the Tribune, where the roots of professional expertness and editorial fire go back three-quarters of a century, the last 15 years have been the years of greatest renown. They have been the harvest years, the years of recognition.

The recent years have brought recognition far beyond the prairie hamlets and logging towns of north-central Idaho, influence extending into the statehouse, the Halls of Congress and the White House, and a remarkable partnership between a newspaper and its public.

They have also been the years of William F. Johnston, a big, football-playing, elk-hunting, backwoods intellectual who has served as the Tribune's voice and public image since 1949. He has burned his brand so indelibly on the newspaper that for many the Tribune has become synonymous with "B.J."—the initials with which he signs his editorials.

For hosts of readers, like this one, who snatched a moment from a political campaign to write him 13 years ago, the Tribune is B.J.:

"My Dear Mr. B.J.: I wish I had properly recorded your name when I met you at the airport, because I have now read your remarkable editorial and want to tell you how very grateful I am. My brief hours in the Valley of the Shining Waters were as happy, carefree, and exhilarating as any I have had for a long, long time. Reading your editorial 'Our Proudest Welcome' afterward reminds me, once more, of the solemnity of my task and the proper measurement of a man who seeks this appalling assignment. I shall do my best not to disappoint you.

"Sincerely yours,

"Adlai E. Stevenson."

To readers of the newspaper, particularly those who have come to know it since the 1940's, it would be difficult to conceive of the Tribune with any other brand than that of B.J. And yet Tribune readers, a few with vast relief and many more with deep reluctance, were facing up to that prospect this week.

Johnston, a veteran of Idaho politics and journalism, was preparing to say farewell not only to the Lewiston country and to a career as a working newspaperman but also to the State. He will leave in July to become publisher of student publications at the University of Washington at Seattle.

His replacements already are on deck: Bill Hall, the bright, young (27) political editor of the Idaho State Journal (Pocatello), who will have the unenviable task of filling B.J.'s editorial shoes, and Charles P. Boren, the Tribune city editor, whose easier duty it will be to pick up the administrative reins, which B.J. was wont to leave dangling.

Perhaps it was because the editor and publisher, A. L. (Bud) Alford, the son of one of the cofounders of the Tribune, preferred to hold the newsroom reins himself. Or perhaps it was because B.J. was not a man to dot the i's and cross the t's. But at any rate there was little time for the niceties of administration during the B.J. era. Not while there were rivers to be developed, roads to be built, parks to be established, municipal governments to be revamped, a Nation to be saved from the Republicans, a State to be saved from the Democrats.

He lost his daily newsroom battles against time and space more often than he won them. He lost some battles in the wider realm of public affairs, as well, but it was remarkable how many of the big ones he won.

His most recent victory—one he particularly wanted to chalk up before he left—came when Congress gave final approval this month to creation of Idaho's first national park, a network of historical sites in north-central Idaho which will be linked together as the Nez Perce National Park.

It was B.J., more than any other man, who made the park a reality. Drawing upon the lessons he had learned in many an earlier cause, utilizing the skills of master editorialist and master lobbyist, and with the considerable forces of the Tribune at his command, he put together a winning team of U.S. Senators, Members of Congress, sub-Cabinet officers, historians, Indian leaders, and park service officials.

It was as a builder—a term of which he has become fond in recent years—that B.J. helped secure the park. Some of the other projects which he has played a major part in building: the Lewis & Clark Highway, connecting the Clearwater Valley with western Montana over the Lolo Pass; authorization and construction of Dworshak Dam on the North Fork of the Clearwater River; construction of a series of Lower Snake River dams to bring slackwater navigation to Lewiston by 1970, and establishment of a city manager form of government for Lewiston.

But it was as a critic—a term he has come lately to favor less—that B.J. first won his spurs after coming to the Tribune as a fiery young man of 32 who had led a successful student revolt against political and social domination by the Greek letter fraternities at the University of Idaho.

He arrived in the era of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, and his free-wheeling investigations, of a new Republican administration in Washington which had brought, among other things, a reversal of long-held Federal resource development policies in the Northwest, of a Republican State administration wedded to the concept of laissez faire. They were times that called for dissent—and it was as a dissenter that B.J. first came to be known.

In his editorials and in his personal column, "Where Angels Fear," the young editor went forth to do battle with the Wisconsin Senator, who commanded a wide Idaho following which included the State's two Senators, Herman Welker and Henry Dworshak:

"Honest, sincere citizens have succumbed to the totalitarian theory that the way to combat ideas they don't like is to put people in jail. They have borrowed this page of the Communist handbook to fight communism. They have discarded the old fashioned American notion that every idea must compete freely on its merits in the marketplace of public opinion if free citizens are to decide freely what is the truth.

"Well, I'm not buying any part of it, Thomas Jefferson said it well enough for me:

"'I swear on the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man.'

"In my book that covers the McCarthys, the Jenners, and every self-appointed thought policeman up and down Main Street of Lewiston. If you think this means I have 'something to hide' go ahead and turn me in to Jumpin' Joe."

In an editorial, "An Election Far Away," published 2 months before the presidential election of 1952 and reprinted widely by other newspapers, B.J. told the story of an election campaign in which one of the great issues was Communists in government, in which a candidate had fostered mistrust of the nation's military heroes, heaped scorn on the liberals, denounced the socialists and enlisted the support of some of the leading industrialists.

"There were other issues in the election, of course, besides the issue of communism in Government. But underlying all the stated issues was the deep suspicion, constantly fanned by the candidate, that a great and proud nation had been sold down the river by traitors and that only forceful and ruthless action based upon a burning and zealous national patriotism could save the country from disaster."

How did the candidate fare?

"What was known on the day after election was only this: That the candidate, Adolph Hitler, had won the support of the people to make his party the most powerful in Germany."

Closer to home, B.J. quickly become involved in a crusade that turned out to be a lost cause. This was the battle for full hydroelectric power development of Hells Canyon, the deepest gorge in North America, about 100 miles up the Snake River from Lewiston.

The Tribune had been equally enthusiastic about Eisenhower and Stevenson during the summer of 1952, but one of the things that cooled B.J.'s ardor for Ike and put the Tribune in Adlai's camp was Eisenhower's lack of interest, as a campaigner, in full development of the Middle Snake.

B.J.'s worst fears were confirmed when Eisenhower appointed Oregon's Gov. Douglas McKay, an ardent States righter, as Secretary of the Interior and McKay withdrew the Department as an intervenor before the Federal Power Commission in support of construction of a high dam in Hells Canyon.

This tipped the scales in favor of Idaho Power Co., which had applied for a license to build three smaller dams in Hells Canyon. The Tribune, marshaling the facts and figures of the engineers, fought long and hard, but vainly, for the higher dam, with its greater storage capacity and its promise of cheaper and more abundant power for the Northwest.

The Hells Canyon battle brought B.J. into conflict with some highly placed antagonists, and one of them was Idaho's Governor Len Jordan, a zealous and outspoken advocate of private development of the Middle Snake. The conflict coincided with another burning issue which found B.J. and the Governor on opposite sides.

In 1951 the newly elected Governor had advocated, as an economy measure, the closing of Northern Idaho College of Education, a 55-year-old normal school situated at Lewiston. The school was abruptly closed by the economy-minded State legislature, giving rise to bitter resentment in the Lewiston country.

Coming on the heels of the normal school episode, the Hells Canyon fight deepened the breach between B.J. and Jordan, reopening wounds that did not begin to heal until years later, when the two found common ground elsewhere.

B.J. was to say much later of Jordan: "It was never our intention to ride him or feud with him. But there was a deep split between us. However, this is all behind us now. I think he has mellowed, and I understand he says the same thing about me.

"I am very pleased to be able to say we've both outgrown it. He was a tremendous help on the Nez Perce National Park, not just dutifully, but with crusading enthusiasm."

Some of the editor's most fruitful relationships arose out of the Hells Canyon fight, relationships which were to shape the course for him in future years. And some of them developed from the most unlikely quarters.

A florid-faced executive from Spokane dropped into the ink-stained office of the Tribune one day to have a look at the country editor who had been writing the far-out Hells Canyon editorials. It was Kinsey M. Robinson, president of Washington Water Power Co. and one of the intellectual giants of private power.

"He came by to see who I was and to give me the benefit of his views," B.J. recalled. "He stayed for about 2½ hours.

"He had an immense amount of information and a mastery of the technical details. But he didn't use his facts to mow me down or trip me up. He didn't smother me, as he could easily have done. He respected my efforts to go directly to the central issues; he didn't duck, he answered me on the issues I raised, and sometimes he conceded some points.

"I gained a vast respect for his enthusiasm. He is a man who is in love with kilowatts, and with the development of his region. I'm convinced that if he hadn't happened to have started as a lineman for Idaho Power Co., he might well have turned out to be a great Administrator for the Bonneville Power Administration, or a great Secretary of the Interior. He had the ability to see the real things behind the labels."

On another occasion, white-haired Idaho Senator Henry Dworshak, an archconservative about whom B.J. had had few kind things to say, called at the office to make a political statement. He unburdoned himself of the statement, then proceeded to tell B.J. what he thought of his editorials.

"I asked him if he was all through with the news release and wanted to get into a discussion, because if that was the case I had a few observations of my own I wanted to make.

"He said 'yes,' so we went at it. He began to raise his voice, and so did I. Then he started to pound the desk, and I did, too. Pretty soon the newsroom staff and half the printers were gathered outside the door, wondering what would happen next and whether they should come in and break it up.

"Then Dworshak stopped and said, 'Say, you seem to have some pretty strong feelings about this.' And I said, 'I sure do.' Then we calmed down and discussed it some more."

The basic differences continued, but out of that first violent contact there came a meeting of kindred spirits which was to bear fruit in the successful campaigns in Congress for completion of the Lewis & Clark Highway and construction of Bruces Eddy Dam, which was renamed Dworshak after the Senator's death in 1962.

"I learned more from Dworshak than from almost anyone else," B.J. remarked recently. "He taught me that despite the most vigorous disagreement there could be mutual understanding and respect."

When the Senator died, few felt the loss more keenly than B.J. He wrote:

"The words 'liberal' and 'conservative' may have been battered beyond recognition by the quarrels of our era, but Dworshak certainly was a notable champion of old-fashioned conservatism.

"He was a steadfast opponent of big government and big spending, but without ever reaching the stage of fanaticism which impugned the patriotism or integrity of those with a different philosophy.

"He voted frequently with the extremists of the radical right—but never joined them in foul or frantic slurs against their opponents. He was a champion of causes mostly lost, but seldom did he succumb to bitterness to a degree which jeopardized his abiding sense of fairness and friendliness."

Through Dworshak and through a growing acquaintanceship elsewhere in high places, the fruit of his earlier years of eloquence in dissent, B.J. bridged the gap between editor and politican, between critic and builder. The times and circumstances were changing and nowhere was this more evident than in Boise, where, in 1955, a new kind of Republican administration took office under the leadership of Gov. Robert E. Smylie.

"I had known him as attorney general, in the days when I was more partisan, and he was partisan, too," B.J. recalled. "But that was a nonpartisan office, and we worked well together.

"When he became Governor the relationship continued and developed. We were able to be helpful to each other. He was helpful to us not just because these were our projects but because it was good politics to work for them. I have always been impressed by his knowledge of State government, his drive and ambition."

The normal school was reopened. Effective support from the State administration was enlisted for completion of the Lewis & Clark Highway. In turn, the Governor, a liberal Republican, enjoyed more consistent support for his policies from the Tribune than from any other newspaper in the State.

The years brought recurring and fruitful contacts with others with whom B.J. found common ground—with Senators Henry Jackson and Warren Magnuson of Washington, with Senator Albert Gore of Tennessee, the chairman of an important Senate highway committee, with Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois, and with Philleo Nash, U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs. They liked B.J.'s approach to the news.

"I have found that most of these people are very public spirited. Through their contacts with newsmen they are likely to get the feeling that the press is inclined to grill. An aggressive press may be proper in Washington, D.C., but sometimes this attitude filters all the way down until the lowliest cub reporter feels it is his duty to make a U.S. Senator prove he isn't a son of a bitch.

"I have found that these people appreciate and reciprocate a show of genuine curiosity on the part of a reporter, a sincere attempt to get at the facts."

As the times changed, as the Tribune and the Lewiston country moved toward the attainment of long-sought goals, as the irons in the fire grew hotter, as the desk-pounding gave way to the long-distance telephone call and committee luncheons at the Hotel Lewis-Clark replaced the midnight beer parties at Bojack's, some of the closest to him sensed a change in the managing editor.

Had B.J. mellowed? Had he become a part of the establishment?

"Many of the things which made me a nut, or a radical, have become respectable in recent years. The city manager plan, one-way streets in Lewiston, annual sessions of the legislature, and, yes, Hells Canyon Dam. I have not changed my position so much, but I have come to understand the positions of others better.

"You get to be more of a builder and less of a critic as you learn to build. Critics are a dime a dozen. Every main street has its critics. We must have them, but to have them is not enough. Criticism is easy, but building is harder.

"There are real dangers in an editor going beyond the editorial page as a builder. But in our area there were so many things that needed building. Without seeking them, they just came in. As you learn, and as you become informed, the building often follows."

And what should be the role of an editorial page, and the newspaper which enfolds it? B.J. offered this view at a meeting of journalism students at Pocatello in 1959:

"As I understand it, the Founding Fathers did not create a special guarantee for the press in the Constitution merely so editorial writers could share with their readers their wisdom, ignorance or prejudices, according to their moods and methods.

"I think a contract was implied. It pledged the free press to inform the public as accurately, objectively, and courageously as its resources would permit about public affairs in the news columns. Having discharged this basic responsibility to the people, the press was to enjoy the very great privilege of expressing its editorial opinions of the men and movements it had reported upon in the news.

"The Founding Fathers, fortunately for us, took the view that the citizens of America would be wise enough—collectively if not individually—to sort through the various guardians of public opinon and come up with at least a workable version of the truth.

"This revolutionary idea later was formalized into the doctrine that the truth eventually will prevail if ideas and information are allowed to circulate freely enough in the marketplace of public opinion * * *.

"It is easy to be proud when one has the great power of a newspaper at his disposal—even if he has undervalued or dissipated that power, as many of us have. It is much harder to be humble. But our strength will come from our humility, not from our pride. We can be forever proud of the job we have to do. We must be forever humble as to our ability to do it.

"This, to, is easier to say than to achieve. Sometimes we gloat when we should be reflecting after a cause has been won or a candidate defeated. Sometimes, when we have been beset by delegations—besieged by streams of petty, bickering, selfish humans—it is hard to remember that a newspaper mostly serves the unseen readers.

"These unseen, unheard, ordinary people are fairer, kinder and more decent—collectively if not individually—on the average if not in any specific dispute, than the scrambling climbers who have learned the angles and who come to grind their axes at the whetstone of humanity—their newspaper.

"But whatever the day may bring—and however poorly we may meet the obligations of a given day—we have no choice but to remember, day by day and word by written word, that we owe a debt to the Founding Fathers as well as to our readers which we can repay only in fairness, courage and integrity."

If the Tribune has fulfilled its compact with fairness, courage and integrity, says B.J., it is because of a publishing tradition committed to excellence to a degree unusual in any undertaking.

He may have been pondering his own part in that tradition when, on a wintry night in 1961, as the Tribune prepared to move to new quarters, he sat alone at his typewriter, pounding out his last editorial in the cluttered, cramped old building which had served as the newspaper's home for 59 years:

"The editorials, too, have flowed or stuttered or struggled into print over half-remembered generations as one frail mortal and then another endeavored with the time and strength and understanding he had to capture the elusive words which might approximate in honor the voice of the Tribune.

"What shall be said of this latest assertion by William E. Borah?

"How can one rise through the shock and sorrow of some unnoted, long-forgotten private loss to write of pending public matters? (It must be done for good or ill within these same dark walls before the inexorable deadline; amid pain or pleasure it must be done.)

"There was for one the brutal, illuminating night when Al Smith lost the election.

"There was for another the long, demanding campaigns for a Hells Canyon dam or a Northern Idaho College of Education.

"There were for several over the generations the battle for the open river to the sea and the struggle to open a new highway across the Lolo Pass to Missoula.

"And the people—

"They came in streams or separately. They came angry or full of gratitude, threatening or imploring, shouting or sobbing or smiling, to tell how it was or seemed to be when they tried or had to put aside their private character to step upon the public stage.

"The people came—publicity chairmen and Governors, Senators, mechanics, nurses, baseball players, students, jailbirds, artists, teachers, industralists, and sometimes, per chance, a President of the United States.

"And they came hoping—even if they doubted and distrusted and damned—they came hoping still that this dusty, cluttered, crumbling place would somehow house the dream of a free and noble press to serve all the quarreling, struggling, hoping people of a wondrous land.

"And sometimes, when wisdom paused a moment in its flight and strength arose in time to meet the challenge—the mighty hope and honored dream for a glorious moment at least came true.

"The cobwebs sway for the last time for all we know. The battered floor will creak no more, perhaps, to hurrying footsteps. The whispering breeze carrying tales of times long gone will rustle then unheard.

"But in the proud new building the memories will linger. Much that is old and appears decrepit is much too precious to ever leave behind.—B.J."

"BIG BROTHER"—INVASIONS OF PRIVACY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, today's "Big Brother" item is a letter from Dr. Hans F. Winterkorn, professor of civil engineering at Princeton University.

Professor Winterkorn's letter speaks for itself, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Princeton University, School of Engineering and Applied Science,
Princeton, N.J., April 15, 1965.

Hon. Edward V. Long,
Senator from Missouri,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Long: It was indeed a pleasure to meet you and Mrs. Long the other day on the occasion of the crowning of Princess Ann at the dinner of the Missouri State Society.

The purpose of this letter is to express to you my personal thanks for your courageous investigation of the tampering in post offices with first-class mail of American citizens. This tampering has been going on for quite a long time also at the Princeton Post Office. My personal mail was often steamed opened and the flaps reglued so carelessly that the stamps actually were lost in the process and the letters arrived finally without stamps. This I think is a good indication that the opening must have occurred right in our own post office here.

If I could be of help to your committee, I should be glad to testify on my experience with the post office in Princeton.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Hans F. Winterkorn,
Professor of Civil Engineering.

SALUTE TO TUNISIA ON THE CELEBRATION OF HER INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, with our Nation's anniversary of independence approaching rapidly, the United States is being reminded almost weekly of great strides taken around the globe, during the postwar era, toward the establishment of self-governing nations dedicated to concepts of liberty and to respect for the dignity of man.

Only a generation ago, Africa generally was regarded as the "dark continent," a land presumably populated by unambitious, benighted individuals, an area to be exploited and governed by absentee landlords, a treasure house of raw materials upon which the so-called civilized world might draw at its whim.

As events and pressures have intensified concern for the well-being of others, the irresistible forces which brought into being the United States of America have been nourished and nurtured by our Nation. Consequently, we can regard with gratification and satisfaction the trends which have enabled other peoples to embark on the course charted at Independence Hall, in Philadelphia, 189 years ago.

That movement has given birth to nearly 3 dozen self-governing republics and voluntary commonwealths, established in a brief span of time on the continent of Africa. The most recent celebration of its own independence day occurred in Tunisia, on June 1. In commemorating the recognition of their own sovereignty, nearly 4 million citizens of that former French territory reaffirmed—in a manner which justifies faith in their capability and courage—their dedication to the ideals of respect for individuals, of opportunity to choose one's own way of life, and of collective cooperation for mutual advancement and betterment.

It is a privilege to note the observance of Tunisia's Independence Day, and, in passing, to remark that in the months ahead, during the current year, some 20-odd other African countries will enjoy the same rewarding emotions, which also have been felt earlier this year in another 8 free African nations. No longer is this great, rich continent to be regarded as backward and unaspiring. We trust that the promise of a rewarding future will be realized by each one.

INTERVENTION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, although President Johnson's intervention into the Dominican Republic was misunderstood and misinterpreted by certain members of the American press corps, and by the editors of several influential papers, it has been encouraging to me to note just how much support and understanding one finds for the President's policy from a broad reading of the American press.

As an indication of the breadth of this support, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record five recent items:

First. An article in the Washington Star for June 1, 1965, by the veteran liberal columnist, Eric Sevareid.

Second. An article by the well-known Hearst columnist, Pierre J. Huss, in the New York Journal American for May 16, 1965.

Third. An article by Ray Cromley, veteran columnist for the Scripps-Howard press, in the Washington Daily News for May 12, 1965.

Fourth. An editorial which appeared on May 4, 1965, in the Bridgeport, Conn., Post.

Fifth. An article in the Washington Star for May 31, 1965, by the well-known Washington columnist, Max Freedman.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues, in particular, to a few paragraphs from Mr. Sevareid's column, which I consider all the more significant because Mr. Sevareid has, over the years, been regarded as a member of the liberal community—as a champion of moderation and a foe of extremism.

> For me it is impossible to believe that the Communist threat was a myth—

Said Mr. Sevareid—

> impossible to believe that a democratic and stable government could have been formed by the impassioned leaders of thousands of armed and impassioned people, a vast number of them youngsters. It is hard for me to believe that we could not have prevented the tragic fighting in the northern part of the city, easy to believe that we did prevent an even more awful blood-letting in the congested downtown region.
>
> Meantime the nonsense arguments should stop. To say that the United States has kept the Dominican Republic from enjoying a free, stable democratic government is nonsense; we have given them another chance to find their feet on the long, hard road to democracy. To say that the real fear in Latin America is of American gunboat diplomacy is nonsense; every literate Latin American knows that American interventions have always been temporary while communism is permanent.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 1, 1965]

Some Answers to Second-Guessers

(By Eric Sevareid)

The tide of second guessing about the American intervention in Santo Domingo—as to its justification, its size, its methods and its aims—had reached oceanic proportions by the time this writer managed to get to the first European city established in the New World. Here in what Columbus called "the land of God," had come the first teachers and preachers, yet here remains, after 5 centuries, one of the political hellholes of the hemisphere, its soiled streets once again thronged with armed men from abroad.

The scenes of bitter sorrow in Santo Domingo have been well described; there are other things, perhaps, worth putting down at this late date. I thought I had rarely seen such brave work by combat reporters, rarely such emotional involvement on the part of some of them, rarely such a wealth of unconfirmable reports and rumors, rarely such a disastrous lack of contact between reports and American officials who were not only physically remote but for a long time silenced by Presidential orders. And rarely have I read such certain conclusions in American press editorials about a phenomenon in which so much was uncertain and inconclusive.

For me it is impossible to believe that the Communist threat was a myth, impossible to believe that a democratic and stable government could have been formed by the impassioned leaders of thousands of armed and impassioned people, a vast number of them youngsters. It is hard for me to believe that we could not have prevented the tragic fighting in the northern part of the city, easy to believe that we did prevent an even more awful bloodletting in the congested downtown region.

I cannot understand the cry that we put in far too many men. An airport, several miles of corridor and a safety sector with a long perimeter require thousands of soldiers who require other thousands to support and supply them. Nor can I understand the complaint that the President acted with too much haste.

Over many years I have been adjusted to the complaint of "too late with too little." I find it hard to make a quick switch to the complaint of "too soon with too much." I fail to understand the editorialist who points out with disdain that after all, there were only a few handfuls of Communists present.

In a very real sense their lack of numbers is their strength. It was because they were few that President Bosch had not bothered to deal severely with them. It was because they were few that they could do much of their work undetected. It was because they were few that they could act with rapidity when the explosion came. It was because they were few that foreign opinionmakers could make the Americans seem ridiculous and give us a propaganda defeat. As John Bartlow Martin reminds us, Communists do not make revolutions, they take them over.

Partly because of this—their small numbers—American troops could not invade the heart of the city, or allow anyone else to invade it.

You cannot risk causing many deaths in order to capture a few individuals and expect, ever, to justify such an action to anybody, certainly not to the American people. So, at this writing at least, the Dominican Communists remain, finding safety as they first found strength, in their numbers—their small numbers.

And their small number in various other Latin American countries lies near the heart of the profound dilemma that confronts the United States for the future. Revolts are brewing in other nations to the south. In all these revolts Communist elements will be present. Are we to put down every uprising because a Communist threat is present? Obviously we cannot, even though some of these uprisings probably will produce Communist governments. This is why Castro laughs in his beard. He believes the political metamorphosis of Latin America is not manageable on our terms.

But nothing in this realm of human action is inevitable; the game is not lost as long as we act on the assumption that it can be won. There are Latin societies strong enough to handle the Communists on their own. Others will be galvanized into counteraction by Communist victories or near victories close by their borders.

Meantime the nonsense arguments should stop. To say that the United States has kept the Dominican Republic from enjoying a free, stable democratic government is nonsense; we have given them another chance to find their feet on the long, hard road to democracy. To say that the real fear in Latin America is of American gunboat diplomacy is nonsense; every literate Latin American knows that American interventions have always been temporary while communism is permanent.

It is nonsense to indulge any longer the self-conscious idea that Latin America's troubles are the fault of the United States. Some are; most are the fault of Latin America. Its ways of life are superior to ours in more than a few respects, but not in respect to the art of government. In the last century and a half there have been in all of Latin America approximately 3,700 coups, rebellions, and civil wars.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, May 16, 1965]

World in Focus: Intervention Versus Aggression

(By Pierre J. Huss)

The Soviet Union, Red China, and Communist Cuba never tire of branding U.S. military intervention in South Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic as "naked aggression." We are so accustomed to hearing this propaganda smear that we shrug it off. But the Reds know from the big lie technique that the oftener you tell a whopper the more will unconsciously sink into the minds of those you target as your next victim.

To set the record straight, then, what is intervention and aggression—especially if you put it in the light of the large-scale landing of U.S. Marines in the Dominican Republic? I asked one of the foremost experts in U.N. to answer that question, Ambassador Liu Chieh of Nationalist China.

I turn this column over to Ambassador Chieh:

"Intervention and aggression are not necessarily synonymous or interchangeable words. In recent world history most flagrant acts of aggression have been committed without involving overt and direct acts of intervention. In our day this type of concealed, indirect but carefully calculated aggression—usually carried out through the familiar tactics of infiltration, subversion and the use of proxies—has been developed by the Communists into a fine art. Indeed, it has become the most favored, as well as the most effective tool of Communist foreign policy."

Ambassador Chieh added:

"Yet this type of aggression has received no careful consideration in the textbooks of international law. One of the basic tenets of international law is the concept of direct responsibility of states for their international conduct. In the Communist strategy of protracted conflict, direct action is more often than not avoided.

"This being so, it is often difficult to fasten on the Communist governments the precise legal blame, even when they have in fact committed legal aggression.

"The Communist governments do not set great store by bourgeois international law. Yet they do not hesitate to turn traditional judicial concepts to their own advantage. Now the U.S. action in the Dominican Republic was admittedly an act of intervention. The U.S. Government never concealed this fact. This intervention, far from being an aggression, was intended to accomplish the dual purpose of protecting American lives and forestalling the Communist takeover of a sister republic. So the U.S. action was in fact but a response to Communist intervention and aggression."

Ambassador Chieh emphasized that if a sovereign people in a helpless country are threatened by the Red foe, their right must be upheld to pick a government that is the choice of the popular majority.

"It should be remembered," he said, "that the right of self-determination can be properly exercised only in unfettered freedom.

"In the case of the Dominican Republic, there was ample evidence that Communist conspirators attempted to exploit the chaos and confusion that initially broke out in Santo Domingo. It would have been a mockery of the principle of self-determination if the Dominican people had been left at the mercy of these Communist adventurers."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, May 12, 1965]

U.S. Dominican Action Is Boost for Vietnamese

(By Ray Cromley)

President Johnson's quick, strong action in the Dominican Republic may have a major effect on morale in Vietnam.

A Vietnamese guerrilla fighter now in town says privately that "the U.S. Dominican stand is more significant to him than American raids in North Vietnam."

The northern raids have boosted South Vietnamese confidence markedly. But there has still been the nagging fear these bombings may be part of a U.S. buildup in preparation for negotiations. There's a strong belief in South Vietnam that negotiations mean defeat.

SOMETHING ELSE

Moving U.S. troops into the Dominican Republic, without shilly shallying, to stop a Red thrust in that tiny country, is something else again.

It means to this guerrilla fighter and to other Vietnamese he is in contact with, that President Johnson really means to stop communism.

Since Laos, they don't believe promises or speeches.

But if Mr. Johnson is willing to stake U.S. prestige in the tiny Dominican Republic, then it's not likely, they reason, the President could afford to let Vietnam go down the drain.

By the same token, this Dominican action may be discouraging to Hanoi.

The nagging fear among South Vietnamese officials, military men, hamlet chiefs, police, and everyone else who has stuck his neck and his family's neck out in fighting the Communists, has been that the United States would pull out despite President Johnson's assurances to the contrary.

BIG QUESTION

The one question almost every Vietnamese I saw asked me on my trip through South Vietnam was, "Will the United States stay if the war is long and discouraging?"

These men knew a pullout would mean death for themselves and their families at the hands of Communists.

This worry about what the United States would do has not engendered courage. In some cases, it has meant that local officials hedged their bets and kept tightly to neutrality, straying neither to the Communist or Government sides.

The feeling that the United States would leave accounts in sizable measure for Cambodia's Red China leanings, for Burma's careful leftist "neutrality," and for the cautiousness of millions of uncommitted people in southeast Asia.

EXPERIENCE

Experience in the mainland China and other Asian wars suggests that when the people are certain which side will win a war, they leap to that side in large numbers.

Because of the Korean, mainland China and Lao wars, there's a strong feeling in Asia that the United States is good at "quickie" fights, but that it wearies in long struggles. This feeling accounts for the belief in many Asian minds that in the long run the Reds will win.

The trickle of information from South Vietnam the past few days seems to indicate the Dominican action will help convince some doubters that the war is not in the Communist bag.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, May 4, 1965]

An Error Rectified

It is now clear that the United States originally underestimated the role of communists in the Dominican Republic. But when the error was discovered, it acted swiftly with armed forces.

That simplified analysis was made in informed diplomatic circles in Washington over the weekend following the turbulent week of rioting and shooting in Santo Domingo.

The United States sent nearly 5,000 marines and airborne troops into the island, solely to rescue American and other foreign citizens whose lives were endangered by the rising anarchy. President Johnson announced that 4,500 additional marines and paratroops were being sent to the Republic.

Some critics had been arguing that our military operation was larger than necessary, and was primarily intended to halt a rebellion which threatened to open the way to Communist domination of the little nation.

Actually, President Johnson's moves appear to have been based on both considerations. In his announcement that more troops were to be sent to Santo Domingo, President Johnson said their presence was necessary to secure the island against communism, as the Red uprising had been taken over by Communist conspirators directed from abroad.

This would seem clearly to mean that Castro and his deadly crews are behind the anarchy in the Dominican Republic. Law and order broke down completely when rebellious army leaders who started the uprising acknowledged they could not control the elements they had set loose. Those elements were under control of hardcore Communists trained in Cuba and Czechoslovakia, and they began deliberate moves to attack U.S. nationals and property.

By last midweek more than 50 Communists had been identified, actively engaged in arming and leading toughs and criminals in an effort to set up a second Communist bastion in this hemisphere.

President Johnson moved quickly, despite the knowledge that many Latin Americans and Europeans would be infuriated by "unilateral" Yankee action reiminiscent of gunboat diplomacy. The President took the action because he felt that at the moment there was no other course. It was certainly better to bruise Latin sensibilities than risk the deaths of U.S. citizens, and a continued trend to anarchy which would eventually make another Cuba out of the Dominican Republic.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram, May 5, 1965]

The Johnson Doctrine

President Johnson is bolstering the Monroe Doctrine and bringing it up to date. It will be remembered that for more than 100 years, the Monroe Doctrine kept this hemisphere from further colonization by European powers by warning that any attempt at a power grab by a foreign country on this hemisphere would be opposed by the United States.

The Monroe Doctrine had its most crucial test in 1867 in Mexico. Austrian Archduke Maximilian I established a kingdom there in 1864. Pressure from the United States forced France to withdraw its armed support. President Lincoln was occupied in the Civil War but lent his influence to Mexican patriots against the monarchy. Patriots led by Benito Juarez defeated Maximilian and he was executed.

Theodore Roosevelt enforced the Monroe Doctrine against Kaiser Wilhelm's Germany at the turn of the century. In the Venezuela claims dispute, he advanced the theory, which became known as the Roosevelt corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, that the United States had direct interest and the obligation to impose order in the affairs of Latin American countries. That turned back German warships that had been dispatched to collect German claims. Latin America did not like it but the Roosevelt corollary maintained order in the hemisphere for a third of a century.

Now President Johnson has imposed his own corollary to the ancient Monroe Doctrine. That is, that when foreign elements including citizens of other Latin American countries, intervene in the affairs of another such country, the United States will oppose them. It is because Communist-trained rebels, including some Cuban and Czechoslovakia trainees, infiltrated the rebellion and took control, that American marines joined the counterrebellion.

The marines had been sent to evacuate American and other nationals and did. In the meantime, a cease-fire was violated because the rebels had lost control of their forces. The rebels had been infiltrated by Castro and the Soviet Union. They could not secure the cease-fire to which they had agreed.

Former President Eisenhower approved Mr. Johnson's action. Had Mr. Eisenhower moved as quickly in Cuba, Fidel Castro might not have had a chance to consolidate the first Communist foothold on the hemisphere. President Johnson is acting to prevent a second foothold. Of course he was immediately branded an imperialist by Castro and the Soviet Union. They could not stand being frustrated in the second power grab.

[From the Evening Star, Washington (D.C.), May 31, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S DOMINICAN ACTION

(By Max Freedman)

It is best to admit that the sending of U.S. marines into the Dominican Republic, without the prior consent of the Organization of American States, constituted a technical breach of the charter under which this American system of regional security operates. No amount of retrospective logic can wipe out that fact. The serious questions are whether President Johnson and Secretary Rusk had any valid alternative; and whether their actions since the early days of the crisis have strengthened or weakened the inter-American system.

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, for example, has recalled that President Kennedy was very careful to consult with OAS during the Cuban crisis of 1962. He speaks with special authority on that crisis for his own contribution in those critical days was consistently valiant and distinguished. Yet Senator KENNEDY, on reflection, will surely admit that his comparison, at bottom, is completely misleading.

The essential feature of the Cuban crisis is that President Kennedy, amid conditions of intense secrecy and in days filled with almost incredible activity, had a margin of precious time to prepare the American response down to the last detail. Included in that plan of action was the wise decision to inform the OAS, the United Nations, and various leaders of the Western World.

But this statement of America's intentions, whether conveyed privately or publicly, came very late in the day. It came only after the carefully considered American plan had been set in motion. At no time was President Kennedy prepared to give the inter-American system the right to modify his plan, to delay it, or to veto it. In no sense of the term as understood by diplomacy was there any "consultation" with the OAS. President Kennedy merely informed it of his plans when it became both wise and convenient for him to do so.

Now it would be absurd to compare the Dominican crisis with the Cuban crisis as a threat to peace. But the inherent danger of the present crisis is not now the issue. What concerns us is the fact that the special circumstances of the Dominican crisis gave President Johnson less time for working with the OAS than President Kennedy had in the Cuban emergency. Those circumstances included the breakdown of law and order, the sinister threat of Communist mischief in conditions of spreading anarchy, the urgent and repeated confessions by the Dominican authorities then in power that they had lost control of the situation, and the reluctant but unanimous judgment of U.S. officials in Santo Domingo that troops had to be sent at once by Washington to protect and evacuate American citizens.

It was the unanimous decision of everyone who participated in Johnson's decision that the crisis would tolerate no delay. There was the related agreement that the OAS, even in the best of circumstances, could take no action in less than 48 hours; and the warning messages from Santo Domingo emphasized that such a delay would entail an intolerable risk to American lives.

Was this an unreasonable estimate of the situation when one remembers the history of the OAS in other emergencies and its conduct in this crisis? There will be many Americans, as well as many people in Latin America, who will be ready to believe that we are able to indulge these academic anxieties only because the President's decision did in fact avert disaster. For it would be a very different debate if we were conducting it on the ruins of freedom in the Dominican Republic, if another Castro-influenced government were in power there, and if the contagion of anarchy and communism spread to other lands in Latin America.

The record shows that President Johnson, perhaps more than any other President in our history, has been eager to strengthen the inter-American system and to equip it with the power to act quickly and decisively in meeting any threat to the security of this hemisphere. If he succeeds in this enterprise, it may well be the judgment of future historians that a small technical breach, soon rectified, led to the most significant gains in regional consultation and security. It is President Johnson's long-term commitment to the OAS that matters, and it is high time that commitment were more closely understood, both here and in Latin America.

SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MAGNA CARTA

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the 750th anniversary of the granting of the Magna Carta is at hand; and I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a proclamation on the subject by the mayor of Dallas, along with a statement on the great charter, prepared most ably by Mrs. Harry Joseph Morris, State chairman of the Texas State Magna Carta Committee.

There being no objection, the proclamation and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
City of Dallas.

PROCLAMATION

This year, 1965, is the 750th anniversary of the granting of the great charter known as Magna Carta; and

Whereas Magna Carta provided the cornerstone of constitutional free government and some of the basic political ideas which shaped our Nation's Declaration of Independence and Constitution; and

Whereas in Magna Carta are embedded the concepts of government limited by law, of individual liberties, of right of trial by jury, of just taxation subject to approval by a competent assembly, and other fundamental principles of freedom and justice; and

Whereas to commemorate the 750th anniversary of the granting of Magna Carta, special ceremonies will be held at Runnymede, England, site at which King John and 2,000 English barons fashioned Magna Carta: Now, therefore,

I, Erik Jonsson, mayor of the city of Dallas, do hereby proclaim June 13–19, 1965, as Magna Carta Week.

ERIK JONSSON,
Mayor of the City of Dallas.

THE 750TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MAGNA CARTA

(By Mrs. Harry Joseph Morris, charter, honorary life State regent of the Texas division of the National Society Magna Carta Dames; State chairman, the Texas State Magna Carta Committee; and official representative of the State of Texas, appointed by Gov. John Connally; and official representative of the city of Dallas, appointed by Mayor Erik Jonsson, of Dallas, to the 750th anniversary of the Magna Carta, at Runnymede)

King John of England granted the great charter, the Magna Carta, at a certain meadow between Staines and Windsor, near Egham, known as Runnymede on Monday, the 15th of June, 1215 A.D.

In preparation for his parley with the barons of England, he had made his headquarters at Windsor Castle. The insurgents were in possession of the city of London. The barons' armed host crossed the Thames by Staines bridge and set up their pavilions on Runnymede. John came there to meet them, with a small retinue of bishops and magnates whose names can be read in the preamble to the charter. His advisers included Stephen Langton, cardinal and archbishop of Canterbury, and the Earl Marshal of England, Hubert de Burgh. The weight of their counsel coupled with the unrelenting pressure of the baronial leadership compelled John to cede the charter.

Modern historians point to the limited application of the charter, interpreting it as a feudal document intended to reform specific abuses of John's own reign. It is true that the barons in 1215 were often thinking in terms of their own order and that many generations later lawyers began to interpret the charter in the light of vastly changed circumstances. It is equally true that the Magna Carta proved in times of crisis to be the safeguard of constitutional progress and that the simple legal rulings embodied in the charter are the principles in which our courts take pride today, and has been the keystone for not only English law, but for the development of our own.

Quoting from Gov. John Connally, "In this age of space, when mankind is on the verge of explorations of other planets, it is well to pause for awhile and reflect on our priceless heritage of freedom. Without such a heritage, all we are and all we hope to be, would be meaningless, for liberty is our most priceless possession."

Further quoting from Gov. John Connally's official memorandum, dated February 9, 1965: "Magna Carta provided the cornerstone of constitutional free government and some of the basic political ideas which shaped our own Nation's Declaration of Independence and Constitution. In Magna Carta are embedded the concepts of government limited by law, of individual liberties, of right of trial by jury, of just taxation subject to approval by a competent assembly, and other fundamental principles of freedom and justice. * * * It is fitting that this 750th anniversary of the granting of the Magna Carta be observed by all citizens, and that the importance of Magna Carta to our form of government and our way of life be recognized. Therefore, I, as Governor of Texas, do hereby designate the week of June 13–19, 1965, as Magna Carta Week in Texas."

The surety barons, from whom the members of the Texas Division of the National Society Magna Carta Dames claim descent are: William d' Albini, Roger Bigod, Hugh Bigod, Henry de Bohun, Richard de Clare, Gilbert de Clare, John Fitzrobert, Robert Fitzwalter, William de Huntingfield, John de Lacie, William de Lanvallei, William Malet, William de Mowbray, Saire de Quincy, Robert de Roos, Geoffrey de Saye, Robert de Vere. The names of the other surety barons who have no known issue living today are: William de Fortibus, William de Hardell, Geoffrey de Mandeville, William Marshall, Roger de Montbegon, Richard de Montfichet, Richard de Percy, Eustace de Vesci.

The 750th anniversary of the Magna Carta will be celebrated in Britain in June 1965, and some 200 American descendants of the Magna Carta barons, headed by Mrs. John S. Wurts, Sr., national president of the National Society Magna Carta Dames, and her daughter, Miss Dorothy Wurts, national Magna Carta tour director, both of Philadelphia, Pa., with representatives from all of the 50 States will attend.

Mrs. Harry Joseph Morris, charter, honorary life State regent of the Texas division of the National Society Magna Carta Dames, 6840 Lakewood Boulevard, Dallas, who has been appointed by Gov. John Connally to be the official representative of the State of Texas, and who has also been appointed by Mayor Erik Jonsson to be the official representative of the city of Dallas, will head the Texas delegation who will attend the 750th anniversary of the Magna Carta ceremonies in England. The Texas delegation includes: Mrs. George Halfin Likins and Miss Florine Antoinette Tye, Abilene; Mr. Jameston Rezin Brannon, Jr., Carthage; Miss Nadine Lain, Mr. and Mrs. Lee Laird, Mr. and Mrs. Frederick M. Lange, Miss Grace Lockey, Mrs. John I. Moore, Mr. Richard James Price, Mrs. Verna Tye Price, and Mrs. Morris, all of Dallas; Mrs. D. L. Decker, Jr., Mrs. Robert E. Hulver, Mrs. E. Bates Nisbet, Houston; Mrs. Robert J. Whelan and Miss Regina Whelan, Marshall; Mrs. William E. Bates, Midland; Mrs. Ervin A. Tyroff, San Antonio; Mrs. F. Knight Parker, San Augustine; Mrs. L. E. Livingston, Jr., Seabrook; Mrs. Paul G. Gooch, Victoria; Mrs. Robert Knox Egan, Mr. and Mrs. John Hart Wilson, Wichita Falls; and they will be headquartered at the Europa Hotel in London, England, from June 6 through 16, and will enjoy many interesting tours through the historic sites of England.

Among the events scheduled are: On Monday, June 7, the Magna Carta tour group will be honor guests at the full dress rehearsal of the Magna Carta play, written by John Arden, one of Britain's most praised young playwrights, who was commissioned to write a play commemorating the 750th anniversary of the Magna Carta, by the city of London, which will be premiered at the Mermaid Theater, the only theater in the ancient city of London, in a riverside setting. On Thursday, June 10, the party will attend the Magna Carta ceremony at St. Paul's Cathedral in London, and her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, hopes to attend. On Saturday, June 12, they will see the lovely ceremony known as "Trooping the Color," celebrating the official birthday of the Queen, when a full dress parade of the Brigade of Guards is held by the Queen on Horse Guards Parade. The highlight of the trip will be at Runnymede on Tuesday, June 15, when a special ceremony presented by the Magna Carta Trust, England, to commemorate the historic sealing of the Great Charter by King John, in A.D. 1215, will be held. A ceremony will also be held in the Great Hall of the Law Courts on June 15, in London, at which the Lord Chancellor and the judges of the Supreme Court will be present, with representatives of the legal profession in Britain and distinguished representatives from the Commonwealth and the United States attending.

It is interesting to note that Runnymede is still a placid green meadow, uninterrupted except by a small memorial to the Magna Carta erected by the American Bar Association, and the new memorial to the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States of America, which was dedicated with an acre of ground, on May 14, 1965, by Her Majesty, the Queen, with Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and her two children, Caroline and John, Jr., Kennedy, attending.

When the Magna Carta was granted on Runnymede in 1215, a number of copies were sealed and were taken with writs to the shires in the country. Four copies remain; one in Salisbury Cathedral (probably the one taken to Wiltshire), one in Lincoln Cathedral (probably the one taken to Lincolnshire), and two in the British Museum. There are three reissues of the Magan Carta, in 1216, in 1217, and in 1225. A copy of the latter, known as the Laycock Abbey reissue, is in the British Museum.

The Dallas-Fort Worth Colony of the Texas Division of the National Society of Magna Carta Dames, of which Mrs. James D. Lutrell, Sr., is the regent, presented a facsimile of the Magna Carta, which was sent to New York by England, for the World's Fair in 1939, with an honor guard of which John William MacGowan was captain. Mr. MacGowan presented the facsimile to the Dallas-Fort Worth Colony, who in turn presented it to the Dallas Public Library at a formal dedication on Monday, June 15, 1964, on the 749th anniversary of the Magna Carta, with Mrs. Lutrell, Sr., assisted by Mrs. Harry Joseph Morris, honorary life regent of the Dallas-Fort Worth Colony, and charter, honorary life State regent of the Texas Division of the National Society Magna Carta Dames, making the presentation to Mrs. Lillian Bradshaw, director-librarian of the Dallas Public Library, in her office. The facsimile includes both the Latin version and the English translation, and hangs as a permanent display in the Texas history and genealogy department of the Dallas Public Library.

Mayor Erik Jonsson has proclaimed June 13–19, 1965, as Magna Carta Week in Dallas, and other mayors in the various cities throughout the State are also issuing similar proclamations, in a statewide observance of the 750th anniversary of the Magna Carta.

"ELECTRONICS: THE ROOM-SIZE WORLD"

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in a few short weeks the performance of the communications satellite known as Early Bird has astonished peoples around the globe. Since the launching in April, this extraordinary vehicle has demonstrated to all mankind the remarkable achievements possible by talented, determined individuals laboring in a free society and motivated by a desire to put technological skill and scientific knowhow into service for human benefit.

The Communications Satellite Corporation has, with this almost unbelievable dependable relay mechanism, taken a first step in making practicable a truly global means of communication. The effectiveness of America's approach to the linking of continents and nations justifies the confidence typified by the Communications Satellite Act of 1962. I trust that the initial successes are an answer to all who doubted the soundness of the policy embodied in that controverted legislation.

The success of Early Bird was due in large part to pioneering efforts of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; but great credit must be given to private enterprise, notably, two versatile corporations which carry on a large proportion of their activities in my home State of California—the Douglas Aircraft Co., which produced the launch vehicle; and the Hughes Aircraft Co., which fabricated the satellite.

With a new era in worldwide communications dawning, I believe Congress is warranted in viewing with satisfaction its record of supporting NASA programs and making possible the formation of the Communications Satellite Corporation. I feel that the American people will benefit from knowing more details about this venture, as recounted in an article—published in a recent issue of Time magazine—which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTRONICS: THE ROOM-SIZE WORLD

Lyndon Johnson immediately grasped the significance and potential of Early Bird, the new communications satellite hovering 22,300 miles above the equator. Aware that the Russians were flooding European TV stations with films and pictures for the 20th anniversary of V–E day, the President acted swiftly last week to upstage them.

In Washington, U.S.-network bigwigs were expecting to meet at the White House to complain about the President's increasing preemption of prime TV time on short notice. Instead of a meeting, Johnson produced a new short-notice request. As soon as possible, he said, he wanted to use Early Bird to broadcast a V–E anniversary speech direct to Europe. Three and one-half hours later, in a slow and measured drawl, he was chiding Charles de Gaulle live on British and Italian TV screens, and being taped for later rebroadcast in almost every other European nation.

GLOBAL BLANKET

As a means of muting Russia's planned propaganda barrage, European broadcasters called it "a master stroke." But the unprecedented transatlantic transmission of the master's voice and face also gave rise to international problems undreamed of a week ago. CBS's Walter Cronkite noted that the President had violated diplomatic protocol by addressing foreign peoples directly without first notifying their governments. A British Broadcasting Corp. official complained that he was forced to disrupt the normal evening schedule on short notice. Foreign chiefs of state, suddenly alert to the prestige potential of broadcasting directly to foreign nations by satellite, began stirring. German Chancellor Ludwig Erhard immediately requested time to address the American people.

Such new problems only served to underscore the new epoch in communications that rose with the drumshaped, 85-pound satellite. In an age fast growing familiar with man's race beyond the confines of his own world, Early Bird reached back toward the earth and seemed to shrink it almost to room size. All by itself, the satellite blanketed more than one-third of the globe. If two more soar into orbit, for the first time in history it will be literally true that for every nation instant contact will be possible with every inhabited spot on earth.

WORLD TOWN MEETING

In Europe and the United States, television's showmen labored to exploit Early Bird's versatility. At their best, the programs were as moving and immediate as a closeup of Houston's great Surgeon Michael DeBakey repairing a human heart while fascinated doctors in Geneva looked over his shoulder. Europe watched troop movements in the streets of Santo Domingo while bullets still ricocheted across the Caribbean town. The Town Meeting of the World turned international as Barry Goldwater in New York, Dean Rusk and Sir Alec Douglas-Home in London, and Maurice Schumann in Paris joined in a transatlantic gabfest. A mug shot of Canada's most wanted man, relayed by Early Bird and recognized by a televiewer in Florida, gave accused bank robber Georges Lemay the dubious fame of becoming the first fugitive nabbed by satellite. NBC teamed up with the BBC and, for a refreshing few minutes, Huntley-Brinkley became Huntley-Dimbleby.

Goonhilly Downs, Pleumeur-Bodou, Raisting, Andover—the unfamiliar places where big, ground-based stations were relaying programs to Early Bird—became part of the language of the communications industry. And between the best and the worst that TV had to offer, imaginative men could pick out the promise of a dream born more than a century ago, when the first crude telegraph suggested that man might someday far outreach the limitations of his speech and hearing.

MAGIC FACTOR

As the telegraph matured into the telephone, the telephone into radio, and radio into television, each successive stage in the electronics revolution was hailed by optimistic prophets as a magic factor that would weld all the world into one peaceful unit. But always some technical problem kept the vision from coming quite true. Telephone talk, for instance, could not cross oceans on early telegraph cables, and the first radiotelephones were noisy and capricious. Television proved even harder to handle because its signals ride on high-frequency radio waves that are useful only over line-of-sight distances; unaided, they cannot travel past the horizon, an average of 30 miles away.

Only a few years ago, before the success of the first experimental satellites, electronic communication was still disappointingly short of its theoretical ideal. Plentiful telephone circuits crossed the United States and Europe on improved landlines, or by means of microwave beams that hopped between towers on buildings or mountaintops. TV programs used the same beams or traveled overland by coaxial cable. In 1956 American Telephone & Telegraph, the British General Post Office, and Canadian Overseas Telecommunications Corp. laid twin cables under the North Atlantic capable of carrying 36 simultaneous telephone conversations. But the cables were expensive and of limited capacity, and TV could not squeeze itself through them.

ALL BUT IMPOSSIBLE

Whatever was needed to make possible a system of truly worldwide communication was still missing, although scientists were reasonably sure they knew what that missing link was. In 1945, British Electronics Engineer Arthur C. Clarke, who later became a first-rank science-fiction writer ("Childhood's End"), published in Wireless World an extraordinarily farsighted article spelling out in detail his theory that earth satellites on high orbits could act as relay stations carrying telephone and TV to the entire earth.

The biggest space vehicles in existence then were German V–2 rockets with a vertical range of only 100 miles. Even so, Clarke boldly selected a particularly difficult orbit for his relay satellite: it should circle at 22,300 miles above the earth's surface, he said. At that distance, Clarke's calculations showed, it would take exactly 24 hours for the satellite to complete one orbit. "It would remain," he wrote, "fixed in the sky of a whole hemisphere and, unlike other heavenly bodies, would neither rise nor set." Nearly 20 years later, Early Bird follows that orbit.

Nothing like a relay satellite was within the reach of the best technology of 1945, but the needed elements were developed as if on cue. Transistors (invented in 1948) and other solid-state electronic devices replaced vacuum tubes, which would have been too bulky, short-lived, and power hungry for use in satellites. High-power rockets were spawned by the United States-Soviet race for long-range ballistic missiles. High-speed electronic computers appeared just in time to take over the all-but-impossible task of calculating orbits, solving complex equations in split seconds.

Everything fell into place like matching pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. By the mid-1950's electronics engineers began to realize that relay satellites were not only possible, they might well prove enormously profitable.

First to fit all the new techniques together was Bell Telephone Laboratories, which built Telstar I, and had it launched at its own expense in July 1962. Circling in a comparatively low elliptical orbit, 600 to 3,500 miles above the earth, Telstar was a striking success; it relayed the first live TV picture (a view of the American flag) across the Atlantic to receiving stations in England and France. Telephone talk over Telstar was as clear as if the speakers were only blocks apart.

But Telstar was only an experiment, as were its successors Telstar II and Relay I and II built by Radio Corp. of America for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. On low orbits, they all whirled around the earth faster than the 24-hour period of the earth's rotation; they could be used for communication only during the brief periods when they were within line-of-sight range of their ground stations. Such a system would require many more satellites to be practical.

DESPERATE PLOY

At Hughes Aircraft Co. in California, however, three young engineers, Drs. Harold A. Rosen, Donald D. Williams, and Thomas Hudspeth, were anxious to shoot for a higher target—nothing less than the 22,300-mile synchronous orbit conceived by Clarke back in 1945. They were sure they could lick its formidable problems, but they could not convince the Hughes management. "One day," says Hughes Vice President Lawrence A. Hyland, "Williams walked into my office and laid a cashier's check for $10,000—his entire savings—on my desk. 'Here's what I want to contribute to the program,' he said. 'I'm sorry it's all I can do.' " It was enough. Williams' check was returned, but the company decided that his faith was worth investing in. Out of that desperate ploy grew Early Bird.

Synchronous satellites, such as the Hughes men wanted to build, have much in their favor. Best of all, they seem to hang in one spot in the sky. But they also have two strikes against them before they take to space. They must be kept as light as possible because of the great rocket effort needed to place them on their high orbits, and in spite of their lightness, they must transmit a radio signal strong enough to be heard at that great distance. Perhaps more serious is the problem of keeping them on station above a selected point on the earth's equator. They are continually pushed out of position by irregularities in the earth's gravitation, by the influence of the sun and moon, and even by the infinitesimal pressure of sunlight. They must carry propulsion devices that will always be ready to nudge them back in place again. These obstacles were formidable, but Rosen & Co. were not daunted.

Syncom I, the Huges-built oldest brother of Early Bird, reached its orbit in 1963, but an exploding tank of high-pressure nitrogen kept it from succeeding electronically. Syncom II and III, used by the Department of Defense, were successful, but their performance has been kept partially secret. Early Bird, the fourth of the series, was built and launched for Comsat, the private company that was created by Congress to set up a commercial communications satellite system. In the Syncom family, Early Bird was the big, public success.

Rosen was moved to compose a ditty to the tune of "Bye, Bye, Blackbird":

> "Pack up all your cares and woes,
> Retire all those old servos,
> Bye, bye, tracking.
> Get rid of all those rusty gears,
> Early Bird will end your fears,
> Bye, bye, tracking.
> So sell your stock in RCA
> And buy some Comsat right away,
> Tracking, bye, bye."

So many investors have apparently taken Rosen's advice about Comsat stock since it first went on the market last June, the price rose from 20 to a high of 66¾ this year.

LEFT TURNS

Early Bird is a miracle of delicate electronics and advanced spacecraftsmanship. The first problem was how to get it into an equatorial orbit from Cape Kennedy. If the cape were on the equator, Early Bird's rocket would have been asked only to carry it to the desired height and push it up to the proper speed—about 7,000 miles per hour. But the cape is 28° north of the equator, so Early Bird had to make a more complicated maneuver, turning sideways when it reached orbiting height. This left turn in space was accomplished nimbly, and ever since, Early Bird has kept itself on station by firing delicate burps of steam from its hydrogen peroxide thrusters.

Early Bird's curved sides are covered with 6,000 solar cells to supply electric power, and the satellite spins like a gyroscope to keep stabilized. One short antenna receives radio signals from the earth. They are fed to a transponder which amplifies them and then transmits them back to earth. Much of the transmitted energy is lost in space, but enough reaches the earth to be picked up by powerful receiving stations in the United States and Europe and amplified once more before being transmitted to home receivers.

LATER BIRDS

According to Rosen, who makes no secret of his glowing euphoria, Early Bird's remarkable success is only a small beginning. In the works at Hughes are much-improved successors: HS– (for Hughes Satellite) 304 and HS–307, both of which will have more communication channels, more solar cells to give more power, and a better nudging system to keep them on station. Instead of using hydrogen peroxide to generate high pressure steam, they will decompose water electrically into hydrogen and oxygen and combine the two gases in delicate explosions to counteract drifting. HS–304 will hav 1,200 voice channels instead of Early Bird' 240. HS–307 can have as many as 50,00 channels.

Among triumphant Hughes men, impres sive dollar figures are familiar talk thes days. HS–304, they say, will cost $2,500,000 weigh 172 pounds, and can be put on statio by a Delta rocket for $3,900,000. Four HS-304's can be clustered on a single Atlas ($6,500,000), and put on different stations around the earth. HS-307, weighing 770 pounds, will need an Atlas for each launch. By comparison, say the Hughes economists, the new telephone cable that A.T. & T. is about to lay between New Jersey and France will have only 128 channels and cost $56 million.

LAG AND ECHO

Despite such advantages, all communications experts are far from ready to agree that synchronous satellites are about to take over the world's long-distance telephoning and TV. For one thing, the round trip from earth to Early Bird hovering over the Equator is at least 44,600 miles, and radio waves, which move with the speed of light, takes three-tenths of a second to go the distance. Smaller delays in landlines add to the lag. This makes no difference for TV and other one-way transmission, but telephoning, say some critics, may sound disjointed with an extra one-half second between remarks and replies.

What effect this will have on the public can hardly be decided by laboratory tests. President Joseph V. Charyk and members of his board of directors who have already used Early Bird for phone conversations, claim that they cannot detect any timelag. But the lag is there, and it may affect some telephone talkers more than others. Deliberate speakers who listen politely until the other party has put a period on each spoken sentence will have no trouble, but impulsive talkers who constantly interrupt and throw in a word here and there may have difficulty.

Electronic echoes are another problem. They have been all but eliminated over the longest landlines, but at synchronous-satellite distances they may be annoying.[1] The public's decision will not be known until masses of ordinary telephone callers get real, unstaged experience with timelag and echoes in their talk.

SPACED AND RANDOM

Lower flying satellites on orbits about 6,000 miles above the earth are still in the running as worldwide communicators, and two formidable teams, A.T. & T. allied with RCA, and Thompson-Ramo-Woolridge, Inc., working with International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., are hard at work on them. Spaced at even intervals around their orbits, 12 such birds will insure that 2 or more will always be in line of sight from ground stations spotted around the earth.

Low satellites will need comparatively simple propulsion apparatus to keep them spaced evenly, less rocket effort will be needed to put them in orbit, and more weight will be available for extra voice or TV channels. Randomly spaced satellites with no propulsion can be cheaper still, and devote even more of their weight to working electronics. But more of them will be needed—perhaps 18—to avoid gaps in ground coverage. Because they are closer to the earth, both types will sound louder to ground stations, but expensive steerable antennas will be needed to track them across the sky, and skilled operators will be required to pick them up and switch traffic from one to another.

FLARES AND SUNSPOTS

While the satellite argument goes on, submarine cables are improving fast, and the longlines department of A.T. & T. takes issue with all estimates of comparative cost and capacity. Transistorized cables of the near future, say Bell engineers, will each be capable of carrying one TV channel or 720 telephone conversations. Their life expectancy will be 20 years without repairs, and they will be safe from all the dangers of space. Satellites, on the other hand, cannot be taken in for repairs, and their life expectancy is unknown. It may be expensively short, especially during periods of high solar activity when flares associated with sunspots are bombarding the earth with high-energy particles. Satellite enthusiasts, to be sure, are not intimidated by solar flares. They insist that tougher electronic components can be built to cope with them. Such potential troubles are dismissed, properly perhaps, as mere "engineering difficulties."

Whatever the combination of satellite and cable that is finally developed will have a profound effect on world communication. Enthusiasts like Rosen are already convinced that in a few years large satellites can be put in orbit with enough power to broadcast TV and radio programs directly to individual homes anywhere on earth. No expensive ground-relay stations will be needed on the receiving end. The programs will be picked up by 6-foot dish antennas that will cost about $100, if mass produced. If the satellites are synchronous, as Rosen is sure they will be, the antennas will be motionless, staring fixedly at a single point in the sky.

Rosen's group is proposing a special educational television satellite for NASA. It is designed to carry perfect color or black-and-white TV direct to home receivers. "You ain't seen nothing yet," says Rosen. "The benefit to mankind of such a system staggers the imagination. It may well be the major return to humanity of man's venture into space. What we're trying to do is to save the world."

Even less dedicated men than Rosen see a startling communications explosion ahead. A sampling of their predictions for the near future:

A world information center will catalog and make available the expanding mass of information now threatening to swamp the world's libraries. With easy access to the center by satellite-relayed phone calls from any spot on earth and with computers programed to do their tedious reference hunting for them, researchers will save countless man-hours as they make use of all the recorded knowledge of the human race.

Medical men in remote regions will be able to keep in constant touch with their colleagues in the most up-to-date cities. Consultation with specialists will be available over color TV. Cardiograms and electroencephalograms are already sent over existing lines for diagnosis; soon, everything but the patient himself may be sent to well-equipped centers for analysis and advice.

Worldwide telephoning will become as commonplace as the dialing of local calls. A phone call from New York to Tokyo may cost no more than a call from New York to Chicago, because to the distant satellite relay station, the difference in earthly distance will be insignificant.

Data transmission will bring the skills of giant computers to anyone who needs them. The computers themselves will join forces in a vast network, and automation of industry will become an international reality.

Facsimile transmission not only promises to eliminate the relative slowness of jet-carried airmail, it conjures up visions of home-printed newspapers. With a satellite network to gather information for the editors and the same network to transmit that information to subscribers, an improved version of office copying machines may soon be hooked to home TV sets to make high-quality reproduction of text and pictures on rolls of reusable plastic.

Educational television will guarantee that all the world's culture will be available to all the world. The receiving dishes pointing at the sky will be able to collect the most sophisticated technical information for the most backward countries.

NOTHING BUT GREEK

Whether or not the spread of such scientific largesse will indeed "save the world" is a problem that will not be solved by scientists alone. The sociological implications are immense. Arthur Clarke, for example, who still keeps a fatherly eye on the multimillion-dollar system he proposed in Wireless World for a modest fee of $40 back in 1945, foresees sweeping changes touched off by communication satellites. Cities, he thinks, may disappear. Their principal reason for being is to cluster people close together where they can see and talk with each other, a process that is not always enjoyable. When an executive can instantly reach all his contacts, wherever they may be, by television, he will have little reason for leaving home. One of Clarke's more frightening thoughts is that every man on earth will eventually have his own telephone number and will carry personal apparatus that wil permit him to be called, even by people who have no idea where he may be.

Clarke also believes that multiple satellites will offer so many kinds of entertainment that no one will need be confined to programs that are not to his taste. The worldwide audience will be so large that it will be profitable to offer programs that carry nothing but chess, say, or plays in Greek.

BESIEGED BY NOISE

Some prophets, however, see no near-future utopia brought to reality by Early Bird and its progeny. "I doubt if more food will be grown in India," says Rand Corp. Sociologist Joseph Goldsen, "even if every village gets a television set with lecturers teaching new agricultural techniques every hour. It takes generations to change customs and traditions. Only a few years ago, we used to pipedream about a TV-satellite system that was 10 to 20 years away. It doesn't seem that far off any more, but what will it be used to transmit? Perhaps Russia and the United States will each use its satellites for psychological warfare—which would be nothing more than they are doing now with short-wave broadcasts. One thing I'm sure of, the world will be besieged with more and more noise."

At present the United States may be the only nation that has the technical resources to set up an effective world-communications system, but the Russians are not far behind. On April 23 they launched their first attempt, which has apparently gone into a 12-hour orbit that will keep it over the Soviet landmass for a considerable time during each revolution. Two or three satellites would provide the U.S.S.R. with communications day and night. This may be all that the Russians are planning, but a powerful satellite sending strong, clear radio propaganda mixed with entertainment to the transistor radios that swarm in every country would be a powerful and potentially dangerous influence. The United States could set up the same sort of system, of course, and so could other countries.

POSSIBILITIES OF TROUBLE

Probably several will. There may soon come a time when hostile or pirate satellites will creep close to legitimate ones and try to kidnap their listeners. Jamming of programs may be tried, just as the Soviets now jam Voice of America broadcasts. Another trick that has been suggested is to learn the frequency and code of a satellite's station-keeping system and send it commands that will make it shove itself out of orbit.

Even if such hostilities never materialize, there will be economic struggles to control the satellites, which are the first space ventures with a big money-making potential. As more and more countries get into the act, so many satellites may be sent into orbit that they could overcrowd the airwaves, making communication difficult or impossible.

---

[1] Eerie echoes were noticeable on some of the first Early Bird broadcasts, but technicians traced them to the system that carried the audio portion of some programs over landlines and cables.

The possibilities for trouble are very real; they call for space laws that will be obeyed by all nations. The hope is that the benefits bestowed by satellites will be so great that even the most hostile countries will find it to their advantage to cooperate in harnessing the great communications explosion.

THE U.N. A SHINING SUCCESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it takes no genius to point out the many imperfections in the United Nations. They are many and they are serious. I can think of no business more important than the imperative task of reforming and improving the United Nations.

In my judgment this institution is an essential to life on this earth as the air we breathe and the water we drink. Of course it is not the only international institution dedicated to peace. But peace in this nuclear-missile age—this age of militant, aggressive communism is such a fragile thing—that without a United Nations that works, peace will almost certainly not endure, and the death and destruction of nuclear war is all but inevitable.

So the U.N. and its success is literally a matter of life and death. Of course these relatively minor amendments we consider today to enlarge the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council will not determine the U.N.'s future. In a sense they very slightly increase the injustice of the U.N.'s present organizational discrimination against the size, financial, military, social and moral support the United States gives the U.N.

But in view of the immense growth of the United Nations from 51 to 114 nations since it was originally formed 20 years ago, these amendments are necessary.

This occasion should remind us, however, how imperative and how urgent is the necessity for our proceeding with the greatest prudent speed to put the U.N. house back in order.

Today the U.N. Assembly is paralyzed by the dispute over peacekeeping assessments. It cannot act in Vietnam or anywhere else in the world where assembly action is required to overcome the Russian veto, because it is out of business and will be for months. And when it recovers its capacity to vote, the assembly will still fail to reflect even the most rudimentary elements of size and power which an effective international organization should reflect.

The Security Council has been repeatedly paralyzed on every clash between free and Communist nations by the veto power of its permanent members, particularly the U.S.S.R.

Somehow, in some way, through some means we must find a way to overcome what could be fatal defects.

But let us not lose sight of the big fact, Mr. President, that with all these weaknesses, the U.N. has been a shining success. Again and again and again—in the Suez, the Congo, Cyprus, and elsewhere United Nations peace-keeping forces have averted or sharply limited wars that could easily have erupted into the last world war.

And the World Health Organization, UNESCO, and other agencies of the United Nations have worked hard and well to overcome the basic causes of war—want, ignorance, disease.

Even the much derided debating society—the General Assembly—has by and large been immensely helpful to peace by focusing world opinion on aggression, and by forcing nations to recognize they must come into the arena of debate and discussion to defend their action.

And above all, Mr. President, let us recognize that American policy has won one bright success after another in the U.N. For us to quit now would be like the Yankees quitting baseball. Were the winners, the winners? Never have we had to use our veto. More than a hundred times our great Soviet adversary has used hers. In Korea the U.N. gave this Nation invaluable moral support in our police action against Communist aggression. In the Cuban missile dispute, Adlai Stevenson's brilliant performance in the great forum of the United Nations won this country solid non-Communist support in the world, and was undoubtedly of prime importance in bringing Khrushchev to his knees.

We have a great record, an undefeated record in the United Nations. We can support it with both realism and optimism. Reform of the U.N. will require work. It is needed and urgently, but let us proceed to this reform with a prudent recognition of the remarkable value of this institution on the record to America and to freedom.

PROGRAMS FOR REVITALIZATION OF CHILE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, an important development in Latin American affairs is taking place in Chile, under the leadership of President Eduardo Frei. His election last fall, followed by the recent election of a majority of Christian Democratic deputies to the chamber of deputies, has set the stage for a vigorous effort for social and economic reform, advanced within the framework of democratic principles and traditional values.

Jeremiah O'Leary recently wrote an informative report on Chile and the programs being initiated by President Frei to meet the many problems facing his country. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. O'Leary's column, which was published on April 4 in the Washington Star, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 4, 1965]

LATIN AMERICA—1965: FREI HAS CHANCE TO REVITALIZE CHILE

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—Chile is one Latin American country with excellent statistics and lots of plans to lift itself out of its current economic slump.

President Eduardo Frei Montalva inherited some fine statistics and plans when he took over last fall from the administration of President Jorge Alessandri. His inheritance included a good 10-year-development plan that had not gotten off the ground and a national debt that had doubled in the preceding 6 years.

What had happened was that social services grew but internal savings were inadequate and there were drops in mining, manufacturing, and food production. Sick of inflation and high prices, the voters of Chile first elected Frei president by the greatest plurality in history, then gave him an overwhelming majority in Congress.

Frei, who has gained great stature as a politician, had made last month's congressional election a plebiscite. The results were a crushing defeat for the Popular Front coalition of the Communists and Socialists. Frei's Christian Democrat candidates polled 988,000 votes from their own party as well as a great mass of Radicals, Liberals, Conservatives, Democratic Agrarian Laborists and Chile's considerable number of independent and unattached voters.

Frei has plans of his own and now has won the power to put them into effect. He is offering land reform to the campesinos; state-financed housing to the slum-dwellers in the cities; an overhaul of the bureaucracy; stern tax enforcement even to the extent of sending evaders to jail, and "Chileanization" of the vital copper industry.

The story of Chile's straits today is easily told in terms of food. The Texas-sized country has many of the characteristics of fertile California yet must import $150 million a year in food because 40 percent of the arable land lies idle. The fact is that 5.9 percent of the population owns 65.3 percent of the arable land and 78 percent of the irrigated land.

Only 7 percent of this string-bean nation of mountains and valleys is arable. The big landowners hang on to their estates because land represents social status, a hedge against inflation and can be used for collateral on loans. There is no particular impetus to increase production of food because government price policies neglect agriculture in favor of industry.

The key figure to remember is that only 27 percent of Chileans live in rural areas. Therefore, all the pressures favor the consumer, not the producer, in the matter of food prices. This produces weird results, such as the widespread slaughtering of dairy cattle because the price of meat is high but that of milk is low.

But if Chile did not have to import $150 million worth of food a year, she would not have the chronic balance of payments troubles that plague her. Last year, Chile imported $120 million more than she exported. In addition, her budget deficit of $160 million had to be covered by international loans.

Frei is strongly committed to strong land reform, providing for payment in bonds instead of cash for the first time, and hoping that the distribution of land will increase rather than cut production. He often says, "The cost of doing nothing is much more."

He also hopes to contain price increases, amounting to about 25 percent a year and the cost of living which was 38.4 percent in 1964.

In this picture of growing optimism with a dynamic President and this power to carry out his plans, the United States is a vital factor. Chile is deemed so crucial a nation and so well worth saving from ruination or communism that it ranks first in per capita assistance from the United States and second in the world in amount of U.S. aid received. Chile has received loans and grants totaling $868 million since 1951 and nearly 600 million since the Alliance for Progress was born.

The list of projects in which Chile receives aid from the United States includes seaport and airport construction; schools and public housing; financial reform and currency stabilization; food; supervised agricultural credit as well as a large Peace Corps representation.

Chile, with an external debt of $2.1 billion, has a long way to go on the road to economic recovery, yet no one here doubts that the nation has the essential viability to do the job. It has the highest literacy rate (80 percent) in South America and a vital, almost entirely European population. Chile has all the resources to become a shining example of an emergent nation.

Frei has the better part of 6 years, a clear mandate from his people and the wholehearted support of the United States. If Chile cannot advance under these conditions, no Latin country can.

Frei's accession to the Presidency over Salvador Allende was a considerable victory in which he achieved a 56-percent majority. But he controlled only one-third of Congress until last month's elections. Now he has 82 deputies, and possibly 1 more, in the Chamber of Deputies roster of 147. And he has 13 of 45 senators.

Thus his path is clear to advance his legislative measures and he is not even expected to wait for the sitting of the newly elected Congress on May 21. The lame ducks have seen the light.

Christian Democracy in Chile is a form of nationalistic leftism of the democratic variety. It derives its programs for social justice from several papal encyclicals. It is entirely democratic in a nation that enjoys the purest form of democracy in the Western Hemisphere with the possible exception of Costa Rica. Therefore, although it is anti-Communist, the Christian Democratic Party would not deny the Communists' right to exist.

Some American observers believe Chile today is entirely too tolerant of Communist Cuba. Chilean officials have told me they would resume relations with Havana in short order if they did not feel bound by the Organization of American States mandate against such relations.

There is, indeed, a strong streak of anti-Americanism in the Christian Democrats, although it smacks more of neutralism than of leaning toward the Eastern bloc. Much of this sentiment is attributable to pride. Chileans, who are largely of European stock, consider themselves far more sophisticated than other Latins, as indeed they are. They probably have a deep inner resentment against the need for massive aid from the United States, and many Chileans feel called upon to prove their independence.

American officials also are watching with interest Chile's relationship with the Soviet Union recently and the new Russian envoy, Aleksandr Anikin, is expected to assemble an extremely large staff in the next year.

Also present in Santiago is a small trade mission from Communist China. The Chileans say defensively they will trade and have relations with whomever they feel they need.

Relations between the Frei government and the staff of U.S. Ambassador Ralph Dungan are extremely cordial. Dungan, former White House staffman under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, is a straight-from-the-shoulder man of whom the Chileans are fond.

American observers are optimistic that Frei can bring Chile through the next troublesome years. He will not have to face the voters again until the municipal elections of 1967 and the voting for half of the senate in 1969.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MONRONEY AT DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE HONOR AWARDS CEREMONY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on May 18, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] delivered the principal address at the honor awards ceremony of the Department of Agriculture. Senator Monroney, as all of us know, has worked diligently, through the years, for the improvement of the civil service system and for the welfare of Federal employees. His remarks about the achievements, the responsibilities, and the rights of Federal employees are of broad interest; and I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Senator Monroney at Department of Agriculture Honor Awards Ceremony, May 18, 1965

Mr. Secretary, Mr. Staats, Bishop Moore, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Robertson, honored members of the Federal service, and other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, this is one of those shining moments of truth when we can all stand a little taller, as proud fellow workers for the Government of this great Nation. The Sylvan Theater, it seems to me, is a most appropriate site for this 19th annual awards ceremony. In this green and beautiful amphitheater with that mammoth obelisk that honors the father of our country as backdrop, we sense the majesty and magnitude of our Government and the greatness of those people in the civil service who furnish the day-to-day dynamics of government.

We assemble here to honor a group of men and women who have excelled in an impressive variety of endeavors affecting many, many millions of Americans. In fact, the whole world is a better place because of the dedicated and inspired service of the USDA group we honor here today.

USDA programs do not concern farmers alone. They involve industry, because much of industry depends on our farms, fields, forests, and food for raw material.

They concern all citizens, all consumers, because these programs affect the diets, the health, the standard of living of every man, woman, and child in the United States—and more and more, they are affecting men, women, and children worldwide.

I know of no public agency, anywhere, which over the years has contributed more to the basic welfare of this great Nation than has the U.S. Department of Agriculture. U.S. agriculture stands today as one of the great strengths of the free world, thanks to more than a century of dedicated and unremitting service by you—the employees of the Department.

Unfortunately, that service has not always brought the rewards and recognition it deserved. Criticism of surplus and subsidy has at times confused the facts of agriculture's contribution—and the Department's contribution—to the national well-being. This has not always enhanced the prestige of those who service agriculture.

This is why I feel that awards ceremonies like this are of great value. They are one way of showing our appreciation for outstanding service. They are also a way of letting all citizens know that we in Government are proud of our people. When you in USDA earn an award for constructive suggestions, outstanding performance, or long years of effective service, you have clearly merited the distinction. We can all feel proud of your accomplishments.

But, I have heard criticism of the Federal awards program which I think should be mentioned at an occasion like this; namely, that the civil servant is paid a good salary to do an efficient job, so why give him special awards for doing that job well. What the critics do not understand is that the awards being presented here today are for performance beyond mere efficiency.

As a public servant myself since 1939, I would be the first to say that all of us must be efficient and carry out our designated responsibilities. But there is an attitude toward a job—and toward life itself, if you will—which separates and distinguishes a man.

There is a theory—I can't find the originator of it—which says that all progress is made by the dissatisfied. Those who are content with the world are not apt to change it. Only those who are rankled by the status quo will strive to upset it—therefore, change comes about because someone is unhappy about the world in which he finds himself.

Maeterlinck said that "The future is a world limited by ourselves; in which we discover only what concerns us." What a primitive world we would have if each man accepted all the old patterns of life; the safe, the routine ways. What an inperfect government this would be but for the dedication of our civil servants to higher and higher standards of service.

Yes, we have the greatest government ever known to man because of the quality of service it renders our people. Our society has been elevated to its present preeminence because our public officials have placed service above self, have demonstrated consistent and unquestionable morality, diligence, and good purpose.

The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., often speaks of this quality of service which has been his greatest objective. Mr. Macy has said the public official "can drift with society's ebb and flow, or he can set his own course, and in that way help to change the standards in his time and in the future."

One aspect of this ceremony which particularly impresses me is that the awardees represent a broad spectrum of Government service—old and young, men and women, Washington and field offices, individual effort and group action, scientific and managerial, high rank and low, secretary and administrator.

So it seems clear that the opportunity to innovate and do an outstanding job is present at all levels of Government service.

The regulations don't indicate that a typist must smile when someone asks her a question.

The Government clerk may have no instructions to say "please" and "thank you" when talking to the public.

The fieldman is not forced to be patient when a farmer does not understand the regulations quickly.

The job description of branch chief will not necessarily indicate that he must reach out for new and better ways to get the job done.

But the smile, the "thank you," the patience and the reaching out must be part of every Government employee's personality.

I know that Government—and big business as well—does not always reward initiative, or recognize the innovator. This is one price we pay for living in a complicated world—many of us do not enjoy the satisfaction of close personal relationships on the job that were possible in other years. We sometimes feel like small wheels in very big machines.

And, I repeat, this feeling is not limited to Government. Every large organization—public or private—must find ways to seek out those employees who want to achieve, who want to question, who want to improve things.

Time does not permit me to do what I would like to do and congratulate each of you individually. My desire to do this stems from the fact that I am greatly impressed with the tremendous record each winner has made. My personal knowledge of what one of you, my fellow Oklahoman Mr. Edd Lemmons, has done speaks most highly for all of you who receive the superior service awards with him today.

The Federal merit system, which puts a premium on excellence and high standards, has evolved over a long, long period of time, going back 82 years to the passage of the first Civil Service Act in 1883. At no time in the history of this country has the Government worker stood in higher repute than he stands today. And the worker himself deserves the most credit for this.

In the 14 years that I have served as a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have seen many refinements and improvements in the civil service system. Many of these improvements can be credited to the genius of the late Senator Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina, whose recent passing came as a severe loss to civil servants everywhere. Those of us who have been assigned to carry on in this worthy endeavor have our work cut out for us.

As it is impossible to enumerate the many factors which have brought the Federal service to its present position of eminence, so is it difficult to foresee each step which we must take in the future if our trend toward greater excellence is to prevail. But there are some clear and very evident opportunities for further advancement toward improved productivity within the Federal service, toward better conduct of the Nation's business.

If there is a key word today it is that word "excellence." The President, in his message last week calling for new salary legislation, used the term in describing the obligation of the Federal Government to be a good employer. He said, "I define a good employer as one who demands excellence and rewards it."

Those of you we honor here today have responded to your Government's demand for excellence. I was curious in scanning your individual records of accomplishment to find a common ingredient of your success.

I believe I have discovered one of the magic traits. I note that many of you have strained and perspired through night courses, through career development programs of one kind or another, and that all of you have been persistent and diligent in the elaboration of your expertise long after you have completed your formal education.

I hope that in the years ahead we can encourage more and more Government workers to devote part of their leisure time to continuing education. Our schools, colleges, and universities stand ready to offer courses which can improve the skills of Government employees. I note that some departments and agencies of Government are putting far more emphasis on career development and continuing education, with incentives, than others.

Most Government workers, in my opinion, like most people employed in private industry, are motivated by desires for self-improvement that cannot be satisfied by the paycheck alone. But, while monetary remuneration seems of secondary importance to an increasing number in the work force, we must see that the pay of civil servants is fair and just.

In recent years, considerable advancement has been made toward this goal. Only last year, the Congress reaffirmed its support of a policy that provides Federal pay systems on the basis of comparability with salary patterns in private industry.

To such a deserving group of Federal employees I cannot resist this prediction—that Congress will again this year reaffirm the comparability doctrine.

I am convinced that Congress must continue to face up to this pay problem over the years ahead, yielding to no other entity the duty of preserving the doctrine of comparability. For there is also the need of accountability—this being the task of seeing that Government and Government employees perform in a manner that merits positive action by the Congress to support fair and just pay rates.

Within the executive branch itself much has been done and is being done to encourage higher performance, higher work standards. We take heart in the very dramatic promotions recently of several career servants to high administrative posts. The President has thus recognized excellence in the terms that are most meaningful to those who strive for it.

In making these promotions from within the service, the President has emphasized the importance of creativity, and he has also emphasized once again that he is not afraid of new ideas, of new approaches to problems whether the problems themselves be fresh or stale.

This is the age of jet airplanes, satellites, and probes to Mars. But, perhaps of equal importance is what I call the quiet revolution in agriculture, which has changed the course of history without many of us even realizing it. While Russia can be proud—and justly so—of a Russian walking in space, America has reached a point in technological excellence which puts within our grasp the ability to forever banish hunger from the world. And, our American heritage has given us the conscience to want to share this knowledge—and the food it produces—with all the world's people.

Think of it: For the first time in recorded history, we possess the knowledge to grow all the food we need. For the first time in recorded history, we as a nation, are providing billions of dollars in food aid to our hungry neighbors abroad. Never before has such an organized effort been undertaken on such a vast scale.

Our challenge today is to use the productive genius of American know-how to serve the needs of all our people—and people throughout the world. We must make use of our agricultural abundance, a powerful weapon in the world struggle for peace. And we must make use of our agricultural productivity as a force for democracy in a world where the majority of its people live in newly developing nations.

We who devote our lives to public service have an especially challenging opportunity to pioneer in the struggle to free man from want. We must have the imagination not only to mechanically carry out the wishes of the Congress, but to inspire our fellow citizens, to pioneer new ways to get the job done faster, better, and cheaper. Our work must not only be efficient, it must be the best in the Nation, because 190 million citizens are our bosses, our customers, and our stockholders.

In honoring these outstanding USDA employees today, we honor also the thousands of workers who serve with them in the Department of Agriculture, the men and women who do not get awards, but who also serve faithfully, with pride and honor.

We here today have the chance to get from our jobs what most men never realize—knowledge that we are serving our fellow men; that we can make a real contribution to the progress of the human race.

In the golden age of the mid-20th century, we owe it to ourselves, our families, and our Nation to follow in the footsteps of these we honor today.

FISCAL POLICY AND THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM—STATEMENT BY DONALD C. COOK

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, Donald C. Cook has expressed his views on the need for a new gold policy and for action to move in the direction of a new international reserve currency to be used in the settlement of payments balances.

His remarks are a vital commentary on fiscal policy and the balance-of-payments problem.

I ask unanimous consent that a report on his views, written by Ben Weberman, and published on May 4, 1965, in the American Banker, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW GOLD POLICY, WORLD RESERVE CURRENCY ADVOCATED BY COOK

(By Ben Weberman)

NEW YORK.—Donald C. Cook, president of American Electric Power Co., who is still among President Johnson's close advisers on domestic and foreign financial affairs, is one who advocates a new gold policy for this country and would like to see progress moving in the direction of a new international reserve currency.

These views were revealed in an interview with the progressive utility executive, who was unable to accept the post of Secretary of the Treasury when it was offered by the President but who has remained a friend and confidant of Mr. Johnson.

For that reason, much weight must be given to his view that the United States could curb gold speculation by terminating the standing offer to buy gold at $35 an ounce (less a modest handling charge).

The United States would continue to redeem dollars for gold at $35 an ounce—that is the measure which fixes the value of the dollar—but is acting rather foolishly to stand ready under all circumstances to pay that price for all the metal offered to it, he declared.

The merit of accepting such a new policy is that gold speculation again would hold considerable risk. "The speculator would no longer have a 'put' on the United States enabling him to resell the yellow metal at any time at a price close to cost," Mr. Cook declared.

Up to now, the only cost of speculation is barely more than loss of income that could otherwise be earned on funds sterilized in gold. This is not nearly enough to dampen the demand of speculators who think they are playing for big profits from the hoped for devaluation of the pound or the dollar, he explained.

The realization that gold could drop to $30, $25 an ounce—or lower—would certainly tend to dampen speculative purchases of gold and could even bring quite a bit back to the Government stockpile from privately held supplies. It might also reduce the appetite of some countries for increased amounts of gold for reserve purposes.

At the same time, he urged moving ahead toward the adoption of a new international monetary reserve unit to be used in settlement of payments balances. The possibility of worldwide acceptance of this concept has been greatly enhanced as a result of the success of the American efforts to solve the country's balance-of-payments problem by restricting capital exports and the realization that an American surplus will produce deficits and possibly economic contraction abroad, Mr. Cook indicated.

This has highlighted the basic inadequacy of existing monetary mechanisms and placed in bold relief the need for reform, he added. He likened the potential system to the Federal Reserve assistance in settling interbank balances.

In Mr. Cook's opinion, the chief stumbling block to successful development of a reserve unit would be the difficulty in establishing one which has the stability and therefore would be readily accepted by all payments surplus countries.

A possible answer would be complete separation of the obligation of each country to the sponsoring international entity on the one hand and to everyone else on the other.

Stability then could be achieved by imposing a requirement that each country protect the value of its own subscription made in its own currency value against inflation or devaluation. Thus, if the relative price of a country's currency were reduced—through either devaluation or inflationary loss of purchasing power—more currency would have to be contributed to the entity to offset the difference.

This requirement, Mr. Cook added, would have the additional merit of bringing pressure on member countries to control their own economic affairs in such a way as to insure fiscal responsibility.

Some form of international reserve unit has been backed by virtually every country which is a party to the International Monetary Fund. The French favor such a unit, too, though they have perverted the idea by trying to tie settlements to gold and there just isn't enough gold in the world for such a purpose. To mark up the price of gold, to enable gold to stay in the picture as Mr. Rueff has proposed, would be sheer lunacy for us, catastrophe for our friends, and a highly successful speculation for France, which could then sell back to us for $70 or $105, or whatever an ounce the gold it has so recently purchased for $35 an ounce from us.

Mr. Cook was only slightly concerned about the U.S. balance-of-payments problem. "The belief that this country has a terrible balance-of-payments problem and that it could wreck our economy is all wrong," he asserted.

He predicted that within 6 to 12 months, some of the European governments which have been calling most loudly for elimination of the U.S. deficit and for curtailment of U.S. investment in their industries would not only be letting up on the criticism but would be willing—indeed would desire—to see a continued deficit in the U.S. international payments. They would realize, he explained, that this country's deficit is not structural but results from exports of short-term and long-term capital which is necessary to their own economies.

An additional way of curbing speculation in gold, Mr. Cook said, could be done by raising the charges on official sales to say 1 percent or 35 cents an ounce. This would immediately serve to deter some of those who now buy gold on very slim margins—often no more than 3 percent or 5 percent. Ultimate sale back to the United States—if this country were to continue to be a buyer, would be at $35 less 1 percent and the 2 percent charge for the round trip which would wipe out a good part of the cash investment.

Furthermore, if the United States were to say, in effect, that it will sell gold at $35 to the full extent of the $14.5 billion stockpile if necessary but is not necessarily going to pay that price for the yellow metal, a considerable amount would come out of privately owned supply.

There is no reason why speculators should have a virtually cost-free perpetual "put" on the United States of gold at $35 an ounce, he declared. It would cost up to 10 percent to buy 1-year option to "put" common stock where there is free-market risk, he explained.

The chief uncertainty which Mr. Cook feels about the United States effort to curb the balance of payments deficit is whether this country could be insulated from European recessions.

There is no question about the possibility that withdrawal of dollars from European money and capital markets will be tightening credit and curbing expansion in several countries. This is already evident in Italy and the U.K., for example.

But the key question for U.S. policy is whether the spillover of recessionary tendency would be felt here. It may be necessary to face up to this problem before it really develops, Mr. Cook declared.

Actually, he explained, any one of the three things could happen.

"Such a hue and cry could be raised in Europe about the Johnson voluntary program that we will ease up. But this would require the European countries to admit that they have been wrong about the impact of the U.S. deficit. Some of them now admit it, but I don't think all of them will. Many Europeans who have been complaining the loudest are doing so on the basis of a deep-seated fear of competition from American corporations in their home markets.

"The second possibility," he said, "is that we will have the unfortunate experience of being pushed into correcting something (the payments deficit) when it is not computed properly." He explained that we charge ourselves with short-term capital outflows but do not credit ourselves with short-term inflows, thus greatly overstating the so-called deficit in our balance of payments.

The third choice, and the one apparently most favored by Mr. Cook, involves "broader recognition of the need for reform of the international monetary system."

"There is no reason why the dollar should have to carry worldwide responsibility for providing reserves and maintaining international liquidity," he declared. "This task can and should be shared by all major countries through an international organization that would issue an international monetary unit having protection of its stability."

The development and use of such a unit, too, would permit U.S. corporations, including banks, to resume the export of capital without being charged with creating a balance-of-payments deficit, endangering the economy, and generally acting unpatriotically. He added that the United States is the only real capital market in the world and this would permit us to make U.S. capital freely available abroad to the great profit of both parties to the transaction.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ON PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S FILM "YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 426, which was reported today from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 426) relating to the John F. Kennedy film, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

WHAT SHALL WE DO ABOUT THE POLICIES OF PRESIDENT CHARLES DE GAULLE?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is painful to be forced even to consider what we should do about the policies of President Charles de Gaulle, for France has been our oldest ally and we have benefited greatly from French culture. Some would like to pretend that all is well between ourselves and France and between ourselves and General de Gaulle. But we cannot permanently ignore reality and much as we would like to be friends, we must recognize that General de Gaulle has made it abundantly clear that he is basically anti-American and that he seems determined to weaken the United States and, if possible, to pull us down.

He has kept the main body of French troops out of the NATO armies—contributing approximately 1½ divisions to the joint defense of Western Europe. Our six divisions in NATO, primarily designed for the defense of France, are actually four times the number of French troops committed to the organization. In addition, the French Navy and their Air Force have been kept completely separate from NATO.

General de Gaulle has also refused to allow the Common Market either to admit the British or to enter into cooperative trade relationships with the United States. He has not only recognized Communist China and North Vietnam, which have declared themselves sworn enemies of the United States, but has fostered cooperative trading with these countries and is supplying them with many vital commodities. His weight has consistently been thrown against American policy in southeast Asia—a region in which France itself conspicuously failed and from which it was expelled by an armed revolt of the people 11 years ago. Indeed, we became involved in that area only because France had failed so conspicuously to meet the needs and satisfy the aspirations of the Vietnamese.

Recently, he has taken a hostile attitude toward our policies in the Caribbean. He has constantly attacked unilateral military action on our part while at the same time with Russia he has sabotaged the development of the U.N. police force. He has thus helped to create the power vacuum into which we have been reluctantly forced to move.

Economically, General de Gaulle and the Bank of France, which is under his control, have been calling on us to pay in gold both, first, the some $300 to $400 million of additional foreign exchange claims against us which come into French hands each year; and, second, a large part of the $1.2 billion claims which have accumulated in the past. In 1964, France withdrew $400 million in gold from us, and this year—up to 2 weeks ago—she has withdrawn $544 million more.

In the last month, France has withdrawn between $50 and $60 million, and there is strong evidence that the general intends to withdraw an equal amount each month of the year. Her example has been followed by certain other northern European countries. In addition to all this, the general has seldom missed an opportunity to refer scornfully to the Anglo-Saxons by which he seems to mean primarily us, and to state that he believes the United States should abandon its participation in European affairs except, of course, to help provide Europe and France with a nuclear shield and come to their aid with all our strength if they are attacked.

The general is indeed behaving as though he had concluded that we will become hopelessly bogged down in southeast Asia and possibly also in Latin America, and that he would then move with our enemies for the kill.

II. UNWARRANTED TREATMENT

I submit that we do not deserve to be treated in this way. I freely grant that General de Gaulle is a dedicated patriot and that his refusal to bow his knee to Hitler and Petain, and his organization of the French forces of liberation and resistance were truly heroic. He deserves great credit for his bravery and sturdy independence. I recognize that Roosevelt and Churchill may have angered him by not giving him the deference in Allied decisions which he craved and to which he believed himself entitled. Probably we did recognize the Petain government for too long. I believed it then, and I believe it now. I regard the general also as a distinguished stylist endowed with rare literary abilities in thorough keeping with the historic qualities of French prose. He is, without doubt, an intense patriot and in many ways an able statesman.

I also recognize that France is, of course, a sovereign nation and that she has every legal right to make her own decisions. But we have our rights as well and we are entitled to help protect our basic interests and with becoming and modest firmness to defend ourselves.

We would like to be friends both of France and of General de Gaulle. We are gratefully aware that we could probably never have won our independence had it not been for French help, and that France, as I have said, has been our oldest ally. The names of Lafayette, Rochambeau, and DeGrasse will always be cherished by us. We, like the rest of the world, have both enjoyed and been benefited by the many contributions of France to the intellectual, scientific, and artistic achievements of mankind. Some of our choicest spirits, such as Jefferson, Franklin, Madison, and Monroe have drawn many of their qualities from French culture. Pasteur, Victor Hugo, Moliere, and the French painters from Clouet to Degas have enriched our lives. All this we have said many times and we shall continue both to say it and to mean it. We wish to develop the closest cultural relations with France and to exchange with her lecturers, musicians, artists, and dramatic companies.

But our French friends need also to remember that twice within this last half century our full force has been thrown voluntarily into their defense and that Americans by the millions have twice crossed the ocean to redeem France at great loss of blood and treasure. We have helped to save France from those who had invaded, ravaged, and despoiled her. Could France have shaken off Hitler and Vichy 20 years ago without our troops and our air and naval power? As a matter of fact, with all due credit to the heroism of the many members of the French Resistance, we did more to save France from Hitler than the French, as a nation, did themselves. Perhaps this is what hurts the general, and makes him take the attitude he is taking. Thus, after the war we poured $17 billion into the rehabilitation of Europe of which $2½ billion went to France. All of this was in the form of grants—except the initial loan—and was indeed the greatest example of farsighted generosity in the history of the world. Hundreds of thousands of our men are now stationed overseas in our effort to stabilize the world and, in all, since the war we have expended $110 billion in an effort to help the peoples of the world.

And, as for relative politeness and mutual consideration, General de Gaulle needs to remember that Roosevelt, Churchill, and Eisenhower stood aside and allowed the small French forces to have the honor and glory of entering Paris. And how poorly did General de Gaulle repay this abnegation when he ignored and indeed boycotted the exercises commemorating the bloody landings which our American soldiers made on Omaha Beach 20 years before. For a nation which prides itself on its politeness, this was indeed a sorry self-revelation. We have tried to be patient and friendly and have quietly borne repeated slights and adverse actions.

I am glad that we have followed this policy thus far, for I believe in good will as a solvent of difficulties. There are some who believe we should continue to be silent nonresistants in the hope that either the general will change his policies or that time will remove him painlessly and bring a different set of principles and personalities to the fore. I have come to the conclusion, however, that we should not be silent and inactive if President de Gaulle and France continue on their present course. For many Europeans and many Frenchmen seem to believe that they can so play upon our supposed inferiority complex and our desire to be liked as to bend us to their will even though this should be not only against our deepest interests but also against those of the international community. A decent self-respect therefore requires that we should cease to be purely passive and that we should show that the general's policy is not only morally wrong but that if continued it will be also against the best interests of France herself.

III. FRANCE ALONE CANNOT DRAG US DOWN

First, let me say that France, by its own efforts, can never drag down the economy of the United States. Our annual gross national product of $650 billion and our average per capita product of approximately $3,300 gives us a basic strength which can withstand all the economic onslaughts which General de Gaulle may bring. Furthermore, even if General de Gaulle should demand gold for all of his some $1.3 billion holdings, we would be able to meet his claims 10 times over. We have a reserve of $14 billion in gold. Our troubles would only come if he were able to get the other countries and central banks of Europe which hold nearly $8 billion to do likewise, and, if (1) he were also to get the private holders of some $12 billion of claims against the United States to be deposited in these central banks, and then (2) persuade these banks and governments to ask that their dollar claims be redeemed in gold.

IV. THE UNITED STATES IS NOT DEFENSELESS

Fortunately, we are not defenseless, and there are tools ready at hand by which we can lessen the monetary and economic squeeze which General de Gaulle obviously intends to impose upon us.

If we act in a firm but friendly manner to protect ourselves and the free world, we may induce a different form of behavior from President de Gaulle and his followers. French self-interest may therefore effect what American patience and humility have failed to achieve. We cannot afford to wait until the slow and inexorable movements of time have brought different personalities and policies to the fore. For, if these policies of the general are not checked now, they may infect the rising generation of French politicians, economists, and financiers, which will lead ultimately to more serious clashes.

Diplomats are inhibited by occupation, disposition, and tradition from speaking frankly about such matters. But this makes it possible for legislators to move into the vacuum they create and, without committing our country, we can sound a warning which may possibly induce sober second thoughts among the rulers of France.

First. The first we have already taken. By the exchange equalization tax and the Gore Amendment, we have taken legislative steps to lessen the flow of American capital to Europe. And by President Johnson's voluntary agreement with the financial leaders of the country we are shutting off most of our export of capital. This should remove one of General de Gaulle's chief verbal complaints. For he has often complained of American investment in Europe. In order to reduce our unfavorable balance of payments, we are now obliging him. France can now do what the general has long wanted, namely, supply its own capital.

It will be interesting to see if France and De Gaulle continue to be enthusiastic over this policy. For we can all remember how a few years ago our Canadian friends raised similar cries only to protest loudly when we proposed to apply the exchange equalization tax to them as well as to others. So loud and deep were their complaints that this would ruin them that we made an exception for Canada and are now furnishing them with the capital against which they formerly crusaded.

Will France go through a similar reversal?

One thing seems to be constant in all this flux. In the eyes of many foreigners the United States is always wrong.

Second. A second way in which we can defend ourselves is to reduce our dollar expenditures for the support of the troops we have stationed in France to help protect that country.

Last year we spent $231 million in this fashion and, while this was $200 million less than we spent in 1957, it is still too much. This policy indeed gives De Gaulle most of the dollars which he then turns into gold at our expense.

It is understood that France refuses to let us use francs for these purposes but insists upon the dollars which she then scorns and which she uses only to get her hand on more gold.

This heavy drain can be reduced by moving many of our command and military functions to other countries. Since France is making so slight a contribution to NATO, much of the staff can be moved forward to West Germany while air and other supporting units can be shifted from France to Belgium and Holland.

Third. Similarly, we can cut down on, or even eliminate, our aid to the former French possessions in Africa. Last year we spent $192 million on these countries of which $125 million was in the form of grants, while $67 million were loans. Indeed, since 1957, we have spent no less than $1.1 billion on these African territories. There would seem to be no good reason why we should assume so much responsibility for these countries which, with one or two exceptions, are French-oriented and for which France should assume the liability.

Fourth. In 1963, we spent $50 million for transportation on French vessels and airlines. This was two and a half times as much as we spent in 1957. It would only be commonsense for us quietly to shift our governmental transportation of persons and things either to ships flying our own flag or those of friendly and cooperative countries such as Great Britain. Without initiating any public boycott, American tourist agencies can be quietly encouraged to book their clients on other lines.

Fifth. It is estimated that in 1963 American tourists spent $119 million traveling in France. Here again no public boycott should be carried out initially, but a considerable number of Americans, anxious to defend our country's financial integrity, can voluntarily decide either to see the United States first, or, if they feel impelled to go to Europe, may be induced to prefer the Uffizi in Florence to the Louvre, and St. Peters to Notre Dame. We should not seek to compete with France on the lower but rather on the higher levels of life. But our own art galleries now rank among the best in the world. The National Gallery in Washington is one of the most impressive and the Metropolitan in New York is close behind. We in Chicago are in turn very proud of our great collection of French impressionist and post-impressionist paintings which are probably second only to those in the Jeu de Paume in Paris and the marvelous Chester Dale collection here. It is not geographical chauvinism to say that Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, southern California, Florida, and Hawaii can give us as relaxing a vacation as can the French Riviera.

The French often complain about the rudeness of American tourists and this irritation is probably one of the contributing causes of international ill-will. Therefore, by reducing our tourist trade with them, we can reduce this cause of international friction, and by making tourists fewer, possibly make them more appreciated. This will contribute to—rather than detract from—international good feeling.

These last four items listed above total approximately $600 million a year. By cutting these items to the very bone, we can eliminate our unfavorable balance of payments with France and possibly turn it into a net favorable balance. By our cutting off American investment we can make such a favorable balance still larger.

Since General de Gaulle is such a strong advocate of the pure gold standard, along with his financial adviser, Monsieur Jacques Rueff, I am sure he will not object if we then ask France to make her payments in gold rather than in French exchange.

In these ways, we may induce a greater desire on the part of France to cooperate financially and to seek with us an improved international monetary system.

And I am one who believes that we need an improved international monetary system. The present system of exchange with the two key currencies being the pound and the dollar, is not ideal. If France were to start losing rather than gaining gold, a mighty stimulus would be added to such actions. I believe the respect of the French for us would also increase when they found we were no longer as soft as they had believed.

V. POTENTIAL DIPLOMATIC AND ECONOMIC WEAPONS

If all this is not enough there are always two further possibilities: (1) As I reminded the Senate several months ago, France still owes us enormous sums from World War I. As a memorandum which Secretary Fowler sent me shows—and I shall later ask to have it inserted in the RECORD—this now amounts to a total of $6,456 million. This global sum is composed of just short of $2 billion in unmatured principal, leaving the matured principal and interest which is both due and unpaid at almost precisely $4½ billion. Of this, the unpaid and due principal amounts to $1.9 billion.

These are legal debts. For, in 1931, we merely postponed collection of the war debts and did not cancel them. France has argued that she has no obligation to pay us since Germany refused to pay her further reparations. But this is not a legal justification for the French refusal to pay us. We are legally obligated to pay gold when the French present their foreign exchange dollar claims against us. We have loyally lived up to our legal obligations and we shall continue to do so. But, out of consideration for France, we have refrained for a third of a century from pressing our legal claims against her. If the French run on the dollar continues, we should again bring forward these claims. It would be a gracious act to forgive the unpaid interest and I would favor doing just that, but the principal of $1.9 billion would be a proper claim. In fact, a good basis for settlement would be for us to cancel France's whole indebtedness to us in return for their cancelling the total foreign exchange claims which they hold against us. They have already paid off in French currency the French citizens from whom they have taken these claims, and they could do the same with any other claims which are now current.

The slate would then be wiped clean. Monetary sources of friction would disappear and the countries could resume their proverbial friendship so painfully interrupted by the policies of President de Gaulle. If the general does not agree to this, we can carry the case to the World Court.

And second, we could reduce our military forces under NATO. At the very beginning of NATO, I proposed that our relative contribution in men should be approximately one to the European's four. I was unfortunately dissuaded from this by appeals from the State Department, but I submit that time has proved that I was correct and the State Department wrong. General de Gaulle is acting in such a way as to make such action very tempting—the withdrawal of our troops, in part. I do not wish at this time definitely to recommend this course since I fear the Communist menace to Europe as well as to Africa and Asia. But, if the French persist in their present policies, we may be reluctantly forced to take such an action.

It seems ridiculous that we are contributing more men to the defense of France than France herself is contributing.

VI. THE CHOICE IS DE GAULLE'S

I wish to close with a plea to France and to General de Gaulle to change their policies and to become our friends instead of our antagonists. We have too much in common to justify a deep rift in our relations. We have proved our desire to be helpful friends and allies. That is what we still want to be. We pray that France and her able President will not force us to adopt any or all of the self-defensive measures I have suggested. But we cannot be expected continually to lower our flag in the presence of such determined hostility and to have our very generosity and desire to help turned into the very weapons of our undoing.

The choice is up to France and to its President. We shall await with interest the choice which is to be made.

In the meantime, let us encourage the friendliest of cultural relations with France. Let us welcome French visitors to our shores with especial hospitality. Let us arrange American tours for French orchestras, theatrical companies, and art exhibits. Perhaps the French might like to reciprocate. Firm in the defense of our rights, we should be gracious and friendly in our personal bearing. The Romans had a phrase for this: "Fortiter in re. Suaviter in modo." Let this be the motto for our action. How foolish it would be for the general to continue his personal feud which can only overtax the resources of France and play into the hands of the real enemies of the Western democracies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Secretary of the Treasury Fowler, giving some of the details and figures which I have mentioned.

There being no objection, the material ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1965.

Hon. PAUL DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I have set down in the following paragraphs answers to the questions on France which you asked me during the executive session on my nomination.

1. Amount of money owing by France to the U.S. from World War I loans:

As of June 30, 1964, the amount outstanding on France's debt to the United States arising from World War I was $6,456 million. This was composed of $1,959 million of unmatured principal and $4,497 million of principal and interest due and unpaid. Of this latter amount $1,905 million represented principal due and unpaid and $2,592 million interest due and unpaid.

2. Amount of money owing by France to the U.S. from World War II loans:

There were no formal loans or credits to France during World War II. However, of the total $597 million which the French Government presently owes the U.S. Government (exclusive of World War I debts), $213 million relates to the 1946 lend-lease settlement, $201 million to the settlement at the same time for sales of oversea surplus property, and $179 million is under the 1945 lend-lease termination loan made by the Export-Import Bank. The other $4 million relates to loans made in 1953–54 for development projects in providing basic and strategic materials in former French oversea territories. (The foregoing figures exclude Export-Import Bank loans to private entities in France and foreign currency loans to private enterprise under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.)

3. Loans made to France in the post-World War II period in connection with the Marshall plan and related programs:

Loans and credits made by the United States in France in the postwar period, including all of the loans mentioned in the preceding response, as well as certain others, totaled about $2.5 billion. Of this total, about $225 million are usually called Marshall plan loans. All of this $225 million has been repaid.

4. Amounts that U.S. military establishments spend in France in connection with the NATO mission on an annual basis since 1957:

The figures below are the total U.S. military expenditures in France on a U.S. fiscal year basis. A small portion of these funds represents procurement in France of goods and services used elsewhere; however, the greatest portion of these amounts represents expenditures in France in connection with our NATO commitments.

	Millions
Fiscal year 1957	$453
Fiscal year 1958	375
Fiscal year 1959	318
Fiscal year 1960	280
Fiscal year 1961	299
Fiscal year 1962	269
Fiscal year 1963	257
Fiscal year 1964	231

5. Grants and loans to the former French Colonial Empire and new countries constituted out of the empire since 1957:

The data supplied cover all U.S. economic aid programs for fiscal years 1958 through 1964, including grants and loans by AID and predecessor agencies, all titles of Public Law 480 (excluding the U.S.-use portion of title I sales), and Export-Import Bank loans over 5 years.

The following table gives the annual amounts for fiscal years 1958 through 1964 for total grants and loans on a net obligations and loan authorizations basis. The data are given separately for African countries and for the southeast Asian countries which constituted former French Indochina (South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia).

Total U.S. economic grants and loans to the 21 countries which were formerly associated with or territories of France for the fiscal years 1958–64

[In millions of dollars]

	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	Total
Africa	62	84	142	224	149	251	192	1,104
Grants	27	40	55	168	77	177	125	669
Loans	35	44	87	56	72	74	67	435
Southeast Asia	249	258	246	198	201	254	264	1,670
Grants	247	238	234	185	201	254	266	1,625
Loans	2	20	12	13	----------	----------	−2	45

The 18 countries in Africa which were formerly associated with or territories of France accounted for 39.8 percent, or $1.1 billion of the total for the 21 countries. The countries of former French Indochina—Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia—accounted for 60.2 percent, or $1.7 billion of the total.

6. Shipping payments for passenger and freight movements to and from France on French vessels, airlines, etc.:

The U.S. Government does not calculate a bilateral balance of payments on transportation account with France. However, the French do publish a bilateral balance of payments with the United States. The figures below are taken from this source and show French receipts from the United States on account of transportation, some of which are, because of statistical limitations, on a net basis.

Year:	*Million*
1957	$20
1958	24
1959	31
1960	33
1961	33
1962	45
1963	50

7. Estimated U.S. tourist expenditures in France on an annual basis since 1957:

Tourist expenditures in France by U.S. residents in the years 1957–63 are estimated as follows:

Year:	*Million*
1957	$83
1958	93
1959	(1)
1960	118
1961	105
1962	112
1963	119

[1] Not available.

I hope this information will be helpful to you. It is always a pleasure to be of assistance.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY H. FOWLER.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY—FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, recently students at Ohio State University conducted a sit-in demonstration protesting the fact that President Novice G. Fawcett banned a controversial speaker who had been invited by a campus group. The man had already spoken at two State-supported universities in Ohio. No trouble occurred, and his speaking engagements were without incident.

Mr. President, it may be dangerous to permit certain opinions to be expressed. It is more dangerous to suppress the expression of such opinions. To attempt to prevent an explosion in a boiler by sitting on the safety valve is obviously foolish.

If there is one place in an open society where free, untrammelled discussion should be permitted, it is in our colleges and universities. The great English conservative Benjamin Disraeli, stated this well in a speech before the House of Commons in 1873 when he said, "A university should be a place of light, of liberty, and of learning." It is interesting to note the sequence in which he listed the functions of a university—light, liberty, and then learning.

Mr. President, the debris of the witch hunts of a decade ago is still with us. Much debris of that period has been cleared up, but it may take a generation to remove all this rubbish—pointless suspicion, fear, character assassinations, ruined careers, speaker bans at some of our colleges and universities.

In any form of government, except in dictatorships of the extreme left and fascist dictatorships, freedom of speech should be taken for granted. People should be free to criticize, to challenge, to expose. There is an implied sense of weakness, an implied lack of confidence and evidence of fear when citizens' minds are stifled. Fear of speaking our minds can do much more to harm our Nation than Communists or Fascists could ever hope to do. Communist and Fascists ideologies cannot stamp out our faith in human dignity, but fear can.

When controversial speakers are banned from our colleges and universities, it seems to me that an importance is given to them and to their views that they do not deserve.

I know that in two instances when Ohio University at Athens, Ohio, permitted such leftwing, extremist speakers to appear, and speak, the students left and enjoyed themselves. The speeches made no impression on them at all.

I have confidence that our young people today have enough faith in our form of government and in our American way of life to reject any foreign ideologies, whether they be communism, fascism, or whatever. In attempting to withhold from them the right to hear the viewpoints of others we do our young people a disservice. Surely, each generation should be entitled to know what it is we are struggling to preserve and what it is that threatens democracy in our time.

This brings to mind an incident of some years ago in which a young society matron, active in rightwing extremist organizations of her day, asked Chancellor Robert Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, whether it was a fact that communism was taught in his university. He replied, "Yes, madam, and we also teach cancer in our medical school."

Yet the fact is that those right-wing, arch-conservative trustees of Ohio State University, some of whom seem to yearn for the William McKinley era, have acted arbitrarily in preventing freedom of speech on the campus of Ohio State University.

Contrast the action by the president of Ohio State University with the following statement by President Vernon R. Alden, of Ohio University at Athens, Ohio. Dr. Alden is one of the great educators of our Nation. His recent services to the Federal Government in connection with President Johnson's program for the war on poverty have been outstanding. Furthermore, through his leadership he has shown how a great university can be a force for progress for the economy of an entire region of the Nation. Recently Dr. Alden stated:

> We believe that freedom of inquiry and discussion is essential to a student's educational development. We recognize the right of our students to engage in free discussion, to hear speakers of their choice, and to speak and write without fear of administrative action.

Loyalty cannot be coerced or compelled.

Controversy of any kind still seems in disrepute among our people. At the root of this attitude is the idea that, by reason of Communist aggression or conspiracy, liberty must be sacrificed for the sake of security. That is the most dangerous political patent medicine ever forced upon the American people.

In my opinion, the trustees of Ohio State University do a disservice to the students of that great institution and to the cause of academic freedom when they ban controversial speakers from appearing on the campus. Unfortunately, this has been a practice at Ohio State for the past 6 years. The recent incident is not the first. As a result, many fine teachers in all fields of learning have gone to other colleges and universities where this policy does not exist. I am told by many professors and instructors at Ohio State University and by other educators that the prestige of the university and the morale of its faculty and student body are at an all time low.

On numerous occasions I have spoken with top officials of various executive agencies and have spoken out in this chamber deploring the fact that colleges and universities in a few States—notably California, Massachusetts, and Texas—receive the lion's share of Federal research and development funds. I strongly urge that more of these funds be earmarked for colleges and universities in Ohio and the Midwest. On numerous occasions I have proudly spoken of the outstanding qualifications of the faculties of Ohio State University and of other Ohio colleges and universities and of the ideal location of the State of Ohio, arguing that these factors have entitled us to be granted more consideration in connection with Federal research and development projects which too often have gone elsewhere.

However, ultra-conservative policies, such as this speaker ban imposed by trustees of this university, discourage scholars from coming to teach and study there and they, of course, indirectly figure in the preference given to other universities in the assignment of further Federal funds and projects. Naturally, competent, efficiency-minded Federal officials will allocate these funds to colleges and universities from whence the most benefit may be derived. As the prestige of a college drops in the academic community, so does its chance for larger allocations of research and development funds. These trustees by their actions have been doing a disservice to their university and to their State.

This process has a spiraling effect. In this space age of change and challenge industries employing highly technical personnel desire to locate near colleges and universities, both for the technical assistance that can be derived from close proximity to them and for the fact that many of their key personnel desire to live near an academic environment. When that academic environment deteriorates, so does the attractiveness of the entire geographical area as a location for a modern industry. As a result, jobs which might have been available to workingmen and women do not materialize; increased profits for businessmen are lost; and possible increases in tax revenues to the local and State governments vanish. Therefore, it is not only the educational institution that suffers from restrictive academic policies, but also the entire community and the entire State.

I am proud of the many fine colleges and universities in Ohio. Few States in the Union can match them in quantity and quality. They are a great asset to our State and to the Nation. Their graduates have distinguished themselves in every field of endeavor and in every part of the world.

This has been true of Ohio State University, a great institution of learning. I, along with other Ohioans, want it to continue to be true. This cannot be the case if the board of trustees continues its detrimental, ultraconservative, anti-intellectual policies.

In that connection, I was very happy to read today in the Plain Dealer, a great newspaper in Cleveland, Ohio, an editorial entitled "OSU To Benefit From Shocknessy." I was pleased to learn that James W. Shocknessy, a great leader in my State, the chairman of the Ohio Turnpike Commission, and a man who has been my personal friend over the years, was appointed by Governor Rhodes to be a member of the board of trustees of the Ohio State University.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Plain Dealer be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OSU To Benefit From Shocknessy

James W. Shocknessy, who has excelled in every task he has ever undertaken, can now make his gift of logic and his talent for policy forming available to the board of trustees of Ohio State University.

In appointing him to the board, Governor Rhodes could not have made a better choice. The Ohio senate should confirm quickly.

Although the Governor is a Republican and Shocknessy a Democrat, this is the second time Rhodes has sought out the services of the Ohio Turnpike Commission's chairman.

The first was when the Governor appointed him to expedite completion of Interstate 71. In this Shocknessy has shown his characteristic ability to get a job done, just as he formerly had done in getting the turnpike built.

Shocknessy's appointment to the OSU board comes at time when the board and the university face a multiplicity of problems, not the least of which center around a 15-year-old gag rule empowering the OSU president to bar practically any guest speaker from the campus.

OSU students and a faculty group have been demanding that the rule be abolished. The Plain Dealer editorially has pointed out that the rule has given the university a poor name in the academic community.

We are confident that the alert mind of Shocknessy will help the board to arrive at a correct decision on this and other questions that will confront it.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I know that Trustee James W. Shocknessy, a new trustee of the Ohio State University, will be one voice raised at all times in favor of freedom of speech.

Fascists, Communists, and others who seek to crush by force those who disagree with their opinions are doing an evil. That was the method of the czars of Russia, the bourbons of France and of Adolf Hitler of Germany. They failed miserably. You cannot exterminate ideas with clubs, you only scatter them. Combat wrong opinions with right opinions; combat fallacies with facts.

Mr. President, in the Washington Post of May 7, 1965, there appeared an excellent column by Bill Gold entitled "A Backward Look at Ohio State." Bill Gold, a great journalist and an alumnus of Ohio State University, is an example of the high caliber of men graduated by that university. In his column he speaks of the speaker ban at Ohio State both from the viewpoint of a concerned American and as an alumnus.

I ask unanimous consent that the part of his column relating to this subject be printed in the Record at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Backward Look at Ohio State

During the years that I was an undergraduate at Ohio State University more than three decades ago, the depression was at its worst and Communists were singing a siren song to unhappy Americans. The university was run by a conservative board of trustees. The trustees were banker types. Across their vests were heavy gold watch chains that almost looked as if they had been drawn

> there by a critical cartoonist. Students lived in the hope that some day the board's outlook would become more progressive.
>
> When it was announced that one of this country's top Communists had been invited to address the Liberal Club in University Hall, the trustees shuddered. But the suggestion that the trustees ban the Communist was voted down. Even the conservative board thought that students ought to be free to speak and listen—and learn.
>
> So the Communist spoke, and laid an egg. I was assigned to cover his speech and "just write what the man said." My account was published without comment on the front page of the campus daily. Nobody was subverted, and no Communist speaker was booked during the remainder of my stay at Ohio State because the student response had been a flat zero.
>
> All this came to mind during the past few days when I read about sit-ins at Ohio State touched off by the president of the university when he banned a controversial speaker who had been invited by a campus group. The man had already spoken at two other State-supported universities in Ohio, and there had been no trouble. When OSU's president refused to let him speak, students rebelled.
>
> Sit-ins and similar demonstrations are not my dish of tea, but neither is a university president who hasn't done his homework. Until the outlook changes at the old school, I think I'll deny that I ever attended there. Perhaps it would be better to just give some plausible story like claiming that I was a high school dropout.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, we must hold fast to our heritage as free men and women. We must renew our confidence in each other, our tolerances, our sense of being good neighbors.

I am hopeful that the trustees of Ohio State University will reconsider their present policies. I urge them to have more faith in the students attending that university and in the faculty that teaches there.

Free discussion is the lamp that lights democracy. Its glow must not be dimmed under a shroud of fear.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BLOOD TEST KIT FOR PHENYLKETONURIA (PKU)

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, recently, on the floor of the Senate, reference was made to the development of a blood test kit for phenylketonuria—known by some of us who are less articulate and knowledgeable in the field of medical science as PKU—which has been marketed by Ames Co., a subsidiary of Miles Laboratories, Inc., a well-known 80-year-old Elkhart, Ind., pharmaceutical manufacturer. This blood test promises to save thousands of infants from mental retardation and, when broadly accepted, will be a remarkable advance in medicine.

I should have prefaced my remarks, when I referred to those of us who are less knowledgeable in the field of medical science, by excluding the present Presiding Officer, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] because I know of his long interest in the field of mental retardation and mental health.

This test method was conceived by Dr. Robert Guthrie, of Buffalo, N.Y. In performing the test a drop of the infant's blood is used to determine if the child is afflicted with PKU. If undetected and untreated, brain damage occurs with subsequent mental retardation; however, early detection and medically supervised dietary treatment prevent severe mental retardation in most phenylketonuric infants. Such test procedures hold forth a promise of normal, happy lives.

The Ames Co. undertook the development of the Guthrie test method and has marketed a technically refined product.

The discussion on the Senate floor was based on certain data supplied by the Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There were certain inaccuracies in this data which should be corrected for the record.

To set forth the general position of Ames, I would like at this point to quote from a letter to the shareholders signed by Walter A. Compton, M.D., president of Miles Laboratories, Inc.:

> Our Ames Co. has been involved in PKU research for nearly 10 years. In 1958 it pioneered in developing and bringing to market a urine test to detect this condition, and has in intervening years very materially increased knowledge and attention to this preventable mental disease throughout the world. While not an important product in terms of sales volume, this test has performed a significant role in medicine since, if used routinely, it could lead to the substantial improvement, perhaps even virtual elimination, of PKU as one of the causes of mental retardation.
>
> It was because of Ames' reputation in this field that a Dr. Robert Guthrie brought his test concept to us. This test is done on blood and, although much more difficult and expensive to perform, it may have the advantage of detecting PKU a few days earlier than can a urine test. Ames agreed to manufacture and market a test based on the Guthrie concept and began to do so in the fall of 1963. This proved to be quite an undertaking because a great deal of research time was spent in refining the test to meet essential standards of quality and uniformity. Ten substantial technical alterations and improvements were required before in our judgment the test could be said to be sufficiently reliable for general use. Moreover, a new production facility has been built and equipped to manufacture the test properly because of special requirements inherent in the product. After this, an intensive educational campaign was necessary to get the new product brought to the attention of health authorities and into clinical use; this was a costly undertaking.
>
> Ames has never had any monopoly position in the market; there are several competing products that we know of. Nor has Ames even approached recovery of its investment in making this product available. The new product was originally scaled from our estimates to be sold at a price resulting in 42 cents per test. After some 5 months of manufacturing and marketing experience, this was reduced to the present level of approximately 21 cents. At this price, if it were possible for every child born in the United States each year to be tested, this would amount to about $850,000. Yet it has been estimated that early detection and the avoidance of institutional care would save the taxpayers $20 million when spread over the lifetime of the PKU victims born each year. This is quite apart from the human misery which would be prevented.
>
> In summary we believe that your company has acted in the public interest by developing, manufacturing, and bringing into use reliable tests produced under the high standards of quality required for such products. Actually, this test based on the Guthrie concept was made available largely as a public service, without expectation of significant profit, as part of our responsibility as a leader in this field of medicine. We believe it has made a worthwhile contribution. Much more could be said about the inaccurate inferences which have been drawn in the press in this matter but we believe the above represent the responsible and significant facts.

Now let me set forth for the record the points in conflict and in more detail explain the position of Ames.

It has been implied that, by reason of the fact that Dr. Guthrie filed a patent application covering this test method and thereafter entered into a license agreement with Ames, this action resulted in delaying disclosure of the Guthrie test method. This is clearly erroneous. Dr. Guthrie had discussed his test method in public as early as July 1960 at a scientific meeting in London and further publication in U.S. medical journals followed in 1961. Thus Dr. Guthrie's invention was not concealed and was public knowledge almost 2 years prior to the April 1962 filing of a patent application by Dr. Guthrie, and long prior to the June 1962 agreement with Ames Co. for the development and marketing of the blood test.

It has also been implied that the Ames Co. or Dr. Guthrie sought to establish rights in the Guthrie test method contrary to the Government's rights.

If this were the case, I would be highly alarmed. However, the facts are to the contrary. At all times Ames Co. and Dr. Guthrie and his private sponsors recognized that any agreement was subject to the assertion of controlling Government rights. The June 1962 agreement between Ames Co. and Dr. Guthrie was expressly subject to the prior rights of the Government.

I have had an opportunity to read verbatim the contractual agreements. One clause specifically requires that Government laws are controlling and recognized.

Moreover, the suggestion that Ames and Dr. Guthrie were acting independently of the Government's interest ignores the plain fact that—as recognized in the provision that the agreement was subject to the assertion of Government rights—the Surgeon General had the power to review and approve any license agreement and to impose such additional conditions as he believed necessary for the public interest.

(At this point Mr. YOUNG of Ohio took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, yesterday, we had a rather lengthy and, I felt, enlightening debate on the various aspects of our patent law, especially in the field of medicine and health. The Surgeon General has the power of review and approval and has used it extensively. He used it to deny the application in this particular case.

Although the terms or conditions for a license were never resolved, since no license was granted, advisers to the Surgeon General had indicated that if any license agreement were approved, it would be limited to a maximum duration of 2 years and would embody other specific limitations or conditions.

As matters developed, in May of 1964 the Surgeon General—again within his authority—disallowed the granting of any form of exclusive license. In short, Ames has never had an exclusive license, and Dr. Guthrie has assigned his patent application to the Government.

Even though Ames received no exclusive rights for even a limited period, it has continued to serve the public interest by making available a fully developed blood test kit and has by extensive informational efforts directed to the professions emphasized the value of PKU testing.

In this connection, it has also been suggested that the blood test kit originally made by Dr. Guthrie had already been developed and tried, and that further development was unnecessary. This is not true. That product was at best an experimental product for field trial use only.

The product marketed by Ames Co. is not the same product as produced for the field trial. Ames Co. has spent $93,000 in research and development on the product, and a number of significant changes were required to be made in order to produce a marketable product.

While certainly a contribution, it must be recognized that the test product that was being produced by Dr. Guthrie for field trial was being made under relatively rudimentary conditions in a rented house and with only limited facilities available to him. Dr. Guthrie contacted the Ames Co. because he recognized that the product had to be developed and brought out under the direction of a modern pharmaceutical company that had experience and broad skills and facilities available to it, and he knew that Ames Co. had experience in just that kind of testing. Also, it was demonstrated at the time that there were defects in the test, and that further development and refinement of the product was essential before use by the public in general.

Products to aid in the diagnosis of disease require as high an order of assurance as possible that the test results will be accurate. The danger lies, study shows, between false positives on the one hand and false negatives on the other hand. A false positive would cause undue apprehension, although the baby would always be rechecked and the fact that it was a false positive would be confirmed with no harm done. But a false negative—indicating that the disease was not present—could be tragic. This is particularly true in the case of tests for PKU since, if undetected and untreated, the result may and probably will be irremediable brain damage. This is so since corrective clinical treatment must be taken as soon after birth as possible, if the desired results are to be obtained.

A private company cannot distribute a diagnostic test product for public use until all known defects are removed and there is an assurance of reproducibility of results and accuracy of performance. This care must be exercised not only for reasons of integrity, but also to fulfill adherence to Government regulations and to minimize exposure to civil liabilities. Ames Co. devoted considerable resources and scientific technology in order to develop a marketable product.

Let me specify the additional steps taken by Ames to improve the product, to make it marketable, to make it a product of integrity and reliability, and to show that a great deal of effort was required from the time of final testing to the time of selling it over the counter to the public in general.

First. The micro-organism *B. subtilis* ATCC 6051 was changed to *B. subtilis* ATCC 6633 for better standardization. This was necessary because ATCC 6633 was readily available from reputable commercial sources while ATCC 6051 was not. There were available exacting control standards for ATCC 6633 which were not defined for the ATCC 6051 strain of the *B. subtilis* used in the original kit.

Second. The heat dried spore suspension in the original kit was changed to a liquid suspension in a sealed ampule. It was necessary to make this change to secure standardization and to have a reliable means of securing an exact range of viable spores. This could not be accomplished by the original method of heat drying.

The possibility of contamination strongly existed in the original method as spore vials were open to the atmosphere during the required drying procedure. The sealed ampule provided maximum accuracy as to spore addition to the test medium.

Third. Since heat drying was eliminated, the total spore count per ampule was decreased. This refinement was based upon considerable Ames research effort to arrive at a definite spore count per ampule which would result in optimum readability of the test.

Fourth. The glucose content was decreased from 1 to 0.5 percent. The reason for this change—although it appears to be relatively insignificant—nevertheless was to improve the stability of the end product in terms of assuring maximum lifespan from date of manufacture to date of use.

Fifth. Ferric chloride was eliminated to prevent turbidity in the final dissolved medium. This improvement again resulted in increased readability of the test medium, an important attribute of such test.

Sixth. Sodium sulfite as used in the original kit was changed to sodium sulfate in the refinement process to be in keeping with the growth medium described in the Demain study "Minimal Media for Quantitive Studies with Bacillus Subtilis," an established reference on the subject to make it uniform to other tests which are conducted throughout the country on other products.

Seventh. The dehydrated medium produced at Ames' direction by an independent source was a definite improvement over the original process. The original method utilized a dry blend of ingredients which was found unsatisfactory in that total drying was difficult to obtain and the method called for numerous stages of mixing and dispensing. This, in turn, required a constant checking of each mixture as it was completed. In changing to the dehydrated medium, Ames was able to achieve definite uniformity of component ingredients, minimize contamination exposure, increase stability, and meet commercial production requirements. This refinement also made the test easier to perform and lessened the possibility of error by the user.

Eighth. Ames' refinement process eliminated the separate vial of dried b-2-thienylalanin used in the original kit. Ames incorporated the b-2-thienylalanin directly into the dehydrated medium. A decrease in concentration of b-2-thienylalanin was found to be necessary to secure an optimum medium. These changes were pointed toward the good manufacturing objective of securing maximum uniformity of essential ingredients by combining three of the original components into one dehydrated powder and thereafter into one container as opposed to three separate containers originally utilized in the kit. It makes the kit easier to use and more reliable.

Ninth. An additional improvement was the utilization of five plastic trays and covers in each of the Ames kits as opposed to but one plastic tray and cover in every fifth original kit. Ames found it necessary to provide a one-time use tray. The single tray and cover per every fifth kit as originally devised required using the single tray for repeated testing, thus increasing contamination exposure. Evidence of such contamination had been observed in the single tray method.

Tenth. In addition to the refinements set forth above, considerable time and effort were expended in developing quality control procedures and specifications to insure that the product as manufactured in individual batches and from batch to batch would be accurate and effective in testing babies. A few of such specifications and procedures are—raw material testing, moisture control of test medium, identity control procedures, microbiological assay on B. subtilis spores, procedures for stability testing of batch file samples at 6-, 12-, 24-, and 36-month intervals, and finished product testing procedure.

Mr. President, the development and marketing of a product of the nature of Guthrie product is an intricate process. We are dealing with the lives of young babies, just born, and it is important that we go to the *n*th degree to protect their health and safety.

All of this work on the inhibition assay involved substantial use of research personnel and considerable product development, including experimental manufacturing. The Ames quality control methods development group worked out assay procedures for phenylalanin, b-2-thienylalanin and medium components; this has been expressly commented upon in item 10 above. The microbiology section and the biostatistical section of Ames quality control developed an evaluation method for kit performance which resulted in a consistent procedure for determination of acceptability of the finished kit. This technological accomplishment was once again in addition to the other quality control procedures set forth in item 10 above.

The above summary refutes a charge that no further development was necessary to market the product commercially. This development effort required additional effort, investment, and expense.

Mr. President, there has been a considerable amount of discussion in committee and on the floor of the Senate during the past several months about some unfortunate practices indulged in by certain drug companies. I do not condone them. I do not condone the charging of exorbitant prices. Ames Co. has been accused of charging an exorbitant price for the product that it developed from the Guthrie test method and it has been stated that such product could be produced for $6, including all costs, for a kit containing 500 tests. At the $6 figure, the cost per test would be 1.2 cents per test. Dr. Guthrie had been working under Federal grants for several years during the development of his blood test method. He had received Public Health Service support of more than $250,000 and had received additional outside private support of about $100,000.

In 1962 the Children's Bureau made a grant for Dr. Guthrie to carry out a broad-scale program of field trial of this blood test method. During this project $570,207 was spent by the Children's Bureau to test 404,568 babies across the country. A breakdown of the budget for this project shows the following:

Expenditures of Children's Bureau grants-in-aid funds (title V, pt. 1, Social Security Act) for Guthrie PKU project, fiscal years 1962–64

Special project grant to University of Buffalo (Dr. Guthrie):	
Staff	$120, 132
Supporting services (travel, laboratory supplies, epidemiologic surveillance, postage, etc.)	109, 864
Test kit materials	61, 467
Scientific equipment	3, 444
Total	294, 907
Cost of PKU field testing by 30 States (formula grant funds under title V, pt. 1, Social Security Act)	275, 300
Total	570, 207

This table shows the errors in the statistics of the Children's Bureau as to what the product cost to make. I call particular attention to the cost of the test kit materials of $61,467.

Although in several instances the Federal agencies suggest that the cost per test of the Guthrie kit was 1.2 cents per test, this is clearly erroneous. The budget supplied by the Children's Bureau indicates that the actual cost of the test kit materials alone was 9.2 cents per test based on the number of blood and urine tests—665,902—actually performed during the program. It should be noted that this is for materials cost only and does not include other costs attributable to manufacturing and distribution since it ascribes no labor or overhead. These costs are not defined in the Children's Bureau budget.

Only the cost of the test material is included, and even so the cost was several times the amount of the reliable cost.

It is impossible to determine what the actual cost per test was during the Children's Bureau program. However, it can be conclusively proven that the per test cost was more than 9.2 cents and not the 1.2 cents per test as indicated in the agency's statements.

But regardless of what the costs may or may not be for a governmental agency engaged in manufacturing diagnostic products, the pertinent question is what are the costs—and resulting price—of a reputable, experienced private company that must assume all legal responsibility for and stand behind its products. Further, it is impractical to compare the cost or price of the original field trial test unit with that of the Ames product. It would be similar to comparing a model T Ford to a 1965 Lincoln. Although both are for the same function, the model T is obviously a rudimentary form of transportation and the Lincoln is a very sophisticated, highly refined product.

It is important that misconceptions concerning the price of the Ames product be corrected. It is suggested in certain memorandums by the Children's Bureau that the marketed price of the Ames Co. for the Guthrie test kit was $262.50 for 500 tests or more than 52 cents per test. This is inaccurate. The test kit produced by Ames has never been priced at $262.50, nor has it ever been produced in units of 500.

I do not know where this information was obtained. It is wrong. It is erroneous. It is false. In fact, the test kit has been produced only in units of 325 since the inception of its marketing by the Ames Co. The price per test of the Ames kit was 42 cents per test from November 1963 until April 1964. At that time the price was cut to 21 cents per test.

The misconceptions concerning Ames selling price imply an unconscionable profit. This also is wrong.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a memorandum from the vice president of finance for Miles Laboratories, Inc., to the president of Ames Co., Mr. George Orr, concerning a cost analysis made of the Ames Co. PKU blood test kits. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point—and this is of equal importance—a copy of the examination made by the public accounting firm of Price Waterhouse & Co.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILES LABORATORIES, INC., INTEROFFICE COMMUNICATION

MAY 25, 1965.

To: George W. Orr.
From: Joseph H. Hoyt.
Subject: Ames PKU blood test kits.

In accordance with your request I have reviewed our sales and cost records in regard to subject product.

In my opinion, the accompanying statement of unrecovered costs at April 30, 1965, on Ames PKU blood test kits presents fairly the data shown therein.

The unrecovered cost to date of $131,823 does not include the cost of $50,000 for the film, "PKU Mental Deficiency Can Be Prevented," nor does it include an allocation for corporate overhead expense, such as executive, legal, financial, or administrative. These items have been excluded because it is felt they may be controversial.

The records show that our current selling price for the Ames PKU blood test kit is 20.8 cents per test and that our direct production and distribution costs are 6.6 cents per test. However, after making allowance for continuing marketing, research, and divisional administrative expenses, I estimate our total operating cost at 17.4 cents per test. This leaves an operating margin of approximately 3.4 cents per test.

If Ames is able to sell tests for 20 percent of the total U.S. potential market of 4 million babies, this would produce annual operating margin of some $27,000. At this rate, assuming no further reduction in prices, it will take about 5 years to recover those costs yet unrecovered at April 30, 1965.

Prior to April 1964, our selling price was 41.7 cents per test. However, at that time our production and distribution costs alone were 15.1 cents per test. This higher cost was due to heavy quality control charges and other increased expenses attributable to the learning period.

JOSEPH H. HOYT.

Miles Laboratories, Inc.—Statement of unrecovered costs at Apr. 30, 1965, on Ames PKU blood test kits

Net sales of test kits from Nov. 1, 1963 to Apr. 30, 1965	$72, 243
Costs and expenses applicable to these sales:	
Production	24, 380
Distribution [1]	4, 141
Advertising	29, 025
Selling [1]	22, 215
Division Adiminstration [1]	3, 589
Total	83, 350
Excess of costs and expenses	11, 107
Add:	
Cost of research and development commencing in 1962	93, 753
Cost of special equipment and facilities	26, 963
Total unrecovered costs at Apr. 30, 1965	131, 823

[1] Represents division expenses basically allocated as a percentage to net sales. No amounts are included for corporate administrative overhead expenses of Miles Laboratories, Inc.

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 26, 1965.*

The BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
Miles Laboratories, Inc.,
Elkhart, Ind.

DEAR SIRS: We have examined the consolidated financial statements of Miles Laboratories, Inc. and its subsidiaries for the years ended December 31, 1962, 1963, and 1964, and have previously expressed our opinion thereon under dates of February 11, 1963, February 17, 1964, and February 19, 1965. Our examinations were made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

As a supplement to the foregoing examinations, we have examined the statement of unrecovered costs at April 30, 1965, on Ames PKU blood test kits and made such additional tests of the pertinent accounting

> records and performed such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. In our opinion, the accompanying statement of unrecovered costs at April 30, 1965, on Ames PKU blood test kits presents fairly the data shown therein.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> PRICE WATERHOUSE Co.

Mr. BAYH. It will be seen that the public accounting firm report supports the analysis.

This memorandum indicates that the total operating costs are 17.4 cents per test leaving a margin of approximately 3.4 cents per test. Against this the Ames Co. is trying to recover costs which to April 30, 1965, were yet unrecovered in the amount of $131,823. The unrecovered costs were largely involved in the research and the development of the product and acquiring special equipment and facilities required for the manufacture of these test kits.

There is a very small potential market for the product, one in which there is little volume and very little hope of profitability. Further, in the highly scientifically oriented pharmaceutical industry there is also the problem of product obsolescence because of new research and technical achievement. Research is now being conducted by other companies in this very area of medicine.

One product is being tested now, which, if it proves to be successful, could make obsolete the Ames product and the product of its competitors.

Therefore it is impossible to project the length of time that the Ames test will be used. It is difficult, then, to insure recovery of the unrecovered costs to date. I do not believe that the present cost is providing an unconscionable profit.

In keeping with its responsibility, Ames Co. has undertaken an extensive program of education concerning this form of mental retardation, and the use of its product for the detection of this condition. Such costs are a part of business operations and must be assigned to the products involved. These costs include such items as medical literature, informative mailings, and scientific exhibits. In this particular case Ames Co. is not assigning to this product certain other educational costs which could be attributed to it.

An example of the latter is the sound motion picture entitled "PKU Mental Deficiency Can Be Prevented." Ames underwrote the production of this film, which was produced under the direction of and narrated by Harry A. Waisman, Ph. D., M.D., professor of pediatrics, University of Wisconsin Medical School. Fifty prints of this film have been made for Ames' film library. There are an average of 65 to 70 showings per month, and it is estimated that the film has been viewed by well over 100,000 persons. The film is shown to medical, nursing, and medical technician students; hospital medical and nursing staffs, medical, nursing, and medical technician society meetings; and even to college and high school science students. Several State public health agencies have purchased prints of the film—at cost of the print—for their film libraries.

I had the good fortune to see the film. I believe that most Senators would recognize the importance of striking out as forcefully as we can in every way possible to prevent mental illness and mental retardation. If it were possible, we should offer to Ames a type of "Emmy" Award for the fine production and the public service that is being rendered by the film.

In summary, an analysis of the expenses for the Ames blood test kit will show that the price is in keeping with good business practices and well within reason. The product is being marketed by Ames Co. at a reasonable price.

Our Nation is becoming increasingly aware of the serious effects of mental illness. Millions of dollars are spent annually in an effort to cure those who are afflicted. In fact, this Congress has recently embarked upon a program which will result in investing significantly higher proportions of our national resources into curing and caring for those who are mentally ill.

Fortunately for our country, men and women of science and medicine in both industry and academic life have recognized the need to do battle against mental illness long before the majority of us in the Halls of Government. Because of their leadership, significant technological accomplishments have been made not only to treat mental illness after it has been diagnosed but to prevent the very occurrence of the disease.

Dr. Robert Guthrie has been one of the academic contributors. He has conceived a test which will help make it possible to save several hundred American babies, boys and girls, and eventually men and women, from being afflicted with mental retardation each year. How much wiser it is to devote resources to try to prevent an illness from occurring than to be faced with the alternative of spending many times this amount of funds and effort for treatment.

Ames Co. industrial scientists had developed a urine test to detect PKU before the development of the Guthrie blood test. Ames urine test, although it may have the disadvantage of detecting PKU a few days later than the Guthrie blood test, continues to be used and has made a continuing significant contribution to medical science. Because of the effort devoted to the cause of mental retardation prevention by Ames Co., many young Americans are whole and happy instead of facing a lifelong tragedy of retardation. I, for one, think that Dr. Guthrie and Ames Co. should be complimented for the effort they have made for the development of effective blood tests against PKU and for the effort Ames Co. has made to make this product readily available to members of the medical profession.

We in the Congress and in the State legislatures recognize our responsibility to enact programs which devote more of our resources to an attack against the dreaded mental diseases which are rampant throughout the country. But I believe that we must also recognize that mental illness can be arrested only with the full cooperation of government, industry, scientists, and educational institutions.

I make that statement on the floor of the Senate and take the time of Senators only because I believe it is important that when we make accusations which tend to make such cooperative ventures between medicine, government and educational institutions less than desirable, we are in fact not serving the purpose which we all really wish to serve; namely, rapid elimination of mental illness wherever it may appear and in whatever form it may appear.

SILVER COINAGE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, many of us have looked forward to a message from the Treasury Department and from the President of the United States on the subject of silver. That message was delivered to the Congress of the United States at noon today. It has many good elements. It is long overdue. Part of the message provides for the protection of our silver supply. A similar proposal has been embodied in a bill introduced by the Senator from Nevada and cosponsored by several other western Senators.

These matters are all to the good.

Another provision of the message would provide for the reduction in the amount of silver in subsidiary silver coins of the United States. Last year many Senators suggested that such a reduction should be made. At that time representatives of the Treasury Department testified that enactment of the proposed legislation introduced last year would raise the monetary value of silver to $1.45 an ounce, and that in turn would cause the disappearance in circulation of all current silver coins, especially the outstanding silver dollars, and in all probability it would lead in the future to the melting down of subsidiary coins.

The President has today made the same suggestion that we have made, except that he has proposed that there shall be no more silver in dimes and quarters, and that the only coin in which the use of silver will be continued will be the silver half dollar. The half dollar will be a coin faced with an alloy of 80 percent silver and 20 percent copper, bonded to a core of 21 percent silver and 79 percent copper. That coin will continue to be minted with the image of President Kennedy.

So in the future the only coin minted with a silver content will be the silver half dollar.

With rather refreshing frankness, I believe, in an early paragraph of his message the President said:

> Silver is becoming too scarce for continued large-scale use in coins. To maintain unchanged our high silver coinage in the face of this stark reality would only invite a chronic and growing scarcity of coins.

Many of us have been making that statement for 5 years. To maintain the silver content of coins at 90 percent would mean that we would come to the end of silver for use in coinage.

The President referred to "large scale" use. The President's message states that silver is becoming too scarce for use in coins—much to the regret of the people of America, who have had some of the most beautiful and most useful coins that have ever been minted. Much to their regret, today marks the end of silver for use in our coins. We shall no longer have a silver content in coins.

The President states further in his message:

> I want to make it absolutely clear that these changes in our coinage will have no effect on the purchasing power of our coins.

Last year the Treasury Department representatives came in and said that it would have no effect on the purchasing power. The new coins—the dimes and quarters—will be useful coins.

It will be a coin that will work in vending machines. I have nothing but praise for the Treasury Department, which has tried to solve this very difficult problem. I shall say more about that later.

This Presidential message seeks to accomplish two things. First, it says that this is the end of the use of silver in the coinage of America. It says to us in America that we are going to reserve our stockpiles of about a billion ounces of silver for industrial purposes rather than for coinage. Many of us have said for years that it is necessary to transfer some of the billion ounces of silver to the defense stockpile and reserve the rest of the silver for coinage alone.

But the President says in his message that it is believed our stocks of silver will be adequate, once the large present drainage from coinage is greatly reduced, to meet any foreseeable requirement.

Then he says that prompt action will protect silver coinage by freeing our reserves for the redemption of silver certificates at $1.29 an ounce. This, in effect, until our present 1 billion ounces of silver are exhausted, will mean that we are pegging the price of silver at $1.29 an ounce. At the end of that time, the price of silver would go to what the free market would demand.

Many of us have said that what should be done is to save this great stockpile of silver for the use of coinage and defense purposes only, and let the silver that is used by the electronic, photographic, silverware, and new industries seek its price level in the free marketplace.

The Presidential proposal would do neither of those things. I hope there will be early hearings on the proposal. I shall have more to say about it and the bill at the time hearings are conducted. It is with real regret that I have received this message, a message which goes only part way toward solving a complex, complicated problem.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am glad to yield to my senior colleague.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am in accord with the views which my colleague from Montana has just expressed. I am quite certain that the administration has tried to find a solution to the difficult impasse in which it finds itself.

While it is recognized that no more silver will be used in dimes and quarters, that does not mean that the present silver coinage—at least that which is now in use—will not increase in value as a result. That applies also to the new half-dollar, or four-bit piece, in which the silver content will be reduced to around 40 percent. Slight hope—a very slight hope—is held out for the silver dollar—the so-called cartwheel. I believe that in that respect the Treasury Department is, in effect, whistling in the dark. There is no question that the price will be maintained in the range of $1.25 to $1.29 for a short while—a year or 2, perhaps a little longer; only time will tell—but as soon as the lid is off, I believe the price of silver can be expected to go up to as much as $2.50 or $3 an ounce. That will not be beneficial for the country as a whole, although it will be for the producers of silver.

It will also mean, of course, increased costs so far as the manufacturers and buyers of silver products are concerned.

As the Senator knows, and as the Senators from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE and Mr. CANNON] are aware, we had a meeting with the Treasury officials a week ago Monday. They pointed out to the four of us at that time that only 5 million silver dollars could be minted before the end of the present fiscal year. They also showed us an advertisement that indicated that as high as $7.50 was being quoted for one silver dollar of a mintage not yet in operation, based on a mintage of 45 million silver dollars. If only 5 million silver dollars were to be all that were to be minted, then it was natural and logical to anticipate that the speculative price would rise correspondingly anywhere from $15 to $25, or more, for one silver dollar. It was then, in my office, that the four of us told the Treasury that we were not interested in enriching speculators. We were not interested in a silver dollar being worth $7.50 or $15 or $25. We said that what we were interested in was having silver dollars circulated in our States and therefore, in view of the facts given to us, we requested that the minting of the dollars be stopped. This was done immediately.

It is well that this story is brought out, because it was the western Senators who suggested the stopping of the minting of silver dollars in the Denver Mint, silver dollars which Congress had authorized at the administration's request, and for which Congress had appropriated $600,000.

I, too, am disappointed in this message; but I think that, all things considered, the administration has done the best it could under the circumstances. I am sure that the four of us will be heard when the hearings on the proposed legislation, which will be considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency, get underway.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Unfortunately, I was unable to hear the full extent of the Senator's remarks. However, I was pleased to hear the majority leader's expression of disappointment in the message. I should like to make a few comments about it.

My first comment is that no mention was made in the message of setting aside a reserve of silver for use in defense. As the Senator knows, I introduced a bill to set aside such a reserve. Obviously, we are using between 23 and 40 million ounces of silver a year for defense purposes. As soon as the Treasury's reserve evaporates, we shall have to go into the open market to try to buy silver at a greatly increased cost to the taxpayers.

It seems to me to be only commonsense that some kind of strategic reserve be set up. The message does not mention anything at all about that. I think this is a really serious defect in the message.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not have the floor, but I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This matter has been discussed among the Senators from Nevada and Montana. Our feelings are exactly those of the Senator from Colorado. We feel that there should be a sizable strategic reserve of silver placed in the stockpile, where it could be kept off the market, where it could not be used for redemptive purposes, but could be used for defense reasons if and when the occasion should arise.

I assure the distinguished Senator from Colorado that we agree fully with him that there should be a sizable reserve of silver in the stockpile, and we hope that it will be forthcoming.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am in complete concurrence with my senior colleague from Montana. I believe that as a result of this message, some changes will occur in the silver market. The Treasury Department should transfer to the Office of Emergency Planning a reserve of silver for defense purposes.

Mr. DOMINICK. I certainly welcome the support of the Senators from Montana and also, I hope, the Senators from Nevada take the same position, because I think it is of overriding importance.

There is another problem that bothers me. I am not quite sure how it should be dealt with, but something should be done. If we are to try to stimulate the production of silver in order to take care of the lack of supply, in comparison with demand, it makes no sense to me to keep a ceiling on top of what our Treasury silver can be sold for.

What we are doing is exactly what the junior Senator from Montana said. We are saying to the industrial users, "Only you can have our Treasury silver at $1.29 or whatever less we may be willing to sell it to you for. We will not allow the silver to go over that price until the supply is exhausted."

In the meantime, we would achieve no additional production from this practice. Somehow or other, if we are to try to ease the supply-and-demand situation by taking the silver out of our coins, I personally wish that we had done what the Senator suggested, so that the sale for a higher price could be stimulated. If we do not do what the Senator suggested, we are not accomplishing a thing except holding the additional reserve in the Treasury for a year and a half or two years. It may not last that long unless we are willing to let the price go up to stimulate production. It would require at least 3 or 4 more years to try to get the production of silver stimulated by means of a higher price. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I completely concur. That would be a backward approach. We should set aside our silver and encourage the taking of action now, rather than a few months from now, after our reserves are gone. We should encourage the opening up of new mines and have silver available for coinage and have the marketplace determine the price for industrial uses.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I very much appreciate his comments.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana. I commend him on the very able presentation he is making. He has long been one of the leaders in this very troublesome field of the coinage of silver.

It has been a great pleasure for me to recognize his leadership and work closely with him and with the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished Senator from Colorado. We recognize the seriousness of the problem with which the Treasury Department has been faced in the past few years in attempting to solve the continual shortage in the Nation's coinage needs.

Today, as has been repeated on the floor many times, I am sure, the President has sent us a message requesting legislation in which the Treasury officials obviously concur. I, too, have been disappointed with the recommendations that have been made to Congress. I do not for 1 minute believe that what I call an artificial shortage of coins would cease to exist, even if all of the Treasury recommendations were adopted forthwith.

Since this subject has not been covered by the distinguished junior Senator from Montana, I should like to examine very briefly some of the past events which have occurred in the constant struggle to keep silver in our coinage system.

A short 2 years ago, in April of 1963, the then Secretary of the Treasury stated before the Committee on Banking and Currency that the Treasury had an adequate supply of silver on hand with which to meet our coinage needs for the next 10 to 20 years. However, in slightly over 2 years, we now find that we have only enough silver remaining to meet the demand for coinage for not more than 3 years. The mint is now consuming silver at the rate of 300 million silver ounces annually. The existing supply will disappear sooner if the demand for the redemption of silver certificates continues at its present pace. We must redeem the silver certificates with a dollar's worth of silver.

Senators from the West commented particularly on this problem at the time we considered the bill for the redemption of silver certificates. The Treasury stated that, among other things, there should be some type of order on the redemption of the millions of dollars' worth of silver certificates carried within the Federal Reserve System because of the demand on silver certificates. This was a vehicle to cut down on the very limited supplies of silver that were in the Treasury of the United States.

I am sure that the Senator from Montana feels the same way on the problem of silver certificates.

Mr. METCALF. I am in complete accord.

Mr. BIBLE. The Senator may wish to comment on that as we discuss the matter further and meet the problem head on. I went into this matter at some length approximately 2 weeks ago when I introduced legislation to prohibit melting silver coins and to stop hoarding and speculation in silver coins. I was joined in that legislation by my distinguished colleague and by the distinguished Senators from Montana.

It seems to me that, despite what the President has suggested today, we must enact legislation to prevent the melting of silver coins, and the hoarding and speculation. I recognize that this is a difficult situation to enforce. My mail seems to indicate that I am trying to go back to the Volstead Act.

We must try to enact legislation along this line. We must enact legislation to prevent the continued exportation of coins from this country overseas. If we do not do this, it is apparent to me that the legislation which is recommended today by the Treasury Department will see the disappearance of all silver coins.

A price of $1.29 for silver will not bring the silver out of the ground. A floor of $1.25 will not help to increase the production of silver. The problem can be met only by increased production of silver. Price is the main factor which will control world production.

I share the viewpoint of the Senator from Colorado that we must find some device by which to increase production. I do not buy the idea that there is very little silver in the world, or that there is very little silver in the United States.

When properly priced, I believe that we shall see all kinds of silver come into being. Among other things, I believe that the use of silver should be continued in all of the coins, not only in the 50-cent pieces, which the Presidential message pinpoints with reference to the use of 40-percent silver, but also in dimes and quarters as well.

I believe that we must enact legislation and do our best to prevent speculation and hoarding, as well as the other measures embraced in my bill. Next week the Committee on Banking and Currency will afford ample opportunity for the presentation of testimony.

The wholesale use of silver certificates should be curtailed wherever possible. I could not agree more with the statements that have been made about creating a silver stockpile to meet defense needs. I renew that plea. I again emphasize that the production of 5 million silver dollars would create a speculator's paradise. I testified and pointed out at the time that this would not solve the problem. I am completely aware that there are very few more complicated or intricate problems than the one that faces Congress on this issue.

I hope, and I am sure, that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold exhaustive hearings on this problem. It is many faceted. It is not easy of solution. The attention of monetary experts and the practical men in this field should be directed to the problem. I am prepared to speak at length at the hearings in support of the continued use of silver, even though in a reduced amount, in the coinage system of our country.

In closing, I particularly commend the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] for the great leadership he has shown.

I pledge myself to continue to work side by side with him. He has made a real contribution in trying to bring this complex problem to a successful conclusion.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator from Nevada. I pay tribute to his leadership and his interest in the coinage of silver and silver mining in the West and his introduction of a bill that would provide for controls so silver coins would not be melted down. I feel that some of the controls mentioned in the President's message and other controls would be necessary to protect silver coins during the interim period when we were working with regard to coins of lesser silver content. I pledge myself to help him in trying to carry out any effort to help solve a difficult situation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Senator from Montana for yielding to me. I commend him for the comments he has made on this very difficult subject. I agree with the distinguished junior Senator and the distinguished senior Senator from Montana, as well as my senior colleague from Nevada in the comments they have made on this subject.

I, too, was very much disappointed in the President's message sent to Congress on the coinage problem. It is a big step in the wrong direction. Congress would be well advised to reject the recommendations when they are properly before us.

If we do not, our coinage system will be debased and confidence in our coinage both at home and abroad will be damaged.

I completely agree with the comments of the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado concerning the reserve. I do not believe legislation is required, but if it is, I would hope it would be acted on rapidly, so that a reserve could be set aside. I believe that could be done by Executive order in order to set aside a reserve for defense purposes. I believe this is extremely important.

I also agree with the statement that the artificial price of $1.29 will not bring silver out of the ground. The message requesting authority, proposing a domestic price on silver at not less than $1.25, is shooting in the dark and wishful thinking because the production of silver at that price would not be stimulated.

The message itself refers to the increased use of silver by domestic and commercial users over a period of years. Relating that to purchases which are going to be made, the price artificially pegged at $1.29, where it is at present, is not going to help production.

I am in accord with the statement of my distinguished colleague with regard to the redemption of silver certificates. Action should be taken rapidly to discontinue redemption of silver certificates with the bullion we have now on hand, because it is being depleted very rapidly.

This proposal would create a private silver mine for the silver manufacturers. I do not believe this would be in the general interest of the taxpayers who have accumulated the silver bullion for whatever purposes needed, particularly for coinage.

If the proposal is carried out, it will not increase the production of mining in this country at a time when we should be trying to do everything we can to stimulate domestic mining. World production of silver is so much less than the use of silver, that we must stimulate production. The proposal in the message would not accomplish that end.

Lastly, these proposals would eliminate silver in coinage, and would encourage hoarding—driving high silver content coinage from circulation. It would not abate speculation. It would cause the chaos and confusion which characterize the present situation, difficult as it is, to appear to be a simple one.

Again I compliment my colleague. Much can be gained by following the proposals of the bill offered by my colleague, both with regard to the silver reserve and hoarding and shipment abroad. The measure could advance our efforts to find a solution to the difficult situation that confronts us, and result in extending the period of time the reserves might be held. It also would give us an opportunity, by reduction of the silver content in all coins, to form a realistic method of trying to stimulate silver production.

Mr. METCALF. The distinguished Senator from Neveda has made an outstanding contribution to this discussion. I completely concur in his statement that pegging the price at $1.29 is going to mean that we have a private silver mine, as he so eloquently put it, for industrial users. It will dissipate our silver reserve, and we shall have to go into the silver market at higher prices. It would delay production in the mining industry at a time when new sources of the metal will have to be found.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Does the Senator from Montana believe that the coinage with the new silver content will result in speculation in coinage?

Mr. METCALF. I agree that the proposal submitted in the Presidential message would mean a hoarding of present silver coins—and destruction of the silver dollars which have already disappeared—as well as the half dollars, dimes, and quarters.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Coins with baser metals would drive from circulation those with more valuable metals.

Mr. METCALF. Beginning at noon today, I predict that people will begin to speculate and hoard dimes and quarters.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. At the recently proposed coinage of silver dollars for use in areas where they are in circulation it was ascertained that the mintage of a few millions in silver dollars would have resulted in speculation and hoarding by speculators. What is the opinion of the Senator from Montana concerning the coinage of silver dollars if they had been minted with the date of 1922 on them, which is the last mintage date for silver dollars? I believe that was the year.

Mr. METCALF. Last year many of us suggested that such a procedure be followed. However, the content of the silver dollar is worth on the market slightly more than a dollar. As the result of this message, those who have silver would hold it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Does the Senator believe that silver dollars will shortly be driven out of circulation?

Mr. METCALF. Certainly. I would welcome a new silver dollar with the same silver content proposed for half dollars—40 percent.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. So if silver dollars had been minted, there would not have been speculation among the coin collectors to the same extent. The situation would have been relieved.

Mr. METCALF. It would have been relieved at the time. I do not believe it would at this time, with the other silver shortage, which would not be taken care of.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am glad to yield to my friend the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, earlier this year, I introduced a bill to do exactly what the Senator has suggested. I agreed, when discussion arose concerning the minting of 5 million silver dollars—that so long as the number was inadequate, we would be better off not even going ahead with the minting of silver dollars even if we did backdate them so they would not become collector's items, especially to those who collect silver dollars for every year in which they happen to be minted. I was completely in accord with the two Senators from Montana and my distinguished colleague when he considered this matter and agreed that it would not be wise to go ahead with the minting of a token number of silver dollars this year which could not actually reach circulation but would immediately be driven into the speculators' market.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. How many silver dollars were melted down under the Pittman Act in 1922? Does the Senator have that figure?

Mr. METCALF. I do not have that figure at hand.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Hundreds of millions of silver dollars were melted down.

Mr. METCALF. The Senator is correct. The huge silver stock which the Treasury Department acquired by the Silver Purchase Act, at $1.29——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Under the Silver Purchase Act they melted down——

Mr. METCALF. In 1929 the Government of the United States was going to make a huge profit from the silver which it purchased as low as 30 cents an ounce back in depression days.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator is familiar with the fact that Maria Theresa thalers minted in Vienna were circulated along the East Coast of Africa when they were first minted in the 1780's, and when the date was changed on those coins, the people in that area, and along the Red Sea, would not accept them. Maria Theresa thalers, even since that time, have been minted in Vienna with the same date of 1780. They are still in circulation today.

Mr. METCALF. There is no reason why, at the proper time, we could not take similar action.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator in yielding to me again. I wish to comment on the silver dollar problem brought up by the Senator from Texas under the President's proposal as it was given to us today. I do not see any prospect in the near future of ever minting any more silver dollars, because as long as we hold to the price of $1.29 for the stocks which we have at present, and offer to pay only $1.25 to produce, we will not produce any more silver. At 90 percent, or a little over what it was worth, that will be more valuable than the silver dollar is now. The minute we mint that coin, it will go out of circulation, and that situation will continue in the foreseeable future unless we do something about permitting the price of silver, outside of coinage, to go up in order to stimulate production.

The big problem is the perennial messing around with the law of supply and demand. Until we get back to permitting some kind of law of supply and demand to operate properly, as it has in other fields, we shall have this continuing problem.

How long does the Senator anticipate—presupposing that the President's bill goes through as written—it would be before we would be out of our silver supply?

Mr. METCALF. I believe in approximately a year. The redemption of silver certificates would be continued so heavily that the silver supply of 1 billion ounces would be exhausted in approximately a year. The Senator from Colorado will remember, because he was on the Committee on Banking and Currency and took part in a long interrogation during the hearings, that last year the Treasury Department said that it had 1½ billion ounces of silver. Now it has 1 billion——

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe it is a little less.

Mr. METCALF. A little less; yes. As a result, there will not be enough silver to take care of the new silver program, unless we set it aside for coinage and stop redeeming silver certificates at $1.29 an ounce.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy that the Senator brought this point up, because it is timely and important and will become more pressing as time goes on.

Mr. METCALF. I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from Colorado to this colloquy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

GI BILL NEEDED TO AVOID DISCRIMINATION AGAINST VETERANS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the cold war GI bill (S. 9) is now pending on the Senate Calendar, eligible to be brought up for consideration at any time.

The main objection to the bill which was brought out in hearings by the Department of Defense was that it would lure men out of service, thus harming the reenlistment rates of the military service. Yet, the same hearings reveal that less than 10 percent of draftees and, at the most, 25 percent of volunteers remain in the service after their first enlistment.

This means that the educational opportunities of 90 percent of our draftees and 75 percent of the volunteers are being impeded and denied on the presumption that it is necessary to maintain our military strength by securing the reenlistment of only 10 percent of the draftees who do reenlist, and the reenlistment of only 25 percent of volunteers. It is in reenlistment, I submit, Mr. President, that the cold war bill would serve as an inducement for military service, and would prevent discrimination against so many veterans.

There is a provision in this GI bill, not in previous bills, that a serviceman would not lose his rights to educational benefits by reenlistment. I submit that, contrary to the contention of the Department of Defense, instead of reducing the rate of reenlistment, since he would have an incentive for an educational opportunity after his time of service was up, it would induce more reenlistments and thus serve the purposes of defense.

It is a shortsighted policy, without consideration of all the facts, the statistics, and the implications of the failure of reenlistment that has caused the Department of Defense shortsightedly to oppose the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the May 28, 1965, Washington Daily News, entitled "Bill Will Aid Cold War Veterans" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[The Washington (D.C.) Daily News, May 28, 1965]

EDUCATION ASSIST: BILL WILL AID COLD WAR VETERANS

(By William Steif)

A bill to provide educational assistance to veterans of the cold war probably will be pushed to a vote in Congress this year.

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has approved a sweeping measure introduced by Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas. More cautious versions are pending in both Houses of Congress.

The Yarborough bill, introduced in two previous Congresses and once passed by the Senate, will spark controversy because of its size and administration opposition to it.

Senator YARBOROUGH's bill contains some window dressing, guaranteeing small loans, but the main education features include:

Eligibility for any veteran who has served more than 6 months between January 31, 1955, cutoff date for the Korean war GI bill, and July 1, 1967, when the present draft law ends.

Full-time college students without dependents would get $110 a month; with one dependent $135; with more than one dependent $160.

Maximum amount of education allowed would be 36 months, the amount to be determined by multiplying the number of days the veteran served by 1.5 times.

Schooling would have to begin within 3 years after discharge or enactment of the bill, whichever is later, and would have to be finished within 8 years.

SELLING POINT

A major selling point is that veterans over 21 would be aided. Under the administration's proposed higher education bill, needy students who would be awarded scholarships would have to be under 21.

Senator YARBOROUGH estimated also 6 million veterans would be eligible. He told the committee headed by Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, that, on the basis of the World War II and Korean war GI bills, more than 1.4 million veterans would take advantage of his proposal. He forecast total cost at $1.9 billion, with the first year's cost $326 million and yearly spending going down after 1968.

Other GI bill proposals are much more limited. Senator JOHN TOWER, Republican, of Texas, for instance, would add only veterans of southeast Asia. Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE, Democrat, of Texas, of the House Veterans Committee, has introduced a bill limited to "hot spots," for which campaign ribbons are issued.

But Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, in committee discussion of Senator YARBOROUGH's bill, said he couldn't "understand why you have to be shot at to get an education."

The Senate committee voted on a straight party line, 11 Democrats for and 5 Republicans against.

OPTIMISTIC

Senate sources were optimistic over the bill's chances because of increasing draft quotas and expanded use of American servicemen in both southeast Asia and the Caribbean.

Senator YARBOROUGH also has an ace in the hole. The administration's higher education measure is in Senator HILL's committee now, and some sources think Senator YARBOROUGH's bill may wind up as a section of the President's proposal. In that case, the administration might have trouble ungluing what it likes from what it dislikes.

ADMINISTRATION'S SCENIC HIGHWAY AND ROAD BEAUTIFICATION LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY SENATOR RANDOLPH

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works, it is my responsibility to introduce, by request of the administration, legislation relating to the scenic development and esthetic enhancement of our Federal-aid highway systems. I ask that the bill remain at the desk until June 11, in order that other Members may examine it and join as cosponsors if they so desire; and that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

The bill (S. 2084) to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

That section 131 of title 23, United States Code, is revised to read as follows:

"SEC. 131. CONTROL OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

"(a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices in areas adjacent to the Interstate System and the primary system should be controlled in order to protect the public investment in such highways, to promote the safety, convenience and recreational value of public travel, and to preserve natural beauty.

"(b) No Federal-aid highway funds heretofore or hereafter authorized shall be apportioned on or after January 1, 1968, to any State which has not made provision for effective control of the erection and maintenance along the Interstate System and the primary system of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices which are within one thousand feet of the nearest edge of the pavement and visible from the main traveled way of the system.

"(c) Effective control means that after January 1, 1968, such signs, displays and devices shall be limited to (1) directional and other official signs and notices which are required or authorized by law, and (2) signs advertising the sale or lease of property upon which they are located or activities conducted on such property, and shall conform to national standards which are hereby authorized to be promulgated by the Secretary hereunder. Such national standards shall contain provisions concerning the lighting, size and number of signs and such other requirements as may be appropriate to implement this section.

"(d) Notwithstanding any provision of this section, signs, displays and devices may be erected and maintained within areas adjacent to the Interstate System and the primary system which are zoned industrial or commercial under authority of State law, or which are not zoned under authority of State law, but are used predominantly for industrial or commercial activities, as determined in accordance with national standards to be established by the Secretary.

"(e) Notwithstanding any provision of this section, any sign, display, or device in existence since on or before June 1, 1965, which does not conform to this section shall not be required to be removed until July 1, 1970.

"(f) Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State hereunder shall be reapportioned to the other States.

"(g) Whenever a State shall submit evidence satisfactory to the Secretary that it is unable to secure effective control, as herein provided, under its police powers, Federal-aid funds may be used to pay the Federal pro rata share of the costs of providing effective control by purchase or condemnation.

"(h) All public lands or reservations which are adjacent to any portion of the Interstate System and the primary system shall be controlled in accordance with the provisions of this section and the national standards.

"(i) In order to provide information in the specific interests of the traveling public, the State highway departments are authorized to maintain maps and to permit informational directories and advertising pamphlets to be made available at safety rest areas. Subject to the approval of the Secretary, a State may also establish information centers at safety rest areas for the purpose of informing the public of places of interest within the State and providing such other information as a State may consider desirable.

"(j) Any State highway department which has, under the law in effect on June 1, 1965, entered into an agreement with the Secretary to control the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices in areas adjacent to the Interstate System shall be entitled to receive the bonus payments as set forth in the agreement. Such payments shall be paid only from appropriations from moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, which appropriations are hereby authorized. The provisions of this subsection shall not be construed to exempt any State from controlling outdoor advertising as provided in this section."

TITLE II

That chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to add at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 135. CONTROL OF JUNKYARDS

"(a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that the establishment and maintenance of junkyards in areas adjacent to the Interstate System and the primary system should be controlled in order to protect the public investment in such highways, to promote the safety, convenience, and recreational value of public travel, and to preserve natural beauty.

"(b) No Federal-aid highway funds heretofore or hereafter authorized shall be apportioned on or after January 1, 1968, to any State which has not made provision for effective control of the establishment and maintenance along the Interstate System and the primary system of outdoor junkyards, any portion of which is within 1,000 feet of the nearest edge of the pavement and visible from the main traveled way of the system.

"(c) Effective control means that by January 1, 1968, such junkyards shall be screened so as not to be visible from the main traveled way of the system, or shall be removed from sight. The term 'junkyard,' as used herein, includes but is not limited to any place which is used, maintained, or operated for the purpose of storing, keeping, buying, selling, or disposing of garbage, trash, scrap metal, rope, rags, batteries, paper, rubber, or junked, dismantled, or wrecked automobiles or parts thereof.

"(d) Notwithstanding any provision of this section, any junkyard in existence since on or before June 1, 1965, which does not conform to the requirements of this section and which the Secretary finds as a practical matter cannot be screened, shall not be required to be removed until July 1, 1970.

"(e) Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State hereunder shall be reapportioned to the other States.

"(f) Whenever a State shall submit evidence satisfactory to the Secretary that it is unable to make provision for effective control, as herein provided, under its police powers, Federal-aid funds may be used to pay the Federal pro rata share of the costs of providing effective control by purchase or condemnation and screening or removal and disposal.

"(g) All public lands or reservations which are adjacent to any portion of the Interstate and primary systems shall be effectively controlled in accordance with the provisions of this section."

SEC. 2. The table of sections of chapter 1, title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 135. Control of junkyards."

TITLE III

That section 319 of title 23, United States Code, is revised to read as follows:

"SEC. 319. LANDSCAPING AND SCENIC ENHANCEMENT

"(a) The Secretary may approve as a part of the construction of Federal-aid highways the costs of landscape and roadside development, including acquisition and development of publicly owned and controlled rest and recreation areas and sanitary and other facilities reasonably necessary to accommodate the travelling public.

"(b) Three per centum of the funds apportioned to a State for Federal-aid highways for any fiscal year shall be used for acquisition of interests in and improvement of strips of land necessary for the restoration, preservation and enhancement of scenic beauty adjacent to such highways, without being matched by the State. The Secretary may authorize exceptions from this requirement, upon application of a State and upon a showing that such amount is in excess of the needs of the State for these purposes. Any funds not used as required by this subsection shall lapse."

SEC. 2. Section 101(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by deleting the word "and" immediately before the words "elimination of hazards of railway-grade crossings" in the definition of the term "construction", by changing the period at the end of such definition to a comma, and by adding the words "and landscaping and scenic enhancement authorized by law."

SEC. 3. Section 208 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by changing the period at the end of subsection (a) to a comma and adding the words: "and not to exceed 3 per centum of the funds appropriated or authorized for such purposes in any fiscal year shall be available to pay the costs of acquisition of interests in and improvement of strips of land necessary for the restoration, preservation and enhancement of scenic beauty adjacent to such roads."

TITLE IV

That section 104 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f), and inserting after subsection (d) the following:

"(e) Each State shall expend one-third of any funds hereafter apportioned to it under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of this section for construction of scenic roads and roads leading to recreational or scenic areas and for purposes authorized by section 319 (a) of this title, as approved by the Secretary. Such roads and projects shall be part of a Federal-aid system other than the Interstate System. A State may in its discretion expend any of the remaining two-thirds of such funds, with approval of the Secretary, for the purpose described in this subsection."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as President Johnson stated in his message to the Congress on transmitting the draft legislation:

> Today's new conservation must shift from the classic role of protecting threatened nature. It must restore beauty where it has already been destroyed. It must deal with the dangers which urbanization and growth and technology offer to the world we live in. It must make an effort to put beauty within reach of those who live in our cities, and make it part of the daily life of every American. For its concern is with restoring and enhancing the entire relationship between man and the natural world which is the source of so many treasured human values.

The senior Senator from West Virginia shares the viewpoint so eloquently expressed by the President. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads, I shall strive to assure that we will give prompt but deliberate consideration to this legislation. As one who has cosponsored scenic road legislation in the past—in the 88th Congress with the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and in this Congress with the able junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and other Senators—I welcome the leadership of President Johnson in this field.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to reassert a point of view which I advanced at the 50th annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials in Atlanta last December. At that time I stated that our Federal-aid highway program, as the major public works undertaking in America "can and should make a positive contribution to the esthetic and cultural values of our society. As the Interstate System is extended into the cities there will arise unexcelled opportunities to remodel large metropolitan areas in accordance not only with the needs for improved transportation, but also with the vitally important needs for recreational areas, open spaces and improved housing. At the same time, this task can be accomplished with a due regard for maintaining architectural continuity with the past and preserving areas of historical interest. Our highways thus can become a truly constructive element in improving the physical and social environment of the American community."

The legislation now introduced will provide a significant step in that direction.

Title I contains the administration's draft proposals for the control of outdoor advertising.

Title II provides for the control of junkyards.

Title III would make mandatory the present voluntary provision for the use of 3 percent of a State's apportioned Federal-aid funds for landscaping and scenic enhancement of its highways.

Title IV would require the expenditure of one-third of a State's secondary road funds for the construction of scenic roads and roads leading to recreational or scenic areas, and for scenic enhancement of existing roads.

Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Public Works has been in the forefront of much conservation legislation. Not only through the work of the Subcommittee on Flood Control—Rivers and Harbors, which is under the capable direction of the chairman of the full committee [Mr. MCNAMARA], whom I wish to commend very highly, but also through the actions of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, which is led with distinction by the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senate Committee on Public Works has given direction and leadership to conservation of our air and water resources. The committee welcomes this opportunity to extend the conservation program into the field of highway legislation.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator from West Virginia is an active and helpful member of the committee. I very much appreciate his kind remarks about me. He has been carrying the great load in committee and doing most of the work, particularly in his subcommittee which deals with this subject.

I am glad the Senator is introducing legislation which grows out of the President's recommendation for what is commonly referred to as the beautification of our highways program. Is is the intention of the Senator to proceed immediately, or has he not yet arrived at a decision in that connection?

Mr. RANDOLPH. We have not yet scheduled a date for hearings. However, we shall proceed as soon as other committee business and adequate staff preparation will permit. I doubt that we have arrived at that point. We have indicated—and I know the Senator is in accord with this view—that there will be deliberate consideration of the proposed legislation and that adequate hearings will be held.

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes; we have discussed that matter.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We will allow every opportunity for Members of the Senate to study the proposed legislation and to join in sponsorship of this bill. I know that that is consonant with the viewpoint of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. I again thank the Senator for the fine work he is doing in this area.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss a little further the so-called phantom report—a report which was prepared by a staff member of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and which was conveniently leaked to the press under circumstances that gave the impression that it represented the views of the six majority members of the committee.

However, significantly, notwithstanding repeated challenges, not one of them as yet has had the courage to stand up and accept any responsibility for the report as representing his own views, and only one of them has had the decency to repudiate it. The situation is more or less like Topsy—it just "growed"; no one accepts any responsibility for its parentage. I wonder if we should not call the report the bastard child of the committee.

Anyway, since the report was leaked to the press under circumstances which give the impression that they wanted it to look like a report that was prepared by the committee and critical of me, I shall review the report further and point out some of its perfectly ridiculous aspects. After reading it I can readily understand how all those whose names are associated with the report would run rather than stand and defend it. I say again that I respect their right as members of the Committee on Rules and Administration not to be present on the floor of the Senate when the report is discussed. I respect their right to remain silent and not answer my questions. I would defend that right if anyone should criticize them just as I would defend the right of any witness appearing before a congressional committee to plead his rights under the fifth amendment.

That is their constitutional right. I would defend both, but I do not respect their decision.

Where I come from whenever a statement is made that is attributed to anyone and he is challenged to stand up and either accept that statement or repudiate it, we respect that person as a man who stands up and does so. I regret that in the present instance some of the Members have not quite measured up to that standard. Nevertheless, that is their responsibility.

Today I shall read some more parts of the report to show how ridiculous it is. In reality, when the facts are out, the report will be seen as more of a criticism of the committee itself. I read first from page 36 of the report:

> Let it be said in the beginning of this review and appraisal of McCloskey's testimony and that of his associates that, when considered in the light of subsequent events, it was unfortunate that the committee did not examine him before it filed its first report on July 8, 1964.

As I said the other day, that is the master understatement of the year. I continue to read:

> If there is one irrefutable fact concerning this Reynolds-McCloskey controversy, it is that this committee had no knowledge or even intimation from any source that Reynolds would testify to the charges he later made or, to put it another way, that the McCloskey Co. had paid Don Reynolds Associates $109,205.60 and not $73,631.28.

There is no truth whatever in that last statement as borne out by the record. I point out again that on July 8, 1964, the committee did file its final report. The report was discussed in the Senate on the 27th day of July 1964, as appears in the Congressional Record in volume 110, part 13, page 17030. In that colloquy we find a statement which is a direct notice to the committee that it should examine this particular check. I ask unanimous consent that the colloquy which I had with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], on July 27, 1964, be printed at this point in the Record.

In these remarks I was giving direct notice to the chairman that he should get the check from Mr. McCloskey to see if there had been an overpayment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Mr. Williams of Delaware. I concur in what the Senator from Nebraska stated. Mr. McCloskey should have been called. It would have been far better.
>
> There is one other missing link which may have only supported the other testimony or it may have raised other questions. Some of the canceled checks were in the committee hearings and I have them before me.
>
> The committee has also the canceled check by which Bobby Baker got his $4,000. The committee has the canceled check for $1,500 that Mr. McLeod received. But what the committee does not have and which the committee should have and which I hope it will still try to obtain, is a copy of Mr. McCloskey's check to Mr. Reynolds as payment for this stadium insurance. I think it would be very important to have that information.
>
> Mr. Jordan of North Carolina. I think Mr. Reynolds' record shows what the amount is. The report shows what he paid for the performance bond. But I shall not argue that point.
>
> Mr. Williams of Delaware. It shows that Mr. Reynolds was to get $73,631.28 from Mr. McCloskey.
>
> He paid Hutchinson, Rivinus & Co., who handled the insurance for Reynolds, $63,599.72. That left a difference for his commission of $10,031.56. Out of that $10,031.56 he wrote a check for $4,000 to Bobby Baker and two checks to Mr. McLeod, one for $1,000 and one for $500.
>
> While it may be merely routine, I should like to see the $73,631.28 check to see if that is exactly what was paid. I would suggest that even now the committee could obtain a copy of that check. It may be interesting.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall read from that Record.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] had just said that he thought Mr. McCloskey should have been called as a witness. I replied:

> I concur in what the Senator from Nebraska stated. Mr. McCloskey should have been called. It would have been far better.
>
> There is one other missing link which may have only supported the other testimony or it may have raised other questions. Some of the canceled checks were in the committee hearings, and I have them before me.
>
> The committee has also the canceled check by which Bobby Baker got his $4,000. The committee has the canceled check for $1,500 that Mr. McLeod received. But what the committee does not have and which the commitee should have and which I hope it will still try to obtain, is a copy of Mr. McCloskey's check to Mr. Reynolds as payment for this stadium insurance. I think it would be very important to have that information.
>
> Mr. Jordan of North Carolina. I think Mr. Reynolds' record shows what the amount is. The report shows what he paid for the performance bond. But I shall not argue that point.
>
> Mr. Williams of Delaware. It shows that Mr. Reynolds was to get $73,631.28 from Mr. McCloskey.
>
> He paid Hutchinson, Rivinus & Co., who handled the insurance for Reynolds, $63,599.72. That left a difference for his commission of $10,031.56. Out of that $10,031.56 he wrote a check for $4,000 to Bobby Baker and two checks to Mr. McLeod, one for $1,000 and one for $500.
>
> While it may be merely routine, I should like to see the $73,631.28 check to see if that is exactly what was paid. I would suggest that even now the committee could obtain a copy of that check. It may be interesting.

My statement on July 27, 1964, as it appears in the RECORD, was definite notice to the committee that it should get that check. Apparently, the committee made no effort whatever to get the check. If it did it did not say anything about it publicly.

After this notice on July 27, 1964, I was able to obtain the check, and on September 1, 1964, I made a speech in the Senate. At that time I stated that I then had a copy of the $109,000 check, which clearly established that there had been a $35,000 overpayment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield briefly?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I invite attention to the fact that had the majority of the committee been desirous of obtaining the check to which the Senator from Delaware called attention in July 1964, the committee had the power of subpena.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Delaware did not have such power.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The committee had the power of subpena, and it had a staff which was financed by reason of the committee having been given a quarter of a million dollars to pay the investigating staff. I had no investigating staff and no power of subpena; I paid my own expenses. But now I am criticized because I did not obtain the information for the committee sooner.

What were they doing to earn their money? Were they interested only in claiming credit for information that I developed?

Mr. CURTIS. The record should also show that long prior to the date when the Senator from Delaware finally got the check, the majority had, on the record, voted against calling Mr. McCloskey to ascertain what he had; and they also had voted against recalling Don Reynolds.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. At that time they even refused Mr. Reynolds a chance to give his testimony in public session. They did later release a copy of the executive session, but refused to call him as a public witness during the first investigation.

I shall continue to read from page 7 of the report which deals with the same problem, but first I want to note the absence of the majority members from the Senate Chamber.

Mr. President, it is significant that none of the Senators on the other side of the aisle are in the Chamber as I speak. I do not blame them for running out or leaving or for being absent. Nevertheless, I believe that if such statements as I am discussing had been attributed to me I would stand up and either accept them or repudiate them like a man.

I continue to read from page 7, on the same report which shows that the committee, without exactly saying so, is trying to create an impression that I was at fault even though the committee had bungled the job the first time by not getting the information. I read from the top of page 7 of the report:

> On September 1, 1964, 54 days after the committee's first report was filed; 9 months and 20 days after Senate Resolution 212 was agreed to; 6½ months after Don B. Reynolds last testified before the committee in executive session; and 9½ months after Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS last testified before the committee and said he gave it all the information he had obtained up to that time—November 14, 1963, and that he would keep on supplying the committee with any information coming into his possession the Senator, without prior notice to the committee or its chairman, disclosed on the floor of the Senate that he had in his possession evidence proving that Don B. Reynolds Associates, Inc., had collected $109,205.60, and not just $73,631.28, from McCloskey & Co., purporting to be the premium on the District of Columbia Stadium performance bond for which Reynolds had acted as broker.

The committee went to a great deal of trouble to state the number of days that had elapsed between different events. It is true that I produced the check 9½ months after I testified in November 1963, at which time I had furnished information on the stadium contract, but I gave them all the information I had as of that date. What the committee did not state in this report is the fact that the statement I made on September 1, 1964, at which time I had disclosed that I had this check, was made 1 month and 23 days after the committee had filed its final report on July 8 and closed the investigation. It was 1 month and 4 days after the Senate had, by a vote, established a select committee to conduct further investigations. Obviously the Senate had no confidence in the Rules Committee or the job it had done, because the Senate then established a new committee. My speech of September 1, 1964, was 1 month and 4 days, exactly, after I had told the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], chairman of the committee, on the floor of the Senate, that the Senate Rules Committee should, even at that late date, get a copy of the McCloskey check.

But my suggestion was completely ignored. The committee sat back and waited, apparently hoping it would not be discovered. It was obvious that the committee had no intention of trying to develop any information as to whether there had been a $35,000 overpayment unless I was able to produce such evidence. The committee seemed to be more concerned over the fact that I was able to present such evidence than it was in getting the evidence itself.

The committee now complains that I had not obtained the information for it sooner. I, too, wish I had been able to get it sooner, but what information I gave to the committee was accepted by the majority members with about the same degree of enthusiasm that a little boy accepts a dose of castor oil that is administered by his mother. The committee was about as glad to get any information I supplied it about Baker as was that little boy.

I continue to read from page 36 of the report:

> The committee will not belabor the point as to when Senator WILLIAMS first learned of Reynolds' change of mind. It is sufficient to say that neither the Senator nor Reynolds has, even to this day, disclosed exactly when the Senator came into possession of Reynolds' new story. When he attended the public hearing, upon invitation of the chairman, on December 1, 1964, he said, "If you are trying to pin down the exact date where I got that check, that is not going to be told." On the floor of the Senate, September 1, 1964, he was asked by Senator MANSFIELD whether his discovery of the $109,205.60 and the other circumstances had been brought to the attention of either the Committee on Government Operations or to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and his answer was "only by my statements here today has it been called to the attention of any committee" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 16, p. 21237).
>
> On the same day and at page 21237 he said that he would say that the overpayment had been brought to his attention before the committee closed its hearings and the investigation was ended (July 8, 1964). In answer to the repeated charges made by Senator WILLIAMS on the floor of the Senate that the committee should have investigated this matter further and should have subpenaed McCloskey, the committee asserts, without fear of contradiction, that it had no reason to believe Reynolds' first story was not correct and especially so after McCloskey had confirmed at least a part of it in a telephone call to him while he was in Ireland.

Why are they so concerned as to the exact date I got the check? I had already told them it was between August 10 and August 15, 1964.

I shall tell you why they want the exact date, they want to find out who gave me the information and then teach that party a lesson on what happens to anyone who testifies against friends of this administration.

Let one point be clear: I shall not tell the Senate the exact date because I believe that the committee is seeking to find out who gave me the information so that it can then retaliate against that person. The committee is more interested in where I get the information than in the information itself. But I did tell the committee that I would show the proof to the majority leader, if they cannot take my word this information was received between August 10 and 15. That is near enough.

It was in the 5-day period between August 10 and August 15 that I got the check. I can establish that quite readily because it so happened that when I got the document, it had to be photostated, and not wishing to go to the Senate photostating room we went to a commercial establishment in Washington. I have the receipt here on my desk to show that I paid $3.50 for this service, and the receipt gives the exact date. If that is questioned further I shall show it to the majority leader to prove this point. I offered it to him the other day, but he insisted that my word was enough. I appreciate his confidence.

The receipt shows the exact date I obtained a copy of this check, and I can pin the date down specifically to show that it was between August 10 and August 15. That is close enough, and that is over a month after the committee had made its final report on July 8, 1964.

Now the committee has launched a crusade against all those who testified before the committee against Mr. Baker and his associates. It has launched a crusade to discredit what I have done. Furthermore, the majority members of the committee want to find out who cooperated with me in getting this information and then to launch a crusade against them. It is desperate for that information but they are only wasting their time. The committee should be more interested in the information I obtained than in where I got it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry I was not present to hear more of the Senator's speech. Perhaps the questions I wish to ask may be redundant. I should like to make a comment to the Senator from Delaware based on the information in the report.

Is my understanding correct that the committee still contemplates releasing a report, or has a report been released, that, in the opinion of the Senator from Delaware, reflects on his trustworthiness, his character, and his honor?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Such a report was prepared by a staff member. It was leaked to the press. They refuse to say what they plan to do with it. While one could read this report and it could be said that no specific charge was brought against the Senator from Delaware, yet the clear impression is left to the reader that the Senator from Delaware did not play fair with or perhaps even lied to the committee. I will not let such a backhanded insinuation go unchallenged.

That is a point that I resent very much. That is the reason that 2 weeks ago I challenged the members of the committee if they had any criticism to make of the Senator from Delaware to come to the Senate floor and lay it out in the open. Surely they should either accept responsibility for the report or repudiate it.

As I read from the report, before the Senator came to the Chamber, it was inferred that when I testified before the committee on November 14, 1963, and submitted certain documents that I had withheld information concerning the overpayment for the performance bond. That is not true. I submitted all of the information that I had at the time, and it was not until months later that I got a copy of the $109,205.60 check, which established the overpayment.

In the meantime, however, on July 27, 1964, I had specifically requested the chairman of the committee that he should get this check to see if there had been an overpayment.

This warning was ignored; but later I got the check, and on September 1, 1964, I made my speech in the Senate and furnished documents to prove the overpayment.

It developed later that there was a $35,000 overpayment, and instead of the check being for around $73,000 it was for approximately $109,000. There had been a rather persistent rumor that there had been an overpayment on this bond. In a colloquy with the Senator from North Carolina on July 27, which was a month and a half before I disclosed this to the Senate and about 3 weeks before I received the check, I suggested that he should get this particular check from Mr. McCloskey to see if that was the exact amount that had been paid or whether there was an overpayment. With all of its subpena power, the committee did not even try to get the check.

When I got the check sometime between the 10th and the 15th of August the committee members blamed me because I did not have the check earlier before the committee made its final report. That is unfair criticism.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that, in the opinion of the Senator from Delaware, the innuendoes and implications—while the direct statements made in the report still have not been disclosed, but have been leaked in part to the press—create the impression that the Senator from Delaware is not a truthful man?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was the impression that I obtained. The position that I was caught in when the report was first leaked to the press was embarrassing. The information was leaked out near the end of the week, and I was going home for the weekend. The first story appeared in our newspaper on Saturday morning. It said that the reporter was unable to reach the Senator from Delaware. The story appeared in the Saturday afternoon newspapers, and there it was stated that they had been able to reach the Senator from Delaware but that I had no comment until I had read the report.

How can one comment on something that is leaked out when the committee itself had not had the decency to tell me about the report or to send me a copy of it?

People who read the article in the newspaper surely got the impression that at least there is an inference of criticism of John Williams by this committee. Had I allowed the situation to drag on for 3 to 6 weeks while the committee was working on the report such an impression would have been established in the minds of the people. I had to answer it, and it was on this basis that I issued a challenge to the majority members of the committee to come to the Senate and repeat any criticism they had in my presence. Fortunately, I now have a copy of the report. If the Senator from Oregon is interested he can read it. It is very interesting reading.

Perhaps it is true that this is just a report prepared by a staff member of the committee, but in the absence of a repudiation by the majority members of the committee the impression is given that it represents their views.

The report goes to great length to point out that it was 9½ months after I first testified before the committee and stated that I gave them all the information that I had obtained up to that time that I produced the $109,205.60 check. I had given them all the information I had at the time. Later I obtained this other information, and now they try to make it appear that I had not played square with them. I resent such tactics. Suppose other information should be found at this late date, information which has not as yet been disclosed. Would that mean that the man who produces this new evidence had not disclosed all the information that he had as of today. Certainly not.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I read the report, I wish to make a statement.

The Senator from Delaware and the senior Senator from Oregon have been colleagues in the Senate for some years. Political labels are subject to varied interpretations. However, I believe that, in broad outline, it is an appropriate label to apply to the Senator from Delaware, and it would be very accurate to say, that the Senator from Delaware is considered to be of a conservative, political faith, but an exceedingly sincere conservative.

I have nothing but respect for sincere men who believe what they profess. I have nothing but respect for the Senator from Delaware. It is appropriate to say that I am labeled as a liberal. I sincerely believe in my political philosophy.

We happen to have our differences legislativewise on specific issues, as our respective voting records show. I say here on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that I consider the Senator from Delaware to be a sincere Senator, a completely trustworthy Senator, a truthful man, and a man of unquestioned honor.

If this report justifies the interpretation that the Senator from Delaware fears that it does, it would be most regrettable if any Senate committee brought forth such a report. I still believe that the Committee on Rules and Administration, when it finally issues a public report, will issue a report that is in itself truthful. It would not be a truthful report if it were a report which would cast a reflection upon the Senator from Delaware and seek to leave the impression with the American people that the Senator from Delaware is not a truthful man.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks and comments of the senior Senator from Oregon. They are what I would expect from a man who has always demonstrated that he is a person of integrity and one who respects fairplay.

I repeat again—if there are majority members of the committee with any question in their minds as to what I have done or not done, they should at least have the courtesy of telling me what is on their minds. Why are they not here today?

Thus far, we have had a situation in which not a single statement has appeared in the press, nor has anything been said on or off the floor of the Senate, that could be attributed to any of the majority members of the committee wherein they have criticized me. I cannot say that any of them have endorsed the report. However, the manner in which the report has been leaked to the press has created the impression that the allegations and insinuations represent their views.

That is the reason why I said they should publicly either accept or repudiate it. I regret that, notwithstanding the fact that this report has been lying around for 2 or 3 weeks, they have not seen fit to speak. By their silence they are condemning themselves. Any statement in the report is not correct when it infers that I had this check in my possession prior to the making of the final report by the committee on July 8. I challenge anyone to question this statement. They do not dare.

In another part of the report, they tried to create the impression that the committee had never really concluded its investigation on July 8, 1964. That is not true. On July 8 the chairman of the committee submitted his final report to the Senate. I have the report here on my desk. It was a final report accompanied by a statement from the chairman of the committee, and the report of July 8, 1964, was accepted by the Senate as a final report. If they dispute this point, why are they not here today? They are outside the Chamber now.

On the 27th day of July we debated the committee recommendations for a change in the Senate rules. At that time the Senate agreed to the Cooper amendment to their recommendations, thus establishing a select committee, which by the way has still not been appointed.

After I had obtained the check, which was after the final report had been filed on July 8 and after the colloquy on the floor on July 27 in which I entreated them to get the check, it was on September 1, I disclosed that I had the check.

On the 10th of September the majority leader submitted a resolution instructing the committee to investigate the new charges, and more money was appropriated for the committee to reopen the investigation.

Now in this report the committee tries to say they had not stopped the investigation last year. Ridiculous. I do not blame them for running rather than defending such an absurd argument.

It is a clear-cut history that the committee was finished at that time. There is no question about it. I refer to the statement of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], in submitting the report from the Committee on Rules and Administration, which reads as follows:

> The Committee on Rules and Administration, which, pursuant to Senate Resolution 212, agreed to October 10, 1963 (as supplemented by S. Res. 221, agreed to November 1, 1963, S. Res. 291, agreed to February 10, 1964, and S. Res. 319, agreed to April 29, 1964), was authorized and directed to make a study and investigation with respect to any financial or business interests or activities of any officer or employee or former officer or employee of the Senate, having concluded such study, submit the following report to the Senate thereon together with recommendations.

I repeat, "having concluded such study." So there is no question about it.

Yet, in the new staff report the committee is trying to give the impression that it was still engaged in a continuing investigation and uses this claim as the basis of the charge against me for speaking in the Senate on September 1, 1964. It is true that about 6 months before when I was testifying I had told the committee I would submit to them any additional information I obtained; and I did submit what information I received while the committee was active. But then it filed its final report and said it was done. I had no committee to report to. After my remarks of September 1 the Senate had to authorize it again to reopen the investigation, and this was done on the 10th of September. At that time, some of us tried to get the Committee on Government Operations to handle the new investigation. There was even a vote on that question in the Senate. We were unsuccessful in getting the Committee on Government Operations to investigate the second phase of the question so the Rules Committee got a second chance. There is no question about it. I do not think anyone will try to defend the position taken in this new "phantom" report. It cannot be done.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. What the Senator says about the majority of the committee filing the final report is true. It is also true that the services of some of the expert employees of that committee, employed for the investigation, were no longer needed, and they left.

As further evidence that the committee was closing the hearings, I read the first paragraph of the minority views, signed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and myself:

> We are unable to concur in the majority report of this investigation. We cannot concur because the investigation never has been completed. Proper judgments, conclusions, and recommendations can be drawn only when all the facts are in. An investigation, in order to be accurate and fair, must be complete and thorough. Every possible witness who may have helpful information should be called, placed under oath, and questioned. This is the only way to obtain the truth and the whole truth. This was not done in the so-called Baker investigation.

The minority views show in detail how we tried to have Mr. McCloskey called, so we could ask how much he paid for the bond, and to produce his checks. The majority voted that request down.

It is also true that the report was filed as a final report because it brought in legislative recommendations. Because the Senate could not accept them, the Senate voted it down and adopted the alternative recommendations made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] for another committee to take over.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct on that point. There is no possible question about it. It is significant that no member of the majority from the Committee on Rules and Administration is present today to challenge this point, nor have they been on the floor to defend this report in previous discussions. They leaked the allegations to the press and ran. If it had not been for my obtaining a copy and challenging them they may have tried to let it slide through. This is a contemptable procedure and not one worthy of Senators.

I wish to show another example of shadowboxing in this phantom report.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, is the Senator leaving the McCloskey matter?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not entirely.

Mr. CURTIS. I have a few quotations from the testimony I would like to read.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. In the McLendon report he complains that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] was late in getting the check; that he should have gotten the check earlier. Was it not within the power of the committee to do that, when the Senator called it to the committee's attention weeks after?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly, yet I am criticized for having been unable to get it for them earlier. One of my friends said I should not really blame the committee for this criticism but that I should accept it as a compliment from the majority members of the committee on my ability to get the evidence. It is true that I was only one Senator with no expense allowance for investigations and no subpena powers, while the committee had a quarter of a million dollars and subpena powers. Yet, with all the committee's authority and power it was not able to get the check. I thank the committee for this vote of confidence.

Mr. CURTIS. It must be remembered that the committee followed the procedure of calling a witness in executive session to see if he should be called later in open session. Don Reynolds was called in to the executive session in January 1964. The minority members tried to have him called in public session so he could be further questioned. It is interesting to note how skillful Counsel McLendon was in not going into the facts as to what McCloskey paid for the bond. I read from part 1 of the testimony of Don Reynolds, page 4:

> Mr. McLendon. Do you remember the amount of the bond, face amount of the bond?
>
> Mr. Reynolds. It was either $14 or $15 million. The penalty amount of it, sir.
>
> Mr. McLendon. And what was the amount of the premium?
>
> Mr. Reynolds. I think the gross amount was in the neighborhood of $73,000 or $74,000.
>
> Mr. McLendon. And do you remember the amount of your commission?
>
> Mr. Reynolds. It was about $10,000, sir.
>
> Mr. McLendon. I show you a document dated September 13, 1960, on the stationery of Hutchinson, Rivinus & Co., addressed to you, and ask you to state whether you received that.
>
> Mr. Reynolds. I did, sir.

It shows the insurance broker, the amount of the premium, and also the commission. We were unable to have Reynolds to further pursue this question, and we had no knowledge as to whether we could get McCloskey.

It is interesting, in retrospect, to see how skillful counsel was in concealing the facts. At no time was Reynolds asked how much McCloskey's payment was for the bond. At no time was Reynolds asked how much Reynolds billed McCloskey for. This is important for the further reason that the report implies that Reynolds somehow changed his testimony. That is not true at all. The committee never asked Reynolds how much he billed McCloskey for and how much he paid.

The committee let weeks go by, until the Senator from Delaware finally brought forth this check.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. During the time the minority members were trying to have Mr. McCloskey called as a witness, the majority counsel and the other staff members insisted they had talked with him and that Mr. McCloskey had said the amount was only $73,000; presumably they considered it sacrilegious to ask him to come to the committee and testify and verify it.

I read further from page 16, which shows a great deal of shadowboxing in this so-called phantom report.

(At this point Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am quoting from the "phantom" report, which was conveniently leaked to the press:

> On the following day, September 2, 1964, the Senator stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (vol. 110, pt. 16, p. 21337).
>
> "Yesterday I placed in the RECORD a statement showing that he [McCloskey] had drawn from the District Commissioners $100,000 to pay for this bond which originally cost only $73,000."
>
> It was obvious from these and other statements made by the Senator that he was alleging that McCloskey had falsified his request for reimbursement for the cost of his performance bond and that an excess payment had actually been made and resulted in the increase in the cost of constructing the stadium.
>
> These charges turned out to be erroneous, due no doubt to the fact that the Senator did not have all of the relevant information.

Mr. President, I quote further from the report, page 17, on this same point:

> CONCLUSIONS
>
> By way of summary, the committee reports that a careful consideration of the testimony of the witnesses, the examination of numerous records, including recorded minutes of meetings of the board and of the advisory committees, compels the conclusion that the allegations made against the board and its agents and employees, charging or suggesting fraud or wrongdoing of any kind, are without the slightest foundation in fact.

Mr. President, they will not find anywhere that I said the District Board was guilty of fraud or any wrongdoing. I did say that there had been an overpayment of $35,000 on the bond; yet the committee spends a great deal of time to clear the District Board of charges that had never been made.

To get it straight I quote from my speech of the first of September 1964 in the Senate, wherein I outlined this: overpayment and the collection of $100,000 from the District as payment for the bond which the record shows as having cost only $73,631.28.

At that time I incorporated in the RECORD a copy of the performance bond which I had obtained from the District office.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD both my statement of September 1, 1964, in that connection along with the insertions made at that time.

There being no objection, the excerpts and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On October 17, 1960, Mr. McCloskey, instead of sending a check for the amount of this invoice, forwarded to Mr. Reynolds his check of $109,205.60, representing an overpayment of $35,574.32.

To establish further that the correct cost of this bond was only $73,631.28, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the performance and payment bond as submitted by Mr. McCloskey to the District of Columbia under date of June 18, 1960:

[June 18, 1960, District of Columbia, Standard Form No. ED 25, revised]

PERFORMANCE AND PAYMENT BOND

Know all men by these presents, that we, McCloskey & Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, as principal, and the Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., a Connecticut corporation, of Hartford, Conn., as surety are held and firmly bound unto the District of Columbia Armory Board, hereinafter called the Board, in the penal sum of $14,247,188, lawful money of the United States, for the payment of which sum well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our heirs, executors, administrators, and successors, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

The condition of this obligation is such, that whereas the principal entered into a certain contract, hereto attached, with the Board, dated July 7, 1960, for construction of the District of Columbia Stadium, 22d and East Capitol Streets, Washington, D.C. (invitation No. C-60159-B), as more fully set forth in said contract.

Now, therefore, if the principal shall well and truly perform and fulfill all the undertakings, covenants, terms, conditions, and agreements of said contract during the original term of said contract and any extensions thereof that may be granted by the Board, with or without notice to the surety, and during the life of any guaranty required under the contract, and shall also well and truly perform and fulfill all the undertakings, covenants, terms, conditions, and agreements of any and all duly authorized modifications of said contract that may hereafter be made, notice of which modifications to the surety being hereby waived, and shall save harmless and indemnify the Board from any and all claims, delays, suits, costs, charges, damages, counsel fees, judgments, and decrees to which said Board may be subjected at any time, on account of any infringement by said principal of letters patent or copyrights, unless otherwise specifically stipulated in said contract, or on account of any injuries to persons or damage to property or premises that occur as a result of any act or omission of the principal in connection with the prosecution of the work, and pay the same, and if said contract is for work, material, or supplies, within the meaning of the act of September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 676, 688), or for the construction, alteration, or repair of a public building or public work, within the meaning of the act of July 7, 1932 (47 Stat. 608), shall promptly make payment to all persons supplying the principal with labor and materials in the prosecution of the work provided for in said contract and any such authorized extension or modification thereof, and shall keep the work so performed under said contract in repair for such period as said contract may provide, then this obligation to be void; otherwise to remain in full force and virtue.

It witness whereof, the above-bounden parties have executed this instrument under their several seals this seventh day of July 1960, the name and corporate seal of each corporate party being hereto affixed and these presents duly signed by its undersigned representative, pursuant to authority of its governing body.

Signed and sealed in the presence of Chester H. Gray.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ARMORY BOARD,
FLOYD D. AKERS,
Chairman.
ROBERT E. MCLAUGHLIN,
Member.
W. H. ABENDROTH,
Member.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.
[Corporate seal]
MCCLOSKEY & CO.
Attest:
T. D. MCCLOSKEY,
Vice President.
J. DRESS PANNELL,
Secretary.
Principal:
[Corporate seal]
THE AETNA CASUALTY & SURETY CO.
HARTFORD, CONN.
Attest:
W. J. RYAN,
EUGENE FIELDS,
Attorney-in-Fact.
Surety.

The rate of premium on this bond is $10 per thousand, first 100,000; $6.50 per thousand next 2,500,000; $5.25 per thousand next 2,500,000; $5 per thousand next 2,500,000; $4.90 per thousand over 7,500,000.

Total amount of premium charged, $73,631.28.

(The above must be filled in by corporate surety.)

Authority of attorney-in-fact on file:

WILBUR H. LAWYER,
Supervisor, Bid and Contract Division, Procurement Office, District of Columbia.

This document, which was filed with the government of the District of Columbia, clearly establishes the total amount of the premium charged on this bond as being only $73,631.28.

As evidence that Mr. McCloskey not only charged off this larger amount as a business expense item on this government contract and that he actually collected this additional amount from the government to cover the cost of this $73,000 bond, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an invoice submitted by McCloskey & Co., Philadelphia, to the government of the District of Columbia, in which he lists the cost of the performance bond as having been $100,000 and which was paid on that basis:

MCCLOSKEY & CO.,
BUILDERS,
Philadelphia, August 9, 1960.

Re District of Columbia Stadium—C-403-60, requisition No. 1.

Mr. J. A. BLASER,
District of Columbia Armory Secretary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We request payment for work performed at the above project for the period July 14, 1960, to July 31, 1960, inclusive, detailed as follows:

Item	Percent complete	Amount payable
Bond (1)	100	$100, 000
Excavation	10	57, 500
Material stored on site: H beam piles (15,094 linear feet, at $3.75 per linear foot)		56, 600
Total		214, 100
Less 10 percent		21, 410
Total amount due this payment		102, 690

> I certify that all items of work and material shown in the requisition are correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> McCloskey & Co.,
> F. K. Colborn, Jr.,
> *Project Manager.*
>
> Approved for payment:
>
> W. A. Curtis,
> *Alternating Contracting Officer for D.C. Armory Board.*
>
> August 26, 1960.
>
> Original and three copies: T. D. McCloskey, accounting department.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, there were no charges against the District Board. But there were charges that there had been an overpayment on this particular bond and the record shows that Mr. McCloskey did collect his $100,000.

Had I the power of subpena, which the committee had, I can assure the Senate that I would have obtained it sooner. I do not believe that they wanted this check. What they resent now is not the fact that it came late, but the fact that it came at all and was able to embarrass them.

However, there was some other evidence that the committee had which it did not use in its first hearings. I should like to discuss this other evidence. Perhaps this is what it had in mind when the committee in this "phantom" report referred to available evidence which was not called to the attention of all the members of the committee. I now refer to the $5,000 payment by the Redwood National Bank which was made to Mr. Wayne Bromley, a lobbyist in Washington. The check was endorsed by Mr. Bromley and turned over to Mr. Baker, who cashed it in the Senate Disbursing Office for 50 $100 bills.

The committee had information concerning this payoff in their files long before it closed its hearings last July 8, yet it did nothing about it.

In fact, on July 27, 1964, in a discussion in the Senate, the chairman of the committee denied having ever heard of it.

Whether this evidence was turned over to the committee chairman at the time, I cannot say, but it was in their files. I should like to go back first to the Congressional Record of July 27, 1964. This was the first time I mentioned this incident, and it appears in the Congressional Record, volume 110, part 13, page 17034:

> Mr. Williams. There is one further point, I direct this more or less in the form of a question to my good friend, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan]. Perhaps he can answer it.
>
> There was described in some of the correspondence I have had with agencies—and I am sure he has copies of it, but I did not get all the answers—a case in which the Redwood National Bank of California was trying to obtain a charter for a bank. It filed its application for a charter on June 22, 1962.
>
> This charter was filed by the Redwood National Bank of San Rafael, Calif. The application was routinely filed by its attorney, Mr. Roderick Martinelli.
>
> The bank's application for a charter was approved on September 15, 1962. The bank opened its doors on January 5, 1963.
>
> What gives me concern and the question I have is: After the application had been filed, one of the corporate officers was advised by their attorney, Mr. Martinelli, that one of the friends or relatives of one of the proposed stockholders of the bank had told him that in order to get the charter approved it would be better to hire a Washington lobbyist at $5,000. He could not say why it was necessary.
>
> Anyway, they had to have the charter, so they agreed to pay the $5,000 to the Washington lobbyist who presumably could help them.
>
> When the check was sent to this Washington lobbyist, the check was made out to him, but it was not mailed to him. On the contrary, the check was left in Baker's office. After the check was left in Baker's office the lobbyist came in and endorsed the check. After he had endorsed it the records show that Bobby Baker took the check and went down to Mr. Brenkworth's office in the Senate Disbursing Office and cashed it and that Baker picked up 50 $100 bills for the check.
>
> Now where and why did Mr. Baker enter into this transaction?
>
> Did he get a part of the fee, or just what was his part?
>
> I understand that the lobbyist says he ultimately got all of the money. To what extent did the committee call on the bank or the lobyist to get all the details of this strange transaction? By the way, this lobbyist was a former employee of the Senate, so both could be called. To what extent did the committee pursue that line? I was very much concerned that any bank would feel obliged to pay $5,000 in this manner.
>
> I checked with the Comptroller of the Currecy, Mr. Saxon, and I have a letter from him in which he states that at no time did he ever hear from either Mr. Baker or the lobbyist to whom reference was made. He did not know that they were even lawyers of record. So, apparently they received $5,000 for doing nothing.
>
> I am wondering who it was that thought it was necessary to pay this $5,000 to get a charter to this bank and who did really get the money.
>
> Did the committee question Mr. Baker on this strange deal?
>
> I know the committee was aware of this transaction long before I found it.
>
> I have the greatest respect for the Senator from North Carolina. He has some information in his files, or at least the committee has, which contains the answers I should like to get. Surely he would not overlook the significance of the $5,000 check paid to a Washington lobbyist to get a charter, and particularly when the committee was advised that Mr. Baker cashed the check.
>
> Mr. Jordan of North Carolina. In answer to the Senator's question, I am sorry, but that is something that I had not heard of before. I know nothing about it. If the Senator would give us more information, I assure the Senator that it will be checked.

Mr. President, this was on July 27, 1964. Later, after the committee was authorized—under the Mansfield resolution as approved on September 10—to reopen the investigation on October 2, 1964, I wrote a letter to the chairman of the committee again calling his attention to this particular transaction and suggesting that as they were reopening the investigation, they should call witnesses on this subject.

I quote from my letter of October 2, 1964, to the chairman of the committee:

> Your committee already has in its files records of the $5,000 check which Mr. Baker cashed in the Senate Disbursing Office for 50 $100 bills. This check was paid by the Redwood National Bank of California to Mr. Wayne Bromley, but I understand that the check was left at Mr. Baker's office and that Mr. Bromley merely endorsed the check and Mr. Baker cashed it. I am enclosing a letter signed by Mr. James J. Saxon, Comptroller of the Currency, in which he states that as far as the official record is concerned neither Mr. Bromley rendered any service toward getting this charter approved nor did Mr. Baker.
>
> I am sure that your committee will wish to question both Mr. Baker and Mr. Bromley to determine what arrangements they had. As you will recall we discussed this case in our colloquy on the floor on July 27.

Mr. President, subsequently on December 8 the committee did call Mr. Bromley, and Mr. Bromley took the fifth amendment on the basis that he could not discuss the transaction without incriminating himself.

The significant point is that contrary to the statement made by the chairman of the committee on the 27th of July 1964, when he stated that he had no knowledge of this $5,000 payment and that it was something he had not heard of before, the committee did have information on this payment in its files. This $5,000 check, cashed by Mr. Baker, was confirmed to the committee in a letter from the Senate Disbursing Office under date of January 17, 1964. This letter was addressed to the chairman of the committee, and it told all about the $5,000 check being cashed by Mr. Baker after it had been endorsed by Mr. Bromley. The committee had this on January 17, 6 months before I mentioned it on the floor of the Senate. In addition, Mr. Bromley was interviewed by staff members of the committee on January 16 or 20—both dates are referred to—and again on March 12, 1964. Did they ask him about the check, or did they conveniently forget about it? If they did not ask about this check, why not? The committee did know about the transaction. Why was this case not disclosed in its first hearings? The information was in its files 6 months before the filing of the final report, yet it did nothing about it until it was learned that I knew about it and mentioned it on the floor of the Senate and again in a letter to the chairman.

Whether the other members of the committee had been alerted, I do not know. But I say that if they refer to evidence having been withheld this may be what they are talking about.

In addition, the Rules Committee also had in its files copies of records of the telephone calls which Mr. Baker made to San Rafael, Calif.—at least five or six calls. This was the address of the bank making the payment. Mr. Baker called from his Washington office, and apparently all the calls were charged to the U.S. Government as official business. They are marked "official." Why did they not check these telephone calls to San Rafael, Calif., to see if they were to these bank officials, and if so, for what purpose? Why did they not question Mr. Bromley and Mr. Baker regarding this $5,000 payment? Why did they sit on this evidence in their own files until after they discovered that I knew about the transaction?

Certainly they should have checked to determine if the calls were to the same people. These calls are all listed. There was one call for 8 minutes, cost $5.25; another for 2 minutes, cost $2.25; another for 2 minutes; and another for 8 minutes. On the 10th of October there was one for 6¾ minutes, cost $3.45. They were all made by Mr. Baker to San Rafael, Calif., the address of the bank trying to get its charter.

Mr. Baker and Mr. Bromley both took the fifth amendment when questioned, but the committee does state that it is fair to assume that they split this fee.

So I ask again, Why did they wait until the investigation was reopened before using the information which had been in their own files for months prior thereto?

Instead they waited until they knew that some of us knew about it before they disclosed it. They had had more than ample time to have called witnesses in this case prior to closing the first investigation and prior to the time that the chairman said he knew nothing about it. I am not suggesting that the chairman was untruthful on July 27, 1964, when he said he knew nothing about it. Perhaps the staff had not told him about the evidence they had, but is that my fault? That letter was not addressed to John Williams; it was addressed to the chairman of the committee. If it was withheld it was withheld within the committee.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware inform me who paid for the telephone calls?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Every taxpayer paid his proportionate share of many of Mr. Baker's business telephone charges. Why did not the majority Members raise a question about this point? Why did not someone question Mr. Baker about the large number of telephone calls that he was charging to the American taxpayers by representing them as official business? It is a violation of the law for any public official to charge his personal calls to the Government. Some of those people to whom these calls were made took the fifth amendment when they appeared before the committee.

Then there were calls to Puerto Rico. These were calls to various business associates of his. The record shows that practically all of these calls were charged as official business, yet the majority Members do not seem to be concerned. All their criticism is directed against the man who started the investigation. Very mild criticism is directed against Mr. Baker, apparently because he has friends in high places.

Mr. SCOTT. Has the Senator in his possession any information as to who paid the income tax on this fee?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. Nor do I find any record that the committee was interested in that point. I did not find it in the report. I will say that the Internal Revenue Service knows about it, and the FBI knows about it, and the committee knows about it. When it was called to my attention and I went to the disbursing office of the Senate sometime in 1964—I believe about the middle of the year—I found that everybody had been there before me. There is also a January 17, 1964, letter from the Senate disbursing officer to the Rules Committee telling about the check's being cashed by Mr. Baker.

Mr. SCOTT. Since the majority of the committee and the majority staff members do not advise the minority members of what they are doing, and since we are as much in the dark as to what they intend to take up when they next meet as we usually are—we are denied even the courtesy of knowing about the agenda until the last possible minute—I must revert to the rumor route and say that I have heard from sources outside the committee that when the committee meets—and the majority staff members have had several meetings to discuss how to handle the report and how to handle the minority—it is planned to withdraw the defamatory report which contains such criticisms of the Senator from Delaware and substitute therefor—may I have the attention of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark]?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. I was indulging in information that I have received from sources outside the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have been informed that the majority members are considering withdrawing the first and second draft of the so-called McLendon draft, and substituting substantially a report of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], which has the merit of being factual, even though there is considerable room for disagreement as to conclusions, although from the standpoint of the minority it does not contain any defamatory matter. I am asking for information, I may say to my colleague from Pennsylvania. Since the committee does not tell me, I should like to inquire whether the majority have been considering or are about to arrive at a substitution for the McLendon draft, putting in its place the Clark recommendations, or some other report.

Mr. CLARK. I say to my senior colleague, as I leave the Chamber——

Mr. SCOTT. I thank my colleague for calling me the senior. He rarely does that.

Mr. CLARK. I thought I said "my dear colleague."

As I leave the Chamber I say to my colleague that there is nothing to withdraw, because nothing has been adopted, and that the majority members of the committee have been considering various drafts—new drafts and old drafts—of the report, which perhaps most of us could agree to, and which in due course will be presented to the full committee. All I can say to the Senator from Pennsylvania is that the matter may be described as being in a state of flux.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, before the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] leaves the Chamber, I should like to ask him a question about this report.

I know there are jackrabbits in Kansas, but I do not think they can run any faster than the Senator. He is already out the door. [Laughter.]

Someone has said that the majority committee members want to take time to see if they can find something to criticize Williams about concerning the Baker investigation before they repudiate this report.

If after 2 years of dragging around, with all the resources of the FBI and their own staff at their disposal, they do not have any criticism to make now, it is about time that they either put up or shut up. Where I come from we consider a man to be a man when he stands up and backs up any charges which are attributed to him, and when he runs out rather than withdraw or accept them we have a word to describe him, but I shall not use it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I regret the necessity of delaying the Senate, but when we consider the charges by innuendo which have been made I think it is obvious what I have been subjected to. No member of the committee supports this report, but they give the impression that they are by their silence. That is most unfair. I resent it, and have no respect for such actions in the Senate.

I quote one other statement referred to in the report. Last December the committee had said that they were going to incorporate all the correspondence which the Senator from Delaware had had with the committee. Then when they went to get the correspondence they could not find all of it in their files. They had either lost it or, as someone said, they had destroyed some of the records. But I do not believe that they would want to say that they "destroyed" a record because that is a nasty word. But apparently they do not have all of the correspondence.

Mr. President, I am always glad to oblige and lend a helping hand whenever I can to the committee. So I thought I would give to the committee the letters which the committee has lost or destroyed. The first letter was my letter of March 2, addressed to the chairman of the committee. I shall read the letter:

March 2, 1964.

Hon. B. Everett Jordan,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Over the weekend I received a report to the effect that while serving in the U.S. Senate, Senator Charles E. Daniel, of South Carolina, arranged a payment to Mr. Robert Baker approximating $30,000 and that this payment was made in the form of stock in either the Carolina Pipeline Co. or the Winn Dixie Corp., or both.

I have been advised that Mr. Jessop I. McDonnell, formerly working in Mr. Baker's office, is aware of this transaction and that while he may be reluctant would, if subpenaed by the committee, confirm the deal.

Since Mr. Baker's financial statement did include holdings in these two companies and in view of the seriousness of this allegation, which involves a former Member of the Senate, I felt it should be transmitted to your committee in the hope that you could determine its accuracy or inaccuracy.

Yours sincerely,

John J. Williams.

Two days later, on March 4, I received the following letter signed by Mr. Lennox B. McLendon, the general counsel. I am sure the committee would desire to have that letter in the Record, so I shall read it into the Record.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on
Rules and Administration.
March 4, 1964.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: Senator B. Everett Jordan has asked me to answer your letter addressed to him on the date of March 2, 1964. In your letter you refer to a report received by you that former U.S. Senator Charles E. Daniel had made a payment to Robert G. Baker in the amount of approximately $30,000 in the form of stock in either one of two corporations.

A report to this same effect was obtained by us sometime ago and last week we had one of our very best investigators to interview Mr. Daniel in Greenville, S.C. He disclosed that he had on one occasion purchased some stock in the Carolina Pipeline Co. and resold part of it to Robert G. Baker at the price of approximately $3,400. He denied that he had had any other transaction with Mr. Baker involving either stock or cash payments.

With great respect, I am,
Yours sincerely,
Lennox P. McLendon,
General Counsel.

The committee may have obtained all the information necessary, but it is not clear that they have all the answers. I wish they had called Mr. McDonnell to obtain his testimony because my report indicated that he was present when the transaction occurred. In the printed hearings of January 23 and 24 a financial statement appears on pages 762 and 763, which Mr. Baker filed with the National Bank of Washington, D.C.

That was the first time I found that he listed his holdings in the Carolina Pipeline Co.—3,300 shares, valued at $20,000. It could be that he bought more stock afterward; it could be that the price appreciated; or it could be something else. The letter is not clear how many shares Mr. Baker got for his $3,400, but I still say, "Why leave these things hanging? Why not establish when the stock was bought, the dates of the certificates, and their value? Clear it up so that it is not left hanging in the air."

But this is a sample of the committee's work. That is why so little has been accomplished.

I emphasize that there is a big difference between asking questions of witnesses under oath and asking those questions under other circumstances. Much has been said to the effect that Mr. Reynolds' testimony has been discredited. I do not say that Mr. Reynolds has not made some wild statements but, on the other hand, when the witnesses have been called and put under oath, it is significant that over 80 percent of what he had said has been substantiated.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I have taken a moment to check on the proposed witness, Jay McDonnell. He was an employee of the U.S. Senate. The Senator has raised an interesting point, because the only information we had pertaining to the 3,300 shares, except the information which the Senator from Delaware offered, as the Senator has pointed out, was that Baker had some 20,000 shares——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, he had 3,300 shares valued, according to his statement, at $20,000 but according to the letter he paid $3,400. There may be an explanation but let us get it.

Mr. SCOTT. He had 3,300 shares valued at $20,000.

The man who perhaps could have cleared that up was Jay McDonnell. I should like to advise the Senator from Delaware that the minority members of the committee asked that Mr. McDonnell, a former employee of the Senate, be called as a witness to throw a little light on that testimony. The majority members of the committee, for reasons of their own, voted it down. I believe the vote was 6 to 3. Therefore, we were unable in this, as in many other cases, to pursue the investigation in order to get at the truth. Again for reasons which the majority will have to explain to the country, we were denied the opportunity to pursue this matter further, and the mystery continues to exist.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. That emphasizes the importance of calling these witnesses and putting them under oath. There is a big difference between merely asking a witness something when he is not under oath and asking him the same question when he is under oath. As Senators know, there was a substantial change in the testimony of many of the witnesses after they were put under oath as compared to the earlier stories they had given to the committee. I shall take the time of the Senate to cite only a couple of examples which point that up very clearly. A question of a payment by Mr. Weiner, who was later called as a witness, arose. It was claimed that he had paid Mr. Baker $5,000 in connection with a piece of freight forwarders legislation. In an earlier statement Mr. Weiner had given one story, but when called before the committee he changed his testimony. I should like to read briefly the colloquy that took place:

Mr. McLendon. All right. Mr. Weiner, you have been interviewed by the FBI, haven't you?

Mr. Weiner. I sure have.

Mr. McLendon. You also have been interviewed by the Internal Revenue Service?

Mr. Weiner. Yes, sir.

Mr. McLendon. Is your testimony here today consistent with what you told those two agencies?

Mr. Weiner. No, sir.

Mr. McLendon. It is not. I have a little reluctance in asking the next question, but I will ask it.

Mr. Weiner. Please do, sir.

Mr. McLendon. In what respect is what you told here today not consistent with what you told the Internal Revenue?

Mr. Weiner. I am under oath today, sir.

That is the difference—under oath before a committee meant possible perjury.

Mr. McLeod, a former employee of the District Committee of the House of Representatives, likewise testified before the committee on December 2, 1964, as shown on pages 241 and 242 of the record. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] was questioning the witness:

He too changed his story when placed under oath.

Senator Curtis. Did you talk to Mr. Drennan, of the staff?

Mr. McLeod. I talked to two people with the staff. I don't remember the name.

Senator Curtis. Did you tell them that you mailed the invoices?

Mr. McLeod. I don't think I did. I don't remember.

Senator Curtis. Did you tell them that it was for legal services?

Mr. McLeod. No; I didn't. When they asked me what it was for I said the statement speaks for itself.

(At this point Senator Clark entered the hearing room.)

Senator Curtis. What did the statement say?

Mr. McLeod. For legal services.

Senator Curtis. So it is true then, that you conveyed to them the idea that it was for legal services?

Mr. McLeod. Well, I was in an informal meeting with them. I was not under oath.

Senator Curtis. I understand.

Mr. McLeod. And I sidestepped a few things, I think.

So it is evident that the only way we can clear this up is to call these people as witnesses. I have cited but a few of the examples. Mr. Baker, Mr. Bromley, and many other witnesses who told the committee one story, later saw fit to plead the fifth amendment rather than talk. Of course, when an employee takes the fifth amendment in effect he is saying, "I cannot answer your questions because if I do, my lawyers tell me I will incriminate myself." That is the basis for taking the fifth amendment. We ought to keep that in mind.

Again I say that I defend the right of anyone to plead the fifth amendment. It is a constitutional privilege, just as it is the right of the majority members of the committee not to stand up and either accept responsibility or repudiate this report. But I still say that an employee of the Government or a Senator has some responsibility.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. At the time Mr. McLeod gave the two different stories, one under oath and one not under oath, was he not an employee of the other body?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I could not answer the question. The activities to which the questions were directed were actions taken while he was an employee of the House Committee on the District of Columbia. I do not know whether he is still in the employ of the Government or just when he left.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the Senator from Delaware know whether any proceedings have been started against Mr. McLeod, either by the other body or by the executive branch?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No proceedings have been started to my knowledge. From a reading of this report it will appear that the committee is not half so critical of Mr. McLeod and Mr. Baker, or any of the rest of those taking the fifth amendment as it is of the witnesses who testified against those men.

The criticism seems to be directed against those who testified. The report is far more critical of the Senator from Delaware than it is of Mr. Baker or any of his associates. As I read it they really seem to pity Mr. Baker and almost apologize for having to criticize him at all.

So far as Mr. McCloskey and the overpayment on the stadium contract is concerned, he is built up here as a great hero, a knight in shining armor riding on his white charger. He also is the finance chairman of the Democratic National Committee. It seems that they almost consider it sacrilegious that anyone should have raised any question concerning the fact that there was a $35,000 overpayment on his performance bond. They even infer that all this is the result of a smear on the part of someone who was aggrieved. It is not a smear. It is only the whitewash peeling off before it ever got dry. It is the peeled whitewash that they are seeing, not a smear. Whitewash applied over dirt always peels—any country boy knows that.

Yes, there has been a great effort to discredit witnesses. Much of the report seeks to discredit Mr. Reynolds and his testimony, presumably on the basis that if he can be discredited the grand jury or others who are investigating, may have a tendency to think that all the charges have been trumped up by irresponsible individuals.

Sure, what Mr. Reynolds was doing was wrong. He admits that, but once recognizing that he was wrong he agreed to give testimony before the committee rather than take the fifth amendment as others did.

Let us give him credit; he was an essential witness.

I am not carrying the torch for Reynolds. I never knew the man until this case broke in September or October 1963. Then it developed that as a partner of Mr. Baker's he would be one of the key witnesses. I promptly began to obtain what information I could from him and kept persuading him to talk.

But in all fairness, let us make the record clear as to just who Mr. Reynolds is and what he did. I checked on him because I wanted his complete record. I checked with the various departments with whom he had worked so that I could have the information officially. Let us cut out all the sham and look at the facts.

I learned that Reynolds was born in 1916. In 1934, he enlisted as a private in the Regular Army. Between 1936 and 1940 he was a cadet at the U.S. Military Academy. In 1941 he entered military service as a second lieutenant. On May 25, 1946, he received an honorable discharge as a captain. Here is a copy of his honorable discharge. Without question he served his country.

After 5 years, on June 13, 1951, he returned to active duty as a member of the Air Force. In the meantime he had been promoted from captain to major. He served during the Korean war and was discharged again in 1953, November 20, receiving an honorable discharge.

It is interesting to note that during most of the time between 1951 and 1953, when he was serving with the U.S. Air Force, he had top-secret clearance. I did not give that top-secret clearance to him; the Air Force gave it to him. I am merely reviewing his service record.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Reynolds' service record be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the record was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1965.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Miss Lenhart of your staff has requested that we furnish you a record of military service of Mr. Don B. Reynolds, a former member of the Air Force.

The attachment hereto shows the military service of Mr. Reynolds as reflected in Air Force files.

Sincerely,

WALTER T. GALLIGAN,
Colonel, U.S. Air Force, Deputy Chief, Congressional Investigations Division, Office of Legislative Liaison.

INFORMATION CONCERNING MILITARY SERVICE OF DON BUCK REYNOLDS, AO42411

Born January 20, 1916

Private, Regular Army, July 1, 1934, to June 27, 1936.

Cadet, U.S. Military Academy, July 1, 1936, to January 10, 1938; August 29, 1938, to January 11, 1940.

Accepted appointment, second lieutenant (ORC), August 16, 1941.

Entered on extended active duty, September 13, 1941, as second lieutenant (ORC).

Promoted to first lieutenant (AUS), June 1, 1942.

Promoted to captain (AUS), December 1, 1942.

Released from extended active duty in grade of captain, May 25, 1946.

Promoted to major (AUS) (not on extended active duty), November 20, 1946.

Entered on extended active duty in Air Force, June 13, 1951, in grade of major.

Released from extended active duty in the grade of major and discharged, November 20, 1953.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Between 1946 and 1951 Reynolds worked for the Government overseas. This was between military duties. This is the official record as submitted by the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD Mr. Reynold's record of civilian service with the Government as furnished by Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., under date of March 24, 1964. This report lists a series of promotions; and remember they gave him those promotions—I did not even know the man until this investigation started.

There being no objection, the record was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1964.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reply to your letter of March 10, 1964, in which you request the employment record of Mr. Don B. Reynolds.

I have enclosed a statement of Mr. Reynolds' Federal service as shown in his official personnel folder.

If I can be of further assistance at any time, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr., *Chairman.*

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL SERVICE, BUREAU OF RECRUITING AND EXAMINING, U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Name: Reynolds, Don B.

Date of birth: January 20, 1916.

(Authority for original appointment (examination from which appointed or other authority—Executive order, law, or other exemption).)

NATURE OF ACTION, POSITION, GRADE, SALARY, ETC., EFFECTIVE DATE

Accepted appointment, Department of State, Division of Foreign Service Personnel, Berlin: Vice consul, $2,980; April 4, 1946.

Change in status and appropriation: $2,980 to $3,397.20; July 1, 1946.

Change in status: $3,397.20 to FSS–12, $3,480; November 13, 1946.

Periodic within-class promotion: FSS–12, $3,600; April 6, 1947.

Class change (blanket class change to raise all vice consuls of class 12 or below, to class 11): FSS–12, $3,600, to FSS–11, $3,600; May 5, 1947.

Change of tenure of employment (previously limited to June 30, 1947; limitation now removed and employment is continued on permanent indefinite basis): $3,600; July 1, 1947.

Periodic within-class pay increase: $3,720; April 18, 1948.

Transfer (Berlin to Vienna): Vice consul, FSS–11, $3,720; October 19, 1948.

Change of title, allotment, and promotion: Vice consul (DP visa officer), FSS–8, $4,500; October 31, 1948.

Change of permanent station, Vienna (Salzburg): FSS–8, $4,500; May 15, 1949.

Periodic within-class pay increase: FSS–8, $4,830 to $5,010; November 13, 1949.

Transfer to Vienna: Vice consul (DP visa officer), FSS–8, $5,010, to consular officer (vice consul), FSS–8, $5,010; January 10, 1950.

Transfer and change of position title: Consular officer (vice consul) to political officer (attaché), FSS–8, $5,010; July 31, 1950.

Periodic within-class pay increase: Political officer (attaché), FSS–8, $5,010 to $5,190; November 26, 1950.

Indefinite promotion (E.O. 10180): Political officer (attaché), FSS–8, $5,190, to FSS–7, $5,370; June 10, 1951.

Separation for military duty: June 17, 1951.

CAREER SERVICE DIVISION.

(The above transcript of service history does not include all salary changes, intra-agency transfers within an organizational unit not involving changes from one official headquarters or duty station to another, and promotions or demotions, since Federal agencies are not required to report all such actions.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, upon leaving the service in 1953 Mr. Reynolds entered private insurance business. I understand—and this is the official record—that he made the so-called million-dollar club for his large sales of life insurance.

Then, apparently, he fell in with some associates who were not so good. He started to go astray. He became associated in business with Bobby Baker and some of his associates. His fatal mistake was to become a business associate of Mr. Baker's. Mr. Baker and his associates thought highly enough of Mr. Reynolds that they decided to go in business with him. He was in the insurance and real estate business and similar lines of operation as a partner with Mr. Baker and his friends.

In his own testimony before the committee Mr. Reynolds admits that he did wrong. I give him credit for such an admission. He admitted that he had allowed himself to be used as the bag man, handling political payoffs for Mr. Baker and his crowd in Washington. That was the beginning of his downfall. But after leaving the service of the Government he was considered honorable enough to be a business associate of Mr. Baker and others. He was considered to be reputable enough so that the man who was then serving as the majority leader of the U.S. Senate selected him as the person from whom he bought life insurance policies totaling about $200,000.

I did not buy any insurance from him. I never heard of the man. This life insurance was bought from Mr. Reynolds by the man who is now in the White House. Mr. Reynolds was considered an honorable enough citizen so that the man who was serving as majority leader and who later served as Vice President accepted a stereo set from him as a gift. Mr. Reynolds furnished evidence to the committee that he paid for this stereo set. Likewise Mr. Reynolds gave proof of the television time he purchased from the L.B.J. Co. as a kickback on this insurance.

I never accepted a stereo set from him. I think it is improper for a Member of the Senate to accept a $600 or a $800 gift from anybody. Let us get the record straight—Mr. Reynolds was Mr. Baker's and Mr. Johnson's associate, not an associate of mine, as this committee report would imply.

When did Mr. Baker and his other associates suddenly decide that Mr. Reynolds was such a disreputable character? When did they begin to discredit him? It was after I and some others persuaded him to appear before the committee and not take the fifth amendment. He was urged to tell about the financial arrangements which he had had with Mr. Baker and his associates. He was urged to furnish the committee with documents and canceled checks showing payments and all the receipts for the different transactions. He was urged to turn them over to the committee and let the committee clear up this case. When he refused their suggestion that he take the fifth amendment before the committee they began their attack on his credibility.

I pay my respects not so much to him, although I am glad he testified; I pay my respects to his wife. She is as charming a lady as I have ever met. I have great respect for her.

She and Mr. Reynolds were in my office on several occasions. At first he kept insisting that he would not testify and would not produce his records. Finally, his wife was the one who insisted that he had to make a break with the crowd and come clean. She said, "If you do, I will stand back of you." It was her persuasiveness that induced Mr. Reynolds to talk. I was glad when he turned the records over to us so that we could move ahead and I am sure he made the right decision. When a man has done wrong he should admit it and clear it up.

Certainly, the man did wrong. I do not defend what he has done, but let us make it clear that those who have been pointing the finger of scorn at him in recent months are the ones who were in business with him, accepting his gifts, and letting him serve as their bagman for political payoffs. Only after he had been persuaded not to take the fifth amendment did he fall from their graces. I am glad he saw fit not to take the fifth amendment. I wish today that some of the others had recognized their responsibilities as citizens and had come before Congress and told how they had used their official positions for their own personal benefits.

Any man who is a public official and has $50,000 to $100,000 in $100 bills stashed away in his Government office should be required to answer the question by a congressional committee of "Where did you get that money?"

Why has not more emphasis been placed on determining where Mr. Baker got the $100,000 in cash? Why has not more interest been expressed in the fact that here was an employee of the U.S. Government, one who served as secretary to the majority of the Senate, and who during a span of 4 years by his own statements. had pyramided his net worth from $84,000 to over $2 million and all while drawing a $19,000 salary and creating but a negligible tax liability?

Those are his figures, not mine. The man was buying stock from various companies which had applications before various Government agencies to obtain important decisions. What assistance did Mr. Baker give them toward obtaining these decisions? Why was he able to buy stock from those companies for about 10 percent of its quoted market value at the time it was purchased?

Surely these are questions that we can ask any public official. I have no respect for the public official who takes the fifth amendment rather than answer such questions. We find that the MGIC stock was purchased by Mr. Baker at around $2.50 a share, and the day on which he exercised the option the stock was selling in the open market for $25 a share. Why this special consideration or payoff?

The company could not have functioned without two decisions which had been received from the Government agencies. Surely these are questions that should be asked. Taking the fifth amendment is not an answer. Yet based on this report the committee does not appear to be at all concerned.

Why is the committee more critical of the individual who has called this to its attention and requested that it obtain the information than it is of Mr. Baker. The committee almost apologizes to Mr. Baker because it had to place any criticism on him.

In another instance a lobbyist said that he sold him stock for $4,600. He said that he did not know what the stock was worth at the time of the sale. However, looking at the stock prices the stock was worth about $32,000 on that date. Was this a payoff?

Under our laws today if a man sells to any American citizen for $4,600, stock which has a quoted market value of $32,000, the difference being approximately $28,000, that transaction would be taxable to the recipient as income or it would be taxable to the man who gave it on the basis of a gift tax. That is the law. There are no exceptions.

We cannot escape that under our income tax laws. It is taxable to one or to the other. Has anyone been asked to pay taxes on it? Not to my knowledge. I do not see the question raised at all in this report. But, let any other American citizen try to sell corporation stock of the value of $30,000 for $5,000. Questions would be raised.

These are our laws. We do not need different laws. What we need is enforcement without favoritism. Yet, the Department of Justice has been piddling around for a year. It is about time that we find out about what action they contemplate. If it is their decision that there are no violations of the law or if there is no basis for prosecution, let us face it.

There are laws against filing a false financial statement—as Mr. Baker did—to obtain a Government loan. Yet, has he been prosecuted? No, he has not even been criticized in this report for such actions. There are laws against any other American citizen's selling $30,000 worth of stock to any public official for $5,000. If there are not then let us face it—it means that our whole income tax system has failed. Either that or we must accept the fact that the laws are only applicable when certain people are involved.

These are documented facts about Mr. Baker's activities. We cannot escape them. We cannot escape the fact that thousands of dollars are involved in the sale of MGIC stock which was bought for $2.50 a share at the time that the market price of the stock was $25 a share. We cannot escape that. One would not escape his tax obligations if he were a citizen with lesser connections than Bobby Baker. We cannot overlook the fact that thousands of dollars are involved in the MGIC stock which was purchased for $2.50 a share at the time that it was quoted on the market at $25 a share. We cannot escape that. What service did he or the other Government employees involved render this company?

Instead of criticizing the man who exposed these transactions why not concentrate on getting the facts? Who besides Mr. Baker participated in this windfall profit running into thousands of dollars?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Once more I state for the RECORD that the distinguished Senator from Delaware has performed a most valuable public service. The Senator from Delaware is totally honest. He has been forthright, active, and helpful.

The failure of the majority of the committee to diligently pursue this investigation from the very start will stand as a blot on the Senate for all time to come. However, they are guilty of something which is even greater, and that is the report which no one can read without coming to the conclusion that it intentionally smears and degrades the innocent to protect the guilty, that it intentionally and deliberately smears and degrades those who offer damaging testimony against the politically powerful. It is nothing less than a shame that the taxpayers should be exposed to this effort.

The efforts of the Senator from Delaware have been outstanding. He has pursued this inquiry alone, without the power of subpena. He has spent his own money. The fact that the majority of the committee permitted an employee to insult the Senator publicly and to make this statement concerning his actions, and then write a report such as this—which has not been repudiated—is unbelievable. They did call one meeting that we know of to attempt to use this report as a basis to start a report. The minority members were present.

I am sure that the high character, dignity, and truthfulness of the Senator from Delaware are not debatable. They are known by every Senator and everyone else. I regret that this smear was attempted for the purpose of protecting the guilty.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. It is not the Senator from Delaware who is on trial. It is not Bobby Baker who is on trial. It is the Senate of the United States which is on trial.

Are we to adopt as acceptable standards for Senate employees and Senators, standards of conduct which have been laid down and practiced by Mr. Baker and his associates? Are we going to accept the right of Senate employees and Senators to charge their personal telephone calls—as they were charged in this case—to the Government? Certainly it is a violation of the law. I have as yet to see any criticism in any of the committee reports to the effect that they thought Mr. Baker was wrong in doing that. I have not heard any criticism uttered by the majority members of the committee that it was wrong to have thousands of dollars in his filing cabinet in an office under the dome of the Capitol. This is not denied; in a 2-month period, Mr. Baker had approximately $40,000, mostly in $100 bills, that he used to pay his bills. That money was conveniently stashed away in a filing cabinet in the office of this Government official right here under the dome of the Capitol.

But do the majority members of the Rules Committee appear concerned about this point. No indeed, their criticism is leveled at the man who exposed the situation.

Is that the standard of conduct that we expect under this Great Society? If we find that there are no violations of the law by Mr. Baker, as some would like to say, then we must say that any other official of the Government, any other employee of the Senate, or any Senator can do likewise.

We must say also that any private citizen can do the same. If an agent of the Treasury Department were to find several thousands of dollars locked up in a file cabinet of a private citizen while they were auditing his books; you can be sure they would ask how the man got the money. Let the man say, "It is none of your business. Under the fifth amendment I refuse to answer the question," and see what happens. I would advise the taxpayer that if he has lesser connections than Mr. Baker he had better not try to get away with it.

During this investigation, my mail had been intercepted for practically the entire time that the Rules Committee was working on this case. That is a matter of record. If this statement is challenged I can prove it. Copies of the mail that I would receive from the agencies were forwarded to the committee. The chairman of the committee said that it was not pursuant to his instructions; then who did give the orders. No one will admit that they gave instructions. But these things just do not happen; someone in a high position had to give these orders. Why are they afraid of my inquiries?

I can prove this statement if anyone dares to challenge it. I have no objection to turning my information over to the committee. But if the committee had been one-half as interested in developing the facts of the case as it was in finding out what I knew or how I was getting information this investigation would have been over a year ago.

Intercepting the mail of a Senator by having the agency send copies of his correspondence to someone on the other side of the aisle is an unprecedented action.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Will the Senator explain more specifically what he meant when he said his mail was intercepted?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I corresponded with various agencies and asked them certain questions in connection with the Baker investigation. Copies of the replies which the agencies made to me were sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the committee got that information before I did.

Mr. COOPER. I did not know about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I know the minority members of the committee did not know about it. The majority members did not think I knew about it. I doubt if any of the minority members ever saw this correspondence. But I can prove this any time anyone wishes to challenge my statement. It is a highly irregular procedure for an agency of the Government to send to the opposition, who are the majority members, without my consent copies of the replies to any questions I submitted to them. I can only assume that they wanted to make sure the committee was kept abreast of anything I was working on but it is highly improper procedure.

It could not be the result of the interest of this administration in making a full disclosure of Mr. Baker's activities.

If the committee had spent one-half the time in trying to develop the case that it did in trying to suppress information or finding out how much I knew this case would have been over long ago.

Over the 18 years I have been in this body I have had previous experience in developing instances of wrongdoing, yet I have never experienced as much resistance to full disclosure as that which I have experienced in the last 12 or 18 months in trying to get information concerning Mr. Baker's activities. I have never experienced or seen an instance before when a committee directed its criticism against someone who was trying to provide evidence rather than against those who were guilty of wrongdoing.

I know the minority members of the committee do not defend Bobby Baker, but if one reads the report he will find the majority almost apologizing that they have to criticize him. They give the impression that, after all, he was wrong, and they do not like it, but he really violated no laws.

Mr. President, if he violated no laws we are in bad shape. If there are no laws applying to an employee who on an annual salary of $19,000 can increase his net worth half a million dollars a year for 4 successive years there is something wrong. I did not see where he paid more than a negligible amount of tax in any year. Mathematically speaking, one cannot accumulate money in that way under our tax laws. If any other American citizen thinks it can be done let him try it.

Has Baker been stopped from doing business with defense plants? No. As I pointed out the other day, when he wanted to expand his vending machine business some of the defense contractors, apparently anxious to show the administration on whose side they are, began doing business with him. The Defense Department about a year ago gave a confidential security clearance for Mr. Baker's company, so he can expand his vending machine business in defense installations.

Let the average citizen try to get a security clearance under such circumstances, when he has taken the fifth amendment, or when he is subjected to charges such as Mr. Baker. But, oh, how easily he got the clearance. It was almost automatic. Let the average citizen try to get clearance under such circumstances, and see what happens.

Mr. President, if these are the standards of morality being established by the Great Society, then God help America. It is time that higher standards of morality were established for higher officials.

Let the White House not go through the sanctimonious process of sending to Congress a code of ethics when under that code of ethics one would be fired if he did what Bobby Baker did or if he had accepted a stereo set, as was done by the one who sent the code of ethics to the Congress.

Mr. President, since none of the majority members of the committee are present to defend the report which was attributed to them I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said:

Mr. President. I am glad these little whimsies come at the end of the day, to make the day so cheerful and endurable.

I have taken note that there are seven exits from the Senate Chamber; and when the distinguished Senator from Delaware sought to hurl a question at the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] I observed that he came in a certain door, and made an enthusiastic exit out that door.

I am reminded of the man who called on a mountaineer. He noticed that the mountaineer had three holes in the base-board of his cabin. He asked, "What are those three holes for?" the mountaineer replied, "They are for the cat." The visitor said, "You need only one cat hole for a cat to get out." The mountaineer said, "Yes, but when I say 'scat' to that cat, I mean scat."

The question of our friend from Delaware caused a hasty retreat. I was eager to find out what the answer was to be to the question that was addressed to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7717) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLER, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. KARTH, Mr. HECHLER, Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, and Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the treaty on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER AMENDMENTS

The legislative clerk stated by title the United Nations Charter amendments, Executive A (89th Cong., 1st sess.).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the amendments to the United Nations Charter.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider Executive A, 89th Congress, 1st session, two amendments to the Charter of the United Nations to enlarge the membership of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, and for other purposes, which was read the second time, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

[On the report of the Special Political Committee (A/5675)]

1991 (XVIII). QUESTION OF EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION ON THE SECURITY COUNCIL AND THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

A

The General Assembly,

Considering that the present composition of the Security Council is inequitable and unbalanced,

Recognizing that the increase in the membership of the United Nations makes it necessary to enlarge the membership of the Security Council, thus providing for a more adequate geographical representation of non-permanent members and making it a more effective organ for carrying out its functions under the Charter of the United Nations,

Bearing in mind the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee on arrangements for a conference for the purpose of reviewing the Charter,[1]

1. Decides to adopt, in accordance with Article 108 of the Charter of the United Nations the following amendments to the Charter and to submit them for ratification by the States Members of the United Nations:

(a) In Article 23, paragraph 1, the word "eleven" in the first sentence shall be replaced by the word "fifteen", and the word "six" in the third sentence by the word "ten";

(b) In article 23, paragraph 2, the second sentence shall then be reworded as follows: "In the first election of the non-permanent members after the increase of the membership of the Security Council from eleven to fifteen, two of the four additional members shall be chosen for a term of one year.";

(c) In Article 27, paragraph 2, the word "seven" shall be replaced by the word "nine";

(d) In Article 27, paragraph 3, the word "seven" shall be replaced by the word "nine";

2. Calls upon all Member States to ratify the above amendments in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by 1 September 1965;

3. Further decides that the ten non-permanent members of the Security Council shall be elected according to the following pattern:

(a) Five from African and Asian States;

(b) One from Eastern European States;

(c) Two from Latin American States;

(d) Two from Western European and other States.

1285TH PLENARY MEETING,
17 December 1963.

B

The General Assembly,

Recognizing that the increase in the membership of the United Nations makes it necessary to enlarge the membership of the Economic and Social Council, with a view to providing for a more adequate geographical representation therein, and making it a more effective organ for carrying out its function under Chapters IX and X of the Charter of the United Nations,

Recalling Economic and Social Council resolutions 974 B and C (XXXVI) of 22 July 1963,

Bearing in mind the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee on arrangements for a conference for the purpose of reviewing the Charter,[2]

1. Decides to adopt, in accordance with Article 108 of the Charter of the United Nations, the following amendment to the Charter and to submit it for ratification by the Member States of the United Nations:

"Article 61

"1. The Economic and Social Council shall consist of twenty-seven Members of the United Nations elected by the General Assembly.

"2. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 3, nine members of the Economic and Social Council shall be elected each year for a term of three years. A retiring member shall be eligible for immediate reelection.

"3. At the first election after the increase in the membership of the Economic and Social Council from eighteen to twenty-seven members in addition to the members elected in place of the six members whose term of office expires at the end of that year, nine additional members shall be elected. Of these nine additional members, the term of office of three members so elected shall expire at the end of one year, and of three other members at the end of two years, in accordance with arrangements made by the General Assembly.

"4. Each member of the Economic and Social Council shall have one representative."

2. Calls upon all Member States to ratify the above amendment in accordance with their respective, constitutional processes by 1 September 1965;

3. Further decides that, without prejudice to the present distribution of seats in the Economic and Social Council, the nine additional members shall be elected according to the following pattern:

(a) Seven from African and Asian States;

(b) One from Latin American States;

(c) One from Western European and other States.

1285TH PLENARY MEETING,
17 December 1963.

CHARTER AMENDMENT RATIFICATION

Afghanistan
Albania
Algeria
Austria
Brazil
Bulgaria
Cameroon
Canada
Central African Republic
Ceylon
Chad
Costa Rica
Cuba
Czechoslovakia
Denmark
El Salvador
Ethiopia
Finland
Gabon
Ghana
Guinea
Hungary
Iceland
India
Iran
Iraq
Ireland
Ivory Coast
Jamaica
Jordan
Kenya
Kuwait
Liberia
Libya
Madagascar
Mali
Mauritania
Morocco
Nepal
Netherlands
New Zealand
Niger
Nigeria
Norway
Outer Mongolia
Pakistan
Philippines
Poland
Rumania
Rwanda
Sierra Leone
Sweden
Syria
Tanzania
Thailand
Togo
Trinidad-Tobago
Tunisia
Uganda
U.S.S.R.
United Arab Republic
Upper Volta
Yugoslavia

PRESENT TEXTS OF ARTICLES 23, 27, AND 61 OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Article 23

1. The Security Council shall consist of eleven Members of the United Nations. The Republic of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America shall be permanent members of the Security Council. The General Assembly shall elect six other Members of the United Nations to be non-permanent Members of the Security Council, due regard being specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization, and also to equitable geographical distribution.

2. The non-permanent members of the Security Council shall be elected for a term of two years. In the first election of the non-permanent members, however, three shall be chosen for a term of one year. A retiring member shall not be eligible for immediate re-election.

3. Each member of the Security Council shall have one representative.

Article 27

1. Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote.

2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members.

---

[1] A/5487, par. 9.

[2] A/5487, par. 9.

3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.[1]

Article 61

1. The Economic and Social Council shall consist of eighteen Members of the United Nations elected by the General Assembly.

2. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 3, six members of the Economic and Social Council shall be elected each year for a term of three years. A retiring member shall be eligible for immediate re-election.

3. At the first election, eighteen members of the Economic and Social Council shall be chosen. The term of office of six members so chosen shall expire at the end of one year, and of six other members at the end of two years, in accordance with arrangements made by the General Assembly.

4. Each member of the Economic and Social Council shall have one representative.

Mr. **THURMOND**. Mr. President, the best interests of the United States would be served by the Senate's withholding its consent to Executive "A," which consists of two amendments to the United Nations Charter. One amendment would increase the membership of the United Nations Social and Economic Council from 18 to 27, and the new increment of 9 seats would be distributed as follows: 7 to nations of Africa and Asia, 1 to a nation of Latin America, and 1 to a nation of Western Europe or elsewhere.

The other amendment would increase the membership of the United Nations Security Council from 11 to 15, and the number of affirmative votes to constitute a majority would be increased from 7 to 9, still including the requirement for the affirmative vote of all 5 permanent members of the Security Council. The distribution of the membership under this amendment, in addition to the permanent members, would be as follows: Five seats for Asian and African nations, one seat for an Eastern European nation, two seats for Latin American nations, and two seats for nations of Western Europe and elsewhere.

Of the two amendments, that dealing with the Security Council is of more importance and of more significance by far. This is true because of the special powers and authority vested by the United Nations Charter in the Security Council.

The United Nations Charter recognizes the principle of popular representation in the international organization by the manner in which the General Assembly is constituted. Eligibility for membership is conditioned only on the fact of statehood and the announced acceptance of the obligations of the United Nations Charter. The states admitted have an equal voice and an equal vote in the General Assembly regardless of disparities in their populations, their financial contributions to the purposes of the United Nations, or of their representative character.

Membership in the General Assembly has more than doubled from the 51 charter members in 1945 to 114 members in 1965.

The United Nations Charter did not, of course, contemplate the General Assembly as the authoritative body of the United Nations, as evidence has demonstrated. Had the General Assembly been constituted as the authoritative action body of the United Nations, the United Nations would be even more ineffectual than it has proved to be under the present charter. The General Assembly has been reduced to almost total ineffectiveness, as was particularly evidenced during its past session, despite the fact that the General Assembly dealt primarily only with procedural matters during this period.

Eligibility requirements for membership in the General Assembly are such that less responsible nations are in a majority, and the so-called newly emerging nations have demonstrated a degree of impatience, irresponsibility, and radicalism that is inconsistent with, if not entirely prohibitive to, effective operation of a stable international organization.

The Security Council, on the other hand, is more selectively constituted and originally designed at a level of membership which was not prohibitive of effective deliberation and decision. In addition to the five permanent members, there are only six others.

The allocation of authority by the charter to the Security Council indicates clearly that the Security Council was conceived as the principal body around which the United Nations activities would be centered, and particularly so with regard to those activities dealing with international peace and security.

Article 24 of the charter gives the Security Council "primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security." Under the provisions of chapter 7 of the charter, the Security Council has the sole authority to make decisions that are binding and compulsory on all members for coercive or enforcement actions.

If, therefore, the United Nations is to serve a useful peacekeeping role in the world, the Security Council must serve as the agency which fulfills this function.

The amendment to increase the membership of the Security Council from 11 to 15 and the number of affirmative votes to approve an action from 7 to 9, purportedly represents an effort to make the Security Council more representative and to reflect the increase in the total membership in the United Nations which has occurred in the past two decades. The actual effect of the proposed increase in the membership of the Security Council will be to propel the Security Council along the same road of irresponsibility and paralysis that the General Assembly has already traveled.

Even with the membership of the Security Council limited to 11, there is great difficulty in securing an affirmative vote of 7 members for any particular constructive action, even aside from the problem of the veto held by each of the 5 permanent members. The United States has, to date, consistently followed a policy of not using its veto on the Security Council, although it is the only one of the permanent members of the Security Council who have adhered to such a course. Even with the present constitution of the Security Council, the policy of abstaining on issues which are distasteful, rather than casting a negative vote which would have the effect of a veto, has increasingly proved embarrassing to the United States. The latest incident of this nature was the abstention by the United States on the motion to inject the United Nations into the Dominican situation after the Organization of American States had already, at our urging, assumed a peacekeeping role. The fact that we were unable or unwilling to prevent this action by the Security Council was a severe setback to our efforts to get the Organization of American States to undertake and assume a responsible peacekeeping role in the Western Hemisphere.

The increase in membership of the Security Council from 11 to 15, with the membership further weighted in favor of African and Asian nations, can only assure that the United States will be faced even more frequently with the situation where it has to choose between abstaining in the Security Council on actions which are unpalatable and against the best interests of the United States, or abandoning its policy of nonexercise of its veto.

As established, the Security Council was contemplated not as a popular representative body but as an agency composed of the most responsible states, and thereby, those nations which would, of necessity, have to provide the means for carrying out the Security Council's decisions. Article 23 provides that—

> The General Assembly shall elect six other members of the United Nations to be nonpermanent members of the Security Council, due regard being specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution of members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the organization, and also to equitable geographical distribution.

It is worthy of note that even geographical distribution of the seats on the Security Council was subordinated to the contribution of the states to the purposes of the United Nations, which, in effect, is a measurement of the responsibility of the particular state. The proposed dilution of the membership of the Security Council is in conflict with the principle laid down in article 23 for the election of members to the Security Council.

One of the most meaningful measures of contributions to the United Nations is financial support. Article 17 of the charter provides that the expenses of the United Nations shall be borne by the members as apportioned by the General Assembly. Under Rule 161 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee on Contributions is charged with advising the General Assembly concerning the apportionment of the expenses of the Organization among members according to their capacity to pay. Under this procedure, the United States, since the beginning of the United Nations, has been assessed and has paid approximately one-third of the regular budget. Despite the increase in membership to more than double the original number of states represented in the general Assembly, the United States has increasingly paid a larger and larger share of the expenses of the United Nations. It is clear, therefore, that the relative financial contribution of the United States to the United Nations has increased rather than decreased in the past two decades. It would be totally inconsistent, under these circumstances, to reduce the weight of the U.S. vote and influence on the Security Council.

---

[1] Chapter VI contains Articles 33–38 relating to Pacific Settlement of Disputes. Paragraph 3 of Article 52, relating to Regional Arrangements, reads:

"3. The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council."

The Senate, in deciding whether to give its advice and consent to the ratification of these proposed amendments to the United Nations Charter, should give consideration to the fact that these proposals are quite different in origin than is normally the case with treaties submitted to this body. Usually, treaties submitted to this body for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification have previously been negotiated by the U.S. Government, and, therefore, represent agreements which our Government has taken an active interest in securing and believes to be in the best interest of the United States.

The amendments to the U.N. Charter now under consideration did not originate in any such manner. They were submitted to the Senate as a result of action of the U.N. General Assembly. The resolution to submit the charter amendments to member states for ratification was passed by the U.N. General Assembly in 1963.

At that time, the United States did not favor the proposed increase in the membership of either the Security Council or the Economic and Social Council to 15 and 27 members, respectively. The U.S. position was stated by the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Francis T. P. Plimpton. Ambassador Plimpton stated:

> While the United States supports enlargement of the Councils, it is also concerned that they do not become unwieldy in size and that their composition is such as to make them useful instrumentalities in their respective areas of responsibility. The United States believes that the Security Council should not only provide for equitable geographical distribution, as the charter says, but must—as the charter also provides—reflect "the contribution of members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security." We also believe that in the interest of the Security Council's most effective functioning it should be as small as possible consistent with these principles.
>
> A Security Council of 13 not only would permit the African and Asian members of the United Nations to hold 4 of the elective seats—a fair share, since they constitute roughly half of the total U.N. membership—but would also provide a council whose overall composition would continue to take into account the ability of members to contribute to the attainment of the purposes of the organization.
>
> In the case of the Economic and Social Council, the United States believes that it should be sufficiently representative to carry weight with the whole United Nations membership. At the same time, the United States believes that if the Council's recommendations are to be meaningful a balance must be maintained among its members between the developed and the developing states.
>
> A final word about our position on the draft resolutions now before the Committee on the enlargement of the Councils.
>
> The U.S. delegation is authorized to vote in favor of amendments to the Charter providing for a 13-seat Security Council and a 24-seat Economic and Social Council. We have no authority to support any other proposals for amendments to the Charter, and if any other proposal is put to a vote at this time, we shall have to vote against it.

When the matter actually came to a vote, the United States abstained, rather than vote against the resolution as our representative has previously indicated we would do. The treaty which we are considering, therefore, was not initiated by the executive branch of the U.S. Government, but rather the proposal was thrust upon it by the action of the United Nations General Assembly.

The position of the United States in the General Assembly of the United Nations, as summarized by Ambassador Plimpton, was meritorious and a correct position. To the extent circumstances have changed since 1963, when the General Assembly proposed this amendment to the United Nations Charter, those changes, and circumstances support the wisdom of our initial position rather than mitigating against it. Since 1963, the General Assembly with its enlarged membership has demonstrated its complete ineffectiveness, and the financial crisis of the United Nations has worsened materially.

Under the provisions of article 108 of the United Nations Charter, no amendment to the charter can become effective unless it is ratified by two-thirds of the members of the United Nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council. This gives the United States, in effect, a veto over proposed amendments to the United Nations Charter. The decision of the Senate, therefore, on whether to give its advice and consent to the ratification of the proposed amendments to the United Nations Charter, if negative, would prevent the change in the charter.

The interest of the United States should come first. To approve the proposed amendments to the United Nations Charter would be to reduce the weight of the United States on the Security Council by almost 50 percent and the weight of the United States on the Economic and Social Council by about 30 percent. The Senate cannot serve the interest of the United States by agreeing to dilute our influence on the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, while the United States is having to provide a major and increasing portion of the financial support of the United Nations.

The proposed amendments to the Charter of the United Nations would weaken the ability of the United States to protect her own vital interests in the broad spectrum of international issues which come before the United Nations.

The Senate has no power to cause the Executive to use the U.S. veto in the Security Council when the occasion demands in order to protect the interest of the United States. The Senate does have both the power and the responsibility to veto amendments to the United Nations Charter which are in derogation of the best interests of the United States.

To fulfill its responsibility to protect the interests of the United States, the Senate should exercise its power by vetoing the proposed amendments to the United Nations Charter.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I support the two proposed amendments to the Charter of the United Nations. They were reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations without dissent. They are relatively simple amendments to the United Nations Charter and do not affect either the seats or the right to veto of the permanent members of the Security Council, including ourselves. They are a necessary administrative change in the charter structure, resulting from the vast expansion in the membership of the United Nations since the charter was originally adopted.

The question of the size of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council first arose in 1956, after the United Nations membership had increased from 60 to 80 nations in 2 years. Half of the new members were from Africa and Asia. It was obvious that more newly independent nations would inevitably be admitted in the future. It was equally clear that greater representation would have to be provided for those areas, either through the enlargement of the Councils or by reducing the traditional geographic allocation of seats at the expense of the older members of the United Nations.

The primary course was clearly dictated by pragmatic international political considerations. It would have been impossible to cut back the representation of older members of the United Nations in the Security Council in order to make way for the newly inducted members.

When the question of increasing the size of these two Councils came before the General Assembly on December 17, 1933, the vote to increase the size of the Security Council was 97 to 11, and on the enlargement of the Economic and Social Council it was 96 to 11. In both instances, the United States abstained.

The resolutions of amendment require that they be ratified by each state by September 1, 1965, in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. We are, therefore, within discernable distance of the deadline. As of now, 65 nations of the required 76, which means two-thirds of the total United Nations membership of 114, have ratified the amendments.

These resolutions also provide for the geographic distribution of the elective seats. In the case of the Security Council, the resolution provides that the 10 nonpermanent members shall be elected as follows: 5 from African and Asian States, 4 from Eastern European States, 2 from Latin American States, and 2 from Western European and other states. The status of the five permanent members would not be affected.

The result of these resolutions would be to double the present representation of nonpermanent members from the aforementioned geographic areas, except in the case of Latin America, where the membership would remain the same. These patterns of geographic distribution for the election of nonpermanent members of these Councils are not actually incorporated in the amendments which are submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent. However, they are a part of General Assembly Resolution 1991, and will govern the action of the General Assembly when it comes to elect the nonpermanent members.

I should like to note that with respect to the question of the financing of peacekeeping operations, these amendments to the charter are entirely irrelevant. Whether we have acted wisely or not—and I believe that, largely speaking, we have acted wisely with respect to the present controversy respecting the financing of peacekeeping operations by the United Nations—has nothing whatever to do with the two amendments to the United Nations Charter.

Therefore, I shall not divert the attention of the Senate from the pertinent and germane consideration of these two charter amendments by digressing into the financial situation. I should like, however, to have printed in the RECORD the reasons given by Secretary of State Dean Rusk when he appeared before the committee in support of these two treaties. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the excerpt from Secretary of State Rusk's testimony, which appears on page 4 of the committee report, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

7. ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF ENLARGED COUNCILS

In his testimony before the committee on April 28, Secretary of State Rusk asserted that neither of the two proposed amendments would affect U.S. membership on the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, nor would they alter U.S. veto rights in the Security Council. In addition, he stated that the amendments have the following advantages:

"First, they would modernize the current obsolete apportionment of seats on the two Councils in line with the present membership.

"Second, they would add to the prestige of the Councils and to the confidence of the membership at large that they are fairly represented in these principal organs which are charged with serving the interests of all members.

"Third, they would alleviate the present severe pressures on the original allocation of seats which has led to bickering and to such unsatisfactory practices as split terms on the Security Council.

"Fourth, the proposed distribution of seats in the enlarged Councils, which is included in the Assembly resolution, should help minimize contentious rivalries for seats on the Councils and help to assure that a greater number of countries over the years will have opportunity to participate in the affairs of the Councils.

"The proposed enlargements are reasonable and equitable without expanding the Councils to unwieldy sizes.

"The proposed voting majorities are fair and workable—and in our judgment would not materially change the voting alinement from the present situation."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement from the message of the President of the United States, transmitting to the Senate the two charter amendments now under consideration. This statement appears on page 5 of the committee report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> An increase in the representation of both Councils is now clearly necessary to restore the balance which existed between the Councils and the General Assembly when the charter came into force. An expansion of 50 percent in the case of the Economic and Social Council and less in the Security Council is a reasonable way to adjust to a membership which has more than doubled. At the same time, the expansion is not such as to make the Councils unwieldy.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, so much for these two simple charter amendments which I hope will receive the overwhelming approval of the Senate when we vote—hopefully later this afternoon. However, the bringing of these two charter amendments in treaty form to the floor of the Senate raises large questions of the future of the United Nations which I should like to discuss.

In my judgment, the United Nations is now in a very difficult situation. We, as the prime moving force in its creation back in 1945, should be pressing for a revision of its charter on far more fundamental lines than are represented by these two modest amendments. In order to support that statement. I should like to review at this time the policy of the United States with respect to peacekeeping as laid down by the last three Presidents of the United States.

On September 22, 1960, President Dwight D. Eisenhower stated, in a speech to the General Assembly:

> Thus, we see as our goal, not a superstate above nations, but a world community embracing them all, rooted in law and justice and enhancing the potentialities and common purposes of all peoples.

It is significant that Christian Herter, after he succeeded John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State—presumably with the approval of his chief, President Eisenhower—committed the United States for the first time to the principle of general and complete disarmament under effective inspection, and also under enforcible world law.

This commitment by Secretary Herter received little publicity at the time. Previous to that time, and for many years, going back to the days before World War II, the Soviet Union had advocated general and complete disarmament. This was first done by its foreign Minister, Mr. Litvinov.

Before World War II the difficulty with the Soviet Union's proposal was that it was couched in typically vague form. It gave no assurance of adequate inspection, veracity, or control of the disarmament process. It made not even the slightest gesture toward the need of creating a rule of law, a permanent international institution which would supervise the disarmament process, and tribunals in which political disputes might be resolved without resort to force.

In order to do this, it was obvious that there would have to be created an executive body which would deal with the disarmament process and with political problems, judicial institutions which would be able to hear cases and render decrees, and an international police force which would be able to enforce the decrees once they were made.

Shortly after President Kennedy took office, he advanced considerably further the position taken by Secretary of State Herter. President Kennedy said on September 25, 1961, in an extraordinarily wonderful speech made to the United Nations:

> We must create worldwide law and law enforcement as we outlaw worldwide law and weapons.

In a historic address at American University on June 10, 1963, President Kennedy said:

> Our primary long-range interest is general and complete disarmament—designed to take place by stages, permitting parallel political developments to build the new institutions of peace which would take the place of arms.

Some 18 months before President Kennedy made that commitment on behalf of our country, the McCloy-Zorin agreement of 18 points dealing with general and complete disarmament had been negotiated in Washington, in September of 1961.

As a result of that agreement and of the work done by the newly created Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the United States tabled, at the 18-nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva, a draft outline of a treaty of general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

The Soviet Union had previously tabled its own outline treaty on the same subject. The differences between the two treaties are great, and the difficulties are formidable, but in my judgment they are not insuperable.

Ever since the spring of 1962 efforts have been made at Geneva and before the United Nations to narrow the gap between those two draft treaties. Those efforts have been only moderately successful, and a wide difference still exists.

When President Johnson took office in his own right, he said, in his communication to the Congress on January 15, 1965, that we must be "vigilant for opportunities for improving the hopes of peace."

The policy of this country in support of general and complete disarmament under effective international controls and also enforcible world law, first enunciated by Secretary of State Herter, is still the fixed policy of the United States of America, as has been evidenced by a number of resolutions offered by our delegation to the United Nations in connection with the current debate on disarmament which is being held in New York.

The steps taken toward peace in the past 4 years, including the adoption of the limited nuclear test ban treaty, the hotline agreement, the United Nations resolution against weapons in space, and in pursuit of a policy of mutual example in reducing excessive defense expenditures, have made a substantial contribution to the relaxation of international tensions.

Unfortunately, the unhappy events in South Vietnam, North Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic have, for the time being, heated up again the cold war and have made peaceful coexistence more difficult; but it is my belief that this is a temporary hiatus.

I point out that it was immediately after the Russians built the wall in Berlin that we were able to achieve the Zorin-McCloy agreement. History proves that very often at times of highest international tension both parties turn away from confrontation and are prepared, as a matter of wisdom, to make efforts to reach accommodation and move forward in the cause of peace.

There can be no dissent by any Member of this body on either side of the aisle from the statement that the basic purpose of U.S. foreign policy is the achievement of a just and lasting peace, which can best be attained by the application of the rule of law in the international community.

In support of that policy we supported the resolution in the General Assembly at its 14th session—and the resolution was unanimously adopted—that "the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control" is the objective of all the members of the United Nations. That resolution called upon governments "to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem."

I should like to refer now to a historic address by President Kennedy made to the 18th session of the United Nations Assembly on September 1963, hardly 2 months before he was assassinated. He called for the revision of the charter of the United Nations to permit the development of that body into "a genuine world security system." He declared that the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations must be strengthened by the adoption of sound financial arrangements and the maintenance of standby peace force contingents by member nations. He stated that resort to special missions for the conciliation and adjudication of international disputes should be increased.

That was then, on September 20, 1963, and is, today, a matter of urgency. Today it is a matter of increasing urgency, in view of the fact that our international relations have deteriorated and degenerated since President Kennedy made that speech.

I suggest that the reason why a forward movement toward peace under enforcible world law is particularly important and urgent now is that technological and political developments have given rise to new perils to peace through the increasing spread of nuclear weapons, as evidenced by the successful detonation of two nuclear devices by the Chinese Communists, the continued development of an independent nuclear deterrent by France, and the possibility that several other nations, which have the capacity to make nuclear weapons, will shortly follow a similar course, unless we can achieve a nonproliferation agreement.

The United States recommended only 2 days ago to the United Nations—and I was happy to be present when it was done—the prompt reconvening of the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference at Geneva in order that it might consider a nonproliferation agreement which would include as one of its parts the reduction of nuclear armaments of all nations now having such armaments.

I was accordingly disappointed to see, on the very next day, after the tabling of the resolution at the United Nations, that the Secretary of Defense announced that during the next 12 months we were going to increase by approximately 10 percent our nuclear warheads in Europe.

To me it seems an extraordinary thing that at a time when we should be making every possible effort to negotiate with the Soviet Union a method for eliminating nuclear weapons—and conventional weapons, too—we are encouraging some of our NATO allies to get their fingers closer to the nuclear trigger. Instead of making such efforts, we are going to encourage the possibility of having nuclear weapons among other European states, when we should be discussing means, as a matter of self-preservation, to get rid of the delicate balance of terror under which we live.

While we are doing that we should also get rid of the equal, but much less publicized, terror of chemical, biological, and radiological instruments of warfare, which are an even greater threat to the survival of our civilization.

In order to achieve an international accord for general and complete disarmament under effective control and the development of international peacekeeping machinery, we must get the enthusiastic support not only of the Congress of the United States, but also of an informed public opinion in this country.

Therefore I have submitted, with the cosponsorship of 25 other Senators, a resolution on planning for peace, Senate Concurrent Resolution 32. This resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, which recently held 2 days of hearings on it. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] made an eloquent and persuasive argument in support of the resolution. He is present in the Chamber. The junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], who is also present, and who is also a cosponsor, as is the Senator from New York, made an equally fine written statement in support of the resolution.

I hope very much that this resolution can shortly be reported to the floor and adopted by the Senate. Ten Members of the House of Representatives have introduced identical resolutions in the House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the completion of my remarks a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it may be asked, What has all this to do with the two simple treaties which we are about to pass on? To that intelligent question I would make the following reply:

The two charter amendments merely scratch the top of the surface of an underlying problem to which we have not faced up either in Congress, the State Department, or in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

What we need, in my judgment, is for the President of the United States to be supported not only by Congress but also by his own executive agencies, for in the testimony by the State Department and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency before the Committee on Foreign Relations with respect to Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, it can be said that the resolution was damned with faint praise.

Accordingly, I would hope that the President would formulate as speedily as possible specific and detailed proposals for the implementation of the foreign policy objectives of the United States regarding the establishment of an international authority to keep the peace under conditions of general and complete disarmament, effectively guaranteed by adequate inspection and control and protected by a system of enforcible world law.

Mr. President, how are we going to get that done?

Can it be done under the present Charter of the United Nations, hamstrung as it is by the one-vote, one-nation principle in the General Assembly; hamstrung as it is by the veto provisions in the Security Council where any one of five separate nation-states can nullify any action desired by every other member of the United Nations?

Can it be done, unless we can so amend the Charter of the United Nations to give it adequate and automatic financial resources to enable it to continue its peacekeeping efforts and to institute new ones?

Mr. President, I doubt it. I doubt it, unless we can count upon the strong support of the majority of not only the "have" nations, but also the "have not" nations, for a comprehensive revision of the Charter of the United Nations which will do these things; namely, eliminate the veto, and provide for some form of voting under which some little country—and I say this not invidiously or with the intent of reflecting on a gallant little country—such as the Ivory Coast, can have the same vote in the General Assembly as the United States of America. We cannot accomplish this unless we can find some automatic source of revenue, such as a small tax on international trade which will keep the treasury of the United Nations full.

We cannot do it unless the United Nations will move further than it has so far in supporting multilateral international efforts to remedy the sorry condition of the "have not" nations in the world. For, Mr. President, the rich nations are getting richer and the poor nations are getting poorer. We are faced with a revolution of rising expectations. We cannot long ignore the fact that we live in an oasis of affluence surrounded by a desert of poverty.

In my judgment, the United Nations is ill equipped, under its present charter, to take the necessary steps toward achieving that just and lasting peace which is the goal of our national policy.

It may be well that we are not going to be able to make the necessary changes in the charter in the foreseeable future, particularly in view of the present unfortunate decline of the influence of the United Nations, caused in part by the controversy over finances involving the interpretation of rule XIX. We may be unable to make the necessary changes because at present we are too timid to suggest them or, because, having been brought to the point where we will suggest them, we cannot get adequate support from the other nation-states in the world.

Mr. President, there is another way to which we can turn to achieve the same result. That way would be by operating out of the 18-nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva, which consists largely of the major countries of the world, exclusive of Communist China, which have substantial amounts of armaments. We can create through the mechanism of a disarmament treaty an international disarmament organization, to be composed of the major military nations of the world, which would have a consultative body, a legislature if you will, where there is no veto, and an executive who will be able to act with greater strength than the present powers of the Secretary General of the United Nations permit. That international disarmament organization could be put in the position of not only supervising the implementation of a disarmament treaty but also of helping to keep the peace all over the world, for it would have assigned to it an international police force, which I personally would hope would be recruited on the basis of individual enlistments instead of on the basis of national contingents. As the disarmament process continues, the international police force would be in a position to enforce the disarmament treaty.

Finally, we would need additional world tribunals for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes not settled by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, or arbitration. Such bodies could be set up with a real connection with the United Nations but with a status under which they would report primarily to the International Disarmament Organization.

These three new institutions, the International Disarmament Organization, a Permanent World Peace Force, and a World Tribunal for the peaceful settlement of disputes, which are political rather than merely legal, could well be financed by appropriate and reliable arrangements such as the kind of financing to which I referred earlier, which would be a small tax on international trade, or some other appropriate measure.

Since the major states having power in the world are members of the 18-nation conference, with the exception of Communist China, they would be able, through this kind of tax, to secure adequate financing for these purposes.

Therefore, Mr. President, I close with the thought that our Government should take the lead and not follow along behind others in studying, formulating, and perfecting specific and detailed proposals for the implementation of the foreign policy objectives of the United States, to which I have just referred.

I would hope that we would do this in the reasonably near future. Not only is it an important matter of self-survival; not only is it a question of keeping Western civilization intact; it is also a matter in which, in the short range, we can move to rehabilitate the image of the United States of America, which has recently suffered severely as a result of some of our activities on the international scene.

I would hope that the President would take the lead in formulating these proposals which I have suggested and that he would make available the studies which I hope he will cause to be made, to the Congress and the public generally, and that he would, in short order, transmit the results of his studies to the heads of government of all the nations of the world, urging them to initiate similar studies on matters germane to the subject matter which I have been discussing.

In my opinion, in that way, the United States of America can again take the lead for a just and lasting peace which is the major objective of our foreign policy.

Exhibit 1

S. Con. Res. 32

Whereas it is the policy of the United States, as stated by President Johnson in his communication to the Congress on arms control on January 15, 1965, to be "vigilant for opportunities for improving the hopes for peace"; and

Whereas the steps taken toward peace in the past four years, including the adoption of the limited nuclear test ban treaty, the hot line agreement, the United Nations resolution against weapons in space, and the pursuit of a policy of mutual example in reducing excessive defense expenditures, have contributed to the relaxation of international tensions; and

Whereas these developments have enhanced the prospect for the negotiation of further international agreements based upon mutual interest and calculated to advance the cause of world peace; and

Whereas the basic purpose of United States foreign policy is the achievement of a just and lasting peace, which can best be attained through the development of the rule of law in the international community; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly, at its fourteenth session, unanimously adopted "the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control", and called upon governments "to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem"; and

Whereas President Eisenhower stated on September 22, 1960, to the Fifteenth General Assembly, "Thus, we see as our goal, not a superstate above nations, but a world community embracing them all, rooted in law and justice and enhancing the potentialities and common purposes of all peoples"; and

Whereas President Kennedy stated on September 25, 1961, that we must create "worldwide law and law enforcement as we outlaw worldwide war and weapons", and stated further on June 10, 1963, that "our primary long-range interest" is "general and complete disarmament—designed to take place by stages, permitting parallel political developments to build the new institutions of peace which would take the place of arms"; and

Whereas the United States program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, introduced at the sixteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly, defined the objective of the United States as "A world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective international control" and the "institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations" and called for the creation of an International Disarmament Organization to insure compliance with disarmament obligations, a United Nations Peace Force to keep the peace during the period of disarmament and thereafter; and improved processes for the peaceful settlement of international disputes; and

Whereas President Kennedy, in addressing the eighteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly on September 20, 1963, called for the revision of the Charter of the United Nations to permit the development of that body into "a genuine world security system", and declared that the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations must be strengthened by the adoption of sound, financial arrangements and the maintenance of standby peace force contingents by member nations, and that resort to special missions for the conciliation and adjudication of international disputes be increased; and

Whereas the realization of these goals through international negotiations, United Nations Charter revision, or otherwise, is a matter of urgency because (1) technological and political developments have given rise to new perils to peace through the increasing spread of nuclear weapons, as evidenced by the successful detonation of a nuclear device by the Chinese Communists, the continued development of an independent nuclear deterrent by France, and the possibility that several other nations, which have the capacity to make nuclear weapons, will follow a similar course; and (2) the increasing cost of the arms race is preventing human needs from being met in all the countries of the world; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly, during recent sessions, has resolved to keep in being the Committee on Arrangements for the purpose of reviewing the charter, and has further resolved to ask the Committee to submit periodic reports, with recommendations, to future sessions of the General Assembly; and

Whereas the achievement of an international accord for general and complete disarmament under effective controls and the development of international peacekeeping machinery require not only the support of the Congress, but also an informed public opinion in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President should be supported in his efforts to achieve peace and disarmament under legally effective controls and to develop international institutions capable of permanently keeping the peace.

Sec. 2. The President is hereby requested to formulate as speedily as possible specific and detailed proposals for the implementation of the foreign policy objectives of the United States regarding the establishment of an international authority to keep the peace under conditions of general and complete disarmament effectively guaranteed by adequate inspection and controls. In formulating such proposals, the President is requested to consider whether the development of effective international machinery for the supervision of disarmament and the maintenance of peace, including (1) an International Disarmament Organization; (2) a permanent World Peace Force; (3) world tribunals for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes not settled by negotiations; (4) other international institutions necessary for the enforcement of world peace under the rule of law; and (5) appropriate and reliable financial arrangements for the support of such peacekeeping machinery, may best be achieved by revision of the Charter of the United Nations, by a new treaty, or by a combination of the two.

SEC. 3. The President should make such proposals available to the Congress and to the public generally.

SEC. 4. The President is requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the heads of government of all of the nations of the world and to urge them to initiate within their governments studies of matters germane to this resolution and to formulate and make generally available recommendations based upon such studies.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. I have just heard the latter part of the Senator's speech and find myself in agreement with his objectives and his thoughts, but I am not so concerned about what our image may be.

I agree completely that the objective of world peace, peace through the rule of law, must be attained within our lifetime, or in our children's lifetime if their children, in turn, are to have lives in which they can enjoy peace.

I congratulate the Senator on his address.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the resolution of ratification.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, regarding the proposed amendments to the Charter of the United Nations, in my opinion these amendments would not weaken our standing in the United Nations, or weaken the United Nations itself. In all probability they would strengthen it.

When the U.N. was organized, there were only 51 members. There were 11 members of the Security Council at that time. Now there are 114 members in the United Nations. One of the amendments calls for 15 members on the Security Council, so that more parts of the world may be represented on the Security Council. The same is true of the Economic and Social Council, on which the representation would be increased from 18 to 27.

It seems to me that the approval of the amendments is in order, and therefore I shall support them.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have sought this time to speak, not because I have any doubt that the charter revisions will be approved, but to say a word about the United Nations.

This amendment taking cognizance of the enlarged size of the U.N. is the first amendment to the charter which is being considered for Senate approval and apparently will be approved. There has been so much question raised about whether the U.N. could last, and whether it could last here in the United States, that I believe we should say something about the U.N.'s powers of endurance.

It is my firm conviction—and I believe the American people feel the same way—that we will not let the U.N. collapse for financial reasons. We may insist, as we may very well have to insist, upon certain proportions which we will pay and which we will not pay. It may be that we ought to be a little tougher about article XIX than we have been. But we cannot and will not permit an organization which has served us so well for so long, and which is so vitally needed for the future, to have its capacity to act destroyed by financial considerations.

The overwhelming majority of the 114 nations in the U.N. certainly wish to remain associated with the organization. More and more the world understands that we need a U.N., even a U.N. that will have its peaks and valleys of influence and effect, that will be weaker at one time than it is at another. At present it is in a difficult condition because of uncertainty as to how to deal with the many extremely complex problems of peacekeeping. But the fact is that the organization has had the vitality to last for 20 years, and no nation seems to be in a hurry to "take a walk" out of it, except someone who becomes temperamental, like Sukarno—and he does not seem to be very much missed.

It is clear that the United Nations does have enough virility to act for peace upon important occasions. It did send troops into the Congo; there is a great deal of argument about whether they did well or badly, but the United Nations did send them in. It still has troops in the area between Israel and Egypt. It still has peacekeeping forces in Cyprus. It is very much alive; it has a great deal of vitality and vigor in it.

More important than anything else, it seems to be the determination of the overwhelming preponderance of the nations concerned to stay together in this kind of world organization. The present time is a valley for the U.N. It will have other valleys as time goes on. But it gives every indication of remaining a permanent forum for the debate of mankind in the effort to keep the peace, and a basis for the creation of some means by which the rule of law may replace the rule of force and by which armaments, as the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] said, might in some way be controlled.

The United Nations still is the last best hope of mankind for peace. As one Senator, I say today—and I believe this sentiment is deeply embedded in the hearts of the American people—that given any kind of reasonable break—and that phrase is as important as what I am about to add to it—given any kind of reasonable break, we will do our utmost to preserve the U.N. and see that it does not crack up and collapse for financial reasons or other reasons of that character. If given any kind of reasonable break, it will continue. The patience of the people of the United States is not limitless, but it is great. While notice should be served on other members of the U.N. that our patience cannot be tried without end, they should equally know our determination, and all the power and majesty that we can muster, to keep the United Nations in business.

President Eisenhower said very much the same thing in September of 1960, as I recall, shortly before the election that year, as did President Kennedy, when he addressed the United Nations General Assembly. I believe that is as true today as it was then, and if we are given any kind of reasonable break, financial and otherwise, in respect to our relations with the other members, it will remain true for decades to come.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve as a delegate to the United Nations during the previous session. Therefore, I am somewhat familiar with its problems and the nature of the charter amendments which are pending, which would increase the membership of the Security Council and also the Economic and Social Council. I believe it is important that we make the decision requested today.

At the same time, it seems to me that the United Nations is facing a double-barreled crisis. That crisis is both financial and political in nature. We shall have to meet the financial crisis later in the Congress and in the Senate, because the United States has been contributing up to 32 percent or more of the cost of the operations of that agency, and many countries have not supported it.

In my opinion, a very excellent editorial appeared in the Washington Post this morning entitled "The Disintegrating U.N." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DISINTEGRATING U.N.

It is painfully evident that the United Nations, on the eve of its 20th anniversary, is undergoing a critical transformation. Two decades ago its founders at San Francisco visualized the United Nations as a formidable international agent for the maintenance of peace. Today it is unwilling to face the issue of taxing its members for peacekeeping operations.

Last December when the General Assembly met it was paralyzed by the controversy over enforcement of article 19 of the U.N. Charter. The United States contended that, under this clear-cut provision, the Soviet Union, France, and various other countries more than 2 years in arrears in the payment of their assessments, had forfeited their right to vote in the Assembly. The delinquents replied that the assessments made by the General Assembly were illegal. The issue was never decided because of fear that enforcement of the charter would tear the organization apart. The Assembly limped along on a unanimous-consent basis for a while and then adjourned, leaving a Special Committee on Peacekeeping to wrestle with the problem.

The Committee was instructed to bring in its report on the broad problem of peacekeeping operations by June 15. But no agreement is in sight. Instead of offering a solution the Committee is said to be asking for more time, while Secretary-General U Thant and Assembly President Alex Quaison-Sackey are again pleading for the avoidance of a showdown on article 19. Their report, warning of the dangers of a deadlock in the Assembly, is indicative of the sad status to which the U.N. has fallen.

The United States, too, has had to recognize the fact that there is no majority in the Assembly for enforcement of the charter. Despite their great interest in peacekeeping operations, many small countries are fearful of antagonizing the Soviet Union. So they will not insist on the U.N.'s right to tax for the maintenance of peacekeeping forces. It is all too evident, as recognized in the report of Messrs. Thant and Quaison-Sackey, that the U.N. will be dependent upon voluntary contributions for such peacekeeping ventures as it may undertake in the foreseeable future.

No doubt we shall hear much about this erosion of the United Nations when the Senate takes up the question of consenting to ratification to the proposed charter amendments today. Foes of international organization may be expected to oppose the amendments as a means of further weakening the U.N. But there is no logic in making a bad situation worse. While frankly recognizing the predicament of the U.N., the Senate will need to guard itself against slipping into cooperation with the wreckers.

The amendments which the Senate is asked to approve stand on their own merits. One would enlarge the Security Council and the other would enlarge the Economic and Social Council in line with the expanded membership of the organization. These are modernizing changes which have nothing to do with the U.N.'s impotence in the peacekeeping sphere. If they are approved, they will become a salutary precedent for other possible changes in the charter.

It is far more important, however, to check the drift away from the concept of collective security. If the U.N. is reduced to the status of a debating society, for want of courage and a community of interests among its members, the security of every small country will suffer. It is time for every U.N. member to take a sober look at the current drift and to act as if the next crisis to arise might be in its own backyard.

Mr. CARLSON. My service in the United Nations during the 19th General Assembly led me to believe that the United Nations is confronted with some very serious difficulties and they must be resolved if that body is to maintain its position in the world as the agency that we established for peacekeeping purposes. I sincerely hope that steps will be taken to maintain that agency, but the United Nations must be strengthened or, in my opinion, it will be of no benefit to the nations on this globe.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong support for the two proposed amendments to the United Nations Charter now before the Senate.

These two charter amendments, the first to have been adopted by the General Assembly since the founding of the United Nations, would increase the size of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council in order that these organs might better reflect the vast changes in the membership and composition of the United Nations which have occurred during the last 20 years. These amendments are both wise and realistic. They are increased evidence of the capability of the United Nations to adapt to change. In order to operate effectively the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council ought to be more representative of the U.N. membership as a whole.

These amendments must be ratified by two-thirds of the member states, including all of the permanent members, by September 1 of this year. To date, more than 60 of the required 76 nations, including the Soviet Union, have ratified them.

I am confident that the Senate will, by a large vote, give its approval to the proposed amendments. Their adoption will strengthen the United Nations.

The policy of our Government has consistently been to search for ways and means to strengthen the U.N. in order to help maintain peace and avoid armed conflict. The United States has long championed the cause of world peace through the rule of law. Senate approval of these two amendments will be yet another indication of our strong resolve to strengthen and build international machinery capable of resolving disputes among nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the treaty will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages, up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to speak before the resolution is read?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. President, it may be a little ghastly to address a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair, but what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is there objection to the treaty being considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages, up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification? If there is no objection, the clerk will read the resolution of ratification.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to be heard.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to be heard very briefly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it could well be that the amendments here proposed, innocuous as they are, may be a break-through to further amendments to the charter at some subsequent time.

All that is before us is a proposal to expand the Security Council from 11 to 15 members and to expand the Social and Economic Committee from 18 to 27. That is hardly offensive and objectionable, and I presume everybody can support the resolution that is before us; but I wanted to be on record with at least a few observations with respect to the United Nations, because this month marks the 20th anniversary of that organization.

I shall not quite forget it, because when they assembled in San Francisco I happened to be in Lebanon, on the Mediterranean coast. While visiting with the President of Lebanon, who, in addition to everything else, was a professor at the American University at Beirut, he told me President Roosevelt was sending a four-motored plane to Cairo, Egypt, to take him to San Francisco, by way of New York. He confessed that he had never been in an airplane before, and he addressed himself to this adventure with a degree of rather tremulous excitement. But I encouraged him and told him how safe it was to fly from one place on the earth to another by air. So he had his first trip, an ocean hop at that; and from there he went to San Francisco.

I followed the U.N. Charter with a great deal of interest. I had some trepidation about our agreeing to the veto.

I had some more trepidation about concurring with three votes for the Soviet Union; namely, one for the Ukraine, one for Byelorussia, and one for the Soviet Union. But, at long last, the charter was fashioned and, as I recall, it was deposited in the State Department in Washington on the 4th day of July 1945.

Obviously, it was hailed for the noble sentiments which were written into a kind of preamble, sentiments which were noble, almost incandescent as a matter of fact. I suppose there is no one on the face of the earth, who, reading that delightful language, could not share in the expressions of hope that all these lovely and gorgeous things would ultimately come true.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the Preamble was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United Nations Preamble to the United Nations Charter

We the peoples of the United Nations determined—

To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind; and

To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small; and

To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained; and

To promote social progress and better standard of life in larger freedom;

And for these ends—

To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors; and

To unite our strength to maintain international peace and security; and

To ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest; and

To employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples;

Have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

Accordingly, our respective governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed to the present Charter of the United Nations and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations.

ORIGIN

The "United Nations" was a name devised by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt It was first used in the Declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942, when representatives of 26 nations pledged their governments to continue fighting together against the Axis Powers.

The United Nations Charter was drawn up by the representatives of 50 countries at the United Nations Conference on International Organization, which met at San Francisco from April 25 to June 26, 1945. The representatives deliberated on the basis of proposals worked out by representatives of China, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and the United States at Dumbarton Oaks in August–October 1944. The charter was signed on June 26, 1945. Poland, not represented at the Conference, signed it later but nevertheless became one of the original 51 members.

The United Nations officially came into existence on October 24, 1945, when the charter had been ratified by China, France, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and the United States, and by a majority of other signatories. October 24 is now universally celebrated as United Nations Day.

PURPOSES AND PRINCIPLES

The purposes of the United Nations are:

To maintain international peace and security.

To develop friendly relations among nations.

To cooperate internationally in solving international economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian problems and in promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in attaining these common ends.

The United Nations acts in accordance with these principles.

It is based on the sovereign equality of all its members.

All members are to fulfill in good faith their charter obligations.

They are to settle their international disputes by peaceful means and without endangering peace, security, and justice.

They are to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against other states.

They are to give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the charter, and not to assist states against which preventive or enforcement action is being taken.

The United Nations is to insure that states which are not members act in accordance with these principles insofar as is necessary to maintain international peace and security.

Nothing in the charter is to authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are purely the national concern of any state.

The official languages of the United Nations are Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish. Its working languages are English and French. Spanish is also a working language of the General Assembly and of the Economic and Social Council.

Membership of the United Nations is open to all peace-loving nations which accept the obligations of the United Nations Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.

The original members of the United Nations are those countries which signed the Declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942, or took part in the San Francisco Conference, and which signed and ratified the charter.

Other countries can be admitted by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

Members may be suspended or expelled by the General Assembly on recommendation of the Security Council. They may be suspended if the Security Council is taking enforcement action against them or expelled if they persistently violate the principles of the charter. The Security Council can restore its rights to a suspended member.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I like to read the preamble every once in a while and realize how far we have missed the point.

All this was done at a time when there were only 46 nations which were original signatories to the charter.

Today, there are 114 nations, as I recall, and along with it, the United Nations has proliferated from the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Trusteeship Council, and the Court of International Justice, into 38 subordinate or ancillary bodies which cover virtually every activity under the sun.

Mr. President, I am deeply interested in the fact that the administrative expenses for the United Nations today are roughly $92 million, and that seemingly the United States is committed to paying one-third of that sum. Yet, the 113 other nations scattered on every continent of the globe pick up only two-thirds of the tab.

To me, that looks like an unequal division of the burden. I assume that if we take into account other contributions which the United States has made, perhaps our share of the load comes to almost 40 percent, instead of one-third of the burden.

I fancy that at one time or another the American people are going to take into account these facts and will probably insist that there be some modification of this kind of formula; because, large as we are, wealthy as we are, that is still an unequal, unfair burden, if for no other reason than there should be burdens on other countries as well, because they are equal beneficiaries of whatever good the United Nations might achieve.

Accordingly, I make the point now and presume we shall be hearing a good deal about it as time goes on.

When it comes to peacekeeping, I point out, first of all, the many delinquent nations which have not paid any part of the United Nations expense, or have paid only a portion where peacekeeping is concerned. Much of that burden has fallen upon the United States. If we are all in this together, if this is to be a concert of action, if the term "United" Nations means anything, of course we should be able to expect other countries to pay their share of the load when it comes to keeping the peace of the world.

We sometimes wonder how effective the United States is. I have some doubts about it. At one time, we had 20,000 persons in the Congo. There are 1,000 technicians there today.

Only this week, a dispatch from the Congo indicates that government troops are still pursuing the rebels in the Congo.

I heard from a high official of this Government one of the most barbarous incidents which has ever been related to me. If I had had any dinner, I would be in no shape to tell what the consequences would be, but here was a tale of a stiletto thrust into a man's stomach, and pulling that stiletto upwards and laying him open, and then reaching in and getting a kidney and eating it raw.

One of the highest officials in our Foreign Service related that story to me—this and a few others—not later than last week.

Therefore, I wonder how much value we are getting out of the money we have spent in the Congo, after all.

Of course, we have been trying to keep the peace there since 1960.

This is 1965.

Five years, in my book, is a long time not to get results.

The same thing is true in the Middle East, the contest and conflict in the Gulf of Aqaba and the Gaza strip. One might have thought, after the United Nations force went in there, that serenity, peace, and light would suddenly come to the Middle East.

What do we find?

We find that the Arabs are now undertaking to divert water from the River Jordan and the Sea of Tiberias, and trying to prevent every effort to bring water to the thirsty acres in the Negev, so that more people can find a homeland there.

What a strange thing. It would appear that the spirit of nationalism has not been assuaged. I wonder whether U Thant might not give a little more attention to that situation, in the course of his peregrinations from one end of the country to the other.

There still remains the difficulty between Indian and Pakistan over Kasmir. It has not been settled. It has been going on for a long time. We wonder about the effectiveness of the United Nations. There has been no agreement on this problem. It has been going on since 1948. That is a period of 17 years.

We went into Korea in 1950, but the 17th parallel is still the dividing line. That was 15 years ago.

About the only testimony to the United Nations is the composite cemetery in Korea with the flags of all the nations flying. This "Land of Morning Calm," as Korea is called, is anything but calm. The division is still present. The troops are still there. Who knows what the ultimate outcome will be?

When it comes to Cuba, we asked only that a United Nations inspection team go in and make an on-site inspection. It has not been done, from that day to this. The United Nations confesses the fact in its own report; it has not been done.

I become furious every once in a while about Cuba. Who knows whether there are missiles there, and how many Soviet troops in civilian attire may still be there?

Many students who come into my office see a little sign I have behind my desk, and they go back to college and make a sign of their own, and place it on their automobile bumpers: "Don't worry. They are still 90 miles away."

That indicates an intriguing kind of influence.

Then, of course, we have never had an explanation from India about its going in and seizing the Portuguese Colony of Goa. When Nehru was still alive, he was likely to indulge in philosophical utterances, but he did not bat an eyelash about going in with sheer force and taking over that colony, instead of submitting the dispute to the United Nations.

India is a signatory. Under the United Nations Charter we are entitled to establish such regional agencies. We have set up OAS. We have set up Cento and Seato.

Today a speech was made on the floor of the Senate about President de Gaulle and France. I saw in the press reports last week that President de Gaulle had taken his representatives out of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. What can that connote by way of fidelity to concert of action and to concert of spirit, and to the noble purposes of the United Nations and all the regional arrangements that we have contrived under the charter?

The amazing thing is that in all these premises the United Nations has been steadily going broke. I do not know where they are going to get the money. When the resolution for the $250 million bond issue was in jeopardy on the floor of the Senate I bent over backward, against the wishes of a good many of my own party members, in order to get it out of the fire. But I am not going to do it again until we see some better arrangement and until we see a greater concert of action on the part of delinquent members.

I wish to read into the RECORD—it is very short—a critical analysis of the U.S. position on article 19 of the United Nations Charter. This was drawn up by the Republican policy committee. It deserves some currency in the country:

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE U.S. POSITION ON ARTICLE 19 OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

It is not mere coincidence that, at a time of deep troubles for the United Nations, prestige of the United States within that Organization has dropped to an alltime low. A recapitulation of U.S. policy, with respect to the financial problems of the U.N. will help to explain why.

Article 19 of the United Nations Charter provides that a U.N. member owing a total of 2 years or more of assessed contributions to the United Nations shall be deprived of all voting rights in the General Assembly, unless the latter is satisfied that failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the delinquent member.

I can imagine no condition that would get any country off the hook under that clause, because the assessments go as low as $2,300 for a little country. That is the cost of one Government clerk or typist in our Government. Whenever a government cannot scare up $2,300, there must be something very much wrong.

I read further:

All major decisions in the General Assembly must be arrived at by a two-thirds majority vote—any decisions affecting a member's voting rights would almost certainly require such a vote.

There are now 12 members in arrears 2 years or more and subject to loss of voting privileges under article 19. Eighteen members have never paid anything on United Nations Emergency Force (Near East) peacekeeping operations. Twenty-eight members have never paid anything on the Congo peacekeeping operations. Some of these have not had time to fall 2 years behind.

Before long there may be more.

To continue:

In the years 1961 through 1963, the United States not only paid its regular assessments but made large donations to help the United Nations meet its operating deficits caused by the refusal of many member nations to pay their assessments. Beginning with Senator GEORGE AIKEN's report on the United Nations for 1960, Republican Senators warned that this U.S. policy actually weakened the United Nations rather than strengthened it. They predicted a serious crisis for the United Nations unless members could be persuaded that they must honor their obligations and that the United States would not bail out the United Nations forever.

In 1962, the Democratic administration persuaded the General Assembly to raise funds by a $200 million bond issue. Both Senators AIKEN and HICKENLOOPER then predicted the U.N.-bond plan would not change the situation: Members who had always paid their assessments would subscribe to their bond quotas, but there was no means of requiring delinquent members to buy such bonds.

Republicans proposed that a 3-year U.S. loan to the United Nations would have a more salutary effect than would any further donations by the United States. Republicans also demanded that the United States initiate a serious study in the United Nations of the whole financial support problem. The Democratic administration insisted, however, that its bond plan would solve the more urgent fiscal problems of the United Nations.

By 1964, it was quite clear the United Nations was in even graver financial difficulties. In October, the administration suddenly let it be known that when the General Assembly convened in December, the United States would move to deprive delinquent members of their voting rights under article 19. Administration officials announced the United States would withhold any financial pledges until the question of voting rights of delinquent members was resolved.

The administration never carried out its publicized promises. The issue of voting rights never came to the floor of the General Assembly. In the end, our representatives allowed Russia to vote without challenge (although it would have been permitted under art. 19).

What followed was a complete surrender by the United States in the U.N.

First. We withdrew our threat to withhold financial pledges.

Second. We began once again to make up U.N. deficits through donations beyond our regular assessments. Thus, the United Nations is meeting its current financial obligations by borrowing from the U.N. Special Fund, just as our State Department announced a $60 million donation to that Fund.

Third. This means the large number of delinquent members are still free to propose and dispose in the General Assembly without the responsibility of having to pay for anying.

Fourth. The U.S. representative on April 29, 1965, agreed that article 19 would not even be mentioned in the draft resolution to be proposed by the U.N. Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations.

We Republican Senators call for firm decisions on the part of the administration:

1. Either seek enforcement of article 19 against delinquent U.N. members, or publicly acknowledge article 19 is now a dead letter.
2. Cease this worse-than-useless policy of rescuing the United Nations each year by a hastily improvised plan of donations from the United States and a few other members.
3. Help initiate an entirely new method of financing under which all members give financial support to the United Nations, thereby making it a truly international organization.

That is my story, Mr. President, in this month of June 1965, as we observe the 20th anniversary of the United Nations.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I take some exception to the comments of my distinguished leader—not to its substance, but to some inferences that might be drawn. In saying so, I know of his valuable support of the U.N.

I support the ratification of the amendments as they will provide a more equitable representation of the membership of the United Nations in the Security and Economic and Social Councils. I agreed with my minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN and, I am sure, with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, that the amendments ought to open the way to further needed improvements in the United Nations.

I know that the U.N. is having hard days. There is a great deal of frustration in our country—and properly in some respects—and throughout the world about the U.N. We have been concerned that the Soviet Union has refused to pay its assessment for peacekeeping activities of the U.N. The failure of the U.S.S.R. to support the General Assembly recommendations coupled with its veto in the Security Council, if it is condoned and if its example is followed by other countries, could vitiate any peacekeeping functions of the U.N.

As we look back at the history of the U.N., the peacekeeping function which it has been able to assert in the Middle East, in Cyprus, in the Congo, and in other crisis areas, has been of great importance. It is conceivable, reasonable to believe that it has prevented the enlargement of wars in those areas. I very much hope that the members of the U.N. will come to know that if they do not place their affairs in order, if they do not pay their assessments, the peacekeeping function important to their security and peace may go. I hope that our country will take note of the third recommendation which our minority party made in its views, and that the administration will initiate some system of assessment which will be observed by the members of the U.N.

I know there is opposition to the U.N. Some argue that the United States should leave it. But on this anniversary year, and at this time when we will ratify these amendments to its charter, I should like to say that with all of its disappointments we could not even begin to know the added dangers that the world might have faced without the United Nations.

For a long period in the U.N. our positions were uniformly supported. Now when we are having some difficulty, it would be an abdication of responsibility, an evidence of lack of confidence in our policies to pull out, as some contend we should do. We should have more courage, more faith in ourselves.

I hope these amendments may open the way to improvement of the U.N. Nevertheless, I could not let the opportunity pass without saying that despite our frustrations, I believe the U.N. has played a great role, and that it can have a great role in the future. We will attempt to strengthen it, but we must give the U.N. support—as an instrument of the rule of law.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to make a comment, and then I shall yield.

Mr. President, if I were not for the U.N., I would not have gone through some of the agonies I did in other times and periods in order to support the administration in keeping it right side up. But I believe the time has come to quit apologizing for the failures of the U.N. and to bring the "horse to the trough." It will require some aggressive action on the part of the U.N. if it is ever going to get anywhere. That is the thing that I quarrel about. So it is only to make an efficient, effective, and vigorous organization that I make my proposals. When the U.N. fails, we ought to beat them over the head, because it would be good for them. Otherwise the U.N. would remain little more than a debating society. When at long last an expeditionary force is sent out, we shall have to pay the bill.

I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, earlier today I spoke on the amendments, and I shall take only an instant—for this is a timely moment—to identify myself with the views expressed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], which I fully adopt as my own. In the great spirit of Senator Vandenberg, whose creativity so largely contributed to the birth of the U.N., it is very important that we on this side, as well as those in the majority, identify ourselves with the determination to keep the U.N. alive and to make it work. To paraphrase the words of our leader on this side, we should hit them over the head, but we should not dump them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree.

Mr. JAVITS. We may have to call U.N. members to task sometimes, but we should not get out on any light ground if we are given any reasonable opportunity to cooperate with the great bulk of the nations of the world. I thank my colleague.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to make one additional comment. It riles me somewhat that we indulge in circumvention when we go in to rob one of the funds. I do not know that it is quite true, but we are told that the U.N. dipped into the Children's Fund a year or two ago and took some money from that fund in order to keep the U.N. administratively afloat.

Why do we not come squarely up to the problem? Let us confront it here and now and see whether or not it can be worked out. Let us confront the delinquent countries with the statement, "Come to the mill or else." That has always been a good expression out in our country. We have not scolded enough. We have a way of making them do it. The action on the amendments will be followed by a foreign aid bill. Perhaps turning off the spigot will do some good, because it appears that when money is involved, and it is not so readily available, perhaps they will discipline themselves a little and come into the spirit of the United Nations. I would be the last man in the world to dump them. I wish to see the U.N. work and to carry out all of the noble promises that were made in the preamble.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the main purpose of the two pending amendments to the United Nations Charter is to increase the number of nonpermanent members on the Security Council from 11 to 15—increasing from 7 to 9 the number of affirmative votes required for Council decisions—and to increase the membership of the Economic and Social Council from 18 to 27.

The amendments also provide for certain changes in the election procedures which are to be followed after the increase in the membership of the two councils has been approved by the requisite number of nations. They do not, however, affect either the seats of or the right to veto of the permanent members of the Security Council.

The United Nations resolution incorporating these amendments, which was approved by the General Assembly on December 17, 1963, calls upon member states to ratify them in accordance with their constitutional processes by September 1, 1965. In this connection, article 108 of the charter requires that the amendments must be ratified by two-thirds of the United Nations membership, including the five permanent members of the Security Council.

As of this date, 71 nations of the required 76, which represents two-thirds of the total United Nations membership of 114, have ratified the amendments. The Soviet Union is the only permanent member of the Security Council which has ratified them, but both the United Kingdom and France have indicated that they intend to do so.

These are the first proposed amendments to the Charter of the United Nations since it was formed, almost 20 years ago. During that time, the membership in that Organization has grown from 51 nations in 1945 to 114 nations in 1965. Nevertheless, the size of both the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council has remained the same and, as presently constituted, neither Council realistically reflects this growth in membership.

Mr. President, the pending amendments, if approved, will bring about a more equitable balance between the total membership of the United Nations and the number of nations represented on the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. This is an adjustment which is long overdue. I hope, therefore, that the Senate will give its advice and consent to their ratification.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had not planned even to make the brief remarks that I now intend to make, had I not listened to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits].

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from New York, but I certainly would go much further than either one of them went. Nothing has been said in the discussion about the United Nations on this 21st anniversary which refers to the derelictions of the United States vis-a-vis the United Nations. It is always interesting to me to listen to discussions on foreign policy on the part of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and others in this country which tend to overlook the derelictions of the United States.

The United Nations is in a weakened condition tonight; but, in my judgment, no country is more responsible for that than the United States. When I think of the failures of the United States to live up to its obligations in respect to the United Nations, at least a word ought to be spoken for the Record, placing a part of the blame where it belongs—right on our own country. The holier-than-thou attitude that the U.S. Government tends to develop when things go awry in American foreign policy ought to be called what it actually is—plain national hypocrisy on the part of our Government.

There has been much talk today about article 19. The United States ducked and walked out on its obligations in respect to article 19. We have an Ambassador to the United Nations by the name of Adlai Stevenson. He made a speech in which he sought to defend our position as only a procedural matter. Adlai Sevenson knew better then, and he knows better now. The Secretary of State knew better then, and he knows better now.

The vote that Adlai Stevenson cast in behalf of the United States was a vote of great substance on a substantive issue. Procedure was not involved in it at all. What the State Department had decided, and what Adlai Stevenson carried out as his instruction, was that we were not willing to face up to our preachment about applying the rule of law to foreign policy.

An advisory opinion had been obtained from the World Court. We joined in asking for that advisory opinion. That advisory opinion made crystal clear that all members of the United Nations were bound by the charter to pay their assessments in respect to peacekeeping functions under article 19. It will be recalled, and the Record will show, that I was among the first to speak on the floor of the Senate in support of the proposal that the United States take an unequivocal stand in insisting that article 19 be complied with. The Record will also show that on both sides of the aisle, Senators supported that view.

But then the State Department apparently developed a lack of fortitude in regard to this matter and decided that the rule of law within the United Nations could be compromised. The United States ran for cover in the very face of an advisory opinion by the World Court that laid down what the law was.

So we decided, under the sophistry of Adlai Stevenson's speech, that we would duck the issue and would go along with a vote to adjourn; and that was as substantive a vote as Adlai Stevensin could ever cast in the United Nations. The issue was there. That was the time to face that issue and let the members of the United Nations stand up and be counted. That was months after the issue was first raised. The issue had been kicked around in the United Nations, in New York, for months. We certainly had a right to expect our Government not to retreat from the application of the rule of law under the charter, as handed down in a decision by the World Court itself. When we did that, we helped to weaken the United Nations. We received much adverse comment around the world, and we deserved it, because we walked out on our position of leadership in the United Nations.

That was not the only instance of the United States being guilty of weakening the United Nations. We have done it time and again in respect to other matters. Do not forget that it was the United States and Great Britain that tried to circumvent the United Nations with respect to Cyprus. Do not forget that it was the United States and Great Britain that opposed the United Nations exercising its clear jurisdiction with respect to the threat to the peace in the Mediterranean, involving Cyprus.

The United States and Great Britain together tried to get NATO to move into Cyprus. That was our proposal. NATO, under international law, did not have the slightest claim to any jurisdictional right in Cyprus; and when the United States took the position of trying to have a body that had no basis under international law for any intervention in Cyprus, we weakened the United Nations. But we were kicked back into the United Nations by France and Russia. The record is clear that France and Russia were busy for some time, lining up nation after nation in support of United Nations jurisdiction over Cyprus; and we were finally confronted with the accomplished fact. The other great powers in the world favored the United Nations jurisdiction; and then, and only then, did the United States change its course and go along. But we had no choice. Either we would have gone along, or we would have been outvoted.

That was such an obvious error on the part of the United States that 10 days before France and Russia showed their hands, the senior Senator from Oregon urged that the United States change its course of action and join in having the United Nations take jurisdiction over the Cyprus issue.

That was not the only instance in which the United States weakened the United Nations. To all intents and purposes, we have so far as the peacekeeping functions of the United Nations are concerned, scuttled that part of the United Nations program in connection with our course of action in Vietnam. But the fact that the United States has not been willing to lay the entire southeast Asia matter before the United Nations, under the clear mandates of the Articles of the United Nations, apparently indicates that we shall follow a course of action of making use of the procedures of the United Nations only when convenient to our objectives. That was what Adlai Stevenson in effect said in that most unfortunate speech he made many months ago before the Security Council in rejecting U.N. handling of the Vietnam war.

Had he resigned instead of making that speech, he would have changed the course of world history and also would have enabled the United States to strengthen the cause of peace in the world, rather than to go ahead with escalation, first in South Vietnam, and now in North Vietnam, a procedure that is costing so much blood.

No; apparently we are willing to follow the peacekeeping procedures of the United Nations if we think that to do so will be in our interest; but we are not willing to consider what would be in the interest of the peace of the world. That is what we pledge to do. That is what our signature on the charter means, if it means anything.

I have listened to the Senator from Illinois this after. I do not intend to leave the blame on other countries alone. There are other countries that are guilty of joining in this weakening and almost scuttling of the United Nations. Among them are Russia and France. In my judgment, some of the members of the United Nations which are following a colonial policy which cannot possibly be reconciled with the charter of the United Nations are also helping to scuttle the United Nations.

But the time has come when we, too, ought to start to live up to our obligations under the United Nations and not violate them. The United States has yet to make use of the provision of the charter which would provide for calling an extraordinary session of the General Assembly to meet the threat of the peace of the world.

Our record is a sorry one with regard to that part of the United Nations Charter. We talk a good game about peace. However, we are making a record which is anything but a record of which future generations of American boys and girls can be proud in regard to the way we have been acting in respect to our conduct toward our obligations under the United Nations Charter.

In regard to the comments of the Senator from Illinois about the peacekeeping activities in the Congo, in the Mideast, in Cyprus, in Kashmir, and elsewhere; my disagreement with him is that if the United Nations had not gone into the Congo, there would have been a major war in that area of the world. If the United Nations had not gone into Cyprus, in my judgment we would have been involved in a major war in the Mediterranean. If the United Nations peacekeeping force had not been committed for some years on the Gaza strip, that part of the world could have very well been a tinderbox which could have ignited a third world war. Let note be taken of the fact that the United Nations has been maintaining a peacekeeping force in the Kashmir area. In my judgment, if they had not gone there, Kashmir and India would have been involved in a major holocaust before now.

The peacekeeping function of the United Nations is not to be criticized. What is to be criticized is that various nations of the world, including the United States, have not lived up to their obligation to make greater use of the peacekeeping procedures of the United Nations.

I support these amendments tonight because I agree with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that they might lead to a strengthening of the United Nations and might lead to further amendment.

We ought to exercise more leadership than we have in the past on an even more important issue at the U.N. We have done practically nothing about it. There is an amendment which would seek to change the voting procedure in the Security Council by abolishing the veto. So long as any one of the five can throw a veto against a proposal to set up an effective peacekeeping procedure to meet a threat to the peace of the world, in my judgment, we have not gone nearly as far as we have an obligation to go in outlawing war.

The United States cannot talk about outlawing war because the United States makes war. The United States makes war illegally, as we are making war illegally now in Asia, in clear, open violation of our obligation under the United Nations Charter.

That is a sordid and sad record. I always hope for improvement. I always hope for conversion. I am hopeful that in due course of time we shall have a different State Department. With a different State Department, we may have a State Department that would be willing to use the procedures of the United Nations to promote peace rather than to violate the procedures and be guilty of promoting war, as the United States is doing at the moment that I am talking.

Mr. President, I hope that after these amendments are agreed to, in the next General Assembly of the United Nations the American Ambassador will be given instructions to try to obtain support from the United Nations to start dealing for the elimination of the veto in the Security Council. Until the power is taken away from the big five to prevent the setting of peaceful procedures for meeting threats to the peace of the world, the United Nations will continue to be much weaker than we ought to make it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the treaty will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Sen-

ate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive A, Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, proposing amendments to the Charter of the United Nations.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Minnesota, [Mr. Mondale], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] are paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell]. If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii and the Senator from Rhode Island would each vote "yea" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] are paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from California would each vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 71, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 106 Ex.]

YEAS—71

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Ellender
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—29

Allott
Bass
Bayh
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Church
Douglas
Eastland
Ervin
Gore
Hart
Hruska
Inouye
Kuchel
Lausche
Magnuson
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Mondale
Morton
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Smathers
Thurmond
Tower

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bartlett in the chair). Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. Morse, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAGIC HAPPENINGS IN LOUISIANA

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, a tragic thing happened in Louisiana last night, an incident of which I am ashamed, because it was something the people of Louisiana were unable to prevent. The sheriff of Washington Parish, in which Bogalusa is located, had two responsible Negro deputies on his force for a period of approximately 1 year. An assassin killed one of those two Negroes, and an effort was made to murder the other one while he was performing his official duties. According to the evidence I have, one deputy was shot and killed while he was driving an official vehicle. He was shot with a high-powered rifle. An attempt on the life of the other deputy was made by the same people, using a shotgun.

I agree with the statement of the Governor of our State that it is a blot on the State of Louisiana and a disgrace. We are sorry that it was not possible for the responsible, good people of our State to prevent this murder from happening.

I would hope that the people of this Nation would accord us the assumption that all good citizens are entitled to the presumption that they are innocent until proved guilty. It may prove to be the fact that the crime was not committed by Louisianians. When the survivor of the two deputies was shot, he did not run. When he was able to, he managed to reach the radio and he described the murder car and reported that the car was headed toward Mississippi. The Mississippi police set up a roadblock and apprehended a man in Mississippi.

We have reason to believe that three men were involved in this murder. The man captured refused to waive his right not to be extradited and will not talk.

It is our judgment that, through the alert and energetic efforts of the deputy who survived, we have been fortunate in apprehending one of the culprits in this murder. We hope to apprehend the others and I am assured that we are working hard in our efforts to do so.

Mr. President, most of the people of Louisiana, and most of the people of Bogalusa are fine, law-abiding citizens. They feel strongly about the problems of integration and segregation just as you and I do.

The Congress of National Equality had been picketing a number of retail stores in Bogalusa because those stores did not hire Negroes as clerks. The Ku Klux Klan and the White Citizens' Council people had been counterpicketing the pickets. The Governor of Louisiana and the mayor of Bogalusa had persuaded the counterpickets to quit counterpicketing. The Ku Klux Klan group had initiated a recall petition to recall the mayor because of his moderation. They had succeeded in obtaining enough signatures to get a recall election. The Governor had persuaded the people who had signed the petition that they were in error and they were in the process of withdrawing their names from the recall petition.

All of these honorable, decent people will suffer for the crimes of ignorant, uninformed, prejudiced, and biased persons. The record should show that the elected officials and the responsible people of the community were trying to do right as God would let them see it.

We thought great progress was being made in the Bogalusa area. These two deputies were not attacked in Bogalusa. They were attacked in a small town near Bogalusa. I assume, however, this tragic event will be associated with what is going on in the Bogalusa community.

On behalf of the Governor, myself, and the Louisiana delegation, I want to state that we regret very much that this event occurred in our State. We have done everything within our power to avoid it. Our responsible law officials have done everything they could to prevent anyone from being injured, insulted, or mistreated, because he exercised some rights available to him as an American citizen, even the right to picket a store in which he was never employed, or the right to protest to get himself heard through a demonstration. All these rights have been protected to the best of the ability of the mayor, the sheriff, and the Governor. At least half the State police of Louisiana have been working assiduously in the Bogalusa area to try to maintain peace and try to prevent occurrence of an event such as happened last night.

We wish we could have prevented it. Sometimes, crimes of that nature are beyond the capacity of good law officials to prevent, even when they try their utmost.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the statement of the Governor of Louisiana.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Gov. John McKeithen of Louisiana

Louisiana is shocked by the dastardly, heinous, cowardly deed perpetrated last night in our State. I have sent telegrams of sympathy to the next of kin of the deceased and to the surviving peace officer. The murder of this officer of the law and the attempted murder of his associate is a blot on our history and a disgrace to us all. The sad, sad part of it is that a few—very few—misguided souls seem determined to wreck us all. We shall not let this occur: The guilty parties shall be found. They shall be brought to justice and we shall demonstrate to the world that Louisianians are law-abiding, God-fearing citizens and that our State is no haven for cowards and murderers. Good, in the end, frequently results from great tragedy. Let us fervently pray, then, that the bonds of understanding and love between and among our peoples will spring from the tragedy of last evening.

VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the current issue of Ramparts magazine devotes several articles to the subject of Vietnam. It is already evident that the policy of bombing North Vietnam to drive her to the negotiating table has been a total failure. The bombing has not deterred the Vietcong from anything at all. Indeed, if there is any direct connection between North Vietnam and the Vietcong, the bombing of the north seems to have inspired new efforts on the part of the rebels in the south.

Sooner or later, Americans are going to have to study the reasons why we got ourselves into this perilous situation and whether it was worthwhile enough, in the first instance, to justify the high cost in life and money of today's military effort.

Reading the articles in Ramparts magazine may help many Americans understand much better, not only what is at stake in Vietnam but also some of the things that are not at stake.

I ask unanimous consent to have these articles, consisting of an editorial entitled: "The Unreasonable Question," an article entitled "The Vietnam Lobby," and a series called "Four Views on Southeast Asia," printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Unreasonable Question

The virgin issue in our Vietnam policy is the moral one. The Lilliputian measures of public dissent have been couched in supremely practical terms: How are we going about the war? Should we be escalating or negotiating? Are our policies efficient? Are we winning?

These are reasonable questions, asked by reasonable men. The unreasonable question—the seemingly unutterable question is—why?

But this is the essential query. It is what must be asked before any rational discussion of policy alternatives is possible. It is the question Ramparts asks in this special issue on the moral disaster of our southeast Asia policy.

Why is the public told America was asked to step into Vietnam, when our initial involvement was actually installing, financing, and arming a despotic and unpopular premier as a democratic alternative to the overwhelming grassroots popularity of the Communist guerrillas?

Why do people still believe that southeast Asia is ready to fall, country by country, like dominos into the Communist axis, when Asian nations are in reality complex, perverse, and independent—like Cambodia where a king can feel comfortable as a Socialist and an anti-Communist at the same time?

Why do serious, concrete, nonestablishment proposals for peace stand so little chance of being heard and understood by American policymakers?

Why—and this is the most disturbing question of all—why is there no significant number of Americans asking these questions? Is the age of consensus that complete? Or have we lost all capacity for moral outrage?

The cold war and its hot complexes are no longer as simple minded as they appeared in the late 1940's. This is a post-Vandenberg era: foreign policy should be debatable. Indeed, it must be debated if this country is to rid itself of the clumsy, generous, paramissionary, quasi-gangbusters crazy quilt of little reality that has covered our bipartisan foreign policy through four administrations.

There can be no better place to begin such a debate than over our southeastern Asia policy. We know it doesn't work. Let us ask why.

The Editors.

The "Vietnam Lobby"

(By Robert Scheer and Warren Hinckle)

Among the stacks of wood-based engravings filed in dustry pyramids in the New Leader's editorial offices is a generously-sized full-faced reproduction of the late Ngo Dinh Diem.

The typed label on the back that used to identify Diem as "Vietnam's Democratic Alternative" has been torn off. The steel plate is worn from rubbing, face down, against the shellacked surface of the public school surplus-type furniture in the magazine's quarters in the old social democratic Rand School Building on New York's still-cobblestoned 15th Street.

The New Leader's cut file is a strange place to begin the story of the "Vietnam Lobby," but then it is a strange story. It is the history of a small and enthusiastic group of people—including a cardinal, an ex-Austrian Socialist leader, and a CIA agent—who maneuvered the Eisenhower administration and the American press into supporting the ruthless, unpopular and hopeless regime of a despot and believed it actually was all an exercise in democracy. That this group was able to accomplish this against the better thoughts of Eisenhower and over the traditional wariness of the press is testimony to its power and its persuasiveness. Another chapter of the history of the "Vietnam Lobby" is how its thesis came to be accepted by a broad consensus of liberals and intellectuals in America—a consensus that only recently has begun to splinter and is still largely intact.

The thesis is based on an overriding belief in the beauty of the American way of life—and in the nefarious nature of communism. It is the belief that the only reason a nation might vote communistic is because it hasn't been properly exposed to the democratic way of life: If a people know democracy, they will vote democratic. And if it becomes necessary on occasion to tolerate undemocratic means to achieve the ultimate democratic goal—well, it is all for the people's own good.

For the New Leader, a liberal, militantly anti-Communist biweekly with a strong belief in social reform, this theory was naturally applicable to the case of Diem, a firm anti-Communist. The New Leader in 1959 hailed Diem's "Democratic One Man Rule." To the school of liberalism where anticommunism is the sine qua non, the idea of a "Democratic one man rule" is not an anomoly.

The story of the "Vietnam Lobby" is a case study in American politics from the mid-1950's to the early 1960's, and the role of the New Leader in that period is worth singling out for special attention because the magazine played a smaller but similar role in spreading the thesis of the Nation's most famous pressure group—the China lobby. The disillusioned idealists and ex-radicals that C. Wright Mills once dubbed "The NATO intellectuals" were prominent in both lobbies. Like the New Leader, they were willing to believe the best about anything or anybody anti-Communist.

The history of the "Vietnam Lobby" dates from a meeting in a Tokyo tea room in 1950. There Wesley Fishel, a young Michigan State University political scientist, had a serious conversation with Ngo Dinh Diem. Diem was in the 17th year of a self-imposed exile. A sort of Catholic mandarin, he was by family background, personal inclination, and training a member of Vietnam's feudal aristocracy. The mandarin sense of survival called for cooperation with the French, and Diem had risen to the rank of Governor of Phat Diem Province in the French colonial civil service. A militant anti-Communist, in 1933 he helped the French fight the Communists who were then leading the Vietnamese anti-colonial revolt. But Diem decided that France and Vietnam were incompatible, and went into exile. It is illustrative of his character that he chose voluntary exile rather than remain in his country and fight with the "masses" (which included the Communists) against the French. Diem was a firm believer in the ways of God dictating the acts of men. He would wait for some Hegelian force to sweep him back onto the center-stage of his country's history. Providence, in 1950, took the form of Wesley Fishel.

The young professor was impressed by Diem's long wait to rule his country and his views on independent nationalism, anticommunism, and social reform. Fishel urged Diem to come to the United States to seek this Government's support. When Diem agreed, Fishel arranged for Michigan State to sponsor the trip. On the Michigan State campus, Diem found kinship and support among both faculty and administration—a relationship which later developed into the university's extensive aid project to Diem's government, where a team of some 20 professors did everything from drafting his budgets to training his secret police. Outside the academic world, Diem found support in the hierarchy of the Catholic Church. Diem's brother, Bishop Can, arranged for the Vietnamese exile to stay in Maryknoll seminaries in New Jersey and New York. This was Cardinal Spellman's territory, and the Cardinal and the Vietnamese Mandarin soon developed a close relationship. And no wonder. Diem was an anti-Communist and he was a Catholic. His brother was even a Bishop. One could not approach the Cardinal with better credentials.

In addition to the academicians and the clerics, Diem found to his surprise that he had a strong appeal with American liberals and intellectuals. When Diem was in the United States, from 1950 to 1953, Senator Joseph McCarthy was on the loose and liberals felt it mandatory to show their anti-communism. The liberal-intellectual world was still quaking from the shocks of the loss of China, the Korean war, and the conviction of Alger Hiss. To suggest dealing with Communists—any Communists—on any terms was unthinkable in this climate. Yet Communist forces in Asia had monopolized the undeniably popular twin battle cries: nationalism and social reform. The liberals searched for a "third way." They thought they found it in the anti-Communist Diem as the leader of a "free" Vietnam. To think that the Vietnamese people would suddenly give to an absentee aristocrat the credit and gratitude for the fruits of the 20-year anti-colonial war the Communists had been leading against the French was, to say the least, naively optimistic. It also ignored Vietnamese history. It proved disastrous. The same tragic results were to occur a decade later when, again ignoring recent history, the Kennedy-Johnson administrations followed the same fruitless military path of the French before them.

One of the first liberals to openly champion Diem was inveterate traveler, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. Justice Douglas had just returned, discouraged, from a visit to Vietnam. An influx of American military aid hadn't helped the French in their losing war against Ho Chi Minh's Vietminh forces. The Vietminh clearly had the support of the people; but the Vietminh were Communist-led, and thus clearly unacceptable as leaders of Vietnam. Then Douglas met Diem in Washington, and became enthusiastic. The Justice arranged a breakfast with Senators MIKE MANSFIELD and John F. Kennedy and introduced them to Diem. Both men were taken with him. And during the next few years, before Dien Bien Phu, both MANSFIELD and Kennedy were extremely critical of the French presence in Vietnam and of the Eisenhower administration's support of them. They called for an "independent nationalist alternative," a phrase which later was to become a cliché. Kennedy, in a major speech immediately before the Geneva Conference in April of 1954, warned against any negotiated solution that would allow participation in the Vietnamese Government by Ho Chi Minh. The Communists, he said, would then eventually take over because they were so popular. Instead, he called for an independent—i.e., a Democratic and anti-Communist—Vietnam, supported by the United States. This Vietnam Diem was to lead.

The Geneva Conference, of course, called for no such thing. It affirmed the independence of the colonial government of Vietnam and called for an end to hostilities. A sort of interim trustee arrangement was agreed upon whereby the French would preside in the south and the Vietminh in the north for 2 years, ending in national elections in 1956 when the Vietnamese people would choose their own government. Those elections were never held because the "Vietnam Lobby" did not want them. Clearly, Ho Chi Minh would have won a popular vote—and that would have been the end of the "independent nationalistic alternative."

Thus men as diverse in their backgrounds as Spellman, Douglas, and Kennedy—not to mention John Foster Dulles—came to support an aggressive policy against a popular adversary in the name of freedom and to believe in it.

The telephone operator in the chancery was used to such things, but even she blinked a little when Cardinal Spellman picked up the telephone and said: "Get me Joe Kennedy." When these two powerful men got on the line together, one winter afternoon in 1955, they settled quickly, as men of decision do, the steps that had to be taken to swing the wavering Eisenhower administration solidly behind the young regime of Premier Ngo Dinh Diem. The report of this extraordinary conversation comes from Joseph Buttinger, an official of the International Rescue Committee, who was sitting in Spellman's office. Buttinger had just returned from Saigon, and he brought bad news. Diem's administration was in trouble. Buttinger thought Diem was the only hope of Vietnam, but needed to consolidate his power. There was opposition from the Vietnamese, from the French and from some key Americans. Diem could not survive without increased U.S. support, yet the present U.S. commitment appeared in danger of waning. Eisenhower's special Ambassador to Vietnam, Gen. Lawton Collins, was openly skeptical of Diem's ability to establish a viable regime. The journalist Joseph Alsop felt Diem's base of support was too narrow to effectively rival the popular Viet Minh. Eisenhower himself was not particularly sympathetic to Diem. The general recognized Ho Chi Minh's popularity, and was opposed to the effort to install an alternative as both undemocratic and of dubious success, as he later remarked in his book "Mandate for Change."

But the Eisenhower administration, not noted for its rigidity of purpose, was vulnerable to the political pressures marshaled by Cardinal Spellman and the elder Kennedy. Kennedy arranged for Buttinger to meet with Senator MANSFIELD and some key State Department personnel in Washington. His son, Senator John F. Kennedy, was in California, but Buttinger had a long conversation with the Senator's assistant, Ted Sorenson. Spellman took care of the press. He set up meetings for Buttinger with editors of the New York Times, the editorial board of the Herald Tribune, and key editors of both Time and Life. Two days later the Times printed an editorial containing the Buttinger thesis. Buttinger himself took pen in hand and wrote an article for the Reporter praising Diem as democracy's alternative in southeast Asia.

To fully appreciate Buttinger's role in the "Vietnam lobby" it is necessary to go back to Diem's ascendance to the premiership in July 1954. The new Premier from his first day in office began to crush all opposition and concentrate power within a small, nepotistic group. Diem's targets included the private armies of the religious sects, anti-Communist Vietnamese leaders who made the mistake of also being anti-Diem, and the identifiable Vietminh partisans remaining in South Vietnam. This did not make for popular acclaim but Diem wasn't looking for popularity. He knew that his base of support was minuscule, that he would have trouble with the majority of the population who has been supporting the Vietminh in the long war against the French. So force was the only way he could effectively ready his people for the "democratic alternative." His authoritarian tactics were not widely reported in the American press until 8 years later, when he fell from favor.

Diem's strongman rule in South Vietnam gave the United States two policy choices. It could keep the Vietminh from power, block the scheduled 1956 national elections, prevent unification of the country, hang on and trust for the best. Or it could follow the new French policy of flexibility in a hopeless situation, allow the elections, learn to live with an unquestionably greater Communist influence in Vietnam, and accept the necessary parallel of a lessening of Western power there.

There were arguments for both positions within the Eisenhower administration. Helpful in pushing the United States into a "hard line" of support for the authoritarian Diem was an unusual array of visitors to Saigon in the early days of the new Premier's rule.

Cardinal Spellman, who told an American Legion Convention that the Geneva agreements meant "taps" for freedom in southeast Asia, flew to Vietnam to hand-deliver the first check of Catholic Relief Agency aid. Wesley Fishel, the Michigan State University professor, took up residence in the Presidential Palace and became one of Diem's chief advisers. Also bedding down in the palace was Wolf Ladejinsky, a New Dealer who had stayed on in the Agriculture Department only to be plowed under in the McCarthy period. Diem hired Ladejinsky to study land reform, which convinced many American liberals that Diem was serious about social reforms. (These reforms proved later to be not only inefficient but laughable. Diem tried to restore the colonial property balance by returning to absentee landlords land that the bewildered peasants thought they owned—land the Communists had given them during the revolutionary period.)

Another important visitor to Diem was Leo Cherne, the President of the International Rescue Committee. Founded to help refugees from Germany in the Hitler period, the committee turned during the cold war to aiding refugees from Communist countries. Cherne spent two and a half weeks in Vietnam and came away convinced that Diem had great potential as an anti-Communist leader. He then sent his assistant, Joseph Buttinger, to set up a Vietnam operation for the Committee. There Buttinger met Col. (now Gen.) Edward Lansdale, the CIA's man in Saigon, hero of Eugene Burdick's "The Ugly American" and villain of Grahame Greene's "The Quiet American." Lansdale, a gregarious former San Francisco advertising man who believes in "selling" the American way abroad, is given sole credit in the recent book on the CIA, "The Invisible Government," for the U.S. support of Diem. That is not quite fair. It ignores the hard work of Cardinal Spellman and Buttinger. It was the unlikely triumvirate of the CIA man, the cardinal and Buttinger, an ex-Austrian Socialist leader, that was responsible for forming U.S. policy behind Diem.

Landsdale went through channels. He convinced CIA Director Allen Dulles of Diem's worth. Dulles talked to his brother, the Secretary of State. And John Foster Dulles brought the word to Eisenhower.

Spellman's influence was important in certifying Diem as a solid anti-Communist, no small thing in the McCarthy era.

Buttinger made the contacts in the ex-radical and the liberal circles which were to eventually support the consensus of the "Vietnam lobby" for the next 6 years.

Buttinger's background is important in understanding the eagerness with which he accepted Diem as the "alternative." A disillusioned Socialist, Buttinger saw in the stocky, 5-foot-5 Premier the nationalist answer to communism that he had himself attempted to provide as an Austrian Socialist leader in the 1930's. Buttinger was then one Gustav Richter, the provincial youth leader of the Social-Democratic Party which had been forced underground by the waves of victorious fascism. Buttinger fought back, but it was an embittering experience. His one accomplishment, he relates in his memoirs, "In The Twilight of Socialism," was to halt the spread of the Communists. But just when Buttinger had reorganized his party, the Nazis goosestepped in. He fled to Paris and then to New York, and in flight the certainty of his world of Socialist politics vanished, and so did his ideology. Buttinger did not join the Socialist Party in America, though in a continuing search for new ideas to replace his fallen Marxist certainty he dabbled in Socialist politics as an editor of Dissent magazine.

He took to Diem with the enthusiasm that can only be mustered by an ex-radical who, once again, has something to believe in. He had been in Vietnam only 4 days when, at Landsdale's request, he met Diem. He was to meet with him frequently during the ensuing 3 months. Landsdale took Buttinger under his wing and introduced him to the top security people in Diem's government and the Vietnamese Army. This convinced Buttinger that Diem had the strength to remain in power if only the United States would give him complete support.

Before Buttinger left for the United States in December 1954, he had several 5- and 6-hour conversations with Diem. He returned a man with a mission: to settle for nothing less than a total commitment to Diem by the United States.

With the aid of Lansdale and Cardinal Spellman, he succeeded, and the "Vietnam lobby" was born.

The "Vietnam lobby" was an unusual alliance of ex-left intellectuals, conservative generals, and liberal politicians. Its primary goal was to convince the public that "free Vietnam" was accomplishing miracles and could withstand the Red onslaught if the United States would continue its support. One year after Buttinger's return from Vietnam, in the fall of 1955, the "lobby" achieved a measure of formal organization with the establishment of the American Friends of Vietnam. The Friends, for the next 6 years, were in the forefront of the fight to maintain Diem's regime as a showcase of democracy.

Like all such organizations, the American Friends of Vietnam had a letterhead with a string of impressive names running in small print down the side. But the Friends' list was unusual because it was virtually a roll call of the liberal center: Senators John F. Kennedy and Richard Neuberger, intellectuals Max Lerner and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Representatives EMANUEL CELLER and EDNA KELLY, diplomat Angier Biddle Duke. For balance, there was Socialist Norman Thomas (who has since changed his position radically) and ultra-conservative J. Bracken Lee. Two famous generals, "Wild Bill" Donovan and "Iron Mike" O'Daniel, were cochairmen.

The Friends was run by its 14-member executive committee. An analysis of the committee reveals a curious relationship between the Friends, the International Rescue Committee, and a New York fund raiser and public relations man named Harold Oram. The relationship is extraordinary because the executive committee of the International Rescue Committee, the executive committee of the American Friends of Vietnam, and Harold Oram's executive personnel were all pretty much the same people.

It was Oram, then public relations man for the International Rescue Committee and a former promoter of 1930's leftist causes, who later became associated with anti-Communist and liberal center groups, whom Buttinger first approached for help when he returned from Vietnam in late 1954. Oram arranged through a friend at the Catholic Relief Agency in Washington for Buttinger to meet with Cardinal Spellman.

Two months before the organization of the American Friends of Vietnam was announced, Oram's public relations firm signed a contract to represent the Vietnamese Government for $3,000 a month plus expenses. They stayed on the job until 1961, Oram was a member of the executive committee of the American Friends of Vietnam. So was Elliot Newcomb, his partner at the time the contract was signed with the Diem regime. Newcomb left the firm a year later, but remained on the executive committee and was subsequently treasurer. The executive secretary, and later corporation secretary and assistant treasurer of the American Friends of Vietnam, was a young man named Gilbert Jonas—Oram's account executive and "campaign director" on the Vietnam account. Oram and Jonas were registered as foreign agents acting for the Republic of Vietnam during the same period they held key executive positions on the Friends, a seemingly independent committee dedicated to the blameless purpose of working "to extend more broadly a mutual understanding of Vietnamese and American history, cultural customs, and democratic institutions."

The interlocking directorates of the International Rescue Committee and the Friends was more to be expected than the strange connection between the Republic of Vietnam and the Friends of Vietnam. Nine of the 14 directors of the Friends were also members of the board of directors of the International Rescue Committee, or were its employees. Both Leo Cherne and Joseph Buttinger were on the Friends' board. Cardinal Spellman was represented by Monsignor Hartnett, a key official of the Catholic Relief Agency. Two writers for the New Leader, Norbert Muhlen and Sol Sanders, were also on the executive committee of the Friends. The anticommunism and quest for social reform that characterized the New Leader was typical of the philosophies of men on these two groups: New Deal liberals like Leo Cherne and ex-radicals like Buttinger, Oram, and Jonas. Jonas later became public affairs director of the International Rescue Committee, and served on Kennedy's presidential campaign staff in 1960 as an adviser on minority group problems.

Oram earned his $3,000 a month. Diem was not always an easy man to keep popular. His consolidation of power in Vietnam had authoritarian overtones, and his off-the-cuff remarks were often blatantly undemocratic. The first task of the "Vietnam Lobby" was to package Diem as a commodity palatable to the American public. The packaging operation assumed grand scale proportions during Diem's triumphal official visit to the United States in 1957. Diem landed aboard President Eisenhower's personal plane, addressed a joint session of Congress, then took off for New York and breakfast with Cardinal Spellman. Mayor Wagner hailed him as the man "to whom freedom is the very breath of life itself." At a dinner jointly sponsored by the International Rescue Committee and the American Friends of Vietnam, Angier Biddle Duke presented Diem with the Adm. Richard E. Byrd Award for "inspired leadership in the cause of the free world."

Diem's American advisers took care that his speeches were liberally salted with democratic cliches. Many of Diem's speeches were written by Buttinger, others by Sol Sanders. Sanders, a Friends' director who was writing articles on southeast Asia for the New Leader, had been close to Diem when the Vietnamese leader was in exile in America during the early 1950's. They enjoyed a poignant reunion, recalling those more difficult times when both were low on funds and Diem would come into New York by train from the Maryknoll seminary in Ossining and have tea with Sanders in a Greenwich Village cafe. (Sanders, now an Asia correspondent for U.S. News & World Report, was one of Diem's few friends who remained loyal to the end—even when he fell from U.S. favor. To Sanders' credit, he resigned from the American Friends of Vietnam when the executive committee fired off a congratulatory telegram to the generals who had deposed and murdered Diem. The telegram arrived while Diem's body was still, literaly, warm.) But in 1957 Diem was the certified President of South Vietnam, and during 3 years in office had managed to crush rival religious sects and independent politicians and surround himself with a court of American advisers—Michigan State University professors, military advisers, AID, officials, Catholic Welfare aids.

Diem, however, had achieved little else in 3 years in office. But during his visit to America the "lobby" promoted the "miracle" myth. Everything that Diem did, or attempted, was described as a miracle. Articles appeared in magazines, from the Reporter to Look, hailing the "miracles" of political stability, land reform, refugee settlement, and economic development allegedly achieved by the Diem regime. But the "miracle" was actually only a miracle of public relations.

The "Vietnam Lobby" also perpetuated a second myth—that free elections for all Vietnam, which would include the Communists, and called for in the Geneva agreements, were simply a means of enslaving the free people of Vietnam. Since the Communist-backed Viet Minh would almost certainly win, because they had "duped" the populace, the United States was actually striking a blow for freedom by keeping the people of Vietnam from holding a national election. We were "saving" them from themselves, and at the same time teaching them the golden way of American democracy through Diem's "showcase" government. This type of rationale Kipling used to write poems about.

In many ways the most important of the myths promoted by the "Vietnam lobby" was the refugee myth. The dramatic story of 1 million refugees fleeing to the south from the Communist north supported the theory of the North Vietnam leaders as "devils" and Diem's regime as the sanctuary of freedom. Naive, well-meaning publicists like Dr. Tom Dooley projected this view with extraordinary success in the United States (Ramparts, January 1965). What Americans were not told was that the refugees were almost all Catholics, many of whom had fought with the French against the Communist Viet Minh, and who realized they could get better treatment under the Catholic Diem. These refugees were settled and well cared for through extensive American aid, becoming a privileged minority in South Vietnam. But Diem had to use repressive police measures to keep in line the remainder of the population (13 million) which did not share the Catholic's visceral hatred of communism, and in fact were sympathetic toward the Viet Minh. It took an equally dramatic event—the protest of self-immolation by a Bhuddist monk—to center attention on Diem's preferential treatment of the Catholic minority.

The "lobby" had a myth for almost every occasion. When things began to go badly for Diem in 1961, the Kennedy administration rationalized the radical increase in this Nation's military involvement in Vietnam by adhering to the myth that aggression by the Communists had wrecked Diem's progressive programs, and even forced him to adopt some totalitarian means—temporarily, because of the crisis, of course. So persuasive and pervasive were the myths postulated by the "Vietnam lobby" that few people were willing to believe that the source of the trouble might lie with Diem himself.

The crowd in Madison Square Garden was dressed like it was a coming-out party instead of a political rally. But the tweeds and sweptback coiffures were proper because the Young Americans for Freedom's big "Tshombe freedom rally" in October of 1962, was something of a coronation ceremony: the rightwing college group was presenting awards to its heroes. John Wayne got an award. So did John Dos Passos and STROM THURMOND. And so did Marvin Liebman.

Marvin Liebman is a 41-year-old ex-Communist turned publicist for rightwing causes—apparently a good publicist, judging from the way the YAF chose to honor him. Liebman provides an interesting link between the activities of the two great cold war pressure groups: the China lobby and the Vietnam lobby. A late-blooming member of the China lobby, Liebman quit the Communist Party in 1945, but it was not until 1957, while working with the International Rescue Committee, that his politics took a sharp curve to the right. Liebman, working for Harold Oram's public relations firm (his name appeared on Oram's stationery alongside that of Gilbert Jonas during the middle 1950's), was instrumental in setting up the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the U.N.

Liebman became a sort of rightwing establishment man. He was secretary of the Committee of One Million, an adviser to the Young Americans for Freedom, a collaborator with National Review Editor William F. Buckley, Jr., in setting up the Committee for Freedom of All People—which was outdone in its protest over Khrushchev's visit to the United States only by the National Review's black-bordered cover.

The China lobby, like the "Vietnam lobby," fused liberal and rightwing elements in the impassioned promotion of an anti-Communist leader (for Diem, read Chiang Kai-shek), whose prime and perhaps sole qualification for leadership was his anticommunism. Ross Y. Koen, in his book "The China Lobby in American Politics" (remarkably unavailable since shortly after its 1960 publication), names among the prime outlets for pro-Chiang propaganda, Life, the Reader's Digest—and the New Leader.

The New Leader's role in the China lobby became a cause celebre in 1963 when Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's Foreign Relations Committee released testimony stating that Chiang Kai-shek's New York publicity firm had paid the New Leader $3,000, in 1958, to publish a pro-Chiang article. There are two conflicting accounts. One was given to Senator FULBRIGHT's committee by Mr. Hamilton Wright, Jr., a principal in the publicity firm then working for Chiang.

"As I recall, they [New Leader editors] approached me and said, 'Look, you are representing the Republic of China. We have this wonderful article that has been written, and we are going to put this out as a special supplement. Now, it is going to go; you know our circulation is to the intellectual group and, gee, we just don't have enough money to get this into print all the way. We can certainly use a contribution:' "[1]

The other version is the New Leader's. It is even more interesting because it blames the whole thing on Marvin Liebman. S. M. Levitas, the New Leader's longtime editor and a bitter anti-Communist out of the East European Socialist tradition, died in 1961. The magazine's new editor, Myron Kolatch wrote FULBRIGHT and said that a check of the files revealed no such payoff. Kolatch said that the $3,000 came to the New Leader from the American-Asia Education Exchange in connection with an article "Communist China: Power and Prospects," by Dr. Richard L. Walker. The article was to appear in a special issue of the magazine and Levitas asked the Exchange to purchase 10,000 reprints for $3,000 to help finance the issue. Levitas was a member of the Exchange. The author, Dr. Walker, was on its Board of Directors and Marvin Liebman, whom the New York Times described as "a publicist connected with Nationalist Chinese causes," was the Secretary-Treasurer. The Exchange, in fact, operated out of Liebman's publicity office. Kolatch said that he subsequently learned that the Exchange got the $3,000 from Liebman who got it, in turn, from Chiang's publicity firm. The New Leader, Kolatch said, had not been aware that the funds originated in the Nationalist China camp.

The China-Lobby/"Vietnam Lobby" syndrome came full circle in the spring of 1964 when Liebman was revealed as the promoter of an advertisement in the Washington Star, signed by the parents of American soldiers killed in Vietnam, which called for an extension of the war.

The New Leader, in recent years, has lost much of the blind anti-communism which allowed it to accept too readily the positions of the China Lobby and the "Vietnam Lobby," according to author Paul Jacobs:

"The New Leader today is much different than it was under Levitas. For Levitas, the primary role of the magazine was fighting the Communists and very often he subordinated all else to it. Considering the bitter experience the non-Communist left had with the Communists, Levitas' position was understandable. But the tragedy was that it led not only to an obsession but to an inability to accept the fact that changes were taking place inside the Communist world. Today the New Leader does have a better understanding of the problems the world faces and an article is no longer measured only by how anti-Communist it may be."

But the New Leader school of anticommunism—shared in the fifties by the Reporter and other liberal publications and such groups as the International Rescue Committee and the Congress for Cultural Freedom—is important because it helped to shape the cold war as we live it today. When World War II ended, the State Department and the Pentagon had to formulate policies for a world where the Communists were now the enemy—but where splinter Socialist movements, both democratic and undemocratic, were emerging all over Europe and Asia. It was obvious that we couldn't be against everybody. Instrumental in helping decide where to draw the line was the circle of ex-radicals and disillusioned intellectuals, and social democrats such as Levitas, whose principal anticommunism dated from the creation of the Third International. Where a State Department career man might be insensitive to the crimes of the Third International against the intellectuals, old Bolsheviks and the Jews, a former East European Socialist like Levitas could speak with passion about who were the good guys and who were the bad guys—and which side the United States should support in the name of anticommunism.

The same liberals who backed Diem fought Senator Joseph McCarthy, but they fought McCarthy on his own battleground of anticommunism. This was the only ground acceptable in the hate climate of the 1950's and the anticommunism of the ex-radical turned "liberal" had paramount influence in the hard line of America's postwar politics.

The "Vietnam lobby" was the ultimate product of this school of liberal cold war anticommunism. Unlike the businessmen, missionaries, and military politicians that joined the China lobby for self-seeking reasons, the members of the "Vietnam lobby" were true believers. They were on a crusade for democracy. Looking at the world through anti-Red glasses, they convinced themselves that a Diem could be a Democrat. They had trouble convincing Eisenhower, so they pressured his administration into line. Then they set out to convince the country. They succeeded, and the myths that they created—that we were "asked" to step in by the Vietnamese people, that we are protecting "democracy" by blocking elections—remain long after Diem to haunt the State Department white paper, and President Johnson's speeches.

Senator FULBRIGHT, in a recent speech on ideology and foreign policy, cited a thought of William Makepeace Thackeray that applies with extraordinary precision to the "Vietnam lobby": "The wicked are wicked, no doubt," wrote Thackeray, "and they go astray and they fall, and they come by their deserts; but who can tell the mischief which the very virtuous do?"

FOUR VIEWS ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

1. A VIEW FROM PHNOM PENH

(By Robert Scheer)

The missionary spirit requires for its sustenance a stereotyped view of those who are to be saved and a horrific view of the devil who tempts them. Otherwise complex and individual personalities are reduced to so many "souls." So it is with great national powers bent on saving smaller ones from the forces that would bedevil them.

It is for this reason that we have been given the "domino theory" which is the basis of U.S. policy in southeast Asia. This theory quite simply reduces a hodgepodge of peoples, each possessing its own lengthy, confused and emotionally charged history and cultural patterns, into so many abstract names—neat black dominoes all ready to fall.

The thesis is a simple one. The devil is China, obsessed with a desire to conquer the free and independent nations of southeast Asia. The Chinese have created a pattern of successful subversion first in North Vietnam and now South Vietnam. If they are allowed to attain victory there it will create a momentum that will cause all of southeast Asia to fall.

In the United States or in Western circles abroad this seems a plausible thesis. But outside of that rarefied atmosphere it soon becomes obvious that the theory doesn't hold. The simple priorities and concerns of cold war are not those of Asian leaders or of the masses. And our pictures of Asian reality are quite frequently ludicrous. There are hates and fears and desires among these people that are quite removed from ours—and which we have not begun to understand.

For example, Sukarno's "Go-to-hell-with-your-aid" Indonesia, while moving closer to China's foreign policy, is at the same time determined to reduce the hold that Indonesia's 3 percent Chinese minority has on the country's economy. As in all southeast Asian countries, the Chinese are the power elite of Indonesian business and commerce. Sukarno, for all his militant pan-Asian sentiments, wants to keep the Chinese in line. One of Indonesia's fears about Malaysia is that the 42 percent of Malaysians who are Chinese will come eventually to control Indonesian commerce.

We have helped create such immense barriers to understanding our enemy that it is often impossible for even the well intentioned and dedicated observer to increase his understanding. We have come to accept the fact that Americans are not allowed to travel to the Communist countries of Asia but there is now a growing list of non-Communist countries that chose to deny us access. It is impossible for any American to obtain a visa to Burma. American newspaper reporters are now generally denied access to Cambodia and Indonesia. There is a whole world in Asia that affects us more and more decisively as we know less and less about it. This ignorance of this other world allows Americans to hold to the most fantastic notions concerning it. There is in fact no proposition that one can utter about the Communists of Asia, no matter how fantastic—i.e., for example, they use babies for fertilizer—that does not seem plausible. For there are no observers to challenge it; there is no traffic of ideas.

---

[1] Activities of Nondiplomatic Representatives of Foreign Principals in the United States, pt. 7, p. 725, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1963.

During February and March of this year Western observers were offered a rare opportunity to enter this other world. The Cambodian Government sponsored the first Conference of Indochinese People in the capital city of Phnom Penh, and some American reporters (at first I was alone, then we grew to five) were granted visas to visit Cambodia for the conference.

The conference included a wide spectrum of political, social, and ethnic groups. Delegates from North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front (Vietcong) had to contend with Vietnamese neutralists who were as haunted by the specter of communism as they were by American imperialism. Everyone listened politely as the dozens of ethnic groups explained their own very special problems, the religious sects going into the most detailed description of the harassment they have received over the centuries. The conference even broadened its concept of Indochina to include all those peoples found between India and China, and received President Sukarno of Indonesia for a 4-day visit. And on the last day a mass rally, presided over by the vice president of the National Liberation Front and Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia, seemed agreed that Ho Chi Minh, Charles de Gaulle, and Fidel Castro were the three great men of this era.

While all this was in progress, everyone, delegates and observers alike, were conscious of the distant and repetitive sound of American bombs falling on North Vietnam. (We couldn't really hear the sound of bombs but it seemed that way as one listened to the speeches and read the dispatches in the local press.) Some people showed hatred for the few of us among the correspondents who were American. The Vice President of the NLF banned us from his press conference, a rather fat French ex-colonial snarled over cocktails at me, "Vous êtes un assassin," and Sukarno, during his speeches, would pick out the American types in the audience to broil with fiery and derogatory phrases. Finally after some frigid conversation with Chinese newsmen and a few trips to their Embassy, I realized that we are each of us held responsible for America, regardless of our personal politics. It is difficult to exaggerate the gap between our worlds.

Sitting at the conference, often half bored and noncomprehending amidst robed Buddhists, dark Austriennes, northern Catholics, Chams, Islamic Khmers, Caodaiste Vietnamese, Neutralist Laotians and Royalist Cambodians, it seems that there has never been an arrogance quite as great as that of us Americans. We not only presume to control events in this part of the world but must also impose a political ideology—a concept of freedom no less—on its people. It is cruel enough to push people around for their gold and ivory but it is perverse and emasculating to dictate their history and believe that it is done in their interest. The best description of it is still provided by Graham Greene's "Quiet American" in Vietnam who is busily making plastic bicycle-pump bombs to help the Cao Dai generals vanquish the Hoa Hao chieftains so that democracy will reign supreme.

During a lull in the Conference I went to Angkor, the site of the high point of the magnificent Khmer civilization some 10,000 years ago. There I met an American foreign Service officer up from our Embassy in Saigon. He was a genial and interesting fellow and as we wandered through the ruins of Angkor for several hours, inspecting the intricate architecture and sensitive sculpture, he calmly explained to me that we might soon have to bomb Hanoi as part of our effort not to escalate the war. He wanted to be sure to "take in" the ruins before the war spread to Cambodia. He explained to me just how the Chinese Communists would sweep down through Cambodia the minute the United States withdrew from South Vietnam. If not the Chinese, then the Vietcong would take it over within 3 months. It was necessary to protect the Cambodians from this fate, despite their feelings to the contrary, because they were a simple people who did not understand the nature of modern communism. He particularly understood this menace because he had read a book on communism by a man named Brezhinsky, which he strongly recommended to me. His favorite line that it would be "irresponsible" of us to abandon these people to their naivete. At first I thought he was putting me on—saying all this in the midst of the ruins of an empire that had to be moved every few centuries because of successive invasions of neighboring peoples and about the modern Cambodians who are perhaps the most sensitive observers of the intricacies of Asian politics. But after hours of this conversation, spun out in the dullest and most sincere fashion, I began to understand with horror that those Jules Feiffer cartoons do make up our most accurate history.

After this encounter I returned to Phnom Penh with great symapthy for the position of Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia, who is potentially the most tragic figure here. For it is he who is caught in the midst of this nightmare and not the leaders of the Vietcong. After 20 years of fighting, the Vietcong no longer have illusions about the nature of the enemy. They seem to almost accept the conditions of war as the only coherent view of life. There is probably no other way to survive when one has spent his infancy, adolescence and now his adulthood fighting for what he believed all along was his birthright. These are the "just men"—noble, proud, defiant, idealistic, spiteful, and extremely petty and jealous of their prerogatives. One cannot help but hope they win; few have so earned their chance at history. But one can hardly expect that such a victory will produce a lovely or generous society. The soil has been too hard too long.

But the Cambodians have escaped all this and they do have another vision of life. Their fortune is due not only to the suffering of the Viet Minh and Vietcong but also to the skill and diligence of their leader Prince Sihanouk. It was the Viet Minh victory over the French that forced the dissolution of the French hold on Indochina and gave Cambodia its independence, and it is Prince Sihanouk who has kept that independence from being mangled by America's obsessions during the cold war.

If one is to understand the current international position of Cambodia he must first realize the enormity of the United States failure there during the past 10 years. Back in the winter of 1955 and 1954, when the first phase of the Indochina war was drawing to a close, the Cambodian Government of Prince Sihanouk was solidly allied on the side of the "free world" and Cambodian troops had fought under French command against the Viet Minh. During the Geneva ocnference the Viet Minh wanted the rebels who had fought against Sihanouk to represent Cambodia.

The United States helped the Cambodians to gain independence but it did so because of the requirements of cold war politics. As the Prince recalls his conversation with John Foster Dulles in 1953, the latter said, "I promise you to force the French to give you independence in order for us together to vanquish the Viet Minh, that is to say, communism." Dulles insisted that the French Army remain or "you will be instantly devoured by the Communists." But at that point Cambodian nationalism required French withdrawal. It has been 10 years now and Cambodia still has not been devoured. This U.S. obsession with Communist expansion and cold war politics troubled the Cambodians even then, but it was only during the next 10 years that they realized how totally divorced the U.S. perspective was from Asian reality.

In the simplest sense it went contrary to the known facts. As the Prince has written: "At the Geneva Conference we were opposed to the Communist powers because they, with the Viet Minh, wanted to divide our country * * * since the Geneva conference all of the Communist countries, including the Democratic Republic of Vietnam have respected our sovereignty and our frontiers. The allies of the 'free world' on the contrary, have attacked and menaced our independence and territorial integrity." This last is a reference to the border incursions of the Thai and Vietnamese Armies which the United States has built up to several hundred thousand strong—as compared with 29,000 Cambodian troops. Both of these countries have traditionally represented a much greater threat to Cambodia than China. Units of the Vietnamese Army, accompanied by American advisers, have frequently crossed over into Cambodia and fought on Cambodian soil in their pursuit of the Vietcong. United States planes have 'accidentally' sprayed Cambodian fields with insecticides as they sought to deny food and shelter to the Communists. It is this sort of blundering incomprehension on the part of the United States that alarms the Cambodians. But most frightening of all is the U.S. view of China.

In one of his writings the Prince recalls another conversation with Dulles in which the latter expounded on the "unpopularity" of the Chinese regime and his expectancy that the Chinese people would soon rise up against Mao. In recounting this anecdote the Prince added:

"The aids of the American Minister agreed with respect and conviction. My friend, Ambassador Nong Kimny, looked at them with visible bewilderment. I was able, however, to manage a polite smile."

The Cambodians know the Chinese as well as do any outsiders for there has been a good deal of contact in recent years. But their concerns are not ours and their comprehension of modern China is vastly different.

In an important statement in 1963, Prince Sihanouk systematically took apart the argument that the Chinese Communists have been an aggressive military power in Asia. He further presented the rather novel idea that the viability of Chinese Communist institutions be judged in terms of the needs and history of China.

"In order to realize that a comparison between the life of a Chinese peasant on his people's commune and that of a Khmer (Cambodian) peasant on his vast lands is nonsense, it is necessary to know that, prior to the institution of the new regime by Mao, the people of China were without any doubt the most miserable of the world."

"The Westerners have always had the weakness—or the vanity—to believe that 'their' democracy is the only means of answering the aspirations of the people. This is not a criticism, on the contrary, I sincerely admire the British or American democracy * * * in Great Britain or in the United States."

The Prince does have his own fears of communism. Cambodia is an underpopulated and lush country that neither needs nor wants the sort of militant commitment to rapid development and national order that has come to be associated with communism. It is amazingly enough, a rather happy kingdom, very effectively and undramatically modernizing itself. The Prince is aware of the currents running through Asia which have given the Communists great appeal as the champions of anti-imperialism—an appeal which extends to Cambodia—but his view of Communist expansion is totally different than that of the State Department.

The U.S. Government bases its view of communism (its containment policy) on the case of Soviet Russia's expansion through Eastern Europe following World War II. This was accomplished either through direct military occupation or quite obvious infiltration and civil war. It was, above all, communism opposed to existing nationalist sentiments. Now whether the State Department wants to believe it or not, communism in Asia has been a very different phenomenon. The Chinese Communists have worked very effectively with existing Asian nationalist movements. That is why they now enjoy excellent relations with the most virulent and independent nationalists. The exception often thought of, Tibet, is seen, rightly or wrongly, by Chinese everywhere as an internal affair affecting one of the traditional provinces of China. As to the dispute with India it is by now clear that the Chinese were in at least as "correct" a position as the Indians. It is simply wrong to take the war in Vietnam as another instance of Chinese aggression. The Vietnamese Communists have been at it as long as the Chinese and actually managed to attain power (1945) before their Chinese counterparts.

Many nationalists in Asia, including those in Cambodia, are worried about Communist expansion, not through military power or subversion, but rather as an ideal that has greater attractiveness than the charisma or program of the individual national leaders. The irony is that this ideal has become infinitely more attractive as a result of a U.S. policy which has made of the Communists the central fighters against imperialism and for nationalism. There seems little doubt that Sukarno was brought to the conference in Cambodia to demonstrate that one could be a strong nationalist even if not a Communist. But it is this tendency that Prince Sihanouk fears. In his opening speech to the conference he stated it in the most candid terms:

"The American armaments have not restrained, much less driven back by 1 millimeter, the progress of communism from which the United States pretends to preserve the people of South Vietnam and Laos. On the contrary, the Americans have succeeded in attaining what the Socialist powers themselves would have difficulty in doing: to know how in a few years to cast most of the population of South Vietnam and Laos into the arms of communism, whereas the normal conditions of life of the inhabitants of the prosperous Cochinchine and the religious and monarchistic convictions of the Laotians were scarcely predisposed to Marxism."

It is out of this concern with communism as an ideal, made more attractive by the American "presence," that the Prince so desperately desires peace and the withdrawal of the Americans. But he knows that American cooperation is necessary to the establishment of peace. He also has a sufficient understanding of American irrationality not to permit himself that hysterical anti-Americanism so common in Asia. His concern is that the United States will cause an extension of the war that will spell the end of Cambodia and perhaps non-Communist nationalism in Asia as well.

In his address to the conference he stated that it was true that if America was foolish enough to attack China with her 700 million people she would prove indeed to be a paper tiger—for China. But for the small countries of Indochina, "l'impérialisme U.S. reste un tigre très réel."

Sihanouk planned this conference last fall with the hope of producing agreement among the participants on a solution to the war that would ultimately be acceptable to the Americans. In his scheduled opening remarks he tried to introduce this "constructive spirit." He pointed out that the most important thing was to convince the unconvinced—the people of the West—"beginning with the people of the United States." He explained just how difficult this would be because the United States "profoundly wounded in her self-respect and her pride" was capable of pursuing the most dangerous course. To the Americans so concerned with "saving face" he offered the example of France. As a result of De Gaulle's policy of withdrawal from the colonies and subsequent support of their independence, the prestige and popularity of France in the underdeveloped world "has never been so great." De Gaulle himself was presented to the delegates as "the greatest Chief of State of the 'free' world and the only Western leader worthy of the name." The Prince asked for a reasonable style in the wording of resolutions, "calm and moderate without hatred nor passion."

His program for the peace involved a reconvening of the Geneva conference which would work out the means of foreign withdrawal and the reunification of Vietnam by popular and democratic consultation. The most controversial point was his suggestion "for authentic neutralization of South Vietnam at least until the time of popular consultation toward unification of the country."

Over the past years proposals very much like these have been offered by the national liberation front and the main obstacle was the refusal of the United States and England to permit a reconvening of the Geneva conference. But now there was a new difficulty: the NLF had changed its position and it, too, was opposed to any negotiations at this time.

It was clear from the beginning of the conference that Prince Sihanouk's proposals would not be adopted into the final resolutions. When the conference formally opened, Sihanouk merely made some welcoming remarks and contented himself with distributing among the delegates and the press, printed copies of his scheduled remarks, rather than delivering them orally. He said that he wanted his address distributed for history, so that the record would show that a peace proposal did exist. In another time it might have been accepted and ultimately will have to be if peace is to return to Indochina.

The NLF and the North Vietnamese delegations had become intransigent. They maintained throughout the conference that total U.S. withdrawal from South Vietnam was a prior condition for any negotiations. The Pathet Lao on the other hand, did accept the Prince's proposals for a reconvened Geneva conference on Laos.

But why the NFL obstinancy and change in position? The answer has to be the U.S. bombing of North Vietnam. Prior to the start of the bombing the NFL had continuously called for a new Geneva conference. Immediately following the bombing in January, their leaders in an interview in the French Communist paper, Humanité, withdrew the offer. In private conversations the North Vietnamese delegates and those from the NFL expressed the view that to go publicly on record at this time for a negotiated peace would be—to use a few old American expressions—"talking with a gun at your head" and "appeasement." The NLF states publicly now that it is quite willing to go on fighting for another 20 years if that is what is necessary to force the Americans out. Perhaps this is partly a bluff, although the Prince thinks otherwise. But what is certain is that neither the NLF nor the North Vietnamese will ever give in to the bombing. To do so would violate not only the essentially obstinate, idealistic, and perverse spirit of the Vietnamese themselves, but also the heart of Asian nationalism. American planes and their bombs and rockets are the symbols of "neocolonialism" just as the sun helmets and rifle were symbols of the older variety. No one in Asia doubts that the white man has superior firepower but to expect them to kow-tow to that superiority seriously misreads the times. It is the almost unanimous opinion among those knowledgeable about this part of the world that the Vietnamese and Chinese are quite prepared to have their countries leveled to the ground and to take up guerrilla fighting once again rather than give in to the American planes.

It is quite certain that before there can be any possibility of negotiations, the United States will have to desist from such raids for at least several months. But getting the NLF to a peace conference is going to be difficult under any circumstances. They can be expected to dig their heels in at the merest threat of negotiation because of their past experience with such techniques and the history of their movement.

The people in the NLF have been waging a long hard war for ten years now—despite American insistence to the contrary—with very little support from anyone. They had to fight this war largely because of (as they see it) the treachery of the Geneva conference of 1954 and of the subsequent role of the United States. It is important to recall that these people, including the "hard core" Communists among them, were left behind in the south to fend for themselves after the division of the country in 1954. They were told by their leaders in the north that the elections scheduled in the accords for 1956 would actually be held and that they should prepare for that day. The day never came since the United States had discovered in Diem a new hope for "democracy" and used its military and financial power to support him in blocking the elections.

The years that followed were very hard on these ex-resistance fighters who were left to the caprices of the Diem regime. They were rounded up, forced to give public confessions, imprisoned and tortured. In this period (1954–59) they received no support from the north which was preoccupied with its own problems and contented itself with periodic calls for the United States to live up to the Geneva agreement.

The second stage of fighting started in the south when these same cadres had had enough of Diem's repression, enough of hoping for a peaceful solution, and took up arms. By all indications this was done without the approval of the government in Hanoi. They have since fought almost entirely on their own, painstakingly securing arms and building up combat units with little more than moral support from Hanoi and Peiping. They are, therefore, not particularly eager to give all this up at the moment of their greatest military successes—with the Saigon regime tottering—simply because the North is now suffering bombardment and Cambodia fears an extension of the war. Neither are they terribly concerned with world peace for the world has not shown itself to be very concerned with theirs. They would, perhaps, under certain circumstances go to the conference table but they would be very skeptical and suspicious bargainers.

It would be nearly impossible (for as much psychological as political reasons) for them to deal directly with the United States. More importantly the United States would have to give strong indications prior to the holding of a conference that she accepted the fact that her role in Indochina was at an end. This is what the French did prior to the 1954 conference. At the moment it does not seem likely that the United States will accept any such arrangement, but one must then ask what is it that the United States wants?

A reading of the American press produces the confidence that there is a great Johnsonian design behind the apparent chaos of our policy in Vietnam. The deliberate sowing of confusion and the contradictory stances have come to be known as the President's manipulative stock in trade. One almost expects, as a matter of faith, that he will pull some grand compromise which will be accepted as a victory by all parties concerned. But traveling in southeast Asia one realizes how great a distance separates this world from the one President Johnson inhabits. The idea that southeast Asian politics may be treated as those of a convention of Democrats or of the U.S. Congress is perhaps the most dangerous of the cold war years.

The central problem is that the United States has come to rely on attaining a military position of strength as a prior condition for negotiations. This is particularly dangerous when one realizes that the military position of the South Vietnam-United States Army has never been weaker. Our own officials accept the fact that 80 percent of the countryside is in Vietcong hands, that the South Vietnam Army will not fight and that we may not be able to hold out much longer. The prospects for a position of military superiority have never been so dim. This in turn has produced a feeling of desperate frustration among our officials and advisers, many of whom have developed a personal obsession with a "win" policy.

A particularly committed group is the military which has placed so much of its prestige on victory here. They are convinced that this is the new type of war they must learn to win—a view held in isolation from the political history of Vietnam. Then too, Vietnam is the only war they have at the moment and that is why there are 17 American generals and innumerable colonels in Saigon. A mere major has no status at all. It is the place for quick promotions and the establishment of a combat record. An instance of this is offered by the experience of the Special Forces. Originally sent to Vietnam in 1961 as actual combat units, they were granted higher pay, more status and quicker promotion than other "advisers" in Vietnam. As a result many of the military careerists occupying desk jobs in Saigon infiltrated the Special Forces and it soon had no taste for fighting and enough influence to avoid it.

For various reasons this obsession of a relatively small group of Americans with victory in Vietnam grows. But given the refusal of the South Vietnamese Army to fight (many of the officers have already made their deal with the Vietcong), the U.S. reliance on a military posture must find another outlet. And thus we have the business of bombing which if it accomplishes nothing else does allow our personnel in Saigon to feel that they are doing something "dramatic."

We are then at a very dangerous impasse in Vietnam with neither side willing to make the first moves toward negotiations and with the United States moving toward an irreversible extension of the war.

In this impasse it would seem that the proposals offered by Prince Sihanouk offer the only hope of establishing peace. Time is running out for those who do care about world peace, of those using their influence toward the end of allowing countries like Cambodia, France, and the Soviet Union to take the initiative in Vietnam. If the United States would drop its insistence on a strong military posture, which is hopeless in any case, and support the idea of a Geneva conference, it would have a good chance of success. A reconvened conference would allow the Soviet Union, France, and Cambodia to work out a proposal that could enlist the support of China and England. To date the English have shown no independence at all from the American position but perhaps once they are pushed onto center stage they will act more responsibly.

In order for a solution to be acceptable to the NLF it must involve a complete end of the American presence in Vietnam. But some Western influence could be retained if the United States passes leadership of the Western position to the French. In return, the NLF would likely accept a period of continued division of the country, some appearances of neutralism and participation in a coalition government with some mechanism for elections. It must be expected that the NLF will very likely be the dominant force in South Vietnam. For it to be otherwise would require rewriting the history of the past 20 years. But it would be a serious mistake to think of the NLF as a mere pawn of the north which can ignore the power that various groups in the south, such as the Buddhists and students have amassed. And to cite Prince Sihanouk again, the longer the United States holds on the more likely it is that the government of the south will be a replica of the one in the north.

The main problem now is to convince American policymakers that they are not going to obtain a military position of strength, that if they continue using their airpower over the north it will make negotiations impossible and will ultimately involve them in a ground war in Asia that nobody wants. They must be convinced that the United States has had its day in southeast Asia, that the program didn't work and it is now time to retire gracefully. The alternative is to forget what it was that she was originally after and simply pursue an adventuristic policy of military victory. This would very much heighten the danger of communism in Asia rather than lessen it for it would squeeze out the non-Communist nationalists and force Asians to choose between the United States and Asian communism. There is no question but that they would choose the latter.

It is significant that Sukarno chose to come to the conference for he is one who knows something about the political winds of Asia. He came, he said, because "I believe that it may be one of the most significant events in the history of Asia." He said that he wanted to show the world that the nationalists of the "new emerging nations" were alined solidly alongside the NLF, the North Vietnamese and China in "our common resistance to American imperialism."

The French are much more at home in this part of the world than we are and they know that the time of Western leadership is over. As a result they have been invited back in as a guest and the impact of French culture and politics will continue to be important. This can be the role of the United States as well. But if she insists on playing out her hand to the end, out of a spirit of obstinancy or whatever nightmarish vision of China she might have, it will leave a legacy of hate in Asia that will make the English and French experience seem a love feast. As one old British colonial officer told me: "The timber's here, all that's needed is for you damn fools to go ahead and light it."

2. A VIEW FROM THE PRINCE—EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW WITH PRINCE NORODOM SIHANOUK BY RAMPARTS' ROBERT SCHEER

One of the reasons advanced by the Cambodian Royal Government for the rejection of United States aid is that the American foreign-aid program was designed to develop a capitalist economy. In what ways is a capitalist economy incompatible with Cambodia's plans for the future?

"Our decision to reject United States aid in all its forms must be placed in a general context: repeated aggressions by the South Vietnamese; permanent and insufferable hostility of the South Vietnamese and Thai people, U.S. allies, who give wide support to our own rebels, the so-called Free Khmers of Son Ngoc Thanh and Sam Sary; the fanatic campaign against Cambodia and her regime, of almost all of the American press that speaks of us as "ingrates, pocketing the United States' money while serving Red China," etc. In passing, I would call it to your attention that if Cambodia is not able to offer herself the luxury of a capitalistic economy (which would put her under the fist of several rich businessmen and foreign powers), she has not on the other hand adopted the Communist system. Private interests still control a large sector, notably in the realm of agriculture and small and medium industry. If they are able to prove their capacities in these areas, the state will not wish to assume any new control. In taking over control of the banks, of the import-export trade and insurance, the Government has assured itself of a revenue that the foreigner had in the past counted for his own profit."

What are the overall, long-term domestic objectives of the Royal Cambodian Government, and in what sense are these socialistic?

"Khmer socialism stems neither from Marxism nor from any other foreign doctrine. Inspired by the sentiments of solidarity, love, and compassion for the Buddha, it is linked to our national heritage. Our kings of Angkor have always practiced it. Also, we never deem it contradictory to call the movement of the young people of the kingdom, the Young Royal Socialists of Khmer.

"Our objectives are those of every nation that has the desire to rise from an underdeveloped state: to complete the modernization of our country's economic structure, to continue increasing our agricultural production (especially rice, corn, rubber), through a politique de l'eau (dams, canals, reservoirs, etc.) and to create new industries and products in order to satisfy, without recourse to unfavorable import arrangements, our essential national needs."

What is the Cambodian view of the U.S. role in South Vietnam and what solution does Cambodia offer toward ending this war? Would your Royal Highness please also comment on the American fear of losing face if it permitted a negotiated peace in South Vietnam?

"The answer to this very important question may be found in my speech at the opening of the conference of the Indo-Chinese people. There, I proposed the neutrality of South Vietnam, Cambodia, anad Laos, by means of complete and simultaneous disengagement of the East and the West in this region, with strict guarantees and feasible international control.

"I believe the negotiated solution to be always valuable. But the progressive escalation of the war (the American raids of terror on North Vietnam and the countermeasures that the Socialist world will inevitably take) might ruin attempts at compromise. An all-out conflict, that the United States will finally lose without even being able to save face, is what we are risking."

What is the reaction of your Royal Highness to the United States argument which holds that the nations of southeast Asia would fall like dominos to Communist rule, in the event of United States withdrawal from South Vietnam?

"It is certain that if the United States provoke a major confrontation in this region—which will inevitably end in their humiliating retreat—all the other Asian nations, one after another (beginning with the allies of the United States), will come to know, if not domination, at least a very strong Communist influence.

That is exactly what I have tried to avoid by interceding over the years for a true neutrality for Laos and South Vietnam, by suggesting that they form with Cambodia, which is already neutral, a "buffer zone" separating the East and West in this troubled region of southern Asia.

But, the United States, in Laos, has "played ball" with the extreme right and liquidated the neutralists. In perpetuating the war in South Vietnam, in supporting in

Saigon leaders who are universally unpopular, known as her "creatures," the United States has forced the majority of the common people and the majority of the elite of South Vietnam into the arms of the Communists. This is not the way to combat communism in this region, or in many others. This "anti-Communist" war, by reason of the imperialist character that it forcibly assumes in the eyes of the masses, on the contrary, favors communism."

Could Your Royal Highness comment on the level of understanding of the United States Government concerning developments in the People's Republic of China?

"It concerns a total incomprehension. The People's Republic of China replaces, in the imagination of the United States, the ogres, the wolves in sheeps clothing and other frightening phantoms. Your compatriots understand nothing of Asia. They are afraid of it! They mistrust it! They mistreat it! And they are astonished that they are not loved."

To what extent would United States military withdrawal from South Vietnam—and the effect this action would have on the South Vietnamese and Cambodian frontier issue—contribute to a friendly cooperation between the people of Cambodia and the United States?

"It is very certain that when the United States will have put an end, in one way or another, to the war they are waging in South Vietnam and in Laos, we will no longer have any reason to be hostile to her. For our hostility stems from the fact that the United States unconditionally supports the Vietnamese and Thais, not only against the Communists, but also against us, the Cambodians, who are neutralists and nationalists. The Vietnamese and Thais are our two traditional adversaries who have, over the course of centuries, torn apart the Khmer Realm and who would like nothing better than to wipe it off the map, joining their frontiers at the Mekong.

"The day when the planes supplied by the United States (and piloted by Americans) no longer bomb our territory, when the American tanks, accompanied by South Vietnamese troops, directed by American advisers, no longer penetrate our frontier villages carrying death—the day when America will have recalled her troops from our Indochina, then our relations will inevitably relax."

How would Your Royal Highness see future relations between the United States and a peaceful and disengaged Asia, once the American military presence has disappeared?

"A south Asia peaceful and nonalined, thanks to the joint understanding of East and West, cannot fail to maintain good relations among the eastern and western camps—also with the United States. America would no longer be, in our eyes, an imperialistic nation that seeks to impose her policy and her government upon us, but a great nation from whom we would no longer have anything to fear. Unfortunately, we are not there yet."

3. A VIEW FROM DJAKARTA

(By William Worthy)

"Among the Western countries * * * in the period of Kapitalismus im Aufsteig, they had great men such as Disraeli, Bismarck, and Gambetta. * * * Now in this age of the universal revolution of man they have nobody. * * * They do not have some 'conceptor' whose voice is worth listening to by all mankind. * * * In the past I called America 'the center of an idea.' Now I can no longer regard America as the center of an idea."—From a speech to the nation by President Sukarno, August 17, 1964 (the Indonesian "Fourth of July").

Arnold Toynbee has said that an affluent nation that has not known real suffering for decades, a well-armed nation that for 100 years has not known war on its own soil, is at a serious disadvantage in trying to understand and work with the driving forces in a revolutionary world.

One 2-hour speech of a Sukarno or one "report to the people" by a Sihanouk can provide everyday Americans with the kind of heart-and-soul insights the development of understanding requires. But few will listen, and as the world closes in on the smuggest nation on earth, we remain hopelessly ignorant, hopelessly deaf to the warning thunder, and hopelessly arrogant. Even the concept of revolution is not widely understood in our culture. Most of the handful of Americans capable of understanding fearfully look away from the revolutionary future.

Angrily and mistakenly, our editorial writers have begun hurling the "satellite" charge at nonbloc countries that are now opposing U.S. policies, not passively with nonalinement but vigorously with Sukarno's newly articulated concept of confrontation. However we choose to categorize such nations, it is unrealistic to expect them to accept our self-seeking assessments of American purposes and motivations. The suffering Asian is conditioned to reject the political wares of the affluent white bloc. With the Philippines now beginning to churn politically, and even Pakistan no longer in Washington's hip pocket, the market is shrinking for the status quo ideology by which most Americans live. "What have we not gone through?" asked President Sukarno of his 104 million countrymen last summer.

"The colonial court, colonial prisons, the poenale sanctie, lands of exile, the gallows? We have gone through that. Military Fascism? We have gone through that. Colonial aggression? We have gone through that. Imperialist intervention and subversion? We have gone through that. Counterrevolution? We have gone through that. And in opposing all those evils we have combined brain with brawn, tactics of struggle with the building of strength, legal action with illegal activities, guerrilla warfare with frontal warfare, diplomacy with confrontation. People with such experience behind them, a tempered nation like this, cannot easily be defeated."

"Ampera," the title of a new Indonesian intellectual journal, means "the message of the suffering of the people." Officials here freely admit that the economy is not in good shape. Inflation and budget priorities for the military in the Malaysia dispute have helped to intensify the prevailing misery. Pragmatically, the constant political necessity of tuning in on the message of popular suffering binds a Sukarno to a Mao, a Nkrumah to a Kim Il Sung, a Nasser to a Ho Chi Minh, a Sihanouk to the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam. Without exception, these chiefs of state have a dismaying array of domestic problems that demand their undivided attention. But the West fears that such concentration on the people's welfare would hasten the day of full decolonization. In a variety of ways, say the Asians, the United States and its NATO partners are keeping three continents in a state of turmoil. Now from more and more capitals comes the inevitable, unified response (e.g., as summed up editorially in the Indonesian Herald, Jan. 8, 1965). "The diplomacy of confrontation has to be transacted on all continents. Neocolonialism must be resisted and made to fail wherever it threatens national freedom."

Belatedly but clearly, we must try to see where the new emerging forces, singly and collectively, are headed. But to gain a sense of the political and economic direction in which they are traveling, it is first necessary to reject in toto the contrived propaganda notions that leaders out of favor in Washington are (1) sinister; (2) incompetent and chaotic administrators (Indonesia has been collapsing for 15 years, according to segments of the American press, yet people in India are currently dying on the streets of starvation in increasing numbers, but virtually none of this news appears in our press since New Delhi's abandonment of nonalinement); (3) unpopular with their fear-ridden peoples; and (4) about to be overthrown.

Having led his fragmented victims of colonialism through the 40 years of unremitting trials, 63-year-old Sukarno belies the calumnies of the Western press, as do many of his counterparts. They have left their mark on every aspect throughout the newly emerging world. These are men of extraordinary personality. To understand the complex countries they rule, we should demand of our newspapers, periodicals and book publishers a maximum of objective information about these men, their writings and speeches. We should ask the television networks for more personal documentaries, free of superfluous editorial dissertations. Looking back at the extraordinary propaganda barrage about Fidel Castro during the first 3 years of the Cuban revolution, I still wonder why the discerning minority of our reading public—those who remember the lies and contradictions of yesteryear—never arose in wrath at government and mass media when, one by one, the myths and fabrications were quietly withdrawn and discarded.

Kidney troubles did not affect Sukarno's judgment, as one American newspaper speculated in its initial shock at his United Nations walkout. His decision was not impulsive. The possibility never existed that Washington, London, and Moscow could muster enough pressure or sweet talk to induce this political veteran to reverse a decision he fully understood. He did not receive cues or instructions from Peiping.

Like Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia, "Bung Karno," as he is popularly known inside Indonesia, knows where he wants to go and has firm ideas on how to get there. Art connoisseur, student of history, multilingual, widely traveled, and well informed (he has read everything, his people tell me), he is clearly guided by a sense of the future so tragically lacking among rootless Americans. In 1930, when we advanced Americans thought of the starving Chinese within a patronizing missionary framework or in the nonpolitical terms of "The Good Earth," this 29-year-old East Javanese colonial was telling a Dutch colonial court in the now famous city of Bandung: "The present struggle for power in China has become the lifeblood of the rivalry between the dragons of imperialism. The present struggle for power in China has become the basis of the foreign policies of Japan, America, and Britain." A year earlier, the Dutch had thrown him into jail when he declared: "At the end of the world war which is coming, at the end of the Pacific war, at that time Indonesia will become independent." In March 1933, he persuaded the nationalist movement to reject Dutch offers to elect a few Indonesians to their Parliament. He wrote: "We must pursue a principled policy of noncooperation, rejecting in principle joining the Volksraad, the States General and the League of Nations."

Eight or nine days before the startling news of Indonesia's withdrawal from the United Nations, President Sukarno addressed a luncheon meeting of the American Men's Association in Djakarta. His noncontroversial tone seemed in keeping with a monthly get-together of well-fed Americans residing in a revolutionary capital and dining in the country's most expensive hotel. From the gay and light presidential banter I perceived no foreign policy trends, nor projected any notion of better relations with Washington.

"Among my closest friends are Americans," he told his American audience. "For example, Howard Jones. I love him immensely. Mary Lou. I love her imunensely. I hope Howard is not jealous about that. She is the only Ambassador's wife whom I kiss publicly, because I love her."

Less than a month earlier, a mile away from that luncheon site, student demonstrators had sacked and burned a U.S. Information Service library to protest the United States-Belgian airlift at Stanleyville. Simultaneously, the Indonesian people as a whole, leaders included, had expressed strong disapproval of the Congo intervention. On November 10, while President Modibo Keita of Mali was on a state visit to Djakarta, his host publicly attacked the United Nations and the role of the Secretary General in Malaysia's birth. "To hell with U Thant," he cried, repeating it a second time for the benefit of cue-conscious analysts.

Nevertheless, the American community took heart at the luncheon meeting just before Christmas. Even top-level Embassy personnel were reassured when Sukarno reiterated his admiration for Thomas Jefferson and Franklin Roosevelt. They chose to forget his direct thrusts at contemporary America in his important annual policy speech on August 17. Thus disarmed, they reacted with dismay on New Year's Day when the same charming head of state pulled his country out of the world organization. "And in that good speech at the luncheon he did not give even a hint of what was coming," a surprised and somewhat indignant American remarked to me later.

This sample of Yankee naiveté has been widely matched elsewhere during the protracted cold war period of declining U.S. prestige. Recently a New Yorker who, in the 1950's worked for USIS in Phnom-Penh reminisced in a letter to this writer: "In Ambassador Strom's day, Prince Sihanouk used to irritate hell out of the Ambassador, and keep everyone alternately hopping and guessing. * * * How they used to stew over whether or not Monseigneur would attend the Fourth of July reception—or whether he would dump this minister or that 'haut functionnaire' whom the top brass had been busy cultivating with scotch and flattery. To me it was a kind of never-never-land operation."

Despite great contrasts in size, history, and leadership style, Cambodia and Indonesia exemplify neutralist disillusionment with a once-admired nation. The small Buddhist kingdom and the sprawling island republic have become leaders in Asian efforts to arrest American policies in South Vietnam, the Congo, Cuba, and other colonial conflict areas. "As long as I live," said Prince Norodom Sihanouk on January 8, "I will fight for the disappearance of the despicable American imperialists from the Far East." President Sukarno is forcefully demanding the worldwide elimination of all foreign military bases and the withdrawal of all foreign troops. Last November, from the vantage point of North Vietnam, I was able to observe the new closeness between Hanoi and the hitherto nonalined capitals of Phnom-Penh and Djakarta. Together with China, North Korea, and conceivably Burma, they constitute the likely Asian nucleus for a revolutionary United Nations. In December, Chau Seng, a top aid to Prince Sihanouk, told me: "Cambodia, which tries to safeguard its strict neutrality, has leaned toward China only through the fault of the United States. * * * It is the same process which has pushed Cuba toward the Socialist camp."

Revolution, says Sukarno, rejects yesterday. A revolution is a do-it-yourself outfit. A revolution is not a very polite thing. A revolution is forced to recognize a dividing line between friend and foe.

"Yesterday" is easily defined: outside domination in many guises, outside exploitation, outside interference, deliberate stagnation. Thus measured, thus judged, have our postwar policies pointed toward yesterday's colonial enslavement or tomorrow's universal liberation? Three months before the Bay of Pigs invasion, almost 4 years before he Congo airlift, the Manchester Guardian (Jan. 12, 1961) reported the verdict: the worldwide consensus that the United States has become "the arch imperialist." At that time the list of countries cited as evidence was considerably shorter than today's list. But the main instrument for implementing the policies regarded as imperialistic or neocolonialist was then, and still is, the Central Intelligence Agency.

To Asians seeking their freedom and national sovereignty the name "CIA" has, for 18 years connoted oil, minerals, and blind reaction, political assassination, bribed journalists, corrupted rulers, covert arms drops and officially denied air attacks, piratical coastal forays, Uncle Tom diplomacy, coup d'etat, and fanatical anticommunism.

In "The Invisible Government" (pp. 144–145), the authors report that, during Sukarno's 1961 visit to Washington [President] "Kennedy commented to one of his aids: 'No wonder Sukarno doesn't like us very much. He has to sit down with people who tried to overthrow him.' "

For CIA plots against Sukarno the British base at nearby Singapore is made to order. Whether or not one agrees with the Indonesians that Malaysia is a neocolonialist project to protect British investments, Djakarta knows that Washington consorts with London in Kuala Lumpur in return for Whitehall's moral support in South Vietnam. Both Tory and Labor spokesmen have publicly acknowledged the back-scratching deal. From other military bases in the North Borneo area of the Malaysian Federation, the British have long been infiltrating arms, supplies, and agents across the jungle border into Indonesian Borneo. No knowledgeable Indonesian believes that the CIA has remained aloof.

These Western tactics have already backfired. D. N. Aidit, chairman of the powerful Indonesian Communist Party, knows this. "Everything is bad for the Americans," he told me joyfully. "There is no way out for the U.S. imperialists. They thought Malaysia as a member of the U.N. Security Council was a good thing for them. But, on the contrary, they got Malaysia and lost Indonesia." The discerning visitor to Asia can readily perceive the hollow ring "they got Malaysia" brings to Asian ears. But even the London press is speculating that, because of multiple forms of internal strife, the Federation of Malaysia will disintegrate and dissolve. The British miscalculated on their defunct Central African Federation and West Indies Federation. Wrote one Djakarta editorialist: "Such is the dynamics and durability of puppetry. In all but name the British still rule in Malaysia."

When Prince Sihanouk followed Sukarno on a state visit to the White House, President Kennedy's wry comment on the Indonesian head of state would have applied as well to the Cambodian leader. For over a decade, the Prince has also had to protect his government from would-be assassins, putschs, and well-financed harassments. In the last several months the new vigor of his attacks on the U.S. may indicate that his patience is running out, or that he is under domestic pressure to force a halt. On overt military attacks the count is high: over 300 border violations by our client states of South Vietnam and Thailand with the toll of dead, missing, and kidnapping running into dozens; 78 killed by chemicals sprayed from a plane last July; a U.S. Special Forces C–123 plane, with 8 Americans aboard, shot down by Cambodian forces last October 24. The wreckage I saw on display in Phnom Penh had been spat upon by angry Cambodians.

The Prince's closest personal brush with death came 6 years ago. Thanks to imperial rivalries over predominant influence in his country, he escaped. For years, the French and British have been unhappy when, ejected from one colonial situation after another, they observe soon afterward a de facto American replacement. It was from them that he received a tip about an American plot hatched and broached at the September 1958 Bangkok meeting of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO). SEATO, wrote Walter Lippmann, on September 14, 1954, is "the first formal instrument in modern times which is designed to license international intervention in internal affairs." In that period of the fifties, John Foster Dulles had branded the concept of neutrality "dangerous and immoral." Despite personal pleas by the Secretary of State and his CIA brother, Allen Dulles, Sihanouk persisted in his dangerous immorality by declining to join SEATO.

"Never mind, SEATO will protect you just the same," U.S. Ambassador McClintock told the Prince. Sihanouk was firm: "But we reject SEATO 'protection.' We have never asked for it. We don't want it. We want absolutely nothing to do with SEATO or any other military pacts." The American chargé d'affaires bluntly warned: "If Cambodia goes back on her desire to participate in the war against communism, it can provoke Congress into refusing to Cambodia not only military aid but economic aid as well."

But nothing worked. Although anti-Communist in domestic policy, Sihanouk began working with leftwing elements in the interests of internal unity. Externally, to defend his neutrality, he journeyed to Moscow and Eastern Europe to open diplomatic relations with the Soviet bloc. In 1958 he recognized China. Commented the British weekly Peace News: "Only a foolish man would attempt a dangerous street crossing with eyes to the right or to the left alone, and Norodom Sihanouk is no fool."

Unlike Washington, two of the old colonial powers in Asia have learned to move with the times. The French and the Dutch have abandoned dark schemes hatched in secret. They maintain good relations with former colonies. As America's reputation in Asia has sunk to lower and lower levels, the prestige of President de Gaulle among anticolonial forces has risen. He masterfully negotiated an end to the fighting in Algeria and accepted decolonization. "Why," ask Asians, "did not a man of John F. Kennedy's intellect display the same realism toward Cuba, Vietnam, and China?"

For years Walter Lippmann has written of "our moral and intellectual unpreparedness for the reality of things." He was keenly disappointed that the new and vigorous Chief Executive did not start to reeducate the American people during the momentum of his 100-day honeymoon. In mid-1961 on a television broadcast, he observed that Kennedy had missed an historic opportunity to build an indispensable popular base for a new and realistic foreign policy. Lippmann understood that, in the final analysis, all efforts to find solutions to international problems become domestic problems. In every government, for every proffered solution, someone has to account to a domestic public. The greatest irony is that the China and Cuba boycott policies have served neither national interest nor the wider needs of the world community. These two emotional binges have been a pandering to the lowest common denominator of popular American ignorance. From the start, policies on Vietnam have been made without any pretense of consulting the people and presenting them with all the facts.

Powerful though the Presidency is, Kennedy was still only one man. His failure to puncture the myths and to set the country right-side up does not absolve other elements of the society, including the press, of the same overdue obligation. From half way around the world I perceive little at home to cheer, much to cause despair. Throughout the entire postwar era, when a frightened and misguided nation was slipping ever deeper into foredoomed support of Diems, wild political exiles, former Nazi generals and a politics of violence, the press at almost any moment could have forced a healthy national debate. By abdicating, by ignoring its historic duty, by becoming an uncritical instrument of a colonialist international line, the U.S. communications media have made themselves suspect among a billion revolutionary people.

Perhaps the most serious indictment of daily press performance can be made of its fuzzy criteria for newsworthiness. Both consciously and unconsciously, certain vital stories are killed because communism is in some way involved. On news desks, deep visceral political reactions of ethically weak and emotionally insecure individuals can be decisive; one does not have to postulate a conspiracy theory.

When I conversed with President Sukarno at Bogor Palace, he referred to the lasting damage that the American press has often done to the cause of United States-Indonesia understanding. In a long article last May for Le Monde Diplomatique in Paris, he spelled out his strong feelings:

"The forces against which we struggled had still another weapon in their armory: propaganda, a weapon they turn against us without ceasing and without the least regard for the truth.

"Let there be a molehill, they will make a mountain of it. Let there be a mote in our eye, it is a beam to them—a beam put there 'accidentally on purpose.' If there is a mere difference of opinion among us, they cry havoc. If there is drought or flood and a bad harvest, they cry economic corruption and mismanagement. If there is an attempted coup, they have the whole country rising against a dictatorial government. If our youth demonstrates against some blatant act of neocolonial domination, they have Dutch heads rolling in the gutters, or British women and children in peril of their lives. And always, at all times, on all occasions and at every opportunity, they chant: communism, communism, communism—all is communism.

"Thus cloaked by the anti-Communist cry and a furious smokescreen of abuse and misrepresentation and outright lies, the forces of the old order in the world fight tooth and claw to maintain their vested privileges and to protect the interests they claim as theirs as though by divine right. And in this way, the difficulties natural to our situation have been willfully compounded by reaction many times over."

Asia, of course, has been victimized by the morally corrupt writers and propagandists. But equal damage to East-West understanding results when, for example, an American reporter makes no effort to remain detached and to weed out his strong personal antipathies. In February, U.S. Ambassador Jones asked Dr. Ruslan Abdulgani, the Indonesian Cabinet Minister who coordinates information programs, to grant an interview to Robert Kleiman, visiting correspondent of the New York Times. To accommodate the reporter's schedule, Dr. Abdulgani received him at his home on the evening of February 9. Later, following Kleiman's hasty departure from the country—so far as I have been able to ascertain, he was not deported—the minister's account of an extraordinary half hour appeared in the Indonesian press:

"Minister Abdulgani, who received the sting of an 'Ugly American,' related that Kleiman had described Indonesia's opinion as 'nonsense' when the minister contended that Malaysia was created as a neocolonial base encircling this country. * * * Kleiman accused Indonesia of being ungrateful when Minister Abdulgani outlined to him Indonesia's reasons for pulling out from the U.N. Kleiman also said that Indonesia was ungrateful toward the United States which had helped this country in winning its independence. * * * He said Indonesia was also ungrateful to America for its efforts in winning back West Irian (New Guinea). * * * It was Robert Kennedy who returned West Irian to Indonesia's lap, Kleiman was reported by Minister Abdulgani as saying, despite the minister's contention that West Irian was won by Indonesia herself. * * * Kleiman later told Minister Abdulgani that Indonesia would come kneeling to America to help it out from Communist China's grip. Minister Abdulgani cut short the interview and asked Kleiman to leave this house." Antara news agency later reported that President Sukarno fully backed Dr. Abdulgani's action.

Shortly before being transferred from Washington to another post, Indonesia's Ambassador to the United States, Zairin Zain, told the Baltimore Sun, in late January, that "the costly 15-year U.S. aid program to Indonesia probably did more harm than good." The Ambassador made charges often levied elsewhere in Asia.

"During Indonesia's fledgling years foreign powers almost forced the Djakarta government to accept development loans which today are causing severe repayment problems. All too often, these loans were used to finance big prestige projects in population centers which disrupted rather than improved the nation's overall economy.

"Development grants were humiliating because they were given in a way that made recipients feel like beggars who should be profuse and specific in their thanks.

"Under the food-for-peace program surplus American crops have been sold to Indonesia for soft local currency. While this might have saved Indonesia the strain of payments in hard currencies, the rupiah payments for American foodstuffs disrupted the internal monetary structure and caused inflation. This in turn promoted smuggling. The people of Indonesia live on 3,000 islands. Smuggling has been a particular problem in the islands around Singapore.

"Many aid officials who went to Indonesia have shown no appreciation for the country's history, no knowledge of its social structure, no sensitivity for its values and feelings."

Early in February, the Japanese journal, Nihon Keizai Shimbun, reported that the United States has lost much of its enthusiasm for giving aid in competition with the Soviet Union in light of the prevailing détente. The Indonesian Herald cited the Japanese analysis as evidence that politics, not humanitarianism, has been the driving force behind the aid program.

Like other leaders of the new emerging forces, President Sukarno appears to be uneasy over India's move from Nehru's early neutrality policy into a position of "neo-alinement in the American camp." Last April, some of the Asian-African foreign ministers met in Bandung to prepare for the Second Conference of Heads of State, now scheduled to open on June 29 in Algiers. Sukarno addressed the ministers. Without calling India by name, he referred to the deteriorating economic situation she finds herself in despite "special" attention she is receiving from a host of Western aid specialists, leading banks and international institutions:

"I heard just now from the Geneva Conference on Trade and Development. It seems that there is a certain subcontinent which of recent years has received an inflow of capital and aid to the sum of $23 billion. Flowing out of the same area in the same period, $13.4 billion went in interest, profits and dividends. And the deterioration in the terms of trade accounted for a loss of some $10.1 billion more.

"What sums are these—and what a balance. Twenty-three billion dollars flowing in; $13.4 billion, plus $10.1 billion flowing out. Five hundred million dollars more flowed out than ever flowed in. Five hundred million more flowed out of that region.

"What is this? The investment of capital that leads to the growth of the underdeveloped? The granting of aid to start off the process of self-propelling growth? I think not, sisters and brothers. What is it but a fresh pattern of domination and exploitation?"

After leading the fifth largest nation out of the United Nations, Sukarno promptly sent Foreign Minister Subandrio to Peiping, first to coordinate the Chinese and Indonesian revolutions of 750 million persons, and then to tie in more effectively with the world revolution, including the Negro revolution in the United States. Before 1965 ends, the world will see flesh and bones on the long-discussed concept of A–A and AAA (Asia, Africa, and Latin America) solidarity.

Soon after the June A–A conference in Algiers, Sukarno almost certainly will convene a Conference of the New Emerging Forces (CONEFO). Early in February he publicly suggested the site here in Djakarta. The distinction between the two gatherings will be clear. Based on geography, the June meeting will bring together countries as widely disparate as Haile Selassie's feudalistic, pro-American monarchy and the People's Republic of China. Except on the clearest issues, such as South Africa, the degree of possible cooperation is considerably circumscribed.

Political and ideological lines will become much easier to draw in CONEFO, which is a longtime Sukarno dream. Since the United States and Britain will never permit a retooling of the U.N. in accord with A–A demands, CONEFO will logically lead to the establishment of a revolutionary rival. I believe the West, already alarmed by just the suggestion, will be surprised at the number of prospective members. The concept encompasses revolutionary governments, underground and exile revolutionary movements, and what Sukarno calls "progressive forces in the capitalist countries."

Blaming the idea on China, attributing to it an antiwhite motivation, the New York Times saw in its realization "a nightmare alliance." But to peoples still living under the nightmare of colonialism and racism, CONEFO and its followup permanent organization will have enormous appeal. Where neocolonialism is deemed to hold sway—in Thailand, the Philippines, Laos, South Korea, Britain's new Federation of South Arabia, parts of Africa, virtually all of Latin America except Cuba—the new revolutionary body would play an agitational and financial role. By coordinating sources for arms, guerrilla training and other direct support, it could tip many scales for change in this decade.

Weak even in their own history, Americans are hardly expert at spotting historical turning points in the outer CONEFO world. In the early 1950's one such crossroads slipped by almost unnoticed. Fed up with her futile protests to Washington, the moderately Socialist and pro-Western Government of Burma under U Nu indignantly renounced

United States economic aid when the CIA stubbornly continued to finance disruptive activities by Koumintang military remnants in remote areas near the sensitive China border. U Nu, then Prime Minister, placed the dignity of Burmese sovereignty above the importance of dollar aid. His government has been succeeded by one far more radical, to which Dr. Subandrio, of Indonesia, paid a visit in January on his way to Peiping. Perhaps Burma will attend CONEFO as well as the Algiers session.

Sukarno's famous "Go to hell with your aid" remarks to U.S. Ambassador Jones closely followed Cambodia's renunciation of all aid. Once again, the CIA and the military were involved. The United States had decided to support the new and supposedly independent nation of Malaysia which, in fact, even some British Laborites conceded is run from London. A succession of other instances of aid renunciation will follow, marking the spreading conviction that the have-not nations will not collapse if United States aid, United States investment and Yankee tourists are cut off because of Washington's political displeasure. On crucial issues in the General Assembly, Adlai Stevenson will henceforth be scrounging for votes to replace some that heretofore have been automatic.

King Canute was objectively a fanatic. Our politicians today are also fanatics, standing athwart the revolutionary tide, projecting everywhere a cruel image of neocolonialist backlashers. At home, a backlasher professes to favor racial equality; his objection, he argues, is against the movement's pace or method, or both. From aircraft carriers in distant waters and from billion-dollar bases in other people's lands we claim to have retained our anticolonial and antimilitarist traditions. But we behave remarkably like the camouflaged bigots who aid a civil rights organization with a $5 contribution, try to slow down its progress, and then strike out violently if a Negro moves next door.

Whatever it is we think we are defending, from Seoul to Caracas via Leopoldville and Johannesburg, will have been decisively taken from us before this decade expires. A rash of political arrests during February in South Korea where the desire for reunification with the prosperous and reconstructed north is strong; anti-Yankee demonstrations and resumption of Huk activity in the Philippines; a large and violent anti-Malaysia "Tommy Go Home" demonstration on February 13 in Malaysia's capital—these are among the unmistakable auguries.

Conditioned to conditioning, victimized by an effective if hidden domestic propaganda apparatus, we give every sign of continuing along the same path that is already strewn with disaster. The cost in lives and treasure, the enmity of unborn generations will be wholly without recompense. For a brief while it will be possible to go on solemnly believing that grace and Deity are on the American side. But we'd be wiser to heed Sukarno's warning that "not even the gods in heaven can stop the flow of history."

4. A VIEW FROM WASHINGTON

(By Marcus Raskin)

Since World War II American policymakers have developed America's foreign relations role as that of world policeman. We assumed this role in Vietnam, a place where we did not begin to comprehend the complex crosscurrents of politics, nationalism, personality, tradition, history, and other people's interests. To support this policeman policy our military and CIA programs in southeast Asia grew to mammoth proportions without rhyme or reason. These programs often reflected little more than the power struggles of the agencies of American bureaucracy, rather than anything that went on in Asia. A report on Vietnam and southeast Asia prepared for four Senators at the request of President Kennedy in 1963 stated:

"It should also be noted, in all frankness, that our own bureaucratic tendencies to act in uniform and enlarging patterns have resulted in an expansion of the U.S. commitment in some places to an extent which would appear to bear only the remotest relationship to what is essential, or even desirable, in terms of U.S. interests."

The United States, by the military and covert way it operated in Vietnam in the past 10 years, has nurtured strong antiwhite and anti-Western feelings in southeast Asia. Whether we called it responsibility or empire, the facts were that the United States succeeded to the Japanese and French hegemony in Asia without really knowing why or with what purpose. Empires are very seldom built by design. They start almost accidentally: their dynamics and actions define what they are. Each empire has its own characteristics, although historically they all seem to involve defense of some allies, suppression of certain regimes in favor of others, and a powerful ideology. Ultimately, there are common characteristics in the lack of judgment on the part of leaders who no longer are able to distinguish between real and chimerical interests because of the empire's octopus-like tentacles. Those tentacles, especially if they include extensive military involvement, strangle the judgment of its leaders.

Relating to Vietnam militarily has camouflaged America's real interests and distorted the type of diplomacy and politics which should be employed there. The methods we have followed in Vietnam may not be without their costs in terms of our own Nation's stability and freedom of choice. Thus, when we ask the military to undertake projects which are inherently unmilitary, we are courting great danger. It is overdramatic to say that the United States will be faced with a French Organization de l'Armee Secrete (OAS) situation with our military if we substantially expand the war, and then attempt an accommodation, but such seeds are easily sown. For example, the official American policy in South Vietnam is to support a civilian government, but the rank-and-file military, including high-ranking American military officers on the scene, support the South Vietnamese military. Bad habits are learned in such wars and they may too easily be applied at home.

It is hard for American civilian leadership to learn that the military is not a machine which can be started and stopped by pressing a button. By definition of their mission, the military want to follow through to a military victory. We will find that each day American policymakers procrastinate on a political settlement, the war will escalate upward militarily on its own momentum. In this regard the military bureaucratic course of the war is quite instructive. The special forces and the Army were the military forces under President Kennedy who were given responsibility for the war. After the apparent failure of these forces to pacify the country, the Air Force lobbied for involvement. Using the Gulf of Tonkin as the pretext, the Air Force sent planes to South Vietnam as a deterrent. But deterrents are vulnerable and can be easily destroyed by guerrillas as these were at Bienhoa. Here the psychology of the paper tiger played its part. The Air Force's pride was wounded and it decided to prove itself through greater involvement. Once this occurred, the Marines and the Navy (but less so) lobbied successfully for an expanded role. Not to be outdone, the Army also wanted increased participation. This was also granted by the White House. Finally, the Strategic Air Command (SAC) in a nonnuclear way also wanted in. Paradoxically, the military may have wished for that involvement because they feared that the war would end—the politicians might negotiate military withdrawal before they had a chance to test themselves in battle. Because of such a massive military involvement in the war, in a political sense it became very hard to impress our opponents of peaceful intentions or to counter those groups in the American Government and the public who want a win in the military sense.

The Vietnamese operation as a military venture is not one in which very many can take particular pride. The bad habits of that war have included torture, napalming, defoliation, and inability to understand what means could yield suitable ends. Although governments are by their nature, notoriously uncritical of themselves, democracies, by their nature, have a better chance of holding their governments and the actions of individuals in government, to account (even though personal responsibility for actions is not a very fashionable virtue in government). Too often men in government are expected to operate by inverted meanings of responsibility and morality or to forget about them. This sort of responsibility and morality can be seen in Vietnam. Where, as in the case of Vietnam, three out of four Americans, until the middle of 1964, were not even aware that the United States was involved militarily, officials seem to have felt themselves free to allow sadistic and totalitarian methods in the name of fuzzy objectives. Such methods spread easily, and unthinkingly, in governments. It is best that they be exposed and terminated.

With the realization that neither the United States alone nor the Western powers together can dictate a result in southeast Asia, does there remain any role which these countries can play in that area? Most certainly it is not that of policeman or white man's burden for Asia. That lesson was learned, or should have been, 10 years ago. Perhaps the moderately clever learned it at the end of World War II. Nor is it likely that pacts such as SEATO, which do not comprise the great nations having real or geographical interests in southeast Asia—Japan, India, and Burma—can ever mean anything. If the great powers are to exercise a role, and if there is to be a long-term settlement, it will have to be in concert with other nations; that is, through the United Nations. Although the present line of the Chinese Communists and the North Vietnamese is to oppose U.N. involvement, because they fear that the Geneva and Laotian Agreements would be scrapped, any new settlement would necessarily be predicated on those agreements. The purpose of U.N. involvement would be to guarantee their terms.

While the U.N. machinery appears to the West to be unwieldly and in need of much improvement, the facts are that the U.N., in the southeast Asian area, has done more to stabilize that region than either the SEATO arrangement or the American military intervention. For example, the U.N. was instrumental in ending the 1961 Laotian crisis whereas SEATO was unable even to agree on what the crisis was. The probability is that America's allies in SEATO would be more likely to act under U.N. direction than under SEATO auspices in southeast Asia, since SEATO, as an international or regional institution, has absolutely no moral or political force behind it. Furthermore, the nations of southeast Asia are more favorably disposed to the U.N.—because of the voting power of the Afro-Asian and Latin American nations in the General Assembly—than they are to pact alliances which are comprised principally of white Western Powers. The prescription of action is not an easy one, for it will mean that we shall have to reconsider how the United States is to relate to the world, and to itself. No doubt, there are other courses that parallel the one I outline. The policy I have drawn is illustrative, as any policy must be, until it is put to the hard test of negotiation and practice.

1. Recently, more and more evidence has been reported in the United States about the torture and napalming of the Vietcong and peasants by the South Vietnamese Army, with either American participation or acquiescence. This brutality and torture can only revolt those who are concerned with politics rather than sadism. We cannot control the torture of the North Vietnamese. We are responsible for what we do and for what our agents do. In the spirit of shouldering our responsibility we must immediately put a stop to the bombings and torture now either allowed or sanctioned by the United States. That policy is shortsighted politically and foolish militarily. It has not resulted in any advantage to the United States. If a political settlement is the objective and elections are held, those South Vietnamese who supported the torture and napalming will be defeated. The South Vietnamese we support and prop up will change only when we change. When that happens, they may be able to retain some favor in their own country.

Although there is evidence which makes clear the historic roots of torture in Indochina as a method of politics, there is sufficent evidence to show how Western methods have updated the more "primitive" Vietnamese ways. At the very least, we should adopt and enforce the prisoners-of-war (POW) and Red Cross conventions as they apply to the Vietnam war. There is still another point to the sadism and torture. Bureaucracy and organization may involve itself in such things almost antiseptically. That is a dangerous trend in government and should be stopped. An independent investigation (along the lines of the Warren Commission) of the activities and directives of American personnel in the conduct of the war would do much to restore responsibility in statecraft. Such an investigation would help set standards by which the various agencies of the American Government operate internationally. (The new CIA Director could benefit greatly from this.)

2. Under the 1954 Geneva accords an election was to have been held in July 1956 in South and North Vietnam to determine the type of government it would have as a unified nation. A conference of the 14 powers, similar to the Laos negotiation but now with U.N. sponsorship, should be convened (provided for in article 4, Geneva accords of 1962) to negotiate a permanent cessation of all military activities. As evidence of its good intentions, prior to the convening of the conference, the United States should stop bombing North Vietnam. The United States, as a member of the 14 nations conference, should join with the other great powers in guaranteeing the borders of the area. The conference would draw the outlines for a confederated state of Vietnam which would come into existence after certain agreed-upon conditions were met. The International Control Commission (ICC) or another body agreed upon, would act as the investigator-enforcer. (It should be recalled that this method was adopted in the Palestine-Israeli situation and has worked well.) A political amnesty in both North and South Vietnam would be declared and all elements of the population, north and south, would be free to seek political representation by democratic means. This would be enforced by the ICC under U.N. sponsorship. North and South Vietnam would be admitted to the U.N. as separate states. Once confederation was achieved the Vietnamese would have single representation.

3. The ICC could be greatly strengthened if it received its authority from the U.N., and became a responsibility of the U.N. Its task would be to investigate complaints, act as a police force, conduct the initial elections in Vietnam, and make continuous reports to the U.N. about any border difficulties. Responsibility for serving on the ICC would rotate among U.N. members. Payment for this activity would come from the great powers to the U.N., earmarked for the ICC. Further, with U.S. support, the ICC would act to negotiate out differences between Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and North and South Vietnam that have mounted over the past 10 years.

4. The situation in Laos will continue to deteriorate unless the United States undertakes diplomatic means to stop the war in Vietnam. To insure Laotian stability, the United States should now lead an effort to give the ICC greater power and authority to act in the entire southeast Asian sector. The ICC should request, through U.N. good offices, troops from Burma, the Philippines, Nepal, New Zealand, Yugoslavia, and Algeria. They would police borders and serve as an inspection unit for arms control in the area. National responsibility for troop detachements would be on a rotational basis.

5. The United States, through the U.N., should offer aid to Laos, South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Cambodia, and Thailand in fashioning a common market between themselves, with a customs and payments union, emergency funds to finance special quick payoff projects (United States and U.N. files are bulging with such projects) and a long-term economic development project such as the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) for southeast Asia. Indeed, it could use the Special Fund as its primary instrument for some of these projects. The Mekong River project, which is a striking plan for land and water development, has united Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and South Vietnam in this development activity. It is even said by those involved in the project that the Pathet Lao support the Mekong Delta project and that the North Vietnamese would too, if it were extended into their area.

Correlatively, a planning bank, whose directors would be Cambodia, North Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, South Vietnam, the United States, France, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, could direct the expenditure and planning of short-term projects in South and North Vietnam, and the Mekong project in southeast Asia. The planning bank could be funded by these powers under authority of the U.N. using the Economic Commission for Asia in the Far East (ECAFE) as its "parent." The organizational structure of the planning bank would allow for inclusion of both donors and recipients as board directors. The People's Republic of China would be invited to join in one of these capacities.

6. The United States should now compensate for the bombings of Cambodian territory, the destruction of their villages, their total innocents, and their land.

The North Vietnamese are anxious for trade with the South. Except for food which they received from the Russians in 1955, the North Vietnamese would have continued the war in 1955 to obtain rice. They will do so in the future unless they are able to obtain rice from some source. The resumption of trade and the normalization of relations with North Vietnam is a small price to pay for stabilizing the situation in the Indochinese area. Like South Vietnam, North Vietnam has been under a crushing military and economic burden. Its leadership has been fighting for 25 years and is concerned that North Vietnam will lose everything in a war that could spread to their territory—and to keep control of their country from the Chinese and the Soviet Union. This can only be accomplished in the context of peace. In a widened military action the Chinese almost certainly would move a large military force into North Vietnam.

The North Vietnamese position as supported by the Chinese and the Russians has been reasonably consistent since the Geneva Conference of 1954. Their demands flow from the Geneva accords themselves. On February 4, 1955, they proposed restoring normal road, rail, sea, air, and postal relations between the two zones (as promulgated in the Geneva accords) and general elections. The problem with the Geneva accords was that no nation which felt any responsibility for stability in southeast Asia cared to guarantee the agreements of that Conference. France was in no position to carry out a guarantee for the whole of Vietnam as enunciated in the accords, especially in the face of American objections. If a Geneva Conference were held along the lines of the 1954 Conference with the difference being that the United States would join and guarantee the results, the probability is that Vietnam would maintain—or attain—an existence independent of Communist China.

Barring the inability of the United States to control its appetite for military involvement, there is a reason for some cautious optimism. There are two strong political currents in southeast Asia. One is nationalism and the other is fear of Chinese domination. The direction of North Vietnamese and future South Vietnamese leadership (assuming it is to have any sort of indigenous mass support) will be to achieve national political identity for their nations. This means that the local political and military leadership will work to lessen the influence of the great powers (United States, France, China, and the Soviet Union) in southeast Asia. They are aware that they cannot get very far by having outside troops prop up their regimes or by being wholly dependent upon outside forces politically, diplomatically, or economically.

No doubt this attitude will cause the great powers some consternation, since historically they have used the region of southeast Asia as a pawn in their game. However, that age of international politics is over. Will Communist China abide by that view? There is no question that U.S. relations with China will soon enter a new stage. To no little extent what the United States does will drastically affect Chinese activity. If the United States helps in fashioning the political concerns of southeast Asia on real issues—water, food, and electric power—we will be in a better position of blunting Chinese power because the southeast Asian nations will have a reason for being independent. If we make it possible for China to participate in such projects peacefully we will have accomplished much in recognizing the legitimate interests of 650 million people and will have discouraged both their unreal interests and ours. Settlement of the Vietnam war can be used as an opening wedge for improving relations with Communist China in this next period of international affairs. The risks of that policy for the United States are incomparably less than a holy war with China—which can only result either in a nuclear episode or a prolonged land war which the United States would probably lose on China's mainland.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have an article written by Edgar Snow and published in the May 22 issue of the New Republic, entitled "Is Peace Still Possible?" printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS PEACE STILL POSSIBLE?—THE UNITED STATES, CHINA, AND VIETNAM

(By Edgar Snow)

What would the United States accomplish by a major war in Asia—and why is it running that risk?

Since 1950 U.S. military intervention has prevented the people's republic from completing the unification of China by liberating the island province of Taiwan from the control of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. That is the basic fact which has rendered all fruitful discussion impossible between the United States and China. It is also a keystone in the strategy which has built up to war with North Vietnam. Fixed by military alliances with South Korea, Japan, Chiang Kai-shek, and Thailand, the American strategy has sought for a decade to close the armored perimeter around Communist China by securing a stable alliance in South Vietnam. If either Vietnam or Taiwan broke away completely from the American orbit it is thought that all the other positions would tumble after.

Yet the American protectorate in Taiwan rests on superior force almost as exclusively as does its claim to the right to bomb Vietnam. No mainland Chinese Government, whether Communist or not, could recognize the legality of the present situation. Nor can or does the United States itself deny that Taiwan is legally part of China, as it unquestionably was before Japan seized it as booty after the war of 1895.

Taiwan's return to China was guaranteed by the grand alliance of Russia, the United States and Britain at Teheran, in 1943. That decision was further confirmed at the Potsdam Conference. In 1945 the United States assisted the then mainland Chinese government to restore China's sovereignty on Taiwan. Even after Chiang Kai-shek's defeat, in 1949, President Truman declared that the United States would not intervene in China's civil war to protect the self-exiled Generalissimo.

Negotiations which would have led to Taiwan's more or less peaceful surrender was interrupted by the Korean war. After that, and before China intervened in North Korea, President Truman reversed himself by imposing a temporary protectorate over Taiwan as a wartime measure. The protectorate was later formalized when John Foster Dulles made a treaty of alliance which bound the United States to Chiang Kai-shek.

In effect, the United States unilaterally punished China for its role in the defense of North Korea by detaching Taiwan and China's offshore islands from the mainland. Ever since then the United States has asserted that Chiang Kai-shek's defeated regime—a one-party dictatorship—must alone be regarded by the world as the legal guardian of the 700 million Chinese answerable to the People's Republic—also a one-party dictatorship. It has blocked mainland China from representation in the United Nations. It has imposed an economic boycott (no longer effective with other powers) illegalized American citizens' contacts with Communist China, patrolled the Taiwan Straits with its warships and planes, and maintained continuous illegal air reconnaissance over the mainland.

Since 1956 the government of the People's Republic of China has held monthly conversations at Warsaw with the United States, on an ambassadorial level, in an attempt to recover Taiwan by peaceful negotiations. The People's Republic has steadily insisted upon a legal solution to the Taiwan question and the problem of U.S. recognition of the Chinese revolution as the stable national power of China. It has demanded that the United States recognize its sovereignty over Taiwan—as 50 nations have already done—and simultaneously agree in principle to cease using armed force to prevent China's national unification. Premier Chou En-lai told me that once these matters of principle were conceded, the timing and manner of U.S. armed withdrawal would be subject to negotiation.

The United States declines to make any such declarations. Its counter demand is that Peiping first renounce the use of force against Chiang Kai-shek before further discussions. Peiping has declined to make any such concessions; its view is that the United States has no more right to impose conditions over the conduct of China's internal affairs than China would have in the case of a civil war in the United States. In effect, Washington demands that Peiping renounce the use of armed force in civil war as illegal, while recognizing the legality of U.S. armed intervention in such a war. China cannot do that.

All China's leaders are united on Taiwan. Chairman Mao Tse-tung, Premier Chou En-lai, Foreign Minister Ch'en Yi have all told me personally that no compromise is possible. Peiping's policy on Taiwan is probably immutable, at least as long as armed intervention continues there. During my recent visit I directly asked leading officials if Taiwan was the only dispute preventing normalization of Sino-American relations. All agreed that it was. China did not regard disputes affecting neighboring countries as part of her direct or national territorial quarrel with the United States. Specifically, conflicting interests in Vietnam need not prevent restoration of Sino-American relations, "as between states."

Such is the simple legal solution. The early American hope of a triumphant return of Chiang Kai-shek to the mainland—thus justifying the United States position that he is the only National Government of China—has long since been abandoned. What practical reason then exists for continued rejection by the United States of normal contacts with China's 700 million? The answer must be that the "simple legal solution" would mean a Christian admission of past error and excessive zeal on a scale intolerable to the self-esteem of the United States and to its pretensions to armed hegemony in the Far East. In President Johnson's idiom it is his Christian duty to maintain freedom, and there is no doubt his good intention is to hasten the end of social revolution under leaders called Communists.

For much the same reason, President Johnson has now ordered the air invasion of North Vietnam.

In the Chinese revolution, nationalism and communism are twins, but they are not Siamese twins. They are not even identical twins. The same is true in Vietnam. John Foster Dulles, and American policymakers dominated by his ghost, have insisted on treating them as Siamese twins. This misconception has led the United States into unilateral military intervention in Taiwan, and now, step by step, into war with Vietnam and an approaching war with China. It has, moreover, brought the United States into positions of increasing weakness and instability, and into deep moral, legal, and political contradictions.

The U.S. good intentions in Vietnam are now clearly violating international treaties and laws, including the United Nations Charter, which it helped to write. It is obliged to rely on extralegal force—which it has so often charged against the Communists—to impose its good will on nations very remote from U.S. shores, and even more remote from them in human and historical conditions. Its invasion of North Vietnam lacks legal or allied support and has negligible organized support of enfranchised free men (if any) in Vietnam itself. To retreat is becoming impossible; to advance further may mean general war.

With the exception of Senator Wayne Morse and one or two of his colleagues, few American Congressmen care to discuss how the United States got a foothold in Saigon. No Senator even attempts to refute Morse when he periodically takes the floor to repeat his charges that the entire operation has been an illegal job of shoe-horning Americans into the colonial hegemony which France legally renounced in 1954.

At the Geneva Conference of 1954 France met with the Vietnamese, Britain, Russia, China, Canada, India, Poland and others to guarantee complete independence to Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam. It was specified that no foreign military personnel should be stationed in Vietnam except for a few French technicians, who were to be withdrawn after 1956. John Foster Dulles refused to sign the treaty but Under Secretary of State Bedell Smith pledged the United States not to obstruct fulfillment of its terms. That pledge has been consistently ignored.

As is well known, the end of the civil war left Vietnam divided at the 17th parallel. The division was intended to be temporary and the treaty specifically provided that regional governments of the two halves should rapidly restore communications. A national plebiscite was to unify Vietnam by 1956. Even before the treaty was concluded the United States offered support to a man pledged to destroy it—Ngo Dinh Diem.

After President Eisenhower offered aid to Diem there was a farcical U.S.-backed election. Diem ousted the legal head of the state, Bao Dai. With further U.S. support Diem set up a dictatorship which rejected unification and violated other treaty terms. The United States gave Diem large sums of money and arms and illegally sent in military experts. By 1956 a de facto protectorate existed. Diem initiated a large-scale manhunt to eliminate both his nationalist opposition and pro-Hanoi partisans or alleged partisans left in the countryside. Within 2 years Diem's control, which had been near complete before the repressions began, disappeared over more than half the hinterland.

In 1958, after repeated appeals to implement the Geneva Treaty provisions to restore communications and establish a national government had been ignored by Saigon, President Ho Chi Minh retaliated. He openly called for revolt by anti-Diem forces in the South. Widespread guerrilla warfare ensued. The United States steadily increased its military aid and personnel and Diem continued to lose ground. His assassination was at least welcomed by, if not directly ordered by, U.S. agencies in Saigon. The numerous military regimes which followed Diem all failed to make headway against the National Liberation Front.

Despite Saigon's armies exceeding 400,000 men, plus paid auxiliaries of nearly 200,000, aided by more than 30,000 American military personnel and large air and naval armadas, the political decision in the South was, by 1965, already virtually won by the insurgent forces. Ho Chi Minh's regular army in the North had never crossed the 17th parallel. Americans insisted that his moral aid and infiltration of armed personnel into the South were responsible for their failure. Secretary McNamara in April "guesstimated" the figure of "infiltrators" at 39,000, or about one-tenth as numerous as the Saigon forces armed and trained by the United States. On that ground, President Johnson ordered air raids on North Vietnam and brought in American combat units. He has threatened to use every means—not excluding nuclear tactical weapons, according to Secretary McNamara—to force Vietnam to terms.

THE ELUSIVE POLITICAL DECISION

As in its demands on China concerning Taiwan, U.S. objectives in Vietnam are equally insupportable for any independent nation. The Vietnamese are asked to renounce the use of force to overthrow a foreign-supported dictatorship, while recognizing American intervention and its use of armed force in Vietnam as legal. That is something no Vietnamese nationalist leader can do. But Ho Chi Minh is not only a nationalist, he is also a Communist. In the eyes of those who believe that any war against Communists is a holy war and provides its own morality which supersedes all legal technicalities, the United

States is not an aggressor but a liberator. But much of the world is bound to disagree.

Objectively, and quite apart from moral or legal considerations, it is my view that the United States is now unwittingly entering a trap best suited to the needs of the nationalist-Communist defenders of Vietnam's independence. The political decision which has eluded the United States in South Vietnam most certainly cannot be won by air attacks on North Vietnam. Nuclear weapons of course could extinguish North Vietnam but that would not mean a political decision, either. It would bring responses which would likely mean world holocaust.

If the air invasion is confined to conventional weapons the probable consequence will be a gradual alinement of all Vietnam and much of Asia against the United States. Vietnamese may soon cease to fight Vietnamese. Around them the dominoes of southeast Asia are already falling. Indonesia is lost and Cambodia is lost. Both nations now recognize the National Liberation Front as the legitimate government of South Vietnam. Burma has voluntarily guaranteed China not to provide any baser to U.S. forces. India and Pakistan oppose the U.S. invasion of North Vietnam. SEATO is moribund. De Gaulle has specifically excluded French aid to U.S. purposes in eastern Asia. Nor can any of the other NATO powers promise serious support for a wider war. Japan has also made known its desire to be included out.

As the area of devastation broadens, American armies numbering into the hundreds of thousands—and American armies without any significant allies—may be required to defend the thousands already there as potential hostages of the Vietnamese. China may gradually be drawn in, and then Russia. As U.S. positions of political weakness multiply around the earth it is not unlikely that Western volunteers may also be found to support Vietnamese independence on a scale perhaps larger than the defense of the Spanish Republic.

Until last February, when the U.S. Air Force began its current program of systematic destruction of North Vietnam, it seemed possible that President Johnson would choose a peaceful way out of his inherited problems. Before I left China last January I had talks with Chairman Mao Tse-tung, Premier Chou En-lai, and Foreign Minister Ch'en Yi. At that time all considered the possibility and even likelihood of events which have now transpired. All equally expressed the desire that there would be no enlargement of the war. On that assumption, Mao Tse-tung stated that a Geneva conference could be called and he included, among possible circumstances for such a conference, the continued presence of American forces in South Vietnam. I believe that Mao's view at that time coincided with the thinking of Ho Chi Minh. Foreign Minister Ch'en Yi indicated that China was then at least ready to discuss the neutralization of South Vietnam.

Contrary to impressions given by Washington spokesmen and the press in general, China is not running Vietnam. There are not, or at least until recently were not, any Chinese troops in Vietnam. But the opinion of the leaders of the United States that in fighting Vietnam they are fighting China obviously has both a political and an emotional basis.

The truth is that the American chase in Vietnam is part of a larger hunt for China which has obsessed American power for 15 years. It may be compared to the lifelong pursuit of Moby Dick by the brooding New England whale hunter, Ahab. In Herman Melville's classic 19th century allegory Ahab finds Moby Dick in his own element, the sea, and the giant whale had no intention of invading New England, Ahab's home. In his first attempt at a kill, Ahab loses a leg to Moby Dick. After that, it maddens Ahab to know that the whale is running free across the vast Pacific. He loves Moby Dick and he cannot rest until his lesson has been taught to that monstrous elemental power. In rational moments, Ahab sees his own reason and his frail sailing ship imperiled by his compulsive aim, but male animal pride and passion spin his fate. In the end Ahab kills the whale and thereby destroys himself.

THE COMPULSIVE PURSUIT

The American people as a whole has small interest in and a short memory for incidents in the far Pacific. But the collective Ahab who now defines American purposes in Asia perhaps thinks he lost a leg in China when the revolution succeeded there. His second encounter, in Korea, ended in bruised pride and stalemate. Since then the pursuit has been compulsive.

Melville's Ahab could by no means destroy the whale or change the nature of the whale by cutting up Moby Dick. His lifelong moral purpose thus had no valid reality. Is the American pursuit of China—through its tail-flukes in Korea, Taiwan, and Vietnam—just as senseless, as profound, as inevitable, and as fatal? Or is there some way to halt the hunt short of catastrophe to Ahab, or Moby Dick, or to both?

The allegory has its limitations. "Hastening the passing" of Communist China has been the announced purpose of U.S. policy ever since John Foster Dulles so defined it many years ago. The contest is not one sided, however. The Chinese response has been to extend its ideological struggle against American imperialism across all the seas and far into the flanks of American power in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

One may say that between the United States and China there is bifocal undeclared war of varying degrees of intensity. One struggle arises from China's national ambition to unify all Chinese territory under one sovereignty, a goal blocked by the U.S. unilateral armed protectorate over Taiwan and the Penghu Islands. That conflict has all along had a means of peaceful solution in accordance with traditional concepts of national sovereignty.

The ideological struggle between Chinese Communism and American capitalism—or "neo-imperialism," as the Chinese see it—is another matter. That has no solution foreseeable to anyone but the prophets. As long as Communist China does not attempt to impose its views by armed invasion in violation of another nation's independence, however, the twins of nationalism and communism should be considered as closely related but separate problems. This is a distinction which American policy has failed to make. Refusal to concede China's territorial sovereignty in Taiwan intensified and expanded the ideological war. Satisfaction of China's legitimate national demands for self-determination and unification could have resolved the Sino-American conflict on that level and modified the nationalistic passions invested in the ideological struggle.

Similarly, the U.S. contradiction with Vietnam is divisible into issues of nationalism or national sovereignty on the one hand, and differences over Vietnam's internal social revolutionary and world ideological sympathies on the other hand.

U.S. officials stress that the Vietnam issue is far wider than the country. If the rebels are allowed to exist—or even given recognition in negotiations—their example will be followed elsewhere. That is only partly true. Such means may succeed only where a ruling class and its foreign allies are as isolated from mass support as they are in Vietnam. What Americans seek to prove once and for all is that radical revolutions henceforth can be prevented from winning anywhere.

Vietnam is now a laboratory where the most advanced weapons are being tested against man. It is hoped that this research will produce a successful formula applicable wherever a social revolution takes to arms, whether in Asia, Africa, or Latin America. "All power," said Mao Tse-tung, "grows out of the barrel of a gun," but his corollary is, "Man is more important than the weapon." That is, under able revolutionary leadership the have-not majority, however initially weak in weapons, can eventually seize power from any counterrevolutionary minority strong in weapons but politically degenerate. That is not to say that the have-nots will win on the first try, or even the hundredth try, or that they will win everywhere in the same way. What Mao and Ho and their followers assert is that even if Vietnam is submerged the revolution will rise again, and not only in Vietnam or Santo Domingo. Each defeat is a step toward victory.

Communist leaders have prevailed over more than one-third of the world by learning how to exploit intolerable conditions. unless the conditions of the masses are changed in the potentially revolutionary countries, no world political decision can be won by superior arms alone. Among those nations with governments themselves founded on revolutionary victories—including the American Revolution—against rulers intolerable to the people, the bombing of North Vietnam amounts to acknowledgment of political defeat in South Vietnam. Each bombing nullifies more of the effects of years of costly prestige-building American preachments about respect for national freedom, sovereignty, self-determination, and international law.

Apart from such political gains for Mao Tse-tung, some other advantages accrue to him. At home, the new dimensions of the war provide a useful lesson to silence skeptics among younger generation Chinese who may have doubted Mao's thesis, "imperialism will never change." Mao probably did not expect so many American forces to help him, so soon, to prove his point. For Mao this kind of war is an improvement over the Taiwan stalemate, where it was not possible to involve the United States in a direct struggle for political hegemony on the continent. American military operations against Vietnam must also increase tension inside the U.S.S.R., where the leadership may soon have to choose whether to abandon all further claims to leadership of the world revolution, or return to effective alliance with China.

As the danger grows that the test lab may explode and spill its weapons across the earth in universal catastrophe, is it still possible to negotiate a solution to prevent escalation of the Vietnam war into general war? That would now require United States acceptance of the only international treaty which defines Vietnam's national status and sovereignty. It would require the United States to halt its air assaults and announce an unconditional readiness to attend a conference to enforce the Geneva Treaty of 1954, which guaranteed Vietnamese freedom from foreign military interference. In such a conference the several regional regimes exercising de facto political and administrative power in Vietnam would all have to participate.

AN ATTRACTIVE WAY OUT

President Johnson, however, may have closed that way out by prematurely committing himself not to deal with the Vietcong. Even to authorize the Saigon neutralists to do so now would badly damage his internal and world prestige.

The alternative, if the United States carries the war into Hanoi, the industrial heartland of the north, and the Chinese frontier areas, can mean a prolonged war of attrition, the ultimate limits of which no man could foresee. Once American ground forces in great numbers became locked in direct prestigious all-Vietnam battle with the regular Vietnamese armies, the visitors would find themselves in the same trap that held Japan's warlord armies ensnared in China after 1937. At enormous cost the

United States could win many battles and depopulate vast areas, but to make new deserts cannot bring peace.

Convinced that time, geography, human numbers, and justice are all on their side, the Vietnamese and their allies are probably prepared to see all their cities laid waste, and return to fight it out in the hills and jungles, if necessary, rather than yield a political decision or any form of legal recognition of American rights of armed intervention against the sovereign rights of an internal revolution.

President Johnson is obviously aware of the danger. His advisers tell him he can avoid it. And in truth the conscious aim of the consensus President is not to gobble up China or even to devour the dolphin at his tailflukes. When I was asked the question in China I said that President Johnson's true need in Vietnam was to find "an attractive way out" of war there, and I still believe that to be so. He has since tried to make it clear that he wants to help Vietnam, not hurt it. The bombing and burning of Vietnam and Vietnamese are full of good intentions. Has not the President declared his readiness to rebuild everything being destroyed (except human life) in a generous Christian way, by means of a billion dollars of help from the Great Society?

If southern-based Vietnamese or Chinese or Soviet bombers were destroying New England would a consensus President agree to accept the invaders' good will or take their yuan or rubles in exchange for recognition of their right to be there to bomb the United States? Is it correct to assess the national pride of Vietnam in far baser coin? It is a profound psychological error to suppose that the more a foreigner beats and flays any part of Vietnam the harder it must become for a consensus Vietnamese leader to unite all his people in a common cause of patriotism against the only visible foreign invader. The truth is just the opposite.

Ho Chi Minh won recognition as Vietnam's liberator throughout the whole nation when he led 8 years of struggle for independence from the French. Those who shared in his victory have now opposed the United States for a decade. Could they reasonably be expected to do less than defend their dearly won national independence at whatever cost? "The Vietnamese have shown they are prepared to die for their freedom," Chou En-lai declared. "When a man is ready to die he cannot be conquered by threatening him with death. Tell that to President Johnson."

But is it not freedom that President Johnson wishes to give them? In truth, he desires that rather than a big war. He merely wants legal recognition for the United States right to use armed force to impose freedom as he sees it. In these perilous circumstances, Ahab must somehow be prevented from taking full charge. This can only be done if world opinion speedily unites to insist that the noninvolved powers bring the belligerents to a Geneva conference to define their differing views on freedom.

In the midst of preparing for nuclear attack—which the Chinese have considered a growing possibility ever since they blew their bomb—it was reassuring in some indefinable way, to recognize an ancient sense of humanist philosophy in a few casual remarks of Communist leaders. After discussing matters touched upon in this report for an hour or more, Marshall Ch'en Yi said to me, "Whatever happens, it will only be an incident in the perspective of history and ultimately be forgotten. The American and the Chinese people will renew their friendship."

Mao Tse-tung predicted that a deep commitment of American troops in Vietnam would speed up the victory of social revolution there. Then he remarked that the world was changing very rapidly and no one could predict how future generations would judge men and events of today. Probably all of us, he said, even Marx and Lenin—and I doubt that he would exclude President Johnson—would appear rather ridiculous a thousand years from now.

About the Author

Edgar Snow lived and worked as a foreign correspondent in China for 12 years. Representing publications such as the Chicago Tribune, the Chicago Daily News, and the Saturday Evening Post—of which he was an assistant editor for 10 years—he knew Asia under colonialism and was long an eyewitness of war and revolution in China and other Asian countries. He returned to China in 1960 for 5 months (for Look magazine) and was back again in the winter of 1964–65 for 3 months.

Mr. Snow is the only American writer authorized by the U.S. State Department and the Chinese Government to visit China. He is also the only person who has interviewed Mao Tse-tung for publication since 1949. Of the present inquiry he says: "Some of the observations here are sharply at variance with views officially held at Washington. I believe the facts are correct but recognize that they will be unpalatable to Americans conditioned by their press to confuse rationalizations and justifications of policies with information."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe that one of the most courageous and able columnists writing in the press today is Richard Starnes of the Washington Daily News. For many months, he has been writing articles which obviously are the result of a considerable amount of research dealing with America's unjustifiable policy in Asia.

Last Monday, May 31, he wrote his latest article on American policy in Asia under the title "The Cruel Truth."

Mr. President, he points out that if the United States is to continue its present course of action in Asia, it will have to increase American troops in Asia by huge numbers.

This statement of an undeniable fact needs to be understood by the American people. If the United States is going to continue to make war in Asia, is going to continue to escalate that war, as is its obvious plan, that plan can now be changed in my judgment, only by the President of the United States. We shall have to send over to Asia in the months ahead not a few thousand more men but several hundred thousand more men. Eventually, as we get more and more bogged down in Asia, we shall have to send several million more men.

All we will do will be to win military engagements. We shall never win the peace.

Mr. President, I take a few moments to invite attention to the highlights of Mr. Starnes' article. When I finish, I shall ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the Record.

Mr. Starnes says:

> Limited bombing of North Vietnam has failed to change the course of the war, and its failure holds the promise of a grim future for a million American families.
>
> Putting aside the torrent of rubbish that has been produced on the subject by the Pentagon, the State Department, and by various journalistic Jezebels, here are the facts about what the people of the United States soon will have to face in prosecuting a war 10,000 miles from home:
>
> Vietcong guerrillas total about 145,000 according to the estimate universally accepted by experts.
>
> Arrayed against them are 50,000 U.S. troops and 550,000 South Vietnamese, the latter figure including village militiamen and other paramilitary forces of highly questionable fighting zeal.
>
> The rule of thumb for fighting and winning guerrilla war is that defending forces must hold a manpower ratio of at least 10 or 12 to 1 against the enemy. By this rule, our forces in South Vietnam must total at least 1.4 million before a favorable decision can be expected—even if there is no substantial intervention from North Vietnam or Communist China.

Mr. President, I repeat what he writes, that even if there is no substantial intervention from North Vietnam, or Communist China, we will need 1,400,000 American troops to give us any reasonable expectation of a military victory over the Vietcong.

Mr. President, a military victory over the Vietcong will not conquer them. A military victory would not make it possible for us to withdraw. We have bought for ourselves in Asia a perpetual war for many decades to come if we follow this unilateral military course of action in Asia, and we shall be bogged down there for a quarter to a half century; and then we shall be kicked out. In the long run the white man will be run out of Asia so far as being allowed to stay there and dominate any segment of Asia is concerned.

Mr. Starnes is warning the American people what this will mean in American manpower, as I have now for more than a year and a half from this desk on the floor of the Senate several times a week tried to warn this administration of its folly in Asia. I call the administration's attention tonight to these figures of Mr. Starnes, and I ask the President to answer them. The American people now are entitled to its answers from the President himself, for he has made it his war, he has come to accept now the blue print of the war that in the first instance was drawn by McNamara and Taylor; then Rusk joined in, and then the Bundys, and now the White House. The American people are entitled to hear from the President of the United States in regard to such vital statistics as Mr. Starnes sets forth in his column.

He goes on to say:

> Where will the 1.4 million men come from? As we have seen, presently under arms in South Vietnam (by an estimate so generous as to be wildly unrealistic) are 600,000 soldiers. A great many of these are, to use the military euphemism, undependable. But even giving them all the best of it, our manpower deficit in Vietnam today is not less than 800,000 men.

Mr. President, the Vietnamese soldiers are so undependable that the American military is now running the war. It no longer is a South Vietnamese war. It no longer is a war being fought by the South Vietnamese, so far as any effectiveness is concerned. It is being fought by American soldiers. It is being directed by the American military. We shall have to greatly increase the number of American soldiers in Vietnam to meet the imbalance that Mr. Starnes points out in this penetrating article. He goes on to say:

> Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, who not so long ago was announcing that the United States could start reducing its manpower commitment in Vietnam, has lately made a great hurrah about drafting 160,000 fresh troops for the Army of South Vietnam.
>
> Put aside, for the moment, the question of whether these peasant children will bring any fighting spirit with them when they reach the South Vietnamese boot camps. Even put aside the question of where the 8,000 officers and noncoms will be found to lead them (when South Vietnamese troops already under arms are disgracefully underofficered). Count the 160,000 (if that many can be caught and prevented from deserting) just as the 550,000 have been counted—as full-size, able-bodied fighting men.

I am glad that Mr. Starnes has made this passing reference to desertions, because the fact is that desertions from the South Vietnamese army are colossal. The last briefing that I heard on this particular point showed that, given a 90-day period and a given number of thousands of South Vietnamese soldiers, they expect from 20 to 35 percent desertions every 90 days.

It is very hard to reconcile that with the propaganda of the White House and the State Department and the Pentagon, that there is a tremendous will on the part of the South Vietnamese to fight this war.

The undeniable fact is that the desertions bear very directly upon the issue of the will to fight in South Vietnam. Furthermore, Mr. President, we all know how unstable the South Vietnamese Government is. It has been unstable ever since the United States set up its first puppet, Mr. Diem. The article which I inserted in the RECORD a few moments ago discusses the South Vietnamese lobby. It bears very directly, as I have brought out in so many speeches for so many months, on how Diem came to be selected as the U.S. puppet, sent to South Vietnam, taken from Washington and New York to South Vietnam, militarized and financed to do the bidding of the United States in a territory that never was set up as a separate governmental territory under the Geneva accords of 1954.

Mr. President, it will take a little more time for the American people to understand how our Government is trying to fool them. It has tried to pull the wool over their eyes and has tried to propagandize them in regard to the Geneva accords.

The Geneva accords did not even create two governments in South Vietnam. It only set up two zones, and provided for the election of officers for a united Vietnam in 1956. The Government of South Vietnam is a creature of the United States. To set up a government in South Vietnam is in violation of the very purpose of the Geneva accords themselves.

Many people do not like to face the fact that the United States can be guilty of great, horrendous international policy mistakes too.

When Mr. Starnes makes this passing reference to desertions in the South Vietnamese Army, he is really indirectly calling attention to one of the great problems that confront the successful prosecution of a war in South Vietnam. He goes on to say:

> The shortage of manpower is now reduced to 640,000—and it is a shortage that will have to be made up by American troops.
>
> But even this cruel truth is not the whole truth. The whole truth is much worse.
>
> It took 13 years and 430,000 troops (80,000 British and 350,000 Malay) to subdue Communist guerrillas in the Malay Peninsula.
>
> How many guerrillas?
>
> According to the "Handbook to Malaya and the Emergency" (Singapore: Public Relations Office, 1953) there were only 8,000. They were, moreover, effectively cut off from outside supply and reinforcement. Thus, even under optimum conditions, it required a hold-down ratio of better than 50 to 1 before the British could prevail.
>
> In Cyprus, Britain had 40,000 troops pitted against 400 guerrillas—and quit on the rebels' terms.
>
> This melancholy arithmetic explains why the bombing of North Vietnam has had no effect. The battle for South Vietnam will not be won until somebody puts up something on the order of 1 million first-line fighting men. In view of the nonfeasance of the U.S. allies in helping prosecute the war, it is plain that Americans are the ones who will have to fight—and die—in large numbers to maintain our precarious toehold on the mainland of Asia.
>
> Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow know these facts, perhaps better than Washington knows them. They plainly doubt that we will elect to make the sacrifice in young lives that is needed. That explains their restrained response to the bombing. Airplanes can neither take nor hold territory, and clearly the Communist world deems the United States unwilling to put on the counters that count—namely, men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article in continuity be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRUEL TRUTH

(By Richard Starnes)

Limited bombing of North Vietnam has failed to change the course of the war, and its failure holds the promise of a grim future for a million American families.

Putting aside the torrent of rubbish that has been produced on the subject by the Pentagon, the State Department and by various journalistic Jezebels, here are the facts about what the people of the United States soon will have to face in prosecuting a war 10,000 miles from home:

Vietcong guerrillas total about 145,000 according to the estimate universally accepted by experts.

Arrayed against them are 50,000 U.S. troops and 550,000 South Vietnamese, the latter figure including village militiamen and other paramilitary forces of highly questionable fighting zeal.

The rule of thumb for fighting and winning guerrilla war is that defending forces must hold a manpower ratio of at least 10 or 12 to 1 against the enemy. By this rule, our forces in South Vietnam must total as least 1.4 million before a favorable decision can be expected—even if there is no substantial intervention from North Vietnam or Communist China.

Where will the 1.4 million men come from?

As we have seen, presently under arms in South Vietnam (by an estimate so generous as to be wildly unrealistic) are 600,000 soldiers. A great many of these are, to use the military euphemism, undependable. But even giving them all the best of it, our manpower deficit in Vietnam today is not less than 800,000 men.

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, who not so long ago was announcing that the United States could start reducing its manpower commitment in Vietnam, has lately made a great hurrah about drafting 160,000 fresh troops for the Army of South Vietnam.

Put aside, for the moment, the question of whether these peasant children will bring any fighting spirit with them when they reach the South Vietnamese boot camps. Even put aside the question of where the 8,000 officers and noncoms will be found to lead them (when South Vietnamese troops already under arms are disgracefully underofficered). Count the 160,000 (if that many can be caught and prevented from deserting) just as the 550,000 have been counted—as full-size, able-bodied fighting men.

The shortage of manpower is now reduced to 640,000—and it is a shortage that will have to be made up by American troops.

But even this cruel truth is not the whole truth. The whole truth is much worse.

It took 13 years and 430,000 troops (80,000 British and 350,000 Malay) to subdue Communist guerrillas in the Malay Peninsula.

How many guerrillas?

According to the "Handbook to Malaya and the Emergency" (Singapore: Public Relations Office, 1953) there were only 8,000. They were, moreover, effectively cut off from outside supply and reinforcement. Thus, even under optimum conditions, it required a holddown ratio of better than 50 to 1 before the British could prevail.

In Cyprus, Britain had 40,000 troops pitted against 400 guerrillas—and quit on the rebels' terms.

This melancholy arithmetic explains why the bombing of North Vietnam has had no effect. The battle for South Vietnam will not be won until somebody puts up something on the order of 1 million firstline fighting men. In view of the nonfeasance of the United States allies in helping prosecute the war, it is plain that Americans are the ones who will have to fight—and die—in large numbers to maintain our precarious toehold on the mainland of Asia.

Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow know these facts, perhaps better than Washington knows them. They plainly doubt that we will elect to make the sacrifice in young lives that is needed. That explains their restrained response to the bombing. Airplanes can neither take nor hold territory, and clearly the Communist world deems the United States unwilling to put up the counters that count—namely, men.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what does that all mean? It means that we shall need the 1,400,000 men merely to fight the Vietcong. Remember, Ho Chi Minh has not yet moved with his divisions. Remember that China has not yet moved with its many millions. And I do not intend to whistle by a graveyard. I leave that to the President, to the Secretary of State, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Bundys and to Taylor. Mr. President, whistling by graveyards will never stop filling those graveyards. If we follow the course of this administration, we shall fill new graveyards with the bodies of American soldiers that we are sending to Asia in an illegal and unjustifiable war, and there will be hundreds of thousands of them in the years ahead.

I do not share the view expressed by some that North Vietnam and China will not eventually move. They have no choice. They are bound to move if we follow this unilateral course of action. That is why a few moments ago on the floor of the Senate, when the amendments to the United Nations Charter were up, I sadly but dutifully pointed out the malfeasance of the United States in its relationship to its obligations in respect to the United Nations Charter. I sadly point out now what I consider to be the malfeasance of the Government of the United States in respect to its responsibilities to try to put into effect the rule of law instead of the jungle law of military might in conducting our relationships with Asia.

This morning the Secretary of State appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee to try to alibi and rationalize the President's proposal to increase the foreign aid bill by $89 million in order to provide what they now call economic aid to South Vietnam. Unfortunately I could not hear the Secretary of State because I was chairing public hearings on the higher education bill, S. 600. The administration has urged me to proceed with those hearings as rapidly as possible so that we can get the bill before the committee, and, we hope, eventually to the floor of the Senate. But this afternoon I have checked very carefully the testimony of the Secretary of State before the Foreign Relations Committee this morning. I was engaged in a more worthwhile project this morning than was the Secretary of State. While this administration is going forward with its plans to kill American boys in the armed forces in Asia in what I consider to be a totally unnecessary venture and an illegal war, the senior Senator from Oregon was seeking to provide the facilities and the necessary assistance to thousands and thousands of young men and women so that they could develop to the maximum extent possible their intellectual potential, which is a much more important security weapon for the future of this Republic than the war in southeast Asia of the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense.

I shall speak at some length on the question during the undetermined future as we take up tomorrow and in the many days to follow the foreign aid bill. I should like to state very briefly tonight that one of the amendments to the foreign aid bill will be an amendment that would cut $500 million from the foreign aid bill. Speaking tentatively, without any binding commitment on my part, I would look with some favor upon reducing that amendment by $89 million if the President is willing to earmark the $89 million, and make perfectly clear that it will actually be spent in preparing what I have been heard to say so many times are the seedbeds of economic freedom in Asia, which constitute the only weapons that can defeat communism in Asia. Not even our nuclear bombs can defeat communism in Asia. But the Communists cannot stand up against a system of economic freedom because it always produces political freedom. It has a cause-to-effect relationship that cannot be broken.

But I also wish to say to Mr. Rusk that I have some other suggestions to make to him. It is rather paradoxical, is it not, that the President of the United States should be talking about $89 million additional to be spent by way of foreign aid in Asia while day in and day out and week in and week out he is destroying with American bombs in North Vietnam many times $89 million? The American taxpayers will not be fooled by that. The American taxpayers know that. We are going to be eventually asked to rebuild our own destruction. What a nonsensical performance, particularly when anyone who will study the history know that we do not win peace through war destruction, particularly in a nuclear age. We shall not win peace in Asia by destroying the great values that we are destroying materially and also by creating the enmity and the spirit of revenge against the United States that will last in Asiatic society for hundreds of years.

I wish to say to the Secretary of State that I would look with some favor upon earmarking $89 million for economic freedom in Asia and earmarking additional money for economic freedom in Latin America, in Africa, in India, in Pakistan, in Greece, and in Turkey if they would reduce their military aid accordingly. I would go them one better. I would be willing to give them $2 for economic aid for every $1 that they will cut out of military aid, and that will produce more peace in the world than American military aid.

The other day we read in the newspapers the proposal of the Secretary of Defense recommending that we make available to the regimes in the Arab Republic—in fact, to one country, Saudi Arabia—$100 million worth of additional military aid.

Have we lost our minds?

That same article discussed making available additional military aid to Israel or other powers that might be in opposition to the Arab nations. We have been doing this for a long time, and what peace has it produced? We have been going on the assumption that if we build up military power on the part of conflicting forces, we shall promote peace. When the holocaust comes, history will point a shameful finger at the United States, because by our military aid program we have added to the danger of war.

Next week and the week thereafter I shall give the Senate an opportunity to cut back on American military aid with respect to India, Pakistan, Greece, Turkey, and all other nations in the Middle East, because I am satisfied that military aid is one of the causes of the threat to peace in the world.

The United States is the chief offender in regard to endangering peace because of the military aid it makes available to nations that we know are in open hostility to each other at the very time we supply military aid. I shall continue to speak out against this unsound foreign policy of the United States, a policy that, in my judgment, is creating, month by month, an increasing threat to the peace of the world.

I merely wanted to go on record tonight, because I would not want the weekend to come and pass without my views being known in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in opposition to Secretary Rusk's proposal and the President's proposal that $89 million be added to an already bloated foreign aid bill and foreign assistance program. I know that the President talks about a barebones foreign aid bill. It is not a barebones foreign aid bill; it is covered with fat. The foreign aid bill must be considered in the light of the total foreign assistance program of the United States. That comes to almost $7 billion, not $3.8 billion.

So when we vote next week in the Foreign Relations Committee on the $89 million figure, I shall oppose it, unless the Committee on Foreign Relations wishes to adopt one or the other of the amendments I have suggested tonight to reduce the military foreign aid at least a commensurate amount.

MEMORIALS OF OREGON HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two memorials from the 53d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, House Joint Memorial 25 and House Joint Memorial 18.

There being no objection, the memorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 18

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 53d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Federal Government has established and is assisting the several States in the construction of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

Whereas the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways is designed to connect principal metropolitan areas, cities and industrial centers, to serve the national defense; and

Whereas Astoria, because of its strategic location, has served and is serving military establishments, business, industry and recreation on the coast of Oregon, is a center for business and industry from a large area of the coast with substantial new industries now locating in the area and potential for accelerated expansion and development with the opening of the Oregon-Washington Bridge on the Columbia River, is a recreation center for Oregon and the Pacific Northwest, is the base of a new Job Corps Center and has been recently selected as the location of a new U.S. Coast Guard installation; and

Whereas U.S. Highway No. 30 extends between Astoria and Portland and the designation of this part of U.S. Highway No. 30 as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways would complete the route to the Pacific coast: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting in cooperation with the Oregon State Highway Department, to designate as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways that portion of U.S. Highway No. 30 which extends between Astoria and Portland, Oreg.

2. A copy of this memorial shall be transmitted to the Secretary of Commerce and to each member of the Oregon congressional

delegation and to the Oregon State Highway Commission.

Adopted by house April 15, 1965.

——— ———,
Chief Clerk of House.
F. F. MONGOMERY,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate April 29, 1965.

HARRY D. BOIVIN,
President of Senate.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 25

To His Excellency, the Honorable President of the United States, to the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 53d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas a report on the organization and management of the U.S. customs has been submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury, which report contemplates the downgrading of the quality and quantity of services furnished by the U.S. customs office in Portland, Oreg., and

Whereas the downgrading of the U.S. customs office in Portland, Oreg., would severely impair its ability to furnish adequate services to local brokers, exporters and importers, thus affecting the economy of the region; and

Whereas the U.S. customs offices in the State of Oregon have a long tradition of service to the people of the west coast, the first U.S. customs office on the west coast having been established in Oregon in 1848, and the headquarters office in Portland, Oreg., in 1870; and

Whereas Portland, Oreg., as the headquarters port for the U.S. Customs District 29, also serves the Oregon ports of Astoria, Newport, and Coos Bay and the Washington ports of Longview and Vancouver and is of service to the Inland Empire consisting of the States of Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and part of Washington; and

Whereas Portland, Oreg., is a national distribution center for imported and exported goods: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Secretary of the Treasury is memorialized to revise the proposed plan for reorganization of customs districts as contained in the report issued in December 1964 by the Bureau of Customs of the Treasury Department and entitled "An Evaluation of: Mission, Organization, Management" and commonly referred to as the Stover report so that the proposed customs district 19 be divided into two districts, one of which shall constitute the present customs district of Oregon (District 29) and Montana-Idaho (District 33), with district headquarters in Portland, Oreg.

2. A copy of this memorial shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and to each Member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Friday, June 4, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Adoption of the Swedish Constitution of 1809

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, June 6 is an important date in Sweden and for Swedish Americans since it commemorates the adoption of the Constitution of 1809, which heralded the advent of constitutional democracy in Sweden. The Constitution of 1809 is still part of Sweden's fundamental law, thus making the Swedish Constitution the oldest written Constitution still in force in Europe. Like our own Constitution, the Swedish Constitution has proved flexible and adaptable to the needs of an evolving democratic system. The Swedish Constitution of today comprises four separate parts: the basic Instrument of Government of 1809; the Act of Succession of 1810; the Parliament—Riksdag—Act of 1866; and the Freedom of the Press Act of 1949.

In actuality, the beginnings of parliamentary government in Sweden reach back far before 1809. Sweden's first Riksdag, or Parliament, met in 1435. Consisting of four estates—nobility, clergy, burghers, and peasants—it was one of the earliest parliaments in the world. The Parliament provided for by the Constitution of 1809 was based on the same four estates. In fact, the 1809 Constitution in many respects simply reaffirmed the parliamentary principles and individual liberties which had by that time become traditions of Swedish Government. In another sense, however, it was an important new step toward parliamentary government since the respective powers of executive and legislative were for the first time specifically defined.

The following year, in 1810, the Act of Succession, establishing the provisions for accession to the Swedish throne, was adopted, and the Bernadotte dynasty, which is still Sweden's royal family, acceded to the throne. The constitutional limits of the monarchy require the King to accept the advice of his ministers and to choose his ministers from among the group which controls Parliament. Thus, the decisive power actually rests with the party in majority in Parliament, making Sweden a genuine parliamentary and democratic monarchy.

The chief significance of the Riksdag Act of 1866 was that it replaced the unicameral legislature composed of the four medieval estates with a bicameral legislature elected by restricted suffrage. From this beginning of genuine elective government the suffrage was expanded until universal male suffrage was adopted in 1907 and universal adult suffrage was enacted in 1921.

One of the most interesting and progressive aspects of the Swedish Constitution are the freedom of the press laws formally adopted in 1949 but in principle based on earlier laws of 1766 and 1812. The basic principle of the laws is that the public is entitled to as complete information as possible on government policies and actions if it is to be able to assess these policies objectively and thereby intelligently exercise its electoral responsibilities. Thus, the laws emphasize the public character of official documents and state that, with certain specifically enumerated exceptions, every citizen is entitled to gain access to government documents.

Under this Constitution, which has been added to and revised as the times have demanded changes, Sweden has evolved into a prosperous industrialized society with one of the most stable democratic political systems in the world. On the occasion of Swedish Flag Day it gives me great pleasure to congratulate the people of Sweden on their accomplishments and to join my fellow Americans in extending our best wishes for continued success and prosperity to our good friends in Sweden.

Birchite Misrepresentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 16, 1965, the John Birch Society had published a so-called report on its organization through an advertising supplement in the pictorial magazine section of the Detroit Free Press, one of our home city dailies. Under the heading "What National Leaders Say" about this organization, the society published the picture of one Rev. J. L. Ward, minister, Memphis, Tenn., a Negro, who allegedly in an August 29, 1964, statement praised the John Birch Society as "one of the greatest organizations in the world today; not subversive, but concerned with justice for all and the peace and dignity of everyone."

Mr. Speaker, I have made a check on this man through highly respected Memphis contacts. I am informed that the Reverend Ward is an itinerant preacher; that he has no stature in the community, let alone on any national level. Mr. Speaker, we resent this attempt by the

John Birch Society to clean up its image by falsely representing to the public that any responsible Negro leader has endorsed its organization and the undemocratic principles for which it stands.

Former Congressman and Mrs. Izac Observe Their Golden Wedding Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to advise my colleagues, that on Saturday June 5, former Congressman and Mrs. Edouard Victor Michael Izac, of San Diego and Washington, D.C., will observe their golden wedding anniversary. It was my pleasure to serve with Ed Izac, when I came to the Congress many years ago. He has a splendid record of service to our country. I know you join with me in wishing Congressman and Mrs. Izac many more years of health and happiness.

Congressman Izac, a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, class of 1915, was married the day following his graduation to Agnes Cabell, daughter of the late Maj. Gen. De Rosey Carroll Cabell. They have six children, five of whom are living. Three will attend the private ceremony here in Washington. The other two, in service and stationed overseas, are not expected to attend.

Congressman Izac, holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor, served in Congress for 10 years, representing San Diego and Imperial Counties of California. Presently retired, he and Mrs. Izac have traveled extensively in Europe and the Holy Land. Mr. Izac is the author of "Prisoner of the U-90", his autobiography of World War I while held prisoner. He has written articles for current magazines and lectured extensively since his congressional terms.

A Mass is to be celebrated Saturday morning in the private chapel of His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate. The Mass will be celebrated by the Izacs' youngest son, ordained a Catholic priest a year ago. He will be assisted by two monsignors and the delegate will bestow the pontiff's special blessing upon the couple. The Mass, to which the children and grandchildren have been invited, will be followed by a private breakfast.

Congressman Izac, when asked about the celebration, said:

> It is a very quiet affair. We look back with fond memories on San Diego days and watch from afar its growth and prosperity. We are here in Washington because most of our children reside in the area.

These include his eldest daughter, Cabell Waller Berge, who served as her father's secretary in Congress—with three children and two grandchildren—Comdr. Edouard V. Izac, Jr., stationed in Naples, Italy— with four children—who will try to fly home for the occasion; Charles D. Izac, serving in a civilian capacity with Army materiel here—and his wife and three children—Mrs. Eugene Fenton Smallwood (Suzanne) whose husband, Major Smallwood, and six children are shortly to leave their assignment in Hawaii for Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; soon to visit their parents before the new assignment; and the Rev. Carroll Andre Izac, presently assigned to Our Lady of Victory Church, in Washington, D.C. The sixth child, Forrest Rene, deceased, is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

Early this fall, the Congressman's book, "The Holy Land—Then and Now" will be published.

The 408th Anniversary of 1st Law for Religious Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was in Transylvania, in 1557, that mankind took the first formal step toward that human right which is only now beginning to be universally recognized: the right of each man to the protection of government in his exercise of religion.

Transylvania, a semi-independent principality, preserving its practical independency by playing off against each other the rival claims of the Austrian and Turkish Empires, suffered internal dissensions on religious grounds. The reformation had pitted against each other adherents of various forms of Christian belief: Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist, and Unitarian.

Out of the desire of the ruling classes in Transylvania to maintain their power in tranquility, and to keep their ascendancy over the Greek Orthodox peasantry of the Transylvania countryside, came a move craftily politic in its motive, but vastly important as the first step toward a generous statesmanship. On June 1, 1557, the legislative body of Transylvania, called the Diet, passed the first of a series of laws establishing, for the Christian religion in these four forms, free exercise and equal rights for all time.

Eugene Horvath, in his monograph, "Transylvania and the History of the Rumanians," says of the period from 1556 to 1570:

> The most important event of the period outlined above was the spread of Protestantism, and Transylvania is usually regarded as the country where religious liberty was first formally insured. While conceding that this was the outcome of a struggle in which every denomination demanded exclusive rights for itself, it cannot be denied that as a result of that struggle an equilibrium was established, which had no counterpart in the other Christian countries of Europe.

More important, though, than this local and transitory success of a political expedient, was the example it gave, of the establishment by law of the principle of religious freedom. It is to the imitations and extensions of this first tentative legislative step that we owe, now, the freedom of each man and of all men, in America and in many other countries, to pray, to preach, to teach, and to assemble for worship, in accordance with the dictates of our own conscience.

Rightly, then, do we do honor in our own day to the Diet of Transylvania on the 408th anniversary of the act of June 1, 1557.

Federal Reserve Threatens Money Growth, the Keystone of Our Recent Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this, the 89th Congress, WRIGHT PATMAN, our distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, saw fit to appoint me to the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance. I take my new responsibility on this important subcommittee very seriously. I have long been aware of the importance of money and credit to the small businesses, miners, farmers, and ranchers in my own district.

So it is only natural, Mr. Speaker, that so soon after assuming a certain degree of responsibility for monetary policy I was disturbed to learn that the Federal Reserve money managers, operating under a cloudy congressional delegation of power have just, within a few short weeks, plunged commercial bank reserves down to a minus $173 million. Now where does this leave that Idaho businessman? I know well where it leaves the money-market banker in New York—in the driver's seat where he usually is. My question, Mr. Speaker, is just how long can we hold out and what will happen if this credit squeeze is not reversed: Recession—as in 1957 and 1960, caused by similar credit squeezes. Even as proud as the administration is of the results of the recent tax cut—and they have every right to feel proud, and so does the Congress—the administration has not failed to give due credit to monetary policy in our unprecedented prosperity. Otto Eckstein, of the President's own Council of Economic Advisers, on May 19, in New York City, advised the National Association of Purchasing Agents that, and I quote:

> These expansionary fiscal policies could work so successfully because monetary policy also facilitated expansion. This time—in contrast to previous experience—the money supply was permitted to expand along with the economy. The short-term rates important for international money flows have increased, but long-term rates have not risen substantially, and the supply of credit has remained ample to finance sound investments.

While some authorities question whether short-term rates truly affect international money flows, the heart of Mr. Eckstein's analysis is sound. This is the administration thinking that has served the Nation so splendidly since 1961. I will do my utmost to prevent abandonment of these sound and proven policies for a drastic course of action unwillingly imposed upon the American people by those powerful few who are able to profit at the same time their fellow citizens may suffer in an economic slowdown.

State Expenditures Are Inadequate for Combating Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the June 1965 issue of the Connecticut State Journal carries a clear and thoughtful article on the need for increased Federal participation in carrying out an effective program of water pollution control and abatement. This article was written by our colleague, Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN, who serves with great distinction on the House Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power, which has for the past 2 years been working intensively on problems of water pollution. Congressman MONAGAN has brought to the subcommittee a wealth of experience from his service as a former mayor of Waterbury, Conn., and as Congressman of Connecticut's Fifth District since 1958. He has been a tower of strength and assistance to me in my work as chairman of the subcommittee.

Representative MONAGAN's knowledge of both the technical and policy aspects of water pollution is probably as comprehensive as that of any legislator in our country.

Congressman MONAGAN's article, "The Costs of Combating the Evils of Water Pollution: State Expenditures Are Clearly Inadequate," discusses many important features of the Water Quality Act of 1965, which has passed both the Senate and the House and is slated to go to conference in the near future. I believe it will be very informative to all Members of Congress as well as the general public, and I therefore request unanimous consent to have it inserted at this point in the RECORD:

THE COSTS OF COMBATING THE EVILS OF WATER POLLUTION—STATE EXPENDITURES ARE CLEARLY INADEQUATE

One point that is perfectly clear about water pollution: All levels of Government must do more in research and enforcement, provide additional trained personnel to do the job, and, spend more money, if we are to combat effectively the Nation's single most serious domestic hazard.

As our population increases and our economy grows, the demand for usable water also increases and, despite all current abatement efforts, we have been fighting a losing battle.

Water pollution is a problem which affects every community and every State in the Nation. It must be attacked at each of these levels of government, but the cost of mounting the attack places full emphasis on the responsibility of the Federal Government to assume the leadership.

The Natural Resources Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, of which I am a member, has held exhaustive hearings on pollution during the past 3 years in various parts of the United States and we have developed one of the most definitive records on this subject that has ever been compiled.

One of our most interesting and informative hearings was conducted in Connecticut on October 4, 1963. One of the principal witnesses at the Hartford hearing, over which I presided, was Mr. William S. Wise, director of the Connecticut Water Resources Commission—a public official of many years standing and a very faithful servant of the people of Connecticut. I am sure that there is no more qualified expert on the subject of water pollution in Connecticut than Mr. Wise.

In the course of his testimony, Mr. Wise gave a succinct answer to the question, "How can the goal of water pollution abatement be reached?"

"The path to a goal of clean water for the use and enjoyment of every one," he said, "is obstructed with several hurdles. First, there is the money hurdle, especially when these projects compete for funds with other public and private projects for a more glamorous appeal. There is also the difficulty, in getting pollution control placed on a priority list for proper consideration by both public and private officials."

He pointed out that there are many who contend that water pollution conditions can be remedied by the mere issuance of a directive by an administrative or control agency. He quite properly placed first emphasis on the money hurdle.

The House and Senate have recently approved different versions of a Water Quality Act of 1965 which I am confident will become law in the immediate future when the conferees reach agreement. Both Houses of Congress agree that there is urgent need for immediate action. There are some differences of opinion as to the procedures to be followed.

The House bill includes an amendment, which I proposed to increase the authorized appropriation for sewage disposal plant construction grants from $100 to $150 million for fiscal years 1966–67.

While the work of the Natural Resources Subcommittee of the House has not been completed, we are in a position at this time to make recommendations on the basis of our studies, and the more we probe the problem of water pollution control, the more convinced I am that corrective measures must be taken immediately and that the Federal Government must bear the role of greatest responsibility.

The situation calls for increased expenditures at this time as an investment in the Nation's future. Our studies have shown that local communities and States cannot or will not provide adequate funds to meet the problem. It is, therefore, my feeling that the Federal Government must step up its participation if we are to meet the crisis which confronts us. We must be shamefully aware that in spite of current efforts, all of our major streams, rivers, and lakes are growing dirtier apace.

President Johnson has stressed the importance of water quality standards and has recommended increased grants for sewage treatment projects, improved administration of the Federal water pollution control program and a research and development program to cope with the problem of storm and sanitary sewage. The President has asked the Nation to recognize the fact that water pollution is a threat to the health and the economic welfare of all Americans.

This growing menace is jeopardizing our water supplies, threatening the public health, destroying aquatic life, and disgracing our environment. Domestic sewage is but one of the pollutants. They include oils, garbage, chemicals, acid drainage from mines and from industry, discharge of new chemicals such as synthetic fibers and detergents, pesticides, and radioactive wastes.

Our own Federal installations are at fault, too, and I am happy to be able to state that our Natural Resources Subcommittee is today focusing specific attention on this phase of the problem in order that Congress may be able to approach a national disgrace with clean hands in this respect.

The Water Quality Act, which has been approved by the House, is similar to my bill, H.R. 3716, which I filed to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. It would establish a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, provide grants for research and development, increase funds for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, and authorize standards of water quality.

I have successfully recommended that existing construction grant limitations be raised from $600,000 and $2.4 million for a single and combined sewage control project, respectively, to $1.2 million and $4.8 million. One cannot ignore the evidence compiled by the subcommittee as to Federal obligation nor avoid the conclusion that the national interest requires a stepping up, not only in research but also in construction of facilities and, above all, in enforcement activity if the Nation's water resources are to satisfy the tremendous demands which will be made upon them.

As a stimulant to the abatement of industrial pollution, I have also filed legislation to encourage the construction and installation of control equipment by providing tax writeoffs to business and industries for that purpose. This bill is currently under study by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Money is the principal solution to the evils of water pollution. This was painfully evident in the testimony given by Mr. Wise during the Connecticut hearings of the Natural Resources Subcommittee.

Mr. Wise testified that "under the grant program, the number of municipal treatment plants installed per year is limited by the amount of funds allocated to the State."

He added, "because of its per capita income status, Connecticut is near the bottom of the totem pole on per capita allotments."

The Connecticut commission has adopted a policy of allocating available Federal funds on a priority basis and in such manner as to assure construction of the greatest number of plants per year. The water pollution control program in Connecticut is carried on under two agencies—the water resources commission and the State department of health. The water resources commission has the major responsibility for carrying on the comprehensive program. The department of health inspects the municipal sewage treatment plants, conducts laboratory analyses, and carries on other important activities in this field.

Connecticut does not provide State aid for the construction of sewage treatment works, or any treatment works. In the words of Mr. Wise: "Connecticut has two problems. One is the limited funds that are made available by the legislature, and the other is the salary schedule which is not adequate to compete with that set up in surrounding States and the Federal agencies."

For the years 1963–1964, the Connecticut Legislature appropriated $99,950 for the operation of this program under the water resources commission. In addition, approximately $65,000 was appropriated to the State health department to carry on its water pollution control activities. These amounts are clearly inadequate to make a dent on a program requiring much more than these amounts to construct one plant.

In the course of our hearings at Hartford, I asked Mr. Wise, "Have you found that the Federal construction grant program has been helpful in accelerating the pace of construction of sewage disposal plants?"

He answered, "Well, because of the limited amount that is allocated to the State it means you can't build more than three or four projects per year."

Mr. MONAGAN. By that do you mean that more funds would mean more construction?

Mr. WISE. Yes, sir, it would.

Mr. MONAGAN. And that funds that have been granted in the past have accelerated the construction?

Mr. WISE. I would like to say that we have a terrific headache right now in trying to allocate these funds in accordance with our program to produce the most, to get the most plants and the most treatment. There are a number of requests for funds that we cannot honor, at least within this year or within a year or two to come. So that the amount of funds we get limits the number of treatment plants; because obviously, as a State agency, it would be most difficult—I don't say it would be impossible, but it would be very difficult and very cumbersome—to try to force a municipality to build a treatment plant without Federal funds.

Project Neptune-Atlantic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a new and rapidly expanding State university in my district, Florida Atlantic, has recently been selected as the participating university in Project Neptune-Atlantic. The Neptune project is a cooperative venture between the privately owned American merchant marine and the scientific community in furtherance of the national oceanographic program of the United States. Under this program a team of oceanographers will collect oceanographic data while aboard a merchant vessel without interfering with the ship's normal operations.

In participating in this project, Florida Atlantic will use what has come to be known as the "van" concept of data collection. Their Department of Ocean Engineering will equip a portable van with scientific instruments. This van will then be transported to New York where it will be loaded upon the SS *Export Champion* and utilized during the ship's normal run to the Mediterranean. Upon return to New York the van will be unloaded and returned to the university where the data collected on the trip will be analyzed and appraised.

I am extremely proud of the part Florida Atlantic will be playing in this cooperative venture. The field of oceanography is so vast and so full of challenges that utilization of our merchant fleet in cooperation with the scientific community will provide the opportunity to release our specialized oceanographic vessels for more sophisticated research tasks. Florida Atlantic is well on the way to becoming one of the Nation's leading institutions for ocean research and ocean engineering.

The 408th Anniversary of the Act of Religious Tolerance by the Transylvanian Diet on June 1, 1557

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, as Americans we are all proud of our heritage of religious freedom. We all worship freely in the churches and synagogues of our own choice and can send our children to private and church-supported schools if we so wish. Our churches play an important role in our society both as educators, dispensers of charity and culture, and nobody suffers for believing in any creed or sect.

While we all know that there is only one truth, we let the individual fulfill his quest for the search of truth. This inheritance came to us first through the Founding Fathers who have designed the first amendment forbidding an established state church and establishing freedom of conscience, and before that it came from their forebears, many of whom left their ancestral countries exactly to avoid religious persecution, be they the Puritans of Massachusetts or the Catholics of Maryland. For the history of the 16th and 17th centuries in Europe is full with wars, atrocities, and persecutions between the Christian denominations in the name of religion. Not until the Peace of Westphalia—1648—on the Continent and until the coming of William of Orange to the English throne did the period of religious bias and warfare come to the end in Europe.

It is, therefore, with special fondness that we remember today the anniversary of the first religious tolerance legislation in Europe which was not passed by any of the western or southern European parliaments and diets, but by the Diet of Transylvania at Torda in 1557 amid the ferment of reformation and beginning counterreformation. Transylvania at this point was nominally independent, but only for a few years and only by the necessity to survive the Turkish onslaught while the Habsburg kings of Hungary were powerless to ban the Asiatic invader.

The text of the act which was passed by a Protestant dominated Diet—only the Polish court minister Novocampius spoke for the Catholic religion—but signed into law by the Roman Catholic Queen Isabella, a daughter of the Polish king, contained the seeds of all later tolerance legislations all over Europe and the United States. It stated:

> Each person may hold any religious faith he wishes with old or new rites, while we at the same time leave it to their judgment to do as they please in the matter of their faith, just so long, however, as they bring no harm to bear on anyone at all, lest the followers of a new religion be a source of irritation to the old profession of faith or become in any way injurious to its followers.

The Transylvania of the 16th century had its trials and tribulations but it was a country which sent hundreds of its students to Western European universities and where culture and literature and theological discussion equally flourished despite the periods of devastating wars. Also it was the recognition of the common danger faced by the Turks and by the impotence of the Habsburg kings to deal with them, while claiming Transylvania as part of the Hungarian Kingdom. There was, however, no question that Transylvania formed part of the Hungarian Kingdom. The three "nations" as the estates were called contained the two branches of Hungarians—Magyars and Szekelys—and the German Saxons while the Rumanians at this time only formed a minority which usually restricted itself to shepherding in the mountains or shared the life of serfdom with Hungarian and Szekely peasants alike.

On April 28, 1965, in my speech I dealt in more details about the history and fate of the peoples of Transylvania. I did not go into many concrete cases about the present today, commemorating this anniversary which shows the wisdom and cultural maturity of the Hungarian and German peoples of Transylvania already in the 16th century. I cannot refrain from more direct remarks about the sad destiny of these peoples under Communist Rumanian rule.

There is no political or economic freedom in Transylvania today, much less real religious freedom. The dictatorship of the one-party, Marxist-Leninist state has created oppression and the silence of the graveyard in this country for all elements not fully subscribing to the goal of a Communist society. This is true despite the 1963–1964 amnesty which let psychological and physically broken persons who were lingering in the jails often for 10 to 15 years out into freedom but without any pensions and often banning them to return to their cities or professions. This is true despite the relative easing of visa requirements to Western tourists and the relative safety the tourists enjoy which was not the case 4 or 5 years ago.

Let me illustrate what political freedom is in Communist Rumania for anyone. Some people were discussing in private over a couple of bottles of wine what would happen if the Hungarian revolution was to be victorious and the Stalinist regime could be changed in Rumania. They wrote down certain names of well-known Hungarians and Rumanians who might be asked to become the leaders. One of them was an informer drinking with them and egging them on. A few weeks later not only were the participants of the discussion in the hands of the secret police but also those persons whose names they jotted down on a paper. The end result was the show trial of Kolozsvar Cluj in 1957 which resulted in three death sentences—openly admitted—and in 18 long prison terms. Two of the defendants sentenced to death belonged to the group whose names were jotted down.

For religious freedom a few other data shall suffice. According to affidavits received in one Hungarian village in the autonomous region not less than 17 Unitarian ministers were arrested in the period between 1954 and 1962 and not less than 50 persons arrested and sentenced to long prison terms for "having been in league with the ministers against the security of the Socialist state." Out of the three bishoprics of the Roman Catholic Church—almost strictly Hungarian—two remain vacant and in the third the bishop still has no full freedom to exercise his ecclesiastical duties. And letters still come and visitors still state in affidavits that "going to church is a sin against the government in Rumania."

As to economic freedom in a nationalized industry and collectivized agriculture, it would be foolish even to discuss the rights of the individual to contract his work and talents freely.

Until this point I consciously avoided to single out the persecution of the 1.75 million Hungarian minority as such since Communist oppression is also felt by the Rumanian-origin citizens of Transylvania as well.

However, it would be sanctimonious hypocrisy to state that everyone is equally badly off in Rumania and that there exists no unjustifiable and undeserved persecution of the Hungarian minority which at times approximates a gradual, but not less deadly genocide.

I realize that our foreign policy officials shake their heads when one talks about genocide in this case; to them apparently it means the physical extermination by massacres, gas chambers, or by deportations into inhospitable climate zones of the members of an ethnic group. Yet even by this standard the recent past could be counted as qualifying for the genocide description. Between 1944, the return of the Rumanian Army and irregulars in the wake of the Red army which they joined after fighting it in bloody battles for 3 years, and 1961 the losses of the Transylvanian Hungarians by massacres and deportations into the inhospitable regions of the Danube Delta amounted to about 250,000, or about 15 percent of the ethnic group as of 1947.

But what would be the name for a linguistic, cultural, and psychological forced assimilation that the Rumanian Communist regime implements in Transylvania? Is it permissible under the peace treaties to which our country remains a signatory and which provided that Rumania shall not discriminate against any of her citizens on the grounds of sex, religion, and language when the term "Hungarian," nay even the term "Rumanian Hungarian" cannot be printed in any press products, but only cohabiting nationalities within Rumania, when the schools have been merged with the Rumanian ones and the number of Hungarian courses are decreasing year by year and new and new scores of students are forced to join the Rumanian branches though they are Hungarian by ethnic background and language?

Is a lack of discrimination toward the Hungarians in Transylvania when those who still survive the selective examinations in Rumanian language and receive their diplomas are assigned by the Communist state into areas outside of Transylvania or in the southern districts where Rumanians form the predominant nationality? When the few new plants and factories which are established in Hungarian areas of Transylvania—while new industrial complexes are being established in the former old kingdom of Rumania—are used to settle Rumanian workers, craftsmen, and engineers into compact Hungarian villages and towns while local labor is encouraged to migrate into the Rumanian areas of Brasov and other southern Transylvanian regions, is it what the peace treaty stipulated? When nobody, even in the autonomous region which never comprised more than 28 percent of the Hungarians, dares to speak Hungarian in the public places lest he be attacked by Rumanian hooligans and additionally arrested by the police for disorderly conduct while defending himself, is this in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations or the universal declaration of human rights?

The list could be continued endlessly from the truncation of the autonomous region to the systematic removal of even the Hungarian Communists from many administrative positions in the autonomous region and to others.

We find that the protagonists of the present policy of expanded trade and cultural exchange with Rumania counter these facts with the argument that Rumania's dependence on Russia has been decreasing and that Rumania might become another Yugoslavia or even leave the bloc. While disagreeing that Tito's Yugoslavia ever was an asset to the free world in its struggle with international communism, what are the facts? On June 8, 1964, Representative GLENARD LIPSCOMB proved on the floor of the House that Rumania served as an intermediary for the transhipment of American grain sold to Russia to Castro's Cuba. That trade and political-ideological relations with Red China have increased for the past 2 years and that as David Binder from the New York Times reported it Gheorghiu-Dej's funeral this March had been attended by Chou En-lai and that the query of the American correspondent was answered by the Rumanian spokesman by pointing to the close and intimate friendship between the two countries. Lately one organization circulated photographs showing Rumanian trucks sold to North Vietnam ferrying North Vietnamese troops, which photographs seemed to be bona fide. Such is the world political attitude of our newly found Rumanian Communist friends. Nota bene, there has not yet been even one Transylvanian Hungarian included into the cultural and student exchange program agreed upon by the State Department and the Rumanian Government in an exchange of notes.

Mr. Speaker, considering the evidence, I cannot help but suggest certain courses of action to the State Department regarding Rumania and her suppression of its citizens, especially the Hungarians in Transylvania.

First, there should be no more extension of technical data involving patents, plant construction plans, and testing equipments in petroleum industry and other aid until further concessions are extended by the Rumanian Communist regime to its citizens and relief is granted to the Hungarian minority facing a gradual genocide.

Second, these concessions should include Rumanian Communist measures resulting in a halt of further Rumanization of the schools, the cessation of dispersal of Hungarian professionals, the restoration by administrative decree of the autonomous region in its 1953 boundaries, the holding of elections free of Government pressure on the local levels to insure the proportionate share of Hungarians in the local administration and restoration of the independence of the Hungarian University at Kolozsvar—Cluj—and the medical college at Marosvasarhely—Tirgu Mures.

Third, there should be an official diplomatic démarche by the United States Government to the Bucharest Communist regime on the basis of American obligations under the 1947 peace treaty listing the continued violations and reminding the Rumanian Government that Rumania's claim to Transylvania in the peace treaty is based in part upon the nondiscrimination clause of the same, and that the U.S. Government will consider itself free to change its position on the territorial issues unless relief is granted to the persecuted and the minorities.

Fourth, should the cessation of aid and the diplomatic démarche fail to achieve any concrete and positive results, our Government should raise the issue of minority persecution in the United Nations Social and Economic Council, or even in the General Assembly if need be.

Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Murski, of Brenham, Tex.: 64 Years of Married Bliss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. J. PICKLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of widespread family separations, broken marriages, and alarming divorce rates, it is especially heartwarming to see a somewhat rare example of a lifetime of marital bliss.

In my district, there lives a couple now approaching the 64th year of married life; and I take this opportunity to bring this remarkable couple to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Murski of 405 Peabody Street in Brenham, Tex., are the oldest married couple in Washington County. Both are 85 and are retired farmers. They were born and reared in Washington County and have lived there all their lives. They have three children now living in Brenham—Mrs. Janie Rutkowski, Mrs. Robert Bunzel and Ben Murski.

Last year, Mr. and Mrs. Murski were honored by the Diocese of Austin as one of the oldest married couples. Their picture was published in the Lone Star Register, official publication of the Catholic Diocese of Austin.

This charming and inspirational couple has the love, admiration and respect of all the citizens of Washington County, and, Mr. Chairman, it is with much pride and pleasure that I congratulate and salute this wonderful marriage and partnership, and extend to them warmest, best wishes for many more years of marital bliss.

The Agricultural Situation in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. Talcott] is directing our attention to a situation that merits the attention of all Members. The artificially created manpower shortage for which the administration, and in particular Labor Secretary Wirtz, is responsible, has had repercussions throughout the entire country. This situation described by the gentleman from California adversely affects not only producers but consumers throughout the country.

The producers of vegetables in my district are indirectly feeling the adverse results of the administration's indifference to the facts of life as they pertain to farm labor.

For years U.S. citizens whose normal residences are in the Southwest States move up to the Midwest during growing seasons to care and harvest the vegetable crops. A substantial number this year have gone to California where they have failed to meet the real manpower needs. In so doing, a manpower shortage is beginning to develop in midwestern farm regions.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I anticipate numerous economic and social problems that will beset us from the redevelopment of the "wetbacks"—illegal entrants from Mexico. In past years I have struggled to aid individuals who have become victimized by legal complications caused by illegal entry into the country. When the bracero program was effectively functioning, the problem of illegal entry vanished.

Grand Knight Order of Merit Tendered Congressman Peter Rodino

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to insert into the Congressional Record a speech made by the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable Peter Wallace Rodino, Jr., when he was tendered the Grand Knight, Order of Merit of the Italian Republic by the Italian Ambassador, His Excellency Sergio Fenoaltea on June 2, 1965. The Grand Knight, Order of Merit of the Italian Republic is one of the highest honors that the Republic of Italy can tender on a non-Italian.

My distinguished colleague, Mr. Rodino, who is an attorney, was one of the first enlisted men to be commissioned overseas. He served with the 1st Armored Division and Military Mission Italian Army. He was discharged as a captain in 1946 and spearheaded the drive against communism in the April 1948 elections in Italy. Mr. Rodino has been decorated with the U.S. Bronze Star, the Star of Solidarity of the Italian Republic, and has been honored as a Knight Commander of the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic. He has received many awards and citations including those from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Amvets, and the Catholic War Veterans, and the 1964 Bill of Rights Award for distinguished public service in the field of government.

Mr. Rodino has served his country in war, and he has continued to serve his country in the highest legislative body in the world. In his 17 years as a Member of the Congress of the United States, he has earned the admiration and respect of all of his colleagues for the humility that he possesses and the concientious manner in which he has applied himself to his legislative duties. He is affectionately called "Pete" by all of his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks of Congressman Rodino follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN PETER W. RODINO, JR.

I am grateful, indeed, for the high honor that is being tendered to me today.

Haunting thoughts and powerful emotions race through my mind as this cherished moment becomes an unforgettable memory for me.

First, I think of my father, a son of Italy and an immigrant in America, who taught me many things—not the least of which is humility.

I think of Italy's abundant, everlasting contributions to the cultural enrichment of the civilized world. Michelangelo in sculpture, DaVinci in art, Verdi in music, Dante in literature—to name but a few in that long parade of creative genius.

And, because this is Italian National Day, I think of Joseph Mazzini, an idealist motivated by the loftiest aims, a soldier of democracy and herald of liberty.

A man of courage and vision, in the tradition of Christopher Columbus, Mazzini foresaw a golden age when all peoples, having established free governments, would prosper together in peace and in justice.

The dream of Mazzini is yet to be realized, but the inspiration remains alive and compelling—undiminished by the passage of time, undimmed by the frustration of temporary failures.

In the 13 decades since Mazzini bravely unfurled his banner of freedom, the United States has grown in power and prestige and has emerged as the strongest, most influential nation among the nations of the world.

The goal of the United States is no less than the dream of Mazzini: to encourage the establishment of free governments everywhere, that all peoples might dwell together in a golden age of peace, prosperity, liberty, and justice.

It is the pursuit of this unselfish and noble goal that shapes, limits, defines and gives direction to American foreign policy. This explains why the United States readily extends a helping hand to nations in need. This is the reason President Kennedy established the Peace Corps to furnish technical assistance to struggling young democracies. And this is why President Johnson is quick to respond when weak and disadvantaged countries are menaced by stronger, predatory neighbors.

But the United States cannot achieve success alone. America needs and America seeks the counsel, support, and active participation of all free nations to spread the breath of liberty and to carry the seeds of democracy to the farthest outposts of civilization.

And so this occasion today transcends the tendering of an esteemed and coveted award by the Government of Italy to a citizen of the United States. I view it as the strengthening of the bridge of friendship that links two great nations in the cause of global freedom.

This bridge of friendship, forged on the anvil of mutual respect and anchored in the bedrock of mutual understanding, carries the hopes of mankind to fashion a better world, where peace with honor is no longer a dream, where human dignity has been secured for all.

In leading this struggle for universal freedom, this generation—in Italy and in America—is proving itself worthy of its nation's heritage, and faithful to the traditions of democracy that have given meaning and purpose to each nation's history.

The dedicated effort to bring about a better world is now in strong and capable hands. There is good reason for optimism. Important progress has been made, and ultimate success is within reach. Let us continue to march forward.

The 19th Anniversary of the Italian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the fortunes of Italy have always been followed with particular concern in this country. The people of the United States have always treasured the bonds of affection and interest that link them to the people of Italy. The Italian heroes Christopher Columbus, Giovanni da Verrazano, and Amerigo Vespucci are also our heroes. Insofar as the glories of ancient Rome and of the Italian Renaissance belong to the world, they also belong to us. In our midst, we can count more than 5 million citizens who can trace their origins to Italy, and who have contributed much to the life of our Nation.

It therefore gives me particular pleasure to extend my best wishes to the people of Italy on an occasion that holds much significance for them. Nineteen years ago, on June 2, 1946, the people of Italy held their first elections following World War II and took the momentous decision to become a republic. Every year since that time, they have set aside the second of June to commemorate that decision, which marked the beginning of a period of vast change and astounding achievement in Italy. Few developments in the postwar period have been followed with so much enthusiasm and excitement. The achievements of the Italian people have captured the lasting respect and admiration of the American people.

Sixteenth Annual Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards—Address by the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as president of the National Council to Combat Blindness—Fight For Sight, Inc., I had the privilege and the pleasure of attending the 16th annual Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards luncheon on May 21, 1965. The distinguished Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY was the guest speaker at the luncheon.

The awards are made annually for reporting on medical research and public health programs.

The Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation announces the 16th annual Albert Lasker Awards for Medical Journalism. These awards were first presented in 1950 to encourage the writing and publication in general newspapers and national magazines of outstanding articles on public health and medical research. In 1955 the awards were extended to include television broadcasts.

The purpose of these awards is to create increased public and professional interest in the advances that are made in laboratory and clinical medical research, and in the actual or possible application of these advances to public health programs. The benefits to mankind of medical achievement can often be greatly increased if the lag between a laboratory discovery and its application in clinical medicine is shortened by public knowledge of research findings.

The Foundation seeks especially to recognize outstanding articles and broadcasts on those diseases and public health problems which are the main causes of death and disability in the United States.

The Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards consist of $2,500 each, an engraved citation and a statuette of the Winged Victory of Samothrace, symbolizing victory over death and disease. When special citations are given, the award consists of an engraved citation.

Announcement of the winners of the awards for work published or broadcast during 1964 will be made in May 1965.

In 1964 the foundation established the Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Fellowship Award. Previous winners of an Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Award are eligible for the fellowship award under the following conditions: Starting with articles published or programs broadcast during 1963, winners who, in subsequent years, receive the journalism award three times will become "Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Award Fellows." At the time the journalism award is given to a winner for the third time this winner will receive an honorarium of $1,000 in addition to the $2,500 Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Award. The fellowship award was established in celebration of the 15th anniversary of the presentation of the Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards.

The continuing purpose of the Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards is to honor writers and television broadcasts that focus, with appropriate urgency and authority, national public attention upon a major research discovery and its clinical application, or upon a significant public health problem or program.

The address of the Vice President of the United States follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE 16TH ANNUAL ALBERT LASKER MEDICAL JOURNALISM AWARDS LUNCHEON, SHERATON-EAST HOTEL, FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1965

We honor today the best in medical journalism.

These awards have a meaning far beyond the recognition of excellence in medical reporting and interpretation. They symbolize the winged victory of man's understanding over ignorance, man's conscience and the triumph of the healing arts over pain and death.

There is special significance in these 16th annual Albert Lasker medical journalism awards. Nineteen hundred and sixty-five is truly a year of health decision. It is a year of policy breakthroughs against the backlog of American health needs. Our country is poised today to achieve many of the goals which Lasker awardees of previous years have envisioned in their pioneering articles, their broadcasts and telecasts.

The Congress is now in the process of considering and—hopefully—enacting the most comprehensive, enlightened program of health legislation ever recommended by an American President.

The goal of this program is to protect, to enhance, to strengthen the most important asset this Nation possesses—our people. We seek to conserve our most precious resource—human lives—from the ravages of man's most ancient enemy—disease. This deadly foe will, by three diseases alone—cancer, heart disease, and stroke—kill two out of every three of us—if we do not strike back now. In material costs, these three diseases will exact an estimated $31 billion toll this year alone.

To defeat these three scourges and many others, President Johnson has submitted to the Congress a wide range of legislative weapons. His proposals are designed to make available modernized and increased numbers of medical facilities; to overcome critical shortages of skilled, professional personnel—as in new community mental health centers; to provide a sound financial basis for health services for the elderly; to offer expanded service against mental retardation as well as against other forms of disability; to foster loans for comprehensive group practice; and to give added health protection to consumers.

Of the President's many notable recommendations, few will, I believe, be more highly esteemed—and rightly so—by the present and future generations than the proposed establishments of multipurpose regional medical complexes. These complexes, as urged by the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke, will assure more—and more uniform—excellence in research, in education and in patient care. Not just in a few big cities, but to service every town and hamlet in every region; centered not just in great teaching hospitals but in community hospitals and geared—not just for specialists, but for general practitioners.

We laymen know—we are proud and grateful—that American medicine, including post-graduate medical education, has long been preeminent in the world. But many of our ablest physicians have reminded us that, in these fast-moving times—with new information and new techniques proliferating—professional knowledge becomes rapidly obsolete. Professional skills, unless sharpened, rust. The result can be—has been—a serious lag in putting new medical discoveries to work. Thus, many a patient receives less than the best that medicine wants to—and might otherwise—provide.

We Americans believe in equality and in quality. When life or death is at stake, there should be no second-class patients in our land.

American doctors do want to practice the very best medicine for every patient. Physicians know better than anyone that, in medical diagnosis, in treatment and rehabilitation, too little too late can spell heartbreak for patients and their loved ones.

Time is of the essence in all war—no less so, in the universal war against disease.

So, we must not needlessly lose a day or a month in conquering avoidable death and pain.

In 1964, 1,800,000 Americans died. Of that number, 985,000 Americans were lost to cardiovascular-renal diseases, and 290,000 to cancer.

These deaths are conventionally attributed to what are termed "natural causes" (as distinguished from deaths by manmade violence).

But man has proven there is little that is really natural or inevitable about many once fatal diseases. Polio was once considered a natural cause of disability; so was rheumatic fever. Influenza and tuberculosis were long viewed as naturally heavy killers.

Today, we have tamed these and other killers and cripplers. We are determined to wipe them out and lots more disease, too. Not just some day, but at the earliest possible day. Not just for the well-to-do, but for every income bracket.

In medicine, as in so many other sciences, there is an unbeatable combination—will and skill. We Americans must make up our minds to achieve our medical goals, as a people. History confirms what a free people can accompilsh when it lifts its medical and other sights. Throughout the annals of time, most progress has occurred when men and women, once passive, have risen up against what they had considered their fate and have chosen to defy the so-called inevitable.

At those times, they have declared: This evil condition need not be. So it was when man decided, for example: Slavery need not be. So it was last year when America affirmed: Poverty need not be. And, now we declare: Most diseases need not be. So-called incurable diseases can one day be cured, provided we give men of science still more of the means—the money, the personnel, the equipment, the facilities, as well as the respect and the freedom—to do their work.

The war against disease is one war we do want to—we must—escalate. We must seek out and attack this enemy in its home base, wherever we find it.

That is why many of the next great advances will come in preventive and diagnostic medicine.

The world looks to America for medical leadership. There are few institutions in this vast country which are capable of doing so much additional good for humanity as a great organization in Bethesda, Md.—the National Institutes of Health.

When an NIH delegation has gone abroad, no foreign mob has ever hoisted a sign, "Yankee Go Home." No American flag has ever been torn down because the United States shipped Salk or Sabin vaccine to a people fearing a polio epidemic.

Medical research and medical aid do cost money. But death has no price tag—its cost is beyond estimate.

This country loses a precious asset every time one of our citizens needlessly dies. America's most important budget—its human budget—has always been in a certain sense unbalanced. Why? Because hundreds of thousands of our citizens have died ahead of their time.

Saving life, prolonging meaningful life—even for a month or a year—is an achievement beyond comparison.

How much might humanity have benefited if, for example, medical science could have added 1 year of productive life, to say, Albert Einstein or Enrico Fermi? Who can estimate what mankind has lost from the untimely deaths or other great scientists—and of statesmen, humanitarians, artists? But famous or unknown, important or ordinary, every human being deserves every year that science can win for him.

We are determined to extend life expectancy—for every group in our population. To do so, science must learn more about the very process of life, about what goes on at the cellular level in elderly years. In exploring these mysteries, we may find answers of incalculable value to the conquest of specific diseases.

Some day, we will be able to tell the world that science has discovered the secrets of aging or of cancer or of muscular dystrophy, or multiple sclerosis. That news will outrank, in importance, even the wonderful tidings that man has landed on the moon.

Our people hunger for more news about health.

The American public is eager to learn still more about how to keep well and get well. An informed layman is a crucial ally of medicine—both on broad issues of public policy and as an individual patient. Professionals recognize that particular skill and care are necessary in communicating complex medical facts to laymen. But doctors also appreciate the tremendous value of sound medical communication to the public. Outstanding journalism—such as you honor today—stimulates the very best in society.

Excellent journalism focuses, informs, arouses, inspires—for readers, listeners, and viewers. Such journalism raises neither false hopes nor false fears.

Great medical journalism is a cornerstone for the good life in the Great Society. It helps make whole—man's understanding and thereby helps make possible—man's healing.

For this, it deserves our respect, our praise, and our everlasting gratitude.

The 16th Annual Albert Lasker Medical Journalism Awards were made to the following:

SIXTEENTH ANNUAL ALBERT LASKER MEDICAL JOURNALISM AWARDS

NEWSPAPER AWARD PRESENTED TO ALTON BLAKESLEE AND DR. JEREMIAH STAMLER

For their valuable 12-part series, "Your Heart Has Nine Lives," released by the Associated Press in May 1964; for the sound and careful research done in preparing this series, which constitutes a valuable compendium of our present knowledge about heart disease and stroke; for informing and advising the public of the suspected factors in these diseases; and for pointing out that men and women can and should begin to act intelligently concerning the new knowledge which has come to us from medical research, and thus begin to reduce the enormous toll of heart disease, the No. 1 cause of death in this country.

MAGAZINE AWARD PRESENTED TO MATT CLARK

For his article, "Birth Control: The Pill and the Church," which appeared as the cover story in Newsweek magazine on July 6, 1964, shortly after Pope Paul VI issued his historic pronouncement that the Church of Rome took new cognizance of the moral and practical questions raised by the subject of fertility regulation.

For reviewing, in his article, what oral contraceptives are, and what they can and cannot do; what the historic position of the church has been, and how it may change in the view of informed churchmen; what the public mood is on this question, and on using the new oral method of conception control.

For bringing to realization the fact that no medical or scientific issue in history so completely involves the conscience, morality, religious belief, and economic well-being of so many people as does the question of family size limitation.

And for projecting the great news value of a definite and growing attitude within the Roman Catholic Church for a movement toward new doctrinal positions on the purposes of sexuality in marriage and responsible parenthood, in the light of emerging attitudes, new discoveries, and the problems of world population growth.

TELEVISION AWARD PRESENTED TO FRED W. FRIENDLY AND JAY M'MULLEN

For the courageous program, written by Jay McMullen, Fred W. Friendly, executive producer, and broadcast over the CBS television network on January 22, 1964.

For revealing—through pictures often made with hidden cameras, and through interviews with pushers, addicts, a Mafia mobster and law enforcement officials—the sordid and fiscal details of the multimillion-dollar business of heroin.

For tracing the illicit route of heroin traffic from the poppy fields of Turkey, through Syria, Lebanon, Italy, and France, to America.

For suggesting that the medical treatment of heroin addicts is not the whole answer to the heroin problem, but that stopping the business of heroin—along every step of the way, back to its source—is fundamental to a solution of this problem.

SPECIAL CITATION PRESENTED TO JACK NELSON

For his 10-part series, "Milledgeville—Reform and Crisis," published in the Atlanta Constitution in April 1964—another important contribution to the development of a sound mental health program in Georgia.

For his serving as the conscience which spurred public officials from apathy to action.

For reviewing the present state of the reforms accomplished 5 years earlier, and for courageously pointing out the shocking conditions still tolerated.

For focusing public attention on the official reports that confirmed his findings, and recommended major reforms and a change in the local community's attitude toward the care of the mentally ill in Georgia.

SPECIAL CITATION PRESENTED TO EDGAR T. BELL

For the program, "The Twilight World," on mental retardation, broadcast over station KWTV in Oklahoma City, on October 14 and 28, 1964, and written and produced by Harlan Mendenhall.

For the high standard of excellence which Edgar Bell, general manager of station KWTV, has maintained in presenting this program, which challenges other stations and producers to investigate local health problems with the same community responsibility and urgency.

For involving the participation of families, schools, voluntary agencies, and legislators in the problems of the mentally retarded, this special citation is given.

The Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation is to be especially congratulated for its outstanding community service.

The Hall of Fame for Great Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include at this point an address made by our colleague, Hon. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, of New York, on May 30, commemorating the founding of the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University in New York City.

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 23D DISTRICT, NEW YORK, HALL OF FAME, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, MAY 30, 1965

I am privileged to participate in today's ceremonies at the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University. Today's occasion is doubly significant, for we are commemorating both the anniversary of the founding of the Hall of Fame on May 30, 1901, and Memorial Day. In a sense these ceremonies are not unrelated, for the Hall of Fame represents the heritage of America, and the dead we honor throughout the Nation fought to preserve it.

It is fitting to pause today and ask ourselves whether our country is fulfilling the expectations of those enshrined here. How satisfied would these honored men and women be with the quality of American life were they to come alive today? Would they be as encouraged to achieve excellence in the United States of 1965 as they were in earlier years?

To these questions, I submit that we can give, on the whole, affirmative answers. For all the difficulties that we face in the world and all the unsolved problems at home, I agree with our ebullient Vice President that we live in a time of unparalleled challenge and excitement.

While Jonathan Edwards might frown on the secularism of much of our life, Roger Williams would applaud the total religious freedom we enjoy. While Alexander Hamilton would be appalled at the power of the people, Andrew Jackson would be delighted that the rampaging American public is playing a constantly increasing role in the guidance of its own destinies. While George Washington might grieve over the decline of the aristocracy, Henry Ward Beecher and Harriet Beecher Stowe would be incredulously thrilled at the steady progress toward full participation in their national life of the descendants of America's slaves.

And so one could go on through the entire list.

Today, however, I would prefer to consider one of the men enshrined here and to inquire what meaning his life and his thought may have for us today. I refer to the man who perhaps could have been elected to the Hall of Fame under more categories than any other of those who were elected: Thomas Jefferson.

Elected among the first group of Americans chosen for the Hall of Fame in 1900 as a "statesman," Jefferson would have merited consideration in the categories of "authors; educators; humanitarians, social and economic reformers; engineers, architects; and inventors." If there were a category of "parliamentarians," Jefferson would qualify for that too: One of his signal, but less well-known, accomplishments was his "Manual of Parliamentary Practice," compiled while he was Vice President and Presiding Officer of the Senate. Jefferson's manual, as it is called, still provides one of the foundations for the present rules and practice of the Congress. In addition, Jefferson was an amateur violinist (an interest which also I share), but I suppose his ranking as a performer would scarcely qualify him for election to the Hall of Fame in the category of "artists."

This very catalog suggests a first point of significance for us today in Jefferson's life. Often called a renaissance man, his versatility and breadth of interest stand in noteworthy contrast to the increased specialization with which we are too often oppressed today.

Yet, at the same time that in our professional lives we may be constrained to pursue increased specialization, in our leisure hours—and no society has ever offered a comparable degree of leisure—we are challenged in an unprecedented way to give constructive and imaginative meaning to Jefferson's phrase "the pursuit of happiness." Who among those statued here—indeed who in world's history—has more to teach us about that very pursuit of happiness than Jefferson himself?

While the problems of education in Jefferson's day and in ours are vastly different, Jefferson's stress on the importance of education for the successful functioning of a democratic system is totally relevant in this year 1965. In his "Notes on Virginia," Jefferson said:

"Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves are its only safe depositories. And to render even them safe, their minds must be improved."

Jefferson espoused a broad system of public education, of public library, and the establishment of the University of Virginia. We are still working at what he started. Vast progress has been made in extending the benefits of education to millions of young people, yet the problems seem to grow with even greater speed than our achievements.

In the field of human rights, one can hardly present Jefferson as an exponent of racial integration. He was, after all, a man of his time. Yet he was ahead of his time in his vitriolic condemnation of slavery and, in the opening words of the Declaration of Independence, he presented to us and to all the world an inspiring ideal—an ideal which demands equality of opportunity for all our citizens—an ideal toward which we are striving daily but which yet remains far from fully realized—the ideal that "all men are created equal." While Jefferson is not known as a religious man in a conventional sense, I have always felt that the principle of equal opportunity for all men necessarily is based on a religious foundation. It can scarcely be defended on the basis of the kind of rationalism which was so popular in Jefferson's time.

As for Jefferson's general views of government, and his distrust of a strong Federal Government, it should first be noted that he was living in a largely rural and agricultural society. I submit that he was pragmatic enough so that, if he were alive today, he would recognize that the tremendous demands and complexities of our largely urban society call for a comparably complex and far-reaching governmental structure.

That Jefferson was not loath to exercise the powers of the Federal Government when he felt the national interest so demanded was abundantly illustrated in his courageous action for purchase of Louisiana Territory.

Jefferson was deeply concerned with individual freedom. In his day, with the closing of the frontier almost a century away, individual freedom could be achieved with a minimum of government protection. Today, true freedom for the individual—the right to seek, on an equal basis with others, the fullest realization of the individual's potential—cannot be secured by the inaction of government. The vicious cycle of poverty, generation after generation, is a prison. Narcotics addiction is a prison. The denial of equal rights and opportunities because of skin color is a prison, and so indeed is the hopelessness and despair that that denial begets. Fear is a prison, whether it be fear of muggings in the streets or subways, or fear of being destitute in one's old age because of overwhelming hospital and medical bills.

In all of these respects and more, government today must seek to give to our people freedom in the largest sense. And, by force of circumstance and the relatively slow growth of local government resources, it is especially the Federal Government which must play an increasingly important role in this endeavor.

I cannot believe that Jefferson, with his essential humanitarianism, would have come to any other conclusion.

There is one other aspect of Jefferson's philosophy I would like to touch on. He was a great believer in revolution. The American Revolution, he predicted, would be "immortal" and in 1790 he wrote:

"It is indeed an animating thought, that while we are securing the rights of ourselves and our posterity, we are pointing out the way to struggling nations, who wish like us to emerge from their tyrannies also."

In his belief that our revolution would be regarded as a milestone in the march of all mankind to freedom, Jefferson was eminently correct. I can testify, from my dealings with representatives of many newly independent countries at the United Nations, that our Declaration of Independence is one of their sacred documents and that our example in breaking free of the colonial yoke has inspired them.

It is true that Jefferson, because of his intense distrust of government, had a somewhat romantic view of the need for perennial revolutions. Thus, you will recall the famous statement he made in a letter written in 1787: "The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants."

Without suggesting that we must take that admonition literally, I do submit that in the eyes of much of the world we seem to have lost sight of our own past, of the necessity, when tyranny emerges, of revolution. Too often these days we seem to be committed to the status quo.

Recently I heard it stated by a high official of our Government that today, in some countries, we can no longer run the risk of letting revolutions take their natural course. To me this is at the same time a depressing and a dangerous doctrine.

I realize that this thinking reflects the presence of a new factor in the equation. The existence in every area of trained Communists ready at a moment's notice to move in on a indigenous revolution and seek to pervert it to the purposes of international communism.

I fully recognize that danger. Yet I wonder whether, in the long run, we will not increase, rather than diminish, the chances of ultimate Communist takeover by inevitably charging in ourselves, with or without the approval of other nations in the community, in an effort to dictate how the revolution will come out.

I have enormous sympathy for the shattering dilemma which confronted our President the day he decided to send American marines to the Dominican Republic. Moreover, I applaud the President's current efforts to transfer as much responsibility as possible to the Organization of American States and to seek the formation of a government which can command the loyalties of the vast majority of the Dominican people. Yet, even if these efforts are successful, our initial unilateral intervention has, I am afraid, set us back 50 years in our relations with Latin America. This was a fearful price to pay for whatever was achieved.

And I wonder how far we can carry the doctrine that we will prevent the coming to power of Communists in any other country of this hemisphere. Would we send our troops to Brazil or Argentina if we were fearful that a revolution in one of those great countries were to be taken over by the Communists? And if the doctrine is valid for all of Latin America, why is it not valid for a country such as India where we have an immeasurable stake in the preservation of a non-Communist democratic regime? And what about the case—which has never yet occured but which is not inconceivable—of a pro-Communist party gaining power through free elections?

One of the worst features of this policy, it seems to me, is that it simply invites frantic calls for assistance from every right-wing dictatorship who will quickly cry "help, help, Communists."

By relying on force of arms instead of the force of ideas of education, of the desire of people to solve their social and economic problems in a context of freedom, we may well be falling into a Communist trap.

Let us instead marshal our ideas and our ideals, let us marshal our immense resources to help the Betancourts, the Figueres, yes, and the Freis win their battles for progress and human decency. Where no such leaders appear, let us bend every effort to find and train them. Let us redouble our efforts under the Alliance for Progress to help build throughout Latin America a strong, freedom-loving middle class, especially through education. If we have to repel force with force, let us at least do so in concert with our friends who have demonstrated, more recently than we, their belief in the right of revolution when oppression and reaction offers no alternative.

Let us not, above all, become identified with oligarchies and juntas that use the cry of anticommunism as a cover for a determination to maintain the status quo—a status quo where the rich are very rich, the poor are very poor, with no one between.

In short, and in conclusion, we must be true to ourselves and to our heritage—a heritage which Thomas Jefferson so splendidly exemplifies. In so doing, we shall also, in Jefferson's phrase, be showing "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

Address by the President of the United States at Commencement Exercises, Baylor University, Waco, Tex., May 28, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of President Lyndon B. Johnson:

TEXT OF THE REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, BAYLOR UNIVERSITY, WACO, TEX., MAY 28, 1965

Mr. President, members of the board of trustees, faculty, student body, my fellow Americans, this is a moment I deeply wish my parents could have lived to share. In the first place, my father would have enjoyed what you have so generously said of me—and my mother would have believed it.

More than that, the honor you pay me is, in a real sense, honor that is due my mother. All of her life she spoke often of Baylor—a trait I have found not uncommon among all of your alumni. Her pride in Baylor—and in being the granddaughter of a president of Baylor—passed on to me early and influenced the course of my own life more constructively than I could ever describe.

So, I am most grateful to you for this moment—and for its meaning to me.

Woodrow Wilson once told the men of Princeton that: "It is not learning—but the spirit of service—that will give a college place in the public annals of the Nation."

For 120 years, Baylor University has touched the lives of many generations with an unusual spirit of selfless service. That spirit—expressed in the works of ministers and missionaries, public servants and public school teachers, of devout parents and dedicated citizens—has not only won for Baylor a place of esteem in this State and this Nation. It has served the betterment of the condition of man to the remote ends of this earth.

On this occasion, we meet here today at a historic hour in the life of the American nations.

In Washington, leaders of this hemisphere are meeting to work together to open a road to durable peace in the Dominican Republic.

Their efforts will have our full support. For at stake is the future not only of one of our sister republics but the principles and the values of all the American Republics.

We are members of an inter-American system in which large and small nations are partners in the defense of freedom and in the progress of economic welfare and social justice.

That partnership must be constantly strengthened. Our common aim and our combined ability must increase—in crisis as well as in calm. The tragedy of the past 4 weeks in the Dominican Republic renews our common resolution to accept common responsibility in dealing with common dangers.

In that unfortunate nation, 4 weeks ago, the legacy of dictatorship exploded in fury and anarchy. Hundreds of Dominicans died, leaving thousands of widows and orphans of war. Nineteen of our own American boys lost their lives. The capital city, birthplace of the Western Hemisphere, was split asunder. Blood and hate drowned ideals. And for days freedom itself stood on the edge of disaster.

In those early terrible hours, we did what we had to do. Remembering Simon Bolivar's admonition that "To hesitate is destruction"; as your President, I did what I had to do.

Since then, working with the Organization of American States and its distinguished Secretary General, Jose Mora, the forces of democracy have acted. The results are clear.

More than 6,500 men, women, and children from 46 different countries have been evacuated. Not a single life was lost.

A cease fire was achieved, bringing an end to the threat of wholesale bloodshed.

An international zone of refuge was opened as a haven for all men of peace, and a safe corridor 17 miles long was established by American men.

More than 8 million pounds of food have been distributed to the Dominican people.

A well-trained, disciplined band of Communists was prevented from destroying the hopes of Dominican democracy.

Political avenues were opened to help the Dominican people find a Dominican solution to their problems.

Today those achievements are guaranteed—guaranteed by the troops of five nations representing this hemisphere. They are under the command of the able Brazilian general, General Alvim.

For the first time in history the Organization of American States has created and sent to the soil of an American nation an international peacekeeping military force.

That may be the greatest achievement of all.

The United States made its forces a part of that inter-American force. And, as the contributions of the Latin American nations have been incorporated into the OAS force, in the past 2 days the United States have removed 1,600 troops from the island.

I am issuing orders this morning to remove an additional 1,700 men on Saturday. I have also instructed our commander, General Palmer, to discuss possible further withdrawals with General Alvim. Such action will be taken when the military commanders believe it is safe and warranted by the arrival of further Latin American forces and by the continued stabilization of the military situation.

Now we ask ourselves this morning: "What is next?"

The answer to that question rests partly with the people of the Dominican Republic and partly with their neighbors throughout this hemisphere.

Already, under the distinguished leadership of Secretary General Mora, the broad outlines of a reasonable settlement are beginning to emerge—outlines which meet the needs and respond to the desires first of the Dominican people themselves and then of all the people of this hemisphere.

First, the Dominican people—and the people of their sister republics—do not want government by extremists of either the left or right. That is clear. They want to be ruled neither by an old conspiracy of reaction and tyranny nor by a new conspiracy of Communist violence.

Second, they want—as we do—an end to slaughter in the streets and to brutality in the barrios.

Third, they want—as we do—food and work and quiet in the night.

Fourth, they want—as we do—a constitutional government that will represent them all, and work for all their hopes.

Fifth, the Dominican people know they need the help of sympathetic neighbors in healing their wounds and in negotiating their divisions, but what they want ultimately, is the chance to shape their own course.

Those are the hopes of the Dominican people. But they are our hopes, too. And they are shared by responsible people in every nation of this hemisphere.

Out of the Dominican crucible the 20 American nations must now forge a stronger shield against disaster.

The opportunity is here now for a new thrust forward: to show the world the way to true international cooperation in the cause of peace and in the struggle to win a better life for all of us.

We believe the new world may most wisely approach this task guided by new realities.

The first reality is that old concepts and old labels are largely obsolete. In today's world, with the enemies of freedom talking about wars of national liberation, the old distinction between civil war and international war has already lost most of its meaning.

Second is the reality that when forces of freedom move slowly—whether on political, economic, or military fronts—the forces of slavery and subversion move rapidly, and they move decisively.

Third, we know that when a Communist group seeks to exploit misery, the entire free American system is put in deadly danger. We also know that these dangers can be found today in many of our lands. There is no trouble anywhere these evil forces will not try to turn to their advantage. We can expect more efforts at triumph by terror and conquest through chaos.

Fourth, we have learned in the Dominican Republic that we can act decisively and together.

Fifth, it is clear that we need new international machinery geared to meet the fast-moving events. When hours can decide the fate of generations, the moment of decision must become the moment of action.

Just as these lessons of the past 4 weeks are clear, so are the basic principles which have guided the purpose of the United States of America.

We seek no territory. We do not seek to impose our will on anyone. We intend to work for the self-determination of the peoples of the Americas within the framework of freedom.

In times past, large nations have used their power to impose their will on smaller nations. Today we have placed our forces at the disposition of the nations of this hemisphere to assure the peoples of those nations the right to exercise their own will in freedom.

In accordance with the resolution of the eighth meeting of the ministers at Punta del Este, we will join with the other OAS nations in opposing a Communist takeover in this hemisphere.

And in accordance with the charter of Punta del Este, we will join with other OAS nations in pressing for change among those who would maintain a feudal system—a feudal system that denies social justice and economic progress to the ordinary peoples of this hemisphere.

We want for the peoples of this hemisphere only what they want for themselves—liberty, justice, dignity, a better life for all.

More than "a few agitators" was necessary to bring on the tragic and the cruel bloodshed in the Dominican Republic. They needed additional help and a deeper cause. And they had both.

For the roots of the trouble are found wherever the landless and the despised, the poor and the oppressed, stand before the gates of opportunity seeking entry into a brighter land.

They can get there only if we narrow the gap between the rich nations and the poor—and between the rich and the poor within each nation. And this is the heart of the purpose of the United States.

Here on the campus of Baylor University we will reaffirm that purpose on June 26 when almost 50 Peace Corps volunteers will begin training for service in the Dominican Republic. These young men and women will go to the barrios of Santo Domingo and Santiago to work with and to work for the people of the Dominican Republic in attaining a new life and new hope.

At home, with the strong cooperation of our Congress, we are waging war on poverty; we are opening new paths of learning for all our children; we are creating new jobs for our workers; we are providing health care for our older citizens; we are eliminating injustice and inequality; we are bringing new economic life to whole regions. These objectives we will continue to pursue with all of our strength and all of our determination.

As peace returns to the Dominican people and as a broad base is laid for a new Dominican Government responsive to the people's will, the United States will be prepared to join in full measure in the massive task of reconstruction and in the hopeful work of lasting economic progress.

For in bold ink our signature is on the charter of the alliance. That charter commands a peaceful democratic social revolution across the hemisphere. It asks that unjust privilege be ended and that unfair power be curbed. It asks that we help throw open the gates of opportunity to these millions who stand there now knocking.

Just as we have joined in the Dominican Republic to bring peace to a troubled land, we have joined with these forces across the hemisphere who seek to advance their own independence and their own democratic progress.

We work with and for those men and women not because we have to. We work because morality commands it, justice requires it, and our own dignity as men depends on it. We work not because we fear the unjust wrath of our enemy, but because we fear the just wrath of God.

In Santo Domingo the last month has been grim. The storm there is not yet over. But a new sense of hope is beginning. Across the angry arguments of the opposing forces, the voice of good sense is now beginning to be heard.

As the Organization of American States recommits itself to the hard efforts of peacemaking, the Government and the people of the United States proudly pledge full support to the peacemakers.

The path ahead is long, the way ahead is hard. So we must, in the words of the prophet, "Mount up on the wings of eagles, run and not grow weary."

Thank you.

Representative Henry B. Gonzalez Addresses Graduates of St. Mary's University, and Receives Doctor's Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last Sunday, May 30, Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, of San Antonio, Tex., delivered to the graduates of St. Mary's University, in San Antonio, Tex., an inspiring address on the meaning of education, and was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Representative GONZALEZ is a distinguished alumnus of the law school of St. Mary's University, and is now in his second term as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, representing the citizens of Bexar County.

HENRY B. GONZALEZ is a very able Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, and is an outstanding Texan, being the first Texas citizen of Spanish-Mexican descent to be elected to our State senate since 1846, and the first Texas citizen of Spanish-Mexican descent ever to be elected to the U.S. Congress. His ability is matched only by his dedication and concern for his constituents and their welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Representative GONZALEZ' commencement address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY

(By HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Member of Congress, San Antonio, Tex., May 30, 1965)

"Certainly it is heaven on earth to have a man's mind move in charity, rest in providence, and turn upon the poles of truth."

SIR FRANCIS BACON
(of Truth).

"Disciplina praesidium civitatis."

(Motto of the University of Texas.)

"Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

HERBERT G. WELLS
(The Outline of History).

Reverend Father, deans of the University, distinguished faculty, alumni, friends and members of the graduating class, those of you who are receiving your baccalaureate degrees tonight are going through one of the most significant and memorable of the experiences of life. Your degrees will not automatically assure you of future happiness or success. Neither will your degree signify that your education is now complete. No man is ever fully educated, because no single mind can encompass all the knowledge that this world has to offer. But you who have earned your first degree can be justly proud of your achievement, because you now have enough experience and enough knowledge to understand some of the great complexities of our world and our times and you possess the background that will enable you to plumb ever deeper into the depths of the unknown.

And those of you who have earned your second degree, the masters degree, can be proud that you have mastered at least one small portion of the field of your choice. You can be proud that you not only know more than you did a year or two ago, but that you have made a contribution to the store of knowledge by writing and defending a thesis. You have the satisfaction of knowing that you have learned in greater depth and are prepared now to learn in ever finer detail.

Not everyone is educated, and not all of us are educated, though we possess varying kinds of academic degrees and though we have devoted long years to study. Great learning is worthy, and great scholars are justly proud of their knowledge, but great learning, before it has any meaning, must be devoted to one single goal—the pursuit of the truth. If any one of us is truly educated, we must seek the truth, and if we fail to seek the truth we are not educated. The man who devotes his energies to the pursuit of truth obtains the greatest of all life satisfactions. The great English essayist and scholar, Sir Francis Bacon, perhaps said it best when he wrote, "Certainly it is heaven on earth to have a man's mind move in charity, rest in providence, and turn upon the poles of truth." If you would be satisfied with life, and if you would be truly educated, you should live by those words.

Never in all the history of our world has education been so important as it is now. If there ever was a time when the truth could make us free, then that time is now.

Our technology, gained through billions of hours of research, bought by billions upon billions of dollars, has given us great blessings and placed our lives under deep shadows. We all live in great affluence, and our wealth and power is increasing daily. But at the same time we are forced to live in the very shadow of death, so that in our daily lives we all remember Herbert Wells forbidding words, "human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

And this is true. We must in our time solve the riddle of whether we are the masters of our own inventions or whether we are slaves to them. We must solve the issue of whether we can control the atom or whether it shall control us. The contest is not decided. That is why education is more important today than ever and one reason why your being here is important, not just to yourselves, but to the world around you, a world that is racing against time to solve its tangled problems—to feed the hungry, heal the sick, and free us all from the scourge of war and the disaster of utter destruction.

I am not saying that education alone will solve all our problems, and I am not saying that we must have an educated elite. What I am saying is that this world has such fantastic problems that we must better equip all our people to deal with those problems.

We have great difficulties in this world. But adversity is just one side of the coin. We have great opportunities. This is the best of times. We may well want to think that it is the worst of times, but it is the best of times. The opportunities that lie ahead are difficult to imagine, yet they are there if we grasp them, and we can grasp them only by preparing ourselves.

We must have a population that is not only educated, but a population that is flexible and able to react to changing times. These are times in which staggering changes take place almost overnight. Those who would not be crushed by change must be able to react to change and control it and bend it to their own will and make it accrue to their advantage.

Let me reduce this proposition to simpler terms.

Here in San Antonio we have often failed to keep up with changing times, and we have lost much by not taking advantage of opportunities that we have been confronted with. We have very often been asleep at the switch during the 20th century, and the results are painfully clear. We have the lowest per capita income of any of the great cities of this State. One person out of every four in this county is poverty stricken, and it is not infrequent that people here actually go hungry for lack of the price of food.

Let me cite a single statistic educational attainment. The average citizen of Bexar County in 1960 had the same education as a man in Dallas had in 1940. We are no less than 25 years behind. Whereas the average citizen of Dallas County in 1960 had a high school education, the average citizen of Bexar County had only 10 years of school. Since 1940, we have made less progress in almost everything than any other metropolitan county in Texas. We have not been prepared for the 20th century. If we ourselves as a great city are not to trail behind forever and not to be always left in the economic backwaters and out of the mainstream of life, we must use our energies and imaginations and leadership to better advantage. We have lost much time, and cannot afford to lose any more. Our hope is in you, and I know that you will not fail us.

If you perform as you can, by 1980, or by 1990, Bexar County will no longer be the poorest big city in Texas, and will no longer be the least educated and will no longer depend on an uncertain Federal payroll for its economic lifeblood.

Education is not the sole problem that we have, but we do know that poverty and ignorance go hand in hand, and hunger follows not far behind.

Education alone may not solve the problems of the world or of **Bexar County,** and education alone may never solve the problems of Mississippi or Appalachia, but it will help.

I believe that if we are to win the race between education and catastrophe we ought to concentrate greater resources on our schools, from kindergarten through the university. I have always supported, with my voice and my votes, investments in education.

Education is expensive and it is hard to get. It will become even more expensive and even more hard to get in the future. We are committed to education as a people and we must see to it that our commitment is carried out, for the benefit of ourselves and for all people.

Adequate educational legislation must not mistake beautiful schools for good schools. We must not only build classrooms and laboratories, but we must be willing to pay the price that is demanded to get better teachers, teachers of better ability and who are better prepared. We must upgrade the quality of our education as well as the quantity of it.

We are not doing enough for education in Bexar County, and we are not doing enough in Texas. Unless we make the sacrifices that are required to upgrade our schools—sacrifices at the local and State and Federal levels—then we are leaving our children behind in the starting gates of life. There are those who know horses better than I, but I know enough to assure you that a horse who is last out of the starting gate is going to have to outrun the whole field or finish last.

As a nation we are confronted with the fact that not all States and not all localities can afford the same level of education, no matter how hard they try. How can we assure that a child in the Deep South be as well educated as the one from New York? How can we see that the children of the District of Columbia get the same quality of education as those across the District line in suburban Maryland or Virginia, and how can we see to it that Bexar County has as good schools as Houston or Fort Worth or Dallas?

I do not believe that these problems can be solved all at the local level, and they cannot be completely solved at the State level. Nor can Federal action alone assure a national standard of education that is adequate.

Educational leadership involves a great deal. For a while we felt that the race for education was merely a race to see who could reach the moon first, but today we know that there is much more at stake than a mere moon race.

The motto of one of our great universities here in Texas is in Latin, "Disciplina Praesidium Civitatis." In English, this means roughly that discipline is the guardian of the state. Discipline—learning, understanding, rational action—is the strength and fortress of a free state and a free society. A freeman knows that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. He also knows that freedom depends on decisions that he alone can make.

A free, democratic society is based on the pure and simple proposition that men are capable of self-government. The assumption is that all men are rational—not just one man or a few—and that, therefore, all men should decide for themselves how they should be governed. In such a society much depends on the governed. They must be ready, willing, and able to act for themselves. They must not be willing to let others act for them. They must be able to be members of the majority when they are in the majority and to be members of the loyal opposition when they are in a minority.

Aristotle did not have a great deal of faith in democratic government, believing that it was inclined to extremes. Plato and Polybius believed that governments moved in a cycle. Of course they felt that the first form of government was non-government—anarchy, and that from a state of anarchy men would turn to democracy. But, men being as they are, and human nature being what it is, they felt that the people in a democracy would soon begin to tire of their task of self-government and would begin to let fewer men make all the decisions. An elite would develop, and democracy would then become a state of oligarchy—government by a few. As life progressed onward, the great philosopher felt that oligarchy would become monarchy, and that monarchy itself would become absolute and despotic, so that at the end of the cycle, anarchy would have passed to freedom and freedom to slavery.

In this country we have been fortunate enough to show that a free, democratic government can stand the test of time. We have discovered, as the Republic has grown and matured, that the true basis of a viable and lasting democracy is education. We have discovered that education and education alone can prepare a citizen to uphold the responsibilities of self-government. That is why we can truthfully say that learning—discipline, as the Romans put it—is the guardian of the state and the basis of our freedom.

You have now, by virtue of long years of schooling, earned your diploma, which is a passport into a new life, and which is the key to the kingdom—the key to knowledge, wisdom, and virtue, the keys to truth and light.

You have earned the right to citizenship, the right to take up the full burden of self-government and self-discipline—for yourself and for your Nation.

May your life be filled with the satisfaction of knowing that you have pursued truth all your days, so that at the end of your life you can say that, as Sir Francis Bacon did, "Certainly it is heaven on earth to have a man's mind move in charity, rest in providence, and turn upon the poles of truth."

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 4, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT, a Senator from Utah, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we are grateful for the privilege we have at the beginning of each of our sessions to approach Thee and ask for the guidance of Thy spirit in our consideration of the problems of our country. Each day's problems seem new, but actually they are as old as mankind. They grow out of our weaknesses, our inability to face reality, and the situations we ourselves create. We realize that under these circumstances we cannot hope for sound solutions to these problems without the guidance of Thy personal wisdom and without the assurance that Thou art still with us, that Thou art still ruling in the world, and that, in spite of all the difficulties, the divisions, and the dangers that seem to lie around us, we can rely upon Thee and Thy inspiration.

Bless us, that we may be made equal to the tasks we face today, and that our decisions may be valuable for our country in the future.

We also ask that Thou be with America's two astronauts, soaring high above us on their important space mission. Provide them with a safe landing, dear Lord. We pray in the name of Thy Son, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 3, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7777) to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee, U.S. Air Force, retired, to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H.R. 7777) to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee, U.S. Air Force, retired, to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

LIMITATIONS ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Adm. David L. McDonald, U.S. Navy, for appointment as the Chief of Naval Operations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lawson B. Knott, Jr., of Virginia, to be Administrator of General Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PROPOSED CONFERENCE BY NORODOM SIHANOUK, CHIEF OF STATE OF CAMBODIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 or 3 minutes in addition to the 3 minutes permitted under the order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Montana is recognized for the time which he has requested.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the New York Times of June 4 there is a letter from Norodom Sihanouk, Chief of State of Cambodia, in which he discusses his position on a proposed conference covering a possible guarantee of his country's neutrality.

I believe this letter is of the greatest importance in arriving at an understanding of what Prince Sihanouk regards as the vital interests of his country and in revealing his views as to the powers which should be invited to a conference to consider them. In this communication, he recalls a message sent to him by British Prime Minister Harold Wilson and his reply. Prince Sihanouk states that the reconvening of the Geneva Conference on Cambodia should concern itself with the problem of Cambodia, to the exclusion of all others. He states that the interested powers, Great Britain, U.S.S.R., United States, France, and the People's Republic of China, should agree in advance on a solution which would satisfy all on the problem of representation of South Vietnam at the conference. There were three possibilities in this particular respect listed by Prince Sihanouk as to who should or should not represent Saigon and one other possibility—that South Vietnam should not be represented at the conference at all.

Prince Sihanouk stated further that he informed the British Prime Minister that Cambodia stood ready in advance to accept any solution regarding South Vietnamese representation which "would be mutually approved by the great powers of the East and the West."

This, I reiterate, is the stated viewpoint of Prince Sihanouk and whether or not we agree with his stipulations, the point I wish to emphasize is that he evidently stands ready to participate in another Geneva conference which would cover the question of Cambodia's neutrality and that question only. That question, may I say, is in itself of great significance to the future of southeast Asia.

Coincidentally with the publication of this letter, the New York Times reports on a statement of policy which was made yesterday in the House of Commons and a white paper which was issued by the British Government. That Government indicates that in its view the road to a possible peace in southeast Asia is barred for the moment by the negative attitude of the Soviet Union. It is well to recall that the proposal for a Cambodian conference was first raised by Prince Sihanouk in 1962, and again proposed in March of 1965 at which time it was stated that the conference should be composed of the nine participants of the 1954 Geneva meeting, including South Vietnam. China and North Vietnam accepted at once and the Soviet Union took the lead in extending requests to the other participants. By the end of last April, the United States and Britain had agreed to a reconvening of the Geneva group.

Since then nothing has been heard of the proposed conference and since then Prince Sihanouk has stated that the South Vietnamese Government, which he had included a month previously, no longer represented the South Vietnamese people. He insisted instead that Saigon would have to be represented by the People's National Liberation Front. On the basis of Sihanouk's letter, which is dated May 16, 1965, however, he now suggests a number of alternatives concerning South Vietnamese participation, and would leave it up to the five great powers to make the decision in advance. The British white paper suggests that the conference be summoned as planned and this would include all the original Geneva powers including South Vietnam and that the question of Vietcong participation be settled later.

It would be my hope that the British suggestion together with the views of Prince Sihanouk might be given the most serious consideration; in my opinion that the question of Vietcong participation should be set aside; that the original Geneva powers meet; and that this conference, if it comes into being, consider only the question of Cambodian neutrality. It would be within the authority of the Soviet Union and Great Britain as cochairmen of the Geneva conference to issue such a call, name a date, and get the Geneva group together again. All of the Geneva powers have, at one time or another, accepted Sihanouk's proposal; there is no reason now why those acceptances cannot be meshed, the call issued, the conference begun. The initiative in this respect seems to lie with the Soviet Union and if this is so and it desires peace in southeast Asia, as I assume it does, this in my opinion would be the first short step toward the possible achievement of that goal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the letter from Norodom Sihanouk, head of the state of Cambodia, dated May 16, 1965, to the editor of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIHANOUK DISCUSSES CAMBODIAN CONFERENCE

To the EDITOR:

In your May 6 editorial (internal edition May 7) you analyze the reasons which impelled Cambodia to sever diplomatic relations with the United States.

You write that this decision stemmed from my conviction that I could avoid vassalage to China, by paying occasional "political tribute." A little further you say that I try to avoid Chinese interference in my country by making concessions to China in foreign affairs.

You attribute to me sentiments that are not at all mine, and thus you create an unfortunate confusion in the minds of your readers.

Last month I wrote in the monthly review Kambuja published in Pnompenh. I have never had the slightest illusion on the fate that awaits me at the hands of the Communists, as well as that which is reserved for my government, after having removed from our region the influence and especially the presence of the free world, and the United States in particular.

In an editorial which will appear shortly in this same review, I concede again that after the disappearance of the United States from our region and the victory of the Communist camp, I myself and the people's Socialist community that I have created would inevitably disappear from the scene.

I know the Chinese well enough to understand that they cannot be bought and that it is perfectly useless to bend before them, or to play their game occasionally in the hope of extracting some ulterior advantage. If I acted thus, I would be despised, and rightly so, by the Chinese people, who would not alter their plans one iota so far as my country is concerned.

But there is one thing that you Americans seem incapable of understanding. And that is that Cambodia has broken off with the United States of America not because it is a "pawn of Peiping," as you write, but for reasons of dignity and national honor that we have * * * placed on Cambodia, you display obvious spite in saying that the fault is mine and that because I allow myself to be "maneuvered by Peiping," the meeting may not take place.

As for the prospect of an international conference taking place on Cambodia, you let it be known that the fault lies with me because I allow myself "to be run by Peiping," that the meeting will not take place.

But then you immediately point out that this conference was intended "in part to provide a way for exploratory conversations on Vietnam." And this is repeated and emulated by all the press of the free world. We Cambodians have come to the conclusion that the neutrality of Cambodia and our territorial integrity do not concern you at all and that this conference is simply, in your eyes, a good way to sound out the ultimate intentions of the Vietnamese and the Chinese in regard to South Vietnam and that you will link our problem to that of Vietnam, by refusing to give any guarantee whatever to Cambodia if the Communists remain intransigent on Vietnam.

The People's Republic of China, the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam have stated clearly their determination not to accept the government of Saigon as partner in an international meeting.

We ourselves are well aware that the government of Saigon has lost control of almost four-fifths of the Vietnamese border with Cambodia and we also are aware of the fact that Saigon persists in claiming the coastal Khmères Islands, while the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam and Hanoi acknowledge our ownership.

Nevertheless—and in an effort to arrive at a solution in such a difficult context—I advised the British Prime Minister Harold Wilson, who had sent me on May 11 an urgent message, that Cambodia would accept the conference on two conditions:

First of all, that the conference should concern itself with the Cambodian problem to the exclusion of the Vietnamese or Laotian problem. Then, that the interested powers: Great Britain, U.S.S.R., the United States, France, and the People's Republic of China, should agree in advance on a solution which would satisfy all, on the problem of the representation of South Vietnam.

I pointed out to Mr. Wilson that there were four possibilities: (1) that South Vietnam should not be represented at the conference; (2) or should be represented by the National Liberation Front; (3) or be represented by the Government of Saigon; (4) or finally be represented bilaterally: one seat to the NLF, which is supported by the Socialist camp, and another seat to the Government of Saigon, which is backed by the free world.

I informed the British Prime Minister that Cambodia stands ready in advance to accept whatever solution regarding the representation of South Vietnam would be mutually approved by the great powers of the East and the West.

This will prove to you, I hope, that we are not the puppets of Peiping and that we do not put "spokes in any wheels" in order to defeat a project that the United States has put so long on "ice" and which now they discover has so many merits.

NORODOM SIHANOUK,
Head of State of Cambodia.

PNOMPENH, *May 16, 1965.*

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Joint resolution relating to the Wisconsin National Guard

Whereas the Department of the Army has announced its intention to eliminate the Army Reserve as an independent entity and to reduce the strength of the Wisconsin National Guard, including the reduction of Wisconsin's famed Red Arrow Division from a division to a brigade of the National Guard; and

Whereas the proposed reorganization takes little note of the outstanding contribution to world peace and order made by Wisconsin's reservists and guardsmen and is likely to create a serious problem of morale in Wisconsin military units: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin:

1. Respectfully requests that in light of the outstanding tradition of Wisconsin's 32d Red Arrow National Guard Division, Wisconsin, it be kept as a separate brigade rather than being made a divisional brigade attached to a Minnesota division; and

2. Respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to withhold its approval of the proposed reorganization of Reserve and National Guard organizations until the advisability of this reorganization has been thoroughly explored; and be it further

Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of Defense, to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the congressional delegation from Wisconsin.

PATRICK GLUY,
President of the Senate.
WILLIAM P. NUGENT,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
ROBERT T. HUBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JAMES P. BUCKLEY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. SPARKMAN introduced a bill (S. 2088) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

A BILL TO ALLOW FEDERAL EMPLOYEES CREDIT FOR UNUSED SICK LEAVE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to give Federal employees an incentive for accumulating unused sick leave.

At present, Federal employees are allowed 13 days a year of sick leave, which they may accumulate indefinitely against the day when some catastrophic illness may overtake them. Thus, many employees who enjoy good health arrive at the time when they are to retire or leave the Government service with a large amount of accumulated sick leave. At present, they receive no consideration for accumulating this sick leave.

This bill would allow Federal employees to credit unused sick leave in their retirement annuity computations, or, alternatively, to receive severance pay amounting to one-half the value of the unused leave.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2088) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 231

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 233

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to Senate bill 1837, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965, and ask that it be printed. I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the amendment may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The explanation presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT REGARDING MILITARY AID TO LATIN AMERICA

Section 511(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act now limits the value of grant programs of defense articles for American Republics in any fiscal year to $55 million, "of which a part may be used during each fiscal year for assistance in implementing a feasible plan for regional defense."

The first part of the amendment would authorize the use of up to $25 million of the $55 million total "for assistance to an Inter-American military force under the control of the Organization of American States." This is the same provision which was written into the bill by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1963 and approved by the Senate. The provision of existing law is the compromise which resulted in conference that year.

The second part of the amendment would replace section 511(b) of the existing law which provides that "internal security requirements shall not, unless the President determines otherwise and promptly reports such determination to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, be the basis for military assistance programs for American Republics."

As rewritten by the amendment, section 511(b) would require military assistance to Latin America to be furnished to the maximum extent feasible in accordance with joint plans (including such plans relating to internal security problems) approved by the OAS. The justification for this change is as follows:

When the restriction on military assistance for internal security was written into the law in the late 1950's, most of the internal security difficulties in Latin America were caused by groups trying to overthrow dictators. Many of the internal security difficulties now come from groups trying to overthrow freely elected legitimate governments, as in Colombia and Venezuela. Furthermore, the existing law has been effectively nullified by Presidential determinations that internal security requirements justify military assistance in almost every country of the hemisphere except Cuba.

The proposed new subsection (b) is designed to encourage joint military planning by the OAS, not only in connection with an inter-American force but also in connection with all security problems. Joint planning for internal security is a logical extension of the Special Consultant Committee on Security Against the Subversive Action of International Communism established at the Punta del Este Conference in January 1962. Some of the actions which the OAS has subsequently taken with respect to Cuban efforts at subversion have been based on recommendations of this Committee. The joint planning contemplated by the amendment, however, would go beyond plans to deal with international subversion and would embrace all kinds of internal security problems—for example, the banditry problem in Colombia, the mineworkers problem in Bolivia, etc.

It may be argued that this represents too great a degree of OAS intervention in the domestic affairs of the countries concerned. But if a country has an internal security problem so serious as to require outside assistance, then is it not preferable for the intervention to come from the OAS rather than from, as is now the case, the United States?

Furnishing of U.S. military assistance in accordance with OAS plans would probably have the further great advantage of reducing the amount of assistance and restraining intra-Latin American arms races. For example, Peru will be reluctant to approve plans which call for much military assistance to Ecuador, and vice versa. The OAS would almost certainly provide a tougher screening for military assistance than is now provided by the machinery of the U.S. Government.

There is precedent for the requirement for joint planning in the military assistance which was furnished to Europe in the early days of NATO.

It should also be noted that the amendment is qualified by requiring military assistance to be furnished in accordance with joint plans "to the maximum extent feasible." The amendment recognizes that the OAS cannot gear itself up for this task overnight; but it does provide a nudge in that direction.

Similarly, the amendment authorizes, but does not earmark, $25 million for assistance to an inter-American force. This is in line with the Senate's action in 1963. (In 1959, the Senate did earmark $31.5 million for an inter-American force, but the provision could not be held in conference.)

Finally, the amendment is in line with—and indeed, supports—President Johnson's call at Baylor University May 28 for "new international machinery geared to meet the fast-moving events."

AMENDMENT NO. 235

Mr. **PROXMIRE** submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1837, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 232

Mr. **YOUNG** of Ohio. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] is necessarily absent today. I have been asked to submit an amendment to the medicare bill, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon, and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The effect of the Neuberger-Hayden amendment would be to cover active treatment of mental illness in private or public accredited mental hospitals on the same basis as physical illness treated in a general hospital. The amendment would accomplish this by transferring the provisions covering care in psychiatric hospitals, public or private, from the voluntary supplementary plan to the basic hospital plan.

H.R. 6675 now provides for coverage of mental hospitals under the limited benefits of the voluntary supplementary plan. Thus, a mental patient in order to be admitted to a psychiatric hospital must face the following requirements: First, pay a monthly $3 premium to qualify for benefits under the supplementary plan; second, pay the remaining 20 percent of the hospital cost; third, treatment limited to lifetime maximum of 180 days.

Treatment of mental illness is covered under the basic hospital plan only in those general hospitals which offer psychiatric care. However, as a practical matter this benefit would be virtually unavailable. Only about 20 percent of general hospitals actually do offer any psychiatric care and of the 60 urban areas in our country having a population of between 50,000 and 100,000 people, less than half have a general hospital with a psychiatric unit.

Psychiatric services in general hospitals of many States are either nonexistent or negligible. According to the American Psychiatric Association, Alaska, New Hampshire, and Wyoming have no such facilities; Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Maine, and New Mexico each have but one unit in one general hospital; Arkansas, Hawaii, Mississippi, Rhode Island, and Vermont have only two hospitals with psychiatric units; and Nevada, North and South Dakota have only three hospitals with such units.

The value of timely and active treatment has been attested to by the American Psychiatric Association and the National Association of State Mental Health Directors. According to these authorities, some 75 percent of the elderly who receive such care are capable of returning to their homes.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 232) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXCISE TAX TREATMENT FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE SWEEPSTAKES—PART IV

AMENDMENT NO. 234

Mr. **McINTYRE**. Mr. President, perhaps the single most important consideration which favors the adoption of my proposed amendment to the excise tax reduction bill is a sense of fairness. At present, the 10-percent excise tax on wagering is not levied upon all forms of wagering. The Internal Revenue Code contains certain specific exemptions for types of legalized private wagering which make up the bulk of all legal wagering in the United States. Parimutuel races and gambling casinos are exempt from the operation of the wagering tax, as a result of specific provisions in the law.

Section 4402 of title 26, United States Code, contains the exemption for parimutuel races. The language of this section is clear:

> No tax shall be imposed by this subchapter—
>
> (1) Parimutuels.
>
> On any wager placed with, or in any wager placed in a wagering pool conducted by, a parimutuel wagering enterprise licensed under State law.

Now, Mr. President, it just does not make sense to me that the Congress would exempt privately run parimutuel racing, operated for profit, from the wagering tax, while at the same time a wagering tax would be imposed on a sweepstakes operated by a sovereign State from which the proceeds are to go to a public school system.

Mr. President, since the Congress in its wisdom has exempted parimutuel wagering from the Federal wagering tax, I think that it may be of interest to see just how much money is involved as contrasted with the small-scale operation of the New Hampshire sweepstakes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a table prepared from the statistical reports for the year 1964 by the National Association of State Racing Commissioners, showing the parimutuel turnover, by State, of those States involved, and the amount which would accrue to the Federal Government if the wagering tax were imposed in this area.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I

State	Parimutuel turnover, 1964	Potential Federal 10 percent wagering tax
Arizona	$22, 203, 634	$2, 220, 363
Arkansas	26, 979, 409	2, 697, 940
California	597, 020, 277	59, 702, 027
Colorado	16, 986, 933	1, 698, 693
Delaware	90, 343, 857	9, 034, 385
Florida	170, 551, 057	17, 055, 105
Idaho	608, 634	60, 863
Illinois	425, 063, 731	42, 506, 373
Kentucky	87, 986, 182	8, 798, 618
Louisiana	49, 077, 742	4, 907, 774
Maine	18, 551, 179	1, 855, 117
Maryland	211, 807, 236	21, 180, 723
Massachusetts	100, 339, 974	10, 033, 997
Michigan	173, 696, 547	17, 369, 654
Nebraska	47, 585, 946	4, 758, 594
Nevada	5, 066, 783	506, 678
New Hampshire	105, 068, 383	10, 506, 838
New Jersey	315, 916, 726	31, 591, 672
New Mexico	38, 234, 884	3, 823, 488
New York	1, 382, 939, 936	138, 293, 993
Ohio	158, 000, 144	15, 800, 014
Oregon	14, 880, 263	1, 488, 026
Pennsylvania	67, 383, 044	6, 738, 304
Rhode Island	106, 393, 918	10, 639, 391
South Dakota	4, 606, 198	460, 619
Vermont	29, 509, 450	2, 950, 945
Washington	29, 805, 755	2, 980, 575
West Virginia	104, 961, 525	10, 496, 152
Total	4, 401, 569, 347	440, 156, 934

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, this table shows how insignificant the $587,704.04 which the State of New Hampshire paid last year in Federal wagering taxes is, compared with the possible $440,156,934 which could be raised by eliminating the exemption for parimutuel racing.

The national parimutuel turnover in 1964 of over $4.4 billion completely overshadows the $5.7 million gross of the New Hampshire sweepstakes.

Now, Mr. President, I do not see the logic in the Treasury's position. The Treasury seems willing enough to let the huge, privately run, parimutuel operations continue to operate free and clear of the wagering tax, while it resists any attempt to remove this tax from a State-run sweepstakes the proceeds of which are marked exclusively for public education.

Mr. President, the false logic of this position bothers me. What is the rationale for exempting private casinos and parimutuel betting from the wagering tax while including State-operated sweepstakes along with illegal wagering? I would like to obtain a sound answer to this question. The people of New Hampshire would like to obtain an answer. There does not seem to be any sense of fairness in the application of this law.

Before the New Hampshire sweepstakes was established, perhaps there was a good justification for the preferred treatment accorded legalized gambling. The wagering tax law was enacted in an attempt to regulate and control illegal gambling, and thus no purpose was served by covering wagering operations already licensed and supervised by State authorities. The intent of the law was clear. But its language was not sufficiently broad enough to cover the future New Hampshire sweepstakes.

Thus the State of New Hampshire finds itself classed with illegal gamblers, with criminals, under the operation of the Federal law. The Congress cannot permit this situation to exist any longer.

Mr. President, at this time I would like to formally introduce my amendment to H.R. 8371, on behalf of myself and my senior colleague from New Hampshire, Senator COTTON. I send this amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed and referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 234) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

On page 23, after line 14, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 211. STATE-CONDUCTED SWEEPSTAKES.

"(a) Section 4402 (relating to exemptions from the tax on wagers) is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of paragraph (1), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting ', or', and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" '(3) STATE-CONDUCTED SWEEPSTAKES.—On any wager placed in a sweepstakes, wagering pool, or lottery—

" '(A) which is conducted by an agency of a State acting under authority of State law, and

" '(B) the ultimate winners in which are determined by the results of a horse race,

but only if such wager is placed with the State agency conducting such sweepstakes, wagering pool, or lottery, or with its authorized employees or agents.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to wagers placed after March 10, 1964."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1807, the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965, at the next printing of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert O. Doyle, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal, middle district of Georgia, for a term of 4 years, vice Gibson Ezell, deceased.

Charles B. Bendlage, Jr., of Iowa, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of Iowa, for a term of 4 years (reappointment).

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, June 11, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

PRESSURE FOR CONTRIBUTIONS BY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES TO POLITICAL FUNCTIONS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have often said that the foundation of our Federal Government is the civil service employee.

Administrations come and go but the orderly process of Government business knows no interruption because of the capable and effective service of the civil service worker.

That is why I am again dismayed to see that efforts are being made to pressure Federal employees into contributing to political functions.

Whether this pressure be "soft" or "hard," it is wrong. Whether this pressure is exerted by either party, it is still a breach of the law and regulations which were established to protect the worker.

The Washington Evening Star has focused its columns on these violations in the past. It did so again on May 28 and June 1.

The highly respected Star writer, Walter Pincus, has drawn public attention to what is going on this year. I quote from his article of May 28:

> Machinery to solicit political contributions from Federal employees again has been set in motion by Democratic Party officials given the job of selling $100 tickets to the 1965 Democratic congressional dinner on June 24 at the National Armory.

In his article, Mr. Pincus quotes one political appointee to this effect:

> You have a choice—break the Justice Department's law or Maguire's law.

The Justice Department's law referred to is a section of the Federal Code making it illegal for a Federal employee to directly or indirectly solicit contributions of a political nature.

Maguire's law was a reference to the Democratic Party Treasurer Richard Maguire, the man, according to Mr. Pincus, "credited with setting up the machinery for systematic solicitation within Federal agencies."

I would strongly suggest that there should be no choice. Maguire's law, as the Star put it in an editorial on June 1, "ought to be repealed, fast."

I am hopeful that the Justice Department, the Civil Service Commission, and the Congress will look into these reports.

I am hopeful, but not very optimistic, that the agency heads in whose department these solicitations are taking place, will demand that they stop.

I am hopeful, but not very optimistic, that President Johnson will see to it that they halt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled, "U.S. Workers Targets Again," and the editorial, "Maguire's Law," both from the Evening Star, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 28, 1965]

MONEY AND POLITICS: U.S. WORKERS TARGETS AGAIN

(By Walter Pincus)

Machinery to solicit political contributions from Federal employees again has been set in motion by Democratic Party officials given the job of selling $100 tickets to the 1965 Democratic congressional dinner on June 24 at the National Armory.

The aim this year, through mailings and personal contact, apparently, is get those employees who contributed last year during the presidential campaign to contribute again.

As part of their program, the Democrats again appear to be planning to push ticket sales within Federal departments and agencies—a practice that previously has stirred up criticism from within the civil service.

This year, however, it's the "salesmen" selected to do the pushing who appear disturbed.

"You have a choice—break the Justice Department's law or Maguire's law," one political appointee said Wednesday. He had just been made part of his agency's team to push sales of $100 tickets to the dinner to a list of his colleagues.

The "Justice Department's law" is a section of the Federal code which makes it illegal for one Federal employee to "directly or indirectly" solicit, receive "or * * * in any manner (be) concerned in soliciting or receiving, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for any political purpose whatever * * *" from another Federal employee. The penalties: A fine of not more than $5,000 or a sentence of not more than 3 years in jail or both.

"Maguire's law" refers to Democratic Party Treasurer Richard Maguire, the man credited with setting up the machinery for systematic solicitation within Federal agencies.

The "inhouse" salesmen, for the most part, are the agency's political appointees whose futures depend in large part on the good will of party officials.

In the past, the Federal law has pretty much been winked at. This year, however, the Justice Department is weighing a Federal Bureau of Investigation report to determine whether several officials of the Rural Electrification Administration violated Federal law in their promotion, last year, of $100 tickets to the Democratic fundraising gala.

The Civil Service Commission, after a preliminary inquiry into the matter last fall, determined the facts were such to warrant study for prosecution.

Despite the Justice Department inquiry, Democratic Party aids have begun to distribute lists of last year's contributors to Federal agencies to aid in selling this year's dinner tickets.

Officials at both the State and Commerce Departments reportedly not only have received such lists, but have discussed promotion of ticket sales with selected top staff members.

At the State Department, a meeting reportedly took place within the past week and the list of last year's contributors was broken down among a group of eight political oppointee "salesmen." Their job was to keep to the "strictly political" jobholders, but to encourage them to again contribute to the party.

Reports that a similar meeting took place at Commerce could not be confirmed.

At one point in the State meeting, a suggestion that solicitation letters be sent to Ambassadors overseas was vetoed.

Complementing the direct solicitation effort is a mailing to lists of contributors over the signature of Party Chairman John M. Bailey inviting the recipient to the dinner and enclosing a pledge card.

The card contains a code number that permits the dinner committee to identify a Government employee's agency and so seat him with his coworkers.

MILDER THAN 1964 EFFORT

This year's inhouse solicitation appears to be much milder in its approach than was the effort made last year to sell gala tickets.

At that time, top agency officials scheduled cocktail parties to precede the event and agency salesmen went down their assigned lists asking fellow workers if they were coming to the party.

From the party, buses took those present to the gala where they all sat together—usually with the front row of their section filled with the highest ranking agency officials from the Secretary down.

How much actual pressure is involved in ticket sales? Some civil servants considered the very fact they receive an invitation at home implied pressure.

One agency salesman said the belief that President Johnson was the kind of politician who watched officeholder contributor lists was a form of pressure.

NEW ELEMENT NOW

Adds a Democratic National Committee spokesman: "The biggest pressure came from repeated news stories that employees were being threatened as to what would happen if they didn't come through."

This year there appears to be a new element of resentment among the "salesmen." They have a fear that should someone report them—as happened in the REA case—no one, particularly party officials, could come to their defense.

Party officials who hand out contributor lists in no way violate the law. Only the Federal employee who approaches a colleague faces trouble.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 1, 1965]

MAGUIRE'S LAW

Well, the time for another of the Democrats' $100-a-plate fundraising dinners is once more drawing near. And once more the party hierarchy in Government offices all over town is revving up the machinery to put the arm on Federal employees for contributions—in clear violation of Federal law.

Thus far, as the Star's Walter Pincus noted the other day, the main complaints are coming from employees recruited to push the congressional dinner ticket sales. Their concern is understandable. For the Federal code is quite specific in making it a crime for any Federal employee "directly or indirectly" to solicit funds from another Federal employee "for any political purpose whatever." And while this is not a new provision, most of the ticket pushers are fully aware that the Justice Department is examining an FBI report on complaints which arose in connection with a similar party gala last year.

The trouble is, as one anonymous political appointee put it, that he and many of his colleagues are placed in a position of breaking either "the Justice Department's law or Maguire's law"—the latter referring to the solicitation plans reportedly set up by Richard Maguire, the Democratic treasurer.

There is no question, of course, about what action is called for here. "Maguire's law" ought to be repealed, fast, and no congressional action is required to do it. Legislation may well be desirable to encourage wider financial support of political candidates and their parties, possibly through tax credits or tax deductions. But in the meantime Federal employees should be protected against the pressures to give which are inevitably present under the sort of solicitation program which is now getting underway.

BOMBING OF TARGETS IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post contains an article entitled "Another Korea?" written by Joseph Alsop. Mr. Alsop criticizes the selection of targets for bombing in North Vietnam. He refers to such targets as being relatively insignificant. He also warns that we have lost the initiative because we have not been hitting some of the important targets.

This practice ought to be brought to the attention of Secretary McNamara and Secretary Rusk, because Mr. Alsop is a knowledgeable individual, one who has spent considerable time in the Far East.

I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER KOREA?

(By Joseph Alsop)

HONG KONG.—Any attempt to sum up the present dangerous situation in Vietnam must begin with the fact that the initiative has been completely abandoned to the enemy during the entire period since the middle of March.

The President's decision to bomb North Vietnamese targets initially produced very big dividends. The North Vietnamese Government was visibly consternated and thrown off balance. The Vietcong were not merely thrown off balance; according to all indications on the spot, their morale plummeted downward to the low point reported by the French newspaperman, Georges Chaffard.

In the South Vietnamese Government and Army, and among the civil population, morale improved proportionally. Relative governmental stability was consequently achieved. The final defeat that had been uncomfortably close (for South Vietnam was literally cut in half in late January) was decisively prevented.

That left the problem of retaining the initiative that had thus been regained. In South Vietnam, not a great deal could be done immediately. To be sure, certain important actions were taken, like the courageous ground offensive, supported by tremendous airpower, that drove the enemy from his positions along Route 19, from Pleiku to the seacoast. But the South Vietnamese Army lacked the reserves to launch offensives against the enemy main force units in their mountain and jungle redoubts; and the Americans, who were coming in to reconstitute the reserves, were not yet ready for action.

That left the bombing of the north, which should be conceived as a boxer's left hand, reinforcing the work of his right hand. What was needed, of course, was nothing like the area bombing of Hanoi which people who have never set foot in Asia seem to regard as the only alternative to the nibbling attacks we have been making.

But there is all the difference in the world between quietly but sternly increased pressure, and trying to pressure a man by biting him persistently in the toe. Or another way to put it is to say that there is a wide gap between a carefully modulated crescendo and getting permanently stuck on the least important note in the piano keyboard.

Single note-playing is really all that has been happening. The pianists in Washington, measuring distances to Hanoi in quarter inches, reportedly believe they have been playing a crescendo; but they are mistaken.

The targets are trivial. The areas under attack are those of least importance to the Hanoi government. What is now the main supply and invasion route has not even been hit once on North Vietnamese soil, for it runs from North Vietnam, into Samneua Province in Laos, at a point rather far in the north.

What may be the logic of this one-note piano playing is pretty hard to perceive. Countless missions are run, and planes and pilots are lost, on road reconnaissance—on "roadwork" as the Navy pilots scornfully say. But no truck can move on these roads without oil fuel; and the limited petroleum stores are probably the most vulnerable single feature of the North Vietnamese economy. Would not taking out the petroleum stores be cheaper in the end?

There are other such questions. What is beyond question, meanwhile, is the unfortunate political-military effect of the American abandonment of the briefly regained initiative. The apparent proof of iron American resolution, of final American commitment, was responsible for two-thirds of the good effects of President Johnson's February decision in South Vietnam.

But the South Vietnamese, who know their own country, are not to be deceived about the comparative unimportance of the targets being hit and the relative insignificance of the areas being covered. In the south, therefore, what started as proof of American resolution has begun to be regarded as still another proof of American irresolution. A recurrence of political troubles has automatically resulted.

One can assume with confidence that the impression conveyed in the north has been the same as in the south, but with reverse effects. A man who expects severe and mounting pressure, and then experiences nothing much worse than persistent annoyance, is not likely to be thrown off his stride for very long, it must be remembered.

Hence the situation is doubly dangerous. It is dangerous, first, because a mere local catastrophe can conceivably have generalized effects this summer because of the slumping mood of the south. And it is dangerous, second, because we are all too likely to end in another Korean-style war, under much less favorable conditions, unless the principle of the boxer's right and left begins to be remembered. That is the most important point of all.

MILITARY SERVICEMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Washington Post this morning contains an article entitled "On Soldiers' Pay, Taxable and Other," written by Marquis Childs. Because of the pending proposed legislation relating to an increase in military pay, I believe that Mr. Childs' observations warrant the attention of the readers of the RECORD; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON SOLDIERS' PAY, TAXABLE AND OTHER

(By Marquis Childs)

Until a recent Executive order the most glaring inequity in the operation of the Federal income tax law was one that hit comparatively few taxpayers. If you were a serviceman in a jungle foxhole in Vietnam the Federal tax was levied not only on your base pay but on your extra compensation for "duty subject to hostile fire."

This last was a bit of bureaucratic gobbledygook intended to evade the word combat. Protests began to come from Congress about men under fire having their pay subject to Federal taxation. Noting that one of his constituents, Capt. F. R. Kendrick, a helicopter pilot from El Dorado, Ark., had raised a question about this obvious injustice, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN called on the President to exempt men in Vietnam.

The President has that power under a precedent established by Congress at the request of President Truman 6 months after the start of the Korean war in 1950. President Johnson issued an Executive order on April 24 designating Vietnam and the waters within 100 miles of the Vietnamese coast "an area in which Armed Forces of the United States are and have been engaged in combat." The order was made retroactive to January 1, 1964.

This not only righted a conspicuous injustice but it was official recognition—the only one thus far—of the grim reality of what is happening in Vietnam. With nearly 50,000 Americans on the ground in the Vietnamese conflict the fact can no longer be evaded that this is a war albeit an undeclared war.

Now a move is on to make the Dominican Republic a combat zone. Although whether Congress has any authority in this field is questionable, Senator GEORGE SMATHERS had introduced a bill specifying April 28 as the date on which combat began in the Dominican Republic and adjacent waters. Marines and paratroopers in service there would also be exempted. As in Vietnam, this would apply to enlisted personnel. Officers in combat get a $200 a month deduction.

When set alongside the income scales and spending standards of the affluent society military pay appears niggardly. Granted that you cannot recompense men for patriotism, duty, dedication to service in the Armed Forces, nevertheless compensation should be at least adequate. And the feeling is growing in Congress that even the proposed 5-percent increase in military pay will still leave most grades shortchanged.

The beginning pay of an enlisted man is $78 a month. This goes to a high for a soldier with 26 years of service of $573.90. That is base pay. It does not include about 40 percent additional compensation for housing and subsistence, most of which has in peacetime been exempt from income tax.

Combat pay is an across-the-board addition for all grades of $55 a month. It was the ruling that this amount, along with regular pay, was subject to Federal taxation that caused the greatest resentment among men daily under fire. Captain Kendricks had said he had no intention of paying tax on "hostile fire" pay.

A 5-percent pay boost will mean very little to enlisted personnel. To a lieutenant general with monthly pay of $1,614 it is a sizable increase. That is the inherent injustice of an across-the-board proposal—it gives slight help to those in the lower ranks. The same imbalance was part of the last cut in the Federal income tax rates. For those in the lower brackets it meant a negligible saving while for the minority on the top level the amount saved was substantial.

There has been a lot of talk about giving relief to the small taxpayer but so far nothing has come of it. A large proportion of the 2,600,000 men in the Armed Forces of the United States are in this category and, except for approximately 50,000 in Vietnam, they are subject to Federal income tax. Despite pressures to make it so, a specific Bureau of Internal Revenue ruling held that Europe, where most Americans overseas are stationed, is not a combat zone.

As the war in Vietnam has escalated, so have American casualty lists, although they are still comparatively small.

The pay structure of the military, as engineered by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, is designed to keep career men with career skills in the service. This is proving more and more difficult in competition with private industry that constantly lures away with much higher salaries men trained in electronics and other techniques. Moreover, the McNamara goal was for a peacetime service, and in Vietnam we have a wartime army.

EXCISE TAXES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal of June 4, 1965, contains an article entitled "The Excise Tax; Reform, Not Repeal, Would Best Serve the Nation," written by Harley L. Lutz. The article is timely not only because of the impending passage of excise tax cuts and eliminations, but because of Mr. Lutz' commentary on the inflationary situation in this country.

He points out that certain administration spokesmen have belittled inflation as being nonexistent or relatively unimportant; but he produces figures to demonstrate that since 1960 the increase in our gross national product has consisted 40 percent of inflation. I have been saying that such increase has been 30 percent. While I have used a somewhat different basis than Dr. Lutz uses, I think he points up the fact that, if anything, I have been conservative in my own estimate of 30 percent inflation. If anything, I should be inclined to defer to the judgment of this distinguished writer and economist. I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EXCISE TAX: LUTZ SAYS REFORM, NOT REPEAL, WOULD BEST SERVE THE NATION

(By Harley L. Lutz)

The President's message asking for repeal of certain parts of the Federal excise tax system criticized these taxes in terms that have been stated many times over the years before the congressional tax-writing committees. After the defeat of a broad-based excise tax bill in 1932, the Congress proceeded to throw together a miscellaneous assortment of levies. In World War II the list was extended and during the Korean war some rates were increased. There was neither consistency nor logic in the selection, the rates, or the principles of application. The result was a highly selective array of excise taxes that was grossly discriminatory among both producers and consumers of taxed and exempt articles.

The recommendations call for repeal of specified classes of excise taxes as of July 1, 1965, and of others as of January 1, 1966. The notable omissions are those taxes which are earmarked for the highway fund and the taxes on alcoholic beverages and tobacco products. Under the President's plan the passenger car tax rate would drop to 5 percent by January 1, 1967, but the House this week voted to eliminate this tax by 1969. The telepohne tax rate would be reduced, with termination set for 1969. Estimated costs of the highway program are higher and increased taxes to meet the increased cost are asked for, relating to diesel fuel, heavy truck use tax, and tread rubber.

LAPSE OF LOGIC

A curious lapse of logic crept into the text. Excise tax repeal was defended on the ground, among others, that this would lessen the burden of regressive taxes on low-income families. Yet, in proposing a final tax rate of 5 percent on passenger cars, it is said that this tax would not be regressive. For the average family, a $2,000 fur coat is vastly less important than a $2,000 automobile.

The attitude toward long-range Federal tax policy revealed in the message is greatly to be regretted. Repeal of the existing discriminatory excises is a necessary first step toward reform. The next step should be the introduction of a broad excise tax, applicable to virtually all consumer products at a uniform rate. This would end the discrimination and equalize the tax situation for both producers and consumers. The final stage of manufacture would be an appropriate point of collection. This method is now used in the case of taxes on alcoholic beverages, tobacco products, and the extensive category designated as "manufacturers excises." In the estimates for 1966, almost $9 billion of excise tax revenue was collectible at the manufacturing level.

The intention, clearly indicated in the message, is repeal, not reform. It is elimination of revenue, not replacement. The effect will be to increase the relative dependence of the Federal budget on the income taxes and to increase budgetary vulnerability to variations in the level of business activity. In the original budget estimate of revenues for fiscal year 1966, the net excise tax yield was 12 percent of total administrative budget receipts. After giving effect to the proposed reductions and the new estimate of total revenues announced in the message, this proportion would drop to 9.2 percent.

It is also said that the deficit for fiscal year 1966, originally estimated at $5.3 billion, will be lower because of higher receipts and reduced expenditures. These gains would not be enough to eliminate the deficit, even if there were no excise tax repeal. But since repeal is proposed, and this is said to be a matter of careful timing, the obvious intention is to maintain a deficit, not to strive for its elimination.

REVERSAL OF ATTITUDE

The stock arguments advanced against the present excise system have failed, up to now, to impress either the Ways and Means Committee or the Senate Finance Committee. These arguments have always been countered by the objection that we could not afford the revenue loss involved. Despite this committee record, it now appears that we can afford a revenue loss even greater than the President has proposed. The bill is to be rushed to enactment with unseemly haste. Public hearings are not necessary for both tax committees are fully informed as to the objections to the present excise system. The marvel is that there should be such a sudden, sweeping reversal of attitude. And the pity is that there will be no public hearings on how to reform the excise taxes so as to make them a more equitable and productive feature of the Federal tax system.

The apostles of the new fiscal order appear unworried about the prospect of budget deficits. Yet there is in the message an undercurrent of concern about the current fiscal policy. It is revealed by the emphasis on the beneficial effects of the earlier tax cuts, on the absence of inflation, and on the desirability of providing a further stimulus to the economy through the proposed excise tax changes. The stimulant is to be the addition of the tax reduction to total demand.

The persistence of belief in this theory is amazing in view of the plain logic of the case. As a matter of simple arithmetic, tax changes up or down do not affect total spending power at any given state of the economy. Such changes merely alter the proportions of total income spent by the people and the Government, respectively, without changing the total. Lower taxes do give a lift to morale through the added satisfaction of keeping and using more of the fruits of one's toil or thrift, instead of being compelled to submit to the decisions of Government as to how they shall be spent.

The real source of stimulus to the economy is the additional spending power created by the deficits. Tax reduction, with no cut or even an increase of spending, is a popular way to create a deficit. It is therefore a first step, but not the important one, in the stimulative process.

It is recognized, even by the ardent advocates of deficits, that a point can be reached at which the ice is too thin to bear more weight. They seek consolation for the deficit course by referring to the evidence that inflation has not happened yet.

Consequently, it is appropriate to examine the data which are relied upon to demonstrate absence of inflation. The chief statistical tools employed in this demonstration are the wholesale and consumer price indexes. From the end of 1960 to the end of 1964, a period which embraces most of the 50-month span of uninterrupted business activity, the wholesale index was virtually stationary. The consumer price index rose from 103.1 to 108.7 on the base of 1957–59 prices. The stability of these indexes provides support for the thesis that we have been spared the evils of inflation, notwithstanding aggregate net deficits of $26.5 billion and a public debt increase of $28.4 billion in this time.

In another area, however, the evidence is not so reassuring. This is the record of gross national product. The only test of inflation here is a comparison of GNP in current dollars with the value expressed in dollars of constant purchasing power. In the annual Economic Report the dollar purchasing power in 1954 is used as the base. The results for the years 1960 and 1964 are:

Gross national product, in current and 1954 dollars (billions)

Year	Current dollars	1954 dollars
1960	502.6	439.9
1964	622.3	515.7
Increase	119.7	75.8

These figures show that whereas the increase of goods and services produced from 1960 through 1964 was valued at $119.7 billion in current dollars, the same quantitative increase of output would have been valued at $75.8 billion if the purchasing power of the dollar had been the same in 1964 as it was in 1954. Since we are dealing with the same quantity of product, the difference between the two measures of increased value, amounting to $43.9 billion over the period, must be the result of depreciation of the dollar. In other words, some 40 percent of the increase in gross national product since 1960 does not represent greater actual output of goods and services but an inflationary markup of real product.

It is proper to ask at this point why there is so much divergence between the results revealed by the price indexes cited above and those derived from the GNP data. A clue to the explanation is provided by the behavior of the components of GNP. The annual Economic Report regularly translated these components from current dollars into the equivalent in 1954 dollars. The report also provides a table showing, for each component of GNP, the implicit price deflator by which its current dollar value is to be deflated to equal the 1954 value. For 1964 these price deflators are as follows:

Category:	*Implicit price deflator*
Total GNP	120.7
Personal consumption expenditure	114.9
Durable goods	105.2
Nondurable goods	116.6
Services	122.7
Gross private domestic investment:	
New construction	125.7
Residential nonfarm	122.0
Other	130.2
Export of goods and services	105.6
Imports of goods and services	98.2
Government purchases of goods and services	138.5
Federal	136.0
State and local	141.3

These figures suggest that the rise in the cost of services has been an important factor in the inflation of GNP in terms of constant 1954 dollars. The implicit deflators are highest, indicating need for relatively more deflation, for the components in which services are the sole, or a principal, element. Much of the construction industry is labor intensive, while export industries are more likely to be capital intensive. Almost 70 percent of Government purchases of goods and services consist of wage and salary disbursements. Moreover, the proportion of total consumption expenditure devoted to services has risen somewhat in the post-World War II years. The wholesale price index includes commodities only and would not reflect services. The Consumer Price Index does include services, and from December 1960 to November 1964 the index for all services except rent rose by 10.5 index points. This is in marked contrast with the movement of the overall Consumer Price Index.

It seems that we have here an illustration of that inflationary force known as wage-cost-push. The new purchasing power created by the budget deficits has made it possible for employers, private and public, to comply with the successive rounds of demands for higher pay. This should have led to price increases, but the Government's hostile attitude toward anything more than trivial, spotty price advances had blocked off this course. Productivity gains have thus far enabled efficient operators to absorb the higher wage costs without raising prices. Despite the guidelines for wage increases proposed by the Council of Economic Advisers there is some doubt if wage increases have been held within the suggested limits. The economic report shows that output per man-hour in nonagricultural industries increased at an average rate of 3 percent per year from 1960 through 1964, and that average gross weekly earnings in manufacturing increased at a rate of 4.7 percent annually over the same period.

It is not contended here that the round of tax cut and deficit spending coming up in the excise tax repealer is the one to carry the inflation flood over the dike. The combination of creating new money and sitting on the price lid may hold the opposing forces in equilibrium for some time yet. Eventually the accumulation of inflationary new money will have an expansionary force that cannot be contained by any display of governmental displeasure at price increases.

There may be a short-run advantage in excise tax repeal. The business community and the man in the street are enthusiastically for it. This broad grassroots support seems already to have pressured congressional leaders to go even further than the President has recommended. It can be said, however, without fear of successful contradiction, that the long-run advantage to the Treasury, the business interests, and the people generally, is to be found in reform, not elimination of excise or consumption taxes as a source of Federal revenue.

TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS BY DIPLOMATIC PERSONNEL

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in this morning's press I note a report, under the dateline of New Brunswick, N.J., of a meeting between the director of the New Jersey Turnpike Authority and a representative of the Department of State in regard to a recent practice inaugurated by the New Jersey Turnpike Authority to escort from the turnpike diplomats who are violating the speed laws.

This incident is another illustration of a problem which I think we have not come anywhere near solving. I regard any American who represents this country abroad and who violates the laws of another country as a person who ought not to be continued in the representation of this country abroad. Equally, any foreign diplomat or representative—and it is not always one of high station, but frequently one of lower rank—who comes here and violates the hospitality which this country affords, whether it be parking by a fire hydrant or by blocking another's driveway, and laughing at that person when he is asked to move, to say nothing of the violation of speed laws and other traffic laws which cause hazard to American and other lives on the highways, ought not to be permitted to continue to remain in this country.

I would not try to draw the line too nicely. I would seek to have such persons recalled; likewise, I would recall every one of our diplomats abroad who committed similar violations.

Anyone who is so thoughtless of the lives and conveniences of others, and who is so indifferent to the decencies that one human being ought to accord another, as to violate the laws of this country as they relate to blocking traffic and causing dangerous accidents, is not a good representative of any government. It does no kindness to another government to let such a persons remain in this country; and it is also wrong for us to let any such person who represents this country abroad remain in any other country.

I propose to ask our committee to look into this situation in some depth, because on the basis of my personal experience I am not satisfied that we have done anything other than to try to poultice this condition from time to time.

I am glad that the New Jersey Turnpike Authority has taken this action. It is intolerable that any person who speeds deliberately should be able to tear up his ticket and throw it in the face of the police who are trying to enforce the rules of the road and thus protect the lives, whether American or others, of those who use our highways.

AUTHORIZATION FOR INCREASED BED CAPACITY FOR ALL VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 259, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) expressing the sense of Congress on increasing the authorized bed capacity for all Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, when the Veterans' Administration announced the closing of the 11 hospitals we had only a few hours notice. There was no opportunity for the Members of Congress or the various veterans' organizations to discuss the proposal and make detailed studies, or to hold hearings to determine whether or not in each instance the closing would be justified.

The Veterans' Administration has termed these hospitals as "obsolete hospitals" in a letter to me dated January 13, 1965, saying that they must "be inactivated and replaced with modern facilities." I was advised orally by the Administrator that with the 125,000-bed limit for the veterans, new hospitals could not be built until the old ones are closed. I know that Fort Bayard in New Mexico is not an obsolete facility, that a new medical and surgical department was installed in the hospital in 1959, and that the facilities and care rendered there are first class. I also had information that many of the veterans' hospitals have waiting lists. A compilation of information about veterans' hospitals prepared by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, as up to date as December 31, 1964, showed that the total waiting list of veterans desiring to enter hospitals to be 12,558.

I, along with other Members of Congress, was shocked to learn about these closings, especially after we were informed that waiting lists exist at some hospitals and that apparently the ones being announced for closing were selected more or less on a computer basis instead of taking into consideration the human element involved in closing these facilities. Senators MANSFIELD, MONTOYA, METCALF, and I were in agreement that it did not make much sense to close out these facilities long before new hospitals in the discussion stage were to be constructed. We especially objected to the fact that the Members of Congress were not consulted and given an opportunity to discuss these closings and make some presentation to the Department before the order went out.

In view of the waiting lists at veterans hospitals and due to the fact that the Veterans' Administration has not completed construction of additional beds to replace the beds in the hospitals ordered closed, Senators MANSFIELD, METCALF, and MONTOYA joined me in introducing Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, the sense of the Congress that the authorized bed capacity limitation of 125,000 for all Veterans' Administration hospitals should be increased to 130,000.

We are very appreciative of the cooperation received from the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and the members of the committee in arranging prompt hearings on the resolution and reporting it for consideration of the Senate.

I fully agree with the objective of the Veterans' Administration, as set forth in Mr. Driver's statement before the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on January 22, that is to improve the medical and hospital services for our veterans. I believe that they are entitled to and should have the best care possible. But I object to the closing of 2,000 or 3,000 beds suddenly and moving these sick veterans long distances from hospitals near their homes to other veterans hospitals or military hospitals.

The number of facilities selected for immediate closing is staggering. It may be true that some of these facilities are unsatisfactory, but should this be the controlling factor in deciding to close a hospital? I know that in times past, facilities have been modernized and that new facilities have been built. To what extent has the Veterans' Administration looked into the possibility and cost of modernizing those facilities that may not be up to standard? I know that the facilities at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., have been in good condition, that this is a modern facility, the climate excellent for bronchial and respiratory diseases, and that this facility could probably be enlarged at considerably less cost than would be required to build another large hospital. I would suspect that the facilities at some of the other hospitals ordered closed may be very satisfactory.

The Veterans' Administration points out that the closed beds will be reestablished in areas of greater need. This would be persuasive if these facilities were already authorized and construction completed and beds available. But many things can happen between the time that a proposal to build new hospitals is made and getting the authorization and construction funds and actually completing the building. Granted, the intentions of the VA are to build new and better facilities at more convenient locations, this is no guarantee that they will be built next year or within the next 5 or 10 years. In the meantime, what happens? The VA must go out and contract beds in other hospitals into which they can move the veterans now hospitalized at the facilities being closed. I know this to be a fact because the VA has for some time contracted for 20 emergency beds at William Beaumont Army Hospital in El Paso, Tex. I am advised that the VA has arranged with William Beaumont to make available an additional 50 beds for patients to be moved from Fort Bayard.

The Veterans' Administration has been providing care to non-service-connected veterans on the basis of space available. I was advised by the Veterans' Administrator that there are insufficient beds to care for all of these non-service-connected cases. I am sure that many of them are as deserving as some of those that are being cared for. How can we say to one veteran, "We will give you hospitalization" but say to his neighbor veteran, who may need hospital care just as badly, "We will put you on a waiting list because we do not have enough beds." From the information that has been furnished me, I believe that is taking place. If there are insufficient beds to give all veterans of equal circumstances the same treatment then I say that we need more hospital beds and that the number should be increased to provide those beds. We should not be closing facilities, then going out and contracting for beds to care for veterans from the closed facilities and at the same time denying veterans, who need care and are unable to provide it, hospitalization because we do not have the beds to put them in.

Mr. President, programs have been proposed and we have been legislating for relief of poverty conditions throughout the country. I believe that there are economic factors that should be considered in the closing of these hospitals. The people of my State are in sympathy with the economy program and they want to see efficiency and economy in government. However, I do not find anyone that is anxious to start with cutting out hospital beds for veterans, many of whom are living near the hospital on a very meager pension.

Whether or not a veteran is service connected, if he is unable to pay for his own medical treatment or hospitalization, I believe that the Government has an obligation to help provide some sort of care for that individual. Many of the veterans that are cared for at Fort Bayard in New Mexico have moved near the hospital with their families because they are frequently hospitalized during the year. Having their families near means a great deal to these men. Some of these people are able to operate small businesses to supplement the family income. Being required to move to some large city at a remote location will work a great hardship on the veterans from this area and on their families. Either the family stays and struggles along without the father, or moves to the city where hospitalization is available. This creates an economic hardship on many of these people because of the high cost of living in the cities. Also, some of the members of the families in the Fort Bayard area are able to obtain employment in the hospital or nearby. This employment would be difficult to obtain if the family had to move to some large city. I do not believe that these human factors have been given sufficient consideration.

The Veterans' Administration states that the purpose of these closings is to afford better treatment for the veterans. The veterans that are hospitalized at Fort Bayard in New Mexico are receiving the best of care and I do not believe that this care will be improved by removing them to El Paso, Albuquerque, or Tucson. If there are certain types of treatment that are not available at Fort Bayard, then the particular patient can be sent to some other hospital, but these patients who have moved into the southwest area to be near Fort Bayard where the type of treatment they need is available should not now be required to make another move. There are plenty of patients that need the type of treatment afforded at Fort Bayard, and I am sure that this holds true at a number of the other hospitals ordered closed.

I understand that the House Appropriations Committee has restored the funds necessary to operate these hospitals for another year. I believe that further study is necessary and that in the meantime we should pass this resolution expressing to the executive branch of the Government the sense of Congress that more beds are necessary and should be provided to give proper care and hospitalization to our veteran population.

Mr. President, I particularly wish to thank the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] for the fine way in which he conducted the hearings for Senators who participated in the hearings.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the veterans of this country are entitled to the very best medical and hospital care which a grateful Nation can provide.

For that reason, I rise today in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, the bill which I cosponsored and which would increase the authorized bed capacity in Veterans' Administration hospitals from 125,000 to 130,000.

To be perfectly frank about it, the chief purpose of this bill is to make sure that all areas of this Nation which are now served by Veterans' Administration hospitals will continue to be so served in the future.

Unless we adopt this resolution, there is a very strong probability that this will not be true for very long. The Veterans' Administration, acting with what I believe to be false economy, wants to close 11 existing hospitals, including one in my State of New Mexico located at Fort Bayard, near Silver City.

Subsequently, a Presidential study commission modified that recommendation and called for closing only 6 of the 11 which were doomed by the Veterans' Administration.

It is my sincere hope that this modified position will be further improved through the good offices of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives.

Surely, everything which has been said in either body of this veterans hospital problem since February, when the concurrent resolution was introduced, has indicated clearly our concern with this threat to the care of men who risked everything for their country when their country needed them.

The need for hospital beds for veterans has been increasing every year. In the fiscal year 1964, the Veterans' Administration treated 730,000 patients, an increase of 25,000 over the year before.

The trend has been steadily upward, and will probably continue in that direction because our veteran population is growing older.

The average age of our World War I veterans is now 72, and those of World War II average 46 years.

Congress has given recognition to this fact of a changing and aging veteran population by funding 4,000 nursing care beds.

At the same time, in the interest of maximum economy and maximum yield for the tax dollar, the Bureau of the Budget has wisely insisted that the Veterans' Administration use existing facilities in providing these nursing care beds.

Why run the risk of a bed shortage by closing any hospitals at this time? It simply does not make sense.

Testimony before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare clearly shows that the Veterans' Administration wants to close these hospitals in order to activate beds in newly constructed hospitals. These beds cannot be used at present because of the 125,000 ceiling which has been imposed by administrative fiat.

Let me emphasize that Congress has never set any kind of ceiling on the number of Veterans' Administration beds which could be activated at any given time. Our criterion has been simply that the needs of veterans must be met.

By declaring that it is the sense of Congress that this arbitrary ceiling be raised to 130,000 beds, we will be sure that veterans everywhere will receive the care to which they are entitled.

Let us not gamble with their welfare.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as the Senate considers Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 to increase the bed capacity of Veterans' Administration hospitals from 125,000 to 130,000, it behooves us to dwell on the subject of the President's order of early this year to close 11 VA hospitals, 4 old soldiers' homes and 16 local VA offices.

When on January 13 Veterans' Administrator William J. Driver announced these closings the reaction of the Nation—eloquently voiced in the Congress—was immediate and profuse. While on one hand the Veterans' Administration contended that economies would be effected, hard evidence was produced to indicate that in facility after facility these savings were more illusory than real. In addition, it was shown that many communities would be adversely affected by the withdrawal of these facilities. And finally—and most important—as many veterans and their families indicated in their protests, medical and domiciliary care for the veterans themselves would suffer.

From January 22 to January 28, the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held hearings on these proposed closings, producing 679 pages of testimony.

The following month an amendment was added to a supplemental appropriation bill, signed into law on February 11 as Public Law 89-2, barring any closings of VA facilities until May 1.

Prior to this May 1 deadline, on April 10, having some second thoughts and recognizing that some of the closings announced the previous January might have been unwise, the President appointed a special commission to present a report to him as to which facilities should be retained and which should be abandoned. This special commission was to report by June 1 and all planned closings were stayed until that time.

On May 11, the Nation's press announced the result of the special commission's deliberations and its recommendations to President Johnson that he reverse the decision to close five of the VA hospitals, the old soldiers' homes and eight of the VA regional offices. But no formal report was issued to the public.

The White House has now had the special commission's report for almost a month. The June 1 deadline has come and gone. The Nation's 22 million veterans, their families, the communities and employees affected and all citizens are entitled to know in an official way what is in the report and what the President intends to do with respect to its recommendations.

Now, as the Senate votes to increase VA bed capacity, is the proper time to call upon the President to share with the Nation the administration's intentions with respect to the retention and closing of the VA facilities which were first ordered closed last January. This matter should no longer be allowed to be suspended between an administrative heaven and earth, tantalizing servicemen and their families, medical personnel, and the affected communities with indecision.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 270), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BACKGROUND

The medical care program of the Veterans' Administration is one of the largest in the world. Potentially affecting some 22 million veterans, it operates on a budget calling for an expenditure of over $1 billion per year. It involves the direct ownership and operation today of 168 hospitals in the United States. During fiscal year 1964, Veterans' Administration hospitals provided care for more than 730,000 patients, which represented an annual increase of over 25,000 patients over the fiscal year 1963 total. Such yearly increase has been fairly constant over the past 4 years. Obviously, a program of this magnitude is one of considerable and continuing interest to the Congress and the people of the United States.

That interest is not based solely on the size and cost of the program. It is considerably heightened by the fact that during the last few years, the quality of the medical care available to beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration has been raised to a point where it unquestionably represents the best medical care available anywhere in the world at any time in the world's history.

When one realizes that this program also represents an attempt on the part of Congress to partially discharge our obligation to the men and women who have offered their lives in defense of our country, it is obvious that anything materially affecting that program should be of immediate concern to Congress. It is. Just as Congress, when it was informed as to what was needed to assure our veterans the best possible medical care, promptly made it available, so too is the Congress quick to respond to any development which threatens the continued rendition of that care or other services to the veteran. Consequently, when on January 13, 1965, the Veterans' Administration announced the closure of a number of hospitals and domiciliaries, the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which had jurisdiction in the matter, initiated an inquiry into the matter.

During the course of the public hearings it became evident that the action by the Veterans' Administration was necessitated in order to activate hospital beds in newly constructed hospitals in areas of dire need. Congress has never set a limitation on the number of hospital beds that the Veterans' Administration can operate. That limitation was placed on the VA hospital system by President Eisenhower in 1959 at the suggestion of the then Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Sumner G. Whittier.

EXPLANATION OF THE RESOLUTION

In providing hospital facilities for the veterans of the United States, Congress has never placed a limit on the number or character of beds in the Veterans' Administration hospital system.

However, as previously pointed out, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Sumner G. Whittier, in a letter to the President dated February 2, 1959, recommended that the total bed capacity of the Veterans' Administration hospital system be limited to 125,000 beds. President Eisenhower approved this overall total by letter dated February 26, 1959.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 would declare it to be the sense of Congress that the authorized bed capacity limitation should, in view of the present need for additional beds in the VA hospital system, be increased by the President to the limitation of 130,000, and respectfully requests the President to take such action as soon as practicable.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, constantly reviewing the operation of the Veterans' Administration hospital system, is keenly aware of the great and growing need of the veterans of the country for the best hospital facilities and care possible, and finds that there is presently a need for additional beds in the Veterans' Administration hospital system. Therefore, the committee unanimously recommends that Congress, through the enactment of Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, request the President to increase the authorized bed capacity of the Veterans' Administration hospitals to 130,000 beds.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that the authorized bed capacity limitation of one hundred and twenty-five thousand for all Veterans' Administration hospitals which was established by the President in a letter to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, dated February 26, 1959, should, in view of the present need for additional bed capacity in such hospitals, be increased by the President to the limitation of one hundred and thirty thousand, and the President is hereby respectfully requested by the Congress to take such action as soon as practicable.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. **ANDERSON**. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

THE TALE OF TWO CITIES

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, an excellent speech by a fine southern gentleman, the former Governor of Florida, LeRoy Collins, recently came to my attention.

This speech was delivered at the Inter-American Bar Association Conference in San Juan, P.R., on May 25, 1965. The speech is a 20th century tale of two cities—Selma, Ala., and an unnamed village in the Dominican Republic. The speech deserves the attention of, not only all Members of Congress, but also the readers of the Congressional Record. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the speech may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of Remarks by LeRoy Collins, Director, Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, Joint Regional Meeting of the American Bar Association and 14th Biennial Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association, San Juan, P.R., May 25, 1965

Let me tell you briefly a 20th century tale of two cities—Selma, Ala., and an unnamed village in the Dominican Republic.

It is a tale which concerns us all—Latin Americans and North Americans, alike—for, in the fundamentals with which I am concerned tonight, it is the same story.

The Dominican Republic has been much in the news lately. It also has been much in my mind and my heart.

Two years ago, U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas and I became involved in an effort to attack the problem of illiteracy in the Dominican Republic, where 8 out of 10 people can neither read nor write.

Justice Douglas was involved as president of the Parvin Foundation and I as president of the National Association of Broadcasters.

We both believed that a country with a high rate of illiteracy could be brought almost to total literacy in a remarkably short time through television instruction. We were eager to prove this, not only to aid the Dominicans but also as a pilot program for use elsewhere.

With the additional help of a small grant from the Alliance for Progress, we produced a rather remarkable series of filmed Spanish literacy lessons intended for broadcast over the television station in Santo Domingo. Before this could come to fruition, however, President Juan Bosch and his elected constitutional democratic government were overthrown by a military junta.

Our literacy film project director, who happened to be on the island at the time of the coup d'etat, with the inhabitants of that nameless backwoods hamlet especially in mind, summed up his final report to Justice Douglas and me as follows:

"The big tragedy of the Dominican Republic is that virtually no one is left on the island to help those wonderful, eager-eyed, handsome people.

"During the few months of the constitutional democracy, many of them had a glimpse, for the first time in their lives, of a totally new vision. Back in the campo the poverty is so grinding and life so futile, it is almost impossible for anyone raised in different circumstances to grasp it; but those people actually had no concept of themselves as being something significantly different from the animals with which they shared their pitiful lot.

"For a brief period, some of them had been exposed to the revolutionary idea that they were human beings.

"And then the lights went out again."

Nearly 2 years later I found myself in Selma, Ala., with a special mandate from President Johnson to help avert a repetition of the bloody assault upon unarmed civil rights demonstrators made 2 days before by local and State police.

At 1 o'clock in the morning, we were negotiating with the civil rights leaders in the parsonage of the church located in the center of the compound where police had confined the demonstrators. Our negotiations were interrupted as a young Negro woman was brought into the room, where an exhausted doctor was trying to catch a few moments of sleep. A bullet, fired apparently from behind the police lines and into the compound where her group was singing, had drilled a disfiguring hole through her lip, knocking out a tooth but miraculously doing no other damage.

She was in considerable pain, but tranquil. As the doctor awoke and began to treat her wounds, her friends who had gathered around were clearly concerned, but also calm.

While the doctor worked, we resumed our negotiations as if this were nothing out of the ordinary—and, tragically, perhaps, it was not.

Those people were fully aware that their friends and loved ones had been shot, beaten and even murdered. Yet they remained unruffled, moving relentlessly toward an objective from which mere bullets and billyclubs could not turn them back—human freedom and dignity.

They had seen the same light the Dominican campesinos had seen—the realization that no man on earth has to tolerate being treated as anything essentially less than other human beings. And no one, or no thing, was going to put out that light for them.

I said this was a story of hemispheric concern. Actually, it concerns the whole world. For this is what is happening around the globe.

It is the story of two-thirds of all mankind, which means 2 billion individuals. It is the story of 80 percent of the people in Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

It is nothing less than the current history of humanity.

And I think it is the most exciting, most hopeful, chapter in all of man's history—not because of the current condition of most men, women, and children now residing on earth, but because of the hope this day holds for tomorrow.

The light of freedom from racial discrimination, the light of hope for an end of man's tyranny over other men, now has been glimpsed by too many people for any force ever to extinguish it anywhere on earth for long or everywhere on earth at any one time.

To be sure, the current condition of mankind is anything but comforting. Although more people enjoy a good life than ever before, so also do more people suffer a miserable life than ever before.

What those of us with plenty of food and clothes, with decent roofs over our heads, like to regard as civilization and culture is little more than a thin, superficial crust. This comfortable hotel where we are now meeting, for example, is about as far from reality from the point of view of most earth dwellers as would be a space station on the moon.

Every 24 hours, as the earth unrolls itself from its own shadow, 3 billion persons—each with an individual personality and identity all his own—rub the sleep from their eyes and face the sunlight. But two of every three can see only despair.

They are the ones who went to sleep with sickness in their mind or body or both, with gnawing hunger in their stomachs and wretched poverty engulfing them like an endless sea. And they awoke the same way, as if from a nightmare which was not an evil dream at all but rather the actual and constant condition of all their waking and sleeping hours.

All of us have a tough time grasping the enormity of the significance in human terms of a figure like 2 billion people. A newspaper account of the death of 1 person, even a total stranger, in an auto wreck on a highway we frequently travel seems more intimately understandable than a report of 100 people killed in a train wreck in Afghanistan.

So, let us pick one solitary soul out of that wretched, impersonal mass of 2 billion. What does this story I am talking about mean to Jose Gonzales, a peasant living somewhere to the south of us? I would not say he is typical of the 2 billion, but he is typical of many hundreds of millions of them.

Jose is 40 years old. In my country he would be regarded as a young man, with the most rewarding part of his life ahead of him. In his country, Jose is an old man, with all but 5 years of his life expectancy already used up.

Jose tills the soil. It is the only thing he knows how to do. He does it exactly the way his father did, and his father's father, and so on back as far as anyone can remember.

Each season Jose gets less and less of a crop from the soil. He accepts this, for his father and his father's father experienced the same thing. The concepts of irrigation and fertilization are as foreign to him as Einstein's theory of relativity.

Jose is sick. But, then, he always has been sick. So has everyone else he ever knew. In fact, there is no word in his vocabulary for "healthy." It is an idea he never has had any reason to express.

Jose is hungry. But he does not feel too bad about it because he knows he is less hungry than his wife or his children—of necessity, because unless he is strong enough to man the plow, there will be nothing for any of them to eat.

Jose cannot read or write. In fact this skill would be as foreign to him as flying a helicopter or conducting the London Philharmonic. There is nothing to read and no one who could read any of his writing if he could write it.

Worst of all, Jose is resigned—for the same reason flamingos do not question why they have pink feathers or fish do not try to walk on land.

Jose's wife is no different. She never knew the joys of childhood, either. She never sang or danced. Her eyes are dull, and when she looks at a flower her mind sees nothing.

But now the outlook for the future of people in this desolate situation is undergoing dramatic change.

For Jose has a son, one of several, Pedro. He is different. True, like his father, and his five brothers, Pedro is ignorant, illiterate, sick, poor, and hungry.

But, unlike them, he is not resigned.

Somewhere, somehow, Pedro caught a fleeting glimpse of that light which said to him: "It does not have to be this way."

It has given him hope, and he, in turn, is determined, if it is the last thing he does, to change things so that neither he nor his children will be limited to the legacy of doom passed on by his father.

And he is not alone. People who feel this way are all over Latin America, Asia, and Africa. Millions are in North America, too.

Thoreau once said of his day that "most men live lives of quiet desperation." Well, the desperation is still with us, but the difference now is that the desperate are no longer quiet.

No one knows for sure how many there are—not the entire 2 billion, by any means. But they number in the millions, and there are many, many more right this moment than there were this hour yesterday.

They will not be turned back, not after they have seen that light.

In the United States, they sometimes sing, "We Shall Overcome." They will, too.

The question before the world right now is, "How soon?" And, "How?"

It is at this point, I think, that those of us among that other 1 billion people—that shrinking minority of 1 in 3—enter the story.

There is nothing we, who have throughout history controlled the world, can do to stop this worldwide movement of undeniable aspirations for human freedom and dignity which is gaining in speed and volume every day.

There is little, if anything, we who have been accustomed to controlling can do to control it. Only the people who are making the avalanche move can do that.

But there are colossal things we can do to help guide it.

Those who are frightened by what they see happening within that two-thirds of mankind and think it means their destruction are deluded—unless, of course, in their panic they should elect to run out in front of the avalanche and try to make it come to a stop. Then, they are sure to be destroyed—even worse, forgotten.

Why should the admittance of two-thirds of humanity into full membership in the human race, with opportunity for access to the full abundance of a still-fruitful planet, be regarded as a threat to the more fortunate one-third?

Look at the prospects for a moment as a matter of cold economics, if you will:

In the United States, if the average income of Negroes were on a par with the average white income, the American gross national product would expand by $23 billion a year.

But think of this: Experts have estimated that a capital investment of $10 a year per capita in the underdeveloped lands of the 2 billion poverty victims of the world would increase their overall per capita income by one-fourth (from $100 a year to $125 a year). This would bring them to the takeoff point for broad self-sustained economic development required of the technological age.

If the present pattern of U.S. exports should continue, the American share of this worldwide increase in consumer buying power would stimulate an enormous increase in our U.S. industrial output, and quickly wipe out all our domestic employment deficiencies.

Most of the 3 billion of the world population are people of color. And the story of the struggle now rolling around the globe—in so many instances—has its roots in the story of dark-skinned people seeking escape from the suffocating exploitation of white racism.

In such situations, white minorities have used the myth of racial superiority and the powers of economic advantage to keep the dark majorities in poverty and servitude. Efforts of victims of that system to bring about change have been met more often than not with crushing force.

While conditions vary greatly in degree of poverty or of discrimination and the means of protest vary from docile prayers on courthouse steps to terror tactics in the jungle, there are common denominators: poverty, indignity, injustice, and the victims' determination to change their lot.

The easy answer is to blame this unrest on communism. But the truth is just not that simple.

If Moscow and Peiping suddenly were to become centers of democratic enlightenment, or if the Soviet Union and China were to disappear from the face of the earth without a trace, the unrest would not stop. For the basic human indignities and the proverty which feed the unrest would still exist. And so would the determination of the multitudes who suffer.

It is not fair to the millions upon millions of people who struggle for no other reason than to improve their own and their children's lot in life—indeed, it is an outrageous distortion of history—to credit their aspirations to Karl Marx or any of his latter-day followers.

Wherever there is human suffering and human resentment against that suffering, there will be the activists of the totalitarian left seeking to guide the inevitable change in their direction, just as there will be activists of the totalitarian right trying to preserve the status quo or recover what once was the status quo.

I hope we are learning that not everyone who struggles for change is an instrument of communism and that fundamental change does not necessarily mean communism, just as not everyone who opposes communism is a supporter of human freedom.

Moreover, I hope we are learning that force is not always the answer to communism but even can become its greatest incubator.

The struggle going on all over the world is not some gigantic, devilish plot unfolding.

The suffering is real. The degradation is not contrived. And although plotters try to turn it to their own advantage, the determination of the sufferers to change their lives is as real as any decent conviction held by any of the rest of us.

Indeed, what they seek is nothing more—or less—than what the early settlers along the eastern seaboard of North America sought or what the numerous national heroes in the struggle all through Latin America have sought. It is human dignity and freedom.

And those of us who have had the advantages of life under democratic systems have no right to abandon them to—or drive them into the arms of—the forces of totalitarianism, whether of the left or of the right.

We often hear it said that peace is the product of strength. That is true. But we badly delude ourselves if we equate strength with force alone.

History documents this throughout its course. Oppressed people have something going for them which in time succeeds against superior force. It is the justice of their cause and the fact that men will sacrifice everything, including their lives, to win. How else could Washington have won with his little force arrayed against the vast might of England in 1776?

The strength of our country, beyond military might, must lie in affirmative, creative efforts to help people rid themselves of the ravages of poverty and the oppression of tyranny. This is the side of right. Any other side is wrong, regardless of who is on it and regardless of what expediencies it may be dressed up in.

No hemisphere, no nation, no community is immune from this revolution of rising expectations. I do not care where you live, you have only to walk a short distance from your door to find the tinder. You will not have long to wait for the spark.

The United States has been especially blessed. Not only are its degrees of impoverishment less acute than in most quarters of the world, but it also has a system of law which—if we choose to use it wisely and courageously—can help bring about necessary social and economic and political change in an orderly and peaceful manner.

We have employed the institution of law in the United States for two purposes: to enshrine established concepts of freedom and justice into the fabric of our society and to open the doors for the ushering in of new needed reforms.

While we are ashamed of what happened at Selma, this was not the symbol of America's failure. Rather it was a painful reminder of democracy's peaceful successes which far outnumber its violent failures.

Those of us associated with the law—as lawyers, as judges, as administrators of laws, as professors of law—have a special responsibility in this connection.

I especially want to commend the American Bar Association for its decision in this session to explore ways of providing more legal help to the poor, in conjunction with the Federal antipoverty program.

Law can be no better than the legislators who make it, than the lawyers who advocate it, than the judges who interpret it, than the people who support it.

I think we all have a responsibility to see to it that the institution of law serves the legitimate ends of this global ferment for change in our time, rather than thwarting it; that it helps clear the way, rather than clutters the path; that it stays out front, rather than remains in the rear, content merely to help consolidate gains made through great pain and sacrifice by others.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act is a clear example of how a President and a Congress, working together, can use the instrument of law to implement the basic rights of American citizenship.

It contains a unique feature. The last title in the act established the agency for which I have responsibility, the Community Relations Service. The function of this new agency is to help bring about voluntary compliance with the provisions of the act.

So far as I have been able to determine, this is the first time such a provision has been written into one of our Nation's laws.

Our agency has no power to enforce or coerce. But it is given the authority to go into any community in the land and offer its services in helping to resolve disputes or disorders arising from racial discrimination.

While we help put out such fires, we also seek to prevent fires from starting in the first place. We do this by aiding local communities—white and Negro citizens working together—to begin eradicating root causes of racial troubles: bad housing, unemployment, poor health, inadequate schools.

This is genuine pioneering in law, and I am pleased to report that it works.

We need more of it—in the United States and throughout the world.

If we do not help the institution of law better to become the enthusiastic partner of the universal striving for human freedom and dignity—to become an instrument of change— it will become the target and the certain victim of such change.

Nor can our concern be confined to our immediate area of interest. The whole world is our concern, and no longer can we allow the artificial lines of province, nation, or hemisphere to wall us off from cooperating in this common concern.

Some 2,500 years ago, the Greek lawyer and legislator, Solon, was asked how justice best could be assured in Athens. He replied that justice would be assured only when those not hurt personally by injustice were as outraged as those who were.

This is an age of outrage. And it is high time, indeed the hour is late, for more of us who feel so comfortable among our privileges and so immune from personal hurt, to share the outrage.

It is also an age of high excitement, and I would not miss it for the world.

Mr. Justice Holmes of the U.S. Supreme Court once wrote:

"I think it is required of a man that he should share the actions and passions of his time at peril of being judged not to have lived."

The actions and passions of our time are the struggles of two-thirds of humanity to join the human race in reality as well as in theory.

The law and those of us who breathe life into the law must share the actions and passions of our time, just as Holmes said.

Alfred Lord Tennyson spoke of a—

> "Child crying in the night,
> Crying for a light,
> With no weapon but a cry."

Tennyson's day has gone forever. Children of God still cry in the night. Some of them still have no weapon but a cry.

But other weapons are available to most people now. Some have guns which will kill. More importantly, more are beginning to see that light, a weapon far more powerful than a gun; the dawn of understanding that it does not have to be the way it is; that they can change things.

Let us resolve to help them change in the ways of freedom.

RESOLUTION IN TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR JOHNSTON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, the board of deacons of the Kensington Baptist Church has written a moving tribute to the late Senator Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina, properly citing his unwavering religious faith and service to his church and community.

I join most wholeheartedly in the expressions contained in the resolution adopted by the board of deacons, and I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the deacons of the Kensington Baptist Church wish to record the high regard which the group has for one of its departed members, the late Olin D. Johnston, U.S. Senator from South Carolina; and

Whereas it is the feeling of the group that the Senator, during the years which he served the church in the capacity of deacon, contributed immeasurably to its spiritual life; and

Whereas the contribution he made in this respect was accomplished in the ways outlined below, as well as in other admirable and worthy means difficult to describe—

The steadfastness of purpose, the feeling of stability he imparted to the group as he gave evidence of the certainty of his salvation; and the spiritual strength which was communicated to the group through his having this assurance;

The inspiration received by the group as he so vividly demonstrated his faith in a risen Saviour in his public and family life;

The dignity with which he made suggestions for promoting the spiritual life of the church;

His faithfulness in attending all meetings of the group if it was at all possible for him to do so;

His readiness to give God the glory for the blessings he and his family were receiving; and

Possession of those qualities in such abundance, and his unstinting use of them, which caused him to give of himself completely to his God and his church, his fellow man, and his country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the deacons of the Kensington Baptist Church, 10100 Connecticut Avenue, Kensington, Md., by means of this resolution, express to Mrs. Johnston and her family, deep appreciation for the signal honor of having had the illustrious Senator as a member of the board of deacons; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be presented to Mrs. Johnston in appropriate form; copies sent to two Baptist papers—the South Carolina Courier and the Maryland Baptist; and that it be read at a regular meeting of the church so that its contents will become a permanent record for posterity's sake.

For the board of deacons:

J. HERBERT JOHN,
PAUL L. ALEXANDER,
DAYTON S. WARD,
Resolutions Committee.

Attest:

THOMAS L. PAINTER, D.D.,
Pastor.

OVERPLANTING OF COTTON AND RICE ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN ARKANSAS AREA

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, under date of March 4, 1965, I called the attention of the Senate to the substantial overplanting of rice and cotton that had developed in the Arkansas area.

Since that time, the Department of Agriculture has assessed and collected $556,766.76 in penalties for overplanting—$434,101.42 was collected on cotton overplanting; $122,665.34 was collected on rice overplanting.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a report on these collections, as furnished under date of May 27, 1965, by the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the letter and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1965.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: With further reference to our investigation of overplanting of cotton and rice acreage allotments in Arkansas, I am enclosing herewith supplemental list No. 11 of the penalties assessed in these cases in Ashley, Chicot, Conway, Craighead, Crittenden, Cross, Desha, Jackson, Jefferson, Lawrence, Lee, Lincoln, Monroe, Phillips, Prairie, Randolph, St. Francis, and Woodruff Counties as of May 19, 1965.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH M. BIRKHEAD,
Assistant to the Secretary.

List of farms overplanted and amount of penalty, State of Arkansas, as of May 19, 1965

County	Commodity	Amount of penalty assessed	Amount of penalty paid
Ashley	Cotton: No change from last report. Cumulative total for cotton, 1 farm.	$1,941.26	0
	Rice: No change from last report. Cumulative total for rice, 1 farm.	1,802.09	0
Chicot	Cotton: No change from last report. Cumulative total for cotton, 2 farms.	119.75	$89.76
Conway	Cotton: No change from last report. Cumulative total for cotton, 3 farms.	1,103.43	0
Craighead	Cotton: Cumulative total for cotton, 27 farms	39,226.73	36,997.77
	Rice: Cumulative total for rice, 14 farms	78,535.11	63,655.07
Crittenden	Cotton: No change from last report. Cumulative total for cotton, 9 farms.	45,790.04	41,221.87
	Rice: No change from last report. Cumulative total for rice, 1 farm.	1,905.01	0
Cross	Cotton: No change from last report. Cumulative total for cotton, 2 farms.	507.35	0
Desha	Cotton: Cumulative total for cotton, 13 farms	18,705.78	500.21
Jackson	Cotton: No change from last report. Cumulative total for cotton, 1 farm.	1,042.64	0
	Rice: No change from last report. Cumulative total for rice, 1 farm.	412.66	0
Jefferson	Cotton: No change from last report. Cumulative total for cotton, 2 farms.	11,455.22	0
	Rice: Cumulative total for rice, 5 farms	14,019.57	146.75
Lawrence	Cotton: Cumulative total for cotton, 4 farms	1,444.53	1,123.43
	Rice: Cumulative total for rice, 5 farms	14,994.46	4,708.96
Lee	Cotton: Cumulative total for cotton, 14 farms	14,247.37	11,551.10
	Rice: Cumulative total for rice, 3 farms	5,694.18	2,162.51
Lincoln	Cotton: No change from last report. Cumulative total for cotton, 1 farm	291.11	0
Monroe	Rice: No change from last report. Cumulative total for rice, 1 farm	3,179.61	3,179.61
Phillips	Cotton: No change from last report. Cumulative total for cotton, 12 farms	12,280.60	9,705.71
	Rice: Cumulative total for rice, 2 farms	986.46	986.46
Prairie	Rice: No change from last report. Cumulative total for rice, 1 farm	4,021.33	4,021.33
Randolph	Cotton: No change from last report. Cumulative total for cotton, 3 farms	903.72	0
	Rice: No change from last report. Cumulative total for rice, 1 farm	11,278.50	11,278.50
St. Francis	Cotton: Cumulative total for cotton, 167 farms	352,121.87	332,911.57
	Rice: Cumulative total for rice, 32 farms	55,692.56	30,217.92
Woodruff	Cotton: No change from last report. Cumulative total for cotton, 1 farm.	1,930.04	0
	Rice: No change from last report. Cumulative total for rice, 1 farm.	2,308.23	2,308.23
Cumulative State total for cotton.		503,111.44	434,101.42
Cumulative State total for rice.		194,829.77	122,665.34
Total		697,941.21	556,766.76

COINAGE LEGISLATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that our annual consumption of silver exceeds the world production of that metal and in 2 or 3 more years at the current rate, our billion ounces of stockpile would be gone, creating not only a monetary problem, but a very serious industrial problem for certain industries, where there is no known adequate substitute, it is a foregone conclusion that the Congress will act, and act promptly to authorize for most, if not all, of our coins a metal allow that will contain no silver.

Since we are faced with what a German philosopher once termed "a categorical imperative" and, therefore, must act promptly, I have set the coinage bill down for action by the full Banking and Currency Committee for next Wednesday, June 9, at which time, I hope that we not only can complete the hearings, but likewise vote in executive session to report the bill.

Normally, our committee does not report a bill until the hearings have been printed. In this instance, however, the issues are both simple and well understood by both the committee and the public. They are: First, a critical shortage of silver. Second, a formula for a coin that, without silver, will activate coin machines and have a pleasing appearance. Third, shall the new program apply to all silver coins, or to dimes and quarters only?

With all due deference, it is my personal opinion that the latter issue is the only one that we need to seriously consider. The 90 percent of silver in our silver dollars is not an issue because we have no present intention to mint any more silver dollars until a Commission on Coinage proposed to be appointed, has submitted a report concerning a permanent policy. But the President has recommended that we cut the present silver content of the 50-cent piece, which is approximately 80 percent, to approximately 40 percent; and I understand that the Treasury Department plans, if such a bill is enacted, to produce about 100 million silver Kennedy half dollars per year and that would consume approximately 15 million ounces of silver per year, or nearly one-half of our current total domestic production of silver. The commercial users of silver claim that eventually we will have to completely abandon silver for coinage purposes and they, therefore, see no good and sufficient reason for not making the complete break at the present time. There are more in this country, however, who would feel more assured concerning the value and the respect for our currency at home and abroad if we would continue the production of at least one silver coin.

At our hearings next Wednesday, I hope that the witnesses will concentrate their attention on that issue.

CLUB INTERNATIONALE: A NEW EXPERIMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, many private institutions in this country, and local and National Government agencies have contributed notably to people-to-people programs fostering good will and better understanding between this and other countries throughout the world.

We know that individual contacts with citizens of foreign lands, brought about through travel and daily conduct of business, are of prime importance in the maintenance of good international relations. Treaties, alliances, and agreements between nations follow paths where cordial relations have already been established through intercourse in trade and travel. Compacts among governments do not flourish where they are not prefaced by good will among men.

I would like to bring to your attention a unique group which is now being organized in the United States, and which is destined to make a major contribution to furtherance of international understanding among peoples at the "grassroots" level. This is a nationwide association, Club Internationale, whose members are Americans interested in travel and the opportunities it brings toward fuller appreciation of peoples in foreign countries, their philosophies, their ideas and ideals, their problems, their cultures, and their day-to-day life experiences.

Club Internationale is set up through local chapters in various communities, with national headquarters in Washington, D.C. The club has a 3-year program for its members, offering travel to countries of the Western Hemisphere in the first 2 years—to such places as Mexico, Canada, and areas of the Caribbean. In the third year, members enjoy European vacations. All are provided at exceptionally low costs, to enable more Americans to take advantage of the rich experience of travel, and vacations abroad.

What is especially unique about Club Internationale is its efforts to reach greater numbers of our ordinary citizens who have the desire to travel, but who cannot afford many of the high-cost vacations which limit these opportunities to those of greater affluence. Another outstanding feature of Club Internationale's program is the design to help its members be better prepared for their foreign travel. This is done through lectures, language courses, meetings with foreign nationals in this country, and a number of carefully planned social and recreational events conducted throughout the 3-year period of memberships.

While chapters of Club Internationale are being formed in the United States, plans will be made to organize similar groups in other countries of the world. A vacation club has been operating for nearly 14 years, with great success, throughout Europe. So the idea is tried and true. Club Internationale, now underway here, is assured similar success because the response to lures of foreign travel and vacations overseas is so widespread among our own citizens.

Club Internationale, in the United States, is a new people-to-people approach here. It will encourage foreign visitors to come here. It will give our traveling public incentives to fulfill the role of good-will ambassadors when our citizens go abroad.

Club Internationale can be the breakthrough for many thousands of Americans who have dreamed of vacation travel to other countries, but who, until now, have been without too much hope of realizing their desires.

BIG BROTHER: CUSTOMS SERVICE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, today's big brother award goes to the Bureau of Customs. It concerns the treatment of a young man named Richard H. Rosichan of Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. Rosichan describes in some detail the use by the customs service of paid informers to catch, not narcotics peddlers or diamond smugglers, but dealers in gold coins.

Slowly but surely, the Federal Government would turn us into a nation of paid tattletales.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Rosichan's letter printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Atlanta, Ga.,
May 19, 1965.

Senator Edward Long,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Long: Thank you for your reply to my letter, sent in care of Senator Talmadge, regarding my experience with U.S. Post Office snooping at my mail. I noted in the most recent issue of Newsweek that you are now investigating the use of tipsters in the IRS and other agencies. I thought you might be interested in an experience I had in this regard with the customs department.

In early June of last year, I was on a bus bound from Toronto, Canada, to Buffalo, N.Y. I had arrived in Toronto on a direct flight from the Bahamas, and had also been to Jamaica. I had been buying large amounts of copper and silver coins for collectors in both places. At the U.S. customs station at Lewiston, N.Y., near Niagara Falls, I was summarily yanked off the bus when the customs inspector was told that I had coins (I told him). I was hustled into the station with my baggage, and the bus left without me. Without being given any explanation by the head inspector, who was as rude a person as I've ever met, I was questioned about all kinds of irrelevant personal matters, such as what cities had I lived in during my childhood, what was I taking at the University of Buffalo, where I was a student, etc. My baggage was opened, but the inspector's main interest was not in the articles inside, but in the papers, including a number of personal letters, which he freely and unapologetically began to read. My person was also searched. I finally called up my lawyer in Buffalo, who in turn called the collector of customs, who in turn called the inspector who had been harassing me, and at that point the harassment magically ceased. I was informed that there had been a lot of gold-coin smuggling in the area, that all coin dealers were suspect, and that this was standard procedure. However, I was also told that I would have to wait until their coin specialist arrived.

I waited, rather curious as to the nature of this specialist. About 10 or 15 minutes later, a tall, blondish, friendly man, rather young, walked in, grabbed my hand and pumped it, introduced himself as Mr. Grimes, and even offered me a cigarette. Rather startled at this sudden show of friendliness from a member of a department which I had grown less than fond of in the previous half hour, I mentioned my grievance at having been thus treated without cause or suspicion. He explained that customs had the right to look at everything brought into the country by anyone, even their personal mail, even to opening sealed letters, etc., with no warrant or anything else.

He then, getting friendlier all the time, finally made me realize why I had been kept there to talk with him. It seemed that there was a reward for turning in any coin dealer smuggling in gold coins—in fact, this reward amounts to 25 percent of the total value of the coins seized. As a matter of fact, a number of people had made some pretty good money doing this. Why not me? It was money in the bank, and I must know quite a few dealers.

Anxious for nothing except getting out of there as soon as humanly possible and never seeing the blasted place again, I played along with Mr. Grimes, implying that I certainly was interested, that I didn't know anyone but sure would keep my eyes open, etc. On hearing this, Mr. Grimes just lit up. He took me out of the room, got my baggage together, took me right out of there, after calling off the inspector and his assistant, and drove me in his own car into Niagara Falls, where he put me on a bus for Buffalo, at his expense. I was so bitter about the whole humiliating experience that a few months later Life printed a letter of mine which said some rather uncomplimentary things about the customs service.

Now the truth of the matter is, Senator, is that first of all I wouldn't turn anyone in under this ruling. The reasons are manyfold. First, I am not an informer. Second, I do not regard bringing in gold coins without a license as any worse of a crime than failing to carry a gun for protection against the Indians (a crime in certain New England towns). This is a ruling, originally a 1962 Executive order of President Kennedy's, not an act of Congress, which makes virtually no difference as far as the gold outflow is concerned, and which, along with a few opportunistic gold speculators, penalizes tens of thousands of legitimate collectors and dealers, and has resulted in such asinine excesses as the seizure from the Witte Museum in San Antonio, Tex., of a number of gold coins that were supposedly "illegal."

The most important reason, however, is that as far as I am concerned, accepting a 25-percent profit on such informing would virtually be stealing from the Government. Look at it this way. Suppose a man smuggles in gold coins with a gold value of $670 and a collectors' value of $1,000. In order to buy these coins, he pays, say, 900 American dollars into a foreign account. So we see, in effect, US$900 being sold to buy gold. For turning the man in, an informer would collect between $167.50 and $250 from the Government. The question is, Is it worth such an amount to prevent the conversion of US$900 into gold in the first place? Particularly when the gold in question remains within the United States? I don't think so.

At any rate, thank you for taking the time to read this, and I wish you good fortune in your efforts to curb abuses by Federal agencies.

Sincerely yours,
Richard H. Rosichan.

SURVIVAL OR SURRENDER FOR ENDANGERED WILDLIFE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the past several months, I have discussed several times, on the Senate floor, rare and endangered species of American wildlife. I have pointed out, for the benefit of Senators and others who read the Record, the progress of my amendment to provide $350,000 to get on with the job. I am happy to say that these funds were included in the Interior Department appropriations bill, as it was passed by the Senate. We go to conference on the bill on June 14, and I am extremely hopeful that the members of the conference committee will approve my amendment.

Since April 29, when I last discussed on the Senate floor the subject of endangered species, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has published a pamphlet entitled "Survival or Surrender for Endangered Wildlife." This pamphlet is extremely well done; and, because its distribution is limited, I ask leave to have it printed at this point in my remarks in the Record. I urge Senators to read this presentation; and I shall welcome support in my efforts to have this great American natural resource protected and conserved.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Survival or Surrender for Endangered Wildlife

A MOMENT OF TIME AND A SPARK

A little more than a century ago a man might have looked up by the hour as a flock of passenger pigeons winged overhead, almost from horizon to horizon.

A little more than half a century ago the last passenger pigeon on earth died in a zoo.

A little more than a century ago a man might have watched by the hour as a herd of bison thundered across the land.

A little more than half a century ago the only bison left on earth were a few dozen in some private herds. But a spark of concern caught fire, and the American bison was brought back from the edge of oblivion to continue as part of our peculiarly American heritage.

Today the future of many kinds of wildlife depends on how brightly burns a spark of concern. We can recall, in shortened form, Aldo Leopold's observation on the extinction of the passenger pigeon: "For one species to mourn the death of another is a new thing under the sun. We, who have lost our pigeons, mourn the loss. Had the funeral been ours, the pigeons would hardly have mourned us. In this fact, rather than in nylons or atomic bombs, lies evidence of our superiority over the beasts." And we can be assured by the bison we see today that imperiled wildlife can be saved when concern is bright enough.

FROM ARCHAEOPTERYX TO PASSENGER PIGEON

Through the eons of time, who knows how many kinds of animals have lived and died? Why did the huge dinosaurs, the formidable saber-toothed tiger, the diminutive five-toed horse, the gigantic mastodons and mammoths, and that reptilelike bird, the archaeopteryx, disappear from the earth? They held important places in the wildlife communities of their times, which collectively spanned millions of years. Now they are known only from bones that happened to be preserved beneath the surface of the earth.

These ancient species were gone before history, so the reasons for their passing are unknown. We know they disappeared along with thousands of other species that lived long before man began to dominate the earth; we can only speculate on the cause of their demise on the basis of geologic evidence and our knowledge of species that survived until historic times.

Species on the earth at any given time have developed through natural processes working toward a balance of life in the world. Each species and subspecies has some special characteristic, some individual feature, that distinguishes it from other species or subspecies. Wildlife species have attributes that fit them for specific niches in their wildlife communities much as the professions in our human communities fill specific needs. If species arise that are better adapted to fill community niches, the original occupants are replaced. And when there is a change in the conditions for which a species is fitted, the species faces three alternatives: adapt, move on, or die.

Before the relatively recent arrival of man, species disappeared because gradual changes, such as shift in climate, glacial advance, or inundation by the oceans, eliminated the habitats to which they were adapted, or because they lost in competition with other species. Changes were speeded up by civilized man with his technological means of rapidly altering environment, his propensity for introducing competing species, both wild and domestic, and his more direct means of destruction. As a result, species are now disappearing at a disproportionately greater rate than formerly and apparently much more rapidly than they are evolving.

Of all the continents, North America has witnessed the most drastic changes in abundance of wildlife and the greatest number of extinctions in historic times. This is undoubtedly because of its sudden transition from primitive to highly civilized conditions. Among the victims in America, during its short history of settlement, were the great auk, Labrador duck, passenger pigeon, heath hen, and Carolina parakeet, among birds; the Arizona elk, eastern elk, California grizzly, Texas grizzly, plains grizzly, eastern forest bison, giant sea mink, plains gray wolf, eastern puma, and Badlands bighorn, among mammals; and the Michigan grayling, San Gorgonio trout, Pahranagat spinedace, thicktail chub, harelip sucker, Owens River pupfish, and Ash Meadows killifish, among fish. There may be other less-known species that have passed out of existence, with so little known about them that their passing went unrecorded.

Life on oceanic islands has been most vulnerable of all to man's interference. In the West Indies, Puerto Rico has been severely affected. Two birds confined to this island are gone and others are going. Of the Pacific islands, the Hawaiian group has suffered most. Sixteen of its remarkable native birds are gone and many more are in jeopardy. The relatively simple community organization of native island life, with few species, few predators, and little disease, has made it particularly vulnerable to introduced continental species more resistant to disease and adapted to tougher competition. Disease against which isolated island life had built up no immunity, competition for community niches, and predation spelled disaster when with the help of man the foreign invaders reached the islands. Introduced rats, rabbits, goats, domestic cats, mongooses, and man himself have been among the worst destroyers of island plant and animal life.

Flightless birds like the Laysan rail of the Hawaiian Islands were at an obvious disadvantage when predatory animals were introduced. The habit of congregating in dense flocks made the passenger pigeon, the Carolina parakeet, and the Eskimo curlew vulnerable to mass slaughter. Flocking and flightlessness together preordained the great auk to extinction at the hands of oil- and meat-hungry mariners.

Yes, nothing is more certain than death and extinction. Yet man, being man, is reluctant to accept the inevitable without a struggle. He has prolonged his own lifespan materially through the wonders of medical science. He seems reluctant to let other species become extinct, perhaps even more reluctant when those other species may have been brought to the edge of extinction by the actions of some of man's own kind.

Man believes that the technological ability that enabled him to harness the atom can also, if properly directed, increase the survival span of other species. This is the challenge.

A QUESTION OF STATUS

Absence of easily understood, clearly defined criteria has made it difficult for the public to become aware when a species of wildlife may be near extinction. To determine whether a species is in danger, information is needed about the area it originally occupied and its abundance, the changes in its distribution and the causes of those changes, its present status in numbers and range, and the natural and human factors that may act upon it. We need to know when pollution may be making unlivable the only stream that is the habitat of a race of fish; or when the drying up of the last bit of marsh will wipe out the only source of food for a species of bird; or when too-close proximity of an introduced species will bring about the disappearance of the special characteristics that distinguish an interesting subspecies.

To make discussion practical, specialists of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the U.S. Department of the Interior have suggested the circumstances under which wildlife should be considered as in peril and have prepared a list of species considered rare and endangered. The terms used to show the status of wildlife species—and subspecies or races—are these:

An endangered species is one whose prospects of survival and reproduction are in immediate jeopardy. Its peril may result from one or many causes—ravages of disease, predation by another animal, competition from a more aggressive species, a change in habitat. An endangered species must have help, or extinction will probably follow. In this classification the specialists put 16 mammals, 34 birds, 25 fishes, 1 reptile, 2 amphibians.

A rare species is one whose numbers are few throughout its range. So long as conditions remain stable and favorable, a rare species may continue, though in limited numbers. When such a species occupies a limited habitat, adverse influences are more critical, and changes in environment may quickly make it endangered. In this classification the specialists put 12 mammals, 16 birds, 14 fishes, 1 reptile, 1 amphibian.

A peripheral species is one whose occurrence in the United States is at the edge of its natural range. Such a species may be found in satisfactory numbers outside our country, but its retention in our Nation's fauna calls for special attention. In this classification the specialists noted 9 mammals, 68 birds, 4 fishes, 2 reptiles.

In a classification status questionable have been placed a number of wildlife species. Wildlife specialists have suggested that information be sought on these species so that their status can be determined. Some of them may be in danger. In this classification the specialists have listed 18 mammals, 45 birds, 49 fishes.

In their list the specialists included more than 200 forms of mammals, birds, fishes, reptiles, and amphibians occurring naturally within the 50 States and Puerto Rico. Of these species, 78 are regarded as endangered and 44 as rare; 21 are peripheral species whose continuance in our country's fauna is threatened; and the rest are status-questionable species suggested for special study.

Thumbnail notes on 15 endangered species are given here as typical.

Key deer, *Odocoileus virginianus clavium:* This diminutive white-tailed deer once occupied most of the lower Florida Keys, but overhunting, development of the islands, and hurricanes and fires reduced it to an estimated 30 by 1949. Protective legislation, establishment of the Key Deer Wildlife Refuge in 1953, and favorable publicity in its behalf have helped this resilient deer. Its numbers appear to be increasing slowly; they were estimated at 300 in 1964. This is a good example of what man can do to assist a dwindling race, if he so desires.

Delmarva Peninsula fox squirrel, *Sciurus niger cinereus:* This local race of fox squirrel, which inhabits the same country as the smaller gray squirrel, apparently survives chiefly in Dorchester County, Md. Its decline was due to overhunting, as well as encroachment on its habitat by logging, cultivation, construction, roadbuilding, and forest fires.

Black-footed ferret, *mustela nigripes:* This large weasel traditionally lived in company with prairie dogs, which provided it with a natural prey and with den sites. Destruction of the prairie dogs, grazing or cultivation of the grasslands, hunting, and highway mortality have brought the ferret to the verge of extinction. Its best hope appears to be the establishment of sanctuaries where prairie dogs still exist in numbers.

Grizzly bear, *Ursus horribilis:* Greatly reduced in all of its former range except Canada and Alaska, south of which the grizzly seems to be making its last stand in Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks. Continuous persecution as a predator, and the development and alteration of the wilderness areas on which it depends, are mainly responsible.

Whooping crane, *Grus americana:* This magnificent bird is now reduced to a population of about 42 in the wild and 8 in captivity. The migrants breed in southern Mackenzie Province, Canada, and winter at the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge on the Texas coast. During migration they are subjected to shooting and much of their former breeding range has been altered adversely by man. Their best hope seems to be in strict enforcement of existing laws, provision of additional refuge areas, and attempts to reinforce the population by specimens bred in captivity.

Ivory-billed woodpecker, *Campephilus principalis:* Once resident from Oklahoma to North Carolina and southward, this largest American woodpecker may already be extinct. Feeding on the larvae of wood-boring beetles, they were dependent on large tracts of forest with dead and dying trees. Removal of overmature forests has reduced the birds' essential habitat to the vanishing point.

Florida Everglade kite, *Rostrhamus sociabilis plumbeus:* This species is reduced to a score or less in the vicinity of Lake Okeechobee and the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge in Florida. It feeds on a single species of snail that lives in fresh water lakes and marshes. Extensive drainage of these habitats, or their destruction by fire, is fatal to the kite.

Attwater's prairie chicken, *Tympanuchus cupido attwateri:* First cousin of the extinct heath hen of the Northeast, this bird is threatened with the same fate. Approximately 1,300 are thought to reside in the coastal prairie of Texas. Cultivation and grazing of the natural tall grass habitat are chiefly responsible for the birds' decline.

California condor, *Gymnogyps californianus:* Our largest soaring land bird, which once ranged from the Columbia River to Mexico and east to Texas, was reduced by 1964 to an estimated population of 40, mostly in the Los Padres National Forest of southern California. Human disturbances, mainly shooting, are chiefly responsible.

Nene or Hawaiian goose, *Branta sandvicensis:* The official State bird of Hawaii was reduced to fewer than 50 in the late 1880's, owing to hunting, predation by introduced mammals, and destruction of habitat by introduced grazing animals. Protection and restoration programs have produced an estimated 285 on Hawaii and Maui at the present time.

Aleutian Canada goose, *Branta canadensis leucopareia:* Once regarded as extinct, this very small race of Canada goose which once bred widely on the Aleutian Islands was rediscovered in 1963 on remote Buldir Island, where there were no introduced foxes and rats. Present numbers are about 300, and attempts are being made to rear captive birds for restocking the former range.

Apache trout, *Salmo* sp: This fish, differing in several respects from the similar Gila trout, was once widespread in the upper tributaries of the White and Colorado Rivers in Arizona. Introduction of competing species and modification of habitat by deforestation have reduced the population to two small streams on the Fort Apache Indian Reservation.

Humpback chub, *Gila cypha:* Little is known of the former status of this distinctive minnow, which now occurs in the Green and Colorado Rivers north of the Grand Canyon. Its upper range along the Utah-Wyoming border has now been inundated by the Flaming Gorge Dam.

Devils Hole pupfish, *Cyprinodon diabolis:* This small, specialized fish, probably a relict of the Ice Age, now occurs only in a single, spring-fed pool in southern Nevada. It requires warm water and heavy algae growth, and human tampering with the habitat might well doom it.

Green turtle, *Chelonia mydas mydas:* This large marine turtle occurs worldwide in tropical waters but has been greatly reduced as a breeding population in the mainland United States by heavy pressure on it for food and by molestation of its eggs and young.

AWAY FROM THE EDGE

As early as colonial times attempts were made to help wildlife, principally by restrictions on hunting. By 1880, all the States had some form of game laws. A change from mere protection to the principle of managing wildlife for enjoyment by everyone began with establishment of the first Federal parks and sanctuaries, now called wildlife refuges, at the turn of the century.

As refuges and parks were dedicated to preserving the native fauna and flora, biological surveys of the distribution, habits, economic importance, and classification of wildlife added to the knowledge on which effective management depended. The first comprehensive study of a species coupled with effective management was Stoddard's monumental investigation of the bobwhite quail in Georgia in the 1920's. In the next 25 years, many other studies of wildlife, mostly game species, were carried out.

The developing science of wildlife management aimed at more effective preservation of habitats, protection and other measures for declining species, and better harvesting of game species. For most fish and wildlife, management has progressed to the point where adequate methods are available to enhance production and to permit a safe annual harvest of game, but conventional management measures have not been enough for some kinds of wildlife, and their survival may depend on new approaches.

For survival, a species' year-round needs must be provided for. For migratory animals, this means provision not only on breeding and wintering grounds but also in transit between those areas. Rapidly changing conditions brought about by more intense land use and other human-related factors can permanently reduce the likelihood of survival of some forms. For other species, relatively adverse conditions may be only temporary, and habitats substituted for those damaged or destroyed can tide them through brief periods of adversity. If a species must be protected from excessive hunting, more intensive enforcement or more restrictive regulations may be needed. When a species is being killed off by a well-meaning but uninformed public, more extensive informational programs may help.

Since the first Federal refuge on Pelican Island in Florida in 1903, nearly 300 Federal refuges have been established. The Federal refuge system is now adequate for many species of wildlife, including some in the endangered category, but a few additional areas are needed to meet special requirements. The recently enacted land and water conservation fund legislation may be a means to this end.

On some areas, all that is needed is protection of the land and water and the associated flora and fauna. On others a major habitat restoration is necessary, or the elimination of such adverse factors as human disturbance, excessive predation, or disease-producing conditions. Cereal and other crops have provided supplementary food for wildlife and by holding them on managed areas have helped to reduce mortality.

To facilitate development and management that is possible only under full ownership, most Federal wildlife refuges have been purchased in fee title. Some refuges have been superimposed on lands controlled by other Federal agencies for flood control, irrigation, forest and range management, or other purposes. Still others are under leases or easements whose purpose is to preserve, improve, or reestablish conditions needed by wildlife species. Such provisions may range from closure to hunting to prevention of burning, disking, or plowing of vegetation, or merely assurance that water and marsh areas shall not be drained. Lower costs and less maintenance responsibility are advantages of lease-type arrangements.

Wildlife refuges and habitat management have enhanced the survival prospects of many forms of wildlife. The American bison, estimated to have numbered about 60 million in 1800 when it already had begun to decline, had completely disappeared from the wild about 1900. Restoration of this species to manageable numbers on the National Bison Range in Montana and other Federal, State, and private refuges, parks, and zoos, from stock preserved in small private herds, appears to have assured it preservation. The Key deer in southern Florida and the trumpeter swan in southwestern Montana and parts of Idaho and Wyoming have responded well to habitat management combined with protection from hunting.

The Forest Service and the Michigan Conservation Department are managing forest regrowth for the nesting of the Kirtland's warbler which seems to be coming back. The National Park Service, in preserving representative elements of this Nation's flora and fauna, is contributing to the welfare of species using its lands, particularly the nonmigratory forms which may remain within park boundaries throughout their lives. The National Audubon Society has always been in the vanguard of action on behalf of endangered and other wildlife, not only in fostering protection but in purchasing and dedicating lands and waters necessary for them. A substantial number of other national and international organizations are engaged in similar projects.

Other wildlife species that have been brought back from the edge of extinction include the sea otter, fur seal, wild turkey, snowy egret, Hudsonian godwit, and golden plover. Control of the sea lamprey on the Great Lakes is bringing about a spectacular return of lake trout to commercially harvestable quantities. In the West, research on methods of reducing fish losses at damsites is showing promise.

Regulations

Federal and State regulations provide for harvest of game species that can tolerate periodic removal of part of their number and for protection of those that need this assistance. International treaties, Federal and State legislation, and effective enforcement have largely eliminated market hunting and have strictly controlled the use of wildlife plumage, furs, and other parts in the clothing trade. Egrets, herons, grebes, and many other nongame species benefit from this protection.

Rare game species that can be readily identified by the hunter can be protected by keeping them off the list of species that may be taken. Rare species that resemble more common species in appearance or habits, or occupy the same habitats, must be protected by other means. Two important protective measures are control of the time when hunting is allowed and control of the place. Hunting of a species may be delayed, moved up, or interrupted in order to protect a similar but rarer type while it is passing through or resident on an area. An example is a delay in opening the hunting season on snow geese in a Province of Canada to permit the earlier migrating, rare Ross' geese to pass through safely.

By restricting the place where hunting is permitted, plentiful species can be taken with minimal risk to rare or endangered forms. Permitting hunting of the abundant lesser sandhill crane only in western Texas and eastern New Mexico protects the endangered whooping crane and the rare greater sandhill crane. Other provisions to regulate the take of certain wildlife include special seasons, limitations on equipment or methods, restrictions on daily or seasonal bag, hunting by permit only, and sanctuaries or refuges where hunting is curtailed or prohibited. Many regulations favor rare wildlife by reducing predator or competitive species that share limited habitats.

Education

Universal stewardship of wildlife is the objective. Responsible citizens must not only obey the laws themselves but must encourage others to obey. Organizations and individuals who have an interest in our native wildlife must take every opportunity to convey the conservation message to everyone. The subject has headline value. Interesting articles and pictures are readily accepted by the press and they form the basis for popular television programs.

Practically untouched are opportunities for bringing this conservation message to schoolchildren. The story of endangered species is the chronicle of much of our wasted natural wealth. Though wildlife in general is a renewable resource, a wildlife species that is once lost can never be replaced. This is the kind of story youthful minds can grasp and champion.

Additional measures

Despite substantial habitat management and enforcement efforts on their behalf, certain species have bleak survival prospects, particularly those with narrow ranges of adaptability or with specialized habits and requirements. Many forms of wildlife, particularly migratory species, cannot be kept on managed habitats or under protective observation all the time. Other measures are needed.

Each species and variety of wildlife is a product of many generations of development. To preserve it, a knowledge of its characteristics and living requirements is essential. The needs of many species, particularly the more abundant ones, are fairly well known, and for them management measures have been quite successful. For many rare and endangered species, some of the essential information is sketchy or lacking. Here, further preservation efforts must start with factfinding.

A first step is an appraisal of the status and range of each endangered form followed by intensive studies of its habits and the factors that affect its productivity and survival. These investigations will point the way toward improving habitat and developing more effective regulations.

A promising and relatively recent development in the program to preserve rare and endangered species is the use of propagation methods that include the capture and direct transfer of stock from one location where they are present to another where they are dwindling or have disappeared, and the taking of wild stock into captivity for mass production and later release to bolster existing numbers or to establish new populations. To avoid risk to endangered species, preliminary propagation experiments should be carried out with closely related but more abundant species. For instance, research on the captive production and release to the wild of sandhill cranes is expected to yield information that eventually can be used with whooping cranes.

Methods that have been successful in restoring breeding flocks of Canada geese in the North Central States now are giving a new lease on life to the State bird of Hawaii, the nene or Hawaiian goose. They have been used to restore or extend the ranges of the trumpeter swan, the pronghorn antelope, and numerous native big game and small upland game species.

Trial-and-error methods of the past are yielding to research-based techniques. Intensive physiological, pathological, genetic, and behaviorial studies must be a part of any program to restore endangered forms. If production in captivity is used to supplement production in the wild, purity of genetic, behaviorial, and physical characteristics must be maintained. Captivity-induced changes must be scrupulously guarded against, because they may entail the loss or detrimental modification of traits essential to survival in the wild. The individuals to be released must be properly conditioned so that they will behave naturally in the wild.

After release, their fate in the wild must be closely watched to determine the factors that lead to failure or to successful reestablishment as a natural population. Satisfactorily carried out, it is impossible to distinguish the members of an artificially planted wildlife population from those that have appeared by natural expansion. As a bonus benefit, captive propagation reduces the risk of catastrophic loss of the wild population, by maintaining productive stock in captivity.

The passenger pigeon, the health hen, and the Labrador duck do not need more company in oblivion. Taking all our endangered wildlife away from the edge of extinction will not be easy, but past successes with what appeared to be hopeless situations prove that it can be done. What has been accomplished with the American bison, the pronghorn antelope, the trumpeter swan, the American egret, can be repeated with the Florida manatee, the black-footed ferret, the whooping crane, the California condor. Tomorrow may be too late.

THE PRICE IS RIGHT

There is an economic angle to the perpetuation of endangered wildlife. Concentrations of wildlife of any kind seem to draw people: chambers of commerce often advertise them as local attractions. When people gather, they naturally spend money and prime the local economy. Curiosity draws thousands of visitors to Aransas National Wildlife Refuge in Texas, where the remnants of the once great population of whooping cranes gather to spend the winter. Sightseeing boats on the Intracoastal Waterway near the refuge are supported by people hoping to get a view of these majestic birds. But in our whole national economy this is only a small part.

Many species that have reached the endangered category were once important sources of food or other raw material for human use. The bison and the beaver practically supported the settlement of the West. The passenger pigeon, the sturgeon, and the prairie chicken were staple food items in the markets of yesteryear. We cannot expect any resurgence of an endangered species to make it an important food item again, but perhaps society owes a debt to assure survival of these wild forms now threatened with extinction.

Americans are notorious for their interest in the underdog. This interest goes out to wildlife struggling for their very existence against obstacles that sometimes are the inevitable results of human progress, but sometimes the results of human indifference or human greed.

Suppose the last whooping crane quietly gave up the struggle for survival in some lonely marsh. Would it make any difference to you? Chances are you'll never see a live one anyhow—millions of Americans never will. Why worry? The same may be said of many other rare or endangered species of wildlife. What are the values of these creatures? Why spend time and effort to save them?

Coldly appraised, there is little doubt we could get along without most forms of wildlife, be they common, rare, or threatened with extinction. We could get along without baseball, or golf, or automobiles, or coal, or trees, or many, many other things—if we had to. But each of these helps make life easier, or pleasanter, or more interesting. It's a question of how many good things we want and can afford.

A businessman, after a period of clawing competition, realized he must either slow up or blow up and took off on a fishing trip to the coast. The three game fish he caught were big ones, and figuring what he spent for his trip, they had a value of about $170 apiece. Or was that the value of the fish?

Can we set a value on a whooping crane as the price a zoo might offer on a free and open market?

The American bison or buffalo has been restored to the point that it is necessary to keep some of the herds to manageable size by disposing of a few animals for food. Could we figure the true worth of bison to the American people in foodstore values?

Can the worth of a city park be calculated in board feet of trees and square feet of dirt? Or in children's feet at play?

A generation ago there was a vogue for estimating the worth of the chemicals and other elements that make up a human's body. In those days it came to something less than a dollar. Prices are higher now, and no doubt a human these days is worth more than a dollar. Isn't he?

Human happiness is the sum total of all the desires and enjoyments and accomplishments of all the individuals who make up the human population. Take away one part from the whole, and the whole is no longer complete.

As the numbers of a wildlife species grow fewer, their true value grows greater, for in the few are concentrated all the worth of one small but valuable part of our whole world.

History is replete with examples of evolution and change, a matter of considerable import to mankind as an indication or insight into his own future. Threatened species are visible indicators of some of the changes that are often so subtle as to be otherwise unnoticed and, therefore, unmeasured.

Nothing is surer than death and extinction, but the death of a species can be postponed longer than that of an individual. Man's wisdom and experience have not been extensive enough to grasp the full significance of the loss of a species of wildlife. Each occupies a niche and makes a contribution to the whole of life. The biological impact of forever removing a species from the environment may not always be readily discernible, but something of value has been lost.

Why feel concern for the whooping cranes?

Because they are still there.

ROOM FOR ALL

Many conservation organizations and societies have long records of aid to wildlife species that needed a helping hand. A bright spot in the history of the bison was the establishment in 1908 of the National Bison Range in Montana. The American Bison Society raised the necessary funds to buy animals for the initial herd. The venture was financed in part with pennies and nickels contributed by schoolchildren.

The responsibility for and the efforts to develop and undertake restoration programs should not be considered primarily those of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Department of the Interior, or the Federal Government. The problems of saving most of the rare or endangered forms of fish and wildlife are extremely varied. There are ample opportunities and great rewards of satisfaction for you as an individual, for your conservation organization, for industry, for agriculture, and for forestry, as well as for all levels of government.

A list of species considered by specialists in their fields to be rare or endangered is being maintained by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. Information on the status of these animals and possible avenues of action to correct their plight may be secured from the Bureau.

Each individual, organization, and government agency is urged to continue and to increase participation to the fullest extent practicable to achieve the goal of saving those forms of wildlife that may otherwise disappear from the scene.

SENATE CLOTURE RULE WORKS WELL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in connection with the recent cloture vote by the Senate, the Washington Star recently published a thought-provoking editorial, which points out, from the record, that our present Senate rule on cloture served Congress and the country well.

Our cloture rule has demonstrated that it can be used effectively to halt debate at times when a decision is desired on proposed legislation which is widely supported, while at the same time the rule is strong enough to prevent a high-riding majority from trampling on the rights of minority opinion in the Senate, without allowing adequate opportunity to acquaint the country with all ramifications involved in a pending measure. Clearly, there is no urgent need at this time, on the basis of the performance record of the Senate, for future changes in the cloture rule.

I ask that the editorial from the Washington Star be printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, May 26, 1965]

Cloture Imposed

From a practical point of view, it is a good thing that the Senate has voted cloture on the impending voting rights bill. There was never any doubt in any Senator's mind that the bill will become law during this session of Congress.

And it ought to be law. This newspaper has reservations about some clauses and some proposed amendments, but surely, in 1965, there is no excuse for depriving any Americans of the right to vote through discriminatory administration of literacy tests.

Beyond the immediate practicalities, the imposition of cloture in this debate actually supports the institution it is designed to limit, the senatorial filibuster. For the fact that cloture can be voted when such an overwhelming majority agrees shows that the filibuster is not always and in all circumstances a roadblock to progress.

It is enough to recall that Senator MORSE has used the device for purposes of his own, and liberals have attempted to do so on recent occasions. Its legitimate use is quite clear. It is a parliamentary maneuver available in our Government to save the Congress from itself. For there are occasions when Congress, caught in powerful or momentary emotions, is as apt as any individual to do things it will regret when calm returns. In such moments, the filibuster is a useful procedure to have available for those who keep their heads. It should not be outlawed, in our view, nor should the imposition of cloture on debate be made any easier than it now is.

The principle of complete freedom of debate in the upper house is as precious to our democracy as the principle of equality in the voting booth.

EXCISE TAX REPEAL OR REDUCTION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as were nearly all Members of the Senate, I was extremely pleased to read the message of the President of May 17 setting out proposed details of the excise tax repeal and reduction. Likewise, I was delighted with the report of the House Ways and Means Committee on the legislation to accomplish the repeal and reduction of these nuisance taxes.

Yet, Mr. President, prompt House and Senate action on H.R. 8371, the excise tax repeal bill, will not solve the new problems being created by the mere consideration.

The President proposed, and the House committee has concurred, that manufacturers excise taxes on air conditioners be effective after May 14. He also proposed, and the committee also concurred, that the first step in the removal of manufacturers taxes on automobiles be effective after May 14.

As a result, sales of automobiles and air conditioners have proceeded in orderly fashion with buyers assured that they will be rebated the amounts they pay for excise taxes.

This is, however, not so with other appliances.

The president of the largest appliance manufacturing firm in this country, who is a valued friend of mine, recently wrote me that "retailers as well as consumers are drying up as far as sales are concerned."

Faced with almost certain elimination of excise taxes on July 1—the date set by the President and by the House committee, the retailer simply is not buying appliances. Neither is the consumer. It is quite understandable that purchasers would wait, wherever possible, in order to save 10 percent.

The company headed by my friend has taken what steps it can to rectify this. In the case of its own branches, the company has agreed to allow a rebate effective May 25 in the amount of the manufacturer's excise taxes. The company cannot do this for independent distributors, but it has urged them to pass on the eventual cut retroactively to retailers.

The action of this company, although small, is costing the company $500,000 between May 25 and July 1. There will, of course, be a corresponding loss in profits and in taxes paid on profits.

Mr. President, it seems to me that setting an artificial date such as July 1 for the reduction in excise taxes is simply an invitation to the consumer to avoid buying. This is causing suffering in retailing, wholesaling and manufacturing of all the items so effected.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I believe Congress would be wise in making the repeal effective June 1 and I shall, at the proper time, so move.

THE POTOMAC IS A NEGLECTED PATIENT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Potomac River must be viewed as a neglected patient in need of first aid and intensive treatment.

It is going to take some new high-powered medicines and some new instruments to successfully treat the Potomac.

The major problems of the river that must be dealt with are: siltation, municipal and industrial pollution, pollution from mine acid, a guaranteed water supply for the future, and the preservation of the valley's historic, scenic, and esthetic values.

To deal successfully with the ills of the Potomac will cost money. If we postpone treatment, however, it will cost still more money and much of the damage will be permanent—irreparable.

One of the major ills of the Potomac today is siltation. The 2½ million tons of silt carried down the river each year are enough to fill 6 million bathtubs full to the brim. This silt severely reduces water quality, fills navigation channels, hampers the growth of the fishing industry, and reduces the recreational value of the river.

To prevent siltation, commonsense soil conservation measures must be intensified in rural areas and applied to urban areas, especially those areas undergoing development.

The expansion of the stream valley open spaces acquisition program is essential to the protection of the watershed in urban areas. To be most successful, open space acquisition should proceed urban development.

The distinguished junior Senators from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and I have introduced legislation which would allow up to a 50-percent Federal contribution for the acquisition and development of open space. This bill, S. 1577, would greatly increase the ability of many local communities to purchase and preserve open space.

My bill to create a C. & O. Canal National Historical Park and the completion of the George Washington Parkway will form a protective barrier along the Maryland shore of the Potomac from Cumberland to Fort Washington.

To solve the problems of the Potomac River there will be a need for increased intergovernmental cooperation.

The National Capital region started as a 10-mile square. It spread out to include the first ring of adjacent counties. Now, it includes the second ring. Soon, however, it will merge with the Baltimore area, sprawl west to the Appalachians, and east to the Chesapeak Bay.

As the region continues to grow and develop, many new problems will arise and new solutions will have to be arrived at. The Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River, and the Appalachian Regional Commission are good beginnings at intergovernmental cooperation, but much more must be done in this area.

I am very hopeful, Mr. President, that the current interest in the Potomac River will lead to close and more effective cooperation between the Federal and State and local governments.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is still in the morning hour.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, would the Senator withdraw that request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without regard to the rule of germaneness, I may proceed.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, has any business been laid before the Senate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to allow me to have some business laid before the Senate?

Mr. **CLARK**. I shall be happy to yield if I may have consent to proceed without violating the rule of germaneness.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 157, S. 1837.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The bill will be stated by title.

The **Legislative Clerk**. A bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

PRESIDENT'S SPEECH ON U.S. AIM TO KEEP PEACE

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, last night in Chicago, before the Cook County Democratic Party dinner, the President of the United States delivered an excellent speech on his aspirations, and the aspirations of all Americans, for a just and lasting peace.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the President's speech, as it appeared in this morning's Washington Post, may be printed in the **Record** at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1).

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I am happy to note that the President is turning to the Russian people and pointing out the obvious fact that "the men and women of Russia want peace and the taste of its sweet fruits" to the same extent as do the people of the United States.

The President stresses the fact that there has never been war between Russia and the United States, and that there need not be. He points out—and I agree—the importance of our standing firm in defense of freedom. However, he also points out the desirability of a ceaseless search for appropriate procedures and plans by which a just peace can be secured.

I am particularly struck by the wise words of the late Secretary General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjold, which the President of the United States said he carries in his pocket. They are:

> The qualities peace requires are just those I believe we all need today—perseverance and patience, a firm grip on realities, careful but imaginative planning, a clear awareness of the dangers—but also of the fact that fate is what we make it.

The President avers his intention to proceed with the careful, but imaginative, planning necessary to assure peace and justice and progress for all the peoples of the earth. He points out that there is in America a strong consensus that the world shall not walk again the road to darkness that led mankind into the valley of war 30 years ago.

The President points out that the American people want no part of war, while, on the other hand, they are not interested in appeasement.

I find the speech of the President most heartening in the dark days in which we are living, with world war III threatening in Vietnam, with a situation in the Dominican Republic which none can consider satisfactory, and which some, at least, consider most unfortunate, including the political leaders of some of the countries in Latin America which hitherto have been our warm friends. I refer particularly to Mexico, Chile, and Venezuela.

I am disappointed, as I know many others are, with the type of support which our Dominican policy is receiving in the Organization of American States.

There seems to be little confidence in the actions we took in the Dominican Republic. In fact, there are wags who say that if we had not intervened so precipitately—if we had not appeared to back the forces of General Imbert, the assassin of Trujillo; if he had not been whisked out to the aircraft carrier *Boxer*, and then returned to the island of Santo Domingo to head the junta which opposed the constitutional rebels, and is still opposing them, we might now have in the Dominican Republic the kind of government we are looking for.

I note in the morning's newspapers that there appears to be a third force rising in the Dominican Republic, which is halfway between the group of Colonel Caamano and the group headed by the assassin Imbert. It may be that this third force will become stronger and finally take over. However, if it should, I would hope that the third force would believe in liberal democracy and would be prepared to endorse the massive program of public works needed to attack the Dominican Republic's unemployment problem. This, for the moment, at least in my opinion, is more important than a sterile quarrel over when elections should be held and whether the constitution of 1963 or the constitution of 1962 should be reinstated. I would hope we would remember that, with all of his failings, and he has many, Juan Bosch nonetheless was the only freely elected President the Dominican Republic had in 30 years; that he was elected by a large majority; and that he was overthrown in an illegal and brutal revolution.

Things are better in the Dominican Republic, and I hope that, in due course, the efforts of the Organization of American States, aided and abetted by the forces of the United States of America, will be able to bring about a just and lasting peace in that troubled land. But we must remember that, whether our action was right or not—and I do not intend to pass on that question at this time—our prestige has suffered a serious blow in the eyes of most of the leaders of Latin America who should be on our side—the Government of Mexico; the Government of Venezuela and its former President, Romulo Betancourt; and the Government of Chile, where President Frei Montalva is carrying into effect the very principles of our American democracy.

We should be astute in carrying out the President's call for imaginative planning to bring peace to the Dominican Republic and to restore the respect of Latin America for the actions of our own country. That search for peace should continue and be unceasing.

Similarly in Vietnam, under conditions far more difficult than in the Dominican Republic, I hope the search for peace will continue.

At the time of the consideration by the Senate of the request of the President for an additional appropriation of $700 million to be used to support the war in Vietnam, I had occasion to review the rather sorry prospects for achieving peace and the quite unhappy posture into which our foreign policy has brought us.

Yesterday, in connection with the consideration of a treaty involving two amendments to the United Nations Charter, I had occasion to speak again on the need for careful and imaginative planning, which is so necessary to the achievement of a just and lasting peace.

I am happy indeed that the President endorses the need for careful and imaginative planning, because I do not think we are getting it from either the State Department or the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I hope the President will urge both of those groups, which are under his control, to get down to brass tacks, in the search for peace in Vietnam and Santo Domingo, and the broader search for peace along the lines of my discussion. We have lost the initiative in the search for peace, and we must regain it.

It is most heartening to me that the President of the United States clearly sees the problems. It is for these reasons that I have commended the President for the excellent address which he made in Chicago last night.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Exhibit 1

[From the Washington Post,
June 4, 1965]

Text of President's Speech on U.S. Aim To Keep Peace

In this city of Chicago, 28 years ago, a President of these United States described the condition of the world in these words:

"Without a declaration of war and without warning or justification of any kind, civilians, including vast numbers of women and children, are being ruthlessly murdered. Ships are being attacked * * * without cause or notice. Nations are fomenting and taking sides in civil warfare in nations that have never done them any harm * * *. Innocent peoples, innocent nations, are being cruelly sacrificed to a greed for power and supremacy which is devoid of all sense of justice and human considerations."

The world did not heed the vision or the wisdom of Franklin D. Roosevelt when he called upon all peace-loving nations to join together to "quarantine the aggressors." And those who loved peace above all else, lost their peace and all else.

That history need not—and must not—be allowed to repeat its full course again.

The peace of mankind must not—and will not—be lost again. If similarities are many between the worlds of 1937 and 1965, the differences are far more numerous.

The peace-loving nations are not weak now as they were then—not lacking in will now as they were then.

Educated in the adversity of a great war, tested in the trial of continuing danger, united in the face of ever-present peril, the peace-loving peoples have built strength in the 1960's they did not have in the 1930's.

That strength has one unmistakable meaning: For aggression there is no prize. At the end of the road of conquest, the only sure reward is sure ruin.

For 20 years, we have applied what Abraham Lincoln said would be the great lesson of peace:

"Teaching men that what they cannot take by an election neither can they take by war: Teaching all the folly of being the beginners of a war."

But there are other differences, too, between 1937 and 1965.

The people of Communist countries are wiser, too. While their leaders have chosen to close a curtain about them to keep out knowledge of the free world's peaceful intention, the people of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe know—above all other peoples on this earth—the cost and catastrophe to their homeland of 20th-century warfare.

The men and women of Russia—the men and women of all the nations of Eastern Europe—want peace and the taste of its sweet fruits.

And none want them to have peace more than do the people of the United States.

Between the great powers of East and West, there is no history of conflict on battlefields of the past. Between the people of the Soviet Union and the people of the United States, there has been friendship and there can be greater understanding.

The common interests of the peoples of Russia and the United States are many—and this I would say to the people of the Soviet Union: There is no American interest in conflict with the Soviet people anywhere. And no true Soviet interest is served by the support of aggression or subversion anywhere. We of the United States stand ready always to go with you onto the fields of peace—to plow new furrows, to plant new seed, to tend new growth—so that we and all mankind may someday share together a new and bountiful harvest of happiness and hope on this earth.

Jefferson said of Americans: "Peace is our passion."

Peace is our passion still. In this union, in this hemisphere, in every region of the world, in every forum of nations, the United States is working for peace—and that work will never cease.

But as I have spoken to Communist countries, let me speak also to the free world.

I carry in my pocket—and often read to those who visit the White House—some wise words written by a man of peace, the late Secretary General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjold. The words are these:

"The qualities peace requires are just those I believe we all need today—perseverance and patience, a firm grip on realities, careful but imaginative planning, a clear awareness of the dangers—but also of the fact that fate is what we make it."

In the 1930's, we made our fate not by what we did but by what we failed to do. We propelled ourselves—and all mankind—toward tragedy, not by decisiveness but by vacillation, not by resolution but by irresolution, not by action but by inaction.

The failure of freemen in the 1930's was not of the sword but of the soul—and there must be no such failure in this decade.

Let us not delude ourselves again by the belief that peace can be secured by submissiveness or extended by expediency.

Let us not adopt again the arrogance that peace is less important to the peoples of less important countries because they are distant or different from our own. Let us not return again to the impulsiveness which accepts as safe every promise of peace from the enemies of peace and rejects as dangerous every proposal for strength from its friends.

Perservering and patient, firmly gripping realities, proceeding in clear awareness of the dangers, let us proceed with the careful but imaginative planning necessary to assure peace and justice and progress for all the peoples of earth.

This is the course we of the United States have chosen—and this is the course we shall faithfully hold—for we believe that it leads to peace for mankind.

Nowhere in the world do we seek dominion over others.

Everywhere in the world do we seek decency for all.

Out among the earth's peoples, Americans are working—as few peoples have ever worked—to bring learning and light and health and housing and hope to the family of man. Food from our fields is feeding 100 million people—including 70 million children. Medicine from our laboratories is saving the lives of many millions more. And I daresay there is not one citizen present here who would have their country conduct its course otherwise.

George Washington once told us that we have one option:

"Whether (to) be respectable and prosperous or contemptible and miserable as a nation."

Today we are prosperous—more prosperous than any other nation in all the history of man. We have enjoyed 50 consecutive months of economic expansion—the longest ever known in peacetime and the end is not in sight.

Our people are prospering and moving upward. Just last year, the number of families living on less than $3,000 income decreased by 18 percent—and the number of families with more than 10,000 income increased 22 percent.

But money is no measure of the moral force at work among Americans today. For we are committed—by a broad and broadening consensus—to bringing brightness into lives where darkness dwells, opening beauty to lives closed over by ugliness, and guaranteeing the rights God gave them to those man had forgotten.

The consensus within America today is a consensus of courage—and let none abroad believe that this consensus stops at the water's edge.

For there is in America a consensus—a strong and deep and abiding majority consensus—that the world shall not walk again the road to darkness that led mankind into the valley of war 30 years ago.

The united will of the American people is itself the ultimate and most profound difference between 1937 and 1965, and let neither friends of peace—nor foes—underestimate the meaning of that unity.

The American people want to be a part of no war. But the American people want no part of appeasement of any aggression.

Over the years of our history, our forces have gone forth into many lands—but always they return when they are no longer needed. For the purpose of America is never to suppress liberty but to save it, never to take freedom but to return it, never to breach peace but to bolster it, never to seize land but to save lives.

One month ago, when our marines went into the Dominican Republic, it was for these same ends.

I have been advised today by the commander of the inter-American forces, General Alvin, and the deputy commander, Lieutenant General Palmer, that conditions in the Dominican Republic now permit further reduction of our military personnel. I have, accordingly, ordered the withdrawal of all remaining units of the U.S. Marine Corps totaling approximately 2,100 men.

Our purpose is—and will always be—to serve the peace of mankind.

Let me say this to you:

A man does what he must—in spite of personal consequences, in spite of obstacles and dangers and pressures—and that is the basis of all human morality.

Those words are not mine. They were written by the man in whose great steps I follow—John Fitzgerald Kennedy. But it is that spirit which guides me in all that I do.

For men—as for nations—the way of the peacemaker is never an easy way.

While all men hate war, they too often hate still more the discipline, the duty, the demands of acting to preserve the peace they love. But I am confident—I am certain—that this generation of Americans is willing to accept demands that are stern to enjoy a world that is safe.

For we know—as all men must know wherever they live—that after losing peace again—and it is the united will of America that it shall not be lost.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I commend to the Senate the enactment of the foreign aid bill as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. In substance, the proposed legislation continues the foreign aid program in its present form, but the bill includes certain innovations which have the potentiality for bringing about major improvements in the program. It is these innovations that I should like to discuss.

The form and specifications of the bill are familiar and are explained with clarity and in detail in the committee's report. Generally, the bill provides new authority for appropriations for fiscal year 1966 of not to exceed $1,988,695,000, a reduction of $28.2 million in the request of the administration. Combined with preexisting authority, the committee bill authorizes a total appropriation for fiscal year 1966 of $3,352,170,000. The bill authorizes appropriations in approximately the same amounts for fiscal year 1967.

The most important innovations in this bill are the following: First, a 2-year authorization of funds for the present program; second, a provision calling for the termination of foreign aid in its present form at the end of fiscal year 1967, coupled with the establishment of a Foreign Aid Planning Committee, with two-thirds of its members to be drawn from the Congress, to be entrusted with responsibility for studying the aid program and submitting its recommendations by January 3, 1967; third, an amendment to the statement of policy expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States and other nations should channel increasing amounts of their aid through multilateral organizations, coupled with a grant of authority to the President to make available to the World Bank and its affiliates as much as 20 percent of funds authorized for development lending under title I.

I proposed to the committee another innovation, the legislative separation of economic and military assistance programs. A majority of the committee's members opposed this suggestion, in part because of reluctance to divest the Committee on Foreign Relations of legislative jurisdiction over the military assistance program. I would note in this connection that the recent special authorization of $700 million for Vietnam was enacted without the scrutiny of the foreign policy committee of either House of Congress. Since the sum involved was considerable, it is interesting to note that no question of committee jurisdiction was raised.

The ratio of reviews to revisions in the foreign aid program has been high indeed. It is the hope of the Foreign Relations Committee—its intention I should say—that the work of the Foreign Aid Planning Committee called for by this bill will result in revisions as well as recommendations. It is difficult to foresee precise changes that are likely to come about after a 2-year period, but it is clear that very substantial changes are required. They are needed, among other reasons, because of the manifest disenchantment of the Senate with the present program. There is no consensus at present beyond the general feeling that the program must be changed. It is to be hoped that a thorough and extended study of foreign aid will lead to the development of a new consensus in support of a new approach to aid. Whether a new consensus around a new approach can be developed by 1967 is uncertain; it seems clear, however, that the creation of a Foreign Aid Planning Committee, as proposed by the Senator from Oregon, is an intelligent and appropriate way to begin the effort.

There are two excellent reasons for the 2-year authorization called for by the committee bill. The first reason has to do with the Congress; the second has to do with the purposes of our aid.

Annual aid bills require Members of the Senate to engage in meticulous, tedious, and repetitious reviews of programs which have been reviewed many times before and whose specifications are well known. The tendency has been to relieve the tedium by introducing into the annual foreign aid debate all sorts of interesting but extraneous matters. The foreign aid debate has become an annual occasion for the airing of grievances—many, to be sure, related in one way or another to foreign aid; most, at least, related to the country's foreign policy; a few, however, having to do with domestic problems that no amount of tortured logic could ever relate to foreign aid.

Because of the introduction of all these extraneous matters, the annual debate on foreign aid has become in reality an all-year debate on foreign aid. This, of course, has certain educational benefits for Members of the Senate, but I am reminded just a bit of the story of the little girl whose aunt gave her a book about penguins. After she had read it, her aunt asked her if she had learned something about penguins. "Indeed, yes," replied the little girl, "much more than I care to know."

The second reason for a 2-year authorization is the nature of the development process itself. Economic development is a long-term process which does not lend itself to the 1-year legislative cycle of the American Congress. The conventional short-term approach greatly impedes planning by the recipient of aid while the donor is denied the opportunity to offer incentives to recipients to make necessary internal economic reforms. There has been a tendency in the experience of AID and its predecessor agencies to hasten to commit funds as the end of a fiscal year approaches, with the result that recipients may be pushed into premature commitments.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, which in my opinion was the best aid bill we have ever enacted, provided long-term authorizations both for the Alliance for Progress and for development lending to Asian and African countries. The Congress has been tampering with these legislative provisions ever since, largely nullifying the policy benefits of the long-term authorization. We are thus, in effect, back on a year-to-year basis, which, whatever merit it may have from the viewpoint of congressional tradition, has no merit whatever from the viewpoint of sound and promising economic development.

The very nature of the economic development process requires the casting of foreign aid in a new time perspective. The Congress of the United States can make a contribution to this end by adopting the 2-year authorization called for by the committee bill.

The most important innovation in this bill, which is more nearly the anticipation of an innovation than a substantive change in itself, is the authority given to the President to make available up to 20 percent of development lending funds under title I to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and to its two affiliates, the International Development Association and the International Finance Corporation. It is specified in the committee's amendment to section 205 of the act that funds made available to these organizations may be used by them under their own criteria and rules rather than under those governing American bilateral assistance. This amendment, in my opinion, constitutes a first tentative step toward an objective which, if fulfilled, will greatly increase the effectiveness of foreign aid throughout the world. That objective is the general multilateralization of economic aid for development purposes.

The case for multilateralism is more than a matter of administration. Since putting forth earlier in the spring a general proposal for the multilateralization of development lending, I have been reminded by well-qualified people that the field staffs of the Agency for International Development area, in many instances, more extensive and at least as well qualified as those of the international lending agencies. I do not question the competence of AID's economists and technicians, but no matter how good they are they have one insuperable disability of which employees of the World Bank, for example, are free: they are Americans, representing a rich and powerful nation with interests that go far beyond the economic development of the recipient countries.

The fundamental difference between bilateralism and multilateralism in foreign aid is psychological. Bilateral aid carries a connotation of charity, which in the long run has a debilitating effect on both recipient and donor, fostering attitudes of cranky dependency or anger on the part of the recipient and of self-righteous frustration on the part of the donor, attitudes which, once formed, feed destructively upon each other. Multilateral aid, on the other hand, has the more dignified connotation of a community organized to meet its common and rightful responsibilities toward its less fortunate members. The one is appropriate to a world of nation states with unlimited sovereignty, the other to a world that is at least groping toward a broader community.

Unlike any single nation, an international agency like the World Bank is capable of entering into an institutional relationship with the recipient of its aid, thereby converting the aid-giving process from an act of charity to an act of community responsibility. It is true of course that the international agencies draw most of their resources from the same countries that provide bilateral aid, but, as the former President of the World Bank, Eugene Black, has pointed out:

> The act of generosity is one stage removed and this is quite enough to draw its sting.[1]

Greatly as they want our aid, the poor nations of the world want our respect no less. Above all they need the self-respect that will enable them to go forward confidently in building their own societies. I believe we can help to make this possible by multilateralizing some part of our aid. And in so doing, we will also be advancing our own security by the cultivation of stable and mutually respectful relations.

It should be understood that while the Bank and the IDA are independent international agencies, the influence of the United States on their policies is considerable because decisions on loans are made by votes weighted according to contributions. As the largest single contributor the United States has the greatest voting power. In channeling development loans through the IDA, therefore, the United States would be renouncing exclusive control, with its attendant disadvantages, while retaining great influence on the disposition of its contributions.

In the long run international aid programs are more likely to advance the national interests of the United States than aid programs which are closely supervised by our own Government. The explanation for this paradox lies in the nature of the new nationalism of the emergent countries.

---

[1] Eugene Black, "Second Lecture," Stafford Little Series, Princeton University, May 8, 1962.

As Roger Hilsman suggested in a recent speech, the wave of the future in the emerging countries is unlikely to be either communism or capitalism but the new nationalism. The national feeling of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin American can become a force for the development of peaceful and progressive societies or a force for the development of totalitarian and aggressive societies. Which course the emerging countries take depends in large part on whether the United States makes itself the friend or the opponent of the new nationalism.

The essence of the nationalism of the peoples of the underdeveloped countries is a profound desire to stand on their own feet as members of successful and self-respecting communities. The history of many of these nations has been one of subordination to the West with its superior wealth, superior technique and superior power. Inevitably, therefore, the struggle for self-respecting independence has been anti-Western in tone and ideology.

To be anti-Western, or anticolonial, has become a way of asserting pride and independence, not because the West is the enemy of the legitimate aspirations of nationalism but because it once was in fact and now remains so in symbol. Much of the vocabulary of the new nationalism is borrowed from Marxism-Leninism, not because the Communist philosophy is so appealing in itself but because it is full of soul-satisfying anathemas against "colonialism" and "capitalist exploitation."

If we are wise, we will perceive that the cries of "colonialism" and "neocolonialism" that issue from the nationalist leaders of the emerging countries are not nearly so much attacks on America as assertions of their own aspirations. If we are wise, we will perceive when the leader of an underdeveloped country tells us to "go jump in the lake" with our aid that his motive is not so much ingratitude as frustration in the presence of so much wealth and power and a proud determination to tell us that we cannot buy him or his country with our riches. If we are wise, we will understand these motives and we will be compassionate toward them and, most important of all, we will make ourselves the friend of the new nationalism.

How can this be done? It can be done by helping the emergent nations to satisfy their two fundamental needs, which are no less valid for being logically contradictory: on the one hand, they need our help; on the other hand, they need to be free of us. They need our help because we are rich and they are poor; they need to be free of us because, because no matter how worthy our motives, we are the living symbols of the colonial past. What we must do—and it is not merely playing with words—is to help the emerging nations in such a way as to free them of the need for our help.

It is a matter not only of what we do but of how we do it. The aim of our aid programs is the development of prosperous, independent societies, but the method of our aid has been bilateralism, which, to one degree or another, cannot help but perpetuate a relationship of client and patron. The problem is to provide aid without inflicting ourselves, that is to say, without arousing the conviction or illusion—of "neocolonialism."

The answer, I think, is multilateralism. Just as aid itself can provide the substance and resources for national independence, an aid program conducted by an international institution which has no function and no interests outside of economic development, and which arouses no memories of a colonial past, can help provide the feeling and the conviction of national independence.

National independence is a state of mind as well as a political and economic arrangement. Multilateral aid can help to cultivate that state of mind in a way that bilateralism cannot. It is precisely for this reason that the multilateralization of some part of our aid is not only in the interests of the recipient countries but, insofar as we wish to make ourselves the friends of the new nationalism, in the national interests of the United States as well.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. First, I congratulate the Senator from Arkansas for having been willing to accept the challenge of again floor managing the bill. I know of the many frustrations which he must have felt as a result of debates on foreign aid during the past few years. But it is literally true that no Member of the Senate knows as much about the subject or is as well qualified to present the administration's program of foreign aid, as modified by the Foreign Relations Committee, as the Senator from Arkansas.

Second, I congratulate the Senator for the excellent speech which he has made in support of this very good bill which we brought out of committee.

I should like to make a couple of comments while the Senator is still in the Chamber. I wish—and I suspect the Senator from Arkansas wishes—that the authorization of foreign aid could be for 4 years instead of 2 years. Perhaps as a result of a restudy of foreign aid which is about to be engaged in, we can come back with a recommendation to that effect, for, after all, the Appropriations Committee must pass on the bill every year. If we could establish the guidelines in the Committee on Foreign Relations and on the floor of the Senate, would it not be wiser to have an even longer authorization?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I try to get what I believe is possible. I believe that there is an argument to be made, and it does not apply so much to the Senate as it does to the other body—that each Congress should be given an opportunity to pass upon the program. However, I am bound to say that even if there were a 4-year authorization, there would be nothing to prevent the committee from initiating amendments. So that argument is not insuperable. Even if there were a 4-year authorization, the probabilities are that some part of the aid program would require attention during the interim. But we would be spared the long drawn out, tedious reexamination of everything. So on balance, in the past I have supported a 4-year authorization of the Development Loan Fund. I believe that is a good idea.

Mr. CLARK. It occurs to me that in addition to the tediousness and futility, if it might be so called, of the long drawn out annual Senate debate, there is the fact, which the Senator mentioned, that so much of the development loan program and, to some extent, the technical assistance program, too, requires long-range planning.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct. That is a further reason that should be mentioned. A longer authorization would make possible better preparation for programs.

Mr. CLARK. Without impinging on some of the Senator's views about unlimited debate——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Those views have been somewhat modified in recent years by the action of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I am delighted to hear that. I point out that much of the reason why there is what the Senator has referred to as an all-year debate on foreign aid is due to the fact that much of the discussion on the floor of the Senate is not germane.

I am happy to see the majority leader in the Chamber. Not too long ago, perhaps irritated as a result of an incident that none of us were very happy about on that day, he was good enough to cosponsor with me a proposed change in the germaneness rule which would make it possible for the majority leader or the Senator in charge of a bill to invoke the rule of germaneness to last during the pendency of the consideration of a measure on the floor of the Senate, full well realizing that, under the customs of the Senate, unanimous consent would almost always be given to lift the germaneness rule for any Senator who is faced with any press release emergency. I make that observation, because I believe that if we could have a time limitation by unanimous consent for the consideration of amendments, we would be far advanced. I am confident that we cannot get it this year. Perhaps the thing to do is to change the rules of the Senate so that there can be some reasonable limitation on debate. Events of the recent past seem to have removed the major reason, for the time being at least, for unlimited debate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was certainly modified.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has referred to multilateral aid. I quite agree with him that it is important, and I am happy that it is being encouraged in the bill.

The Senator spoke of a world groping for a broader community than that of nations and states. I would hope that we could proceed further than we have with multilateral efforts to keep the peace, which is another wide area where, it seems to me, unlimited national sovereignty is obsolete. Therefore, I would register some mild dissent to Roger Hilsman's attitude of "welcoming the new nationalism." It occurs to me that while the new nationalism has much to commend it in terms of developing nations which are achieving their independence, what we really need is a new internationalism in which, through the United Nations, through the International Monetary Fund, and through the World Bank, we might come to a gradual yielding of absolute sovereignty. I do not mean a world government but merely some procedural devices by which, when the interests of the entire world and perhaps the survival of our civilization are at stake, we could move away from that strict national sovereignty which, to my way of thinking, is one of the impediments in achieving a just and a lasting peace.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In fairness to Mr. Hilsman, who was discussing the emerging nations, I do not believe he applied his thesis to the developed nations. He was not thinking of that thesis in connection with the United States or Great Britain. He was thinking of the new countries; and, as applied to them, I believe he is quite correct. I do not know whether he necessarily welcomes it, but he was discussing it as a fact of life. I agree. One of the great difficulties we have with such nations is our dealings with them under the AID program. What I was talking about relates only to our relations with those countries, not to Germany, France, or England.

I believe these two movements may be going on and progressing at the same time. The highly developed countries are groping for ways to modify their nationalism. For example, I consider that the Common Market is a modification of absolute national sovereignity in a particular area. They find it very difficult to move in the political field, as they necessarily will. The emerging countries still have to go through that phase.

It is like an incubation phase. They must assert their nationalism in order to achieve their identity before they can move into the other phase. I believe that it is Mr. Hilsman's thesis that they will have to go through a complete stage. If we do not recognize that, we shall be the loser. The developing countries will turn for their development toward the totalitarian Communist bloc because they need help. Where are they to get it? If we are to help them become countries that will contribute to our concept of society, we must recognize and take into account that fact in our efforts to aid them. That is where the technique of the multilateral assistance enters into the process. I believe it is a far healthier and more effective way to give aid. That was really the point that I was trying to make. The experience we had in relation to the Bank and its affiliates has almost demonstrated that beyond doubt.

The World Bank is an illustration of one point. It is particularly applicable to poorer nations, the emergent nations. Since the Bank was established, there has not been a single default, although some countries which are large borrowers from the Bank have had to roll over their debts to their other creditors. Why is it that such countries have so high a regard for their obligations to the World Bank, as distinguished from their individual national creditors? I believe it is the feeling that they have a greater feeling of responsibility toward the Bank.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator from Arkansas. Yet I should like to emphasize another aspect of the same situation, which is that all these fiercely nationalistic formerly colonial states, as they emerge into freedom and independence, are determined not only to get into the United Nations, but also to play an active part when they become members.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. It has occurred to me that many Senators are not really aware of the widespread activities of the United Nations and of the active part taken by the citizens of these developing countries. Norway is a quite well developed country. Trygve Lie was the first Secretary General of the United Nations, and he was followed by Dag Hammarskjold. Now the Secretary General is U Thant, of Burma. Whenever one goes to the United Nations—and I know that the Senator from Arkansas has been there many times—he observes representatives of Asian, African, and Latin-American countries frequently taking important roles in connection with the international activities of the United Nations.

That was one instance with respect to which I wished to raise a question concerning Mr. Hilsman's new nationalism as opposed to the old nationalism.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas for permitting me to inject myself into the discussion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his comments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to add my compliments to those paid by the Senator from Pennsylvania to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, not only for his soundness of outlook and his fine exposition, but because he is once again managing the foreign aid bill. I know it is not an easy task; it is an onerous chore; but someone has to manage it, and I can think of no one who is better qualified, no one who is more patient, no one who is more persevering than the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, S. 1837 contains provisions that deal with the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act; in other words, the Public Law 480 program, which provides the legislative base for the food for peace program. These provisions have not received sufficient attention.

S. 1837 provides for the termination of assistance under title I of Public Law 480, the Food for Peace Act, effective by June 30, 1967.

This title of the food for peace law authorizes sales of surplus agricultural commodities to friendly countries, in which payment is made in local currencies. This part of Public Law 480 has been, by far, the largest segment of the food for peace program and the most important part of the program.

Another provision of S. 1837 appears to call for the inclusion in the termination provision of title II of Public Law 480, which is second in importance in the food for peace operations. It provides that the President shall submit his recommendations and legislative proposals for future programs by July 1, 1966. Title II of the food for peace operation provides for the sending of agricultural commodities on a straight grant or gift basis to countries that are experiencing emergency conditions, such as earthquakes, floods, and other natural disasters.

Title II further provides for useful grants for economic development projects, such as the extremely important food-for-wages program.

I do not know how many Senators are familiar with the way in which we have used food as an economic development tool. In my judgment, it is one of the most dynamic, effective oversea programs in which this country is participating. Through this method, which is now operating in a number of countries, are able to use wheat, corn, milk, and other commodities to pay the wages of the workers who are engaged in community and rural development programs. During the past few days, I have been thinking that this is the kind of program that ought to be used on a much larger scale in areas like the Dominican Republic, where there is so much unemployment and such an urgent need for improving community and rural development projects. The same techniques should be used in areas such as southeast Asia, especially South Vietnam, where there is underemployment or unemployment, and an urgent need to improve roads, irrigation systems, rural schools, and community services of all kinds. It has been a highly successful program wherever it has been tried. It is one that I would hope we would expand in the years ahead.

For more than 10 years, Public Law 480 has been the legislative authority for the impressive achievements under our entire food for peace effort. I had the responsibility and the privilege of directing this program as a special assistant to the late President Kennedy during 1961 and the first half of 1962. I regard it as our most effective and successful single oversea program.

On March 31, 1965, President Johnson, in transmitting his annual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, stated:

> The food for peace program is one of the most inspiring enterprises ever undertaken by any nation in all history—and every American can be proud of it without regard to partisanship or political pressure.

Later, I shall point out some of the reasons why the food for peace program has been so successful. However, my primary purpose today is to state my very strong opposition to the amendments to Public Law 480 contained in the Foreign Assistance Act. Public Law 480 places an absolutely crucial role in our domestic agricultural program.

If we were to terminate the oversea food programs, I dread to think of what would happen to the agricultural economy in the United States, and what would happen to the income of American producers.

I do not wish to imply that this is a program of benefit alone to the American farmer. It is a humanitarian program, too. It has meant the difference between life and death to millions of people on earth. It has been an unusual blending of self-interest and of humanitarian service to hungry people in countries around the globe.

This program was conceived by agricultural leaders. It grew out of our own domestic agricultural situation. It was authorized in Congress through the Agricultural Committees, and for agricultural reasons, and operated primarily by the Department of Agriculture.

The program accounts for exports of surplus agricultural commodities worth approximately $1.6 billion a year. For some crops, such as wheat, rice, vegetable oils, feed grains, and cotton, it accounts for the export of a substantial part of our entire annual production. For example, in the case of wheat, 1 out of 3 acres of wheat planted in the United States is now utilized in our food for peace program.

Furthermore, food for peace exports are carefully coordinated by the Department of Agriculture with its very large and growing cash exports which have now reached $4.5 billion annually.

If one were to add the amount of food for peace exports to the amount of cash exports, we would have now reached a level of more than $6 billion a year total agricultural exports, which is the highest amount in our history.

These exports have not only contributed to a favorable balance of trade for the United States, but also have been a vital factor in bettering our balance-of-payments situation. The cumulative increase in dollar earnings from agricultural exports since 1958 has been more than $4 billion. Not only is Public Law 480 coordinated with the various foreign trade programs of agriculture, but also it is closely interrelated with domestic agricultural policies and programs.

The decisions regarding foreign trade programs directly and indirectly affect almost every decision that we take regarding our domestic farm programs. The reverse is also true.

It would be impossible for the agricultural committees to plan our commodity programs here at home unless we had some assurance of what would be happening in terms of our outlets for agricultural commodities overseas.

In this connection, I am hopeful that the relationship of the food-for-peace program with domestic agricultural programs will receive even greater emphasis. I believe that we need to be doing more planning, rather than less, in gearing our agricultural program with the opportunities that are ahead of us for the oversea utilization of our food commodities.

President Johnson, in his farm message, as well as in his foreign assistance message, discussed the important role that agriculture plays in promoting economic growth in developing countries. He said that we must use both our agricultural abundance—in other words, the existing agricultural surplus—and also our technical know-how in the important work of raising food production and nutrition in the underdeveloped countries. He urged the Secretary of Agriculture to study and recommend changes in agricultural policies designed to broaden and improve the food-for-peace program, and to gear the program more specifically to meet the needs of recipient countries and their development programs.

To digress for a moment, the most urgent food need of the underdeveloped countries is for more protein food. Lack of protein does almost incredible damage, particularly to children of preschool age. That is damage that cannot be repaired. Once a child reaches the age of 6 or 7 and has gone through a period of years with a serious protein deficiency, both his mind and his physical body are damaged to a degree that can never be repaired, no matter how much medical attention he might receive later in life.

So there is a desperate need for more protein commodities in oversea programs. I am delighted that the Agency for International Development is making provision for protein supplements and vitamin fortification of diets we are providing in our foreign assistance effort. However, we ought to be doing more to provide milk, dairy products, meats, and other high protein foods as high protein supplements the surplus cereals that we have been making available these past 10 years.

I make these brief references to the agricultural programs and to the operations of the Department of Agriculture to illustrate the extent to which the food-for-peace program is related to activities of the Department of Agriculture, and to urge that Congres delete the sections of S. 1837 that relates to our food-for-peace program.

I believe it is necessary that the Public Law 480 authority—our food-for-peace authority—continue to be reviewed very carefully by the Agricultural Committees of Congress, and that those programs be related to domestic agricultural policy.

Titles I and II of Public Law 480, which are affected by S. 1837, will expire in any event on December 31, 1966. Prior to that time, we shall have a complete review of those programs by the executive branch and by the Agriculture Committees. Careful decisions can be made prior to the end of 1966 which would remove the need for the review called for in S. 1837.

Furthermore, the foreign policy aspects of food for peace and the foreign assistance aspects of food for peace have traditionally been considered by the Foreign Relations Committees of the House and Senate, as well as by the Agriculture Committees. Presumably, that consideration will be given before we extend this program, following its expiration at the end of 1966. At the present time, the executive branch is engaged in the most comprehensive review it has ever made of the food for peace and its relationship to the economic growth of developing countries.

I look forward to the conclusions and recommendations of the administration, since they should be important planning tools for the extension of this program beyond 1966.

I would like to give some indication of the volume of exports under the program of food for peace and some of its related benefits, so that we may have a better understanding of the relationship between this program and our own domestic economy.

In the calendar year 1964, 18 million tons of agricultural commodities were shipped overseas through food-for-peace channels.

This included 560 million bushels of wheat. It included 12 million bags of rice. It included 960 million pounds of vegetable oil. It included 1.2 million bales of cotton.

Hundreds of millions of pounds of dairy products, mainly nonfat dry milk, have been made available to needy children through such voluntary relief agencies as CARE, Catholic Relief Services, Lutheran World Relief, the Mennonite Central Committee, the Church World Service, the American Friends Service Committee, and other beneficial groups. American food is being used increasingly in school lunch programs, and greater emphasis is being given to combating malnutrition through the vitaminizing of milk and the enrichment of other foods.

Any interruption of this school lunch program, which is reaching approximately 40 million children throughout the world every day, for the purposes of review or for whatever purposes, would cause incredible distress and dismay in one country after another.

A few years ago it seemed likely that we would exhaust our dry milk supply, and the word went out that we had to cut out the school lunch program abroad. Many cablegrams came to Washington from Embassies all over the world pointing out the serious consequences of that fact within the receiving countries.

Small but important work projects are being financed in part in many countries to help the economy of village areas and afford employment to people who would otherwise be without work. Food deficits in countries like India and Pakistan are being met in large measure by concessional sales of food from the United States.

We no longer read of massive famines that used to destroy literally millions of people in such countries as India, because those famines have been brought to an end, due in large part to the shipment of our surplus food to such countries. The proceeds of these sales for such currencies as rupees, cruzieros, and other currencies, are being used to finance some of our operations, such as expenses of Embassies, the Voice of America program, some Fulbright exchange programs, and for economic development projects in various countries.

So the food-for-peace program results in many additional benefits to the United States. It adds to farm income of our producers. It means reduced carrying charges on surpluses which would otherwise be piling up at the expense of the taxpayers and carried by the Department of Agriculture. It means jobs for thousands of workers who are involved in processing, handling, and transporting the commodities. There are earnings for many businesses, for example, railroads and steamship lines, and various plants in the marketing field.

I submit that our own merchant marine would go under without the stimulus of the food-for-peace program.

Public Law 480 also pays off in the promotion of strength and peaceful development around the world and the building of future cash markets for agricultural commodities.

This is one portion of the program that is not always recognized. Some of our best cash customers were nations which at one time were brought into the use of American food through our food-for-peace effort. Consider, for example, Japan. For a few years after World War II we made food available to Japan on either a grant basis or for sale on a concessional arrangement. We literally taught millions of young Japanese to develop a liking for American milk, wheat, and other products. Today, far from giving Japan food, Japan is our best single customer for the products raised on our farms.

We hope to stimulate other countries in that direction which are now finding it difficult to reach that stage of development.

So we have developed a good plan in the Public Law 480 program, one that balances, on the one hand, our own self-interest, and, on the other hand, satisfies a desire to perform a humanitarian act in feeding hungry peoples of the world.

Our agricultural abundance and our agricultural know-how, effectively used, can form a firm basis for economic development and growth.

I hope we shall retain this remarkable program and keep it moving forward.

Again, I urge that the provision in S. 1837 which affects Public Law 480 be deleted. I do not intend at the present time to press for Senate action to delete the objectionable language in the Senate bill, because the House-passed bill does not contain the language to which I have referred. It will come up in conference. I express the strong hope that the House position, which in no way affects Public Law 480 will be sustained in conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table headed "Exports of U.S. farm products under Public Law 480 compared with total exports of U.S. farm products, calendar years 1955–64."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*Exports of U.S. farm products under Public Law 480 compared with total exports of U.S. farm products, calendar years 1955–64*

[In millions of dollars]

Program	1955 through 1961	1962	1963	1964	1955 through 1964
Public Law 480:					
Title I	5,042	1,010	1,163	1,182	8,397
Title II	708	143	174	116	1,141
Title III:					
Barter	1,416	137	74	118	[1] 1,745
Donations	1,083	178	169	183	1,613
Title IV	1	42	51	93	187
Total	8,250	1,510	1,631	1,692	13,083
Mutual security (AID) [2]	1,826	35	11	23	1,895
Commercial sales [3]	19,465	3,489	3,942	4,632	31,528
Total exports	29,541	5,034	5,584	6,347	46,506
Total Public Law 480 exports as percent of total exports	28	30	29	27	28

[1] The addition of $22,000,000 shipments under the barter program in July–December 1954 brings the total of shipments under this program since the beginning of Public Law 480 to $1,767,000,000. The addition of $20,000,000 shipments under the donations program in July–December 1956 brings the total of shipments under this program since the beginning of Public Law 480 to $1,633,000,000.

[2] Sales for foreign currency, economic aid, and expenditures under development loans (1964). Public Laws 87-195, 87-665, and 87-165.

[3] Commercial sales for dollars include, in addition to unassisted commercial transactions, shipments of some commodities with governmental assistance in the form of export payments, short- and medium-term credit, and sales of Government-owned commodities at less than domestic market prices.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

There being no objection, the Senate (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) adjourned until Monday, June 7, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 4, 1965:

Adm. David L. McDonald, U.S. Navy, for appointment as the Chief of Naval Operations for a term of 2 years, effective August 1, 1965.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 4, 1965:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Lawson B. Knott, Jr., of Virginia, to be Administrator of General Services.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted this verse of the Scriptures:

Acts 17: 28: *He is not far from any one of us; for in Him we live and move and have our being.*

O Thou God of grace and goodness, whose resources of divine wisdom and power are abundantly sufficient for our many needs, endow us with a loyalty that never wavers and a courage that never falters as we seek to fulfill the high and holy mission which Thou hast entrusted to us.

May it be our purpose and passion to minister to mankind's heartaches and hopes by strengthening the bonds of appreciation and understanding, of fellowship and peace, between the nations of the earth and the members of the human family.

Grant that we may authenticate the grandeur and glory of the ideals and principles of our democracy by incarnating them more fully in our personal and public life.

Inspire us to give our allegiance to the Prince of Peace who rules with the scepter of justice, righteousness, mercy, and love. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 3, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on increasing the authorized bed capacity for all Veterans' Administration hospitals.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1965.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on June 3, 1965, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following messages:

That the Senate passed House Concurrent Resolution 426, entitled "Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the viewing of the United States Information Agency film, 'Years of Lightning, Day of Drums,' at the 25th class reunion of the Harvard class of 1940 in Cambridge, Massachusetts."; and

That the Senate passed S. 1404, entitled "An act to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes."

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED—SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, June 3, 1965, he did on June 4, 1965, sign the following enrolled bill of the Senate, S. 1135, "An act to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended," so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before December 31, 1968.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN URBAN AREAS

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Small Business Subcommittee No. 5, the Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in Urban Areas, be permitted to sit during general debate today, June 7, and tomorrow, June 8.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE LUTHER A. JOHNSON

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, news has just come to me, almost in a matter of hours, of the death of one of our grand old men of American democracy. He is our former colleague here in the House, Luther A. Johnson, of Corsicana, Tex., who died full of years and honors in his 89th year. What matters to me is not only that, of course, he was my friend and a product of the State of Texas, but that he was one of the mainstays in his time of the processes of government that make our country the greatest of all time. It is impossible for me to imagine the system under which we live and thrive here in the United States without men like Luther A. Johnson to refresh and nourish, to fight for and insist upon, the principles that are indigenous to freedom and decency as spelled out in the Constitution of the United States.

The impact he made on history from the standpoint of the spectacular and the overwhelming may not arrest the attention of the writers of capsule histories of this country. But to the thorough student of American government, and what makes its wheels go round, Luther A. Johnson will be found to have been what I like to call the indispensable legislator and the outstanding politician. I remember him well and favorably as an able Member of this body which he served from his first election here to the 68th Congress in 1923 to the hour of his resignation in July of 1946, when he was named a judge of the Tax Court of the United States. I like to think that I have some experience and knowledge of fiduciary matters and I can testify that in complex problems of taxation as they developed in the period of Congressman Johnson's lifetime, he made of himself a respected and remarkable authority. Moreover, I like especially to remind myself that his work made our work easier because he furnished us with the judicial point of view, the unbiased judgment, the knowledge and the honor behind it, that made it possible for us to accept his conclusions as predicated upon exact data and sound reasoning.

In this House, I ask, where problems are staggering in their depth and their perplexing contradictions, to say nothing of their volume, what is more valuable than an informed colleague who can be trusted in his field and whose opinions bear the mark of a well-trained and a sound intellect? For Representative Johnson made the most of his potential as an individual and as a graduate from the law department of Cumberland University, in Lebanon, Tenn. He made the most of his early law practice in Corsicana, Tex., where he was born in 1875; and he made the most of his work as the prosecuting attorney of Navarro County in the years between 1898 to 1902. In 1916 he was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention at St. Louis. And in 1920 he was chairman of the Democratic State convention at Fort Worth. It was after this, on March 4, 1923, that he was elected to this House and reelected—as a Democrat—to the 11 succeeding Congresses.

Judge Luther A. Johnson's contribution to the clarification and adjudication of tax problems during his tenure as judge of the Tax Court is another one of those more or less unsung services of great value for which all Americans can be grateful. We can all be thankful to Almighty God that he gave us as a friend, as a patriot, as a legislator, as a judge, a man of the stature of Luther Alexander Johnson, and that He made it possible for him to be with us for so many years. Judge Johnson will live as an example to American youth and as a symbol of the noble type of personality that can grow and fulfill his potential under free government.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], as I know Members from both sides of the aisle do, in paying tribute to the memory of this great man.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has made reference to the distinguished career of the late Luther Johnson. Mr. Johnson, during the critical years before and after World War II, was a tower of strength in Washington as a senior member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. He contributed mightily to the strength and security of our Nation.

Later, as a member of the Tax Court he served faithfully and well. He made it his business throughout his life to serve the public interest.

I like to think of the late Luther Johnson today not as a public official, but as a man with a warm heart, a friendly and understanding man, a conscientious man, a gentle Christian man.

When I came to Washington in December 1934, in order to attend the sessions of the 74th Congress which began in January, I met Luther Johnson for the first time. I grew to respect him and to love him. He was a confidant and friend. He never missed an opportunity to encourage the 100 new Members who entered Congress in January 1935.

Throughout his career Mr. Johnson measured up to the highest standards. Democrats and Republicans alike were his friends.

I join my colleagues who knew Luther Johnson in paying tribute to his memory and in extending deepest sympathy to loved ones left behind.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in their expression as to the great loss this country has sustained in the passing of former Representative Luther A. Johnson. He was honest, able, fearless, and absolutely courageous.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall that in 1939, 1940, 1941, during World War II, Representative Johnson took a very leading part in seeing that this country passed some of the first and most important legislation designed to strengthen our great country and our allies at a very bleak period in the history of our country.

To each member of his family and to his many dear friends, I extend my sincere sympathy.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, this country has lost one of the sweetest spirits who ever served in this House. My State has lost one of its outstanding public servants. The world has lost one of those rare individuals of broad vision. who could see the problems in other lands without forgetting the practicalities at home. For 23 years Luther Johnson represented the Sixth District of Texas. He was my friend and my neighbor. He loved the people of central Texas as they loved him.

Later, he served on the Tax Court. Still later, he retired to his home in Corsicana. Although he was 89 years old and had become rather feeble, he still loved to meet with, and discuss affairs of the day with his friends.

It was my happy privilege to serve with Luther Johnson for many years. I know of no man who was more devoted to his friends, to his family, and to his country. I feel a keen personal loss which I know is shared by all who knew him.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I learn of the death of the Honorable Luther Johnson, of Texas. He served with great distinction in this body for many years. A man universally respected, Luther Johnson left his mark on good legislation. He advocated and practiced principles of good government. I have never known a man who was more honorable. To me he was a friend and an inspiration. It was a privilege and a distinction to have known him. To the family I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened by the news of the death of the Honorable Luther Johnson, of Corsicana, Tex., a former Member of this body. As many of you know, I succeeded Mr. Johnson as Representative of the Sixth District of Texas. I do not believe that there were many freshman Members of Congress who were as fortunate as I to have had the friendship and guidance of such a great statesman and gentleman during my early years in the Congress.

Mr. Johnson came to the Congress in 1923 after an illustrious career as a prosecuting attorney of Navarro County, district attorney of the 13th Judicial District of Texas, a delegate to the Democratic convention in 1916, and chairman of the Democratic State convention in 1920. He served with distinction in the House until 1946 when he was appointed to the bench of the U.S. Tax Court by President Truman where he remained until his retirement in 1956. While in the House of Representatives he served on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and at the time of his resignation, he was the second ranking Democratic member of that committee.

Judge Johnson's tenure of office in the House was marked by his great consideration for his fellow man, about whose welfare he was always concerned. Even during his years of retirement when I would have the occasion to breakfast with him in the Navarro Hotel in Corsicana, Tex., while visiting in my district, his concern was for the people he had represented in the Congress, and he would ask for many of them by name and inquire of their well-being. It was this facet of his nature which stood me in such good stead during my early years in the Congress as I went to him with many problems and always found him most helpful.

Mr. Speaker, I could fill the pages of the RECORD with many glowing words of Judge Johnson, but I do not believe I could say more than to say that he lived his entire life for his fellow man and a desire to serve him better.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the passing of our late colleague from Texas, Luther Alexander Johnson. I had the privilege of serving with Judge Johnson in the House from the date of my election until he resigned in 1946. As a new Member of the Congress, I was privileged to enjoy his friendship and counsel which I valued very highly.

In addition to the distinguished career which he enjoyed in his many years of service in the House of Representatives, he also added luster to his many achievements through his service on the Tax Court of the United States from July 1946 until his retirement in September 1956. He brought learning and integrity to the Tax Court and his contributions are legion. It is always sad when those with whom we have associated closely must leave us, and particularly so when they are individuals of integrity, wisdom and knowledge and have devoted a lifetime to the service of their district, State, and Nation.

My sincerest consolation to the surviving members of his family.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and service of the Honorable Luther A. Johnson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS OF CERTAIN PROPOSED PUBLIC LAND ACTIONS

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar (H.R. 396) to provide that until June 30, 1968, Congress shall be notified of certain public land actions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand in this bill there is an exemption of 5,000 acres of forest land, and, if so, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs why this exception of tracts of 5,000 acres?

Mr. ASPINALL. The reason is we continue the same procedure as is in effect at the present time. This is an operation we have had throughout many years and in order not to upset the present procedure, that has worked so well, we recommend the provisions of the present bill we are now considering.

Mr. GROSS. Then 5,000 acres of forest land is not considered to be an exceptionally large tract of land?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. Different procedures apply to forest lands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 396

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That pending the implementation of recommendations to be made by the Public Land Law Review Commission and except as to actions covered by section 2 of this Act the Secretary of the Interior, or his designee, may not affect the withdrawal, reservation, restriction, or change in use designation or classification involving more than two thousand five hundred and sixty acres of public lands until after the expiration of sixty days from the date upon which a report of the facts, including but not limited to the following information, concerning the proposed action is submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

(1) the officer or agency proposing the withdrawal, reservation, restriction, designation, or classification;

(2) the agency having administrative jurisdiction over the lands;

(3) the purpose for which the area is proposed to be used or, if the purpose is classified for national security reasons, a statement to that effect and, if publication in the Federal Register has been withheld for security reasons, a statement to that effect;

(4) the location, acreage, and legal description of the area;

(5) the period during which the proposed withdrawal, reservation, restriction, designation, or classification will continue in effect;

(6) description of any contamination which may result;

(7) effect on any nonpublic lands within the exterior boundaries of the described area and, if acquisition of nonpublic lands is proposed, citation of authority for acquisition;

(8) detailed discussion of the effect that the proposed action will have on the operation of the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws and laws and regulations relating to the conservation, utilization, and development of mineral, timber, and other material resources; grazing, fish, wildlife, and water resources; and scenic, wilderness, recreation, and other values;

(9) a statement of the leases, licenses, or permits in force, indicating those that would be terminated after the proposed action is consummated; and

(10) whether the purpose for which the area is proposed to be used involves the use of water.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture may not effect any formal classification or designation of national forest lands involving five thousand acres or more when the action will exclude from the area one or more major uses for a considerable period of time or request the Secretary of the Interior to effect a withdrawal or reservation of lands involving five thousand acres or more in conjunction with national forest use until after the expiration of sixty days from the date upon which a report of the facts concerning the proposed action is submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The reports submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture shall contain the information set forth in section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 3. The filing of an application by a department or agency of the Federal Government with the Secretary of the Interior for withdrawal, reservation, or restriction, or the publication of notice in the Federal Register by the Secretary of the Interior of a proposed designation or classification of public lands or the publication of notice in the Federal Register by the Secretary of Agriculture that he has, in accordance with section 2 hereof, notified the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of his intention to request the Secretary of the Interior to effect a withdrawal or reservation of public lands shall have the effect of segregating such land from settlement, location, sale, selection, entry, lease, or other form of disposal under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, unless the application or the publication or a subsequent modification of such application or publication specifies that the land shall remain open for one or more such forms of disposal under the public land laws. Such segregative effect shall continue for a period of two years from the date of application or publication, unless withdrawal, reservation, restriction, designation, or classification has theretofore been completed in accordance with the provisions of this Act or unless the Secretary of the Interior with the concurrence of the requesting agency shall terminate it sooner. Not more than ninety days nor less than thirty days prior to the expiration of such two-year period, the proposal may be renewed and notice of such renewal, including a statement of the necessity for continued segregation, shall be given to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and filed for publication in the Federal Register whereupon the segregative effect shall be extended for an additional period not exceeding two years, unless Congress, or the Secretary of the Interior with the concurrence of the requesting agency, terminates the segregation at an earlier date.

SEC. 4. The provisions in this Act shall not apply to proposed withdrawals, reservations, and restrictions of public lands for defense purposes requiring an Act of Congress in accordance with the provisions of the Act of February 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 27); and nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as superseding or amending that Act.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "public lands" includes (1) the public domain of the United States; (2) reservations, other than Indian reservations, created from the public domain; (3) lands permanently or temporarily withdrawn from the public domain and reserved or withheld from private appropriation, and (4) the surface and subsurface resources of all such lands.

(b) The term "withdrawal, reservation, or restriction" includes withdrawal actions taken under (1) the authorities included in Executive Order Numbered 10355 of May 26, 1952 (17 F.R. 4831); (2) the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388; 48 U.S.C. 416); (3) the Act of April 16, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 116; 43 U.S.C. 561); (4) section 1 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1269; 43 U.S.C. 315); (5) section 10 of the Act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. 413; 48 U.S.C. 464); (6) the Act of May 24, 1928, as amended (45 Stat. 728; 49 U.S.C. 211–214).

(c) The terms "change in use designation and use classification" include (1) classifications under section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1272; 43 U.S.C. 315f); (2) classifications under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of June 14, 1926, as amended (44 Stat. 741; 43 U.S.C. 869, 869 1–4); (3) classifications under the Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 609: 43 U.S.C. 682a–e); (4) classifications under the Alaska Public Sale Act of August 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 679; 48 U.S.C. 364a–e); (5) orders to prevent issuance of leases, licenses, or permits; (6) orders to prevent cutting of timber or removal of other materials; (7) orders closing public lands to applications under the public land laws; (8) mineral classifications of public lands; and (9) waterpower site classification of public lands.

SEC. 6. Notification by the Secretary of the Interior to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives shall not be required under this Act if notification of classification or proposed classification has been furnished to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives under any other statute within two years of the withdrawal, reservation, restriction, or change in use designation, or classification of the same lands under procedures specified in this Act.

SEC. 7. The requirements of this Act shall expire June 30, 1968, except that the segregation of any public lands under this Act prior to June 30, 1968, shall continue for the period of time allowed by this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after "Commission" insert "and except as to actions covered by section 2 of this Act."

Page 5, line 22, through page 6, line 21, strike out all of subsections 5. (b) and 5. (c) and insert the following:

"(b) The term 'withdrawal, reservation, or restriction' includes withdrawal actions taken under (1) the authorities included in Executive Order Numbered 10355 of May 26, 1952 (17 F.R. 4831); (2) the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388; 43 U.S.C. 416); (3) the Act of April 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 116) as amended (43 U.S.C. 561); (4) section 1 of the Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269) as amended (43 U.S.C. 315); (5) section 10 of the Act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. 413; 48 U.S.C. 464); (6) the Act of May 24, 1928 (45 Stat. 728) as amended (49 U.S.C. 211–214).

"(c) The term 'change in use designation and use classification' include (1) classifications under section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1272) as amended (43 U.S.C. 315f); (2) classifications under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741) as amended (43 U.S.C. 869, 869 1–4); (3) classifications under the Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609) as amended (43 U.S.C. 682–e); (4) classifications under the Alaska Public Sale Act of August 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 679; 48 U.S.C. 364a–e); (5) orders to prevent issuance of leases, licenses, or permits; (6) orders to prevent cutting of timber or removal of other materials; (7) orders closing public lands to applications under the public land laws; (8) mineral classifications of public lands; and (9) waterpower site classification of public lands."

Page 1, lines 6 to 9 inclusive, strike out all of section 7 and insert the following:

"SEC. 7. This Act shall expire June 30, 1969, but any segregation initiated pursuant to this Act shall continue for the period provided in section 3."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to provide that until June 30, 1969, Congress shall be notified of certain proposed public land actions."

AMENDING RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS VITALIZATION ACT OF 1964

The Clerk called the bill, H.R. 7762, to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the Officers' Training Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7762

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all provisions of law other than section 2107 (b) and (f) of title 10, United States Code, that apply to midshipmen appointed under section 2107(a) of that title, apply to midshipmen appointed in the Naval Reserve under section 6904 of that title before October 13, 1964.

SEC. 2. Section 2109(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting the words ", and designated applicants for membership in," after the words "members of" wherever they appear.

SEC. 3. The effective date of this Act is October 13, 1964.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That all provisions of law except section 2107 (b)(3) and (f) of title 10, United States Code, that apply to midshipmen appointed under Public Law 88–647, apply to midshipmen appointed in the Naval Reserve before October 13, 1964.

"SEC. 2. Section 2109(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting the words ', and designated applicants for membership in,' after the words 'members of' wherever they appear.

"SEC. 3. Section 209 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words 'retainer pay' and 'Retainer pay' wherever they appear in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the words 'subsistence allowance' and 'Subsistence allowance' in place thereof, respectively.

"SEC. 4. The effective date of this act is October 13, 1964."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "To amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, with respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps."

REMOVAL OF RETIREMENT INEQUITY WITH RESPECT TO THE U.S. BOTANIC GARDEN

The Clerk called the bill, H.R. 6686, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act with respect to the U.S. Botanic Garden and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to address a question concerning the possibility of freezing patronage employees in this particular situation. I wonder if the gentleman responsible for this could tell me how many people have been appointed in the last 4 years?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will the gentleman restate his question?

Mr. HALL. It is my understanding that this bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act as applied to the U.S. Botanical Garden people on Capitol Hill came about as the result of the development of patronage appointments and this, in effect, freezes them in these positions. My question is, How many appointments have been made in the last 4 years?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Actually there are only 52 employees concerned in this. I think the gentleman is correct; they would be patronage people, but many of them had these jobs for quite a long time.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman will agree that this does in fact freeze them into permanent positions; is that correct?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Actually there are only 52 employees concerned in this—just 52. I think the gentleman is correct when he says that they would be patronage people. But I am sure that many of them have had these jobs quite a long time.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman would agree that this does in effect freeze them into permanent positions; is that not also correct?

Mr. BECKWORTH. The bill would make their jobs no more permanent than they are at this time.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman does not feel that this bill can be interpreted as freezing them in these positions regardless of the ebb and flow of the majority party in the future?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No, sir; they would be no more permanent than they are at this time.

Actually, this is all that this bill does: Public Law 88–267 extended the congressional employees retirement system to the personnel in the Office of the Architect of the Capitol. It was the general understanding when that legislation was being considered that the Botanic Garden employees would also be covered because their activities are administered by the Architect. It was later discovered that an 1873 law vests jurisdiction of the Botanic Gardens in the Joint Committee on the Library, which in 1934 delegated the administrative function to the Architect of the Capitol. Therefore, what in effect happened was an inadvertent omission from Public Law 88–267 of this small group of Botanic Garden employees. It was not meant that they be excluded by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, but through an inadvertence they were omitted from the coverage of that law.

Mr. HALL. Now can the gentleman who is on the floor, my distinguished friend from Texas, answer my original question as to the number that have been appointed in the last 4 years?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do not have the number that have been appointed in the last 4 years or the last 8 years or the last 12 years. I do know there are 52 of these people who will be affected by this and most of them, in my judgment, have been there a long time.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6686

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1(c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2251(c)), is amended by inserting "an officer or employee of the United States Botanic Garden," immediately following "the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol,".

(b) Section 2(c) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2252(c)), is amended by inserting "and officers and employees of the United States Botanic Garden" immediately following "the employees of the Architect of the Capitol".

(c) Section 2(f) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2252(f)), is amended by striking out "; and the Architect of the Capitol and the Librarian of Congress are authorized to exclude from the operation of this Act any employees under the office of the Architect of the Capitol and the Library of Congress, respectively, whose tenure of employment is temporary or of uncertain duration." and inserting in lieu thereof "; and the Architect of the Capitol, the Librarian of Congress, and the Director or Acting Director of the United States Botanic Garden are authorized to exclude from the operation of this Act any employees under the office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Library of Congress, and the United States Botanic Garden, respectively, whose tenure of employment is temporary or of uncertain duration.".

SEC. 2. The provisions under the heading "CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Public Law 85–844), shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall not apply in the case of officers and employees retired or otherwise separated prior to the date of enactment of this Act. The rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if such amendments had not been enacted.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 6686, a bill to bring the Botanic Garden employees into civil service retirement programs.

Briefly, the intent of this bill is to allow the 52 employees of the Botanic Garden to enjoy the same retirement benefits as do the 7,000 other congressional employees. This group of employees was accidentally excluded from coverage when the Civil Service Retirement Act was amended in the 88th Congress.

These fine dedicated career workers are devoted to beauty and conservation—two words fast becoming bywords in the Nation's Capital.

Indeed, with today's emphasis on national beautification it is ironic that those dedicated wholly to this end should be discriminated against when it comes to benefits. Simple justice demands that this bill was passed to insure equality of treatment for all employees of the Congress.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPLICATION OF EVACUATION AND ALLOTMENT PAY LAW TO GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1732) to extend the act of September 26, 1961, relating to allotment and assignment of pay, to cover the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1732

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (1) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize pay with respect to civilian employees of the United States in cases of emergency evacuations, to consolidate the laws governing allotment and assignment of pay by such employees, and for other purposes", approved September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 662; 5 U.S.C. 3071), is amended—

(1) by striking out the word "and" immediately following "(F) the Library of Congress;";

(2) by adding

"(G) the Government Printing Office; and" immediately below

"(F) the Library of Congress;"; and

(3) by striking out "(G)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(H)".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSISTANCE FOR DISASTER VICTIMS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1796) to amend the Small Business Act to provide additional assistance for disaster victims.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this bill is scheduled to come up under suspension of the rules today, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, will he reserve the right to object so that I may make a brief statement?

Mr. HALL. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the right to object.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not on the suspension calendar today. It has been taken off because an application for a rule is pending. I will state that there is no objection to this bill. It passed the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and its Small Business Subcommittee unanimously. It passed the U.S. Senate unanimously. It passed the House Committee on Banking and Currency unanimously. It passed the House Subcommittee on Small Business unanimously. There has been no objection to it. This legislation is very much needed and if the gentleman can see his way clear not to object, it would be very much appreciated. Otherwise, there will be delay unless it is passed by unanimous consent. If the gentleman can consistently see his way clear not to object, I think it will be appreciated by the people in the disaster areas where they have had not only one disaster but some have had two in the same season. Some have lost not only their homes but also their businesses. There is an urgent and immediate need for this legislation, and I hope the gentleman can see his way clear not to object.

Mr. HALL. My friend, the gentleman from Texas, makes a very eloquent plea. Certainly I am not against the purpose of the bill nor the action of the committee, but I submit it does not qualify under the rules of the committee of objectors, insofar as neither the Bureau of the Budget report or the Small Business Administration views are attached and inasmuch as a rule has been requested in addition to having been on the Consent Calendar, whether it has been withdrawn or not, I am constrained to renew my request that it be passed over.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Furthermore, the bill violates the rule for consideration on the Consent Calendar by virtue of the fact that it deals with $50 million.

Mr. HALL. Yes, I thank the gentleman from Iowa. This is another area wherein it does not qualify for consideration on the Consent Calendar in addition to the other reasons that I mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INTEREST RATES ON FOREIGN OFFICIAL TIME DEPOSITS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5306) to continue the authority of domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic deposits.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, since this bill has a rule and is also scheduled to be considered under suspension of the rules, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

SBA AUTHORITY TO LEND TO SBIC'S AND STATE AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7847) to amend the Small Business Act.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on the same basis as for the last two bills, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE DURATION OF COPYRIGHT PROTECTION IN CERTAIN CASES

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 431) extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 431

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in any case in which the renewal term of copyright subsisting in any work on the date of approval of this resolution, or the term thereof as extended by Public Law 87–688, would expire prior to December 31, 1967, such term is hereby continued until December 31, 1967.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 6, delete "87–688" and insert in lieu thereof "87–668".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CRIER-LAW CLERKS BY U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7707) to authorize the appointment of crier-law clerks by district judges.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to interrogate one of the handlers of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of anyone to explain the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMENDING TITLES 10 AND 14, UNITED STATES CODE, AND THE MILITARY PERSONNEL AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES' CLAIMS ACT OF 1964, WITH RESPECT TO THE SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES BY MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES AND CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES FOR DAMAGE TO, OR LOSS OF, PERSONAL PROPERTY INCIDENT TO THEIR SERVICE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5024) to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, and the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, with respect to the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States, for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that there is no objection on the part of the Bureau of the Budget and that the Department of Defense has submitted this particular bill, but I wonder what will be the total effect in cost. If the potential cost is no more than $327,000, how will all the claimants' requests be satisfied?

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. As stated on page 8 of the report, the best information we have as to the effect—and the military records show this—is that figures as to retroactive payment have been collected on the outstanding unpaid balances and result in a total of $327,126.86. This would take care of 195 claimants, the total number we know would be affected.

If this should run more than $327,000, according to my meager knowledge of the procedure, it would have to come out of appropriations and therefore Congress would pass on it.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina. I wonder if this rather large fund is not rather closely related to the forgiveness features the gentleman and I have discussed before with regard to accountability and responsibility of paying officers and/or the requests for reimbursement by them?

Mr. ASHMORE. No. This has nothing to do with that matter. I believe the gentleman is confusing the claims covered in this bill with another type.

Mr. HALL. I understand. I am not confused. I understand that this is a personal property "floater" type of insurance which we purchase for these people. Why not guarantee payment in this manner in adequate amounts?

Mr. ASHMORE. Yes. They have not been paid more than was coming to them for some purpose. This is where they have not been paid properly for losses.

Mr. HALL. This would increase the limit from $6,500 to $10,000; is that correct?

Mr. ASHMORE. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did not Congress last year increase the administrative settlement from $2,500 to $6,500? When was that granted?

Mr. ASHMORE. The gentleman from Iowa is correct in saying it was increased in that the then existing authority for the military departments was extended to the civilian agencies. The maximum was $6,500 and that limit was fixed in 1956. The gentleman is correct in that.

That is working so well and has been administered so well since the amount was brought up to $6,500 that we believe the recommendation and request of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force in particular should be carried out and they should be given additional authority, that is, the amount should be increased up to the maximum of $10,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is not the fact that much of this relates to the loss of property either in warehouses or while it is being transported? Is that not correct?

Mr. ASHMORE. That is correct. Due to a disaster or a catastrophe or something of that nature.

Mr. GROSS. And now you want to increase the limit to $10,000 for administrative settlement. Is that due to the fact that we are permitting more personal property to be shipped around the world, or is it due to the fact that the dollar is getting cheaper all the time?

Mr. ASHMORE. No. I would not say it is due to the fact that we are permitting military personnel or men in that position to carry more property. It is only to cover losses that are of such amount that the $6,500 provided as the limit provided for administrative settlement by the Government could not provide compensation. When that occurs, when the loss is greater that the amount of $6,500 for which the Government has in effect acted as a self-insurer, then the members of the military personnel who have sustained this loss have to take the loss personally unless a bill comes to the Congress for relief and we pass it in order to pay them what has been reasonably adjudged to be fair and just compensation for the property, which incidentally they have to establish they were using as necessary and proper in their military duties. Now, in order to prevent so many of those bills from coming here, as the gentleman well knows they do, we think it would be wise to give the military authorities the authority and jurisdiction to settle those claims in amounts up to $10,000. This is to take care of that relatively small number of claims where the amount is in excess of the $6,500 limit.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I do not think we are getting at the root of this situation at all by simply continuing to increase the permissive settlements. In your report on the bill you say that the average claims submitted are settled for about $300.

Mr. ASHMORE. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And you say, "the severe losses which occur in disaster situations are less than 1 percent of the total number of claims presented."

Mr. ASHMORE. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. If this is true, then I think that the Congress ought to take a look at the settlements that go up to $10,000. I think we have gone just about as high as we ought to go pending some action with respect to the amount of personal property that they can ship all over the world. Pending some meaningful limitation on that, I think the limit ought to be held to $6,500.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the average claim is only $300, and in view of the fact that less than 1 percent of the claims are over $6,500; and in view of the fact that this was changed within the last Congress, plus the obvious fact that it is again delegating the power and duty of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF ENLISTED MEMBERS OF THE AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5252) to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5252

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all payments of basic allowance for subsistence heretofore made to enlisted members of the Air Force who were assigned to the Tainan Air Force Station, Tainan, Taiwan, during the period beginning on October 1, 1960, and ending on June 30, 1962, and which are otherwise correct, are validated to the extent that those allowances were paid, because the military commander concerned determined that no Government mess was available to those enlisted members under regulations prescribed under section 402 of title 37, United States Code. Any enlisted member who has made a repayment to the United States of the amount so paid to him as a basic allowance for subsistence is entitled to be paid the amount involved, if otherwise proper.

SEC. 2. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amounts expended under this Act.

SEC. 3. Appropriations available to the Department of the Air Force for the pay and allowances of military personnel are available for payments under this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike "paid," and insert "paid".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 903) to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to hear the views of the proponent of the bill as to why the Federal Power Commission views are not indicated and in general why this does not qualify for the Consent Calendar; but is brought up at this time, on the basis of the rules laid down by the House and by the majority party in particular.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I was not aware that there was anything that would cause this bill not to qualify because my understanding is that there are complete reports from all departments. This is a matter in the Department of the Interior, of course, having to do with a very small area of land, straightening out the boundaries of a park. I do not quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman knows that we have certain rules for qualifying bills for the Consent Calendar that have been established by the objectors and by the majority party as approved by the House of Representatives at the beginning of this session. For example, we do not consider anything involving over $1 million of expenditure from the U.S. Treasury, or bills on which we do not have committee reports. The Department of Agriculture has no objection but defers to the Federal Power Commission. There are no Federal Power Commission views at this time. The Bureau of the Budget has no objection, but refers to the departmental reports. What really concerns me is that the Department of the Interior itself says that there are local interests that have brought up objection to the passage of this bill.

I find nothing in the hearings or in the report to indicate what these local interests are. I have no preference pro or con with reference to the bill. I am simply seeking compliance with the rules of the House, which were laid down for qualification for bills on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there was originally interest in the area having to do with irrigation projects which did offer some objection. They were not really objecting. They simply asked to defer action last year, at the time of the hearings. They have since withdrawn their objections. The parties originally objecting have now indicated support for the bill. So far as I know there is no objection to the bill on the part of any Californian or any interests there or any department of the Government. The only reason why this situation developed here is that there was a variance in the lines and many years ago, back in the twenties, there was a power reservation and as a result this area was temporarily left out of the park on its creation in 1940.

Since that time the people who have been interested have withdrawn their objection. So far as I know, there is no objection by any department of the Government or any individual organization in the State of California.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman know what the Federal Power Commission views are on this bill?

Mr. SISK. It is my understanding that the Federal Power Commission has no jurisdiction and no interest whatsoever in the matter. I believe that is the view of the chairman of the full committee and of the ranking Republican on the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I do understand from the gentleman from California that the objections in the two areas for power purposes, or the local interest objections, have been withdrawn?

Mr. SISK. That is exactly correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to my colleague on the committee, the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that there is widespread and unanimous support for the purpose of this bill throughout the State of California. It is widely felt by people interested in the conservation of State resources that this area should have been included in the original park and we are very pleased now that action is being taken to accomplish this. I want to assure the gentleman that there is no difference of opinion within the State of

California. There is unanimous support for this bill.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman from California know of any objection on the part of the Federal Power Commission?

Mr. BALDWIN. I do not know of any objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my colleague that there is no objection to this bill. These two tracts of land now being included were reserved because of opposition in the State of California, and the desire to fully investigate the possibility of hydroelectric development as well as storage of water. That opposition has all been resolved and has been withdrawn. The Federal Power Commission has no jurisdiction in this matter and therefore a report from that agency is not necessary.

Mr. HALL. Is this an in-holding?

Mr. SAYLOR. No; this is not an inholding. This is land which belongs to the Federal Government and is in a national forest. It will now be included and transferred into a national park.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, on the assurances of our colleagues on each side of the aisle; but we must insist on qualification of the bills under the House's own ground rules in the future. This will not be considered a precedent to fracturing such rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 903

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all lands in Tehipite Valley within the Sierra National Forest lying north of a line described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the existing west boundary of the Kings Canyon National Park on the hydrographic divide on the southwest side of the Gorge of Despair in section 13, township 12 south, range 29 east. Mount Diablo base and meridian, being the crest of a ridge designated as Silver Spur;

thence following the crest of Silver Spur westerly to the intersection with the west line of section 14, township 12 south, range 29 east; thence northwesterly in a straight line across the middle fork of the Kings River to the point of intersection of the right bank of a stream or intermitent stream and the 4,400-foot contour north of Tombstone Ridge, in section 15, township 12 south, range 29 east, being a point on the existing west boundary of the park.

and all lands in the Cedar Grove area of the Sequoia National Forest lying east of the west section lines of sections 11 and 14, township 13 south, range 30 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian and are hereby excluded from the said national forests and made a part of the Kings Canyon National Park, subject to all the laws and regulations applicable to such park.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "park." and insert "park;".

Page 2, line 12, after "meridian," strike out and".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 122]

Abbitt
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Arends
Ayres
Bell
Bingham
Bonner
Bow
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Cahill
Callaway
Casey
Cederberg
Clawson, Del
Conable
Conyers
Cramer
Diggs
Donohue
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Farnsley
Findley
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Giaimo
Green, Oreg.
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Helstoski
Holifield
Holland
Jacobs
Jennings
Joelson
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Keogh
Krebs
Landrum
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McEwen
McVicker
Mackay
Mackie
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
May
Michel
Miller
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Nix
Passman
Pelly
Philbin
Pirnie
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Randall
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Roosevelt
Roush
St Germain
Shipley
Slack
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Willis
Wright

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 346 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FURTHER CALL OF THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the next bill on the Consent Calendar.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5280) to provide for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, inasmuch as this bill appears elsewhere today on the agenda under suspension of the rules, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

RELATING TO VEGA DAM AND RESERVOIR, COLO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 399) to provide adjustments in order to make uniform the estate acquired for the Vega Dam and Reservoir, Collbran project, Colorado, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to reconvey mineral interests in certain lands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 399

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to provide adjustments in the interests in land heretofore acquired for the Vega Dam and Reservoir, Collbran project, Colorado, and thereby make uniform the estate acquired to fulfill necessary real estate requirements of the project, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to reconvey to the former owner thereof any mineral interest, including oil and gas, heretofore acquired for said project, whenever the Secretary shall determine that the retention of such mineral interest is not required for public purposes and he shall have received an application for reconveyance as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall give notice to the former owner of such mineral interest of the availability of the interest for reconveyance under the provisions of this Act. The former owner shall thereafter file an application within ninety days of the date of notice if he desires to have the interest reconveyed to him.

SEC. 3. Any mineral interest reconveyed under this Act shall be transferred for an amount determined by the Secretary to be equal to the price at which the mineral interest was acquired by the United States.

SEC. 4. As used in this Act the term "former owner" means the person from whom any mineral interest was acquired by the United States or, if such person is deceased, his spouse; or if such spouse is deceased, his children or heirs at law.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior may delegate any authority conferred upon him by this Act to any officer or employee of the Department of the Interior. Such officer or employee shall exercise the authority so delegated under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOVABLE PROPERTY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1000) to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1000

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of July 29, 1954 (68 Stat. 580), as amended by the Act of August 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 940), is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1. That whenever an irrigation district, municipality, or water users' organization assumes operation and maintenance of works constructed to furnish or distribute a water supply pursuant to a contract entered into with the United States in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) (43 U.S.C. 371. note). (43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.), the Secretary of the Interior may transfer to said district, municipality, or organization title to movable property which has been purchased with funds advanced by the district, municipality, or organization or which, in the case of property purchased with appropriated funds, is necessary to the operation and maintenance of such works and the value of which is to be repaid under a contract with the district, municipality, or organization. In order to encourage the assumption by irrigation districts, municipalities, and water users' organizations of the operation and maintenance of works constructed to furnish or distribute a water supply, the Secretary is authorized to use appropriated funds available for the project involved to acquire movable property for transfer under the terms and conditions hereinbefore provided, at the time operation and maintenance is assumed."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out "(43 U.S.C. 371, note)," and insert "(43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.),".

Page 2, after line 18, add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Whenever a municipal corporation or other organization to which water for municipal, domestic or industrial use is furnished or distributed under a contract entered into with the United States pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws so requests, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to transfer to it or its nominee the care, operation and maintenance of the works by which such water supply is made available or such part of those works as, in his judgment, is appropriate in the circumstances, subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Speaker, can someone on the committee identify the original owner of the equipment that may be turned over to the irrigation district or the municipality?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Sometimes this property is purchased with funds furnished by the irrigation district or the municipality. At other times it is property that is furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation. But in either event the cost is nothing to the Government, because this property is included in the pay-back or reimbursement.

Mr. GROSS. This is not original Government property?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Well, in some instances it might be, but if it is original Government property, it is charged to the irrigation district and it is paid for out of the proceeds of the water that is sold. So there is no cost to the Government.

Mr. GROSS. On what basis do they arrive at a price for this movable equipment? This could run into a considerable amount of money in big draglines and other earth-moving equipment.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, it must be at the actual value of the property that is sold, which would be determined by the price and depreciated on a certain scale.

Mr. GROSS. Who will make this determination?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The Secretary of the Interior would make it according to a schedule and scale set up by the GAO.

Mr. GROSS. This would in no way result in a windfall to a municipality or other subdivision of the Government?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If the gentleman will yield further, certainly it was not intended to do this. If there is any loophole in it that would make this possible, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is quite interested in this, and myself would make every effort to get the bill amended or to plug up any loopholes. We questioned them at length on it, and if there is any possible manner in which they can do this, it is just not known to the committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I interrogated the witnesses from the Interior Department to make sure that there would not be a windfall and we were assured by them that the charges that would be made to the irrigation district or the water district would reimburse the Federal Government for all charges.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPOUSES' ANNUITIES UNDER RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3157) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice on the basis that it does not qualify, as it is on the Consent Calendar for today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7954) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to conform to the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, London (1960).

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this bill also appears on the Calendar for Suspension of the Rules, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY OF THE CHOCTAW TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5860) to amend the law relating to the final disposition of the property of the Choctaw Tribe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5860

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of August 25, 1959 (73 Stat. 420), as amended by Act of August 24, 1962 (76 Stat. 405), is amended as follows: The words "six years", which appear twice in section 1(a), once in section 1(d), once in section 11, once in section 12(a), and once in section 12(b), are changed to "eleven years."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "eleven" and insert "nine".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5280) to provide for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5280

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is declared to be the policy of Congress to safeguard the position of the United States with respect to its international balance of payments. To effectuate this policy the President shall undertake continuous surveillance over the private flow of dollar funds from the United States to foreign countries, the solicitation of cooperation by banks, investment bankers and companies, insurance companies, finance companies, pension funds, and other financial interests to curtail expansion of such flow, and the authorization of such voluntary agreements or programs as may be necessary and appropriate to safeguard the position of the United States with respect to its international balance of payments.

SEC. 2. (a) The President is authorized to consult with representatives of banks, investment bankers and companies, insurance companies, finance companies, pension funds, and other financial interests to stimulate voluntary efforts to aid in the improvement of the balance-of-paymens position of the United States.

(b) When the President finds it necessary and appropriate to safeguard the United States balance-of-payments position, he may request banks, investment bankers and companies, insurance companies, finance companies, pension funds, and other financial interests to discuss the formulation of voluntary agreements or programs to achieve such objective. If the President makes such a request, no such discussion nor the formulation of any voluntary agreement or program in the course of such discussion shall

be construed to be within the prohibitions of the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act of the United States, provided that no act or omission to act in effectuation of such voluntary agreement or program is taken until after such voluntary agreement or program is approved in accordance with the provisions of subsections (c) and (d) hereof.

(c) The President may approve any voluntary agreement or program among banks, investment bankers and companies, insurance companies, finance companies, pension funds, and other financial interests that he finds to be necessary and appropriate to safeguard the United States balance-of-payments position. No act or omission to act which occurs pursuant to any such approved voluntary agreement or program shall be construed to be within the prohibitions of the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(d) No voluntary agreement or program shall be approved by a delegate of the President except after submission to the Attorney General for his review as to its effect on competition and a finding by the Attorney General after consultation with the delegate of the President that the actual or potential detriment to competition is outweighed by the benefits of such agreement or program to the safeguarding of the United States balance-of-payments position.

(e) Any meeting of representatives of banks, investment bankers and companies, insurance companies, finance companies, pension funds, and other financial interests requested by the President pursuant to this Act, or pursuant to any approved voluntary agreement or program, shall comply with the provisions of Executive Order 11007, dated February 26, 1962, applicable to the conduct of meetings of industry advisory committees.

(f) The Attorney General shall continuously review the operation of any agreement or program approved pursuant to this Act, and shall recommend to the President the withdrawal or suspension of such approval if in his judgment after consultation with the delegate of the President its actual or potential detriment to competition outweighs its benefit to the safeguarding of the United States balance-of-payments position.

(g) The Attorney General shall have the authority to require the production of such books, records, or other information from any participant in a voluntary agreement or program as he may determine reasonably necessary for the performance of his responsibilities under this Act.

(h) Upon withdrawal of any request or finding made hereunder or approval granted hereunder, or upon termination of this Act, the provisions of this section shall not apply to any subsequent act or omission to act.

Sec. 3. On or before January 1, 1966, and at least once every six months thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Congress and to the President reports on the performance of his responsibilities under this Act. A summary of each voluntary agreement or program approved pursuant to this Act shall be published by the President in the Federal Register within three days of its effective date.

Sec. 4. The President may require such reports as he deems necessary to carry out the policy of this Act from any person, firm, or corporation within the United States concerning any activities affecting the United States balance-of-payments position.

Sec. 5. The President may delegate the authority granted him by this Act, except that the authority granted may be delegated to only officials appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, whether acting singly or jointly or as a committee or board.

Sec. 6. This Act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate on December 31, 1967, or on such date prior thereto as the President shall find that the authority conferred by this Act is no longer necessary as a means of safeguarding the balance-of-payments position and shall by proclamation so declare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is part of the President's 10-point program, communicated to the Congress in his message of February 10, 1965, to restore a balance to the international trading accounts of the United States.

H.R. 5280 establishes procedures for the formulation, organization and operation of voluntary agreements or programs among banks, investment bankers and companies, insurance companies, finance companies, pension funds, and other financial interests, that provide for joint action, under the supervision of responsible Government officials, determined to be needed to safeguard the balance-of-payments position of the United States. Such voluntary cooperative action by representatives of the U.S. financial community is to be directed to the curtailment of the private flow of dollar funds and credit from the United States to foreign countries.

The participants in the voluntary agreements or programs that are authorized by H.R. 5280, when there has been compliance with procedures established in the bill, shall have immunity from the provisions of the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act, for authorized meetings and agreements, and acts or omissions to act which occur pursuant to any such approved voluntary agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I would be one of the last to grant immunity from the antitrust laws to banks, or to any other entities, were it not for a highly paramount and overriding consideration. The question of our balance of payments is such a paramount consideration, it must receive careful and immediate attention.

Mr. Speaker, the President urges Congress to do exactly that. He seeks, however, needed corrective action by a voluntary agreement in the first instance by the banking community. This bill is a part of his suggestion to enable us to prevent the outflow of dollars abroad so that we can maintain a better dollar balance than heretofore.

Mr. Speaker, it is implicit in the President's program that if these voluntary actions fail, then it may be necessary to take mandatory measures. The President is loath to do that, and I am quite sure you all agree that mandatory controls should be the last resort. I do not believe it will be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the restrictions, for example, that are now under operation with reference to individual industrial expansion programs, under the supervision of the Department of Commerce, are working very well. This bill is another step and seeks to encourage the banks and the financial communities to get together to formulate agreements voluntarily in order to curtail our credits abroad, and so to prevent the undue flow of dollars abroad.

Mr. Speaker, in 1964 the deficit in the United States balance of payments amounted to more than $3 billion, and this was the seventh consecutive year that the deficit had been at this level, or higher.

In 1964 our gold stocks decreased $125 million. This was the smallest decrease since 1958 when the gold drain amounted to $2.275 billion.

Mr. Speaker, these statistics show how important it is to bring about a balance in our international payments in order to prevent further drains on our gold stocks.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it appears that President de Gaulle of France seems bent upon reducing our gold position and hurting our position as a world power, I would say. He trades with Red China, with North Vietnam, with bearded Castro, the Red menace of the Caribbean. He wants us out of Europe. He wants Britain out of Europe. He intereferes with the smooth operation of NATO. Now he siphons off as much of our gold as possible through the dollar holdings he has accumulated. He siphons off our gold for speculative reasons; he knows that the dollar is the strongest currency and the only one that can support the vast flow of international commerce.

Mr. Speaker, why he takes this speculative position, and why other countries follow him, is difficult to understand. He probably does not want to recall that during the First and Second World Wars the United States loaned vast sums of money to France, billions of dollars, which yet remain unpaid. I would say, as some of the savants say, that to De Gaulle gratitude is a heavy burden. It has become a heavy burden to him.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Has De Gaulle ever been asked to pay, and why was he not asked to pay when we were dishing out billions to France under the foreign handout program?

Mr. CELLER. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, that President Eisenhower, President Kennedy and President Johnson each certainly have reminded President de Gaulle, through his emissaries here, that France owes a staggering debt to the United States.

I am quite sure the situation was not overlooked.

Mr. GROSS. I am looking at the bill, section 4 on page 5, which says that the President may require such reports as he deems necessary to carry out the policy of this act from any person, firm, or corporation within the United States concerning any activities affecting the U.S. balance-of-payments position.

This means, as I read it, that the President could pry into the records of any individual, firm, or corporation.

Mr. CELLER. It is quite essential that the President, or the one to whom he delegates—and I will say to the gentleman he cannot delegate one to supervise these matters unless that delegate's name has been approved by the Senate—has to act in accordance with all of the facts that are available to help the President; therefore, the President, being the architect of our foreign policy, either he or through his authorized agent who has been confirmed by the Senate, must have broad powers to uncover the facts and to see that there has been no violation of the antitrust laws. We are granting these financial institutions immunity from the antitrust laws. It is essential that the President not only be able to examine the books of those that participate in the voluntary agreement but also those whose actions influence the balance-of-payments position but who may not be directly involved in the agreements. They may be indirectly involved. Therefore, to be sure there has been no departure from the procedure established in the bill the President, indeed, must have authority to get these reports.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now, you have the Department of Justice, the Treasury Department, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Reserve System, the FDIC, and the Bureau of the Budget all directly or indirectly affected by this legislation, yet your report shows no departmental views. Why is that?

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman had read the hearings, he would have discovered that the Treasury Department approved the bill, the Federal Reserve Board approved the bill, the Department of Justice approved the bill, and the banking fraternity in general approved the bill; and the White House requested the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Why are these facts not available to the Members?

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman had read the hearings he would see where they had appeared.

Mr. GROSS. Ordinarily when a bill comes to the floor of the House the report contains the views of the various agencies and departments that are affected by the proposed legislation; yet in this case we have to go to the hearings in order to find out the views of these various departments. I do not understand why there is no mention of that in the report recommending the bill.

Mr. CELLER. There was no objection to the bill from any source, as I remember it. I think it was the unanimous viewpoint of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary that the bill be reported favorably. A very careful reading of the bill will show that proper safeguards surround these operations. We provide, for example, that the standards and regulations that have been promulgated by the Department of Justice concerning operation of the business advisory groups shall be operative in meetings that are authorized in this bill. No meeting can be held without the presence of a full-time Government official. Transcripts must be taken to record all the proceedings. The agreements must be published in the Federal Register. Periodical reports must be made to the Congress and to the President. Finally, the powers granted by this bill expire at the end of December 1967. This bill is no different in principle from section 708 of the Defense Production Act that we passed during the Korean conflict. Operations under that bill were efficient and successful.

It is also consistent with the procedures that were established during World War II. Those procedures were not based on legislation but were based on arrangements within the executive branch.

I will say to the Members of the House, every possible safeguard has been written into this bill so that there will be no abuse of the powers we grant in authorizing financial institutions to make these voluntary agreements.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join in support of this legislation. It came from the subcommittee by unanimous vote and came from the full committee by unanimous vote.

I noted the question of my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] concerning the views of the several departments of the Federal Government on the proposal. The question was in large part answered by the able chairman of our committee, but I should like to give the names of the spokesmen for such departments which supported the legislation. Ramsey Clark, Deputy Attorney General, speaking for the Department of Justice spoke in support of the bill. Frederick L. Deming, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, speaking for the Treasury Department, spoke in favor of the legislation. William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, that able economist and public official of such high repute, spoke in support of the legislation. And from the private financial community, there was George C. Scott, senior vice president of the First National City Bank of New York. In addition to what the chairman has said concerning precedent for this type of legislation, it is my memory that we had this type of legislation during the Korean conflict.

I am mindful of the question presented by my able colleague from Iowa [Mr. Gross] about section 4 at page 5 of the bill. I raised that question with Mr. Ramsey Clark. In his testimony on page 63 of the hearing record will be found the answer. The answer, in effect, was that the books and papers that could be called for under this legislation would be strictly limited to records which pertain to the balance-of-payments deficit which had proven to be such a problem not only in this administration, but in two former administrations, as well. I am glad to repeat what the chairman has said. This legislation expires by its own terms on the 31st day of December 1967, and can be terminated prior thereto whenever the President of the United States is of the opinion that it is no longer needed. I think it will be helpful, and I think the legislation will serve a useful public purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to section 4, there is this language which reads "concerning any activities affecting the U.S. balance-of-payments position. The President"—I reiterate "any activities." The President can pry into the affairs of any firm, corporation, or individual—"any activities affecting the U.S. balance of payments"—this can be almost anything dealing with the operation of any individual, firm, or corporation in the banking business or in the loan business or any financial institution.

I cannot see that those words impose any particular restriction upon what the President can do by way of prying into the records of private business. On the contrary I think it opens the door.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I should like to quote the exact language of Mr. Ramsey Clark, the Deputy Attorney General, when I raised the same question with him in the hearings:

> I will point out it is limited to reports of activities affecting the balance-of-payments position of the United States. That would seem to be very narrow.

Mr. Speaker, of course, officials of the Federal Government, acting under the Constitution and acting under the well-recognized principles of confidentiality, if they do get such information, are not apt to disclose such information—we have no record to the contrary—to unauthorized persons or for improper purposes. I am certain that the President of the United States would not do so under this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5280, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill as amended was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXEMPTION FROM DUTY FOR RETURNING RESIDENTS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8147) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to reduce until July 1, 1967, the exemption from duty for returning residents to $50 fair retail value, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 8147

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the article description for item 813.31 (77A Stat. 413) of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 (Tariff Schedules of the United States; 28 Fed. Reg., part II, Aug. 17, 1963; 19 U.S.C., sec. 1202) is amended by striking out all after "Articles" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "not over $100 (or $200 in the case of persons arriving directly or indirectly from American Samoa, Guam, or the Virgin Islands of the United States, not more than $100 of which shall have been acquired elsewhere than in such insular possessions) in aggregate fair retail value in the country of acquisition, if such person arrives from the Virgin Islands of the United States or from a contingous country which maintains a free zone or free port, or arrives from any other country after having remained beyond the territorial limits of the United States for a period of not less than 48 hours, and in either case has not claimed an exemption under this item (813.31) or under item 915.30 within the 30 days immediately preceding his arrival".

(b) Item 813.30 (77A Stat. 413) of such title I is amended by striking out "(including not more than 1 wine gallon of alcoholic beverages and not more than 100 cigars)" and inserting in lieu thereof ", including (but only in the case of an individual who has attained the age of 21) not more than 1 quart of alcoholic beverages (or 1 wine gallon of such beverages if such individual arrives directly or indirectly from American Samoa, Guam, or the Virgin Islands of the United States, not more than 1 quart of which shall have been acquired elsewhere than in such insular possessions, if the remainder is brought or shipped from such possessions) and including not more than 100 cigars,".

(c) (1) Item 813.32 (77A Stat. 413) of such title I is repealed.

(2) Item 813.40 (77A Stat. 413) of such title I is amended by striking out "or 813.32".

(3) Headnote 1(a) (77A Stat. 411) for subpart A of part 2 of schedule 8 of such title I is amended by striking out "or any article which has been exempted from duty under item 813.32".

SEC. 2. Subdivision (2) of subsection (a) of section 321 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1321(a)(2)), is amended by striking out "value" and inserting in lieu thereof "fair retail value in the country of shipment", and by striking out "exemption from duty or tax under paragraph 1798 (b)(2) or (c)(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "exemption from duty under item 812.25 or 813.31 of title I".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to persons arriving in the United States on or after July 1, 1965. The amendments made by section 2 shall apply with respect to articles arriving in the United States on or after July 1, 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

It will be recalled that the Congress in 1961 passed legislation providing a temporary reduction from $500 to $100 in the amount of purchases made abroad which a returning resident of the United States could bring into this country free of duty and internal revenue taxes. That legislation was prompted by a recommendation of the President at the time in the light of the then existing balance-of-payments problem. It was concluded that a more liberal customs exemption which had been designed to encourage American expenditures abroad and to provide more dollars to dollar-hungry Europe was not warranted at that time.

The temporary exemption was extended by Public Law 88–53 until July 1, 1965, on recommendation of the administration.

Unless further legislative action is taken by the Congress prior to July 1, 1965, the full $500 allowance will be restored.

Mr. Speaker, the bill as reported initially by the committee provided for a reduction in the amount of goods which could be brought back by an American tourist from abroad, from $100, the temporary amount, to $50. Upon further consideration of the matter, the Ways and Means Committee unanimously agreed to an amendment, which is at the Speaker's desk, to retain the $100 limitation with certain modifications.

It should be recognized that the $100 limitation on the amount that one can bring back to the United States was initially enacted in 1897 and continued to be the limitation until 1948, when the $500 limitation was enacted.

As I indicated earlier, the increase in the exemption from $100 to $500 was largely to assist dollar-short West European countries following World War II. These countries have no shortage of dollars today; there is no reason for returning to the $500 exemption. On the other hand, to slash the exemption to $50 seemed to your committee to be going too far the other way—some suggested that you might just as well eliminate the exemption entirely.

A return to normalcy, so to speak, with respect to the exemption, seemed the best course to follow. It would extend to the U.S. citizen a reasonable allowance for purchases abroad, allay the concern of our neighboring countries, Canada and Mexico, as well as that of friendly overseas nations that feel they would be adversely affected by a further curtailment of American tourist duty-free purchases, and would make a contribution to the solution of our balance-of-payments problem.

We believe it is time to get away from the permanent $500 provision and return to the $100 limitation with the modifications to which I referred.

The proposal before the House would not only return on a permanent basis to the $100 figure, but would have it apply on the basis of fair retail value of the articles for which the exemption is claimed. The returning-resident exemption has always been computed on the basis of the foreign wholesale value of the articles. A change in the basis of valuation was recommended by the Treasury Department in order to provide a more realistic measure for goods brought in by tourists and to facilitate customs clearance of passengers. Most travelers are not familiar with the fact that the duty exemption is valued on the wholesale price abroad. They report their purchases to the customs in terms of the amount actually paid for the goods. It is a practical impossibility for the customs authorities to make a case-by-case determination of wholesale value of all the varieties of goods that might be included in a claim for exemption and the practice is to make an allowance of 40 percent from the retail purchase price in order to arrive at foreign wholesale value. This means that in most instances, the present $100 exemption amounts to $167 in terms of retail value. The $100 exemption on the basis of fair retail value will mean what most travelers think it means.

The committee is recommending one further change in the exemption privilege for returning residents, and that is to reduce the quantity of alcoholic beverages that might be included in an exemption from 1 wine gallon to 1 quart. Prior to 1936, there was no specified limitation on the quantity of alcoholic beverages that could be included in the returning-resident exemption. In that year, as part of a comprehensive statute to tighten the enforcement of the revenue collection laws relating to distilled spirits, an amendment to the tourist exemption provision was made to limit the amount of alcoholic beverages that may be included in the exemption to 1 wine gallon. It will be recalled that this was shortly after the repeal of prohibition. The internal revenue tax on distilled spirits at that time was $2.00 per proof gallon. With the present rate of $10.50 per proof gallon on distilled spirits and the extensive use of the alcoholic beverage privilege in connection with the returning-resident exemption, a considerable loss of revenue is sustained—aside from the loss in customs duty of $1.00 to $1.25 per proof gallon on whiskey. When you consider this and also the fact that in the case of a family, each person, of whatever age, is entitled to the full amount of the exemption, including the 1-gallon allowance for alcoholic beverages, the committee concluded that it was time to reduce this privilege. Thus, it is recommending not only the reduction in the liquor allowance from 1 gallon to 1 quart but also to allow the liquor exemption only in the case of persons who at the time of arrival in the United States have reached the age of 21.

In connection with the previous reduced exemption privilege, special provision was made for U.S. residents returning from the Virgin Islands of the United States. Briefly, this was to double the amount of the exemption allowed to persons arriving from the Virgin Islands with the proviso that at least one-half of the articles included in the exemption must be acquired in the Virgin Islands. In this bill your committee is recommending doubling the exemption in the case of persons arriving from U.S. possessions—American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands—and also to retain the present 1-gallon liquor allowance for persons returning from these islands.

One quart of the 1-gallon allowance may be acquired elsewhere than in the islands but the remaining quantity must be acquired while in the insular possession by the returning resident and brought or shipped from these possessions. These special provisions are for the purpose of encouraging tourist travel to these islands. In the case of the Virgin Islands, tourist trade is the mainstay of its economy and measures are being taken to develop tourism in American Samoa and Guam. The retention of the 1-gallon allowance for residents returning from these islands would provide an inducement to visitors to nearby areas to also visit the islands and this would be of special benefit to the

Virgin Islands. However, the liquor allowance would in no case be extended to any individual who has not attained the age of 21 at the time of arrival in the United States. These special provisions would be permanent.

There is one further proposal that I should mention and that is to amend section 321 of the Tariff Act of 1930. This section deals with duty waivers which the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make in the case of small imports in order to avoid excessive administrative costs. Included in these provisions is one which permits the exemption from duty and tax of articles not exceeding $10 in value sent as bona fide gifts from persons in foreign countries to persons in the United States. The dollar amounts specified in section 321 would, under the proposal, be determined on the basis of fair retail value instead of foreign wholesale value, as in the case of the exemption for returning residents.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Throughout the report it refers to tourists.

Mr. MILLS. That is right. American tourists abroad returning to the United States with purchases from abroad.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman take into consideration the fact that this is an off year and when and if this Congress adjourns, if it ever adjourns, there is going to be, if all the records of the past do not fail as an indicator, a sizable exodus of Members of Congress on junkets abroad. Now, are they tourists for the purposes of this bill, or what are they? Will they be made to conform to the terms of this measure if it is enacted?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, of course, the gentleman from Iowa is not referring to himself or the gentleman from Arkansas as one who might go abroad.

Mr. GROSS. No. We have something in common on that score at least.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Iowa goes to Iowa, and I go to Arkansas.

But, at any rate, if there happened to be a Member of Congress who saw fit to go somewhere outside this country when Congress adjourns, he would be a returning tourist within the meaning of this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. So it applies to all. How about a State Department officer or official coming back?

Mr. MILLS. It applies to any American citizen. The same rule applies to any American citizen except that we do have a provision, as you know, permitting members of the Armed Forces who work for the Government abroad or who are stationed abroad to return with their own household goods and matters like that in excess of this $100. It is not something necessarily purchased abroad, but it may have been taken with them when they went abroad.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I want the House to know that the astronauts have landed close to the watching ships and are waiting to be picked up.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 8147 as originally reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and must reluctantly go along with the bill as amended because the current exemptions for returning tourists will expire on June 30, 1965, unless some action is taken by the Congress prior to that date.

Even though the bill does not go as far as I think it should, I do think that the bill does some things which are desirable and necessary.

First of all, we recognize the unlikelihood of being able to raise the current limitations in the near future and we, therefore, face up to the situation by making the proposed exemption in the bill permanent.

Secondly, we are again calling to the attention of the American people the problem of our balance-of-payments deficit and hoping that we will receive more restraint on their part in excessive purchases from overseas. We do have a minor reduction in the baggage exemption by basing the exemption on the fair retail value of the goods rather than the current practice of basing the exemption on the wholesale value of the goods.

The original bill, however, prior to the amendment, did provide for this exemption to be reduced to $50.

It may be asked, if cutting the baggage exemption is desirable, why does Congress not go the whole way and eliminate the baggage exemption entirely? We, on the Ways and Means Committee, considered this question when this bill was before us. The answer, however, once you think about it, is quite obvious. Total elimination of the baggage exemption would lead to a most unreasonable delay in clearing passengers at our airports, at our borders, and at the docks at which transoceanic vessels berth.

Virtually everyone coming in from abroad has made minor acquisitions, be they only a package of foreign cigarettes, some postcards, a couple of handkerchiefs, a cigarette lighter, or something of that kind. If there were no baggage exemption at all, each passenger would have to declare every single item, significant or insignificant, brought back with him, and the customs inspector would have to thumb through the tariff schedules of the United States to determine the rate of duty for each such item. When you consider that these schedules occupy more than 350 closely packed pages in the annotated version of the United States Code, you can begin to see what a job this would be. Then the very minor amounts of duty would have to be collected and accounted for. All in all, the clearance of each passenger would take an inordinate amount of time, the services of greatly increased numbers of customs inspectors would be required and the amount of duty collected would by no means be commensurate with the hardship to the passenger nor with the expense incurred by the United States for this purpose.

Another important aspect of the bill is that it limits the duty exemption, so far as liquor is concerned, to importations not in excess of one quart and allows this exemption only for liquor imported by an adult. This is a change from the existing law in which every returning resident is allowed a duty-free and tax-free gallon of liquor for himself and all of the members of his family who accompany him, regardless of their ages.

There are several reasons to support the changes which will be made by this aspect of the bill. One reason, and the most important, is that this change is a measure calculated to serve the basic purpose of the bill; to help our balance-of-payments position. Importations of liquor are among the most numerous brought in under the present duty exemption law. This is so because the duty and the internal revenue tax saving when the exemption is used is so large in terms of the value of the liquor.

A second reason, and it is a very important one, is that in recent years a scheme has developed which, in my opinion, perverts the purpose of the baggage exemption law. That law was designed to allow the person who goes abroad to enjoy a tariff break when, as a part of his trip to a foreign country, he acquires the various articles which are normally available for sale in the area, and which are of interest or utility or pleasant to have as souvenirs of his visit or as a gift for those to whom he will be returning.

In recent years, however, a scheme has developed through which firms which specialize in procuring liquor from Europe have been able to solicit mail orders from people who go to Canada and elsewhere and, through what I consider a loophole in the law, send them back duty-free and tax-free liquor from Europe. For example, an American who goes with his family to visit a relative in Montreal is now able to send a mail order to Switzerland and obtain a gallon of tax- and duty-free liquor, shipped from Europe, for himself and for every member of his family, including his infant children, who went with him to Canada. The irony of this situation is that although such a person can get 4, 5, or 6 or however many gallons of tax- and duty-free liquor shipped home to the United States from Europe because of his Canadian trip, he could not go into a store in Montreal and buy the same liquor on a tax- or duty-free basis there and carry it home into the United States. True he would escape American duty and taxes when he returned to this country. But he could only buy the liquor for delivery in Montreal subject to equally high or higher Canadian taxes.

I can see no more reason why the American who lives, say, in the Washington area, and goes to visit members of his family in Montreal should enjoy the privilege of getting duty-free liquor from Europe when we all would agree that he should enjoy no such privilege if he were to go and visit a different member of his family, say, in Cleveland, Ohio.

In short, the passenger baggage exemption was not intended to cover this kind of thing. The scope of this mail-order business has, I think, become larger than any of us had suspected. We were informed, in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee when this legislation was being considered there, that consolidated shipments of as much as 2,000 gallons are coming in at New York as a result of it; and, incidentally, the excise taxes and duty on 2,000 gallons would run in the neighborhood of $25,000, which, of course, would be in addition to the State taxes which are avoided by shipments of this sort.

This mail-order business is not mentioned in the bill but it is clear that by reducing the limit on duty-free liquor to a quart per adult the profit will be taken out of it and it will die on the vine.

I believe that the proposed legislation is necessary for substantive balance-of-payments reasons. I believe, moreover, that it serves the further purpose of calling the balance-of-payments problem to the attention of each American who travels abroad. From this point of view, it is psychologically beneficial. This bill will not work a hardship on any person who travels abroad because it is not extreme in its impact on any individual. And, finally, I believe that it will rectify a serious deficiency which now exists in the present baggage exemption law.

For all of these reasons, I favor the legislation and urge its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, while the bill as originally reported by the committee did have some element of controversy as far as concerned some of us, the committee amendment adopted this morning removes the objections. There is no objection in the committee, as I understand, to the bill in its present form or the bill as it will be amended by the committee amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman clarify his explanation a bit. Do I understand that in effect this committee amendment that will be accepted embodies the suggestions made by the minority in its minority views?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes, probably the two principal ones; one was that we should continue the present $100 limitation rather than lowering it to $50. The other suggestion we made in the minority report was that we felt this should be permanent rather than having the Congress constantly facing a periodic renewal and the possibility of returning to the $500 duty-free limitation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What is the best guess as to how much this will affect the deficit in balance of payments?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Let me say this to the gentleman. Although the Treasury Department does have some calculations as to what they think might transpire under their recommendations, I think there is a very serious question we have with respect to this legislation; namely, whether it will have any effect on the balance of payments. What the committee is doing here is to adopt a proper basis for an exemption for returning tourists. We are amending the law to provide a more reasonable method of determining the value of duty-free merchandise that a tourist can bring in. I do not support the bill with the idea that it is going to have any significant effect on our balance-of-payments problem, because there is nothing in this bill that limits how much money an individual can spend abroad.

I think there is a lack of evidence before the committee that this bill will have anything more than a psychological effect, and as far as I am concerned, I do not think we are going to be fooling anybody as to how much effect this will have on the balance of payments. I do think that the changes made by the bill as it comes to us, with the amendment to be offered, is a reasonable improvement of the basic law.

Mr. GROSS. So far as it will curtail the bringing into this country of products made by low-cost labor in foreign countries, I am for this bill. But what this Congress ought to do is to get busy and amend the Trade Agreements Act to increase the tariffs to restrict the importation of foreign products coming into this country where such products are already in adequate or surplus supply. This bill is in a sense really nit-picking in the area of stopping imports.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's views.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8147) as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the title of the bill (H.R. 8147) be amended to read as follows:

> A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the exemption from duty for returning residents, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], the most worthy and able chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the able ranking minority member, my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], for their interest in H.R. 8147, exemption from duty for returning residents, and their understanding attitude to the problems of my district concerning this legislation. Mr. Speaker, this is a compromise of the various positions taken on this bill and in behalf of the people of the 15th District of Texas, I give my approval to it. We have a special or peculiar situation on the Border Country of Texas, and as I said in my testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, our people are one. We live and play together. The Rio Grande River is but a technical division of our countries of the United States and Mexico. It is not a division of our people. There are many ways in which this is proven daily, Mr. Speaker, therefore I feel I must submit to the membership that although the compromise will affect our border trade some, it is far more acceptable than the original bill, and I would like to further add, Mr. Speaker, my gratitude to all the members of the Ways and Means Committee who cooperated with me on this endeavor.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, while every American is becoming increasingly concerned about the outflow of U.S. gold, this bill which would reduce the duty-free allowance of goods purchased outside the United States by returning American tourists in the case of the Bahamas has us cutting off our noses to spite our faces.

I had hoped that the committee would include in the list of tourist areas exempted by this bill the Bahama islands. These islands, some of which lie only 60 miles from the Florida coast, are British dependencies but closely related to the United States.

Many tourists visiting Florida pay a call to the Bahamas as well. Tourists are the major industry of the Bahamas, and last year U.S. tourists there spent $53 million there. However, Bahamas tourism industries such as hotels and restaurants spent $93 million in the United States.

To cut off this favorable balance between the United States and the Bahamas by reducing the duty-free allowance will have little effect on our overall gold outflow problem. In fact, overseas travel is but a small portion of the total outflow of our gold caused by the dollar drain.

I object to this legislation, and urge that the Congress include the Bahamas as an exempted area under the provisions of this bill.

If we want to halt the steady drain on U.S. gold let us go to the source—the constant and unreasonable demands of such as Charles de Gaulle, whose steady insistence on U.S. gold for dollars has been the primary cause for half of the $975 million in gold lost during the first 4 months of this year. All this is allowed to exist, and more gold is given to De Gaulle despite the fact that France still owes the American people some $6.5 billion in World War I debts and has not made a payment on that debt since 1931.

It is about time we sent De Gaulle the bill, instead of directing our efforts at a few American tourists.

FIVE-DAY WEEK FOR POSTMASTERS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1771) to establish a 5-day week for postmasters, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1771

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 3541(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out "postmasters" in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "postmasters in fourth-class post offices"; and

(2) adding immediately following paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) To compute the daily rate of basic compensation for postmasters (other than postmasters in fourth-class post offices), the annual rate of compensation shall be divided by 260."

(b) Chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after section 3576 thereof the following new section:

"§ 3577. Workweek of postmasters in post offices of the first, second, and third classes

"(a) The Postmaster General shall schedule postmasters in post offices of the first, second, and third classes to work a five-day week.

"(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall not be held or considered to permit the closing of any post office on any weekday, Monday through Saturday, inclusive.".

(c) The table of contents of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting

"3577. Workweek of postmasters in post offices of the first, second, and third classes."

immediately below

"3576. Holiday service of rural carriers and employees assigned to road duty.".

Sec. 2. Section 3544(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "fiscal year" and inserting in lieu thereof "calendar year".

Sec. 3 (a) The first section of this Act shall become effective at the beginning of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1966.

(b) Section 2 of this Act shall become effective at the beginning of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) If the basic salary of a postmaster in a fourth-class post office was adjusted at the beginning of the first pay period which began after Januuary 1, 1965, in accordance with the third sentence of section 3544(b) of title 39, United States Code, prior to the amendment by section 2 of this Act, and if he held such position, on the effective date of section 2 of this Act, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted as of such effective date, to that rate of basic compensation to which he would have been entitled if the amendment made by section 2 had been in effect on the date of such adjustment. Any increase in compensation under this subsection shall not be deemed to be an equivalent increase in basic compensation within the meaning of section 3552 of title 39, United States Code.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to establish a five-day workweek for postmasters, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1771, relating to a 5-day workweek for postmasters of post offices of the first, second, and third classes, was reported unanimously by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. We have not heard any objection to the favorable consideration of this legislation.

As early as October 1963, Postmaster General John A. Gronouski in a letter to the Honorable Tom Murray, chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, stated that he concurs and endorses the proposal to establish a 5-day, 40-hour workweek for postmasters who are scheduled to work at least 40 hours a week. He stated at that time that he planned to institute this program by administrative action starting in July 1964.

The program has not been implemented for the reason that the necessary orders could not be issued unless sufficient funds were available to pay the additional cost. The funds have never been made available.

The first section of H.R. 1771, as proposed to be amended by the committee, will overcome this difficulty by establishing a congressional policy requiring the 5-day workweek for postmasters in post offices of the first, second, and third classes. The program will go into effect in January 1966 in order to lessen the impact on the budgetary situation of the Department. We do not recommend that the policy be extended to postmasters of the fourth-class for the reason that the postmasters in fourth-class post offices are scheduled to work less than 40 hours in any particular week.

It should be made very clear that nothing that is proposed by this legislation will have any effect on the current policy of having all post offices open 6 days a week.

Section 2 of H.R. 1771, as amended, is a perfecting amendment to overcome an inequity against certain postmasters of the fourth class when the revenue unit receipts of their offices require that they be readjusted in January of any calendar year from one revenue unit category to a lower category. Existing law requires the basic salary of the postmaster to be fixed at the lowest step which is higher than the basic salary received by him at the end of the preceding "fiscal year."

The use of the rate of the basic salary at the end of the preceding fiscal year has the unintended effect of eliminating from consideration in making the adjustment any salary benefits such as a pay increase the postmaster may have received between the end of the preceding "fiscal year" and the time when the adjustment is made the next following January.

This legislation will correct this inequity by using as a standard the basic salary of the postmaster in effect at the end of the preceding "calendar year."

Mr. Speaker, the 6-day, 48-hour workweek has gone out of style many years ago. Almost 30 years ago, during the 74th Congress, legislation was enacted establishing a 5-day, 40-hour workweek for all postal employees except postmasters.

We now find ourselves in these modern times in the ridiculous position of having a law that permits but does not require approximately 18,000 postmasters in second- and third-class post offices to be scheduled on a 6-day, 48-hour workweek. At the same time, approximately 4,300 postmasters in post offices of the first class and approximately 1,400 postmasters in post offices of the second class, who have either an Assistant Postmaster or other supervisory personnel available as replacements, to work a 5-day, 40-hour workweek.

We do not advocate the payment of overtime compensation for postmasters who are presidential appointees. We do believe, however, that it is time to change the law and require a 5-day workweek for all postmasters who are scheduled to work more than 40 hours a week. This legislation will accomplish this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members here today to outlaw this archaic policy of permitting some of our presidential appointed postmasters to have a 5-day week while, at the same time, requiring others to work a 6-day week. I urge your favorable consideration of H.R. 1771.

Mr. Speaker, under this legislation the postmasters involved will be scheduled to work a 5-day week.

The regulations controlling the daily schedule are contained in the committee report on page 2. These regulations require not less than 8 hours of duty a day.

We want the Record to show very clearly that we expect the postmasters to follow the requirements of the regulations and to be on duty 5 days a week and 8 hours a day.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee, I concur in the remarks made by the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York. The legislation is a step in the right direction. It standardizes the workweek in the postal system the same as exists in private industry and in other departments of the Government.

I would like to ask the gentleman from New York a question or two. I note that this will cost additional money for the operation of the Post Office Department.

Mr. DULSKI. That is true. It is $18 million-plus.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman have assurance from the Postmaster General that when he testifies before the proper committee of the House he will ask for this increase to take care of this additional cost and it will not have to be absorbed and the services cut further?

Mr. DULSKI. The gentleman knows that we have discussed this matter in committee and we feel he should at the proper time make the request for this amount of money.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I concur with the gentleman he should make a request for this additional money so that he will not have to sacrifice the postal service or cause further reductions in the service as a result of this increased cost.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I would like to ask a couple of questions. I am not exactly here with a bleeding heart for postmasters of the United States, each of whom undoubtedly sought his office with considerable zeal and used every effort and influence he could to obtain it, well knowing what the requirements as to time were. Do I understand that this bill will not only have the effect of limiting the hours to 40 hours a week but also in such cases as postmasters who may not work that many hours a week, requiring them to get up to that number of hours?

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] made a very good statement with respect to the gentleman's question and I join up with the gentleman from New York, as well as with other members of the committee which is responsible for this bill, in saying that in exchange for the 40-hour week we expect the postmasters to work 40 hours.

Mr. HOSMER. Among the arduous duties of a postmaster of the United States there is included banquets and ceremonies at banquets, civic occasions, and so forth, many of which are not scheduled during the ordinary hours of work, 8 to 5, or whatever they may be. As a consequence, I would like to ask the gentleman if the attendance of the postmasters at such ceremonial occasions, at least outside of the 8-to-5 working hours, is going to incur the overtime pay expense that must be footed by the taxpayers?

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DULSKI. On page 2 of the report, it says:

> Post Office Department regulations require all postmasters in first-, second-, and third-class post offices to devote not less than 8 hours during the business part of the day to the conduct of their offices.
>
> At first-, second-, and third-class offices, postmasters shall devote not less than 8 hours during the business part of the day to the conduct of their offices and the performance of duties appropriate to their positions.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. I take that to mean then that any of these extraneous things that have come to be part of the postmaster's duties which occur outside of these business hours will, in fact, be compensated for by the taxpayers of the United States; is that right? Is my understanding correct?

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOSMER. Will the postmaster then be paid on an hourly basis or on what kind of a basis would he be paid for these hours he spends at this kind of occasion or event?

Mr. GROSS. That would probably depend on the classification of the post office.

Mr. HOSMER. Well, it would run at least $10 to $15 an hour?

Mr. GROSS. I would have no way of knowing.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DULSKI. There is no additional compensation. Postmasters are paid on a yearly basis.

Mr. HOSMER. If the gentleman will yield further, how are you going to take care of the overtime? You say it is going to cost $18 million?

Mr. DULSKI. The law prohibits any payment of overtime. And according to the computation that we have here, the cost of changing would be as the result of vices. At the present time we have vices of about 312 and it will be changed to 260. That is for the clerk who will take the place of the postmaster during the 8 hours.

Mr. HOSMER. Is the postmaster then still going to have to go to these ceremonial occasions on his own time, if they occur outside of business hours or will this law have the effect of requiring him to send a representative who is, in fact, on duty at that time to represent him?

Mr. DULSKI. It all depends on the functon. If it is a post office function that it is a part of his duty to attend that is one matter. But if it is a celebration or a banquet or if he went to some other affair, then he would be doing that as a personal matter.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. I understand the statement to be made that this is practically the only remaining area of Government where the 40-hour week is not applicable. I would call attention to the fact that undoubtedly this is not the case with the White House. Will legislation be considered to impose a 40-hour week at that locality?

Mr. GROSS. I would think if the recommendation comes from the White House insisting on a 40-hour week—and witnessing some of the things that have gone on in this session of the Congress, it would not surprise me at all if a 40-hour week was adopted at the White House if the demand came from the gentleman who administers things at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, and especially if the rose garden is in full bloom.

Mr. HOSMER. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. I think it is a matter of fact, looking at some of the legislation that has passed through the Congress, it might be a good idea to have a 40-hour week here too.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I, too, was a member of the subcommittee that considered this legislation. We all listened very attentively to the witnesses who came before us. While we might have had some misgivings about the proposition before the hearings, when the hearings were completed, we were all unanimous as to the necessity for the 40-hour week for postmasters. We have in many instances by reason of postmasters working a 6-day week found that the hourly rate of the postmaster was less than the clerks that he was supervising. I, therefore, endorse this bill and ask that you vote in favor of it.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the trend of the times, because of automation on the one hand and an ever increasing number of job seekers on the other hand, is toward a shorter workweek. The 40-hour, 5-day workweek has long become the accepted norm and demands to shorten the workweek increasingly are being accepted by enlightened management. I believe it is long past the time for the U.S. Government to catch up with the norm and provide a 5-day maximum workweek for all career, full-time employees. A major group left behind in this trend have been our thousands of postmasters in the small post offices throughout the country. These postmasters of whom I speak are not those in the larger offices where there is usually an adequate number of clerks and supervisors to permit the postmaster to have a fairly normal workweek. The postmasters who would be benefited by the bill are in the small offices where they may be the only employee, perhaps with some clerical assistance. Today, most of these postmasters work 6 full days a week and many often work Sundays as well to provide their patrons with prompt and efficient service. About 20,000 postmasters would benefit from this bill; 6,850 in second-class offices and 12,965 in third-class offices. The bill would preclude any benefit to the 8,976 postmasters of fourth class offices since in these small offices there is less than 40 hours of required postal business to be performed each week. Thus, while a postmaster in a fourth-class office may work 6 days a week each day's work may be a few hours to a maximum of 6 hours and 40 minutes.

The Post Office Department reports that this bill will cost about $18½ million a year. The cost will be due to the need to employ clerks to take the place of the postmaster on what is now his sixth day of work. While there is a high cost involved, I sincerely believe it is a cost that postmasters themselves have had to indirectly carry for too long. In effect, their own rate of pay, in terms of the number of hours a week they worked often was less than the hourly rate of pay received by their own clerks.

I fully concur in this bill and urge every Member to vote with me for passage.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 1771, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish a 5-day workweek for postmasters, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPOUSES' ANNUITIES UNDER RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3157) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3157

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (e) of section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 (45 U.S.C. 228b(e)) is amended by changing the colon before the last proviso to a period and by striking out all that follows down through the period at the end of such subsection.

Sec. 2. This Act shall take effect with respect to annuities accruing in months after the month in which this Act was enacted, and shall apply also to annuities paid in lump sum equal to their commuted value because of a reduction in such annuities under section 2(e) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as in effect before the amendments made by this Act, as if such annuities had not been paid in such lump sums: *Provided, however,* That the amounts of such annuities which were paid in lump sums equal to their commuted value shall not be included in this amount of annuities which become payable by reason of section 1 of this Act.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to permit the spouse of a railroad employee to receive a spouse's annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act concurrently with the receipt of social security benefits or railroad retirement benefits earned in her own right without reduction in the spouse's annuity. Under existing law, social security benefits received by the spouse in her own right are deducted from her railroad retirement spouse's benefits. The bill will benefit approximately 41,000 women; 40,000 of them are social security beneficiaries, and 1,000 of them are railroad retirement beneficiaries.

Under existing law, any person who is entitled to railroad retirement benefits whether as an annuitant or as a survivor of a railroad employee, who is also entitled to social security benefits based upon his own wage record, may, with one exception, draw full benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, and full benefits under the Social Security Act, without reduction. This one exception involves women who are entitled to an annuity as the spouse of a retired railroad employee. Under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, deductions are made from the annuity paid to the spouse of any railroad employee until the deductions equal the total of social security or railroad retirement benefits to which she is entitled in her own right.

This bill would repeal these provisions under which deductions are made from the annuity of the spouse of benefits which she has earned under social security or under the Railroad Retirement Act.

The provision which this bill would repeal involves the only case under the Railroad Retirement Act in which the entire amount of social security benefits which a person has earned based on her own wage record are deducted from her railroad retirement benefits. There are a number of instances under existing law in which an individual can draw full benefits under both the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act. For example, a retired railroad worker may draw both benefits simultaneously. A survivor of a railroad employee can draw both survivor benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act and social security benefits which he has earned in his own right; however, survivor benefits are paid under only one of these acts—usually under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act which in general guarantee that at least 110 percent of the total amount of social security benefits otherwise payable will be paid to the survivors of the railroad employee.

This bill would eliminate one of the most glaring inequities in the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937. Except for the cases discussed previously involving the application of the guaranteed minimum provisions, the requirement that the spouse's annuity be reduced by the amount of social security benefits earned by the spouse in her own right is the only situation of this type arising under the Railroad Retirement Act. This bill would repeal the provision providing for this offset, eliminating this inequity.

Legislation dealing with this subject has been before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for many years. The first bill introduced on this subject was H.R. 738, 84th Congress, introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams]. Since that time bills having a similar purpose and effect have been pending before the committee each Congress. During this Congress bills have been introduced by Mr. Poff, Mr. Beckworth, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina, and Mr. Mathias. Over the years, these bills have consistently been opposed by the Railroad Retirement Board, primarily because of their cost, currently estimated at approximately $14 million a year. It is our feeling that the equities involved in this legislation are sufficiently compelling to justify these small added costs, and we recommend that the House approve the bill.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has adequately explained this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the railroad retirement fund has been the subject of great concern for some time. It has been unable to maintain itself on an actuarial basis. The last Congress managed to get agreement from both management and labor to some basic changes which would eventually bail it out. Many suggestions have been made over the years for liberalization of payments to retirees and the conditions under which they could qualify. All of these have been bypassed because of their disastrous effect on the fund itself.

Today we have before us a proposal to liberalize the provisions under which the spouse's annuity may be paid to the wife of a retiree. It is a very small, almost insignificant change from the standpoint of the money involved—small enough so that it can safely be considered without further jeopardizing the fund itself. On the other hand, it corrects what has been recognized by the committee, and last year by the Congress itself, as a gross inequity.

As it now stands, the wife of a retiree must forgo her right to the spouse's annuity if she has acquired in her own right social security payments in an amount as great as the annuity. On the face of it, it seems unfair and it seems more so when we discover that this is the only incidence in the Federal law which results in this situation.

It is well understood that sweeping liberalization of the railroad retirement fund is not possible, even though there is much that might be said in favor of it. We should, however, correct this glaringly unfair provision and thereby make it possible for the spouse to retain those payments which she has earned by her own endeavors without penalizing her merely because her husband happens to have been covered under the Railroad Retirement Act, rather than some other pension or retirement system.

I recommend that the House again accept these provisions and pass H.R. 3157.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia, who has been a longtime proponent of this legislation over a period of years and one of its strongest advocates.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in support of H.R. 3157, similar to H.R. 651 which I introduced on the first day of the 89th Congress, I will be brief. This is because the bill itself is brief, the subject matter is brief, and the justification is brief. In fact, the justification can be stated in one word—fairness.

At one time, the Railroad Retirement Act carried a dual benefits restriction against all classes of beneficiaries. None were permitted to draw the full amount of railroad retirement benefits if they were also entitled to social security benefits. Under the equitable doctrine that what one pays for one should receive, these restrictions, one by one, were stricken from the act. Today, all have been repealed but one, the one which applies to beneficiaries who are wives or husbands of retired railroad workers. This legislation would repeal this last restriction.

The restriction against railroad spouses is the rankest sort of discrimination, defying the most artful rationalization. Why should a man or women who happens to be the husband or wife of a railroad worker be treated differently than a spouse of another worker? The same social security taxes have been paid in the two cases. If one is to receive less benefits than the other, then why should his taxes not be less? H.R. 3157 eliminates this discrimination by guaranteeing that when payments are made into two separate retirement systems, benefits will be forthcoming from both systems.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3157 is similar to H.R. 12362 which passed the House last year but which died in the Senate when the Congress adjourned. According to the actuaries, the deficit involved is only thirty-two hundredths of 1 percent of taxable payroll. While this legislation provides no tax increases to provide additional revenue to the fund, I agree with the statement in the unanimous bipartisan committee report last year that "the equities involved in this legislation are sufficiently compelling to justify the small added costs to the railroad retirement system."

Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill early this year will give the other body ample tibe to act upon it before the 89th Congress adjourns. I congratulate the chairman and members of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, who is also a champion of this legislation and has introduced bills on this under his own name.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. This bill will amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to remove a serious defect in the act. This amendment will permit the husband or wife of a railroad employee to receive a spouse's annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act at the same time he or she is receiving social security benefits earned in his or her own right. These benefits would be received without any reduction in the annuity as is the case under present law.

I have had several letters from wives of railroad employees telling me that they have worked hard and paid their social security tax with the belief they were investing in security for their old age. Then on retirement, they find, that just because their husband is drawing a pension under railroad retirement, that they cannot receive full social security benefits. Many of them, who recall the sacrifices made to pay social security taxes while they worked, are inclined to highly question this legal technicality in the law.

This inequity in the law has been brought before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee several times in the past 10 years. I am proud to serve as a member of this committee and wish to commend the committee for its prompt consideration of this legislation in this 89th Congress. My bill, H.R. 6296, is similar to H.R. 3157 introduced by the chairman of the full committee, Mr. Harris. When this legislation was considered by the committee, I made the motion that the chairman's bill, H.R. 3157, be reported to the House, and was gratified that this motion carried by a unanimous vote.

I urge the adoption of this bill, hope that it will pass by an overwhelming vote and have early consideration in the other body.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Roberts].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to speak for a bill that is before the House that will benefit women. The purpose of the bill is to permit the spouse of a railroad employee to receive a spouse's annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act along with any social security benefits she might have accrued.

I feel, where the women have rightfully earned social security benefits, they should not be penalized by a law that prohibits them to enjoy these benefits simply because they happened to marry a railroader.

As the wife of a railroader and as an employee under social security, the women should have the right to benefit from retirement benefits like anyone else. There should be no discrimination made against them, simply because their husband's job comes under the Railroad Retirement Act.

It has been brought out that the amount involved, some $14 million, would not have an adverse effect on the retirement fund itself. Therefore, I wholeheartedly support this legislation which will not penalize an American woman just because she happened to be married to a railroader who is covered under the Railroad Retirement Act rather than some other pension or retirement system.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thought perhaps it would be wise to elaborate briefly on the cost features of the bill as was explained by our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. O'Brien]. Throughout the years of my service in the Congress and on the committee, I have been a strong advocate of keeping the railroad retirement fund on a sound basis. This is imperative. It is absolutely necessary. We had to take into consideration this fundamental policy in the consideration of correcting the inequity which is involved in this legislation. As Mr. O'Brien mentioned a moment ago, this legislation would cost the fund approximately $14 million. Currently the fund is running a deficit of $19½ million a year or .44 percent of taxable payroll. This would make the total deficiency about $33 million a year or .76 percent of taxable payroll.

I realize that this is getting close to the point of being beyond the limits of actuarial tolerance for a sound railroad retirement program. During the years there has been some difference of opinion among the actuaries as to what tolerance should be accepted to maintain a sound fund. The more recent estimate is that if the fund is considered to be deficient by one-half of 1 percent of the taxable payroll or less, then it would be all right. If it goes beyond that, then it gets into a questionable area. There are those in the past—and I think actuaries of note and reputation—who contended that so long as we are within 1 percent of taxable payroll, that that percentage is a tolerance that could be permitted and there would not be any danger.

Frankly, I do not know; I am not an actuary. But I have gone on the basis during these years that a tolerance of between one-half and 1 percent could be accepted to maintain a sound fund in the railroad retirement system. I call this to the attention of the House so the House may know that there is an encroachment here on the fund and to the degree of tolerance, so that the House may know what the actual situation is. I think it means that we must be exceedingly careful in the future about encroaching further on the fund. There is one thing we must be certain of, and that is that when a person retires who is in the railroad industry and receives his check, the money must be there to pay it. We want to be sure that that is done.

At the same time we do feel that here is a glaring and gross inequity, as has been explained previously, that should be corrected. For that reason I have sought to do so as have other colleagues on the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman has made the statement that he did make. I think the beneficiaries of this legislation should be put on notice and made aware of the fact that this cannot go on indefinitely, and that if their take is going to be increased they are going to deplete the funds.

Mr. HARRIS. I think all of us should be aware of the situation and be sure that we meet it without making the tax so exorbitant, the tax on employees and the railroad industry, as to make the whole program questionable.

Mr. GROSS. I think they especially ought to be made aware of this situation, if they are not already aware of it.

Mr. HARRIS. That is one reason I took this time to discuss the matter with the House so that the House would be fully aware of the present situation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee that considered this legislation, I am very much in favor of it. This bill is long overdue as it corrects a long overdue reform of the Railroad Retirement Act. This same legislation was approved by our committee and by the House last year; but the Senate did not act upon it. I sincerely believe this bill is much needed and trust the other body will act favorably upon it as soon as possible.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House passage of the sound legislation proposed by the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. H.R. 3157 is sound because it corrects an inequity which in past years tended to discriminate against the surviving spouses of retired railroad employees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 3157, as amended?

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that in his opinion two-thirds of the Members had voted in the affirmative.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Obviously, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 323, nays 0, not voting 110, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—323

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Carter
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matthews
Meeds
Mills
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Moorhead
Morris
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Race
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—110

Abbitt
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Arends
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Bell
Bingham
Bonner
Bow
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Conable
Conyers
Cooley
Cramer
Derwinski
Donohue
Edwards, Calif.
Farnsley
Findley
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Giaimo
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Halleck
Halpern
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Helstoski
Holifield
Holland
Jacobs
Jennings
Joelson
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Keogh
Landrum
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McEwen
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackay
Mackie
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Matsunaga
May
Michel
Miller
Wright
Monagan
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
Nix
Passman
Pelly
Philbin
Pirnie
Powell
Purcell
Quillen
Randall
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Roosevelt
Roush
St Germain
St. Onge
Shipley
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Toll
Weltner
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Minish
Zablocki

So the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Miller with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Jennings with Mrs. May.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Morse.

Mr. Cameron with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Minish with Mr. Brock.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Pelly.

Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Randall with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Calloway.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Conable.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Bingham with Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. St Germain.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Long of Maryland.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Passman.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Monagan with Mr. Carey.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Joelson.

Mr. Slack with Mr. Roush.

Mr. Weltner with Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Smith of Virginia.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Farnsley.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Matsunaga.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Mackay.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEMINI ASTRONAUTS LAND SAFELY

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to announce that our two U.S. astronauts are now safely aboard the carrier *Wasp*. The helicopters have landed, the sailors have cheered, and the bands have played. Now they are on the island of the *Wasp* being debriefed. So this is a mission well done and well accomplished. I am sure the Congress and the Members of the House as well as the American people congratulate these two courageous men and their families and wish them well. They have certainly done well by the United States of America. They have performed a difficult task in a dedicated and devoted manner which reflects credit on every young person in America and on America as a whole.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his congratulations to Astronauts McDivitt and White and their families.

Furthermore, I think Members of the House would be interested in knowing that the grandfather of Astronaut White served for a time in the House of Representatives. During the 50th Congress, 1887–89, he represented the Indiana district which I now represent. The grandfather, James Bain White, was born in Scotland, but came as a lad to America and settled in Fort Wayne, Ind. After brilliant service in the Civil War, he returned to Fort Wayne where he engaged in a successful mercantile business in addition to his political activities.

Astronaut White's father, Edward White, also a native of Fort Wayne, likewise has an illustrious career, being recently retired from the Air Force with the rank of major general.

Fort Wayne and the Fourth Indiana Congressional District take great pride in the achievements of all these distinguished Americans.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Congratulations to the present Member, then, too.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as does every Member of the House and every American, in paying tribute to two great Americans who have performed such an outstanding feat and who have registered another great advance in America's conquest of space. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics ever since it was organized. In that committee all of us have worked toward goals which these two distinguished Americans have done so much to help us to reach. Their feat puts America in the forefront of the space race, and we all rejoice in their marvelous accomplishment and their safe return.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the distinguished majority leader. That was a very good statement. I am glad to say that our Science and Astronautics Committee has been completely bipartisan in operation and has always been one of the hardest working committees of the House.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in saluting these two courageous Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the safe and successful splashdown today of Astronauts Edward White and James McDivitt is the culmination of one more giant stride along our pathway to the moon. The 62-orbit flight aboard the Gemini spacecraft, and Astronaut White's 20-minute walk in space on Friday, serve to vindicate the more thorough and comprehensive pace of our program. While the Russians, in one sense, are getting there first—beating us to the punch on occasion—the Gemini 4 mission proves beyond a doubt that we are getting there with the most.

I salute these two courageous Americans. Their efforts and those of their fellow astronauts are matched only in the wild daydreams of science-fiction characters. In keeping with the traditions of the great explorers and adventurers of the past, they have pushed the barriers of knowledge and experience back even further.

Our late and lamented President Kennedy committed this Nation to land a man on the moon by 1970. The 4-day flight just ended is a major step in that direction and it proves that when this Nation is united in a determined and worthwhile effort nothing will stand in our way.

Our civilian space agency has done a magnificent job and certainly deserves to share the spotlight with Astronauts White and McDivitt. Gemini-Titan 4 has been a smashing success, and we will pray that Gemini-Titan 5, in August, will be just as successful.

USE OF ADDITIVES IN CONFECTIONERY

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7042) to amend section 402(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7042

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 402(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) If it is confectionery, and it bears or contains—

"any alcohol other than not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum by volume derived solely from the use of flavoring extracts."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is identical to a bill, H.R. 4731, which passed the House during the last Congress on August 12, 1964.

Five bills dealing with this subject have been introduced in the House in this Congress—H.R. 6328 by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]; H.R. 7402 by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD]; H.R. 7820 by the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER]; H.R. 7925 by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI]; and H.R. 8323 by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 7042, amends section 402(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit manufacturers of candy to use food additives which are cleared for safety—I repeat—which are cleared for safety, by the Food and Drug Administration, in the manufacture of candy, whether or not these additives are nutritive.

The bill was considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and was unanimously reported by the committee and is before the House by the direction of the committee today.

Under existing law, a candy manufacturer may not use, in the manufacture of candy, any substance which is not nutritive except authorized coloring, harmless flavoring, natural gum, pectin, or certain harmless resinous glazes.

This means then that if a candy manufacturer needs to use an additive to impart some particular quality to one of his products—for example, an additive which would preserve shelf life, or otherwise aid in the manufacture of the candy—he may find that although the particular additive which he wishes to use is completely harmless and safe, and has already been cleared by the Food and Drug Administration for use by all other segments of the food manufacturing industry, he must determine whether this particular additive is nutritive. If the additive is nutritive, he can use it; if the additive is not nutritive, he is prohibited from using it even though that same additive may be used by all other segments of the food industry from canning and freezing manufacturers to baby food manufacturers.

In other words, a substance which can be used in the manufacture of cookies, soft drinks, ice cream, or pastry frequently cannot be used in the manufacture of candy.

This odd result arises primarily out of the history of the provisions of the Food and Drug Act which relate to the manufacture of candy. Prior to 1906, when the Pure Food and Drug Act was first passed, many harmful substances were used in the manufacture of candy. The 1906 act contained specific prohibitions against the use of certain substances in the manufacture of candy, and spelled out the substances which were not permitted to be used. In 1938, the 1906 act was expanded so that instead of the law specifying which substances could not be used, the law prohibited use of any nonnutritive substance, with certain specified exceptions.

The 1906 law specified substances that could not be used; the 1938 law listed the substances that could be used. This provision—section 402(d)—has not been changed since 1938, notwithstanding other developments that have occurred since, primarily the adoption of the food additive amendment in 1938.

In 1958, the Congress amended the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to add a new section 409 giving the Food and Drug Administration authority to regulate the use of additives in the manufacture of food. Under this amendment, no substance may be used which will become a component of, or otherwise affect the characteristics of food, unless that substance has been cleared in advance by the Food and Drug Administration, and a regulation approving the uses of that substance has been printed in the Federal Register. No change was made at that time in section 402(d), covering use of additives in the manufacture of confectionery, although it may well have been appropriate for the Congress to consider such a change.

At present, therefore, the presence of section 402(d) in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, along with section 409 creates an unusual situation under which an additive can be be used in the manufacture of all types of food if it is nonnutritive, but that same additive cannot be used in the manufacture of candy.

This restriction, applicable only to the candy industry, imposes on that industry rigid requirements not present in any other segment of the food industry, and in the opinion of the committee, serves no useful purpose in the protection of the public health. Section 409 relating to food additives already provides ample protection, and the continuation of the extra restrictions imposed by section 402(d) is no longer necessary and should be repealed.

This bill, therefore, amends the Food and Drug Act so as to eliminate the present restrictions applicable only to the manufacture of confectionery, and puts confectionery manufacturers on the same basis as all other food manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, this bill merely places candy manufacturers on the same basis as all other food manufacturers in the United States with respect to the use of additives in the manufacture of their product.

The author of the bill is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD]. We commend the bill to the House for its consideration and approval.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of the bill now before us, I rise to speak on its behalf. This bill was introduced to remedy a situation whereby the candy manufacturers of this country, many of whom are located in the congressional district that I am privileged to represent, have been unfairly discriminated against by reason of the current provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which apply to their industry. An identical bill, H.R. 4731, was introduced by me in the last Congress and was passed by this body at the end of last summer. Unfortunately the other body had not sufficient time to consider it before final adjournment.

Section 402(d) of the act, the present section to which my bill is addressed, provides for a blanket prohibition of the use of all nonnutritive ingredients in the manufacture of candy. As our distinguished chairman has so ably stated, this prohibition was once needed as one of several legislative safeguards for the consumer against the possible use of harmful ingredients or cheap fillers in the manufacture of candy. Today, however, such provision clearly is not needed. It does not recognize that under modern methods a better candy product is possible if certain additives, which may coincidentally be nonnutritive, but which have been declared perfectly safe by the Food and Drug Administration, are used in the manufacturing process. These ingredients facilitate the mechanical processes involved, they improve the flavor of the product, and they also enable it to stay fresher for a longer period of time. The law should be updated to take account of these technological advances.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that my bill does not pave the way for the use of harmful ingredients or cheap fillers such as talc in the confectionery which we all eat. Sections 402 and 409 of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act still give very real and satisfactory protection to the consumers of candy. Section 409 of the act, for example, states:

> Any substance whose use results in its becoming a component or otherwise affecting the characteristics of any food (including confectionery) may not be used unless there is in effect, and its use or intended use are in conformity with a regulation issued by the Food and Drug Administration under certain specified terms

In plain English, the Food and Drug Administration has to pass on the safeness of each and every potentially harmful additive before it can be used by the candy manufacturer. The bill I am proposing in no way alters these strict safeguards.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I should like to emphasize to my respected colleagues that the bill before them serves to remedy a situation in which, for reasons which no longer apply, the candy industry has been singled out in a discriminatory fashion. By passing this amendment, you will be placing the confectionery industry on the same basis as now applies to the other segments of the food industry. The existing law in this area presents an anomalous situation, since the additives in question may be, and are, used by the canning, the frozen food, the baking, the bottling and the preserving segments of the food industry—even, for instance, the bread and the baby food industries—but these same substances may not presently be used in the manufacture of candy.

In urging favorable action on this bill, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that this discriminatory and anamalous treatment of the confectionery industry is neither warranted nor desirable. What began as a safeguard has become with time a hindrance—a discriminatory hindrance—to an important American industry. I urge my colleagues to take the simple corrective action necessary by passing H.R. 7042.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the primary purpose of this bill is to rescue a major industry of this country from an untenable position. In 1938 the candy manufacturers of this country were made subject to very restrictive legislation which boiled down to a denial of their right to use in the preservation of candy practically anything that was nonnutritive. At that time these restrictions were warranted and justified; but as time went on and science moved in we discovered in this country many methods of freshening and preserving various food products, and we now have a situation where we are trying to rescue the candy industry from what might be described as a statutory limbo. This bill is designed to place candy manufacturers in exactly the same position as other manufacturers of foods commonly used by children. The bill will permit them to use in the preservation of candy exactly the same materials which the Food and Drug Act permit the ice cream, cooky, and many other food manufacturers to use.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the Food and Drug Administration a year ago recommended against the enactment of this bill in its present form; but nevertheless this bill in identical language was reported unanimously by our committee and last year approved unanimously by the House.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I have a sort of a family interest in this legislation. I have eight young grandchildren and I would match their consumption of candy against that of any other group of eight children in the country. And I am very sure that I would not be supporting the bill here today and urging others to support a bill which would bring about the slightest bit of hazard or danger to the young people of our country.

In other words, we are providing in this bill that the candy industry be bound by the same rules and the same law as are other producers of foods. I do not believe that represents an unfair request. It is my further opinion that it will save the industry from enormous losses which come about as a result of stale candy resulting from this present inability to use ingredients which we in our judgment permit to be used in baby food consumed by little children—infants who are denied for health reasons even the consumption of candy by their parents.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this legislation is warranted and is justified. It will help a great industry and will do absolutely no harm to the consuming public, and we recommend its adoption by the House.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] has adequately explained this bill. We passed the bill last year. Unfortunately it was caught in the logjam in the Senate and was not passed in that body.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House repeat its action of last year and pass this bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 7042.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill as amended was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

IMPLEMENTING THE CONVENTION FOR THE SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7954) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to conform to the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, London (1960), as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7954

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 153), is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (w) is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(5) 'Nuclear ship' means a ship provided with a nuclear powerplant."

(2) Subsection (x) is amended to read as follows:

"(x) 'Radiotelegraph auto alarm' on a ship of the United States subject to the provisions of part II of title III of this Act means an automatic alarm receiving apparatus which responds to the radiotelegraph alarm signal and has been approved by the Commission. 'Radiotelegraph auto alarm' on a foreign ship means an automatic alarm receiving apparatus which responds to the radiotelegraph alarm signal and has been approved by the government of the country in which the ship is registered: *Provided,* That the United States and the country in which the ship is registered are parties to the same treaty, convention, or agreement prescribing the requirements for such apparatus. Nothing in this Act or in any other provision of law shall be construed to require the recognition of a radiotelegraph auto alarm as complying with part II of title III of this Act, on a foreign ship subject to such part, where the country in which the ship is registered and the United States are not parties to the same treaty, convention, or agreement prescribing the requirements for such apparatus."

(3) Subsection (y) is amended to read as follows:

"(y)(1) 'Operator' on a ship of the United States means, for the purpose of parts II and III of title III of this Act, a person holding a radio operator's license of the proper class as described and issued by the Commission.

"(2) 'Operator' on a foreign ship means, for the purpose of part II of title III of this Act, a person holding a certificate as such of the proper class complying with the provisions of the radio regulations annexed to the International Telecommunication Convention in force, or complying with an agreement or treaty between the United States and the country in which the ship is registered."

(4)(A) Subsections (aa) through (dd) are redesignated as subsections (bb) through (ee), respectively; (B) subsections (ee) and (ff) are repealed; (C) subsection (gg) is redesignated as subsection (ff); (D) subsection (z) is redesignated as subsection (aa); and (E) the following new subsection is inserted immediately after subsection (y):

"(z)(1) 'Radio officer' on a ship of the United States means, for the purpose of part II of title III of this Act, a person holding at least a first or second class radiotelegraph operator's license as prescribed and issued by the Commission. When such person is employed to operate a radiotelegraph station aboard a ship of the United States, he is also required to be licensed as a 'radio officer' in accordance with the Act of May 12, 1948 (46 U.S.C. 229a–h).

"(2) 'Radio officer' on a foreign ship means, for the purpose of part II of title III of this Act, a person holding at least a first or second class radiotelegraph operator's certificate complying with the provisions of the radio regulations annexed to the International Telecommunication Convention in force."

SEC. 2. (a) The heading of section 351 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows: "SHIP RADIO STATIONS AND OPERATIONS".

(b) Subsection (a) of such section 351 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as provided in section 352 hereof it shall be unlawful—

"(1) For any ship of the United States, other than a cargo ship of less than three hundred gross tons, to be navigated in the open sea outside of a harbor or port, or for any ship of the United States or any foreign country, other than a cargo ship of less than three hundred gross tons, to leave or attempt to leave any harbor or port of the United States for a voyage in the open sea, unless such ship is equipped with an efficient radio station in operating condition, as specified by subparagraphs (A) and (B) of this paragraph, in charge of and operated by one or more radio officers or operators, adequately installed and protected so as to insure proper operation, and so as not to endanger the ship and radio station as hereinafter provided, and, in the case of a ship of the United States, unless there is on board a valid station license issued in accordance with this Act.

"(A) Passenger ships irrespective of size and cargo ships of one thousand six hundred gross tons and upward shall be equipped with a radiotelegraph station complying with the provisions of this part;

"(B) Cargo ships of three hundred gross tons and upward but less than one thousand six hundred gross tons, unless equipped with a radiotelegraph station complying with the provisions of this part, shall be equipped with a radiotelephone station complying with the provisions of this part.

"(2) For any ship of the United States of one thousand six hundred gross tons and upward to be navigated in the open sea outside of a harbor or port, or for any such ship of the United States or any foreign country to leave or attempt to leave any harbor or port of the United States for a voyage in the open sea, unless such ship is equipped with efficient radio direction finding apparatus approved by the Commission, properly adjusted in operating condition as hereinafter provided."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 352 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by striking out paragraph (6) and inserting after paragraph (5) thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(6) A ship navigating solely on any bays, sounds, rivers, or protected waters within the jurisdiction of the United States, or to a ship leaving or attempting to leave any harbor or port of the United States for a voyage solely on any bays, sounds, rivers, or protected waters within the jurisdiction of the United States;

"(7) A ship navigating solely on the Great Lakes of North America and the River Saint Lawrence as far east as a straight line drawn from Cap des Rosiers to West Point, Anticosti Island, and, on the north side of Anticosti Island, the sixty-third meridian, or to a ship leaving or attempting to leave any harbor or port of the United States for a voyage solely on such waters and within such area;

"(8) A ship which is navigated during the course of a voyage both on the Great Lakes of North America and in the open sea, during the period while such ship is being navigated within the Great Lakes of North America and their connecting and tributary waters as far east as the lower exit of the Saint Lambert lock at Montreal in the Province of Quebec, Canada."

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 352 is amended by striking out all through paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Except for nuclear ships, the Commission may, if it considers that the route or the conditions of the voyage or other circumstances are such as to render a radio station unreasonable or unnecessary for the purposes of this part, exempt from the provisions of this part any ship or class of ships which falls within any of the following descriptions:

"(1) Passenger ships which in the course of their voyage do not go more than twenty nautical miles from the nearest land or, alternatively, do not go more than two hundred nautical miles between two consecutive ports;"

(c) Such section 352 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Except for nuclear ships, and except for ships of five thousand gross tons and upward which are subject to the Safety Convention, the Commission may exempt from the requirements, for radio direction finding apparatus, of this part and of the Safety Convention, any ship which falls within the descriptions set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (b) of this section, if it considers that the route or conditions of the voyage or other circumstances are such as to render such apparatus unreasonable or unnecessary."

SEC. 4. Section 353 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"RADIO OFFICERS, WATCHES, AUTO ALARM-RADIOTELEGRAPH EQUIPPED SHIPS

"SEC. 353. (a) Each cargo ship which in accordance with this part is equipped with a radiotelegraph station and which is not equipped with a radiotelegraph auto alarm, and each passenger ship required by this part to be equipped with a radiotelegraph station, shall, for safety purposes, carry at least two radio officers.

"(b) A cargo ship which in accordance with this part is equipped with a radiotelegraph station, which is equipped with a radiotelegraph auto alarm, shall, for safety purposes, carry at least one radio officer who shall have had at least six months' previous service in the aggregate as a radio officer in a station on board a ship or ships of the United States.

"(c) Each ship of the United States which in accordance with this part is equipped with a radiotelegraph station shall, while being navigated in the open sea outside of a harbor or port, keep a continuous watch by means of radio officers whenever the station is not being used for authorized traffic: *Provided*, That, in lieu thereof, on a cargo ship equipped with a radiotelegraph auto alarm in proper operating condition, a watch of at least eight hours per day, in the aggregate, shall be maintained by means of a radio officer.

"(d) The Commission shall, when it finds it necessary for safety purposes, have authority to prescribe the particular hours of watch on a ship of the United States which in accordance with this part is equipped with a radiotelegraph station.

"(e) On all ships of the United States equipped with a radiotelegraph auto alarm, said apparatus shall be in operation at all times while the ship is being navigated in the open sea outside of a harbor or port when the radio officer is not on watch."

SEC. 5. Section 354 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"OPERATORS, WATCHES—RADIOTELEPHONE-EQUIPPED SHIPS

"SEC. 354. (a) Each cargo ship which in accordance with this part is equipped with a radiotelephone station shall, for safety purposes, carry at least one operator who may be the master, an officer, or a member of the crew.

"(b) Each cargo ship of the United States which in accordance with this part is equipped with a radiotelephone station shall, while being navigated in the open sea outside of a harbor or port, maintain continuous watch whenever the station is not being used for authorized traffic."

SEC. 6. Section 355 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS—RADIOTELEGRAPH-EQUIPPED SHIPS

"SEC. 355. The radiotelegraph station and the radio direction finding apparatus required by section 351 of this part shall comply with the following requirements:

"(a) The radiotelegraph station shall include a main installation and a reserve installation, electrically separate and electrically independent of each other: *Provided*, That, in installations on cargo ships of three hundred gross tons and upward but less than one thousand six hundred gross tons, and in installations on cargo ships of one thousand six hundred gross tons and upward installed prior to November 19, 1952, if the main transmitter complies with all the requirements for the reserve transmitter, the latter may be omitted.

"(b) The radiotelegraph station shall be so located that no harmful interference from extraneous mechanical or other noise will be caused to the proper reception of radio signals, and shall be placed in the upper part of the ship in a position of the greatest possible safety and as high as practicable above the deepest load waterline. The location of the radiotelegraph operating room or rooms shall be approved by the Commandant of the Coast Guard. The radiotelegraph installation shall be installed in such a position that it will be protected against the harmful effects of water or extremes of temperature, and shall be readily accessible both for immediate use in case of distress and for repair.

"(c) The radiotelegraph operating room shall be of sufficient size and of adequate ventilation to enable the main and reserve radiotelegraph installations to be operated efficiently, and shall not be used for any purpose which will interfere with the operation of the radiotelegraph station. The sleeping accommodation of at least one radio officer shall be situated as near as practicable to the radiotelegraph operating room. In ships the keels of which are laid on or after May 26, 1965, this sleeping accommodaton shall not be within the radiotelegraph operating room.

"(d) The main and reserve installations shall be capable of transmitting and receiving on the frequencies, and using the classes of emission, designated by the Commission pursuant to law for the purposes of distress and safety of navigation.

"(e) The main and reserve installations shall, when connected to the main antenna, have a minimum normal range of two hundred nautical miles and one hundred nautical miles, respectively; that is, they must be capable of transmitting and receiving clearly perceptible signals from ship to ship by day and under normal conditions and circumstances over the specified ranges.

"(f) Sufficient electrical energy shall be available at all times to operate the main installation over the normal range required by subsection (e) of this section as well as for the purpose of charging any batteries forming part of the radiotelegraph station.

"(g) The reserve installation shall include a source of electrical energy independent of the propelling power of the ship and of any other electrical system and shall be capable of being put into operation rapidly and of working for at least six continuous hours. The reserve source of energy and its switchboard shall be as high as practicable in the ship and readily accessible to the radio officer.

"(h) There shall be provided between the bridge of the ship and the radiotelegraph operating room, and between the bridge and the location of the radio direction finding apparatus, when such apparatus is not located on the bridge, an efficient two-way system for calling and voice communication which shall be independent of any other communication system in the ship.

"(i) The radio direction finding apparatus shall be efficient and capable of receiving signals with the minimum of receiver noise and of taking bearings from which the true bearing and direction may be determined. It shall be capable of receiving signals on the radiotelegraph frequencies assigned by the radio regulations annexed to the International Telecommunication Convention in force for the purposes of distress, direction finding, and maritime radio beacons, and, in installations made after May 26, 1965, such other frequencies as the Commission may for safety purposes designate."

SEC. 7. Section 356 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS—RADIOTELEPHONE EQUIPPED SHIPS

"SEC. 356. Cargo ships of three hundred gross tons and upward but less than one thousand six hundred gross tons may. in lieu of the radiotelegraph station prescribed by section 355, be equipped with a radiotelephone station complying with the following requirements:

"(a) The radiotelephone station shall be in the upper part of the ship, so located that it is sheltered to the greatest possible extent from noise which might impair the correct reception of messages and signals, and, unless such station is situated on the bridge, there shall be efficient communication with the bridge.

"(b) The radiotelephone installation shall be capable of transmitting and receiving on the frequencies, and using the classes of emission, designated by the Commission pursuant to law for the purposes of distress and safety of navigation.

"(c) The radiotelephone installation shall have a minimum normal range of one hundred and fifty nautical miles; that is, it shall be capable of transmitting and receiving clearly perceptible signals from ship to ship by day and under normal conditions and circumstances over this range.

"(d) There shall be available at all times a main source of electrical energy sufficient to operate the installation over the normal range required by subsection (c) of this section. If batteries are provided they shall have sufficient capacity to operate the transmitter and receiver for at least six continuous hours under normal working conditions. In installations made on or after November 19, 1952, a reserve source of electrical energy shall be provided in the upper part of the ship unless the main source of energy is so situated."

SEC. 8. Section 357 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"SURVIVAL CRAFT

"SEC. 357. Every ship required to be provided with survival craft radio by treaty to which the United States is a party, by statute, or by regulation made in conformity with a treaty, convention, or statute, shall be fitted with efficient radio equipment appropriate to such requirement under such rules and regulations as the Commission may find necessary for safety of life. For purposes of this section, 'radio equipment' shall include portable as well as nonportable apparatus."

SEC. 9. Subsection (a) of section 359 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The master of every ship of the United States, equipped with radio transmitting apparatus, which meets with dangerous ice, a dangerous derelict, a tropical storm, or any other direct danger to navigation, or encounters subfreezing air temperatures associated with gale force winds causing severe ice accretion on superstructures, or winds of force 10 or above on the Beaufort scale for which no storm warning has been received, shall cause to be transmitted all pertinent information relating thereto to ships in the vicinity and to the appropriate authorities on land, in accordance with rules and regulations issued by the Commission. When they consider it necessary, such authorities of the United States shall promptly bring the information received by them to the knowledge of those concerned, including interested foreign authorities."

SEC. 10. Section 361 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"CERTIFICATES

"SEC. 361. (a) Each vessel of the United States to which the Safety Convention applies shall comply with the radio and communication provisions of said Convention at all times while the vessel is in use, in addition to all other requirements of law, and shall have on board an appropriate certificate as prescribed by the Safety Convention.

"(b) Appropriate certificates concerning the radio particulars provided for in said Convention shall be issued upon proper request to any vessel which is subject to the radio provisions of the Safety Convention and is found by the Commission to comply therewith. Cargo ship safety radio telegraphy certificates, cargo ship safety radiotelephony certificates, and exemption certificates with respect to radio particulars shall be issued by the Commission. Other certificates concerning the radio particulars provided for in the said Convention shall be issued by the Commandant of the Coast Guard or whatever other agency is authorized by law to do so upon request of the Commission made after proper inspection or determination of the facts. If the holder of a certificate violates the radio provisions of the Safety Convention or the provisions of this Act, or the rules, regulations, or conditions prescribed by the Commission, and if the effective administration of the Safety Convention or of this part so requires, the Commission, after hearing in accordance with law, is authorized to modify or cancel a certificate which it has issued, or to request the modification or cancellation of a certificate which has been issued by another agency upon the Commission's request. Upon receipt of such request for modification or cancellation, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, or whatever agency is authorized by law to do so, shall modify or cancel the certificate in accordance therewith."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so that the law of this country will conform to the Conventions for the Safety of Life at Sea which were formulated in London in 1960.

Mr. Speaker, these conventions have been ratified by the U.S. Senate. This took place on April 12, 1962.

Mr. Speaker, the objective of the legislation is to modernize compulsory ship-radio safety requirements. Actually there are a number of technical amendments to the Communications Act, but the three primary matters to be concerned with here I believe could be summed up in this manner:

First. It would lower the limit from 500 to 300 gross tons with regard to cargo ships which are required to carry radio installations.

Second. It would eliminate nuclear ships from the categories of ships with regard to which the Commission is presently authorized to make exemptions insofar as radio installations are concerned. Of course, nuclear ships would be included in these provisions.

Third. It would eliminate the compulsory radio requirements of the Communications Act for vessels which are navigated both in the open sea and on the Great Lakes during that time that the vessels are on the Great Lakes.

Vessels operating on the Great Lakes are subject to the safety radio requirements of the Great Lakes Agreement between the United States and Canada.

Mr. Speaker, it was necessary to have one amendment to the bill in order to clarify language so that there would be no misunderstanding with regard to a provision of the bill requiring reinstallation in older ships and putting in new directional finding apparatus which would create a very great economic burden if it were required. It requires this new directional finding apparatus only with regard to new installations that are put into these ships.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the bill simply follows out the agreements we made at the London Convention.

The representative who testified before our committee on this subject was Commissioner Bartlett of the Federal Communications Commission who attended the London Conference.

We encountered no opposition to the bill and, speaking for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I hope the House will pass it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, this legislation came out of our subcommittee and out of the full committee unanimously. It has been well explained by the gentleman from Texas and I believe the House should approve the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas that the rules be suspended and the bill be passed.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed.

AMENDING THE LEAD-ZINC SMALL PRODUCERS STABILIZATION ACT OF OCTOBER 3, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5842) to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766; 30 U.S.C. 681 et seq.), as amended, is further amended—

(1) by substituting for the present text of section 2(d) the following: "The maximum amount of payments which may be made pursuant to this Act on account of sales of newly mined ores or concentrates produced therefrom made during any calendar year shall not exceed $2,500,000";

(2) by substituting for the present text of section 3(a) the following: "Subject to the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of this section, no stabilization payments under this Act shall be made to any small domestic producer on sales, or further processing in lieu of sales, in any calendar year in excess of one thousand two hundred tons of zinc and one thousand two hundred tons of lead";

(3) by substituting for the present text of section 6 (a)(2) the following: "The term 'small domestic producer' means any person or firm who, during a period of not less than twelve months, has engaged in producing ores or concentrates from mines located within the United States or its possessions and in selling the material so produced in normal commercial channels and who, during any twelve-month period between January 1, 1960, and the first day of the period for which he seeks payments under this Act, has not produced or sold ores or concentrates the recoverable content of which is more than three thousands tons of lead and zinc combined, recoverable content being computed as 95 per centum of the lead content of the ores or concentrates and 85 per centum of the zinc content of the ores or concentrates: *Provided,* That the principal product or products of such producer is either lead or zinc or a combination of lead and zinc. The term 'small domestic producer' does not include any firm which is a subsidiary of, or controlled by, a large producer.";

(4) by substituting in section 7 the dates December 31, 1969, and March 31, 1970, for the dates December 31, 1965 and March 31, 1966, respectively, which appear therein; and

(5) by deletion of section 9(c).

Sec. 2. The amendments to the Act of October 3, 1961, as amended, which are contained in section 1 of this Act shall be effective on January 1, 1966.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request for the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in supporting enactment of H.R. 5842, which will permit extension, if necessary, of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act, I wish to make a few things clear for Members of the House as well as for the record. First of all let us recall that when this law was enacted in 1961 it was intended solely for the purpose of assisting small producers to weather the economic storms that existed in the lead-zinc industry until such time as we could enact long-range legislation to assure stability for the entire industry. We assumed that the large producers—even if their operations were uneconomical—could survive. But we stated then, and we repeat now, that the important thing is a long-range solution.

The long-range solution to the lead-zinc problem lies in import legislation. We have tried many avenues and each time have found opposition. The result has been that no long-range program has been enacted. But we are trying again. I have introduced a bill, and it is cosponsored by 34 other Members of the House, to establish a flexible quota system that would insure the availability of both lead and zinc as needed for our peacetime and defense requirements while at the same time guaranteeing stability to this basic industry. My bill, H.R. 3183, is pending before the Ways and Means Committee; we are awaiting the comments of the administration and we are hopeful that shortly we will be able to have this long-range solution enacted.

We must also take note of the fact that a new Tariff Commission report to the President is just about completed and will, we understand, be forwarded to him within the next day or two. This report will undoubtedly have much valuable data in it, regardless of the recommendations—or lack of recommendations—that it contains.

The Tariff Commission report will be helpful in developing the information needed for consideration of a long-range solution of the lead-zinc industry problems. But, until that solution is enacted, it is necessary that we continue to insure the ability of the small producer to remain in business if, at some future day the price once again falls to the point where it would be uneconomical to remain in business.

The second point we should keep in mind is that the prices of both lead and zinc are now at the point where no stabilization price support payments need be made to the small producers. In other words, there has been an improvement in the price situation since the Small Producers Stabilization Act became law 3½ years ago. That law, the act of October 3, 1961—75 Stat. 766—was placed on the statute books as a temporary measure and would expire at the end of this year. We had been hopeful, as I indicated a moment ago, that by the end of this year we would have enacted long-range legislation. So, while we do not have to make any payment at this time, we must face the reality that with the Tariff Commission report not yet available and the administration comments not yet made, it does not look probable that a long-range legislative solution to the lead-zinc problem will be enacted by the end of calendar year 1965.

Third, and possibly most important, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that a survey that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs conducted last year disclosed that the majority of the participants in the stabililization program would not be able to remain in business unless the price remains at or above 14½ cents per pound or the Government pays the stabilization difference between the market price and the 14½ cents per pound. And let us not forget that during the last 2 years there have been shortages of lead and zinc and that these shortages would have been more acute if we had not encouraged small producers to bring additional supplies of lead and zinc on the market by offering them stabilization payments. Therefore, recognizing that it is unlikely at this point that long-range legislation will be enacted by the end of this year, recognizing further the need for the continued production of lead and zinc by the beneficiaries of the Small Producers Act, and anticipating the possibility of a future down trend in the prices of lead and zinc if we fail to obtain the enactment of legislation similar to the flexible quota bill that would guarantee a long-range stablization of the industry, we recommend to the House that the Small Producers Stabilization Act be extended for a 4-year period.

Fourth, Mr. Speaker, I think the House should keep in mind that this bill will not result in any increase in programed expenditures or in budgetary requirements. Back in 1961 we authorized a $16,500,000 program; payments to date have amounted to $2.1 million. For the 4 additional years that we propose this program we would authorize payments of only $10 million which, coupled with the $2.1 million already spent, would be approximately $12.1 million in total payments as compared with the $16.5 million estimated when the original program was authorized in 1961.

In addition, we have amended the basic act to simplify administration and provide for less restrictions on participation in the program. We have done this based on the experience under the act which indicated that the original requirements were far too restrictive and cumbersome.

The administration does not object to the extension of this program and, Mr. Speaker, I recommend that the House follow the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in suspending the rules and passing H.R. 5842, as amended, to extend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act until December 31, 1969.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to suspend the rules and pass this bill. But I cannot fail to remind my colleagues of what happened when this bill was originally before the House of Representatives. At that time I told the Members of the House that the bill would not produce the desired results. It was backward, we were asking the largest number of producers to come in the first year and annually reduced the amount we would support during each of the next 5 years. I was overruled in that decision. The House adopted the version that the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee had passed and reported to the floor of the House.

To show that my position was correct, if you will look at the report the committee filed, you will find in 1962 we received 103 applications, in 1963 we received 22 applications and in 1964 we received 1 application and so far in 1965 we have not received an application.

Now all I would like to ask you is how when we were trying to get new mines opened and to support the small miner, how our record bears up? It just shows that you could not get the small miner back into production in a year and, therefore, the bill did not prove satisfactory. If we had reversed the figures, I am sure we would now have probably 103 applications for miners to come in and open new mines and produce lead and zinc.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. What my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is saying is that we did not bring in a greater number of small mines, as we wanted to produce the lead and zinc that we expected to produce at that time. Therefore, the escalation has been in reverse rather than as my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, wanted and as he has been describing.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. However, the benefits to the mine operators who did qualify have proved of immeasurable value and that extends to the whole United States; is that not correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is right. Those miners who were able to qualify did benefit from the bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. That is right.

Mr. SAYLOR. My point is, if we would have changed the formula, we would have had more people qualify and with the present price of lead and zinc, it still would not have cost us any more.

Mr. ASPINALL. Under the present circumstances, the small miners who did not qualify cannot qualify at the present time.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. No new miners—that is, small miners—will be able to qualify under this bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have always recognized that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was one of the major "miner" prophets of the House on mining matters, but I think he qualifies now as one of the major prophets. There is no question about the fact that we would have had more participants in this program and probably would have benefited more people if we had adopted the reasoning of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the first place. But the gentleman, I am quite sure, in fairness, a quality that has always characterized our good friend, would admit that it was principally the decision of the administration on the subject of escalation rather than the view of the committee that prevailed at the time his viewpoints were first presented to the committee. Would he not agree to that?

Mr. SAYLOR. I think that is correct.

Mr. EDMONDSON. And would not the gentleman also concede that under the amendment which was adopted by the committee which changes the period for qualification from back in 1956 to 1960, a 4-year period, in which you have to have records to show you did not have production in excess of 3,000 tons combined, which amendment changes that period to the period from 1961 to the time of the effectiveness of this law, we will make it possible for some additional minor producers who did not have those records and did not have that 4-year period of small production as a record to bring to the General Services Administration, to come in under this new program?

Mr. SAYLOR. I sincerely hope there will be some small mines able to qualify with the changes that the committee has made.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should be passed, and it should be passed by an overwhelming vote, and without further delay in the Congress.

The program to assist small lead-zinc producers has resulted in a significant improvement in the economic picture for the operators of small lead and zinc mines in a dozen States.

In no area has this improvement been more pronounced than in the tristate district of Oklahoma, Kansas, and Missouri. Hundreds of people are working in that district today, as a result of this legislation.

Furthermore, under the existing price level for lead and zinc, the program is not costing the Government a penny.

I hope the price levels will continue to make it possible for our small producers to engage in business, and to contribute to a strong domestic mining economy, without further expense to the Government.

Should prices decline, however, the presence of this program would operate as insurance for the small producers for the next 4 years.

I am deeply grateful to the chairman of the full committee, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, for the support which he has given this program, and to President Johnson and Secretary of the Interior Udall for their vital support and assistance. Our mining economy in the United States is stronger today because of this program, and I trust it will be continued for the next 4 years.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5842, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE 76TH COMMENCEMENT OF CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address by the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 76th commencement of the Catholic University of America on June 6, 1965, the university conferred upon President Lyndon B. Johnson the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

On this occasion the President made an address of great significance and importance not only to the people of the United States, but to the people of the entire world. I enclose in my remarks the commencement address made by President Johnson.

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 1965]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO GRADUATES AT CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY

(NOTE.—Following is the text of President Johnson's remarks at commencement exercises at Catholic University:)

On this campus dedicated to the glory of God, it is fitting that we meet on this first day of the week. For this is the day kept by Christendom as a day of remembrance, a day of renewal, a day of rededication to the moral values by which we guide our lives.

In our temporal affairs—no less than in affairs of the spirit—this is a season for remembrance, for renewal, for rededication to the moral values by which men guide the course of their governments on this earth.

On this occasion, then, I come to speak—at this time and place—about the morality of nations. For while I believe devotedly in the separation of church and state, I do not believe it is pleasing in the sight of God for men to separate morality from their might.

Your Nation is a mighty nation—the mightiest in all the milleniums of man. But let none who would measure that might—or test it—be deceived and let us never deceive ourselves.

The strength of our society does not rest in the silos of our missiles nor lie in the vaults of our wealth—for neither arms nor silver are gods before which we kneel.

The might of America lies in the morality of our purposes and their support by the will of our united peoples.

It was Jefferson who said that—

"Our interests * * * will ever be found inseparable from our moral duties."

That standard guides us still.

For America's only interests in the world today are those we regard as inseparable from our moral duties to mankind.

ABIDING TRUTH

This is the truth—the abiding truth—about America. Yet all through this century, men in other lands have—for reasons of their own—elected to discount moral duty as the motivation that moves America.

In its place, they have erected and embraced myths of their own creation—the myths of American isolationism and imperialism, the myths of American materialism and militarism.

I would recall the words once spoken by a man who deeply understood these times, this land, and the truth about them both, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. For he once said:

"The great enemy of the truth is very often not the lie—deliberate, contrived, and dishonest—but the myth—persistent, persuasive, and unrealistic."

If we cannot persuade other men to disbelieve their own persistent, persuasive, and unrealistic myths about America's motivations, we can urge them to seek after the truth—for the truth about America has been chronicled on every continent in this century.

Twenty-one years ago tomorrow—on the 7th of June 1944—it was neither isolationism nor imperialism that sent our sons ashore in Normandy to intervene in the destiny of the continent of Europe where our culture was cradled.

Nor was it materialism that moved this Nation to the works of the postwar world—committing her crops, dedicating her dollars, and determination to reconstruct the ruined lands of friend and foe, sharing her skills and resources to strengthen the foundations for emerging nations all around the globe.

Neither was it militarism that motivated this Nation to dismantle her arms in good faith when victory was won and offer up the atom in good faith for control by all nations. Nor is it militarism now that motivates America to stand her sons by the sons of Europe or Asia or Latin America in keeping a vigil of peace and freedom for all mankind.

NATION'S MORAL DUTY

What America has done—and what America is doing now around the world—draws from deep and flowing springs of moral duty, and let none underestimate the depth of flow of those wellsprings of American purpose.

On this, let me speak forthrightly—to you and to the world.

All through history the doubt of men for the morality of their own generation has been exceeded only by their doubt for the morality of the next generation. As long ago as ancient Chaldea—when history was just beginning—there was a popular verse, saying:

"We are fallen upon evil times,
And the world has waxed very old and wicked,
Politics are very corrupt,
The sons of men are not so righteous
As their parents were."

Whatever some say, you of this class of 1965 know that words such as these do not describe your America in these times. This is a new time in our land—a time young in spirit, a time of renewal, a time of resurgence for those forces which fashion a finer and fairer society.

The people—and their politics—are keeping faith with America's ideals, as never before: in education, in health, in the human environment. That great American commitment to equality for all men—in the sight of the law as in the sight of God—is, at last, being fulfilled. Sons of men—and daughters, too—are giving of themselves as volunteers for good and noble works in a manner their parents never thought of doing.

If men elsewhere say they have never met such an America before, they are right—and we are honored and proud.

For this is an America morally aware, morally aroused—an America determined to end at home the compromise of its own moral duty which has, for much too long, given credence to those who would doubt us or misrepresent us elsewhere in the world.

MYTHS AND TRUTH

Myths, misrepresentations, and misunderstandings are enemies of truth—and enemies of America—but they shall not be masters of either.

The truth of America's purposes cannot be veiled.

Sure of its moral purposes—surer of its own moral performance—America shall not be deterred from doing what must be done to preserve this last peace man shall ever have to win or lose.

We have—as our forefathers had—a decent respect for the informed opinions of mankind, but we of this generation also have an abiding commitment to preserve and perpetuate the enduring values of mankind.

And we shall keep that commitment.

Our purpose, our policy—our constant and continuing commitment—was set forth just 18 years ago this weekend by the Secretary of State of the United States, George C. Marshall.

In a speech the world will never forget, that great citizen of war and peace said this for the United States:

"Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos. Its purpose should be * * * to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist."

That is America's purpose now—our only purpose—in the hungry and poor and desperate and chaotic lands to the farthest corners of the earth. In the policies that guide us abroad—as in the principles that govern us at home—we of the United States cherish the right of others to choose for themselves what they shall believe and what their own societies and institutions shall be.

On this right rests all morality among nations—and we intend to guard and defend this right for others as for ourselves.

But the shade of a shield is not enough to cause stable societies to grow and free institutions to flower in integrity.

POPE JOHN QUOTED

Pope John XXIII reminded us that peace would be only "an empty-sounding word" unless it rested upon, as he put it—

"An order founded on truth, built according to justice, vivified and integrated by charity, and put into practice in freedom."

That is the next imperative of morality among nations—to integrate the system of nations and peoples by charity, not the charity of callous and calculating dole, but the compassionate charity of learning and love.

This, too, has been—and will continue to be—the purpose of the American people: to maintain in our policies toward all nations a spirit of compassion and caring. For, we believe, as Pope John said:

"There is an immense task incumbent on all men of good will, namely the task of restoring the relations of the human family in truth, in justice, in love, and in freedom."

That, finally, is the highest morality of nations—the noblest purpose to which great powers can put their great persuasion: to restoring relations between the human family.

Our world has been scarred and sundered by war since the beginning of time and man. On every continent, men of every color—and every creed—live with memories of wars past and dread of wars to come.

Peace is still a stranger—knocking at the door.

We of America—we of the free world—are ready, as we are always ready, to open that door and invite peace to enter, to dwell in the house of all nations forever.

On this Sunday morning, then, I would say to the people—and to the leaders—of the Communist countries, to the Soviet Union, to nations of Eastern Europe and Southeast Asia, we extend to you our invitation: come, now, let us reason together.

As peace knocks, our door is unlatched.

Our table is set.

We are ready—and we believe mankind is ready with us.

We wait, only for those of the human family who have barred their doors and closed their windows to pull back your curtains and signify to mankind that you are ready, too, to welcome peace to the table of man.

A great American President—Franklin Roosevelt—once said:

"The most serious threat to our institutions comes from those who refuse to face the need for change."

GROWING FAITH

Today in both the open world of freedom and in the curtained world of communism, men and their families are enjoying the comfort and contentment of a life none have known before.

There is still discontent—but there is less despair. There is still need—but the wants are not so mean. There is still futility today—but there is more faith for tomorrow.

The most serious threat—the only threat—to this improving condition of all peoples lies with those who refuse to face the need for change: refuse to face the need for renouncing war in all its guises.

The will of the world—the great and growing moral force of mankind—presses for that renunciation. For men know today, as they have not been able to know before, that war serves no necessary end of any nation on earth.

Only a few days ago, an American son stepped out into the void of space and walked his way from the coast of the Pacific to the coast of the Atlantic over this continent. When his walk was complete, he did not want to return to the capsule from which he had emerged.

In many ways, this epitomizes our age. The peoples of earth—in lands old and young—are enjoying experiences man has never known before, and they will not willingly return to the old world of war from which they have emerged.

On this campus, then—on this day of peace and promise—I would offer one message to men everywhere and to their leaders in every nation.

MESSAGE TO WORLD

We of the United States welcome the gains and the progress all people have realized since the brutal and bitter years of war and devastation and exploitation.

We are grateful for the progress we ourselves have achieved, and we are determined to press forward—not for our gain and greatness alone, but for the gain and good of all mankind.

But the need of man—the need of these times—is not for arms races or moon races, not for races into space or races to the bottom of the sea. If competition there must be, we are ready and we are willing always to take up the challenges and commit our country to its tasks. But this is a moment when the opportunity is open and beckoning for men of all nations to take together a walk toward peace.

The stranger knocks. Peace seeks admission at all our doors. Let us, then, open our doors and go forth together to walk at each other's side toward peace.

For let us never forget, the longest journey begins with a single step.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST DISASTER RELIEF ACT OF 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute; to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce a bill to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters. The President, late Saturday evening, vetoed S. 327, of which I was the principal sponsor in the House of Representatives. You will recall that the House, on April 19, passed H.R. 7303 and subsequently amended this language into S. 327 and returned it to the Senate which quickly concurred and sent the bill to the President for signature.

It is my understanding that the language which precipitated the veto came in section 5(a) and related to the question of appropriations for bank stabilization work along the Eel River. This language was considered as congressional encroachment upon the Executive powers because it required further review by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives prior to the request for appropriations. In this bill which I introduce today, I have stricken the language upon which the veto was predicated.

Without questioning the basic merits of the veto, I respectfully urge the House of Representatives to give early and favorable consideration of the bill which I introduce today, for time is of the essence. The areas which were stricken so heavily last Christmas week are areas where the construction season is limited to the summer months because of the inclement weather, including heavy snows in the late fall and winter. If we do not have action now, we will lose a full year in assisting to rebuild these areas. The economies of the flood-stricken areas are in a critical state. Only by meeting our obligations in a timely fashion can we revive and restore these economies to a measure of normalcy. Let us not by delay create any further widespread areas of poverty and great unemployment.

In his veto message to the Senate of the United States, President Johnson said, and I quote:

> I am in complete sympathy with the purpose of this legislation. I am anxious that the relief to the States involved be made available as quickly as possible.

The President has also assured us that he will approve the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act immediately in the form which I am introducing here today.

Mr. Speaker, in order to clarify this matter completely, I place at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the President's veto message:

To the Senate of the United States:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 327, to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters.

This bill authorizes additional funds and other special assistance to aid in the reconstruction and repair of damage caused in the Pacific Northwest by the devastating floods of last winter. I am in complete sympathy with the purpose of this legislation. However, in spite of the bill's general desirability, section 5 seriously violates the spirit of the division of powers between the legislative and executive branches. Despite my strong support for the substantive relief, I must withhold approval until this unwise and objectionable provision is deleted.

The provision is contained in that part of section 5(a) stipulating that:

"The President, acting through the Office of Emergency Planning, is authorized to perform all or any part of the recommended work determined to be in the public interest and to reimburse any common carrier for any of such recommended work performed by such carrier, but no appropriation shall be made for any such work which has not been approved before June 30, 1966, by resolution adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively."

The Attorney General advises me that this provision is clearly a "coming into agreement" with a congressional committee requirement. This device requires an executive official to obtain the approval of a committee or other unit of Congress before taking an executive action. It is not only an undesirable and improper encroachment by the Congress and its committees into the area of executive responsibilities—it also leads to inefficient administration. The executive branch is given, by the Constitution, the responsibility to implement all laws—a specific and exclusive responsibility which cannot properly be shared with a committee of Congress.

The proper separation of powers and division of responsibilities between Congress and the executive branch is a matter of continuing concern to me. I must oppose the tendency to use any device to involve congressional committees in the administration of programs and the implementation of laws. I have spoken out against this before. Less than a year ago, in a signing statement on the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, I requested deletion of a provision much the same as the one in S. 327.

Although I am unable to approve S. 327 in its present form for the reasons stated, I am anxious that the relief to the States involved be made available as quickly as possible. Accordingly, I will approve S. 327 immediately when the Congress has eliminated the provision in section 5 which infringes upon the responsibilities of the executive branch. I see no reason why this cannot be accomplished in a few days and have directed the executive branch to cooperate fully with the Congress to this end.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 5, 1965.*

LEGISLATING AGAINST NASSER

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in this morning's Washington Post directs attention to an important matter which the House will act upon tomorrow, June 8, when it considers H.R. 7105, the bill to extend the Export Control Act of 1949.

While there is no controversy over the necessity of extending this act, an important issue has been raised with respect to the type of congressional action that should be taken to insulate American business concerns from pressures from the Arab League designed to discourage trade with Israel.

The action recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency is to increase the President's discretionary authority to take such steps as he deems appropriate to meet boycotts and restraints of trade against countries friendly to the United States. The committee felt that it would be an intrusion upon the prerogatives of the President, who has the constitutional responsibility for the conduct of foreign policy, to limit his choice of action in an area of increasing sensitivity.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the members of this body will weigh carefully the point of view expressed in the Washington Post editorial which follows:

LEGISLATING AGAINST NASSER

The House is expected on Tuesday to take up, and probably approve, an amendment to the Export Control Act which would make it illegal for American businessmen to comply with the Arab League boycott against Israel. Also early next week, the Senate is expected to vote on Senator ERNEST GRUENING's amendment to the foreign-aid authorization bill which would call for an end to all types of U.S. assistance to the United Arab Republic.

These proposals reflect congressional irritation with United Arab Republic President Nasser, both for his permitting this year's storming of the U.S. Information Service library in Cairo and his longtime enmity toward Israel. The irritation is understandable. But to tie down the President's flexibility in foreign affairs through legislative restrictions would be a dangerous form of interference with the conduct of foreign policy.

The House amendment proposed by Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER has the danger of greater appeal because it is aimed at a specific situation. The Arab League's Central Boycott Office in Damascus, plus its subsidiary offices in all the Arab States, has made it a practice to dispatch questionnaires to foreign businessmen asking them to indicate whether they have any commercial relations with Israel. If they do, the assumption is that they then are disqualified from obtaining any Arab business.

Congressman MULTER and Senators JACOB K. JAVITS and JOHN J. WILLIAMS, who have a similar bill now pending before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, think the way to meet the situation is to make it illegal for American businessmen to fill out the boycott office forms. The administration, on the other hand, contends that such an amendment would boomerang and end up in a boycott of the American businessmen.

The Arab boycott measures unquestionably have been annoying and in grave conflict with American principles applicable to foreign trade. At one time, TWA flights which refueled in Saudi Arabia were forbidden to carry Jewish passengers. In 1963, British public opinion was aroused when Lord Mancroft, a Jew who sat on the board of directors of an insurance group, was forced to resign his directorship because of Arab pressure. This year, there was a threat to boycott New York's Chase Manhattan Bank in the mistaken belief that the bank was acting as an agent for Israeli bonds, instead of merely certifying their authenticity.

Regardless of how infuriating these Arab boycott practices may be, however, the conduct of foreign affairs belongs in the White House and the State Department, not in restrictive legislation on Capitol Hill.

LAW REQUIRING ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS SHOULD BE REPEALED AND APPROPRIATIONS MADE FOR THE BIENNIUM

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 3 I submitted a written suggestion to the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, and on June 4 appeared in person before the committee in support of my proposal.

It was my recommendation that the law requiring annual appropriations be repealed and that appropriations be made for the biennium, 2 fiscal years at a time, with a change in the Antideficiency Act to limit expenditures in any 3 months to one-eighth of the total for the 2-year period. A careful study of the effect of such change convinces me this would enable the executive departments and agencies to reduce personnel, would save hundreds of millions of dollars annually, and the value in improved operations of programs would be tremendous.

I present here a copy of my statement:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to recommend that the requirement for annual appropriations be repealed and that new legislation be enacted providing that appropriations be made for a period of 2 fiscal years at a time. This would enable the executive departments and agencies to plan and carry out their programs far more effectively and would avoid the present necessity for each department and agency to begin, at the same time, internal hearings on the budget for the fiscal year subsequent to that for which they are justifying appropriations before the Congress.

If this change were made it would be of tremendous benefit to the executive departments and agencies, to the Members of the Senate where 100 Members have to parcel out among themselves a workload which we in the House of Representatives can divide among 435 Members, and I believe would result in substantial savings on Government programs.

This change would be of great help to all Members of Congress, as the first session could largely be taken up by hearings and passage of appropriations bills for the 2 ensuing fiscal years, leaving the second session almost completely free for floor consideration of other legislative matters. During the first year the legislative committees to a great degree would be conducting their hearings, acting on bills, and getting ready for final passage of legislation in the second year. It has been my observation that legislation is usually finally passed in the second year of a term, though this year has been somewhat different.

Of course, there should be no set rule to require this procedure as annual review of defense appropriations, domestic public works, and some other items might be advisable. Some legislation would need to come up quickly and many bills would pass one body or the other in the first year of a Congress; some supplemental appropriations would doubtless be made in the second year.

I think such a change would be worth its weight in gold. I would point out that since 1921, when annual appropriations were required by the Budgeting and Accounting Act, the annual appropriations, followed by Federal programs of the executive departments and agencies, have increased from $4.8 billion for fiscal year 1921 and $3.9 billion for fiscal year 1922, to the present workload and programs of the executive departments and agencies and of the Congress, where present annual budgets are about $100 billion each fiscal year. You can clearly see that what is needed by both the Congress and the executive department is time to properly handle this increased governmental activity.

This recommendation is based on almost 24 years of service in the House of Representatives, including 22 years on the Appropriations Committee where I have had quite a wide variety of experience and am presently serving as chairman of one of the subcommittees. We can get all the information we need; we have means to check any answers given. However, there are many duties members cannot delegate to anyone. What we need is more time; the 100 Members of the Senate need time more than the 435 Members of the House, and the executive departments and agencies need time to plan operations and to carry them out even more than the Congress. Appropriations on a 2-year basis will provide that time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was impossible for me to be present in the House on Tuesday, June 1, and to respond to rollcall No. 116, on H.R. 8639, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies; and to rollcall No. 117, on H.R. 3584, to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on both of these bills.

THERE IS NATURAL BEAUTY EVERYWHERE

Mr. POAGE .Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, last week the New York Daily News published an article under the byline of Ted Lewis more or less critical of President Johnson's efforts to beautify America. Mr. Lewis did not see fit to take direct issue with the beautification idea, but he sought to discredit it by such suggestions as the charge that "the Lone Star State is big but its landscape is drab and without one scenic beauty worth touting."

I think a statement of this kind establishes the fact that the author has no appreciation of beauty as beauty is to be found wherever man looks for it. One man can stand on the mountain top with the wonders of nature spread before him and see no beauty because there is none in himself. Another with his feet in the bog will look up through the reeds and for him the seawinds will play an oaten symphony. I have stood on the mountains of Switzerland; I have been on the beach at Coco Cabana and have beheld the Great White Way at New York and have seen Diamond Head at Honolulu, but I have never known a more beautiful land than the high plains of Texas just as day was breaking—possibly Mr. Lewis has never stirred about at that time—or the prairies of central Texas just as the sun goes down. There is plenty of beauty in Texas just as there is in any other part of the world for those who want to find it.

What the President wants to do, and what I want to do, is to make it easier for more people to find that beauty. That does not mean that we have to eliminate all advertising; it does not mean that we have to ship all of our overage cars to the Northeast, but it does mean that we should use judgment and decency in the location of advertising, industrial, and business structures. I think it is clear that this can be done without destroying any of the factors that help our people make a better livelihood. After all, Walter Reuther is right when he suggests that we should have both "bread and roses." Possibly it would be more meaningful to say both bread and hyacinths—"if I had but two loaves of bread, I would sell one and buy white hyacinths to feed my soul." And certainly all of those are right who recognize the close relationship between poverty and ugliness. The public aspects of poverty are as ugly from the scenic side as are the private aspects from the personal side. As we build a more affluent society, we will automatically remove many of the scars of poverty, but we should as we advance economically expect much more in the way of beauty from our citizens, both rich and poor. I have always been impressed when I visit our neighbor to the south—Mexico—to find around the huts of the poorest peons blooming flowers and plants.

Unfortunately, our people as a whole have not made the effort to beautify their own habitations that has been made by people in many other lands. Americans need to feel, and must have a sense of personal responsibility, for the beautification of their own premises. Too often, we depend only on the Government. The Government must help, and I am delighted that there is a growing recognition of public responsibility. The government—local, State, and National—has done much to beautify our country. Our individual citizens must do much more. Too often, we find our public housing developments taking on the appearance of slums because the grounds are not adequately beautified. This is not the fault of the housing authorities; it is the fault of the people who live in these communities. Too many of them simply refuse to accept any personal responsibility for the care and appearance of their community.

Again, referring to Mexico, I was greatly impressed on a visit to an industrial park near the city of Mexico, where I saw a number of small but extremely neat and well-kept houses belonging to the industrial plant. I asked how they kept them so well, how they were able to have so many flowers and to keep the lawns in such good shape. The president of the company said:

> It is simple; we don't keep them at all; each man keeps his own and if he doesn't keep it well, we take the house away from him and he will have to look in the slums of the city for a place to live.

I think we could learn much from our Latin neighbors.

Unfortunately, it is in the great cities where the sense of personal responsibility for beauty is most lacking. Possibly this is due to the fact that the citizens of our great cities have by and large depended more and more on the Government, and less and less upon themselves. What we need is a partnership between Government and individuals in the beautification of our land, and it should go all the way from Broadway to what Mr. Lewis describes as the "drab landscape of Texas." Unquestionably, those of us from the Lone Star State should the better appreciate the beauty of Manhattan Island, and there is much beauty there, and by the same token, Mr. Lewis and the Daily News should the better appreciate the beauty of the vast open spaces of the West, and there is much beauty there.

Our Federal Government has established a great system of national parks and national monuments. This system should be, and will be, enlarged and developed although much of it should, in my judgment, remain in large part undeveloped—I do not mean inaccessible. One of the great services that only Government can render in making natural beauty available to our people is to provide access, that is, to provide roads and parkways. Our Federal Government is now building the greatest system of highways in the world. I have long wanted to see our States play a larger part in the development of natural beauty.

For at least 30 years I have urged that the State of Texas should start on a system of State parkways, and I have even suggested that the first one of these parkways should be buit from our capital city, not even in the district I have the honor to represent. I have suggested that this parkway should go west from Austin, possibly by Bee Caves to Hamilton's Pool—a collapsed cavern which the State should, in my judgment, own. The parkway should then cross the Pedernales River and recross it somewhere between Johnson City and the L.B.J. Ranch. This would take it along the south bank of the river overlooking the President's home.

I would then take the parkway on through Fredericksburg—a quaint and interesting center of early German culture in Texas—and on to the Bear Mountain which I want the State to own. Bear Mountain is a red granite laccolith, the only red granite in this section. It has a balanced rock approximately the size of the one in the Garden of the Gods. It also has a hickory forest on the north slope, the only hickory I know of west of the Brazos River. I would then take the parkway north into Llano County to the Enchanted Rock, which the State should have purchased years ago. The Enchanted Rock is a great laccolith of gray granite approximately the same size, but not quite so high, as the Stone Mountain at Atlanta. It has an attractive little stream on the east side and it is definitely a scenic spot.

I would then take the parkway east across the Buchanan Dam by Inks Park, which the State now owns, then up the mountain to the Longhorn Cavern—also owned by the State and one of the largest and most attractive caverns in the United States. I would then suggest taking the parkway down by the Granite Shoals Lake to Marble Falls. From there, it could go straight back to Austin over the hills, or preferably, it could go back on the north side of the Colorado River passing several collapsed caverns and passing Travis Peak, a limestone hill and the highest point in Travis County.

This route traverses an area in which wild flowers abound; I drove over some of it at Eastertime. Nowhere are there more magnificent displays of bluebonnets, our State flower, than in the Buchanan Dam-Inks Park area. Nowhere have I ever seen a finer display of white prickly poppies than in the Enchanted Rock area.

I would envision a parkway, at least through most of the area, of 300 feet right-of-way, but I do not think that we should attempt to establish the rigid specifications of interstate highways. I do not contemplate a dual highway. I want this to be a scenic route, not a thoroughfare. I want it to be for the purpose of seeing natural beauty, not simply for the purpose of getting from one place to another. This right-of-way should be planted to native flowers and shrubs like bluebonnet, Indian-paintbrush, winecups, Canterbury-bells, western daisies, tree cyprus, yuccas, redbud, Spanish-oaks, and so forth.

Once the principle of State parkways is established, I think we should begin to think in terms of a parkway running from north to south Texas. Probably the first part should be from Fort Worth west through Cresson, an open prairieland Mr. Lewis does not like but, to me, one of the most beautiful sections in

Texas, a land rich with wild flowers and great vistas. This parkway should enter the Brazos Valley above Granbury, passing the Comanche Peak down to Glen Rose with its dinosaur tracks, west roughly with the Puluxy River, then through one of the most beautiful gaps in Texas to the Bosque Valley, possibly down this valley all the way to Valley Mills, then through the Tonkawa Park, and Bluff Creek areas, then south to Mother Neff Park, on down by Belton Reservoir and Stillhouse Hollow Lake, possibly crossing the earlier projected parkway at Marble Falls, and on down through Blanco County into San Antonio from the north.

I would also have my State and every other State begin the acquisition of points of natural and historic interest even though they may not be able as yet to develop these points. Texas already owns the Palo Duro Canyon, with which I am sure Mr. Lewis is not acquainted. The State or the Federal Government should own El Capitan and the Guadalupe Mountains—the highest point in Texas and incidentally about twice as high as any peak east of the Mississippi. The State gave the Federal Government the Big Bend National Park, the finest display of Chihuahuan desert scenery in the world. The State has also given the Federal Government by far the longest and most magnificent stretch of national beach area in Padre Island. The State should be acquiring title to such spots as the 700 Springs, the Double Mountain, Pilot Knob out of Austin—the only known volcano east of the Pecos River—and many more points of interest.

As our population increases, we need more space. As our income increases, our people will have far greater opportunity to enjoy these beauty spots. The President is on the right track. We should be cooperating with him not only at the level of State and local governments, but also as individuals, and if we are to do this, we must recognize that there is beauty in every part of our country, and that it is our duty to preserve it and to make it available to our people.

IN MEMORIAM: MICHAEL SCHWERNER, ANDREW GOODMAN, AND JAMES CHANEY

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and the following members of the New York congressional delegation—Congressmen HERBERT TENZER, JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, HUGH L. CAREY, ADAM C. POWELL, JAMES H. SCHEUER, JACOB H. GILBERT, JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, OGDEN R. REID, JOHN G. DOW, JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, and SEYMOUR HALPERN—I submit to my colleagues, and to the Nation, a matter of tragic American history.

We are presently experiencing a silent revolution, with sounds generating throughout the land from such localities as Selma, Birmingham, Meridian, and other areas north, east, south, and west.

None of us is untouched by the wave of emotion and activities that sweeps from one coast to the other. And the lives of every American, from this decade on, have been discernibly changed by events such as the act of June 21, 1964.

On that unforgettable day the lives of three American citizens were ruthlessly eradicated. It was an act of such wanton violence that people throughout the world recoiled in horror. It was an act of such callous violation of the law that people throughout this country reacted in fear.

Such was the emotional upheaval that resulted from the attack on law and order that a whirlwind of change began to spin in every city and town in the Nation. The whirlwind of change is now gathering force and power as it blows across the far reaches of this continent and rushes down Constitution Avenue and into the very Chambers of this great hall.

The sounds generated by this whirlwind turn to a call for freedom. Freedom of choice, freedom from want, freedom from fear for all our citizens, no matter what the color of their skins.

The greater tragedy of this event is that the three American citizens who were so wantonly murdered were the representation of the youth of this country. They were boys who had been moved by the misery of others and who had acted in the American tradition.

They had followed the greatest concepts of 2,000 years of what we call our civilization. They chose to combat the apparent injustice by teaching and by good works.

And for their lessons of equality, for their practice of nonviolence, for their love of their fellow men, they were brutally murdered and casually interred within a crude dam that was meant to hold back the rising tide of a rabid countryside.

Gentlemen, we the undersigned of the New York delegation to the Congress of the United States, take a particular interest in the memory and the association of these martyred boys, because two of them came from the city of New York.

We pay homage to all three, because the exemplify the kind of American we would wish ourselves to be.

Michael Schwerner was born in New York City. He was a graduate of the New York School of Social Work, and had been a staff member of Hamilton-Madison House in New York City, prior to organizing the Meridan Center for the youth of that community. His parents now reside in Pelham, N.Y.

Andrew Goodman, whose parents reside in New York City, was a 20-year-old student who volunteered to spend his summer teaching and helping those who were being deprived of their full rights as American citizens.

James Chaney had grown up in Meridian, had worked in Meridian, had attended school in Meridian, and died in Meridian along with two neighbors from New York.

It becomes, therefore, just and fitting that we acknowledge the historic significance of their sacrifice and that we express our heartfelt gratitude for their sacrifice.

It is our express hope and wish that all citizens throughout the land commemorate the anniversary of their deaths, that we remember the date of June 21, 1964, as a milestone in our American heritage.

We urge all the citizens of our own city of New York to make a special effort to establish this date, and this period, as one not to be forgotten. We urge that they associate these young men, and the anniversary of their deaths, with the social strivings for a better community and a better world for every citizen and group of citizens within our State.

It would be fitting that during this first anniversary period a special commemorative period be established to honor the memory of these three boys and salute the efforts of all the others who have moved courageously toward the continuation of this American struggle in all parts of the country.

We urge the executive branches of government, both on the State and municipal levels, to take appropriate action for the creation of a truly significant commemorative period during the month of June. We urge that industry, both manufacturing and retail, in the city of New York participate with local government in displaying the photographs of these boys prominently. And we urge that they all participate in special ceremonies to mark this period.

We recommend that all persons, institutions, and business organizations within New York take the opportunity at this particular time to expand the horizons of all people within our community and join in the battle to eliminate the cruel racial barriers that still exist in schools, industry, and neighborhoods. We also join those who take justifiable pride in the great work performed in this area by many of our people.

We are aware that plans are now under way to finance and construct a community center in Meridian, Miss., devoted to the memory of these three boys. We most emphatically endorse this project which can only add to the betterment of understanding amongst people in this country.

It is our firm belief that we are now on the road that will lead us to a newer and brighter future for all the citizens of this Nation, a road which will open great and magnificent horizons to future generations.

Therefore, we wish to take our rightful position on this road and to progress side by side with the men of good will from everywhere in this country, and we can honor these boys most by enacting a strong voting rights bill, including an explicit ban on State poll taxes.

IS THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION GUILTY OF ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior appear to be embarking upon one of the most pernicious and blatantly illegal lobbying campaigns to influence pending legislation which I have ever seen any executive agency undertake in my 16 years in the Congress. This whole questionable scheme came to my attention recently when I received from the Bureau a booklet of color photographs of Lake Powell, the lake created by construction of the Glen Canyon Dam. The concluding pages of this slick-paper, eye-catching booklet contain an outright huckster's pitch obviously designed to get public support and in turn create pressure on the Congress for approval of the Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams. Both of these proposals are contained in legislation presently pending before the Congress and only one of which has been endorsed by the Bureau of the Budget.

So that each of our colleagues may appreciate fully the impact of this lobbying effort, I quote the text of these pages which constitute the attempt by an executive agency to influence pending legislation:

THE FUTURE

What do you do with a great river which is the lifeline for the arid half of a country?

First, you treasure, regulate, and husband what it holds. Then you plan the future for that water as carefully as King Midas counted his gold.

The tremendous basin of the Colorado River is divided into an upper basin and lower basin. The four-State upper basin contains the Colorado River storage project. The lower basin holds famed Hoover Dam and Lake Mead, serving California, Arizona, and Nevada. It also holds other significant water projects, but needs further development to utilize its allotted share of Colorado River water. This additional development is essential to its future.

Why does the lower basin need more water now? Because the population explosion in the lower basin States during the past 15 years has been phenomenal. The population has doubled and doubled again, and this growth rate is expected to continue.

This is why further water development is needed now. To supply the means to bring more water to more people. Not for convenience, but out of necessity.

Construction of these new water supply and delivery works will be expensive. But basic to Reclamation's policy—contrary to many other Federal programs—is payback to the U.S. Treasury for construction costs.

Sale of water alone cannot do it. But sale of power, generated by that water, is the traditional congressionally endorsed means of achieving balance.

And that is the why for consideration of Bridge Canyon Dam and construction of Marble Canyon Dam, as proposed to the Congress.

These dams are cash registers. They will ring up sales of electric power produced by Colorado River water.

Is hydroelectric power obsolete? Can nuclear or coal-fired energy spin the generators more cheaply? These questions represent confused concepts. Hydropower is unique in that it is the only power system which can be started and stopped at the flick of a switch. It can supply power intantly on demand. This is peaking power champing at the bit and ready for use at those times of day when the demand is heavy. Integration of Federal hydropower and steam-generation plants of others has been the practical solution for many years. It will continue to be.

It has been charged that "these new dams would 'flood out' the river's canyon in Grand Canyon National Park." Any such charge has no basis in truth. First, only one of these structures, Bridge Canyon Dam, will impinge in any way on Grand Canyon National Park. The other structure, Marble Canyon Dam, would be many miles beyond the upstream boundary of the park. Second, the lake formed by Bridge Canyon Dam would back only 13 miles along the Colorado where the river is the park boundary. At the boundary, the canyon is 2,100 feet deep. The lake water would add only 90 feet to the present river level. At 13 miles upstream along the boundary, the added water depth would be zero. The remaining 92 river-miles within Grand Canyon National Park would remain untouched.

A blue lake above Bridge Canyon Dam, deep within the inner gorge, would make this spectacular canyon easy of access by boat for millions. Easy of access for the millions of Americans who love to boat, fish, and swim, and water ski, or just laze in the sun, in God's country. For the millions of Americans who would see, for the first time, a new part of their heritage of natural beauty.

There is a natural order in our universe. God created both man and nature. And man serves God. But nature serves man.

Man cannot improve upon nature. But, as he has since before dawn of history, man must continue to adapt nature to his needs. Still, that process of adapting must preserve—inbalance—the whole natural heritage that is his.

The Colorado River and its basin are a great and abundant treasure house of natural resources and natural wonders.

Let us husband the one wisely. Let us enjoy the other fully.

I do not question the beautiful choice of words contained in this sirupy sales pitch, but that is not the issue at hand.

In his letter to me enclosing the booklet, Reclamation Commissioner "Hominy" Dominy stated that:

> More than a million dodgers are being distributed advertising its availability. We hope it will achieve nationwde attenton and thereby achieve a greater national understanding of the reclamation program which is so important to the future of the West and of the Nation.

Use of funds appropriated by the Congress to prepare—including the taking of pictures by the Reclamation Commissioner—produce, promote, and distribute this booklet seems to me to be a clear violation of section 1913 of title 18 of the United States Code which states:

§ 1913. Lobbying with appropriated moneys

No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment. June 25, 1948, c. 645, 62 Stat. 792.

Mr. Speaker, the language of this section appears abundantly clear. Accordingly, I have written to the Comptroller General requesting that he determine whether appropriated funds were utilized in the preparation, production, promotion, and/or distribution of this propaganda and whether such expenditures are allowable. The text of my letter to the Comptroller General follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1965.

Hon. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: Enclosed is a copy of a booklet I received recently from the Department of the Interior entitled "Lake Powell: Jewel of the Colorado." I did not solicit this booklet. The covering letter signed by Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of Reclamation, states that "more than a million dodgers" have been distributed advertising the booklet.

Pages 27 and 28 of the booklet are obviously blatent lobbying attempts by the Bureau of Reclamation to try to get public and in turn congressional support for legislation presently pending in the Congress to authorize construction of the proposed Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams by the Bureau of Reclamation. Neither dam has been approved by the Congress. In fact, the Bureau of the Budget recently advised the Department of the Interior that authorization for Bridge Canyon Dam—which would flood part of the Grand Canyon National Park—would not be sought by the administration at this time.

If section 1913 of title 18 of the United States Code, which prohibits use of appropriated funds for lobbying, has any meaning at all, it would seem to me that it is applicable to the booklet in question. The fact that the Interior Department has sent over a million dodgers on this booklet would seem to indicate that the booklet does not fall within the exemption of that section applicable to communications with Members of Congress on request for legislation.

I respectfully request your opinion as to whether money appropriated by the Congress was used for the costs of preparation—including picture taking and writing—publications, promotion, and/or distribution of this booklet. If such funds were used, your opinion is also requested as to whether these expenditures should be disallowed because they were made unlawfully.

I realize the Department of Justice, with which I am communicating separately, has the responsibility for determining whether a criminal violation of the statute has occurred, so do not concern yourself with that issue. I do assume, however, that you are responsible for disallowing any expenditures which may have violated the provision of title 18, section 1913, of the United States Code.

A reply to my request as expeditiously as possible would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, section 1913 of title 18 of the United States Code carries criminal penalties for its violation. Therefore, I have written to the Attorney General with the request that he determine whether a violation of the statute has occurred. The text of my letter to the Attorney General follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1965.

Hon. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: On May 20 1965, I received an unsolicited letter from the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, enclosing a booklet entitled "Lake Powell—Jewel of the Colorado." Lake Powell was created by the construction of the Glen Canyon Dam, a Bureau of Reclamation project authorized by the Congress.

The final two pages of the booklet (pages 27 and 28) contain a series of positive argumentations obviously designed to evoke public support for Bureau of Reclamation construction of the Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams on the lower Colorado River. The Congress has presently pending before it legislation designed to authorize construction of certain features of the so-called Pacific southwestern water plan, including construction of Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams.

It seems to me that this obvious lobbying attempt by the Bureau of Reclamation to get public and in turn congressional support for this legislation is contrary to the provisions of the prohibition against lobbying with appropriated moneys contained in title 18, United States Code, section 1913.

The proposal to construct Bridge Canyon Dam would form a lake, backing water 13 miles into the Grand Canyon National Park—as is duly noted in the booklet. However, the booklet states, "It has been charged that these new dams would 'flood out' the river's canyon in the Grand Canyon National Park. Any such charge has no basis in truth." A number of highly respected conservation groups, such as the Sierra Clubs, have opposed this proposal on the grounds it would adversely affect the beauty of Grand Canyon. Several Members of Congress have taken a similar position in both the Senate and House of Representatives.

Even the Bureau of the Budget in a letter to the chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, dated May 10, 1965, had sufficient justification to overrule the Bureau of Reclamation on the Bridge Canyon proposal and recommended against construction of Bridge Canyon Dam at this time. The Bureau of the Budget stated, "There is no disagreement that the dam would alter the wilderness character of this part of the river. Deferral of a decision on Bridge Canyon Dam would enable the Federal Government to reevaluate the scenic considerations involved—preferably by a group of outstanding citizens and of the need for additional power, as well as revenues desired for the Lower Colorado River Basin account."

Needless to say, I am alarmed as a Member of Congress to find that taxpayers may be footing the bill for the preparation, production, promotion, and distribution of these booklets and over a million advertisements concerning the booklet designed by the Bureau of Reclamation to lobby directly and indirectly for authorization of a project which is contrary to the position taken by the President and Members of Congress.

I am aware that this problem of using appropriated funds to attempt to influence legislation has arisen before and that 18 U.S.C. 1913 provides criminal penalties. I am also aware that section 1913 contains an exemption when the activity is undertaken at the request of any Member of Congress, but that exemption seems to apply only to communicating with other Members of Congress "through the proper official channels." It seems very unlikely to me that over a million advertisements of the booklet are necessary merely to communicate directly with Members of Congress. It further seems unlikely to me that the method chosen by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior to try to build public support for this legislation constitutes using a proper official channel.

I am fully cognizant of the letter from the Department of Justice to Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, dated May 10, 1962, interpreting this statute with reference to another situation. That letter is contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 6, page 8451. In that instance, the Department of Justice stated, "There is nothing in the legislative history to indicate any intent to prohibit bureau chiefs and department heads from communicating directly to Members of Congress the views of the administration in power concerning proposed legislation. It was also noted in your letter that this authority stems from the constitutional provision that the President "shall from time to time * * * recommend to their [Congress] consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

I can only assume that the opinion of the Department of Justice stated in its above-mentioned letter does not and cannot apply to this action taken by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior since the booklet is clearly intended to influence legislation indirectly through lobbying for public support rather than direct correspondence with Members of Congress. In addition, this power cannot have been derived from the President because the views expressed in the booklet are contrary to those expressed by the President's own Bureau of the Budget.

Therefore, I am herewith referring this matter to the Department of Justice with the request that the Department determine as expeditiously as possible whether violation of 18 U.S.C. 1913 has occurred in the preparation, production, promotion, and distribution of the booklet entitled "Lake Powell—Jewel of the Colorado." You may also wish to advise the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, as to whether subsequent distribution of these booklets through his office constitute violation of the above-mentioned statute.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I believe every Member of Congress, whether he may favor construction of this particular dam or not, should be alarmed by this action taken by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior in an effort to lobby for a proposal before the Congress. Picture if you will the consequences on every Member if bureaucrats are permitted to use the vast funds and publicity resources of the Federal Government with impunity in an attempt to create public support for their legislative proposals, regardless of whether such proposals have the approval of the Chief Executive. Such activities can only lead to a serious erosion of the powers of the Congress. Because of the importance of this issue and its implications on future congressional-executive branch relationships, I will keep the Congress advised of actions taken by the General Accounting Office and the Department of Justice on this matter.

GEMINI SPACE FLIGHT

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], and the distinguished ranking minority member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], in this well-deserved tribute to Astronauts White and McDivitt for their great feat in outer space. They have executed, without mishap, a mission which was modified significantly after the Soviet spacewalk. This very fact is a most welcome proof of the flexibility and inherent capability of our space program.

As a member of the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee which handles the National Aeronautics and Space Administration budget, I naturally took a particularly keen interest in Astronauts White and McDivitt's 4-day, 62-orbit journey aboard Gemini 4. Our American space equipment has been proved and our trained scientists and engineers have more self-confidence. Our extravehicular activity was twice the duration of the Soviet Union. Further, the use of a hand-held thruster allowed Astronaut White to maneuver himself around the outside of the capsule, something not accomplished by the U.S.S.R.

Also, the Gemini 4 capsule was maneuvered by the astronauts in an attempt to approach the burned out booster. Although the distance was not closed as much as planned, this was a demonstration of the technique which will be vital to coupling and assembling spacecraft in the future missions. Finally, as usual, the U.S. Gemini 4 feat outshines the Soviets because of the complete candor and freedom with which it was conducted. The whole world must surely note this striking difference in our societies. Hundreds of millions of people throughout the world could hear Astronauts White and McDivitt via instant radio transmissions from outer space, while millions more saw the Cape Kennedy liftoff via the Earlybird satellite television transmission.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Astronauts White and McDivitt, and all of NASA's engineers, scientists, and technicians who made this Gemini 4 shot such a masterful and complete success. I also, under unanimous consent, include with my remarks an editorial from the Springfield, Mass., Sunday Republican of June 6 entitled "Gemini Space Flight":

GEMINI SPACE FLIGHT

> The most daring exploit in the Gemini space flight was accomplished when Astronaut Edward H. White, declaring, "This is fun," walked alone by himself for 20 minutes, climbed all over the space capsule, and was reluctant to return to it. He had been scheduled for only 12 minutes alone in outer space.
>
> The Russian astronaut, Alexei Leonov, stayed in outer space only 10 minutes and lacked any means of self-propulsion such as White had.
>
> If all continues to go as well as it has thus far, the 4-day Gemini space flight, the longest in history, will be successfully completed tomorrow afternoon.
>
> It will be the result of the infinite pains which have been taken in preparing for the flight. It will also be the result of the skill and composure of the two astronauts, White and James McDivitt.

TIME FOR PAY INCREASES AND DEPENDENTS' ALLOWANCES FOR MEMBERS OF OUR MILITARY SERVICES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, I introduced a military pay bill aimed primarily at making it financially possible for the family man to pursue a career in our armed services.

It incorporates a new concept—an allowance on account of dependents. Every officer and enlisted person up to and including the rank of colonel or its equivalent would be paid an allowance of $35 per month for each dependent up to three, and $15 per month for each dependent in excess of three. The remainder of my bill incorporates the provisions of H.R. 5725, the pay bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. L. MENDEL RIVERS], chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Speaker, we have too long indulged in the fiction that a member of our armed services can support his family on a poverty pay scale, which makes no allowance for dependents other than for housing. Even if we raised the pay scale as proposed in my bill it will still be too low for the family with dependents unless the additional dependents' allowance is provided.

No private employer in this Nation, however small he may be, would expect any man to work for $78 a month plus board and barracks for the first 4 months, and then at $83 a month for the following 20 months.

No private employer in this Nation, however small he may be, would expect a man to provide for a family of four on a monthly salary of $167.10. But for some strange reason the greatest employer of them all, the Federal Government, expects him to do so. Consequently, the turnover among military personnel has been such as to constitute a serious item of cost in maintaining our Armed Forces. For example, let us consider the following statistical facts of the cost of turnover in the Army:

The record with regard to draftees during fiscal year 1963-64 indicates a staggering 58.2 percent turnover per year; to maintain an average draftee strength of 187,202, it was necessary to replace 210,791 losses of inductees with 225,000 gains or an average yearly turnover of 108,967.

The Regular Army, as distinguished from the draftees, has a 50.1 overall reenlistment rate. Only 12.9 percent of the inductees, 22.5 percent of the first term enlistees, and 84.5 percent of the career men reenlist.

The Department of the Army estimates that, based on actual experience through March 1965, and programed change thereafter, there will be a 14.4 percent officer personnel turnover of 16,000 out of 111,000 officers. There will also be a 25.6 percent enlisted personnel turnover based on losses (excluding reenlistments) of 231,100 and gains—excluding reenlistments—of 204,200.

Based on fiscal year 1964 data, the total costs of bringing an enlisted man through basic combat training and a common specialist skill during the first 21 to 25 weeks of his service will average $3,269. This is the minimum training required for a first duty assignment in an operational unit.

If the man is given basic combat training in a technical specialty, the total costs of his first 21 to 31 weeks in the Army, will average $5,486.

The weighted average cost of training of the two figures above is $3,934.

If the average cost of training for the first 27 to 31 weeks of enlisted training, that is $3,934 per man, is taken as the cost of turnover, the annual cost of Army enlisted personnel turnover exceeds $800 million per year. Adding the cost of turnover of officer personnel, total Army personnel turnover costs per year will probably exceed $1 billion.

Moreover, if the pay and allowances are added to the cost of training for a 2-year period of service as a cost of turnover, the cost in the Army alone becomes astronomical—possibly several billions per year.

While I do not have comparable figures for the Navy and Air Force the per man cost of turnover must necessarily be as high or higher due to the highly technical nature of the training required in those services.

It is probable that we do not save any money at all through our present penurious military pay scale. On the contrary, it appears that creating this pocket of poverty creates an additional financial burden for the Federal Government.

It is indeed a sad commentary that the U.S. Government has through the low pay scales for members of its armed services created a pocket of poverty for more than 3 million military dependents.

I have received letters from military dependent wives of personnel stationed in Hawaii telling of their necessitous circumstances; the percentage of military wives who work, often at menial jobs, to support their families is extremely high. Further, the percentage of "moonlighters" among members of the armed services is high, both in Washington and in Hawaii.

The allowance for dependents which I propose is extremely modest; it costs much more than $35 today to feed and clothe each dependent. However, I believe it is a step toward alleviating the plight of the family man in uniform.

The total cost of my proposed program is estimated at $1.25 to $1.50 billion per year.

While it is important that our military budget be reduced to the absolute minimum to provide other needed services, and to liquidate our national debt, it is just as important that we provide adequately for those upon whom we depend to protect our very way of life in times of war and other emergencies.

Moreover, there is serious doubt that our niggardly attitude toward military pay actually saves money. Studies have shown that in reality it costs even more than if we were to adopt the principle that a man is worthy of his hire, and should be paid living wages and allowances.

Certainly, as shown by the figures I have quoted we are losing money on the high rate of military turnover. Of greater concern to us, however, is the fact that we are losing in the efficiency and morale of the people we depend upon to keep our Nation secure in this troubled world.

As the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, L. MENDEL RIVERS, stated in a speech to this body on January 11 of this year:

> We may develop the most exotic weapons systems in the world; we may build the finest missiles; we may construct fantastic underwater missile launchers; we may lead the world in equipment, but if we do not have men and women provided with a standard of living equivalent to the standard of living they are defending, then one of these days we will awaken to the sad realization that our Armed Forces are sadly deficient in two indispensable ingredients—leadership and motivation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we take this additional step toward stamping out poverty by making adequate provision for the pay and allowances of our military personnel.

A BILL TO INCREASE COVERAGE OF MOVING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement by John W. Macy, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to provide additional reimbursement of expenses incurred by Federal workers when they are called upon to move to new places of employment. The bill is based upon recommendations of the Civil Service

Commission. Following is a statement provided to me by Mr. John M. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, explaining the purpose and justification of the legislation:

Statement of Purpose and Justification of a Draft Bill To Amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as Amended, To Provide for Reimbursement of Certain Moving Expenses of Employees and To Authorize Payment of Expenses for Storage of Household Goods and Personal Effects Within the Continental United States

PURPOSE

To reduce financial losses incurred by employees when they are transferred in the interest of the Government.

JUSTIFICATION

When a Federal agency has decided that it is necessary or desirable to transfer an employee to another official station, the agency should pay the expenses of the move. The employee should not have to contribute, sometimes substantially, to cover the cost of a move primarily for the benefit of the Government.

Agencies move employees for two basic reasons. On the one hand changes in the amount of work, or shifts in program emphasis or organizational structure may require the transfer of people and functions. The current Department of Defense program for closing unnecessary installations is one case in point. Automation of processes in such agencies as the Internal Revenue Service is another, and there are many more. On the other hand, periodic moves of personnel are a requirement of certain kinds of occupations and agency career programs. Regular changes of duty stations are a feature of particular occupations such as bank examining, in which it is important to maintain objectivity. Certain career systems such as that of the Forest Service are built around progressive shifts of personnel to locations which have positions of greater responsibility.

Under the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, the Government pays for some of the basic costs of moving its employees, i.e., per diem for the employee and transportation of the employee, his family, and his household goods. There is ample evidence to indicate that for most employees these payments fall substantially short of covering all the necessary and reasonable expenses related to moving. Understandably, this leads to reluctance to move. When employees are unable or unwilling to transfer, Government's efficiency drops and its costs go up. Besides losing the services of experienced employees, agencies may have to promote less well-qualified people or spend extra time and money to find, hire, and train new people to do the work. Agencies say that the certain prospect of financial losses which the employee can ill afford frequently tips the scale against the experienced employee's making the move his agency needs to have him make.

At the same time, in large scale shifts of personnel such as may occur under the current program of the Department of Defense to close installations, employees may have to make geographical moves or face protracted unemployment. This would be particularly likely for employees with substantial service who have skills which may not be readily marketable in the community where they have worked. For these employees, the difficulties of breaking long-established ties, selling their homes, and so on, would be compounded by the necessity to pay entirely of their own resources the many expenses typically incurred in moving that are not reimbursable under current laws. Expenses that are necessary and reasonable for employees to incur should be borne largely by management when it is in management's interest that the moves take place.

Item coverage

Studies have consistently shown that most Federal employees lose money when they move. A Commission survey of more than 5,000 employees who moved in fiscal 1962 showed for the more than 80 percent of the respondents who reported net losses an average loss of $558 on the items covered in the survey. The object of this bill is to eliminate or reduce such losses for the following types of expenses commonly encountered by employees when they move:

1. Transportation of household goods: The current reimbursable weight limit on the shipment of household goods is 7,000 pounds. About one family in five ships goods in excess of this limit and others dispose of goods they would like to keep in order to come within the limit. The bill would raise the maximum weight limit for which employees could be reimbursed to 11,000 pounds.

This is the same limit in use by the military. Most employees would ship goods well within this limit. The bill also provides a technical change to authorize the use of Government bills of lading instead of the commuted rates system when employees are transferred between posts of duty in the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia. Prior to 1946, the Government arranged to ship household goods on Government bills of lading. This involved the Government in many administrative operations, such as negotiating and awarding contracts to carriers for transportation and accessorial services, inspecting the packing and crating operations, paying bills, auditing payments, and settling loss and damage claims. The commuted rates system was authorized in section 1(b) of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to simplify the administrative problem. Under this system, the employees make their own arrangements with carriers, pay for the transportation and then are reimbursed by the Government according to a scale of commuted rates. Although this system is satisfactory for many types of shipments, occasions arise when very substantial savings can be accomplished through use of the Government bill of lading system. In these instances, Government agencies should have discretionary authority to take advantage of the savings by using Government bills of lading. The system would continue to be subject to regulations of the President as at present.

2. Family travel expenses: The Government does not currently reimburse employees for family travel (other than transportation) from the old official station to the new or for househunting trips to the new station to locate permanent quarters. These expenses are commonly encountered in moving. The bill would permit per diem in lieu of subsistence for family travel to the new station. It would permit per diem and transportation for the employee and his spouse for round trip travel to find permanent quarters at the new official station, as long as the trip was within the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia. Per diem rates for family members would be set within the maximum rates prescribed in or pursuant to section 3 of the Travel Expense Act, as amended, and the number and length of trips to locate permanent quarters would be prescribed by regulation.

3. Subsistence in temporary quarters: Temporary quarters for the employee or the employee and his family are a frequent item of necessary expense in employee moves. Under this bill employees and their immediate families who had this kind of expense would in most cases be permitted up to 30 days subsistence in temporary quarters (employees moving to or from certain enumerated areas could have up to 60 days when shipping time exceeds 30 days. Generally employees would not need to use the full period allowed).

A flat subsistence allowance would not be paid. Reimbursement would be made only for actual subsistence expenses incurred, based on acceptable evidence, and at rates well within the limits set by reference to the maximum per diem rates prescribed in or pursuant to section 3 of the Travel Expense Act, as amended. Appropriate fractional per diem rates could be set for the spouse and other members of the immediate family, and rates diminishing over time could be established to encourage moves to permanent quarters. Reimbursement for subsistence would be allowed only for temporary quarters in the United States, the District of Columbia, the territories and possessions, Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone.

4. Real estate transactions: The expenses of selling the home and buying another were the sources of the heaviest losses reported in the Commission's survey of Federal employees. Costs of selling the old home averaged $677 and closing costs paid by the employee on new homes averaged $297.

The bill would permit reimbursement for such costs on an actual expense basis, including settlement of unexpired leases for employees moving from rented quarters. Reimbursement would be provided only for expenses required to be paid by the employee. Appropriate rates of reimbursement would be set by regulation to reflect standard or average charges for the locality where the expense is incurred. Allowable expenses could vary in individual cases and from place to place, but might include such items as State and local transfer taxes, necessary legal fees and broker's commissions, documentary stamps, settlement costs, title search, recording fees, and the like.

5. Miscellaneous expenses: Although the major items of moving expense are identified with the areas mentioned above there are numerous contingencies and smaller items of expense which are individually not burdensome, but when taken together come to sizable amounts. Such items as losses on prepaid fees, auto registration, use taxes, connecting appliances and many others fall in this category. They are legitimate moving costs which merit reimbursement but they would be administratively burdensome to handle on an actual expense basis. Therefore, the bill proposes a flat allowance related to the principal determinants of the size of employee moving expenses, that is, salary level and family status. Employee losses on moves increase with grade level and are higher for employees with dependents than for employees without dependents. Single movers would receive the equivalent of 1 week's basic compensation and employees with an immediate family the equivalent of 2 week's basic compensation to cover these other costs of moving. A showing of actual expense would not be required.

6. Storage of goods: Storage expenses for household goods of employees moving to isolated locations in the continental United States (excluding Alaska) where there are no residence quarters could be paid for up to 3 years or goods would be stored in Government-owned facilities. In contrast to other provisions of the bill, this proposed authority for reimbursement for extended storage of household goods would not be broadly applicable to employee moves. It is a special provision designed to meet the unique situation of agencies which must assign employees for permanent duty at places where housing is not available.

The Army and the Air Force, for example, are engaged in activating missile sites at remote, sparsely populated locations. The relatively short duration of the projects to activate these sites (8 to 36 months) makes it difficult to interest builders in putting up housing. Consequently, Federal employees assigned to such locations must live in contractor-furnished trailers or similar makeshift quarters where they cannot use their household goods. The costs of storing household goods for extended periods makes employees reluctant to accept such assignments and hampers recruitment. Thus the proposed authority is intended to alleviate this situation where there are no residence quarters at the site or within reasonable commuting distance.

Employee coverage

The proposed legislation would not cover employees who are reimbursed for moving expenses under other statutes; e.g., Foreign Service personnel and other personnel who are reimbursed for moving under the terms of the Foreign Service Act. It would not apply to intermittently employed experts and consultants on per diem pay, employees transferring in their own interest, and all other persons not entitled to Government-paid travel. It would, however, apply to former employees who had been separated from the service in a reduction-in-force or a transfer of function and who could have been transferred at Government expense except for the fact that placement was not made prior to their separation. Persons in this situation could benefit from this bill if they obtained a nontemporary appointment to a Federal position within 6 months of the time they were separated.

Geographical coverage

The increased weight limit, per diem for family travel en route to the new official station, and the allowance for miscellaneous expenses would apply in the United States and overseas. The provision for storage of household goods would apply only to employees in the continental United States, excluding Alaska. (Employees in Alaska are covered as to storage of household goods by Public Law 88-266 of Feb. 5, 1964.) The provision for "househunting" per diem would apply within the continental United States excluding Alaska.

The provision for reimbursement for subsistence expense in temporary quarters would apply only to employees moving to official stations within the United States (including the District of Columbia) its territories and possessions, Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone. (Reimbursement for temporary quarters overseas is already provided by the Overseas Differentials and Allowances Act.) The provisions for reimbursement of real estate expenses would apply only in the same area as covered for subsistence in temporary quarters.

What is done for others?

There are substantial precedents for the types of reimbursement proposed in this bill. The Government already provides a special relocation allowance, equal to the basic monthly allowance for quarters, for a member of the uniformed services whose dependents move when he has a permanent change of station. (Career Incentive Act of 1955, Public Law 20, 84th Cong.)

The Government already provides for officers and employees transferring under the Foreign Service Act of 1946 allowances and reimbursement covering many expenses of the kinds proposed to be covered under this bill (60 Stat. 1025, 1026, and 1027). Legislation passed in the 86th Congress provides other civilian employees assigned to foreign areas with special transfer allowances for extraordinary, necessary, and reasonable expenses, not otherwise compensated for (Public Law 86-707).

Business is far more generous in reimbursing its employees for company moves than is the Government in dealing with its civilian employees.

A 1964 study of industry practice[1] confirms earlier studies by the National Industrial Conference Board and others that the great majority of businesses having specific policies on transfer expenses (generally the larger firms) do everything possible, within reason, to ease the burden on employees who are asked to move. Practically all underwrite temporary living expenses and moving and storage costs. In addition, other allowances or combinations are granted, especially in the case of management and professional employees who frequently are guaranteed against real estate losses and are afforded various types of assistance in disposing of homes and in meeting other expenses.

Administration of the proposed legislation

Regulations for administration of the proposed legislation would be issued for the President by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, who prescribes other regulations under the Administrative Expenses Act. For interagency moves, the head of the agency to which the move is made would determine whether a transfer is in the Government's interest. However, when an interagency move results from a reduction-in-force or transfer of function the transfer would be presumed in the Government's interest unless there was a specific determination otherwise and the agency losing the employee would be able to share the cost of the move. Heads of executive departments and agencies using the extended storage authority would issue implementing regulations.

Cost

Although a number of variables are involved which preclude precise cost estimates at this time the annual cost to the Government is estimated at $22 million. Approximately 25 percent of this cost would be for transportation, travel, and subsistence expenses, approximately 33 percent for real estate expenses, and the remaining 42 percent for the miscellaneous expense allowance.

"FRISCO" PRESIDENT ADDRESSES DRURY COLLEGE GRADUATING CLASS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the president of the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway, Mr. L. W. Menk, spoke before the 1965 graduating class of Drury College in Springfield, Mo., on May 30, 1965. An outstanding example, himself, of the results of our competitive and free-enterprise system, Mr. Menk gave a challenging message to those young men and women on whom the responsibility of leadership will soon fall. The essence of his remarks was that "all you young people need to do is to go out into the world with sincerity and honesty of purpose, using the best intelligence you have, and not be afraid to work."

I commend his remarks to my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY L. W. MENK, PRESIDENT, ST. LOUIS-SAN FRANCISCO RAILWAY, BEFORE THE 1965 GRADUATING CLASS, DRURY COLLEGE, SPRINGFIELD, MO., MAY 30, 1965

Dr. Brandenburg, members of the trustees, faculty and staff, distinguished guests, and graduates, it is with a deep sense of humility that I receive this honorary degree from Drury College, and certainly this is a day I will always cherish. For me it is an honor in itself to be associated with an institution which has served so many young Americans so well for more than 90 years.

This is a time of mixed emotions for many here today. There is pride in accomplishment. There is joy in the attainment of a desired goal. There is a tinge of sadness in leaving faculty and friends. There is eagerness to start one's lifework. There is confidence, yet concern, about the future.

Naturally, I cannot experience all of these emotions personally, but I can and do feel privileged in sharing this proud hour with you and in extending my warmest congratulations on your academic accomplishments.

And in sharing your finest hour—for a few moments I would like also to share with you some of my thoughts and concerns about the lives you are about to begin. The word "commencement" means a beginning. It marks for you a transition between the things you call the past and the future. If we want a good life, if we want to lay a few stepping stones for future generations, we must look to the future. Charles Kettering, the noted inventor, has said: "We must look where we are going and not where we've been. We must use the past as a guidepost, not as a hitching post."

In many ways, our times are like the time Charles Dickens described at the beginning of his book, "The Tale of Two Cities"—"It is the best of times, it is the worst of times." It is the worst of times because the challenges and the perils to our way of life are probably as serious as they have ever been. But it is the best of times because we have the opportunity to strengthen freedom by our responsible actions and ideas.

The opportunities for many of you lie in the fountainhead of our Nation's growth—business. Many of you will be seeking your vocation in the business world, and I know of no other area in the field of human endeavor where the opportunities, the personal rewards and satisfaction, and the chance to strike a blow for freedom and for mankind are so numerous. As Richard Eells writes in his book "The Meaning of Modern Business"—"American management generally has a deep sense of social responsibility. To a degree, it is indoctrinated with the Judeo-Christian ideals of our civilization, with its sense of community among all men of good will and its respect for the dignity of man."

In your enthusiasm for success, give first call to the service you can render—to the contributions you can make—remembering that you cannot change the world * * * but you can help others change their attitude toward the world.

The challenge to help others change their attitude toward the world can be successfully met only by the power of truth. False and erroneous attitudes must be changed, and only truth can overcome falsehood and error. The assiduous pursuit of truth does not and should not end with formal schooling. Rather, the desire for it must be kept burning throughout your entire life—truth in family matters, truth in business matters, truth in money or financial matters.

One of the often misquoted passages of the Bible is that quote taken out of context—"Money is the root of all evil." St. Timothy said in the Bible—"For the love of money is the root of all evil." There's quite a difference. Coveting money as an end in itself is evil and foolish. It's the use to which money is put to make the world a better, more meaningful, more comfortable place to live in that counts. But while it is the natural desire of each of us to improve our personal standard of living, it is equally important to do what we can to give of ourselves in improving the lot of our fellow man.

---

[1] American Management Association Research Study 67, "Reimbursing Personnel for Transfer and Relocation Costs."

Business—in our democratic system—is a Christian institution. Nobody else in the world enjoys a higher degree of individual freedom than do we. Many substitutes for our American free enterprise system have been suggested, but none has proved itself capable of producing the standards of living comparable to ours. It has permitted men and business institutions to work out things for themselves—in their own way—and the result has been production of more and better things for everyone.

The minority leader of the Senate—Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois—said recently that the trend that disturbs him and many others as well—is, and I quote, "The deeper and deeper intrusion of Federal power into the affairs of the people." Senator DIRKSEN called it a step-by-step process, and added, "The little erosions—that's the way freedom is lost."

The great thing about our free enterprise system is that—when it has been left alone to function honestly and independently—it has created the economic progress that has built our cities, our highways, our schools and colleges, and our railroads.

Wonderful opportunities suggest themselves—in any career you choose—because in your generation we will move into one of the greatest periods of development in the history of this country—a period of rapid evolution in the whole technical, industrial, and social structure of the world. With your training you should be among those who will stand out and have responsible positions. Along with those positions will come trials and tribulations that go with responsibility. But I sincerely believe that all you young people need to do is to go out into the world with sincerity and honesty of purpose, using the best intelligence you have, and not be afraid to work. Keeping in mind the words of Edward Everett Hale—"I am only one man but I am one man; I can't do everything but I can do something; what I can do, I ought to do; and what I ought to do, by the grace of God I will do."

Life is really interesting—when you know something is ahead. Set reasonable goals for yourselves—decide where you want to be 1 or 2 years from now and what you have to learn and do to get there. But in setting your goal—set one that will strengthen your potential and open up all the stops on your ability, your energy, and your enthusiasm. Go out with the idea that you want to do something—to reach some goal—and you will get it done, remembering—that the only difference between those who do and those who don't is that the ones who do, try. But in trying let's heed the admonishment of Paul the Apostle to "test all things; hold fast that which is good."

Nothing starts to grow until we plant the seeds. So we must lay a fairly long-range plan and work to it. Work and continue to strive for what you hope to attain—and be patient.

Modern business and industry depend to a large degree on effective teamwork. Most achievements in our technology and corporate or institutional progress stem from this team concept—yet there is a serious danger in such a concept. The word for it is conformity. Wherever you go you will be working as part of the team in whatever institution you may serve—so know its rules and objectives—and contribute to it—not as a stick-in-the-mud conformist, but as an individual, a unique person.

The late President Kennedy once said that "conformity is the jailer of freedom and the enemy of growth." Too often people sacrifice their personal goals and high ideals to become strict conformists—but real personal satisfaction, achievement, and pride never come to those who forsake the difficult course—who do not venture into the uncharted ground, who are merely content to follow the crowd.

It was Theodore Roosevelt that said: "Far better it is to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs—even though checkered by failure—than to rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much, because they live in the great twilight that knows not victory nor defeat."

Every time you face a problem and master it, no matter how small or large the problem, nor how often you have failed, you will acquire new strength and new wisdom. Every time you make a choice and act on it, boldly and decisively, you are girding yourself anew with courage.

Stay out of ruts. Sometimes it is difficult to keep informed and up to date on new developments and issues, while at the same time you put forth your good efforts to earn a living. But I know you will achieve much happiness by working constantly to enlarge your knowledge and taking a lively, personal interest in those affairs which affect your community and participating in them.

How keenly—how very much—progress depends upon informed people who are alert to opportunity; who stand up and be counted; who have the courage of their convictions.

Remember—that almost every generation of Americans has faced a world of tension and crises as it prepared to leave the college campus. In 1917 our college graduates left the campus to face World War I. Twelve years later our graduates faced the worst depression in history. And 12 years after that my contemporaries finished their education and entered World War II.

You are now about to begin the process of learning how to make a major contribution to our society.

I believe that in this society opportunities are boundless. It may be true that there are not the same opportunities for the same things that there were a few generations ago, but there are thousands of new fields now being explored and thousands more will be. We are not at the end of our progress, but at the beginning. I think each of us here today could jot down the most fantastic prediction we could make with respect to the future of this country of ours, and we will fall short. I am an optimist, but a realist as well, and I believe there never were such opportunities for young men and young women of ability as there are today.

Time will be on your side, and everyone has precisely the same amount of time—24 hours a day. So much, then, depends on your desire—your will—to be a "doer," to accomplish things meaningful.

There is the old story about the fellow who was on his way to church when he passed a mudhole and heard a poor frog croaking for help. Said the frog, "I have been down here for 3 days. I can't get out and I'm going to die if I don't get help."

The churchgoer was sympathetic and promised that when church was over he would come back and help the frog out.

After church he changed his clothes and came back to the mudhole and he saw the frog hopping along the road. "Aren't you," he said, "the frog that was down in the mudhole?"

"Yes," said the frog, "but I got out by myself." The man said, "I thought you couldn't get out." "Well," said the frog, "I didn't think I could either but after you left a snake came down after me."

So besides having the time and having the opportunity—sometimes we need incentive to do things.

You have already shown that you are capable of learning. You will have to keep on learning by experience and hard work. Of course, this will be difficult.

There are always those who lose heart and permit fear and escape to rule their existence. But there are many more whose concern for human dignity and human excellence, as reflected in their own spirit and their own personal performance, carry them on to rewarding and successful lives. Faith in God, America, faith in the future, and faith in human nature all will widen and deepen your life's purpose.

Polonius, in Shakespeare's "Hamlet," told us how to help accomplish our task in life when he said: "This above all: to thine own self be true; and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man."

You live in the only form of society which places its highest value on the opportunity of the individual to make the most of himself. Grasp that opportunity. Live that you make a full contribution to your own realization and development, as well as to the society which makes all this possible. And in all things, "to thine own self be true."

Good luck to each of you and Godspeed.

POLISH PEASANT PARTY

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective pillars of resistance against communism, wherever that false ideology is imposed on people, is the rigid independence and spirit of the farm populations, or, as they are more historically known in Europe, the peasants. This past weekend, the Polish Peasant Party in Exile commemorated the 70th anniversary of its creation and its effective service to the cause of freedom and economic advancement of the Polish people.

In this year's resolution the leaders of the Polish Peasant Party, speaking from a free world forum on behalf of their oppressed brethren, issued a most compelling statement. I include as part of my remarks excerpts from this statement which I feel are of special significance:

PROCLAMATION OF THE POLISH PEASANT PARTY ON THE PEASANT DAY OF THE YEAR 1965

In this year's Peasant Day, while tendering our heartfelt greetings to our fellow members in Poland and to those dispersed in the free world, to the peasants, workers and to the working intelligentsia, to the Polish nation as a whole on the 70th anniversary of the creation of our party celebrated this year, we wish to assure you, that today and in the future, as it was in the past, our efforts within the framework of the Polish Peasant Party will unshakenly aim at fighting and winning a free, independent, democratic and socially just Poland.

The peasants with the support of the church constitute to the present day a pillar of the passive but conscious resistance to those who surrendered our country to the colonial dependence from Moscow.

The peasants and workers fight against the Communists and have become the bitterest opposition to the ruling dictatorial Communist system of the Moscow imperialism of the colonial exploitation.

Just as the Bolsheviks' defeat near Warsaw in the year 1920 was caused by the national-conscious peasants and workers and their collaboration with the whole Polish nation, we may be certain of a complete final victory over the tyranny, foreign violence, exploitation and social injustice, so inhumanly applied in Poland by the Communist regime. In pursuit of this aim one needs a broad collaboration and a steady effort of all political and social factions.

Let's bear it in mind that the Polish nation is waiting for our contribution, for the contribution of our generation into a build-up of the foundations for a new edifice of the Polish state:

A state which will become a homeland of all the Poles.

A state in which hatred, disdain, and injustice will be replaced by a just social order.

A state in which only our own and all citizens will decide upon their own and the country's fate.

A state which will honor the Polish tradition, the Polish cultural achievements, religious freedom, right of property, the right of expression of one's thoughts.

A state in which will rule harmony and legal order.

A state honoring all laws.

The work to reach this goal will be accompanied by the deception and many disappointments. The weaklings will fall off.

Peasants and workers in Poland constitute a power, which nothing can withstand if it is well directed.

Victory lies in the hands of those who do not become discouraged with the adversities.

No system lasted forever. None of them escaped the historical justice. The experience of the Communist systems will also end and maybe sooner than the various pessimists think. Today, it is already visible a distinct breakup of the Communist systems, caused by the errors and contradictions of their doctrines and by the abuses of power. This breakup is visible not only in the economical field, but also in the social and political domain.

Even the partners of the Communist bloc did notice it that the communism is subordinating their respective nations' interests and states to the imperialism of the Soviet Russia and sells them out in the servitude of Moscow.

Twenty years of the occupation of Poland and the countries of the east central Europe by the Soviet Russia and her policy of oppression and exploitation did convince them that the Communist ideas serve Russia to spread her world aggression through the medium of the international character of the Communist doctrine, which Russia has sponsored and has been shrewdly spreading it in every country naming herself a sole exponent and guardian of the purity of the Communist ideas.

We here in the free world do not need Moscow's and Gomulka's protection. We need an independent Poland, a Poland which will take under her care all of her children. We need a free Poland just for all her citizens regardless of social origin, political or religious convictions.

Such a Poland will not be built by Mr. Gomulka. Mr. Gomulka is building Poland for the ruling elite, for a "new class" of the Communist rulers, living in the affluence and harboring only disdain for the wornout but hard-laboring masses of the common people. He stressed it in his speech announcing this year's elections to the "Sejm" and National Councils. In his speech he refused even a passive electoral right to the believing Catholics. It means, he denies this right nearly to the whole nation. Only and exclusively a handful of opportunists engaged in the "building of socialism" in Poland will have their right to be elected. They will enjoy the right of making up resolutions of orders in accordance with the needs and aims of Soviet Russia and in accordance with the security of the authority of the ruling elite.

This handful of the godless people decides if the children will get religious instructions, how many children are to be born in Poland, when and which convents and churches are to be robbed and closed.

This handful will decide how the working people are to be materially exploited, whose property is to be taken away from him, when a peasant is to be deprived of his land and the best way to subordinate and subjugate him.

This year's Communist elections in Poland, as the previous ones, we regard as a great trickery. There is no freedom where a citizen is ordered and forced to vote for the candidates of a single Communist bloc list.

There is no freedom in Poland because the nation has no right to present the candidates whom it trusts. We condemn this kind of electoral comedy in Poland and are against such elections. Whatever result of such kind of elections will be announced by the Communist regime in Poland we shall regard it as a result of rape committed on the Polish nation. The Polish nation knows best how it should estimate such elections and what its attitude toward these elections should be.

Mr. Speaker, each year in its proclamation on behalf of the peasants of Poland, the Polish Peasant Party voices the demands of the silenced citizens of Poland. This year in the proclamation they asked for the following:

1. The withdrawal from the Polish soil of the Soviet armed forces and Soviet functionaries.

2. The release of all political prisoners in Poland and the repatriation of all Poles still in captivity in the Soviet Union.

3. To submit for the deliberation of the United Nations Organization the matter of freedom for Poland and for the other enslaved nations from the central European countries.

4. We demand in accordance with the principle of the self-determination of Nations that free elections in Poland must be conducted under the international control.

5. Recognition by the United States of America and Great Britain of the frontier of Oder and Nysa in the west of Poland.

6. Discontinuance of the persecution of the church, abolishment of the censorship, and the reestablishment in Poland of the freedom of speech, rights of congregation and creation of the independent political parties, independent social, youth and cultural organizations and full territorial self-government.

7. Reestablishment of a governmental system based upon the liberty, democracy, social justice, respect of the laws of the citizens and of the nation.

8. Liquidation of the Soviet colonialism in the countries of the central, eastern Europe and the unification of the whole Europe, in liberty as a factor of the lasting peace in Europe and in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I now add as part of my remarks resolutions which were approved at the annual meeting of the Polish Peasant Party, held Sunday, June 6, in Chicago, Ill.:

Resolutions Adopted at the Celebration of the Polish Peasant Day in Chicago on June 6, 1965

Assembled at the celebration of the Polish Peasant Day, held in Chicago on June 6, 1965, we—

1. Pay our tribute to the Polish nation, which has been living in the Communist slavery for 20 years, and declare our solidarity in its fight for survival, for its culture and its independence;

2. Pay our tribute to the Polish peasants for their defending of their native land and the Catholic faith, for their adherence to the principles of freedom, independence, democracy and social justice;

3. Send our great respects and express our gratitude to His Eminence Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, the Primate of Poland, to the Polish Episcopate and clergy for their defense of faith, moral rights of the nation and for their devotion to the Polish people;

4. Join the entire Polish nation in its preparations to celebration of the Millenium of Christianity of Poland in 1966, the foundatin of our culture and our adherence to the West;

5. Pay our great tribute to the memory of the great pioneers and leaders of the Peasant movement in connection with the 70th anniversary of the establishment of the Polish Peasant Party, and promise to continue under the leadership of the President Stanislaw Mikolajczyk our work for the achievement of freedom and independence of Poland, democracy, and social justice;

6. Protest against the depriving Poland of independence and the Polish nation of freedom by the Soviet Union, against the persecution of the church and religion, against the persecution of the Polish writer, against the falsification of the will of the nation in the so-called "elections", against the inhuman exploitation of the Polish peasants, workers, artisans and the intelligentia;

7. Condemn the Warsaw agents of Moscow for their betraying of the most essential interests of the Polish nation, for their dissipation of the hard-earned money of the Polish people in the interest of the Soviet Union and the Soviet world aggression;

8. Condemn them for their helping out Moscow in biological destruction of the Polish nation through demoralization of the Polish youth and through their depopulation policy;

9. Condemn them for their continuous sharpening of censorship and limiting freedom of the Polish science;

10. Condemn them for their disgracing the Polish people by their subversive activities among the Poles living in the free world and by their espionage conducted in the free world in the interest of Moscow;

11. Condemn them for their irresponsible attacks against the people of the United States for whom the Polish nation has a great regard and shows great friendship;

12. Demand that the Governments of the United States and Great Britain put the question of freedom of Poland and other countries of central-eastern Europe on the agenda of the United Nations;

13. Demand that the monstrous crime committed by the Soviet Union in the Katyn Forest 25 years ago be put on the agenda of the United Nations;

14. Demand that the United States and Great Britain recognize the western border of Poland on the Oder and Neisse line as right and just, and that Polish eastern territories, grabbed by the Soviet Union, be restored to Poland;

15. Demand that the Red army and various Soviet officials be withdrawn from Poland;

16. Demand that full religious freedom be restored in Poland, that Poles still held against their will in the U.S.S.R. be repatriated from the Soviet Union to Poland, that all political prisoners be released, that freedom of speech and assembly be restored, that true local government be established, that independent political parties, cooperative, professional, youth and cultural organizations be reestablished;

17. Demand that free and democratic elections be held in Poland under the international control; and

> 18. Appeal to the entire Polonia and to all patriotic organizations for an absolute resistance against the attempts of Gomulka to subordinate Polonia and the political emigress to the Communist regime to frustrate their fight for freedom of Poland and against the infiltration and diversion of various open and disguised Communist agents.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we recognize the fundamental weakness of the Communist world. This weakness is dramatized by groups such as the Polish Peasant Party, which both within the country and through spokesmen in the Free World, very effectively and persistently struggles to restore legitimate freedom and progressive government to the millions of people now suffering under Communist enslavement.

THE PATENT SYSTEM

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which would prevent the U.S. Government from purchasing any patented item from any manufacturer unless that manufacturer owns the patent or is licensed to manufacture the product by the patent holder, except where the national security is involved.

Passage of this legislation is vital if the patent laws of the United States are to continue to serve as a stimulant to the creative efforts of the private sector of our economy. Many American-owned patents have been used by foreign companies to manufacture products which are then sold on the world market in competition with products made by the legal owner of the patent. In fact, the U.S. Government continues to purchase foreign-source products manufactured through the unauthorized use of American patents. Our Government should protect American patent rights rather than encourage infringement by the overseas purchase of items that have been fabricated through the pirating of American patents which have involved the investment of millions of dollars in research and development.

The Defense Department, particularly, has been guilty of purchasing items overseas at the expense of American jobs and American dollars. Incentive to do research is discouraged by such practices. I have recently received a report from an American firm in the Chicago area that the Defense Department has informed them they will probably lose the business they have done in the past with our Government on a certain product because of a lower bid received on the same product from a foreign firm. After spending considerable effort and money to improve this product, the Chicago firm now stands to lose its volume of business to a foreign firm which has not had to bear research costs for the development and improvement of the product covered by a patent which that foreign firm is infringing.

Mr. Speaker, the laws of the United States have provided a strong patent system for the purpose of encouraging research and inventiveness. The purchase of patented products by our Government from unlicensed sources is a threat to American industry and to future progress. I am hopeful that the Committee on the Judiciary will give prompt consideration to the pending bills which seek to prevent this practice.

THE KENNEDY ROUND, UNCTAD, AND SUGAR

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the International Sugar Agreement will expire on December 31, 1965. By this agreement the International Sugar Council, under the auspices of the United Nations, fixes import quotas in order to "stabilize" sugar markets and prices.

The implications of the expiration of the sugar agreement for the Kennedy round and for the role of the Kennedy round in helping developing countries find effective solutions to their trade needs is of special concern. I reported on June 2 to the House on the progress of the Kennedy round negotiations, but I wish to call attention separately to the impending international negotiations that will affect world sugar trade.

The present sugar agreement was initiated in 1958. It was extended in 1959 for 5 years and in 1963 for 2 years. Since its establishment, however, world sugar consumption and production patterns have change sufficiently to require a thorough reexamination of the world sugar market this year. Among these changes is increased sugar production by developed countries, especially the European Economic Community, which is now almost self-sufficient in sugar. Another is the Kennedy round emphasis both on freeing up trade in agricultural products and on providing access for less-developed country products in developed-country markets. Another is the formation of the United Nations Trade and Development Board as the operating organ of the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

All of these factors have important implications for U.S. policy, not only toward the kind of sugar trading patterns it wishes to create, but in terms of its concern with the progress and success of the Kennedy round, its position toward the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development and the new U.N. Trade and Development Board, and especially toward less-developed countries.

U.S. policymakers seem to me to have two choices of international mechanisms. The first is to place discussion and decision on sugar problems in the context of the Kennedy round. The second is to continue to treat sugar in the United Nations content.

If it chose the GATT course the United States would be in a very favorable position to increase the stake of less-developed countries in GATT and increase their active participation in the GATT negotiations. This has been, up to date, a major U.S. objective.

If it chose the second course of action the United States would no doubt allow the reactivation of the International Sugar Council and permit the new U.N. Trade and Development Board to assume a major role in determining policy for future world sugar trade. This alternative could have the result of forcing developed countries to import a larger share of cane sugar. It could have the less desirable effect of increasing the importance of the U.N. Trade and Development Board, and of removing sugar from the purview of GATT at a time when the importance of GATT should be strengthened.

In choosing either of the above alternatives the U.S. position would be enhanced by the fact that the United States, perhaps more than any developed country, has reserved a large part of its domestic sugar market for foreign producers. In the eyes of developing nations the United States thus would stand in very favorable contrast to the European Economic Community, which autarchically produces its own beet sugar but which likes to assume a sympathetic posture toward less-developed countries in UNCTAD.

World sugar policy will affect U.S. domestic sugar legislation and vice versa. The policy planners of the State and Agriculture Departments must fully coordinate their decisions on sugar with the special representative for trade negotiations. The United States must consider carefully its approach to the problems of world sugar trade and weigh the alternative approaches to world sugar policy.

The congressional committees which consider the Sugar Act—the Finance Committee in the Senate and the Agriculture Committee in the House—must be brought into the decisionmaking process, through the process of timely public hearings. Too long have these matters been decided behind closed doors in the closing days of a congressional session, with no one in the Congress, let alone in the public, in a position to follow or to understand the important economic and political decisions being made. There is a great deal of war and peace involved in international economic decisions, not the least of which is the area of sugar.

WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty has done it again. We have heard charges of corruption and mismanagement of funds within local and regional offices of the Office of Economic Opportunity, but the Washington headquarters seems bent on establishing an ever better record of procrastination and delay.

I received a copy of a letter from a president of a South Dakota college which was addressed to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The school applied for assistance from the OEO for work-study programs for summer students over 2 months ago. To date they have heard nothing from the OEO and the program has gone down the drain because of procrastination and delay. The school was also unable to make use of the OEO's recent announcement of additional programs for summer work-study jobs because the announcement was sent out about 2 weeks before the spring semester ended. Of course, there was no time to properly recruit or assign jobs because of the late date of the announcement.

The war on poverty seems to be more publicity than practicality. Much time is spent cultivating good public relations with high-sounding announcements of programs for student aid and help for the underprivileged, but when it comes to implementing an effective, workable program, the war on poverty is completely derelict. This program is not a vision of a Great Society but a short-range plan for reelection.

One of the greatest areas of poverty would seem to be the poverty of action within the administration of the OEO itself. Under unanimous consent I place the letter from the president of one of our State colleges in the Record so all Members may be familiar with this latest and most disappointing effort of the war on poverty:

May 27, 1965.

Hon. Frank Keppel,
Commissioner, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Keppel: Under date of May 23, 1965, I received a printed announcement from your office announcing work opportunities for college students for the summer term. To me this seems highly ridiculous. If there were programs which were available for college students during the summertime we should have known about this at least 2 months ago so that proper recruitment and assignment of jobs could have taken place. At this time such an announcement as far as we are concerned isn't worth the time it took to send it to us.

Approximately 2 months ago we made application for an off-campus study-work program on a full-time basis for a period of 8 weeks for a total of 22 students that needed summer jobs and could be assigned in poverty stricken areas to do work in line with their vocational objectives. Now it is May 27. We have heard nothing about our application. Our academic year has come to an end and we are in no position to recruit students for these jobs or to place them in any kind of a job for the summer. Here we had a real opportunity, not only to serve our students who need financial help in getting through college, but a real opportunity to lift the educational levels of a considerable number of youth who live in poverty stricken areas, but the procrastination and delay has been so late that now the program has gone down the drain.

Frankly, I have been distinctly disappointed in the way the work-study programs under the Economic Opportunity Act have been administered and I am certainly not very enthusiastic about the procrastination and delay which is taking place in other programs designed to help youth. I have about gotten to the place where I want no part of any such Federal program but rather prefer to use what money we can make available to carry on our own work-study programs. I do not doubt but what my letter sounds rather bitter, but frankly that is the way I feel about the matter and unless there is some change in the expedition of these matters as far as we are concerned I can see no great help coming to the students of Northern State College.

Sincerely yours,

_____ _____.

THE FIRST RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE ACT OF JUNE 1, 1557, IN TRANSYLVANIA

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to join in commemorating the 408th anniversary of the first Religious Tolerance Act in Transylvania passed in 1557 in the Diet in Torda.

Nothing is closer to our hearts than the cause of freedom of religion and conscience. It is among our most cherished rights and a fundamental guarantee of the first amendment. Many of our ancestors fled from Europe as a result of religious persecution. Members of all faiths had reason to find new homes in America to escape various kinds of religious discrimination in their homelands.

The Torda Act of 1557 stated, in the midst of the tumult and heated emotions of the Reformation and Counterreformation:

> Each person may hold whatever religious faith he wishes, with old or new rituals, while we at the same time leave it to their judgment to do as they please in the matter of their faith, just so long, however, as they bring no harm to bear on anyone at all, lest the followers of a new religion be a source of irritation to the old profession of faith or become in some way injurious to others.

It is symbolic of a common purpose that this act was passed by a Protestant-dominated Diet and signed by a Roman Catholic monarch. While only a partial charter, it became the foundation for the more comprehensive "Act of Religious Liberty and Freedom of Conscience," which was evolved by subsequent sessions of the Diet between 1557 and 1571.

I am happy to salute this initial affirmation of freedom of religion and conscience.

SILVER COINAGE

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, I made some remarks with respect to silver and our coinage situation. At that time the Honorable James F. Battin of the Second District of Montana asked me to include in the Record some remarks of his, because of the necessity that he leave. I neglected to do this, and therefore ask unanimous consent that his remarks may be included at the close of my remarks today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Battin] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague, the gentleman from Idaho, in opposition to the U.S. Treasury proposals for changing silver coins. The gentleman from Idaho has worked long and tirelessly on the problem, which he understands well. His father, before him, was considered a silver expert here in Congress.

I joined my colleague in the last session and again this year in introducing legislation which we and others believe would solve both our coinage and our silver problem and still retain the intrinsic value of all of our coins and possibly even make it possible to mint silver dollars which Montanans prefer to the paper variety but which have now gone the way of the dodo bird.

Because of various factors, our mints are consuming silver this year at an abnormal rate and did last year in overcoming a coin shortage. But during the years 1950 to 1962 only about 50 million ounces annually were used for coins. Last year some 200 million ounces were used and the rate this year is at about 300 million ounces. But the shortage is fast being overcome and a normal average would seem to be about 100 million ounces.

And in projecting future supplies and uses of silver, we cannot take production alone as a criteria. There is now about 1.9 billion ounces of silver in outstanding coinage. About two-thirds of this silver will be recovered either by the Treasury or other sources. So we are not nearly as bad off as the Treasury would have us believe for future supplies for coinage.

Also, if the recommendations of the gentleman from Idaho are followed to continue minting coins as they now are but with a silver content of 40 percent instead of 90 percent, the usage of new and recovered silver would be further reduced, but the coins would be indistinguishable from our present coins.

This plan would, I am convinced, prevent the disappearance of our present coin supply into collectors' and hoarders' closets because the new coins would retain a relatively high silver content and their intrinsic value.

Under the Treasury plan, I believe we could expect to see the quick disappearance of all present coins as the new sandwich coins appeared, especially those with no silver.

As the gentleman from Idaho pointed out in a recent letter to the President, an announcement that the United States plans to adopt a coinage system such as this would create a monstrous coin shortage and certainly lead to serious questions about our monetary system. We are now attemping to solve our balance-of-payments and gold problem to preserve the retention of the 25-percent gold backing for Federal Reserve notes and I am convinced that we need to retain as much silver as possible in our coins to preserve the confidence of the American people and the world in the financial stability of the United States.

Dr. Franz Pick, publisher of a currency journal, told an assembly of the New York University Graduate School of Business Administration recently that "debasement" of the dollar, balance-of-payments deficits and "mismanagement" of gold and silver policies mean the U.S. currency cannot continue to exist withour foreign aid. He said the Government has made "a little dollarette" out of the once proud dollars which has dropped in buying power to 44 cents between 1940 and 1965.

Dr. Pick added that "the deplorable lack of Treasury foresight shows at present that not only as far as gold is concerned, but silver, too, we are at the end of the rope which has held the dollarette above the water."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 123, I was necessarily absent, on official business at the White House. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 123, I was absent, on official business at the White House. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am the fourth Member of the House Republican task force on education to comment on the hearing conducted by the task force in New York City on May 24.

Although, unfortunately, I was unable to be present at this New York hearing, I have had an opportunity to examine and become familiar with the hearing proceedings.

Before making comment on certain aspects of this hearing, I would like to say that personally I feel that a program of tax credits promises, indeed, to be a unique and effective device for helping student taxpayers and their parents cope with the escalating costs of higher education.

For one thing, such a program would perform as an inducement for students of high ability and low income to gain a college education, thereby providing both a humanitarian and sociological benefit.

For another thing, this type of approach to relieving the strain of high educational costs would dispense with the setting up of expansive and expensive bureaucratic machinery and would, therefore, provide more education for the tax dollar.

It is my considered opinion that something should be done right now about this situation of rising higher educational costs, and I certainly feel privileged and happy to join with my fellow Republicans in a task force effort to push forward this tax-credit-for-higher education program.

It is indeed unfortunate that the congressional leadership in the House of Representatives has not programed any congressional hearings on tax credits for higher education; hence, Republicans will try—as with the May 24 hearing in New York—to reach the people and give to them their message as it relates to tax credits and the costs of higher education. Republicans will also try through congressional proceedings to get their word on tax credits out across the land.

With respect to the House GOP task force on education hearing in New York on May 24, the record shows that there was some really strong support for tax credits as an aid for meeting the rising costs of higher education.

In this respect, Dr. E. Hugh Luskey presented some highly interesting testimony to the May 24 meeting, testimony which set forth in concise and well-defined manner his views on costs as related to higher education.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Luckey, a former trustee of Cornell University, presently is a member of the board of trust of Vanderbilt University, professor and chairman of the Department of Medicine of Cornell University Medical College, and president-elect of the New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, New York City.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert Dr. E. Hugh Luckey's testimony in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF DR. E. HUGH LUCKEY BEFORE TASK FORCE ON EDUCATION, REPUBLICAN PLANNING AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE, MAY 24, 1965

(NOTE.—Dr. Luckey, a former trustee of Cornell University, currently is a member of the board of trust of Vanderbilt University, professor and chairman of the Department of Medicine of Cornell University Medical College, and president-elect of the New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, New York City.)

Congressman QUIE, members of the task force on education, my statement today can be quite brief. It is my understanding that the particular focus of the hearings today is how to provide the best possible advanced education for our young people without excessive personal or family financial sacrifice. Thus, there are two matters before us: The maintenance of a strong higher educational system and an equitable distribution of its costs.

I must speak with two perspectives. First, as the father of four teenage children I look forward to 1 year in the next 4 when I should have all four children attending college simultaneously. Perhaps this disqualifies me as your usual unbiased witness. The other perspective derives from my personal professional commitment to higher education. For the last 28 years I have been either a recipient or purveyor of higher education. In the role of trustee of two of our private universities, I have had the opportunity to learn and observe some aspects of the limitations as well as successes of our higher educational system.

My personal views may be stated most briefly in a topical manner:

1. The education of our young people is one of our most important natural resources.

2. The optimal development of this natural resource will provide one of our most important media for improvement of our society and will afford a potent weapon in the international ideological competition in which we are involved.

3. The efficient development of this resource requires that the opportunity to obtain an education be based only on intellectual capacity and motivation, not on ability to pay, geographic or ethnological origin or the sex of the youngster.

4. Our national facilities for higher education fall short of our needs—in quantity and quality.

5. These institutions for higher education require additional support to do all we know how to do even at the present time—and needs will continue to increase in the future.

6. The personal and family costs of higher education have reached such a level that expense alone is a serious limiting factor in election of such education.

7. There is the need for redistribution of costs of higher education.

8. The integrity of our higher educational system will best be maintained if multiple sources of support are continued, rather than exclusive dependence either on Federal and local government or on private support.

9. Any legislation to provide tax relief of individuals in respect to their expenditures for expenses of higher education should include a mechanism for stimulation of private contributions in support of higher education.

10. These requirements are met in H.R. 1681 which would allow a tax credit for tuition and fees paid by individuals to institutions of higher education and a tax credit for certain contributions made by individuals or corporations to such institutions.

Thank you.

Dr. Alfred H. Bowker, chancellor of the City University of New York, appeared as a witness before the task force on education, and in support of the tax credit proposal, he offered the following testimony:

Mr. BOWKER. I am the chancellor of the City University of New York, the institution described by President Gallagher, consisting of the 10 municipally supported colleges, or municipally and State supported. As you can see, I am speaking for myself and not for the institution, because I don't agree with Dr. Gallagher entirely.

On the whole, I have tended to favor the tax credit legislation. I think some of the things that he points out as weaknesses are weaknesses. I don't think there is any question that things like the tax credit and the scholar incentive program in New York have the effect of providing an incentive to raise tuition. If you want to document this, I think the regents' master plan for the development of higher education in New York gives an extensive table of tuition increases in the State, since the State put it in, put in the scholar incentive program.

On the other hand, I believe that that is likely to be the mechanism by which Federal funds and State scholarships and so forth can be most legitimately and easily funneled into support of private higher education, and therefore I am not quite alarmed about it. But as a factual statement I think it does hold up.

There are two reasons why I tend to favor the tax credit.

One is—and I guess the committee realizes at this point that students attending my institution will not benefit—one is the fact that has been mentioned by several speakers. It is desirable, I think, for a student to have the widest freedom of choice in selecting an institution. This freedom of choice is, to some extent, inhibited by increases in costs which must be met from tuition, and this tax credit program will, to the middle-income family, make this choice easier.

There is, however, another reason which actually deals more within the family of public information. Many of the great traditional sources of education for New York City students have been the midwestern universities: Minnesota, Michigan, Ann Arbor, and many go to Chapel Hill and to the New England State universities. This particular mobility from State to State is becoming increasingly difficult as States are beginning, and I think quite appropriately, either to impose quotas or, most typically, to impose rather high tuition charges on out-of-State students.

This is very important to the young people of New York. As I said, these have been strong and attractive institutions to our citizens, and none of the proposed kind of scholarship or other legislation, it seems to me, are likely to tackle that problem.

A tax-credit scheme of this sort strikes me, for various reasons, as being more directed toward the kind of family and the kind of young person who would consider going out of State. I was disappointed this year that the bill to allow New York State students to take some of their State-awarded scholarships out of State didn't fare very well. This was because of opposition from the private sector here in the State.

I do agree, however, with Dr. Gallagher in that we are at the moment, it seems to me, in the higher education, kind of tinkering with the problem in various ways and we lack what might be called a national educational policy. President Connat published a book this fall in which he pointed out a lot of the political and practical problems, and was directed very much toward this question of how we could develop a policy, and he indeed was very pessimistic. But among the ways we are tinkering with the present situation I think the tax-credit one is feasible.

For those students who go out of State, and indeed for those students who go to public institutions within the State, which are low tuition or small tuition, it would be, of course, more useful if some of the allowable costs involved living expenses as well as tuition and fees, but whether that is done or not, I would tend to support the legislation.

I gave a speech on educational policy in December which was reprinted in the last issue of the Journal of the American Statistical Association, and since that is not a best seller I don't suppose many of you saw it. If you examine the States which have really high achievement in terms of having large numbers of their young people in education, in higher education you find, of course, that they are almost in the Middle West or West. The leading States are Utah and Arizona, North Dakota, Kansas, and Montana, Minnesota and California, parts of the top 10. This is just in terms of the enrollment in the State in proportion to college age population.

It its characteristic of all these States that they have substantial numbers of students in public higher education. Something like 20 to 30 percent of the college age population is in public higher education. This doesn't mean that private higher education has a small role. In fact, in Utah, which by a large margin leads the rest of the country in providing educational opportunities for its students, public education is only about two-thirds of the total. There is extensive private education in Utah, and very good.

But it does mean that there needs to be, I believe, an underpinning of 20 percent, maybe 25 percent, of publicly supported opportunities within a State. Here in the East we don't approach that anywhere, although Florida, Massachusetts, and New York are closer than other Eastern States.

I thought at the time it might be feasible to devise a program in which things of this sort, like the tax credit and scholarships and other plans, which primarily benefited private education, could be combined with a program of subsidy of State-supported institutions directly, and that this would make a reasonable package for higher education. After hearing all the discussions this year, I am now pessimistic about that.

I do not think, however, there remains an opportunity for the Federal Government to subsidize the community college movement rather heavily without getting in the midst of the all of this argument between private and public colleges which you heard today.

From the point of view of the student, particularly the low-income student, I think this would be the most promising. This could be done partly through existing legislation, for the Higher Educational Facilities Act allocates a certain amount for public facilities, and that could be expanded—and the Vocational Education Act and similar bills provide 90 percent for technical problems. These have been primarily aimed at the high schools, but in the current legislation community colleges are available, and that particular channel of money could be widened.

I do believe, as I said, that a comprehensive policy has got to give some attention to a basic underpinning of enrollement provided from public sources, but I do believe at the same time it is important, particularly in this State and in many Eastern States, both from the point of view of the student and from the point of view of the institutions, that certain associated measures such as the tax credit be taken to maintain the health of private higher education.

That is my statement.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the House GOP task force on education who previously addressed the House with respect to this matter of tax credits for higher educational costs introduced to the Record letters representing certain sentiments with respect to this subject of tax credits. These letters were, of course, replies to communications of inquiry sent out in considerable volume to educators—and others interested in education—by Congressman Albert H. Quie, chairman of the House Republican task force on education.

As was evidenced by the reports of the other members of the task force on education, the letters concerned were running in a ratio of about 7 to 2 in favor of a program of tax credits to assist in coping with the swiftly increasing costs of higher education.

Letters in this ratio were submitted to the Record by my Republican colleagues, and in a like manner, I would like to, at this point, make a similar offering to the Record of this type of correspondence.

In this group are seven letters for tax credits and two against, and with respect to the two opposed, I would like to make these qualifications:

The letter from Marshall Buckalew, president of Morris Harvey College in Charleston, W. Va., represents only the personal opinion of the writer and does not in any manner pose as the official position of the institution over which the correspondent presides—no official position has been taken by that institution's governing board with respect to the matter of tax credits as an aid to higher educational costs.

Too, the letter directed to Chairman Quie by Mr. Robert S. Reigeluth, 265 Church Street, New Haven 9, Conn., represents not so much a condemnation of the tax credit proposal but, instead, a predisposition toward a tax deduction approach—the correspondent would like to have it made clear that while he favors the tax deduction approach, he still feels that the adoption of either the tax deduction or the tax credit programs would be a material improvement over the present situation.

Hence, Mr. Reigeluth offers a qualified "no" to the tax credit proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the seven letters favoring the tax credit program.

THE COFFEYVILLE COLLEGE,
Coffeyville, Kans., May 20, 1965.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE QUIE: Those of us who have to do with higher education in this area of our country are very much concerned in the increasing costs of education. As a result, we are most interested in tax credits as an assistance in a meeting of these higher costs which mount each year.

This area of Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Arkansas are in a financially repressed area and an overabundance of labor which results in a severe financial hardship that our patrons face in being able to finance a college education. The result is that numerous students are unable to attend college.

Part-time employment for students is necessarily limited and the few opportunities in our area are not commensurate to the large number of applicants. Each semester, students find it necessary to discontinue their schooling because of lack of finances.

It is for these reasons that tax credits offer a significant assistance to our college population.

Sincerely yours,
KARL M. WILSON, *Dean.*

MAY 24, 1965.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE QUIE: I was very much interested in your letter seeking information concerning support for higher education. I would certainly be very much in favor of legislation which would authorize tax credits as a means of helping to offset the increasing costs of higher education. Such a program would certainly aid both private and public higher education, and would help or offset increasing tuition and living costs.

It now seems that the university system will probably be considering the advisability of increasing tuition costs for the 1966–67 school year. It seems improbable that Georgia's tax income will keep pace with the needs of higher education. Such increases, if made, will add considerably to the burden borne by middle and lower income families. Some relief is certainly justifiable.

Sincerely,

THOMAS Y. WHITLEY.

RIDER COLLEGE,
Trenton, N.J., May 20, 1965.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: We are strongly in favor of tax credits for higher education. We believe that this method provides an effective means whereby many qualified students from families of modest means may be enabled to attend our colleges and universities.

The rapidly mounting costs of education make it imperative to decrease the strain on family budgets where family income is modest and where, frequently, several children must be maintained in college at the same time.

We sincerely hope that the task force on education will successfully support legislation that will establish such tax credits.

Very truly yours,

F. F. MOORE,
President.

WASHINGTON COLLEGE,
Chestertown, Md., May 20, 1965.

Mr. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: In reply to your letter of May 17, I have already in various educational meetings expressed my endorsement of the idea of income tax credits to the parents of students attending institutions of higher education. I must admit that I have come to this conclusion slowly and somewhat reluctantly. But there is no question, on the one hand, that the educational attainments of our citizenry have a direct influence on our entire national economy and culture: these people are national assets, and it is in the interests of the Nation that their numbers should be maintained and increased as much as possible. On the other hand, and here I speak particularly of the private institution of higher education, the necessary costs of providing the proper kind of educational service for our college students have mounted so rapidly that it is only the really well-to-do family who can afford, without assistance, to send their children to college or university today. Of course, I assume that the proposed bill will make no distinction between publicly supported higher education and privately supported education. But there can be no question that the greatest benefit will redound to those students and their families who are in attendance at private institutions, simply because of their extremely high costs today.

It must be recognized, of course, that the provision of this kind of aid will not measurably improve the financial situation of the private institutions of higher education. We have more students now than we can handle. The great benefit thus would be to the student and his parents. Whether some means should be sought and found whereby financial assistance can be provided to the private colleges and universities from public funds may have yet to be sought.

Very sincerely yours,

DANIEL Z. GIBSON,
President.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
May 20, 1965.

ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: I strongly favor the tax credits for higher education which has been recently proposed as a means for meeting the increasing costs of higher education. This will indeed provide additional funds for parents and relatives to meet the financial obligations incident to the continuation and improvement of our already well established higher education system. This can then be provided without undue financial burden to those who are responsible for meeting these costs.

I can think of no other solution which will more effectively alleviate these problems than the enactment of this legislation.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT P. HARKINS, M.D.

CHOWAN COLLEGE,
Murfreesboro, N.C., May 20, 1965.

Representative ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: I am in receipt of your letter of May 17 incident to the question of tax credits as a means of helping to offset the increasing costs of higher education.

Regretfully, I will be unable to attend the hearing on tax credits scheduled for May 24 in New York.

Please let me use this means to emphasize that I heartily endorse the principle of tax credits as a means to help offset the cost of increasing costs of higher education. These should be made to students and parents, on a graduated basis related to income in effect. It is my sincere hope that legislation will be effected which will authorize tax credits, hopefully, beginning with September of this year.

I commend and encourage you in the aforementioned effort.

Very sincerely yours,

BRUCE E. WHITTAKER,
President.

MERCHANTS NATIONAL BANK & TRUST CO.,
Indianapolis, Ind., May 19, 1965.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE QUIE: I appreciate the honor you have paid me in expressing interest in my views on education tax credits. As a banker, lawyer, and parent I have a deep interest in this problem.

Let me say, without equivocation, that I strongly favor legislation authorizing tax credits as a means of encouraging expansion of higher education among this Nation's young people. I am acutely aware of the rising costs of higher education as I have a son in Indiana University and a son-in-law at Purdue. It is essential to the future growth of our country that we make higher education available to an ever increasing percentage of our youth. It is also essential that our institutions of higher learning be permitted to operate in an atmosphere of academic freedom. Direct and excessive government subsidization of these institutions cannot be conducive to such academic freedom. Neither can we continue to rely upon the generosity of our society's more affluent members to provide most of the endowment of our colleges and universities. I am a member of the executive committee of the Wabash College Deferred Giving Board and recognize both the importance of this approach and the fact that it alone is not adequate to support the necessary expansion demanded.

Every parent who sacrifices after-tax dollars for his child's education is contributing not only to that child's future, but to the future of America. Every available means should be employed by our Government to encourage these sacrifices. Certainly the tax credit approach is a most desirable approach in that it leaves the burden with the parent, but lightens it. It also provides the indirect type of subsidy to the educational institution which will permit continued academic freedom.

I believe that it is also essential that our higher educational institutions meet the challenge of increasing enrollment by a geographical distribution of their facilities that will permit a greater number of students to remain at home while pursuing their education. This could be of enormous financial relief to parents as well as to the universities. Dormitories are costly to build and costly to maintain.

Here in Indiana, our two great State universities, Indiana and Purdue, are moving in that direction. Soon we hope to provide centers of learning that will be readily accessible on a daily basis to most of our young people.

It would be most beneficial to our entire national educational program if the cost problem could be attacked from opposite directions, that is, tax credits and increased accessibility.

I sincerely hope that these comments are of some value to your organization.

Very truly yours,

PAUL E. RAWLEY,
Vice President and Trust Officer.

Mr. Speaker, I now offer the two letters opposing the tax credit approach.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
May 21, 1965.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In answer to your letter regarding suggestions for the enactment of a resolution authorizing tax credits as a means of helping to offset higher education costs, here are a few suggestions which might be helpful in drafting legislation.

First of all, let me say that some form of tax assistance for parents who are educating children is important and overdue. There is nothing that would do more to improve the overall level of education in this country, and unquestionably many talented and brilliant young people would be able to complete their education who are not now able to do so. This is particularly so at the graduate school level. Few families can afford the extra expense of tuition bills continued through years of graduate school.

A further benefit from a tax assistance program is that the use of scholarship funds would actually be broadened. Many families who would otherwise seek scholarship aid would be able to finance their childrens' education through the tax assistance program, which in turn would permit truly needy cases to receive greater financial assistance from scholarship funds.

My suggestion would be that legislation take the form of a deduction for tuition expenses—net of scholarship aid. This would be simple to administer. Expenses for board and room, which vary, depending upon circumstances, probably could not be included as a deduction. Many students live off the campus or at home, and it would be difficult, if not impossible, to make a uniform regulation to administer this category of expenditures.

Perhaps there are some who favor a straight tax credit, but it seems to me that this is going further than is necessary and becomes an actual subsidy for education.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. REIGELUTH.

MORRIS HARVEY COLLEGE,
Charleston, W. Va., May 21, 1965.

Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE,
Chairman, Task Force on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: The following statement is made in response to your letter of May 21 requesting our view on legislation authorizing tax credit as a means to offset the cost of higher education. This is my personal opinions since this matter has not been acted upon by our official governing board.

I am personally opposed to authorizing tax credit as a means to offset the cost of higher education. I am confident that there are more effective ways to provide assistance to the worthy student in need of financial help.

I favor a program of Federal financial assistance to qualifying students along the lines made available to the American GI immediately following World War II. This program enabled the individual student to select the college of his choice, public or private. This practical approach to the problem maintains individual freedom of choice for the student and his parents in the choice of an institution. It is also the best means I know of to assure the continuation of the dual system of higher education in America—public and private. Due to the great discrepancy which is developing in the tuition differential in the public and private schools it would appear that by the year A.D. 2000, private higher education in America will play a very minor role in its impact upon American economic, political, and cultural forces.

Every student attending public institutions is subsidized by the American taxpayer to the extent of several hundred dollars annually and without question this socialization of American education is resulting in the destruction of our dual system of higher education. The only effective way I know to prevent this trend is to subsidize the individual student, who wishes to attend a private institution, in the same amount as we subsidize students attending a public institution.

I want to point out that I do not advocate subsidizing private institutions but that any financial aid should be given to the individual student and he should have the choice of his institution of higher education.

This statement, I realize, is very brief but after spending more than 25 years in the field of higher education, I feel this is the best way of preserving our dual system of higher education and the advantages which this system has given to the American way of life.

Sincerely,

MARSHALL BUCKALEW,
President.

MARINE COMMENDATION

Mr. **KREBS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CORMAN.** Mr. Speaker, the last of our American Marine units are being withdrawn from the Dominican Republic today, and I think it is proper that we commend the Marine Corps for another job well done.

The recent demonstration of the political instability in the Caribbean again proved the value to this Nation of the Navy-Marine Corps team. Following the outbreak of civil war in the Dominican Republic, President Johnson ordered U.S. Marines to be landed at Santo Domingo to protect American lives as well as the lives of friendly foreign nationals.

During the month that the Marines remained on the strife-torn island, they saved countless lives, prevented further bloodshed by making it possible for a cease-fire to take place, and protected the Dominican Republic against a possible takeover by extremists of the right or the left.

At this time, I would like to present a brief chronology of Marine Corps activities in the Dominican Republic.

The Marine Corps maintains three battalion landing teams afloat with the U.S. fleets: one in the Far East, one in the Mediterranean and one in the Caribbean. Their forward alert posture provides the United States with forces immediately available to protect American interests. In the recent disturbance in the Dominican Republic, the President directed Marines to land to protect property and to evacuate American nationals.

April 27: The Amphibious Squadron was ordered to close to the Dominican Republic and to begin evacuating U.S. citizens in Haina. Marines of the 6th Marine Expeditionary Unit were landed to provide perimeter security.

April 28: The American Ambassador requested marines be landed at Santo Domingo to insure safety of personnel being evacuated from the polo grounds and to reinforce the guard at the U.S. Embassy. Four hundred marines were landed.

April 29: The worsening situation in Santo Domingo caused the American Ambassador to request that all of the 6th Marine Expeditionary Unit be landed to protect American lives. By the next day, some 2,000 marines of the 6th Marine Expeditionary Unit had landed and established positions at the polo field, El Embajador Hotel and the U.S. Embassy. The first Army troops landed on April 30.

May 1: Additional marines were flown to Santo Domingo. Forces secured a north-south line on the west side of Santo Domingo. Army forces secured the San Isidro Airfield and the Duarte Bridge at the east entrance to Santo Domingo.

May 2: A total of 3,023 persons had been evacuated.

May 4: By the end of this day, more than 6,000 marines had arrived in the Dominican Republic.

May 5: A total of 4,317 had been evacuated—2,694 of these were Americans.

May 14: Marine forces had increased to approximately 8,000.

June 1: Marine units began withdrawing from the Dominican Republic.

June 7: It is estimated that all Marine units will have been withdrawn from the Dominican Republic.

During this entire period, 8 marines were killed in action and 29 were wounded in action.

We can well be proud of the outstanding performance and effectiveness of the U.S. Marine Corps in the Caribbean.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXXVIII

Mr. **KREBS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MULTER.** Mr. Speaker, the following articles concern slums, the cost of medical care and crime in New York City.

The articles appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 14, 1965, as part of the series on "New York City in Crisis," and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: SLUMS JUST AS BAD 4 YEARS AFTER MAYOR'S PLEDGE

(By Alfonso Narvaez and Barry Gottehrer)

In 1961, during his campaign for reelection Mayor Wagner made a dramatic, well-publicized grand tour of the worst slum areas of New York City.

The mayor pledged then that the slums would be rehabilitated, "if it is the last thing I do."

Last week, almost 4 years later, the New York Young Republican Club decided to take another look at these same slum areas.

According to their findings, documented in a report and copies of photos sent to the mayor yesterday, conditions in these areas—and in many of the same buildings visited by the mayor—conditions today are as bad, if not worse, than they were in 1961.

DENIES RECEIVING REPORT

Asked to comment on the charges of neglect, the mayor's office said it had not yet received the report and would not comment at least until after it had.

Charging that the city administration does not care about the slum dwellers, the Young Republicans accused the mayor of "openly and notoriously tolerating slum conditions at houses which he had personally inspected in 1961 and had then pledged promptly to rehabilitate but which upon reinspection have been found to have deteriorated to the point where they now pose danger to the health and safety of inhabitants."

After inspecting four areas in Manhattan—East Fifth Street, East 100th SW., 106th Street, and West 84th Street—the Young Republicans charged that "the slums permitted to fester by the city are at the root of the civil rights problems in this city.

"By his refusal to keep his word, the mayor has encouraged slumlords and made them secure in the knowledge that, except for an occasional burst of activity, for the benefit of the press, their acts would go virtually unpunished."

On East Fifth Street where the mayor announced a plan to rehabilitate the entire block in 1961, the report charged that No. 629, the center of the mayor's visit in 1961, had been left to deteriorate completely and now sported a vacate order effective April 8, 1965.

At the time of their visit on April 10, the Republicans found a number of families still living in the building.

There was no water in the bathrooms and damaged roof beams threatened to give way and collapse the building on the tenants.

Beneath the stairwell of the building the committee found cans of paint and turpentine. They also found empty liquor bottles.

Everywhere on the block, where the mayor stated that he was "shocked by the conditions of squalor and shambles," the committee charged that his pledge of immediate rehabilitation had not been kept.

"Most of the East Fifth Street residents whom we saw bore that same look of despair and frustration that has marked the wretched and hopeless in the shanty towns across this Nation and throughout the world," the committee said in the report sent to the mayor. "The two little girls who walked down the street collecting empty whisky bottles to sell to a junkman, and searched for empty soda bottles to turn in at the corner store, certainly should have had better things to do for themselves."

The retracing of Mayor Wagner's steps brought them to East 100th Street. At 311, a bright mosaic decorated the front of the building, but inside the committee found the back hall crammed with uncollected garbage and the halls reeked of urine and filth.

Other houses on this block, as well as on East 106th Street—another "sight" on the mayor's itinerary—were marked with broken windows, refuse-laden halls and alleyways, fire hazards, and reports of roach and rat infestation.

The committee reported that at West 84th Street, where the mayor ordered an all-out war and shock-attack on the slum conditions, there had been some external improvements, but the Republicans say they found that addiction, alcoholism, and thefts were prevalent in the neighborhood.

One area—which the mayor did not visit, but the Young Republicans did—was East Fifth Street, between C and D, a block surveyed by the New York City in Crisis series early in March.

RAT-INFESTED TENEMENTS

At that time Herald Tribune reporters found the people living in dirty, rat-infested tenements.

At 751 East Fifth, the reporters noted halls that were dingy and dirty; paint peeling from the walls; ceilings in most of the apartments cracked and in poor condition; gaping 3-foot holes in many of the apartment ceilings. They learned that the tenants had been without heat, hot water, or services for almost 3 months.

On April 10, the Young Republicans visited the same building and found filth, peeling paint, cracked ceilings, and the like still present.

"In the back yard we found literally tons of refuse, ranging from 10 or more dead and decaying fish emitting the most horrible stench, to inflammable liquids and other refuse which, if ignited, would cause a holocaust. Children ran up to us to complain that mice were seen recently roaming the building. Much of what we have described above and worse was photographed by us and is available for your inspection."

Charles G. Moerdler, president of the club, concluded his 3-page letter and 13-page report to the mayor with, "The point we are trying to impress on you is this: More than 1 month ago a crusading newspaper in its 'City in Crisis' series dwelt for 2 consecutive days upon the abyssmal conditions existing at one of the buildings on the lower east side of Manhattan.

"A month later we find that many of those conditions still exist and that the health and safety of residents of this city are being jeopardized by your administration's inaction.

"When * * * do you intend finally to do something to relieve the misery and degradation of the downtrodden of the city?"

Mrs. Norma Hunt, a 4-year resident at 751 East Fifth, confirmed the charges of neglect yesterday.

Though she said heat and hot water had been resumed and "some work" had been done on the plumbing, Mrs. Hunt said that the halls were still filthy and that the superintendent was still waiting for supplies from the department of real estate, which had taken over the buildings last month.

Milton Mollen, the mayor's housing and development coordinator, said late yesterday that he had not seen the letter or the charges and would not comment on them until he had personally inspected the four areas.

Rebirth of Street: Test in Harlem

(By Edward J. Silberfarb)

Work will begin Monday on a $5.5 million rehabilitation of Harlem's 114th Street, with city officials in the meantime seeking to avert a clash over the project between civil rights groups and craft unions.

At a city hall ceremony yesterday, Mayor Wagner announced reconstruction is ready to begin on three of the project's 37 old-law tenements which line both sides of West 114th Street between Seventh and Eighth Avenues. The $5,512,000 mortgage, which bears a 3⅜-percent interest rate, is the largest ever insured by the Federal Housing Authority for a rehabilitation project.

The renovation of the West 114th Street block was originally slated to get underway as early as April 1, but paperwork has delayed the Federal-city project and set the target date back. The massive rehabilitation program was announced February 2 by Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Activity, which oversees President Johnson's war on poverty.

A hint of possible racial strife hung in the air despite assurances from Mayor Wagner and Mrs. Hortense W. Gabel, Rent and Rehabilitation Administrator, that "mixed crews" will work on the project.

Dr. Arthur Logan, board chairman of Haryou Act, the Harlem Youth Agency, said he is pleased the rehabilitation is about to get underway, and in an interview later added, "We will press to put the people in the block to work on this project. We will try to get them in the unions or we will try to put them to work anyway."

But in a separate interview after the ceremony, the mayor was asked if any nonunion labor would work on the job. He replied, "The answer is 'No.'"

In a long-standing dispute, civil rights groups have pressed for more Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the construction trades unions and especially to work on city-sponsored projects.

Mrs. Gabel said, "Peter Brennan (president of the Construction Trades Council) has pledged that there will be mixed crews on the (114th Street) job."

Curtis McFarley, president of the 114th Street Block Association, said some 25 Negro laborers and semiskilled workers who live on the block would be available to work on the job but do not belong to building trades unions.

The purpose of the 114th Street project is to provide renovated apartments for low-income tenants without having to relocate them. Some 1,600 persons live on the block.

The buildings will be rehabilitated three at a time, with work expected to take 3 months on each group. Tenants will move temporarily to other buildings on the block while work progresses on their own buildings, with all moving costs to be paid by the sponsor. The nonprofit Community Improvement Corp. of Manhattan is the sponsor and will be the landlord. The FHA mortgage will pay for acquisition as well as construction.

According to Mrs. Gabel, there will be 458 apartments ranging from efficiencies to five-bedroom units with multibedroom apartments comprising the majority.

The average rent now is $50 an apartment and will rise to an average of $75 after rehabilitation, but, according to Mrs. Gabel, "no one wishing to stay on the block will have to move because of increased rentals."

Mayor Wagner called the project a test of "the feasibility of renovation without relocation" and "the most ambitious undertaking yet to be launched under the New York City demonstration experimental rehabilitation project."

Most of the buildings are now railroad-type apartments running from front to rear. They have walk-through bedrooms and water closets with tubs but no sinks.

After rehabilitation, the typical floor will have two U-shaped units opposite each other, one facing the street, the other the backyard. Walk-through bedrooms will be replaced by bedrooms that can be separated by doors from the rest of the apartment for privacy.

Other features will include new kitchens and bathrooms, new floors, walls, ceilings and windows, closets, front doorbell and buzzer systems, locked mailboxes, spruced-up exteriors and a garbage disposal system with access on each floor.

Hospital Waste—Blue Cross Drain

(Note.—How high Blue Cross rates? While the State debates, Science Editor Ubell continues his special series in the article below.)

(By Earl Ubell)

New York's voluntary (nonprofit) hospitals seem to do their buying like a housewife shopping at the corner grocery: They pay 20 to 100 percent more for common drugs than city hospitals do.

That extra percentage goes on your hospital bill, and if you are a member of Blue Cross it goes on your premium.

Typically, 13 voluntary hospitals paid $3.85 for 50 tablets of Orinase, a widely used oral diabetic medicine—the same price paid by the corner drugstore. One voluntary hospital paid $4.17 for the same drug. The city paid $2.50.

The voluntaries pay more because they do not usually require bids; they order by brand name rather than chemical name, and, what is more important, the hospitals do not get together and order drugs jointly for savings on bulk orders.

Those drug prices—and many more like them, brought out in a survey made last December by the Greater New York Hospital Association among its members—provided only a hint of inefficiency in New York hospitals. There also was waste in such things as laundry, food, use of nurses, laboratories, even administration.

Yet it is precisely the extra dollars bred by inefficiency that form a significant—although unknown—part of the spiraling Blue Cross rates. For it is a fact: Blue Cross premiums are hitched as closely to hospital costs as a wagon to a horse. Yet unlike a wagon driver, Blue Cross can only indirectly steer cost improvement in hospitals.

The Governor's Committee on Hospital Costs headed by Marion Folsom bore down very hard on waste in hosiptals in its report issued last Saturday. The report said, among other things:

"Hospital management practices suffer badly in comparison with those in other industries.

"Much could also be done through hospitals acting jointly. There are, for example, obvious economies to be realized through joint purchasing. Nevertheless, little joint purchasing is done."

Even the records of Blue Cross, which audits all the city's voluntary and proprietary (profitmaking) hospital books, demonstrates the possibility of substantial savings.

Costs of such items as laundry, food service administration, and operation of plant can vary as much as 40 percent within the same group of comparable hospitals. For example, in one hospital the cost of food can be $3.44 a day per patient, while in another it is as much as $4.87, a 42-percent difference. The difference cannot be related to the quality of food alone.

Some typical items that can be found in New York's hospitals:

A nurse opens a new bottle of antiseptic to paint a patient's skin preparatory to surgery. She uses a third of the bottle and throws the rest in a trash can. Cost: $3.50.

The chief of surgery orders an electrocardiogram machine used in his department three or four times a week. Yet the department of medicine has three such machines, one of which is idle most of the time. Cost: $500.

It costs hospital A $1.40 a day per patient for laundry. Hospital B, which is about the same size, pays 83 cents a day. Cost: Perhaps $150,000 a year difference between the two hospitals.

In the view of some observers, Blue Cross is not entirely an innocent victim of the hospitals' practices. The reimbursement formula by which Blue Cross pays the hospitals pays all the costs related to Blue Cross patients. Although a hospital administrator cannot spend money wildly, he is assured of getting back from the Blue Cross nearly all he spends. As long as his spending keeps pace with other hospitals in his group, he can buy nearly anything he wants. Thus, hospital costs have increased among voluntary hospitals in the city some 8 to 9.5 percent a year for the last 5 years.

The Folsom committee has this to say about these rises: "Unquestionably, the formula was partially responsible for this rise. The present payment formulas hold few incentives for economy. Either there must be new formulas with built-in incentives for economy, or there must be subsidiary procedures to monitor and moderate costs."

Then there is operations on weekends. Few hospitals around the city have made any move to increase weekend operations and thus gain 2 extra days, or to increase elective surgery in the summer months and thereby gain time and money there.

On this subject the Folsom committee said:

"Substantial net savings would be possible, particularly in obviating the need for construction of new beds, if hospitals were used as fully on weekends as during the week. Patients admitted on Friday tend to stay longer as a result of the lost weekend in hospital operations."

Much of the recent increase in costs came from the rise in salaries among all workers in hospitals because of union pressures. There are some who believe that, now that most hospitals have "caught up" with the wages of the rest of the industrial community, hospital costs will level out.

However, a crucial factor in hospital costs is excess beds. The exact number of such beds in the city is unknown. It has been estimated to be some 3,000. It costs a hospital almost the same money to maintain an empty as a full bed.

Although the Hospital Review and Planning Council—which last year received power from the State legislature to monitor hospitals—has stopped excess building of beds in New York, many hospital administrations—particularly the small hospitals—keep their census artificially high. They do this by asking doctors not to discharge patients until another patient is ready to take his place.

Already the hospital council, with the urging of Blue Cross, has stopped the construction of any hospital with fewer than 200 beds. That number soon will be raised to 300. The reason for the limitation on the number of beds is that in New York it has been found that the smaller the hospital, the less efficiently it can operate.

This council also has refused modernization permits to hospitals which have inefficient plants, in the hopes of causing mergers to produce larger, therefore more efficient, hospitals. Such mergers already have taken place.

The obsolete character of many hospitals contributes enormously to inefficiency. The Hospital Review and Planning Council has calculated that it would take $393 million to modernize and rebuild the hospitals in the city. The capital debt was piled up because hospitals refused to put away money for replacement of plant. Blue Cross in its reimbursement formula does provide some money for capital costs.

The many hospitals work with obsolete kitchens, laundries, pharmacies and arrangements of rooms in wards. The last often requires more nurses than necessary because patients are scattered in units on different floors.

One silent consumer of dollars is what is called the hospital's traffic pattern. Since the largest hospitals have grown by bits and pieces, they have elevators, tunnels and bridges at odd places. Food, laundry, doctors, nurses and patients have to travel many extra miles each day, consuming time that might otherwise be well spent.

All told, however, some progress has been made in increasing hospital efficiency, reducing overhospitalization, bringing pressure to bear on overall costs. But there is a long way to go before any of this is reflected in Blue Cross rates.

Two Robberies in 30 Minutes: D.A.'s Wife Cringes in Crime Wave

Four armed marauders ranging in age from 15 to 22 were in custody yesterday after committing a robbery near District Attorney Frank S. Hogan's home on upper Riverside Drive. It was their second holdup within 30 minutes on the drive.

It is no secret that the prosecutor's wife, even like women all over New York City, dreads going out at night in the area of her apartment house at 404 Riverside Drive, near 112th Street.

Police of the West 126th Street Precinct gave these details:

Shortly after 11 p.m. Monday, Melvin Moskowitz, 18, a rabbinical student at Yeshiva Haichel Hatorah School, 630 Riverside Drive, at 140th Street, walked out of the school and was set upon by four strangers just outside the school's entrance. Threatened with a knife and what looked like .22-caliber pistol, his assailants demanded $5—which he didn't have.

The rabbinical student managed to get out of their clutches and ran back into the school, where the police were notified of the incident.

A half hour later, as radio police were on the prowl for the four felons, they spotted a quartet pummeling Syed Ahmed in front of 456 Riverside Drive, at 118th Street, where he lives. He had been robbed of $30, which the police recovered as they grabbed the assailants, later identified by the rabbinical student as his attackers.

Neither of the victims was seriously injured. Three of the four suspects were booked for violating the weapons law as well as for assault and robbery. They were identified by police as Manuel Vargas, of 2291 Second Avenue, and Manuel Ramirez, of 600 West 142d Street, both 22, and Luis Morales, 18, of 636 West 136th Street. They were held in $2,000 bail each in criminal court. The identity of the fourth suspect was withheld because he is only 15. He was held as a juvenile delinquent.

District Attorney Hogan, who has lived in the same Riverside Drive building for many years, is generally driven to and from his home by an armed detective in an official unmarked black Cadillac.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXXIX

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following articles concern the loss of factory jobs in New York City and the cost of medical care.

They appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 16, 1965, as part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" and follow:

New York City in Crisis: How Blue Cross Can Cut Rates: Untangle Services

(By Earl Ubell)

Until somebody organizes New York's tangled net of medical services, your Blue Cross premiums will continue to creep upward. Blue Cross, along with the rest of us, is caught in that web.

It is the cost of hospital care that primarily determines what you pay for insurance. And the costs depend on erratic, conflicting and often irrevocable decisions of groups acting in their self-interest. Here are some typical judgments made every day in this city:

A doctor places his patient in a hospital rather than a nursing home so he can collect a fee.

A patient pressures a doctor to hospitalize him so that insurance will pay. His policy doesn't pay for home care.

A hospital administrator sends out the order: Don't discharge your patient until another one can fill that bed.

A board of trustees maintains a small, inefficient and obsolete hospital because of "tradition."

A city government doesn't pay the full bill for indigent patients in voluntary hospitals.

A community doesn't assume the full burden of training interns, residents, and nurses; instead it loads the cost on to Blue Cross.

In each case Blue Cross can take only mild corrective action if it finds out what has happened. The cash and privately insured patients pay through the nose.

BIG RECOMMENDATIONS

What can be done about this irrational system of medical care? Last Saturday, the Governor's committee on hospital costs, headed by Marion B. Folsom, made some powerful recommendations. Essentially, the committee attempted to impose controls on each group in various ways:

On doctors: "Utilization" committees in each hospital that would judge the reasonableness of each hospitalization, plus a New York State Health Department medical audit plan to check the quality of medical care rendered by doctors.

On patients: New insurance laws that provide alternatives to hospitalization: home care, nursing home care, free admission testing that would provide lab facilities before a patient gets to the hospital.

On hospital administrators: A uniform accounting system, utilization committees, demands for full-week, all-year operation, joint purchasing with other hospitals and better management.

On boards of trustees: More power to State and regional hospital review and planning councils to limit the number of beds, to consolidate small hospitals, to convert others to nursing homes and to close still others.

On the city government: A demand that it pay the full cost of indigent patients.

On the community: A plan to take the burden of training nurses and other medical personnel from the hospitals' budget.

The committee also criticized Blue Cross for being so yielding to the demands of hospitals and asked it to increase representation on its board of directors from subscribers and the general public, to reduce the hospital domination.

THE FORMULA FOR PAY

And then there was the formula by which Blue Cross pays the hospitals. The Folsom committee wants it revised to increase incentives for economy in the hospitals. In short, the committee wants Blue Cross to be tougher than it has ever been.

J. Douglas Colman, head of Associated Hospital Service (the city's Blue Cross), said about the committee: "Most of the recommendations of the Governor's committee will have our wholehearted support. In fact, many of them stem from Blue Cross demonstrations. As the committee itself said, the crucial matter is implementation. Usefulness to the patients will depend on how and how soon they are put into action."

Indeed, Blue Cross in New York has stepped up its pressure on hospitals. The formula by which hospitals are paid introduced for the first time in 1959 a careful audit of hospital books. That has cut down flagrant abuses in proprietary (profitmaking) hospitals and exposed careless administration in voluntary hospitals.

Furthermore, Blue Cross has campaigned against unnecessary beds by refusing to sign contracts with proprietary hospitals which build in areas where more hospital facilities are not needed. In addition, the formula penalizes hospitals operating unnecessary beds.

If all the Folsom recommendations are carried out, it is likely that they will reduce hospital costs, or at the very least increase services to patients. The question is: Will they be carried out?

First, the State and city governments will have to put up some $50 million a year in cash for training programs and indigent patients. The State will also have to find some way to help voluntary hospitals catch up with capital improvement programs worth $400 million. Fast action on those points is not likely, considering the problem with the present State budget.

Second, the Folsom committee really ducked the crucial issue: The total organization of medical care in the community. Although they recommended more power to the regional hospital councils and to the State department of health, they drew up no grand scheme for untangling the city's medical services.

In particular, they also incidentally suggested what should be done with physicians, who ultimately control most of what is spent for medical care. The Folsom committee recommended such things as utilization committees, which supposedly would eliminate unnecessary hospitalization. However, it is not unknown in the history of medicine that mutual backscratching among doctors can make a mockery out of the most stringent regulations.

Few experts believe that doctors can be controlled by regulations. They think the best method is to induce the medical community to make voluntary arrangements in their own self-interest.

Such arrangements have been made in California in the Kaiser Medical Plan, where doctors practice in partnerships in hospitals. The plan is arranged to benefit the physician if he chooses the appropriate institution for treatment: home, office, or hospital. It makes no difference to a patient—everything is covered by insurance.

In New York, the Health Insurance Plan also attempts to organize doctors in groups, but they do not operate out of hospitals. In fact, although HIP patients have a lower hospitalization rate than patients treated by physicians in solo practice, the benefit of that lowered hospitalization does not accrue to the doctors.

A CHANGE SUGGESTED

The Folsom committee suggested a change in New York State's law that would permit HIP to sell its own hospital insurance, which it may not now do. This would reduce the total HIP premium and possibly leave Blue Cross with high-risk patients.

David Heyman, a member of the board of hospitals and a financier, has in the past suggested a grandiose plan of medical service in New York. In essence, all the doctors would be organized in groups centered around hospitals, which in turn would be supervised by medical schools or teaching hospitals. Such an organization could provide a rational basis for keeping medical costs within bounds.

However, few persons give that plan any chance unless there is a deep and sudden crisis. If nothing checks Blue Cross rates, that crisis may come sooner than expected.

Ten Thousand Factory Jobs a Year Down the Drain

(By Barrett McGurn)

New York City is still suffering a net loss of 10,000 factory jobs each year despite mounting efforts to reverse the trend.

This is the best information in the hands of Louis Broido, commissioner of commerce and industrial development, as he works with one of the smallest departmental staffs in the municipal government to combat industrial anemia.

The drain goes on. One Brooklyn factory, for instance, according to Mr. Broido, is sorely tempted by an offer it has just received from southeast Pennsylvania. A group of businessmen there have chipped $3 million into an industrial development corporation and are dangling low-interest loans before the eyes of the intrigued Brooklynites. It will be hard for Mr. Broido, with the present limited assets at his command, to thwart the Pennsylvania maneuver.

SQUEEZING INDUSTRY OUT

Pressures of all sorts are squeezing industry out of the five boroughs.

Part of it is the rival demand for more educational and park space. When Mr. Broido's aids read a New York City newspaper editorial yesterday recommending that city-owned land in the Flatlands part of Brooklyn be used as a park and school zone, one of them commented bitterly:

"More park land in which more unemployed can enjoy more leisure."

In that case, Mr. Broido has the inside track, however, since the board of estimate already has given tentative approval to the idea of converting the Flatlands plot into an industrial center.

The key trouble facing New York industry, according to a survey by the department of commerce and industrial development, is the shortage of space for horizontal expansion. Factories like to operate on one level, not inside skyscrapers. Zoning that is already tough where factories are concerned is, according to Mr. Broido's staff, getting even more severe. Factories are being "boxed in" in favor of residential developments.

When Mr. Broido's staff asked factory operators what their greatest headaches were, many mentioned traffic, labor costs, and taxes, but 70 percent cited the shortage of space as No. 1.

Working quietly with the board of estimate and with other sections of the city government, Mr. Broido is pressing for an easing of the anti-industrial zoning laws. Where a rule cannot be changed, sometimes a more favorable "interpretation" is possible, although Mr. Broido's aids concede that "obviously zoning laws cannot be flouted."

Mr. Broido's staff recognizes that 10,000 lost industrial jobs are a threat to a city with a large population of high school dropouts and unskilled (many of them Negroes and Puerto Ricans) people who find it hard to uncover any other employment opportunities and are drawn toward the rolls of vandalism and the ranks of the half million New Yorkers who are already on relief.

Even so Commissioner Broido is far from despair. During the last month, thanks in part to the publicity that has been given to the commissioner's fight against the blue-collar job drain, a dozen factories have asked his assistance in getting part of the $100 million in State aid now available for industry.

This is a marked gain from 2 years ago when Mr. Broido revamped the city commerce department. At that time it was little more than a glad-hand agency for welcoming official visitors and tourists.

In his first weeks, Mr. Broido received no requests for aid.

The results of the upsurge will not be felt for another 6 to 12 months, however, for fly-by-nights must be screened out, credit ratings of applicants must be checked, according to the staff of the city's commerce and development department.

In all, 10 factories so far have qualified through Mr. Broido for the State aid. They have received an average of $219,000 in second mortgage loans of 15 to 20 years at the low interest rate of from 2¾ to 3½ percent interest. Almost all of this aid was effected during the last year, Commissioner Broido's second year in action.

A second reason why Commissioner Broido is not disheartened by the continuing blue-collar job flight is that as he says, he thinks "the worm has turned." During 1964 New York City has lost 10,000 factory jobs, but the previous 5 years were 50 percent worse. From 1958 through 1963, the city lost an average of 15,000 industrial jobs a year, many of them in the garment trade that moved into the low-wage area of the South.

At least the downdraft is a third less than it was.

Perhaps because misery loves company, Mr. Broido's aids also draw a certain reassurance from the fact that New York is not alone among the Nation's great cities where needed industrial jobs are concerned. A certain grim satisfaction was derived this week at the department of commerce and industrial development from a Chicago announcement that the city has just lost 2 major industries, and from a Detroit admission that 126,000 industrial jobs have vanished in the last 6 years—45,000 more than New York City has lost.

Many of the Detroiters moved away. The automobile city's labor force has shrunk by 108,000.

Many big city factory jobs have vanished altogether, eaten away by mergers and automation. Some have moved to the South and to California.

Even more grounds for hope that the 10,000-a-year loss eventually may be stemmed in New York City is drawn at the department of commerce and industrial development from a set of arguments that have been worked up as an answer to fleeing factories.

Is it true that other areas do not have New York City's occupancy tax? This is the department's reply: True, but after you move there you may find that they invent new taxes. Take the case of the Reliable Sample Co. It moved 4 years ago to Wanaque, N.J., in the Ramapos, attracted by low taxes. Then a $5,000 inventory tax was created. When the factory moved back to

New York City a month ago the town announced additional tariffs, a total of $12,000. The town tried to impound the plant's machinery until the sum was paid. The case is still being argued.

Is it true that New York's wages are high? The department's answer: When you consider low worker output in certain southern areas New York City wages are not all that high.

There is a part 2 to this reply. The department cites what happened when the Defense Department protested about high union wages at the New York Naval Shipyard and moved a $40 million contract for LPD electronic landing ships to Pascagoula, Miss. Production at Pascagoula since then has been interrupted by a strike and wages have had to be raised. The moral, according to Mr. Broido's department: "Labor costs rise wherever factories go."

DOESN'T MINIMIZE NEED

A final reason for reassurance in Commissioner Broido's view is that even though New York City has lost 81,000 desirable factory jobs in 6 years gains in other areas have caused an employment increase of 30,400 in the city during 1964. Skyscraper jobs for the well educated continue to multiply.

This, the commissioner said, was a 271 percent better showing than New York City made in each of the previous 5 years when the average employment gain inside the 5 boroughs was 11,200 jobs a year.

Mr. Broido does not suggest that this minimizes the need for factory jobs, a type of employment required by many of New York's neediest. He and his aids do argue, however, that in-the-family talks with other municipal branches have cut many of the cords that have been strangling New York City industry now.

These talks have been with the city housing authority (which sometimes wants to condemn factory land for public dwellings), Federal, State, and city public works agencies, the housing and redevelopment board, the buildings department, the city planning commission, and the highway and traffic department; have cut many of the cords that have been strangling New York City industry until now.

The building department has been showing factories how to construct loading platforms making it easier to handle cargo in a city of congestion. The highway department has cooperated in the sale of sections of the public streets to factories that had no other place for expansion. Each of the other agencies has listened to Mr. Broido with more patience than a factory man on his own might have expected.

ADDRESSES BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FREEMAN

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of accompanying Secretary of Agriculture Freeman on his tour of three Department research installations on May 27, 28, and 29. We visited the Northern Utilization Research and Development Laboratory at Peoria, Ill.; the Southern Utilization Research and Development Laboratory at New Orleans, La.; and the unique "fly factory" at Mission, Tex., where Department entomologists are raising screwworms in an attempt to annihilate this costly menace to southwestern cattle production.

I was tremendously impressed with what I saw at all three places:

The scientific centers at Peoria and New Orleans are producing a steady flow of new products and processes that enrich our lives. Consumers gain by getting better foods and fabrics and other goods of everyday living. Industry gains by getting good basic raw materials at good prices. Farmers gain by profitable use of their crops. Our economy, our whole Nation, benefits from the increased flow of goods and services provided by utilization research.

Secretary Freeman's two major speeches during the tour provided valuable insight into the utilization research effort in agriculture, as well as the extraordinary work underway to rid the Southwest of the screwworm.

With the consent of the House, I would like to introduce his two speeches into the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN AT A DINNER MEETING JOINTLY SPONSORED BY THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE NEW ORLEANS AREA AND THE FEDERAL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION, NEW ORLEANS, LA., MAY 28, 1965

It is certainly no secret that I am proud of American agriculture. I want every American to share that feeling of pride.

Each year the American people enjoy a greater abundance of food of higher quality and at lower real cost than ever before. That abundance has contributed to our strength—and to the welfare of people throughout the world.

Almost daily I am visited by delegations from countries all over the world. Without exception, regardless of political persuasion or the area of the world they represent, all of them express their respect—and amazement—at the marvel of American agriculture. They find it hard to believe that fewer than 8 percent of the American people can produce more food and fiber than we can use or even sell and share abroad.

President Johnson, I know, has great pride in our agriculture. He has said:

"Progress in every aspect of our Nation's life depends on the abundant harvest of our fields. Because our people eat better, at less cost, than any other people in all the world's history, we can spend our earnings for the many other things which make life rewarding."

Why American agriculture is so successful is no secret. Our system of agriculture is based on the American family farm. No other system provides the incentive for innovation and enterprise as does the family farm. An immense industrial complex employing millions of persons to make and distribute nearly $30 billion worth of equipment, fertilizer, chemicals and all the other products used in farming has been built around the American family farm.

Similarly, in order to move the abundance of food and fiber to the consumer, a processing and manufacturing complex which distributes over $100 billion worth of essential consumer products each year has been developed around American agriculture.

While only one out of every 14 people today is a farmer, a great many more Americans depend on his productivity and his energy for the paycheck they draw.

Here in New Orleans, for example, over 30 percent of the Nation's grain exports leave for world markets each year—and this is more than twice the volume of grain exports handled by any other port. Together with Baton Rouge, this area accounts for over a third of the grain we export.

Prosperity in agriculture means prosperity in business and industry, and New Orleans is a good example of that fact.

My job as Secretary of Agriculture is to insure to the best of my abilities that the strength of this partnership in prosperity between agriculture and industry and commerce is never diminished. And that is the reason I am here in New Orleans.

I am midway in an all-too-brief tour of a number of the research installations maintained by the Department. I am making this inspection because I am keenly aware that research is another essential ingredient in the success of American agriculture.

The productivity of American agriculture is a continued challenge to our scientific ability. While agriculture is successful today, we cannot assume that it will be equally successful in the future. Vast new areas of knowledge need to be tapped if we are to continue to move ahead.

The seeds which produce our crops today will likely be susceptible to disease in another decade or two. So we must constantly develop new and better seeds. As consumer needs change, we must develop food and fiber products which will meet these new appetites and desires. These are only two of the many jobs that research must perform.

Earlier today, our group visited the Southern Utilization Research Laboratory. There, we saw striking examples of the kind of consumer-oriented research that is so important to agriculture. The new finishes for cotton fabrics and the new foods we saw are the latest in a long line of innovations that have made life a little more comfortable and healthful, a little more satisfying and enjoyable for our people.

I was very much interested in the single chemical treatment that gives cotton its desirable wash-wear characteristics and, at the same time, permits the use of attractive and inexpensive dyes.

We saw a yet experimental process that removes most of the oil and calories from peanuts without affecting their flavor or protein. This new process can apparently be applied to other nuts as well. This new technique should go a long way in helping to open up markets for peanuts, particularly in this era of emphasis on low-calorie diets.

I was also interested in the methods for producing sweetpotato flakes and cottonseed flour. The flakes are helping to bring back our old markets for sweetpotatoes. And an acceptable flour that is rich in protein could play a major role in feeding people in the developing nations of the world.

I was particularly impressed by the basic research efforts now underway to isolate pure seed proteins and study their chemical and physical properties. This work, by Dr. Altschul, could result in a much better understanding of the process of plant growth than we have now.

The work that I saw today at the Southern Laboratory is part of a larger nationwide effort in utilization research and development. The major share of this research is done in 4 regional laboratories—a fifth to be added soon—and 10 field stations throughout the country. Some is done under contract by State agricultural stations, universities, and industry. And some is done in the research institutions of 20 countries in Europe, Asia, South America, and Australia, with funds generated by the Public Law 480 program.

This research pays dividends to the entire economy. Consumers have more desirable or more varied products. Overseas markets are more adequately supplied. Producers and processors have additional sources of income, and agricultural resources are more effectively utilized.

We take a hard, practical approach in this work. We recognize that the most obvious uses for farm products were exploited long ago.

We also know that developing a technically possible process is only the beginning. The process must then meet the tests of economics and practicality. And the resulting end product must fill a real need of industry or consumers and be able to compete with alternate products on the market. Our goals are not met if we merely shift markets from one abundant commodity to another.

The success of this research indicates these conditions are not impossible to meet. There are many examples:

Convenience foods have revolutionized our eating habits. You know them all—frozen vegetables, fruits, and whole meals; potato flakes and granules; powdered eggs and milk; cake mixes; and the frozen orange juice concentrate that was developed here in the South with the Florida Citrus Commission.

Washable, shrinkproof wools that keep their softness, and improved cottons, have been received enthusiastically by consumers. The cottons were developed in the Southern Laboratory here in New Orleans. Besides the wash-wear fabrics, there are also cottons that resist soiling, wrinkling, fire, rot, water, weather, and mildew; and cottons that can be molded and others that are resilient and stretchable.

Techniques for mass production of penicillin developed in the USDA laboratory at Peoria, Ill., made this drug, and subsequently other wonder drugs, widely available for treating diseases. The benefits to people can't be measured. For agriculture, it made possible confinement-rearing of poultry and other livestock. One result was an expansion of broiler production from a $50 million industry to a $1 billion industry in about 20 years.

Methods for producing dextran have made it available as an extender for blood plasma.

Improved technology for processing soybeans has been used so effectively by industry that today, they are a major source of vegetable oils for food and industrial use.

About a million pounds of starch are being produced from corn each year by a process developed through utilization research. This is a specialized type of cornstarch used mainly to add strength to paper toweling.

Another product from grain, called cereal xanthate, has potential use in the manufacture of insulation board, corrugated boxes, and paper. There is a potential market for 100 million bushels of grain a year for this product in the paper industry.

A new linseed oil paint that is water soluble is beginning to compete successfully with the synthetic paints which have taken much of the traditional market of our flaxseed producers. I understand linseed oil may gain a share of the sizeable market for coatings to protect concrete.

Surplus animal fats are moving into industrial outlets as plastics and plasticizers for use in raincoats, seat covers, paper coatings, waxes, and other applications.

This is an outstanding record of keeping agricultural raw materials competitive in this specialized age. But much remains to be done. There are too many problems to be solved—too many questions that remain unanswered—for us to do other than continue to work and to invest to make our utilization research even more effective.

As an example:

Everyone is concerned about the quality of food and feed. Only a short time ago, toxins were shown to be positively identified with certain moldy agricultural commodities. Needless to say, both the Department of Agriculture and industry are deeply concerned about this problem. Both want to protect consumers from possible hazards by keeping our stored commodities free of any kind of contamination.

Our people at the Southern Utilization Laboratory are hard at work to learn how to prevent their growth, or to remove them as a source of contamination.

This is a relatively new problem—one that couldn't have been foreseen despite our best efforts. The point is—such unforeseen problems are a normal part of problem solving in research. Any scientist will tell you that as he resolves one difficulty, the door opens just wide enough for him to see many more. He has learned enough to ask the questions he couldn't have asked before.

Utilization research also has a prominent part to play in agricultural exports. Products must be tailored to the needs of foreign consumers, at a price they can pay, and stable enough to withstand shipping and storage.

The parboiled wheat product, bulgur, meets these criteria. Before long, we hope to achieve substantial dollar markets abroad for this nutritious food.

Utilization research has created a market in Japan for five million bushels of soybeans annually for use in traditional Japanese foods. This specialized market did not exist a few years ago. Actually, until about 20 years ago, the United States had no significant share of the world soybean market. Now our soybean exports are valued at more than $700 million annually.

American farm exports are of prime importance to our agricultural and business communities, and in the future will be even more so. Last year we shipped to other countries the harvest from one out of every four acres of our cropland. We sent abroad two-thirds of our wheat, nearly two-thirds of our rice, almost half of our soybeans, a third of our cotton, and about a fourth of our tobacco.

Our agricultural exports topped the $6 billion mark last year, a solid contribution to easing our difficult balance-of-payments problem.

I am convinced this figure can go much higher, but only if our products are good and if they are needed. The job of utilization research is to help make certain they meet these standards.

I have a great deal of confidence in the ability of our nationwide agricultural research effort to help solve some of the serious difficulties faced by important agricultural commodities.

Here in the South, research is helping cotton in its uphill battle to retain markets invaded by synthetic fibers. Each year, growers use new knowledge to cut corners—to knock a few cents off the costs of planting, harvesting, and handling. As the domestic and world economies grow more complex and competition becomes stronger and more exacting, growers will depend increasingly on the help of research to maintain a competitive edge in cotton.

The same is true of the South's new livestock economy, which has helped so much to make the area self-sufficient and diversified. This new industry has been made possible by the development of grasses and legumes and cattle specially adapted to the hot and humid regions of the area. It will prosper only as research continues to provide the knowledge necessary to meet the continuing problems.

Most of us here today have lived through several decades of the most profound change the world has ever seen in such a short period of time. But scientists tell us that the most revolutionary changes are still ahead and cannot even be predicted.

Research is the instant reflex we must have to build the Great Society that President Johnson holds before us as a challenge and a dream that can be realized.

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman at Mission, Tex., May 29, 1965

The hospitality that Texans have made famous is enough to make this a day to remember. Most memorable of all, however, is the opportunity to meet here with the Secretary of Agriculture and Livestock of Mexico, Juan Gil Preciado.

I am sure that under his guidance, Mexico will continue to make great progress in animal health and the other agricultural fields in which she has already accomplished so much.

The Secretary's appointment to his present post climaxed a distinguished career in agricultural education and in politics. In our Department, we remember him most for his part in the dramatic campaign of the 1940's and 1950's when our two countries eradicated aftosa—foot-and-mouth disease. His energy, his efficiency, and his warmth made him many friends among our scientists.

We have enjoyed splendid relations with our next-door neighbor in many other cooperative undertakings. We are especially happy that Secretary Gil Preciado is the man we will be working with to achieve our common ends—a healthy agriculture for North America.

The task of achieving and maintaining a healthy agriculture, both in North America and throughout the world, consists of many parts. The Secretary and I have witnessed one of these essential parts here today in the control and eradication of pests.

A healthy agriculture requires that man control the pests and diseases that prey upon it. We must control them safely, and we must learn to do an even better job if tomorrow's hungry people are to be fed.

These are the things I want to talk briefly about today.

Until man turned to research, the control and eradication of pests was a losing game. Without the scientists, there could be no cooperative programs in control and regulation of pests.

This is one reason why I have spent a good deal of time in the past few days inspecting the work of the USDA's agricultural research. I want to know more than I know, and to meet with and talk to some of the people who are leading our race for the tools of abundance.

This morning, however, was the first time I've had to change clothes twice and take a bath in order to find out what's going on. It was worth the trouble.

I have been through the world's largest insect nursery. It was a unique experience. Never before in the long history of man have so many insects been raised artificially. Until now, in fact, the very last thing man has wanted to do was to raise more insects.

One new concept—the sterility principle of pest control—has changed all this. It is one of the few truly original scientific ideas of this century. And, like most revolutionary ideas, it is very simple.

Eliminate the ability of pests to reproduce—let them mate with others of their species—and their failure to reproduce will eventually annihilate their own kind from all the areas they saturate. That's all.

Nearly a quarter of a century passed, however, between the concept and the practical application of this idea—an idea that a Texan originated in Texas. The man is Edward F. Knipling who was born at Port Lavaca and educated at Texas A. & M. College. While he was doing research on screwworm control for the U.S. Department of Agriculture up at Kerrville, in the early 1930's, he originated the sterility principle. His idea received nothing but discouragement; it was utterly visionary and impractical, most people said. And it was—then.

It was the atom that made the idea work. Atomic radiation furnished a means of sterilizing flies wholesale—and an idea became a practical new instrument in man's quest for abundance.

The total cost of 7 years of research on the sterility principle was $250,000. It's one of the best investments ever made in agricultural research. I guess there's no way of measuring the suffering that screwworms once inflicted on livestock and wildlife. Or the years of stockmen's lives that went into treating and preventing screwworm infestations in their animals. But we do figure that screwworm eradication is saving the livestock industry about $20 million a year in the Southeast and more than $60 million a year here in the Southwest. And we can't even speculate on what future applications of this principle may accomplish.

In putting this research to work, our specialists in animal disease eradication have pioneered in many areas. For one thing, they have made screwworm eradication an outstanding example of the peaceful use of atomic energy. And in getting the programs airborne, they have solved some of the most staggering biological and engineering problems that our Department has ever faced.

The sterility method was used to eradicate screwworms from the Dutch island of Curaçao in 1954 and from the southeastern United States in 1959.

The eradication of this costly livestock pest from the Southwest was infinitely more complex. For example, the fly would never have been pushed down below the international border without the splendid cooperation we have enjoyed with our partners from the Republic of Mexico. And here in the Southwest, livestock producers and sportsmen of five States took the lead. Through the Southwest Animal Health Research Foundation, they reached down in their pockets and raised money to match the Federal funds. The State of Texas supported the program. Extension services, teachers, and students of vocational agriculture, regulatory agencies, and many other public and private groups did their part.

Work began in February of 1962, and 2 years later the cooperators were able to announce that self-sustaining populations of the screwworm had been eradicated all the way west to Arizona.

Since we no longer have native-born screwworms in the eradication area, the program east of Arizona has become one of protection against reinfestation. We now need to find the most economical way to maintain a living barrier of sterile flies to the south of us.

This barrier protects not only livestock, but wildlife as well. Right here in Hidalgo County, I am told, deer numbers increased 60 percent last year.

I understand, though, that a ranchman who leases his land for hunting can get more for a pound of venison on the hoof than he can for a pound of beef. This is, I am sure, a welcome dividend both for the farmer and the sportsmen.

This self-eradication method has enormous promise for people throughout the world. It helped wipe out the melon fly on the isolated Pacific island of Rota and the oriental fruit fly on Guam. It is used along the California-Mexico border against the Mexican fruit fly. Researchers in Egypt Israel, and Central America are exploring possibilities of using the method against the Mediterranean fruit fly. And in the Caribbean, on Grand Turk Island, our entomologists are testing the sterility method against house flies.

In Africa, researchers are studying the possibility of sterilizing tsetse flies to control one of the world's worst disease-spreading insects. These flies spread sleeping sickness in humans, and disease in livestock, over African areas larger than the United States. If tsetse flies could be eradicated from many of these areas—and that's a mighty big "if"—millions of acres might be freed of one of the most formidable obstacles to livestock production. These areas could then help to supply the protein so scarce in those areas.

Control of pests is an essential task if the American people are to continue to enjoy their present high standard of living, and if the age of abundance is to be enjoyed by all of mankind. If the tools we have today for this work had not been developed—the chemical, biological, environmental and others—the consequence would be catastrophic. Many of the foods we consider to be commonplace would be expensive luxuries, and some would not be available at all. The cost of food would likely be much higher—perhaps as much as a third more costly.

The value of pest control should never be underestimated, nor taken for granted. At the same time, however, the methods we use to control pests must always carefully consider the health and well-being of people who use either pesticides or the products protected by their use, and also the protection of fish, wildlife, soil, air, and water from pesticide pollution.

It should not be overlooked that to protect human health often requires the intelligent use—the safe use—of pesticides. This was dramatically illustrated in Houston last August when that city was battling an outbreak of encephalitis. Insecticides helped to destroy the disease-carrying mosquito and their breeding grounds.

We use—and encourage others to use—those effective means of pest control that provide the least potential hazard to man and animals. When residual pesticides must be used, they should be applied sparingly, precisely, and only as often as is absolutely necessary. We urge that all users of pesticides exercise constant vigilance to assure the protection of human health by avoiding unnecessary exposure of crops, livestock, fish, and wildlife.

Further, the search for new ways to control pests without the use of chemicals—or with a minimum use of such materials—is one of our greatest research efforts today. The development of the sterility method of pest control shows this kind of research has been carried on for many years. And last year the Congress appropriated an additional $28 million primarily for this purpose. We have developed many highly imaginative means for dealing with pests, such as combining a small amount of pesticide with an attractant to selectively control pests; and we are working on others, such as the use of light and sound to attract a specific pest.

The sterility concept represents the biggest single breakthrough in controlling pests without the use of chemicals. It is a unique example of safety and effectiveness. It illustrates dramatically what happens when one man has an idea and the persistence to see it put to use. And it shows what cooperation—from ranch to ranch, from State to State, from nation to nation—can accomplish. Eventually thousands, millions, and perhaps even billions of people benefit.

I am convinced that, working together, we can protect agriculture against its natural enemies and, at the same time, safeguard the health of the rest of our environment.

A JOINT RESOLUTION TO ADOPT A SPECIFIC VERSION OF THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER AS THE NATIONAL ANTHEM OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BANDSTRA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution to adopt a specific version of "The Star-Spangled Banner" as the national anthem of the United States of America.

When our national anthem was officially adopted in 1931, the act of Congress declared that "the words and music known as 'The Star-Spangled Banner' is designated the national anthem of the United States of America." In the years since then, many Americans have come to believe that only one song is our national anthem and have not realized that the music of "The Star-Spangled Banner," like many of our folk tunes, is sung by many people, each using his own tune. Consequently, the music known as "The Star-Spangled Banner" refers to many different songs, and our national anthem is left open to editing by everyone. Much of this editing may be good, but some of it may be in poor taste and not in keeping in dignity with the national anthem. This can be confusing to the citizen who sincerely wants to sing or hear the "real" version of "The Star-Spangled Banner."

A musician in my district, Dr. Henry Cox, has spent many hours studying, editing, and revising our national anthem with the goal in mind of preparing one arrangement which would retain the patriotic quality of the song, be in good musical style, avoid the monotony of rhythm that is sometimes found, and follow the rhythmic pattern of speech, as well as the meaning, intended by Francis Scott Key's original poem.

Dr. Cox's almost 65 years of study has resulted in the version of "The Star-Spangled Banner" which I am introducing today.

Dr. Cox is highly qualified as a musician, and his version of "The Star-Spangled Banner" has been praised as an excellent arrangement. Dr. Cox, now 84 years of age, is well known in his hometown of Pella, Iowa, where he lives in retirement. His musical career has been a long and successful one. A teacher of music since his 15th year, he was conductor of the Pella Band at the age of 16. In 1897, he was graduated from the Des Moines Musical College in Des Moines, Iowa, and later did 2 years of graduate study in Berlin. During his career, he was director of the Grinnell College Band at Grinnell, Iowa; director of the Music Department at Central College at Pella; head of the Orchestra Department of the Des Moines Musical College; chairman of the music faculty of Christian College in Columbia, Mo.; head of the Orchestral Department of the State University of Iowa at Iowa City, Iowa; and engaged in various musical activities in Omaha, Nebr., from 1909 until 1939, including founding of the Omaha School of Orchestral Instruments and the Omaha Music School Settlement.

In 1939, he retired from his activities in Omaha and returned to Pella, and in 1944 became head of the Orchestral Department at Central College. He retired from that position in 1949, but continued to teach in his private studio at Pella. He is the author of two books on music and, throughout his teaching career, was active as a concert violinist.

Dr. Cox has given much time and thought to his version of "The Star-Spangled Banner," and I hope the Congress will give careful consideration to adopting it as the official version of our national anthem.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON AT HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gilligan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 4, President Lyndon Johnson delivered an address at Howard University that is of the greatest historic importance to the Nation and to the world. I do not presume too much in saying this, nor in stating that it should be read as a manifesto for all men of all time who genuinely believe in democracy and the institutions of freedom. I deem it a truly high honor to include it in the Record of the Congress of the United States:

Address by President Johnson at Howard University

Our earth is the home of revolution.

In every corner of every continent men charged with hope contend with ancient ways in pursuit of justice. They reach for the newest of weapons to realize the oldest of dreams: that each may walk in freedom and pride, stretching his talents, enjoying the fruits of the earth.

Our enemies may occasionally seize the day of change. But it is the banner of our revolution they take. And our own future is linked to this process of swift and turbulent change in many lands. But nothing, in any country, touches us more profoundly, nothing is more freighted with meaning for our own destiny, than the revolution of the Negro American.

In far too many ways American Negroes have been another nation: Deprived of freedom, crippled by hatred, the doors of opportunity closed to hope.

In our time change has come to this Nation too. Heroically, the American Negro—acting with impressive restraint—has peacefully protested and marched, entered the courtrooms and the seats of government, demanding a justice long denied. The voice of the Negro was the call to action. But it is a tribute to America that, once aroused, the courts and the Congress, the President and most of the people, have been the allies of progress.

Thus we have seen the high court of the country declare that discrimination based on race was repugnant to the Constitution and therefore void. We have seen—in 1957, 1960, and again in 1964—the first civil rights legislation in almost a century.

As majority leader I helped guide two of these bills through the Senate. And, as your President, I was proud to sign the third. And soon we will have the fourth new law, guaranteeing every American the right to vote.

No act of my administration will give me greater satisfaction than the day when my signature makes this bill too, the law of the land.

NOT THE END

The voting rights bill will be the latest, and among the most important, in a long series of victories. But this victory—as Winston Churchill said of another triumph for freedom—"is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning."

That beginning is freedom; and the barriers to that freedom are tumbling. Freedom is the right to share, fully and equally, in American society—to vote, to hold a job, to enter a public place, to go to school. It is the right to be treated, in every part of our national life, as a man equal in dignity and promise to all others.

But freedom is not enough. You do not wipe away the scars of centuries by saying: Now, you are free to go where you want, do as you desire, and choose the leaders you please.

You do not take a man who, for years, has been hobbled by chains, liberate him, bring him to the starting line of a race, saying "you are free to compete with all the others," and still justly believe you have been completely fair.

Thus it is not enough to open the gates of opportunity. All our citizens must have the ability to walk through those gates.

This is the next and the more profound stage of the battle for civil rights. We seek not just freedom but opportunity—not just legal equity but human ability—not just equality as a right and a theory, but equality as a fact and a result.

For the task is to give 20 million Negroes the same chance as every other American to learn and grow, to work and share in society, to develop their abilities, physical, mental, and spiritual, and to pursue their individual happiness.

To this end equal opportunity is essential, but not enough. Men and women of all races are born with the same range of abilities. But ability is not just the product of birth. It is stretched or stunted by the family you live with, and the neighborhood you live in—by the school you go to, and the poverty or richness of your surroundings. It is the product of a hundred unseen forces playing upon the infant, the child and the man.

This graduating class at Howard University is witness to the indomitable determination of the Negro American to win his way in American life.

The number of Negroes in schools of high learning has almost doubled in 15 years. The number of nonwhite professional workers has more than doubled in 10 years. The median income of Negro college women now exceeds that of white college women. And these are the enormous accomplishments of distinguished individual Negroes—many of them graduates of this institution.

These are proud and impressive achievements. But they only tell the story of a growing middle-class minority, steadily narrowing the gap between them and their white counterparts.

GRIMMER STORY

But for the great majority of Negro Americans—the poor, the unemployed, the uprooted and dispossessed—there is a grimmer story. They still are another nation. Despite the court orders and the laws, the victories and speeches, for them the walls are rising and the gulf is widening.

Here are some of the facts of this American failure:

Thirty-five years ago the rate of unemployment for Negroes and whites was about the same. Today the Negro rate is twice as high.

In 1948 the 8-percent unemployment rate for Negro teenage boys was actually less than that of whites. By last year it had grown to 23 percent as against 13 percent for whites.

Between 1949 and 1959, the income of Negro men relative to white men declined in every section of the country. From 1952 to 1963 the median income of Negro families compared to white actually dropped from 57 to 53 percent.

In the years 1955–57, 22 percent of experienced Negro workers were out of work at some time during the year. In 1961–63 that portion had soared to 29 percent.

Since 1947, the number of white families living in poverty has decreased 27 percent, while the number of poor nonwhite families went down only 3 percent.

The infant mortality of nonwhites in 1940 was 70 percent greater than whites. Twenty-two years later it was 90 percent greater.

Moreover, the isolation of Negro from white communities is increasing, rather than diminishing, as Negroes crowd into the central cities—becoming a city within a city.

Of course, Negro Americans, as well as white Americans, have shared in our rising national abundance. But the harsh fact of the matter is that in the battle for true equality too many are losing ground.

TWO BASIC REASONS

We are not completely sure why this is. The causes are complex and subtle. But we do know the two broad basic reasons. And we know we have to act.

First, Negroes are trapped—as many whites are trapped—in inherited, gateless poverty. They lack training and skills. They are shut in slums, without decent medical care. Private and public poverty combine to cripple their capacities.

We are attacking these evils through our poverty program, our education program, our health program, and a dozen more—aimed at the root causes of poverty.

We will increase, and accelerate, and broaden this attack in years to come, until this most enduring of foes yields to our unyielding will.

But there is a second cause, more difficult to explain, more deeply grounded, more desperate in its force. It is the devastating heritage of long years of slavery, and a century of oppression, hatred, and injustice.

For Negro poverty is not white poverty. Many of its causes and many of its cures are the same. But there are differences—deep, corrosive, obstinate differences—radiating painful roots into the community, the family, and the nature of the individual.

These differences are not racial differences. They are solely and simply the consequence of ancient brutality, past injustice, and present prejudice. They are anguishing to observe. For the Negro they are a reminder of oppression. For the white they are a reminder of guilt. But they must be faced, and dealt with, and overcome, if we are to reach the time when the only difference between Negroes and whites is the color of their skin.

Nor can we find a complete answer in the experience of other American minorities. They made a valiant and largely successful effort to emerge from poverty and prejudice. The Negro, like these others, will have to rely mostly on his own efforts. But he cannot do it alone. For they did not have the heritage of centuries to overcome. They did not have a cultural tradition which had been twisted and battered by endless years of hatred and hopelessness. Nor were they excluded because of race or color—a feeling whose dark intensity is matched by no other prejudice in our society.

Nor can these differences be understood as isolated informities. They are a seamless web. They cause each other. They result from each other. They reinforce each other. Much of the Negro community is buried under a blanket of history and circumstance. It is not a lasting solution to lift just one corner. We must stand on all sides and raise the entire cover if we are to liberate our fellow citizens.

One of the differences is the increased concentration of Negroes in our cities. More than 73 percent of all Negroes live in urban areas compared with less than 70 percent of whites. Most of them live in slums. And most of them live together; a separated people. Men are shaped by their world. When it is a world of decay ringed by an invisible wall—when escape is arduous and uncertain, and the saving pressures of a more hopeful society are unknown—it can cripple the youth and desolate the man.

There is also the burden a dark skin can add to the search for a productive place in society. Unemployment strikes most swiftly and broadly at the Negro. This burden erodes hope. Blighted hope breeds despair. Despair brings indifference to the learning which offers a way out. And despair coupled with indifference is often the source of destructive rebellion against the fabric of society.

There is also the lacerating hurt of early collision with white hatred or prejudice, distaste or condescension. Other groups have felt similar intolerance. But success and achievement could wipe it away. They do not change the color of a man's skin. I have seen this uncomprehending pain in the eyes of young Mexican-American schoolchildren. It can be overcome. But, for many, the wounds are always open.

Perhaps most important—its influence radiating to every part of life—is the breakdown of the Negro family structure. For this, most of all, white America must accept responsibility. It flows from centuries of oppression and persecution of the Negro man. It flows from the long years of degradation and discrimination which have attacked his dignity and assaulted his ability to provide for hs family.

This, too, is not pleasant to look upon. But it must be faced by those whose serious intent is to improve the life of all Americans.

Only a minority—less than half—of all Negro children reach the age of 18 having lived all their lives with both parents. At this moment, today, little less than two-thirds are living with both parents. Probably a majority of all Negro children receive federally aided public assistance during their childhood.

The family is the cornerstone of our society. More than any other force it shapes the attitude, the hopes, the ambitions, and the values of the child. When the family collapses the child is usually damaged. When it happens on a massive scale the community itself is crippled.

Unless we work to strengthen the family—to create conditions under which most parents will stay together—all the rest: schools and playgrounds, public assistance and private concern—will not be enough to cut completely the circle of despair and deprivation.

There is no single easy answer to all these problems.

Jobs are part of the answer. They bring the income which permits a man to provide for his family.

Decent homes in decent surroundings and a chance to learn are a part of the answer.

Welfare and social programs better designed to hold families together are part of the answer.

Care for the sick is part of the answer.

An understanding heart by all Americans is also part of the answer.

To all these fronts—and a dozen more—I will dedicate the expanding efforts of my administration.

TO CALL CONFERENCE

But there are other answers still to be found. Nor do we fully understand all the problems. Therefore, this fall, I intend to call a White House conference of scholars, experts, Negro leaders, and officials at every level of government.

Its theme and title: "To Fulfill These Rights."

Its object: To help the American Negro to fulfill the rights which—after the long time of injustice—he is finally about to secure.

To move beyond opportunity to achievement.

To shatter forever, not only the barriers of law and public practice, but the walls which bound the condition of man by the color of his skin.

To dissolve, as best we can, the antique enmities of the heart which diminish the holder, divide the great democracy, and do wrong to the children of God.

I pledge this will be a chief goal of my administration and of my program next year, and in years to come.

I hope it will be part of the program of all America.

For what is justice?

It is to fulfill the fair expectations of man.

Thus, American justice is a very special thing. For, from the first, this has been a land of towering expectations. It was to be a nation where each man would be ruled by the common consent of all—enshrined in law, given life by institutions, guided by men themselves subject to its rule. And all—of every station and origin—would be touched equally in obligation and in liberty.

Beyond the law lay the land. It was a rich land, glowing with more abundant promise than ever man had seen. Here, unlike any place yet known, all were to share the harvest.

And beyond this was the dignity of man. Each could become whatever his qualities of mind and spirit would permit—to strive, to seek, and, if he could, to find his happiness.

This is American justice. We have pursued it faithfully to the edge of our imperfections. And we have failed to find it for the American Negro.

It is the glorious opportunity of this generation to end the one huge wrong of the American Nation—and in so doing to find his happiness.

This is American justice. We have pursued it faithfully to the edge of our imperfections. And we have failed to find it for the American Negro.

It is the glorious opportunity of this generation to end the one huge wrong of the American Nation—and in so doing to find America for ourselves, with the same immense thrill of discovery which gripped those who first began to realize that here, at last, was a home for freedom.

All it will take is for all of us to understand what this country is and what it must become.

The Scripture promises: "I shall light a candle of understanding in thine heart, which shall not be put out."

Together, and with millions more, we can light that candle of understanding in the heart of America.

And, once lit, it will never again go out.

CEREMONIES MEMORIALIZING THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly privileged on Memorial Day last to have participated in ceremonies dedicating a plaque memorializing the late President Kennedy in Paris, Mo.

It was truly an inspiring cememony. The distinguished citizens of this vicinity made of the moment a rite of solemn rededication to those noble ideals which the late President so personified in his life.

The climax of the ceremonies was a moving and brilliant address by the Honorable William L. Hungate, our colleague from the Ninth District of Missouri.

I know that Members of this body would be greatly interested in the text of his address and I therefore, under unanimous consent, insert them at this point in the Record:

The Genius of John F. Kennedy: Statement for Delivery at the Dedication of a Kennedy Memorial Plaque in Paris, Mo., May 30, 1965

Senator Vanlandingham, Representative Southern, Dr.-Mayor Barnett, distinguished Judges, my colleague Congresswoman Mink of Hawaii, reverend clergy, and friends, we are citizens of a nation marching to greatness with the lockstep of destiny. Political and personal courage has been ours, in the face of fearsome obstacles, powerful enemies, and seemingly impossible odds. Political and personal statesmanship also has been ours; not always, but certainly when it was most needed, to see us through some terrible domestic or international crises—crises calculated to cut us down and drive us from the road to glory and success.

Nor can we ourselves—we, the American people—claim exclusive credit for all we have achieved as a nation. For seemingly we are gifted with the greatest fortune in several areas: outstanding natural resources for one, geographical advantages for another, and, most important, an almost mystical ability to correctly determine, in time of crisis, the potential ability of our political leaders, and to select our best and most able citizens to lead us from the jaws of catastrophe to the haven of victory and accomplishment.

So it was when, in November 1960, the American people elected to the Presidency the late John F. Kennedy, a man both wise and imaginative, sensitive and strong, knowledgeable in the area of economic needs and human rights, capable in both the diplomatic arts of persuasion and compulsion.

When John F. Kennedy first appeared upon the scene, as our newly elected President, there was much that needed doing in America and throughout the world. Domestically, a kind of stagnation had begun to settle in upon us. With a population increasing in size, a mile a minute, we seemed to be producing no new jobs—or so few that the national economy was clearly in danger of losing step with the demands of the moment. With a country crying out for learning, we had no significant national program in effect looking to the improvement of our educational facilities. With an ever-increasing army of senior citizens present in our midst, we as a people had made no move to care for and attend to the medical needs of this large and important segment of the national community. With a Federal Constitution setting forth the demand for absolute equality in the area of American voting rights and other major areas, there seemed no strong executive hand at the wheel, to enforce the Federal will, so far as these vital matters were concerned.

The appearance of John F. Kennedy changed all this, to the distinct advantage of the Nation at large. During his abbreviated term in office, a new era began. It can be called an era of reform, combined with a determined effort, in the field of international politics, to alter our former national stance, in the interest of both peace and forceful determination; to place ourselves on the line, solidly against the further extension of Communist slavery, yet also to preserve and encourage open communication between ourselves and the Communist leaders of the world, in the interest of universal peace.

President Kennedy's years in office will always be marked with distinction, above all, for his handling of the Cuban crisis of 1962. It was then that he took the supreme risk, telling the American people—and, indeed, the people of the entire free world—what had to be faced, and thereupon proceeded to block the course of the Soviet convoy carrying medium-range rockets to sites in Cuba. By so doing he prevented a severe alteration of the international balance of power, and at the same moment made clear the American spirit, in the eyes of the world.

John F. Kennedy was the youngest man ever to be elected to the Presidency. He was also the first President born in the 20th century and the first Roman Catholic; the first of purely Irish descent. Yet all of this is mere window dressing, in the historical sense, for the main fact of the matter is that he accomplished what few before him have been able to accomplish.

It often is observed that an American President can be effective abroad or effective at home—but not both. The range of subjects with which a President must deal renders it difficult in the extreme for him to follow through problems simultaneously as a foreign minister and as a politician.

And yet the record of John F. Kennedy reveals his genius in this very regard. In the area of foreign relations he played a mighty hand: Driving the missiles out of Cuba, bolstering our world position, yet working constantly for a kind of rapprochement with the Soviet Union, in behalf of international accord.

At the same time, domestically, he launched a program with the object of placing education, the ballot box, and medical care within reach of every American citizen, social, racial, and economic considerations notwithstanding.

It is ironic that during the period that John F. Kennedy was in office, Congress was not receptive to his domestic program, yet no sooner was he gone than the mood of Congress softened, and feature after feature of his New Frontier design was enacted into law, without difficulty.

So far as domestic politics are concerned, however, John F. Kennedy will be remembered as a brave and noble warrior in many major battles. It was he who forced the question of education upon the attention of national legislators who wanted to pretend it was some kind of local matter. It was he who worked for medical care—genuine medical care—for the aged, under social security. It was he who rushed to battle—out in the open, without qualification, repeatedly—in behalf of the spirit of civil rights, as well as the mere letter of the law.

As a naval officer and a native son of Massachusetts, President Kennedy well understood the importance of our water resources. He recognized that our Nation could ill afford and need not afford disastrous floods which wreak havoc to our cities and lay waste to our farmlands. President Kennedy knew the power of these streams could be preserved for productive uses. He recognized the constantly increasing power needs of an expanding and dynamic economy and knew that development of water resources could provide the necessary energy to tame the wheels of progress. President Kennedy foresaw that a Nation with constantly increasing leisure time must have additional recreational facilities, another byproduct of the appropriate development of our water resources. He saw the inherent danger in pollution of the air we breathe and the water we drink, and he was the champion of causes similar to those now crying out for development of such dams in our State as the Joanna or Cannon, and such basins as the Meramec, Chariton, and Grand River.

As a stanch supporter and a great admirer of John F. Kennedy, during his service as President of the United States, I take the greatest pride in participating in this event—the dedication of a Kennedy Memorial plaque, to stand forever as a symbol of respect to a man who lived, and worked, and died, fighting for the democratic principles in which he so deeply believed.

I thank you for your attention.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the Committee on Ways and Means will bring up tomorrow, under unanimous consent, three bills reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means. They are H.R. 4493, to continue until the close of June 30, 1966, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap; H.R. 5768, to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk; and H.R. 7621, to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to limit button blanks to crude forms suitable for manufacture into buttons.

WATER AND TEETH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the Woonsocket Call recently commented editorially on the problem of dental caries, a disease suffered by 95 percent of the American people, and on the use of water fluoridation to eliminate this needless dental decay.

The editorial discusses the fact that 67 million Americans today are drinking fluoridated water, and within the next few months it will be made available to an additional 10.5 or 11 million persons. Both New York City with some 8 million inhabitants and Detroit with another 2.5 million will insure better dental health for their residents by following the lead of other farsighted cities in adopting community water fluoridation. The editorial also points out that, contrary to rumor, there have been no reports of any major disaster occurring anywhere from excess fluoridation.

The U.S. Public Health Service, charged with the responsibility of safeguarding the Nation's health, has since 1952 urged people of this country to take advantage of the proven effectiveness of water fluoridation in reducing dental decay. Certain individuals, a vociferous minority, have closed their eyes to the facts and have worked in opposition to this progressive measure. However, virtually every reputable scientific organization in this and other countries has approved and endorsed fluoridation of public water supplies. I am proud to report that in the State of Rhode Island, 88 percent of the population drinks fluoridated water.

I hope that in the near future all of the citizens of our Great Society can enjoy the benefits of this public health measure.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Woonsocket, R.I., Call and Evening Reporter on April 28. It is a tribute to this fine newspaper's sense of public responsibility. This editorial is fair and objective and leaves little doubt in the reader's mind of the facts about fluoridation. I, therefore, include the editorial verbatim in the RECORD:

WATER AND TEETH

As little explosive pockets of opinion about water fluoridation get into the news on occasion, a trend is quietly developing, it seems, so that the latest figures from Washington show some 67 million consumers of such water, including us in Woonsocket.

In other words, approximately one-third of the Nation is drinking water either artificially treated with fluorides, or water that is natural in this element. Dr. Donald J. Galagan, an assistant surgeon general with the U.S. Public Health Service, and chief of its division on dental public health and resources, said that within a few months, "an additional 10.5 to 11 million persons will be drinking artificially fluoridated water." About 7 million citizens already drink wet stuff that is by nature fluoridated, he noted.

It is something of a major decision to treat local water supplies, some medical and other authorities being opposed to it, supposedly on the ground that fluorides are poisonous in certain doses. So, too, is aspirin, it may be said.

Another factor is cost. A small municipality, for example, needs special equipment and a man to supervise its operation, so that only correctly apportioned amounts enter supply lines for any given volume of water.

Even so, we have received no reports of any major disaster occurring anywhere through excessive fluoridation. Indeed, perhaps water tastes bad when overdosed, thus carrying its own built-in protection.

When New York and Detroit commence plans for fluoridation, millions of persons will be involved, some 8 million of them in New York City alone, and 2.5 million in Detroit. Presumably, some thought has been given the project by these cities planners.

The trend toward water fluoridation as a means of avoiding dental decay has been steady, according to Dr. Galagan, ever since initiation of the process in 1945. Strangely enough, proposals to fluoridate more often lose than win when put to popular vote.

To vote on fluoridation seems to be the democratic way, provided both sides are permitted to present their cases. It is worth reflecting, however, that there are 2,792 communities with fluoridation, and that the community increase in 1962, 1963, and last year, was 124, 236, and 180, respectively.

THE VIETNAM ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is no news and no exaggeration to say that the most critical problem confronting this country today is the crisis in Vietnam. It is also one of the most complex issues of our time; an issue which defies the quick and easy "answers" of withdrawal or total escalation which offer no real solution at all.

One of the most thoughtful and persuasive statements on this subject was made 2 weeks ago by the very able and distinguished professor of political science at the University of California, Dr. Robert Scalapino. Professor Scalapino is chairman of the department of political science on the university's Berkeley campus, and is one of the most knowledgeable men in the entire country on the problems of southeast Asia. His comments, therefore, deserve close attention and consideration.

Professor Scalapino has made a number of important points, a few of which I would like to emphasize briefly.

The National Liberation Front, he has stressed, is a movement directed and controlled in all of its important aspects by Communists outside of Vietnam. Is it not revealing, he has asked, that almost none of the top Buddhist, Cao Dai, Hoa Hao, Catholic, or Dai Viet leaders have joined this supposed "patriotic front"?

An impressive aspect of the Vietcong's organization, he reminds us, involves coercion. Since 1959, Dr. Scalapino points out, Vietcong terrorists, operating under orders from Hanoi, have killed between 6,000 and 10,000 village and district leaders. In the first 4 months of this year alone more than 260 were liquidated, some in the most horrible fashion. Is it any wonder that progress on the local community level has been halting and slow?

The political instability of the national government in Saigon continues to constitute a grave threat, Mr. Scalapino makes clear. The task of nation building in this area of the world, with its many diverse ethnic and religious groups, is certain to be long and difficult at best. But, he emphasizes, none of these groups wants to come under Communist dominance, which is, of course, the objective of Hanoi and Peiping.

There is criticism of our Vietnam policy in Asia and in this country. With the possible exception of Indonesia, however, not a single non-Communist government wants the American presence withdrawn. To allow the Chinese, Professor Scalapino has stated, to establish their hegemony over Asia either directly or through trusted followers, would be to desert the force of Asian nationalism, not support it.

Nor will withdrawal under pressure produce peace. To do so would merely set the stage for further surrenders, and ultimate global war.

What then, Professor Scalapino asks, should our policy be? In his two-point response he offers, I believe, a sound basis for our policy.

Let us keep open, he suggests, two broad channels with respect to the entire Communist world. Let one channel involve our willingness to engaged in the broadest cultural relations, the fullest trade and the most extensive interactions. Let us state specifically that we are willing to remove American military forces from all of southeast Asia as soon as some international guarantees and international force can be established so that neutrality and independence in this region can be secured. Let us embark directly upon the giant task of economic development which President Johnson has sketched, and let us indicate our willingness to participate with all nations who are willing and able to help.

The second channel is headed by a warning to the Communist leaders of the north that the use of force will be met by force. If there is to be any chance of peace in our time, we must make clear that we are not paper tigers.

Fundamentally, Professor Scalapino has concluded, our policy must be one designed to encourage moderation and discourage extremism on the part of our opponents, and one that seeks now to start closing the gap between the haves and the have-nots of this world.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Professor Scalapino's excellent and timely address, which I include in its entirety, to our colleagues for their attention:

The Vietnam Issue

(By Robert A. Scalapino)

The Vietnam crisis is one of the most complex and serious crises to have confronted the United States since World War II. Nothing which I say here is intended to imply that there are any easy solutions, or that the facts are unambiguous. Yet, on balance, the evidence, in my opinion, supports the main thrust of our present policy while suggesting also certain improvements. Either withdrawal or total escalation would represent far graver risks.

What are the most essential facts? Let us turn first to the situation in South Vietnam. The Communists, as you know, insist that the National Liberation Front must be recognized as the only legitimate representative of the South Vietnamese people. They assert that it is an indigenous, nationalist force having the support of a majority of the people. Each of these assertions is, on balance, either false or misleading.

THE NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT

The so-called National Liberation Front of South Vietnam is, and always has been, an instrument of the North Vietnamese Communist Party. It has made use of indigenous grievances to acquire support and in earlier times at least, its rank and file came mainly from southern peasant lads, persuaded or coerced into service, but its most dynamic elements have always been external.

The Vietcong, in fact, is a carbon copy of the Vietminh which earlier secured the north for the Communists, and which, in turn, borrowed heavily from the organizational tactics of the Chinese Communists. Hanoi serves as its headquarters. Differences over immediate tactics may indeed have existed between the VC and Hanoi from time to time. But there have never been any significant differences in basic policies or programs, as anyone who has studied this movement knows well.

If there is any doubt on this question, listen to the words of Peiping, uttered only 1 month ago. The Vietnamese struggle for national liberation against the United States, said Peiping, was certain to win because it was under "the wise leadership of the Marxist-Leninist Workers' Party of Vietnam." The leaders of Hanoi have been saying the same thing repeatedly for at least 5 years.

This, then, is a movement directed and controlled in all of its important aspects not only by Communists, but by Communists outside South Vietnam. The real nationalist leaders of South Vietnam know these facts very well. That is why they have refused to join the Vietcong, despite serious disagreements among themselves. Is it not revealing that almost none of the top Buddhist, Cao Dai, Hoa Eao, Catholic, or Dai Viet leaders have joined this supposed "patriotic front"? Is it not significant that the Vietcong leaders are all nameless, faceless men, leaders unknown to their own people? And is this not some evidence that we are not fighting against nationalism in Vietnam, but rather attempting to support genuine nationalists who do not wish to fall under Communist rule?

THE VIETCONG

But what of the people? Do they support communism in spite of the opposition of their leaders? The Communists assert that the Vietcong control some two-thirds of the south, and have the support of a great majority of the South Vietnamese people. Once again, these so-called facts are either false or misleading. It is true that the Vietcong control a large part of South Vietnam either wholly or partially—perhaps 60 percent of the territory. It is also true that they have support—in various forms—of the people in this territory, and from some people not in Vietcong areas as well.

There are three significant points to be made, however, which are often overlooked by those who insist that the people support the Vietcong, or that if the Vietnamese want communism, they should be allowed to have it. First, the Vietcong at this stage is not posing to the peasant the issue of communism versus an open system. On the contrary, Vietcong propaganda carefully hides the true nature of the leadership of this movement and its long-range goals. Typically, VC literature plays upon purely local grievances, or "bourgeois democratic" themes such as religious freedom, political rights, and land reform. Considerable support in some areas has been garnered as a result of these campaigns. However, this is not support for communism, and events in the north have shown so tragically how this cycle can be played out.

The northern peasants also were promised land reform, religious freedom, and political rights. But after the Vietminh came to full power in 1954, they got communism, and in 1956, when the northern regime imposed land collectivization, a full-scale revolt occurred in which thousands of peasants were killed.

But fraud is not the only basis for Vietcong power. Organization is probably a more significant factor. The Vietcong, patterned after all other Communist movements, has developed great organizational skill, and it operates in a society where, generally speaking, the organizational units are weak and disconnected. Anyone familiar with American big city politics knows that organization is often more important than issues, and not necessarily connected with them.

TERROR

And an impressive aspect of Vietcong organization involves coercion. Since Hanoi gave the orders for guerrilla warfare in 1959, Vietcong terrorists have killed between 6,000 and 10,000 village and district leaders according to reliable estimates. What government could easily maintain stability or engage in reform under such conditions? In the first 4 months of this year alone, more than 260 local leaders have been liquidated, some of them in the most horrible fashion. Terror has been used, to be sure, by both sides, but the systematic terror of the Vietcong has involved an attempt to wipe out all political authority except their own at the all-important local and district levels. Some of these local leaders were, no doubt, bad, others indifferent, some good—but the only issue in any case was whether they supported the government.

If the Vietcong were truly so popular, would this massive terrorism be necessary? In my own field research, I became convinced that only a small percentage of the South Vietnamese had a firm political commitment to the Vietcong, although the percentage committed to the government was not much higher. But the great majority of people were primarily concerned with the problem of survival for themselves and their families. In this sense, the problem of the Vietcong is a military problem—as was the problem of the Malayan terrorists—a problem of being able to provide security so that people can live, work and think without fear.

POLITICAL INSTABILITY

The political instability of the National Government in Saigon continues to constitute a grave threat. In part, of course, this is a product of the degree of freedom which exists in the south despite the war. The task of nation building in this area is certain to be long and difficult especially if any degree of freedom accompanies it, as a result of the diverse ethnic and religious groups composing the society. It would be wise to reemphasize that none of these groups want to come under Communist dominance. The Vietcong can always collect 3 Catholics, 5 Cao Dai, and 10 Buddhists, but it cannot represent the mainstreams. Indeed, the powerful Buddhist movement continues to stand committed to a truly neutralist solution with the Vietcong going north, and the American forces going out, a solution which may be unrealistic but which certainly would not be against our objectives if it could be effected.

NORTH VIETNAM

What are the most vital facts concerning the north? The evidence suggests that despite certain gains in 1962–63, economic conditions there are not good. The party organs themselves admit that some of the younger generation thinks too much about material gains, and not enough about sacrifices for the fatherland. "Get Out of South Vietnam" buttons could not be distributed in Hanoi. More importantly, perhaps, have been the radical changes which took place in the Lao Dong Party of North Vietnam beginning in late 1962. At that time, the younger, militant pro-Chinese elements captured control of the central committee, and they have been in control up to date.

We know some of the arguments that took place, and we can guess others. One critical issue was, Should the war in the south be escalated or not? The militants argued that it should, and, following the Chinese line, deprecated the risks of heavier American involvement. They too argued that we were paper tigers. Increased North Vietnamese involvement in the southern war is directly connected with this major political change in the north. Since early 1963, the alliance between Peiping and Hanoi has been exceedingly close, and both parties have pursued a totally militant line.

POLICY ALTERNATIVES

How do these facts affect the alternatives of policy confronting us? Let us look first at the arguments favoring withdrawal. Some say that if we were to allow the Communists to take all of Vietnam, Ho would become another Tito, and help in the containment of China. I regard this argument as very dubious. In the first place, Ho himself is 75 years of age, in indifferent health, and, whatever his personal views, not likely to be active for long. As just noted, the rising Communist leaders of the north are the young pro-Chinese elements, and men like Truong Chinh, whose name—Long March—signifies his allegiance. It should be remembered that if Vietnam has a long history of struggle against Chinese domination, it has an equally long history of accommodation to Chinese power. More important, Titoism was a product of a true balance of power and of certain historical circumstances. Tito quite literally exists between East and West; no such balance of power will exist in southeast Asia if we withdraw. Nor are the Vietnamese interests as limited as those of Tito. Hanoi claims control over the Communist movements of this entire region and if it is victorious in South Vietnam, it will certainly exercise its claim in Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand, at least.

The great argument for withdrawal is that it will prevent war, and in some measure, put us into harmony with the force of Asian nationalism. Let me discuss the second argument first. Of course there is criticism of our Vietnam policy in Asia, as there is in America. It is simply not true, however, to imply that the non-Communist leaders of Asia want us to withdraw from the Asian area. With the possible exception of Indonesia, not a single non-Communist government of this region wants the American presence to disappear. Privately, this has been made clear to many of us. Why would they want American influence in Asia to be destroyed? They know that in Asia, if there is to be a balance of power, it must involve the United States at present. Did not India call upon us as well as the Russians for aid when attacked by China? Have not the neutralists Souphannaphouma and Kong Le found in us their only hope against the Communists in Laos? Are not Tungku Abdul Rahman and Lee Kuan Yew in Malaysia dependent in the final analysis upon us as well as the British if they are to avoid being destroyed? And these men are not reactionaries. They are social democrats and nationalists—all of them.

To allow the Chinese to establish their hegemony over Asia either directly or through their trusted followers, will be to desert the force of Asian nationalism, not to support it. If any proof is needed, look at the tributary status which Cambodia has had to accept, and look at the mounting pressures upon other small states like Burma and Nepal. We face a real challenge, and one not completely met, of working more closely with non-Communist Asians on political and military matters, but we cannot meet that challenge by reverting to isolation.

WITHDRAWAL WILL NOT PRODUCE PEACE

Nor will withdrawal produce peace. On the contrary, it will go a long distance toward making world war III inevitable. The Peiping thesis concerning the United States is well known but let me summarize it: American imperialism is a paper tiger. If challenged firmly, it will retreat. People are more important than weapons, and by launching people's wars, we can destroy the United States and its lackies. The Russians, on the other hand, by appeasing America and seeking peaceful coexistence with her are undermining the revolutionary forces of the world.

If we prove this Peiping thesis correct by withdrawing from Vietnam under pressure, we will have merely set the stage for further surrenders, and ultimate global war. Only a month ago, Peiping launched the Thai patriotic front with great fanfare. A leading Government spokesman proclaimed that the Chinese people would support the Thai in their liberation struggle, and asserted that they looked upon such support as our glorious international duty. Some individuals will shortly tell us that this movement also is an indigenous, nationalist movement that springs out of the yearnings of the Thai.

The domino theory is not adequate to explain the problem. The state after Thailand may be Venezuela not Burma. The game is checkers, not dominos, but it is a deadly game, and old notions about geographic spheres of influence—you take Asia, we will take the Western Hemisphere—as advanced by Lippmann and others have little relation to the modern world.

COMMUNIST REJECTION OF COMPROMISE

What, then, should our policy be? In Asia, a militant power is emerging. Note carefully that Communist China not only rejects all notion of compromise with us at the moment, she also rejects all compromise with her two other enemies, the Soviet Union and India. A few months ago, it was legitimate perhaps to believe that Peiping and her ally might be willing to negotiate with us on terms short of unconditional surrender. But note what has happened. Peiping described the proposals of the 17 nonalined nations as a plot concocted by Tito; labeled the Indian proposal for an Afro-Asian international force in Vietnam to patrol the boundary as "ridiculous," told U Thant not to come to Peiping, rejected all British, French, and Canadian private overtures; forced Sihanouk to sabotage completely the Cambodian Conference, and denounced our cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam for 5 days as "a dirty trick."

The burden of proof is certainly upon those who seriously believe that Peiping and Hanoi are willing to settle the Vietnam crisis peacefully except on their own terms; namely, the total withdrawal of American troops and aid from the South; the recognition of the National Liberation Front as the only legitimate representative of the South Vietnamese people, and the rapid unification of the country under the Lao Bong Party.

We cannot and should not accept those conditions, nor should we engage in any trick of having the French or Russians accept them for us. The Vietcong should be allowed to participate in any negotiations but as Communists, whether a part of, or a part from Hanoi, and all other South Vietnamese groups should be given full representation.

As I have stated, Peiping is also demanding unconditional surrender from the Russians. To improve Sino-Soviet relations, she recently asserted, the Soviet leaders must totally repudiate Khrushchev and all of his acts, and apologize to the Communist world for the Soviet policies of the past decade. It is not surprising that the Russians have rejected these terms, and that the Indians have rejected the terms of settlement proposed for the border crisis. I cannot understand the logic of those who feel that we would preserve world peace by being the first major power to capitulate to Peiping.

POLICY PROPOSAL

Rather, I would propose this policy: Let us keep open two broad channels with respect to the entire Communist world. Let one of those channels lead to peaceful coexistence, and involve our willingness to engage in the broadest cultural relations, the fullest trade, and extensive interaction with all in the major international organizations and discussions of our time. Let us make it clear to China as well as to others that we do indeed want to live and let live. And let us state specifically that we are willing to remove American military forces from all of southeast Asia as soon as some international guarantees and international force can be established so that the true neutrality and independence of this region can be secured. Let us seek to support the development of Finlands, not Bulgarias in Asia. What could be more in accordance with true Asian nationalism than this, and more moral?

Let us also embark immediately upon the giant task of economic development which President Johnson recently sketched in concert with other societies, and once again, let us indicate our willingness to participate with all nations who are willing and able to help.

But the other channel must also be clearly marked and adequately maintained. This second channel is headed by the warning that if the Communists of Hanoi or Peiping, or anyone else insist upon using force to settle disputes upon their own terms, they will be met by force. If there is to be any chance of peace in our times, we must make it clear that we are not paper tigers.

Our present policy, on balance, is an attempt to avoid the extremes. No one can guarantee its success. Perhaps its primary weakness is that it runs counter to American psychology in some degree. We are an impatient people, who tend to want quick and efficient answers—thus to many, it should be "all in" or "all out." Mao Tse-tung shrewdly recognized this weakness recently when he reportedly said that "the Americans will lose in Vietnam because they don't have the patience for this type of situation."

Mao must be proven wrong. We must acquire the maturity that goes with global responsibility, and recognize the importance of graduated, flexibility responses to crises situations. Fundamentally our policy must be one designed to encourage moderation and discourage extremism on the part of our opponents, and one that seeks now to start closing the gap between the haves and the have nots of the world. This is the only route to peace.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Minish (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Matsunaga (at the request of Mr. Albert), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. Bingham (at the request of Mr. Rosenthal), for Monday, June 7, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. Callaway (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for the balance of the week, on account of official business as a Member inspecting personally conditions in Vietnam.

Mr. Pelly (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for Monday, June 7, 1965, on account of death in his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Patman, for 40 minutes, on Wednesday and Thursday of this week; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Halpern, for 10 minutes on June 8.

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. Krebs), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Cohelan (at the request of Mr. Krebs), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Patman (at the request of Mr. Krebs), for 60 minutes, on June 9, 1965; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Machen.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Burton of Utah) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Hosmer.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Krebs) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Todd.

Mr. Hanley.

Mr. Fountain.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1404. An act to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on increasing the authorized bed capacity for all Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 8, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1199. Communication from the President of the United States transmitting amendments to the request for appropriations made in the budget for the fiscal year 1966, for the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Civil, and for the Department of the Interior. (H. Doc. No. 200); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1200. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 15, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the reports on Hampton Creek, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 5, 1949. (H. Doc. No. 201); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1201. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, Public Law 83–480; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1202. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to provide for more effective security servicing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1203. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of lack of effective action by the military services to obtain NATO cost sharing of military construction projects in Europe, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1204. A letter from the Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, transmitting an audit report for the year ended March 31, 1965, for the Reserve Officers Association, pursuant to section 15b of Public Law 81–595; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1205. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of loss of time discounts on payments made by the Los Angeles Contract Management District, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1206. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of failure to make timely repairs on acquired single-family properties in Wichita, Kans., adversely affected sales potential and resulted in additional repair costs, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1207. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a resolution of the Legislature of the territory of American Samoa relative to application by resident aliens for U.S. nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1208. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on a reevaluation of the economic justifications of the Kaskaskia River navigation project, pursuant to Public Law 87–874; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 4, 1965, the following bills were reported:

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 412. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7105, a bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 443). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 413. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 8464, a bill to provide, for the period beginning on July 1, 1965, and ending on June 30, 1966, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 444). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Thirteenth report on Government operations in space (analysis of civil-military roles and relationships); without amendment (Rept. No. 445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted June 7, 1965*]

Mrs. GRIFFITHS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4493. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1966, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap; with amendments (Rept. No. 446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5768. A bill to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk; without amendment (Rept. No. 447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 7621. A bill to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to limit button blanks to crude forms suitable for manufacture into buttons; with amendments (Rept. No. 448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 8798. A bill to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 8799. A bill relating to the application of section 1303 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to back pay received by certain commissioned officers under the act of September 2, 1957; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 8800. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from gasoline- or diesel-powered vehicles, to establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8801. A bill to expand and improve existing law and to provide for the establishment of regulations for the purpose of controlling pollution from vessels and certain other sources in the Great Lakes and other navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 8802. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in years 1966 and 1975 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 8803. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 8804. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of their surviving spouses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 8805. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, optometry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Br. Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 8806. A bill to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 8897. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Conservation Act to provide that no land contained in the national wildlife refuge system shall be sold, transferred for any other use, or otherwise disposed of without the approval of the Migratory Bird Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By. Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 8808. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide for the payment of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows who are now ineligible for such a pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 8809. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway running generally east-west through the State of Maine as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 8810. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program under which foreign agricultural workers can be recruited for temporary employment in the continental United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 8811. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, optometry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intertate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 8812. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to a taxpayer who is a student at a college for certain expenses incurred in obtaining a higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 8813. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to liberalize certain provisions thereof pertaining to qualifications for retirement and computation of annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 8814. A bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 8815. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of disability annuities payable under the Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 8816. A bill to authorize the U.S. Governor to agree to amendments to the Articles of Agreement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 8817. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 8818. A bill to provide for payment of special pay for duty subject to hostile fire to members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in Vietnam and waters adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 8819. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 8820. A bill to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 8821. A bill to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 8822. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 8823. A bill to broaden the purposes for which Federal-aid secondary highway funds may be used; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 8824. A bill to provide for landscaping and scenic enhancement of Federal-aid highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 8825. A bill to provide for the control of outdoor advertising along certain Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 8826. A bill to provide for the control of junkyards along certain Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 8827. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to protect and promote the health of seamen on vessels of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 499. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BANDSTRA:

H.J. Res. 500. Joint resolution to adopt a specific version of the "Star-Spangled Banner" as the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

297. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the proposed closing of veterans' hospitals, domiciliary homes, and regional offices; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

298. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to transporting firearms in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

299. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, opposing legislation to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

300. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to continuing the agricultural conservation program by supporting the annual appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

301. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to imposing user fees for the use of public land or water areas in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

302. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, relative to apportionment of membership in the State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

303. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to the pro-

posed reorganization of Reserve and National Guard organizations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

304. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to studying methods to eliminate the electoral college; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

305. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to the Federal excise tax on telephone services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 8828. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christel Guessefeldt, a natural born American citizen, executrix and sole heir of her father, Richard Guessefeldt, late a resident of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 8829. A bill for the relief of S. Sgt. Robert E. Martin, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 8830. A bill for the relief of Tomas Bidegain Elizondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 8831. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yuen Zang Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 8832. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of the Algonac Manufacturing Co. and John A. Maxwell against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 8833. A bill for the relief of Serafina Antonietta Corea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 8834. A bill for the relief of Teresa Knap; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 8835. A bill for the relief of Neville Cartwright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8836. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Trapani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 8837. A bill for the relief of Sfc. Jack E. Redding, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 8838. A bill for the relief of Misak Parsekyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8839. A bill for the relief of Athanasios George Koutretsis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8840. A bill for the relief of Constantinos George Koutretsis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 8841. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Linda Emily Simmons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

222. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Fishing Bridge Station, Wyo., relative to construction improvement of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth His handiwork. How true these words of Holy Scripture speak to us, our Heavenly Father, and will speak to us through the experiences of two who now prepare to return to earth, after the rare experience of being in orbit in the heavens.

We are grateful to Thee that we live in such an exciting and challenging day. We bow in humility at the knowledge we are receiving, and the possibilities of the future. Thou art a great God. The more we discover, the more we find how little we know. We are only touching the hem of Thy garment of creation.

In this session of the U.S. Senate, at the near moment of reentry of Astronauts James A. McDivitt and Edward H. White II, we bow before Thee, our Creator, praying Thy protection in their behalf. Give to all associated with this flight clear minds and steady hands and thoughts. We are grateful that our basic philosophy is the concern and safety of these men, above everything else.

In a world that needs peace, we dedicate the work of the space program for peaceful purposes. In all that is done and discovered, may men of all nations be blessed, through our accomplishments, with abundant and long life.

Bless the Nation we love the most and its leaders and people, we pray in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 4, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

DISASTER RELIEF—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 34)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a veto message on Senate bill 327, received by the Secretary of the Senate during adjournment, which, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and, with the accompanying bill, will be appropriately referred, and printed as a Senate document.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I return herewith, without my approval S. 327, "To provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters."

This bill authorizes additional funds and other special assistance to aid in the reconstruction and repair of damage caused in the Pacific Northwest by the devastating floods of last winter. I am in complete sympathy with the purpose of this legislation. However, in spite of the bill's general desirability, section 5 seriously violates the spirit of the division of powers between the legislative and executive branches. Despite my strong support for the substantive relief, I must withhold approval until this unwise and objectionable provision is deleted.

The provision is contained in that part of section 5(a) stipulating that:

> The President, acting through the Office of Emergency Planning is authorized to perform all or any part of the recommended work determined to be in the public interest and to reimburse any common carrier for any of such recommended work performed by such carrier, but no appropriation shall be made for any such work which has not been approved before June 30, 1966, by resolution adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively.

The Attorney General advises me that this provision is clearly a "coming into agreement" with a congressional committee requirement. This device requires an executive official to obtain the approval of a committee or other unit of Congress before taking an executive action. It is not only an undesirable and improper encroachment by the Congress and its committees into the area of executive responsibilities—it also leads to inefficient administration. The executive branch is given, by the Constitution, the responsibility to implement all laws—a specific and exclusive responsibility which cannot properly be shared with a committee of Congress.

The proper separation of powers and division of responsibilities between Congress and the executive branch is a matter of continuing concern to me. I must oppose the tendency to use any device to involve congressional committees in the administration of programs and the implementation of laws. I have spoken out against this before. Less than a year ago, in a signing statement on the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, I requested deletion of a provision much the same as the one in S. 327.

Although I am unable to approve S. 327 in its present form for the reasons stated, I am anxious that the relief to the States involved be made available as quickly as possible. Accordingly, I will approve S. 327 immediately when the Congress has eliminated the provision in section 5 which infringes upon the responsibilities of the executive branch. I see no reason why this cannot be accomplished in a few days and have directed the executive branch to cooperate fully with the Congress to this end.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 5, 1965.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1135) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before December 31, 1968, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR UNDER RULE VIII

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar under rule VIII was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Commerce, the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Judiciary Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE TO GUARANTEE THE TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY AND NEUTRALITY OF CAMBODIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on June 4, the press officer of the Department of State, Mr. Robert J. McCloskey, said that the U.S. Government is prepared to attend an international conference on the question of guaranteeing the territorial integrity and neutrality of the Kingdom of Cambodia. He made it clear, moreover, that insofar as this Government is concerned it wants this conference confined to that question.

Mr. President, that is a significant clarification, even though it was not widely reported in the press. It seems to me to set at rest one of the uncertainties which has previously forestalled the conference insofar as Prince Sihanouk is concerned and as he has expressed these uncertainties in a letter to the New York Times last week.

With this official clarification on the record, it would appear that only one point still blocks the actual convening of the conference. That is the question of representation of Vietnam—North and South. Prince Sihanouk, in his letter to the Times was both flexible and accommodating on this point. He listed several possible formulas and said, in effect, that he would accept any alternative which the larger powers could agree upon, including no representation for Vietnam at all.

What this suggests to me, Mr. President, is that there is a clear responsibility on the part of all the Geneva conferees and particularly on the part of the Cochairmen, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, to intensify and concentrate their efforts on the difficult but not insurmountable diplomatic question of the representation of Vietnam at a conference on Cambodia.

It is not an easy question. But it is a question which ought not to be allowed to block, as apparently the sole remaining obstacle, a conference on Cambodia's neutrality and territorial integrity. The latter question, in itself, is too important to put off. It is one of the keys to general stability in southeast Asia which quite apart from the conflict in Vietnam, has got to be faced sooner or later.

Moreover, it is basic to the Mekong concept. It is, in fact, a prerequisite to giving meaning to this highly constructive proposal which the President first made at Baltimore some weeks ago and for which $19 million was asked last week as part of the President's special request for $89 million for southeast Asian development. The Mekong project is not likely to attract a significant international investment for the development of southeast Asia unless this conference on Cambodian neutrality and territorial integrity can be convened and can make a prior contribution to the political stability of the region.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET, 1966, FOR DEPARTMENT OF STATE (S. DOC. NO. 33)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1966, in the amount of $1 million, for the Department of State (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

THE FLORENCE AGREEMENT

A communication from the President of the United States, proposing legislation to permit the United States to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials, commonly known as the Florence Agreement, opened for signature at Lake Success, N.Y., on November 27, 1950; to the Committee on Finance.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF LOUISIANA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 156

Concurrent resolution expressing opposition of the Legislature of Louisiana to the proposed elimination of the U.S. Army Reserve and reorganization of the National Guard

Whereas during our Nation's history, it has been necessary to wage wars in order to preserve our way of life and destroy tyrannies which were dedicated to the destruction of our status as a free people, and such tyrannies continue to exist; and

Whereas the very history of our country attests to the wisdom of its traditional military concept that, as a democracy, it may best deter aggression by the effective implementation of relatively small but thoroughly trained professional Armed Forces, adequately supported, however, by civilian Reserve components of such Armed Forces; and

Whereas such civilian Reserve components have proven themselves more than equal to the tasks assigned to them both in peace and in war, and have provided our country with the majority of combat personnel dedicated to its defense in time of war and in numbers which its economy could not support and which its citizens would not tolerate as a standing professional peacetime armed force; and

Whereas we adhere to the firm belief that although weapons have changed and no doubt will continue to change, as they have throughout the history of mankind, the successful defense of our country and of its people must, in the final analysis, depend upon the ability of the people of our civilian Reserve Armed Forces to take and to hold ground; and

Whereas in such belief, we do not discount the effectiveness of any weapon or weapons, but rather deem it folly to rely solely on one instrument or on a few instruments of war to the exclusion of all others: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Louisiana Legislature (the Senate thereof concurring), That the Legislature of Louisiana hereby records its complete opposition to the recent move of the Secretary of Defense of the United States, the effect of which, if implemented, eventually will be the destruction of U.S. civilian Reserve Forces and the reduction of the civilian Reserves to a status of ineffectiveness; be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution shall be transmitted immediately by the clerk of the house to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense of the

United States, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Louisiana.

Vail M. Delony,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. C. Aycock,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 2089. A bill to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters (Rept. No. 276).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive B, 89th Congress, 1st session, protocol for the extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, opened for signature in Washington from March 22 until and including April 23, 1964 (Executive Rept. No. 2).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin; and

John F. Quinn, Jr., of New Mexico, to be U.S. attorney for the district of New Mexico.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Floyd R. Gibson, of Missouri, to be U.S. circuit judge, eighth circuit.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Kuchel):

S. 2089. A bill to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2090. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program under which foreign agricultural workers can be recruited for temporary employment in the continental United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2091. A bill for the relief of Joaquin U. Villagomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2092. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados to provide for paid advertising; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2093. A bill for the relief of Young Shoon Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2094. A bill to amend section 117(q)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2095. A bill for the relief of Maryellen Boone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 2096. A bill to authorize the construction of certain additional roads in connection with the program of basic improvements authorized under the act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 2097. A bill to provide for judicial review of the constitutionality of grants or loans under certain acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2098. A bill for the relief of the town of Bremen, Ind.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

DISASTER RELIEF FOR OREGON, WASHINGTON, CALIFORNIA, NEVADA, AND IDAHO

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send a bill to the desk on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the senior Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the junior Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], and myself. I ask that the bill be printed at this point in the Record and that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2089) to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters, introduced by Mr. Morse (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress hereby recognizes (1) that the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho have experienced extensive property loss and damage as the result of floods and high waters during December 1964, and January and February 1965, (2) that much of the affected area is federally owned and administered, and (3) that the livelihood of the people in the area is dependent on prompt restoration of transportation facilities, and therefore Congress declares the need for special measures designed to aid and accelerate those States in their efforts to provide for the reconstruction of devastated areas.

Sec. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated, out on any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in addition to the amounts authorized in section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code, not to exceed $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and not to exceed $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Such sums shall be obligated and expended by the Secretary of Commerce in accordance with such section 125, and related provisions of title 23 of the United States Code for the repair and reconstruction of highways, roads, and trails, damaged as the result of a disaster.

Sec. 3. (a) Notwithstanding provisions of existing contracts, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, separately, and as part of the regular road and trail construction program, shall reimburse timber sale contractors or otherwise arrange to bear road and trail construction and restoration costs either directly or in cooperation with timber purchasers to the extent of costs determined by the respective Secretary as incurred or to be incurred for restoring roads in any stage of construction authorized by a contract for the purchase of timber from lands under his jurisdiction to substantially the same condition as existed prior to the damage resulting from the floods of December 1964, and January and February of 1965 in California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho, and to the extent costs determined by the respective Secretary as incurred or to be incurred for completing road construction not performed under any such contract prior to the floods but which, because of changed conditions resulting from the floods, exceed road construction costs as originally determined by the respective Secretary. The costs for such road restoration, reconstruction, and construction under any single timber purchase contract on roads not accepted prior to the floods, whether construction was complete, partial, or not yet begun, shall be borne as follows: 15 per centum of all amounts shall be borne by the timber purchaser, except that such purchaser shall not be required to bear costs of more than $4,500, and the Secretary shall bear the remaining portion of such costs. This subsection shall not apply (1) in the case of any road restoration or reconstruction if the cost of such restoration or reconstruction is less than $500, and (2) in the case of any road construction if the increase in the cost of such construction as the result of the floods is less than $500 more than the construction costs as originally determined by the respective Secretary.

(b) Where the Secretary determines that damages are so great that restoration, reconstruction, or construction is not practical under the cost-sharing arrangement authorized by subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary may allow cancellation of the contract notwithstanding provisions therein.

(c) Paragraph (3) of section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) For forest development roads and trails, $123,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, of which not to exceed $38,000,000 shall be used solely for the construction, repair, and reconstruction of forest development roads and trails in the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho, necessary because of the floods and high waters in such States during December 1964, and January and February 1965, and $85,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967."

(d) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to reduce to seven days the minimum period of advance public notice required by the first section of the Act of June 4, 1897 (16 U.S.C. 476), in connection with the sale of timber from national forests, whenever the Secretary determines that the sale of such timber will assist in the reconstruction of any area of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho damaged by floods or high waters during December 1964, and January and February 1965.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to give any public land entryman such additional time in which to comply with any requirement of law in connection with any public land entry for lands in California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho, as the Secretary finds appropriate because of interference with the entryman's ability to comply with such requirement resulting from floods and high waters during December 1964, and January and February 1965.

SEC. 5. (a) The President, acting through the Office of Emergency Planning, shall make a survey to determine what protective works would be necessary to prevent the recurrence of damage by floods or high waters to those banks of the Eel River, California, which are adjacent to the trackage of any common carrier by railroad and shall report to Congress the results of such survey together with the cost of any recommended work within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act. The President, acting through the Office of Emergency Planning, is authorized to perform all or any part of the recommended work determined to be in the public interest and to reimburse any common carrier for any of such recommended work performed by such carrier. The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army shall be used to make the survey authorized by this section, shall recommend necessary work that has been determined by the President acting through the Office of Emergency Planning to be in the public interest, and shall be used to supervise any work authorized to be performed under this section.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $3,875,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 6. Loans made pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) for the purpose of replacing, reconstructing, or repairing dwellings in California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho, damaged or destroyed by the floods and high waters of December 1964, and January and February 1965, may have a maturity of up to thirty years, except that section 7(c) of such Act shall not apply to such loans.

SEC. 7. This Act, other than section 5 and the amendment made by section 3(c), shall not be in effect after June 30, 1966, except with respect to payment of expenditures for obligations and commitments entered into under this Act on or before such date.

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I see my good friend the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] in the Chamber. I have every reason to believe that the Senate committee under the able leadership of the senior Senator from Michigan will see to it that the bill is reported to the Senate before the day is out.

Although I have not received official notification of the text of the President's veto message, I have been informed that the President vetoed the disaster relief bill, S. 327, which was designed to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho as a result of the damage caused by the unprecedented floods of December 1964 and January and February 1965 in those States. I have discussed the veto action with my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and with Senators MURPHY and KUCHEL, of California, and I should indicate that all of us are deeply concerned over the fact that the veto, which appears to have been based on purely technical grounds, was applied to a disaster relief bill which is so urgently needed by the States mentioned above.

I have been advised informally that the language of S. 327 which was found objectionable to the President is that which appears as a portion of section 5 (a) of the bill. This language reads as follows: "but no appropriation shall be made for any such work which has not been approved before June 30, 1966, by resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively."

It is my understanding that the veto was predicated on the President's view that the above-quoted language would encroach upon the administrative powers of the executive branch of the Government. The language which the President found objectionable required that before appropriations for construction, or reimbursement for construction, performed on the Eel River could be made, the Office of Emergency Planning would have to justify such appropriations before the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, even though Congress had already authorized such funds.

Apparently, the further authorization required by a resolution of the Public Works Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives constituted the basis of the charge of interference with the functions of the executive branch of the Government.

In order to facilitate action on the disaster relief for the Western States which was envisaged in my bill, S. 327, I am reintroducing my bill with the deletion of the language of section 5(a) which was found objectionable by the President. I am pleased to have Senators NEUBERGER, RANDOLPH, MURPHY, and KUCHEL as cosponsors of the bill.

In fairness to the President, I should point out that his veto related only to a portion of section 5(a) of S. 327 and that this section deals with the survey of protective works necessary to prevent recurrence of flood damage along the banks of the Eel River, Calif. This section was not in my original bill but was inserted by action of the House of Representatives.

My colleagues from California, both the junior and senior Senators, and my colleague from Oregon, as well as the senior Senator from Oregon, are entitled to have it clearly understood that we did not have this language in our bill as we introduced it in the Senate. This was a matter that was agreed to at the House level. Apparently it was thought that in order to expedite the handling of the bill, it was necessary to accept the language in conference.

We have the responsibility of seeing to it that every possible time saving measure be accomplished. As the RECORD will show, I have been highly critical, and rightly so, of the executive branch of the Government.

I say to the President that it was necessary for me on two different occasions to get in touch with the President and point out to him that his Bureau of the Budget and his agencies downtown were not moving with the dispatch they should have used last January, February, and March, in order to bring relief to the people of the Pacific Northwest. I believe it to be particularly apropos, in view of the debate that will be taking place in the Senate in the next several days or weeks on foreign aid, to repeat my statement that if this aid had involved a disaster in a foreign country, we would not have had to go through all the checks and balances that we had to go through to get the money for the relief of our own people who have experienced a disaster. That is why I think it is so important that this administration——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I believe it is important, now that this administration has seen fit to veto the bill, that we proceed with the utmost speed and dispatch, as I know will be done, to get the bill passed, so we can start getting help for the people of Oregon, California, and Washington, and the other States, who, in my judgment, have been denied for too long a time relief to which they are entitled.

It is my hope that the Senate Public Works Committee and the Senate will take immediate action on the reintroduced disaster relief bill. Prompt action thereon is extremely important because this is emergency legislation and contracts have been advertised for emergency repair work by the Forest Service and other Government agencies having jurisdiction over the repair of damage occasioned by the floods in Oregon and other Western States. Failure to act promptly on this bill would cause tremendous problems in connection with the efforts that we are undertaking to repair the damage of the floods of last winter.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I commend the Senator, and would like to add my own voice to this discussion by saying that I was shocked to learn of the veto action taken by the White House, because of certain language which was not put in by the Senate, and which came about through a misunderstanding. It is my hope that the Senate will report the bill promptly, today, regardless of other considerations that the Senate may be engaged in, so that prompt action may be taken in this matter. We are particularly anxious to bring about relief to the people of our State, people whose land was covered with silt and mud, whose means of earning a living was wiped away.

We are still talking about this matter in the month of June, when this occurrence took place in early winter.

My very first job as a U.S. Senator was to tour the disaster area and to observe firsthand the results of the catastrophe. After such an inspection, the need for prompt relief was apparent.

Senator MORSE, shortly after the disaster introduced S. 327, and I was pleased to cosponsor the measure. I am also a member of the Senate Public Works Committee which held hearings on the legislation. Members of the committee were cognizant of the necessity for urgent action, and I understand the delay by the committee was necessitated by the failure of the various departments to submit their reports. After the bill was reported in the Senate on April 22, the majority leader, also appreciative of the emergency nature, promptly scheduled the legislation which was passed by the Senate on April 23. About a month later, S. 327 cleared the House committee and finally passed the House on May 19, 1965. The Senate on May 20 agreed to the House amendments, and most of us felt that at long last funds were to be made available to these flood-stricken victims.

Such was not the case. Although I have not had an opportunity to examine the President's statement regarding the veto, I understand it is based on congressional committee infringement on Executive authority. Specifically, the President objected to that part of section 5 (a) which precluded appropriations for the Eel River in California which had not been approved before June 30, 1966, by resolution adopted by Public Works Committees of the House and the Senate. This is not the first time that this problem has appeared, and I am at a loss to understand why the President selected a disaster bill to voice this objection.

Mr. President, I only hope that the Congress will realize that the delay has been all too long and will expeditiously send this measure, which I am cosponsoring with Senator MORSE, back to the President for his immediate approval.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for the unfailing efforts he has given to me and my colleague from Oregon in an effort to get disaster relief to our State and to our people.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] has handed me a note which indicates that the number of the bill will be S. 2089. The Senator from Michigan can close his ears when I make this compliment to him, because he is a modest man, but I want the record to show that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] has never failed us in this effort. Let me add what I have said before: The fact that there has been some delay in relief for the people of the Pacific Northwest has not been due to any dereliction on the part of the Senator from Michigan. We have had complete cooperation from him and his committee.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, briefly, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from California. Our committee will lose no time in the consideration of this matter. We are already working on it. First efforts have been taken already. The bill has a number. We will handle the bill with as much expedition as possible.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, it is my understanding that the bill, S. 327, which the President vetoed, and which has now been reintroduced as S. 2089, is now being considered by the Public Works Committee. I wish to state for the record that the Senate granted the committee permission to meet during the session of the Senate today. It is my hope that this important bill, which means so much to the people of California, Oregon, Idaho, and Nevada, will be reported to the Senate and passed as expeditiously as possible.

SERIOUS AGRICULTURAL LABOR SHORTAGES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill and ask that the text of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks; and also that the bill lie at the desk until next Friday for possible cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the requests of the Senator from Texas are granted.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, throughout this year's citrus and vegetable season in California and Florida, Labor Secretary Wirtz has flatly denied that serious agricultural labor shortages existed, in spite of severe crop losses due to insufficient labor.

Eventually, after long congressional and farm industry pressure, the Secretary did allow some limited, temporary admission of foreign workers for California and Florida in accord with the industry's labor source customs and needs.

Now, the Texas fruit and vegetable season is close at hand in many areas, and the Labor Secretary again says there is no labor shortage. In addition, my State has not been so fortunate as California and Florida. The Secretary has not seen fit to allow even limited admission of braceros to help Texas farmers.

Certainly, a labor shortage exists and will grow worse in my State under the Secretary's present procedures. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks the May employment outlook reports of the Texas Employment Commission for the Brownsville, Harlingen, San Benito, and McAllen labor markets. I note that the commission prominently predicts a shortage of vegetable harvest hands.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 1965.

BROWNSVILLE-HARLINGEN-SAN BENITO LABOR MARKET EMPLOYMENT TRENDS AND OUTLOOK

April highlights: An increased demand for farm hands was responsible for an upswing in total employment.

Unemployment rose slightly over March but remained below the estimate for April 1964.

The possibility of a shortage of vegetable harvest hands exists for the spring vegetable harvest.

Summer job seekers will add to the area labor force at the end of the spring school term.

Employment trends: Total employment in Cameron County moved upward over the month and was estimated at 45,000 in mid-April. This figure represented a gain of 220 over the previous month and 870 more than April 1964. All of the March to April increase was credited to seasonal workers as additional hands were utilized in cotton, grain, and vegetable crops.

Manufacturing employment requirements were reduced by 160 over the past month. A number of firms engaged in the processing of seafood products reduced their work force as shrimping operations were curtailed. Personnel cuts by cotton oil mills and vegetable canneries also contributed to the employment losses.

Additional hiring of 130 by firms in the nonmanufacturing industries failed to offset manufacturing losses. The gains were spread throughout a number of industries and no significant trend was evident.

Unemployment up slightly: At mid-April the number of idle workers throughout the county was estimated at 3,200 or 6.6 percent of the total labor force. This was an increase of 80 over the previous month, but 50 less than April 1964. The unexpected increase was attributed to a temporary slowdown in the food and kindred industry.

Forecast: An increased demand for farm labor is in prospect over the next 30- to 45-day period. The harvesting of tomatoes, green beans, and cucumbers, plus cotton crop activity will combine in adding to mounting labor demands.

Manufacturing employment requirements are predicted to increase over the next 60 days. The major part of the gain will be in the food and kindred industry as firms engaged in vegetable canning reach peak production.

MAY 1965.

McALLEN LABOR MARKET EMPLOYMENT TRENDS AND OUTLOOK: HIDALGO AND STARR COUNTIES

April review: A rise in total employment in Hidalgo and Starr Counties was attributed to an increased demand for agricultural workers.

Unemployment dropped sharply as outmigration reached a peak.

Possibility of a farm labor shortage exists for harvesting spring vegetables.

A further rise in employment and a corresponding drop in unemployment is forecast over the next 30 days.

Total employment up: Total employment at mid-April was estimated at 58,450—up some 1,300 from the previous month and 950 from April 1964. An increased demand for farm labor was responsible for the gain.

Manufacturing employment decreased by 250 from 1 month ago. Area canning firms were largely responsible for the reductions as they completed processing of carrots and beets.

Nonmanufacturing workrolls increased by 200 over the past month and partially absorbed the manufacturing losses. The additions were distributed throughout the various industries with mining, construction and wholesale trade showing the most significant gain.

Unemployment drop: Unemployment in Hidalgo and Starr Counties dropped sharply over the past month. At mid-April the number of jobless workers was estimated at 3,620 or 5.8 percent of the total labor force. The April estimate is 1,050 lower than last month, and 630 less than April 1964. The peak departure of migratory workers to other locations was primarily responsible for the drop.

Outlook and forecast: The demand for agricultural labor will increase with the harvesting of tomatoes, cantaloups, green beans, and other vegetables. Activities connected with the approaching cotton harvest will add to mounting labor needs and the possibility of a farmhand shortage exists for May and early June.

The next 60 days will see stepped-up hiring by manufacturers. The food and kindred industry will lead in the hiring as canning plants staff to handle spring vegetable processing.

Employment predictions in the nonmanufacturing grouping point to estimated reductions of 670 over the next 2 months, with further cuts due by mid-August. The decrease is to be expected as vegetable packing sheds complete seasonal operations.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have been pleased to note from recent correspondence with the Labor Secretary that he is working with the Texas Employment Commission to "meet the labor needs of Texas growers." If he is indeed working with the commission, and if he is attendant to the warnings expressed in the two labor forecasts I have just placed in the Record, then there is real reason to hope that bracero workers will soon be admitted to Texas.

The Secretary also informs me that "the primary concern was an anticipated need for Mexicans later in the year to harvest pickling cucumbers." I am pleased to have this further expression of understanding from the Secretary. And I only point out that time continues to drift by and that farmers and ranchers cannot conjure workers overnight. Some definite advance planning must be done, and an early Labor Department decision would do much to permit such planning.

However, these belated Labor Department rulings are too confusing to be allowed to stand as U.S. labor policy for years to come. I hope a more lasting method of meeting the problem can be found, and for that reason I offer legislation.

Mr. President, the bill I introduce today would place agriculture labor recruitment responsibility upon State authorities. The officer of each State principally concerned with agriculture is given responsibility to make a final determination about the number of workers needed to harvest crops.

In the case of Texas that official is the commissioner of agriculture.

This bill would give the States sole jurisdiction over the "finding of a need" for additional foreign workers. The U.S. Attorney General then would supervise the necessary immigration.

Certainly, this would be far more equitable than the present hectic and unsatisfactory control from Washington. Those officials closest to the situation are far better able to determine the needs of agriculture.

It has proved impossible in this heavily agricultural Nation of 190 million people for one Federal official to make an almost day-to-day labor need determination in each of 50 States. The labor problems of industry alone are enough to keep the Labor Secretary and his Department busy around the clock.

Most important, my bill would relieve the present impossible situation while preserving exactly the same goal the Labor Secretary says he is seeking: The use of as many unemployed American workers as possible.

My State and all other States can be depended upon to give first choice to its own residents and citizens who need and want this work. But, when there is a legitimate insufficient number of local farm workers available—as there has been all this season—the States would have, under my bill, authority to import additional workers to avoid serious crop losses.

My bill would require the Attorney General to provide recruitment and reception centers for the workers. The Justice Department would be required to establish and operate reception centers at or near places of entry of workers into the United States for the purpose of housing and receiving such workers while final arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the United States.

The Attorney General also would be required to provide transportation for bracero workers from the recruitment centers outside the United States to reception centers established in this country. The same procedure would apply when braceros returned to Mexico.

In addition, a special safeguard has been written into this bill guarding against infiltration of subversive elements into the normal flow of foreign workers.

Mr. President, the bill I introduce today is a companion measure to a House bill proposed by the Honorable Edward J. Gurney, of Florida's 11th District. I hope that this bill will be seriously and promptly considered by both Houses of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Wall Street Journal of June 3 be printed at this point in the Record. The article graphically documents the increased costs being paid by American grocery shoppers because of the lack of adequate farm labor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Vegetable Prices Remain High, Reflecting Poor Crop Weather and Ban on Braceros

(By S. LaVerne Jervis)

Chicago.—The consumer food budget, already strained this year by sharply advancing meat prices, is taking on an added burden at the vegetable counter.

Steeper prices for fresh vegetables and some fruits paced the Government's April consumer price index to a new high and the sharpest jump for that month in 5 years. A check of supermarkets shows that prices are holding at these lofty peaks. In more normal years prices turn down about mid-May as supplies begin reaching retailers in greater volume.

For instance, one store in a nationwide chain is selling lettuce for 39 cents a head, against 19 cents a year ago. Cauliflower retails for 49 cents a head, up from 29 cents a year ago. Strawberries bring 49 cents a pint, compared with 33 cents last year.

Though prices are expected to ease somewhat this summer as home-grown crops reach the market, the drop will be less and later than usual, the produce buyer for a large supermarket chain says.

The highest prices are mainly the result of two factors: A shortage of experienced stoop labor to pick crops and poor growing weather in much of the country. "This has been one of the worst growing years for a large number of crops that I can remember," says a Government crop analyst.

CUCUMBER GROWERS' PLIGHT

The Agriculture Department said early last month that spring vegetable production would drop to 3.6 billion pounds, 3 percent below last year and 2 percent below the 1959–63 average. But output of several key vegetables will be down much more, and the amount reaching market may be severely reduced because of the labor shortage at harvesttime. For example, production of late spring onions will be down 7 percent from last year and 15 percent below the 1959–63 average, and spring asparagus output is estimated at 6 percent below 1964 and 19 percent below the 5-year average.

Weather in the past month has continued poor in many areas, hampering the growth of crops and setting back harvest about 2 weeks.

Most disturbing to producers is the labor shortage, which they feel could be averted. It stems from an order by Labor Secretary Wirtz preventing foreign labor from entering this country. Last year more than 200,000 foreign farmworkers, mostly Mexicans, flocked across the border. So far this year only 1,500 have been allowed to enter, and this was in response to a recommendation from a special panel.

Michigan cucumber growers have spent about $60,000 to send recruiters around the country seeking laborers to replace the Mexican braceros who previously harvested the cucumbers. The results have been negligible. Of one group of 780 recruited, only 17 were still on the job after 2 weeks.

SHIPMENTS ARE SMALLER

Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, said, "Prices are being forced up by a Government-created labor shortage which has increased farm costs and made it impossible to harvest a normal crop." Mr. Shuman predicts that "consumers will be faced with still larger price jumps for fresh fruits and vegetables" if the Government policy on foreign labor is continued.

The Farm Bureau says strawberries are being plowed under in California and crops such as tomatoes aren't being planted in as large a volume as last year because of fears there won't be labor available. for harvest.

A further indication of the drop in vegetable supplies is the low rate of shipments from major producing points compared with a year ago. In a recent week, only 56 carloads of onions were shipped out of Texas, compared with 241 in the similar week of 1964. Texas yellow onions currently wholesale in Chicago for $4.25 per 50-pound sack, compared with $2 a year ago.

In the same week shipments of lettuce from Arizona and California totaled 150 cars, barely more than half the year-earlier total. Also, storekeepers moan about the quality of lettuce they have been receiving. "We have to throw away at least 2 or 3 rotten heads out of every 24-head crate, so we have to get more for those we can sell," says the produce manager for one retail chain.

Production of celery, which retails for 29 cents a stalk in Chicago, double the price a year ago, is estimated by the Government about 2 percent below last year's output. Wet fields in California delayed cutting about a week.

Green pepper crops in the major producing States of Texas and Florida are expected to be 6 percent below last year's. Tomato production is about the same as last year, but in southern producing areas cool weather has caused a 2-week delay in growth.

Potato prices, which have been high since last fall, are now about down to the year-ago level but have receded slowly because the California harvest was pushed 2 to 3 weeks behind schedule by cold weather. Last week California long white potatoes wholesaled in Chicago for $8 a hundred pounds, compared with $6 a year ago.

The bill (S. 2090) to provide for the establishment of a program under which foreign agricultural workers can be recruited for temporary employment in the continental United States, introduced by Mr. Tower, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on

Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Agricultural Workers Act".

SEC. 2. For the purpose of assisting in the production of agricultural commodities and products, by supplying agricultural workers from foreign countries (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the foreign countries concerned), the Attorney General is authorized—

(1) to recruit such workers (including any such workers who are temporarily in the United States under legal entry);

(2) to establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the continental United States for the purpose of receiving and housing such workers while arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the continental United States;

(3) to provide transportation for such workers from recruitment centers outside the continental United States to such reception centers and transportation from such reception centers to such recruitment centers after termination of employment;

(4) to provide such workers with such subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses (not exceeding $150 burial expenses in any one case) as may be or become necessary during transportation authorized by paragraph (3) and while such workers are at reception centers;

(5) to assist such workers and employers in negotiating contracts for agricultural employment (such workers being free to accept or decline agricultural employment with any eligible employer and to choose the type of agricultural employment they desire, and eligible employers being free to offer agricultural employment to any workers of their choice not under contract to other employers);

(6) to guarantee the performance by employers of provisions of such contracts relating to the payment of wages or the furnishing of transportation.

SEC. 3. No workers shall be made available under this Act to any employer unless such employer enters into an agreement with the United States—

(1) to indemnify the United States against loss by reason of its guarantee of such employer's contracts;

(2) to reimburse the United States for essential expenses incurred by it under this Act, except salaries and expenses of personnel engaged in compliance activities, in amounts not to exceed $15 per worker; and

(3) to pay to the United States, in any case in which a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the contract entered into under paragraph (5) of section 2 of this Act, an amount determined by the Attorney General to be equivalent to the normal cost to the employer of returning other workers from the place of employment to such reception center, less any portion thereof required to be paid by other employers. If the employer can establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the employer has provided or paid to the worker the cost of return transportation and subsistence from the place of employment to the appropriate reception center, the Attorney General under such regulations as he may prescribe may relieve the employer of his obligation to the United States under this subsection.

SEC. 4. No workers recruited under this Act shall be available for employment in any area unless the Attorney General has received a certification from the State officer principally responsible for agriculture in the State where the workers are to be employed that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed, and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages, standard hours of work, and working conditions comparable to those offered to foreign workers. In carrying out the provisions of clauses (1) and (2) of this section, provision shall be made for consultation with agricultural employers and workers for the purpose of obtaining facts relevant to the supply of domestic farmworkers and the wages paid such workers engaged in similar employment. Information with respect to certifications under clauses (1) and (2) shall be posted in the appropriate local public employment offices and such other public places as the Attorney General may require.

SEC. 5. No workers recruited under this Act shall be made available to any employer or permitted to remain in the employ of any employer—

(1) for employment in other than temporary or seasonal occupations, except in specific cases when found by the Attorney General necessary to avoid undue hardship; or

(2) for employment to operate or maintain power-driven self-propelled harvesting, planting, or cultivating machinery, except in specific cases when found by the Attorney General necessary for a temporary period to avoid undue hardship.

SEC. 6. Workers recruited under this Act who are not citizens of the United States shall be admitted to the United States subject to the immigration laws (or if already in the United States by virtue of legal entry and otherwise eligible for admission to the United States, may, pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the foreign country concerned, be permitted to remain therein) for such time and under such conditions as may be specified by the Attorney General but, notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability upon any person for the failure of any such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment. No workers shall be made available under this Act to, nor shall any worker made available under this Act be permitted to remain in the employ of, any employer who has in his employ any alien when such employer knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such alien is not lawfully within the United States.

SEC. 7. Workers recruited under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to any Federal or State tax levied to provide illness or disability benefits for them.

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this Act, the Attorney General is authorized—

(1) to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies; and to allocate or transfer funds or otherwise to pay or reimburse such agencies for expenses in connection therewith;

(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

(3) when necessary to supplement the domestic agricultural labor force, to cooperate with the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements or arrangements relating to the employment in the United States, subject to the immigration laws, of agricultural workers from foreign countries.

SEC. 9. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "agricultural employment" includes services or activities included within the provisions of section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or section 3121(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(2) The term "employer" shall include an association, or other group, of employers, but only if (A) those of its members for whom workers are being obtained are bound, in the event of its default, to carry out the obligations undertaken by it pursuant to section 3 of this Act, or (B) the Attorney General determines that such individual liability is not necessary to assure performance of such obligations.

SEC. 10. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Attorney General, pursuant to the general immigration laws, to permit the importation of aliens of any nationality for agricultural employment as defined in section 9 of this Act, or to permit any such alien who entered the United States legally to remain for the purpose of engaging in such agricultural employment under such conditions and for such time as the Attorney General shall specify.

SEC. 11. (a) Section 210(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Foreign Agricultural Workers Act".

(b) Section 3121(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (65 Stat. 119; 7 U.S.C. 1461–1468)", and inserting in lieu thereof "the Foreign Agricultural Workers Act".

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CONSTITUTIONALITY OF GRANTS OR LOANS UNDER CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL ACTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during the course of Senate debate on the Perkins-Morse Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Senators will recall that there was much discussion concerning judicial review.

At that time, as floor leader for the bill, in opposing amendments being offered to it, I indicated to the Senate my belief that the purpose of the amendment under discussion could better be served through the enactment of general purpose legislation affecting all educational acts, and I indicated my willingness to assist in this endeavor through the reintroduction of legislation offered previously in the 87th and 88th Congresses by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and myself.

It is for this purpose that I today send to the desk, for appropriate referral, on my own behalf and that of Senators CLARK and YARBOROUGH, a bill to provide for judicial review of the constitutionality of grants or loans under certain educational acts. It is my hope that hearings can be held at an early date by the Judiciary Committee upon this legislation since, in my judgment, the course of educational legislation in the Congress of the United States for the balance of this session and in sessions to come may very well be disturbed until we have received from the Supreme Court the guidelines of constitutional interpretation so badly needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2097) to provide for judicial review of the constitutionality of grants or loans under certain acts, introduced by Mr. Morse (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TOWN OF BREMEN, IND.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill for relief of the town of Bremen, Ind., from a liability to the United States in the amount of Federal civil defense matching funds advanced to it in July 1961, toward the cost of radio equipment. The town made an error in purchasing the equipment prior to the required approval of the project and prior to the date of availability of the applicable Federal civil defense funds. Because of that mistake in timing, the liability was incurred, a liability which would not have existed otherwise. A companion bill, H.R. 6922, was offered in the House by Congressman John Brademas on March 30. I make this statement of explanation in order that there may be understanding by the committee to which the bill is referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2098) for the relief of the town of Bremen, Ind., introduced by Mr. Hartke, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 236

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 240 THROUGH 250

Mr. MORSE submitted 11 amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1837, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 237

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to H.R. 8371, the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, to provide that taxes which would be repealed July 1, 1965, be removed immediately upon enactment.

In spite of the expeditious treatment given the excise tax bill, the certain passage of this bill has created special problems in large segments of our economy. Except with regard to automobiles and air-conditioners, which tax cuts are retroactive to May 14, distributional problems are becoming severe.

Manufacturers report that dealers and distributors are delaying placing their orders for delivery until after July 1 to minimize the mechanics of floor stock refunds, and because of consumer reluctance to buy higher priced merchandise until after the excise taxes are repealed.

This situation threatens to slow down or halt production at a time when the new 1966 lines of merchandise are being manufactured and introduced for shipment to distributors and dealers through the country. Manufacturing and dealer-distributor inventories are usually high in the month of June.

Many manufacturers and dealers in order to offset a consumer buyer's strike have reduced prices or offered consumer refunds in anticipation of the removal of the excise tax and are presently absorbing that loss. Distributors and dealers, however, are delaying their purchases and thereby blocking the channels of distribution.

Mr. President, many of our businesses rely on distribution rather than warehouses. A stoppage in the pipeline is a serious matter. The benefits to be derived from an early effective date far outweigh any potential revenue loss caused by acceleration. At this point in time, the revenue loss will be minimal because of buyer and distributor reaction in waiting for the cut. That loss will be more than offset by the increased sales and the early return of normalcy to our economy.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 237) was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> On page 15, line 22, strike out "July 1, 1965" and insert "the date of enactment of the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965";
>
> On page 16, line 23, strike out "July 1, 1965" and insert "the date of enactment of this Act";
>
> On page 19, line 4, strike out "July 1, 1965" and insert "the date of enactment of this Act";
>
> On page 20, line 4, strike out "July 1, 1965" and insert "the date of enactment of this Act";
>
> On page 20, line 13, strike out "July 1, 1965" and insert "the date of enactment of this Act";
>
> On page 42, line 23, strike out "July 1, 1965" and insert "the date of the enactment of this Act";
>
> On page 43, line 18, strike out "July 1, 1965" and insert "the date of the enactment of this Act";
>
> On page 43, line 23, strike out "July 1, 1965" and insert "the date of the enactment of this Act";
>
> On page 46, line 13, strike out "July 1, 1965" and insert "the date of enactment of this Act".

"SAFE CAR" AMENDMENT TO EXCISE TAX BILL

AMENDMENT NO. 238

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, 1 in every 5 Americans is destined to be killed or injured in a traffic accident in the coming decade unless we do something about it.

We must protect the lives and health of the American people against this epidemic of traffic fatalities and injuries that afflicts us—48,000 dead, 3.8 million injured. To do so there are many factors to be considered. There is the driver, the road, and the car itself.

We must improve the performance capability of the driver through expanded driver education and training programs.

We must reduce the difficulty of the traffic situation he faces through improved highway construction and design.

But no matter how trained the driver or safe the road, the traffic accident problem has become so great that some crashes are unavoidable and others inevitable. It is vital, therefore, that the machine itself be designed and safety features provided to protect the occupants against injury and death.

A significant step in this direction was taken when Congress enacted Public Law 88-515, authorizing the General Services Administration to establish safety specifications for all passenger cars and light trucks purchased by the Federal Government. The devices GSA will require under its initial regulations are designed to avert the first collision and minimize the effects of the second collision.

The "first collision" is between the car and another car, a tree, or some other part of the environment. To help the driver avoid this collision, the GSA standards would require the following devices on all Government-purchased autos:

First. Dual operation of braking system.

Second. Safe tires and safety rims.

Third. Standard gear quadrant—PRNDL.

Fourth. Glare reduction surfaces.

Fifth. Sweep design of windshield wipers-washers.

Sixth. Backup lights.

Seventh. Outside rear-view mirrors.

Eighth. Four-way flasher.

If the first collision is not averted—if the driver, the road or the vehicle fail—then the crash momentum must be used up in the second collision where the body is either ejected from the car, suffering serious injury or death, or strikes against the buttons, knobs, lines and stylings of the auto's interior. To protect the occupant in the second collision, the GSA standards would require the following:

First. Anchorage for seat-belt assemblies.

Second. Padded dash and visors.

Third. Recessed dash instruments and control devices.

Fourth. Impact absorbing steering wheel and column displacement.

Fifth. Safety door latches and hinges.

Sixth. Anchorage of seats.

Seventh. Safety glass.

Eighth. Standard bumper heights.

In addition, exhaust emission control systems in accordance with the Federal Clean Air Act will be required.

These 17 safety features are not the final and complete answer to vehicle safety design by any manner or means. But they represent a beginning. They give the American people who today are little more than fugitives from the law of averages a better assurance against serious injury or death whenever they are involved in a traffic accident.

Does not simple justice and plain commonsense demand that these safety devices which the Federal Government will require on all 1967 model series it purchases be made standard equipment on all cars? In my mind it does.

One would hope that automakers would voluntarily make all these safety features standard equipment on future models. Past history and present indications do not hold out much hope for this.

At the same time, there are some encouraging signs on the horizon. Look magazine's business editor, Al Rothenberg, in an article entitled "Car Safety: Miracles or Mayhem" terms 1965 the "comeback year" for Detroit's safety engineers. The reason, according to Rothenberg, is because "that car is fast becoming an abbreviation for carnage." I ask unanimous consent to insert at the end of my remarks Mr. Rothenberg's article.

Last week's U.S. News & World Report carried an article entitled "More Safety for Autos—Changes in the Works" indicating that the "latest watchword in Detroit" is safety and saying:

> Motorists now can look forward to better visibility, new ways to soften the impact of a crash, new devices for steering and signaling.

I ask unanimous consent to include this article in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

An interesting article appeared in the September 1964 issue of the Journal of American Insurance entitled "Here's Tomorrow on Wheels" which I ask to be inserted at the end of my remarks. The article describes some interesting automotive traffic innovations for the future but goes on to say:

> How about safety now? While automakers promise fantastic innovations in design and convenience in 1965 cars and those of the future, mutual automobile insurance companies continue to urge adoption of inexpensive improvements that would advance auto safety.

This, Mr. President, is the key question. How about safety now? The answer depends on private and public action. The problem of traffic safety is a responsibility of both private industry and Government. Working together in a cooperative framework they can help solve the problem. With the automotive excise tax repeal now before the Senate we have a unique opportunity to encourage the installation of safety features on automobiles as standard equipment. The excise tax repeal bill, as approved by the House, would end, in gradual steps, the present excise tax on new cars. As I indicated on May 26, I would condition the last two steps, or 4 percent of the repeal, on whether or not the automotive industry has included as standard equipment for all cars safety devices required on GSA-purchased cars under provisions of Public Law 88-515. Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an amendment to H.R. 8371 and ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at the end of my remarks.

In considering this amendment I would hope that all Members of Congress keep in mind that at the current rate of increase traffic deaths will claim the lives of 100,000 Americans by 1975. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a State-by-State listing of motor vehicle deaths and injuries for 1963 and 1964, as compiled by the National Safety Council.

There being no objection, the listing was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTOR VEHICLE DEATHS AND INJURIES BY STATES, 1964 AND 1963

Forty-seven States and the District of Columbia have reported their death and injury experience for 7 to 12 months of 1964. The table below shows all of the injury data reported by each State.

The large variations in the State ratios of injuries to deaths (last column in the table) are due to such factors as: (1) differences between States in the proportion of travel which is in urban and rural areas (the injury-death ratio for urban accidents is about four times the ratio for rural accidents); (2) differences in the completeness of reporting; (3) omission of some or all of the injuries in urban accidents.

Year-to-year changes for individual States are influenced in some cases by conditions or changes which make the totals noncomparable, such as: (1) increased emphasis on injury reporting; (2) changes in reporting procedures or forms; (3) inclusion of additional locations in the reporting program; (4) changes in the severity of injuries reported.

	Months reported	Deaths [1]		Injuries [1]		Percent change, 1963 to 1964		1964 ratio of injuries to deaths
		1964	1963	1964	1963	Deaths	Injuries	
Total, United States	(2)	[3] 41,630	[3] 38,174	1,826,636	1,655,590	+9	+10	44
Alabama	12	956	844	[4] 5,944	[4] 5,052	+13	+18	6
Alaska	12	45	43	[4] 1,077	[4] 933	+5	+15	24
Arizona	11	585	510	18,250	16,508	+15	+11	31
Arkansas	12	634	556	7,824	6,921	+14	+13	12
California	12	4,736	4,318	215,395	197,559	+10	+9	45
Colorado	12	565	506	21,860	20,534	+12	+6	39
Connecticut	9	228	226	16,432	15,061	+1	+9	72
Delaware	12	118	96	4,573	4,198	+23	+9	39
District of Columbia	12	115	96	10,794	10,240	+20	+5	94
Florida	12	1,520	1,472	82,379	70,266	+3	+17	54
Georgia	12	1,268	1,255	[5] 19,037	[5] 16,559	+1	+15	15
Hawaii	12	97	85	7,026	5,726	+13	+23	72
Idaho	12	262	207	8,827	8,313	+27	+6	34
Illinois	11	1,986	1,854	122,112	107,926	+7	+13	61
Indiana	10	1,153	1,089	53,268	44,708	+6	+19	46
Iowa	(6)							
Kansas	12	669	609	20,406	18,143	+10	+12	31
Kentucky	11	829	755	22,094	20,440	+10	+8	27
Louisiana	12	1,005	825	[4] 18,638	[4] 14,916	+22	+25	19
Maine	12	197	197	8,746	8,539	0	+2	44
Maryland	12	613	593	39,211	34,631	+3	+13	64
Massachusetts	7	381	378	71,804	63,926	+1	+12	188
Michigan	12	2,091	1,847	141,749	123,473	+13	+15	68
Minnesota	11	763	732	42,761	36,579	+4	+17	56
Mississippi	12	644	657	11,330	10,655	−2	+6	18
Missouri	12	1,276	1,161	17,852	15,712	+10	+14	14
Montana	11	241	206	4,903	4,142	+17	+18	20
Nebraska	12	448	347	14,740	13,780	+29	+7	33
Nevada	(6)							
New Hampshire	12	157	141	8,045	7,546	+11	+7	51
New Jersey	8	678	622	72,854	63,597	+9	+15	107
New Mexico	12	386	367	8,426	7,515	+5	+12	22
New York	10	2,790	2,349	237,801	232,957	+19	+2	85
North Carolina	12	1,571	1,370	49,130	42,662	+15	+15	31
North Dakota	12	185	194	4,021	3,706	−5	+8	22
Ohio	12	2,096	1,998	108,270	93,515	+5	+16	52
Oklahoma	12	781	761	21,220	20,389	+3	+4	27
Oregon	11	493	496	24,635	21,286	−1	+16	50
Pennsylvania	7	963	869	53,817	48,017	+11	+12	56
Rhode Island	(6)							
South Carolina	12	866	793	[5] 16,915	[5] 18,628	+9	−9	20
South Dakota	12	270	219	4,569	4,153	+23	+10	17
Tennessee	12	1,005	935	25,433	24,750	+13	+3	25
Texas	11	2,692	2,389	82,970	72,899	+13	+14	31
Utah	10	246	219	11,559	10,356	+12	+12	47
Vermont	12	131	112	[7] 5,000	5,006	+17	(8)	38
Virginia	11	960	901	35,478	31,762	+7	+12	37
Washington	12	724	625	3,842	3,742	+16	+22	53
West Virginia	12	467	431	6,241	5,100	+8	+22	13
Wisconsin	10	896	740	33,428	29,347	+21	+14	37
Wyoming	12	148	179	3,950	3,217	−17	+23	27
Puerto Rico	10	366	335	14,935	13,733	+9	+9	38
Virgin Islands	12	8	12	433	396	−42	+9	54

[1] All figures are preliminary. To insure proper comparisons, 1964 figures cover the same reporting period as those for 1963.

[2] Death and injury totals cover reports for all months indicated in this column.

[3] Death totals and changes differ from national figures because those shown here are based on the States and months for which injury data are reported.

[4] Rural injuries only.

[5] Figures not completely comparable.

[6] No report.

[7] Estimate.

[8] Less than 0.5 percent.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the problem of traffic safety has long been of interest to me. For a time it appeared we, as a nation, were making progress in this field. Death rates were declining and there was hope of continued improvement. The past 2 years have shocked us out of our complacency that all was well. Deaths and injuries and fantastic economic losses are on the climb again. Fortunately, the problem has become the concern of many, as is pointed out in an article by Dan Cordtz in today's Wall Street Journal. Mr. President, I want to commend the work and tireless energy of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] whose efforts on behalf of improved traffic safety, both as

Governor and now as Senator, set an example for all to follow. The efforts of Senator Hartke and Senator Magnuson, among others, are vital in the total effort needed to help solve this problem. The job is so vast that the energies of all of us are needed to bring some order out of the current chaos of traffic safety. I pledge my continued efforts in this regard and I know that my colleagues here in the Senate will intend to stay with the fight so we can save the lives and health of our people in all the 50 States. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at the end of my remarks Mr. Cordtz' article.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment and articles will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 238) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

On page 3, strike out lines 17 through 20 and insert the following:

"4 percent for the period after December 31, 1967, in the case of articles not qualifying under subsection (c).

"2 percent for the period January 1, 1968, through December 31, 1968, in the case of articles qualifying under subsection (c).

Effective for the period beginning January 1, 1969, the tax imposed under this paragraph shall not apply to articles qualifying under subsection (c)."

On page 5, after line 9, insert the following:

"(c) Passenger Safety Devices.—Section 4061 (relating to imposition of tax on motor vehicles) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) Passenger Safety Devices.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(A), an article shall qualify under this subsection only if—

"'(1) such article is a chassis or a body of an automobile which is equipped with the passenger safety devices which (A) would be required, under the Act of August 30, 1964 (Public Law 88–515), if such automobile were purchased for use by the Federal Government and (B) conform with the commercial standards prescribed by the Administrator of General Services under such Act which are in effect on the day on which such automobile is sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer; or

"'(2) such article is not an automobile chassis or body, or is an automobile chassis or body which has not been assembled into an automobile.'"

On page 5, line 10, strike out "(c)" and insert "(d".

The articles presented by Mr. Ribicoff are as follows:

[From Look magazine]

CAR SAFETY: MIRACLES OR MAYHEM?

(By Al Rothenberg)

The auto industry has gone full throttle on a crash safety program to keep its customers alive. In Detroit a crash program means: Get going and don't spare the dollar. Exotic research breakthroughs, substantial improvements has pushed well past the blueprint stage. Careful planners may pause at a yellow light of caution, but 98 million American motorists now head toward a revolution in signaling, steering, braking and visibility. More important, drivers will shoulder less strain—a load that now overpowers them.

Steering problems spin engineering brains. The steering column, running from the driver's hands to the front end, is a potential fat steel dagger of death. B. J. Campbell, respected head of the automotive crash injury research project at Cornell University, urges a shaft that collapses on impact. So does the General Service Administration, the Federal agency that makes mass Government purchases.

How about utopia? No column, no steering wheel. Ford Motor engineering has successfully tested an experimental Thunderbird, piloted by a pair of palm sized half knobs at hip height. These small controls, mechanically linked, operate in unison.

The T-Bird system offers another plus, variable-ratio steering. Translation: A series of slight turns of the steering knobs will produce progressively greater turns of the front wheels. Full-left to full-right wheel turn requires only one complete rotation of the steering controls. Conventional steering wheels need about four full turns between terminals. Code name for the project is "Wrist Twist." Four Mercury cars are highway testing an adaption that retains the steering column and constant ratio of steering to front wheels. John A. Versace, Ford's manager of human factors research, emphasizes that the T-Bird rolling laboratory is purely experimental. "All we're doing with this vehicle is exploring the unknown."

Better visibility would follow wrist twist's abolition of the steering wheel. Engineers also envision lifesaving changes in automobile glass. A light-sensitive windshield, now in the lab stage, is dark enough to block blinding sunrays in daylight, lets more light through at night. Another possibility is a flexible glass that bubbles on impact, does not shatter or produce skin-ripping jagged edges.

Signaling becomes more difficult as jet-hot air-conditioner sales seal more car windows in the peak summer-travel season. To handle the problem, voice communication via the standard car radio or a separate receiver has arrived. "We will be able to warn drivers of danger ahead, ask them to turn off a directional signal, even provide route directions," says Alex L. Haynes, Ford's executive engineer for vehicle safety. In signal flashing, experimental tail lamps glow green at Ford, blue at General Motors. Both turn red on braking.

Braking breakthroughs since World War II include power assists, self-adjusters, disks. Next, we may get pushbutton hand controls, because fingers react quicker than feet.

Driving, strain, especially on go-for-broke expressways, will at least partly pass from human minds to remote speed-control systems. Marquette Division of Curtiss-Wright Corp. has a portable electronic beam tosser that can be stationed at highway trouble spots. It beeps a warning to the driver that his speed has to be changed, then changes it automatically. The receiver will be mounted on speed-control devices already available in many cars. With present units, the driver presets a desired speed, and the car maintains the rate no matter what the terrain.

Electronics in cars has a future. A "black box" may provide instant data on all moving parts and tell you when your 500-horsepower V-8 needs a tune-up. Another dial may flash a warning that odorless but lethal carbon monoxide is seeping into the car.

At least three safety advances will arrive this fall in the 1966 models. Instrument-panel controls in over half the new cars will be recessed, because protruding knobs can, and do, injure. More seat-belt companies will offer front-seat diagonal shoulder straps. Door locks will be stronger, less likely to spring in a smashup.

The big question: When do we get the more dramatic innovations like the wrist twist? The big answer (in 3 parts) is near future, far future, maybe never. The big reason for delay: controversy.

The battles affect even the more prosaic improvements. "Recessed instrument-panel knobs would be fine, because knobs should be out of the way in an accident," says one spokesman. "But controls also have to be within easy reach." Ford's Haynes suggests knobs that break on impact. Both Roy Haeusler, safety engineer at Chrysler, and Haynes urge shoulder harnesses, plus seat belts, but Chrysler now is the only auto producer making both items available. Harry Dumville, director of the technical liaison section of the GM engineering staff, who sees advantages to the strap, still asks, "Where do we anchor it? If the strap travels across the driver, over the seat back and down to the floor, the downward load easily could crack a collarbone." The diagonal belt is more effective in head-on crashes, but most cars are hit on the side. Dumville, like every safety engineer, yearns for a flexible windshield: "Ideally, it would be made of transparent rubber."

Green tail lamps? Researchers found them almost invisible in fog. Collapsible steering columns? Dumville wonders: "Where do we make the point of collapse so it is effective whether the driver is a 300-pound male or a 90-pound girl?" He sizzles at other suggestions. A 4-inch foam-rubber lining inside the car was one idea. Unfortunately, foam rubber stores, rather than absorbs, energy and uncoils enough force to blow the brains out of a man's head. Further suggestion: hydraulic bumpers that cut down impact force before it reaches the engine, and later, the driver. But a bumper capable of dissipating the energy of a 20 miles per hour crash would have to jut 3 feet in front of the car.

In the ultra area, Curtiss-Wright's remote speed control won't work unless every car carries a receiver. Radar brakes? Dumville reports: "Too often, the car stops when it should keep going. Turning a corner, I was halted when the radar beam reflected off a parked car." "Other times, it didn't reflect at all when a test car went roaring at a high mound of sand. Ford engineers rate wrist twist mechanically sound for the market, but they also realize that its introduction would require retraining for all drivers. They estimate that average motorists can master the technique in about half an hour—if they are willing to try. GM, also in the wrist-twist development business, has a pistol-grip control in its research armory. Poison-gas dial indicator? Safety men worry that the device might malfunction, and they recommend, instead, periodic checks of the car underbody.

Far out or not, safety changes cost money and take time. Says Dumville, "These improvements often require extensive tooling. We just don't grab things off the shelf."

Solving technical problems is only the first step. Suppose a good radar brake was developed? The manufacturer's per unit cost might run to a thousand dollars. How many car owners could or would buy it? Nine years ago, Ford keyed its sales to a safety package of seat belts, padded dash, shatterproof mirror, stronger door locks, deep-dish steering wheel (to protect the driver from the steering column). Result: flop. In a few months, Ford switched its pitch to horsepower after the sales curve paralleled the depression of the deep dish.

Auto men naturally resent charges of apathy, John F. Gordon, GM president, told Look, "we are spending more money than we ever did before on safety research."

Though 90 percent of all car crashes are the handiwork of the driver, insiders and outsiders agree: "We must do everything possible, or impossible, 'to save the poor nut behind the wheel'—in spite of himself." Yet the marketing men know it's tough to sell safety. Cornell's Campbell retorts, "The least amount of progress has been made in areas where safety conflicted with styling, mainly the forward section of the car. I have great faith in Detroit stylists and believe they can create a salable package."

The auto makers contribute heavily to safety research at Cornell, UCLA, and other centers, including Detroit's own Wayne State University. WSU has quietly learned a lot from cadavers strapped onto high-speed test-sleds. Hard-shell dummies also ride the simulated death trail, but the corpses alone can deliver data on brain and skin injuries. As one speaker at a Detroit safety conference noted: "Live volunteers are scarce." The companies crash more than one car a week, to test new kinds of belt restrainers, steel structural designs, sheet metal, and padding. Ford also has a crane that drops cars 30 feet on their noses to get a better view of undercar distortions during a crash.

After Ford's sad sales experience in 1956, the safety engineer slipped in importance. This may be his comeback year. The reason, obviously, is that car is fast becoming an abbreviation for carnage. Basing their forecasts on the current annual accident-increase rate, safety experts say that by 1975 100,000 Americans a year will die in traffic. We could pass the halfway mark to that bloody goal by the end of this year. More cars and more drivers inevitably raise the death rate. Detroit's trump card from 1946 through 1961 was the steady decline in the ratio of deaths to vehicle mileage. The trump is now an unfunny joker. With a 3-year upturn, the alarm bells are clanging. Better car design and more driver education will help—but not enough. The big problem, however, is public apathy. Motorists never really accepted seat belts until State legislatures made them compulsory. Parnelli Jones, the 1963 Indianapolis 500 winner, believes shoulder harnesses would save countless lives. He wears them in every race—but not in his family sedan.

YOUR SAFETY-CHECK

Traffic experts say driver education is just one part of the effort to make highways safer. Mechanical upkeep is another. The national vehicle safety-check for communities program is sponsored each May and June by Look and the Auto Industries Highway Safety Committee, in cooperation with the Association of State and Provincial Safety Coordinators, in the 31 States that do not require official State vehicle inspection. Autos are put through free lanes, where volunteers check brakes, glass, horn, exhaust systems, tires, windshield wipers, front and rear lights, turn signals, mirrors and steering. Last year, 3 million vehicles were safety-checked in 3,700 participating communities. For information about or assistance in setting up a program, write to: National Vehicle Safety-Check for Communities, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., 20006.

[From the U.S. News & World Report]

More Safety for Autos—Changes in the Works

(Note.—Latest watchword in Detroit: Safety. Motorists now can look forward to better visibility, new ways to soften the impact of a crash, new devices for steering and signaling.

(For a report on what's ahead, direct from industry sources.)

Detroit.—The new car you'll be buying in the next year or so will have more safety built into it than ever before.

A growing emphasis on safety is becoming apparent among all U.S. auto makers.

Now on the way from car manufacturers are new features designed to keep you out of serious accidents, or reduce the chances of serious injury in a mishap.

For instance—

Knobs and levers on instrument panels are to be recessed. Panels themselves will be darker in color to cut down on glare, particularly from night lights.

Metal with a dull finish will replace shiny chrome on windshield wipers that now can reflect the sun's glare.

Car bumpers, front and rear, will be a uniform height off the ground, regardless of make or model, to minimize damage from collisions.

Seat belts are to be furnished on rear as well as front seats. Stronger locks will keep doors more securely latched, to prevent motorists from being thrown out of cars in crackups.

These safety features, industry sources say, are to become standard equipment on all new cars by the 1967 model year at the latest—and with little increase in price to the car buyer.

For anyone willing to pay extra, a host of other safety devices are to be offered on every make and model:

Shoulder harnesses to strap in the driver and other front-seat passengers.

Anchors to keep folding-type seats firmly in place in case of sudden jolts.

Dual systems of brakes that work even if one set should fail.

A device to flash all tail and turn lights simultaneously in order to warn approaching motorists that an emergency stop is being made.

A bigger outside rearview mirror, double the surface of mirrors that now generally come with new cars.

A steering wheel and steering column built to absorb greater impact.

A number of these features already are available on some foreign and U.S. cars. Putting all these optional extras on a car could add as much as $200 to the bill for a typical auto, according to industry experts.

"There's no question," says an executive of one of the big three auto manufacturers, "that there is more emphasis on safety now than ever before in the laboratories and styling studios of every auto company."

Behind many of the safety improvements coming soon are new regulations issued by the Federal Government.

DEVICES ON GOVERNMENT CARS

The General Services Administration, starting with 1967 models, is going to require new safety features to be built into the 60,000 cars it buys for Government use each year. It is these features that auto manufacturers voluntarily plan to put into cars they sell private buyers.

Already, the GSA has indicated that additional safety devices will be required on cars sold to the Government. Expectation is that some will be made available on autos sold to the public.

Car seats, under one measure now being considered, would have to be redesigned to prevent "whiplash" injuries to the neck from sudden stops. Another idea is an antiskid device to keep cars from going out of control on slippery pavements. Government officials are studying the feasibility of relocating the gas tank to prevent fire after collision.

DRAMATIC IMPROVEMENTS AHEAD

Even more dramatic improvements in auto safety, looking beyond those under scrutiny by the Government, promise to come out of the laboratories and proving grounds. Some are expected to show up on cars before the end of the decade.

Beyond the blueprint stage are devices that would eliminate the steering wheel. Test cars now being driven by Ford are steered by a pair of 5-inch knobs, more than a foot apart at hip height, that work in unison. A stingle stick to control both speed and direction is being developed by General Motors.

In both cases, the new steering systems reduce the danger that the driver, thrown forward in an accident, would be impaled on a steering column. The new devices for guidance also give the driver a clearer view of the road.

Better visibility is a prime target of auto-safety engineers. Now in the lab stage is a light-sensitive windshield. It's designed to lessen glare of oncoming headlights or rays of the sun, yet provide adequate vision at night.

Other research on windshields is pointed at a flexible glass that would bend under impact without shattering or producing jagged edges.

Intensive research is underway to improve signal lights. Auto companies are testing blue and green taillights that turn red on braking to provide a sharper light contrast than at present.

Other tests involve new methods of braking. Pushbutton controls to halt cars may replace pedals. "Fingers react quicker than feet," says a safety expert.

Ford, in recent weeks, has put on display an experimental early warning system, using present car radios. This system would keep a driver advised of road hazards beyond his range of vision.

NEW LAWS?

The stepup in safety research by auto companies comes at a time of growing concern over car safety in Washington and in State capitals.

There is more and more talk of expanding Government authority over the broad field of auto safety.

On May 25, a Senate subcommittee began hearings on a bill to set safety standards for tires. Later this year, the same group is to consider a proposal to compel auto makers to equip new cars with a whole range of safety devices.

Another Senate subcommittee, headed by Senator Abraham Ribicoff, Democrat, of Connecticut, is in the midst of hearings on how the Federal Government can improve traffic safety.

Bills dealing with auto safety are also pending in more than 30 States.

EMPHASIS ON SPEED

Pressure on automakers is coming from the administration, too. Commerce Secretary John Connor has expressed concern over growing emphasis on speed and on the size of the automobile engines.

Mr. Connor has indicated he is opposed to Federal controls on car makers. But he has been meeting quietly, in recent weeks, with auto industry officials. Mr. Connor's aim is to persuade them to install more safety features voluntarily.

Auto company officials, for their part, question whether the public is really interested in safety. Few motorists, it is claimed, purchase safety items now available as extra-cost options. Surveys show that most people who have seat belts in their cars use them much less than half the time.

Safety engineers also say that auto design is not the only factor in highway safety. Faulty driving and poorly designed roads are regarded by most traffic authorities as even more significant causes of highway casualties.

Nevertheless, it is clear, the country's auto makers are stepping up their efforts to build safer cars.

[From the Journal of American Insurance]

Here's Tomorrow on Wheels—As 1965 Autos Appear, Makers Forge Ahead With More Innovations and Improvements

Space probers are readying a Titan II missile for Project Gemini, a two-man orbital trip that hopefully will lead us to the moon by 1970. Watching intently on the sidelines are the automotive engineers, interested in improving transportation on this planet.

For auto men, Project Gemini will mark the first major test of the fuel cell, which converts a chemical reaction's energy into electrical current. In the Titan II spacecraft, a fuel cell will provide auxiliary power. In the autos of 1975 or beyond, cells may provide long-lasting motive power similar to the quiet electric batteries that powered autos early in this century. Unlike batteries, fuel cells would not have to be recharged frequently. And they would not pollute the air or take up space required by today's engines.

Testing of fuel cells aboard Titan II exemplifies far-reaching studies manufacturers are making to improve motor vehicles. Their most recent efforts will be unveiled later this month in thousands of auto showrooms displaying 1965 model cars. In Detroit, stylists are already meeting deadlines on 1967 designs. And automotive researchers are seeking new ways of moving a growing number of people and an increasing quantity of goods.

Their success is revealed in automakers' recent progress reports and at exhibitions, including the New York World's Fair. Here are some of tomorrow's automotive innovations, some only a few years away:

Automatically controlled highway lanes on which vehicles safely travel bumper to bumper at maximum speed. General Motors, which claims the system would double freeway capacity, proposes that expressways have one normal lane of traffic, one "transitional" lane and one "Autoline" lane of fast-moving vehicles protected from collision by automatic controls.

Automatic controls and warning devices that would alert drivers or reduce the speed of cars when they come too close to vehicles ahead. One system would use electrohydraulic devices for converting electrical signals into mechanical actions.

Minibank headlights, a series of 12 small lamps mounted across the front of Ford Motor Co.'s Aurora, a practical dream car with 23 experimental features. These one-inch sealed beam units would produce controlled road illumination with multiple stages between brightest and dimmest extremes. Beams could be directed to light shoulders. Ford also wraps rear turn signals of the Aurora around the side for increased effectiveness and adds turn signals on the side of the car.

Automatic auto parking in space-saving garages equipped with individual pallets borne on air bearings. A car could be parked every 14 seconds in such a garage, according to designers.

Exclusive bus lanes on expressways that could permit movement of 1,450 buses per hour carrying more than 70,000 persons. Such bus or bus-train lanes could be incorporated into our present expressway system and equipped with interchange terminals in suburban areas.

Even the 1965 models unveiled this month incorporate some forward-looking improvements that add to automotive safety and provide reassurance for auto insurers who must meet growing costs of highway accidents. Some models have disk brakes which are less likely to fail or fade in emergency stop situations. Others have tandem brake systems that assure that one set will work if the other fails. Low-profile tires provide broader tread that grips pavements better. And 1965 auto bodies are less cluttered by tail fins and chrome frills that have been responsible for injuries to pedestrians.

Negatively, the 1965 models incorporate more powerful motors and are advertised to emphasize speed as well as availability of high-performance engines for many models. Wraparound windshields and rear windows, more pronounced in the 1965 cars, do not increase visibility but will run up insurance losses on broken glass. Even side windows are curved to provide more shoulder room.

In all, manufacturers expended several design years, 40 million test miles, and about $1.2 billion to develop the 1965 models. Proponents of auto safety point out however that only a small fraction of the cost was applied to safety improvements.

Tomorrow's vehicles will reflect innovations not only in moving people, but also in movement of goods for an exploding, migrating population. Trucks, already toting closed containers, will carry weather-tight containerized loads to multilevel "open" warehouses. Here computers will control inventories and ship cargoes out through integrated freight terminals served by helicopters, barges, railroads, and pipelines, as well as local and highway trucks. For insurers, controlled containerized shipping will mean fewer cargo thefts, reduced cargo damage and probably fewer reports of compensable injuries among warehouse workers and teamsters.

While high-salaried professional engineers in Detroit struggle with the practical and applied research problems of modern-day transport, undergraduates at Massachusetts Institute of Technology may have the ultimate answer to commuters' transportation woes. They envision a commucar, a compact electric car controlled by computers that would whisk a commuter to his job over toll roads with electrified siderails. Commucars would get automatic 15-second safety checks before entering express lanes and would be routed by data processing cards. Best of all, they could be rented rather than owned, to be summoned from an automatic garage at the twist of a dial.

A dream, perhaps, but that's what tomorrow on wheels promises to be.

HOW ABOUT SAFETY NOW?

While auto makers promise fantastic innovations in design and convenience in 1965 cars and those of the future, mutual automobile insurance companies continue to urge adoption of inexpensive improvements that would advance auto safety. Liberty Mutual Insurance Co.'s survival car II demonstrated how a conventional car could be made substantially safer with improvements that would cost only $10 per car in added production cost.

Safety improvements most often urged by experts include flexible steering wheels, rollover bars, reinforced trunks and doors, fail-safe dual brake systems, safety harnesses and padden interiors, wraparound seats and recessed handles and knobs.

Adoption of these safety improvements will be vital to auto insurers and their policyholders in the next decade. According to the central automobile safety committee of Kemper Insurance, there will be 130 million traffic accidents involving 220 million vehicles in the next 10 years. More than 38 million persons will be injured or killed, it estimates, and damage will exceed $100 billion. At this rate, 1 of every 5 Americans will be injured or killed in the decade to come, and each driver will have an accident every 4 years.

To avoid this toll, traffic experts say, we must have improved driver training and licensing, far-reaching research into accident causes, and vehicles designed for greater safety. The job, they say, can start now on drawing boards in Detroit.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 7, 1965]

Congress Versus Cars—Pressure Is Increasing for New Federal Rule on Auto, Tire Safety—Senators Ribicoff, Nelson Urge Dual Brakes, Padded Dash—Tires Called Inadequate—Detroit Defends Its Products

(By Dan Cordtz)

Washington.—They're still welcome at the White House, but the country's carmakers are having their troubles on Capitol Hill.

The motor men are no strangers to the legislative wars, of course. In years past, they've faced official accusations of everything from price gouging and mistreatment of dealers to high-pressure financing tactics and the squeezing out of smaller competitors. But now the politicians are up to something considered potentially much more troublesome: They're laying unfriendly hands on the car itself.

"I can't remember a time," says the Washington representative of one major auto manufacturer, "when a Congress has come up with so many legislative proposals aimed at the product. Maybe we should call it the Year of the Serpent."

Most likely to succeed in Congress this year is an antipollution plan. The Senate already has passed a bill requiring that new cars, beginning in 1967, be equipped with a $50 device to cut down on smog-producing exhaust fumes, and the House starts work on similar legislation this week.

COSTLIER TIRES, SAFETY ITEMS?

Other action may follow in years ahead, if not in this session. This morning the Senate Commerce Committee resumes hearings on proposals which could make the auto companies put better and costlier tires on many models. Scheduled for later consideration is a measure which would compel Detroit to add a long list of safety items, including padded dashboards and collapsible steering wheels, as standard equipment on each new passenger vehicle. Estimated cost: over $100 per car. Tomorrow an amendment to the excise tax bill will be proposed, requiring that the companies add this gear as a condition for getting a final tax cut that would amount to an estimated average of $90 on new cars.

Ironically, even if the tax reduction bill passes without this amendment, the planned cut now looks like a mixed blessing for the industry. Apparent congressional determination to eliminate Federal auto taxes in 3 years plays directly into the hands of critics who previously hesitated to push laws that would boost new car prices.

"I think there will be a lot of feeling that if they get a big tax cut, they ought to use some of that money to make the cars safer," predicts Commerce Committee Chairman Warren Magnuson, of Washington State. A veteran Republican on the committee adds, "It's awfully hard to be against safety, especially if it doesn't cost the customers anything."

Despite such comments, it's quite possible the industry will get through this session of Congress relatively unscathed. Action on tire and safety equipment could easily be put off for 2 or 3 years while the Government tries to fill in the wide gaps in information about accidents and their causes. Nevertheless, the long-term outlook for the auto men is not reassuring. Once the research is done, their critics are sure to redouble their efforts.

"We're a big, tempting target," a company official admits glumly. "The reformers have been after us for years, and the safety gimmick looks like the best one they've ever come up with."

NO SHORTAGE OF LEADERS

Certainly there is no shortage of willing leaders for the congressional assault forces. In the Senate, a couple of liberal Democrats are eagerly vying for the role. Wisconsin's Senator Gaylord Nelson struck the first legislative blow by introducing both the tire and safety equipment bills. But probably in a better strategic position for the long haul is Senator Abraham Ribicoff, who first started berating the auto industry as Governor of Connecticut, and kept sniping at it as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Senator Ribicoff introduced the excise tax amendment calling for new safety items; but, more important, he has a platform which enables him to pursue his crusade more broadly. Largely to promote establishment of a new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, he was awarded chairmanship of the subcommittee on reorganization of the Executive branch when the 89th Congress convened. While legislation to authorize that long-time White House project languishes in the subcommittee, the dapper Connecticut Democrat has plunged into a vigorous investigation of the Government's suspected shortcomings in the field of auto safety.

"We spend $1 billion to protect 3 men in a space capsule, and I approve completely," he declares. "But we won't even spend 1 percent of that to protect 190 million Americans on the highway. When a plane crashes, we spare no expense to find out why—even put it back together, piece by piece. But we kill 48,000 a year on the highways and we don't even have accurate statistics, much less information on the causes."

The Government, Senator RIBICOFF contends, has no sense of urgency about traffic safety. He notes that a report on the executive branch's safety operations, ordered by President Johnson in January for mid-March delivery, has yet to appear. Recently, he adds, the General Services Administration was denied funds to police its requirements of safety equipment on cars the Government buys; the National Bureau of Standards decided to abandon some "unique" tire testing equipment rather than move it to its new headquarters at Gaithersburg, Md.; and the Public Health Service, in Senator RIBICOFF's words, "downgraded" the traffic safety work of its Accident Prevention Division.

As a less recent but more serious example of this pattern, Senator RIBICOFF cites the 1961 abolition of the Defense Department's Commission on Accidental Trauma. According to its own reports, the Commission did the earliest research work leading to development of padded auto dashboards, crash-resistant door locks, and steering wheels and columns which give way under strong impact. It also claimed to have first demonstrated the effectiveness of seat belts in reducing crash injuries. Nevertheless, the House Appropriations Committee voted to scrap the Commission on the ground that its research was not directed at military problems. (Senator RIBICOFF points to a Government report that one-third of the Korean war deaths were caused by vehicle accidents not related to combat and adds that today more servicemen are killed in car crashes than die from all diseases combined.)

"It's a strange thing," he declares, "that every time an agency begins to do something in this area, it seems to disappear. I'd like to know why."

In his position as a self-appointed "goad," Senator RIBICOFF will be able to go on asking such questions almost indefinitely, and he intends to do so. But despite his support for more research, he feels enough is already known to form a basis for safety legislation. "We should go on trying to improve drivers and the roads," he says, "but it's time to do something about the cars, too."

Senator NELSON, also a former Governor with a long interest in highway safety, agrees. He quotes with approval the assertion of a Columbia University safety expert that "we design cars and roads and then tell the driver to adapt himself to them as best he can. We should start the other way around. Let us first find out what the driver's capacities are and then build cars and roads to fit them."

Like his Connecticut colleague, Senator NELSON takes a dim view of Detroit's attitude toward safety. "The slightest mention of safety standards seems to cause panic in the automobile industry," he remarks. Adds Senator RIBICOFF "They say, 'safety won't sell cars.' Well, it's not so much a question of safety selling cars, but the responsibility of any segment of American society to save lives."

SECRETARY CONNOR'S CONCERN

Auto industry officials, of course, say they accept that responsibility and are in fact now turning out cars that are entirely safe. But they prefer to put their advertising emphasis almost exclusively on styling and power. Even Commerce Secretary Connor, a former General Motors Corp. director, conceded to Senator RIBICOFF that he is disturbed about the "hot car" theme and intends to talk to his Detroit friends about it.

Many lawmakers see elimination of the speed and power appeal as the key to car safety, but they are frankly pessimistic about prospects. A legislator from a major car-producing State says, "You'll never solve the problem until you put a speed governor on every car, but you'll never get the American public to accept the idea, either." In this area, Congress seems limited to pressuring auto manufacturers to forgo the horsepower race voluntarily, as they did briefly a few years back. So attention is largely focused on the car's other equipment.

For example, Senator NELSON's tire bill, which is cosponsored by a dozen other Democrats, would set load and speed standards for tires and would establish uniform terminology and labeling rules. The aim is to enable a purchaser to tell readily if a given tire would be adequate for his car and driving habits. When the Senate Commerce Committee opened its hearings late last month, expert witnesses testified not even a tire dealer can be sure what the markings on the side of a tire really mean. And, although Senator NELSON is concerned about helping buyers of replacement tires, he is also aroused over testimony that auto companies ignore tiremakers' advice and equip new cars with tires said to be unsafe for capacity loads at legal highway speeds.

LETTERS TO DETROIT

"One rubber executive told the Federal Trade Commission many station wagons need eight-ply tires," he declares, "but today all American wagons come with two-ply tires. They sell a nine-passenger car and put on tires designed to carry two people and no baggage." Senator NELSON has just sent letters to the presidents of the four major auto firms asking what they are doing to correct the situation described in this "unrefuted testimony."

Both Senators NELSON and RIBICOFF charge the motor industry with false economy in its tire policy. They extend this accusation to its reluctance to equip all cars with the safety devices due to be required on vehicles bought for Government use, starting with 1967 models. Both the Nelson safety equipment bill and the Ribicoff excise tax amendment would require this extension of Federal standards.

Included in the list are: Seat and seat-belt anchorages which meet special specifications; padded dashboards and padded sun visors; recessed dashboard controls and gages; safety door latches and hinges to help keep doors from springing open in a crash; impact-absorbing steering wheels and columns; rear flashing warning lights for use when the car is halted on the highway; laminated safety glass in all windows; dual braking systems, to provide a backup in case one system fails; standard bumper heights and standard patterns for automatic gear-shift levers; full-sweep windshield wipers; glare-cutting paint on surfaces likely to reflect light into the driver's eyes; fully adequate tires and safety rims, and such already popular equipment as backup lights and outside rearview mirrors.

Still being studied and likely to be added at some point are seat backs designed to reduce "whiplash" neck injuries; antiskid devices for brakes; and improvements in visibility and gasoline tank design. Manufacturers, while they decline to talk publicly about pending legislation at all, stoutly resist such official standards. They argue privately that customers can now have such equipment if they want it, and add they will quickly adopt voluntarily any safety devices of proven value.

Their congressional critics scoff at any such possibility. "It took strong public pressure to get action out of Detroit on seat belts," asserts Senator RIBICOFF. Senator NELSON adds, "They might not fight Federal standards if the States start getting into this field. But it's up to Congress to do the job."

AMENDMENT NO. 239

Mr. FONG submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8371, supra, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] may be added as cosponsor to S. 1927, to preserve as an area of historic interest certain structures and lands comprising the Washington Navy Yard, at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAR ORPHANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be listed as a cosponsor of S. 2067, to amend the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act to increase the monthly educational benefits available to the children of American servicemen who have lost their lives through hostile actions or extrahazardous duty, introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. President, 2 years ago I introduced a similar measure. At that time we had just been dramatically reminded of the selfless devotion of the officers and men who daily risk great dangers in the defense of free men by the tragic loss of the nuclear-powered submarine, the U.S.S. *Thresher*.

I investigated then the educational opportunities available to the children of the men of the *Thresher* crew, and discovered that the monthly benefit provided by the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act was established in 1956. I further discovered that although by 1963 tuition costs had increased by nearly 50 percent, there had been no increase in the monthly payment.

Since 1963 education expenses have continued to rise. The children of the *Thresher* crew are 2 years older. Each day we read news of our men who have made the supreme sacrifice for freedom. These men too leave children behind them. Surely the very least we can do is to insure these children adequate educational opportunities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of May 24, 1965, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors of the following bill and joint resolution:

S. 2022. A bill to provide for the orderly marketing of articles imported into the United States, to establish a flexible basis for the adjustment by the U.S. economy to expanded trade, and to afford foreign supplying nations a fair share of the growth or change in the U.S. market: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. COTTON, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. SCOTT.

S.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women: Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McGee, Mr. Scott, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Tower, Mr. Tydings, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN BILLS BY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that hearings will be held by the subcommittee on S. 631, to permit U.S. judges who resign after attaining age 65 and after serving for at least 15 years to continue to receive the salary which they were receiving at the time of resignation. S. 1513, to increase from $10,000 to $30,000, the limitation on the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts in suits against the United States for breach of contract or for compensation. S. 1587, to amend the Tucker Act to increase from $10,000 to $50,000 the limitation on the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts in suits against the United States for breach of contract or for compensation. S. 1804, to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the U.S. Court of Claims. H.R. 1665, to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in special jurisdictional cases; and H.R. 3997, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recordings as well as by shorthand or mechanical means.

The hearings are scheduled for Thursday, June 10, at 10 a.m., in room 6226 of the New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit statements pertaining to these measures should communicate with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

John H. Reddy, of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney, eastern district of Tennessee, term of 4 years—reappointment.

Cato Ellis, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal, western district of Tennessee, term of 4 years—reappointment.

Wesley H. Petrie, of Hawaii, to be U.S. marshal district of Hawaii, term of 4 years—reappointment.

Anton T. Skoro, of Idaho, to be U.S. marshal, district of Idaho, term of 4 years—reappointment.

R. Ben Hosler, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of Ohio, term of 4 years—reappointment.

Fred F. Hoh, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of Ohio, term of 4 years—reappointment.

Ellis Maylett, of Utah, to be U.S. marshal, district of Utah, term of 4 years—reappointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, June 14, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 7, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1135) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before December 31, 1968.

INSPECTION, MAINTENANCE, AND REPAIR OF FIXED EQUIPMENT IN FEDERAL BUILDINGS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 261, Senate bill 1516.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

Tht Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1516) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 273), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would permit the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts with private concerns for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment and equipment systems in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years.

Under existing authority of law contracts for such services are executed on an annual basis. The Acting Administrator of General Services reported that authority to enter into contracts for a longer period of time will make possible greater economy, safety, and efficiency in the maintenance and operation of Federal buildings and equipment at less cost to the Government than is possible under the requirement that such contracts be negotiated on an annual basis.

BACKGROUND

The Acting Administrator of General Services reported to the committee that the fixed equipment and equipment systems intended to be serviced, inspected, or repaired under the authority of this amendment, would include air conditioning, heating systems, elevators, plumbing, pneumatic tube systems, and other similar equipment which has been installed in Federal buildings. A substantial part of the servicing of this equipment can be performed by private firms which specialize in the maintenance of this type of equipment.

The Acting Administrator stated that in many localities the Government has been unable to employ or retain for any length of time employees with specialized training and skilled craftsman to perform the work because of local labor market conditions. In some localities there is insufficient work of this nature to require full-time employees and in other locations the workload fluctuates so much that it is difficult to schedule for a fixed staff of service personnel.

EXPLANATION AND JUSTIFICATION

The following detailed explanation and justification for this proposal has been transmitted to the President of the Senate and referred to the committee by letter dated February 5, 1965, from the Acting Administrator of General Services.

The fixed equipment systems intended to be covered by this measure include heating, refrigeration, ventilation, air conditioning, electrical vertical transportation, plumbing, fire protection, watchmen, fuel and pneumatic tube systems installed in Federal buildings. Typical items common to these systems are the following: Boilers, stokers, and oil burners; compressors, chillers, and cooling towers; fans, airhandlers, and induction units; transformers, motors, generators, high voltage switchgear and interior distribution wiring; pumps, piping, and water tanks; fire alarms and watchman central recorders; fuel tanks, and lines; blowers and tube stations; and elevators and escalators. Such systems are relatively complex and costly and require continuous inspection, maintenance, and repair (when necessary) of such a character that they can be operated efficiently, with the greatest possible safety, with a minimum of service interruption, for the longest possible time economically justifiable.

A substantial part of the servicing of this equipment is subject to being performed for the Government by contracting with firms which specialize in the various aspects thereof. It would be very advantageous to the Government if more of this servicing could be contracted out. There are several reasons for this. For one thing, the Government in many localities have been unable to employ, or to retain for any length of time those employed, the necessary number of specially trained skilled craftsmen, and supervisors with know-how, to perform the work because of local labor market conditions. For another, by contracting for this work the Government is relieved of the added costs and difficulties inherent in purchasing, transporting and storing innumerable spare parts and other supplies which would otherwise be necessary, as well as arranging for the availability of such spare parts and other supplies promptly when and where needed in the many Federal buildings throughout the country, not infrequently on an emergency basis. For a third, even assuming that the Government could obtain and retain the necessary skilled craftsmen at all locations, the amount of such service work required at any given time for any given Federal building varies to such an extent that it would be most difficult, if not impossible, in many small isolated locations, to schedule the work so that the skilled craftsmen employed by the Government would be fully employed on the one hand, or that, on the other hand, there are sufficient skilled craftsmen available to handle the work on other occasions when unpredictable and urgent heavy demands for their services may arise to service particular buildings. For these reasons and because of other problems, some of which are indicated hereinafter, the usual practice of private industry is to enter into long-term contracts with specialty firms for such services.

Under present law, Government contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of such equipment may be entered into for only 1 year. It is believed that authority to contract for a longer period will yield lower costs and more efficient and satisfactory service and operations.

It has been our experience that many contractors do not fully carry out their obligations under 1-year contracts with us for equipment inspection, maintenance, and repair, as hidden deficiencies in such maintenance show up later, often after the contract has expired and a new contractor is on the job. Because of their inherently latent nature, it is most difficult to prove whether the deficiencies in performance under such contracts are attributable to one short-term contractor or to another, at least to the extent that the Government can obtain appropriate damages or other relief in a court of law, or before an administrative tribunal, for the failure of a contractor to properly perform such a maintenance contract. As one consequence, the Government has had to bear the cost of remedying such deficiencies. Another conesquence has been that our equipment has not been operable, because of shutdown time for repairs, more frequently and for longer periods than it should be. Thus, we have been handicapped in properly protecting the Government's interests.

Another somewhat different type of situation which has confronted us is that contractors will refrain from bidding on a 1-year contract when they have knowledge under an existing contract that abnormal maintenance will probably be required during the ensuing year.

It is considered that authority to enter into contracts to service this equipment for a maximum of 5 years will do much to alleviate this type of situation, as most major defects in maintenance will show up in a 5-year period. Under a 5-year contract, the contractor will have a much greater incentive to perform proper maintenance during the early years of the life of equipment than under a 1-year contract. And, under a 5-year contract, even if a contractor neglects the maintenance during the early years, his neglect can much more easily be charged against him than it could be under a 1-year contract, as such a contractor could not sit back with the thought that the Government would have great difficulty in proving that he, rather than his successor contractor, was responsible therefor.

Another benefit to the Government which would flow from the grant of authority to enter into such 5-year contracts is that, in many cases, lower prices could be obtained under one contract for 5 years as contrasted with these obtainable under five contracts for 1 year each.

Under the longer term contract, contractors would be able to arrange for longer range, bigger volume purchasing of supplies and spare parts, and otherwise more economical operations. An important fringe benefit would be the greater time a contractor's personnel would have to become acquainted with the characteristics of the particular pieces of equipment which were being serviced, including the relationship of such equipment to the structural and other characteristics of the buildings in which it is located, or in connection with which it is used, and the detailed nature of the circumstances under which it must be operated. Each new contractor under an annual contract arrangement has to organize for the job and train his employees for the particular tasks required by the contract, thus sacrificing to some extent the efficiency that results from experience in actually performing the work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1516

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 210(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 490(a)), is further amended (1) by striking out the word "and" where it last appears in subsection (12) thereof; (2) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (13) thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and (3) by adding the following new subsection at the end of such section 210(a):

"(14) to enter into contracts for periods not exceeding five years for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in such buildings which are federally owned."

PROCUREMENT OF PROPERTY AND NONPERSONAL SERVICES BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 262, Senate bill 1004.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1004) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 2, to strike out:

(1) to agencies and activities specified in section 2303(a) of title 10, United States Code, or

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(1) to the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; or

So as to make the bill read:

S. 1004

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 302. (a) Executive agencies shall make purchases and contracts for property and nonpersonal services in accordance with the provisions of this title and implementing regulations of the Administrator; but this title does not apply—

"(1) to the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; or

"(2) when this title is made inapplicable pursuant to section 602(d) of this Act or any other law, but when this title is made inapplicable by any such provision of law sections 3709 and 3710 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5 and 8), shall be applicable in the absence of authority conferred by statute to procure without advertising or without regard to said section 3709."

Sec. 2. Subsection (c) of section 302 of said Act is amended as follows:

(a) By revising paragraph (4) to read:

"(4) for professional nonpersonal services;".

(b) By revising paragraph (15) to read:

"(15) otherwise authorized by law, except that section 304 shall apply to purchases and contracts made without advertising under this paragraph."

Sec. 3. The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 307 of said Act is amended by inserting immediately after "section," the following: "and except as provided in section 205(d) with respect to the Administrator."

Sec. 4. Subsection (b) of section 307 of said Act is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof.

Sec. 5. Section 310 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 310. Sections 3709, 3710, and 3735 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5, 8, and 13), shall not apply to the procurement of property or nonpersonal services made by an executive agency pursuant to this title. Any provision of law which authorizes an executive agency (other than an executive agency which is exempted from the provisions of this title by section 302(a) of this Act), to procure any property or nonpersonal services without advertising or without regard to said section 3709 shall be construed to authorize the procurement of such property or services pursuant to section 302 (c)(15) of this Act without regard to the advertising requirements of sections 302(c) and 303 of this Act."

Sec. 6. Title III of said Act is amended by striking out the words "property and services" wherever they appear in that title (except where such words appear in section 304 (b) of that title), and inserting in lieu thereof the words "property and nonpersonal services".

Sec. 7. Subsection (d) of section 602 of said Act is amended as follows:

(a) By striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraph (15) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and the leasing and acquisition of real property, as authorized by law;".

(b) By striking out the word "or" where it appears at the end of paragraph (18).

(c) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph (19), and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or".

(d) By adding at the end of that subsection the following new paragraph:

"(20) The Secretary of the Interior with respect to procurement for program operations under the Bonneville Project Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 731), as amended."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 274), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The primary purpose of this bill is to make the modern code of procurement procedures contained in title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 directly applicable by statute to executive agencies of the Government not now so covered. At the present time, use of this modern code by such agencies is entirely on a permissive, delegated basis. This code will replace use of the limited provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes, governing advertising and negotiation. A common statutory foundation of procurement authority will further enable the Administrator of General Services to prescribe uniform procurement policies and procedures for agencies and so to develop uniform procurement practices for the benefit both of the Government and the businessman contracting with the Government.

The bill also proposes certain less significant improvements in procurement. The bill would exclude the procurement of personal services from the operation of title III, which is essentially a property management code of procedures. It would make certain limitations of section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (concerning fees of cost-type contracts, contingent fees, examination records, etc.) applicable to contracts negotiated by executive agencies under any law, not only title III.

The bill has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Department of Defense, as well as the General Services Administration which requested the proposed legislation as a part of its 1965 legislative program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR MANSFIELD AT ST. MARY COLLEGE, XAVIER, KANS.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on Memorial Day, the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] delivered the address at the commencement exercises of St. Mary College, Xavier, Kans. With the exception of some paragraphs of opening and closing remarks, the text of Senator MANSFIELD's address was printed in the Washington Sunday Star of June 6, 1965.

Because the speech deals with a subject of consuming importance to all of us, because it is discerning, and because, in my judgment, it ought to be read by the largest possible audience, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANSFIELD SEES HOPE FOR PEACE IN NUCLEAR STANDOFF

(NOTE.—Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD spoke at the commencement exercises of St. Mary College in Xavier, Kans., on May 30. For one of the men in positions of real power in Washington, his speeches are few. In this one he gave his own definition of the issues between the Communist world and the Western World, in simple terms, and revealed some of his own philosophy about our role in meeting the most important challenge before mankind today. This is the text, with the omission of a few paragraphs of opening and closing remarks.)

It is of some of these international changes of the past 15 years which I would like to speak today. These are changes which began as trickles just after your were born and and now coming into flood as you enter adulthood.

An overriding change since the Korean war has been the emergence of a kind of stalemate between Russia and the United States in terms of destructive nuclear capacity. Nuclear technology in both nations has now reached a point at which no significant military advantage is likely to be gained merely by pushing the accumulation of more destructive power. That is not to say that the Russians are not alert to possible technological breakthroughs or that we have gone to sleep. The search goes on here and it also goes on there. But a decisive altering of the basic nuclear stalemate is not in sight.

The fact is that both Russia and the United States are already in a position in which each can obliterate at least half the population of the other in a very short time. That is a sobering reality for all those with a share of the responsibility for the many decisions which, in the end, may involve an ultimate decision as to whether or not these instruments are used.

MONUMENT TO J.F.K.

The very magnitude of the nuclear threat which hangs over the earth has had, oddly, a kind of constructive influence on world affairs. It is one of the realities which underlay the Russian withdrawal of missiles from Cuba a couple of years ago. And it was a major factor in the achievement of the nuclear test ban treaty. That treaty, in turn, was a precipitant in bringing about an improvement in the general relations—at least until recently—between the two principal nuclear powers. In that respect, the treaty was a most significant achievement in the drive for a more peaceful world. It stands as an enduring and appropriate monument to John Fitzgerald Kennedy—who would have been 48 yesterday—who refused, with great courage, to be deflected by political considerations, from his determination to achieve it.

The nuclear stalemate between Russia and the United States, then, is, indeed, one of the most significant changes of the past decade and a half. It has produced an international situation with which the principal nations have managed to live in reasonable stability for several years. In its context, the prospect of a Soviet military invasion of Western Europe which, for example, was once regarded as acute, appears to have receded. And by the same token, the military liberation of Eastern Europe which once was loudly trumpeted is no longer pressed from any responsible source as the basis of a sound policy for the Nation.

In short, the overall position of the two great nuclear powers in today's world appears to have become, increasingly, one of live and let live. This trend has emerged largely because the point has sunk home that the alternative is the opposite on such a scale as to drain either the triumph of freedom or the victory of communism of rational meaning. But the picture of a gradual easement in Soviet-United States relations is not complete unless we also take into consideration the effect of recent developments in Vietnam. These developments have not helped the trend which was inaugurated under President Eisenhower, pursued most effectively by President Kennedy, and vastly encouraged and continued by President Johnson.

The changed situation in Russian-United States relations in turn has been paralleled by changes throughout the Soviet bloc. It is obvious that the greater stability in Russian-United States relations has not set well with China but it has generally been welcomed by such Eastern European nations as Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

Communism did not spring full-blown in those Eastern European nations at the close of World War II. Communism was in fact grafted by Soviet power onto several countries with different traditions, even as Stalin shut down on them an iron lid of ideological uniformity. The clothes of Communist conformity, however, were uncomfortable in Eastern Europe and, beneath them, the individual national traditions continued to stir. In recent years, this force for diversity has begun to find fuller expression.

The growing independence in eastern Europe has been encouraged cautiously by recent policies of the United States. This was a cardinal principle of the foreign policy of President Kennedy, who recognized its value with respect to Poland even when he was a Senator. The conclusion of trade agreements and travel arrangements with eastern European countries which pose no threat to us, as, for example, with Poland and Yugoslavia, has tended to increase their independence from the Soviet Union and provided some inducement for other satellite countries to follow in their footsteps—and that they have been, in fact, doing.

EUROPEAN CHANGES

In this atmosphere of reduced tension in Europe, a difficult and intricate problem remains as the central roadblock to further progress toward a stable peace in that region. That is the problem of a divided Germany. In East Germany, the Soviet Union has continued to maintain a harsh and rigid control over a people who dislike the Communist system intensely. For our part, policy with respect to Germany is, apparently, based on an official assessment of immediate Soviet intentions in Europe which differs considerably from that of our allies in Western Europe. It appears to me that these nations—West Germany, Britain, France, Italy, and others—see the Soviet situation in quite a different perspective—at least insofar as this perspective is reflected in policies. The Europeans, for example, carry on a trade with the Soviet Union which over recent years has run in the billions. What we have done in a most limited way in trade with Poland and Yugoslavia, they have done many, many times over with all of Eastern Europe and, of course, with the Soviet Union itself. Travel within Europe—East and West—is now very extensive and the lines of communication by sea, rail, road, and air between the two parts of the Continent have expanded very markedly. In short, the Europeans generally have been acting with respect to the Soviet bloc as though peace had arrived in Europe. We have not, in policy, shared that optimism.

If there were a fusion of views as to precisely what the situation is, it is conceivable that, with it, there might also come a parallel recognition that proposals aimed at ending the armed confrontation in Germany and moving toward reunification are worth pursuing most intensely. A number of ideas have been advanced over the years which could serve as a beginning, but they have not as yet led to significant changes in policy.

The shift in Europe over the past few years is not unique. It is paralleled, for example, by significant changes which involve the underdeveloped countries. The political face of Africa has changed and over most of that continent control is now exercised by African leaders rather than by Europeans. Many new nations have been added to the ranks of the intensely independent and underdeveloped states. But from the point of view of the nuclear powers, almost all such states are, now, of less importance as strategic prizes, to be wooed for their value as bases in the event of a total war. We ourselves have recognized this change to a considerable degree. We have, for example, abandoned a number of advanced airbases in these areas in the light of the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile and Polaris-carrying nuclear submarines. Similarly, the control of alien territory to insure access to strategic military raw materials which was once an absolutely vital consideration for all great powers may no longer carry quite so much weight.

RESISTING AGGRESSION

This change in attitudes involving the underdeveloped nations applies in southeast Asia. President Johnson has said that there is no need for a forward base in that part of the world. Our fundamental power in the Pacific is air and sea power. This power, supreme throughout the Pacific, is sufficient to protect American security from any direct military threat from that part of the world for some years to come.

We also have in Vietnam, as elsewhere in southeast Asia, a shared interest with all free nations in resisting aggression. We can and will remair prepared to assist in stopping overt attempts to overrun peoples by force. But beyond this goal of preventing aggression in order to promote peace and freedom under the rule of law in the world, our direct national interests in southeast Asia are not nearly as great, for example, as those which we have with respect to Latin America.

For these reasons, as well as a basic aversion to war itself, the President has made it clear that we are willing to enter into unconditional discussions in an effort to find an honorable settlement in Vietnam and a more stable situation throughout southeast Asia. But if there is ever to be an honorable settlement, there has to be a beginning. There has to be a confrontation across the tables of peace. If such a meeting is to have any prospect of a successful outcome, there is also a parallel and simultaneous need for an interim cease-fire and standfast—both north and south. Unless the sounds of conflict are, first, stilled on all sides, the words of peace will not be heard on any side.

COMMON EFFORT NEEDED

I am at a loss to understand how those elsewhere—in Peiping, for example—expect to be taken seriously in professing to hold paramount the interests of the people of Vietnam and a restoration of peace when, at the same time, they insist upon interpreting the President's words as meaning something other than unconditional discussion. It would be in our own best interests no less than in the best interests of the underdeveloped countries of southeast Asia were the latter able to concentrate on their own inner national needs and growth. That was clearly the President's hope when he offered to join with the Soviet Union and other nations in a common effort for the development of southeast Asia.

A common effort of this kind is clearly, too, the best way to help most of the underdeveloped nations, wherever they may be in the world, to remain free of outside domination and influence and to give indigenous institutions of freedom an opportunity to take root. Indeed, in the long run, it may be just about the only way to help them.

We are not likely to insure freedom within these nations by taking it upon ourselves either to overwhelm them with unilateral help or by turning our backs on their genuine needs for help. The one is the road to an isolated internationalism for this Nation. The other is the road to a national isolation for this Nation. And neither road is likely to lead to the safeguarding of the basic interests of this Nation. In short, the great need is for a discrete and discerning cooperation with other nations in dealing with underdeveloped nations.

SEARCH FOR PEACE

This principle has relevance for the current crisis in the Dominican Republic which, after decades of a cruel dictatorship, is still a most underdeveloped nation. The President faced a critical situation—an emergency—there some weeks ago. He acted to meet it on humanitarian grounds and he met it well. And he is acting now to bring fully into play, the concept of cooperation with others in that situation. As a member of the Organization of American States, our military and diplomatic resources in the Dominican Republic are being used more and more in support of the Organization. For the problem in the island is not one of unique responsibility for the United States. It is one which must engage primarily the Dominican people and their leaders and, to the extent that it is necessary, the entire Western Hemisphere.

With the development of an inter-American military force, the heavy initial commitment of American forces on the island has already been reduced. And it is to be hoped, moreover, that this reduction will be rapidly accelerated if stability can be restored under the guidance of the OAS. I would hope, too, that the inter-American force which would remain could play two roles—that is, to support the efforts of the OAS and also to help in the reconstruction of Santo Domingo which has been seriously damaged in the struggle. It would also be desirable if other American states could develop a peace corps and send contingents to join the young men and women of this Nation who are already undertaking in the Dominican Republic many works of useful and peaceful construction.

To Americans, even to college students like you, the affairs of nations outside our borders may seem remote and unimportant at times, especially on a day like today. But I need not remind you—on Memorial Day—that events whose origins lay thousands of miles from our shores have reached into this Nation in the past and called us to sacrifice. As Americans, as inhabitants of the only world we have, I ask you to exercise the increasing responsibility which will be yours in the years ahead to see that no stone lies unturned, and that no outdated myth or ancient hatred lies unexamined, and that no opportunity is neglected in the slow painstaking search for a lasting peace.

And I ask you, too, to give your prayers to the President of the United States. His is the enormous burden in these matters. His is the paramount responsibility. For him, there is no rest from the incessant pressure of the problems of the Nation. For him, there is a plethora of advice and criticism which is easily enough extended. But upon him, in the end, falls the weight of grave decision as he seeks to follow the slender path to that stable peace which is the world's great need.

AID TO SOUTH VIETNAM BY COUNTRIES OTHER THAN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the United States continues with the unpleasant but necessary task of helping the people of southeast Asia to resist the aggressions of communism. You and I and the rest of the American people read each day about the maneuvers of the South Vietnamese and our own troops; the areas being defended; and the growing casualty toll.

I have heard public expressions of doubt, even on the floor of the Senate, about the desirability of our action, expressions which imply, at least, that we are responsible for this problem. What blindness. Every action taken by this Nation has been geared to offset aggression in one form or another started by the Communists in each instance. Whether we speak of Berlin, Cuba, Santo Domingo, Indonesia, South Vietnam, or the Congo, all the problems have been created by the clearly spoken and reiterated words of the Communists that they intend to rule the world.

Are we alone in recognizing these problems? Are we so different in seeing problems in South Vietnam that other countries back away from supporting our position? Exactly the opposite is true. Today, 38 nations are giving or have agreed to give aid in one form or another to the people of South Vietnam, who are resisting naked Communist aggression.

To me, this is highly interesting. I have compiled a list of the countries which are proceeding to give aid to South Vietnam at present, together with a statement of what aid is being provided—at least, those things that are being done which are not under security classification.

These countries—and I shall not read everything they are doing, but I wish to name the countries—include Australia, Nationalist China, Japan, South Korea, Laos, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Greece, Turkey, Iran, Israel, India, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France—even France has provided some aid—Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Holland, Spain, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, and Guatemala.

In addition, it ought to be noted that only 10 nations were assisting us in South Vietnam prior to July 16, 1964, less than a year ago. The other 28 nations have begun their assistance since that time.

In addition to the countries I have named, several other Central American countries, including Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, and El Salvador, have been trying to muster a medical team to send to South Vietnam for assistance.

It seems to me that such assistance is of extreme importance, because nowhere have I seen any kind of rundown in the news media or elsewhere which would indicate the degree of support which is being given to the free South Vietnamese people in their efforts to resist Communist aggression by North Vietnam and Red China. Therefore, I am happy to present this information for the benefit of all Senators and for the country as a whole, in the hope that more recognition may be given of the assistance which other countries have been and are giving to South Vietnam and to the United States in the interest of preserving the freedom of people, not only in southeast Asia, but in the rest of the world, as well, against Communist aggression.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement I have prepared be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Foreign Countries Having Provided Aid to South Vietnam Outside of the United States

Australia: Infantry battalion on the way; 100 combat advisers there; air force unit with planes in Vietnam; 8-man surgical party; civil engineers; training 110 Vietnamese in Australia. Goods: 1 million textbooks in Vietnamese language for schools; windmills; hand tools; radio sets; building broadcasting station in Vietnam.

Nationalist China: 80-man agricultural team; 16-man psychological warfare team; 8-man electrical power mission; 10-man surgical team; training 200 Vietnamese in Taiwan. Goods: 26 aluminum prefabricated warehouses; agricultural tools, seeds, and fertilizers; math textbooks; electrical power stations.

Japan: $55 million in economic assistance, mainly through reparations; 90 Japanese personnel in Vietnam—70 of which are working on the construction of a power dam (Japanese are not allowed to send military forces; these are civilians); 6-man surgical team; large amount of medical goods; 20,000 radios; 25 ambulances; electrical transmission lines.

Korea: 130-man mobile army surgical hospital; 10 military instructors in Vietnam teaching karate and hand-to-hand combat; 2,200-man task force—mainly engineering corps with security troops.

Laos: 1 million kip (Laotian currency) for refugees.

Malaysia: Although they can't provide military men, the Malaysians have established schools for training in Communist counterinsurgency using the experience they have gained from their combat with Communist infiltration. Have trained some 2,000 Vietnamese since 1962. They have also sent some armed vehicles to help.

New Zealand: Surgical team; 25-man corps of engineers rebuilding buildings; artillery battery, will be sent (Andac); have built science building at the University of Saigon estimated at $200,000.

Philippines: 70 military personnel; civilian and military medical teams; President of Philippines has asked for 2,000 additional men to go to Vietnam—this motion has passed the House and is now in the Senate.

Thailand: Military air detachment in Vietnam (other military information is classified); cement; roofing material.

Greece: Medical supplies.

Turkey: Medical supplies; offers of cement.

Iran: 1,000 tons POL products.

Israel: Pharmaceutical supplies; offers for training in Israel.

India: Money for flood relief; plans for other asssitance in the economic field (being part of the ICC hinders Indian help in any further manner).

Austria: Medicines, supplies, blankets, tents.

Belgium: Medicines.

Canada: $2.5 million of assistance; medical professor at the University of Saigon; training over 130 Vietnamese in Canada in long-term studies such as engineering, etc.; $500,000 worth of aluminum warehouses.

Denmark: Planning to train Vietnamese nurses; have provided assistance for refugees.

France: Since 1956 have provided $100 million in assistance; 500 people working in Vietnam—medical, educational, cultural missions.

Germany: $20 million in assistance; can't send troops; have provided physicians for medical school, technicians, and ambulances.

Ireland: Financial support in the amount of 1,000 pounds.

Italy: 9-man surgical team.

Luxembourg: Is planning to help but not sure how.

Holland: Antibiotics; agreed to send medical team.

Spain: Medicines, equipment, and blankets.

Switzerland: 10 microscopes.

United Kingdom: Personnel in Vietnam—advisory and professors; couple million dollars worth of equipment.

Argentina: 2 military observers—study possible assistance.

Brazil: Coffee, medical supplies.

Ecuador: Medicines.

Guatemala: Typhoid para typhoid serum.

Several other Central American countries (including Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, El Salvador and others) have been trying to muster a medical team.

Prior to July 16, 1964, only 10 nations were assisting the war in South Vietnam including the United States. All others listed above have entered since then.

TRAVEL IS NO LONGER A HANDICAP FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is remarkable how very much is being done in recent years to assist the handicapped in leading a normal, useful life.

Not so long ago travel was a difficult and harassing business for a man in a wheelchair. Now, however, the airlines have agreed on a standardized policy for serving the handicapped. No longer are they refused passage at the airport because of the whim of a ticket taker.

Increasingly, hotel and motel keepers are installing the facilities—level entrances, wide doorways—required by the handicapped. Soon, perhaps, the depressing experience of being denied accommodations because of physical barriers will be a thing of the past.

Many civic leaders have given their time and effort to improving the lot of the handicapped. The leadership to the movement and the confidence in its success, however, have come from one source: The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped under the chairmanship of the late Gen. Melvin Maas and Harold Russell.

Once again the Committee has come up with a new imaginative and useful program. Working in conjunction with the nationwide Hertz rent-a-car system, there are now hand-controlled cars available for the use of the handicapped in nine of our Nation's largest cities. The service will be a boon to all traveling handicapped and the Hertz Co. is to be congratulated on its interest and cooperation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement from the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Rental Cars With Hand Controls Now Available to Handicapped Travelers

Hertz Rent A Car, in cooperation with the President's Committee, now makes cars equipped with hand controls available to handicapped persons who must travel in connection with their business or for pleasure. This service is available at the present time in the following cities:

New York, N.Y. (212) MU 8–7744; Detroit, Mich. (313) WO 2–3290; Chicago, Ill. (312) DE 7–7272; Washington, D.C. (202) 296–6500; Los Angeles, Calif. (213) MA 6-4841; San Francisco, Calif. (415) PR 1–2200; Miami, Fla. (305) FR 7–4601; Dallas, Tex. (214) RI 1–4611; Boston, Mass. (617) HU 2–9100.

There will be no additional charge for hand control equipment. Standard rental rates will apply. The cars must be returned to one of the above cities. At least 2 days advance notice is requested so that the equipment may be installed and tested prior to the rental. A valid driver's license must be presented at the time of rental.

To place a reservation, handicapped travelers can call collect, person to person, to the city in which he wishes to rent a car, and ask to speak to "the man in charge of hand controls." To avoid a wait when picking up the car, the traveler should tell the hand control man by telephone whether he has a Hertz or other nationally recognized credit card. If he has none, he may state his place of employment, resident address, and a personal reference.

Renters without a nationally recognized charge card will be asked to leave a cash deposit, based on the length of rental and estimate of anticipated mileage. The deposit will be accepted in cash or traveler's checks, and will be deducted from the total rental charges, with a cash refund or balance due payable at the rental's completion.

TECHNOLOGICAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record for the convenient reference of other Senators a penetrating and important article by Claude Witze, senior editor of Air Force and Space Digest. The article appeared in the May edition of this professional journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Answer to Future Threats: Action or Reaction?

(By Claude Witze)

There is no denying that America, and Americans, have learned a lot from the cold war. Most of the lessons were taken the hard way. We have been amazed by many things, ranging from the Communists' speedy development of thermonuclear weapons to Sputnik and to the swamp war being waged against freedom in South Vietnam.

It seems a bit incredible, for example, that the Wright brothers came out of Dayton, Ohio, more than 60 years ago and that U.S. airpower has dominated world aviation, yet the Russians were first into space. This was because we willed it so. Sputnik could have been ours; we were warned that the Russians were moving into space, and we did less than we could have done.

This kind of technological conservatism has been with us for a long time. The Wright brothers contended with it. In the years immediately after Kitty Hawk, the boys from the bicycle shop strove to interest their own Government in the airplane. The skepticism was almost overwhelming. It was not until after the British, Germans, and the French displayed serious curiosity that the Signal Corps ordered the first military aircraft. Octave Chanute speculated that a European country would have bought the rights before we got around to it, except for the possibility that the Wrights could be kept "dangling in the expectation that some of your competitors will discover the secret and they can get your invention cheaper."

In this case, the assessment of a technological capability was more important to the United States than the capability itself. If the Wright brothers had said they knew how to build a controllable airplane but couldn't convince anyone they could, there would have been no sale. History would have been different, but the possibility of that having happened is remote because someone in Europe would have believed them, even if their countrymen had refused to.

The quality of judgment exercised in evaluating information is critical. It was sad on the eve of Pearl Harbor, terrible during the events leading to the Korean war, faulty in its estimate of the Soviet nuclear timetable. In South Vietnam, where coups take place more frequently than a CIA agent gets his hair cut, somebody is consistenty wrong.

Here is the place to introduce a disturbing axiom:

"The most dangerous development at the decisionmaking level of any government is overcentralization of the assessment of technological, military, and political intelligence."

At stake are the paths to be taken in military strategy and the efforts made to face up to technological and other threats.

These paths and efforts are always determined by those who may evaluate intelligence against the background of their own prejudices, opinions, and ambitions. With a system of checks and balances, pitting one prejudice against another, there is at least hope for objectivity in the final assessment. But with centralized control of intelligence, the men in power may accept or reject intelligence information according to whether it confirms or refutes opinions already held. Let us examine a recent example.

Not long ago, at a public luncheon in Washington, a high Defense Department official scoffed at reports that a new source of energy is being explored and that it might have an application in weaponry. The project, it was emphasized, is only conceptual. The speaker was asked what his opinion would be if we were offered sound intelligence information indicating that the Russians were making spectacular progress toward an operational capability with this new energy source. His answer, in substance, was that he would not believe the intelligence. Within days, the same subject was brought up at a hearing before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. A witness from the Brookhaven National Laboratory testified that his organization has started basic research looking for the key to this new source of energy. If the secret can be unlocked, the hydrogen bomb will be overshadowed.

The important point is that one Pentagon official, who doubtless approves of the Brookhaven effort, apparently would not consider the applicability of this concept to weaponry, even if he were told the potential enemy had a headstart.

It is currently fashionable to cite the steady increase in Federal funds for research and development, and certainly we are accumulating scientific knowledge at a record rate. But the major problem of the next decade will be the application of that knowledge to translate it into working systems for military missions. If we don't want to believe there is a threat, the working systems will never show up in the arsenal of the free world.

Another aspect, brought to mind by Brookhaven's search for a new energy source, is the concern over the proliferation of thermonuclear weapons. The Chinese have shaken us for what is only the first time. France has a program and so does Great Britain. There is talk of the possibility in a long list of "*n*th powers," from Sweden to Egypt. The full truth is that technology is in a constant surge against any and all of man's efforts to curb the spread of thermonuclear weapons. If it were possible to find a way for nations to stop building and storing bombs and missiles of this type, the Brookhavens of the world still would seek new sources of greater energy. It is their scientific mission to press for technological advances.

Edward Teller, fixing his sights on the part of the spectrum in which his expertise cannot be questioned, has said that nuclear explosives "are being developed with great speed and in an unpredictable manner." And he adds, "technical surprises are an almost yearly occurrence in this rapidly advancing field."

The debate on the nuclear test ban treaty is over, and it will not be reargued here. The treaty aside, it remains that Dr. Teller is but a voice. There are more influential men, some of whom believe military technology is on a plateau and should be kept there. They look for no surprises in the area of weaponry. It is a concept expressed recently in print by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner and Dr. Herbert F. York. They hold that improved weaponry escalates international tension and makes war more likely. It would appear the only surprise they are willing to face is from another country—not necessarily Russia—when it succeeds in overturning the power advantages now claimed by the United States.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, recently retired USAF Chief of Staff, has avoided mentioning names, but he has replied to the Wiesner-York school.

"Some of the more conservative scientific voices," is the way he identified them in a recent Washington speech. And he said, "They see little possibility in the immediate future for new breakthroughs of major proportions in weapons technology, and they suggest that the scientific community needs a short breathing spell in which to search out the limits of military potential in the discoveries they have already made."

Then the general spotted another and more psychological argument for a conservative approach to new weaponry. This is the one that says, "New U.S. weapons will automatically trigger the U.S.S.R. to undertake still more costly programs for countering our weapons, and we, in turn, would then have to try to offset these developments, and so on up the never-ending spiral."

General LeMay did not throw any brickbats, he declared that those who argue along this line "advocate that the United States should try to establish a condition of military stability between the two great powers, and that from this condition of balance we might be able to steadily and mutually lower ourselves to more peaceful plateaus. This school, therefore, classifies all new weapon systems as destabilizing, and it urges that we hold off investing in radical new systems."

What the general really is warning us against is the acceptance of this philosophy, because it entails a bigger risk than its proponents realize. The basic idea that the contribution of technology to future military systems will be small is in error. During the LeMay career, as in that of captains and lieutenants many years his junior, other prophets have been wrong. And the optimists have not been wrong as often as have the conservatives.

The classic example is Dr. Vannevar Bush's statement that the ICBM was technologically impossible. There are others. Take the debate over the H-bomb. President Harry Truman gave the project a green light, but the decision was a marginal one. What would the situation be today if we had refrained from this effort because of any single argument or combination of arguments? It is enough to say that progress on the ICBM and on the H-bomb exceeded expectations; and because it did, the peace has been preserved. There are many who feel that the climate in 1965 is disturbingly like the climate when the ICBM and H-bomb decisions were made, reluctantly.

There is no intention here to imply that U.S. policy is being made by men with blind spots about technological progress behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Nor are we disarming unilaterally in the belief that this is the way to prevent war. It is essential to recognize, however, that these philosophies exist, that they are widely promulgated, and that they affect the decisionmaking process.

This was brought home to the U.S. Congrĕss a couple of months ago during the debate on authorization and funding for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. There was nothing unusual about the fact that ACDA had both friends and foes on the floor of the House and Senate, or that both sides, in the heat of the argument, resorted to some alarmism.

In the course of this discussion, which went on for several days, an interesting development was the introduction into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Senate proceedings, Mar. 10, 1965) of the text of a study called "Information and Strategic Stability," by Bruce Russett, a political scientist from Yale University. Professor Russett took this assignment from the Institute for Defense Analyses, which had a contract sponsored jointly by the ACDA, the Department of Defense, and the U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Station. ACDA's share was $10,000.

The Russett paper was part of a larger report. Counsel for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency said that "no specific arms control or reduction proposal has resulted from suggestions contained in the study, although it provided some useful information. As with any study in this field, only those ideas which are clearly in the best interests of our national security will be selected as a basis of formulating U.S. arms-control policy."

Nevertheless, the point was made in the Senate debate that the ACDA had been advised, in the words of Senator JOHN G. TOWER, Republican, of Texas, "to bury our head in the sand and ignore what our enemies are doing." More precisely, the Russett report suggests that complete and accurate information—intelligence is another name for it—about a potential enemy's capabilities will not prevent an arms race. It suggests, further, that too much intelligence can fertilize competition.

"If the weaker side is to be satisfied with inferiority," the report says, "it must have some assurance that conflict is improbable."

Later there is a discussion of how this can be done. One idea of Professor Russett is that "it might be desirable, for instance, to reassure the Soviets that no Polaris submarines were within firing range of the U.S.S.R.; and yet we could not afford to pinpoint the location of all of them. One proposed solution is for the Soviets to be able to demand that a few submarines, of their choosing, surface and make their positions known." Presumably this would convince the Russians we were not preparing for an attack, and, by calming their nuclear jitters, might prevent a preemptive attack by them on us.

More germane to this discussion of technological intelligence and how it is used is the Russett suggestion that this information could go through automatic data-processing equipment. The input would be from sensors, presumably in satellites. The machine would be programed so that it give out only sparse information, filtering out "sensitive" material that might provoke one side or the other to start a war.

Other ideas proposed include the use of observation systems with limited capability or automatic measures for delaying the transmission of information. Of the latter, "One example is building observation satellites which record images on film that must be recovered and processed before the information becomes available. This would provide no data, for instance, on the current location of mobile missiles, as would a satellite equipped with television."

Then there is a proposal that transmission of information be stopped entirely during a crisis, and another giving the observed nation a power to veto what information is transmitted.

While Senate critics centered their fire on the fact that the Arms Control Agency was spending public money to get this kind of advice, unaccepted even by the Agency, the point to be made here is that the philosophy behind it has some prevalence.

This becomes vitally important if an evaluator of intelligence should adhere to such a philosophy, taking the attitude that nobody should "bother me with facts, it's evidence I'm looking for." This danger is discussed at length in "The Strategy of Subversion," by Paul W. Blackstock (Quadrangle Books, 1964). Professor Blackstock says that Allen Dulles, former head of the Central Intelligence Agency, recognized that "prejudice is the most serious occupational hazard we have in intelligence work." Then he points out that CIA itself allowed such a factor to distort its estimates before the Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion in 1962.

"From the point of view of management and control," the Blackstock text says, "there is no magic organizational formula for eliminating the distortion (thus) introduced into the system by the policy line of any one Government agency. The theoretical solution most widely adopted by our own and most governments is to separate the intelligence collection and estimating functions from the policymaking and operational functions. Within the military establishment, the G–2 or intelligence is thus separated from G–3, plans and operations."

The author points out that CIA collects and evaluates intelligence and also is engaged in covert operations. He finds that this leads to the "comforting illusion, both in the field and in the intelligence center, that almost any hoped-for action can be carried off successfully."

It is not difficult to see how this approach can nourish illusions in the utilization of, or the failure to utilize, technological intelligence as well. Assessment of this data should not be made by the same persons who can flash a green or red light on development of an improved system that strains the state of the art. There is evidence that the Soviets did not work under this handicap.

A couple of years ago Moscow's Marshal Malinovsky made it known that "Soviet military doctrine * * * is based on the superiority of the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. over the armies of the most powerful countries of capitalism, with respect to military-technological means." He did not indicate any relaxation of the Russian technological effort, nor a cutting back in the output of nuclear material, nor an eschewal of military missions in space, nor a determination to develop new weapons only when forced to do so by the capitalists. There is no intelligence signalling that Malinovsky's delineation of Russian doctrine is not correct.

Lt. Gen. W. A. Davis, vice commander of the Air Force Systems Command, spoke on the same point in a recent Washington address. Said General Davis:

"The vigorous advance of technology has a vital role in the security of our Nation—not only military but also economic and political. This point needs to be strongly stressed. During the past 20 years we have had an explosion of technology that is unique in history. It has stimulated a rapid advance in our standard of living. It also has led to a revolution in military thinking.

"It is not too surprising to find a few people who believe that we have gone just about as far as we can go with technology—especially military technology—for the time being. These people seem to believe that the enormous wave of recent technological activity has just about crested. The conclusion is drawn that we need to absorb the impact of this wave before we move on to the next."

General Davis then put his finger on the threat, the one that will dominate American safety for the next decade:

"Of course, this attitude is predictable," he said, "but it is also a complacent one and, therefore, dangerous. The fact is that we simply cannot coast on our past achievements, and remain competitive at the same time * * *.

"Technology is just as dynamic today as it has been during the past 20 years. This is especially true in the area of military technology. Those who argue that this is not the case are really overlooking two fundamental facts.

"First, the Soviet drive against the free world is aimed at all areas of suspected weakness.

"Second, the Soviets are pushing military technology very actively in all areas."

The "few people" referred to by General Davis fail to give weight to factors other than the Soviet technological push. For the coming decade, there is no reason to believe the goal of a worldwide Communist society will change. The methods of reaching that goal will change, even to the utilization of coexistence as a tool. It is common today to speak of the détente, or the easing of strained relations. There have been détentes before—it is necessary to mention here only "The Spirit of Camp David"—and there probably will be more.

There is little peaceful about peaceful coexistence in the Soviet view. The Communists will continue to use political, economic, and subversive forces, backed by military strength, to exploit and undermine independent people. Their ruthlessness will not diminish, and they will continue to repudiate agreements when it serves their purpose. They are not satisfied with their present position vis-a-vis the United States so far as military power is concerned, and this is the main reason for Russia's great emphasis on technological superiority. They are today increasing the size and lethality of their nuclear stockpile. By the middle of this 1965 to 1975 decade, it is entirely possible their store of nuclear arms will surpass that of the free world. If we recall here Dr. Teller's observation that technical surprises come almost every year in this area, the Russian numerical superiority of the 1970's may be less important than the qualitative change that is bound to accompany their progress.

The news of this qualitative change, when it comes, will be in the form of technological intelligence. Some skeptics, like those who discount potential new energy sources, will stand firm against facts that do not conform to their personal views.

Harry H. Ransom has written, in "Central Intelligence and National Security," that history is "replete with examples of polticians who, for one reason or another, refused to believe intelligence estimates, which, in many cases, turned out to be accurate. There are instances, whether * * * in Hitler's Chancellery or more recently in the U.S. National Security Council, where the acceptance of hard and accurate intelligence has been impossible because of skeptical recipients."

In fairness, it must be added that the Ransom book, published in 1958, argued that more centralization was necessary. But it warned, also, that the intelligence producers should not lose their rapport with the users of intelligence. This warning has not always been heeded.

Prof. Richard E. Neustadt was quoted last year as saying "information is not only a key to action; it is a key to power in this Government." And, he added, "the right to information" about important things "is hardly guaranteed to anybody." The practical meaning of this is that information, including that on technical capabilities, is subject to dilution along the route from gathering to assessment. The information input, by the time it reaches a highly centralized assessment center where decisions are made, may not be always right. The result can be a wrong decision, even though the chances are it will be an important one.

Consider the cancellation of the Skybolt air-launched ballistic missile. In announcing that the project had been killed, President Kennedy stated that Skybolt is technologically "beyond us." This was debatable. Skybolt was described by its designers 2 years earlier as "entirely within the state of the art." Today the Pentagon is developing a new short-range attack missile (SRAM). Like Skybolt, it is intended to prolong the usefulness of the B–52 bomber, although the mission has been altered. There are some who believe it is not as good a choice as Skybolt. But that is not the point.

The important point is that the Skybolt was portrayed as complicated, costly, and unnecessary. Information coming out of the White House made the missile look like a technological monstrosity, which it was not, and ignored other aspects of the project—most importantly, that Great Britain had the fate of its government, its independent nuclear force, and its diplomatic sovereignty, all invested in Skybolt. These facts were not in the White House presentation. If they had been, they would have worked against the cancellation. The resulting crisis in our relations with England was only patched up at the Nassau Conference.

Some failures to react to intelligence, or reluctance to grind in observations, facts, and opinions that conflict with personal views, have their roots in several ingrained attitudes. Most of them are related directly to the Soviet threat. One is a hopefully held conviction that Russia is reducing its technological effort, particularly in the development of weapons and aerospace techniques. Another is that the Soviets are reducing their production of nuclear materials. A third is that the Communists are not preparing to use space for military purposes.

And here is another: the concept that Russians develop new weaponry only in response to provocation by the United States. This argument holds that the United States started the cold war and the arms race. The United States can, the reasoning goes, cool off the cold war by easing up on development of new systems, be they in space, the atmosphere, or on the ground. An extreme example is the conviction that the United States will remain fairly safe from nuclear attack so long as we do not build a defense against nuclear attack. This is part of the case against ordering the Nike-X system into production. It follows that we must not build a defense against intercontinental missiles unless we also have a shelter program, which Congress has refused to finance.

There is ample evidence that the Russians disagree. In addition to a shelter program, Moscow is working diligently on a missile defense system. In last November's Red

Square parade the Soviets proudly displayed what appears to be the prototype of an exoatmospheric defense missile. From photographs, the weapon is about the size of our Minuteman ICBM. It apparently is designed to intercept incoming missiles before they enter the atmosphere, a defense technique considered—in this country—as somewhat of a strain on the state of the art. There are competent observers who believe, judging by the Russian record, that this system can be operational before 1970.

The story of Russian aircraft development is another we cannot ignore. A large number of modern aircraft have appeared in the Soviet Union and there is no reason to believe they are not pressing developments in the supersonic flight regimes, up to and including hypersonic vehicles.

For the broad base of Soviet technology and a comparison with our own, the common measure is the output of graduates from scientific and technical educational institutions. For the United States, the last peak was in 1950. The total went well above 125,000 and that influx made an unmeasured contribution to our postwar progress in missiles, space, and aerospace technology. It is frequently overlooked that this vital strength was a byproduct, to a large degree, of the GI bill of rights. Many of those educated veterans today are in management positions.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, at least 50,000 of those talented men have recently moved out of defense industry as a result of cutbacks.

Meanwhile, the Russians continue to increase their output of scientists and engineers. In 1964 there were about 140,000 new engineers added to the Soviet pool. There are 3,625 technical colleges in Russia, with an enrollment of 2,981,000 students. If we add higher degrees to the 140,000 new engineers, the total was about 190,000 graduates in Russia last year. The comparable figure for the United States is not more than 45,000. They are producing about 3 engineers to our 1.

On top of this is the Soviet chain of research institutes and laboratories. Authoritative directives, published in Russia, list from 3,000 to 5,000 of these facilities, about double the number of 10 years ago. They range from small laboratories to giant scientific complexes and the Soviet scientific city of Novosibirsk. There are at least a dozen institutes for which we have no parallel. These are research centers devoted to scientific subjects that do not warrant specialized attention in this country. One of the fields on which they are putting high emphasis is cybernetics and indications are that they intend to automate not merely industry, but large segments of Soviet society. It is an area where the payoff potential is the highest.

There is no implication here that the United States has faltered in the area of pure science and basic research. The blocks are accumulating. But we are in danger of being surpassed in applied science—applied, in this instance, to projects that can preserve our national security and that of the free world.

The great difficulty of an essay like this, trying to postulate the requirements of a future decade, is that we cannot know enough about what to expect. In the annals of the U.S. Air Force there is an example of this inability to predict breakthroughs. It is the famous Von Kármán report of the immediate postwar years "Toward New Horizons." This is hailed in USAF history as a landmark, which it was, in that it pointed the way to the ballistic missile program. Yet the ballistic missile, and the space-age wonders that followed, would have been impossible without the transistor. And the transistor is not mentioned in the Von Kármán report. Nobody had heard of it. Nobody predicted it.

What is certain about the next 10 years is that the confrontation with communism will continue. The pace and the strategy of the Red effort may change, but not the goal. The problem of maintaining world peace will become more complex as unrest accelerates in the underdeveloped and newly emerging nations. Technology will become more complicated and more expensive. Space competence will grow and we will have it thrust upon us that space is pregnant with military threat. The Russians recognize this and Lyndon Johnson, when he was a Senator, was apprehensive about the possibilities. Significant arms reduction is not likely, although there will be continued efforts at arms control, some of them effective.

Military power, as always, will remain the tool of national policy. The use of that power, in turn, will be limited by fear of escalation, the slippery character of alliances on both sides of the Iron Curtain, and all of mankind's opposition to the use of force. There will be frequent crises to test how much effect these limiting factors really have.

When we say our military policy must be responsive to our national policy, it is with the understanding that neither one is a neatly tied package. As we have seen in the case of South Vietnam, national policy is a fluid thing that comes out of speeches, interviews, congressional presentations, directives, and similar expressions of Executive opinion. Pressures may come from East Berlin, the Suez Canal, Hanoi, or a Senate committee hearing.

In the midst of this flux, military superiority must be maintained. It must be able to deter war at all levels and be effective in all kinds of crises. It must be adaptable to realistic arms control efforts, which means that it must be a safe force and not provocative. The force must be survivable and flexible. It must provide multiple options and respond in a precisely controlled way to any challenge. It must be accurate and exercise precise discrimination in the selection of targets.

For all these requirements, vigorous application of technological advances is essential. Space, defense systems, and continued counterforce superiority must have priority. For the lower level threat, which means the wars we are most likely to fight, the refinement of nuclear capability must continue, providing highly discriminatory tactical weapons.

The thrust of Russian power has been inhibited, since the end of World War II, by the capability of the United States to build modern weapons and deliver them. We must face it: there is going to be a redistribution of the power that is loose in the rest of the world, greased on the tracks of time by technological progress. Anyone who doubts this should study De Gaulle's France, Communist China, Nasser's Egypt, and—even—India.

C. P. Snow made an error in 1960 when he predicted that China and several other States would have nuclear capability by 1966. But his mistake was only on the calendar. He was making a guess without the benefit of intelligence. Intelligence enabled the United States to predict, quite accurately, when the Chinese would explode their first bomb. Intelligence did not let us know how sophisticated the Chinese bomb would be, according to the official statements. As in the case of Russia, technology moved faster than we anticipated.

To keep abreast of these challenges in the murky future, the American people must learn how to spend their money wisely. The choice is between risking our money or our security. A high risk with expensive technology means we will take a lower risk with the military threat.

How we assess technological intelligence in the long run will determine how we will use our money and ability for the application of breakthroughs to projects with high security payoff. On the basis of past experience, the giant steps will be taken only in response to an obvious threat. Thus it was that a decade ago we jumped into massive unknowns when the green light was turned on for the ballistic missile program. The Soviets forced us to do it and we did it successfully.

In the next 10 years it could be fatal to wait for Soviet stimulation. The response from now on must be to the things we know about technological possibilities.

ALBERT D. HUTZLER

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of the Senate to the passing of an outstanding Marylander and a fine American.

Albert D. Hutzler gave the finest kind of service to the welfare of the general public. As a successful businessman, and for 35 years the president and general manager of the Hutzler's Department Store, he could have devoted little time to the problems of the community. Instead, a munificent philanthropist, he took an interest in many different community projects. He was a trustee of Johns Hopkins University and Enoch Pratt Free Library, a director of the Jewish Welfare Board of Baltimore, and an effective president of the Baltimore Association of Commerce.

Baltimore will miss Albert Hutzler. Maryland and the Nation are truly poorer for his passing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD yesterday morning's editorial from the Baltimore Sun and the accompanying article.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, June 6, 1965]

ALBERT D. HUTZLER, SR.

Albert D. Hutzler, Sr., was one of those busy men to whom public and private agencies frequently turn for help, in keeping with the adage that if you want something done, ask a busy man to do it. The adage is far from infallible, as the number of figureheads and absentee members of boards and commissions will attest. But it was true in Mr. Hutzler's case. He responded willingly to the calls upon his service, and whatever the problem, he worked hard himself to get it solved. Parks, city planning, expressways, public housing, social welfare agencies, medical care, libraries and colleges only begin to summarize the host of interests to which he devoted himself, and primarily in his native city of Baltimore. A decade ago he expressed confidence in the renaissance of downtown, "if the citizens remain in the present state of alarm," which may be described as the state which he himself frequently was in. But it was a controlled state, tempered with understanding, patience and wry humor, which sustained a steady drive toward public improvements even when poor health made appearances an effort. The pace he set as a conscientious citizen is not likely often to be matched, but the city will be blessed if Mr. Hutzler's example has inspired others to try.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, June 6, 1965]

A. D. Hutzler, Merchant, Dead at 76—Civic Leader Succumbs to Illness at Estate Near Pikesville

Albert David Hutzler, Sr., a merchant philanthropist in the Baltimore tradition of Enoch Pratt, George Peabody, and Johns Hopkins, died late yesterday morning at his Pikesville estate, Pomona, following an illness of nearly 3 months.

Mr. Hutzler, chairman of the board of Hutzler Bros., was 76 years old.

He had been convalescing at his home after leaving Johns Hopkins Hospital late in March.

THIRTY-FIVE YEARS AS PRESIDENT

For 35 years, from 1919 to 1954, he was president and general manager of the department store founded by his father and uncles.

Despite his active and demanding business career, Mr. Hutzler devoted a generous share of his time and talents to his wide range of charitable and civic interests.

He was elected president of the Baltimore Association of Commerce in the depression year of 1932. He served so effectively that he was honored by the Advertising Club for his imaginative contributions to business during one of the most difficult and abnormal years in the history of the city.

SERVED AS ADVISER

He was one of two Baltimoreans selected by the Jewish Tribune for their 1933 honor roll. His work with the BAC was again cited.

Mr. Hutzler served the Federal Government as an adviser on retailing to the vice chairman of the War Production Board.

In 1934, as an executive of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, he testified against tariff increases before the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee.

A year later he went before the committee again to register his general agreement with President Roosevelt's social security program.

Mr. Hutzler took a constant interest in Baltimore, the city where he was born, November 22, 1888.

In the early forties he warned of a spreading "ring of blight" that threatened to choke the city's vital center.

He advocated a crosstown expressway in 1944 and was still advocating it in 1955 when he wrote that an era of renaissance had begun in downtown Baltimore that would continue only if the citizens remain in the present state of alarm.

WORKED FOR IDEAS

City planning, he said in 1946, "is more than an esthetic thing—we want a city that is an efficient plant to achieve the objectives of its citizens."

Mr. Hutzler worked to put his ideas into effect. He was a former commissioner of the Maryland Emergency Housing and Park Commission, a former director of the Baltimore Council of Social Agencies, a former chairman of the Commission on City Planning, a former member of the Arsenal and Veterans Memorial Commission, and a former commissioner of the Housing Authority of Baltimore.

Mr. Hutzler took a wholehearted interest in educational institutions. Johns Hopkins University, from which he was graduated with an A.B. degree as a member of the class of 1908, was his particular favorite.

He was a founding member and past president of the Friends of the Johns Hopkins Library.

SERVICES TO HOPKINS

He was elected to the university board of trustees in 1951 and was named cochairman of the committee for buildings and grants during a period of plant expansion capped by the new $4,500,000 library.

Omicron Delta Kappa elected him an honorary member in 1955 in recognition of his services to the Hopkins.

Mr. Hutzler was a trustee and member of the executive committee of the Enoch Pratt Free Library and a founding member of the Pikesville Memorial Library.

He was a former trustee of Goucher College and a trustee of the Athenaeum of the Maryland Historical Society.

Mr. Hutzler's business horizon extended far beyond his namesake company. Some of the organizations he served as a director were:

The Retail Research Association, Associated Merchandising Corp., Eutaw Savings Bank, National Retail Dry Goods Association, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Baltimore, Consolidated Gas & Electric Light and Power Co., and the Baltimore National Bank.

Mr. Hutzler served the charities of his religion and of his city long and often. He was president of the Associated Jewish Charities from 1923 to 1925 and spent the next 2 years leading the Jewish Children's Society through a sweeping reorganization.

He was a former director of the Jewish Welfare Board of Baltimore, a former member of the executive committee of the Baltimore Community Chest, an honorary chairman of the Medical Center Commission, and president of the Hutzler Fund, Inc.

He was an active, lifelong member of Har Sinai congregation.

Mr. Hutzler was the son of the late David and Ella Gutman Hutzler.

He received his early education at Friends School.

After his graduation from the Hopkins, he spent more than a year with L. Bamberger & Co., Newark, N.J., for training in merchandising before joining Hutzler's in 1910.

He married the former Gretchen Hochschild in 1911. She survives him.

Others surviving are two sons, Albert D. Hutzler, Jr., and Richard H. Hutzler, a daughter, Mrs. Caroline A. Bernstein, and a brother, Joel G. D. Hutzler.

"THE LASTING VALUES OF THE PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it was my distinct pleasure to speak before the New York State Waterways Association, Inc., at its 55th annual luncheon, held in New York City on May 28, 1965.

The purpose of the association is to foster and protect rivers, harbors, and waterways of the State of New York for navigation, commerce, conservation, flood control, recreation, irrigation, hydroelectric power, and related functions. The association has a membership throughout the State, consisting of corporations, civic, commercial, and trade organizations, port authorities and commissions, municipal and public bodies, and a few individuals.

I have a very deep interest in the development of our natural resources, not only in the great State of Florida, which I have the honor to represent, but throughout the Nation. I naturally was delighted to have the opportunity to speak before this distinguished group.

I ask unanimous consent that the address which I made before the New York State Waterways Association be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Lasting Values of the Public Works Program to the People of the United States

(Address by Senator Holland at the 55th annual luncheon, New York State Waterways Association, Inc., May 28, 1965)

It was a journey through the northern part of this great State of New York, even before peace was concluded with Great Britain, which prompted our first President, George Washington, to recognize with the eyes of an engineer the vast inland navigation possibilities of the United States, and with the voice of a farsighted statesman to express the fervent hope: "Would God that we may have the wisdom and courage to improve them."

All our Nation should be happy in the knowledge that we have had—and continue to have—that wisdom and courage.

The development of our water resources has been a major factor in the transformation of our country from the wilderness of Washington's time into the greatest industrial nation on earth. Our public works programs, carried forward by some States but in major part by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers during the last 140 years, are conferring virtually incalculable benefits, day in and day out, upon all the people of our great land.

The development of our national commerce, and its continued virile growth, is due in substantial measure to the construction of navigation facilities.

About 22,000 miles of inland and intracoastal waterways have been constructed or improved, of which some 19,000 miles are currently in commercial use. This total includes about 12,000 miles with at least the 9-foot depth required to accommodate barge transportation.

In addition, about 500 commercial harbors have been built or improved by the Corps of Engineers with the approval of the Congress. It is perhaps hard for many of us to realize that, in their natural state, few harbors on either coast could handle modern shipping. When the SS *Great Eastern*—the famous "great iron ship"—crossed the Atlantic in the 1890's, Portland, Maine, was the only American harbor that could receive her. Your New York harbor had a controlling depth of only 24 feet when the first appropriation for its improvement was made in 1884. The splendid harbor we know today is a fabulous gateway to the world, accommodating the oceans' largest ships, and handling some 155 million tons of cargo a year.

Early in the 1950's the public works program in connection with ship channels and waterway improvements was greatly stepped up because of unprecedented changes in the technology of ocean transportation. Channel improvements, where justified, were designed to meet the projected needs of new supertankers and super ore carriers and the growing volume of ocean shipping.

The impact of channel improvement activity since 1950 has significantly altered the character and dimensions of the network of channels in your own great port. It has put into motion other activities and recommendations that will bring even more profound changes in the next 5 to 10 years. To illustrate, the Federal expenditures for new channel construction in the New York-New Jersey port area since 1950 have amounted to $80 million. Credit for these achievements belongs to many private and public port interests, as well as to the Congress and the Corps of Engineers.

The future program for channel improvements here includes projects in every section of the New Jersey-New York port. I single out one report now before us in the Congress which recommends doubling the capacity of the port's deepwater anchorages at a cost of $45 million.

And now as to the Great Lakes. Public works projects built over the last hundred years have developed the Great Lakes into one of the world's greatest inland water transportation systems. The flow of basic raw materials through its improved connecting channels and harbors led to the rise of the vast industrial complex along and adjacent to the shores of the lakes, and it is a principal artery of commerce supporting a constantly accelerating economic growth throughout the area. Although plagued in recent years by low water levels, the Great Lakes system is now carrying in excess of 95 billion ton-miles of traffic annually.

A project of wide interest and, it seems to me, of great potential for a vital industrial area of our country, is the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal which now has been recommended for construction by the Corps of Engineers. The canal would link the six States contiguous to the Ohio River plus the eight States adjoining the Great Lakes, one of which is the State of New York.

The Engineers' report shows rather conclusively that the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal would provide for the free flow of low-cost waterborne commerce between the gulf intercoastal, the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Great Lakes, and the St. Lawrence Seaway navigation systems. It is said that a continuous inland navigation system would probably reverse the decline of coal and steel production in the Upper Ohio River Basin, where these industries are essential to the area's economy.

I am sure there must be great interest on the part of this organization in this project which has so long been ardently advocated by Congressman KIRWAN, of Ohio.

Construction of the 321-mile St. Lawrence Seaway as a joint project of the United States and Canada opened the Great Lakes system to worldwide traffic. In order to accommodate the largest vessels which can transit the seaway, the Great Lakes connecting channels are now being appropriately deepened. This job was started 2 years before the seaway was opened to traffic in 1959, and will be finished in 1967.

A companion study to determine what modifications of Great Lakes ports are necessary in order that full advantage may be taken of the seaway is nearing completion. As a result of this study, a number of port improvement projects have been authorized so far, and many have been completed or are now underway, including—in this State—Buffalo, Rochester, Great Sodus Bay, and Oswego Harbors.

During its first 5 years of operation, the volume of traffic passing through the seaway was below the original forecast. Although the waterway got off to a slow start there is sound evidence that it will prove a great boon to northern New York, the Great Lakes area, and the rest of the country, as was originally predicted. During 1964, traffic increased about 30 percent to nearly 40 million tons, only 4 million tons less than the projection for that year. This was a heartening showing for, during the previous 4 years, the average annual deficit had been nearly 10 million tons. Increasing adequacy of the inland ports, and a rising awareness on the part of shippers of the advantages the seaway affords, seem to have been prime factors in the upturn. There is reason to believe now that the project may reach, and possibly exceed, its target of 50 million tons in 1968.

I had the pleasure of handling the appropriations bill for the seaway from the beginning to the dedication. Also, Mrs. Holland, Mary, and I had the pleasure of attending the dedication in Montreal which we thoroughly enjoyed. However, I am sure Mary was more interested in seeing Queen Elizabeth than in the dedication. We regretted that our plane was prevented by bad weather from landing the next day at Massena, where the American dedication took place.

Of particular interest to you, I am sure, and to the State of New York, is the Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway, linking the Great Lakes system and the Atlantic seaboard via the port of New York. As you know, this 184-mile segment of the New York State Barge Canal system between Oswego, on Lake Erie, and Waterford, on the Hudson, is being improved by deepening the channels between locks to 14 feet, increasing depths over the lock sills from 12 to 13 feet, and increasing the clearance of overhead structures to 20 feet. At the present time this improvement project is approximately 78 percent complete. It is noteworthy that shipping interests estimate that, as a result of the increase of one foot in draft through the locks, loads carried by vessels can be boosted 16 to 18 percent.

However, of far greater importance to the State in terms of future benefits is the special study being conducted to determine the advisability of providing improvements beyond those I have mentioned and which were authorized by the 1935 River and Harbor Act, as modified by the 1962 act, setting a $28 million limitation on Federal expenditure.

To date the pending study has indicated that complete modernization of the entire Barge Canal system on the order of that now being carried out in the Ohio is not economically feasible. The justification for raising the present $28 million ceiling to permit completion of the work authorized by the 1935 act has been determined to be favorable, and the Corps of Engineers so testified before our Senate committee at the last session of the Congress.

An interim report now nearing completion gives consideration to limited improvement by providing longer locks to permit the use of double tows on the canal system. Upon completion of this study it will be submitted to the State, at which time the State's views on the transfer of the canal system to the Federal Government will be requested. The 1959 amendment to your State constitution covering transfer of the system is permissive only and implementation requires special legislation. I understand your State legislature is currently considering this matter and that one house has already taken favorable action. Further action on completion of all phases of the pending study will depend upon the attitude of the State toward the transfer proposal which is, of course, a matter for your State to decide, without outside interference or advice.

One of the Nation's tremendous economic assets is the Mississippi River system, involving, besides the mighty Mississippi, the Ohio, Tennessee, Missouri, Illinois, and other rivers, major portions of which have been improved through the years to form an integrated modern waterway network with over 6,000 miles of channel 9 feet or more in depth, a network uniting the industrial heartland of the Nation with low-cost barge transportation.

Coupled with the Mississippi system is another great waterway, one of especial significance to my own State of Florida—the Gulf Intracoastal, which stretches over 1,100 miles from Appalachee Bay, Fla., around the gulf coast to the Mexican border, connecting the busy southern ports with the Midwest, the East, and the Great Lakes. During the short span of its existence—the last existing link was completed in 1949—this important artery of waterborne commerce has been instrumental in revitalizing the economy of the entire region it serves. Originally justified to the Congress on the basis of a potential of 5 million tons per year, in 1963 it carried more than 13 times that amount of commerce—over 67 million tons.

Also of immense significance to Florida, as well as to other States on the seaboard, is the Atlantic Intracoastal, a heavily traveled 1,456-mile protected water highway leading from Trenton, N.J., the New York area, down the coast to Miami. An $11.5 million project for the enlargement of this waterway between Jacksonville and Miami was completed just 2 months ago. The Atlantic Intracoastal has been a boon to commercial users and has served as an impetus to the mushrooming, recreational boating industry. With the skyrocketing sales of small boats, the waterway is dotted by recreation craft of all sizes and descriptions daily. Marinas, fishing camps, and resort areas have sprung up along the entire length of the route.

One of the most significant developments in the history of waterway improvement was initiated a year ago last February when President Johnson broke ground for the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, which had been in the dream stage for almost a century and a half. This $158 million project cutting across the neck of the Florida peninsula will afford a direct, short, and protected route between the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic coast ports for barging large quantities of long-haul freight. It will unite the Atlantic and Gulf Intracoastal Waterways into a system encompassing an area of 34 States. The saving in distance, as compared with the exposed and hazardous route around the Florida Keys, will be more than 600 miles.

One good indication of the vast interest behind the nationwide navigation development program is that over the past decade annual appropriations for this purpose have risen about 600 percent. Funds for the current fiscal year total some $300 million, and the 1966 civil works budget now being considered by the Congress contemplates a further boost of about $27 million.

Turning to another major aspect of public works—the construction of flood control facilities has conferred enormous and lasting benefits upon the American people. It is estimated that the facilities which have come into service since the general flood control program was inaugurated about 30 years ago have already prevented flood damages in excess of twice the actual investment in protection.

A large number of areas throughout our land are relatively well protected now by the more than 800 flood control and related projects already completed or placed in partial operation. A great many facilities help to protect whole river valleys and all their inhabitants from the scourge of flooding waters. Hundreds of other projects are local, substantially protecting individual urban communities and agricultural land.

Unfortunately, however, far too many American communities still lack a reasonable measure of protection—or any at all. Within the last few months, two major flood disasters have dramatically emphasized the necessity for greatly increased and expedited efforts to curb the power of our rivers to destroy life and property and leave thousands of people homeless.

Sad experience is sometimes the best teacher. There is a bitter lesson to be learned from the fact that had all 33 of the authorized local flood control projects on the upper Mississippi been completed when the river went on its most recent rampage, they would have prevented in that one flood alone more than 1½ times their total Federal and local cost. The seven projects which were completed paid for themselves 3 times over.

I believe that the flood control facilities in the State of New York have proved to be excellent investments. The 5 reservoir and 27 local protection projects completed since 1938 at a total Federal and local cost of about $96 million are credited with saving more than $152 million in damages—well in excess of 1½ times the amount spent to build them. Four projects are now under construction, including the $120 million Allegheny Dam and Reservoir, which is over 67 percent complete, and three local facilities. Eighteen other projects estimated to cost about $230 million have been authorized but not as yet started. However, a request for funds to initiate construction on one of these—the $2.5 million Rosendale local project on Rondout Creek—is contained in the fiscal year 1966 budget.

I regret that lack of time prevents my discussion of our large flood control and multipurpose project in Florida, the central and southern Florida program, which is conferring vast benefits upon our State and the Nation.

Another source of lasting value to the people of America from our public works programs is the production of hydroelectric power. Despite the fact that the generation of power is only one of the purposes served by these multipurpose projects, Government plants now in operation have a total nameplate rating of nearly 9 million kilowatts—over a fifth of the Nation's total hydro capacity, the largest block of hydro under a single agency in our country. The power is normally marketed through agencies of the Department of the Interior. The total ultimate capacity of the 59 plants which are either in operation or under construction will be in excess of 17 million kilowatts. Additional projects authorized by the Congress, some of them already in the advance engineering and design stage—such as the Libby Dam project on the Kootenai River in Montana—will bring the total ultimate capacity under current authorization to over 21 million kilowatts.

Abundant low-cost power, and water transportation from its heartland to the sea—both important benefits of our public works programs—have transformed the Pacific Northwest in less than a quarter of a century. With the rise of the great aluminum industry and other new industrial developments which thrive on cheap power and cheap transportation, new jobs, and new opportunities for the enjoyment of the good life have been provided for millions of Americans.

Besides the time-honored triad of navigation, flood control, and power, our public works programs are conferring immeasurable benefits upon our people in the fields of municipal, agricultural, and industrial water supply; pollution abatement, recreation, and the conservation of our irreplaceable fish and wildlife heritage—purposes which have come into prominence in all water resources planning and development within comparatively recent years.

Much as I would like to discuss all of these splendid objectives, time does not permit me to do so.

However, some idea of the recreational dividends which accrue to the American people from our public works programs may be gathered from the fact that last year some 160 million of us visited reservoir projects of the Army Engineers to enjoy boating, swimming, camping, hunting, and other recreational pursuits. If the recreation visitors at all projects—waterways, harbors, beach erosion projects, and so forth—were added in, the figure would be at least double. It is estimated that by 1980, attendance at reservoir projects will top 300 million.

It is indicative of the progress which has been made in the field of water resources development "for the greatest good of the greatest number of people over the longest period of time"—which is the basic criterion for the entire program—that, during the last decade, nationwide civil works expenditures by the Army Engineers have doubled—from $503 million in 1955 to about $1.1 billion in 1964. It is of great interest to me, and, I think to this audience, that New York and Florida have far outrun the national rate of increase. During this same decade, Federal expenditures in both of our States have more than tripled.

I am much more interested, however, and I am sure that you are also, in the fact that both of our States, in so many public works matters, have assumed the responsibility ourselves and with our own money have made numerous improvements in waterways, harbors, and other projects.

Your great State was a leader in this matter of developing your own resources many, many years ago when you constructed such projects as the Erie Canal, the canal to Lake Champlain, and later continued with the St. Lawrence power development and others.

Our younger State of Florida with smaller resources than yours, though larger in area, has followed in that path. I am sure you will be interested to know that in the great central and south Florida flood district we are paying more than one-third of the cost out of State and district funds. That is the way it should be in these important developmental programs and I hope we may always keep it that way. I feel that the people of the several States can preserve not only their own independence and pride in a more perfect way by meeting many of their own intrastate development programs with their own dollars, but we can also in this manner give full notice to the Federal Government of our deep concern and of our urgent desire that the United States, in appropriate projects, should play its full part in developing assets of vast importance not only to ourselves but also to the Nation as a whole.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES—RESOLUTION OF THE CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last Wednesday, while I was making my maiden speech on the subject of reapportionment of State legislatures, the conference of mayors was holding its annual conference in St. Louis.

At that conference, the mayors adopted a resolution strongly endorsing the principle of one man, one vote, and firmly opposing the proposed amendments to our Constitution that would permit one house of a State legislature to be apportioned on the basis of factors other than population.

This support from the conference of mayors is most welcome to those of us who are fighting these proposed amendments. The conference represents the mayors of virtually every major city in the country. It includes both prominent Republicans and outstanding Democrats. The conference was founded in 1932, and now represents 90 percent of all American cities larger than 30,000 in population.

The mayors of these cities thus speak for tens of millions of Americans. Their opposition to the rotten-borough amendments is most significant.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the conference of mayors be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Whereas there is nothing more basic to democracy and our Federal system of government than the principle that one man's vote is as good as another's; and

Whereas this bedrock principle has been denied, evaded, and defied in operations of many State legislatures which have vital responsibilities for and controlling influence on the governmental powers of cities and other local governments in our Federal system; and

Whereas the States have no authority under the U.S. Constitution or their own laws to arrange elections of State legislatures so that a vote in one area weighs more than that in another; and

Whereas State legislatures nevertheless have been so constituted to assure underrepresentation of cities and urban areas where most of the population lives; and

Whereas this underrepresentation has meant continued State neglect of municipal and urban needs; and

Whereas malapportionment of State legislatures must be overcome not only to restore equal voting rights to all citizens but to strengthen State governments themselves; and

Whereas the U.S. Supreme Court has reaffirmed the one-man-one-vote principle as requisite in elections of both houses of State legislatures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the U.S. conference of mayors, That efficient and equitable operation of our representative system of government requires that both houses of State legislatures be apportioned strictly according to population; be it further

Resolved, That the conference calls on State governments promptly to meet their responsibility to provide full representative government by reapportioning legislative seats on the basis of population; be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. conference of mayors is opposed to the constitutional amendments pending before the Congress which would dilute or overturn the U.S. Supreme Court decisions requiring reapportionment.

SKILLED AIR PILOTS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, some of the most skilled bush pilots in the world base their operations at Kotzebue, Alaska. For 2 months each year they fly polar bear hunters out over the icepack of the Bering Sea. This is dangerous work, requiring experience and judgment. It requires also the able and invaluable assistance of the FAA Flight Service Station at Kotzebue. This station, under the direction of my good and longtime friend, Area Manager Joseph Walsh, provides the traffic control, the weather reporting and the emergency service which do so much to improve the flight safety record in this region.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article written by George Fay in the FAA magazine Horizons be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUNTING POLAR BEARS AT KOTZEBUE, ALASKA

"Service" is spelled with capital letters at the Kotzebue Flight Service Station in Alaska. Kotzebue is a village of 1,800 Eskimos located 30 miles north of the Arctic Circle on the western coast of Alaska where the North American Continent brushes against Siberia. It is home for 11 FAA families who man this "last frontier" station—a key facility in the Alaskan region.

Who are the men who serve in this land of extremes where winters are long and sunless, and summers are bright with almost continuous sunshine—the sun never dips below the horizon for a 36-day period starting in mid-June—where one of man's oldest forms of transportation, the dogsled and team of huskies, stubbornly and successfully competes with the airplane for hunting and getting around the Arctic vastness?

Joseph E. Walsh, area manager at Kotzebue, a born and bred Alaskan, typifies this breed of men—and women—who serve in remote Alaskan stations where morale seems to raise in direct proportion to the station's remoteness and isolation.

"This isn't the easiest place in the world to live in," admits Walsh. "What makes serving up here worthwhile for us is the knowledge that we are doing something vital and important. Flying in Alaska isn't inherently dangerous, but its no place to get lost and run out of gas. Pilots rely on us and keep us hopping in their requests for our services."

Although they are kept busy year round, the action steps up to fever pitch in April when the polar bear hunting season opens. Professional hunters and scouts swarm into Kotzebue and Point Hope—150 miles farther north—in their ski-equipped light aircraft to begin the "harvest" of the giant bears which roam the icecap in search of seals and walruses.

At dawn's first light, scouts and hunters ready their aircraft and their gear for the long day's hunt. The first item of business is to tune in their radios to the Kotzebue Beacon frequency for the weather broadcasts which are given at 6:15 and 7:15 each morning. The broadcasts from the flight service station cover weather conditions in the hunt areas on the icepack between Siberia and Alaska.

Next they file a flight plan either in person or by radio with the FSS giving all the necessary information to aid searchers in case they run into difficulty. As Ernest M. Crump, chief air traffic control specialist at the FSS, puts it: "No pilot flying out on the ice would be caught dead without filing a flight plan. And these pilots are some of the best in the business."

Using the "buddy system," the hunters fly in pairs over the ice in rectangular patterns searching for telltale bear shadows. Cruising at 75 knots, the hunters cannot actually see the bears which are perfectly camouflaged against the white terrain below their aircraft. They look for breaks in the ice where the polar bears—hunters themselves—prey upon the seals and walruses which sun themselves on the "ice islands." They keep in touch on the "bush frequency," 3411.5 kilowatts, to lend a hand in case someone runs into trouble. Back at the FSS, the air traffic control specialist also monitors this frequency, following the progress of each flight, alert to any emergency request for assistance.

This assistance might take many forms: Like aircraft saves for example—there have already been a dozen this season—where pilots were blown off course and couldn't find their way back to Kotzebue or Point Hope. The specialists, pilots themselves, help the lost pilot with terrain identification and give him bearings to fly home. Or they contact the U.S. Air Force radar stations in the area for a pinpoint fix on the aircraft. If an airplane doesn't make it back, they crank up the search and rescue machinery and fly search missions themselves when they are not on watch.

It's one thing for Joe Walsh to brag about his people, but what do the pilots think of the service they receive? A recent letter received by Alaskan Region Director James G. Rogers, from Anchorage Pilot Jeff Brown, gives an eloquent answer. "Having been engaged in guiding polar bear hunters on the polar ice pack for the past 3 years, I have had unlimited contact with Kotzebue radio. In my opinion, shared by all the guides, Kotzebue radio is the most outstanding FAA station in Alaska. Their work can be summed up in a word—professionalism. The specialists, to a man, are among the finest to be found anywhere. I would also like to commend the maintenance personnel for their efforts. It is virtually impossible to be anywhere on the ice and not be able to pick up Kotzebue with good ADF equipment. In closing, I would further say that because of the high proficiency of the personnel at this station, many accidents have been avoided, and that certainly many lives have been saved."

When the long day is over, and the last aircraft is tied down for the night, the specialists often go into town to swap stories about the day's hunt with the pilots. There is talk about the big bear that got away, and there is usually some airplane talk, too—how some things might have been done better, how the operation could be made a bit safer.

It is this close rapport between pilots and air traffic control specialists that makes duty at Kotzebue FSS a rich and rewarding experience. In a word, it's "service."

INSTRUMENTS OF FEDERAL RESERVE POLICY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, during the past week, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, which is charged by act of Congress with responsibility for maintaining the value of our money, gave a timely warning in New York with respect to dangers inherent in excessive expansion of, and deterioration in, the quality of bank credit. He asked bankers and the investing public not to forget what happened to our economy after 1929 following an exaggerated distortion of asset values based primarily upon expansion of credit advanced by banks and others to finance unsound speculative commitments.

Not only did stock prices, which had been inflated by excessive buying on credit with narrow margins, decline drastically in 1929 but eventually real estate values also dropped, and many banks were forced to close because of loans made on real estate, even though at only 50 percent of estimated value. At present national banks may make conventional mortgage loans up to as much as 80 percent of value on property and more on Government insured mortgages. Savings and loan associations can lend larger amounts for longer periods, and many of these associations have borrowed from the home loan banks to make loans in excess of the flow of funds from savings.

One of the basic instruments available to the Federal Reserve for limiting the expansion of bank credit is the requirement that member banks maintain certain reserve deposits with the Federal Reserve Banks. In its latest annual report, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System suggested some revisions in the law governing the fixing of reserve requirements. The main purpose of these changes would be to enable the establishment of a structure of requirements that would be more equitable as among different classes of banks and still serve as effective limitations on credit expansion.

In a recent speech, Mr. E. Sherman Adams, vice president of the First National City Bank of New York, discussed the subject of reserve requirements and suggested some changes in the structure proposed by the Federal Reserve Board. I asked the Chairman of the Board for comments on Mr. Adam's suggestions and have received a reply, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record as an extension of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Board of Governors of the
Federal Reserve System,
Washington, June 3, 1965.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I was interested in seeing your letter from Mr. Giles H. Miller, Jr., of Culpeper dated May 17, referring to a recent address by Mr. E. Sherman Adams, and am glad to have this opportunity to send you a few comments.

The address by Mr. Adams dealt first with the requirements for the pledging of bank assets to secure public deposits.

In 1962 this problem was the subject of an interesting report by a committee of the New York State Bankers Association of which Mr. Adams was chairman. Thereafter the problem was studied in the Federal Reserve System. This study led to a view that the problem falls within the province of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, especially if full insurance coverage for public deposits were to be considered, and that if the commercial banks favored a proposal in this area, they should take the initiative in furthering it. There was also a suggestion that the matter should be approached on the State level where the chief legal requirements for pledging of securities are imposed. In view of these opinions, the Board of Governors here has not yet felt that there was any occasion for it to take a position on this matter.

The other subject that Mr. Adams discussed was that of reserve requirements. He was very frank in espousing the view that the best requirement is simply the lowest requirement—or, in the case of savings accounts, no requirement at all. I have felt that the requirements that resulted from developments of the 1930's and 1940's were unnecessarily high, and the Board has made several reductions from those peak levels, but as you know, in addition to the reasons for still lower reserve requirements suggested by Mr. Adams, there are a good many other factors involved, the combination of which has prevented the reducing of requirements to the levels that some people might desire. These other factors are related to the role of reserve requirements in the effective functioning of monetary policy as a stabilizing force in national economic developments.

Within the general framework of favoring lower requirements, Mr. Adams also expresses concern about the treatment of the larger banks as compared with the smaller banks, under any new graduated system of requirements that might be put into effect. This leads to the question of the number of categories of requiremens that there should be under any graduated system. While such a question might seem a mere technical detail, it turns out to be a matter of considerable substance, as indicated below.

In the report of the President's Committee on Financial Institutions, to which reference was made in the Board's annual report for 1964 (pp. 200–202), it was suggested that a new graduated system of reserve requirements on demand deposits be considered, and, in such a system, that there be a very low requirement, much lower than the present requirement for country banks, for the many banks of very small size. A main purpose of such a low figure would be to avoid the strain that would be imposed on many nonmember banks, which are predominantly small banks, if they had to adhere to reserve requirements in the present range of member bank requirements. The Committee's discussion went on to suggest that the graduated system might include two other categories of requirements on demand deposits, which might correspond roughly to the present requirements of country banks and of reserve city banks.

In discussing this suggested approach with its three categories, Mr. Adams refers to a "fear of discrimination against larger banks" and he suggests that this fear "might be easily dissipated * * * simply by reducing the number of categories from three to two."

It should be remembered that the bottom category in the proposed graduated system of requirements was conceived to provide for a very low percentage of reserves on the first few million dollars of a bank's deposits, in order to take care of the special situation of very small banks. If the total number of categories were to be only two, this would imply a single percentage requirement that would apply to all deposits beyond this small first bracket. Hence, the requirements on all these deposits would be brought to the same level, which would apply alike to the deposits of medium-sized banks and to those of the largest banks which are now reserve city banks and hence subject to higher requirements. While such a change might be very welcome from the viewpoint of the present reserve city banks, it would necessitate a much greater redistribution of required reserves than if there were introduced a graduated system with three categories as envisioned in the report of the President's Committee.

Finally, I should refer back to the early part of Mr. Adams' address where he speaks of "$50 billion of banking resources which are unnecessarily, unjustifiably frozen, unavailable for meeting the credit needs of business and consumer." This may sound as if another $50 billion of loans could be made if only these resources were unfrozen. I should point out that it does not seem reasonable to believe that bank loans could now be $50 billion higher without inflationary consequences. Some kind of restraint on credit expansion would be necessary. Hence, the idea that the actions suggested by Mr. Adams would enable would-be borrowers to get more credit seems, at least in large part, illusory.

Sincerely yours,

WM. McC. MARTIN, Jr.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON AT WILLIAM AND MARY COLLEGE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on yesterday the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, delivered the commencement address at historic William and Mary College. We who are privileged to serve in the Senate with Senator ROBERTSON know him as a profound student of history, a speaker of moving eloquence and a statesman outstanding in his services to Virginia and to our country. He is indeed worthy of the tremendous heritage which is his as Senator from the State which has given to our country Washington, Jefferson, George Mason, Patrick Henry, James Madison, and so many of her greatest and noblest sons. The address is so rich in historical information and so inspiring and challenging in its appeal to Americans to be true to our country and the fundamental principles upon which it was founded under God, that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNDAMENTAL VALUES

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at the commencement exercises of William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va., June 6, 1965)

Writing recently in a Paris newspaper, a distinguished French student of government, said: "We live in an era of crowding change. The tempo of history has never been more rapid, the shifting patterns formed by the kaleidoscope of events have never been more startling. Yet there are values that do not change—values which provide the points of reference, stars to help chart the course, for those in any country called upon to steer the ship of state." It is to commend those fundamental values to which the historic College of William and Mary made such a major contribution that I dedicate my remarks today.

Few Virginians who do not enjoy the honor and distinction of being an alumnus are more indebted than I to this great school. William and Mary graduates shaped both my public school and college training—E. C. Glass in the public schools of Lynchburg; J. Taylor Thompson in the high school of Rocky Mount, and Dr. J. A. C. Chandler of Richmond College.

I rejoiced, of course, when my friend and inspiring English teacher, Dr. Chandler, was made president of William and Mary and welcomed the opportunity of paying some of my indebtedness to him when, as a member of the Senate of Virginia, I vigorously supported his request for more adequate State funds for Virginia's oldest institution of learning. I rejoiced, too, in the splendid manner in which Dr. Chandler's son, Admiral Chandler, carried on his father's expansion program at William and Mary. Today, I have occasion to commend one of the Old Dominion's best educators, Dr. Paschall, on the manner in which he has developed a school rated as one of the four most popular coeducational schools in the Nation, to which 10 out-of-State students apply for admission to every one that can be accepted. Naturally, I hope that the next session of our general assembly can find the funds with which to meet the urgent expansion plans of William and Mary and all other State institutions because in the words of William and Mary's most distinguished alumnus—Thomas Jefferson—"any nation that expects to be both ignorant and free, expects what never has been and never will be."

Seventy-two years ago, a brilliant product of William and Mary, J. Allen Watts of Roanoke, spoke here on the 200th anniversary of the founding of William and Mary. Grover Cleveland was President and our country was in the midst of a rather painful depression. The Populist Party was demanding the debasement of our currency as a means of inflating farm income and stimulating employment. Others were advocating various types of socialistic schemes on the theory that our private enterprise system had failed.

Mr. Watts called attention to the number of leaders from William and Mary who contributed to the birth of this nation. In addition to Thomas Jefferson, they included two of the three Virginia members to the first Constitutional Convention in Annapolis; four of the seven to the Philadelphia convention in 1787, including Edmund Randolph; six of the first eight U.S. Senators, and three of the eight Virginia-born Presidents.

On that 200th anniversary Mr. Watts spoke of those priceless principles of political and economic freedom that were born of the brain and purchased with the blood of our Founding Fathers, in these words:

"The chief danger that menaces this country of ours is the danger that these principles may be forgotten, or may be cast aside as antiquated and of no value in these latter days. Hoping and believing as I do in the great destiny of this country, I feel that our safety depends upon our keeping before us for emulation the names and deeds of our colonial and revolutionary sires, whose lofty intellects, dauntless wills, and unquestionable love of true liberty—liberty regulated by law—enabled them to gain a foothold in this country, wrest it first from the savage and then from England, and found the first true republic the world has ever seen, and under whose care the common property, the common liberty, and the common future of all were to be protected."

Fortunately, we weathered the economic storm of 1893 and few except those of us who delight in studying Virginia history and political trends remember the warning issued then by Allen Watts. I repeat and emphasize that warning today because I am not too sure that our representative democracy as framed by Thomas Jefferson and other William and Mary trained men, will successfully survive the attacks currently being made upon it. It is threatened by physical force from abroad by the godless ideology of communism, and at home by those who are gradually destroying the 10th amendment described by Daniel Webster as "the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security and public prosperity."

The same thought was expressed by Judge Pine of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia at the Marshall-Wythe-Blackstone celebration here in September 1954, when he said: "They found a formula by which the hard-won freedom of the people and the sovereignty of the States could be preserved and at the same time a national government of sufficient strength to provide order and security and perform national functions could be created.

"In their plan of government, they took the totality of sovereign power residing in the people, a theory on which there was no disagreement and vested a portion of it in the United States, reserving the remainder to the States and the people, a distribution, but not an equal distribution, of sovereign power. They made the United States supreme in its national sphere, without detracting from the supremacy of the States within their respective State spheres, except for the imposition of several restraints deemed necessary in the national interest for the protection of individual or property rights—for example, the restraint upon the States against the passing of any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contract. They thereby formed a duality of sovereignty within the same orbit—a device, I believe, without exact historical precedent."

Under the form of government described here 70-odd years ago by Allen Watts, and again 11 years ago by Judge Pine, we have become, in the brief span of less than two centuries—a short period compared with the 900 years of the city-state of Athens—the richest and most powerful nation in the world. But, we are eroding the 10th amendment and undermining the stature and the very existence of the States. With a national budget of $100 billion, national spending of $147 billion, and an unlimited Federal control wherever any of that money is being spent, we are gradually destroying our private enterprise system—the most essential ingredient of our inherited government.

Historians who do not seek to put the past on trial, and demand that it justify itself, are agreed that the age which gave birth to our unique form of government produced a group of men better trained in the history and science of government than any similar group in recorded history. You students of history know, of course, the characteristics of great periods in man's search for personal freedom. There was, for instance, the physical preparedness program of Sparta and the training for war; there was a period when the city state of Athens was dedicated to the promotion of art and the period of Pericles when it was dedicated to the development of a pure democracy. The period that produced John Adams in Massachusetts, Benjamin Franklin in Pennsylvania, and Washington, Jefferson, and George Mason in Virginia, was dedicated to a study of the science of government. If I were in complete charge of all State institutions of higher learning, a requirement for a college degree would be a passing grade on Virginia's Declaration of Rights adopted in this historic city in June 1776, 3 weeks before our national Declaration of Independence. There were 128 members of that Convention of whom 21 were William and Mary-trained. While George Mason is entitled to full credit for the authorship of that immortal document, it was really the product of the thinking of that age and its fundamental principles had been virtually agreed upon by the historic meeting 2 years earlier in Fairfax County, which adopted the famous Fairfax Resolves.

Under that unique system of private enterprise within the framework of constitutional liberty, we have achieved both personal freedom and great prosperity.

As Senator TALMADGE, of Georgia, recently said, "With only 6 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of the world's land area, we are better paid, better housed, better fed, and better clothed than any people in the world. The hourly pay of our factory workers is three times that of the most prosperous nation in Europe—West Germany—and five times that of France. No nation has our means of instant communication, which includes entertainment, as well as news. With a turn of a dial, we can bring the world into our living rooms. For every 1,000 persons in the United States, there are 395 telephones, 900 radios, and almost 300 television sets. We have 3½ million miles in superhighways, roads, and streets, and enough passenger cars to accommodate our entire population in their front seats at one time."

At the end of World War II, we had such worldwide economic advantage, that we undertook the herculean problem of rehabilitating not only our allies in that war but our former enemies. To that end, we have loaned and given away much over $100 billion and the Congress is asked this year to continue that unprecedented foreign aid program, with an appropriation that is just slightly less than the entire expenses of our Government when I was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1932.

Unfortunately, our unprecedented prosperity has failed to bring us happiness or to produce by any proper definition a Great Society. In our mental institutions, there are more patients in proportion to population than in any nation in the world. In crimes of violence, in the proportion of wrecked homes and in suicides, we lead the nations of the world. Consequently we haven't induced a single ally to adopt our form of government. We have military commitments in many parts of the world and we have contributed to the armament and training of 100 divisions of foreign troops. Not only in the NATO alliance are we committed to defend freedom against the spread of communism in Europe, but we are committed to the same undertaking in every continent of the world, and at this time, especially in South America and in southeast Asia. Are we making that worldwide fight against an alien ideology that denies the existence of God and the teachings of the Bible for the protection and survival of the Christian religion, or are we making it for some materialistic motive? Are we pouring our funds from our Treasury, and perhaps planning to immolate upon the altar of war, thousands of our boys in the jungles of southeast Asia for the preservation of values that do not change, or are we actually supporting at home and abroad a government of men and not of laws—a government which is not dedicated to the Christian religion? Those familiar with the founding of William and Mary College know that its primary purpose was to train ministers in the new colony for the Church of England. They know that the secular students trained in that school framed resolutions in this historic city called Virginia's Declaration of Rights, which acknowledge God as our Creator who had endowed us, his children, with certain inalienable rights.

Some 100 years ago, Alexis de Tocqueville, the brilliant Frenchman whose scholarly analysis of our country is an enduring classic, said about the United States: "If I ask the first American I meet, at home or abroad, whether he considers religion to be of service to law and social order, he will answer unhesitatingly that civilized society, especially if it be free, cannot exist without religion. Respect for religion is, in [the American's] eyes, the best safeguard for political stability and private security * * *. Those [Americans] who know least about government know this much: * * * Infidel doctrines have never made any progress in the United States."

In keeping with that fundamental principle of our Government, we inscribed on our coins "In God We Trust." We included a reference to God in our national anthem and our Allegiance to the Flag, and we prescribed that those who took the oath of any public office should swear to support and uphold the Constitution "so help me God."

While, as I have said, we are now the most powerful Nation in the world, with more long-range missiles, more long-range bombers and the most formidable armada of warships, we would suffer heavily if by some mishap the present so-called brush war in South Vietnam should ultimately mushroom into a worldwide atomic war. In the event of such a war our casualties could easily amount to 35 million the first day. While undoubtedly we could emerge as the technical winner, it would be a pyrrhic victory, destroying civilization as we have known it and leaving mankind cowering behind a windbreak, or trembling in the disease-soaked ruins of a slum.

Therefore, one of the values that does not change is the fact mentioned in the Philadelphia Convention of 1787 by Benjamin Franklin when he said: "I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

We still need God as our ally but we cannot sincerely pray that He will protect us from the holocaust of another world war unless we exert our best efforts to correct the current trend in this Nation to materialism. We have ignored the advice of our great leader in World War I, Woodrow Wilson, who, deploring the spirit of selfishness and materialism which caused our Nation to turn down his plan for a world peace, based upon Christrian principles and unselfish international cooperation, said in the summer of 1923: "The sum of the whole matter is this: If our civilization is to survive materially, it must be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming imbued with the spirit of Christ and made free and happy by the practices that spring from that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and the shadows lifted from the road ahead."

The answer to that challenge that can be given by the members of this splendid graduating class was provided by a Jewish leader in Persia, nearly 500 years before the birth of Christ. His name was Mordecai, and his beautiful niece—Esther—was the favorite wife of a Persian King named Xerxes. Xerxes' best claim to fame is that he raised the largest army of ancient history to invade the small country of Greece and admitted defeat when his supply ships were destroyed by a much smaller number of Greek ships in the historic battle of Salamis. Xerxes, known for his despotism and cruelty, had decreed the destruction of all Jewish people in his Empire. Mordecai appealed to Esther to risk her life in order to save her people. Down through the ages of time that challenge may have been addressed to you: "Who knoweth whether thou art come to the Kingdom for such a time as this?" It is in the tradition of your great alma mater to furnish leaders when a crisis requires them.

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER LOOKS AT THE SCHOOLS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, during my campaign for election as a U.S. Senator, I was fortunate to become acquainted with Richard Schifter, of Montgomery County, an outstanding lawyer and a highly public-spirited citizen.

Mr. Schifter has been interested for many years in the quality of education in Maryland. He served with distinction in the Montgomery County Parent-Teachers' Association. Seven years ago he was appointed by Governor Tawes to the State board of education.

He has taken seriously his duties as a member of the State board, and has made many contributions to the improvement of our educational system. Recently, Mr. Schifter addressed the Montgomery County Elementary School Principals' Association on the problems of education in Maryland.

In his speech, Mr. Schifter addressed himself to three important problems that merit consideration, not only in Maryland, but also in every State or community that is concerned with the quality of education. Specifically, he discussed the role of laymen—both parents and public officials—in shaping educational policy, the need for new and increased standards of teacher certification and for improved curriculums.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Schifter's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER LOOKS AT THE SCHOOLS

(Speech delivered by Richard Schifter before the Montgomery County Elementary School Principals' Association, May 12, 1965)

As I started to prepare my speech for today, I became increasingly conscious of the fact that I must begin by justifying my right to speak to you on the subject of education. After all, normally, when educators meet, they might hear a message of greeting from a Governor, a mayor, or the president of the board of education; but when they get to the very purpose of their convocation, the business of education, they hear from fellow members of the profession.

My presence here today is explained by the fact that I am a member of the State board of education. Yet what right does that give me to speak to you on a subject which is your life's work? Has the Governor's letter of appointment invested me with some special knowledge which I did not possess theretofore? Besides, what is the State board of education, anyway?

It is this last question which made me reflect on what Madison Avenue would call our public image. I believe that to many members of the profession the State board of education was for years personified by Miss Rice, the dictator of certification. Recently the problems of certification have been transferred closer to home, so that instead of battling Miss Rice in Baltimore, a Montgomery County teacher has to enter the fray against Mr. Reymore in Rockville.

To the parents of Montgomery County the State board has been a mysterious agency of government which makes those rules for the schools which make no sense. Parents who complain about overlaps or duplications in the curriculum could be told: "Sorry, that's a requirement imposed by the State board of education."

There is one other claim to fame which our board possesses in Montgomery County: 2 years ago, when the county board voted to turn your fingerprints over to the county police for checking, our board simply told the county board: "Don't do it." This unexpected assertion of authority by that quiet, unassuming board in Baltimore evoked a reaction similar to that created by an overly permissive mother who suddenly lays down the law to her offspring. The county board replied: "We'll do it anyway." Lawsuits followed which ended in a decision by our court of appeals reiterating what really has been the law of our State for decades: the supremacy of the State board in the field of elementary and secondary education.

What the laws of our State provide is that the State board "shall determine the educational policies of the State." This statutory grant of power, our court of appeals has held, "confers a comprehensive visitational power upon the State board which is summary and exclusive." It means, the court has said, that county boards must act in accordance with instructions received from the State board.

It is my understanding that for a great many years the educational system of our State was indeed run from the State level. In the last 25 years, however, there has been a tendency to let the counties exert a great deal of autonomy. My own position has been that there is a golden middle way for a State board of education between autocratic control and abdication of responsibility: that of asserting leadership. I have been happy to note that this course has recently also been recommended by Dr. Conant and that title V of the new Federal Aid to Education Act is specifically designed to provide the funds needed to strengthen State departments of education.

Dr. Conant is, of course, an educator of renown, whose opinions on educational policy command attention. Federal aid money speaks even louder than the words of Dr. Conant. But what significance is there in a State board member taking a position in support of State educational leadership? This question brings us back to a problem I posed in the beginning: that of the role of the nonprofessional in the field of education.

At the time of my appointment, almost 6 years ago, this did not seem to be a problem at all. Following my designation, I had carefully read the public school law of Maryland. Secure in the knowledge that I was one of the chosen seven to whom the legislature had entrusted the job of determining the educational policies of the State, I was ready to start on the job of reforming the schools from the ground up.

With this feeling of mission and purpose, I presented myself to the State superintendent of schools. I still remember his first words to me. As I entered his office and introduced myself, he looked me over for a few seconds and then said: "You are younger that I thought you were." If this were not enough to deflate me, the subsequent conference certainly did. What I recall most vividly was the superintendent's statement that the State board meets four times annually and his emphatic assertion that no additional meetings were necessary.

It was shortly after that encounter that I read an article which suggested that in the view of some members of the profession it is the job of a school board "to hire and support a competent professional as superintendent, defend the schools against public criticism, and persuade the people to open their pocketbooks." In the years that followed I had many occasions to remember this article, for I did indeed encounter the attitude of some members of the profession that the best school board members are those that are seen but not heard from.

I want to emphasize the fact that only some members of the profession feel that way. Others do not. There is, therefore, most certainly an opportunity for a dialog to take place between the profession, on one hand, and not only school board members but interested citizens generally, on the other.

But why should such a dialog take place? I can suggest several reasons for it:

1. As our society increases in complexity, the role of government increases. I, for one, believe that we cannot turn back the clock, return to a simpler day and cut back the functions of government. By the same token I would not disregard the threat which centralized governmental control poses to the democratic fiber of our country. It is important for us, therefore, to use traditional means as well as new ways to establish grassroots control over governmental processes, to prevent bureaucratic machines from grinding away with total disregard of the popular will.

You, ladies, and gentlemen, are government. Whether you like it or not, you constitute the largest and most significant bureaucracy of our county, affecting the lives of a majority of the families living here. Even if everything you do is correct, it is still healthy to have your basic approaches and policies the subject of informed discussion with interested members of the public. Such discussion enables you to test and develop your own thoughts. It might also prevent you from going off the deep end, and thus provide the checks on government which must exist in any true democracy.

Keep in mind, in that connection, that you are not being singled out for special scrutiny. We are a democracy, not a technocracy. The recommendations of professionals in government, be they economists or engineers, atomic scientists or generals, are ultimately subjected to review by nonprofessionals, by laymen as we call them in the field of education. The suggestions of the professionals are indeed tested in the marketplace of ideas.

Does that mean that at times you will have to engage in arguments with people who are rightfully called crackpots? I am afraid it does. But that, ladies and gentlemen, is the price of democracy. As a matter of fact, you may want to ask yourself whether the lay public has a monopoly on crackpot ideas. There are a few such ideas, you know, that may have come from within the profession.

2. Beyond these rather theoretical considerations, there are also some practical ones. Thoughtful parents, I submit to you, can have an intelligent point of view on problems of education. They can match your extensive professional experience with a great number of children with their intensive personal experience with a small number of children. Their observations and yours could fruitfully supplement one another.

Let me emphasize that, as I see it, the problems which should thus be subject to public discussion are problems of policy, not problems of day-to-day school administration. I am not suggesting that you confer with the PTA before you arrange the lunch hour schedule. But when you are dealing with a question such as when and at what speed numbers concepts should be introduced into the elementary school curriculum, you will be able to have some useful discussions with parents. After all, by the time a child enters kindergarten he may, in our county, have had 1 or 2 years of parental instruction in numbers concepts behind him. A professional who has dealt extensively in the field of mathematics instruction might usefully compare notes with a group of parents, each of whom has had some intensive experience in the field—not with formal instruction, but with the simple process of teaching children how to count and getting other rudimentary mathematical concepts across to them.

If we agree, therefore, that there should indeed be a dialog between members of the profession and members of the general public, what are the points which should be brought up for discussion? Before answering this question, let me make some general observations about the state of public education in our country today.

All indicators point to the fact that we are now at a decisive turning point in the field of education. For the last quarter-century, far too small a proportion of our gross national product has been allocated to education, particularly if we consider the enormous increase in the number of schoolchildren. But there has been a change in circumstances in recent years. All of us who have had dealings with the Montgomery County school system have been aware of the significant increases in financial support at the county and State level over the last 7 years. Now we can expect an increase in Federal aid as well. From here on in, it would seem, the problem will be less one of getting the needed funds and more a matter of spending them wisely.

In this connection, I was particularly interested to note in last Sunday's newspaper the report of the latest Gallup poll on what the American public rates as major domestic problems. Choosing among 10 problems suggested as important national issues, the greatest number of persons questioned listed concern over improving public education as the issue to which they want to see the Government devote its attention. We, the boards of education and the members of the profession, must concern ourselves with the steps necessary to improve the quality of the educational services rendered by our public schools.

To discuss the quality of education, we must first take inventory. We must examine what we are doing and set ourselves appropriate goals for improvement. In examining what it is that we are doing now, we should be frank with ourselves and with the general public in recognizing present shortcomings. We are not serving the cause of good education by just patting ourselves on the back and by pointing to the improvements that have taken place in education in recent years. I remember listening to a speech by a prominent educator a few years ago and then asking a person in the audience to summarize what he said. The reply was: "Things are good and getting better."

There is no doubt that things have gotten better, but they never will be good enough. Our job is to identify the weaknesses in our schools and to take steps to eliminate them.

Let me try to be specific. Nothing that any school board, superintendent, or even a principal may recommend to improve the quality of our educational program will be of any value unless there are teachers who are able to carry out these recommendations. Our greatest concern must, therefore, be with the quality of our teachers. How competent are they? What steps are we taking to admit to the profession the persons qualified to teach and exclude from it those not qualified? Are our present certification requirements realistic measurements of qualification? Do they compel teachers to prepare themselves properly for their calling? Or are there better ways of teacher preparation than those suggested by the certification requirements?

I have heretofore made mention of Miss Rice and Mr. Reymore. As you know, they are not really the dictators of certification. Nor are they expounding immutable principles handed down from Mount Sinai. They are merely applying to individual cases the certification rules adopted by a group of mortals, the State board of education. If these rules do not serve their intended purpose, they ought to be changed.

As you may have read, I have, at recent State board meetings, raised questions about our present certification standards. Let me try to spell out what I have in mind.

First, at one end of the scale, I have expressed concern about our present State minimum requirements for permission to teach. As you well know, you do not really have to be fully certified in order to be allowed to teach. So-called substandard certificates are available to those who fail to qualify. The actual minimum requirement in our State is that the prospective teacher be a high school graduate. Not a single day of college preparation is required.

There is a county in our State in which more than 10 percent of all elementary school teachers have had less than 2 years of college preparation. Yet that very county has on two successive occasions used increases in State aid not to improve its salary scale but to reduce the local tax rate. It was the only county in the State to take such action. I suspect that there must be some causal relationship between those tax reductions and the clear lack of an adequate number of qualified teachers in that county.

My suggestion that we raise the minimum requirement to teach in the schools of the State to 2 years of college has been countered with the claim that if we took such action, some counties might be unable to staff all of their classrooms. My answer is that if we were to give adequate notice of a change in requirements, the counties in question would search harder for qualified teachers. If they really were unable to find the teachers, if they really had to close down some classrooms and send the children home, it wouldn't be for long. An aroused citizenry would see to it that the funds are provided to hire teachers who do meet the minimum requirements. If we believe that teaching is a profession, that teachers should be properly prepared, would it not be the fair, the honest thing to do to tell the parents: "Sorry, we don't have a sufficient number of teachers for our schools." Would that approach not be preferable to the practice of staffing the schools with teachers who have less than 2 years of college preparation and who under our own standards are totally unqualified, yet leaving the public in blissful ignorance of that fact?

The problem of substandard certificates is no longer of direct concern in Montgomery County. Let me, therefore, turn to a problem which is literally closer to home: that of full certification. Let me ask these questions: Are all the courses we require, both before and after certification, really necessary to prepare a teacher? By the same token, are there ways in which teachers could be better prepared than by being made to adhere to our present requirements?

When we talk about certification requirements, our thoughts turn immediately to the professional courses, the source of complaint for so many teachers and would-be teachers. As you know, we presently require of elementary schoolteachers 18 semester hours of education courses in addition to practice teaching. In view of the fact that no one really quarrels with the practice teaching requirement, our attention can appropriately focus on the courses in educational psychology, history of education, principles of elementary school education, etc.

The criticism which I have heard from a great many teachers over the years is that most of these courses lack significant content in themselves and that the usefulness of a course consequently becomes wholly dependent on the ability of the professor who conducts it. A good professor can make one of these courses come to life. One less well equipped can make a normally boring course a truly painful experience. Too high a percentage of courses, I am told, falls into the latter class.

Let me make clear what I am trying to say. I am not opposed to professional preparation. I do believe that teachers must learn how to teach. What I oppose are courses which are supposed to help train teachers but which actually do not fulfill that purpose.

Today a great many authorities, including Dr. Conant, share the view held by many teachers and interested members of the public that the schools of education are not doing the job we expect them to do. Yet—and this is an aspect of the problem which concerns me deeply—through our certification requirements we compel conscientious teachers to attend these institutions and go through so many courses that do not improve their ability to teach, but merely waste their time.

I am not prepared to offer any easy solutions to this problem. A great many suggestions have been made for the improvement of programs of teacher education. The so-called MAT programs have received high praise from some observers. Dr. Conant has offered an entirely new approach to certification; different States have experimented with differing systems. There is much activity in the field that we in Maryland's public schools could study with profit.

It has been my view that the problem of teacher preparation and certification is one of sufficient urgency to be singled out for study by a statewide committee appointed by the State board of education. Such a committee could examine the problem in detail, hear from teachers, principals, administrators, study both the traditional programs and the new departures. After having completed its study, such a committee could come up with its recommendations. I would hope that if, on the evidence assembled, the committee concludes that fundamental changes are needed in our requirements for teacher certification, it will not hesitate to say so.

In the meantime, I hope that our county school systems will not wait for the results of the study before coming up with specific recommendations of their own. As you may know, the State board rules authorize the State superintendent of schools to approve special pilot programs which would lead to full certification. There is, therefore, ample room for new ideas to be tried out in practice.

There is one approach, in particular, that could be tried in a county such as ours: that of teaching internships. At present, as we know, responsibility for teacher preparation is in the hands of the colleges of education with the program of practice teaching in local school systems serving as a mere adjunct to the college program. I would suggest that we try a pilot program under which we reverse the procedure. We could recruit a number of college graduates who have not taken any education courses to serve as teaching interns in the county. The program could be under the overall direction of a person serving on the county staff, with specific responsibility for day-to-day supervision being vested in principals at the elementary level and department heads at the secondary level. At the elementary level we could start the program in a few schools, the principals of which would be interested in such a program; assign, let us say, three or four interns to the school, and then let the principal fashion a program for these interns, working in cooperation with a few master teachers in the school and in consultation with the county's program director.

The program for interns would involve classroom observation, practice teaching, administrative experience, and evaluation conferences, all within the confines of the school, and participation in such courses at a nearby college as the principal deems necessary. The program should continue for 1 year, at the end of which the principal could either recommend or fail to recommend an intern for certification.

This, let me assure you, is no more than a personal suggestion which I would like to leave with you. It is most certainly not a program or a program recommendation of the State board of education.

I am sure you agree that once we have a good teacher, we want to place him in the best possible position for the utilization of his talents. Here again, school administration plays a significant role. And here, too, is a thought which I would like to submit for your consideration.

During the last few years, three of my children completed elementary school in Montgomery County, having spent all their school years in the county's public schools. I followed their school program as closely as I could, and came to certain conclusions on the basis of my observations. One such conclusion is that by the time one of our youngsters reaches sixth grade, we expect practically the impossible from the teachers whom we still place in the so-called self-contained classrooms.

For a teacher to keep the respect of her students she must, among other qualities, possess a fund of knowledge in the subjects she teaches. But how can we expect a sixth-grade teacher in Montgomery County to keep up with her class, impress the daughter of an Assistant Secretary of State with her knowledge in the field of social studies, and match wits in the field of science with the son of an atomic physicist? Whatever the situation may be elsewhere, in Montgomery County we do need departmentalization in the upper elementary grades. We simply cannot expect a teacher to perform adequately in mathematics, the sciences, English, and social studies when we reach the sixth-grade level. Something has to suffer—either the teacher or the program. Often it may be both.

There is one way in which we could possibly simplify the situation. It may also be a way of solving certain other problems about the organizational structure of our schools. We have for some years operated on a 6–3–3 basis. As you may know, in some areas of the country a shift to a 4–4–4 division of the school system has been proposed, having students attend elementary school for 4 years, then move on to junior high school for another 4 years, and finally to senior high school for 4 years. The approach which I would like to suggest for your consideration is a 5–3–4 system. Besides providing departmentalized instruction in the sixth grade, this approach might also provide for grouping children in keeping with their stages of development. A transfer from one school to the next at ages 11 and 14 seems to me to be more appropriate than transfers at the ages of 12 and 15. From a purely administrative point of view, it should also be possible to handle such a shift gradually. It would mean the slowing up of new construction of elementary schools and the faster expansion of senior high schools. Junior high schools would remain unaffected as far as their size is concerned.

I have thus touched on two major topics which I hope school administrators and other members of the profession will consider in the months and years to come. There are, as you are well aware, a great many other problems as well. I could mention the problems that I feel the elementary school curriculum poses. I could have used the opportunity to tell you of my firm conviction that our approach to foreign-language instruction needs drastic revision. I could have complained to you about our language-arts program, which makes the average educated American lag significantly behind the average educated Englishman in his mastery of the English language. I could also have spoken to you on the subject of year-round employment for those teachers who need a year-round salary. Perhaps there will be other opportunities for us to discuss such subjects.

The theme which I would like to leave with you is that we should not just be satisfied with the feeling that things are good and getting better. Let us, instead, work hard to identify the weaknesses in our schools; let us find ways of doing our work better; and let us then act to improve our schools. As President Johnson put it in his recent education message: "We are now embarked on another venture to put the American dream to work in meeting the new demands of a new day. Once again we must start where men who would improve their society have always known they must begin—with an educational system restudied, reinforced, and revitalized."

JAPANESE VIOLATION OF NORTH PACIFIC FISHERIES CONVENTION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, there was reported over the weekend the first confirmed Japanese violation of the 1953 North Pacific Fisheries Convention. Senator Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, and I have discussed this matter fully and there is absolute agreement that speedy, firm action by the U.S. Government is required.

The U.S. treaty with Japan and Canada provides that the Japanese will not take salmon or halibut east of 175° west longitude, which is referred to as the provisional abstention line. During the 12 years in which the treaty has been in effect there have been no previous reported violations of the convention by Japanese vessels taking salmon or halibut on our side, that is, east of the abstention line. This record was not only broken by reports over the weekend, but was dramatically and massively smashed with a series of reports involving a total of 19 Japanese fishing vessel sightings during the past several days in violation of Japanese treaty obligations. The sightings were made by Coast Guard and Navy patrol planes. The vessels were sighted illegally fishing up to 90 miles across the abstention line. One vessel was seized by the U.S. Coast Guard and later attempted to leave the scene of violations. This vessel at last report was being escorted to Adak, Alaska, for return to appropriate Japanese authorities under the terms of the international convention.

All the facts and details on this serious and unfortunate occurrence are not in. I believe, however, that when the full story is known, there will be revealed a sad chapter in the history of Japanese-American relations in the fisheries field. For many years we have diligently attempted to make international arrangements by which our interest and Japan's interest would be fully protected. Many of us hoped that this was accomplished by joining with Japan and Canada in negotiating and finally ratifying the North Pacific Fisheries Convention in 1953. However, our experience under the convention has left much to be desired. During these years Japan has, for the first time in history, taken substantial quantities of salmon of North American origin, principally the red salmon which spawn in rivers feeding into Bristol Bay. This activity has continued, although it is a clear violation of the intent and purpose of the convention.

The provisional abstention line was set at 175° west longitude as a temporary line marking that area in which no salmon of North American origin migrated. In recent years American scientists and Japanese scientists have agreed that Bristol Bay salmon do migrate beyond the provisional line, yet Japan has steadfastly refused to agree to adjust the location of the line. As a result Japan has taken large quantities of North American salmon and has taken them on the high seas in a manner that makes the conservation of salmon by the State of Alaska virtually impossible. American fishermen are not permitted to fish with nets on the high seas because of the waste involved in taking immature fish, the damage to the fish caught or lost, and the inability to determine any proper escapement of salmon for individual spawning streams.

Japan's catch of salmon on the high seas has been severely, and in my opinion very properly, criticized by all who are familiar with the problem. This past week Japan openly, and flagrantly, and grossly violated her own international commitments by permitting large mother ships to operate close to the abstention line and thereby encouraging large numbers of Japanese catcher vessels to engage in the salmon fishery on our side of the line. Only a very severe and direct reproach will be adequate to express the feelings of our fishermen and others interested in the conservation of this important fishery resource. In my opinion, we will for many generations look back on this dark episode and wonder if Japan can be expected to comply with any future international commitments on the conservation of fishery resources on the high seas.

BIG BROTHER: ANTIBUG

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently considerable attention has been given to a new device, labeled "Antibug," an electronic jamming instrument.

I have some most interesting correspondence from the manufacturer of Antibug, indicating that electronic snooping, far from being an American phenomenon, is an international problem of very large proportions.

The manufacturer also enclosed a sheet of details for antisnooping which is most interesting.

I ask unanimous consent to have this material printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dectron Industries, Inc.,
May 20, 1965.

Mr. Bernard Fensterwald, Jr.,
Chief Counsel, U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Fensterwald: With reference to your letter dated May 3, 1965 concerning Newsweek, April 26, 1965, coverage of our new product line, "Antibug," this office is very interested in cooperating with your committee. I enclose literature covering our Antibug model Mark I. I enclose also, for your convenience, copies of sources of supply for "bugging equipment" as well as other information and background material.

In addition to Antibug model Mark I, Antibug models III and IV have been designed and developed upon the demand of national heads of industry, Government officials and business leaders. Models Mark III and Mark IV are smartly tailored desk equipment which will protect an entire building area or in some cases a complete building. Using the Mark I or II together with Mark III or IV businessmen are assured of the opportunity to talk openly and freely within the offices or conference rooms, and the personalized portable models, Mark I and II extend this coverage during outside discussions.

Public response to the recent introduction of "Antibug," Mark I, by several international magazine articles featuring "bugging," newspapers, worldwide television, together with Dectron's own research program has definitely shown that people throughout the world, at all levels, are keenly aware of this common security problem. For your personal interest, Mr. Hugh W. Jamieson, one of the original partners of Litton Industries, Beverly Hills, Calif., is currently chairman of the board of directors in this firm. Mr. Jamieson has been involved in a $28 million law suit, the decision of which is still pending, and much of the background of this case involves "bugging and listening devices." Mr. Jamieson's problem with this private invasion was one of the pertinent inspirations for the application of Dectron R. & D. discoveries into the creation of the "Antibug." I understand from several prominent magazine and newspaper sources requesting assistance from this firm, that feature articles of international scope will be forthcoming on this subject, and that continued worldwide publicity regarding this issue of bugging may be anticipated.

As you are probably aware, the Newsweek article referred to above, was read into the recent FDA testimony before the Judiciary Committee. I shall be delighted to assist you and your future endeavors with required information or other requests.

Thank you most kindly for your interest in this firm and our product line.

Sincerely yours,
E. S. Moorhead,
Director of Marketing and Research.

Dectron Industries, Inc.

If you don't like snoopers around your house or office, here's what you can do:

1. Rent or borrow a small mine detector. These are readily available from supply houses that serve the building industry. They are also used by experts who call themselves "anti-intrusion specialists." A mine detector will change the pitch of its sound when passed near a wired mike.

2. Buy a small used neon sign and turn it on near your phone when you talk. A snooper will hear nothing but the loud buzzing radiated by the sign's transformer. This works only with an induction coil, not with a wired tap.

3. To detect a wireless mike, you can use a special FM set tuned to 74 megacycles. A squeal is your tipoff. Leave the set on to jam the FM channel.

4. Talk quietly and turn on a nearby radio set—fairly loud, to balk wireless mikes. Today's snooper devices can eliminate certain interfering tones, but these tricks still work. So does the business of letting water run in a shower.

5. Call the phone company if you see a suspicious man working on a pole or near your wires. If a repairman comes to your door, check with the phone company before admitting him. (Credentials are easily faked.)

6. Check with the phone company if you hear your phone ring and a voice say, "just checking."

7. Notify your phone company, the FBI, the FCC, or any other law enforcement agencies if you hear persistent "funny sounds." These sometimes occur in stormy weather, but shouldn't persist. A good telephone line is silent. Strange scratchings, an echo, or odd delays are a tipoff of a tap.

So are faint voices. These used to be caused by induction from other wires. But today's lines are better. Such sounds are sometimes caused by an imbalance in the circuit, due to unskilled wiretapping.

8. If you're a top-secret man, you can buy a portable telephone conversation scrambler for about $275 a set. It's held against the phone and changes your voice into unintelligible sounds that can only be unscrambled by a matching device.

THE DOMINICAN INTERVENTION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the men best qualified to speak on American relations with Latin America is Dr. John Plank, a former foreign service officer and professor of Latin American affairs at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. Dr. Plank is now a member of the staff of the highly regarded Brookings Institution. He is one of our most astute and knowledgeable experts on Latin American affairs.

Writing in the June 6 issue of the New York Times magazine, Dr. Plank asserts:

> Honest dialog between the two Americas and true inter-American cooperation, never frequent or easy, have been made much more difficult by our Dominican intervention.

Dr. Plank sees the U.S. intervention in the Dominican struggle as an unfortunate result of "an overemphasis on cold war criteria." He warns that "the ferment of change in Latin America today should not be evaluated in cold war terms." As he puts it:

> If, for instance, the Alliance for Progress comes widely to be believed in Latin America to be nothing more than a weapon in our cold war arsenal, the Alliance for Progress will die.

Mr. President, I believe that President Johnson is striving mightily to correct what may very well have been a mistaken unilateral intervention on our part in the Dominican crisis. To avoid further questionable actions of this kind, I do hope that our policy planners will ponder carefully the article by Dr. Plank which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR GOOD NEIGHBORS SHOULD COME FIRST

(By John Plank)

We cannot yet reckon fully the costs to us of sudden, unilateral military intervention in the affairs of the Dominican Republic. We are obliged, however, on the basis of what we do know to look again at the Latin American policy of the United States. What are its principles, its premises and assumptions, its goals and priorities?

Such questions need urgently to be considered. Our Government's Dominican actions have caused concern among responsible citizens throughout the hemisphere, many of whom think they see in those actions signs of a partial return to a policy believed to have been superseded years ago. That policy was characterized by a thinly veiled contempt for the Latin Americans, self-arrogation to the United States of responsibility for determining the hemisphere's destinies, and a too-ready disposition to rely on our Armed Forces in defense of our hemispheric interests. A cloud of suspicion and doubt, confusion and bewilderment, now hangs over the region. Honest dialog between the two Americas and true inter-American cooperation, never frequent or easy, have been made much more difficult by our Dominican intervention.

The possibility of a tragic miscalculation of the Dominican kind—a miscalculation evidently traceable to faulty reporting from our embassy personnel and others in Santo Domingo—has been a real and present danger for more than a decade, ever since the onset of the cold war in Latin America.

Since the 1950's our Latin American policy has been marked by an awkward if unavoidable dualism. One strand of policy has run from the era of the "good neighbor" and the traditions, myths, customs and institutions of the inter-American system. To the extent that this strand has informed policy decisions, the states of Latin America have been regarded as standing in a special familial relation to us. They, while weaker than we and much less successful, are entitled to our full respect. Their integrity, independence, and sovereign equality with us are, at almost all costs, to be safeguarded, not only against threats and incursions from outside the hemisphere but also against untoward manifestations of our own vast power. Every appropriate effort is to be made to help our Latin American neighbors translate their juridical equality with us into effective equality in respects—political, economic, and social.

The other strand of policy, which is not really compatible with the former one, derives from our conception of Latin America as an active theater in the cold war, one of the battlegrounds on which we engage those whom we have identified as our mortal enemies, the Communists. In Latin America, as in Asia, Africa, and Europe, our national survival is seen ultimately to be at stake.

Those in our Government who are charged with responsibility for our Latin American policy find themselves in an extraordinarily difficult situation. In effect, they are required to approach Latin America with split vision, and the Latin America that appears under the good-neighbor perspective is not the Latin America that appears under the cold-war perspective.

The consequences of this duality of approach are manifested in all aspects of our official dealings with Latin America: political, military, economic, social, even cultural. No decision respecting Latin America is taken without some weighing of good-neighbor considerations against cold-war ones. Because of the different natures of the policy criteria, ambiguity in our Latin American policy decisions is inevitable.

Is a leading Latin American intellectual to be invited to the United States and encouraged to meet with North Americans, or is he to be denied a visa because of his failure to pass a stringent political test administered by a cautious consular officer? Is military assistance to a despotic regime to be curtailed because it is known that the regime maintains itself in power only through the use or threat of force; or is such assistance to be continued because the despot and his armed henchmen have been ferocious, if frequently overzealous and unsophisticated, battlers against the Communists? Is economic aid to be given to a country because of the country's desire to develop and our recognition of the crying needs of its people; or is it to be withheld because of doubts about the depths of commitment of the country's political leaders to our side in the cold war?

Although both kinds of criteria continue to be employed, it seems evident that during recent times cold-war considerations have weighed ever more heavily in the scales of judgment. That this should be the case is understandable. The cold war completely overshadows all other concerns in our global foreign policy. Moreover, the cold war in this hemisphere is becoming more intense and has, since 1959 and Castro's appearance, taken on increasingly a paramilitary cast.

Also, it is not surprising that our overworked officials, burdened with heavy responsibilities and harried by the press and Congress, should want to simplify their decisionmaking process by greater and greater subordination of good-neighbor factors to cold-war ones. They can accomplish this subordination by assuming that good-neighbor policy and cold-war policy are strictly congruent. As time passes they will come to believe that. Some of them undoubtedly already do so.

We shall pay much for such subordination, however, and we should consider carefully whether it is worth its cost. Our Dominican disaster, for example, and its unfortunate hemispheric repercussions, are largely accountable to an overemphasis on cold-war criteria, almost to the exclusion of criteria of other sorts. If our interest in a given country is focused heavily on the question of Communist capabilities and prospects, if a disproportionate number of questions put by Washington to our missions in the field, whether bearing on matters political, economic, social, or military, are to be answered with the Communist/non-Communist dichotomy at the forefront of attention, then our understanding of that country is going to be seriously biased. The ferment of change in Latin America today should not be evaluated in cold-war terms.

There is another, more serious consequence of weighting cold-war factors too heavily in devising Latin American policy. It is that we shall alienate increasing numbers of Latin Americans and shall forfeit much of our small capital of trust and confidence so painfully and haltingly acquired during the past 30 years.

If, for instance, the Alliance for Progress comes widely to be believed in Latin America to be nothing more than a weapon in our cold-war arsenal, the Alliance for Progress will die. The formal machinery of the Alliance will persist, of course, but the business transacted under its aegis will be disguished blackmail operations on the Latin American side and disguised bribery or payoff on our own. The spirit, the mystique, the challenge of the Alliance will disappear—and with them our best hope for building an effective inter-American community.

What must be stressed is that the Latin Americans think of themselves as people, not as objects at stake in a global conflict. They think of their states as societies in search of individual national identities and destinies, not as pieces of inhabited territory to be allocated to one side or the other in the cold war. Under the good-neighbor perspective, these aspects of the Latin American reality are recognized; under the cold-war perspective they are not, except derivatively and expedientially.

We must not allow the cold war to elide or absorb the good neighbor. The latter antedates the former and, is a more comprehensive and profound expression of our best long-range interests. In striking the balance between the demands imposed by the one and those imposed by the other, knowledge counts for more than doctrine, understanding for more than fervor, judgment for more than determination, and prudence for more than might.

It is tempting to speculate on how different might have been the course of our relations with Latin America had we chosen in 1945 to announce our willingness to give positive content to the good-neighbor policy through a program analogous to the Alliance for Progress. Had we done so, and had we moved with energy and good will to implement the program, the impact of the cold war upon the hemisphere and upon our Latin American policy would have been very different. For we should have initiated our program at a time of exceptional inter-American harmony and we might well have captured the momentum of inter-American cooperation acquired during the Second World War.

Moreover, we would have had a crucial margin of time, several years, in which to help Latin America prepare itself for the revolution of expectations and to establish firmly our identification with the forces of constructive, responsible, democratic reform.

This speculation is useful only because it serves to point up how very different was the policy we actually followed, which was until recently one of comparative neglect of the region. Although alert to the more obvious cold-war threats in the hemisphere (we moved expeditiously to prevent a Communist takeover of Guatemala in 1954), and although not unsympathetic to the restless strivings of most people in the area for fundamental changes in their own status and in the traditionally sanctioned order of their societies, we devoted little time and few resources to Latin America.

On the basis of periodic reassurances to ourselves that there existed in the region "an immense reservoir of good will" toward the United States we relegated Latin America to the lowest priority among the major areas of the world. Busy confronting the Communists elsewhere, busy building new alliances and bolstering old ones, we regarded Latin America as something of a nuisance. What we wanted in the hemisphere above all else was quiet. We did not want our attention diverted from our other more important tasks.

The decade 1948–58 was a crucial one for Latin America. The region's great masses, urban and rural, bestirred themselves and began to make demands—political, economic, and social—that they had not made earlier and that the established order simply could not meet. The intellectuals, the professionals, the students, toyed with alternative modes of political and social organization. Nationalism, often strident and xenophobic, came increasingly to serve the purposes of Latin American demagogs.

Democratic regimes were sorely tried; the more fragile of them collapsed into dictatorships. The possibility of mass violence became ever more real. It is symbolic that the decade began in the year of the devastating Bogotá riots and ended in the year that Vice President Nixon was attacked in Lima and Caracas. Fidel Castro is reported to have been in Bogotá in 1948; we know where he was in 1958.

Where was the United States? Was it energetically, wholeheartedly, and constructively helping the Latin Americans to solve their economic and social problems? Was it identified in the minds of Latin America's young people with the forces of responsible but major change? Did the United States, through its actions in that decade, give those young people reason automatically to cast their lot with it in the global struggle against communism? The questions are rhetorical.

Young people do not stay young; a person 20 years old in 1948 was 30 in 1958; he is 37 today. The United States, through negligence rather than design, nearly forfeited a generation of Latin Americans.

That it did not altogether forfeit them is due to the tardy recognition by the Eisenhower administration that the immense reservoir of good will was rapidly drying up. More important, it is due to the sensitivity and vision of President Kennedy, who captured the imagination of Latin Americans as no other U.S. President except Lincoln has done and who, through his announcement of the Alliance for Progress, put the United States squarely on the side of profound reform in Latin America.

President Kennedy's Latin American policy combined as deftly as two such incongruent elements can be combined, the good neighbor and the cold war. Both weighed heavily in all his Latin American decisions. Some among us criticize him for the inconclusiveness of his actions against Castro, but the President was not to be pushed into behavior that would jeopardize, perhaps destroy, the developing climate of inter-American trust and cooperation. When the introduction of missiles directly threatened our vital national interests, he moved forcefully, but that threat absent, he acted with masterful restraint.

Some Latin Americans criticized him for making assistance under the Alliance for Progress contingent upon the carrying out of difficult reforms; but the President, relating the Alliance for Progress to the cold war, judged that only by undergoing profound and painful changes could the societies of Latin America acquire the inner coherence, the national consensus, that would make possible their withstanding, over the long term, Communist subversion and aggression.

There was, of course, a personal dimension of President Kennedy's Latin American behavior that transcended policy matters as such, one that must be taken into account in assessing his performance. He conveyed to the Latin Americans, as his predecessors had not done, that he understood and sympathized with them, that their problems were his problems. Responsible democratic and reformist Latin Americans felt that in President Kennedy they had a champion.

President Johnson inherited President Kennedy's Latin American problems and program. What he did not and could not inherit was the special trust and confidence invested in President Kennedy by the Latin Americans. That trust and confidence President Johnson will have to earn himself.

It must be said that he has not yet earned it, and that this Government's reaction to the outbreak of major disorders in the Dominican Republic has done little to reassure those to the south.

Today Latin America is in crisis. Only in Mexico and Chile, and to a lesser extent in Costa Rica, is there real institutional stability, and the future of at least two of those countries is perhaps less certain than present appearances would indicate.

The causes of the crisis are well know: the revolution of expectations, expanding populations pressing on limited resources; immense population shifts from rural squalor to urban poverty and congestion; invidious class distinctions; serious unemployment, and worrisome inflation; inequitable patterns of tax and income distribution; unresponsive and ineffective governments; lack of skilled and responsible political leadership and of adequate institutions for effective popular political participation.

This list is far from exhaustive. But are there not enough items on it to account for massive unrest in Latin America? The turbulence we have seen in the region in the past is likely to pale before the turbulence we shall see during the months and years ahead.

In the absence of out-and-out occupation by our Armed Forces, we cannot exert other than marginal and indirect control over developments in the states of Latin America. With that in mind, what should our policy be as we confront the troubled situation below our borders? In the eyes of the world we are at a clear policy crossroads today, and the world is awaiting our next major decision to see which route we have chosen. The options available to us can be reduced to two.

First, we can conclude, as evidently we did in taking our Dominican actions, that the cold war risks in this hemisphere have become so great, the capability of Communist elements to take advantage of situations so advanced, and the inability of other Latin American elements to deal with the internal problems of their societies so manifest, that the United States must reexamine its whole relationship to the inter-American system and to the good-neighbor policy that system reflects.

More specifically, we can conclude that the United States must take to itself the right not only unilaterally to determine the existence and nature of Communist threats of takeover of Latin American societies, but also to act unilaterally or preemptively if in our judgment such action is called for to repel those threats. The principles of self-determination, nonintervention and multilateral decisionmaking regrettably may have to take second place from time to time to the exigencies of the cold war. Those principles, of course, will remain operative, but only within limits established by ourselves.

The second option depends upon a sharply different assessment. By this assessment, the conflict between progressive and traditional interests is the dominant problem in Latin America today, and our cold war engagement with the Communists in the hemisphere is refracted through this prism in the eyes of most politically engaged Latin Americans. They do not, and they will not, see the cold war as we do. Most Latin American societies are in the incipient stages of profound national transformation with attendant disorder and the likelihood of violence (after all, the mold of custom is being broken). But very few Latin Americans participating in the social and political processes now underway foresee—or want to foresee—at the end of their national revolutions a substitution of their former relationship with the United States by a suffocating identification with the Communist world.

What they want is independence, identity, integrity, national dignity, things of which they feel their histories have until now deprived them. What they want is to move into the modern world, but to do so on their own, not on the leading strings of either the United States or the Communist powers. They want to be free to make their own mistakes, to decide their own destinies. They do not want to be Communists nor to see their societies taken over by the Communists; but they take it ill that the United States should presume to tell them what they can and cannot want.

The policy course that one derives from this assessment calls for sensitive understanding of the aspirations that motivate most demands for change in today's Latin America. It calls for a recognition that to equate anti-Americanism with procommunism is much too simple, and that much activity that we regard as being undertaken against our interest is not sparked by the Communists nor being carried out for the purpose of moving the region into the Communist camp.

It also calls for the utmost restraint and the most scrupulous caution on our part in the use of our coercive power. It calls for a show of confidence in the Latin Americans, a willingness to stand in the background and to let them largely on their own complete their perilous passage to modernity. It calls for a substantial elevation in the status assigned to good-neighbor considerations in the formulation of our decisions, a further development of the Latin American policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy, and the evaluation of cold-war threats under the assumptions of good-neighbor premises rather than the reverse.

The risks involved in this second policy are real. We cannot forget our bitter Cuban experience. But we do the Latin Americans small credit by assuming that the lessons or Cuba have been altogether lost upon them. Moreover, we must weigh these risks against the certain consequences of following the first policy. Those consequences include the evisceration of the inter-American system, a sharp reversal in our progress toward inter-American community, the welling up of great resentment toward the United States on the part of most Latin Americans, and a corresponding increase in the appeal of Communist propaganda and agitation.

Further, if we follow this policy, we shall probably have to set up proxy or client regimes in troubled parts of the hemisphere more and more frequently, in violation of legitimate nationalist aspirations, and to commit our own Armed Forces, with the deplorable effects such commitment entails. Neither our own long-term interests nor those of the Latin Americans will be well served if we follow this course.

On the other hand, if we reassign primacy to the philosophy of the good neighbor in our hemispheric dealings, we shall probably see intensified and evermore fruitful efforts by responsible Latin American leaders to work together and with us, across national frontiers, to resolve pressing Latin American problems. Knowing that we will protect them against external threats and will help them upon request to cope with domestic violence and subversion, they will move with greater assurance and optimism to meet the demands of their societies. Knowing that our attitude toward them is benign and constructive, they will assert their independence from us in various ways, experimenting with their freedom. They will increasingly act without us; they will not be acting against us. Over the longer term they will surmount their ingrained fear of us, their nagging sense of inferiority in dealing with us, and will assume their proper roles as self-confident, responsible members of a hemispheric community of which we too will be a part. Surely that is the outcome we want to see. Surely the running of some short-term risks is not too high a price to pay for its attainment.

DEMONSTRATIONS ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, during the past several months, we have read articles in the press concerning demonstrations on college campuses across the Nation in opposition to the President's policy in Vietnam as well as teach-ins on the part of the intellectual community.

A refreshing change is the responsible action taken by the student council of the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque, in adopting a resolution in support of the administration's actions. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Whereas the foreign policy of the United States is of vital concern to the students of the University of New Mexico; and
>
> Whereas the present situation in Vietnam is of great significance to the students of the University of New Mexico as members of the world community: Be it
>
> *Resolved by the Student Council of the University of New Mexico,* That the student council of the University of New Mexico pledges its support to the actions being taken by President Johnson in Vietnam.
>
> JIM BRANCH, Jr.,
> *Student Body President.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WE CANNOT WIN COLD WARS WITHOUT REALLY TRYING

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in early March I began a series of statements to the Senate to demonstrate from the periodical press the need for establishment of an institution similar to the proposed Freedom Academy, a new agency in the American Government to conduct intensive research in the art of unconventional or nonmilitary warfare and to provide extensive related training to three broad categories of persons. One category of trainees would be American Government personnel whose work concerns international relations. The second category would be citizens of foreign countries who need training for defense to help protect their own countries' national sovereignties against this new and highly successful type of aggression. American citizens employed abroad outside the Government would compose the third category. These are persons who could contribute considerably to the stability of host societies if properly trained and if properly utilized.

Each house of Congress has had before it more than 5 years bills which propose similar action. In 1960 the Senate approved such a bill, accepting the favorable report of the Committee on the Judiciary, ordered printed on June 30, 1960, which observed in part:

> The committee considers this bill to be one of the most important ever introduced in the Congress. This is the first measure to recognize that a concentrated development and training program must precede a significant improvement in our cold war capabilities. The various agencies and bureaus can be shuffled and reshuffled. Advisory committees, interdepartmental committees, and coordinating agencies can be created and recreated, but until they are staffed by highly motivated personnel who have been systematically and intensively trained in the vast and complex field of total political warfare, we can expect little improvement in our situation.
>
> This one lone Freedom Academy * * * can lay the foundation for a major breakthrough. Properly staffed and funded, it will stand as a symbol of our determination to win the cold war. It will give courage to our friends and dismay our enemies. It is a practical, fundamental approach to our national survival. The committee recommends the enactment of the Freedom Commission bill at the earliest possible time.

But the House of Representatives failed to act in 1960. The bill, although subsequently introduced and subjected to several hearings, has not been moved since.

Five years ago the Vietnamese war was just beginning. We were just recognizing the Cuban revolution as Communists. We have allowed 5 valuable years of time to elapse without significant effort to improve defense of the non-Communist world against nonmilitary aggression.

On March 4—pages 4164–4165 of the RECORD—I discussed my intentions for this series of statements to the Senate.

To the many observers who support the Freedom Academy concept, this attitude that we are not so successful as we might be has required no argumentative support; and, naively perhaps, we have thought we needed no considerable evidential support in contending that our side of the world is not prepared to fight in the specific arena where the battle between Communist aggressors and their victims is being fought.

This is the area of nonmilitary or guerrilla warefare. I noted our past experience in guerrilla warfare, citing the increasing sophistication characterizing these tactics since we ourselves have adopted more conventional techniques.

Its political side is far more thorough now. Psychological warfare is mounted against a people by their enemies from within to soften their resistance to the more tangible guerrilla or quasi-military operation conducted in conjunction with it at the later stages of attack.

And we seem to stand by, wringing our hands, wondering what is going on as we see the will to resist among an ally's people wafting away like so much smoke.

On March 11—pages 4482–4484 of the RECORD—I utilized newspaper dispatches to demonstrate the use of such methods by Communist aggressors to take control of the Congo Republic.

Then on March 18—pages 5436–5440 of the RECORD—I discussed the critical deficiency in the non-Communist world in simple understanding of the techniques of nonmilitary warfare. The subject has been intensely studied by Communist leaders for more than a generation. They have developed a new academic discipline about which we know remarkably little.

On April 1—pages 6613–6617—my topic, along with further current demonstrative news dispatches, was an evaluation by Hanson Baldwin of overall U.S.

strategy in the present international climate.

On April 13—pages 7865–7869 of the Record—my subject was a series of Communist takeovers and near takeovers in Africa.

The subject on April 28—pages 8806–8813 of the Record—was the threatening development of aggressive campaigns in Latin America.

And, most recently, on May 14—10542–10549 of the Record—I reviewed the development of the Freedom Academy proposal and tried further to demonstrate the validity of the idea to the present context of Latin American developments.

The bill, S. 1231, is sponsored by a diverse group of Senators. They are a bipartisan group, and their philosophical views range widely from liberal to conservative. But they agree on this proposal as a promising means to bolster our defenses and our allies' defenses against a new kind of aggressive warfare for which we have not sufficiently prepared ourselves. Besides myself, sponsors of the bill are Senators Case, Dodd, Douglas, Fong, Hickenlooper, Lausche, Miller, Prouty, Proxmire, Scott, Smathers, Murphy, and Fannin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Today I should like to discuss one of the areas of incipient development of a new nonmilitary aggressive campaign. In this campaign, targeted at Thailand, we have actually been formally notified by the aggressor, Communist China, that their campaign is begun. This seems to be the declaration of war in this new kind of aggressive warfare.

The Washington Post of January 31, 1965, printed a dispatch by Keyes Beech of the Chicago Daily News Service in which appeared one of the earliest accounts of the declaration of war against Thailand. Beech filed his story from Bangkok:

> Thailand may soon face guerrilla war.
>
> All the evidence points to one conclusion: Red China has marked the Western-alined nation as next in its list of victims in the struggle for control of southeast Asia.
>
> What appears to be emerging is a typical preinsurgency pattern that in many ways bears a startling resemblance to developments leading up to "liberate" South Vietnam 5 years ago.
>
> Peiping's formal declaration of war on Thailand came November 1 with publication of a "manifesto" by the Thailand Independence Movement. The manifesto was quite explicit. The movement's first objective is to "drive the U.S. imperialist aggressor out of Thailand."
>
> Next it aims to overthrow the traitorous and dictatorial pro-United States government * * * and replace it with parties and individuals who are faithful to the policy of neutrality and peace.

So we can regret more profoundly, Mr. President, that we have not devoted ourselves over the past 5 years to intense training of Thai citizens who might now be better prepared to understand the nature of the aggression they face and how best to defend against it. Beech continues:

> The sudden birth of the Thailand Independence Movement went virtually unnoticed here. But so, at the time, did the National Liberation Front in Vietnam when its birth was proclaimed by Hanoi in 1960.

The aggressors seem already to have taken up position for their campaign. On December 11:

> A Thai border patrol * * * found, abandoned less than 48 hours before * * * a secret encampment that housed between 250 and 300 men. In addition to barracks for that many men, the camp had recreation facilities, a firing range, watchtowers, and 50 revetments. Bamboo traps were also found, as were bags full of documents that gave clear evidence that the camp had radio communications with the Chinese mainland.
>
> Indications are that the subversion has gone farther than supposed in Bangkok. The developing pattern is one of assassination of minor local officials including police, intimidation of schools, churches, and general erosion of government authority.
>
> Red pockets have multiplied like measles. Entire villages are wholly or in part under Communist control.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Keyes Beech dispatch, "Guerrilla War Threat Grows in Thailand," taken from the Washington Post of January 31, 1965, appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 31, 1965]

Guerrilla War Threat Grows in Thailand

(By Keyes Beech)

Bangkok.—Thailand, a military-run country teetering on the brink of democracy, may soon face an external threat graver than its internal political problems—guerrilla war.

All the evidence points to one conclusion: Red China has marked the Western alined nation as next in the list of victims in the struggle for control of southeast Asia. And Indonesia appears to be aiding Peiping.

"We may have a guerrilla war going in Thailand before the year is out," Chinese Foreign Minister Chen Yi reportedly said to a visiting diplomat in Peiping recently, as if he were commenting on what a nice day it was.

He may be right, for what appears to be emerging is a typical pre-insurgency pattern that in many ways bears a startling resemblance to developments leading up to the Communist drive to "liberate" South Vietnam 5 years ago.

Peiping's formal declaration of war on Thailand came November 1 with publication of a "manifesto" by the Thailand Independence Movement. The manifesto was quite explicit. The movement's first objective is to "drive the U.S. imperialist aggressor out of Thailand."

Next it aims to overthrow the "traitorous and dictatorial" pro-United States government of Premier Thahom Kittikachorn and replace it with "parties and individuals who are faithful to the policy of neutrality and peace."

The sudden birth of the Thailand Independence Movement went virtually unnoticed here. But so, at the time, did the National Liberation Front in Vietnam when its birth was proclaimed by Hanoi in 1960.

In Buddhist Thailand one area of domestic discontent is the four southern provinces whose 600,000 inhabitants are mainly Moslem and therefore feel closer to Moslem Malaysia and Indonesia than Thailand. Intelligence agencies have established a definite link between political agitation in the four provinces and the Indonesia Government. In this endeavor the Indonesia Embassy in Bangkok has been of valuable assistance.

But more important was a discovery made December 11 by a Thai border patrol just north of the Malaysian frontier. Pursuing a small band of Chinese Communist terrorists, Thai police stumbled on a jungle hideout that startled them with its implications.

What they found, abandoned less than 48 hours before, was a secret encampment that housed between 250 and 300 men. In addition to barracks for that many men, the camp had recreation facilities, a firing range, watchtowers and 50 revetments. Bamboo traps were also found, as were bags full of documents that gave clear evidence that the camp had radio communications with the Chinese mainland.

Thailand's greatest threat, however, lies in its northeastern province, which borders on Laos. Approximately 10 million people, or roughly one-third of Thailand's population, live in this area. Remote from Bangkok, poor and ethnically close to the Laotians, the people of northeast Thailand have long been a target of Communist subversion.

But indications are that the subversion has gone farther than supposed in Bangkok. The developing pattern is one of assassination of minor local officials including police, intimidation of schools, churches and general erosion of government authority.

Several hundred armed men, some of them Pathet Lao veterans of the fighting in Laos, reportedly are holed up in a cluster of thickly wooded hills near the Laos border. Red pockets have multiplied like measles. Entire villages are wholly or in part under Communist control.

And there are domestic problems. After more than three decades of military rule and seven palace revolutions, the consensus seems to be that it is time for elections and parliamentary government.

With the late Field Marshal Sarit Thanarat's ban on free expression, lifted and freed political prisoners blinking in the light of a new day, both the press and politicians have fallen upon government mistakes and misdoings with great gusto.

Sarit's chosen heir, Kittikachorn, is committed to pushing through a return to constitutional government in 1965 and elections in 1966, yet he has voiced reservations about whether Thailand is ready for democratic government.

Experimental democracy in the early 1950's led to near total confusion, political demagogery and the rapid growth of Communist elements supported by ever willing Red China. Sarit seized power in 1957 and put a stop to all that by a series of measures that included on-the-spot execution of Communists.

In today's political climate, with shooting wars in neighboring Laos and South Vietnam and the Communists bidding for control of all southeast Asia, the risks of democracy in politically naive Thailand are painfully obvious.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, United Press International, by dispatch filed from Tokyo on February 5, 1965, added further information. It reported a broadcast of the New China news agency which "outlined a program—for Thailand—aimed at 'overthrowing the Fascist dictatorial government'; withdrawing from SEATO and 'driving all imperialist troops out of Thailand'; economic reforms with emphasis on restricting foreign capital 'whose aim is to seize profits from Thailand'; and 'suppressing and meting out severe punishment to traitors and bureaucrats who oppress the people.' "

UPI noted parallels between this and other Communist programs proposed to undercut other target societies:

> The reforms followed the same revolutionary textbook that the Communists have used in Vietnam and tried to use in Malaya and the Philippines.

I ask unanimous consent that the UPI dispatch "China Picks Thailand as Next Target, Pledges Support to Rebel Movement" from the Washington Post of February 6, 1965, appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

China Picks Thailand as Next Target, Pledges Support to Rebel Movement

TOKYO, February 5.—Communist China announced today that a "patriotic front" had been formed in Thailand to overthrow the pro-Western government and eradicate American influence there.

It was the first time that Peiping had openly named Thailand as the next target of a Communist campaign in southeast Asia.

Thailand is the stanchest U.S. ally on the Asian mainland. Bangkok, the capital, is the headquarters of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO)—the American-led defense alliance in the Orient.

(In Washington, U.S. officials expressed concern but said that Peiping's announcement of support for the front had been anticipated.

("It strikes me as the logical step in Peiping's policy of supporting subversion whereever possible in southeast Asia," one official said.)

(From Bangkok, Reuters reported that Thailand had tightened its anti-Communist security as refugees from the fighting in Laos continued to enter the country across the Mekong River. Police sources said 56 Communist suspects had been arrested in northeastern Thailand in the past few days. Latest figures place the number of Lao refugees at 15,000.)

Communist China's designs on Thailand were made clear in a broadcast of the New China news agency heard here today, although the "patriotic front" was first announced January 1 in a clandestine Thai language broadcast.

Today's broadcast urged "all patriotic people to unite as one and launch a resolute struggle to drive out U.S. imperialism and realize the independence, democracy, peace, neutrality and prosperity of Thailand."

The broadcast outlined a program aimed at "overthrowing the Fascist dictatorial government"; withdrawing from SEATO and "driving all imperialist troops * * * out of Thailand"; economic reforms with emphasis on restricting foreign capital "whose aim is to seize profits from Thailand"; and "suppressing and meting out severe punishment to traitors and bureaucrats who oppress the people."

The "reforms" followed the same revolutionary textbook that the Communists have used in Vietnam and tried to use in Malaya and the Philippines.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Murrey Marder of the Post followed a few days later with a interpretive article. He indicated that the new campaign had been expected:

> The intensified Chinese threats against Thailand have been growing for 3 months, and the danger has been anticipated for at least 3 years, American officials said yesterday.

But the responsible American Government agencies have not been providing Thai citizens the kind of political training which would enhance their effectiveness against such aggression directed against their society. Evidently we have satisfied ourselves with the act of anticipating itself.

After the November 1 declaration of war, Marder writes, the subversion campaign intensified:

> A pattern of terrorism developed, with assassinations and kidnapings of local officials. Arms caches were discovered. There was a sharp increase in the level of anti-Government broadcasts from clandestine radio stations in the area, and Communist stations outside the nation sharply increased.

And, responsive to American suggestions, a defensive campaign has been established in the area of Thailand near Laos:

> Mobile development units operating a combined civic development, psychological warfare, and security program have been concentrated in that area.

One suspects that this effort is stopgap at best. Where, for example, have the political operatives been trained? How much is known about motivational factors among the 10 million Thai peasants who populate the area? That is, how can the Government most effectively rally these people to its defense? And why, if we have recognized the threat for so long, has not the executive branch of our Government established a research and training program of a magnitude sufficient to meet the growing likelihood of our encountering this kind of aggression throughout the world?

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Murrey Marder, "New Peiping Target, Thailand, Foresaw Subversive Attempt," from the Washington Post of February 7, 1965, appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 7, 1965]

New Peiping Target, Thailand, Foresaw Subversive Attempts

(By Murrey Marder)

Communist China's public call for overthrowing the Government of Thailand served notice that Peiping can hit numerous targets in southeast Asia even if the United States and the Soviet Union try to calm the Vietnam crisis.

Public attention suddenly was focused on that added danger spot by a Red Chinese broadcast on Friday.

But the intensified Chinese threats against Thailand have been growing for 3 months, and the danger has been anticipated for at least 3 years, American officials said yesterday.

The Chinese call to prepare to topple the Thai Government, "which is subservient to U.S. imperialism," came on the eve of Soviet Premier Alexei N. Kosygin's arrival in Communist North Vietnam.

TIMING OR COINCIDENCE

The timing may well have been more than coincidental. Kosygin was just leaving Peiping where he received a demonstrably cool reception from Red China's leaders. Besides preaching a more militant brand of Marxism, what is more important to the rulers in Peiping is that they regard all of Asia as their preserve for penetration. The Russians as well as Americans are both despised as interlopers.

Even if Soviet and American interests should coincide in trying to tamp down the anti-Communist struggle in South Vietnam, and the ambitions of North Vietnam, which would require great diplomatic sleight-of-hand, Communist China has limitless targets in sight.

American officials were actually in the midst of discussions about new methods to counter the growing Communist danger in Thailand when the latest Chinese threat was issued.

U.S. Ambassador to Thailand Graham Martin has been in Washington for 2 weeks for consultations with officials of the State Department and the Agency for International Development.

AID INCREASE PLANNED

Some increases in military and economic aid to Thailand are being planned.

Officials said they regard the Communist subversive threat to Thailand as increasingly serious, and enough to warrant more intensified efforts, but neither sudden or dangerous enough to justify any quick crash program.

Thailand is the strongest ally of the United States in the shaky southeast Asian area; it is also, officials here emphasized, the nation with the best record of cooperation in "self-help" work to face its huge social, economic, and security problems.

Thailand's 1,000-mile border on Laos, the tens of thousands of North Vietnamese who took refuge in Thailand during the Indochina war with France, and its areas of Moslem discontent in the south, make it especially attractive as a Communist object of subversion.

Beginning in November, the subversion campaign suddenly escalated, with Communist calls for establishment of a Thailand independence movement. On January 1, a national patriotic front was said to have been formed, to topple the Thai Government and eliminate all American presence.

PATTERN OF TERRORISM

A pattern of terrorism developed, with assassinations and kidnapings of local officials. Arms caches were discovered. There was a sharp increase in the level of anti-government broadcasts from clandestine radio stations in the area, and Communist stations outside the nation sharply increased.

So far, American officials said, there is no sign of organized guerrilla insurgency, such as in South Vietnam or Laos. But that stage is believed to be in the offing.

Officials here said that fortunately, 3 years ago, the United States finally convinced Thailand that it must pay greater attention to its seriously underdeveloped exposed northeast area adjoining Laos, where about one-third of Thailand's 30 million people live. Mobile development units operating a combined civic development, psychological warfare and security program have been concentrated in that area.

Last December, Thailand's foreign minister, Thanat Khoman, warned that if the United States should withdraw from South Vietnam, the threats to southeast Asia would be enormous. At present, American officials said yesterday, Thailand's government is convinced that the United States will not allow that slide to begin.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, and now Seymour Topping of the New York Times has updated reports of the new war in Thailand. His story, datelined Bangkok, appeared in the Times of May 17, 1965:

> An outburst of banditry and assassination of rural officials, especially in border regions, has alarmed the Thai Government.
>
> Thai and U.S. officials say the violence has disclosed a lack of security in many rural

areas that could eventually be exploited by Communists to start a guerrilla movement. Some assassinations of village officials appear to be politically motivated, although detailed information is sparse.

An exhaustive official survey of the security problem has shown that it is due in great part to the inadequacy of the police force.

Police surveillance is so lax in some rural areas that the Bangkok government cannot be said to be in effective administrative control.

While security officials do not believe that the Communists have made substantial inroads, they compare the recent rash of assassinations to those in South Vietnam of 1958. The murder of local Vietnamese officials preceded the development of the wide Vietcong rebellion.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Seymour Topping, "Terrorism Is on Rise in Thai Countryside," from the New York Times of May 17, 1965, appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRORISM IS ON RISE IN THAI COUNTRYSIDE

(By Seymour Topping)

BANGKOK, THAILAND, May 16.—An outburst of banditry and assassination of rural officials, especially in border regions, has alarmed the Thai Government.

Thai and U.S. officials say the violence has disclosed a lack of security in many rural areas that could eventually be exploited by Communists to start a guerrilla movement. Some assassinations of village officials appear to be politically motivated, although detailed information is sparse.

An exhaustive official survey of the security problem has shown that it is due in great part to the inadequacy of the police force.

Police surveillance is so lax in some rural areas that the Bangkok government cannot be said to be in effective administrative control. U.S. officials have proposed a program to assist the Government in increasing the 28,000-man provincial police force by about 25 percent.

While security officials do not believe that the Communists have made substantial inroads, they compare the recent rash of assassinations to those in South Vietnam in 1958. The murder of local Vietnamese officials preceded the development of the wide Vietcong rebellion.

Communist agents, either Laotian infiltrators or members of the Patriotic Thailand Front, which was recently formed with Chinese Communist backing, would find it harder to start a guerrilla movement in this country than it was in Vietnam. Thai peasants are more prosperous, more than 80 percent own their own land, and Thailand has been free of colonialism.

Some areas are considered ripe for subversion, however, because gangs of armed freebooters have undermined confidence in the Government's ability to insure security.

MILITARY AID PROPOSED

The proposed police buildup would accompany a reorganization of the army aimed at making it a more effective counterinsurgency force. U.S. officials have also suggested a program to help the Thai Government strengthen its volunteer defense corps.

The corps consists of 140 militia companies, two assigned to each province, which operate under the Minister of the Interior. These companies would be bolstered to act as a nucleus for local antiguerrilla forces if necessary.

Paradoxically, it is the Government's program of road building and other public works construction, opening many remote rural areas, that has made officials aware of the terrorism.

Many villages in the interior are visited only two or three times a month by a police patrolman, who is the villagers' symbol of Bangkok's authority. Villagers sometimes balk at cooperation with these patrolmen who are paid only about $22 a month and are thus tempted to become involved in corruption.

As roads have been cut into these areas, bandits have attacked buses and other traffic. An unusually bold series of raids early this year followed the opening earlier of an important highway between Korat, northeast of Bankok, and Nongkhai, near the Laotian border in northeast Thailand.

NORTHEAST A PROBLEM AREA

The northeast, populated by poorer Thai of Lao extraction, is looked upon as the region most susceptible to Communist infiltration from Laos, across the Mekong River. It has suffered the more striking increase in armed assaults.

According to official Thai figures, in the first quarter of 1965 there was an 80-percent increase in armed robbery over the corresponding period of 1964. In southern provinces, where Chinese terrorists have operated for years, there was a 13-percent increase.

The nationwide average increase is recorded as only 1 percent.

In the northeast, two village chiefs have been assassinated in the last 10 days. One was shot down Wednesday night during a temple fair.

Both chiefs, like many other assassinated officials, were identified as police informants. Responsibility for the murders has been placed on a band of armed young men who have been variously described as Communists and bandits.

Mr. MUNDT. These reports, Mr. President, added to others preceding them in this series of statements, as well as to a substantial number of additional news stories collected in my files, indicate that we face, as the principal non-Communist power in the world, an organized worldwide campaign of nonmilitary aggression which at present has reached the active stage of guerrilla warfare on three continents—Africa, Asia, and South America—and is approaching that stage on a fourth, in the Central American section and islands offshore of North America.

The United States has yet to accept the responsibility seemingly incident to its world role to provide effective political training in defense against nonmilitary aggression to offset the very thorough training common throughout the Communist bloc of citizens from countries which the Communists have targeted for aggression.

A recent strategy conference held in Virginia focused on this weakness in our defensive structure. Max Freedman, writing in the Washington Evening Star of May 26, 1965, discussed conversations among the multidisciplined group who attended:

> Its discussions all had a practical purpose—to make scholarship relevant to the actual agenda of the Government and to set that agenda in a larger perspective than it is usually possible for harassed officials to achieve.
>
> In its report * * * the panel assumed that the problems of subversion and sabotage and insurrection will fill the next 10 years and present new challenges to the United States. It believes the time has come for the U.S. Government to abandon the concept of counterinsurgency and to accept a new philosophy that gives a much higher priority to Communist subversion.
>
> At present, men working on counterinsurgency are * * * usually remote from the center of power, and their advice and assistance often are ignored until the troubles have burst upon us.
>
> The panel recommends that a new agency be established, preferably in the Executive Office of the President, to direct and manage the campaign to forestall subversion and defeat it * * *. Wise planning of this kind involves a smaller and cheaper U.S. effort than large-scale intervention after the troubles have occurred, as in Vietnam.
>
> The important point is that the Communists boast that they have discovered a new kind of warfare in subversion, while we have been haphazard and meager, furtive and underhand, in our response to that challenge. The panel wants this inadequate U.S. policy to be replaced by a visible, vigorous, and enduring commitment.

The proposal that Max Freedman discussed is more far reaching than that recommended by supporters of the Freedom Academy bill. But our proposal complements it perfectly in that any new approach to the challenge of nonmilitary warfare will demand a research and training effort vastly more extensive than any so far supported in the area of international relations. The job we face is to familiarize ourselves and to make ourselves and our allies effective with regard to a discipline in which our antagonists have a headstart of a generation's time over us.

I ask unanimous consent that Max Freedman's article "Parley Studies Future U.S. Policy," from the Washington Evening Star of May 26, 1965, appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 26, 1965]

PARLEY STUDIES FUTURE U.S. POLICY

(By Max Freedman)

For 3 days the recent conference at Airlie House in Virginia had drawn about 100 people into an examination of the major problems in world affairs. The participants came from universities and from business, from the Federal Government, from journalism and from other disciplines. Divided in their training and experience, they were united in their determination to confront the problems that will face the United States in the next 10 years in its "Strategy for Peace," the theme of the conference.

This Airlie conference, as distinct from the recent gestures and demonstrations on university campuses, was not concerned with the mere expression of academic anxiety and protest. Its discussions all had a practical purpose—to make scholarship relevant to the actual agenda of the Government and to set that agenda in a larger perspective than it is usually possible for harassed officials to achieve.

Nowhere was this purpose better realized than in the report of the discussion group of Asia. The chairman was Dr. Kenneth Young, formerly Ambassador to Thailand and now the president of the Asia Society. Its rapporteur was a scholarly officer from the Air Force, Col. Edward Foote, now working with the Council on Foreign Relations.

In its report, which will be published some time from now, the panel assumed that the problems of subversion and sabotage and insurrection will fill the next 10 years and present new challenges to the United States.

It believes the time has come for the U.S. Government to abandon the concept of counterinsurgency and to accept a new philosophy that gives a much higher priority to Communist subversion.

Perhaps it is true that counterinsurgency has had its day because it is essentially a negative doctrine. It waits for the Communists to make their thrust and then tries to counter the trouble. It does not anticipate the trouble, try to avert it by a process of self-help in the threatened areas, quickly mobilize diverse forms of U.S. aid, and seek to pluck out the Communist mischief at its roots. All these criticisms may be valid but it would be unjust to bury the doctrine of counterinsurgency without some praise for its services. It is easy to recall the stubborn skepticism and entrenched opposition that met the pioneer efforts of men like Walt Rostow of the State Department as they pointed to the more dangerous character of Communist subversion. If we now can move beyond counterinsurgency, it is only because of the foundation for success already achieved.

At present the men working on counterinsurgency are found in marginal positions in various departments and agencies of the Government. They are usually remote from the centers of power, and their advice and assistance often are ignored until the troubles have burst upon us. They lack the power and prestige inside the bureaucracy which come only from an established commitment, a large budget, and a purpose which visibly commands the support of the President. Yet Vietnam, and the unrest in the Dominican Republic, clearly show that subversion is a greater threat than direct military aggression.

The panel recommends that a new agency be established, preferably in the Executive Office of the President, to direct and manage the campaign to forestall subversion and defeat it. The establishment of such an agency would in itself be a powerful weapon in the U.S. armory. It would embody the long-term commitment of the United States to deny easy victories to subversion. It would mobilize the scattered energies of U.S. officials and give them concentrated purpose. It would give the threatened nations the assurance of American help before the subversion had actually done its mischief. Wise planning of this kind involves a smaller and cheaper U.S. effort than large-scale intervention after the troubles have occurred, as in Vietnam.

The important point is that the Communists boast that they have discovered a new kind of warfare in subversion, while we have been haphazard and meager, furtive and underhand, in our response to that challenge. The panel wants this inadequate U.S. policy to be replaced by a visible, vigorous, and enduring commitment. The Communists would then know that we have at last accepted the challenge of subversion with the same firmness and constancy shown by the United States years ago when it responded to the more open challenges of aggression. The Airlie House report will certainly be studied by many offices of the Government and not least in the White House.

Mr. MUNDT. The President of the United States addressed himself to these same problems in his May 29 speech to the graduating class at Baylor University. He spoke of new realities:

The first reality is that old concepts and old labels are largely obsolete. In today's world, with the enemies of freedom talking about "wars of national liberation," the old distinction between "civil war" and "international war" has lost much of its meaning.

Second is the reality that when forces of freedom move slowly, whether on political, economic, or military fronts, the forces of slavery and subversion move rapidly and decisively.

Third, we know that when a Communist group seeks to exploit misery, the entire free inter-American system is put in deadly danger. There is no trouble anywhere these evil forces will not try to turn to their advantage. We can expect more efforts at triumph by terror and conquest through chaos.

Fourth, we have learned in the Dominican Republic that we can act decisively and together.

Fifth, it is clear that we need new international machinery geared to meet fast-moving events. When hours can decide the fate of generations, the moment of decision must become the moment of action.

Part of this new machinery must be directed to understanding the threat and to disseminating very broadly the understanding. The Freedom Academy bill is well suited, if enacted, toward performing that function.

We are far behind the point our responsibilities direct we should be. A recent editorial column of the Dallas Morning News suggests how far:

For nearly half a century, the Communists have been developing the art of unconventional warfare. From a humble beginning—the establishment of the Lenin School in Moscow in the 1920's—the Reds today maintain some 6,000 special schools which have graduated experts in the tactics of subversion, espionage, infiltration, agitation, and propaganda to man the staffs of 75 Communist parties throughout the non-Communist world.

At all of them, cadres are being trained to work day in and day out around the globe to undermine freedom and promote communism.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Ken Thompson, "Anti-Red School Urged for United States," from the Dallas Morning News of December 31, 1964, be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the artice was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Dec. 31, 1964]

Anti-Red School Urged for United States

(By Ken Thompson)

For nearly half a century, the Communists have been developing the art of unconventional warfare. From a humble beginning—the establishment of the Lenin School in Moscow in the 1920's—the Reds today maintain some 6,000 special schools which have graduated experts in the tactics of subversion, espionage, infiltration, agitation, and propaganda to man the staffs of 75 Communist parties throughout the non-Communist world.

Most of these schools are located behind the Iron Curtain, but a few exist within the borders of free nations.

At all of them, cadres are being trained to work day in and day out around the globe to undermine freedom and promote communism.

While the United States and its allies do a creditable job of combating conventional and even diplomatic warfare by the Communists, we have not even begun to compete with, much less overcome, their unconventional "cold" warfare offensive.

By and large, most of our citizens and leaders don't even fully understand the concept of unconventional warfare—even though, in the long run, it is just as important and may be more decisive than conventional military strength or strategy.

Fourteen years ago a group of citizens in Orlando, Fla., recognizing this gap in our Nation's security, proposed the idea of establishing a Federal Freedom Academy where leaders of this country and its allies in the free world could study the tactics of unconventional warfare and learn how to combat it.

After several years, the idea caught fire. Numerous bipartisan groups, from the junior chamber of commerce to the AFL–CIO, supported it and a Gallup poll showed that Americans favored establishment of such an academy by a margin of 4 to 1.

Finally, in 1959, Representative Sydney Herlong, Democrat, of Florida, and Representative Walter Judd, Republican, of Minnesota, cosponsored a bill in the House to establish the academy. They were joined in the Senate by Senator Karl Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota, and Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois.

In 1960 the Senate adopted the measure, but no action was taken by the House.

Two years later, President Kennedy appointed a special committee to take a new look at the proposal. The committee recommended that new legislation be drafted, and the job was turned over to the State Department, which, because it was cool to the whole idea, drew up a weak substitute for the original plan.

Because there was little enthusiasm for the State Department substitute, the matter made no further headway in Congress.

Last year, however, nine Members of the House introduced separate bills designed to accomplish the original objective. While each of the bills differed somewhat, they all had the same basic purpose: to set up a Federal academy where the tactics of psychological warfare could be studied and experts could be trained to engage and defeat the cold war cadres of the Communist bloc.

Such an academy would engage only in research and education, no operational activities. Government officials and leaders from all walks of civilian life—including representatives from friendly nations—would be given valuable instruction on the nature of communism and how to resist its further encroachments on freedom.

The academy would be run by an independent commission under the general supervision of Congress; its members would be appointed by the President, subject to the confirmation of the Senate.

The establishment of such an academy is even more essential today than when it was originally proposed, for the Red bloc has stepped up its cold war offensive in all parts of the world. Handling of this proposal by Congress in the past has been less than encouraging. But if we are ever going to close the unconventional warfare gap with the Communists, Congress would do well to put this item near the top of its agenda.

Mr. MUNDT. Also I ask that the column by Denton King, "One Man's Opinion" in Grit for March 21, 1965, appear at the end of my remarks as well together with a copy of my recent newsletter to my South Dakota constituents on this general subject.

There being no objection, the article and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Grit, Mar. 21, 1965]

Mundt Proposes Measure in Senate To Create New Freedom Academy

(By Denton King)

One bill which has been introduced in the U.S. Senate certainly deserves more than passing interest and a better fate than to be relegated to some subcommittee's "forgotten" file to gather dust.

It is a proposal sponsored by Senator Karl E. Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota, to establish a cold-war advance research, development, and training center called the Freedom Academy. He terms the measure "a bipartisan effort to develop the advanced techniques and means required to defeat by peaceful means the threat to liberty posed by communism."

Five Democratic and five Republican Senators are cosponsors of the bill with Mundt. The Democrats are Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut; William Proxmire, of Wisconsin; Frank J. Lausche, of Ohio; and George A. Smathers, of Florida. The Republicans include Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey; Hiram L. Fong, of Hawaii; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa; Jack Miller, of Iowa; and Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania.

"Long ago we learned that communism isn't going to roll over and play deal simply because Red leaders say they want peaceful coexistence," said Mundt. "Today in Vietnam we are experiencing once again the bitter lesson of Communist aggressive designs in one of their most flagrant forms—warfare against a free people."

He explained that although the United States is adequately prepared with a massive defense system to meet an overt act of aggression, in the area of global conflict involving subversion, infiltration, psychological warfare, and economic warfare, this country too often fails to recognize the Communist tactics at an early stage when effective action could be taken to halt them with minimum effort and expense.

The Freedom Academy legislative proposal which Senator Mundt advances was approved once by the Senate but failed to come up for a vote in the House.

Senator Mundt said his measure had three purposes:

1. To conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge to increase the capabilities of the United States in the global struggle between freedom and communism.

2. To educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and then to implement this knowledge.

3. To provide education and training for carefully selected foreign students under appropriate conditions.

Certainly any program which would nip the spread of communism in countries in which the United States is vitally interested before it became necessary to sacrifice U.S. lives as is now the case in Vietnam should receive the closest attention from Congress.

For a Fair Chance for a Free People

(Report from Karl Mundt, Senator from South Dakota)

Consistency—or contrariness. A recent item in the "20 Years Ago" column of the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader might be termed consistency in pursuing an objective, or, possibly, a demonstration of contrariness (or merely a case of one's "needle getting stuck in a groove and being unable to change tunes"). Whatever definition applies, the item came as a surprise and recalled earlier legislative efforts. The paragraph of two decades ago reads: "The war could have been averted if proper educational systems had been functioning throughout the world, Representative Karl Mundt said today."

That was in 1945 at the end of the European action of World War II. Two years later success was achieved in House passage and then Senate approval of the Smith-Mundt Act which established our exchange-of-persons programs, providing for bringing foreign students to the United States for educational purposes, setting up our overseas libraries and a program of assisting American-sponsored universities abroad, together with making permanent the Voice of America activities.

This year—for the 6th successive year—I have been urging enactment of my proposal (cosponsored by Senators and House Members on both sides of the political aisle) to establish a Freedom Academy to provide specific training in cold war techniques to Americans representing us abroad. In addition, such a training institution would be available to foreign public servants who could come here not only to learn the techniques and steps needed to foster freedom against encroachments of communism but also to learn to utilize the disciplines of democracy in developing and maintaining stable, solvent, public-serving government in their own countries.

Perhaps the "needle is stuck in a groove," but I still believe shooting wars can be averted, problems like Vietnam can be corrected, and cold wars can be won through the proper use of educational tools in our relationships abroad.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

One of the new subcommittees on which I serve is called the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations. The chairman of this subcommitte is Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washington. Our purpose is to review problems involving our national security as well as the policies which are followed in trying to solve them.

Can the United States survive? This thought is always uppermost in the minds of the members of our committee. History has shown us that one great society after another has been tested in the cruel crucible of international problems, and each has sunk when it has failed to meet the responsibilities of greatness. Our Nation now leads the free world—our policies must be wisely drawn, carefully carried out, fully understood at home and abroad, and strongly supported by allies and our own citizens if we are to continue to succeed and survive.

The Communists have challenged the belief that freemen ought to be allowed to remain free, and they foment—by intrigue, by uprisings, by revolution, by terrorism—what they choose to call "wars of liberation" for the purpose of bringing new nations and new land areas under Red domination.

The policy of the United States has been to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

Criticism of our actions usually follow these lines: "Wars of national liberation are purely domestic matters," "Neutralism is the best policy to follow in southeast Asia," "These problems, such as involvement in Vietnam, should be turned over to the United Nations for settlement."

If we believed that civil wars which have been cropping up around the world are simply domestic affairs, then we would give in to Communist expansion, for these are not civil wars in the true sense, but they are wars of aggression, planned by Communists, supported by Communists, and directed, in the main, by Red army officers or by generals who have been trained in Communist-controlled countries.

Those who support the theory of neutralism fail to realize that it takes two to make this policy work, and, in the Communist mind, one is never neutral—he is either with the Communists or against them.

It does not downgrade the United Nations to point out, candidly, that this organization does not have the resources to handle these problems. It happens to be the way in which it is set up, the way in which the members view it. If we overburden that organization, it probably will not survive.

Our committee feels that we must continue to study in greater detail the means of making more effective use of nonmilitary measures in preventing the deterioration of international political situations. Major tools are diplomacy, trade, economic assistance, information programs, cultural exchanges, and good example.

In most major aspects, the United States has done a great job of building its military might. While we continue to develop our military forces, we also must study how to use all the other elements of international relationships. We must constantly strive to make all sides yearn more for the conference table than for the battlefield but, unfortunately, we have had to subject these aggressors to the ordeal of the fight to make them appreciate the blessings of peace and that the costs of settlement are more profitable than the costs of war. It is an old rule that a diplomat cannot be expected to win more at the conference table than his soldier-compatriot has won, or can win, on the field of battle.

In truth, we must admit that our national policies do not now get full support at home, or from other free countries, but we must strive, not to win popularity contests, but to maintain the principles of freedom against the incursion of communism.

Mark Twain probably summed up our challenge best when he said, "Always do right. This will gratify some people, and astonish the rest."

Cordially yours,

Karl E. Mundt,
U.S. Senator.

FOREIGN POLICY VIEWS OF SENATOR COOPER

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, few Members of the U.S. Senate evoke as much bipartisan respect for their views on foreign and domestic affairs as does the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper]. An interview containing some of Senator Cooper's foreign policy views as published in the June 7 issue of the Christian Science Monitor. I ask unanimous consent that the interview be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United States Urged To Shortstop Crises

(By David K. Willis)

Washington.—Are the crises confronting the United States in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic symptomatic of an underlying fault in American foreign policy?

Senator John Sherman Cooper, Republican, of Kentucky, former Ambassador to India and former U.S. delegate to the United Nations, is inclined to believe that they are.

He does so judiciously, weighing each word as he is interviewed in his office. From time to time he gets up from his chair, his tall soldierly figure framed against the huge wall map of the world behind his desk.

MARINE ACTION BACKED

Then he sits again and slowly fills out his point: that perhaps the United States has something to learn about continuous planning, not only to deal with, but to avert, major crises.

Such planning is far from easy, of course. And the Senator says that some is already done—notably by the Policy Planning Council in the State Department, headed by Walt W. Rostow.

But taking an overall view, the Senator believes that the council does not really have the weight and the authority for effective future planning.

His conclusion is that much more is needed.

Our talk turned first to the Dominican Republic, where the United States is still engaged in a search for a constitutional government and a return to peace and order.

POLICY SUPPORTED

Senator Cooper believes the President acted rightly in sending in U.S. Marine Corps. He recalls that when mobs threatened Vice President Richard M. Nixon in Caracas in May 1958, President Eisenhower ordered marines and airborne troops flown to Guantanamo and Puerto Rico as "a precautionary measure."

In both cases, the object was to protect American lives.

But on the uprising itself and the possibility of a Communist takeover, the Senator was disturbed.

"It seems to me," he said, "that after Trujillo was overthrown, the United States turned the Dominican Republic into a kind of showcase in the Caribbean.

"Castro had come to power in Cuba, and we put our money on Juan Bosch, to show what a democratically elected government could do."

But when the Bosch government toppled 7 months later, the United States cut off all aid to the incoming government headed by Donald Reid Cabral.

"These are difficult questions," the Senator said, "and it is always easy to talk with hindsight. But it does seem to me that we might have anticipated the kind of trouble that has broken out in recent weeks."

He appeared to be saying that it might have been wiser for the United States to continue a good measure of aid to Mr. Cabral.

The Dominican Republic had no tradition of or real experience in democratic processes. Its economy was in such a chaotic state that more trouble was almost inevitable.

AVOIDING CRITICISM

The Senator's views, that there could have been more consistency in contingency planning, so that the major uprising could have been handled with less criticism.

The Johnson administration, from the President down, says news of the situation in Santo Domingo came so suddenly that the President's only choice was to send marines.

Main criticism was that the President did not consult with the Organization of American States beforehand.

Senator Cooper would prefer to avoid such criticism by letting the U.S. contingency plans be known privately beforehand.

He sees Vietnam as another example where current troubles might have been anticipated.

The United States began giving military help to France in 1950 and continued it up until 1954 and the French defeat.

From then on, in bilateral agreements and under SEATO obligations, the aid continued.

"I feel we could have made greater efforts to see that this aid was effective," he said. "We should have seen that it was really reaching the South Vietnamese people through the Diem regime. We should have made sure the aid was developing a political idea."

Another point about policy in Vietnam: "If we were not willing to have elections throughout all Vietnam in 1956, as provided for by the Geneva Agreement in 1954—and we were not, because of Communist infiltration from the north—then at least we should have allowed the South Vietnamese to vote.

"What do the South Vietnamese people want to do? Stay independent? Join the north? Keep the Americans there? Our aid has not been accomplishing real reform.

"Unless we ask the South Vietnamese people what they want, our presence there looks like an occupation."

CRISIS PLANNING HIT

The Senator paused. "It is all very easy to criticize," he said. "But I do feel that we in this country tend to plan during a crisis, and then, once the heat is off, to shelve things and wait for next time."

He detected the same basic fault in the U.S. attitude to the NATO alliance. The United States knew President de Gaulle's views. They were nationalistic, to be sure, but then every country has similar feelings to a greater or lesser degree.

What should the United States be doing about France? Why is it now so very difficult to come to an agreement in NATO over military and other policies?

"Perhaps our own planning should have been more intense in the fifties," the Senator said.

"Perhaps we could have more actively discussed trade policies of NATO countries toward Eastern Europe, as well as methods of helping underdeveloped countries in the West.

"We could have initiated studies of weapons systems and made a real effort to bring the other countries deep into the discussions."

The Senator said he had talked to representatives of the NATO countries. They had told him how seriously concerned they were about nuclear defense.

USE OF FOREIGN AID

He agreed that the United States had the overriding responsibility. But, he said, other, non-nuclear countries were interested in the byproducts of nuclear research, for peaceful uses. They wanted to share some aspects of nuclear research, for a whole range of commercial and industrial uses.

"I have no specific proposals on what the United States should do here," he said, "but I do feel that the whole field should be discussed with our allies, to see if there are not some ways we could share the results of our research with them.

"I don't suppose American contractors would like it—but it would be good for our country, and certainly would make us more respected in Europe."

Running through the Senator's remarks was an intense interest in what the United States does with its foreign aid. Wise use of this aid, he believes, is an essential part of American foreign policy.

For years he has argued that small groups of private citizens and members of the Agency for International Development (AID), should conduct regular country-by-country checks of all aid programs. These would be in addition to AID's own annual reviews.

He has spoken on the Senate floor, and everywhere else possible. Finally, in December 1963, President Johnson publicly agreed that a new system of evaluation should be set up.

In March of this year the President appointed a 14-member advisory committee under the chairmanship of Dr. James A. Perkins, president of Cornell University, to analyze aid programs.

Senator Cooper is pleased—though he has some reservations. The committee will report only to the President, whereas the Senator wants its information to be available to the Congress as well.

On the whole, the Senator believes that U.S. foreign aid has done well. But, together with other Members of Congress, he has serious doubts about the wisdom of giving aid to countries who do not act in the best interests of the United States.

Particularly on his mind are Indonesia and Egypt—Indonesia because it expropriates U.S. property and stands by while Government buildings are damaged by mobs, and Egypt because of its assistance to rebel forces in some emerging African nations.

Last December the Senator suggested that President Johnson stop all further foreign aid around the world pending a thorough review.

At the time there was enough aid in the pipelines for about 2 more years. The Senator argued that aid could easily be resumed before that period ended; the President would simply refrain from authorizing new projects until reports were made.

The President is not likely to take up the suggestion, but he is well aware of congressional opinion against foreign aid; his appointment of the advisory committee is one sign of this.

Senator Cooper outlined to this newspaper the three objectives of a country-by-country aid review.

1. To see whether the country's own plans fitted its actual needs;

2. To look at the country's own efforts at social reform. "Some countries might object to this as an intrusion on their sovereignty," he noted, "but after all, it's our money, and it should serve our interests as well as theirs."

3. To see that aid is not scattered all over the place, but channeled into worthwhile plans.

The Senator makes it clear that he thinks the present AID Director, David Bell, is doing a good job.

But he warns against tying the aid to too many political strings. The danger is that receiving countries can then try and take control of the aid programs, saying that if it is stopped, it will hurt the United States politically.

"We should stick to purely economic grounds when we think of giving aid," the Senator said. "Other countries will respect us more if we do. And we should work more through international organizations: the U.N. Development Fund and the World Bank. That way we might take the political sting out of aid."

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on June 4, President Johnson made a superb speech on the subject of the position of the Negro American in our common society. The speech, delivered to the graduating class of Howard University, was one of the finest ever given by President Johnson; certainly, no speech ever given by a public official surpasses the understanding and compassion displayed by President Johnson in his address.

I am sure that most Members of Congress would agree wholeheartedly with the President when he said, as he did last Friday:

> Thus, it is not enough just to open the gates of opportunity. All our citizens must have the ability to walk through these gates; and this is the next and the more profound stage of the battle for civil rights.

Understandably enough, there has been much favorable editorial comment on the President's address. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the President's speech at Howard University, as well as editorials from the June 6 issues of the New York Times and the Washington Post, and an article, by Tom Wicker, from the June 7 issue of the New York Times, printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address, editorials, and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 5, 1965]

TRANSCRIPT OF JOHNSON ADDRESS TO HOWARD UNIVERSITY GRADUATES

Dr. Nabrit, my fellow Americans: I am delighted at the chance to speak at this important and this historic institution. Howard has long been an outstanding center for the education of Negro Americans. Its students are of every race and color, and they come from many countries of the world. It is truly a working example of democratic excellence.

Our earth is the home of revolution. In every corner of every continent men charged with hope contend with ancient ways in the pursuit of justice. They reach for the newest of weapons to realize the oldest of dreams—that each may walk in freedom and pride, stretching his talents, enjoying the fruits of the earth.

Our enemies may occasionally seize the day of change. But it is the banner of our revolution they take and our own future is linked to this process of swift and turbulent change in many lands in the world.

But nothing in any country touches us more profoundly and nothing is more freighted with meaning for our own destiny than the revolution of the Negro American.

In far too many ways American Negroes have been another nation, deprived of freedom, crippled by hatred, the doors of opportunity closed to hope.

In our time change has come to this Nation, too. The American Negro, acting with impressive restraint, has peacefully protested and marched, entered the courtroom and the seats of government, demanding a justice that has long been denied.

THE CALL TO ACTION

The voice of the Negro was the call to action. But it is a tribute to America that, once aroused, the courts and the Congress, the President and most of the people, have been the allies of progress.

Thus we have seen the High Court of the country declare that discrimination based on race was repugnant to the Constitution and therefore void.

We have seen in 1957, in 1960, and again in 1964 the first civil rights legislation in this Nation in almost an entire century.

As majority leader of the U.S. Senate I helped to guide two of these bills through the Senate, and as your President I was proud to sign the third.

And now very soon we will have the fourth—a new law guaranteeing every American the right to vote.

No act of my entire administration will give me greater satisfaction than the day when my signature makes this bill too the law of this land.

The voting rights bill will be the latest and among the most important in a long series of victories. But this victory, as Winston Churchill said of another triumph for freedom, is not the end; it is not even the beginning of the end.

But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning. That beginning is freedom and the barriers to that freedom are tumbling down.

THE RIGHT TO SHARE

Freedom is the right to share, share fully and equally in American society, to vote, to hold a job, to enter a public place, to go to school. It is the right to be treated in every part of our national life as a person equal in dignity and promise to all others.

But freedom is not enough. You do not wipe away the scars of centuries by saying now you're free to go where you want and do as you desire and choose the leaders you please. You do not take a person who for years has been hobbled by chains and liberate him, bring him up to the starting line of a race and then say, you're free to compete with all the others, and still justly believe that you have been completely fair.

Thus it is not enough just to open the gates of opportunity.

All our citizens must have the ability to walk through those gates and this is the next and the more profound stage of the battle for civil rights.

We seek not just freedom but opportunity. We seek not just legal equity but human ability. Not just equality as a right and a theory but equality as a fact and equality as a result.

For the task is to give 20 million Negroes the same chance as every other American to learn and grow, to work and share in society, to develop their abilities—physical, mental, and spiritual—and to pursue their individual happiness.

To this end equal opportunity is essential, but not enough, not enough. Men and women of all races are born with the same range of abilities. But ability is not just the product of birth; ability is stretched or stunted by the family that you live with and the neighborhood you live in, by the school you go to, and the poverty or the richness of your surroundings.

It is the product of 100 unseen forces playing upon the little infant, the child, and finally the man. This graduating class at Howard University is witness to the indomitable determination of the Negro American to win his way in American life.

The number of Negroes in schools of higher learning has almost doubled in 15 years. The number of nonwhite professional workers has more than doubled in 10 years. The median income of Negro college women tonight exceeds that of white college women.

And there are also the enormous accomplishments of distinguished individual Negroes, many of them graduates of this institution, and one of them the first lady ambassador in the history of the United States.

NARROWING THE GAP

These are proud and impressive achievements. But they tell only the story of a growing middle-class minority steadily narrowing the gap between them and their white counterparts.

But for the great majority of Negro Americans, the poor, the unemployed, the uprooted and the dispossessed, there's a much grimmer story.

They still, as we meet here tonight, are another nation. Despite the court orders and the laws, despite the legislative victories and the speeches, for them the walls are rising and the gulf is widening and here are some of the facts of this American failure.

Thirty-five years ago, the rate of unemployment for Negroes and whites was about the same. Tonight the Negro rate is twice as high.

In 1948, the 8 percent unemployment rate for Negro teenage boys was actually less than that of whites. By last year, that rate had grown to 23 percent as against 13 percent for whites unemployed.

Between 1949 and 1959, the income of Negro men relative to white men declined in every section of this country. From 1952 to 1963, the median income of Negro families compared to whites actually dropped from 57 to 53 percent.

In the years 1955 through 1957, 22 percent of experienced Negro workers were out of work at some time during the year. In 1961 through 1963, that proportion had soared to 29 percent. Since 1947, the number of white families living in poverty has decreased 27 percent, while the number of poor nonwhite families decreased only 3 percent.

The infant mortality of nonwhites in 1940 was 70 percent greater than whites. Twenty-two years later it was 90 percent greater. Moreover, the isolation of Negro from white communities is increasing rather than decreasing, as Negroes crowd into the central cities and become a city within a city.

Of course. Negro Americans as well as white Americans have shared in our rising national abundance, but the harsh fact of the matter is that in the battle for true equality too many, far too many, are losing ground every day.

COMPLEX AND SUBTLE

We are not completely sure why this is. We know the causes are complex and subtle, but we do know the two broad basic reasons, and we do know that we have to act. First, Negroes are trapped, as many whites are trapped, in inherited gateless poverty. They lack training and skills. They are shut in in slums without decent medical care. Private and public poverty combine to cripple their capacities.

We are trying to attack these evils through my poverty program, through our education program, through our medical care and our other health programs, and a dozen more of the Great Society programs that are aimed at the root causes of this poverty.

We will increase and we will accelerate and we will broaden this attack in years to come until this most enduring of foes finally yields to our unyielding will.

But there is a second cause much more difficult to explain, more deeply grounded, more desperate in its force. And it is the devastating heritage of long years of slavery and a century of oppression and hatred and injustice.

For Negro poverty is not white poverty. Many of its causes and many of its cures are the same but there are differences—deep, corrosive, obstinate differences—radiating painful roots into the community and into the family and the nature of the individual.

These differences are not racial differences. They are solely and simply the consequence of ancient brutality, past injustice, and present prejudice.

They are anguishing to observe. For the Negro, they are a constant reminder of oppression. For the white, they are the constant reminder of guilt.

But they must be faced and they must be dealt with and they must be overcome. If we are ever to reach the time when the only difference between Negroes and whites is the color of their skins.

Nor can we find a complete answer in the experience of other American minorities. They made a valiant and a largely successful effort to emerge from poverty and prejudice. The Negro, like these others, will have to rely mostly on his own efforts but he just cannot do it alone, for they did not have the heritage of centuries to overcome and they did not have a cultural tradition which had been twisted and battered by endless years of hatred and hopelessness.

DARK INTENSITY

Nor were they excluded these others, because of race or color, a feeling whose dark intensity is matched by no other prejudice in our society. Nor can these differences be understood as isolated infirmities. They are a seamless web. They cause each other. They result from each other. They reinforce each other.

Much of the Negro community is buried under a blanket of history and circumstance. It is not a lasting solution to lift just one corner of that blanket. We must stand on all sides and we must raise the entire cover if we are to liberate our fellow citizens.

One of the differences is the increased concentration of Negroes in our cities. More than 73 percent of all Negroes live in urban areas compared with less than 70 percent for whites. Most of these Negroes live in slums. Most of these Negroes live together, a separate people, and men are shaped by their world.

When it is a world of decay ringed by an invisible wall, when escape is arduous and uncertain and the saving pressures of a more hopeful society are unknown, it can cripple the youth and it can desolate the men.

There is also the burden that a dark skin can add to the search for a productive place in our society.

Unemployment strikes most swiftly and broadly at the Negro. This burden erodes hope. Blighted hope breeds despair. Despair brings indifference to the learning which offers a way out, and despair coupled with indifference is often the source of destructive rebellion against the fabric of society.

There is also the lacerating hurt of early collision with white hatred or prejudice, distaste or condescension. Other groups have felt similar intolerance, but success and achievement could wipe it away. They do not change the color of a man's skin.

I have seen this uncomprehending pain in the eyes of the little young Mexican-American schoolchildren that I taught many years ago. But it can be overcome. But for many the wounds are always open.

Perhaps most important—its influence radiating to every part of life—is the breakdown of the Negro family structure. For this, most of all, white America must accept responsibility. It flows from centuries of oppression and persecution of the Negro man; it flows from the long years of degradation and discrimination which have attacked his dignity and assaulted his ability to produce for his family.

This, too, is not pleasant to look upon, but it must be faced by those whose serious intent is to improve the life of all Americans.

FAMILY IS CORNERSTONE

Only a minority—less than half of all Negro children—reach the age of 18 having lived all their lives with both of their parents.

At this moment tonight, little less than two-thirds are at home with both of their parents.

Probably a majority of all Negro children received federally aided public assistance sometime during their childhood.

The family is the cornerstone of our society. More than any other force it shapes the attitude, the hopes, the ambitions, and the values of the child.

When the family collapses, it is the children that are usually damaged. When it happens on a massive scale, the entire community itself is crippled.

So, unless we work to strengthen the family, to create conditions under which most parents will stay together, all the rest—schools and playgrounds and public assistance and private concern—will never be enough to cut completely the circle of despair and deprivation.

There is no single easy answer to all of these problems. Jobs are part of the answer. They bring the income which permits a man to provide for his family, decent home in decent surroundings and a chance to learn—an equal chance to learn—are part of the answer.

Welfare and social programs, better designed to hold families together are part of the answer. Care for the sick is part of the answer. An understanding heart by all Americans is another big part of the answer.

And to all of these fronts and a dozen more I will dedicate the expanding efforts of the Johnson administration.

But there are other answers that are still to be found, nor do we fully understand even all of the problems. Therefore, I want to announce tonight that this fall I intend to call a White House conference of scholars and experts and outstanding Negro leaders of both races and officials of government at every level.

This White House Conference theme and title will be to fulfill these rights. Its object will be to help the American Negro fulfill the rights, which after the long time of injustice, he is finally about to secure, to move beyond opportunity to achievement, to shatter forever, not only the barriers of law and public practice, but the walls which bound the condition of man by the color of his skin, to dissolve as best we can the antique enmities of the heart which diminish the holder, divide the great democracy, and do wrong, great wrong, to the children of God.

CHIEF GOAL OF PROGRAM

And I pledge you tonight that this will be a chief goal of my administration and of my program next year and in the years to come. And I hope, and I pray, and I believe it will be a part of the program of all America.

For what is justice?

It is to fulfill the fair expectations of man,

Thus, American justice is a very special thing. For, from the first, this has been a land of towering expectations. It was to be a nation where each man could be ruled by the common consent of all, enshrined in law, given life by institutions, guided by men themselves subject to its rule. And all—all of every station and origin—would be touched equally in obligation and in liberty.

Beyond the law lay the land. It was a rich land, glowing with more abundant promise than man had ever seen. Here, unlike any place yet known, all were to share the harvest. And beyond this was the dignity of man.

Each could become whatever his qualities of mind and spirit would permit to strive, to seek, and if he could, to find his happiness.

This is American justice. We have pursued it faithfully to the edge of our imperfections and we have failed to find it for the American Negro.

So it is the glorious opportunity of this generation to end the one huge wrong of the American Nation and in so doing to find America for ourselves with the same immense thrill of discovery which gripped those who first began to realize that here, at last, was a home for freedom.

And all it will take is for all of us to understand what this country is and what this country must become.

The Scripture promises, "I shall light a candle of understanding in thine heart which shall not be put out." Together, and with millions more, we can light that candle of understanding in the heart of all America, and once lit it will never again go out.

[From the New York Times, June 6, 1965]

"To Fulfill These Rights"

President Johnson has addressed himself boldly to what is unquestionably the most basic and also the most complicated phase of the civil rights struggle—the need for translating newly reinforced legal rights into genuine equality. In his Howard University commencement speech, the President exhibited the same forthrightness and resolve he used to drive the Civil Rights Act through Congress and is now applying to smash barriers to Negro voting.

The difficulty, however, is that the second phase of the struggle does not lend itself to the same clear types of solution as the first. A courageous President, backed by the aroused conscience of the Nation, could—and did—accomplish in a year or two the destruction of legal walls that have penned the Negro into a ghetto of undereducation, wretched housing, low pay, job exclusion and social neglect.

But giving the great mass of ghetto-dwellers the ability to walk through the gates of hope and opportunity presents a vastly more challenging assignment. The nature of that challenge was well indicated by Mr. Johnson's citation of statistics showing that Negroes, always at the bottom of the economic scale, have been slipping even further behind in the years of maximum prosperity since World War II—the years in which they have made their greatest progress in establishing their right to equal treatment by law.

Bayard Rustin, the ranking economic philosopher of the civil rights movement, noted at a recent New York conference how inexorably changing technology is snuffing out the unskilled and semiskilled jobs that have historically been the mainstay of Negro employment. If every Negro were changed into a white man overnight, Mr. Rustin observed, he would not be able to get a job because business today does not want what he has—"muscle power."

The cures for the social afflictions that hold the Negro in thrall lie in public and private programs that make the present war on poverty and all its related undertakings for expanded education, urban renewal and improved welfare services seem incredibly puny. In the absence of much more massive action to engender full employment, clear the slums and make more schooling available to more people, the chief effect of these programs may be to confront the United States with problems not unlike those of the "revolutions of rising expectations" in Africa and Asia.

The conference the President intends to hold at the White House next fall with the theme, "To Fulfill These Rights," will have as its mission the development of an action program as crucial for the country as it is for the Negro.

[From the Washington Post, June 6, 1965]

Mr. Johnson's Candle

President Johnson probed far beneath the surface of the racial problem when he addressed the graduates of Howard University on Friday. Instead of boasting about the accomplishments of his administration in opening doors to the Negro, he acknowledged in the words of Winston Churchill that what has been done "is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning."

The beginning is freedom, the President said. But freedom is always merely a starting point. Freedom for what? Men do not eat freedom or find shelter from the elements in it. Nor does freedom itself enlighten the mind or enrich the spirit. "It is not enough," the President said, "to open the gates of opportunity. All our citizens must have the ability to walk through those gates."

The problem to which the President addressed himself is not primarily racial. Rather it is an acute social problem, with racial overtones. How is the ability to live in freedom, comfort, and dignity to be acquired by the poor, the unemployed and the deprived? The President recognized that it is not merely a matter of providing jobs, playgrounds and decent housing, however important these things may be. People who have lived for generations in depressing slums, with meager education, without the acquisition of skills, with little medical care, and no tradition of self-improvement are easy victims of despair and the lassitude of hopelessness. Youngsters who live in unstable homes or have no homes, at all miss the chief ingredients that makes for a cohesive society.

The chief significance of the President's address is that he traced the ills which he has sought to combat through his antipoverty and civil rights programs to very deep roots. Implicit in his discussion is the fact that the Government cannot reach all of these sources of maladjustment, except in a remote way. In addition to all the Government can do there is need for human understanding, individual and group efforts and a general improvement of the social, moral, and intellectual environment in which people live. This is an immense order, but the first requirement of progress is to view the problem in all its dimensions.

Apparently it will be the chief assignment of the White House conference which the President intends to call a few months hence to delve into these deeply-rooted aspects of the problem. It will look beyond the guarantee of rights to fulfillment of the promise of a better life. It will join the concept of freedom to that of achievement. Of course no White House conference can change the mores of the people, but a candid exploration of what lies beyond the gates of freedom can add to the national ferment out of which social progress may grow.

The President recognized the great accomplishments of Howard University and other institutions which have contributed so much to the preparation of Negroes for high positions and professional careers. But he was right to attack the problems confronting the

Negro in this period of rapid evolution in a much broader context. The deep concern of this democratic land is not only with the elite who are prepared for new opportunities but also with the millions for whom there has been no dawn of new hope. The President's drive in the direction of suppressing prejudices, broadening horizons, and awakening latent capacities in the great masses of forgotten men and women is in keeping with the finest traditions of this restless and energetic people. He is indeed lighting a "candle of understanding."

[From the New York Times, June 7, 1965]

JOHNSON VIEW OF NEGRO—PRESIDENT TAKES SAME ADVANCED POSITION ASSUMED BY SUPREME COURT IN SCHOOL CASE

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, June 6.—President Johnson has now taken the same advanced view of the Negro's role in American life that the Supreme Court took of his role in the American school system in the famous Brown decision of 1954.

Prior to that case, the Court had held and it was accepted American doctrine, that "separate but equal" schools satisfied all the Nation's legal and moral obligations to Negro education. So long as the facilities and curriculums of segregated Negro schools were "equal" to those provided for whites, it had been asserted, it was all right for them to be "separate."

But in the Brown case the Supreme Court swept that doctrine aside with one sociological stroke. It held that segregated schools, no matter how "equal" technically, were inherently unequal because of the fact that they were also "separate." Segregation itself, the Court said in effect, enforced and perpetuated the role of inferiority that had been assigned to—and largely accepted by—the Negro.

At Howard University Friday night, Mr. Johnson laid down much the same principle on a far broader scale.

Providing for the Negro an equal "right" to vote, to get a job, to go to unsegregated schools, to due process of law, Mr. Johnson was really saying, provided him with no more than "separate but equal" citizenship. And just as had been true in education, so it was true in the broader view that "separate" is inherently "unequal."

Up to now, Mr. Johnson argued, the Negro population really had made up "another nation" within the United States—poverty-stricken, ill-educated, crowded into ghettos without gates, despised first for the color of their skin and only a little less for their ignorance and poverty. Therefore, it really was but little more than an empty gesture to make legal decrees of equal rights and equal opportunity for them.

For these things could not, in fact, exist for the Negro until he had the ability and the standing to take advantage of them. And after a century and more of oppression and persecution, after generations of the inherent inequality of separation, he had no such ability or standing.

Thus did President Johnson face squarely what must be ranked as the most difficult problem in American life. That problem is not the enforcing of legal equity for the Negro. It is, rather, the acceptance of the Negro as an equal human being rather than a "separate but equal" human being—a man with a darker skin rather than a "black man."

That difficulty is symbolized in countless ways—perhaps first of all in the fact that since the beginning of time white has been the symbolic color of purity and hope, and black the color of evil and fear. Carried into racial attitudes, Mr. Johnson said Friday night, color sensitivity is "a feeling whose dark intensity is matched by no other prejudice in our society."

Even he chose the word "dark" to make his point.

That is why some civil rights experts are convinced that the greatest civil rights progress in coming years will be legal progress in the South. For in the Southern States, with their long history of slavery and segregation, the comparatively easy battle for legal equity is still in progress and that equity is likely to be widely attained in the foreseeable future.

When it is, the South then will be joined with the great cities of the North and the other centers of Negro life in what the President called "the next and more profound stage of the battle."

In Mr. Johnson's speech there was a hint of bafflement and frustration, as if he could not confidently suggest how that stage of the battle were to be won. More and better jobs, more and better homes, more and better schools, more and better welfare and social programs—all these he suggested as "part of the answer," and added:

"An understanding heart by all Americans is also part of the answer."

That was the nub of it, as Mr. Johnson seemed to know. The Government can provide the schools, the homes, the programs, perhaps even the jobs, although it will take time and massive effort. When the Southern States resisted school desegregation, troops could be sent to enforce it; when a southern Negro is disfranchised, court orders and Federal referees can award him the vote.

But if absolute equality for the Negro depends, finally, on the absolute end of separation for the Negroes, then troops and courts will be of limited use. For they have no jurisdiction over the human heart, where the ultimate problem lies.

THE DANGER OF ISOLATIONISM; EVIDENCE OF RED DISCIPLINE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it appears that two of the most popular myths promulgated by newspaper and television pundits are that the Communist satellites of Eastern Europe are divorcing themselves from Soviet control, and that the Soviet Union is mellowing and is, therefore, not participating in the Communist aggression against South Vietnam. The able columnist and astute observer, David Lawrence, has, in successive articles, deflated both of these shibboleths. I ask unanimous consent that his articles, entitled "Isolationism Again Poses Danger" and "Polish Voting Shows Red Discipline," which were published in the Washington Evening Star on June 1 and June 2, respectively, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, June 1, 1965]

ISOLATIONISM AGAIN POSES DANGER

(By David Lawrence)

A great deal of argument that is superficial, and possibly dangerous in its consequences, is being heard not only outside but inside this country concerning policies of the U.S. Government in world affairs. Much of it overlooks some unpleasant truths—namely, that both the United Nations and the Organization of American States, which are frequently urged as a logical means of achieving world peace, are themselves torn asunder by Communist intrigue and are not as effective as they might be in solving international troubles.

Also, an increasing number of people in America are being misled today by what are called "neoisolationist" groups. These are persons in academic life as well as in Congress who have decided that, because the United States cannot by itself possibly police the world, the thing to do is to withdraw from Vietnam and the Dominican Republic and everywhere else and to let the rest of the world get along as best it can.

Unfortunately, these exponents of isolationism are unmindful of the fact that two world wars were indirectly the result of exactly such a philosophy. Almost up to the outbreak of each of the major conflicts, there were isolationists in the United States who were demanding that there be less preparedness and also that Americans stay out of foreign alliances altogether. Nevertheless, the end result in each case was a war in which many Americans lost their lives. The same kind of isolationism which ignored the evolution of conflicts that ultimately caused direct attacks on the United States now is shaping up as a potential danger to the American people.

It is true that the United States does not have the resources to police the entire world or even to sustain it economically. But this does not justify an abandonment of the crusade to bring about a better life among the smaller nations, including the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, or a discontinuance of the effort to impress the peoples of the larger nations that their destiny is wrapped up in what can be done by the United States, together with free governments in their own countries, to develop a lasting peace in the world.

The rise of German imperialism in the early part of this century met with indifference just as did the steady aggression of Hitler's imperialism in the 1930's. Today, another enemy of the same type—Communist imperialism—is spreading its tentacles to almost every region of the world. The isolationists, however would, in effect, run up the white flag and remove from the scene the biggest single force that could thwart the ambitions of the Communists—namely, the military and economic power of the United States.

Neither in Vietnam nor in the Dominican Republic does a civil war itself present a direct threat to the American people. The menace is the backing given by the Red Chinese and the Soviet Governments respectively, whose agents have infested all the capitals of the world and have infiltrated also inside the United States.

Today's world is not safe for large or small nations. The Communist imperialists are not bound by any code of morals, nor do they respect international boundaries. Just because the threat to America is not clearly defined in the day-by-day debate, there are lots of persons who think that "neoisolationism" or isolationism is the right course to pursue.

What is surprising is that many persons who know the history of the periods preceding World Wars I and II are in the forefront of the discussion today in trying to drag their own nation into an isolationism which can in itself furnish the very conditions that may plunge the United States into a war against its will. For enemy governments misconstrue such isolationism or pacifism as a sign of weakness or fear, thus encouraging aggressors to take chances. Whether the isolationists are Members of Congress or professors on the campus, they are giving encouragement, though unintentionally perhaps, to the Communist cause.

It is unfortunate that the true enemies in the cold war are not clearly marked out. It was only a few days ago that President Johnson called Red China the real enemy in southeast Asia. It may be wondered how long it will be before the Soviet government, too, will be painted in its true colors. It is important for the whole world to understand that the main obstacle to peace and international understanding is the Communist infiltration everywhere which prevents international cooperation through the United Nations or other instruments of collective action.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, June 2, 1965]

POLISH VOTING SHOWS RED DISCIPLINE

(By David Lawrence)

For several months the impression has been conveyed to the people of the United States that somehow or other the satellite states in Eastern Europe now are being given more and more freedom and are being subjected less and less to Communist dictatorship. But the facts which came out in the open this week show how mistaken such an impression really is. What are those facts?

1. While about 18.5 million people voted in the national elections in Poland for parliamentary and local government candidates, there was no opposition party. The Communists dominated the single party whose candidates were on the ballot.

2. Although the voting was said to be not compulsory, it was considered unwise to abstain. More than 90 percent of the electorate turned out to vote. This is evidence of how well disciplined is the Communist organization.

3. Each of the 616 candidates for the 460 National Parliament seats was pledged to support the Communist-drafted platform.

A dispatch from Warsaw by United Press International, describing the elections, said that some curtained booths were provided for those voters who wished to strike out certain names where there was more than one candidate for the same post, but that few voters went into the booths. The dispatch added:

"Most voters considered the results were preordained and that making a public show of secret balloting would be a futile and perhaps ill-advised gesture."

The Communists have maintained complete power over the conduct of the five elections after World War II, which have been held in 1947, 1952, 1957, 1961, and 1965. Thus, in a period of 18 years, there have been only five opportunities for the people to go through the form of voting. But, in each case, the Communist leaders have taken charge and no opportunity was given to cast votes for an opposition party.

By maintaining such complete control over the elections and by selecting candidates who are thoroughly indoctrinated with Communist ideology, the Russians have no need today to station their troops in Poland, or in any of the other satellites. Such is the recognition of Communist power and the effect of an involuntary acquiescence to it. The Moscow Government controls what is going on just as effectively as if it had military rule in each of the satellite countries. Indeed, civilian Communists are as thoroughly trained in how to maintain discipline as any army could be.

What occurred in Poland this week is a sample not only of what happens in the other Communist-bloc countries in Eastern Europe but of what is planned for every country in Latin America in which the Communists today are seeking to take over the sovereign governments by an infiltration process.

Cuba is a significant example of how the Communists work. They send to a country trained leaders who know how to pick out the officials to supervise the operations of the national as well as the local governments. If the Dominican Republic fell into the hands of the Communists tomorrow, a similar plan would be used there. Likewise, if South Vietnam were taken over by the North Vietnamese Government, which today is Communist-controlled, it would mean the end of the present government at Saigon.

Yet there are many so-called liberals in America who are willing to accuse their own Government of impérialism, notwithstanding the fact that the objective of the United States is plainly designed to emancipate the peoples of the smaller nations who currently may be under Communist rule or who are being threatened with conquest through the intrigue of the Soviet regime.

The way by which the Moscow government administers a country as big as Poland is clear proof of why it is so often said that it isn't necessary for the Russians to land troops in any Latin American country. Once the election machinery comes under the control of the Communist Party system by infiltration within a country, there is no need for military action.

It is this kind of strategy which deceives many gullible observers, who seem to think that Communist infiltration is insignificant because the actual band of Communists may be small in size. They little realize that it doesn't take a large number of persons to form a ruling group and that, once a political party is established under Communists auspices, the discipline soon covers every worker in the factory and every peasant on the farm. Thus, the Communist organization in Poland today is known as the United Workers Party which in turn dominates the United Peasant Party and the Democratic Party, and in nearly all instances they have the same slate of candidates.

The so-called elections in Poland this week are a tragic reminder of the failure of the United Nations to take effective steps to remove the aggressors from the territory of peoples who once enjoyed self-determination and freedom.

RISKS INVOLVED IN A U.S. MILITARY POLICY OF NUCLEAR STALEMATE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the June 1965 issue of the Air Force and Space Digest, there appears an article entitled "The Myth of Détente: 'We Can Win Without Trying.'" This excellent article was written by the able historian, Herman S. Wolk.

In the article, Mr. Wolk points out the great risks involved in a U.S. military policy of nuclear stalemate. I highly recommend the article to all Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, and to the American public. Unfortunately, such realistic viewpoints receive a minimum of coverage from our mass news media. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MYTH OF DÉTENTE: "WE CAN WIN WITHOUT TRYING"

(Mr. Wolk is a historian at SAC Headquarters, Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr., and specializes in the military-political aspects of the cold war. He has written on facets of this subject for Air Force and Space Digest several times over the past few years. His most recent offering was an article in the August 1964 issue, "Is History Obsolete?" Others by Mr. Wolk have appeared in October 1964, March 1962, and December 1961. The opinions and conclusions expressed here are Mr. Wolk's own and do not necessarily represent official positions of the U.S. Air Force or the Strategic Air Command.)

(By Herman S. Wolk)

The U.S. international political and strategic positions, in a state of subtle flux during the past several years, have recently emerged in more definite form. The combination for the future appears now as one of détente plus a form of minimum deterrence.

Recognizing the capriciousness of history and the inevitability of change, let us examine the validity of this combination and its effect upon the future of the United States. Can we expect international politics to stand still or technology to freeze? Can leadtime lost while we stabilize be regained?

Although military policy forms an intrinsic part of national security affairs, it is subordinate to the political "grand design." Today, then, a significant measure of U.S. national security is predicated upon a burgeoning rapprochement between the United States and the Soviet Union.

What precisely does détente mean? Narrowly defined, it denotes an easing of strained relations. It does not denote specific settlement of outstanding political issues. Indeed, as Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, has pointed out, we have no reason for expecting any dramatic solutions to festering problems such as the German question or our southeast Asian difficulties.

The real significance of the latest American-Soviet détente lies in the changed psychological environment between the two nations. The acceptance of this psychological shift toward what the Russians call "coexistence" is the result of the lessening of tensions which—from the American view—grew out of the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, the limited nuclear test ban treaty, and the Sino-Soviet schism. Underlying the rapprochement is the prevailing U.S. view that both countries share an overwhelming common interest; i.e., the prevention of nuclear war.

Another vital ingredient is the growing mood of turning inward, of redirecting our attention and energies toward pressing domestic matters and away from efforts to unlock long-neglected international problems. There is abroad in our land a new feeling of peaceful coexistence.[1] Ironically, this feeling has arisen from the success of U.S. strategic nuclear deterrence, which in large measure has preserved the peace for almost two decades. Increasingly, the aura of détente has taken on the attributes of a new orthodoxy.

While the reality, depth, and permanence of the thaw are open to question, its byproducts are clearly visible. Foremost is the drive toward what has been called nuclear stalemate. This has been made possible by the concomitants of détente, which include a lessening of cold-war ideology and a downgrading of military and strategic considerations.

It is important to recognize that this nuclear stalemate lacks the legitimacy of a formal agreement. As far as the United States is concerned, it has been implemented primarily by unilateral initiative with perhaps a tacit understanding that the Soviets also have accepted a strategic slowdown as in their best interest.

"With the distintegration of the bipolar world on which the cold war was based, Americans * * * have begun to shift their attention * * * to problems of their own domestic society. At last they begin to feel themselves able to dismiss from first place in their minds the external world that, for a generation past, has intruded itself so alarmingly on their consciousness." (Louis J. Halle.)

---

[1] One indicator of the popular acceptance of détente has been the almost unanimous support and acceptance of Senator FULBRIGHT's "New Realities and Old Myths," which, in effect, formed a theory and rationale for accommodation. There have been exceptions to this consensus. See my "Is History Obsolete?" Air Force/Space Digest, August 1964, and Morton Kaplan's searing indictment of the Fulbright thesis, "Old Realities and New Myths," World Politics, January 1965.

"Both sides in the arms race are * * * confronted by the dilemma of steadily increasing military power and steadily decreasing national security. It is our considered professional judgment that this dilemma has no technical solution." (Jerome Wiesner and Herbert York.)

"All sensible people in all our countries agree that the threat which brought our Alliance into being—the direct military threat to Western Europe from Soviet Russia—has receded. But all sensible people know that it has not disappeared; and nobody can feel sure that it will not loom again should the West weaken its defensive posture. If we were in danger of forgetting this, the fall of Khrushchev and the explosion of a first nuclear device in China have been a salutary reminder.

"The Chinese nuclear explosion * * * was perhaps the most immediately dramatic of all the warnings we have had. Militarily and in the short term, it is of very little importance. Politically and psychologically, and in the long term, it is very important indeed. * * * The only safe working hypothesis for us to adopt is that if the Soviet Union resigns itself to the prospect of China's becoming a nuclear power—and it can hardly do otherwise—it will have somehow or other to come to terms with China: and that if it succeeds in doing so, the implications are not likely to be to the advantage of the West." (Manlio Brosio, Secretary General of NATO.)

Thus we find the United States leveling off development of offensive strategic nuclear weapon systems. Proponents of what we may call strategic stability have won out over the adherents of strategic superiority. Strategic military stability can be seen as a means of arms control. It forms a midpoint between those who clamor for disarmament and those who seek clear strategic superiority.

But, as an outgrowth of détente, stability rests upon a dual rationale. Along with the arms-control syndrome, there has evolved a growing conviction in U.S. political and scientific circles that a technological solution to the arms race does not exist. There is an assumption that further technological development or breakthroughs are not possible. Jerome Wiesner, scientific adviser to President Kennedy, and Herbert York, Director of Defense Research and Engineering under President Eisenhower, have recently espoused this viewpoint and declared that since World War II our national security has been decreasing while at the same time our military power has been increasing.

The philosophies of détente and technological rigor mortis lead logically to a strategy of minimum deterrence, which is seen as perfectly compatible with a period of accommodation.

Minimum or finite deterrence signals an end to any doctrine that relies primarily on counterforce strategy. Much of the confusion in the debate over counterforce and city-busting minimum deterrence can be traced to the tricky business of force structure and the particular period in time that one is talking about. For example, the United States today possesses a good measure of both counterforce capability and city-busting punch. The B-52 fleet insures a significant measure of discriminating counterforce ability. The growing hardened and dispersed Minuteman force, together with the Polaris submarine fleet, augments counterforce with a powerful missile force.

But if one wishes to look into the 1970's, it becomes equally obvious that—given the present policy direction—the United States will rely primarily on the Minuteman-Polaris combination as far as a strategic nuclear deterrent is concerned. The signs are unmistakable. This trend toward minimum deterrence and away from preponderant counterforce has sometimes been described as controlled or limited counterforce.

The strong pull of détente, with its emphasis on mutual deterrence and strategic stability rather than superiority, fosters both the strategy and force structure which will govern the future U.S. posture. Thus, while it is admitted that the B-47 is obsolete and is, in fact, being phased out; that the B-52 will be entering a period of obsolescence (it has been announced that early model B-52's will be phased out in the near future); and that Atlas and Titan I ICBM units are phased out, the basic rationale for the strategic moratorium rests upon a tacit international détente between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Yet nuclear strategy is only as credible as the means available to carry it out. A Minuteman-Polaris force is primarily a minimum deterrent. The future design of the strategic deterrent force is consistent with the halt in the arms race, the establishment of a rapprochement, and the assumption that no significant technological breakthroughs are over the horizon. The strategic situation toward which we are headed is in perfect concert with politics of continuing détente.

The present climate did not develop overnight. For several years, despite setbacks, an accommodation has been building. It has been nurtured by the idea that money siphoned from weapons can be used in a thousand peaceful pursuits without having to pay any price and without degradation to our national security. An influential segment of the U.S. population has never accepted the fact that nuclear deterrence has anything to do with the pursuit of peace and freedom. A tinge of nuclear pacifism has always been present. Too, in the absence of direct crises between America and Russia, some have become tired of the cold war. Others will argue that the cold war, with its ideological overtones and large military expenditures, is a thing of the past.

In addition, the so-called end of bipolarity has accelerated the pull of accommodation. Since it is felt the United States and the Soviet Union are now only two of many power centers, it is said that nationalism and regionalism have tempered the cold war.

If all of this sounds like an overly neat package, it is nevertheless precisely in tune with the times. However, in the interests of distasteful realism, several questions must be raised. The first has to do with what the diplomatic historian of World War II, Herbert Feis, has called the prankishness of history.[2] Khrushchev's ouster serves as an excellent example of historical surprise—strategic intelligence was conspicuous by its absence. What further unpredictable events lie around the corner? Who is audacious and foolish enough to claim foresight?

There is danger in attempting to settle for a technological stalemate in an age of political revolution. International communism being no longer monolithic, we shall have to deal with a fluid international situation. In view of Mao Tse-tung's age, we may be entering a period when the top leadership of both Soviet Russia and Red China will be in a state of flux. Today's détente may be tomorrow's conflict.

As to prophecy, we must relearn the old lesson that we cannot unilaterally foreclose technological development. It would, of course, be comforting if we could make positive predictions about the course—or the end—of technology and then sit back and relax, ending the drain on our pocketbooks. Yet, the hard facts of technology and the contemporary world do not allow us this luxury.

Technology, advanced weapons development, strategy, and politics are not separate entities but meshing segments impacting on the Nation's overall standing in the international community. Great powers are those that are technologically advanced. Technological timidity has become a direct road to second-rate-power status.

The United States has all the tools to set the technological pace in the second half of the century. As the American gross national product continues to grow, as our research centers advance the boundaries of knowledge, and as U.S. industry continues to gain in efficiency and productivity, it becomes mandatory to channel the results into the Nation's lifeblood, including the Defense Establishment in general and the tools of strategic nuclear deterrence in particular.

Our national power has been progressively built over the years. Its solid foundation was constructed as an answer to aggression in the post-World War II period—to the enslavement of Eastern Europe, the Berlin blockade, the Korean war, and the Soviet thrust into the space age on October 4, 1957. The design, evolution, and production of strategic weapons take years. Dynamism today—or lack of it—will shape our national posture in the years ahead. Leadtime remains a reality to be grappled with; there are no magic detours.

History has demonstrated the lesson of technological preparedness. It was the U.S.S.R.'s sputnik that thrust space into the cold war. Have we forgotten that following the moonshot of Lunik II on September 14, 1959, Khrushchev arrived in the United States the very next day and presented President Eisenhower with a replica of the hammer and sickle Russia had sent to the moon?

Too often ignored in the lessons of the Cuban missile crisis is the role and importance of strategic military superiority. Many have pointed to the Cuban crisis as a kind of watershed which turned nuclear confrontation into rapprochement. Yet it also proved the flexibility and utility of strategic power both as a deterrent and as an umbrella for conventional forces. The Cuban crisis demonstrated the correlation between usable strategic power and political leverage.

We still have a long way to go in mastering the psychological use of military strength. Escalation, for example, is a two-way street; it is a danger to be guarded against and a threat that can be magnificently exploited under proper conditions. There is no substitute for strategic superiority.

This point has not been lost on the Soviets. Robert D. Crane of the Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., in discussing the aftermath of the missile showdown and the connection between a new Russian power buildup and détente, has put it this way:

"The future success of the strategy developed by Khrushchev during the late 1950's and early 1960's would require another period of détente similar to the one he initiated soon after coming to power. The new period of détente, however, would have to be basically different in purpose. It would not be designed merely as a temporary measure to gain time for building up the defenses of the Soviet Union against outside pressures. Rather it would have to make possible a long-range program of basic military research and development. This military research and development program in turn would rely on political and diplomatic support in the form of a strategic dialog on arms constraints."[3]

THE MYTH OF DÉTENTE

Thus, the Wiesner and York thesis that our national security has declined with the increase in U.S. military power is misleading at best and patently false at worst. If our power had not dramatically increased in the years after World War II, we might not have any national security to worry about today. Further, they seem to infer that the decrease in security has come about as a consequence of the increase in military power. This is a strange and perverse logic.

---

[2] Herbert Feis, "The Prankishness of History," Virginia Quarterly Review, winter 1965.

[3] Robert D. Crane, "The Sino-Soviet Dispute on War and the Cuban Crisis," Orbis, fall 1964, p. 548.

No sane person argues with the oftenstated fact that the United States and the U.S.S.R. share a common interest in avoiding nuclear war. Yet, surely this is not our only interest, nor does it take precedence over all others, including the preservation of a free, democratic society. Is Soviet occupation of Western Europe preferable to a policy which possesses a minimum risk of nuclear war? Those who stress the comomn-interest theme seem willing to turn their backs on a host of problems including a rapidly deteriorating Western alliance. Paradoxically, the American penchant for détente has reinforced the French position for going full speed on building a Force de Frappe.

Today's liberals who preach the new isolationism because of their obsession with nuclear weapons and escalation are practicing escapism and parochialism under the guise of restraint and moderation.

The dilemma remains: What is the role of strategic nuclear deterrence in the age of détente? Most importantly perhaps, despite the existence of an accommodation, one must certainly underscore the requirement for specifically defined long-range objectives in our national-security policy; objectives that will withstand unsuspected future shocks. Logically, this calls for continuing the policy of nuclear deterrence that has been the cornerstone of American national-security policy for two decades—years that have seen almost unbelievable transformations in world politics and the very fabric of our lives.

The fact is that our strategic retaliatory force is basic to our security. It demands top priority because any weakness here could be fatal. This does not mean neglect of conventional and unconventional forces. Bernard Brodie has described the interrelationship of general and limited-war forces this way:

"The more effectively we do our job in the area of total war capabilities, the greater the range of possible cases for the application of limited force. In other words, we probably have to spend more on total war in order to have sound reasons for spending more on limited war."[4]

Deterrence cannot be bought cheaply nor can it be taken for granted. If deterrence is to be maintained, it must be dynamic—based on technological advance, not technological stalemate. To gamble with technology is tantamount to playing Russian roulette with survival.

Of equal importance to technology is the use of the nuclear deterrent on the international political stage. The supreme irony is that, in certain situations, nonuse of deterrence in international politics can be as dangerous as overplaying one's nuclear capability. Neither of these extremes can substitute for timing and dexterity.

Recognition that change and uncertainty are the stuff of history demands flexibility and an open mind. The idea that the existence of nuclear weapons plus accommodation equals the absence of war and that we can therefore settle for a policy of inaction is spurious and self-defeating.

The United States must not turn its back on the future. Should we think that today—or tomorrow—might be a convenient place to stop, even for a breather, other nations will pick up the challenge. And with what philosophies and purposes to guide them? We dare not risk it.

The present world situation and our commitment to freedom demand that no artificial obstacles be placed in the way of scientific progress and the technological revolution. Technological stability cannot be decreed.

The slowdown in the pursuit of technological progress can result only in wasting away our hard-earned stockpile of scientific knowledge. Leadtime being what it is, this would create a built-in hiatus between the time unanticipated events shock the Nation into moving forward in weaponry and the time when the needed new systems can be operational.

Western democracy's best safeguard is strategic military superiority. Without it our free institutions could be wiped out in hours. Neither the Soviet leaders nor the militant Red Chinese hierarchy have forsworn their ultimate objectives.

In an age which pays homage to images, euphemism, and cutely turned phrases, we must guard vigilantly aganist any unilateral act of technological stalemate or cutback. There is evolving a cult which seeks to cloak constraint and cutback under the cover of rapprochement and reasonableness. Such distortion attempts to circumvent realities by incessantly telling us we can win without really trying.

When survival depends upon knowledge and its constant application, wisdom becomes the ability to recognize and accept the realities of the nuclear age.

Until world powers have reached agreement on outstanding political questions backed by guaranteed arms inspection and a supranational organization with the power and means of enforcement, Oskar Morgenstern's admonition will remain sound: The defense we need is the defense we can afford.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the editorials "Should Wait" and "United States Acts as Critics Argue" which appeared in the Columbus, Ind., Evening Republican and the Anderson, Ind., Bulletin respectively. Both articles bring to light again the wisdom of President Johnson's immediate action in the Dominican Republic which saved countless lives of Americans and extirpated the Communist infiltration of the Rebel forces.

As the President recognizes, it is always important that we work with our American neighbors when crises plague our Hemisphere; but unfortunately we have yet to build an inter-American machinery capable of instantly responding to the sudden flare-ups which the Communists are so quick to take advantage of.

These editorials laud the President's effective interim activity which assured that there would not be another "Cuba" and which paved the way for the Organization of American States to undertake further responsibilities in assisting the Dominican peoples in achieving a peaceful, democratic development.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbus (Ind.) Republican, May 7, 1965]

SHOULD WAIT?

With the Dominican crisis appearing to be eased slightly, second-guessers are arguing over the wisdom of President Johnson's rapid dispatch of American troops to their first landing on the soil of a Latin nation in more than a generation.

President Johnson has repeated several times that his first reason to get the marines into Santo Domingo was to protect American lives and that these forces were bolstered as the fighting grew worse and it appeared that Communist forces were taking over the rebellion.

But a number of critics still question whether or not there ever really was any danger of a Communist takeover of the Dominican Republic. The New York Times observed that since U.S. troops have intervened, no one any longer will be able to prove or disprove the thesis that a rebel victory would have brought a Communist government to Santo Domingo.

The Times seems to be saying that President Johnson should have waited until the new government had signed a trade agreement with the Soviet Union and Russian technicians had begun arriving, perhaps being spared from their duties in Cuba. It was this same New York Times which had so much trouble making up its mind whether Castro was really a Communist.

And while the Times raises the question of no proof that the Communists were a threat in Santo Domingo, other critics warn of the great damage done by this return to gunboat diplomacy, damage to the good neighbor policy, and to the concept of inter-American cooperation, equality, and nonintervention in internal affairs built up over the years.

It is most likely, however, that the Dominican revolution would have long been over and many American lives possibly lost before the Organization of American States could have decided on the need for such action and acted.

The whole Dominican question should be debated in the councils of the OAS, and the OAS must take the lead in attempting to solve the Dominican problem. But it is, thanks to the United States, that the problem confronting the Organization of American States is that of building a stable democracy in the Dominican Republic and not a problem of what to do about another Communist "Cuba" in the Western Hemisphere.

[From the Anderson (Ind.) Bulletin, May 8, 1965]

UNITED STATES ACTS AS CRITICS ARGUE

With the Dominican crisis sputtering to an end, at least in its shooting phase, second-guessers are arguing over the wisdom of President Johnson's rapid dispatching of American troops to their first landing on the soil of a Latin nation in more than a generation.

One question that occupies some critics is whether or not there ever really was any danger of a Communist takeover of the Dominican Republic. The New York Times, for one, observed that since U.S. troops had intervened, no one any longer will be able to prove or disprove the thesis that a rebel victory would have brought a Communist government to Santo Domingo.

Presumably, the President should have waited until the new government had signed a trade agreement with the Soviet Union and Russian technicians had begun arriving, perhaps being spared from their duties in Cuba.

---

[4] Bernard Brodie, "Defense Policy and the Possibility of Total War," Daedalus, October 1962, reprinted in Survival, the Institute of Strategic Studies, London, November–December 1962.

Others decry the great damage done the good neighbor policy and the concept of inter-American cooperation and equity and nonintervention in internal affairs, so laboriously built up over the years, by this alleged return to "gunboat diplomacy."

The fact is, however, that the Dominican revolution would have long been over before the Organization of American States could have decided on the need for action, and taken such action, had the United States sat back and waited upon its advice and consent.

The whole Dominican question, of course, should be debated in the councils of the OAS. But it is thanks to the United States that the problem confronting us and our Latin fellow members today is that of building stable democracy in the Dominican Republic and not what to do about another Communist foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the bill.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FLIGHT OF "GEMINI IV"—RECESS TO 1:30 O'CLOCK

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a happy suggestion to make to my majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and to the floor manager of the foreign aid bill at the moment, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. History is being made at this very moment. The eyes of the world are on two great patriots in a space ship who are in the process of coming down to earth. My suggestion is that no Senator should feel the slightest dereliction in his Senate duties because he is in front of a television set somewhere in the precincts of the Senate. I respectfully suggest that the Senate take a recess until those two great patriots are safely landed and all of us have had an opportunity to be participants as observers in that great chapter of American history. I make that suggestion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to recognize the achievement, and as a mark of respect and admiration for astronauts James A. McDivitt and Edward H. White, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 1:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) took a recess until 1:30 o'clock the same day.

On the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair).

RECESS UNTIL 2 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As a further mark of respect and admiration for Astronauts James A. McDivitt and Edward H. White, the Senate will stand in recess until 2 o'clock.

There being no objection, the Senate took a recess until 2 p.m. the same day.

On the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair).

RECESS UNTIL 2:30 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the same reasons previously stated, I move that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate took a recess until 2:30 p.m.

On the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HARRIS in the chair).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTES TO ASTRONAUTS JAMES A. McDIVITT AND EDWARD H. WHITE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I maye be recognized briefly, I should like to take this means to commend the astronauts, Mr. James A. McDivitt and Mr. Edward H. White, who have just completed a 4-day successful space flight. They carried much in the way of hopes as far as our own country is concerned. They comported themselves with valor, with dignity, and with courage.

We are just as happy as they are, as their wives are, as their families are, that they have been able to successfully complete this flight and add additional luster to the struggle that is going on in man's attempts to conquer outer space. The Senate extends to them its best wishes and congratulations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the successful flight of the astronauts, through orbit, is, first of all, testimony to their personal courage. I doubt whether anybody can quite appreciate the courage that has to be summoned up for a man to offer himself for a flight in space. It is a testimony also to their fidelity to their country and the contribution they can make to science and to the well-being and defense of their country.

In addition, it is testimony to man's unending curiosity about space, and his constant devotion to the endeavor of conquering space and distance.

I presume we can set apart perhaps the last 100 years as that period in which we conquered time, space, distance, and temperature, by means of the telephone, the telegraph, the radio, television, air conditioning, the airplane, and the helicopter. All of these are nothing more than man's conquest of natural forces.

Again two great intrepid souls have offered themselves, along with others, for the purpose of conquering space; I say, All hail to their courage and to their devotion to their country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I join our distinguished leaders in the remarks they have made commending the astronauts and all those who have been associated with them in making this accomplishment possible. It has been a great undertaking. It has called for adventure of the highest order. Even though the accomplishments thus far attained have been spectacular, and will continue to be so through the years in the impact they will have, it is difficult to envisage the extent to which this effort can and will be carried out.

I heard over the radio this morning, as I was driving to work, the voice of Dr. Wernher von Braun, speaking at a college commencement at which he was given an honorary doctor's degree, make this rather simple statement, but one of great implication—that man would continue to explore space as long as there was yet space unexplored.

When we think back to the times of exploration by water, that same spirit was in being. Even to this day, if there is any unexplored area anywhere on earth, man seeks to explore it. It is an easy prediction to reflect that that will continue. The flight which has just been made has done much toward forwarding us to that day.

Dr. von Braun, in the same statement, laid down a kind of calendar of events as they may happen in the future. It is freely predicted that we shall land a man on the moon by 1970, within 5 years of this time.

I heard Dr. von Braun make a speech at one time in which he said:

> We shall not stop at the moon. We shall go to Mars. We shall go to Venus—yea, we shall go to the outermost of galaxies.

It shows the dreams that motivate those people as they search the outer reaches of space.

It has been my good fortune to watch those developments at rather close hand. Fifteen years ago Dr. von Braun and his team of German scientists were moved to my hometown. There they did work on missiles. In 1955 they constructed the first moderate-range missile, a range of probably a hundred miles. I remember how they were able to stretch that distance until they attained a range of some 1,500 miles.

I remind Senators that it was a missile that was produced at Redstone Arsenal in my hometown, the souped-up Redstone that became Jupiter-C, that put up the first satellite for the free world. It was the Redstone that carried Alan Shepard.

There in my hometown I have watched through the years the development of the mightiest space machine in the world. The Saturn has an initial thrust of 1½ million foot-pounds. Saturn 5, which is the ultimate in that development, will have five times that thrust; and it will be that mechanism which will be used to put a man on the moon within the next 5 years.

We should feel good that this mission has been so well completed. We should feel happy. We should feel humbled, and at the same time we should look to the future with a great deal of confidence as to what man can do and will do.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at 10 minutes to 1 the Senator from Oregon suggested to the majority leader that, in view of the fact that we were living in a great hour of history, it would be most appropriate if the Senate took a recess so that Senators could join in the experience of the writing of that history. The majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], in his characteristic way, immediately joined me in that suggestion, and I thank him. I know I thank him in behalf of the entire membership of the Senate for declaring the recess that permitted us in the last hour and a half to see this great chapter of American history written.

Two great patriots, the primary personages involved in the writing of the chapter, were among others who also helped write this chapter.

(At this point Mr. HARRIS took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Chris Craft, all the scientists, all the astronauts, including McDivitt and White, and hundreds of patriotic Americans, made it possible for these two dedicated patriots to write this glorious chapter.

I believe that each of us is a better human being because of the observations we have made and the participation in which we were involved as Americans during the past hour and a half, as we anxiously followed the return of McDivitt and White to the aircraft carrier *Wasp*.

Mr. President, this is a great hour in which to be alive. I hope that each of us will rededicate himself to the responsibilities which are ours as free Americans, and will do what we can in accordance with our sights and our reason, as a result of the exciting chapter of history which has just been written, to make this country an ever better place in which to live.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] just referred to our being more humble. Certainly, we are more humble. But I hope each of us feels more dedicated to the spiritual values which are such an inseparable part of our conditioning as human beings, and will make his own interpretation of an event such as this. I do not see how anyone can see and hear what we have just witnessed in the past hour and a half without recognizing that there is a Creator who directs the universe.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few preliminary remarks involving discussion of procedure and the program, so far as opposition to the foreign aid bill now before the Senate is concerned.

We are now in the second day of debate on this bill. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], made the opening statement for the proponents of the foreign aid bill.

This afternoon it falls to my responsibility to make the opening statement on behalf of the opposition to the foreign aid bill.

It is really not accurate to talk about proponents and opponents, because there is no difference between us as to the ultimate objective. We have a common objective, irrespective of differences in position on the bill as between affirmative support and negative opposition.

Our objective as U.S. Senators in connection with the foreign aid bill is to follow a course of action which we believe to be in the best interests of the United States.

There is no difference between us, I am sure, so far as that objective is concerned. Our differences, really, are differences in the evaluation of objectives, differences in interpretation of the facts, differences as to the best procedures to be followed to promote the common objective: The best welfare of the United States of America.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, this is not a new position for me, so far as my attitude toward the foreign aid program is concerned.

I believe that the foreign aid program of the United States, at the present time, over all, is not in the best interests of future generations of Americans, nor is it in the best interests of the present generation of Americans.

As debate progresses, I shall advance—as I have in many years past, by bringing up to date the evidence which has been adduced since I last discussed those premises—my deep conviction that everywhere that foreign aid is being operated on the basis of its present format, American foreign aid is making hundreds of thousands of Communists around the world.

I shall advance the premise, and defend it, that American military aid, as it is being administered at present, jeopardizes peace, and that if it is peace which America seeks, drastic changes in American military aid should be enacted into law this year. They should have been enacted last year. They should have been enacted the year before that. They should have been enacted many years past, because I am satisfied that when the history of American military aid is written—after those of us in the Senate who will be voting on this bill are gone from the scene—future generations of Americans will be condemned with the course of action which we have followed in respect to American military aid.

Mr. President, before I enter into a discussion of the substance of some of the premises I have in mind, let me speak for a few moments about some procedures to be followed in connection with the debate. I particularly invite the attention of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] with whom I have worked for many years to make foreign aid worth while.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator believe there is understanding on the part of the administration and others that our efforts through the years have been designed to improve and strengthen the administration of foreign aid, and that if some of the amendments that we propose were adopted, it would mean not only the saving of funds to the Treasury, but also the far more effective use of foreign aid, by which it would tend to achieve the objectives that are alleged for it, but which are being thwarted by its maladministration?

Mr. MORSE. I wish I could reply by saying that I believe the administration has that understanding, but the administration has not shown the slightest evidence that it comprehends the point of view of the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon and others of us who have been trying to change the foreign aid program for some time.

So far as I can see, this administration does not even show that it has any understanding of what the Comptroller General of the United States has been pointing out for years as being involved in our foreign aid program—inefficiency, waste, corruption, and threats to the peace. With evidence so clear, I am at a loss to understand why this administration and previous administrations have not tried to put into effect the necessary reforms based upon the reports of our own Comptroller General. When Congress has acted to write changes into law over administration objections, those changes are subsequently advertised as great improvements by the administration. Of course, there are many more changes that any administration would find useful if it could bring itself to recognize that in the past Congress has shown good judgment in amending the program.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I know the Senator appreciates it, but I wonder how many others appreciate, that our foreign military aid program, which is ostensibly designed to check communism and the military advances of the Soviet Union and others—China among others—has resulted in our giving money for that purpose to countries which use the arms to fight each other. I refer to the case of India and Pakistan; Greece and Turkey, which fight each other over Cyprus; and the latest development, our offering arms to Jordan, to be used by them to raid Israel and to kill people.

It is fantastic that the administration does not appreciate that fact and serve notice on those countries that no more military aid will be provided unless it is used for the purposes originally indicated, some of which are no longer valid.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Alaska knows, he is unanswerably right. In past years, I have supported his amendments dealing with these matters, and shall again do so this year.

This afternoon I shall speak only in terms of rather broad generalities, and shall outline the case which I propose to make against the administration with respect to foreign aid; then we shall go into depth which respect to the serious mistakes which the Senator from Alaska has outlined. For example, he has referred to the military aid program of the United States in the Middle East.

I could not believe my eyes when I picked up the newspaper the other morning and read that the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, made a formal official proposal that we would supply Saudi Arabia with $100 million worth of military aid. It is unbelievable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. That is what he said in that speech. That is what he proposed in the speech he made. He proposed, formally, to build up in the Middle East military aid to Saudi Arabia to the tune of $100 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe Mr. McNamara spoke about selling military equipment. I do not believe he called it aid. If the Senator is referring to the same article that I read, it was not aid, as we use the word; rather, he was speaking about authorizing the sale of the equipment for cash to Saudi Arabia.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator believe that the sale of $100 million worth of military equipment to Saudi Arabia is not aid?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not aid in the usual sense in which we use that word. In the Senator's sense, of course, all of it is aid.

Mr. MORSE. What does the Senator think I have been protesting all these years?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe the RECORD could leave the impression that we were giving aid. I did not know that the Senator was using the word in that fashion.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I have been protesting; namely, our Government's giving or selling weapons of war to endanger the peace of the world, to kill thousands of human beings, and then ringing church bells on Sundays. What national hyprocrisy.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. How does the administration reconcile its oft reiterated pleas for peace on earth, and the peacekeeping objective as being the prime objective of the United States in the world, with going into the arms business on this tremendous scale?

Mr. MORSE. I never look to this administration to reconcile its inconsistencies or its malfeasances.

Mr. President, going back to my thesis, imagine building up the military power of dictatorships in the Middle East, which at the very moment that I speak are talking about making war. Does anyone believe that the McNamara program for $100 million worth of military equipment for Saudi Arabia will be used for the sheiks to play tiddlywinks or hopscotch or hide-and-seek or ring-around-the-rosy? We are dealing with dangerous men. The proposal is to equip them. A great deal of it will find its way to the royalist Yemenis, who are fighting the Egyptians whose war machine we feed with surplus food. The administration has the audacity to try to tell the American people, through this misleading propaganda, that we are a nation of peace.

We are a threat to the peace of the world. It is about time that the American people faced the fact that if they follow this administration in its war plans, hundreds of thousands of American boys will die in battle in the months not too far ahead—but not with the vote of the Senator from Oregon.

We will either practice our ideals, or we will have no ideals. Imagine the great sums of money, taken from the taxpayers of the United States, being used to build up competing military machines in India and Pakistan, which would be of no value to the United States in case of war with Russia. The American people do not know, because they have been taken so far down the road to government by concealment that they do not have the facts as to what their Government is up to, about the high secrecy on which American foreign policy is conducted. The American people do not have the facts about the police state institution that has been built into this so-called democracy, known as the CIA, whose activities, I may say as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, in Latin America have been a source of threat to the peace, time and time again.

Mr. President, I do not intend to support that kind of foreign policy, because I believe that we have a sacred obligation to future generations of American boys and girls. For example, we should return to the type of foreign policy that Franklin Roosevelt envisioned when, 20 years ago, he tried to obtain support for following a course of action in Indochina directly opposite to the course of action that the present administration is following and preceding administrations have followed in Indochina. Had we followed the Franklin Roosevelt program, American boys would not be dying in southeast Asia today.

There are many who do not wish to listen to tough talk. There are many who do not wish to face up to the ugly realities. They would much prefer to take the flag behind the chair of the Presiding Officer and wave it into tatters with their so-called superpatriotism.

Let me say to those who are so anxious to have American boys die in southeast Asia, "Come on. The line forms at the right. Offer yourselves as a substitute for an American boy whom you are drafting and sending over there. You come back in a coffin, since you are so anxious that there be killing of God's children, whatever their race or color, in an unnecessary, unjustifiable, illegal, and unconscionable war in southeast Asia." It is a war that the President cannot justify under his oath as Commander in Chief under the Constitution of the United States, because the President does not have the slightest right under the Constitution to send a single boy to his death in southeast Asia without a declaration of war.

Where is the declaration of war? I will tell the Senate why a proposed declaration of war is not before the Congress. The American people would not accept it, for a proposal really to make the present war legal under the Constitution would then bring forth a demand from coast to coast across this country for a consideration of all facets of the international law implications of such a war.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Has the distinguished Senator from Oregon any explanation as to why neither the present administration nor any preceding administration has ever invoked articles 1, 2, 33, and 37 of the United Nations Charter, to which we are signatories, and which we helped to create?

Mr. MORSE. They do not have any good reason. But I will tell the Senator what some of their alibis are. There has never come from the State Department a single justification that has any international law standing for the United States violating its signature to the United Nations Charter. We stand in open violation of the United Nations Charter, and the Secretary of State knows it. All he can do is go around insulting those who have forgotten more about international law and more about Asia than he will ever know. His attacks upon the academic world, the colleges and the universities of this country, are inexcusable.

I renew this afternoon my challenge to the Secretary of State to meet me on any campus or campuses that he wishes to name for a discussion of American foreign policy in respect to the war in Asia. I also warn him that he will not be protected in the debate by executive privilege. We shall tell the American people all the facts that have been made available to us, which is a small percentage of what ought to be made available, because not even in the Senate are we protected from Government by concealment.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. As the Senator well knows, articles 1 and 2 of the United Nations Charter prescribe and make mandatory peaceful approaches in international difficulties. Article 33 outlines eight different steps which, if we adhered to the charter to which we are a signatory, are prescribed and to be used first of all before any other methods are used. If all of those have been used and failed, article 37 makes it mandatory that we shall, not may, then lay the issue before the Security Council. Is there any understandable explanation why that course has never been tried?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Alaska has brought out the fact time and time again for the past 2 years. So has the senior Senator from Oregon. So have the great scholars of the universities of this country—time and time again. But such a procedure would interfere with the propaganda of this administration and with its concealed purposes in Asia.

I told the Senator that I would call his attention to some of the rationalizations and alibis of the spokesmen for the administration. When I have pleaded in the Foreign Relations Committee for the submission of these great issues to the United Nations, the answer of the State Department is, "Senator, do you not think Russia would veto that course in the Security Council?"

My reply is, "Perhaps. I cannot be sure, and neither can you. We shall never know until we try. But I believe Red Russia would veto it."

That is why I desire to put Red Russia on the spot. That is why I wish to show who it is that has refused to resort to the rule of law for the settlement of threats to the peace. That is why I want to get my country out of the position of international outlawry and make it a law-abiding nation again. That is why I wish my country to get back within its treaty obligations. I wish to prove that it is not the United Sates, but a Communist nation, that is seeking to resort to outlawry in order to cause threats to the peace of the world.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Is there not a provision in the United Nations Charter that if we fail in the Security Council, we still have the opportunity to lay the issue before the General Assembly?

Mr. MORSE. That is the point. I have said to the Secretary of State, "Why are you stopping with the Security Council section of the United Nations Charter? Read on. Read on and see what can be done by laying the matter before an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations." It is our obligation to do so. After we put Russia on the spot, if she does veto the proposal—and she might surprise us, but let us assume that she vetoes it—what do we suppose would happen?

We would then have lined up 80, 85, 90, 95, or 100 nations of the world in favor of setting up what Franklin Roosevelt proposed 20 years ago before the United Nations even came into being, when he pleaded for an international trusteeship in Indochina, carried out by the peace-loving nations of the world. What do we suppose would be Russia's reaction and Red China's reaction if we had that kind of alinement? I think we would have no trouble getting it, but the plan requires leadership.

We have not been leading; we have been running out on our obligations under the United Nations Charter. Several things flashed through my mind as I surveyed over the weekend the pronouncements of the President and his official spokesmen—the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, McGeorge Bundy, and others—who have been trying to sell the propaganda line for a war in Asia at the same time they have talked about peace.

Mr. President, do you know what I think worries them? They are not so sure as they thought they had reason to be 30 days ago that Russia will continue to stand on the sidelines. It is perfectly clear that 30 days ago the administration thought that the hatred that Russia has for China, and the fear that Russia has for China, would cause Russia not to move. But there is clearly embedded and implied in some of the pronouncements over the weekend a growing concern as to what Russia may be up to. There are reports about antimissile weapons in North Vietnam—from Russia. There are reports of some effective fighter-bombers in North Vietnam—from Russia. There are reports out of Russia itself that Russia does not intend to walk out on its obligations to North Vietnam. There is concern about some worrisome reports being received about movements within Red China.

The bombing of North Vietnam has not worked. The bombing of North Vietnam has not driven the North Vietnamese to the conference table. The bombing of North Vietnam has not yet moved a single division of the North Vietnamese Army of more than 350,000 troops. Of course we are concerned. We have every right to be concerned. The bombing that we have been doing has not yet even stirred up a major overt military response; it has not resulted in the slightest inclination on the part of North Vietnam or the Vietcong to go to the conference table. It is not surprising that our leaders should start to show some signs of concern as to whether or not they have been on the right course. They have been on the wrong course from the beginning. Of course, the situation will become worse, not better.

Not so many days ago I sat in the Chamber and listened to the reservationists at the time the so-called $700 million military bill for South Vietnam was before the Senate. Reservationist after reservationist in this body rose and pointed out and wanted it understood that when he voted for that bill, he was not voting a blank check. All of them wanted it understood that when they voted for the $700 million, they expected to be consulted by the President if there was any plan to send additional troops to South Vietnam. They made good statements for home consumption, I suppose, if one believes in that kind of politics. But it was too much for me. The record will show that I replied to the reservationists.

I said, "You are being consulted right now. If any of you reservationists think you will be consulted, after you use this vehicle this afternoon in which the President has asked you to ride by way of a vote of confidence in him for supporting what he is doing in southeast Asia, you could not be more mistaken."

I wonder what those reservationists have to say today. Were the reservationists consulted before more troops were sent to Vietnam? Thousands more troops have been sent to South Vietnam; and the Senate was not consulted.

When we get through with certain amendments to the bill that I understand will be offered with the approval of the administration, including an amendment for the $89 million proposal that I shall discuss before I finish my speech this afternoon, we shall have another maneuver on the part of the administration to have us hogtied and handcuffed even more, because those votes will be interpreted as further votes of confidence for making war in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, we must make up our minds whether or not we shall try to carry out the most important international commitment the United States has; namely, the commitment to honor our signature on existing treaties; or whether we shall follow a course of action in foreign policy of tearing up those treaties, so far as our responsibility toward them is concerned.

I fully realize, as I shall say in Madison Square Garden tomorrow night, that we cannot expect to follow the course of action that the senior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] have been following, and win any popularity contests. But I have never been interested in popularity contests. I have been interested only in carrying out my trust under my oath that I have taken four times in the Senate. No partisan consideration will ever deter me from voting on the basis of the facts as I find them to be.

I had a fascinating experience this morning in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am not privileged with propriety to say more than this: In my judgment, a considerable number of my colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Relations wish that our Government were following a different course of action than it is following in respect to the war in Asia. I know the argument—"But we are in the war. What can we do now? We are in it; we must go along. We will make a bad image around the world if we do not continue the program." Is not that some argument? Mr. President, what do you suppose would happen to a poor freshman student who was taking a course in logic in any university in this country if he so argued? His professor would call him in and advise with him as to whether or not he really had the capacity to continue his college work.

I say respectfully that if any Senator thinks there should be a change in our foreign policy, he should work, fight, and vote; not go along out of partisan consideration or because it might show that he differs with the President. I believe that the best friends the President has at any time are those who are willing to differ with him when they think he is wrong.

I shall return to a discussion of some matters of procedure in connection with this debate. It is not the intention of the senior Senator from Oregon to engage in a debate that could be described as a debate in extenso. I know the Senate rather well. I doubt if very much could be said in the Senate to change the position of very many Senators on issues as they arise. Of course, that should not be the case. However, I think that crystallization or atrophy has set in—I do not care which word is used. So, I believe that those in opposition to the bill have the responsibility of making an adequate record.

I have no intention, may I say to the chairman of the committee, as I have already said to the majority leader, of prolonging the debate to any great length. I shall speak at too great length for most of my colleagues, no matter how brief I may be. However, I intend to make a respectful, adequate case for the record, and for future reference, on these issues as they arise.

I announce this afternoon, as I have announced to the majority and minority leaders, that I will not, as of now, enter into any agreements for time limitations, or any amendments, or any time certain to vote. However, that will not preclude, if my colleagues on the opposite side agree, my entering into such arrangements after we feel that an adequate record has been made in opposition to the bill and in support of the amendments that we shall offer.

I hope that will put to rest the concern that some Senators seem to have that we may be in for a long summer on this bill. On the other hand, the spirit of cooperation on the part of the opposition should, and I am sure that it will, receive reciprocity from the proponents of the bill. We shall expect and ask for understandings from time to time in regard to the order of taking up amendments, the accommodation in respect to the length of the daily sessions, and the postponement of certain matters to meet reasonable and legitimate needs of Senators. However, I want the record to be perfectly clear that we will not engage in what might be called a lengthy debate, although we will not be deterred from making whatever record we believe needs to be made on a given issue, to help our positions so far as any participation in the debate is concerned, the offering of amendments, debate on the amendments, and pressing for a vote thereon.

I shall start this afternoon with an amendment. However, before I offer that amendment and ask to have it made the pending business, I wish to discuss two or three procedural matters in connection with it. I shall need the attention of the acting Parliamentarian in connection with certain questions that I shall raise in respect to this amendment.

I believe that courtesy, fair play, and proper respect are due to the President of the United States on the part of each of us. That belief justifies my calling up as my first amendment one which deals with his proposal to add $89 million to the foreign aid bill for what he refers to as an amount of money needed to start an economic program in southeast Asia, not limited to South Vietnam, but to the countries in southeast Asia.

This bill was before the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning. I offered two amendments. I offered one amendment which proposed that the $89 million for economic assistance in southeast Asia be granted, but that the military aid program be reduced by a similar amount—that is the military program anywhere in the world—and that decision be left with the administration as to where the $89 million of military aid should be eliminated.

Mr. President, the administration could cut out many times $89 million from our military aid program and still have somewhere near a legitimate military aid program. I am for certain types of military aid.

As I expected my amendment was defeated, although there were four votes for it, and much language from Senators who voted against the amendment. I am so accustomed to receiving the words and not the votes. I am accustomed to receiving pats on the back out in the cloakroom, but not the votes.

As one of my colleagues said to Mrs. Morse in the dining room after the vote on the $700 millon vote of confidence, "Midge, I hope you noticed that yesterday my vote was very weak."

Her reply was, "But I heard you."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Is it not correct that four votes in the Committee on Foreign Relations are a distinct improvement over the lone fight that the senior Senator from Oregon has been carrying on for so many years?

Mr. MORSE. I have not been alone. The Senator from Alaska has been with me from the beginning. He has been my teacher.

Mr. GRUENING. But not on the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. MORSE. I have voted alone in the committee many times. I have received the finest, most courteous, and considerate treatment in the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, I do not have the votes.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator probably observed that in the vote of confidence, there was an increase of 50 percent.

Mr. MORSE. And more words, too. We received more verbal support on the issue of the so-called vote of confidence than we every received before. I predict to the Senator from Alaska that we shall have even more support a year from now.

Mr. GRUENING. I am informed that that will be true in the House. In the Senate, the gain was 50 percent, with the accession of one additional supporter. However, in the House, support for our position was increased from 0 to 7, which mathematicians would consider to be infinity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish there were some way the President could be apprised of what I am satisfied are the deep feelings at the grassroots in this Republic. One cannot go across the country, as I have done, without recognizing the great uneasiness and concern on the part of the average American citizen about what we are doing in Asia, and the bewilderment of the average citizen, who says, "How does it happen that we seem to be doing this all alone? How does it happen that, for the most part, all we are getting from our alleged allies is words, but no real support?"

The President is going to have a sad awakening about the true feeling of the American people. I should like to save him from it. As the Senator from Alaska knows, the President and I have stood shoulder to shoulder on so many issues, for so many years, that I am anything but happy in finding myself in such complete disagreement with the President in regard to so many phases of American foreign policy. I blame his advisers more than I blame him. Nevertheless, he has to analyze the advice he gets; that is his responsibility.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Does not the Senator from Oregon consider it a great pity, when the President has such a magnificent domestic program, with so many parts of it that we can applaud enthusiastically, for example, the civil rights program; the educational program, in connection with which the Senator from Oregon played so important a part; the war on poverty; the campaign to beautify America; the antipollution program; the coming enactment of a hospital-care program; and many other things that all of us can wholeheartedly applaud—to find the domestic program so greatly diminished by the program which looms up in southeast Asia, where our policy, which I believe is so mistakenly pursued, will wreck all our domestic programs, because the Moloch of war will consume all of them?

Mr. MORSE. If we get into a massive war, or even a minor one, we shall have to forget all about domestic programs, and we shall also have to forget all about many other things that will rise to plague Americans in respect to their very basic freedoms and liberties, because if we get into a massive war, this time it will be a total war. A moment ago I said the military aid we make available to Pakistan, Greece, Turkey, and India will be of no value to the United States in case of a war in Asia. However, our military-aid program is sold to the American people on the claimed basis that it will be of aid in that connection.

Many Senators have been heard to say, for example, on political platforms, "Ah, but it is cheaper to keep a Pakistani boy or a Turkish boy or an Indian boy or a Greek boy in uniform than it is to keep an American boy in uniform." What tommyrot. Certainly it is tommyrot, because those Pakistani or Turkish or Greek or Indian boys would be of no value in case of a war with Russia, for that would be a fast nuclear war. The interesting thing is that Greece, India, Turkey, and Pakistan are dependent for their protection upon the canopy of American nuclear power. That is what protects them—not the military aid we send them. Pakistani leaders have said—as I have said many times in debate in the Senate—that they have no intention of sending their troops into southeast Asia. Their foreign minister says that is the problem of the United States. He says, "Our problem is India." What a position of morality that puts us in. We equip India and Pakistan militarily, so they can make war on each other; yet we talk about being a moral nation. Instead, we are a thoroughly hypocritical Nation, as regards our military foreign aid and assistance program, for we are doing the very things that cannot be reconciled with Christian morality.

Mr. GRUENING. If the Senator from Oregon will yield further, let me say that, speaking of morality, there was published in the Saturday newspapers an Associated Press story written by Malcolm Brown, a Pulitzer Prize winner, who has been in southeast Asia for many years, and who is the author of the recent very excellent book entitled "The New Face of War." In the article he pointed out that no prisoners are now being taken by either side. He wrote that as soon as either a South Vietnamese or North Vietnamese is caught off base, he is promptly killed, and sometimes first is tortured, and that is being done not only by "the wicked opposition" at which we point the finger of scorn, but also by our South Vietnamese ally, whom we are supposed to control. Under those circumstances, what has become of our morality?

Mr. MORSE. That is one of the most disturbing things about this situation.

Last Friday night, I was one of the speakers at the baccalaureate ceremony at Salem College, in West Virginia. While there, I talked with a great clergyman who recently returned from South Vietnam. Even though I had already known of the events to which he testified, nevertheless it was very shocking to hear of them from one who was there and saw them. We talk about our moral values, about our keeping spiritual faith, and about practicing our professings about peace; but, in spite of all that, we find that we are charged with being subversive.

On the floor of the Senate I said, "It is not going to be long"—and, in fact, it has already begun to develop—"until some will claim that God Almighty is on our side in this war."

That is always a part of war propaganda; the proponents always claim that God is on their side. In effect, they enlist God—without any word from Him about the enlistment.

Last week, I read in a religious periodical an editorial in which the writer paid his disrespects to me. The editorial was written by a clergyman. It was rather sad to find that apparently he had stopped reading the Bible, for if he had not stopped reading it, he could not have written the editorial. However, apparently he is going to try to associate God with our participation in this war; apparently he thinks that only Americans are the children of God.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield again to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from Oregon will recall that 2 weeks ago there appeared in the New York Times an impressive advertisement, which at that time was signed by 2,500 clergymen of all faiths—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish; and later the number of signers was increased to over 16,000. One of the points made in the advertisement was that the signatories felt they were properly qualified to interpret what we are doing in carrying out the will of God; and they felt that what we were doing was not the will of God, but, instead, was in violation of the will of God.

Therefore, I do not know that anyone is entitled to speak authoritatively on what divine providence believes, but certainly the clergy of this Nation, of all denominations, presumably because of their profession are in a better position to be able to interpret the divine will. They all felt definitely—certainly the 16,000 clergymen felt definitely, and so expressed themselves—that what we were doing in Vietnam was not the will of God but a violation of God's will and as was stated by them in the advertisements, would bring down the wrath of God upon our Nation if it persisted.

Mr. MORSE. I read that advertisement. Of course, as the Senator from Alaska knows, I have always held the position that I have no right to seek to impose my religious convictions upon others in connection with debate on controversial issues, but I have a duty to be true to my religious convictions. The Senator knows I hold the point of view that the Holy of Holies, the sanctum of sanctums, the inner temple, does not happen to be my Congregational Church, or the material church of any other Member of this body of any faith. Those material structures are but symbols of the Holy of Holies.

It happens to be a deep faith of mine that the Holy of Holies resides in each of us, and takes the form of our conscience; and that when we sit in that temple, we never sit alone, but with our God.

Let me say to the Senator from Alaska that I have been approaching the moral issues connected with the foreign policy controversy from the standpoint of communion in that temple.

I do not intend to walk out on my spiritual obligations because of the arguments of political expediency which I heard this morning—which I have heard on the floor of the Senate, and which I hear in the cloakrooms—that merely because we happen to occupy a seat in the U.S. Senate, apparently Senators must not express any public disagreement with the President or show any disunity because it might be misinterpreted around the world.

We are not going to stop or change a course of action which is headed straight toward war by following political expediency. If we are going to stop war, if we are going to remove the growing danger of a holocaust, we must speak out, no matter how much criticism it may stir up within the administration, within the Senate, or within the country. If that is not the responsibility of every Senator, I do not know what is the responsibility of being a Senator.

I can be counted out if I am expected to participate in any "cover up" job or "snow" job for the administration while it finds its bearings.

Mr. President, returning to my amendment, it was offered this morning in the Committee on Foreign Relations and was voted down, although four members voted for it.

The amendment would have granted the President $89 million for economic use in southeast Asia, but would have reduced military aid in the bill in various part of the world—to be decided by the President—by an equal amount of $89 million.

Subsequent to the meeting, an able member of the staff—and I have supplemented by further inquiry and verified to my satisfaction his doubt—pointed out to me that there was a possibility, if my amendment were to be adopted that, later on in debate, I might be forestalling the offering of amendments for an additional cut in military aid.

I am going to offer amendments for additional cuts in military aid, as well as amendments for additional cuts in many other sections of the bill.

This afternoon, in sending my first amendment to the desk, I have changed it from the way it was offered this morning in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I send a copy to the Parliamentarian as well as a copy to the Presiding Officer before I ask some questions on it.

The amendment reads as follows:

> At the end of section 504(a) add the following:
>
> "Of the funds made available for the fiscal year 1966 pursuant to this section, $9,000,000 shall be transferred to and consolidated with funds otherwise made available pursuant to section 212, which relates to authorization for technical cooperation and development grants, and $80,000,000 shall be transferred to and consolidated with funds otherwise made available pursuant to section 402, which relates to authorization for supporting assistance. The funds so transferred shall remain available until expended solely for use in southeast Asia in accordance with the provisions of section 212 and section 402 respectively."

Please note that under the amendment, $9 million would be transferred to and consolidated with funds made available pursuant to section 212, which deals with technical cooperation and development grants, and $80 million would be transferred and consolidated with sections dealing with supporting assistance.

We all know what supporting assistance is. Supporting assistance is money given to a country such as India, Turkey, Pakistan, or Thailand, or to any other country which maintains a military establishment far beyond its economic capacity to support.

Therefore, under the carefully titled "supporting assistance," we would be really granting, in a sense, additional military aid, and additional economic aid, as a sort of subsidy to one of those countries to maintain a higher military program than it could otherwise support.

Mr. President, for the benefit of the Parliamentarian, counsel for the committee has just advised me that the legislative counsel for the Senate suggests that I add an additional sentence to my amendment—inasmuch as we have been working out the wording of the amendment only during the past few hours—as follows:

> Amounts transferred pursuant to this subsection shall not be taken into account in determining amounts authorized to be transferred pursuant to section 610.

I have been advised that this language is necessary to take care of certain technical problems which otherwise would arise.

I do not wish to offer the amendment in this form unless I can be sure of a favorable answer, from a parliamentary standpoint, to the following question, which I raise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORSE. If I offer the amendment and ask to have it made the pending business of the Senate, will the transfer of $9 million, to be consolidated with funds otherwise made available pursuant to section 212, which relates to authorizations for technical cooperation and development grants, in any way preclude the Senator from Oregon or any other Senator from subsequently, at some point during the course of the debate, from offering an amendment which would seek to reduce the amount of money in the foreign aid bill for authorization for technical cooperation and development grants?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Oregon that it is not within the province of the Chair to construe or interpret amendments or the effect thereof. However, if the amendment were adopted, any other portion of the bill would still be amendable, perhaps in such a way that it might have an effect on the provisions of this amendment, or the effect of this amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I believe I understand the Chair's statement. However, I hope the Chair will bear with me. Assume that my amendment were adopted, and that it would transfer $9 million to the section that deals with the authorization for technical cooperation and development grants. To make it easy to follow, let us assume that the next amendment to be offered by a Senator would decrease the authorization in the bill for technical cooperation and development grants by 50 percent. Would the adoption of my amendment preclude another Senator or the Senator from Oregon from subsequently offering an amendment to reduce the authorization for technical cooperation and development grants by 50 percent or any other percentage?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In further answer to the question of the Senator from Oregon, the Chair advises the Senator that so long as the subsequent amendment did not change the language which had been adopted in this amendment, the subsequent amendment would be in order, and there would be no restriction on it.

Mr. MORSE. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. An amendment that sought to reduce by a given percentage the amount of money in the bill proposed to be authorized for technical assistance and development grants would be in order even though this amendment had been adopted, which added to the section dealing with technical assistance and development grants the sum of $9 million. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry that I seem to be so technical, but I have learned from experience that now is the time to close the gates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's inquiries are perfectly in order.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I have one more question to address to the Chair. Let me now go to the next part of my amendment, dealing with $80 million which would be transferred and consolidated with funds otherwise made available pursuant to section 402, which relates to authorizations for supporting assistance. I have the same question. If that amendment were adopted, and I or any other Senator should subsequently decide to offer an amendment to reduce the supporting assistance in the bill by any given percentage or any given amount, would such amendment be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct; so long as it did not attempt to amend the language of an amendment agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Chair. As usual, I thank the Parliamentarian. I yield now to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the senior Senator from Oregon whether the $89 million refers to the proposed development of the Mekong Delta.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator mean the President's proposal for $89 million?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes; does the Senator's amendment deal with that proposal?

Mr. MORSE. It deals with the President's proposal to increase the foreign aid bill by $89 million. The amendment I would offer merely provides that the $89 million shall not be granted over and above the authorization of the foreign aid bill, but will have to be included within the foreign aid bill; and to do that we would transfer $9 million of the present foreign aid bill to the technical cooperation development grants and $80 million to supporting assistance.

In other words, if my amendment were adopted, the President would not get an additional $89 million, but would get the $89 million within the present authorization amount for expenditure in accordance with whatever blueprint plans he had for assistance in the Mekong Delta, Laos, Thailand, or any other place in southeast Asia.

Mr. GRUENING. I ask the Senator from Oregon whether he does not believe there are sufficient funds in the foreign aid program, as requested by the White House, to take care of the situation, without providing an additional $89 million.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; that is why the amendment would be offered. It would not add $89 million. It would hold the President to the ceiling of the present bill. Of course, I shall try to lower that ceiling.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator from Oregon believe that if the amendment or some variation thereof were adopted, it would not be in effect an authorization or commitment to spend a billion dollars in further developments, and would be so taken?

Mr. MORSE. That will be developed in the debate. The President has been honest and frank with us and with the Senate and the whole country. He has made it clear that this is only the beginning. He made very clear that the $89 million is a starter. If we can change our military status in southeast Asia, no Member of this body will be more strenuous than the senior Senator from Oregon in urging our effort to develop the economic freedom of southeast Asia, so that the people there can become politically free.

However, I am a little disturbed about the President's wish to spend $89 million in a so-called crash economic program in this part of the world, while at the same time he is destroying many times $89 million worth of property by our course of bombings in North Vietnam and South Vietnam.

This is not the first time that a foreign aid program has been sent to Congress, followed by a later request for more money for Vietnam alone. That is getting to be a timeworn device for increasing foreign aid, because Congress is faced with a foreign aid program under which sums have been allocated to various countries, and we are solemnly assured that any reduction in them would be a breach of faith.

But the needs of a real hotspot like Vietnam are not included. Then we are asked to spend more just for Vietnam. That was done once in connection with military aid. This year it is being done to increase supporting assistance by $80 million and technical aid by $9 million. And we will all be assured that a "no" vote will cause a great collapse in confidence in us.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. In view of the likelihood that the program will be a $1 billion program—a very extensive and major program—as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, can the Senator tell me whether, there have been extensive hearings as to the feasibility, economic, engineering, and otherwise, which would justify the Congress in committing itself essentially to the proposed program without further investigation?

Mr. MORSE. There have been extensive hearings which would justify me in saying that the record has been made in hearing in support of the proposed $89 million program. In all fairness I should say also that the Foreign Relations Committee has conducted voluminous hearings on the entire program of foreign aid. I believe the situation is pretty well understood by members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Again, as the Senator knows, I am a stickler for making a specific record on a specific proposal to which we can turn and show that the amount of money that is being proposed for various items is being wisely proposed.

I shall make the following statement to the Senator because he can get the document. I cannot use it on the floor of the Senate because when it was handed to us in the committee this morning, it was made perfectly clear that it was to be used for confidential use within the committee.

This morning we had a memorandum that I understood to be one that indicated the items in the program for which it was contemplated the $89 million would be spent. I do not wish to leave the impression that there has been any finality of judgment. I wish I had the memorandum before me so that I could refresh my memory as to its caption. There was not much discussion of it in the committee. I believe it was in the recommendation and illustrative stage. It was to indicate by illustration what the administration has in mind in the expenditure of the $89 million.

Very interestingly, what little discussion there was included the raising of doubting questions immediately: "Why here? Why there? Why for this? Why for that?"

It was pointed out that our discussion this morning was not intended for the purpose of passing judgment on those questions.

But what occurred bears out what the Senator has said. We certainly ought to have hearings to determine whether or not we believe the President's program is a wise one in regard to the particular expenditure.

I am glad that the Senator has raised the question, for it shows the problem which is confronting us. We do not get requests for hearings in depth in regard to a program that the President wishes to put in operation. To the contrary, we are in a state in which the President makes a blanket request, and then we are supposed to act on it peremptorily. I believe that is the worst possible way to develop foreign policy. No matter how they wish to clothe it and no matter how they desire to deny it, the fact is that that is a rubberstamp approach to our job in the Senate. I believe we serve the interests of the public by not rubberstamping the President.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. In the Senator's experience on the Foreign Relations Committee, have there been many—or, indeed, have there been any—specific requests for a specific project as distinguished from the general policy of asking for a lump sum of money, and then allowing the AID agency to use that money as it sees fit? Is that procedure not setting a substantial precedent which would seem to commit the Senate specifically to a program?

Mr. MORSE. In all fairness, I would have to say that there have been a good many instances in which we have been asked to pass upon specific projects in this sense. The workbooks that the Department of State and the AID people send up to us at the beginning of our hearings on the annual foreign aid bill and for discussion during our executive sessions on it contain detailed breakdowns of money as it has been spent in the past and as it is proposed to be spent projectwise in the future. Yet I would also have to say that we do not spend any considerable amount of time on those individual projects. They are sort of used as examples.

Mr. GRUENING. Illustrative.

Mr. MORSE. Illustrative material. One of my criticisms of the foreign aid bills of the past several years has been the delegation of decisionmaking power to the members of the AID organization and the State Department rather than to have the committee itself exercise a greater check on individual expenditures. I shall go into that subject at some length in a few days when we reach a discussion of my amendment which the committee has recommended, although it was changed somewhat, but I believe it still is a good amendment. That amendment would restore to some extent the checking power of the Congress upon the foreign aid program and bring the whole present program to an end in 1967 and start all over again. That is a pretty important check. I do not wish to go into that question today. I wish to try to limit myself to the present amendment. But these questions are pertinent. I believe I would have to say, in reply to the Senator from Alaska, that what we have here is a repetition of the tendency of the present administration to ask for blanket approval, and the fewer questions asked, the greater pleasure will be the response.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Does not the Senator understand that in the President's Johns Hopkins address, when he was explaining the need for bombing North Vietnam, he was offering $1 billion as a kind of carrot to accompany the stick, and therefore make the people of southeast Asia feel that there was another no less important aspect other than military to our policy, namely, to give them economic aid as well as to apply military pressure, which hitherto we have so much emphasized?

Mr. MORSE. I believe at the time the Senator from Alaska, as I recall, described it as a sort of bribe proposal—a statement in which I joined. I thought it was a little unfortunate for the President to offer them a great deal of money and at the same time try to defend bombing North Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. Has the Senator given sufficient attention to the program to know whether the program would convey any material benefits to North Vietnam? I ask that question because it seems to me that if that were the "carrot" going along with the "stick" of bombing designed to induce the North Vietnamese to cry "uncle" and to quit, an offer of economic aid which would largely benefit South Vietnam would not be very persuasive.

Mr. MORSE. Nothing would stop the President from spending any of the money in the proposed program in North Vietnam in the due course of time. I have heard no specific proposal to do so. It would be extremely difficult to interpret the President's speeches over the weekend in any other light than to say that they indicate that the President would not be adverse to spending money in North Vietnam if a negotiated settlement were reached.

But I shall tell the Senator what we can do. We can take judicial notice now that the American taxpayer will eventually rebuild all the devastation that we have caused in North Vietnam.

When we are through bombing China—and I believe we are on our way to bombing China in the not very distant future—we shall rebuild it all. But we shall be just plain goofy. What we ought to be doing is avoiding all that devastation, all that waste. What those people have developed has been developed at great sacrifice over the years. I do not know why we must destroy first and then pay for the rebuilding. If we get into a war with China and North Vietnam, we shall be engaged in it for a minimum of 25 years. We shall have perpetual war, not on a major scale after we have laid waste; but they will keep sniping at us. They will hate us for hundreds of years. Eventually, they will kick us out. The Senator from Alaska and I will not be here; but no matter how many centuries it takes, we shall be driven out. We shall never be able to buy good will with American dollars. So I am at a loss to understand the goofy performance in which we are engaged.

Mr. GRUENING. We are not going to buy good will when we are bombing North Vietnam, when we are raining napalm and other bombs on North Vietnam. We cannot be considered ambassadors of good will at the same time we are bombing.

Mr. MORSE. One who listens to the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State would think we were killing no one in North Vietnam. I have tried for weeks to have the administration tell the American people the number of casualties we have caused in North Vietnam and in South Vietnam. The American people are entitled to know. If anyone says we can bomb munition centers, bridges, transportation centers, terminal centers, and railroad yards, and not kill human beings, he is misleading the American people. That needs to be said on the floor of the Senate. Of course we are killing North Vietnamese. We are killing thousands in South Vietnam. I hope it is true that we are not killing them in massive numbers. But this is a killing war. The Defense Department keeps and publishes all the figures of killings and casualties in the south committeed by the Vietcong. But they tell nothing of the South Vietnamese civilians we are killing and maiming with our napalm and strafing and artillery.

A few minutes ago, the Senator from Alaska spoke about the shocking atrocities that are being committed by the South Vietnamese, by the North Vietnamese, and by the Vietcong. I am advised by reliable persons, who know what is taking place over there, that this war has made a scrap of paper of the Geneva treaty, which bears the signature of the United States, in respect to the treatment of war prisoners. The only argument I have heard is the weak one: "It really does not apply, because we have not declared war." Imagine that. I am not saying that U.S. forces are guilty of atrocities, but I am saying that American military personnel have stood by while atrocities have been committed by the South Vietnamese; and we have yet to file our first complaint in the United Nations against North Vietnam, South Vietnam, and the Vietcong for violations of the articles of war.

The period of this war will not be a proud chapter in their country's history, for future American boys and girls to read about. I know that war is dirty and brutal; but there are articles of war aimed at making it less dirty and less brutal.

It is not often that one sees published in the American press what appears in the foreign press, because the American people are being treated, by and large, to a "kept" press, so far as war news from South Vietnam is concerned. One of the reasons is that the Pentagon and the State Department will not let American correspondents send home the truth. But it can be obtained in many European newspapers. If the American people could only read what is written about us in the European press by European correspondents, they would be much surprised. The European correspondents report the news some way, somehow. It is interesting to see, from a comparison of the photographs that appear in the American press with those that appear in the European press, what is taking place in southeast Asia.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. From the Senator's knowledge of the state of the war in South Vietnam, does he believe that the construction of Mekong Delta dams and other facilities can occur while a war is raging and the Vietcong is, supposedly, holding a large section of that country?

Mr. MORSE. That is one of the great difficulties I have with this bit of propaganda that the administration is handing out.

I agree that we ought to be of economic assistance to the people of South Vietnam, as does the Senator from Alaska. I want to be of assistance to them. I wish to do something to improve their health. I want to do something to increase their longevity, which now is from 30 to 35 years. I want to do something to improve their education. I want to do something to overcome their lack of electricity. I want to provide electric power for them. But I do not see how there is any hope of doing that while the war is going on, because the proposal is to supply this aid in the very area that is controlled by the Vietcong. The Vietcong control about 75 percent of the land area of South Vietnam.

Apparently, a complex has been developed in this country that the dollar speaks; and that if we will only say to the ignorant, illiterate masses of South Vietnam, "If you will stop your fighting, we will give you a large sum of money and a large amount of economic assistance," they will stop their fighting. But we receive too many reports that they hate us, suspect us, do not believe us. They are suspicious that we are laying a trap for them.

I do not believe we can build such dams now. We shall have to cooperate in an economic program for the South Vietnamese; but we shall have to bring in many other people to help us. That is why we ought to be stressing efforts to obtain an honorable negotiated settlement which will come as nearly as possible to adopting Franklin Roosevelt's notion of an international trusteeship. For many years I have pleaded for the economic freedom of those people. Only then will they be able to develop their political freedom. That is my formula. People do not dispute my formula; they merely think it is too idealistic.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from Oregon well knows that whenever a major hydro development has been proposed in this country, such as TVA, Boulder Dam, Bonneville, or Grand Coulee, hearings have been held before the appropriate committees of Congress to consider the engineering feasibility. Has anything similar been proposed concerning the Mekong Delta program?

Mr. MORSE. The answer is "No."

Mr. GRUENING. How can the Senate justify giving a blank check for $89 million? It will be a commitment. It is so considered. We will have embarked on it by making the first downpayment.

Mr. MORSE. It would be more than $89 million, as the Senator pointed out. There would be a commitment for more money.

Mr. GRUENING. $1 billion.

Mr. MORSE. I do not know how much it would be. However, it would be a huge sum of money.

I am opposed to starting the program now. I am for ending the war.

Mr. GRUENING. I share that view.

Mr. MORSE. The major problem that confronts us is getting the killing stopped.

Mr. GRUENING. I share that view emphatically. I suggest that the fighting be stopped before we start an economic reconstruction. As of now, both sides are in the constant process of destruction. However, it is proposed that we embark on a program which would involve the expenditure of more than $1 billion while the destruction is continuing.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, so far as South Vietnam is concerned, we have no guarantee that any construction that we would initiate would continue to stand as long as the fighting continues.

I think it is proper for me to say this, although I should like to have counsel for the committee pay close heed. I shall not go very far. I do not propose to discuss the specific contents of the memorandum that was given to the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning. However, I believe that it is appropriate to say that it is not contemplated that the $89 million would all be spent in South Vietnam. In fact, it is not contemplated that a very large share of the money would be spent in South Vietnam.

A large share of it, so far as tentative plans are concerned, would be spent in southeast Asia, but not in South Vietnam.

Counsel for the committee has pointed out to me that the President's message itself bears out what I have just said. The message spells out some of this recommendations. The part that I shall refer to is found on page 2.

This, in a substantial way, is a good substitute for my discussion of the memorandum that was handed to us this morning which contained the caveat that, in effect, it was not to be used outside the committee. I read from the Presidential message:

> To support our own effort, I ask the Congress to authorize and appropriate for fiscal year 1966 an additional $89 million for the Agency for International Development for expanded programs of economic and social development in southeast Asia.
>
> This money will serve many purposes:
>
> First. Approximately $19 million will provide the first installment of our contribution to the accelerated development of the Mekong River Basin.

I read further from page 2 of the President's message:

> Second. Five million dollars will be used to support electrification cooperatives near three provincial towns—Long Xuyen, Dalat, and Nha Thang—in South Vietnam.

Reading further:

> Third. Seven million dollars will help provide improved medical and surgical services, especially in the more remote areas of Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

This money would be spent outside South Vietnam.

I read further from the Presidential message:

> Fourth. Approximately $6 million will be used to train people for the construction of roads, dams, and other small-scale village projects in Thailand and Laos.

Reading further:

> Fifth. Approximately $45 million will be used to finance increasing imports of iron and steel, cement, chemicals and pesticides, drugs, trucks, and other essential goods necessary for a growing civilian economy. This money will allow factories not only to continue but through investment, to expand production of both capital and consumer goods. It will provide materials for urgently needed low-cost housing. And it will maintain production incentives and avoid inflation. It is not easy for a small country, with a low income, to fight a war on its own soil and at the same time persist in the business of nation building. The additional import support which I propose will help Vietnam to persevere in this difficult task.
>
> Sixth. An additional $7 million will supplement the present program of agricultural

development and support additional government services in all three countries, and will help in the planning of further industrial expansion in the secure areas of Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. That would be South Vietnam.

Mr. MORSE. That would be South Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. There is no provision contained in the proposal for economic aid that would do anything that would induce the North Vietnamese to feel that they would be a part of the program and thus induce them to stop their fighting. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. It is not spelled out. However, the President has made it very clear in his public statements that if they stopped their fighting, he would give them some money.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator believe that this is an argument that would be listened to by the people who are being bombed daily?

Mr. MORSE. It would make them very suspicious. I believe that it is too bad that we are supplying the Communists with the kind of propaganda they use. What propaganda is Red China putting out? What propaganda is North Vietnam putting out? I believe that they are very unfair. This is not the President's motivation. However, I do not know why he opens himself up to this kind of propaganda attack.

The Communists charge him with trying to buy an end to this war with American dollars. As they put it, "They will not fall for it."

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Alaska for his contribution.

Mr. President, on the basis of the parliamentary rulings that I have received, I now offer my corrected amendment, and ask that it be read and made the pending business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 14, insert the following:

At the end of section 504(a) add the following:

"Of the funds made available for the fiscal year 1966 pursuant to this section, $9,000,000 shall be transferred to and consolidated with funds otherwise made available pursuant to section 212, which relates to authorization for technical cooperation and development grants, and $80,000,000 shall be transferred to and consolidated with funds otherwise made available pursuant to section 402, which relates to authorization for supporting assistance. The funds so transferred shall remain available until expended solely for use in southeast Asia in accordance with the provisions of section 212 and section 402 respectively. Amounts transferred pursuant to this subsection shall not be taken into account in determining amounts authorized to be transferred pursuant to section 610."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have about finished my discussion of the amendment. I shall have no objection to voting on the amendment if the Senate remains in session tonight. However, that is entirely up to the opponents of the amendment and to the leadership of the Senate.

I believed that we owed the President the courtesy, out of respect to him, of starting with this amendment, because this is what the country is talking about at the present time. This is the latest request that the President has made of Congress.

The Committee on Foreign Relations took action on the matter this morning—unfortunate action in my judgment. However, I shall not speak at any greater length on this amendment.

I say to the majority leader that I made an open, general statement in opposition to the bill. I prefer, after we dispose of the amendment, to make one more general statement in opposition to the bill, based upon my minority views. Then, I intend to proceed with offering amendments which I shall discuss briefly, and then proceed with the business of disposing of the bill. I shall not enter into an agreement on this amendment, because, as the Senator from Montana knows, if we cannot vote on this amendment tonight, I prefer not to have a vote on it before Wednesday. I might even give some consideration—after the case pro and the case con are made—to withdrawing the amendment temporarily; but I have no objection to having the Senate vote on this amendment tonight.

I shall summarize the amendment as follows: It would give the President, out of military aid funds, the $89 million, earmarked for southeast Asia; the amendment would not give him an additional $89 million for the foreign aid bill. The bill already includes millions of dollars more than should be in it. The President can transfer funds in the way this amendment proposes, so that he can spend $89 million for the specific purpose he wants to spend it for; namely, for economic assistance in southeast Asia. However, I do not believe there is any justification for the President's using the Vietnam war as the vehicle for having the bill include an additional $89 million.

At this stage, I believe that the transfer procedure provided by my amendment is preferable. It shows our good faith insofar as the President is concerned. It gives him an opportunity to see what he can do with the economic approach.

However, the Senator from Alaska has said that we have not had hearings on it or have not had an opportunity to see whether it is feasible to spend any of it in the midst of a war in South Vietnam, in respect to seeing what can be accomplished with it.

But I shall offer this amendment first. I make perfectly clear that my offering of the amendment does not mean I do not think the bill should be cut. Later, I shall offer my major amendment to cut the entire bill by $500 million. There is nothing inconsistent between this amendment and my announced plan to offer an amendment to cut the bill by $500 million.

However, for the time being, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what did the Senator from Oregon have in mind with respect to a vote on his amendment?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. There should be a quorum call. The majority leader should then announce to the Senate that the amendment is pending and that I have made my case in chief on it.

The only comments I shall make now will be in reply to the remarks of any Senators who may oppose my amendment; and then I shall be ready to have the vote taken.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask the question because I have been requested by the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], to offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon. The reason why the Senator from Arkansas is not in the Chamber at this time, so as to be able to offer, himself, this amendment is that the Senator from Arkansas is temporarily detained in Dr. Calver's office.

Would the same forecast of a vote by the Senator from Oregon be applicable to the substitute being offered?

Mr. MORSE. I would not "buy that pig in a poke" until I hear what the substitute is.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The substitute is the committee action, which, in effect is based on the special message, and would add an additional $89 million, as requested by the President.

Mr. MORSE. Then I shall oppose that amendment; but I shall not speak at any great length against it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that; and I appreciate the suggestion made. I was wondering whether, on the basis of his original suggestion, it would be possible, after allowing a certain length of time for explanation, to take the vote this evening.

Mr. MORSE. I hope so, for I favor getting on with our work.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator suggest how much time he thinks he would require before reaching the yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. MORSE. I would favor letting Senators discuss the amendment, and then vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I offer to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon a substitute amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out, on page 4, lines 15 through 17, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(2) Strike out "$215,000,000 which", and substitute "$219,000,000 for use beginning in the fiscal year 1966 and $210,000,000 for use beginning in the fiscal year 1967, which sums".

On page 10, strike out lines 14 through 19, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(a) In the first sentence, strike out "for use beginning in the fiscal year 1965".

(b) In the first sentence, strike out "$405,000,000 which" and substitute "$430,000,000 for use beginning in the fiscal year 1966 and $350,000,000 for use beginning in the fiscal year 1967 which sums".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement made by Hon. Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State, before the Foreign Relations Committee, on June 3, 1965.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, JUNE 3, 1965

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate this committee's prompt consideration of the President's request for increased economic assistance funds for southeast Asia. I regret that it was not possible to quantify these additional fiscal year 1966 requirements during the committee's regular consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act.

The President, in his message to the Congress on Tuesday, put the purpose of our presence in Vietnam succinctly when he said:

"We are defending the right of the people of South Vietnam to decide their own destiny. Where this right is attacked by force, we have no alternative but to reply with strength. But military action is not a final solution in this area; it is only a partial means to a much larger goal. Freedom and progress will be possible in Vietnam only as the people are assured that history is on their side—that it will give them a chance to make a living in peace, to educate their children, to escape the ravages of disease and, above all, to be free of the oppressors who for so long have fed on their labors.

"Our effort on behalf of the people of southeast Asia should unite, not divide, the people of that region. Our policy is not to spread conflict but to heal conflict."

The President's current request is for funds required to serve this purpose, at this juncture, in South Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

In the President's statement on Vietnam on March 25, and again in his historic address at Johns Hopkins University, on April 7, the President invited Asia to respond to his offer of a U.S. role in meeting the basic human needs of the peoples of southeast Asia. The Secretary General of the United Nations and his colleagues in New York, Bangkok, and elsewhere have taken up his invitation to explore institutional and program possibilities. We are gratified that the Asian governments, and notably the Government of Japan, have commenced the study of means to improve the welfare of the peoples of southeast Asia. The greatest contribution to this goal would be, of course, to end violence and to relieve peoples of the burdens they bear today for support of military organizations and operations. But we cannot await tranquillity in the area to begin needed expanded processes of social and economic development. And so we must begin and chart a course which permits those whose ideas and political systems may differ amongst themselves all to participate either as beneficiaries or as donors. Happily the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East is an institution which benefits from the leadership of the United Nations Secretariat in New York and is currently led by a dedicated group of international servants. To it already belong most of the countries of Asia and the Far East, and adherence of others should not present great difficulties.

We would like to hold open the possibility that a peaceful North Vietnam might share in the benefits that would come from peace itself and also from participation in such multilateral institutions and programs as appear to meet the common need for economic and social development.

The magnificent successes of the Marshall plan in Europe grew from a simple unelaborated idea which took account of political, economic, and security realities. The Marshall plan was not imposed upon Europe. We do not intend to impose a U.S. plan on Asia. However, the President has given us the concept. Both within the Government of the United States and within governments and multilateral institutions elsewhere plans and possibilities are being explored for fulfilling a noble goal.

The President has requested an increase of $80 million in the authorization for supporting assistance and $9 million for technical cooperation, all for expanded programs of economic assistance in southeast Asia. Two basic and urgent purposes would be served:

1. These funds would permit the first concrete action in carrying out the President's April 7 proposal to launch an intensified, international campaign to stimulate southeast Asian economic and social progress and promote closer regional economic cooperation. This request and the congressional response to it should, we believe, demonstrate to other prosperous nations and the southeast Asian countries that we are ready to do our part if they do theirs. As Asian institutions and plans are developed, we will prepare for submission to Congress next January, a more complete presentation of requirements for this special effort. When the necessary steps have been taken with respect to the projected Asian Development Bank, we plan to ask for funds to make a U.S. contribution through appropriate legislative channels.

2. These funds also would enable South Vietnam to undertake expansion of industrial production and investment, increased low-cost housing construction, transportation and other public works improvements while carrying out an expanded defense effort.

The expanded development program from southeast Asia will require larger contributions through multilateral arrangements, both existing and newly established, as well as increased bilateral assistance. The former will include funds fully administered by international bodies—such as the expected U.N.-sponsored consortium for the Nam Ngum Dam in Laos and the proposed Asian Development Bank—as well as funds for projects planned and coordinated by regional agencies but implemented as national projects. Excluded from what we describe as the expanded development effort are our police assistance programs and the large commodity import programs required to sustain the military efforts of weak economies.

In this message to the Congress submitting the foreign assistance proposals last January, the President pointed out that the minimum budget proposed did not allow for major increases which might be required during the year. "If they should arise, he said, "I shall not hestiate to inform the Congress and request additional funds." Anticipating increases in South Vietnam's requirements for economic or military assistance, he asked for a special standby authorization for additional appropriations for our assistance to Vietnam only.

The House of Representatives decided to broaden the proposed standby authorization to cover all southeast Asia. This committee preferred to reserve any further authorization pending specific requests and hearings.

In the past 2 weeks, the size of the additional bilateral U.S. economic aid requirements in Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos has become clearer.

At the same time, it has become evident that our broader purpose of stimulating regional economic cooperation requires prompt action on available multinational projects, without waiting for a complete set of regional institutions to emerge. We propose, therefore, to commit approximately $.9 million to Mekong Basin projects early in fiscal year 1966 if feasibility reviews now under way prove favorable and other conditions are met.

The Mekong water resource projects include:

The Nam Ngum Dam in Laos, serving both Laos and northern Thailand: $13.5 million. The first stage of this 20,000 kilowatt power project on a Mekong tributary is estimated to cost about $27 million. The Mekong Committee has asked the World Bank to manage construction, using funds granted by the United States and other advanced countries. Subject to a finding of economic and financial feasibility, we propose to commit the United States to a grant of half of the total cost, provided other countries contribute the balance in grant funds.

A power transmission line linking Vientiane, Laos, and Nongkhai, Thailand, across the Mekong River. Ancillary to this would be an expansion of distribution lines in the Vientiane area. Cost estimate: $500,000.

Phase II engineering studies of the proposed Pa Mong Dam, a very large Mekong main stream project between Laos and Northeast Thailand: $4.5 million in fiscal year 1966 technical cooperation funds. Continuation of a long-term study by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation of this major project of the basin development scheme was dropped from the initial fiscal year 1966 AID presentation because of uncertainty as to the findings of the first phase study on irrigation demand. We are now informed that the Bureau of Reclamation team will recommend going ahead with the engineering reconnaissance, including aerial mapping, site testing, and canal alinement.

Feasibility studies of irrigation dam projects on the Mun and Chi Rivers in north east Thailand. Acceleration of this work, also by the Bureau of Reclamation, will require an increase of at least $500,000 in technical cooperation funds above previous estimates.

Nothing is more fundamental to progress in southeast Asia than improved health services. The severe shortage of doctors and other health services in the rural areas of Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand has long been a major concern of their Governments, and of AID. We propose to intensify our assistance by: Providing additional medical and surgical teams, both military and civilian, to serve sick and injured civilians in provincial and other rural towns of South Vietnam; broadening our assistance to rural public health programs in Thailand, particularly in provision of equipment to provincial hospitals, health centers, and drug distribution agents; and rehabilitating or better equipping rural dispensaries in Laos, supplementing our present extensive health and sanitation program which now provides pharmaceuticals and more than 100 Philippine doctors and nurses who train Lao medics and care for the sick throughout the country.

These additional efforts will require additional supporting assistance, largely in Vietnam, and additional technical cooperation funds, largely in Thailand.

The third field of expanded assistance to the people of southeast Asia is the training and equipping of local engineering and public works agencies for rural development work—simple roads, water wells, irrigation ponds, schools, etc.

We propose expansion of previously planned projects of this sort in northeast Thailand and, for the first time, in the southernmost provinces of Thailand. In Laos, we propose to expand the existing program of training and equipping the highway department staff by applying an on-the-job training approach to the rehabilitation of the road from Vientiane to Luang Prabang.

Rural electrification cooperatives have played an important role in the development of the United States and other countries. In cooperation with the U.S. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, we propose to help the people of three selected areas of South Vietnam establish electric coops. We hope these pilot projects will become models for bringing light and power for the homes and small industries of southeast Asia within reach of their incomes. This represents $5.5 million of the supporting assistance increase requested.

Expanded technical assistance to Lao agricultural development, particularly agricultural credit and marketing, and the introduction on a wider scale of improved livestock and seeds are proposed.

Industrial expansion in Vietnam, both now and immediately after the cessation of hostilities, will be essential to the country's rehabilitation and progress toward self-support. Without waiting for peace, we propose to contract with potential private American investors and other expert groups to conduct feasibility studies looking to the establishment of new plants, in such lines of production as fertilizer, cement and kraft paper. Related public works, particularly port development, also will require additional funds for feasibility studies.

The largest element of the supplemental request is for $45 million in additional supporting assistance to finance Vietnam's commercial imports. In testimony before the congressional committees this spring, we have pointed to the necessity of using a then undetermined amount of the proposed standby authorization for this purpose. In the past 2 weeks, we have been able to refine somewhat our calculations of the impact of increased defense and police budgets and expanded public works and investment programs on the demand for imported goods. We now estimate that in addition to the commodity import support previously programed for basic support of the economy, about $45 million will be required to maintain economic growth and avoid destructive inflation.

This increased dependence on our aid results partly from Vietcong interdiction of rice shipments, rail and road sabotage and terrorism—all combining to prevent any rice export earnings in 1965.

In the eight northern coastal provinces of Vietnam alone, some 215,000 refugees have fled their homes because of Vietcong terror, 9,000 in just the past week. This mass movement of people requires more construction materials, medicines, and food, not to mention the other economic and social consequences of such mass uprootings.

In addition to these war-connected requirements, there is a growing need for investment in urban and rural areas as a demonstration of the government's determination to emerge from this conflict a viable country, dedicated to the long-run task of nation building.

At the same time, further expansion of the Vietnamese armed forces and police and of security forces construction has expanded the demand for goods in the marketplace.

To meet these requirements for basic economic support, we proposed last January in the fiscal 1966 budget now before the Congress, supporting assistance plus such additional amounts later found to be required to support a higher but then undetermined level of Vietnamese military and civil operations. After taking into account currently available estimates of Vietnamese foreign exchange requirements and earnings, including receipts from U.S. military forces in Vietnam, we now see a probable shortfall of $40 to $50 million. This request would cover a midpoint in that range of estimates. These funds would finance imports of a variety of goods such as construction materials, pharmaceuticals, fertilizers, pesticides, tires and tubes, and trucks.

We hope, Mr. Chairman, that these programs will meet the approval of the committee and that you will add the request to the pending authorization bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, an explanation has been made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] of the proposed additional $89 million. The Senator from Oregon made that explanation in explaining his position on the Presidential request. I do not feel that I should go into greater detail than he has gone, because he has covered the situation succinctly and to the point, and the issue is clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on this question, I wish to have the yeas and nays ordered.

The issue is clearly drawn. My amendment would authorize the President to spend the $89 million out of the military aid authorization of the bill he sent here, which the committee voted to place before the Senate. The substitute amendment would add another $89 million to the President's foreign aid program. The President uses the Vietnam issue—which has a great emotional appeal—as the springboard for firing that missile. However, he does not need it; he does not need to have Congress add $89 million to the bill. It is one thing to authorize him to spend it for this purpose—which I am glad to vote to do; but it is quite another thing for Congress to say to him, "You can have $89 million more," when we know we have ahead of us a long debate in connection with the elimination of the unconscionable amounts of waste embedded in the President's $3,380 million proposal.

So all the chairman of the committee has done is to propose that Congress say, "Mr. President, we will give you $89 million more." I am opposed to that. I suggest that the sensible thing for us to do at this stage is to say to the President, "If you want to spend for this purpose $89 million of the amount of money you have asked for in the bill, which the Foreign Relations Committee recommends authorizing you to do, we are not going to oppose your spending it for that purpose; but in order to do it, you will have to transfer $89 million from military funds into your technical assistance and supporting assistance program."

That is the issue.

If the majority leader does not object, I suggest the absence of a quorum, in order to obtain a yea and nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw the proposed amendment to the Morse amendment. I am advised that it is not in order as a substitute for the Morse amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be withdrawn.

S. 2089—DISASTER RELIEF FOR CALIFORNIA, OREGON, WASHINGTON, NEVADA, AND IDAHO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2089, which has just been reported by the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2089), to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho, for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2089

An Act to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress hereby recognizes (1) that the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho have experienced extensive property loss and damage as the result of floods and high waters during December 1964, and January and February 1965, (2) that much of the affected area is federally owned and administered, and (3) that the livelihood of the people in the area is dependent on prompt restoration of transportation facilities and, therefore, Congress declares the need for special measures designed to aid and accelerate those States in their efforts to provide for the reconstruction of devastated areas.

Sec. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in addition to the amounts authorized in section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code, not to exceed $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and not to exceed $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Such sums shall be obligated and expended by the Secretary of Commerce in accordance with such section 125, and related provisions of title 23 of the United States Code for the repair and reconstruction of highways, roads, and trails, damaged as the result of a disaster.

Sec. 3. (a) Notwithstanding provisions of existing contracts, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, separately, and as part of the regular road and trail construction program, shall reimburse timber sale contractors or otherwise arrange to bear road and trail construction and restoration costs either directly or in cooperation with timber purchasers to the extent of costs determined by the respective Secretary as incurred or to be incurred for restoring roads in any stage of construction authorized by a contract for the purchase of timber from lands under his jurisdiction to substantially the same condition as existed prior to the damage resulting from the floods of December 1964, and January and February of 1965 in California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho, and to the extent costs determined by the respective Secretary as incurred or to be incurred for completing road construction not performed under any such contract prior to the floods but which, because of changed conditions resulting from the floods, exceed road construction costs as originally determined by the respective Secretary. The costs for such road restoration, reconstruction, and construction under any single timber purchase contract on roads not accepted prior to the floods, whether construction was complete, partial, or not yet begun, shall be borne as follows: 15 per centum of all amounts shall be borne by the timber purchaser, except that such purchaser shall not be required to bear costs of more than $4,500, and the Secretary shall bear the remaining portion of such costs. This subsection shall not apply (1) in the case of any road restoration or reconstruction if the cost of such restoration or reconstruction is less than $500, and (2) in the case of any road construction if the increase in the cost of such construction as the result of the floods is less than $500 more than the construction costs as originally determined by the respective Secretary.

(b) Where the Secretary determines that damages are so great that restoration, reconstruction, or construction is not practical under the cost-sharing arrangement authorized by subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary may allow cancellation of the contract notwithstanding provisions therein.

(c) Paragraph (3) of section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) For forest development roads and trails, $123,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, of which not to exceed $38,000,000 shall be used solely for the construction, repair, and reconstruction of forest development roads and trails in the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho, necessary because of the floods and high waters in such States during December 1964, and January and February 1965, and $85,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967."

(d) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to reduce to seven days the minimum period of advance public notice required by the first section of the Act of June 4, 1897 (16 U.S.C. 476), in connection with the sale of timber from national forests, whenever the Secretary determines that the sale of such timber will assist in the reconstruction of any area of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho damaged by floods or high waters during December 1964, and January and February 1965.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to give any public land entryman such additional time in which to comply with any requirement of law in connection with any public land entry for lands in California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho, as the Secretary finds appropriate because of interference with the entryman's ability to comply with such requirement resulting from floods and high waters during December 1964, and January and February 1965.

SEC. 5. (a) The President, acting through the Office of Emergency Planning, shall make a survey to determine what protective works would be necessary to prevent the recurrence of damage by floods or high waters to those banks of the Eel River, California, which are adjacent to the trackage of any common carrier by railroad and shall report to Congress the results of such survey together with the cost of any recommended work within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act. The President, acting through the Office of Emergency Planning, is authorized to perform all or any part of the recommended work determined to be in the public interest and to reimburse any common carrier for any of such recommended work performed by such carrier. The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army shall be used to make the survey authorized by this section, shall recommend necessary work that has been determined by the President acting through the Office of Emergency Planning to be in the public interest, and shall be used to supervise any work authorized to be performed under this section.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $3,875,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 6. Loans made pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) for the purpose of replacing, reconstructing, or repairing dwellings in California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho, damaged or destroyed by the floods and high waters of December 1964, and January and February 1965, may have a maturity of up to thirty years, except that section 7(c) of such Act shall not apply to such loans.

SEC. 7. This Act, other than section 5 and the amendment made by section 3(c), shall not be in effect after June 30, 1966, except with respect to payment of expenditures for obligations and commitments entered into under this Act on or before such date.

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say in behalf of all the cosponsors of the bill which I introduced, and on behalf of the people of our States, that we appreciate very much the dispatch with which the Senate, the committee, and the leadership has moved this afternoon.

Also, the committee staffs, majority and minority, deserve the heartfelt thanks of all the people of the States involved. I am sure I am at liberty to express my appreciation—and I do. I am delighted that the Senate has taken this course of action.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I know that all of us were saddened and shocked by the tragic floods which ravaged the Pacific coast in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. When the Senator from Oregon sponsored the bill, together with his colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and all the other Senators interested in speedily rehabilitating their States, the bill was quickly brought before the Committee on Public Works, under the leadership of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

As usual, the Senator from Oregon brought before the committee precise information regarding the consequences of the floods which he proposed to remedy, information which was adequate yet reasonable, and enabled the entire committee to support the recommendations.

Senators on both sides of the aisle were happy to do what they could to assist the States whose people had suffered such terrible damage.

I am glad to have been able to work with the chairman, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]; and I hope that this measure will be of assistance to all the States concerned.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky, the Senator from Michigan, and all others who worked so hard for quick passage of the bill.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 1837 to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Morse amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, in order to bring Senators into the Chamber, and then I shall be ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was about to help the minority leader by telling him what my amendment would do. The amendment would authorize the President to spend $89 million for the economic program which he sets out in his message to Congress. The amendment would not add $89 million to the $3,380 million that he has recommended be authorized. It would not allow him to increase his aid program. We say to him, "You may spend the money for this purpose, but you must transfer funds for that purpose from military aid to the extent of $89 million."

The thesis of my argument is that there is no question that he can take the $89 million without in any way jeopardizing the aid program, by saving in many other places and spending it for this purpose. The program is already far larger than it ought to be. I would authorize the program, but I would not give the President more money.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the President of the United States has made an earnest request for an extra $89 million, as did the Secretary of State when he appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee. That money is to be devoted to a variety of economic and social purposes, including the addition of health teams, particularly in Vietnam, but I would assume also in Laos and Thailand.

When I was in Vietnam the first time, Dienbienphu had not fallen. The French were making preparations to withdraw.

When I went back to Vietnam the second time, I found what a problem confronted this small, unsophisticated country in trying to reorient its economy. We sent people from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to reconstitute their monetary system. We sent doctors and economic experts to keep the economy afloat. We siphoned many thousands of young men out of Vietnam and put them into training courses under the leadership of "Iron Mike" O'Daniel, to whip the Vietnamese Army of 125,000 into shape.

During that second visit I saw the French merchants withdraw from Saigon and elsewhere and leave the economy on its uppers.

How much worse it must be, in view of the decimation that is taking place at the present time in Vietnam.

The newspapers in this country do not disclose the casualty lists of the Vietnamese Army. If I had to make a guess, I would say at least 30,000 and perhaps more have been killed in battle.

That is really something to withdraw from the economic bloodstream of the country, which is teetering between solvency and bankruptcy.

As I think of the decimation of the industries and farms and places of work, I can readily imagine the situation out there at present to be infinitely worse than when the French finally withdrew.

All this will require some transfusion. What is the use of saving a shell, if it is not a vital, going economy, and if it is on its uppers?

The President makes a request for $89 million for that purpose. Among other things, he is including the question of health. What a tremendous incidence of elephantiasis and other tropical diseases must be there, particularly among the civilian population. When we equate $89 million against the fact that we are spending between one and a half million dollars and $2 million a day now, and when, according to last reports, we have 61,000 advisers in Vietnam, it would seem to me that it is cheese paring to deny the $89 million by consolidating it within the total of the foreign aid bill.

I am as anxious as anyone to save on foreign aid. I shall go quite a long way, but I believe that our friend from Oregon picked out the wrong area in which to effectuate an economy. I shall not do it at the expense of a poor beleaguered people where the guns are shattering the instrumentalities of existence and where planes and helicopters are bombing the country and making it increasingly difficult to carry on what little industry they have and what little service industry they have. So the amendment would appear to me to be terribly shortsighted, and I therefore earnestly hope that the amendment will not prevail. That is all I have to say.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have been confronted with something of a problem on the proposal. Our minority leader has stated that in recent months we have been successful in killing 30,000 Vietcong. I do not know who has counted them. I do not know how successfully the Vietcong have been in killing Vietnamese. I do not know that anyone has counted them either. I do know that had the President made his proposal 6 months ago, it would probably have been an effective suggestion. I do not know how many people we have killed in North Vietnam in the past 3 or 4 months. I do not know that we shall ever know. It seems that we have started on a course that can lead to all-out nuclear war; and if that is anything to be proud of, let those who feel that way make the most of it.

So far as concerns the request for $89 million, that is the initial request for a program which it is estimated will cost something like $1 billion. That would be a very small percentage of the cost of allout war in dollars, even if we did not consider the cost of life at all—and I do not know how much that would be.

About a month ago, when the President requested the restoration of $115 million to the foreign aid bill, I made the motion in the Foreign Relations Committee that the President be authorized to spend $115 million for either peace or war. This would have given him some bargaining power if negotiation could be arranged.

My suggestion was rejected by the administration, which wanted the money for war, and defeated in committee. No mention was made of peace.

Mr. President, I am not now in a mood to be very obliging when the administration asks for $89 million which it does not need at the present time. The administration does not need it now any more than it will need the money on the 1st of July. It can get it on the 1st of July. What it now desires is to propagandize the world into believing that the Congress is unanimously behind any move which the administration chooses to make. For that reason I am voting for the amendment and against the substitute.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, my objection to the request for $89 million is not similar to the objection of the distinguished Senator from Vermont. Involved as we are in Vietnam, having advanced to the place to which we have now advanced, if the President of the United States should request the Congress for money necessary to pursue the course which in his opinion we should pursue in this emergency, I would vote for the amount requested—if it came separate from the foreign aid bill, pinpointed for southeast Asia. But the thing which I resent is that the appropriation is tied to the foreign aid bill. This is entirely consistent with certain strategies I have observed, in connection with other administration measures. It is designed to write into the foreign aid bundle an appropriation that has all the appeal of standing behind the President and our boys in Vietnam. This proponement is tied to the foreign aid bill, so that when we come to the final vote on foreign aid, every Senator who votes against the entire bundle can be labeled with the charge that he did not vote for an appropriation needed by our President and our troops who are desperately fighting in Vietnam.

If the administration requires money for the emergency—and, unlike the Senator from Vermont, I am not questioning the need of standing by the President on the proposal—I wish the request would come separately, because I cannot resist the suspicion that the proposal is buried in the bill as a whip to make us vote for the whole package.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont is not questioning in any sense of the word the need for standing by the President if the security of the United States is really threatened and we become engaged in an all-out war—and we are close to it now. But I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that we should not conduct a war under the guise of the foreign aid program.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. If I misinterpreted his statement, I apologize. I now clearly understand what he meant, and I agree with him 100 percent. This is an emergency in which, in my opinion, we must support the President, and we must support the war effort. But to put the proposal in the present bill, instead of calling for separate legislation, is to me a very transparent effort to put us in a position in which we must swallow the whole package or else we shall be charged with doing something to endanger the safety of this country, and are failing to show the world that the Congress of the United States is behind the President in this time of need.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. First, I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that Congress has the responsibility for providing the necessary funds to wage war in Vietnam, and as one Member of the Senate, I shall vote whatever is necessary without any strings attached. I agree with the Senator that as long as we have men dying on the battlefront, we must provide the funds, for the arms, and whatever is needed without any limitation.

However, this proposal for the expenditure of an extra $89 million has nothing whatever to do with the war effort. Five million dollars of that amount authorizes the start of the development of the Mekong River Basin project, which eventually would cost us $1 billion. As yet, this project has never been approved by the Congress. If we now approve this $5 million, it will be thought that Congress is committed to go through with this billion dollar project.

It is proposed that $19 million of the amount would be spent for electrical cooperatives in South Vietnam; medical services, $7 million; training and small scale village projects in Laos and Thailand, $6 million; commodity imports, $45 million; agricultural development and industrial expansion, $7 million—a total of $89 million. Not a dime in the proposal would involve the war effort.

Furthermore adequate authority and funds are already in the bill if the President deems their expenditures necessary.

The other day the administration wanted $700 million for the war effort in Vietnam. We voted that money to provide the necessary equipment for our Armed Forces in Vietnam.

I would vote for it again tomorrow if such action is needed. However, I think it most unwise to include $89 million which is not a part of the war effort and with no more study than has been given to this proposal. The impression would go out through all this area that Congress is committing itself to these multi-billion-dollar projects, although we never considered their feasibility.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware. I have practically finished all I desired to say. The distinguished Senator from Delaware is, as usual, accurate and thorough in his analysis. Whether the $89 million is designed for the actual conduct of the defense of South Vietnam or is to be used for internal developments of the country, when we pick up the newspapers after the vote, on foreign aid, and when we listen to the orators in the next campaign—I am not running in the next campaign, so I feel free to say this—when we listen to the administration orators, the people will be told that when this country was desperately fighting to maintain American prestige abroad, and when our boys were fighting over there, Senators who voted against this foreign aid package refused to back the President. That is why I resent this special authorization being tucked into this bill. I want to make it clear that I would respond to a request from the President to support the Vietnam struggle but if it is embedded in the foreign aid bill I shall use my own judgment on the whole bill and not be clubbed into voting for it because of this one item.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that that will probably be so; but when it is said, it probably will not have that effect among thousands of people, because the people will not be that easily fooled.

Mr. COTTON. Having reviewed the past few elections, I am not so confident that the people cannot be fooled.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. I should like to direct a question to the Senator from Oregon. Would it be possible under the terms of the Senator's amendment for the President or whoever takes charge of the program to take $89 million out of existing military funds and use that amount to finance the economic and technical program which the President has recommended for southeast Asia?

Mr. MORSE. That is what the amendment provides.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] exactly expressed my reaction to the pending proposal.

Mr. MORSE. Mine, too.

Mr. McGOVERN. I was much disturbed by some of the news reports that were published over the weekend about what has happened in the South Vietnam crisis. From all indications we have left the role of adviser. We are no longer even maintaining any pretense of being advisers; we are now committing our own forces in actual combat.

Mr. MORSE. We are running the war.

Mr. McGOVERN. So far as I know, we have not declared war. Nevertheless, American military forces are involved in the actual fighting. One of the tragic byproducts is that we are killing not only Vietcong fighters; we are killing many innocent people, as well.

An article entitled "Drive by Vietcong Wiping Out Gains of Saigon Troops," written by Jack Langguth, appeared on the front page of the New York Times yesterday. It reports on one of our bombing raids and states, in part:

> Many Vietnamese—one estimate was as high as 500—were killed by the strikes. The American contention is that they were Vietcong soldiers. But three out of four patients seeking treatment in a Vietnamese hospital afterward for burns from napalm, or jellied gasoline, were village women.

I do not see how we can win any friends among the Vietnamese people for our side of this conflict when three out of four victims of our napalm bombing attacks are village women. That is hardly calculated to win the support of the people in the villages and in the countryside.

It is not surprising, in view of facts of that kind, that also published in the New York Times of yesterday was an article by E. W. Kenworthy, reporting on growing apprehension in the Senate, much of which has not been publicly expressed, about the course we are now following in this conflict.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles by Mr. Langguth and Mr. Kenworthy, and also an article entitled "Active U.S. Combat Role in Vietnam Acknowledged," written by John W. Finney, and published in yesterday's New York Times, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, June 6, 1965]

Drive by Vietcong Wiping Out Gains of Saigon Troops—Government Optimism Upset by the Week's Big Battles in Central Highlands—Casualties Up Sharply—Reds Put Three Battalions Out of Combat—800 Men Are Dead or Missing

(By Jack Langguth)

Saigon, South Vietnam, June 5.—In the last 8 days the Vietcong guerrillas have dispelled almost all the optimism that the South Vietnamese Government had been promoting for 3 months.

The Communist forces appear to have proved, if there were doubts, that the South Vietnamese Army fared well all spring only by default.

In the central Province of Quangngai last weekend, the Communists began to move again after weeks of planning and regrouping. They followed their victory there with successful raids in Pleiku, Phubon, Darlac, and Kontum Provinces, the heart of the Central Highlands.

VIETCONG FIGURES ELUSIVE

The casualties of the last week have been high, apparently on both sides. The Government has lost the effective use of three 300-man battalions—two at Quangngai and one in the Phubon ambushes.

The total of dead or missing from Government ranks runs close to 800 men.

Vietcong casualty figures have always been difficult to pinpoint. As the Communists withdrew from Quangngai last Monday, U.S. jet bombers pounded the hills into which they were headed.

Many Vietnamese—one estimate was as high as 500—were killed by the strikes. The American contention is that they were Vietcong soldiers. But three out of four patients seeking treatment in a Vietnamese hospital afterward for burns from napalm, or jellied gasoline, were village women.

TACTICS HELD UNCHANGED

Senior American military advisers in Saigon, never apprehensive in their public comments, have professed to take comfort from the fact that the Communists have so far followed familiar tactics.

"What we've seen so far is the same pattern of attacks, but more of them," a leading U.S. officer said yesterday. He meant that the Communists were still relying on ambushes rather than on direct clashes with the Government forces.

In Phubon, the Vietcong ambush was a classic example of guerrilla tactics. A sizable group of Communist soldiers attacked a convoy on the road to the province capital.

When the Government forces, as many as 200 men, began to retreat in confusion to the village they had left, a larger Vietcong unit caught them at another point on the road and ripped their ranks apart.

U.S. advisers assigned to military operations watched with dismay the success of 10 similar ambushes throughout the central highlands.

They have stepped up their warnings to Vietnamese commanders that greater caution must be exercised before convoys or road-clearing units take to the highways.

Though the Communist have restricted themselves to a strategy of surprise attack, the size and scope of the Vietcong forces have surpassed U.S. expectations.

According to official intelligence estimates, the Communists have 15,000 trained full-time soldiers operating in the swatch of land from the 17th parallel—the border of North Vietnam—to the point, 50 miles northeast of Saigon, where the Annamite Mountains end.

TOTAL MAY BE DOUBLED

But intelligence procedures for verifying the presence of Communist forces are slow and conservative. With the entrance of some, or perhaps all, of the North Vietnamese Army's 325th Division into the south, the figure may be double the official estimate or more.

From this large and free-roaming strength, American advisers expect two kinds of attack.

"There will be a Vietcong spectacular in the Saigon area," a high intelligence source predicted.

This could mean major terrorist attacks or a bravado military action within the capital, he said, "We also look for a concerted attempt to seize and hold a district or province capital," the source added, "but they can't do it."

One such attack appeared underway tonight at Daksut, an isolated district capital in the mountains of Pleiku Province.

Initial figures from the double ambushes at Phubon appeared by the week's end to have been inflated. While military spokesmen first reported that all 300 men of the battalion had been in on the road-clearing operation, later information indicated that only half that number had been attacked. Forty Government soldiers are either dead or missing.

U.S. OFFICERS' FLIGHT

With the return of a majority of the ambushed unit, the behavior of the battalion's senior American adviser came under close scrutiny in Saigon.

When it appeared, during the second ambush, that all hope was lost for the Government troops, the American officer, who was slightly wounded, ordered a helicopter to evacuate him and his two American enlisted men.

His commanders here are reluctant to criticize his action. But to some, in retrospect, his departure seems to have been premature.

But U.S. commanders have been equally critical of advisers who tried to continue an attack with a handful of men when Vietnamese troops would not follow them.

The sensitive position of an American adviser was demonstrated last Saturday by an American lieutenant at Quangngai. Caught in that ambush, he advised the Vietnamese commander to break for the high ground of a neighboring hill.

When the advice was rejected, the lieutenant led his two sergeants out on foot through the Vietcong trap. The Vietnamese Army battalion stayed behind and was annihilated.

MORTAR RAID AT PLEIKU

Saigon, June 5.—Communist guerrillas staged a mortar attack tonight against the district headquarters at Daksut, 50 miles southwest of Quangngai, the scene of a major battle earlier this week.

A U.S. military spokesman said two South Vietnamese soldiers had been killed and three others injured as 81-millimeter mortar shells blasted the headquarters. The headquarters building was reported to be burning.

Initial reports from Pleiku, an important U.S. post 50 miles south of Daksut in the central highlands, said 12 Americans and 300 Vietnamese soldiers were at Daksut.

Intelligence reports said two Vietcong battalions were in the area.

Meanwhile, U.S. air strikes against North Vietnam continued with five raids north of the border.

Fourteen F–105 Thunderchief jet fighter-bombers destroyed or damaged 12 trucks and 2 bridges on armed reconnaissance flights over highway routes. They ranged from 75 to 90 miles north of the border.

In another mission 20 Navy A–4 Skyhawks, supported by 8 F–8 Crusader fighters from the carrier *Bon Homme Richard*, bombed and strafed port facilities at Benthuy, near Vinh, about 160 miles south of Hanoi.

A U.S. military spokesman said pilots had reported having hit an offshore wharf with missiles and having damaged a coalyard and warehouses. A direct bomb hit was scored an an antiaircraft site. In other strikes, trucks and bridges were destroyed.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, June 6, 1965]

DEBATE OVER VIETNAM POLICY—AND VIEWS OF KEY SENATORS

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

Washington, June 5.—In a commencement address last week, Senator Mike Mansfield departed from his text—the opportunities open to college women—to praise the reporting of American correspondents from the Dominican Republic and Vietnam. He often found it, he said, more accurate than the information he got from official sources.

The Senate Democratic leader was moved to make these remarks because he was disturbed by the constant complaints of President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk about "misreporting" from these two critical areas and about "misjudgments" and "misrepresentations" of the administration's policy by some columnists and editorial writers. Even more, Mr. Mansfield was concerned over the frame of mind indicated by such complaints.

RESERVATIONS

There must be "no forced convergence" with official views "in the name of national unity," the Senator told the graduates of Clarke College, in Dubuque, Iowa, because that kind of unity is "not a source of strength" but of "dangerous and delusive weakness."

A number of Members of Congress, particularly in the Senate, must have felt a twinge of conscience on reading those words, because they are increasingly aware, and disturbed, that they appear to be yielding to a forced convergence with official views by remaining silent on a Vietnamese policy about which they have the gravest doubts and fears.

The disquiet in the Senate is not to be measured by the almost daily jeremiads of Senators Wayne Morse and Ernest Gruening, nor by the occasional, considered and temperate criticisms of Senators Frank Church and George McGovern. The only true glimpse of the gnawing concern came a month ago when several of the most respected Senators in both parties rose to say they did not regard their votes for the President's $700 million supplemental military request as an endorsement of the policy in Vietnam or as a predated pledge of support for further involvement of U.S. forces there.

Aside from those already named, the Senators most critical, or at least deeply troubled, by the Vietnam policy are the following members of the Foreign Relations Committee: J. W. Fulbright, the chairman, Mike Mansfield, George Aiken, Albert Gore, and Joseph Clark. To these should be added John Sherman Cooper, Jacob Javits, Gaylord Nelson, and Robert Kennedy. Many others are known to share their misgivings.

Reporters who have talked privately to these Senators are thoroughly familiar with their criticisms and reservations. But before these are set forth, two caveats should be entered.

First, all of the critics believe that the President is a man of peace; that his overriding purpose, however they may question the methods, is "to seek peace and pursue it," that he earnestly wants to engage the North Vietnamese in negotiations.

OPTIONS ARE FEW

Second, they are quite aware that the President is confronted by a condition, most of it inherited, and not a theory; that his options are few, unpleasant and risky, with the choice—in Lord Morley's phrase—possibly "lying between two blunders."

Furthermore, most of the Senate critics feel it is only fair to await the event of the cautiously hopeful reading of the situation given to the Foreign Relations Committee this week by Secretary Rusk.

This reading may be summarized as follows:

There has not been the slightest response from Hanoi, Peiping or Moscow to the President's offer of unconditional negotiations, or to the more discreet feelers put out through diplomatic and private channels. The Hanoi Government and the Vietcong are evidently determined on an offensive during the monsoon period; are confident this will succeed, and believe that when it does, the United States—weary of the fruitless task of bolstering up the South Vietnamese regime and under mounting criticism from its allies and the uncommitted nations—will accept the inevitable and withdraw. When this strategy comes to naught—and Mr. Rusk assures the committee it would fail—then, the administration believes, Hanoi may be willing to talk.

FORD PROPOSAL

The proposal for a supplemental appropriation was first made by Gerald Ford the House Republican leader, on the night of April 28, when the President called in congressional leaders to inform them of the dispatch of marines to Santo Domingo. The President at first said the appropriation was not necessary, but he later adopted the proposal as a way of demonstrating congressional support. Some Senators believe that if there had been a secret vote, the proposal would have been rejected.

Criticism of the Vietnam policy are made on military, psychological, political and historic grounds.

The critics believe the decision to bomb North Vietnam was a mistake. They fear that it will not seriously impede the North's sending of men and material into South Vietnam; that it will not bring Hanoi to the conference table, but reinforce its determination to install the National Liberation Front as the Government of South Vietnam; that it will strengthen popular support of the Ho Chi Minh regime; that it will heal the rupture between the Soviet Union and Communist China and make it impossible for Moscow to exert pressure on Hanoi for negotiations, and that, finally, it will alienate public opinion in allied and noncommitted countries.

Above all, these critics fear that the bombing will escalate the war. What will the administration do, they ask, if North Vietnam sends a large infantry force to the aid of the Vietcong; if the South Vietnamese Government's positions are overrun; if sizable numbers of U.S. Marines are killed?

QUESTIONS OF BOMBING

Will there be a public clamor in the United States to retaliate by bombing Hanoi, or even—as some officers in the Pentagon have already been urging—the atomic installation in Communist China?

One Senator, in a mood of deep gloom the other day, said: "We are escalating every day."

Some members of the Foreign Relations Committee, men who have spent years wrestling with the complexities of foreign affairs, consulting with the experts on the conflict between Moscow and Peiping and the mentality of underdeveloped areas emerging into nationhood, believe that the President is taking a too simple, rigid and ideological view of the situation in Vietnam.

They argue that he underestimates the danger if the North Vietnamese are continually bombed, of their complete subservience to Peiping and overlooks the possibility that a united Vietnam, while Marxist and under the influence of Communist China because of propinquity, might develop into a Titoist regime.

These critics may be right or wrong—and there is some expert opinion arraigned against them as well as with them. But what worries them increasingly is the President's mental and emotional attitudes.

THE CONSULTATIONS

The Senators do not complain that Mr. Johnson does not call them in. He is forever summoning them to the White House. But, they say, he does not consult, or even discuss, with them, he delivers lectures. He inveighs against the critics of his policy, and any hesitantly broached reservation sends him off on a repetitious round of self-defense.

The President, one Senator said the other day, is suffering from "overbriefing and underconsultation." What perplexed and alarmed this Senator was that the President, who had made a point of consulting all shades of opinion on domestic issues, is apparently relying entirely on a narrow circle of advisers on Vietnam—chiefly on Secretary of Defense McNamara, McGeorge Bundy, his Assistant for National Security Affairs, and William Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

Many Senators who have the most profound respect for Mr. McNamara's abilities as an organizer, question his credentials in foreign affairs. His preeminent quality is quick decisiveness, they say, and this is not necessarily a virtue when applied to problems as intricate as Vietnam.

REASONS FOR SILENCE

But ironically, in the opinion of some Senators, it is this very quality that has led the President to rely so heavily on his Secretary of Defense. According to this view, the President is frustrated by foreign problems just because they are indeterminate, resistant to both reason and persuasion, and incapable of final settlement. And so, one Senator says, he finds comfort in turning to Mr. McNamara who seems to believe a foreign policy can be neatly tooled on a mental lathe.

The question remains, however, why do the critics not voice their doubts and fears?

First, they admit, for the very simple and self-serving reason that a legislator thinks twice before criticizing a President when American soldiers are fighting abroad.

Second, there is a genuine reluctance to exacerbate the President's irritation with his critics at a time when, as Senators all testify, he is under emotional strain.

Third, there is a disinclination to criticize the day-to-day implementation of policy in Vietnam. As Mr. FULBRIGHT himself said on becoming committee chairman several years ago: "Aside from the fact that the President has the primary constitutional responsibility, the Senate as a practical matter is very poorly equipped to deal with day-to-day policymaking or outguess the President in this field."

However, decisions to bomb North Vietnam or commit U.S. ground forces to combat, many Senators believe, are hardly operational decisions but basic policy determinations.

SENATE'S ROLE

In the speech just quoted, Mr. FULBRIGHT went on to say that the Senate is "very well equipped to deal with the longer range, more basic questions" of foreign policy.

All too often, he said, the Senate and the country have found themselves in a situation—as with the Taiwan resolution of Secretary of State Dulles, which was the progenitor of last summer's Tonkin Gulf resolution—"where the Executive, consulting itself, has announced a policy."

"Whereupon," said Mr. FULBRIGHT, "the cry goes out that it cannot be debated, since this would show the world we are divided. What we must do, instead, is swallow our doubts about the wisdom of the policy. We must rally to the Executive in a great show of national unity."

The chairman then declared it was impossible "for a democratic country to have a viable, effective policy unless it is founded on the widest possible public discussion." Nor, he added, did he believe our allies feared such healthy debate.

"Their greatest fears," Mr. FULBRIGHT said, "arise over precipitate announcements of foreign policy which neither the Congress nor the country has properly considered."

More and more Members of Congress are coming around to the view that, if the bombing does not lead to negotiations and the war escalates, there must be a full-scale debate on Vietnam policy.

Last Thursday, 28 House Democrats, including 7 from the Foreign Affairs Committee, called for public hearings on this complex issue.

Active U.S. Combat Role in Vietnam Acknowledged

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, June 5.—The State Department acknowledged publicly today for the first time that U.S. ground troops in South Vietnam were engaging in combat in defense of key installations against Communist guerrillas.

The Department's acknowledgement was contained in a statement redefining the military role of U.S. forces in South Vietnam.

Until now the Department had insisted that the troops were there in an advisory and defensive role and only returned fire in self-defense. The Department continued to make this point today, but it also conceded that under some circumstances the troops were engaging in combat in protecting key installations.

The Department's statement was prompted by requests for an official redefinition of the American military role in South Vietnam.

MORE THAN STATIC DEFENSE

Although not officially stated, it has become increasingly apparent in recent weeks that some U.S. troops have been engaged in more than static defense and have been actively seeking out the Vietcong forces.

Reports from Saigon, for example, have described how U.S. marines near the Da Nang Airbase in the northern part of South Vietnam have conducted "search and clear" patrols several miles from the base. Photographs have shown members of the 173d Airborne Brigade conducting helicopter-supported patrols north of Saigon.

In view of these reports, newsmen asked the State Department yesterday to redefine the military role of U.S. forces in South Vietnam.

In response, the Department spokesman, Robert J. McCloskey, issued the following statement, approved by the highest Department officials:

"As you know, American troops have been sent to South Vietnam recently with the mission of protecting key installations there. In establishing and patrolling their defense perimeters, they come into contact with the Vietcong and at times are fired upon. Our troops naturally return the fire.

"It should come as no surprise therefore that our troops engage in combat in these and similar circumstances. But let me emphasize that the Vietnamese Government forces are carrying the brunt of combat operations. Those U.S. forces assigned as advisers to the armed forces of Vietnam remain in that capacity."

It was apparent, particularly from the use of the phrase "similar circumstances," that the combat was not limited to returning fire in self-defense. Mr. McCloskey affirmed, in elaborating upon the statement, that some U.S. troops had been conducting active patrols to seek out the Vietcong, in carrying out their responsibility of protecting key bases.

In defining the combat role, the statement drew a clear distinction between American troops sent in as advisers and those sent in more recently to protect critical air, communications, and port facilities.

According to the latest official estimate by the Defense Department, there are 42,000 American troops in South Vietnam, but the actual number is believed to be closer to 45,000. Of this total, 12,000 combat marines and 3,600 paratroops of the 173d Airborne Brigade are assigned to a defensive mission rather than an advisory one.

The number of American troops has doubled since early March, when the first marines landed to protect the air base at Danang. Since then the defensive responsibilities of the marines have been extended to cover Chulai, south of Da Nang, where Navy Seabees are building an airbase, and Phubai, a critical communications facility near Hue. The airborne troops are guarding the airbase at Bienhoa, near Saigon, and a nearby port facility at Vungtau.

TOTAL OF 60,000 EXPECTED

Although not confirmed by the administration, it is expected that the number of American troops will grow to 60,000 in the immediate months ahead as additional defensive responsibilities are assumed in South Vietnam.

The State Department statement skirted the question of whether U.S. forces would next undertake offensive action in support of Vietnamese troops, as has been suggested by military officials in Saigon. Privately, however, administration sources are suggesting that it may become necessary in the near future for some troops to enter into open, direct combat against the Vietcong.

As now contemplated, this expanded combat role could take one or both of two forms.

Under one strategy, the American forces would come to the assistance of Vietnamese troops pinned down or overwhelmed by the Vietcong. Under the other, more ambitious inkblot strategy, the American forces would set up, around strategic coastal centers, separate enclaves that would gradually be joined through clear and secure operations against the Vietcong.

Fifteen Thousand More Reported Due

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, June 5.—About 15,000 more U.S. troops, with amphibious equipment, will arrive in South Vietnam soon, informed military sources said here today.

These sources said the amphibious equipment was for use in South Vietnam's crisscrossed rivers and flooded ricefields.

Waves of cargo aircraft are bringing the reinforcements to Okinawa and the Philippines from Forts Eustis and Story in Virginia.

Two kinds of amphibious vehicles are being shipped to the Philippines, military sources said. They are the Lark 5, used mainly for ship-to-shore cargo armored tank and troop carrier.

The Lark, which can also be used for troop transport, is an aluminum craft about 8 feet high and 65 feet long. It travels on land with tires or tracks, as well as on water.

The Lark's four enormous inflatable tires are well over 6 feet high.

Military sources said the vehicles would be ideal for operations in river and swamp areas such as the Mekong Delta, in the south, which is flooded most of the year.

The Larks would also be useful in dealing with the almost continuous shuttle of supplies and equipment coming from U.S. bases in the Western Pacific, they said.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, for many months, those observers who are aware of attitudes in the Senate have known that the apprehension over our Vietnam policy has been much greater than the public expression of that apprehension. Many of the most thoughtful Members of the Senate have deep misgivings about our growing involvement in the southeast Asian crisis. For a variety of reasons, Senators have chosen either to soften their criticism of our present policy or to suppress any comment at all.

Whether or not this restraint and suppression have been in the national interest is a question that only history can decide. I am convinced, however, that as our troop commitment grows each day, we are more and more raising fundamental questions that ought to be fully discussed in Congress.

If the United States is to wage a major war in Vietnam, then that matter certainly falls within the responsibility of Congress and ought to be thoroughly aired in congressional hearings and debate. Recent reports that American troops in Vietnam are in fact taking on an active combat role rather than serving as advisers raise serious new questions that need to be fully understood and discussed by the Senate.

Mr. President, the unfortunate nature of combat in South Vietnam is well illustrated by news reports of recent fighting between the Vietcong and Government forces. An estimated 800 men of the South Vietnamese Government forces are either dead or missing as a result of last week's combat. The other side of the coin is that American jet bombers which participated in the increased fighting took a heavy toll of village life. It is estimated that three out of four patients seeking treatment in a Vietnamese hospital after the American raids were village women burned by napalm jellied gasoline bombs.

This is the kind of unfortunate byproduct of our involvement in this war, Mr. President, that makes it so hard for us to win the confidence of the Vietnamese people. How can we expect to win the support of villagers whose wives and children are burned by our napalm attacks? And how can the Government forces which we are attempting to sustain suffer weekly losses of as high as 800 men and expect to turn the war favorably to their side?

For the various reasons I have outlined, I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from South Dakota and other Senators, in view of the points that have been raised by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], that my amendment would not prevent the expenditure of this money for the very purpose for which the President asks for it. It assures it. I am for the expenditure of the funds for economic aid. My amendment would merely prevent the addition of $89 million more to the foreign aid bill.

As the Senator from New Hampshire has said, if the time comes when the President needs more money for military aid for Vietnam, and he makes his case, he will get it. But I quite agree with the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New Hampshire that it is not necessary to provide the $89 million this afternoon to accomplish the economic purpose the President has in mind. My amendment would accomplish that for him.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is with considerable reluctance that I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. I shall do so for several reasons, most of which are procedural rather than substantive.

I agree that for reasons of our overall foreign policy—the psychological factor being perhaps the most important reason—this $89 million should be given to the President.

I am as convinced as is the Senator from Oregon that we shall not find a military solution to the situation in Vietnam. If we are to be able to maintain our position there, it will be largely because we have won the hearts of the people. We shall never do that by burning people with napalm bombs.

Therefore, I support, as the Senator from Oregon says he supports, a request for the $89 million of additional economic aid for use in the Mekong Delta, in Thailand, and in Laos, as well as in Vietnam.

I want an opportunity later to vote to reduce the military aid which is contained in the bill. We shall have an opportunity to do that. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] assured the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning that he would propose a reduction in military aid, cutting the amount back to what was given last year.

I supported that proposal in the Committee on Foreign Relations. We carried the day for awhile. However, at the end we were overridden when one of our distinguished, charming, and likable members of the committee came in with a number of proxies from members of the committee who were not undertaking to listen to any of the testimony. Then the cut in military aid was set aside.

My real quarrel with the senior Senator from Oregon—and I know he will take this in the proper spirit—is that the military aid program is too small. It is not too big. We ought to be doing much more than we are doing to shore up our relationships with the underdeveloped nations of the world. Too much difference exist now between the rich and the poor nations.

I am strongly in support of the position taken by the distinguished chairman of the committee that we should make more aid possible. However, we are able to do that only to a modest extent. We shall never solve the world's problems unless the United States of America makes a considerably greater effort than it is making now to assist the underdeveloped countries of the world to become self-sufficient. The senior Senator from Oregon wants to eliminate $89 million from the bill. I cannot go along with him, although I specifically support a cut in the military aid, as I have just indicated. Therefore, I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall give the Senator from Pennsylvania an opportunity to vote for a greater cut in military aid than the figure of last year. That figure is merely a gesture.

I want the Senator from Pennsylvania to know that he does not disagree with me, although he may try to talk himself into a disagreement on economic aid. I hope that the Senator from Pennsylvania does not believe that the only possible place to make a cut in the bill is in military aid. When we make other cuts in the aid program, we cut military aid very effectively. Some of the technical assistance is concealed military aid.

The amount involved here is merely $89 million. However, the important thing is that I am supporting the program of the President for $89 million for economic aid. The Senator from Pennsylvania is quite right. I stated my case in chief this afternoon. That is only the beginning. As the Senator from Alaska and I pointed out, we would probably be giving aid to the extent of $1 billion over the course of years. We cannot do it overnight. However, we would be engaged in a great deal of waste if we were to extend this aid and, at the same time, kill people with napalm bombs in North and South Vietnam. We would be destroying a lot of the aid in the progress of making war.

We had better get the war settled first. I have a little difficulty with the paradox of pouring $89 million of aid into a country and, at the same time, destroying $89 million worth of property.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Oregon and I have discussed this matter before. I shall not detain the Senate any longer than to say that I oppose the amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon. The net result would be that the President would not take the $89 million out of military aid if the bill were to pass. He would take it out of economic aid at the very time that we should be boosting economic aid.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator does not have to say that in defense of the President.

Mr. CLARK. I am not defending him.

Mr. MORSE. That is a good argument for voting for my amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon is voted down, which I hope it will be, I intend to offer an amendment which was approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations by a vote of 13 to 4 this morning. The amendment I intend to offer is essentially the administration proposal.

I do not like to eliminate the aid by such a procedure. I believe that the way to deal with the measure is to vote the amendment down and then have the Senate vote as it pleases on the program. I am sure that there will be many opportunities for the Senate to cut the amount, as the senior Senator from Oregon has stated, in any part of the bill.

I believe that it would be a mistake to do this. I believe that we should have a straight vote on the measure. I hope the amendment is rejected. I shall, immediately after the vote, offer the proposal of the President and get a vote on that. Then many other amendments may be offered. I see no reason to mix the two elements together.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Oregon. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from

Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] are absent on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 107 Leg.]

YEAS—22

Aiken
Bartlett
Bible
Burdick
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Gruening
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
McGovern
Metcalf
Morse
Pearson
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—45

Allott
Anderson
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Dirksen
Dominick
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Harris
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McIntyre
McNamara
Miller
Montoya
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Talmadge
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—33

Bass
Bayh
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Case
Dodd
Douglas
Gore
Hart
Inouye
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Magnuson
McGee
Mondale
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Symington
Williams, N.J.

So Mr. Morse's amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] proposes an amendment on page 4, strike out lines 15 through 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, as I wish to explain it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the Record at this point.

The amendment submitted by Mr. Fulbright is as follows:

> Strike out, on page 4, lines 15 through 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "(2) Strike out '$215,000,000 which', and substitute '$219,000,000 for use beginning in the fiscal year 1966 and $210,000,000 for use beginning in the fiscal year 1967, which sums'."
>
> On page 10, strike out lines 14 through 19, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "(a) In the first sentence, strike out 'for use beginning in the fiscal year 1965'.
>
> "(b) In the first sentence, strike out '$405,000,000 which' and substitute '$430,000,000 for use beginning in the fiscal year 1966 and $350,000,000 for use beginning in the fiscal year 1967 which sums'."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, President Johnson has shown wisdom and vision in his message to the Congress of June 1 calling for expanded economic assistance to South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos. The Congress can demonstrate its own wisdom by providing the additional $89 million requested by the President for social and economic development in southeast Asia as promptly and enthusiastically as it recently provided and additional $700 million for the conduct of the war in Vietnam.

The issue for the unhappy people of South Vietnam is not one of power politics and the grand strategy of the cold war. It is rather one of who is more likely to bring some security and happiness and hope into their lives, the Saigon Government or the Vietcong rebels. For this reason President Johnson is eminently right in asserting:

> The effort to create more progressive societies cannot wait for an ideal moment. It cannot wait until peace has been finally secured. We must move ahead now.

The uses to which the requested $89 million would be put are set forth in the President's message. About $19 million will be used as an installment on an accelerated program for the development of the Mekong River Basin, including the construction of the top priority Nam Ngum Dam. Five million dollars will be used to support electrification cooperatives in South Vietnam; $7 million will provide medical services in rural areas in Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand; $6 million will be used to train people for the construction of roads, dams, and other small-scale village projects in Thailand and Laos; about $45 million will be used to finance imports of iron and steel and other materials necessary for industrial expansion and low-cost housing programs; and $7 million will be used to supplement existing agricultural development programs in all three countries and to plan industrial expansion in the secure areas of South Vietnam.

President Johnson pointed out in an impressive but little noted speech to the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists on May 13 that the war in Vietnam has three faces: The first is the face of armed conflict; the second is the search for a political solution through negotiations without preconditions; the third is the face of human social and economic needs.

It is to this third face of the war that the President's message of June 1 is addressed. The amount of money involved is small, small indeed compared to the cost of the war. But the matter is one of great importance because, as President Johnson said in his remarks on May 13, the struggle for the satisfaction of human needs is "the most important battle of all in which we are engaged."

Important steps have already been taken in the prosecution of this "most important battle of all." In his Johns Hopkins address of April 7 President Johnson outlined a large-scale program for the development of southeast Asia, a program in which he expressed hope for the participation of both the Soviet Union and North Vietnam. Specifically, the President envisioned programs of education, health, and the development of the resources of the Mekong River. Since then Eugene Black, the President's personal representative to initiate American participation in these programs, has begun consultations with United Nations officials on means of carrying forward the great cooperative task of development in southeast Asia. In addition, the President has indicated that the United

States is prepared to support and participate in an Asian Development Bank.

So preoccupied have we been with the war and political upheavals in South Vietnam that little attention has been paid to our Government's creditable efforts to contribute to the welfare of the South Vietnamese people. These efforts have hardly been proportionate to our contributions to the war but they have been notable nonetheless. American assistance, for example, has contributed to impressive advances in agriculture in South Vietnam, including the doubling of rice production since 1954. American aid has made possible the establishment of 12,000 hamlet health stations where hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese can now receive treatment; over 7 million people have been vaccinated against cholera; and a medical school is now being built that will graduate as many doctors in a single year as now serve the entire population of South Vietnam. In the last 2 years American aid has helped to build more than 4,000 classrooms and another 2,000 are to be built within the next year; primarily because of American aid enrollment in vocational schools in South Vietnam has increased from 300,000 in 1955 to more than 1,500,000 at present.

There have been achievements of potentially great importance, particularly in the fields of education and public administration. Between 1955 and 1963, enrollment in elementary schools increased from 300,000 to over 1,400,000 and more than 3 million elementary and secondary school textbooks have been published. In the field of public administration, a National Institute of Administration has been established and is expected by 1966, according to one AID publication, to graduate some 350 qualified civil servants a year to serve both the Central and local governments—although another AID publication puts the figure at 160.

These are the kinds of programs that President Johnson now proposes to expand. It is of the greatest importance that we do so because the stakes of political and economic development are as high as the stakes of the war itself. Indeed, the meeting of human needs, so far as the Vietnamese people are concerned, is both the only meaningful objective of the war and the probable condition of success in the war.

It may be that the Vietnamese people are divided between those who are passionately committed to communism and those who are passionately committed to democracy, but I am much inclined to doubt it. I believe it to be more likely that the Vietnamese people are all but united in the desire for an end to violence and for some measure of security and hope in their lives. I feel sure that the Vietnamese people are principally interested in tending their rice crops and building factories and raising their children for a better life. When these needs are met—and only when these needs are met—does it become possible for people to think of their spiritual needs and of the relevance of political philosophies in meeting them.

I believe it to be quite likely that the choices made by individual Vietnamese as between the government in Saigon and the Vietcong have little indeed to do with slogans about "freedom" and the "dignity of the individual" on the one hand, and "fraternal socialism" and "national liberation" on the other—not because these concepts are meaningless or fraudulent in general but because they are utterly meaningless and utterly fraudulent to a people who live in constant terror and wretched deprivation. Under the conditions existing in Vietnam, the choices of individuals as between one side and the other can only be made on the much more elemental level of: Who is likely to put an end to violence? Who is likely to provide food and clothing or the opportunity to earn them? Who is likely to bring doctors to cure disease and teachers to educate our children?

Because this is true, the "third face of the war" of which President Johnson spoke—the face of human need—is of the greatest importance. There are broader reasons—reasons that go beyond Vietnam—why the "third face of the war" is of great importance.

The struggle in Vietnam, after all, is part of a general struggle in which the peoples of Asia, Latin America, and Africa are engaged. It is a struggle for economic development and national fulfillment and, within the context of these, for human dignity. The peoples of the emerging countries are caught up in a new nationalism, a force more meaningful to them and therefore more powerful than either of the two competing ideologies. The ideologies—communism and democracy in their various forms—are likely to be successful in the underdeveloped world to the extent—and only to the extent—that they make themselves the friends of the new nationalism.

After centuries of foreign domination, the most prized and most delicate possession of the emerging peoples is an awakening sense of their own capacity and their own dignity as human beings. If these are to be fulfilled, the peoples of the emerging nations must have our help but they must also have our respect. They must have our assistance in the social and economic aspects of nation building, but they must also have the right to resolve their own problems in their own ways—even if their ways are sometimes distasteful to us—and they must have the right to make their own mistakes—even if they seem to us to be bad mistakes indeed—because it is only when people take full responsibility for their errors that they can also take full satisfaction in their accomplishments.

No matter how generous our motives in dealing with the less developed countries, many nationalist leaders are likely to regard us with suspicion. This, I believe, is all but inevitable and it should not alarm us unduly. Suspicion of the West is the legacy of the colonial past and we must be patient and mature in waiting for time to do its healing work. We must understand, however little we may like it, that proud and patriotic leaders of emerging nations are naturally reluctant to be "taken into camp" by the United States. If we appreciate this, we will understand that in some cases the most effective way for us to discredit the leader or government of a less developed country is by embracing it too closely, and conversely, the most effective way to influence a country may be by not trying too hard to influence it.

It was not many years ago that politicians in the American South were automatically suspect in the eyes of their fellow southerners if they cozied too closely with rapacious "Eastern interests." Similarly, and quite naturally, it is demeaning in the eyes of proud and sensitive peoples in the less developed countries if their leaders stand in too well with a rich and powerful America. It is necessary for us to understand these feelings and it is necessary for us to be wary indeed of the arrogance of great power. If we are modest in the use of power and responsive to the sensibilities of the new nationalism, the peoples of the emerging nations may come to acknowledge that Americans after all are fairly decent people just as we southerners sometimes have to admit that at least some Yankees are not so bad as they used to seem.

The sense of capacity and dignity in the emerging countries is a delicate thing indeed. It can be shattered with tragic facility by a great power, either deliberately or inadvertently. To the extent that we understand the extreme delicacy of our relations with the less developed nations and act accordingly, we can make ourselves the true friends of the new nationalism. If we succeed in this, the rewards will be rich indeed, both for our own security and for the democratic ideals in which we believe.

It is for these reasons that the "third face" of the war in Vietnam is of such great importance. It is for these reasons that President Johnson is wise and farsighted in stating in his message of June 1 that in Vietnam "military action is not a final solution" but "only a partial means to a much larger goal."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Arkansas whether a vote in favor of the amendment would be a commitment to vote for the total billion dollars?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would not be a vote for anything beyond what is proposed by the amendment. It is commonsense that if the war takes a better turn, if some reasonable peaceful settlement can be achieved in the reasonable future—and I do not mean next week, but in the course of the years—and the war does not degenerate into an all-out war, we could be of further assistance to the area. There is no question about that.

The President made that clear in his Baltimore speech, and in his statement here. We have made it clear in other countries. Consider what was done in Korea—far more than is contemplated in this amendment. It is clear we will help these people reconstitute and reconstruct their country, but this is not a commitment to do so. The facts of life would indicate that we are bound to do so, especially if we can achieve some kind of truce or peace in the area.

So long as the war is continuing as it is, what we can do in this respect will be limited because the opportunities are limited.

If it is possible to achieve a cessation of the struggle, I believe that this kind of activity would step up, and everyone would like to see that. We are spending $2 billion a year now. Why would it not be a bargain, if we could prevent any kind of expansion of the war, so that we could do something in the economic field, which would be less expensive than in the military field. This would be a small part of what we are spending now to prosecute the war. That is on a small scale compared to what it could be.

My personal interest in this matter is that it could have an important influence upon the course of the war itself. It could well have an influence upon the Vietcong and the people of South Vietnam. Heavens knows, I still believe that it is worthwhile to prevent an all-out war. It would be better to try to find a basis for a truce and a settlement. These are things we cannot prove on a sliderule. It is a matter of the psychology of the area. This is not only the opinion of the President but also the opinion of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for an understanding?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas for that purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would any of this money be spent in North Vietnam?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would not. It would be spent only in South Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is no commitment, then, to rehabilitate North Vietnam?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No commitment at all. Not one penny of this money would go to North Vietnam. Forty-five million dollars of it will be for commodity imports into South Vietnam along the line the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was discussing a moment ago, for cement, steel, and materials needed for the building of houses, and the usual things to build up the economy.

Then there is the initiation of a dam on the Mekong River of $19 million. There are three electric cooperatives. Representatives of our own REA association went over there and recommended three REA's, in effect, to be built in South Vietnam, at a cost of $5 million. Also, medical services would cost $7 million. Training for small-scale village projects in Laos and Thailand—these are items preventive in nature—would cost $6 million.

The accelerated Mekong River Basin development would cost $19 million. Those are the items, none of which go to North Vietnam.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We are proposing to make these expenditures while the conflict is still in progress, however?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. If we are to carry on the conflict at all——

Mr. McCLELLAN. If we are going to do this, I do not see how we can withdraw from the conflict. We hear a great deal of talk about withdrawing from the conflict, but we do not wish to build all these things and let the Communists take them over later.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is not the purpose of the amendment, let me assure the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know whether it is premature to go down there and build all these things, unless we have the determination to go through with it, to make certain that we are going to see the program through. I merely wish to get my bearings on this problem. I am not trying to be critical. I wish to get some information concerning it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am in accord with the Senator. In my view, this is a very important factor, if we are to prevail and see things through.

Mr. McCLELLAN. How does the Senator contemplate that this could possibly influence North Vietnam to come to a settlement? I do not quite see the logic of that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have been told on numerous occasions that in South Vietnam the Vietcong are made up of some hard-core Communists who furnish the leadership and the organization, but that there are large numbers of South Vietnamese who have been fighting with the Vietcong in opposition to their own domestic and local government. This practice began when Diem was President. These people were dissidents with regard to the Diem government. They became associated with the opposition and are called Vietcong.

Ambassador Lodge, who was the only one who stated that we should do someing to the best of our ability to alienate the South Vietnamese from the Vietcong—the South Vietnamese who have thus far been supporting the Vietcong—and to give them hope, to inspire their allegiance to support the regular Government of South Vietnam.

Much of the trouble we have had there has been caused because the South Vietnamese Government has not had the support of its own people. There have been a succession of failures along that line.

Mr. McCLELLAN. They have lacked stability. The question is——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is one of the main reasons.

Mr. McCLELLAN. One of the thoughts in my mind is that in trying to achieve this purpose, to seek a stable government——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Within South Vietnam.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If we fail to do that, then we risk continued conflict.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could the Senator from Arkansas inform me how much money has been spent in that area since 1954? Does he have the figures at hand? I understand that over $2 billion a year have already been spent there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In South Vietnam alone?

Mr. ELLENDER. In South Vietnam and Thailand and——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But not on projects of this kind?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is economic aid.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no. The major part is for military aid. That is for military expenditures. The total cost is running at the rate of $2 billion a year. Military expenditures, including those on our own forces, have accounted for the bulk of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall the figures, in this area, which would include Cambodia and Laos——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is the date the Senator has in mind?

Mr. ELLENDER. 1954.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not have those figures. I have them from 1946 to 1964. That was $2 billion for Vietnam.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is economic aid?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Economic aid.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator would like to add more.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want to add anything. All I can say is——

Mr. ELLENDER. How does he expect to do it with the paltry sum that is proposed here, when it has not been done with the amount we have spent?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish we were not involved, but we are involved, and we have to do the best with a bad situation. Congress thought enough of the idea to add $700 million to the military appropriation. I believe the suggested approach is justified.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. As I understood the President's Johns Hopkins speech, he was offering economic aid in addition to the bombings in North Vietnam to induce the Vietnamese to quit the war. If all the expenditures are to be made in South Vietnam and not in North Vietnam, how will that be an inducement for the North Vietnamese to lay down their arms?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it would be an inducement indirectly. If this program should strengthen the South Vietnamese Government, if it should have a beneficial effect upon some of the followers, or a substantial number of the followers, of the Vietcong, it would influence Hanoi, because Hanoi is their principal support.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, much has been written and said in the past about the handling of the funds. Would these funds be handled by the same administration, or would a special group be set up by the President, which might be more representative and effective?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This appropriation would be handled by the established AID program. There is talk of a southeast Asia bank, and Mr. Eugene Black is engaged in exploring that idea. That is a separate thing, however. It would be a separate organization under Mr. Black. This money would be handled by the same organization.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to raise the question which I raised at the committee meeting this morning, where, after considerable soul searching and doubt, I was one of the Senators who voted to report the amendment favorably. I did so with the understanding that a portion of the $6 million, which is to be spent in training people in the villages, would be made available in part to the people of South Vietnam, and not only to the people of Thailand and Laos.

However, I noticed that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, in response to an earlier question, said that the $6 million to train the villagers would be used in Laos and Thailand.

It does not make sense to me to spend money in training villagers where we are not fighting a war and not give a thin dime to train villagers in areas where we are fighting a war.

Every report we have had indicates that one reason we are not making headway in Vietnam, even though the soldiers fight well and the military is doing its job, is that we have not been able to develop any kind of political leadership to set up a stable government in the villages and in the Central Government of South Vietnam. The main difficulty is that we have not been able to develop leadership in the villages, to seal them off, to protect them, to make them stable.

If this is a proposal to spend $6 million in village centers in areas where we are not doing any fighting, and to ignore places where the war is being fought, I would be against it as it would be a great demonstration of unrealistic leadership by this administration.

It was my understanding, after discussion—and it was a brief discussion—in the Foreign Relations Committee this morning, that the major portion of the $6 million, or some of it, would be spent in South Vietnam.

Now I am confronted with the record which we have made so far today, which shows that it is proposed to train villagers in areas where people are living in peace. I want to correct that record.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If there was any misunderstanding, it arose because a major part of the total money involved will be spent in South Vietnam. The village program itself, however, as was stated in the presentation and in the report, will be spent in Laos and Thailand. I believe that in South Vietnam there are already advisers in every one of the provinces, who have been trying to teach, as well as they could, the people living in these villages, and to train the villagers. This would be in addition to what already is going on in South Vietnam. This is not all that is being done today in South Vietnam. Most of this money, as I already stated, would improve the medical service in Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand. The electric cooperatives would be helped in South Vietnam. In South Vietnam they already are conducting some kind of activities in the villages.

Mr. MUNDT. There is no question that they have been dabbling around in the training of villagers in South Vietnam. However, the fact is that Maxwell Taylor, Cabot Lodge, and Assistant Ambassador Johnson have said that the reason we are having difficulty is that we have not been able adequately to train the villagers in South Vietnam. They have been dabbling around, and, having dabbled around, it seems to me that to spend this additional $6 million in areas which are not in conflict would be ridiculous.

It illustrates the big weakness in the administration's program in Vietnam. A military operation is being carried on which is fairly successful. The military personnel have performed valorous service. All reports indicate that in the main the South Vietnamese soldiers are brave and effective. We are conducting a holding operation. It is holding for what? There is no use holding for eternity to come along. We should be holding for conditions to improve in South Vietnam. Everyone tells that the way to do it is to establish stability in the villages and in Saigon. Now comes this proposal to pour money into villages—not into villages in South Vietnam, but, instead, in Thailand and in Laos, where people are doing well.

I do not object to helping the people in Laos and Thailand, but it seems to me that we ought to do first things first. We ought to develop some kind of effective political training program in South Vietnam.

We asked one witness before our committee, who said there were some 70,000 Americans in uniform fighting the war under the American flag, how many political operatives were serving there, trying to do something while the military holds the fort, he said he did not know. We asked him, "Do you have a thousand?"

The answer was, "We are not sure."

We asked him, "Would you say 50?"

The answer was, "We will have to look in the record."

"Well," we asked, "can you write them on the back of a playing card?"

We have not had any answer yet. I doubt that we have a score of fully qualified American political operatives in Vietnam.

The evidence shows that we are losing the war in the same way in Vietnam that we are losing the war generally in the cold war area, for lack of a training program, the lack of a Freedom Academy, or something of that kind, where American and native operatives could be trained, who would know all about setting up a civilan government that would resist communism. To spend this money in other areas would be deplorable. I hope the Senator will not set up an iron wall around this $6 million and have it all spent in areas where it is not needed, instead of spending it where it is needed the most.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is nothing in the bill to keep the administrators from using it in South Vietnam. In addition, in the presentation for the regular 1966 program, it was shown that they intended to spend this money in the hamlet program to help construct simple improvements such as marketplaces and irrigation facilities, and so forth.

I agree with the Senator, as he knows, and I complained at the same time that the Senator did, subsequent to the testimony of Mr. Lodge. However, all I can tell him is that this is for Laos and Thailand, I believe on the assumption that the other program is already underway. Subsequent to the committee meeting to which the Senator refers, I talked with the President, and under a special dispensation of the committee, I sent him a copy of the testimony, to give him the benefit of the discussion, and to show him how the Senator from South Dakota and others approved of the idea of setting up local, grassroots developments in trying to develop the allegiance of the people to the Central Government.

I believe it would be very worthwhile to undertake some of the projects in Laos and Thailand because those countries are right on the firing line, too. They are next in line. We do not want the same situation to develop in those countries that has developed in South Vietnam.

The major part of the program would be in South Vietnam. There is no Iron Curtain. The bill itself would not authorize the money for use in only one country.

Mr. MUNDT. I went into the bill meticulously because the decision I had to make was a close one. On balance, I voted in favor of the amendment, but I did so with the understanding in my mind that certainly some of the money for village defense would be given to South Vietnam. I could not find anything in the bill that would exclude that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not excluded.

Mr. MUNDT. I did not want anything adopted on the floor of the Senate or included in the legislative history of this amendment that would exclude it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the President's message, he stated that the money would be devoted to projects in Thailand and Laos. Whether or not that was an oversight, I do not know. I know they are doing somewhat the same thing, or exactly the same thing, in Vietnam, although I think not on a big enough scale.

Mr. MUNDT. They are doing something. By their united and unanimous testimony, what they have done however has failed. It is not adequate. That is the big weakness. The proposal is to spend $89 million, $6 million in an area in which we are failing notoriously in the conflict. To lift that $6 million out of the area of the conflict would not make sense at all. I am glad to have the Senator's assurance that he believes we shall spend some of the $6 million in South Vietnam.

I am glad that the Senator sent the testimony to the White House, because we had a spirited discussion of the subject when Ambassador Lodge was before the committee. We must continue to try to do something really effective and enduring in South Vietnam while the military is holding the situation. They cannot hold it forever.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I honestly believe that the proposal was influenced partly by that discussion and that meeting. The proposal grew out of that meeting. Not all of it would be devoted merely to political education, but it is intended to take the emphasis away from the purely military and to convince the people of South Vietnam that they will have a future by lining up with the U.S. Government. If they will do so, we shall demonstrate that we mean it when we say that we wish to help that country reconstruct itself and to have a better life.

That is a part of it. It is partly psychological warfare. That is the way in which it is waged. We cannot engage exclusively in words; we must do something in substance.

Mr. MUNDT. What the Senator has said is true. Today at noon at the White House luncheon which the Senator and I attended I emphasized again to the Secretary of State, beside whom I was seated, the testimony that we received, the colloquy and the contributions which the distinguished chairman and all the rest of us made. It is not enough merely to concentrate on a military operation without doing something to improve the conditions of the country while we are holding it. Our committee has an idea as to how it ought to be done. Earlier on the floor today I made a statement as to how I thought it ought to be done through establishment of a freedom academy in America. But it is a bit disillusioning to hear that we are going clearly outside the area of the conflict to engage in the kind of reforms that are so badly needed in the area of the conflict.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not clear outside. It is very close. It is not entirely disassociated.

Mr. MUNDT. It is close, but they ought not to miss the target even if the miss is close. They ought to be shooting at the bullseye.

If they are not shooting at the bullseye, they are not doing the job they should be doing. All the witnesses have said that we are failing at that point. We are not permitted to pass a piece of proposed legislation that we have been trying to pass for 6 years in order to give the people involved the necessary training for their jobs. We cannot win the cold war by the military alone. Untrained people and untrained villages cannot do it. We ought to train the villagers, but we ought to do something else. I hope that the Senator will use his influence, if the bill passes, to see that the major portion of the $6 million is placed where the emergency and the need is the greatest. I have great confidence in his persuasive ability. I shall support his amendment reluctantly but with hope for improvement in the programing at the other end of the avenue.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I have a very brief question to ask. I believe an answer to it will be helpful to me and other Senators.

How much are we now spending in terms of economic aid on a year-by-year basis in South Vietnam?

I notice in the report that $46 million is designated for the Near East and southeast and $44 million for the Far East. How much are we spending on economic aid in that area?

Mr. AIKEN. That was classified information. I believe the report came to the committee and was classified.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This year's figure was not classified. In 1965 the amount is $210 million.

Mr. AIKEN. I had the impression that the information was classified, but I may have been mistaken.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The proposed amount is classified. They always classify that.

Mr. AIKEN. They classify everything that they think they might make a mistake on. To cover up their mistakes, they classify the information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The $210 million is not classified. That is the amount for the fiscal year 1965.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is all kinds of economic aid, aid other than military.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Economic aid, $210,200,000.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, that amount does not include the military expense of carrying on the war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no. That is only economic aid. The amount for military assistance is much greater than that.

Mr. AIKEN. That was the so-called economic assistance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. That is what the Senator from Colorado inquired about.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I asked my previous question because there is a continuance of stories about the mishandling of aid. I have been told by people who have returned from that area—civilians, if you will—that it is a national scandal.

Mr. President, it certainly would be my purpose to send whatever aid is needed. I completely agree with the stated purposes. The experience is not new. The same thing happened in the Philippines 17 or 18 years ago. President Magsaysay handled it very well and without very much help from us. My objection is that we have heard the program has not been well handled. Obviously in the past some people have made mistakes. Now we are asked to repair the damage by letting the same people make more mistakes. We would merely add more money to the authorization.

Possibly the administration of the program is not proper. That is why I asked the question. I did so in the hope that a special group or team composed of people with immediate knowledge—possibly some of the people who had experience in the program in the Philippines—could handle the present situation in the Far East. Perhaps they could spend the money effectively.

Before I joined this body it was my contention for many years that while foreign aid is needed, the waste of the taxpayers' dollars in the administration of foreign aid has in the past been shocking and should not be allowed to continue. I see no reason why we should repair the damage merely by sending more money.

I wish the chairman of the committee could say that a special committee will be selected by the President to see that the job is done properly, in which case I would be glad to sit here and vote dollars all day—as long as I knew that they would be properly spent. But to continue to send good money after bad money, as the old expression goes, I cannot find it within my conscience to do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has mentioned a special committee. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] offered an amendment, which was adopted by the committee, to provide for a special committee of 12 to review the whole question and make recommendations in the future. But I do not believe there is any possibility of any new administrator or new personnel coming in to administer the particular proposal we are discussing. There may be improvements and changes if the study comes in, but it will not be in time to affect the present proposal.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Arkansas has served on the Foreign Relations Committee for many years and has been its distinguished chairman. I should like to ask him if in his experience he believes and knows that in the time we have been involved in Vietnam—of course, we have been involved there since 1950, but particularly since 1954—the United States, under any of the administrations, has had any plans for the economic development of South Vietnam to stabilize the economy of that country, to raise the living standard of the people? Has it had any comprehensive project to the Senator's knowledge?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe we have had a comprehensive project program for Vietnam alone. There has been a great deal of work done on the so-called Mekong Valley, the Mekong Basin project. That is comprehensive.

It is a continuing commission that has been studying the problem. It has not been only the United States. The commission is comprised of many participating countries. Our program in South Vietnam has been similar to others. It is not a comprehensive plan. At the moment, it is an attempt to alleviate the conditions.

One of the reasons there have never been long-term, comprehensive plans is the nature of the annual foreign aid bill. Congress has refused to give such a plan any long-term life. Every time such a plan has been proposed, it has been largely with an annual appropriation. We never knew what could be done from one year to the next. It has been handled as an annual program. Congress is more at fault than the administration.

Mr. COOPER. I remember the Senator's efforts to correct that situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We failed, though.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator made a strong effort to provide a longer-term authorization. I was happy to support the Senator.

Our aid program for Vietnam has now been in existence for 11 years. It goes back to 1954, but unfortunately it seems we have not been able to bring about economic stability in South Vietnam, and to give much hope to its people. Does the Senator consider this amendment authorizing $89 million for economic aid will give any greater economic stability and hope?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What influences my judgment is that we find ourselves in a critical and dangerous military situation, a war that could expand into another Korea or even a world war. I do not know how to turn the program around.

What appeals to me the most about the proposal is the possibility—at least, I hope it is a probability—that the emphasis will be changed from escalating the war into construction or reconstruction and development in this area. I hope that this might at least add to the incentive for arranging some kind of truce, some turn-around of the ever-increasing escalation. I frankly do not like it. It is highly dangerous. With the possible use of nuclear weapons, and so on, I am pressed to try to do everything I can to improve conditions.

I do not know that this amendment will achieve the purpose. It is a good gesture and has substance to it. Our people can use it with persuasion upon the people of southeast Asia.

I was told by Mr. Black that the reception of the President's program has been favorable in areas that have not heretofore been friendly to us, such as Cambodia. He is going there to try to negotiate a bank modeled, although not precisely, after the Inter-American Bank. Others, in addition to ourselves, would contribute capital. We would not contribute the majority of the capital, and he does not propose that we should. It will be an effort to try to turn this very dangerous, escalating war around, and to afford a new emphasis or a new look, if you like.

That is why I think the amendment is important. I do not know how we can get out of this situation without disaster. We can no longer withdraw. I believe that it does us no good to say that we should not have gone there. We are there. We are committed to be there. What are we going to do about it?

The amendment could help us to turn around and bring about better conditions in South Vietnam. It might give the Vietnamese people some hope that if they will support their own government and support our efforts, there will be hope at the end; whereas they may feel now that there is no hope and they do not care what happens.

Mr. COOPER. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas that in considering our situation in Vietnam, it does not do much good to talk about the past except as experience for the future.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are in a difficult situation.

Mr. COOPER. I do not think we are going to win this struggle or help the South Vietnamese to win it by military aid alone. In such a context, we shall have an escalated war, or we shall be in Vietnam for a long time as a holding force.

This proposal offers the only hope for the future. My problem is whether this is a part of a comprehensive plan which the administration is proposing, and which will move into the area of economic development or is it only an emergency proposal.

I am afraid it may be only a palliative. We stand by the President in this emergency without regard to party. I believe also that the people of South Vietnam will not choose a democratic system of government unless there is improvement in their standard of living. But any economic plan for South Vietnam must have a comprehensive long-range purpose. I will support such a program, but I am afraid that this request will not do the job. I hope that the administration will present a broad-scale program centered on the President's Johns Hopkins speech.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The $19 million is offered as a long-term plan, a Mekong Delta plan, that has been years in developing. It is somewhat like the TVA development, in which we are not prepared to build the whole program; we would only be participants. But the $45 million is not a long-term plan. It is a rescue operation to keep the economy afloat.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, it is not frequently that I disagree with my chairman, who devotes a great deal of time to these problems, or with the Committee on Foreign Relations, although I do disagree on occasion.

I have been greatly troubled by this amendment, and I am opposed to it. I am not opposed to it because of the $89 million. We are spending $2 billion a year in South Vietnam. We have been spending hundreds of millions of dollars in South Vietnam for fertilizer, for village organization, and for developing new products in Vietnam, so that the natives of that country can adopt new means of making a better livelihood. We have been doing that for years.

In response to the question asked by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] a moment ago, we have had such a program. We have had one in South Vietnam since before hostilities began and to the extent they exist now in the full-scale war we have on our hands.

We had programs in the mountain areas to settle the mountain people of South Vietnam and to provide them with new crops. We had programs to form cooperatives for the marketing of their rice and the new products which we hoped to develop. We had programs to build access highways in that country, so that the farmers could ship their products to market.

We found that by applying fertilizer to the rice paddies, two bushels of rice could be grown where one bushel grew before. That virtually doubled the income. Hence we went further into marketing operations.

We have done a great deal in Vietnam, and a vast amount must be done in addition, before that country can have a vital economy, before it can have what we would call by any standard a self-supporting, modern economy. That will take a long time. I believe we must devote a tremendous amount of time and attention to try to accomplish these things.

But today we are in the throes of a conflict, of a war, that is taking place in the jungles. When I see proposed for the program today $19 million to establish rural electric cooperatives there, I wonder how long the light bulbs would remain until the bandits came and take them out of the sockets. I wonder how long we could expect to have a successful operation of that kind.

First we must be able to pacify that country. There are two ways to go. We could go on the theory of pacifying the country purely by the force of arms, by shooting everything that moved. Or we could move to the other horn of the dilemma and try to pacify the country by educating the people in the villages, hoping that by such education they would gradually throw off the revolters.

The problem is difficult. But what bothers me is that—I think it was only last Thursday—suddenly over the airwaves came the announcement that it was proposed to spend $89 million for the development of the Mekong River Delta. We had testimony—good so far as it went—from the Secretary of State. As I recall, that was on Friday. We had before us maps of the great Mekong River, its valley, and its tributaries.

It was my understanding from the outset, and the announcement was made, that this money would go into the development of the Mekong River Valley. That valley touches Cambodia. In fact, it goes through Cambodia. It touches Vietnam. It touches Laos. It is the boundary, in fact, for a great distance between Laos and Thailand. It affects both North and South Vietnam. It is a vast river system.

It was my understanding, although later evidence did not seem to bear this out, that this was a proposal to develop a water system and, therefore, food producing and all other aspects of flood control which would be involved in the harnessing of this great Mekong River system.

Anyone who has seen that river system knows that it is a vast one. It is bigger than the Jordan, which we spent years in studying. However, there was an attempt, or a desire to report the bill favorably. The attempt was postponed, as I frankly requested. The committee very courteously agreed. I objected to reporting the bill on Friday when it had been announced, in effect, the night before. I thought that it was too soon and the information was too meager.

The thing that bothered me concerned what kind of a pig in the poke we would propose to buy with the $89 million, what kind of commitments would we make toward the underwriting of a vast project which would cost literally billions of dollars before it was completed. How much of the cost would the United States have to underwrite? How much would we have to be responsible for in the years to come? Even granting that we may be able to pacify the situation and restore some kind of economic and political stability in Vietnam, what would we be buying with the $89 million? We have all voted for literally billions of dollars on occasion. We have voted for hundreds of million of dollars on occasion.

However, on most occasions we knew what the future project would be. We knew what we were expected to meet down the road.

My objection is that I do not know what we are getting into. I find now that only $19 million, or perhaps less than that, is proposed to be expended in the Mekong River Valley.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would be $19 million in the Mekong River Valley.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It would be $19 million in the Mekong River Valley. The rest of it would be something else again.

I was at the committee meeting this morning. I did not stay until the end of the meeting. I did not stay until the final vote. I did not leave in a huff. However, I left quite sure that the committee, in the majority, was going to vote to report the bill.

I announced at the time that my difficulty was that we could not support this proposal until we had a better definition or a better layout as to what the program would start with, and what burdens and pains we would take on with the particular program. If it were only $89 million in South Vietnam, that would be one thing. I could look at that in one way. However, if we were to start a new collateral program there in addition to the program we already have there, I would want to know more about it. I would want to know what the future would be. I would want to know what we would be getting into.

It was for that reason, and not because of the $89 million, that I thought it would be unwise for us to vote for this program until we had a more detailed examination and a less emotional area than the sudden request of the President one night and a demand to vote the measure out the next day.

I am not enthusiastic about that kind of legislation. I think it is precipitous and does not merit support merely because someone asks for it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the advice of the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Arkansas. As I read the measure, $4 million is proposed to be added in technical development grants and some $25 million is proposed to be added in support assistance.

The Senator has been talking about $89 million. Where is the provision for the other money to make up the amount of $89 million? What would that money go into?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there would be $9 million added to the committee bill in technical assistance and $80 million in supporting assistance. It would be in those broad categories.

Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa is disturbed about not having all the details. As I recall, the Senate even more precipitately authorized and appropriated $700 million, and no one knew whether that was to be used for nuclear bombs for Peiping, or what it was to be used for. They will do what they please with the money. I do not know why we seem to be willing to trust the military to do anything that they prefer to do, but yet we want to have every "i" dotted and every "t" crossed when economic assistance is involved. We have created the impression that the only thing we have confidence in is the military.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not agree that that is an analogy at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe that when we appropriate money for the military, we know what it is for. It is for war. It is for military activity.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What the Senator is saying is that he has confidence in the military leaders and no confidence in the civilian leaders.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No, I do not agree with that. I do not know what we propose to do in the Mekong River Delta. However, in a military operation, victory is the goal that we seek.

Do we start in on the Mekong River operation and underwrite it from now until it is finished? We may have to continue with this for a generation. Do we propose to get other countries in on the operation? If so, to what extent? What will be their contributory share?

There are a dozen questions, or perhaps hundreds of questions of that kind. We have not explored the potential of the possible demands on us in the future.

For that reason, it would not be $89 million. That would not be the amount involved. It would involve a program that I do not believe we have sufficiently explored. I believe that it is too precipitate. For that reason I must oppose it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment for the reason that the Senator from Iowa has pointed out. I am opposed to the amendment because I do not propose to subsidize the Vietcong to the tune of many millions of dollars. That is exactly what we would do if this bill were to be passed.

Who would get the money we would spend in the delta which is controlled by but the Vietcong? The delta will be controlled by the Vietcong for a long time to come. They control that area of South Vietnam. If we build up a rural electrification plan, if they do not destroy it, they will take it over. If we build up a cooperative, if they do not destroy it, they will take it over.

The program that we are talking about would be seized by the Vietcong. This would end as a subsidization and strengthening of the Vietcong. Most people do not seem to realize the strength of the Vietcong in this part of South Vietnam. We cannot be spending money for economic aid projects in that part of the country as long as the Vietcong rules it. We would like to think that we can pour in some American dollars, and that they will bribe the people of the villages, and that then the people of the villages will come over to the side of the United States. But such a view could not be more incorrect; and the events which already have transpired there show how wrong it is. We have been spending money there for a long time.

What is the information we obtain from people who return from that area and give us the results of their surveys, studies, and observations of the results of our program in this part of Vietnam? They tell us that our program there has not weakened the Vietcong; instead, it has strengthened the Vietcong. The Vietcong are running these villages and hamlets, and are collecting the taxes, and are appointing the officials. Yet it is proposed that, in the midst of this war, we spend there this large amount of money.

In my opinion, there is no difference between what the administration proposes to do by means of the $89 million and the aid we are already pouring into the Vietcong-controlled areas of South Vietnam. We must face the fact that this is a proposal for another psychological boost for the administration's program that is going awry in South Vietnam.

When I heard the recent argument in favor of providing the $700 million, I realized that I had then heard almost everything. A few minutes ago it was argued, here on the floor of the Senate, that after we had voted for the $700 million, we could not well object to the present request for $89 million. However, I point out that we did not know much about where the $700 million would go; and I say to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] that we do not know, either, where this $89 million will go. Most of it will go into the category of supporting assistance, a category that Congress has striven mightily to reduce because it is a giveaway category.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] was quite correct when he pointed out that the administration has, after giving us only a few hours' notice, asked for this amount, on a rubber-stamp basis. We have not received sufficient depth of explanation as to whether this money will help us win the war in Vietnam or whether it will weaken our chances of winning the war there. Therefore, we must face the fact that the war there must be settled before we can have the very broad, expansive program that I believe we should have for the economic development of that area—but not in a situation in which the Vietcong control.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I have great respect for the judgment of the Senator from Oregon; but I should like to test the accuracy of his statement to the effect that the Vietcong will get all this money. On the basis of the published request made by representatives of the administration before the Foreign Relations Committee, it is clear that $45 million of the $89 million is for commodity imports, to feed the people there. Does the Senator from Oregon think those commodities will be used to feed the Vietcong?

Mr. MORSE. The record shows perfectly clearly that great quantities of materials we have sent into this part of Vietnam have been taken by the Vietcong, even before they had been distributed by the U.S. distributors. The Vietcong drove out our assistance and aid people, and got the credit for the material we sent there; and the Vietcong will do it with these commodities, too.

Mr. CLARK. With all due respect to the Senator from Oregon, I take the position that very little——

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Pennsylvania does not know what he is talking about, because if he had read the report, he would not make such a statement.

Mr. CLARK. I take the position that very, very little——

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Pennsylvania wants to have us proceed on a rubberstamp basis; but I do not join the Senator from Pennsylvania in the sophistries engaged in in trying to alibi for the administration in connection with giving away, for the benefit of the Vietcong, large amounts of the money of the taxpayers of the United States. The Senator from Pennsylvania can vote for that if he wishes to; but I will not vote for it, for the Vietcong are running the show there, and such a program will not stop them from running it. The Vietcong will be stopped only by our first winning the war there. So we can clearly see what would happen by following the course the Senator from Pennsylvania favors.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon does not wish to yield to me, I shall wait until I obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. MORSE. I yielded to the Senator from Pennsylvania, at his request.

Mr. CLARK. Yes, but I do not intend to be constantly interrupted when I am in the midst of a sentence.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, who is doing the interrupting? The Senator from Pennsylvania asked me to yield; and I yielded to him. Then he made a comment about my statement, and I answered his comment. He did not like the information I gave him then. He never does like to be answered by the facts; he either runs off the floor when some Senator tries to answer him, or he gets into the kind of personal dispute he has brought up now. Mr. President, I am used to his arguments.

Mr. President, I wish to say that in my judgment we have here a great opportunity to do something in connection with Vietnam by first of all making perfectly clear to the President that we are going to back him if he will come forward with a specific economic aid program that will show that we are not going to be helping the enemy. But I will not vote for the building of an REA in the Vietcong-controlled part of South Vietnam, and then think I am saving the taxpayers some money or am doing something to help win this war. Of course the Vietcong will take over such developments. Any physical investment we make there before the Vietcong are whipped or before this war is settled on the basis of a negotiated settlement will play right into the hands of the Vietcong; and I do not think we can justify voting for this request, so that the administration can propagandize the American people by saying, "We are going to spend $19 million in South Vietnam." My prediction now is that the money will not be spent there, because the administration will find, on the basis of its own investigation, that we would be throwing the money away if it were spent before the war is settled in the part of Vietnam that at the present time is not run by the United States or by the South Vietnamese, but is run by the Vietcong. I think it is perfectly silly to be talking about spending millions of American dollars in an area that is presently controlled by our enemy.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall be very brief.

I ask Senators the Members of the Senate to arrive at their own considered judgments as to how much of the $89 million the administration has requested is likely to end up in the hands of the Vietcong.

The largest single item is $45 million for commodity imports. I have read both favorable reports and unfavorable reports in connection with our aid activities in Vietnam. My own view is that very little, if any, of the $45 million will not go exactly where we would like to have it go—that is, to the people of South Vietnam who are resisting the Vietcong.

Six million dollars will go for training in small-scale village projects in Laos and Thailand. It seems to me highly unlikely that any of that money would go to the Vietcong.

Seven million dollars will go for medical services in Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand. Some of it might be used for the treatment of wounded prisoners of the Vietcong—but very little of it, I suspect. I doubt that any substantial part of that medical aid item would go to the Vietcong.

Seven million dollars will go for agricultural development and for industrial expansion. It might well be that if the Vietcong were to overrun areas where our AID people were foolish enough to put the $7 million, some of it might inure to the benefit of the Vietcong. My guess is that our administrators will not be foolish enough to put that money into areas where the Vietcong has taken over.

Five million dollars is to go for hydroelectric projects in South Vietnam. That program already has received the approval of Mr. Clyde Ellis, whom all of us know, and for whom we have great respect. I cannot believe that he will see that money put into areas or programs in areas where the Vietcong will get the benefit of it.

Nineteen million dollars will go for the development of the Mekong River Basin, which includes parts of Cambodia, Thailand, and Laos. In my judgment, it is highly unlikely that that $19 million will go to the Vietcong.

So I state, as my position, that this money will go for useful purposes, that the plan has been well thought through, and that the amendment should be supported.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 26, as follows:

[No. 108 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Allott
Anderson
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Holland
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Montoya
Mundt
Nelson
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—26

Aiken
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Burdick
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Eastland
Ellender
Fannin
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
McClellan
Miller
Morse
Murphy
Pearson
Robertson
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—32

Bass
Bayh
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Case
Douglas
Gore
Hill
Inouye
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Magnuson
McGee
Mondale
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Simpson
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 233

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 233 and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] proposes an amendment——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD as this point.

The amendment (No. 233), offered by Mr. FULBRIGHT, is as follows:

On page 14, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

"(h) Amend section 511, which relates to restrictions on military aid to Latin America, as follows:

"(1) In subsection (a), strike out 'a part may be used during each fiscal year for assistance in implementing a feasible plan for regional defense, and insert '$25,000,000 may be used for assistance to an inter-American military force under the control of the Organization of American States'.

"(2) Amend subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) to the maximum extent feasible, military assistance shall be furnished to American Republics only in accordance with joint plans (including joint plans relating to internal security problems) approved by the Organization of American States. The President shall submit quarterly reports to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on the implementation of this subsection.' "

On line 14, strike out "(h)" and insert "(i)".

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not expect to ask for a yea and nay vote tonight. I merely wish to make the amendment the pending business and take it up tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT—ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the majority leader and the minority leader, I should like to inquire about the plan for meeting tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention to have the Senate convene at 12 o'clock. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest that the majority leader give consideration to convening at 11 o'clock and to entering into a unanimous-consent agreement on the pending amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish it were possible to comply with the Senator's request. Unfortunately, the Committee on Finance is holding hearings on excise tax legislation. As the Senator well knows, this is a very important subject, which runs into a time limitation at the end of this month.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO LIMIT DEBATE ON PENDING AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE. I suggest that a unanimous-consent agreement be entered into to vote on this important amendment tomorrow. We may not be able to get a vote tomorrow unless we can enter into an arrangement whereby we could have an early vote, perhaps by having 45 minutes of debate on each side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and I hope this will meet with the approval of the Senate—that there be an hour and a half of debate allowed on the pending amendment, the time to be equally divided, 45 minutes to be under the control of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the proponent of the amendment, and 45 minutes under the control of the majority leader or whomever he may designate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That after the Senate convenes on Tuesday, June 8, 1965, debate on the pending amendment, No. 233, proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to the bill S. 1837, a bill to further amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, be limited to 90 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] or any Senator designated by him.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the situation that has developed, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this evening, it not adjourn, but recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, because of the time limitation that has been entered into I would suggest that the transaction of morning business be postponed until after the Senate concludes the consideration of the pending amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the minority leader and majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, has the order been entered for the Senate to recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk certain amendments to the foreign aid authorization bill. This is my first batch. I ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

RECESS UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 8, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 7, 1965:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Edward Burling, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the term expiring March 3, 1970, vice John L. Newbold, term expired.

U.S. MARSHAL

Elmer W. Dissapayne, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 24, 1965.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public

Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. For permanent promotion:

To be senior surgeons

James P. Shortal
Clifford E. Nelson
Donald A. Carlyle
Norman Tarr
D. Wells Goodrich
Walter H. Freygang
Stanley F. Yolles
Sherman N. Kieffer
David M. Fried
Nicholas C. Leone
Albert L. Steplock
Alfred S. Ketcham
Francis T. Flood
Karl F. Urbach
Maurice L. Sievers
James L. Deadwyler
Robert DeLashmutt
Nicholas J. Galluzsi
Albert Sjoerdsma
Richard A. Prindle
John W. Gashman
Eugene J. Vanscott
Leon Rosen
Robert S. Gordon, Jr.
Warren A. Rasmusson
Burton S. Eggertsen, Jr.
Martin D. Hicklin
Martha R. Wilson
Charles H. Lithgow
John H. Ackerman
Carl S. Shultz
Robert A. Marks, Jr.
John H. Edgcomb

To be surgeons

James A. Richardson
William B. Furgerson, Jr.
Robert R. Fletcher
Edward J. Hinman
Ferdinand R. Hassler, Jr.
John R. S. Remsberg
James E. Wesley
Charles L. Donaldson
George H. Longenbaugh
Walter E. Williamson, Jr.
Robert E. Streicher
John C. Bailar III
Norman C. Telles
James R. Warbasse
Robert E. Markush
David K. Wagner
David L. Aronson
George P. Sperry
H. Bruce Dull
Kurt W. Kohn
Albert C. Diddams
Charles L. Greenblatt
Robert L. Dernlan
Jacob A. Brody
Philip R. B. McMaster
Robert B. Couch
Isao Hoshiwara
Albert Z. Kapikian
Arvo B. Ederma
Harry P. Anastopulos
Robert C. Hoye
Harold E. Ramsey
Joseph P. O'Malley
Axel W. Hoke
Saul W. Rosen
Victor J. Albertazzi
Fred E. Tosh
Roland W. Sonntag
Peter G. Contacos
John R. Gill, Jr.
Jimmie D. Hawthorne
Lynn R. Hamilton

To be senior assistant surgeons

Allan L. Brackensiek
Enrique Piovanetti-Pietri

To be senior dental surgeon

Harold R. Stanley, Jr.

To be dental surgeons

Jerry D. Nishwander
Keith C. Winkler
James R. Hull
Jack W. Gamble
Clair L. Gardner
James W. Miller
Reginald N. Edwards
Clement K. Schmitt
Richard B. McDowell
Russell O. Glaucer
John W. Vitamvas
Ray W. Alcox
George L. Crocker
Wayne R. Jameson
Richard S. Law
Thomas E. McClellan

To be senior sanitary engineers

Ronald E. Bales
Paul F. Woolrich
James B. Coulter
George W. Burke, Jr.
Dade W. Moeller
Richard D. Coleman
Roy O. McCaldin
Charles V. Wright, Jr.
Joseph W. Fitzpatrick
James A. Anderegg
Everett L. Mac Leman
Gordon E. Stone
Zakok D. Harrison
Albert G. Friend

To be sanitary engineers

Herbert R. Pahren
Julius J. Sabo
William A. Rosenkranz

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Richard L. Douglas
Dale B. Parke
Denis J. Prager
Charles F. Costa
James D. Russell
Marvin Rosenstein
William L. Ryan
Daniel L. Petke
Phillip L. Taylor
Lawrence J. Perez, Jr.
Samuel B. McKee
Robert H. Reeves
William F. Buchholz, Jr.
Jerry L. Butler
Thomas M. Moore
John B. Wheeler
Richard L. Mikkelsen
Peter Y. Bengtson
William E. Barkley
David E. Bernhardt
Allen H. Palmer
Robert W. Zeller
Herbert M. Dawson
Richard F. Wromble
Howard D. Metz
Richard F. Boggs
Frank E. Hall
William A. Felsing, Jr.
Maris Pubulis
Joseph R. Franzmathes
Charles H. Wentworth III
Elwyn Holtrop
John K. Carswell
James V. Waskiewicz
Ronald F. Coene

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Robert G. Britain
Robert P. Stein
Malcolm B. Reddoch
Perry S. Plexico
Walter G. Gilbert
Bruce M. Burnett
David K. Smith
Dean R. Chaussee
Patrick J. Godsil
Bobby L. Dillard
John R. O'Connor
Gary S. Logsdon
John J. Convery
Michael B. Spear
Lawrence A. Schmid
Frank L. Rothfuss, Jr.
Larry E. Crane
Warren W. Church
Wilbur Van Dokkenberg, Jr.
Wayne T. Craney
Francis W. Norris, Jr.
Thomas P. Glavin
Joseph P. Mastromauro
James K. Michels
William S. Properzio
Jerome P. Wiener
Robert N. Snelling
Harry F. D. Smith, Jr.
Robert C. Dunlap
Dale A. Stevenson

To be pharmacists

Gene G. Knapp
Paul J. Lesage
Wesley R. Gladhart, Jr.
M. Thomas Wagner, Jr.
Mark H. Barnett
John H. Herath

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Leighton H. Tooms
Robert L. Childress
Lyle M. Glascock
Edward C. O. Brennan
Laurence D. Sykes
John J. Piecoro, Jr.
Richard R. Ashbaugh
Ronald A. Gomes
Walter Jakubowski
William P. Heffernan
Dan Y. Miura
Nancy B. Finch
Raymond J. Farkas

To be assistant pharmacists

Louis C. Fras
Maurice H. Lacerte
Edwin A. Gailbreath

To be senior scientists

Kelsey C. Milner
Edward M. Scott
Thomas W. Haines
Richard Q. Bell
John H. Weisburger
Elizabeth K. Weisburger
Albert S. Perry

To be scientist

George P. Kubica

To be nurse officers

Rudolph P. Zalesak
Elizabeth A. Zacha
Ellen I. McDonald
Frances D. Marancelli
Lawrence A. Levine
Patricia P. Grimaila
Alice M. Haggerty
Theresa M. La Lancette
Alice E. Duncan

To be senior assistant nurse officers

Ray Cameron
Sidney S. Louis

To be assistant nurse officer

Nan P. Drake

To be senior veterinary officers

Preston Holden
William Kaplan

To be veterinary officer

Gordon D. Wallace

To be dietitians

Jane A. Davidsaver
Louise L. Boyer
Molette M. Jacobson

To be senior assistant dietitian

Carol J. Bresley

To be therapists

William E. Cox
Melvin Bader
Martha M. Lasche
Lawrence Sidel
Mario L. Salvanelli
Vincent J. Barbato
Howard M. Fisher
Lennes A. Talbot

To be senior assistant therapists

Robert Livengood
James L. Werner

To be assistant therapist

Joseph B. Hayden

To be health services officers

Robert N. Beauregard
Robert J. Mahon
Charles F. Froom
Paul Blank
Paul E. Jones
Kenneth R. Nelson, Jr.

To be senior assistant health services officers

Robert M. Moroney
Charles W. Roach
Robert A. Haaf
Gerald Katz

To be assistant health services officer

James E. DeLozier

POSTMASTER

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Ruth A. Parker, Lincoln, Ark., in place of A. W. Bishop, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Gordon W. Clancy, Barstow, Calif., in place of W. C. Upton, retired.

Noel W. Bassett, Fall River Mills, Calif., in place of M. A. Bartle, retired.

Arpad J. Sutch, Hermosa Beach, Calif., in place of A. H. Morgenstern, retired.

Robert S. Gleason, Oceanside, Calif., in place of F. H. Lauraine, retired.

Nellie F. Chandler, Shingletown, Calif., in place of L. I. Miller, retired.

Mary L. Charlesworth, Sunland, Calif., in place of M. M. Kearns, retired.

William D. Wilson, Sun Valley, Calif., in place of Fred Jacobsen, retired.

Louise A. McCallen, Truckee, Calif., in place of R. T. Higgins, resigned.

Cleo B. McKnight, Tupman, Calif., in place of O. M. Love, retired.

Eunice V. Isaman, Valyermo, Calif., in place of G. C. Brandenburg, retired.

COLORADO

Edward G. Ruhter, Empire, Colo., in place of T. N. Nelson, retired.

Kenneth W. Simon, Naturita, Colo., in place of Maggie Jacobsen, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Daniel A. Shembreskis, Oakville, Conn., in place of C. T. Kelly, retired.

Doris P. Boivin, South Woodstock, Conn., in place of M. L. White, retired.

DELAWARE

Herbert L. Semans, Magnolia, Del., in place of H. C. Whitney, resigned.

FLORIDA

Clifford E. Baxter, Delray Beach, Fla., in place of L. E. Diggans, deceased.

Wilton P. Banks, Pompano Beach, Fla., in place of W. W. Parrish, deceased.

James P. Seckinger, Wildwood, Fla., in place of E. A. Phillips, deceased.

GEORGIA

Jefferson S. McRae, Mount Vernon, Ga., in place of Anna Morrison, retired.

IDAHO

Ardinelle L. White, Pierce, Idaho, in place of M. J. Williams, retired.

ILLINOIS

Lorman P. Wehling, Cottage Hills, Ill., in place of C. A. Ray, retired.

Robert C. Wright, Marseilles, Ill., in place of G. M. Farrell, retired.

R. Dean Rogers, Mulkeytown, Ill., in place of J. D. Cook, retired.

Allen D. Welker, Olney, Ill., in place of J. L. Schaub, transferred.

John C. Wenger, Rock City, Ill., in place of R. J. Hofmeister, retired.

Lela Green, Wheeler, Ill., in place of J. A. Leturno, retired.

INDIANA

Leo J. Rouhier, Goodland, Ind., in place of F. E. Louette, retired.

Hazel R. Tudor, Stilesville, Ind., in place of M. T. Keller, retired.

IOWA

Leslie N. Bitgen, Bellevue, Iowa, in place of G. L. Beeler, retired.

Ronald D. Stewart, Braddyville, Iowa, in place of L. G. McMullan, retired.

Harlan Morgan, Castana, Iowa, in place of L. H. McDonald, transferred.

William G. Gantz, Onawa, Iowa, in place of J. F. Cooper, transferred.

Arnold F. Brehmer, Peterson, Iowa, in place of J. L. Brown, transferred.

KENTUCKY

William H. Miller, Campton, Ky., in place of Jack Smith, retired.

Mildred K. Skaggs, Crockett, Ky., in place of Lee Skaggs, retired.

Jack L. Hopgood, Morganfield, Ky., in place of C. H. McElroy, retired.

LOUISIANA

August M. Hofmann, Jr., Reserve, La., in place of M. J. Donaldson, resigned.

Marion D. Morris, Saint Francisville, La., in place of A. S. Daniel, retired.

MAINE

William C. Abelli, East Winthrop, Maine, in place of L. F. Mace, retired.

MARYLAND

Audrey M. MacWilliams, Churchton, Md., in place of M. C. Dawson, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Raymond J. Decker, Chesterfield, Mass., in place of W. H. Baker, retired.

Norman D. Potter, South Lee, Mass., in place of A. I. Brown, retired.

Chester J. Martin, Turners Falls, Mass., in place of J. T. Shanahan, retired.

MICHIGAN

Earl Engle, Jr., Woodland, Mich., in place of N. E. Sifton, retired.

MINNESOTA

Donald C. Stroman, Alberta, Minn., in place of R. W. Treischel, retired.

Vernon D. Desing, Barnesville, Minn., in place of J. E. Pasch, retired.

J. Sherman Kerr, Bemidji, Minn., in place of A. J. Breen, retired.

Sheldon H. Peterson, Grygla, Minn., in place of F. A. Brown, retired.

Squire H. Holmes, Middle River, Minn., in place of Mary Davidson, resigned.

Daniel J. O'Connell, Orr, Minn., in place of O. A. Ofstad, retired.

Clifton E. Brevik, Twin Valley, Minn., in place of A. E. Jones, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Richard A. Jermyn, Handsboro, Miss., in place of M. S. Washington, deceased.

Walter D. Heslep, Indianola, Miss., in place of R. M. Yarbrough, retired.

Robert E. Dobbs, Mantee, Miss., in place of A. J. Hensley, retired.

MISSOURI

Nolan L. Rowe, Granby, Mo., in place of Cornelia Hart, retired.

MONTANA

Alfred G. Walker, Arlee, Mont., in place of Kenneth LeCompt, deceased.

Marjorie D. Badgley, Rexford, Mont., in place of C. M. Hurst, retired.

NEBRASKA

Kenneth D. Timme, Pleasant Dale, Nebr., in place of Myrtle Haist, retired.

E. Jerome Christensen, Ruskin, Nebr., in place of A. M. Olsen, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Dixie B. Sparks, Fort Stanton, N. Mex., in place of M. J. Price, deceased.

Clark T. White, San Jon, N. Mex., in place of A. M. Hawley, retired.

NEW YORK

Joseph P. Komarowski, Barker, N.Y., in place of G. D. Burgess, retired.

Donald A. Wiley, Cape Vincent, N.Y., in place of W. O. Wiley, retired.

Virginia S. Gimmillaro, Chadwicks, N.Y., in place of Gus Di Savino, retired.

Leonard Seidel, Delanson, N.Y., in place of W. C. Wilber, retired.

Luke Bottiglieri, Dobbs Ferry, N.Y., in place of W. P. Hurley, retired.

Thomas J. Powers, Elnora, N.Y., in place of L. K. Petersen, retired.

John L. Kress, Jr., Galway, N.Y., in place of J. T. Hunter, retired.

Howard D. Holland, Hadley, N.Y., in place of V. B. Hawk, retired.

Irene L. Murphy, Hicksville, N.Y., in place of H. C. Cotier, resigned.

Lenora M. Turner, Indian Lake, N.Y., in place of J. F. Farrell, retired.

Helen M. Ohanesian, Jefferson Valley, N.Y., in place of Pauline O'Neill, retired.

Theodore V. Auguston, Lake Grove, N.Y., in place of W. A. Williams, resigned.

Dominic F. Mazza, Liverpool, N.Y., in place of J. J. Gaffney, deceased.

Joseph W. Mannion, Memphis, N.Y., in place of Carmen Murano, resigned.

Charles Germeck, Miller Place, N.Y., in place of J. E. Fiasconaro, resigned.

Stephen J. Kennedy, Niagara University, N.Y., in place of V. E. Trunk, resigned.

Leonard V. Behr, Orangeburg, N.Y., in place of C. A. Chamberlain, retired.

Wayne C. Jones, Petersburg, N.Y., in place of V. S. Manchester, retired.

John F. Boyle, Ransomville, N.Y., in place of J. E. Foster, transferred.

Maurice E. Karker, Richmondville, N.Y., in place of G. M. Dibble, retired.

Katherine I. Bristol, Schuylerville, N.Y., in place of W. R. Reel, removed.

Donald E. Felter, Sparrow Bush, N.Y., in place of M. L. Hendershot, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Allen W. Lanier, Chinquapin, N.C., in place of B. S. James, retired.

Sallie W. Elmore, Dover, N.C., in place of M. A. Elmore, retired.

Levin B. Culpepper, Elizabeth City, N.C., in place of R. L. Garrett, retired.

Walter T. Upchurch, Norwood, N.C., in place of C. J. Usserly, transferred.

Leon E. Peedin, Princeton, N.C., in place of L. D. Braswell, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Lyle W. Bethke, Kulm, N. Dak., in place of Oscar Lange, retired.

OHIO

Harold R. Ferrell, Fletcher, Ohio, in place of C. H. Buroker, retired.

Otis A. Redmond, Harbor View, Ohio, in place of H. P. Pearce, retired.

Wayne E. Hastings, Homerville, Ohio, in place of H. D. Holshoe, transferred.

Martha J. Cox, Windsor, Ohio, in place of E. E. Windsor, retired.

OKLAHOMA

M. Jack Phelps, Selman, Okla., in place of B. M. Gass, retired.

Eugene T. Moseley, Watonga, Okla., in place of Clarence Knappenberger, retired.

OREGON

Alva N. Bradford, Medford, Oreg., in place of A. M. Hamilton, deceased.

Harold M. Enberg, Wasco, Oreg., in place of H. R. White, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert B. Good, Bird in Hand, Pa.; in place of A. S. Myers, retired.

Rudolph V. Benigni, Brookville, Pa., in place of H. H. Allshouse, retired.

Nicholas Lalich, Duquesne, Pa., in place of P. S. McDermott, retired.

Stewart E. Marsh, East Stroudsburg, Pa., in place of N. B. Gregory, retired.

Donald E. Sherwin, Karns City, Pa., in place of E. M. Burke, retired.

W. Elliot Jones, Kelton, Pa., in place of E. L. Moore, retired.

Gerald A. Volk, Loretto, Pa., in place of M. C. Bengele, retired.

Joseph L. Kelley, Jr., Narberth, Pa., in place of R. S. Basler, retired.

Hugh A. Armstrong, New Providence, Pa., in place of D. M. Herr, retired.

Phaon R. Herb, Orwigsburg, Pa., in place of N. L. Wuchter, retired.

Donald L. Morris, Point Pleasant, Pa., in place of M. E. Yost, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Jose R. Sotomayor, Barceloneta, P.R., in place of D. G. Sotomayer, retired.

Felipe B. Cruz, Jr., Vieques, P.R., in place of F. B. Cruz, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Joseph J. Brant, Ulmers, S.C., in place of J. E. Deer, declined.

TEXAS

Alfred M. Lemons, Booker, Tex., in place of A. R. Garton, retired.

Jack C. Shadowens, De Berry, Tex., in place of T. L. Westmoreland, retired.

O. Lavelle Taliaferro, Eden, Tex., in place of R. A. Haynes, retired.

UTAH

Warren L. Marble, Monroe, Utah, in place of Elliott Larsen, retired.

L. Clark Roberts, Myton, Utah, in place of H. J. Percival, removed.

VERMONT

Mary A. Bagley, West Topsham, Vt., in place of L. G. Bagley, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Elton T. Matthews, Atlantic, Va., in place of S. E. Mears, retired.

Jack L. Russell, Berryville, Va., in place of T. M. Hooker, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Lowell E. Canaday, Crab Orchard, W. Va., in place of W. F. Shrewsbury, retired.

Cecil Ward, Gilbert, W. Va., in place of H. A. Buchanan, resigned.

Ruth B. Netotea, Raysal, W. Va., in place of J. G. Bryant, resigned.

Harley F. Wright, Reader, W. Va., in place of J. A. Haught, retired.

WISCONSIN

Raymond E. Mattison, Amberg, Wis., in place of A. S. Port, retired.

Malcolm J. Goodrich, Pickett, Wis., in place of J. H. Buchholz, retired.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3298, and 3299:

To be majors

Abbott, Lael J., O84845.
Ackermann, William A., O81365.
Ackerson, Robert L., O66297.
Adair, Thomas W., O92147.
Adams, Floyd C., Jr., O66652.
Adams, Henry L., O79158.
Adams, Thomas H., OF100281.
Adams, William A., O65939.
Ahearn, David C., O66374.
Aiton, William S., O79160.
Aker, John R., O66265.
Albrecht, Jack R., O67892.
Albright, William L., O70247.
Alderman, Craig, Jr., O66347.
Aleong, Fletcher A. K., O89405.
Allee, Robert J., OF102131.
Allen, Harry E., O67893.
Allen, James L., O66654.
Allen, Loma O., Jr., O66655.
Allen, Terry de La M., Jr., O66606.
Allen, William MacD., O67547.
Alves, Manuel A., O87465.
Ambrose, Homer, Jr., O65647.
Ames, William F., O79162.
Amundson, Donald M., O71435.
Anderson, David J., O79164.
Anderson, George B., O79165.
Anderson, James L., O66656.

Anderson, John H., O95426.
Anderson, Robert N., O84585.
Anderson, Thomas E., O66661.
Andolina, Edward S., O79166.
Angell, Burrel D., O65843.
Angle, Ralph G., O95141.
Anhalt, Walter C., OF100418.
Anson, Richard W., O66662.
Anthony, Richard D., O88240.
Aoyagi, Toshio, OF100232.
Applegate, Walter V., O66663.
Arena, Darrell R., O82135.
Armstrong, James E., O66521.
Arnold, Edward L., O66133.
Arnold, Harvey L., Jr., O66214.
Arnold, Henry R., O81369.
Aron, Fred W., Jr., O66667.
Asensio, Manuel J., Jr., O66574.
Ashby, Claude T., Jr., O84846.
Ashhurst, James H., 3d, O84586.
Atkinson, Frank W., Jr., O66669.
Atkinson, Robert V., O66671.
Attaway, Hubert H., Jr., O65852.
Austermann, William D., O66673.
Austin, Maynard A., OF100466.
Aycock, Herbert L., O70252.
Ayers, Thomas D., O66329.
Bacci, John J., O66674.
Backhurst, George F., O70254.
Bailey, Broadus, Jr., O71757.
Bailey, Harry R., O70257.
Bailey, Vincent P., O66452.
Bakarich, Michael N., O73059.
Baker, Fred I., Jr., O79170.
Baker, Wallace I.. O70259.
Ball, Ray E., O66680.
Baltzell, Lowell F., O93021.
Banze, William C., O79172.
Bardis, Michael J., O66681.
Barger, Ferdinand O., Jr., O70262.
Barkley, George F., O66516.
Barnard, Talbott, O67895.
Barnett, John H., O79175.
Barrell, Edgar A., 3d, O66683.
Bart, John F., O66529.
Bartel, George B., O66397.
Bartelle, Talmadge L., O80273.
Barth, Richard L., O66609.
Bartholomew, Theodore F., O94912.
Barton, Stephen F., O79178.
Bass, Sampson H., Jr., O70265.
Bauer, Charles J., O71441.
Bauer, Frank L., O65886.
Beardsley, Stephen G., Jr., O66688.
Beasley, Horace B., O66689.
Beaulieu, Richard E., O67985.
Bechamp, Edward J., O65822.
Beckwith, William J., O79183.
Beekman, Gerald R., O94847.
Beelman, Dale C., O66694.
Behneman, John F., O79184.
Beil, James N., O65899.
Bell, Kermit W., O66567.
Bellochi, Joseph F., OF100588.
Belt, Charles M., O67987.
Belteau, Robert J., O72819.
Benedict, Frank C., O66419.
Bennett, Hal C., Jr., O65764.
Benson, Carl G., O79186.
Bergeron, Noel L., O91755.
Bergeson, Raymond O., O66494.
Berke, Henry H., Jr., O66700.
Bernard, George L., O70273.
Berrier, Jerry A., O66701.
Berry, Billy E., O66702.
Berry, James A., O69461.
Berry, Ray W., O71644.
Bethea, John D., O66375.
Bickerstaff, Hugh J., Jr., O71645.
Bickley, Nelson R., Jr., O65848.
Bieber, Werner F., O66704.
Biglione, Normand J., O70276.
Billman, Ervin L., O66705.
Bing, Tom L., O70277.
Black, Charles S., Jr., O65864.
Black, Vernon R., O97240.
Blackwell, Paul H., Jr., O75146.
Blair, John M., O75147.
Blair, John S., O91554.
Blake, James F., O70278.
Blakely, William R., Jr., O67891.
Bland, Ivan C., O66706.
Blankenship, James H., O95178.
Blaser, Charles O., O72822.
Block, Theodore S., O66709.
Bloomer, Harry P., Jr., OF102141.
Blumenthal, Donald K., O65527.
Boettcher, Henry J., Jr., O73290.
Bomar, Lesil S., Jr., O65920.
Bond, Robert G., O79190.
Boos, Michael A., O66573.
Booth, James W., O88574.
Bouffard, Robert L., O66714.
Boughton, Richard B., O65513.
Bovard, John O., O66385.
Bowen, John W., O66715.
Bowers, Richard K., O66717.
Boyd, Donald E., O70280.
Boyles, William B., 066491.
Brackett, Charles R., O91769.
Bracy, Alfred McR., O66508.
Bradford, Edward M., O70282.
Bradley, Joseph S., Jr., O88583.
Brakenridge, Edward K., Jr., O74644.
Braley, Theodore LeR., Jr., O82146.
Brantley, Edward G., O79196.
Bray, Gaither C., O75151.
Bray, Victor H., O79197.
Brazil, Hal B., O79198.
Bremer, James H., O66518.
Bretz, Robert D., O71765.
Breunig, Joseph T., O79199.
Brewer, John F., Jr., O66259.
Bridges, Bennie R., O66729.
Brillhart, Allen T., O73294.
Broadhurst, Hugh H., Jr., O66466.
Broady, William, O72326.
Brocato, Cyrus V., O81389.
Brockington, John S. OF102148.
Brockman, Harry J., O82148.
Brockwell, Leyburn W., Jr., O79202.
Brodin, Thomas T., O66530.
Brogden, Wyndell E., O70286.
Brooks, Standish O., OF102421.
Brooks, Thomas V., Jr., O75155.
Browder, John M., O67898.
Brown, Brisbane H., Jr., O66737.
Brown, Gerald W., O71766.
Brown, Horace W., O66559.
Brown, John P., O95642.
Brown, Paul J., O66307.
Brown, Richard W., O75158.
Brown, Sam P., O66739.
Brownfield, John F., O94571.
Brownlee, Robert W., O66138.
Brunosky, Frank, O66741.
Bryan, Lawrence E., O67795.
Bryan, Louis C., Jr., O66524.
Buchanan, Charles J., O63197.
Buckley, Blair, Jr., O66421.
Bullock, Richard S., O66242.
Burch, George L., O72831.
Burckert, James F., O73024.
Burdick, Leonard R., O71650.
Burgess, Robert L., O80210.
Burke, Martin J., Jr., O66745.
Burke, Robert L., O66597.
Burkert, Alfred, Jr., O81392.
Burkhalter, Thomas H., O66746.
Burkhard, Alfred E. S., O66541.
Burkheimer, Jack W., O66436.
Burnett, Otis E., O74653.
Burns, Gilbert L., O66309.
Burns, Jack W., O63631.
Burt, Donald L., O74654.
Bush, Franklin D., O84595.
Bush, Ralph, O79208.
Butler, Albert C., O66749.
Butler, Elbert L., Jr., O74939.
Byrd, James C., O85469.
Byron, Joseph P., O66752.
Cade, Alfred J., O66753.
Calahan, James E., O66754.
Calcatera, Kenneth J., O65891.
Callahan, Joseph J., O70295.
Campbell, James E., Jr., O66517.
Campbell, Joseph L., O85305.
Cannon, John L., O66239.
Capps, William R., O65898.
Carah, Kenneth J., O65519.
Carder, Kenneth E., O79214.
Cardinalli, Guy F., O75160.
Carey, Milton G., O68333.
Carlson, William E., O72837.
Carmichael, Robert B., O66760.
Carney, Harland E., O82153.
Carnie, Sidney K., O66761.
Carpenter, Gordon D., O66353.
Carr, John M., O67904.
Carter, Frank A., O65906.
Carter, Robert H., O66764.
Carter, William D., O66766.
Carter, William G., O70297.
Cartland, Harry E., O67998.
Cary, David B., Sr., O79218.
Casey, John H., O70171.
Cash, William G., O65771.
Cassels, Kenneth G., O65657.
Cate, William F., Jr., O71456.
Caughron, Walter E., Jr., O71457.
Cavaleri, Edwin F., Jr., O70172.
Cesar, Edison M., Jr., O82156.
Challis, Arthur J., O81396.
Chase, Marvin K., Jr., O79221.
Chasteen, Paul C., O66773.
Chavez, Joseph D., O71460.
Cheaney, Frank H., Jr., O66775.
Chriss, James V., O79224.
Christensen, Douglas E., O65523.
Christy, Deryck G., OF102157.
Chung, Donald Y. B., O66778.
Ciccolo, William N., O66779
Clark, Donald E., O79225.
Clark, John R., Jr., O73302.
Clark, Roy C., Jr., O79227.
Clark, Walter B., Jr., O65639.
Claybrook, John H., O66593.
Cleary, Alexander B., O79228.
Clemens, Glen, O70175.
Click, Charles E., O92292.
Cline, Ralph M., Jr., O66373.
Clinton, Frederick C., O79230.
Clohecy, Richard M., O72843.
Clough, Junie L., O63525.
Cluck, Charlie E., O72367.
Clune, William C., O68088.
Clyne, Norman G., Jr., O66785.
Coad, William F., O73303.
Cochran, James F., 3d, O72845.
Cochran, William J., O67558.
Coffman, King J., O66295.
Cole, Thomas F., O66249.
Coleman, Richard C., O66484.
Collier, Thomas W., O66225.
Collins, John G., O84853.
Collins, Thomas W., O94577.
Colombo, James L., O66787.
Comish, Leo S., Jr., O79234.
Comstock, Keith L., O66488.
Condina, Ernest F., O66496.
Connelly, Donald W., O73305.
Conner, Donald H., O66791.
Constance, Harbin A., O67909.
Cook, James R., O75165.
Cook, Peter H., O75055.
Cook, Robert S., O66793.
Cooke, John W., Jr., O66540.
Corbridge, Leigh J., Jr., O66526.
Cordell, Glenn A., O66391.
Corley, Robert J., O71773.
Cosper, Manley H., Jr., O70310.
Cottey, Robert J., O66379.
Courant, Thomas E., O66236.
Covington, Albert A., O85146.
Covington, Edward B., 3d, O66796.
Cowan, Kenneth D., O70311.
Cox, Alden LeR., O70312.
Cox, Floyd W., Jr., O66799.
Cox, Rodney E., O66800.
Cravens, James O., O82160.
Creed, William H., O94282.
Cress, William, O72850.
Crosby, John W., Jr., O65812.
Crow, James E., O66331.
Crowe, Cecil A., O86026.
Crowell, Chester D., Jr., O66805.
Crutchley, Donald O., O70177.
Cuevas, Ramon N., Jr., O66807.
Culbertson, Roger A., O96751.
Cullen, Victor A., O66144.
Cully, Frederick R., O66809.
Culpepper, Grady A., O97825.
Culton, William H., O79243.

Cummings, Eldon L., O70318.
Cunningham, Carl L., O71777.
Cunningham, Lee D., O64921.
Curtis, Robert L., O81405.
Cuta, Weston W., O78781.
Cutter, William S., O66811.
Daly, James J., O84854.
Danford, Howard H., O66438.
Daniel, Samuel E., O84603.
Daniell, Sidney C., O66817.
Danzeisen, William H., Jr., O65935.
Daugherty, Lucius L., III, O65763.
Davaz, Carl G., OF100254.
Davey, Robert A., O66819.
Davidson, Jay A., O65669.
Davidson, William W., O68182.
Davis, Addison D., 3d, O79246.
Davis, Alvah B., Jr., O67914.
Davis, Dale T., O66822.
Davis, Donald D., O65776.
Davis, Fred J., O65821.
Davis, George R., O66823.
Davis, Graham C., O66824.
Davis, Ken A., O67563.
Davis, Richard K., O79247.
Dawdy, Charles A., Jr., O65518.
Day, James O., O66602.
Day, Robert L., O66829.
DeAngelis, Joseph A., O66364.
DeBord, Leonard A., O67564.
DeLapp, William C., 3d, O66832.
deLorimer, Alfred J., O63183.
deShazo, Thomas E., Jr., O70086.
DeVille, David A., O65790.
DeWald, Arthur B., O66515.
Deadwyler, Earnest W., O71666.
Dean, Fred E., O66830.
Dean, James C., O79249.
Dean, Reginald L., Jr., O87501.
Deets, Robert M., O79250.
Deiss, Herbert, O66258.
Delahanty, John F., Jr., O79251.
Delaune, Elton J., Jr., O67808.
Denton, Earle L., 075173.
Derhaag, James J., O69629.
Dermatis, Walter G., O81411.
Des Roches, Bernard H., O65658.
Desmarais, Arthur J., O79252.
Dethlefs, Henry J., O66835.
Deverill, Arthur P., Jr., 066369.
diLorenzo, Lucius V., OF102174.
Dietderich, Wallace R., O81414.
Dinkins, William H., O65653.
Dirkx, Gerard M., O82164.
Dixon, Charles E., Jr., O99308.
Dombrowsky, Albert J., Jr., O66400.
Donahue, Joseph E., O88370.
Donovan, Paul, O66843.
Doody, Richard F., O66571.
Dooley, Michael J., O72857.
Dorchak, Steven, Jr., O65984.
Dorman, James, O66844.
Dowler, Thomas W., O66232.
Driskill, John G., O66231.
Dufresne, Ernest J., Jr., O70181.
Dughi, Charles H., O66849.
Dukes, Harry L., Jr., O65869.
Duncan, Conrad L., O88664.
Duncan, Dorman L., Jr., O67565.
Dunmire, Thomas S., O66532.
Dunn, Robert H., O66449.
Dupke, Carl F., Jr., O66305.
Durham, Morris C., O85157.
Durie, Robert E., O66535.
Dutchyshyn, Harry V., O66300.
Dyson, William E., O66852.
Earle, Marsden P., Jr., O66600.
Earnest, Clyde T., Jr., O66285.
Easler, Charles J., Jr., O65877.
Easton, Byron S., O74679.
Ebel, William E., O66854.
Eckert, Edward N., O66460.
Eckhart, Amil J., O82167.
Edgerton, John D., O66855.
Edgington, Roger N., O79262.
Edwards, Richard O., O73324.
Edwards, Robert A., O66857.
Edwards, William H., O66858.
Effinger, Robert C., Jr., O63696.
Eisenbraun, John M., O92185.
Eisenhart, Warren H., O66429.
Elliott, James C., Jr., O79264.
Elliott, John R., O70331.
Elliott, Robert H., Jr., O74682.
Elliott, Robert W., O65318.
Elliott, Wayne H., O66560.
Elliott, Wilburt L., O66863.
Ellis, Thomas N., O66468.
Elmer, Lee N., O69913.
Emrick, George E., O71786.
England, Marion F., Jr., O99836.
Englesby, Howard E., O66865.
Erickson, Arne B., O66867.
Erickson, Arthur LeR., O66368.
Espey, John R., O66386.
Espy, Carl L., Jr., O66868.
Evanchick, John, O71787.
Evans, John C., O66870.
Evans, Timothy L., O66872.
Evans, Winston K., O66873.
Everhart, Tommy L., O66874.
Evers, Richard E., O97114.
Fahey, James P., Jr., O82169.
Fairey, John M., O70333.
Farmes, William C., O99642.
Fasone, James G., O82170.
Federhen, Herbert M., 4th, O80212.
Feeney, Raymond E., O87513.
Fendler, Donn C., O95664.
Ferebee, David W., Jr., O79274.
Fife, James A., O65767.
Fink, Charles A., O79275.
Finsterle, James C., O72868.
Finter, George A., O71492.
Fiser, Donald D., O70183.
Fitts, William H., O79276.
Fitzpatrick, Thomas E., O66544.
Fitzpatrick, Thomas W., O96967.
Fitzsimons, John F., O67570.
Flanagan, Eugene P., O66601.
Fleigh, Raymond L., Jr., OF102181.
Fleming, Jack R., O65661.
Fleming, James M., O84607.
Flint, Roy K., O68185.
Floro, Lawrence A., Jr., O66893.
Fogg, Charles L., O66895.
Foley, James D., O65876.
Foley, John V., O66237.
Fonshell, William R., Jr., O66897.
Forsythe, David A., O69486.
Foster, John K., O84609.
Foster, Robert W., O81427.
Frampton, Henry G., Jr., O95637.
Francisco, Allan J., O68346.
Frankeberger, John R., O66903.
Frankhouser, Enoch D., O79282.
Fraser, Edward A., O65514.
Frederick, Austin, O66905.
Fricke, Charles J., O81430.
Friend, Donald F., O66907.
Frydendall, Jerry D., O85170.
Fuesel, Stanislaus J., O94748.
Fugit, Daniel S., OF102465.
Fulwyler, Niles J., O66908.
Fuqua, Harold E., O65795.
Furuya, Charles S., O65996.
Gallagher, George M., O79286.
Ganevsky, Walter J., O92192.
Gardner, Frank C., O79292.
Gardner, Jack J., O66152.
Gardner, Morris L., O74690.
Garibay, Raul A., O66913.
Garland, Donald E., O66914.
Garrison, Robert M., O67818.
Garver, John B., Jr., O66408.
Garver, Ralph T., O66284.
Gary, Robert P., O65650.
Gaskill, Robert C., O67819.
Gatzka, Charles A., O66153.
Gearey, Thomas P., O66918.
Geisel, Francis R., O91838.
Gelber, Morris J., O84616.
Gelke, Donald E., O66921.
Geoghegan, Malcolm H., O79294.
Georger, John F., O74694.
Gerard, Robert J., O74695.
Gessner, Richard A., O79297.
Gibbs, Gerald G., Jr., O66420.
Gibler, John K., O66923.
Gibney, John V., O66514.
Gilbert, Edgar A., Jr., O66216.
Gilbert, Robert L., O92015.
Gilkey, Clarence D., O66262.
Gillette, Edward C., 3d, O84618.
Gillis, Harrell N., O84619.
Girdner, Ralph W., O66359.
Gittleman, Warren E., O74696.
Gleason, William J., O87523.
Gleason, William P., O66580.
Glidden, Harry R., O71793.
Glisson, William C., O79301.
Glore, Ray C., O85397.
Glynn, William P., 3d, O66930.
Goad, Maury F., O71794.
Gober, Floyd C., OF101087.
Goddard, Ross M., Jr., O74698.
Goff, John E., O94752.
Golden, Harold R., O66935.
Goliash, Joseph F., O66938.
Gooch, Kaye W., O66939.
Goodall, Arthur L., O66940.
Goodwin, William E., O79307.
Gooler, Darrel L., O70345.
Gorby, Alvin R., O66409.
Gorden, Charles F., Jr., O81444.
Gordon, Marvin E., O75195.
Gotschall, Wellington, Jr., O66942.
Gould, David C., O66944.
Graham, James A., Jr., O66945.
Graham, William L., O66002.
Graham, William R., O70190.
Graves, Charles S., O69494.
Graves, Charles E., O71502.
Gray, Donald J., O66503.
Gray, George B., Jr., O69661.
Grayeb, George A,, Jr., O66605.
Grazioli, Albert J., O70346.
Green, Albert F., O77032.
Green, James E., Jr., O88710.
Green, L. D., O79310.
Greene, DeReef A., O97308.
Greene, Dorsey B., Jr., O65643.
Greer, George D., O66949.
Gregory, Theodore O., O66425.
Griffiths, Meryl A., OF102480.
Grissom, Charles C., O66954.
Griswold, William H., Jr., O79313.
Groninger, Dwight L., O66955.
Gross, Francis P., 3d, O68350.
Grubbs, John A., O68008.
Grzybowski, Conrad J., O91514.
Guertin, J. A., Richard, O66958.
Guess, Carl B., Jr., O66599.
Guinn, William D., Jr., O66959.
Gustafson, William G., O66961.
Hafers, Ernest R., O85114.
Haff, Peter W., O73338.
Haggerty, John P., O85176.
Haid, Donald J., O69496.
Hains, Peter C., O66401.
Hairston, Charles, O66964.
Hale, Charles L., O71673.
Hale, James N., O94756.
Haley, George R., O66965.
Haley, James F., O65847.
Hall, Daniel D., O71674.
Halvorson, John A., O81450.
Hamilton, John D., OF102488.
Hamilton, Philip W., Jr., O66534.
Hamilton, Wilson S., O66967.
Hammer, Hoyt M., Jr., O71505.
Hamner, Charles T., O97914.
Hampton, Robert W., O87527.
Hanby, John B., Jr., O71797.
Hand, Robert P., O66458.
Hanlin, Emmert L., Jr., O82180.
Hansard, David G., O66378.
Hanson, Harvey LeR., O66971.
Harageones, Angelo J., O75203.
Haras, Robert J., O66250.
Hardin, Harold F., Jr., O72891.
Harrell, George W., Jr., O77990.
Harriman, William C., O66974.
Harrington, Robert H., O82182.
Harris, Charles M., O96307.
Harris, Daniel D., Jr., O66976.
Harris, Richard L., O65806.
Harrison, Hugh B., O79320.
Harrison, William J., O66330.
Harrison, William L.. Jr., O66465.
Hartigan, David E., Jr., O66159.
Hartup, James C., O91862.
Harty, William Q., O70193.

Hasting, Richard A., OF102490.
Hastings, Wallace H., Jr., O66581.
Hasty, Gerald R., O71507.
Hathaway, Worten M., O65652.
Haun, Philip D., O65769.
Hauser, Ferdinand H., O71800.
Hawkins, Algin S., O84626.
Hawkins, Jeremiah B., O67821.
Hawkins, Lewis L., O66986.
Hayden, Charles W., O74718.
Hayden, Robert T., O71677.
Hayes, Aldric McC., O97917.
Hayes, Daniel P., O66011.
Haynie, Orris F., O67824.
Hays, James D., O66987.
Heathcock, James T., O66989.
Heflin, Henry G., Jr., O66990.
Heilman, Robert L., O66991.
Heineke, Richard R., O65521.
Heinlein, Willard H., O71509.
Helms, Howard F., O65789.
Hemmer, James B., O70370.
Hemphill, Donald F., O65854.
Henderson, Lewis J., O66584.
Henderson, William J., O66994.
Hendrickx, Edward J., O97920.
Hendrix, Jamie R., O65666.
Hennessy, Bruce L., O79321.
Hennigan, John R., O67825.
Henry, Henry N., Jr., O88731.
Heon, Normand P., OF102910.
Hermann, John R., Jr., O66553.
Hermann, Ullrich, O69679.
Herrgesell, Oscar, O66996.
Herriford, Robert L., Sr., O79322.
Herstrom, Frederick W., O66998.
Hervey, Lynn C., O70195.
Hettinger, John A., Jr., O66435.
Higgs, Irwin L., O67001.
Hilborn, James R., O71679.
Hiley, Thomas E., Sr., O67002.
Hill, Charles E., Jr., O79326.
Hill, John G., O66538.
Hill, Thomas R., O66255.
Hill, William C., O65868.
Hippler, Richard A., O71517.
Hoagland, Dale N., O88738.
Hobbs, William A., O85769.
Hockett, Donald F., O70378.
Hodge, Harold B., Jr., O87792.
Hoenstine, Charles A., Jr., O66351.
Hoey, Edison V., O84862.
Hoey, William R., O81457.
Hogan, Henry W., O67007.
Hogsten, Edward McN., O72734.
Holden, William B., O66565.
Hollander, Herbert C., O66299.
Holle, Kendrick, O67010.
Holley, William T., O67011.
Holloman, Robert A., 3d, O70379.
Holmes, Ashley, W., Jr., O67012.
Holmes, Robert S., O66302.
Holt, Winfield A., O66533.
Holton, Duval G., Jr., OF102499.
Holtz, Edward S., O67013.
Honeycutt, Weldon F., O82339.
Hooper, Everett E., O65654.
Hooper, George T., O65857.
Hope, Leon MacK., O67015.
Hopkins, David A., O67016.
Horn, William L., O66267.
Houchin, Clifford G., O64291.
Howard, Joseph D., O99661.
Hubbard, Samuel J., O66411.
Huber, Helmut, O82187.
Hudson, James L., O66163.
Hughes, Charles M. O72492.
Hughes, Martin, Jr., O79335.
Hughes, Roy, OF102920.
Hukkala, Tenho R., O67023.
Hulley, Robert N., O66525.
Hunter, Thomas C., Jr., O71524.
Hunzeker William K., O67584.
Hurley, Robert D., O67025.
Huskerson, Guy M., Jr., O67026.
Hutchins Alvin C., Jr., O79340.
Hutchins, John A., Jr., O67027.
Hyde, James L., O71811.
Hyde, Orion J., O67029.
Hylton, Irvin L., O67029.
Irvin, Matthew W., O74731.
Isaacs, Carroll C., OF100091.
Ison, Glenn W., O72904.
Jackman, Donald LeR., O73072.
Jackson, Luther H., O88755.
Jacobs, Kenneth R., O73038.
Jacoby, Richard A., O89787.
Jacquay, Louis H., O75216.
Jaggers, Joseph N., Jr.. O66493.
James, William, O65926.
Jameson, John G., Jr., O67033.
Jardstrom, Veikko E., O65828.
Jarvis, James W., Jr., O67035.
Jarvis, Robert C., O79343.
Jelinek, Howard C., O66566.
Jenkins, Wallace E., O67037.
Jenkins, William E., O67833.
Jensen, Lavar, O65516.
Jeo, Calvin C., O71682.
Jetmore, Clinton N., Jr., O84631.
Jimison, John G., O82189.
Johns, Harvey B., Jr., O70391.
Johns, John H., O65861.
Johnson, George R. H., O69511.
Johnson, Gerald K., O71527.
Johnson, Paul R., O84864.
Johnson, Raymond E., O67042.
Johnson, Richard F., O64381.
Johnson, Wilbert T., O82191.
Johnston, James A., O75219.
Jones, Eugene N., O99336.
Jones, Frank A., Jr., O65887.
Jones, Robert W., O95050.
Jones, Wesley G., O66557.
Jones, William H., Jr., O80214.
Jordan, Pendleton A., 3d, O65664.
Jorgensen, LeRoy, O67048.
Joy, Robert S., O84634.
Justice, Robert E., O79347.
Juvenal, Michael P., O66477.
Karlson, Ernest E., O67052.
Kaser. William T., O67053.
Katz, Abraham D., O79348.
Keating, Kenneth J., O66441.
Keeler, Robert B., O67056.
Keeley, John B., O66340.
Keller, George A., O74743.
Kelley, Robert L., O79350.
Kelley, Robert W., O79351.
Kelley, William D., O67058.
Kelly, Donald P., Jr., O65644.
Kelly, Keith S., O67059.
Keltz, Richard E., Sr., O67060.
Kennedy, Edmund J., 3d, O67062.
Kenney, John F. C.. Jr., O66275.
Kennington, Joseph M., OF100299.
Kenyon, Nathaniel C., O75111.
Kern, John H., O65781.
Kerr, Thomas J., O85342.
Kersey, Walter G., O67065.
Kidwell, Birtrun S., Jr., O66323.
Kiefer, Homer W., Jr., O66327.
Kiernan, Thomas A., O66304.
Kilgour, Jordan McI., O67066.
Kim. Richard, O73355.
Kimball, Albert L., O65784.
Kimmel, Robert G., O66464.
King, Henry J., O73356.
King, James A., O82195.
King, Jimmie, O84865.
Kingery, Thomas E., O66032.
Kirchmaier, Charles S., Jr., OF102515.
Kirklighter, Gerald W., O67067.
Kirkwood, Clifford T., 085398.
Kirschner, Thomas R., O94597.
Kirtland, Jack P., O67587.
Kitchens, Ernest, Jr., O70203.
Kitts, James R., Jr., O71536.
Kitts, Richard A., O67068.
Kizirian, John, O91916.
Klingelhoefer, John W., 071537.
Klinner, Enzo F., Jr., O68193.
Knight, Albert R., Jr., O64208.
Knight, Daniel B., Jr., O66528.
Knight, Herbert E., O69518.
Knight, Jeffrey D., O66447.
Knipp, Fred M., O67072.
Knutson, Kent G., O66318.
Kochanek, Louis J., O67075.
Komar, George, O75224.
Korchek, Robert L., O66520.
Kostoff, Peter C., O79354.
Kotite, Richard S., O74750.
Kovach, James H., O81471.
Kozlowski, Stanley G., O73358.
Krafski, Richard S., O70404.
Kraft, Donald E., O67077.
Kramer, George R., Sr., O79356.
Krause, George W., O73359.
Kreitler, Clark F., O67078.
Kuick, Stanley J., O66422.
Kurek, Robert A., O79357.
LaBerbera, Albert, O67081.
Ladner, Theron G., O81474.
Lamas, Albert A., O65793.
Lambert, David R., O94600.
Lamp, Harold R., O66349.
Lancaster, William A., O74754.
Landry, Robert L., O71543.
Lane, Edward E., O66335.
Lang, Richard N., O66424.
Lang, Vaughn O., O67088.
Lange, Karl F., O67089.
Langford, Richard J. E., Jr., O89242.
Lank, Joseph M., O67090.
Larkin, Richard X., O66417.
Lasher, Donald R., O66430.
Lauzon, Donald E., O82198.
Lawrence, Alfred F., Jr., O66235.
Lawrence, Paul S., O71545.
Lax, William M., O67096.
Layman, George G., O67097.
Leach, Bertram G., O67098.
Leach, Jack H., O68371.
Leach, Robert W., O66380.
Leary, Arthur J., Jr., O67099.
Leer, Boyd W., O75232.
Leggett, William T., Jr., O66361.
Lehan, James F., Jr., O66345.
Lehman, Albert C., O66312.
Leider, Robert, O73365.
Lennon, Leo H., O66444.
Lenz, Daniel A., O86415.
Lepper, Lewis, O66629.
Leroux, Francis, O67105.
Lesher, Harry E., Jr., OF102596.
Lewis, Glenn W., O97935.
Lewis, Vernon B., Jr., O88127.
Lewis, William D., O75233.
Lichtenwalter, Leon, E., Jr., O66322.
Liebl, Arthur F. W., O67109.
Liles, Donald E., O66630.
Little, Andrew E., O89247.
Livingston, Otis W., Jr., O65896.
Livsey, William J., Jr., O68025.
Lloyd, Elwood A., O79365.
Locke, Donald K., O65816.
Lodge, Warren J., O67595.
London, James E., O79367.
Long, Harold B., Jr., O71934.
Longmore, Myron J., O67116.
Loshbough, Robert P., O66176.
Lott, Robert P., O97322.
Loutzenhiser, Richard H., O75238.
Lowder, Henry I., O66381.
Loy. William M., O75240.
Lubold, Guy M., Jr., O65524.
Luck, Robert H., O75241.
Lund, John R., O69731.
Lupton, Edward R., O67120.
Lusby, Harold L., O75242.
Lush, Rolla S., O67121.
Luther, Jay E., O66301.
Lutz, Bradley T., O71550.
Lycan, Daniel L., O67122.
Lynch, Thomas P., O71696.
Lyon, David K., O66243.
MacDonald, Kenneth W., O67124.
MacDougall, John B., O84646.
MacGarrigle, George L., Jr., O66545.
MacMillan, William D., 4th, O74762.
MacNeill, Rohry O'D., O75244.
Magill, Henry F., O65856.
Mallet, Henri-Gerard, O71831.
Mallonee, Paul G., O65832.
Malone, Paul B., 3d, O66324.
Maloney, James W., O66228.
Mann, John E., O92478.
Mantooth, William H., O70208.
Maples, Floyd M., O70209.
Marine, George E., O72929.
Marlatt, Tommy D., O94874.
Marlow, Thorne H., O67137.

Marsh, Martin K., O82204.
Marshall, Billy E., O84870.
Martin, David H., Jr., O66434.
Martin, Frederick L., O82205.
Martin, George W., O81482.
Mashburn, Wilbur F., O79373.
Mason, James R., O69526.
Matthews, Alfred W., O65917.
Mauer, John C., O66469.
Maxham, Robert L., O67145.
Mayse, Harvey C., OF101842.
McBride, Thomas F., Jr., O71698.
McCaffree, Robert J., O67841.
McCaffrey, Charles T., Jr., O67149.
McCauley, Paul J., O67151.
McClung, Edgar B., O66388.
McCracken, John R., OF102548.
McCrone, Clarence L., Jr., O71701.
McDermott, Frank E., O91925.
McDonnell, James E., O66487.
McDowell, Chester W., Jr., O90268.
McGarry, Robert S., O66257.
McGlone, John E., O67844.
McGowan, Robert S., O66360.
McGrath, Robert W., O73373.
McGregor, Frank A., 3d, O68200.
McGregor, John E., O79378.
McGuyre, Lewis N., O84459.
McIntyre, Lawrence A., O74771.
McKee, Dewey E., O89254.
McKenzie, Lawrence S., Jr., O85621.
McKnight, Clarence C., Jr., O66367.
McKnight, Robert D., O67158.
McLain, Charles I., O67159.
McLean, Thomas S., Sr., O70110.
McMahon, Patrick B., O75020.
McManus, Richard J., O67847.
McMenemy, Alexander E., O67160.
McMurrer, James E., Jr., O73376.
McMurry, Donald R., O70429.
McNamara, John J., O70430.
McNulty, Edward S., O70213.
Medaris, Oliver J., O68384.
Meeker, Ernest L., O72943.
Mennicke, Victor O., O84874.
Mennona, Edward, O71561.
Mensch, Donald H., O65879.
Mercer, Robert B., O65651.
Mess, John A., O67172.
Messier, Raymond E., O68201.
Meyer, Alvin J., O67174.
Meyer, Henry R., O66270.
Mezo, Joseph T., O65825.
Michel, Werner E., O74780.
Mickel, Larry S., O66387.
Miles, Edgar G., O67176.
Miles, Mark A., O65777.
Miller, Bruce McK., O67178.
Miller, Edwin N., O67183.
Miller, Frank O., Jr., O93471.
Miller, George W., O66354.
Miller, Henry B., O73377.
Miller, Stuart L., O64183.
Miller, Wayne B., Jr., O67184.
Milligan, George, 3d, O72945.
Mills, George E., O63599.
Misch, John M., O66272.
Mitchell, Corwin A., O66320.
Mittenthal, Lothrop, O83844.
Mode, Albert K., O94310.
Monoriti, Elidio J., O66183.
Monshower, Alvah C., Jr., O80217.
Moody, Robert W., O70435.
Mooney, Charles W., O82211.
Moore, Ernest W., O70215.
Moore, Fred J., O87460.
Moore, Raymond E., O65923.
Moore, Richard D., O66220.
Moore, William C., O66382.
Moorer, John D., Jr , O67193.
Moosman, Gene L., O64467.
Moran, Otis A., Jr., O66398.
Morgan, James R., O67197.
Morgan, Robert L., O66233.
Morris, John J., O79389.
Morrissey, Robert J., O82212.
Morrissey, Robert L., O67200.
Morse, Gerald E., O71845.
Morton, Hurshall G., O79391.
Moseley, Henry G., O66423.
Mulcahy, George J., O70440.
Mullen, Raymond C., Jr., O67205.
Mundy, William E., O65933.
Munroe, Robert S., O82213.
Murnighan, Richard L., O67207.
Murphy, James F., O70444.
Murphy, William H., O97338.
Murray, Lynn O., O70446.
Murray, Thomas H., O73380.
Murrie, Burt J., O72954.
Myers, Joe B., O82068.
Myers, Lawrence S., O74789.
Myers, Sammy D., O81497.
Myfelt, Kenneth F., O79400.
Nasby, Joseph A., Jr., O73381.
Neal, Robert W., O67214.
Neely, Albert D., O71578.
Nelms, Norman S., O73382.
Nelson, Thomas W., O66226.
Nelson, William D., O67217.
Nettles, Elritt N., O87572.
Neumann, Harold B., O89363.
Newton, Aubrey H., O91658.
Newton, Robert D., O70452.
Nichols, Stephen E., O66358.
Nix, Edward J., O65565.
Nixon, Donald A., O66509.
Noakley, Don H., O67225.
Noble, Edwin L., Jr., O67226.
Nord, Alan A., O67229.
Northcut, Jimmy E., O82214.
Norton, Charles W., Jr., O91343.
Nunn, David H., O67231.
Obach, Ronald M., O66453.
O'Boyle, Peter A., O79408.
O'Brien, George F., O88865.
Ochis, Ronald F., O70459.
O'Connor, Theodore E., O67235.
O'Dea, Thomas F., Jr., O71709.
Oglesby, Lenox W., O67236.
O'Grady, Patrick J., O79409.
Oksa, Reino O., O71850.
Oliveira, Joseph G., O69536.
Olson, Roger J., O71851.
Oltman, Richard M., O67238.
O'Malley, Robert M., O97832.
O'Mary, Paul R., O67239.
Omps, Avon R., O79411.
Orr, Carson D., O67243.
Osborn, George K., 3d, O74794.
Osborne, Paul R., O67244.
O'Steen, Ernest C., O85229.
O'Sullivan, Warren S., O66264.
Oswald, Philip L., O97956.
Otis, Paul H., O69763.
Ottomeyer, Donald J., O81503.
Overby, Lauren M., O88170.
Overdahl, Norman L., O67248.
Ozment, Fred N., Jr., O97342.
Pack, Ishmael, O67249.
Pafford, Donald V., O66454.
Palmer, Harold B., O72959.
Palmore, Glenn L., O72960.
Paluh, Joseph R., O66350.
Paparone, Cono R., O67251.
Paquette, Dean R., O71583.
Park, Alan H., O67252.
Parker, Richard F., O65851.
Parks, John E., O65890.
Parks, Walter G., O66343.
Parmenter, Russell E., O82217.
Parmentier, Stanley J., O67253.
Pate, John H., O90629.
Patrick, George H., 3d, O67255.
Patterson, Archie O., O79415.
Patterson, Bruce E., O70467.
Patterson, James H., O67257.
Patton, Robert S., O67258.
Paul, Lloyd H., O79416.
Pavlovsky, Gilbert W., O65880.
Pawson, Wilbur A., O70220.
Peat, Douglas W., O67262.
Peel, Vernon, O65827.
Pehrson, Alan R., O67263.
Pelton, John DeW., O66588.
Pendleton, Freeman L., O66463.
Perkins, Thomas C., Jr., O66069.
Perritt, Harvey H., Jr., O66450.
Petersen, Donald F., O67267.
Peterson, Guy E., O65336.
Peterson, James M., O66372.
Petitt, Homer, Jr., OF102242.
Petrenko, Glenn, O67853.
Petro, Peter P., O67268.
Pettit, James S., 2d, O66480.
Petty, Carlisle R., Jr., O79424.
Petty, Thomas B., O67269.
Peugh, Frank J., O75266.
Phillips, Harold B., O65778.
Phillips, Shepperd H., O74811.
Pierce, Forest E., O70221.
Pierce, Robert W., O67270.
Pierce, Samuel M., O67271.
Pierce, Walter H., O82224.
Pilk, Jack R., 066308.
Pim, Benjamin F., Jr., O65928.
Piotrzkowski, Joseph L., O71589.
Pittman, Castel L., Jr., O69544.
Plackner, William V., O67273.
Plotkin, Nathan, O67274.
Polanski, Joseph T., O65863.
Pollard, Arnold R., O67276.
Potter, Floyd E., O81512.
Potts, William L., O67279.
Poulnot, James O., O88180.
Powell, Bill C., O67280.
Powell, Royce M., Jr., O72969.
Powell, Terry E., O65823.
Power, Arthur V., O77163.
Preisendorfer, Edward P., O99380.
Presson, Charles W., O79433.
Price, Douglas E., O67282.
Price, James E., O67283.
Price, Robert E., O71592.
Pride, Daniel H., O92238.
Prince, Ivan R., Jr., O67284.
Prince, John R., Jr., O65762.
Pruett, Kenneth E., O65900.
Puckhaber, Herman F., Jr., O74817.
Purvis, Gerald W., O70479.
Putnam, Lawrence H., O66383.
Quigley, Edwards M., Jr., O70223.
Quinn, John T., O66591.
Quinnett, Robert L., O70481.
Quint, Alvin M., O94782.
Rackley, Everett W., O66077.
Radcliffe, Jack W., O97187.
Rademacher, Leon E., O70482.
Rafferty, Robert R., O67290.
Ragano, Frank P., O77173.
Rainey, Charles N., O66504.
Rajchel, Louis J., Jr., O66568.
Ramirez, Willard A., O70483.
Rathbone, William A., O66193.
Rathburn, Thomas K., O97961.
Raunswinder, Richard N., O65628.
Ray, Leonard C., O84881.
Reagor, James L., O67606.
Reason, Raymond, Jr., O70485.
Red, Dale S., O67299.
Reece, Laurence H., Jr., O67859.
Reeder, Claire J., O84665.
Reeve, John H., O67303.
Rehm, Thomas A., O66426.
Reilly, William F., O66219.
Reinstein, Vincent P., O67306.
Reish, Richard D., O70488.
Relyea, George R., O66245.
Repetto, John W., O73388.
Rhiddlehoover, Loyd P., Jr., O66522.
Rhoads, Arthur A., O81516.
Rhodes, Robert H., O77179.
Richards, Abraham L., O73052.
Richards, Everett D., O66332.
Riddick, Mills A., O67314.
Riese, Paul E., O67316.
Rieser, John D., O94887.
Rife, William T., Jr., O70490.
Riggs, Theodore S., Jr., O66195.
Risch, Theodore D., O67320.
Riser, Clarence A., O79444.
Ritter, William H., 066548.
Roberts, Lee W., O68398.
Roberts, Ovid E., 3d, 067324.
Robertson, Victor M., Jr., O67862.
Rockhold, Howard R., Jr., O66198.
Rodney, Richard M., O67332.
Rodolph, Carl P., Jr., O66199.
Rodriguez, Joseph C., O74826.
Rogers, Jefferson K., 075082.
Rogers, John P., O68838.
Rogerson, William T., O68155.
Rollins, Robert L., O67337.

Rolya, William I., O74932.
Romero, Louis J., O67338.
Rooney, John J., O84884.
Roper, Harry McK., Jr., O66246.
Rorabaugh, William P., O71594.
Ross, Howard R., O69550.
Ross, Wilbur A., O66546.
Roth, Loren W., O79451.
Roth, Raymond R., O68156.
Routon, Lewis A., O74829.
Rowe, James W., O70228.
Rowland, Louis N., O67341.
Rowland, Richard O., O67342.
Royals, Gerald E., O67343.
Roys, Gerald R., OF100340.
Rozsypal, George F., 079452.
Ruff, Clarence G., O66263.
Runion, Roger C., O67344.
Runquist, Joseph J., O67345.
Rupert, Rodney T., O82230.
Russell, Donald N., O65791.
Russell, Robert L., O66403.
Russell, William H., Jr. O82231.
Sagul, John C., O67350.
Salucci, Ralph, O66089.
Samisch, Hillel, Jr., O67352.
Samuels, Steven A., O73395.
Sandel, Derrell W., O71865.
Sanders, Curtis M., Jr., O93500.
Sands, Carthel L., O84887.
Sanford, Eugene S., O73396.
Sarber, William R., Jr., O67354.
Sargent, Francis M., O79458.
Sasseen, Jack A., O71866.
Sauers, Robert L., O67355.
Sayre, John R., O67358.
Scanlon, James B., O97194.
Schaefer, Richard B., O66201.
Schandler, Herbert Y., O66296.
Schaub, Warren M., O69554.
Scheets, George M., O95097.
Schexnayder, Edmond P., O67865.
Schilling, Dan E., O65642.
Schlager, Robert L., O79459.
Schleusing, Frederick C., O79460.
Schlim, Albert W., O67360.
Schmalhorst, Joseph H., O68401.
Schmidt, Richard H., O67362.
Schneider, Malven E., O79461.
Schrage, Gerhardt H., O97197.
Schroeder, Donald B., O70498.
Schubarth, Herman E., O70034.
Schultz, Paul E., O79462.
Scott, Albert W., O79464.
Scott, Cecil R., O97199.
Scott, Gilbert T., O66337.
Scudder, Wilbur A., Jr., O79465.
Seamands, George A., O67364.
Sears, Robert L., O66475.
Selby, Carman T., O79468.
Sell, Charles E., O66293.
Selleck, Clyde A., Jr., O66218.
Sells, Donald E., O66248.
Senna, Jozef F., O67366.
Serio, Frank E., O81522.
Shackleton, Ronald A., O67367.
Shahrabani, Maurice G., O84888.
Shannon, John F., O67368.
Shay, Charles J., O71722.
Shea, Eugene A., O79471.
Shea, John M., O65640.
Shelton, Cyrus Q., Jr., O65907.
Shelton, Henry R., O70234.
Shelton, Mason R., O65788.
Shinn, Charles E., O81524.
Shirley, Edward L., O70501.
Shiver, Ivey M., 3d, O65862.
Shuler, William A., Jr., O79475.
Shull, Wesley B., O67373.
Siegert, Robert W., Jr., O95390.
Simons, Gerald S., O67379.
Simpson, John A., O67380.
Simpson, John H., Jr., O99733.
Simpson, Richard R., O67381.
Singletary, R. M., O67382.
Singleton, James L., O94961.
Skelton, Robert D., O99996.
Sleeper, Julian R., O74844.
Slesinger, Burton E., OF100358.
Slingerland, Douglas A., O66473.
Sluga, Leonard A., O66298.
Smallwood, Grady L., O67383.
Smith, Charles L., O71724.
Smith, James R., O70506.
Smith, John D., O66310.
Smith, Lawrence R., O81527.
Smith, Noel M., O70237.
Smith, Robley W., O93509.
Smith, Russell V., O99735.
Smith, Thomas R., O75294.
Smith, Tommie G., O79480.
Smith, Vincent K., O67390.
Smith, William B., O71875.
Smith, William D., O74848.
Snyder, Oscar P., Jr., O67391.
Snyder, William P., O66274.
Soberick, Thomas, O84889.
Solley, Bill, O67393.
Sorbo, William P., O81530.
Sorg, Creighton D., O88952.
Spaulding, Warren A., O66252.
Spearing, James M., OF101086.
Specker, Robert W., O74851.
Spence, Elmer D., O94791.
Spencer, William H., O66586.
Spero, Paul G., O67397.
Sperow, Charles C., O77208.
Spicher, William F., O79485.
Spirito, Leonard A., O68208.
Spitzer, Robert N., O67398.
Sprague, John T., Jr., O67399.
Stahl, John J., Jr., O64084.
Stallman, Arnold S., OF103044.
Stanaland, William A., O67401.
Stanford, Daly H., O67402.
Stanier, Richard E., O66432.
Stanley, Windal R., O84674.
Starr, Merle D., O79486.
Stebbins, Arthur R., O66356.
Steen, Charles S., Jr., O66513.
Stephens, Jack V., O67407.
Sterling, Norris P., O67409.
Stevens, Frederick A., Jr., O66479.
Stevens, Story C., O82366.
Stevenson, Robert D., O70515.
Stevenson, William M., O67412.
Stewart, Alex, Jr., O65632.
Stewart, Harvey E., O79489.
Stidham, James A., O74859.
Stipetic, John J., O65888.
Stockman, Bonny R., O67413.
Stoker, James D., O75299.
Stokes, Eugene J., Jr., O66278.
Stone, Lawrence J., O67416.
Stone, Walter D., Jr., O67418.
Stonecipher, Robert G., O71608.
Storey, William J., O67874.
Story, Richard E., O67419.
Stottle, Leslie J., Jr., O96803.
Stoverink, Robert I., O84891.
Strange, Loren C., O94502.
Strickland, George E., O67421.
Strong, William R., O67423.
Stubblebine, Albert N., 3d, O66363.
Sucher, Edwin G., O65829.
Sullivan, John J., O66462.
Sullivan, Robert A., O67425.
Sumpter, Cecil A., Jr., O79495.
Sutton, Larry L., O96495.
Sveiven, Desmond D., O81540.
Svoboda, Charles J., O73055.
Swann, H. L., Jr., O82241.
Swarts, Sidney M., O67621.
Sweat, Melvin H., O82242.
Swygert, Donald R., O66280.
Sykes, Cecil R., O66355.
Sykes, Earl R.. O79497.
Szalwinski, Ambrose A., O67429.
Szymczyk, Norbert J., O66576.
Talley, Richard P., O66205.
Tanner, Eugene P., O67431.
Tanner, William T., Jr., O65526.
Tausch, William H., Jr., O67434.
Taylor, Arthur E., Jr., O66437.
Taylor, George E., O67436.
Taylor, James R., O81543.
Taylor, Julius C., Jr., O71880.
Tedford, John B., O65830.
Templeton, Norman T., O67967.
Tenore, Jacob A., O79500.
Thieme, Alfred L., O66457.
Thomas, Reynold, Jr., O66451.
Thomas, William E., O71610.
Thomason, Dana L., O82245.
Thompson, Dwight S., O67443.
Thompson, Edmund A., O66376.
Thompson, Edmund R., O66277.
Thompson, Glen D., O92134.
Thomson, Francis A., O69566.
Thralls, Rodney E., O71612.
Threadgill, Frank G., O89154.
Threlkeld, Donald H., O66643.
Thuston, William O., O67448.
Tipton, John H., Jr., O66370.
Toepel, Adalbert E., Jr., O66486.
Tombaugh, William W., O70532.
Tousley, Horace W., O70533.
Tow, James L., O66495.
Traylor, Robert J., O73000.
Trimble, Rae C., O67457.
Trinkler, Kenneth T., O82249.
Tripp Perry D., Jr., O67458.
Tronsrue, George M., Jr., O66240.
Trotti, Robert S., Jr., O67969.
Troutman, Allen C., O82250.
Truax, Robert H., O66478.
Tucker, Jesse F., Jr., O84894.
Tudor, Alfred T., Jr., O67628.
Tufft, Arthur H., O79505.
Turek, Charles E., O84895.
Turner, Frank D., Jr., O67877.
Turner, George M., O67970.
Turner, Robert C., O66587.
Turner, Robert I., O79506.
Twitchell, Lowell De V., O70539.
Tyler, William H., O65780.
Tyson, Wallace S., O67463.
Ulmen, Patrick A., O99750.
Ulmer, Walter F., Jr., O66389.
Underhill, George R., O66362.
Utegaard, Rolf W., O65641.
Utzman, Charles D., O82373.
Uzee, Richard J., O67465.
Vail, Ira D., O82251.
Van Ness, Richard E., Jr., O67468.
Van Netta, Ernest A., O70544.
Van Winkle, Parker C., O71886.
Varljen, Frank E., O97367.
Vass, Marshall B., O89916.
Vaughn, Edward J., O70545.
Vaughn, Lowell W., O82253.
Vavra, Luke A., Jr., O65872.
Verlautz, Sidney J., O67472.
Vermillion, Russell G., O67473.
Vincent, Samuel M., O92032.
Vinson, Frank C., Jr., O92600.
Viterna, Robert O., O69569.
Vitetta, Eugene J., O67474.
Vogel, Herbert D., Jr., O66502.
Von Dach, Robert F., O97692.
Vuley, Ernest A., Jr., O67476.
Waara, Ralph C., O67477.
Wagers, Robert W., O74879.
Wagner, Julian F., O67479.
Walden, Don E., Jr., O79512.
Waldron, Edward E., 2d, O75311.
Waldron, Garald L., O73002.
Walker, William A., O92835.
Walker, William A., Jr., O66321.
Walker, William O., O71620.
Wall, James E., O79513.
Wallace, Raymond E., O66342.
Waller, Carol D., OF100904.
Wallis, Charles R., O66221.
Walter, Eugene H., O97049.
Walters, Thomas E., O67485.
Walton, Fred H., Jr., O67879.
Ward, Leon T., O67487.
Ward, Norman E., Jr., O73421.
Wardinski, Michael L., O75313.
Warner, Nelson M., O67489.
Warren, William R., O67491.
Wasiak, Joseph E., O66481.
Watkins, Charles E., O66339.
Watkins, Walter L., O97050.
Watson, Carroll R., O82254.
Watt, Gus H., O69571.
Watts, Bobbie M., O79517.
Watts, David E., O67493.
Watts, Harry L., 3d, O79518.
Wayman, Wilbur St. C., Jr., O66119.
Weathers, Robert B., O65936.
Weaver, Clarence S., O75314.

Weaver, Gene A., O70552.
Weaver, Robert McT., O67633.
Webb, Harold T., O67880.
Weber, Edmund G., O67495.
Weed, Mahlon G., O66510.
Wehmeyer, Rubin R., O67498.
Wehr, Arthur J., Jr., O67499.
Weindorf, Donald W., O67500.
Weinert, Donald G., O66281.
Weisflog, James H., O84683.
Welch, James S., O70555.
Welch, Robert L., O67502.
Wensyel, James W., O66336.
Werner Donald R., O67508.
West, Wilfred W., O67510.
Wetherington, Andreul J., O65637.
Wetzel, Robert L., O66448.
Whalen, Thomas B., O92042.
Whalen, Thomas R., O67511.
Wharton, Lonnie V., O65814.
Wheeler, Bernard DeW., O91420.
Wheeler, Robert J., O66483.
Wheeler, Robert J., O67513.
White, James R., O73084.
White, Joseph D., O67515.
White, Loren J., O79525.
Whitener, Hubert J., O68411.
Whiting, Frederick D., 3d, O67516.
Whitmore, James F., O70562.
Wiard, Robert C., Jr., O67519.
Wiens, Gene B., O64855.
Wilcomb, Gerald A., O84687.
Wilcox, William R., O79528.
Wiles, Richard I., O66531.
Willard, Charles G., O70564.
Willcox, Edward C., Jr., O79530.
Willet, Paul J., O69832.
Willey, Donald E., O66124.
Willey, Oliver A., Jr., O74891.
Williams, Bruce F., O67527.
Williams, Charles E., O67528.
Williams, Donald L., O67529.
Williams, Fred A., O67530.
Williams, Harvey D., O68175.
Williams, Joel J., O67532.
Williams, Lewis A., O66273.
Williams, Maurice C., O79532.
Williams, Robert S., Jr., O65517.
Williams, William F., O94970.
Williamson, John A., O75321.
Willis, Maurice L., O67534.
Wilson, Drake, O66286.
Wilson, Harry S., Jr., O66266.
Wilson, Leland A., O95409.
Wilson, Max J., O84897.
Windish, John E., O70567.
Wirth, Gustav A., Jr., O67536.
Wirth, Paul R., O67537.
Witherell, John R., O66251.
Wittbecker, Richard A., O71747.
Woeber, Frank A., O79536.
Womack, Richard J., O92613.
Wood, Raymond D., Jr., O67538.
Wood, Robert L., O85805.
Woodill, William R., O67540.
Woodroof, Robert R., O75325.
Woods, Jack C., O89167.
Wooldridge, William D., O70571.
Wooley, Wilson C., O67542.
Wootten, Angus E., O70572.
Wright, Benjamin C., O65913.
Wright, Gilbert P., O79540.
Wuthrich, Edward E., O66222.
Yancey, Truman E., O75327.
Yarbrough, Charles V., O66604.
Young, Harold G., O84898.
Young, Harrison J., O79542.
Young, Robert S., O71633.
Yuille, Ryan S., O67543.
Zaice, Joseph E., O67888.
Zimmerman, Lawrence E., O92617.

To be majors, chaplain

Beasley, Joseph H., O79688.
Casey, Walter E., O79690.
Egan, Thomas F., O89769.
Fosmire, William L., O79691.
Hasten, Donald B., O85330.
Hawn, Robert H., O96977.
Hayes, James R., O76798.
Lively, Carlos J., Junior, O85200.
Ostrovsky, Jack, O97769.
Saylor, Daniel T., O81866.
Shevlin, John G., O80357.

To be majors, Women's Army Corps

Allen, Mary F., L511.
Busse, Norma V., L467.
Chaffin, Frances V., L567.
Dohnal, June P., L478.
Fea, Jennie W., L542.
Fraser, Betty R., L512.
Grimes, Mary J., L416.
Heinke, Selma F., L558.
Heinze, Shirley R., L417.
Hinton, Edith M., L493.
Hopfenspirger, Nancy M., L418.
Hutchins, Eleanor P., L420.
Isham, Ruth M., L563.
Jebb, Margaret M., L422.
Jefferies, Vashti V., L513.
Lambeth, Maida E., L425.
Lott, Beverly J., L401.
Madden, Margaret J., L485.
Polk, Doris D., L430.
Sansing, Mary J., L487.
Smith, Elizabeth R., Jr., L500.
Stauber, Ruby R., L465.
Stearns, Dorcas A., L437.
Watson, Dorothy L., L514.
Wilde, Elizabeth J., L442.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Allen, George L., O75461.
Altstatt, Leslie B., O75463.
Barton, Dewey L., O77968.
Becker, Quinn H., O75910.
Benjamin, George S., O75918.
Blair, Lawrence C., O88010.
Bowers, Bruce T., O75944.
Brougher, David E., O75963.
Burk, Billy D., O75982.
Campbell, John J., O88606.
Carter, Samuel C., O89805.
Chamberlin, Frank H., O73266.
Coddington, Robert C., O81784.
Cohen, William, O77979.
Collins, James R., O76020.
Dangerfield, Harry G., O78579.
Davis, Thomas E., O97435.
Day, Robert E., O66291.
Deffebach, Roy R., O76066.
Driscoll, Paul J., O76087.
Earll, Jerry M., O88374.
Edland, Robert W., O76100.
Ellis, Donald L., O76102.
Elton, Richard C., O76103.
Ettelson, Donald M., O88056.
Evans, Oliver N., O92320.
Fischer, Stanton P., O76123.
Galas, Stanley M., O88068.
Gallo, Anthony E., Jr., O88069.
Geer, Thomas McG., O76149.
Gillespie, James T., O76154.
Giordano, Wally P., O78585.
Go, Sumio, O89959.
Gorczyca, Casimir A., O76165.
Graham, Gene O., O88080.
Guevara, Santiago F., Jr., O76180.
Hale, Meredith S., O87771.
Harding, Clarke T., Jr., O78586.
Harrison, Richard E., O81845.
Haskins, William L., O77991.
Hersperger, Webb S., O88099.
Himma, Einar, O88395.
Horan, Dennis P., O76239.
Humma, Gerard T., O88106.
Humphries, David S., O78070.
Jackson, William M., Jr., O78000.
James, Frank K., Jr., O87536.
Johnson, Merrill C., O77869.
Johnston, Gerald S., O76271.
Jones, Harry E., Jr., O76273.
Jones, Lee Roy G., O77871.
Juden, Alexander G., Jr., O88406.
Kaku, Michio, O89348.
Ketchum, James S., O76294.
Kimmerling, Richard W., O76297.
Knochel, James P., O76306.
Krouse, John M., O97147.
Krueger, James D., O91303.
Legters, Llewellyn J., O88121.
Leighton, Henry A., O92086.
Leonard, Lawrence M., O76335.
Limesand, Donovan E., O88420.
Lindell, Maurice E., O82346.
Linnemann, Roger E., O90352.
Llorens, Alfred S., O77885.
Lubow, Martin, O76354.
Luttrull, John W., O88134.
MacDonnell, John C., Jr., O88136.
Magruder, Levin F., Jr., O77891.
Mangus, Samuel J., O76368.
May, Russell L., O88142.
McCully, John T., O76407.
McGinty, John B., O88146.
Meyer, Hobart, Jr., O76389.
Miller, William MacA., O75023.
Mittemeyer, Bernhard T., O88156.
Morelli, Robert J., O88159.
Morgan, Richard A., Jr., O77905.
Munson, Wayne M., O88851.
Mutz, Sterling B., O76454.
Nelson, William P., O76463.
Oberlin, David W. W., O76476.
Ognibene, Andre, J., O78012.
Olsson, Ray A., O76481.
Pare, Robert H., O76491.
Peard, William G., O76503.
Pearson, Warren T., O99375.
Penner, Robert, O77919.
Perry, Ronald H., O88470.
Popper, Jordan S., O78019.
Quigley, William F., O76533.
Reese, Herbert E., O76542.
Reid, Robert L., O88186.
Richards, John C., O76552.
Rozanski, Thomas F., O82361.
Sadler, Theodore R., Jr., O76579.
Sallomi, Samuel J., O77932.
Schreiber, Otto J., O77934.
Shinaberger, James H., O77938.
Siemsen, Arnold W., O90603.
Simsen, Donald A., O76633.
Smith, James B., O89382.
Smith, John H., Jr., O76644.
Smith, Thomas J., O76647.
Snyder, Donald L., O88948.
Sommer, Albrecht F. J. W., O78615.
Spaulding, Leland C., O78127.
Spees, Everett K., Jr., O75431.
Stracener, Carl E., O78026.
Tompkins, Forrest G., O88215.
Ward, John E., O92037.
Williams, Derek W., O89645.
Wilson, William B., Jr., O90614.
Wynne, Garnet F., Jr., O88534.
Zullo, Joseph C., O88538.

To be majors, Dental Corps

Acevedo, Alejandro, O75131.
Andrews, Dale H., O87992.
Bird, William C., O73987.
Bleicher, Philip A., Jr., O84765.
Boyers, Robert C., O71449.
Call, Robert I., O96544.
Caulder, Shelley L., O85134.
Coats, William C., Jr., O81783.
Corso, William A., O77824.
Cutright, Duane E., O88641.
Eagan, Clement D., O88053.
Fiebiger, Guy E., O71919.
Fuller, Walter W., O74005.
Gerhard, Roy C., O74944.
Goska, Francis A., O73526.
Griffith, John G., 2d, O74705.
Guilford, Harold J., Jr., O88714.
Holt, John E., O85771.
Hose, Gene C., O88104.
Kelly, James J., O73962.
Kontner, Rudolph J., O75226.
Landolfe, Frank R., O88119.
Lane, Charles E., Jr., O75229.
Larson, Harold R., O91439.
Layman, David E., O88120.
Lowery, Rodney K., O92708.
Martin, James E., O88140.
McDermott, Michael J., O88145.
McFarland, Paul H., Jr., O72514.
Mertz, Harry L., Jr., O74776.
Michaud, Edward C., Jr., O74779.
Mullins, Harold A., O74928.
O'Connor, Tod W., O91480.
Ohlenbusch, Robert E., O92233.
Older, Alva H., Jr., O94121.

Parris, Sam H., O88173.
Poprik, Michael, Jr., O74025.
Prince, Jack P., O74026.
Reif, Charles W., O99966.
Reynolds, Shirley L., O95090.
Robinson, Daniel J., O75278.
Schiele, Raymond J., O75426.
Scott, Walter J., O74839.
Shannon, Charles J., Jr., O94130.
Staffanou, Robert S., O75296.
Stave, Rodney L., O86809.
Strong, Wilbur W., O88212.
Sweeney, Thomas P., O91525.
Volkmann, James A., O89394.
Warren, Elbert A., O91412.
Weber, Dale L., O88520.
Ziegenfelder, Rush F., 3d, O93104.

To be majors, Veterinary Corps

Fischer, George F., O84984.
Ramsey, Frank A., O85646.
Warne, Robert J., O84819.

To be majors, Medical Service Corps

Allen, Joseph K., O70248.
Arnold, John W., O69851.
Barnes, William W., O70263.
Becknell, George P., Jr., O70268.
Billick, Eugene W., Jr., O73463.
Borg, Lavern G., O66713.
Brumfield, Clyde E., OF102149.
Camp, Melvin J., O73026.
Capozzi, Henry P., O71909.
Cardenas-Lartigue, Gilbert O., O92172.
Dube, Thomas S., O71915.
Edell, Joseph E., Jr., O95014.
Faulconer, Ernest B., O71918.
Foegen, George J., O71494.
Ginsberg, David M., O71922.
Greene, Hazel L., Jr., O74946.
Hall, Ellis F., Jr., O70357.
Haskins, Stanley R., O70364.
Heath, Charles V., O95651.
Henley, Stephen, O73098.
Huncharek, John, O84741.
Huntsman, Howard A., Jr., O74951.
Jacox, Gilbert L., O73102.
Kerr, Russell L., Jr., O73471.
Kiel, Richard A., O75381.
King, Zane K., O73043.
Kneessy, Alfred D., O65665.
Krise, Edward F., O69967.
Lail, Eugene, O84743.
Lask, Alphonse F., O71932.
Leven, Fred, Jr., O97415.
McClure, Warner D., O68199.
McDonald, Neil J., O78669.
McGlade, Joseph G., O67843.
McNab, James F., O74923.
McSwain, Earl C., Jr., O71705.
Molli, Louis J., O73472.
Moore, Lynn B., O70436.
Murdoch, Wallace P., O69999.
Oestereich, Orlyn C., O88866.
Patch, Charles E., Jr., O71710.
Pearson, William G., O71948.
Prince, Roy C., O70476.
Pursley, Robert J., O71714.
Ramthun, Gerald A., O67857.
Rea, Robert L., O73480.
Reeves, Joseph, O72780.
Reiter, Robert J., OF103016.
Rezendes, Ernest F., Jr., O71955.
Rigney, Max E., O71957.
Rutkowski, Roman B., O67348.
Sabol, Donald E., O94128.
Saylor, William L., OF103025.
Schmidt, Howard H., O71960.
Shaw, Eugene D., O71721.
Shea, George M., O70500.
Slack, Dana S., O70505.
Stein, Dale R., OF103045.
Taft, Hunter G., Jr., O74030.
Thompson, John H., Jr., O71732.
Tuggle, Joseph M., Jr., O70534.
Warnes, Allan T., O66645.
Watkins, Robert E., O71967.
Wilks, Norman E., O71968.
Williams, George D., Jr., O71896.
Williams, Glenn M., OF100911.
Williams, Vern M., Jr., O71745.
Wilson, Kenneth R., O71969.
Yarbrough, Charles R., O94510.
Yarbrough, Roy D., O75444.
Young, William W., O73489.
Zeiss, Warren W., Jr., O71750.

To be majors, Army Nurse Corps

Anderson, Linnette M., N2799.
Avery, Sarah E., N3069.
Bachmeyer, Janet A., N2943.
Bellar, Mary E., N2890.
Brown, Eleanor N., N2781.
Burlack, Marion F., N2791.
Butcher, Anna M., N2782.
Calcagni, Doris M., N2746.
Chapin, Viola M., N2740.
Coleman, Patricia L., N2733.
Cooper, Jacqueline L., N2998.
Costello, Barbara R., N2792.
Davis, Betty L., N2636.
Dever, Dorothy M., N2705.
Diggs, Gloria M., N2948.
Dolan, Gertrude A., N2637.
Dyson, Barbara J., N2597.
Edwards, Ruth E. J., N3015.
Fink, Barbara P., N2701.
Gipson, Marguerite L., N2596.
Grillot, Florence A., N2768.
Gunn, Ira P., N2769.
Gunuskey, Dolores L., N2693.
Hagarty, Catherine R., N2801.
Hankins, Cecile J., N3080.
Hooks, Doris, N2932.
Judge, Cecilia A., N2903.
Kraemer, Vidalia L., N2703.
Lane, Barbara E., N2604.
Lloyd, Katherine M., N2984.
McCarthy, Kathryn V., N2905.
McHugh, Mary C., N2668.
Minter, Marion L., N2788.
Nelson, Margaret B., N2986.
Nickel, Elsie G., N2725.
Nouchi, Mitsue M.. N2805.
Paradis, Madeleine V., N2600.
Ranberg, Florence V., N2820.
Rodgers, Marie L., N2654.
Simons, Elizabeth A., N2764.
Siegt, Dorothy M., N2823.
Smyth, Anna M., N2790.
Tirado-Gonzalez, Crisonia, N3102.
Turgeon, Beatrice L., N2734.
Vance, Vivian J., N2658.
Wells, Ruby E., N2922.
Young, Mary G., N2697.

To be majors, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Barr, Virginia M., J84.
Cruickshank, Helen E., M10151.
Duncan, Tommye J., J24.
Dyer, Arvilla L., J85.
Gray, Barbara D., M10168.
Morris, Mary V., J86.
Neale, Julia A., R10177.
Reynolds, Cora D., M10141.
Rosenthal, Viola L., R10166.
Sherburne, Jeanne, R10157.

To be captains

Aamodt, Ludvig, Jr., O87000.
Abbuhl, Willmott, O89021.
Abernathy, Eugene B., O84763.
Abrahamson, James L., O87001.
Abrams, Harry C., O87002.
Abreu, Ronald P., O92150.
Adams, Charles M., 3d., O85812.
Adams, Hugh W. H., O91732.
Adams, Hunter W., O85814.
Adams, James W. R., O87003.
Adams, Melvin M., O85816.
Adams, William D., O82380.
Adamson, Henry K., 3d., O87004.
Adkins, Thomas J., Jr., OF102128.
Agee, Damon W., Jr., O85819.
Akers, Jimmy D., O99600.
Akin, Robert B., O84934.
Aleksiunas, Robert A., O99287.
Allanson, Will B., O85120.
Allen, Jerry P., O83847.
Allen, Richard H., O97645.
Allen, Teddy G., O83848.
Alley, Frank M., Jr., O85828.
Allison, James K., OF102796.
Allison, Roy L., O82387.
Allred, Raymond S., Jr., O85399.
Altom, Gilbert J., O85475.
Alvarez, Alfred P., OF102798.
Amend, William B., O86984.
Ammons, David C., O89026.
Amos, John O., O91739.
Anderson, Frederick D., O87005.
Anderson, Richard J., O85835.
Andre, David H., O931[illegible]6.
Andrews, John D., O87993.
Angolia, John R., O85838.
Apostle, Basil N., O85478.
Appleton, Forrest W., O92153.
Apruzzese, Vincent A., O91437.
Argrett, James H., Jr., O85842.
Arndt, Terrence L., O88558.
Arrisgado, Maurice M., O87468.
Arwood, Thomas B., O90217.
Atwood, John B., O94910.
Auyong, Stephen K. H., O85845.
Bacon, Donald D., O93020.
Badger, William W., O95153.
Bagdonas, Edward, O87006.
Bahniuk, Edward M., O91152.
Bair, Arthur H., Jr., O87007.
Baker, David G., O85848.
Balaguer, Melchor C., O83677.
Balberde, Alexander, Jr., O97881.
Baldwin, Alan W., O87009.
Baldwin, Ronald C., O87010.
Baldwin, Roy G., O84942.
Balkovetz, Fred W., O85479.
Banks, John W., Jr., O84943.
Banning, Robert D., O95157.
Bareiss, David A., O85849.
Barkett, John S., O88561.
Barmore, Frederick E., Jr., O85851.
Barnard, Robert H., O85852.
Barnes, Jimmie E., O91549.
Barnes, William R., O85853.
Barnwell, Isaiah E., Jr., O83850.
Barnwell, Marion L., O83851.
Barratt, Richard H., O85856.
Barrett, Peter J., O85857.
Barrett, Richard J., O85858.
Barrett, William M., O85859.
Barrington, David, O85860.
Barros, John J., O85861.
Barrow, John P., O85721.
Barrus, Rollin L., O88334.
Barton, Charles D., O85864.
Basha, Robert T., O91156.
Basham, Harold R., O91550.
Batcheler, George E., O85866.
Baugh, Raymond C., O87014.
Baxter, Thomas R., O84121.
Beach, David R., O85871.
Beach, Dwight E., Jr., O87015.
Beard, Charles T., O89930.
Beard, Louin L., O87017.
Beasley, James W., OF102136.
Beasley, John D., 3d, O85873.
Beasley, Rodney S., O91249.
Beasley, William A., O88335.
Beaumont, Marion E., O92159.
Bechthold, Wayne H., O87018.
Beck, Buddy G., O82413.
Beck, John A., O88565.
Becker, Ronald C., O84122.
Beckett, Jack A., O97125.
Beech, Gary D., O87019.
Behie, Edward H., O85878.
Behnke, James E., O89029.
Beld, Thomas W., O92228.
Belinsky, Howard M., O83680.
Belisle, Aldorien E., Jr., O97799.
Bell, Randall W., O87021.
Benagh, William E., Jr., O87022.
Bennett, Eugene W., O87474.
Bennett, Richard C., O87023.
Bennett, Roger M., O94045.
Benson, Frederick S., 3d, O85882.
Bentley, Robert G., O94272.
Bergevin, Duane B., O83855.
Berman, Leo, O86998.
Bernard, Richard A., O96445.
Berta, Thomas L., O85886.
Bertils, Bertel R., O87025.
Bertolett, Craig R., O87026.
Besson, Frank S., 3d, O87027.
Beurket, Raymond T., Jr., O87028.

Beyer, Alfred H., O91161.
Beyer, Harry C., O82421.
Beyer, Lawrence F., O98320.
Bialkowski, Alan J., O99612.
Bias, William K., OF102409.
Bicknell, Hilton B., O85890.
Bihn, Marvin A., O99793.
Birrane, John H., O85895.
Bishop, Edward L., O85897.
Bishop, John C., O85898.
Bishop, Robert L., O83856.
Biskup, Robert L., O87679.
Blakely, Clyde H., OF101172.
Blanchard, Robert D., O90343.
Blasco, Andrew P., O85901.
Bliss, Richard A., O90133.
Boes, Richard W., O97268.
Bogenrife, Richard E., O85484.
Bohman, Jack E., O87030.
Boles, John L., O85485.
Boles, Wayne T., O85906.
Boliaris, Daniel F., Jr., OF102413.
Boller, Richard R., O97009.
Bond, John A., O85908.
Boothe, Robert S., O83859.
Borgmann, Wayne A., O85910.
Borlund, Thomas V., O87032.
Borstorff, Allan R., O85911.
Bosking, William H., 2d, O85486.
Boss, Jerry L., O99615.
Boston, Louis J., O85913.
Boulware, Jefferson T., Jr., O85128.
Bourque, Archille O., Jr., O99796.
Bowdan, Melvin R., Jr., O91768.
Bowers, Robert F., O87033.
Bowser, William H., O85916.
Boyd, James R., O85917.
Boyd, Robert C., O97285.
Boyd, Thomas G., O91531.
Boyd, William J., O97089.
Boyle, Russell T., Jr., O87036.
Boysen, John H., O85919.
Bradin, James W., 4th, O83866.
Bradley, Holley D., O82437.
Braithwaite, David A., O85921.
Branagan, Brian J., O99295.
Brandt, Harold H., O92279.
Brashear, Hollis N., OF100259.
Brass, Ronald W., O87038.
Braun, Paul A., O84957.
Breedlove, Joe J., O85925.
Breen, William W., O87039.
Brenner, Donald R., O94739.
Breslin, Frederick C., O85927.
Brett, William J., O88588.
Breuel, Albert A., O87040.
Brewer, Robert R., O84128.
Brewster, Nathan H., O82440.
Brickner, Robert L., O91771.
Briggs, Harold L., Jr., O87041.
Broadhurst, Donald G., O82444.
Broksieck, Don E., O99798.
Broocke, Nathan I., O87042.
Brooks, Joseph H., O88343.
Brothwell, Richard W., O97286.
Broullon, Anthony J., O85932.
Brown, Charles S., Jr., O87692.
Brown, Donn W., O96951.
Brown, Elbert L., Jr., O89036.
Brown, Jerry R., O87696.
Brown, Joseph E., O84930.
Brown, Larry D., O93367.
Brown, Michael A., O99296.
Brown, Patty E., O85938.
Brown, Richard L., O85940.
Brown, Roy E., O91559.
Brown, Spencer L., O82449.
Brown, Walter T., Jr., O87043.
Brownfield, Boyd J., O85943.
Browning, David B., Jr., O85492.
Brunkow, Richard O., O99298.
Bruno, Ferando A., O83870.
Bruschette, Jerome A., O82453.
Buchanan, William J., Jr., O85948.
Buckman, LeRoy R., O84129.
Buckner, James L., O85950.
Buczek, Richard C., O91780.
Buell, William C., 5th, O87045.
Buffaloe, Laurence W., O85951.
Bullard, Monte R., O96744.
Bunij, Edwin W., O85494.
Buntyn, James R., Jr., O84130.
Buono, Daniel P., O85954.
Burba, Edwin H., Jr., O87046.
Burchell, Larry E., O87047.
Burkholder, Robert D., O85957.
Burleson, Grady L., O83872.
Burleson, Willard M., Jr., O87048.
Burley, Earl B., O85958.
Burns, Walter L., O82463.
Burrell, Raymond E., O84131.
Burwell, James M., O87050.
Bush, William A., O87051.
Butt, Herbert H., Jr., O88021.
Butts, Orville N., O99618.
Butts, William T., O92170.
Byrd, Charles R., O85962.
Cain, Morton G., O89884.
Calhoun, George H., O85964.
Callahan, Joel T., O85965.
Campbell, George C., OF100246.
Campbell, J Frank, O87053.
Campbell, James T., O91785.
Campbell, Robert P., O96953.
Campi, Francis V., O85969.
Cannon, Edwin E., Jr., O83873.
Cannon, Robert S., O82470.
Cantrell, Ralph D., O84767.
Carbone, Anthony J., O89799.
Carey, Norman C., O85497.
Carlisle, Robert M., O85972.
Carmichael, Rex, Jr., OF102828.
Carmichael, Roderick L., 3d, O96747.
Carr, Benny M., O87055.
Carrier, David R., O87056.
Carroll, Edward J., O85976.
Carroll, John F., O87057.
Carter, Bobby J., O97626.
Caston, James C., O91183.
Cavoli, Ivo J., O89317.
Cercy, James C., O92174.
Chalmers, Paul A., Jr., O87059.
Chancellor, Robert L., O84138.
Chandler, Edward V., Jr., O83877.
Chandler, Fitzhugh H., Jr., O87060.
Chapman, Clarence E., Jr., O95748.
Christie, Jerrold L., O84964.
Christy, William C., Jr., O87705.
Cini, Lyn G., O97098.
Clark, Howard W., O89788.
Clark, Richard A., O88626.
Clark, Richard L., O87062.
Clark, Richard M., O89192.
Clark, Vernon L., O94280.
Clarke, William E., Jr., O87063.
Clary, William T., O88629.
Clement, Joe M., O85996.
Clement, John P., 3d, O84770.
Clifton, James A., O85997.
Clough, William S., O83691.
Cohen, Michael I., O82496.
Coker, James R., O97292.
Colby, Nathaniel F., O87066.
Cole, John W., O84142.
Cole, Leslie W., O88632.
Coleman, Charlie W., O99628.
Collamore, Jerry A., O89834.
Conlon, John F., O86007.
Connolly, John D., O83693.
Conway, Rody M., O87067.
Cook, Donald M., O97893.
Cook, Kenneth J., O89841.
Cook, Robert W., O84144.
Cooley, Russell E., 3d, O86011.
Cooney, Terence P., O89044.
Cooper, Robert H., OF100252.
Cooper, William H., 3d, O82501.
Corby, John F., O87068.
Coreth, Joseph H., O87069.
Cornell, Marcus C., O83694.
Corns, Johnnie H., O94956.
Corr, James C., O87070.
Cortelli, Richard J., O89978.
Cotton, Thomas W., O83881.
Cotts, David G., O87071.
Courts, Philip E., O97895.
Covington, Dwight H., O94281.
Covington, Henry H., 3d, O87072.
Cox, John R., O87073.
Cox, Kenneth E., Jr., O83882.
Cox, Ronald D., O91757.
Coyne, John F., Jr., O93379.
Craig, Hal N., O86019.
Craig, Joe F., O82510.
Cramer, Ronald P., O93380.
Craven, Ronald E., O86022.
Crawford, George S., O85512.
Creasy, Calvin H., O99631.
Creighton, Francis W., O85513.
Crofoot, George W., O94921.
Cross, George B., O88035.
Crowe, Donald F., O86027.
Crowl, Ronald C., O88037.
Crowley, Ronald C., O83884.
Cubert, Burleigh M., O86030.
Culp, Don F., O93033.
Cumming, Richard E., OF101901.
Curran, Francis P., O84149.
Curran, Joseph S., Jr., OF100678.
Curran, Martin D., O86033.
Currin, David M., O84970.
Custer, Leslie L., O94065.
Cyr, Arthur R., Jr., O87076.
Dacey, Robert J., OF102169.
Dahill, John B., O86039.
Dahlinger, Richard K., O97381.
Daines, Guy E., O97103.
Dalhausser, Robert W., O86041.
Daniel, Howard, Jr., O86042.
Dankert, Derald T., OF102446.
Danley, James M., Jr., O99633.
Darby, Barney D., Jr., O86044.
Darling, Ivan R., OF102447.
Dast, William A., O91804.
Davenport, Robert L., O90045.
Davenport, William H., O87722.
David, Ronald C., O88361.
Davis, Alexander D., O93384.
Davis, Bruce H., O97296.
Davis, Charley B., O91806.
Davis, Donald R., O87079.
Davis, George C., O88644.
Davis, Kenneth M., Jr., O97898.
Davis, Paul L., O85517.
Davis, Robert E., O89328.
Davis, Roy J., O88647.
Dawkins, Peter M., O87080.
Dawson, Lawrence S., O86048.
Day, George E., O87081.
De Atkine, Norvell B., O87082.
DeCesare, Armand G., O99457.
De Ford, Dale D., O86050.
De Grant, Robert L., O86051.
DeMetrovich, Frederick F., O88364.
De Mont, Robert W., O87083.
De Nio, Jean H., O82538.
DePace, Anthony J., O85521.
DeRocher, Robert F., O89463.
DeYoung, Thomas A., O86062.
Deasy, William T., OF100699.
Del Buono, John A., O86053.
Del Rosso, Louis J., O99053.
Delikat, Stanley J., O87085.
Demartini, Frank J., Jr., O86055.
Dembinski, Mark L., O84974.
Dendtler, Robert B., O89048.
Dennis, John A., O86057.
Denzler, Ancil L., O93387.
Devereaux, Alfred B., Jr., O87086.
Dewey, Lawrence R., Jr., O86060.
Dexter, Charles E., O99817.
Di Giacinto, Joseph V., O84157.
Dickson, Carroll Z., O86063.
Diehl, Thomas E., O86064.
Dietrich, Regis P., Jr., O86065.
Dillon, John P., O84158.
Dishman, Benjamin E., O87088.
Dishner, Wilbert J., Jr., O83889.
Doehle, Douglas A., O91812.
Domal, Stanley J., O86072.
Dombrosky, Francis B., O82545.
Donahue, Andrew J., O82546.
Donaldson, Orlow B., 3d, O86073.
Dorland, Gilbert N., O87089.
Dorris, Albert F., O87090.
Dorsey, James A., O87091.
Dougherty, George J., O91228.
Doukas, James W., O94853.
Downey, Hal W., O86083.
Downing, William R., O86084.
Downs, George M., Jr., O97901.
Doyle, Stuart G., O83892.
Drago, James P., OF101038.

Draper, Stanford C., O91580.
Drennon, Clarence B., O82549.
Drew, John B., O96963.
Duchin, Ronald A., O86088.
Duggan, Dennis M., O87093.
Dumas, George G., O86092.
Dumas, Jesse D., O86093.
Dunne, Rory W., O87505.
Durham, Thomas F., O86101.
Dyer, Glenn H., O87095.
Dygert, George H., O88373.
Eady, William D., O86102.
Eberhard, Edward J., O87096.
Eckelbarger, Donald E., O87097.
Edison, Robert G., O86104.
Edmond, Holman, Jr., O83893.
Edwards, Donald E., O86106.
Eggleston, Carl B., O86109.
Eiche, Jon J., O86110.
Eklund, Robert G., O91816.
Eldredge, Richard B., O84979.
Eldredge, Robert E., O84164.
Elias, Paul J., O87099.
Elkins, Donald W., O84980.
Ellerthorpe, Donald O., O94292.
Elliott, Charles R., O82561.
Ellis, Orous L., Jr., O83895.
Ellison, William E., O86113.
Emery, Bruce W., O86114.
Emery, James S., O87735.
Emmerson, Arthur, 7th, O87100.
Endicott, Willard E., O86116.
Engler, Jean H., O87101.
Enright, Joseph F., Jr., O87102.
Eppler, Daniel R., O86120.
Epstein, David G., O86121.
Ernharth, Ronald L., O87103.
Eskridge, Robert J., O86126.
Essex, Peter E., O82566.
Evans, Jacky R., O82568.
Evans, Jaye H., O87510.
Evans, Robert D., O87104.
Eward, Harry J., O86130.
Fagan, Allan P., O84165.
Farill, Trent G., O83896.
Farley, Dennis S., O89205.
Farley, John C., O86132.
Farnsworth, Fred L., O82571.
Farrar, Raymond E., O83708.
Farris, Jack B., Jr., O83897.
Fay, Warren E., O95018.
Felsher, Edwin H., Jr., O86133.
Fenton, Charles R., O89675.
Ferguson, James C., Jr., O87108.
Fernandez, Robert A., O86134.
Fernandez, Victor M., O87109.
Ferrick, John F., OF101208.
Fields, Charles G., O86138.
Fields, Harvey R., O83899.
Filer, Robert E., O84167.
Finch, James T., O91822.
Finnerty, Ronald E., O92188.
Fish, Richard O., O83901.
Fisher, Don R., O82576.
Fisher, Luke C., Jr., O85534.
Fisher, Raymond W., O87112.
Fitchett, Donald J., O87113.
Fitzgerald, Robert E., OF102873.
Fitzgerald, William A., Jr., O87114.
Fitzsimmons, John E., O91203.
Fletcher, James E., O85536.
Fletcher, Michael J., O87115.
Fletcher, Thomas H., O87116.
Flitcraft, Stanley G., O86147.
Flowers, Robert G., Jr., O82579.
Fluke, Eugene C., O86148.
Forbes, Maynard C., O84986.
Fortney, Kenneth R., Jr., O87744.
Foster, James E., O86153.
Fournier, Albert L., O92321.
Fowler, Darrell L., O84169.
Fowler, James H., O95321.
Fowler, John G., Jr., O94582.
Fox, Morton, O88379.
Fraase, William K., O86156.
Franklin, George G., Jr., O88064.
Franks, Frederick M., Jr., O87118.
Franz, Jay C., O87119.
Frazier, Robert L., O85540.
Freeman, Bobby H., O93407.
Freiler, John J., Jr., O86159.
French, Uri S., 3d, O93038.
Frey, Heino J., OF100271.
Frey, Robert S., O87121.
Fried, David E., O87122.
Fudge, Eugene E., O86166.
Fuller, Dwight H., O87124.
Gabel, Michael A., O87125.
Gaines, Roger Q., O87127.
Galbreath, Carlton A., O83902.
Gallagher, Robert J., O86168.
Galon, Ezequiel, Jr., O86169.
Garcia, William J., Jr., O87128.
Gard, William B., O82594.
Gay, Andrew McD., Jr., OF102470.
Gayler, James M., O86174.
Gear, Edward R., O84991.
Gegner, William R., O86176.
Gehler, Donald C., O86177.
Geiger, Arthur H., O89060.
George, Alfred W., O87130.
George, James T., O99850.
Gercz, Francis G., Jr., O87131.
Gerhardt, Igor D., O87132.
Gess, William D., Jr., O82600.
Gessner, Charles J. B., O86180.
Getz, Charles E., O87133.
Gibbs, James A., 2d, O87134.
Gibbs, Philip E., O87135.
Gilbertson, Clarence L., O87751.
Gillette, Michael J., O87136.
Gilliam, Glen L., O89061.
Ginex, Thomas D., O87752.
Giraudo, Robert A., O86189.
Gleason, James E., O86190.
Glod, Stanley J., OF100273.
Glover, Ronald F., O91840.
Gomez, Vincent C., O92350.
Gomichon des Granges, Jacques F., O86059.
Good, William K., Jr., O85546.
Goodman, Donald W., O89992.
Goodpasture, Albert V., 3d, O87138.
Gordon, Jack J., O97122.
Gordon, Raymond, O83908.
Goring, Richard H., O86193.
Gorman, Patrick H., O86194.
Goudie, Richard B., O85173.
Gowen, Ralph D., O84176.
Gracey, Lloyd F., Jr., O85755.
Graham, Charles M., O91846.
Grassi, Robert H., O86197.
Graven, Marion F., 3d, O87140.
Gravett, Ray A., O91256.
Gray, David T., O87141.
Gray, Harlen E., O88708.
Greenberg, Paul L., O99651.
Greene, Earnest L., O91850.
Greene, Robert P., O85547.
Greene, Therman R., O86200.
Greeson, James H., O87676.
Grieg, John M., O85417.
Griffin, Arthur R., O87144.
Griffith, Allen L., O82618.
Griffith, James E., O85550.
Griffith, Jerry R., O94858.
Griffiths, Allyn C., Jr., O96609.
Griggs, Donald B., OF101816.
Grim, Richard A., O95294.
Grooms, Jimmy R., O86205.
Gross, Gerald D., O84995.
Groth, Carl H., Jr., O87145.
Groves, James R., O82623.
Guild, William B., O87147.
Guillory, Kenneth R., O89216.
Guinn, Ollie R., O87767.
Gumpf, John A., O93043.
Gunerman, Howard E., O86209.
Gurr, John W., O87148.
Gustafson, Carl S., O92370.
Guthrie, John S., Jr., O87149.
Hackett, Gerald R., O95688.
Haddock, Raymond E., O84996.
Hadjis, John, O91169.
Hagerty, Harve J., O86212.
Hahn, James S., O87151.
Haight, Barrett S., O87152.
Haines, Richard E., O87526.
Hair, Henry H., 3d, O90020.
Hall, James R., Jr., O92378.
Hallman, Rodney G., OF102486.
Hamby, Jerrell E., O85418.
Hamel, Robert D., OF102898.
Hamil, Richard C., O86217.
Hamilton, Welton E., O82638.
Hancock, James B., O92198.
Hankins, James A., O97915.
Hanson, Charles K., O85177.
Hanzel, Richard D., O87776.
Hardin, Robert E., O83915.
Hardwick, Willis C., O85556.
Hardy, John D., O87777.
Harkins, John F., O87153.
Harleston, Robert A., OF100557.
Harmon, Charles P., O84180.
Harmon, Donald G., O86224.
Harmon, Wilburn H., O85761.
Harnly, Richard W., O87155.
Harrell, John R., O87156.
Harris, Arnold F., O86227.
Harris, Douglas R., O94757.
Harris, Henry L., O92385.
Harris, Lyman B., Jr., O99859.
Harris, Wiley V., Jr., O87157.
Harrison, George F., O87158.
Haselton, Hunter G., O86232.
Haskell, Charles T., Jr., O83917.
Haskins, Franklin C., O89501.
Hastings, Clark W., O89502.
Hattori, Masaki, O99655.
Hauschild, John L., O91599.
Havis, Joe D., OF102197.
Hawranick, Theodore, 3d, O94931.
Hawthorne, Raymond S., OF101821.
Hayton, Samuel L., O88092.
Hazen, William C., O95577.
Heald, Paul G., O91265.
Healey, Roger, Jr., O92063.
Heath, Guy H., Jr., O87160.
Heath, Stratton R., Jr., O99063.
Heberle, Charles J., O86240.
Hedrick, Miles C., O96979.
Heim, Craig G., O92392.
Helbling, James J., O85561.
Hempstead, Edward B., O86244.
Hendricks, Carl C., O84183.
Henry, Charles W., Jr., O86246.
Hernandez, Jose A., O82656.
Herr, Edward L., O92065.
Herron, Roy H., O83921.
Hesch, Russell J., O86252.
Hess, Ronald H., O92405.
Hesse, John L., O89505.
Hessler, Thomas J., O85566.
Hewitt, Russell A., O87162.
Hickey, William C., Jr., O82657.
Hicks, Arthur J., Jr., O91339.
Hicks, David L., O87789.
Hicks, Gerald D., O91868.
Higgins, Glenn E., O99869.
Hightower, Louis V., 3d., O87163.
Hill, Jimmy C., O87164.
Hillen, John F., Jr., O85569.
Hilliard, Maurice G., O87165.
Hilmes, Jerome B., O87166.
Hilton, Thomas G., O87791.
Hines, Frank E., O96626.
Hintze, Richard A., O86265.
Hixon, Jerry F., O85570.
Hixson, Peter C., O95040.
Hoagland, Jackson, Jr., O97921.
Hobar, Basil J., O86266.
Hoffman, James E., O82663.
Hoffman, Jason G., O86269.
Hogan, Jerry H., O86271.
Hohl, Richard E., O85571.
Holder, Richard T., O95042.
Hollingsworth, Victor L., O84186.
Holloway, Havis L., O89509.
Holloway, William B., O97205.
Holman, Robert E., Jr., O87167.
Holmes, Ernest L., O88398.
Holst, Raymond H., O91275.
Hooker, George A., O92068.
Hopkins, Richard L., O88743.
Hopkins, Stephen H., O87535.
Hopper, Robert F., O92204.
Horn, Jesse L., Jr., O89511.
Hornaday, Robert W., O91873.
Horton, Franklin N., O86280.
Horton, Lowrey P., O89376.
Horton, William R., O86281.
Hotchkiss, Richard M., O87168.
Houltry, Allyn C., O87169.

Houser, Charles M., O97134.
Houston, Samuel B., O86282.
Howard, Freeman I., O87170.
Howard, James D., O86283.
Howard, Joe, O85574.
Howe, Robert B., Jr., O87171.
Hubler, George E., Jr., O85003.
Hudson, William K., OF102202.
Huggin, Benjamin A., O86286.
Huggins, Bobby R., O86287.
Hughes, Joseph L., Jr., O84189.
Hughes, William L., O99880.
Hull, Arthur V., O89074.
Hulse, Kent O., O85005.
Humes, Walter W., O86292.
Humphrey, Johnny M., O83926.
Hunnicutt, Roy D., O82676.
Hunt, James W., Jr., O89224.
Hunter, Harry D., O99882.
Huntingdon, John P., O87172.
Hurley, William P., Jr., O88751.
Hurst, Joseph W., Jr., O87174.
Hurteau, Joseph C., O87799.
Hutcheson, Samuel Z., O84193.
Hutton, Cuthbert P., O87175.
Hutzler, Ralph L., Jr., O91879.
Hyers, James E., O85006.
Imler, Estan F., Jr., O87177.
Infante, Donald R., O95341.
Inglett, Robert A., O86301.
Ingram, Donald D., O87178.
Ingram, Samuel T., O85578.
Inman, Terence B., O86302.
Irons, Richard L., O86305.
Isaacson, Roy W., O94867.
Isacco, Michael D., O87179.
Ivey, Charles E., O96610.
Ivey, Claude T., O92420.
Ivey, Donald J., O86309.
Ivey, Herman V., O87180.
Ivey, William L., O86310.
Iwai, Robert H., O82681.
Jackson, George B., Jr., O94473.
Jackson, Gordon R., OF102927.
Jackson, Lacy M., O85189.
Jackson, Raymond L., Jr., O95044.
Jaco, Neal T., O97137.
Jacob, Gustave F., OF100293.
Jacobson, Walter R., O89075.
Jagoe, Marcellus H., 3d, O85008.
James, James D., O86312.
Jankiewicz, Edward J., Jr., O88756.
Janosko, Eugene S., O96327.
Jay, Gary M., O97314.
Jayne, Robert K., Jr., O86316.
Jebavy, Ronald J., O82683.
Jefferson, Harvey P., O86317.
Jennings. Gerald R., O90124.
Jervell, Broder L., Jr., O87181.
Joh, John A., 3d, O87182.
Johnsen, Frederick W., O99886.
Johnson, Bruce C., O87183.
Johnson, Charles E., O87184.
Johnson, Darel S., O87185.
Johnson, Dean B., O86326.
Johnson, Floyd C., O82690.
Johnson, Gaylon L., O84196.
Johnson, George P., O87186.
Johnson, Gonzales B., O83931.
Johnson, Harold D., O86329.
Johnson, Harold E., O91887.
Johnson, James O., O83932.
Johnson, Jeremy R., O92674.
Johnson, John P., 3d, O87187.
Johnson, John W., O86330.
Johnson, Michael D., O89814.
Johnson, Richard B., O87188.
Johnson, Richard G., O94090.
Johnson, Stanley R., O86331.
Johnson, William M., O92074.
Jolly, Donald H., O90130.
Jones, Edwin Y., Jr., O86334.
Jones, Gary W., O86336.
Jones, Harry A., O85582.
Jones, James M., O99666.
Jones, Julius E., O86338.
Jones, Manley W., Jr., O87809.
Jones, Martin A., O85583.
Jones, Robert P., O87810.
Jones, Roland A., O86339.
Jordan, George W., Jr., O86341.
Jordan, Josef C., Jr., O86342.
Jordan, Richard K., O87189.
Joyce, John H., O86343.
Joyce, John P., O89347.
Junier, Edward J., O86344.
Jurkowich, George J., O86345.
Kaiser, Samuel E., O82699.
Kaler, William R., O95051.
Kaley, Peter M., OF102512.
Kanarowski, Stanley M., Jr., O87194.
Kane, John S., O92206.
Kane, Paul N., O82702.
Kannarr, Harold E., OF100297.
Kaplan, Kenneth, O86347.
Kapp, Kirby S., O87195.
Karegeannes, Harry G., O92207.
Karl, Edward V., O86348.
Karp, John C., Jr., O86349.
Katsarsky, Leonard G., O87196.
Kawano, Kenneth I., O86350.
Kaye, Francis, O82700.
Keefe, Paul F., O87197.
Keefer, Gary L., O91895.
Keefer, John J., O99667.
Keighler, Howard V., 3d., O82713.
Kell, Wallace A., O86351.
Kellenberger, William E., O86352.
Kelley, Wilbourne A., 3d, O87198.
Kelly, Edward J., O89523.
Kelly, Peter J., O84201.
Kelly, Robert H., O99891.
Kendall, Donald S., O87199.
Kennedy, James M., Jr., O84202.
Kennedy, Paul, J., Jr., O84203.
Kennedy, Thomas J., O86357.
Kenworthy, John H., O90155.
Kern, Jack R., OF102939.
Kernan, Michael F., O85015.
Kerr, Paul J., O88275.
Kesterson, Charles R., O90147.
Keyes, Billy G., O86360.
Kierstead, Dana S., O99893.
Kilgore, Jack E., O91502.
Killian, Howard J., Jr., O88768.
Kimball, William D., O92079.
Kincaid, William L., O85429.
King, Howard F., Jr., O85016.
Kirby, Ernest R., O86369.
Kirshman, Ronald L., O82723.
Kittelberger, Kenneth F., O86373.
Kleb, George R., O87204.
Klein, Alvin A., O87823.
Klein, Frank J., Jr., O99338.
Klein, Stephen, O87205.
Kline, Gary L., O86377.
Klys, Adam J., O84789.
Kneiss, Richard F., O88116.
Knoop, Paul R., O85590.
Koch, Gerald L., O99339.
Kocienda, Richard V., O87207.
Kodama, Lester T., O86381.
Koepfer, Donald J., O86382.
Koger, Ronald G., O93451.
Koisch, John J., O87208.
Kolasheski, Richard F., O85592.
Kolin, Raymond A., O86383.
Komer, James E., O87826.
Koneval, Robert W., OF102945.
Koon, Carl B., O86384.
Korf, Calvin L., O96769.
Kouril, Robert F., O94312.
Kramer, Leo A., Jr., O86388.
Krausz, George M., O96997.
Krawciw, Nicholas S., O87209.
Kromer, William S., O96771.
Kronkaitis, John, O83744.
Krupa, Stephen A., Jr., O91304.
Kubo, Arthur S., O87211.
Kuhn, William K., Jr., O94479.
Kuschner, Andrew K., O87212.
Kushner, John R., O86394.
LaFrance, Richard B., O86397.
La Marche, Bertrand D., O88777.
LaSpina, Jack J., Jr., O99901.
Lacy, Paul J., O88775.
Ladd, Ottie A., O94599.
Ladner, Donald A., OF101835.
Lagana, John J., Jr., O86398.
Lagasse, Louis R., O82739.
Lagutchik, Peter, Jr., O89084.
Lai, Leonard S. Y., O86400.
Lamb, Richard D., O85786.
Lampe, Christian F., Jr., O88415.
Landrum, Donald J., O85596.
Langendorff, Herbert E., Jr., O85598.
Langford, Ollie L., O87213.
Larsen, Henry S., Jr., O87214.
Lasner, Edwin J., OF102952.
Lasseter, Earle F., O89536.
Lauby, Robert F., O88781.
Laughlin, Edward N., O87215.
Lavey, Michael A., O91907.
Lavine, Sanford V., O99074.
Lawrence, Ashton C., Jr., O87216.
Lawson, Owan D., O85602.
LeClere, Dick T., O87217.
Ledbetter, Homer M., O86408.
Lee, Gordon K., Jr., O91627.
Lehmann, Clark T., O91909.
Lehrfeld, William R., O87218.
Leitzen, Thomas R., O86413.
Leonard, Daniel R., OF102526.
Lester, Donald P., O87836.
Letchworth, Robert, O87220.
Lewis, Homer, Jr., O90325.
Lewis, Tedd M., O93458.
Lidy, Albert M., O87223.
Liepins, George, O90200.
Lightner, Thomas G., O95352.
Ligon, John L., O85605.
Linden, Albert H., Jr., O86420.
Lindsey, Charles R., O90201.
Lindstrom, Frank V., O95284.
Linver, Sidney L., O85606.
Little, William E., Jr., O92216.
Livingston, George D., Jr., O82755.
Locklear, James P., O88792.
Lockwood, Edward D., O87840.
Loftus, William K., O85201.
Long, Gary D., O86423.
Long, Melvin D., O89094.
Longoria, Ezekiel, O88795.
Lord, Frederick J., Jr., O90211.
Losey, Roy E., Jr., O87224.
Louney, Patrick D., O88798.
Love, James E., O86429.
Love, Richard M., O87841.
Lovelace, George E., O95065.
Lovvorn, Robert H., O85610.
Lucas, Robert H., O94613.
Lucke, David B., O83747.
Ludgewait, Herbert H., O91753.
Ludlam, Donald M., O87225.
Luedtke, David A., O87226.
Luksik, Franklin D., O82762.
Lunt, Robert G., O85612.
Luther, William A., Jr., O87227.
Lutz, Charles M., O87228.
Luzietti, John E., O94316.
Lyles, Billy A., O94484.
Lymburner, John F., O97623.
Lymn, Harry C., O87229.
Lynch, Eugene S., O92709.
Lynn, Ira I., O87842.
Lytle, Charles E., O87231.
MacDonald, Robert W., O85206.
MacWillie, Donald Mac G., Jr., O86440.
Macci, David K., O85613.
Mackey, Billy O., O85614.
Madden, James W., O87232.
Madden, William L., O86441.
Madigan, Eugene F., O87233.
Madigan, John E., O86442.
Maglin, Richard R., O87234.
Magnussen, Mark H., O87235.
Mairs, Robert J., 3d, O85616.
Malave-Garcia, Samuel, O83943.
Maloney, Mark L., O88804.
Manderson, Ivor C., O86449.
Manderville, Bernard P., O86450.
Manganaro, S Joseph, O96776.
Mann, Hal G., O88138.
Mansfield, Clayton J., Jr., O87237.
Manzo, Fred V., O87238.
Markham, Don, O87239.
Markham, John F., O87845.
Marks, Max G., O89356.
Marley, Ronald W., O86457.
Marlow, John B., OF102097.
Maroscher, Albert G., O86459.
Marsh, Byron D., O87240.
Marshall, William K., O87241.

Martin, Cary W., OF102543.
Martin, Lewis R., O87242.
Martin, Richard H., O86462.
Martinez-Boucher, Rafael E., O83947.
Mason, Donald R., O86468.
Massey, James L., Jr., O87243.
Matchette, Claude R., O86473.
Mathis, Douglas, O86475.
Matteo, Thomas F., Jr., O86476.
Matthes, Donald T., O87244.
Matthews, Edward W., O83360.
Matthews, John P., O85208.
Matzeder, Clarence J., O86477.
Maxson, Ronald G., O83950.
Maxwell, Michael W., O86481.
Mayers, John J., Jr., O87245.
Mays, James L., O86483.
McAllister, Max F., Jr., O83757.
McCabe, Franklyn W., O95358.
McCaig, Tom H., O94771.
McCarthy, Frank T., O99917.
McClurg, Donald W., O87247.
McCluskey, William J., O83951.
McConnell Gerald B., O92222.
McConville, Frederick J., O87248.
McCoy, Jerald W., O87249.
McCracken, Henry E., Jr., O87250.
McCrary, Richard F., O91834.
McCullough, Overton H., O86488.
McCullough, William G., Jr., O86489.
McDonald, Robert A., O87251.
McFadden, John H., O86494.
McFadden, Phillip L., O86495.
McGaw, Charles D., O83671.
McGovern, Richard T., O93056.
McGovern, William L., O95360.
McGranahan, Kenneth L., O94320.
McGrath, William B., O95068.
McInerney, Bernard M., O89253.
McInnes, Thomas J., O88286.
McIntosh, Larry P., O82794.
McKeon, James E., O94110.
McKinnon, Graham, 3d, O85043.
McKinzie, George J., O88826.
McLaughlin, Edward J., O86500.
McLaughlin, Godwin P., O87254.
McLeod, Roger L., O83958.
McLeod, Roy G., O86501.
McMahan, Emmet K., 3d, O92225.
McMicken, Farris G., O99924.
McMorrow, Thomas F., O87255.
McMullen, Clifford C., OF102978.
McNabb, Jerry W., O86503.
McNamara, Andrew T., 3d, O88443.
McNamara, Michael J., O95623.
McNerney, John C., O87256.
McNutt, Joel W., O86505.
McRorie, Raymond C., O99353.
McShane, Donald L., O85436.
McSweeney, Albert, Jr., O87258.
Meadows, Kenneth D., O92096.
Medaris, John B., Jr., O87259.
Megehee, Daniel B., O86509.
Mellom, James T., O85437.
Meloy, John N., O87260.
Mentor, John L., O86513.
Mercadante, Richard T., O86514.
Merchant, Don L., O86515.
Merchant, James L., O86516.
Merritt, Richard H., Jr., O82803.
Metcalf, George P., 3d, O85045.
Metcalf, Ronald C., O86518.
Meyer. Richard J., Jr., O87262.
Mezins, Nikolajs, O85793.
Mickelson, Roger W., O89260.
Miles, Elwyn C., Jr., O93469.
Miles, James L., O84224.
Miles, Peter D., O82806.
Miley, John R., O86524.
Millar, Roger M., O97329.
Miller, Carl J., O86525.
Miller, Gary A., O84226.
Miller, James H., O87264.
Miller, Joseph, Jr., O87854.
Miller, Retsae H., O83962.
Miller, Sheron W., O97949.
Mills, Jerry C., O87266.
Milton, Maurice D., O97331.
Mineo, Nicholas A., O85047.
Miner, William H., O88838.
Minnich, Lawrence E., O87269.
Mitchell, Charles C., O86532.
Mitchell, John R., O86533.
Mitchell, Radcliffe, G, Jr, O91954
Mitchell, Richard G., O88840.
Mitchell, Thomas P., O94492.
Moe, Donald W., O85623.
Moellering, John H., O87270.
Moffitt, Robert B., O87856.
Mohr, Carl E., O99929.
Molthen, Theodore J., O97950.
Monroe, DeWitt T., Jr., O87271.
Montgomery, Horace, Jr., O86536.
Mooney, Thomas R., O87272.
Moore, Claude P., O86537.
Moore, George A., O85049.
Moore, Riley R., 2d, O87273.
Moorhead, John H., O86541.
Moraski, Leon K., O87276.
Moreland, Harry W., O86544.
Moreland, Joseph A., O94878.
Morgan, Harold D., O87858.
Morris, Dannie B., O89111.
Morris, George A., O86549.
Morrison, Marvin E., Jr., OF102570.
Morrissey, Dennis J., Jr., O87279.
Morrow, Douglas C., O93061.
Morton, James O., O85627.
Moses, Johnny M., O86553.
Moss, Marvin F., O87280.
Motley, James B., O86557.
Mountel, William E., O86558.
Mozey, William B., Jr., O86559.
Muchmore, Gilbert L., O85354.
Muirhead, Thomas H., O87986.
Mullen, Cassius J., O87281.
Mullen, William J., 3d, O87282.
Mullenix, Ronald O., O92742.
Mulvaney, Merle LeR., OF100665.
Mulvey, Robert A., O94624.
Murdock, Delon T., OF102573.
Murray, Charles M., OF100322.
Murray, Lark R., O89114.
Murray, Robert E., O97346.
Murry, William V., O87284.
Musil, Louis F., O87864.
Myers, Marvin O., O86565.
Myers, Walter K., O97749.
Myers, William M., O92102.
Nance, Nelson T., O88456.
Nash, John M., O87285.
Naughton, Hugh V., O85051.
Neal, John O., Jr., O87286.
Nee, John R., O91807.
Nelson, Carl W., O86570.
Nelson, Raymond W., O82841.
Nelson, Roosevelt, O83964.
Nelson, Turner L., O84796.
Netzloff, Edwin A., O87287.
Newberry, Milton S., O87288.
Nichols, James M., Jr., 088859.
Nilsson, John A., O89266.
Nishimoto, Masami, O84239.
Noga, Gerald W., O87290.
Nordgren, Alfred E., Jr., O87291.
Norman, Kenneth G., O87292.
Norris, Jimmy R., O92104.
Norton, Graham J., Jr., O90348.
Norvell, Frank C., Jr., O85057.
Novogratz, Robert M., O87293.
Nowak, Leonard G., O85633.
Nugent, Richard O., O86580.
Nulk, Robert A., O84240.
Nunn, Lee R., Jr., O87294.
O'Brien, James J., O87295.
O'Bryan, Michael F., O91659.
O'Connor, Edward J., Jr., O83766.
O'Connor, Hugh T., O87297.
Odell, Ersal D., O91481.
Odom, Fredwin M., O99939.
O'Donovan, Thomas E., Jr., O83767.
Offield, Nathan A., O82852.
Offutt, Edward W., O86587.
Ogden, Gregory T., O86588.
Oliver, Eugene L., Jr., O87301.
Oliver, Robert T., O86593.
Olson, Frederick N., O85634.
O'Meara, Andrew P., Jr., O87298.
Ondecker, Lawrence W., O94327.
O'Neill, Kevin J., O87300.
Oppelander, Robert W., O86596.
Orndorff, John F., O87302.
O'Roark, Dulaney L., Jr., OF100326.
O'Rourke, Thomas A., Jr., O82855.
Orr, John B., O86597.
Orr, Paul F., O86598.
Orth, Richard C., Jr., O86599.
Osborn. John J., O84244.
Osteen, James L., O99942.
Ostermeier, William F., OF102582.
Ostrowidzki, Joseph, O85442.
O'Sullivan, Christopher J., O85063.
Ota, Harry S., O99943.
Ott, John S., O86600.
Otto, Wilbur M., O94880.
Owens, Augustus L., O86602.
Pace, Prewitt, L., O82860.
Paddock, Alfred H., Jr., O91483.
Pangman, James K., O86604.
Paquette, Roger K., O87305.
Parchen, David H., O82864.
Paris, William L., CF101941.
Parker, Purvis L., O89600.
Parker, Raymond L., O87872.
Parker, Robert W., O86611.
Parker, Wendell G., O82866.
Parks, James D., Jr., O87873.
Parolini, George W., O87306.
Paschall, Jim R., O87307.
Pasco, Allen, O85635.
Passarella, Patrick F., O87308.
Pastella, Donald R., O87874.
Patrick, Horace B., O92111.
Patterson, Harvey G., OF103003.
Patterson, Joseph M., O95079.
Pattison, John A., O86614.
Patton, Garry L., O99706.
Pawlik, Eugene A., Sr., O86617.
Peeler, Charles E., O93486.
Penrod, David J., OF102591.
Perkins, Jerry L., O85067.
Perry, Charles C., OF102593.
Perry, Richard O., O84248.
Perry, Robert P., O96672.
Perry, William R., O94632.
Person, James L., O86625.
Peterson, Humphrey, Jr., O94330.
Peterson, Rolland B., O85069.
Petric, John A., O86627.
Peyton, John H., O86628.
Pfabe, Richard K., O85445.
Pfister, Cloyd H., O99708.
Phelps, Keith A., O94633.
Phifer, Thomas K., O86630.
Phillips, Don, O91352.
Phillips, Harold E., O94635.
Phillips, Joseph A., O87311.
Piech, Arthur S., OF103007.
Pierce, Dale W., O83971.
Pierre, Russell, Jr., O86636.
Pietsch, Robert C., O87584.
Pihl, Donald S., O86638.
Pike, James C., O86640.
Pike, Verner N., OF103008.
Pishon, Nicholas E., O86645.
Pistone, Ronald A., O87312.
Pitts, Walter E., Jr., O94333.
Plasket, Richard L., O83770.
Plassmeyer, Martin L., O87313.
Plummer, George W., OF102246.
Plummer, Thomas F., Jr., O87314.
Poach, James R., 3d, O89128.
Poe, Thurel J., Jr., O86652.
Pokorny, Anthony G., Jr., O87315.
Pollard, Gordon K., O82880.
Pollock, William C., Jr., O87316.
Ponton, Hector R., O83973.
Poole, Buddy J., O86657.
Poole, William J., O87317.
Poore, Roger S., O92747.
Pope, John L., O87887.
Posey, Dudley M., O86659.
Posey, Frank D., O82881.
Potts, William E., O96788.
Poudrier, Gerald E., O99379.
Pound, Bruce W., O91356.
Powell, Jamo C., O94636.
Powell, Roger E., O97184.
Powers, Byron L., O91982.
Prahm, Byron F., O82885.
Prentice, Charles C., O87888.
Presnell, Darrell D., O82886.
Price, Herman L., O82887.

Prisk, Courtney E., O87319.
Pruett, Billy R., O85072.
Putman, William P., O89577.
Putnam, Sidney F., O82891.
Quattlebaum, Charles W., O85643.
Quinlan, Patrick J., O85644.
Quinn, John T., O99961.
Quinn, Roger A., O87320.
Raetz, Paul E., O95088.
Raffaele, Eugene J., O86666.
Rafferty, Joseph V., O86667.
Ramey, Harold M., O85645.
Ramsey, Raymond R., Jr., O87321.
Ranch, Lewis C., O87323.
Randall, Thomas G., O85446.
Rapaport, Benjamin, O86668.
Rask, Richard H., O87893.
Ratcliffe, John P., O86670.
Rath, Peter F., O89579.
Raupp, Edward R., O82895.
Ravan, Jack E., O87324.
Rawlings, Charles S., O93073.
Ray, Harry D., Jr., O86671.
Ray, Paul H., OF102604.
Rebholz, Edward S., O85647.
Recher, Ronald R., O87326.
Reddin, Thomas E., O86672.
Redding, Frank J., 3d, O87327.
Redmond, Burt P., O84254.
Reed, George B., O99716.
Reed, John W., O86673.
Rees, Warren K., O83975.
Reid, Loren D., O83435.
Reid, Thomas F., O89480.
Reinen, Robert H., O87898.
Reinhard, Donald R., O87328.
Renalds, Hugh H., O87329.
Reneau, Joseph S., O91363.
Renfro, Ronald D., O84255.
Resley, Patrick E., O85075.
Rewerts, David G., O86675.
Rhen, Thomas A., O91988.
Rhoads, Milton D., O86677.
Richard, Virgil A., O86680.
Richards, Arthur E., 3d, O86681.
Richards, Gerald T., O85651.
Richardson, Celeste T., O91365.
Richardson, Joseph B., O89135.
Richardson, Odie B., Jr., O92243.
Rider, Charles R., O88897.
Riggs, Gary A., O90674.
Rill, Joseph H., Jr., O82908.
Riordan, Robert W., Jr., O87331.
Rizzo, Peter J., O83977.
Roach, Armand D., Jr., O89281.
Roberts, Joel E. L., O86689.
Roberts, Milton R., O82913.
Roberts, Thomas D., 2d. O87334.
Robinson, Charles A., Jr., O85079.
Robinson, Edward C., O87335.
Robinson, James C., Jr., O83978.
Roche, William H., Jr., O91366.
Roeming, Fredric E., O86697.
Roesler, Gilbert E., O87336.
Rogers, David H., O87337.
Rogers, Frederick T., O91367.
Rogers, James D., O91994.
Rogers, James H., O90185.
Rogers, Richard E., O87338.
Rogers, Richard L., O85655.
Root, Duane B., O83980.
Roppo, Leo J., O85245.
Rosamond, John B., O88905.
Rose, Robert S., O82921.
Ross, Lawrence C., O87340.
Rothblum, Richard A., O87342.
Rougeau, James L., O90439.
Rounseville, Richard G., O86706.
Roush, David L., O87344.
Rowe, James C., O87345.
Rubio, Euripedes, Jr., O99722.
Rugenstein, Edgar H., O86708.
Runke, Richard P., Jr., OF100341.
Rusch, Richard M., O84262.
Rushton, Pierce A., Jr., O87347.
Russell, Frederick W., 3d., O84263.
Russell, Thomas B., O87348.
Rutledge, Leslie E., Jr., O82930.
Ryan, Robert H., O87350.
Ryburn, Glenn O., Jr., O97031.
Ryker, George C., O97032.
Sadler, Richard C., O86713.
Salley, Robert W., O86715.
Salomon, Leon E., O91678.
Salter, Ronald H., O87351.
Sambol, Donald G., O90452.
Sanaker, John M., O92538.
Sanders, Clarence B., Jr., O86717.
Sanders, Paul B., O82933.
Sanner, Herman R., O82934.
Santos, Melecio Z., Jr., O87353.
Sargent, Terrence D., O82935.
Satterwhite, James J., O87355.
Sauer, Jack L., O84265.
Saunders, James D., O83781.
Sauvageot, Jean A., O91378.
Schafer, Lawrence H., O82940.
Schiano, Louis J., O86725.
Schlapak, Benjamin R., O86726.
Schlieper, David P., O91681.
Schloesser, Robert P., O97196.
Schlossberg, Arnold, Jr., O83986.
Schmacker, Bruce E., O87358.
Schmid, Karl F., O86729.
Schmid, Thomas W., O99986.
Schmidt, Peter B., O87359.
Schneebeck, Gene A., O86731.
Schooner, Murray J., O83784.
Schor, Stephen H., O86734.
Schorr, Gerard J., O85662.
Schott, Joseph D., O92247.
Schow, Robert A., Jr., O87362.
Schrader, Johnie R., O91506.
Schreifels, Eugene H., O94889.
Schriver, Robert F., O88490.
Schroeder, Romayne E., O88916.
Schroeder, Louis J., O87364.
Schuette, Ronald W., O85250.
Schultz, Gary E., O88919.
Schumann, Reinhard H., O89597
Schwab, Don A., O85083.
Schwartz, Paul R., O94340.
Schwartz, William L., O87365.
Scillian, Billie H., O95387.
Scott, James MacK., O83990.
Scott, John O., O97973.
Scott, Walter J., O92007.
Scott, William A., O86740.
Scovel, Dennis A., O99392.
Sechtman, Paul L., O85252.
Secrest, Bobby P., O92248.
Seitz, John A., 3d, O86743.
Serda, William C., Jr., O83991.
Seybold, Thomas K., O87368.
Shackelford, William L., O99990.
Shaffer, Malcolm S., O86748.
Shain, Robert G., O87369.
Shanahan, Edward J., Jr., O89140.
Sharp, John B., O85800.
Shaw, Terrence L., O86752.
Sheaffer, Phillip G., O87372.
Sheedy, Louis W., O86753.
Shelby, Donald M., O82957.
Shelton, Hal T., O84270.
Shelton, Ronald T., O87374.
Shepard, George T., O82959.
Shepard, Phillip G., O86754.
Shephard, David A. C., O86755.
Sherrell, Wilson J., O86757.
Shilling, Jack C., O87913.
Shock, John P., Jr., O87375.
Shouse, Delbert F., O86758.
Shriver, Louis M., Jr., O83790.
Shrontz, Alva G., O99992.
Shunk, William A., O94132.
Silva, Warren R., O86763.
Simmons, Jerry W., O97979.
Simpson, Donald T., O87378.
Simpson, John D., O87379.
Simpson, Robert M., O94343.
Simroe, Theodore W., Jr., O87380.
Sims, John R., OF101045.
Singer, Lawrence A., O91383.
Singleton, Richard, OF102633.
Sisson, Brooks H., O87381.
Sisterman, Lawrence E., O86768.
Sitten, John R., Jr., O84273.
Sivert, William D., Jr., O89379.
Skidmore, John D., O90491.
Skowronek, Richard P., O87382.
Slater, Paul A., O87618.
Slayton, Emmett, Jr., O86774.
Slifer, Richard D., O86775.
Slocum, Neil R., O88939.
Smart, Donald L., O87383.
Smart, Lee D., O88207.
Smith, Allen D., O85667.
Smith, Billy V., O86777.
Smith, Charles E., O86778.
Smith, Duane N., O85669.
Smith, Edward C., Jr., O84275.
Smith, Gary N., O93079.
Smith, Glenn A., 2d, O86780.
Smith, Jack C., Jr., O87384.
Smith, Lee C., Jr., O83994.
Smith, Richard N., O82978.
Smith, Robert A., O89383.
Smith, Robert B., OF100352.
Smith, Robert T., Jr., O85261.
Smith, Stanley L., Jr., O92124.
Smith, Thomas S., Jr., O87621.
Smith, Warren S., O87385.
Smith, William G., O95626.
Smitherman, Joe V., O88945.
Snell, Douglas H., O92252.
Snell, Robert A., O84276.
Snow, Quentin E., O88497.
Snyder, Thomas E., O83995.
Socks, Hugh J., Jr., O87386.
Solomon, Irwin E., O85262.
Solomon, William V., O82985.
Soriano, Feliciano P., O86791.
Sovine, Leroy K., O86794.
Sowell, Mark S., Jr., O90623.
Spanjers, Leonard J., O87920.
Sparling, Darryl E., O86796.
Spearman, David L., O83996.
Spears, Tom, O91388.
Spence, James, O97653.
Spera, Francis P., O86799.
Spitz, Harry R., Jr., O92081.
Springfield, Bruce W., O86802.
Squire, John H., O83998.
St. Amant, Joseph F., O87928.
St. John, John E., O99400.
Stadler, Gerald P., O87389.
Stalker, Paul R., O95396.
Stallings, Jimmie L., O90267.
Stanley, Frederick J., O87627.
Stansell, Ernest L., Jr., O86805.
Starley, Vernon B., O85672.
Stauch, Edward G., O87390.
Stead, Robert W., O92018.
Steakley, David L., O87930.
Stebbins, Allen F., O86810.
Stebbins, Ronald S., O86811.
Steele, Jerry T., O84280.
Steele, Merrill F., Jr., O82996.
Stephens, Donald L., O94649.
Stephens, Glen C., OF102639.
Stevens, Eulin L., O86814.
Stewart, Alexander G., O90381.
Stewart, Robert G., O84000.
Stiles, Howard J., O87392.
Stokke, Edward T., OF100009.
Stout, Stephen P., O98558.
Strandes, Peter K., O90525.
Streeter, William F., O86823.
Strickland, Robert D., O89620.
Strickler, John C., Jr., O97361.
Stroh, George C., O86825.
Stromberg, Peter L., O87395.
Stroud, Lamar A., Jr., OF100011.
Stuart, James E. B., Jr., O97334.
Stults, Claude L., Jr., O86828.
Su-Brown, James C., OF100013.
Sullenberger, Louis E., Jr., O87397.
Sullivan, Joseph H., O87398.
Sundt, Richard S., O87399.
Suszynski, Joseph F., O96804.
Sutton, Donald M., O84284.
Sutton, James C., OF100499.
Sutton, William M., Jr., O92021.
Svendsen, Don F., O87400.
Swain, Richard C., O92129.
Swan, Sinclair O., O83015.
Sweeney, Robert F., O86837.
Swindells, John E., O86838.
Swinson, Benjamin L., O91401.
Szustak, Frank G., O86842.
Talbot, Ralph, 4th, O90538.
Talkington, Thomas E., O90163.
Tamer, Robert S., O87940.

Tannenbaum, David L., O87634.
Tarbet, Kenneth D., O91526.
Taylor, Harry, Jr., O98471.
Taylor, James R., O87941.
Taylor, Paul W., O88970.
Taylor, Ralph W., O86846.
Taylor, William D., O86847.
Taylor, William E., O84004.
Temple, William E., O87401.
Tennant, Charles E., O87402.
Tennis, Gayland L., 083020.
Terry, Robert L., 092132.
Terseck, Richard J., O86850.
Thibodeau, Charles A., Jr., O83801.
Thoma, Charles J., O89390.
Thomas, Charles R., 088972.
Thomas, Kenneth E., O84006.
Thomas, Marvin L., Jr., O87403.
Thomas, Phillip J., O86853.
Thomas, William S., 3d, OF103052
Thompson, Billie F., O85679.
Thompson, James P., Jr., O86856.
Thompson, John T., Jr., O94503.
Thompson, Paul F., 2d, O86857.
Thompson, Robert A., O87945.
Thompson, Vernon D., O86858.
Thornton, Tommy W., O93526.
Thudium, Christian C., Jr., O87404.
Tillar, Donaldson P., Jr., O87405.
Tilling, William T., Jr., O84287.
Tipka, John W., O86861.
Tippin, Garold L., O83025.
Tipton Carl W. O90111.
Tobin, Ernest H., O99746.
Todaro, Joseph E., O87406.
Todd, Alan R., O97212.
Tomberlin, John R., Jr., O91710.
Tomiczek, Paul W., Jr., O87407.
Tompson, John C., O86864.
Toner, Richard M., OF100880.
Toothaker, Thomas R., O86866.
Torretto, Richard J., O87951.
Toskey, William M., O87408.
Townley, Robert R., O85274.
Tozier, Robert E., O87644.
Treacy, John T., O87645.
Tredinnick, Richard E., O97485.
Tremayne, James R., O94898.
Tripp, Frederick G., O83031.
Tritaik, Wayne A., O86871.
Tritz. James W., O87410.
Tucker, Everette L., Jr., O83032.
Tucker, John D., O86873.
Tucker, Tracy W., O86874.
Tucker, Woodson C., 3d, O90561.
Tully, Walter B., Jr., O87411.
Tunnell, William R., O98338.
Turenne, Paul N., O84011.
Turgeon, Gareth M., OF100361.
Turley, Jesse D., 3d, O86877.
Turner, Peter J., O89303.
Turner, Rex M., O88509.
Turner, Robert A., O87413.
Turpin, Robert P., O95110.
Tyler, Erven S., O87414.
Tyler, James R., O82372.
Uhler, Robert G., C86880.
Uhlrich, Theodore W., Jr., O83034.
Ulzheimer, Robert, O83806.
Unger, Curtis G., OF101841.
Urciuoli, George R., O93094.
Valandry, David D., O97215.
Valimont, Benjamin F., O90568.
Van Devender, Edward P., O84013.
Van Loben Sels, James W., O87415.
Van Steenbergen, Albert R., O83807.
Van Zandt, Homer R., OF102653.
Vanhooser, David P., O85687.
Vanlandingham, Robert E., O85688.
Vansant, Keith F., O97366.
Varley, William L., O99405.
Vaughn, John P., O84291.
Venden, Roger, D., O86891.
Venzke, Gene A., O86892.
Vermette, Robert E., O94901.
Versace, Humbert R., O87417.
Vinetti, Peter A., O86896.
Vogl, Raymond E., O94354.
Volpe, Michael, O83808.
Waddell, Marion F., O83043.
Wagner, Edward H., O83044.
Wagner, Michael P., O83517.
Wagner, Robert C., O85689.
Wait, William M., O86900.
Wakelin, John D., O94507.
Walker, Clifford M., Jr., O89307.
Wall, Kenneth L., O86903.
Wall, William J., Jr., O86904.
Wallace, Malcolm K. R., O86905.
Wallace, Richard C., O83049.
Walsh, James E., Jr., O87418.
Walsh, Richard J., O88992.
Walter, Dennis I., O87419.
Walters, Charles C., O83051.
Walters, James P., O87421.
Walton, Ronald A., O83052.
Walton, Warren J., O89160.
Warmath, Julius G., O85384.
Warren, Warren J., O87424.
Warvi, Martin, M., O98279.
Wasson, James V., O85694.
Watson, Charles W., O97803.
Watson, Kermit G., OF103070.
Watts, Thurman, O85279.
Weatherly, Emory D., Jr., O88996.
Weaver, Carl A., Jr., O87425.
Webb, Daniel J., O83058.
Webb, Earl E., O92606.
Webb, James R., O88223.
Webb, Waldo R., O86915.
Webber, Paul B., O83059.
Weber, Ralph P., O87426.
Weber, William J., O91416.
Weekley, Robert M., O87430.
Weeks, Joseph P., O86916.
Weeks, William J., Jr., O86917.
Weisler, Julian E., 2d, O87432.
Weiss, James J., O99413.
Welch, Richard D., Jr., O87433.
Welker, John J., O86921.
Wells, James L., O86922.
Wells, Theodore D., O87434.
Welsh, Richard W., O84020.
Wesel, Robert M., O86925.
Westgard, William C., O86927.
Wheeler, Albin G., O93100.
Wheeler, Joseph W., Jr., O87437.
Wheeler, Robert A., O87438.
Wheeler, Rock C., Jr., O84297.
Whitacre, Dorwin H., O99414.
White, Donald P., O85100.
Whitehead, Dorsey M., O83068.
Whiteside, Jerry E., O86930.
Whitley, Henry G., Jr., O86931.
Whitmarsh, Donald B., O88228.
Whorton, Billy L., O92608.
Wicker, Raymond K., OF100042.
Wickstrom, Charles J., O85700.
Widder, David J. W., O86934.
Wigner, Larry R., O94509.
Wilbanks, Ronald H., Jr., O92043.
Wiley, Larry N., O87440.
Wilhite, James A., O84022.
Wilkerson, Edwin A., O86937.
Wilkinson, Cicero, O84023.
Wilkinson, Coleman D., O92045.
Wilkinson, Tary D., O85701.
Williams, Billy D., O85702.
Williams, Donald B., O87441.
Williams, Joe E., O87442.
Williams, Phillip J., O93540.
Williams, Robert S., Jr., O84025.
Williams, Russell L., O96553.
Williams, Stuart H., O92273.
Williamson, Alan R., O86940.
Willoughby, Kenneth L., O84026.
Wilmoth, Frederick L., O87443.
Wilson, Carroll R., O86941.
Wilson, Douglas B., Jr., O83812.
Wilson, Gifford D., O94802.
Wilson, Henry W., O86943.
Wilson, James F., O88232.
Wilson, John S., O87444.
Wilson, Martin L., O86945.
Wilson, Sanford H., OF102678.
Windham, William J., O86946.
Winebarger, Marion C., O86947.
Winter, Maurice G., O86950.
Wise, George W., OF100046.
Wise, Ronald T., O91728.
Withington, Robert J., O83815.
Witter, Lee F., O84300.
Wolfe, June E., Jr., O91540.
Wolfe, Rodney D., O87978.
Wood, Robert D., O83083.
Woodall, Jack D., O84301.
Woodhouse, Donald L., O86955.
Woods, Roy S., Jr., O86956.
Worthington, Wayne L., O87980.
Wosicki, Walter J., O87446.
Wright, Dean W., O91432.
Wright, Willie F., O86960.
Yateman, Sidney H., O87448.
Yates, Richard P., O86963.
Yawn, Malcolm T., OF101149.
Yeats, Philip L., O87449.
Yelverton, Rush S., O87450.
Yoder, Kenneth E., O83817.
Yon, Frank E., O86967.
Young, Carl L., O86970.
Young, Leon A., OF103084.
Young, Troy R., O87672.
Zachary, James L.. O92149.
Zagalak, Stanley J., O87452.
Zahn, Kenneth C., O86973.
Zajac, Stephen G., O86974.
Zaldo, William T., 3d, O87453.
Zeltman, Ronald W., O84305.
Zierak, Robert A., O86976.
Zierdt, William H., 3d, O87454.
Zimbrick, Duane E., O85712.
Zukowski, Albin T., O87675.
Zumbro, Harold D., O85714.

To be captains, Chaplain

Banks, Dallas C., Jr., O97372.
Bartley, Don L., OF102134.
Borson, Bernard K., OF102142.
Brough, Alfred E., OF100242.
De Santis, Michael M., O99038.
DeVeaux, John A., Jr., OF102172.
Greenspan, Alan M., OF102194.
Hanson, James E., O97762.
Lembke, Paul W., O99191.
Linderman, James R., OF100308.
Millard, Harry L., O98547.
Moore, Bobby D., OF100319.
Scott, John C., O99727.
Van Meter, James W., Jr., O97990.
Wilk, Max W., OF100365.

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Carroll, Sallie L. E., L606.
Gross, Dorothy M., L629.
Hodges, Mae E., L612.
Kelly, Jacquelin J., L601.
Murray, Haraldean, L605.
Phillips, Charlotte E., L581.
Thornton, Dorothy J., L584.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Abrams, Arthur J., OF100862.
Allison, Howard H., OF102795.
Ballard, Jerry D., O99784.
Barclay, William A., OF102404.
Barreca, Nicholas E., OF102405.
Beaver, Harry C., OF102137.
Biles, Andrew R., Jr., OF101799.
Blumhardt, Ralph, OF101801.
Boulis, Matthew N., OF102143.
Brown, Frank M., OF100490.
Buckingham, Frank M., OF100244.
Carolan, Patrick J., OF100764.
Cavanagh, Richard C., OF102830.
Clark, James R., OF100249.
Clarke, John S., OF102159.
Cudia, Joseph, OF102444.
Eversmann, William W., Jr., OF102176.
Falchetta, Stephen L., OF101812.
Finkel, Arnold, OF101813.
Fishburn, Bruce R., OF101085.
Fleurant, Lucien B., OF101152.
Fravel, William J., OF102875.
Gardner, William R., OF101814.
Gerlock, Amil J., Jr., OF102880.
Gibbons, Robert B., OF101073.
Groesbeck, Clarence J., OF103365.
Gross, Alton F., OF100218.
Handley, George J., OF100457.
Hansen, Raymond A., OF100469.
Harper, Randall C., OF100278.
Harris, Hugh G., OF101819.
Hess, Richard J., OF100952.
Hobson, Robert W., 2d, OF101822.

Hodges John McI., OF101823.
Hofeldt, Fred D., Jr., OF101108.
Hovey, Leslie M., OF102501.
Hunter, John D., Jr., OF102503.
Kearney, John J., OF101827.
Knepshield, James H., OF101832.
LeVine, Richard B., OF100659.
Lehman, Richard H., OF101838.
Linden, David A., OF100739.
Linder, Charles W., OF101839.
Lindstrom, Eric E., OF102216.
Liptak, Richard A., OF100781.
Llewellyn, Craig H., OF100913.
Lowry, Roswell T., OF102218.
Martin, Loren W., OF100312.
McBride, William P., OF102220.
McDonald, Herbert B., OF100107.
McKee, Alan F., OF101845.
McKee, Willis P., Jr., OF102973.
McManis, James C., OF100268.
Miura, Calvin M., OF102231.
Mock, Joseph, P., OF102232.
Nagle, John P., OF102234.
Nelson, James H., OF100436.
Peck, Morgan S., OF102588.
Polender, Bruce A., OF102248.
Ribbe, Robert E., OF100138.
Robinson, Theodore A., OF102611.
Rock, Nicholas L., OF100869.
Ryder, Geoffrey, C., OF101858.
Sacks, Richard P., OF102622.
Samson, Donald W., OF102263.
Sebesta, Donald G., OF100349.
Shaw, James T., OF101859.
Slaughter, John C., O99998.
Smith, Donald R., OF102117.
Solomon, Herbert M., OF101174.
Spicer, Melvin J., OF100115.
Stark, Fred R., OF102637.
Stasko, Thomas W., OF101860.
Stevens, Kenneth McA., OF101264.
Stevenson, James R., OF100389.
Sullivan, Robert G., OF103050.
Thomas, David R., OF101861.
Thomas, Stephen R., OF100683.
Tomlin, Jerrold E., OF102284.
Walters, Theodore A., OF102288.
Webster, Phillip L., OF101864.
Whaley, Sidney F., Jr., OF101198.
Williams, Charles E., OF102296.
Woldoff, Mitchell, OF102680.
Yelland, Graham, OF 101274.
Zuck, Thomas F., OF102303.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Beasley, Joe D., 3d, OF100353.
Bent, Jerry P., OF102814.
Fagouri, Edward L., OF102867.
Goldberg, Stuart E., OF101092.
Henry, Samuel W., OF102493.
Holden, Richard C., OF101207.
King, David L., O98132.
Kirchoff, Rodney M., OF101052.
Matich, Joseph A., OF102020.
Tempel, Thomas R., OF100681.

To be captains, Veterinary Corps

Barck, John C., O99785.
Bixby, Howard R., O97279.
Carraway, Claude W., Jr., O96748.
DePaoli, Alexander, O97702.
Freel, Marvin E., O99843.
Godzik, Joseph R., O99852.
Hilmas, Duane E., O99870.
Huxsoll, David L., OF102923.
Johnsen, Dennis O., O99334.
Keefe, Thomas J., O99890.
Morris, James M., O99931.
Nix, Marvin S., Jr., O99361.
Reddin, George B., Jr., O99385.
Riddell, John R., O97135.
Robinson, David M., O99515.
Sims, William M., Jr., O99229.
Smith, Paul, OF101169.
Stanton, Jack S., O97261.
Stephenson, Edward H., OF101206.
Stumbo, Barney A., O97710.
Van Zytveld, William A., OF100364.
Via, Robert E., Jr., OF100025.
Vosdingh, Ralph A., O99409.
Walker, Jerry S., O99115.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Anderson, Leroy S., O84118.
Bardill, Donald R., O91548.
Bevilacqua, Joseph J., O91553.
Boston, Lester E., Jr., O88576.
Boyd, William M., Jr., OF101203.
Boyer, John W., O91557.
Brady, Patrick H., O88015.
Brewer, Jerry R., O94994.
Burton, Nelson L., O85960.
Carter, William A., O88350.
Cobbs, John R., O85738.
Cohen, Meyer W., O87710.
Corn, Poe R., O95638.
Crow, Kenneth E., O86025.
Cygan, Herbert E., O84971.
Diffie, Dale P., OF102173.
Dimmitt, William A., O88368.
Dix, Richard A., O85523.
Dryden, David D., O82551.
Duffy, Paul F., O88255.
Dupuy, Lloyd C., O86099.
Fain, Ronald A., O84983.
Fechner, Ruben F., Jr., O82572.
Field, Richard W., O86137.
Fletcher, Oliver K., Jr., O88679.
Giroux, Arthur R., O94751.
Good, Roger S., OF100855.
Grodt, Robert G., O96679.
Habeck, Edgar J., O91855.
Hanson, Robert L., O99858.
Harris, Leonard G., O94087.
Hatfield, Earl P., O94463.
Hayes, John D., O83918.
Helgeson, James G., O96981.
Heller, Kyle M., O88730.
Helser, Carl W., O88095.
Higgs, Richard H., O86256.
Hill, William R., O86259.
Hoke, Mark L., O96983.
Hubbart, James A., O92070.
Jackson, Thomas C., O86311.
Jenkins, William N., O85775.
Johnson, Harry D., O94766.
Keim, Walter H., O89232.
Kelling, George H., O85589.
Kennan, James S., O86356.
Kielman, Roger W., O86362.
Lamport, James E., O92084.
Lander, Robert J., O88779.
Lanier, Daniel, Jr., O98439.
LaValley, John W., O94481.
Leach, William O., O85788.
Logan, Robert F., Jr., O83940.
Madden, John T., Jr., O88281.
McLeod, William R., O88827.
Milske, Thomas R., O88155.
Moore, Douglas E., O86539.
Moseley, Robert R., O91946.
Murphy, Robert J., O88853.
Murray, Robert E., O92101.
Norton, George T., O94120.
O'Donnell, Frank P., O85061.
Paul, C. Peter, O87875.
Payne, John C., O86619.
Picha, Norbert O., O88876.
Pittman, Thurman M., O86648.
Poksay, Robert A., O95082.
Proe, John D., O86664.
Roberts, John E., O82912.
Rockwell, John H., O88902.
Roles, Robert H., O91676.
Russillo, Michael P., Jr., O88307.
Scanlan, William H., O88914.
Schiefer, Donald D., O94642.
Short, Edward A., O88204.
Simpson, Calbrieth L., Jr., O86764.
Sites, William G., O88206.
Slyman, George L., O95393.
Snyder, Harvey W., 2d, O87623.
Sobocinski, Philip Z., O94862.
Sorem, David N., O88951.
Summary, Robert J., O93085.
Tuten, William R., 3d, O94656.
Walker, Marvin E., O93096.
Wheeler, Gerald E., O83066.
Wilson, Jack R., 2d, O83075.
Woods, William B., O83085.
Wunder, William H., O89018.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Balkema, Sarah A., N3035.
Berry, Dorothy M., N3055.
Dietrich, Maryanne, N3157.
Gosling, Bernadine J., N3042.
Grady, Henrietta C., N3074.
Hart, Suzanne D., N3054.
Kidon, Shirley A., N3140.
Konstanski, Maria R., N3065.
Latchford, Marie M., N3152.
McCormack, Winifred R., N3050.
McLeod, Darlene K., N2982.
Nakama, Shizuko, N3184.
Scheerer, Marjorie J., N3137.
Scott, Roberta W., N3096.
Seufert, Helen J., N3012.
Sinclair, Janie A., N3108.
Stanfield, Ruby N., N3173.
Tresselt, Elizabeth E., N3062
Troche, Adoree R., N3122.
West, Nina, N3149.

To be captains, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Pavlis, Patricia M., M10186.
Walker, Hilda L., M10193.

To be first lieutenants

Abbott, Paul N., O95413.
Abrams, Creighton W., 3d, OF102394.
Ackerman, Duane V., O95414.
Ackley, Russell C., O95415.
Acklin, James M., 3d, O95761.
Adams, Bobby R., O96301.
Adams, Elmer E., O95418.
Adams, Keith E., O95762.
Ailinger, Lawrence G., O95763.
Akagi, Hart M., O95419.
Alcala, Raoul H., O95764.
Allen, William A., Jr., O95420.
Allgair, John A., O96304.
Alt, Jeffrey C., O95765.
Amon, Lawrence R., O95766.
Amundson, Roger E., O96560.
Anderson, Charles C., Jr., O95767.
Andress, James G., O95768.
Andrews, Eugene S., O95423.
Andrews, Robert P., O95769.
Andrews, Roger C., O95770.
Archibald, Robert C., O96819.
Armstrong, Chalmers H., 3d, O95771.
Armstrong, David A., O95772.
Arnold, Preston T., O92884.
Arnold, Steven L., O95773.
Asherman, Richard E., O92886.
Ator, Richard D., O96563.
Austin, Ralph E., Jr., O92889.
Ayers, Thomas, 3d, O95427.
Babb, Donald N., O95774.
Bachelor, Larry D., O95775.
Baggett, Fred K., O92940.
Baiden, Arthur H., 3d, O96308.
Bailey, Ellis M., O95776.
Bailey, Joseph N., Jr., O95359.
Baker, Philip E., O95428.
Baker, Richard H., O92891.
Baltes, Paul A., Jr., O95777.
Banks, Stephen J., O92893.
Barham, Thomas B., O95432.
Barnes, John W., O92903.
Barry, Richard A., O95778.
Bartelme, Michael J., O95779.
Bates, Phillip H., O96822.
Batt, Howard C., O95780.
Battaglioli, Victor J., O92910.
Baughman, Harold D., O95781.
Bauman, Robert D., O95782.
Baumgartner, Gary W., OF102135.
Baxter, Gene E., O95783.
Beach, Lanny J., O95433.
Becker, Robert A., O93312.
Beckner, Donald W., O95567.
Beedle, Charles E., OF100237.
Beim, Alexander, O96567.
Belke, Richard A., O99790.
Bell, William P., 2d, O96315.
Benchoff, Dennis L., O95784.
Bender, Charles D., O92928.
Bentley, James H., O96317.
Berg, James M., O96319.

Bergeron, Donald N., O95785.
Bergman, Todd L., O95786.
Bernitt, Charles F., O95787.
Berry, Ralph W., O95436.
Berry, Roy C., O95437.
Bickert, Dale J., O92934.
Biddison, Alan McC., O95788.
Bila, Ronald V., O96568.
Bilafer, Martin F., O95789.
Bird, William J., O95790.
Blackwood, William A., Jr., O96321.
Blumhardt, Glen A., O95791.
Blundell, James D., O95792.
Blynn, David M., O95793.
Bobbitt, Joseph R., 3d, O95444.
Bode, John T., O95794.
Bonavolonta, Julius J., O92947.
Bondshu, Arthur F., O95795.
Bonner, Harold S., O92954.
Boose, Donald W., Jr., O92959.
Boozer, Wilburn L., O95796.
Borrello, Ronald A., O95797.
Bothwell, Frederick C., 3d, O95798.
Boudreaux, John S., O96824.
Bowman, Patrick A., O95448.
Bowman, William R., O92973.
Boyd, Harry R., Jr., O95799.
Brewer, Thomas C., O95801.
Briggs, David S., O92988.
Bristol, Donald F., O92993.
Brogi, Robert P., O95802.
Broom, Thad A., Jr., O95803.
Broshous, Charles R., Jr., O95804.
Brown, Arthur S., O95805.
Brown, Charles E., O95806.
Brown, Gary L., O95807.
Brown, Harold L., Jr., O95808.
Brown, John B., Jr., O95453.
Brown, Kenneth N., O95458.
Brown, Martin A., 3d, O92537.
Brown, Morris E., Jr., O95809.
Brown, Robert L., O96826.
Brown, Roger A., O95810.
Brown, Thomas M., O96331.
Brown, William R., O96333.
Browning, Philip Y., Jr., O95812.
Bruckner, Richard D., O95456.
Bryde, Walter J., Jr., O95813.
Bryson, Edward B., Jr., O96334.
Buck, Thomas E., O95814.
Buckley, Daniel J., Jr., O95459.
Bugay, James A., O95460.
Bulger, Dennis B., O93012.
Bungay, David J., O93014.
Burchill, Howard R., O93017.
Burke, Edward J., Jr., OF102426.
Burke, Paul W., O95815.
Burns, Charles S., 3d, O95463.
Burns, Donald A., O95816.
Burns, Gary M., O93024.
Burns, Philip J., O95817.
Burns, Samuel A., O96335.
Burns, William C., Jr., O95818.
Burr, Ralph R., Jr., O95819.
Buttolph, Dan D., O95820.
Butzer, Charles B., O95821.
Byers, John W., O95822.
Byrd, William A., O96823.
Cacioppe, Richard C., O95824.
Calhoun, William R., Jr., O95825.
Call, William A., Jr., O93107.
Callahan, James E., O95502.
Campbell, Winton G., Jr., O96337.
Canary, Patrick L., O95827.
Canatsey, John D., O96338.
Canelos, William A., O93135.
Caram, Meredith H., O94215.
Caristo, Frederic G., O95469.
Carlson, Richard I., O95828.
Carmack, Douglas W., O96339.
Carnes, George P., O95829.
Carr, Sammie T., O95830.
Carter, Benjamin F., Jr., O95832.
Casp, Michael A., O95833.
Cassady, John R., 2d, O96340.
Cassetty, Jimmy L., O96341.
Cassidy, Edwin C., Jr., O95473.
Caufield, Frank J., O95834.
Cauthen, William A., Jr., O95835.
Chadbourne, Glenn A., O95836.
Chandler, Charles R., O95838.
Charbonneau, Ronald J., O93150.
Charrin, Jack R., O96572.
Chegar, Richard D., O95839.
Chisholm, Ronald J., O95840.
Chladek, Richard M., O95841.
Christopher, William G., O95842.
Chrobak, Walter J., O95843.
Clark, Daniel D., O95844.
Clark, Winston B., Jr., O95845.
Clary, Joe K., O96346.
Clement, Samuel A., Jr., O95446.
Cobb, Tyrus R., Jr., O95846.
Colan, Albert R., Jr., O93154.
Cole, Roy W., 3d, O95847.
Coleman, Bennie L., O93157.
Collins, George G., O99301.
Comello, Jerome J., O95848.
Comer, Frederick E., Jr., O95849.
Conn, Joseph E., O95479.
Conners, David C., O93166.
Conway, John L., O96349.
Cooper, Walter A., O95851.
Costain, Phillip A., O95852.
Costello, Daniel S., OF102439.
Cowles, James H., O95853.
Crabtree, Michael A., O95855.
Cragin, Robert O., O95485.
Craig, Lawrence P., O95486.
Crane, Lawrence R., O95856.
Cristina, Barry R., O95488.
Cropsey, Karl S., O96353.
Cross, William M., O95857.
Crow, Rufus C., Jr., O95858.
Crowder, Charlie C., Jr., O95489.
Crowell, Arthur N., O95859.
Culp, Robert S., Jr., O95860.
Culp, Thomas D., O95861.
Culver, Thomas R., O95862.
Cummings, John W., O93194.
Cummings, Walter B., O96575.
Curren, Grindley C., O95863.
Currin, James M., O95864.
Curtis, Anthony McB., O93207.
Curtis, Richard M., O93214.
Dacunto, Lawrence J., O95491.
Dalziel, Dean A., O93265.
Damewood, John H., O93155.
Dansby, Robert F., Jr., O96356.
Danzeiser, David A., O96839.
Dargle, John W., O95865.
Darrah, John W., 3d, O95866.
Darrell, Charles C., O95867.
Daugherty, William F., O95868.
Davies, David M., O96840.
Davis, Alec C., O95493.
Davis, Hugh L., O96358.
Davis, Richard E., O96360.
Davis, Thomas R., O95869.
DeAmico, Anthony R., O95870.
De Bauche, Gary A., O95496.
DeGenhardt, Jacob R., Jr., O95877.
DeGroot, Michael H., O95262.
DeJardin, Alan R., O95871.
DeLuca, Donald P., O93234.
DeMarco, Francis H., Jr., O93240.
DeRossett, William J., O96376.
DeSapri, Donald A., O95872.
DeVore, John E., O95873.
DeVries, Robert K., O95874.
DeVries, Russell, Jr., O95875.
Dean, Kenneth L., Jr., O95876.
Deigert, Richard, O93231.
Denison, Dan L., O95878.
Denton, Donald A., O95879.
Detrixhe, James B. W., O95498.
Deutsch, Henry A., O96362.
Dewey, Victor O., O95880.
Dickinson, Robert C., O95881.
Dieal, William J., Jr., O95882.
Dill, Earnest W., O96363.
Dillard, James H., O94951.
Dilley, John H., Jr., O95883.
Dingwall, Bennett T., 3d, O96577.
Dobbins, Paul J., O95884.
Dodd, James W., O95885.
Dodge, Francis N., Jr., O96579.
Doenecke, William T., O96364.
Dolan, David, O93252.
Dolson, Kenneth R., O95886.
Dominy, Charles E., O95887.
Dooley, James C., O95506.
Dopp, George G. B., O93262.
Dorr, Guy E., O95507.
Doten, Frederick S., O95888.
Douglas, Robert E., O95889.
Downing, Wayne A., O95890.
Draper, Shirley W., Jr., O96366.
Ducatte, Maynard R., O93274.
Duncan, George R., O95891.
Dunmyer, James W., O95892.
Dunn, David R., O93275.
Dupuy, Trevor N., Jr., O95893.
Duzenski, Thadeus A., O99827.
Dworsak, William F., O95894.
Dwyer, Edward J., Jr., O95895.
Easterbrook, John E., O95896.
Eccleston, Thomas F., O95879.
Edwards, Thomas B., O96370.
Eller, James M., O93289.
Elliott, Jackie R., O96371.
Ellis, James R., O95898.
Ellis, Robert L., O95899.
Englund, Douglas M., O96847.
Estes, James H., O99837.
Evans, Donald D., O98159.
Evans, John G., O95900.
Evans, William A., O95901.
Even, Donald G., O93311.
Faley, Thomas E., Jr., O95902.
Fanning, Charles J., O96850.
Fargo. James C., O95515.
Farmen, William N., O95516.
Farmer, Michael B., O93315.
Faxon, Robert M., O93325.
Fee, John E., O95903.
Feeley, Thomas M., O95535.
Feldman, David A., O95904.
Felter, Joseph H., Jr., O93333.
Ferguson, John P., Jr., O95905.
Fillers, Donald J., O96374.
Finlayson, John D., O95906.
Finn, Bertram P., O95907.
Fintel, Arthur T., O95908.
Fiore, Francis A. N., O95909.
Fischer, John A., O96581.
Fischer, William F., O95353.
Fishburne, Elliott C., 3d, O95910.
Fisher, Charles L., Jr., O95911.
Fisher, William R., O95520.
Flint, Dennis D., O95912.
Florence, John P., O95913.
Florreich, James H., O95481.
Forcier, David N., O93347.
Fosbrook, Geoffrey A., Jr., O96582.
Foss, Ardeen R., O95914.
Foss, Kenneth A., Jr., O95524.
Fox, Ralph M., O95915.
Franck, John LeR., O95916.
Franke, Roger W., O95917.
Franks, Clifton R., O95918.
Fraser, Harry L., O95919.
Friedberg, Richard S., O96939.
Froeschle, Joel D., O95920.
Fuellhart, Robert H., Jr., O95921.
Gaglioti, John W., O96377.
Gaillitis, Vilnis, O95527.
Gaines, Glenn T., O96378.
Galanti, Philip J., Jr., O95922.
Gall, John S., O95528.
Garde, Daniel F., O93366.
Gardner, Alan D., O96380.
Garner, Gerald G., O95529.
Garofalo, Ferdinand P., OF102468.
Garrett, Mickey, O95530.
Garrett, Robert P., O95923.
Garvey, Richard E., Jr., O95925.
Garvin, David B., O95926.
Gauthier, John A., O93388.
Gavan, William H., O95927.
Gayer, Barry F., O96382.
Geeck, Philip F., O96583.
Geimer, William S., O96383.
Geiss, Charles G., O95928.
Gerard, Jacques B., O93400.
Gerety, Richard P., O95533.
Gezelman, Allen D., O95929.
Giese, George H., Jr., O93413.
Giese, Paul A., O96584.
Gilligan, Richard M., Jr., O97121.
Gilmore, Gary B., O93420.
Girardi, Alfred F., O95931.
Glaser, Donald S., O93428.

Gleason, James M., O95932.
Glenn, Thomas J., O96388.
Glosson, Clyde W., O95207.
Godshall, Michael L., O95933.
Godwin, John T., O95934.
Goetz, Arthur D., O93429.
Goode, Robert H., Jr., O95936.
Goodrich, Thomas B., Jr., O95539.
Gorden, Fred A., O95937.
Gorder, Charles W., O95540.
Gordon, Don E., 096389.
Gordon, Richard M., O96860.
Graham, Henry L., Jr., 095541.
Grahn, Norman D., O95938.
Grammas, George N., OF101286.
Gramzow, Richard H., O95939.
Grasseschi, Thomas A., O96862.
Greason, Earl S., 3d, O93444.
Grebe, Michael W., O95940.
Greely, Gerald D., O95543.
Green, Joe C., O93445.
Green, Roger W., Jr., O95941.
Greene, Fred W., 3d, O96391.
Greenwalt, Robert D., O95942.
Grev, Ellsworth C., O96864.
Grimshaw, John M., O95944.
Grinder, John T., Jr., O96865.
Gross, Joseph E., 3d, O95945.
Guarino, Joseph L., O95946.
Guillen, Luis E., Jr., OF102481.
Gunderman, George L., O95947.
Gutzman, Philip C., O95546.
Habblett, John S., O95948.
Hagerty, Harry E., Jr., O95949.
Hall, William A., 3d, O96393.
Hameister, Herbert H., O95950.
Hamilton, Edward A., Jr., O95951.
Hamilton, Robert E., O93497.
Handy, George W., O95952.
Hansen, Kraig U., O95953.
Hanshaw, William G., O95551.
Hanson, John R., 2d, O93503.
Hard, Donald W., O95954.
Hardy, Rodolph D., Jr., O93512.
Harper, Robert E., O95956.
Harris, Donald W., O95709.
Harris, Harold E., O95958.
Harrison, Willard E., Jr., O95959.
Hartman, Allison R., Jr., O95960.
Hassell, Richard L., O96396.
Hasty, Donald D., O96397.
Havercroft, Roger V., O95961.
Hawkins, Robert M., O95552.
Hayes, Richard D., O92532.
Haynes, Frank, O96398.
Hecht, Howard B., O95553.
Hecomovich, George S., O95554.
Heigl, James J., Jr., O95962.
Heiser, Joel M. S., O96399.
Heldman, James R., O95963.
Heldstab, John C., O96400.
Heller, Stephen M., O95555.
Helmuth, Richard E., Jr., O95964.
Henderson, Leonard C., O95965.
Henderson, Ronald R., O95966.
Hendren, Ed W., O95967.
Henn, Karl M., O95968.
Hensel, Mark C., Jr., O96403.
Herre, Thomas A., O95969.
Hertel, Guy S., O94106.
Hertel, Herbert C., Jr., O95970.
Hess, Hunter C., O96868.
Hesse, Thomas M., O95557.
Hetrick, James L., O95558.
Heyman, David L., O96404.
Hickey, John J., Jr., O95971.
Hidalgo, Richard L., O96405.
Higgins, Paul R., O96869.
Higinbotham, Lewis, O95972.
Hill, Thomas R., Jr., O96407.
Hillyard, Frederick J., O95973.
Hilton, Roger T., O95974.
Hineman, Phillip D., O99871.
Hinske, Donald P., O95484.
Hirai, Kenneth H., O95561.
Hitch, James K., O94163.
Hodder, Clinton A., O94176.
Hogan, Thomas M., O96408.
Holcomb, Cornelius C., Jr., O95975.
Holderness, Stephen W., Jr., O95976.
Holeman, Robert E., O95977.
Holmes, Larry L., O99875.
Hoos, William A., Jr., O95978.
Horan, David C., O94179.
Hornbostel, John F., Jr., O95564.
Horoschak, Peter P., O95979.
Horton, Chapin, O95565.
Howard, Malcolm J., O95980.
Hueman, Thomas P., O95981.
Hufschmid, Robert G., O95982.
Hughes, William McC., Jr., O95983.
Hull, Vernon R., OF102502.
Hunsicker, John E., 3d, O95984.
Hurst, Lawrence, O95512.
Hurst, Nicholas R., O95985.
Hyde, Clinton O'N., Jr., O95986.
Ingram, William L., O96412.
Irby, Dewitt T., O95654.
Irwin, Richard W., O95987.
Ishoy, Kenneth V., O95988.
Ivy, Charles H., O95989.
Izzard, William A., O95690.
James, Richard A., O95990.
Jankowski, Walter J., Jr., O96592.
Jellett, James M., O96593.
Jennings, Gordon L., O96416.
Jimenez, Tristan C. N., O95574.
Johnson, Cal D., O95991.
Johnson, Joe S., Jr., O95992.
Johnson, Kenneth M., O94219.
Johnson, Marshall B., O95993.
Johnson, Robert P., O94221.
Johnson, William L., O96417.
Johnsson, Erik G., Jr., O95994.
Jones, David M., O95995.
Jones, John W., Jr., O05996.
Jones, Matthew J., Jr., O95580.
Jones, Paul M., O95997.
Jordan, Carl M., Jr., O95582.
Jordan, Robert W., O95998.
Jorgensen, James P., O95677.
Jorgensen, John F., O94227.
Joyner, James L., O96875.
Kambrod, Matthew R., O95999.
Kamm, Ervin F., Jr., O96000.
Kaplan, Thomas J., O96421.
Karlseng, Robert C., O94601.
Karrer, Donald, O96001.
Kay, John R., O94233.
Kays, James L., O96002.
Kehoe, John C., 3d, O94250.
Keller, David L., O96423.
Kelley, Edward M., O91899.
Kelly, David G., O94256.
Kelly, Edward F., O97064.
Kelly, Gerald L., O99669.
Kelly, John J., O96003.
Kelly, Patrick O., O96004.
Kendall, John F., O96005.
Kendall, John L., O94248.
Kent, Richard S., O96006.
Keuker, Christopher H., 2d, O96007.
Keup, Robert A., O94264.
Keyes, August L., O96008.
Kieffer, Joseph S., 3d, O96009.
Kilgore, David M., O96424.
Kilmartin, Thomas J., 3d, O96010.
Kimsey, James V., O96011.
Kinard, William H., 3d, O96012.
King, John H., O96013.
King, Peter G., O96014.
Kirby, John J., 3d, O96015.
Kirchner, Warren F., O95584.
Kirkegaard, Paul J., O96016.
Kirschenbauer, George W., O96017.
Kizer, Carl S., O94273.
Kling, Thomas R., O96018.
Klunk, David G., O95586.
Kohler, Johann R. W., O96020.
Kolker, Edward F., O96427.
Kosco, William G., O96021.
Krause, James E., O96022.
Krause, Robert G., O96023.
Kriesel, Melvin E., Jr., O96024.
Krueger, Don E., O94301.
Krukowski, Edward E., O96025.
Kueny, Joseph J., O94345.
Kunhart, Thomas J., O96428.
LaFrange, Joseph W., 3d, O96429.
LaRoque, Fred R., Jr., O96026.
Lair, Don L., O96027.
Landis, Harry L., OF102950.
Landry, John R., O96028.
Lane, Joseph H., O96029.
Lane, Ronald L., O96030.
Lang, Walter P., Jr., O94368.
Lape, Jerry V., O96031.
Larsen, Arnold L., Jr., O96032.
Lavoie, Wilfred G., O94390.
Lawless, William J., Jr., O94398.
Lawson, Anthony B., O96033.
Lawton, Allen E., O94415.
LeGate, Richard E., O96430.
Learish, Dean L., O96034.
Lee, Roger C., O96035.
Lembo, Richard A., O96036.
Lemon, David L., O94458.
Lewis, Robert P., Jr., O95602.
Liepis, William J., O94547.
Lilley, Robert J., Jr., O96037.
Lindseth, Marvin D., O96432.
Lindsey, James L., O96038.
Lippert, Phillip S., O95603.
Loftus, James S., Jr., O96351.
Logan, David W., O96040.
Long, Hugh W., 3d, O94557.
Loupe, Sylvain MacR., O96041.
Lovett, David E., O95605.
Lovgren, Arthur A., O96042.
Lowrance, Jerry M., O96598.
Lubavs, Konstantins A., O96883.
Lucas, Larry F., O96435.
Luchsinger, Arthur F., O95607.
Lurker, Ralph L., O96043.
Lyle, James M., O94641.
Lynch, Albert F., Jr., O96044.
Lynn, Jon V., O96045.
Lyons, William T., O94646.
MacDonald, John M., Jr., O94663.
MacMurdy, William L., Jr., O96884.
MacNamara, Gervase M., O94671.
Madish, Daniel T., O94672.
Malcor, Dennis P., O96437.
Malley, James H. M., O96048.
Mancuso, Frank N., O94697.
Manley, John R., O94705.
Mann, Thomas L., O95613.
Manning, Eugene B., O95614.
Manzi, Joseph F., Jr., O94717.
Marangola, Joseph C., O94725.
Marble, Kenneth A., O94732.
Martin, Bernard M., O96049.
Martin, Donald H., O96438.
Martin, James R., O96050.
Masington, Nicholas J., Jr., O94740.
Mason, Robert W., O94777.
Massey, George M., O96502.
Mayo, Richard E., O96051.
McAnany, Robert B., O96441.
McAndrew, James M., O94818.
McAndrews, Thomas A., O95617.
McCarthy, Jefferson B., O96052.
McCarthy, Terrance C., O96053.
McCassey, Everett S., O96599.
McClure, Donald L., O96442.
McCollum, Lawrence J., O95618.
McCormick, Michael J., O95620.
McCotter, Orson L., O96443.
McCoy, James B., O96889.
McCrorey, James K., O96054.
McDevitt, James J., Jr., O96891.
McDonald, Robert L., O96055.
McDonnell, Michael R. N., O96056.
McDonough, James M., Jr., O96057.
McDowall, Raymond G., Jr., O96058.
McElhose, Alan F., O96059.
McEnany, Brian R., O96060.
McGarry, Andrew T., OF102551.
McGarry, Thomas W., O96061.
McGurk, Robert S., O96062.
McKay, James F., Jr., O96063.
McKeithan, Clifford M., O96064.
McKenzie, Roger L., O95624.
McKinley, Brian V., O96065.
McKinney, John T., Jr., O96892.
McLaughlin, David R., O96066.
McLaughlin, William H., O96449.
McMahan, Thomas E., Jr., O96067.
McManners, John A., O95625.
McNamara, Paul D. D., O96068.
McQuade, Walter J., Jr., O94884.
McQuillen, James F., O96069.
McRae, Wilton D., O96070.

Meade, William C., 3d, O96071.
Meehan, John F., 3d, O96072.
Meeth, Harry, 3d, O96073.
Meilahn, William M., O95627.
Meier, Thomas R., O94923.
Mengel, Larry L., O96074.
Mennie, Thomas L., O96075.
Menning, Walter R., O96076.
Merriam, Charles S., 2d, O96077.
Meshinsky, Edward, O94959.
Meurrens, Bernard E., OF102555.
Meyer, Ronald J., O94976.
Meyer, Samuel S., 3d, O96078.
Meyers, Frederick F., Jr., O96600.
Meyers, Jerry F., OF102230.
Middaugh, Thomas R., O96079.
Mikkelson, David W., O95629.
Milam, Michael McL., OF102557.
Miller, Allen Z., O96080.
Miller, Frank D., Jr., O96081.
Miller, Robert A., O96601.
Miller, William L., Jr., O96082.
Minson, David C., O96083.
Monahan, Daniel F., O95633.
Monax, Dennis J., O95634.
Montgomery, James R., O92920.
Montgomery, William C., O96451.
Mooney, Lowell T., Jr., O96452.
Mooradian, Moorad, OF102567.
Moore, David W., O96084.
Moore, Donald W., O96602.
Moore, Howard W., Jr., O96453.
Moore, Jimmy R., OF101849.
Moore, Michael, O96085.
Moore, Robert A., O96454.
Moore, Thomas J., O96086.
Mooring, Laurence G., O96087.
Morey, Carter, OF102569.
Morgan, Douglas W., O96088.
Morgan, Paul B., O95061.
Morin, Carl R., Jr., O96089.
Mortensen, Ernest J., O95067.
Mott, William H., 4th, O95087.
Mottola, Louis F., O95099.
Mount, Jimmy D., O96090.
Mount, Wallace K., O96456.
Mueller, Thomas O., O96541.
Mullen, Edward F., Jr., O95118.
Mumford, John B., O96091.
Mundt, David L., O96092.
Munsch, Robert C., O96093.
Murphy, Paul T., O96094.
Murphy, Vincent E., O96095.
Murray, Charles A., O96096.
Murray, Thomas E., 2d, O96097.
Myers, William R., O96457.
Nahlen, Charles L., O96098.
Najjar, Alphonse L., O95126.
Nau, John F., Jr., O96099.
Neale, James F., 3d, O95127.
Needs, Larry R., O96100.
Neidlinger, Darryl M., O96458
Neilson, Robert S., O96459.
Nelson, Peter G., O96605.
Nelson, Phillip E., O96101.
Neumann, David C., O96102.
Nichols, Brent H., O95447.
Nieuwboer, Harry W., O96103.
Noake, David A., O96104.
Noel, Harlan M., O96606.
Nolen, William R., O96462.
Noles, William O., O96463.
Norman, Phil R., O95647.
Northrop, Edward D., Jr., O95133.
Norwood, Marvin P., O96105.
Novotny, John L., O96106.
Nunnelee, Joseph D., 2d, O96107.
Nydegger, Neil K., O96108.
O'Brien, Michael T., O96109.
O'Connor, Dennis M., O95136.
O'Hagan, Patrick J., O95137.
Oldfield, Peter J., O96111.
O'Neal, John W., O96110.
O'Neill, Malcolm R., O95138.
Ord, Robert L., 3d, O96112.
O'Rourke, Thomas C., O95140.
Ostonberg, Thomas F., O96113.
Overcash. Johnny B., O95296.
Pakula, Kenneth R., O96114.
Pardi, Livio F., O96115.
Paris, James R., O96420.
Parker, John C., O95146.
Parker, Wayne B., O96116.
Parowski, Paul R., O95148.
Parsons, Bruce B., O96118.
Partyka, Gerald S., O95149.
Pate, Robert A., OF102585.
Pattarozzi, Anthony A., Jr., O96119.
Paulison, Robert P., O95150.
Paxton, Gary L., O96120.
Pearson, Thomas D., Jr., O96121.
Peay, James H. B., 3d, O95152.
Pederson, James D., O95655.
Pellegrino, Joseph P., O96470.
Pelzl, Albert LeR., O96471.
Pendergraft, Joe E., O96122.
Pendleton, Raymond A., O96123.
Perdew, Eldon L., O96124.
Perrine, Charles H., O95154.
Perry, Richard, O99707.
Perry, Stephen O., Jr., O96661.
Peters, Frederick J., O96472.
Peterson, James C., O96125.
Peterson, Leon L., O95156.
Petrolino, Joseph A., Jr., O96126.
Petty, William D., O96127.
Peyton, Mark T., Jr., O96906.
Pfeifer, Bill P., O96128.
Phelps, Richard D., O95656.
Phillips, David J., O96129.
Phillips, Richard K., O96473.
Phillips, Robert L., O96130.
Piersol, Lawrence LeR., O96475.
Pilton, Gavin W., O95658.
Pincince, George S., OF101003.
Poggenburg, William G., O95659.
Pond, Herbert D., OF101856.
Pons, Philip E., Jr., O96131.
Poole, George E., Jr., O96478.
Popkoski, Edward S., O95159.
Popp, Douglas M. A., 095160.
Porter, Jeffrey B., O95161.
Porter, John D., Jr., O96132.
Porter, Joseph G., Jr., O96133.
Porter, Richard W., OF101857.
Posey, Larry O'D., OF102596.
Power, Joseph W., 3d, O96479.
Powers, William S., O96491.
Prall, Josef D., O95660.
Prezioso, Anthony A., O95167.
Price, Donald A., O96135.
Prince, Howard T., 2d, O96136.
Pryor, Ralph W., O96137.
Quigley, Ralph P., O96481.
Quirk, Gerald L., O96640.
Racouillat, Richard N., O96138.
Reavill, Jackson C., O96140.
Redmond, James L., O96141.
Redmond, Lawrence A., O95175.
Redmond, Robert A., O96142.
Reeves, Stacy E., 3d, O96143.
Regan, John S., O96144.
Reich, Russell O., Jr., O96145.
Reid, Robert L., O96146.
Reimer, Dennis J., O96147.
Remener, Lawrence J., O96148.
Remenicky, James P., O95182.
Remington, Will M., O96149.
Renaghan, Kevin G., O96150.
Rencurrel, Ronald B., O95184.
Renner, John A., O95667.
Rethore, Bernard G., O95186.
Reynolds, Marcel F., OF100732.
Rice, Richard B., O96151.
Richardson, Dennis W., O95669.
Richardson, Lawrence C., O96152.
Richardson, Thomas C., Jr., O96641.
Richardson, Willoughby F., 3d, O95188.
Ricks, Robert E., Jr., O96153.
Riegel, Curtis E., O96488.
Rigby, Joe W., O96154.
Riggs, David K., O96155.
Rintz, Robert E., O96156.
Riordan, Richard G., O95672.
Rishel, Waide N., Jr., O96157.
Robb, Allan D., O96158.
Robbins, Christopher R., O96159.
Roberts, Thomas C., 3d, O97201.
Roche, John H., O95194.
Rockswold, Ellis G., O96642.
Rodgers, Joseph A., O96612.
Rogan, James P., O96492.
Rogers, Douglas H., O95195.
Rohrbacher, Richard, O96160.
Rose, Jerry D., O96161.
Rosenberg, Michael J., O96162.
Ross, William L., Jr., O96163.
Rowe, Dorsey E., O96164.
Rowell, John O., Jr., O96614.
Roze, Uldis R., O96165.
Rubery, Daniel J., O95198.
Rucker, Jack L., O96166.
Ruhmann, Richard A., OF102617.
Rumph, Robert R., O96167.
Rush, Terry J., O95199.
Rushatz, Alfred S., O96168.
Russell, Stanley W., O96496.
Ryan, James C., O96169.
Sagerty, Kenneth T., O96498.
Salter, Douglas N., O96616.
Salvitti, Joseph M., O95202.
Samas, Frank R., OF100344.
Sampson, Jon L., O96499.
Samuels, Seymour, 3d, O95203.
Sanders, Bobby W., O95609.
Sans, John A., O96500.
Sarran, George C., O96170.
Saulnier, Philip J., O95204.
Sawczyn, William, O95680.
Sayera, Ronny J., O96171.
Sazama, Francis J., Jr., O96172.
Scarsella, Alan N., O96173.
Scharpf, Francis R., O96174.
Scheewe, Lawrence R., O96175.
Schein, George, 2d, O96176.
Scherr, William A., 3d, O96177.
Schmidt, James K., O96178.
Schmidt, John L., Jr., O96179.
Schmidt, Marlin E., O96180.
Schmidt, Rodney J., O96181.
Schott, Paul D., O96182.
Schram, Robert E., O96915.
Schroder, John K., O95209.
Scott, Hal G., O96501.
Seamahorn, William E., O96617.
Selby, John R., O96184.
Shaw, Charles L., O96185.
Shaw, Stanley L., O95213.
Sheaffer, Frederick E., O96186.
Shegog. James H., O96619.
Sherard, Stewart, Jr., O96187.
Sholly, David J., O96188.
Shope, Walter R., O96189.
Shuey, Robert D., O96190.
Shulman, Carl D., O96621.
Shutes, Stanford W., Jr., O96191.
Siedzick, Peter S., O96192.
Sikorski, Robert J., Jr., O96193
Simcox, Thomas A., O96194.
Simoneaux, Joseph A., O96195.
Simpson, Benjamin E., O96925.
Simpson, Donald A., O96503.
Simpson, William N., 3d, O95220.
Sims, Larry P., O92888.
Skarupa, Ronald A., O96196.
Sklar, Richard R., 2d, O96197.
Skown, Bernard, O96198.
Slaggie, Thomas J., OF100982.
Slater, Duane L., O96199.
Sloan, John N., O96200.
Smith, Dale F., O96201.
Smith, David B., O95223.
Smith, James A., O96623.
Smith, James A., O96505.
Smith, Larry D., O96202.
Smith, Robert D., O95693.
Smith, Turner T., Jr., O96507.
Smith, William F., O96203.
Smith, William L., O96624.
Snider, Don M., O96204.
Snover, Raife E., O96205.
Snow, Wayne A., O96206.
Snyder, Bradley J., O96646.
Sobieski, Henry F., O95228.
Sobke, John F., O95229.
Spangler, David R., O96207.
Spencer, James J., O96208.
Spencer, Samuel W., 2d, O95699.
Spencer, Thomas A., O96648.
Sperman, Stephen D., O96209.
Spivey, Christopher B., O96210.
Spradling, Eldon H., O96211.
Sprague, Harold E., 2d, O96212.
Sproul, Robert H., O95230.

Sprouse, Derek G., O96213.
Spurlock, James E., O96214.
Stafne, James A., O95702.
Stancer, William H., O96508.
Stancil, Brian M., O96625.
Stanley, Gerald I., O96509.
Stanley, Warner D., 3d, O96215.
Starbird, Edward A., O96216.
Steele, Samuel L., O96217.
Steinle, Peter E., O95232.
Stenquist, Emery C., Jr., O95705.
Stephenson, Dan T., O96219.
Stephenson, Richard C., O96220.
Stewart, Donald E., O96221.
Stewart, John F., Jr., O96511.
Stewart, Phillip R., O96222.
Stiegler, Douglas P., O96512.
Stieglitz, Gilbert J., O95707.
Stone, Tim F., O95710.
Stong, Todd D., O96223.
Storat, Richard E., O96224.
Story, Eddie B., O96513.
Story, Jonathan, 3d, O95234.
Street, Donald R., O96225.
Strohmeyer, James A., O96226.
Stroup, Theodore G., Jr., O96227.
Strunk, William T., O95711.
Struthers, Allen B., O96627.
Sturdivant, Robert D., O96924.
Sughrue, Lawrence T., O96704.
Sullivan, Milton L., O95713.
Swanson, Lawrence E., O96628.
Swant, Billy J., O96650.
Sweeney, Denne A., O96228.
Sweet, George B., 3d, O96229.
Swick, Charles D., O96230.
Symanski, David E., O96231.
Szwarckop, Joseph D., O96232.
Szydlo, Robert B., O95239.
Szymczak, Robert W., O96233.
Tallman, Harold S., O96651.
Talmadge, Roger S., O97192.
Tambling, David F., O95240.
Tanski, Chester J., Jr., O95241.
Tarbet, Robert M., Jr., O96234.
Taylor, John L., O96235.
Taylor, John V., Jr., O95295.
Taylor, Kenneth D., OF102644.
Taylor, Leonard C., O96236.
Taylor, Walter D., Jr., O96237.
Teed, Dan G., O96238.
Telenko, George J., Jr., O96239.
Templeton, Geoffrey B., O95244.
Thees, John D., Jr., O95245.
Thomas, Billie N., O96240.
Thomas, John K., O95722.
Thomas, Robert B., O96241.
Thomas, Steven A., O96630.
Thompson, Stanley E., O96242.
Thrasher, Robert H., O96522.
Tilt, William M., O95725.
Tindale, Alan C., O96243.
Tinnemeyer, Charles W., O96244.
Tomlinson, Gene B., O96245.
Treadwell, David O'N., O96247.
Tremaine, Myron D., O96248.
Tumelson, Ronald A., O96249.
Tumlin, Ronald W., O96250.
Tumpane, James R., O96251.
Turcotte, Gerald V., O95253.
Tyson, Robert D., O95255.
Tysver, Gerald A., O96252.
Ulmer, Jerry W., O95256.
Ulmer, John M., O96253.
Ulveling, Max G., O96530.
Urna, Henry D., O96254.
Van Stone, John S., O95261.
Varela, Louis, Jr., O95731.
Vogel, William McK., O95264.
Voss, Donald J., O96255.
Voss, James G., O95265.
Vranish, John M., O96256.
Waggoner, Ivan LeR., O96257.
Wagner, David W., O95734.
Wagner, Frederic C., 3d, O96532.
Wagner, John H., 2d, O96258.
Wagner, Steventon, O96259.
Walgren, William E., O96633.
Walker, Thomas E., 2d, O96261.
Walker, William L., O95735.
Wallace, Jim B., O96634.
Wallace, Kenneth M., O96262.
Wallace, Roy V., Jr., O96263.
Walsh, Gordon O'D., O96534.
Ward, Francis E., Jr., O95272.
Ward, Robert E., 3d, O96655.
Ward, Windsor E., O96264.
Warner, Stephen D., O96265.
Wasaff, Samuel K., Jr., O96266.
Washington, Thomas E., O96536.
Waters, Lawrence E., O96267.
Waynick, William C., O96537.
Webb, Arthur M., O96268.
Webb, Ernest LeR., O96269.
Webb, Quentin R., O96538.
Weigand, Gerald L., O95278.
Weinfurter, Robert J., O96270.
Weiss, James W., O96271.
Weisz, Paul J., O96540.
Welper, Francis E., Jr., O96272.
Welsh, Myron R., O95744.
Werner, Walter J., O95283.
Wertz, Paul F., O96273.
West, Kenneth M., O96928.
West, Steven G., O96274.
Westberg, William J., O96658.
Westfall, Francis D., Jr., O96275.
Whatley, Tommy V., O96543.
White, William D., Jr., O96276.
Whitehead, William C., Jr., O96277.
Whitlock, Gary B., OF102671.
Whitmore, Stanley E., Jr., O96278.
Wilcox, John G., O96279.
Wilhelm, Alfred D., Jr., O96280.
Wilkerson, Benjamin R., Jr., O96281.
Williams, James E., O95747.
Williams, Michael J., O96549.
Williams, Warren B., O96550.
Williamson, Donald L., O96282.
Willis, Wayne D., O96283.
Wills, Edward L., O96636.
Windom, David L., O96284.
Winkler, John C., O96285.
Withers, Geoffrey D., O96286.
Witzel, Ronald W., O96287.
Woeber, Donald H., O96288.
Wolf, Robert L., O95299.
Wong, Robert Y., O96289.
Woods, Sanderson A., OF102301.
Worthington, Henry W., O96290.
Worthington, James M., Jr., O96291.
Wren, Richard C., O96555.
Wuerpel, Charles L., O96292.
Wylie, Richard W., O96293.
Yearout, Robert DeW., O96662.
Zabik, Robert D., O96294.
Zenker, Ernest G., O96295.
Ziegler, William F., O95309.
Zima, Ernest I., Jr., O95310.
Zinn, Ronald L., O96296.
Zmuida, Paul T., O96297.
Zoller, Norman E., O95243.
Zugel, Raymond J., O96558.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Ralph, Rose A. C., L626.
Smith, Tamma C., L631.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Amos, William H., Jr., O96305.
Baker, John W., 2d, O92890.
Barbour, Michael C., O92898.
Biggs, Barry L., O95439.
Bolte, Gordon L., OF102820.
Bowman, Robert W., Jr., O96326.
Burrell, Charles F., O97288.
Campbell, Austin B., O97289.
Coats, Rogers L., O95476.
Conway, Brian J., O93168.
Davis, Bernard R., O95494.
Elliott, Robert F., O97301.
Gilliam, Frank H., Jr., O96586.
Goldberg, Bertram, O95935.
Grady, Milton, O96390.
Hacker, Helmut F., O96588.
Howland, Elvin B., O94183.
Johnson, Donald A., O95575.
Kerner, George F., O94263.
Klemperer, Walter M., O96594.
Kovach, Frank, O94294.
Kullbom, Merrill C., Jr., O94348.
Laible, James P., O94355.
Long, Freddie E., O96434.
Long, John T., O95604.
Maruca, Robert T., OF100385.
Mazur, John F., O95616.
McGowan, John J., O94345.
Meyer, Gregory C., OF102556.
Mueller, Hans J. W., O97015.
Oliver, Gerald C., O96464.
Oppenneer, Keith D., O97340.
Pedersen, Carl E., Jr., O96469.
Radcliffe, John H., O95170.
Reinert, John F., O95181.
Rexrode, Robert W., OF102608.
Rogers, Bobby E., O96493.
Shaw, George J., Jr., O95686.
Snyder, Charles W., Jr., O95227.
Thompson, Dale L., Jr., O95723.
Thornton, Joseph A., Jr., O96521.
Warner, David J., OF102663.
Weigand, Denis M., O95277.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Beam, Ida M., N3103.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington in the District of Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Washington is a city of contrasts and contradictions. Nowhere is this more apparent than in Government.

Congress has lowered income taxes in the name of giving Americans more of their own money to spend. It also is raising taxes on their incomes in the name of social security.

The country is fighting a war in Vietnam and simultaneously repealing wartime excise taxes because we are not at war.

Our prosperity is the highest in the Nation's history and we are embarking on a massive antipoverty campaign.

Secretary McNamara is sending troops to the Dominican Republic, cutting back our Reserve forces and closing military bases.

We face a long hot summer of discontent and violence on the streets of our cities and a gigantic domestic Peace Corps is being formed.

Beauty has become a national objective and yet we are constructing some of the ugliest public buildings in the world.

The poverty program to help the poor is lining the pockets of its well-to-do administrators.

The administration wants to spend $3 billion for foreign aid in the name of friendship while Uncle Sam is badgered by over a hundred nations at the U.N. and "Yankee Go Home" signs are posted on five continents.

The Pentagon spends $50 billion a year for an Army, Navy, and Air Force and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency clamors for total and complete disarmament.

The President calls for pay raises for Government civil servants and disapproves the size of military pay boosts needed to get many service family incomes above the poverty program level.

We plead with other countries not to develop nuclear weapons and, at the time time, double the overseas stockpiles of our own.

Mountains of surplus crops are stored around the country while the Agriculture Department spends millions of dollars a year learning how to produce more of the same.

In order to maintain a sound dollar, we no longer mint them.

Togetherness and interdependence with Communist countries is being urged at the State Department while Russia expels our diplomats and we expel hers.

Cigarette packages will bear health hazard labels; the National Institutes of Health carries on a vast anticancer crusade; tobacco crops receive Government subsidy.

These are but a few examples of the perplexing ways of Washington. All this may seem confusing to the average person, and the reason it seems confusing is because it is.

However, there is no reason for alarm or despair. It confuses our enemies, too. They have no idea what we are up to either. Therefore, they cannot possibly devise countermeasures to thwart us.

Commencement Address of the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey Before the University of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday June 7, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, we in the Free State of Maryland were deeply honored to have the Vice President, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, make the commencement address Saturday, June 5, 1965, before 4,301 graduates at the University of Maryland. This great American, who has been in the forefront of the fight for human rights in our country, gave the graduating class an address which certainly should stand the test of time in history. It was particularly appropriate that the Vice President selected the University of Maryland—a leading institution in our great Free State—to make his inspiring speech. He certainly set the stage by clearly defining the burden these graduates will carry into their adult lives in our country. I am positive that they will carry this responsibility to guarantee every American equal rights in our society.

The Vice President was honored at a luncheon after ceremonies and Mr. HUMPHREY was kind enough to pay a personal visit to my family in Hyattsville later that day where we were honoring my daughter Sue, who just graduated from the University of Maryland, with a reception for the family and personal friends. I would like to take this opportunity to express the gratitude of my family, myself, and the University of Maryland to the Vice President for giving of himself to us in a great speech and in his personal visit.

Because of the significance of the Vice President's speech it is an honor for me to include it here in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COMMENCEMENT, JUNE 5, 1965

President Elkins, members of the board of trustees, distinguished deans and faculty, members of the class of 1965, parents, and distinguished guests, it is with a deep sense of honor, mixed with a special feeling of pleasure, that I accept this degree from the University of Maryland.

I am honored because I receive this degree from one of America's great institutions of higher learning.

Chartered and opened in 1807 as the College of Medicine of Maryland, this institution became a university in 1812. Today your schools and faculties cover almost every field of human endeavor, and you carry the lamp of learning to every corner of the globe.

In particular, I noted with great pride that Chancellor Ludwig Erhard received an honorary degree from the University of Maryland at the recent commencement of your university's branch in the Federal Republic of Germany. And it is also a matter of some pride to speak at the commencement of the IC4A track and field champion.

But I am especially pleased to be here today for another and quite personal reason. For the past 16 years the Humphrey family has considered Maryland to be its second home. We moved to Maryland in 1949, when I began my freshman term as a U.S. Senator and we have come to cherish our home in Chevy Chase. Despite suggestions to move the Vice President to larger quarters, the Humphrey family is still happily in residence at the same old stand. And we love it.

Today I wish to raise for your consideration a question of utmost importance facing the people of this Nation: How can we conserve most effectively the human resources of America?

President Woodrow Wilson once observed: "I believed in democracy because it releases the energy of every human being."

It has been our remarkable capacity to release the energy of the American people which has set this Nation apart from all others of the world.

And it will be the energy, creativity, and determination brought by Americans to the task of democratic government which will preserve this Nation as a beacon of hope in a weary and struggling world.

The American people must take seriously the necessity of using to the fullest our vast reservoirs of untapped human skills, intellect, and ability existing in this country.

We can no longer afford the luxury of squandering these human resources through poverty, disease, illiteracy, unemployment, or discrimination.

We must, in particular, come to understand that discrimination can assume many forms and many guises. Rural families trapped in the never-ending cycle of low income and inadequate educational opportunities are the victims of discrimination just as directly as Negro families striving to free themselves from the hopelessness of the urban ghetto.

Unskilled workers cast on the scrap heap of the technologically unemployed are lost to this Nation just as completely as Spanish-speaking Americans unable to locate sustained and meaningful employment opportunities.

The simple truth is this: America needs everybody in the difficult business of making democracy work. And, for the first time in recorded history, we possess the economic wealth and the intellectual attainment required to make every American a full partner in this noble enterprise.

I wish to reflect briefly upon one area of particular significance at this juncture in our Nation's history: our efforts to root out and destroy in America the ancient curse of racial prejudice.

Today we stand upon the threshold of a challenging new era in this struggle for civil rights and equal opportunity in America.

Looking back over the past generation, we see a historic victory has been achieved: Namely, the elimination of legalized prejudice and discrimination in America.

Where schools, hotels, restaurants, hospitals, public parks, and public transportation facilities operated on a segregated basis, they usually did so with either the explicit or implicit consent of local, State, or National law.

Whether in a court of law, or on the sidewalk in front of a segregated restaurant, the civil rights movement has been primarily concerned with tearing down these barriers of legalized discrimination.

With the series of historic Supreme Court decisions culminating in *Brown* vs. *Board of Education* in 1954—and with the series of congressional actions leading to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965—this initial phase of the civil rights struggle is now drawing to a close.

I am especially pleased to report that the response to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has been most heartening. In our Southern States, in particular, we have encountered determination to comply with the provisions of this legislation.

And while the press has told of instances where people attempted to thwart the law, the real story has been the far greater evidence of widespread compliance in all sections of the country.

Many brave and courageous persons, both black and white, have been willing to risk their lives, and sometimes to lose their lives, in carrying forward this assault upon the barriers of legalized discrimination.

In large measure we can look with pride upon the dignity and compassion, yes, even the love, which has characterized the efforts of these courageous Americans.

Their actions have demonstrated for every person in this country and around the world that freedom still lives here. They have shown us again that the quest for freedom is the strongest and most compelling force in the world.

We see that victory is not far off, yet, we also know that the struggle has only begun.

And, in many respects, the most difficult and challenging days for America lie just ahead.

In the next few years, we must determine whether or not we can build successfully on this foundation of equal rights and opportunity.

We must discover whether or not American Negroes and other minority groups can now be brought fully into the mainstream of our political, economic, and social life.

Our task will be one of complementing the reality of equal rights with the attitude of equal respect among all peoples and races in America.

For only when equal respect drives out completely the false doctrines of racial superiority will we have fashioned in America a national community worthy of our promises of the past and our hopes for the future.

This is, of course, the basis for equality of regard and respect between Negroes and white persons. It is found in history. It is found in the arts. It is found in the great achievements of countless men and women.

On too many occasions we have failed to acknowledge the remarkable contributions of Negroes particularly to the sum total of human knowledge and achievement. From earliest times in Africa up to the present day in America, the accomplishments of Negroes have been obscured by false history, incomplete history, and rationalized history. And this misleading and misread historical record has played its part in discouraging a climate of equal respect among peoples of all races.

With the help of archeology, with the careful study of African art, with ancient documents and writings, we are just now beginning to rediscover Africa's many contributions to the expansion of human knowledge.

Negroes participated from the very beginning in the discovery and exploration of the New World. And they participated not simply as slaves, but just as frequently as soldiers and sailors, as Jesuit missionaries and as free settlers.

Twenty-six of the forty-four settlers who established Los Angeles in 1781 were Negro. The founder of Chicago was a Haitian Negro, educated in France. When he encountered job discrimination in New Orleans, he traveled up the Mississippi, eventually establishing the first permanent residence on the site of the present-day metropolis.

How many of us recall that the first man to lose his life in the cause of American independence was a runaway slave, Crispus Attucks? You will find his name on a monument on the Boston Common, commemorating the Boston massacre of March 5, 1770. And do we realize that 30,000 Negroes fought shoulder to shoulder with General Washington in our War of Independence?

How much do we remember of Frederick Douglass, a self-educated former slave who overcame tremendous obstacles to attain world renown as an abolitionist orator and publisher and who served in high Government posts in the administration of five Presidents?

How many of us realize that the man credited with perfecting the technique of blood transfusions was a Negro, Dr. Charles Drew? How many millions of persons are alive today because of the pioneering research of this skilled physician?

There are, of course, many more instances and many more names of Negroes and people of other minority groups who have made outstanding but unsung contributions to this Nation's history.

And there exists today across America what Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, has described as the quiet revolution, a revolution stemming from the dramatic increase of Negro enrollment in college and professional schools, from the rising level of income among Negroes, and from the declining rate of school dropouts among Negroes as compared to the population in general.

These men and women are succeeding despite the handicaps of prejudice, of closed doors, of limited or nonexistent educational opportunities, and of the deep psychological wound of being a Negro in a period where this often implied second-class citizenship and back of the bus.

Will we be able ever to calculate the loss to America, and to the entire world, of the potential talent among our Negro citizens which nevertheless sacrificed, and are still sacrificing, for reasons of prejudice and discrimination?

Will we be able ever to realize the terrible human price we have paid in supporting this system of second-class citizenship?

Today we have finally struck down the supporting members of this structure of prejudice. And today we are taking long-overdue steps to build a climate of equal respect for Negro Americans—a climate where each person will have an opportunity to seek fulfillment as a unique and creative individual.

For surely these are the essential elements of man's humaneness: The potentiality for creativity and the ability to pursue excellence. In business, in education, in the professions, in the arts, we are striving to provide Negroes and other minorities with the chance to exercise their uniquely human qualities.

And through such massive efforts as the antipoverty program, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, we are attempting to reach down into the ghetto, into the slum, and into rural areas to give the forgotten youngster a chance to function as a creative, productive, and responsible human being.

We must extend the hand of opportunity to this forgotten individual caught in the ghetto. But it must necessarily remain the responsibility of the individual, as it is the responsibility of every human being, to grasp this hand firmly and with determination.

For any person, whether white or Negro, the pursuit of excellence and creativity involves the willingness to accept responsibility and the courage to take risks. These are the qualities upon which respect thrives. And these are the qualities so abundantly evident in the lives of the Negroes I have noted.

History is written about persons who accepted the challenge of excellence and creativity and ultimately prevailed. I am fully confident that this era will be remembered as the time when America provided every person with an opportunity to accept this challenge, when we discarded forever the shroud of hate and bigotry for the shining mantle of human freedom and dignity.

This will be the time when the human resources of America were truly harnessed in the exhilarating work of extending the blessings of freedom and justice to peoples everywhere.

Michigan's Pictured Rocks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join my colleague, Congressman Clevenger, in his efforts to safeguard and preserve one of the Nation's natural treasures, Michigan's Pictured Rocks shoreline.

The rapid disappearance of open space in general and unspoiled natural areas in particular makes it mandatory that we quickly do all we can to guard and maintain as much of the American wilderness as possible.

In view of our rapid population growth time runs short for the initiation of a really meaningful conservation program. This bill to save Michigan's Pictured Rocks national lakeshore is an important effort in an important direction.

I am privileged to join my distinguished colleague and to sponsor his legislation.

Vice President Humphrey Addresses Syracuse University Graduates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. HANLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my great privilege and pleasure to accompany Vice President Humphrey to the commencement exercises at Syracuse University. Vice President Humphrey delivered a thought-provoking address to the 2,700 graduates and their guests on the role of the Congress in the formulation and execution of national policy.

The Vice President paid us a great tribute by centering his remarks on the tremendous responsibility that the Congress has as a constitutional instrument designed to promote the actualization of democracy. I commend his address to my colleagues, knowing that all of us appreciate his words of praise and his wise counsel.

An Address by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey at the 111th Commencement of Syracuse University, June 6, 1965

Chancellor Tolley, members of the board of trustees, distinguished deans and faculty, members of the class of 1965, parents, and distinguished guests, the honor you have done me today is most deeply appreciated. I am especially delighted that the chancellor and the board of trustees extended their invitation as a result, in part, of a vote of the senior class.

I have always been friendly to votes, and I am always pleased when votes are friendly to me. I do not, of course, know against whom I was running, but I trust that it was some worthy Republican—of which this State has many.

My presence here today is particularly satisfying because this year marks the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Maxwell School. Syracuse University has made many contributions to scholarship and to professional excellence in a wide variety of fields. But, as one who has devoted his life to the public service, I want to express my personal gratitude and the gratitude of the U.S. Government for the work of the Maxwell School.

In addition to Maxwell's outstanding contributions to social science scholarship and the upgrading of the public service, its undergraduate course in public affairs and citizenship is world famous.

Your chancellor tells me that more than 20,000 Syracuse undergraduates have taken this course over the past generation—20,000 citizens who have been educated to their continuing personal responsibilities for the preservation and extension of human freedom on this globe. It is difficult to think of a more fundamental contribution which a university can make to society.

My congratulations go to the Maxwell School for what it has already accomplished and for what I know it will continue to accomplish in the years ahead.

As a former university teacher, I am aware of the pitfalls of commencement speeches. It is so easy to follow the formula: The world is in a mess, the older generation has failed, it is up to the graduating class to put things right. But platitudes rarely change attitudes, and baneful criticism and vapid exhortations are cheap substitutes for hard thought and analysis.

I prefer to take my stand on the proposition that the American people, working through democratic institutions, have met, are meeting, and will continue to meet the complex problems of our age.

If we still have a long way to go—in achieving human equality, in securing international and domestic tranquility, in extending the benefits of our technical genius to all citizens in the American Republic and to all mankind—let us glory in the unfinished agenda.

Let us glory in the fact that we still possess the wit and the wisdom to continue making our American democratic system responsive to the terribly complex problems of this turbulent age.

I want to discuss with this graduating class the importance of one of the great constitutional instruments at the disposal of the American people in the business of making democracy work. I refer to the institution of the U.S. Congress.

What I have to say, I think, needs saying because all too many of our citizens take an indifferent, or even a hostile, view toward the legislative branch.

This is not to underestimate the need for strong and able Presidential leadership or for wise and humane judicial decisions. It is, however, to reaffirm the vital role of Congress in our constitutional system.

Few persons can deal directly with either a President or a Supreme Court. But any person can communicate with his elected representatives in Washington.

The Members of Congress provide a direct link between the National Government and the almost 195 million persons who comprise this Republic.

Surely this connection is vital in keeping our National Government responsive to the needs and opinions of the American people.

I have found congressional service to be a remarkable form of higher education. My teachers have been Presidents and department heads, constituents and the press, and, above all, a group of wise and distinguished colleagues in both Houses.

I cannot in a few minutes convey to you all that I have learned from these teachers. But perhaps I can suggest some lessons in democratic theory and practice which I have gained from my collegial experiences in Congress.

The first lesson has to do with the creative and constructive dimension of the process of compromise.

There are 100 Members of the U.S. Senate; 435 Members of the House. They come from States and districts as diverse as Nevada and New York, Alaska and Alabama. No two States or regions of the United States have identical interests or prejudices.

One of the jobs of Congress is to reconcile such differences through the process of compromise and accommodation.

What sometimes seem to the untutored eye to be legislative obstructionisms are often no more than the honest expressions of dedicated representatives—trying to make clear the attitudes and interests of their States and regions.

As Sir Richard Grenfell once observed: "Mankind is slowly learning that because two men differ neither need be wicked."

From the earliest days of this Republic—at the Constitutional Convention of 1787—the leaders of this Nation have maintained an unwavering commitment to moderation. If our Founding Fathers had not understood the need to overcome extremes in drafting our Constitution, this noble experiment in the art of self-government would have surely foundered on the rocks of dissension and discord.

As in the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention, the heart of congressional activity are skills of negotiation—of honest bargaining among equals. My willingness to compromise—and I have done so more times than I can count—is the respect I pay to the dignity of those with whom I disagree.

Through reasonable discussion, through taking into account the views of many, Congress amends and refines legislative proposals so that once a law is passed it reflects the collective judgment of a diverse people.

Surely this is a remarkable service. Surely, the habits of accommodation and compromise are of universal consequence. These are the skills and attitudes so desperately needed on the larger stage of world conflict.

World order and the rule of law will be secure on this earth only when men have learned to cope with the continuing conflicts of peoples and nations through peaceful processes of legislative bargaining.

A second lesson I have learned from my congressional teachers is the importance of the congressional role of responsible surveillance. There are roughly 70 separate departments and agencies of the Federal Government. Some are small; some are large. All are engaged in carrying out the will of the people as expressed through Congress.

In the interests of efficiency, economy, and responsiveness, these departments and agencies need a continuing critical review by the committees and Houses of Congress. The genius of our Founding Fathers is nowhere more in evidence than in those sections of the Constitution which provide for checks and balances.

Through its review of the executive budget, in the appropriations process, through committee investigations, through advice and consent on appointments and treaties, and through informal discussion, Congress seeks to improve and to support the executive branch of the Government.

This exercise in freedom protects and extends freedom. If legislative voices are occasionally strident, citizens should take stock of what their world would be like if no legislative voices were heard at all.

We know what happens in countries without independent and constructively analytical legislatures.

Mankind invented a word for such systems centuries ago. The word is "tyranny."

But there is a final lesson I have learned from my congressional teachers: the creative joy of politics. Each Congress is devoted in substantial measure to the depelopment of new public policies designed to promote the general welfare and the national security of this Nation. Congress is not a battlefield for blind armies that clash by night. It is a place where national objectives are sought—where Presidential programs are reviewed—where great societies are endlessly debated and implemented.

If, as Emerson once wrote, Congress is a "standing insurrection," it is a standing insurrection against the ancient enemies of mankind: war, poverty, ignorance, injustice, sickness, environmental ugliness, economic and personal insecurity.

Few careers open such remarkable opportunities for translating dreams into reality. A new bill, a creative amendment, a wise appropriation, may mean the difference between health and sickness, jobs and idleness, peace and war for millions of human beings.

Stemming from ancient parliamentary origins, the main job of Congress is to redress grievances, to right wrongs, to make freedom and justice living realities for all. What higher calling exists? This is the essence of politics: to translate the concerns and the creative responses of a vast citizenry into effective and humane laws.

I cannot conclude without a personal note. For almost 20 years, Congress has been my home. As Vice President, my relationships with my former colleagues are inevitably more formal and more intermittent than in past years. Yet I can say unashamedly that I cherish them dearly. I have seen their weaknesses as they have seen mine.

I have on occasion been restive of delays and procedural anachronisms—and so have they. But I have seen in the Halls of Congress more idealism, more humaneness and compassion, more empathy, more understanding, more profiles of courage than in any other institution I have ever known. Like many of you today, I find it in my heart to praise and to thank my teachers.

Perhaps some of these brief words of tribute to the institution of freedom known as the U.S. Congress may stay with you. As long as Congress continues to function as a responsible and viable element in our constitutional system, the promise of American democracy will forever endure—the torch of freedom will forever light the path of the future.

Each of you, however, must also assume a personal responsibility for preserving freedom in these perilous times. And the nature of this responsibility is best illustrated by John Adams' notion of the spirit of public happiness.

It was this spirit, said Adams, that possessed the American colonists and won the revolution even before it was fought—a spirit which is reflected in delight in participation in public discussion and public action. It is a sense of joy in citizenship, in self-government, in self-control, in self-discipline, and in dedication.

An important part of the mission of this great university has been to instill in each of you this spirit of public happiness. And it will be this dedication to public service—found in the hearts of Americans alive today and of generations yet unborn—that will insure the ultimate victory of freemen in their struggle against the forces of tyranny and oppression.

Address by Hon. Horace R. Kornegay, of North Carolina, Veterans of World War I State Convention, Greensboro, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague and friend, Congressman HORACE R. KORNEGAY, of North Carolina, recently was asked to be a principal speaker at the annual convention of Veterans of World War I in his hometown of Greensboro, N.C.

On that occasion, our colleague, who is a combat infantry veteran of World War II and who now serves as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, delivered a cogent and eloquent address in which he supported the foreign military actions of President Johnson in South Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

This very able young Congressman, who fought valiantly for his country in the Second World War—and who holds the Purple Heart award for his own personal sacrifice and contribution—warned the veterans of the First World

War that a "misguided philosophy of appeasement and pacificism" could lead to a repeat of history that got us into both World Wars.

His voice to that group on May 29 is one that should be heard by many and I would like to call his address to the attention of the Members of Congress:

PEACE AT ANY COST: WE CANNOT AFFORD IT

(Address by HORACE R. KORNEGAY, Member of Congress, Sixth District, North Carolina, at Veterans of World War I State convention, King Cotton Hotel, Greensboro, N.C., May 29, 1965)

I am honored to be asked to address this group tonight and I welcome the occasion. That is, I did until this day grew closer and I began to think about what I should say. By the way, if you ever want to get somebody to do something, just ask them to do it a long time in advance. Invariably, they will agree. That's what happened to me. I was tickled to death to get an invitation to come here tonight and agreed readily several weeks ago to come. But, as Saturday, May 29, got closer to us I wondered if I hadn't accepted too hastily.

My talk tonight may be like that of the young preacher's. He had just returned home from delivering a sermon at a larger church to which he hoped to be called. "How was your sermon?" his wife asked. "Which one?" he responded. "The one I was going to give, the one I did give, or the one I delivered so brilliantly on the way home in the car?" I am sure that after I leave here tonight I will think of a number of things I should have said that I failed to mention and that speech will probably be a better one than this one.

But, I am happy to be with you and to be a small part of this wonderful occasion.

Those of you who answered freedom's call during World War I served notice that the United States of America does in principle and in fact believe in freedom and will fight to preserve it wherever necessary.

You were called to arms to "make the world safe for democracy" in a "war to end all wars." The fact that these noble objectives were not 100 percent attained does not preclude the fact that the basic purposes were fulfilled, that the world was made safer—at least for a quarter of a century—for those who desire freedom from tyranny.

You were not the first to go forth in pursuit of our country's quest for world peace and freedom from fear—nor were you the last. For, a generation later, I personally "plowed some of the same ground" that you did in Europe, in another great conflict.

But, the fact that you did, in great numbers and in great strength, go forth into a strange land and engage in mortal combat with an enemy you did not know and who spoke in a strange language made it known that we intend to defy aggression and that we will use whatever force necessary wherever it is needed to defend and protect that cherished freedom which we hold so dear.

This national determination existed then. It exists today. At this very minute, other brave young Americans are standing guard on foreign soil to defend against assaults on freedom. On a narrow strip of rich coastal mountain and delta lands running 900 miles in the tropics along the South China Sea to the Gulf of Siam, there are American troops. They are there tonight—in South Vietnam—because the independence of a nation and the freedom of its people are being threatened by Communist aggression and terrorism. In response to requests from the Government of South Vietnam, the United States has been providing assistance to the Vietnamese in their struggle to maintain their independence and their freedom. We have been there for more than 10 years, during the tenure of three different Presidents of the United States.

In another section of the world, there are other American men and women in uniform, bearing arms in an attempt to halt another Communist takeover in the Western Hemisphere. President Lyndon B. Johnson sent U.S. troops into the Dominican Republic to prevent another Castro-type success in Latin America. His actions were in the interest of national self-defense, since the further extension of communim in this hemisphere would be a very great danger to the peace and safety of the United States.

As we meet here tonight in comfort, in peaceful surroundings up to 100,000 Americans are actively committed to finding peaceful solutions to wartime conditions—in South Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic. Once again, it might be said the United States is a nation of war, for to these 100,000 young men and women, it is a war. Many have died in these far-off places; many more have been wounded in battle. But, even though they are serving in a cold war grown hot, they bleed and die just as your friends did in World War I and mine in World War II.

I think we should support and applaud their efforts, just as you and I were supported in the wars we fought. For some strange, unexplainable reason it has become the "chic" and popular thing to do—especially on college campuses in other parts of the country—to decry this nation's so-called imperialism in Vietnam and to denounce American intervention in Latin America. Taking a lesson from others who use civil disobedience in furtherance of their own personal causes, some of these self-appointed, political experts conduct teach-ins in our inequities, march in protest demonstrations, and write silly open letters to the editor.

This mysterious business is hard to fathom. At the very time when we should let the President and the world know that we approve of defending democracy—at any place, at any time—and at a time when we should make it known to those young soldiers that they are not dying and bleeding for a vain or iniquitous cause.

Just recently Time magazine—certainly no ardent supporter of Lyndon Baines Johnson—described President Johnson as "one of the most remarkable of all wartime Presidents." In a recent speech, the President stated our position in simple, but unmistakable terms. He said, "I think that if the enemy there believes that we are there to stay, that we are not going to tuck our tails and run home and abandon our friends, I believe in due time peace can be restored in that area."

In another talk, in Baltimore last month, he warned: "Let no one think for a moment that retreat from Vietnam would bring an end to the conflict. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another." The President said, and rightly so, that America must draw the line in southeast Asia and in the words of the Bible, he said, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further."

You and I know what would happen if we did follow the advice of the "ivory tower intellectuals and their bearded young pseudo-intellectual friends" and withdraw from Vietnam—and Santo Domingo. We all know what would happen; in just a short while, the red flag of communism would fly over yet another section of the world.

The Kremlin would extend its tentacles to other peoples who are unwilling to come under the sphere of communism, but who are unable to resist.

This well-meaning, perhaps, but misguided philosophy of appeasement and pacifism has a long history. It is not new. But, we are in imminent danger of seeing history repeat itself at this particular moment. Those who picket the White House, the petitioners who buy full-page newspaper ads, the professors and students engaged in weekend teach-ins and even some Members of Congress who proclaim loudly and forcefully for the United States to get out of Vietnam apparently have no concern for what will happen afterward. Surely, they must care; they just don't happen to think about the ultimate consequences and the dangers to America.

Those seeking peace at any price might be reminded that it was just this type of thinking that got us into both World Wars. As you here remember, Congress refused to allow Woodrow Wilson to arm American merchant vessels as protection against submarine attacks. This convinced Germany that the United States would not fight, and as a result the President had to later call for a declaration of war.

Franklin D. Roosevelt had the same experience when the Congress refused to relax the restrictions on the most severe neutrality law in the country's history. Again, our actions encouraged aggressors and led them to believe that the United States would not fight. Then came Pearl Harbor.

This type of exhibitionist conduct on the part of some of our people is giving Peiping, Hanoi, and Moscow, as well as Havana, the impression that we do not support President Johnson. This is evidenced in the various demonstrations, the published petitions, and pacifist speeches.

A short time ago, Secretary of State Dean Rusk said: "This is the clearest lesson of our time: From Munich until today we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and brings even more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of a lasting peace."

What is it that we want in South Vietnam? What are we doing there? First, and most importantly, we have been told by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara that the simple fact is that South Vietnam, a member of the free world family, is striving to preserve its independence from Communist attack. The Vietnamese have asked our help. We have given it. We should all hope that we shall continue to give it.

We do so in mutual interest, theirs and ours. Basic to the principles of freedom and self-determination which have sustained our great country for almost two centuries is the right of peoples everywhere to live and develop in peace. Our own security is strengthened by the determination of others to remain free and by our commitment to assist them. We cannot let this member of our family down, regardless of the distance in miles from our own shores.

The ultimate goal of the United States in Asia, as in the rest of the world, is to help maintain free and independent nations which can develop politically, economically, and socially, and which can be responsible members of the world community. In this region and elsewhere, many people share our sense of the value of such freedom and independence. They have taken the risks and made the sacrifices linked to the commitment to membership in the family of the free world. They have done this in the belief that we would back up our pledges to help defend them. It is not right or even expedient, nor is it in our nature, to abandon them when the going is difficult.

Southeast Asia has great strategic significance in the forward defense of the United States. Its location across east-west air and sea lanes flanks the Indian subcontinent on one side and Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines on the other, and dominates the gateway between the Pacific and Indian Oceans. In Communist hands, this area would pose a most serious threat to the security of the United States and to the family of free world nations to which we belong. To defend southeast Asia, we must meet the challenge in South Vietnam.

The United States' role in South Vietnam, then is: first, to answer the call of the South

Vietnamese, a member nation of our free world family, to help them save their country for themselves; and second, to help prevent the strategic danger which would exist if communism absorbed southeast Asia's people and resources. Also, this will prove that the free world can—and will—cope with Communist "wars of liberation" as we have coped successfully with Communist aggression at other levels.

I am not suggesting that it will be easy—or cheap. But what is the cost of freedom? How valuable is it? I think you will agree; our freedoms are not for sale, nor will we abdicate them to the Communists.

To move quickly to another part of the world, in our own hemisphere. What is our objective in the Dominican Republic? This should be clear enough. It is: a freely elected constitutional government which can undertake the social, economic, and political reforms that a majority of the people there seem to demand. But, it is also clear that the Dominican people are not yet capable of attaining their goal without help. If a democratic government were established as a result of the revolution and the subsequent occupation, it might be an easy target for a new military dictator—like Castro—unless some protection could be offered from the outside. In addition to bringing a halt there to a bloody civil war, we are paving the way for the establishment of a free society and a government of the Dominican people's choosing. I am happy that other member nations of the OAS are now sending troops into the Dominican Republic and that some of our own soldiers are returning to their normal duties—the protection of America.

I would remind you of a quote from President Johnson: "Wherever Americans go, the American flag goes also."

It is my opinion that every American—North American and South American—should be grateful that we have a President who believes in defending our freedoms from any who would defile them.

And, we can be grateful to the hundreds and thousands of young men and women who now serve their country in the uniforms of the various military services—as you did. I can vouch that their Government will be grateful to them.

I have the honor and the privilege to serve on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and I know firsthand something of the appreciation that this country has for those who served. Your Government has spent a grand total of more than $131 billion on veterans benefits. At the end of the last fiscal year of the Government, there were 2,226,000 living veterans of World War I. Some 1,129,444 of them were receiving pension or compensation payments and in the last fiscal year, this group received over $2 billion.

I know that you are interested in the current controversy regarding the proposed closings of several hospitals operated by the Veterans' Administration. Our House Veterans' Committee held its longest hearings in 15 years, from February 18 to April 1—and recorded some 2,400 pages of testimony on this subject. As a result of these voluminous—and often tedious—hearings, sufficient evidence was presented to show that the President should take another look at the proposal. I am certain that because of this evidence and the efforts put forth by you and many like you that some of the VA hospitals will be saved that otherwise would have been lost.

As you know, our committee secured the passage of Public Law 88–450 which permits the use of 4,000 additional nursing-care beds in the existing Veterans' Administration hospital system. We are also doing all we can to implement the installation of these much-needed nursing-care beds. Committee Chairman OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, recently wrote to President Johnson to urge that these facilities be put into operation as rapidly as possible.

I am pleased to call to your attention that the last Congress passed a better pension bill, Public Law 88–664, which liberalized pension payments. I realize that it was not as much as some of us had hoped for, however, it is better than what we had before. It might interest you to know that World War I veterans have received over $37 billion in benefits, and that more than $13 billion of that sum has been in the form of pension payments. This is more than 10 times the amount of pension paid to any other group of veterans.

Another part of Public Law 88–664 is a great help in a much-needed area of service. It provides aid and attendance to severely disabled and handicapped veterans. Now housebound veterans are able to receive assistance that was not available. This section alone has been of tremendous aid to those less able to help themselves.

My point in emphasizing some of the legislation that has been enacted to aid and benefit the veteran is that he has not been—and will not be forgotten or neglected by his grateful nation.

I can assure you that neither you, those who served later, those who are serving now, nor those who will serve in the years to come will be ignored. We are ever grateful to you, as we will be to them.

You and this occasion reminds be of a poem which typifies such brave men as yourselves. It was written by one of America's greatest veteran leaders, Bryan Gentry. It is called G. I. Joe and one verse goes like this:

> "Every ounce of him a soldier;
>   Every inch of him a man—
> When he fought your battles for you;
>   Ate with fingers from a can.
> And the courage of his laughter
>   Dulled the panic of his fear—
> When it came his turn for dying,
>   He stepped up without a tear."

Thank you.

SENATE

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

(Legislative day of Monday, June 7, 1965)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, at the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of our spirits: As again in the stewardship of public responsibilities Thy servants in this forum of freedom turn to waiting tasks, may the love of dear ones, the confidence of those who trust them, the spur of conscience to measure up to their best, and the commanding call of goodness be the white stars to lead them on, as they follow the gleam of the Kingly Light.

In this troubled and uncertain day, when the seamless robe of our common humanity is rent by inner strife and outward fears and foes, gird us to be ministers of reconciliation and to be anxious for nothing but to do the right, as Thou dost give us to see the right.

In these days of destiny, may we know no glory save the supreme satisfaction of rendering to the Republic and to the world our utmost service, unsullied by base motives of self-interest.

At this altar of devotion, we pledge anew unswerving firmness of purpose in the fulfillment of the high and holy cause of human dignity to which the forces of freedom are committed, as the fiercest battle of the ages is being waged in our day on this torn and tortured earth.

May this be the victory—even our faith—which overcomes the world of darkness.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 7, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 5, 1965, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 339) to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1000) to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 399. An act to provide adjustments in order to make uniform the estate acquired for the Vega Dam and Reservoir, Collbran project, Colorado, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to reconvey mineral interests in certain lands;

H.R. 903. An act to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1732. An act to extend the act of September 26, 1961, relating to allotment and assignment of pay, to cover the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1771. An act to establish a 5-day workweek for postmasters, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3157. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits;

H.R. 5252. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force;

H.R. 5280. An act to provide for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States;

H.R. 5842. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961;

H.R. 5860. An act to amend the law relating to the final disposition of the property of the Choctaw Tribe;

H.R. 6686. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act with respect to the U.S. Botanic Garden, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7042. An act to amend section 402(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

H.R. 7762. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, with respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps;

H.R. 7954. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to conform to the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, London (1960);

H.R. 8147. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the exemption from duty for returning residents, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 431. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 399. An act to provide adjustments in order to make uniform the estate acquired for the Vega Dam and Reservoir, Collbran project, Colorado, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to reconvey mineral interests in certain lands;

H.R. 903. An act to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5842. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961; and

H.R. 5860. An act to amend the law relating to the final disposition of the property of the Choctaw Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1732. An act to extend the act of September 26, 1961, relating to allotment and assignment of pay, to cover the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1771. An act to establish a 5-day workweek for postmasters, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6686. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act with respect to the U.S. Botanic Garden, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3157. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits; and

H.R. 7042. An act to amend section 402(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 5252. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force;

H.R. 5280. An act to provide for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance of payments position of the United States; and

H.J. Res. 431. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7762. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, with respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7954. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to conform to the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, London (1960); to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 8147. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the exemption from duty for returning residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senate operating under controlled time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, immediately upon meeting the Senate proceeds to operate on controlled time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Judiciary Committee, and the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Judiciary Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Fred J. Nichol, of South Dakota, to be U.S. district judge for South Dakota; and

Irving Hill, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask unanimous consent that the time necessary for the quorum call not be taken from either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request is granted. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, No. 233, offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT REGARDING MILITARY AID TO LATIN AMERICA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, section 511(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act now limits the value of grant programs of defense articles for American Republics in any fiscal year to $55 million, "of which a part may be used during each fiscal year for assistance in implementing a feasible plan for regional defense."

The first part of the amendment would authorize the use of up to $25 million of the $55 million total "for assistance to an inter-American military force under the control of the Organization of American States." This is the same provision which was written into the bill by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1963 and approved by the Senate. The provision of existing law is the compromise which resulted in conference that year.

The second part of the amendment would replace section 511(b) of the existing law which provides that "internal security requirements shall not, unless the President determines otherwise and promptly reports such determination to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, be the basis for military assistance programs for American Republics."

As rewritten by the amendment, section 511(b) would require military assistance to Latin America to be furnished to the maximum extent feasible in accordance with joint plans—including such plans relating to internal security problems—approved by the OAS. The justification for this change is as follows:

When the restriction on military assistance for internal security was written into the law in the late 1950's, most of the internal security difficulties in Latin America were caused by groups trying to overthrow dictators. Many of the internal security difficulties now come from groups trying to overthrow freely elected legitimate governments, as in Columbia and Venezuela. Furthermore, the existing law has been effectively nullified by presidential determinations that internal security requirements justify military assistance in almost every country of the hemisphere except Cuba.

The proposed new subsection (b) is designed to encourage joint military planning by the OAS, not only in connection with an inter-American force but also in connection with all security problems. Joint planning for internal security is a logical extension of the Special Consultative Committee on Security Against the Subversive Action of International Communism established at the Punta del Este Conference in January 1962. Some of the actions which the OAS has subsequently taken with respect to Cuban efforts at subversion have been based on recommendations of this Committee. The joint planning contemplated by the amendment, however, would go beyond plans to deal with international subversion and would embrace all kinds of internal security problems—for example, the banditry problem in Colombia, the mineworkers problem in Bolivia, and so forth.

It may be argued that this represents too great a degree of OAS intervention in the domestic affairs of the countries concerned. But if a country has an internal security problem so serious as to require outside assistance, then is it not preferable for the intervention to come from the OAS rather than from, as is now the case, the United States?

Furnishing of U.S. military assistance in accordance with OAS plans would probably have the further great advantage of reducing the amount of assistance and restraining intra-Latin American arms races. For example, Peru will be reluctant to approve plans which call for much military assistance to Ecuador, and vice versa. The OAS would almost certainly provide a tougher screening for military assistance than is now provided by the machinery of the U.S. Government.

There is precedent for the requirement for joint planning in the military assistance which was furnished to Europe in the early days of NATO.

It should also be noted that the amendment is qualified by requiring military assistance to be furnished in accordance with joint plans "to the maximum extent feasible." The amendment recognizes that the OAS cannot gear itself up for this task overnight; but it does provide a nudge in that direction.

Similarly, the amendment authorizes, but does not earmark, $25 million for assistance to an inter-American force. This is in line with the Senate's action in 1963. In 1959, the Senate did earmark $31.5 million for an inter-American force, but the provision could not be held in conference.

Finally, the amendment is in line with—and, indeed, supports—President Johnson's call at Baylor University May 28 for "new international machinery geared to meet the fast-moving events."

This proposal is not new in the Committee on Foreign Relations or in the Senate, which approved previously, as I have pointed out, provisions to encourage the development of an inter-American force.

The circumstances that have arisen in the Dominican Republic within the past 6 weeks inspired me to offer the proposal once again for the consideration of the Senate. These circumstances arose after the bill was reported, but the committee has considered the same matter in earlier years. The developments in the Dominican Republic, where a substantial number of Brazilian troops have been supplied, and a smaller number of troops from three other Central American countries have been supplied, are the reason why I thought it appropriate to have the Senate consider once again a proposal toward developing an inter-American force. Such a force would, I think, relieve the United States of much of the burden of trying to maintain the peace as best we can during this transitional period in the Latin American area.

Mr. President, that is all I desire to say, unless Senators wish to ask questions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations seems to me to have a great deal of merit. I would assume that at the moment we are underwriting the inter-American force which is actually in being. This proposal would legalize our action, to some degree at least, and would give some validity to the concept, which I think has great merit. It would get away from the unilateral idea, which seems to hurt us so much in our relations with certain of our neighbors when conditions arise which may seem to necessitate some kind of intervention.

Therefore, I would hope that the amendment would carry, because I believe it is not only meritorious but necessary, and would give some strength to the concept of inter-American peace, at least so far as inter-American forces are concerned, a concept which seems to be and, I hope is, getting off the ground at the moment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe the use of funds now for an inter-American force is quite in accord with the spirit of existing law.

As I read section 511, it provides, in part:

> * * * in any fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year 1962, shall not exceed $55 million, of which a part may be used during each fiscal year for assistance in implementing a feasible plan for regional defense.

That is quite broad as to the idea of this kind of activity, but I believe the amendment would clarify the situation and make more direct and positive what is intended to be done.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I heartily endorse the amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, not only for the reasons which he and the majority leader have stated, but because I believe the amendment looks to a broader and more international solution of the problems of peace, a solution which I find more in accord with the efforts to achieve a kind of enforceable world peace through world law, a kind of international arrangement, to be sure only at the regional level, but a kind of arrangement which the original charter of the United Nations contemplated.

This building up of an OAS force is, I believe, well within the spirit and letter of the U.N. charter provision which recognizes the development of regional groups to help keep the peace and help to solve economic and other problems of a region. It is a step in the right direction. I sincerely hope the Senate will approve the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield whatever time he may desire to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have studied the amendment and I am in thorough agreement with it.

I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the committee would agree to put this proposal on a matching basis with the various states of South and Central America. In other words, it seems that under his amendment the entire burden would be on the United States. If language could be added to the amendment that would make it clear that since the money is to be made available and will be under the control of the Organization of American States, we would expect not only full cooperation from the members of the Organization of American States, but also reasonable contributions from them toward financing any force that may come into being, then I could support the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would assume that they would supply troops, just as in the case of the Dominican Republic they are supplying troops.

Mr. ELLENDER. We are supplying the logistics.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are supplying the logistics. I had not thought of the proposal in that sense. The bill itself would authorize up to $55 million for military assistance to Latin America. This is much less than Latin America spends on armaments itself.

I do not know what the Senator means by "matching." We would pay $25 million. If they furnished troops and manpower, the cost would run far beyond that amount. I do not know what kind of formula the Senator from Louisiana has in mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my belief that they ought to contribute to the cost of the logistics. In many cases, we are even paying the transportation costs of soldiers from the various countries. I presume we shall also be furnishing the food for the soldiers wherever they are located.

It seems to me that this ought to be done on a more or less matching basis. Let the other countries furnish in proportion to their capabilities and allow them credit for the pay that they may make available to the soldiers that they send to areas where they are needed.

It seems to me that if we adopted the amendment as it is written, it would be interpreted as meaning that we intend to be the only nation furnishing the wherewithal to carry on this program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator has a formula that he thinks would work, I should like to have him present it. It would be difficult to work out. This activity is in its initial stages. Our negotiators would certainly be expected to try to get the cooperation of the other countries to furnish the troops, which is the main thing they can furnish. Many of the countries are quite incapable of furnishing sophisticated equipment. They do not make them. We furnish the sophisticated equipment to their national armies now. I do not know that any of them make the modern weapons. That is a thing that we are best suited to do.

We hoped that they would do two things. We hoped that they would furnish a large part of the manpower of the OAS and the responsibility for the action so that they would relieve us of the charge of interventionism and imperialism.

Mr. ELLENDER. We could write some language into the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Could the Senator propose some language?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been very busy on other matters. To be frank, I took the amendments home with me last night. I did not have much time to study all amendments thoroughly. However, it seems to me that we could have some kind of understanding whereby they would at least furnish the manpower.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would be extremely difficult to implement this program in the early stages. Does the Senator believe that a general expression of expectation at this time on the part of our representatives for a reasonable contribution by the other parties should be made as a matter of policy, rather than as a precise formula? I do not believe that it is possible to devise a precise formula.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not want to do so at the present time. It would be rather difficult. However, there are approximately 14,000 Americans in the Dominican Republic now. We are paying for the logistics for those men. We are also paying for the logistics for the few soldiers who are there from six other countries.

It occurs to me that there ought to be some kind of understanding that they would at least be willing to furnish manpower if we are to furnish logistics. That would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That would be clearly contemplated. This proposal would mean nothing at all unless they were to furnish manpower and take the responsibility for developing the plans. It would be meaningless otherwise. It would merely mean that we would be spending $25 million, in the same manner as we spend money on our own forces.

I believe it is contemplated that the other members of the OAS will furnish a larger part, or a majority, of the manpower. The thing that we could best furnish would be the sophisticated modern equipment that a police force uses, such as modern transportation and small arms.

I would not expect any nuclear weapons or anything of that kind to be involved. This would be a sort of police force of relatively small size which would move into a situation.

We should not dictate as to what the course of policy affairs would be in a country.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall take the amendment with me for further study.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe that we could have a precise formula. I believe that an expression of policy as to guidelines would be better.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I had in mind, so that they would not have the notion that we would have the soldiers to add to their force and pay all the money necessary to feed them and purchase all the necessary military hardware.

I believe that an expression of that kind would do some good.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

How much time does the Senator have remaining?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How much time does the Senator wish? I shall yield as much time as the Senator wants.

Mr. MORSE. I shall start with 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I support the amendment. There are certain caveats that I shall develop in the course of my brief remarks.

As the Senator from Arkansas knows, in the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs we have pressed for this amendment for several years. In the statement which the Senator from Arkansas made this morning he said:

> The first part of the amendment would authorize the use of up to $25 million of the $55 million total for assistance to an Inter-American military force under the control of the Organization of American States. This is the same provision which was written into the bill by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1963 and approved by the Senate. The provision of existing law is the compromise which resulted in conference that year.

I recall very well the discussion in 1963. We strongly urged this amendment in both the subcommittee and the full committee. We said, among other things, that it was necessary to develop a cooperative effort on the part of Latin American countries to act and plan jointly for their own defense and internal security.

It has been said many times that the purpose of our military aid in Latin America is alleged to be to help them in connection with their maintaining internal security, but not in connection with their making war against one another.

If we follow this proposal—and it is substantially in line with the objectives of the act of Punta del Este to which the Senator referred in his statement this morning—we could do several things. One is that we could reduce the total amount of military expenditures in Latin America, both United States aid and domestic expenditure.

I do not want anyone to charge me with inconsistency in connection with a subsequent amendment that I shall offer. I shall vote for this amendment. I urge that the amendment be adopted. However, that does not mean that when I vote for the amendment I am approving $55 million for aid in Latin America. I shall offer an amendment which would reduce that $55 million. I believe that the adoption of the amendment would strengthen the amendment that I shall subsequently offer. If we could have this kind of military planning sanctioned, in my judgment we would have good reason to reduce the remaining amount by the amount that I shall ask to have it reduced.

I urge the adoption of this amendment for an additional reason. I believe that this is one of the ways to help build up the Organization of American States as an effective, regional organization for the application of the rule of law. I believe that if any heed is to be paid to the Organization of American States in Latin America when there is a trouble spot, we must have the enforcement facilities available which would result from this amendment.

In the Dominican Republic crisis, what a boon it would have been to the United States if we had had a type of joint military planning and joint military force available to move into the Dominican Republic, rather than to send in American troops, which latter course of action has cost us so dearly so far as American prestige is concerned. It will take some time for the dust of misunderstanding to settle in regard to the action taken by the United States.

The objective of this amendment is in line with what the overwhelming majority of the full committee and the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs have been urging for some time.

I commend the Senator from Arkansas for the clear and succinct statement that he made today on the floor of the Senate in support of the amendment.

I was not privileged to be present when the Senator made his statement. We were finishing our conferences on the education issues on the measure which passed this morning. I strongly support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is one of the most effective ways of strengthening the Organization of American States and putting some teeth into it, so to speak, and also putting the Organization in a position which I think will weaken the argument that is so often made against U.S. intervention.

If there is this joint military organization, carrying with it the responsibility to act jointly when there is a crisis arising in Latin America in which there has been a threat or actual takeover by Communists, we shall not be hearing so much about American intervention, for it will not be intervention. It will be action by the Organization of American States, in keeping with the commitments that the Organization made in Punta del Este, moving to protect themselves jointly. I support the amendment for that reason.

The next point I wish to make is that too much of our military aid has gone to building up military prestige and military status in various Latin American countries. Let us be frank about it. It has gone to build up military oligarchies in some of the countries, and it has gone to build up the strength of military juntas, or groups which from time to time became military juntas, to decide to overthrow constitutional government.

Let me make very clear for future reference that when I vote for this kind of organization, I am talking about an organization that ought to be available and in reserve to protect freedom in Latin America and the rights of the people in those countries against either a military or a Communist coup, because either a military or a Communist coup threatens the internal security of any country so far as its constitutional processes are concerned.

Let there be no doubt that I am supporting the amendment because I believe we need to strengthen the Organization of American States so that it can be an effective instrument to protect constitutionalism in various countries in Latin America from both the right and the left. In my judgment, that is what the Organization of American States must do in the great battle we are waging for men's minds against threats of communism on the one hand and fascism on the other hand.

Also, I am supporting the amendment because of our country's selfish interests; but it is necessary to give attention to our own selfish interests. It is important that we develop this kind of organization so that joint efforts will be taken in Latin America, and not put ourselves in the position in which we have found ourselves in the Dominican crisis for the past several weeks, when we had to go into that country to protect American nationals after the Government had advised our Government that it was not in a position to protect American lives.

With the other implementations which should be developed, I am sure the Organization of American States will really be an effective regional united nations in the Western Hemisphere, to see to it that the security of their countries is protected by joint action and pledge the Organization of American States as a legal instrumentality for settling disputes by resort to the rule of law rather than to military force.

Lastly, I reemphasize what I have already said. This is the way, in the long run, to reduce American appropriations for military aid in Latin America in the amount we are now providing. Adoption of the amendment would buttress the argument which I shall make a few days hence in connection with an amendment I shall offer relative to military aid around the world, including Latin America.

I am delighted to join the chairman of the full committee in supporting the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not know whether any other Senator is prepared to discuss the amendment. I am ready to vote, if the majority leader is willing to vote now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest to the majority leader that we may find ourselves in a problem, because the unanimous-consent agreement has been printed and sent out. We may find that some of our colleagues expect a vote at 1:30, and will be back to vote at 1:30.

My suggestion to the majority leader, if there are no other Senators who wish to speak on the amendment, is that this matter be put aside until 1:30 so that the Senate may take up other matters in the meantime.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I see no indication that any Senator desires a yea-and-nay vote. It seems to me there is no opposition to it. Why not bring this matter to a close on the basis of a quorum call and then a voice vote?

Mr. MORSE. That is fine.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the time to come out of the time controlled by the majority leader?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute to announce that there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the pending amendment and that the vote will come somewhere between 1:15 and 1:30 p.m.

I yield 25 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

AMENDMENT NO. 242

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall use this time to present my amendment No. 242. It is not now pending, but I shall make the case for it now so I shall not have to do so later.

My amendment would reduce loan funds authorized for the Alliance for Progress by $100 million.

Foreign aid to Latin America today bears only a remote resemblance to the Alliance for Progress begun in 1961. It bears a much greater resemblance to the policy of the Eisenhower years, when we supported military juntas and dictators by giving them medals. But in line with more modern foreign policy thinking, anyone we approve gets money, so now we support them with millions of dollars of American money.

I suppose the Dominican Republic is the most graphic example of the failure of this policy and the waste of American money. Much has been written since the first week in May, when American troops landed, of the support given by the U.S. Treasury to the regime of President Juan Bosch. That government's success was almost as important to the Kennedy administration as it was to Mr. Bosch himself. For fiscal year 1963, the United States supported that government with $53.5 million. In a country of 3½ million people, that amounts to some $15.50 per person. Fiscal year 1964 reflects the period when no aid was given to the junta that overthrew Bosch, but still our aid amounted to $15.2 million. In fiscal year 1965, business was as usual with the junta and the level of our aid went back up.

Since figures for fiscal year 1965 are still unpublished, the exact figure cannot be used. But for 1962, 1963, and 1964, we spent a total of $103.9 million on the Dominican Republic, for an average yearly expenditure of $34.6 million.

We find in the annual report of the Inter-American Development Bank, covering 1964 but reporting largely on 1963, that—

> Loans received by the government and other public agencies (11.4 and 14.8 million pesos for 1962 and 1963, respectively) together with an inflow of private capital (5.8 and 7.7 million pesos in the same 2 years) enabled the country to finance its current account deficit. In September 1964, the country's gross foreign exchange holdings totaled U.S. $45 million, compared to U.S. $29 million a year earlier.

The value of the use to which this American money is put is surely one of the questions that Congress and the public are asking of the entire foreign aid effort.

Writing from the Dominican Republic in yesterday's Washington Post, John Goshko concludes his story on the Dominican economy with these comments:

> If history is to be prevented from repeating itself at some not too distant date, a complete overhaul of the Dominican economy will be required.

Of course, we are told right along that the Alliance for Progress finances reform measures in Latin America, and that it is designed to raise the living standards of the lower classes in the economic scale of these countries. But that is not the real theory of the Alliance today. Today it concentrates on strengthening upper classes so they will be in a better position to prevent any unrest among the deprived people of these countries from getting out of hand—meaning to prevent it from posing any real threat to the status quo.

Mr. Goshko continues to undermine the alleged theory of the Alliance for Progress when he say:

> For the first time, a real attack will have to be made on such problems as land reform, shortage of trained personnel, corruption, the lack of foreign investment, and the modernization of the all-important sugar industry. Its production costs approximately 9 cents a pound while the world market price hovers between 2 and 5 cents.

It is Uncle Sam that has supported this difference, for despite this great overpricing of its chief commodity for sale abroad, its foreign exchange holdings were half again in 1964 what they were in 1963. All the problems listed as being unapproached as yet are exactly those the American people are told their money has been spent to remedy.

Mr. Goshko continues:

> Before the April revolution, the United States was contributing about $20 million annually * * *—

That figure is low; when military and food for peace are included, it is more like $30 million—

> to the Dominican Republic, mostly for balance-of-payments support. But now the United States is involved so inextricably that it will have little choice but to up the ante by staggering amounts. Whether the United States will have to do this directly or under the cover of the OAS or a Dominican government responsive to U.S. control is still unclear. What is clear is that the U.S. taxpayer is going to have the Dominican Republic on his back for a long time to come.

That is true not only of the Dominican Republic but of most of Latin America because the Alliance for Progress is not financing reforms worthy of the name in most of the nations of the hemisphere. It is carrying along the same conditions that have given rise to so much unrest there in the last decade. And as we have seen in the Dominican Republic, the masses of the people are not forestalled forever from trying to provide the remedies to their own problems.

Elsewhere in his article, Mr. Goshko writes:

> At present, all efforts are being focused on bringing the economy back to its prerevolution level. Yet the depressed state of the prerevolutionary economy, with its propagation of poverty and backwardness, was among the principal precipitating factors of the present crisis.

The Congress and the American people might well ask just where our $103.9 million went, if an aid program of that magnitude to a very small country produced nothing but a "propagation of poverty and backwardness." That is not only the record of the Dominican Republic since the fall of Trujillo; it is the record of the United States, too, and its foreign aid program.

It is popular to say of the Dominican Republic that its troubles stem from the long years of the Trujillo dictatorship when no political leadership was allowed to develop and when both economic and political affairs were gathered into the hands of the Trujillo family.

But look around Latin America and you find that the lack of stable political institutions and qualified democratic leadership are the rule and not the exception.

AID PROGRAM HAS FAILED IN BOLIVIA

Another of our foreign aid failures is Bolivia. And the report from La Paz last week by Henry Raymont in the New York Times tells the story of why American policy and American aid are failing in so many countries of the hemisphere.

He reports that the Bolivian junta is sending a mission to Washington—and it was here last week and may still be in town—to press for more American aid to finance the junta. It is not as though they are not already on the list for substantial assistance.

In fiscal year 1962, Bolivia received $39.5 million; in fiscal 1963, $70.4 million, and in 1964, $80.2 million. This is a country of 4 million people, which means an aid level of about $20 per person last year.

Apparently, that is not enough for the junta. I suppose the key sentence in Raymont's report is:

> President Johnson and the Pentagon were reported to have been deeply concerned over the potential danger of a Communist coup d'etat.

Those are the old familiar phrases that one hears before a foreign government comes to Washington to get more money. "Communist coup" is always good for more money and more military aid. The militarists in Latin America have learned that lesson well in the last 2 years and they are playing it for all it is worth.

We learn that the President was not satisfied with the information he was receiving from the Embassy in La Paz and so a military officer was sent down to Bolivia to make an independent assessment of the situation.

It takes only a little experience with Latin American affairs, or affairs in any part of the world, for that matter, to know that the military officer recommended more money and more military aid.

The militarists stick together like birds of a feather around the world. American militarists are no different when it comes to feathering their own nests.

In this case, the officer recommended to the junta that it send a mission directly to Washington to make the appeal, even though our Embassy recommended against it.

Listen to that—our Embassy recommended against it. This is another example of substituting the Pentagon in American foreign affairs for real civilian control.

Says Mr. Raymont:

> According to qualified informants, it was immediately after Colonel Wimert's arrival and against the advice of the Embassy that the junta decided to send a four-man mission to Washington, ostensibly to negotiate new financing for rehabilitation of the mines. * * *
>
> Bolivian officials hinted that Colonel Wimert and the Defense Department had appreciated the urgency of the situation here more than the Embassy had and that this explained the presence of Colonel La Fuente in the mission.

Colonel Fuente is chief of staff of the Bolivian Army. The story continues:

> The army chief is expected to appeal directly to the Pentagon for broad military assistance and for defense-support projects to bolster the army's civic action program.

Once again the State Department has moved out of the picture and the Pentagon has moved in to take over American foreign policy.

Mr. Raymont continues:

> Some American diplomats suggest that the junta is exaggerating the Communist menace here as a way of forcing help from Washington. The Embassy is known to look askance at the suggestion that Bolivia may be asking for financial help without drafting a complete development program.

One of the Bolivian officials is quoted by Mr. Raymont as saying:

> We are doing our utmost to convince Washington that a crash aid program in Bolivia is imperative now to assure financial solvency and political and social stability. Otherwise we may see the development of another Dominican situation, which would be more dangerous and costly to solve.

If that is the line of the Bolivian junta, they certainly know well how to touch all the sensitive spots in the administration that lead to the opening of the pocketbook.

But I would point out to the Bolivian aid mission that they already have a "crash" program of aid from the United States. The rate of aid they have been getting for the past several years is a crash program. They have been the principal recipient of supporting assistance, which is grant economic aid and to which the Congress has been trying to put an end.

It is time for the Congress to ask what good it has done. It is time for Congress to ask the Bolivian aid mission what has happened to the $190 million we extended to Bolivia in the 3 years of 1962, 1963, and 1964. That is a lot of money for a country of 4 million people. What use was it put to, that the country feels itself on the edge of a civil war and threatened by a Communist coup, if in fact it is so threatened at all?

Mr. President, if money will prevent the spread of communism, Bolivia has had plenty of it. It is a question of how the money is spent. Every time we let the military get its hand into the pocket of military aid, we should get ready for a shocking waste and inefficiency in the expenditure of the money. These American militarists are no different from militarists around the world when it comes to inefficiency and feathering their own nests.

Is it not fair to ask the Bolivians why more money would do any good if $190 million in 3 years did not?

I warn the Congress and the administration and the people of Bolivia that the United States is going to have Bolivia on its back for a long time to come, too, unless we stop being suckers for every Latin colonel who comes along and whispers the magic words: Communist coup.

All the money in the world is not going to forestall Communist coups unless it is put to the real and basic reform of the Latin American economies.

That, I say to the Bolivian aid mission, is the lesson of the Dominican Republic. We sank millions into that country in the name of preventing revolution and the revolution came, anyway, and American troops had to go in to put it down. The same is in store for Bolivia if we go on handing out money to the same old juntas and ruling classes that cannot maintain themselves even temporarily in that part of the world without American support.

I say to them that I do not think it matters one whit whether you get a "crash" aid program from the United States. Unless you make better use of what you have been getting, you are going to have another revolution there, anyway, and the United States will still have to do what it thinks best when the time comes. In my mind, the only question is how much more we are going to waste on another junta in the interim.

I know it is commonly pointed out that our largest aid programs in Latin America are in Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela. But I do not think the principle is much different. I find it hard to believe that American aid to Chile is performing anything like the function for which one expects to expend $227.4 million in 1962, $98.3 million in 1963, and $141.2 million in 1964. That was the record of our aid to Chile in the years just prior to the last election, when the great issue was whether the country would go Communist or select a democratic, reform government. As a matter of fact, a large program loan was negotiated with Chile just prior to that election.

But Chile has only 8.5 million people. We have been helping Chile at the average rate of $18 per person for several years. That is an extremely high rate of foreign aid to any country. Yet Chile remained on the edge of radicalism, or so we were led to believe when it came time to extend a new loan.

I see no sign that Chile is going to be off our backs, either, in the foreseeable future.

The Alliance for Progress is a 10-year program. It is almost half way through. The results in altogether too many countries of the hemisphere have not shown much more than a maintenance of the status quo, subsidized with American dollars. I am very doubtful that at the end of the 10 years, conditions in most of these countries will have moved any further away from unrest and potential revolution than they were in 1961, when the Alliance program was started.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the newspaper to which I referred, and an article appearing in the June 8 issue of the New York Times entitled "Bogotá To Seek Aid for Economy in United States."

There being no objection, the three articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 1965]

Economic Collapse Aggravates Island Crisis

(By John Goshko)

Santo Domingo, June 6.—The king-sized problems of putting this revolution-shattered country back into working order are nowhere so evident as in the economic field.

Until now, the economic aspects of the crisis have been overshadowed by the more immediate need to create a single government out of the rival factions. No economy can move without a political horse to pull it.

But the converse also is true. Whatever government finally does emerge here will not last very long unless it has behind it an economy capable at least of providing people with the necessities of life and producing revenues to pay for governmental services.

Until a few days ago, the United States and the Organization of American States were concerned exclusively with the day-to-day problems of feeding the hungry and trying to prevent total financial chaos by meeting part of the defunct government's payroll obligations.

CONDITIONS EASED

The effort, especially from the U.S. side, was a massive one. Before it runs its short-term course, it will have seen the distribution of approximately 15 million pounds of food and the payment of government workers besides.

Now, the prolongation of the cease-fire has eased disaster conditions considerably. Food again is available through normal channels, and free distribution continues for those who cannot pay the roughly doubled prices.

The big U.S. disaster program, is already being turned over to the OAS and to Dominican church and welfare organizations.

Within the next few days, 9 of the 11 U.S. teams overseeing disaster relief are expected to be withdrawn.

But if the problem of keeping people alive has largely been licked, things look much gloomier in regard to the next step—getting the money economy functioning again.

TWO AREAS OF CONTROL

Here the difficulty arises directly from the fact that the Dominican Republic currently consists of two countries: the enclave in Santo Domingo, held by the forces of Col. Francisco Caamano Deno and the rest of the city and the interior, which are under actual or nominal control of the troops led by Gen. Antonio Imbert Berrera.

Ciudad Nueva, controlled by the Caamano forces, is probably the most economically important real estate in the country. Within it are most of the docks and warehouses that make Santo Domingo the country's key seaport and distribution center. There, too, is the commercial center that contains the main offices of the banks, business establishments, and the major communications facilities.

So long as the commercial heart is shut down and cut off, the rest of the Dominican Republic will be severely crippled in its efforts to restart normal banking and credit operations, obtain the imports vital to industry, and carry on business in general.

Still, as many as 40 factories in the Santo Domingo area that had been shut down or partially closed are operating again. Branch banks outside the Ciudad Nueva have reinstituted some services, although in most cases their biggest reserves lie in the central offices beyond the reach of bank officials and depositors.

In the countryside, which was untouched by the fighting, the sugarcane mills that form the backbone of the economy have continued to produce. They also are able to export their products through their small ports close to the mills.

But in 6 to 8 weeks the factories are expected to require the new supplies that normalloy flow into Santo Domingo. The mills and plantations will need credit and other banking services.

A similar dilemma faces one of the two factions that claim to be the government.

On the Caamano side, there is no immediate need for money since this siege. Conditions reduce life's necessities to the barest essentials. The rebels have food, water, and arms; and in their present situation that's all they need.

But the Imbert faction has a much bigger territory to run and consequently has a desperate need for the revenues on which a government normally depends.

Yet where before the revolution the Dominican Government could count on $13 to $16 million a month through taxes and other sources, the junta now is taking in a bare $1 million weekly.

The funds provided by the United States more or less met the Government payroll for April and most of May. But if the political stalemate is not broken soon the minimal public services now being offered will bog down again in financing crisis.

For all these reasons, U.S. and OAS officials agree that a political solution must somehow be worked out quickly. As one puts it: "We can go on erecting jerry-built structures to keep things functioning after a fashion—after all, these people didn't have much to begin with. But if you don't have a country in the accepted sense, you can't have an economy."

His words point to what is perhaps the biggest problem of all, although no one really has had time to think about it yet.

At present, all efforts are being focused on bringing the economy back to its prerevolution level. Yet the depressed state of the prerevolutionary economy, with its propagation of poverty and backwardness, was among the principal precipitating factors of the present crisis.

If history is to be prevented from repeating itself at some not too distant date, a complete overhaul of the Dominican economy will be required. For the first time, a real attack will have to be made on such problems as land reform, shortage of trained personnel, corruption, the lack of foreign investment, and the modernization of the all-important sugar industry. Its production costs approximately 9 cents a pound while the world market price hovers between 2 and 5 cents.

The how, when, and who of these problems are matters that no one even wants to discuss at this point. But sooner or later they will have to be faced; and among those required to do the facing will be the United States.

Before the April revolution, the United States was contributing about $20 million annually to the Dominican Republic, mostly for balance-of-payments support. But now the United States is involved so inextricably that it will have little choice but to up the ante by staggering amounts.

Whether the United States will have to do this directly or under the cover of the OAS or a Dominican government responsive to U.S. control is still unclear. What is clear is that the U.S. taxpayer is going to have the Dominican Republic on his back for a long time to come.

[From the New York Times, June 4, 1965]

BOLIVIA PRESSING FOR WIDE U.S. AID—AIM IS TO AVERT SOCIAL CRISIS OVER MINE REORGANIZATION

(By Henry Raymont)

LA PAZ, BOLIVIA, June 3—Bolivia's military junta is pressing for wide economic and military help from the United States to complement its measures to reorganize the nationalized mining industry and overcome a violent, Communist-dominated strike.

A leading Bolivian policymaker disclosed today that the appeal for new aid was made this week to a representative of President Johnson sent here on a confidential mission. The request is to be repeated in detail to Mr. Johnson and other administration officials by a Bolivian mission that arrived in Washington yesterday.

Bolivian officials have suggested that they will need $5 million immediately for highway development projects to absorb 7,000 miners who are to be dismissed as part of the industry reorganization.

LONG-TERM PLAN WEIGHED

In addition, a long-term $100 million aid program is under discussion. It would take in Alliance for Progress plans to accelerate Bolivia's overall economic and social development.

"We are doing our utmost," the Bolivian official said, "to convince Washington that a crash aid program in Bolivia is imperative now to assure financial solvency and political and social stability. Otherwise we may see the development of another Dominican situation, which would be more dangerous and costly to solve."

Bolivian Government sources identified the White House representative as Col. Paul Wimert of the Army. They said he had been sent to evaluate the widespread strike and subsequent insurrection that flared in Bolivia last week.

President Johnson and the Pentagon were reported to have been deeply concerned over the potential danger of a Communist coup d'etat.

The U.S. Embassy, however, professed no knowledge of a Presidential mission and was inclined to discount Colonel Wimert's 3-day visit, which ended yesterday. Embassy officials said he had served here as military attaché for 4 years and was visiting old friends on the way to an assignment in Chile.

Colonel Wimert met most top officials of the governing junta.

According to qualified informants, it was immediately after Colonel Wimert's arrival and against the advice of the Embassy that the junta decided to send a four-man mission to Washington, ostensibly to negotiate new financing for rehabilitation of the mines.

ARMY CHIEF IN MISSION

The mission comprised Jaime Berdecio, Minister of the Economy; Col. Juan Lechin Suarez, president of the Bolivian Mining Corp.; Col. David La Fuente, chief of staff of the army, and Jose Romero Loza, president of the Bolivian Industrial Confederation and a spokesman for major private business interests.

Bolivian officials hinted that Colonel Wimert and the Defense Department had appreciated the urgency of the situation here more than the Embassy had and that this explained the presence of Colonel La Fuente in the mission.

The army chief is expected to appeal directly to the Pentagon for broad military assistance and for defense-support projects to bolster the army's civic-action program.

Some American diplomats suggest that the junta is exaggerating the Communist menace here as a way of forcing help from Washington. The Embassy is known to look askance at the suggestion that Bolivia may be asking for financial help without drafting a complete development program.

[From the New York Times, June 8, 1965]

BOGOTÁ TO SEEK AID FOR ECONOMY IN UNITED STATES

BOGOTÁ, COLOMBIA, June 7.—The Government has decided to send a delegation of public and private leaders to the United States this week to seek means of averting total paralysis of Colombia's economy.

The decision was taken as reports from industrial centers in Cali, Medellin, and elsewhere told of factory shutdowns because of a lack of raw materials that normally are imported. Five hundred plants have been affected by the inability to obtain import licenses owing to a shortage of dollars or the high cost of dollars.

It is understood here that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, and other lenders are reluctant to extend more credit until economic reforms, including devaluation of the peso, are undertaken. Although the peso has been devalued, in effect, because of the dollar shortage, President Guillermo León Valencia has refused to take formal action, on the ground that devaluation will not solve Colombia's basic economic problems.

The Cabinet is reluctant to push unpopular measures, such as import, price and wage controls, because congressional elections are due in March and a presidential vote 2 months later.

The Cabinet is reluctant to push unpopular measures, such as import, price and wage controls, because congressional elections are due in March and a presidential vote 2 months later.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, consider Colombia, heretofore a showcase of the Alliance for Progress. It is an example of another Latin American country that has drawn heavily upon American economic aid but is not showing the results that it should. This story indicates that Colombia is on the economic ropes, yet Colombia received $331 million from us in the years 1962 through 1964—an average of $110 million a year. Now we read that she needs money "to avert total paralysis" of her economy. What was accomplished with the $331 million? What good did it do? Why should we give Colombia anything more when other lenders refused to give, as is pointed out in the article?

Note what the article states:

> It is understood here that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, and other lenders are reluctant to extend more credit until economic reforms, including devaluation of the peso, are undertaken. Although the peso has been devalued, in effect, because of the dollar shortage, President Guillermo Leon Valencia has refused to take formal action, on the ground that devaluation will not solve Colombia's basic economic problems.

Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious what the strategy in Colombia is. They are going to come with outstretched hands to Uncle Sam again and ask for millions more to be wasted because they will not live up to their responsibilities under the Alliance-for-Progress program and adopt the necessary reforms, particularly economic reforms, that will stabilize their own currency.

Do not forget that the Alliance-for-Progress program is not a U.S. unilateral program. The Alliance-for-Progress program is a cooperative program. I was one of the congressional delegates to Bogotá that brought forth the act of Bogotá, and I was one of the congressional delegates to Punta del Este that brought forth the act of Punta del Este. Both of those acts pledged all the signatories thereto to a joint cooperative effort in bringing about the necessary reforms in their respective countries so that the American taxpayer who pays the economic and the military aid bill will get a dollar value for a dollar spent. That has not happened in too many Latin American countries under the Alliance-for-Progress program.

The results of our extensive aid have been to produce more pleas for money from the countries that have received the most. What has gone to them before has apparently produced little or no economic stability or improvement in these countries.

Therefore, I shall urge that the Alliance-for-Progress lending be reduced by $100 million.

That is the amendment that I shall bring up in due course.

The last country that I wish to discuss briefly is Venezuela. Today Venezuela is not the Venezuela of Betancourt.

Even the wildest enthusiasts for foreign aid out of the pocket of the U.S. taxpayer have always admitted that U.S. Government foreign aid cannot succeed unless there is a far larger outpouring into the underdeveloped countries of not only government aid from other developed countries but also of an even far greater amount of private foreign investment. Without that private foreign investment, everyone admits that taxpayers' foreign aid will be so far insufficient as to be money down a rathole.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, for years I have joined other Senators in trying to make our foreign aid support come from private investment. I have maintained that we should export our system of economic freedom into Latin America. I have with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] time and time again in a series of bills designed to transfer more of our so-called foreign aid program into American investments abroad. Let us see what is happening to this objective in Venezuela. If Venezuela gets by with this program, it will spread to other Latin American countries, and the objectives of the Alliance-for-Progress program itself will suffer most.

But is that outpouring of private foreign investment going to come? A wave of private predators in the underdeveloped countries is now taking advantage of thoughtless national enthusiasm in these countries with new devices to take without compensation private property already invested there. All over the world conditions are getting worse and worse to expect our investors to export the dollars we need at home into private foreign investment in underdeveloped countries.

The Hickenlooper amendment and other amendments like it already offered to this bill have recognized a tendency to nationalization for the account of the foreign governments themselves of longstanding American investment abroad.

But what I see goes far beyond nationalization and is a far more insidious danger to investor confidence and far more compelling for U.S. Government aid policy.

If a sovereign foreign government wants to condemn property to put it into public ownership, that is one thing. So long as it is paid for—which is the point of the Hickenlooper amendment—we cannot object to that. I do not object to it. That is its right of sovereignty. Every day we condemn property for our own governmental purposes and pay the private owner from whom we take it.

But in a speech a few weeks ago about the SEC's attitude toward a Venezuelan Government bond issue, I pointed out that private interests of governmental insiders in these underdeveloped countries are now boldly riding an understandable nationalism in their countries for their own private ends. In my judgment this private raiding of U.S. investment—if it is persisted in—is, far more than nationalization, going to give the coup de grace to all the much desired private investment in underdeveloped countries necessary to make U.S. Government foreign aid anything more than a rathole operation for the benefit of the U.S. private interests who have built up their own private vested interests in the U.S. aid policy.

Venezuela as well as being one of our best hopes for democracy and development in Latin America is one of the richest and most promising countries in Latin America. It does not need foreign aid. But as I pointed out, there is even now pending in the Venezuelan Congress a bill which would compel American investors in U.S. insurance companies, which under difficult conditions have been doing business in Venezuela for years, to give away to private Venezuelan insiders 51 percent of their stock and control of their companies at forced sale to Venezuelan political party insiders.

If they can get by with it in the case of insurance companies, I say to American investors and other operators in Venezuela, you have no protection either. If they can get by with it in the case of insurance companies, they can get by with it on oil companies. If they can get by with it on oil companies and insurance companies, they can do it to every other major American investment in Venezuela.

This is not nationalization for Venezuelan national account or for the benefit of all the people of Venezuela. And I have been gratified that since I exposed the situation, I have learned that responsible Venezuelans agree with me.

Again this is not nationalization for the benefit of the people or the Government of Venezuela. It is confiscation for the private accounts of private Venezuelans in what I call the Pizarro tradition. Senators remember Pizarro. He was the ruthless conquistador of Peru whose striking statue—by an American sculptoress—stands today in the Plaza de Armas in Lima. In the Spanish conquest, Pizarro—the conqueror of Peru—pledged the Indian Inca, who was his prisoner, that Pizarro would not shed the Inca's blood if the Inca filled for Pizarro a room full of gold. The Inca did fill the room with gold and Pizarro took the gold. But, then do you know how Pizarro kept his word to the Inca? He indeed did not shed the Inca's blood. He just strangled the Inca instead.

There is today in every underdeveloped country plenty of would-be Pizarros with respect to established businesses that have long been developed with American investors' capital. The new form of confiscation is not a legal taking with full and adequate compensation under international law. It is not for the benefit of all the people of these countries by way of nationalization. It is a seizure instigated for the benefit of the particular Pizarros who have a temporary predatory political position that enables them for their own private interests, to compromise the future interest of their whole country by warning additional future private capital not to come into the country or it too will be "Pizarroed."

I have been intensely interested in this Venezuelan situation—in which as I have said, the most responsible Venezuelans agree with me—because I see here a cloud now no bigger than a man's hand which, if Venezuela creates the precedent for the rest of the world, is going to grow and grow and grow until it is a black thundercloud which will frighten to cover every private investor in an underdeveloped country.

I digress long enough to answer a Venezuelan editor. A Venezuelan editor wrote an editorial after my first speech on this subject and said that the reason I spoke out on this issue is that I own a large amount of stock in American companies which have investments in Venezuela.

I do not own a share of stock in any company in this country or any foreign country. I am not a man of any wealth whatsoever, but I thought it was rather amusing. This is a typical type of rebuttal that we get in Latin America, sometimes from editors. When they do not have a fact, they imagine one and then use that as their answer.

I say to that editor that what he is doing is supporting a not too concealed form of confiscation of American wealth in Venezuela.

Everyone with eyes to see the future is aware that this first prototype operation against the foreign insurance companies doing business in Venezuela—if it works—will be only the beginning of the extension of the same seizure of other people's money for private account of every foreign private investment now in Venezuela. And, if in Venezuela, then in every underdeveloped country in the world.

Now when the private investing public completely wakes up—and I intend to do the best I can to wake it up—to realize that presumptively they are going to be "Pizarroed" if they invest in underdeveloped countries, any aid the U.S. taxpayer is willing to give to world development through AID and other forms of foreign aid will be hopelessly insufficiently implemented by imprudent private investment. Then truly as I have prophesied, the insufficient amounts contributed through governmental foreign aid to underdeveloped countries will be money down a rathole.

I am completely aware that the United States cannot or does not want to tell any underdeveloped sovereign country what to do despite the accusations that have been made against me for my earlier speech. I do not want and I am not presuming to tell Venezuela what to do or any other countries which may follow Venezuela's example. If an underdeveloped country wants to be a modern Pizarro, this—and the consequences—is its own business. So also if U.S. businessmen or ambitious bankers want to take imprudent risks for their own personal account in investment in underdeveloped countries, that is their privilege, barring our immediate concern about the export of dollars badly needed for all our own development at home of the underdeveloped resources and underdeveloped people of our own country. Smart adventurers have made money before doing business in risky countries with unstable governments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 3 more minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. On the other hand, we can still—I assume—tell ourselves what to do and in this Pizarro situation in Venezuela and elsewhere, it is clear what our own U.S. Government policy should be. Attending strictly to our own business, if there is getting loose in the world this Pizarro complex to confiscate existing American investment for the account of private government and party insiders in these underdeveloped countries, there are clearly three imperatives of U.S. Government policy:

First. Entirely apart from our foreign aid appropriation, it is ridiculous for the U.S. taxpayers, through whatever form of foreign assistance, to be guaranteeing loans of any kind to U.S. investments in countries with this Pizarro complex. If private investors want to take imprudent risks for extraordinary profits they should take them without the guarantee of U.S. taxpayers.

Second. It is the particular duty of the SEC to take judicial notice, as we lawyers say, of these foreign government raids for private account in underdeveloped countries and to warn and warn and warn the U.S. investor of this growing climate of private confiscation for the benefit of these private Pizarros of whatever he invests abroad. I warn the SEC that I will be unremitting in my warnings to the SEC to be adequate in the SEC's warnings to the uninformed U.S. investing public on this growing danger and in my warnings to the public to hold the SEC responsible if the public is not warned. I do not think U.S. Government policy wants a repetition of the sucker climate for foreign securities we had in the 1920's.

Third. As for the significance of this incident in Venezuela to this whole debate about foreign aid, the logic is ruthless. If—as seems likely—this Venezuelan precedent is to be created, then it is a farce to pretend that this proposed U.S. Government foreign aid contribution is not just money down a rathole. If this precedent is going to be created in Venezuela, the richest and most hopefully democratic country in the underdeveloped world, then there is simply not going to be a flow of private investment—United States or European—into underdeveloped countries teeming, even more than Venezuela with hungry private Pizarros. Certainly there is going to be no gushing flow adequate to implement in any hoped-for degree the inadequate funds for foreign aid which can be expected from taxpayers' government appropriations either here or abroad. And because of the certainty of the failure of such supplemental private funds to arrive, the funds that can be provided by way of Government are, as even the proponents of foreign aid admit, merely money—and hope—down the rathole.

Lastly, let me say to my friends in Latin America that we are trying to export to them economic freedom. That is based, of course, upon our private enterprise system. But if they are going to follow the example that is about to be set in Venezuela, they will not only discourage American investors from setting up their private enterprises in cooperation with the people in Latin America, but they will store up a form of protest against American taxpayers, who will serve notice on the politicians in the Congress and in the executive branch of the Government that they want no more waste of American taxpayer's money in a foreign aid program which produces such horrendous results.

Mr. President, I believe we can safely save $100 million on the Alliance for Progress program next year, and, by doing so, serve clear notice on Latin America that it must do a better job of putting its own economic house in order before the pockets of the American taxpayers are going to be called upon for more funds.

I close with the following statement: The issue is whether or not the American taxpayers are going to invest in a sound program in Latin America or whether or not the Congress of the United States will permit Latin American irresponsible juntas, one junta after another, to pick the pockets of the American taxpayer. I am against pocket picking.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

FOREIGN AID NECESSARY BUT INADEQUATE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to discuss briefly the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, an amendment which I fully support because it represents the beginning of a new line of policy with respect to military aid. Also, I deeply believe—and this will be the burden of my remarks today—that we need a new line of policy with respect to economic aid as well.

The Senator from Arkansas proposes that we recognize—in practice as well as in words—the primacy in our policy of cooperative activities in the Americas on a regional basis, by actually committing a portion of the funds authorized for military aid to a force acting on the part of the Organization of American States, and by committing future expenditures for Latin American military aid to OAS jurisdiction as well. This is the way in which we may, at long last, have an approach to the rule of law instead of the rule of force.

The first stage of nationalism is now being succeeded by regionalism; and if the region will but accept the responsibility, which is implicit in Senator FULBRIGHT's amendment, then the whole movement toward regional action can make great progress.

This amendment is in the nature of an inducement to the OAS to accept that kind of responsibility.

I believe that as the most powerful Nation, by far, we should offer that inducement in order to rebut completely any idea that we are trying to dictate to anybody or that we seek a reversion to gunboat diplomacy.

I hope the Fulbright amendment will be adopted and incorporated into the bill. I hope that the Senator from Arkansas will then insist on it and fight for it in conference. I hope that if it becomes necessary we shall vote on it, because it is important enough that we should do so. I feel it is essential that we take a strong position on it. I hope that the Senator from Arkansas will not feel that for the sake of peace in conference he will have to give up a big part of this amendment. It is too important for him to do that. It is high time, in our relations with our sister body—and we respect them and have deep affection for them—that we show a little vertebra, especially on the foreign aid bill. I hope very much that the Senator from Arkansas will feel encouraged to do that, especially with respect to this kind of amendment, with which we are seeking to break through to a new field in the foreign aid program. The amendment makes a great deal of sense. I am delighted that the Senator from Arkansas has offered it.

It is in that spirit that I wish to discuss a subject, the long and short of which is that we are beginning to build a bridge, in respect to foreign aid, which does not have the necessary few feet at each end to connect it with the land on both sides. In other words, it does not quite meet the objective. It is by now very clear that, so far as our goal is concerned, we have a very real opponent, a highly formidable opponent, in the Communist idea. Superficially it is becoming more and more difficult to make the people of Africa, of Latin America, of the Middle East, and of Asia, with their age-old suffering and lack of understanding of the evangelism of democracy as we know it and as Western Europe knows it, and as it is beginning to be known, to some extent, in Latin America, in Asia and other parts of the world, understand that they still have a long way to go.

Communist doctrine, superficially, is more attractive to them than the level of starvation which has been their lot for centuries. If we cannot immeasurably improve their lot through democracy, so that their economic well-being can be made compatible with dignity, we are not using the resources of our system as we should. It is my deep conviction that we are not doing so, and that we shall fail completely unless we do.

Just as the Senator from Arkansas leads us now to the missing link in our military affairs through regional action, as he seeks to have it operate through the Organization of American States, so I believe the missing link in the economic field is our failure to use the private sector. The difference is like the difference between day and night; the difference between success and failure.

Therefore, I strongly urge that the Committee on Foreign Relations give consideration to a plan which will establish an organization in the field of foreign aid similar to the role played by Comsat—the Communications Satellite Corp.—in the field of communications. I propose a federally chartered investment corporation, capitalized at $2.5 billion, to beef up our foreign investments and to supplement what the foreign aid program and international lending agencies are doing.

I do not agree—I disagree most emphatically—with the proposal to terminate the foreign aid program in its present form at the end of fiscal year 1967. Surely, there are widespread defects in the program; but the fact is that it has been phased into a heavily economic assistance program.

All of the arguments about foreign aid, its efficiency, its effectiveness, its strategy, and its tactics, cannot stretch the amount of aid which we have to meet the need as we should meet it. Something fundamental and basic is missing. We could be as efficient as we like and yet we would not cover what is the essential need with the resources that are made available today.

In short, our job is not just to keep abreast of population growth or of the latest reasonable techniques in help. Our job is to give the developing countries a feeling that their greatest hope is with us, not with the United States only but with the free world and with the cause of freedom.

In my judgment, we will not have enough time to determine this struggle between freedom and Communist totalitarianism, unless we improve the economic aid situation. The people of the world are too impatient, and even if they are uneducated and cannot understand the ideological argument, they are not going to wait until they do. The struggle is going to be determined, in my judgment, by economic competition and social justice.

The things which reach the individual's mind and heart directly, even without education or experience in self-government, are the joys and excitements of individual freedom and individual dignity. On that basis we are not giving people the opportunity to see measurable increased hope from us of such superior strength and decisive character as to win this struggle with another philosophy. Though communism may not offer a selection of automobiles ranging from the Mustang to the Lincoln, nonetheless, we must recognize its appeal to people who are in a relatively primitive economic state by giving them some basic security, some basic subsistence levels, some basic industrialization opportunities, and some basic assurance of getting above the level of starvation which has been their lot for centuries. We can do it infinitely better, of course, and with individual dignity preserved but we must demonstrate it for the Communist thesis can be made to sound superficially more idealistic and more immediate in the selling to the audience we and they are trying to reach. So the competition is real, it is earnest, and we must show a decisive superiority.

I disagree most emphatically with the Foreign Relations Committee's recommendation that the foreign aid program be terminated in its present form at the end of fiscal year 1967, because despite some defects—some of which I will outline below—the program is sound and run with effectiveness. Sixty-five percent of our aid in fiscal year 1966 is economic assistance, while 10 years ago two-thirds of our aid was military. In fiscal year 1966, 74 percent of development loans will go to 7 countries; 88 percent of the supporting assistance to 4 countries; 72 percent of the military assistance to 11 countries. Foreign aid expenditures account for one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product as compared to 2 percent at height of Marshall plan, and 3.5 percent of the Federal budget—nearly 12 percent 17 years ago. Over 85 percent of all aid dollars is now committed directly for purchase of U.S. goods and services. Ending the program so abruptly will seriously undermine the effect of this program in the next 2 years. It will also undermine the efforts of aid recipient countries to use U.S. economic assistance in a rational, well-planned manner.

But the foreign aid program under consideration by the Congress this year is inadequate in certain respects. I summarize these inadequacies as follows:

First. While the close to $3.4 billion that would be authorized under the House-passed bill, or that reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is inadequate, when compared to the needs of the developing nations of the free world, it is probably in the order of magnitude just about all that can be expected from appropriations by the Congress. While I shall analyze this figure here in governmental terms, I shall later on in these remarks make clear that the substantial accretions to our effort in foreign aid must and can come from the private sector.

According to the 1964 annual report of the Council of Economic Advisors, the total long-term receipts of developing countries from public and private bilateral and multinational sources now total in the area of $8 billion a year. On the other hand, estimates made by a number of highly reputable experts place the capital needs of the developing countries at between an additional $7 to $11 billion per annum. This gap is based on the modest assumption that such additional funds would be required to permit developing countries to grow at an overall rate of between 4½ and 6 percent per year. Given the present 2.1 percent annual increase in the world's population, the increase in per capita gross national product that will result from this additional flow of capital, would amount to between 2.1 to 3.9 percent per year. The average per capita gross national product of developing countries is now estimated at $130 per year. The need for additional capital indicated above is, therefore, real and critical.

While it is true that in addition to funds authorized under the Foreign Assistance Act, the United States also supplies economic aid to developing countries through food for peace, the Export-Import Bank, the Peace Corps, and capital subscriptions to international organizations—IBRD, IADB, IDA and IFC—the totality of aid available for essential development remains inadequate. In fiscal year 1964 total U.S. economic aid—bilateral and through international agencies—was $4.8 billion.

There is a related problem which must also be considered: the interest cost and duration of credit presently being extended to developing nations. Today these countries are paying about $2½ billion a year, or one-fifth of their gross capital inflows, for servicing their externally held public debt and the charges are mounting rapidly. Still worse, the charges are mounting much more rapidly than are the exports earnings required to service the total debt. Between 1956 and 1962 debt service rose from 3 to 7 percent of the value of developing countries exports of goods and services. The need for a drastic increase in the volume of long-term, low-cost credits—both public and private—cannot, therefore, be stressed enough.

Second. At the present time much too little of our foreign aid is channeled through multilateral organizations. I was, therefore, gratified that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee put two important provisions in the pending bill: First, section 101(b) which urges that the United States and other free world nations place an increasing portion of their assistance programs on a multilateral basis; and, second, section 102(b) which authorizes the President, after consideration of the extent of additional participation by other countries, to make available up to 20 percent of funds authorized under title I to IDA, the IBRD, or the IFC on a grant or loan basis for use by these international development agencies under their own criteria and regulations.

The share of the total free world aid flow channeled through multilateral agencies has increased from 12 percent in 1960 to 17 percent in 1963. In fiscal year 1966 the share of U.S. economic assistance to be channeled through multilateral organizations—the IBRD, IADB, IDA, and IFC—represents 14 percent of our total economic aid—11 percent in fiscal year 1965.

I fully agree with the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, that multilateral aid carries the dignified connotation of a community—the non-Communist world—organized to meet its common and rightful responsibilities toward its less fortunate members. Bilateral aid programs are susceptible to political influences, to misdirected economic priorities, loss of economic objectivity, and postponement of necessary economic and social reforms in the recipient country. Multilateral aid—while not always a success—is relatively independent of political pressures, makes available to a developing country the experience of all nations, enables it to buy in the cheapest markets, and to avoid any compromise to its sovereignty in regulating its internal affairs. Because international lending agencies are generally felt to have no ulterior motive, they can exert more influence over the use of a loan than is possible for a bilateral lender; they can insist that the projects for which they can lend are established on a sound basis and—most important—they can make their lending conditional upon commensurate efforts being made by the recipient country itself and enforce it.

The well-known Clay committee's report of March 1963 made the following observations on multilateral aid:

> We believe that both multilateral and bilateral assistance programs will have important roles in the foreseeable future. We also believe that the interest both of the United States and of the developing nations will be best served by the gradual shifting to effective international administration, free of the complications arising from membership of the Soviet bloc, of as large a share of the responsibility for developmental investment as the cooperation of other free world aid-giving nations makes possible.
>
> A multilateral organization, having no political or commercial interests of its own to serve, is able to concentrate on obtaining the greatest possible return, in terms of economic and social development, for each dollar of aid funds invested. It is also better able to limit its assistance to projects which are soundly conceived and executed and to condition the financing of such projects upon appropriate economic performance by the recipient country. Moreover, conditions imposed by an international cooperative organization are not so susceptible to the charge that they infringe on the sovereignty of the recipient country; even if they offend national sensitivities, they do less damage to the fragile fabric of comity among nations than when such resentment is directed against a single country. Also, to the extent that international administration integrates funds contributed by a number of countries, it avoids the difficult problems of coordination which arise when aid is provided by many independent sources.

Should section 102(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965 become law, the United States would still be left with a substantial portion of its development aid program—food for peace, Export-Import Bank loans, funds for the Alliance for Progress, and a substantial amount of technical assistance—administered on a bilateral basis.

Third. Much is to be said for authorization of foreign economic assistance funds beyond 1 year at a time—the practice with respect to most aspects of the program. I believe that experience with the Development Loan Fund and the Alliance for Progress—both of which were, until this year, under multiyear authorizations—strongly support the extension of this idea to the whole program. Sound planning of economic development programs is difficult if not impossible on the basis of year-to-year uncertainties. Also, annual review of this program requires an inordinate amount of time of the Congress and administration officials. Both could, in my view, spend their time more effectively in administration and legislative oversight.

Fourth. It is my judgment that the big missing element if we are to prevail—and it is certainly in the interest of mankind that we should—must be supplied by what is the true genius of our civilization, and the endemic weakness of the Communist civilization. There are two things we can give that the Communists cannot give no matter how hard they might try, no matter how much Brezhnev and Kosygin might want to—credit and ownership.

The missing link in the whole foreign aid picture in my judgment is the full and complete participation of the private sector, and I believe that this is the direction of the whole effort into which we must now move.

The recognition is becoming widespread that all of the resources and the technical know-how of the private sector must be enlisted if we are really to make foreign aid count as a decisive factor in the victory of freedom.

During the past 4 years there has been an increasing emphasis on private enterprise cooperation in the foreign aid program. However, in my view we have only scratched the surface of the potentials in such cooperation. The Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid, which I proposed and which became part of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, bears therefore an important responsibility in recommending to the President and the Congress further means for bringing about the most effective utilization of private enterprise in the achievement of the basic objectives of the U.S. foreign aid program. The Committee must by law submit its final report by June 30, 1965. The Committee report comes at a time when it could be of material assistance in strengthening and modernizing this crucial effort.

Fifth. On May 19, 1965, I introduced a bill, S. 1992, which would provide a new approach in Government-private enterprise cooperation in the field of foreign economic assistance. The bill is cosponsored by Senators COOPER, HARTKE, MORSE, PELL, and SCOTT and has been referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for consideration.

I believe that the 1960's call for the introduction of new concepts for the channeling of private and public capital and technical know-how from the developed to developing countries which are struggling to develop their economies in a democratic framework. The federally chartered Peace by Investment Corporation which would be created under this bill, extends the concept of Government-private enterprise cooperation embodied in Comsat by joining private effort and the national purpose. This Corporation would tap very large private resources, mostly millions of small investors, for the purpose of sound investment in developing countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I have an additional 3 minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, we have very limited time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the main point is that we are now appropriating approximately $3.5 billion a year for foreign aid, and that is probably somewhere near the feasible limit of what we can appropriate from public funds. When we consider everything else that everyone in the world is doing, foreign aid amounts to approximately $8 billion a year. We have approved $3 to $4 billion a year. It is my deep conviction that the only way in which to make this up is by a private enterprise system. The way in which to achieve that kind of result from a private enterprise system is by a federally chartered investment company such as Comsat, the German Development Corporation, and similar organizations established in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. I have proposed that in the Peace By Investment Corporation.

As provided in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, military aid is the one road to be traveled by economic aid. In my judgment, we are within sight of achieving our goal, as represented in foreign aid, provided we have the fortitude and the initiative to continue to carry through with aid from the great public resources which we have used. The great private resources ought to be set to work on this aspect of the struggle for peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a while ago in colloquy with my distinguished colleague from Arkansas, I suggested that it might be well to have language added to the amendment to indicate that the program would be on a cost-sharing basis.

In this connection I suggest this language, which I have discussed with the chairman of the committee, and which is, I understand, agreeable to him. My suggested amendment is as follows:

> In line 8 of the amendment by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], after the word "assistance", to insert "on a cost sharing basis.".

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the senior Senator from Louisiana. I am perfectly willing to accept the language. I believe that it is a very good amendment. I am glad to accept that language, and I so modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that, out of the $55 million that would be allocated for military help to South American nations, the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas would authorize the use of $25 million for an inter-American military force to be under the control of the Organization of American States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct, except that the $55 million would not really be allocated. That would be a ceiling to be put on military assistance to all Latin America.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that the administration still would have the ultimate decision as to whether it would subscribe to the policy of putting $25 million into a regional operation, or any part thereof?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The language is clearly permissive. It may be used. It does not provide that it shall be used. If the administration does not wish to use it, there would be nothing in the measure that would compel it to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Montana has time remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He yielded time to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I read from line 11 of the amendment which provides, "to the maximum extent feasible, military assistance shall be furnished to American republics only in accordance with joint plans." "To the maximum extent possible" is interpreted by me to mean that our Government shall determine to what maximum lengths it will go in making the allocation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that is correct. It would leave to the administration the discretion as to whether or not it would be feasible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, However, I shall take 1 minute to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 233) offered by the Senator from Arkansas. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 109 Leg.]

YEAS—91

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—9

Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Curtis
Hart
Magnuson
Moss
Muskie
Prouty
Symington

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment (No. 233), as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 236

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, No. 236, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment (No. 236) submitted by Mr. PROXMIRE is as follows:

On page 15, line 6, insert the following:

"(a) Amend section 604(b), which relates to maximum prices for commodities procured under the Act, by inserting '(1)' after the word 'than' and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'or (2) in the case of petroleum or petroleum products, the price generally charged by the supplier in comparable export sales from the source country at the time of purchase. Clause (2) of the foregoing sentence shall not apply to the purchase price in sales under formal competitive bid procedures. The term "comparable export sales" as used in such clause shall not include sales to affiliates.'

"(b) Amend section 604, which relates to procurement, by adding the following new subsection (e):

" '(e) No part of the funds made available under this Act or Commodity Credit Corporation owned commodities shall be used to pay any barter contractor's commission or disposal fees (commodity disposal cost) in any case in which commodities furnished to a recipient country are procured through the barter of other commodities and any such commission or fee shall be paid or absorbed by the supplier of the commodities through a reduction in anticipated profits.' "

On page 15, line 6, strike "(a)" and insert "(c)".

On page 16, line 3, strike "(b)" and insert "(d)".

On page 16, line 22, strike "(c)" and insert "(e)".

On page 17, line 11, strike "(d)" and insert "(f)".

On page 18, line 12, strike "(e)" and insert "(g)".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 40 minutes be allotted to discussion of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, 20 minutes to a side——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I hope that I shall not be compelled to object, I have not had an opportunity to study the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. So far as I am concerned, it has come out of the blue, so to speak. It is not the kind of amendment that Senators should vote upon without both sides of the question being understood. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, if his committee had an opportunity to study the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. We considered the amendment and rejected it. Last year, however, we did accept it and took it into conference with the House but we could not save it in conference.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to have an opportunity to study the amendment briefly. As soon as I know a little bit more about it, I believe that I shall be willing to agree to limit debate. I would rather have the Senator from Wisconsin go ahead and make his presentation, and then I may be willing to agree.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, temporarily, I withdraw the unanimous consent request.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my amendment would amend section 604 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the use of funds made available under the act for payment for petroleum products at prices in excess of competitive world market prices, and bar the use of Federal funds for the payment of barter agents' commissions.

My amendment has these two objectives:

First. To prohibit the Agency for International Development—AID—from purchasing oil for use in its program at higher than world competitive prices, that is, it would end the international oil bromide that only fools affiliates and AID pays posted prices.

Second. To forbid the use of Federal funds to pay any barter agent's commission in any case in which commodities or defense articles furnished to a recipient are procured through the barter of other commodities or defense articles.

In my judgment, there are three compelling reasons for urging passage of my amendment. They are:

First. Economy: If this amendment had been in force in 1964, AID could have passed a $16,500,000 savings along to the hard-pressed American taxpayer.

Second. The balance-of-payments deficit: This savings would have helped lower our deficit. A significant proportion of the $100 million spent by AID in oil purchases was spent with foreign suppliers. Almost all of these purchases were for posted prices.

Third. The free enterprise system: My amendment would force AID to fight for competitive oil prices in huge areas of the world where the international oil companies now rig prices at artificially high levels.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to his colleague [Mr. NELSON]?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. NELSON. Do I correctly understand that the AID agency is the only one of the Federal Government agencies which buys at posted prices?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. The other big oil procurement agency is the Defense Department, and it never buys at posted prices. It has a policy of not buying at posted prices.

Mr. NELSON. Has the AID agency or anyone else given any justification or argument for justification of buying at posted prices?

Mr. PROXMIRE. At one time Mr. David Bell, the Director of the AID agency, indicated in a directive that it would not buy at posted prices. He was subsequenty reversed on that policy.

Since then, State Department and AID opposed the amendment. Its argument does not make any sense to me, and I shall discuss that issue in the course of my presentation. But they do oppose it. The Agency for International Development does not oppose most of my assumptions, but it opposes the amendment.

Before going into detail on my proposal, I would like to point out that the Agency for International Development denies that any savings could result from this amendment. AID admits that posted prices are always higher than competitive prices. AID also admits that the Department of Defense has refused to pay the posted price for oil and has successfully purchased oil at lower, competitive prices in the same areas of the world where AID continues to pay the higher, posted prices.

But how does AID come to the conclusion that no savings would result from my amendment in the face of these two admissions? Simply by begging the question. Boiled down, this is the State Department's position:

> AID pays the higher posted price in the Far East because it is the only price that exists. The Department of Defense manages to buy at a lower, competitive price in this same area of the world because it purchases in much larger quantities. AID's purchases from the large international oil companies represent such a small portion of their business, that AID is not in a position to force a competitive price.

I simply refuse to accept this explanation. In the first place, the State Department has made no attempt to force a competitive pricing situation and yet rejects out of hand any effort to do this on the ground that "it won't do any good."

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. NELSON. I am puzzled by the Senator's statement that both AID and the Defense Department buy oil in the same geographical area, and the Defense Department acquires the oil at competitive prices and the AID agency acquires it at posted prices. After all, this is one Government. Why does not the Defense Department make the acquisition of oil for both?

Mr. PROXMIRE. In some cases that has taken place, as in Korea and in a few other areas. That is the exception, however, and not the rule. By and large, AID recipients will secure the oil. The purchase is not made by AID, which is giving the assistance. In some cases the Defense Department handles the transaction and in such cases there is a big saving, because the price is the world competitive price.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the Senator's answer to the question of his colleague from Wisconsin, AID does not buy the oil directly. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct, to a degree. Actually the international oil companies bill AID directly for these oil shipments.

Mr. ELLENDER. What method is used by AID in order to have the recipient country pay the posted price? Why is not the recipient country given the privilege of buying at competitive prices?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The answer is that AID has adopted this policy, since we provide the funds and the assistance, and the position of AID has not been challenged. It is interesting that in some of the countries that are getting this assistance serious consideration is being given to installing their own refining procedures, so that they will not have to go through the present procedure, because it hurts both them and our taxpayers. They realize that. In a few countries there has been expropriation, which we feel may have been provoked by this policy of AID.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not had an opportunity to read all the hearings, but I would like to know if any specific instance is cited to indicate that AID insists that the oil be purchased by the recipient country on the basis of posted prices?

Mr. PROXMIRE. We have taken the facts that have been developed and revealed. It is a fact that AID has proceeded on the basis of posted prices. It is the only agency that requires posted prices. No effort has been made to ask for advertised competitive bidding, or to ask a country to follow such a procedure. The practice of paying posted prices has been the rule. AID does not contest that fact. They agree that there is this difference between their procurement policy and the procurement policy of the Defense Department. There is no doubt on that issue.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator assuming that in quite a large number of cases the recipient country buys the oil at posted prices, although there is no evidence to indicate that it is actually doing so?

Mr. PROXMIRE. In my opinion, the evidence is conclusive. The purchases have consistently been made on the basis of posted prices, with the exception of South Korea, for example, and a few other places, where the Defense Department has done the purchasing. In those instances world competitive prices have been paid. AID has paid competitive prices, and not posted prices in those cases and only in those cases.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us what losses the recipient countries have sustained because they are forced to buy at posted prices?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will rephrase my question. What is the difference between the competitive prices and the posted prices?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It varies. The posted prices vary between 20 and 40 percent higher than competitive prices. There is good reason for paying the posted prices. It makes good sense, particularly good business sense, because it reduces a company's tax liability. It gives an international oil company an opportunity virtually to eliminate its income taxes. It is good for the oil company, but it is something the Government of the United States should not have to pay, and the foreign country should not be forced to pay it through our AID program.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish the Senator would go further into the question of how income taxes are affected.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. If a company receives more in income, it would seem to me that it would pay more income taxes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. A company which has a producing facility in Saudi Arabia, for example, and sells its oil in France, would pay a higher price in Saudi Arabia, where there is no income tax, and where the company pays on a per barrel basis. The affiliate must pay a higher price, and the cost in France would be greater, and therefore the profit in France might be negligible. For this reason the company pays little tax to France. The high posted price in Saudi Arabia makes its material cost so high that it has no French tax liability. Therefore, the posted price makes sense from the standpoint of reducing the company's overall tax liability. The tax is reduced in France. It is no higher than before in Saudi Arabia where the tax is on a per barrel basis.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. TOWER. I apologize. This is a highly complicated subject, and it has come up so recently that I ask these questions primarily out of ignorance. As I understand, this is AID-financed oil. The purchases are financed by AID. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TOWER. Where does most of the oil go? What areas are we talking about? They are not specified.

Mr. PROXMIRE. A great deal of it goes to southeast Asia. Much of it goes to Laos and Vietnam. However, it goes wherever in the world we have an AID program to provide oil to recipient countries. Most of it, if we want to put it on a percentage basis, goes to southeast Asia.

Mr. TOWER. Is the storage and distribution of the oil actually handled by AID or is it handled by private commercial facilities, or what?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is handled by private commercial facilities.

Mr. TOWER. If the amendment were adopted, would it mean that AID would have to establish its own distribution and storage facilities?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; AID would not have to establish its own distribution and storage facilities. All it would be required to do would be what the Defense Department does and what any private buyer does. They would have to do their best to buy at competitive prices.

We are dealing with a homogeneous commodity. It is one in which the price is the big element and in which quality is easily defined. Monopoly is not easy. It takes careful rigging with Government cooperation. This is an isolated example of how the affiliates and AID have alone paid this artificial, posted price.

Mr. TOWER. In other words, the oil is acquired offshore. Is that correct? Is it acquired outside the United States?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is acquired substantially, though not entirely, from American companies, some of the big American companies—it may be the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, or some other American company—which have holdings all over the world.

Mr. TOWER. The oil is not domestically produced, but is produced in such places as Indonesia, or other parts of the world. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure that would be the case in most cases, although perhaps not in all.

Mr. TOWER. Would the adoption of the Senator's amendment have any effect on the price of domestic crude or the importation of foreign crude into this country? This subject may seem abstract, but I wonder if the Senator could give his opinion on it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The impact of the amendment would be negligible on the price that AID pays. Although $100 million is a great deal of money, this business, as the Senator knows, is an enormous business, involving many billions of dollars a year. Therefore the purchases by AID could not be said to be so significant as to affect the price. Perhaps if the Defense Department were adopting this position, it could have an impact.

Mr. TOWER. The Defense Department, of course, gets it for its own use. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; and it buys at competitive prices, too.

Mr. CLARK. I was of the view that under the AID program there was, if not a compulsion, at least a persuasion always to "buy American," to buy from American companies. That policy might well account for the fact that the recipient countries would have the say about where the oil that they receive should be purchased. The AID people were acting under a governmental policy by which they were supposed to buy American products for use in the AID program. Therefore, American oil should be bought.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think there is something to that statement. The fact is that last year 17 percent of AID oil was purchased not from American companies but from foreign countries. The fact is that the recipient countries buy not only from American but from foreign countries. The thrust of the Senator's question may be correct. In other words, we have tried to influence the countries to buy from American companies wherever possible, for it does have a somewhat favorable effect on our balance of payments.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not generally what might loosely be called a cartel of oil companies, in which the U.S. oil companies participate, which results in a posted price for oil? My understanding is that it is the Gulf coast posted price, which is far above the world price, and it is that higher price which AID is insisting be paid for oil delivered to foreign countries.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe that the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct. I appreciate that statement, which I believe gives emphasis to the point.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Can the Senator tell us what part of the oil is produced by American or domestic producers?

Mr. PROXMIRE. American domestic producers? I do not have those figures. We have studied the question for a couple of years and we have asked this kind of question over and over again. It is our impression, as I said to the Senator from Texas, that very little is produced by American domestic producers. Much of it is procured from American companies, but from their foreign holdings.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I gained the impression that the amendment would preclude any American-produced oil from being sold into the AID program on that basis

Mr. PROXMIRE. Oh, no. The amendment would not have that result at all. There is no reason why we should buy at posted prices from American companies; I mean American companies which are producing in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, or some other American State. It is very, very unlikely that we would do that, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, because if we are buying oil from South American countries, and relatively little of it goes there, we would be much more inclined to buy from Colombia or from one of the other South American countries, and certainly in southeast Asia the transportation situation—that is where a great deal of the oil goes—would necessitate our buying it out in that area.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator aware of the fact that in trying to protect our balance of payments, our country has been trying to go more and more on a buy-American basis? Obviously in a great number of instances—in fact, any time the decision is actually meaningful—invariably the decision is to buy American, even though it costs more than it would to buy from foreigners to help protect our balance of payments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me that we would be much more likely to buy from American companies if the amendment is adopted. I make that statement for several reasons. For one thing, people who are interested in the amendment and who have talked to me are overwhelmingly from American independent companies. They feel very strongly that they have been excluded from the situation. They would like to bid and participate.

Second, we have a very competitive oil industry, whereas the foreign countries are cartelized and operated on a much more monopolistic basis, and lend themselves much more to the posted price kind of procedure.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As the Senator knows, the foreign price is lower than the American price, to begin with. It is difficult for me to see how any American oil could be shipped to meet any of the AID requirements, if the American companies must not only meet the foreign price but also must pay the ocean freight to get it to where it is to be used. On that basis I would gain the impression that what the Senator is doing is going exactly opposite from the buy-American policy. We tend to hurt our balance of payments insofar as Americans are denied the right to sell oil. In addition, it seems that the amendment might very well keep American producers from having an opportunity to sell where they might have a market available to them. The Senator knows that with regard to almost everything else we manufacture in this country the buy-American policy reaches out to it.

Every industry except oil is given an opportunity to benefit. We have a big shipping subsidy. I think it should be more, because that is one way in which we can help our balance of payments. We buy a great many things abroad. We buy a great many American commodities and ship them abroad. In many instances, in doing business with foreign concerns, we require that they spend the dollars they receive in order to buy American commodities.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana might well offer an amendment which would require us to provide American-produced oil in the AID program. But my amendment would not affect that policy at all. So far as I know—and the State Department has had plenty of time to come up with other figures—not a gallon of AID oil is produced in this country. Perhaps some of it is, but I doubt it very much. All the economic elements and other elements in the situation would indicate that very, very little—and perhaps none of it—is bought here.

So far as the balance of payments is concerned, the amendment would help in our balance-of-payments situation because it would reduce the amount of American AID dollars that are required to buy the oil that is needed. It would reduce the amount by $16.5 million or $17 million, which in a $100 million total is a substantial amount. There is no question that the amendment, regardless of any other possibilities, would have the effect of improving our balance-of-payments situation. It would reduce the amount that we spend.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator knows that the American companies make a showing that they are bringing into this country on an annual basis a greater amount than they are taking out. I believe the favorable balance of payment that we have with regard to the oil and gas industry is about $400 million. Of course, they must make some money over there in order to be able to do that.

I reserve any further question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am somewhat puzzled by the fact that the Senator has offered two amendments in one. It seems to me that there may be merit in his argument with reference to the first part of the amendment, that is, the posting of prices. I am not talking about how good business might dictate the posting of prices, but I do understand—and I take the Senator's word for the fact—that it cost us extra money last year by reason of using these posted prices.

But the second part of this has to do with barter sales. I can only take the word of the agency that administers the act, but that agency has stated that the proposal might completely end barter purchases, barter sales, and that is where the balance of payments would be greatly affected, because in making those barter transactions, surplus commodities are used in lieu of dollars to buy the products, the commodities that are needed in the AID program, and the amendment would put an end to that. That is where the big money would be involved, and money that, as I see it, which would affect our balance of payments disadvantageously.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would be happy to separate the amendment. Of course, it could be separated by any Senator who would wish to do so. Frankly, I am offering the amendment in its present form in order to save the time of the Senate and the time of the Senator from Alabama.

We have a unique situation in relation to paying barter commissions in the AID program. It is not the custom; it is not done in the commercial area at all by the buyer. It is done by the seller, by the supplier. We feel under those circumstances that there is every reason to expect and predict that the bartering agents get double commissions this way. They get one from the buyer and one from the seller. What we are trying to provide is that the usual commercial method be used. We would provide that the bartering commissions be paid by the seller rather than making the Federal Government pay them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I understand, what happens is that we employ a barter agent—or I suppose in this country we would call him a broker—to buy up the things that we desire, to bring together the two parties, those who want our surplus commodities and those who have the things that we want to buy and use in our AID program. In other words, we employ him, as I understand it. This is a most complex and technical subject.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Alabama has raised a very good point. Frankly, the amendment as originally drafted and submitted was defective.

It went much further than we thought it should go. Is the Senator referring to amendment No. 236?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I looked at it earlier today.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I had an earlier amendment that went further with respect to barter agents' commissions than it had to go, and raised the point which the Senator from Alabama properly raises. Let me read the language of this amendment, which is now corrected. Does the Senator have the amendment No. 236 before him?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This amendment reads, in part:

> No part of the funds made available under this act or Commodity Credit Corporation owned commodities shall be used to pay any barter contractor's commission or disposal fees (commodity disposal cost) in any case in which commodities furnished to a recipient country are procured through the barter of other commodities and any such commission or fee shall be paid or absorbed by the supplier of the commodities through a reduction in anticipated profits.

It does not provide that suppliers may not pay a commission. That was the point that was objected to by AID in the original amendment. We have eliminated that. All we provided was that AID shall not pay the barter agent's commission.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, it still has a barter situation in it. I have read the substance of the comment that the AID agency has made, concerning the way the business is carried on.

There are two main types of barter transactions. In one type the barter contractor is "paid" by the CCC in the form of commodities. In other words, the barter contractor agrees to furnish certain goods to a third country in return for a specified quantity of CCC-owned commodities.

In return, they specify the quantity of CCC-owned commodities. This specified quantity is determined by competitive bidding, and the barter contractor makes profit or suffers a loss depending on his business acumen and how well he has calculated his bid. This amendment seems to mean that the barter contractor would be prohibited from making a profit. In that case, of course, it would be impossible to arrange any barter transactions, and the barter program, which is helpful to the U.S. balance of payments, would come to an end.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is exactly my point. That refers to the earlier amendment. The language here is clear. It does not prohibit a barter contractor from receiving the commission he has always received from the supplier. It does not interfere with or prohibit that practice.

The amendment merely provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation which acts as the AID agency in this case, shall not, in effect, pay any barter contractor's commission. So the amendment does meet the specific objection made by AID. The amendment would not interfere with the normal practice, and it would not prevent or prohibit payment of a commission.

The "yeas" and "nays" on the amendment have already been ordered. If the Senator from Alabama is agreeable, I should be happy to ask unanimous consent to rescind the order for the "yeas" and "nays" if he would be willing to support the posted price aspect of the amendment.

I shall be happy to separate the amendment, to ask unanimous consent for the rescinding of the order for the yeas and nays, and to dispose of the amendment by acting on the first part of it now by voice vote, if that is the Senator's disposition.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield, while the Senator from Alabama is considering that proposal?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that the Senator from Alabama will accept that suggestion. A similar amendment was adopted by the Senate last year. I attended the hearings at which the amendment was considered, and I supported the amendment, which was carefully considered and adopted last year by the Senate.

I also read with some care the reply of AID. I find it quite unpersuasive.

It seems to me that we are vastly overemphasizing what seems to me to be a simple matter.

I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if I correctly understand that what the amendment seeks to do is to provide that the world price, determined on a free market basis for oil, shall be paid by AID, instead of the artificially fixed and controlled posted price, which regulates the price of oil in this country at a far higher level than abroad.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct. He states the proposal much better than I have stated it, and has done so concisely.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask, apropos the question asked by the Senator from Pennsylvania, whether this concept of the Senator's amendment, that the world price shall govern rather than the posted price, might result in a situation in which the Soviet Union, for example, which is highly competitive in the world oil market, might, by reason of being the low bidder, be awarded the contract, rather than an oil company owned or operated in the United States.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest to the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Wisconsin that all materials furnished in the AID program are required to be furnished by American companies, whether or not their prices are higher than others. This is done for two good reasons: to support the buy-American principle and also to protect our own balance of payments. It is highly unlikely that AID would purchase from any but American suppliers.

Mr. MILLER. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would not lay a foundation for violating that policy; would it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. All the amendment would do would be to put AID on the same basis as the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense does not buy from Russia, but buys competitively on the world market to obtain the best price.

But it is excellent legislative history to emphasize that the amendment does not breach the present procedure of not buying from Communist countries. The Senator from Iowa has raised a good point, and I appreciate his doing so.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. The situations are not comparable, because AID buys for its own use.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is true.

Mr. TOWER. I should like to hear the Senator address himself to the comments in the AID memorandum.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am doing that in the course of my presentation.

Mr. TOWER. The AID memorandum states:

> The amendment would increase the administrative burden on AID in carrying out its pricing regulations without compensation in savings. For example, it would involve AID in costly, time-confusing arguments, and possible litigation.
>
> The amendment will make the administration of the foreign exchange laws and regulations of foreign countries more difficult and will invite fraud and corruption in the administration of those laws.
>
> The actual result of the amendment would be to deprive AID, in many cases, of any effective control over prices charged in AID-financed petroleum sales.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is pretty powerful rhetoric, but it does not make any sense. After all, what we are saying is that AID should pay on the same basis as the generality of commerce pays.

Mr. TOWER. That is exactly my statement.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I know. After all, people who purchase oil for relatively small companies do not pay the posted price. They insist on paying the competitive price or the world price. I am saying that AID should do the same thing. It is inconceivable that this procedure should be more expensive and require more administration. They would have to ask for competitive prices, but that does not involve a great deal of additional bureaucracy or expense on their part. It certainly is not corrupt. It seems to me that it is the essence of free enterprise, and that prevents corruption.

Mr. TOWER. Referring to the question asked by the Senator from Iowa, would the oil be required to be purchased from none but American companies?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No. Under the AID program, 17 percent is bought from foreign companies; and, of course, what is bought from American companies is overwhelmingly produced abroad.

Mr. TOWER. Do we buy from Dutch Shell?

Mr. PROXMIRE. We buy some. We do not pay the competitive price, of course. We buy from them at the posted price.

Mr. CLARK. It occurs to me that the Defense Department analogy should be pressed harder than has hitherto been the case.

If the objections of AID are sound, why are they not compulsive with the Defense Department? Obviously, the Defense Department does not think those objections are any good or it would be paying the posted prices. In addition, the analogy is even closer. While the Defense Department buys for its own use, AID buys for someone else, and the money is that of the American taxpayers. The taxpayers are entitled to the best possible return for their funds.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I also reject the theory of AID officials that the huge oil companies will not compete for AID's business because AID does not buy in sufficiently large quantities. I am sure that all Senators have had the experience of observing that gasoline stations of even the largest oil companies meet the price competition of independents by matching and even exceeding any price cut. If Standard Oil will compete for my 5 gallons of regular, why would not it compete for AID's tens of millions of dollars of oil purchases?

The first part of the amendment would require that petroleum products procured with AID funds be purchased at a "price generally charged by the supplier in comparable export sales from the source country at the time of purchase" or under formal competitive bid procedures. The term "comparable export sales" as used in my amendment does not include sales to affiliates.

For the past 10 years or more, AID petroleum purchases have amounted to more than $100 million a year. Virtually all of these purchases, incidentally, have been from overseas sources and a substantial amount from foreign owned companies. Thus, there has been a substantial drain on our balance of payments from these purchases alone.

The great bulk of these purchases have been made through seven international companies which have affiliated operations all over the world. My amendment would exclude "sales to affiliates" of these oil giants in determining market price because transactions between the seven international companies and their affiliates are conducted at artificially arrived at purchase rates, termed "posted prices," fully 20 to 40 percent above world prices for petroleum products.

We have indicated this before. However, let me stress it again. Why are "posted prices" used in transactions between these huge oil firms and their own affiliates?

Basically, these artificially arrived at posted prices are meant to give the international oil companies certain tax breaks. For example, a company has oil production facilities in Saudi Arabia and a processing affiliate in France. Prices posted at the wellhead in Saudi Arabia are 20 to 40 percent in excess of the competitive world price. The French affiliate pays the abnormally high price, deducts it on its tax return as a cost of doing business, and thus escapes the high French tax rate on the extra money it paid to its own Saudi Arabian operation for its oil. It does not cost the company any more in taxes at the Saudi Arabian end because Saudi Arabia charges a uniform per barrel tax on oil produced within its boundaries, regardless of the price for which the oil is sold. Consequently, the extra amount paid by the French affiliate for the oil is not taxed in Saudi Arabia.

This may make good sense in terms of the internal transactions of international oil companies. But it does not make good sense for the American Government to pay these posted prices. No other nonaffiliated purchaser would. In fact, the Department of Defense, which uses enormous amounts of oil products, never pays posted prices for them. Why should AID do so then?

On the basis of AID's own figures, the agency last year paid posted prices for about 55 percent of AID financed petroleum sales of approximately $100 million. Assuming the posted price markup was an average of 30 percent, the savings to the American taxpayer would have been $16,500,000 if AID would have paid competitive rather than posted prices.

Bulk fuels—gasoline and kerosene—constituted 50 percent of AID financed sales of petroleum products in 1964. Of this, half went to Korea and was purchased at competitive prices through use of Department of Defense stocks. Forty percent of the bulk fuel purchased went to Vietnam and Laos at posted prices.

When asked to account for this, AID contended that the storage and distribution facilities in Vietnam and Laos are owned by affiliates who must buy from the major suppliers at posted prices. In my estimation, this is a totally unacceptable situation—one that AID should fight, not meekly accept.

If there presently is virtually no discounting from posted prices for movements of bulk fuels into the Far East, AID should encourage competition to develop by requiring advertised bidding. If it is true that there are areas in the world, such as the Far East, where no price yardstick exists outside the posted price, then formal competitive bid procedures should determine the purchase price. How can there ever be a competitive market if major purchasers such as AID are willing to pay artificially high prices?

My amendment would require formal bid procedures be used in areas where the only existing transactions are in posted prices. This would permit independent producers to bid in the kind of competitive market for which the United States should be known. The practice followed by AID has cost American taxpayers millions of dollars and has put us in the position of not living up to the free enterprise that we preach. Surely the noncompetitive, rigged, artificial prices countenanced by AID cannot qualify under our country's definition of free enterprise.

AID's practice of paying posted prices for oil is damaging our country in two other respects. First, it has hurt us in the balance-of-payments situation. A significant part of the AID-financed oil program last year was handed on a golden platter to foreign suppliers—virtually all at posted prices. Much of this business is going to French companies at a time when the French Government is doing everything in its power to not only embarrass the U.S. Government, but to force changes in world monetary policies which would have serious repercussions on the status and position of America in the free world.

I am not advocating that all AID oil be purchased from American companies. I am suggesting that it is unwise for this country to increase our balance-of-payments difficulties by paying prices to foreign oil companies that are 20 to 40 percent higher than competitive prices.

Another danger of continuing the posted price purchasing practice is that by forcing recipient countries to use foreign aid funds to buy oil at prices 20 to 40 percent in excess of the market price, we are encouraging these countries to cut costs by building their own facilities or expropriating existing facilities of affiliate companies charging posted prices.

This is the point that I raised with the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

For example, the Governments of Ceylon and Syria have expropriated all oil facilities. Tunisia and Ghana have built their own refineries. This is not surprising. What is surprising is that similar action has not yet been taken in all countries where one international oil company uses its position as the only distributor or supplier to charge exorbitant, artificially set prices for oil.

The second part of my amendment is designed to stop still another abuse in the AID-financed oil program.

How would this save money and how much? One of the ways in which petroleum products are purchased by foreign countries with AID funds is through barter. For example, funds are used to purchase other commodities which can in turn be exchanged for oil and gas.

Suppliers of other products customarily pay the servicing charges and disposal fees associated with their sales. These are normal business costs. But when AID finances barter transactions involving oil, it insists that the oil suppliers should not pay brokerage or selling costs. Why should the Government pay the brokerage fees? Why should normal business procedures be overturned merely to benefit one industry which hardly is in need of subsidy?

Officials of AID have been critical of this provision of my amendment on the mistaken ground that it would make it impossible to use barter arrangements. This criticism ignores the fact that suppliers have been paying agents' fees under barter arrangements since the program has been in operation.

Another criticism—that my amendment would preclude the inclusion of the barter contractor's charge in the price of the goods financed by AID—is also false. Actually, the amendment prohibits the payment by any Federal agency of these fees in the form of additional agricultural surpluses or otherwise. Whenever we do pay this commission, it is likely that the barter agent will receive a double commission—one from the supplier and the other from the Commodity Credit Corporation, which frequently participates in barter transactions through sales of surplus food. My amendment would eliminate this possibility of a double commission.

I find it strange that an arm of the Government would oppose a measure that is designed exclusively to save the taxpayers' money while at the same time not curtailing any existing program. If the administrators of this program are not concerned with the waste of public funds, then the Congress must assume this concern and act forcefully.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to discuss very briefly the other part of the amendment. It might be helpful for the RECORD.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is agreeable.

Mr. MILLER. I am not sure that we have cleared up the difficulty which I previously mentioned.

I believe that both the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Iowa have the same objective in mind. But I am not sure, as yet, that the amendment clears it up.

I shall read from amendment No. 236 of the Senator from Wisconsin. The amendment points out that the general policy is going to be that:

> In the case of petroleum or petroleum products, the price generally charged by the supplier in comparable export sales from the source country at the time of purchase.

I want this question cleared up. An exception to that general provision is provided for by the amendment of the Senator, which would provide that that particular clause of the foregoing sentence shall not apply to the purchase price in sales under formal competitive bid procedures.

That is the way AID can avoid this provision. What the Senator from Wisconsin has in mind is that there would be formal competitive bid procedures as a general practice. However, I presume that if the AID administration desires to avoid formal competitive bid procedures, all it would have to do would be to buy from suppliers at comparable export sales prices from the source country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. However, we exclude sales to affiliates from the competitive export price.

Mr. MILLER. I do not see where in the amendment that exclusionary provision is.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is on line 11, page 1, going over to page 2. The words are:

> The term "comparable export sales" as used in such clause shall not include sales to affiliates.

Mr. MILLER. That is so; but the point is that the competitive bid procedure can be applied and AID will buy at comparable export sales.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. Any useful system for buying at the world price is fine. We do not want to go through the unnecessary procedure of advertising bids if a competitive world price can be established and products can be bought on that basis.

Mr. MILLER. In determining the competitive world price, the intention of the senior Senator from Wisconsin is that countries such as the Soviet Union not be considered similar. In line with what the Senator from Wisconsin has just said, the French oil companies and their competitive bidding would not be taken into account. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. We would not mean to exclude French or other free world companies. We buy from the French under the present arrangement. We do not want that to change. We do not buy from the Russians. We do not want that to change. There is no intention under the amendment of buying either from Russia or Red China. Red China does not have any to offer, anyway.

Mr. MILLER. There is nothing in the amendment that provides we shall do so?

Mr. PROXMIRE. As the Senator from Pennsylvania pointed out a little while ago, we have had much experience in buying at the competitive world price. The Defense Department always does it. There is no question about the Defense Department buying from Russia. It never has.

Mr. MILLER. I understood that the Senator did not like some of the disadvantage of buying from the French, in view of the French attitude toward our gold situation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We are giving France an unnecessary advantage by paying the posted price, and the French companies are earning 20 to 40 percent more than the competitive world price would bring. We are damaging our balance of payments by doing this. I am for purchasing from the French. This amendment does not preclude that, but it provides that we should purchase on a competitive basis, and not on an artificial basis. The amendment would enable us to purchase on a competitive basis.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to have it made clear that when we talk about the world competitive price in competition under free trade we should not take into account companies under Soviet control or other Communist-dominated oil suppliers. I think it would be most unfortunate, for example, if a price of $3 a barrel for a certain type of oil were generally the world price, but the Soviet Union had a price of $2 a barrel, and the $3 price should be diluted as a result.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The amount of these purchases is 3 percent or less of the total amount of all AID expenditures. None of the rest of the AID expenditures are paid for at artificially rigged prices. The other AID purchases are made on the basis of competitive prices. I am only saying that that is the way we should buy oil. We do not buy other commodities involved in AID from Russia or other Communist countries. There is nothing in the amendment that is opposed to the present practice or that would persuade us to feel that we, as a result of adoption of the amendment, were going to be compelled to buy oil from Russia, or that there is any possibility of it. We are making a legislative history to this effect. I assure the Senator from Iowa and other Senators that there is no intention that we should purchase oil from Russia or other Communist countries.

Mr. MILLER. I grant that, but in determining the competitive world price, assuming that we are not going to buy from the Soviet Union and are going to buy from an American-owned company or affiliate; for example, it seems to me the decision by AID, in support of a competitive world price, should not be guided by or affected at all by what the Soviet Union is offering its petroleum products for. That is my point. If, for example, the competitive world price, excluding the Soviet Union were $3 a barrel, but the Soviet price were $2 a barrel, which would dilute the price down to about $2.50 a barrel, it seems to me we would have an artificial price which we do not want to take into account.

That problem can be taken care of by legislative history, insofar as the Senator's interpretation of his amendment is concerned. All I want to be certain about is that when we talk about competitive bid prices we are talking about bids which do not take into account bids or prices by the Soviet Union or Communist-controlled countries. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield before he leaves the subject of posted prices, along the lines of the colloquy a moment ago, there is something that disturbs me. It is one of the difficulties the Agency encounters. What was the expression that was used? Was it "competitive prices"?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Competitive prices.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Competitive prices, or comparable prices. The trouble is that in most areas of the world in which AID finds itself involved in these transactions there is a single supplier or there is an intercompany arrangement, and a competitive price cannot be had. A competitive bid cannot be obtained; so a comparable price cannot be obtained. In certain countries where AID finances the import of petroleum products, particularly in Vietnam and Laos, virtually every import is an intercompany transaction.

We are talking about competitive bidding and comparable prices as if the conditions which prevail in this country prevail in those areas, but they do not. I wish the Senator from Wisconsin would comment on that point.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator has made a very strong point. It has been stated that the Defense Department is in a different position. The position I take in my speech is that this is exactly what AID should fight for. The bid may not be accepted, but it seems to me AID should at least ask for a competitive bid. If it gets only one, at least it has tried.

The Defense Department buys all over the world in the same way. It has been said that the Defense Department buys a great deal more. That is true. But AID buys $100 million of oil products in a year.

We all know the way the oil industry has developed in this country. If there are two or three competitors in Milwaukee, for example, and one company cuts gas prices, a company like Standard Oil, Shell, or another huge giant, does the same thing. We believe that if the same effort were made to obtain a world competitive price, it would be helpful.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that there was at one time a world oil cartel—there still is a world oil cartel on paper, and partially in practice—that the oil wells in the Persian Gulf area have such a terrific flow each hour of every day that production costs are lower there. The oil cartel has been making huge profits per barrel, and holding prices down to somewhere near the American level, minus freight—in some cases plus freight; but now that more competition has come into the field, with the development of oil wells in Algeria and the Sahara Desert, there are signs that the cartel is in difficulty on its prices.

As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, he would try to use the growing competition as a club with which to compel the cartel—largely American in origin but not entirely American in origin—to reduce its prices. I believe that the Senator from Wisconsin makes a strong argument to the effect that, if the Department of Defense can do this, why cannot AID do it also?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed. The Senator from Illinois has been most helpful in pointing out that the international oil situation is such, and the economic situation is such, that my amendment would work, and work practically, and work well. We do not have a situation in which there is a world shortage of oil. There is an excess of oil in the world today. The situation lends itself to a buyer's market. The situation is such that if we believe in competitive prices, we can cut the costs of the AID program, save the taxpayers' money, and also assist the balance-of-payments problem—although on a moderate scale.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Is the Senator suggesting that an established marketing system could possibly be broken or upset by AID putting out $100 worth of petroleum purchases for competitive bidding? According to AID, it would make the problem more difficult and would remove, from its point of view, any effective control over the prices charged to AID. This is AID's contention.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We are not saying that this would revolutionize the world procedure. There are cases in which it would provide competition and substantially reduce prices. In many other cases it would not. We are saying, that there will at least be an attempt to get competitive prices. It will be perfectly proper and legal, under the amendment, in such cases, to pay comparable export prices.

Mr. TOWER. The major oil companies contend that this would upset the arrangement now in effect, by which the oil is stored and distributed through private commercial sources, and would make it incumbent upon AID to provide for its own storage and transmission facilities.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The big oil companies have said that is true. But it does not mean that it follows—that such would be the case. Of course, the big oil boys do not wish to have the Federal Government pay less, or have AID pay less. They enjoy getting higher prices, naturally. They cannot be blamed for that. They wish the posted prices to be maintained. However, there is no necessity for AID to establish its own facilities. Because we have the posted price situation, as I point out in my speech, there are two countries which are now establishing their own refining facilities precisely to get away from the posted price procedure followed by AID. There has been expropriation in two other countries because of the present AID policy.

Mr. TOWER. For example, with Sukarno expropriating American oil properties in Indonesia, under the provisions of the Senator's amendment, would Sukarno be eligible to enter a competitive bid for AID-financed oil purchases?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I suppose this is true of almost everything sold. The AID agency buys a myriad items of which oil is only 3 percent. Everything else is bought on a competitive basis. It is clear that it would not be in the interests of this country to have AID follow a policy of buying anything from Sukarno at the present time, or from Soviet Russia, or from Red China. This is a policy that my amendment, it seems to me, does not bear on directly.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to ask the Senator a question. I do not wish to be provocative, but the thought came to my mind, as I am sure it has come to the minds of other Senators, as to whether adoption of the Senator's amendment would be a vote of no confidence in David Bell, because we would assume that AID wishes to buy as cheaply as possible.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, indeed. Quite the contrary. I am glad the Senator has raised that point. I have great admiration for David Bell. I believe that he has been a superlative Administrator—perhaps the best foreign aid Administrator we have ever had. He is operating in a difficult field. The AID Administrator, Mr. Bell, at one time suggested this position, but he was overruled.

Let me quote a regulation which was published in the Federal Register for December 31, 1963, which was never finally approved but stated under section 201.63:

> Comparable export sales within the meaning of this paragraph shall not include sales to affiliates.

This is exactly what I am getting at. Mr. Bell thought it was a good system, but later he was persuaded to think otherwise. When we modify AID procedure, or amend the foreign aid program in any way, why should it be regarded as a repudiation or criticism of the very fine AID Agency Administrator.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Wisconsin has just stated that Mr. Bell thought this was a good system, but now he says that he is against his amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Agency is against it. It is for the administration's bill, of course. It is against all amendments except a few which the administration will offer.

Mr. JAVITS. I am interested in Mr. Bell's judgment. I can hardly conceive that his judgment would be suborned. It deals directly with the question of being against him unless he had some intellectual conviction on the subject. This is the point I am questioning. Has the Senator had any opportunity to write to him, or to ask him, or in any way to find out why he has apparently changed his views?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The AID Agency is against the amendment. The State Department is against it. Mr. Bell, as head of the AID Agency, speaks for the administration, of course, and is against the amendment. On the other hand, I believe that the Senator from New York is sophisticated enough to understand how these things operate. When one is the head of an agency he accepts the ruling of his superiors. Mr. Bell is an able man. But he does not have the complete authority to speak his mind or the independence of a U.S. Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Wisconsin feels, then, that he cannot get any help from him in terms of whether he changed his mind by intellectual conviction between 1963 and now, or whether he changed his mind because he is the head of the AID Agency?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am afraid not.

I thank the Senator from New York for his comments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the Senator from Wisconsin consider a possible limitation on the debate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed. I shall be perfectly happy, under the circumstances, to allow more time to the opponents than to the proponents, since I have already taken a great deal of time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I was about to discuss the possible modification of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin which might be discussed very briefly before the time limitation is put on. It might save some time if we could do it in this way.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO LIMIT DEBATE ON PENDING AMENDMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 45 minutes of debate be allowed on the pending amendment, 15 minutes in favor of the proponent, and 30 minutes in opposition to the amendment, the time to be divided between the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] or the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the majority leader could modify his request to have the time begin at the conclusion of the colloquy which I should like to have with the Senator from Wisconsin, and which I am sure will be brief, regarding a possible modification of his amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; with that proviso.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, would there be time to debate it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot hear the request of the Senator from Montana. Will he restate his request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment be limited to 45 minutes, 15 minutes to be under the control of the proponent of the amendment, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and 30 minutes under the control of the chairman of the committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] or the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the time begin to run at the conclusion of my colloquy with the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. MANSFIELD. From the time the Senator concludes his colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, is it the intention of the distinguished majority leader to call up the appropriation bill for the Treasury and Post Office Departments today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, it seems to me that in line with our discussion of the competitive world price and in our emphasis on the buy-America program, which is the general policy of AID, we might make the amendment correspond with that policy so far as formal competitive bidding procedures are concerned.

I wonder if the Senator from Wisconsin would favorably consider a modification of his amendment so that on line 10, page 1, following the word "sales," we would insert the words "by U.S. suppliers or other affiliates."

This would make it very clear that in the event there is competitive bidding, it will be competitive bidding with respect to U.S. suppliers or their affiliated suppliers.

In the case of a French oil company, for example, if AID desires to follow that route, they could come in under the first clause of the amendment, so that it would not be necessary to exclude them. However, it would make it clear that when we talk about competitive procedures we are talking about American-owned or American-affiliated oil companies.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would not like to modify my amendment in that way, although I appreciate the help of the Senator from Iowa. I know how sincere he is. I notice that we buy 59.9 percent of our oil—at least AID does—from so-called major international companies, like Standard Oil Co., Royal Dutch Shell, Gulf Oil, British Petroleum, Standard Oil of California, and Texaco. Most of them are American owned. Some are not. Seventeen percent of the oil is bought abroad. I believe it a healthy competitive situation to have the other countries of the free world involved in this competition, especially in view of the fact that virtually all the oil is bought abroad. I believe none of it is bought in this country. Therefore it makes sense to have Standard Oil, for example, in competition with British Petroleum.

The American taxpayers are better served if that is the case, because they get a better price, and the foreign aid program costs that much less.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there are two answers to what the Senator has said. The first is that we do not follow that policy under AID. The Senate already has recognized that policy. Granted that in some cases a lower price may be available, the buy America policy requires purchases from U.S. suppliers.

The second point is that if it is desired by the AID administration to buy from one of the international oil companies which is not a U.S. company or its affiliate, it can do so by using the "comparable export" sales prices in the first part of the amendment.

Therefore I really do not believe that the Senator from Wisconsin correctly gages the thrust of my proposal.

What I am trying to point out is that when we get into the competitive bid procedure, which is the thrust of the amendment, insofar as our U.S. companies are concerned, they are the ones who will enter into the competitive bidding. If that is not satisfactory, the AID administration can come in under the first clause of the amendment and use the price generally charged in "comparable export" sales.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is a part of the provision under the old law, too. This proposal would not change it. My amendment has nothing to do, so far as I know, with the so-called buy-America provision. It would not change the present situation. They are buying now from Royal Dutch Shell and British Petroleum. They are buying it under the present provisions of the Buy-America Act. There is nothing in the amendment that would vitiate anything in the Buy-America Act.

Mr. MILLER. Then I fail to see the difficulty with my proposed modification. Let me ask the Senator a question. Suppose there is a situation in which several U.S.-affiliated companies are involved, and a French company is also involved. Under my amendment, competitive bidding by the U.S. company would be the way. But I point out to the Senator from Wisconsin that if that competitive bid is not adequate and not satisfactory, or if it should be deemed to be overreaching, all the AID administration would have to do would be to take the first clause of the amendment and see what the French price would be under the "comparable sales" provision, and it could go that route.

All I am trying to do with my modification is to make it clear that when we have competitive bidding it be competitive bidding among U.S. companies.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure the Senator is sincere, but I would like to study the full impact of his proposal. My present reaction is that I would be against his proposal. However, during the course of the presentation by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] and other Senators, we shall have time to study it.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The limitation on time for debate begins now. The time allowed is 45 minutes—30 minutes is allowed to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have great respect for the sincere purposes of the Senator from Wisconsin. However, likewise I honor the integrity and honesty of Mr. Bell, the Administrator of AID.

There is pointed divergence between the views expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin and those expressed by Mr. Bell, the Administrator. I should like to point out what Mr. Bell has said on this subject. I read from page 224 of the hearings:

> The executive branch strongly opposes the Senate amendment.
>
> The amendment is based on assumptions which are incorrect. Under the Senate amendment there would be no effective savings to the foreign aid program. Further, the amendment would have the following adverse effects:
>
> (1) The amendment would increase the administrative burden on AID in carrying out its pricing regulations without compensation in savings. For example, it would involve AID in costly, time-consuming arguments and possible litigation.
>
> (2) The amendment will make the administration of the foreign exchange laws and regulations of foreign countries more difficult and will invite fraud and corruption in the administration of those laws.
>
> (3) The actual result of the amendment would be to deprive AID, in many cases, of any effective control over prices charged in AID financed petroleum sales.

I now go to page 225:

> Underlying the Senate amendment, is the assumption that the major international petroleum suppliers sell to their affiliates in recipient countries at so-called "posted prices" which allegedly exceed prices established in competitive sales to other purchasers by 20 to 35 percent. The amendment is apparently intended to preclude AID from financing posted prices.

He goes on to say:

> The executive branch believes that these assumptions are incorrect.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] mentioned these only a few minutes ago. If one attempts to read the letter sent to the committee by AID, he would have to spend hours to interpret and understand it clearly. The significant aspect of the treatment of this subject has not been mentioned on the floor of the Senate. It is difficult to analyze exactly what the ultimate financial impact of petroleum and crude oil buying program will be on the Treasury of the United States.

The members of the Foreign Relations Committee recognized that fact. We called upon the General Accounting Office to study the question and report to us. The General Accounting Office took a look at it and said, "It will take us 3 months to delve into this question and to reach a conclusion that we can say is sound. Even then we shall not be prepared to report to you in writing, but only on an oral basis."

I point that out to show the complexity of the problem. I have listened to this argument for 2 years; and, having listened to it on the floor of the Senate and in the committee, I must say that it is unclear to me. I make no confession that I am possessed of a dullness of mind so grave that I would not have some clarity of understanding of it if it were a simple problem.

It must be admitted that the problem is complex. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], having in mind the good of the taxpayer and the purpose to save taxpayers' dollars, sincerely and honestly propounded his amendment. But I cannot disregard the words of Mr. Bell of the AID program, and impliedly the fortification that the administration gives that it is not extravagantly and deliberately feeding dollars into the coffers of the oil companies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield an additional 2 minutes to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The best information I have been able to obtain from the AID officials is that only in Laos and Vietnam would the amendment make any difference, because in all other areas AID is purchasing on a so-called competitive basis. But in Laos and Vietnam as little as 1 percent of the sales in that area are not on a basis of intercompany practices.

As the Senator knows, AID has all sorts of requirements to protect against monopolistic practices. The prices paid appear to be reasonable under the circumstances, and there is no information to the contrary.

The force of the amendment would be to try to determine that the price of 99 percent of the oil ought to be based upon the price of 1 percent of it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe a reading of the letter will disclose that in Japan we deliver most of the fuel, and there we get it not from the oil companies, but from the Department of Defense which brings in its large ships and transfers it. That cannot be done in a few of those countries in southeast Asia.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. With regard to the oil which we have delivered in Japan, the Navy furnishes all the necessary bulk storage facilities, which naturally enable us to buy on a larger basis and for our own use rather than resale. That action then tends to put the Department of Defense in a position of buying on a more advantageous basis.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is my opinion that the complexity of the problem requires a detailed study by the Accounting Office with a report back to our committee next year as to what should be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct, and so is the Senator from Louisiana. AID has provided us with a summary position paper which states:

> AID does not finance posted prices when other prices are available. A review of AID expenditures shows that AID has financed at posted prices only when such prices are the prevailing ones in an area, and at discounted prices when there is a pattern of discounting in an area. There is virtually no discounting in primary places where the product has been financed at posted prices.

As the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, that means Vietnam and Laos.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I believe the course that we should follow is to order the General Accounting Office to check into the question and to give us a factual, sound report about what the ultimate fiscal results are through the practices followed by AID.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the Senator from Wisconsin would like to use a portion of his time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I prefer to reserve my time, because I have already placed most of my argument into the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator from Wisconsin say that he yielded back his time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; I said I would withhold the use of my time. Perhaps later I shall yield back some of it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on my time I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin apparently proceeds on the basis that some antitrust problem might be involved. The AID administration itself points out that as one of the reasons why the amendment should not be agreed to. The AID agency is not set up to be an antitrust agency. That is the function of the Department of Justice, and it should remain with the Department of Justice. If there is any collusion with respect to oil prices, those who are guilty of the collusion should be prosecuted by the Department of Justice.

It is only in Vietnam and Laos that AID fails to purchase at so-called competitive prices. But in those particular areas, AID buys the oil available to it, because there are only about three major companies which supply oil in that area.

But before AID buys the oil, it is required to certify that the price charged is not higher than any of the following prices: First, the prevailing price charged in the country in which it is received at the time of export. Second, the supplier's own price, the price of the one selling it, whether it be Standard Oil or anyone else which sells to other customers similarly situated, such as the price for oil sold in Japan, India, or other areas. Third, the price at which the product is purchased does not exceed the price at which the product could be obtained from any other source. Fourth, AID is required to certify that the price it pays does not exceed the prevailing market price in the United States at the time of purchase.

So considered from any basis on which one could determine what the reasonable, fair price ought to be, AID is required to certify, no matter how one considers the situation, in four different ways: From the point of view of the price in the country in which it is buying the oil; the price in other countries similarly situated; that the price at which the seller sells to others is not exceeded; and also that the price does not exceed the prevailing price in the United States.

AID is following these practices. There has been no showing whatever that the price of oil is excessive when sold in the two countries where the amendment would be effective. AID tells me that this amendment would in effect force on it an impossible way of trying to determine what the price ought to be. I am informed that as much as 99 percent of the oil is purchased in the two countries under the procedures I have outlined. Only about 1 percent of the oil is purchased under conditions which the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin seeks to affect.

The Senator from Wisconsin stated that there was some controversy as to Standard Oil; that Standard Oil was providing a discount on oil sold in the Near East. The Near East is an area of surplus oil. Oil can be bought at a discount in the Near East because it is a glut on the market there. But in Vietnam, Laos, and other areas there is no surplus of oil; therefore, oil is not sold at a discount in those areas.

Also, the Senator from Wisconsin would like to have AID do business in the same way that the Department of Defense does business. In some instances, the AID Agency buys oil from the Department of Defense, because the Department of Defense has certain purchasing advantages that AID does not have.

Keep in mind that the Department of Defense buys oil for its own purposes. When the Department of Defense buys oil in the Far East, it buys for storage in the huge facilities it has in Japan. It can buy oil cheaper in the Near East, because if someone has oil on hand that he must sell in a hurry, the Department of Defense can buy it at the cheapest price and still have a place to store it until it can be moved. But the AID Agency has no storage facilities and does not buy for its own use. AID buys oil for third parties, countries we are seeking to aid—in this case, Vietnam and Laos.

So in this situation, the administration says the amendment is not workable. AID would be required to break down all the usual business practices under which the free enterprise system operates in the area, in order to achieve the purposes the Senator from Wisconsin has proposed. There is no showing that even if that were done, 5 cents would be saved. So why do it?

As the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] so well pointed out, this subject could well be studied by the General Accounting Office. Senators who have been Members of this body for as long as a year know that the General Accounting Office is the most scrupulous investigator the Government has in respect to such practices. Yet the GAO says that it would require at least 3 months to make an adequate study to determine whether the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would achieve any satisfactory results. Until that time, both GAO and those who have responsibility for the program believe the procedure that is now in operation should be continued.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Could the Senator explain to me—he did try, but I must admit that I am still somewhat confused—why a procedure which is perfectly satisfactory to the Department of Defense—a department which buys much more oil than AID—is not perfectly good for AID, which buys a hundred million dollars' worth of oil and is losing some $16 million a year because it is paying much more for its oil than it has to?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin mentioned the $16 million difference based on an assumption that a statement made by a former company executive with regard to the Near East would be correct if applied to Vietnam and Laos.

There is from time to time a substantial discount against the posted prices in the Near East. That happens when companies producing in the area have more oil on hand than they can store or handle. When oil is in large surplus, they put it up for sale, and anyone can get a discount. However, in Vietnam there is a deficit situation, as there is in Laos. Those countries do not produce oil. Therefore, to quote AID, there is no basis to say that one can buy oil in deficit areas on the same basis that it can be purchased in surplus areas. If oil were known to be in surplus in Vietnam, producers would direct their ships to places where the oil could be sold, or at least to a place like Japan where it could be stored.

If one had, as the Department of Defense has, facilities in Japan to store fantastic quantities of oil, and there were a tanker at sea with oil to sell and no one else to sell oil to, then the tanker might well sell his oil to the Department of Defense at Japan even if he had to sell at a discount. However, AID does not buy oil for its own use. It is buying for Laos and Vietnam, which are the ultimate recipients.

When the oil is required, the buyer is willing to pay the regular prices, because he is buying to fill the need of another. So the assumption that the oil would be for sale at a discount is, according to AID, completely unfounded.

The only support that the Senator has for his statement is a reference to an area which is producing oil and which, as we know, has oil running out of its ears; namely, the Near East.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I find the able argument of the Senator rather unpersuasive.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have never known the Senator from Pennsylvania to agree with me on anything involving oil or gas.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator will agree that I do agree with him on patents.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am happy to agree with that statement.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am under the impression that the Defense Department buys a great deal of oil in the Far East and in Japan, and that it pays posted prices nowhere. Why should AID pay posted prices for its oil from the Far East when the Defense Department pays far lower prices for its oil?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the suggestion that has been made concerning the Department of Defense would also be true of AID in all countries except these two countries, Vietnam and Laos. That is the prevailing practice for the purchase of oil in all countries except these two. However, in these two countries, the prevailing practice is to pay the posted price. In doing so, AID is required to find out that the price they pay does not exceed the prevailing price in the source country at the time of export.

Therefore, the prices they are charging cannot exceed the price at which oil is for sale in Vietnam or Laos. We are speaking only of those two countries.

The price paid cannot exceed the price for which the same companies sell oil to customers similarly situated. The price cannot exceed the price for which oil can be obtained from other sources. It cannot exceed the prevailing market price in the United States. AID is bound by those four standards. They say that they can operate as they are operating. However, to do as has been suggested here would get them into situations in which they do not desire to be involved. It would require that they break up the business practices of companies dealing in those areas, without any showing that they would save money by doing so.

In the next instance, AID would be required to take over the job of the Department of Justice, which they do not seek, and try to be the antitrust agency. The Department of Justice has that as its responsibility.

These are American companies. If they conspire or act in concert to overcharge the public, the Department of Justice has the responsibility to go into it. AID does not want that job.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. TOWER. Is it not true that the Department of Defense maintains its own storage and transmission facilities? Is it not true that the amendment, if agreed to, might require AID to establish its own transmission and storage facilities?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Perhaps so. That would cost a great deal of money. It does not make much sense to store this much oil in Vietnam or Laos, where the Vietcong are trying to destroy materiel all the time.

The Department of Defense has a different system of buying—although in all foreign countries save those two, it is the same—in countries where the competitive situation determines the price.

Mr. TOWER. Except in Vietnam and Laos, and there it is the same.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct. However, the Defense Department has its own storage and bulk facilities. It is in a position to buy and store oil. If a company has vast storage and bulk facilities, it can buy oil cheaper than otherwise.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in view of the fact that a number of Senators were not able to hear the arguments of Senators opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum prepared in the Office of International Development summarizing the position of the Agency against the Proxmire amendment may appear at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The memorandum is as follows:

PETROLEUM PRICES AND BARTER TRANSACTIONS

(Summary position paper on amendments Nos. 235 and 236, by Senator PROXMIRE)

This amendment deals with two distinctly separate issues. A summary of the arguments opposing this amendment appears directly below. Following the summary, detailed arguments are set forth.

I. PETROLEUM PRICES

The amendment should be rejected because:

A. It would leave AID in certain situations with no meaningful basis for evaluating petroleum prices.

B. AID, on the basis of statutory authority and administrative regulations, presently has a complete system for reviewing petroleum prices.

C. The factual basis for the amendment is incorrect.

D. The amendment attempts to raise questions concerning the entire distribution and pricing systems of the international oil companies. If these complex issues need to be discussed, they should be considered separately and completely, when all the facts are available, and not as part of the Foreign Assistance Act.

II. BARTER TRANSACTIONS

The amendment should be rejected because it could stop barter transactions, which help the U.S. balance-of-payments position and increase U.S. agricultural exports.

DISCUSSION

Section 604(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act establishes a "prevailing market price" test for all products financed by AID, including petroleum products. This amendment appears to eliminate not only the "prevailing market price" test when AID finances the purchase of petroleum products but also the other price tests for petroleum products that AID has established on an administrative basis. By so doing, the amendment would prevent AID from exercising effective control over the prices charged in many AID-financed petroleum purchases.

The significant feature of this amendment is that it states that AID cannot use any intercompany transactions as one of the bases for determining prices in comparable export sales.

It is this feature that causes the difficulty. Seventy-five percent of bulk fuels and at least 90 percent of lubricants in world trade move in intercompany transactions. In fact, in certain countries for which AID finances the import of petroleum products, such as Vietnam and Laos, virtually every import is an intercompany transaction.

This amendment, however, says that AID must exclude the prices charged in intercompany transactions when AID calculates the prices charged in comparable sales. The amendment, therefore, would leave AID in many cases with no way of determining comparable prices. For this reason the amendment should be rejected.

It should be noted that under present law and administrative regulations there are detailed price requirements for AID-financed petroleum purchases.

AID Regulation 1, which implements the existing statutory price requirements, requires every supplier of an AID-financed petroleum shipment to certify in writing that the price charged is no higher than any of the following prices for comparable exports:

1. The prevailing price in the source country at the time of export,
2. The supplier's own price in sales to other customers similarly situated,
3. The price at which the product could be obtained from any other source, and
4. The prevailing market price in the United States at the time of export.

In determining whether regulation 1 has been complied with, AID not only reviews all the relevant documents but also applies various tests. These tests may include comparisons with AID-financed sales of comparable products in other countries, examination of the supplier's records to check prices in other, non-AID-financed sales and a review and comparison based on price and product information received from various sources. Upon occasion AID requires additional certifications from ranking officials of supplying companies.

It would seem, therefore, that existing legislation and regulations are sufficient to keep a careful check on petroleum prices in AID-financed sales. This unnecessary amendment, which imposes an unworkable standard, should be rejected.

RESPONSE TO STATEMENTS RE PETROLEUM PRICING

1. "AID unnecessarily finances petroleum products at posted prices."

AID does not finance at posted prices when other prices are available. A review of AID expenditures shows that AID has financed at posted prices only when such prices are the prevailing ones in an area and at discounted prices when there is a pattern of discounting in an area. There is virtually no discounting in the primary places where AID has been financing at posted prices, Vietnam and Laos.

2. "Whenever AID financed purchases of any petroleum product (crude oils, bulk fuels or lubricants), it was paying an average of 30 percent more than it should have."

The only evidence supporting this assertion is a statement by a director of Standard Oil that in the Middle East there has been an 11 to 16 percent (not 30 percent) differential between actual prices and posted prices for crude oils. First, AID-financed purchases of crude oils in the Middle East have been at actual or competitive prices. Second, in countries such as Vietnam and Laos, where AID has been financing at posted prices, there is virtually no discounting, because the oversupply that exists in the Middle East does not exist in the Far East. There is no evidence that AID has been paying more than it should have.

3. "AID should be able to avoid paying posted prices in the Far East since the DOD does not pay posted prices."

The following points are relevant in rebutting this assertion:

(a) DOD operates its own storage and distribution facilities in Japan, where AID does not.

(b) DOD can enter into long-term contracts for a variety of products, whereas AID does not purchase on its own behalf and the procurement it finances is necessarily limited to the particular product needed in the recipient country at a given time.

(c) DOD is itself an end-user and does not resell in competition with the oil companies or their affiliates (this factor may significantly influence the price at which the oil companies are willing to sell to DOD).

(d) On a worldwide basis DOD purchases about 15 times the volume that AID finances.

(e) Section 601(b)(4) of the Foreign Assistance Act states, in effect, that AID to the maximum extent practicable should carry out programs of assistance through private channels.

Moreover, when AID has been able to utilize DOD stocks in Japan, it has done so. In the Korean program, which has now ended, AID made extensive use of DOD stocks and consequently financed purchases at discounted prices.

BARTER TRANSACTIONS

This amendment, which attempts to require that commissions in barter transactions be paid by the supplier or the recipient country, should be opposed for the following reasons:

1. In a barter transaction the United States is using surplus agricultural commodities, rather than dollars, to obtain something needed by a recipient country. It has the effect of permitting offshore procurement, without any dollar outflow, of products of which the United States is a net importer, and the additional benefit of increasing U.S. agricultural exports.

This amendment might stop barter transactions. The present commission system, which was decided upon after review by the Executive Stockpile Committee in 1960 and the CCC Board of Directors in 1962, has significantly increased barter transactions (from 0 to $28 million in 3 years) without significant cost to the United States. In fact, in only a very few barter transactions does AID use its funds to pay any commission.

> 2. In addition to hurting U.S. balance-of-payments efforts and U.S. agricultural exports, the amendment would impose an unfair burden on the supplier or the recipient country. A barter rather than direct procurement is used solely for the benefit of the United States. This is no reason for the supplier or the recipient country to pay any commission that may be involved.
>
> 3. The present procedures, arrived at after careful and lengthy study, have proved effective in aiding the U.S. balance-of-payments position and increasing agricultural exports. These procedures should not be changed in the absence of compelling evidence that new procedures would bring greater benefit to the United States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, would it be agreeable to the Senator from Alabama if the senior Senator from Wisconsin yielded back all but 4 minutes of his time and the Senator from Alabama yielded back his time?

As the mover of the amendment, I prefer to conclude the debate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who is one of the ablest debaters in the country, has based his entire argument against this amendment, as I understand it, on the condition that there is a deficit of oil in the Far East and a surplus of oil in the Middle East.

I have before me a report from a recent issue of Business Week magazine.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I referred to Vietnam and Laos. I am not referring to Indonesia.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Business Week magazine of recent date contains an article entitled "Japan's Oil Hunger Sets Off a Free-for-All."

This article concerns the Japanese market. I read from the article:

> With oil in oversupply everywhere, an imposing array of companies—international majors and international Japanese outfits—is engaged in a free-for-all to win larger shares of the expanding market.
>
> The resulting competition is frenzied. Prices are being cut to the quick—even below costs in some products. Distributors steal dealers and customers with abandon.

Mr. President, I submit that no plausible argument has been made against my amendment. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who is another very persuasive debater, cited the report by the executive branch against the amendment.

The Senator stated that he could not understand it. I agree. I submit AID has no argument against this amendment except their great prestige. In the absence of a real case they have wisely resorted to confusion plus confusion compounded. And frankly, the combination of the administration plus the oil industry plus confusion is a devastating opponent in any debate.

Now, Mr. President, why should this amendment be considered complex or confusing?

What is confusing about it? What are we asking? Our arguments are not confusing. We are saying that the AID agency should not pay rigged posted prices. We say that it should pay competitive prices. What is confusing about that? What is complicated about that?

After all, any Senator who is in favor of keeping the cost of the AID program down, should vote for the amendment. Any Senator who is in favor of competition should vote for the amendment. Any Senator who feels that our expenditures overseas, when they are excessive, damage our balance of payments should vote for the amendment.

What is confusing or contradictory about these arguments?

One other phase of the amendment concerns the barter contractor's commissions. The fact is that barter contractor's commissions are not paid by buyers anywhere—except and only except in the case of the AID Agency.

We say that the regular commercial practice used elsewhere should be used by AID.

It is clear that this amendment would save the money of the taxpayers. A precedent has been established and followed successfully for years by the Department of Defense. We should follow that precedent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 110 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Bartlett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mondale
Muskie
Nelson
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—60

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Cotton
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Fannin
Fulbright
Harris
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—11

Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Curtis
Ervin
Hart
Magnuson
Mansfield
Morse
Moss
Prouty
Symington

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendments (No. 236) were rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendments were rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 263, H.R. 7060.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7060) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the pending bill be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

On page 2, line 10, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$5,875,000" and insert "$5,874,000".

On page 6, line 2, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to strike out "$101,000,000" and insert "$115,-510,000".

On page 6, line 20, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "$22,500,000" and insert "$23,-125,000".

On page 7, line 21, after the word "applicants", to strike out $154,600,000" and insert "$164,500,000".

On page 8, line 7, after the word "Commissioner", to strike out "$439,000,000" and insert "$446,250,000".

On page 8, after line 8, to insert:

"Administrative provision

"Not to exceed 2½ per centum of any appropriation available to the Internal Revenue Service for the current fiscal year may be transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any other such appropriation or appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 2½ per centum by such transfers, and any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate."

On page 8, line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "forty-five" and insert "one hundred and twenty-five", and on page 9, line 6, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to strike out "$12,627,000" and insert "$12,105,000".

On page 11, line 23, after the word "law", to strike out "$4,298,900,000" and insert "$4,-321,350,000", and on line 24, to insert the following proviso:

"*Provided,* That not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation available to the Post Office Department for the current fiscal year may be transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any other such appropriation or appropriations; but the appropriation "Administration and regional operation" shall not be increased by more than $1,000,000 as a result of such transfers:".

On page 13, line 6, after the word "Government", to strike out "$226,000,000" and insert "$216,000,000".

On page 13, line 13, after the word "plans", to strike out "$95,000,000" and insert "$110,-000,000".

On page 15, line 19, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to strike out "$7,920,000" and insert "$7,-973,000".

At the top of page 19, to insert a new title as follows:

"TITLE V—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

"International Monetary Fund

"Increase in Quota, International Monetary Fund

"To finance an increase in the quota of the United States in the International Monetary Fund, $1,035,000,000 to be available from June 2, 1965, and to remain available until expended."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations has authorized me to present to the Senate its report No. 275 on the pending bill (H.R. 7060) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for fiscal year 1966 and on a 1965 supplemental request for the International Monetary Fund.

Members will find on their desks printed copies of the bill and committee report, and I will now present to the Senate a brief summary of what is in the bill.

The agencies covered by this bill have the responsibility of administering a total of $19,348,667,000, of which more than $11.6 billion is for definite and indefinite permanent appropriations which are not included in the pending bill. The 1966 estimates in this category total $11,649,998,000. Of this amount, $11.5 billion is for interest on the public debt, an increase of $300 million over the 1965 estimate of $11.2 billion.

The bill which is recommended to the Senate provides total appropriations of $7,698,669,000, consisting of 1966 appropriations amounting to $6,663,669,000 and a supplemental item of $1,035 million for the International Monetary Fund. The amount recommended is an increase of $1,094,265,000 over the House allowance, $1,237,264,000 over the appropriation for 1965, but $51,101,000 under the estimates for 1966. I repeat that statement. The amount is $51.1 million under the estimates for 1966.

Increases over the House figures were approved by the committee on the basis of what it regarded as convincing testimony presented by competent departmental witnesses in support of their requests and in the belief that failure to appropriate the additional funds would impair the capabilities of the agencies to perform their missions effectively and economically.

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Appropriations totaling $1,304,014,000 are recommended in the accompanying bill for the regular annual requirements of the Treasury Department for fiscal 1966. This is a decrease of $8,951,000 in the estimates and an increase of $31,-762,000 over the House bill. The amount recommended is $62,359,000 more than the 1965 allowance.

The major items of increase over the House are in the Coast Guard and Internal Revenue Service accounts.

COAST GUARD

For acquisition, construction, and improvements of the Coast Guard, the committee recommends a total of $115,510,-000, an increase of $14.5 million over the House, and the same as the budget estimates. The amount recommended will allow the Coast Guard to carry out the 1966 phase of a long-range program to replace or improve its obsolescent or inadequate facilities. Included in the amount recommended is the budget addendum request of $6,260,000 contained in Senate Document No. 24, dated May 17, 1965. This request was not considered by the House as it had acted on the bill prior to the submission of this request. This additional sum is required to replace 17 small Coast Guard patrol craft deployed to Vietnam in compliance with the recent decision to augment patrol activities in that area. The decision to deploy these vessels was made recently and is presently being accomplished. For this reason the need for additional funds could not be foreseen when the regular estimates were prepared and submitted to the Congress. The deployment of the patrol craft from their regularly assigned missions has seriously reduced the search and rescue and law-enforcement capabilities off the shores of the United States and the committee feels that it is most urgent that these capabilities be restored at the very earliest possible date.

RESERVE TRAINING

For Reserve training of the Coast Guard the committee recommends $23.1 million, an increase of $625,000 over the House allowance, and $625,000 under the estimate, but $2.1 million over 1965.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

For the Internal Revenue Service the committee recommends a total of $628,-350,000, an increase of nearly $30 million over 1965; $17.1 million over the House, and $9.2 million under the estimate. Of the total increase recommended, $9.9 million has been applied to revenue accounting and processing and $7.2 million for compliance activities. These increases will fund the 1966 scheduled program for gradual conversion to the master file ADP system; the staffing and equipment necessary for the new data center at Detroit; and raise operational levels and thereby improve taxpayer compliance. For "Revenue accounting and processing" the committee has allowed the 1,404 additional man-years of employment requested over 1965 and for "Compliance" activities the committee recommends an increase of 1,380 additional positions over the 41,476 provided in 1965.

SECRET SERVICE

For salaries and expenses of the Secret Service the committee recommends $12.1 million. This amount includes the $8.7 million requested in the President's estimate and $3.3 million of the $3.8 million contained in the Secretary's special addendum request. During the course of the hearings Secretary of the Treasury Fowler withdrew a request previously submitted for $522,000 for two Presidential armored vehicles. It was made clear to the committee that the President did not approve the original request for these vehicles and that if they were built, he would not use or condone their use in his protection. Thus the $522,000 was disallowed.

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

For the Post Office Department the Committee recommends a total of $5,-340,850,000, an increase a $13,850,000 over 1965; $27,450,000 over the House, and $42,150,000 under the estimates.

OPERATIONS

For "Operations," the bread-and-butter account of the Post Office Department, the committee has restored $22.5 million of the $35 million House cut. The amount recommended provides for the 5,204 additional positions requested to handle an estimated 3-percent mail volume increase over 1965 and also allows for the employment of the 15,000 additional positions requested to relieve excessive overtime. Funds are also provided to give postmasters at second- and third-class post offices clerical replacement to give them relief of at least one Saturday off out of every 4 weeks.

BUILDING OCCUPANCY

For "Building occupancy," formerly referred to as the "Facilities" account, the committee allowed $216 million, a decrease of $10 million in the estimate, but $17 million over 1965.

PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

For "Plant and Equipment" the committee recommends $110 million, an increase of $27 million over the amount available for 1965; $14 million under the estimate and $15 million over the House.

For the Executive Office of the President and independent agencies the committee concurred with the House except for a $53,000 increase recommended for the Bureau of the Budget.

Details on these items appear on pages 13 and 16 of the report before you.

TITLE V—INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Mr. President, there was referred to the committee Senate Document No. 31 dated June 1, 1965, proposing a 1965 supplemental request of $1,035 million in order to finance an increase in the quota of the United States in the International Monetary Fund. The increased U.S. subscription, amounting to the amount requested, is part of a program calling for a general increase of 25 percent for all members and larger increases for 16 members. The full committee held hearings on this item and recommended approval of the request. This appropriation is authorized by Public Law 89–31 which became law on June 2, 1965, and was not considered by the House Appropriations Committee.

This is a brief summary of what is contained in the bill. A more detailed explanation will be found in the committee report, which is on the desks of the Senators.

The chairman of the subcommittee is proud and happy to be able to report that the bill was unanimously reported by the subcommittee and unanimously reported by the full committee.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, I wish to say that, as is always the case in any association with the Senator from Virginia, this year he was uniformly courteous, uniformly thoughtful, uniformly considerate, and wisely determinative—if I may begin to get a little bit purple in my phraseology—of the needs of the services of the United States within the purview of the bill, and of the Members of the Senate, including most especially the members of the committee.

I see present in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], who so well represents that beleaguered "tail on the kite," and who came in for some very special but necessary treatment. But I wish to say seriously that it is always a pleasure to work with the Senator from Virginia. The present experience is only the last of a great many such that I have enjoyed, and I appreciate it deeply.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I acknowledge with grateful appreciation the tribute of my colleague from New Jersey. No chairman of any subcommittee ever worked with a better and more cooperative group. No member of that committee closed his ears and said, "I will not budge." Everyone was willing to consider and listen to arguments. In that process we reached agreements on which all of us could finally come before this body with a united front.

I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator. I rise chiefly at this time to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Virginia. Once again he is rendering excellent service in guiding the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill through the Senate. Our chairman works, as I have noted, with dispatch, good sense, and good judgment.

So long as I am bestowing plaudits, I should like to refer to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], who has been a most effective member of the subcommittee, and who not only has achieved greatly—on account of his service on the subcommittee—for New Jersey, but has taken into account the needs of the entire Nation.

I should also like to say, speaking for myself—but I am sure my sentiments reflect those of all the other members, too—that my service with the subcommittee has been greatly facilitated by the fact that Mr. Joe Gonzales, the professional staff member, has been so kind, courteous, effective, and always efficient.

As the Senate knows, I have long had a deep interest in the welfare of our Nation's Coast Guard. In times of war and in times of peace, the Coast Guard performs a vital service in the cause of our Nation's security and well-being.

Because of the great importance of seeing to it that the Coast Guard is maintained on a high level of operating efficiency and because I believe it is the responsibility of Congress to see that it is so maintained, 2 years ago I introduced a bill to provide for annual congressional authorization of the Coast Guard program for procurement of vessels and aircraft and for the construction of shore and off shore establishments. The Congress approved this bill and the Coast Guard authorization and appropriations procedures have now been brought into line with those of the military services. It was my pleasure to preside at the meeting of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the Commerce Committee on March 5 of this year when testimony was received on the fiscal 1966 Coast Guard program. I was also pleased to be present with our chairman when the Coast Guard came before the Treasury and Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee.

The Congress, in this year's authorization bill, approved the full amount requested by the administration for capital improvements of the Coast Guard. The bill before us today provides the full appropriation of the budget estimate including the additional $6,260,000 requested by the Secretary of the Treasury to replace the 17 small patrol craft sent to Vietnam by the President to augment the patrol activities along the Vietnamese coast. The transfer of these vessels will seriously impair the search and rescue and the law enforcement capabilities of the Coast Guard off the shores of the United States. The money appropriated today will see that these capabilities are restored to full strength.

As the Congress knows, the capital investment which our Nation has in the Coast Guard exceeds $2 billion, and yet in the years following World War II our replacement program seldom exceeded $10 million a year. This, of course, was not enough to update the fleet. It was, in fact, not even enough simply to replace present outworn equipment. It was because of this serious deterioration in our Coast Guard fleet and capability that the 10-year vessel construction plan was undertaken. This plan covers the period from 1964 to 1974 and is now in its second year of execution. If this plan is to be carried out—as I believe it should—it will soon be necessary to have an acquisition construction and improvement program in excess of $170 million a year. We do not have such a program today. Today's bill appropriates but $115,510,000 for the purpose. Obviously, this falls short of what is needed if we are to have an updated fully competent Coast Guard. I intend to continue to press in the future for the full funding of the vessel construction plan.

This is not to say, however, that the Coast Guard is not now performing in an excellent manner. It is. The last 5 years have seen a remarkable increase in the demands placed upon this service. For example, Coast Guard search and rescue missions increased by 23 percent. Coast Guard aircraft rescue missions increased by 67 percent. Small boat rescue missions increased by 61 percent. The number of persons rescued from vessels and aircraft have more than doubled in the last 5 years. As the able Commandant of the Coast Guard, Admiral Roland, testified, in the last 10 years the Coast Guard has rescued 21,888 persons and saved property valued at more than $15 billion.

The Coast Guard's aids to navigation have increased as technical and engineering capabilities have become more sophisticated. The Coast Guard, too, has a responsibility in the rapidly growing field of oceanography. Although it receives but 1 percent of the Federal funds spent on oceanography research in any given year, it produces over 25 percent of the data.

Over the 10-year period, Coast Guard responsibilities in the enforcement of international fishing agreements have been substantially increased. The Bartlett act providing criminal penalties for the violation of the territorial waters of the United States has also added to the Coast Guard's responsibility.

Because of these increased responsibilities in respect to the fishery, last year the Congress authorized and appropriated funds for the construction of a medium endurance cutter to be used to patrol the North Atlantic fisheries. This year I am pleased to see—as all Alaskans are pleased to learn—the Congress has authorized and is in this bill appropriating funds for a similar medium endurance cutter to be used on the northwest Pacific fishery patrol.

Mr. President, the Coast Guard is small in size in comparison with the

Army, the Navy or the Air Force. It is not small, Mr. President, in the size of its responsibility nor in the tradition and the ability with which it meets these responsibilities.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I appreciate the kind remarks of the distinguished Senator from Alaska. All of us know that Alaska is the largest State in the Union. We know that it is strategically located. If an attack should ever come from the north—which we hope will never come—the fact remains that the capital of Alaska is farther from us than the capital of France. Therefore, we feel very fortunate that we have on our committee so well informed a man from that vast and great area that will bring to our attention the needs of the Nation, and especially the need for patrol craft for the Coast Guard operating in those cold and sometimes frozen waters. I am pleased to have been able to provide additional patrol craft when 17 of our best ones were taken to Vietnam, where, of course, they were badly needed.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I should like to add only the comment that in addition to the important service that he renders to his State and his country, the Senator from Alaska is a delightful companion to his colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator is very kind.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further comment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. The need for an effective patrolling system in the Coast Guard was amply demonstrated only this past weekend. Since 1953 there has been in effect a treaty arrangement participated in by the United States, Canada, and Japan. Among other things that treaty provides that the Japanese shall not fish for salmon east of 175 west longitude. In the last couple of years, the Japanese, although, insofar as I know, doing so legally, have caught great numbers of salmon of North American origin immediately west of that so-called line of abstention; this last weekend they were observed invading waters east of that line. In fact, Coast Guard patrol craft and aircraft reported 19 violations. That action attests to the fact that the Coast Guard is now better equipped to detect violations. A Coast Guard cutter was on the scene and apprehended one vessel and took it under escort to Adak, where a determination will now be made as to what will be done with the vessel.

The incident points up as well as anything else could, in my judgment, the need for an ever more efficient and even larger Coast Guard in the light of changing and modern conditions.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I should like to join the distinguished Senator from Alaska, who sits with me on the Committee on Commerce and who is deeply interested in the Coast Guard, in commending the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and his subcommittee for the much needed steps taken in the bill.

In my own State the property of the Coast Guard is being allowed to deteriorate, which was poor economy. An item for repair and reconstruction is carried in the bill. The Coast Guard plays an exceedingly important part in the rugged northeast coast, and it is one of the services which is extremely important.

I thank the Senator personally and commend him sincerely for what has been done in the bill to take care of this much needed service when so many services which are not as vital are receiving untold millions of dollars.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator. I frankly admit that in cooperating with friends from Alaska and from the New England States, I was also thinking about the fact that the Old Dominion has a little ocean front of its own. So happily we all work together. I cannot claim to be too altruistic about it. It was needed for all of us.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I offer one further explanation for the benefit of the RECORD? Commencing only last year the Committee on Commerce was given legislative authority to pass on the authorization bill submitted annually, thus bringing the Coast Guard in line with the military services.

The Senator from New Hampshire, I know from personal experience, has been a tower of strength with respect to the Coast Guard. I could not resume my seat without saying that the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is now detained in his home State on official business, has always on that committee—and, as the Senator from Virginia knows, he is likewise a member of the Committee on Appropriations—been in the forefront of the endeavor to improve the Coast Guard.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I observe in the general statement made by the Senator from Virginia, a discussion of the interest obligation of the U.S. Government on its outstanding indebtedness. I find that appropriations are authorized not to exceed $11.5 billion to meet the interest obligation of the Government.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. The amount goes up every year, because we have been going into the red at an average of about $6 billion a year. It is necessary to pay interest on the bonds.

When I was elected to Congress in 1932, the total expenses of the Government were a little over $4 billion. In another year or two, the interest on the national debt alone will be three times that amount.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the present indebtedness of the Nation as shown by the testimony given before the Senator's committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is estimated to be $316.9 billion for fiscal 1965.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my recollection that at the end of World War II, the debt was about $264 billion. It has gone beyond $308 billion, because the administration has had to ask for new authority. Therefore, the debt is now more than that figure.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is an astounding amount; and apparently it is necessary to raise the limit every year.

In 1963, it was $306.5 billion. In 1964, it was $312.5 billion. It is now estimated to be $316.9 billion for 1965, and is going higher every month.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yesterday the Senator from Virginia discussed on the floor of the Senate a talk made recently by Mr. McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors. In his statement, Mr. Martin dealt in a most vital manner with the monetary system of the country. He warned the bankers and the people of the Nation that we may have a return to what happened in 1929 and 1930, when there was a collapse, first, of the securities market, then of the real estate market, then of the banks and building and loan associations, and finally a wiping out of the savings and the bringing of tragedy upon the people of the Nation. I should like to hear what the Senator from Virginia may have to say on the subject of the warning given by Mr. Martin.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yesterday—and my statement will be found at pages 12693–12694 of yesterday's RECORD—I endorsed what Mr. Martin said: That while we have built-in protections against another recession similar to that of 1929, there are many similarities of conditions that then existed, and we do not have any foolproof assurance that there can never be another recession. Therefore, Mr. Martin felt that banks should use a little more caution in extending loans. They can now lend up to 80 percent of principal on Government-insured loans. I understand that sometimes the savings and loan associations lend at 100 percent of the principal amount. We know that in 1932 banks that had loaned at only 50 percent of the principal value failed.

So I say that while we are in a period of our greatest prosperity—and all economists predict that it will continue throughout this year—and while within a few days we shall be voting on another tax cut of $4.5 billion or $5 billion to further stimulate and implement purchasing power, it is well enough to remember what has happened in the past as an indication of what could happen again. I am glad that the Senator from Ohio has invited attention to it.

Mr. Martin's statement appears in the RECORD. I hope that Senators who are interested in this phase of the problem will read what Chairman Martin said and what I said concerning the problems confronting the Federal Reserve Board, to which Congress has delegated the responsibility of fixing the value of our money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not true that in the 1920's the primary cause of the collapse of the economy was the overextension of credit, under which people were buying on credit, banks were lending money on poor security, individuals thought that the stock market prices would advance without end, and people were borrowing on their furniture and on their automobiles, and that finally there had to come a tightening of the credit, and when that tightening came, the people were wiped out through the foreclosure of the mortgages that were outstanding and through pledges they had to meet but could not meet?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Those statements are correct. Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, indicated that some of the same conditions exist today, and he said we ought to take a close look at them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is significance to be attached to the fact that Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, occupying the primary position in the Nation with respect to monetary policies and credit expansion, made his statement in spite of his close relationship with the administration? Is it to be inferred that he made the statement only because he felt it had to be made, the Nation had to be warned, and Congress had to be told to stop inflationary practices, and recognize that we cannot continue to increase the debt, and reduce taxes without recreating the dangerous situation that existed in the 1930's?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am sure Governor Martin made his statement reluctantly and only because he felt he owed a duty to the American public to express frankly his fears that unless some check were placed on what might be called easy money and overextension of credit, there might be a repetition of the unhappy experience of 1929, which in 1930 resulted in the worst depression we have ever known.

Of course, when the Dow Jones average of industrial stocks dropped about 9 points the day following his speech, Governor Martin was much embarrassed; but he still felt that he had done his duty. My feeling is that many investors knew that some of the stocks were quite high, so they took that as an excuse to unload. In any event, I am sure Governor Martin reluctantly did what he did, but he acted from a sense of duty.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Virginia mentioned the excise tax reduction that is now being proposed. I observe that the House did not remain content with the recommendation made by the President as to the aggregate amount of the reduction, but went on to increase the amount.

Within the last 2 weeks, the Senate had before it a bill which contained an administration recommendation of $450 million for certain programs, but the Senate said, "We will spend $600 million." The point I wish to make is that we in Congress are contributing to the spread of extravagant credit and are exhibiting an attitude that a new remedy has been found that will forever guarantee the control of the natural laws, laws which ordinarily precipitate collapse when they are not followed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is true that the appropriating clause in the bill is under the request and that the House passed a tax cut measure that involved approximately $1 billion or more spread over several years. Fortunately, we bring before the Senate today an appropriation bill which is substantially less than the amount which the President recommended. To whatever extent it was possible to go, consistent with the continuation of effective service in the Post Office Department and effective collection of taxes, and we must collect them, we have practiced economy in the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in conclusion, the Senator from Virginia knows that I have a bill pending before his committee for the authorization of a study to determine whether the practices of banks require new legislation because of evils that are developing. If it is found that the practices are sound, no harm would be done.

I should merely like to request the Senator from Virginia to have a hearing on that bill set down. I have a judgment, based on reason and intuition, that all is not well and that we had better take a good look at the banking system of the Nation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator has introduced an important bill. It concerns investigation. The Committee on Government Operations conducted extensive investigations of alleged crooked practices in banks. The committee has not as yet made their report. However, it has discovered some improper practices. We are trying to correct those practices.

I tell the distinguished Senator from Ohio that the Committee on Banking and Currency has been bogged down with legislation. We have before us now the most comprehensive housing bill—an omnibus bill which contains everything imaginable, running into billions of dollars. We have spent weeks on that measure. We have held hearings on a bank merger bill. Tomorrow, we shall start considering a coin bill. However, as soon as we can dispose of the legislation on which we must act, I shall be very glad to refer the bill of the Senator from Ohio to a subcommittee for hearings. We shall go into the general practices of banks to see whether the loan policies and other policies are on a sound or unsound basis.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not take exception to the intention of the Senator from Virginia, as chairman of the committee, to give me a hearing.

I am glad to engage in this colloquy with the Senator. I am pleased to say that I am glad to a greater degree to learn that my views coincide with the views of the Senator from Virginia on this very important problem concerning the Nation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 7060) was passed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. CASE, and Mr. ALLOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MORSE ON RECEIVING DEGREE FROM SALEM COLLEGE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on last Friday evening, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] received a degree of Doctor of Pedagogy from Salem College in West Virginia.

It was my privilege to present our colleague with this honor during the ceremonies at that institution of higher learning.

Salem College has made a most constructive contribution over a long period of years to the education of the young men and women of West Virginia, and other States, particularly to youth who have not in the past had the finances with which to attend larger institutions—not better institutions, because Salem College is an institution of excellence.

I call attention to the honor which comes to the senior Senator from Oregon because this is more than merely the presentation of another honorary degree to a man who serves in public life. The senior Senator from Oregon, by reason of his chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has perhaps done as much or even more than any Member of Congress to bring educational programs to our children, youth, and adults.

It is not an overstatement for me to emphasize that the Senator has been preeminent in his leadership in this important phase of the strengthening of America.

In the remarks of the senior Senator from Oregon at this occasion at Salem College, he said that our most important weapon is education. He spelled out the value of a college education to the individual by saying that the lifetime earnings of that person would perhaps amount to $480,000, and that the lifetime earnings for a high school graduate would perhaps approximate $290,000.

The lifetime earnings of a young man who dropped out of high school would be approximately $160,000 to $170,000. For the boy who dropped out at the grade school level, the anticipated lifetime earnings would be approximately $80,000.

Not only has Senator MORSE been preeminent in many fields of endeavor within this body, but particularly his leadership in developing a stronger educational program for the United States is one to which I call attention this afternoon because of the honorary degree which was conferred upon Senator MORSE by this institution of learning in my State of West Virginia. It is my alma mater, and I know the value of the dedicated teacher staff and of the productivity of the institution in giving training to so many thousands of young men and women.

Now we are glad to add as an alumnus of that institution Senator MORSE, and in no sense is it merely an honorary one, because Senator MORSE is an honorable man and we think of him as an active member of our own alumni body.

I say to you, Mr. President, and to the other Members of this body, that I believe Senator MORSE is the conscience of education in the Congress of the United States.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1912. A bill to amend sections 1, 17a, 57j, 64a(5), 67(b), 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 277).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 16. A bill for the relief of Eugeninsz Lupinski (Rept. No. 278);

S. 68. A bill for the relief of Mehdi Heravi (Rept. No. 279);

S. 248. A bill for the relief of Violet Shina (Rept. No. 280);

S. 372. A bill for the relief of Antonio Jesus Senra (Rodriguez) and his wife, Mercedes M. Miranda de Senra (Rept. No. 281);

S. 374. A bill for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Castrillo (Fernandez) (Rept. No. 282);

S. 521. A bill for the relief of Maria Gioconda Femia (Rept. No. 283);

S. 550. A bill for the relief of Patrick Anthony Linnane (Rept. No. 284);

S. 573. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sedat M. Ayata (Rept. No. 285);

S. 653. A bill for the relief of George Paluras (Georgios Palouras) (Rept. No. 286);

S. 678. A bill for the relief of Lee Hi Sook (Rept. No. 287);

S. 703. A bill for the relief of Kimie Okamoto Addington (Rept. No. 288);

S. 857 A bill for the relief of Mrs. Styllliani Papathanasiou (Rept. No. 289); and

S. 1281. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria Clotilde Costa (Rept. No. 291).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 130. A bill for the relief of Felicidad Caletena (Rept. No. 282);

S. 207. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose S. Lastra (Rept. No. 293);

S. 358. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Gasparovic and Dragica Rendulic Gasparovic (Rept. No. 294);

S. 454. A bill for the relief of Lee Hyang Na (Rept. No. 295);

S. 517. A bill for the relief of John William Daugherty, Jr. (Rept. No. 296);

S. 551. A bill for the relief of Richard Bing-Yin Lam (Rept. No. 297); and

S. 778. A bill for the relief of Nicola Moric (Rept. No. 290).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 614. A bill for the relief of Evanglia Moshou Kantas (Rept. No. 298).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 4185. An act to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 301).

By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 2166. An act for the relief of Staiman Bros.-Simon Wrecking Co. (Rept. No. 302).

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 300)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities, I wish to report to the Senate, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, S. 1483, providing for the establishment of a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, and I submit a report thereon.

The bill contains the proposals strongly supported by President Johnson's administration for the Foundation. It also contains, I believe, the best elements from related legislation introduced earlier in this Congress by Senators GRUENING and JAVITS and by myself. Moreover, I believe it contains highly constructive provisions and objectives from legislation introduced during previous Congresses.

I would like to emphasize that the bill represents comprehensive bipartisan effort. In this respect, I would like to pay special tribute to Senator JAVITS. He can justly be termed the congressional pioneer in legislation closely allied to the present bill. His valuable efforts date back to 1949, when he was a Member of the House of Representatives. He submitted amendments which were approved and which I believe substantially strengthen S. 1483, particularly in regard to encouraging State activities within the broad spectrum of the arts.

If Senate rules would allow more than one Senator to report a given bill, I would be most happy to join with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], ranking minority member of the committee and of the subcommittee, in reporting S. 1483 to our body. I do so in spirit and with admiration for his great leadership in this field which is of such mutual concern to us both.

I should also like to pay tribute to the other members of the subcommittee, who have contributed so much to this bill. The efforts of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] to stimulate and encourage our Nation's cultural progress date back many years. His experience with related legislation, as the report shows, predates my own. He has contributed to the substance of S. 1483, and also to the report I am privileged to submit. It was due to the recommendations of the Senator from Texas that we adopted language in the report pertaining to freedom of expression as one of the significant guidelines of the bill.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], during the 87th Congress, introduced a bill containing the concept of matching grants to the States for progress in the arts. He is the father of this concept which is an important part of the present legislation.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] also contributed their talents and time to the bill during our careful deliberations on it. The Senator from New Jersey was a member of the Senate Special Subcommittee on the Arts, the parent body of the present subcommittee. The Senators from Massachusetts and California added their abilities to the subcommittee this year.

I also wish to pay special tribute to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], who introduced in the 89th Congress the first bill to benefit both the arts and humanities, S. 111. Important provisions from his bill are to be found in S. 1483, together with the language he recommended to benefit studies in language, both modern and classic, and in the field of linguistics. I believe that the bill has been strengthened significantly by the knowledge and experience of the Senator from Alaska and by his close association with the development of this legislation.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the eminently wise and knowledgeable chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has my particular and abiding admiration. It was through him that the Subcommittee on the Arts was retitled this year to include the Humanities.

I also would like to express my appreciation to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], a cosponsor of S. 1483, for his cooperation as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] be added as cosponsors of S. 1483 at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, a great number of Senators have joined as cosponsors of S. 1483. I am indeed very grateful to them for their most helpful and welcome support. I am delighted that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] from my home State is a cosponsor of this measure; and I should like the RECORD to show at this point all the distinguished cosponsors of S. 1483, as reported.

They are Senators ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BASS, BAYH, BREWSTER, BURDICK, BYRD of West Virginia, CASE, CLARK, COOPER, DODD, DOUGLAS, FONG, GRUENING, HART, HARTKE, INOUYE, JACKSON, JAVITS, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KENNEDY of New York, KUCHEL, LONG of Missouri, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MCINTYRE, METCALF, MILLER, MONDALE, MONTOYA, MORSE, MOSS, MURPHY, MUSKIE, NEUBERGER, NELSON, PASTORE, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep appreciation for the graciousness of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]. I am convinced that without him to synthesize the ideas which we had, this great historic moment would not now be here, when we take up the bill which is likely to become law to establish for our Government the position in the whole field of the arts and culture in general.

I am gratified that the Senator from Rhode Island has acknowledged my own efforts, which go back 16 years. Let me say to all Senators that the introduction of this bill represents a movement in this country which can be of the greatest satisfaction and comfort to every American of almost any kind which has ever been presented to Congress.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New York with reference to the leadership of the Senator from Rhode Island on this bill.

It has been my privilege to serve for the last three Congresses on the Special Committee on the Arts which held hearings earlier on the bill. The hearings were conducted with great skill and ability by the Senator from Rhode Island. He has now brought to the floor of the Senate combined bills for the creation of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. This is a great step forward in the creation of this Foundation and Federal encouragement in both fields of the arts and humanities.

Such a Foundation was recommended to the Government more than a century and a quarter ago. It has taken more than a century and a quarter to come to this moment in the history of the Senate today in the Government's encouragement of the arts and humanities.

The Senator from Rhode Island has pursued this subject from year to year with great diligence and skill, and I commend him for it. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has also worked with him for many years, and deserves great credit for his part in bringing the bill to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINTS RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2099. A bill for the relief of Giorgio Oggiano; and

S. 2100. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Neil S. Murphy, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2101. A bill for the relief of Lucia Vitello Mariano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 2102. A bill to protect and conserve the North Pacific fur seals, and to administer the Pribilof Islands for the conservation of fur seals and other wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 2103. A bill to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution extending for 1 year the existing authority for the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CASE:

S.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to designate the 7th day of November in 1965 as National Teachers' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS DURING INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION YEAR

Mr. CHURCH (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. COOPER) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the 20th anniversary of the United Nations during International Cooperation Year, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CHURCH, which appears under a separate heading.)

JUSTICE FOR THE PRIBILOVIANS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce today a far-reaching bill dealing with the administration of the Pribilof Islands in the Bering Sea. A similar bill will be introduced by Representative RIVERS.

The bill has two principal titles. Title I gives legal expression to the terms of the Fur Seal Convention ratified by the Congress on Thursday, January 30, 1964. The North Pacific Fur Seal Convention has been in effect since 1911. It is an agreement with Canada, Japan, Russia, and the United States participating which governs the conservation and utilization of the immensely valuable and unique fur seal resources of the North Pacific.

This is important, but even more important is title II which deals with the administration of the islands. This is designed to bring to the people of the Pribilof Islands—at this late date—the full benefits, rights, duties, and responsibilities which are theirs as citizens of Alaska and citizens of the United States.

Fog shrouded and remote in the Bering Sea, the Pribilof Islands of St. Paul and St. George serve as rookeries for over 1½ million Alaska fur seals. The 642 residents of the two islands are direct descendants of the Aleut people brought to the islands by the Russians in the early 19th century to harvest fur seals. The Pribilovians are experts in the techniques of the harvest which extends through July and August each year. Without them, the fur seal industry would not be as efficient and profitable as it is.

The responsibility for the conservation and utilization of the fur seals lies with the Secretary of the Interior. He also has responsibility for the administration of these islands and the people on them. These responsibilities have been delegated by him to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

During the Russian days the Pribilovians were treated as wards of the state. They were not paid for their labor. They worked, in a state close to bondage, at the direction of the Russian colonial officials. In exchange, they were given the food they needed for life and the clothing and shelter they needed for protection. They knew no money. No money changed hands. No savings were accumulated by the people; no investments made. No one starved, but there was no escape. When the American Nation took over the sealing operations on the Pribilofs, they took over as well this system of maintaining the natives. It continued without substantial change until 1950.

In 1950 the first wage plan went into effect. Men were paid for the work they performed and were able to pay for what food, clothing, and goods they desired. Since 1950, there have been numerous improvements in the management of the islands especially under the recent leadership of the director, Howard Baltzo and the island manager, Howard Euneau. Even so, there is more to be done.

The bill which I introduce today is designed to allow the Pribilovians to stand on their own feet and to obtain for them the protection and rights enjoyed by all American citizens.

Interest in the status of the Pribilovians is not new. All my life I have heard accounts of their problems. All my life, I have heard, too, the official reassurances that Pribilovians are being well and fairly treated. And yet the problems continue.

The bill which I introduce today, should it become law, will insure once and for all equality of treatment for the Pribilovians.

I cannot introduce this bill without paying tribute to three persons with whom I have worked closely on its preparation.

First, to Howard Rock, publisher and editor of the Tundra Times, who, in a series of articles this winter, made clear to all who read them that the time had come to see that full justice was done on the islands.

Secondly, to Willard Bowman, executive director of the Alaska State Commission for Human Rights, who, at my suggestion and at the instruction of Gov. William A. Egan, undertook a study of the conditions on the islands. Mr. Bowman has now made his report. At his recommendation, a commission made up of officials of the Department of the Interior and the State of Alaska has now been appointed under the direction of Hugh J. Wade, secretary of state for Alaska. This commission will undertake its work this summer and I look forward to its recommendations.

Thirdly, to Donald McKernan, director of the bureau of commercial fisheries, who has given me his full and continuing cooperation in the preparation of this legislation. I have not the slightest doubt that the bureau of commercial fisheries and the Department of the Interior are anxious to see that the welfare of the Pribilovians is served.

The bill which I introduce is a long one. It provides the Secretary of the Interior the authority he needs to see that the following reforms are carried out:

Since 1950, wages have been paid and civil service retirement benefits have been calculated accordingly. This bill will allow the inclusion of services performed before 1950 in the computation of these benefits.

There is now no native ownership on the islands. There are but two exceptions: The Russian Orthodox Church on St. Paul and the Russian Orthodox Church on St. George. These two churches were built during the days of Russian ownership and were deeded, by the treaty of cession, to their respective congregations. The bill which I introduce provides for the transfer of title to lands, houses, and property from the government to the citizens. A fair compensation is provided for.

For many years no person could visit the islands without first receiving a pass to do so from the bureau of commercial fisheries. Until quite recently, this pass could only be obtained in Seattle. Now at least, it can be obtained on the islands itself. My bill abolishes this odious pass system in its entirety.

The bill which I introduce today provides for the development and strengthening of incorporated local government. It provides that educational facilities shall be operated by the State of Alaska and that standards shall be maintained equal to that of the Alaska education system. The bill provides that the bureau of commercial fisheries may turn over its health and welfare responsibilities as well.

It should be made clear that the bill authorizes the Secretary to do all these things but it does not require him to do so immediately upon enactment. These things take time and it is necessary to insure that the interests of the Pribilovians are assured throughout the transfer of responsibilities.

No doubt this bill can be improved. No doubt it will be improved as hearings are held and comments are received from the agencies, the State government and the Pribilovians themselves. It is, however, a beginning, an important and significant beginning. And it makes clear the good intentions and the firm determination of everyone concerned to see that equal rights for all applies to the Pribilovians as well as to all other Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that a line-by-line analysis of the bill which I have prepared may be made a part of the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the line-by-line analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2102) to protect and conserve the North Pacific fur seals, and to administer the Pribilof Islands for the conservation of fur seals and other wildlife, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Bartlett, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The line-by-line analysis presented by Mr. Bartlett is as follows:

Line-by-Line Analysis

TITLE I. CONSERVATION AND PROTECTION OF THE NORTH PACIFIC FUR SEALS

Section 101 makes it unlawful for any American person or vessel to take fur seals except as provided under this act. It also requires American vessels to allow Canadian, Japanese, and Soviet officials to board and search in international waters if such vessel is suspected of sealing.

Section 102 allows Indians, Aleuts and Eskimos to seal, as they always have, in small hand-propelled boats and without firearms. This permission does not extend to Indians, Aleuts and Eskimos employed by other people who are sealing.

Section 103 provides for the conducting of scientific research and investigations and for the taking of fur seals for educational, scientific, or exhibition purposes.

Section 104 authorizes the Secretary to take, cure, process and sell fur seal skins and to contract with any public or private agency to do the same in his behalf.

Section 105 authorizes enforcement officials to board any vessel suspected of sealing and coming under the jurisdiction of any of the parties to the Fur Seal Convention. It permits the seizure of vessels and the arresting of persons and provides for the turning over of the arrested person of seized vessel to the nation having jurisdiction over person or vessel.

Section 106 says that the President shall appoint a U.S. commissioner and may appoint a deputy commissioner. They are to be paid travel expenses and per diem.

Section 107 authorizes the Secretary of State together with the Secretary of the Interior to accept or reject recommendations made by the International Commission.

Section 108 authorizes the head of any Federal agency to assist the Secretary of the Interior or the Commission whenever such help is needed.

Section 109 defines convention, party or parties, commission, sealing, North Pacific Ocean and import.

TITLE II. ADMINISTRATION OF THE PRIBILOF ISLANDS

Section 201 provides that the Pribilof Islands "shall continue to be administered as a special reservation" by the Secretary of the Interior for fur seals, other wildlife, "and for other purposes."

Section 202 provides that the Secretary may make contracts, agreements or leases or permits to public or private agencies or persons including the Pribilovians for the use of government-owned real or personal property on the islands for tourist accommodations, for educational, recreational, residential, commercial purposes and for the operation, maintenance and repair of Government facilities, for transportation and storage of food and supplies in order to carry out the provisions of this title.

Section 203 to carry out the provisions of this title the Secretary may provide the Pribilovians with such facilities, services and equipment including food, fuel, shelter, transportation, education, medical and dental care, with or without reimbursement. He may provide, at reasonable rates, food, fuel, shelter, transportation, education, medical and dental care to the employees of the Department and their dependents, to tourists and to other persons. He may furnish Federal employees and dependents "and other persons" emergency medical care, including transportation, without charge. He may purchase and transport such supplies and equipment as he considers necessary and he may purchase, construct and maintain such facilities as may be necessary. All proceeds from the above will be credited to the current appropriation.

Section 204 authorizes the Secretary to enter into an agreement with the Governor of Alaska so that the State may assume the full responsibility for education and the costs. Provision is also made for agreements with the State to furnish adequate food, shelter, transportation and medical care. Such agreements must provide that the State will meet the educational needs of the Pribilovians in the same way as it meets the needs of all its citizens. The Secretary may transfer to the State, without reimbursement, the title to such real or personal property as may be necessary to carry out any agreements arrived at. Any authority which the Secretary is given in this section which is transferred by agreement to the State of Alaska shall terminate 6 months after the effective date of the agreement.

Section 205. The Secretary may also enter into agreements with any other Federal agency to transfer medical and dental care responsibilities.

Section 206 authorizes the Secretary to set aside as much land on St. Paul Island as necessary to establish a townsite. It provides for the surveying of the townsite and the issuing of a patent therefor to a trustee. The trustee may convey title to the Pribilovians of the improved or unimproved lots upon payment "of an amount to be determined by the Secretary." Titles are inalienable except upon approval of the Secretary. The lots so conveyed will not be subject to sale and satisfaction of debts or contracts except that should a municipal corporation be established the lots would be subject to taxation and to sale and satisfaction of the tax debts thereof. In determining the prices to be charged for the lots, the Secretary shall consider the economic status of the Pribilovians, the factor of isolation and the restrictive nature of the title to be conveyed and the improvements which the purchaser may have made upon them. The proceeds from the sale shall go into the Pribilof Islands fund in the treasury for the administration of the islands. Whenever the Secretary determines that the community is financially capable, all such revenues shall be turned over to it. All lands not needed for Federal activities and not sold under the terms of this title shall be turned over by the trustee to the municipality either with or without reimbursement. When the municipality is incorporated, the

Secretary shall turn over title to all streets and alleys.

Section 207 provides for a $500 fine or 6 months' imprisonment for anyone who violates or fails to comply with regulations issued by the Secretary under this title.

Section 208 defines the term "Pribilof Islands."

Section 209 provides that service by Pribilovians in the sealing operations performed before January 1, 1950, shall be considered for the computation of civil service retirement. And civil service retirement benefits shall be paid accordingly.

TITLE III. GENERAL

Section 301 provides that any vessel caught in violation of the provisions of this act shall be subject to forfeiture, skins, equipment and all. All provisions by law relating to seizure, forfeiture, and sale are made applicable to boats seized under this act..

Section 302 makes enforcement of the act the joint responsibility of the Secretaries of the Interior, Treasury, and the Department under which the Coast Guard is operated. It authorizes U.S. district courts to issue such warrants and so forth as are necessary for enforcement of the act. This section defines the duties and the activities which enforcement officials will have under the terms of the act.

Section 303 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to issue such regulations as necessary.

Section 304. Persons violating titles I or III of this act may be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than a year, or both.

Section 305 allows the Secretary to enter into agreements for research.

Section 306 defines "person taking" and "natives of the Pribilof Islands."

Section 307 authorizes the appropriation of such sums as necessary.

Section 308 repeals the old Pribilof Act and amends the Statehood Act so as to replace references to the old Fur Seal Act with references to the new.

DESIGNATION OF NOVEMBER 7, 1965, AS "NATIONAL TEACHERS' DAY"

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution requesting that the President of the United States proclaim the 7th day of November 1965 as National Teachers' Day.

National Teachers' Day is a fitting way to honor and praise the teachers of America. We honor their service, spirit, and dedication. No group contributes more importantly to the future of the United States.

Teachers play a vital role in training our youth today, to become the responsible citizen of tomorrow. They not only teach or instruct, but guide, encourage, and lead and this takes interest, understanding, and potent effort under often trying conditions.

Teachers frequently have provided the impetus to their students for further achievement and contribution to society. One teacher, as in the case of President Johnson, can encourage a pupil and influence the shape of his future life. Many great Americans owe their first inspiration to their teachers.

It is imperative that this country have good schools—but our schools are only as good as our teachers. It is necessary to remind the citizens of this country of the contribution teachers make to the national welfare and to the growth of the individual child, although their contribution can never be sufficiently honored. Proclamation of National Teachers' Day is a small yet tangible way to demonstrate our appreciation for all our teachers, the elementary, secondary, and college teachers, the teachers of the exceptional child and the teachers of vocational skills, who have done so much for America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 90) to designate the 7th day of November in 1965 as "National Teachers' Day," introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS DURING INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION YEAR

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the time of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations Charter at San Francisco is fast approaching. On June 26 of this year representatives from the nations of the world will gather at San Francisco to celebrate two decades of achievement by the United Nations Organization. Both the United Nations General Assembly and the President of the United States have designated all of 1965 as International Cooperation Year.

During the leadership of five American Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—the U.S. Government has remained firm in its commitment to the United Nations. I was fortunate enough to accompany President Johnson to the United Nations shortly after he became President, where I heard his eloquent speech reaffirming American support of the world organization. At that time, he said:

> More than ever, we support the United Nations as the best instrument ever devised to promote the peace of the world and to promote the well-being of mankind.

I certainly agree with the importance President Johnson attaches to the United Nations, and I was highly pleased by his recent announcement that he would attend the anniversary celebration in San Francisco. I think it is most fitting for the President of the United States to reaffirm our commitment to the United Nations at this symbolic gathering.

The life of the United Nations has been filled with achievements in a variety of areas. It has contributed greatly to the stability of the world by its work in the field of human rights, by its efforts in stamping out debilitating diseases such as malaria, and by its efforts in helping countries with the necessary economic aid for building modern nations.

The United Nations has rendered valuable service to the world in encouraging the long-term political and economic development that is absolutely vital if war is to be averted. But perhaps even more important is the work the United Nations has done to dampen down the fires which might lead to general war. In helping mediate various crises such as Berlin in 1948 and Cuba in 1962, the United Nations Organization helped avert possible conflict between the great powers. In its role in the Korean war of 1950, the Suez clash of 1956, the Congo operation of this decade, and the continuing crisis in Cyprus, the United Nations has played an indispensable role in quelling brush fires which might well have led to a world conflagration.

Because of the importance of the United Nations and its 20th anniversary celebration of International Cooperation Year, because of our faith in the future of this organization, and because of our knowledge of the need to take further steps to increase the possibilities for peace in the world, I am submitting, on my own behalf, and on behalf of Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. COOPER a resolution which affirms congressional support of the United Nations. I hope that all Senators will join us in favoring this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 36

Whereas the year 1965 marks the twentieth anniversary of the United Nations, which will be celebrated in San Francisco on June 26, 1965; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly has designated the year 1965 as International Cooperation Year; and

Whereas the President of the United States has proclaimed 1965 as International Cooperation Year, and has set up a broad program within the executive branch to review our present international policies in cooperation with a bipartisan group of distinguished private citizens; and

Whereas the President has charged those participating in the International Cooperation Year program to "search and explore and canvass and thorouoghly discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace;" and

Whereas the International Cooperation Year program will culminate in a White House Conference on International Cooperation which the President has announced he will convene in November 1965; and

Whereas during the twenty years of its existence the United Nations has played an important, and at times crucial, role in pursuit of one of its stated purposes "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind;" and

Whereas during that time the United Nations has also performed a valuable service through the specialized agencies and otherwise in helping to establish human rights and to eliminate those ancient enemies of mankind—hunger, poverty, disease and ignorance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States of America rededicates itself to the principles of the United Nations and to the furtherance of international cooperation within the framework of law and order; and that all other members of the United Nations are urged to do likewise.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that in connection with the examination for International Cooperation Year of United States participation in international cooperative activities, the executive branch should (1) review with a high sense of urgency the current state of international peacekeeping machinery with a view to making specific suggestions for strengthening this machinery, (2) review other major elements of international community and cooperation with a view to making specific suggestions to promote the growth of institutions of international cooperation and law and order, and (3) review urgently the status of disarmament negotiations with a view to further progress in reducing the dangers and burden of competitive national armaments.

SEC. 3. In order to provide for participation by the Congress in the White House Conference on International Cooperation, subject to an invitation by the President, there is hereby created a congressional delegation of twelve members to be composed of six Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Any vacancy in the membership of the delegation shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointments.

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE REPORT ON S. 1698, BANK MERGER BILL, BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be authorized until midnight today to file its report on S. 1698, the bank merger bill, together with supplementary, individual, or minority views if desired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 251

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8371) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendments when submitted by Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, which appears under a separate heading.)

ABOLISH ATROCIOUS EXCISE TAXES: OPPOSE PROPOSED TAX ON FUEL USED FOR TRAVEL ON INLAND WATERWAYS

AMENDMENT NO. 251

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, all Americans rejoiced when President Johnson requested the Congress to eliminate many excise taxes and reduce others. Excise taxes are, in reality, sales taxes. These obnoxious taxes burden most those who have least. They violate the sound principle of just taxation, that taxes should be levied according to ability to pay.

I have long been opposed to the continuation of these various atrocious wartime tax measures and have on numerous occasions urged their repeal. I did so as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in the 81st Congress when I served as Congressman at Large from Ohio. My first speech in the Senate, early in 1959, was in opposition to the continuation of excise taxes, particularly the tax on telephone users for local and long-distance telephone calls.

These abominable taxes were imposed during World War II as necessary fund-raising measures for the war effort and to restrain the use and purchase of scarce and vital services and commodities. For example, to discourage people from traveling by airplanes and to encourage spending money to purchase Government bonds instead of buying jewelry, leather goods, and so forth. Today, however, the imposition of excise taxes, or the so-called luxury taxes, unnecessarily burdens Americans. They serve only to help restrict private purchasing power, to stifle incentive, and to hold back economic growth.

Mr. President, the Nation is in the midst of an unprecedented period of prosperity in which our economy has continually moved ahead for 52 months. All indications are that this will continue. There is no doubt whatever that this is in large part due to the income tax cut enacted last year. This placed $14 billion in the pocketbooks of American working men and women, created an additional $28 billion in consumer buying power, aided in the creation of nearly 2 million additional jobs which brought about the lowest unemployment rate in 7 years, and allowed businessmen to invest an additional $6½ billion in plants and machinery. All this occurred while prices remained stable. This is an unprecedented achievement.

I am delighted that the President has recommended a 7-percent reduction in the telephone tax effective next January, with complete repeal by 1969, and the reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on automobiles, and elimination of the taxes on such items as jewelry, furs, toilet articles and cosmetics, luggage, handbags and other leather goods. These may have been luxuries in years gone by, but today they are necessities. Ask any businessman if his briefcase or luggage is a luxury. Ask any women if she considers her handbag and lipstick as luxuries. It certainly is not realistic in this day and age to term light bulbs, telephones, television sets, automobiles, radios, refrigerators, fishing poles, and inexpensive cameras, "luxuries."

Inasmuch as some excise taxes are necessary for our good "Uncle" to operate efficiently, I am not opposed to sumptuary taxes on alcohol and cigarettes and tobacco which have been imposed for many years, and which bring in sizable revenues to our Government. However, I am definitely opposed to the regressive taxes on necessities, which lay the heaviest burden on the poorest people.

Mr. President, I was distressed that the President recommended the 5-percent tax on air travel be made permanent and that additional taxes be placed on the air transportation industry. Travel by air is no longer a luxury. It is a vital and fundamental part of our transportation system and communications network. In most instances it is a necessity. It is just about the only means of public transportation between many of our cities, and in some States, such as Alaska, it is practically the only means of transportation. Twenty or twenty-five years ago air travel might have been considered a luxury in many instances, but today there are few who would question the fact that it is a necessity for millions of Americans. It is unconscionable to continue to levy the tax on air transportation.

It has been argued that at the present time the civil users of our airways are not paying their full share of airway costs. Frankly, I do not believe this is a valid argument. In the past, the Federal Government has subsidized our railways and still does so by various means. The tax on railways passengers was abolished some time ago. Many industries have been indirectly aided and subsidized by the Federal Government, but special taxes are not placed on them because of that fact. At a time when we are eliminating taxes on furs, playing cards, jukeboxes, and other purely amusement devices, it is unconscionable to add to the cost of necessary air travel.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment to H.R. 8371 which would completely abolish the 5-percent tax on air transportation. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed, and printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 251) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

On page 30, beginning with line 23, strike out all through line 6 on page 31 (section 303 of the bill, relating to tax on transportation of persons by air).

On page 46, strike out lines 6 through 10.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the same reasoning applies to our inland waterways. The President has recommended a tax of 2 cents per gallon on all fuel used for travel on the inland waterways, both for business and recreational purposes. The imposition of this tax would do great harm to the economy of the State of Ohio. Our great State is bounded on the north by Lake Erie and on the south and much of the east by the Ohio River, two of the world's greatest inland waterways. In addition, Ohio teems with rivers which are vital to the economy of the State—the Scioto, the Maumee, the Cuyahoga, the Miami, the Mahoning, the Muskingum, to name a few. Also, our State abounds in great inland lakes which provide recreational facilities for boating enthusiasts—Grand Lake and Indian Lake, to name two of the largest. A tax on fuel used on these important waterways could be ruinous to many parts of the State. The same is true, I am sure, of many States in the Union blessed with great inland waterways.

Low-cost water transportation and the national policies which make it possible have been fully justified by experience. We must continue as we have done since the earliest days of the Republic, when the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 was adopted, and the first settlers floated down the Ohio River, to improve and maintain our lakes and rivers, harbors, bays, and sounds as common highways forever free to all our people, without tolls or taxes or any imposition on their use. Andrew Jackson truly said long ago:

> All improvements effected by the general funds of the Nation for general use should be open to the enjoyment of all our fellow citizens, exempt from the payment of tolls or any imposition of that character.

A reversal of that policy pursued without significant interruption since the earliest days of our national life, through the imposition of tolls or user taxes would discourage waterway use and waste priceless public assets. Imposing such regressive taxes should not even be considered. It would severely dislocate established competitive and community relationships and discourage economic growth, inflicting serious hardships on communities in depressed areas whose future prospects depend directly on full development of their water resources. The use of the waterways of our States and the Nation should always be available and free for all our citizens.

It would be unconscionable to consider imposing a discriminatory excise tax or any sort of tariff, or tax, on the use of our waterways. To do so would be contrary to the public interest, against the public welfare, and would hamper our economy. It would mean the loss of their jobs for hundreds of thousands of worthy and industrious men and women, and economic depression for many areas of the Nation.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the Senate Committee on Finance will eliminate the outrageous 5-percent tax on air travel when it considers this general legislation. Also, I shall strongly oppose any attempt to impose a tax on those who use our inland waterways.

Each year since World War II the Congress has extended these excise taxes for 1 year, holding out the promise to citizens that each year will be the last year for them. Very shortly the annual renewal date will be upon us. This year that promise will become a reality. After June 30 of this year, most of these regressive excise or sales taxes will no longer plague Americans. They will be swept out of existence and be buried unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

STRENGTHENING THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES, AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STUDENTS IN POSTSECONDARY AND HIGHER EDUCATION—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 252

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (S. 600) to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students on postsecondary and higher education. This amendment, if adopted, will expand the National Defense Education Act, providing grants and stipends to encourage the training of students and teachers for work in international affairs. The amendment would add less than $3.5 million to the appropriation request for the National Defense Education Act in fiscal year 1966, and would amend the National Defense Education Act to—

Provide grants to colleges and universities to aid in the establishment and operation of international affairs programs to train individuals for overseas business or Government work, for work in the United States in international affairs, or for teaching or research work in international affairs;

Provide stipends for students undertaking advanced training in order to teach international affairs in colleges; and

Provide grants to colleges to help in the establishment of short-term or regular session institutes on international affairs for high school teachers, with stipends for those participating in the program.

This legislation is required to meet the growing national need for expertise in international affairs. The bill grew out of a Library of Congress survey of 32 U.S. universities and colleges, conducted several years ago at my request, which emphasized the need for expanding and improving programs in international affairs studies on high priority.

A greater number of students, teachers, businessmen, professional people, and Government officials must be better prepared to deal with the growing challenges and opportunities in the international field. The increasing responsibilities inherent in U.S. free world leadership require additional efforts to improve the quality and expand the scope of international affairs studies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 252) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT NO. 253

Mr. CASE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 600, supra, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NO. 254

Mr. ELLENDER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 255

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 1837, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965, and ask that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the table.

The amendment (No. 255) is as follows:

> On page 4, line 21, strike out "July 1, 1966" and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1967."
>
> On page 4, line 24, strike out "$7,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,000,000."

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment, providing for modest expansion in the provision for assistance to American schools and hospitals abroad.

In the first instance, it would extend until July 1, 1967 the exclusion from the provisions of the Battle Act which these projects have enjoyed. As reported by the committee, S. 1837 would repeal this exclusion effective July 1, 1966. It seems to me that since the bill provides general authorization for foreign assistance programs over a 2-year period, it is only fair that the Battle Act exclusion should remain in effect for the term of the bill.

There is a specific case in point to which this 2-year extension would apply. It is the American-sponsored children's hospital in Krakow, Poland, which has been supported under the foreign assistance program since 1959. Although the main hospital structure has been completed, the American committee responsible for this excellent project, now is actively contemplating the construction of a nurses' residence and school and a new laboratory structure. They hope to be able to undertake a feasibility study of these proposed expansions with counterpart assistance during fiscal 1966, and if the results are favorable, to proceed with construction in fiscal 1967. They could not proceed beyond the feasibility study under the repeal date of July 1, 1966, provided in the bill approved by committee. For this reason, it seems to me that it is only fair that the exclusion extend to July 1, 1967, so that this worthy project could be undertaken if it is found to be feasible.

Second, my amendment would increase by $2 million the amount authorized for use in each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

I would say at the outset that, in offering this amendment, I am not an advocate of indefinite expansion of our various assistance programs. In the case of the hospitals and schools, however, I note that the total authorization is being cut from $18 million for fiscal 1965 to $7 million in each of the next 2 fiscal years, by terms of the committee bill. While I agree with many of the guidelines which the administration has laid down with respect to continuation of this kind of assistance, it does seem to me that the phaseout has been extremely abrupt, and that it will redound to the detriment of many, many worthy projects around the world. I understand, moreover, that the $7 million which had been allowed by the administration, is very fully programed and that there is virtually no leeway for meeting new needs.

The amendment which I propose would allow a modest increase of the authorization to $9 million in each of the 2 fiscal years. It would not, to be sure, cover all of the worthy projects which probably should be supported, but it will allow at least for consideration of some of the most deserving.

In particular, it might allow for the $175,000 needed to make a feasibility study of the Krakow Hospital expansion project, and subsequent construction funds if that study is favorable.

Another extremely worthy project which has come to my attention and which certainly should receive consideration under this program is the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center in Jerusalem, which is an expanding complex of the most modern facilities for teaching, healing, and research in most of the medical sciences, including medical, dental, nursing, and pharmacology schools. This facility, which is training an increasing number of medical specialists for service throughout the eastern Mediterranean and African regions, is strongly supported by the Hadassah Medical Relief Association, Inc., a nonprofit organization with branches in the 50 States. It is my understanding that notwithstanding the superb efforts of this association to support the center in Jerusalem, there are distinct limits to the volunteer support which can be counted on to finance capital expansion of the Center.

I attach at this point a list of facilities planned under the capital construction program of the Hadassah Center for the years 1966 and 1967, and ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hadassah Medical Relief Association, Inc., Programs of New Capital Construction and Research for Fiscal Years 1966 and 1967

Hadassah-Selingsburg Comprehensive School.
Hadassah-Brandeis Vocational School.
Vocational guidance facilities.
J. F. Kennedy Memorial Center.
Nurses residence.
Kidney transplant laboratory and operating theater.
Neurological institute.
Ophthalmological institute.
Nursing postgraduate school.
New research laboratories.
Equipment for mother and child pavilion.
Research animal breeding house.
Residents and interns hostel.
Pediatric-student conference room.
Air-conditioning of radial intensive care unit of the medical center.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the total cost of these projects planned at the Jerusalem Center will be about $4,375,000 and that only about $2 million can be anticipated in contributions to the Hadassah Relief Association and that the balance must come from other sources. Hadassah hopes that it might be considered for counterpart assistance under terms of the amendment which I propose.

I might add that, with regard to the two projects which I have mentioned, there are ample prospects for financing through U.S.-owned counterpart currency. I understand that the United States is credited with a favorable balance of approximately $62 million in Israeli pounds and approximately $494 million in Polish zlotys. To my mind, there could be no more worthy way of making use of these foreign currency holdings.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 256

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance System, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I would like to announce the following schedule of hearings on bills pending before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and assigned to subcommittees which I chair:

June 22 through 25, the Subcommittee on Labor will hear witnesses on S. 256, repeal of section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act; and on S. 731 and H.R. 5883, amendments to the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act.

July 6 through 9 and 12 through 16, the subcommittee will hear witnesses on S. 1986, extension of coverage of minimum wage and amendments to the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Meanwhile, the Select Subcommittee on Poverty, which has pending S. 1759, amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, will hear witnesses on June 28 and 29.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN SURPLUS PROPERTY PROGRAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I wish to announce that that subcommittee will hold hearings on the domestic and foreign surplus property program on Thursday, June 10 at 2 p.m., and Friday, June 11 at 10 a.m., in room 3302 of the New Senate Office Building. Future hearings will be held on this subject and those who desire to testify later should so notify Mr. Glenn Shriver of the staff of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

U.S. POLICY ON VIETNAM—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on June 1, at Michigan State University, in East Lansing, Mich., Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey delivered an address on the administration's position in the Vietnam conflict.

In his usual able manner, the Vice President underscored the basic reasons governing the involvement of the United States in southeast Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by the Vice President at Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich., on June 1, 1965

It is a pleasure to accept the invitation of the Michigan State People-to-People Committee to discuss U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Coming here today from Washington—once aptly described as "a city of southern efficiency and northern charm"—it is refreshing to return to the atmosphere of excitement, of expectation and love of learning that is characteristic of a great university.

Action is to the politician what reflection is to the scholar—and as a political leader, it is a rewarding experience to confront the enthusiastic questioning of the student and the careful scrutiny of the professor.

It is a welcomed—if risky—experience.

It is welcome, because nowhere are solid arguments and perceptive judgments more appreciated.

It is risky because nothing chills nonsense like exposure to the brisk air of a university.

The subject which I am about to discuss with you is appropriate for this audience because it pertains to war and peace.

No group should be more interested in war and peace than those who will be expected to bear the brunt of the fighting if war should come.

It is therefore a natural and healthy phenomenon that war and peace in southeast Asia should have become the subject of lively debate and vigorous discussion on university campuses across the country.

As the debate on U.S. policy in Vietnam has flourished during the past 6 months, the United States has continued to be challenged to match deeds with words in opposing aggression and defending the freedom of a friendly nation.

We have met that challenge.

Our firm and decisive response to naked aggression against South Vietnam has demonstrated to our friends that our power remains preeminent and our devotion to freedom firm—and to our foes that the United States is no paper tiger.

The measured application of American power proves that we are prepared to meet aggression in whatever form, that we shall not be forced to choose between humiliation and holocaust, that the firmness of our response in no way diminishes our devotion to peace.

Our action in Vietnam is a part of the continuing struggle which the American people must be prepared to wage if we are to preserve free civilization as we know it and resist the expansion of Communist power.

It is a further indication that the breakup of the bipolar world, which has characterized the international relations of the past two decades, and the easing of tensions between East and West following the nuclear test ban, may have changed the pattern of U.S. involvement in world affairs, but it has not diminished it.

We retain the role of leader of the free world that we inherited at the end of World War II, and in that role our responsibilities remain worldwide. In that role our responsibility extends to distant Asia as well as to countries on our doorstep.

President Johnson has made it unmistakably clear that we intend to meet those responsibilities.

It was in the role of defender of the free world that we originally made a commitment to Vietnam in 1954.

It was in this role that three administrations maintained that commitment.

Although as students of history you may debate the wisdom of the original decision to take up the responsibilities which the French relinquished in 1954, this question has little relevance for the policymaker today.

President Johnson in his Baltimore speech of April 7 and his Washington speech of May 13 spelled out those alternatives and which we have chosen as the basis of our policy.

They are three:

First. In the face of armed conflict, in the face of continued aggressions, we will not withdraw, we will not abandon the people of Vietnam. We shall keep our word.

Our refusal to withdraw is based on our recognition that sudden withdrawal from Vietnam would only weaken the position of free societies in Asia—which could only regard withdrawal as a loss of interest by the United States in the area and an enticement to accommodate themselves to Communist China.

In refusing to withdraw we reject the belief that by some Hegelian law of inevitability, China is destined to swallow up all of Asia. And I find it curious that proponents of the inevitability theory so often combine it with advocacy of the Titoist doctrine that Vietnam would become an independent neutral nation if we would withdraw our military forces. The arguments are absolutely incompatible.

We refuse to withdraw in the certain knowledge that withdrawal would mean the betrayal of those who have opposed the spread of communism in southeast Asia, would mean certain death or exile.

Finally, in relation to the Sino-Soviet contest, a withdrawal by us would vindicate the Chinese thesis that militancy pays—and discredit the Soviet thesis of peaceful coexistence.

Second. Recognizing that a political solution of the conflict is essential, we stand ready to engage in unconditional discussions. We have no desire for further military escalation of the war. We stand ready to consider any solution which would bring peace and justice to all of Vietnam, North and South.

I would like to make crystal clear who is in favor of a political settlement and who is opposed, who has offered the olive branch and who has rejected it. President Johnson has affirmed not only our willingness to hold unconditional discussions to end the war, but our ardent desire to do so.

What has been the response of the Communist governments in Hanoi and Peiping?

They have rejected every peace offer from any source. They have spurned the efforts of the U.N. to mediate. They have scorned the offer of the British. They have brushed aside the efforts of the Indian Government. In short—the Communist governments in Hanoi and Peiping have rejected all efforts to restore peace and justice to the people of Vietnam.

Third. We recognize that the people of Vietnam must have a cause for which to fight, they must have hope of a better day. We have made it clear to the people of Vietnam that to improve their lives and fulfill their hopes we stand ready to support a massive cooperative development effort—not only for Vietnam but for all of southeast Asia. It is our hope, as President Johnson has said, that "the works of peace can bring men together in a common effort to abandon forever the works of war."

These three principles—honoring our military commitment, a continuing willingness to seek a political solution, and a massive economic development program—remain the bases of our policy.

The struggle in Vietnam has a special significance for the United States as the defender of the free world because it confronts us with a bold new form of aggression—which could rank in military importance with the discovery of gunpowder. I refer to the war of national liberation.

Vietnam offers a classic example of what can be accomplished by militant Communist forces intent on deliberate subversion of a country from within.

There we have seen a Communist state refuse to leave its neighbors in peace. We have seen the infiltration of Communist cadres to strengthen and direct guerrilla warfare in violation of international accords. We have seen the Communists who control and direct the war from Hanoi insist that the war in South Vietnam is internal because many of the Vietcong are South Vietnamese. We have seen them portray the struggle as a civil war—in which the popular forces are arrayed against American imperialism.

It is this new sophisticated form of warfare that is becoming the major challenge to our security, to the security of all free nations. This new warfare is often more dangerous than the old—a war in which the leaders cannot be located, in which the sources of supply cannot be easily cut off, in which the enemy forces are not outsiders but indigenous troops—in which signed truces do not halt the struggle.

The supreme challenge today is to prove to our Communist foes and our freedom-loving friends that the new face of war is no less pernicious than the old, that it can be defeated by those of strong mind, stout heart, and a will of steel. We know now that most Communist regimes do not desire to blow the world to pieces. They prefer to pick it up piece by piece.

How do we successfully meet the challenge posed by wars of national liberation? We need a balanced military force comprising air, sea, and land power. We need maximum flexibility in our forces—making it possible to respond rapidly to any situation. We need men experience in guerrilla and psychological warfare, in all the paramilitary arts that are practiced in wars of national liberation. We must adapt our aircraft and ships to the conditions we find. We must relearn the tactics of ground warfare in a guerrilla setting and adapt our equipment and our weapons accordingly.

Overwhelming military power alone is not an adequate response to wars of national liberation. Since these wars feed on seething social discontent, success in countering them requires a subtle blending of economic aid, political expertise, educational efforts, information and propaganda programs—combined with military power.

Where wars of liberation flourish, the military struggle is but one part of a larger social and political struggle. And these struggles will continue and revolutionary ferment will increase until governments come to power capable of implementing systematic social and economic programs designed to abolish shocking social and economic inequality between the privileged few and the impoverished masses, between glittering capitals and festering slums, between favored urban enclaves and primitive rural areas.

For the masses of the people in the developing countries of Asia who have never known the benefits of modern civilization, the status quo is no longer a burden to be patiently borne, but an oppressor to be cast off.

The primary responsibility for preserving the independence and security of a country remains with the people and the government of that country. If the people and their leaders have no will to preserve their independence, no outside force can save them. If the government can provide the people with a cause for which to fight, with a program inspiring sacrifice and effort, that government can be capable of defending itself against Communist infiltration and subversion from within. Where subversion from within is supported from outside, as is the case in Vietnam, outside assistance is needed if such a government is to achieve this capability. In many areas of the world, the United States has inherited the role of protector and defender of non-Communist nations which are under Communist assault. It is a role we have not sought. It is often a painful and expensive one. But it is an essential one—both to the security of the non-Communist world and to our own.

As I have noted, in overcoming wars of national liberation no one mode of response is adequate. At this point I would like to call attention to the nonmilitary side of the struggle that is required in this complex situation. My example again is Vietnam. I refer to the little noticed side of the struggle—the struggle for a better life. It is the battle of the Vietnamese people not merely to survive, but to build, to make progress, to move forward.

In the past decade, rice production has been doubled. Corn output is expected to be four times as large next year as it was in 1962. Pig production has more than doubled since 1955.

The average Vietnamese can expect to live only 35 years. Yet there are only 200 civilian doctors. A new medical school we are helping to build will graduate that number of new doctors each year.

Meanwhile, we have helped vaccinate more than 7 million people against cholera and millions more against other diseases. More than 12,000 hamlet health stations have been built and stocked with medical supplies.

In Vietnam—as everywhere—"civilization is a race between education and catastrophe." Education is the foundation of any country's future. For it is impossible to run a government, local or national, to man factories or to enrich the national life without trained and educated people. Elementary school enrollment was 300,000 in 1955—it is five times that number today. Vocational school enrollment has quadrupled. The university population is increasing steadily.

This progress has been achieved against the most appalling odds. It has been made despite the carefully planned and executed program of terror and harassment carried out by the Vietcong.

There is a curious misconception abroad that the Vietcong is a great idealistic movement, a sort of "Indochinese wing of the American Populist Party"—to use Arthur Schlesinger's phrase. In reality, they are, he continues, "a collection of very tough terrorists whose gains have come in the main not from the hopes they have inspired but from the fear they have created."

In the countryside, agricultural stations have regularly been destroyed and medical clinics raided. Malaria control team members have been killed or kidnaped. Village chiefs, schoolteachers and others who represent order and social service have been made special targets by the terrorists.

All told, it is estimated that 10,000 civilian officials have been killed or kidnaped since 1954. If one were to use comparable figures for the United States in relation to population, this would amount to 130,000 officials.

Yet the effort goes on despite these attacks and dangers. Brave and tireless Vietnamese continue to take seeds and fertilizer and farming know-how to the villagers; teachers continue to man the schools; medical teams go into the country despite the clear and always present danger. And at their side—I am proud to say—go American civilian workers. And they, too, have been killed and kidnaped. These men and women, Vietnamese and American—and increasingly of other nationalities—are the unsung, unpublicized heroes of this phase of the struggle. So long as they persevere wars of national liberation can be defeated.

As I understand it, you have decided to participate in this struggle by adopting the hamlet of Long Yen in Tay Ninh Province. This hamlet, 60 miles from Saigon, has vigorously resisted absorption into Vietcong hands. I am told you plan to raise funds—to build a new two-room school, to construct an open-air market and to pay for both a schoolteacher and a health officer. These are things the people of the hamlet themselves have decided they most need and want.

I have heard that word of Michigan State's program has struck sparks in other campuses as well.

This is most encouraging, most inspiring. For the need is so great—not just the physical need, but the need for people to know that other people stand with them. In this fashion you will be helping the Vietnamese people build a future for themselves. You will be working to defeat a new and pernicious form of aggression against mankind.

In assisting independent nations—whether in southeast Asia or in our own hemisphere—there will be required on our part patience as well as courage, "the will to endure as well as the will to resist."

But our willingness to meet our obligation to assist free nations should not be confused with a desire to extend American power or impose American ways.

We do not aspire to any Pax Americana. We have no desire to play the role of global gendarme. Where multilateral organizations are ready and capable of assuming the burden of defending independent nations from Communist assault, of preventing internal rebellions from leading to chaos and anarchy, we welcome their intervention. As we know from recent history, international organizations like the U.N. are not always capable of stepping in quickly. When they are capable we welcome their presence.

Our stakes in southeast Asia are too high for the recklessness either of withdrawal or of general conflagration. We need not choose between inglorious retreat or unlimited retaliation. The stakes can be secured through a wise multiple strategy if we but sustain our national determination to see the job through to success.

Our Vietnamese friends look forward to the day when national independence and security will be achieved, permitting the withdrawal of foreign forces. We share that hope and that expectation.

But we know that that hope cannot be achieved if the United States shirks its obligations, if it attempts to withdraw from the world, to retreat from its responsibilities as a world leader. If we refuse to share the burden of preserving the peace—who will take it on? If we refuse to share the burden of defending free societies, who can guarantee their survival? If we will not join in the defense of democracy, what are its future prospects?

I fail to see the logic of those who recommend that we withdraw from the world. If we are concerned about our national security in all its aspects, we cannot ignore Asia because Europe has been made secure. We learned by hard experience in Europe that involvement is the price of resisting aggression, that appeasement is not only morally wrong, but a threat to national security.

In a complex world, we must practice patience and perseverance—patience to defend free nations in distant Asia as well as those close to home. We must not be lured by quick and easy solutions. We must not abandon our goals because of frustration. We must continue to pursue the goal of peace and freedom—acknowledging both the prospects of success and the consequences of failure. If we act with vision and wisdom, we shall not fail.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR PASTORE AT PORTSMOUTH PRIORY SCHOOL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, one of the ablest and most brilliant men with whom it has been my privilege to serve during my many years in Congress is the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. He speaks with moving eloquence, with commanding logic, and with impressive knowledge to stir men's hearts, to challenge their minds, and to inspire them ever onward.

On yesterday, Senator PASTORE delivered the commencement address at Portsmouth Priory School, at Portsmouth, R.I. He reminded the graduates that they are the premise and the promise of the America-to-be. His address was a beautiful appeal to the youth of our country to develop to the fullest the talents with which God has endowed them, and to carry on the never-ending struggle for freedom, for peace, and for the service of mankind.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE TO PORTSMOUTH PRIORY SCHOOL GRADUATION CLASS OF 1965, PORTSMOUTH, R.I., MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1965

I am honored and happy to be at the Priory—and to be privileged to share your important day.

I feel at home in historic Portsmouth. I have come here as often as I could—and for a selfish reason. My daughter was at Elmhurst.

This year she, too, says farewell to Portsmouth—and a distant college becomes the calling place of her parents.

It is a little frightening how your children grow up—and seem to grow away from you.

So, my first thoughts, perhaps, are with your mothers and fathers. Out of their love comes the means and the meaning of this day. The sincerity of their Christian duty culminates in this scene of beauty. Theirs is truly a Benedictine benediction.

We parents are grateful to God for His wonderful blessing that we call by a simple name—the sweet and simple name of "family."

Here, with your faculty, you have fashioned another family. Here you have found another kind mother—an alma mater you can never forget.

Here your teachers have imbued you with the truest tests and deepest values of education. The test is not merely how well you learn but how well you live.

Out of the teacher's sacrifice the scholar is lifted to his own place of service to self and to society, to family, to church, and to state.

With all the sincerity of a father's heart, I salute the teacher.

And I salute you of the graduating class of 1965.

It has been well said that restless youth is the source spring of America's constant renewal—without it we should wither away.

You are the premise and the promise of the America-to-be.

I come here today with a sense of pride in the America-that-is.

In the past year it has been my opportunity to journey to many points in our country. From coast to coast it has been my privilege to take part in many gatherings of our people.

I have found an America that is not old—an America that is not tired—an America that is not fearful.

It is an America that is a little proud of what it has done, is doing, and intends to do to make this world a little better for people who want to be decent, and mean to be free.

It is an America prosperous beyond an economist's dream.

It is a generous America—eagerly generous to share its prosperity, its power, its purpose of honorable peace with people everywhere.

I have found an America surprisingly young again.

It has its errors, its pains, and its aches. But these are the growing pains of a nation that counts its age in decades in a world that counts its weariness in centuries.

But never in recorded history has a nation taken such giant steps to overcome its ills.

And we have not failed the needy anywhere in the world.

Never in the experience of mankind has a nation, as a nation, so sent its youth to the wide flung frontiers of human need.

In far away places our Peace Corps proves that America has ideas and ideals framed in decency and dignity that we have a moral purpose that we treasure just as much as our material and military strength.

President Johnson has said that our record of fighting hunger and illiteracy and underprivilege abroad has shown us that we can, and should, and must, fight those evils at home.

We are doing that.

To my mind poverty and peace are the paramount, inseparable problems of our time.

This means your time, young men of this graduating class.

In my heart I believe that we cannot have tranquility at home if a great segment of our people feel that equity and opportunity have passed them by.

In my heart I do not believe that we can have peace in the world if little people can be made to feel that they have been counted out and left by conquerors to languish in poverty.

Poverty seems unreasonable in a world of plenty when the science of man holds every potential of satisfying every human need.

War seems irrational when we know that peace holds so much promise in removing the ancient causes of war.

We want a world in which men can walk with triumph in their eyes and not with terror in their hearts.

We want the hearts of the world to sing with their God-given goals of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That is the aim of our free society.

But remember this, remember this well, in our world of challenge and change only an educated society can stay free.

Only a truly educated society can lift up the lowly and neglected of its own people, providing the means for self-improvement, education, training, rehabilitation, changes in social attitudes and institutions, their chance for a share in the good and Great Society.

Only an educated society can be a leader in this modern world. It is a world where two-thirds of its people are underprivileged and impatient. They seek in their lifetime to lift themselves to what took us centuries to achieve.

Only an educated society with spiritual purpose can match a science minded communism—a materialistic mind vacillating between domination and destruction of the world.

In a tomorrow of instant global communication, when physical man will speed through space at 5 million miles an hour, the mind of man cannot falter for a moment, the heart of man cannot fail him for an instant.

Only an educated society can give us a lease on liberty.

The future of freedom depends on the youth of today and the use he makes of the classroom of tomorrow.

It is the duty of each youth to develop to the fullest the talents with which God has endowed him. This cannot be a selfish development—it must be for the service of mankind.

But that is something you have learned at Portsmouth Priory.

Hasn't a Benedictine said it something like this: "The work we do in life is given us by God. We must work while the light lasts—and since the light is the light of faith—we must work fully and faithfully to the last moment of our lives."

To this I would say God has granted that you should be born in a time of boundless opportunity.

Don't stop short of your best.

With your preparation here, I have confidence in your capacity to carry on to college and beyond. I have confidence in your convictions, and your courage.

You will have a ready answer to that eternal challenge: ask only what you can do for your country and your God.

That challenge brings memories of a youth who used to travel these ways and these waters. Along this shore, at Melville, he learned the arts of war and the urgency of peace.

John Kennedy knew that peace was compounded of power and justice and liberty.

On a cold January day, 4 years ago, he set our hearts on fire with these words: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and success of liberty."

Today those words are graven on a stone in a sacred acre of England's Runnymede. There on a June day 750 years ago, King John signed the Magna Carta of the freedoms that have been fostered and have grown wherever the English language is spoken.

May they still be treasured 750 years from now—and may the spirit of a free America still echo John Kennedy's parting phrase: "Let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

INCREASING WORLD FOOD OUTPUT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, much of man's history can be traced in his continuous and usually futile struggle to produce sufficient food to sustain his person and his society. Today in what is perhaps the era of man's greatest technological understanding, there remains in the lesser developed countries a tragic shortage of food, even as the populations of these countries are increasing.

The dilemma created by the failure to exploit the existing technical knowledge in the underdeveloped areas was explored recently in a detailed report by U.S. Department of Agriculture International Agricultural Economist, Lester R. Brown.

In a report entitled "Increasing World Food Output," Mr. Brown compares the progress in raising acreage yields for a number of countries and in several crops. His observations were the subject of an editorial in the May 21 Washington Post and a news item by Gene M. White in the Post's May 27 issue. I believe these two press reports, together with the summary of Mr. Brown's findings, as printed in "Increasing World Food Output," contribute greatly to the available knowledge on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the reports and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 21, 1965]

FOOD AND KNOWLEDGE

In the first half of the 19th century David Ricardo, T. R. Malthus and other classical economists predicted an end to economic progress that was predicated on the assumption of diminishing returns in agriculture. Their prophecy proved false, not only because of the opening up of new lands in the Western Hemisphere and Australasia, but more importantly because advancing technology—better techniques of cultivation, irrigation and the introduction of chemical fertilizers—raised acreage yields. The technological advance that laid the Ricardian bogey of diminishing returns is based on widely diffused knowledge. But the application of that knowledge in the underdeveloped areas, where two thirds of the world's population dwells, is proceeding at a snail's pace at a time when the supply of virgin land is being exhausted.

The dilemma created by the failure to exploit the existing technical knowledge in the underdeveloped areas is the subject of a report on "Increasing World Food Output" by Lester R. Brown of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In a series of fascinating graphs, Mr. Brown compares the progress in raising acreage yields for a number of countries and several crops. India today, his estimates indicate, is getting the same number of pounds of rice per acre as Japan did in the 12th century. And there are other equally striking disparities in yields for other crops, evidence of the lag in the application of agricultural technology.

The failure to adopt modern methods is related to low literacy rates and the failure in many countries to develop a market-oriented agriculture. As a result the acreage "yield gap" between the developed and underdeveloped areas is steadily widening. Food shipments from the developed to the underdeveloped countries will be helpful, but they cannot, Mr. Brown explains, "account for more than a very small fraction of projected increases in food needs over the next several years."

It would be a tragedy if the prophecies of Ricardo and Malthus were fulfilled, not because they were based on valid assumptions, but because man is unable to utilize the fruits of his own intelligence.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 27, 1965]

UNITED STATES PESSIMISTIC ON WORLD FOOD CRISIS

(By Jean M. White)

The food shortages in the world's hungry countries are likely to get worse before they get better because there is little chance for a "yield takeoff" under present conditions.

An Agriculture Department report, just released, sees no realistic hope for a quick jump in food production in most of the underdeveloped lands, in which two-thirds of the world's population lives.

The food problems, the study emphasizes, is more involved than seeds, fertilizer, machinery, and modern farm technology.

Since the world is running out of new land to plow, the only answer for the land-scarce, less-developed countries is to raise their crop yields per acre.

But here these countries are handicapped by low literacy rates and low income levels without a market-oriented agriculture. Farmers who can't read are hard to reach with new farming methods, to be taught, for instance, that they can't keep hybrid corn seed from year to year. If they have to eat up 80 percent of their crop to subsist, they don't have money to invest in seeds, fertilizer, and the machines to increase the yield of their land.

"Food shortages emerging in the less-developed world are not due to a lack of technology but to the inability to apply existing technology as fast as current and projected rates of population growth require," the report observes.

Lester R. Brown, agricultural economist, who recently returned from a trip to India, is the author of "Increasing World Food Output."

He applies the takoff concept, used by Economist W. W. Rostow for income per person, to yield per acre.

As Brown sees it, there are four major pretakeoff factors for a sudden, sustained rise in per-acre crop yields. These are a relatively high level of literacy, an income level to provide capital to invest in yield-raising capital inputs, a market-oriented agriculture, and support from the nonagricultural economy in such things as fertilizers, pesticides, and transportation.

The big jumps in yields in the last few decades have come chiefly in the developed regions. Between 1934–38 and 1960, grain yields in North America increased 109 percent. But in Asia, where food needs are much greater with a rapid population growth, they rose only 7 percent.

Before World War II, the less-developed countries of Asia, Africa, and South America, were mostly exporters of grain. Now they no longer can grow enough food to feed their growing populations and are steadily losing ground in the race with expanding population.

India now needs 7 million tons of imported grain to feed its people. China needs 6 million tons. In his report, Brown warns that it will be "very difficult to establish a secure and lasting world order in a situation where the less-developed world continues to become increasingly dependent on concessional food shipments from the advanced countries."

And in the future, he notes, food shipments cannot account for more than a small part of the projected increase in food needs over the next several years. The solution, he emphasizes, must come from improving agriculture within the less-developed countries of the world.

SUMMARY

In the past 25 years, some very significant changes occurred in the worldwide man-land-food relationship. Food output per person in the less developed regions (Asia, Africa, and Latin America) dropped sharply during World War II, but trended steadily upward during the 1950's, in most cases reaching or closely approaching prewar levels. In the 1960's, however, output per person in these regions has shown a disturbing tendency to trend downward.

Before the war, the less developed regions were exporting 11 million tons of grain per year to the developed countries. After the war, this flow reversed. During the early postwar years, 4 million tons of grain per year moved from the developed to the less developed world. As population growth rates accelerated in the 1950's, this flow increased, averaging 13 million tons per year in the late 1950's. In the 1960's, the flow has increased further, reaching 21 million tons in 1961 and, according to preliminary estimates, 25 million tons in 1964.

The less developed world is clearly losing the capacity to feed itself; stated otherwise, a growing share of the increase in population is being sustained by food shipments from the developed regions, largely from the United States under the food-for-peace program.

Why is the less developed world losing the capacity to feed itself? The answer can be stated in simple terms. Throughout history, man has increased the food supply by expanding the area under cultivation. But today many densely populated, less developed countries have nearly exhausted the supply of new land that can readily be brought under cultivation. Nearly half of the world's people live in less developed countries that are now essentially fixed-land economies—that is, almost all cultivable land is already in use. These countries must look to rising per acre yields for most of the additions to their food supply. They must generate a yield takeoff—a sustained rise in yield per acre.

The ability to generate a trend of rapidly rising yields, however, has been confined largely to the more advanced countries. Over the past quarter century, all the increase in food output in both North America and Western Europe came from raising yield per acre. Yield per acre in North America, the most advanced region, increased 109 percent; in Asia, the least advanced region, it increased only 7 percent, and for the entire less developed world it rose only 8 percent.

Once yield-per-acre takeoffs are achieved, yields tend to continue upward. There is no record of a post-takeoff country in which yields have tended to level off or trend downward. If anything, yields tend to increase at an accelerating rate after takeoff. The problem is to generate the yield takeoff. And the big question is: What is needed for a yield takeoff?

One factor facilitating a yield-per-acre takeoff is a reasonably high level of literacy. A trend of rapidly rising yields implies the continuous movement of new ideas and techniques from the research plot to the farmer, and this is much easier in a largely literate society.

Rates of yield increase vary widely among countries with widely varying literacy levels. Major grain producing countries with literacy levels below 50 percent raised yields at 0.2 percent per year between 1935 and 1939 and 1960 and 1962. Those with literacy levels between 50 and 80 percent achieved a 1.1 percent annual rate of gain; those above 80 percent averaged 1.4 percent.

There is also a close relationship between the average level of income per person in a country and its ability to raise output per acre. Countries with average per capita incomes below $200 per year raised yields an average of 0.2 percent per year between prewar and 1961–62. Those with incomes between $200 and $1,000 averaged a 1 percent rate of yield increase. And those with incomes above $1,000 averaged more than 2.2 percent per year.

Another factor facilitating a yield-per-acre takeoff is the development of a market-oriented agriculture. In subsistence-type economies, the share of farm output entering the market is often very small, limiting the amount of cash which farmers have to purchase yield-raising inputs such as fertilizer. This was not a serious handicap when food output could be increased by simply expanding the area under cultivation.

Agriculture is often quite independent of the remainder of the economy in an area-expanding situation, but as it becomes possible to increase the food supply only by raising yields, agriculture becomes quite dependent on the remainder of the economy for a wide variety of goods and services, varying from capital inputs such as fertilizer and pesticides to services such as research, credit, and transportation. Thus, the ability to raise yields is closely related to the level of development of the nonagricultural supporting sector.

The failure of a fixed-land economy with a rapidly growing population to achieve a yield takeoff is serious. Food output per person begins to trend downward, and because the agricultural population continues to grow, throughout the early stages of development, output per person in agriculture also begins to decline. With the greater part of the population still in agriculture, this makes a per capita income takeoff for the total population exceedingly difficult.

Although the factors described above may facilitate a yield takeoff they are not in themselves sufficient to cause a yield takeoff. In addition, certain incentives are required.

Favorable prices for farm products are an important incentive. The term "favorable prices and much higher fertilizer costs than pared with the cost of the purchased inputs required to raise yields. Less-developed economies usually have much lower food prices and much higher fertilizer costs than developed economies. For example, a pound of rice in Japan buys three times as much ammonium sulphate as a pound of rice in India. This relationship between prices of farm products and costs of yield-raising inputs was not so important when new land was still available.

But favorable prices for farm products is not enough. The people on the land must be the principal beneficiaries of these favorable prices. There must also be a strong link between effort and reward. The strength of this link is affected by such factors as patterns of land tenure and tax systems. The less-developed countries which have become fixed-land economies before achieving a per capita income takeoff are faced with the necessity of achieving the income per person takeoff and the yield per acre takeoff at the same time.

To describe what it takes to generate a yield-per-acre takeoff is, in a sense, to describe the process of modernization and development. Stated otherwise, the more advanced an economy is the easier it is to generate a yield takeoff. The densely populated, less-developed countries, which have virtually exhausted the supply of new land that can readily be brought under cultivation must compress a lot of progress into a very short period of time if they are to generate the yield takeoff needed to feed their rapidly growing populations.

CONSERVATION OF PRODUCING AREAS FOR MIGRATORY WATERFOWL IN CANADA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, there is presently pending before the Committee on Commerce a bill, S. 922, introduced by me, with the cosponsorship of my colleague [Mr. Curtis] and six other Senators, designed to cure the one major weakness in our present program of migratory waterfowl conservation.

The central fact which must be recognized in dealing with this conservation problem is that most of the ducks and other birds cross the international boundary line during the course of their annual migration. About 65 percent of them are produced and raised in Canada. These birds are mostly harvested in this country, and they provide a major share of the duck kill each year. But our present program of acquiring lands in this easements is limited to the lands in this country. The Canadian wetlands are endangered to an increasing extent by conversion to agricultural use and by other factors.

This is the point of weakness in the present conservation program—the Canadian wetlands, where most of the waterfowl are produced. The purpose of Senate bill 922 is to permit the extension of our program to encompass these Canadian producing areas, as well as our own.

It is heartening to be able to report that increased understanding of this problem and increased support for action to deal with it are becoming evident in many quarters.

Of the first importance is the leadership for a conservation program which has only recently been supplied by the Canadian Government. Until very recently, the Dominion Government has seemed somewhat hesitant to attack the problem on a broad scale. We in this country must recognize that Canada has not felt this problem as keenly as we have, since there are in Canada fewer people and, therefore, fewer hunters, but more ducks.

Now, however, Mr. Arthur Laing, Canadian Minister of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources, has developed and publicly urged a large-scale program to maintain irreplaceable wetlands, with especial emphasis on the pothole region of the prairie Provinces, which is of special interest to our hunters in the central flyway States. I shall ask to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks a short news item, taken from the Conservation News, dealing with his address to the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters.

Second. I wish to have printed in the Record a resolution, adopted by the National Wildlife Federation at its recent annual convention, dealing with the acquisition of waterfowl wetlands, which calls for the use of United States funds in Canada for that purpose, as is provided in S. 922.

Third. I wish to have printed in the Record brief excerpts from an article published in the spring 1965, issue of Ducks Unlimited Quarterly. Ducks Unlimited, a private nonprofit organization devoted to the cause of waterfowl conservation, has raised from among its membership, and donated, more than $10 million, over the years, to the purpose of acquiring and conserving wetlands for waterfowl in Canada. This private group has carried the burden of this effort almost alone, for many years, because under our program Federal funds could not be expended outside the United States.

At present, all the funds that Ducks Unlimited can devote to wetlands conservation are put into use in Canada, because it is recognized that there is where the chief problem lies. That indicates the urgency of conserving the Canadian wetlands. It is time that this fine organization received some assistance from the Federal Government, inasmuch as the funds which would be expended in Canada under the provisions of Senate bill 922 would ultimately be repayable from sales of Federal duck stamps—in other words, by the duck hunters, themselves.

The Interior Department appropriation bill for 1966, which now is in conference, provided in both its House and its Senate versions the sum of $7,500,000, in addition to an estimated $5 million from Federal hunting stamps, for the continued acquisition of wetlands under the emergency acquisition program authorized by Public Law 87–383. That was the full amount of the budget request.

Thus, the prospects for real progress for the duck hunters are beginning to brighten. It is about time they did. The duck population has suffered severely from recent years of drought. Likewise, the poor hunting has discouraged some hunters, many of whom have felt it was hardly worthwhile to buy a stamp.

Now the outlook is much more promising. We are told that water conditions in the Canadian breeding areas are the best in many years. If favorable weather conditions stimulate a large production of birds, and liberal hunting regulations are possible, interest in the sport should be reawakened among many who have been discouraged by the poor seasons of recent years. However, that will make it all the more essential to provide a sound conservation program to the Canadian wetlands, which are the source of most of the ducks, in order to sustain the duck population at a level sufficient to permit continued good hunting year after year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the newspaper article, resolution, and excerpts to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article, resolution, and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Conservation News, May 15, 1965]

Canadian Official Proposes Large-Scale Wetlands Program

A large-scale program to maintain irreplaceable wetlands has been proposed by the Honorable Arthur Laing, Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources for Canada. Speaking to the 37th annual convention of the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters in Ottawa recently, the Cabinet member pointed to a pilot program undertaken by the Canadian Wildlife Service in the past 2 years in which several dozen leasing agreements have been signed with farmers in the three prairie Provinces to maintain their wetlands in natural condition. "Payments to farmers have been based on the area of the wetlands and the value of the surrounding land discounted at 5 percent for a 20-year period," he said. "During this pilot program, we have tried to find solutions to the administrative problems posed by the different land tenure systems that we must deal with in the prairie Provinces. We have also worked out techniques for measuring the extent of the wetlands on an individual's property, and we have learned what numbers of men we must put in the field to do the job."

Recommending to the Cabinet that a large-scale program be started in 1967, Minister Laing told sportsmen, "Although maintenance of the prairie pothole duck factory is of primary importance, the program which I hope to get underway will also include the purchase of long-term leases of large wetlands not only in the prairies but also in the rest of Canada as well."

Resolution 5: Acquisition of Waterfowl Wetlands

Whereas the preservation of an adequate number of suitable wetlands is essential to the maintenance of continental flights of migratory waterfowl; and

Whereas the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Department of the Interior, is embarked upon an emergency acquisition program designed to preserve wetlands through purchases or leases in perpetuity; and

Whereas a major part of the 7-year emergency wetlands acquisition program was to be financed through an advance appropriation of $105 million against future sales of migratory bird hunting stamps; and

Whereas the program was delayed in the major production areas of North Dakota and South Dakota because of a reluctance on the part of the State governments to allow the Federal acquisition of wetlands until the counties concerned were offered financial relief; and

Whereas the U.S. Congress now has enacted a law which provides for more equitable sharing of revenues from units of the National Wildlife Refuge System; and

Whereas only a comparatively small portion of the acquisition program has been completed because of this delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation, in annual convention assembled March 7, 1965, in Washington, D.C., hereby expresses the belief that repayment of the advance loan, scheduled to begin in 1969, should be deferred until the emergency wetlands acquisition program is completed or the entire $105 million is appropriated and expended; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation hereby expresses its belief that the use of U.S. funds in Canada for acquisition of waterfowl wetlands would be a beneficial procedure.

[From Ducks Unlimited Quarterly, spring 1965]

DU Makes Largest Appropriation, $650,000, for 1965 Construction—Henry Schmidt, Ohio, Elected President

The largest appropriation ever made in the 28-year history of Ducks Unlimited, was made at the 1965 annual meeting of the board of trustees on April 2, when $650,000 was set aside for the construction and rehabilitation of waterfowl nesting areas on the Canadian breeding grounds. The grant was made at the 28th annual meeting of DU's State chairmen and trustees, at the Hotel Monteleone, in New Orleans, on April 1, 2, and 3, attended by 76 representatives from 23 States and 3 Canadian Provinces, as well as members of the staffs of DU in the United States and Canada.

Henry G. Schmidt, of Cleveland, Ohio, president of the North American Coal Co., was elected to the presidency to succeed Albert B. McKee, Jr., of San Marino, Calif., who held the office for the past 2 years and was promoted to the post of chairman of the board. Stirling S. Adams, of New York, former board chairman, was elected to the important post as chairman of the executive committee. All offices are for a 1-year term.

Thus does the amount sent to DU (Canada) soar past the $10 million mark—$10,150,000, to be exact—which the duckhunter-sportsmen of the United States have made available for the important work of building or restoring more than 750 "duck factories," as they are affectionately known by wildfowlers of both nations, in the Canadian Provinces, primarily in the prairies, which produce the vast majority of the continental waterfowl supply. It is conservatively estimated that at least 65 percent of this continent's migratory waterfowl raise their young north of the U.S. border, and inasmuch as Federal funds prohibits the use of duck stamp moneys to be spent for this purpose outside the territorial borders of the United States, the development of the continent's primary duck breeding areas in Canada must be supported by sportsmen through the contributions of private funds to Ducks Unlimited which has dedicated itself to this task.

Reelected vice presidents in their respective regions were J. Roger Crowe, of Stuttgart, Ark., gulf region; Robert D. Marcotte, Omaha, Nebr., Mississippi region; Norman H. Ott, Milwaukee, Wis., Great Lakes region; John H. Ewing, New York, N.Y., north Atlantic region, and Eugene duPont III, Yamassee, S.C., south Atlantic region. Elected to the vice presidency of the Pacific region was William P. Elser, of San Diego, Calif., who succeeded E. Herrick Low, of San Francisco, in that office.

Reelected treasurer and secretary respectively were Robert Winthrop and Henry E. Coe, III, both of New York, and returned to office were three other New Yorkers—Assistant Treasurers Clarence E. Stouch and Orson D. Munn and Robert I. Lowell, who was reelected assistant secretary. All these officers were named for 1-year terms.

HAWAII-NEPAL HEALTH SURVEY PROJECT

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, two articles from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and an article from the Honolulu Advertiser concerning a project which merits the attention of all Americans, especially at this time when the foreign aid bill is soon to become a topic of discussion here on the floor of the Senate.

I am referring to the Hawaii-Nepal health survey project. This is a State-of-Hawaii-sponsored foreign aid project financed by the citizens and business community of Hawaii, with the cooperation of the University of Hawaii, the Bishop Museum, of Hawaii, and the East-West Center, a Federal project, situated in Honolulu.

I further understand that the State provides no outright grant except through the contributed professional resources of the University of Hawaii. Money will be donated by the citizens of the State themselves. Most of the participants will be from Hawaii and will work with Nepalese counterparts.

Dr. Verne Chaney, executive director of the Thomas A. Dooley Foundation, Inc., which is the sponsor for the Hawaii-Nepal health fund project, as this endeavor is formally called, has stated:

> There are many important ramifications of this effort for the State of Hawaii as well as the Nation. There is limited precedence in the California-Chile alliance (sponsored by Federal/State funds only) and which was heralded by the late President Kennedy as pioneering a new era of foreign aid. A Hawaiian foreign aid program for Nepal will certainly be strange to the Nepalese, not to mention the propaganda confusion that will accrue to the Chinese and the Russians, who are quite active in Nepal. It is a type of aid program that is direct, people-to-people, cooperative, cheap, without aid for politics overtones and one that makes sense to the average citizen. It reflects well on the Asian orientation and understanding of Hawaii and its being truly the center of East-West interchange. Our public appeal for financial support is "Be a Hawaiian ambassador to Nepal." It would be a hope that other States might follow similar ambassador programs for developing countries and as such would be in line with the recent appeal by President Johnson to the unmatched private resources of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the articles printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Mar. 12, 1965]

NEPAL PROJECT IS TERMED NEW FOREIGN AID CONCEPT

Dr. Verne Chaney, executive director and cofounder of the Thomas A. Dooley Foundation, yesterday praised Hawaii for leading the way in the quest for understanding and world peace.

He made the remarks while commenting on Hawaii's participation in the 15-month Hawaii-Nepal project on public health which is scheduled to begin in June.

Hawaii will send a technical team from the University of Hawaii, East-West Center, and Bishop Museum to administer the program in Nepal. All funds will be privately contributed.

Dr. Chaney said the move "heralds the beginning of an entirely new concept in foreign aid."

Addressing a joint session of the senate and house yesterday, he said: "In this Hawaiian health survey program for His Majesty's Government of Nepal, we have the first example of a State providing foreign aid to a developing nation with private financing."

Hawaii will work jointly with the Dooley Foundation in administering the program in Nepal. Chaney summed up the foundation's purpose this way:

"The Dooley Foundation feels that it has an unusual opportunity and role to play in the world mess of things.

"We are not political; we are not sectarian; we are simply people helping people because they need help and because it is right.

"We wish to help bridge the gaps of friendship and understanding between peoples. Our tool for this shall be medicine."

Private agencies in America are unique in being able to provide direct, nonpolitical help on a person-to-person basis, Dr. Chaney told the legislators.

"Government-to-government aid is faceless and strictly political, whether from East or West," he said.

The program itself will consist of a $270,000 public health survey in the fields of infectious diseases, nutrition, sanitation, anthropology and entomology.

The technicians will also help the people of Nepal to set up their own public health program for the future.

Public health is in dire need of attention in Nepal, he said.

All personnel from the team will be from the islands.

Those already committed to the project are: Dr. Robert Worth, consultant, professor of public health at the University of Hawaii; Robert Murphy, administrative assistant; Dr. N. K. Shah, program director; Dr. L. Poudayl, laboratory director; Miss Carolyn McCue, chief technician; Miss Phyllis Morita, laboratory technician; Dr. Alan Howard, anthropologist; Mrs. Kajorn Howard, nutritionist; Peyton Rowan, sanitary engineer; Mrs. Peggy Rowan, public health nurse; and others yet to be selected.

Heading the local committee to raise funds for the project are: Retired Navy Adm. Harry D. Felt; Chinn Ho, of Capital Investments; and Ernest Albrecht, of Pan American World Airways.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Mar. 10, 1965]

HAWAII JOINS DOOLEY FOUNDATION IN NEPAL PROGRAM

The State of Hawaii today embarked on a humanitarian-educational-research venture which Gov. John A. Burns endorsed as highly significant.

The University of Hawaii, East-West Center, and Bishop Museum will join the Thomas A. Dooley Foundation in conducting a public health program in Nepal, a tiny country in the Himalaya Mountains between India and Red China.

Under the program Hawaii will render technical assistance to administer a public health survey and training program.

Dr. Verne Chaney, executive director and cofounder of the Dooley Foundation, called the Hawaii-Nepal program a unique first.

It represents the first time a State has offered aid to a developing nation not with private funds but with technical assistance from such facilities as the university center, and museum.

The program will be financed solely through funds from Hawaii's citizens and business community.

A 10-man team from Hawaii is scheduled to go to Nepal in June, and the program is expected to last 15 months.

Heading the local committee for the Nepal project are Chinn Ho, Enrest Albrecht and retired Adm. Harry D. Felt. They are members of the foundation's board of directors and national advisory council.

Working on the technical end of the program are Dr. Robert Worth, professor of public health at the university; Dr. Roland Force, of the Bishop Museum; and Dr. Baron Goto, a vice chancellor of the East-West Center.

The Governor today met with Dr. Chaney and the committee members and publicly urged islanders to support the "most noteworthy activity."

Dr. Chaney said the purpose of the public health survey program will be to evaluate health conditions, sanitation, disease and nutritional problems.

The Hawaii team also will help the Nepal people develop a solid public health program for the future—an area in dire need of attention.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Apr. 8, 1965]

PERSONNEL TRAINING AT UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII FOR NEPAL DOOLEY PROJECT

(By Burt Anderson)

A Thomas A. Dooley Foundation health research project in Nepal may prove valuable to more than just that small Asian country, its director predicted in Honolulu yesterday.

"The climate of Nepal varies from subtropical in the low plains along the Indian border to arctic in the Himalayas," said Dr. Narayan Shah, an official of the Nepal Department of Public Health. "We expect to uncover and study a large variety of the world's diseases."

Shah is at the University of Hawaii this week to plan the 15-month project schedule to begin late this summer. He is working with Dr. Robert Worth, University of Hawaii professor of public health, the project's consultant.

Shah said some of Nepal's major diseases are gastro and intestinal and venereal maladies, tuberculosis and leprosy. But he expects to learn much more about the nation's health problems during the survey.

"Heart conditions have been found in the cities," he said, "but so far we know very little about heart disease in rural areas. In many areas, people have never had physical examinations."

The Dooley Foundation, named after the late doctor who practiced in Laos until his death from cancer, has launched projects in Laos, Cambodia and India. It has hospitals in 11 Asian nations.

Shah, an M.D. with a master's in public health from Johns Hopkins University, has been working about a year on preliminary plans for the Nepal project while the foundation has recruited volunteers and sought private funds, mostly in Hawaii.

Dr. Verne Chaney, the foundation's executive director, is in Hawaii to raise the $270,000 needed to support the Nepal project. Most others fly by helicopter to selected sample areas, where a total of more than 9,000 men, women, and children will receive complete physical examinations. Nepal's population is 9.5 million.

"In each village selected, everybody will be tested," Shah said.

The teams will study dietary habits and test water supplies and sewage disposal systems.

"Everything that might relate to diseases will be examined," Shah said.

The volunteers are already in training at the university. In June, they will go to the Peace Corps training camp on the big island where they will set up camps and field laboratories like those they will use in Nepal.

Because the project is supported by private donations, the foundation will avoid putting Nepal's Government on the spot politically. Russia, Red China, and India also provide aid to the country.

The foundation will leave a public health research laboratory in Nepal when the project is finished.

Volunteers from Hawaii who will work on the project include Peyton Rowan, a sanitary engineer soon to be discharged from the Navy; his wife, Peggy, a nurse; Carolyne McCue, a laboratory technician; Phyllis Morita, now with the foundation in Laos; Diane Brown, a graduate student in sociology at the University of Hawaii; and Richard Mitchell, a laboratory technician who will be discharged from the Army.

Shah yesterday said plans for the project are in good shape. "The hardest part, the preliminary planning, is over," he said, "But there's much more work to do."

He will return to Nepal Sunday to resume his duties there.

STUDENT ADDRESSES, MARION INSTITUTE, MARION, ALA.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on May 23 of this year I had the distinct privilege of making the commencement address at the Marion Institute in Marion, Ala. To me, one of the most interesting parts of the commencement program was the addresses of three young graduates of that institution. Cadet Capt. John Warren Martin, Jr., made the valedictory address, Cadet Sfc. Joseph Franklin Decker II, made one of the salutatory addresses, and Cadet Cpl. Ed Polk Douglas made the other.

Because I know that the future security and welfare of our Nation depends largely upon the quality of young people graduating from our schools, I always enjoy meeting and visiting with them and learning of their philosophies and ideals. I was very impressed with the remarks made by the three cadets at Marion Institute's commencement, and I believe that the Members of this body and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will enjoy and benefit from a reading of their remarks. I ask unanimous consent to have their speeches printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS, COMMENCEMENT, 1964–65

(By Cadet Capt. John Warren Martin, Jr.)

Senator McCLELLAN, Colonel Robinson, members of the faculty, parents, friends, and fellow graduates, to say the very least, it is an unequaled honor for me to represent and speak this morning in behalf of my fellow classmates. It is, however, an ever greater challenge, for it has proved extremely difficult to assemble some message for you which I hope will be worthwhile and meaningful.

As I stand here reflecting the past and looking into the future, many thoughts pass through my mind.

We are passing another milestone in the development of our ability to shoulder the burdens of tomorrow which will be left to us shortly.

Today we sit assembled for the last time, and tomorrow we will go out into the world in all directions. Some of us to continue our education, and others to begin their life's work.

I didn't have to search very far to find inspiration for this address. I found it printed on a stained-glass window inside the chapel here at Marion. On that window are words spoken by President Woodrow Wilson. He made the statement that "America is securely great, not because she has great men in her now, but only as she can make sure of having great men in the next generation."

His words intrigue me for he mentions the "next generation." President Wilson was speaking to our grandparents' generation and resting the future of this Nation on our parents' generation. His words, however, are just as true and meaningful today, to you and me, as they were back in the early 1900's when he spoke them to our grandparents.

And so it is that I wish to explicate to you this morning, some of my thoughts about our generation and what lies ahead for us after these years at Marion Institute are over. And for us in the college department, that time is now at hand.

We are young men born and raised in a period of time that is quite unparalled in the history of mankind. For the most part, ours have been good times, with there being little for us to be concerned about save perhaps the acquiring of an education. Prosperity has been widespread, and consequently ours has been the good life, the comfortable life. We have grown up during a span of America's history that has been, in a sense, revolutionary. Incomes have shot upward, luxuries have, in many cases, become commonplace. Virtually every aspect of this country has multiplied and expanded. And now we as young citizens find ourselves about to enter this adult-made world; and my concern is this: Are we ready? Ready physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually to take this step into the adult world of our elders and take from their hands the reigns of this great Nation?

We had better be, my fellow classmates, because the dangers to our society, to our way of life, to our freedom, to our own personal liberty and prosperity are no longer obvious ones. These dangers are not painted bright yellow for everyone to see. They are not dangers which we can always combat physically. They are dangers which penetrate our very minds. They are the dangers which have accompanied our affluent society and which appear when we are expecting them least.

And the deadliest of these evils, the one which can play havoc with our society, which can cripple our Nation in a moment, can be summed up in a single word. Apathy. Indifference, not really caring one way or another, the physical act of not being interested enough in the struggles confronting this Nation to do something about them; the lack of the courage, the initiative, and the self-sacrifice to be positive with our reactions instead of being content to let others be concerned. The fear that this disease is present in our generation, my fellow cadets, is an ominous danger sign to me. Because if it is, the road ahead for us and for our children will be immeasurably more difficult.

You've heard, I'm sure the expression that a person never really realizes what he has until he loses it. A classic example of this is one's eyes. How common is the gift of sight to all of us. So very common that after only blindness can fully penetrate our minds with a true appreciation of our eyesight.

And the very same thing can be said of many things which we enjoy in everyday life and so frequently "take for granted."

I ask you this question in all sincerity. Will we in this country, will you and I have to lose or have seriously threatened our individual freedoms, our freedom to worship as we choose, our freedom to assemble, our freedom to vote, our freedom to print and read the truth, our freedom to live within the law, our freedom to govern ourselves, and our natural right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

Will we have to lose these precious possessions before we take a deep and personal interest in the affairs of our society, our Government, before we fully accept the responsibilities one day to be ours? Must we be awakened by so cruel an experience?

As I previously stated, ours has been a comfortable life. This is most definitely a blessing to us as well as a stern challenge. Most of us were born around the end of one of mankind's bitterest struggles, World War II. During those turbulent years, and also in the early 1950's when we were giving our first-, second-, and third-grade teachers a hard time, many of our fathers and other young men like us were fighting and dying to give us every blessing which this great land has.

In our generation we have not felt nor actually faced a charging enemy, intent on destroying us and everything that we stand for.

Is it possible that because we have been fortunate enough not to have had to fight physical enemies of our society that we do not place a proper value on our liberties?

Every American should love freedom. He should be so very proud of the principles upon which this country has been built, that nothing could curb his efforts to protect and preserve those God-given liberties which we enjoy today and which countless man and women chose to defend with their lives.

We have been shielded from our enemies' onslaught by our parents and our elders. But the time is at hand when that shield of security and protection cannot be held up for us. Very soon Vietnam will be our problem. The fate of the Dominican Republic and many other nations, as well as our own, will be in our hands to preserve, protect, and defend in the name of freedom, equality, and justice for all.

It will be up to you and me, my fellow classmates, not to merely maintain a status quo, but to go forward in making for our posterity a country even stronger, not necessarily militarily, but socially, spiritually, and morally; a country deeply in love with its hard bought liberties and a country willing to pay any price to preserve them.

And this is a great challenge. But it is a challenge that must be met by the youth in our generation, by the countless other graduates around the country, and by every man and woman who calls himself a citizen of these United States.

How can you and I, as graduates of Marion Institute, do our part in accepting responsibilities which are to be ours? How can we as individuals not succumb to this apathy, this indifference? How can we here today truly do our part tomorrow? Those are difficult questions, yet fair ones.

I'll tell you how. We can pick up our M1 rifle, that we will use in life, our intellect, our intelligence, and load it with ammunition of knowledge gained here on this campus and in these classrooms. Unsheath a bayonet of wisdom and mount it on the barrel of our rifle. Because to attack with knowledge, but unwisely, surely is of little benefit.

Next, take up and put on your fatigues, helmet, boots, your armor, your faith in yourself, in God, and in our way of life. Around your waist strap a pistol of discipline. For without discipline little can be accomplished, but with it, great battles have been won. Add to your pistol belt a canteen filled with courage, mental and physical, for our futures will not all be easy. In your pack don't forget to include many candy bars of endurance and perseverance for you will surely need them. And finally, take up your hand radio to guide always, your conscience. For when you follow the orders you receive on it, you very seldom are misled and lost.

Let us dedicate ourselves to carry on in the traditions of the many great Marion Institute alumni who are today making their mark in history by their deeds and actions as leaders in our great country. Let us also go forth and become examples which those here at Marion can look to with pride and the realization that their efforts were not in vain.

Colonel Robinson, and members of the faculty, as spokesman for the graduating class of 1965, let me take this opportunity to thank each of you for your untiring efforts to keep each of us on the proper path of career development.

Let me assure you today that it is our united goal to take the seeds of leadership, wisdom, and knowledge planted here at Marion, and cultivate them that they might grow into trees of knowledge.

We thank you again for your untiring efforts and we hope that someday in the future you can look with pride upon the accomplishments of the class of 1965. It is our intent to achieve such stature in the world of tomorrow.

To my classmates, I owe you much and I wish to express my gratitude to you for the experiences of this year and the friendships which we have made. I wish you every success in the future. Thank you, and as we say in the Air Force and all the Armed Forces, goodby for now, for we will surely meet again.

SALUTATORY ADDRESS, COMMENCEMENT 1964–65

(By Cadet Cpl. Ed Polk Douglas)

Senator MCCLELLAN, Colonel Robinson, members of the faculty, distinguished guests, parents, friends, and fellow graduates; we, of the class of 1965, are happy to welcome you to our day. A day we have looked forward to for a long time.

Stopping for a moment to look over our years at Marion, the only all-inclusive word we could use in describing them is "change" outwardly. Our campus has been changed by both the addition and improvement of numerous facilities. The quadrangle, the tennis courts, the walkways, the future library, right next door. Why just last week the whole brigade trooped out to the new stadium and "sodded it down." Something to tell our grandchildren about.

Marion Institute is very much alive and ever growing, and in our years here, we have grown and developed also. To use a phrase of the late Sir Winston Churchill: "This is not the end; this is not even the beginning of the end—it is only the end of the beginning"—and so Marion Institute is a milestone for us, a foundation upon which an education and a life can be built.

We have learned here the meaning of our motto—truth, honor, and service. These are fundamentals which are not outdated, or old fashioned. These are modern, workable, and will stand us in good stead. Let us hope that these qualities which are a part of Marion Institute have become a part of us.

At this time, we of the class of 1965, would like to express our appreciation and thanks to the administration, who tried their best to keep us too busy to be homesick; our instructors who forced us to learn enough to pass; and the townspeople of Marion—who somehow managed to put up with us.

For myself, I would like to say "thanks" to my fellow cadets, for the wonderful times spent, to the library, and cafeteria staffs who kept us growing both mentally and physically, and last, but certainly not least, to my parents who, in their concern for my future, caused me to become a part of the Marion Institute.

SALUTATORY ADDRESS, COMMENCEMENT 1964–65

(By Cadet Sfc. Joseph Franklin Decker II)

Senator MCCLELLAN, Colonel Robinson, members of the faculty, honored guests, visitors, and fellow classmates of the 1965 graduating class, as is my duty and my privilege as salutatorian today, I would take this opportunity to extend to all of you a most cordial welcome to the 123d annual commencement exercises at the Marion Institute today. As I review the past school year I see many outstanding accomplishments made by this graduating class, both individually and collectively, but I believe it is important that we remember that it is not in our past accomplishments that we find our success in the future. Our success in the future will only be determined by what we can accomplish with what we have learned here.

The future will determine our success along the road of life. Our training here at Marion will be of invaluable aid to us in negotiating this road in which the rapid changes economically, socially, politically, seem to be falling about our heads every day, but again we must realize no matter what the quality of our education or the quality of our training, our goals will only be determined through the practical application. This same thing that we have received here at Marion, we have, I believe, gained insight into the solution of this problem of practical application. With this knowledge in our hands we may press forward to great things, making every effort to succeed and every effort to capitalize on all opportunities presented to us.

I would wish each of you, of the graduating class, the very best of luck in all your future endeavors, and would urge you once more to use to the utmost of your ability the training you have received here, and by the grace of God, and with all hope in the future, may the touchstone of success be yours. With these words, I as salutatorian, would salute you, the graduating class of 1965, for the honors you have received in the past here at Marion, for the honors bestowed upon you here today, and for the honors to be received by you in all your future endeavors. I wish you good luck and Godspeed.

NEW YORK ACADEMY OF MEDICINE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on May 26, the New York Academy of Medicine, a nonprofit association of 2,000 physicians in the New York area, issued a major policy statement on government-aided health care.

In its declaration, the academy in effect distinguished its position from that of the American Medical Association, which opposes government participation in health care, except in cases of indigency. The academy declared that such care should be "based on health need alone, not on a test of ability to pay."

It is significant that a large and distinguished group of doctors have announced their clear support of our efforts in Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the declaration; a covering letter from Dr. John L. Madden, president of the New York Academy of Medicine; and a New York Times article on the document, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the declaration, letter, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW YORK ACADEMY OF MEDICINE,
New York, N.Y., May 27, 1965.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The New York Academy of Medicine has been increasingly concerned that as the health-care functions of government extend into new areas of activity particular attention be given to measures that will assure a constantly rising standard of the health care for all people. We share with you the strong feeling that the financing and administrative arrangements in any health-care program are major factors determining the effectiveness with which tax funds are used in meeting the public purposes intended. This is one of the reasons why over the years we have initiated study projects in the general area of social-economic problems as related to the health services.

One of our recent social-economic projects, financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation, was established 2 years ago for the specific purpose of considering matters of social and public policy. This group consisted of 40 persons selected from throughout the country because of their special interest and knowledge of health problems and social policy. Fellows of the academy served in this group and one of the academy's standing committees has continuously reviewed and discussed the observations of the special study group.

After many meetings and discussions with experts in health and related fields, a policy statement on the role of government and problems of health care was formulated. Our policymaking body, the trustees and council of the academy, has studied and reworked this statement during the past month. On May 26, 1965, on behalf of the academy, they adopted the attached declaration of policy. I feel personally that this carefully considered document is one of the most significant issued by the academy in recent years. I know the other officers and officials of the academy share this feeling.

I am forwarding this policy statement to you because we feel it represents the kind of leadership the American people and our Government expect from interested and informed members of the medical profession. Some of our conclusions, as set forth in this statement, have direct relevance to public issues under study by the Congress in relation to pending health care bills. I hope you and your associates will find time to review the attached two-page document and request any additional information you may wish.

This document may be used in any manner you feel is in the public interest.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MADDEN,
President.

A POLICY STATEMENT ON THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT TAX FUNDS IN PROBLEMS OF HEALTH CARE

In the light of present knowledge and informed opinion the trustees and council of the New York Academy of Medicine believe that—

1. In the United States today a serious gap exists between the state of health of significant numbers of people and that state of health which would be attainable if the best of present-day medical knowledge were more universally available and more fully utilized by the people of this country.

2. A major goal of our democratic society must be that all people have the assurance of an equal opportunity to obtain a high quality of comprehensive health care.

3. The attainment of the goal of equal access to a high quality of comprehensive health care requires that governmental and voluntary agencies must work together: first, to identify the reasons such services are not more universally available to people; and, then, second, to take whatever actions are necessary to make them more widely available.

4. The steps taken to improve the accessibility of health care must always taken into account the importance of using the Nation's resources in the most effective and economical manner consistent with the enhancement of individual dignity and high standards of care.

5. It is both legitimate and essential that Federal, State, and local legislative and executive agencies be concerned that the goal of high-quality comprehensive health care for all our people is reached to the fullest extent possible, and that this concern requires, at appropriate levels of government, such functions as the following:

(a) Establishment of priorities for new as well as existing governmental health care programs;

(b) Allocation of the funds needed to achieve these priorities;

(c) Implementation of such measures as are required to assure universal access to health care;

(d) Introduction of such effective controls as may be needed to assure a high quality of care, economically provided;

(e) Support of demonstration and research efforts to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of health care programs;

(f) Consultation with appropriate professional groups and agencies in the exercise of its policymaking and administrative functions.

6. Whenever Federal, State, or local tax funds are allocated for health care purposes, an appropriate governmental agency must be fully accountable for achievement of the purposes for which the funds were made available—including the establishment and maintenance of standards of performance and the administrative procedures required for economical use of funds.

7. The varying fiscal capacities and efforts of the several States have resulted in an uneven and inadequate level of many of those health services that are required in the national interest. When the Nation as a whole suffers from such varying levels of essential health services, the resources of the Federal Government must be utilized for establishing and maintaining standards of service, as well as for an equitable basis of financing throughout the Nation.

8. The availability of health services, as a matter of human right, should be based on health need alone, not on a test of ability to pay. The full attainment of this goal requires the broadest possible participation in the systems of financing health services, if individual dignity and self-dependency are to be enhanced.

9. When Federal and/or State and local tax funds are available for purchase of health care, whether for public assistance social security, or other categories of public program beneficiaries, it is the official health agencies, and the official health agencies alone, to which should be delegated responsibility for the administration of such funds. The official health agency is the only unit of Government that can coordinate all governmental health programs and combine public responsibility and accountability and the other functions of public administration with the professional skills, concern, and consultation required for setting standards and for

continuous evaluation of program quality and overall effectiveness.

May 26, 1965.

[From the New York Times, May 30, 1965]

Physicians Here for Equal Care—Academy, Opposing AMA, Rules Out Inability To Pay as Only Basis of U.S. Aid

(By Will Lissner)

The New York Academy of Medicine declared yesterday that health care should be "based on health need alone, not on a test of ability to pay."

The major policy statement thus repudiated the stand of the American Medical Association that Government-aided health care should be provided only to those proving that they had no means of paying for it. The academy also differed with the association on other basic points.

It was the first comprehensive statement since 1947 by the academy, a nonprofit association of 2,000 physicians in the New York area, on the social-economic aspects of medicine. Many members of the academy also belong to the American Medical Association.

The pronouncement was intended to detail the role of Government in health affairs, as that role is viewed by the academy's policymaking body, which consists of its trustees and council.

EQUAL ACCESS THE GOAL

In its view, governmental agencies have equal responsibility with voluntary agencies for taking whatever actions are necessary to assure all people equal access to a high quality of comprehensive health care.

A serious gap exists between the health care that people need and what many of them get, the statement said. Assurance of equal access must be a major goal of a democratic society, it declared, and is a proper concern of Federal, State, and local government.

This concern of government requires that appropriate official levels establish priorities for new as well as existing programs, allocate funds to achieve them and implement the necessary measures, the statement said.

Government also must maintain effective controls, support demonstration and research efforts and exercise policymaking and administrative functions in consultation with appropriate professional groups, according to the academy.

The statement rejected proposals that tax funds for health care be administered by private nonprofit agencies.

Whenever tax funds are so allocated, it declared, the appropriate governmental agency, and it alone, must be made fully accountable for them. This includes establishing and maintaining standards of performance and the required administrative procedures.

"The official health agency," it said, "is the only unit of government that can coordinate all governmental health programs and combine public responsibility and accountability and the other functions of public administration with the professional skills, concern and consultation required for setting standards and for continuous evaluation of program quality and overall effectiveness."

The statement broke with the position of the American Medical Association that health care was primarily a State and local concern, and not a Federal one.

It said: "The varying fiscal capacities and efforts of the several States have resulted in an uneven and inadequate level of many of those health services that are required in the national interest."

STUDY LASTED 2 YEARS

When the Nation as a whole suffers from such varying levels of essential health services," the statement said, "the resources of the Federal Government must be utilized for establishing and maintaining standards of service, as well as for an equitable basis of financing throughout the Nation."

The statement was prepared by a subcommittee of 40 persons, half of them physicians and the others social scientists and leading citizens, after a 2-year study. It was aided by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

Dr. John L. Madden, president of the academy, sent copies to Senators Jacob K. Javits and Robert F. Kennedy of New York. Some of the conclusions, he wrote them, "have direct relevance to public issue under study by the Congress."

"BIG BROTHER"—INVASION OF PRIVACY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, today's "big brother" item is an advertisement for so-called Intelligence Equipment for Law Enforcement, by a California electronics manufacturer. I hesitate to give any further identification for fear of publicizing a specific company involved in a business which poses a direct threat to the privacy of every American citizen.

Although there is a small warning on the back page of the advertisement, it is interesting that the carefully worded introductory page makes no mention of possible Federal, State, or local laws which may be violated by the use of this equipment. It is also significant that the manufacturer states that some of its products are available to industry as well as Government, and that it conducts training schools in the usage of all forms of snooping gear.

Because of the menace which the widespread distribution and use of eavesdropping equipment poses to many of our constitutional liberties, and because of the need to awaken my fellow countrymen to the dangers inherent in continued legislative inaction, I ask unanimous consent to have the partial listing of the California manufacturer's equipment catalog printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the listing was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MINIATURE TRANSMITTERS

T–10: The world famous "sugar lump" transmitter used where ease of concealment and size is of primary importance (⅞ by ¾ by 9/16 inches), $60.

T–12: A compact easily concealed carry-on transmitter used where range is not important but where size is. Used by many women undercover agents (1¾ by 1¼ by ½ inches), $95.

T–301: A very small transmitter (somewhat larger than the T–10) using an extremely sensitive mike so that larger areas may be covered. Used by undercover agents as a long range expendable unit (2⅜ by 15/16 by ¾ inches), $105.

T–101: Probably the most well-known combination miniature transmitter made. Used both as a carryable or plantable unit and either as a battery powered or A.C. 110-volt permanent transmitter. Has many additional features (3⅛ by 2⅜ by ¾ inches), $300.

T–101A: Similar to the T–101, but not having the A.C. 110-volt capability. One of our two largest volume units (3⅛ by 2⅜ by ¾ inches), $225.

T–101B: An attractive briefcase with a built-in concealed transmitter used by salesmen, undercover agents, dealers, vice squads, etc. $350.

T–101P: An attractive picture and picture frame with built-in battery powered transmitter. Used in motels, hotels, offices, etc. $350.

T–000: The very popular internationally known export transmitter has gained much interest due to its increased range and power maintaining an extremely low battery drain rate (5¼ by 1½ by 3⅛ inches), $250.

T–000AC: Similar in quality and power to the T–000, but being the 110-volt A.C. equivalent. Used primarily for permanent installation where range and long periods of operation are important (5¼ by 1½ by 3⅛ inches), $300.

T–000ACL: A very attractive table lamp with built-in transmitter used in hotels, motels, offices, etc., operating when the cord is plugged into 110-volt a.c. whether or not the light is on. $375.

T–105: Well-known parasitic telephone tap, requiring no batteries; 30–50 m.c. Frequency Modulated. Used where long life is important. Considered the finest instrument of is type made (1½ by ⅝ by ⅞ inches), $105.

T–105B: Same size as the T–105, but requiring a 9-volt battery for its source of operating power. Not as popular as the parasitic, but necessary under some conditions which the parasitic will not function (1½ by ⅝ by ⅞ inches), $95.

RECEIVERS

RM–40: Police Systems automative receiver with AFC, record jack, etc. A very popular highly sensitive unit, in the 30–50 megacycle range (4½ by 6½ by 8¾ inches), $200.

B–100: Portable 30–50 megacycle receiver designed especially for the surveillance field. The only transitorized portable presently available (8¾ by 3½ by 4½ inches), $350.

RH–1: Modified Hallicrafter stationary receiver. (30–50 megacycle, 13½ by 8 by 5 inches), $125.

RM–200: Modified monitor DR–200 with special speaker, antenna, etc. (High-low band, 30–50 and 152–174 Mc.) (14¼ by 8 by 10½ inches), $260.

RMC–40: Police Systems crystal controlled automotive receiver (4½ by 6½ by 8¾ inches), $179.50.

RECORDERS

Concertone 400: Concertone portable recorder, 5-inch reels, battery and 110-volt a.c. Up to 3 hours per side record time, the most widely used portable in police service, 1⅞ and 3¾ I.P.S. (11 by 8 by 3½ inches), $199.50.

MR–400: Modified Concertone 400, having police systems built in telephone actuated trigger, with attachments (11 by 8 by 3½ inches), $300.

G–3/10: Geloso Stenotape 3 speed 110 volt a.c. recorder with up to 10 hours record time. An extremely high fidelity instrument (12 by 8 by 6 inches), $300.

Brentwood 555: Brentwood 2-speed portable with 5-inch reels (3¾ and 1⅞ I.P.S.). An excellent lower priced quality recorder, $165.

Brentwood 550: Freeman portable battery operated, 2-speed (1⅞ and 3¾ I.P.S.) 3-inch reels (5 by 9 by 2½ inches), $145.

MRT–1: Transicorder, 1⅞ and 3¾ I.P.S. with 3-inch reels (7 by 6 by 2 inches). Used to place in briefcases, where one wishes to open and close briefcase without revealing recorder, $125.

RECORDER ACCESSORIES

In addition to the standard recorder accessories available from the recorder manufacturer, Police Systems manufactures the following:

VMR–441: Police Systems extremely sensitive voice acuated relay used to turn recorder on or off with sound impulse (3½ by 4⅛ by 4 inches), $145.

TAR–431: Police Systems external telephone acuated triggering unit. Used to turn recorder on or off when telephone is being used (3¼ by 2⅛ by 1⅝ inches), $100.

LOCATING AND TAILING DEVICES

Police Systems is presently the only manufacturer of a visual directional device used to follow or find automobiles.

RMCE-40: "Cyclops Eye" complete modified 30-50 m.c. automotive receiver. Mounted under dash in automobile, used to follow moving vehicles, indicating when they turn right or left. (Also used to locate vehicles), $325.

T-200A: Tailing signal transmitter, fits under dash, in parasitic working off 12-volt automotive current, ties into automotive antenna. Used in conjunction with RMCE-40, $225.

T-200B: Battery operated (self contained) version of the T-200A with magnet so that it can be quickly placed on gas tank or other metal structure under automobile. Used in conjunction with RMCE-40, $265.

T-202A: Higher powered, longer range version of the T-200A series, parasitc, using automotive 12-volt system and antenna, $265.

T-202B: Higher powered, longer range version of the T-200B series, with permanent magnet, etc., $295.

TR-600: "Cyclops Eye" to modify used RM-40, $135.

PORTABLE AMPLIFIERS

A-11: Pocket amplifier, used for listening through walls, etc., complete with high fidelity headset and contact microphone, $145.

PP-1T: University 25-watt portable amplifier with loudspeaker, having additional capability of amplified listening, used where one cannot get close enough to normally overhear, $245.

DEBUGGING EQUIPMENT

Police Systems is presently the only manufacturer-supplier of portable transistorized debugging equipment available to the general public. The amount of bugging equipment used in private enterprise for the purpose of underselling competition, etc., makes such an instrument invaluable to any businessman in a monetarily responsible position.

RF-2: Police Systems hand-size debugging meter. Covers from 1 to 450 M.C. taking the awkwardness out of debugging (5½ by 3 by 2 inches). Used in industry, military, secret service, etc., where the need for secrecy is paramount, $90.

RF-3: Similar in theory to the RF-2, but vastly more sophisticated, having both the visual and listening capability so the operator may distinguish between a hidden transmitter and other types of frequency radiation, $195.

FIELD GLASSES

Binoculars for night work (also excellent for daylight usage). Coated lenses and sturdy carrying case, $50.

PORTABLE TWO-WAY RADIO EQUIPMENT

TW-5: Exclusive units, considered the finest hand transceivers available in this price range. Used in conjunction with bugging and debugging to alert operators of impeding problems, $150 pair.

TW-2: Radion units, very fine hand transceivers for a very reasonable price, where maximum range is not of prime importance, $50 pair.

RECORDING TAPE

Five-inch, one-half mil, 1,800-foot Mylar high-fidelity tape, $5.

Five-inch, 1½ mil, standard 660-foot acetate tape, $1.50.

Three and one-fourth inch, one-half mil, 600-foot Mylar, $2.

INDUCTION PICKUP COIL

LT-1: Telephone line induction pickup coil. Used in conjunction with Police Systems A-11 pocket amplifier and MT-1 to overhear telephone conversation without cutting the phone line, $20.

MT-1: Matching transformer for the LT-1 necessary when used in conjunction with the A-11 pocket amplifier, $15.

LT-2: Telephone pickup coil-suction cup type, fits on telephone handset, $6.

ALTERNATING CURRENT POWER SUPPLIES

PS-1: 110-volt alternating current to 12-volt direct current power supply for RM-40 receiver. Used where one wishes to use the RM-40 in a house, or other building with 110 volts, $42.50.

PS-2: 110-volt alternating current to 13.5-volt direct current power supply used in the T-101 combination package series, $75.

PS-3: 110-volt alternating current to 9-volt direct current power supply, $55.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, this listing of snooping gadgetry should prove to be an eye opener to those who have ignored or been unaware of this growing threat to individual privacy. It is disturbing to think that unknown types and quantities of this eavesdropping equipment are being purchased and used by individuals throughout the width and breadth of this Nation. The miniature transmitter in the salesman's briefcase, the concealed transmitter in the picture frame and table lamp of the hotel and motel room, the bugged telephone at the office may well be commentaries on contemporary life in this Nation rather than pipedreams of the future. The individual no longer knows if, when, and where he is being bugged.

These facts make it abundantly clear that the clear distinction between the public and the private sectors of an individual's life is being rapidly blurred by technical advances. This disturbing trend is being accelerated by both Government agents and private citizens. It is bad enough having law enforcement officials using this gear on private citizens, but it is worse to have private snoopers spying on their fellow citizens. This, gentlemen, is precisely what is happening as more and more equipment is made available to the general public.

This is a menace which we Americans must eventually face. It is a problem which this legislative body must ultimately solve. I am confident that this peril will be faced and solved. Then, and only then, will our vanishing freedom—the right of privacy—again become a constitutional reality in this Nation.

FROM BLIGHT TO RESTORATION—STRAWBERY BANKE RECREATES COLONIAL ATMOSPHERE IN PORTSMOUTH, N.H.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, May 29 marked the historic opening of one of the most unique urban-renewal projects in the country—the Strawbery Banke colonial restoration project, in Portsmouth, N.H.

From blight to colonial restoration, this effort to recreate a typical 18th century community represents an investment of millions of dollars and the time and tireless energies of hundreds of local residents of the seacoast area.

The completion of the first two houses on the 9-acre site—Governor Goodwin Mansion and Chase House—signals only the beginning of a new era for Portsmouth.

Dating back to 1953, when the Portsmouth City Council authorized the Portsmouth housing authority to file an application to survey the South End as a possible urban-renewal area, we have seen the first such project in the United States to have historic preservation as the major reuse develop into a reality.

Fearing that the city's rich historical tradition would fall prey to bulldozers and earthmovers that were tearing down the old, to make way for 20th century progress, in 1958 a concerned local citizenry formed a nonprofit corporation, with 387 original incorporators. Final approval for the plan was announced by the Urban Renewal Administration in 1959; in 1961, title was transferred to the housing authority; and in 1963, the first stages of demolition activity were underway.

Mr. President, for all those who are interested in seeing history in the making, I heartily recommend a visit to this charming area, which also records on its guest book visits from such historic figures as George Washington, Lafayette, Prince Louis Philippe, John Paul Jones, and Paul Revere, who is alleged to have made a midnight ride to Portsmouth 4 months before his heralded trip to Lexington and Concord.

In order to bring some of the historical significance of this area to the attention of Senators and other readers of the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that certain articles from the Portsmouth Herald supplement of May 28 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portsmouth (N.H.) Herald, May 28, 1965]

BANKE OWES ITS LIFE TO URBAN RENEWAL—SITE WAS FIRST PROJECT OF HOUSING AUTHORITY

Urban renewal has been praised, picketed, protested and proclaimed—depending on whom it affects and where it is effected.

But no one can deny that—for better or for worse—it's here to stay.

Strawbery Banke is, to a large degree, a product of urban renewal.

Without it, it is doubtful the project would have ever gotten off the ground.

The Marcy-Washington Streets project—the name originally given to the area under consideration for urban renewal—was the first project undertaken by Portsmouth Housing Authority.

In an effort to control a section of the city which had, in its opinion, become blighted as a result of neglect, the housing authority proposed that the area be transformed into a waterfront garden apartment district.

The original idea's transformation into a proposal for a colonial restoration project represents an important example of cooperation between Federal, State and local agencies.

It took years and money to bring the project to fruition. And a lot of work remains to be done.

Here is how Portsmouth Housing Authority recounts its role in the development of Strawbery Banke:

"The Marcy-Washington Streets project was the first project of any type undertaken by Portsmouth Housing Authority.

"Its history goes back to February 1954, when the authority started preliminary studies in the area. During the planning of the project it became apparent that the size (about 4 acres) would have to be increased to effectively remove all blighting influences.

"The project was then increased in size to 18 acres; and planning continued.

"Before long, the residents of the area spoke out in opposition to the project. After a number of meetings with the owners and, because of the lesser degree of blight in the southerly section, the project boundaries were again changed and the size of the area was reduced.

"The plans for the area were again revised to conform to new boundaries. During the entire life of the project up to this point, the cleared land was to be used for the construction of private garden-type apartments.

"When plans were finally completed, the authority submitted them to the Urban Renewal Administration in New York for approval.

"About this time, a number of local people were becoming interested in securing a site for a colonial village. They were concerned about the rate at which the old colonial homes were deteriorating and being razed to make way for new buildings.

"The group finally organized and selected the area of our project as their first choice for a site.

"After several discussions with the group, it became evident that if the housing authority could revise its plans, the two proposals for the area could be achieved. We could clear the area and designate the reuse as colonial restoration.

"Meetings were held with representatives of the Urban Renewal Administration; and they finally agreed to allow us to revise the plans for the area.

"The group of people interested in this historical restoration incorporated as a nonprofit corporation known as Strawberry Banke, Inc.

"The revisions were completed and the final project report was submitted to New York.

"In August 1960 the final approval of the Federal Government was granted, and, subsequently, a contract for the project was signed.

"The first signs of activity in the area became apparent during the spring of 1961, when the second acquisition appraisal commenced, and engineers began their survey of the area.

"This project is the first one of its kind in the United States.

"Several other projects have preserved and rehabilitated historic structures, but this is the first one to have historical preservation as the major reuse.

"After the authority acquired the land and structures in the area, most of the land and 27 structures having historical importance were to be sold to Strawbery Banke, Inc., and on September 24, 1964, title to the major portion of the land and buildings was transferred. Several other structures were eligible for relocation within the area by the present owners; and the rest were demolished.

"Strawbery Banke, Inc. now is responsible for the restoration of the structures acquired from the authority as well as any others which they may bring on the site. Strawbery Banke will initially restore the buildings with money raised through stock sales, donations, and gifts.

"Later, they will use revenue derived from an admission fee to be charged to tour the area.

"There are controls in the urban renewal plan governing the land use, requiring the restoration of buildings and the provision of parking and landscaping.

"There are also additional controls which govern the use of any building which may be used for dwelling purposes.

"These controls are binding on Strawbery Banke for a period of 40 years.

"In many urban renewal projects it is a simple matter to show how the city recovers its share of project costs through increased tax revenues within the project area after the revedeloper has constructed the improvements.

"Although it is not as clear cut in this project, it is felt that the economic effect of the anticipated tourist business generated as a result of this project will offset the cost to the city.

"Also, the maintenance costs of the area to the city will decrease considerably and the blighting influence to the surrounding neighborhood will be removed and the value of that property should gradually increase.

"This project is an excellent example of the flexibility of the urban renewal program and it has resulted in much favorable comment in many areas and a considerable number of publications have run articles about it."

PUDDLE DOCK ONLY AREA TO ESCAPE FIRE OF 1813

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Everybody credits "people" with preserving Strawbery Banke. Actually, it was a disastrous fire that made today's colonial restoration possible. The following account of the great fire of 1813 gives proper credit to the flames for sparing Strawbery Banke.)

If it hadn't been for the great fire of 1813, Strawbery Banke probably wouldn't be here today.

The site on which Strawbery Banke now stands—at the edge of what was then Puddle Dock—was the only area of the city which escaped the general conflagration which destroyed much of the city.

Because it escaped, it remains probably the only authentic link between the city of today and the little colonial community along the dock.

It was on the evening of December 22, 1813, that the citizens of Boston saw the skies in the north brighten in the cold night air and caused them to prepare their horses for a ride to Charlestown which they imagined to be on fire.

At this same time, the residents of a small town beyond Windsor, Vt., thought that their town was aflame.

The fire, which was about 100 miles away in Portsmouth, was at that time destroying 272 buildings in the center of the seaport city.

The great fire started in a barn on the estate of the late Colonel Woodward which was situated on the site of the present Unitarian Church on the corner of Church and State Streets.

It was later reported to have been started by Mrs. Woodward's mentally unbalanced maid who bore the name of Colbath.

The girl had taken offense because her mistress had confiscated several bottles of wine given to her by one of the gentlemen boarders in the house.

She thereby threatened Mrs. Woodward in a conversation with a friend hours before the fire with the words, "I'll burn her out."

By the next morning, the center of the city was in ruins, the area of some 15 acres was studded with chimneys, tottering walls, and the charred stumps of hundreds of trees.

The fire extended from its origin all the way down State Street to the Piscataqua River.

An account of the fire reports that the flames were spread by strong winds which carried sparks onto nearby roofs.

The first home of Daniel Webster on the corner of Court and Pleasant Streets was destroyed within the first hour of the catastrophe and one-half hour later all buildings within the extent of a quarter mile were burning.

The residents of the dwellings were forced out into the cold December night, young and old, rich and poor alike.

Some were almost hysterical as the flames crackled and roared in the wind and the thundering crashes of toppling buildings added to the shrieks of pain and anguish.

Aid in the form of firefighters came from area communities and the navy yard.

The great fire caused $300,000 worth of property damage and, as few persons in those days carried insurance, the loss was severely felt by the city.

Fortunately, no lives were lost and the only injury occurred when a man received a broken leg from a falling wall.

To help relieve the distressed residents of Portsmouth, donations from cities poured into the area.

Boston gave the largest sum from one city, $20,000, and the total sum from all the cities was equally divided among the distressed.

As a result of the fire, the city passed an ordinance requiring that all buildings built thereafter with a height of more than 13 feet from the sidewalk to the eaves could not be of wooden frame construction.

The houses within Strawbery Banke, which date before the fire, are mostly wooden frame dwellings, and this is perhaps the most striking difference when compared to structures in other parts of the city.

The first great evidence of city planning is seen directly after the fire as the city had to rebuild just about everything, except the untouched Puddle Dock area.

The structures in this area were haphazardly built around that small tidal inlet.

Said to be named for the inlet of water in the Black Friars area of London, Puddle Dock was located in the center of present Strawbery Banke.

It was filled in with cinders from the railroad roundhouse and the nearby powerplant in 1899, and had served as a shallow, calm water anchorage for small craft.

The economy of the neighborhood depended upon it and therefore it influenced the placement of the structures around it.

A map printed in the year of the great fire shows the south shore of the inlet completely undeveloped with marshes predominating.

Wharves and houses covered the north shore and these were the ones which were saved by the fire and are being restored today as part of Strawbery Banke.

By 1839, the next detailed map showed that considerable construction had been done on the south shore, and by 1850, was ringed by docks.

The Puddle Dock area is said to have resembled a small English seacoast town.

As seen in Strawbery Banke today, the narrow streets and small simple dwellings remain. The houses were set very close to or right on the streets. If there was a sidewalk, it was of Durham flagstone which were large flat stones floated down the Piscataqua River in gundalows from Durham.

The streets were often nothing but mud holes and therefore the Durham flagstone was laid down across the streets from each corner to form a crosswalk so that pedestrians could avoid getting mud on their feet.

On many corners in Strawbery Banke, the old corner posts which protected the corners of houses from the wheels of carelessly driven wagons are still standing.

These posts were made of granite and stand about 3 feet tall.

The buildings in the area all have quite shallow basements because of the high watertable resulting from their nearness to Puddle Dock.

A 1697 contract for the construction of a house in the area provided for the installation of a pump in the basement.

Pumps in those days were similar to those on board ships and were hollowed out logs with a plunger and proved fairly effective.

Puddle Dock extended from the present Liberty Pole to the South Mill Pond at extreme high tides.

Thus at times the South End was an island with Meeting House Hill at its crest.

Liberty Bridge, which had a draw enabling boats to pass, was located where the Liberty Pole stands today.

At the inlet's opposite end was Canoe Bridge.

Of stone arch construction, Canoe Bridge had an opening of 25 or 30 feet for the passage of small craft. Today Washington Street and Newton Avenue join where Canoe Bridge was once located.

Toward the end of the 1800's, Puddle Dock declined in its importance to the area.

Even though few people in Portsmouth can remember when the tidal inlet existed, there is one local man who will never forget it.

He is Frank Churchill of 110 Court Street, who fell into Puddle Dock as a boy.

Wearing heavy clothing at the time, young Churchill almost lost his life in the cold muddy waters of Puddle Dock.

As a part of its restoration of the area, Strawbery Banke eventually hopes to reflect the small community that once existed with Puddle Dock in its center.

Spared by fire 152 years ago, the old Puddle Dock area will soon live again to show the people of today's modern world how their forefathers lived in the colonial town which was first called Strawbery Banke.

VISITOR'S INFORMATION

Open daily, Monday through Sunday.

Hours open: 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Tickets may be purchased at the designated entrance to the compound.

Exhibits open to the public:

Governor Goodwin mansion: Completely restored and furnished dwelling.

Chase house: Completely restored and furnished dwelling.

Demonstrations and displays:

Capt. John Clark house: Example of restoration in progress.

Aaron Conant house: Strawbery Banke Guild Shop. Crafts, antiques, gifts and souvenirs on sale.

Rider-Wood house: Demonstrations of weaving and spinning.

Dr. John Jackson house: Strawbery Banke, Inc. headquarters.

Jacob Lewis house: Exhibit of Strawbery Banke plans and model of restoration area.

East-Hilton house: Architectural museum.

West-Amazeen house: Crewel work and rug-hooking demonstrations and exhibits.

Deacon Penhallow house: Penny Shop and rest rooms.

Peacock house: Furniture repair and refinishing.

James Marden house: Candle dipping (east side), pewterer (west side).

STUDENT ADDRESSES, MORTON, WYO., HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I was privileged to attend the graduation ceremonies of the Morton, Wyo., High School on May 18, and I was impressed by the excellent addresses given by valedictorian, Carol Winchester, and salutatorian, Janice Six.

The two young ladies have been kind enough to provide me with copies of their remarks, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS—"EDUCATION—AUTOMATION?"

Education has always been important and desirable, but today it is more necessary than ever before. Machines are performing more and more of the jobs formerly done by unskilled labor.

We are living in a period of rapid technological change. We witness these changes in our daily lives, whether there is a change in our commuter schedules or the opening of a new stretch of superhighway. The fact remains that we allocate our time differently from the way it was done in the good old days.

Our schools have changed. The red-brick building has been rewired to accommodate the heavy new load of projectors and electrical devices, and the desks are no longer nailed to the wooden floor.

There are probably many among you here tonight who can remember when our own Morton School was a one-room elementary school with one teacher. You have seen it change over the years into this modern school plant of which we are all justly proud. But the improvement must continue in our own school as well as in the Nation, not only in buildings but in the curriculum also.

It is against this background that we ought to deal with the educational part of automation and that we ought to raise our voices in the eternal cry for more and better education. We all must realize that we need a sound education and training to meet the challenge of automation.

It has been demonstrated that those who suffer most heavily from the consequences are those who lack education or easily sold skills. They include the displaced worker, members of minority groups who have acquired neither a sound education nor an easily sold skill, and the school dropout, who in today's world is undereducated.

It has been said that the prosperous are becoming richer and the poverty stricken are becoming poorer. Today there is reason to believe that the educated are receiving a better education and the ignorant are losing further ground in the competitive struggle for work, the enjoyment of leisure, and the good things in life. The gap between the educated and the undereducated is widening the distance between the haves and the have-nots, while the isolation of those who are jobless and dependent upon charity or government subsidy is creating a dangerous social problem.

The cry for additional education is seldom challenged. But what does it mean? What are the specific implications of automation?

First, every child must be assured of the opportunity of acquiring a comprehensive, general education.

There is a growing recognition that the future belongs to the educated. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson recently pointed out the importance of education when he said, "The American standard of living for generations to come will be largely determined by how well the country walks the narrow and nervous border between automation's province of either plenty or misery. * * * It is the educator, not the businessman, not the union official, not the bureaucrat, who must tell us how to keep our youngsters in school to prepare them for a productive life."

Second, there is a constant need to evaluate and alter the present curriculum.

Provisions should be made for easier transfer from one curriculum to another with a minimum of effort or loss of time and credit. Programs of work-related education should be made available to provide part-time jobs for those who might need self-support in order to stay in school. This would eliminate the economic circumstances which force many students to become dropouts.

Third, adequate counseling staffs are needed to supplement the teaching staff.

Proper counseling, effective motivation and a flexible program will help each student to continue his school career through graduation and college, or technical-school placement, or acceptance in a work assignment for which he is qualified.

Fourth, sufficient funds are needed to meet the challenge to education.

It is interesting to note that more money was spent to house the New York World's Fair than on all public school building construction in the United States last year. While dollars are no cure-all, they are essential to a sound educational system.

Fifth, major emphasis should be placed on the basic skills of learning and communicating.

With these skills students will be equipped to take more training or retraining when job changes become necessary. The sign of a good education, after all, is not merely learning facts, but the ability to proceed independently—in short, educating the student to educate himself.

Sixth, education for lifelong learning.

Seventh, education for leisure.

The student's education should include increasing interests in cultural entertainments. There will be plenty of new leisure time for these interests made available through automation.

As Sir Julian Huxley put it, "Machines are going to do the jobs now. Man has got to learn to live."

Some of you may be asking yourselves, just what is the meaning of the word automation?

The word "automation" merely means a far greater sense of urgency and a dramatic rate of change.

Classmates, I challenge you, as leaders of the world in a short number of years, to make the most of your educational opportunities today.

In closing, my classmates and I wish to thank our parents, teachers, and school administrators for their help and guidance during these 12 years in which we have acquired a good start on our education.

Thank you.

SALUTATORY ADDRESS

(By Janice Six, Morton High School)

What future do I face? That question is undoubtedly one of the most important issues confronting the high school graduate of today. Graduates, stepping over the threshold of life, gaze upon a world divided between good and evil. Imagine on one side are the accumulated, controversial problems of mankind: Communism, poverty, hemispheric crisis, and national and State questions. On the other side are classified life's joys and benefits: Freedom of expression and of choice, the chances for self-improvement and success. Yet, discovering the median strip is not an easy task.

Each and every day, the newspapers are overflowing with the sordid news of raging riots and the indecisions of men and women. Economic failures and tragic accidents capture headlines across the Nation. These and countless other incidents present an extremely grim view of the world situation.

How can a young graduate determine his destiny in life? How can he or she be assured of a decent living and the satisfaction of accomplishment? The answer is not established in a black and white form.

For example, take communism. Is there a solution to communism, the free world's most dreaded enemy? In the later writings of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, they stated that the ideal Communist society in general terms is: "A system of social ownership under which production would be carried on by voluntary associations of workers, distribution would be in accordance with needs, the state would cease to be an instrument of force and 'wither away' and the individual would live in freedom and in harmony with society."

A society is developed by its people. Commonsense exemplifies the fact that illiterate people cannot possibly create a society in which the individual would live in freedom and in harmony. However, in a similar light, peasants can't freely survive in a society antagonized by professed, educated Communists.

Mao Tse-tung, dominating Communist China's 700 million people, has boasted that his nation could afford to lose 300 million people in a nuclear war and still emerge victorious. Why? Because there would be that many less ignorant mouths to sustain. He would still have millions to exploit in the supposedly glorious benefits of communism.

Communism succeeds only because of the ignorance of the masses. Therefore, education is the principle solution enabling the individual to rise above his dictators. For without enlightening man's mind to the optimistic hope of life and freedom how can he but remain ignorant and oppressed?

Americans are the most fortunate people on this earth. The terms "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" have never reached the ears of over half the world's inhabitants. To illustrate, the citizens of Latin America strive daily to secure sufficient food to eat. They haven't time to concentrate on the pursuit of happiness. The poverty stricken must be made to see the reasons causing their lot in life.

I am sure you are familiar with the slogan: "Help people to help themselves." Perhaps this phrasing is more significant: Educate people to help themselves.

The Peace Corps, working in the far corners of the earth, has endeavored to instruct people in coping with their environments. As graduates beginning to climb life's ladder, we must learn to cope with our environment also. Each rung may be an obstacle to overcome, but it can be surmounted with patience and courage and faith.

As you have gazed upon this graduating class tonight, perhaps you have reflected upon your own high school graduation and the years spent in learning. Those years of learning have never ceased. From childhood to adolescence to young adulthood we have progressed. From these doors tonight, we shall step onto life's threshold to continue learning.

The world is not an easy place in which to spend a lifetime, but the world can be conquered through education. Each of us shall go our separate ways, but our destiny is the same—to learn, to gain wisdom, and to gain understanding.

In closing, I would say our greatest objective in life is as stated in our class motto: "Knowledge is power."

With that last thought, on behalf of the graduating class of Morton High School, I welcome you to our commencement exercises.

For, without knowledge, there can be no prosperous future.

ESSAY ON: "WHAT MY AMERICAN HERITAGE MEANS TO ME"

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there has recently come to my attention an outstanding essay written by a high school student from Tucker, Ga., on "What My American Heritage Means to Me."

This prize-winning essay, which was written by Margaret DeVita of Tucker High School, contains some very fine thoughts which bear repeating here today. Miss DeVita is to be congratulated for her understanding and appreciation of our form of government and the American way of life, and I ask unanimous consent that her essay be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT MY AMERICAN HERITAGE MEANS TO ME

(First prize essay by Margaret DeVita, Tucker High School, Tucker, Ga.)

Church: "It is a church of many faiths standing on every corner. Its doors stand open, and I may enter or leave whenever I wish. Here I am free to form my own beliefs concerning God and to worship Him as my doctrine dictates."

Vote: "It is my right as an individual to take part in our Government, and to voice my opinion through support of a party, as an official or a cause. When I step into the voting booth, I am free to make my own decision and if I desire, I may even write in my choice. This in itself is a priceless inheritance."

School: "Although its facilities for teaching may not be equal to all others, no boy or girl is barred from the education which it offers, unless by his or her own limitations. Here I am encouraged both to lead and to follow, to listen and yet to voice my opinions. I am treated as an individual, but I learn to be tolerant of others. I am given the chance to pursue a variety of studies, not excluding the doctrines of countries which are directly opposed to our democratic ideals."

Organization: "It may be a national party, a community civic group debating local policies or a student club involved in service to the school. In each of these, I am free to serve and support a belief or opinion without fear of suppression."

Privilege: "No other country offers to its citizens the opportunities it affords me. It owes no man a living but every man the opportunity to create a way of life for himself."

Responsibility: "Privilege brings responsibility, and as a citizen, I am entrusted with the ideals on which this Nation was established. It is my duty, the obligation of each of us, to protect and preserve these principles so that they may be passed on to future generations."

COMMUNIST THREAT IN THE CARIBBEAN

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is my opinion that a vast majority of the American people applauded the action of the President in the decisive action which he has taken to prevent a Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic. The prospect of another Communist stronghold in this hemisphere, and only a short distance from our shores, is intolerable and it is my view that the President acted in the best interests of the United States, all of Latin America, and the entire free world.

There recently appeared in the Omaha World-Herald and the Danville, Ill., Commercial-News two excellent editorials commending the President for his action and calling attention to the fact that if he had not taken the course that he did we would today probably be confronted with the threat of another Communist regime in the Caribbean.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, May 10, 1965]

A SOUND POSITION

Last week, Americans were facing up to the facts that:

President Johnson had intervened in the Dominican Republic to prevent a Communist takeover.

The intervention has the solid support of the American people.

The intervention apparently violates that part of the Charter of the Organization of American States which says that "no state or group of states has the right to intervene directly or indirectly for any reason whatever in the internal or external affairs of any other state."

How is the United States to justify itself? Mr. Johnson was getting quite a bit of advice on the point.

Columnist Walter Lippmann, who is enthusiastic about the President's prompt action, says that he takes "the old-fashioned and classical diplomatic ground that the Dominican Republic lies squarely within the sphere of influence of the United States, and that it is normal, not abnormal, for a great power to insist that within its sphere of influence no other great power shall exercise hostile military and political force."

A surprising further aspect of Mr. Lippmann's argument is that the United States should give up the "globalism" proclaimed by Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt, and look after America's sphere of influence.

The Wall Street Journal has another suggestion for facing up to the nonintervention clause of the OAS Treaty. That is to admit quite simply that part of the treaty was a mistake. Says the newspaper:

"Such absolute and inflexible language is itself a contravention not only of the Monroe Doctrine but of the realities of Latin and world politics. The U.S. fault, it seems to us, is not in intervening to oppose communism but in originally permitting itself to be wrapped up in such unequivocal linguistic prohibition."

And Bill Henry, salty observer for the Los Angeles Times, says "there are those who raise their hands in holy horror every time you mention that citizens of some country or other are by and large incapable of self-government, but such gestures don't change the facts of the case."

The facts and opinions added together are that the United States intervened to prevent a Communist takeover in a country which is unable to protect itself; that the self-interest of the United States and the protection of the hemisphere moved the United States to act; that treaty language which prohibits such intervention cannot be binding when America's vital national interests are at stake.

We think that is a reasonable representation of the consensus on the Dominican affair. We believe that the position is sound, and that President Johnson has acted admirably, and we join with millions of other Americans in hoping that the President will act just as courageously if called upon to do so again.

[From the Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News, May 9, 1965]

WHILE CRITICS ARGUE

With the Dominican crisis diminishing, at least in its shooting phase, second-guessers are arguing over the wisdom of President Johnson's rapid dispatching of American troops to their first landing on the soil of a Latin nation in more than a generation.

One question that occupies some critics is whether or not there ever really was any danger of a Communist takeover of the Dominican Republic. The New York Times, for one, observed that since U.S. troops had intervened, "no one any longer will be able to prove or disprove the thesis that a rebel victory would have brought a Communist government to Santo Domingo."

Presumably, the President should have waited until the new government had signed a trade agreement with the Soviet Union and Russian technicians had begun arriving, perhaps being spared from their duties in Cuba.

Others decry the great damage done the good-neighbor policy and the concept of inter-American cooperation and equality and nonintervention in internal affairs, so laboriously built up over the years, by this alleged return to "gunboat diplomacy."

The fact is, however, that the Dominican revolution would have long been over before the Organization of American States could have decided on the need for action, and taken such action, had the United States sat back and waited upon its advice and consent.

The whole Dominican question, of course, should be debated in the councils of the OAS. But it is thanks to the United States that the problem confronting us and our Latin fellow members today is that of building stable democracy in the Dominican Republic and not what to do about another Communist foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

NATIONAL SQUARE DANCE WEEK

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Kathryn Dennis and Ernest Schleuning, who represent the Black Hills Callers Association, asking that Congress give consideration to naming the week of September 19 through the 25th as "National Square Dance Week."

I was very much interested in this proposal. Surely there is nothing more American than the square dance. It has brought pleasure to every age group, in every era of our country's history. It is indeed our own American national folk dance. It has been danced in front of sod shanties and it has been danced in our largest ballrooms. The music has been provided by one fiddler, or harmonica player, and by great orchestras. Grandfather and grandson, mothers and daughters, all have delighted to the intricate figures of the square dance.

In an effort to call this to the attention of other Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from the Black Hills Callers Association printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Rapid City, S.D.,
June 3, 1965.

Senator Karl Mundt,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mundt: We wonder if you are aware of the vast number of persons in our country, and indeed in the whole world, now enjoying our own national folk dance—the square dance.

A movement has begun to have the President declare the week of September 19 through 25, 1965, as National Square Dance Week. Several of our national square dance publications have been urging their readers to write directly to the President. However, when we wrote we were advised by Mr. Douglass Cater, Special Assistant to the President, that such a proclamation must be requested by Congress.

We are asking your help as to the best way to get our request before Congress. Would a petition bearing the signatures of individual square dancers be the proper approach? Or shall we have them write individually to their Congressmen?

We are also starting a similar movement on a State level and are sending a message to Governor Boe to this effect.

We understand that a postage stamp acknowledging the square dance to be the American folk dance is going to be issued. This will add to the national awareness of the movement.

We will surely appreciate any help you can give us in furthering our cause.

Sincerely,
Black Hills Callers Association.
Ernest Schleuning.
Kathryn Dennis.

LABOR UNIONS AND ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, Members of the Senate who, like myself, claim the right and privilege of criticizing decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court of which we disapprove, owe, I think, a duty to the Court to express our approval of decisions which are in the best tradition of our highest tribunal and which clearly preserve a fundamental principle of private enterprise within the framework of a written Constitution.

In 1950, John L. Lewis, then president of the powerful United Mine Workers boasted that he would provide for his union the highest pay scale ever granted a labor union in the history of the Nation. In order to force compliance with that wage scale upon a reluctant industry, he decided to create an acute shortage of coal, as a means of increasing the price of coal, which he thought, in turn, would induce the coal operators to pay the wage scale which he demanded. Consequently, that czar of the coal industry decreed that no coal company could operate more than 3 days a week. At that time, nearly all of the coal operations were under the control of Lewis' union and hence he made his production directive effective.

In 1950, I felt so outraged by what I deemed to be a clear violation of the antitrust laws, and a violation of the clear intent of Congress to permit collective bargaining for wages and working conditions without violating antitrust laws, that I introduced a bill to make the United Mine Workers Union, or any other union which used its economic powers to fix prices or conspired in a way that endangered the general welfare, subject to the antitrust laws and such penalties as courts of competent jurisdiction might see fit to impose upon the proof of the actions complained of. The Senate Judiciary Committee, to which my bill was referred, conducted 2 days of hearings and then buried it and it has never again seen the light of day, although I reintroduced the same bill this year.

Imagine, therefore, my pleasant surprise when I learned on yesterday that the Supreme Court had held in the case of United Mine Workers against Pennington and others, that I was right, eternally right, in 1950 when I claimed that John L. Lewis' coal curtailment program, in order to fix prices, had violated our antitrust laws. I need no longer to push that bill.

On yesterday, the Supreme Court held that labor unions in their process of collective bargaining are subject to the antitrust laws. This case therefore could have far-reaching effects. The contract in question was one between the United Mine Workers and large coal operators, which, in a limited coal market, was designed to force small operators now employing 40 percent of the miners, out of business. The union agreed not to attempt to control the hours of work of employees and not to oppose automation; in fact they agreed to help finance automation. As productivity increased the agreement called for higher wage scales, which the union agreed to impose on all smaller companies whether mechanized or not.

The net effect of the opinion delivered by Mr. Justice White is that Congress in taking jurisdiction of the labor field in various acts—the Walsh-Healy Act, the Davis-Bacon Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Taft-Hartley Act, and the Landrum-Griffin amendments—had not precluded judicial intervention to uphold and apply the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act designed to protect competition and to break up monopolies.

Mr. Justice Goldberg stated at the outset of his dissent that this case and its companion case decided the same day—Local Union No. 189 against Jewel Tea Co.—obviously mean that the Court refuses to give validity to what he considers to be congressional intent to "prohibit judicial intervention via the antitrust route in legitimate collective bargaining." He cited the case of *United States* v. *Hutcheson,* 312 U.S. 219, to bear out his position and stated that the Court should hold the antitrust laws inapplicable.

In concurring, Justices Douglas, Black, and Clark stated that the agreement itself is prima facie evidence of the antitrust laws and that both employers and the union should be found to have violated them.

There is another aspect of the Pennington case that deals with sales of coal to TVA. In this the Court reaffirmed the doctrine of *Eastern R. Conf.* v. *Noerr Motors,* 365 U.S. 127, that the Sherman Act was not intended to bar concerted activities of competitors from seeking to influence public officials. Since the case was remanded for proceedings consistent with the opinion, this matter, which dealt with instructions to the jury, will be straightened out in further proceedings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point, the majority opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court in the above-mentioned case of United Mine Workers of America against James L. Pennington, and others.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Supreme Court of the United States, No. 48.—October term, 1964, on writ of certiorari to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, June 7, 1965)

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, PETITIONER, *v.* JAMES M. PENNINGTON ET AL.

Mr. Justice White delivered the opinion of the Court.

This action began as a suit by the trustees of the United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund against the respondents, individually and as owners of Phillips Brothers Coal Company, a partnership, seeking to recover some $55,000 in royalty payments alleged to be due and payable under the trust provisions of the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement of 1950, as amended, September 29, 1952, executed by Phillips and United Mine Workers of America on or about October 1, 1953, and re-executed with amendments on or about September 8, 1955, and October 22, 1956. Phillips filed an answer and a cross claim against UMW, alleging in both that the trustees, the UMW and certain large coal operators had conspired to restrain and to monopolize interstate commerce in violation of §§ 1 and 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1, 2 (1958 ed.). Actual damages in the amount of $100,000 were claimed for the period beginning February 14, 1954, and ending December 31, 1958.[1]

The allegations of the cross claim were essentially as follows: Prior to the 1950 Wage Agreement between the operators and the union, severe controversy had existed in the industry, particularly over wages, the welfare fund and the union's efforts to control the working time of its members. Since 1950, however, relative peace has existed in the industry, all as the result of the 1950 wage agreement and its amendments and the additional understandings entered into between UMW and the large operators. Allegedly the parties considered overproduction to be the critical problem of the coal industry. The agreed solution was to be the elimination of the smaller companies, the larger companies thereby controlling the market. More specifically, the union abandoned its efforts to control the working time of the miners, agreed not to oppose the rapid mechanization of the mines which would substantially reduce mine employment, agreed to help finance such mechanization and agreed to impose the terms of the 1950 agreement on all operators without regard for their ability to pay. The benefit to the union was to be increased wages as productivity increased with mechanization, these increases to be demanded of the smaller companies whether mechanized or not. Royalty payments into the welfare fund were to be increased also, and the union was to have effective control over the Fund's use. The union and large companies agreed upon other steps to exclude the marketing, production, and sale of nonunion coal. Thus the companies agreed not to lease coal lands to nonunion operators, and in 1958 agreed not to sell or buy coal from such companies. The companies and the union jointly and successfully approached the Secretary of Labor to obtain establishment under the Walsh-Healy Act, 41 U.S.C. § 35 et seq. (1958 ed.), of a minimum wage for employees of contractors selling coal to the TVA, such minimum wage being much higher than in other industries and making it difficult for small companies to compete in the TVA term contract market. At a later time, at a meeting attended by both union and company representatives, the TVA was urged to curtail its spot market purchases, a substantial portion of which were exempt from the Walsh-Healy order. Thereafter four of the larger companies waged a destructive and collusive price-cutting campaign in the TVA spot market for coal, two of the companies, West Kentucky Coal Co. and its subsidiary Nashville Coal Co., being those in which the union had large investments and over which it was in position to exercise control.

The complaint survived motions to dismiss and after a five-week trial before a jury, a verdict was returned in favor of Phillips and against the trustees and the union, the damages against the union being fixed in the amount of $90,000, to be trebled under 15 U.S.C. § 15 (1958 ed.). The trial court set aside the verdict against the trustees but overruled the union's motion for judgment notwithstanding the verdict or in the alternative for a new trial. The Court of Appeals affirmed. 325 F. 2d 804. It ruled that the union was not exempt from liability under the Sherman Act on the facts of this case, considered the instructions adequate and found the evidence generally sufficient to support the verdict. We granted certiorari. 377 U.S. 929. We reverse and remand the case for proceedings consistent with this opinion.

I

We first consider UMW's contention that the trial court erred in denying its motion for directed verdict and for judgment notwithstanding the verdict, since a determination in UMW's favor on this issue would finally resolve the controversy. The question presented by this phase of the case is whether in the circumstances of this case the union is exempt from liability under the antitrust laws. We think the answer is clearly in the negative and that the union's motions were correctly denied.

The antitrust laws do not bar the existence and operation of labor unions as such. Moreover, § 20 of the Clayton Act and § 4 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act permit a union, acting alone, to engage in the conduct therein specified without violating the Sherman Act. *United States* v. *Hutcheson,* 312 U.S. 219; *United States* v. *International Hod Carriers Council,* 313 U.S. 539, affirming per curiam, 37 F. Supp. 191 (D.C.N.D. Ill. 1941); *United States* v. *American Federation of Musicians,* 318 U.S. 741, affirming per curiam, 47 F. Supp. 304 (D.C.N.D. Ill. 1942).

But neither § 20 nor § 4 expressly deals with arrangements or agreements between unions and employers. Neither section tells us whether any or all such arrangements or agreements are barred or permitted by the antitrust laws. Thus Hutcheson itself stated:

"So long as a union acts in its self-interest and does not combine with non-labor groups, the licit and the illicit under § 20 are not to be distinguished by any judgment regarding the wisdom or unwisdom, the rightness or wrongness, the selfishness or unselfishness of the end of which the particular union activities are the means." 312 U.S., at 232.

And in *Allen-Bradley* v. *Local Union No. 3, IBEW,* 325 U.S. 797, this Court made explicit what had been merely a qualifying expression in Hutcheson and held that "when the unions participated with a combination of business men who had complete power to eliminate all competition among themselves and to prevent all competition from others, a situation was created not included within the exemptions of the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts." Id., at 809. See also *United Brotherhood of Carpenters* v. *United States,* 330 U.S. 395, 398–400; *United States* v. *Employing Plasterers Assn.,* 347 U.S. 186, 190. Subsequent cases have applied the Allen-Bradley doctrine to such combinations without regard to whether they found expression in a collective bargaining agreement, *United Brotherhood of Carpenters* v. *United States, supra;* see *Teamsters Union* v. *Oliver,* 358 U.S. 283, 296, and even though the mechanism for effectuating the purpose of the combination was an agreement on wages, see *Adams Dairy Co.* v. *St. Louis Dairy Co.,* 260 F. 2d 46 (C.A. 8th Cir. 1958), or on hours of work, *Philadelphia Record Co.* v. *Manufacturing Photo-Engravers Assn.,* 155 F. 2d 799 (C.A. 3d Cir. 1946).

If the UMW in this case, in order to protect its wage scale by maintaining employer income, had presented a set of prices at which the mine operators would be required to sell their coal, the union and the employers who happened to agree could not successfully defend this contract provision if it were challenged under the antitrust laws by the United States or by some party injured by the arrangement. Cf. *Allen-Bradley* v. *Local Union No. 3, IBEW,* 325 U.S. 797; *United States* v. *Borden Co.,* 308 U.S. 188, 203–205; *Lumber Prods. Assn.* v. *United States,* 144 F. 2d 546, 548 (C.A. 9th Cir. 1944), aff'd on this issue *sub nom. Brotherhood of Carpenters* v. *United States,* 330 U.S. 395, 398–400; *Las Vegas Merchant Plumbers Assn.* v. *United States,* 210 F. 2d 732 (C.A. 9th Cir. 1954), cert. denied, 348 U.S. 817; *Local 175, IBEW* v. *United States,* 219 F. 2d 431 (C.A. 6th Cir. 1955), cert. denied, 349 U.S. 917. In such a case, the restraint on the product market is direct and immediate, is of the type characteristically deemed unreasonable under the Sherman Act and the union gets from the promise nothing more concrete than a hope for better wages to come.

Likewise, if as is alleged in this case, the union became a party to a collusive bidding arrangement designed to drive Phillips and others from the TVA spot market, we think any claim to exemption from antitrust liability would be frivolous at best. For this reason alone the motions of the unions were properly denied.

A major part of Phillips' case, however, was that the union entered into a conspiracy with the large operators to impose the agreed upon wage and royalty scales upon the smaller, nonunion operators, regardless of their ability to pay and regardless of whether or not the union represented the employees of these companies, all for the purpose of eliminating them from the industry, limiting production and pre-empting the market for the large, unionized operators. The UMW urges that since such an agreement concerned wage standards, it is exempt from the antitrust laws.

It is true that wages lie at the very heart of those subjects about which employers and unions must bargain and the law contemplates agreements on wages not only between individual employers and a union but agreements between the union and employers in a multi-employer bargaining unit. *Labor Board* v. *Truck Drivers Union,* 353 U.S. 87, 94–96. The union benefit from the wage scale agreed upon is direct and concrete and the effect on the product market, though clearly present, results from the elimination of competition based on wages among the employers in the bargaining unit, which is not the kind of restraint Congress intended the Sherman Act to proscribe. *Apex Hosiery* v. *Leader,* 310 U.S. 469, 503–504; see *Adams Dairy Co.* v. *St. Louis Dairy Co.,* 260 F. 2d 46 (C.A. 8th Cir. 1958). We think it beyond question that a union may conclude a wage agreement for the multi-employer bargaining unit without violating the antitrust laws and that it may as a matter of its own policy, and not by agreement with all or part of the employers of that unit, seek the same wages from other employers.

This is not to say that an agreement resulting from union-employer negotiations is automatically exempt from Sherman Act scrutiny simply because the negotiations involve a compulsory subject of bargaining, regardless of the subject or the form and content of the agreement. Unquestionably the Board's demarcation of the bounds of the duty to bargain has great relevance to any consideration of the sweep of labor's antitrust immunity, for we are concerned here with harmonizing the Sherman Act with the national policy expressed in the National Labor Relations Act of promoting "the peaceful settlement of industrial disputes by subjecting labor-management controversies to the mediatory influence of negotiation," *Fibreboard Paper Prods. Corp.* v. *Labor Board*, 379 U.S. 203, 211. But there are limits to what a union or an employer may offer or extract in the name of wages, and because they must bargain does not mean that the agreement reached may disregard other laws. *Teamsters Union* v. *Oliver*, 358 U.S. 283, 296; *Brotherhood of Carpenters* v. *United States*, 330 U.S. 395. 399–400.

---

[1] The parties stipulated that the damages period would include the four-year limitation period, 15 U.S.C. § 15 (1958 ed.), proceding filing of Phillips' cross claim and extend up to December 31, 1958, the date on which Phillips terminated its business.

We have said that a union may make wage agreements with a multi-employer bargaining unit and may in pursuance of its own union interests seek to obtain the same terms from other employers. No case under the antitrust laws could be made out on evidence limited to such union behavior.[2] But we think a union forfeits its exemption from the antitrust laws when it is clearly shown that it has agreed with one set of employers to impose a certain wage scale on other bargaining units. One group of employers may not conspire to eliminate competitors from the industry and the union is liable with the employers if it becomes a party to the conspiracy. This is true even though the unions' part in the scheme is an undertaking to secure the same wages, hours or other conditions of employment from the remaining employers in the industry.

We do not find anything in the national labor policy that conflicts with this conclusion. This Court has recognized that a legitimate aim of any national labor organization is to obtain uniformity of labor standards and that a consequence of such union activity may be to eliminate competition based on differences in such standards. *Apex Hosiery* v. *Leader*, 310 U.S. 469, 503. But there is nothing in the labor policy indicating that the union and the employers in one bargaining unit are free to bargain about the wages, hours and working conditions of other bargaining units or to attempt to settle these matters for the entire industry. On the contrary, the duty to bargain unit by unit leads to a quite different conclusion. The union's obligation to its members would seem best served if the union retained the ability to respond to each bargaining situation as the individual circumstances might warrant, without being strait-jacketed by some prior agreement with the favored employers.

So far as the employer is concerned it has long been the Board's view that an employer may not condition the signing of a collective agreement on the union's organization of a majority of the industry. *American Range Lines, Inc.*, 13 N.L.R.B. 139, 147 (1939); *Samuel Youlin*, 22 N.L.R.B. 879, 885 (1940); *Newton Chevrolet, Inc.*, 37 N.L.R.B. 334, 341 (1941); See *Labor Board* v. *George P. Pilling & Son Co.*, 119 F. 2d 32, 38 (C. A. 3d Cir. 1941). In such cases the obvious interest of the employer is to ensure that acceptance of the union's wage demands will not adversely affect his competitive position. In *American Range Lines, Inc., supra*, the Board rejected that employer interest as a justification for the demand. "[A]n employer cannot lawfully deny his employees the right to bargain collectively through their designated representative in an appropriate unit because he envisions competitive disadvantages accruing from such bargaining." 13 N.L.R.B., at 147. Such an employer condition, if upheld, would clearly reduce the extent of collective bargaining. Thus, in *Newton Chevrolet, Inc., supra*, where it was held a refusal to bargain for the employer to insist on a provision that the agreed contract terms would not become effective until five competitors had signed substantially similar contracts, the Board stated that "[t]here is nothing in the Act to justify the imposition of a duty upon an exclusive bargaining representative to secure an agreement from a majority of an employer's competitors as a condition precedent to the negotiation of an agreement with the employer. To permit individual employers to refuse to bargain collectively until some or all of their competitors had done so clearly would lead to frustration of the fundamental purpose of the Act to encourage the practice of collective bargaining." 37 N.L.R.B., at 341. Permitting insistence on an agreement by the union to attempt to impose a similar contract on other employers would likewise seem to impose a restraining influence on the extent of collective bargaining, for the union could avoid impasse only by surrendering its freedom to act in its own interest vis-a-vis other employers, something it will be unwilling to do in many instances. Once again, the employer's interest is a competitive interest rather than an interest in regulating its own labor relations, and the effect on the union of such an agreement would be to limit the free exercise of the employees' right to engage in concerted activities accordingly to their own views of their self-interest. In sum, we cannot conclude that the national labor policy provides any support for such agreements.

On the other hand, the policy of the antitrust laws is clearly set against employer-union agreements seeking to prescribe labor standards outside the bargaining unit. One could hardly contend, for example, that one group of employers could lawfully demand that the union impose on other employers wages that were significantly higher than those paid by the requesting employers, or a system of computing wages that, because of differences in methods of production, would be more costly to one set of employers than to another. The anticompetitive potential of such a combination is obvious, but is little more severe than what is alleged to have been the purpose and effect of the conspiracy in this case to establish wages at a level that marginal producers could not pay so that they would be driven from the industry. And if the conspiracy presently under attack were declared exempt it would hardly be possible to deny exemption to such avowedly discriminatory schemes.

From the viewpoint of antitrust policy, moreover, all such agreements between a group of employers and a union that the union will seek specified labor standards outside the bargaining unit suffer from a more basic defect, without regard to predatory intention or effect in the particular case. For the salient characteristic of such agreements is that the union surrenders its freedom of action with respect to its bargaining policy. Prior to the agreement the union might seek uniform standards in its own self-interest but would be required to assess in each case the probable costs and gains of a strike or other collective action to that end and thus might conclude that the objective of uniform standards should temporarily give way. After the agreement the union's interest would be bound in each case to that of the favored employer group. It is just such restraints upon the freedom of economic units to act according to their own choice and discretion that run counter to antitrust policy. See *e.g.*, *Associated Press* v. *United States*, 326 U.S. 1, 19; *Fashion Originators' Guild* v. *Federal Trade Comm'n*, 312 U.S. 457, 465; *Anderson* v. *Shipowners Assn.*, 272 U.S. 359, 364–365.

Thus the relevant labor and antitrust policies compel us to conclude that the alleged agreement between UMW and the large operators to secure uniform labor standards throughout the industry, if proved, was not exempt from the antitrust laws.

II

The UMW next contends that the trial court erroneously denied its motion for a new trial based on claimed errors in the admission of evidence.

In *Eastern R. Conf.* v. *Noerr Motors*, 365 U.S. 127, the Court rejected an attempt to base a Sherman Act conspiracy on evidence consisting entirely of activities of competitors seeking to influence public officials. The Sherman Act, it was held, was not intended to bar concerted action of this kind even though the resulting official action damaged other competitors at whom the campaign is aimed. Furthermore, the illegality of the conduct "was not at all affected by any anticompetitive purpose it may have had," id., at 140—even though the "sole purpose in seeking to influence the passage and enforcement of laws was to destroy the truckers as competitors for the long-distance freight business," id., at 138. Nothing could be clearer from the Court's opinion than that anticompetitive purpose did not illegalize the conduct there involved.

We agree with the UMW that both the Court of Appeals and the trial court failed to take proper account of the *Noerr* case. In approving the instructions of the trial court with regard to the approaches of the union and the operators to the Secretary of Labor and to the TVA officials, the Court of Appeals considered Noerr as applying only to conduct "unaccompanied by purpose or intent to further a conspiracy to violate a statute. It is the illegal purpose or intent inherent in the conduct which vitiates the conduct which would otherwise be legal." 325 F. 2d, at 817. Noerr shields from the Sherman Act a concerted effort to influence public officials regardless of intent or purpose. The Court of Appeals, however, would hold the conduct illegal depending upon proof of an illegal purpose.

The instructions of the trial court to the jury exhibit a similar infirmity. The jury was instructed that the approach to the Secretary of Labor was legal unless part of a conspiracy to drive small operators out of business and that the approach to the TVA was not a violation of the antitrust laws "unless the parties so urged the TVA to modify its policies in buying coal for the purpose of driving the small operators out of business." If, therefore, the jury determined the requisite anticompetitive purpose to be present, it was free to find an illegal conspiracy based solely on the Walsh-Healy and TVA episodes, or in any event to attribute illegality to these acts as part of a general plan to eliminate Phillips and other distributors similarly situated. Neither finding, however, is permitted by Noerr for the reasons stated in that case. Joint efforts to influence public officials do not violate the antitrust laws even though intended to eliminate competition. Such conduct is not illegal, either standing alone or as part of a broader scheme itself violative of the Sherman Act. The jury should have been so instructed and, given the obviously telling nature of this evidence, we cannot hold this lapse to be mere harmless error.[3]

---

[2] Unilaterally, and without agreement with any employer group to do so, a union may adopt a uniform wage policy and seek vigorously to implement it even though it may suspect that some employers cannot effectively compete if they are required to pay the wage scale demanded by the union. The union need not gear its wage demands to those which the weakest units in the industry can afford to pay. Such union conduct is not alone sufficient evidence to maintain a union-employer conspiracy charge under the Sherman Act. There must be additional direct or indirect evidence of the conspiracy. There was, of course, other evidence in this case, but we indicate no opinion as to its sufficiency.

There is another reason for remanding this case for further proceedings in the lower courts. It is clear under *Noerr* that Phillips could not collect any damages under the Sherman Act for any injury which it suffered from the action of the Secretary of Labor. The conduct of the union and the operators did not violate the Act, the action taken to set a minimum wage for government purchases of coal was the act of a public official who is not claimed to be a co-conspirator, and the jury should have been instructed, as Phillips requested, to exclude any damages which Phillips may have suffered as a result of the Secretary's Walsh-Healy determinations.[4] See also *American Banana Co.* v. *United Fruit Co.*, 213 U.S. 347, 358; *Angle* v. *Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha R. Co.*, 151 U.S. 1, 16–21; *Okefenokee Rural Elec. Mem. Corp.* v. *Florida P. & L. Co.*, 214 F. 2d 413, 418 (C.A. 5th Cir. 1954). The trial court, however, admitted evidence concerning the Walsh-Healy episodes for "whatever bearing it may have on the overall picture" and told the jury in its final instructions to include in the verdict all damages resulting directly from any act which was found to be part of the conspiracy. The effect this may have had on the jury is reflected by the statement of the Court of Appeals that the jury could reasonably conclude "that the wage determination for the coal industry under the Walsh-Healy Act and the dumping of West Kentucky coal on the TVA spot market materially and adversely affected the operation of Phillips in the important TVA market . . . ," 325 F. 2d at 815, and that "this minimum wage determination prevented Phillips from bidding on the TVA term market * * *," id., at 815.[5]

The judgment is reversed and the case remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

It is so ordered.

THE LARAMIE BOOMERANG AND AMERICAN CRITICS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, one of the most cogent editorials on the Vietnam question that it has been my privilege to read appeared in the May 21 Laramie Boomerang. The editorial deals with the relative values of American involvement in international affairs vis-a-vis Communist involvement.

Headed "U.S. Critics Need History Lesson," the editorial asks the very trenchant and relevant question, "What nations, what peoples, are free today as a result of Communist support in the realization of their nationalistic aspirations?" The editorial then examines the Philippines and Japan, both of which were occupied by the United States, and both of which today are free, independent, and prosperous nations because we gave them independence as opposed to the slavery which accompanies Communist subjugation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Laramie Boomerang be printed in the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CRITICS NEED HISTORY LESSON

Either history is wrong or there has been a profound alteration of the American character in our time, as reflected in our dealings with other nations.

To listen to some critics of Government policy, in southeast Asia particularly, the United States is pursuing a course of blatant neo-imperialism. Under the guise of defending democracy, we are—they charge—pushing to the brink of war in a misdirected attempt to extend our national self-interests in a part of the world we don't belong in.

According to one, Prof. George McT. Kahin, an expert on southeast Asia and one of the principal speakers at the recent "first national teach-in" in Washington, the United States has consistently failed "to appreciate the importance of Asian nationalism to work with, rather than against, that powerful force."

We are, he said, driving nationalists throughout Asia into the Communist camp because the Communists have recognized what we blindly ignore.

Whatever elements of truth there may be in such charges, it is possible that the scholars might better serve their ideals and the struggling peoples they are concerned about if they left off castigating the United States for a bit and directed their energies to teaching the world a little modern history.

One question they might well ask on an imaginary examination paper is: What nations, what peoples, are free today as a result of Communist support in the realization of their nationalistic aspirations?

The answer should be as obvious to professors and students of world affairs as it is to the ordinary person who has only a high school education and reads his daily newspaper.

If the question were asked of the United States, the answer would require pages. Two examples leap to the mind in Asia alone—the Philippines and Japan.

The Spanish-American War of 1898 was America's first excursion into global "imperialism." One of the fruits of victory in that war was hegemony over the Philippine Islands.

The ensuing military occupation required years of bloody fighting, in which tens of thousands died, before Filipino guerrillas were subdued. All of the moral charges and military arguments being directed against the United States in Vietnam now could have been made against us in the Philippines then, and many of them were.

Today, the Philippines is a free and independent nation—something it surely would not be had the United States withdrawn in its "legitimate" sphere of interest and stopped interfering with the nationalistic aspirations of certain Filipinos.

In 1945, the United States utterly defeated Japan and imposed and institutionalized, as its conqueror's prerogative, its own ideas of how a country should be governed.

Today, Japan is a free and independent nation, the most advanced in Asia and one of the most respected in the world.

Far from being dominated ideologically by the United States, it is, as a responsible free nation should be, often an outspoken—but constructive—critic of American actions. Far from being bound in economic vassalage to Wall Street imperialists, it is a tough competitor.

Foreigners may forget these and other examples of America's failure to understand nationalistic aspirations.

NATIONAL TRENDS AFFECTING STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, we seldom have an opportunity to stand back from the hectic pace of each day, to examine the sum of our action on individual issues. I often consider longingly the position of commentators, students, and writers who have the good fortune to devote a major portion of their time to examining the effect of the composite of our actions on the long-term well-being of the Nation.

Just recently, Ray Morgan, Kansas correspondent for the Kansas City Star and Times, of Kansas City, Mo., spent several days in Washington, discussing with a wide range of interested persons the national trends which affect the integrity of the States and local governments in our Federal system. The result of Mr. Morgan's very able analysis was published in a four-part series, from June 1 to June 4, in the Kansas City Times.

Mr. Morgan is a very able writer and student of any subject he undertakes. His contribution to better public understanding of the problems of intergovernmental relations deserves the careful attention of all who are concerned with our system of government. I ask unanimous consent that the series of articles by Mr. Morgan be printed at this point in the RECORD.

---

[3] It would of course still be within the province of the trial judge to admit this evidence, if he deemed it probative and not unduly prejudicial, under the "establish judicial rule of evidence that testimony of prior or subsequent transactions, which for some reason are barred from forming the basis for a suit, may nevertheless be introduced if it tends reasonably to show the purpose and character of the particular transactions under scrutiny. *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States*, 221 U.S. 1, 46–47; *United States* v. *Reading Co.*, 253 U.S. 26, 43–44." *Federal Trade Comm'n* v. *Cement Institute*, 333 U.S. 683, 705; see also *Heicke* v. *United States*, 227 U.S. 131, 145; *American Medical Assn.* v. *United States*, 130 F. 2d 233, 250–252 (C.A.D.C. Cir. 1942), aff'd, 317 U.S. 519 (certiorari limited to other issues).

[4] By contrast, in *Continental Ore Co.* v. *Union Carbide & Carbon Corp.*, 370 U.S. 690, we held that the acts of a wartime purchasing agent appointed by the Canadian Government could be proved as part of the conspiracy and as an element in computing damages. The purchasing agent, however, was not a public official but the wholly owned subsidiary of an American corporation alleged to be a principal actor in the conspiracy. The acts complained of had been performed at the direction of the purchasing agent's American parent and there was "no indication that the Controller or any other official within the structure of the Canadian Government approved or would have approved of joint efforts to monopolize the production and sale of vanadium or directed that purchases from [the plaintiff] be stopped." 370 U.S., at 706. That case is wholly dissimilar from both Noerr and the present case.

[5] This latter conclusion regarding the term market would seem doubly erroneous as Phillips had virtually conceded, in the course of offering evidence respecting bids of the alleged conspirators on the term market, that it was claiming no damages from its exclusion from the term market, a market it never had any immediate prospect of entering. The trial court ruled that the proffered testimony was inadmissible on the damages phase of the case.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Times, June 1, 1965]

States Lagging as U.S. Expands—With Federal Government Spending Widely, Their Role Decreases

(By Ray Morgan, the Star's Kansas correspondent)

Washington.—Have the States and local governments of this country become useless relics of an era when the pace of the Nation was much slower and transportation and communication more difficult?

Are the growing millions of dollars being pumped by the Federal Government into grants-in-aid programs in the States, such as in Kansas and Missouri, beginning to forecast the day when the Federal Government will be the sole proprietor of government function?

EYED BY MANY

These questions are getting a great deal of attention these days from President Lyndon B. Johnson and his staff, the Congress, the organizations here which represent the State, and local governments and of private pressure groups which have a special interest in the program.

House and Senate subcommittees on intergovernmental relations, headed by Senator Edmund Muskie, Democrat, of Maine, and Representative L. H. Fountain, Democrat, of North Carolina, are seeking in hearings now underway to determine whether Congress needs to take further legislative action to define the roles.

Some Federal officials are saying privately that State and local governments only impede the goals the Nation has set for itself. Some county and State officials argue that the Federal Government has usurped the powers of the States and local governments.

The issue is nothing new. From the establishment of the Republic, the division of authority and responsibility between the National Government and the States has been debated with fervor.

What has brought this into new and sharper focus is the growing entrance of the Federal Government into such fields as public housing, urban renewal, air and water pollution, water treatment and sewerage facilities and mental health.

SOME NEW FORMS

In some areas, these programs have been channeled through existing governmental units. In others, these have been bypassed in favor of newly created local agencies such as public housing and urban renewal agencies.

This is what has brought into debate at all levels the question of whether the time has not come for Americans, through their elected representatives at all levels, to reexamine their positions to determine how government in a new era of free society can function.

One finds an increasing awareness here in Washington, particularly in view of international and domestic developments since the onset of World War II which have given special importance to the structure of this Federal system.

The sequence of international crises has brought into sharp focus the contrast between the Federal form, which has powers divided among the parts, and unitarian systems under which all public powers stem from the Central Government.

ASK MORE SERVICES

At home, the Government has expanded its role with problems of national economic growth and stability, with accelerated population mobility, particularly into and around large urban areas, and with the insistence of the voters on more and improved governmental services.

W. R. Coleman, a former Missouri State official and now Director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations created by Congress, is one of the most articulate spokesmen on the crisis.

"Growth and complexity of our modern life and governmental activity has added greatly to the variety and extent of interaction among the several levels of government," Coleman said.

"The increased interaction has expanded opportunities for actual accomplishment of a greater range of intergovernmental cooperation. However, such expansion of governmental activities at all levels has correspondingly increased the number of actual and potential frictions within our Federal system.

"In the process, municipal and State officials have become increasingly more concerned with intergovernmental relations. Similar attention also has emanated from a succession of recent Congresses and Presidents."

HELD MISSOURI JOB

Coleman, who holds degrees in public administration and political science, served as director of the merit system for Missouri following his graduation and in State governments of Louisiana and Oregon. He also served as assistant director of the National Science Foundation before becoming director of the commission when it was established in 1959 under President Dwight D. Eisenhower. His mother still lives in Callao, Mo.

"During the administration of President Truman, the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the Hoover Commission, addressed itself to the Federal-State relationship," he said.

"It concentrated especially here with reference to administration of Federal grants-in-aid programs. In one of its reports it recommended that a permanent agency 'be created with primary responsibility for study information and guidance in the field of Federal-State relationships.' "

In 1953, President Eisenhower again called for a thorough review of intergovernmental relations and the Congress responded by authorizing the creation of a commission made up of persons appointed by the President and designated Members of Congress.

CHICAGO MAN AT HELM

"This commission came to be known by the name of the chairman, the late Meyer Kestnbaum of Chicago," Coleman said. "In 1955, the Kestnbaum Commission issued its formal report, the most comprehensive review of intergovernmental relations since the adoption of the Constitution. That resulted in the creation of this commission."

The commission, on which John Anderson, Jr., of Kansas, served during the time he was Governor, has looked into the matters thoroughly and systematically. What Coleman sees ahead for the States as a result is what the Navy has expressed as "shape up or ship out."

"We need the States, but they must modernize if they survive," Coleman said in his office at 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue.

"They must reexamine and update their constitutions, provide incentives for cooperative efforts between cities and counties, allow cities and counties to band together to create authorities to handle certain functions of Government, and help local areas to obtain a certain degree of autonomy to deal with problems."

[From the Kansas City Times, June 2, 1965]

States Pay for Their Apathy—Failure To Act Invited Federal Expansion, Officials Agree

(By Ray Morgan, the Star's Kansas correspondent)

Washington.—Insensitivity by the States to the needs of their own areas and their refusal to finance solutions adequately brought on the crisis that resulted in the Federal entrance into new fields.

This is the consensus of official groups connected with State governments such as the Council of State Governments, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Federal officials, President Lyndon B. Johnson, and Members of Congress.

BEGINNING TO SEE JOB AHEAD

There are signs the States realize they face going the way of the dinosaurs unless they provide their own solutions. Everywhere here there is a great scurrying by State officials to show they want to be helpful partners.

As a spokesman for the Council of State Governments said: "Strong State leadership will determine its role within the Federal system in influencing the character of development within its boundaries."

There is an aroused public concern being indicated by citizen groups to help the sagging States regain their feet to offset what appeared to be a near breakdown of State influence. This comes in the face of growing Federal action to fill the vacuum created by the failure of the States to act.

One such group, the Citizens Conference on State Government, is Kansas City-oriented, with Homer Wadsworth, president of the Kansas City school board and director of the Kansas City Association of Trusts and Foundations, as the chairman.

LEADERS AMONG TRUSTEES

Its influential members include as trustees, such men as Benson Ford, of the Ford Motor Co.; Clarence Shuman, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and Neil Haggerty, of the AFL–CIO Building Trades Department, who are devoting their efforts to helping the State governments.

William G. Coleman, executive director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Affairs, said the group had applied for grants from the Ford and Carnegie Foundations to help it in its studies, and that the commission and Members of Congress were watching its activities.

"The idea was originally incorporated by George Morgan, a Kansas City lawyer and a former member of the Missouri General Assembly; Dr. Warren Peterson, of Community Studies, Inc., of Kansas City, and Horace Sheldon, of the Ford Motor Co.," Coleman said.

Morgan is temporary director of the group and the trustees will meet in July in Detroit to consider appointment of a full-time director. Its primary concern will be to beef up State legislative functions to make State government more efficient.

A FORD GRANT FOR RESEARCH

Another indication of the growing concern for the States is a similar grant recently issued by the Ford Foundation to Terry Sanford, former Governor of North Carolina, to engage in independent research on the growing crisis of State governments.

A Federal economist, Laslow Ecker-Racz, is quick to point out that State and local governments still bear the major share of the cost of government as compared with the share of the Federal Government.

Ecker-Racz, who is assistant director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations here, has large multicolored graphs of 2 years of research by his staff. The charts show graphically how State and local governments have had sharp rises in expenditures to meet the crisis.

"The problem, of course, is that both State and local governments waited too long to start," Ecker-Racz said.

STATES FAILED TO ACT

"Local groups and urban areas tried to get the States to try to do something about problems such as public housing, urban renewal, and air and water pollution. For one reason or another the States were reluctant to act.

"These groups conceived the idea of going to the Congress, the President or Federal agencies with their problems. In the more politically oriented atmosphere in Washington where the value of votes is recognized, they found a ready ear and a willing purse. That was the beginning."

Another factor, of course, was the unwillingness of the States and the legislatures to provide the funds. They have been too prone to look at the short-range tax rate. As one Member of Congress said at recent hearings on intergovernmental relations: "All of the States would have begun to act if they could have found an easy way to get the funds."

STATE, LOCAL COSTS SKYROCKET

The statistics prepared by Ecker-Racz show, ironically enough, a growing dependence on State and local governments to meet costs compared to the Federal Government. State and local costs of government rose from $51 billion in 1948 to about $201 billion this year.

Federal costs of government rose, on the other hand, from around $43 billion in 1948 to around $107 billion in 1965.

In the same period, Federal debt limits remained fairly constant, moving from about $275 billion to just over $300 billion. In the same period from 1948 to 1965, State and local debt soared drastically from just under $20 billion to more than $100 billion.

All over the Nation, States are under pressure from their own citizens to revamp their constitutions in the light of modern-day needs and to reapportion legislatures. Federal officials and Members of Congress warn, however, that reapportionment will only get the reins of government back in the hands of the majorities and will not bring any immediate panaceas.

Perhaps the greatest thing on the side of State survival are its supporters as an equal instrument of the Federal system. Representative ROBERT ELLSWORTH, Republican, of Kansas, for instance, points out that many of the programs which became Federal responsibility were experimented with and perfected at State levels.

PULL FOR STATE SOVEREIGNTY

There are indications that some groups are trying to pull the States back by their bootstraps. As John C. Davidson, vice president of the government finance division of the National Association of Manufacturers, said at House and Senate intergovernmental relations subcommittees here last week:

"We do not believe that too much stress can be placed on the importance of again focusing public attention on the strategic position of the States in our open society. In our opinion, it is time to close down the bypasses of State governments in dealings between the Federal and local governments, and give renewed recognition to the dependence of our system on strong and resourceful State governments.

"In short, we believe that in this era a save-our-States approach should be the key to resolving problems of intergovernmental relations. We believe an increase of pace in redressing the balance of the Federal system is needed for its greater effectiveness and that every effort should be made to encourage the States and their localities to accept and discharge greater responsibility for the performance of public services appropriate to their jurisdiction."

[From the Kansas City Times, June 3, 1965]

LOCAL LEADERS SHED SHACKLES—ARCHAIC STRUCTURES FALL AS THEY STREAMLINE FOR MODERN LIFE

(By Ray Morgan, the Star's Kansas correspondent)

WASHINGTON.—It may well be that the decade from 1965 to 1975 may be known in Federal, State, and local government relations as the decade of the three R's—reapportionment, reorganization, and revitalization.

Already the leaders of such local government units as the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, and the National Mayors Conference are rushing here to convince Federal officials they are casting off their archaic structures for progress.

KANSAS IS EXAMPLE

States that see the handwriting on the wall are revising their constitutions to give greater autonomy to counties and cities to deal directly with pressing problems and tax needs. State legislatures, as in Kansas, are providing authority to local governments to cooperate with each other in solving issues.

The reason, of course, is that Congress has allowed the Federal Government to create its own local agencies, bypassing the existing city and county units, in such areas as public housing, sponsored by the late Senator Robert Taft; urban renewal and now the antipoverty programs.

One of the most articulate spokesmen for the cause of revamping and revitalizing local government to give it the stature and thinking to deal with domestic problems is a bright young man, Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director of the National Association of Counties here.

"It certainly appears to us that the Supreme Court's 'one man, one vote' rule is likely to stick and bring in its wake not only legislative reapportionment, but the precious byproducts of reorganization and revitalization of State and local government," Hillenbrand said.

"This is almost certainly the decade of decision for the future role of State and local governments in our Federal system. Our hope is that when the dust settles counties will emerge as very powerful and forceful partners in the family of State and local governments."

MUST CHANGE THINKING

One of the first things citizens must do, Hillenbrand believes, if they are not to go the route of default to local Federal administrative agencies is to rid local governments of "retired thinking," a term he uses to describe the obsessive preoccupation with holding down the local property tax.

"What has happened in many instances is that most of us seem to be too busy making a living and we have let only the very wealthy or the retired who have the time to take over county government," Hillenbrand said.

Edward G. Michaelian, an industrialist who has taken an interest in local government by being elected to the governing board of Westchester County, N.Y., and who is president of N.A.C.O., has brought definite ideas to Washington on the problems of local government.

One of his pet ideas is that the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a bipartisan group created by Congress under President Dwight D. Eisenhower, be expanded to include private citizens of the stature of Harry S. Truman and Eisenhower.

"We are now in the age of partnership and governmental togetherness," Michaelian said. "In modern America, we are increasingly aware that the concept of separate levels of government, operating with exclusive sources of revenue, is now obsolete. We have embarked on bold national partnership programs, designed to bring the combined resources of the Federal, State, and local governments to bear in solving basic problems.

STRESS ON PARTNERSHIP

"Our purpose is to support vigorously the partnership programs; to call attention to some of the counties' problems in partnership and finally to suggest ways and means of increasing the effectiveness of the Federal-State-local partnership. There is special need to strengthen both the financial and policymakng roles of local government in national programs."

To accomplish these objectives, the county officials, through their organization, have submitted a white paper to Congress and President Lyndon B. Johnson calling for the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to be expanded and undertake a study of Federal, State, and local government financing; that policymaking boards on all interrelated Federal programs be expanded to include State and local government representatives and that the White House name a staff member to deal with local government problems.

A hopeful sign that the States and the local governments are becoming increasingly concerned about regaining their partnership role effectively in the intergovernmental partnership is that the National Association of Counties, the National Governors Conference, and the Council of State Governments will meet jointly for the first time to discuss the problem early this fall.

AFRAID OF BEING LEFT OUT

At a recent meeting of the National League of Cities at the Washington Hilton Hotel here, Allen Pritchard, former executive of the League of Kansas Municipalities and now administrative assistant to Senator JAMES B. PEARSON, Republican, of Kansas, said the cities have now swung full pendulum from turning for help to the Federal Government instead of the States to finding themselves concerned over being bypassed by Federal agencies.

Pritchard said national planners have begun to question the ability of transitory local political leadership to deliver the city vote and are instead turning to other types of voting blocs.

"I would warn, however," Pritchard said, "against those who often appear as champions of the city but who, in fact, use local government as a mechanism of defense—sort of a Maginot line against what they refer to as 'Federal centralism.' Their tear-shedding for cities is used to block Federal urban-oriented programs and does not represent a constructive attitude toward local government or any real faith in cities as institutions. Instead, it simply accepts cities as something less evil than that which is proposed.

"Constantly frustrating Congress and the executive agencies is administrative confusion at the local level. There is constant complaint about the proliferation of local government. With some considerable justification, they question the capacity, legal, administrative, and financial—of many of these units to deal effectively with these problems.

"MUST SPOT PROBLEMS

"The thrust of both executive and congressional planning is, therefore, to identify a national problem, develop an answer and then worry about how to work out an administrative arrangement which respects the States and tolerates local government confusion."

It could not be clearer. Citizens who want, as most Americans do, a voice at the local level must bring the structure of city and county government out of the 18th century into modern 20th century America.

[From the Kansas City Times, June 4, 1965]

UNION CONCEPT FACES EROSION—THOUGHTFUL MEN IN ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT SEEK A SOLUTION

(By Ray Morgan, the Star's Kansas correspondent)

WASHINGTON.—The quiet crisis has replaced the rattling rifle fire and booming mortars of Antietam and Shiloh of 100 years ago in the effort to preserve and strengthen the Federal Union, but the issues are still as clear and vibrant.

Out of the bright minds of such men as Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and Alexander Hamilton came the concept of a union of sovereign States willing to the National Government the rights to protect certain universal freedoms and provide certain national services of mutual need.

Ever since, free men have debated in taverns, on the floors of Congress, and in political conventions the meanings of this concept, the roles of the State and local governments on one hand and the Federal Government on the other.

MOVE TO CENTRALISM

After the bloody Civil War of 1861 to 1865 was fought on this issue, the pendulum of Government began to swing toward a stronger and stronger National Government as the States and local governments, under the Union concept, began to abdicate more and more responsibility.

Now, however, there is a growing concern here and across the Nation by the Members of Congress, President Lyndon Johnson and organizations of other units of Government, that there is a danger that the State and local governments may wither as partners and die from inactivity.

No one wants to talk about this crisis as one of States rights, because as one Member of Congress said recently in the National Capitol Building, "It is unfortunate that the term has become virtually synonymous in recent years with the building of political prisons for Negroes."

Instead it is a genuine awareness by Senators and Representatives, who owe their existence to the voters in their respective States; President Johnson; Dwight D. Eisenhower, and others that the concept of Government must be changed from one of isolated layers into one of cooperative partners.

TASK FOR HUMPHREY

President Johnson has begun to talk about the partnership in terms of "creative federalism." Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, who knows the problems both from his role as a U.S. Senator and as a former mayor of Minneapolis, has been named to work with cities and counties.

One Federal official said in discussions this week: "We've got to stop thinking about our Federal system as a layer cake with each layer separated in its own compartment, but as a marble cake with the layers intertwined in one equal unit."

The concern of the Congress for the future of Federal, State, and local government relations is shown in the new series of hearings being conducted by the House and Senate Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittees, headed by Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, and Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina.

Dr. Walter Heller, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers under Johnson and the late John F. Kennedy, has suggested that Federal taxing resources utilized to raise funds for State and local governments.

ANDERSON HAS PLAN

John Anderson, Jr., former Governor of Kansas, told the subcommittees last week that he thought Congress should explore such a concept. He said his experience had indicated States were reluctant to enter certain areas only because of a lack of funds.

William G. Coleman, Executive Director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations the last 5 years, has become one of the most articulate spokesmen on the roles of the three levels of government.

The Commission has served to bring the issue into focus, with its membership of three U.S. Senators, three U.S. House Members, three from the Federal executive branch, four Governors, three State legislators, three county officials, four mayors, and three public members.

An example of the renewed concern of the States for a partnership role is indicated by the current effort to establish a New England Interstate Planning Commission to coordinate planning regarding the physical, economic, and social resources of the New England States.

BILLS MUST COINCIDE

This Commission would undertake pertinent studies and make practical recommendations for achieving these goals. Consistent legislation in the six States involved is naturally necessary, and a bill has been drafted which the six Governors have approved. The bill was developed out of the deliberation and cooperation of three New England organizations and the Council of State Governments.

County governments are receiving renewed interest because of their role, and new demands are being made for their efficient operation. This stems from the fact that even in the largest cities the county has responsibility for many of the most important functions, such as welfare, care of the aged, mental health, juvenile matters, courts and penal administration.

The trend to the suburbs has brought the urban county face to face with becoming a regional city providing a host of municipal services once the sole responsibility of cities.

Out of all these discussions, both from the standpoint of the State and local government officials who come here and from Federal officials administering the programs, these seem to be basic facts:

Federal grants-in-aid must continue to be used to encourage the State and local governments to overhaul their machinery and undertake reforms that will make them more effective tools in the Federal partnership of government.

State governments must continue the processes now underway to revamp their constitutions to bring them into the modern era of transportation and communications, give more power to city and county governments, cooperate in regional projects and provide regional planning among themselves.

State and local governments must be given a greater voice in determining domestic policies through congressional action to require that Federal programs be administered by intergovernmental boards which include them, in the fashion of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Regulations.

County governments must reorient themselves as government units of the future by replacing sole authorities of boards of judges or commissioners with an administrative executive such as mayors in city governments and by becoming active, vibrant coordinated area units.

The time has come for an overall approach to the problem of government financing with a goal of finding the most efficient way of channeling the share of gross national product needed to finance Federal, State and local administration.

SPUR FOR ACTION

There is a growing awareness at all levels of enlightened leadership that a government of freemen is only the vehicle for doing cooperatively what they cannot do for themselves individually. This leadership is attempting to galvanize the laggards into a new preservation of our constitutional concept.

Perhaps the best summation lies in the story of a visit home by the great Daniel Webster to one of his New England towns. As he walked along the street, a woman stopped him on the sidewalk and asked:

"How goes it with the Union, Mr. Webster?"

"It goes well with the Union, madam," Webster is reported to have replied. "It will as long as freemen care."

APPOINTMENT OF SAMUEL C. JACKSON TO EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, recently the President appointed members to the Equal Opportunity Commission, created by Congress by means of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Among those appointed to the Commission was Samuel C. Jackson, of Topeka, Kans.

I compliment the President for his selection, and was happy to be able to endorse Mr. Jackson's nomination. He is an outstanding civic leader, a respected attorney, a fine public servant, and a revered leader of his race.

On May 13, 1965, the Topeka State Journal, in a lead editorial, commented on Mr. Jackson's appointment. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Topeka (Kans.) State Journal, May 13, 1965]

A GOOD MAN FOR THE JOB

President Johnson made a wise decision when he nominated Samuel C. Jackson, a Topekan, to be a member of the newly created Equal Opportunity Commission. Jackson has served Kansas and the local community in a number of ways, and he will be serving the Nation in his new job.

The Commission was created by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to administer title 7 of the act prohibiting racial discrimination in employment. Jackson's background should qualify him to be a member of the Commission.

Since 1962, Jackson has been institutional attorney for the Kansas State Department of Social Welfare. He is president of the Topeka branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and has been a regional attorney for the NAACP. He also has been active in collegiate, State and county Republican organizations. A Topekan since 1943, Jackson is a graduate of Washburn University School of Law.

"I recognize the law must be enforced vigorously, but with restraint so the rights of the employer as well as minority groups will be fully and equally protected," Jackson said upon announcement of his nomination. His statement was typical of the way he has functioned in the past.

As president of the Topeka branch of the NAACP, Jackson has directed a number of civil rights demonstrations and programs in the community. He has been firm in his pursuit of the goals of minority groups and fair to the majority. He can be expected to conduct himself similarly in his new, full-time job of advancing the cause of civil rights on the national level.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senate is considering one of the most important bills in the history of U.S. foreign assistance. The bill before us would end the current foreign aid program by June 30, 1967. This bill requests a sweeping 12-month search for a new

U.S. aid program. Meanwhile, it would authorize $3.35 billion dollars for each of the final 2 years in the current program.

If this bill is enacted in the same general form as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate will have initiated the first broad-scale reevaluation of foreign aid since the current program was adopted in 1961.

In my opinion, this bill does not suggest that there is something wrong with the basic principle of foreign aid. The principle of foreign aid is as right today as it was in 1947 when President Harry Truman launched the Marshall plan—America's enormously successful effort to revive war-torn Europe. As the Foreign Relations Committee states in its report on the bill now before us:

> Some kind of foreign assistance program is essential to the national interests of the United States.

Mr. President, at this very moment American boys are fighting in the jungles, skies, and seas of southeast Asia. They are fighting to preserve the right of all less-developed Asian countries to grow and prosper without the constant threat of Communist domination.

American boys are being killed in action. American boys are being wounded. If we permit poverty, disease, starvation, and economic instability to continue elsewhere in the world, I do not doubt for a minute that American boys will again have to fight Communist aggression.

Are we going to fight communism with our dollars or only with our American boys?

While communism breeds on poverty and despair, American aid can bring hope to millions of underprivileged peoples. Either we keep helping these peoples in less-developed countries to stand on their own feet, or we are going to have to keep sending American boys to fight. I would much rather send American technicians, American food, and American dollars to build a more peaceful and prosperous world.

The great question this bill raises is: What aid program will best advance American interests in future years?

The establishment of a Foreign Aid Planning Committee, called for in this bill, could help us answer that question. Of course, President Johnson has already had our current program under review. Not long after he became President he appointed a high-level committee to study U.S. foreign aid. But without the long period for study recommended by this bill, it has been difficult to take a completely new look at the full scope of U.S. aid operations.

In my remaining time, Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate the tremendous effort our country is making to provide technical assistance abroad. Title II—Technical Cooperation and Development Grants—and title IV—Alliance for Progress Grants—would authorize $280 million for U.S. technical assistance in fiscal year 1966. This amounts to around 12 percent of the total U.S. nonmilitary aid authorization. In addition the Agency for International Development will contribute first, $65 million to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance and the United Nations Special Fund; and, second, $5 million for United Nations technical and operational assistance to the Congo.

When combined with funds recovered from earlier programs, titles II and IV would provide $92 million for Africa, $70 million for Latin America, $46 million for the Near East and south Asia, $34 million for the Far East, and $59 million for research, program support, and interregional activities. The Foreign Relations Committee this year found these technical assistance programs "among the most praiseworthy and hopeful elements in the Foreign Assistance Act."

U.S. technical assistance concentrates on building the human resources necessary for economic development. Our programs reach out to countries desperately in need of technical specialists in education, food and agriculture, health and sanitation. We provide American know-how and training for the local administrators of schools and universities, agricultural extension services, public health systems, trade associations, labor unions, and cooperatives.

We are today beginning to meet the vast skilled manpower shortage which plagues so many less-developed countries.

In around 40 less-developed countries, where development is in its earliest stages, more than 50 percent of U.S. aid is for technical assistance. In 25 countries—primarily in Africa—all U.S. aid is for technical assistance. Today, over 5,000 American experts are working abroad giving personal, face-to-face attention to the burning needs of thousands of vital projects. Meanwhile, approximately 9,000 citizens from less-developed countries are training at U.S. business firms and industries, colleges and universities, hospitals and local, State and Federal Government agencies.

The task of building new institutions and of training an adequate number of new technicians is exceedingly difficult. It takes a long time. So we must renew our determination to continue these projects until our objectives are achieved. We must not be satisfied with short-run technical assistance programs whose results are lost in a few years. Our impact must be made strong and long lasting.

I am particularly pleased to see the recent efforts to improve the ties between the Agency for International Development and our universities and colleges. Approximately 70 U.S. universities and colleges are already performing technical assistance tasks under AID contracts worth around $160 million. This year I am cosponsoring a bill, S. 1212, which would greatly increase Federal assistance to U.S. institutions which are contributing, or wish to contribute, to the U.S. technical assistance efforts abroad.

The U.S. commitment to provide technical assistance is already meeting with a good response from schools and business firms across the country. Every State in the Union is now sharing in the U.S. aid program. I am particularly pleased to note that Missouri is providing an example of what many States are doing to achieve U.S. aid objectives around the world.

Since 1957, for instance, the University of Missouri has been carrying out an extensive program of agricultural assistance in northeast India. By the end of last year, 14 top agricultural experts had been sent to India by the University of Missouri. The university today is concentrating its efforts at India's new Orissa University of Agriculture and Technology. This university was modeled after the U.S. land-grant university.

At the same time, a number of outstanding Indian students are studying agriculture and veterinary science at the University of Missouri at Columbia. Last year, Missouri's Prof. C. R. Meeker launched a program to demonstrate irrigation pumps in a group of Indian villages. Village committees of farmers assisted in the planning of the demonstration program. These demonstrations have already led to the increased use of irrigation pumps throughout the area. New land is being put into production and new crops are being introduced.

Also last year, with the help of the University of Missouri's Dr. J. M. Poehlman, the Orissa University set up an agricultural experiment station. This required the organization of a university farm. Tractors, pumps, and bullock carts were pooled and the crop-weather observatory was included in the plan. Agricultural research is already in progress under the new agricultural experiment station.

One of our biggest successes has been the creation of a system of poultry production. Dr. Quinton Kinder, poultry expert from the University of Missouri, successfully introduced poultry development plans in both Assam and Orissa. Prof. C. R. Meeker, an extension adviser from the University of Missouri, recently reported that:

> Where feed costs for poultry and eggs in the United States run about 50 percent of the cost of production, here (India) it is more nearly 80 to 85 percent. The university is attempting to solve this problem by introducing hybrid maize cultivation during the rabi season. Thousands of acres stand idle following paddy harvest due to lack of irrigation which will be needed for maize production. If irrigation is widely expanded, maize could also become an important crop and make possible the expansion of livestock production on a broad scale.

This is the great challenge of technical assistance.

But as the challenge is great so are the rewards. The Missouri trained Indian who now heads the University of Assam's poultry program wrote:

> The unique services of Professor Kinder to our poultry unit, and the U.S. AID cooperation and dedication of the fine buildings to us, will be written in the letters of gold in our hearts.

Since 1951, U.S. technicians have put in 1,000 man-years of service in India. Over 4,200 Indian trainees have studied in the United States. More than 1,000 of these Indian trainees studied U.S. methods of rural extension, irrigation, seed production, and dairy production.

With the assistance of U.S. experts, over 1.2 million acres of land have been irrigated. Food storage capacity has increased from 75,000 tons in 1925 to more than 3 million tons this year.

U.S. assistance to the Indian national malaria program has practically eliminated a disease which formerly incapacitated 100 million Indian people each year. U.S. technical assistance in this project is coordinated with the World Health Organization.

U.S. technical experts have also played a significant role in the improvement of industrial management in India. Three hundred managers and technicians have received training in the United States. American advisory services resulted in the organization of central mechanical liaison units which insure optimum utilization of $150 million worth of heavy construction equipment.

Technical assistance today is vital. It is necessary before a country can begin the long process of industrialization. It is essential for increasing the food supply where population explosion keeps millions on the verge of starvation.

Through technical assistance Americans develop person-to-person relationships with the recipients of our foreign aid. And in doing so, bonds of friendship are made which may some day be crucial in the paths of many new nations.

Mr. President, I conclude by urging that strong consideration be given in the future to expanding our technical assistance programs. We have a vast abundance of technical skills. We have created the most technically advanced country in the world. Our great system of university education provides the scientific methods with which to meet the world's new challenges and problems.

There have been troubles with administering foreign aid. There has been mismanagement. But we cannot pause. We must correct our mistakes. And then we must get on with the job of helping these nations to stand on their own feet. We must move on, for there is still much to be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 9, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 8 (legislative day of June 7), 1965:

International Atomic Energy Agency

Verne B. Lewis, of Maryland, to be the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency, vice Frank K. Hefner.

In the Air Force

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code:

Maj. Gen. Sam Maddux, Jr., 1561A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph H. Moore, 1836A, Regular Air Force.

The following officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Jr., 555A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Gen. Mark E. Bradley, 552A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Ralph P. Swofford, Jr., 547A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code:

In the grade of general

Lt. Gen. John D. Ryan, 1418A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force, currently serving as general under recess appointment.

Lt. Gen. Kenneth B. Hobson, 616A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, 1336A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

In the grade of lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Horace M. Wade, 1872A, Regular Air Force, currently serving as lieutenant general under recess appointment.

Maj. Gen. Albert P. Clark, 1218A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Lewis L. Mundell, 1286A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John W. Carpenter, III, 1647A, Regular Air Force.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 8 (legislative day of June 7), 1965:

Department of Justice

Floyd R. Gibson, of Missouri, to be U.S. circuit judge, 8th circuit.

James B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years.

John F. Quinn, Jr., of New Mexico, to be U.S. attorney for the district of New Mexico for the term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture:

Acts 10: 38: *He went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed, for God was with Him.*

Almighty God, we turn to Thee in prayer to be inspired to extend a helping hand and a warm heart to all who await the healing touch and the word of hope for the ills of our social order.

May we always keep together and keep in balance our work and worship, our service for God and our service for man, our upward look to Thee and our downward reach to needy mankind.

Inspire us to see our work in its right perspective, realizing that in order to discharge our duties and tasks faithfully we must renew our vision and strength in the nourishing silences of God.

Grant that the cry for social justice may find our hearts responding to that challenge and demand. May the good and better things of life no longer be reserved for the benefit of the few and shut up within the walls of opulence but be scattered broadcast for the poor and needy to share.

Hear us in His name who sought the silent place of prayer whence He emerged with the light of victory in His face and the note of power in His word. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1004. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes;

S. 1516. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes; and

S. 2089. An act to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to continue hearings during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Michigan if this is the Thompson subcommittee?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Yes, it is, Mr. Speaker. The ranking minority member of the committee joined in asking for this permission.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], did call me to say that he had no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PATENTS AND COPYRIGHTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Patents and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary have permission to sit during general debate on June 9, 10, and 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that the bills which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, had planned to call up under unanimous consent today will be called up under unanimous consent tomorrow.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8775) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited not to exceed 3 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 124]

Andrews, George W.
Bell
Bonner
Bow
Brown, Ohio
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Cederberg
Clawson, Del
Conyers
Dorn
Evins, Tenn.
Flynt
Gibbons
Green, Oreg.
Halleck
Halpern
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Helstoski
Holland
Jacobs
Jennings
Landrum
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McEwen
McVicker
Mackay
Matsunaga
Mink
Morrison
Morton
O'Hara, Mich.
Powell
Price
Purcell
Resnick
Rivers, Alaska
Skubitz
Stafford
Todd
Toll
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8775, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, may I first say that I am presently serving as acting chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee. For several years I did bring this bill to the House on behalf of the committee but, this year, having assumed chairmanship of another subcommittee, I have been succeeded on the Legislative Subcommittee by my colleague, GEORGE ANDREWS of Alabama who, unfortunately, has been called away by a serious illness in his family. So I am, today, in a pinch-hitting capacity in order to keep the legislative bill on the schedule earlier announced.

I should like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the members of the subcommittee—we have three new members this year—for the work and help they gave us, and the cooperation we have had from everyone on the subcommittee in getting this bill together and bringing it to you. I think we have a good bill, and we hope the House will find it acceptable.

For all items in the bill as now pending, which not only includes the House, but also the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the Architect of the Capitol, there is a total of $150,589,107. This is $54,[illegible]83,115 under the budget requests, but $12,818,759 over the appropriations for these same items for the current fiscal year. I should say that these totals exclude, as they have excluded for many years, amounts for the other body which traditionally have been added to the bill by that body when it goes there.

Three or four items account for most of the increase above current appropriations. We have here annualized the last pay increase for Members of the House and for the employees, as well as the additional clerk hire granted this year by the House and the annualization of all costs involved in the occupation and use of the Rayburn Building. A complete list of the principal changes—both increases and decreases—is on pages 4 and 5 of the report.

The bill total has fluctuated somewhat in recent years as various construction, major repair, and remodeling projects were initiated, accelerated, tapered off, or terminated. The 1964 bill, for example, was considerably higher than the year before. The 1965 bill was somewhat lower. This year it is somewhat higher—with both capital items and recurring costs contributing. It is well below the total budget request for 1966 but with a degree of recurring elevation above the previous year.

The average House Member now serves in excess of 440,000 people; there are 103 districts with more than 500,000 constituents. Not until 1933 when the second House office building was opened did Members of the House have as much as two rooms for themselves and their office help.

When the second building was completed in 1933, our population was about 125 million. Today it is 195 million. The country is much bigger, and of course growing.

When the second building was completed in 1933, the Federal budget was about $4.6 billion. Today it is over $100 billion, and growing. National legislative responsibilities have increased many times over, with manifest budgetary impact in the legislative establishment.

When the second building was completed in 1933, each Member of the House was limited by law to two clerks in his office. Constituencies were smaller; the national population was much smaller; Federal responsibilities were quite limited, the whole Federal budget being less than $5 billion; communications and transport systems linking the home districts with Members at Washington were far more limited. Today, because of constantly increasing burdens and the vastly changed situation, the law allows Members from the larger districts up to 11 clerks, subject, however, to an overriding salary ceiling that, as a practical matter, precludes hiring that many by all but a few Members. But with all the added help, probably time is still the scarcest commodity in the average Member's day.

These are some of the hard-core reasons and considerations underlying the larger legislative branch budget. They do not justify the precise amounts but they do account for much of the general levels of expenditure.

Sometimes overlooked but of passing pertinency is the partially offsetting item of about $13 million derived from certain operations which earn income. We will return through these activities—catalog card sales, copyright fees, and sales of Government publications—roughly $13 million to the Treasury this year which means we are dealing here today actually with $137 million of the taxpayers' money, not counting, of course, the funds for the other body.

There are funds in the bill for certain construction items of interest to the House. There is $7,300,000 included to complete the Rayburn Building by adding some additional facilities planned by the building commission; to finish the underground garage now under construction—and for other items—all spelled out in the hearings; $5,200,000 is to pay for a program of improvement and remodeling of the Cannon Office Building.

For several years we have been engaged in a fairly high cost program updating the physical condition of the library buildings, repairing the art work, putting in a complete new plumbing system and air conditioning and climate control and adding very badly needed fire protection facilities and otherwise restoring, repairing, or replacing the book conveyor systems and things of that sort. We believe this item this year will bring the physical plant of the library into very good, first-class shape. We have also cleaned the interior and installed new lighting facilities and the results inside the original library building are rather dramatic. I think every Member who will take the time to go over there and look at what has been done will be very pleased with it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 125]

Abernethy
Andrews,
  George W.
Ayres
Baring
Belcher
Bell
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Brown, Ohio
Callaway
Cameron
Cederberg
Clawson, Del
Curtis
Dent
Diggs
Dowdy
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Flynt
Green, Oreg.
Grover
Halleck
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hébert
Helstoski
Holifield
Holland
Jacobs
Jennings
Landrum
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McDowell
McVicker
Mackay
Mailliard
Matsunaga
Miller
Mink
Morrison
Morton
Powell
Purcell
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Rivers, Alaska
Roncalio
Roosevelt
Rumsfeld
Scheuer
Scott
Smith, Calif.
Stafford
Stalbaum
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Udall
Williams
Willis

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 8775, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 363 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, there are three or four other items I should mention—of course, the committee report covers every pertinent item. We have made provision in the bill this year for additional help that will be needed to keep the Capitol Building open until 10 o'clock at night during the visitor season—roughly Easter through Labor Day. Under the present situation the building is closed to visitors at 4:30 in the afternoon. Under daylight saving time, of course, that means 3 or 4 hours of daylight time in the day when these visitors are not permitted to come into the building. We made provision last year for 52 additional policemen to provide largely, though not entirely, for the opening of the Rayburn Building. As it worked out, only 30 of those positions have been authorized so far. So in this bill we have retained funds for 20 police private positions to provide the service that will be needed on the House side in connection with keeping the Capitol Building open until 10 o'clock at night. This will cost about $133,000 plus whatever the other body sees fit to provide in this same program for requirements at that end of the building.

We know that the number of visitors to the Capitol increases year by year. We are now running during the tourist season between 30,000 and 40,000 a day, and it is becoming difficult to accommodate these people. A great many of these visitors are high school youngsters who save money all year to make the trip, and it works a great hardship on them trying to crowd them through the building during the time it is now open.

This building is one that has appeal to the American people of a nature that justifies its being available to those who want to see it as long as it can be reasonably provided. I hope the House will agree to this action on our part. It is something that I am certain will meet widespread approval.

We have disallowed some items I want to make reference to. After several years of wrangling it was agreed in the fiscal 1964 bill, and provision was made for engineering and architectural work on the project to restore the old Senate Chamber and the old Supreme Court chamber here in the Capitol. These plans have been completed, and the estimated cost to do this restoration work would be about $700,000. Also, in last year's bill, we made provision for funds to be used to hire outside engineers to make a survey of the condition of the west-central wall of the Capitol. About $102,000 was spent to make that study. The study has now been completed, and is being considered by the Capitol Extension Commission. It contains some very important recommendations as to what needs to be done under the conditions that are currently found to exist there. Since it seems likely that the Congress is going to have to do something to carry out these engineering recommendations in the not too distant future, it seemed to us more appropriate to pass over the $700,000 renovation item for the present so that if it is decided some west front work is to be done, from which additional workspace would likely result, that the modification of these two chambers could be done in conjunction with that, or at least reconsidered at that time. The old Senate Chamber currently is being used and until some additional space for those functions is provided, it would seem more sensible to us to leave the situation as it is. I think most, if not all, of us would eventually like to see those chambers restored and be available to the people of this country to see when they come here, because they undoubtedly would be of great historic interest. But a delay at this time seemed to us to be wise.

You will also note this year the amount of money we pay the Metropolitan Police for the assistance they provide us is higher. We feel this program that makes it possible for us to have these professionals assist us in our policing problems, especially the 5 or 6 man-dog teams that we have, has done a lot to improve the general situation on Capitol Hill. We have been pleased with the improvement that has taken place in the last year. But we do not want to let up. We want to continue making Capitol Hill as safe as it is possible to do so.

Last year we had a controversial matter dealing with the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy.

For many years since the creation of this Joint Committee, Congress has annually appropriated $20,000. But it was never activated. Last year the committee was activated, or somewhat so, and so this year the committee has allowed $120,000, the budget request, since obviously the $20,000 token appropriation heretofore is not enough to permit any real accomplishments. There is some question about this being a duplication of the work of the two Committees on the Judiciary. But reading the actions of the Congress, especially here on the floor last year, the committee felt it was not our prerogative to decide what the will of the House is, and therefore on the assumption that since it was the action of the House that created these facilities, we have as in the case of other joint committees, funded it.

One other very important item that I should mention before I yield the floor is a project which accounts for most of the reduction below the budget requests in this bill.

Actually, aside from this one item, we have reduced the budget requests something like $4.6 million. The rest of the reduction is due to the fact that we have omitted a request for the money to construct a new Government Printing Office. Last year we agreed in conference to $2,500,000 for engineering and architect's fees to prepare the plans for the project, but with a proviso that no further progress in funding would be agreed to until the matter of a site had been settled. If you followed recent actions of two of the committees of the House, as well as the press, I think it is quite obvious that the site selected by the Joint Committee on Printing for this proposed new plant—the Bolling-Anacostia base area—is far from being settled. No one seems to be in a position at this time to know what this site problem will amount to and when it will be settled. So we have omitted the item at this time. I believe that is the only wise course under the circumstances. If the House ever agrees to funding the Government Printing Office, I think it should be done only after we are dead sure where it is going to be situated. The major function of the Government Printing Office is to serve the Congress and it is my very strong personal opinion that this operation ought to be always in rather close proximity to the Capitol itself. Speaking for myself, I would want to be sure that we are not going to have it far off somewhere where it would not be in a position to give the kind of service that we have always had from the Government Printing Office so far as our congressional activity and work are involved.

Mr. Chairman, that about sums up the highlights of the bill. We have tried to make it as tight as we could. We have tried to abide by the wishes of the House to anticipate what we could in terms of the operations in the year ahead. I hope the membership will find it acceptable to them.

Under leave granted, I include the summary of the amounts from the committee report:

Summary of the bill

Group	Appropriations, 1965 (to date)	Budget estimates (amended)	Committee bill	Committee bill compared with—	
				Appropriation, 1965	Budget estimates
House of Representatives	$60, 525, 470	$69, 012, 520	$66, 414, 730	+$5, 889, 260	−$2, 597, 790
Joint items	6, 876, 778	8, 655, 502	8, 748, 477	+1, 871, 699	+92, 975
Architect of the Capitol (excludes Senate items)	19, 724, 300	24, 123, 400	23, 127, 600	+3, 403, 300	−995, 800
Botanic Garden	500, 000	467, 000	467, 000	−33, 000	
Library of Congress	24, 081, 800	26, 644, 800	25, 502, 300	+1, 420, 500	−1, 142, 500
Government Printing Office (excluding proposed new building)	23, 562, 000	26, 329, 000	26, 329, 000	+2, 767, 000	
Subtotal	135, 270, 348	155, 232, 222	150, 589, 107	+15, 318, 759	−4, 643, 115
Proposed new building for GPO	2, 500, 000	49, 640, 000		−2, 500, 000	−49, 640, 000
Grand total (for items considered by the House)	137, 770, 348	204, 872, 222	150, 589, 107	+12, 818, 759	−54, 283, 115

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that the $150 million which the committee recommends in the bill is for the housekeeping expenses for the House of Representatives alone, and includes nothing insofar as the other body is concerned?

Mr. STEED. There are no funds at all which are exclusively for the other body, but the bill does contain joint costs, such as for the Library of Congress, the Architect, the Botanic Garden, the Government Printing Office, and things which we share jointly. The only things omitted are the housekeeping items exclusively those of the other body. Under the traditional pattern, they add those when the bill goes to them.

Mr. GROSS. So when we pass the bill in the House, it will be sent to the other body, and the other body will put in what they believe they ought to have?

Mr. STEED. That is correct. Those items are automatically in conference, or before the House for voting at that time. It has been the traditional rule of comity that we leave them alone and hope they will leave us alone.

Mr. GROSS. That is quite a rule, that rule of comity.

Mr. STEED. I might say to the gentleman, it has been my personal opinion that of late it has been better observed on this side of the Capitol than on the other.

Mr. GROSS. I would have to agree with the gentleman in that respect.

I note in the report, on page 20, with respect to the Government Printing Office, this statement:

> The original request this year was $44,787,000 but that was rather hurriedly adjusted upward to $49,640,000 after the preferred site was selected (Government-owned Bolling-Anacostia). The Joint Committee approved that selection on April 28.

Do I understand that if the plant should be built on the Bolling-Anacostia tract, that we would provide for purchase of the land which is already Government owned? Why did the figure suddenly jump from $44 million to $49 million?

Mr. STEED. There is no money involved for the purchase of any land at all at that site. The increase was the estimate of the architect-engineers. They revised the estimates to apply the general plans and designs to this particular piece of land.

It is my personal opinion that this additional amount for which they are asking exceeds what the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate authorized. Even if we had included this item at the increased amount in the bill—which we did not—there might be some question as to it being subject to a point of order. I may be in error, but the question is there.

I hope that before the matter comes up again not only will the question of the site be thoroughly settled, but also the question of the amount of authorized expenditure for the total cost of the building.

Mr. GROSS. Am I correct in assuming that when they were told this preferred site had been selected—I believe the gentleman will agree it is a preferred site—that they then submitted a higher cost figure by some $5 million, simply to put up a better or larger building on a preferred site? Was this the reasoning?

Mr. STEED. The answer they gave us was that applying their original outline of the plans for the building to this particular site had caused the estimated cost to be increased by this amount.

I might say that there never has been a time when the Joint Committee on Printing had clear title, so to speak, to this land. It does not have title now. From what the two other committees of the House have been saying and doing, and judging from the position of the Department of Defense which has title to the land, it is my personal opinion that there is serious question they will ever get title to this land. But that is only my guess at this point.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

If the gentleman will yield further, I should like to say that I believe the committee exercised excellent judgment in deferring this project. I support the contention of witnesses before the committee that all possible printing should be sent out to printers over the country. I think that private enterprise should be utilized wherever possible.

Any new building for the Government Printing Office should be built and equipped with that in mind.

Mr. STEED. I agree with the gentleman, and if he read the hearings, he would give this subcommittee credit for permitting private industry to come in and make contributions, which I think they did very well. This brings up the point that there is more involved here than just the total amount of the cost of the building or the site itself. There are other parts of this project which we did not go into this year for the reason that the lack of site was sufficient to put it aside. The gentleman can rest assured, though, if it ever comes up, there will be considerable attention given to other factors that are involved in it.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that your hearings on this subject were excellent and the course you elected to pursue was likewise an excellent judgment. I compliment you and the members of the subcommittee.

There are several other interesting items in your hearings, one in particular, dealing with the insurance that is carried on the Cadillacs that are operated around the House of Representatives. I understand that the Clerk of the House says that the company which provides those long, black cars carries most of the insurance, but the Clerk also carries an insurance policy costing $168 for each vehicle. If it is true, that the company which supplies these automobiles carries insurance on them and then the Clerk purchases insurance for each one of them at a premium cost of $168 a copy, these must be the best insured automobiles anywhere in the United States, maybe in the world.

Mr. STEED. We were interested for the same reason that the gentleman is.

It is true that the Congress and the House do operate some vehicles that we own ourselves and a few others that are rented. We were interested in the matter. We are not experts on it, but we think it is something that the Committee on House Administration might give some attention to and could clear up. I am glad that the gentleman brought the matter up.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to know what is covered by this insurance. I cannot conceive of this much money being spent for such a purpose. I would like to know what the coverage is. I wonder if this could have started under Bobby Baker or something of that kind.

Mr. STEED. I do not know about that, but I do know the matter of insurance is a policy matter not within our jurisdiction. We would be happy to get more clarification on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the efforts of your subcommittee as represented by the bill and committee report before us have been accomplished under both fortunate and unfortunate circumstances. The misfortune has come about because of a health problem in the immediate family of our chairman, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, which necessitated his personal attention before the work of the committee had been completed. This was unfortunate indeed because his dedication and response to the assignment of chairmanship was so prominent during the course of the hearings. I know that the cause of appropriating money for the legislative branch of Government and the public services that it provides would have been well served indeed by his continued service.

The good fortune was provided by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], who so willingly and ably took over the assignment. As a present member of the committee and past chairman of the committee, his acquaintance with the amounts of money provided for in the bill has certainly been amply demonstrated to the House in his very clear and precise presentation of the bill to you this afternoon. Needless to say, it has been a real pleasure to have had the opportunity of working with both of these very distinguished chairmen as well as the rest of the members of the committee, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. SLACK, Mr. FLYNT, and Mr. REIFEL have all performed with distinction and displayed only the best interests of the Congress and the Nation. Their diligence had made the work of the gentleman now speaking very easy, and I am particularly fortunate today to find that little needs to be added to the very thorough and complete explanation that has already been provided to the House.

While this is not a large bill, as appropriation bills go, it is one that carries great significance to the proficient operation of the Congress and related public services. It is my opinion that the committee has done well in responding to the appropriation needs of the Congress and at the same time effecting a reduction in the budget estimates of over $54 million. The committee has kept in mind at all times that the Congress of the United States is a servant of the people and so should always be in a position of responding to that service in a most proficient and efficient manner, making sure that the public interest is always properly accommodated. The strength and stature of our Government as well as our Nation will never be any better than the extent to which Congress is able to respond to the congressional and legislative needs of any given day, both in terms of routine matters as well as times of emergency.

This appropriation bill, like all others, brings us face to face with the realities of the cost of Government and our own congressional action. The committee report, thanks to some very fine work on the part of the committee staff, has developed this point most realistically, explicitly, and convincingly. It identifies that as our population and Government have grown, additional requirements on individual Members of Congress as well as committees have grown right along with our more complex and prosperous society.

While the bill, as I have stated before, represents a total figure at a little over $54 million less than the budget estimate, it is also a figure that is $12¾ million higher than the comparable appropriation of last year. This increase, however, is accountable primarily to three major expenditures.

Page 4 of the committee report identifies the selected items that have been reduced below last year's appropriation, as well as the selected increases above last year's appropriation. May I call to your attention the three specific increases, which incidentally total just a little more than the amount of money that this bill provides in addition to the total amount for last year. They are, mainly, $5½ million to account for the increased salaries, which as you know applies to the Members as well as to the individual and committee staffs and the necessary service personnel. May I remind the House that there might well be a further increase during this session that could require additional moneys in this category for fiscal 1966.

Secondly, there is $5.2 million which is the estimated cost of remodeling the Cannon Office Building under a plan that has recently been adopted by the appropriate committee. The third item of $2½ million provides for the costs of the additional volume of congressional printing and binding.

All of the additional increases represent expanded necessary services by the Congress, the Library of Congress, and all related activities. Inasmuch as most of these are actual necessities provided for by actions of Congress, there is little that your committee can do other than to provide adequate and sufficient funds with which to carry them out.

While it is difficult to separate them, I think it might well be said that more than $20 million of the total amount can be directly attributed to providing most essential public services. To mention but a few of them, they include such items as providing books and services for the blind; the Superintendent of Documents, who distributes numerous Government documents that are of value to many citizens and their varied activities; the copyright office, which provides a great public service; the distribution of various materials from the Library of Congress to the depository libraries throughout the country, thereby making valuable library material available not only to those in the immediate area of Washington, but throughout the entire Nation; the Law Library, which certainly serves a wonderful purpose, in that it is possibly the most complete Law Library anywhere in the world today; even the collection of foreign library material, which is accomplished by the use of foreign currency acquired through Public Law 480, but in turn provides the opportunity for a better public acquaintance with conditions throughout foreign lands.

Your committee has sincerely endeavored to provide for the needs of Members, the needs of committees, the general activities of the Congress, and appropriate accommodations for the public. This includes office space, furniture, staffing, parking, and maintenance of buildings and grounds.

I can very heartily recommend to the House the decision of the committee to provide for the Capitol Building being open to the visiting public until 10 p.m. daily during the tourist season. It has become increasingly evident during the past year and recent months that the total number of visitors is increasing daily, having reached the point of where some days there have been as many as 40,000 people going through the Capitol Building in a single day. It, therefore, is most appropriate that we provide for an extension of visiting hours beyond the 4:30 p.m. closing which is present policy, particularly in view of daylight saving time.

The experience with the extended visiting hours has been most satisfactory at the Washington Monument and the Smithsonian Institution, and I am sure will have equal success and response at the Capitol. I have noted so often that those who are fortunate enough to have an opportunity of visiting their Nation's Capital City and Capitol Building always leave Washington with a little more interest in Government than they had when they came. There are few factors that I can think of that are as contributing to a strong representative government as that of an interested populace, which is substantially generated in this manner. I am sure the added rather minor expense is more than justified, in view of these great public benefits.

While the needs of Members, we all know, are both varied and many, and sometimes most difficult to be able to comply with in their entirety, I think at the same time it is well that we point out the proficiency and efficiency of a good many Members of the Congress, for it is to be noted that in many instances they do not use the full amount of money that is available to them. The committee report identifies that at a recent date there were 328 Members who were not using the full salary allowance entitlement, and that the law permits the employment of 888 more clerks than are presently employed. The same is true in many offices with the moneys provided for telephone, stationery, and other necessities. However, as is true with all branches of Government as it continues to grow, these requirements become more complex and more involved as every year goes by.

As we continue to add new space as recently accomplished by the Rayburn Building and the additional garage space that is presently in the process of construction, it naturally follows that additional maintenance and service personnel are required. As we look to the future, and as evidenced by exploration of your committee during the course of the hearings, it is my opinion that many improvements can be made. It occurs to me that savings could be accomplished and better services provided were there a clarification and a coordination of management and administrative authorities. Several steps of this kind have already been taken, which are most commendable. I am sure it would provide greater proficiency were all of the various categories of services under one supervision, such as custodial, administrative, general public, and congressional services. I can, for instance, see no good reason why the personnel in the Capitol Law Library should not be under one supervision as compared to the two that now prevails. The same is true with custodial as well as administrative personnel in a good many instances.

Your committee directed considerable attention to the question of whether or not elevator operators should be used in the automatic elevators of the new Rayburn Building. Inasmuch as we have installed the very latest equipment in automatic elevator operation, I see little or no need for now expending additional moneys in order to provide operators. While it has been suggested that there is some need for operators on the two banks of four elevators near the front entrance, in order to provide better service and direction to the public, this could easily be accomplished without additional personnel. Moneys are provided in the bill for the remodeling of the Cannon Building. This will mean that two wings of that building will be vacated, also relieving elevator personnel which could be used in the Rayburn Building. By further planning and proficient use of elevator operators throughout all the buildings, there is sufficient personnel to accommodate such needs as have been suggested. There is a total of 25 passenger elevators plus 4 passenger-freight elevators, together with several escalators, so that there should be no question that adequate service of this kind is available and therefore should accommodate the needs under any and all circumstances.

The Rayburn Building has been completed, offices moved, and it is now in full operation, and upon inquiry of the committee, it was revealed that there had been no specific complaints regarding elevator service without operators up to the time of consideration by the committee.

These, of course, are all patronage jobs, and there is evidence that such assignments can rather lead to inefficient and less reliable service. That this is true has already been called to the attention of the committee by my own inquiry.

We all know about the needs for an effective police force in connection with the Capitol and Grounds. While the Capitol Police Force certainly does a very commendable job of responding to police and guard duties, because of these being patronage assignments, there is a terrific turnover in personnel, and in many instances, some of them serve for only a period of 3 months. Because of the great responsibility that each of these men has, it seems somewhat of a waste of money to properly train them, provide them with uniforms and necessary equipment, only to have to replace them in such a short period of time. I am sure that far greater proficiency and protection could be achieved for less money were it to become a policy that they ought to serve for a longer period of time. Corrections such as these would only be in compliance with good management practices.

I am in complete agreement with the committee in its decision not to provide moneys for the new GPO printing plant this year. As the committee report identifies, the lack of any certainty as to a desirable site being available left the committee little choice but to delay this decision until such time as the entire matter can be further explored and evaluated.

It seems just as wise to delay the restoration of the Old Senate and Supreme Court Chambers, in view of the present consideration pending relative to the west Capitol front. There certainly is a relation between the two projects and they ought to be considered together. I am sure that to the visiting public it can well be an advantage to have these two projects designed and considered simultaneously.

There are obviously many more observations that might be made with regard to the numerous items for which moneys are provided in this appropriation bill. Let me conclude, however, by suggesting that each individual Member might well direct some attention to the committee report, the committee hearings and the general operation of your Nation's Capitol, for I am sure that it is in the best interests of the entire Nation for each of us to be well acquainted with the intricacies and the complexities of the many services and activities involved. To do so, I am sure, will bring many suggesstions for improvement that will bring assurance that this Capitol and the Congress are truly a model of representative government that will bring pride and confidence to every visitor and citizen of this Nation. With these observations, I very heartily recommend this bill to you for approval.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I should be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is there by any chance any money in this bill for planning for another House Office Building as was suggested by one of the Members of the House not so long ago?

Mr. LANGEN. No, there is no money for planning an additional building, although I should say to the gentleman from Iowa there was a brief reference at one time to such a matter. However, there is no money provided in this bill for that purpose nor is there language contained in the report to cover such matter.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, will my good friend from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. LANGEN. I should be happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. GROSS. How much money is there in this bill for elevator operators in the Rayburn Building?

Mr. LANGEN. There is an amount of $35,000 which will provide for the hiring of 16 operators, only for the period of one-half year, which would be the busiest part of the year, and for the purpose of determining the extent to which extra needed service might be provided in this manner.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that seems to me to be the well-known foot in the door. Further, I want to say to the gentleman, as well as the acting chairman of the subcommittee, that at the proper time I intend to offer an amendment to try to get the $35,000 out of this bill and stop this totally unnecessary manning of elevators in the Rayburn Building. Let us not further compound that felony.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his always appropriate and worthy contributions.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in full support of the favorable action taken by the Legislative Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee to provide funds requested to fully implement the statutory responsibilities of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy. I want to thank them for their careful consideration and favorable action. On May 13, 1964, the subcommittee made a thorough and searching examination of all the issues involved in this matter. The results of that examination will be found beginning on page 659 of the report of hearings. That record speaks for itself.

This appropriation for the joint committee, recommended by this committee, involves one very fundamental and overriding issue. That issue is whether Congress shall exercise control over policy which regulates immigration into the United States. That is the question now before the Members of the House.

The statutory duties of the joint committee are defined in section 401 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Briefly stated, those duties are "to make a continuing study of, first, the administration of the immigration laws and its effect on the national security, the economy, and social welfare of the United States; and, second, such conditions within or without the United States which in the opinion of the committee might have any bearing on the immigration and nationality policy of the United States."

There is no disagreement about the responsibility reposing upon Congress to discharge these statutory functions.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk and former Attorney General ROBERT KENNEDY, in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, given during the hearings of 1964, have both reaffirmed the exclusive authority of Congress in this vital area of national policy. Quoted statements from both Cabinet members on this issue will be found on pages 660 and 661 of the report on hearings before the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations.

The passage of reform immigration legislation during this session of Congress—which I am confident will be done—will in no way diminish the need for the work of the joint committee. If anything, passage of such legislation would increase the need for that work.

The major tasks before the joint committee in the year ahead are:

First. A thorough study and review of all nonquota provisions of law, particularly the present and future outcomes of nonquota immigration from the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Second. A study of advisory opinions of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State, to determine whether this administrative practice is setting policy which is not authorized by law or covered by expressed congressional intent.

Third. A study of the education exchange program to determine whether that program is being used as a subterfuge by people to gain immigrant status and benefits.

Fourth. A complete study of nonimmigrant worker classes, in light of the current needs of the United States.

Fifth. A study of the so-called commuter class of aliens and their relation to basic policy considerations.

Sixth. A complete review of the general grounds of exclusion and deportation of aliens. There has been no review of these matters since the law was enacted in 1952. There is need to determine whether the authorized grounds for exclusion and deportation are realistic in light of experience over the past 13 years.

The joint committee is the proper instrument of Congress to undertake and complete these policy studies. I stated before the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations that this work could not be done by the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of which I am also chairman. I presented solid reasons based upon experience for this conclusion, which will be found on pages 661, 662, and 663 of the report of hearings on this appropriation.

Because of the favorable action taken by the House Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations and by the full Appropriations Committee the vital work which I have outlined will be launched immediately after the authorized funds become available.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For maintenance, including equipment; waterproof wearing apparel; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); prevention and eradication of insect and other pests without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; miscellaneous items; and for all necessary services; $3,807,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 18, line 3, strike the figure "$3,807,000" and insert "$3,772,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing complicated about this amendment. It would simply strike out the $35,000 foot-in-the-door appropriation for 16 elevator operators in the Rayburn House Office Building. I do not need to remind the Members of the House, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] has already stated, that that building is equipped with the most modern elevators it is possible to obtain and that all it takes is a slight bit of pressure from the end of a finger to get the elevator to take you to any floor in the building. I cannot think of any more unconscionable raid on the taxpayers of this country than to now stick the foot in the door and start using 16 elevator operators in the Rayburn Building.

The hearings shed some light on this business. Mr. ANDREWS, chairman of the subcommittee, questioning witnesses from the Architect's office, said:

> We went through this briefly when we had the supplemental bill before us, but the question has again arisen: Why 60 operator positions for the 30 automatically operable elevators in the Rayburn Building?
>
> Mr. HENLOCK. The only answer we can give, Mr. Chairman, is that it has been the practice for many years to have elevator operators.

Mr. Rubel, also of the Architect's office, responding to questions, said:

> Personally, knowing the elevator equipment to be the most modern equipment available, and since it is equipped for full automatic operation, theoretically there is no need for attendants.

Mr. Chairman, elevator operators in the Rayburn Building are needed just about as much as a bullfrog needs feathers.

I hope this amendment will be adopted. I say again that to put operators on those expensive, completely automatic elevators in the Rayburn Building would only be compounding the felonies that have already been perpetrated in the construction and equipment of that edifice. It is hard to believe the Members of the House would open the door to a probable future expenditure of some $300,000 a year for the satisfaction of political patronage.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and possibly for some additional reasons other than those of the gentleman from Iowa.

I was doing a little thinking today, when I was riding one of those elevators. I have come to a conclusion, with which I believe other Members will agree, that to put operators on those automatic elevators at the Rayburn House Office Building actually would slow up the traffic rather than speed it up. When people found an elevator operator, they would come to his door and would start asking him questions, and the operator would keep the elevator stopped while Members were trying to get where they wanted to go.

This type of elevator is so simple that it does not require an expert to operate it.

I do not wish to see us start to do something which is not only costly but which also will actually reduce the efficiency of the things for which we spent so much money to acquire. That is the first point.

I believe it would be a fine thing on these elevators out here in the lobby to have starters at the base, and possibly at the top, but I do not believe we need elevator operators on these elevators which have been put there.

I should like to rise in support of that position.

While I have the floor, I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee.

There is a line in the report which did not disturb me too much but which rather intrigued me, because I could not find anything in the bill about it.

The subtitle of one of the sections on page 14 of the report is, "additional House office building project."

I wonder if there is contemplated another House office building project, or if there is any authority or a foot in the door in the bill. Can the gentleman answer that?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. The only explanation I can give to the gentleman is that this is the traditional way the matter has been identified. In recent times, of course, there has been money for an additional House office building. Seven million three hundred thousand dollars of the money in this bill is for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Wait a minute now. The gentleman says "for that purpose." Does the gentleman mean for another House office building?

Mr. STEED. To finish the additional House office building, commonly known as the Rayburn Building.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. We have three House office buildings now. I wish to know whether there is to be a fourth. Does "additional" mean another?

Mr. STEED. No. The gentleman can rest assured that there is nothing here that has anything to do with a fourth office building. That is the way we have always identified this item.

The gentleman should remember that the additional House office building, now known as the Rayburn Building, has been under construction for quite a few years. Though it may be occupied by the Members today, so far as paying of the bills and responsibilities of the subcommittee are concerned, until the money which is in here this year is disbursed, it still is an additional House office building.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I understand that we run on tradition and custom around here, but I believe that when we carry forward titles or subheadings we are going a little too far. Let us put something on it to distinguish it. This kind of alarms us.

When it says "additional House office building project" that makes me think, "Well, they must have another project which is going to get moving."

I do not like to see these things get a foot in the door and get started without knowing about them. I do not mind being beaten on the floor.

The gentleman says there is no money for an additional House office building, other than the three we have now?

Mr. STEED. That is correct.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEED. And we used this language because we thought if we changed it, it might cause more excitement and confusion than if we leave it as it has always been.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I think there are two points that might be worthy of consideration with regard to this particular amendment that no one has mentioned and that is the fact that not even Capitol Hill can be considered safe in Washington, D.C., as it is today. Crime continues to increase. There is a matter of increased personal safety involved at least for the ladies in the area in the operation of these elevators when there is an operator present. This is worthy of some consideration when we consider the safety of the ladies and other employees on Capitol Hill. Then, too, during certain periods, literally thousands, both old and young, visit this building daily and operators provide needed information and assistance.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I might say in reply to the gentleman that I will vote for more police or anything that will bring about added safety, but to try to tell me that some of these elevator operators we have would be of any service in trying to protect anybody I do not think is a valid argument at all.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It ought to be pointed out that once thrown into full gear it will cost a matter of at least $250,000 a year to man those fully automatic elevators. This could very well be spent on police protection rather than something that we can easily be expected to do ourselves.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I want to thank the gentleman, and I do concur in that opinion.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be helpful to the House to have a little of the background on this particular matter. As a matter of fact, in the bill last year provision was made and the funds are now available to hire 64 elevator operators for the Rayburn Building. You could have 64 of them working there this minute if the powers that be had seen fit to put them on. This money will remain available until July 1. This costs about $280,000 a year.

Since we were only recently in occupancy of the Rayburn Building, despite the fact that they had the authority and the money to hire the elevator operators, the powers that be held off. They did not want to use any operators there if it could be avoided. As time has gone on and traffic in the building has built up we have seen the pattern of the way people going through there, the way it has developed. It just seems that since the subway ends at the part of the building where these eight elevators on the north-central part of the building are located, that that gets the heaviest load of traffic.

The committee was asked what we have done even with this item in the bill. We have actually reduced the number of elevator operators from 64 to 16. Even at that we have put a limitation on how long a time these 16 could be used. The committee does not want these elevators manned, but what happened was that I first agreed, as a personal view, that the requests of those who wanted these eight north elevators manned should be granted. I went along with it. Then after we discussed it in the subcommittee I went along with those who felt we did not need any at all.

After we marked up the bill in the subcommittee many Members who thought some help was needed there made a protest. In the full committee an amendment was offered and approved to add to the original version by the subcommittee this $35,000 on this experimental basis. There is quite a division of opinion among our colleagues as to whether we should or should not have operators there. I know we had hoped that automatic elevators would eliminate this need. However, the groups of tourists who come do create some problems. There have been several complaints that people have had their arms caught in the doors or the doors were slammed on them as these automatic doors closed when a large group of people were going in and out. I am speaking of tourists now.

What we hoped was that when this decision by the full committee was made to add this rather small amount of money on an experimental basis and restrict it solely to that part of the year when there are large groups of tourists coming, that we could then determine whether a service of this sort paid for itself or not. I am there a lot, and I think there are situations under which it would be helpful to have somebody on these particular elevators.

If the Members would use the elevators nearest their offices and not concentrate on these particular eight elevators we would not have some of the jams we now have. But the habit of people is such that everybody walks to that spot and therefore the big use is on these elevators.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Would one of these operators be put on the private elevator that runs to the swimming pool? If you are going to equip completely automatic elevators of this kind with operators, the next step probably will be to provide a boy to escort the House Members and carry his towel down to the swimming pool.

Mr. STEED. If the Members followed the same habit of going to the swimming pool as they do everywhere else, they would all go down to the swimming pool in the same elevators. That may account for some of the traffic. The whole idea here is that since there is a strong division of opinion among the Members of the House on this particular problem, we thought this experiment might give us some information and know-how so that next year we could determine whether or not this whole operation should be wiped out or whether we are now in fact giving a service that is necessary. I would like to see the experiment carried out.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have already expressed my support for this amendment. Just let me add one or two comments that I think are pertinent. During the course of the testimony before the committee there were no complaints as to the operation of the elevators. I call your attention to the fact that automatic elevators are not new. We find them in buildings all over any major city. People have become accustomed to them. These are the very latest in that kind of equipment. I see no reason why they should not serve the needs of the membership of the Congress as well as the visiting public in a most admirable manner.

In view of the fact that even under present circumstances there are personnel available, so there would be someone on each of the floors to provide the necessary service and guidance, I believe it is completely unnecessary to include this amount of money.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I gladly yield to my colleague.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman to yield so that I might make one other point that I failed to make a few minutes ago. I think if the people in charge of the employees in these buildings would make some suggestions as to the use of these elevators it would be helpful. Just today I was coming down an elevator in the Rayburn Office Building and some employees got on there who went down one floor. Particularly at a time when these employees, such as caretakers and people who clean up, and so forth, have to go to another part of the building, it seems to me they could walk down one flight of steps and save the use of the elevator. I think just a word to the employees to use a little judgment would be helpful, particularly when we are faced with quorum calls or rollcalls when their unnecessary use of the elevators just adds to the confusion.

Mr. Chairman, I might as well put in another gripe. When we have quorum calls, the elevator designated for Members and press runs up to the gallery. No Member who is answering a quorum call has to go up to the gallery or come from the gallery, unless there is some Member in the gallery while the quorum call is going on. It seems to me that we could benefit by giving a little instruction that would help to expedite the service here on the Hill.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his pertinent remarks. May I also remind the House that there is a total of 25 passenger elevators in that building, which should be adequate to supply any demand; plus the fact that there are quite a number of escalators designed to provide the same kind of service. So there is adequate equipment in this building. It seems to me that it is rather superfluous to provide this additional personnel and the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express particularly my commendation to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed], and to his very fine subcommittee, for the great work they perform from year to year in trying to legislate with reference to the funds necessary to operate the legislative branch of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, I know from time to time they take a pretty rough beating and a lot of criticism which, I am sure, is unjustified.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the particular amendment, this seems to me to be one of the finest demonstrations of being penny wise and pound foolish about which I have ever heard.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Iowa [Mr. Gross], for whom I have a high regard—and he is a good friend of mine—is attempting here to strike out the sum of $35,000 which, compared to the total contained in this bill—and certainly to the total expenses involved—is infinitesimal.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that we should be giving some consideration to the fact that there are users of those elevators besides those of us who are Members of the Congress.

Today Washington, D.C., is visited by over 10 million Americans, and there will be that many visiting the Nation's Capital this year. This figure is increasing.

Mr. Chairman, these buildings located at the Capitol are not simply the property of those of us who are Members of Congress. They are the property of all Americans, the entire 200 million American people. I feel that we have some obligation regarding their protection, regarding their convenience, regarding information that they be given in order to make it as easy as possible when they come to our Nation's Capital to visit their seat of Government.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know just how satisfactory or unsatisfactory operators may be on those elevators in the Rayburn Building. However, I have to place my confidence in the committee. Let us experiment with the basic eight elevators which were discussed by the gentleman from Iowa. Personally, I would gladly support the entire request of $280,000 with which to man every one of those elevators in the Rayburn Building, because from the standpoint of protection—and I mean this specifically, as the gentleman from Louisiana specified a while ago with reference to the female employees here on the Hill, and from the standpoint of value and information, and from the fact that there are still a good many millions of people who are not accustomed to automatic elevators, I might say to my good friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I will, if I have time.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we owe to the American people this consideration. In view of the fact that the committee has not seen fit to authorize the entire $280,000 but, rather, to try on an experimental basis, the assistance or lack thereof, that operators might be with reference to this bank of eight in the front of the building, certainly it seems to me that we, as Members of Congress, should support the committee.

I certainly hope that we are interested in making this effort possible.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have time, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman talking about a police force or is the gentleman talking about elevator operators when he talks about the protection of women at the Capitol?

Mr. SISK. I am talking now about manning these particular elevators. As the gentleman knows, we are adding some policemen to the police force here. It is necessary to do this because there are a number of new spots that have to be policed. I feel sure that a substantial part of the protection on the Hill, around and in the House Office Buildings and here at the Capitol itself depends upon the efficiency of that police force. But I am sure the gentleman from Iowa will admit that a manned elevator certainly can preclude incidents of the nature which have occurred in the past, whether he wears a police uniform or whether he be in civilian clothing.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It is not only a question of the police force itself, but also a question of courts to back up the police if we are going to protect the law-abiding citizens of the District of Columbia, and elsewhere in the country.

But, let me say to the gentleman, hotel after hotel today has installed automatic elevators, including some of the so-called leading hotels in Washington, D.C. You go in and operate them yourself.

Mr. SISK. There is always a bellboy who accompanies you to your room.

Mr. GROSS. No, there is not always a bellboy. I may be visiting a guest in a hotel.

Mr. SISK. I have not been in a hotel in this city that did not have a bellboy to go along. Of course, if we are going to furnish people to accompany the individual this could become a great deal more expensive.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows better than that.

Mr. SISK. I hope that the House goes along with the Committee, and let us see how the situation works out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 29, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Thompson of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8775) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill be passed.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Gross moves that the bill H.R. 8775 be recommitted to the House Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:
>
> On page 18, line 3, strike out the figure "$3,807,000" and insert "$3,772,000".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 149, nays 244, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—149

Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Baldwin
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Carter
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Craley
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Findley
Fino
Ford, Gerald R.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gibbons
Goodell
Grider
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Hathaway
Herlong
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Keith
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
MacGregor
Mackie
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morse
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Ottinger
Pelly
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Tupper
Utt
Vigorito
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Whalley
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—244

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ashmore
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Carey
Casey
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dowdy
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Hays
Hechler
Henderson
Holifield
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Leggett
Lennon
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Matthews
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Weltner
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—40

Andrews, George W.
Aspinall
Baring
Bell
Bonner
Bow
Brown, Ohio
Callaway
Cameron
Cederberg
Celler
Clawson, Del
Dorn
Downing
Evins, Tenn.
Flynt
Fogarty
Green, Oreg.
Halleck
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hébert
Helstoski
Holland
Jacobs
Landrum
Lindsay
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackay
Matsunaga
Morton
Powell
Purcell
Smith, Va.
Stephens
Toll
White, Idaho
Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Callaway for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Evins of Tennessee against.

Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Bow for, with Mr. Helstoski against.

Mr. Harvey of Michigan for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Macdonald against.

Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Cameron against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Mackay with Mr. White of Idaho.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. McVicker.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Matsunaga.

Mr. Bonner with Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Willis.

Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Downing with Mr. Purcell.

Messrs. McCARTHY, HICKS, SAYLOR, and REINECKE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BARRETT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include tables and other material on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 285, A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO ALLOW THE SHOWING IN THE UNITED STATES OF THE U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY FILM "JOHN F. KENNEDY—YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS"

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 415, Rept. No. 458) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 415

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 285) to allow the showing in the United States of the United States Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums." After general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the concurrent resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REGULATION OF EXPORTS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 412, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 412

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7105) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from California [Mr. Smith] and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 412 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate, making it in order to consider the substitute now in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, for consideration of H.R. 7105, a bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

The Export Control Act furnishes the basic authority for the control of exports to Communist bloc countries. It furnishes authority for restricting the outflow of scarce materials, as well as authority to regulate exports in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States. The enactment of H.R. 7105 will extend the Export Control Act for 4 additional years.

Under the act as now in effect, there are no civil or administrative sanctions available for the punishment of violations other than the suspension or revocation of export licenses. Offenders may be prosecuted criminally, but this is a procedure which may not be appropriate to the circumstances. The bill to be considered would authorize the administrative imposition of a civil penalty not exceeding $1,000 for any violation of the act or any regulation, order, or license issued under it. The bill clarifies the rights of persons who wish to contest in court the imposition of any such penalty.

The bill as reported will furnish the administration with clear legal authority to protect American business firms from competitive pressure to become involved in foreign trade conspiracies against countries friendly to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 412 in order that H.R. 7105 may be discussed and voted on.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 412 will provide, upon adoption, for the consideration of H.R. 7105 on a 2-hour open rule.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7105 seeks to amend the act in three instances: First, to extend the act for another 4 years, until June 30, 1969; second, to authorize the administration imposition of civil, monetary penalties of up to $1,000 for violations of the act; third, to furnish the administration with clear, legal authority to protect American firms from pressures to become involved in trade boycotts or conspiracies against countries friendly to the United States.

At present, there are no civil penalties for those trading under the act other than a suspension or revocation of their export license. Available criminal penalties are often not appropriate. There is a need for a penalty, sharp enough to be a deterrent, but not so severe that a sense of fairness would cause it not to be employed in cases of less than major violations. The committee felt that the figure of $1,000 meets the need. Export privileges may be suspended up to 1 year as a means of collection, but no longer.

The third amendment apparently was due to the efforts of Arab countries to boycott or blacklist firms which dealt with Israel. The bill adds a new section, section 2(4), which reads in full:

> The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

The legal powers of the President to regulate exports, conferred by section 3 of the act, are expressed in terms which limit their exercise to the effectuation of policies set forth in section 2. It is therefore questionable whether the administration would have the legal power to fully protect American firms without such an amendment.

The final amendment to the act is in section 3(a), empowering the President to prohibit or regulate exports of "any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data." The amendment replaces "technical data" with "information," a much broader term.

The supplemental views, signed by 17 members from both parties, finds no fault with any of the amendments discussed above. Rather, the complaint is that the declaration of policy is not implemented by any language contained in the bill. These views point out that the witnesses of both the Departments of State and Commerce have testified that their policy of a case-by-case study of each complaint, and doing what they think indicated, will not be changed by the declaration of policy presently written into the bill. Testimony before the committee indicated that major firms with complaints are assisted while smaller ones get no help.

On page 14 of the report, the implementing language to accompany the policy declaration is set out. It requires only that the rules and regulations to be adopted pursuant to the policy declaration shall prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements inconsistent with the policy declaration.

The supplemental views hold that since the Departments of State and Commerce will not change their policy and actively protect American firms unless directed to do so by legislation, that such legislation should be enacted to enforce the policy declaration.

The language which I understand will be offered as an amendment will read:

> Such rules and regulations shall prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements inconsistent with the section 2(4) hereof.

I know of no objection to the rule, Mr. Speaker, I urge its adoption and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7105) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7105, with Mr. Denton in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7105, which would amend the Export Control Act of 1949, was considered by your Banking and Currency Committee over a period of the equivalent of 7 days of hearings. The full Committee and Subcommittee on International Trade had before them the Secretary of Commerce, the Acting Secretary of State, a number of Members of Congress, and outside witnesses.

The main purposes of the bill as it was reported out of your committee are as follows:

First. It would extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for 4 additional years.

Second. It would authorize the administrative imposition of civil monetary penalties not exceeding $1,000 for violation of the act.

Third. It would furnish the administration with clear legal authority to protect American business firms from competitive pressures to become involved in foreign trade conspiracies against countries friendly to the United States.

The Export Control Act of 1949 furnishes the President with the basic authority necessary to control exports from the United States to our enemies such as the Communist bloc countries. In addition it furnishes authority for restricting the export of scarce commodities, and finally it provides authority to regulate exports to further the foreign policy aims of our country. There was no controversy during the hearings before the full committee over the need for extension of this act. The original request called for an unlimited extension of the act but your committee felt that the extension should be limited to a period of 4 years in order to afford the Congress an opportunity for periodic review.

Regarding the civil penalties provision of the bill, under the act as now in effect there are no civil or administrative sanctions available for the punishment of violations other than the suspension or revocation of export licenses. Offenders may be prosecuted criminally, but this procedure may not be appropriate to the circumstances. There was a real need to be met for a penalty which would be serious enough to act as a deterrent but not so severe it would preclude its use in cases not involving a serious offense.

This is the reason, Mr. Chairman, why your committee in this bill authorized the administrative imposition of civil monetary penalties not exceeding $1,000 for violations of the act.

Most of the time of your Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee on International Trade was taken up in hearing testimony from administration witnesses, Members of Congress, and outside witnesses on the so-called Arab boycott. Basically, the purpose of those desiring legislation as contained in a number of bills introduced on this question want to prevent U.S. business firms from being allowed to comply with the requests for information demanded by the Arab League. In furthering the Arab League boycott against Israel, the League requires, for example, U.S. business firms to state among other things that they do not do business with Israel, that they do not employ Jews, that the majority ownership of their firm is held by others than Jews, and so forth.

All witnesses before your committee fully agreed that such requirements were deplorable, onerous, and contrary to the public policy of the United States both domestic and foreign. There was no disagreement by any of the witnesses that this situation poses extremely difficult problems for our Government and that thus far no truly satisfactory solution had been found to the situation except to attempt to deal with the problem on a case-by-case basis.

In view of the very understandably strong emotions aroused by the Arab boycott, there naturally has developed a feeling by some that the Congress should do something.

Mr. Chairman, your committee, as has been indicated, gave lengthy and careful study to this issue and the amendment which your committee recommends is in my judgment the appropriate action which this body should take. This amendment states:

> The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

In addition, in section 3(a) the term "technical data" was omitted and the word "information" substituted. The word "information" was used so that there would be no doubt that, if and when appropriate, the granting of any information by U.S. firms to foreign countries or their representatives enabling them to carry out a boycott against nations friendly to the United States would be a violation under the act.

As has been indicated, Mr. Chairman, your committee has recommended an amendment to the Export Control Act which clearly and precisely states a policy declaration on this matter. No doubt the argument will be made that policy statements have been declared by the Congress many times in the past and all too often they have been honored more in the breach.

But the fact must not be overlooked that in this most delicate area of foreign policy a lot of factors have to be weighed before a decision is made. Your committee did not believe it was wise to go beyond this declaration of policy statement and adopt legislative language which would make mandatory an explicit course of action by the executive branch. It was not thought that this sort of restriction on the President's authority in the most critical area of foreign policy and international trade would be wise or necessary.

Since original enactment of the export control legislation 25 years ago, the President has had administrative discretion under the statutory language to enable him to administer a complicated control program in the light of changing economic and political situations throughout the world. This system of export control has served our Nation well for a quarter of a century and we should not now—in response to the emotional pressures of the moment—undertake to write into the law detailed administrative directions to apply to a specific, narrow situation. If we should require the President to issue specific regulations against "boycotts and restrictive trade practices" as has been suggested, those regulations would have to be carried out regardless of the countries involved and regardless of any adverse impact on other far more important aspects of our foreign policy and national security.

The plain fact of the matter is that no one can possibly foresee the consequences of such mandatory, administrative detail-type legislation. That is why the Congress has in the past very wisely written the Export Control Act so as to leave administrative discretion in the hands of of the President—and that is exactly the way we should continue this law.

In their testimony before the Subcommittee on International Trade, witnesses for the administration stressed that, although the administration is very strongly opposed to restrictive trade practices against countries friendly to the United States, they could not support an amendment to the Export Control Act which would require the President to take specific administrative action regardless of the circumstances that may actually develop in the future.

We must keep in mind that the proposed amendment to require specific regulations be put into effect is directed against American businesses who are engaged in international trade in the Middle East area. The amendment would prohibit American businessmen from doing certain things. This amendment would not prevent the Arab nations from continuing their boycott efforts. This amendment would not penalize the Arab nations for continuing their efforts. The only ones to be penalized would be Americans.

Aside from the very important and fundamental policy consideration that the President of the United States should continue to have broad discretion in administering the Export Control Act, I should like to emphasize that even if this policy consideration were not involved the suggestion now before you would still be most unwise. If we could assume that it would result in terminating the Arab boycott efforts against Israel, then we might be justified in experimenting with it. If we could assume that adoption of this suggestion would in net result be better for America's economic interests, better for America's foreign policy interests, then we could take a chance on experimenting with this suggestion.

But the truth of the matter is that one cannot assume any of these things. The House is urged to approve this bill in the form recommended by your committee. Extension of the Export Control Act in this form will give the President of the United States sufficient authority to deal with all matters relating to export control, including the Arab boycott situation, in such manner as he deems most appropriate. This is as it should be.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, the only question of controversy in this legislation, H.R. 7105, is the provision adoped by the committee relative to the Arab boycott. On this section of the bill before us we deliberated the issue at length—the subcommittee held extensive hearings and there was no question of the committee's position opposing this boycott.

The only question was on how this can be effectively accomplished through amendment of the bill extending the Export Control Act.

I had hoped the committee would adopt stronger language than that contained in a declaration of policy.

The subcommittee's hearings convinced me more than ever of the need for language not only expressing our opposition to boycotts, but to provide means to prevent American firms from participating in any boycott carried out by a foreign nation to further its own political objectives aimed at a country friendly to the United States.

I feel, and I am sure each of you feels, we have an obligation to protect the American businessman. We have an obligation to prevent American business from being used as pawns in a foreign political situation. We have an obligation as Members of Congress to prevent harassment, intimidation, and blackmailing of American business by a foreign nation.

The subcommittee did approve language setting forth a declaration of policy. This was well and good as far as it went. In fact, it was virtually the same language as the first part of the legislation that I offered in the subcommittee, which was identical with the legislation introduced by 30 of our colleague in this House and by 30 Members of the other body.

But our amendment had a second part—and that is the part that had teeth, and that is the part that was left out of the committee amendment. Just to say we oppose boycotts is like saying we oppose sin. But what do we do about it?

True, the committee also included the word "information" in the Presidential authority section of the act—in other words, they included information as part of the jurisdiction the President may act on.

But to leave this to the President—with due respect—is not enough. Little if anything has been done for the past 15 years to thwart this boycott. I do not think we can hold out much hope for executive action without stronger language.

We have had declarations of policy in other instances written into legislation before. For example, our foreign aid bill contains antibias clauses, antiaggression clauses, and so forth. But it is left up to the administration to implement—and we all know that this has never been done.

So, it is one thing for Congress to express its sense. In this case, to set forth, in the declaration of our trade policy, our opposition to boycotts, and in turn ask that rules be promulgated to implement the declaration.

I feel we should leave no question in this legislation. Let us say we do not like this intimidation and blackmailing of American business and back it up by providing means to eliminate it. And that is all the advocates of this amendment would do.

True, we cannot legislate as to what a foreign power can or cannot do in regard to its own nationals, but we certainly can and should legislate in regard to establishing standards for American business to follow. That is all we who associated ourselves with the supplemental views want.

I should point out—and this is important—that a majority of the committee signed the supplemental views supporting this position. This is unheard of. Although the vote was 14 to 11 in committee, and the amendment did not prevail, there were 7 absentees and 1 who abstained from voting at the time. This position was reversed in the report with 17 members actually signing the supplemental views, with 1 additional member not available at the time but who has since declared his agreement with these views, making it a total of 18 members—a clear majority favoring this supplemental language.

Aside from the immorality and injustice involved with the existing Arab boycott practices which, in themselves, should be ample basis for this type of corrective legislation, the amendment can be fully justified as being in keeping with U.S. trade policy to promote free trade, to improve balance of payments, and to eliminate unwarranted trade barriers.

The testimony at the hearings fully convinced me that trade with the Arabs would not be seriously affected. To the contrary, I think in the long run effective legislation enacted here will ultimately improve our trade picture in the Middle East.

Incidentally, as a final note, I should point out that the testimony brought out that there was not a single known instance of opposition on the part of American business to the provision prohibiting participation in this boycott practice.

The major objection voiced by administration spokesmen was that the adoption of stronger language would place the United States in the inconsistent position of opposing economic boycotts in the Middle East while at the same time fostering an economic boycott in the Western Hemisphere against Cuba. But there is an essential difference between the two, for the Arab boycott is a secondary boycott, while our economic deprivation program against Cuba is not. We may discourage other nations from supplying Cuba with critically needed goods, but if, for example, a British firm decides to sell buses to Cuba, we do not boycott that firm. Under the Arab boycott—the secondary boycott—such a firm would be subject to the boycott. I think this is a very important distinction to keep in mind.

I strongly believe that we need the definitive language in this bill to protect the American businessman, to promote free trade, and to show the world that the U.S. Government will not be bullied or intimidated. And I ask all who are interested in fostering these causes to vote today for effective action.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H.R. 7105, is essentially a very simple proposition. It is a bill which seeks simply to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for a period of 4 years. This act, as we have come to know over the years, furnishes the basic authority for control of exports to Communist bloc countries, for restricting the outflow of scarce materials and for regulation of exports in furtherance of U.S. foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, there was, as might be expected, no controversy whatever of the need for the extension of the Export Control Act. It is an unfortunate fact of life that this legislation continues to be very urgently needed as a weapon in the cold war in which we continue to be engaged.

It was the consensus of the committee that a 4-year period would afford the Congress adequate opportunity for periodic review.

The bill contains two amendments which are worthy of mention; one of which is completely noncontroversial, and the other of which, as has been mentioned, raises a very difficult and delicate issue.

The simpler amendment would authorize civil monetary penalties not exceeding $1,000 for violation of the Export Control Act as a supplement to other penalties, some of which are more lenient and some more severe than those already in the act.

The more difficult amendment seeks to be responsive to the problem raised by pressures put upon American businessmen and business concerns in an effort to facilitate or implement boycotts or restrictive trade practices against countries friendly to the United States.

As we have heard, this situation, in its most graphic form, is illustrated by the Arab boycott against Israel.

The committee heard witnesses from the Department of State and the Department of Commerce, and witnesses from industry, and Members of Congress. Each and every one of the witnesses who testified deplored the fact of the Arab boycott.

There was no disagreement as to how this boycott is being implemented by the Arab League. Very simply, what happens is that an American concern seeking to do business in one of the Arab States receives a questionnaire insisting upon certain imformation as to the origin of the materials going into the product which the American firm seeks to sell and information as to whether or not the American firm also does business with Israel. If the American firm refuses to answer, it runs the risk of being boycotted by the Arab State in question.

As I say, this situation, which is not a new one, is one which was deplored by each and every one of the witnesses heard by the committee. The Department of State and the Department of Commerce witnesses indicated very strongly that it was the policy of the United States to resist such boycott efforts aimed at third party countries friendly to the United States.

The real issue that presented itself was how this resistance should be implemented.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. If, as the witnesses testified, the policy of the United States is to resist the effort to compel adherence to the boycott, would it not make the task of such officials easier if it were written into law? The act has not been administered well under provisions which permit the exercise of discretion. I believe the Congress ought to give direction to the officials, make specific their task so that there is no doubt of congressional intent.

Mr. ASHLEY. I appreciate very much the question of my illustrious friend from Illinois, because this is exactly the conclusion at which the committee arrived.

As a matter of actual fact, at the present time there is no policy statement to the effect that the United States does oppose such boycotts and restraints of trade. For this reason the broad consensus of the committee was to put this into writing and to make it a part of our law, not merely for the purpose of better defining the policy of the United States but really, which is much more important, to strengthen the hand of the President by giving him new, added authority as a basis for his actions to implement the policy.

Let me put it this way: At the present time the President is limited in the actions that he can take to register the opposition of the United States to boycotts and restraints of trade aimed at third-party countries friendly to the United States. With the added language written into the bill that is before us, the President then would have authority to take specific action. It was the feeling of the committee, at least at the time that the vote was taken, that it would be better to leave the specific acts aimed at implementing this statement of policy to the President who, after all, under the Constitution, is charged with the responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs. In all deference to my good friends on the committee on both sides of the aisle, a very difficult problem was raised as to whether this action on the part of the committee of simply writing in the increased power, namely, the expanded authority given to the President, was sufficient. The amendments that have been proposed by my distinguished friends, the gentlemen from New York [Mr. CELLER, Mr. MULTER, and Mr. HALPERN] and by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and many others, would have the committee go further and would have this body go further by prohibiting American business concerns from responding to the requests for information from the Arab League. I can only say this: The witnesses appearing before the Department of Commerce and the Department of State set forth in very unequivocal terms that this kind of action would jeopardize our own information denial programs; would interfere with the conduct of foreign affairs in the Middle East, particularly at a time when that situation is becoming more and more delicate and more and more volatile; would almost surely adversely affect our balance of payments; and, as a matter of fact, might very well result in hurting rather than helping the gallant new nation of Israel. This was the testimony of the top official in the Department of State.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ASHLEY. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does not the gentleman find an inconsistency with the testimony of the witnesses to the effect that it would interfere with our policy in the Middle East and with their other testimony to which he referred in which they said they were resisting the Arab boycott? In practice, I find no such resistance. That is why I favor the supplemental views in the report of the 17 members of the committee. I will support the amendment they propose to offer.

Mr. ASHLEY. The real question that presented itself in that connection was with respect to the method used by the Department of State to meet this type of effort on the part of the Arab League in implementing its boycotts. The State Department witness, Mr. Ball, felt quite strongly that it could be more successful in coping with the boycott on a case-by-case basis rather than by outlawing or prohibiting American businessmen from responding to questionnaires.

The thrust of his testimony was to the effect that we really cannot expect the Arab States to respond to the suggested amendment other than by finding new ways of securing the same information; only then it would be less reliable information. And it was his thought that although the motive behind the amendment is beyond question, its result might be very injurious to the very country that we seek to assist in so many ways.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if my distinguished friend will yield further, did the witnesses who advanced that contention delineate in any respect the manner in which it would be injurious to the country of Israel, which is the country, I assume, the gentleman is referring to?

Mr. ASHLEY. Let me say to the gentleman that there are many hundreds of American firms that are generating enormous trade with the Arab States and with Israel. Last year the U.S. exports to the Arab States amounted to approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars. This in turn resulted in a net favorable balance of trade for the United States of about half a billion dollars.

The volume of export business the United States did with Israel last year was approximately $130 million, and something approximately half of that resulted in a net favorable balance of trade. Many American businesses have succeeded through the effort of the State Department and through the efforts of their own representatives abroad in doing business both in Israel and the Arab States.

It was the testimony of Secretary Ball that if the prohibition suggested in the amendment were to become law, the Arab League would find ways of adducing information necessary for further punitive steps against American firms, both those that presently do business with Israel and in the Arab States and those which simply seek to do business with the Arab States.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if my distinguished friend will yield further, what could the Arab League do under those circumstances that they are not now attempting to do? I believe we must call a halt to surrendering to the effrontery of the Arab League. It has no right to demand the information which they have demanded. We should have refused long ago to permit the subjection of our business community to such questions.

Mr. ASHLEY. Again I refer to the testimony of men experienced in our State Department who feel quite strongly about this, and I must say as chairman of the subcommittee that conducted the hearings, and for the membership of the subcommittee, we were inclined to agree with Mr. Ball, that this proposed legislation would be regarded by the Arab States as being pro-Zionist and anti-Arab and would result in a worsening of relationships between the United States and the Arab countries; and that the Arab States might perfectly well turn to our European competitors for the goods and services we now provide and which are so important to us as a trading nation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if my distinguished friend will yield further, I assume the European competitors to whom they refer are competitors who are not dealing with Israel presently; if they were, they would be in the same position, would they not?

Mr. ASHLEY. Let us suppose that they are. I would say to the gentleman this, that the proposed amendment is the first effort on the part of any country to respond to the boycott in this manner.

There have been efforts to counter the boycott on the part of our sister nations throughout the world, but on the same informal basis, the same case-by-case basis, that our State Department has been using.

In some respects, Mr. Chairman, what I have said is, perhaps, somewhat beside the point although I believe it is well to give to the members of the Committee the background as to the considerations with which our committee has been concerned. I say that perhaps it is not entirely in point because I am happy to report that there may be agreement on an amendment that will be offered by one of our colleagues to bring together in acceptable compromise the conflicting positions that I have outlined.

This amendment does not take the form suggested by the language read by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. It is new language that has been drafted only in recent hours and I hope that the Committee will pay particular attention to it when it is offered. It does represent a means of solving a delicate, difficult situation, hopefully to the satisfaction of those who have been on opposing sides.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the generous amount of time which has been yielded to me by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, over a period of years, we, as members of Congress, have given to the Executive much authority with respect to the operations of foreign affairs and many times have succumbed to the position that the White House wanted to take in order to provide what we called a more flexible position for the Executive and not to interfere with our foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this has been very wise in most instances. However, unfortunately, I believe a number of times we have abandoned a position that the American people wanted us to take to express forcibly to the world and to the Executive what the people of the United States felt was meaningful with respect to our own position of leadership in the free world and our own desires for freedom and liberty for others.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this bill encompasses something that I feel is a perfect example of what has taken place in the past where the pressures are for Congress to keep its hands off as we move into a new phase of export control and the continuation of the present act. However, we are faced with the facts of life with reference to the Middle East, where there is an Arab boycott that has been going on to some extent as a result of our own action or inaction, however you want to term it. In other words, we have condoned, in effect, that boycott.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read for the RECORD the supplemental views that were signed by 17 of the 33 members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency with respect to restrictive trade practices and boycotts:

> We compliment the committee for adopting a very clear declaration of policy against restrictive trade practices and boycotts. The language as added to the bill by the subcommittee amendment is the exact language of the declaration of policy contained in about 60 bills that were introduced in both Houses of Congress.
>
> Unfortunately, the bill, as reported to the House, does not go far enough because it fails to implement this declaration of policy.
>
> It is important to keep clearly in mind that the State Department and the Commerce Department both testified before committees in both Houses of Congress that the declaration of policy is in accord with American principles and they went so far as to say they deplored the Arab boycotts and the restrictive trade practices indulged in by some of the Arab countries and that such conduct is to be condemned.
>
> Nevertheless, they have also indicated that on their so-called case-by-case review of complaints against this boycott and these restrictive trade practices, they have done little or nothing. Their testimony before the committees of both Houses indicates that even if we adopt this declaration of policy, they do not intend to change their practice, but will continue to review these matters on a case-by-case basis, doing what they think may be indicated should be done in each case.
>
> This will be deliberately flying in the face of the intent of the Congress and of the best American practices. The testimony clearly indicates that when a large bank or a large company applies to the State Department or the Commerce Department for help in connection with these boycott practices, representations are made on their behalf to the Arab governments concerned and relief is obtained. But when small merchants make complaints to the departments and seek help, they get a lot of doubletalk and are told either to comply or to lose their right to do business in these other countries.
>
> This is a double standard that the Congress must not permit to exist. The only way we can stop it is by adopting implementing language.
>
> The language as contained in the various bills seeking to amend the Export Control Act was quite broad. The amendment offered in the committee, which was defeated by a vote of 14 to 11 with 1 member voting present and 7 members being absent, is not as broad as that contained in the original amendments. It now meets the objection raised by the executive departments, that if the language as originally proposed were adopted, it would possibly prohibit Americans from even courteously responding to requests and indicating that the American law prohibits their giving any detailed information.
>
> The amendment as offered in the committee and which will be offered on the floor takes that possibility into account and requires only that the rules and regulations to be adopted pursuant to the declaration of policy, in order to implement the declaration of policy, shall prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements inconsistent with the declaration of policy. No one can or should object to that.
>
> As a matter of fact, as has been repeatedly pointed out, an American employer or an American firm is prohibited by law from asking what one's religion is, what his race is, what his place of origin may be or that of his ancestors. Despite such prohibitions in existing law, the practices of the State Department and the Commerce Department give permission, if not direction, to Americans to answer to foreigners the very questions which they are prohibited from asking of or answering to other Americans.
>
> This is an intolerable situation and it should be stopped at the earliest possible moment.
>
> It could be stopped by action of the Commerce Department or of the State Department without this legislation.
>
> Obviously, they have not stopped doing it and have no intention of stopping this practice, unless we direct it by appropriate legislation. We urge the enactment of such appropriate legislation.
>
> The language of the amendment, which we will offer and support on the floor of the House, will simply read: "Such rules and regulations shall prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of argeements inconsistent with the section 2(4) hereof."
>
> Section 2(4) is the declaration of policy adopted by the committee which reads: "The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States."

Mr. Chairman, the opponents of straightforward congressional action against the Arab League economic boycott of Israel are intoning the shopworn phrases "flexible foreign policy" and "tieing the President's hands."

In the past these expressions have always carried the day against congressional efforts forcefully to deal with the Sukarnos, Nassers, and others who delight in ridiculing and opposing U.S. foreign policies.

To those who bow at the altar of a so-called flexible foreign policy, forever sterilized against congressional exposure, let me say this:

Is it not better for Congress to tie the hands of the executive than to have the job done for us by dictators of Nasser's ilk?

Is it not better for the people's representatives in Congress assembled to correct a policy whose inflexibility has rewarded those who would pursue a policy of economic and military strangulation of a nation we helped to create?

Mr. Chairman, there is only one matter at issue, and that is, Shall we or shall we not continue to tolerate the Arab League economic boycott?

Shall we merely legislate a statement of congressional intent and policy that we know will be ignored by the executive branch?

Shall we, as a nation, continue tacitly to support a vicious economic boycott?

Shall we grant to American businessmen the means by which they legally can escape compliance with Arab League questionnaires which defy every principle upon which this country was founded?

Or shall we, in the high sounding name of "Presidential discretion" and "flexible foreign policy," once again turn the other cheek to foreign interests.

The choice, Mr. Chairman, is that simple.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. I want to commend the gentleman for his very fine speech. Does not the gentleman believe that both the Department of State and the Department of Commerce can be rightfully criticized for having knuckled under to the Arab League by condoning this intolerable practice at the same time saying they condemn it? Is that not what their practice has been over the years?

Mr. WIDNALL. It has been a beautiful case of walking the fence without taking a position so far as I can see.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I should first like to congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, for the very clear, logical, and moderate talk that he has just given. Indeed, I think he has outlined the case for congressional action very clearly and very simply.

I think it is time for the United States to do everything it can to foil the Arab boycott.

It is argued that for the United States to bear down on this boycott would undercut our efforts with nations cooperating in the U.S.-sponsored boycotts of North Vietnam and Cuba. I say there is no similarity between the Arab boycott and ours, and I am shocked at the suggestion. The situations are not parallel in the slightest. Israel under no circumstances can be called an aggressor nation. Cuba and North Vietnam fall into the category of direct or indirect aggressors. Furthermore, even in the case of Cuba or North Vietnam, our Government does not impose secondary boycotts. We do not blacklist any British firm, for example, which is doing business with Cuba; this is the offense which I think is chiefly to be struck down and which should be struck down by the Congress if we are to do what is right in this area.

I think there is another reason to demand stronger action by the United States in dealing with the Arab boycott, and that is its discriminatory basis. We have a strong policy in this country against inquiring about a person's race, religion, or national origin. Yet it is precisely by asking questions such as these of American companies that the Arab League effectuates its boycott. This is an intolerable situation and one which requires a firm rule designed to assist American companies in resisting these outrageous demands. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I endorse the gentleman's statement and support him in the amendment that he is preparing to offer.

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I do not believe I say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] that foreign policy is ever consistent. Different methods are always used with respect to different countries. Cuba and China, for example, cannot be placed on a par with little Israel or placed on a par with any of the Arab States.

I would say, certainly, that holding a trigger at the heads of American firms, demanding that they answer these questionnaires, is most obnoxious, as obnoxious as an alligator. For the United States to acquiesce in this malpractice to me is most repulsive and to most businessmen is most distressing.

The State Department and the Department of Commerce, with cavalier complacency, lend support to this Arab arrogance. Unfortunately, I fear, there are quite too many "Arabphiles" in the lower echelons of the State Department. To get there one must speak Arabic. How does one usually learn to speak Arabic? One goes to Roberts College or to the American College at Constantinople and Beirut, stays there 6 years, and learns Arabic. One then takes on the color of his surroundings in Arabia and becomes more Arab than the Arabs. There are too many of such kinds in the lower echelons of the State Department, and that is where policy originates. They influence those above them.

I would say that this man, Nasser, who was the chief engineer of these questionnaires and the Israel boycott, as the guiding spirit of the so-called Arab League, is a so-called megalomaniac. We should give him scant attention. He is as pleasant as a wart on one's nose.

The Arab League leaders themselves are a pusillanimous lot. If we show strength and courage to them, they quail.

We saw what the Chase National Bank did. It said, "We will have nothing to do with the questionnaires." It lost no business. There was no boycott thereafter against the Chase National Bank.

The Hilton Hotels thumbed their nose at the Arab League leaders. What happened? Nothing. They prospered in the Arab League countries.

When Nasser and his cohorts threatened Erhard, Chancellor of the Federal German Republic, and said, "If you recognize little Israel diplomatically, we will recognize East Germany," Erhard recognized Israel, and Nasser and the Arab countries did not recognize East Germany. The threat was sound and fury and signified nothing.

So we see that when one shows a bit of courage to these Arabs, they withdraw.

I will say that the Arabs would continue to trade wherever it is useful and advantageous for them to trade—regardless of answering questionnaires. We would not lose an iota of trade with the Arab countries if we passed the amendment which I shall support, sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

I have been to Israel a number of times. I wish you could go there yourselves and see for yourselves the wonderful things that little country has done, surrounded as it is by enemies who want to plunge it into the sea. That is a country where the flame of democracy burns brightly, and we must nurture that flame wherever it burns. We will not nurture it by insisting that American firms in this cowardly manner truckle to the Arabs. That will hurt little Israel.

Such action will not nurture of the Israel flame of democracy.

I said this before the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and those who have heard me will forgive repetition. If you go to Israel you see a determination among those people in little Israel, a determination as firm as a rock you hold in your hands.

You see an exaltation there that is as fierce as a streak of lightning.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. And you see a wondrous courage and, above all, a tremendous faith, a faith in their flag, a faith in themselves, and a faith in their country. They do not wear their faith as one would the fashion of a hat. Theirs is the faith, in the language of Browning, that can move mountains. In that faith, in that exaltation, and in that courage they will go far and they will worst the Arabs eventually, despite the fact that there are 40 million Arabs against 2 million Jews. Therefore, I say that the Multer amendment will strengthen and not weaken American commerce and at the same time help little Israel. Now, to state that our State Department is friendly to Israel, will not help. As to Israel our State Department is long on preachment and promises and short on performance. Somebody once said, "Sometimes our friends are more troublesome than our enemies."

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment our eminent dean of the House for his most excellent statement, and I wish to be associated with his remarks.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from New York. He has discussed the principle involved with his usual eloquence, expressing the need for legislation against the boycotting Americans of Jewish faith by the leaders of the Arab States. I will support the Multer amendment. I urge the chairman of the committee to accept this amendment. My only sorrow is that it is not stronger and is not mandatory on our Government. I have long sought this legislation in previous legislation and welcome any amendment to recognize the right of all Americans.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman refers to supporting the Multer amendment, do you mean the Multer amendment referred to in the committee report?

Mr. CELLER. No. I do not know whether it is in the committee report, but I think his amendment will soon be read to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I think and, in fact, I know that the distinguished dean of the House, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. CELLER] in referring to the Multer amendment, was referring to the Multer amendment which I will read in a moment. It is not the same as that in the supplemental views that has been read by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. It is much stronger and adds a great deal of strength to the bill. I think that it will do what the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] referred to, that is, it will make mandatory that which we declare here as policy.

I think it is the unanimous opinion of this House that the declaration of policy as contained in this bill is good and should be implemented. I trust that the implementation will be found in the amendment which I will offer after the bill is read and open for amendment. I refer to this amendment not as the Multer amendment but as the Multer-Halpern amendment. We struggled over this language long and arduously, and I think we have come up with an excellent result. I think all who are concerned will agree that this new language, if this amendment is adopted—and I trust it will be—does the full job.

Let me direct your attention first to page 5 of the bill, please. There on lines 16 to 19 you find the declaration of policy which is precisely the language of the declaration of policy in the 30-odd bills which were introduced in this House and some 30-odd bills which were introduced in the other body. That declaration of policy reads as follows:

> The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

The Multer-Halpern amendment does not touch that language. It continues that language and adds to the declaration of policy the following language:

> The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States—

And this is the new language—

> to encourage and request domestic concerns engaged in the export of articles, materials, supplies or information to refuse to take any action, including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements which have the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts forced or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States.

This gives us a very broad and complete declaration of policy. I do not know how you could adopt any language that would make it any broader or stronger; that would say that this country and American citizens are opposed to restrictive trade practices and opposed to boycotts and opposed to doing anything that would further them, that they are opposed to aiding any such boycott of a foreign country against another country friendly to the United States.

Now, for the implementation that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] asked for, there is in the same Multer-Halpern amendment, this additional language. The act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence—bear in mind, you are now extending the Export Control Act which provides for the issuance by the President of rules and regulations to implement the act—this new language will read as follows: Referring to the rules and regulations now called for by the existing act:

> Such rules and regulations shall implement the provisions of section 2(4) of this act.

Section 2(4) of this act, when you adopt this amendment, will be the declaration of policy which is already in the bill and the additional language that I have read to you.

I say that this does the full job, gives us a complete declaration of policy against restrictive trade practices, against boycotts, and directs an implementation of that policy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman on his amendment and say to him that I think it accomplishes the basic purposes of those Members of the House who introduced legislation on this subject and who feel so strongly about it. I should like to say to the gentleman that I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the full committee [Mr. PATMAN], the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ASHLEY] for their great consideration and cooperation with us in getting a full record on this matter.

I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] are to be congratulated on getting very broad support for the bill based upon the record which has been made on this matter.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I think much of the credit is to be given to all of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, because they approached this subject with an open mind and with a desire to accomplish the result we had in mind. There has been a difference of opinion as to the language to be used. I do think that now we have language that does the job and everybody can be happy with it.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am privileged to associate myself with this amendment. I feel it is strong. It sets forth our opposition to restrictive trade practices and boycotts. It requests domestic firms to refuse to participate in such practices. It requires rules and regulations to be promulgated to implement the declaration.

This language, Mr. Chairman, is a big improvement over the committee language. I find it not the ultimate that all of us would like, but it certainly is acceptable. It does not equivocate. Short of better language, it has my support.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] upon the language of the amendment which he proposes to offer. That, Mr. Chairman, together with the statement which the gentleman has made, I presume will delineate the intent of the Congress and will, in effect, do away with this economic inquisition on the part of the Arab countries.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, we must depend upon the rules and regulations, as the gentleman has stated, to implement the language of the amendment. I know that the State Department will be governed by this language and will not, through the use of any weasel words or any weasel rules and regulations, attempt to escape from the intent of the Congress in the promulgation of this language. This should put an end to this blackmail and this boycott by the Arab countries.

Mr. Chairman, I can understand the position of the State Department. They desire to be all things to all men. Obviously this is a difficult thing to do.

Our Ambassadors in the various countries do all they can to retain the friendship of the countries to which they are accredited, irrespective of the general effect of the policies of these countries on others. The State Department very naturally is guided by the reports of the various Ambassadors in making policy. They say they oppose the boycott, but want each case treated individually. This, to me, seems an impossible task.

The State Department favored assistance to Israel to make it an economically viable state. Israel no longer receives any grant aid and is now, I believe, to a degree economically viable.

The boycott is harmful to Israel's economy, yet the State Department is satisfied to permit its continuance. This I cannot understand.

They oppose the boycott against American business, but oppose an act that would remove it. This, I also cannot understand.

It seems to me we must rescue the State Department from what I believe is an untenable position.

The Arabs can boycott whomsoever they please; but that does not mean we must assist them.

As I see it, this amendment is but putting into effect a declaration made in one of our foreign aid bills opposing boycotts and blockades against American citizens and American business.

Seventeen years ago this year a series of armistice agreements were signed between the newly created State of Israel and the Arab States which had sought, unsuccessfully, to prevent its founding. Unsuccessful in their attempt to destroy Israel by force of arms, the Arab States have contended that a state of war still exists, and have moved their campaign of action against that country onto the economic plane. In general, this has consisted of closing the Suez Canal to all Israeli ships and goods, of establishing a blacklist of companies which do business with Israel, as well as boycott threats against companies which are considering doing business with Israel.

In actual fact, the repercussions and extent of this attempted economic warfare are far wider than the above list would lead the uninitiated observer to believe. Along with those of other nations, American manufacturers, business firms, traders, importers and exporters, and companies engaged in almost every conceivable type of commerce have been subjected to a wide variety of practices which are completely contrary to the normal course of international trade.

Nearly 15 years ago, the Arab countries created the Central Arab Boycott of Israel Office, with headquarters in Damascus. Designed to coordinate the activities of the Arab States in their economic warfare against the State of Israel, it has a semiofficial status within the Arab League. Its purposes and functions, however, are unlike those of any other boycotting operation. It not only sees to it that Arab countries and companies do not purchase Israeli goods and services, it extends its operations to a secondary boycott of foreign firms who have any kind of dealings with Israel whatever, and even a tertiary boycott of other foreign companies who deal with these companies.

While we as Americans cannot legally question the right of Arab companies or the various Arab States to refuse to deal with Israel if they so choose, we can most vigorously oppose the secondary and tertiary boycotts which they attempt to impose upon American firms. At the present time, it is the policy of the Arab boycott office to send out what are euphemistically termed "questionnaires" in the event a company is suspected of committing any of approximately 20 different possible actions which entail blacklisting. These "questionnaires," which have, I think legitimately, been termed an "economic inquisition," are a very serious affront to American businessmen pursuing their legitimate interests and ends. They require an answer, for failure to do so is usually taken as prima facie evidence of guilt. They require notarized evidence that the firm is not violating any of the various conditions which lead to boycotting action. These and the many other conditions which the boycott office create for American companies are demeaning, embarrassing, and humiliating. It is my firm conviction that they should also be illegal.

The Arab boycott has as its main purpose the undermining of the economy of the State of Israel. In order to achieve this goal, it has tried to draw into its armory the operations of companies from all over the globe. As many others have pointed out, this is an incredible extension of a regional dispute; should it set a precedent, American business would become involved in every single political dispute the world over.

However, this political aspect is not the only one. It has often been charged that the boycott has not affected Israel to any great degree. Although it is true that the effect has certainly not been that intended by the Arab states, it would be false to claim that the economy of Israel has not suffered. Economists have pointed out that it forces an uneconomic reallocation of resources—not only in Israel, but actually in the Arab States as well. Both parties to this dispute have, in fact, been harmed. The Israelis are required to obtain some goods through wholly illogical and often expensive channels, while the Arab States, as a result of their operations, are similarly forced to obtain replacement goods which are often inferior in quality and workmanship from companies not on the blacklist.

Quite obviously, also, the possibilities of greater foreign investment by both American and European companies in the Middle East are seriously hampered. Many companies are simply not willing to risk large capital outlays for only a portion of what could be a vast and very profitable common market.

But, let us also consider American industry. By being unnecessarily coerced into choosing one market rather than both, American businessmen deprive themselves of additional sales. This not only deprives many of the economies of larger production and markets, it also lowers their profit potential. And, from the standpoint of the United States as a whole, this boycott artificially limits the quantity of total American exports, a factor which we have often been told is of the essence in reducing our balance-of-payments deficits.

The primary purpose of the legislation which has been introduced is to assist American business in overcoming this artificial wall to expanded trade. Some businesses have cooperated with the boycott in order not to lose their sales and markets; others have curtailed their trade or hesitated to fully exploit the potential markets which do exist; and yet others have categorically and vigorously rejected any attempt by foreign agents to tell them in what manner they should run their own enterprises. There is no clear and meaningful reason why American businessmen should be forced to answer the various interrogations which the boycott office carries out, why they should be required to obtain special affidavits, or why American chambers of commerce or other trade organizations should be forced to certify commercial invoices as to their nature or composition of their products. The legislation which has been introduced to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 is designed solely for the purpose of protecting American businessmen and enterprises from the intimidation and harassment of the Arab boycott office.

Despite the clarity of purpose behind this amendment, and the demonstrable need for it, there have been serious misstatements of its intent, as well as misinterpretations of its applicability. It is sad to report that among those who have been guilty of such misrepresentation, and contradictory public and private utterances about the amendment are two departments of the Government: State and Commerce. Even though they have both reiterated their opposition to such restrictive practices in principle, they have consistently argued that making it illegal for American companies to respond to such questionnaires would seriously impair American economic policies with respect to Communist China and Cuba, for example. They have also claimed that it would be better for American companies to learn to live with the boycott, because altering the situation might endanger American relations with the Arab nations. I do not think it is necessary to summarize here all of their arguments—they are, I think it is fair to say, generally contradictory and seemingly unconcerned with any of the economic or moral principles which are a vital part of this question.

It has been demonstrated conclusively that there are many American and European companies which have refused to knuckle under to the kinds of pressure and threats which the Arab States have brought to bear. A prime example has been the Hilton hotel chain; another has been the Chase Manhattan Bank; and, probably the most commonly known examples are the various airlines which continue to operate services to both Arab nations and Israel. Evidently, if the Arab countries feel that they have more to gain by continuing their connections with certain companies which operate both in their own territory as well as in Israel, the provisions of the boycott are overlooked or speciously explained away. Similarly, it is obvious that certain of the Arab States enforce the provisions of the boycott far less stringently than others; there are examples too numerous to detail of companies with a sales office in Israel, or an assembly plant there, or Israelis among their stockholders, or who have violated some or all of the myriad other offenses against the boycott, whose products are quite obviously a part of the local scene.

All in all, the Arab attempt to boycott Israel and seriously affect her economy by threatening foreign companies, traders, and manufacturers is not only a breach of established international trade practice, it is illogical, unreasonable, and, as I have said before, it should be illegal. Various European chambers of commerce have come out strongly against having manufacturers and businessmen in their countries subject themselves to such harassment and intimidation. I see no reason why the U.S. Government should not similarly support American businessmen. In fact, this amendment presents two very clear alternatives: either Congress approves of it, thereby protecting American businessmen from such foreign pressure, or Congress fails to approve it, thereby putting American businessmen at the mercy of any and all foreign countries who wish to extend their disputes into the arena of international trade generally, and American commerce specifically. These are the alternatives. It is Congress duty to protect and defend the interests of the United States and its citizens; unless it votes to pass this amendment, it will have been derelict in this duty.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, referring to the previous speaker, I would just say that many things we have presumed to intend as to what the State Department is going to do in some of these areas are not carried out.

Mr. Chairman, I am very disappointed that this amendment is going to be offered at this time which, certainly, is not as strong as the one where 17 of the members of the committee signed supplemental views.

When you say "to encourage and request," it is far different than saying "prohibit." The word "prohibit" was the intent, because we felt this was the only way we could make it strong enough as to what the intent of the Congress was and what should be done in trying to eliminate the harmful aspects of this boycott now being conducted by the Arab nations.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see where this will do the job. If I could, I would certainly go along with what is being proposed by the gentleman from New York right now. However, I fully intend to offer as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman the original wording cited in the supplemental views of the members of this committee.

Mr. MULTER. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair. He always is and he always has been. I am sure he is going to be fair now. However, I believe the gentleman ought to tell this body at this time that the declaration of policy as contained in the reported bill is exactly as it was in the proposed amendments. We have every word we wanted exactly as we offered it then. It is in the bill now on page 5 thereof. Now we come forward and by the Multer-Halpern amendment add to the declaration of policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Now, we go further and we add to that declaration of policy additional language. As I said when someone threw out the suggestion when we were discussing this language that this additional declaration weakens the first, I said, "All right; let us take it out." He ran away. He said, "Oh, no, no, keep it in."

Obviously, it does add not just something but a great deal. If the gentleman will just look at it and bear in mind that what we are doing is not taking anything away from the present language but adding to it. In addition to the original declaration of policy there is an additional declaration that the State Department and the Commerce Department shall encourage and request American concerns to refuse to cooperate with these restrictive trade practices and with these boycotts.

However, Mr. Chairman, what is more important and what is not in the present bill is that we add, as was suggested in the supplemental views, in order to implement the declaration of policy—that is, the language I used in the supplemental views that 17 of us signed—now we will add to this bill by my amendment this language:

> Such rules and regulations shall implement the provisions of section 2(4) of this Act.

And section 2(4) is the declaration now contained in the bill, plus the additional declaration.

In answer to those who suggest "implement by rules and regulations" will not do the job, let me say, you cannot implement it negatively. You have to implement it positively, and the State Department and the Commerce Department must issue rules that will implement this by saying to American firms "You cannot answer these questionnaires; it is nobody's business what your religion may be or what the religion is of anyone connected with your firm. You do not answer these questions. You may do nothing that will in any way aid these restrictive trade practices or this boycotting."

Mr. WIDNALL. I never understood the word "prohibit" to be really negative. We thought that was very positive, and that is the reason for the language.

Mr. MULTER. Let me call to the gentleman's attention what we do in all statutes. The commandment is that you shall not steal. We do not write that into a penal code. We provide that he who steals shall be punished. We declare that these trade practices are immoral, we say that these practices are wrong and bad. We say we will implement that declaration by rules which say you cannot do this and shall not do that. But bear in mind in this same statute you have criminal penalties and certainly you do not want any man, woman, or any American concern who innocently may answer an inquiry, to be indicted and found guilty of a crime because they did not know of the existence of this policy or these rules and regulations. These rules and regulations will require that the American public be advised of the declaration of policy. They must be fully advised of all its implications and then be guided accordingly. I think this does a full job without putting any innocent American concern, or anyone, in the position of being indicted for a criminal offense when they did not have any intention of committing any crime.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New York who has been in the forefront of the fight against the Arab boycott.

It is the stated policy of our Government to promote trade and encourage exports, and anything inimical to such policy should be removed. Furthermore, we must protect American businessmen against pressures and harassment which will discourage trade.

The State Department, in its usual diplomatic terms, has characterized the Arab boycott as "regrettable" and "unfortunate." Not being so polite, I characterize it as reprehensible blackmail on American business.

Concern has been expressed by some that the enactment of the proposed amendments to the Export Control Act would result in the Arab states terminating their trade with the United States. I would remind those who have such misgivings that we still sell wheat to the Arab nations under Public Law 480. The Arab States would not be so foolish as to deprive themselves of the benefits of Public Law 480 by terminating trade with the United States.

Some have also expressed concern that we would be favoring one "friendly" nation as against another. The word "friendly" is hardly applicable to the United Arab Republic which is cuddling up to the Soviet Union, disrupting peacekeeping activity in the Congo, and whose leader has invited the United States to "jump in the ocean."

At any rate, the proposed amendment would not favor one nation as against another, but rather would insure neutrality so that American business would be free to trade with both Israel and the United Arab Republic.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. I think we are in the position we have found ourselves in here in the House where, as you know and I know, you march up the hill then march down again. We have reached the top of the hill in this matter, and I think the House is prepared to vote for the prohibition on the furnishing of this information. I for one, and I know many, many others on both sides of the aisle, are sick and tired of providing advisory language, then seeing the intent and the will of the House destroyed by those who are in the administrative agencies of the Government. I cannot believe that using the words "encourage and request" will do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Will the gentleman answer this question: Would you take out this subdivision (b) of the declaration of policy? Will you recommend that we take out "to encourage and request"?

Mr. WIDNALL. Not in the declaration of policy. It could be taken out.

Mr. MULTER. Would you recommend taking it out?

Mr. WIDNALL. I think it is the same sort of thing we have done over and over again during the years and have accomplished nothing. The gentleman will see the day when he will regret it because the State Department and the Commerce Department did not implement the legislation in the way you hoped that it would.

Mr. MULTER. My amendment says they shall do so.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. With all due respect to my colleague, the gentleman from New York, for whom I have a great deal of admiration, I think what we have in this amendment is merely a stronger statement of policy than that included in the original committee bill. With respect to that original statement of policy, the State Department testified before the committee that this has always been our policy and that they intended to continue to take each matter on a case-by-case basis and, in effect, do nothing.

The new Multer-Halpern amendment purports to strengthen the committee bill by adding a requirement that the State Department implement. But what do they have to implement? They have to implement only rules and regulations to "encourage and request" domestic concerns to refuse to cooperate in supplying information. There are no more teeth than there were in the original committee version.

Mr. MULTER. Do not omit the first part of the declaration of policy from these rules and regulations:

First, shall implement the declaration of policy which is (a) to wit—to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts and (b) to encourage and request domestic concerns to refuse to cooperate.

Mr. OTTINGER. Would the gentleman accept language to substitute for the words "to encourage and request" the words "to require"? I think this is what will be necessary to see that the State Department implements the policy to achieve what the gentleman seeks. What we need is mandatory language such as the gentleman from New York proposed in the supplemental views subscribed by a majority of our committee—not merely the precatory language proposed in this compromise amendment.

Mr. MULTER. I beg this House and beg this Committee—let us stop quibbling about words. The language is as inclusive as we can make it. Now to add to it a shall or must provision for the implementation of this declaration of policy is mere redundancy. I assure you in my opinion and if you only look at this fairly, you will have to agree that this is going to do the full job and the State Department cannot run away from it.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. I want to say to the gentleman from New York quite honestly, I think from my standpoint, he has done too good a job with his amendment. I take the view that the foreign policy of the United States is the rightful prerogative of the President of the United States and it is generally a sad day when the House of Representatives seeks to insert itself into this area, particularly when the President has indicated the course he wishes to follow. The language that the gentlemen from New York [Mr. Multer and Mr. Halpern] have suggested, quite frankly, goes far beyond what normally would be acceptable to me. But we have sat through days and weeks of hearings. The two positions have been well established. We are not talking about an area that is easily reduced to a common denominator. There are conflicting views. Those who seek no compromise, and those who rule out as a possibility language that can bridge the two positions, I say do so at their own risk, really. I would suggest this may not be in the best interest of what they seek to accomplish. I do not like the language of this amendment because I think it goes too far in hampering the conduct of foreign affairs by the President of the United States. I accept it with reluctance because I feel, in the best interest of what we are trying to accomplish here, it provides the best means of doing so.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. With respect to the supplemental views that appear in the report which have the support of 17 members of the committee and which refer to an amendment which will be offered and was read by the gentleman from New Jersey, is it the gentleman's understanding that the amendment, as stated in the supplemental views, will not be offered now when the time comes for offering amendments?

Mr. MULTER. It is my intention to offer the amendment I have read and that I have been discussing here this afternoon, and it will be offered in lieu of the language that appears in the supplemental views.

Mr. YATES. Is it the gentleman's understanding as well that no Member from the other side, no matter whose name appears thereon, will offer that amendment?

Mr. MULTER. Let me put it this way. I do not intend to quibble with the gentleman. When the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] worked up this language with me, it was my understanding that he accepted this and I accepted it and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley] indicated he would accept it. The distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. Patman] indicated he would accept and that that would be the end of it. I hope it will be the end of it. I think we have a good compromise. But it looks now as though some of the minority Members do not wish to go along with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. In answer to the gentleman from Illinois, I intend to offer the original amendment suggested by the 17 who signed the supplemental views. It will be offered as a substitute for the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer]. That amendment is something which has recently been drawn. It is not printed or circulated.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. A moment ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley] said that the amendment went too far. I believe that sometimes Members of this House forget the provision of the Constitution which says the sole authority over the control of exports is placed in the legislative branch. I do not believe the language goes too far at all.

Mr. MULTER. Whether it does not go far enough, or goes too far, I hope the committee will accept it as a happy compromise.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. May I compliment the great statesman from New York [Mr. Multer] and the others who have collaborated in the selection of language so plain that all can understand and so firm that none would dare to ignore. The friendship of the United States for the State of Israel is deep and enduring, and the boycott of the Arab States aimed to harm Israel is repugnant to every sense of decency and morality. I read from a telegram I have just received from Milton J. Silberman, speaking for the American Zionist Council and the Illinois Conference of Jewish Organizations: "I respectfully request that you communicate with our entire Illinois delegation our feeling that they support regardless of party the philosophies of the Multer-Halpern amendment which prohibits cooperation with boycotts."

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I wish to agree with the gentleman from Washington and to say that I must disagree with my good friend from Ohio. There is a place in foreign policy for the Congress. I believe the gentleman has used restraint. I believe the amendment which he and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] have worked out will do the job effectively and affirmatively. I hope it will be upheld by the House. The executive branch has not always been clear in this matter.

The Department of State has always been reluctant to take firm action against the boycott and similar activities. But the Congress of the United States and the national conventions have reiterated their opposition to those practices on many occasions.

On July 25, 1956, the Senate unanimously adopted a resolution offered by Senator Herbert Lehman, which reads as follows:

> Whereas the protection of the integrity of U.S. citizenship and of the proper rights of U.S. citizens in their pursuit of lawful trade, travel, and other activities abroad is a principle of U.S. sovereignty; and
>
> Whereas it is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among U.S. citizens based on their individual religious affiliations and since any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinctions among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to U.S. citizens generally is inconsistent with our principles: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved,* That it is the sense of the Senate that it regards any such distinction directed against U.S. citizens as incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations, and that in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state every reasonable effort should be made to maintain this principle.

The Democratic Party, in 1956, at its convention declared:

> We oppose, as contrary to American principles, the practice of any government which discriminates against American citizens on grounds of race or religion. We will not countenance any arrangement or treaty with any government which by its terms or in its practical application would sanction such practices.

The Republican platform read:

> We approve appropriate action to oppose the imposition by foreign governments of discrimination against U.S. citizens, based on their religion or race.

In 1959, ARAMCO was under fire because it was charged that it was screening employees who might have to apply for visas for Saudi Arabia. The New York State Commission Against Discrimination permitted ARAMCO an exemption from its laws because the Department of States said that U.S. policy in the Near East might be affected. The New York State Supreme Court ruled against ARAMCO. The supreme court said:

> If the enforcement of the public policy of New York State would embarrass the State Department in the Near East, then it should be said that the honor of American citizenship—if it remains for New York State to uphold it—will survive ARAMCO's fall from Arab grace.

In 1959, Congress adopted an amendment to the foreign aid appropriation which declared:

> It is the sense of Congress that any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to U.S. citizens generally is repugnant to our principles, and in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this act these principles

> shall be applied as the President may determine.

In the summer of 1960, Congress again took action on this issue, approving an amendment which originated in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which firmly declared American opposition to boycotts. The Mutual Security Act declared:

> It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as: (1) the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations; and (2) the purposes of this act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades and the restriction of the use of international waterways.

A few weeks later, the Democratic platform declared:

> Protection of the rights of American citizens to travel, to pursue lawful trade and to engage in other lawful activities abroad without distinction as to race or religion is a cardinal function of the national sovereignty. We will oppose any international agreement or treaty which by its terms or practices differentiates among American citizens on grounds of race or religion.

Two weeks later the Republican convention promised "to seek an end to transit and trade restrictions, blockades and boycotts."

Now at last we can together make the whole matter clear. The Multer-Halpern amendment does exactly what is needed.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending bill, H.R. 7105, to amend the Export Control Act of 1949. The purpose of this proposal is to provide American exporters protection from the increasing intimidation of that notorious world troublemaker, Nasser, as he spares no savagery to wreak economic havoc on Israel, America's great democratic friend.

As my colleagues are aware, this legislation has had my sponsorship and support for some time. I am proud to be the author of H.R. 7863, a bill similar to the amendment now before the committee. Further, during hearings held by the Committee on Banking and Currency in consideration of this amendment to the Export Control Act, I was pleased to offer my views in behalf of the bill and to urge its being favorably reported.

American exporters are not immune to the effects of restrictive trade measures. Such is the case of the Arab boycott.

Nasser's cunning against Israel employs the Arab boycott in this way: Exporters in the United States and elsewhere in the world who wish to trade with the United Arab Republic find themselves subject to close control by the central Arab boycott office in Damascus, Syria. In order to conduct commerce, the exporters must file with this office voluminous information on their trade with other countries, especially Israel. Those who refuse to comply with the boycott restrictions or who indicate trade with Israel firms find themselves denied trade with the United Arab Republic. It is purely and simply a blacklist which results from the answers furnished by the exporters.

We have two principal reasons to oppose this Arab boycott: First, American business deserves protection from this harassment, and second, Israel deserves our support in helping to check the vicious effects of these restrictions.

A nation that is free is under national obligation to secure and assure that freedom for all who act in allegiance to it. Thus, Mr. Chairman, it is our responsibility to protect the rights and freedom of this Nation's export community by enacting this legislation which will allow its members to turn a deaf ear on the demands of the central Arab boycott office.

Further, and just as importantly, our belief in freedom is a belief in fostering national independence throughout the world and in doing our best to save it whenever it is threatened. Again, then, Nasser's intended victimizing of Israel must be met with our rightful wrath, and that is and will be a significant expression of the action I ask the House to take today.

For the protection of democratic rights here and abroad, we should give this legislation our overwhelming approval.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, opponents of the mandatory antiboycott legislation now before the House have characterized it as emotional and have criticized its efficacy and wisdom. At the same time, they agree that the boycott practices are thoroughly indefensible and a flagrant violation of the rights of American business firms. It seems to me that theirs is the emotional attitude, relying upon noble declarations of policy to accomplish our objective of protecting American business against these boycott practices. It is evident that Nasser and his cohorts are not moved by words, and that a negative attitude will achieve nothing.

Mere declarations of policy will not protect American business firms from the blackmail tactics of the Arab States. What is absolutely essential, as my cosigners and I stated in our supplemental committee report, is to implement this declaration of policy against restrictive trade practices or boycotts by prohibiting the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements that would further such practices or boycotts.

Our committee hearings clearly established that the boycott measures constitute a serious problem to many American firms, particularly smaller ones, and that our citizens want relief from them. One witness, whose importing firm has been victimized by the Arab League because of its trade with Israel, testified that if restrictions of this kind had been imposed when the firm was organized 25 years ago, "we not only would not have grown, but probably could not have continued at all." It is a regrettable fact that small firms are compelled to succumb to the Arab tactics or lose their right to do business in those countries. I think our merchants have a right to expect the support of their Government in this intolerable situation.

The leader of the free world must not permit itself to be a party to these reprehensible policies. By tolerating the participation, reluctant as it is, of American firms in the Arab boycott against Israel, we are injuring our national esteem, involving our citizens in other nations' disputes, and aiding and abetting an aggressive assault against a stanch ally.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is the duty of the Congress to insure that American businessmen need observe only the normally accepted practices of international commerce. The mandatory antiboycott measure is urgently needed. I am proud to sponsor it. I urge its approval.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] to protect American firms and American interests from the Arab boycott of Israel.

As we know, the Arab League, in attempts to further its economic boycott of Israel, has required American firms doing business with any of its member nations to state, among other things, that they do not do business with Israel, that they do not employ Jews, and that the majority ownership of their firms is not held by Jews.

These requirements are not only deplorable and onerous, they are completely contradictory to the policies and the principles of this country.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the committee's bill sets forth a declaration of policy against this practice. But a declaration of policy is not enough. We need language, which this amendment provides, to prevent American firms from participating in any boycott which is carried out by a foreign nation or nations to further its own political objectives and which is aimed at a country friendly to the United States.

We cannot, of course, legislate as to what a foreign power can do or cannot do in regard to its own nationals. But we certainly can and should legislate as to the standards of our own practices.

This is what this amendment seeks to do. It implements the declaration already included in the bill by giving it the teeth which can make it effective. As support for the very principles and policies of our country, this amendment should be approved overwhelmingly today.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. 2032) is amended by changing "1965" to read "1969".
>
> SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. 2025) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:
>
> "(c) The head of any department or agency exercising any functions under this Act, or any officer or employee of such department or agency specifically designated by the

head thereof, may impose a civil penalty not to exceed $1,000 for each violation of this Act or any regulation, order, or license issued under this Act, either in addition to or in lieu of any other liability or penalty which may be imposed.

"(d) The payment of any penalty imposed pursuant to subsection (c) may be made a condition, for a period not exceeding one year after the imposition of such penalty, to the granting, restoration, or continuing validity of any export license, permission, or privilege granted or to be granted to the person upon whom such penalty is imposed.

"(e) Any amount paid in satisfaction of any penalty imposed pursuant to subsection (c) shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt. The head of the department or agency concerned may, in his discretion, refund any such penalty, within two years after payment, on the ground of a material error of fact or law in the imposition. Notwithstanding section 1346(a) of title 28 of the United States Code, no action for the refund of any such penalty may be maintained in any court.

"(f) In the event of the failure of any person to pay a penalty imposed pursuant to subsection (c), a civil action for the recovery thereof may, in the discretion of the head of the department or agency concerned, be brought in the name of the United States. In any such action, the court shall determine de novo all issues necessary to the establishment of liability. Except as provided in this subsection and in subsection (d), no such liability shall be asserted, claimed, or recovered upon by the United States in any way unless it has previously been reduced to judgment.

"(g) Nothing in subsection (c), (d), or (f) shall limit—

"(1) the availability of other administrative or judicial remedies with respect to violations of this Act or any regulation, order, or license issued under this Act,

"(2) the authority to compromise and settle administrative proceedings brought with respect to violations of this Act or any regulation, order, or license issued under this Act, or

"(3) the authority to compromise, remit, or mitigate seizures and forfeitures pursuant to section 1(b) of title VI of the Act of June 15, 1917 (22 U.S.C. 401(b))."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good deal this afternoon with reference to questions as to race or religion being asked of those who come under this act. I would like to call attention to the agricultural census presently being taken in the State of Iowa. The farmers of the State of Iowa are being asked, "What is your race? Mark one: white, Negro, or other." Yet when any applicant for Federal employment fills out a Form 57, and all must do so, it is prohibited by law these questions be asked. I would like to know how it is possible to ask the farmers of Iowa what their race may be when this same question cannot be asked of an individual applying for Federal employment. Are the farmers of Iowa being discriminated against? What is the story? Perhaps this committee is not the place to raise the question, but I want someone, somewhere to tell me why the asking of this question is prohibited when a person seeks employment in the Federal Government and is required to be answered in an agricultural census.

As far as this particular act is concerned, I do not think it is worth the paper it is written on. I call your attention to the story which appeared in the Washington Star on May 8 of this year. The opening paragraph of this story reads:

> Faced with the threat of a boycott campaign by a conservative organization, the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. recently halted negotiations to sell Communist Rumania a $50 million synthetic rubber plant even though the deal had the official approval of the U.S. Government and the personal blessing of President Johnson.

What does the Export Control Act mean if it does not stop the sale of a synthetic rubber plant worth $50 million to the Communist country of Rumania? This sale was stopped but only because patriotic citizens of this country rose up and threatened a boycott of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. at their retail outlets throughout the country; their various plants; and particularly at the recent Memorial Day speedway races at Indianapolis, Ind. What does this Export Control Act mean if Lyndon Johnson and his State Department give their blessing to the sale of a strategic synthetic rubber plant to the Communists? It seems to me this afternoon that the renewal of this act is tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee. I could not be less interested in whether this act is extended if the President of the United States is not interested in controlling such exports.

The Clerk. Page 5, line 8:

Sec. 3. (a) Section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. 2022) is amended (1) by redesignating clauses (a), (b), and (c) in the first sentence as (A), (B), and (C), (2) by inserting "(1)" at the beginning of the first, "(2)" at the beginning of the second, and "(3)" at the beginning of the third typographical paragraph thereof, and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States."

(b) Section 3(c) of such Act is amended by changing "clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof" to read "section 2(1)(B) or 2(1)(C) of this Act".

Sec. 4. (a) The first and last sentences of section 3(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. App. 2023(a)) are amended by changing "technical data" to read "information".

(b) Section 4(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. App. 2024(a)) is amended (1) by changing "which articles, materials, or supplies" to read "what" and (2) by striking out "thereof".

(c) Section 5(b) of such Act (50 U.S.C. App. 2025(b)) is amended by changing "any material" to read "anything".

Mr. PATMAN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the committee amendment be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULTER

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Multer: After the words "United States", insert "(a)" and on page 5, line 19, after the words "United States" and before the period insert: "And (b) to encourage and request domestic concerns engaged in the export of articles, materials, supplies, or information, to refuse to take any action, including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements which have the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States".

And at page 6, immediately after line 7, add the following: "(d) Section 3(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such rules and regulations shall implement the provisions of section 2(4) of this Act."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. Surely.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have conferred with a sufficient number of Members on the majority side, including the chairman of the subcommittee that conducted hearings on this bill, to justify me as chairman of the full committee in accepting the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WIDNALL

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Widnall as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Multer: On page 6, immediately after line 7, add the following:

"(d) Section 3(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

" 'Such rules and regulations shall prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements inconsistent with section 2(4) of this Act.' "

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite clear from the debate that has taken place that the one issue with respect to continuing the Export Control Act is the way we will try to take care of restrictive trade measures or boycotts and prevent unfriendly nations from stepping in to try to accomplish their purposes under this act, as it involves our people in the United States.

As the majority of our committee said in the supplemental views in the report, who supported the amendment I have offered as a substitute—and I shall read it:

> Such rules and regulations shall prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements inconsistent with the section 2(4) hereof.

That section 2(4) is the declaration of policy which was adopted by the committee that is in the bill and which is being offered to the House, where it says:

> The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

Frankly, as a member of the committee, and the ranking member of the committee, I am surprised by the offering of this amendment on the floor today by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]. I think it definitely weakens the intent of the members of the committee, after hearing all of the testimony produced before the committee from administration witnesses and others.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, the Arab boycott is odious on its face. The United States has always opposed it as a matter of policy, but our policy has lacked teeth.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Members of the House that certificates of origin and information of stock ownership and holders thereof requiring the identification of Jewish ownership are repugnant and are contrary to the laws of many States of this Nation. Our Government should not facilitate—in any sense—direct or indirect, the filing of these reports by American companies.

Secondary and tertiary boycotts should be opposed as a clear restraint of international trade. I further believe it is essential for the future of Israel that something be done here and now, to put teeth in a policy that has always been U.S. policy but has never been fully implemented. Some U.S. and European firms have opposed the boycott and have prevailed; some have capitulated. The loss of markets to Israel is hard to measure, but the boycott in and of itself is certainly a form of economic warfare contrary to peace in the area.

The amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New Jersey and which uses the word "prohibit" is correct. We should not be fainthearted here today. We should support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman from New York for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the members of the committee the fact that the administration admitted in testimony which they offered that they had done nothing to halt the Arab boycott. Naturally, the administration supports a weaker amendment, one which "encourages and requests," but does not prohibit. Without using the language of the substitute amendment which I have offered, we will not meet the problem.

Mr. Chairman, those who want to do something about the Arab boycott should support this substitute amendment which is set forth in the supplemental views signed by 17 members of the committee. I am offering that amendment and I feel it deserves the full support of the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle and it should be made very clear as to the position we take, which reflects the views of the American people, I am sure.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the substitute amendment.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. Is it not a fact that the majority of the committee, by signature, on the committee report endorsed the gentleman's substitute amendment?

Mr. WIDNALL. That is correct.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to say it, but it begins to look as though I have been had. By that, I mean just this: It is quite true that the majority of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency subscribed to the views which I circulated as the supplemental views to accompany this bill and we said, in so many words, that we would support an amendment on the floor such as the substitute now offered.

But, Mr. Chairman, for days and for hours we have labored to bring to this House a better amendment than that contained in the supplemental views.

The amendment which I have offered is the Multer-Halpern amendment which has been agreed to and which has been worked out laboriously and ably and will do the full job.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to have this accepted by the majority on the Democratic side of the Committee on Banking and Currency and have the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] who was working with me on this on the Republican side to say, "This is fine," and then have the ranking minority member of the committee come along and say, "It is all right, but I am not going to be bound by it. I am going to go further" is another matter. Put it mildly, it just is not nice. Of course, that is his legislative prerogative. I did not talk to him. Maybe I should not have assumed Mr. HALPERN was acting for him. I believe I had the right to do so.

This seems like an attempt to impose what is to be labeled a Republican amendment. It is bringing partisan politics into a matter which should be bipartisan. We have always bragged about our foreign policy as being bipartisan. This is injecting partisan politics into a matter which I had every reason to believe had been worked out on a bipartisan basis.

The gentleman from New Jersey has offered a substitute which takes out at least half of the declaration of policy. That half is the guts of it, if I may use the vernacular. The declaration of policy as we brought it to the floor is only half the job. We will by my amendment add the other half to the declaration of policy. In addition it will add a requirement that that declaration of policy be implemented.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. As far as the supplemental views are concerned, are they the views of the gentleman from New York, or were they?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, they were.

Mr. WIDNALL. With whom did the gentleman negotiate this settlement?

Mr. MULTER. With the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. WIDNALL. You have not discussed this with the ranking minority member of the full committee?

Mr. MULTER. There was a Multer-Halpern amendment in committee as we talked about it in committee, as we fought for it in committee, and as we put it in the supplemental views. Then the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] and I worked out this language with all others concerned. I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] was acting in good faith. I had no idea I should have inquired day by day or hour by hour, whether he was acting for the minority.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. I repeat what I said earlier, and that is that I am privileged to associate myself with the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York. I think it is a good amendment. I worked hard with the gentleman in trying to come up with language that would be acceptable to the House. He is accurate in reporting that. However, he should realize that I can only speak for myself. I never represented myself otherwise, either to the gentleman from New York or to the committee or anyone else. Naturally I cannot speak for any other members who may have signed the report, which, incidentally, had a majority of the signatures of the members of the committee. I said this language was a big improvement over the original declaration of policy. But I also informed the gentleman from New York that I would still have preferred stronger language. I never gave the slightest indication that I could speak for any other Member. Earlier on the floor today I repeated that this was not the ultimate that we would like. But short of better language it has my support. I still think it is a tremendous blow to the Arab boycott. The language is strong; it leaves little question as to our position on the boycott and requires administration action to eliminate it. If anyone has an amendment that can improve this language, naturally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see it; but again I repeat that this is, in my opinion, the best achievable language and I had hoped it would be accepted without opposition. But every Member of this House is entitled to his own legislative prerogative and this, obviously, is the position assumed by the ranking member of the full committee, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, all I can say is, as I started out by saying, I have been "had." In the future I will ask for a written statement that the man I deal with on the other side is acting for members of his party.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Is it not a fact if the amendment that is offered as a substitute were adopted, there is the greatest possibility that there might be no legislation on this matter at all? That, on the other hand, the amendment which the gentleman in the well has offered in all probability will be acted upon, and will be a tremendous step forward?

Mr. MULTER. I believe the gentleman to be correct.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we have heard this debate before. The problem is that the State Department has never paid any attention to language having to do with this subject. It is perfectly clear that nothing in the record bears out or supports the argument that the State Department and the Commerce Department are likely to follow the intent of the Congress on this issue.

Again and again, year after year, Congress after Congress, this subject has come up. All kinds of language stating the view of Congress has been placed in the record and nothing is done. It seems to me that we are dealing with a question that is basically a moral question and a question of fairplay. There can be no similarity between this case and the case of the boycott of Cuba and North Vietnam as I said a moment ago in general debate. Nobody by any stretch of the imagination can make out a case that the State of Israel is an aggressor nation. The reason for the United States imposing a boycott on Cuba and North Vietnam is because those nations engage in direct and indirect aggression, and for that reason the State Department's argument, I think, falls on its face.

It is clear that the requirements that are made by Arab States that U.S. businessmen put down in writing the place of origin of goods, and the religious affiliation of officers and directors of companies, involve practices that violate national policy and, in many States, the law itself. It seems to me clear it is time that the Congress took some effective action in this area. For that reason I intend to support the substitute amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] the fact that the supplemental views were signed in a bipartisan manner by eight Democrats and nine Republicans supporting the views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] just made a statement in characterizing what is going on by saying he has been had. Let me just say the change in views today on the floor of the House, if they are accepted by a majority vote, will prove once again that we have been had by the State Department and that we are not exercising the will of the Congress. I think it is about time we asserted ourselves and let them know how American people feel very deeply about a subject that hurts and hurts badly throughout this country. It is about time we faced up to our responsibilities in connection with this.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, what we are attempting to do here is to put an end to secondary and tertiary blacklisting practices that are odious and offensive. And it is up to the Congress to put a stop to them.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support an amendment to the Export Control Act of 1949 which would prevent Arab bloc countries or any other nation from interfering with normal trade opportunities of American businessmen. Recent events show that certain Arab nations are making it extremely difficult for American businessmen to trade with Arab countries if they choose to trade with the economically vibrant State of Israel. I oppose any measure, whether overt or clandestine, which would affect the free economy of this young state. Many American corporations and businesses are quietly and unnecessarily capitulating to the vicious pressures of the Arab boycott of Israel.

Under conditions of the Arab boycott, American businessmen who trade with Israel are blacklisted from doing business in the 12 countries of the Arab League. The Arab economic boycott of Israel differs from any other act of economic warfare of one nation against another. It is not limited to the boycott of Israel goods and Israel firms. It extends to a secondary boycott of foreign firms doing business with Israel.

To avoid this pressure against U.S. businessmen and its potential effect on the economy of the State of Israel, I have introduced a bill amending section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949 to permit U.S. businessmen to engage in normal trade opportunities without fear of reprisals from foreign countries which object to such trade.

The Schweiker bill amends the Export Control Act of 1949 to prohibit domestic exporters from taking any action, including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements, in furtherance of restrictive trade practices or boycotts imposed by one foreign country against another foreign country friendly to the United States.

Our country believes in cooperation and equanimity in trading with all friendly nations. And we hope and request that the same attitude of equanimity and fairness be the business policy for all American businessmen. At a time when our national efforts are bent to promoting international peace through the fostering of trade and commerce between nations, it becomes all the more desirable to enact legislation such as the Schweiker bill.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to the debate. The question is really whether the House is going to implement the policy declaration by requiring that information not be furnished and agreements not be signed which further the Arab boycott. The compromise amendment which has been worked out leaves us without mandatory provisions which appear necessary if the intent of Congress is to be carried out.

The supplemental views in the report (Rept. No. 434) at page 13 state that both the State Department and the Commerce Department deplore the Arab boycott and maintain it is present policy to condemn restrictive trade practices and boycotts. However, according to the supplemental views filed by a majority of the committee:

> Their testimony before the committees of both Houses indicates that even if we adopt this declaration of policy, they do not intend to change their practice, but will continue to review these matters on a case by case, doing what they think may be indicated should be done in each case.

The committee majority said, "The only way we can stop it is by adopting implementing language," and recommended rules and regulations to prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] has offered the stronger, mandatory provision as a substitute. I support it for the very reasons which persuaded the majority to sign the supplemental views.

Mr. Chairman, ever since 1951 the Arab League has maintained an economic boycott of U.S. firms doing business with Israel. I have long been concerned over this affront to American citizens and have written numerous letters to the State Department and the President regarding this important issue.

I have also brought this matter before this House. On December 16, 1963, the New York World-Telegram and Sun published a list of 84 companies of the 114 which were officially boycotted by one or more Arab States in 1963. I brought that list to the attention of my colleagues on December 17, 1963. I will not repeat the list but refer the Members of this House to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 19, page 24835. The list has grown considerably since 1963 and as of January 1964, 164 U.S. firms were on the blacklist.

In order to provide evidence for their blacklist, Arab countries require that American firms fill out questionnaires and file affidavits concerning their business transactions with Israel. In addition, information is requested regarding the religion of the officers of American business firms, as well as the origin of component parts of the product to insure that they do not come from Israel.

In order to end this unwarranted and pernicious intervention in American commerce and discrimination against American firms and citizens, I joined with several of my colleagues and introduced H.R. 4802. This bill contains the same language as is found in section

2(4) of H.R. 7105, the bill before us today:

> The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

It is, of course, important that the Congress and the United States express themselves against the Arab boycott. But expressions of opposition to this nefarious boycott are not enough. My bill also prohibits:

> The taking of any actions, including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements, by domestic concerns engaged in the export of articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, from the United States which have the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States.

While the language of the substitute is different, the purpose is to prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements which further the boycott.

Mr. Chairman, the time is long overdue for this country on behalf of all its citizens to vigorously oppose the nefarious Arab boycott and to prohibit any American firms from cooperating with the boycott by furnishing information. We must take a firm stand on this matter and take it now.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I will quickly try to review the bidding and clear the air here. As I understand it, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has agreed on a compromise. There is no denying that he was the man who first sparked the idea of legislation aimed at the Arab boycott. I think that having agreed on the compromise, he now finds himself in a position where something stronger is offered. I, for one, think the gentleman has rendered a great service in trying to get the compromise and I am going to accept the stronger offer and if I have to fall back on the compromise, I intend to do it.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] that at no time has the State Department or the Department of Commerce tried to equate the situation with which we are dealing this afternoon with that of Cuba. Nothing could be further from any of our thoughts. The plain fact is if we pass the kind of legislation suggested by Mr. WIDNALL we will be the first country to take governmental action of this kind. We are not in a very strong position to do this because of our own information denial programs.

We would do nothing more than to invite the same kind of legislation from other countries from whom we seek information, in our information-denial program.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. Is it not true that Secretary of Commerce Conner testified before our committee and did cite Cuba as an instance of U.S. trade restrictions; and did not Secretary Ball do the same?

Mr. ASHLEY. If the gentleman from New York will review the testimony he will find that neither Secretary Ball nor Secretary Connor equated the Cuban situation with the Arab boycott. They made that abundantly clear in response to questioning by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I would say that there would not be a single "nay" vote against the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey if it held out any hope of outlawing the Arab boycott. But no action of this body or by the United States can achieve this result, so let us look at the issue before us. The issue is simply whether the Congress will go this far beyond what was requested by the administration when it sent down this bill.

We have written a statement of policy. We have buttressed that statement of policy with additional language. Now, shall we insist on going all the way? If we do, then we should support the language of the gentleman from New Jersey. If, however, we wish to take any cognizance of the responsibility of the administration in a matter which most certainly does bear upon the conduct of foreign affairs, then I say we can accept the amendment and should support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. I believe the gentleman referred earlier to a compromise effected, and said it was a fine compromise. With whom was the compromise effected? Was it with other Members of Congress, or a Member of Congress and the State Department? That is the question.

Mr. ASHLEY. The gentleman has heard time and again that the gentlemen from New York [Mr. HALPERN and Mr. MULTER] worked out this language. Mr. MULTER does not deny that nor does Mr. HALPERN. I have discussed the language proposed by Mr. MULTER and Mr. HALPERN with Members on this side of the aisle. The gentleman has had as much time as we have had to analyze it. We find it does represent the kind of compromise—although I personally am not overly fond of it—that we can live with.

I hope the gentleman from New Jersey, if he will take a few moments, will come to the same conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

I notice, in the amendment offered by the able gentleman, the language which reads:

> And at page 6, immediately after line 7, add the following:
>
> "(d) Section 3(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Such rules and regulations shall implement the provisions of Section 2(4) of this Act'."

In the first place, section 2(4), if I understand it correctly, refers to the policy declaration on page 5, which reads:

> (4) The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

Is that correct?

Mr. MULTER. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. The language is that "such rules and regulations shall implement the provisions" of that section just read. Who makes the rules and regulations relevant to our export trade and its government?

Mr. MULTER. Under section 3 of the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, which we are extending by this bill, the President of the United States makes the rules and regulations.

Mr. PEPPER. In other words, the Congress, pursuant to its legislative responsibility, is imposing a mandate upon the President effectively to carry out this policy which the Congress is declaring.

Mr. MULTER. That is precisely the point I have been trying to make.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Multer-Halpern amendment. It is my hope that this amendment will bring to an end the offensive practices of Arab countries who try to use American business firms in their boycott of Israel. Sometimes the prospective American suppliers are asked whether they trade with Israel, use products from Israel, employ Jews or have Jews among their stockholders or managers. American firms should not be forced to answer these questions and supply such information to the Arab League boycott office.

May I call to the attention of my colleagues the supplemental views filed by the gentleman from New York, Congressman MULTER, and 16 other members of the Banking and Currency Committee, wherein they point out that an American employer or an American firm is prohibited by law from asking what one's religion is, what his race is, what his place of origin may be, or that of his ancestors. Yet the State Department and the Commerce Department give permission, despite such prohibitions in existing law, to Americans to answer to foreigners the very questions which they are prohibited from asking of, or answering to, other Americans. I agree that this is an intolerable situation and it should be stopped. I think that the Multer-Halpern amendment adds a great deal of strength to the declaration of policy worked out by the committee against restrictive trade practices and boycotts. The committee members are to be commended for their work on this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIDNALL) there were—ayes 53, noes 85.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PATMAN and Mr. WIDNALL.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 64, noes 96.

So the substitute to the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALPERN

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Multer amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALPERN to the amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: Add following such amendment the following:

"(e) Rules and regulations required to be promulgated pursuant to the amendment made by subsection (d) of this section shall be promulgated as expeditiously as practicable, and shall be published in the Federal Register within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, requiring rules and regulations, is not enough. It is vital that we show determination, that we mean business. All this amendment to the amendment does is to spell out that these rules and regulations about which we have heard so much today shall be promulgated and not be entwined in the cobwebs of the administrative branch; that they must be promulgated within 90 days and published in the Federal Register. I do not see how anybody can oppose this amendment, and I trust it will prevail.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the Chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, in order to implement the agreement that was entered into by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] the committee on this side is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. HALPERN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on this bill today.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIPSCOMB

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LIPSCOMB: On page 5, strike out line 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following: inserting immediately after "technical data" the following: "or any other information".

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The amendment is satisfactory to our side and we are willing to accept it.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I firmly support extending the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, the act which provides the authority for a program of controls on exports to the Communist bloc.

It is essential to our national security and welfare that we have a system of controls over shipments of goods, materials, supplies, and technical data to the Communist bloc. This act, if it is adequately administered, can be an effective means to help prevent a buildup of the economic and military arsenal of the Communist bloc which we all know is relentlessly pursuing its designs to overcome the free world.

Many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives know of the work done in this area by the House Select Committee on Export Control of the 87th Congress. It was my privilege to serve on that committee and to cosponsor legislation which was passed in 1962 extending the Export Control Act until this year and making several amendments to the act. The most vital change made in the act at that time was to provide that the economic significance of exports, as well as their military significance, must be considered in weighing their effect on our national security.

I was completely convinced at that time and am equally convinced today that we must have a strong export control program. I regret very much to say that it appears the pattern over recent years has been toward weaker and weaker enforcement of the Export Control Act.

Total exports to the bloc have been increasing in volume over recent years. In addition, the nature of the exports to Communist bloc countries is a cause for much concern. Aside from certain food purchases, their buying here is to acquire equipment, supplies, and know-how essentially for the purpose of helping them to establish or build up industrial capability in vital areas of their economies. A good many of their purchases undoubtedly are to acquire items to serve as prototypes, in other words, items to study, evaluate, and copy.

A major aspect of the interest of the Soviet bloc countries in purchasing here is to acquire technical data. The emphasis is on acquiring information and technology in fields such as chemicals, petroleum refining, petrochemicals, synthetic fertilizers, synthetic fiber, and many others.

Here are some examples of items licensed for export to Communist countries recently.

On May 11, 1965, a license was granted to authorize shipment to Rumania of technical data, materials, and equipment valued at $6,895,100 to construct and operate a fluid catalytic cracking unit with a capacity of 1,100 metric tons a year. This catalytic cracking unit is to produce gasoline, diesel fuel, distillate fuel oils. It also produces certain gases which can be converted to the production of petrochemicals.

Earlier this year a license was issued to authorize shipment to Rumania of technical data for a methane pipeline booster station. The station is a unit comprised of a 4,850-horsepower gas turbine driving a centrifugal compressor to boost the pressure on a 20-inch diameter pipeline carrying methane to Rumanian industrial facilities. This license was granted even though the Department of Commerce did not even know the route of the pipeline.

On May 13, 1964, an export license was granted authorizing shipment to Rumania of $525,000 worth of tanks, gages, meters, valves, oil and gas separators, and other equipment for petroleum production.

Recently a license was granted authorizing the shipment of $31,711 worth of ball and roller bearings to the U.S.S.R.

On March 3 of this year the Department of Commerce issued a license to clear for shipment to the U.S.S.R. technical data for the production of various chemical products such as ethylbenzene, styrene, and polystyrene. These products have a variety of industrial and domestic uses. Styrene is used in the production of various resins, styrene-butadiene rubber, polyesters, and exchange resins. Polystyrene is used for many items such as in packaging, refrigeration, air conditioners, electric coils, lamination of fabrics, wall tiles, records, and others. It is used as well for a large variety of military items.

A license was granted last year authorizing the sale of a $13 million synthetic fiber process to Communist East Germany. Included was technical data for the design, engineering, construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a plant. The location of the plant was not known.

The specific instances I have discussed here are only a few examples of items that are being cleared for export to the Communist bloc under the way the Export Control Act is being administered.

In addition to shortcomings in the administration of the Export Control Act, we are failing to achieve the maximum effectiveness of our COCOM arrangements, agreements we have with NATO countries and Japan to exercise controls on shipments of goods to the bloc. Instead of our working diligently toward making this really a cohesive, forceful working agreement, COCOM controls have been allowed to be watered down so that for practical purposes they have limited impact. Unfortunately, our reaction to the continued efforts on the part of other Nations to reduce COCOM controls has been to acquiesce rather than to vigorously oppose. The result is that increasingly more important and strategic types of goods, materials, and data are being approved for sale to the Communists.

We are spending billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money and devoting the efforts of thousands of people to maintain adequate defenses against communism. It is tragically inconsistent with this effort to allow sales to the Communists of goods and data they can use to build up their military and economic potential and engage in economic warfare in world markets.

Basically I am in full support of the bill, H.R. 7105, to extend and amend the Export Control Act. This amendment to the bill is to help assure that the great stress by the Communist bloc on acquiring technical data and other know-how and information from the United States is clearly recognized.

The Export Control Act now authorizes the President to prohibit or curtail the exportation from the United States of "any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data" which make a significant contribution to the military or economic potential of such nation which would prove detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States. Section 4 of the bill before the House proposes to eliminate the words "technical data" and substitute the word "information." In essence all this amendment does is to leave the words "technical data" in the law.

According to the report on the bill the committee change is proposed for the purpose of making the prohibition all inclusive and to make it clear that the President is authorized to curtail or prohibit the exportation of all information, whether or not it could be labeled as "technical data." I am all for this but believe also that it is essential to underscore the fact that acquiring technical data from us to expand and improve the Communist bloc industrial capacity is a major purpose of the Communist bloc trade efforts. Therefore, in my view, it is necessary to keep this particular terminology in the bill so that there will be absolutely no question that this is fully recognized. The amendment proposed to the bill would do just this. It would amend the bill to leave the term "technical data" in the present law unchanged but would add language to provide that exports of any other kind of information could be prohibited or curtailed, in line with the committee recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DENTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7105) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 412, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 388, nays 1, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—388

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callan
Carey
Carter
Casey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dow
Dowdy
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—1

Goodell

NOT VOTING—44

Andrews, George W.
Ashbrook
Baring
Bell
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Cabell
Callaway
Cameron
Cederberg
Clawson, Del
Collier
Dorn
Downing
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, Ala.
Evins, Tenn.
Flynt
Fogarty
Green, Oreg.
Halleck
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Helstoski
Holland
Jacobs
Landrum
Leggett
McVicker
Mackay
Matsunaga
Michel
Poff
Powell
Purcell
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Stephens
Toll
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Poff.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Mackay with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.
Mr. Flynt with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Matsunaga.
Mr. Landon with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Stephens.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein any relevant explanatory matters in connection therewith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADDITION TO THE PROGRAM FOR THIS WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House of an addition to the program. Following the disposition of the bill H.R. 8464, to increase the debt limit, we are adding House Concurrent Resolution 285 to distribute and show the John F. Kennedy film. Mr. Speaker, in order to dispose of these matters tomorrow on schedule it is hoped that we may meet early. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL HOUSING BILL

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that President Johnson's general housing bill, H.R. 7984, will be scheduled for floor action in the very near future. This is one of the most important pieces of domestic legislation which will be considered by the House this year. It covers nearly all of our programs in the field of housing and community development and is needed to extend and improve those programs.

It has become apparent that the opposition has singled out the President's proposal for rent supplements as the focus of their attack. This is the program which President Johnson has called "the most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve American cities." I think it is most unfortunate that they have chosen to concentrate on a program designed to help lower income families to obtain decent housing. Those are the people who would be the victims if the opposition is successful—families whose income is too low to afford decent housing and who, in addition, are elderly or handicapped, now living in slum housing, or displaced by Government action. As is clearly set forth in the bill, these are the people who would be eligible and these are the people who would lose if we should fail to keep the rent supplement in the bill.

Personally, I am confident that a majority of this House will vote in support of the rent-supplement program. Over the years we have lived up to our responsibility to achieve the goal set forth in the Housing Act of 1949. That goal is "a decent home and a suitable environment for every American family." I cannot believe that the 89th Congress will turn its back on that objective or on low-income families.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed rent supplement program would build on our very successful 4 years of experience under the below-market interest rate program under FHA section 221(d)(3). While that program has suffered from the steady rise in interest rates, it has been meeting a need for rental and cooperative housing within the means of our middle income families. This program, which would be extended for 4 years by the housing bill, has reached a level of approximately 400,000 units a year. The proposed rent supplement would differ in that the interest rate would be sufficiently high to attract private financing and therefore take the mortgage money out of the budget, and instead would provide rent supplements which would enable the proposed program to get down even lower in the income scale.

The way that the rent supplement program would operate is very simple:

First. The housing would be rental and cooperative housing built under FHA section 221(d)(3).

Second. The sponsors would be limited to nonprofit and limited dividend corporations and cooperatives.

Third. The mortgages would bear market interest rates and the housing would be privately financed, thereby reducing the impact on the Federal budget.

Fourth. The families to be aided would be low income families who cannot afford decent private housing by paying one-fourth of their income.

Fifth. The income ceilings would be set individually for each community to reflect different cost levels and would differ by size of family.

Sixth. In addition to being low income, the family would have to be either elderly or handicapped, displaced by Government action, or now living in substandard housing.

Seventh. The family would pay one-fourth of its income for rent and the rent supplement would make up the difference between that amount and the fair market rental of the unit.

Eighth. Finally, when a family's income rose to the point where one-fourth of its income would cover the rent, the supplement payments would stop.

Mr. Speaker, this new program would accomplish a number of things. It would make a net addition to the supply of decent housing available to low income groups. It would enlist the energy and imagination of churches, unions, and civic-minded private citizens. It would complement the existing public housing program and offer low income families another alternative to the choice between slums or regular public housing. It would reduce the impact on the Federal budget of direct Government financing of the whole cost of a unit. Also it would provide a flexible formula that would extend aid to families when they need it, curtail that aid when their incomes rose, and terminate when they could afford housing on their own without the painful necessity of evicting them as is the case in public housing.

Mr. Speaker, the President's rent supplement proposal embodied in section 101 of the housing bill is one of the best new proposals in many years to help the housing problems of low income families, and I urge our colleagues to support section 101, as well as the entire bill, when the bill reaches the floor.

BEAUTY IN THE LONE STAR STATE

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while, I pause to reflect on the institutions that flourish as a part of the Washington scene. One of the most interesting, and perhaps one of the most essential, is the columnist. I, being human, have my pets and as I look them over from time to time, I find that I stick closest to those who are the most objective. Occasionally, I read the writings of one of the other kind—the guy who flourishes by "innuendoes."

Of course, those of us in public office are used to such things, but somehow it always goes against the grain when a columnist has nothing better to do than to hurl barbs at some of the great ladies who carry on their work, sometimes behind the scenes and sometimes in the public eye, basically helping make a success of whatever their husbands may be doing.

The first one that I recall to come under the columnists' guns was that great lady of the whole world, Eleanor Roosevelt. It carries right on down to our present First Lady whose loyalty and devotion to her husband are particularly well known to the old timers in the Texas delegation. We knew her "when."

This was brought to mind by a recent column in the New York Daily News which used the President's plan for beautifying American highways as the vehicle for taking some pot shots at various people and places. The columnist's parting shot says that the Lone Star State is big but its landscape "is drab and without one scenic beauty worth touting." The poor soul.

Every year, I drive many thousands of miles in my own congressional district. Also I have covered the State from end to end and from side to side, starting back in the days before highways were paved. Looking back on any trip I have ever taken and comparing my recollections of beauty I have seen and trying to reconcile it with this columnist's views, I just wonder where the poor soul has been.

Has he, for example, driven along the Hug-the-Coast Highway and seen the ever-changing gulf? Has he ever driven through the cotton country or the rice lands? Has he ever seen fields of Texas bluebonnets? This poor soul ought to take a drive from San Antonio to El Paso and see the grandeur of the great open spaces. Maybe it would be worth his while to slip down into the Big Bend National Park and above all he ought to take one of the highways into El Paso from which he could see, for many, many miles, the unforgettable El Capitan. Perhaps such a writer as I have in mind would not react to places steeped in the lore of early Texas history, of heroes who gave their lives to develop our part of the New World and the new Nation. I doubt if he would thrill to the stories the people can tell of Goliad, Brazoria, Velasco, San Jacinto, and the places where the early pioneers laid the foundation on which we now base our economy.

The natural beauty is there. The history is there. A good reporter would tell their story. A good President will further beautify an already beautiful system of public roads and his courageous lady will do her full share.

INSERTION IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF ARTICLE ON GOLDEN WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Washington News Columnist Milton Berliner made belittling reference to an article which I had inserted in the RECORD. My insertion called attention to the golden wedding anniversary of Mr. Ed Izac, a former Member of this House and one of our great Americans. This insertion was estimated to cost $30.

Mr. Speaker, I did insert that article in the RECORD. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of this term of office, I will have served in the House of Representatives for a period of 30 years. During that time I have only inserted approximately 15 articles in the RECORD. This amounts to one article every 2 years. I do not think I can be accused of loading up the RECORD.

However, Mr. Speaker, I inserted this article in the RECORD in order to tell the people of this country about our former colleague.

Mr. Speaker, this man graduated from the Naval Academy at Annapolis. He won the Congressional Medal of Honor in the First World War when there were only a few men who were accorded this, our country's highest award. The ship which he commanded was sunk by a submarine. At a later date he was taken as a prisoner on a train to a prison camp. There were many boats being sunk in that part of the world and Mr. Izac had certain information that our allies and we Americans needed. En route to the prison camp he jumped out of a window of the train and broke both shoulders in the process. When he was recaptured, they broke a gun over his body and inflicted further bodily injuries. However, this man again escaped and with both arms in casts swam a river to take valuable information to the proper authorities. That is how he got the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, there are three main missions in life: First, your God; second, your country; and third, the family.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the three of them as to how they apply to Mr. Izac. He raised a son to join the priesthood, thereby giving up his life, you might say, in order to help mankind.

He married his wife 50 years ago. Her father was a major general in the U.S. Army. He has a son who is a commander today in foreign waters in the service of this country. He has another son and two daughters. Mr. and Mrs. Izac have 16 grandchildren and 2 great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to tell the Members of this House and the people of this country that what this man has done for his country should never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, if we remember what history tells us, we will remember the surrender of Cornwallis to George Washington. Cornwallis knew his number was up and he got in touch with the British fleet with instructions for it to meet him at Yorktown. When Cornwallis showed up at the appointed place, there was a boat in that fleet scheduled to take certain Tory sympathizers who were not interested in freedom back to Canada.

Our Constitution guarantees free speech, but, Mr. Speaker, to see a man on yesterday in one of our public information media denounce inserting in the RECORD an article dealing with the achievements of a man who has served his country well, and is still doing it. A man who had the courage to spend 50 years of marital bliss with the lady he walked down the aisle with the day after he graduated. He walked down the same aisle with her again last Saturday. Mr. Speaker, he is deserving of another Congressional Medal of Honor. I mean that with all the sincerity at my command. But when one looks at the record of this "great" writer, a feature writer, one is reminded that Judas betrayed Christ for 30 pieces of silver. That is what this writer did yesterday. He betrayed one of America's great heroes. He said it just cost us $30, the same as was paid to the man who betrayed Christ.

JAPANESE FISHERMEN VIOLATE SALMON TREATY

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday five Japanese fishing boats were spotted by our Coast Guard east of the North Pacific Treaty Convention line. Three of these vessels were 60 miles east of this line and two were 28 miles east of the line.

In case anyone should conclude that these Japanese fishing boats were violating the treaty by accident it should be noted that as soon as they were spotted four of them began fleeing westward, the other one had its nets out and accordingly was apprehended by our Coast Guard and taken to Adak.

Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have told Members of the House that the Japanese were violating the spirit of the North Pacific Salmon Treaty by using nets to catch fish in this area. Now I must point out that the Japanese fishing fleet is deliberately guilty of violating the provisions of the treaty.

In this connection, I include the following resolution adopted by the Association of Pacific Fisheries at a meeting in Seattle, Wash., on June 7:

> Whereas R. J. McCloskey on May 28, 1965, speaking for the Department of State not only opposed the fisherman boycott against Japanese trade but gratuitously asserted that the Japanese have complied generally with the provisions of the Tri-Partite Treaty affecting the North American salmon;
>
> Now, therefore, it is demanded that the misleading and detrimental statement be officially retracted as the Japanese have continuously been in violation of the conservation principles of the treaty and even the statement that they have not caught salmon east of the provisional line have now been demonstrated not to be true; and be it also
>
> *Resolved*, That the Department of State submit a strong protest to Japan against its catching salmon of North American origin in violation of the intent of the Tri-Partite Treaty and in addition protest the continuous practice of wasteful fishing methods in violation of the conservation provision of this treaty.
>
> W. V. YONKER,
> *Executive Vice President.*

MINE SAFETY BILL

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 1, 1965, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber and unable to vote on H.R. 3584 and H.R. 8639.

Had I been present, I would, of course, have voted for H.R. 3584, the mine safety bill, which I was pleased to vote for in the 88th Congress and which was similar to my own bill, H.R. 4173, introduced earlier in the session.

H.R. 8639, the State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary and related agencies appropriation bill, was reported from my own Appropriations Committee and would, of course, have had my full support and affirmative vote.

REVENUES FROM EXISTING FEDERAL EXCISE TAX RETURNED TO STATES TO HELP IN THE ELIMINATION OF UNSIGHTLY AUTOMOBILE JUNKYARDS

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to propose that part of the revenues from the existing Federal excise tax on new cars be returned to the States to help pay for elimination of unsightly automobile junkyards.

Under a bill which I have introduced today the Federal Government would grant to the States the revenues produced by 1 percentage point of the excise tax on new autos. The funds would be used by State and local public agencies to alleviate the blight caused by junked cars.

The objective of this legislation should be the ultimate elimination of the eyesores across our Nation caused by rusty auto corpses. Transferring 1 percentage point of the existing excise tax to an auto burial insurance fund would involve no additional tax of any kind. It would be a more appropriate use of funds presently collected.

The auto junkpile could be transformed into new steel or possibly dumped into the gaping holes caused throughout the country by strip mining, exhausted quarries, or other man-made earth cavities.

Under section 205(a) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act enacted earlier this year, open and abandoned strip-mine voids could be considered for use as a final resting place for these old auto frames. By combining these two efforts—mining area restoration and elimination of auto junkpiles—an effective and worthwhile program for solving two national problems could be established.

Based on present new car sales, the funds available to the States under the Schweiker bill would total some $190 million. To receive the grants a State would be required to take into consideration the effect of its proposed program on the market for iron and steel scrap, the benefits of its program to the State's tourist and recreation industry, the improvements in the State's scenic beauty, and the use of its program to assist in mining area restoration.

America is becoming more urban and more crowded. It need not be less beautiful. By eliminating unsightly and unwanted auto junkpiles, we will be taking a major step in restoring for all our citizens the kind of communities in which we wish to live.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation providing for part of the revenues from the existing Federal excise tax on new cars to be returned to the States to help pay for elimination of unsightly automobile junkyards.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include the text of a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 20th anniversary of the United Nations which will be celebrated in San Francisco on June 26, 1965.

This year has also been designated by the General Assembly of the United Nations as the International Cooperation Year.

In order to provide the Congress the opportunity to express its sentiments on these two occasions, I am this morning introducing an appropriate resolution.

Joining me in introducing identical resolutions are the Honorable Frances P. Bolton, ranking minority member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs; the Honorable Donald M. Fraser, member of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements; and the Honorable Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.

The text of our resolution is as follows:

H. Con. Res. 429

(Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the 20th anniversary of the United Nations during International Cooperation Year, and for other purposes)

Whereas the year 1965 marks the 20th anniversary of the United Nations, which will be celebrated in San Francisco on June 26, 1965; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly has designated the year 1965 as International Cooperation Year; and

Whereas the President of the United States has proclaimed 1965 as International Cooperation Year, and has set up a broad program within the executive branch to review our present international policies in cooperation with a bipartisan group of distinguished private citizens; and

Whereas the President has charged those participating in the International Cooperation Year program to "search and explore and canvass and thoroughly discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace;" and

Whereas the International Cooperation Year program will culminate in a White House Conference on International Cooperation which the President has announced he will convene in November 1965; and

Whereas during the 20 years of its existence the United Nations has played an important, and at times crucial, role in pursuit of one of its stated purposes "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind;" and

Whereas during the time the United Nations has also performed a valuable service through the specialized agencies and otherwise in helping to establish human rights and to eliminate those ancient enemies of mankind—hunger, poverty, disease and ignorance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States of America rededicates itself to the principles of the United Nations and to the furtherance of international cooperation within the framework of law and order; and that all other members of the United Nations are urged to do likewise.

Sec. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that in connection with the examination for International Cooperation Year of U.S. participation in international cooperative activities, the executive branch should (1) review with a high sense of urgency the current state of international peacekeeping machinery with a view to making specific suggestions for strengthening this machinery, (2) review other major elements of international community and cooperation with a view to making specific suggestions to promote the growth of institutions of international cooperation and law and order, and (3) review urgently the status of disarmament negotiations with a view to further progress in reducing the dangers and burden of competitive national armaments.

Sec. 3. In order to provide for participation by the Congress in the White House Conference on International Cooperation, subject to an invitation by the President, there is hereby created a congressional delegation of 12 members to be composed of 6 Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and 6 Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Any vacancy in the membership of the delegation shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointments.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that similar resolutions are being introduced this day in the other body to commemorate both the 20th anniversary of the United Nations and to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the International Cooperation Year.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the resolution will receive early and favorable consideration in the Congress.

PROGRAM FOR BEAUTIFYING AMERICA'S HIGHWAYS

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the New York Daily News in its issue of May 27 published an article by its columnist, Ted Lewis, concerning the President's program for beautifying America's highways. I would like to challenge the closing paragraph of that article in which the New York columnist says:

> It will be entertaining to watch the impact, if a beauty law is passed, on the Johnsons' home State of Texas. The Lone Star State is big but its landscape is drab and without one scenic beauty worth touting. And Texas has more roadside auto graveyards than any other State.

We who live in Texas can only assume that Mr. Lewis drew his conclusions from the dark recesses of a Manhattan cavern. He needs to stand in the clear pure air of our southwestern sun country and look at the majesty of El Capitan, the 2,000-foot promontory that fronts the highest peak in Texas. He needs to enter the cool recesses of McKittrick Canyon, behind that peak, the heart of the proposed Guadalupe National Park, recommended in President Johnson's message on natural beauty, and the subject of legislation by Senator Yarborough, Congressman Pool and myself.

If Mr. Lewis' city-bred legs will permit it, he should enjoy the nature-walk along Lost Mine trail in Big Bend National Park and view the majestic mountains that stretch, range after range, toward the south rim of the Rio Grande and Mexico beyond. In and near El Paso, he can visit historic old missions that date back to the days when the Dutch were still colonizing Manhattan.

Texas, like most other States, has its automobile graveyards, and is working to solve the problem. But Texas also has the Nation's finest system of roadside parks, inviting the traveler to pause and enjoy this land of room enough. As our First Lady has already told the Nation, the Texas State Highway Department has made many of its highways avenues of natural beauty—fields of bluebonnets and primroses in the east—and giant yuccas raising their spring blossoms to light the highway bridges in the west.

"Not one scenic beauty worth touting," says this columnist. If he has ever visited Texas, he surely did not stop to look. We hope he will stay longer next time.

REPUBLICAN STUDY GROUP IN PARIS—ARE YOU KIDDING?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I read in the public press that the minority party's policy committee, I believe they call it, has appointed a committee of four Members of the House to go to Paris to find out what is wrong with NATO. I would be the last one to deprive them of the opportunity of going to Paris. When they get there, they can solve this problem pretty rapidly. They only need to see one fellow. His name is General de Gaulle and, when they convince him that he ought to be for NATO, then NATO's problems will vanish. Really, I think the best remark that anybody could make about this junket would be what Senator Dirksen, distinguished minority leader of the other body, said when he was apprised of it. He said—"Are you kidding?"

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 874 TO DELETE THE SPECIAL REQUIREMENT APPLICABLE TO LARGE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced H.R. 8858 to delete the special requirements for eligibility for Public Law 874 funds which have been imposed, inequitably in my judgment, on large city school districts. In order for most school districts to qualify for financial assistance to local school systems under our legislative program to compensate school districts for Federal activities, there need be only 3 percent of the children attending such schools whose parents are employed in a Federal activity. However, in the case of school districts where the population exceeds 35,000, this eligibility requirement under the law is 6 percent. As a consequence, the Los Angeles school districts, where our school systems are confronted with the impact of 30,000 federally connected children, no Federal funds are available to assist in providing elementary and secondary education opportunities for them.

Not only is the city of Los Angeles affected by this unjust requirement, but also other great cities in the United States where the population exceeds 35,000, are completely denied benefits of the impacted aid program. It seems unnecessary for me to recount the increased burdens confronting our large metropolitan areas in furnishing educational opportunity in the face of large population increases. In the city of Los Angeles alone, the school system must absorb 30,000 new students into the classrooms each year. Added to this burden is the fact that in order to keep pace with population growth, many properties have been removed from the tax rolls to provide the necessary expressways and freeways to accommodate the move of traffic.

Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles unified school district currently enrolls 257,000 elementary school children and 234,000 secondary school children. In addition, the school district is responsible for the adult education offerings for 73,000 adult citizens and the higher education facilities for 65,000 students in our junior colleges. The Los Angeles city school system educates about one out of every five children in the State of California and is the largest recipient of the impact of migration to the State. I am extremely hopeful that in long range thinking, legislation may be fashioned which will recognize the tremendous burden imposed upon high growth areas to furnish adequate educational facilities. Public Laws 874 and 815 will not compensate the Los Angeles school system for the entire amount of this inordinate impact. However, because of this fact, it becomes even more essential that the Los Angeles school system be properly compensated for the impact occasioned by Federal activity as are other smaller cities and communities throughout the Nation. Because of impact in the Los Angeles schools, 30,000 of our students must attend school in double sessions. The legislation is essential to the well-being of large city school programs throughout the country. It is legislation that in justice to the principles of impacted aid should have been included in the original legislation.

I urge its immediate consideration and passage.

FAMILY RECREATIONAL USE OF THE SAN GORGONIO WILDERNESS AREA OF SAN BERNARDINO NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to provide for family winter recreational use of a portion of the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area in the San Bernardino National Forest.

Let me state that this bill, like others which have been introduced by certain of my California colleagues, will in no way reduce the area presently set aside for wilderness preservation within the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area. It provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall set aside for family winter recreational use an area of such size as may be necessary for that purpose, but not to exceed 3,500 acres. It also provides that the Secretary shall immediately designate other wilderness lands of the same or larger acreage, and adjacent to San Gorgonio Area, to be included in the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area so that the acreage set aside for wilderness preservation will not be reduced.

Last year this body's Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held hearings on similar bills in which the testimony developed the fact that the 3,500 acres in San Gorgonio above the 8,600-foot level constitute the only consistently reliable snow area in southern California suitable for family winter recreational use. More than that, it became apparent during those hearings that it is an ideal area and uniquely suitable for such usage.

This legislation will provide reasonable access to winter recreational activity for the burgeoning population of southern California. At the same time, it will provide for preservation of the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area in its natural state by the addition of at least as much acreage for wilderness usage as may be designated for family winter recreational usage, thus preserving the basic wilderness values.

I have long loved and sought to preserve the wilderness areas in our country. However, I realize that we must meet the critical needs of the 11 million people in the southern California area for the exhilarating and salutary physical and spiritual values of family outdoor winter recreation. These needs can be satisfied without diminishing the basic wilderness values. I believe, and it has been demonstrated here in America—in northern California, Colorado, Utah, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York—as well as in Europe—in Switzerland, Austria, Germany, France, and Italy—and in Japan, by well planned developments in winter recreational areas, that these parallel needs and values can be satisfied and preserved. I further believe that this legislation will do the job.

THE OAS TURNS A CORNER

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, France, Jordan, and Uruguay urged the United Nations Security Council to enlarge their staff and mandate of the U.N.'s observer in the Dominican Republic. Clearly, this represents an effort to derogate the powers of the inter-American regional system.

Intrusion of the United Nations in Western Hemisphere affairs would be a mischievous development. Many nations in Africa, the Middle East, and Asia have little understanding of hemisphere conditions and evolving inter-American doctrines. Further, since the Soviet Union possesses the veto, inviting the U.N. Security Council to participate in hemisphere peacekeeping operations would be tantamount to opening the sheepfold to the wolf.

At the same time, critics of the inter-American system demonstrate an impatience with the pace with which the OAS has moved in the current Dominican situation. In this respect, it is well to recall that the basic documents of the regional system—the OAS Charter and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance—were forged in an era before the Sino-Soviets had intensified in this hemisphere their tactics of aggression by subversion. Nevertheless, the Organization of American States is demonstrating an ability to adapt to new challenges to the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere. Secretary General of the OAS, Dr. Jose Mora, is to be commended for his efforts to bring some settlement in the Dominician chaos. The presence of the capable Brazilian general, Hugo Panasco Alvim, as commander of the inter-American peace force is a heartening and laudable development.

In its June 11, 1964, edition, Life magazine contains an illuminating editorial regarding the impact of the Dominican revolution upon the Organization of American States, the fundamental difficulties which initially impeded OAS action, and the encouraging "new willingness and ability to face realities." The editorial follows:

The OAS Turns a Corner

There are troops patrolling the streets of Santo Domingo today wearing helmets marked "O.E.A." The initials stand, in Spanish, for the Organization of American States; and these troops are part of the first peacekeeping force ever fielded by that organization. Their presence, according to President Johnson in his assessment of the several positive accomplishments of the U.S. intervention, "may be the greatest achievement of all."

Even though the United States failed unilaterally to find a political solution in the Dominican Republic, getting the OAS to commit itself was a remarkable piece of work. The troops (so far, over 1,500 men from four Latin American countries) are welcome and will be useful in maintaining the cease fire which the U.S. forces put into effect. They are even more welcome for their symbolic importance.

In the past, the OAS has often discouraged even sympathetic diplomats. "We're a bunch of guitar players, I'm sorry to say," lamented one senior ambassador after a long, weary meeting recently. Afflicted with procedural encumbrances, its deliberations have frequently bogged down in legalistic garrulities. It also suffers from a bad case of chronic cross-purpose.

Unlike the U.N., which sprang more or less full grown into being at San Francisco in 1945, the OAS represents the sum, or residue, of what one authority calls a veritable hodgepodge of organizations, resolutions, treaties, conventions, principles, and procedures, stretching over roughly 150 years of hemisphere history. Technically, the term OAS applies only to the international organization set up after a meeting in Bogotá, Colombia, in 1948. However, other treaties, such as the one of Rio de Janeiro in 1947 and that signed in 1961 at Punta del Este, Uruguay, which launched the Alliance for Progress—further define its powers and responsibilities. In general terms, the OAS is supposed to do three things: (1) protect American states against encroachment from outside the hemisphere; (2) prevent conflicts and mediate disputes between American states; (3) while preserving political liberty, promote social and economic improvements.

To achieve these laudable aims, the OAS has a complex structure of organs and suborgans capable mostly of causing delay. For practical purposes, the principal organ is the council, which sits in Washington permanently and is made up of ambassadors from each of the 20 member states. The council is not meant to have any decisive function of its own, but it has sometimes found ways to act when it felt a collective sense of urgency.

The fundamental difficulties of the OAS turn upon the concept of intervention. The traditional Latin American fear of U.S. intervention has confused efforts to deal with the prime foreign intervention—Sino-Soviet communism. Although in 1948, 1954, and again in 1962 the OAS equated Communist subversion with foreign aggression, it was only with the greatest difficulty that a two-thirds majority of members could be brought to vote sanctions against Communist Cuba.

It is not surprising that many Latin Americans reacted indignantly to the unilateral U.S. action in the Dominican Republic. It looked too much like a return to the Marine expeditions of 40 or 50 years ago. One Ambassador went so far as to describe the episode as a "Waterloo for the OAS," and the United States has been required to undertake a massive diplomatic effort to restore the organization's prestige and soothe abraded feelings. We needed the OAS to validate and internationalize our intervention. In so doing it has demonstrated its own new willingness and ability to face realities.

Some heckling has been heard. Both U.N. Secretary General U Thant and France's President Charles de Gaulle have, for different reasons, protested that peacekeeping is the sole prerogative of the U.N. Security Council. Similar arguments have been offered before. But the U.N. Charter specifically notes that it is perfectly all right for a regional organization to do a peacekeeping job, if done in a manner "consistent with the purposes and principles" of the U.N. The Dominican operation is the best sort of peacekeeping job.

Having shown a willingness and ability to grasp such higher responsibilities, the OAS deserves encouragement instead of carping. It naturally shares the inhibitions and timidities of its members and sometimes tends to magnify them, particularly the old fear of U.S. dominance. But it is rapidly growing out of this fixation. To deal with its real challenges—subversion and the confusion subversion feeds on—the OAS must simplify and tighten up its machinery. It must also set up a permanent, relatively small but swiftly mobile, inter-American peace force which can act as a fire brigade under OAS control anywhere in the hemisphere. For this force there is already a model at hand. It is patrolling the streets of Santo Domingo right now wearing helmets marked "O.E.A."

A TRIBUTE TO HARRY SUCHMAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to Harry Suchman who died on May 21. A charter member of the Liberal Party and the party's first vice chairman of New York County, Harry Suchman was the Liberal Party leader in the 5th assembly district which I have the honor of representing. He was a driving force in the community. A number of years ago he organized a rent clinic on the West Side which was supported by the Office of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Harry Suchman was a director of the West Side Community Center and a member of the executive board of the Housing and Redevelopment Commission for the West Side. Harry Suchman was known and loved on the West Side for his devotion to the betterment of the community.

Mr. Speaker, New York has lost a citizen who gave generously of his time and talent to his fellow citizens. As part of this tribute, I wish to include the following obituary which appeared in the New York Times of May 22, 1965.

The obituary follows:

HARRY SUCHMAN, LAWYER, 70, DIES—FIRST VICE CHAIRMAN OF NEW YORK COUNTY LIBERAL PARTY

Harry Suchman, a lawyer and the first vice chairman of the Liberal Party of New York County, died yesterday in his home, 200 West

90th Street, after an illness of several months. He was 70 years old.

Mr. Suchman was associated with the law firm of David Berg, of 350 Fifth Avenue. He conducted a general practice and also specialized in real estate law.

He was a charter member of the Liberal Party and an unsuccessful candidate on its ticket for assemblyman from the fifth district on the middle West Side in 1952 and for the city council from the 25th senatorial district in 1961.

More than 10 years ago, he was an organizer of a rent clinic on the West Side and he had supervised it in cooperation with the Office of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which cited him for his service.

Since 1958 he was a director of the West Side School Community Center. He was also on the executive board of Housing and Redevelopment Commission for the West Side.

Mr. Suchman was born in New York, attended Townsend Harris Hall and was graduated from City College and Columbia Law School. He also held a B.S. in education degree from Teachers College.

A son of Israel Suchman, a pioneer operator of motion picture theaters in New York, he worked his way through college playing the piano accompaniment to silent movies. He gave recitals and continued to play at social events later in life.

Mr. Suchman controlled a number of motion picture theaters early in his career and was chairman of the negotiating committee of the Theater Owners Chamber of Commerce.

From 1951 to 1958, he was secretary to Municipal Court Justice (now Civil Court Judge) George Starke.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Florinda Suchman; a son, Daniel; a brother, Abraham; two sisters, Mrs. Rose Rinderman and Mrs. Elizabeth Ferber, and a grandchild.

A funeral service will be held tomorrow at 2:30 p.m. at the Riverside Chapel, Amsterdam Avenue and 76th Street.

EXPLANATION OF VOTING POSITIONS

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 5, 1965, I attended the session of the House of Representatives until early evening. By previous arrangement, I had committed myself to appear before an official meeting of the Council of Rimersburg Borough in Clarion County, northwestern Pennsylvania, several hours drive north of Pittsburgh, Pa.

Under these circumstances, it was necessary that I take the plane to Pittsburgh and drive to Rimersburg, arriving Monday evening about 10:30 p.m. for the latter part of the official council meeting. I drove back to Pittsburgh, arriving around 2 a.m. Tuesday morning, April 6, 1965, and took the 8 a.m. plane from Pittsburgh to Washington, D.C., in order to attend the committee meetings of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the House Science and Astronautics Committee, upon which I serve.

While I was able to answer at the session of the House of Representatives on April 5, 1965, rollcall No. 61 and rollcall No. 62, as well as rollcall No. 63, I was not able because of this previous official commitment, to be present for rollcall No. 64 which occurred early in the evening.

On rollcall No. 64, final passage of H.R. 7060 making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for fiscal 1965-66, I would have voted "yea" had I been able to be present.

On March 15, 1965, rollcall No. 33, I would have voted "yea" on final passage of H.R. 4714 to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964.

On March 22, 1965, rollcall No. 42, I would have voted "nay" on the motion to recommit H.R. 5688 on Crime and Criminal Procedure in the District of Columbia. I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 43 for final passage of that bill had I been able to be present at that time.

In each of the cases, it was necessary for me to be out of town on essential commitments, as well as appointments in my district.

NEW HAMPSHIRE GENERAL COURT VOTES APPEAL TO CONGRESS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION ON REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the New Hampshire General Court recently passed a concurrent resolution calling upon the Congress to convene a constitutional convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution to permit States having a bicameral legislature to apportion the membership of one house on factors other than population.

The proposed amendment would authorize this to be done only where the electorate of that State endorsed such a reapportionment plan in a statewide referendum.

For the Record, I am offering the text of appropriate pages of the Journal of the New Hampshire Senate for April 1 describing this action by the legislature. This material speaks for itself. I fully endorse it and offered my own joint resolution (H.J. Res. 362) on March 3 for the purpose of amending the Constitution in exactly the same manner.

The text of the Senate Journal and my own joint resolution follow:

Concurrent Resolution Applying to the Congress To Call a Convention for the Purpose of Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Resolved by the house of representatives, the senate concurring, That this legislature respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"Article —

"Section 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

"Sec. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

"Sec. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."; be it further

Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

The above concurrent resolution was adopted.

H.J. Res. 362

Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"Article XXV

"Section 1. Nothing in the Constitution of the United States shall prohibit a State, having a bicameral legislature, from apportioning the membership of one house of its legislature on factors other than population, if the citizens of the State shall have the opportunity to vote upon the apportionment.

"Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

CONGRESSMAN WYDLER, SPACE COMMITTEE MEMBER, URGES WIDER MILITARY SPACE ROLE IN MAJOR POLICY ADDRESS

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wydler], a distinguished member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, made a number of compelling points in the course of an address he delivered recently at the annual meeting of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics. His intimate knowledge of the space program make his recommendations of particular significance at this time when so many crucial decisions concerning the program must be made. It is important that the Congress participate in these decisions in the light of all possible knowledge. Mr. WYDLER'S address is an important contribution to that knowledge.

Congressman WYDLER advocates a broader role for the military in space, among other important points. He states flatly, and correctly in my opinion:

> We need a second major space effort—for military control of near space * * *. Manned earth orbit should be given military direction and major funding at once.

This is an important speech and I offer it at this point in the RECORD so that all Members may have an opportunity to study it:

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF AERONAUTICS AND ASTRONAUTICS, LONG ISLAND SECTION, PLANNING FOR OUR SPACE PROGRAM

As your Congressman, I have recently completed another annual review, with fellow Members of the House of Representatives Science and Astronautics Committee, of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration budget authorization. From this background, I welcome the opportunity to speak to the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics because I feel a kindred spirit in our mutual interests here.

My congressional space committee assignment is one which I prize highly. It is interesting, of course, but in addition, it is a challenge to understanding which is unique in the legislative course of business. As the years have gone by, I can assure you there has been a significant change in the hearings with which we do business. The NASA budget, and indeed science, are no longer taken on faith, debated lightly and approved with lopsided votes, unembarrassed by any informed discussion. I believe this is all to the good—for you, as scientists and engineers; for me, as a Congressman; and for our country.

Our country is once again presented with an opportunity for some far-reaching decisions with respect to the space program. Fortunately, we are in an excellent position to consider the future carefully and deliberately, with much-improved communication between the scientific and engineering community and the policymaking machinery of Government. I believe the AIAA has a vital role to play in planning our space program and I am delighted to start the dialog here tonight with you.

First, let us reflect on the last time we had a chance to set our course. It was in 1957 that America was serenely committed to a modest effort, in connection with the International Geophysical Year, to place a satellite in earth orbit. But October and December jarred us rudely awake to the fact that Vanguard had failed—and sputnik had succeeded with a startling heavy payload. Our space program planning at that time was a haphazard affair of military-service bickering, National Academy of Sciences management by default, Von Braun frustration, and, I admit, congressional suspicion and apathy. But we came quickly to the realization that we were in a space race and a new organization was urgently needed. Many voices were heard in this turbulent period, but I want to recall to your mind one particular important fact that, in the light of present experience, seems to have been forgotten.

Only 1 week after sputnik was launched into its history-making orbit by the massive booster rocket which the U.S.S.R. had ironically been forced to develop for its overweight atomic warhead—only 1 week after our Nation began a soul-searching appraisal of its prestige in the eyes of the world—and only 1 week after our Government agencies had been illuminated in all of their short-thinking and petty politics, a plan was presented to President Eisenhower. A plan for the establishment of an Astronautical Research and Development Agency, similar to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (the old NACA). This proposal would provide an agency with the responsibility for all space projects except those directly related to the military.

Now, I imagine there are some oldtimers in the audience who have remembered the origin of the proposal I am talking about. For it was the American Rocket Society, one of the precursors of the AIAA, which came boldly forward with this timely plan. And the present form of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency owes much to the foresight and thinking of your technical society.

Here is my theme for tonight, then: The United States needs to have your well-considered thoughts in 1965 just as in 1957. We are now confronted with the long leadtime items for post-Apollo planning The voices of the scientific and engineering community, through their organized and established technical and professional societies can fill a particular role in long-range planning which no other American institution is prepared or equipped to do.

I have arrived at this conclusion by noting the recent efforts of the Congress to obtain scientific advice and become internally constituted to better deal with the increasing technical content of all major public-policy decisions. This year, there was a significant improvement in questioning by our committee members during briefings and hearings. It was gratifying to see the sharpened presentations of budget justification by the executive branch personnel.

Last year, we authorized the Library of Congress to augment the Legislative Reference Service by establishing a Science Policy Research Division. This small group of specialists is able to give us objective background information, and to point up policy issues, and to act as a bridge to the scientific community. We are doing our homework better and the days when science bills involving billions of dollars were voted through the Congress on faith alone are, thank goodness, in the past. We are now in a position to obtain more advice and to understand the meaning of it, if not all the intricacies.

The intensity with which Congress looks at executive proposals may often result in a significant shift in effort. As an illustration, I call your attention to our action this year on the 260-inch, solid-propellant motor, and the SNAP-8 nuclear power package. The Bureau of the Budget had quite apparently made arbitrary cuts in these programs to stay within an imposed dollar limitation. But my Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology heard testimony, obtained staff reports, made inquiries of industrial contractors, and evaluated technical papers in the open literature to come to the conclusion that deletion of these programs was unwise. The future of the M-1 liquid-hydrogen engine was also examined carefully to see where it fit in to future NASA missions. Resolving that the United States should not again be caught short of key propulsive power in our launch vehicles and space power for communication and space-vehicle operation, we recommended judicious extension of these programs in the fiscal year 1966 period.

We in Congress need your help. You on Long Island cannot only build parts and vehicles—but you can take part in future planning. And Congress is the right point of contact—we are ready, willing, and able to play our role. But we need information and disinterested witnesses.

Our recourse to scientific advice has been broadened and is paying off. But many of the sources of data are suspect of bias to some extent and a discounting of their position must be made. Executive agencies are necessarily, to a degree, self-serving and defensive in their budget presentations. Contractors, as many of you know, are apt to become so involved in their own projects that they lose perspective. Ad hoc advisory committees of eminent authorities are useful as sounding boards but by their very nature have a transitory effect. In fact, as the Federal dollar pervades more and more of our science and engineering establishment, it is difficult to find a mouth which can voice an opinion without risking a bite of the hand that feeds it. This is a dangerous situation. I am sure you will agree.

The professional technical society comes nearer to circumventing traditional criticism of congressional advisers then most groups which come to mind. Here we feel that we can get a consensus of opinion representing the Member's views which irons out the effects of individual employment loyalty or special bias. Particularly, with respect to technical feasibility of long-range plans, the professional association would be a prime source of comment.

And yet, to my knowledge, the Congress has heard very little from the AIAA on the subject of post-Apollo plans. This is not meant to be a criticism for I realize that it is difficult to organize for rapid response of a large diversified membership. Also, the AIAA, like other societies, is primarily concerned with broad issues of standards, industrial stability, manpower utilization, and individual member welfare. Nevertheless, your membership is spread throughout the country and widely within government, industry, and universities; and seems to constitute an excellent reservoir of competence and experience.

I have heard one difficulty expressed with respect to calling on the AIAA for counsel. It is the limitation on lobbying which goes with your tax-exempt status under the Internal Revenue Code. The risk of losing this status if you engaged in certain prohibited political activities needs to be carefully analyzed.

Our House Science and Astronautics Committee issued a report in August of last year which explored this question in detail. Of course, there are no absolutes in the law and each particular case must be decided on its own merits, and in the light of the activity and the wording of the organization's charter. I recommend close reading of our report to your officers, but I want to offer its conclusions to you for perusal.

As far as the Internal Revenue Code is concerned, the AIAA does not have a main purpose of influencing the passage or defeat of legislation and, therefore, there is no limitation upon the extent to which you may engage in political activities. The AIAA may offer information to Congress regardless of whether it is solicited or not, although, I am sure we would always invite testimony which you would be prepared to give in the name of the society.

It appears quite clear that the AIAA does not come under coverage of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Comments or editorials in trade journals or magazines relating to pending or proposed legislation are quite proper. Testimony by your elected officials before cognizant committees of Congress would not place your status in jeopardy.

Now, here is where your help is needed. Apollo is a national commitment, and one which we are increasingly confident of meeting. The United States has—in a very real sense—decreased the options of the Soviet Union to surprise us or to badly surpass us in any one area of space exploration. We are ahead in space science and satellite applications. They are ahead in manned space flight. But the arena of struggle for international power and prestige will be space technology for some time to come. And we must not be mesmerized by the Apollo goal of 1970 or thereabouts into thinking that this is the sum and substance of our space program. No one would speculate that after the successful manned lunar landing our program would decrease to a few scientific probes or a low-cost, manned orbital laboratory. We are in space for many good sound reasons, our capability is growing every day and the cost, in terms of its percentage of gross national product is reasonable at the $7 billion annual combined total for NASA, the Department of Defense, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

But analysis of presently approved programs in these three agencies shows that by 1973 we will be spending less than $4 billion per year. The Congress has heard of no long-range proposals for further space ventures. NASA Director Webb has called for a wide national discussion of future plans. I agree that this is desirable and proper, but I point out that the time is short. You know as well as I the lead time for new hardware, launch pads, and communication and tracking networks. Our national discussion should begin immediately and be timed to present some well-thought-out programs to the Congress and to the public by early next year.

To accomplish this end, we must be aware of four barriers to imaginative, timely, long-range planning.

First, we may pay too much attention to the day-to-day competition with the Russians and devote too much time to guessing whether they are going to the Moon by this or that rendezvous technique or planning earth-orbiting laboratories. The Russian influence must not preoccupy our program guidance, except we must meet its military challenge.

Second, our present broad base of space science and its vast accumulation of data must not lead to complacency that we have exhausted the information to be gained from inexpensive, unmanned satellites or probes. Further, there are many satellite applications, such as navigation and traffic control or direct-broadcast television, which can have every bit of the commercial impact of Comsat. Policy decisions must be considered promptly which will lead to additional private sector enterprises utilizing space technology. Delays due to interagency wrangling or indecision over the role and extent of Federal support will defer the benefits and economic payout of such schemes. It is even possible that Japan or a European consortium could beat us to the marketplace in some commercial applications.

Third, further delay in deciding whether there is military value in space technology seems unrealistic. The Department of Defense has talked about the Manned Orbiting Laboratory for almost 2 years. This prolonged agonizing is a deterrent to long-range planning for our entire national space program and should not continue. A start should be made on an operational program which would be flexible enough to move in the most useful direction for military purposes whether they be satellite inspection, interception, earth surveillance, or space-based weapons. We need a second major space effort—for military control of near space. General LeMay in March stated that "It is in the arena of space that Soviet technological developments are most likely to bypass this generation of U.S. weapons systems." He is right, and the Congress should not allow this to happen. Manned earth orbit should be given military direction and major funding at once.

Finally, a threat to future planning is posed by the tendency to defer new launch and space-vehicle development commitments in the hope for technological breakthroughs. It is tempting to plan for the continued use of present hardware because of its greater reliability and lower cost when repetitive units are manufactured. It is too easy to say that presently approved programs require all the money and talent which NASA has at its disposal—so that new programs should be put off in order to take advantage of flight experience. But space exploration requires a constant push at the leading edge of the state-of-the-art. Just as the Apollo goal was necessary to focus the program of the 1960's, so will a firm future plan be required to keep our technology advancing through the 1970's.

Advanced planning is important for another and broader reason. The United States has an increasing number of large technology programs which individually require significant segments of our total resources of technical manpower, facilities, and dollars. These include the supersonic transport, high-speed ground transportation, oceanography, pollution abatement, and space exploration. The need for long-range projections of the requirements for these ventures is basic to any policy decision. Otherwise, we would find, a few years hence, that competition for funds and dislocations of manpower and materials would be interfering with many of our programs. Then, we would be forced to make expedient, short-term decisions under pressure. So, it is not just NASA that I am talking about, but all the Federal agencies that spend the $15.5 billion science and technology budget which represents 70 percent of the technical personnel in the United States.

Planning technology programs in Government is difficult at best because of the annual nature of the funding and the so-called requirements merry-go-round which seems to insist on firm missions before systems development can begin. So far, our efforts have been rather unproductive. The White House Office of Science and Technology has a responsibility to identify national goals and to develop Government-wide planning techniques and policies. But the evidence to date shows that projections for the entire Federal Government are extremely complex and much additional thinking will be required in and out of Washington before these problems are solved.

In summary, my message to you tonight is simply this:

Our country must get on with the job of long-range planning for large technological programs. We must know more about the alternatives for employing the tremendous scientific and engineering capability which we have built up. It is an expendable but renewable resource—and it can also be misspent or allowed to decay if not used wisely.

The space program represents the largest single project in terms of money, and future plans in this area will therefore have the greatest effect on the overall picture. We are on the threshold of major decision.

I call for a vigorous national discussion on post-Apollo plans, their technical feasibility, their timing and cost, and their results in terms of advancing human knowledge, securing the national defense, and maintaining our scientific supremacy. The discussion should involve all sectors of our economy and all walks of life. A leading voice should be that of the technical community whose consensus can be most effectively transmitted through professional societies such as yours. The American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics has a vital role to play and I charge you to meet that responsibility to yourself and your country.

THE BACKBONE OF OUR NATION

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last week the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune-Democrat reprinted an editorial which first appeared in the Chicago Tribune and by now must surely have had wide circulation throughout the country. Yet some of my colleagues may not have read it, so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record not only for their benefit but also to assure that this outstanding contribution will be available in posterity.

"The Real Man of the Year" is the backbone of our Nation. He merits our highest commendations but actually gets little attention. Here on earth, that is. But in the Great Beyond—where an accounting is kept of good deeds and virtues, of sincere tolerance and patience, of unpublicized charities and sacrifices, of deep devotion to country and love of fellowmen—our man is building up a score that is sure to bring far more important awards. He may be overlooked or taken for granted in a materialistic society, but he is certain to be a standout in the eyes of God.

"The Real Man of the Year" deserves your closest attention. It follows:

The Real Man of the Year

The Tribune today presents the real man of the year.

He was not picked by the Junior Association of Commerce, or by the Senior Association of Commerce, or by the politicians, or by any association of newspapermen. You won't find his picture in the papers. You may not recognize him as you pass him on the street. But we hope you do.

Our man of the year is in the middle-income brackets. He gets up every morning at 6:30 so that he can get to his job in an office or factory at 8 or 8:30. He works hard, not only because he wants advancement, but because he thinks his employer deserves a fair deal. He is honest and dependable.

Our man of the year manages to get along with one wife. They have three or four children, whom they love so much they teach them to be respectful, law abiding, and self-reliant. They have done their best to earn and save enough money to send their children to college, but the rising costs of higher education make this goal more difficult each year.

The rising cost of everything also makes it harder to put aside money for retirement. Recent Federal income tax reductions have helped the people in high-income brackets and low-income brackets, but the man in the middle has got little benefit. There are no loopholes in the income tax for him, and he can't put any money into tax-exempt securities.

Social security taxes, which started at $30 a year, are now up to $174. Soon the medicare program will make them much higher. Local property taxes have doubled, and so have the various State taxes. Worst of all, the purchasing power of the dollar is only 42 percent of what it was when our man of the year bought his first insurance policy in 1937. The little money which he has set aside for a rainy day is worth about half of what it was when he earned it.

Our man of the year belongs to a church and works at his religion. He is no saint, but he understands the Biblical meaning of neighbor and tries to be decent to men of all races and creeds. You won't find him, however, in civil disobedience demonstrations. He believes laws ought to be enforced.

Our man of the year is not ashamed to be considered a patriot. He flies the flag on national holidays. He can't understand Americans who join organizations dedicated to the destruction of America. He can't understand legislators and judges who strive to undermine law and order, or to feather their own nests.

Our man of the year believes in our system of Government. He votes at every election, but he votes only once.

For all his merits, we salute him.

GROWING TAX BURDEN AND HUNDRED BILLION BUDGETS CALL FOR FURTHER CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OF BUDGETARY PROCESS

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of how best to achieve efficiency and economy in the Federal Government in this era of $100 billion budgets is one which engages all taxpayers. They are concerned, and rightly so, with the modernization of congressional procedures because they recognize, not only that they are paying more and enjoying it less, but that congressional reforms will help assure full value for their tax dollars. They do not have to be told, because they know, that congressional procedures used in carrying out duties and responsibilities in the appropriations process in that long ago era of the $5 billion budget are far from adequate today. Significant reforms in the congressional budgetary process are long overdue. National solvency, the need to maintain and assure it, regarding which there has always been a great consensus, and I use this term advisedly, is a problem which necessarily must engage our best minds and our most earnest endeavors. Although I do not see such dangers as present in our situation, we must not ignore or be unmindful of the history of our century. It shows that those nations which irresponsibly spend themselves into inflation and bankruptcy, with the inevitable twin attendant evils of war and revolution, are ultimately responsible for the destruction of millions of innocent families in their own and other nations. We are faced, in the Congress, with growing and competitive demands in all fields of our national life. We must make wise choices in the expenditure of funds, choices which, in such fields as defense, education, science, and so on, assure our very survival. These choices are the responsibility of the Congress because, under the Constitution, Congress has the exclusive right to appropriate funds.

The Congress has already largely lost the legislative initiative to the executive branch, and the policymaking initiative to both the executive and judicial branches. Regardless of any new efforts which may be made to regain these initiatives, there are areas in which the Congress must remain supreme. The most important of these are the investigatory role, watching over the way in which executive departments and agencies follow the intent of the Congress, and the overseeing of the executive budgetary process. Unfortunately, the Congress has not even maintained its constitutional supremacy in these fields. The reasons for this are many and varied. Some Members of Congress claim it is due to the ever-increasing volume of casework, and others advance other views. What is clear, however, is that the expanding role of Government and the myriad services it performs are significant factors.

The reforms Congress must seek should enable it to reclaim its position as a strong, independent, coequal branch of Government, and the surgeon's scalpel would seem to be indicated, rather than the blunderbuss or the headsman's ax. Reforms should include fundamental changes in the review and control of the budgetary process, and the increased use of the machinery already available to Congress through its own standing committees, and the General Accounting Office, to provide review of the operations of the Executive.

Budgetary reform must be concerned with the fact that while requests for funds are made by the administration, witnesses who appear before the appropriations committees of the Congress on behalf of budget requests represent exclusively the executive branch of the Government. The fund requests of the administration are supported by elaborate justifications based on department and agency studies by an army of more than 2,000 technical experts, but the appropriations committees of the Congress are staffed by a corporal's guard, in comparison, which does not have access to the depth and detail of information available to the administration.

The administration's leadtime in the preparation of the budget is some 18 months, while Congress must make its determinations in a matter of weeks. Further, the congressional committees are forced to rely upon administration witnesses who appear before them in an ex parte type of proceeding for the sole purpose of justifying department and agency budget requests. The end result of all this is that because congressional committees do not have access to impartial witnesses and impartial information the funds appropriated may or may not be responsive to the real needs.

It is widely recognized that Congress labors under great handicaps in connection with its constitutional role in the budgetary process. Much as been written on the subject, and Congress has, itself, devoted much time and study to the issue. Reform of the procedures of the Congress in the budgetary process, however, have lagged far behind budgetary reforms in the executive which Congress has wrought by numerous important enactments in this century. Twentieth century reform of the budgetary process in the executive branch began with proposals by the Taft Commission on Economy and Efficiency for an Executive Budget in 1912. The Congress enlarged upon this suggestion when it enacted the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 which provided first, a comprehensive executive budget; second, established the Bureau of the Budget; and third, assigned responsibility for accounting to the new General Accounting Office headed by a Comptroller General, a new accounting arrangement which it established.

In 1937, the President's Committee on Administrative Management originated the modern concept of the Executive Office of the President. The work of this Committee led to the Reorganization Act of 1939, and Executive Order No. 8248 of September 8, 1939, which set the stage for the growth of the Bureau of the Budget to its present size and importance.

Following this, the budgetary provisions of the National Security Act Amendments of 1949 and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 were passed, receiving their impetus from the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

A tentative effort, doomed to failure, involving the congressional process was attempted in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which provided for a legislative budget. It also provided that the Senate and House Appropriations Committees and the Finance Committee of the Senate and the House Ways and Means Committee would meet jointly at the beginning of each session and report to the Congress a legislative budget based on the President's budget recommendations and including "estimated overall Federal receipts and expenditures." The legislative budget was to include recommendations as to the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditures in the next fiscal year. This machinery broke down at the very beginning. Since the day when the unworkability of these provisions became clear, the Senate has concentrated its reform zeal and efforts on the enactment of the McClellan bill, which as S. 2, is before the Senate this year with some 76 sponsors. The Senate has adopted this provision several times since it was first introduced in 1952.

In my opinion, the McClellan bill, S. 2, to create a Joint Committee on the Budget, has served an extremely useful purpose in keeping the issue of budgetary reform alive, and in calling attention to the problems facing Congress in this field. However, the House of Representatives has never accepted this proposal in the 13 years it has been before the Congress and it seems it is unlikely to do so in the foreseeable future. The time has come, therefore, to explore proposals for congressional budgetary reform short of S. 2, and in some respects to go beyond it.

The need to reform the budgetary process is urgent, because the rapidly increasing needs and expenditures in our expanding urbanized society are too great to tolerate waste and misdirection. The problem is the best use of funds, and the concomitant budgetary controls involves two things, as I see it, first, economy and efficiency in Government which can only be achieved by a continuous review in depth as to how the executive is operating, and second, the need to examine the way in which the Bureau of the Budget makes its determinations as to the Federal budget. It is in these areas that the Congress has the least knowledge and the least amount of effective review and control.

We know that the Bureau of the Budget is authorized by the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 to "assemble, correlate, revise, reduce, or increase the requests for appropriations of the several departments or establishments." How the Bureau of the Budget operates, the criteria it uses to determine as between competing requests and to settle disputes as to priorities, duplication of effort, jurisdiction, increase and decrease in budgeted amounts, here the Congress has no information at all. As it is, Congress gets a Federal budget submitted by the President with the amounts all neatly settled, the bleeding bodies carefully hidden off stage out of sight of inquisitive committees of Congress. In other words, what the Congress gets is the last and final word from the Bureau of the Budget which, at times, seems to have some of the attributes of the Delphic Oracle and the Sphinx. At times, President Johnson's bare-bones budget seems to bear the label, "Don't touch, this is perfect as it is."

Once the Congress receives the budget, it is studied and handled by congressional subcommittees on a piecemeal basis, with little if any coordination between the authorizing and appropriating committees, and the Committees on Government Operations. All committees of Congress need much more information than they now receive to make the basic and vital judgments they must make under the Constitution. The problem becomes even more apparent when the Congress itself becomes the initiator of a legislative proposal. Unless a letter is received from the Bureau of the Budget containing the magic words, "The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program," or unless the Bureau of the Budget includes a new authorization for the congressional proposal in a supplemental appropriations bill Congress takes no action at all on it even though it was the author.

For example, take the case of the $50 million urban renewal rehabilitation loan program which the Congress itself started in the Housing Act of 1964. Despite strong bipartisan support and the blessing of the President when he signed the Housing Act of 1964 into law, no effort was made by the Bureau of the Budget to fund the program. Even though the Senate, in a most unusual action, added on the floor an appropriation for the program to the second supplemental appropriations bill, House Appropriations Committee conferees while admitting the program's great value would not go along with the appropriation since it did not have Budget Bureau approval. This year, President Johnson included the needed appropriation in his budget but if the Congress had not made the fight it did last fall this highly significant program might not have been provided for in this year's budget.

In cases such as this, the administrative agency concerned feels that it is impossible to publicly support the new program in any way even though it may want the appropriation. This is not the case of an agency going over the head of the Bureau of the Budget on the President's program once a decision has been made by the executive but, rather, a case of the Bureau of the Budget stifling the information Congress needs to make an appropriations decision on its own program.

Under present arrangements, the General Accounting Office can provide only a partial answer to the problem of securing congressional control and review over efficiency and economy in the Government. As it is now, the GAO is confined to after-the-fact inspections and examinations, refunds, collections, measurable savings, and other procedures. Even so, the savings it is annually responsible for have been estimated by the Comptroller General to be about four times the cost of running the GAO each year. Many of the reports of the GAO involve questions in which the congressional intent has not been made unmistakably clear, inviting a lack of response by the administrative department or agency concerned. Congress alone can resolve the question of its intent. What is more, the lack of powerful and consistent congressional backing for the GAO and for implementation of its reports weakens the GAO in its relations with the executive and, whether we recognize it or not, also undermines the position of the Congress itself. The GAO is advisory only, and has no way to enforce its reports. It is up to the executive and the Congress to implement them, or to see that they are implemented. The Comptroller General told the Senate Government Operations Committee in 1963:

> We are very sure that there has not been enough attention given to the reports of the General Accounting Office. * * * We feel we are in the best position today to give an objective, unbiased, if you will, report on the financial operations of the Government. * * * I would like to emphasize that so far as the budget is concerned neither I personally nor my office sees that budget until perhaps a day before it reaches the press. It is surprising and unfortunate that an organization such as ours does not have access to the budget justification * * * until after the appropriation bills have been passed.

A year later, the Senate Appropriations Committee had this to say regarding the work of the GAO in Senate Report No. 1095, 88th Congress, 2d session:

> The committee believes that there has been a lack of prompt and adequate attention given by the agencies to recommendations contained in reports of the General Accounting Office. Failure to immediately implement proposals of the General Accounting Office in many instances provides for the continued unnecessary expenditure of Government funds. The committee strongly urges the departments to give prompt and vigorous attention to deficiencies and recommendations contained in reports of the Comptroller General. The committee shares the views of the President of the United States in his remarks to the press, on May 2, 1964, following a Cabinet meeting in which he outlined a nine-point program to achieve greater efficiency and economy in Government operations. Included in the program was his request that "all reports made by the General Accounting Office and congressional committees be given prompt and thorough and careful attention."

I can illustrate the situation as it exists today from my own experience. As ranking minority member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and its Housing Subcommittee, I have become increasingly alarmed over the lack of prompt, thorough, and careful attention given GAO reports by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Federal Urban Renewal Administration. Late last year I requested the Library of Congress to review the 23 GAO reports on the Federal urban renewal program which had been issued, and then sent this review to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Kermit Gordon, and asked him what action the Budget Bureau had taken on them. Mr. Gordon replied, under date of March 27, 1965, that:

> Detailed investigation by the Bureau of the Budget of each GAO report would obviously have been impossible; over the 10-year period covered by the cited reports, we have been able to devote less than the full time of one examiner to the entire urban renewal program in all of its aspects.
>
> Under these circumstances, most of our efforts to secure adequate agency consideration of such reports are part of our day-to-day work with general problems, and legislative programs; we are not in a position to take formal action on each such report.

Imagine, one man assigned only part time to overseeing a $5 billion program which the GAO found provided inadequate relocation assistance and displaced families into substandard housing, allowed excessive noncash and grant-in-aid credits and large-scale demolition without determining whether less costly renewal methods were warranted, used different inspection standards resulting in housing classified as substandard for project eligibility purposes which formerly had been classified as suitable for relocation purposes and so on. What better proof can there be of the need for review by Congress of Executive performance?

Mr. Gordon's reply clearly indicates that it is not Budget Bureau policy to make its own findings based on GAO reports, to implement GAO reports, or to give GAO reports prompt, thorough, and careful attention though requested to do so by the President. Formal action by the Bureau of the Budget on each GAO report on urban renewal over this 10-year period, which would have involved about two reports each year, might have prevented the Federal Urban Renewal Administration from repeating the same costly mistakes, in human and economic terms, over and over again throughout the past 10 years experience with this $5 billion program. Formal action on two reports each year would not seem to be an unreasonable expectation.

In most welcome contrast to this attitude on the part of the Bureau of the Budget stands the recent action of the House in adopting language in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1966, restoring control of this vital urban renewal program to the Congress, and requiring that funds be provided in the appropriation bills on an annual basis to finance all new urban renewal grants. This language will prevent the Federal Urban Renewal Commissioner from making binding contracts before money is appropriated. The House acted on the basis of the following paragraph in the committee report:

> Urban Renewal Administration: The committee is greatly concerned over lack of congressional control over the urban renewal program. During the past few years the Congress has lost control over the expenditure of $4,725 million by granting the right to make binding contracts before money is appropriated. The committee recommends language to provide that funds be provided in the annual appropriation bills to finance all new urban renewal grants. This will recapture the control lost by the Congress at a time when the program is picking up momentum and the need for closer supervision by the Congress becomes more and more evident. GAO reports and other publications have made valid criticisms of the program. The action of the committee is designed to reduce future criticism while there is still time.

In view of the above, it is clear that Congress must take steps to provide more careful review of the budgetary process, and take the wraps off the General Accounting Office, if we are serious about maintaining congressional prerogatives and achieving efficiency and economy in government.

The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Robert Ash Wallace, while a staff member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, wrote that the implementation of section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, providing for expenditures analyses to be made by the General Accounting Office would represent solid progress. This section has not been utilized by the Congress since its enactment. Mr. Wallace said that in such implementation the GAO should concentrate on purely analytical and investigatory activities to provide Congress with information, and that the GAO should probably be utilized in the following ways:

First. Sit as observers during budgetary proceedings on the formulation of the budget, being permitted to ask questions and receive information.

Second. Study justification sheets for agency money requests in detail.

Third. Be given the power, with adequate safeguards, of procuring information by subpena if otherwise denied.

Fourth. Taking into account the information provided, study the laws being carried out in an effort to compare goals with operations.

Fifth. Become familiar enough with the details of programs to discuss them with Members of Congress. Information developed should help Congressmen to assess the areas where more funds than requested could more nearly achieve legislative goals, and, also, areas where reductions could be made with the least damage to these goals and the extent to which damage would be done, so they can decide on the issue of effects versus the desire for economy.

Sixth. Appear at committee hearings to give testimony, and provide competent information.

Seventh. Furnish memoranda to individual Members of Congress on request and discuss budgetary matters with such Members or their staffs in person. This would relieve Members of Congress of complete dependence for information on the committees and the agencies.

Eighth. A congressional budget office in the GAO could provide accurate data during congressional hearings, and represent the public interest rather than the interests of particular agencies and their friends.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In my opinion, the first step in modernizing congressional control and review over the budgetary process for the purpose of achieving efficiency and economy in government would be to provide that the Director and the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget is much more powerful than Congress had in mind when this office was created by the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950. More than one national publication in recent months has called attention to the prominent role played by the Budget Director. One White House aid has been reported as saying:

> The Bureau has never been stronger than it is now. Other administrations used it. This administration relies on it.

Another White House spokesman, or possibly the same one, was reported by another national publication to have said that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget "is like an 11th Cabinet member and except for the men running the Pentagon, State, and Treasury, is probably more important that the others." Yet, the Budget Director may well be the only major official of the Federal Government not responsible either to an electorate or to the Congress. The usefulness of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the President would no more be diminished by the requirement of Senate confirmation than the value of Cabinet officials and other Federal officials to the President is diminished by the present requirement of Senate confirmation of them.

Second, section 201(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, providing for the transmission to the Congress of the budget, and for the President's budget message, should be amended to provide for a detailed report on the work and activities of the Bureau of the Budget including steps taken by it to achieve efficiency and economy in Government pursuant to section 209 of such act, and to implement GAO reports.

Third, the act creating the Joint Economic Committee should be amended to establish a permanent subcommittee to be known as the "Joint Subcommittee on the Federal Budget and Fiscal Policy," which would reflect the composition of the Joint Economic Committee. It would be the function of such joint subcommittee, as a guide to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the Federal budget, first, to make a continuing study of the Federal budget and fiscal policy, including an examination of the criteria used by the Bureau of the Budget in evaluating budgetary requests of the various executive departments and agencies; second, to study and recommend ways and means of promoting and achieving efficiency and economy in government, such study to include (a) reports made by the General Accounting Office, (b) a review of any report, or part thereof, of the results of any study made by the Bureau of the Budget under section 209 of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and transmitted to the Congress by the President; and, third, from time to time to make such reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable.

Fourth, section 207 of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 should be amended by adding a requirement that in the preparation of the budget the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall consult with the Comptroller General with respect to ways and means of implementing GAO reports, and shall transmit to the appropriations and legislative committees of the Congress having jurisdiction over the subject matter involved (A) a copy of the comment on any GAO report made by the head of a Federal department or agency to the Bureau of the Budget, and (B) a report of the action taken by the Bureau of the Budget in implementing such GAO report.

The Bureau of the Budget recently stated that:

> We are, however, in wholehearted support of the view that the head of each agency should provide for systematic and prompt consideration of all GAO reports on the work of his agency; that the President is entitled to assurance that all such reports are given careful attention at a level of authority within the agency consistent with the nature of the audit findings and recommendations; and that the appropriate committees of Congress are entitled to receive agency reports on follow-up actions if they so desire.

Fifth, the rules of the Senate and House of Representatives should be amended to require the standing committees in the House and Senate, as well as the Committees on Government Operations, to review and report to their respective Houses as soon as practicable their recommendations regarding each GAO report received. This would go beyond the present practice in which the

Senate and House rules merely suggest that the Government Operations Committees submit such recommendations to their respective Houses as they deem necessary or desirable, and would provide the legislative committees with a basis for further legislative action in the fields within their jurisdiction which are covered by the GAO reports. In no way would such a rules change diminish the present authority of the House and Senate Committees on Government Operations. It would, however, provide an opportunity for the questions of legislative intent often raised by the General Accounting Office to be presented, considered, and settled in the appropriate forum where legislative action alone can be taken; that is, in the legislative committees which had original jurisdiction over the program involved.

I am pleased that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee and the second ranking Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee, has joined me in introducing identical bills, H.R. 8725, and H.R. 8755, to carry out these five recommendations.

Sixth, there is an additional proposal which I have been considering. The Comptroller General, in his 1963 testimony before the Senate Committee on Government Operations, said:

> It is surprising and unfortunate that an organization such as ours does not have access to the budget justification until after the appropriation bills have been passed.

Such a situation makes it very difficult for the Comptroller General to advise congressional committees and individual Members of Congress on budget requests in light of its studies. To some extent, this problem is met by requiring the Bureau of the Budget to consult with the Comptroller General on specific reports, as I have already suggested. However, I have written to the Comptroller General asking for his views on this language and any additional suggestions he may have for legislation covering the problem he has raised.

CONCLUSION

I would simply note in conclusion that these recommendations, while new, are not bold or startling. They are, rather, commonsense minimum steps on which we can build as experience with them dictates. They maintain, enhance, and build on, rather than undo, the reforms in the budgetary process launched by the Taft Commission on Efficiency and Economy in 1912, the President's Committee on Administrative Management in 1937, and the Hoover Commission, reforms which were enlarged upon and perfected by the Congress itself in such important measures as the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950. Furthermore, they avoid the pitfall which has plagued S. 2 and its antecedent measures, since they are not concerned with particular items in the budget prior to action by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

Adoption of my proposals will forcefully reiterate the intent of the Congress to supervise and achieve efficiency and economy in the Federal Government expressed in its previous enactments to improve the budgetary process, and provide powerful new tools for this purpose. We must not be misled to believe that simply setting a limit of $100 billion on the Federal budget is enough, and that we can safely ignore the fact that the Federal debt ceiling is inching upward to the half trillion dollar mark. Nor must we forget that while wars are won on the battlefields peace can only be maintained by wise, generous, and prudent governments.

I include as part of my remarks the text of my bill which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has cosponsored. I also include the well-known article by Mr. Kermit Gordon, entitled "How Much Should Government Do?":

H.R. 8725

A bill to modernize congressional control and review over the budgetary process for the purpose of achieving efficiency and economy in the Federal Government, to provide that the Director and the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall be appointed, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to establish a Joint Subcommittee on the Federal Budget and Fiscal Policy in the Joint Economic Committee, and to strengthen the functions of the General Accounting Office

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 16 of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 creating the Bureau of the Budget (31 U.S.C. 16) is hereby amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", by and with the advice and consent of the Senate".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 201(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, providing for the transmission to the Congress of the budget (31 U.S.C. 11(a)), is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (10); by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(12) work and activities of the Bureau of the Budget including a detailed report on the steps taken by it to achieve efficiency and economy in Government and to implement reports made by the General Accounting Office."

(b) Section 207 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 16) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the preparation of the budget the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall consult with the Comptroller General of the United States with respect to ways and means of implementing proposals and recommendations made by the Comptroller General of the United States to the President or to the Congress to achieve greater economy or efficiency in public expenditures. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall, in addition, transmit to the appropriations and legislative committees of the Senate and House of Representatives having jurisdiction over the subject matter involved (1) a copy of the comment on any General Accounting Office report made by the head of the department or agency to the Bureau of the Budget, together with (2) a report of the action taken by the Bureau of the Budget in implementing such General Accounting Office report."

SEC. 3. Section 5 of the Employment Act of 1946 establishing the Joint Economic Committee (15 U.S.C. 1024) is amended by adding a new subsection at the end thereof as follows:

"(g) There is hereby established in the Joint Economic Committee a permanent subcommittee to be known as the 'Joint Subcommittee on the Federal Budget and Fiscal Policy', the membership of which shall reflect the composition of the Joint Economic Committee. It shall be the function of such joint subcommittee, as a guide to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the Federal budget—

"(1) to make a continuing study of the Federal budget and fiscal policy including an examination of the criteria used by the Bureau of the Budget in evaluating budgetary requests of the various executive departments and agencies;

"(2) to study and recommend ways and means of promoting and achieving efficiency and economy in Government which study shall include (A) reports made by the General Accounting Office, (B) a review of any report, or part thereof, of the results of any study made by the Bureau of the Budget under section 209 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 18), and transmitted to the Congress by the President; and

"(3) from time to time to make such reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable."

SEC. 4. (a) The provisions of this section are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively; and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

(b)(1) Clause 8(c)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by inserting immediately after "United States" the following: "relating to matters within the jurisdiction of the committee", and by striking out "such recommendations to the House as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports" and inserting in lieu thereof "a recommendation to the House in connection with each such report received by the committee. A recommendation in connection with such a report shall be submitted to the House as soon as practicable during the Congress in which such report was received."

(2) Clause (j)(2)(A) of rule XXV of the Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting immediately after "United States" the following: "relating to matters within the jurisdiction of the committee", and by striking out "such recommendations to the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports" and inserting in lieu thereof "a recommendation to the Senate in connection with each such report received by the committee. A recommendation in connection with such a report shall be submitted to the Senate as soon as practicable during the Congress in which such report was received.

(c)(1) Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"31. Each standing committee of the House shall have the duty of receiving and considering all reports of the Comptroller General of the United States relating to matters within its jurisdiction and of submitting a recommendation to the House in connection with the subject matter of each such report received by the committee. A recommendation in connection with such a report shall be submitted to the House as soon as practicable during the Congress in which such report was received."

(2) Rule XXV of the Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"6. Each standing committee of the Senate shall have the duty of receiving and considering all reports of the Comptroller General of the United States relating to matters within its jurisdiction and of submitting a recommendation to the Senate in connection with the subject matter of each such report received by the committee. A recommendation in connection with such a report shall be submitted to the Senate as soon as practicable during the Congress in which such report was received."

[From the Saturday Review, January 9, 1965]

HOW MUCH SHOULD GOVERNMENT DO?

(By Kermit Gordon)

In a community where I once lived, there was a civic association dedicated to the economical conduct of the local government. Since I shared this interest, I undertook to look into the policies of the association in order to decide whether or not I should join.

I never did become a member, for I discovered that the association had a view of the meaning of economy that I could not accept. The association had a simple, one-plank program—opposition to any proposals for new programs that cost money. I found no evidence that the group had any interest in looking critically at the usefulness of ongoing programs, or weighing the prospective benefits of new proposals against the realized benefits of old programs, or searching for ways to cut the costs of governmental activities without reducing their benefits. Just a single objective—oppose anything new.

I remember thinking at the time how great a distortion of the meaning of economy this view conveyed. But I later discovered that Edmund Burke fretted about the same question two centuries ago. "Economy," said Burke, "is a distributive virtue, and consists not in saving but in selection * * *. Parsimony requires no providence, no sagacity, no powers of combination, no comparison, no judgment."

My friends in the civic association were practicing parsimony under the guise of economy. If there is a common conservative error in the way the citizen looks at public budgeting, this is probably it. For parsimony is not only distinguishable from economy—it is often the enemy of economy. To accept the status quo of government programs while opposing innovation is to run the risk of spending money on objects of lesser urgency while denying recognition to more compelling needs. And this, of course, is the very opposite of economy. It is waste.

The path of parsimony often leads to a narrow preoccupation with a single measure of the soundness of government finance—the total size of the public budget. If the budget does not increase over the previous year, it is thought on that ground alone to be a good budget. But this is clearly an imperfect test. A budget unchanged in total size from the year before may constitute simply a timid extension of established programs, however questionable some of them may be, or it may reflect a searching effort to expand here and contract there in order to increase the benefits flowing from a given amount of expenditure.

This is what President Johnson had in mind when he said in his budget message last January:

"An austere budget need not be and should not be a standstill budget. When budgetary restraint leads the Government to turn its back on new needs and new problems, economy becomes but another word for stagnation. But when vigorous pruning of old programs and procedures releases the funds to meet new challenges and opportunities, economy becomes the companion of progress."

If the confusion of parsimony with economy is the error that often entraps conservatives in their thinking about public budgets, there is a closely symmetrical error that often appears on the liberal side. This is the confusion of profligacy with progress—the disposition to look with favor on an increase in total public spending just because it is an increase. This preference for rising expenditures rests on two convictions—the conviction that rising expenditures are needed to stimulate the economy and promote economic growth, and the conviction that the public sector of the economy is too small relative to the private sector.

But as to the first of these, it is clear that a need for fiscal stimulus is not in itself sufficient to justify higher public expenditure, for any stimulus that can be provided through increased expenditures can also be provided through reduced tax rates.

As to the second of these, the proponents of public sector expansion soon make clear that they are talking not about expansion of our programs for defense, space, veterans, agriculture, or interest on the public debt—which together constitute more than 80 percent of the administrative budget—but rather about our programs in health, education, welfare, housing and urban renewal, mass transportation, air and water pollution, area development, and related fields.

Certainly, then, however convincing the argument for increased spending in this limited sector, it is hardly a logical basis for favoring increased total spending on principle. The case for an increase in total spending must rest on judgments concerning all major programs in the budget, not merely on judgments concerning one sector.

Parsimony and profligacy are false guides to policy for exactly the same reason: both deny the necessity for choice. Neither, in Burke's words, requires providence, sagacity, combination, comparison, or judgment. Neither faces up to the budgetary challenge of the 1960's.

The necessity for choice—for a reexamination of the premises of existing programs, for a weighing of alternatives—is always an imperative of responsible budgetmaking. But we live in a time when this imperative has taken on a special urgency.

New claims on the Federal budget, many of them bearing credentials of the highest merit, press in on every side. We need more education and better education, from the primary grades through the graduate and professional schools. We should expand our job training and retraining programs, both for the unskilled and for those whose skills are obsolete. We must intensify the war on poverty. We need improved outdoor recreation facilities, efficient urban mass transportation, and better mental health facilities. We need to bring the benefits of medical research discoveries to more peoples more quickly. We should step up our attack on air and water pollution.

These and other demands—new, compelling, and costly—make it doubly necessary that we look carefully at the programs that have already found a place in the Federal budget. They are not suspect simply because they are there; but neither does their long tenure exempt them from periodic scrutiny to determine whether their shape and size are appropriate.

The problems of adapting public programs to social change are difficult even in the most favorable circumstances. But when social change proceeds as rapidly as it has in recent years, the difficulties are compounded. Let me try to illustrate the problems of adaptation by drawing on two cases of unusual difficulty—farm policy and water resources policy. These are simply illustrative; others could readily be cited.

We are currently spending between $3.5 billion and $4 billion for farm commodity programs. The rationale for these farm income supports has changed drastically over the years. In the 1930's, farm income supports were basically a relief measure designed to prevent the literal collapse of the farm economy. During the Second World War and to a lesser extent during the Korean war, income supports were a stimulus for needed production increases. Since then, supports have been used primarily to counteract the price- and income-depressing effects of the increase in farm productivity.

The revolution of the past several decades in farm technology has been accompanied by a revolution in the social and economic structure of the farming industry. In 1963 there were 3,500,000 farms. The 1 million farms with cash receipts of over $10,000 accounted for only 27 percent of the number of farms but for almost 80 percent of the sales of farm products. These 1 million farmers could produce all of the Nation's farm needs, including our large commercial exports. Taking into account earnings from off-farm work, the 1963 average income of these 1 million relatively successful farmers was over $9,500, up 13 percent from 4 years ago. These 1 million farmers earn average rates of return on their capital investments and labor almost equal to the corresponding averages in the nonfarm economy.

Our farm income supports basically operate through the price support technique—although in recent years some direct income payments have crept into the system. This implies that the distribution of the direct and indirect assistance provided by the Federal Government is roughly the same as the distribution of cash receipts. On this basis, about 80 percent of our assistance goes to the 1 million farmers whose average income exceeds $9,500. The other 20 percent of assistance is spread thinly among the remaining 2,500,000 farmers.

These figures highlight the dramatic impact of changing farm technology on Government farm programs. The farms that produce most of the Nation's food and fiber no longer fall into the lowest one-third of the Nation's income distribution. Most are successful business firms. Their continued success is of course not independent of Government commodity programs, whose elimination would cause a sharp fall in the income of all farmers. But these programs are no longer a means of distributing income to the neediest groups in our population; they are not welfare programs. From a welfare standpoint, the chief claimants to assistance are the 2.5 million farmers who do not now and cannot in the future be expected to operate successful commercial farms. Yet their needs cannot be met through farm commodity programs. Rather, they require assistance in the painful transition to nonfarm jobs, to which most of them or their children will certainly have to move.

This is an area in which our current programs and attitudes are, at least in part, based upon conditions that no longer exist. In the interest of both the farmer and the Nation at large, we need to reexamine the hidden premises of our current policies and shape them anew, in closer correspondence to the facts of today's world.

Federal expenditures on water resources and related activities, for example, currently amount to about $1.5 billion per year and are rising at some 3 to 4 percent annually. These projects serve five major purposes: irrigation, flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, and recreation—and in many cases one project serves two or more of these purposes.

These outlays constitute national investment in productive facilities. They have played a major role in our national growth, and many regions of the country owe much of their current prosperity to past national investment in water resources. Here, too, however, our current policies and practices are partly based upon objectives and concepts that have been overrun by events.

This does not mean, necessarily, that we are spending too much in this area, but we may well be spending too much on some aspects of water resources development and too little on others. Let me illustrate with a few examples.

The Nation's reclamation program dates from the Reclamation Act of 1902. Since then the total value of projects authorized has been $9.8 billion. Of this amount, about $5 billion has been spent; annual expenditures are now running at about $325 million.

Reclamation investment is principally irrigation investment. Of the $9.8 billion authorized for the program to date, some $5.7 billion has been or will be allocated to irrigation. Under the reclamation program the prices charged for irrigation water are heavily subsidized. The $5.7 billion cost bears no interest, and of this $5.7 billion only $3 billion will be repaid by irrigation water users. For projects that Congress is likely to be considering next year, the typical investment costs for irrigation will range between $500 and $1,500 an acre, most of which will not be recovered in the price of irrigated water.

Reclamation law was designed primarily to help develop the West by irrigating arid lands. The program was initiated at a time when the Nation sought to encourage family farm settlement on public lands in the West. Over one-fourth of the irrigated lands in the West was developed under this program, and about 5 percent of total U.S. agricultural production takes place on reclamation irrigated land.

Two major and closely related kinds of economic change have occurred during recent decades to raise the problem of how best to adapt the reclamation program to new needs. The first, and most obvious, is the problem of surplus agricultural production. Our farm commodity programs, through acreage controls, marketing quotas, and diversion payments, seek to limit agricultural production. But subsidized irrigation tends to increase production. In most cases, but not all, the crops irrigated are not the same crops as those subject to production limitations. But through the complex chain of market and producer substitution, increased production of one crop tends to aggravate the surplus situation of other crops.

These facts do not imply that irrigation investment is per se undesirable. Though we are limiting total agricultural production, there is still room for a shift, within the total, from less efficient to more efficient areas of production. Nevertheless, it is clear that irrigation policy must be based upon an integrated approach that looks at the most desirable locational pattern of agricultural production.

A second major set of economic changes arises out of the growing need for water for municipal and industrial uses. The urbanization and industrialization of America—in the new West as well as in the older eastern seaboard and Middle West—has dramatically increased the demand for urban water.

In many parts of the Nation—particularly the Southwest—water has become an increasingly scarce resource. Now, if there is any one principle of economics that economists of every persuasion would accept, it is that the price system is an exceptionally useful mechanism both for conserving a scarce resource and for allocating it to uses with the greatest value. But we rely too little on this mechanism in considering the water problems of the Nation. Additional agricultural surpluses have little value. Yet irrigation water for agricultural purposes is priced far below cost. Added water for municipal and industrial uses makes a major contribution to the burgeoning urban economies of the West. But projects designed to add to municipal and industrial water often receive less attention and, unlike those for irrigation water, are priced to recover full costs. The city of Los Angeles currently pays $20 per acre-foot for water from Boulder Dam and will soon be paying $63 an acre-foot for water brought down from northern California. Many southern California irrigators pay $2.25 per acre-foot for water from Boulder Dam, and for new Federal irrigation water will be paying perhaps $10 per acre-foot.

The need is clear, I believe, to think through the implications of a rapidly changing economy for the composition and structure of our water resources program. The solutions will not be easy. We cannot and should not ignore the plight of the commercial farmer whose livelihood depends upon irrigated water and whose water table is falling year by year. We have an obligation to those agricultural communities whose heavy investment in the land was based upon continued availability of water supplies. Nevertheless, having said this, I believe we must take steps gradually to adapt this program, designed to meet the problems of agricultural settlement, to the needs of the rapidly growing urban communities of our Nation.

The pursuit of the goals of the Great Society requires that we give equal attention to the need for innovation and the need for reform. The Great Society must be an efficient society. The responsibility of the Federal Government to heed the new needs of an evolving society is no greater than our responsibility to assure that the old programs are using the right number of dollars.

The task of modernizing the Federal budget will not be accomplished in 1 year or 4. It is a continuing struggle, for the barriers are formidable and the pitfalls many. But it is an effort that should command the support and assistance of all who choose economy over both parsimony and profligacy.

NATIONAL PERIOD OF COMMEMORATION ON ANNIVERSARY OF DEATHS OF MICHAEL SCHWERNER, ANDREW GOODMAN, AND JAMES CHANEY

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in an age compounded largely of indifference, isolation, and cynicism, many young Americans are without a cause.

They fail to find, or neglect to pursue, an idea against which they can test their capacity for selflessness and courage. It remains for the few idealists in each generation to take up the challenges of their world and to fulfill their own lives in the service of others who may be less strong, less fortunate. It has been this remarkable minority, more often abused than admired, which has long replenished the social consciousness of America.

Three such young Americans were Michael Schwerner, Andrew Goodman, and James Chaney. The course they followed in their allegiance to an idea led to their deaths in Mississippi. That idea is that all men have certain rights that cannot be usurped by other men or their institutions; that among these rights is the freedom to register, to vote, and to participate fully and directly in the selection of their government. The concept was not diminished by the vicious murder of these young men; indeed, it was ennobled.

I wish to join with my colleagues in the New York congressional delegation in calling for a commemorative period for the week beginning June 21, the date the young men were killed. It is particularly fitting that we do so, for both Michael Schwerner and Andrew Goodman were from New York City.

I believe one of the major purposes of this commemoration to be that it forms a statement to the families and friends of the martyred men that we have not forgotten their loss, and that their suffering will be long remembered in this Nation.

The significance of the sacrifice last summer, I believe, is that it was made for everyone in this country, irrespective of race, creed, or color. It forced upon us the renewed recognition that everyone is caught up in man's enduring struggle for freedom. No one can be a bystander, an observer, or a witness, for to do so is to relinquish or ignore one's own humanity. It makes one less a man.

The road to freedom on which the three men traveled was for them and will be for others, one marked by hardship and tragedy. All of us must travel the same thoroughfare, and if we do not elect to drive we shall be driven.

New York City is proud of the memory of Michael Schwerner and Andrew Goodman at the same time it shares the grief that has afflicted their families. In this tragedy, New Yorkers and all other Americans have come to know the goodness in the hearts and minds of Goodman, Schwerner, and Chaney, and this knowledge has enhanced the greatness of their goal.

FEDERAL RENT SUBSIDIES

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pernicious measures to come from the White House planners in a long time is now winding its way through the Halls of Congress. This is the ill-conceived program of Federal rent subsidies for middle-income families, authorized by the administration's omnibus housing bill, H.R. 7984.

Mr. Ted Lewis in his column "Capitol Stuff," from the June 3 Daily News, helps point out the particularly valuable contribution made on this issue by our dedicated colleague, Mr. FINO, of New York, and other members of the minority. In an effort to shed some light on this bill, I include Mr. Lewis' article in the RECORD at this point:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, June 2.—President Johnson's novel welfare state idea of Federal rent subsidies for lower- and moderate-income families is in considerable trouble.

House Republicans have decided that the rent-supplement issue offers them their one big chance to give Johnson his first legislative comeuppance of the session. They are banking on the support of dissident Southern Democrats. And when the showdown vote comes later this month, both sides agree, victory—or defeat—will be by a most slender margin.

This rent-supplement proposal by Johnson never has been described clearly. So much legislation has been sent to Congress for action that it was easy to overlook the significance of his rent-aid request.

The President was a little ambiguous about details when he submitted the proposal to Congress in his March message on housing legislation.

At the time, in urging extension of Government-assisted housing and urban development programs, he said it should include, for the first time, rent-supplement payments to provide better housing for families unable to afford it.

Johnson, in his message, said that, in his opinion, "the most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city is the rent supplement."

The House Banking and Currency Committee, in favorably reporting the omnibus housing bill with its rent-supplement provision, voted along party lines. The eight Republicans, headed by Representative PAUL FINO, of New York, filed a stinging minority report. It is this GOP report that reveals—even in occasionally exaggerated form—why the rent proposal is so controversial.

ALLOWS WEAVER TO SET CEILINGS

In the first place, it shows that Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver would gain the authority to set income ceilings on those families to be aided by rent subsidies.

And it discloses that Weaver's ceilings generally would cover moderate-income families as well as lower. In New York, for example, the ceiling as projected, would be $8,900, and in Newark, $8,750.

Families in that coverage area would get rent subsidies if the aid was necessary to give them decent, safe, and sanitary housing. They would be required to pay out of their own pockets rent up to 25 percent of their monthly income. The Government would kick in the rest.

The Federal rent-supplement payments would be made to the private nonprofit corporations that are supposed to supply the proper new housing developments. Thus, the owner would get "fair market rental" for the unit a family occupies.

The Democratic committee report estimated that the cost of such Federal rent aid would be $50 million the first year, increasing $50 million each year thereafter. On this basis, the Fino GOP report calculated that if the program got through Congress, the total cost would be $8 billion, projected into the year 2008.

GOP ASKS, BUT NO ONE ANSWERS

The Fino reports asks many questions that the majority report fails to answer. For example, FINO says the formula for rent aid "kills the incentive of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts."

He and his fellow committee Republicans point out that a family with $3,000-a-year income—$250 a month—could live in a $100-a-month apartment and pay rent of only $62.50 monthly (one fourth of income). But if the same family's income increased to $400 a month, it would have to pay the full market rent of $100 a month.

"In other words," says the GOP report, "the family with $250-a-month income has no incentive to improve its living accommodations by increasing its earnings to enable it to rent better accommodations. It can live in the same accommodations with $250-a-month income as it could if it increased its income to $400 a month."

The Republican critics are also worried about "economic integration." This concerns the fact that in the proposed new housing developments there would be some families paying their own rent and others having Uncle Sam's assistance.

"We oppose the view," says the GOP report, "of those who would move the $2,000-a-year family in the apartment next door to the $5,000-a-year tenant and into the $15,000-a-year neighborhood solely through rent subsidies.

AND SO THE CONTROVERSY GROWS

"Moreover, we seriously question whether the man paying $150 a month for an apartment would understand why his next-door neighbor should receive equal value for half the rent."

These arguments only go to show how controversial is the issue that is about to be fought out in the House—whether or not the Republicans are right when they say the whole rental subsidy program "is the way of the socialistic state."

Johnson rent-aid supporters in the House, led by Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, of the Banking Committee, think the plan is the only one feasible to meet the substandard housing problem.

PATMAN estimates that there are 8 million American families who live in substandard housing. Many of these are within the income range in which they are unable to afford decent housing. Therefore, they must have rent assistance.

As for the "across-the-board economic integration" that Banking Committee Republicans are disturbed about, their Democratic colleagues consider it a most sound idea to mix the underprivileged with the privileged. The argument is that it gives an incentive to the former for improving his lot and educates the latter on how the other half lives.

TROOP 12, SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA COUNCIL, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA, CELEBRATES ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 26, and 27, troop 12 of the San Francisco Bay Area Council, Boy Scouts of America, will celebrate its 50th anniversary. Troop 12 was begun in 1915 and is composed of boys of Japanese parentage. The unit is but 5 years younger than the scouting movement in the United States. Since it is one of the few units celebrating 50 continuous years, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the facts of its humble beginning and great achievements. The story of the background and history of Troop 12 follows:

One day in late 1913 a high school lad, an American boy of Japanese ancestry, by mere chance picked up a copy of "The Handbook for Boys" published by the then infant movement called the Boy Scouts of America. So captivated was this youngster with the basic tenets of scouting, so spellbound was he with the great promise of adventure scouting proposed, that he could not put the book down until he had turned the last page in the early hours of the next morning.

The place, San Francisco, Calif.; the youngster's name, Masanobu Morisuye. Scouting excited his imagination just as it had the founder of scouting, Sir Robert Baden-Powell. It brought visions of fun in the great outdoors, of campfires beneath whispering pines and bright stars, of good fellowship and communion with nature away from city lights and clattering cable cars, a chance of growing under the Scout oath: "On my honor, I will do my best," and the 12 points of the Scout law.

Looking about his neighborhood, Masanobu found there was no troop nearby that he could join, so he set about to organize one. He went to his Japanese language teacher, Mr. Yoshizo Sano, principal of the school, and begged and urged that he sponsor and be its scoutmaster. Mr. Sano, at first reluctant, finally agreed but under the condition that Masanobu and his friends all meet and pass the tenderfoot requirements by the first meeting.

Thus troop 12 was born. Initially just a troop of boys in the formative years, they were granted a national charter in March 1915, and given unit No. 12—a humble beginning, but what a proud group of boys with knicker pants, campaign hats, leggings, and wooden staves. The jackets were hand-me-downs from benevolent older units, the shirts were handsewn by their mothers, but such were the forebears of a Scout troop now rich in heritage, customs, and tradition.

Today, 50 years have passed since this modest beginning, and the scouting spirit has been imbued in the lives of more than 700 youngsters through the scouting trail laid out by troop 12.

History records that even before receiving its charter, troop 12's boys were competent enough to demonstrate first aid before former President Taft when he visited the Panama Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco in February of 1915. In those days, it was merely routine to hike from San Francisco to their camp on the banks of the Russian River, a 4-day trip of 60 miles, dragging and pulling a two-wheel cart of supplies, and living off the land en route. The boys received a citation from the Nation's Capital lauding them in their record of liberty bond sales and victory gardens during World War I. One hundred boys with troop 12's patch on their silk neckerchief stood five wide and a block long on Market Street in San Francisco to parade in the opening of the International Exposition in 1939—all of them members of its crack drum and bugle corps.

Who can say how many minds were seared by the horrors of being forsaken by one's own country and herded into concentration camps, yet from there many of troop 12's boys arose to fight for their country in two wars—World War II, in both the Atlantic and the Pacific, and the vicious, insidious war of prejudice, winning both with dignity; the first as members of the famed 442 Regimental

Combat Team and as volunteers in the Pacific and CBI theaters; the second, more slowly but just as determinedly and valiantly here at home.

Historians of troop 12 would be remiss should they not mention the dedication of her young men who maintained scouting in the relocation centers of Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming for youngsters in these camps. And vitally important in the continued life of troop 12 were men such as Tsune Baba, the Reverend Joseph Tsukamoto, Yo Noguchi, Kei Tsukamoto, Hisao Inouye, Jutaro Shiota, and many others who gave the unit new life when boys returned to the west coast after almost 4 years of confinement. One of the brightest highlights for the unit came subsequent to the difficult years of adjustment when 21 boys of its troop and explorer post led by Kei Hori and Bill Hikido, two of its present leaders, took part in the first Asian Jamboree at Gotemba, Japan. A true people-to-people relationship in the international brotherhood of scouting was experienced, the boys living in the homes of their host scouts as they represented the United States in the many cities they toured—truly one of the proudest moments of this historical unit.

Witness now the boys of troop 12, scattered throughout the length and breadth of this great land as well as in many foreign nations, learning to serve through experience in national and international jamborees. Witness their role in their service to this country. Note the many doctors, engineers, economists, teachers and professors, social workers, agronomists and attorneys, military men and businessmen, and skilled workers that fill the ranks of its alumni, including some 40 Eagle Scouts. Five awardees of the coveted Silver Beaver have come from its scouters. Two wood badges are also among them.

Today, more than 126 boys swell its membership in the family of pack, troop, and post 12. The traditional drum and bugle corps has been revived. The members of unit 12 stand to guide its next 50 years with a vision of a great society in a greater America.

On June 25, 26, and 27, troop 12 will celebrate its 50th anniversary with a thankful toast to the past and a hopeful toast to the future. This is the golden anniversary for troop 12, and its members stand in humility and thanks that it could thus grow and write a proud history in this great land. Its sponsor, the Council of Japanese Christian Churches of San Francisco join in thanking God for these 50 wonderful fruitful years and pray that His blessings be upon all who come under troop 12's flag. The past, however, is but prolog in troop 12's story.

SAN FRANCISCO MAYOR CRITICAL OF POVERTY PROGRAM IN METROPOLITAN AREAS

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Mailliard] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, now mayor of San Francisco, the Honorable John F. Shelley, recently attended the U.S. conference of mayors meeting in St. Louis, during which time he took issue with the administration of Federal antipoverty funds in metropolitan areas.

Mayor Shelley has received wide support among other mayors for his stand.

I submit this article from the New York Times of June 2, 1965, which clarifies Mayor Shelley's questions on the poverty crusade in big cities. The article follows:

(By Ben A. Franklin)

St. Louis, June 1.—A group of angry big-city mayors failed today in a move to get the U.S. conference of mayors to back their charge that the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity was "trying to wreck local government by setting the poor against city hall."

The controversy was shifted to the politically less exposed channel of private consultation with Vice President Humphrey. A committee of mayors will call on him to convey their grievances. That way, the mayors said, they hope to avoid the political pitfall of being labeled as "against the poor."

Mr. Humphrey has been designated by President Johnson as a special liaison with the country's mayors in antipoverty and civil rights matters.

A strongly worded resolution—accusing administrators of the Federal antipoverty program of creating tensions among the poor against mayors and of "fostering class struggle" against city administrations—was bottled up today in the resolutions committee of the conference of mayors meeting here.

The resolution was drafted by Mayors John F. Shelley, of San Francisco, and Samuel W. Yorty, of Los Angeles, both Democrats. It had seemed almost certain of passage by the conference at a final plenary session tomorrow.

SUPPORT FOR SHELLEY

Mayor Shelley has obtained wide support here among mayors of both parties for his complaint that the Office of Economic Opportunity's organization of the poor into militant, politically active local antipoverty committees is "undermining the integrity of local government."

In the resolutions committee he was supported by Mayor William F. Walsh, of Syracuse, and Herman W. Goldner, of St. Petersburg, Fla., both Republicans, and Merle E. Allen, of Ogden, Utah, a Democrat.

The resolutions committee's decision to refer the Shelley resolution to top officers of the conference with a request for immediate action in arranging a meeting with Vice President Humphrey subtracted little from the thrust of the mayor's anger.

At one point today, Mayors Walsh, of Syracuse, and Allen, of Ogden, called for an investigation of "the subversion of purpose" of the antipoverty program by Federal officials.

In Syracuse, Mayor Walsh said, federally financed antipoverty workers refer to city officials as "the enemy." He said the poor in Syracuse "are being urged to storm city hall."

"This is the most diabolical social work I have ever heard of," he declared.

Mayor Shelley read to the committee excerpts from the Office of Economic Opportunity's "Community Action Agency Workbook," published last March under the name of Theodore M. Berry, the agency's director of community action programs. The book stressed the importance of "organizing low-income residents for political effectiveness."

The question on the mayors' minds today was: Political effectiveness for or against whom?

In Mayor Shelley's copy of the workbook, the word "strife" was penciled in the margin beside this passage:

"Another method considered by some to have merit (in increasing the political effectiveness of the poor) is facilitating the opportunities for the poor to participate in protest actions, mounted by communitywide and national organizations. Such participation, advocates claim, reduces the tendency for defeatism among low-income people. The experience exposes them to the possibilities of effective social action and enhances their confidence that through collective effort they can effect and improve their circumstances."

Mayor Shelley said the Federal agency's insistence that "the poor must dominate this thing" would have the effect of "wrecking the program" by removing it from the control of elected city officials "who are responsible to the taxpayers."

"The elected city official must retain control," he declared.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC FINANCE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency have permission to sit tomorrow while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I hope I will not have to—the gentleman is not going to consider legislation tomorrow to increase further the deficit of the country while we are over here doing something about another temporary debt ceiling?

Mr. PATMAN. No; we are trying to do something to pay off the national debt.

Mr. GROSS. That is just fine; Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

TAX CREDITS TO HIGHER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gurney] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the past 4 legislative days some time has been devoted here in the House to a consideration of some very interesting testimony on the proposal to advance higher education by the use of a tuition tax credit system. The testimony read into the Record has been that of a number of leading educators who were present at a hearing conducted in New York by the Republican task force on education.

That there is a good case for some type of action of this kind seems to be beyond contradiction. It is estimated that at least one-third of the high school graduates in the United States who are capable of advanced education are financially unable to go to college. Those of us who are parents of college students know the problems brought on by the rising costs of a college education. Each year the rising price of maintenance and the increase in faculty salaries forces colleges to choose between letting their programs lag, their plants deteriorate, and losing fine teachers, and the alternative of raising tuition.

It is not a choice the colleges make because the traffic will bear it. The traffic cannot, and in many of our private institutions the result is classrooms partly empty or the lowering of standards to keep enrollment full with those students who are able to pay.

Two years ago there was a study conducted by the Ford Foundation which revealed that 69 percent of the parents interviewed would like to send their children to college in the future. Less than half of them expected to be able to do so.

Rising costs have made another change in our college picture. The private institution is losing its enrollment to the less expensive tuitions of the tax-supported public university. For the past 15 years the enrollment in private institutions in relation to that of public institutions has dropped at the rate of 1 percent a year.

This is indeed an alarming trend.

The genius and strength of higher education in the United States has been in its diversity. There is first the basic diversity between the private and the tax-supported institution. Then there are the differences between church-related and nondenominational colleges and universities. Public institutions vary widely in their philosophies of education, and the individual backgrounds and needs of the States that support them. The size of the university differs tremendously, as do the academic programs and curriculum. Admission policies, the methods of instruction, and even the types of student attending vary in infinite combination.

From among the many combinations offered, the student may choose the school that best meets his academic and financial capabilities, and which will offer him the most beneficial environment and program. Herein lies a great source of the strength of our system of higher education.

Nowhere in the world is there such a choice. Correspondingly, nowhere else in the world is there such a fine system of higher education.

The threat is that the increasing costs of providing such a high level of education will eventually cause great harm to it. More and more students abandon the smaller private colleges and either attend tax-supported larger schools or find these unsuitable to their needs and drop out entirely. More students are excluded altogether because of inability to pay and a fine potential is wasted.

But the danger to the system as a whole is the most frightening: If nearly all our institutions of higher learning become public, the imbalance would destroy forever the diversity which has been our strength.

Deeply concerned with these and other problems of higher education, the House Republican task force on education has been exploring a proposal which has gathered tremendous support. Educators, parents, students themselves, and legislators, have all expressed favor. It is becoming apparent that some kind of tax credit to parents of college students, covering a portion of the cost of education, will give specific help to individual parents, aid to higher education in general, and at the same time preserve the qualities which we enjoy today.

A tax credit system would fortify the resources of American citizens so that they could better afford to meet the costs of all the diversified types of institutions. Free choice would still be present, and the number of students from which the colleges could choose would be increased. The colleges could choose on the basis of qualification not pocketbook, and the student could continue to make his selection according to his academic and vocational needs.

In addition, such a tax credit program would encourage a student to select that field of study for which he was most interested and for which he was best suited. The individual interested in electronics would be in a position to attend a school that offered him a high quality of training in that particular field. He would not be forced to attend a State university whose specialty was some area other than electronics.

It is quite obvious, too, that a tax credit program would help many more colleges than do the present Federal financial aid programs. According to the Office of Education, 94 percent of all Federal research grants made in 1963 went to only 100 universities. When the total number of higher educational institutions is considered, this is a small amount—just about 5 percent.

There are always obvious problems associated with government programs designed to provide financial assistance, and any Federal aid extended our universities and colleges must not jeopardize the current diversity and freedom in these institutions. The tax credit system is ideally constituted to achieve this, for under this program it would be the student, not the school, who would receive the direct financial benefit. Moreover, the constitutional issue of separation of church and state would be avoided, and fears of Federal domination in the higher educational system could be dispelled.

Today, Mr. Speaker. I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the thoughtful remarks of two educators who appeared before the House Republican task force on education during the hearings of May 24 in New York City.

The first is the Reverend Virgil Blum, S.J., who is chairman of the Department of Political Science at Marquette and a member of the Steering Committee of the Citizens National Committee for Higher Education. In his testimony, Reverend Blum emphasized the importance of retaining diversity in our higher education.

The other educator is Father William Hogan, director of research at Fordham University. Father Hogan deals specifically with some of the advantages of a tax credit plan.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I submit the respective statements for the Record:

Statement by Rev. Virgil C. Blum, S.J., Chairman, Department of Political Science, Marquette University, Before the Education Task Force of the Congressional Committee of the Republican Party, May 24, 1965

Mr. Quie. The problem of financing higher education is becoming increasingly complex. While on the one hand sharply rising education costs are forcing private college tuition so high that it is beyond the reach of the vast majority of parents, salaries, teaching loans, and research opportunities in private institutions are, generally, compare so unfavorably with State universities and the highly endowed private universities that faculty recruitment and retention is becoming an almost impossible task.

The more private institutions raise tuition just to stay in business, the more rapid is the shift of students to tax-supported institutions. As recently as 1950, more than 50 percent of our students attended private colleges. The percentage has plummeted to 35 percent, and is falling rapidly. In fact, even as our public colleges and universities are bursting at the seams with the onrush of students, enrollment at private institutions is almost at a standstill. No less than 90 percent of the increase in freshmen in 1963 occurred in public institutions. Moreover, it is predicted that 80 percent of our students will be in State institutions by 1975, and 90 percent by 1985.

If this high concentration of students in public institutions should come about, we shall have lost diversity in education, which is so essential for freedom of mind in the pursuit of truth. To quote Dr. Harold W. Dodds, past president of Princeton University: "When it is no longer possible for a man to find a school for this boy except within a universal system, it will be too late to worry about freedom as we have known it, for it will be gone."

I should think that most academicians would agree that State monopoly in education is undemocratic, uneconomical, and educationally unsound. State monopoly in education, as the great apostle of liberty John Stuart Mill emphasized, is an instrument that "establishes a despotism over the mind." It destroys even the possibility of free and open inquiry, since it permits no choice in education and compels student-attendance at institutions of one educational philosophy only.

While high tuition charges are forcing many students to attend tax-supported public institutions, scores of our 1,380 private institutions have empty classrooms, and other scores could double or triple their enrollment and be better colleges—if only students could afford to pay high tuition. Some 456 4-year private liberal arts colleges have fewer than 1,000 students. In 1963 their average enrollment was 545 full-time students, and with enrollment in private colleges virtually at a standstill they have not increased much since.

The inability of parents to pay soaring tuition charges has many dire consequences for education in many if not most private liberal arts colleges and not a few private universities. To attract students, these schools keep tuition so far below operating costs that their academic quality suffers seriously—library holdings are inadequate, laboratory facilities are obsolete, and teacher quality deteriorates rapidly. Referring to low salaries in private colleges, Dr. Barnaby Keeney, president of Brown University, said: "What all this amounts to is that every student at almost every private college in the country is on a scholarship from the faculty."

It is of course no solution to the problem of financing private higher education to tell these institutions to raise their tuition substantially. This cannot be done because these institutions are in competition with State-owned, tax-supported institutions that sell their education product at an 80 or 90 percent discount. This impossible competitive situation was put graphically by Dr. Lawrence A. Kimpton several years ago when chancellor of the University of Chicago. "To put it in the crassest terms possible," he said, "it is hard to market a product at a fair price when down the street someone is giving it away." A new Federal loan program would not improve the competitive situation for private institutions.

I should like to suggest that the Federal Government give serious consideration to a program of tax credits on tuition and fees paid to institutions of higher education. In other words, a program which would subsidize the demand rather than the supply—the student rather than the college. The tax credit program could be supplemented with a tuition grant program for the children of low income families, as Republicans on the House Education Subcommittee proposed in an elementary and secondary education program. A Federal program of assistance to the student would enable the student to purchase his education in the school of his choice. Thus he would not be compelled to attend a State institution to share in education tax funds.

A well conceived tax credit program would provide an equal dollar for every scholar. The Federal tax credit would follow the student, thus providing financial means for his education. Such a program would clearly not result in the heavy concentration of Federal funds in a few institutions. Every college student, in both public and private institutions, would benefit from the adoption of the Ribicoff-Dominick-Curtis tax credit proposal.

In the best interest of higher education and the national welfare, a further concentration of Federal funds in a few institutions is undesirable. In existing Federal-aid programs, a handful of State and private universities get nearly all the Federal money. As a result, the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

In 1962 the Federal Government granted $1.2 billion to higher education. Of this sum, $613 million was for research, $99 million for facilities and equipment, $257 million for student grants, $162 million for international education (including $68 million for student aid), and $30 million for faculty and curriculum development.

Did the Nation's 2,040 colleges and universities share equitably in these Federal expenditures? Not only did most institutions not share in these vast sums of tax funds, but the concentration of the Federal funds in a handful of universities has aggravated the financial and faculty problems of a large proportion of the private institutions. Of the $613 million expended for research, for example, 38 percent went to 10 universities; 58 percent to 25; and 90 percent to 100. The heavy concentration of Federal funds in a few institutions has sharply raised the salary scale of teachers of science, has enabled these schools to place some of their best teachers and research scholars on full-time research, and has enabled them to hire the best faculty from colleges and universities which are not supported by large Federal grants. The attraction of such highly endowed universities, together with the attractions of business and government, has resulted in a shortage of teachers to teach the thousands of young men and women who are now in college and will soon enter college.

The Brookings report on "The Effects of Federal programs on higher education" observes that "Most college presidents report difficulty in filling some staff positions, especially in mathematics and the sciences, and many educators—presidents, graduate deans, and faculty—believe that the liberal arts college is now receiving only the poorer products of graduate schools." Brookings reports that a polling of college presidents revealed that 81 percent had experienced unusual difficulty in getting qualified college teachers.

While Federal Government educational policies are making it extremely difficult for private colleges and many private universities to continue to fulfill the important task of educating young men and women with competent faculty, these policies are likewise creating extremely difficult problems for the large public universities. Several weeks ago Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF accused the Federal Government of creating unrest on American campuses by luring professors from the classrooms. He said that federally financed research has erected a wall between the professor and the student. While the professor locks himself in his laboratory, his students, whom he never advises, are left in the hands of graduate students whose primary concern is the completion of their doctoral research.

It should be noted that this flight of the low-paid private college teacher to the ranks of the high-paid university researcher is taking place at the very time when enrollments already are straining facilities and teaching staffs. Today it is becoming practically impossible to hire a teacher; you hire a teacher-researcher, with a maximum of 6 or 9 hours of teaching. Leon F. Trachtman, executive secretary of the Purdue University Research Foundation, observed: "At the large public institutions where graduate instruction and research really compete with undergraduate instruction for the time and energy of the faculty, the latter usually is the loser."

Moreover, even assuming that a small college has faculty members capable of research that merits support, they are not apt to receive such support from the Federal Government. Frederick C. Klein, writing in the Wall Street Journal, says: "Many small colleges complain that their research proposals often are passed over by granting agencies in favor of those submitted by faculty members from larger schools. And they say the resulting accumulation of funds at these big schools puts small schools at a decided disadvantage in recruiting teachers to man their science programs."

"It's been tough for the small schools to attract scientists, and if present trends continue, it's going to be tougher," says Byron Trippitt, president of Wabash College. The result, he says, will be a decline in the quality of the science programs these schools offer. In the national interest Congress must find a remedy for this decline in the quality of the science programs of hundreds of liberal arts colleges and many universities.

Massive Federal grants have enabled large public universities to raid the small colleges of their best teachers, and to compound the evil by putting them in research with little teaching duties. Thus these teachers are lost to the students in both the liberal arts colleges and the federally subsidized university. Many professors think that recent student unrest is the direct result of the feeling that the faculty have no interest in them. This feeling of alienation is the wall between the professor and the student to which Senator RIBICOFF referred.

It is certainly no solution to this problem to establish a national foundation for the humanities as has been proposed. In fact the establishment of such a foundation would surely aggravate the problem because it would undoubtedly result in the flight of the faculties of the humanities to the research corrals also. This would be to erect a second wall, leaving the student with even a greater feeling of alienation. And, moreover, it would result in the raiding of the best humanities teachers from our liberal arts colleges also.

Is Congress really about to make a desolate wasteland of our liberal arts colleges and many of our private universities?

In view of the rapidly increasing student population, we need a Federal education program which will enable the educational institutions of our Nation to give our young men and women the best education of which they are capable. If we are to do this successfully, we must strengthen all our colleges and universities to do the job; we cannot justify the existence of weak institutions which fail to give their students a good education. To strengthen all our institutions is in the national interest.

But how is this to be done? This can best be done today, it seems to me, by helping parents pay tuition in the college of their choice. With such assistance from the Federal Government by way of tax credits on tuition and fees, and by way of direct tuition grants to low income families, our colleges would no longer be forced to subsidize their students so heavily. Thus they could use a larger portion of their voluntary contributions to improve their faculty, their library holdings, and their laboratory facilities.

TESTIMONY OF FATHER HOGAN, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

Reverend HOGAN. My name is William Hogan. I am director of research at the Fordham University. I appreciate the opportunity to come here to make a brief statement this afternoon in behalf of this bill.

We at Fordham, as are many other liberal arts and relatively small private institutions, are quite concerned with the increasing costs of education. Our faculty salary increase now is an annual thing. Annual increments are expected by faculty, and if these aren't forthcoming you find that they can be very readily enticed away by either industry or larger institutions that are able to pay faculty salaries that are much higher than ours.

Further, we have increments for clerical personnel and maintenance personnel which add to the total cost of education, and private schools such as ours that are not richly endowed have to depend on tuition for most of their support. For most of our income, I should say.

To cover this, it has been necessary in the past decade to increase tuition several times, and some of these tuition increases have been on a proportional basis rather than substantial. So this has put us and has put many of the private schools at a disadvantage with the State-supported schools.

I have also taught as a visiting professor in one of the State-supported schools in the Midwest, and I have seen their mode of operation, and how they can readily obtain increases in their budget from the State legislature, and do obtain substantial increases in their budget every year from the State legislature, which, of course, have to be justified, no question about that, but they are forthcoming, and in large amounts, and this is something that we can't depend on since we have to depend on our tuition as the main source of our income, and this just cannot be increased constantly.

So that we feel, with the numbers that are shifting from private educational institutions to those that are State supported, and these figures have been recited to you, that there must be some way in which we can find a means to help preserve the private educational institutional system in our country, because we have to offer—we feel very strongly about this—a choice for the student who wishes to pursue his education through the college and university level.

Loans have been granted by the Government, and these have been a help in some instances, but many of the students are loathe to shoulder a burden which is rather substantial by borrowing much of their tuition over the 4-year period, so that we figure that this has limited the choice that the students have had.

Further, we also feel very strongly that there is a double burden on the parents. They pay taxes to support the State institutions and they also pay the tuition of the youngsters that come to the private institutions. This becomes particularly difficult if they have more than one student in college at a time. Some have as many as two and three, and this is a substantial burden.

So we feel strongly that this tax credit would be a big help. First, it will be a help to the private institution, since more students will be able to come and pay the difference in tuition if you have this tax credit. Secondly, it will provide the student with a choice. We think this is most important. Thirdly, it will be more equitable, we feel, for the taxpayer who wishes to send his child to a private institution and yet must support the State educational institution.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, members of the GOP task force on education who have appeared prior to me have submitted to the Record letters received by Congressman Albert H. Quie, task force chairman, on the matter of tax credits for helping in meeting the increasing costs of higher education. At this point I introduce seven letters favoring this tax credit proposal to the Record:

Nichols, Speidel, & Nichols,
Batavia, Ohio, May 20, 1965.
Hon. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: Thanks for your letter of May 17 concerning the question of tax credits for higher education, and I am in favor of this. I have already expressed my opinion in a communication to trustees of universities throughout the country and I am hopeful that the project will be successful.

Yours very truly,
Hugh C. Nichols.

New England College,
Henniker, N.H., May 19, 1965.
Hon. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: I do indeed favor tax credits for higher education. Just as an example of how expensive a college education is becoming, may I cite the fact that from 1958 to September 1965 tuition at New England College will have increased from $600 to $1,300, and frankly the end is not yet in sight if we are to operate a top flight institution of higher education.

It has been my contention for years that parents of college students, in line with the often expressed concern of the Federal Government and the constitutional expression in our State government relative to the importance of education, should be given financial relief in terms of some form of tax credit.

Certainly tax credit is a fairer way of granting relief from the burden of tuition and other expenses as parents struggle to provide the next generation with higher education, because under the tax credit plan privately operated nonprofit institutions are not penalized as against the State universities.

I hope you will register me as being exceedingly favorable to the tax credit plan to aid those parents who have youngsters in college.

Sincerely yours,
H. Raymond Danforth,
President.

The Ohio State University Hospitals,
Columbus, Ohio, May 21, 1965.
Hon. Albert H. Quie,
House Republican Task Force on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: As a physician and educator, I naturally have great respect for the importance of education. Also, as a person who had to work his entire way through school, I recognize how some areas of my formal education had to be relatively neglected because of the time spent in earning my day-to-day living expenses. I was fortunate enough to get a scholarship which made it possible to go to college. Now even though my three children are all far better students than I was at the same stage of the game, I look forward to a very expensive period in the near future with a 17-, 15-, and 13-year-old spread in ages. Although my oldest child is a straight-A student through the 11th grade, scholarships of only token amounts would be available to her because my income should be adequate to take care of her education. However, I can foresee that with two, and more likely three, in college at one time, this will put considerable strain on the budget.

The above situation brings up a point that parallels my observations in the case of patients here at university hospital. The indigent and very wealthy get the best medical care. The former group's hospital bill is picked up by some organization, and professional services are gratis. It is the hardworking citizen in the middle-income group who is conscientious in his obligations that finds all of the costs added to his tax obligations keeping him on a treadmill. It is this same type of person who seeks the best for his children in the way of education. Unless he has unusually bright children, he finds the cost of college serving as another increasingly heavy burden.

There seems to be no hesitation in allowing tax deductions on brick and mortar in this country as exemplified by the deductibility of interests on mortgages. The backbone of our country—the brains—are allowed no similar opportunity which could and would encourage development and productivity of this great natural resource.

Costs of education are continuing to rise. Let us allow more people to improve their seed without breaking down the plant which is trying to accumulate enough nourishment for all of its seeds as well as for its own sustenance.

I hope that your task force on education can successfully impress people at the hearing that tax credits represent a real investment in the youth of our country.

Respectfully yours,
Samuel Saslaw, M.D., Ph. D.,
Professor of Medicine and Microbiology.

Stuart & Murphy,
Williamsport, Pa., May 21, 1965.
Hon. Albert H. Quie,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 17, 1965, asking for my views concerning enactment of legislation authorizing tax credits for higher education.

I am interested in and do favor the enactment of such legislation as I am convinced the mounting cost of college and other higher education has worked hardships on parents, students and, to some degree, on the colleges themselves.

I am somewhat familiar with the provisions of Senate bill 12 which would provide a maximum tax credit of $325. I believe many families are particularly hard pressed when they have more than one child in college at the same time. I would favor some revisions of Senate bill 12 to provide some increased tax credit for those families which have more than one child in school during the same year.

Very truly yours,
Nathan W. Stuart.

Brock Candy Co.,
Chattanooga, Tenn., May 20, 1965.
Hon. Albert H. Quie,
Republic Planning and Research Committee, Task Force on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: I appreciate your requesting my opinion on the collection of tax credits for higher education.

I am very definitely in favor of this incentive for the people of this country to go to school. It is an incentive, because it enables the taxpayer to determine where and for what his money is spent. And, inasmuch as he controls it, he will certainly take a greater interest in it than if it were done by someone with a less personal interest. He can also be better assured of obtaining his full dollar value, rather than have his tax money go through the Washington administrative branches and back through the State and local levels, wringing out a great deal of his dollar in administrative expense.

In addition to tax deductions for higher education, I think there should be some tax deductions for trade schools or a means of learning some form of specialty work for those unable to attend college. I realize that there is a great need for college trained people; but, as an employer, I also realize that there is just as great a need for competent mechanics, machinists, electricians, etc.

In closing, I would like to state that there are a number of people in this country, and I suppose will forever be educated beyond their means of comprehension. They probably would have made an excellent machinist or electrician and end up by being a "bad" Ph. D.

I thank you for this opportunity.
With best wishes,
Very truly yours,
C. F. Brock,
President.

Drs. McKay, McKay, Baird & Justis,
Charlotte, N.C., May 20, 1965.
Hon. Albert H. Quie,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Quie: I am 100 percent in favor of tax credits for higher education, and I do appreciate the ones of you in Congress who are trying to do something about it.

I am father of three children and was a member of the board of trustees of Mars Hill College.

Cordially yours,
H. Haynes Baird, M.D.

Richmond, Va., *May 20, 1965.*
Hon. Albert H. Quie,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Quie: I received your letter of May 17, having to do with your program for the allowance of tax credits as a means of helping to offset increased cost of higher education.

I am heartily in favor of this. I know of no single item that would be of more benefit to more people. I have served on the board of my prep school, and I am now on the board at the University of Virginia, and I have observed during my service on these boards how many people make real sacrifices in educating their children. One of the principles stressed by our Government, and by all governments today, is the education of its youth, and I feel that every person in this country is now about as heavily taxed as their incomes will stand, and, unless some relief is given to people who have children to educate, in many instances they will be unable to receive an education. I know of no tax benefit that would be more widely acclaimed than this.

I am surprised that more publicity has not been given this move, because I feel that a poll would show almost unanimous affirmative enthusiasm.

Very truly yours,
WALKLEY E. JOHNSON.

REDUCTION OF DRUG PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OLSEN of Montana). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to reduce the price of patented drugs by removing the special privileges from firms which abuse their patents by charging exorbitantly high prices.

I had the privilege of cosponsoring the 1962 Drug Act with the late Senator Estes Kefauver, which made considerable strides in protecting the consumer against harmful drugs by requiring additional tests for safety, new tests for effectiveness, and the sale of patented drugs under their generic or medical names rather than under a trade name. Commendable as that law was, further legislation is still needed to protect the consumer from outrageous costs of some drugs. My bill seeks to protect the sick and ailing from price gouging on vitally needed drugs by stimulating competition. At the same time, the bill encourages research and leaves ample room for reasonable profit.

The bill, essentially, would permit the compulsory licensing of drugs which have been patented for over 3 years, and which have been selling from producer to druggist at a markup of over 500 percent. In practice, the producer will still have a monopoly for 5 years, because he is granted a 3-year monopoly under my bill, and he will have about 2 years that are required to process a patent application. I think the point should be emphasized that this bill would be concerned with only those patented drugs with the most exaggerated markup. No drug would be affected whose price to the druggist is 500 percent or less of production costs—costs which include research and overhead expenses.

I firmly believe that this legislation is needed as a further step in consumer protection because drug producers are often monopolistic manufacturers who set prices at exorbitant markups of either several hundred or even a thousand percent of actual costs, and thus take advantage of stricken persons by squeezing out of them the last few pennies and dollars which the traffic will bear.

Thus, millions of Americans who suffer from disease or injury are a captive market for excessively priced prescription drugs, because they have no choice among competitive products. In the case of prednisone, a drug on which many arthritics depend, the markup is estimated to be as much as 20 times the cost of production. For the patient, the cost of this drug may be as high as $30 a month, which is quite a large sum for a retired person or a person with limited means.

I realize that my bill is not without opposition, but the arguments advanced against it simply do not measure up. One of the frequent arguments against the control of prescription drug prices is that this would deter drug research. This is not so. We all know that major research is conducted in other industries without exaggerated markups of products, and high profits from drug markups are just not plowed back into research as is often supposed.

Another argument holds that this bill would be the beginning of the end of the patent system. Well this is totally untrue. Drugs on which consumers depend for their health and even their lives, should be given special patent consideration in this country, just as they are given special treatment in most all other nations of the world. Of the 77 nations on which information is available, only 3, including the United States, do not protect the drug consumer from excessively high prices by either direct price controls—compulsory licensing or some sort of patent limitation.

I think the drug industry, like all other industries, should be permitted to make a fair profit, and my bill provides ample room for this. For even after other competitors are licensed, they must pay to the original developer a royalty of 8 percent which is actually higher than the royalty now generally paid in the drug industry.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing may I say that although great progress has been made in the last few years in drug legislation, partially due to the determination and dedication of the late Senator Estes Kefauver, the task is not completed until we afford some help to consumers who are paying till it hurts for drugs that are intended to relieve their pain.

I would like to see my colleagues approve this bill and knock out the financial as well as the physical pain that plagues too many of our fellow Americans today.

JUNK YARDS: DISGUISE OR DISPOSE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the recent White House Conference on Natural Beauty, the President sent several recommendations designed to beautify America to the Congress. This is a worthy objective and one with which I have no quarrel.

In submitting these bills, the President addressed himself to the problem of automobile junkyards and thereby indicated his recognition that auto graveyards along our Nation's highways are blemishes not only on our countryside but also on our credentials of affluence and esthetic values.

The automobile has become far more than a means of transportation to the average American. When Dad brings a new car into the family driveway, every member of the family, and the neighbors too, are thrilled by the shiny exterior, the glittering chromium, and the distinctive fragrance of the new upholstery. We test all the new gadgets, thrill to the engine's quiet power, and relish the comfort in which it carries us around the city or across the countryside.

All kinds of interpretations are placed upon an individual's attachment to his automobile, but the elements are fairly obvious. Americans, by and large, are an energetic, restless, inventive people, and the new automobile models which emerge from our factories each year are designed to meet the requirements of all of those qualities. Americans also have their aesthetic sensibilities, their appreciation of the beautiful.

This impulse, too, the automobile satisfies, at least when the car is new. But years and thousands of miles later, the once beautiful car, worn, rusted, and wrinkled when compared with newer models, reaches the end of its useful life.

This problem strikes most Americans right in the eye. Our first conception comes from the shocking sight of acres and acres of old car bodies covering a field as we drive down the highway. We are perhaps stunned by thinking of the investment these cars once represented and of the miles they have traveled. Of course, we are repelled by the ugliness of the sight. Just as we once thrilled to the beauty of the new car, so now we are irritated by this ugly desecration of the countryside.

Indeed, the problem is of such scope that we must come to grips with it.

We are manufacturing in this country some 9 million vehicles a year, including nearly 8 million cars. Experts forecast that the 10 million car year will be reached by the end of this decade. And every one of these vehicles, sooner or later, reaches the end of its useful life. Every one of them will have to be disposed of, or become a rusting hulk in some field or backyard. This year, an estimated 5 million cars and 700,000 trucks are going out of service. This figure is only an estimate, because no exact count is presently possible. However, we know that half the new automobiles are out of service after 10 years and the remaining half cannot last a great deal longer. All this means that unless an economical, convenient means of disposal is found, America may be littered from ocean to ocean with old-car bodies.

I am convinced that any really effective solution to this problem must utilize the ability and ingenuity of American business and manufacturing. If American economic history demonstrates anything, it is the powerful, dynamic, productive force of the profit motive. My purpose here is to suggest the traditional American business attack on this problem could go a long way toward reducing the problem of disposing of old cars.

I speak with confidence based upon proven evidence that American businessmen of the automobile industry have and can work together on this problem, combining their own interests and the communities interest, and make a profit doing so. I want to describe the operation of an organization in Lansing, Mich., which is currently disposing of more than 2,000 overage cars a year, and doing it on a profitable basis. Nor is this any new, flash-in-the-pan operation, since the company of which I speak has been operating continuously for 38 years.

Back in 1927 a Lansing auto dealer recognized a car, brought in to him for trade, as one he had previously sold. This is a commonplace occurrence for any auto dealer, except that this particular car was one which the dealer remembered as having sold for junk. The junk dealer had either repaired it sufficiently to get it running, or had sold it to someone else who did so. He then had the same old car back, virtually useless, waiting to be disposed of again, and competing in the market with better and safer vehicles. Discussion with other dealers revealed that this was not an uncommon experience for them, whereupon they decided to devise a method of disposing of overage vehicles in a way which would really eliminate them from the market and get them off the streets and lots.

The Auto Salvage Co. was formed and has functioned successfully from that year, 1927. The success of the company, however, was neither automatic nor inevitable. Indeed, the same or similar enterprises have been started in various communities, in Michigan and other States, and none have duplicated this record of success. Some failed, and some flourished just for a time. Mr. Roy F. Dudley, the manager, and Mr. Howard Cook, the president of the Auto Salvage Co., have been most cooperative in explaining to me the details of their operations. I would like to outline their method of operation, with particular attention to certain details which have made this enterprise succeed where so many others have failed.

First of all, Auto Salvage is a limited-cooperative corporation with shares being sold only to holders of new car franchises. The shares are not transferable, but must be sold back to the company for their book value price. The company does not pay dividends, but the owners receive patronage refunds. It is worthy of note that the book value of the company since 1955 has increased some 1,400 percent—$300 to $4,100 per share—a period of generally low scrap steel prices. As I shall show, the owners have further profited in receiving a greater return on the cars which they sell to the company than they could otherwise receive.

The dealers who formed the company agreed that none would sell a car for less than $100. Their thinking was that any car not worth $100 was probably not safe to go on the highway, not worth repairing, and only cluttered the market. All such junkers are sold to the Auto Salvage Co. for a fixed minimum price, presently $30 a car. The salvage company may, of course, pay a higher price if the model happens to be more valuable for their purposes.

At this point the junked car goes through a standard salvage operation. Skilled workmen remove the parts for which there is a market, either as salvage or as replacement parts. Tires and batteries are in the former category, while carburetors, starters, transmissions, and rear axles are usually in greatest demand as replacements. Accessories, ornaments, and other useful small parts are salvaged. Finally, the body is separated from the engine and frame, these heavy steel parts being then sold as scrap steel.

Interestingly enough, the Auto Salvage Co. does not now have facilities for disposing of car bodies. The bodies are actually given away to other scrap dealers who are better equipped or located to dispose of them.

I must digress here for a moment to point out that disposal of automobile bodies is itself a complicated problem. As we know, the automobile body contains a great many different metals and other materials. To be useful as scrap steel, all contaminating elements—as those which would destroy the chemical balance needed in the steel furnace—must be removed. Some of this removal must be done by fairly expensive hand labor. The main technique, however, is by burning the car, inside and out. This removes, by oxidation or melting, most of the impurities. Once burned, the car body is ready for "baling"—that is, it is brushed and compressed into a nearly solid steel block about the size of a television set. This is called a No. 2 bale. Its value depends upon the prevailing prices of scrap steel, which has been a very fluctuating market in recent years.

Here we come to the core of the problem. It would be accurate, generally speaking, to say that disposal of old autos poses no great problem excepting the bodies. All other parts of the car have a ready market either as salvage or scrap. However, the old bodies are the bulkiest, the ugliest, and the most difficult part of the car to dispose of. It requires the biggest investment and entails the greatest financial risk. If we could solve the problem of disposing of car bodies easily and economically, we would virtually eliminate the problem with junkers in this country. And until we do solve the problem of disposing of car bodies, we will still have landscapes cluttered with junkers.

Because of air pollution problems, either the cars cannot be burned in populated areas, or else expensive investment in burning equipment is required. Furthermore, the No. 2 bales are the least desirable kind of scrap from the point of view of the steelmaker. Also complicating the problem further, the development and increasing use of the oxygen furnace, replacing the open hearth furnace in steelmaking, has greatly reduced the demand for scrap steel. The price of scrap steel is about half what it was 10 years ago. Therefore, I emphasize again that an effective, economical means of disposing of car bodies lies at the heart of this whole problem.

When the reduction of an old car is completed, the parts are sorted and then sold as used replacement parts, to the dealers, to garage owners, and to the general public. The sale of used parts, along with some new parts which the Auto Salvage Co. also stocks, provides the major portion of the company's income. Roughly two-thirds of the company's income is from parts sales and one-third from scrap sales. Incidentally, the owners of the company pay the same prices for replacement parts as other customers, even if the part is taken from a car which they have sold a day or two earlier to the company.

So far I have merely outlined the operations of this enterprise, and the procedure is deceptively simple. The dealers sell old cars to their own company which strips it, selling the salvageable parts to the public and disposing of the rest as scrap. But like most business operations, success is determined not by general procedures but by attention to details. Assuredly, certain key elements have been essential to the success of Lansing's Auto Salvage Co.

First and perhaps foremost to the success of the company has been the willingness of the dealers, so accustomed to competing intensively in the sale of new and used cars, to subordinate their loyalty to their own products in this area of auto salvage and disposal. Further, they must recognize that they have a common interest in an economically successful means of disposing of old cars. This the Lansing area auto dealers have done, and, very wisely, they have also recognized, and accepted, a general responsibility to the public. Not only do they get junkers off the streets and lots, but they have had the public relations sense to see that every aspect of the automobile business affects the public's attitude toward them as new car dealers.

As a consequence of this responsible attitude, the Lansing dealers and their company have combined integrity and imagination to create a favorable impression upon the general public. The company is now located along one of the main highways on the edge of Lansing, set well back, yet the person driving by would never know that within 200 yards rest the remains of perhaps a thousand old automobiles. The 8-acre lot is enclosed with woven-wire fencing, and the front is screened by aluminum paneling and shrubbery. I must add also that the officials of the company have never shown the slightest interest in circumventing zoning or other regulations. In short, a sense of civic responsibility has infused the spirit of this enterprise from the beginning.

A second key element in the success of the Auto Salvage Co., and the point which has proved a stumbling block to other similar operations, is the owners' respect for the operational requirements of the company. If the shareholding dealer looks upon the salvage company merely as an auto graveyard the bones of which he may pick whenever it is his advantage to do so, he will destroy the operation. He must respect the company's operating integrity; simply stated, he must respect the company's right to make a profit on the old cars he turns over to it. If the dealers, instead, give the salvage company only the husks and keep all the kernels for themselves, they doom the enterprise.

Such an attitude is shortsighted, for the dealers, by recognizing that their salvage operation like any other business enterprise must operate in the black, will then gain by receiving more money for the old cars they sell the company and also by the appreciation of the book value of their stock. This may seem obvious, but when a dealer sells an old car to the company for $30 and 2 days later has to pay $25 for the transmission from that same car, he is likely to want to argue the point. The dealers must also accept some other restrictions to insure success of their operation. For example, in Lansing the dealers may sell a maximum of two cars per day to their salvage company.

Another essential element to the success of this operation is good management. The Auto Salvage Co. has been particularly fortunate in having a board of directors, headed by the president, Mr. Harold Cook, who have had the foresight to take such steps as were necessary to insure its stability and growth. Mr. Roy Dudley has been the general manager for nearly 20 years, giving long experience and a tenacious loyalty to the enterprise. The result is a business which employs 14 people, provides a public service, a convenience to auto dealers, and a profit.

I have already mentioned the appreciation in value of the company stock. How else does the dealer profit? He is assured of receiving $30 for each car he turns over to salvage, more than he would receive if he sold it to the ordinary junk dealer. At the end of the year he receives a patronage refund, which last year amounted to $13.73 per car. When the stock appreciation value is added, it is obvious that the dealer is receiving, on the average, well over $50 per car.

The officials of Auto Salvage have always been most cooperative in explaining their organization and operation to all who are interested. Inquiries have come from many sections of the country, and even from abroad. This response is in keeping with the general spirit of public service which characterizes the automobile dealers of this country.

One might properly ask whether this kind of operation could succeed in other localities. I believe it could. Admittedly certain conditions are necessary. There must be a sufficient population, and automobile population, to create a demand for a rather large supply of replacement parts. However, the most necessary element is the understanding and cooperation of the automobile dealers of the community.

The President has called for new and imaginative ideas to make our highways more beautiful. But as we begin our search for new approaches to the problem we should not start with the premise that only Washington can find the answers and ignore private and local initiative that could also be utilized. Planting more trees, building higher fences, and imposing Federal penalties by restricting highway grants when junkyards have not been adequately shielded will not solve this problem. It will only hide it—like sweeping dirt under the rug. Let us not be so impetuous in treating the symptoms that we forget the disease itself. If the problem is too many junked automobiles, let us try to get rid of them—not just hide them. And if someone has been able to do this successfully without Federal help—let us give them encouragement. The Lansing automobile dealers have provided a good example of how this problem can be attacked in a positive fashion without restrictions and penalties. Community-minded auto dealers and businessmen across the country should welcome this new approach to a problem which really is not theirs, but which one day may be left on their doorstep if sound solutions are not found to the ever-growing pile of junked automobiles.

THE LATE HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, Texas lost one of its most outstanding citizens in the death of Luther Johnson. He was one of the most popular and most effective Texans to have served in the House for many years. He was a high-ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

When he resigned from Congress to go to the tax court, he also made a very distinguished record there.

His death is mourned by his many, many friends throughout the United States. We extend to his family our deepest sympathy and understanding.

DEDICATION OF J. SPENCER LOVE CENTER OF BURLINGTON INDUSTRIES

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, I was honored and privileged to participate in the dedication of a large, new, attractive industrial plant near Burlington, N.C.

This plant is the newest and most modern in a chain of 127 manufacturing units operated by Burlington Industries, Inc., the world's largest textile producing and distributing organization.

This new facility, which employs over 1,100 persons, is named for the founder of Burlington Industries and stands as a memorial to the memory of a great American and as a monument to the free enterprise system which made our country the greatest nation on earth.

J. Spencer Love founded and built an organization that has plants in 18 States, eight foreign countries, and Puerto Rico and which employs over 67,000 persons. It is proper and fitting that this beautiful new structure is located on Interstate Highway 85, as it reminds all passers-by that there is a place in our Nation for courage, initiative, and imagination—three qualities which Mr. Love possessed in abundance.

His vision and his vitality are carried on through his widow and his fine family. I had the great pleasure last Wednesday to hear Mrs. J. Spencer Love deliver an eloquent message, which I would like to share with Members of this body and for all who read the Journal of this Congress.

I also would like to have reproduced the address on that occasion of our Governor, Dan K. Moore, who spoke of "the period of great promise" now existing in my home State of North Carolina.

The text of the dedicatory remarks of Mrs. Love and Governor Moore follow:

Remarks by Mrs. J. Spencer Love, Dedication of J. Spencer Love Center, June 2, 1965

Governor Moore, Senator Jordan, Congressman Kornegay, distinguished guests, Mr. Rauch and fellow members of the Burlington family, I say "fellow members" because I will always feel a member of this great family.

June 2, 1965 is a day I shall remember as long as I live.

There is only one person who would be more deeply moved than I—that is Spencer.

If he were here, no doubt he would say, "I do not deserve this honor"—for modesty in admitting any personal accomplishments was one of his most endearing qualities.

At the same time, he would be extremely overjoyed that his associates, the officers and directors of the company he founded, have chosen this magnificent center to honor his memory. It is the first and only building to bear his name.

To me it is symbolic of all Burlington Industries.

The supporting steel represents the faith his father and the citizens of Burlington, N.C. expressed in Spencer 42 years ago—without which there would be no Burlington Industries today.

Each brick represents a member of the Burlington family from Charlie Myers and Henry Rauch down to the youngest and most inexperienced employee.

The mortar holding these thousands of bricks together to form this strong and lasting building represents the help and support his associates gave me, particularly those who are so magnificently and so effectively carrying the responsibilities he once had and shared with them.

Equally important, this mortar also represents the employees' loyalty to and belief in Burlington's past, present, and future progress and leadership in the textile industry.

It is my hope that the young men and women who travel this highway will see not just a building, but will recognize the advantages and opportunities of our free enterprise system as represented by the Burlington Hosiery Co., of Burlington Industries.

It is my prayer, as it was Spencer's, that our youth in whom he had such faith, will accept their responsibility to our economy and to our democracy.

Each member of Spencer's family—his stepmother, his mother-in-law, his sisters, and his eight children—join me in saying, "Thank you for honoring his memory."

God bless each of you—each employee of Burlington Industries, and most particularly the men and women who now work and will in the years ahead work in the J. Spencer Love Center.

REMARKS BY GOV. DAN K. MOORE AT DEDICATION OF J. SPENCER LOVE CENTER, BURLINGTON, N.C., JUNE 2, 1965

This is a period of great promise for North Carolina. We stand today on the threshold of a period of greatness such as this State has never witnessed. The challenge of the hour is great. The potential of our people to achieve is unlimited.

We are seeking to expand the educational opportunities for all of our people. We are seeking to expand our established industries and to attract new ones. We are seeking to diversify our agriculture. We are seeking to take the challenge of this moment of great promise and develop it into a time of prosperity and abundance for all of our people.

North Carolina has come to this moment of great promise on the broad shoulders of its long-established industries. We do not overlook the fact that these industries, which grew from our own land and our own people's determination to build a good life for themselves, have, on their own initiative, become very much a part of this marvelous age.

They have—and we witness a perfect example today—become a part of an age in which the application of man's accumulated knowledge produces a miracle a day and man himself is no longer surprised at anything.

These home-grown industries, tied closely to our agricultural heritage, are the strong backbone of our economy. And, none of us here will likely see the day when this is changed.

This is a wonderful day for a great North Carolina industry. It is a wonderful day for the people of this region, especially and, in a very real sense, for all North Carolinians.

We are here to dedicate a very important addition to a company that has held an honored place in the economic life of our State for well over four decades. But, more than that, we are here to dedicate a facility that, in every respect, symbolizes solid progress for our State, a facility that shows confidence in where we are, and a lot of enthusiasm for where we are going.

Certainly, it would be extremely difficult to suggest a more appropriate tribute to Spencer Love. This was a man who pioneered, a man who had vision and who dreamed far beyond his time.

There is little I could add to what Henry Rauch has said in tribute to Spencer Love. In fact, words themselves are inadequate. He was a man of courage, a man of determination, a man of action, and, above all, a man who loved this State and its people.

Burlington Industries grew out of all these things, but I think especially that it grew out of Spencer Love's desire to build something of lasting value for North Carolina and North Carolinians. And, what more lasting gift can a man leave than a great instrument for the building of a more abundant life?

I think it is especially significant that this facility is being dedicated during commencement week in North Carolina. Along with other government officials and many business leaders, I am donning cap and gown this week to talk to the graduates of high schools and colleges across our State.

It is a very pleasant experience for me because it is possible in North Carolina today to talk with complete sincerity about the challenge of the future, about our economic opportunities, about the good life that North Carolina offers, and about the need for young aggressive leadership in the days ahead.

We are telling these young men and women to stay in North Carolina and be a part of the exciting thing that is taking place here. We are trying to encourage and further inspire those who have already decided to join us in this great adventure.

And, we are trying to raise some questions in the minds of those who feel they must look elsewhere for opportunities.

It is good to have an event like this dedication to hold up as an example of the opportunities available here at home, as an example of the way North Carolina is moving.

New textile plants are being established in North Carolina at a rate of 30 or 40 a year, adding substantially to the approximately 1,200 plants that exist. Better wages and better working conditions are the rule rather than the exception. Employer-employee relations—a trademark in North Carolina industry—have never been better.

An industry must have these things in order to produce. And the North Carolina textile industry produces. It produces, in value of shipments, a fourth of the Nation's broad woven cotton goods, more than a third of the manmade fiber fabrics, almost 10 percent of all woolen and worsted goods. Our spinning mills turn out nearly half of all cotton sales yarn produced in the country. Our knitting mills account for 50 percent of the Nation's hosiery.

Your industry employs more North Carolinians than any other industry and the value of the products you manufacture runs well over $3 billion a year.

There is every reason for you to take pride in your industry and in its contribution to North Carolina. And, Burlington Industries can certainly take pride in the leadership it has provided for that industry.

There is no limit to what we can accomplish in the days just ahead. All we have to do is continue working together as we have in the past. We are here today because Spencer Love saw the vision of North Carolina's potential, and went out and did something about it.

He set a fine example for all of us. Yes, North Carolina stands today on the threshold of greatness because of the vision of men like Spencer Love and the contributions to progress of industries like Burlington. We are looking toward an era of unprecedented prosperity and growth. North Carolina needs men like Spencer Love, and it needs industries like Burlington to meet the challenges of the years ahead.

I commend Burlington Industries for its many contributions to the State through the years. And, I congratulate Burlington Industries for its faith in the future as exhibited by this new J. Spencer Love Center. This faith in the future will be justified.

COMBATING DISCRIMINATION

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 8852, a bill to combat more effectively discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. The introduction of this bill has been prompted by criticisms regarding the effectiveness of the provisions of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 during the hearings on legislation to repeal section 14(b) of the Labor-Management Relations Act.

The effect of the bill which I have introduced today would be to create an Equal Employment Opportunities Commission with the power to conduct hearings and issue enforceable compliance orders in cases where employers or labor organizations discriminate in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

My bill contains the same protections against racial discrimination in employment as those included in title VII of the Civil Rights Act. The differences are in enforcement procedures. H.R. 8852 would provide for administrative enforcement of these protections, while the Civil Rights Act provides for judicial enforcement.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act was, with a few important changes, taken from the bill, H.R. 405, reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor in 1963. H.R. 405, as reported, provided for administrative enforcement identical to that proposed in the bill I have introduced today.

When the House Committee on the Judiciary incorporated the provisions of H.R. 405 in the Civil Rights Act, it eliminated the enforcement provisions provided therein and substituted the judicial enforcement provisions which had been offered in the Committee on Education and Labor by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] and rejected by the committee.

I felt then and believe now that the judicial enforcement provisions adopted by the Committee on the Judiciary and now found in title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 are cumbersome and would not be nearly as effective as the administrative enforcement provisions of the bill reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor and contained in H.R. 8852, the bill I have introduced today.

Adoption of H.R. 8852 would, for all substantial purposes, enact the bill reported by the Committee on Education and Labor in 1963, with certain additions made by the Judiciary Committee, and would repeal title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to notify the House that I have been joined in sponsoring this bill by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

BENEFITS FOR POSTMASTERS

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the House passed H.R. 1771 which provides a well-earned benefit for the postmasters of the United States who presently spend many hours each week in their offices in excess of the 40 hours generally required throughout the postal service and the rest of the Federal service. Not only do many postmasters work more than 8 hours a day, but they work on Saturday or Sunday as well. Some of this work is voluntary—they are devoted public servants and they are responsible for the conduct of their offices at all times. But much of it—particularly the service performed on Saturdays when post offices are open to the public—is necessary because no provision has been made for relieving them. This bill provides that relief by requiring the Postmaster General to schedule their services on 5 days a week.

To do this, he will, of course, have to make provisions to cover the post office in the postmaster's absence on Saturday—or another day if it is the sixth day in the week. In first-class post offices and some large second-class offices, this will present no problem, either to the postmasters or to the Department because an assistant postmaster or assistant to the postmaster is already employed. But for most of the 6,850 postmasters in second-class post offices and all of the 12,965 postmasters in third-class post offices, relief can only be provided through an increase in clerk hours to cover the absence of the postmaster. Under the terms of the bill, the Postmaster General will be expected to make the additional assistance available by January 1966. When effected, this change will place all postmasters in presidential offices on a par with most other postal and Federal employees insofar as the important condition of work schedule is concerned.

The postmasters in the 8,976 post offices of the fourth class are not included in the 5-day week provision because their scheduled hours of work do not now exceed 40 hours per week.

I heartily endorse this bill and am confident it will prove not only equitable to the postal employees, but will result in improved efficiency in service to the postal patrons.

THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the distinct pleasures of my service in the Congress is to have the opportunity to commend citizens and organizations in the Second Congressional District of Louisiana for their achievements and for the honors bestowed upon them. No greater pleasure has come to me in this regard than to point with happiness and pride to the accomplishments of the Clarion Herald newspaper, which serves the religious and the laity in the archdiocese of New Orleans.

The Clarion Herald, which now has a circulation of some 125,000 in the Greater New Orleans area and adjacent south Louisiana parishes, won four first-place awards at the recent Catholic Press Association contest in New York City. Through the efforts of the Clarion's fine staff, the newspaper was awarded first-place honors for general excellence; for the best front page; for best presentation for obtaining local advertising, and for the finest series of articles—on the problems of poverty in the New Orleans area—in the public interest from among all the Catholic newspapers in America.

Mr. Speaker, the Clarion Herald has been published in my hometown of New Orleans, La., since February 1963; it is the successor to Catholic Action of the South, which had been published there for some 30 years before.

In the 2½ years since the Clarion began publication, Mr. Speaker, this fine Catholic newspaper has become a vital and enlightening force in my city of New Orleans and across south Louisiana. It is a truly great force for good in my community.

After its first year of publication, the Clarion won two first-place awards from among all the Nation's Catholic newspapers in the Catholic Press Association contest for 1963. For that year, the Clarion won first place in general excellence and for the best front page. Then, in 1964, the Clarion won the same two first-place awards, and also added two more top honors.

The basis for these fine achievements by the Clarion rests with the exemplary advertising, administrative and editorial staffs which the newspaper has. However, Mr. Speaker, no compliments or congratulations would be complete without first citing the great Christian and moral leadership in the archdiocese of New Orleans constantly manifested by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Joseph P. Cody, archbishop of the Archdiocese of New Orleans. This remarkable leader of the church, in a relatively short time among us in the New Orleans area, has displayed those great qualities of faith, hope, and charity which preceded him in his earlier assignments in Kansas City, Mo.; St. Louis, and St. Joseph, Mo. I am confident that the religious and the laity in the Archdiocese of New Orleans will achieve greater spiritual advancement in years to come under the benevolent and wise guidance of Archbishop Cody.

For their distinguished operation of the Clarion Herald, I would like to commend the Reverend Elmo L. Romagosa, executive editor, communications director of the Archdiocese of New Orleans, and assistant pastor of St. John the Baptist Church in New Orleans; Mr. M. F. Everett, former editor of the Catholic Action of the South, and continuing as editor of the Clarion; Mr. Emile Comar, associate editor of the Clarion and former political reporter for the New Orleans, La., States-Item newspaper; the Reverend John P. Reynolds, administrative director of the Clarion; John W. MacCandless, business manager; William P. Dale, advertising director of the newspaper, and all their fine assistants and other staffers on the Clarion Herald.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert into the RECORD three newspaper articles which describe in some detail the four first-place honors awarded to the Clarion Herald at the recent Catholic Press Association contest in New York City.

The three articles follow as attached:

[From the New Orleans (La.) Clarion Herald, May 20, 1965]

CLARION HERALD WINS THREE TOP NEWSPAPER AWARDS

NEW YORK.—The Clarion Herald, praised for its editorial impact, writing and photography Thursday at New York, was declared first in general excellence among the Nation's largest circulation Catholic newspapers.

The decision of judges in the annual Catholic Press Association contest was unanimous.

Two other first place awards were won by the Clarion (circulation 125,000) in competition with newspapers ranging up to 200,000 circulation: Best front page; best presentation for obtaining local advertising.

In winning the general excellence and best front page awards for 1964, the Clarion repeated its wins of 1963, the first year of publication.

Judges said in declaring the Clarion to be first in general excellence:

"Judges unanimously awarded this newspaper the award in this category for the second successive year. It continues its imaginative use of color, editorial impact through its consistently high-level of writing and attention-holding use of the elements of graphic designs.

"An excellent example of a proper balance and use of the written word and photojournalism."

The judges singled out in the "best front page" category the Clarion front page of March 12, 1964, which featured at the top three photographs by Clarion photographer Frank Methe.

One of them accompanied a Newell Schindler story on "Red Jack" Burns, ex-fighter who was grand marshal of the St. Patrick's Day parade.

Another featured a photograph of parishioners of St. Francis Xavier parish in Metairie attending mass at a new altar facing the people.

And the third was a bit of fakery by Methe as he put together a picture of a model of the new International Trade Mart and a photo of Canal Street to show how the skyscraper mart would look when completed.

The advertising campaign which won first place was accorded the Clarion for "Operation Clarion" by advertising manager William P. Dale.

The presentation shows the Clarion's community consciousness, leadership, acceptance, response, influence, openmindedness, and need.

Dale reported that the campaign increased the advertising linage by 83.7 percent a month in the last 6 months of 1964.

Among other winners in the CPA awards competition were:

Best editorial: Mississippi Register, the Reverend Bernard Law, editor, for an editorial entitled "Local Segregation is Dying."

General excellence among newspapers ranging in circulation from 15,000 to 40,000: The Catholic Exponent, Youngstown, Ohio.

General excellence among newspapers in the 1,000 to 15,000 circulation category: Canadian Register, Kingston, Ontario

Best front page among papers in the 15,000 to 40,000 category: Catholic Voice, Oakland, Calif.

Best front page among papers in the 1,000 to 15,000 category: Southern Cross, Savannah, Ga.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Clarion Herald, May 27, 1965]

CLARION HONORED FOR POVERTY SERIES

NEW YORK.—The best campaign in the public interest among the Nation's largest Catholic newspapers was the Clarion Herald's year long efforts to highlight the problems of poverty and the underprivileged in the New Orleans area.

First place in the Catholic Press Association competition for the public interest award was presented to the Clarion at the annual CPA awards luncheon in New York.

Three other first place awards to the Clarion—for general excellence, best front page, and best presentation for obtaining local advertising—were announced last week.

Judges said of the stories, features, and photos on poverty and its problems as prepared by the Clarion staff:

"This newspaper demonstrated unusual skill, imagination, and ability in going to groups in its readership with the total problem of interracial relations.

"The approach was at a basic human level and got away from much of the generalized statements that have become so common.

"The newspaper saw the problem as one of improving the lot of the individual people and so concentrated on such basic problems as the school dropout situation, housing, and employment imaginatively."

Stories in the series—prepared primarily by Newell Schindler and Photographer Frank Methe—dealt in depth with illiteracy, school dropouts, blighted housing, and the problems in public housing areas.

Methe photographs also won honorable mention in two categories—best use of original photograph and best photo story originating with a newspaper.

The Catholic Reporter, Kansas City, Mo., was first place winner in best original photograph category and the Oklahoma Courier won in the best photo story award.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Clarion Herald, May 27, 1965]

JOURNALISM FRONTIER OPENED BY CLARION

Winning top national honors for newspaper excellence in its first year of publication, the Clarion Herald has ushered in a new era of Catholic journalism in the archdiocese of New Orleans.

Replacing the former Catholic Action of the South (circulation about 40,000) in February 1963, it was immediately expanded to go into every Catholic home, giving it a circulation of over 120,000.

From its inception the Clarion Herald has sought to provide wider news and editorial coverage, adding on a locally edited feature section in 1964 to expand its scope.

Competing news services—NCWC news service from Washington and RNS news service from New York—are subscribed to for up-to-date, factual coverage. Both are international in scope.

On the distaff side, the paper carries food columns, fashion news, club notes, and a host of other features.

And on the editorial pages, both liberal and conservative views are presented.

In the planning stage, Archbishop John P. Cody pointed out that the Clarion would sacrifice nothing of what Catholic Action of the South accomplished in the past.

The newspaper, with a growing staff of over 50 full-time workers, utilizes the latest advances in printing and mechanical reproduction.

Type is set by photo process on machines that are an innovation in the field. Printing is by offset, through contract with a New Orleans printer. The high-speed press churns out the Clarion at almost 20,000 an hour.

The professional news staff is supported by numerous local and national columnists such as Mel Leavitt, Hap Glaudi, Scoop Kennedy, Loretta Young, William Buckley, Donald McDonald, Msgr. John D. Conway, and Father Gilbert Roxburgh, O.P.

Photographs by Frank Methe have won numerous awards, including national honors from the National Press Photographers' Association in competition with newspapers throughout the country, including metropolitan dailies.

With its circulation of 120,000, it is the largest weekly in the 10-State Southeastern area and the third largest newspaper in Louisiana.

It is among the top 10 in circulation among the 146 Catholic newspapers in the United States and first in general excellence, as rated by judges in last year's Catholic Press Association awards competition.

The main function of the Clarion is as a teacher for the church. Archbishop Cody felt that a strong, well-edited, and locally produced Catholic newspaper would be the most effective instrument possible for bearing the message of Christ to every Catholic home in the archdiocese.

To do this he has given it full rein to investigate and report all activities that may affect Catholics, whether religious, political, social, or educational.

Its basic ideal has been to present the eternal truths of God in relation to circumstances and conditions of the day.

Thus the Clarion helps bring one of the oldest centers of Catholic faith in the country to the foreground as the most advanced in spreading the word of God.

GERRITT W. WESSELINK

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, last week the General Counsel of the Air Force, Gerritt W. Wesselink, was fatally stricken by a heart attack. In my services on the Armed Services Committee I had come to know and to respect him as an able and devoted public servant. His loss will be sorely felt by the Air Force and the Department of Defense. I am sure that my colleagues who knew this dedicated public servant share my feeling of personal loss and sympathy to his widow and their three fine children.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include as part of my remarks the statement which Secretary Zuckert issued about Mr. Wesselink:

JUNE 4, 1965.

To the members of the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force and the Air Staff:

Each of us personally, in this office, the Air Staff and the U.S. Air Force, has suffered a deep loss with the death of our general counsel, Gerritt W. Wesselink.

Gerry was a big man in every way. He had a big heart and a great warmth and humor. His perspective was big, as were the outstanding professional talents he devoted to his work—so vital to the Air Force interests.

He was a wise and understanding leader of the fine lawyers who constitute our general counsel's office. He made the whole contribution of that organization immeasurably greater than the sum of its individual accomplishments.

Above all, however, all of us have lost an incomparable friend. In our own sadness, we realize that his family has suffered by far the greater loss. Our thoughts and prayers go out to them.

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT,
Secretary of the Air Force.

PRESIDENT ABOLISHES THE LOAN POLICY BOARD OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn that President Johnson, in his Reorganization Plan No. 4, 1965, submitted to the Congress on May 27, 1965, abolished the Loan Policy Board of the Small Business Administration and transferred all of its functions to the Administrator of the SBA.

I was opposed to the establishment of such a Board in the first place. At the time the Small Business Act was passed, section 4(d) provided for the creation of the Board, to consist of the Administrator of SBA as Chariman, and the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, or their designees, as the other members. The purpose of the Board was to establish general policies concerning the granting of applications for financial assistance by the Small Business Administration.

The rationale for including the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce on the Board was that since this was a new agency embarking on new programs, it would need their advice and assistance. It is quite clear that the agency, now more than 10 years old, has all of the top-level expertise necessary for formulating policies which will be in the best interests of small business and the Government. There is no justification or necessity for involving the Treasury Department or the Commerce Department in policymaking decisions of the Small Business Administration.

I have regularly introduced legislation to abolish the Loan Policy Board. In the present Congress my bill, H.R. 585, would accomplish that purpose.

I am pleased that the President's recommendation will make action on my bill unnecessary.

I have by no means been alone in my attitude toward the Board since the House Select Committee on Small Business of this body has frequently called for the abolition of the Board and did so again in its report No. 1935 of December 18, 1964, to the House at the end of the last Congress. In June of 1961 the National Federation of Independent Business conducted a survey of its then 165,000 members and 61 percent favored abolition of the Board.

The Loan Policy Board has established several policies which I believe are not in the best interests of either small business or the Government and I hope that the President's salutary act in abolishing the Board will result in a reconsideration and reversal of those policies.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XC

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the poverty program in New York and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 17, 1965.

It is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis."

The article follows:

New York City in Crisis: Mayor's Poverty Plan Gains—Some Would Serve

(By Barry Gottehrer and Marshall Peck)

Mayor Wagner's proposal to place the city's multimillion-dollar antipoverty program firmly under his administration's control moved a step closer to reality yesterday despite the charge by Representative Adam Clayton Powell that the plan was "illegal" and "against the law of the land."

Julius C. C. Edelstein, the mayor's executive assistant, said that by late yesterday the administration had already convinced "some" community leaders to serve on the board of directors of the proposed corporation to oversee the poverty program.

Under the proposal revealed by the mayor and City Council President Paul Screvane during the appearance before a House subcommittee in Washington Thursday, the corporation would have 5 or 6 community leaders and 11 city officials on its governing board.

The 11 city officials would be the 11 members of the mayor's current Anti-Poverty Operations Board.

They are city council president, welfare commissioner, Mr. Edelstein, city administrator, acting superintendent of schools, budget director, commissioner of labor, executive director of the youth board, director of personnel for the city, commissioner of relocation, and the housing and development coordinator.

Although Mr. Edelstein refused to reveal the names of the community leaders contacted by the mayor and Mr. Screvane, he did say that they hoped to have completed their talent hunt by early next week "at the very latest."

It was understood, however, that A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, had been asked to serve on the board. Mr. Randolph could not be reached to confirm the report.

Mr. Edelstein said that the Corporation Counsel's office was putting final touches on the proposal which, he hoped, would be completed by the middle of next week and in Albany by April 26 at the latest.

The proposal must be approved by both houses of the State legislature and signed by the Governor. Mr. Edelstein said that he expects final approval within a month.

A spokesman for the mayor dismissed Representative Powell's outburst on Thursday as "an act."

Representative Powell, said the aid, "is a very charming man. At some moments he speaks with seriousness. Frankly, I think he was kidding the other day. He was speaking to certain parts of his constituency, I guess."

During the hearings before the House Education and Labor Subcommittee, which he heads and which is now considering changes in the Federal antipoverty act, Representative Powell exploded at the mayor's plan to take control of the city's community action programs away from the local communities.

"There won't be any city-run monopoly of this community action program," said Representative Powell, the controversial Congressman from Harlem whose own alleged "control" of HARYOU act has threatened the Harlem program. "It is against the law. It is illegal. There won't be any monopoly or there won't be any (poverty) program."

The split was over some rather vague wording contained in Public Law 88-45 of August 1964, which set up the poverty program and defined the control of "community action programs."

In the act, community action programs are defined as being "developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served."

Although he would like the wording clarified, Mayor Wagner maintained that the corporation, which would run a proposed string of at first 6 and eventually 16 poverty centers around the city, would not violate this definition.

Representative Powell disagreed. He maintained that the 2-to-1 ratio of city officials on the board was completely opposed to the concept of community action where the programs are run by the people and not by the city administration.

Representative Powell's threat to stop payment of Federal poverty funds to the city if the corporation became a reality is not expected to affect the city's current request for $16.5 million from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

These funds, if approved by Sargent Shriver's office, which is currently studying the request, would come out of funds already approved by Congress and are, theoretically, outside of the domain of Representative Powell and the House Education and Labor Subcommittee.

A spokesman for the Office of Economic Opportunity maintained yesterday that, "New York's request is still being studied." He added that the city's plan for a private corporation, which reportedly had not been developed until 10 days ago, was being studied by his office's legal counsel.

"If our legal counsel decides the corporation is not in violation of the act—and, frankly, we don't think it is," he said, "then I don't see why the plan won't win approval."

Representative Powell's threat to ask the U.S. Comptroller General to stop payment of funds to New York City if the program is put into effect could conceivably derail the city's current request.

Few people who know the Congressman, however, think he will actually press this point.

Representative Powell could not be reached yesterday for his reaction to the mayor's decision to push ahead with the corporation despite his threat.

"You know Adam," said one New York Congressman who does know Adam. "He just wants to show the mayor how important he is. He doesn't care what the mayor does with the poverty program just so long as he keeps his hands off HARYOU act. That's Adam's personal property."

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XCI

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article tells the story of a school in Harlem.

The article is part of a series on "New York City in Crisis" and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 18, 1965.

The article follows:

New York City in Crisis: A City of Contrasts—An Efficient School Amid Grim Surroundings

(By Gwen Gibson)

It is claimed that "Americans won't do stoop labor." Five days a week a pretty, bright, 13-year-old eighth-grade student named Ann Rutledge picks up her schoolbooks and travels by subway, or sometimes by foot, from her home on 102d Street to her classes at Wadleigh Junior High School in Harlem. Ann is a studious young miss from an industrious middle-class family, who excels in English and math and who might be like any other junior high school student anywhere in the country but for a few deplorable facts.

The school she attends sits on 114th Street between 7th and 8th Avenues, in a block considered so squalid that city and Federal authorities have slated it for a $5.5 million renovation project, now scheduled to begin tomorrow.

The streets she travels en route to her classes are notorious for their high crime rate and their traffic in winos and prostitutes numbers and narcotics.

The classes she attends have never been integrated so that Ann and her 1,690 fellow students can enjoy the creative opportunities that come with diversified classes. Wadleigh's enrollment, with the exception of a few Puerto Rican children, is 100 percent Negro.

They call it de facto segregation. And it exists today at Wadleigh and other Harlem schools nearly 11 years after the May 17, 1954, Supreme Court decision which recognized that to separate Negro children from others solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority that affects their hearts and minds.

SOME SURPRISES

What type of school life can a youngster have in this environment, which is the same in practice, if not in intent, as that condemned by the court? What, if any, school spirit can his teachers instill in him? What general quality of education can he hope to receive?

A series of visits to Wadleigh, plus interviews with students, parents, teachers, principal, and neighbors in the block produced some surprising answers.

New York, a city in crisis, is also a city of contrasts. And Wadleigh exists as an efficient, clean, and cheerful oasis in the grimmest of surroundings.

Across the street sit 37 dilapidated 5-story walkup flats with rat-infested basements and garbage-strewn backyards. But walk through the front door of Wadleigh, a five-story, red-brick building, and the atmosphere immediately changes. The ceilings are high; the halls spacious. The walls throughout are painted either a light tan or a cheerful blue. The classrooms have fluorescent lights. The halls, stairways, restrooms, gyms, cafeteria, workrooms, and classrooms are amazingly free of litter for a school packed with so many energetic teenagers.

"We have the best custodians in the business," boasts the principal, Perry Spiro.

Wadleigh's language laboratory—with individual booths and audio-lingual equipment—is outstanding. Master teachers like Rene

Lavergneau, a native of Panama, and John Perkins, a native of Martinique and a graduate of the Sorbonne, instruct the youngsters in Spanish and French.

The school has well-equipped workshops in woodworking, ceramics, metals, printing, millinery, home economics, dressmaking, art, and photography. It has an afterschool community center in the basement where, for 5 cents a year, the students can enjoy basketball, checkers, records, ping-pong, and the like.

Movies are shown from time to time in the auditorium at reduced prices. Assemblies are well attended and 95 percent of the students comply with the dress regulations—white blouses for girls, white shirts and ties for boys.

THE NO. 1 PROBLEM

"Give us 20 more stable people on the staff and you would have people trying to get their children in here," said Miss Enid Vaughan, an English teacher for 20 years. She singled out the one problem—apart from its surroundings—that most plagues Wadleigh.

Like every other junior high school in the New York City public school system, Wadleigh has a large teacher turnover; 24 percent of the teachers on the school's staff of 105 left and were replaced during the 1963–64 school year. This was a couple of percentage points below the city average. But Wadleigh students do live in an inferior neighborhood; they do attend a segregated school, and these facts are apt, as the Supreme Court held in 1954, to affect their hearts and minds and render them more sensitive to such situations.

Mrs. Betty Davis, a math teacher, complained that her class had three different instructors in English last year. "There is a turnover here, and it contributes to a lack of continuity, and the children suffer." She added that when a child attends a segregated school, "there is a scar placed there that is never eliminated. Everything he reads tells him segregated schools are inferior."

It's not surprising that some Wadleigh youngsters, interviewed last month by Reporter Willie Jones, of the Social Dynamics Research Institute at City College, grumbled that their teachers don't care whether they learn or not.

Actually the majority of those on the Wadleigh faculty are professional instructors who care a great deal about the progress of their students. In many cases a special kind of closeness not found in the silk stocking districts develops between teacher and student.

Wadleigh teachers have often laid out money to buy a hot lunch for an indigent child. Many give time after school hours to coach art, chess, typing, or glee club groups. One teacher, who didn't want his name used, is giving two $25 savings bonds this year to outstanding graduates. Another, Edward Feldstein, took his class to Van Cortlandt Park last July, after school closed, and his wife baked cake for the occasion. This was not an unusual case.

Mr. Spiro proudly reels off statistics showing the school has a hard core of dedicated educators. "We have 31 teachers who have been here 7 years or more," he said. "One woman has been here 29 years; two teachers have been here 19 years; one has been here 13, one 14, one 15, one 16 years; and Lester Bash (the assistant to the principal) has been a supervisor in this community for 18 years."

GOOD RECORD

"A half dozen teachers are giving up their lunch hour every week to take part in a special guidance institution sponsored by Bank Street College," he points out. "Other teachers are taking course work in teaching disadvantaged children. Some are doing this for license requirements, yes. But in most cases they are doing it because they want to be more effective."

One teacher, E. E. Plummer, has made it his project to screen and groom children for the Independent School's talent search program and, as a result, numerous Wadleigh children have been admitted to special schools on full scholarships. Eight children were admitted to the Hotchkiss School in Lakeville, Conn., last summer as a result of his efforts.

Of the approximately 200 Wadleigh students who took entrance exams this year, 60 were admitted to special New York City high schools, including music and art, Stuyvesant, Brooklyn Tech, the High School of Art and Design, and numerous high schools of science.

All this is particularly impressive in light of the fact that most students who enter Wadleigh are severely retarded in reading through lack of home training. The average seventh grade enrollee has a fourth grade reading level. Five classes of seventh grade students are taking special reading courses this year in lieu of regular English work.

Still there's a school spirit that spills over into the neighborhood which, for all its squalor, has a share of substantial citizens. Many take a proprietary interest in Wadleigh.

"People in this block are very friendly to us," said Richard Kachalsky, a math instructor for 16 years. "Many teachers park their automobiles outside and there's been little vandalism. Window breakage has been nil. The people across the street will run into the building and tell us if they see someone loitering around our cars."

Ann Rutledge likes her school "very much." She has learned to close her eyes to the filth on the streets outside. One youngster wrote eloquently in the year book: "A day at J. H. S. 88 (Wadleigh) is like being king for a day. I like our school because it is a modern one. It has the best of science rooms * * * a large cafeteria * * * understanding teachers." A more typical attitude was expressed by a bluejean-clad boy of 13 who figured, when asked about his school, "ah, it's all right, I guess."

NEGRO PICTURES

Like many other junior highs, Wadleigh is overcrowded. "We have 56 academic class rooms and 65 official classes," said Mr. Spiro. "Our health education facilities are totally inadequate. We have a nurse only 2½ days a week. We had a doctor only 8 days out of 22 school days last month."

Such deficiences are prevalent throughout the educational system. But Wadleigh has special drawbacks to overcome. It needs a playground badly. At present there is only a sunken, concrete court, 125 by 75 feet, out front. Neighbors voted almost overwhelmingly Thursday night at a school meeting in favor of a proposal to tear down three buildings on 115th Street to provide playground facilities.

Beyond this, teachers like Murray Ackerman insist that the kids at Wadleigh need better textbooks than the stereotyped ones provided by the Board of Education. "We need books that tell something about the Negro's contribution to our American heritage," he said. "Our textbooks should show some pictures of Negroes, and I don't mean Jackie Robinson."

Mr. Ackerman, chapter chairman of the United Teachers Federation, said that during contract negotiations last year the biggest yell from Wadleigh union members was not for more money. "It was for better teaching aids and a bigger voice in planning curriculum."

William Harper, who teaches 8th grade art and guidance classes, believes the school needs a full-time psychologist. "We have more mentally disturbed children than other schools," he said. "Many of those who come here don't know their father, or the mother works, or she is on welfare. It's not just the broken home that causes the trouble, though. It's the combination of that, plus the politicians who don't care, and the slum area, the addicts, the prostitutes in the neighborhood. Sometimes a kid explodes and he breaks a window. That's his only out."

Morton J. David, who teaches 8th and 9th grade science, agreed that "these children are definitely a product of their environment."

"A good teacher can do something to overcome this, but we are not full-time parents," he said.

PEACE CORPS SUCCESS STORY

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the pleasure of appearing before the Committee on Foreign Affairs to testify in support of the Peace Corps—an organization with which I had the honor to be associated for over 3 years.

I should like to take this opportunity to present the full text of my testimony. I believe some of my disinguished colleagues may find some of my suggestions of interest—particularly those relating to some of our other oversea programs:

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS ON THE PEACE CORPS AUTHORIZATION, JUNE 3, 1965

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to you and my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee for giving me this opportunity to present some observations on the Peace Corps.

As I suppose you know, I am the first Peace Corps Congressman, proving that service with the Peace Corps is not necessarily a limit on the horizons of those that serve at least in the 25th District of New York. I was privileged to be the second staff member brought to the Peace Corps by Mr. Shriver, after the now Deputy Director, Mr. Warren Wiggins. I took part in drafting the original Peace Corps documents presented to President Kennedy on the formation of the organization and then was a part of the original Latin American staff of the Peace Corps. I did the in-country explorations for the first Peace Corps programs in Peru, Ecuador, and El Salvador, then was made Director of Programs for the west coast of South America which at that time included Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Chile with some 1,600 volunteers, representing about 22 percent of the entire number of volunteers in the Corps as of a year ago last March when I resigned to run for Congress.

My participation with the Peace Corps was the most exciting and meaningful experience in my life. I refer not only to the knowledge I acquired and the broadening of my horizons through the Peace Corps work, nor just to the fundamental part the Peace Corps played as a basis for my successful race for Congress, nor just to the opportunity to work in association with the most creative, dynamic, and able executive I have ever met, Sargent Shriver, or such outstanding associates as Warren Wiggins, Jack Vaughn who was eventually my immediate superior and is now our Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, Bill Moyers who I believe needs no identification, Frank

Williams now our Ambassador to ECOSOC, and other tremendously capable people associated with the beginning of the organization.

The thing that stands out for me from my Peace Corps experience was the really unique opportunity in life to see a dream come true. I had worked as a lawyer in Latin America and traveled widely in other developing countries of the world. I had worked for a year with the foreign assistance program under the International Cooperation Administration, now AID, and I had seen a good deal of how our official establishment abroad operates. I saw a tremendous vacuum in our operations abroad in that none of our efforts were reaching the people, the ordinary people who will determine the ultimate fate of these countries, the millions who populate the slums that ring the major cities in all these countries, the millions more who are peasants and populate the countryside. I know all of you have traveled widely in these countries and have seen for yourselves the deplorable conditions of undernourishment, inadequate clothing and housing, deprivation of educational opportunity, and absence of hope for the future in which live and suffer the vast majority of the people of the world in these countries. I dreamed, when I saw these conditions, of a U.S. effort that would really get to these people, work with and among them, help them achieve some small measure of progress and encouragement. And I was privileged to be part of such a program in the Peace Corps and see this dream materialize into a wonderful reality. This is, indeed, a rare experience.

I would like to delve for a few minutes into the Peace Corps success story, for the Peace Corps was a pioneer venture. It tried out many new ideas and concepts of foreign service. I think that in its 4 years of operation it has proven many of these new approaches to be valid, and in many cases they are valid not just for the Peace Corps but for our entire overseas effort.

As I alluded before, the most important innovation of the Peace Corps in my opinion was to extend our foreign involvement for the first time to the people, to the masses in the slums and in the countryside. All of our efforts in the past had been directed toward governments and was centered in the major cities, our assistance was directed too frequently for the short term political purposes of persuading those governments to say nice things about us or to vote with us in the UN.

Now, in my view, the future course of the developing countries, in which the great battle between the subjugation of communism and the freedom of democracy is taking place, depends little on what these governments think of us or whether they vote with us in international bodies. Many of the governments are anathema to their own people. Most represent a small artisocracy within the country and are in no sense representative of the people they serve, even in many countries where the forms of elective process are observed.

The future of these countries, in my opinion, depends on whether the masses of starving, deprived people see some progress which touches their lives under a non-Communist society. No matter how much material aid we give to or through the Government, no matter what nice or nasty things the Government may say about us, if these great masses do not experience progress and change affecting their lives, the chance that they will turn to communism in desperation is great and imminent.

The Peace Corps is affecting the lives of these people. The progress may not be great in material terms, but it is a change they can see and feel and touch and smell. And it is change which they can identify with the United States. The change may take the form of better crops, or construction of privys or a new schoolhouse or aqueducts to bring fresh water. Whatever it is, however small, it takes place right in the community. And whatever it is, the people of the community have become involved in producing the change, which in itself may often be the most significant progress.

The big dam, the big electric plant, the big fertilizer plant, we help finance through the Government, even the help we give through American private enterprise as important as such assistance may be, is seldom something these masses of people become a part of or identify with us or with their aspirations. Frequently, what it means to them more than anything else is assistance to a government that they see as the source of their oppression. But the work of the Peace Corps they see and feel as a part of their daily lives.

I think there would be many advantages to us to identify more with the hopes and aspirations of the common people in all of our foreign endeavors, to move the Embassy and AID, USIA, and Intelligence people out into the villages and into the slums. I think it would achieve much more meaningful results developmentally, results with which the people could identify. And I think it would have subsidiary advantages of putting our overseas establishment in closer touch with the people so that the information we received at home, from the President on down, would be more accurate and representative of the true conditions in these countries.

I wonder, for example, whether the information received by the President from the Dominican Republic would have been the same if our oversea establishment had been in meaningful contact with the people instead of concentrated in the capital city, talking to and living with the bigwigs of government and industry in the country.

Associated with the dispersion of the Peace Corps throughout the countryside and in the city slums, is the fact that the Peace Corps volunteers and staff live modestly abroad, in keeping with the way of life of the people with whom they work, the schoolteacher or the agricultural agent or the social worker; that they get paid on the same basis; that they come not to advise or direct, but to do what a requesting local agency would like help doing, under its direction, and the way the local agency wants to do it. The image of the big American coming to tell the poor, ignorant, backward local how to do things, attempting to have him adopt our ways, living better than the most affluent within the country, living apart—these have been enormous barriers to our successful operation abroad. The Peace Corps modesty has been a great factor in its success. I wonder if some of this experience isn't transferable to our other programs.

One of the principal innovations of the Peace Corps and a major factor in its success has been its recruitment and selection of volunteers. I think the Peace Corps has proved that to be effective in a primitive country where people don't wear shoes or have adequate clothing, don't know how to dispose of their human wastes, and don't know anything about healthy child-care practices, in these countries you don't necessarily need the highest level technicians and dedication means a lot. In fact, I think our overall experience abroad has shown that working with primitive conditions, the high level technician will frequently become very frustrated because of the inability to utilize or transfer his sophisticated knowledge, whereas the younger, more flexible American can adapt better and is more effective in communicating what he does know.

I wonder, fitting into what I have said above, if we shouldn't be looking to concentrate our efforts less on technical expertise and more on people of slightly lower level skills, perhaps somewhere between the present AID technician and the average Peace Corps volunteer, who would be willing to work in the slums and in the countryside, whose principal motivation would be service rather than pay, and who would be willing to undergo physical deprivations of living conditions in order to be more effective in his overseas work.

Training has been another key factor in the Peace Corps success. I think the Peace Corps has shown the value of taking several months out of a man's service to prepare him for his overseas experience, both in terms of his effectiveness abroad and in terms of eliminating so-called culture shock. One of the greatest difficulties with all overseas operations, public or private, has been communications, for instance. Many an excellent technician has gone abroad and has found himself unable to communicate his knowledge or apply it to the cultural conditions he found abroad.

This year at the hearings of my committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, on an authorization for increased funds for the Inter-American Bank (H.R. 45), I asked Secretary Thomas Mann how AID was doing on language proficiency of its Latin American personnel. His reply, submitted for the record shocked me. The details are printed on page 292 of those hearings and indicate that of 869 direct hire and other agency personnel abroad, some 566 or more than 65 percent had ratings of less than S–3 which is described as fluency to demonstrate "sufficient control of the structure and adequate vocabulary to handle respresentation requirements and professional discussions within one or more special fields." There were still 175 of these people, or about 20 percent with no knowledge of the language at all and 201 with ratings of S–1, the most rudimentary knowledge of words and phrases.

Together this constitutes more than 43 percent of our direct hire personnel in Latin America who cannot communicate in the language of the country, and this is not taking into account the 376 contractor personnel overseas for whom I am sure the record of language fluency is much less and, of course, the countries in which English is the spoken language. If this is so in Latin America where the relatively easy languages of Spanish and Portuguese are spoken, I can just imagine the statistics in the other parts of the world. I don't think anyone should be sent overseas without at least an S–2 rating in the language of the country.

But communications involves much more than language. I have seen the best meaning and most able of technicians fail overseas for lack of understanding of the culture of the country. Take the North Americans, and I've seen many of them, who become completely exasperated over the Latin American's different sense of time. I've seen our people wash their hands of dealings with Latins on this account. This comes from a lack of understanding of the time sense of the culture, and one who has proper preparation for working in a Latin culture comes to understand their way of working.

What I used to do when I had an appointment with a Latin official was to winkingly ask whether our appointment was on "tiempo Latino" or "tiempo Norteamericano"—Latin American time or North American time. Then if we agreed on Latin time, I'd be an hour late, too, and everyone would be happy.

Similarly I have seen U.S. technicians render themselves unconsciously totally ineffective because they used gestures, quite natural in our society, but highly offensive in the foreign culture. Without realizing it, our people would gravely insult the Latins with whom they were working, by pointing at them for instance in emphasizing some matter of particular importance. The volunteers are prepared in these matters and know what to expect.

The Peace Corps has, I believe, the lowest return rate of any agency working overseas, public or private. This low return, with its concomitant economies, is due largely to the careful preparation during training and the selection out before they go overseas of people unfit for overseas service. We have done much to avoid loss by way of cultural shock because our people know what to expect and get practical simulated training before they leave, or Latin American programs, usually in Puerto Rico. We have avoided great loss through illness by preparing the volunteers with knowledge of the diseases to which they will be subject and proper preventative measures. I think this experience with the value of training is an invaluable lesson for all of our overseas operations.

The chief limitation on the effectiveness of the Peace Corps as an instrument of development, in my view, is the numbers of people it can send. If we are to have a meaningful effect on the development of the developing nations by working in the slums and villages, we will need many more people than we are sending now through the Peace Corps. Indeed, we could probably lose our whole cadre of 10,000 volunteers who are serving now worldwide just in the villages and slums of India alone, and still leave the country of India largely uncovered. In my view, with the background of Peace Corps success, we should be looking for ways to vastly expand our success through the Peace Corps rather than encouraging it to level off.

I certainly do not propose that we increase numbers of volunteers by lowering our standards. The Peace Corps has learned dramatically that the more volunteers there are abroad, the more important it is to have highest quality. Throughout the years, it has stiffened rather than relaxed its standards, and properly so. What we do need to do is find ways of attracting more highly qualified people, for the demand for volunteers and the growth in demand has always far exceeded the supply and its growth.

I have three suggestions in this regard. The first is to start utilizing higher level technicians than the average present volunteer in a program somewhere half way between the present AID and Peace Corps programs, as I have previously suggested. To compensate for the higher earning power and great economic requirements such people have in the United States, and still have them live at appropriately modest levels abroad, you might consider increasing the readjustment allowance paid them upon returning home. This measure would open a vast new resource of highly qualified people to the Peace Corps potential.

Another method of increasing the supply of qualified volunteers would be to make eligible for Peace Corps service married couples with minor children where both parents are willing to serve. We have had some experience with such family volunteers in instances where couples overseas have children during their service, and they have worked out very well. The volunteer mother is no more incapacitated for service than are working mothers in the United States and frequently there is much to be gained from having the community observe the volunteer mother's child care techniques. The blessed event overseas always creates a feeling of empathy between the volunteers and the community and a feeling of empathy between the Peace Corps mother and local women. There are undoubtedly thousands of families in the United States who would serve and serve well if they were given the opportunity to do so. Obviously, there would be a slight increase in per-volunteer cost, but I think the cost would be well worth it.

A third way to tap more qualified people for volunteer service would be to permit Peace Corps service successfully completed as an alternative to military service. Indeed, I have always been disturbed at the number of highly capable people who, by one means or another, are able to avoid national service altogether, be it from pursuing education, from physical handicaps or from other sources.

I think it well worth exploring a requirement of universal national service that would apply to everyone in the country, regardless of reasonable physical or mental handicaps and perhaps permit a choice, for those qualified, or meeting their obligation either through the Peace Corps, work in the poverty program or through military service.

Almost every handicapped person could play a useful role in some aspect of one or another of these programs, and it is my feeling that service in any of them is as valuable as in any of the others. Exceptions would, of course, have to be made for periods of national emergency and, at times, some quota system might have to be applied. This would permit men and women, particularly those who plan to go into professions such as medicine or law that require long educational periods, to be available for useful service. Many of these people now feel they cannot afford to sacrifice 4 years from their professional training for Peace Corps or poverty and military service, but would enthusiastically perform one 2-year stint in any of these services.

Perhaps the committee will think of other ways in which the supply of qualified volunteers could be expanded. One additional suggestion to get more noncollege skilled workers into the Peace Corps, for example, is to permit longer training periods for them.

If we are to capitalize on the good results of the Peace Corps, and really see it make a difference for the developing countries and for our role with respect to them, the numbers of volunteers and volunteer-type workers should be increased substantially.

Still another factor in the Peace Corps success story is the apolitical basis on which Peace Corps assistance is given. We have made it clear that the volunteers are being sent to help the people to achieve their aspirations for development, not as tools of our foreign policy. The fact that the volunteers were permitted to stay in Ghana even while we were having severe political difficulties with the Ghanian Government, or recently in the Dominican Republic and Panama during the crises there, is an important demonstration of their apolitical nature—and a very important factor in their acceptance abroad even during periods of critical relationships with the United States. As Dean Rusk stated upon the formation of the Peace Corps, if the organization is ever used as a tool of our foreign policy it would instantly lose its foreign policy effectiveness.

Here again is a principle that could well be extended to our other developmental efforts. Many countries find our developmental assistance suspect because it is used for short-term political goals as a tool of foreign policy, to be increased as an inducement for the government to perform or refrain from some act to meet our policy objectives and to be withdrawn or reduced as a rebuke for acts upon which we frown.

The people in these countries distrust assistance so government-connected and which is subject to termination for political reasons to their detriment. Handling developmental funds in such a political manner detracts seriously from their acceptance abroad and from the effectiveness with which developmental projects can be carried out.

I think we should divorce completely our developmental funds from politics, using them only to pursue our own long-term self-interest of aiding the people of the developing countries to help themselves and experience meaningful progress under non-Communist auspices. The only suitable alternative, as I see it, is the less desirable one of funneling most or all of our developmental funds through international organizations as Senator FULBRIGHT has suggested.

A good example of the increased effectiveness of the Peace Corps because of its apolitical nature was our recent experience in the Dominican Republic. The volunteers were accepted and trusted by both sides because of their solely developmental role. While our forces were landing and occupying parts of Santo Domingo in the midst of the civil war, Peace Corps volunteers were working in hospitals serving both sides, distributing food, moving back and forth between the lines. Because the volunteers' commitment to the people of the Dominican Republic was total, their acceptance was total. This did not happen simply because the volunteers had built up a reservoir of good will or because they were nice guys. It happened because the Dominican people have very basic, legitimate aspirations to improve their lives and because the Peace Corps volunteers were helping those aspirations come true, with patently no ax to grind.

Indeed, in this aspect, the fact that volunteers were permitted to stay despite statements by some of them that might be construed as critical of the actions of the administration was a great demonstration of our free speech and a very helpful demonstration of the apolitical nature of the volunteer efforts; it substantially increased their acceptance and effectiveness, despite the fact that it may have been somewhat embarrassing to the U.S. policies being executed.

These volunteers in the Dominican Republic, like the 10,000 other volunteers around the world, are not super men or women with extraordinary powers. They have no wand they can wave to permit the developing countries to leapfrog centuries of progress. The only magic they possess is the magic of concern, of caring enough to act. As they help on the people's own terms, within their own capabilities, the volunteers learn as much as they teach. But if any of you doubt that the volunteers' work is effective, that they have struck a deep chord through their activities, I hope you will visit the volunteers, if you haven't already, the next time you go overseas, that you will get away from the principal avenues of the capital city and see for yourselves.

You will come back convinced, as I am, not just that the Peace Corps is effective and important, but that it is one of the most effective instrumentalities we have in our work abroad—and that many of the innovations of the Peace Corps are worthy of emulation in our other programs.

Before I close, I should like to say just a word about some of the specific matters that have been raised by the Peace Corps before this committee and in the other body.

First, I should like to express profound hope that you will not follow the other body's untoward amendment that would deprive either the Peace Corps or the poverty program of Mr. Shriver's services. While I would not for a moment hesitate to acknowledge that the job of heading either organization is a full-time occupation and then some for any ordinary individual, I would plead that Mr. Shriver simply does not fit that category. He has performed miracles with both organizations. Somehow he manages to stay on top of everything in both agencies and to keep both organizations infused with enthusiasm and achieving progress with the help of the excellent staffs with which he has surrounded himself. So long as he is willing to give so much of himself to run both organizations so well, I would hope we would not deprive either of these organizations or the country of his valuable leadership.

Second, I understand that the other body has imposed a flat 5-year limitation on all Peace Corps staff service. While the Peace

Corps has operated on the very healthy principle that its staff should go in, up, and out. I think such management principles are far better handled with flexibility at the executive level than by rigid fiat of legislation. There are sure to be instances where valuable executives should stay beyond 5 years—for example if a country director's service were to terminate in the midst of a crisis such as occurred in the Dominican Republic or Panama. And it seems totally unreasonable to expect career clerical staff to follow the in, up, and out philosophy.

With respect to the Foreign Service Reserve request made by the agency, again it seems to me a mistake to apply this to the clerical staff. They are career people and should not be denied the protection of civil service.

With respect to the executive staff, because of the peculiar nature of Peace Corps service, I think an exemption from civil service is quite appropriate. Peace Corps executive service requires special types of people not ordinarily available through civil service and makes extraordinary demands for sacrifice. For instance, during the first year of the Peace Corps I was out of the country traveling for 7 months and almost without exception worked a 7-day week, more often than not 14 or more hours a day. There were several stretches when the whole staff worked around the clock completely. Furthermore, all executive staff should and most do expect to do an overseas stint.

The Peace Corps has asked for more liberal research funds than allowed by the other body. I think its request is justified and will be glad to tell you some of my experiences with the beneficial results of Peace Corps research. For example, a project undertaken by New York University while I was working with the Peace Corps revealed that volunteers have defined cycles of exhiliration and depression in their work. After about 3 months of service, in particular, it was shown that almost all volunteers had a serious letdown. This was a period when their exaggerated hopes for accomplishment were frustrated, the bloom of initial excitement was off the rose, yet a period before the volunteers were able to achieve identifiable progress.

As a result of this study, conferences were instituted at this point of service at which volunteers could ascertain that their frustrations were shared by their colleagues and were not personal failures—and they could devise together new approaches for attacking their common problems. This helped enormously to hurdle a serious impediment to volunteer effectiveness. Dozens of additional examples could be given of this kind of research that was directly beneficial to operations, maximizing effectiveness and minimizing costs.

I think, too, that if the Peace Corps is to continue to be a successful innovator in foreign policy, research is an essential element to verify its experimentation.

YOUTH OPPORTUNITY CENTERS

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my very deep concern over the future of the Department of Labor's new youth opportunity center program, which has been endangered by the denial of the Department's request for additional funds in 1966 to expand the financing of this program. It is my understanding that the Appropriations Committee rejected this request because of considerations relating to the Labor Department's internal procedures in the disbursing of funds rather than because of any opposition to the youth opportunity centers program, itself. I do not quarrel with the committee's concern over whether this expenditure should come from general funds or from special trust funds, but I do state emphatically that these technical considerations should not be allowed to destroy this program in its first promising stage of development.

These centers were created within the Employment Service system in response to the recognition that undereducated, unskilled, and underprivileged youth require special services if they are to find and hold a steady job. Even relatively low-level jobs often require more education and disciplined work attitudes and habits than these youths have acquired, and automation and technological changes have all but eliminated the unskilled, semiskilled, and entry-level jobs that youth have traditionally sought. To assist unemployed youth in solving their growing problems in gaining employment, the youth opportunity center concept was developed. The result has been to make service to youth an identifiable and more dynamic program in the U.S. Employment Service.

Although special efforts and services will be directed to disadvantaged youth, all youth aged 16 through 21 will be encouraged to utilize the services of the centers. They will be offered all of the counseling, testing, labor information and job development and placement services available at the center. When all of the planned centers are in operation, it is expected that the areas they serve will contain about 55 percent of all youth in the labor forces. The other 45 percent of the youth population will be served by local public employment offices. As an integral part of the Youth Opportunity Center program, the same services planned for Youth Opportunity Centers will be adapted for the youth served in these offices. The same high quality of service will be offered to all youth, no matter where they are served.

In the initial phase of this program, the Department of Labor plans to establish some 200 centers in 105 areas with at least one in every State. Thirty-four of them have already opened and are helping young people to find temporary and permanent employment, as well as providing counseling, testing, and other services. Youth are also being referred by them to training opportunities under the Manpower Development and Training Act, work-training programs in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Job Corps camps and residences, and other community and government programs which can assist young people in becoming employable.

But now there is a danger that new centers will be unable to open and those already in operation will have to close their doors if a way cannot be found to finance the continuance of this program.

Mr. Speaker, my own district has been fortunate enough to have a Youth Opportunity Center approved to serve San Fernando and Pacoima. We have worked hard to convince the Department of Labor that these communities both need and welcome such a center. The California Department of Employment, which will operate the center, has promised that qualified members of these communities will have an opportunity to make their contribution to the work of these centers. It would be intolerable if the funds for this center were now to be denied.

The youth of our country are its most valuable resource. Every effort must be made to salvage those young persons, who, through poverty, disadvantage, or misfortune, have failed to develop occupationally and educationally to the point where they can make a satisfying and productive economic adjustment. We must not neglect those youth who need only a minimal amount of assistance to become fully productive members of society. The Youth Opportunity Centers can make a great contribution to this goal and I believe there should and must be a method to insure the continuance of this program.

VALUE OF RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hanna] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, from the comments we have heard from some of our colleagues we believe there is a measurable amount of misunderstanding about the import and content of section 101 of the Housing Act of 1965 as set forth in H.R. 5840. This section authorizes under special restrictions rent supplements to low-income families and individuals who are in need of standard housing.

The main purpose of this section is to encourage and support new construction in an area where such construction has sadly lagged. Rent supplements would be restricted to housing which is built by:

First. Private nonprofit or a limited dividend corporation, or

Second. By cooperatives and financed with market interest rate mortgages insured by FHA under section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act.

Since only relatively modest amounts of new housing are being provided for families of low and moderate income, the proposed rent supplement program would largely represent a net addition to the supply of such housing and a total increment in the homebuilding level. The projections presented to the committee anticipated 125,000 units per year over a 4-year period.

There are many low- and moderate-income families presently in need of housing which is not being built under existing programs. Public housing has been of some limited help in some areas and could continue where supported by the public and where economically feasible.

The direct loan program helps some moderate income groups as does the FHMA special assistance particularly under the below market interest rate mortgage insurance program. But all of these together reach only a small part of the low- and moderate-income families.

The approach proposed in section 101 of H.R. 5840 is to assist a tenant to new housing by paying on his behalf the difference between what he can reasonably afford to pay and a full fair rent of a unit. Such a payment would be called a rent supplement. Under the program the rent supplement is the difference between the fair market rental for the unit and the amount the family can pay with 25 percent of its income.

To be eligible a family would have to meet the following requirements: First, he must demonstrate that he cannot obtain standard privately owned housing for a rent equal to 25 percent of his income. Secondly, the eligible must belong to one or more of the following classes: elderly, physically handicapped, displaced by urban renewal or other public improvement programs, or is living in substandard housing. How many people do we expect to be eligible you might well ask. Testimony developed by the committee indicates that approximately 70,000 are displaced annually by public improvement programs who would be eligible by income. There are approximately 1.6 million elderly persons and families within the estimated income range that would be eligible for rent supplements. Finally, there are an additional 1.8 million otherwise eligible by income who are living in substandard housing presently.

The proposed rent supplement program has several advantages. As a family's income rises, the amount of rent paid by the family would increase and rent supplement would decrease. Upon losing qualification the tenant could stay on in the premises by simply paying the full fair market rent. The variations possible would permit, in the housing project, families with a wide range of income. This is far preferable to the creation of warrens of poverty that some public housing projects represent.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, this section allows the private sector of our economy to demonstrate its long touted superior ability to meet the public's need for housing once a feasible financial picture has developed. Further, the National Association of Home Builders have joined the administration in assuring that it can be done better and cheaper than by expanding public housing. I recently received a letter from a constituent of mine who has the highest reputation as a builder and as a concerned public-minded citizen, Mr. Ben Deane. I should like to quote from that letter:

> For your information, I am the division chairman of the Governmental Affairs Division (of the N.A.H.B.) of which John J. Linnehan is the staff director. With reference to the rent supplement program, this is one of the things that is somewhat controversial among our builders. I think that this controversy stems from the fact that it is not generally understood. Our builders, being small businessmen and free enterprise people, have a basic distrust for anything that includes a subsidy of this type. The theory being, of course, the more subsidy, the more Government control, the less freedom for our business, and so forth and so on. Nevertheless, the 221(d)(3) and rent supplement program can be a tool which the building industry can use to provide housing for low-income groups as a substitute for public housing. We feel that we can build more and better housing for people in this way considerably cheaper than has been the case under the public housing pattern as it now exists. Further, having built these low-income housing facilities for people as a part of the community, we think that the environment will be more conducive to making these people responsible members of the community rather than long-term wards of the State, as is too often the case in the present public housing separated institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House to consider carefully the merits of this proposal on the basis of the program as it is specifically drawn and limited. It should be the judgment of this body on the basis of fact that H.R. 5840 deserves our support and represents a substantial advance against the problem of substandard housing.

THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY: LET'S HEAR MORE ABOUT IT

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, this Representative has long been calling for a closer look by my fellow Americans at the ever expanding opportunities presented by the tremendous progress now being achieved in Asia. Sadly, however, news of Asian adversity all too often obscures news of Asian achievement. The happier view of progress in Asia generally lies hidden behind headlines of gloom and news of disaster. We constantly read of war in Vietnam, confrontation in the Strait of Malacca, tension in the Formosa Straits, or earthquakes and mine disasters in Japan. As a result when we Americans think of Asia we usually think of trouble. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is important for us to know and comprehend the story of troubles in Asia. For in a world made so tiny by missiles and jet planes that there is no longer any such thing as a "far off place," the problems of Asians have become more than ever the problems of Americans. But, Mr. Speaker, it is equally imperative for us to know the "other" story of Asia—the story of increasing progress and prosperity, of millions of people moving vigorously toward a better life for themselves and for their children. This is an exciting story. Mr. Speaker, it tells of glittering opportunities for America in Asia, and I think that all Americans should know about it and take cognizance of it.

I am therefore absolutely delighted, Mr. Speaker, that the Washington Post saw fit to devote an entire 16-page section of its Sunday, June 6, edition to this "other" story of Asia. The section is entitled "Pacific World," and the opening headline proclaims: "Nations Rimming Ocean Are Surging Ahead." The lead page of the section calls attention to the fact that, "An economic revolution of major importance is occurring in the countries of the Pacific Ocean," and observes that they "are now developing faster than many of those in the Western World." The lead articles note further that, and I quote:

> The Pacific represents new frontier societies, new governments faced with the enormous challenge of meeting the needs of their peoples. These peoples know that as a result of the intercourse of the smaller, modern world, their children's future need not necessarily be the same one of hunger, illiteracy, and physical exhaustion that they have had, and that their parents and grandparents had before them.

Then, in a series of articles these forward surging nations of the Pacific pass in review. Led by Japan who in 20 short years has dramatically risen from the ashes of military defeat to become a mighty economic giant and "the third pillar of the free world," it is truly a spectacular, exciting, colorful parade of countries on their way up: Australia, rich in oil and minerals; Taiwan, whose economic and agricultural achievements are the talk of the Orient; the Philippines, progressing steadily forward; Korea, struggling successfully to pull itself ever upward; Malaysia, the world's leading producer of rubber and marching "second only to Japan in economic strength and stability"; Thailand, where ever increasing surplus crops are being harvested and where budding industries are sprouting everywhere; Little New Zealand, the world's largest exporter of lamb, mutton, butter, and cheese; and tiny Hong Kong, the "jewel of the Pacific" where the "piledrivers have drowned out the yells of the hawkers."

In these articles opportunities for the American entrepreneur in Asia do not go unmentioned. For here is the great potential of a market composed of almost 240 million people. Here, and again I quote from the Post, are:

> The attractions of governments gaining in stability, of a rising middle class with the healthy appetites of the middle class, of official policies that encourage the establishment of pioneer industries and of a market for a widening variety of goods—a market that is close to the source of the primary materials, to modern factories, to cheap and trainable labor and to the good ports of the Pacific Ocean.

This then, Mr. Speaker, is the other story of Asia. It is dramatic. It is exciting. And it is terribly important for America. It tells of rapid industrialization and rising incomes, of developing markets and expanding opportunities. It tells of the emergence of what I call "The Pacific Community"—a community composed of the free nations of Asia and the Americas no longer separated by a great ocean but instead drawn closer together by it. The United States is an integral part of that community, Mr.

Speaker, and my own State of California serves as the great window of the United States on the Pacific. This is a young community, and its great vigor has been dramatically attested to by statistics released on January 15 of this year by the Department of Commerce. These statistics, based on a survey of America's 1963 exports, showed that, and I quote the report:

> California has displaced New York as the top exporter of manufactured goods.

Moreover, statistics also show Japan as one of America's biggest customers; that country is certainly far and away California's best customer, buying over 45 percent of my State's waterborne exports. Conversely, Japan is California's single biggest supplier. America and California are thus deeply involved in the Pacific community, Mr. Speaker. We are all benefiting greatly from the tremendous trade that is going on in this area, and we are enriching our cultural horizons as a result of increased contact with east Asian civilization. But, I submit that with respect to the mighty potential of the Pacific community, we have only begun to scratch the surface. Within the Pacific community, Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing an exciting phenomenon—a chain of development is taking place, and I believe that this is providing the basic force behind the upward movement of the entire membership of the Pacific community. The Washington Post article by Joseph Paull superbly describes the dynamics of this chain of development:

> Undeveloped countries are becoming developed countries and developed countries are becoming sophisticated. The movement is up the scale, rapid and accelerating.
>
> As development and industrialization occur, there is a simultaneous tendency toward nationalism on the one hand and regionalism on the other. Here are countries which are learning to substitute the dignity of self-reliance for the dependency of colonialism.
>
> At the same time, farmers are learning to appreciate the security of a cash return as against the perils of a hand-to-mouth subsistence. As the middle class rises, it develops its own sources of power.
>
> Wealth is being poured into these countries and is being translated into factories, dams, highways, and skyscrapers. Manpower is being used more effectively and more government brainpower is being devoted to economic planning, finance, and industrialization.

Mr. Speaker, this dynamic chain of development signals that a great victory is being won within the Pacific community over economic poverty and social stagnation. America has been a decisive factor in that victory and we can justly share in its glories. American business and American government have played and are continuing to play a great role in Asia, and we as Americans can indeed be proud of that role. But primary credit must certainly go to the peoples of Pacific Asia who have put our help to good use, who are building island and peninsular showcases of prosperity and progress throughout Asia. Those people are working hard, Mr. Speaker; they are working 10 and 12 hours a day, 6½ and 7 days a week. And they are succeeding. They are dramatically demonstrating that free enterprise and hard work, not communism, constitute the real wave of the future. We cheer their progress. We salute their achievements. We earnestly hope for their continued success. For we are all neighbors in the Pacific community. Their success is our success.

And, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Washington Post for bringing word of this great story to its reading public. In so doing, it has performed a truly outstanding service for America. I hope that the "Pacific World" section will be widely read. I also hope that the Post will continue to bring us news of this kind about Asia. More than that, I hope that other newspapers and other news media will emulate the Post in this regard. Let us hear more news of the great story of Asian progress and development. We need to know.

TEXAS BEAUTY

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that every cause, no matter how noble, has its detractors.

There is not one of us who does not applaud the President's drive to beautify America, because all of us have seen how vilely we have used this great and beautiful land of ours. Yet, I noted in a recent New York Daily News column remarks that indicated there was hardly anything in my native State worth beautifying.

Far be it from me to doubt the motives of this columnist. Let it merely be said that every man sees through different eyes. The canyons of New York may be beauty to him, and indeed they are beauty to many; but let it also be said that there is much beauty in Texas.

Those who have never seen Texas think it a desolate place. But those who have been there know otherwise. Those who have been there can tell you of great forests as well as of deserts, and can tell you of great lakes and streams and rivers, and of the matchless beaches along the gulf coast, as well as the oil derricks and ranchlands of legendary fame. Those who know Texas can tell you of great cities and tiny ghost towns; of great mountains and canyons and vast fields.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who find a peculiar comfort and sense of well-being in the great city of New York; but there are also those who find strength and mystery and a strange beauty in the low hills and great plains of Texas, and those who vow that there is more to see in Texas than in a dozen other places scattered through 10 States.

I would not for an instant detract from the beauties and glories of any other place in this Nation; but let no man tell me that Texas is not beautiful and that the drive for preserving and enhancing the great beauty of this Nation will leave Texas untouched because there is nothing to see and nothing to save. Let the doubters come to Texas and see for themselves the awesome power of the Big Bend and the quiet shrine of the Alamo; let them swim at our magnificent seashores and fish in our matchless lakes, and they will doubt no more.

LIBERATE SUBJECT NATIONS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks I include therein some very forceful statements to the Congress and to all liberty-loving Americans of good will, urging the termination of the 25-year long Soviet occupation of the Baltic States.

The statement calls for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and the end of Communist colonialism in Asia, Europe, and the Western Hemisphere.

I want to commend the Lithuanian American Council, Inc., for the strong stand it has taken in these matters, and I hope that our own Government will pursue a policy designed to carry out a program of liberation of captive peoples that is outlined in these statements.

These statements originated with Mr. K. A. Pautienis, president of the Lithuanian American Council, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio, and have been noted by many constituents of mine of Lithuanian background.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN
COUNCIL, INC.,
CLEVELAND CHAPTER,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 27, 1965.

The Honorable Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: Time and again, the question of prompt abolition of colonialism, with particular emphasis on people's rights of self-determination, has been raised in the United Nations and other international circles.

The Western Powers have complied with the majority wishes and have practically relinquished all of their control over Africa and other areas of former colonial influence. The Communist empire, both the Soviet and the Chinese portions, continues to devour new nations thus turning the whole decolonialization idea into a mockery. Red imperialism with its severity and the magnitude of its crimes exceeding those of Hitler and other tyrants, continues its search of new victims.

June 15 marks the 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression against the Baltic States with the ensuing reign of terror and systematic annihilation of their peoples. To add insult to the prolonged injustices, the Soviets are planning large scale celebrations to commemorate the liberation from the capitalistic yoke.

In order to counter this Communist propaganda, Lithuanians and the other nationalities are informing the public about the Soviet and the Chinese aims, their crimes in the occupied countries and their potential danger to our own United States.

Our enclosed declaration is a part of our program, and in order to be more effective, your help is needed.

Very respectfully submitted,

K. A. PAUTIEN'S,
President.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL,
INC., CLEVELAND CHAPTER,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 27, 1965.

To all Americans of good will:

Acting in conspiracy with Hitler's regime, the Soviet Union broke the following major treaties with the Republic of Lithuania:

1. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk of March 3, 1918, in which the Soviet Union forever renounced all claims to Lithuania.
2. The Peace Treaty of April 12, 1920, which defined the common boundaries.
3. The Non-Aggression Pact of September 28, 1926, which was extended until 1945.
4. The Soviet imposed Mutual Assistance Pact of October 10, 1939.

On June 15, 1940, with the above treaties in full force and effect, the military forces of the Soviet Union occupied the territory of Lithuania, and 2 days later repeated the same attack against the Republics of Latvia and Estonia.

Following this unprovoked aggression, the Soviet Union forcibly incorporated the three Baltic States into its empire, and proceeded to suppress, persecute and physically annihilate their peoples by mass executions and deportations to the Siberian wastelands. Various sources place the number of such victims over 1 million.

On July 23, 1940, the United States denounced this aggression of the Baltic States, and all administrations under Presidents Roosevelt to Johnson have refused to recognize the Baltic States incorporation into the Soviet Union.

During the present rise of many former Western colonies to new national independence for the first time in their histories, Lithuania, that traces its kingdom as far back as the 13th century, as well as Latvia and Estonia, continues to bear the yoke of Communist colonialism.

In view of the above, we call on all Americans of good will to aid us in our efforts to terminate this 25-year-long Soviet occupation of the Baltic States.

We call on our administration to present this illegal seizure of the Baltic States before the United Nations and otherwise demand the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

And finally, we call for the immediate end of Communist colonialism in Asia, Europe, and the Western Hemisphere.

This declaration adopted by the Cleveland Chapter of the Lithuanian American Council, Inc., on behalf of U.S. citizens of Lithuanian descent.

K. A. PAUTIENIS,
President.

THE ENCYCLICAL PACEM IN TERRIS ISSUED BY POPE JOHN XXIII

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOELSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant social and religious documents of our time is the Encyclical Pacem in Terris issued by Pope John XXIII on April 11, 1963. This great letter has rightly been the subject of very widespread interest and study.

Recently a distinguished scholar, Father Everett Morgan, S.J., of the Department of Philosophy at Marquette University, Milwaukee, presented a valuable summary and interpretation of Pacem in Terris before the World Affairs Seminar of the Wisconsin Council of Churches and the Greater Milwaukee Council of Churches.

Father Morgan's remarks have been reprinted by the Board of Christian Social Concerns of the East Wisconsin Conference of Methodist Churches.

Because of the interest in the Christian insights contained in Pope John XXIII's encyclical, I include hereafter the text of Father Morgan's statement:

A SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATION OF PACEM IN TERRIS

(By Father Everett Morgan, S.J., Department of Philosophy, Marquette University, Milwaukee)

(NOTE.—The numbers within the [] represent the paragraph numbers of the encyclical.)

PACEM IN TERRIS: INTRODUCTION

Alfred North Whitehead, a noted philosopher and scientist of our 20th century, in his book, "Adventures of Ideas," remarks: "The progress of humanity can be defined as the 'process of transforming society so as to make the original Christian ideals increasingly practicable for its individual members'. I hazard the prophesy that religion will conquer which can render clear to popular understanding some eternal greatness incarnate in the passage of the temporal fact."

Pope John in his Pacem in Terris, has done something of this for the people of our contemporary world; it was written for "all men of good will"; it requires only good will coupled with a modicum of intelligence to understand its most important message.

The message of the social encyclicals of Leo XIII, Pius XI, Pius XII, John XXIII can be summarized in these words of Fr. Charles Davis, S.J., of England:

"Theology can choose; it can remain dead and neglected, or take the pressure of the times and live; but if it chooses life, it has need of three things: (1) a university setting, (2) lay participation, and (3) the ecumenical dialog.

"For too long theology was a closed, safe system, it must today fare forth and jostle in the marketplace with old theologies and new theologies; it must breathe the university atmosphere, where contacts with other disciplines will insure its health; it needs laymen to take it into the socioeconomic and political societies; it must abandon the old wornout controversies in favor of an open dialog—one that will help theology realize its true self all the better."

Today in all parts of our society this is actually taking place; the movement is slow and in places hardly perceptible, but it is coming as surely as is the fact of the sun's rising tomorrow morning. All men of good will regardless of their religious or nonreligious commitment can take some part in this great movement. Our world will be a better place in which to work out one's perfection and salvation if this is done with prudence, enthusiasm, and with a plan. Pope John gives us, in this Pacem in Terris, an overall plan; it is left to the people of good will to implement these ideas as time, place, and circumstances will dictate, and the necessary means become available to this end. This is truly the work of God in our century, and it will be done; not without difficulties, sacrifices, and hard work, but it will be promoted because the spirit of God will be found in this great social and ecumenical movement, this widespread concern for our brothers across the face of the earth, and regardless of ethnic, racial, cultural, or religious milieu, we must be intent on furthering social justice, charity, freedom, and liberty for all mankind.

PACEM IN TERRIS: POPE JOHN XXIII

Pope John, a realist-idealist; he observes the world, he makes a judgment, and he acts. He looked first at the ordered universe; as Albert Einstein said, "Mysterious, yes, but never capricious." Pope John saw law, order, mind, and intelligence; he saw purposiveness, finality, and the plan of God being worked out through the laws of evolution in inanimate nature; in the plant and animal world of our planet. All things point to God, their author and creator; all things say, "Look higher, look beyond and behind us, for He, the great and good God made us; in His will is our order and in His mind is our very life, being, and planned activity. We dutifully carry out His will; we follow the directives of our nature; they were implanted in us by this all-wise and all-good Lord and Master. We come forth from God, and we all return to God; we glorify Him for just being what we are, and acting according to our God-given natures and essences."

Then Pope John observes man and his institutions and conduct; Pope John looked now at that being made a little less than the angels, made to the very image and likeness of God insofar as man has, like his creator, an intellect and will which enables him to know and love; to be known and to be loved; to act with freedom and self-determination; to choose the means to either perfect his nature or to frustrate it; to be virtuous or to be vicious; to be morally good or morally bad; and as a result to receive as a reward for his freely chosen life of virtue, the eternal and everlasting God; to be happy with God forever and ever; or to be unhappy and completely frustrated forever and ever.

Man has a built-in homesickness for God—either man will get back home and be happy or he will remain homesick for God unto eternity; this choice is up to man; no one can make that choice for him; it is a personal one; down in the depths of each soul this tremendous decision must be made: am I going to go with God unto eternity, or am I freely going to decide not to go with God; am I going to be stuck with myself instead of enjoying God for all eternity; this most important choice is up to each human being precisely because it is this power of self-determination and rational deliberation that sets man apart from all other creatures known to us on this planet and in the universe up to the present time.

Yes, Pope John sees man for what he truly is by nature and what he can also become with the grace of God—another Christ; the ideal of manhood and the perfection of human nature lifted up and elevated now to the supernatural order by grace which God alone can give, but which man must accept and use if he is to attain the ideal that God has in His mind from all eternity as the "perfect" embodiment of manly perfection and goodness of life.

Pope John also looks at the conduct and activities of men both past and present; he sees society; the family, the political society, the international community; he looks at the social, cultural and economic orders in all parts of the world. What is it he now sees: is it an ordered, well-organized world now? Is it the kind of socioeconomic order that positively promotes the temporal happiness and perfection of man; is it a type of political, social, and economic life that truly contributes to the common good of all men no matter where they may live on the face of this earth; is it truly a human family of brothers who love and respect one another; do men and their institutions reflect the mind of God in that they enhance and contribute mightly to the developmet of men in all walks of life; in all the regions of their little planet.

The universe beneath man, namely the creatures of God that have no intelligence and free will do God's will; they are like the guided missiles we send into space for they follow the chief engineer's orders in the control room; they are programed by God and they always do His will; they stay in orbit perfectly and in orderly fashion since they are computerized creaures working out God's plan each moment of their existence. They act like a well-ordered and carefully adjusted automated factory—with God as the chief engineer who set them going and who knows how each is going to act before He even presses the button.

It is only when we look at man's world; his institutions, his personal and individual conduct that we see disorder. Pope John saw very clearly that many things were out of kilter in this area. It was like a huge automated factory that had gone somewhat berserk; that had suddenly developed numerous short-circuits and was acting in a very dangerous manner; in fact, it looked like any moment the whole plant might just blow up in a thermonuclear holocaust which would engulf not only humanity but also many other creatures on the face of the earth. A crisis had developed, not in the material universe, not in the plant and animal world, but in the life of that creature who was made a little less than the angels. The old adage of "corruptio optimi pessima" (when the best goes bad it becomes the worst) is very apropos in this context. In short, the very evident disorders of our contemporary world, the very system which borders on chaos, are largely man made; they bear the label put on them by the production-line facilities of human society and human decisions.

It is this world that Pope John sees; it is the great and manifold disorders of this world that Pope John looks at, and he does not turn away his face; he has compassion; he has great love; and above all, Pope John has tremendous trust and confidence in the ability of men of good will to rectify this short-circuited and dangerous system. It is this call to all men of good will that marks the very heart of this encyclical Pacem in Terris, for this is the first time that a papal encyclical has been written and addressed expressly and explicitly to all the members of the human race who have a concern for its interests, and who will take up arms—those of the spirit chiefly—against this rising tide of evil in our time.

What are some of the arms that Pope John offers men of good will to restore peace, justice, freedom, and love in our international community; for remember, this plan cannot be realized unless we all become committed to the necessary means to achieve the end. As Edmund Burke has so truly written: "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing." Too long have the good men of this world—and my dear friends their number far exceeds the number of truly evil men—stayed aloof and remained apathetic in the face of social, political, and economic disorders. What the world needs today is a holy indignation, a just anger and impatience, on the part of more people of good will. As Dag Hammarskjold wrote in his book, "Markings": "Today the way to holiness of life is going to be more and more in the direction of action." And in this respect we can all take a lesson from the dedicated men and women who are committed to the spread of communism; these people never study just to obtain theoretical knowledge or to contemplate, they work and learn the Marxist-Leninist ideology in order to put it into action, to change man and society according to this new ideology and way of life.

What does Pope John recommend as the best plan and means to change the world; if perchance you think it is not in need of change then you either have a false scale of values and an erroneous notion of right and wrong in human conduct or you are living too sheltered a life and out of touch with the real world of the 20th century.

Part 1. Order between men [8–45]

Pope John starts his "Pacem in Terris" with a consideration of the dignity of man, since if a mistake is made here in our notion of man and his intrinsic worth and his place in the universe, then we will end up with a social order that will in all probability be an obstacle to his perfection and happiness, and one that will make it most difficult for man to be good and virtuous. We know how carefully planned are our jaunts into space and back to earth again. One scientist has compared the problem of getting an astronaut into space or orbit as similar to threading the eye of a needle at a distance of 1 mile—try to do this sometime. Only a few inches at take off can mean hundreds or even thousands of miles off target at the end of the journey. So likewise, if we do not understand man properly, his nature, origin and destiny, we can come up with a solution to his problems that will not add to his perfection, but will be a veritable obstacle in his way to this goal; not only to this end of man's perfection, but also it will frustrate God's plan for a world that will aid man to get back to his Creator and Lord for all eternity and for happiness unending. Revelation can give the only complete and correct picture of man—the Pope ultimately relies on this for dignity of man.

So, there must be order amongst men as individual persons. This is an order based on reason and revelation; it is the latter way of knowing about man that adds great light and insights into the human nature; the secular humanist can and has done many worthwhile and praiseworthy things for mankind, and in this we praise him; in this we heartily commend him, but it is revelation alone that can give us a genuine and correct idea of man; in the light of God's revealed truth we see man's dignity now in a far more profound manner than with just the light of unaided intellect and reason—not that we are to minimize the importance of this kind of knowledge (I have to say this to strengthen my hand as a poor philosopher; one who is intent on truth as it can be attained by the light of reason).

Once we see man as equipped by God with his whole panoply of rights—these that are part of his built-in equipment as he comes forth from God into this world—we will begin to understand how often man does not receive what is his due; he, theoretically and speculatively, has these human or natural rights from God, they cannot nor must they ever be taken from him against his will and consent, yet one has only to see our present world to know that millions upon millions of our human brothers and sisters across the face of the earth are not getting what is due to them; they are being deliberately deprived of their human rights by other human beings: by a master race, a political party, a socioeconomic system, by totalitarian dictators, and even by men of good will who do not practice a life of justice, compassion, and love—even though they may have their names enrolled in the membership books of various kinds of social groups, economic groups, yes, sad to say, even church groups.

What are some of these human rights that Pope John lists? Here are a few:

In personal or private life: right to life (what about unborn infants who are deprived in some countries by law of their right to be born; do we hear any or many men of good will clamoring today to protect these infants against being murdered by their own parents, or by doctors hired to murder them for the parents? We do not have the annual figures for murders of this nature, but it is in the multimillions).

Are we more intent on passing laws to prevent cruelty to animals, or to stop using chemical disinfectants since the bugs are being killed so inhumanely in this fashion, and then have human beings campaign and write books and articles, and veritably plead to murder little unborn babies who only ask to be allowed to live. Shall we take up arms against this enormous evil in the name of human rights, or shall we let the lives of these babies be snuffed out because men of good will are concerned, uncommitted, and so apathetic here that they can allow the numbers of such murders to be increased each year yet never raise a voice of protest? We get badly worked up emotionally when we witness a poor Negro struck on the head by a white police officer (and rightly so if he deserve this kind of treatment); do we get similarly aroused when unborn infants are deprived of their right to life? What crime are they guilty of?

Again, "each person has the right to bodily integrity, and to the means suitable for a decent living: food, clothing, shelter, rest, medical care, necessary public services which it is the duty of the community to provide for the benefit of everyone. A person has the right to be protected in the event of ill health, of infirmity arising from work, of widowhood, of impairment through old-age, of forced unemployment, or any other misfortune of which he is the innocent victim and which deprives him of what he needs, one way or another, for his sustenance. [11–12]

In the spiritual order men have a right to: Education, religious worship, choice of a state of life. [13–15]

In society: (1) in the family: right to marry, propagate, educate, and provide for children; this right belongs in the first place to parents; (2) in economic order: natural right to have a range of opportunities for employment offered to men; the right also to freedom in choosing his job as a human being; work that will not undermine his physical well-being, nor assail his moral integrity, and not be harmful to young workers and women, as wives and mothers especially. The wage must satisfy the precepts of justice; sufficient income to provide the worker and his family with a standard of living that accords with human dignity. Moreover the right to the private possession of property, yes, even productive property, but mindful that the private possession of property brings with it (and really precedes it by the nature of earthly goods which are given to all by the Creator), i.e., a social obligation. [18–22]

The right to form voluntary organizations and associations which are indispensable to society and the common good; the right to migrate; the right to play a responsible role in civic affairs, to have one's rights protected by law (e.g., civil rights and all that concerns racial justice and the right to vote, to use libraries, schools, etc., that are open to the public without any unjust discrimination.) [22–27]

Duties are linked with rights: To oneself, duties to others, in general and in civic life; i.e., to organize it well, to make it useful and suitable for human dignity, especially by leaving room for responsible action. [28–34]

What are the very pillars of the civic order? Freedom, justice, truth, love. Civic order grows out of union of minds; it is spiritual in nature; has its origin in God. A new order of society is evolving: The workingman's status is changing; women's status is bettered (no longer can women say that they constitute the largest group of human beings that is being discriminated against). [35–45] Proper adjustment to all of these changes will bring the order that leads to God.

Part II. The State and the citizen [*46–79*]

A. Political authority: (1) Comes from God, giving rights to rulers. It must be subject to God's law; must respect human dignity, when it observes God's law its commands can bind in conscience; it is thereby also a safeguard for human dignity, but conflict with God's law puts an end to just authority. Men must be able to choose their rulers, their constitutions and forms of government: This is a right of citizens. [46–52]

B. The common good: Imposes duties on citizens, and duties on rulers. On rulers: They must understand the real nature of the common good, and act accordingly; they must keep up to date, always bearing in mind the human person; make sure the common good benefits all the citizens equitably, supplying what profits the mind as well as the body; acknowledging and respecting all of the rights of citizens; harmonizing the exercise of citizens' rights and duties; protecting these rights and duties.

Public authorities must also protect the following citizens' rights and duties: Preventing the growth of unfair discrimination; they must promote the extension of these rights, bringing social as well as economic progress; in all of this they must observe impartiality, and make the observance of rights and duties easy. [53–66]

C. Principles for good government (at the national level). [67–74]

(1) No universal rule can be given as to the best form of government; i.e., the allocation of powers to be recommended, or the duties that will follow for state authorities and public officials.

(2) Good law helps promote the common good, but rapid changes are taking place in social life so rulers must be alert in bringing the laws up to date.

(3) Citizens should participate in public life, and thus turns of office are a good thing. [67–74]

D. Features of present-day relations between citizens and the state:

(1) Three things ought to be sought in the legal framework: (a) A charter (bill of rights) stating the rights of citizens; (b) a properly drawn-up constitution; (c) a definition of state-citizen relationship. (Note: The will of the people is not the source of political authority, it is ultimately God who gives it to the people "civilly united;" they transfer it to their freely chosen rulers.)

(2) All of these aspirations toward self-determination which we see today in the emergent nations show that men want to see politics conducted in a better way. [75–79]

Part III. Interstate relations [*80–129*]

A. Political authority: In conducting international relations rulers remain bound by the moral law because: (1) They cannot discard their personal human dignity and conscience; (2) they cannot be compelled by the community to disregard this human dignity nor abandon their social conscience and moral responsibilities, for political authority itself perishes if not based on the moral order.

B. The common good: in international relations the common good remains the objective and end of political authority; it also demands the observance of the moral order, [80–85]

C. Four principles for international peace:

(1) Truth as a basis, since truth makes us admit that: (a) states are equal in dignity, (b) just as clever men have special obligations to the others, so richer states have special obligations to poorer; (c) all states deserve honor, and all (even the smallest and least significant) deserve to be treated fairly when news is published concerning their affairs. [86–90]

(2) Justice as a basis of interstate relations: this regulates the mutual exercise of rights and duties, preventing oppression, solving differences through negotiation, not war; solving problems of minorities, shielding them from repressive measures (negative aspect), helping them to thrive (positive aspect), but let minorities be reasonable in what they demand and ask. [91–97]

(3) Love as a basis of international conduct; this brings about a union that is fruitful; states complement each other: (a) friendly cooperation enables intermediate groups to contribute to the common good, it matches people with the available space, matches industry with labor, solves the refugee problem which is due to unjust restrictions by states; refugees have rights, migrants have rights, praise is due for the relief given to refugees and migrants by both voluntary and other organizations and also commissions in which governments cooperate; (b) competition in armaments is the very antithesis of fruitful cooperation, and it is the states which have made the greatest economic progress that pile up the gigantic stock of arms; this forces the citizens of these countries to bear heavy burdens and other poor nations go without much needed help and capital required for their social and economic progress.

What are some reasons for this situation? Balance in armaments are said to be a deterrent to war, yet these destructive arms could destroy life from the earth. Justice, right, reason, and an appreciation of human dignity cry out to stop this arms race; they demand mutual and simultaneous reduction of stockpiles; disarmament protected by mutual and effective guarantees; all men must work together to achieve disarmament; only by mutual trust and not by a balance of armaments can lasting peace be realized; disagreements should be settled, not by force of arms, but by the norm of reason; regulated by the standards of truth, justice, and in the spirt of brotherhood; "Nothing is lost by peace, war can destroy all." [97–117]

(4) Liberty (freedom) makes it wrong for any nation to engage in activities that involve unjust oppression or unwarranted interference in the affairs of other nations. The stronger nations should help the weaker; they should venture out on new and useful enterprises whilst each retains control of any schemes for its own development; let the richer nations provide aid of all kinds to nations in the earlier stages of development; let men see how they are brothers, have a common origin, common redemption, common supernatural destiny; all called to unite in one great Christian family.

Let the aid given to the poorer countries not interfere with their liberty, and let them feel that they themselves are chiefly responsible for their own economic and social progress, or are bearing the heaviest burden in producing it. All of this is demanded by the natural law and the common law of mankind; let all people respect the distinctive characteristics of every nation and the civic institutions each has inherited; let the stronger beware of any idea of domination. If there be disputes among nations let them be settled by treaties and conventions, not by recourse to arms; it is unthinkable in this age of nuclear weapons that war can any longer be a suitable means for repairing violated rights. It is hoped that nations will create the negotiating machinery for regulating their mutual relations and come to recognize better the human bonds which bind them one to another; to see that ways of individuals and peoples are dictated by love rather than fear. [120–129]

Part IV. The world community [*130–145*]

Relations of men and of political communities with the world community. Interdependence between political communities: social, economic, political; this has now reached world level:

(1) Progress in science, technology, communications has fostered and furthered this;

(2) No nation can pursue its own interests in isolation;

(3) There is a need to promote the universal common good of all men;

(4) The human race is one family;

(5) Formerly national governments managed interstate or international affairs and relations; this is no longer enough; but, present-day political organization and authority at world level are not equal to the tremendous task imposed, too many extremely complex problems; the leaders of individual nations can no longer solve these even though they meet and agree: (a) this is not due to lack of good will, (b) it is due to a structural defect; therefore political organization and authority at a world level must be improved to match the universal common good; the worldwide implications of the common good cannot be met by anything less than world government.

In short, the state is not so much an evil in itself as it is obviously inadequate as a means or as a device for maintaining peace and by managing political power intelligently in the world of today.

Pope John speaks of several roads to peace in our time which offer themselves as feasible for men to pursue; what are some of them? (1) Pacificism, (2) pacific settlement and negotiation of disputes, (3) disarmament, (4) balance of power, (5) collective security (NATO, SEATO, etc.), (6) world government.

World government is the one that Pope John singles out as the best; it is realistic, the alternatives are unworkable, unfeasible, but world government is not an easy solution; in theory it is beautiful and attractive, in practice and actuality we must be patient and have the hope and trust of Pope John. We can narrow down the kinds of world government to these three: The Hobbesian type (the dominance of one big nation over others, e.g., Communist-dominated world community); the Confederate type (the United Nations is close to this idea); the Federal type (this operates on a majority principle; it demands some surrender of national sovereignty in view of the greater and more universal common good of all mankind; yet it permits the possibility of an optimum of national autonomy and freedom consonant in a world structure. It is this type of world government that Pope John looks toward, even though he commends the United Nations, with some reservations, as the institution that we ought to cooperate with and work with today [141–145].

The United Nations operates in these areas: economic, social, cultural, educational, health. Its highest act to date is the passing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, December 10, 1948; this document has its faults; yet it is an important step on the path toward the juridico-political organization of a world community. "It is," says Pope John, "our earnest wish that the United Nations Organization should go from strength to strength, perfecting its constitution and its agencies to meet the extent and grandeur of its tasks. May the time come soon when this Organization will be able to give effective protection to human rights: rights which derive immediately from man's dignity as a person and which, for that reason, are all-embracing, on no account to be violated and never to be filched away. There is all the more reason for wanting this today because men are now much more active in public life of their own country, take a keener interest in international affairs and are becoming ever more conscious of belonging as living members to the whole family of mankind."

Part V. Pastoral and social exhortations
[146–172]

All must play their part in building up healthy relations in civic society; contributing to the common good of the individual political community and the whole human family of mankind.

Let Catholics join with all men of good will to: serve on public bodies; influencing them from within, after gaining professional competence so that they may be respected and listened to in these groups and institutions. But technical competence is not enough; we must live and act in the temporal order so that there is created a synthesis between scientific, technical and professional elements on the one hand and spiritual values on the other.

The great Christian failure has been that even Christian states and their institutions are hardly Christianized, yet they were fashioned by men who were calling themselves Christians; there was an inconsistency between their religious belief and their action in the temporal sphere; why was this?

(1) A lack of proportion between technical and religious and moral formation and education; hence the youth must receive continuing religious training; they must be taught the proper way to carry out their actual tasks; and learning the proper way to apply the social principles in actual situations and cases that arise; this is most difficult since it is a dynamic task that admits of no definitive solution. Often, what has been achieved is so little in relation to what needs to be done.

(2) We have not cooperated with all men of good will in the past as we ought to have done. This cooperation is possible since most of the social doctrine flows from the natural law, and there are large areas for cooperation with non-Catholics, for we have much in common in this social teaching.

(3) We must be consistent in our actions so as not to compromise matters of faith and morals; we must be understanding and detached; willing to work for goals that are only naturally good.

(4) Do not confuse erroneous doctrine with the person who errs; the person still retains his dignity, and contact between believers and nonbelievers can be an occasion for discovering truth. One must distinguish between false philosophies and the movements that flow from them: the philosophies are sometimes false and erroneous regarding the nature, origin, and end of the world and of man, but we must make a clear distinction between the erroneous doctrine and the practical measures that men put into operation in social and economic matters, cultural affairs, and the management of the state; yes, even when these measures have taken their rise and inspiration from false theories. For whereas theory, once formulated, remains for all time unalterably embodied in the words which express it, practical measures, taken up as they are in circumstances which are unchangeable, cannot help being to some extent affected by these circumstances. [158–160]

So it is possible that the movements evolve in a historical context and can change and come into closer conformity with right reason; meetings that might once have been fruitless could at a later time be fruitful, to decide when that time has come is an act of prudence to be made by those directly involved in accordance with Christian social doctrine.

CONCLUSION [161–173]

1. Restoring the social order and reforming it is a gradual process and task, it is an immense one, it binds all men in a collective responsibility.

2. Not many are involved in a true way in this work, the Pope hopes that more will become involved.

3. There can be no peace between men until there is peace within men.

4. This encyclical is dictated by: the profound aspiration for peace, the desire to strengthen the kingdom of the Prince of Peace.

5. Merely human resources are not enough to accomplish this task; Pope John promises his prayers for these intentions; he bestows his blessing; given at Rome on April 11, 1963.

GRANT TO TRAIN LAWYERS IN PROBLEMS OF THE POOR

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Star of June 4 there was a story which states that Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the so-called poverty program, has made a grant of $34,000 to Howard University to train lawyers in the problems of the poor. The man who apparently is going to administer the $34,000 grant is listed as one Julian R. Dugas, director of the neighborhood legal services project. As a reason for this grant Dugas says:

> The emphasis in law schools is on serving the rich.

Mr. Speaker, I resent any such imputation to the legal fraternity and the law schools of this country. I denounce this as a libel on both.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Flynt (at the request of Mr. Stephens), on account of official business.

Mr. Bow (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), through June 25, 1965, on account of illness.

Mr. Langen (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for the balance of the week, on account of death of his mother.

Mr. Grider (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for June 10 through June 14, 1965, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Feighan, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, June 9, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Feighan, for 60 minutes, on Thursday, June 10, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Chamberlain (at the request of Mr. Burton of Utah), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Reuss (at the request of Mr. Adams), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Burke and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ullman.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Burton of Utah) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Fino.
Mr. Burton of Utah.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Adams) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Whitener.
Mr. Weltner.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1004. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1516. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2089. An act to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under

its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 9, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1209. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Annual Report of the Governor of the Virgin Islands for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 11 of the Virgin Islands Organic Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 3014. A bill to regulate the labeling and advertising of cigarettes, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans Affairs. H.R. 202. A bill to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals and the closing of such hospitals; with amendments (Rept. No. 450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 205. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans' educational assistance program; with amendments (Rept. No. 451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 206. A bill to provide a realistic cost-of-living increase in rates of subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training and to the sons and daughters of deceased or permanently and totally disabled veterans pursuing a program of education under the war orphans' educational assistance program; with amendments (Rept. No. 452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 208. A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to extend to all totally disabled veterans the same liberalization of time limits for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training as was authorized for blinded veterans by Public Law 87-591, and to clarify the language of the law relating to the limiting of periods for pursuing such training; with amendments (Rept. No. 453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 227. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to entitle the children of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces prior to September 16, 1940, to benefit under the war orphans' educational assistance program; with an amendment (Rept. No. 454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 235. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to repeal the provisions relating to education of Korean conflict veterans; with amendments (Rept. No. 455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2656. A bill to amend subsection (a) of section 901 of title 38, United States Code, to prescribe the size of flags furnished by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to drape the caskets of deceased veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit corporations to qualify as real estate investment trusts; without amendment (Rept. No. 481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5497. A bill to amend paragraphs b and c of section 14 of the Bankruptcy Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 457). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 415. A resolution providing for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 285, a concurrent resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums"; without amendment (Rept. No. 458). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 571. An act for the relief of Denise Hojebane Barrood; without amendment (Rept. No. 459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 686. An act for the relief of Pietrina Del Frate; with an amendment (Rept. No. 460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 916. An act for the relief of Debra Lynne Sanders; without amendment (Rept. No. 461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1627. A bill for the relief of Esterina Ricupero; with an amendment (Rept. No. 462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1274. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1362. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chu Chai-ho Hay; with an amendment (Rept. No. 464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1392. A bill for the relief of Annie Gabbay; with an amendment (Rept. No. 465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1609. A bill for the relief of Mrs. An Fu Wang Lee; with an amendment (Rept. No. 466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1638. A bill for the relief of Uichi Kayahara; with an amendment (Rept. No. 467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1821. A bill for the relief of Louis Adler; with an amendment (Rept. No. 468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1871. A bill for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo; with an amendment (Rept. No. 469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1873. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Werner; with an amendment (Rept. No. 470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1942. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Eaves; with amendments (Rept. No. 471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2277. A bill for the relief of Louis Stephen Edouard St. Laurent; without amendment (Rept. No. 472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2551. A bill for the relief of Branco da Gloria Franco Freitas; with amendments (Rept. No. 473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2570. A bill for the relief of Mui Kim Chen Liang; with an amendment (Rept. No. 474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2691. A bill for the relief of Irene A. Halkias; with an amendment (Rept. No. 475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2940. A bill for the relief of Sister Myriam (Marta Krzyzowska); with an amendment (Rept. No. 476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5209. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pavica Labetic; with an amendment (Rept. No. 477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6902. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eurina P. Richards; with an amendment (Rept. No. 478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7673. A bill for the relief of Yeghsa Ketenjian; without amendment (Rept. No. 479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 110. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the location of activities of the Committee on Government Operations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 480). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 8842. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 8843. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it a Federal crime to assault or kill supervisory employees in the postal field service while engaged in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8844. A bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code to provide for compulsory licensing of prescription drug patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 8845. A bill to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 8846. A bill to strengthen intergovernmental relations by improving cooperation and the coordination of federally aided activities between the Federal, State, and local levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 8847. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to require the Council of Economic Advisers to advise the President regarding the effect of the importation of petroleum and petroleum products on employment in the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8848. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide transportation for the immediate families of personnel of the American National Red Cross serving with the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 8849. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8850. A bill to establish a program within the Department of Commerce to make grants to the States to assist them in carrying out programs to alleviate the blight along our Nation's highways caused by abandoned motor vehicles; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 8851. A bill to provide for the retirement of enlisted members of the Coast Guard Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 8852. A bill to more effectively prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 8853. A bill to more effectively prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 8854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prohibit opening of mail by the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 8855. A bill to provide for the orderly marketing of articles imported into the United States, to establish a flexible basis for the adjustment by the U.S. economy to expanded trade, and to afford foreign supplying nations a fair share of the growth or change in the U.S. market; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 8856. A bill to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 8857. A bill to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 8858. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to delete the special requirements applicable to large school districts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8859. A bill to provide for family winter recreational use of a portion of the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area, San Bernardino National Forest, Calif., without reducing the area set aside for wilderness preservation within such forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 8860. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions (including the exemptions for dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness) to $1,000 for 1966 and succeeding years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 8861. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse; the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 8862. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1935, to increase the authorized annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 8863. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the General Federation of Women's Clubs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.J. Res. 501. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.J. Res. 502. Joint resolution to provide that a portion of the Garioa fund shall be used to assist in the establishment of Oriental College; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 503. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, relating to membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, so as to authorize certain appropriations thereunder for the fiscal years 1967 and 1968; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.J. Res. 504. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Con. Res. 429. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the 20th anniversary of the United Nations during International Cooperation Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. Con. Res. 430. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the 20th anniversary of the United Nations during International Cooperation Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Con. Res. 431. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the 20th anniversary of the United Nations during International Cooperation Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Con. Res. 432. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the 20th anniversary of the United Nations during International Cooperation Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 414. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 6400, a bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

306. By Mr. SENNER: Memorial of the 27th Arizona State Legislature requesting the President to reconsider reorganization of the Arizona customs district bordering on Mexico; to the Committee on Government Operations.

307. Also, memorial of the Arizona State Senate urging the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads to approve an alinement of Interstate Highway 40; to the Committee on Public Works.

308. By Mr. MONAGAN: Memorial of State of Connecticut, resolution honoring the merchant marine service during the observance of Merchant Marine Week; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 8864. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Badalamenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 8865. A bill for the relief of Ronald Poirier, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 8866. A bill for the relief of Harry M. Kearney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 8867. A bill for the relief of Chow Shu Wen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 8868. A bill for the relief of Halbert Hollingsworth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 8869. A bill for the relief of Demetra Kallianioti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 8870. A bill for the relief of Wynter Harper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 8871. A bill for the relief of Philipe Al Machhara (also known as Phillipp Yousef Moses); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 8872. A bill for the relief of Mr. Dimitria Mijatov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8873. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amina S. Yonan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 8874. A bill for the relief of Joanne Van Den Berg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 8875. A bill for the relief of John W. C. Wong, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 8876. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Di Paola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

223. By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the Episcopal Diocese of New York urging the U.S. Government to show its abhorrance of South Africa's racial policies and continue its work for a just and equitable resolution for human rights in South Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

224. Also, petition circulated by the West Side Democratic Club, Fifth Assembly District, New York County, N.Y., containing 2,111 signatures in support of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party and the challenge to the 5 Members of Congress from Mississippi who are presently seated in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The People of the Seventh District of Alabama Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege as representative of the great Seventh District of Alabama to give the people, for the first time, an opportunity to share with their representative in Congress their views on the vital issues of the day. The return on the questionnaire I sent to my constituents exceeded 11 percent and is an indication of the interest and concern of our people in all of the problems facing our Nation and the world.

In addition to answering the questions, many of the returned questionnaires were accompanied by letters and remarks detailing a specific concern of the writer. This free exchange of views between the people and their representative is an important part of the successful functioning of representative government.

I want to congratulate the people of the Seventh District on the thought and care with which they considered this questionnaire. It is a tribute to the intelligence and dedication to democratic principles of the people I have the honor to represent. I am sure my colleagues would be interested in the results of this poll and I include it as a part of these remarks:

Results of 7th District, Alabama, questionnaire

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you believe the Federal Government must operate within a balanced budget?	89.6	6.9
2. Do you favor a medical care program for the elderly through—		
(a) Increasing social security taxes?	16.2	18.2
(b) Purchase of private insurance that is tax exempt?	27.6	5.6
(c) Voluntary plans without Federal participation?	40.1	4.2
3. Would you favor Federal aid to education even if it meant Federal control of schools—		
(a) For teachers' salaries?	11.8	78.4
(b) For school construction?	16.8	71.8
(c) For any other purpose?	9.1	71.6
4. Do you favor the proposal to change the present quota system to increase immigration from the Pacific-Asian and African nations?	4.1	89.6
5. Do you favor a sharp reduction in—		
(a) Foreign aid to Communist nations?	81.8	12.9
(b) Foreign aid to our allies?	63.8	28.1
(c) All foreign aid spending?	69.5	23.0
6. Do you favor a minimum guaranteed living of $3,000 per year at taxpayers' expense for all Americans whether or not they earn it?	4.6	91.3
7. Labor:		
(a) Do you favor repeal of sec. 14B of the Taft-Hartley Act which would make State right-to-work laws illegal?	16.4	64.0
(b) Do you favor leaving the right-to-work laws on the books under the control of the States?	79.2	8.9
8. Do you favor expanding peaceful coexistence with Soviet Russia and other Communist nations?	40.0	46.8
9. Do you favor an amendment to the Constitution which again would make prayers legal in our schools?	89.9	5.8
10. Do you favor—		
(a) Repeal of the civil rights bill?	62.3	10.2
(b) Modification of the civil rights bill?	34.8	6.5
11. Do you favor an agricultural program which will—		
(a) Maintain rigid supports and quotas to regulate farm economy?	16.7	6.6
(b) Gradually ease supports allowing farm commodities to seek a free market?	60.9	1.9
(c) Have no supports, no controls, immediate free farm economy?	14.9	5.6
12. Do you favor doing away with the Army Reserve and combining its functions with the National Guard?	36.0	46.1
13. Do you favor a proposal now being discussed for introduction to Congress that would require you to register your firearms?	38.3	54.9
14. Do you favor reapportionment of the State legislature by—		
(a) Federal Government	4.7	26.4
(b) State Government	89.0	3.0

Duncan Urges National Research Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN], has recently expressed grave concern over the extensive concentration of Federal programs of scientific research and the impact of these concentrations on the Nation's higher education system—and ultimately upon the structure of our economy. In testimony last week before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower he made a strong case for a coordinated policy of Federal research and development that would recognize the very real national danger in such concentrations and would provide that future funds for research and development be allocated in the long range national interest.

I know that this information is important to those of our colleagues who share a concern over the present trend, and place the text of the gentleman from Oregon's [Mr. DUNCAN] testimony in the RECORD at this point:

URGES NATIONAL RESEARCH POLICY

(Statement by Representative ROBERT B. DUNCAN, of Oregon, before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee during hearings on the impact of Federal research and development policies on scientific and technical manpower, June 3, 1965)

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I appreciate your kindness in permitting me to appear before your committee this morning. I requested this opportunity, not because I pretend to any expertise in research and development policies, but because I am deeply concerned about the impact of these policies on the educational, economic, and social fabric of our Nation.

That I am not alone in this concern is evidenced by the fact that you are holding these hearings to determine the impact of the Federal Government's research and development policies on scientific and technical manpower.

I hope as a result of these hearings and those held last year by the Select Committee on Government Research of the House of Representatives, as well as the consideration given to basic policy problems in federally financed research and development by the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House, that Congress will set a definite policy for the distribution of research and development funds that will represent the national interest, rather than the specific and fragmented short-term mission interests and agency goals of a multitude of executive departments, agencies, services, bureaus, and divisions.

My examination of the hearings and committee reports available on this subject indicates that there is no coordinated executive policy for distribution of research and development funds that is correlated with the broad and long-term national interest as contrasted with immediate, short-run agency missions.

I am concerned because the information available indicates that a severe imbalance in the geographical distribution of Federal research and development funds is producing an imbalance in educational opportunities in our Nation. And that this then produces a further imbalance in the distribution of Federal research and development funds. During the past decade and a half, during which the major acceleration of Federal activity in research occurred, a vicious cycle has been established. And its existence is used by Federal agencies to justify its continuance.

At the risk of repeating information already in the hands of committee members, I am including with my remarks several tabulations from a report by the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives. These are from the committee print entitled "Government and Science, No. 4" and give a factual basis for the balance of my statement.

Prime contracts and grants awarded by DOD, NASA, AEC, HEW, NSF, Agriculture, Interior, and Commerce in fiscal year 1963 for performance of research and development

[In thousands of dollars]

Rank	State	Total	Profit organizations	Educational institutions [1]	Nonprofit organizations	"Other" performers [2]
1	California	3,807,821	3,239,856	426,778	137,540	3,647
2	New York	917,419	711,615	126,725	75,896	3,183
3	Massachusetts	451,918	214,534	175,226	61,381	777
4	Maryland and District of Columbia	445,055	323,620	89,065	31,135	1,235
5	Pennsylvania	348,986	276,669	50,581	21,096	640
6	Texas	330,870	298,163	27,062	5,035	610
7	Washington	321,273	301,886	18,108	[4] 1,053	[4] 226
8	New Jersey	287,758	255,227	28,770	2,853	908
9	Florida	247,808	230,727	14,808	1,343	930
10	Missouri	232,842	214,460	14,372	3,485	525
11	New Mexico	226,207	141,250	83,451	[4] 1,083	[4] 423
12	Colorado	221,581	201,859	14,889	4,082	751
13	Illinois	191,143	63,922	105,537	21,113	571
14	Ohio	185,735	140,332	28,577	16,274	552
15	Louisiana	181,964	171,077	9,679	[4] 1,045	[4] 163
16	Arizona	139,460	131,449	[4] 4,864	2,827	[4] 320
17	Alabama	137,314	127,569	[4] 7,302	2,257	[4] 186
18	Tennessee	133,623	121,045	[4] 10,523	1,780	[4] 275
19	Michigan	133,518	89,865	39,233	3,472	[4] 948
20	Nevada	124,474	111,921	[4] 12,324	3	[4] 226
21	Connecticut	122,985	102,974	17,516	2,270	[4] 225
22	Utah	120,019	110,970	8,774	99	[4] 176
23	Wisconsin	95,024	74,504	18,356	2,083	[4] 81
24	Virginia	73,104	60,290	[4] 9,559	3,047	[4] 208
25	Minnesota	68,853	45,584	18,632	4,106	[4] 531
26	Indiana	[4] 49,681	31,525	16,318	1,623	[4] 215
27	Idaho	[4] 27,621	[4] 21,453	[4] 5,961	60	[4] 147
28	Delaware	[4] 24,490	[4] 23,236	1,150	104	----------
29	North Carolina	21,972	3,512	[4] 13,681	4,050	729
30	Kansas	20,380	[4] 13,303	[4] 6,383	[4] 646	48
31	Iowa	18,537	1,339	16,364	707	127
32	Arkansas	17,133	[4] 14,007	2,744	81	[4] 301
33	Georgia	15,341	5,589	9,208	135	409
34	South Carolina	14,689	[4] 12,451	2,085	46	107
35	New Hampshire	14,199	[4] 10,692	3,384	49	74
36	Oklahoma	13,058	5,489	[4] 6,479	802	288
37	Oregon	12,630	1,322	[4] 9,230	1,614	464
38	South Dakota	12,216	[4] 11,112	983	40	81
39	Rhode Island	9,711	2,120	[4] 7,105	356	124
40	Kentucky	5,647	369	4,976	179	123
41	Alaska	5,554	59	4,762	48	685
42	West Virginia	5,434	1,062	2,312	1,796	[4] 264
43	Vermont	4,904	2,256	2,549	25	[4] 74
44	Montana	4,799	3,006	1,336	71	386
45	Hawaii	4,126	996	2,255	[4] 692	[4] 183
46	Mississippi	4,008	302	3,448	94	[4] 164
47	Nebraska	3,665	308	3,086	71	[4] 200
48	Maine	2,967	156	943	1,711	[4] 157
49	Wyoming	2,342	1,470	537	----------	[4] 335
50	North Dakota	2,284	1,165	926	80	113
	Total [3]	9,864,142	7,929,673	1,488,916	421,438	24,115

[1] Amounts shown include awards for operation of contract research centers.

[2] "Other" performers include all other miscellaneous performers not otherwise classified; e.g., State and local governments and private individuals not associated with institutions or companies.

[3] Does not include U.S. territories and possessions, foreign awards, and unallocated funds.

[4] These figures are within ±50 percent of the geometric mean for the column.

Source: National Science Foundation report to the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, April-July 1964.

Dollars for R. & D. to profit organizations per industrial employee

1. Nevada	$21,081.37
2. New Mexico	10,067.71
3. Arizona	2,556.92
4. California	2,383.80
5. Utah	2,201.91
6. Colorado	2,042.85
7. Louisiana	1,312.23
8. Washington	1,306.97
9. Maryland and District of Columbia	1,177.40
10. Florida	1,150.94
11. South Dakota	772.85
12. Idaho	728.50
13. Texas	600.48
14. Missouri	559.91
15. Alabama	543.01
16. Delaware	403.94
17. Tennessee	380.59
18. New York	373.40
19. New Jersey	316.98
20. Massachusetts	299.16
21. Connecticut	246.09
22. Wyoming	[1] 210.96
23. Virginia	[1] 203.59
24. Pennsylvania	[1] 196.29
25. North Dakota	[1] 193.75
26. Minnesota	[1] 191.84
27. Wisconsin	[1] 158.62
28. Montana	[1] 158.44
29. New Hampshire	[1] 131.71
30. Arkansas	[1] 122.71
31. Kansas	[1] 116.61
32. Ohio	[1] 114.78
33. Michigan	[1] 95.95
34. Vermont	62.93
35. Oklahoma	59.79
36. Illinois	53.58
37. Indiana	52.83
38. South Carolina	49.20
39. Hawaii	43.98
40. Rhode Island	17.87
41. Georgia	17.03
42. Alaska	10.89
43. West Virginia	9.45
44. Oregon	9.22
45. Iowa	7.74
46. North Carolina	6.89
47. Nebraska	4.87
48. Mississippi	2.52
49. Kentucky	2.10
50. Maine	1.53
National average	473.27

[1] These figures are within ±50 percent of the geometric mean of $149.14.

Dollars for performance of R. & D. to educational institutions in fiscal year 1963 per scientist employed by the institutions in calendar year 1962

[In thousands of dollars]

1. New Mexico	163.0
2. Nevada	109.1
3. California	63.8
4. Alaska	62.7
5. Massachusetts	55.4
6. Maryland and the District of Columbia	52.8
7. Illinois	29.6
8. Idaho	28.1
9. New York	[1] 18.8
10. New Jersey	[1] 18.4
11. Rhode Island	[1] 18.2
12. Utah	[1] 16.8
13. Colorado	[1] 16.7
14. Connecticut	[1] 16.1
15. Alabama	[1] 15.3
16. Michigan	[1] 15.1
17. Washington	[1] 14.5
18. Pennsylvania	[1] 14.2
19. Minnesota	[1] 13.8
20. Tennessee	[1] 13.6
21. Vermont	[1] 13.3
22. Hawaii	[1] 13.1
23. Iowa	[1] 13.1
24. Texas	[1] 13.1

See footnote at end of table.

Dollars for performance of R. & D. to educational institutions in fiscal year 1963 per scientist employed by the institutions in calendar year 1962—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

25. Missouri	[1] 12.3
26. Georgia	[1] 12.3
27. Florida	[1] 12.0
28. Louisiana	[1] 11.9
29. Mississippi	[1] 11.6
30. Ohio	[1] 11.3
31. Virginia	[1] 11.1
32. North Carolina	[1] 11.0
33. Wisconsin	[1] 10.9
34. Oregon	[1] 10.8
35. New Hampshire	[1] 10.6
36. Oklahoma	[1] 9.5
37. Arizona	[1] 9.1
38. Indiana	[1] 9.0
39. Kentucky	[1] 8.9
40. Arkansas	[1] 8.6
41. West Virginia	[1] 7.5
42. Kansas	6.8
43. Delaware	6.5
44. Nebraska	6.5
45. South Carolina	6.3
46. Montana	6.0
47. South Dakota	4.5
48. North Dakota	4.2
49. Wyoming	4.1
50. Maine	4.0
National average	24.9

[1] These figures are within ±50 percent of the geometric mean of 13.8.

Dollars for R. & D. to educational institutions in fiscal year 1963 per student enrolled in the fall of 1963

1. New Mexico	$4,002
2. Alaska	2,863
3. Nevada	2,201
4. Massachusetts	1,132
5. Maryland and District of Columbia	782
6. California	749
7. Illinois	450
8. Idaho	405
9. Rhode Island	399
10. New York	311
11. Colorado	[1] 303
12. Connecticut	[1] 291
13. New Jersey	[1] 265
14. New Hamsphire	[1] 253
15. Iowa	[1] 247
16. Washington	[1] 239
17. Minnesota	[1] 235
18. Vermont	[1] 230
19. Pennsylvania	[1] 225
20. Utah	[1] 216
21. Michigan	[1] 213
22. Oregon	[1] 203
23. Wisconsin	[1] 202
24. Georgia	[1] 165
25. North Carolina	[1] 164
26. Alabama	[1] 161
27. Delaware	[1] 160
28. Missouri	[1] 157
29. Hawaii	[1] 156
30. Virginia	[1] 153
31. Florida	[1] 147
32. Tennesseee	[1] 142
33. Louisiana	[1] 140
34. Indiana	[1] 139
35. Ohio	[1] 138
36. Texas	[1] 119
37. Arizona	[1] 107
38. Kansas	[1] 102
39. Oklahoma	99
40. Kentucky	89
41. Arkansas	88
42. Montana	86
43. Mississippi	84
44. Nebraska	81
45. Wyoming	75
46. Maine	72
47. West Virginia	68
48. South Dakota	63
49. South Carolina	62
50. North Dakota	61
National average	353

See footnote at end of table.

[1] These figures are within ±50 percent of the geometric mean of 203.

Dollars for R. & D. to educational institutions in fiscal year 1963 per advanced degree conferred during the 1962–63 scholastic year

[In thousands of dollars]

1. Nevada	195.6
2. Alaska	136.1
3. New Mexico	123.3
4. California	46.7
5. Idaho	27.6
6. Massachusetts	27.0
7. Maryland and District of Columbia	25.8
8. Illinois	16.9
9. Rhode Island	16.8
10. New Hampshire	13.9
11. New Jersey	[1] 13.0
12. Washington	[1] 12.1
13. Utah	[1] 11.4
14. Minnesota	[1] 11.1
15. Virginia	[1] 10.9
16. Iowa	[1] 10.9
17. Florida	[1] 10.3
18. Pennsylvania	[1] 9.6
19. Hawaii	[1] 9.2
20. New York	[1] 8.9
21. Georgia	[1] 8.7
22. Vermont	[1] 8.1
23. Connecticut	[1] 8.1
24. Wisconsin	[1] 8.0
25. Louisiana	[1] 7.6
26. Colorado	[1] 7.2
27. Ohio	[1] 7.0
28. Oregon	[1] 6.9
29. Texas	[1] 6.7
30. Alabama	[1] 6.7
31. North Carolina	[1] 6.6
32. South Carolina	[1] 6.4
33. Missouri	[1] 6.3
34. Michigan	[1] 6.3
35. Delaware	[1] 6.2
36. Tennessee	[1] 5.8
37. Kentucky	[1] 4.9
38. Mississippi	[1] 4.7
39. Arizona	[1] 4.6
40. Montana	[1] 4.6
41. Nebraska	4.4
42. Maine	4.2
43. Arkansas	4.2
44. Oklahoma	3.9
45. Kansas	3.8
46. West Virginia	3.5
47. Indiana	3.4
48. North Dakota	2.6
49. South Dakota	2.5
50. Wyoming	2.1
National average	14.3

[1] These figures are within ±50 percent of the geometric mean of 8.9.

In our failure to date to set a firm national-interest policy for the distribution of Federal research and development funds, now in excess of $15 billion a year, we have in fact made the decision that these funds will be distributed without full regard to the broad long-range national interest.

The huge research and development contracts and grants to a limited number of institutions has strengthened the faculties of these institutions and improved their facilities and equipment, and thus increased their appeal as recipients for Federal research and development contracts and grants. This, I suggest, is at the expense of other fine institutions throughout the country.

But this extends into the industrial field with both direct and indirect results. Proximity to the laboratories and research centers with major Federal contracts is both useful and important to industrial concerns engaged in production for various Federal programs, particularly in military and space-related fields. The existence of these basic resources, educational, scientific, and industrial, then encourages the location in relative proximity of second tier and related enterprises.

The spinoff from the exotic and sophisticated processes being developed for the new technologies is beginning to feed civilian industry. Processes developed for space or destruction are being adapted for earth and construction. These tend to locate near the source of the process and the means for testing and developing. This, too, is fed with Federal dollars, for the seeds were planted and nurtured to maturity under Federal research and development grants and contracts.

As you are well aware, a major concern is how to more rapidly and more effectively make available to industry the knowledge gained from federally sponsored research projects. And some progress is being made in this field with Federal help, for example, the Aerospace Research Applications Center at Indiana University, a joint Federal, private, and Indiana University enterprise.

But the location of major Federal research and development contracts in an area gives a substantial impetus to the development of the more modern technological industries that feed on the results and utilize the research personnel. And the location of these newer industrial complexes attracts additional firms and related industries. The civilian economic impact of Federal research and development contracts is significant.

The failure to set a policy in the national interest and the policy of permitting agencies (despite the oft made protests of executive coordination) to assign these projects and grants on the basis of short-run agency missions is widening the gap between first-, second-, and third-rate universities. There exists in fact as former Secretary of the Army, Elvis Stahr, Jr., now president of Indiana University, has pointed out, a brain drain on some sections of the country. This may be to the advantage of the agency in the short run, but the long-range effect is weakening to the Nation.

For the finest minds of the pockets of technological poverty created by the ad hoc research and development policies of Federal agencies are going to the already favored centers which have reached their preeminence as a direct result of Federal support. Unless Congress acts, the rich will continue to get richer and the poor poorer.

The universities of this Nation have several roles to play. Among these are being the producers of increased knowledge and producers of highly trained manpower. In the scientific and technical fields, the research and development policies of the Federal Government will be the determining factors in how well this assignment can be carried out.

For it is a fact, liberal arts colleges and technical institutions which do not have Federal research programs have difficulty in attracting capable scientists. Yet the Department of Defense has argued that it "must secure contracts with organizations which can carry out a research and development program in the most efficient manner. Therefore, excellence of the contractor in the field of science or engineering is the primary consideration when contracts are let." I challenge this assertion on the grounds that the mission approach of the Department of Defense cannot be considered apart from the broad national interest, nor apart from the necessity in the long run for a broad base for our defense efforts.

But a Department spokesman told a House committee that it had tried dispersion during the 1950's in "areas remote from traditional areas of concentration." None of these attempts, the Department testified, has "materially affected the role of major R. & D. complexes."

As a matter of fact, the Stanford Research Institute completed a study for the Department of Defense to use in determining "what factors are pertinent to geographical distribution of defense R. & D. industry." Without casting any aspersions on the objectivity of the Stanford study, this is something like assigning the fox the task of mapping the defense of the chicken coop.

In my judgment, it is against the national interest for any region of the country to be denied access to the mainstream of America's accelerating technological and scientific society. For in this denial we will freeze into the future the unfortunate imbalances of today and, in fact, make the disparity greater.

The National Science Foundation's program to develop centers of excellence is a fine gesture, and the great University of Oregon, in my district, is one of the beneficiaries of the program. A recent grant of slightly over $4 million will be very helpful. But the magnitude of the Federal research and development programs, expected to continue to expand in coming years, makes the NSF program as useful from a national point of view as using a tack hammer to drive a railroad spike.

From statistics I cited earlier, no matter what measure is taken, whether dollars of R. & D. funds per capita, per scientist, per industrial employee, per advanced degree, per student or whatever, a few States, and within them, a few areas receive a disproportionate share of Federal funds, and in gross contracts and grants a very few receive the preponderance of dollars. And because these funds have been distributed in this manner over the past decade and a half, and perhaps more, institutions and industrial complexes have been created which in turn are used for justification for continuing to place these funds in such a manner.

We are thus creating several sections of the Nation, most particularly southern California, the San Francisco Bay area, New York City and northern New Jersey, and the Boston-Cambridge areas, that under criteria apparently currently being used by NASA and the Department of Defense (two major contracting agencies) are destined to continue to expand and draw, as a magnet, the brightest and most able scientists and engineers from throughout the Nation.

I believe that it is a truism that scientists and engineers, no less than others, will go where the challenges and the opportunities are.

The massive and demanding research activities of the Federal Government have been opening the greatest opportunities and presenting the most stimulating challenges in science and engineering. It is no wonder that the brilliant men and women, often trained out in the remote areas described by the Department of Defense witness, are drawn to southern California or to the Northeast. And this in turn attracts the students who want to study with the top professors and research men who have moved into the great institutions as federally created opportunities are presented.

For the most part, the creation of these great institutions and these sophisticated industrial complexes, represents a multitude of agency decisions. And these decisions were carried out with tax dollars paid by all States. Despite chamber of commerce boasts, there is nothing unique in the southern California climate or topography, nor in the New England or Middle Atlantic States that makes research more effective or more efficient if it is conducted there. The quality of the individuals and the facilities, purchased or employed for the most part with Federal dollars, is the difference.

Advanced computers and laboratories, intricate testing and engineering facilities, and the highly knowledgeable scientists and engineers to operate them can be placed as well at the University of Oregon or Oregon State University as at California Institute of Technology; as well at the University of Wisconsin as at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and produce as much in association with the University of Michigan as with Harvard University.

People and facilities make the difference and these are where the opportunities created with Federal dollars are. Where these Federal dollars for research and development are put are conscious human decisions made most often here in Washington by a multitude of agencies, each concerned with its particular task and mission, and none with an overall national policy viewpoint.

It is this viewpoint of the national interest that we in the Congress must provide or in our failure to do so, acquiesce in the continued and greater concentration of scientific and technological brainpower and research and development facilities in a very limited number of places in the Nation. If it is our responsibility to set national policy, and I believe it is, then can we any longer defer establishing national policy and national goals in a segment of Federal activity that has such a large impact on our educational, economic and social development?

The ten States in the Northeast, the Midwest and the Far West which receive the most Federal research and development support have an annual average of 100 Ph. D. graduates per million population, as compared to 50 Ph. D. graduates per million population in the other 40 States.

As the Federal Government pumps money into the admittedly first rank universities in a limited number of areas, these expanding institutions exercise a strong stimulus on the high school students of the surrounding areas. Studies have shown that high school graduates near these educational institutions are three times more likely to go on to doctoral work than those not in favored areas, and relatively few go more than 500 miles for this opportunity.

What is the result? Can part of it be the fact that more than 75,000 high school graduates a year are capable of Ph. D. level work as compared to the 10,000 degrees actually granted? I do not know, but I hope this committee will find out, for the 65,000 young men and women of outstanding ability each year who do not reach their full potential is a shocking failure of our educational system, in which Congress may have a direct share of the blame.

I am unwilling to concede that a youngster born in southern California or Massachusetts or New York is smarter or more able than one born in Oregon or Florida or Michigan or Alaska. I am likewise unwilling to suggest that the Federal Government should be a party to making one section of the country a better place in which to be educated than another. Yet there are some schools better than others, and among the first rank universities, and those in close behind them, it is Federal support of research and development that is making the difference.

But whether the phenomenal growth of research activities at some of our superior institutions receiving huge Federal contracts and grants contributes in fact to greater advantages for the undergraduate or post graduate doctoral candidate would be worth exploring. We know able students swarm to the doors of these institutions with great hopes for learning at the feet of today's famous scientists and engineers and participating in meeting the challenges of tomorrow, but are these hopes realized in fact, or is education becoming secondary as Federal funds flow in, and top scientists and engineers leave classroom assignments for the disciplines of the laboratory?

As Federal funds finance the growth of so-called "traditional centers" of concentration of research and development funds, are we producing factories of education, with famous names on the marquee, whose roles are played in the classrooms and teaching laboratories by stand-ins, for the principals are busily engaged elsewhere on Federally financed research? Are institutional laboratory and testing facilities to become separate and distinct from the educational and training function of the university?

I do not know the answers to these questions, and many more to which you, as well as I, should seek answers. I do know that there is no doubt that Federal funds are having a profound effect on American higher education. I know that most universities and colleges are wary of this effect lest they become in practice under Federal direction and control. But the impact is there, and perhaps the question with which we are faced is not whether there should be an effect, but rather whether it shall be as the result of many agency policies directed toward various and limited agency goals, or whether the Congress of the United States shall establish a broad national policy within which academic freedom can be preserved and the entire higher educational system of the Nation consciously and deliberately improved.

The National Science Foundation in making a study of this problem used language somewhat reminiscent of the foreign aid program. The report was in terms of "emergent universities," "developing universities." Federal policy—or in fact lack of it—has turned differences into virtual uncrossable chasms—and now those left behind by conscious decision are to be treated as we would an "emergent" nation on the African Continent.

I contend that this is pure nonsense. And I protest it. I want, and I think that this view is shared by most of my colleagues and yours, that the youth of America, all of America, can share in the scientific and technical age we are in truth just entering. If the Federal Government is to engage so heavily in research and development, which I believe it must, and if it is to have such a critical effect on our development as a people, then we have the responsibility to develop those policies which will insure that all America will have the opportunity to contribute its energies and intelligence to this effort. We create the opportunities and the challenges as we will. We cannot deny them to most of the country, in favor of some of the country.

And surely, we cannot continue to create the severe disparity of opportunity on the basis that, that which was, is and shall forevermore be.

Results of Questionnaire Submitted to the 10th District of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I mailed a questionnaire to several thousand of my constituents in the 10th District of North Carolina. The mailing list that we used covered a wide cross section of our citizens, and we believe that it elicited a fair consensus of the thinking of our people.

We were pleasantly surprised at the extent of participation of our constituents in this poll. Approximately 35 percent of the questionnaires have been returned to us as of this date. I am sure that others will be forthcoming in the future.

Eight major questions of legislative policy were listed on the questionnaire. I believe that the results of the poll will be of interest to our colleagues in the House of Representatives. Therefore, the results of the poll follow:

Results of questionnaire submitted to the 10th District of North Carolina

COTTON

1. Do you favor extension of present cotton legislation which eliminates the 2-price cotton system and makes the domestic textile industry competitive with foreign textiles?

	Percent
Yes	84.82
No	9.32
No opinion	5.86

FOREIGN AID

2. (a) Do you favor continued military assistance to friendly nations?

Yes	84.47
No	12.59
No opinion	2.94

(b) Do you favor economic assistance for other nations?

Yes	29.81
No	58.56
No opinion	11.63

EDUCATION

3. Do you favor a program of partial assistance to higher education by giving the parent or sponsor of a college student a tax credit for a portion of the tuition paid?

Yes	82.96
No	15.71
No opinion	1.33

LABOR

4. (a) Do you favor Federal legislation which will repeal State right-to-work laws?

Yes	9.67
No	85.98
No opinion	4.35

(b) Do you favor extension of wage-hour-law coverage to require payment of $1.25 per hour plus overtime minimum wage to laundry, restaurant, hotel, and other employees not now covered?

Yes	54.66
No	38.33
No opinion	7.01

ANTIPOVERTY

5. Do you favor increasing the antipoverty program from $750,000,000 annually to $1,500,000,000?

Yes	13.22
No	82.96
No opinion	3.82

IMMIGRATION

6. Do you favor changing the present national origins quota system?

Yes	18.01
No	69.48
No opinion	12.51

PRAYER AND BIBLE READING

7. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to permit prayer and Bible reading in the public schools on a voluntary basis?

Yes	88.82
No	9.23
No opinion	1.95

REAPPORTIONMENT

8. Do you favor a constitutional amendment allowing State legislatures to reapportion 1 house of a 2-house State legislature on the basis of factors other than population?

Yes	40.28
No	47.56
No opinion	12.16

The 20th Anniversary of the United Nations During 1965—International Cooperation Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an important resolution has been introduced today by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In recognition of the United Nations 20th anniversary celebration scheduled for San Francisco on June 26, 1965, the resolution declares the sense of Congress "that the United States of America rededicates itself to the principles of the United Nations to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

Because 1965 is International Cooperation Year, the resolution also calls on the executive branch to strengthen international peacekeeping machinery and to try for progress in disarmament.

I have unanimous consent to set out the resolution in the RECORD. I am happy to join the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], in sponsoring this concurrent resolution:

H. CON. RES. 429

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the twentieth anniversary of the United Nations during International Cooperation Year, and for other purposes

Whereas the year 1965 marks the twentieth anniversary of the United Nations, which will be celebrated in San Francisco on June 26, 1965; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly has designated the year 1965 as International Cooperation Year; and

Whereas the President of the United States has proclaimed 1965 as International Cooperation Year, and has set up a broad program within the executive branch to review our present international policies in cooperation with a bipartisan group of distinguished private citizens; and

Whereas the President has charged those participating in the International Cooperation Year program to "search and explore and canvass and thoroughly discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace"; and

Whereas the International Cooperation Year program will culminate in a White House Conference on International Cooperation which the President has announced he will convene in November 1965; and

Whereas during the twenty years of its existence the United Nations has played an important, and at times crucial, role in pursuit of one of its stated purposes "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind"; and

Whereas during that time the United Nations has also performed a valuable service through the specialized agencies and otherwise in helping to establish human rights and to eliminate those ancient enemies of mankind—hunger, poverty, disease, and ignorance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States of America rededicates itself to the principles of the United Nations and to the furtherance of international cooperation within the framework of law and order; and that all other members of the United Nations are urged to do likewise.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that in connection with the examination for International Cooperation Year of United States participation in international cooperative activities, the executive branch should (1) review with a high sense of urgency the current state of international peacekeeping machinery with a view to making specific suggestions for strengthening this machinery, (2) review other major elements of international community and cooperation with a view to making specific suggestions to promote the growth of institutions of international cooperation and law and order, and (3) review urgently the status of disarmament negotiations with a view to further progress in reducing the dangers and burden of competitive national armaments.

SEC. 3. In order to provide for participation by the Congress in the White House Conference on International Cooperation, subject to an invitation by the President, there is hereby created a congressional delegation of twelve members to be composed of six Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Any vacancy in the membership of the delegation shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointments.

Law Day, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Georgia, JAMES A. MACKAY, recently addressed the Atlanta chapter of the Federal Bar Association in observance of Law Day, U.S.A. His address dealt with the Federal system; its development and progress today. His comments are relevant to many problems of Federal-State relations. I ask unanimous consent that it be entered at this point in the RECORD.

The address follows:

LAW DAY, U.S.A.

Mr. President, members and guests of the Federal Bar Association, it is a pleasure to be here today to participate in the observance of Law Day, U.S.A.

Last week I had the pleasure of listening to Attorney General Katzenbach speak at a similar observance of Law Day at Emory University. He was speaking to law students, young lawyers, and alumni, most of whom were in the civil practice of the law.

He emphasized that the real strength of the law is in its acceptance in the minds and in the behavior of individual citizens who understand and respect it, and who help those charged with law enforcement in the discharge of their duty. It was a great speech. It was basic.

In thinking about what I might say to you who are members of the Federal Bar and who hold so many positions of high responsibility in the Federal Government, it occurred to me that I should like to make one point: the time has come when we should mount a vigorous counteroffensive against those who create disrespect for law and Government.

Actually, I do not suggest a counteroffensive against these individuals who generate so much talk and publish so many pamphlets. I suggest that our counteroffensive be accomplished by an affirmative effort to create new understanding of the wisdom and worth of our Federal system.

Georgia can take pride in the fact that Georgians joined with citizens of the other 12 Colonies to shape the Articles of Confederation and then the U.S. Constitution. The Federal system is literally ours.

In retrospect, it is a remarkable event of history that the political leaders of the late 18th century did not just repeat the political fragmentation of Western Europe. It is a miracle that they conceived and carried out the principle of the separation of church and state. It is surprising that they could so clearly define the rights of man with which no government should interfere, as they did in the Bill of Rights. It is astounding that they could appreciate the need for a common market nearly 200 years before this idea gained currency in the countries they left. We are the beneficiaries of the fact that they did not quit trying when the Articles of Confederation failed to accomplish what was needed.

One reason we stumbled into a swamp of negativism is that we quit reading the Federalist papers and the Constitution of the United States. They are worth rereading.

Furthermore, it is important to read that phase of our history because these men lived in a time when, on the one hand, there was vast apathy and, on the other hand, there were those who stood ready to attack and criticize anyone who dared to try new solutions to old problems.

That is our situation today. We fight apathy. Someone has said that apathy is the treason of America. There is too much of it. There are those today who criticize new ideas and experimentation. There are those who like to refer to our Federal or National Government as the Central Government. This slick term tries to associate this term with the central committee of the Communist Party.

My friends, how do we take the offensive? I believe that the truth is mightier than the half-truth and a straightforward statement is more powerful than innuendo. You and I and all of us must again examine and understand the great legal principles on which this country was founded. We must look at the reasons why we have a Federal system. The Federal system was established by the people to provide for the common defense. That is why we have it today.

The Federal system was created to facilitate domestic and foreign commerce. That is why we have it today. The Federal system was established to insure justice. That is why we have it today.

In the first half of the 19th century, a debate raged as to whether the power of Federal taxation should be used for national improvements.

The Civil War resolved on the battlefield the question as to whether every human being would be a whole human being or whether some would remain three-fifths of a human being.

The last half of the 19th century saw the emergence of national problems which could not be solved by State and local governments.

The 20th century saw more of the same and it saw the increasing importance of the Federal Government in the common defense of our country and the free world.

The 1930's saw more experiment to find national solutions for national problems in our domestic economy. The search continues. We saw the drift-away from representative government, a dangerous drift, and we paid a price for it in the decline of State governments.

We saw this drift stopped and reversed by the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Baker* v. *Carr* and subsequent decisions.

Today we need to again examine the reasons for our Federal system. We need to be sure that we have a rational, commonsense Federal system, and we need to guard against drifting into a lopsided federalism.

As in the days of the beginning of our Nation, we need our Federal system to provide for our common defense. Vietnam and the Dominican Republic remind us of those tyrannical forces which would like to destroy for all time the idea of representative government and the rule of law.

We need our Federal system to insure justice for every American citizen whether he be in Selma or Manhattan, in Texas, or Alaska.

A new element has been added. A great scholar in the Library of Commerce pointed out to me that today the movement of people is just as important as the movement of goods. He said that the makers of the Constitution thought mainly in terms of the movement of goods. Now, he said, every American has a stake in the health, education, and welfare of every other American because, who knows, at the rate people move about the other fellow may be your next door neighbor. Or, who knows, you may leave that subdivision in DeKalb County, Ga., and move to De Kalb County, Ill., or Seattle for that matter.

Last week I spoke to the Atlanta Lawyers Club and I made this point to them. All of us who are legally trained and who are interested in government have a duty to adapt our Federal system to the realities of today. We need to make it work for us and not against us. We can and must make our Federal system a great instrument for the rule of law and reason. It is not "that" Federal Government—it's "our" Federal Government.

If we do this, we will do much. Arms are needed in Vietnam. But of equal importance in this world struggle are individual men and women who will, in their daily lives, build respect for the rule of law and for our Federal system of government.

Utah and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith my address to the House of Delegates of the Utah Education Association in Salt Lake City on April 24, 1965:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE LAURENCE J. BURTON, OF UTAH, BEFORE THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF THE UTAH EDUCATION ASSOCIATION IN SALT LAKE CITY, APRIL 24, 1965

It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to speak to the Utah Education Association House of Delegates today about matters of mutual concern. I am grateful to the officers and members of this body for extending this courtesy.

As a member in good standing of the UEA for a number of years, I like to think that I have some understanding of the scope of the problems, responsibilities, and opportunities that the education profession has in our State.

Utah and its educators have a rich and distinguished heritage. Without fear of contradiction, I think it can be said that no people anywhere in America put more responsibility in the hands of their educators or place more emphasis on education and expect more from their public schools than do the citizens of Utah.

As a matter of fact, it is this very heritage—our tremendous effort in support of school programs, the unusually large enrollments in Utah, the great responsibility that we place on our teachers, and the high expectations that we have always had for education—that has caused our systems in every Utah county to be stretched and strained, perhaps not to the breaking point, but certainly, to a taut position. Consequently, we have our problems today. But then, we have had them in the past. We will certainly have them in the future. The fact that problems, like the poor, will be always with us, does not relieve us of trying to solve them, just as our predecessors in this field have done before. In our efforts to make better, to refine and specialize our educational services, we seem, in a sense, to be adding to our burden. But that's all right. It is the way it ought to be.

An excellent personal education has become something that is no longer merely nice to have or desirable. Today, a good education is all but necessary if a person is to become a good citizen, a provident parent, and, as President Johnson has said, "a taxpayer, instead of a taxeater."

My short record in Congress, I think, would show that I am not nearly so sympathetic with pain-relieving welfare programs as I am in favor of programs designed to effect a permanent cure. By strengthening education, we are helping to cure, not merely relieve, some of our national problems.

While education is not the sole prescription for all the social, economic and cultural problems rampant in mid-20th century America, it is, in my judgment, the best great hope to help us achieve our national goals.

In good conscience, I have supported Federal aid to vocational schools, higher education, and manpower retraining, as well as Federal loan programs for college students. Finally, with some reservations, I supported the recently passed, so-called Federal aid to education bill which will give Utah approximately $4,100,000 this coming year. I say I supported it with reservations because in terms of what is best for Utah we could have had a better bill if the majority party had allowed some amendments. My reference to the majority is not designed as a political commentary, for indeed, it was a member of that party, Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, who sponsored the key amendment that would have made possible a more fair distribution of Federal funds among all States.

Under title I of the bill, as it passed, apportionment of funds is made to school districts on the basis of the number of school-age children living within the districts who are from families with an annual income of less than $2,000. It is estimated that Utah has 13,989 such children. However, the amount that will be granted by the Federal Government to the districts for each child in this classification will vary from State to State. This is because the Federal grant in each State will be equal to the average expenditure per student that State has already been making.

The purpose of the Green amendment was to eliminate this variance. Under terms of this amendment each State would have received the same amount of money for each qualifying child.

For example, had the Green amendment passed, Utah's per student share under title I of the act would have been approximately $201 per qualifying student as against the $187 we will receive under terms of the bill as passed. In terms of total dollars, Utah would have received some $2,811,000 under the Green amendment instead of the $2,627,000 apportioned under the approved bill. There is a danger that this bill may merely help the "rich get richer and the poor get poorer." In a colloquy with Mrs. GREEN on the House floor during the debate, I asked her, in substance, if that would not be the net effect of the apportionment formula unless her amendment were adopted. She agreed that it would be.

For example, one of our problems in Utah, as any superintendent who is trying to hire teachers can tell you, is the great disparity between what our Utah districts can pay a teacher and what the same teacher can obtain for his services in a wealthier Western State, such as California. The present bill, under title I, will give Utah the aforementioned $2,627,000 and will give California $73,145,000. Utah's per student share will be $187 as against California's $265 per student share. Other wealthy States are treated even better by this bill. New York gets $353 for each qualifying student. Connecticut gets $276; New Jersey $283. This is not an equalizing bill; I believe it should have been. It certainly does not award any E's for effort. My purpose here is not to indulge in a sour grapes recapitulation. I do think, however, that it is important to point out that now we are going to have Federal aid in the form of this act, it is not going to be a panacea for all of our Utah educational headaches.

Another aspect of title I of the bill was cause for considerable concern for Utah during the House debate. It was originally represented by sponsors of the bill that small counties having less than 100 school-age children from families in the less-than-$2,000 category would not qualify for aid. Eleven Utah counties were in this group. I urged in debate on the House floor that the bill be amended to eliminate the arbitrary 100-student minimum. Although my proposal was rejected, I have since been advised by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education that smaller counties will be eligible for aid, provided that a minimum of 3 percent of school-age children residing therein are from families earning less than $2,000 per annum.

Many people, including me, who finally voted for the bill had some genuine reservations about the role private and religious schools would play in participating in the funds. Generally, we wrote a good legislative history during the debate on this subject, and it is the intent of Congress that any services given private and religious schools should only be given through the aegis of the public schools.

My apprehension on this point stems not so much from lack of concern about the quality of private schools as it does from concern for the future of public schools. If the time ever comes that private schools have equal access to public moneys with the public schools, that will be "all she wrote" for the public school system of America. Those of us who are interested in strengthening and improving public schools must always be alert to this danger—and it is a danger. If your church or my church wants to operate its own school system, then you and I ought to pay for it—and not the public treasury.

We are all aware of the fact that many people opposed to any form of Federal aid have used the oft-heard cry of Federal controls. But make no mistake about this, there are many people sympathetic to educational problems for whom this is a real threat. Now that Federal aid is here, it is incumbent upon those of you who have said for so many years that there would be no Federal controls with Federal aid, to make Billy-well sure that there aren't any.

Some opposition locally has developed because it is said that Utah's share of the total cost of this educational bill in terms of Utah tax dollars contributed is almost $5 million, and the total that Utah stands to collect is only $4,100,000. I recognize, from a strictly parochial point of view, that this is a legitimate area of concern. Personally, however, I am not impressed with this argument. We come from a State that through reclamation projects, forest and park developments, public lands expenditures—not to mention defense outlays—receives much more in return from the Federal Government than we contribute in taxes to the Federal Treasury in those particular areas. If every State delegation merely voted along self-interest lines, all Federal programs would become enmeshed in a selfish morass and few would ever be authorized.

The bill as passed contains the following provisions in terms of Utah's participation:

Title I allows for direct aid to Utah school districts in a total amount of $2,627,783, the money to be apportioned on a formula which grants the equivalent of the average expenditure per student in Utah ($187) for each school-age child from a family earning less than $2,000 annually.

Title II provides for the expenditure of $587,662 in Utah in support of a State plan for the acquisition of library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials.

Title III would make available an estimated $690,284 for financing supplemental educational centers and services in Utah.

Title IV authorizes the expenditure of $100 million for the construction of national and regional education research facilities. No specific grants would be made to Utah under this title, although the Utah education system would certainly stand to benefit directly, together with her sister States, from the establishment and operation of such facilities.

Title V provides for a grant of approximately $207,310 to Utah to be used in strengthening the State department of public instruction.

A general provision of the act also extends for 2 more years the granting of aid to federally impacted areas under Public Law 874.

Finally, in conclusion, let me tell you that I want to help men and women of good will and sincere intent, both in and out of the Utah Education Association, achieve those high aspirations for our profession that we all seek. There may be times when we will not agree on the best course to travel, but at least I think our destination will be the same.

While I am privileged to represent this State in the Congress, it would be my hope that you will consider me a "friend at court," so to speak.

In terms of the problems of education in general, and Utah educational problems in particular, it would be my wish always to try to be a party to their solution and not a part of the problem. I hope my vote for Federal aid to education was just that.

Thanks again for the opportunity to speak to you.

Commencement, Aquinas Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure on June 5, 1965, to be invited to the ninth commencement of the Aquinas School in Milton, Mass., as principal speaker. This school was established in 1956 by the Congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph. Aquinas was founded as a nonprofit educational institution for training young women for successful careers in business and was accredited as a 2-year school of business in 1962 by the Accrediting Commission for Business Schools, Washington, D.C. It is located on a beautiful 15-acre campus at the foot of the Blue Hills in Milton.

Following is my address:

THE STREAMS AND THE OCEAN

(Commencement address delivered by Congressman JAMES A. BURKE to graduates of the Aquinas School for Girls, Milton and Newton, Mass., Saturday, June 5, 1965)

Sister Superior, Sisters, members of the faculty, parents and friends of the graduates, and members of the class of 1965, it is a distinct pleasure for me to be here with you on this significant occasion which marks another milestone in the lives of these attractive and hard-working young ladies. It is a pleasure because each commencement ceremony brings another group of American youth closer to what must be the goal of a great democratic nation; the full participation by every citizen in the economic, social, and political workings of that nation.

I am especially honored and pleased to have the opportunity of attending the last joint graduation of the Aquinas School. Your Sisters tell me that by next year the beautiful new facilities at the Newton campus will be completed, and that separate commencements will be held. Therefore, in the future, two graduation speakers will be able to share the pleasure that is undividedly mine today.

The schools of one's community, whether public or private, are a matter of vital concern to every thinking citizen. Such concern is vividly intensified if one has the privilege, as I do, of representing his area in our National Government. It is, therefore, a great source of inspiration and confidence for me, and I am sure, for others, to know that there is within our district an organization which is selflessly devoted to providing the best possible opportunities for further Christian education. The contribution of this order, the Sisters of St. Joseph of Boston, is not limited to this one institution, nor to this one period of time. For nearly 100 years now, the Sisters have played a large and expanding role in the educational history of our State and Nation. The size and diversity of the school program supported by the Boston Sisters alone is eloquent testimony to the vision and devotion of the order. For Aquinas is but one of the more than 100 educational institutions operated by the Sisters; institutions that range from a college to grammar schools, from academies to an educational clinic. And across the land, in Chicago, Los Angeles, Santa Fe, and many other cities, other motherhouses of the Sisters of St. Joseph are also engaged in this great work.

Thus, we can see that it was not a new departure for the Sisters when Mother Mary Euphrasia established your school a decade ago, but only a further instance of the order's continuing commitment to education. In the past decade, I have viewed the growth and progress of this institution with great pride and satisfaction. Ten years ago, 30 young ladies enrolled in your new school to prepare themselves through Christian education for useful and satisfying professional careers. Next fall, 400 students will begin the same experience on 2 campuses. This record of service is one in which all of you—administrators, teachers, and students—can take justifiable pride, one for which the sincere gratitude of our area, our State, and our Nation is your due.

It seems particularly fitting to me that your institution, established by an order of Christian educators, should bear the name of one who throughout his life was directly involved in the various processes of education and who is the patron of all Catholic schools. As you recall, St. Thomas was born in the first quarter of the 13th century, a period which also saw the birth of the university as we recognize it. St. Thomas began his formal studies at one of these infant universities—the one of Naples—and remained, of course, in the scholastic milieu the remainder of his life, both as scholar and teacher.

In later life, when St. Thomas had become famous through his writings and his reputation for general erudition, many younger people sought his counsel on various matters. On one occasion, a young Dominican asked for advice on how to pursue learning. St. Thomas' answer, stemming as it did from the experience gained through a lifetime of seeking knowledge, seems to me as valid today as it was when given seven centuries ago. He wrote, in part:

"Brother John, since you have asked me how one should set about to acquire the treasure of knowledge, this is my advice to you concerning it: namely, that you should choose to enter, not straightway into the ocean, but by way of the little streams; for difficult things ought to be reached by way of easy ones."

Now I think the wisdom in this advice is enhanced when we remember that St. Thomas was indeed a scholar, but not merely a scholar. Although the writings for which he is celebrated are mainly theological in nature, St. Thomas was really a many-sided broadly based individual quite aware of the real world about him. It has been said of him that he was as interested in politics or mysticism as in metaphysics or theology. From this, it would appear that his advice is applicable not only to the formal, scholastic study of the schoolroom variety, but to the greater, even limitless, study which is the living of life itself.

Today, you young ladies are passing your second significant milestone, leaving the second of the major divisions of your lives behind you. I think the two periods you have come through are examples of the little streams mentioned by St. Thomas. The first period, and the first little stream, can be equated with your life as a child in the lap of your family. When you entered the first grade, the stream of your childhood entered a larger tributary represented by formal education. There, you learned lessons from a new set of adults—your teachers—and from your new classmates as well. But just as a small brook enters a larger one and makes it even larger, so with your life: the experiences and knowledge gained in your childhood were not lost when you entered school, but joined with the new experiences and knowledge you gathered in the schools.

And now, you are at the mouth of the second stream, preparing to enter upon the ocean of the everyday world. To say that the streams traversed by you thus far are little is not to say that they are insignificant. As St. Thomas has said, the easy should come as a preparation for the difficult. The lessons you have learned may have seemed difficult at the time of learning, but they were easier than many you must learn on the ocean of the future.

In your travels on that ocean, your experiences and encounters will be more immediate and intense than those to which you are accustomed; your lessons will be more varied and less susceptible of copybook solutions; and your teachers will often be impersonal and less benign than those you have known heretofore. I must add, however, with certainty and with great delight, that if your lessons will be harder, then in like degree will your satisfaction on mastering them be greater.

You are on the threshold of a full and variegated future. The first transition you must make is that from schoolgirl to career woman. Most of you will make this change effortlessly, for, thanks to Aquinas and to your own diligence, you now possess marketable skills in a specialized, high-demand, field. As members of the American labor force, you will become producers as well as consumers. One of the problems you will face is how to balance these two functions. But then we all face that problem, whether we are Congressmen or caretakers.

You will be molders of public opinion and full partners in the governmental processes of your Nation. This may seem purely a privilege, a thing to be looked forward to. It is that indeed, but it also carries with it responsibilities. Citizenship in a democracy is exercised through the ballot; but to exercise good citizenship, you must form opinions, speak out, debate, argue, consult, persuade, read, listen, shout if necessary, and then vote.

You will be the protectors and the agents of transmission for our country's cultural, social, and religious heritage. It will not be enough for you to do your paid work well and neglect these other aspects of life. You must strike a balance, you must set up a system of priorities among many diverse matters.

And most of you will become wives and mothers. The homes you establish will be the sources of new little streams down which you will guide the next generation on its journey to the great ocean you yourselves are about to enter upon.

There are also other large problems, other tough challenges that you will face, ranging in area of occurrence from the local to the extraterrestrial. There is the ongoing ideological struggle being waged between the East and the West, with authoritarianism or freedom as the ultimate outcome, and world peace and survival hanging in the balance. There is the disconcerting split that may be developing within the very ranks of the Western allies. There is the contest being waged for space, and there will be new problems once space is conquered.

Nearer home, there are several troublesome areas of great import. There is the disgraceful situation of poverty and hunger in the most abundantly endowed land on earth. There are poverty's concomitants, ignorance and crime to be dealt with. These problems will be further complicated by the expected advances in technology and the increased incidence of automation. There is the war to be waged on killing and crippling diseases, those of the mind as well as those of the body. And far from least critical, there is the nagging, morally upsetting problem of racial equality, understanding, and civil rights.

Now it may seem to you that most of these issues will be worked out at rather a far removal from your personal lives, that their resolution will scarcely concern you in a direct manner. If you feel that way, I must respectfully say that you are mistaken. In the world of today, there can be no isolation. The problems I have cited are American problems, and as Americans you will be involved in them and affected by their resolution.

I paint a drab picture of the ocean you are embarking upon. But I firmly believe that all is not darkness. I would remind you of the words of William Faulkner upon receiving the Nobel Prize for literature, and who was one of America's greatest literary spokesmen, a man who indeed saw the world darkly, but who could say: "I believe that mankind will not merely endure; he will prevail."

Your futures, then, will be complex and demanding. They will be frought with grave issues, decisions, problems, and quandaries. I am confident, however, that through diligent exercise of the moral values, discipline, and special skills that you take away from the little streams of home, school, and Aquinas, your futures will be bright.

I thank you and extend to each of you my best wishes on your voyage.

COMMENCEMENT PROGRAM

Academic procession: Graduates, guests, faculty.

Chorus: The National Anthem.

Invocation: Rev. William J. Melea, theology instructor, Milton Aquinas.

Welcome: Sister M. Blaithin, CSJ, director of the Milton School.

Reading of award for Secretary of the Year: Barbara M. Curley, the 1964 recipient.

Presentation of the award: By Mr. James L. Barnes, S. S. Pierce Co., to Kathleen M. Murphy, class of 1962.

Introduction of speaker representing Mr. Daniel E. Duggan, chairman of the Milton Selectmen: Mr. William White, selectman, town of Milton.

Address to the graduates: Hon. JAMES A. BURKE, Congress of the United States.

Reading of the diploma: Sister M. Roberta, CSJ, director of the Newton School.

Presentation of diplomas: Sister M. Blaithin, CSJ, director of the Milton School.

Blessing of graduates and assembly: Rev. John E. Foley, theology instructor, Newton Aquinas.

Chorus: America, the Beautiful.

Recessional: Organists—Frances M. Santacross, Margaret S. Coleman, class of 1966.

MILTON GRADUATES

Two-year medical secretarial

Elaine Theresa Chipman, Milton.
Mary Katherine Coleman, Hyde Park.
Kathleen Jane Collins, Braintree.
Janet Mary Concannon, Dorchester.
Mary Margaret Curran, Milton.
Janice Elizabeth DaDomo, Hyde Park.

Carol A. DaRu, Medford.
Patricia Marie Davis, Dedham.
Carol Anne Downes, Dorchester.
Susan Marie Fitzgerald, East Weymouth.
Barbara E. Folsom, Avon.
Karen Marie Foye, Mattapan.
Kathleen Ann Gately, Brockton.
Jeanne Frances Henning, Braintree.
Barbara Helena Hoy, Milton.
Patricia Ann Kenney, Milton.
Mary J. Kosboski, Bridgewater.
Susan Elaine Krauss, Randolph.[1]
Marjorie Ann Lievi, Milton.
Nancy Ada Lyons, Mattapan.
Susan C. MacCarthy, Brookline.[2,4]
Christine M. MacDonald, Milton.
Geraldine Marie Manning, Canton.
Marilyn Lee Marney, Wollaston.[1,4]
Joanne Patricia McDonald, Braintree.
Carole Ann Meehan, Wollaston.
Deirdre Marie Moriarty, Canton.
Elizabeth Ellen Scanlan, North Quincy.[1,4]
Denise Marie Sullivan, Milton.
Mary Alice Sweeney, Brockton.
Stephanie Francesca Talkowski, South Boston.[1]

Two-year legal secretarial

Roberta Claire Anderson, Brockton.
Judith Anne Cassidy, Westwood.
Judith Eileen Flaherty, Braintree.
Barbara Ann Greene, Wollaston.
Myra Irene Jackson, Wollaston.
Donna-Marie Leaman, Newton.
Christena Gordon Minukas, Wollaston.[1,4]
Anne Marie Power, Dorchester.[3,4]
Patricia Eileen Regan, Dedham.
Christine Marie Rizzo, East Boston.[2]
Janet Marie Towle, Cohasset.

Two-year executive secretarial

Maureen A. Berry, Quincy.
Elaine C. Bellinghieri, Canton.
Patricia Lorraine Colarusso, Randolph.[2,4]
Bernadette E. Curtin, Dedham.
Georgieanna C. Dalton, Norwood.
Maurita A. Dalton, Norwood.[1,4]
Jeanne F. DeLucca, North Quincy.
Dolores Colette DuBuc, Dorchester.
Cheryl A. Egan, Quincy.[2,4]
Joanne Marie Francis, Quincy.
Geraldine T. Fraser, Quincy.
Mary T. Grimshaw, Braintree.
Dale J. Henderson, Quincy.[1]
Constance Ann Langone, Mattapan.
Marie Therese McLellan, Assinippi.
Diane M. Mello, Milton.
Sandra Jean Pylant, Hanover.
Eileen Ann Renna, Connecticut.

One-year executive secretarial

Gail Beverly Andersen, Randolph.[4]
Carol A. D'Angelo, Norton.
Paula F. Fitz, Milton.
Sheila P. FitzGerald, East Milton.
Louise E. Galvin, Canton.
Kathleen Marie Hanlon, Braintree.[4]
Mary Ellen Hickey, Rockland.
Eileen Marie Joyce, Roslindale.
Jean Marie Leardo, Revere.[4]
Paula Marie Maham, Braintree.
Anne Marie Mahoney, Milton.
Leona Eugenie Maraget, Weymouth.
Mary Ellen McMorrow, Dorchester.
Frances Louise Nolan, Westwood.
Sheri L. Wetzel, Brockton.
Priscilla Jane Winston, Hanover.

NEWTON GRADUATES

Two-year legal secretarial

Geraldine Cynthia Fleming, Newton.[1,4]
Maureen Teresa Foley, Newton.
Kathleen Mary Keating, Boston.
Carol Anne McCarthy, Lexington.
Mary Louise McClellan, Cambridge.[4]
Catherine Agnes O'Leary, Brighton.
Elizabeth Anne Scribner, Arlington.
Mary Catherine Vose, Framingham.

Two-year medical secretarial

Mary Susan Bonacci, Cambridge.
Elizabeth Jane Caminiti, Waltham.
Roseann Marie Cutroni, Cambridge.[4]
Beverly Ann Cuzzi, Watertown.
Joanne M. Devereaux, Needham.
Annette Claire Doucet, Waltham.
Ann Marie Dussault, Needham.
Barbara Marie Fernald, Connecticut.[1,4]
Arlene Frances Giordano, West Newton.
Carole Jeanne Hayes, Auburndale.
Marie Elaine Martel, Winthrop.[4]
Frances Helen McCaffrey, Brighton.[2,4]
Maureen Elaine McCormack, Brookline.
Mary Therese McKinnon, Cambridge.
Patricia Anne McMillan, Lowell.
Lorraine Rita Merola, Winthrop.[1,4]
Lorraine Anne Nolan, Newton Centre.
Janet Marie Nyren, Natick.[1,4]
Jacqueline Patricia O'Connor, Watertown.
Theresa Ann Shannon, Somerville.[3,4]
Margaret Ann Tully, Brighton.
Mary Eileen Walker, Cambridge.

Two-year executive secretarial

Maureen Theresa Carr, Brighton.
Carol Lynn Clark, Ashland.[1,4]
Patricia Marie Clark, Waltham.
Therese Anne Colandreo, Somerville.[1,4]
Louise Marie d'Entremont, Waltham.
Rita Mary Donovan, Belmont.[4]
Mary Louise Grew, Somerville.
Mary Rita Hall, Newton.
Paula Jean Irwin, Milford.
Dianne Frances Marcin, Somerville.
Virginia Anne McBride, Belmont.
Joanne O'Connor, Lowell.
Marie Rose Myrtho Plaisimond, Haiti.
Patricia Ann Sullivan, Waltham.
Judith Marie Wells, Natick.

One-year executive secretarial

Joanne Mary Callen, Watertown.
Kathleen Mary Carney, Arlington.
Geraldine J. Cioppa, Auburndale.
Anne Marie Flaherty, Brighton.
Susan Jane Galgay, Belmont.
Grace Marie Harrington, West Newton.
Nancy Ann Hawke, Arlington.[4]
Katherine Ann Healey, Waltham.
Judith Ann Johnson, Woburn.
Mary J. Maguire, Wayland.
Joan Kathleen McQuaid, Belmont.
Clara Marie Montillo, West Newton.
Joanna Scrooc, Newton.
Patricia Anne Sullivan, Tewksbury.[4]
Mary V. Toomey, Brighton.
Maureen E. Weker, Winthrop.[4]

USHERS

William Jackson.
Stephen Langone.

Federal Protection for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to make it a Federal crime to assault or kill postal supervisors acting in official capacities.

I firmly believe that the Nation's postal supervisors are entitled to the protection of the Federal criminal law when attempts are made to kill or injure them while they are performing their official duties. I urge the Congress to spell out to evildoers the fact that the long legal arm of the Federal Government protects Federal employees.

---

[1] Honors.
[2] High honors.
[3] Highest honors.
[4] Member of National Business Honor Society.